Ratios of Hidden-Charm Compact Pentaquark Decay Widths in Quark-Diquark Model

A. A. Dobrynina, A. Ya. Parkhomenko, A. V. Zinchenko P. G. Demidov Yaroslavl State University, Yaroslavl, Russia

October 3, 2023

Abstract

A number of resonances comparable with a hypothesis of hidden-charm pentaquark is observed by the LHCb Collaboration. We interpret these narrow resonances as compact hidden-charm diquark-diquark-antiquark systems. Within this assumption, an interplay between the charmonium and open-charm modes is considered. Ratios of such modes for non-strange pentaquarks are obtained and discussed.

1 Introduction

At present, production, properties, and decays of bottom baryons are intensively studied both experimentally and theoretically. Of special interest are Λ_b -, Ξ_b^0 - and Ξ_b^- -baryons which are decaying weakly and many decay modes are found experimentally [\[1\]](#page-5-0). Λ_b -baryon is a bound state of heavy b-quark and a pair of light u - and d -quarks. Its mass and lifetime are $m_{\Lambda_b} = 5619.51 \pm 0.23$ MeV and $\tau_{\Lambda_b} = (1.466 \pm 0.010) \times 10^{-12}$ sec, respectively, [\[1\]](#page-5-0), and such a large lifetime is due to weak interactions. More than 40 decay modes with branching fractions exceeded 10^{-6} are experimentally found [\[1\]](#page-5-0). Two exotic resonances, $P_{\psi}^{N}(4380)^{+}$ and $P_{\psi}^{N}(4450)^{+}$, consistent with the pentaquark interpretation were originally found in the $\Lambda_b \to p + J/\psi + K^-$ decay by the LHCb Collaboration [\[2\]](#page-5-1). Later in the same channel on higher statistics, the LHCb found three narrow resonances: $P_{\psi}^{N}(4312)^{+}$, $P_{\psi}^{N}(4440)^{+}$, and $P_{\psi}^{N}(4457)^{+}$, while the existence of the broad one, $P_{\psi}^{N}(4380)^{+}$, remains under question [\[3\]](#page-5-2). The evidence of the original pentaquark resonances was also announced in the $\Lambda_b \to p + \Lambda_c$ $\pi^{-} + J/\psi$ decay by the LHCb Collaboration [\[4\]](#page-6-0). The evidence of the resonance consistent with the strange $P_{\psi s}^{\Lambda}(4459)^{0}$ pentaquark was reported by the LHCb Collaboration [\[5\]](#page-6-1) in the $\Xi_b^- \to \Lambda + J/\psi + K^-$ decay of the Ξ_b^- -baryon, the $SU(3)_F$ -partner of Λ_b . Unfortunately, spinparities of all these resonances are not yet determined and theoretical speculations about their quantum numbers and binding mechanisms are still debatable (see, for example, the latest reviews on this topic [\[6–](#page-6-2)[8\]](#page-6-3)). Note that several dynamical models of pentaquarks are suggested: baryon-meson model (molecular pentaquark), triquark-diquark model, diquarkdiquark-antiquark model, etc. For example, in the diquark-diquark-antiquark model [\[9,](#page-6-4)

Figure 1: The hidden-charm pentaquark in the diquark-diquark-antiquark model used for getting the mass spectrum in [\[9,](#page-6-4) [10\]](#page-6-5).

10, dynamics is determined by interaction of light diquark $[q_2q_3]$, heavy diquark $[cq_1]$ and c-antiquark, where q_i is one of the light u -, d - or s-quarks as shown in Fig. [1.](#page-1-0) As far as the calculation of the mass spectrum in this model done and experimentally observed resonances can be successfully identified with theoretically calculated states, hidden-charm pentaquark decay mechanism is not working out completely. Here, we give arguments and qualitative estimates of a possible mechanism similar to one suggested for decays of hiddencharm tetraquarks in [\[11\]](#page-6-6).

2 Double Well Potential in Tetraquarks

L. Maiani, A. D. Polosa, and V. Riquer in [\[11\]](#page-6-6) suggested the hypothesis: a tetraquark can plausibly be represented by two diquarks in double well potential separated by a barrier. In this case, there are two length scales: the diquark radius R_{Qq} and tetraquark radius R_{4q} which are assumed to be well separated and their ratio can be estimated as $\lambda = R_{4q}/R_{Qq} \geq 3$. Tunneling transitions of quarks result into tetraquark strong decays. They have also claimed that the diquark radius R_{Qq} in tetraquark can be different from the diquark radius R_{Qq}^{baryon} Qq in baryon. An increase of the experimental resolution and statistics is crucial to support or disprove this hypothesis.

Let us start from the decays of hidden-charm tetraquarks to two D-mesons based on the $X(3872)$ as an example. Diquark-antidiquark system, $\langle [cq][\bar{c}\bar{q}] \rangle$ can rearrange itself into a pair of color singlets by exchanging quarks through tunneling transition. Small overlap between constituent quarks in different wells suppresses the quark-antiquark pair from the direct annihilation. So, the two stage process should occur within this mechanism: first, the light quark and antiquark switch of among two wells and, second, the quark-antiquark pairs obtained are evolved in their color-singlet components (two D-mesons). Including diquark spins (subscripts), consider the states [\[11\]](#page-6-6):

$$
\Psi_{\mathcal{D}}^{(1)} = [cu]_0(x) [\bar{c}\bar{u}]_1(y), \quad \Psi_{\mathcal{D}}^{(2)} = \mathcal{C}\Psi_{\mathcal{D}}^{(1)} = [cu]_1(y) [\bar{c}\bar{u}]_0(x), \tag{1}
$$

with $\mathcal C$ being the charge conjugation operator. After Fierz rearrangements of color and spin indices and assuming quarks to be non-relativistic particles, in evident meson notations one

Figure 2: The hidden-charm pentaquark decay to the charmed baryon and charmed meson.

obtains:

$$
\Psi_{\mathcal{D}}^{(1)} = A D^0 \bar{D}^{*0} - B D^{*0} \bar{D}^0 + i C D^{*0} \times \bar{D}^{*0},
$$

$$
\Psi_{\mathcal{D}}^{(2)} = B D^0 \bar{D}^{*0} - A D^{*0} \bar{D}^0 - i C D^{*0} \times \bar{D}^{*0},
$$

where A, B , and C are non-perturbative coefficients associated to barrier penetration amplitudes for different total spins of u and \bar{u} light quarks.

The other possible decay channel of hidden-charm tetraquarks is to a charmonium and light meson. The tunneling transition of light quarks is as follows:

$$
X_u \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[\Psi_{\mathcal{D}}^{(1)} + \Psi_{\mathcal{D}}^{(2)} \right] = \frac{A+B}{\sqrt{2}} \left[D^0 \bar{\mathbf{D}}^{*0} - \mathbf{D}^{*0} \bar{D}^0 \right],\tag{2}
$$

while the tunneling transition of heavy quarks with finite masses:

$$
X_u \sim a i J/\psi \times (\omega + \rho^0) \,. \tag{3}
$$

For the tunneling amplitude in the leading semiclassical approximation, one has $\mathcal{A}_M \sim$ $e^{-\sqrt{2MEl}}$, where E and ℓ are the barrier height and extension. For the constituent quark masses, m_q and m_c , $E = 100$ MeV and $\ell = 2$ fm [\[11\]](#page-6-6), one can estimate the ratio of amplitudes squared to be:

$$
R = [a/(A+B)]^2 \sim (\mathcal{A}_{m_c}/\mathcal{A}_{m_q})^2 \sim 10^{-3}.
$$
 (4)

With the decay momenta $p_{\rho} \simeq 124$ MeV and $p_D \simeq 2$ MeV [\[11\]](#page-6-6), the decay width ratio has the following estimate:

$$
\frac{\Gamma(X(3872) \to J/\psi \rho)}{\Gamma(X(3872) \to D \bar{D}^*)} = \frac{p_\rho}{p_D} R \sim 0.1.
$$
\n
$$
(5)
$$

Its comparison with existing experimental data [\[1\]](#page-5-0):

$$
B_{\exp}(X(3872) \to J/\psi \,\rho) = (3.8 \pm 1.2)\%, \qquad B_{\exp}(X(3872) \to D\,\bar{D}^*) = (37 \pm 9)\%, \tag{6}
$$

shows the excellent agreement, $R_{\text{exp}} \simeq 0.1$, but one should remember that the coefficients associated to barrier penetration amplitudes are non-perturbative quantities and require a more detail information about a potential shape and parameters entering the potential.

Figure 3: The hidden-charm pentaquark decay to the charmonium and light baryon.

3 Double Well Potential in Pentaquarks

In case of pentaquarks, similar hypothesis can be formulated: a pentaquark can be represented by the heavy diquark and heavy triquark in double well potential separated by barrier [\[10\]](#page-6-5) as shown in Figs. [2](#page-2-0) and [3.](#page-3-0) There are two triquark-diquark representations:

$$
\Psi_1^D = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \epsilon_{ijk} \bar{c}^i \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \epsilon^{jlm} c_l q_m \right] \right] \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \epsilon^{knp} q'_n q''_p \right] \equiv \left[\bar{c} \left[cq \right] \right] \left[q'q'' \right],\tag{7}
$$

$$
\Psi_2^D = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \epsilon_{ikj} \bar{c}^i \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \epsilon^{knp} q'_n q''_p \right] \right] \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \epsilon^{jlm} c_l q_m \right] \equiv \left[\bar{c} \left[q' q'' \right] \right] \left[cq \right],\tag{8}
$$

where all the diquarks are assumed to be $\overline{3}$ -color states. From the color algebra, these states are related, $\Psi_2^D = -\Psi_1^D$, but other internal dynamical properties can be different. The color connection of quarks in Ψ_1^D is used for getting the mass spectrum in [\[10\]](#page-6-5). The color structure of Ψ_2^D is suitable for study the pentaquark strong decays. This is employed in the Dynamical Diquark Model of multiquark exotic hadrons [\[12–](#page-6-7)[14\]](#page-6-8). The color-singlet combinations are meson-baryon alternatives:

$$
\Psi_1^H = \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\,\bar{c}^i c_i\right) \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}\,\epsilon^{jkl} q_j q'_k q''_l\right] \equiv (\bar{c}c) \left[q q' q''\right],
$$
\n
$$
\Psi_2^H = \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\,\bar{c}^i q_i\right) \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}\,\epsilon^{jkl} c_j q'_k q''_l\right] \equiv (\bar{c}q) \left[c q' q''\right],
$$
\n
$$
\Psi_3^H = \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\,\bar{c}^i q'_i\right) \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}\,\epsilon^{jkl} c_j q_k q''_l\right] \equiv (\bar{c}q') \left[c q q''\right],
$$
\n
$$
\Psi_4^H = \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\,\bar{c}^i q''_i\right) \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}\,\epsilon^{jkl} c_j q_k q'_l\right] \equiv (\bar{c}q'') \left[c q q'\right].
$$

From these four states, two of them, Ψ_1^H and Ψ_2^H , only satisfy the heavy-quark-symmetry condition [\[10\]](#page-6-5). The light $[q'q'']$ -diquark is transmitted intact, retaining its spin quantum number, from the b-baryon to pentaquark. Keeping the color of the light diquark unchanged, a convolution of two Levi-Civita tensors entering the triquark gives:

$$
\Psi_1^D = -\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \left[\Psi_1^H + \Psi_2^H \right]. \tag{9}
$$

The color reconnection is not enough to reexpress the pentaquark operator as a direct product of the meson and baryon operators. Spins of quarks and diquarks should be projected onto the definite hadronic spin states. One needs to know the Dirac structure of pentaquark operators to undertake the Fierz transformations in the Dirac space under assumption that quarks are non-relativistic. Let us exemplify this by considering the $P_{\psi}^{N}(4312)^{+}$ pentaquark. Diquark-diquark-antiquark operators with spinless heavy and light diquarks are [\[10\]](#page-6-5):

$$
\Psi_1^{H(1)}(x,y) = \frac{1}{3} \left(\tilde{c}^i(x) \,\sigma_2 \right) \left(c_i(y) \,\sigma_2 \, q_k(y) \right) d_0^k(x),\tag{10}
$$

$$
\Psi_2^{H(1)}(x,y) = \frac{1}{3} \left(\tilde{c}^i(x) \,\sigma_2 \right) \left(c_k(y) \,\sigma_2 \, q_i(y) \right) d_0^k(x). \tag{11}
$$

For the lowest lying pentaquark, $q = u$ and $d_0 = [u C \gamma_5 d]$, being scalar diquark. For simplicity, all the quarks are considered in the non-relativistic limit. After the Fierz transformation of the Pauli matrices and suppressing position dependence of the fields, they can be rewritten in terms of hadrons:

$$
\Psi_1^{H(1)} = -\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} \left[a \, \eta_c + b \, (\sigma \, \mathbf{J}/\psi) \right] p, \quad \Psi_2^{H(1)} = -\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} \left[A \, \bar{D}^0 + B \left(\sigma \, \bar{\mathbf{D}}^{*0} \right) \right] \Lambda_c^+.
$$
 (12)

Here, A and B $(a \text{ and } b)$ are non-perturbative coefficients associated with barrier penetration amplitudes for the light (heavy) quark. They are equal in the limit of the naive Fierz coupling. The decays of the pentaquark into the D-meson and charmed baryon and into a charmonium and light baryon through the tunneling transition are shown in Figs. [2](#page-2-0) and [3.](#page-3-0)

Similarly, diquark-diquark-antiquark operators containing heavy diquark with the spin $S_{hd} = 1$ and light diquark with $S_{ld} = 0$:

$$
\Psi_1^{H(2)}(x,y) = \frac{1}{3} \left(\tilde{c}^i(x) \,\sigma_2 \right) (c_i(y) \,\sigma_2 \,\sigma \, q_k(y)) \, d_0^k(x), \tag{13}
$$

$$
\Psi_2^{H(2)}(x,y) = \frac{1}{3} \left(\tilde{c}^i(x) \,\sigma_2 \right) (c_k(y) \,\sigma_2 \,\sigma \, q_i(y)) \, d_0^k(x). \tag{14}
$$

Being direct product of spinor and vector, they need to be separated into two states with spins $J = 1/2$ and $J = 3/2$. For $P_{\psi}^{N}(4312)^{+}$ interpreted as $J^{P} = 3/2^{-}$ pentaquark [\[9,](#page-6-4) [10\]](#page-6-5), decompositions in term of hadrons are as follows:

$$
\Psi_1^{H(3/2)} = \frac{i\sqrt{2}}{3} \left\{ b' J/\psi - 2ic' \left[\boldsymbol{\sigma} \times J/\psi \right] \right\} p, \tag{15}
$$

$$
\Psi_2^{H(3/2)} = -\frac{i\sqrt{2}}{3} \left\{ B' \,\bar{\boldsymbol{D}}^{*0} - 2iC' \left[\boldsymbol{\sigma} \times \bar{\boldsymbol{D}}^{*0} \right] \right\} \Lambda_c^+.
$$
 (16)

So, $P_{\psi}^{N}(4312)^{+}$ is mainly decaying either to $J/\psi p$ final state, in which it was observed, or to $\Lambda_c^+ \bar{D}^{*0}$.

The tunneling amplitude in leading semiclassical approximation, has a similar exponential behavior as for tetraquarks: $\mathcal{A}_M \sim e^{-\sqrt{2ME}\ell}$, where E and ℓ are barrier height and extension. For constituent quark masses, m_u and m_c , and keeping the same values as for tetraquarks,

 $E = 100$ MeV and $\ell = 2$ fm [\[11\]](#page-6-6), the ratio of amplitudes squared has the same order of magnitude as [\(4\)](#page-2-1):

$$
R_{\text{penta}} = \frac{|b'|^2 + 4|c'|^2}{|B'|^2 + 4|C'|^2} \sim \left(\frac{\mathcal{A}_{m_c}}{\mathcal{A}_{m_u}}\right)^2 \sim 10^{-3} \sim R. \tag{17}
$$

With the decay momenta $p_p \simeq 660$ MeV and $p_{\Lambda_c} \simeq 200$ MeV, being comparable to each other, one can get the ratio of pentaquark decay widths:

$$
\frac{\Gamma(P_{\psi}^{N}(4312)^{+} \to J/\psi p)}{\Gamma(P_{\psi}^{N}(4312)^{+} \to \Lambda_c^{+} \bar{D}^{*0})} = \frac{p_p}{p_{\Lambda_c}} R_{\text{penta}} \sim 10^{-3}.
$$
\n(18)

If this approach is correct, $P_{\psi}^N(4312)^+$ should be also searched in $\Lambda_b^0 \to \Lambda_c^+ \bar{D}^{*0} K^-$ decay with good chances to be observed. This can also be applied to decays of the $P_{\psi s}^{\Lambda}(4459)^{0}$ pentaquark which we left for a future publication.

4 Conclusions

The Quark-Diquark approach used for pentaquarks is working quite successful in predictions of masses of heavy baryons and doubly-heavy exotic hadrons. Decay width of tetraquarks with hidden charm or bottom can be explained within the quark-diquark model by a presence of a barrier between heavy diquark and antidiquark. Similarly, decay width of pentaquarks with hidden charm or bottom can be explained within the quark-diquark model by a presence of a barrier between heavy diquark and heavy triquark. If this approach is correct, $P_{\psi}^{N}(4312)^{+}$ -pentaquark should be also searched in the $\Lambda_b^0 \to \Lambda_c^+ \bar{D}^{*0} K^-$ decay mode with good chances to be found.

Acknowledgments

AP would like to thank Prof. Ahmed Ali for useful discussions. A. D. and A. P. are supported by the Russian Science Foundation (Project No. 22-22-00877, https://rscf.ru/project/22-22- 00877/). A, Z. is supported by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research (Project \mathbb{N}^2 20-32-90205).

References

- [1] Particle Data Group (R. L. Workman et al.), PTEP 2022, 083C01 (2022).
- [2] LHCb Collab. (R. Aaij et al.), Phys. Rev. Lett. 115, 072001 (2015) [\[arXiv:1507.03414](http://arxiv.org/abs/1507.03414) [hep-ex]].
- [3] LHCb Collab. (R. Aaij et al.), Phys. Rev. Lett. 122, 222001 (2019) [\[arXiv:1904.03947](http://arxiv.org/abs/1904.03947) [hep-ex]].
- [4] LHCb Collab. (R. Aaij *et al.*), Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 082003 (2016) [Addendum: Phys. Rev. Lett. 118, 119901 (2017)] [\[arXiv:1606.06999](http://arxiv.org/abs/1606.06999) [hep-ex]].
- [5] LHCb Collab. (R. Aaij et al.), Sci. Bull. 66, 1278 (2021) [\[arXiv:2012.10380](http://arxiv.org/abs/2012.10380) [hep-ex]].
- [6] A. Ali, L. Maiani, and A. D. Polosa, Multiquark Hadrons (Cambridge University Press, 2019).
- [7] N. Brambilla, S. Eidelman, C. Hanhart, A. Nefediev, C. P. Shen, C. E. Thomas, A. Vairo, and C. Z. Yuan, Phys. Rept. 873, 1 (2020) [\[arXiv:1907.07583](http://arxiv.org/abs/1907.07583) [hep-ex]].
- [8] M. Mai, U. G. Meißner and C. Urbach, Phys. Rept. 1001, 1 (2023) [\[arXiv:2206.01477](http://arxiv.org/abs/2206.01477) [hep-ph]].
- [9] A. Ali and A. Y. Parkhomenko, Phys. Lett. B 793, 365-371 (2019) [\[arXiv:1904.00446](http://arxiv.org/abs/1904.00446) $\vert \text{hep-ph} \vert$.
- [10] A. Ali, I. Ahmed, M. J. Aslam, A. Y. Parkhomenko, and A. Rehman, JHEP 10, 256 (2019) [\[arXiv:1907.06507](http://arxiv.org/abs/1907.06507) [hep-ph]].
- [11] L. Maiani, A. D. Polosa, and V. Riquer, Phys. Lett. B 778, 247 (2018) [\[arXiv:1712.05296](http://arxiv.org/abs/1712.05296) $\vert \text{hep-ph} \vert$.
- [12] R. F. Lebed, Phys. Lett. B 749, 454 (2015) [\[arXiv:1507.05867](http://arxiv.org/abs/1507.05867) [hep-ph]].
- [13] R. F. Lebed, Phys. Rev. D 96, 116003 (2017) [\[arXiv:1709.06097](http://arxiv.org/abs/1709.06097) [hep-ph]].
- [14] J. F. Giron, R. F. Lebed, and C. T. Peterson, JHEP 05, 061 (2019) [\[arXiv:1903.04551](http://arxiv.org/abs/1903.04551) [hep-ph]].