

Insights into the nature of the $X(3872)$ through B meson decays

Zhi-Qing Zhang *, Zhi-Lin Guan, Yan-Chao Zhao,
Zi-Yu Zhang, Zhi-Jie Sun, Na Wang, Xiao-Dong Ren

Department of Physics, Henan University of Technology, Zhengzhou, Henan 450052, China

(Dated: August 18, 2022)

Abstract

We study the decays $B_{c,u,d} \rightarrow X(3872)P$ in the perturbative QCD (PQCD) approach, where the puzzling resonance $X(3872)$ is involved and P represents a light pseudoscalar meson K and π . Assuming the $X(3872)$ as a 1^{++} charmonium state, we find the following results: (a) The branching ratios for the decays $B_c^+ \rightarrow X(3872)\pi^+$ and $B_c^+ \rightarrow X(3872)K^+$ agree with the results predicted by the covariant light-front approach within errors, but are larger than those given by the generalized factorization approach; (b) The branching ratio for the decay $B^+ \rightarrow X(3872)K^+$ is predicted as $(3.8_{-1.0}^{+1.1}) \times 10^{-4}$, which is smaller than the previous PQCD calculation result, but still slightly larger than the upper limits set by Belle and BaBar. So we suggest that the decays $B^{0,+} \rightarrow X(3872)K^{0,+}$ should be precisely measured by the running LHCb and Belle II experiments, which is very helpful to probe the inner structure of the $X(3872)$; (c) Compared with the decays $B_{u,d} \rightarrow X(3872)K$, the decays $B_{u,d} \rightarrow X(3872)\pi$ have much smaller branching ratios, which drop to as low as 10^{-6} ; (d) The direct CP violations for these considered decays are very small, only $10^{-3} \sim 10^{-2}$, because the penguin contributions are loop suppressed compared with the tree contributions. Testing the results for the branching ratios and the CP violations including the implicit $SU(3)$ and isospin symmetries in these decays by experiments is helpful to probe the nature of the $X(3872)$.

PACS numbers: 13.25.Hw, 12.38.Bx, 14.40.Nd

* Electronic address: zhangzhiqing@haut.edu.cn

I. INTRODUCTION

Since $X(3872)$ was observed in the exclusive decay $B^\pm \rightarrow K^\pm \pi^+ \pi^- J/\Psi$ by Belle [1], this meson has attracted a great deal of interest up to now. Though the $X(3872)$ has been confirmed by many experimental collaborations, such as CDF [2], D0 [3], Babar [4] and LHCb [5], with quantum numbers $J^{PC} = 1^{++}$ and isospin $I = 0$, there are still many uncertainties. Since the mass of the $X(3872)$ is very close to the $D^0 \bar{D}^{*0}$ threshold, some authors interpret it as a loosely bound molecular state [6–10], where the building blocks are hadrons and they interact with each other by exchanging color neutral forces [11]. Others regard the $X(3872)$ as a compact tetraquark state [12–15], where the building blocks are (anti-)quarks and they interact with each other by exchanging gluons. Certainly, there is also explanation of the $X(3872)$ as a hybrid charmonium state with constituents $c\bar{c}g$ [16, 17], etc. Though there are many different exotic hadron state interpretations about the $X(3872)$, the first radial excitation of $1P$ charmonium state $\chi_{c1}(1P)$ as the most natural assignment has not been ruled out [18–20]. It is noticed that the $X(3872)$ is renamed as $\chi_{c1}(3872)$ by the Particle Data Group (PDG) [21].

In order to investigate the inner structure of the $X(3872)$, a large amount of theoretical studies on the productions and decays of the $X(3872)$ were performed [22–25]. In Ref. [25], the authors calculated $\Gamma(X(3872) \rightarrow J/\psi \pi^+ \pi^-)$ by using the QCD sum rules and concluded that the $X(3872)$ is approximately 97% a charmonium state with a tiny molecular component. Many B meson decays with the $X(3872)$ involved in the final state have been studied by using different approaches [26–32]. In Ref. [27], the authors studied the decays $B \rightarrow \chi_{c1}(1P, 2P)K$ in QCD factorization, and they argued that the $X(3872)$ has a dominant $c\bar{c}$ component but mixes with $D^0 \bar{D}^{*0} + D^{*0} \bar{D}^0$ continuum component. The decays $B_c \rightarrow X(3872)\pi(K)$ were studied both in the covariant light-front approach [28] and the generalized factorization approach [29], respectively. In the former the $X(3872)$ was identified as a 1^{++} charmonium state, while a tetraquark state was assumed in the latter. One may expect that the results for the same decays under the different structure hypothesis for the $X(3872)$ should be different. The decay $B \rightarrow X(3872)K$ was also received much attention by many authors. In Ref. [30, 31], the authors assumed the $X(3872)$ as a loosely bound S-wave molecular state of $D^0 \bar{D}^{*0} (D^{*0} \bar{D}^0)$ and estimated $Br(B^+ \rightarrow X(3872)K^+) = (0.07 \sim 1) \times 10^{-4}$. Furthermore, they considered that $Br(B^0 \rightarrow X(3872)K^0)$ is suppressed more than an order of magnitude compared with $Br(B^+ \rightarrow X(3872)K^+)$. That is to say, if large isospin symmetry between the decays $B^+ \rightarrow X(3872)K^+$ and $B^0 \rightarrow X(3872)K^0$ is observed, any charmonium interpretation for the $X(3872)$ would be disfavored. Two years later, the branching ratio of the decay $B^+ \rightarrow X(3872)K^+$ was calculated by using the PQCD approach under assuming the $X(3872)$ as a regular $c\bar{c}$ charmonium state in Ref. [32], where a large value for the branching ratio was obtained $Br(B^+ \rightarrow X(3872)K^+) = (7.88_{-3.76}^{+4.87}) \times 10^{-4}$. Obviously, this result is much larger than the present experimental upper limits given by Belle [33] and BaBar [34] at 90% C.L. ,

$$Br(B^+ \rightarrow X(3872)K^+) < 2.6 \times 10^{-4} \quad (\text{Belle}), \quad (1)$$

$$Br(B^+ \rightarrow X(3872)K^+) < 3.2 \times 10^{-4} \quad (\text{BaBar}). \quad (2)$$

Here we would like to systematically study the decays $B_{c,u,d} \rightarrow X(3872)P$ in the perturbative QCD approach, where P represents a light pseudoscalar meson K and π . The




FIG. 1: Feynman diagrams contributing to the decay $B_c^+ \rightarrow X(3872)\pi^+$ at leading order.

layout of this paper is as follows, we calculate analytically the amplitudes for the studied decays $B_{c,u,d} \rightarrow X(3872)P$ in Section II. The numerical results and discussions are given in Section III, where we will compare our results with other theoretical predictions and the data. The conclusions are presented in the final part.

II. THE AMPLITUDES OF $B_{c,u,d} \rightarrow X(3872)P$ DECAYS

As we know, the PQCD factorization approach has been used to calculate many two-body charmed B meson decays, and obtained consistent results with experiments. So we will use this approach to study the decays $B_{c,u,d} \rightarrow X(3872)P$. First, the effective Hamiltonian for the decays $B_c^+ \rightarrow X(3872)\pi^+(K^+)$ can be written as [35]

$$H_{eff} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cb}^* V_{uq} [C_1(\mu)O_1(\mu) + C_2(\mu)O_2(\mu)] + H.c., \quad (3)$$

where $C_{1,2}(\mu)$ are the Wilson coefficients at the renormalization scale μ , $q = d$ ($q = s$) for $B_c^+ \rightarrow X(3872)\pi^+$ ($B_c^+ \rightarrow X(3872)K^+$) decay, and $O_{1,2}$ are the four fermion operators,

$$O_1 = \bar{d}_\alpha \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) u_\beta \otimes \bar{c}_\beta \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) b_\alpha, \quad O_2 = \bar{d}_\alpha \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) u_\alpha \otimes \bar{c}_\beta \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) b_\beta. \quad (4)$$

Here we take the decay $B_c^+ \rightarrow X(3872)\pi^+$ as an example to analysis and its Feynman diagrams are given in Fig.1, where only the factorizable and non-factorizable emission diagrams are needed considered at the leading order¹. The amplitude for the factorizable emission diagrams Fig.1(a) and Fig.1(b) can be written as

$$F_{B_c \rightarrow X}^{LL} = 2\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\pi C_F m_{B_c}^4 f_\pi f_{B_c} \sqrt{1 - r_X^2} \int_0^1 dx_2 \int_0^\infty b_1 db_1 b_2 db_2 \exp\left(-\frac{\omega_{B_c}^2 b_1^2}{2}\right) \{ [\Psi^L(x_2 - 2r_b) + \Psi^t(r_b - 2x_2)] E_e(t_a) h(\alpha, \beta_a, b_1, b_2) S_t(x_2) - \Psi^L(r_c + r_X^2(x_1 - 1)) E_e(t_b) h(\alpha, \beta_b, b_2, b_1) S_t(x_1) \}, \quad (5)$$

where the color factor $C_F = 4/3$, $f_{\pi(X)}$ is the decay constant for $\pi(X)$ meson, the mass ratio $r_{X(b,c)} = m_X(m_b, m_c)/m_B$, and $\Psi^{L,t}$ are the distribution amplitudes for the $X(3872)$ given in Sec. III. The evolution factors $E_e(t_{a,b})$ evolving the Sudakov exponent, the hard functions h and the jet function $S_t(x)$ can be found in Ref. [36, 37]. The amplitude for

¹ From now on, we will use X to denote $X(3872)$ for simply in some places.




FIG. 2: Feynman diagrams contributing to the decay $B^+ \rightarrow X(3872)\pi^+$ at leading order.

the non-factorizable spectator diagrams Fig.1(c) and Fig.1(d) is given as

$$\begin{aligned}
M_{B_c \rightarrow X}^{LL} &= \frac{8}{3} \pi C_F m_{B_c}^4 f_{B_c} \sqrt{1 - r_X^2} \int_0^1 dx_2 \int_0^\infty b_1 db_1 b_3 db_3 \phi_\pi^A(x_3) \\
&\quad \{ [\Psi^L(x_2)(x_3 - x_1)(1 - r_X^2) + r_X \Psi^t(x_2)(1 - x_1 - x_2)] E_c(t_c) h(\beta_c, \alpha, b_3, b_1) \\
&\quad + [\Psi^L(x_2)(r_X^2(x_2 - x_3) + 2x_1 + x_2 + x_3 - 2) + r_X \Psi^t(x_2)(1 - x_1 - x_2)] \\
&\quad E_d(t_d) h(\beta_d, \alpha, b_3, b_1) \}, \tag{6}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha, \beta_{a,b,c,d}$ in the hard function and the hard scales $t_{a,b,c,d}$ are given in Appendix.

Second, the effective Hamiltonian for the decays $B_{u,d} \rightarrow X(3872)\pi(K)$ is written as

$$H_{eff} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \left[V_{cb}^* V_{cq} (C_1(\mu) O_1^c(\mu) + C_2(\mu) O_2^c(\mu)) - V_{tb}^* V_{tq} \sum_{i=3}^{10} C_i(\mu) O_i(\mu) \right], \tag{7}$$

where $V_{c(t)b}^* V_{c(t)q}$ is the product of the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) matrix elements, $q = d$ or s . The local four-quark operators $O_i(\mu)$ and the corresponding QCD-corrected Wilson coefficients $C_i(\mu)$ can be found in Ref. [35]. Here we take $B^+ \rightarrow X(3872)\pi^+$ as an example to analysis and its Feynman diagrams are given in Fig.2. The amplitudes for the factorizable and the nonfactorizable emission diagrams from $(V - A) \otimes (V - A)$ operators are denoted as $F_{B \rightarrow \pi}^{LL}$ and $M_{B \rightarrow \pi}^{LL}$, respectively. Their analytic expressions are given as

$$\begin{aligned}
F_{B \rightarrow \pi}^{LL} &= \frac{8\pi C_F m_B^4 f_X}{\sqrt{1 - r_X^2}} \int_0^1 dx_1 dx_3 \int_0^\infty b_1 db_1 b_3 db_3 \phi_B(x_1, b_1) \{ [(r_X^2 - 1) \phi_\pi^A(x_3) ((r_X^2 - 1) \\
&\quad \times x_3 - 1) + (r_X^2 - 1) \phi_\pi^P(x_3) r_\pi (2x_3 - 1) + \phi_\pi^T(x_3) r_\pi (2x_3 (r_X^2 - 1) + 1 + r_X^2)] \\
&\quad \times E_e(t'_a) h(\alpha', \beta'_a, b_1, b_3) S_t(x_3) - 2r_\pi (1 - r_X^2) \phi_\pi^P(x_3) \\
&\quad \times E_e(t'_b) h(\alpha', \beta'_b, b_3, b_1) S_t(x_1) \}, \tag{8}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
M_{B \rightarrow \pi}^{LL} &= \frac{32}{\sqrt{6}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(1 - r_X^2)}} \pi C_F m_B^4 \int_0^1 dx_1 dx_2 \int_0^\infty b_1 db_1 b_2 db_2 \phi_B(x_1, b_1) \\
&\quad \{ [\Psi^L(x_2) (\phi_\pi^A(x_3) (r_X^2 - 1) + 2\phi_\pi^T(x_3) r_\pi) (r_X^2 (x_1 + x_3 - 2x_2) + x_1 - x_3) \\
&\quad + 4r_\pi r_X r_c \phi_\pi^T(x_3) \Psi^t(x_2)] E_c(t'_c) h(\beta'_c, \alpha', b_2, b_1) \}. \tag{9}
\end{aligned}$$

Except the upper two $(V - A) \otimes (V - A)$ type amplitudes, there also exist factorizable and nonfactorizable emission contributions from $(V - A) \otimes (V + A)$ and $(S - P) \otimes (S + P)$

operators, which are expressed as $F_{B \rightarrow \pi}^{LR}$ and $M_{B \rightarrow \pi}^{SP}$, respectively,

$$\begin{aligned}
F_{B \rightarrow \pi}^{LR} &= -F_{B \rightarrow \pi}^{LL}, & (10) \\
M_{B \rightarrow \pi}^{SP} &= -\frac{32}{\sqrt{6}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(1-r_X^2)}} \pi C_F m_B^4 \int_0^1 dx_1 dx_2 \int_0^\infty b_1 db_1 b_2 db_2 \phi_B(x_1, b_1) \\
&\quad \left\{ [\Psi^L(x_2)(\phi_\pi^A(x_3)(r_X^2 - 1) + 2\phi_\pi^T(x_3)r_\pi)(r_X^2(x_1 + x_3 - 2x_2) + x_1 - x_3) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - 4r_\pi r_X r_c \phi_\pi^T(x_3)\Psi^t(x_2)] \right\} E_c(t'_c) h(\beta'_c, \alpha', b_2, b_1), & (11)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha', \beta'_{a,b,c}$ in the upper hard functions and the hard scales $t'_{a,b,c}$ are defined in Appendix.

By combining the amplitudes from the different Feynman diagrams, the total decay amplitudes for the considered decays are given as

$$\mathcal{A}(B_c \rightarrow X(3872)P) = V_{cb}^* V_{uq} [a_1 F_{B_c \rightarrow X}^{LL} + C_1 M_{B_c \rightarrow X}^{LL}], \quad (12)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}(B_{u,d} \rightarrow X(3872)P) &= V_{cb}^* V_{cq} [a_2 F_{B \rightarrow P}^{LL} + C_2 M_{B \rightarrow P}^{LL}] - V_{tb}^* V_{tq} [(a_3 + a_9 - a_5 - a_7) F_{B \rightarrow P}^{LL} \\
&\quad + (C_4 + C_{10}) M_{B \rightarrow P}^{LL} + (C_6 + C_8) M_{B \rightarrow P}^{SP}], & (13)
\end{aligned}$$

where the combinations of the Wilson coefficients $a_1 = C_1/3 + C_2$, $a_2 = C_1 + C_2/3$, $a_i = C_i + C_{i+1}/3$ with $i = 3, 5, 7, 9$, $q = d$ and $q = s$ are corresponding to the decays induced by the $b \rightarrow d$ and $b \rightarrow s$ transitions, respectively.

III. NUMERICAL RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

We use the following input parameters for the numerical calculations [21, 28, 29]

$$f_{B_c} = 0.398_{-0.055}^{+0.054} \text{GeV}, f_B = 0.19 \text{GeV}, f_X = 0.234 \pm 0.052 \text{GeV}, \quad (14)$$

$$M_{B_c} = 6.275 \text{GeV}, M_B = 5.279 \text{GeV}, M_X = 3.87169 \text{GeV}, \quad (15)$$

$$\tau_{B_c} = 0.510 \times 10^{-12} \text{s}, \tau_{B^\pm} = 1.638 \times 10^{-12} \text{s}, \tau_{B^0} = 1.519 \times 10^{-12} \text{s}. \quad (16)$$

For the CKM matrix elements, we adopt the Wolfenstein parametrization and the updated values $A = 0.814$, $\lambda = 0.22537$, $\bar{\rho} = 0.117 \pm 0.021$ and $\bar{\eta} = 0.353 \pm 0.013$ [21]. With the total amplitude, one can write the decay width as

$$\Gamma(B \rightarrow X(3872)P) = \frac{G_F^2}{32\pi m_B} (1 - r_X^2) |\mathcal{A}(B \rightarrow X(3872)P)|^2. \quad (17)$$

The wave functions of B , π and K have been well defined in many works, while those of the B_c and $X(3872)$ exit many uncertainties. For the meson B_c , we use its wave function in the nonrelativistic limit [38]

$$\Phi_{B_c}(x) = \frac{i f_{B_c}}{4N_C} [(\not{p}_{B_c} + M_{B_c}) \gamma_5 \delta(x - r_c)] \exp\left(-\frac{b^2 \omega_{B_c}^2}{2}\right), \quad (18)$$

where the last exponent term shows the k_T dependence. For the $X(3872)$, the light cone distribution amplitude is taken the similar formular with that of the χ_{c1} meson [32, 39]

$$\langle X(3872)(p, \epsilon_L) | \bar{c}_\alpha(z) c_\beta(0) | 0 \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2N_c}} \int dx e^{ixp \cdot z} \{ m_X [\gamma_5 \not{\epsilon}]_{\beta\alpha} \phi_X^L(x) + [\gamma_5 \not{p}]_{\beta\alpha} \phi_X^t(x) \}. \quad (19)$$

TABLE I: Our predictions for the branching ratios of the decays $B_c^+ \rightarrow X(3872)\pi^+(K^+)$, together with the results from the covariant light-front approach (CLFA) [28] and the generalized factorization approach (GFA) [29].

mode	This work	CLFA[28]	GFA[29]
$B_c^+ \rightarrow X(3872)\pi^+(\times 10^{-4})$	$2.7^{+1.4+0.9+0.7+0.2}_{-1.0-0.6-0.5-0.1}$	$1.7^{+0.7+0.1+0.4}_{-0.6-0.2-0.4}$	$0.60^{+0.22+0.14}_{-0.18-0.07}$
$B_c^+ \rightarrow X(3872)K^+(\times 10^{-5})$	$2.5^{+1.3+0.8+0.6+0.2}_{-1.0-0.6-0.4-0.1}$	$1.3^{+0.5+0.1+0.3}_{-0.5-0.2-0.3}$	$0.47^{+0.17+0.11}_{-0.14-0.05}$

Here only the longitudinal polarization contributes to the considered decays, and $\phi_X^{L,t}(x)$ are given as

$$\phi_X^L(x) = 24.68 \frac{f_X}{2\sqrt{2N_c}} x(1-x) \left\{ \frac{x(1-x)(1-2x)^2 [1-4x(1-x)]}{[1-3.47x(1-x)]^3} \right\}^{0.7}, \quad (20)$$

$$\phi_X^t(x) = 13.53 \frac{f_X}{2\sqrt{2N_c}} (1-2x)^2 \left\{ \frac{x(1-x)(1-2x)^2 [1-4x(1-x)]}{[1-3.47x(1-x)]^3} \right\}^{0.7}. \quad (21)$$

Using the input parameters and the wave functions as specified in this section, we give the branching ratios of the decays $B_c^+ \rightarrow X(3872)\pi^+(K^+)$ as follows

$$Br(B_c^+ \rightarrow X(3872)\pi^+) = (2.7^{+1.4+0.9+0.7+0.2}_{-1.0-0.6-0.5-0.1}) \times 10^{-4}, \quad (22)$$

$$Br(B_c^+ \rightarrow X(3872)K^+) = (2.5^{+1.3+0.8+0.6+0.2}_{-1.0-0.6-0.4-0.1}) \times 10^{-5}, \quad (23)$$

where the first error comes from the decay constant of the meson $X(3872)$, $f_X = 0.234 \pm 0.052$ GeV, the second and third uncertainties is caused by the shape parameter $\omega_{B_c} = 0.6 \pm 0.1$ GeV and the decay constant $f_{B_c} = 0.398^{+0.054}_{-0.055}$ GeV, respectively, the last error is from the hard scale-dependent uncertainty, varied from $0.8t$ to $1.2t$. One can find that the branching ratios are sensitive to the decay constant f_X . This is because that the dominate contributions for these two channels are from the factorization emission amplitudes, which are proportional to f_X . $Br(B_c^+ \rightarrow X(3872)\pi^+)$ is about one order larger than $Br(B_c^- \rightarrow X(3872)K^-)$, which is mainly induced by the different CKM elements $V_{ud} = 1 - \lambda^2/2$ and $V_{us} = \lambda$. From Table I, it is shown that our predictions are consistent with the results given in the covariant light-front quark model within errors [28], but much larger than those calculated by the generalized factorization approach [29].

Similarly, the branching ratios of the decays $B \rightarrow X(3872)P$ are calculated as follows

$$Br(B^+ \rightarrow X(3872)K^+) = (3.8^{+0.9+0.6+0.3}_{-0.8-0.5-0.2}) \times 10^{-4}, \quad (24)$$

$$Br(B^0 \rightarrow X(3872)K^0) = (3.5^{+0.7+0.5+0.3}_{-0.6-0.4-0.2}) \times 10^{-4}, \quad (25)$$

$$Br(B^+ \rightarrow X(3872)\pi^+) = (9.3^{+1.5+0.9+0.5}_{-1.3-0.8-0.4}) \times 10^{-6}, \quad (26)$$

$$Br(B^0 \rightarrow X(3872)\pi^0) = (4.3^{+0.7+0.5+0.3}_{-0.6-0.4-0.3}) \times 10^{-6}, \quad (27)$$

where the first uncertainty comes from the shape parameter $\omega_B = 0.4 \pm 0.04$ GeV in B meson wave function, the second error is from the decay constant $f_X = 0.234 \pm 0.052$ GeV of the $X(3872)$, and the third one arises from the choice of the hard scales, which

TABLE II: Comparisons between $Br(B \rightarrow X(3872)\pi(K))$ (this work) and $Br(B \rightarrow \chi_{1c}(1P)\pi(K))$ [40] calculated in PQCD approach, and the data are taken from the Particle Data Group (PDG) 2020 [21].

mode($\times 10^{-4}$)	$B^+ \rightarrow X(3872)K^+$	$B^+ \rightarrow \chi_1(1P)K^+$	$B^0 \rightarrow X(3872)K^0$	$B^0 \rightarrow \chi_1(1P)K^0$
PQCD	$3.8^{+0.9+0.6+0.3}_{-0.8-0.5-0.2}$	$4.4^{+1.9}_{-1.6}$	$3.5^{+0.7+0.5+0.3}_{-0.6-0.4-0.2}$	$4.1^{+1.8}_{-1.6}$
Exp.	–	4.85 ± 0.33	–	3.95 ± 0.27
mode($\times 10^{-5}$)	$B^+ \rightarrow X(3872)\pi^+$	$B^+ \rightarrow \chi_1(1P)\pi^+$	$B^0 \rightarrow X(3872)\pi^0$	$B^0 \rightarrow \chi_1(1P)\pi^0$
PQCD	$0.93^{+0.15+0.09+0.05}_{-0.13-0.08-0.04}$	1.7 ± 0.6	$0.43^{+0.07+0.05+0.03}_{-0.06-0.04-0.03}$	0.8 ± 0.3
Exp.	–	2.2 ± 0.5	–	1.12 ± 0.28

vary from $0.8t$ to $1.2t$. From the results, one can find that the branching ratios for the decays $B^+ \rightarrow X(3872)K^+$ and $B^0 \rightarrow X(3872)K^0$ are close to each other, since they differ only in the lifetimes between B^+ and B^0 in our formalism. Our prediction for the decay $B^- \rightarrow X(3872)K^-$ is less than the previous PQCD calculation result $(7.88^{+4.87}_{-3.76}) \times 10^{-4}$ [32]. While it is still slightly larger than the upper limits 2.6×10^{-4} given by Belle [33] and 3.2×10^{-4} given by BaBar [34]. If the present experimental upper limits are confident, a pure charmonium assignment for the $X(3872)$ is maybe not suitable under the PQCD approach. We expect that the branching ratios for the decays $B^{0,+} \rightarrow X(3872)K^{0,+}$ can be precisely measured at the present LHCb and SuperKEKB experiments, which is very helpful to probe the inner structure of the $X(3872)$.

On the other hand, it is noticed that the $X(3872)$ is renamed as $\chi_{1c}(3872)$ by the present Particle Data Group (PDG) 2020 [21], which seems to assume it as the radial excited state of $\chi_{1c}(1P)$. As we know, the $\chi_{1c}(1P)$ is another P-wave charmonium state with the same quantum numbers $J^{(PC)} = 1^{++}$ but a slightly lighter mass 3.511 GeV. In this case, they should have similar characters in the B meson decays. For example, the branching ratio for the decay $B^+ \rightarrow \chi(1P)K^+$ is measured as $(4.85 \pm 0.33) \times 10^{-4}$ [21], which is consistent with the result predicted by PQCD approach $(4.4^{+1.9}_{-1.6}) \times 10^{-4}$ [40]. The corresponding decay $B^+ \rightarrow X(3872)K^+$ should have similar but slightly smaller branching ratio. The comparisons of the branching ratios between the decays $B \rightarrow X(3872)\pi(K)$ and $B \rightarrow \chi_{1c}(1P)\pi(K)$ can be found in Table II, where the theoretical predictions for the $Br(B \rightarrow \chi_{1c}(1P)\pi(K))$ are taken from another PQCD calculations [40]. From Table II, we can know that the calculations for the decays $B \rightarrow X(3872)P$ by using the PQCD approach are under control and credible. So we suggest that the experimental colleagues can measure these decays at LHCb and Belle II, which is helpful to discriminate the inner structures of the $X(3872)$ from different assumptions.

In Table III, we compare our predictions with the results calculated in the generalized factorization approach [29]. It is interesting that the branching ratios for the decays $B \rightarrow X(3872)\pi(K)$ calculated in these two different approaches are consistent with each other within errors. One can find that $Br(B^+ \rightarrow X(3872)\pi^+) \simeq 2Br(B^0 \rightarrow X(3872)\pi^0)$, which is supported by the isospin symmetry.

In the following we will discuss the CP-violating asymmetries of the decays $B \rightarrow X(3872)P$. As we know, the CP asymmetry arises from the interference between the tree and penguin amplitudes, while for the decays $B_c^+ \rightarrow X(3872)\pi^+(K^+)$, there are no

TABLE III: Our predictions for the branching ratios of the decays $B \rightarrow X(3872)\pi(K)$, together with the results from the generalized factorization approach (GFA) [29].

mode	This work	GFA [29]
$B^+ \rightarrow X(3872)K^+(\times 10^{-4})$	$3.8^{+0.9+0.6+0.3}_{-0.8-0.5-0.2}$	$2.3^{+1.1}_{-0.9} \pm 0.1$
$B^0 \rightarrow X(3872)K^0(\times 10^{-4})$	$3.5^{+0.7+0.5+0.3}_{-0.6-0.4-0.2}$	$2.1^{+1.0}_{-0.8} \pm 0.1$
$B^+ \rightarrow X(3872)\pi^+(\times 10^{-6})$	$9.3^{+1.5+0.9+0.5}_{-1.3-0.8-0.4}$	$11.5^{+5.7}_{-4.5} \pm 0.3$
$B^0 \rightarrow X(3872)\pi^0(\times 10^{-6})$	$4.3^{+0.7+0.5+0.3}_{-0.6-0.4-0.3}$	$5.3^{+2.6}_{-2.1} \pm 0.2$

contributions from the penguin amplitudes, so the corresponding direct CP violation is zero. For the charged decays $B^+ \rightarrow X(3872)\pi^+(K^+)$, we need only consider the direct CP violation A_{CP}^{dir} , which is defined as

$$A_{CP}^{dir} = \frac{|\bar{\mathcal{A}}|^2 - |\mathcal{A}|^2}{|\bar{\mathcal{A}}|^2 + |\mathcal{A}|^2}, \quad (28)$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{A}}$ is the CP-conjugate amplitude of \mathcal{A} . As to the neutral B meson decays, there exists another type CP violation named as time-dependent CP asymmetry, which is induced by the interference between the direct decay and the decay via oscillation, need to be considered. Then the time-dependent CP violation can be defined as

$$A(t)_{CP} = A_f \cos(\Delta m t) + S_f \sin(\Delta m t), \quad (29)$$

where $\Delta m > 0$ is the mass difference of the two neutral B meson mass eigenstates, and the direct CP asymmetry A_f and the mixing-induced CP asymmetry are expressed as

$$A_f = \frac{|\lambda_f|^2 - 1}{|\lambda_f|^2 + 1}, \quad S_f = \frac{2\text{Im}(\lambda_f)}{|\lambda_f|^2 + 1}, \quad (30)$$

with $\lambda_f = \eta_f e^{-2i\beta} \frac{\bar{\mathcal{A}}}{\mathcal{A}}$. η_f is 1(-1) for a CP-even (CP-odd) final state f , β is the CKM angle [21]. Since the charged decay channel and the corresponding neutral mode are the same with each other except the lifetimes and isospin factor in the amplitudes, they have the same direct CP asymmetries. So we need only consider the neutral decays, whose direct CP asymmetries are calculated as

$$A_{X(3872)K_S} = (1.2^{+0.0+0.0+0.2}_{-0.0-0.0-0.3}) \times 10^{-3}, \quad (31)$$

$$A_{X(3872)\pi^0} = (2.7^{+0.1+0.0+0.4}_{-0.2-0.0-0.4}) \times 10^{-2}, \quad (32)$$

where the errors are induced by the same sources as those for the branching ratios, but the difference is that the direct CP violations are less sensitive to the nonperturbative parameters within their uncertainties except the hard scale t . Compared with the tree contributions, the penguin amplitudes are loop suppressed and lower by 1 ~ 2 orders of magnitude. At the same time, the product of the CKM matrix elements associated with the tree amplitudes is about 4 times than that for penguin ones. So the direct CP violations, which arise from the interference between the tree and penguin contributions,

are very small. Since the final state $X(3872)K^0$ and its CP conjugate are flavor-specific, so we should use the CP-odd eigenstate $X(3872)K_S$ to analyze the mixing-induced CP violations. The results for the mixing-induced CP violations are given as

$$S_{X(3872)K_S} = (70.3_{-0.0-0.0-1.2}^{+0.0+0.0+0.9})\%, \quad (33)$$

$$S_{X(3872)\pi} = (-60.8_{-0.0-0.0-1.4}^{+0.0+0.0+1.5})\%, \quad (34)$$

where the errors are similar with those listed in the direct CP violations, and not sensitive to the nonperturbative parameters given in the wave functions. One can find that $S_{X(3872)K_S}$ is consistent well with the current world average value $\sin 2\beta = 0.699 \pm 0.017$ [41], which are obtained from B^0 to charmonium and K^0 decays. So we can check the nature of $X(3872)$ by extracting the CKM phase β from the future experimental data for the decay $B^0 \rightarrow X(3872)K_S$. The mixing-induced CP asymmetry for the decay $B^0 \rightarrow X(3872)\pi^0$ is some different from the world average value of $\sin 2\beta$, which is because that the imagine parts of the total amplitudes for this channel and its conjugate one exist larger different. Our results can be tested by the future experiments.

IV. SUMMARY

We studied the decays $B_{c,u,d} \rightarrow X(3872)\pi(K)$ in the PQCD approach, where the puzzling resonance $X(3872)$ is involved. Assuming the $X(3872)$ as a 1^{++} charmonium state, we calculated the branching ratios and CP asymmetries for the considered decays. Through comparing our predictions with other theoretical results and the available experimental data, we found the following results

(1) The branching ratios of the decays $B_c^- \rightarrow X(3872)\pi^-$ and $B_c^- \rightarrow X(3872)K^-$ can reach the order of 10^{-4} and 10^{-5} , respectively, which are consistent with the covariant light-front approach within errors, but larger than those given by the generalized factorization approach. These results can be discriminated at the present running LHCb and Belle II experiments.

(2) Our predictions for the branching ratio of the decays $B \rightarrow X(3872)K$ and $B \rightarrow X(3872)\pi$ are consistent with the results given by the covariant light-front approach. $Br(B \rightarrow X(3872)K)$ can reach the order of 10^{-4} , which is much larger than that of the decay $B \rightarrow X(3872)\pi$ induced by the $b \rightarrow d$ transition. On the experimental side, it is helpful to probe the inner structure of the $X(3872)$ by measuring the branching ratios and testing the $SU(3)$ and isospin symmetries for these considered decays.

(3) The direct CP violations for the decays $B \rightarrow X(3872)\pi(K)$ are very small, only $10^{-3} \sim 10^{-2}$. The mixing-induced CP violation for the decay $B \rightarrow X(3872)K_S$ agrees well with current world average value $(69.9 \pm 1.7)\%$. But it is different for the value of $S_{X(3872)\pi^0}$, which is because that the imagine parts of the total amplitudes for the decay $B \rightarrow X(3872)\pi^0$ and its conjugate one exist larger different.

Acknowledgment

This work is partly supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 11347030, by the Program of Science and Technology Innovation Talents in Universities of Henan Province 14HASTIT037.

Appendix A

$$\alpha = (x_2 + x_1 - 1)(r_X^2(1 - x_2) - x_1)m_{B_c}^2, \quad (\text{A1})$$

$$\beta_a = (r_b^2 - x_2(1 - r_X^2(1 - x_2)))m_{B_c}^2, \quad (\text{A2})$$

$$\beta_b = (r_c^2 - (1 - x_1)(r_X^2 - x_1))m_{B_c}^2, \quad (\text{A3})$$

$$\beta_c = -(1 - x_1 - x_2)(r_X^2(1 - x_2 - x_3) + x_3 - x_1)m_{B_c}^2, \quad (\text{A4})$$

$$\beta_d = -(1 - x_1 - x_2)(r_X^2(x_3 - x_2) + 1 - x_3 - x_1)m_{B_c}^2, \quad (\text{A5})$$

$$\alpha' = x_1x_3(1 - r_X^2)m_B^2, \quad (\text{A6})$$

$$\beta'_a = x_3(1 - r_X^2)m_B^2, \quad (\text{A7})$$

$$\beta'_b = x_1(1 - r_X^2)m_B^2, \quad (\text{A8})$$

$$\beta'_c = (r_c^2 + (x_1 - x_2)(x_3 + r_X^2(x_2 - x_3)))m_B^2, \quad (\text{A9})$$

$$t_{a(b)} = \max(\sqrt{|\alpha|}, \sqrt{|\beta_{a(b)}|}, 1/b_1, 1/b_2), \quad (\text{A10})$$

$$t_{c(d)} = \max(\sqrt{|\alpha|}, \sqrt{|\beta_{c(d)}|}, 1/b_1, 1/b_3), \quad (\text{A11})$$

$$t'_{a(b)} = \max(\sqrt{|\alpha'|}, \sqrt{|\beta'_{a(b)}|}, 1/b_1, 1/b_3), \quad (\text{A12})$$

$$t'_c = \max(\sqrt{|\alpha'|}, \sqrt{|\beta'_c|}, 1/b_1, 1/b_2). \quad (\text{A13})$$

-
- [1] S. K. Choi *et al.* [Belle Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 262001 (2003).
 - [2] D. Acosta *et al.* [CDF II Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 072001 (2004).
 - [3] V. M. Abazov *et al.* [D0 Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 162002 (2004).
 - [4] B. Aubert *et al.* [BaBar Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **71**, 071103 (2005).
 - [5] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **102**, 092005 (2020).
 - [6] F. E. Close, P. R. Rage, Phys. Lett. B **578**, 119 (2004).
 - [7] C. Y. Wong, Phys. Rev. C **69**, 055202 (2004).
 - [8] E. Braaten and M. Kusunoki, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 074005 (2004).
 - [9] E. S. Swanson, Phys. Lett. B **588**, 189 (2004).
 - [10] Z. Y. Lin, J. B. Cheng, S. L. Zhu, arXiv:2205.03572.
 - [11] H. Chen, W. Q. Niu, and H. Q. Zheng, arXiv:2205.14628.
 - [12] T. W. Chiu *et al.* [TWQCD Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **646**, 95 (2007).
 - [13] N. Barnea, J. Vijande and A. Valcarce, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 054004 (2006).
 - [14] L. Maiani, F. Piccinini, A. D. Polosa and V. Riquer, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 014028 (2005).
 - [15] H. Hogaasen, J. M. Richard and P. Sorba, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 054013 (2006).
 - [16] F. E. Close and S. Godfrey, Phys. Lett. B **574**, 210 (2003).
 - [17] B. A. Li, Phys. Lett. B **605**, 306 (2005).
 - [18] T. Barnes and S. Godfrey, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 054008 (2004).
 - [19] E. J. Eichten, K. Lane and C. Quigg, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 094019 (2004).
 - [20] C. Quigg, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **142**, 87 (2005).

- [21] P. A. Zyla *et al.*[Particle Data Group Collaboration], Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys. **2020**, 083C01 (2020).
- [22] H. X. Chen, Commun. Theor. Phys. **74**, 025201 (2022).
- [23] L. Meng, G. J. Wang, B. Wang, and S. L. Zhu, Phys. Rev. D **104**, 094003 (2021).
- [24] Q. Wu, D. Y. Chen, and T. Matsuki, Eur. Phys. J. C **81**, 193 (2021).
- [25] R. D. Matheus, F. S. Navarra, M. Nielsen, C. M. Zanetti, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 056002 (2009).
- [26] C. Meng, J. J. Sanz-Cillero, M. Shi, D. L. Yao, H. Q. Zheng, Phys. Rev. D **92**, 034020 (2015).
- [27] C. Meng, Y. J. Gao, and K. T. Chao, Phys. Rev. D **87**, 074035 (2013).
- [28] W. Wang, Y. L. Shen, C. D. Lu, Eur. Phys. J. C **51**,841 (2007).
- [29] Y. K. Hsiao, C. Q. Geng, Chin. Phys. C **41**, 013101 (2017).
- [30] E. Braaten, M. Kusunoki, S. Nussinov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 162001 (2004).
- [31] E. Braaten, M. Kusunoki, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 074005 (2005).
- [32] X. Liu, Y. M. Wang, Eur. Phys. J. C **49**, 643 (2007).
- [33] Y. Kato *et al.* [Belle Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **97**, 012005 (2018).
- [34] B. Aubert *et al.* [BaBar Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 052002 (2006).
- [35] G. Buchalla, A. J. Buras, and M. E. Lautenbacher, Rev. Mod. Phys. **68**, 1125 (1996).
- [36] Z. Rui, Z. T. Zou, Phys. Rev. D **90**, 114030 (2014).
- [37] Z. Q. Zhang, S. Y. Wang, X. K. Ma, Phys. Rev. D **93**, 054034 (2016).
- [38] X. Liu, Z. J. Xiao, and C. D. Lu, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 014022, (2010).
- [39] C. H. Chen, H. n. Li, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 114008 (2005).
- [40] R. Zhou, Q. Zhao, L. L. Zhang, Eur. Phys. J. C **78**, 463 (2018).
- [41] Y. S. Amhis *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. C **81**, 226 (2021) and the online update at <https://hflav.web.cern.ch/>