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## Motivation

- Recent intriguing progress in charmonia and bottomonia spectroscopy calls for adequate phenomenological tools for data analysis
- Many newly observed resonances reside near two-body mesonic thresholds
- so that both quark and meson dynamics affect their properties
- and the interplay of quark and meson degrees of freedom may result in quite peculiar properties of such near-threshold resonances
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$$
f(E) \sim \frac{1}{E-E_{f}+\frac{i}{2} \Gamma(k)} \quad \Gamma(k)=g_{f} k \propto \sqrt{E}
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- ... with the simple multi-channel generalisation

$$
f(E) \sim \frac{1}{E-E_{f}+\frac{i}{2} \sum_{i} g_{f}^{(i)} k_{i}}
$$

- Interplay of quark and meson degrees of freedom takes place $\Longrightarrow$ ???


## The problem

What is the generalisation of the simple Flatté formulae to account for the interplay of quark and meson degrees of freedom in a near-threshold resonance?

## Essentials of the formalism

$$
\begin{gathered}
\hat{\mathcal{H}}|X\rangle=E|X\rangle \\
|X\rangle=\left(\begin{array}{c}
c\left|\psi_{0}\right\rangle \\
\chi_{1}(\mathbf{p})\left|M_{11} M_{12}\right\rangle \\
\chi_{2}(\mathbf{p})\left|M_{21} M_{22}\right\rangle \\
\cdots
\end{array}\right) \quad \hat{\mathcal{H}}=\left(\begin{array}{cccc}
E_{0} & f_{1} & f_{2} & \cdots \\
f_{1} & H_{h_{1}} & V_{12} & \cdots \\
f_{2} & V_{21} & H_{h_{2}} & \cdots \\
\cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots
\end{array}\right) \\
H_{h_{i}}\left(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}^{\prime}\right)=\left(\Delta_{i}+\frac{p^{2}}{2 \mu_{i}}\right) \delta^{(3)}\left(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{p}^{\prime}\right)+V_{i i}\left(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}^{\prime}\right)
\end{gathered}
$$

$V_{i j}\left(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}^{\prime}\right)$ - direct mesonic interactions
$f_{i}(\mathbf{p})$ - transition between quark state and $i$-th mesonic state
$\Delta_{i}=\left(m_{i 1}+m_{i 2}\right)-\left(m_{11}+m_{12}\right)-$ splitting between thresholds

## Lippmann-Schwinger equation for the $t$-matrix

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left\{\begin{array}{l}
t_{00}=-\sum_{k} \int f_{k} S_{k} t_{k 0} d^{3} q \\
t_{i 0}=f_{i}-f_{i} S_{0} t_{00}-\sum_{k} \int V_{i k} S_{k} t_{k 0} d^{3} q \\
t_{0 i}=f_{i}-\sum_{k} \int f_{k} S_{k} t_{k i} d^{3} q \\
t_{i j}=V_{i j}-f_{i} S_{0} t_{0 j}-\sum_{k} \int V_{i k} S_{k} t_{k j} d^{3} q
\end{array}\right. \\
& S_{0}=\frac{1}{E_{0}-E-i 0} \quad S_{i}=\frac{1}{\Delta_{i}+\frac{p^{2}}{2 \mu_{i}}-E-i 0}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Exact analytic solution for the $t$-matrix

$$
\begin{aligned}
& t_{00}=-\frac{\left(E-E_{0}\right) \mathcal{G}}{E-E_{0}+\mathcal{G}} \\
& t_{0 i}=\frac{\left(E-E_{0}\right) \bar{\phi}_{i}}{E-E_{0}+\mathcal{G}} \\
& t_{i 0}=\frac{\left(E-E_{0}\right) \phi_{i}}{E-E_{0}+\mathcal{G}} \\
& t_{i j}=t_{i j}^{V}+\frac{\phi_{i} \bar{\phi}_{j}}{E-E_{0}+\mathcal{G}} \\
& \phi_{i}=f_{i}-\sum_{j} \int t_{i j}^{V} S_{j} f_{j} d^{3} q \quad \bar{\phi}_{i}=f_{i}-\sum_{j} \int S_{j} f_{j} t_{j i}^{V} d^{3} q \\
& \mathcal{G}=\sum_{i} \int f_{i}^{2} S_{i} d^{3} q-\sum_{i, j} \int f_{i} S_{i} t_{i j}^{V} S_{j} f_{j} d^{3} k d^{3} q
\end{aligned}
$$
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## Direct interaction $t$-matrix $t^{V}$

$$
t_{i j}^{V}=V_{i j}-\sum_{k} \int V_{i k} S_{k} t_{k j}^{V} d^{3} q
$$

Near threshold $t^{V}$ can be taken in the scattering length approximation (see also Artoisenet, Braaten, Kang, PRD 82 (2010) 014013)
For two channels ( $\Delta_{1}=0, \Delta_{2} \equiv \Delta>0, \mu_{1} \approx \mu_{2}=\mu$ ):

$$
\begin{gathered}
t^{v}=\frac{1}{2 \pi^{2} \mu} \frac{1}{\operatorname{Det}}\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\gamma_{s}+\gamma_{t}+2 i k_{2} & \gamma_{t}-\gamma_{s} \\
\gamma_{t}-\gamma_{s} & \gamma_{s}+\gamma_{t}+2 i k_{1}
\end{array}\right) \\
\text { Det }=4\left(\gamma_{s} \gamma_{t}-k_{1} k_{2}\right)+2 i\left(\gamma_{s}+\gamma_{t}\right)\left(k_{1}+k_{2}\right) \\
k_{1}=\sqrt{2 \mu E} \Theta(E)+i \sqrt{-2 \mu E} \Theta(-E) \\
k_{2}=\sqrt{2 \mu(E-\Delta)} \Theta(E-\Delta)+i \sqrt{2 \mu(\Delta-E)} \Theta(\Delta-E)
\end{gathered}
$$

## Counting parameters...

## A. Nefediev

## Counting parameters...

(1) Elementary state mass $E_{0}$

## Counting parameters...

(1) Elementary state mass $E_{0}$
(2) Isosinglet quark state:

$$
f_{1}(\mathbf{p})=f_{2}(\mathbf{p})=f(\mathbf{p}) \Longrightarrow f_{0} \equiv f(0)
$$

## Counting parameters...

(1) Elementary state mass $E_{0}$
(2) Isosinglet quark state:

$$
f_{1}(\mathbf{p})=f_{2}(\mathbf{p})=f(\mathbf{p}) \Longrightarrow f_{0} \equiv f(0)
$$

(3) Range parameters $R$ and $R^{\prime}$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int f^{2}(\mathbf{q}) S_{i}(\mathbf{q}) d^{3} q=f_{0}^{2}\left(R+4 i \pi^{2} \mu k_{i}\right) \\
& \int f(\mathbf{q}) S_{i}(\mathbf{q}) d^{3} q=f_{0}\left(R^{\prime}+4 i \pi^{2} \mu k_{i}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

## Counting parameters...

(1) Elementary state mass $E_{0}$
(2) Isosinglet quark state:

$$
f_{1}(\mathbf{p})=f_{2}(\mathbf{p})=f(\mathbf{p}) \Longrightarrow f_{0} \equiv f(0)
$$

(3) Range parameters $R$ and $R^{\prime}$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int f^{2}(\mathbf{q}) S_{i}(\mathbf{q}) d^{3} q=f_{0}^{2}\left(R+4 i \pi^{2} \mu k_{i}\right) \\
& \int f(\mathbf{q}) S_{i}(\mathbf{q}) d^{3} q=f_{0}\left(R^{\prime}+4 i \pi^{2} \mu k_{i}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

(9) Direct interaction parameters $\gamma_{s}$ and $\gamma_{t}$

## Counting parameters...

(1) Elementary state mass $E_{0}$
(2) Isosinglet quark state:

$$
f_{1}(\mathbf{p})=f_{2}(\mathbf{p})=f(\mathbf{p}) \Longrightarrow f_{0} \equiv f(0)
$$

(3) Range parameters $R$ and $R^{\prime}$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int f^{2}(\mathbf{q}) S_{i}(\mathbf{q}) d^{3} q=f_{0}^{2}\left(R+4 i \pi^{2} \mu k_{i}\right) \\
& \int f(\mathbf{q}) S_{i}(\mathbf{q}) d^{3} q=f_{0}\left(R^{\prime}+4 i \pi^{2} \mu k_{i}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

(9) Direct interaction parameters $\gamma_{s}$ and $\gamma_{t}$
$\left\{E_{0}, f_{0}, R, R^{\prime}, \gamma_{s}, \gamma_{t}\right\}$

## Counting parameters...
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$$
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(9) Direct interaction parameters $\gamma_{s}$ and $\gamma_{t}$
$\left\{E_{0}, f_{0}, R, R^{\prime}, \gamma_{s}, \gamma_{t}\right\} \Longrightarrow\left\{E_{f}, g_{f}, \gamma_{s}, \gamma_{t}\right\}$

## Solution of the Lippmann-Schwinger equation

$$
\begin{gathered}
t_{s}=\frac{1}{2}\left(t_{11}+t_{22}\right)+t_{12}=\frac{\left(E-E_{C}\right)\left(2 \gamma_{t}+i\left(k_{1}+k_{2}\right)\right)}{4 \pi^{2} \mu D(E)} \\
t_{t}=\frac{1}{2}\left(t_{11}+t_{22}\right)-t_{12}=\frac{2 \gamma_{s}\left(E-E_{f}\right)+i\left(k_{1}+k_{2}\right)\left(E-E_{C}\right)}{4 \pi^{2} \mu D(E)} \\
t_{s t}=\frac{1}{2}\left(t_{11}-t_{22}\right)=\frac{i\left(k_{2}-k_{1}\right)\left(E-E_{C}\right)}{4 \pi^{2} \mu D(E)} \\
D(E)=\gamma_{s}\left(2 \gamma_{t}+i\left(k_{1}+k_{2}\right)\right)\left(E-E_{f}\right)-\left(2 k_{1} k_{2}-i \gamma_{t}\left(k_{1}+k_{2}\right)\right)\left(E-E_{C}\right) \\
E_{C}=E_{f}-\frac{1}{2} g_{f} \gamma_{s}
\end{gathered}
$$
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(1) Case (i): $\left|\gamma_{s}\right| \rightarrow \infty$ and $\left|\gamma_{t}\right| \rightarrow \infty$
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$\mu=966.5 \mathrm{MeV} \quad \Delta=8.1 \mathrm{MeV} \quad g_{f}=0.25$

| Case | $\gamma_{s}, \mathrm{MeV}$ | $\gamma_{t}, \mathrm{MeV}$ | $E_{f}, \mathrm{MeV}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (i) | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | -10.47 |
| (ii) | -30 | $\infty$ | -3.22 |
| (iii) | $\infty$ | -30 | -7.77 |
| (iv) | -30 | -30 | -2.97 |

$E_{f}$ is fixed to have a bound state at $E=-0.5 \mathrm{MeV}$
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Parameter sets are similar to those describing the $X$ (3872) charmonium, however these are not fits for the $X(3872)$ data

## Complex $\omega$-plane

$$
\begin{gathered}
k_{1}=\sqrt{\frac{\mu_{1} \Delta}{2}}\left(\omega+\frac{1}{\omega}\right) \quad k_{2}=\sqrt{\frac{\mu_{2} \Delta}{2}}\left(\omega-\frac{1}{\omega}\right), \\
E=\frac{k_{1}^{2}}{2 \mu_{1}}=\frac{k_{2}^{2}}{2 \mu_{2}}+\Delta=\frac{\Delta}{4}\left(\omega^{2}+\frac{1}{\omega^{2}}+2\right)
\end{gathered}
$$



I: $\quad \operatorname{Im} k_{1}>0, \quad \operatorname{Im} k_{2}>0$
II: $\quad \operatorname{Im} k_{1}<0, \quad \operatorname{Im} k_{2}>0$
III : $\quad \operatorname{Im} k_{1}>0, \quad \operatorname{Im} k_{2}<0$
IV : $\quad \operatorname{Im} k_{1}<0, \quad \operatorname{Im} k_{2}<0$
Thick solid line corresponds to the real values of the energy $E$ on the first sheet

Pole positions in the complex $\omega$-plane


Case (iii)


Case (iv)

## Production rates

- Production from a point-like source
- Stable constituents (no events below threshold)
- No interference between production mechanisms
- Hadronic channel 1 in the final state
- Normalisation: $\int_{0}^{10 \mathrm{MeV}}(d B r / d E) d E=1$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{d B r_{q}}{d E} & \propto\left|\frac{1}{E-E_{0}} t_{01}(E)\right|^{2} \Theta(E) \sqrt{E} \\
\frac{d B r_{h_{1}}}{d E} & \propto\left|t_{11}(E)\right|^{2} \Theta(E) \sqrt{E} \\
\frac{d B r_{h_{2}}}{d E} & \propto\left|t_{21}(E)\right|^{2} \Theta(E) \sqrt{E}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Production through the quark component

(1) Solid line: $\left|\gamma_{s}\right| \rightarrow \infty$ and $\left|\gamma_{t}\right| \rightarrow \infty$
(2) Dashed line: $\gamma_{s}=-30 \mathrm{MeV}$ and $\left|\gamma_{t}\right| \rightarrow \infty$
$\mathrm{dBr}_{q} / \mathrm{dE}\left[\mathrm{MeV}^{-1}\right]$

(3) Dashed-dotted line: $\left|\gamma_{s}\right| \rightarrow \infty$ and $\gamma_{t}=-30 \mathrm{MeV}$
(9) Dotted line: both $\gamma_{s}=\gamma_{t}=-30 \mathrm{MeV}$

## Production through the first hadronic component

(1) Solid line: $\left|\gamma_{s}\right| \rightarrow \infty$ and $\left|\gamma_{t}\right| \rightarrow \infty$
(2) Dashed line: $\gamma_{s}=-30 \mathrm{MeV}$ and $\left|\gamma_{t}\right| \rightarrow \infty$
(3) Dashed-dotted line: $\left|\gamma_{s}\right| \rightarrow \infty$ and $\gamma_{t}=-30 \mathrm{MeV}$
(9) Dotted line: both $\gamma_{s}=\gamma_{t}=-30 \mathrm{MeV}$
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## Production through the second hadronic component

(1) Solid line: $\left|\gamma_{s}\right| \rightarrow \infty$ and $\left|\gamma_{t}\right| \rightarrow \infty$
(2) Dashed line: $\gamma_{s}=-30 \mathrm{MeV}$ and $\left|\gamma_{t}\right| \rightarrow \infty$
(3) Dashed-dotted line: $\left|\gamma_{s}\right| \rightarrow \infty$ and $\gamma_{t}=-30 \mathrm{MeV}$
(9) Dotted line: both $\gamma_{s}=\gamma_{t}=-30 \mathrm{MeV}$
$\mathrm{dBr}_{h_{2}} / \mathrm{dE}\left[\mathrm{MeV}^{-1}\right]$
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- there is no conspiracy between different production mechanisms

then

the interplay of quark and meson degrees of freedom
can produce line shapes of a very peculiar form
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## Conclusions

- The general formalism just presented (or one of its limits) can be used to describe date with irregularities.
- With the full expressions derived one can proceed beyond the near-threshold region.
- If data do not exhibit irregular behaviour, this formalism is useful to study to what extent (statistics, resolution, binning procedure, and so on) the data would need to improve to get sensitive to the structures potentially present.

