

B_c^* meson parameters and radiative decay width within the covariant confined quark model

Aidos Issadykov^{1,*} and Sayabek K. Sakhiyev¹

¹*The Institute of Nuclear Physics,*

Ministry of Energy of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 050032 Almaty, KAZAKHSTAN

Abstract

In this work we tried to predict the parameters of B_c^* meson. Simple assumptions gave us following parameters $m_{B_c^*} = 6329 \pm 10$ MeV and $f_{B_c^*} = 535.5 \pm 57.8$ MeV (for $\Lambda_{B_c^*} = 2.26 \pm 0.14$ GeV in covariant confined quark model). We calculated widths of radiative decays of B_q^* mesons, where $q = u/d, s, c$ and compared them with other theoretical works. It was shown that the width of the B_c^* meson very sensitive to the mass $m_{B_c^*}$ as expected and less to the size parameter $\Lambda_{B_c^*}$.

PACS numbers: 12.39.Ki, 13.30.Ce, 14.40.Nd

*Electronic address: issadykov.a@gmail.com

I. INTRODUCTION

The decay mode $B_c \rightarrow J/\psi \ell \nu$ of B_c meson have about 2 standard deviations disagreement between experimental data and theoretical predictions [1]. Meanwhile, its vector partner B_c^* is still not found. It is expected that the mass difference is not large to decay strongly to B_c meson and light meson. Thus, B_c^* mesons cannot decay strongly but can decay only weakly and electromagnetically. As a result, the partial widths of electromagnetic decay channels, especially single-photon decay channels, are dominant. Since the B_c^* meson was not observed yet, there are some theoretical predictions of its mass and leptonic decay constants in the relativistic quark model[2], Lattice QCD[3, 4], QCD Sum Rules[5] and Nonrelativistic renormalization group[6]. Properties of B_c^* meson in the relativistic quark model[2] as follows:

$$m_{B_c^*} = 6332 \text{ MeV}, \quad f_{B_c^*} = 503 \text{ MeV}. \quad (1)$$

Mass and leptonic decay constant of B_c^* meson in Lattice QCD[3, 4] looks like:

$$m_{B_c^*} = 6332 \pm 9 \text{ MeV}, \quad f_{B_c^*} = 422 \pm 13 \text{ MeV}. \quad (2)$$

Mass and leptonic decay constant of B_c^* meson from QCD Sum Rules[5]:

$$m_{B_c^*} = 6337 \text{ MeV}, \quad f_{B_c^*} = 384 \text{ MeV}. \quad (3)$$

The Nonrelativistic renormalization group [6] gave their prediction on mass differences of B_c^* and B_c mesons

$$\Delta m_{(B_c^* - B_c)} = 50 \pm 17_{-12}^{+15} \text{ MeV}. \quad (4)$$

Radiative decay of B_c^* meson was calculated in [2, 7–22] and have partial widths less than 1 keV which makes the branching ratios of their weak decay modes may be within the detection ability of current experiments. There are several works dedicated to investigate the semileptonic decays of B_c^* [9, 23–25]. The purpose of this paper is to extend our model and predict a model parameters of unobserved B_c^* . We studied $b \rightarrow c$, $b \rightarrow s$ and $b \rightarrow d(u)$ transitions in the framework of covariant confined quark model(CCQM) in our previous works[26–30].

II. MODEL

The covariant confined quark model [31–33] is an effective quantum field approach to hadronic interactions based on an interaction Lagrangian of hadrons interacting with their constituent quarks.

The effective Lagrangian describing the transition of a meson $M(q_1\bar{q}_2)$ to its constituent quarks q_1 and \bar{q}_2

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{\text{int}}(x) &= g_M M(x) \cdot J_M(x) + \text{h.c.}, \\ J_M(x) &= \int dx_1 \int dx_2 F_M(x, x_1, x_2) \bar{q}_2(x_2) \Gamma_M q_1(x_1)\end{aligned}\quad (5)$$

with Γ_M a Dirac matrix which projects onto the spin quantum number of the meson field $M(x)$. The vertex function F_M characterizes the finite size of the meson. Translational invariance requires the function F_M to fulfill the identity $F_M(x + a, x_1 + a, x_2 + a) = F_M(x, x_1, x_2)$ for any four-vector a . A specific form for the vertex function is adopted

$$F_M(x, x_1, x_2) = \delta(x - w_1 x_1 - w_2 x_2) \Phi_M((x_1 - x_2)^2), \quad (6)$$

where Φ_M is the correlation function of the two constituent quarks with masses m_{q_1} and m_{q_2} . The ratios of the quark masses w_i are defined as

$$w_{q_1} = \frac{m_{q_1}}{m_{q_1} + m_{q_2}}, \quad w_{q_2} = \frac{m_{q_2}}{m_{q_1} + m_{q_2}}, \quad w_1 + w_2 = 1. \quad (7)$$

A simple Gaussian form of the vertex function $\bar{\Phi}_M(-k^2)$ is selected

$$\bar{\Phi}_M(-k^2) = \exp(k^2/\Lambda_M^2) \quad (8)$$

with the parameter Λ_M linked to the size of the meson. The minus sign in the argument is chosen to indicate that we are working in the Minkowski space. Since k^2 turns into $-k_E^2$ in the Euclidean space, the form (8) has the appropriate fall-off behavior in the Euclidean region. Any choice for Φ_M is appropriate as long as it falls off sufficiently fast in the ultraviolet region of the Euclidean space to render the corresponding Feynman diagrams ultraviolet finite. We choose a Gaussian form for calculational convenience.

The coupling constant g_M in Eq. (5) is determined by the so-called *compositeness condition*. The compositeness condition requires that the renormalization constant Z_B of the elementary meson field $B(x)$ is set to zero, i.e.

$$Z_B = 1 - \tilde{\Pi}'_B(p^2) = 0, \quad (p^2 = m_B^2) \quad (9)$$

where $\Pi'_B(p^2)$ is the derivative of the mass function.

S -matrix elements are described by the quark-loop diagrams which are the convolution of the vertex functions and quark propagators. In the evaluation of the quark-loop diagrams we use the local Dirac propagator

$$S_q(k) = \frac{1}{m_q - \not{k} - i\epsilon} = \frac{m_q + \not{k}}{m_q^2 - k^2 - i\epsilon} \quad (10)$$

with an effective constituent quark mass m_q .

The meson functions in the case of the pseudoscalar and vector meson are written as

$$\tilde{\Pi}_P(p^2) = N_c g_P^2 \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^{4i}} \tilde{\Phi}_P^2(-k^2) \text{tr} \left(\gamma^5 S_1(k + w_1 p) \gamma^5 S_2(k - w_2 p) \right), \quad (11)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Pi}_V^{\mu\nu}(p^2) &= N_c g_V^2 \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^{4i}} \tilde{\Phi}_V^2(-k^2) \text{tr} \left(\gamma^\mu S_1(k + w_1 p) \gamma^\nu S_2(k - w_2 p) \right) \\ &= g^{\mu\nu} \tilde{\Pi}_V(p^2) + p^\mu p^\nu \tilde{\Pi}_V^{\parallel}(p^2). \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Here $N_c = 3$ is the number of colors. Since the vector meson is on its mass-shell $\epsilon_V \cdot p = 0$ we need to keep the part $\tilde{\Pi}_V(p^2)$. Substituting the derivative of the mass functions into Eq. (9) one can determine the coupling constant g_B as a function of other model parameters. The loop integrations in Eqs. (11) and (12) proceed by using the Fock-Schwinger representation of quark propagators

$$S_q(k + wp) = \frac{1}{m_q - \not{k} - w \not{p}} = (m_q + \not{k} + w \not{p}) \int_0^\infty d\alpha e^{-\alpha[m_q^2 - (k+wp)^2]}. \quad (13)$$

In the obtained integrals over the Fock-Schwinger parameters $0 \leq \alpha_i < \infty$ we introduce an additional integration over the proper time which converts the set of Fock-Schwinger parameters into a simplex. In general case one has

$$\prod_{i=1}^n \int_0^\infty d\alpha_i f(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) = \int_0^\infty dt t^{n-1} \prod_{i=1}^n \int d\alpha_i \delta \left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \right) f(t\alpha_1, \dots, t\alpha_n). \quad (14)$$

Finally, we cut the integration over the proper time at the upper limit by introducing an infrared cutoff λ . One has

$$\int_0^\infty dt (\dots) \rightarrow \int_0^{1/\lambda^2} dt (\dots). \quad (15)$$

This procedure allows us to remove all possible thresholds present in the initial quark diagram. Thus the infrared cutoff parameter λ effectively guarantees the confinement of quarks




FIG. 1: Feynman diagrams contributing in leading order to the dominant one-photon radiative transitions $X_1(p) \rightarrow \gamma(q_2) + X_2(q_1)$ [34].

within hadrons. This method is quite general and can be used for diagrams with an arbitrary number of loops and propagators. In the CCQM the infrared cutoff parameter λ is taken to be universal for all physical processes.

The model parameters are determined by fitting calculated quantities of basic processes to available experimental data or lattice simulations (for details, see Ref. [33]).

III. MATRIX ELEMENTS AND ONE-PHOTON RADIATIVE DECAY WIDTH

The free Lagrangian of quarks is gauged in the standard manner by using minimal substitution which gives

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{int}}^{\text{em}}(x) = e A_\mu(x) J_{\text{em}}^\mu(x), \quad J_{\text{em}}^\mu(x) = e_b \bar{b}(x) \gamma^\mu b(x) + e_q \bar{q}(x) \gamma^\mu q(x) \quad (16)$$

where e_b and e_q are the quark charges in units of the positron charge. The radiative decays of a vector mesons into a pseudoscalar meson and photon $X_1 \rightarrow X_2 \gamma$ are described by the Feynman diagrams shown in Fig. 1.

The invariant matrix element for the one-photon radiative transition $X_1 \rightarrow \gamma X_2$ reads

$$\mathcal{M}_{X_1 \rightarrow \gamma X_2}(p; p', q) = e g_{X_1} g_{X_2} \epsilon_\nu^V(p) \epsilon_\mu^\gamma(q) \int dx \int dy \int dz e^{-ipx + ip'y + iqz} \langle T \{ \bar{J}_{X_1}^\nu(x) J_{\text{em}}^\mu(z) J_{X_2}(y) \} \rangle_0 \quad (17)$$

One has to note that there is an additional piece in the Lagrangian related to the gauging nonlocal interactions of hadrons with their constituents [33]. This piece gives the additional contributions to the electromagnetic processes. However, they are identically zero for the process $X_1 \rightarrow X_2 \gamma$ due to its anomalous nature.

Using the Fourier transforms of the quark currents, we come to the final result

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}_{X_1 \rightarrow \gamma X_2}(p; p', q) &= (2\pi)^4 i \delta(p - p' - q) M(p, p'), \\
M(p, p') &= (-3i) e g_{X_1} g_{X_2} \epsilon_\nu^V(p) \epsilon_\mu^\gamma(q) (e_b M_b^{\mu\nu} + e_q M_q^{\mu\nu}) \\
M_b^{\mu\nu} &= \int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^4 i} \tilde{\Phi}_{X_1}(-\ell_1^2) \tilde{\Phi}_{X_2}(-\ell_2^2) \text{tr} [S_q(k) \gamma^\nu S_b(k-p) \gamma^\mu S_b(k-p') \gamma^5] \\
M_q^{\mu\nu} &= \int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^4 i} \tilde{\Phi}_{X_1}(-\ell_3^2) \tilde{\Phi}_{X_2}(-\ell_4^2) \text{tr} [S_q(k+p') \gamma^\mu S_q(k+p) \gamma^\nu S_b(k) \gamma^5] \quad (18)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\ell_1 = k - w_2 p$, $\ell_2 = k - w_2 p'$ and $\ell_3 = k + w_1 p$, $\ell_4 = k + w_1 p'$. The ratios of quark masses are defined by Eq. (7). Now one has $m_{q_1} = m_b$ and $m_{q_2} = m_q$ with $q = u, d, s$. By using the technique of calculations and taking into account the transversality conditions $\epsilon_\mu^\gamma(q) q^\mu = 0$ and $\epsilon_\nu^V(p) p^\nu = 0$ one can arrive at the standard form of matrix element

$$M(p, p') = e g_{X_1 X_2 \gamma} \varepsilon^{pq\mu\nu} \epsilon_\mu^\gamma(q) \epsilon_\nu^V(p), \quad (19)$$

where $g_{X_1 X_2 \gamma} = e_b I_b(m_{X_1}^2, m_{X_2}^2) + e_q I_q(m_{X_1}^2, m_{X_2}^2)$ is radiative decay constant. The quantities $I_{b,q}$ are defined by the two-fold integrals which are calculated numerically. The electromagnetic decay width is written as

$$\Gamma(X_1 \rightarrow X_2 + \gamma) = \frac{\alpha}{24} m_{X_1}^3 \left(1 - \frac{m_{X_2}^2}{m_{X_1}^2}\right)^3 g_{X_1 X_2 \gamma}^2. \quad (20)$$

where $\alpha = e^2/4\pi = 1/137.036$ is the fine-structure constant.

IV. NUMERICAL RESULTS

The obvious model parameters include constituent quark masses and meson size parameters that are fixed by fitting with the basic processes such as leptonic decay widths with the experimental data or lattice simulations and the differences are considered to be the absolute uncertainty in the respective parameter. These parameters are determined by minimizing the functional $\chi^2 = \sum_i \frac{(y_i^{\text{expt}} - y_i^{\text{theor}})^2}{\sigma_i^2}$ where σ_i is the experimental uncertainty. If σ is too small then we take its value of 10%. Besides, we have observed that the errors of the fitted parameters are of the order of 10%. Thus, the theoretical error of the CCQM is estimated to be of the order of 10% at the level of matrix elements and the order of 15–20% at the level of widths. For present computations, we use the model parameters obtained using the updated least square fit method performed in the Ref. [29, 35, 36].

TABLE I: Input values for some basic electromagnetic decay widths and our least-squares fit values (in keV).

Process	Fit Values	Data [37]
$\rho^\pm \rightarrow \pi^\pm \gamma$	75.7 ± 15.1	67 ± 7.5
$\omega \rightarrow \pi^0 \gamma$	679 ± 135.8	713 ± 26
$K^{*\pm} \rightarrow K^\pm \gamma$	55.8 ± 11.2	46.8 ± 4.7
$K^{*0} \rightarrow K^0 \gamma$	132 ± 26.4	116 ± 10
$D^{*\pm} \rightarrow D^\pm \gamma$	0.75 ± 0.15	1.33 ± 0.37
$J/\psi \rightarrow \eta_c \gamma$	1.77 ± 0.35	1.58 ± 0.37

The results of the least-squares fit used in the present study can be found in Table I. The agreement between the fit and experimental data is quite satisfactory. The result for $J/\psi \rightarrow \eta_c \gamma$ agrees with the one given in [34](please look Table II there).

We think that there are strong relation between pseudoscalar B_q and vector B_q^* mesons. In Table II given the leptonic decay constants and masses of $B_q^{(*)}$ mesons from PDG [37] and corresponding fitted size parameters from previous works in CCQM [28–30, 38, 39].

The leptonic decay constants in CCQM are defined by Eq.10 in [39].

TABLE II: The values of the leptonic decay constants and meson masses(in MeV) except the B_c^* meson parameters from PDG [37] and corresponding our model parameter Λ (in GeV)from our previous works [28–30, 38, 39].

	B_c	B_s^*	B_s	B^{*0}	B^0	B^+
m	6274.47 ± 0.32	$5415.4_{-1.5}^{+1.8}$	5366.88 ± 0.14	5324.70 ± 0.21	5279.65 ± 0.12	5279.34 ± 0.12
f	489	229	238.7	196	193	193
Λ	2.73	1.79	2.05	1.80	1.96	1.96

From Table II one can find next mass differences between pseudoscalar and vector mesons

$$\Delta m_{(B_s^*-B_s)} = 49 \text{ MeV}, \quad (21)$$

$$\Delta m_{(B^{*0}-B^0)} = 45 \text{ MeV}, \quad (22)$$

so that the mass for B_c^* meson assumed as:

$$\Delta m_{(B_c^*-B_c)} = 55 \pm 10 \text{ MeV}, \text{ then } m_{B_c^*} = 6329 \pm 10 \text{ MeV}, \quad (23)$$

which is within the predictions of other models[2–6].

The ratio between size parameters of $B_q^{(*)}$ mesons from our previous works [28–30, 38, 39] as follows

$$\Delta \Lambda_{(B_s^*/B_s)} = 0.876, \quad (24)$$

$$\Delta \Lambda_{(B^{*0}/B^0)} = 0.921, \quad (25)$$

so that the size parameter $\Lambda_{B_c^*}$ assumed as:

$$\Delta \Lambda_{(B_c^*/B_c)} = 0.83 \pm 0.05, \text{ then } \Lambda_{B_c^*} = 2.26 \pm 0.14 \text{ GeV}. \quad (26)$$

Taking into account these two parameters we calculated the width of radiative decay $\Gamma(B_c^{*+} \rightarrow B_c^+ \gamma)$ and $f_{B_c^*}$ leptonic decay constant in In Table III. We calculated the widths of radiative decay in dependence from mass(6319–6339 MeV) and Λ (2.12–2.40 GeV) parameters of B_c^* meson.

The width of $\Gamma(B_c^{*+} \rightarrow B_c^+ \gamma)$ decay strongly depends on the choice of B_c^* meson's mass than on the choice of $\Lambda_{B_c^*}$ in our calculations as expected, and shown on the Figure 2. While $f_{B_c^*}$ leptonic decay constant depends on the choice of $\Lambda_{B_c^*}$. We compared the results of widths of radiative decays of B_q^* mesons within the covariant confined quark model with those from other theoretical predictions in Table IV. For $\Gamma(B_c^{*+} \rightarrow B_c^+ \gamma)$ we used central values of assumed parameters($m_{B_c^*} = 6329 \text{ MeV}$ and $\Lambda_{B_c^*} = 2.26 \text{ GeV}$).




FIG. 2: The width $\Gamma(B_c^{*+} \rightarrow B_c^+ \gamma)$ in dependence on the choice of the B_c^* meson mass and the size parameter $\Lambda_{B_c^*}$.

V. CONCLUSION

In this work we made naive assumptions for the B_c^* meson mass and size parameter $\Lambda_{B_c^*}$ as $m_{B_c^*} = 6329 \pm 10$ MeV and $\Lambda_{B_c^*} = 2.26 \pm 0.14$ GeV. Further, using this numbers We calculated leptonic decay constants for the B_c^* meson, and widths of radiative decays of B_q^* mesons, where $q = u/d, s, c$. In Table III and Fig. 2 were shown that the width $\Gamma(B_c^{*+} \rightarrow B_c^+ \gamma)$ very sensitive to the mass $m_{B_c^*}$ as expected, and less to the size parameter $\Lambda_{B_c^*}$. While the $f_{B_c^*}$ leptonic decay constant strongly depends on the choice of $\Lambda_{B_c^*}$. There is a significant scatter in the values for the decay widths in Table IV. Therefore, their experimental measurement will significantly correct the framework of the existing theoretical approaches to the description of these processes.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank Prof. Mikhail A. Ivanov for useful discussions of some aspects of this work. This research has been funded by the Science Committee of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan (Grant No. AP09057862).

TABLE III: The widths of radiative decay of B_c^* meson in dependence from mass and Λ parameters.

$m_{B_c^*} = 6319$ MeV	$\Gamma(B_c^{*+} \rightarrow B_c^+ \gamma)$, (keV)	$f_{B_c^*}$, (MeV)
$\Lambda = 2.12$	0.023	481
$\Lambda = 2.19$	0.024	508.5
$\Lambda = 2.26$	0.025	536.4
$\Lambda = 2.33$	0.026	564.6
$\Lambda = 2.40$	0.027	593.3
$m_{B_c^*} = 6324$ MeV	$\Gamma(B_c^{*+} \rightarrow B_c^+ \gamma)$, (keV)	$f_{B_c^*}$, (MeV)
$\Lambda = 2.12$	0.032	479.9
$\Lambda = 2.19$	0.033	507.3
$\Lambda = 2.26$	0.034	535
$\Lambda = 2.33$	0.035	563.1
$\Lambda = 2.40$	0.036	591.6
$m_{B_c^*} = 6329$ MeV	$\Gamma(B_c^{*+} \rightarrow B_c^+ \gamma)$, (keV)	$f_{B_c^*}$, (MeV)
$\Lambda = 2.12$	0.042	478.8
$\Lambda = 2.19$	0.044	506
$\Lambda = 2.26$	0.045	533.6
$\Lambda = 2.33$	0.047	561.6
$\Lambda = 2.40$	0.048	589.9
$m_{B_c^*} = 6339$ MeV	$\Gamma(B_c^{*+} \rightarrow B_c^+ \gamma)$, (keV)	$f_{B_c^*}$, (MeV)
$\Lambda = 2.12$	0.069	476.5
$\Lambda = 2.19$	0.072	503.5
$\Lambda = 2.26$	0.074	530.8
$\Lambda = 2.33$	0.077	558.5
$\Lambda = 2.40$	0.079	586.5

TABLE IV: The widths of radiative decays of B_q^* mesons in units of keV.

	$\Gamma(B^{*0} \rightarrow B^0\gamma)$	$\Gamma(B^{*+} \rightarrow B^+\gamma)$	$\Gamma(B_s^{*0} \rightarrow B_s^0\gamma)$	$\Gamma(B_c^{*+} \rightarrow B_c^+\gamma)$
This work	0.117 ± 0.022	0.362 ± 0.072	0.094 ± 0.018	0.045 ± 0.009
[2, 12]	0.070	0.19	0.054	0.033
[7]	0.165	0.520	0.115	0.039
[8]	0.14	0.52	0.06	0.030
[9]	0.116 ± 0.006	0.349 ± 0.018	0.084_{-9}^{+11}	0.049_{-21}^{+28}
[10, 11]	0.181	0.577	0.119	0.023
[13, 14]	0.0096	0.0674	0.148	0.034
[15, 16]	0.13	0.4	0.068	0.022
[17]				0.135
[18]				0.060
[19]				0.059
[20]				0.050
[21]				0.019
[22]				0.019

-
- [1] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb], Phys. Rev. Lett. **120** (2018) no.12, 121801 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.120.121801 [arXiv:1711.05623 [hep-ex]].
- [2] D. Ebert, R. N. Faustov and V. O. Galkin, Phys. Rev. D **67** (2003) 014027
- [3] R. J. Dowdall, C. T. H. Davies, T. C. Hammant and R. R. Horgan, Phys. Rev. D **86** (2012) 094510 [arXiv:1207.5149 [hep-lat]].
- [4] B. Colquhoun *et al.* [HPQCD Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **91** (2015) no.11, 114509 [arXiv:1503.05762 [hep-lat]].
- [5] Z. G. Wang, Eur. Phys. J. A **49** (2013) 131
- [6] A. A. Penin, A. Pineda, V. A. Smirnov and M. Steinhauser, Phys. Lett. B **593** (2004) 124
Erratum: [Phys. Lett. B **677** (2009) no.5, 343]
- [7] V. Simonis, arXiv:1803.01809 [hep-ph].
- [8] S. N. Jena, P. Panda and T. C. Tripathy, Nucl. Phys. A **699** (2002) 649.
- [9] Q. Chang, X. L. Wang, J. Zhu and X. N. Li, Adv. High Energy Phys. **2020** (2020), 3079670 doi:10.1155/2020/3079670 [arXiv:2003.08600 [hep-ph]].
- [10] M. Priyadarsini, P. C. Dash, S. Kar, S. P. Patra and N. Barik, Phys. Rev. D **94** (2016) no.11, 113011.
- [11] S. Patnaik, P. C. Dash, S. Kar, S. Patra and N. Barik, Phys. Rev. D **96** (2017) no.11, 116010
- [12] D. Ebert, R. N. Faustov and V. O. Galkin, Phys. Lett. B **537** (2002) 241
- [13] T. A. Lahde, C. J. Nyfalt and D. O. Riska, Nucl. Phys. A **674** (2000) 141
- [14] T. A. Lahde, Nucl. Phys. A **714** (2003) 183
- [15] H. M. Choi, Phys. Rev. D **75** (2007) 073016
- [16] H. M. Choi and C. R. Ji, Phys. Rev. D **80** (2009) 054016
- [17] E. J. Eichten and C. Quigg, Phys. Rev. D **49** (1994) 5845
- [18] S. S. Gershtein, V. V. Kiselev, A. K. Likhoded and A. V. Tkabladze, Phys. Rev. D **51** (1995) 3613
- [19] L. P. Fulcher, Phys. Rev. D **60** (1999) 074006
- [20] M. A. Nobes and R. M. Woloshyn, J. Phys. G **26** (2000) 1079
- [21] A. P. Monteiro, M. Bhat and K. B. Vijaya Kumar, Phys. Rev. D **95** (2017) no.5, 054016 [arXiv:1608.05782 [hep-ph]].

- [22] A. Abd El-Hady, J. R. Spence and J. P. Vary, Phys. Rev. D **71** (2005) 034006
- [23] Z. G. Wang, Commun. Theor. Phys. **61** (2014) no.1, 81-88 doi:10.1088/0253-6102/61/1/13 [arXiv:1209.1157 [hep-ph]].
- [24] L. R. Dai, X. Zhang and E. Oset, Phys. Rev. D **98** (2018) no.3, 036004 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.98.036004 [arXiv:1806.09583 [hep-ph]].
- [25] T. Wang, Y. Jiang, T. Zhou, X. Z. Tan and G. L. Wang, J. Phys. G **45** (2018) no.11, 115001 doi:10.1088/1361-6471/aae14a [arXiv:1804.06545 [hep-ph]].
- [26] N. R. Soni, A. Issadykov, A. N. Gadaria, Z. Tyulemissov, J. J. Patel and J. N. Pandya, Eur. Phys. J. Plus **138**, no.2, 163 (2023) doi:10.1140/epjp/s13360-023-03779-8 [arXiv:2110.12740 [hep-ph]].
- [27] N. R. Soni, A. Issadykov, A. N. Gadaria, J. J. Patel and J. N. Pandya, Eur. Phys. J. A **58** (2022) no.3, 39 doi:10.1140/epja/s10050-022-00685-y [arXiv:2008.07202 [hep-ph]].
- [28] A. Issadykov and M. A. Ivanov, Phys. Lett. B **783** (2018), 178-182 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2018.06.056 [arXiv:1804.00472 [hep-ph]].
- [29] S. Dubnička, A. Z. Dubničková, A. Issadykov, M. A. Ivanov, A. Liptaj and S. K. Sakhiyev, Phys. Rev. D **93** (2016) no.9, 094022 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.93.094022 [arXiv:1602.07864 [hep-ph]].
- [30] A. Issadykov, M. A. Ivanov and S. K. Sakhiyev, Phys. Rev. D **91** (2015) no.7, 074007 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.91.074007 [arXiv:1502.05280 [hep-ph]].
- [31] G. V. Efimov and M. A. Ivanov, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **4** (1989) no.8, 2031-2060 doi:10.1142/S0217751X89000832
- [32] G. V. Efimov and M. A. Ivanov, *The Quark Confinement Model of Hadrons*, (CRC Press, Boca Raton, 1993).
- [33] T. Branz, A. Faessler, T. Gutsche, M. A. Ivanov, J. G. Körner and V. E. Lyubovitskij, Phys. Rev. D **81** (2010), 034010 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.81.034010 [arXiv:0912.3710 [hep-ph]].
- [34] G. Ganbold, T. Gutsche, M. A. Ivanov and V. E. Lyubovitskij, Phys. Rev. D **104** (2021) no.9, 094048 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.104.094048 [arXiv:2107.08774 [hep-ph]].
- [35] M. A. Ivanov, J. G. Körner and C. T. Tran, Phys. Rev. D **92** (2015) no.11, 114022 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.114022 [arXiv:1508.02678 [hep-ph]].
- [36] G. Ganbold, T. Gutsche, M. A. Ivanov and V. E. Lyubovitskij, J. Phys. G **42** (2015) no.7, 075002 doi:10.1088/0954-3899/42/7/075002 [arXiv:1410.3741 [hep-ph]].

- [37] P. A. Zyla *et al.* [Particle Data Group], PTEP **2020** (2020) no.8, 083C01
doi:10.1093/ptep/ptaa104
- [38] S. Dubnička, A. Z. Dubničková, A. Issadykov, M. A. Ivanov and A. Liptaj, Phys. Rev. D **96**
(2017) no.7, 076017 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.96.076017 [arXiv:1708.09607 [hep-ph]].
- [39] A. Issadykov, M. A. Ivanov and G. Nurbakova, EPJ Web Conf. **158** (2017), 03002
doi:10.1051/epjconf/201715803002 [arXiv:1907.13210 [hep-ph]].