Deciphering the production mechanism of the LHCb Pc states

Meng-Lin Du (杜孟林)
@
University of Electronic Science and Technology of China (UESTC)
电子科技大学

Workshop on Few-Body Problems in Nuclear and Hadron Physics
2026.9.23 @ Beijing

Collaborators: V. Baru, F.-K. Guo, C. Hanhart, U.-G. Meißner, A. Nefediev, J. Oller, Q. Wang, W.-J. Wang, B. Wu

Interpretation of the LHCb Pc states as Hadronic Molecules and Hints of a Narrow Pc(4380), PRL124 (2020), 072001


Revisting the nature of the Pc states, JHEP08(2021)157


Deciphering the production mechanism of the LHCb Pc states, arXiv: 2609.24231


Charmonium-pentaquark states (I)

Observation of exotic structures (P_c) in $\Lambda_b^0 \to J/\psi p K^-$

LHCb, PRL 115, 072001 (2015)









$P_c(4380)^+$: $M = 4380 \pm 8 \pm 29$ MeV
$\Gamma = 205 \pm 18 \pm 86$ MeV
$P_c(4450)^+$: $M = 4449.8 \pm 1.7 \pm 2.5$ MeV
$\Gamma = 39 \pm 5 \pm 19$ MeV

Preferred Parity: Opposite

Charmonium-pentaquark states (II)



LHCb, PRL 122, 222001 (2019)




the $P_c(4440)^+$ and $P_c(4457)^+$ states. The six-dimensional amplitude analysis reported in Ref. [9], which provided evidence for the $P_c(4380)^+$ state, is also obsolete since it used the single $P_c(4450)^+$ state and it lacked the $P_c(4312)^+$ state. Therefore, the results presented in the Letter weaken the previously reported evidence for the $P_c(4380)^+$ state, but do not contradict its existence, since the present one-dimensional analysis is not sensitive to wide P_c^+ states. Only a future six-dimensional amplitude analysis of $\Lambda_b^0 \to J/\psi p K^-$ decays that includes the $P_c(4440)^+$, $P_c(4457)^+$, and $P_c(4312)^+$ states will be able to determine if there is still evidence for the $P_c(4380)^+$ state or any other wide P_c^+ states.

$P_c(4450)^+$

State	M [MeV]	Γ [MeV]
$P_c(4312)^+$	$4311.9 \pm 0.7^{+6.8}_{-0.6}$	$9.8 \pm 2.7^{+\ 3.7}_{-\ 4.5}$
$P_c(4440)^+$	$4440.3 \pm 1.3^{+4.1}_{-4.7}$	$20.6 \pm 4.9^{+\ 8.7}_{-10.1}$
$P_c(4457)^+$	$4457.3 \pm 0.6^{+4.1}_{-1.7}$	$6.4 \pm 2.0^{+\ 5.7}_{-\ 1.9}$

Proposals [after 2019]



Compact Pentaquark

Chromomagnetic model, JB Cheng and YR Liu, PRD100, 054002 (2019)


$P_c(4312)$, $P_c(4440)$, $P_c(4457)$: $J^P = 3/2^-, 1/2^-, 3/2^-$

$P_c(4380)^+$, $P_c(4440)^+$ and $P_c(4457)^+$ is $\frac{3}{2}^-$ R. Deng, PRD105, 116021 (2022)

Compact diquark model, Ali et al., JHEP10, 256 (2019)

R. Zhu et al., PLB797, 134869(2019)
Giron et al., JHEP05, 061 (2019)
.....

$3/2^-$	4240 ± 29
$3/2^+$	4440 ± 35
$5/2^+$	4457 ± 35




Hadron-Charmonium

Compact $(\bar{Q}Q)$ surrounded by light quarks

Eides et al., Mod. Phys. Lett. A 35, 2050151 (2020)

$J^P = 1/2^+, 1/2^-, 3/2^-$



Hadronic Molecule

Extended object

H.X. Chen et al., PRD100, 051501 (2019)
R. Chen et al., PRD100, 011502 (2019)
F.K. Guo et al., PRD99, 091501 (2019)
M.Z. Liu et al., PRL122, 242001 (2019)
Z.H. Guo et al., PLB793, 144 (2019)
L. Meng et al., PRD100, 014031(2019)
J.J. Wu et al., PRC100, 035026 (2019)
J.-Z. Wu et al., CPL41,091201(2024)
.....

Kinematic effect

Kuang et al., EPJC80,433 (2020)
Nakamura, PRD103, L111503(2021)
Burns et al., PRD106,054029(2022)
.....

Heavy Quark Spin Symmetry (HQSS)

- For a heavy-quark Q ($c$harm, $b$ottom) with $m_Q \gg \Lambda_{\rm QCD}$

  ☞ chromomag. interaction $\propto \dfrac{\sigma \cdot \mathbf{B}}{m_Q}$ $\to 0$: independent of heavy-quark spin

- For a hadron containing a heavy-quark Q: $J = s_Q + j_\ell$

S-wave baryon-meson system
$\Sigma_c^{(*)} \bar{D}^{(*)}$ (ground states)

$s_Q = \frac{1}{2} \otimes \frac{1}{2} = 0 \oplus 1$

$j_\ell = \frac{1}{2} \oplus \frac{3}{2}$ → LO Contact Interaction: Only 2 LECs

	Molecule	J^P	M (MeV)		Molecule	J^P	M (MeV)
A	$\bar{D}\Sigma_c$	$\frac{1}{2}^-$	$4311.8 - 4313.0$	B	$\bar{D}\Sigma_c$	$\frac{1}{2}^-$	$4306.3 - 4307.7$
A	$\bar{D}\Sigma_c^*$	$\frac{3}{2}^-$	$4376.1 - 4377.0$	B	$\bar{D}\Sigma_c^*$	$\frac{3}{2}^-$	$4370.5 - 4371.7$
A	$\bar{D}^*\Sigma_c$	$\frac{1}{2}^-$	4440.3^*	B	$\bar{D}^*\Sigma_c$	$\frac{1}{2}^-$	4457.3^*
A	$\bar{D}^*\Sigma_c$	$\frac{3}{2}^-$	4457.3^*	B	$\bar{D}^*\Sigma_c$	$\frac{3}{2}^-$	4440.3^*
A	$\bar{D}^*\Sigma_c^*$	$\frac{1}{2}^-$	$4500.2 - 4501.0$	B	$\bar{D}^*\Sigma_c^*$	$\frac{1}{2}^-$	$4523.2 - 4523.6$
A	$\bar{D}^*\Sigma_c^*$	$\frac{3}{2}^-$	$4510.6 - 4510.8$	B	$\bar{D}^*\Sigma_c^*$	$\frac{3}{2}^-$	$4516.5 - 4516.6$
A	$\bar{D}^*\Sigma_c^*$	$\frac{5}{2}^-$	$4523.3 - 4523.6$	B	$\bar{D}^*\Sigma_c^*$	$\frac{5}{2}^-$	$4500.2 - 4501.0$

7 Pc states!


Xiao et al., PRD88, 56012 (2013)


Liu et al., PRL122,242001 (2019)


Molecular Interpretation [EFT]

MLD et al., PRL124,072001(2020)
MLD et al., JHEP08,157 (2021)


- A coupled-channel analysis of the LHCb spectra using an EFT approach







7 LECs for contact Production




$\bar{D}^{(*)}\Sigma_c^{(*)} \to \bar{D}^{(*)}\Sigma_c^{(*)}$ 2 LECs

$\bar{D}^{(*)}\Sigma_c^{(*)}(S) \to J/\Psi p(S),\ J/\Psi p(D)$

2 LECs

“Contact” Fits to the LHCb data

MLD et al., PRL124,072001(2020)
MLD et al., JHEP08,157 (2021)




☞ $\Lambda > \Lambda_{\rm soft} \sim \sqrt{2\mu\delta} \sim 0.7$ GeV

☞ Cutoff-independent for both solution A and B


	$\Sigma_c \bar{D}^*$	$P_c(4440)$	$P_c(4457)$
Fit A		$\frac{1}{2}^-$	$\frac{3}{2}^-$
Fit B		$\frac{3}{2}^-$	$\frac{1}{2}^-$

If $\Sigma_c^{(*)} \bar{D}^{(*)} \to \Lambda_c \bar{D}^{(*)}$ is included, one more LEC

☞ No need for $\Lambda_c \bar{D}^{(*)}$ overdetermined



Line shape and Pc Poles: Contact



MLD et al., PRL124,072001(2020)
MLD et al., JHEP08,157 (2021)


- $P_c(4312)$, $P_c(4440)$, $P_c(4457)$ are well understood as $\Sigma_c D$, $\Sigma_c D^*$ and $\Sigma_c D^*$ quasi-bound states, respectively
- A narrow Pc(4380) state predicted as a $\Sigma_c^* D$ $3/2^-$ molecule is seen in data

NOT the broad Pc(4380) reported by LHCb in 2015

- $\Sigma_c^* D^*$ states are not seen yet, their production rate is suppressed ?

↪ prompt production in the pp collision in the LHC

P. Ling et al., EPJC81,819 (2021)




Poles and quantum numbers:

		solution A		solution B	
	thr. ([MeV])	J^P	Pole [MeV]	J^P	Pole [MeV]
$P_c(4312)$	$\Sigma_c\bar{D}$ (4321.6)	$\frac{1}{2}^-$	$4314(1)-4(1)i$	$\frac{1}{2}^-$	$4312(2)-4(2)i$
$P_c(4380)$	$\Sigma_c^*\bar{D}$ (4386.2)	$\frac{3}{2}^-$	$4377(1)-7(1)i$	$\frac{3}{2}^-$	$4375(2)-6(1)i$
$P_c(4440)$	$\Sigma_c\bar{D}^*$ (4462.1)	$\frac{1}{2}^-$	$4440(1)-9(2)i$	$\frac{3}{2}^-$	$4441(3)-5(2)i$
$P_c(4457)$	$\Sigma_c\bar{D}^*$ (4462.1)	$\frac{3}{2}^-$	$4458(2)-3(1)i$	$\frac{1}{2}^-$	$4462(4)-5(3)i$
P_c	$\Sigma_c^*\bar{D}^*$ (4526.7)	$\frac{1}{2}^-$	$4498(2)-9(3)i$	$\frac{1}{2}^-$	$4526(3)-9(2)i$
P_c	$\Sigma_c^*\bar{D}^*$ (4526.7)	$\frac{3}{2}^-$	$4510(2)-14(3)i$	$\frac{3}{2}^-$	$4521(2)-12(3)i$
P_c	$\Sigma_c^*\bar{D}^*$ (4526.7)	$\frac{5}{2}^-$	$4525(2)-9(3)i$	$\frac{5}{2}^-$	$4501(3)-6(4)i$

Including OPE

contact + OPE



Long range: OPE


Determined by exp. data

☞ No solution A

☞ Solution B:
Cut-off dependent

☞ $\Lambda_{\rm soft} \sim 700$ MeV


MLD et al., PRL124,072001(2020)
MLD et al., JHEP08,157 (2021)




$+\,\Lambda_c \bar{D}^{(*)}$

contact + OPE + S-D


Solution A



Solution B



Solution A $\Lambda_{\rm soft} \sim 0.7$ GeV Solution B




☞ Overdetermined. w/ $\Lambda_c \bar{D}^{(*)}$ $\Lambda_{\rm soft} \sim 0.9$ GeV

☞ Cutoff-independent only for solution B

Including OPE

contact + OPE



Long range: OPE


Determined by exp. data

☞ No solution A

☞ Solution B:
Cut-off dependent


☞ $\Lambda_{\text{soft}} \sim 700$ MeV

MLD et al., PRL124,072001(2020)
MLD et al., JHEP08,157 (2021)



$+\,\Lambda_c \bar{D}^{(*)}$


contact + OPE + S-D




Fit B shows a much more natural pattern than fit A

⇒ $P_c(4440)$ is $3/2^-$ and $P_c(4457)$ is $1/2^-$

⇒ experimentally testable via $\Lambda_b \to K\Sigma^{(*)}D^{(*)}$ and $\Lambda_b \to K\eta_c p$





☞ Overdetermined. w/ $\Lambda_c \bar{D}^{(*)}$ $\Lambda_{\text{soft}} \sim 0.9$ GeV

☞ Cutoff-independent only for solution B


Analysis based on Born–Oppenheimer effective field theory

$$E_{(\Lambda)_\eta}(r) \equiv E_{\kappa,|\lambda|}(r) = \lim_{T\to\infty} \frac{i}{T} \log\left[\langle \mathrm{vac}|\mathcal{O}_{\kappa,\lambda}(T/2,\, \boldsymbol{r},\, \boldsymbol{R})\, \mathcal{O}^{\dagger}_{\kappa,\lambda}(-T/2,\, \boldsymbol{r},\, \boldsymbol{R})|\mathrm{vac}\rangle\right]$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{\kappa,\lambda}\left(t, \boldsymbol{r}, \boldsymbol{R}\right) = \chi^{\dagger}\left(t, \boldsymbol{R}+\boldsymbol{r}/2\right) \phi\left(t; \boldsymbol{R}+\boldsymbol{r}/2, \boldsymbol{R}\right) P^{\alpha\dagger}_{\kappa,\lambda} H^{\alpha,a}_{8,\kappa}(t, \boldsymbol{R})\, T^{a}\, \phi\left(t; \boldsymbol{R}, \boldsymbol{R}-\boldsymbol{r}/2\right) \psi\left(t, \boldsymbol{R}-\boldsymbol{r}/2\right)$$

$Q\bar{Q}$ color state	Light spin k^P	BO quantum # $D_{\infty h}$	l	J^P $\{s=0, s=1\}$
Octet	$(1/2)^+$	$(1/2)_g$	1/2	$\{1/2^-, (1/2,3/2)^-\}$
8	$(3/2)^+$	$\{(1/2)'_g, (3/2)_g\}$	3/2	$\{3/2^-, (1/2,3/2,5/2)^-\}$


Brambilla et al., PRD112, 114037(2025)



Decay analysis favors the Right one.

Not bound

Alasiri et al., PLB873, 140162(2026)



HQEFT

$P_c(4457)$ as a $J^P = 5/2^-$ $\Sigma_c^* \bar{D}^*$ (4526.7 MeV) bound state.

HQEFT analysis of BOEFT results

$$C_{\frac{1}{2}} \equiv \left\langle s_Q \otimes \frac{1}{2} \middle| \hat{\mathcal{H}}_I \middle| s_Q \otimes \frac{1}{2} \right\rangle, \quad C_{\frac{3}{2}} \equiv \left\langle s_Q \otimes \frac{3}{2} \middle| \hat{\mathcal{H}}_I \middle| s_Q \otimes \frac{3}{2} \right\rangle,$$

$$V_C^{\frac{1}{2}^-} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{3}C_{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{2}{3}C_{\frac{3}{2}} & \frac{2}{3\sqrt{3}}C_{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{2}{3\sqrt{3}}C_{\frac{3}{2}} & \frac{1}{3}\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}C_{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{3}\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}C_{\frac{3}{2}} \\ \frac{2}{3\sqrt{3}}C_{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{2}{3\sqrt{3}}C_{\frac{3}{2}} & \frac{7}{9}C_{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{2}{9}C_{\frac{3}{2}} & -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{9}C_{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{9}C_{\frac{3}{2}} \\ \frac{1}{3}\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}C_{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{3}\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}C_{\frac{3}{2}} & -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{9}C_{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{9}C_{\frac{3}{2}} & \frac{8}{9}C_{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{1}{9}C_{\frac{3}{2}} \end{pmatrix} \begin{matrix} |\Sigma_c \bar{D}\rangle \\ |\Sigma_c \bar{D}^*\rangle \\ |\Sigma_c^* \bar{D}^*\rangle \end{matrix}$$

$$V_C^{\frac{3}{2}^-} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{9}C_{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{8}{9}C_{\frac{3}{2}} & -\frac{1}{3\sqrt{3}}C_{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{1}{3\sqrt{3}}C_{\frac{3}{2}} & -\frac{\sqrt{5}}{9}C_{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{\sqrt{5}}{9}C_{\frac{3}{2}} \\ -\frac{1}{3\sqrt{3}}C_{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{1}{3\sqrt{3}}C_{\frac{3}{2}} & \frac{1}{3}C_{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{2}{3}C_{\frac{3}{2}} & +\frac{1}{3}\sqrt{\frac{5}{3}}C_{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{3}\sqrt{\frac{5}{3}}C_{\frac{3}{2}} \\ -\frac{\sqrt{5}}{9}C_{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{\sqrt{5}}{9}C_{\frac{3}{2}} & \frac{1}{3}\sqrt{\frac{5}{3}}C_{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{3}\sqrt{\frac{5}{3}}C_{\frac{3}{2}} & \frac{5}{9}C_{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{4}{9}C_{\frac{3}{2}} \end{pmatrix} \begin{matrix} |\Sigma_c \bar{D}^*\rangle \\ |\Sigma_c^* \bar{D}\rangle \\ |\Sigma_c^* \bar{D}^*\rangle \end{matrix}$$

$$V_C^{\frac{5}{2}^-} = C_{\frac{3}{2}}. \qquad |\Sigma_c^* \bar{D}^*\rangle$$


$$\mathbb{V}_C^{\frac{1}{2}^-} = P_{1/2}.V_C^{\frac{1}{2}^-}.P_{1/2}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} C_{\frac{3}{2}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & C_{\frac{1}{2}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & C_{\frac{1}{2}} \end{pmatrix}$$


$$\mathbb{V}_C^{\frac{3}{2}^-} = P_{3/2}.V_C^{\frac{3}{2}^-}.P_{3/2}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} C_{\frac{3}{2}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & C_{\frac{3}{2}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & C_{\frac{1}{2}} \end{pmatrix}$$

$C_{\frac{1}{2}} = 0$ ⇒ 4 states!

Triangle Diagrams


LHCb, PRL122, 222001 (2019)








Triangle Diagrams


Burns et al., PRD106,054029 (2022)












- Weakly bound $\Sigma_c^{(*)}D^{(*)}$ resonances are required:
  - 4312 ($\Sigma_c D$, 1/2-)
  - 4380 ($\Sigma_c^* D$, 3/2-)
  - 4440 ($\Sigma_c D^*$, 3/2-)
  - 4457 (1/2-$\Sigma_c D^*$ threshold cusp / 1/2+ triangle)



ZW Liu et al., PRD108,114022 (2023)


Triangle Diagrams


$P_c(4312)^+$, $P_c(4380)^+$, and $P_c(4457)^+$ as double triangle cusps


Nakamura, PRD103,L111503 (2021)

double triangle amplitudes reproduce the peak structures of $P_c(4312)^+$, $P_c(4380)^+$, and $P_c(4457)^+$

Only the $P_c(4440)^+$ peak is due to a resonance










A look at the data

Burns et al., PRD106,054029 (2022)



Including Λc(2595)D





$\Lambda_c(2595)^+$ **DECAY MODES**


$\Lambda_c^+\pi\pi$ and its submode $\Sigma_c(2455)\pi$ — the latter just barely — are the only strong decays allowed to an excited Λ_c^+ having this mass; and the submode seems to dominate.

ode		Fraction (Γ_i / Γ)	Scale Factor/ Conf. LevelP(MeV/c)	
Γ_1	$\Lambda_c^+\pi^+\pi^-$	[1]	117	⌄
Γ_2	$\Sigma_c(2455)^{++}\pi^-$	$(24 \pm 7)\%$	3	⌄
Γ_3	$\Sigma_c(2455)^0\pi^+$	$(24 \pm 7)\%$	3	⌄
Γ_4	$\Lambda_c^+\pi^+\pi^-$ 3-body	$(18 \pm 10)\%$	117	⌄
Γ_5	$\Lambda_c^+\pi^0$	[2] not seen	258	⌄
Γ_6	$\Lambda_c^+\gamma$	not seen	288	⌄

Production of the LHCb Pc states via Box Diagram

W.-J. Wang, MLD, F.-K. Guo, B. Wu, 2609.24231


$\mathcal{L}_{D^*_{s1}} = g_{D^*_{s1}} D^0 \bar{D}^{*,i}_{s1} \partial^i \bar{K}$



$\mathcal{L}_b = g_{\Lambda_b} \bar{\Lambda}^*_c \sigma \cdot \mathbf{D}^*_{s1} \Lambda^0_b$

$\sim \log(s - s_0)$

$ig_{D^*_{s1}} \bar{D}^{0\dagger} \bar{\boldsymbol{D}}^*_{s1} \cdot \boldsymbol{\partial} K^+ + ig'_{D^*_{s1}} \epsilon_{ijk} \bar{D}^{*0,i\dagger} \bar{D}^{*,j}_{s1} \partial^k K^+$



$\sim \dfrac{1}{\sqrt{s - s_0}}$

To the S-wave $\Sigma_c \bar{D}^*$


$$\frac{\sqrt{3} g_1 h_2 g_{D^*_{s1}} g_{\Lambda_b} m_{\Lambda_{c1}} \sqrt{2 m_D}}{F^2_\pi} u^\dagger_{\Sigma_c} \boldsymbol{p}_K \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} u_{\Lambda_b} \times \int \frac{i^2 d^4 l d^4 q}{(2\pi)^8} \frac{(\boldsymbol{l} - \boldsymbol{q}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^*_{\bar{D}^*} E_\pi}{S_{\Sigma_c} S_{\bar{D}^*} S_\pi S_{\bar{D}} S_{\Lambda_{c1}} S_{D^*_{s1}}}$$


To the S-wave $\Sigma_c \bar{D}$

$$\propto g'_{D^*_{s1}} u^\dagger_{\Sigma_c} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot (\boldsymbol{l} - \boldsymbol{q}) \times \boldsymbol{p}_K u_{\Lambda_b} \propto \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \boldsymbol{p}_K \times \boldsymbol{p}_K = 0$$

Production of the LHCb Pc states via Box Diagram

W.-J. Wang, MLD, F.-K. Guo, B. Wu, 2609.24231





$D_{s1}^*(2860)$


$D_{s0}(2590)^-$

$\Lambda_c(2595) \to \Lambda_c(2625)$

rate suppression of $\rho^2 \approx 0.087$ Meinel and Rendon, PRD103,094516(2021), PRD105,154511(2022)

Production of the LHCb Pc states


W.-J. Wang, MLD, F.-K. Guo, B. Wu, 2609.24231



$$\mathcal{B}_1(E) = b_0 + b_1 E^2 + b_2 E^4$$

$\Lambda_c(2595)\bar{D}$ not significant!

consistent with Yalikun et al., PRD104,094039(2021)



$$\frac{\Gamma(\Lambda_b^0 \to P_c^+(4440/4457)K^- \to J/\psi p K^-)}{\Gamma(\Lambda_b^0 \to D^*_{s1}(2860)\Lambda_{c1})} \approx 0.2...0.4\%.$$

$$\frac{\Gamma(\Lambda_b^0 \to P_c^+(4312)K^- \to J/\psi p K^-)}{\Gamma(\Lambda_b^0 \to D^-_{s0}(2590)\Lambda_{c1})} \approx 0.2...0.8\%.$$

Conclusions and Propects

Conclusions


- Molecular interpretation of the Pc's and 7 Pc's are predicted from HQSS
- A narrow Pc(4380), different from the broad one reporeted by LHCb in 2015
- Production through the box diagram
- The missing Pc's from HQSS in LHCb is naturally explained
- Pc(4312): J=1/2, Pc(4457): J=1/2, Pc(4440): J=3/2 from EFT w/ OPE

Propects

- The missing Pc's from HQSS, Pc's with strangeness
- Lattice simulations

$$\frac{\Gamma(\Lambda_b^0 \to P_c^+(4440/4457)K^- \to J/\psi p K^-)}{\Gamma(\Lambda_b^0 \to D_{s1}^*(2860)\Lambda_{c1})} \approx 0.2...0.4\%.$$

$$\frac{\Gamma(\Lambda_b^0 \to P_c^+(4312)K^- \to J/\psi p K^-)}{\Gamma(\Lambda_b^0 \to D_{s0}^-(2590)\Lambda_{c1})} \approx 0.2...0.8\%.$$



Thank you very much for your attention!

Thank you very much for your attention!

backup

Λ_b^0 $I(J^P) = 0(1/2^+)$

Γ_{46}	$\Sigma_c(2455)^{++} D^- K^-$	$(6.0 \pm 0.8) \times 10^{-4}$	1448
Γ_{47}	$\Sigma_c(2455)^{++} D^{*-} K^-$	$(1.36 \pm 0.22) \times 10^{-3}$	1324
Γ_{48}	$\Sigma_c(2520)^{++} D^- K^-$	$(2.8 \pm 0.5) \times 10^{-4}$	1392
Γ_{49}	$\Sigma_c(2520)^{++} D^{*-} K^-$	$(5.4 \pm 1.1) \times 10^{-4}$	1262


Γ_{36}	$\Lambda_c^+ D^-$	$(4.6 \pm 0.6) \times 10^{-4}$	1886
Γ_{37}	$\Lambda_c^+ D_s^-$	$(1.10 \pm 0.10)\ \%$	1833
Γ_{38}	$\Lambda_c^+ D_s^{*-}$	$(1.83 \pm 0.18)\ \%$	1748
Γ_{39}	$\Lambda_c^+ \overline{D}^0 K^-$	$(2.13 \pm 0.20) \times 10^{-3}$	1581
Γ_{40}	$\Lambda_c^+ \overline{D}^{*0} K^-$	$(6.6 \pm 0.7) \times 10^{-3}$	1471

backup

TABLE I. The names of the states, their dominant channels (DCs) and thresholds, the Riemann sheet (RS) where they lie, their quantum numbers found, the pole positions, and the dimensionless couplings to their DCs, $g_{\rm DC}$, from the T-matrix residues for Solutions A and B.

			Solution A			Solution B		
	DC (threshold [MeV])	RS	J^P	Pole [MeV]	$g_{\rm DC}$	J^P	Pole [MeV]	$g_{\rm DC}$
$P_c(4312)$	$\Sigma_c\bar{D}$ (4321.6)	RS_{+++}	$\frac{1}{2}^-$	$4312(1)-5(1)i$	$2.9(1)+0.4(2)i$	$\frac{1}{2}^-$	$4308(4)-2(1)i$	$3.3(2)+0.1(1)i$
$P_c(4380)$	$\Sigma_c^*\bar{D}$ (4386.2)	RS_{+++}	$\frac{3}{2}^-$	$4375(1)-13(2)i$	$3.1(1)+0.3(1)i$	$\frac{3}{2}^-$	$4371(4)-12(1)i$	$3.4(2)+0.2(1)i$
$P_c(4440)$	$\Sigma_c\bar{D}^*$ (4462.1)	RS_{-++}	$\frac{1}{2}^-$	$4436(1)-12(3)i$	$3.9(1)+0.5(1)i$	$\frac{3}{2}^-$	$4438(4)-12(1)i$	$3.9(2)+0.4(1)i$
$P_c(4457)$	$\Sigma_c\bar{D}^*$ (4462.1)	RS_{-++}	$\frac{3}{2}^-$	$4457(2)-1(1)i$	$2.4(1)+0.0(1)i$	$\frac{1}{2}^-$	$4458(3)-1(1)i$	$2.3(3)+0.0(2)i$
P_c	$\Sigma_c^*\bar{D}^*$ (4526.7)	RS_{--+}	$\frac{1}{2}^-$	$4495(1)-21(4)i$	$4.2(1)+0.6(2)i$	$\frac{1}{2}^-$	$4524(3)-8(1)i$	$2.0(4)+0.1(0)i$
P_c	$\Sigma_c^*\bar{D}^*$ (4526.7)	RS_{--+}	$\frac{3}{2}^-$	$4513(2)-15(2)i$	$3.2(2)+0.5(1)i$	$\frac{3}{2}^-$	$4520(4)-13(1)i$	$2.7(3)+0.5(1)i$
P_c	$\Sigma_c^*\bar{D}^*$ (4526.7)	RS_{+}	$\frac{5}{2}^-$	$4524(1)-8(0)i$	$1.9(3)+0.0(0)i$	$\frac{5}{2}^-$	$4498(4)-18(1)i$	$4.1(2)+0.4(1)i$

backup



$$\mathcal{L}_{D_{s0}} = g^0_{\Lambda_b}\bar{\Lambda}_{c1}\bar{D}^\dagger_{s0}\,\Lambda^0_b + ig_{D_{s0}}\bar{D}_{s0}\bar{\boldsymbol{D}}^{*0\dagger}\cdot\boldsymbol{\partial}K^+,$$

$$\mathcal{L}_b = g_{\Lambda_b}\bar{\Lambda}_{c1}\,\boldsymbol{\sigma}\cdot\bar{\boldsymbol{D}}^{*\dagger}_{s1}\,\Lambda^0_b,$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{s1} = ig_{D^*_{s1}}\,\bar{D}^{0\dagger}\bar{\boldsymbol{D}}^*_{s1}\cdot\boldsymbol{\partial}K^+ + ig'_{D^*_{s1}}\epsilon_{ijk}\bar{D}^{*0,i\dagger}\bar{D}^{*,j}_{s1}\partial^k K^+,$$

TABLE II. Best-fit parameters for Solutions A and B. Here k_0 is the proton momentum in the $J/\psi p$ c.m. frame at the reference c.m. energy $(m_D + m_{D^*} + m_{\Sigma_c} + m_{\Sigma_c^*})/2$.

Solution	$C_{1/2}$ [GeV^{-2}]	$C_{3/2}$ [GeV^{-2}]	g_S [GeV^{-2}]	$g_D k_0^2$ [GeV^{-2}]	$g_{\Lambda_b^0} g_{D_{s0}}/g_{\Lambda_b} g_{D^*_{s1}}$
A	−14.33(18)	−9.92(14)	3.75(25)	0.00(63)	1.92(12)
B	−9.70(18)	−13.26(13)	0.00(25)	2.71(27)	−0.60(12)