

# Two-photon transitions of charmonia on the light front

Yang Li,<sup>1</sup> Meijian Li,<sup>2,3,\*</sup> and James P. Vary<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Modern Physics, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei 230026, China*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Physics, P.O. Box 35, FI-40014 University of Jyväskylä, Finland*

<sup>3</sup>*Helsinki Institute of Physics, P.O. Box 64, FI-00014 University of Helsinki, Finland*

<sup>4</sup>*Department of Physics and Astronomy, Iowa State University, Ames, IA 50011*

(Dated: November 30, 2021)

We investigate the two-photon transitions  $H_{c\bar{c}} \rightarrow \gamma^* \gamma$  of the charmonium system in light-front dynamics. The light-front wave functions were obtained from solving the effective Hamiltonian based on light-front holography and one-gluon exchange interaction within the basis light-front quantization approach. We compute the two-photon transition form factors as well as the two-photon decay widths for S- and P-wave charmonia,  $\eta_c$  and  $\chi_{cJ}$  and their excitations. Without introducing any free parameters, our predictions are in good agreement with the recent experimental measurements by BaBar and Belle, shedding light on the relativistic nature of charmonium.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Charmonium is an intriguing system with entangled scales  $\Lambda_{\text{QCD}} \lesssim \alpha_s m_c c^2 \ll m_c c^2$  [1]. Typical estimates put the average velocity of the quarks  $v_c^2 \sim 0.3$ . Thus, there may be large relativistic corrections for observables sensitive to short-distance physics. The two-photon transition of charmonium, viz.  $H_{c\bar{c}} \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ , is one of the leading examples (see Refs. [2–5] for reviews), where predictions based on non-relativistic dynamics appear deficient. Typical symptoms include the slow convergence in non-relativistic effective theories (e.g., NRQCD [6, 7]), large differences among various non-relativistic potential model calculations and discrepancies with the experimental measurements [8, 9]. Driven by recent progress on experimental measurements, the call for fully relativistic approaches is clear.

Lattice computation of the two-photon transition with off-shell photons is particularly challenging, as demonstrated by the large discrepancy between theoretical predictions and the PDG value, since the energetic virtual photon is not an eigenstate of the QCD Hamiltonian [11]. Nevertheless, strides have been made to access the two-photon width [10, 12–15], and transition form factors [10, 12]. Calculations from other relativistic approaches, notably DSE/BSE, have also been reported in the literature and appear successful [16].

In this work, we report the calculation of the two-photon transition form factors (TFFs) of charmonium in a light-front Hamiltonian approach. This approach solves for the light-front wave functions (LFWFs) directly from a low-energy relativistic effective Hamiltonian for QCD [17]. The advantage of this approach is evident from the short-distance  $z^2 \sim 1/Q^2 \ll \Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^{-2}$  behavior of the transition amplitude  $\int d^4x e^{iq \cdot z} \langle 0 | T \{ J^\mu(z) J^\nu(0) \} | H(p) \rangle$ , where the leading contribution comes from the light-cone

distribution amplitude (LCDA)  $\phi_P$  [18, 19],

$$F_{P\gamma\gamma}(Q^2) \stackrel{Q^2 \gg \Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2}{=} \int_0^1 dx T_H(x, Q) \phi_P(x, \tilde{Q}). \quad (1)$$

The hard kernel  $T_H = e_f^2 f_P / (x(1-x)Q^2)$  is computable from perturbation theory. This result can be extended to the full range of  $Q^2$  by using the LFWFs  $\psi_P(x, \vec{k}_\perp)$  [18],

$$F_{P\gamma\gamma}(Q^2) = \int_0^1 dx \int \frac{d^2k_\perp}{16\pi^3} T_H(x, \vec{k}_\perp, Q) \psi_P(x, \vec{k}_\perp), \quad (2)$$

where the hard kernel  $T_H$  is known to the next-to-leading order [20]. The LFWFs and the associated LCDAs play a dominant role in exclusive processes [18, 19, 21]. The LFWFs adopted in this work were previously obtained in a light-front Hamiltonian approach to the charmonium spectra [22, 23].

We compute the two-photon widths and TFFs of the pseudoscalar  $\eta_c$ , scalar  $\chi_{c0}$ , axial vector  $\chi_{c1}$ , and tensor  $\chi_{c2}$  and compare with the recent experimental data wherever available [24–27]. The same LFWFs have been used to compute the decay constants, radiative transitions, semi-leptonic transitions, form factors, (generalized) parton distributions and cross sections of diffractive vector meson production with reasonable agreement over a remarkable wide range of experimental measurements and theoretical predictions [22, 28–33]. All these results, as well as those of the present work, represent predictions of the original model Hamiltonian for charmonia without adjusting its parameters [22].

Our effective Hamiltonian consists of a confining interaction from light-front holography and a one-gluon exchange interaction from leading-order light-front perturbation theory [35]. Light-front holography is a first approximation to QCD based on a remarkable correspondence between QCD and string theory in curved 5-dimension spacetime [37]. The one-gluon exchange interaction is well tested in QED up to  $O(\alpha_{\text{em}}^4)$  [38]. The universality nature of light-front holography strongly restricts the model and there are only two free parameters

\* mliy@jyu.fi

in the Hamiltonian, the quark mass  $m_c \sim 1.5 \text{ GeV}$  and the confining strength  $\kappa \sim 1.0 \text{ GeV}$ . Their precise values are chosen to reproduce the experimental charmonium spectra to within  $\sim 40 \text{ MeV}$  rms mass deviation. The effective Hamiltonian was solved in the basis light-front quantization (BLFQ) approach, which preserves *all kinematical symmetries* of QCD and is equivalent to the covariant construction of LFWFs [39, 40] while providing additional access to the non-perturbative dynamics of the bound states in comparison to Gaussian-like ansätze [40–42].

It is also interesting to compare our results with those obtained from relativizing non-relativistic potential model wave functions [8]. The light-front relativization has to be addressed with care, since exact discrete symmetries on the light front are in general incompatible with non-relativistic parity [43]. As a result, leading-twist LFWFs may be forbidden in non-relativistic dynamics. For example, the spin-singlet LFWF  $\psi_{\uparrow\downarrow-\downarrow\uparrow}^{(\lambda=0)}(x, \vec{k}_\perp)$  of an axial vector is  $S$  or  $D$ -wave as required by light-front parity. However, those partial waves are forbidden by non-relativistic parity relation  $P = (-1)^{L+1}$  where  $L$  is the orbital angular momentum. To overcome this problem, one has to give up the full self-consistent treatment of the dynamics and model the angular and radial part of the wave function separately [8, 43]. In Ref. [8], it was shown that predictions from non-relativistic formulae and from the light-front formulae based on the same non-relativistic wave functions are dramatically different for charmonia, echoing the slow convergence in NRQCD.

## II. FORMALISM

The leading-order contribution of the two-photon transition amplitude  $\mathcal{M}^{\mu\nu\alpha}$  is shown in Fig. 1. It is convenient to introduce the associated helicity amplitudes,  $H_{\lambda_1\lambda_2;\lambda} = \varepsilon_\mu^*(q_1, \lambda_1)\varepsilon_\nu^*(q_2, \lambda_2)e_\alpha(p, \lambda)\mathcal{M}^{\mu\nu\alpha}$  (for scalars and pseudoscalars, the hadron polarization tensor  $e_\alpha = 1$ ), and evaluate the helicity amplitude in terms of the local hadronic matrix element,

$$H_{\lambda_1\lambda_2;\lambda} = \varepsilon_\nu^*(q_2, \lambda_2)\langle\gamma^*(q_1, \lambda_1)|J^\nu(0)|H(p, \lambda)\rangle. \quad (3)$$

We choose a frame in which the light-cone dominance is manifest,  $q_1 = (q_1^+, 0, \vec{q}_{1\perp})$ ,  $q_2 = (0, q_2^-, \vec{q}_{2\perp})$  [8, 18]. From momentum conservation,  $p = (q_1^+, q_2^-, \vec{q}_{1\perp} + \vec{q}_{2\perp})$ . Here we adopt light-cone coordinate,  $v = (v^+, v^-, v^1, v^2)$  where  $v^\pm = v^0 \pm v^3$ , and  $\vec{v}_\perp = (v^1, v^2)$ . The experimentally relevant case involves at most one photon on-shell. We choose the momentum of the on-shell photon to be  $q_2$ . The helicity amplitudes can be expressed in terms of




FIG. 1. Leading order diagrams of the transition form factor  $\gamma^*\gamma \rightarrow H$ .

the LFWFs as (see Fig. 1),

$$H_{\lambda_1\lambda_2;\lambda} = ee_f \sum_{s, \bar{s}, s'} \int_0^1 \frac{dx}{2x(1-x)} \int \frac{d^2k_\perp}{(2\pi)^3} \times \left\{ \frac{1}{x} \psi_{s\bar{s}/\gamma}^{\lambda_1*}(x, \vec{k}_\perp) \psi_{s'\bar{s}'/H}^\lambda(x, \vec{k}'_\perp) \bar{u}_{s'}(k'_q) \not{\epsilon}_2^* u_s(k_q) - \frac{1}{1-x} \psi_{s\bar{s}/\gamma}^{\lambda_1*}(x, \vec{k}_\perp) \psi_{s\bar{s}'/H}^\lambda(x, \vec{k}'_\perp) \bar{v}_{\bar{s}}(k'_q) \not{\epsilon}_2^* v_{\bar{s}'}(k'_q) \right\}, \quad (4)$$

where,  $\psi_{s\bar{s}/\gamma}$  and  $\psi_{s\bar{s}/H}$  are the photon and meson LFWFs, respectively. The former can be computed using light-front perturbation theory [8, 18, 43]. The momenta of the quark before and after the photon emission are,  $k_q = (xp^+, k_q^-, \vec{k}_\perp + x\vec{p}_\perp)$ ,  $k'_q = (xq_1^+, k_q'^-, \vec{k}'_\perp + x\vec{q}_{1\perp})$ , respectively, where  $\vec{k}'_\perp = \vec{k}_\perp + (1-x)\vec{q}_{2\perp}$ . Note that only the light-front 3-momenta need to be specified since partons are always on their mass shells. Similarly, the momenta of the antiquark before and after the photon emission are,  $k_{\bar{q}} = ((1-x)p^+, k_{\bar{q}}^-, -\vec{k}_\perp + (1-x)\vec{p}_\perp)$ ,  $k'_{\bar{q}} = ((1-x)p^+, k_{\bar{q}}'^-, -\vec{k}'_\perp + (1-x)\vec{q}_{1\perp})$ , respectively, where  $\vec{k}'_\perp = \vec{k}_\perp - x\vec{q}_{2\perp}$ . In the single-tag case, only one photon is on-shell and the helicity amplitude  $H_{\lambda_1\lambda_2;\lambda}$  can be extracted from the transverse current  $\vec{J}_\perp$ , similar to the M1 transition investigated in Ref. [28].

### A. $\eta_c \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$

The two-photon transition amplitude of a pseudoscalar can be parametrized by a single form factor [44],

$$\mathcal{M}^{\mu\nu} = 4\pi\alpha_{\text{em}}\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} q_{1\rho}q_{2\sigma} F_{P\gamma\gamma}(q_1^2, q_2^2). \quad (5)$$

For the important case where one of the photons is on-shell, it is useful to define a single-variable TFF  $F_{P\gamma}(q^2) \equiv F_{P\gamma\gamma}(-q^2, 0) = F_{P\gamma\gamma}(0, -q^2)$ .  $F_{P\gamma}(q^2)$  is related to the two-photon width,

$$\Gamma_{P\rightarrow\gamma\gamma} = \frac{\pi}{4}\alpha_{\text{em}}^2 M_P^3 |F_{P\gamma}(0)|^2. \quad (6)$$

The matrix element associated with (5) has the structure of pseudoscalar-vector-vector (PVV) coupling, where each vector meson is substituted by a virtual photon. Using the techniques developed in Ref. [28] for the

M1 transition form factor  $V_{P \rightarrow V\gamma}$ , we obtain a LFWF representation [8],

$$F_{P\gamma}(Q^2) = e_f^2 2\sqrt{2N_C} \int \frac{dx}{2\sqrt{x(1-x)}} \int \frac{d^2k_\perp}{(2\pi)^3} \times \frac{\psi_{\uparrow\downarrow-\downarrow\uparrow/P}^*(x, \vec{k}_\perp)}{k_\perp^2 + m_f^2 + x(1-x)Q^2}, \quad (7)$$

where  $m_f$  is the quark mass,  $N_C = 3$ , and  $e_f = 2/3$ .

At large  $Q \gg \max\{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}, m_f\}$ , Eq. (7) reduces to the celebrated partonic interpretation of Brodsky-Lepage [18],

$$F_{P\gamma}(Q^2) = \frac{e_f^2 f_P}{Q^2} \int_0^1 dx \frac{\phi_P(x, Q)}{x(1-x)}, \quad (8)$$

where,  $\phi$  is the (normalized) pseudoscalar LCDA, and  $f_P$  is the pseudoscalar decay constant. Their relations with the LFWFs are [22],

$$\frac{f_P}{2\sqrt{2N_C}} \phi_P(x, \mu) = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{x(1-x)}} \int \frac{d^2k_\perp}{(2\pi)^3} \psi_{\uparrow\downarrow-\downarrow\uparrow/P}^*(x, \vec{k}_\perp), \quad (9)$$

and  $\int_0^1 \phi_P(x, \mu) = 1$ . For heavy quarkonia, since  $m_f \gg \Lambda_{\text{QCD}}$ , Eq. (8) can be extended to moderate  $Q^2$  with  $x(1-x)Q^2 + m_f^2 \gg \langle k_\perp^2 \rangle$  [8] (cf. [44]),


$$F_{P\gamma}(Q^2) = e_f^2 f_P \int_0^1 dx \frac{\phi_P(x, Q)}{x(1-x)Q^2 + m_f^2}. \quad (10)$$

This expression at  $Q^2 = 0$  implies ( $2m_f \approx M_P$ ),


$$\Gamma_{P \rightarrow \gamma\gamma} \doteq \frac{\pi e_f^4}{4} \alpha_{\text{em}}^2 M_P^3 \frac{f_P^2}{m_f^4} \approx 4\pi e_f^4 \alpha_{\text{em}}^2 \frac{f_P^2}{M_P}. \quad (11)$$

However, this is only accurate in the non-relativistic limit. At small  $Q^2$ , these two equations (10) & (11) clearly overestimate the full light-front prediction (7), as we will see later. For charmonia, the effect is substantial. A further dilemma is that, for pseudoscalar quarkonia  $\eta_c$ , the decay constant  $f_{\eta_c}$  cannot be unambiguously extracted from the experimental measurement. The BLFQ prediction  $f_{\eta_c} = 0.42(7)$  GeV [22] is in good agreement with model-dependent value  $f_{\eta_c} = 0.335(75)$  GeV extracted from the experiment [45] as well as with predictions from Lattice QCD and DSE/BSE calculations [46–49].

The two-photon TFF of  $\eta_c$  is measured by BaBar collaboration [24]. The BaBar data can be well described by a monopole fit with a pole mass  $\Lambda^2 = 8.5 \pm 0.6 \pm 0.7 \text{ GeV}^2 \approx M_{J/\psi}^2$ . This corroborates with the vector meson dominant (VMD) model with the nearest vector mesons.



(a)  $\eta_c(1S)$



(b)  $\eta_c(2S)$

FIG. 2. The two-photon transition form factor of charmed pseudoscalar mesons (a)  $\eta_c(1S)$  and (b)  $\eta_c(2S)$ . The BLFQ predictions employs (7) whereas the BLFQ/DA prediction employs (10). For  $\eta_c(1S)$  the result is compared with calculations from DSE/BSE [16]. A monopole fit with pole mass  $\Lambda = M_{\psi(2S)}$  is provided for  $\eta_c(2S)$  as a reference (see texts).

The BaBar data along with the monopole fit are shown in Fig. 2(a). The BLFQ prediction (7) is in excellent agreement with the BaBar data. Following the analysis in Ref. [22] for the decay constants, our calculation uses the  $N_{\text{max}} = 8$  results, which corresponds to a UV resolution  $\mu_{\text{UV}} \approx \kappa\sqrt{N_{\text{max}}} = 2.8 \text{ GeV}$ . The basis sensitivity shown as uncertainty band is estimated as the difference between the  $N_{\text{max}} = 8$  and  $N_{\text{max}} = 16$  results. A DSE/BSE result is included for comparison [16]. Two recent Lattice calculations are less successful due to the difficulty to represent the photon with large virtuality [12, 13]. More recent Lattice calculations instead focus on the on-shell amplitude.

Note that we present the TFF  $F_{P\gamma}(Q^2)$  instead of the normalized TFF  $F_{P\gamma}(Q^2)/F_{P\gamma}(0)$  to avoid the propagation of errors from  $F_{P\gamma}(0)$  present in both theory and experiment. The value  $F_{P\gamma}(0) \propto \sqrt{\Gamma_{P \rightarrow \gamma\gamma}}$  can also be compared from Fig. 2(a), where we add the PDG value




FIG. 3. Comparison of the normalized LCDA (9) and the normalized effective LCDA  $\phi_{\text{eff}}$  defined using (7). A phenomenological LCDA proposed by Bondar and Chernyak [50] is also compared.

combining measurement of the two-photon width from various processes [27].

The prediction using the LCDA (“BLFQ/DA”) are also included in Fig. 2(a) for comparison. At  $Q^2 = 0$ , the prediction clearly overshoots the BLFQ prediction as expected. One can define a  $Q^2$ -dependent “effective LCDA”  $\phi_{\text{eff}}(x, Q^2)$  using (7) and compare with the LCDA, as shown in Fig. 3. The overlay of the *normalized* LCDA and the *normalized* effective LCDAs at various  $Q^2$  indicates that better agreement can be achieved between the LCDA prediction and the BaBar data if one compares the *normalized* TFF  $F_{P\gamma}(Q^2)/F_{P\gamma}(0)$ . The agreement of the experimental normalized TFF with the phenomenological Bondar-Chernyak LCDA [50] also explains the unexpected success of this model with the *normalized* TFF [21]. Note that the unnormalized LCDAs (true or effective) in general differ from each other, except at large  $Q^2$ .

The on-shell two-photon width from PDG as well as from selected theoretical predictions are collected in Table I. A comparison of selected recent predictions with quantified uncertainties is shown in Fig. 4. Without adjusting any parameter, our predictions appear very competitive with other theoretical approaches.

There is no measurement of the  $\eta_c(2S)$  TFF at the present. Thus, our results Fig. 2(b) are predictions.  $F_{\eta_c\gamma}(0)$  can be accessed via other processes and are also shown in Fig. 2(b). Our prediction is again in good agreement with the PDG value [27]. The monopole fit with a pole mass  $\Lambda = M_{\psi(2S)}$  is depicted for comparison.

In the literature, one of the major sources of uncertainty is the quark mass  $m_f$ . In various models, it is known that both the shape of the TFF  $F_{P\gamma}(Q^2)/F_{P\gamma}(0)$  and the two-photon width  $\Gamma_{P\rightarrow\gamma\gamma}$  are sensitive to the value of the quark mass  $m_f$ , in opposing directions.




FIG. 4. Comparison of selected recent theoretical predictions of the two-photon transition widths for  $\eta_c(1S)$  and  $\chi_{c0}(1P)$  with quantified uncertainties. See Table I for more comparisons of the widths.

When confronted by the experimental data, the former, dictated by the pole mass  $\Lambda^2 \approx \langle \frac{k_{\perp}^2 + m_f^2}{x(1-x)} \rangle$ , typically favors a lower value  $m_f \sim 1.3 \text{ GeV}$  close to the current quark mass whereas the latter favors a larger value close to the effective quark mass. Indeed, (11) is more accurate if  $m_f^2 \rightarrow m_f^2 + \langle k_{\perp}^2 \rangle$ . In our calculation, the effective quark mass  $m_f = 1.57 \text{ GeV}$  is determined from the mass spectroscopy, leaving no room for parameter manipulation. Therefore, it is remarkable that our LFWFs can reproduce the two-photon TFF and the two-photon width simultaneously.

## B. $\chi_{c0} \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$

The transition amplitude of this process can be parametrized by two TFFs [9, 44, 51],

$$\mathcal{M}^{\mu\nu} = 4\pi\alpha_{\text{em}} \left\{ [(q_1 \cdot q_2)g^{\mu\nu} - q_2^\mu q_1^\nu] F_1^S(q_1^2, q_2^2) + \frac{1}{M_S^2} [q_1^2 q_2^2 g^{\mu\nu} + (q_1 \cdot q_2)q_1^\mu q_2^\nu - q_1^2 q_2^\mu q_2^\nu - q_2^2 q_1^\mu q_1^\nu] \times F_2^S(q_1^2, q_2^2) \right\}. \quad (12)$$

TABLE I. A compilation of experimental measurements and selected theoretical predictions of the two-photon width  $\Gamma_{H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma}$  for charmonium. For  $\chi_{c1}$ , the reduced two-photon width  $\tilde{\Gamma}_{H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma}$  is listed instead. The uncertainties have been combined in quadrature. See the text for more details.

	$\eta_c(1S)$	$\eta_c(2S)$	$\chi_{c0}(1P)$	$\chi_{c0}(2P)$	$\chi_{c1}(1P)$	$\chi_{c1}(2P)$	$\chi_{c2}(1P)$	$\chi_{c2}(2P)$
Experiment [27]	5.15(35)	2.1(1.6)	2.20(16)	–	–	$0.02\text{--}0.5^a$	0.56(5)	–
<b>BLFQ</b>	<b>3.7(6)</b>	<b>1.9(4)</b>	<b>1.4(5)</b>	<b>0.64(26)</b>	<b>6(1)</b>	<b>6(2)</b>	<b>0.70(13)</b>	<b>0.58(25)</b>
Lattice [14, 15]	6.57(20)	–	3.7(1.1)	–	–	–	–	–
Lattice [12]	1.122(14)	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Lattice [13]	1.62(19)	–	1.18(38)	–	–	–	–	–
Lattice [10]	2.65(99)	–	2.41(1.04)	–	–	–	–	–
or $\tilde{\Gamma}_{H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma}$ (keV)	NRQCD [7]	9.7–10.8	–	–	–	–	–	–
DSE/BSE [16]	6.39	–	2.39	–	–	–	0.655	–
LFQM [52]	4.88	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
LFQM [40, 53]	5.7–9.7	–	2.36(35)	–	–	–	0.35(1)	–
NRQM/LF [8, 9]	1.7–3.9	0.94–2.45	1.43–2.09	–	–	–	–	–
NRQM [8, 9]	5.2–21	3.1–8.8	3.1–5.5	–	–	–	–	–

<sup>a</sup>The value is for  $\chi_{c1}(3872)$  [26].

With this definition, the two-photon width is,

$$\Gamma_{S \rightarrow \gamma\gamma} = \frac{\pi\alpha_{\text{em}}^2}{4} M_S^3 |F_1^S(0, 0)|^2. \quad (13)$$

If one photon is off-shell, as in “single tagged” experiments, the two-photon width  $\Gamma_{\chi_{c0} \rightarrow \gamma^* \gamma}$  can be solely described by TFF  $F_1^S$ . Thus, it is convenient to introduce a single-variable TFF  $F_{S\gamma}(q^2) = F_1^S(-q^2, 0) = F_1^S(0, -q^2)$ . Its relation with the single-tag two-photon width  $\Gamma_{\chi_{c0} \rightarrow \gamma^* \gamma}$  is,

$$\Gamma_{S \rightarrow \gamma^* \gamma} = \frac{\pi\alpha_{\text{em}}^2 (M_S^2 + Q^2)^3}{2 M_S^3} |F_{S\gamma}(Q^2)|^2. \quad (14)$$

The LFWF representation of the TFF is,

$$F_{S\gamma}(Q^2) = e_f^2 2\sqrt{2N_C} \int_0^1 \frac{dx}{2\sqrt{x(1-x)}} \int \frac{d^2k_\perp}{(2\pi)^3} \psi_{\uparrow\downarrow+\downarrow\uparrow/S}(x, \vec{k}_\perp) \times \frac{k_\perp^2 + x(1-x)(1-2x)^2 Q^2 + (1-2x)^2 m_f^2}{(1-2x)[k_\perp^2 + x(1-x)Q^2 + m_f^2]}. \quad (15)$$

Similar to the pseudoscalar case, the approximate result using the LCDA representation reads,

$$F_{S\gamma}(Q^2) = e_f^2 f_S \int_0^1 dx \frac{(1-2x)\phi_S(x, \mu)}{x(1-x)Q^2 + m_f^2}, \quad (16)$$

where the scalar meson LCDA is defined as,

$$\frac{f_S}{2\sqrt{2N_C}} \phi_S(x, \mu) = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{x(1-x)}} \int \frac{d^2k_\perp}{(2\pi)^3} \psi_{\uparrow\downarrow+\downarrow\uparrow/S}(x, \vec{k}_\perp), \quad (17)$$

and is normalized by  $\int_0^1 dx (1-2x)\phi_S(x, \mu) = 1$ .




FIG. 5. The TFF for  $\chi_{c0}(1P)$ . The DSE/BSE results are included for comparison [16].

The Belle collaboration provided the first measurement of the TFF  $F_{\chi_{c0}\gamma}(Q^2)$ , albeit with limited statistics [25]. The extracted data are shown in Fig. 5. A recent result from DSE/BSE is also shown for comparison [16]. The TFF at  $Q^2 = 0$  is accessed from the two-photon decay width  $\Gamma_{S \rightarrow \gamma\gamma}$  from various processes as compiled by PDG [27]. Our predictions using the LFWFs (15) as well as using the LCDA (17) are both in agreement with the experimental data despite the low statistics. The BLFQ/DA prediction is scaled by  $F_{S\gamma}(0)$  obtained from BLFQ. The value is also in agreement with that extracted from the two-photon decay width  $\Gamma_{S \rightarrow \gamma\gamma}$  (see Table I).

### C. $\chi_{c1} \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$

The two-photon width of an axial vector  $1^{++}$  vanishes due to the Landau-Yang theorem [54, 55]. Instead, one

can define the reduced width as,

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_{A \rightarrow \gamma\gamma} = \lim_{q_i^2 \rightarrow 0} \frac{M_A^2}{q_i^2} \Gamma(A \rightarrow \gamma_L^* \gamma_T). \quad (18)$$

The Belle collaboration recently measured the reduced width of  $\chi_{c1}(3872)$  using single-tag events [26]. The obtained result is,

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_{\chi_{c1}(3872) \rightarrow \gamma\gamma} = 20 - 500 \text{ eV}. \quad (19)$$

On the theory side, the amplitude of  $A \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$  can be parametrized by three TFFs,  $F_{1-3}^A$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}^{\mu\nu\alpha} = & \frac{i}{M_A^2} \left\{ \epsilon^{\mu\nu\beta\gamma} q_{1\beta} q_{2\gamma} (q_1 - q_2)^\alpha F_1^A(q_1^2, q_2^2) \right. \\ & + [\epsilon^{\alpha\nu\beta\gamma} q_{1\beta} q_{2\gamma} q_1^\mu + \epsilon^{\alpha\mu\nu\beta} q_{2\beta} q_1^\mu] F_2^A(q_1^2, q_2^2) \\ & \left. + [\epsilon^{\alpha\mu\beta\gamma} q_{1\beta} q_{2\gamma} q_2^\nu + \epsilon^{\alpha\mu\nu\beta} q_{1\beta} q_2^\nu] F_3^A(q_1^2, q_2^2) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where  $F_2^A(q_1^2, q_2^2) = -F_3^A(q_2^2, q_1^2)$  owing to the boson statistics of photons. The reduced width is related to the TFFs  $F_2^A$  and  $F_3^A$  as,

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_{A \rightarrow \gamma\gamma} = \frac{\pi \alpha_{\text{em}}^2}{6} M_A^3 |F_{A\gamma}(0)|^2, \quad (21)$$

where  $F_{A\gamma}(q^2) = F_2^A(-q^2, 0)/M_A = -F_3^A(0, -q^2)/M_A$ . The LFWF representation of this TFF is,

$$\begin{aligned} F_{A\gamma}(Q^2) = & \frac{16M_A}{M_A^2 + Q^2} e_f^2 \sqrt{N_C} \int_0^1 \frac{dx}{2\sqrt{x(1-x)}} \\ & \times \int \frac{d^2 k_\perp}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{(k_x + ik_y) \psi_{\uparrow\downarrow+\downarrow\uparrow/A}^{(\lambda=-1)}(x, \vec{k}_\perp)}{k_\perp^2 + x(1-x)Q^2 + m_f^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Using the BLFQ LFWFs, the reduced two-photon width of  $\chi_{c1}(1P)$  is predicted to be  $\tilde{\Gamma}_{\chi_{c1} \rightarrow \gamma\gamma} = (6 \pm 1) \text{ keV}$ . Our BLFQ calculation further predicts an excited pure  $c\bar{c}$  axial vector meson with the mass  $M_{\chi'_{c1}} = 3.948(31)(17) \text{ GeV}$ . The two-photon width of this state is predicted to be  $\tilde{\Gamma}_{\chi'_{c1} \rightarrow \gamma\gamma} = (6 \pm 2) \text{ keV}$ , a value significantly above the recent Belle measurement for the 2P candidate  $\chi_{c1}(3872)$ , suggesting that the state possesses a large portion of non- $c\bar{c}$  component [26].

#### D. $\chi_{c2} \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$

The two-photon decay width of the tensor  $\chi_{c2}$  is measured by various experiments as compiled by PDG, and the average value is,  $\Gamma_{\chi_{c2} \rightarrow \gamma\gamma} = 0.56(5) \text{ keV}$  [27]. Physically, this process is determined by two helicity amplitudes,

$$\Gamma_{T \rightarrow \gamma\gamma} = \frac{\pi \alpha_{\text{em}}^2}{5M_T} \left( |H_{++;0}|^2 + |H_{+-;+2}|^2 \right). \quad (23)$$

The LFWFs representation of the helicity amplitudes are,

$$\begin{aligned} H_{++;0} = & e_f^2 \sqrt{2N_C} \int \frac{dx}{2[x(1-x)]^{\frac{3}{2}}} \int \frac{d^2 k_\perp}{(2\pi)^3} \\ & \times \left\{ \frac{k_\perp^2 (2x-1) \psi_{\uparrow\downarrow+\downarrow\uparrow/T}^{(\lambda=0)}(x, \vec{k}_\perp)}{k_\perp^2 + x(1-x)Q^2 + m_f^2} \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{\sqrt{2} m_f (k_x + ik_y) \psi_{\uparrow\uparrow/T}^{(\lambda=0)}(x, \vec{k}_\perp)}{k_\perp^2 + x(1-x)Q^2 + m_f^2} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} H_{+-;+2} = & e_f^2 \sqrt{2N_C} \int \frac{dx}{2[x(1-x)]^{\frac{3}{2}}} \int \frac{d^2 k_\perp}{(2\pi)^3} \\ & \times \left\{ (k_x - ik_y)^2 \frac{(2x-1) \psi_{\uparrow\downarrow+\downarrow\uparrow/T}^{(\lambda=+2)}(x, \vec{k}_\perp) + \psi_{\uparrow\downarrow-\downarrow\uparrow/T}^{(\lambda=+2)}(x, \vec{k}_\perp)}{k_\perp^2 + x(1-x)Q^2 + m_f^2} \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{\sqrt{2} m_f (k_x - ik_y) \psi_{\uparrow\uparrow/T}^{(\lambda=+2)}(x, \vec{k}_\perp)}{k_\perp^2 + x(1-x)Q^2 + m_f^2} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

From these expressions, we obtain the width  $\Gamma_{\chi_{c2} \rightarrow \gamma\gamma} = 0.70(13) \text{ keV}$ , consistent with the PDG value  $0.56(5) \text{ keV}$ . Similarly, we can make a prediction for the 2P tensor as pure  $c\bar{c}$  state. The value  $\Gamma_{\chi'_{c2} \rightarrow \gamma\gamma} = 0.58(25) \text{ keV}$  is consistent with the PDG lower bound  $\Gamma_{\chi_{c2}(3930)} > 0.17 \text{ keV}$  for the 2P candidate  $\chi_{c2}(3930)$ .

#### E. Asymptotic limit

The large  $Q^2$  asymptotic behavior of the TFFs can be computed from perturbative QCD [44],

$$Q^2 F_{P\gamma}(Q^2) \stackrel{Q^2 \rightarrow \infty}{\simeq} 6e_f^2 f_P, \quad (26)$$

$$Q^2 F_{S\gamma}(Q^2) \stackrel{Q^2 \rightarrow \infty}{\simeq} 6e_f^2 f_S(\mu). \quad (27)$$

Figure 6 shows  $Q^2 F_{H\gamma}$  as a function of  $Q^2$  up to large  $Q^2$  from various approaches. The BLFQ results (solid blue) and the BLFQ/DA results (dashed orange) are computed with fixed scale  $\mu = \mu_{UV} \approx \kappa \sqrt{N_{\text{max}}}$ . For the pseudoscalar, their agreement at large  $Q^2$  is excellent as expected. For large  $Q^2$ , the evolution of the DAs may not be negligible. We thus evolve the LCDA using the ERBL evolution [18]. The evolved results (BLFQ/DA,  $\mu = Q$ , green dotted) show some small deviation from the fixed scale results. However, up to  $Q^2 = 500 \text{ GeV}^2$  all results are below the pQCD asymptotic limit, confirming the long-standing observation that the convergence to the pQCD asymptotic limit is very slow [19].

For a scalar meson, the r.h.s. of (27) is scale dependent. The BLFQ result (solid blue) and the BLFQ/DA results at fixed scale (dashed orange) or evolved (dotted green), show large differences at large  $Q^2$ .




FIG. 6. Large  $Q^2$  behavior of the TFF.

### III. SUMMARY

In this work, we investigated the two-photon transitions of heavy quarkonia in the light-front approach using wave functions directly computed from an effective Hamiltonian inspired by light-front holography and one-gluon exchange from light-front QCD. We computed the two photon decay widths and the transition form factors of pseudoscalar, scalar, axial vector and tensor mesons. The results are in good agreement with the available experimental measurements. This is significant since all results reported here are pure predictions – no parameter fitting is performed to obtain these results. We also make predictions for two-photon processes yet to be measured.

In combination with the successes in charmonium spectroscopy as well as other observables, e.g., decay constant, radiative transitions, leptonic transitions, electromagnetic form factors, and parton distributions, our work provides a unified framework to describe the relativistic structure of the charmonium system. We also compare the results with those computed from the extracted light-cone distribution amplitudes, laying the foundation for applications to exclusive processes at high energy.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors acknowledge valuable discussions with T. Lappi, G. Chen, X. Zhao and W. Yan. This work is supported by the New faculty start-up fund of the University of Science and Technology of China. Y. Li and J. P. Vary are supported in part by the US Department of Energy (DOE) under Grant No. DE-FG02-87ER40371. M. Li is supported by the Academy of Finland, project 321840 and under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation program by the European Research Council (ERC, grant agreement No. ERC-2015-CoG-681707) and by the STRONG-2020 project (grant agreement No 824093). The content of this article does not reflect the official opinion of the European Union and responsibility for the information and views expressed therein lies entirely with the authors.

[1] N. Brambilla, S. Eidelman, B. K. Heltsley, R. Vogt, G. T. Bodwin, E. Eichten, A. D. Frawley, A. B. Meyer, R. E. Mitchell and V. Papadimitriou, *et al.* “Heavy Quarkonium: Progress, Puzzles, and Opportunities,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **71**, 1534 (2011) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-

010-1534-9 [arXiv:1010.5827 [hep-ph]].

[2] C. Berger and W. Wagner, “Photon-Photon Reactions,” *Phys. Rept.* **146**, 1-134 (1987) doi:10.1016/0370-1573(87)90012-3

- [3] M. Poppe, “Exclusive Hadron Production in Two Photon Reactions,” *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **1**, 545-668 (1986) doi:10.1142/S0217751X8600023X
- [4] M. Feindt, “A Review of two photon physics,” CERN-PPE-91-90.
- [5] J. P. Lansberg, “New Observables in Inclusive Production of Quarkonia,” *Phys. Rept.* **889**, 1-106 (2020) doi:10.1016/j.physrep.2020.08.007 [arXiv:1903.09185 [hep-ph]].
- [6] F. Feng, Y. Jia and W. L. Sang, “Can Nonrelativistic QCD Explain the  $\gamma\gamma^* \rightarrow \eta_c$  Transition Form Factor Data?,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, no.22, 222001 (2015) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.115.222001 [arXiv:1505.02665 [hep-ph]].
- [7] F. Feng, Y. Jia and W. L. Sang, “Next-to-Next-to-Leading-Order QCD Corrections to the Hadronic width of Pseudoscalar Quarkonium,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, no.25, 252001 (2017) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.119.252001 [arXiv:1707.05758 [hep-ph]].
- [8] I. Babiarz, V. P. Gonçalves, R. Pasechnik, W. Schäfer and A. Szczurek, “ $\gamma^*\gamma^* \rightarrow \eta_c(1S,2S)$  transition form factors for spacelike photons,” *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, no.5, 054018 (2019) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.100.054018 [arXiv:1908.07802 [hep-ph]].
- [9] I. Babiarz, R. Pasechnik, W. Schäfer and A. Szczurek, “Hadroproduction of scalar  $P$ -wave quarkonia in the light-front  $k_T$ -factorization approach,” *JHEP* **06**, 101 (2020) doi:10.1007/JHEP06(2020)101 [arXiv:2002.09352 [hep-ph]].
- [10] J. J. Dudek and R. G. Edwards, “Two Photon Decays of Charmonia from Lattice QCD,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 172001 (2006) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.97.172001 [arXiv:hep-ph/0607140 [hep-ph]].
- [11] C. Liu, Y. Meng and K. L. Zhang, “Ward identity of the vector current and the decay rate of  $\eta_c \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$  in lattice QCD,” *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, no.3, 034502 (2020) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.102.034502 [arXiv:2004.03907 [hep-lat]].
- [12] T. Chen *et al.* [CLQCD], “Two-photon decays of  $\eta_c$  from lattice QCD,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76**, no.7, 358 (2016) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-4212-8 [arXiv:1602.00076 [hep-lat]].
- [13] Y. Chen *et al.* [CLQCD], “Lattice study of two-photon decay widths for scalar and pseudo-scalar charmonium,” *Chin. Phys. C* **44**, no.8, 083108 (2020) doi:10.1088/1674-1137/44/8/083108 [arXiv:2003.09817 [hep-lat]].
- [14] Y. Meng, X. Feng, C. Liu, T. Wang and Z. Zou, “First-principle calculation of  $\eta_c \rightarrow 2\gamma$  decay width from lattice QCD,” [arXiv:2109.09381 [hep-lat]].
- [15] Z. Zou, Y. Meng and C. Liu, “Lattice calculation of  $\chi_{c0} \rightarrow 2\gamma$  decay width,” [arXiv:2111.00768 [hep-lat]].
- [16] J. Chen, M. Ding, L. Chang and Y. x. Liu, “Two Photon Transition Form Factor of  $\bar{c}c$  Quarkonia,” *Phys. Rev. D* **95**, no.1, 016010 (2017) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.95.016010 [arXiv:1611.05960 [nucl-th]].
- [17] S. J. Brodsky, H. C. Pauli and S. S. Pinsky, “Quantum chromodynamics and other field theories on the light cone,” *Phys. Rept.* **301**, 299 (1998); [hep-ph/9705477].
- [18] G. P. Lepage and S. J. Brodsky, “Exclusive Processes in Perturbative Quantum Chromodynamics,” *Phys. Rev. D* **22**, 2157 (1980).
- [19] V. L. Chernyak and A. R. Zhitnitsky, “Asymptotic Behavior of Exclusive Processes in QCD,” *Phys. Rept.* **112**, 173 (1984) doi:10.1016/0370-1573(84)90126-1
- [20] G. Beuf, “Dipole factorization for DIS at NLO: Loop correction to the  $\gamma_{T,L}^* \rightarrow q\bar{q}$  light-front wave functions,” *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, no.5, 054016 (2016) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.94.054016 [arXiv:1606.00777 [hep-ph]].
- [21] V. L. Chernyak and S. I. Eidelman, “Hard exclusive two photon processes in QCD,” *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **80**, 1-42 (2015) doi:10.1016/j.pnnp.2014.09.002 [arXiv:1409.3348 [hep-ph]].
- [22] Y. Li, P. Maris and J. P. Vary, “Quarkonium as a relativistic bound state on the light front,” *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, no. 1, 016022 (2017) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.96.016022 [arXiv:1704.06968 [hep-ph]].
- [23] The light-front wave functions are available from, Li, Yang (2017), “Quarkonium light-front wave functions”, Mendeley Data, doi: 10.17632/5bgp37xwz4.1
- [24] J. P. Lees *et al.* [BaBar], “Measurement of the  $\gamma\gamma^* \rightarrow \eta_c$  transition form factor,” *Phys. Rev. D* **81**, 052010 (2010) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.81.052010 [arXiv:1002.3000 [hep-ex]].
- [25] M. Masuda *et al.* [Belle], “Study of  $K_S^0$  pair production in single-tag two-photon collisions,” *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, no.5, 052003 (2018) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.97.052003 [arXiv:1712.02145 [hep-ex]].
- [26] Y. Teramoto *et al.* [Belle], “Evidence for  $X(3872) \rightarrow J/\psi\pi^+\pi^-$  Produced in Single-Tag Two-Photon Interactions,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126**, no.12, 122001 (2021) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.126.122001 [arXiv:2007.05696 [hep-ex]].
- [27] P. A. Zyla *et al.* [Particle Data Group], “Review of Particle Physics,” *PTEP* **2020**, no.8, 083C01 (2020) doi:10.1093/ptep/ptaa104
- [28] M. Li, Y. Li, P. Maris and J. P. Vary, “Radiative transitions between  $0^{-+}$  and  $1^{-}$  heavy quarkonia on the light front,” *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, no.3, 034024 (2018) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.98.034024 [arXiv:1803.11519 [hep-ph]].
- [29] S. Tang, S. Jia, P. Maris and J. P. Vary, “Semileptonic decay of  $B_c \rightarrow \eta_c$  and  $J/\psi$  on the light front,” *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, no.1, 016002 (2021) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.104.016002 [arXiv:2011.05454 [hep-ph]].
- [30] L. Adhikari, Y. Li, M. Li and J. P. Vary, “Form factors and generalized parton distributions of heavy quarkonia in basis light front quantization,” *Phys. Rev. C* **99**, no.3, 035208 (2019) doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.99.035208 [arXiv:1809.06475 [hep-ph]].
- [31] J. Lan, C. Mondal, M. Li, Y. Li, S. Tang, X. Zhao and J. P. Vary, “Parton Distribution Functions of Heavy Mesons on the Light Front,” *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, no.1, 014020 (2020) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.102.014020 [arXiv:1911.11676 [nucl-th]].
- [32] G. Chen, Y. Li, P. Maris, K. Tuchin and J. P. Vary, “Diffractive charmonium spectrum in high energy collisions in the basis light-front quantization approach,” *Phys. Lett. B* **769**, 477-484 (2017) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2017.04.024 [arXiv:1610.04945 [nucl-th]].
- [33] G. Chen, Y. Li, K. Tuchin and J. P. Vary, “Heavy quarkonia production at energies available at the CERN Large Hadron Collider and future

- electron-ion colliding facilities using basis light-front quantization wave functions,” *Phys. Rev. C* **100**, no.2, 025208 (2019) doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.100.025208 [arXiv:1811.01782 [nucl-th]].
- [34] S. J. Brodsky, T. Huang and G. P. Lepage, “Hadronic and nuclear interactions in QCD,” *Springer Tracts Mod. Phys.* **100**, 81-144 (1982) SLAC-PUB-2868.
- [35] Y. Li, P. Maris, X. Zhao and J. P. Vary, “Heavy Quarkonium in a Holographic Basis,” *Phys. Lett. B* **758**, 118 (2016) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2016.04.065 [arXiv:1509.07212 [hep-ph]].
- [36] J. P. Vary *et al.*, “Hamiltonian light-front field theory in a basis function approach,” *Phys. Rev. C* **81**, 035205 (2010); [arXiv:0905.1411 [nucl-th]].
- [37] S. J. Brodsky, G. F. de Teramond, H. G. Dosch and J. Erlich, “Light-Front Holographic QCD and Emerging Confinement,” *Phys. Rept.* **584**, 1 (2015); [arXiv:1407.8131 [hep-ph]].
- [38] P. Wiecki, Y. Li, X. Zhao, P. Maris and J. P. Vary, “Basis Light-Front Quantization Approach to Positronium,” *Phys. Rev. D* **91**, no. 10, 105009 (2015); [arXiv:1404.6234 [nucl-th]].
- [39] J. Carbonell, B. Desplanques, V. A. Karmanov and J. F. Mathiot, “Explicitly covariant light front dynamics and relativistic few body systems,” *Phys. Rept.* **300**, 215 (1998); [nucl-th/9804029].
- [40] C. W. Hwang and R. S. Guo, “Two-photon and two-gluon decays of p-wave heavy quarkonium using a covariant light-front approach,” *Phys. Rev. D* **82**, 034021 (2010) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.82.034021 [arXiv:1005.2811 [hep-ph]].
- [41] T. Feldmann and P. Kroll, “A Perturbative approach to the eta(c) gamma transition form-factor,” *Phys. Lett. B* **413**, 410-415 (1997) doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(97)01120-9 [arXiv:hep-ph/9709203 [hep-ph]].
- [42] P. Kroll, “The form factors for the photon to pseudoscalar meson transitions - an update,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **71**, 1623 (2011) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-011-1623-4 [arXiv:1012.3542 [hep-ph]].
- [43] T. Lappi, H. Mäntysaari and J. Penttala, “Relativistic corrections to the vector meson light front wave function,” *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, no.5, 054020 (2020) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.102.054020 [arXiv:2006.02830 [hep-ph]].
- [44] M. Hoferichter and P. Stoffer, “Asymptotic behavior of meson transition form factors,” *JHEP* **05**, 159 (2020) doi:10.1007/JHEP05(2020)159 [arXiv:2004.06127 [hep-ph]].
- [45] K. W. Edwards *et al.* [CLEO], “Study of B decays to charmonium states  $B \rightarrow \eta_c K$  and  $B \rightarrow \chi_{c0} K$ ,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 30-34 (2001) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.86.30 [arXiv:hep-ex/0007012 [hep-ex]].
- [46] C. McNeile, C. T. H. Davies, E. Follana, K. Hornbostel and G. P. Lepage, “Heavy meson masses and decay constants from relativistic heavy quarks in full lattice QCD,” *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 074503 (2012); [arXiv:1207.0994 [hep-lat]].
- [47] C. T. H. Davies, C. McNeile, E. Follana, G. P. Lepage, H. Na and J. Shigemitsu, “Update: Precision  $D_s$  decay constant from full lattice QCD using very fine lattices,” *Phys. Rev. D* **82**, 114504 (2010); [arXiv:1008.4018 [hep-lat]].
- [48] G. C. Donald, C. T. H. Davies, R. J. Dowdall, E. Follana, K. Hornbostel, J. Koponen, G. P. Lepage and C. McNeile, “Precision tests of the  $J/\psi$  from full lattice QCD: mass, leptonic width and radiative decay rate to  $\eta_c$ ,” *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 094501 (2012); [arXiv:1208.2855 [hep-lat]].
- [49] M. Blank and A. Krassnigg, “Bottomonium in a Bethe-Salpeter-equation study,” *Phys. Rev. D* **84**, 096014 (2011); [arXiv:1109.6509 [hep-ph]].
- [50] A. E. Bondar and V. L. Chernyak, “Is the BELLE result for the cross section  $\sigma_{e^+e^- \rightarrow J/\psi + \eta_c}$  a real difficulty for QCD?,” *Phys. Lett. B* **612**, 215-222 (2005) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2005.03.021 [arXiv:hep-ph/0412335 [hep-ph]].
- [51] M. A. DeWitt, H. M. Choi and C. R. Ji, “Radiative scalar meson decays in the light front quark model,” *Phys. Rev. D* **68**, 054026 (2003) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.68.054026 [arXiv:hep-ph/0306060 [hep-ph]].
- [52] H. Y. Ryu, H. M. Choi and C. R. Ji, “Systematic twist expansion of  $(\eta_c, \eta_b) \rightarrow \gamma^* \gamma$  transition form factors in light-front quark model,” *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, no.3, 034018 (2018) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.98.034018 [arXiv:1804.08287 [hep-ph]].
- [53] C. W. Hwang and Z. T. Wei, “Covariant light-front approach for heavy quarkonium: Decay constants,  $P \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$  and  $V \rightarrow P\gamma$ ,” *J. Phys. G* **34**, 687-702 (2007) doi:10.1088/0954-3899/34/4/008 [arXiv:hep-ph/0609036 [hep-ph]].
- [54] L. D. Landau, “On the angular momentum of a system of two photons,” *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **60**, no.2, 207-209 (1948) doi:10.1016/B978-0-08-010586-4.50070-5
- [55] C. N. Yang, “Selection Rules for the Dematerialization of a Particle Into Two Photons,” *Phys. Rev.* **77**, 242-245 (1950) doi:10.1103/PhysRev.77.242