

The study on the structure of exotic states $\chi_{c1}(3872)$ via beauty-hadron decays in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV

Chun-tai Wu¹, Zhi-Lei She¹, Xin-Ye Peng^{1,*}, Xiao-Lin Kang¹,
Hong-Ge Xu¹ Dai-Mei Zhou², Gang Chen¹ and Ben-Hao Sa³

¹ School of Mathematics and Physics, China University of Geosciences, Wuhan 430074, China

² Key Laboratory of Quark and Lepton Physics, Central China Normal University, Wuhan 430079, China

³ China Institute of Atomic Energy, P.O. Box 275(10), Beijing 102413, China

(Dated: March 8, 2023)

A dynamically constrained phase-space coalescence (DCPC) model was introduced to study the exotic state $\chi_{c1}(3872)$ yield for three possible structures: tetraquark state, nuclear-like state, and molecular state respectively, where the hadronic final states generated by the parton and hadron cascade model (PACIAE). The $\chi_{c1}(3872)/\psi(2S)$ cross-section ratio from beauty-hadron decays (non-prompt) based on the $\chi_{c1}(3872)$ or $\psi(2S) \rightarrow J/\psi\pi^+\pi^-$ bound state in the decay chains as a function of charged-particle multiplicity and transverse momentum in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV are calculated. A tetraquark state scenario from PACIAE+DCPC model shows better agreement with the LHCb and ATLAS measurements for the non-prompt $\chi_{c1}(3872)/\psi(2S)$ cross-section ratio distributions, indicating that the $\chi_{c1}(3872)$ is more likely to be a compact tetraquark state.

PACS numbers: 25.75.-q, 24.85.+p, 24.10.Lx

I. INTRODUCTION

In addition to mesons composed of quark-antiquark pairs and baryons consisting of three quarks, many bound states that are incompatible with traditional hadron frameworks have been observed in the decades since the quark model proposed by Gell-Mann in 1964 [1]. These bound states, also known as exotic states, including multi-quark states [2–4], hadron molecular states [5], hybrid states [6, 7], and glueballs [8], are allowed and expected by the quantum chromodynamics (QCD) and the quark model. While many unconventional hadron candidates containing heavy quarks have been discovered experimentally in recent years [9], the exact nature of even the most well-studied $\chi_{c1}(3872)$ particle, also known as $X(3872)$, is still unclear.

The $\chi_{c1}(3872)$ particle as an exotic charmonium state was observed in the exclusive decay process $B^\pm \rightarrow K^\pm J/\psi\pi^+\pi^-$ by the Belle Collaboration in 2003, which decays into $J/\psi\pi^+\pi^-$ [10]. Later, CDF II, D0, BE-SIII, and BABAR Collaboration confirmed this exotic state's discovery experimentally [11–14]. Among them, CDF Collaboration proposed that the quantum number of $\chi_{c1}(3872)$ particle may be $J^{PC} = 1^{++}$ or 2^{-+} [15], and D0 Collaboration suggested that $\psi(2S)$ state and $\chi_{c1}(3872)$ state with the same decay mode have the same production and decay properties, which can provide a good benchmark for studying the properties of $\chi_{c1}(3872)$ particle [12]. Finally, the spin and parity of the $\chi_{c1}(3872)$ state are determined by the LHCb Collaboration to $J^{PC} = 1^{++}$ [16]. Although there are several measurements on $\chi_{c1}(3872)$ particle, due to the lack of the understanding of its exact properties, various mod-

els have emerged to describe $\chi_{c1}(3872)$ state as a $D^{*0}\bar{D}^0$ molecular state with small binding energy [17, 18], a compact tetraquark state [19, 20], a hybrid meson [21, 22], or a charmonium-molecule [23, 24].

Recently, The prompt $\chi_{c1}(3872)/\psi(2S)$ cross-section ratio was measured at midrapidity by CMS Collaboration as a function of transverse momentum (p_T) in Pb–Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5$ TeV. The central value for the ratio is close to unity and enhanced with respect to the one measured in pp collisions [25, 26]. This provides a unique experimental input to theoretical models understanding the $\chi_{c1}(3872)$ production mechanism and the nature of its state since the modification of the hadronization mechanism is predicted when a color-deconfined state of the matter called quark–gluon plasma is formed in heavy-ion collisions. The AMPT transport model [27] with instantaneous coalescence, TAMU model [28] considering only the regeneration processes, the statistical hadronization model (SHM) [29] based on the assumption of thermal equilibrium predict the different magnitude of the ratio with different scenarios of the structure.

In high-multiplicity pp collisions at LHC energies, the charged-particle densities can reach values comparable with those measured in peripheral heavy-ion collisions. Measurements at the such condition in pp collisions showed features that resemble those in heavy-ion collisions [30–32]. Recently, a multiplicity dependence of the p_T -differential Λ_c^+/D^0 ratio is observed by ALICE Collaboration, evolving from pp to Pb–Pb collisions smoothly [33, 34]. The prompt $\chi_{c1}(3872)/\psi(2S)$ cross-section ratio is found to decrease as charged-particle multiplicity increases by the LHCb Collaboration [35], which is well described by the comover interaction model [36]. The $\chi_{c1}(3872)/\psi(2S)$ cross-section ratio from beauty-hadron decays (non-prompt) showed a slight increase trend as charged-particle multiplicity increases, no the-

*xinye.peng@cern.ch

oretical calculation is available for such measurement. Thus, studies about non-prompt $\chi_{c1}(3872)$ production at high multiplicity pp collisions can provide further insight into beauty-quark hadronization as well as an understanding of the nature of the $\chi_{c1}(3872)$ structure.

In this paper, the $\chi_{c1}(3872)$ from beauty-hadron decays, produced in high multiplicity pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV, were studied using the Monte Carlo (MC) simulation approach [37]. The multiparticle final states of J/ψ , π^+ , and π^- are generated by the parton and hadron cascade (PACIAE) model [38]. The properties of $\chi_{c1}(3872)$ with the hadronic molecular state, the nuclear-like states, or the compact tetraquarks scenario are studied separately using the dynamically constrained phase space coalescence (DCPC) model on these bases [39–44]. With the PACIAE+DCPC model, the non-prompt $\chi_{c1}(3872)$ of three structures to $\psi(2S)$ cross-section ratio as a function of charged particle multiplicity and as a function of p_T were predicted.

II. THE PACIAE AND DCPC MODEL

The PACIAE [38] model based on the PYTHIA6.4 [37] is a parton and hadron cascade model that can describe multiple relativistic nuclear collisions. In this paper, the PACIAE model is used to simulate pp collisions, which divides the entire collision process into four main stages: parton initiation, parton rescattering, hadronization, and hadron rescattering.

The initial-state free parton is produced by breaking the strings of quarks, antiquarks, and gluons formed in the pp collision with the PACIAE model. The parton rescattering is further considered using the $2 \rightarrow 2$ leading-order (LO) perturbative QCD parton-parton cross sections [45]. The total and differential cross-section in the evolution of the deconfined quark matter state is calculated using the MC method. After the partonic freeze-out, the hadronization of the partonic matter is executed by the LUND string fragmentation [37] or the MC coalescence model [38]. Finally, hadron rescattering is performed based on the two-body collision until the hadronic freeze-out.

The hadron yields are calculated based on a two-step approach. Firstly, the multiplicity final states are simulated by the PACIAE model in pp collisions [38]. After that, a transport model (DCPC) is introduced for the calculation of the hadron yields. The details are explained as follows.

From quantum statistical mechanics [46], both position $\vec{q} \equiv (x, y, z)$ and momentum $\vec{p} \equiv (p_x, p_y, p_z)$ of a particle cannot be defined precisely in the six-dimensional phase space, due to the uncertainty principle, $\Delta\vec{q}\Delta\vec{p} \geq h^3$. However, a volume element h^3 in the six-dimensional phase space corresponds to a state of the particle. Thus, the following integral equation can be used to estimate

the yield of a single particle:

$$Y_1 = \int_{E_\alpha \leq H \leq E_\beta} \frac{d\vec{q}d\vec{p}}{h^3}, \quad (1)$$

where E_α , E_β , and H are the particle's lower and upper energy thresholds and the Hamiltonian quantity, i.e. the energy function, respectively. Furthermore, the yield of N -particle clusters or bound-state hadrons can be obtained by the following integral equation:

$$Y_N = \int \dots \int_{E_\alpha \leq H \leq E_\beta} \frac{d\vec{q}_1 d\vec{p}_1 \dots d\vec{q}_N d\vec{p}_N}{h^{3N}}. \quad (2)$$

For instance, the yield of $\chi_{c1}(3872)$ particle consisting of J/ψ , π^+ , and π^- can be calculated according to the DCPC model using the following integral formula:

$$Y_{\chi_{c1}(3872)} = \int \dots \int \delta_{123} \frac{d\vec{q}_1 d\vec{p}_1 d\vec{q}_2 d\vec{p}_2 d\vec{q}_3 d\vec{p}_3}{h^9}, \quad (3)$$

$$\delta_{123} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } 1 \equiv \pi^+, 2 \equiv \pi^-, 3 \equiv J/\psi; \\ & m_0 - \Delta m \leq m_{inv} \leq m_0 + \Delta m; \\ & \text{Max}\{|\vec{q}_{12}|, |\vec{q}_{23}|, |\vec{q}_{31}|\} \leq R_0; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

$$m_{inv} = \left[(E_1 + E_2 + E_3)^2 - (\vec{p}_1 + \vec{p}_2 + \vec{p}_3)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (5)$$

In Eq. (4), $m_0 = m_{\chi_{c1}(3872)} = 3871.69 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ represents the rest mass of $\chi_{c1}(3872)$ particle [47], R_0 stands for its radius and Δm denotes the uncertainty of the mass. $|\vec{q}_{12}|$, $|\vec{q}_{23}|$, $|\vec{q}_{31}|$ indicate the distances between each of the three component particles π^+ , π^- and J/ψ under the center-of-mass system, respectively, while $\text{Max}\{|\vec{q}_{12}|, |\vec{q}_{23}|, |\vec{q}_{31}|\}$ represents the maximum distance taken between them. The Hamiltonian quantity H satisfies the equation $H^2 = (\vec{p}_{J/\psi} + \vec{p}_{\pi^+} + \vec{p}_{\pi^-})^2 + m_{inv}^2$, and the energy threshold upper and lower limits E_α and E_β satisfy $E_{\alpha,\beta} = (\vec{p}_{J/\psi} + \vec{p}_{\pi^+} + \vec{p}_{\pi^-})^2 + (m_{\chi_{c1}(3872)} \mp \Delta m)^2$. Thus the dynamic constraint condition $E_\alpha \leq H \leq E_\beta$ in Eq. (1) can be equivalently replaced by $m_{\chi_{c1}(3872)} - \Delta m \leq m_{inv} \leq m_{\chi_{c1}(3872)} + \Delta m$ in Eq. (4).

III. RESULTS

The final-state hadrons, including J/ψ , π^+ , and π^- , are simulated using PACIAE model in pp collision at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV. All the parameters are fixed to the default values in PACIAE model, except $\text{parj}(1)$, $\text{parj}(2)$, and $\text{parj}(3)$, which are determined by fitting data from the LHCb Collaboration for J/ψ , π^+ , and π^- in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV. Here, $\text{parj}(1)$, $\text{parj}(2)$, and $\text{parj}(3)$ factors are related to the suppression of diquark–antidiquark pair production compared with quark–anti-quark production, the suppression of s quark pair production compared with u or d pair production, and the extra suppression of strange diquark production compared with

TABLE I: The J/ψ , π^+ and π^- yields in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV calculated by the PACIAE model, compared to the ALICE and LHCb data [48, 49] in $|y| < 0.5$, $0.1 < p_T < 3$ GeV/c for π^\pm and $2 < y < 4.5$, $0 < p_T < 14$ GeV/c for non-prompt J/ψ , respectively.

Particle	ALICE or LHCb data [48, 49]	PACIAE
J/ψ	$(1.60 \pm 0.01 \pm 0.23) \times 10^{-5}$	$(1.60 \pm 0.03) \times 10^{-5}$
π^+	2.26 ± 0.10	2.26 ± 0.01
π^-	2.23 ± 0.10	2.25 ± 0.03

the normal suppression of strange quark, respectively. With the configurations of $\text{parj}(1) = 0.10$, $\text{parj}(2) = 0.20$, $\text{parj}(3) = 0.90$, the production of J/ψ , π^+ , and π^- generated by the PACIAE model fits the ALICE and LHCb data [48, 49] well. Table. I summarizes the comparison of the non-prompt J/ψ , π^+ , and π^- integrated yields at the same p_T and rapidity coverage between experimental data and PACIAE model.

Assuming no dependence of PACIAE model parameters between $\sqrt{s} = 7$ and 8 TeV, the simulation was redone at 8 TeV. After that, the exotic state $\chi_{c1}(3872)$ is constructed by the combination of J/ψ , π^+ , and π^- using DCPC model. Half of the $\chi_{c1}(3872)$ decay width is used as the Δm parameter, i.e., $\Delta m = \Gamma/2 = 1.95$ MeV [44, 50]. The $\chi_{c1}(3872)$ can be separated into three possible structures according to $\text{Max}\{|\bar{q}_{12}|, |\bar{q}_{23}|, |\bar{q}_{31}|\}$. The tetraquark state, the nuclear-like state, and the molecular state are defined with the radius interval $R_0 < 1.2$ fm (χ_{c1}^t) [51], $1.2 < R_0 < 1.96$ fm (χ_{c1}^n) [52], and $1.96 < R_0 < 10$ fm (χ_{c1}^m), respectively.




FIG. 1: The non-prompt $\chi_{c1}(3872)$ to $\psi(2S)$ cross-section ratios in the $J/\psi\pi^+\pi^-$ decay channels obtained with three structures χ_{c1}^t , χ_{c1}^n , and χ_{c1}^m in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV, as a function of charged-particle multiplicity. The open points are computed using the PACIAE+DCPC model, and the solid red points are from the LHCb data [53].

Fig.1 shows the non-prompt $\chi_{c1}(3872)/\psi(2S)$ cross-section ratios in the $J/\psi\pi^+\pi^-$ decay channels with three structures χ_{c1}^t , χ_{c1}^n , and χ_{c1}^m in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV, as a function of charged-particle multiplicity (N_{ch}). Here, the $\psi(2S)$ yields are calculated in the same way as $\chi_{c1}(3872)$ described above. The N_{ch} represents the number of charged particles at the $2 < y < 5$ rapidity interval to match the LHCb data [53]. The non-prompt $\chi_{c1}^t/\psi(2S)$ cross-section ratio is consistent with the LHCb data within uncertainties [53], while other scenarios show larger deviation with respect to the data, indicating that $\chi_{c1}(3872)$ is more likely to be a compact quark state. Both these three scenarios show a similar flat trend with the increasing of the N_{ch} within uncertainties, consistent with the data measurement. From the PACIAE+DCPC model, the number of non-prompt $\chi_{c1}(3872)$ naturally increases with the increasing of the multiplicity, similar to $\psi(2S)$ [3]. Note that, the increasing of multiplicity will also lead to a more significant final-state effect of $\chi_{c1}(3872)$ destruction by the comoving particles in the PACIAE+DCPC model, resulting in a decrease of the $\chi_{c1}(3872)$ yields [54–56]. Similarly, $\psi(2S)$ yields are also suppressed by the final-state breakup interaction of the quarkonium with the comoving particles. However, same as argued in Ref. [53], the effect is less pronounced for non-prompt $\chi_{c1}(3872)$ and $\psi(2S)$ since they're produced from displaced beauty-hadron decay vertices, where the particle density is largely reduced with respect to the primary vertex.

The PACIAE+DCPC model predicts different magnitude for the non-prompt $\chi_{c1}(3872)/\psi(2S)$ cross-section ratio based on different structures, with the hierarchy $\chi_{c1}^t < \chi_{c1}^n < \chi_{c1}^m$. From the PACIAE+DCPC model, it's harder to generate the non-prompt χ_{c1}^t with tetraquark structure with respect to other scenarios since the radius interval for the tetraquark state is smaller, it's more difficult to form the non-prompt χ_{c1}^t in the limited phase space via coalescence mechanism.

A natural next step would be to study the properties of $\chi_{c1}(3872)$ as a compact tetraquark state, as the rapidity and p_T dependence of the non-prompt $\chi_{c1}(3872)/\psi(2S)$ cross-section ratio may give further insight into beauty-quark hadronization. Fig. 2 reports the non-prompt $\chi_{c1}(3872)/\psi(2S)$ cross-section ratio with tetraquark scenario as a function of charged-particle multiplicity at middle rapidity ($-2 < y < 2$) and forward rapidity ($2 < y < 5$), compared to the LHCb data at forward rapidity [53]. The results from the PACIAE+DCPC model indicates minor rapidity dependence for the non-prompt $\chi_{c1}(3872)/\psi(2S)$ cross-section ratio.

The non-prompt $\chi_{c1}(3872)/\psi(2S)$ cross-section ratio with tetraquark scenario as a function of p_T at middle rapidity is presented in Fig. 3. The result is compared with the ATLAS measurement [25]. In the common interval $10 < p_T < 22$ GeV/c, the result from the PACIAE+DCPC model shows a good agreement with the ATLAS data within uncertainties. The model result predicts a slightly increasing trend toward low p_T , mainly due to




FIG. 2: The comparison of the non-prompt $\chi_{c1}(3872)/\psi(2S)$ cross-section ratio as a function of charged-particle multiplicity at middle ($-2 < y < 2$) and forward rapidity ($2 < y < 5$) from the PACIAE+DCPC model, compared to the LHCb data at forward rapidity [53]. The blue and black points represent the PACIAE+DCPC model results in middle and forward rapidity, respectively, and the solid red points are from the LHCb data at forward rapidity [53].




FIG. 3: The non-prompt $\chi_{c1}(3872)/\psi(2S)$ cross-section ratio as a function of p_T in pp collisions obtained with the PACIAE+DCPC model at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV, compared with the ATLAS data [25].

the larger coalescence probability for $\chi_{c1}(3872)$ at low p_T region. Nevertheless, the decay kinematic effect may also play a role due to the mass difference between the parent-beauty hadron and non-prompt hadron for these two particles [57], which is hard to isolate for such non-prompt hadron measurements.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In summary, the PACIAE model is used to generate final-state particles in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV. The π^+ , π^- , and J/ψ originating from beauty-hadron decays are inserted into the DCPC model to produce the exotic state $\chi_{c1}(3872)$. With different spatial parameters R_0 selected, the exotic states $\chi_{c1}(3872)$ of three different structures are constructed as compact tetraquark state, nuclear-like state, and molecular state, respectively. The non-prompt $\chi_{c1}(3872)/\psi(2S)$ cross-section ratios in the $J/\psi\pi^+\pi^-$ decay channels with the three structures as a function of charged-particle multiplicity are obtained from the PACIAE+DCPC model, the compact tetraquark state scenario describes the LHCb data well, indicating that the $\chi_{c1}(3872)$ is more likely to be a compact quark state. Meanwhile, the PACIAE+DCPC model predicts a minor rapidity dependence and a decreasing trend with the increasing of the p_T for the ratio, indicating that the coalescence mechanism may play an important role in the beauty-quark hadronization in a small system. In particular, the slightly decreasing trend with the increasing of the p_T for the non-prompt $\chi_{c1}(3872)/\psi(2S)$ cross-section ratio predicted by PACIAE+DCPC model at low p_T , can be further tested with the ongoing high luminosity Run 3 data at the LHC by multi-experiments.

Acknowledgments The work of X. Y. Peng is supported by the NSFC Key Grant 12061141008 and the National key research and development program of China under 2018YFE0104800. the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC) (Grant No. 12205259), and of X. L. Kang is supported by the NSFC (12005195).

[1] M. Gell-Mann, Phys. Lett. **8**, 214 (1964).
 [2] R. L. Jaffe, Phys. Rev. D **15**, 267 (1977).
 [3] J. Matthew Durham (LHCb), Nucl. Phys. A **1005**, 121918 (2021), 2002.01551.
 [4] S. Dubnicka, A. Z. Dubnickova, M. A. Ivanov, and J. G. Korner, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 114007 (2010), 1004.1291.
 [5] M. T. AlFiky, F. Gabbiani, and A. A. Petrov, Phys. Lett. B **640**, 238 (2006), hep-ph/0506141.

[6] F. E. Close and P. R. Page, Nucl. Phys. B **443**, 233 (1995), hep-ph/9411301.
 [7] R. L. Jaffe, Phys. Rev. Lett. **38**, 195 (1977), [Erratum: Phys.Rev.Lett. 38, 617 (1977)].
 [8] K. K. Seth, Phys. Lett. B **612**, 1 (2005), hep-ph/0411122.
 [9] S. L. Olsen, T. Skwarnicki, and D. Zieminska, Rev. Mod. Phys. **90**, 015003 (2018), 1708.04012.
 [10] S. K. Choi et al. (Belle), Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 262001

- (2003), hep-ex/0309032.
- [11] D. Acosta et al. (CDF), Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 072001 (2004), hep-ex/0312021.
- [12] V. M. Abazov et al. (D0), Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 162002 (2004), hep-ex/0405004.
- [13] B. Aubert et al. (BaBar), Phys. Rev. D **71**, 071103 (2005), hep-ex/0406022.
- [14] M. Ablikim et al. (BESIII), Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 092001 (2014), 1310.4101.
- [15] A. Abulencia et al. (CDF), Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 132002 (2007), hep-ex/0612053.
- [16] R. Aaij et al. (LHCb), Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 222001 (2013), 1302.6269.
- [17] E. Braaten and M. Kusunoki, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 074005 (2004), hep-ph/0311147.
- [18] E. Braaten and M. Kusunoki, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 074005 (2005), hep-ph/0412268.
- [19] L. Maiani, F. Piccinini, A. D. Polosa, and V. Riquer, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 014028 (2005), hep-ph/0412098.
- [20] R. D. Matheus, S. Narison, M. Nielsen, and J. M. Richard, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 014005 (2007), hep-ph/0608297.
- [21] B. A. Li, Phys. Lett. B **605**, 306 (2005), hep-ph/0410264.
- [22] F. E. Close and S. Godfrey, Phys. Lett. B **574**, 210 (2003), hep-ph/0305285.
- [23] N. N. Achasov and E. V. Rogozina, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **30**, 1550181 (2015), 1501.03583.
- [24] R. D. Matheus, F. S. Navarra, M. Nielsen, and C. M. Zanetti, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 056002 (2009), 0907.2683.
- [25] M. Aaboud et al. (ATLAS), JHEP **01**, 117 (2017), 1610.09303.
- [26] S. Chatrchyan et al. (CMS), JHEP **04**, 154 (2013), 1302.3968.
- [27] H. Zhang, J. Liao, E. Wang, Q. Wang, and H. Xing, Phys. Rev. Lett. **126**, 012301 (2021), 2004.00024.
- [28] B. Wu, X. Du, M. Sibila, and R. Rapp, Eur. Phys. J. A **57**, 122 (2021), [Erratum: Eur.Phys.J.A 57, 314 (2021)], 2006.09945.
- [29] A. Andronic, P. Braun-Munzinger, M. K. Köhler, K. Redlich, and J. Stachel, Phys. Lett. B **797**, 134836 (2019), 1901.09200.
- [30] V. Khachatryan et al. (CMS), JHEP **09**, 091 (2010), 1009.4122.
- [31] G. Aad et al. (ATLAS), Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 172301 (2016), 1509.04776.
- [32] J. Adam et al. (ALICE), Nature Phys. **13**, 535 (2017), 1606.07424.
- [33] S. Acharya et al. (ALICE), Phys. Lett. B **829**, 137065 (2022), 2111.11948.
- [34] S. Acharya et al. (ALICE) (2021), 2112.08156.
- [35] R. Aaij et al. (LHCb), Phys. Rev. Lett. **126**, 092001 (2021), 2009.06619.
- [36] A. Esposito, E. G. Ferreira, A. Pilloni, A. D. Polosa, and C. A. Salgado, Eur. Phys. J. C **81**, 669 (2021), 2006.15044.
- [37] T. Sjostrand, S. Mrenna, and P. Z. Skands, JHEP **05**, 026 (2006), hep-ph/0603175.
- [38] B.-H. Sa, D.-M. Zhou, Y.-L. Yan, X.-M. Li, S.-Q. Feng, B.-G. Dong, and X. Cai, Comput. Phys. Commun. **183**, 333 (2012), 1104.1238.
- [39] G. Chen, Y.-L. Yan, D.-S. Li, D.-M. Zhou, M.-J. Wang, B.-G. Dong, and B.-H. Sa, Phys. Rev. C **86**, 054910 (2012), 1209.4182.
- [40] Y.-L. Yan, G. Chen, X.-M. Li, D.-M. Zhou, M.-J. Wang, S.-Y. Hu, L. Ye, and B.-H. Sa, Phys. Rev. C **85**, 024907 (2012), 1107.3207.
- [41] G. Chen, H. Chen, J. Wu, D.-S. Li, and M.-J. Wang, Phys. Rev. C **88**, 034908 (2013), 1307.4515.
- [42] Z. Zhang, L. Zheng, G. Chen, H.-G. Xu, D.-M. Zhou, Y.-L. Yan, and B.-H. Sa, Eur. Phys. J. C **81**, 198 (2021), 2010.10062.
- [43] C.-h. Chen, Y.-L. Xie, H.-g. Xu, Z. Zhang, D.-M. Zhou, Z.-L. She, and G. Chen, Phys. Rev. D **105**, 054013 (2022).
- [44] H.-g. Xu, Z.-L. She, D.-M. Zhou, L. Zheng, X.-L. Kang, G. Chen, and B.-H. Sa, Eur. Phys. J. C **81**, 784 (2021), 2105.06261.
- [45] B. L. Combridge, J. Kripfganz, and J. Ranft, Phys. Lett. B **70**, 234 (1977).
- [46] K. Stowe, *An Introduction to Thermodynamics and Statistical Mechanics* (Cambridge University, Cambridge, 2007).
- [47] M. Tanabashi et al. (Particle Data Group), Phys. Rev. D **98**, 030001 (2018).
- [48] J. Adam et al. (ALICE), Eur. Phys. J. C **75**, 226 (2015), 1504.00024.
- [49] R. Aaij et al. (LHCb), Eur. Phys. J. C **71**, 1645 (2011), 1103.0423.
- [50] T. Aushkevich et al. (Belle), Phys. Rev. D **81**, 031103 (2010), 0810.0358.
- [51] L. S. Kisslinger, W.-h. Ma, and P. Hoodbhoy, Nucl. Phys. A **459**, 645 (1986).
- [52] S. I. Y. Wu, T. Sasakawa, Few Body Syst. **15**, 145 (1993).
- [53] R. Aaij et al. (LHCb), Phys. Rev. Lett. **126**, 092001 (2021), 2009.06619.
- [54] E. G. Ferreira and J.-P. Lansberg, JHEP **10**, 094 (2018), [Erratum: JHEP 03, 063 (2019)], 1804.04474.
- [55] E. G. Ferreira, Phys. Lett. B **749**, 98 (2015), 1411.0549.
- [56] A. Esposito, E. G. Ferreira, A. Pilloni, A. D. Polosa, and C. A. Salgado, Eur. Phys. J. C **81**, 669 (2021), 2006.15044.
- [57] S. Acharya et al. (ALICE), JHEP **12**, 126 (2022), 2202.00815.