



Light, Charmonium & Charmonium-like exotics meson spectroscopy working group

Frank Nerling, Marc Palizaeus, Elisa Fioravanti Helmholtz-Institute Mainz & GSI Darmstadt, University Bochum, INFN Ferrara





Agenda

- Clarification of numbers
 - ➤ Summary of the issue (Frank)
 - ➤ Detailed calculation, more details (Elisabetta)
 - Procedure
- Round table discussion
- Note summarising status of relased results
 - D_s
 - > X scan





Clarifiction of numbers-- Why discussion needed?

- PANDA, assume $\sigma(pp \to X(3872)) = 50$ nb statistics ~ 130 (1300) per day on peak for $\mathcal{L} = 2 \times 10^{31}$ (10^{32}) cm $^{-2}$ s $^{-1}$ efficiency $\sim 50\%$ (4 charged, exclusive) high boost $\beta_{cms} = 0.89$ (fixed target) $\to \beta \gamma = 1.95$ mass resolution ~ 50 -100 MeV (unfitted)
- 1) Soeren, Worms 2014

- Panda is an "X(3872) factory"
 - \simeq 700 events per day in high luminosity mode \simeq 70 events per day in high resolution mode (assuming 50 nb)

2) Soeren, Uppsala 2015

- PANDA, assume $\sigma(pp \to X(3872)) = 50$ nb statistics ~130 (1300) per day on peak for $\mathcal{L} = 2 \times 10^{31}$ (10^{32}) cm⁻² s⁻¹ efficiency ~50% (4 charged, exclusive) high boost $\beta_{cms} = 0.89$ (fixed target) $\to \beta \gamma = 1.95$ mass resolution ~50-100 MeV (unfitted)
- 1') Marc, Uppsala, 2015

- mini-X(3872) factory:
- 7000 events/day expected @ $L = 2 \times 10^{32}$
- extrapolation @ L = 10³¹: 350 X(3872)/day

2') Elisabetta, draft Giesser





Clarifiction of numbers -- Why discussion needed?

=> Basically an issue of a factor of 2

"Descrpeancy understood:

-> Fwd spectrometer not included in original study by M.Galuska

Thus, officially correct value:

- Panda is an "X(3872) factory"
 - \simeq 700 events per day in high luminosity mode \simeq 70 events per day in high resolution mode (assuming 50 nb)

until the study has been repeated inclduing the FwdSpectro

-> to be relased then





What numbers to be relased in general?

- > Numbers on projected X,Y,Z etc, are not basic PANDA numbers
- > Usually, the result of basic PANDA numbers (e.g. efficiencies, Lumi's etc) with other numbers like BR, cross-sections, provided "from outside"

Propsal to PubCom, or lets say our interpretation of Publication policy addendum 9:

=> Focus on correct PANDA numbers and update them when needed

Still we need (all) to understand our numbers and estimation e.g. of projected numbers on X,Y,Z etc.





What numbers to be relased in general?

- → Two (three) issues on input for calculation:
 - a) Nb of produced Y(4260) in Panda (Charm13 proceeding)
 - b) BR: Y(4260) -> Z(3900) by BESIII
 - c) BR: X(3872) -> X J/psi pi pi not anymore 10% but ~5% (Zhiqing' commo

- b) BR: Y(4260) -> Z(3900)
 - -> as already prediscussed with Soren & Elisabetta:

NOt precisely correct: Assuming exclusive Y(4260) production at peak -> change to upper limit

- a) Nb of produced Y(4260)
 - -> Don't understand...., Assumption:
 partial width (Y->ppbar) = partial width (J/psi -> ppbar) ?!
 - -> Why this can be assumed?
- c) BR: X(3872 -> X J/psi pi pi not anymore 10% but ~5% (Zhiqing' comment Interestingly, the updated BR compensates roughly our gain in acceptance (FwdSpectro)