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## THE LHCb DETECTOR

## JINST 3 (2008) S08005



## X(3872)

## The X(3872) Meson

Discovered in 2003 by the Belle collaboration in the $B \rightarrow K X(3872)$ decay where $X(3872) \rightarrow J / \psi \pi^{+} \pi^{-}$
$\circledast$ Mass is roughly equal to $m\left(D^{0}\right)+m\left(D^{* 0}\right)$
$\circledast$ Width is surprisingly narrow $(<1.2 \mathrm{MeV})$
$\circledast$ Large production rate in $p \bar{p}$ collisions



LHCb is largely contributing to shed light on the nature of the X(3872) state:
Determination of the quantum numbers [PRL 110, 222001 (2013)]
$>$ Measurement of $B(\mathrm{X}(3872) \rightarrow \psi(2 \mathrm{~S}) \gamma) / B(\mathrm{X}(3872) \rightarrow \mathrm{J} / \psi \gamma)$ [Nucl.Phys.B886 (2014) 665]
$>$ Precise mass measurement [EPJC 72 (2012) 1972] [JHEP 06 (2013) 065 ]

$$
E_{B}=m\left(D^{0} \bar{D}^{* 0}\right)-m(X(3872))=0.09 \pm 0.28 \mathrm{MeV} / \mathrm{c}^{2} \longrightarrow \begin{gathered}
\text { Loosely bound in the } \\
\text { molecule scenario }
\end{gathered}
$$

$>$ Production cross-section in $p p$ collisions at $\sqrt{ } \mathrm{s}=7 \mathrm{TeV}$ [EPJC 72 (2012) 1972]

$$
\sigma_{X(3872)} \times B R\left(X(3972) \rightarrow J / \psi \pi^{+} \pi^{-}\right)^{\left[2.5<y<4.5, p_{T}>5 \mathrm{GeV}\right]}=5.4 \pm 1.3 \pm 0.8 \mathrm{nb}
$$

$>$ Search for $\mathrm{X}(3872) \rightarrow p \bar{p}$ [EPJC 73 (2013) 2462]
$\frac{B R(X(3872) \rightarrow p \bar{p})}{B R\left(X(3872) \rightarrow J / \psi \pi^{+} \pi^{-}\right)}<2.0 \times 10^{-3}$

## X(3872) Quantum Numbers

[PRL 110, 222001 (2013)]
Previously:
$\circledast B$ factories: Observation of the $X(3872) \rightarrow J / \psi \gamma$ decay $\Rightarrow \mathbf{C}=+$. [PRL 102 132001] [PRL 107091803 ]
$\circledast$ CDF: $2292 \pm 113 p \bar{p} \rightarrow X(3872)+$ anything events. Unknown $\mathrm{X}(3872)$ polarization (only 3 angles). Quantum numbers constrained to $1^{++}$or $2^{-+}$. [PRL 98, 132002 (2007)]
$\circledast$ Belle: $173 \pm 16 B \rightarrow K X(3872)$ events. 1D analysis carried out (Not enough events to bin in 5D). $1^{++}$or $2^{-+}$could not be distinguished. [hep-ex/0505038]



* $1.0 \mathrm{fb}^{-1}$ dataset collected by LHCb in 2011
$\circledast 313 \pm 26 B^{+} \rightarrow K^{+} X(3872)$ with $X(3872) \rightarrow J / \psi \pi^{+} \pi^{-}$
$\circledast$ LHCb performs a 5 D analysis which benefits of the angular correlations to disentangle the quantum number of the $\mathrm{X}(3872)$


## X(3872) Quantum Numbers: $\mathrm{J}^{\mathrm{P}}=\mathbf{1}^{++}$!

* Likelihood-ratio test to discriminate between the $1^{++}$ and the $2^{-+}$assignments
$*$ Simulated experiments, each with the number of signals and background events as in the real experiment
$\circledast$ The two spin hypotheses are completely separated
$\circledast \mathrm{t}>0$ implies $1^{++}$favoured
$\circledast \mathrm{t}<0$ implies $2^{-+}$favoured
Data favour the $1^{++}$over the $2^{-+}$hypothesis at $8.4 \sigma$

$\circledast \eta_{c 2}\left(1^{1} D_{2}\right)\left(J^{P C}=2^{-+}\right)$ruled out
$\circledast \chi_{c 1}\left(2^{3} P_{1}\right)$ disfavoured by the measured mass
$*$ Conventional charmonium interpretation of the $\mathrm{X}(3872)$ seems fading in favour of an exotic scenario!


## Evidence for X(3872) $\rightarrow \psi(2 S) \gamma$

[Nucl.Phys.B886 (2014) 665]
$\circledast$ Observation of the $X(3872) \rightarrow J / \psi \gamma$ decay $\Rightarrow \mathrm{C}=+[$ PRL 102 132001] [PRL 107 091803]
$\circledast$ Measurement of $R_{\psi \gamma} \equiv \frac{\mathcal{B}(X(3872) \rightarrow \psi(2 S) \gamma)}{\mathcal{B}(X(3872) \rightarrow J \psi \gamma)}$ to disentangle the nature of $X(3872)$
$*$ Predicitions of $R_{\psi \gamma}$ vary widely across different models:
$\rightarrow \chi_{c 1}\left(2^{3} P_{1}\right)$ interpretation: $R_{\psi \gamma} \sim 1.2-15$
$\rightarrow D \bar{D}^{*}$ molecular picture: $R_{\psi \gamma} \sim(3-4) \times 10^{-3}$
$\rightarrow$ Mixture of $c \bar{c}$ and $D \bar{D}^{*}: R_{\psi \gamma} \sim 0.5-5$

Controversial experimental status:
$>$ In 2009 BaBar: Evidence of $\mathrm{X}(3872) \rightarrow \Psi(2 \mathrm{~S}) \gamma$ in $\mathrm{B}^{ \pm} \rightarrow \mathrm{X}(3872) \mathrm{K}^{ \pm}$decays:

$$
R_{\Psi \gamma}=3.4 \pm 1.4 \quad[P R L 102 \text { (2009) 132001] }
$$

$>$ In 2011 Belle: No evidence for $\mathrm{X}(3872) \rightarrow \psi(2 \mathrm{~S}) \gamma$ :

$$
\mathrm{R}_{\Psi \gamma}<1.2 @ 90 \text { C.L.[PRL107 (2011) 091803] }
$$

## Evidence for X(3872) $\rightarrow \psi(2 S) \gamma$

[Nucl.Phys.B886 (2014) 665]
$>$ Integrated luminosity $3.0 \mathrm{fb}^{-1}$
$>$ Reconstruction of $\mathrm{B}^{+} \rightarrow \psi(\rightarrow \mu \mu) \gamma \mathrm{K}^{+}$, where $\psi=J / \Psi$ or $\psi(2 S)$
$>\pi^{0}$ veto
$>\mathrm{m}(\Psi \gamma) \in[3.7-4] \mathrm{GeV} / \mathrm{c}^{2}$
$>\Psi$ mass and PV constrained to improve
mass resolution


## Evidence for X(3872) $\rightarrow \psi(2 S) \gamma$

$>$ 2D Fit: $\mathrm{m}(\psi \gamma \mathrm{K})$ vs $\mathrm{m}(\psi \gamma)$
> Peaking backgrounds:
$>\mathrm{J} / \psi$ mode: $\mathrm{B}^{+} \rightarrow \mathrm{J} / \Psi \mathrm{K}^{*+}, \mathrm{K}^{*+} \rightarrow \mathrm{K}^{+} \Pi^{0}(\rightarrow \gamma /()$
$>\psi(2 \mathrm{~S})$ mode: $\mathrm{b} \rightarrow \mathrm{J} / \psi \mathrm{K}^{+} \mathrm{h}+$ random $\gamma$

 Bkg.

## Evidence for X(3872) $\rightarrow \psi(2 S) \gamma$

[Nucl.Phys.B886 (2014) 665]

$$
R_{\psi \gamma} \equiv \frac{\mathcal{B}(X(3872) \rightarrow \psi(2 S) \gamma)}{\mathcal{B}(X(3872) \rightarrow J \psi \gamma)}=2.46 \pm 0.64 \pm 0.29
$$



Does not support a pure DD* molecular interpretation. Standard charmonium and other scenarios still compatible

Can the radiative decays tell us more?
[F.Guo, C. Hanhart et al., arXiv:1410.6712]

## $X(4140) \& X(4270)$

## A BIT OF HISTORY

CDF: Evidence/"Observation" in $\mathrm{B}^{+} \rightarrow \mathrm{J} / \Psi \phi \mathrm{K}^{+}$ [PRL 102, 242002 (2009), arXiv: 1101.6058]
$\mathrm{X}(4140)$
$\mathrm{m}=4143.0^{+2.9}{ }_{-3.0} \pm 0.6 \mathrm{MeV}$
$\Gamma=15.3^{+10.4}-6.1 \pm 2.5 \mathrm{MeV}$

X(4274)
$\mathrm{m}=4274.4^{+8.4}{ }_{-6.7} \pm 1.9 \mathrm{MeV}$
$\Gamma=32.3^{+21.9}{ }_{-15.3} \pm 7.6 \mathrm{MeV}$

Charmonium states with $\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{X}} \gg \mathrm{D}_{(\mathrm{s})}{ }^{(*)} \mathrm{D}_{(\mathrm{s})}{ }^{(*)}$ should decay easily into D mesons. The narrow widths hint that their nature is different: meson-meson, hybrid, tetraquark ...

Belle: No evidence of $\mathrm{X}(4140)$ in $\gamma \gamma \rightarrow \mathrm{J} / \Psi \phi$. Observation of a new state X(4350) [PRL 104, 112004 (2010)]
> D0: "Threshold enhancement consistent with the X(4140) (3.1 $\sigma$ ) ...Second structure consistent with X(4350)" [PRD89 012004 (2014)]
$>$ CMS: Peak in $\mathrm{J} \psi \phi$ consistent with $\mathrm{X}(4140)$. Evidence of a $2^{\text {nd }}$ peak affected by reflections [PLB 734 (2014) 261]
$>$ BaBar: No evidence of X(4140)/X(4274) [arXiv: 1407.7244]
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## SEARCH FOR X(4140)/X(4270) AT LHCb

* According to the CDF results, $35 \pm 11 \mathrm{X}(4140)$ signal candidates and $53 \pm 19 \mathrm{X}(4274)$ signal candidates expected
* No narrow structure is observed near the threshold * The LHCb results disagree at $2.4 \sigma$ level with the CDF measurement

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { LHCb(90\%) C.L. } \\
\frac{\mathcal{B}\left(B^{+} \rightarrow X(4140) K^{+}\right) \times \mathcal{B}(X(4140) \rightarrow J / \psi \phi)}{\mathcal{B}\left(B^{+} \rightarrow J / \psi \phi K^{+}\right)}<0.07 . \\
\frac{\mathcal{B}\left(B^{+} \rightarrow X(4274) K^{+}\right) \times \mathcal{B}(X(4274) \rightarrow J / \psi \phi)}{\mathcal{B}\left(B^{+} \rightarrow J / \psi \phi K^{+}\right)}<0.08 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
$$

An amplitude analysis needed to investigate the resonance nature of these peaks
[LHCb, PRD 85, 091103(R) (2012)]


## $Z(4430)^{+}$

## Z(4430) ${ }^{+}$

Observed in the $\psi(2 S) \pi^{+}$in $B^{0(+)} \rightarrow \psi(2 S) \pi^{+} K^{-(0)}$ decays by Belle
[Belle, PRL100, 142001 (2008)]
$*$ Clear signature of exotic:
Decay to charmonium $\rightarrow c \bar{c}$ pair content
Electric charged $\rightarrow$ at least 2 more light quarks $N_{\text {quarks }}>=4$ !
Tetraquark, $D^{*} D_{1}$ molecule?
$\circledast$ Later 2D "Dalitz" technique: $M^{2}\left(\psi(2 S) \pi^{+}\right)$vs $M^{2}\left(K^{-} \pi^{+}\right)$[Belle, PRD 80, 031104 (R) (2009)]
$\circledast Z(4430)^{+}$not confirmed (nor excluded) by BaBar: Investigation the extent to which reflection of the $K \pi$ mass and angular structures are able to reproduce the $\psi(2 S) \pi$ mass distributions $\quad$ [BaBar, PRD 79, 112001 (2009)]
$\circledast$ Belle presented results of a full 4D amplitude analysis. $J^{P}=1^{+}$favoured but $J^{P}=0^{-}$not excluded
[Belle, PRD 88 (2013) 074026]
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## Confirmation of Z(4430) ${ }^{+}$

[PRL 112, 222002 (2014)]
> Integrated luminosity of $3.0 \mathrm{fb}^{-1}$
$>$ Sample of $>25 \mathrm{k} \mathrm{B}^{0} \rightarrow \psi(2 \mathrm{~S}) \mathrm{K}^{+} \Pi^{-}$candidates (x10 Belle/BaBar)
$>$ Backgrounds from mis-ID physics decay is small
> Sidebands are used to build 4D model of the combinatorial background



## Model Independent Analysis

[PRL 112, 222002 (2014)]
Can reflection of the structures in $m\left(\mathrm{~K}_{\pi}\right)$ and $\cos \theta$ reproduce the $\mathrm{m}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right.$ п) distribution?
[S.U.Chung, Phys. Rev. D56, 7299(1997)]


$>$ Does not make any assumption on the underlying $\mathrm{K}^{*}$ resonances in the system, only restricts their maximal spin ( $\mathrm{J} \leq 2$ ).
$>$ Weight phase space simulated $\mathrm{B}^{0} \rightarrow \psi^{\prime} \mathrm{K}^{+} \Pi^{-}$events with the spherical harmonic moments of $\cos \theta_{\mathrm{K}}$.
$>$ Moments of $\mathrm{K}^{*}$ resonances are unable to explain observed distribution

## Amplitude Model

Use the Isobar approach:
$>$ Build amplitude from sum of two-body decays:

$$
\mathrm{B}^{0} \rightarrow \psi(2 \mathrm{~S}) \mathrm{K}^{*}\left(\rightarrow \Pi^{-} \mathrm{K}+\right) \text { and } \mathrm{B}^{0} \rightarrow \mathrm{Z}(4430)^{-}\left(\rightarrow \psi(2 \mathrm{~S}) \Pi^{-}\right) \mathrm{K}^{+}
$$

$>$ Overlapping and interfering Breit-Wigner resonances.
$>$ Kп sector:
$>$ Default result includes all resonances up to $\mathrm{K}^{*}{ }_{1}(1680)(\mathrm{J} \leq 2)$.
$>$ Kп S-wave: $\mathrm{K} *(800)+\mathrm{K}^{*}(1430)+\mathrm{NR}(L A S S$ as cross-check)
$>\mathrm{K}^{*}$ with $\mathrm{J}>2$ for systematics

| Resonance | $J^{P}$ | Likely $n^{2 S+1} L_{J}$ | Mass $(\mathrm{MeV})$ | Width $(\mathrm{MeV})$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $K_{0}^{*}(800)^{0}(\kappa)$ | $0^{+}$ | - | $682 \pm 29$ | $547 \pm 24$ |
| $K^{*}(892)^{0}$ | $1^{-}$ | $1^{3} S_{1}$ | $895.94 \pm 0.262$ | $48.7 \pm 0.7$ |
| $K_{0}^{*}(1430)^{0}$ | $0^{+}$ | $1^{3} P_{0}$ | $1425 \pm 50$ | $270 \pm 80$ |
| $K_{1}^{*}(1410)^{0}$ | $1^{-}$ | $2^{3} S_{1}$ | $1414 \pm 15$ | $232 \pm 21$ |
| $K_{2}^{*}(1430)^{0}$ | $2^{+}$ | $1^{3} P_{2}$ | $1432.4 \pm 1.3$ | $109 \pm 5$ |
| $B^{0} \rightarrow \psi(2 S) K^{+} \pi^{-}$phase space limit | 1593 |  |  |  |
| $K_{1}^{*}(1680)^{0}$ | $1^{-}$ | $1^{3} D_{1}$ | $1717 \pm 27$ | $322 \pm 110$ |
| $K_{3}^{*}(1780)^{0}$ | $3^{-}$ | $1^{3} D_{3}$ | $1776 \pm 7$ | $159 \pm 21$ |
| $K_{0}^{*}(1950)^{0}$ | $0^{+}$ | $2^{3} P_{0}$ | $1945 \pm 22$ | $201 \pm 78$ |
| $K_{4}^{*}(2045)^{0}$ | $4^{+}$ | $1^{3} F_{4}$ | $2045 \pm 9$ | $198 \pm 30$ |
| $B^{0} \rightarrow J / \psi K^{+} \pi^{-}$phase space limit | 2183 |  |  |  |
| $K_{5}^{*}(2380)^{0}$ | $5^{-}$ | $1^{3} G_{5}$ | $2382 \pm 9$ | $178 \pm 32$ |

# Projections of 4D Amplitude Fit without Z(4430)+ 

[PRL 112, 222002 (2014)]

$>$ Determine goodness-of-fit from 4D $\mathrm{X}^{2}$.
$>$ The $\mathrm{X}^{2} \mathrm{p}$-value $<2 \times 10^{-6}$.
$>$ The data cannot be adequately described only using $\mathrm{J} \leq 3 \mathrm{~K}^{*}$ contributions.


# Projections of 4D Amplitude Fit WITH Z(4430) ${ }^{+}$ 

[PRL 112, 222002 (2014)]
Everything except the $\mathrm{Z} \rightarrow$ large interference between Z and K п sector

$$
\mathrm{J}^{\mathrm{P}}=1^{+}
$$

Z component




> The $4 \mathrm{D} \mathrm{x}^{2} \mathrm{p}$-value $=12 \%$.
$>$ The data are well described when including a $\mathrm{J}^{\mathrm{P}}=1^{+} \mathrm{Z}(4430)$ in the fit

## Z(4430)+ Parameters from Amplitude Fit

[PRL 112, 222002 (2014)]
Amplitude fractions [\%]

|  | LHCb | Belle | Contribution | LHCb | Belle |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $M(Z)[\mathrm{MeV}]$ | $4475 \pm 7_{-25}^{+15}$ | $4485 \pm 22_{-11}^{+28}$ | $S$-wave total | $10.8 \pm 1.3$ |  |
| $\Gamma(Z)[\mathrm{MeV}]$ | $172 \pm 13_{-34}^{+37}$ | $200_{-46-35}^{+41+26}$ | NR | $0.3 \pm 0.8$ |  |
|  |  |  | $K_{0}^{*}(800)$ | $3.2 \pm 2.2$ | $5.8 \pm 2.1$ |
| $f_{Z}[\%]$ | $5.9 \pm 0.9_{-3.3}^{+1.5}$ | $10.3_{-3.5-2.3}^{+3.0+4.3}$ | $K_{0}^{*}(1430)$ | $3.6 \pm 1.1$ | $1.1 \pm 1.4$ |
| $\underset{\text { (with interference) }}{f_{\text {In }}^{\prime}}[\%]$ | $16.7 \pm 1.6_{-5.2}^{+2.6}$ | - | $K^{*}(892)$ | $59.1 \pm 0.9$ | $63.8 \pm 2.6$ |
| significance | $>13.9 \sigma$ | $>5.2 \sigma$ | $K_{2}^{*}(1430)$ | $7.0 \pm 0.4$ | $4.5 \pm 1.0$ |
| $J^{P}$ | $1^{+}$ | $1^{+}$ | $K_{1}^{*}(1410)$ | $1.7 \pm 0.8$ | $4.3 \pm 2.3$ |
|  | New (large) |  | $K_{1}^{*}(1680)$ | $4.0 \pm 1.5$ | $4.4 \pm 1.9$ |
|  | systematic included |  | $Z(4430)^{-}$ | $5.9 \pm 0.9$ | $10.3_{-3.5}^{+3.0}$ |

Very good agreement between $\mathrm{LHCb} /$ Belle results

# RESONANT BEHAVIOUR - A BOUND STATE? 

[PRL 112, 222002 (2014)]
Replace BW amplitude with 6 independent complex numbers in 6 bins of $\mathrm{m}\left(\psi^{\prime} \Pi\right)$ in region of $\mathrm{Z}(4430)$ mass peak.
> Allows Z(4430) shape to be constrained only by amplitudes in Kn sector.
$>$ Observe rapid change of phase near maximum of magnitude $\Rightarrow$ resonance!


Still room for non-resonant interpretation?
[P.Pakhlov, T.Uglov, arXiv: 1408.5295]

## SECOND Exotic Z ${ }^{+}$?

[PRL 112, 222002 (2014)]
Fit confidence level increases with a second exotic ( $\mathrm{J}^{\mathrm{P}}=0^{-}$) component, but...
$>$ No evidence for $\mathrm{Z}_{0}$ in model independent approach.
$>$ Argand diagram for $\mathrm{Z}_{0}$ is inconclusive.
$>$ Need larger samples to characterize this state.

$$
\begin{aligned}
M_{Z_{0}} & =4239 \pm 18_{-10}^{+45} \mathrm{MeV} \\
\Gamma_{Z_{0}} & =220 \pm 47_{-74}^{+108} \mathrm{MeV} \\
f_{Z_{0}} & =\left(1.6 \pm 0.5_{-0.4}^{+1.9}\right) \%
\end{aligned}
$$

Mass and width consistent with other Z's observed by Belle:
$>\mathrm{Z}^{-} \rightarrow \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{c} 1} \mathrm{~T}^{-} \quad\left(\mathrm{J}^{\mathrm{P}} \neq 0^{-}\right)[$PRD 78 (2008) 072004]

$>\mathrm{Z} \rightarrow \mathrm{J} / \Psi \pi^{-}$[arXiv: 1408.6457]

## Conclusion

$X(3872)$
$\checkmark$ Elusive nature despite the world wide efforts
$\checkmark$ Radiative decays ruled out the interpretation of a pure $\mathrm{DD}^{*}$ molecule
$>X(4140) / X(4274)$
$\checkmark$ No evidence of such states/structures in $\mathrm{L}=0.36 \mathrm{fb}^{-1}$
$\checkmark$ But much larger dataset on tape
$>Z(4430)^{+}$
$>$ Confirmation of $\mathrm{Z}(4430)^{+}$
$>$ Resonant behaviour shown
$>\mathrm{J}^{\mathrm{P}}=1^{+}$established $\rightarrow$ Disfavor the interpretation as a $\mathrm{D}^{*} \mathrm{D}_{1}$ molecule or cusp. Tetraquark scenario still standing
[Maiani et al, arXiv:1405.1551]
> Amplitude fit model accommodates a $2^{\text {nd }} \mathrm{Z}$ but more studies are required

## Conclusion (2)

List of charmonium-like states is getting longer and longer
$\checkmark$ Plan to study them in b-hadron decays because of their broad widths or because they have been observed in such decays
$\checkmark$ Amplitude analyses are time consuming due to presence of vectors in the decays products but needed to establish the resonant character/quantum numbers
$\checkmark$ Excited prospects ahead due to the upcoming data taking! (RUN I + RUN II ~ $10 \mathrm{fb}^{-1}$ )

## Back Up

## X(3872) QuANTUM NUMBERS: $\mathrm{J}^{\mathrm{P}}=\mathbf{1}^{++}$!



* How important are the angular correlations?
$\circledast$ Projections in $\cos \theta_{X}$ for all background-subtracted signal candidates (top) and background-subtracted signal candidates with $\left|\cos \theta_{\pi \pi}\right|>0.6$ (bottom)
$*$ Little discrimination between $J^{P C}=1^{++}($red $)$, $J^{P C}=2^{-+}$(blue) without using correlations.

