Spectroscopy and Regge Trajectories of Heavy Quarkonia

D. Ebert¹, R.N. Faustov², V.O. Galkin²

¹Institut für Physik, Humboldt–Universität zu Berlin, Newtonstr. 15, D-12489 Berlin, Germany ²Dorodnicyn Computing Centre, Russian Academy of Sciences, Vavilov Str. 40, 119333 Moscow, Russia

The mass spectra of charmonia and bottomonia are calculated in the framework of the relativistic quark model. The Regge trajectories of heavy quarkonia are constructed. All daughter trajectories are almost linear and parallel, while parent trajectories exhibit some nonlinearity. Such nonlinearity occurs only in the vicinity of ground states and few lowest excitations and is more pronounced for bottomonia, while it is only marginal for charmonia. The obtained results are compared with available experimental data, and a possible interpretation of the new charmonium-like states above open charm production threshold is discussed.

1 Introduction

In recent years a vast amount of experimental data on the heavy quarkonium spectroscopy has been accumulated [1]. The number of known states is constantly increasing. Thus, in the last eight years more than ten new charmonium-like states have been discovered [2]. The total number of charmonium states, listed in the Particle Data Group Listings [1], is 25 at present. Some of the new states (such as $\eta_c(2S)$, h_c , $\chi_{c2}(2P)$, etc.) are the long-awaited ones within the quark model, while some others, with masses higher than the threshold of the open charm production, have narrow widths and unexpected decay properties [2]. There are theoretical indications that some of these new states could be the first manifestation of the existence of exotic hadrons (tetraquarks, molecules, hybrids etc.), which are predicted in QCD [3]. In order to explore such options, a comprehensive understanding of the heavy quarkonium spectroscopy up to rather high orbital and radial excitations is required. The experimentally known bottomonium spectrum consists of 20 states [1]. Therefore, the investigation of the masses of the excited heavy quarkonia states presents an important and interesting problem. To achieve this goal one should treat the quark dynamics in mesons completely relativistically. Here we extend the approach previously used for the investigation of light meson spectroscopy [4] to heavy quarkonia. In order to improve our description, leading radiative corrections to the heavy quark potential [5] are also taken into account. Such corrections are suppressed by additional powers of α_s , which are rather small for heavy quarkonia, and are known only in the framework of the v^2/c^2 expansion. Therefore we treat them perturbatively. The calculation of the masses of highly orbitally and radially excited states up to the fifth excitation is carried out. On this basis, the Regge trajectories for charmonia and bottomonia can be constructed both in the total angular momentum J and radial quantum number n_r , and properties like linearity, parallelism and equidistance of these trajectories can be checked. There are reasons

to expect that the parent Regge trajectories can be nonlinear [6, 7] due to the compactness of their ground and lowest excited states, which puts them in the region where both the linear confining and Coulomb parts of the quark-antiquark potential play a comparable role.

2 Relativistic quark model

In the relativistic quark model based on the quasipotential approach a meson is described by the wave function of the bound quark-antiquark state, which satisfies the quasipotential equation of the Schrödinger type [8, 9]

$$\left(\frac{b^2(M)}{2\mu_R} - \frac{\mathbf{p}^2}{2\mu_R}\right)\Psi_M(\mathbf{p}) = \int \frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3} V(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}; M)\Psi_M(\mathbf{q}),\tag{1}$$

where

$$\mu_R = \frac{M^4 - (m_1^2 - m_2^2)^2}{4M^3}, \qquad b^2(M) = \frac{[M^2 - (m_1 + m_2)^2][M^2 - (m_1 - m_2)^2]}{4M^2}.$$
 (2)

Here M is the meson mass, $m_{1,2}$ are the quark masses, and **p** is their relative momentum.

The kernel $V(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}; M)$ in Eq. (1) is the QCD-motivated quasipotential operator of the quark-antiquark interaction, which is constructed with the help of the off-mass-shell scattering amplitude, projected onto the positive energy states. It is assumed that the effective interaction is the sum of the usual one-gluon exchange term with the mixture of long-range vector and scalar linear confining potentials

$$V(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}; M) = \bar{u}_1(p)\bar{u}_2(-p) \left\{ \frac{4}{3} \alpha_s D_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{k}) \gamma_1^{\mu} \gamma_2^{\nu} + V_{\text{conf}}^V(\mathbf{k}) \Gamma_1^{\mu} \Gamma_{2;\mu} + V_{\text{conf}}^S(\mathbf{k}) \right\} u_1(q) u_2(-q), \quad (3)$$

where the vector confining potential contains the Pauli interaction: $\Gamma_{\mu}(\mathbf{k}) = \gamma_{\mu} + \frac{i\kappa}{2m}\sigma_{\mu\nu}k^{\nu}$. Here α_s is the QCD coupling constant, $D_{\mu\nu}$ is the gluon propagator in the Coulomb gauge, γ_{μ} and u(p) are the Dirac matrices and spinors and $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q}$; κ is the Pauli interaction constant characterizing the anomalous chromomagnetic moment of quarks. Vector and scalar confining potentials in the nonrelativistic limit reduce to

$$V_{\rm conf}^V(r) = (1 - \varepsilon)(Ar + B), \qquad V_{\rm conf}^S(r) = \varepsilon(Ar + B), \tag{4}$$

where ε is the mixing coefficient. Therefore, in this limit the Cornell-type potential is reproduced $V_{\rm NR}(r) = -\frac{4}{3}\frac{\alpha_s}{r} + Ar + B.$

All the model parameters have the same values as in our previous papers [8, 4, 10]: the constituent quark masses $m_u = m_d = 0.33$ GeV, $m_s = 0.5$ GeV, $m_c = 1.55$ GeV, $m_b = 4.88$ GeV, and the parameters of the linear potential A = 0.18 GeV² and B = -0.16 GeV. The value of the mixing coefficient of vector and scalar confining potentials $\varepsilon = -1$ has been determined from the consideration of charmonium radiative decays [8] and matching heavy quark effective theory (HQET). Finally, the universal Pauli interaction constant $\kappa = -1$ has been fixed from the analysis of the fine splitting of heavy quarkonia ${}^{3}P_{J}$ - states [8]. In this case, the long-range chromomagnetic interaction of quarks, which is proportional to $(1 + \kappa)$, vanishes in accordance with the flux-tube model.

The investigations of the heavy quark dynamics in heavy mesons indicate that the charm quark is not heavy enough to be considered as nonrelativistic. Indeed, estimates of the averaged

HQ2013

D. EBERT, R. N. FAUSTOV, V. O. GALKIN

velocity squared for the ground-state charmonium give the value $\langle v^2/c^2 \rangle \sim 0.25$. For excited charmonium states the $\langle v^2/c^2 \rangle$ values are even higher. Therefore, a reliable calculation of the charmonium spectroscopy requires a completely relativistic treatment of the charmed quark without an expansion in its velocity. The quasipotential (3) can in principal be used for arbitrary quark masses. The substitution of the Dirac spinors into (3) results in an extremely nonlocal potential in the configuration space. Clearly, it is very hard to deal with such potentials without any additional approximations. In order to simplify the relativistic QQ potential, we make the following replacement in the Dirac spinors: $\epsilon_{1,2}(p) = \sqrt{m_{1,2}^2 + \mathbf{p}^2} \rightarrow E_{1,2} \equiv (M^2 - m_{2,1}^2 + m_{1,2}^2)/2M$ (see the discussion of this point in [4, 10]). This substitution makes the Fourier transformation of the potential (3) local. The resulting $Q\bar{Q}$ potential then reads

$$V(r) = V_{\rm SI}(r) + V_{\rm SD}(r),\tag{5}$$

where the explicit expression for the spin-independent $V_{\rm SI}(r)$ and spin-dependent $V_{\rm SD}(r)$ parts can be found in Ref. [4].

3 **Results and discussion**

We solve the quasipotential equation with the quasipotential (5), which nonperturbatively accounts for the relativistic dynamics of both heavy quarks, numerically. Then we add the one-loop radiative corrections and the additional one-loop correction for bottomonium due to the finite mass [8] of the charmed quark by using perturbation theory. The calculated masses of charmonia and bottomonia are given in Tables 1,2, where $n = n_r + 1$, n_r is the radial quantum number, L, S and J are the quantum numbers of the orbital, total spin and total angular momenta, respectively. They are confronted with available experimental data from PDG [1], good agreement is found. It is important to note that the nonperturbative relativistic treatment gives a better agreement with data than our previous heavy quarkonium mass spectrum calculation [8], where only relativistic corrections up to v^2/c^2 order were taken into account. However, the differences between former and new predictions are rather small for most of the low-lying states and become noticeable only for higher excitations, where relativistic effects turn out to be particularly important.

In our analysis we calculated masses of both orbitally and radially excited heavy quarkonia up to rather high excitation numbers $(L = 5 \text{ and } n_r = 5)$. This makes it possible to construct the Regge trajectories in the (J, M^2) and (n_r, M^2) planes using the following definitions:

(a) the (J, M^2) Regge trajectory: $J = \alpha M^2 + \alpha_0$; (b) the (n_r, M^2) Regge trajectory: $n_r = \beta M^2 + \beta_0$,

where α , β are the slopes and α_0 , β_0 are the intercepts. These relations arise in most models of quark confinement, but with different values of the slopes.

In Figs. 1, 2 we plot the Regge trajectories in the (J, M^2) and (n_r, M^2) planes for charmonia and bottomonia. We see that the calculated charmonium masses fit nicely to the linear trajectories in both planes (maybe with the exception of the parent trajectories, where the J/ψ and η_c mesons seem to have slightly lower masses). These trajectories are almost parallel and equidistant. For the bottomonium the situation is more complicated. The daughter trajectories, which involve both radially and orbitally excited states, turn out to be almost linear. On the other hand, the parent trajectories, which start from ground states, are exhibiting a nonlinear behaviour in the lower mass region. Such nonlinearity is most pronounced in bottomonium.

State		Theory	Experiment		State		Theory	Theory Experiment	
$n^{2S+1}L_J$	J^{PC}		meson	mass	$n^{2S+1}L_J$	J^{PC}		meson	mass
$1^{1}S_{0}$	0^{-+}	2981	$\eta_c(1S)$	2980.3(1.2)	$2^{3}D_{1}$	1	4150	$\psi(4160)$	4153(3)
$1^{3}S_{1}$	1	3096	$J/\psi(1S)$	3096.916(11)	$2^{3}D_{2}$	$2^{}$	4190		
$2^{1}S_{0}$	0^{-+}	3635	$\eta_c(2S)$	3637(4)	$2^{3}D_{3}$	3	4220		
$2^{3}S_{1}$	1	3685	$\psi(2S)$	3686.09(4)	$2^{1}D_{2}$	2^{-+}	4196	X(4160)?	$4156(^{29}_{25})$
$3^{1}S_{0}$	0^{-+}	3989			$3^{3}D_{1}$	1	4507		
$3^{3}S_{1}$	1	4039	$\psi(4040)$	4039(1)	$3^{3}D_{2}$	$2^{}$	4544		
$4^{1}S_{0}$	0^{-+}	4401			$3^{3}D_{3}$	3	4574		
$4^{3}S_{1}$	1	4427	$\psi(4415)$	4421(4)	$3^{1}D_{2}$	2^{-+}	4549		
$5^{1}S_{0}$	0^{-+}	4811			$4^{3}D_{1}$	1	4857		
$5^{3}S_{1}$	1	4837			$4^{3}D_{2}$	$2^{}$	4896		
$6^{1}S_{0}$	0^{-+}	5155			$4^{3}D_{3}$	3	4920		
$6^{3}S_{1}$	1	5167			$4^{1}D_{2}$	2^{-+}	4898		
$1^{3}P_{0}$	0^{++}	3413	$\chi_{c0}(1P)$	3414.75(31)	$1^{3}F_{2}$	2^{++}	4041		
$1^{3}P_{1}$	1^{++}	3511	$\chi_{c1}(1P)$	3510.66(7)	$1^{3}F_{3}$	3^{++}	4068		
$1^{3}P_{2}$	2^{++}	3555	$\chi_{c2}(1P)$	3556.20(9)	$1^{3}F_{4}$	4^{++}	4093		
$1^{1}P_{1}$	1^{+-}	3525	$h_c(1P)$	3525.41(16)	$1^{1}F_{3}$	3^{+-}	4071		
$2^{3}P_{0}$	0^{++}	3870	$\chi_{c0}(2P)$	3918.4(1.9)	$2^{3}F_{2}$	2^{++}	4361		
$2^{3}P_{1}$	1^{++}	3906			$2^{3}F_{3}$	3^{++}	4400		
$2^{3}P_{2}$	2^{++}	3949	$\chi_{c2}(2P)$	3927.2(2.6)	$2^{3}F_{4}$	4^{++}	4434		
$2^{1}P_{1}$	1^{+-}	3926			$2^{1}F_{3}$	3^{+-}	4406		
$3^{3}P_{0}$	0^{++}	4301			$1^{3}G_{3}$	3	4321		
$3^{3}P_{1}$	1^{++}	4319			$1^{3}G_{4}$	4	4343		
$3^{3}P_{2}$	2^{++}	4354	X(4350)?	4351(5)	$1^{3}G_{5}$	$5^{}$	4357		
$3^{1}P_{1}$	1^{+-}	4337			$1^{1}G_{4}$	4^{-+}	4345		
$4^{3}P_{0}$	0^{++}	4698			$1^{3}H_{4}$	4^{++}	4572		
$4^{3}P_{1}$	1^{++}	4728			$1^{3}H_{5}$	5^{++}	4592		
$4^{3}P_{2}$	2^{++}	4763			$1^{3}H_{6}$	6^{++}	4608		
$4^1 P_1$	1^{+-}	4744			$1^{3}H_{5}$	5^{+-}	4594		
$1^{3}D_{1}$	1	3783	$\psi(3770)$	3772.92(35)					
$1^{3}D_{2}$	$2^{}$	3795		. ,					
$1^{3}D_{3}$	3	3813	X(3820)	3823.5(2.5)					
$1^{1}D_{2}$	2^{-+}	3807							

Table 1: Charmonium mass spectrum (in MeV).

D. EBERT, R. N. FAUSTOV, V. O. GALKIN

State		Theory	Experiment		State		Theory
$n^{2S+1}L_J$	J^{PC}		meson	mass	$n^{2S+1}L_J$	J^{PC}	
$1^{1}S_{0}$	0^{-+}	9398	$\eta_b(1S)$	9398.0(3.2)	$2^{3}D_{1}$	1	10435
$1^{3}S_{1}$	1	9460	$\Upsilon(1S)$	9460.30(26)	$2^{3}D_{2}$	$2^{}$	10443
$2^{1}S_{0}$	0^{-+}	9990	$\eta_b(2S)$	9999(4)	$2^{3}D_{3}$	3	10449
$2^{3}S_{1}$	1	10023	$\Upsilon(2S)$	10023.26(31)	$2^{1}D_{2}$	2^{-+}	10445
$3^{1}S_{0}$	0^{-+}	10329			$3^{3}D_{1}$	1	10704
$3^{3}S_{1}$	1	10355	$\Upsilon(3S)$	10355.2(5)	$3^{3}D_{2}$	$2^{}$	10711
$4^{1}S_{0}$	0^{-+}	10573			$3^{3}D_{3}$	3	10717
$4^{3}S_{1}$	1	10586	$\Upsilon(4S)$	10579.4(1.2)	$3^{1}D_{2}$	2^{-+}	10713
$5^{1}S_{0}$	0^{-+}	10851			$4^{3}D_{1}$	1	10949
$5^{3}S_{1}$	1	10869	$\Upsilon(10860)$	10876(11)	$4^{3}D_{2}$	$2^{}$	10957
$6^{1}S_{0}$	0^{-+}	11061			$4^{3}D_{3}$	3	10963
$6^{3}S_{1}$	1	11088	$\Upsilon(11020)$	11019(8)	$4^{1}D_{2}$	2^{-+}	10959
$1^{3}P_{0}$	0^{++}	9859	$\chi_{b0}(1P)$	9859.44(52)	$1^{3}F_{2}$	2^{++}	10343
$1^{3}P_{1}$	1^{++}	9892	$\chi_{b1}(1P)$	9892.78(40)	$1^{3}F_{3}$	3^{++}	10346
$1^{3}P_{2}$	2^{++}	9912	$\chi_{b2}(1P)$	9912.21(40)	$1^{3}F_{4}$	4^{++}	10349
$1^{1}P_{1}$	1^{+-}	9900	$h_b(1P)$	9899.3(1.0)	$1^{1}F_{3}$	3^{+-}	10347
$2^{3}P_{0}$	0^{++}	10233	$\chi_{b0}(2P)$	10232.5(6)	$2^{3}F_{2}$	2^{++}	10610
$2^{3}P_{1}$	1^{++}	10255	$\chi_{b1}(2P)$	10255.46(55)	$2^{3}F_{3}$	3^{++}	10614
$2^{3}P_{2}$	2^{++}	10268	$\chi_{b2}(2P)$	10268.65(55)	$2^{3}F_{4}$	4^{++}	10617
$2^{1}P_{1}$	1^{+-}	10260	$h_b(2P)$	10259.8(1.2)	$2^{1}F_{3}$	3^{+-}	10615
$3^{3}P_{0}$	0^{++}	10521			$1^{3}G_{3}$	3	10511
$3^{3}P_{1}$	1^{++}	10541	$\chi_b(3P)$	10534(9)	$1^{3}G_{4}$	4	10512
$3^{3}P_{2}$	2^{++}	10550			$1^{3}G_{5}$	$5^{}$	10514
$3^{1}P_{1}$	1^{+-}	10544			$1^{1}G_{4}$	4^{-+}	10513
$4^{3}P_{0}$	0^{++}	10781			$1^{3}H_{4}$	4^{++}	10670
$4^{3}P_{1}$	1^{++}	10802			$1^{3}H_{5}$	5^{++}	10671
$4^{3}P_{2}$	2^{++}	10812			$1^{3}H_{6}$	6^{++}	10672
$4^{1}P_{1}$	1+-	10804			$1^{3}H_{5}$	5^{+-}	10671
$1^{3}D_{1}$	1	10154					
$1^{3}D_{2}$	2	10161	$\Upsilon(1D)$	10163.7(1.4)			
$1^{3}D_{3}^{-}$	3	10166	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				
$1^{1}D_{2}$	2^{-+}	10163					

Table 2: Bottomonium mass spectrum (in MeV).



Figure 1: Parent and daughter (J, M^2) Regge trajectories for charmonium (left) and bottomonium (right) states with natural $(P = (-1)^J)$ parity. Diamonds are predicted masses. Available experimental data are given by dots with particle names. The dashed line corresponds to a nonlinear fit for the parent trajectory.

The origin of this nonlinearity can be easily understood, if one compares the mean radii of these states.

The values of the mean square radii $\sqrt{\langle r^2 \rangle}$ of charmonia and bottomonia, calculated in our model, are given in Table 3. The static potential of the quark-antiquark interaction is plotted in Fig. 3 (solid line). In this figure we also separately plot the contributions from linear confinement (dashed line) and of the modulus of the

As seen form Fig. 3, the Coulomb potential dominates

State	$\sqrt{\langle r^2 \rangle_{\psi}}$	$\sqrt{\langle r^2 angle \gamma}$	State	$\sqrt{\langle r^2 \rangle_{\psi}}$	$\sqrt{\langle r^2 \rangle_{\Upsilon}}$
1S	0.37	0.22	2D	0.99	0.76
1P	0.59	0.41	1H	1.08	0.85
2S	0.71	0.50	3P	1.09	0.84
1D	0.74	0.54	2F	1.09	0.85
2P	0.87	0.65	4S	1.16	0.90
1F	0.87	0.65	3D	1.18	0.94
3S	0.94	0.72	4P	1.26	1.01
1G	0.98	0.75	5S	1.32	1.07

Coulomb potential (dotted line). Table 3: Mean square radii $\sqrt{\langle r^2 \rangle}$ for the spin-singlet states of charmonia and bottomonia (in fm).

for distances less than 0.15 fm, while the confining potential is dominant for distances larger than 0.5 fm. In the intermediate region both potentials play an equally important role. Therefore the light mesons and charmonia (with the exception of the η_c and J/ψ which are in the intermediate region) have characteristic sizes which belong to the region, where the confining potential dominates in the interquark potential. This leads to the emergence of the linear Regge trajectories. On the contrary, the ground and few first excited states of bottomonia have smaller sizes and fall into the region, where the Coulomb part of the potential gives an important contribution. As a result, the parent Regge trajectories of bottomonia are nonlinear, while the daughter trajectories (which fall into the region, where the confining potential is dominant) are still linear ones. In Ref. [6] an interpolating formula between the limiting cases of pure Coulomb and linear interactions was proposed. It can be written as follows:

(a) for the parent trajectory in the (J, M^2) plane: $M^2 = \left(J - \frac{\gamma_1}{(J+2)^2} + \gamma_0\right)/\gamma$,

HQ2013



Figure 2: The (n_r, M^2) Regge trajectories for vector (S-wave), tensor and vector (D-wave) charmonium (left) and bottomonium (right) states (from bottom to top). Notations are the same as in Fig. 1.

(b) for the J = 1 trajectory in the (n_r, M^2) plane: $M^2 = \left(n_r - \frac{\tau_1}{(n_r+2)^2} + \tau_0\right)/\tau$, where the parameters γ , τ , γ_0 , τ_0 and γ_1 , τ_1 determine the slopes, intercepts and nonlinearity of the Regge trajectories, respectively [9]. We find that the nonlinearity of the charmonium Regge trajectories is almost negligible, and its account does not significantly improve the quality of the fit compared to the linear one.

3.1 Comparison with experiment

We first discuss the recently found quarkonium states below the open flavour production threshold. The observation and measurement of the mass of the pseudoscalar ground state η_b [1] provides a significant information about the spinspin interaction in heavy quarkonia. The averaged bottomonium hyperfine splitting measured in $\Upsilon(3S) \rightarrow \eta_b(1S)\gamma$, $\Upsilon(2S) \rightarrow \eta_b(1S)\gamma$ and $\Upsilon(2S) \rightarrow \eta_b(2S)\gamma$ decays is $\Delta M_{\rm hfs}(1S)$ \equiv $M_{\Upsilon(1S)} - M_{\eta_b(1S)} = 69.3 \pm 2.8$ MeV and $\Delta M_{\rm hfs}(2S) \equiv M_{\Upsilon(2S)} - M_{\eta_b(2S)} = 48.7 \pm 2.3 \pm$ 2.1 MeV [1, 11]. Very recently the Belle Collaboration [12] reported the first observation of the radiative transitions $h_b(1P) \rightarrow \eta_b(1S)\gamma$ and $h_b(2P) \rightarrow$ $\eta_b(2S)\gamma$. The measured $\eta_b(1S)$ mass is 9401.0 ± $1.9^{+1.4}_{-2.4}$ MeV, $\eta_b(2S)$ mass is $9999.0 \pm 3.5^{+2.8}_{-1.9}$ MeV and the hyperfine splittings $\Delta M_{\rm hfs}(1S) = 59.3 \pm 1.9^{+2.4}_{-1.4}$ MeV and $\Delta M_{\rm hfs}(2S) = 24.3^{+4.0}_{-4.5}$ MeV [12].



Figure 3: Static potential of the quarkantiquark interaction without the constant term (solid line). Dashed line shows the linear confining potential contribution, while dotted line corresponds to the modulus of the Coulomb potential.

Our predictions for these splittings, $\Delta M_{\rm hfs}(1S) = 62$ MeV and $\Delta M_{\rm hfs}(2S) = 33$ MeV, are in agreement with the experimental values. Note that our model correctly predicts the branching ratios of the corresponding radiative decays [8].

Another important experimental test of the structure of the spin splittings in heavy quarko-

nia comes from the measurement of the masses of the spin-singlet P levels first in charmonium $h_c(1P)$ [1] and very recently in bottomonium $h_b(1P)$ and $h_b(2P)$ [13]. The measured masses of these states almost coincide with the spin-averaged centroid of the triplet states $\langle M({}^{3}P_J)\rangle = [M(\chi_{Q0}) + 3M(\chi_{Q1}) + 5M(\chi_{Q2})]/9$. The hyperfine mass splittings $\Delta M_{\rm hfs}(nP) \equiv$ $\langle M(n^{3}P_J)\rangle - M(n^{1}P_1)$ in bottomonium are found to be $\Delta M_{\rm hfs}(1P) = (1.62 \pm 1.52)$ MeV and $\Delta M_{\rm hfs}(2P) = (0.48^{+1.57}_{-1.22})$ MeV [13]. This observation indicates that the spin-spin contribution is negligible for P levels, and thus shows the vanishing of the long-range chromomagnetic interaction in heavy quarkonia. In our model this is the result of the choice of the value of the long-range chromomagnetic quark moment $\kappa = -1$. Note that our original predictions [8] for the spin-singlet masses are confirmed by these measurements.

The recently observed $\Upsilon(1^3D_2)$ state is the only *D*-wave state found below the threshold of open flavour production. Our prediction for its mass (see Table 2) is in good agreement with the measured value. It will be interesting to observe other $\Upsilon(1D)$ states in order to test further our understanding of spin-orbit and spin-spin interactions in heavy quarkonia. The mass of the newly observed $\chi_b(3P)$ state is also in accord with our prediction.

Next we discuss the observed states above the open flavour production threshold. The most well-established states are the vector 1^{--} states. For charmonium PDG [1] lists seven such states: $\psi(3770), \psi(4040), \psi(4160), X(4260), X(4360), \psi(4415)$ and X(4660), from which only the ψ states are included in the PDG Summary Tables [1]. These states are believed to be ordinary $c\bar{c}$ charmonium (with isospin I = 0). They are well described by our model (see Table 1): $\psi(4040)$ and $\psi(4415)$ are the $3^{3}S_{1}$ and $4^{3}S_{1}$ states, while $\psi(3770)$ and $\psi(4160)$ are the $1^{3}D_{1}$ and $2^{3}D_{1}$ states, respectively. These ψ states fit well to the corresponding Regge trajectories (see Fig. 2). On the other hand, the three new vector states X are considered as unexpected exotic states (their isospin is not determined experimentally). Indeed, we do not have any $c\bar{c}$ candidates for these states in Table 1. Contrary, in Ref. [14] we have found that these states can be described in our model as tetraquarks composed from a diquark and antidiquark $([cq][\bar{cq}], q = u, d)$. In particular, the X(4260) and X(4660) states can be interpreted as the 1^{--} states of such tetraquarks with a scalar diquark $[cq]_{S=0}$ and scalar antidiquark $[c\bar{q}]_{S=0}$ in the relative 1P and 2P states and predicted masses 4244 MeV and 4666 MeV, respectively [14]. The X(4360) can be viewed as the 1⁻⁻ tetraquark with the axial vector diquark $[cq]_{S=1}$ and axial vector antidiquark $[\bar{c}\bar{q}]_{S=1}$ in the relative 1P state, which mass is predicted to be 4350 MeV [14].

The three vector bottomonium states, $\Upsilon(10580)$, $\Upsilon(10860)$ and $\Upsilon(11020)$, observed above open bottom threshold [1], are rather well described in our model as 4^3S_1 , 5^3S_1 and 6^3S_1 states (see Table 2), the mass of $\Upsilon(11020)$ being somewhat higher than the experimental value. They fit to the corresponding Regge trajectory in Fig. 2.

The experimentally observed 2P charmonium states are $\chi_{c2}(2P)$ and $\chi_{c0}(2P)$ which masses are predicted slightly higher (by about 20 MeV and 45 MeV, respectively) in our model. From Table 1 we see that the exotic state X(3872) cannot be described as the $1^{++} 2^3 P_1 c\bar{c}$ state or the $2^{-+} 1^1 D_2 c\bar{c}$ state. If this state belonged to either 2P or 1D multiplets, this could signal a large fine splitting in these multiplets, since the X(3872) mass is 55 MeV below $\chi_{c2}(2P)$ and 100 MeV above $\psi(3770)$. As we see from Table 1, our model does not support such large fine splittings. In Ref. [14] we argued that X(3872) can be considered as the 1^{++} ground state tetraquark, composed from the scalar and axial vector diquark and antidiquark (($[cq]_{S=0}[\bar{cq}]_{S=1} + [cq]_{S=1}[\bar{cq}]_{S=0})/\sqrt{2}$), which mass is predicted to be 3871 MeV. As we see from Table 1, the X(4160) and X(4350) can be attributed judging from the mass value and charge parity C = + both to the pseudo tensor 2^{-+} spin-singlet 2^1D_2 and tensor 2^{++} spin-triplet $3^{3}P_{2}$ charmonium states, respectively. They fit well to the corresponding Regge trajectories in Figs. 1, 2.

The X(4140) state, observed by CDF in $B^+ \to K^+ \phi J/\psi$ decays [15], can correspond in our model to the scalar 0^{++} charmed-strange diquark-antidiquark $[cs]_{S=1}[\bar{c}\bar{s}]_{S=1}$ ground state with predicted mass 4110 MeV, or the axial vector 1^{++} one $([cs]_{S=0}[\bar{c}\bar{s}]_{S=1} + [cs]_{S=1}[\bar{c}\bar{s}]_{S=0})/\sqrt{2}$) with calculated mass 4113 MeV [14]. Two of the three charmonium-like charged X^{\pm} states reported by Belle [16], which are explicitly exotic, can be interpreted in our model as tetraquark states. We do not have tetraquark candidate for the $X(4040)^+$ structure, while the $X(4250)^+$ can be considered as the charged partner of the 1^- 1P state $[cu]_{S=0}[\bar{c}\bar{d}]_{S=0}$ or as the 0^- 1P state of the $([cu]_{S=0}[\bar{c}\bar{d}]_{S=1} + [cu]_{S=1}[\bar{c}\bar{d}]_{S=0})/\sqrt{2}$) tetraquark with predicted masses 4244 MeV and 4267 MeV, respectively [14]. The $X(4430)^+$ could be the first radial (2S) excitation of the 1^+ X(3872) tetraquark or the 0^+ 2S $[cu]_{S=1}[\bar{c}\bar{d}]_{S=1}$ tetraquark, which have very close masses 4431 MeV and 4434 MeV [14].

As we see, a consistent picture of the excited quarkonium states emerges in our model. All well-established states and most of the states, which need additional experimental confirmation, can be interpreted as excited quarkonium or diquark-antidiquark tetraquark states.

4 Conclusions

The mass spectra of charmonia, bottomonia and B_c mesons were calculated in the framework of the relativistic quark model based on the quasipotential approach. Highly radially and orbitally excited quarkonium states were considered. On this basis, the Regge trajectories of heavy quarkonia were constructed both in the (J, M^2) and (n_r, M^2) planes. A different behaviour of these trajectories was observed for parent and daughter trajectories. All daughter trajectories turn out to be almost linear and parallel, while parent trajectories exhibit some nonlinearity. Such nonlinearity occurs only in the vicinity of ground states and few lowest excitations and is mostly pronounced for bottomonia. For charmonia this nonlinearity is only marginal, and its account does not significantly improve the fit. It was shown that the masses of the excited states of heavy quarkonia are determined by the average distances between quarks larger than 0.5 fm, where the linear confining part of the quark-antiquark interaction dominates. This leads to the emergence of almost linear Regge trajectories. On the other hand, a few lowest quarkonium states have average sizes smaller than 0.5 fm and fall in the region, where both the Coulomb and confining potentials play an important role. As a result, the parent Regge trajectories exhibit a certain nonlinearity in this region.

A detailed comparison of the calculated heavy quarkonium masses with available experimental data was carried out. It was found that all data for the states below open flavour production threshold are well reproduced in our model: the difference between predicted and measured masses does not exceed few MeV. For higher excited states, which are above this threshold, most of the well-established conventional states are also well described by our approach, the difference between theory and experiment being somewhat larger, but still within 20 MeV. In this case the multichannel consideration is desirable. It was shown that these states fit well to the corresponding Regge trajectories. Other states, which have unexpected properties and are therefore believed to have an exotic origin, were also discussed. As it was shown in our previous calculation [14], most of these states can be described as diquark-antidiquark tetraquarks. Therefore we have a self-consistent picture of the heavy quarkonium spectra. Future experimental studies of yet unobserved conventional quarkonium states and a clarifica-

tion of the nature and quantum numbers of the exotic quarkonium-like states will provide an additional test of our model.

The authors are grateful to A. Ali, M. A. Ivanov, V. A. Matveev and V. I. Savrin for useful discussions. This work was supported in part by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research under Grant No.12-02-00053-a.

References

- [1] J. Beringer et al. [Particle Data Group], Phys. Rev. D 86, 010001 (2012).
- [2] N. Brambilla et al., Eur. Phys. J. C 71, 1534 (2011).
- [3] E. Klempt and A. Zaitsev, Phys. Rept. 454, 1 (2007).
- [4] D. Ebert, R. N. Faustov and V. O. Galkin, Phys. Rev. D 79, 114029 (2009).
- [5] S. Gupta and S. F. Radford, Phys. Rev. D 24, 2309 (1981); ibid. 25, 3430 (1982); J. Pantaleone, S.-H. H. Tye and Y. J. Ng, Phys. Rev. D 33, 777 (1986).
- [6] M. N. Sergeenko, Z. Phys. C 64, 315 (1994); S. S. Gershtein, A. K. Likhoded and A. V. Luchinsky, Phys. Rev. D 74, 016002 (2006).
- [7] A. M. Badalian, Phys. Atom. Nucl. 74, 1375 (2011).
- [8] D. Ebert, R.N. Faustov and V.O. Galkin, Phys. Rev. D 67, 014027 (2003).
- [9] D. Ebert, R.N. Faustov and V.O. Galkin, Eur. Phys. J. C 71, 1825 (2011).
- [10] D. Ebert, R. N. Faustov and V. O. Galkin, Eur. Phys. J. C 66, 197 (2010).
- [11] S. Dobbs, Z. Metreveli, K. K. Seth, A. Tomaradze and T. Xiao, Phys. Rev. Lett. 109, 082001 (2012).
- [12] I. Adachi et al. [Belle Collaboration], arXiv:1110.3934 [hep-ex]; R. Mizuk et al. [Belle Collaboration], arXiv:1205.6351 [hep-ex].
- [13] J. P. Lees [The BABAR Collaboration], arXiv:1102.4565 [hep-ex]; I. Adachi et al. [Belle Collaboration], arXiv:1103.3419 [hep-ex].
- [14] D. Ebert, R. N. Faustov and V. O. Galkin, Phys. Lett. B 634, 214 (2006); Eur. Phys. J. C 58, 399 (2008); Mod. Phys. Lett. A 24, 567 (2009).
- [15] T. Aaltonen et al. [CDF Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. 102, 242002 (2009).
- [16] S. K. Choi et al. [Belle Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. 100, 142001 (2008); R. Mizuk et al. [Belle Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D 78, 072004 (2008); Phys. Rev. D 80, 031104 (2009).