# Erratum and addendum to 'A Search for the LHCb Charmed "Pentaquark" using Photoproduction of $J/\Psi$ at Threshold in Hall C at Jefferson Lab'

#### July 22, 2016

(A new experiment proposal to JLab-PAC44)

A. Asaturyan, H. Mkrtchyan, V. Tadevosyan, S. Zhamkochyan Alikhanyan National Science Laboratory (YerPhI), Yerevan, Armenia

J. Arrington, W. Armstrong, K. Hafidi, M. Hattawy, Z. Ye Argonne National Laboratory, Chicago, IL

> K. Aniol California State University, Los Angeles, CA

H. Gao, Z. Zhao, T. Liu, X. Yan, C. Gu, C. Peng, X. Li, W. Xiong Duke University, Durham, NC

> P. Markowitz Florida International University, Miami, FL

K. Adhikari, H. Bhatt, D. Bhetuwal, J. Dunne, D. Dutta, L. El-Fassi, L. Ye Mississippi State University, Starkville, MS

> F. R. Wesselmann Old Dominion University, Norforlk, VA

X. Chen, Q. Fu, R. Wang, Y. Zhang, F. Zhao Institute of Modern Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Lanzhou, China.

> R. Dupré Institut de Physique Nuclaire d'Orsay, Orsay, France

> > G. M. Huber, W. Li, A. Zafar University of Regina, SK, Canada

S. Bae, H. Choi, S. Choi, H. Go, J. Ha Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea

H. Atac, B. Duran, S. Joosten<sup>1</sup>,
Z.-E. Meziani<sup>2</sup>, M. Paolone<sup>3</sup>, M. Rehfuss, N. Sparveris Temple University, Philadelphia, PA

J.-P. Chen, E. Chudakov<sup>4</sup>, M. Diefenthaler, O. Hansen, D. Higinbotham, M. Jones<sup>5</sup>, D. Meekins, L. Pentchev, E. Pooser, S. Wood Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility, Newport News, VA

 $<sup>^{1}</sup> co-Spokes person: sylvester. joosten @temple.edu$ 

 $<sup>^{2}</sup> co-Spokes person/Contact:meziani@temple.edu$ 

 $<sup>^{3}</sup>$  co-Spokesperson:tue81317@temple.edu

 $<sup>{}^{4}\</sup>mathrm{co-Spokes person:gen@jlab.org}$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>co-Spokesperson:jones@jlab.org

#### Abstract

We identified an issue in the Monte-Carlo generator used for the experimental projects, that resulted in the  $P_c$  cross sections being *under*estimated by a factor of  $1/2W \approx 1/9$ . Correcting this error leads to a projected number of  $P_c$  events that is approximately 9 times *higher* than what was previously shown. The t-channel cross sections and projections are not affected by this factor.

Furthermore, we quantified the statistical precision with which we can identify the  $P_c$  resonances. We found that, for the most likely ( $P_c(4450)$  5/2+,  $P_c(4380)$  3/2-), a 5 $\sigma$  confidence level is achieved starting from a coupling of 1.3% to the  $J/\Psi p$  channel.

# Contents

1	Erratum: Fixing the $P_c$ cross section in the Monte-Carlo generator	<b>5</b>
<b>2</b>	Addendum: Sensitivity to the $P_c$ resonant production	7

# 1 Erratum: Fixing the $P_c$ cross section in the Monte-Carlo generator

The Monte-Carlo generator uses the following relation for the cross section to simulate the resonant  $\gamma p \rightarrow P_c \rightarrow J/\Psi p$  process,

$$\frac{d\sigma}{dsd\cos\theta_{J/\Psi}} = \frac{dn^{\gamma}}{ds} \frac{d\sigma^{\gamma p \to P_c \to J/\Psi p}}{d\cos\theta_{J/\Psi}},\tag{1}$$

using the bremsstrahlung spectrum  $\frac{dn^{\gamma}}{ds}$  for a 10% RL radiator from Tsai [1], and the  $P_c$  resonant production cross section  $\frac{d\sigma^{\gamma p \to P_c \to J/\Psi_p}}{d\cos\theta_{J/\Psi}}$  from Wang [2].

Unfortunately, a leftover  $\frac{dW}{ds} = \frac{1}{2W}$  jacobian factor from a previous study was incorrectly multiplied with  $\frac{d\sigma^{\gamma p \to P_c \to J/\Psi p}}{d\cos\theta_{J/\Psi}}$ . This erroneous factor incorrectly lowers the total  $P_c$  cross section by approximately a factor of 9 (for the  $P_c(4450)$ , the average W = 4.450 GeV).

After correcting this error, we updated the figures from the proposal. The updated figures are shown in Figs. 1, 2, 3, 4, with a reference to the corresponding figure in the original proposal given in the caption.



Figure 1: This figure supersedes Fig. 11 of the proposal proposal.  $J/\Psi$  production cross section as a function of the photon energy. The  $P_c$  resonant production is shown for the (5/2+, 3/2-) case assuming 3% coupling, compared with the available measurements in this region [3, 4].



Figure 2: This figure supersedes Fig. 13 of the original proposal. Expected results for the reconstructed t and  $E_{\gamma}$  spectrum for 9 days of beam on target, assuming the most probable  $(5/2+, 3/2-) P_c$  from [2] with 5% coupling. There is clear separation in both spectra between the  $P_c$  (5/2+) resonant channel, and the t-channel.



Figure 3: This figure supersedes Fig. 14 of the original proposal. Expected results for the reconstructed t and  $E_{\gamma}$  spectrum for 9 days of beam on target, assuming the less probable  $(5/2-, 3/2+) P_c$  from [2] with 5% coupling. Due to the larger cross section for the 5/2-, the separation in both spectra is even better than for the 5/2+ assumption shown in Fig. 2.



Figure 4: This figure supersedes Fig. 15 of the original proposal. Expected results for the reconstructed  $E_{\gamma}$  spectrum for the calibration measurement with 2 days of beam on target. The left panel shows the (5/2+, 3/2-) case, and the right panel shows the (5/2-, 3/2+) case, both with 5% coupling.

## 2 Addendum: Sensitivity to the $P_c$ resonant production

To obtain an estimate of the sensitivity to the  $P_c$  resonant process as a function of the coupling to the  $J/\Psi p$  channel, we calculated the log-likelihood difference  $\Delta \log \mathcal{L}$  between the hypothesis that the simulated spectra can be described by just a *t*-channel process, and the hypothesis that the  $P_c$  resonances are present on top of the *t*-channel production. We assumed 9 days of beam at 50  $\mu A$  for setting #1. We then used Wilk's theorem [5] to relate the value of  $2\Delta \log \mathcal{L}$  to a value of  $\chi^2$  with 5 degrees of freedom (one for the coupling, and 4 for the mass and width of each of the  $P_c$ ). Note that a binned likelihood approach was used, which yields a conservative estimate compared to the results of a full unbinned extended maximum likelihood procedure.

The results of this sensitivity study can be found in Fig. 5. We found that, for values of the coupling of 1.3% and higher, we have a sensitivity of more than the  $5\sigma$  necessary for discovery. Fig. 5 also shows the projected results in case of a 1.3% coupling.

In the proposal, we assumed a realistic coupling of 5% from Wang [2], which they found to be compatible with the currently existing  $J/\Psi$  photo-production data. A more recent statistical analysis by Blin [6] found an upper limit of the coupling values to be between 8 – 17% at the 95% confidence level for the  $P_c(4450)$  (5/2+). Furthermore, Karliner [7] argues that the coupling cannot be too small, as the  $P_c(4450) \rightarrow J/\Psi p$  signal is 4.1% of the  $J/\Psi p$  final state in  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow K^- J/\Psi p$ . If the coupling would be too small, the value of  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow K^- P_c$  with the  $P_c$ decaying to final states other than  $J/\Psi p$ , becomes unreasonably large in comparison with the measured branching fraction of  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow K^- J/\Psi p$ . This means that, due to the sensitivity of the proposed experiment down to very low values of the coupling, we will have the ability to provide a very strong exclusion of the charmed-pentaquark assumption in case it is not found.



Figure 5: The left figure shows the sensitivity to the  $P_c$  as a function of the coupling to the  $J/\Psi p$  channel, obtained from a log-likelihood analysis. The dashed line shows the  $5\sigma$  level of sensitivity necessary for discovery. This level is reached starting from a coupling of 1.3%. The right panel shows the expected results for the reconstructed  $E_{\gamma}$  spectrum for this 1.3% coupling for the  $P_c(4450)$  (5/2+).

### References

- [1] Yung-Su Tsai and Van Whitis. Thick Target Bremsstrahlung and Target Consideration for Secondary Particle Production by Electrons. *Phys. Rev.*, 149(4):1248–1257, 1966.
- [2] Qian Wang, Xiao-Hai Liu, and Qiang Zhao. Photoproduction of hidden charm pentaquark states  $P_c^+(4380)$  and  $P_c^+(4450)$ . *Phys. Rev.*, D92:034022, 2015.
- [3] B. Gittelman, K. M. Hanson, D. Larson, E. Loh, A. Silverman, and G. Theodosiou. Photoproduction of the psi (3100) Meson at 11-GeV. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 35:1616, 1975.
- [4] Robert L. Anderson. Excess Muons and New Results in psi Photoproduction. 1976. Microfiche at Fermilab.
- [5] S. S. Wilks. The large-sample distribution of the likelihood ratio for testing composite hypotheses. *Annals Math. Statist.*, 9(1):60–62, 1938.
- [6] A. N. Hiller Blin, C. Fernandez-Ramirez, A. Jackura, V. Mathieu, V. I. Mokeev, A. Pilloni, and A. P. Szczepaniak. Studying the pc(4450) resonance in j/psi photoproduction off protons. 2016.
- [7] Marek Karliner and Jonathan L. Rosner. New Exotic Meson and Baryon Resonances from Doubly-Heavy Hadronic Molecules. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 115(12):122001, 2015.