

Theoretical study of $N(1535)$ and $\Sigma^*(1/2^-)$ in the Cabibbo-favored process $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p\bar{K}^0\eta$

Ying Li,¹ Si-Wei Liu,^{2,3} En Wang,^{1,4,*} De-Min Li,^{1,†} Li-Sheng Geng,^{5,6,7,8,‡} and Ju-Jun Xie^{2,3,8,§}

¹*School of Physics, Zhengzhou University, Zhengzhou 450001, China*

²*Institute of Modern Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Lanzhou 730000, China*

³*School of Nuclear Sciences and Technology, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 101408, China*

⁴*Guangxi Key Laboratory of Nuclear Physics and Nuclear Technology, Guangxi Normal University, Guilin 541004, China*

⁵*School of Physics, Beihang University, Beijing 102206, China*

⁶*Beijing Key Laboratory of Advanced Nuclear Materials and Physics, Beihang University, Beijing, 102206, China*

⁷*Peng Huanwu Collaborative Center for Research and Education, Beihang University, Beijing 100191, China*

⁸*Southern Center for Nuclear-Science Theory (SCNT), Institute of Modern Physics,*

Chinese Academy of Sciences, Huizhou 516000, China

(■Dated: June 4, 2024)

Motivated by the recent experimental measurements, we have investigated the Cabibbo-favored process $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p\bar{K}^0\eta$, where the $N(1535)$ resonance is dynamically generated from the S -wave pseudoscalar meson-octet baryon interactions within the chiral unitary approach. The contributions from the intermediate $N(1650)$ and the predicted low-lying baryon $\Sigma^*(1/2^-)$ are also considered. In addition, a Breit-Wigner amplitude for the $N(1535)$ resonance is checked. By comparing with the measured ηp , $\bar{K}^0\eta$, and $p\bar{K}^0$ invariant mass squared distributions, our results support the interpretation of $N(1535)$ as a dynamically generated state. Furthermore, we demonstrate that, with the contribution from $\Sigma^*(1/2^-)$ taken into account, the calculated invariant mass spectrum agrees with the Belle measurements. Future precise measurements of the $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p\bar{K}^0\eta$ process can further elucidate the existence of the low-lying baryon $\Sigma^*(1/2^-)$.

I. INTRODUCTION

Understanding the nature of the low-lying excited baryons with quantum numbers $J^P = 1/2^-$ is one of the most challenging topics in hadron physics [1, 2]. Within the classical constituent quark model, one puzzle of the low-lying excited baryons is the “mass reverse problem”, i.e., the mass of the $N(1535)$ with spin-parity quantum numbers $J^P = 1/2^-$ should be lower than the one of the radial excitation $N(1440)$ with $J^P = 1/2^+$. It is also difficult to understand the strong coupling of the $N(1535)$ to the channels with strangeness, such as the ηN and $K\Lambda$ channels [3–5]. Besides the strong couplings of the $N(1535)$ to the ηN and $K\Lambda$ channels, there is also evidence for a large effective $g_{N(1535)N\eta'}$ coupling from the $\gamma p \rightarrow p\eta'$ reaction [6] and $pp \rightarrow pp\eta'$ reaction [7].

In Refs. [8–11], it was proposed that the $N(1535)$ resonance could be the lowest $L = 1$ orbital excited uud state with a large admixing of the $[ud][us]\bar{s}$ pentaquark component, which leads to a heavier $N(1535)$ than the $N(1440)$, and also gives a natural explanation for the large couplings of $N(1535)$ to the strangeness channels ηN and $K\Lambda$. In addition, $N(1535)$ could be dynamically generated from the S -wave pseudoscalar meson-octet baryon interactions within the chiral unitary approach and is predicted to strongly couple to the channels ηN , $K\Lambda$, and $K\Sigma$ [12–18]. When the pseu-

doscalar meson-baryon mixing with the vector-baryon states was considered, the physical picture remains unchanged [19]. The analyses of the ϕ production in πp and pp collisions suggest that the $N(1535)$ strongly couples to the $K\Sigma$, $K\Lambda$ and ϕN channels [20, 21], which is consistent with the results of the chiral unitary approach. The $N(1535)$ was also interpreted as a three-quark core dressed by meson-nucleon scattering contributions within the Hamiltonian Effective Field Theory [22–24]. We have proposed to study the $N(1535)$ within the chiral unitary approach through the three-body decays of Λ_b [25–27]. Recently, it was suggested to test the molecular nature of $N(1535)$ by measuring its correlation functions [28], or the scattering length and effective range of the channels $K\Sigma$, $K\Lambda$, and ηp [29].

The multi-body non-leptonic decays of charmed baryons have proven to be a rich source of light hadrons since those processes have large phase space and involve complicated final-state strong interactions [30–37]. Theoretically, the Cabibbo-favored process $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p\bar{K}^0\eta$ had been proposed to test the molecular nature of the $N(1535)$ in Ref. [32], where the ηp invariant mass distribution was calculated with in the chiral unitary approach and an effective Lagrangian model. It was shown that the behavior of the $N(1535)$ in the two approaches is different in this process, and the ηp invariant mass distribution could be used to distinguish those two pictures of the $N(1535)$ resonance [32]. Later, Ref. [38] has re-analyzed this process by considering the mixing of pseudoscalar-baryon and vector-baryon interactions within the chiral unitary approach and found that both $N(1535)$ and $N(1650)$ could contribute to the $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p\bar{K}^0\eta$ reaction.

Recently, the Belle Collaboration measured the branch-

*Electronic address: wangen@zzu.edu.cn

†Electronic address: lidm@zzu.edu.cn

‡Electronic address: lisheng.geng@buaa.edu.cn

§Electronic address: xiejujun@impcas.ac.cn

ing fraction $\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow pK_S^0\eta) = (4.35 \pm 0.10 \pm 0.20 \pm 0.22) \times 10^{-3}$, and reported the invariant mass squared distributions [39]. In the ηp invariant mass squared distribution, one finds a narrow peak around $M_{\eta p}^2 = 2.3 \text{ GeV}^2$ and a broad peak around $M_{\eta p}^2 = 2.75 \text{ GeV}^2$, which should correspond to the $N(1535)$ and $N(1650)$ resonances, respectively. In addition, a threshold enhancement around $M_{pK_S^0}^2 = 2.1 \text{ GeV}^2$ in the pK_S^0 invariant mass squared distribution could be associated with the predicted low-lying excited $\Sigma^*(1/2^-)$ baryon state below the pK_S^0 threshold. To date, the $\Sigma^*(1/2^-)$ state has not yet been well confirmed experimentally and theoretically, and searching for the $\Sigma^*(1/2^-)$ state is crucial for deepening our understanding of low-lying excited baryons [40–50]. Thus, the Belle measurements of the process $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow pK_S^0\eta$ could be useful to explore the nature of $N(1535)$ and to search for the predicted low-lying $\Sigma^*(1/2^-)$ state.

In this work, we investigate the process $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p\bar{K}^0\eta$ by considering the contributions from $N(1535)$ in the chiral unitary approach and the Breit-Wigner parameterization (in this way, we take $N(1535)$ as a genuine baryon state). In addition, the intermediate resonances $N(1650)$ and the predicted low-lying baryon $\Sigma^*(1/2^-)$ are also considered. We want to distinguish the molecular picture and genuine baryon state for the $N(1535)$ by comparing our calculations with the Belle measurements. At the same time, we demonstrate that, with the contribution from $\Sigma^*(1/2^-)$, the calculated invariant mass spectrum agrees well with the experimental measurements.

The structure of this paper is as follows. The theoretical framework is presented in Sec. II. Results and discussions are presented in Sec. III. Finally, a summary is given in Sec. IV.

II. FORMALISM

In Subsec. II A, we first present the theoretical formalism for the Cabibbo-favored process $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p\bar{K}^0\eta$, where the $N(1535)$ is dynamically generated from the S -wave pseudoscalar meson-octet baryon interactions. For comparison, we also adopt the Breit-Wigner form for the $N(1535)$ contribution by regarding the $N(1535)$ as a genuine baryon state. In Subsec. II B, we present the contributions from the $N(1650)$ and the predicted low-lying baryon $\Sigma^*(1/2^-)$. Finally, we present the formalism for the invariant mass squared distributions of the process $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p\bar{K}^0\eta$ in Subsec. II C.

A. S -wave meson-baryon interactions and $N(1535)$

As done in Refs. [30–32], for the Cabibbo-favored process $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 p\eta$, the dominant mechanism is the W^+ internal emission, as depicted in Fig. 1. First, the c quark of the initial Λ_c^+ weakly decays into an s quark and a W^+ boson; then the W^+ boson subsequently decays into a $u\bar{d}$ quark pair. Secondly, the s quark and the \bar{d} quark hadronize into \bar{K}^0 , while the u quark from the decay of the W^+ boson and the ud pair of the initial Λ_c^+ , together with the antiquark-quark pair $\bar{q}q (= \bar{u}u + \bar{d}d + \bar{s}s)$ created from the vacuum with the quantum numbers $J^{PC} = 0^{++}$, hadronize into hadron pairs. This




FIG. 1: The quark-level diagram for the weak decay of Λ_c^+ .

could be expressed as,

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_c^+ &\Rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}c(ud - du) \Rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}sW^+(ud - du) \\ &\Rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}s\bar{d}u(\bar{u}u + \bar{d}d + \bar{s}s)(ud - du) \\ &\Rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\bar{K}^0u(\bar{u}u + \bar{d}d + \bar{s}s)(ud - du) \\ &\Rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\bar{K}^0 \sum M_{1i}q_i(ud - du), \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where M is the matrix of the pseudoscalar mesons,

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\eta}{\sqrt{3}} + \frac{\pi^0}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{\eta'}{\sqrt{6}} & \pi^+ & K^+ \\ \pi^- & \frac{\eta}{\sqrt{3}} - \frac{\pi^0}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{\eta'}{\sqrt{6}} & K^0 \\ K^- & \bar{K}^0 & \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\eta' - \frac{\eta}{\sqrt{3}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2)$$

where we have taken the η - η' mixing from Refs. [51, 52].

Then, we can obtain the relevant components of the meson-baryon pair as,

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sum M_{1i}q_i(ud - du) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\pi^0 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\eta \right) \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}u(ud - du) \right] \\ &\quad + \pi^+ \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}d(ud - du) \right] + K^+ \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}s(ud - du) \right] \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\pi^0 p + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}\eta p + \pi^+ n - \frac{\sqrt{6}}{3}K^+ \Lambda, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where the $\eta'p$ channel is ignored since its mass threshold (1896 MeV) is far from the mass region of $N(1535)$. Here, we take the flavor-wave functions for the octet baryons as [27, 53, 54],

$$\begin{aligned} p &= \frac{u(ud - du)}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad n = \frac{d(ud - du)}{\sqrt{2}}, \\ \Lambda &= \frac{u(ds - sd) + d(su - us) - 2s(ud - du)}{2\sqrt{3}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

In addition, with the isospin triplet ($-\pi^+, \pi^0, \pi^-$) and isospin doublet (p, n) [55], we obtain,

$$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}|\pi^0 p\rangle + |\pi^+ n\rangle = -\frac{\sqrt{6}}{2}|\pi N\rangle^{I=1/2}. \quad (5)$$

With the above ingredients, the components of the pseudoscalar meson-octet baryon in Eq. (1) could be rewritten as,

$$\Lambda_c^+ \Rightarrow \bar{K}^0 \left(-\frac{\sqrt{6}}{2}\pi N + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}\eta N - \frac{\sqrt{6}}{3}K\Lambda \right). \quad (6)$$




FIG. 2: Diagrams for the process $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p\bar{K}^0\eta$. (a) Tree diagram, (b) Final-state interactions of the pseudoscalar mesons and octet baryons.

Thus, the process $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p\bar{K}^0\eta$ could occur via the tree diagram of Fig. 2(a) and the S -wave pseudoscalar meson-octet baryon interactions of Fig. 2(b). The corresponding decay amplitude is given by,

$$\mathcal{T}^{N(1535)} = V_1 (h_{\eta N} + h_{\eta N} G_{\eta N} t_{\eta N \rightarrow \eta N} + h_{\pi N} G_{\pi N} t_{\pi N \rightarrow \eta N} + h_{K\Lambda} G_{K\Lambda} t_{K\Lambda \rightarrow \eta N}), \quad (7)$$

with the coefficients

$$h_{\eta N} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}, \quad h_{\pi N} = -\frac{\sqrt{6}}{2}, \quad h_{K\Lambda} = -\frac{\sqrt{6}}{3}, \quad (8)$$

Here, the V_1 stands for the strength of the weak production vertex and could be treated as a constant [30, 36, 56]. The G_i is the meson-baryon loop function and $t_{i \rightarrow \eta N}$ is the transition amplitude between the i -channel and ηN . These transition amplitudes are obtained by solving the Bethe-Salpeter equation,

$$T = [1 - VG]^{-1}V, \quad (9)$$

where V is the interaction kernel matrix between coupled channels, which are πN , ηN , $K\Lambda$, and $K\Sigma$.

The transition potential V_{ij} can be obtained from the lowest order chiral Lagrangian [15, 26],

$$V_{ij} = -C_{ij} \frac{1}{4f_i f_j} (2\sqrt{s} - M_i - M_j) \times \sqrt{\frac{E_i + M_i}{2M_i}} \sqrt{\frac{E_j + M_j}{2M_j}}, \quad (10)$$

where the coefficients C_{ij} , reflecting the SU(3) flavor symmetry, are shown in Table I. In this work, we take the decay constants $f_\pi = 93$ MeV, $f_K = 1.22f_\pi$, and $f_\eta = 1.3f_\pi$. $E_i(E_j)$ is the energy of the baryon in the i -th channel,

$$E_{i(j)} = \frac{s + M_{i(j)}^2 - m_{i(j)}^2}{2\sqrt{s}}, \quad (11)$$

where M_i and m_i are the masses of the baryon and meson in the i -th channel, respectively, and $s = M_{MB}^2$ is the invariant mass squared of the meson-baryon system.

TABLE I: C_{ij} coefficients in the potential ($C_{ij} = C_{ji}$).

	πN	ηN	$K\Lambda$	$K\Sigma$
πN	2	0	3/2	-1/2
ηN		0	-3/2	-3/2
$K\Lambda$			0	0
$K\Sigma$				2

The meson-baryon loop functions G_i could be expressed as [15],

$$G_i(s) = i \int \frac{d^4q}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{2M_i}{(P-q)^2 - M_i^2 + i\epsilon} \frac{1}{q^2 - m_i^2 + i\epsilon}, \quad (12)$$

where P and q are the four-momentum of the meson-baryon system and the meson, respectively, and \sqrt{s} is the invariant mass of the meson-baryon system ($s = P^2$). The integral is logarithmically divergent, and usually, one can use the cut-off method or the dimensional regularization to solve this singular integral [15, 57]. Here, we calculate the integral using the three-momentum cut-off method, and the analytic expression of the loop function G_i could be expressed as [57],

$$G(s) = \frac{2M}{16\pi^2 s} \left\{ \sigma \left(\arctan \frac{s + \Delta}{\sigma \lambda_1} + \arctan \frac{s - \Delta}{\sigma \lambda_2} \right) - \left[(s + \Delta) \ln \frac{(1 + \lambda_1)q_{\max}}{m_1} + (s - \Delta) \ln \frac{(1 + \lambda_2)q_{\max}}{m_2} \right] \right\}, \quad (13)$$

where σ , Δ , λ_1 , and λ_2 are given as follows,

$$\sigma = \left[- (s - (M_i + m_i)^2) (s - (M_i - m_i)^2) \right]^{1/2}, \quad (14)$$

$$\Delta = M_i^2 - m_i^2, \quad (15)$$

$$\lambda_1 = \sqrt{1 + \frac{M_i^2}{q_{\max}^2}}, \quad \lambda_2 = \sqrt{1 + \frac{m_i^2}{q_{\max}^2}}. \quad (16)$$

Here q_{\max} is a three-momentum cut-off parameter. In this work, we take $q_{\max} = 1150$ MeV to produce the pole position of the dynamically generated $N(1535)$ at the one quoted in the Review of Particle Physics (RPP) [5].

To distinguish between the molecular and the genuine baryon pictures, we also adopt the Breit-Wigner amplitude for the contribution of the $N(1535)$ to explore its genuine baryon state picture,

$$\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{N(1535)} = \frac{\tilde{V}_1 M_{N(1535)} \Gamma_{N(1535)}}{M_{\eta p}^2 - M_{N(1535)}^2 + i M_{N(1535)} \Gamma_{N(1535)}}, \quad (17)$$

where the mass and width of $N(1535)$ are $M_{N(1535)} = 1530$ MeV and $\Gamma_{N(1535)} = 150$ MeV [5], respectively, and \tilde{V}_1 is the relative weight of the $N(1535)$ contribution.

B. Contributions from $N(1650)$ and $\Sigma^*(1/2^-)$




FIG. 3: Tree-level diagram accounting for the contribution from the intermediate $N(1650)$ (N^*) and $\Sigma^*(1/2^-)$ (Σ^*).

As discussed in the introduction, besides the $N(1535)$, one could find a bump structure around $M_{\eta p}^2 = 2.75$ GeV² in the ηp invariant mass distribution of the Belle measurements, which can be associated with the $N(1650)$. Furthermore, there is a threshold enhancement around $M_{pK_S^0}^2 = 2.1$ GeV² in the pK_S^0 invariant mass squared distribution, which may be associated with the predicted low-lying baryon $\Sigma^*(1/2^-)$. Hence, we also consider the contributions from the resonances $N(1650)$ and $\Sigma^*(1/2^-)$ in the processes $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 N(1650) \rightarrow p \bar{K}^0 \eta$ and $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \eta \Sigma^*(1/2^-) \rightarrow p \bar{K}^0 \eta$, as depicted in Fig. 3. The Breit-Wigner decay amplitudes of Fig. 3 can be written as,

$$\mathcal{T}^{N(1650)} = \frac{V_2 M_{N^*} \Gamma_{N^*}}{M_{\eta p}^2 - M_{N^*}^2 + i M_{N^*} \Gamma_{N^*}}, \quad (18)$$

$$\mathcal{T}^{\Sigma^*(1/2^-)} = \frac{V_3 M_{\Sigma^*} \Gamma_{\Sigma^*}}{M_{p\bar{K}^0}^2 - M_{\Sigma^*}^2 + i M_{\Sigma^*} \Gamma_{\Sigma^*}}, \quad (19)$$

where the parameters V_2 and V_3 are the relative weights of the contributions from the intermediate resonances $N(1650)$ and $\Sigma^*(1/2^-)$, respectively, which will be determined by fitting the Belle measurements [39]. The mass and width of $N(1650)$ are $M_{N(1650)} = 1665$ MeV and $\Gamma_{N(1650)} = 125$ MeV [5], respectively. Furthermore, we have studied the process of $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \eta \Lambda \pi^+$ and found that the Belle measurements favor

the existence of a $\Sigma^*(1/2^-)$ with a mass about 1380 MeV and width about 120 MeV in the intermediate process $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \eta \Sigma^*(1/2^-) \rightarrow \eta \Lambda \pi^+$ [58, 59]. Thus, in this study we take $M_{\Sigma^*(1/2^-)} = 1380$ MeV and $\Gamma_{\Sigma^*(1/2^-)} = 120$ MeV, as used in Refs. [41–43, 58].

C. Invariant Mass Distributions

There are two different amplitudes for the $N(1535)$ contribution. One is obtained by the S -wave pseudoscalar meson-octet baryon interaction [Eq. (7)], and the other one is the Breit-Wigner form [Eq. (17)].

As we know, the $\Sigma^*(1/2^-)$ state has not yet been well confirmed experimentally and theoretically. In order to examine the existence of the $\Sigma^*(1/2^-)$ in the process $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p K_S^0 \eta$, we first consider two models without the contribution from the $\Sigma^*(1/2^-)$. In these two cases, one is obtained with Eq. (7), denoted as ‘Model A,’ and another one is obtained with Eq. (17), denoted as ‘Model B,’

$$|\mathcal{T}^A|^2 = |\mathcal{T}^{N(1535)} + \mathcal{T}^{N(1650)} e^{i\phi}|^2, \quad (20)$$

$$|\mathcal{T}^B|^2 = |\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{N(1535)} + \mathcal{T}^{N(1650)} e^{i\phi}|^2, \quad (21)$$

with parameter ϕ the relative phase between the contributions from $N(1650)$ and the $N(1535)$.

By considering the contribution from the $\Sigma^*(1/2^-)$, we have two more models, ‘Model C’ and ‘Model D,’ which are defined as follows,

$$|\mathcal{T}^C|^2 = |\mathcal{T}^{N(1535)} + \mathcal{T}^{N(1650)} e^{i\phi} + \mathcal{T}^{\Sigma^*(1/2^-)} e^{i\phi'}|^2, \quad (22)$$

$$|\mathcal{T}^D|^2 = |\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{N(1535)} + \mathcal{T}^{N(1650)} e^{i\phi} + \mathcal{T}^{\Sigma^*(1/2^-)} e^{i\phi'}|^2, \quad (23)$$

where ϕ' is a relative phase between the contributions from $\Sigma^*(1/2^-)$ and the $N(1535)$.

With all the above ingredients, one can write the double differential widths of the process $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p \bar{K}^0 \eta$ as follows,

$$\frac{d^2\Gamma}{dM_{\eta p}^2 dM_{p\bar{K}^0}^2} = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{32M_{\Lambda_c^+}^3} |\mathcal{T}|^2, \quad (24)$$

$$\frac{d^2\Gamma}{dM_{\eta p}^2 dM_{\eta\bar{K}^0}^2} = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{32M_{\Lambda_c^+}^3} |\mathcal{T}|^2. \quad (25)$$

Then one could easily obtain the invariant mass squared distributions $d\Gamma/dM_{\eta p}^2$, $d\Gamma/dM_{p\bar{K}^0}^2$, and $d\Gamma/dM_{\eta\bar{K}^0}^2$ by integrating Eqs. (24) and (25). Note that, for a given value of M_{12} , the range of M_{23}^2 is determined by [5],

$$(M_{23}^2)_{\min} = (E_2^* + E_3^*)^2 - \left(\sqrt{E_2^{*2} - m_2^2} + \sqrt{E_3^{*2} - m_3^2} \right)^2,$$

$$(M_{23}^2)_{\max} = (E_2^* + E_3^*)^2 - \left(\sqrt{E_2^{*2} - m_2^2} - \sqrt{E_3^{*2} - m_3^2} \right)^2,$$

where E_2^* and E_3^* are the energies of particles 2 and 3 in the M_{12} rest frame, which are written as,

$$\begin{aligned} E_2^* &= \frac{M_{12}^2 - m_1^2 + m_2^2}{2M_{12}}, \\ E_3^* &= \frac{M_{\Lambda_c^+}^2 - M_{12}^2 - m_3^2}{2M_{12}}, \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

with m_1 , m_2 , and m_3 are the masses of involved particles 1, 2, and 3, respectively. The particle masses and widths are taken from the RPP [5].

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

In our formalism, we have five free parameters, (1) $V_1(\tilde{V}_1)$, V_2 , V_3 corresponding to the strengths of the contributions from $N(1535)$, $N(1650)$, and $\Sigma^*(1/2^-)$, respectively, (2) the relative phase angle ϕ and ϕ' for the interference between different contributions from the three resonances, as shown in Eqs. (20)-(23).

First, we perform a χ^2 -fit of Model A and Model B to the ηp , $\eta\bar{K}^0$, and $p\bar{K}^0$ invariant mass distributions of the Belle measurements [39], which includes 67 data points in total. We have tabulated the fitted parameters and the $\chi^2/d.o.f.$ in Table II. The obtained $\chi^2/d.o.f.$ is 5.67 and 3.20 for Model A and Model B, respectively. With these fitted parameters in table II, we have calculated the ηp , $\bar{K}^0\eta$, and $p\bar{K}^0$ invariant mass squared distributions of the process $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p\bar{K}^0\eta$, as shown in Fig. 4, where the left panels [Figs. 4(a-c)] are the results of ‘Model A’, and the right panels [Figs. 4(d-e)] are the ones of ‘Model B.’ One can see that although both models could reproduce the peaks of the $N(1535)$ and $N(1650)$ in the ηp invariant mass squared distribution, the high energies region of the ηp invariant mass squared distribution, the near-threshold enhancement in the $p\bar{K}^0$ invariant mass squared distribution can not be well described, which implies that other intermediate resonant contributions should be considered.

Next, we perform the fitting with Model C and Model D, involving the $\Sigma^*(1/2^-)$ contribution. The fitted parameters are tabulated in Table II, and the obtained $\chi^2/d.o.f.$ are 1.55 and 1.69 for Model C and Model D, which are much smaller than the ones of Model A and Model B. With the fitted parameters, we have calculated the ηp , $\bar{K}^0\eta$, and $p\bar{K}^0$ invariant mass squared distributions of the process $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p\bar{K}^0\eta$, as shown in Fig. 5. One finds that, including the contribution from the $\Sigma^*(1/2^-)$, both Model C and Model D could describe the Belle measurements well. Meanwhile, according to Figs. 5(c) and 5(f), the near-threshold enhancement in the $p\bar{K}^0$ invariant mass squared distribution could also be well reproduced, which implies that the $\Sigma^*(1/2^-)$ plays an important role in this process.

On the other hand, in Fig. 5(d), the $N(1535)$ still has a large contribution in the region above $M_{\eta p}^2 > 2.65 \text{ GeV}^2$, and the theoretical results are wider than the experimental data. Furthermore, by comparing Fig. 5(a) with Fig. 5(d), one can easily find that Model C could give a better description of the $N(1535)$ peak, which implies that the present experimental data favor the molecular explanation of the $N(1535)$ state.

From the $\bar{K}^0 p$ invariant mass distributions, as shown in Figs. 5 (c) and (f), it is found that the contribution from the $\Sigma^*(1/2^-)$ is crucial to give a good description of the threshold enhancement of $\bar{K}^0 p$ invariant mass distributions measured by the Belle Collaboration. Meanwhile, by comparing the results of Model C with the ones of Model D, one can conclude that, regarding the $N(1535)$ as a dynamically generated state from the S -wave pseudoscalar-octet baryon interactions, the ηp invariant mass squared distribution of the Belle could be better described.

Finally, with the fitted parameters, we could roughly estimate the ratio $R = \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow N(1535)\bar{K}^0)/\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow N(1650)\bar{K}^0)$ by integrating Eqs. (24) and (25) over the invariant mass squared variables, and obtain $R = 0.14$ for the molecular picture of $N(1535)$, $R = 0.75$ for the genuine baryon state of $N(1535)$. Thus, more precise measurements about the process $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p\bar{K}^0\eta$ by BESIII, Belle II [60], LHCb, and the planned Super Tau-Charm facility [61] in future could be used to test further the molecular nature of $N(1535)$, and to search for the predicted low-lying baryon $\Sigma^*(1/2^-)$.

IV. SUMMARY

Recently, the Belle Collaboration reported their amplitude analysis of the $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p\bar{K}_S^0\eta$ and found the resonant structures corresponding to $N(1535)$ and $N(1650)$ in the ηp invariant mass squared distribution, and a near-threshold enhancement in the $p\bar{K}_S^0$ invariant mass squared distribution, which provides an important lab to explore the properties of the low-lying excited $N(1535)$ state and to search for the predicted $\Sigma^*(1/2^-)$ resonance.

In this work, we have investigated the process $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p\bar{K}^0\eta$ by considering the contributions from the $N(1535)$, $N(1650)$, and $\Sigma^*(1/2^-)$. We have adopted two models for the contribution of the $N(1535)$; one is the molecular picture, where the $N(1535)$ is dynamically generated from the S -wave pseudoscalar meson-octet baryon interactions, and the other one is the Breit-Wigner form to treat the $N(1535)$ as a genuine baryon state. By fitting to the Belle measurements, one finds that the contribution from the $\Sigma^*(1/2^-)$ is crucial to give a good description of the Belle measurements, which implies that the present experimental data support the existence of the $\Sigma^*(1/2^-)$. Furthermore, although the two models with different $N(1535)$ amplitudes could give a reasonable description of the experimental ηp , $\bar{K}^0\eta$, and $p\bar{K}^0$ invariant mass squared distributions, the model regarding $N(1535)$ as a dynamically generated state could give a better description of the $N(1535)$ peak in the ηp invariant mass squared distribution. Furthermore, we have also estimated the ratio $R = \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow N(1535)\bar{K}^0)/\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow N(1650)\bar{K}^0) = 0.14$ and 0.75 for the molecular picture and the genuine baryon state of the $N(1535)$, respectively, which could be tested experimentally in the future.

TABLE II: Fitted parameters of this work.

Parameters	$V_1(\tilde{V}_1)$	V_2	V_3	ϕ	ϕ'	$\chi^2/d.o.f.$
Model A	13939 ± 895	43369 ± 3227	—	$(0.98 \pm 0.21)\pi$	—	5.67
Model B	50151 ± 3730	41144 ± 3059	—	$(1.77 \pm 0.14)\pi$	—	3.20
Model C	11848 ± 813	52495 ± 3938	56230 ± 4019	$(1.35 \pm 0.43)\pi$	$(1.83 \pm 0.35)\pi$	1.55
Model D	47337 ± 2868	48454 ± 2457	61947 ± 4506	$(1.94 \pm 0.21)\pi$	$(0.62 \pm 0.16)\pi$	1.69

Acknowledgments

This work is partly supported by the National Key R&D Program of China under Grant No. 2023YFA1606703 and by the Natural Science Foundation of Henan under Grant No. 232300421140 and No. 222300420554, the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 12075288, No.

12192263, and No. 12361141819. It is also supported by the Project of Youth Backbone Teachers of Colleges and Universities of Henan Province (2020GGJS017), the Open Project of Guangxi Key Laboratory of Nuclear Physics and Nuclear Technology, No. NLK2021-08, and the Youth Innovation Promotion Association CAS.

-
- [1] E. Klempt and A. Zaitsev, *Phys. Rept.* **454** (2007), 1-202 doi:10.1016/j.physrep.2007.07.006 [arXiv:0708.4016 [hep-ph]].
- [2] V. Crede and W. Roberts, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **76** (2013), 076301 doi:10.1088/0034-4885/76/7/076301 [arXiv:1302.7299 [nucl-ex]].
- [3] B. C. Liu and B. S. Zou, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96** (2006) no.4, 042002 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.96.042002 [arXiv:nucl-th/0503069 [nucl-th]].
- [4] L. S. Geng, E. Oset, B. S. Zou and M. Doring, *Phys. Rev. C* **79**, 025203 (2009) doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.79.025203 [arXiv:0807.2913 [hep-ph]].
- [5] R. L. Workman *et al.* [Particle Data Group], *PTEP* **2022** (2022), 083C01 doi:10.1093/ptep/ptac097
- [6] M. Dugger *et al.* [CLAS], *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 062001 (2006) [erratum: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 169905 (2006)] doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.96.062001 [arXiv:nucl-ex/0512019 [nucl-ex]].
- [7] X. Cao and X. G. Lee, *Phys. Rev. C* **78**, 035207 (2008) doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.78.035207 [arXiv:0804.0656 [nucl-th]].
- [8] A. Zhang, Y. R. Liu, P. Z. Huang, W. Z. Deng, X. L. Chen and S. L. Zhu, *HEPNP* **29** (2005), 250 [arXiv:hep-ph/0403210 [hep-ph]].
- [9] C. Helminen and D. O. Riska, *Nucl. Phys. A* **699** (2002), 624-648 doi:10.1016 [arXiv:nucl-th/0011071 [nucl-th]].
- [10] B. S. Zou, *Eur. Phys. J. A* **35** (2008), 325-328 doi:10.1140/epja/i2007-10561-8 [arXiv:0711.4860 [nucl-th]].
- [11] L. Hannelius and D. O. Riska, *Phys. Rev. C* **62** (2000), 045204 doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.62.045204 [arXiv:hep-ph/0001325 [hep-ph]].
- [12] N. Kaiser, P. B. Siegel and W. Weise, *Nucl. Phys. A* **594** (1995), 325-345 doi:10.1016/0375-9474(95)00362-5 [arXiv:nucl-th/9505043 [nucl-th]].
- [13] P. C. Bruns, M. Mai and U. G. Meissner, *Phys. Lett. B* **697** (2011), 254-259 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2011.02.008 [arXiv:1012.2233 [nucl-th]].
- [14] K. P. Khemchandani, A. Martinez Torres, H. Nagahiro and A. Hosaka, *Phys. Rev. D* **88** (2013) no.11, 114016 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.88.114016 [arXiv:1307.8420 [nucl-th]].
- [15] T. Inoue, E. Oset and M. J. Vicente Vacas, *Phys. Rev. C* **65** (2002), 035204 doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.65.035204 [arXiv:hep-ph/0110333 [hep-ph]].
- [16] J. Nieves, A. Pich and E. Ruiz Arriola, *Phys. Rev. D* **84** (2011), 096002 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.84.096002 [arXiv:1107.3247 [hep-ph]].
- [17] D. Gamermann, C. Garcia-Recio, J. Nieves and L. L. Salcedo, *Phys. Rev. D* **84** (2011), 056017 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.84.056017 [arXiv:1104.2737 [hep-ph]].
- [18] N. Kaiser, T. Waas and W. Weise, *Nucl. Phys. A* **612** (1997), 297-320 doi:10.1016/S0375-9474(96)00321-1 [arXiv:hep-ph/9607459 [hep-ph]].
- [19] E. J. Garzon and E. Oset, *Phys. Rev. C* **91** (2015) no.2, 025201 doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.91.025201 [arXiv:1411.3547 [hep-ph]].
- [20] J. J. Xie, B. S. Zou and H. C. Chiang, *Phys. Rev. C* **77** (2008), 015206 doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.77.015206 [arXiv:0705.3950 [nucl-th]].
- [21] M. Doring, E. Oset and B. S. Zou, *Phys. Rev. C* **78** (2008), 025207 doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.78.025207 [arXiv:0805.1799 [nucl-th]].
- [22] C. D. Abell, D. B. Leinweber, Z. W. Liu, A. W. Thomas and J. J. Wu, *Phys. Rev. D* **108** (2023) no.9, 094519 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.108.094519 [arXiv:2306.00337 [hep-lat]].
- [23] D. Guo and Z. W. Liu, *Phys. Rev. D* **105** (2022) no.11, 114039 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.105.114039 [arXiv:2201.11555 [hep-ph]].
- [24] Z. W. Liu, W. Kamleh, D. B. Leinweber, F. M. Stokes, A. W. Thomas and J. J. Wu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116** (2016) no.8, 082004 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.082004 [arXiv:1512.00140 [hep-lat]].
- [25] J. X. Lu, E. Wang, J. J. Xie, L. S. Geng and E. Oset, *Phys. Rev. D* **93** (2016), 094009 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.93.094009 [arXiv:1601.00075 [hep-ph]].
- [26] E. Wang, H. X. Chen, L. S. Geng, D. M. Li and E. Oset, *Phys. Rev. D* **93** (2016) no.9, 094001 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.93.094001 [arXiv:1512.01959 [hep-ph]].
- [27] W. T. Lyu, Y. H. Lyu, M. Y. Duan, G. Y. Wang, D. Y. Chen and E. Wang, [arXiv:2310.11139 [hep-ph]].




FIG. 4: The ηp , $\bar{K}^0\eta$, and $p\bar{K}^0$ invariant mass distributions of the process $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p K_s^0 \eta$ with the fitted parameters of Model A (a-c) and Model B (d-e). The black data points with error bars labeled by ‘Belle’ are the Belle data taken from Ref. [39], and the solid-red curves labeled by ‘Total’ show our theoretical results for the total contributions. In addition, we have also presented the contributions from the $N(1535)$ and $N(1650)$, which are labeled by ‘ $N(1535)$ ’ and ‘ $N(1650)$ ’, respectively.

- [28] R. Molina, C. W. Xiao, W. H. Liang and E. Oset, Phys. Rev. D **109** (2024) no.5, 054002 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.109.054002 [arXiv:2310.12593 [hep-ph]].
- [29] H. P. Li, J. Song, W. H. Liang, R. Molina and E. Oset, [arXiv:2311.14365 [hep-ph]].
- [30] K. Miyahara, T. Hyodo and E. Oset, Phys. Rev. C **92** (2015) no.5, 055204 doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.92.055204 [arXiv:1508.04882 [nucl-th]].
- [31] G. Y. Wang, N. C. Wei, H. M. Yang, E. Wang, L. S. Geng and J. J. Xie, Phys. Rev. D **106** (2022) no.5, 056001 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.106.056001 [arXiv:2206.01425 [hep-ph]].
- [32] J. J. Xie and L. S. Geng, Phys. Rev. D **96** (2017) no.5, 054009 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.96.054009 [arXiv:1704.05714 [hep-ph]].
- [33] T. Hyodo and M. Oka, Phys. Rev. C **84** (2011), 035201 doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.84.035201 [arXiv:1105.5494 [nucl-th]].
- [34] Z. Wang, Y. Y. Wang, E. Wang, D. M. Li and J. J. Xie, Eur. Phys. J. C **80** (2020) no.9, 842 doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-020-8347-2 [arXiv:2004.01438 [hep-ph]].
- [35] C. H. Zeng, J. X. Lu, E. Wang, J. J. Xie and L. S. Geng, Phys. Rev. D **102** (2020) no.7, 076009 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.102.076009 [arXiv:2006.15547 [hep-ph]].
- [36] X. C. Feng, L. L. Wei, M. Y. Duan, E. Wang




FIG. 5: The ηp , $\bar{K}^0\eta$, and $p\bar{K}^0$ invariant mass distributions of the process $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow pK_s^0\eta$ with the fitted parameters of Model C (a-c) and Model D (d-e). The black data points with error bars labeled by ‘Belle’ are the Belle data taken from Ref. [39], and the solid-red curves labeled by ‘Total’ show our theoretical results for the total contributions. In addition, we have also presented the contributions from the $N(1535)$, $N(1650)$ and $\Sigma^*(1/2^-)$, which are labeled by ‘ $N(1535)$ ’, ‘ $N(1650)$ ’, and ‘ $\Sigma^*(1/2^-)$ ’, respectively.

- and D. M. Li, Phys. Lett. B **846** (2023), 138185 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2023.138185 [arXiv:2009.08600 [hep-ph]].
- [37] E. Oset, W. H. Liang, M. Bayar, J. J. Xie, L. R. Dai, M. Albaladejo, M. Nielsen, T. Sekihara, F. Navarra and L. Roca, *et al.* Int. J. Mod. Phys. E **25** (2016), 1630001 doi:10.1142/S0218301316300010 [arXiv:1601.03972 [hep-ph]].
- [38] R. Pavao, S. Sakai and E. Oset, Phys. Rev. C **98** (2018) no.1, 015201 doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.98.015201 [arXiv:1802.07882 [nucl-th]].
- [39] L. K. Li *et al.* [Belle], Phys. Rev. D **107** (2023) no.3, 032004 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.107.032004 [arXiv:2210.01995 [hep-ex]].
- [40] L. Roca and E. Oset, Phys. Rev. C **88**, no.5, 055206 (2013) doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.88.055206 [arXiv:1307.5752 [nucl-th]].
- [41] J. J. Wu, S. Dulat and B. S. Zou, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 017503 (2009) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.80.017503 [arXiv:0906.3950 [hep-ph]].
- [42] J. J. Wu, S. Dulat and B. S. Zou, Phys. Rev. C **81**, 045210 (2010) doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.81.045210 [arXiv:0909.1380 [hep-ph]].
- [43] L. J. Liu, E. Wang, J. J. Xie, K. L. Song and J. Y. Zhu, Phys. Rev. D **98**, no.11, 114017 (2018) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.98.114017 [arXiv:1712.07469 [hep-ex]].

- ph]].
- [44] J. J. Xie and E. Oset, Phys. Lett. B **792** (2019), 450-453 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2019.04.011 [arXiv:1811.07247 [hep-ph]].
- [45] P. Gao, J. J. Wu and B. S. Zou, Phys. Rev. C **81**, 055203 (2010) doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.81.055203 [arXiv:1001.0805 [nucl-th]].
- [46] J. J. Xie and L. S. Geng, Phys. Rev. D **95**, no.7, 074024 (2017) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.95.074024 [arXiv:1703.09502 [hep-ph]].
- [47] E. Wang, J. J. Xie and E. Oset, Phys. Lett. B **753**, 526-532 (2016) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2015.12.060 [arXiv:1509.03367 [hep-ph]].
- [48] Y. H. Lyu, H. Zhang, N. C. Wei, B. C. Ke, E. Wang and J. J. Xie, Chin. Phys. C **47** (2023) no.5, 053108 [arXiv:2301.08615 [hep-ph]].
- [49] S. H. Kim, K. P. Khemchandani, A. Martinez Torres, S. i. Nam and A. Hosaka, Phys. Rev. D **103** (2021) no.11, 114017 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.103.114017 [arXiv:2101.08668 [hep-ph]].
- [50] J. X. Lu, L. S. Geng, M. Doering and M. Mai, Phys. Rev. Lett. **130** (2023) no.7, 071902 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.130.071902 [arXiv:2209.02471 [hep-ph]].
- [51] A. Bramon, A. Grau and G. Pancheri, Phys. Lett. B **283** (1992), 416-420 doi:10.1016/0370-2693(92)90041-2
- [52] W. T. Lyu, Y. H. Lyu, M. Y. Duan, D. M. Li, D. Y. Chen and E. Wang, Phys. Rev. D **109** (2024) no.1, 014008 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.109.014008 [arXiv:2306.16101 [hep-ph]].
- [53] R. P. Pavao, W. H. Liang, J. Nieves and E. Oset, Eur. Phys. J. C **77**, no.4, 265 (2017) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-017-4836-3 [arXiv:1701.06914 [hep-ph]].
- [54] K. Miyahara, T. Hyodo, M. Oka, J. Nieves and E. Oset, Phys. Rev. C **95**, no.3, 035212 (2017) doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.95.035212 [arXiv:1609.00895 [nucl-th]].
- [55] F. E. Close, An Introduction to Quarks and Partons, (Academic Press, London, 1979), p. 481.
- [56] C. D. Lü, W. Wang and F. S. Yu, Phys. Rev. D **93** (2016) no.5, 056008 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.93.056008 [arXiv:1601.04241 [hep-ph]].
- [57] F. K. Guo, R. G. Ping, P. N. Shen, H. C. Chiang and B. S. Zou, Nucl. Phys. A **773** (2006), 78-94 doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysa.2006.04.008 [arXiv:hep-ph/0509050 [hep-ph]].
- [58] W. T. Lyu, S. C. Zhang, G. Y. Wang, J. J. Wu, E. Wang, L. S. Geng and J. J. Xie, [arXiv:2405.09226 [hep-ph]].
- [59] J. Y. Lee *et al.* [Belle], Phys. Rev. D **103**, no.5, 052005 (2021) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.103.052005 [arXiv:2008.11575 [hep-ex]].
- [60] E. Kou *et al.* [Belle-II], PTEP **2019**, no.12, 123C01 (2019) [erratum: PTEP **2020**, no.2, 029201 (2020)] doi:10.1093/ptep/ptz106 [arXiv:1808.10567 [hep-ex]].
- [61] M. Achasov, X. C. Ai, R. Aliberti, L. P. An, Q. An, X. Z. Bai, Y. Bai, O. Bakina, A. Barnyakov and V. Blinov, *et al.* Front. Phys. (Beijing) **19**, no.1, 14701 (2024) doi:10.1007/s11467-023-1333-z [arXiv:2303.15790 [hep-ex]].