

Heavy quarkonium properties from Cornell potential using variational method and supersymmetric quantum mechanic

Alfredo Vega^{1,2} and Jorge Flores¹

¹ *Instituto de Física y Astronomía,
Universidad de Valparaíso,
Avenida Gran Bretaña 1111, Valparaíso, Chile*

² *Centro de Astrofísica de Valparaíso,
Universidad de Valparaíso,
Avenida Gran Bretaña 1111, Valparaíso, Chile*

(Dated: October 10, 2014)

Using the variational method and supersymmetric quantum mechanic we calculate in a approximate way eigenvalues, eigenfunctions and wave functions at origin of Cornell potential. We compare results with numerical solutions for heavy quarkonia $c\bar{c}$, $b\bar{b}$ y $b\bar{c}$.

PACS numbers: 14.40.Pq, 12.39.Pn, 12.60.Jv, 03.65.Ge

Keywords: Quarkonium, Variational Method, Supersymmetric Quantum Mechanic

I. INTRODUCTION

Since the discovery of J/ψ in 1974 [1, 2] the study of heavy quarkonium has been very valuable in hadron physics, because they involve non perturbative aspect of QCD and there are many experimental data involving those hadrons [3–5]. From a theoretical standpoint, heavy quarkonium has been studied from several approaches [6, 7], we can stand out for his simplicity, and because it corresponds to a successful approach, the non relativistic potential models, where quark interaction is modelled using a potential energy in the usual Schrödinger equation. The literature about quark potentials is huge, so here we add a small number of references [7–15], although incomplete is representative and is a good starting point to introduce on this topic. One of the first potential proposed was the Cornell potential [8, 9], that corresponds to a coulombian potential plus a linear confinement term. In this way Cornell potential considers general properties of quark interactions.

Schrödinger equation with Cornell potential do not have analytical solutions, and although it is possible to solve it using numerical methods [16, 17], it is always interesting to obtain an approximate analytical solutions that offer a possibility of additional discussions.

In this work, we solve in an approximate way the Schrödinger equation with Cornell potential using a procedure that correspond to an adaptation method suggested in [18, 19], that considers usual variational methods with supersymmetric quantum mechanic (SUSY QM). Some additional examples using SUSY QM and variational method can be found in [20–22].

The use of SUSY QM [23], born at the beginning of the eighties in studies of supersymmetry breaking in quantum field theories with extra dimensions [24], allows to

get isospectral potentials to the original potential, with the particularity that the ground state of the original potential is not present in the spectrum of isospectral associated potential, so the ground state of the supersymmetric partner potential is related with the first excited state of original potential. This procedure can be repeated in order to get successive potentials whose ground states are related by some standard transformations in SUSY QM, with the different states of the original potential, Cornell in our case. So in this way, if we use the variational method to get solutions for the ground state of different supersymmetric partners of the Cornell potential we can obtain the spectrum and wave functions for heavy quarkonium. Notice that standard variational method has been used to study heavy quarkonium properties considering different phenomenological quark potentials [25, 26].

The procedure described in the previous paragraph is used in this work to get approximated eigenvalues and eigenfunctions for the Schrödinger equation with Cornell potential, and we are using it to study heavy quarkonium $c\bar{c}$, $b\bar{b}$ and $b\bar{c}$, paying special attention to the wave function at the origin (WFO), an important quantity that it is involved in calculations of heavy quarkonium decay rates.

This paper is structured as follow. In section II we summarize the main ingredient of SUSY QM used in this work. Section III it is dedicated to approximated calculations of energies, wave functions and WFO for heavy quarkonium using variational method and SUSY QM and in section IV we discuss our results and conclusions.

II. BASICS OF SUSY QM

In this section we summarize the main ingredients of SUSY QM that we will use in the next sections, in order to calculate heavy mesons properties using Cornell potential. For more details we suggest Ref. [23].

Let us consider Schrödinger equation for the ground state with eigenvalue equal to zero, so the wave function ψ_0 obeys

$$H_1\psi_0(x) = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{d^2\psi_0(x)}{dx^2} + V_1(x)\psi_0(x) = 0 \quad (1)$$

then

$$V_1(x) = \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\psi_0''(x)}{\psi_0(x)}. \quad (2)$$

The hamiltonian H_1 can be factorized as

$$H_1 = A^\dagger A,$$

where

$$A = \frac{\hbar}{\sqrt{2m}} \frac{d}{dx} + W(x) \quad y \quad A^\dagger = -\frac{\hbar}{\sqrt{2m}} \frac{d}{dx} + W(x).$$

With this we can see that for a known V_1 , the superpotential W satisfies a Riccati equation

$$V_1(x) = -\frac{\hbar}{\sqrt{2m}} \frac{dW(x)}{dx} + W^2(x).$$

The solution for $W(x)$ in terms of the ground state wave function is

$$W(x) = -\frac{\hbar}{\sqrt{2m}} \frac{\psi_0'(x)}{\psi_0(x)}. \quad (3)$$

With operators A and A^\dagger it is possible to build a new hamiltonian H_2 given by

$$H_2 = AA^\dagger,$$

that can be expressed by

$$H_2 = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{d^2}{dx^2} + V_2(x),$$

where

$$V_2(x) = \frac{\hbar}{\sqrt{2m}} \frac{dW(x)}{dx} + W^2(x).$$

Potentials $V_1(x)$ and $V_2(x)$ are known as supersymmetric partner potentials, and they have several interesting properties (see [23]).

Eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of H_1 and H_2 are related by

$$E_n^{(2)} = E_{n+1}^{(1)} \quad ; \quad E_0^{(1)} = 0 \quad (4)$$




FIG. 1: This figure show a schematic representation of potential V_1 and his supersymmetric partners V_2 and V_3 with his corresponding spectrum, and show that the ground state of V_1 is not present in V_2 , and the ground state of V_2 is not present in V_3 , and so on. Strictly speaking the shape of each potential is different, but we disregard this in order to present that the ground state of one potential is not present in his supersymmetric partner.

$$\psi_n^{(2)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{E_{n+1}^{(1)}}} A\psi_{n+1}^{(1)} \quad (5)$$

and

$$\psi_{n+1}^{(1)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{E_n^{(2)}}} A^\dagger\psi_n^{(2)}. \quad (6)$$

We want to pay special attention to the relationship in the spectrum of H_1 and H_2 , because with exception of the ground state of H_1 , that does not appear in H_2 , the other levels are shared in both hamiltonians, i.e except $E_0^{(1)}$, potentials V_1 and V_2 are isospectral. Successives applications of this procedure led us to obtain a family of isospectral potentials where, as you can see in FIG. 1, the ground state of V_2 is related with the first excited level of V_1 , ground state of V_3 is related with the first excited level of V_2 and the second level of V_1 , and so on to get more levels of the original potential V_1 .

According to the previous paragraph the ground state of H_2 correspond to the first excited level of H_1 . This fact is specially interesting for us, because usual variational method are good tools to get approximated values for the ground states in the Schrödinger equation, so we can use this simple procedure to get approximated solutions for different supersymmetric partner potentials, and in this way to get solutions for different levels in a potential of interest, as the Cornell potential.

III. SOLUTIONS FOR CORNELL POTENTIAL WITH VARIATIONAL METHODS AND SUSY QM

In this section we use the procedure described in the previous sections, suggested in [18, 19], and we adapt it to the study of heavy quarkonium properties using the

Cornell potential. We calculate energies, wave functions and WFO for S states for $c\bar{c}$, $b\bar{b}$ and $b\bar{c}$.

We consider $U_{nl}(r) = rR_{nl}(r)$, that by considering $\hbar = 1$ satisfies

$$-\frac{1}{2\mu} \frac{d^2 U_{nl}(r)}{dr^2} + V_{eff}(r)U_{nl}(r) = E_n U_{nl}(r), \quad (7)$$

where μ the reduced mass for heavy quarkonium considered, and

$$V_{eff}(r) = V(r) + \frac{l(l+1)}{2\mu r^2}.$$

In this work we consider $l = 0$ (S states), thus the effective potential is equal to the Cornell potential,

$$V_{eff}(r) = V(r) = -\frac{\kappa}{r} + \beta r,$$

where the parameters involved are the same used in the usual calculations that consider this potential, i.e

$$\kappa = 0.52 \quad ; \quad \beta = \frac{1}{(2.34)^2} GeV^2,$$

and the quark masses are

$$\mu_c = 1.84 \left[\frac{GeV}{c^2} \right] \quad y \quad \mu_b = 5.18 \left[\frac{GeV}{c^2} \right].$$

For the variational method we consider the trial wave function

$$U(r) = Nr^\gamma e^{-ar^b}, \quad (8)$$

that will be used to get the ground state in the Cornell potential and in his supersymmetric partners used to calculate the successive levels. In this wave function γ take the values 1, 2, 3, ... depending on if we are calculating the ground state of potentials V_1 , V_2 , ... (according section II), changing this parameter in this way is important, because in order to get approximations for the wave functions of the Cornell potential for different levels, it will be necessary to apply successive transformations defined by (6) and this choice turns out to be the only possibility to get finite WFO with a trial wave function as (8). Parameters a and b are variational parameters and N is the normalization constant, given by

$$N = \sqrt{\frac{(2a)^{\frac{1+2\gamma}{b}} b}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1+2\gamma}{b}\right)}}.$$

To calculate the ground state for the Cornell potential we use (7) and the trial wave function with $\gamma = 1$, so the expectation value for the energy

$$E = -\frac{1}{2\mu} \int_0^\infty U(r) \frac{d^2}{dr^2} U(r) dr + \int_0^\infty \left(-\frac{\kappa}{r} + \beta r \right) U^2(r) dr.$$

TABLE I: Energy values (in GeV) heavy quarkonium $c\bar{c}$, $b\bar{b}$ and $b\bar{c}$. column “Exact” solution correspond to numerical calculations using mathschroe.nb with step $h = 0.00001$, and column “Ours” shows energies calculated in this work.

	$c\bar{c}$		$b\bar{b}$		$b\bar{c}$	
E_n	<i>Exact</i>	<i>Ours</i>	<i>Exact</i>	<i>Ours</i>	<i>Exact</i>	<i>Ours</i>
1s	0.2575	0.2578	-0.1704	-0.1702	0.1110	0.1113
2s	0.8482	0.8096	0.4214	0.3579	0.6813	0.6324
3s	1.2720	1.1427	0.7665	0.5612	1.0686	0.9065

By using a $U(r)$ given by (8), we get an expectation value of the energy that depends on parameters a and b ($E(a, b)$), and by minimizing this, we found an approximated value for the energy and we get values for the parameters a and b . In this case we will call a_0 y b_0 for parameters associated to the ground state.

Now we calculate WFO for the ground state. In this case we consider two approaches that are equivalent when you work with the exact solutions, but they give different values if you use approximated wave functions. Here we use $R(r) = \frac{U(r)}{r}$.

The first approach considered for calculations of WFO, and from now on call “Method 1”, is based in a well known expression that relate WFO with expectation values for first derivative of the potential,

$$|\Psi(0)|^2 = \frac{\mu}{2\pi} \left\langle \frac{dV(r)}{dr} \right\rangle$$

for S states

$$\Psi(r) = R(r)Y(\theta, \varphi) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi}} R(r)$$

so

$$|R(0)|^2 = 2\mu \left\langle \frac{dV(r)}{dr} \right\rangle.$$

The second approach is simply to take $r \rightarrow 0$ in the wave function. This is what we called “method 2” in the next lines. According to this, WFO for ground state can be found directly from $R(r) = \frac{U(r)}{r}$ and (8) (with $\gamma = 1$ for ground state), and we get

$$|R(0)|^2 = N^2 = \frac{(2a_0)^{\frac{1+2\gamma}{b_0}} b_0}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1+2\gamma}{b_0}\right)}$$

Using the variational method to get approximations to the excited states, it is not so simple, because you need to be sure that yours trial eigenfunctions are orthogonal.




FIG. 2: Plots shown a comparison in energies for first three energy values for heavy quarkonium $c\bar{c}$, $b\bar{b}$ y $b\bar{c}$. Square correspond to "exact values" calculated with mathschroe.nb with step $h = 0.00001$, and circles represent values calculated in this paper.

TABLE II: Comparison of WFO for first three energy values for heavy quarkonium $c\bar{c}$, $b\bar{b}$ y $b\bar{c}$. We show values calculated with numerical solution, with method 1 and 2.

WFO	$c\bar{c}$			$b\bar{b}$			$b\bar{c}$		
$ R(0) ^2$	<i>Exact</i>	<i>Method 1</i>	<i>Method 2</i>	<i>Exact</i>	<i>Method 1</i>	<i>Method 2</i>	<i>Exact</i>	<i>Method 1</i>	<i>Method 2</i>
1s	1.4591	1.4384	1.2897	14.1294	13.9824	13.0031	3.1950	3.1486	2.8380
2s	0.9304	0.8160	0.6631	5.7033	4.1764	3.3871	1.7712	1.4551	1.1601
3s	0.7936	0.6781	0.5186	4.2917	2.6210	1.8017	1.4509	1.1171	0.8048

For this reason we consider to solve the problem of the ground states for the supersymmetric partner. Let us consider how to use the SUSY QM and the variational method to get solutions to states 2S.

Previously we use (8) with $\gamma = 1$ to get solutions for the ground state, so using the usual variational method we can get energy values for the states 1S, and we can fix parameter in the wave functions, and we put an index "0" to remember us that correspond to parameters associated to the ground state. With this trial wave function we obtain the superpotential

$$W_{21}(r) = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\mu}} \frac{U'(r)}{U(r)} = \frac{-1 + a_0 b_0 r^{b_0}}{\sqrt{2\mu} r}.$$

here index 21 in W remember us that starting from solutions of potential V_1 (Cornell in this paper) we can built a potential V_2 (an approximated supersymmetric partner for Cornell potential)

$$V_2(r) = [W_{21}(r)]^2 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\mu}} \left(\frac{dW_{21}(r)}{dr} \right)$$

$$V_2(r) = \left(\frac{2 + a_0 b_0 r^{b_0} (-3 + a_0 b_0 + a_0 b_0 r^{b_0})}{2\mu r^2} \right)$$

Now, using the variational method we get an approximated value for ground state energy of potential V_2 . In this case the trial wave function has the shape (8) with $\gamma = 2$, and the energy is related to the first excited state of V_1 .

Using the variational method we get the expectation value for energy that depend on a_0 , b_0 (fixed in previous steps when we calculate the ground state of V_1) and a and b , that must be fixed once we minimize this expectation value. We add an index "1" in parameters a and b .

Notice that, in our discussion for SUSY QM we consider a ground state with eigenvalue equal to zero, so the ground state of energy for V_2 represent a ΔE_2 , so the energy for the first excited state is

$$E_1 = E_0 + \Delta E_2$$

Now we can continue. As we had an approximated solution for V_2 , we can built a W_{32} and from it to get his supersymmetric partner V_3 . If we found the ground state of this new potential using the variational method, we can found the energy of the second excited state by

$$E_2 = E_1 + \Delta E_3,$$

and so on. Table 1 and FIG. 2 show the energy values calculated with the method used in this paper, and we compare it with exact numerical solution that we get using a MATHEMATICA program called mathschroe.nb [16].

Let us consider the wave function for the excited levels of Cornell potential. If we have a solution for the ground state of the potential V_2 , that we call for example $\psi_0^{(2)}$, and as we know W_{21} (we used to built V_2), it is possible to get a wave function for the first excited state of V_1 using

$$\psi_1^{(1)} \sim A_{21}^\dagger \psi_0^{(2)},$$




FIG. 3: Radial probability density functions. The continuous line is numerical and dashed line correspond to method used in this paper. First column correspond to ground states, second column is for first excited state and third column is for second excited stated. The upper row is for $c\bar{c}$, middle row is for $b\bar{b}$ and lower row is for $b\bar{c}$.

In principle, for exact normalized solutions, this transformation give the right normalization, but as we are working with approximated solutions we prefer normalize each wave function at the end, for this reason in previous expression we use symbol “ \sim ”.

A_{21}^\dagger transform solution $\psi_0^{(2)}$ for the ground state of V_2 in a solution for the first excited state of V_1 , so it gave us the wave function of the first excited state of Cornell potential.

$$\psi_1^{(1)} \sim \left(\frac{-1}{\sqrt{2\mu}} \partial r + W_{21}(r) \right) \psi_0^{(2)}$$

In a similar way, we can build the wave function for the second excited state of Cornell potential, if we start from the ground state of solution for V_3

$$\psi_2^{(1)} \sim A_{21}^\dagger A_{32}^\dagger \psi_0^{(3)}$$

$$\psi_2^{(1)} \sim \left(\frac{-1}{\sqrt{2\mu}} \partial r + W_{21}(r) \right) \left(\frac{-1}{\sqrt{2\mu}} \partial r + W_{32}(r) \right) \psi_0^{(3)}$$

In FIG. 3 we show the radial density of probabilities calculated with this method, and comparing it with the result obtained numerically using `mathschroe.nb`. We use the wave functions to calculate WFO, and table III and FIG 4 show a summary of our results obtained using “Method 1” and “Method 2”.

IV. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

We use a procedure to solve an approximate way the Schrödinger equation with Cornell potential using a variational method and SUSY QM. This is phenomenologically interesting, because Cornell potential can describe some properties of heavy quarkonium, for this reason is useful to have analytical wave functions, as the provided in this paper

The results in TABLE I and FIG. 2 show the values for the energies of the first three excited states, that are in good agreement with the exact computation, specially for the ground state and first excited states. This situa-




FIG. 4: Plots shown a comparison in WFO for first three energy values for heavy quarkonium $c\bar{c}$, $b\bar{b}$ y $b\bar{c}$. Circles correspond to "exact values", diamond were calculated with method 1 and squared are values calculated using method 2.

tion remain once we compare the wave functions as you can see in FIG. 3, that show radial probability density functions. Numerical and approximate wave functions are almost the same for the ground state and very close for the first excited state, but when we consider higher radial excitations both wave functions are different.

We also calculate WFO, for this we consider two methods that are equivalent when you work with exact wave functions, but as you can see in TABLE II, they give different results if you use approximated wave functions. The "Method 1", based in calculations of the expectation values of first derivative of potential give a better result than "Method 2".

Our results suggest that the exact method discussed can give results in agreement with numerical exact solutions for lower states, and disagree for higher excited levels. This is not surprising, because we solve the Schrödinger equation in an approximated way with an approximated potential. So even if we start with a good trial wave function for the ground state, for higher radial

excitations the results will be in disagreement with the numerical solutions, but for lower states this approach provide good results. If we use trial wave functions with several parameters it could be possible to improve our results, but as this method work for lower states, maybe could be useful to use it as a complement with a method that works for higher excitations as WKB.

As this approach give us analytical expressions for wave functions close to numerical solutions and they are orthogonal, so this can be useful to do calculations of other heavy quarkonium properties.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by FONDECYT (Chile) under Grant No. 1141280 and by CONICYT (Chile) under Grant No. 7912010025.

-
- [1] J. J. Aubert *et al.* [E598 Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **33**, 1404 (1974).
- [2] J. E. Augustin *et al.* [SLAC-SP-017 Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **33**, 1406 (1974).
- [3] M. B. Voloshin, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **61**, 455 (2008) [arXiv:0711.4556 [hep-ph]].
- [4] C. Patrignani, T. K. Pedlar and J. L. Rosner, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **63**, 21 (2013) [arXiv:1212.6552].
- [5] N. Brambilla, S. Eidelman, B. K. Heltsley, R. Vogt, G. T. Bodwin, E. Eichten, A. D. Frawley and A. B. Meyer *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. C **71**, 1534 (2011) [arXiv:1010.5827 [hep-ph]].
- [6] B. Grinstein, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **15**, 461 (2000) [hep-ph/9811264].
- [7] W. Lucha, F. F. Schoberl and D. Gromes, Phys. Rept. **200**, 127 (1991).
- [8] E. Eichten, K. Gottfried, T. Kinoshita, K. D. Lane and T. M. Yan, Phys. Rev. D **17**, 3090 (1978) [Erratum-ibid. D **21**, 313 (1980)].
- [9] E. Eichten, K. Gottfried, T. Kinoshita, K. D. Lane and T. M. Yan, Phys. Rev. D **21**, 203 (1980).
- [10] J. L. Richardson, Phys. Lett. B **82**, 272 (1979).
- [11] W. Buchmuller and S. H. H. Tye, Phys. Rev. D **24**, 132 (1981).
- [12] S. N. Gupta and S. F. Radford, Phys. Rev. D **24**, 2309 (1981).
- [13] S. N. Gupta, S. F. Radford and W. W. Repko, Phys. Rev. D **34**, 201 (1986).
- [14] P. Gonzalez, A. Valcarce, H. Garcilazo and J. Vijande, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 034007 (2003) [hep-ph/0307310].
- [15] C. O. Dib and N. Neill, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 094011 (2012) [arXiv:1208.2186 [hep-ph]].
- [16] W. Lucha and F. F. Schoberl, Int. J. Mod. Phys. C **10**, 607 (1999) [hep-ph/9811453].
- [17] J. L. Domenech-Garret and M. A. Sanchis-Lozano, Comput. Phys. Commun. **180**, 768 (2009) [arXiv:0805.2704 [hep-ph]].
- [18] E. Gozzi, M. Reuter and W. D. Thacker, Phys. Lett. A **183**, 29 (1993).
- [19] F. Cooper, J. Dawson and H. Shepard, Phys. Lett. A **187**, 140 (1994).
- [20] E. Drigo Filho and R. M. Ricotta, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **10**, 1613 (1995) [hep-th/9507132].
- [21] E. Drigo Filho and R. M. Ricotta, Phys. Lett. A **269**,

- 269 (2000) [hep-th/9910254].
- [22] G. R. Peglow Borges and E. Drigo Filho, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **16**, 4401 (2001).
- [23] F. Cooper, A. Khare and U. Sukhatme, Phys. Rept. **251**, 267 (1995) [hep-th/9405029].
- [24] E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B **188**, 513 (1981).
- [25] Y. B. Ding, X. Q. Li and P. N. Shen, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 074010 (1999) [hep-ph/9808264].
- [26] G. R. Boroun and H. Abdolmalki, Phys. Scr. **80**, 065003 (2009).