

# The role of the $f_0(1710)$ and $a_0(1710)$ resonances in the $D^0 \rightarrow \rho^0\phi, \omega\phi$ decays

Natsumi Ikeno,<sup>1,2,\*</sup> Wei-Hong Liang,<sup>1,3,†</sup> and Eulogio Oset<sup>1,4,‡</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Physics, Guangxi Normal University, Guilin 541004, China

<sup>2</sup>Graduate School of Maritime Sciences, Kobe University, Kobe 658-0022, Japan

<sup>3</sup>Guangxi Key Laboratory of Nuclear Physics and Technology, Guangxi Normal University, Guilin 541004, China

<sup>4</sup>Departamento de Física Teórica and IFIC, Centro Mixto Universidad de Valencia-CSIC

Institutos de Investigación de Paterna, Apartado 22085, 46071 Valencia, Spain

(Dated: December 31, 2024)

We study the  $D^0 \rightarrow \rho^0\phi, \omega\phi$  decays which proceed in a direct mode via internal emission with equal rates. Yet, the experimental branching ratio for the  $\rho^0\phi$  mode is twice as big as that for the  $\omega\phi$  mode. We find a natural explanation based on the extra indirect mechanism where  $K^{*+}K^{*-}$  is produced via external emission and that channel undergoes final state interaction with other vector–vector channels to lead to the  $\rho^0\phi, \omega\phi$  final states, with transition amplitudes dominated by the  $a_0(1710)$  resonance, recently discovered, and  $f_0(1710)$  respectively. The large coupling of the  $a_0(1710)$  to the  $\rho^0\phi$  channel is mostly responsible for this large ratio of the production rates.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The branching fractions of  $D^0 \rightarrow \rho^0\phi, \omega\phi$  are given in the PDG [1] as

$$\text{Br}(D^0 \rightarrow \omega\phi) = (6.5 \pm 1) \times 10^{-4}, \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Br}(D^0 \rightarrow \rho^0\phi; \phi \rightarrow K^+K^-) = (6.9 \pm 0.6) \times 10^{-4}, \quad (2)$$

which, considering the branching ratio of the  $\phi \rightarrow K^+K^-$  [1], implies

$$\text{Br}(D^0 \rightarrow \rho^0\phi) = (14.1 \pm 1.2) \times 10^{-4}. \quad (3)$$

The  $D^0 \rightarrow \rho^0\phi$  rate is about twice as big as that of  $D^0 \rightarrow \omega\phi$ . This result is surprising since the process, which is single Cabibbo suppressed, and requires internal emission [2] since one is producing neutral particles, provides the same decay amplitude in both cases and the phase space for decay is also about the same. This can be easily seen in the topological diagram of Fig. 1 at the quark level.

Since  $\phi \equiv s\bar{s}$  and

$$\rho^0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(u\bar{u} - d\bar{d}), \quad \omega = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(u\bar{u} + d\bar{d}), \quad (4)$$




FIG. 1. Diagram for  $D^0 \rightarrow \phi\rho^0, \phi\omega$  at the quark level, involving internal emission. The  $W\bar{s}u$  vertex is Cabibbo suppressed.

the overlap of  $\rho^0, \omega$  with the  $u\bar{u}$  component gives  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$  in both cases. The phase space, the  $\rho^0$  or  $\omega$  momentum in the  $D^0 \rightarrow \phi\rho^0, \phi\omega$  decay, only gives a 7% increase in the  $D^0 \rightarrow \phi\rho^0$  decay versus  $D^0 \rightarrow \phi\omega$ , because of the smaller  $\rho$  mass, clearly far away from the factor 2.17 ratio of the  $\rho^0\phi, \omega\phi$  rates of the experiment, Eqs. (1)-(3).

The rescue could come from producing other states in a primary step and letting them interact through final state interaction to lead to  $\rho^0\phi, \omega\phi$ . This mechanism could benefit from having this primary process occurring through external emission, which is color favored by a factor  $N_c \equiv 3$ . The final state interaction requires to apply dynamics of strong interaction, and indeed the weak decays are an excellent source of information on strong interaction. An idea of the relevance and interest in this subject can be seen in the following list, not complete, of works done along this line [3–78]. Detailed and pedagogical information can be seen in the review paper [3] and the PhD Thesis of Ref. [63].

Since one has vector–vector ( $VV$ ) in the final state, we search for other  $VV$  states which are produced by external emission. Then we shall rely on the study of the  $VV$  interaction in the local hidden gauge, following the work of Refs. [79–81]. The mechanism for this reaction is discussed in the next section.

## II. ROLE OF $VV$ INTERACTION IN THE $D^0 \rightarrow \rho^0\phi, \omega\phi$ DECAYS

We now look at external emission at the quark level and we can see that again, with a Cabibbo suppressed vertex  $W^+\bar{s}u$ , we can produce  $K^{*+}K^{*-}$  in a first step, see Fig. 2.

The  $K^{*+}K^{*-}$  is not the desired final state, but we can implement the final state interaction of  $K^{*+}K^{*-} \rightarrow \rho^0\phi, \omega\phi$  to produce  $\rho^0\phi$  and  $\omega\phi$  at the end. The idea of using this mechanism was already introduced in Ref. [82]. However a non-perturbative approach to this problem was used, which does not generate the  $f_0(1710)$  and  $a_0(1710)$  resonances. The study of vector–vector interaction was conducted in Ref. [80] using the local hidden gauge approach and coupled channels, and it was found that the scattering matrices developed poles

\* ikeno@maritime.kobe-u.ac.jp

† liangwh@gxnu.edu.cn

‡ oset@ific.uv.es




FIG. 2. Mechanism of  $K^{*+}K^{*-}$  production through external emission.

TABLE I. Masses and widths for the  $a_0(1710)$ .

	Mass [MeV]	$\Gamma$ [MeV]
PDG [1]	$1713 \pm 19$	$107 \pm 15$
LHCb [85]	$1736 \pm 10 \pm 12$	$134 \pm 17 \pm 61$
BESIII [84]	$1817 \pm 8 \pm 20$	$97 \pm 22 \pm 15$
Babar [83]	$1704 \pm 5 \pm 2$	$110 \pm 15 \pm 11$
Geng and Oset [80]	1777	148




FIG. 3. Mechanism for  $D^0 \rightarrow \rho^0 \phi, \omega \phi$  through  $K^{*+}K^{*-}$  production and final state interaction.

for the resonance  $f_0(1710)$  in isospin  $I = 0$ , and another resonance with  $I = 1$  with a mass around 1777 MeV. At the time of the prediction of this  $a_0(1777)$  resonance, there was no experimental information on that state. The situation changed recently when three different collaborations, Babar [83], BESIII [84], and LHCb [85] found evidence for the existence of this state. There is still some discrepancy about the mass of the state, but all these works find evidence for the existence of the state. In the PDG this resonance is cataloged as the  $a_0(1710)$ . In Table I we give the information about the mass and width from these experiments.

The mechanism for final state interaction after  $K^{*+}K^{*-}$  production is given in Fig. 3. Analytically we have

$$\begin{aligned} t_L(\rho^0 \phi) &= AN_c G_{K^{*+}K^{*-}}(M_{D^0}) T_{K^{*+}K^{*-}, \rho^0 \phi}, \\ t_L(\omega \phi) &= AN_c G_{K^{*+}K^{*-}}(M_{D^0}) T_{K^{*+}K^{*-}, \omega \phi}, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where  $A$  is a normalization constant that disappears in the ratios of decay widths and  $N_c$  is the number of colors  $N_c = 3$ . The same normalization constant  $A$  will be used for internal emission, only the factor  $N_c$  will not appear.  $G_{K^{*+}K^{*-}}(M_{D^0})$  is the  $K^{*+}K^{*-}$  loop function, given in the cutoff regularization

by

$$\begin{aligned} G_{K^{*+}K^{*-}}(s) &= \int_{|\vec{q}| < q_{\max}} \frac{d^3 q}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{w_1(\vec{q}) + w_2(\vec{q})}{2w_1(\vec{q})w_2(\vec{q})} \\ &\times \frac{1}{s - [w_1(\vec{q}) + w_2(\vec{q})]^2 + i\epsilon}, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

with  $w_i(\vec{q}) = \sqrt{\vec{q}^2 + m_i^2}$ ,  $m_i = m_{K^{*+}}, m_{K^{*-}}$ .  $T_{K^{*+}K^{*-}, \rho^0 \phi}$  and  $T_{K^{*+}K^{*-}, \omega \phi}$  are the elements of transition matrix  $T$  from  $K^{*+}K^{*-}$  to  $\rho^0 \phi$  or  $\omega \phi$  respectively. These matrix elements are obtained in Ref. [80] using the Bethe-Salpeter equation in coupled channels,

$$T = [I - VG]^{-1}V. \quad (7)$$

with the potential  $V_{ij}$  being provided by the local hidden gauge approach [86–89]. A value of  $q_{\max} = 960$  MeV, was found suited in Refs. [80, 90] to match the dimensional regularization used there.

In the  $I = 1$  sector of the  $\rho \phi$  channel with spin  $J = 0$ , the coupled channels are:  $K^* \bar{K}^*, \rho \omega, \rho \phi$ . In the  $I = 0$  sector of  $\omega \phi$  with  $J = 0$ , the coupled channels are:  $K^* \bar{K}^*, \rho \rho, \omega \omega, \omega \phi, \phi \phi$ . The amplitudes of the  $T$  matrix of Eq. (7) develop a pole, for  $I = 1$  the  $a_0(1710)$ , and for  $I = 0$  the  $f_0(1710)$ . Close to the pole, the amplitudes behave as

$$T_{ij} = \frac{g_i g_j}{s - s_R}, \quad (8)$$

where  $\sqrt{s_R}$  gives the position of the pole in the complex energy plane and  $g_i$  is the coupling of the resonance to the coupled channel  $i$ . The amplitudes of Eq. (8) can be taken in a range of energies about  $2\Gamma$ , with  $\Gamma$  the width of the states, which means that for the decay that we are considering, the  $T$  matrices can be well approximately by their pole form, which is actually a Breit-Wigner amplitude used in most experimental analyses of data. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} T_{K^{*+}K^{*-}, \rho^0 \phi}(s = M_{D^0}^2) &= \frac{g_{R, K^{*+}K^{*-}} g_{R, \rho^0 \phi}}{s - M_R^2 + iM_R \Gamma_R}, \\ T_{K^{*+}K^{*-}, \omega \phi}(s = M_{D^0}^2) &= \frac{g_{R, K^{*+}K^{*-}} g_{R, \omega \phi}}{s - M_R^2 + iM_R \Gamma_R}. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

The couplings in Eq. (9) are given in Table II ( $I = 1$ ) and Table I ( $I = 0$ ) of Ref. [80] and we reproduce them in Table II here.

For the couplings of the resonance to  $K^{*+}K^{*-}$ , we have used the isospin wave function, with our isospin multiplets ( $K^{*+}, K^{*0}$ ), ( $\bar{K}^{*0}, -K^{*-}$ ).

$$|K^* \bar{K}^*, I = 0\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( K^{*+} K^{*-}(-) - K^{*0} \bar{K}^{*0} \right), \quad (10)$$

$$|K^* \bar{K}^*, I = 1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( K^{*+} K^{*-}(-) + K^{*0} \bar{K}^{*0} \right). \quad (11)$$

The amplitudes for internal emission are given both by

$$t^{\text{IE}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} A, \quad (12)$$

TABLE II. Couplings of  $f_0(1710)$  and  $a_0(1710)$  to the needed coupled channels.

$a_0(1710) (J = 0, I = 1)$	$K^* \bar{K}^* (I = 1)$	$\rho\phi$	$K^{*+} K^{*-}$
$g_i$ [MeV]	$7525 + i1529$	$4998 - i1872$	$-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} g_{R, K^* \bar{K}^* (I=1)}$
$f_0(1710) (J = 0, I = 0)$	$K^* \bar{K}^* (I = 0)$	$\omega\phi$	$K^{*+} K^{*-}$
$g_i$ [MeV]	$7124 + i96$	$3010 - i210$	$-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} g_{R, K^* \bar{K}^* (I=0)}$

TABLE III. Results for the ratio  $R_b$  of Eq. (16) with different options.

	Ref. [80]	Ref. [80] $M_{a_0} = 1750$ MeV	PDG [1]	LHCb [85]
$R_b$	3.5	2.8	2.2	2.5

where by putting the same normalization factor  $A$  as in the loop mechanisms we are taking into account the  $\frac{1}{N_c}$  reduction of internal emission versus external emission. All this said, our amplitudes for  $D^0$  decay are

$$\begin{aligned} t_{D^0, \rho\phi} &= t^{\text{IE}} + t_L(\rho\phi), \\ t_{D^0, \omega\phi} &= t^{\text{IE}} + t_L(\omega\phi), \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

and the decay widths will be given by

$$\Gamma_i = \frac{1}{8\pi} \frac{1}{M_{D^0}^2} |t_i|^2 q_i, \quad (14)$$

with  $q_i$  given by

$$q_i = \frac{\lambda^{1/2}(M_{D^0}^2, m_\phi^2, m_i'^2)}{2M_{D^0}}, \quad (15)$$

with  $m_i' = m_\rho$  for  $\rho\phi$  and  $m_i' = m_\omega$  for  $\omega\phi$  decay. We define then the ratio of the widths as

$$R_b = \frac{\Gamma_{D^0 \rightarrow \rho\phi}}{\Gamma_{D^0 \rightarrow \omega\phi}}, \quad (16)$$

and we obtain the results of Table III, where we compare the results with the input of Ref. [80], with the PDG data [1] and with the input of the most recent experiment of LHCb [85]. These results should be compared with the experimental ratio summing relative errors

$$R_b^{\text{exp}} = 2.17 \pm 0.52, [1.65 - 2.69]. \quad (17)$$

We can see that the inclusion of the  $K^{*+} K^{*-}$  production followed by rescattering to the final  $\rho^0\phi, \omega\phi$  states increases the rate of  $D^0 \rightarrow \rho^0\phi$  production versus that of  $D^0 \rightarrow \omega\phi$  by about a factor 2, as in the experiment. We can see that using the result of Ref. [80] one obtains a ratio  $R_b$  30% bigger than the highest value of  $R_b^{\text{exp}}$  in the error band, which is not far away. One reason for the extra enhancement is the fact that the mass of the  $a_0$  is closer to  $M_{D^0}$  than in Ref. [1] or Ref. [85], which makes the  $K^{*+} K^{*-} \rightarrow \rho\phi$  amplitude of Eq. (9) bigger.

Since no uncertainties were given in Ref. [80], we take them from the paper of Ref. [81], with  $m_{a_0} \in [1750 - 1790]$  MeV.

If we take  $m_{a_0} = 1750$  MeV,  $R_b$  is reduced to 2.8, more in agreement with the experimental value. The results obtained with the PDG or LHCb input are compatible with the experimental number. We could guess that the actual mass of the  $a_0$  state could be closer to that of the LHCb measurement  $1736 \pm 10 \pm 12$  [85], or the average given by the PDG of around  $1713 \pm 19$  [1]. Yet, with all the uncertainties, the role of the  $a_0(1710)$  state, increasing the  $R_b$  ratio to reasonable numbers, seems out of the question.

### III. CONCLUSIONS

We have studied the  $D^0 \rightarrow \rho^0\phi, \omega\phi$  decays, which produce directly  $\rho^0\phi, \omega\phi$  with the internal emission mechanism with equal rates. However, experimentally the rate for  $\rho^0\phi$  production is about double the one of  $\omega\phi$  production. We found a natural explanation of this ratio resorting to an indirect production mode, where  $K^{*+} K^{*-}$  is produced in external emission in a first step, and the  $K^{*+} K^{*-}$  undergoes final state interaction with coupled  $VV$  channels to give  $\rho^0\phi$  in  $I = 1$ , or  $\omega\phi$  in  $I = 0$ . The  $VV$  interaction in these  $VV$  channels produces two resonances, the  $f_0(1710)$  in  $I = 0$ , well known in the literature, and the  $a_0(1710)$  that was predicted in Ref. [80] in 2009 and was only found experimentally in 2021 by the Babar collaboration, followed by two other experiments in BESIII in 2022 and LHCb in 2023. We found that mostly due to the stronger coupling of  $a_0(1710)$  to the  $\rho\phi$  channel than the  $f_0(1710)$  to the  $\omega\phi$  channel, the indirect production of  $K^{*+} K^{*-}$  followed by  $f_0(1710)$  or  $a_0(1710)$  production to lead to  $\omega\phi$  or  $\rho^0\phi$  respectively, was responsible for an appreciable increase of the  $\rho\phi$  to the  $\omega\phi$  rate, in fair agreement with experiment. While the role of this newly found  $a_0(1710)$  state has manifested itself clearly in the reactions, future measurements with better precision can help us determine better its properties, mostly concerning its mass, where there are still some differences among the different experiments.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We warmly thank Prof. Qiang Zhao for calling us the attention to this problem and useful discussions. N. I. would like to express gratitude to Guangxi Normal University for their warm hospitality, as part of this work was conducted there. This work is partly supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC) under Grants No. 12365019 and No. 11975083, and by the Central Government Guidance Funds for

Local Scientific and Technological Development, China (No. Guike ZY22096024), and by the Natural Science Foundation of Guangxi province under Grant No. 2023JJA110076. This project has received funding from the European Union Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the program H2020-INFRAIA-2018-1, grant agreement No. 824093 of the STRONG-2020 project. This work of N. I. was partly supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 24K07020.

- 
- [1] S. Navas *et al.* (Particle Data Group), *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 030001 (2024).
- [2] L.-L. Chau, *Phys. Rept.* **95**, 1 (1983).
- [3] E. Oset *et al.*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. E* **25**, 1630001 (2016), arXiv:1601.03972 [hep-ph].
- [4] H.-N. Wang, L.-S. Geng, G. Li, and J.-J. Xie, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 116023 (2024), arXiv:2404.05114 [hep-ph].
- [5] Y. Ding, E. Wang, D.-M. Li, L.-S. Geng, and J.-J. Xie, *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 014032 (2024), arXiv:2401.17322 [hep-ph].
- [6] S.-W. Liu, Q.-H. Shen, and J.-J. Xie, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 114006 (2023), arXiv:2307.09106 [hep-ph].
- [7] W.-T. Lyu, Y.-H. Lyu, M.-Y. Duan, D.-M. Li, D.-Y. Chen, and E. Wang, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 014008 (2024), arXiv:2306.16101 [hep-ph].
- [8] X. Luo, A. Xu, R. Li, and H. Sun, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 034035 (2023), arXiv:2212.12284 [hep-ph].
- [9] X. Zhu, H.-N. Wang, D.-M. Li, E. Wang, L.-S. Geng, and J.-J. Xie, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 034001 (2023), arXiv:2210.12992 [hep-ph].
- [10] G.-Y. Wang, N.-C. Wei, H.-M. Yang, E. Wang, L.-S. Geng, and J.-J. Xie, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 056001 (2022), arXiv:2206.01425 [hep-ph].
- [11] H. A. Ahmed and C. W. Xiao, *Eur. Phys. J. A* **59**, 245 (2023), arXiv:2112.14165 [hep-ph].
- [12] Z.-Y. Wang, J.-Y. Yi, Z.-F. Sun, and C. W. Xiao, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 016025 (2022), arXiv:2109.00153 [hep-ph].
- [13] J.-Y. Wang, M.-Y. Duan, G.-Y. Wang, D.-M. Li, L.-J. Liu, and E. Wang, *Phys. Lett. B* **821**, 136617 (2021), arXiv:2105.04907 [hep-ph].
- [14] X.-Z. Ling, M.-Z. Liu, J.-X. Lu, L.-S. Geng, and J.-J. Xie, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 116016 (2021), arXiv:2102.05349 [hep-ph].
- [15] L.-L. Wei, H.-S. Li, E. Wang, J.-J. Xie, D.-M. Li, and Y.-X. Li, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 114013 (2021), arXiv:2102.03704 [hep-ph].
- [16] N. Ikeno, M. Bayar, and E. Oset, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **81**, 377 (2021), arXiv:2102.01650 [hep-ph].
- [17] W.-Y. Liu, W. Hao, G.-Y. Wang, Y.-Y. Wang, E. Wang, and D.-M. Li, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 034019 (2021), arXiv:2012.01804 [hep-ph].
- [18] X.-C. Feng, L.-L. Wei, M.-Y. Duan, E. Wang, and D.-M. Li, *Phys. Lett. B* **846**, 138185 (2023), arXiv:2009.08600 [hep-ph].
- [19] N. Ikeno, J. M. Dias, W.-H. Liang, and E. Oset, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **84**, 469 (2024), arXiv:2402.04073 [hep-ph].
- [20] G. Toledo, N. Ikeno, and E. Oset, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **81**, 268 (2021), arXiv:2008.11312 [hep-ph].
- [21] M.-Y. Duan, J.-Y. Wang, G.-Y. Wang, E. Wang, and D.-M. Li, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80**, 1041 (2020), arXiv:2008.10139 [hep-ph].
- [22] Z. Wang, Y.-Y. Wang, E. Wang, D.-M. Li, and J.-J. Xie, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80**, 842 (2020), arXiv:2004.01438 [hep-ph].
- [23] Y. Zhang, E. Wang, D.-M. Li, and Y.-X. Li, *Chin. Phys. C* **44**, 093107 (2020), arXiv:2001.06624 [hep-ph].
- [24] R. Molina, J.-J. Xie, W.-H. Liang, L.-S. Geng, and E. Oset, *Phys. Lett. B* **803**, 135279 (2020), arXiv:1908.11557 [hep-ph].
- [25] G. Y. Wang, L. Roca, and E. Oset, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 074018 (2019), arXiv:1907.09188 [hep-ph].
- [26] Z. Rui, Y.-Q. Li, and J. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 093007 (2019), arXiv:1811.12738 [hep-ph].
- [27] L. R. Dai, R. Pavao, S. Sakai, and E. Oset, *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 116004 (2018), arXiv:1804.01136 [hep-ph].
- [28] K. Miyahara and T. Hyodo, *Phys. Rev. C* **98**, 025202 (2018), arXiv:1803.05572 [nucl-th].
- [29] R. Pavao, S. Sakai, and E. Oset, *Phys. Rev. C* **98**, 015201 (2018), arXiv:1802.07882 [nucl-th].
- [30] L. R. Dai, J. M. Dias, and E. Oset, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **78**, 210 (2018), arXiv:1801.07091 [hep-ph].
- [31] W.-H. Liang, S. Sakai, J.-J. Xie, and E. Oset, *Chin. Phys. C* **42**, 044101 (2018), arXiv:1711.04603 [hep-ph].
- [32] S. Sakai, E. Oset, and W. H. Liang, *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, 074025 (2017), arXiv:1707.02236 [hep-ph].
- [33] J.-J. Xie and L.-S. Geng, *Phys. Rev. D* **95**, 074024 (2017), arXiv:1703.09502 [hep-ph].
- [34] M. Albaladejo, J. T. Daub, C. Hanhart, B. Kubis, and B. Mousallam, *JHEP* **04**, 010 (2017), arXiv:1611.03502 [hep-ph].
- [35] W.-H. Liang, M. Bayar, and E. Oset, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77**, 39 (2017), arXiv:1610.08296 [hep-ph].
- [36] J.-J. Xie and L.-S. Geng, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76**, 496 (2016), arXiv:1604.02756 [nucl-th].
- [37] W. Wang, *Phys. Lett. B* **759**, 501 (2016), arXiv:1602.05288 [hep-ph].
- [38] J. M. Dias, F. S. Navarra, M. Nielsen, and E. Oset, *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, 096002 (2016), arXiv:1601.04635 [hep-ph].
- [39] H.-X. Chen, L.-S. Geng, W.-H. Liang, E. Oset, E. Wang, and J.-J. Xie, *Phys. Rev. C* **93**, 065203 (2016), arXiv:1510.01803 [hep-ph].
- [40] B. El-Bennich, A. Furman, R. Kaminski, L. Lesniak, and B. Loiseau, *Phys. Rev. D* **74**, 114009 (2006), arXiv:hep-ph/0608205.
- [41] A. Furman, R. Kaminski, L. Lesniak, and B. Loiseau, *Phys. Lett. B* **622**, 207 (2005), arXiv:hep-ph/0504116.
- [42] J. P. Dedonder, R. Kaminski, L. Lesniak, and B. Loiseau, *Phys. Rev. D* **89**, 094018 (2014), arXiv:1403.2971 [hep-ph].
- [43] A. Furman, R. Kaminski, L. Lesniak, and P. Zenczykowski, *Phys. Lett. B* **699**, 102 (2011), arXiv:1101.4126 [hep-ph].
- [44] S. Sakai, F.-K. Guo, and B. Kubis, *Phys. Lett. B* **808**, 135623 (2020), arXiv:2004.09824 [hep-ph].
- [45] F. Niecknig and B. Kubis, *Phys. Lett. B* **780**, 471 (2018), arXiv:1708.00446 [hep-ph].

- [46] F. Niecknig and B. Kubis, *JHEP* **10**, 142 (2015), [arXiv:1509.03188 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [47] J. T. Daub, C. Hanhart, and B. Kubis, *JHEP* **02**, 009 (2016), [arXiv:1508.06841 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [48] W. H. Liang and E. Oset, *Phys. Lett. B* **737**, 70 (2014), [arXiv:1406.7228 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [49] J.-J. Xie, L.-R. Dai, and E. Oset, *Phys. Lett. B* **742**, 363 (2015), [arXiv:1409.0401 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [50] L. Roca, M. Mai, E. Oset, and U.-G. Meißner, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **75**, 218 (2015), [arXiv:1503.02936 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [51] W.-H. Liang, J.-J. Xie, and E. Oset, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **75**, 609 (2015), [arXiv:1510.03175 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [52] E. Wang, H.-X. Chen, L.-S. Geng, D.-M. Li, and E. Oset, *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, 094001 (2016), [arXiv:1512.01959 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [53] K. Miyahara, T. Hyodo, M. Oka, J. Nieves, and E. Oset, *Phys. Rev. C* **95**, 035212 (2017), [arXiv:1609.00895 \[nucl-th\]](#).
- [54] R. P. Pavao, W. H. Liang, J. Nieves, and E. Oset, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77**, 265 (2017), [arXiv:1701.06914 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [55] J.-J. Xie and E. Oset, *Phys. Lett. B* **792**, 450 (2019), [arXiv:1811.07247 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [56] J. M. Dias, G. Toledo, L. Roca, and E. Oset, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 116019 (2021), [arXiv:2102.08402 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [57] L. Roca and E. Oset, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 034020 (2021), [arXiv:2011.05185 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [58] P. C. Magalhães, M. R. Robilotta, K. S. F. F. Guimaraes, T. Frederico, W. de Paula, I. Bediaga, A. C. d. Reis, C. M. Maekawa, and G. R. S. Zarnauskas, *Phys. Rev. D* **84**, 094001 (2011), [arXiv:1105.5120 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [59] P. C. Magalhães and M. R. Robilotta, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 094005 (2015), [arXiv:1504.06346 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [60] D. R. Boito and R. Escribano, *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 054007 (2009), [arXiv:0907.0189 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [61] M. Diakonou and F. Diakonou, *Phys. Lett. B* **216**, 436 (1989).
- [62] C.-P. Jia, H.-Y. Jiang, J.-P. Wang, and F.-S. Yu, (2024), [arXiv:2408.14959 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [63] J. Niecknig, *Final-state interactions in heavy-meson decays*, Ph.D. thesis, Bonn U., HISKP (2018).
- [64] J.-J. Xie and G. Li, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **78**, 861 (2018), [arXiv:1801.00536 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [65] X. Liu, Z.-T. Zou, Y. Li, and Z.-J. Xiao, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 013006 (2019), [arXiv:1906.02489 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [66] Z. Rui, Y. Li, and H. Li, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79**, 792 (2019), [arXiv:1907.04128 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [67] S. Sakai, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 074041 (2020), [arXiv:2002.08594 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [68] H. A. Ahmed, Z.-Y. Wang, Z.-F. Sun, and C. W. Xiao, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **81**, 695 (2021), [arXiv:2011.08758 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [69] D. He, X. Luo, Y. Xie, and H. Sun, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 094007 (2021), [arXiv:2104.01047 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [70] Y.-W. Peng, W. Liang, X. Xiong, and C.-W. Xiao, *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 036013 (2024), [arXiv:2402.02539 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [71] W. Liang, J.-Y. Yi, C. W. Xiao, and S. Q. Zhou, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 116001 (2023).
- [72] Z.-Y. Wang, Y.-W. Peng, J.-Y. Yi, W. C. Luo, and C. W. Xiao, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 116018 (2023), [arXiv:2306.06395 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [73] L. M. Abreu, N. Ikeno, and E. Oset, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 016007 (2023), [arXiv:2305.02848 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [74] D. He, Y. Xie, and H. Sun, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 094040 (2023), [arXiv:2305.10660 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [75] H. Zhang, Y.-H. Lyu, L.-J. Liu, and E. Wang, *Chin. Phys. C* **47**, 043101 (2023), [arXiv:2212.11512 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [76] Z.-Y. Wang, S.-Q. Luo, Z.-F. Sun, C. W. Xiao, and X. Liu, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 096026 (2022), [arXiv:2211.08946 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [77] J. Song, A. Feijoo, and E. Oset, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 074027 (2022), [arXiv:2205.04781 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [78] Z.-Y. Wang, H. A. Ahmed, and C. W. Xiao, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 016030 (2022), [arXiv:2110.05359 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [79] R. Molina, D. Nicmorus, and E. Oset, *Phys. Rev. D* **78**, 114018 (2008), [arXiv:0809.2233 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [80] L. S. Geng and E. Oset, *Phys. Rev. D* **79**, 074009 (2009), [arXiv:0812.1199 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [81] M.-L. Du, D. Gülmez, F.-K. Guo, U.-G. Meißner, and Q. Wang, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **78**, 988 (2018), [arXiv:1808.09664 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [82] Y. Cao, Y. Cheng, and Q. Zhao, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 073002 (2024), [arXiv:2303.00535 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [83] J. P. Lees *et al.* (BaBar), *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 072002 (2021), [arXiv:2106.05157 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [84] M. Ablikim *et al.* (BESIII), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **129**, 182001 (2022), [arXiv:2204.09614 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [85] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb), *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 032010 (2023), [arXiv:2304.14891 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [86] M. Bando, T. Kugo, S. Uehara, K. Yamawaki, and T. Yanagida, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **54**, 1215 (1985).
- [87] M. Bando, T. Kugo, and K. Yamawaki, *Phys. Rept.* **164**, 217 (1988).
- [88] U. G. Meißner, *Phys. Rept.* **161**, 213 (1988).
- [89] H. Nagahiro, L. Roca, A. Hosaka, and E. Oset, *Phys. Rev. D* **79**, 014015 (2009), [arXiv:0809.0943 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [90] L. R. Dai, E. Oset, and L. S. Geng, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82**, 225 (2022), [arXiv:2111.10230 \[hep-ph\]](#).