

Hadron Spectroscopy

And the PANDA experiment



Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare Joint Helmholtz-Rosatom School for Young Scientist at FAIR, Bekosovo, Feb. 2012

Outline

- Theoretical motivations;
- Experimental introduction;
- Low energy sector;
- Open-Charm and Charmonium spectroscopy;
- Exotic states;
- Future and Perspectives.

Quantum Chromodynamics

Quantum ChromoDynamics (QCD) is the theory of strong interactions that bind quarks and gluons together to form hadrons.

QCD is a nonlinear theory that is not analytically solvable

g coupling constant

From F.A. Wilczek QCD Lecture

masses of the

For the equivalent quantum field theory of weak force and electromagnetism, approximations using perturbation expansions in the interaction strength give very accurate results. However, since the QCD interaction is "so strong", perturbative approximations often fail.

Quantum Chromodynamics

QCD is a Gauge invariant Quantum Field Theory based on a local SU(3) symmetry group:

• matter: quarks are the fundamental building blocks;

 q_i^{f} f = u, d, s, c, b, t f = u, d, s, c, b, t f = u, d, s, c, b, t $rac{spin = 1/2}{charge 2/3; -1/3}$



- interaction carriers: 8 massless spin-1 gluons in the 8-dim representation of SU(3). They carry color determining the non-analyticity of the theory;
- coupling constant: it appears to increase with distance → perturbative calculations are possible only at short distances (large energies).

Hadrons are color-singlet (*i.e. not* colored) combinations of quarks, anti-quarks, and gluons.

Lattice QCD

In order to solve QCD at long distances, Wilson [*PRD* 10:2445-2459, 1974] introduced lattice gauge theory, in which the space-time continuum is discretized on a lattice keeping the gauge symmetry intact.

This discretization allows a non-perturbative approximation to the theory that is successively improvable by increasing the lattice size and decreasing the lattice spacing.



It also makes the gauge theory amenable to numerical simulation by computer.



The simulation of the quark interactions requires the computation of a large, highly non-local matrix determinant, which is extremely time consuming. This determinant arises from the dynamics of the quarks. The simplest way to proceed is thus to ignore the quark dynamics and work in the so-called quenched approximation, with only gluonic degrees of freedom.

Nowadays the agreement with the measured masses is at the few% level.

Effective Field Theories

Effective Field Theories (EFT) are based on the assumption that scales much smaller/bigger than those under study shouldn't matter.

i.e. One can calculate the hydrogen atom spectrum very precisely without knowing top guark mass!

Classical dynamics(mechanics) $v \ll c(Ext \gg \hbar)$ can be seen as an EFT because it does not consider the contribution of the terms that are related with $c(\hbar)$.



Phenomenological quark-potential models

Quarkomium states may be described by potential models. Many specific quark models exist, but most contain a similar basic set of dynamical ingredients.



Abstand zwischen Quarks (fm)

The hadron spectrum

The whole set of theoretical approaches rely on approximations and/or free parameters that must be constrained. Furthermore, They all predict states with explicit gluon content.



Hybrids

In the simplest scenario, an hybrid is a meson with an explicit glue content. Adding a gluon $(J^P=1^+;1^-)$ to a $q\bar{q}$ pair corresponds to create two possible hybrid states. Some of these combinations can even have exotic quantum numbers.



Theoretical models agree to expect 8 exotic charmonia in the 3-5 GeV/ c^2 mass region. The lighter should be a 1⁻⁺ state with a mass of about 4.3 GeV/ c^2 . Quantum numbers and mass splitting are also predicted \rightarrow the observation of the whole pattern would be an unambiguous signature

Glueballs

LQCD makes rather accurate predictions for glueballs. As for hybrids they can have exotic quantum numbers →oddballs



The experimental point of view

- Can we observe experimentally gluonic degrees of freedom?
- How would these manifest themselves in terms of the excitation spectrum and also in the strong decays of hadrons?

Three are the main goals of hadron spectroscopy:

- Identify the physical states and their quantum numbers, and measure their **masses and widths**.
- Determine their decay modes and branching ratios.
- Study the underlying **dynamics of production and decay.**



Partial Wave Analysis I

Partial Wave Analysis (PWA) techniques are used to describe complex, overlapping, interfering states.

A multiparticle phase space is expanded into a (truncated) series of angular momentum functions which describe the reaction matrix element.

$$|lpha
angle = \mathop{}_{{\ell}}{}_{{\ell}} c_{\ell} |\ell
angle$$

The matrix element *M* of some "decay operator" *U* is written as

$$\mathcal{M}=\langle f|U|i
angle=\langle f|U_AU_B\cdots|i
angle$$

The goal is to learn something about *U* parameterizing *M*, and determining the fitting parameters from the data. These parameters are the coefficients of "partial waves".

The elastic scattering of a non relativistic spinless particle from a static central potential

$$rac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} = |f(heta)|^2 \quad ext{where} \ f(heta) = rac{1}{k} \mathop{ imes}_{\ell=0}^\infty (2\ell+1) P_\ell(\cos heta) e^{i\delta_\ell} \sin\delta_\ell$$

is an example of a Partial Wave Analysis.

An example

• Consider reaction $\bar{p}p \rightarrow K^+ K^- \pi^0$

What *really* happened...



Partial Wave Analysis II

Usually, multiparticle final states are described in the so called "isobar model" in which all decays are considered as two body chains.



particle α has angular momentum quantum numbers J and M, particles 1 and 2 have helicities λ_1 and λ_2 $h \equiv \vec{S} \cdot \vec{p}/|\vec{p}|$

$$\mathcal{M} = \langle f | U | i
angle = \langle 1 + 2 | U | lpha
angle = \langle heta, \phi, \lambda_1, \lambda_2 | U | J M
angle$$

The best fit values of the free parameters are determined using an extended maximum likelihood technique or minimizing χ^2 of a set of histograms

The low energy (< 2GeV) range

In the last 20 years many steps forward in the field were possible thanks to the variety of facilities available all over the world.



Main non-qq̄ candidates			
f ₀ (980)	4q state - molecule		
f ₀ (1500)	0 ⁺⁺ glueball candidate		
f ₀ (1370)	0 ⁺⁺ glueball candidate		
f ₀ (1710)	0 ⁺⁺ glueball candidate		
η(1410); η(1460)	0 ⁻⁺ glueball candidate		
f ₁ (1420)	hybrid, 4q state		
π ₁ (1400)	hybrid candidate 1 ⁻⁺		
π ₁ (1600)	hybrid candidate 1 ⁻⁺		
π (1800)	hybrid candidate 0⁻⁺		
π ₂ (1900)	hybrid candidate 2⁻⁺		
π ₁ (2000)	hybrid candidate 1 ⁻⁺		
a ₂ '(2100)	hybrid candidate 1 ⁺⁺		

Nowadays confirmation of predictions, together with unexpected results, are still coming out mainly from e^+e^- collider

π_1 (1400) hybrid

In 1988 GAMS saw a strong B/F asymmetry for the η produced in the reaction $\pi^- p \rightarrow \pi^0 \eta n$ In the mass region 1400 MeV/ c^2 . This can only be determined by an odd wave with q.n. 1⁻⁺.

In 1991 a new more sophisticated PWA analysis gave ambiguous results.

BNL E852 and Cristal Barrel @CERN experiments collected new data in different environments

 $\pi^- p \rightarrow \pi^0 \eta n; \pi^- \eta p$





π₁(1600)

420.000 diffractive events $\pi^-+Pb \rightarrow X + (Pb)_{reco}$ collected by COMPASS exp. @190 GeV/c $\mapsto \pi^-\pi^-\pi^+$



A Partial Wave Analysis (PWA) of this data set was performed by using the isobar model in which a multi-particle final state is described by a sequence of two-body decays acceptance-corrected intensities of the three most prominent waves and of the exotic one



π₁(1600)

All known isovector and isoscalar $\pi\pi$ resonances have been included: $\sigma(600)$ and $f_0(1370)$, $\rho(770)$, $f_0(980)$, $f_2(1270)$, and $\rho_3(1690)$

 $\sigma(600)\pi^-$ with L = 0 and J^P = 0⁻ is used to consider direct 3-body decay into $\pi^-\pi^-\pi^+$ background wave = uniform 3-body phase space added incoherently

Resonance	Mass	Width	Intensity	Channel	Mass [26]	Width [26]
	(MeV/c^2)	(MeV/c^2)	(%)	$J^{PC}M^{\epsilon}[isobar]L$	(MeV/c^2)	(MeV/c^2)
$a_1(1260)$	$1255\pm6^{+7}_{-17}$	$367 \pm 9^{+28}_{-25}$	$67 \pm 3^{+4}_{-20}$	$1^{++}0^+ \rho \pi S$	1230 ± 40	250 - 600
$a_2(1320)$	$1321 \pm 1^{+0}_{-7}$	$110 \pm 2^{+2}_{-15}$	$19.2 \pm 0.6 ^{+0.3}_{-2.2}$	$2^{++}1^+ \rho \pi D$	1318.3 ± 0.6	107 ± 5
$\pi_1(1600)$	$1660 \pm 10^{+0}_{-64}$	$269 \pm 21^{+42}_{-64}$	$1.7\pm0.2^{+0.9}_{-0.1}$	$1^{-+}1^+ \rho \pi P$	1662^{+15}_{-11}	234 ± 50
$\pi_2(1670)$	$1658 \pm 3^{+24}_{-8}$	$271 \pm 9^{+22}_{-24}$	$10.0 \pm 0.4^{+0.7}_{-0.7}$	$2^{-+}0^+ f_2 \pi S$	1672.4 ± 3.2	259 ± 9
$\pi(1800)$	$1785 \pm 9^{+12}_{-6}$	$208 \pm 22^{+21}_{-37}$	$0.8\pm0.1^{+0.3}_{-0.1}$	$0^{-+}0^+ f_0 \pi S$	1816 ± 14	208 ± 12
$a_4(2040)$	$1885 \pm 13^{+50}_{-2}$	$294 \pm 25^{+46}_{-19}$	$1.0\pm0.3^{+0.1}_{-0.1}$	$4^{++}1^+ \rho \pi G$	2001 ± 10	313 ± 31

A total of 42 partial waves are included in the first step of the fit. The χ^2 fit of the spin-density matrix elements obtained for each mass bin is performed in the mass range from 0.8 to 2.32 GeV/c²

comparison with BNL E852 results for $\pi^-p \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^\pm\pi^-\pi^0\pi^0(p/n)$ @ 18 GeV/c

resonance	decay	${\bf mass}({\bf MeV}/{\bf c}^2)$	$width(MeV/c^2)$
$a_4(2040)$	$(\omega \rho)_2^D$	$1985{\pm}10\pm13$	$231{\pm}30{\pm}46$
$a_2(1700)$	$(\omega \rho)_2^S$	$1721 \pm 13 \pm 44$	$279 \pm 49 \pm 66$
$a_2(2000)$	$(\omega \rho)_2^S$	$2003 \pm 10 \pm 19$	$249 \pm 23 \pm 32$
$\pi_1(1600)$	$(b_1\pi)_1^S$	$1664{\pm}8\pm10$	$185{\pm}25\pm28$
$\pi_1(2000)$	$(b_1\pi)_1^S$	$2014 \pm 20 \pm 16$	$230 \pm 32 \pm 73$

Exotic hadrons

The identification of exotic states is an important key to understand hadron spectrum and the process of mass generation.



Exotic hadrons

The identification of exotic states is an important key to understand hadron spectrum and the process of mass generation.



New Data

Hadron spectroscopy has made considerable progresses in the last years by moving to higher energy regions.

Large data sets have been collected by several experiments:

- e⁺e⁻ interactions at the Y(4S) energy: BaBar, BELLE, CLEO 2
- e⁺e⁻→ charmonium energy:
 CLEO-c, BES-II, BES-III
- pp Tevatron collider: CDF, D0

Charmonium states

Charmonium states are under study since many years since this is the energy range where potential models are tuned.

Data come mainly from e^+e^- machines where 1^{--} states can be directly formed.



Hyperfine splitting of charmonium states give access to V_{ss} component of quark potential model

The only measured hyperfine splitting was

 $\Delta M_{hf}(1S)_{c\bar{c}} \equiv M(J/\psi) - M(\eta_c) = 116.6 \pm 1.0 \text{ MeV}$

Recently $\eta'_{C}(2^{1}S_{0})$ has been identified by Belle [PRL89 (2002)102001] and the mass measured also by CLEO and BaBar in two photon fusion.

 $\varDelta M_{hf}(2S)_{c\bar{c}} \equiv M(\psi'(2^3S_1)) - M(\eta'_c(2^1S_0)) = 49 \pm 4 \text{ MeV}$

h_c(¹*P*₁) charmonium state

The process $\psi' \rightarrow \pi^0 h_c$ is the only way to produce h_c from ψ' decay \rightarrow Limited phase space



From the assumption of a small V_{ss} interaction it was expected

$$\Delta M_{hf}(1P) \equiv M(^{3}P) - M(^{1}P) = 0$$

Theoretical predictions of branching ratios: $B(\psi(2S) \rightarrow \pi^0 h_c) = (0.4-1.3) \times 10^{-3}$

B(h_c \rightarrow γη_c) = 41%(NRQCD) B(h_c \rightarrow γη_c) = 88% (PQCD) (Y.P.Kuang, PRD65,094024 (2002)) B(h_c \rightarrow γη_c) = 38%

(S. Godfrey and J.Rosner, PRD66,014012(2002))

There were attempt to produce h_c in $p\bar{p}$ annhilitation at Fermilab (E760,E835) but the statistic was very poor.

$h_{C}({}^{1}P_{1})$ charmonium state

 $e^+e^- \rightarrow \psi' \rightarrow \pi^0 h_c \rightarrow (\gamma \gamma)(\gamma \eta_c)$ The ψ' decay mode is isospin violating



The CLEO experiment was able to find it with a significance of 13 σ in ψ ' decay by means of an exclusive analysis.

The width and the BF $\psi' \rightarrow \pi^0 h_c$ were not measured.

A similar analysis, with higher statistic, was also done by BES



$h_{C}({}^{1}P_{1})$ charmonium state

 $e^+e^- \rightarrow \psi' \rightarrow \pi^0 h_c \rightarrow (\gamma \gamma)(\gamma \eta_c)$ The ψ' decay mode is isospin violating



Bottomonium

The $\Upsilon(1^3S_1)$ state of bottomonium was discovered in 1977. The ground state spin-singlet partner, $\eta_b(1^1S_0)$, has been found only recently by the BaBar Collaboration by studing $\Upsilon(3S) \rightarrow \gamma \ \eta_b(1S)$ [PRL101,071801,2008] Then confirmed in $\Upsilon(2S) \rightarrow \gamma \ \eta_b(1S)$ [PRL103, 161801,2009]



For the states $c(\bar{u}/\bar{d})$ theory and experiment were in agreement.

The quark model describes the spectrum of heavy-light systems and it was expected to be able to predict unobserved excited $D_s(c\bar{s})$ mesons with good accuracy



The discovery of the new D_{S1} states has brought into question potential models



The discovery of the new D_{SJ} states continued ...



The assignment of the q.n. to the $D_s(2710)$ was possible thanks to an analysis performed by BaBar studing *DK*, *D***K* final states.

In the same analysis an other broad
structure in the
$$D^*K$$
 distribution $D_{SJ}(3040)$
 $m(D_{s1}^*(2710)^+) = 2710 \pm 2_{stat}(^{+12}_{-7})_{syst} \text{ MeV}/c^2,$
 $\Gamma = 149 \pm 7_{stat}(^{+39}_{-52})_{syst} \text{ MeV},$
 $m(D_{sJ}^*(2860)^+) = 2862 \pm 2_{stat}(^{+5}_{-2})_{syst} \text{ MeV}/c^2,$
 $\Gamma = 48 \pm 3_{stat} \pm 6_{syst} \text{ MeV},$
 $m(D_{sJ}(3040)) = 3044 \pm 8_{stat}(^{+30}_{-5})_{syst} \text{ MeV}/c^2,$
 $\Gamma = 239 \pm 35_{stat}(^{+46}_{-42})_{syst} \text{ MeV}.$

There is a problem for the potential models in describing excited states





Without entering into the details of each state some general consideration can be drawn.



- masses are barely known;
- often widths are just upper limits;
- few final states have been studied;
- statistics are poor;
- quantum number assignment is possible for few states;
- some resonances need confirmation...

There are problems of compatibility **Theory - Experiment**

X(3872)

Discovered at Belle (+ CDF, D0, BaBar, ...) in $B^+ \rightarrow X K^+ X \rightarrow J/\psi \pi^+ \pi^-$ is the best known but the more obscure.





Mass measurements, in different final states, seam different. X(3872) lays 0.42 MeV below $D^{*0}\overline{D}^{0}$. Width is narrow < 2.3 MeV/ c^{2} @ 90% C.L.. C parity +

X(3872)



Mass measurements, in different final states, seam different. X(3872) lays 0.42 MeV below $D^{*0}\overline{D}^{0}$. Width is narrow < 2.3 MeV/ c^{2} @ 90% C.L.. C parity +

Y(4260)

4.2

4.4

4.6

4.8 $m(\pi^+\pi^-J/\psi)$ (GeV/c²)

It is the first of the "Y" states. It has been discovered by BaBar with the technique of initial state radiation in one year of data taking. PRL95, 142001 (2005)



Today there are six Y states. Q.N. are 1⁻⁻

The Y(4260) appears to represent an overpopulation of the expected 1⁻⁻ states. The absence of open charm production speaks against it being a conventional cc state

The flux tube model and LQCD predict the lowest $c\bar{c}g$ hybrid at ~ 4200 MeV/ c^2 .



Z(4430)

In 2008, Belle studying $B \rightarrow K\pi^{\pm}\psi'$ observed in the $\pi^{\pm}\psi'$ invariant mass distribution a structure near 4.43 GeV



A re-analysis cutting K* region confirmed the evidence, but with different mass (4443) and larger width (~110).

If this peak has to be interpreted as a meson state, it must have an exotic structure: its minimal quark content should be $|c\bar{c}u\bar{d}\rangle$.

The future

35

Events / (10 MeV/c²)

We can expect in the future further results from e^+e^- machines Belle, SuperBelle, BES... but without big surprises

LHC experiments (mainly LHCb) will provide some results.... but they are not tailored for this physics

The Jlab 12 GeV upgrade foresees a program of spectroscopy ... in the energy range were broad overlapping states lay

We have the renascence of antiproton facility with FAIR at Darmstadt... here the antiproton storage ring has been designed primarily

for hadron spectroscopy



Antiproton power

p-beams can be cooled \rightarrow Excellent resonance resolution



- e⁺e⁻: typical mass res. ~ 10 MeV
- Fermilab: 240 keV
- HESR: ~30 keV

The production rate of a certain final state v is a convolution of the BW cross section and the beam energy distribution function $f(E, \Delta E)$: $v = L_0 \left\{ \mathcal{E} \int dE f(E, \Delta E) \sigma_{BW}(E) + \sigma_b \right\}$

The resonance mass M_R , total width Γ_R can be extracted by measuring the formation rate for that resonance as a function of the cm energy E using a maximum likelihood fit.

Spectroscopy with antiprotons

Two are the mechanisms to access particular final states:



Even exotic quantum numbers can be reached $\sigma \sim \! 100 \text{ pb}$

Exotic states are produced with rates similar to qq conventional systems

All ordinary quantum numbers can be reached $\sigma \sim 1 \ \mu b$



Antiproton power





- e⁺e⁻ interactions:
 - Only 1⁻⁻ states are formed
 - Other states only by secondary decays (moderate mass resolution related to the detector ~ 10MeV)
- pp reactions:
 - Most states directly formed (very good mass resolution; \bar{p} -beam can be efficiently cooled $\Delta p/p \sim 10^{-4}$)

Br($p\overline{p} \rightarrow \eta_c$) = 1.2 10⁻³



FAIR Facility for Antiproton and Ion Research



Beam cooling (stochastic & electron)

Antiproton production •Proton Linac 50 MeV •Accelerate p in SIS18 / 100 •Produce p on target •Collect in CR, cool in RESR



General Purpose Detector

Detector requirements:

- nearly 4π solid angle
- high rate capability
- good PID
- momentum resolution
- vertex info for D, ${
 m K^0}_{
 m S}, \Lambda$
- efficient triggermodular design

(partial wave analysis) (2·10⁷ annihilations/s) (γ , e, μ , π , K, p) (~1%) (c_{τ} = 312 μ m for D[±]) (e, μ , K, D, Å) (Hypernuclear experiments)









The PANDA Physics Book

2008 has seen a big effort of the Collaboration preparing the PANDA Physics Book.

More than 200 pages have been produced to describe all the aspects of the scientific program.

Detailed simulations have been performed to evaluate detector performance on many benchmark channels.



arXiv:0903.3905v1

Charmonium states width

Thanks to the precise HESR momentum definition, widths of known states can be precisely measured with an energy scan.

Energy scan of 10 values around the h_c mass, width upper limit is 1MeV; each point represents a 5 day data taking in high luminosity mode, for the channel: $h_c \rightarrow \eta_c \gamma \rightarrow \phi \phi \gamma \rightarrow 4K \gamma$ with a S/B 8:1





Charmonium states width

Thanks to the precise HESR momentum definition, widths of known states can be precisely measured with an energy scan.

Energy scan of 10 values around the h_c mass, width upper limit is 1MeV; each point represents a 5 day data taking in high luminosity mode, module 5 available, for the channel: $h_c \rightarrow \eta_c \gamma \rightarrow \phi \phi \gamma \rightarrow 4K \gamma$ with a S/B 8:1 Resonance cross section N events 40 Г=0.5 MeV Measured rate 30 This holds for all known states in 20 the charmonium region 10 $\delta p/p \ 10^{-4} \longrightarrow \Gamma \ 100 \ \text{KeV}$ 0 3.523 3.524 3.525 3.526 3.527 3.528 $\delta p/p \ 10^{-5} \rightarrow \Gamma \ 10 \ \text{KeV}$ N events 50 Г=1 MeV Γ_{R,MC}[MeV] Γ_{R,reco}[MeV] $\Delta \Gamma_{\rm R}[{\rm MeV}]$ 40 Sensitivity 30 0.92 0.24 1 20 0.75 0.72 0.18 0.5 0.52 0.14 3.523 3.524 3.525 3.526 3.527 3.528 3.529 E, GeV

Charmonium hybrid

PANDA strategy to look for an hypothetical hybrid $\tilde{\eta}$ (J^{PC}=1⁻⁺, mass \approx 4.3 GeV/ c^2 , width 20 MeV) is that of searching it in the channels:



Charmonium hybrid



9C fit: beam, η , χ_{c1} , J/ Ψ and π^0 mass constraints. Final reconstruction efficiency 6,83%, background suppression 10^3



Charmonium hybrid



2.05 m(D⁰π⁰) [GeV/c²]

2

1.95

Other states

Several states denoted as X, Y and Z have been recently detected, whose nature is controversially debated and which are possibly not conventional charmonium states.

These states can be detected with the **PANDA** spectrometer with sufficient event rates and background suppression.

We concentrated on the formation reactions:

 $\overline{p}p \rightarrow Y(3940) \rightarrow J/\Psi\omega$ $\overline{p}p \rightarrow Y(4320) \rightarrow \psi(2S)\pi^{+}\pi^{-}$



Y(3940)







2•10⁴ signal events have been generated at \overline{p} momentum 8,9578 GeV/*c* and 10⁶ $3\pi^+3\pi^-$ background events

6C fit: beam, J/ Ψ , ψ (2S) mass constraints. Reconstruction efficiency 14,9%, background suppression 10⁶

$p\overline{p} \rightarrow f_2(2000-2500) \rightarrow \phi\phi$

The primary goal of this study is to test our capability of reconstructing $\phi\phi$ final states which are expected to be good for exotics (glueball) searching.

This is the region where the BES experiment found an evidence for a tensor ($J^{PC} = 2^{++}$) glueball candidate $\xi(2230)$.

The detection of a possible resonant signal require an energy scan around the central energy value in order to measure the dynamic behavior of the cross-section.

$$\overline{p}p \rightarrow f_2^- \rightarrow \phi\phi \rightarrow K^+K^-K^+K^-$$

The analysis consists in 3 steps:

- reconstruction of the signal;
- evaluation of the background level;
- simulation of the energy scan.

We generated 50 • 10³ signal events and 10⁶ bck events. 4C fit: efficiency 25%



f₂(2235) energy scan

We made the assumption of a mass value of 2235 MeV/ c^2 and a widths of 15 MeV/ c^2





Fit of the total cross section and the derived signal cross-section For a scan width of 10 nb

Needed beam time to achieve a 10σ significance

σ_S [nb]	Beam time $T_{\rm b}$ (\approx)
1	13.7 y
5	$200 \mathrm{d}$
10	$50\mathrm{d}$
100	$12 \mathrm{h}$
500	$0.5 \mathrm{h}$
1000	$7.2 \min$

Expected event rates

reconstructed signal events/day

assume: int. luminosity of 8pb⁻¹/ day and cross section of 1nb

<mark>Y(4260)→J/Ψ</mark> η, J/Ψ→e⁺e⁻:	BR(Y(4260)→J/Ψη)x 169 events/day			
J/Ψ→μ ⁺ μ ⁻ :	BR(Y(4260)→J/Ψη)x 144 events/day			
<mark>Y(3940)→J/Ψω, J</mark> /Ψ→e⁺e⁻:	BR(Y(3940) \rightarrow J/ Ψ ω)x 91 events/day			
J/Ψ→μ⁺μ⁻:	BR(Y(3940) \rightarrow J/ $\Psi\omega$)x 70 events/day			
Y(4320)→Ψ(2S) $\pi^+\pi^-$, J/Ψ→e ⁺ e ⁻ : BR(Y(4320)→Ψ(2S) $\pi^+\pi^-$)x 34 events/da				
$\overline{pp} \rightarrow (\chi_{c1} \pi^0 \pi^0)$ η, J/Ψ $\rightarrow e^+ e^-$:	BR($\Psi \rightarrow \chi_{c1} \pi^0 \pi^0$)x 3.1 events/day			
J/Ψ→ μ ⁺ μ ⁻:	BR($\Psi \rightarrow \chi_{c1} \pi^0 \pi^0$)x 3.6 events/day			
<u>p</u> p→(D⁰ <u>D</u> ⁰*)η:	BR(Ψ→D ⁰ D ⁰ *)x 1.9 events/day			

1 p̄-year running (~200 d) at $p_{\overline{p}}$ =15 GeV/*c* for a survey additional running at optimized momentum (tuned on finding) to improve PWA sensitivity (final goal: total ~600 d, ~3 p-year ?)

Summary

1. LQCD, EFT and QCD-motivated quark potential models describe the properties of the hadron spectrum quite well for the ground states.

2. In the last few years many expected states have been found and their measured properties are in good agreement with the model's predictions.

3. There is an accumulation of mesons with mass in the region between 3800 MeV/ c^2 and 4700 MeV/ c^2 that are not easily explained.

4. These states are relatively narrow although many of them are well above open-charm thresholds. Many of them have partial widths for decays to charmonium + light hadrons that are at the ~MeV scale, which is much larger than typical cc charmonium meson states.

5. At least 3 states: X(3872), Y(4260), Z(4430) are strong candidates for being exotics.

6. There are some problems with the theory when dealing with highly excited states.

7. New, high quality data will certainly come form the PANDA experiment @ FAIR.

Exercise 1

At PANDA we want to study an hypotetical glueball H of mass ~4250 MeV/ c^2 with the reaction $\bar{p}p \rightarrow K^+K^- H$

Which is the minimum \overline{p} momentum required?

Once you measured the mass, how can you determine precisely the width?

Exercise 2

Cherenkov radiation is emitted by a high-energy charged particle which moves through a medium with a velocity greater than the velocity of light propagation in the medium.

Derive the relationship among the particle velocity $v = \beta c$, the index of refraction n of the medium, and the angle θ at which the Cherenkov radiation is emitted relative to the line of flight of the particle.

If the quartz bars of the PANDA DIRC detector have a refraction index n =1.4585, evaluate the Cherenkov threshold for pions, kaons and electrons.

Exercice 3

At PANDA Particle Identification (PID) is a crucial task. List all the detectors and the experimental technique you know to perform PID in different energy ranges.

A DIRC is a special Cherenkov detector where light is collected after many reflection at the end of the radiator slabs.





Why the slabs polishing is so crucial?

Exercise 4

According to the quark model verify the following statements:

- Baryons won't have spin 1;
- Which can be the quark composition of an antibaryon of electric charge +2;
- Why mesons with charge +1 and strangeness -1 are not possible?

Symbol	Quark	Charge
U	up	2/3
d	down	-1/3
С	charm	2/3
S	strange	-1/3
t	top	2/3
b	bottom	-1/3

Exercise 5

Plastic scintillators are detectors producing light when crossed by charged particles. The produced light is proportional to the energy released by the particle.





Some typical parameters of scintillator detectors are:

•	MIP energy loss	2MeV/cm
•	scintillation efficiency	1 photon/100 eV
•	collection efficiency (# photons reaching PMT)	0.1
•	quantum efficiency of PMT	0.25
•	PMT gain	10 ⁶
•	PMT collection time	50 ns

What size has an electrical signal we get from a plastic scintillator 1 cm thick?