

[250/149]



Aug, 2022

K-MATRIX ANALYSIS OF BOTTOMONIUM IN e^+e^-

Eric Swanson





Nils Hüsken



Ryan Mitchell

N. Hüsken, R.E. Mitchell, E.S. Swanson, K-matrix Analysis of e^+e^-
Annihilation in the Bottomonium Region, 2204.11915

Motivation

Seek a comprehensive unitary analysis of all channels $e^+e^- \rightarrow$ bottom

New data makes thresholds evident, fits should move beyond Breit-Wigners.

Previous $\Upsilon(5S)$ branching fractions were estimated by measuring $ee \rightarrow$ <final state> near $\Upsilon(5S)$ and dividing by $ee \rightarrow$ all. This only works if $\Upsilon(5S)$ is produced in isolation (now known to be false!).

Three-body final states can provide additional constraints to the fit.

Formalism

Many channels + thresholds, desire for unitarity => K-matrix formalism

-C

Chew-Mandelstam function


$$K^{-1} = \mathcal{M}^{-1} + i\rho \overbrace{-R}$$

$$\mathcal{M} = (1 + KC)^{-1}K = K(1 + CK)^{-1} = K(K + KCK)^{-1}K$$

$$\rho_{\mu,\nu} = \delta_{\mu,\nu} \frac{k_\nu(s)}{8\pi S_\nu \sqrt{s}}$$

Formalism

Chew-Mandelstam function



red= $\text{Re}(C)$

blue = $\text{Im}(C)$

green= $\text{Im}(\rho)$



Formalism

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mu,ee} = \sum_{\nu} (1 + \hat{K}\hat{C})_{\mu,\nu}^{-1} P_{\nu}$$

Aitchison "P-vector"
hat = reduced channel space

$$K_{\mu,\nu} = \sum_R \frac{g_{R:\mu}g_{R:\nu}}{m_R^2 - s} + f_{\mu,\nu}$$

Formalism



Formalism

Incorporate three-body channels

- i. implement as quasi two-body (as is usually done)
- ii. implement as a perturbative three-body channel

$$\mathcal{M}_{\Delta,ee} = \sum_{\nu} F_{\nu}^{(\Delta)} (1 + \hat{C}\hat{K})_{\nu,ee}^{-1}$$

similar to Aitchison, but for the final state




Formalism

Examples of the "F vector"

$$F_{\mu}^{(\Delta)} = f_{\Delta:\mu}$$

$$F_{\mu}^{(\Delta)} = \sum_R \frac{g_{R:\Delta} g_{R:\mu}}{m_R^2 - s}$$

$$F_{\mu}^{(\Delta)} = \frac{g_{R:\mu} \cdot g_{R:f_0 \Upsilon} \cdot g_{f_0:\pi\pi}}{(m_R^2 - s)(m_{f_0}^2 - s_{\pi\pi})}$$



Formalism

Coupling model

$$g_{R:\mu}(s) = \hat{g}_{R:\mu} \left(\frac{k_\mu(s)}{\beta} \right)^{\ell_\mu} \cdot \exp[-k_\mu^2(s)/\beta^2]$$


$$f_{\mu,\nu} = \hat{f}_{\mu,\nu} \cdot \left(\frac{k_\mu(s)}{\beta} \right)^{\ell_\mu} \cdot \left(\frac{k_\nu(s)}{\beta} \right)^{\ell_\nu} \cdot \exp \left[- \left(\frac{k_\nu^2(s) + k_\mu^2(s)}{\beta^2} \right) \right]$$

High energy damping in the 'background' terms helps fit robustness.

Formalism

Poles and Residues

Search for poles on various sheets



Residues from Cauchy's theorem


$$\text{Res}_\mu = \frac{i}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathcal{M}_{\mu,\mu}(s_n) \cdot \frac{\rho_\mu(s_n)}{\sqrt{s_n}} \cdot (s_n - m_{\text{pole}}^2)$$

Formalism

Can arise due to spurious non-invertibility of $(1+CK)$.

Identify by anomalous residues and behaviour under rescaling the couplings $\hat{g} \rightarrow \lambda \hat{g}$.

Ghost Poles



Results

fitting procedure:

fit total σ below BB^* with BB channel and a single resonance
add three additional resonances

iterate:

add a new channel to absorb difference between inclusive and
exclusive data

refit

add dummy channel

iterate:


add a three body channel

refit

[LASSO was a failure]


Results

quasi two-body, beta=1, fit+68% and 90% CL regions



Results

nine models



red=quasi two-body


yellow = three-body+res coupling

blue = three-body + f

model variation recapitulates
bootstrap variation


Results

hadronic scattering cross sections




Results

pole positions (+ 1000 bootstrap datasets)




Results

couplings and branching fractions




Y(4S)




Y(10750)

Results

couplings and branching fractions



$Y(5S)$




$Y(6S)$

Discussion

masses

[BW params, poles, quark model eigenvalues, LGT plateaus]



Discussion

$\Gamma(ee)$ (keV)

state	RPP	our estimate	LS	GM	SOEF
$\Upsilon(4S)$	0.272	(0.003 - 0.62)	0.31	0.39	0.21
$\Upsilon(5S)$	0.31	(0.037 - 0.068)	0.28	0.33	0.18
$\Upsilon(6S)$	0.13	(0.043 - 0.074)	0.26	0.27	0.15
$\Upsilon(10750)$	(0.01 - 0.40) ^a	(0.004 - 0.10)		2.38 eV ^b	

^a from ambiguous solutions in Ref. [5]

^b assuming a $3D$ state

Conclusions & Observations

First comprehensive and unitary analysis of ee to bottom.

First determination of absolute branching ratios of all four states.

$\Upsilon(10750)$ is confirmed.

$$\Gamma_{ee}(10750) = 0.06(0.06) \text{ keV.}$$

$\Upsilon(4S)$ is 10-20 MeV higher in mass than RPP.

$\Upsilon(6S)$ width is twice RPP value.

Γ_{ee} are significantly smaller than RPP and quark models for higher N.

Indications that open bottom strong decays of higher N states is not well modelled.

Missing channels for 5S and 6S are likely dominated by $Z_b^{(\prime)}$.

Data near 10750 and above 11000 MeV would be very helpful!

~thank you~