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Abstract

In hadron physics, molecular-like multi-hadron states can interact with compact multi-quark states. The latter are modelled as bare states in the Hilbert space of a potential model. In this work, we study several potential models relevant to the bare state, and solve their inverse scattering problems. The first model labelled as ‘cc’ is a separable potential model. We show that it can approximate S-wave near-threshold physics with an error of $\mathcal{O}(\beta^3/M_V^3)$, where $\beta$ sets the maximum momentum of the near-threshold region and $M_V$ is the typical scale of the potential. The second model labelled as ‘bc’ serves as the bare-state-dominance approximation, where interaction between continuum states is ignored. Under this model, we show that a shallow bound state naturally tends to have a small bare-state proportion (which is one minus the compositeness), even if the bare state is crucial for the bound state’s generation. Therefore the bare-state proportion, or the compositeness, cannot figure out the importance of the bare state. The last model labelled as ‘bcc’ is a combination of the former two models. This model not only serves as a correction to the bare-state-dominance approximation, but also can be used to understand the interplay between quark and hadron degrees of freedom. This model naturally leads to the presence of a Castillejo-Dalitz-Dyson (CDD) zero. We consider the energy decomposition of a bound state. The potential ratio of the bare-continuum interaction to the continuum self-interaction is proposed to understand how the bound state is generated. Model-independently, an inequality for the potential ratio is derived. Based on the model ‘bcc’, the CDD zero can be used to estimate the potential ratio. At last, we apply these studies to the deuteron, $\rho$ meson, and $D^*_s(2317)$, and analyze the properties of them.
I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum Chromodynamics (QCD) is the well-established theory of the strong interaction. It describes not only how quarks form hadrons, but also how hadrons interact with each other. However it is difficult to analytically understand these processes within QCD because of its nonperturbative nature. Therefore potential models are still a useful tool in hadron physics.

On the quark level, quarks are placed in a confining potential, and hadrons are bound states in the system. With a suitably designed potential, the model can have a good predictive power. For example, the well-known Godfrey-Isgur model [1] can well describe the mass spectrum of mesons. On the hadron level, hadrons are interacted within a short-range potential. Unlike the quark-level case where bound states can appear both below and above the threshold and no scattering can happen, the hadron-level case can only have bound states below the threshold and scattering happens above the threshold. Various potential models have been used to study the binding and scattering between hadrons. Examples include Hamiltonian effective field theory [2–13] where a potential is parametrized respecting chiral effective field theory, HAL QCD method [14–16] where a potential is reconstructed from Lattice simulated Nambu-Bethe-Salpeter wavefunction, and many potential models for nuclear force like those in Refs. [17–19].

The direct scattering problem starts with a potential, and solves scattering equations to get scattering observables. The inverse scattering problem tries to reconstruct the potential from scattering observables. Most studies of this field were done decades ago. We refer interested readers to a textbook Ref. [20]. There are also inverse scattering problems concerning the off-shell T-matrix instead of the potential (see, e.g., Ref. [21]), which is not the focus of the current work.

Among those studies, however, little attention has been paid to the bare state. In the hadron physics, compact multi-quark states are modelled as bare states, and interact with molecular-like multi-hadron states. For example, in the quark model the $\rho$ meson is a stable bound state of a quark-antiquark pair, while in the real world it can decay to two pions. In the potential model, in addition to the two-pion basis states, one can include the quark-antiquark pair as a bare state to the Hilbert space, and also include the interaction between them. Other examples include the $\Lambda(1405)$ in the $K\bar{N}$-(uds) system [4] and the $D_{s0}^*(2317)$ in the $DK$-(c$\bar{s}$) system [13]. As there are plenty of such kind of systems in hadron physics, the inverse scattering problem with a bare state is worth an exploration, and is the main purpose of this work.

The past works of the inverse scattering problem focus mostly on the reconstruction of the potential. Though in principle one can get any quantity from the potential, it is still interesting to consider using observables to directly construct quantities that are not directly observed, e.g., the wavefunction of the bound state. What’s more, after including the bare state, many new attractive quantities appear, including the bare-state mass, the bare-state proportion in the bound state, and the bare-state distribution in the eigenmodes of the full Hamiltonian. In fact, one of the central topics in hadron physics is to distinguish the structure of hadrons. For the examples introduced before, people want to know if $\Lambda(1405)$ is mostly a $K\bar{N}$ molecular state or a (uds) compact baryon state, and if $D_{s0}^*(2317)$ a $DK$ molecular state or a (c$\bar{s}$) compact meson state. These questions can be summarized in the potential model as how much the bare-state proportion of a bound state is.

Though not starting from the inverse scattering problem, S. Weinberg [22] has found
approximate relations between the compositeness (which is one minus bare-state proportion) of a shallow bound state with the scattering length and effective range. Weinberg’s relations and their extensions [23–47] have been widely used to detect the structure of many hadrons (see Ref. [48] for a review). In fact, one of the extensions [46] by us and our collaborators has made use of techniques from the inverse scattering problem.

Though potential models still prevail in current studies of hadron physics, the inverse problem receives only a little attention. Perhaps the main reason is that the potential can hardly be uniquely determined by observables. But, the success of Weinberg’s exploration mentioned before shows an opportunity that one can still find inverse scattering relations under certain approximations. In this work, we take this opportunity by discussing how some potential models can be used as approximations and studying the inverse scattering problems of them.

In Sec. II, we study the Fredholm determinant that is useful for discussions in inverse scattering problems. In Sec. III, several potential models are discussed. In Sec. IV, those models are applied to analyze real-world systems including the deuteron, $\rho$ meson and $D^{*}_{s0}(2317)$.

II. FREDHOLM DETERMINANT

In this paper, we focus on single continuum-channel systems with or without a single bare state. In the current section, however, systems with an arbitrary number of bare states are also included. For a partial-wave-projected Hamiltonian $H = H_0 + V$, the Fredholm determinant is defined as

$$D(W) := \det \left(1 - \frac{1}{W - H_0} V\right) = \det \left[\frac{1}{W - H_0} (W - H)\right].$$

(1)

In various cases, including the local potential [49, 50], the nonlocal potential [51, 52], and the potential with bare states generated from confined channels [53–56], when $E$ is above the threshold $E_{\text{th}}$, $D(E + i\epsilon)$ proved to satisfy [57]

$$\arg D(E + i\epsilon) = -\delta(E) \mod \pi,$$

(2)

where $\delta$ is the scattering phase shift. For further convenience, we also list some useful alternatives of Eq. (2):

$$e^{i\delta(E)} \sin \delta(E) = -\frac{\text{Im} D(E + i\epsilon)}{D(E + i\epsilon)},$$

(3)

$$\tan \delta(E) = -\frac{\text{Im} D(E + i\epsilon)}{\text{Re} D(E + i\epsilon)}.$$

(4)

From Eq. (1), it is easy to see that $D(W)$ has its zeros residing on the bound states’ energies $E_{B_i}$, its poles on the bare states’ energies $m_{b_i}$, and its branch cut cut starting from the threshold $E_{\text{th}}$ of the only continuum channel to the positive infinity. The zeros and singularities of $D(W)$ prevent its phase from being continuous, so after introducing

$$C(W) := \prod_{i=1}^{N_B} \frac{W - E_{B_i}}{W - E_{\text{th}}},$$

(5)
with $N_b$ and $N_B$ numbers of bare states and bound states respectively, $D(W)/C(W)$ will then have a continual phase possibly except at the threshold. To completely specify the phase convention of $D(W)/C(W)$, we set its phase at complex infinity to be zero:

$$\arg D(\infty)/C(\infty) = 0.$$  \hfill (6)

Because $\text{Im} \, D(E)/C(E) = 0$ below threshold, $\arg D(E)/C(E) = \pi n$ for some integer $n$ for all $E < E_{\text{th}}$. Then $\arg D(E)/C(E) = \arg D(\infty)/C(\infty) = 0$ for all $E < E_{\text{th}}$.

In this work, we also specify the phase convention of the scattering phase shift as

$$\delta(E) := -\arg \frac{D(E + i\varepsilon)}{C(E + i\varepsilon)}.$$  \hfill (7)

From Eq. (5) we know $D(W)/C(W) \sim (W - E_{\text{th}})^{N_B - N_b}$ around the threshold, then we have

$$\delta(\infty) - \delta(E_{\text{th}}) = -\left[ \arg \frac{D(\infty)}{C(\infty)} - \arg \frac{D(E_{\text{th}} + \varepsilon_0 + i\varepsilon)}{C(E_{\text{th}} + \varepsilon_0 + i\varepsilon)} \right]$$

$$= -\left[ \arg \frac{D(E_{\text{th}} - \varepsilon_0)}{C(E_{\text{th}} - \varepsilon_0)} - \arg \frac{D(E_{\text{th}} + \varepsilon_0 + i\varepsilon)}{C(E_{\text{th}} + \varepsilon_0 + i\varepsilon)} \right]$$

$$= -(N_B - N_b) [\arg(-\varepsilon_0) - \arg(\varepsilon_0 + i\varepsilon)] = -\pi(N_B - N_b)$$  \hfill (8)

where we let $\varepsilon \ll \varepsilon_0$, though they are both infinitesimals. The above relation between $\delta(E_{\text{th}})$ and $\delta(\infty)$ is actually a part of the generalized Levinson theorem derived in Ref. [55] (Theorem III) for multichannel scattering with confining potentials. In our convention, we also have $\delta(\infty) = 0$, so $\delta(E_{\text{th}}) = \pi(N_B - N_b)$. Theoretically, the number of bound states and the phase shift are observables, so the Levinson theorem will tell us the number of bare states. Of course, in reality the phase shift at infinity can hardly be seen as an observable, the Levinson theorem can still provide a qualitative estimate about the number of bare states.

$D(W)/C(W)$ is a real analytic function, allowing a standard dispersive analysis that gives

$$\ln \frac{D(W)}{C(W)} = -\frac{1}{\pi} \int_{E_{\text{th}}}^\infty dE \frac{\delta(E)}{E - W},$$  \hfill (9)

where we have assumed

$$\lim_{|W| \to \infty} D(W) = 1.$$  \hfill (10)

Then the dispersive representation of $D(W)$ reads

$$D(W) = \exp \left( -\frac{1}{\pi} \int dE \frac{\delta(E)}{E - W} \right) C(W).$$  \hfill (11)

What’s more, by noting

$$\lim_{|W| \to \infty} W \ln D(W) = \lim_{|W| \to \infty} W \ln \det \left( 1 - \frac{1}{W - H_0} V \right)$$

$$= \lim_{|W| \to \infty} \text{tr} \ln \left( 1 - \frac{1}{W - H_0} V \right)^W $$

$$= \text{tr} \ln \exp(-V) = -\text{tr} V,$$  \hfill (12)
and

$$\lim_{|W| \rightarrow \infty} W \ln D(W) = \lim_{|W| \rightarrow \infty} W \ln \left[ \exp \left( -\frac{1}{\pi} \int dE \frac{\delta(E)}{E - W} \right) C(W) \right]$$

$$= \lim_{|W| \rightarrow \infty} \left[ -\frac{W}{\pi} \int dE \frac{\delta(E)}{E - W} + \ln C(W)^W \right]$$

$$= \frac{1}{\pi} \int dE \delta(E) - \sum_{i=1}^{N_B} (E_{B_i} - E_{\text{th}}) + \sum_{i=1}^{N_b} (m_{b_i} - E_{\text{th}}), \quad (13)$$

one gets a trace formula:

$$\text{tr } V = \sum_{i=1}^{N_B} (E_{B_i} - E_{\text{th}}) - \sum_{i=1}^{N_b} (m_{b_i} - E_{\text{th}}) - \frac{1}{\pi} \int dE \delta(E). \quad (14)$$

III. SEVERAL POTENTIAL MODELS

In this section, we will study the inverse scattering problem for several potential models. We label the first one as ‘cc’, which has a single continuum channel and no bare states, and it is also known as the separable potential model elsewhere. Its Hamiltonian reads

$$H = H_0 + V = \int \frac{p^2 dp}{(2\pi)^3} h_p |p\rangle \langle p| + \lambda_c |f\rangle \langle f|, \quad (15)$$

where $|p\rangle$ are the non-interacting momentum-space continuum states normalized as

$$\langle p|k\rangle = \frac{(2\pi)^3}{p^2} \delta(p - k), \quad (16)$$

$h_p$ is the non-interacting energy, and

$$|f\rangle = \int \frac{p^2 dp}{(2\pi)^3} f(p) |p\rangle. \quad (17)$$

For the $l$-th partial wave, we have $f(p) \rightarrow p^l$ when $p \rightarrow 0$. Without loss of generality, $f(p)$ is assumed to be real. The second model labeled as ‘bc’ includes a continuum channel and a bare state. It has the following Hamiltonian:

$$H = H_0 + V = \left( m |b\rangle \langle b| + \int \frac{p^2 dp}{(2\pi)^3} h_p |p\rangle \langle p| \right) + \lambda_b (|b\rangle \langle f| + |f\rangle \langle b|). \quad (18)$$

This model ignores the interaction between the continuum states. The last model labeled as ‘bcc’ still has a continuum channel and a bare state. It is actually a combination of the former two models:

$$H = H_0 + V = \left( m |b\rangle \langle b| + \int \frac{p^2 dp}{(2\pi)^3} h_p |p\rangle \langle p| \right) + \left[ \lambda_b (|b\rangle \langle f| + |f\rangle \langle b|) + \lambda_c |f\rangle \langle f| \right]. \quad (19)$$
A. Model ‘cc’

The model ‘cc’, or the separable potential model has been widely used mostly because they are easily soluble. In the following, however, we will discuss how it can provide a good approximation for the S-wave near-threshold physics. Let us assume a real-world system described by a Hamiltonian with a specific potential \( V(rw)(\vec{p}, \vec{k}) \). We label the typical momentum scale of \( V(rw)(p, k) \) to be \( M_V \). From dimensional analysis, we should have \( V(rw)(p, k) = \mathcal{O}(M_V^{-2}) \). For example, the well-know Yukawa potential originating from one-boson-exchange reads

\[
V(rw)(\vec{p}, \vec{k}) \propto \frac{1}{(\vec{p} \cdot \vec{k})^2 + M_V^2} = \mathcal{O}(M_V^{-2}),
\]

which after S-wave projection should still be of \( \mathcal{O}(M_V^{-2}) \). Now we want to study how the model ‘cc’ can approximate the near-threshold regime of this system where \( p, k \) are smaller than a momentum \( \beta \).

The potential \( V(rw)(\vec{p}, \vec{k}) \) is a function of three momenta \( \vec{p} \) and \( \vec{k} \). The rotational invariants built of them are \( \vec{p}^2, \vec{k}^2 \) and \( \vec{p} \cdot \vec{k} = p k \cos \theta \). Then in the low-momentum region, the potential can be expanded as a power series in terms of these invariants:

\[
V(rw)(\vec{p}, \vec{k}) = c_0 + c_1 (\vec{p}^2 + \vec{k}^2) + c_2 \vec{p} \cdot \vec{k} + \cdots .
\]

After partial-wave projection, the \( \vec{p} \cdot \vec{k} \) term disappears in the S-wave. Then in the low-momentum region, the corresponding S-wave-projected potential \( V(rw)(p, k) \) can be expanded as

\[
V(rw)(p, k) = v_0 + v_1 (p^2 + k^2) + \cdots .
\]

In the meantime, we can also expand the ‘cc’ potential as

\[
\lambda c f(p) f(k) = \lambda c (f_0 + f_1 p^2 + \cdots )(f_0 + f_1 k^2 + \cdots ) = \lambda c f_0^2 + \lambda c f_0 f_1 (p^2 + k^2) + \cdots .
\]

So by setting \( \lambda c f_0^2 = v_0 \) and \( \lambda c f_0 f_1 = v_1 \), the ‘cc’ potential can reproduce any real-world potential up to the second order of momenta. So the relative error of approximating \( V(rw)(p < \beta, k < \beta) \) is of a higher order: \( \mathcal{O}(\beta^3/M_V^3) \). However, one cannot just conclude that the final error is the same. Because \( V(rw)(p, k) \) of higher momenta can also couple to the low-momentum physics. For example, the second term in the Born series:

\[
\int \frac{q^2 dq}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{V(rw)(p, q)V(rw)(q, k)}{E - h_q},
\]

can receive a contribution of \( \mathcal{O}\left[\frac{1}{M_V^2 M_V^2}\right] \) in the \( q \sim M_V \) region of the integration (we assume \( \mu > M_V \) so that the nonrelativistic approximation \( h_{M_V} \approx M_V^2/2\mu \) works), which is even larger than the first term in the Born series: \( V(rw)(p, k) = \mathcal{O}(M_V^{-2}) \). In Appendix B, we provide an error analysis taking care of the high-momentum region, where we show that the model ‘cc’ can typically approximate the near-threshold physics of a system with a relative error of \( \mathcal{O}(\beta^3/M_V^3) \), providing the absence of a deep bound state.
Now we come to study the model ‘cc’. This model has already been studied decades ago in Refs. [58, 59]. We review and extend their discussions in our notations for completeness.

We first work out the Fredholm determinant:

\[ D(W) = 1 - \lambda_c \langle f | \frac{1}{W - H_0} | f \rangle \equiv 1 - \lambda_c F(W). \]  

(25)

Its imaginary part satisfies

\[ \text{Im} D(h_p + i\varepsilon)/\lambda_c = \pi \langle f | \delta_D(h_p - H_0) | f \rangle = \frac{\pi p^2}{(2\pi)^3 h_p^f} f^2(p) \geq 0, \]  

(26)

where \( \delta_D \) is the Dirac delta function, and \( h_p' = \frac{d}{dp} h_p \). Using Eqs. (25) and (26), one finds (note \( \delta(\infty) = 0 \) by convention)

- \( \lambda_c > 0 \) (repulsive, no bound states): \( \delta \in [-\pi, 0] \) and \( \delta(E_{\text{th}}) = 0 \),
- \( F(E_{\text{th}})^{-1} < \lambda_c < 0 \) (attractive, no bound states): \( \delta \in [0, \pi] \) and \( \delta(E_{\text{th}}) = 0 \),
- \( \lambda_c < F(E_{\text{th}})^{-1} \) (attractive, one bound state): \( \delta \in [0, \pi] \) and \( \delta(E_{\text{th}}) = \pi \).

The Fredholm determinant has the dispersive representation Eq. (11) with

\[ C(W) = \begin{cases} 1 & N_B = 0 \\ \frac{W - E_B}{W - E_{\text{th}}} & N_B = 1 \end{cases}. \]  

(27)

Taking the imaginary part of Eq. (11) and comparing it with Eq. (26), one gets

\[ \lambda_c f^2(p) = \frac{(2\pi)^3 h_p^f}{-\pi p^2} \exp \left( -\frac{1}{\pi} \mathcal{P} \int dE \frac{\delta(E)}{E - h_p} \right) \sin (h_p) C(h_p). \]  

(28)

One can go further when there is a bound state:

\[ |B\rangle = \frac{N}{E_B - H_0} |f\rangle, \]  

(29)

with the normalization factor

\[ N = \langle f | \frac{1}{(E_B - H_0)^2} | f \rangle^{-1/2}. \]  

(30)

This factor also shows up in the derivative of the Fredholm determinant:

\[ \frac{d}{dW} D(W) \bigg|_{W=E_B} = \lambda_c \langle f | \frac{1}{(E_B - H_0)^2} | f \rangle = \exp \left( -\frac{1}{\pi} \mathcal{P} \int dE \frac{\delta(E)}{E - E_B} \right) \frac{1}{E_B - E_{\text{th}}}. \]  

(31)

So one ends up with

\[ |\langle p | B \rangle|^2 = \frac{N^2}{(E_B - h_p)^2} f^2(p) = \frac{E_B - E_{\text{th}}}{(E_B - h_p)^2} \exp \left( \frac{1}{\pi} \int dE \frac{\delta(E)}{E - E_B} \right) \lambda_c f^2(p) \]  

\[ = \frac{-(E_B - E_{\text{th}})}{(h_p - E_{\text{th}})(h_p - E_B)} \frac{(2\pi)^3 h_p^f}{\pi p^2} \sin (h_p) \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{\pi} \mathcal{P} \int dE \left( \frac{\delta(E)}{E - h_p} - \frac{\delta(E)}{E - E_B} \right) \right]. \]  

(32)
A general Hamiltonian with a single bare state can have the following form:

$$H = H_0 + V = \left[ m |b\rangle \langle b| + \int \frac{p^2 dp}{(2\pi)^3} h_p |p\rangle \langle p| \right]$$

$$+ \left[ \lambda_b (|b\rangle \langle f| + |f\rangle \langle b|) + \int \frac{p^2 dp}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{k^2 dk}{(2\pi)^3} V(p, k) |p\rangle \langle k| \right].$$

(33)

The model ‘bc’ can be viewed as a result of the bare-state-dominance approximation. This approximation ignores the $V(p, k)$ term in Eq. (33), and leads us to a Hamiltonian of the form of the model ‘bc’ Eq. (18). The Bloch-Horowitz theory [60, 61] (We provide a simple review in Appendix A) allows one to integrate out the bare state in Eq. (33), then the bare-continuum interaction can be effectively incorporated to an energy-dependent potential:

$$V_{\text{eff}}(p, k; E) = \frac{\lambda_b^2 f(p) f(k)}{E - m} + V(p, k).$$

(34)

So the bare-state-dominance approximation should be good around the energy close to the bare mass.

Now we study the model ‘bc’. The Fredholm determinant of this model is

$$D(W) = 1 - \frac{\lambda_b^2}{W - m} F(W),$$

and its imaginary part is

$$\text{Im} D(h_p + i\varepsilon) = \frac{\lambda_b^2}{h_p - m} \pi \langle f| \delta_D(h_p - H_0) |f\rangle = \frac{\pi p^2}{(2\pi)^3 h'_p} \frac{\lambda_b^2 f^2(p)}{h_p - m}.$$  

(36)

Now the behavior of the phase shift is

- $m - E_{th} > -\lambda_b^2 F(E_{th}) > 0$ (no bound states): $\delta \in [-\pi, 0]$ and $\delta(E_{th}) = -\pi$,
- $m - E_{th} < -\lambda_b^2 F(E_{th})$ (one bound state): $\delta \in [-\pi, 0]$ and $\delta(E_{th}) = 0$.

The Fredholm determinant has the dispersive representation Eq. (11) with

$$C(W) = \begin{cases} \frac{W - E_{th}}{W - m} & N_B = 0 \\ \frac{W - E_B}{W - m} & N_B = 1 \end{cases}. $$

(37)

Using the trace formula Eq. (14) and noting $\text{tr} V = 0$, the bare mass can be found as

$$m = \begin{cases} E_{th} - \frac{1}{\pi} \int dE \delta(E) & N_B = 0 \\ E_B - \frac{1}{\pi} \int dE \delta(E) & N_B = 1 \end{cases}. $$

(38)

This formula can be understood in the extremely-weak-coupling limit $\lambda_b \to 0$, where $\delta(E) = -\pi \theta(m - E)$ with $\theta$ the Heaviside theta function. When $m < E_{th}$, we have $N_B = 1$ and
\[ \delta(E) = -\pi \theta (m - E) = 0. \] When \( m > E_{th} \), we have \( N_B = 0 \). Now taking the imaginary part of Eq. (11) and comparing it with Eq. (36), one gets

\[ \lambda_b^2 f^2(p) = \frac{(2\pi)^3 h'}{p^2} \exp \left( -\frac{1}{\pi} \mathcal{P} \int dE \frac{\delta(E)}{E - h_p} \right) |\sin \delta(h_p)| \times \begin{cases} h_p - E_{th} & N_B = 0 \\ h_p - E_B & N_B = 1. \end{cases} \quad (39) \]

The bare state is distributed in the energy eigenstates:

\[ 1 = \langle b|b \rangle = Z + \int \frac{p^2 dp}{(2\pi)^3} |\langle b|p^+ \rangle|^2, \quad (40) \]

where \( |p^+ \rangle \) are the scattering ‘in’ states, and \( Z \) disappears when no bound states are present. By solving the Lippmann-Schwinger equation

\[ |p^+ \rangle = |p \rangle + \frac{1}{h_p - H_0 + i\varepsilon} V |p^+ \rangle, \quad (41) \]

\( |p^+ \rangle \) is found as

\[ |p^+ \rangle = |p \rangle + c_1 \frac{1}{h_p - m} |b \rangle + c_2 \frac{1}{h_p - H_0} |f \rangle, \quad (42) \]

where

\[ c_1 = \frac{\lambda_b f(p)}{D(h_p + i\varepsilon)}, \quad c_2 = \frac{c_1 - \lambda_b f(p)}{\lambda_b F(h_p + i\varepsilon)}. \quad (43) \]

Using Eqs. (3) and (36), one can get the distribution amplitude:

\[ \langle b|p^+ \rangle = \frac{e^{i\delta} \sin \delta}{\lambda_b f(p)}, \quad (44) \]

and the inverse scattering representation of the distribution:

\[ |\langle b|p^+ \rangle|^2 = \frac{(2\pi)^3 h'}{p^2} \exp \left( \frac{1}{\pi} \mathcal{P} \int dE \frac{\delta(E)}{E - h_p} \right) |\sin \delta(h_p)| \times \begin{cases} 1/(h_p - E_{th}) & N_B = 0 \\ 1/(h_p - E_B) & N_B = 1. \end{cases} \quad (45) \]

We note Eq. (44) reveals that the bare state distribution amplitude is proportional to the T-matrix (\( \propto e^{i\delta} \sin \delta \)). Therefore a resonance peak is expected in the distribution. In fact, this is also true for a general potential as discussed in Ref. [8].

The possible bound state in this model is

\[ |B \rangle = \sqrt{Z} \left( |b \rangle + \frac{\lambda_b}{E_B - H_0} |f \rangle \right), \quad (46) \]

where

\[ Z = |\langle b|B \rangle|^2 = \frac{1}{1 + \langle f| \frac{\lambda_b^2}{(E_B - H_0)^2} |f \rangle}. \quad (47) \]
represents the bare-state proportion of the bound state. $Z$ has a concise dispersive representation

$$Z = \exp \left( \frac{1}{\pi} \int dE \frac{\delta(E)}{E - E_B} \right),$$

which can be derived by noting

$$\langle f \mid \frac{\lambda_b^2}{(E_B - H_0)^2} \mid f \rangle = \left( -\frac{\partial}{\partial W} \right) \left[ \lambda_b^2 F(W) \right] \bigg|_{W = E_B}$$

$$= \left( -\frac{\partial}{\partial W} \right) \left[ W - m - (W - m)D(W) \right] \bigg|_{W = E_B}$$

$$= \left( -\frac{\partial}{\partial W} \right) \left[ W - m - (W - E_B) \exp \left( -\frac{1}{\pi} \int dE \frac{\delta(E)}{E - W} \right) \right] \bigg|_{W = E_B}$$

$$= -1 + \exp \left( -\frac{1}{\pi} \int dE \frac{\delta(E)}{E - E_B} \right).$$

The wavefunction now becomes

$$|\langle p \mid B \rangle|^2 = \frac{1}{h_p - E_B} \frac{(2\pi)^3h_p}{\pi p^2} \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{\pi} \mathcal{P} \int dE \left( \frac{\delta(E)}{E - h_p} - \frac{\delta(E)}{E - E_B} \right) \right] \sin(h_p).$$

We note Eqs. (48) and (50) coincide with the formulas derived in Ref. [46]. This should not come as a surprise, because the approximations employed there are exact in the model ‘bc’. We also note, this formula will be identical to Eq. (32) if one identifies $\delta_{bc}$ with $\delta_{cc} - \pi$. This is also reasonable, because a ‘cc’ model can be recognized as a special case of the ‘bc’ model when $m \to \pm\infty$ with $-\lambda_c^2/m$ fixed at $\lambda_c$, as reflected by Eq. (34). This point was also discovered in Ref. [62].

At last, we also consider the shallow bound state, i.e., a state with $E_B$ close to $E_{th}$. Because of the absence of the continuum self-interaction, the bare state is doubtless crucial to the generation of the bound state. Hence $E_B$ should be sensitive to the bare mass $m$, making it easy to implement the limit $E_B \to E_{th}$ by tuning $m$ with $\lambda_b f_b(p)$ fixed. Then the factor

$$\langle f \mid \frac{\lambda_b^2}{(E_B - H_0)^2} \mid f \rangle = \lambda_b^2 \int \frac{q^2 dq}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{f^2(q)}{(E_B - h_q)^2}$$

diverges in the infrared, and one should see $Z \to 0$ from Eq. (47). So naturally a shallow bound state tends to have a small bare-state proportion, even though the bare state is crucial for its generation.

### C. Model ‘bcc’

In the model ‘bc’, we ignore the whole continuum self-interaction. In the model ‘bcc’, however, we retain part of it, and then this model can serve as a correction to the bare-state-dominance approximation. To be concrete, one can choose a specific energy $h_\beta$ around the bare mass, and set $\lambda_c$ as $V(\bar{p}, \bar{p})/f^2(\bar{p})$, or equivalently, $\langle \bar{p} \mid V_{bcc} \mid \bar{p} \rangle = \langle p \mid V \mid p \rangle$. Then their $\langle \bar{p} \mid T \mid \bar{p} \rangle$ are matched at the leading order of the Born series.
The Fredholm determinant of this model is
\[
D(W) = 1 - \left( \frac{\lambda_b^2}{W - m} + \lambda_c \right) F(W) = 1 - \frac{E_C - W}{E_C - m} \frac{\lambda_b^2}{W - m} F(W), \quad (52)
\]
where
\[
E_C := m - \frac{\lambda_b^2}{\lambda_c} \quad (53)
\]
is known as the Castillejo-Dalitz-Dyson (CDD) zero [63], because it corresponds to a zero of the on-shell T-matrix element \( \langle p | T(h_p + i\varepsilon) | p \rangle \). In this special model, it is even a zero of the off-shell T-matrix element:
\[
\langle p | T(W) | k \rangle = \left( \frac{\lambda_b^2}{W - m} + \lambda_c \right) \frac{f(p) f(k)}{D(W)} = \frac{E_C - W}{E_C - m} \frac{\lambda_b^2}{W - m} \frac{f(p) f(k)}{D(W)} . \quad (54)
\]
At \( E_C \), the system feels as if there are no interactions because the bare-continuum interaction cancels the continuum self-interaction. So the presence of a CDD zero may indicate an interplay between the two interactions. In the context of hadron physics, bare states typically represent compact multi-quark states while continuum states are molecular-like multi-hadron states. The presence of a CDD zero is recognized as an interplay of quark and hadron degrees of freedom [25, 26, 40, 41, 64].

To analyze the bound states of this model, we introduce
\[
A(W) := \frac{\lambda_b^2}{E_C - m} \frac{E_C - W}{W - m} , \quad (55)
\]
so that \( D(W) = 1 - A(W) F(W) \). The analysis of bound states only cares about real-valued \( E < E_{\text{th}} \) where we have \( F(E) < 0 \) and \( F'(E) < 0 \), and hence \( F(E) \) is both negative and monotonically decreasing. If \( A(E) > 0 \), then \( D(E) \geq 1 \) and no bound states can appear because a bound state’s energy satisfies \( D(E_B) = 0 \). If \( A(E) < 0 \), then by noting
\[
A'(E) = -\frac{\lambda_b^2}{(W - m)^2} \leq 0 , \quad (56)
\]
we have
\[
D'(E) = -A'(E) F(E) - A(E) F'(E) \leq 0 , \quad (57)
\]
which means \( D(E) \) is monotonically decreasing except at \( E = m \). The remaining analysis should split into six cases depending on the ordering of \( E_C, m \) and \( E_{\text{th}} \). The results are listed in Table I where we use \((a, b, c)\) to denote the case \(-\infty < a < b < c < +\infty \). Take the first case \((E_C, m, E_{\text{th}})\) as an example, it is easy to find \( D(E < E_C) \geq 1, D(E_C) = 1, D(m_-) = -\infty, D(m_+) = +\infty \) and \( D(E_{\text{th}}) \geq 1 \), so only a single bound state appears and lies in \([E_C, m]\).

From the table, it is easy to summarize that each of conditions \( m < E_{\text{th}} \) and \( D(E_{\text{th}}) < 0 \) can produce a bound state. The condition \( m < E_{\text{th}} \) indicates that a below-threshold bare state can bring a bound state directly. The condition \( D(E_{\text{th}}) < 0 \) can be equivalently expressed as \( \lambda_c - \frac{\lambda_b^2}{E_{\text{th}} - m} < F(E_{\text{th}})^{-1} < 0 \), i.e., negative \( \lambda_c \) and \(-\frac{\lambda_b^2}{E_{\text{th}} - m}\) tend to form a bound
state. Negative $\lambda_c$ corresponds to an attractive continuum self-interaction, and negative $-\frac{\lambda_c^2}{m-E_{th}}$ corresponds to the bare-continuum interaction with an above-threshold bare state. So there are three different ways of forming a bound state: directly by a below-threshold bare state, by an attractive continuum self-interaction, and by the bare-continuum interaction with an above-threshold bare state. On the other hand, we can rewrite Eq. (53) as $\lambda_c = \frac{\lambda_c^2}{m-E_C}$, using which we can get the property of the continuum self-interaction from the relative position between $m$ and $E_C$.

Now we look at the three cases satisfying $m < E_{th}$, where at least a bound state is present, and the bare-continuum interaction resists the generation of the other bound state. Cases $(E_C, m, E_{th})$ and $(m, E_{th}, E_C)$ have repulsive and weak-attractive continuum self-interactions respectively. Both of them cannot form the second bound state. Case $(m, E_C, E_{th})$ has a strong-attractive continuum self-interaction. Two bound states appear only if it is strong enough. This is the only case that two bound states can be formed. If now we turn off the bare-continuum interaction, i.e., we set $\lambda_b = 0$, we will still have two bound states. One is simply the below-threshold bare state, the other is a molecular-like state purely generated by the continuum self-interaction. After we turn on the bare-continuum interaction, the bare state and the molecular-like state are mixed with each other to form two new bound states.

Then we look at the three cases satisfying $m > E_{th}$. Now the bare-continuum interaction behaves as an attractive interaction in forming a bound state. Case $(E_{th}, E_C, m)$ has a strong-repulsive continuum self-interaction, and no bound states can be formed. Case $(E_C, E_{th}, m)$ has a weak-repulsive continuum self-interaction. If the bare-continuum interaction is strong enough, a bound state can be formed. Case $(E_{th}, m, E_C)$ has an attractive continuum self-interaction. A bound state can be formed only if the overall attraction of the two interactions is strong enough. Which interaction dominates the generation of the bound state depends on the relative strength of the two interactions. The ratio $\lambda_c / \left( -\frac{\lambda_c^2}{m-E_{th}} \right) = \frac{m-E_{th}}{E_C-m}$ directly provides a way to quantify the generation mechanism of the bound state. However, there are several flaws. First, the ratio does not have a direct physical meaning. Second, the definition of the ratio relies on the model ‘bcc’, and cannot be generalized. Last, the ratio does not depend on the bound state itself, i.e., it reflects only the relative strength between the two interactions, instead of their impact on the bound state.

With the analysis of bound states, the Fredholm determinant will have the dispersive representation Eq. (11) with

$$ C(W) = \begin{cases} W-E_{th} & N_B = 0 \\ W-m & N_B = 1 \\ W-E_B & N_B = 2 \end{cases} \frac{W-E_{th}}{W-m} \frac{(W-E_{th})(W-E_B)}{(W-E_{th})(W-m)} $$

When $E_C$ is above the threshold, the phase shift at $E_C$ is a multiple of $\pi$. Recalling the definition Eq. (7) and $D(E_C) = D(\infty) = 1$, we have

$$ \delta(E_C) = \arg \frac{C(E_C + i\varepsilon)}{C(\infty + i\varepsilon)} = -\arg \frac{E_C + i\varepsilon - m}{\infty + i\varepsilon - m} = \begin{cases} 0 & E_C > m \\ -\pi & E_C < m \end{cases} $$

where the convention $\delta(\infty) = 0$ is used. So only the case $(E_{th}, E_C, m)$, which has no bound states, can have $\delta(E_C) = -\pi \neq 0$. When $E_C$ below the threshold, one has to locate it as
TABLE I. Bound states of model ‘bcc’ in different cases, where \((a, b, c)\) represents \(-\infty < a < b < c < +\infty\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Bound states</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>((E_C, m, E_{th}))</td>
<td>One in ([E_C, m]).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((m, E_C, E_{th}))</td>
<td>One in ((-\infty, m]). One in ([E_C, E_{th}]) if (D(E_{th}) &lt; 0).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((E_C, E_{th}, m))</td>
<td>One in ([E_C, E_{th}]) if (D(E_{th}) &lt; 0).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((m, E_{th}, E_C))</td>
<td>One in ((-\infty, m]).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((E_{th}, E_C, m))</td>
<td>No bound states.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((E_{th}, m, E_C))</td>
<td>One in ((-\infty, E_{th}]) if (D(E_{th}) &lt; 0).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A zero of the T matrix using analytic continuation. For other behaviors of the phase shift, the discussion is much more complicated than previous models, so we will not analyze them here.

Now because \(\text{tr} V = \lambda_c \langle f|f\rangle \neq 0\), the trace formula Eq. (14) does not provide a useful expression for the bare mass as in Eq. (38). Instead, one should look at

\[
D(E_C \pm i\varepsilon) = 1 = s \exp \left( -\frac{1}{\pi} \int dE \frac{\delta(E)}{E - E_C} \right) C(E_C),
\]

where

\[
s = \begin{cases} 
-1 & E_{th} < E_C < m \\
+1 & \text{Others}
\end{cases}
\]

Then we get the bare mass

\[
m = E_C - s \exp \left( -\frac{1}{\pi} \int dE \frac{\delta(E)}{E - E_C} \right) C_1(E_C),
\]

where \(C_1\) is defined as

\[
C_1(W) := (W - m)C(W) = \begin{cases} 
W - E_{th} & N_B = 0 \\
W - E_B & N_B = 1 \\
(W - E_{B1})(W - E_{B2})/(W - E_{th}) & N_B = 2
\end{cases}
\]

Now we come back to the inverse problem. We first work out the imaginary part of \(D\):

\[
\text{Im} D(h_p + i\varepsilon) = \frac{\pi p^2}{(2\pi)^3 h_p^2} \frac{E_C - h_p \lambda_0^2 f^2(p)}{E_C - m (h_p - m)}. 
\]

Then compare it with the imaginary part of the dispersive representation, one gets

\[
\lambda_0^2 f^2(p) = \frac{(2\pi)^3 h_p^2}{\pi p^2} \frac{E_C - m}{E_C - h_p} \exp \left( -\frac{1}{\pi} \mathcal{P} \int dE \frac{\delta(E)}{E - h_p} \right) \left[ -\sin \delta(h_p) \right] C_1(h_p) 
\]

\[
= \frac{(2\pi)^3 h_p^2}{\pi p^2} \frac{C_1(E_C)}{E_C - h_p} s \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{\pi} \mathcal{P} \int dE \left( \frac{\delta(E)}{E - h_p} - \frac{\delta(E)}{E - E_C} \right) \right] \left[ -\sin \delta(h_p) \right] C_1(h_p),
\]

\[\text{Eq. (65)}\]
where in the second line we have used Eq. (62).

The bare state is distributed in the energy eigenstates:

$$1 = \langle b|b \rangle = \sum_i Z_i + \int \frac{p^2 dp}{(2\pi)^3} |\langle b|p^+ \rangle|^2,$$

(66)

where $|p^+\rangle$ is the scattering 'in' state, and $Z_i := |\langle b|B_i \rangle|^2$ is the bare state proportion of the bound state $|B_i\rangle$. By solving the Lippmann-Schwinger equation Eq. (41), $|p^+\rangle$ can be found to be

$$|p^+\rangle = |p\rangle + \frac{c_1}{h_p - m} |b\rangle + \frac{c_2}{h_p - H_0} |f\rangle,$$

(67)

where

$$c_1 = \frac{\lambda_b f(p)}{D(h_p + i\varepsilon)}, \quad c_2 = \frac{c_1 - \lambda_b f(p)}{\lambda_b F(h_p + i\varepsilon)}.$$

(68)

Note although Eqs. (67) and (68) have exactly the same form with Eqs. (42) and (43), the $D$ and $F$ are different functions. Using Eqs. (3) and (64), one can get the distribution amplitude:

$$\langle b|p^+ \rangle = \frac{e^{i\delta} \sin \delta}{\frac{\pi p^2}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{E_C - h_p}{E_C - m} \lambda_b f(p)}.$$

(69)

and then the inverse scattering representation of the distribution:

$$|\langle b|p^+ \rangle|^2 = \frac{(2\pi)^3 h_p'}{\pi p^2} \frac{E_C - m}{E_C - h_p} \exp \left[ \frac{1}{\pi} \mathcal{P} \int dE \left( \frac{\delta(E)}{E - h_p} \right) \right] \left[ -\sin \delta(h_p) \right] C_1(h_p)$$

$$= \frac{(2\pi)^3 h_p'}{\pi p^2} \frac{C_1(E_C)}{E_C - h_p} \exp \left[ \frac{1}{\pi} \mathcal{P} \int dE \left( \frac{\delta(E)}{E - h_p} - \frac{\delta(E)}{E - E_C} \right) \right] \left[ -\sin \delta(h_p) \right] C_1(h_p).$$

(70)

From now, we focus only on the single bound state case. The bound state can be solved to be

$$|B\rangle = \sqrt{Z} \left( |b\rangle + \frac{\lambda_B}{E_B - H_0} |f\rangle \right),$$

(71)

where $\lambda_B := \lambda_b + \frac{\lambda_c}{\lambda_b} (E_B - m)$ and

$$Z = |\langle b|B \rangle|^2 = \frac{1}{1 + \langle f|\frac{\lambda_B^2}{(E_B - H_0)^2} |f\rangle}.$$
and
\[
\frac{\lambda_B}{\lambda_b} = \frac{E_C - E_B}{E_C - m} = \exp \left( \frac{1}{\pi} \int dE \frac{\delta(E)}{E - E_C} \right),
\]
(74)
one finds the dispersive representation of \( Z \):
\[
Z = \exp \left[ \frac{1}{\pi} \int dE \left( \frac{\delta(E)}{E - E_B} - \frac{\delta(E)}{E - E_C} \right) \right].
\]
(75)
It is now straightforward to get the wavefunction:
\[
|\langle p | B \rangle|^2 = \frac{1}{h_p - E_B} \frac{(2\pi)^3 h'_p}{\pi p^2} \frac{(E_C - E_B)^3}{(E_C - m)^2(E_C - h_p)} \times \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{\pi} \mathcal{P} \int dE \left( \frac{\delta(E)}{E - h_p} - \frac{\delta(E)}{E - E_B} \right) \right] \left[ -\sin \delta(h_p) \right].
\]
(76)
At the end of Sec. III B, it shows that the bare-state proportion \( Z \) cannot faithfully describe the generation of the bound state. In the ‘bc’ model, while the bound state is doubtless generated by the bare state, it can still happen that \( Z \approx 0 \). Now in the ‘bcc’ model, both bare-continuum interaction and continuum self-interaction are included, so it is natural to ask which interaction dominates the generation of the bound state. Qualitatively, Eq. (53) already provides some information by looking at the relative position between \( E_C \) and \( m \). \( E_C < m \) (\( E_C > m \)) indicates a repulsive (attractive) continuum self-interaction, and a larger separation between them indicates a weaker continuum self-interaction, or equivalently a stronger bare-continuum interaction. However this not only does not provide a quantitative criterion, but also has nothing to do with the bound state.
A way to quantify this is to consider the decomposition of the Hamiltonian Eq. (19). The Hamiltonian can be split into four parts:
\[
H = H_0 + V = H_{0b} + H_{0c} + V_{bc} + V_{cc},
\]
(77)
and so does the bound-state energy \( E_B = \langle B | H | B \rangle \), i.e., \( \langle B | H_{0b} + H_{0c} + V_{bc} + V_{cc} | B \rangle \equiv E_{0b} + E_{0c} + E_{bc} + E_{cc} \). To quantify the interplay between the two interactions inside the bound state, we can introduce the potential ratio:
\[
R := \frac{E_{cc}}{E_{bc}}.
\]
(78)
The first three terms of the energy decomposition can actually be model-independently expressed as follows:
\[
\begin{align*}
E_{0b} &= Zm, \\
E_{0c} &= \langle B | H_0 P_X | B \rangle = X E_B - \langle B | VP_X | B \rangle, \\
&= X E_B - E_{bc}/2 - E_{cc}, \\
E_{bc} &= E_B - (E_{0b} + E_{0c} + E_{cc}) = E_B - Zm - X E_B + E_{bc}/2 \\
&= -2Z(m - E_B),
\end{align*}
\]
(79)
When the bare mass is located above the threshold, the bound-state energy is of course smaller than the bare mass. When the bare mass is located below the threshold, according to Table I, there must be a bound state present below the bare mass. So for the single-bound-state case, the bare mass has to be located above the bound-state energy. Then we always have $E_{bc} < 0$, which means that the bare-continuum interaction always has an attractive effect in forming the bound state. Then by noting $E_{0c} = \langle B|H_0P_X|B \rangle \geq XE_{th}$, $E_{cc} \leq E_B - (E_{0b} + XE_{th} + E_{bc}) = -X(E_{th} - E_B) + Z(m - E_B) \leq Z(m - E_B)$, (80) we can derive an inequality for the potential ratio:

$$ R = \frac{E_{cc}}{E_{bc}} \geq \frac{Z(m - E_B)}{-2Z(m - E_B)} = -\frac{1}{2}, $$

(81)
or $E_{cc} \leq -E_{bc}/2$. This inequality puts a general upper limit on the repulsive strength of the continuum self-interaction, exceeding which a bound state is unable to be formed. We emphasize that Eq. (81) holds model-independently whenever the bound state appears below a bare state.

The last term of the energy decomposition should be estimated using the solution Eq. (71):

$$ E_{cc} = Z\lambda_c\lambda_B^2F^2(E_B) = -Z\frac{(m - E_B)^2}{E_C - m}, $$

(82)
where we have used

$$ D(E_B) = 0 \Rightarrow F(E_B) = \frac{E_B - m}{\lambda_B \lambda_b}. $$

(83)
Then the potential ratio becomes

$$ R = \frac{E_{cc}}{E_{bc}} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{m - E_B}{E_C - m}. $$

(84)
So by comparing twice the distance between $E_C$ and $m$ with the distance between $E_B$ and $m$, one can determine which dominates the generation of the bound state. In the hadron physics, there are many states, like $D_{s0}^*(2317)$ and $X(3872)$, which have masses far away from the corresponding quark-model predictions. For such a state, its observed mass is simply $E_B$, and we can treat the quark-model prediction as the bare mass $m$. Then locating the CDD zero can tell us the generation mechanism of the state. What’s more, the potential ratio can also be defined for scattering states:

$$ R(p) := \frac{\langle p^+|V_{cc}|p^+ \rangle}{\langle p^+|V_{bc}|p^+ \rangle} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{m - h_p}{E_C - m}. $$

(85)

IV. ANALYSIS OF REAL-WORLD SYSTEMS

A. Deuteron in proton-neutron system

The deuteron is a shallow bound state of the proton-neutron system. Its properties have been widely studied by hundreds of works (see Ref. [65] for a review). After partial-wave
projection, the relevant channels are $^3S_1$ and $^3D_1$. As the $^3D_1$ channel is only expected to have around 5% contribution, it is reasonable to consider only the $^3S_1$ channel in the first approximation.

The low-energy $^3S_1$ phase shift can be well described by the effective range expansion [66]

$$p \cot \delta_{\text{ERE}} = \frac{1}{a} + \frac{r}{2p^2}$$

(86)

with

$$a = -5.419(7) \, \text{fm}, \quad r = 1.766(8) \, \text{fm}.$$  

(87)

As $\delta_{\text{ERE}}(0) - \delta_{\text{ERE}}(\infty) = \pi$, the Levinson theorem requires the absence of bare states. Of course, the theorem relies on the high energy behavior of the phase shift, which is inaccessible in reality. However it is still reasonable to expect that the possible bare state does not play a significant role, even though we cannot completely rule out the possibility of its existence. Therefore, we consider using the model ‘cc’ to analyze the deuteron.

As discussed in Appendix B, the model ‘cc’ can approximate any S-wave near-threshold physics with an error of $\mathcal{O}(\beta^3/M^3)$. For the deuteron, we can take $\beta$ to be its binding momentum $b = 46$ MeV, and we also take $M = m_\pi = 138$ MeV. Then the error is $\mathcal{O}(4\%)$.

On the other hand, S. Weinberg has developed a method [22] for quantitatively estimating the possible bare-state proportion of the deuteron. The method predicts an unphysical value $Z = -68\%$ with an uncertainty of $\mathcal{O}(b/m_\pi = 33\%)$. Recently, the method was improved in Ref. [46]. It predicts $Z = 0\%$ with an uncertainty of $\mathcal{O}(b^2/m^2_\pi = 11\%)$. Ref. [46] also derived an expression for the deuteron wavefunction, which happens to be exactly the same with Eq. (32) if one identifies $\delta_B$ in that paper with $\delta - \pi$ in Eq. (32). Therefore for the deuteron wavefunction, the model ‘cc’ predicts exactly the same result with that presented in Ref. [46], except the uncertainty changed from $\mathcal{O}(b^2/m^2_\pi = 11\%)$ to $\mathcal{O}(b^3/m^3_\pi = 4\%)$. However, we emphasis that such a change of the uncertainty is not an improvement, because the absence of bare states is assumed a priori in the model ‘cc’.

**B. $\rho$ meson in $\pi\pi-(q\bar{q})$ system**

The observed phase shift of the $\rho$ meson can be well described by a Breit-Wigner (BW) fit up to at least around 1.2 GeV [67, 68] (Though the $K\bar{K}$ channel appears already below 1.2 GeV, the resulting inelasticity is very small):

$$\delta_{\text{BW}}(E) = \arctan \left[ \frac{g^2}{6\pi E (m^2_\rho - E^2)} \right], \quad p = \sqrt{E^2/4 - m^2_\pi},$$

where we take the PDG values [69]: $m_\pi = 140$ MeV, $m_\rho = 775$ MeV and $g = 5.98$. The coupling $g$ is related to the width $\Gamma_\rho = 149$ MeV via

$$\Gamma_\rho = \frac{g^2 p^3_\rho}{6\pi m_\rho}, \quad p_\rho = \sqrt{m^2_\rho/4 - m^2_\pi}.$$  

(89)

This phase shift satisfies $\delta_{\text{BW}}(0) - \delta_{\text{BW}}(\infty) = -\pi$. As there are no bound states, the Levinson theorem requires the existence of a single bare state. Therefore it excludes the applicability of our ‘cc’ model.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \Lambda ) (MeV)</th>
<th>800</th>
<th>1200</th>
<th>1600</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( m ) (MeV) with ( E_C = \infty ) (Model ‘bc’)</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( m ) (MeV) with ( E_C = m_\rho - 1000 ) MeV</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( m ) (MeV) with ( E_C = m_\rho + 1000 ) MeV</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>932</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now we consider the ‘bc’ model. Substituting \( \delta_{\text{BW}} \) in the bare mass formula Eq. (38) simply gives \( m = \infty \) because \( \delta_{\text{BW}}(\infty) \neq 0 \). However this result should not be accepted as true, because the high energy behavior of the phase shift is crucial in deriving it. As mentioned before, the BW fit works at least up to 1.2 GeV. Thus what Eq. (38) really tells us is

\[
m \geq E_{\text{th}} - \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{E_{\text{th}}}^{1.2 \text{GeV}} dE \, \delta_{\text{BW}}(E) = 812 \text{ MeV},
\]

where the inequality holds because \( \delta \leq 0 \) in the model ‘bc’. On the other hand, the model ‘bc’ can be understood as a result of the bare-state-dominance approximation. We do not expect such an approximation to work in the high energy region. So replacing the BW fit with the real-world phase shift up to a higher energy is not a solution for locating the bare mass. Instead, we choose to model the high energy behavior of the phase shift with the following replacement

\[
g^2 \rightarrow g^2(p) = g^2 \left( \frac{1 + \frac{p^2}{m_\rho^2}}{1 + \frac{p^2}{\Lambda^2}} \right)^2,
\]

where \( g^2(p_\rho) = g^2 \) ensures that the near \( \rho \)-mass behavior of the phase shift does not change too much. In fact, the main difference between phase shifts with different \( \Lambda \) is the high energy behavior. We use three different \( \Lambda \) and list the corresponding bare masses in Table II. From the table, the bare mass is expected to have an uncertainty of \( \mathcal{O}(100 \) MeV) coming from the high energy behavior of the phase shift.

With these different \( \Lambda \), we also plot in Fig. 1 the corresponding bare-continuum coupling form factor \( \lambda^2_b f^2(p) \) and the bare state distribution \( \frac{g^2}{(2\pi)^4} |\langle b|p^+ \rangle|^2 \) using Eqs. (39) and (45). While variation of \( \Lambda \) affects \( \lambda^2_b f^2(p) \) a bit, the bare state distribution is quite stable.

Next, we consider the model ‘bcc’. The model requires the existence of a CDD zero. To see how a possible CDD zero may affect our previous predictions, we introduce both \( \Lambda \) and a CDD zero to the BW fit with the following replacement

\[
g^2 \rightarrow g^2(p) = g^2 \left( \frac{1 + \frac{p^2}{m_\rho^2}}{1 + \frac{p^2}{\Lambda^2}} \right)^2 \frac{h_p - E_C}{m_\rho - E_C}.
\]

The observed phase shift does not suggest such a zero to be present close to the range from \( E_{\text{th}} \) to 1200 MeV. We tentatively use \( E_C = m_\rho \pm 1000 \) MeV to study effects of \( E_C \). Using Eq. (62), we include the corresponding bare mass in Table II. From the table, the possible
FIG. 1. Plots of $\lambda^2 b f^2(p)$ and $P_b(p) := \frac{p^2}{(2\pi)^3} |\langle b|p^+ \rangle|^2$ with $\Lambda = 800$(red), 1200(blue), 1600(orange) MeV. The grey vertical line denotes $h_p = m_\rho$.

FIG. 2. Plots of $\lambda^2 b f^2(p)$ and $P_b(p) := \frac{p^2}{(2\pi)^3} |\langle b|p^+ \rangle|^2$ with $\Lambda = 1200$ MeV and $E_C = m_\rho - 1000$ MeV(dashed), $\infty$(solid), $m_\rho + 1000$ MeV(dotted). The grey vertical line denotes $h_p = m_\rho$.

CDD zero is only expected to bring an uncertainty of $O(10$ MeV) to the bare mass. This uncertainty is much smaller than what variation of $\Lambda$ brings.

Then we focus on the $\Lambda = 1200$ MeV case. We plot in Fig. 2 the corresponding $\lambda^2 b f^2(p)$ and $\frac{p^2}{(2\pi)^3} |\langle b|p^+ \rangle|^2$ using Eqs. (65) and (70). We see that while $E_C$ has a drastic effect on $\lambda^2 b f^2(p)$, the bare state distribution is still very stable.

From the above discussions, we have some simple conclusions. First, the bare mass is expected to be larger than 812 MeV, and the precise location of it is more sensitive to $\Lambda$ than $E_C$. The former is related to the bare-continuum interaction, while the latter is to the interplay between bare-continuum interaction and continuum self-interaction. Second, the bare-continuum interaction is sensitive to both $\Lambda$ and $E_C$. Thus it can hardly be determined model-independently. Third, the bare state distribution is quite stable under variations of both $\Lambda$ and $E_C$. Therefore its extractions in Figs. 1 and 2 are reliable.
C. $D_s^0(2317)$ in $DK-(c\bar{s})$ system

$D_s^0(2317)$ can be viewed as a shallow bound state of the $DK-(c\bar{s})$ system. There we have the PDG values \[69\]:

$$E_{th} = 2363 \text{ MeV}, \ E_B = 2318 \text{ MeV}. \quad (93)$$

For the bare $(c\bar{s})$ mass, the well-known Godfrey-Isgur model \[1\] predicts $m = 2480 \text{ MeV}$. On the other hand, a recently published work \[13\] follows the former’s method with updated data, and intentionally removes those masses of near-threshold states as input. It predicts $m = 2406 \text{ MeV}$.

The $Z$ factor of $D_s^0(2317)$ has been investigated by many works \[45, 70–72\] based on Weinberg’s relations, and tends to have a small central value but with a large systematic uncertainty. However, even if $Z$ is small for sure, the potential ratio which measures how $D_s^0(2317)$ is generated is still to be known. In the following, we will focus on it.

Before using the ‘bcc’ model, we first study the system model-independently. Because the bare mass lies above the bound-state energy, we have $R \geq -\frac{1}{2}$ from Eq. (81). Then we get $R \geq -1$ or equivalently $E_{cc} \leq -E_{bc}$, which means that a repulsive continuum self-interaction cannot be stronger than the bare-continuum interaction. For an attractive continuum self-interaction, we consider the model ‘bcc’. First, because in this case we have $E_C > m > E_{th}$, a CDD zero can be observed as a zero of the phase shift. Then from Eq. (84), $R \geq 1$ gives

$$E_C \leq m + \frac{m - E_B}{2}. \quad (94)$$

Using $m = 2480 \text{ MeV}$, we get $E_C \leq 2561 \text{ MeV}$. Using $m = 2406 \text{ MeV}$, we get $E_C \leq 2450 \text{ MeV}$. If future data could exclude the presence of a CDD zero below these energies, the model ‘bcc’ would support that the bare-continuum interaction were the stronger force inside $D_s^0(2317)$, and thus the bare $(c\bar{s})$ state would be crucial for the generation of $D_s^0(2317)$. Of course, this criterion is model-dependent, and its uncertainty needs a further exploration.

V. SUMMARY

In this work, we have studied several toy potential models including their inverse scattering problems. We have also discussed how they can be applied to analysis real-world systems.

The model ‘cc’ has the Hamiltonian Eq. (15). The potential of this model takes a separable form, and hence is also called the separable potential model. We first showed that this model can typically approximate the S-wave near-threshold physics of a system with a relative error of $O(\beta^3/M_V^3)$, providing the absence of a deep bound state. Here $\beta$ is the largest near-threshold momentum and $M_V$ is the typical scale of the potential. Then the inverse scattering representations of some quantities were derived, including the potential Eq. (28), and the possible bound state’s wavefunction Eq. (32).

The model ‘bc’ has the Hamiltonian Eq. (18). This model considers a single bare state, and includes only the interaction between the bare state and the continuum states. This model can be used as an approximation that ignores the continuum states’ self-interaction. The derived inverse scattering representations include the bare mass Eq. (38), the potential Eq. (39), the bare state distribution Eq. (45), and the bare-state proportion $Z$ Eq. (48) and
the wavefunction Eq. (50) of the possible bound state. At the end, we also showed that a shallow bound state tends to have a small bare-state proportion $Z$, even though the bare state plays a crucial role in this model.

The model ‘bcc’ has the Hamiltonian Eq. (19). This model is a combination of the former two models. It can be used to study the correction of the model ‘bc’. A new feature compared to the model ‘bc’ is the presence of a CDD zero, which is a zero of the on-shell T-matrix element. The presence of the zero is recognized as an interplay between the bare-continuum interaction and continuum self-interaction. The derived inverse scattering representations include the bare mass Eq. (62), the potential Eq. (65), the bare state distribution Eq. (70), and the bare-state proportion $Z$ Eq. (75) and the wavefunction Eq. (76) of the possible bound state. We also introduced the potential ratio Eq. (84) for a bound state, which quantifies the relative strength of the continuum self-interaction and the bare-continuum interaction when forming the bound state.

These models were then applied to study several real-world systems. The deuteron was analyzed by the model ‘cc’. Though the prediction for the wavefunction of the deuteron coincides with that in Ref. [46], the model ‘cc’ is expected to have an uncertainty of $\mathcal{O}(b^3/m_\pi^3 = 4\%)$. The $\rho$ meson was analyzed by both the model ‘bc’ and the model ‘bcc’. The results have already been summarized in the last paragraph of Sec. IV B. At last, the potential ratio $R$ of $D_{s0}(2317)$ in the $DK-(c\bar{s})$ system was analyzed. We first showed that model-independently a repulsive $DK$-$DK$ interaction cannot be stronger than the $DK-(c\bar{s})$ interaction inside $D_{s0}(2317)$. Then for the attractive $DK$-$DK$ interaction, based on the model ‘bcc’, we provided a criterion that the bare $(c\bar{s})$ state would be crucial for the generation of $D_{s0}(2317)$ if future experiments could exclude the presence of a CDD zero below 2561 MeV or 2450 MeV. The two energies come from two different quark-model predictions on the bare $(c\bar{s})$ mass from Ref. [1] and Ref. [13] respectively.
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Appendix A: Bloch-Horowitz theory

Consider a separation of the Hilbert space: $1 = P + Q$, where $P$ and $Q$ are projection operators of two subspaces. The Schrödinger equation $H |\psi\rangle = E |\psi\rangle$ becomes

$$\begin{align*}
H_{PP} |\psi_P\rangle + H_{PQ} |\psi_Q\rangle &= E |\psi_P\rangle, \tag{A1} \\
H_{QP} |\psi_P\rangle + H_{QQ} |\psi_Q\rangle &= E |\psi_Q\rangle, \tag{A2}
\end{align*}$$

where $H_{I\bar{J}} := IHJ$ and $|\psi_I\rangle := I |\psi\rangle$ with $I, J = P, Q$. Eq. (A2) gives

$$|\psi_Q\rangle = \frac{1}{E - H_{QQ}} H_{QP} |\psi_P\rangle. \tag{A3}$$
Then substituting it back to Eq. (A1) gives an effective Schrödinger equation:
\[ H_{\text{eff}}(E) |\psi_P\rangle = E |\psi_P\rangle , \]  
(A4)
where \( H_{\text{eff}}(E) \) is the energy-dependent Bloch-Horowitz effective Hamiltonian [60, 61] defined as
\[ H_{\text{eff}}(E) := H_{PP} + H_{PQ} \frac{1}{E - H_{QQ}} H_{QP} . \]  
(A5)

If the original state is normalized as \( \langle \psi | \psi \rangle = 1 \), its \( P \)-space projection will be normalized according to [73]
\[ 1 = \langle \psi_P | \left( 1 + H_{PQ} \frac{1}{(E - H_{QQ})^2} H_{QP} \right) |\psi_P\rangle = \langle \psi_P | \left( 1 - \frac{\partial H_{\text{eff}}(E)}{\partial E} \right) |\psi_P\rangle . \]  
(A6)

It is also convenient to formalize the above discussion when the Hamiltonian can be separated as \( H = H_0 + V \). Then we have
\[ H_{\text{eff}}(E) := H_{0,PP} + V_{PP} + V_{PQ} \frac{1}{E - H_{0,QQ} - V_{QQ}} V_{QP} \equiv H_{0,PP} + V_{\text{eff}}(E) . \]  
(A7)

Appendix B: Approximating S-wave near-threshold physics with a separable potential

We define the \( Q \)-space in the Bloch-Horowitz theory discussed in Appendix A to be all the states with momentum \( q > Q \). Then for the real-world potential \( V^{(\text{rw})}(p, k) \), one gets an effective potential in the remaining \( P \)-space:
\[ V_{\text{eff}}(p, k; E) = V(p, k) + \langle p | V_Q \frac{1}{E - H_{QQ}} Q V |k\rangle \]
\[ = \left[ V(p, k) + \langle p | V_Q \frac{1}{E_0 - H_{QQ}} Q V |k\rangle \right] + \langle p | V_Q \frac{- (E - E_0)}{(E - H_{QQ})(E_0 - H_{QQ})} Q V |k\rangle \]
\[ \equiv [V_e(p, k) + V_f(p, k; E)] \equiv V_e(p, k) + V_f(p, k; E) , \]  
(B1)
where we omit the superscript ‘(rw)’ to simplify the notation, and \( E_0 \) can be chosen as any fixed energy close to \( E_{\text{th}} \).

On the other hand, the same applies to the following separable potential:
\[ V^{(f)}(p, k) = f(p)f(k) , \]  
(B2)
which gives
\[ V_e^{(f)}(p, k) = a f(p)f(k) , \]
\[ V_f^{(f)}(p, k; E) = b(E)f(p)f(k) . \]  
(B3)
where
\[ a = 1 + \langle f_Q | \frac{1}{E_0 - H_{QQ}} f_Q \rangle , \]
\[ b(E) = \langle f_Q | \frac{- (E - E_0)}{(E - H_{QQ})(E_0 - H_{QQ})} f_Q \rangle , \]  
(B4)
and

\[ |f_Q\rangle = Q |f\rangle = \int_Q^\infty \frac{q^2 dq}{(2\pi)^3} f(q) |q\rangle. \tag{B5} \]

Here we want that \( V^{(j)}_e(p, k) \) can approximate \( V_e(p, k) \) up to second order in momenta, and \( V^{(j)}_f(p, k) \) can approximate \( V_f(p, k) \) up to first order in momenta. Consider the expansion

\[ f(p) = f_0 + f_2 p^2 + \mathcal{O}(p^4), \]

one gets

\[ V^{(j)}_e(p, k) = af_0^2 + af_0 f_2 (p^2 + k^2) + \mathcal{O}[p^4, k^4, p^2 k^2], \]

\[ V^{(j)}_f(p, k; E) = b(E) f_0^2 + \mathcal{O}[p^2(E - E_0), k^2(E - E_0)]. \tag{B6} \]

Then we need

\[
af_0^2 = V_e(0, 0), \\
af_0 f_2 = \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial p^2} V_e(p, 0) \right|_{p=0}, \\
b(E) f_0^2 = V_f(0, 0, E). \tag{B7}
\]

The undetermined quantities include \( f_0, f_1 \) and all the \( f^2(q > Q) \). The first two determine the low-momentum behavior of \( f(p) \), while the last one determines the high-momentum behavior, so they can be determined independently. The last one \( f^2(q > Q) \) indicates that we have infinite degrees of freedom. On the other hand, the last equation above is \( E \)-dependent, and can be viewed as infinite equations. One can expand the equation as a power series of \( (E - E_0) \), and retaining a finite number of terms can ensure the existence of a solution. Then one should add \( \mathcal{O}[(E - E_0)^n] \) to \( V^{(j)}_f(p, k; E) \) in Eq. (B6), where \( n \) is the cutoff of the power-series expansion of \( (E - E_0) \), and is assumed to be large enough so that the resulting uncertainty can be ignored in the following error analysis.

Now we analyze the error from this approximation. We label the highest momentum of the states that we want as \( \beta \). According to the effective Schrödinger equation Eq. (A4), all the momenta \( p, k \) in the \( P \)-space will be coupled together, and the energy \( E \) is set to be definite. Therefore we require \( V_{\text{eff}}(p \leq Q, k \leq Q; E \leq \frac{\beta^2}{2m}) \). We also label the typical momentum scale of \( V(p, k) \) to be \( M_V \). As discussed around Eq. (20), we should have \( V(p, k) = \mathcal{O}(M_V^2) \). We will consider the following ordering:

\[ \beta < Q < M_V < \mu, \tag{B8} \]

where the last inequality ensures the nonrelativistic approximation \( h_{M_V} \approx \frac{M_V^2}{2\mu} \).

\( H_{QQ} \) is the Hamiltonian in the \( Q \)-space. We first assume there is no bound states. Then the eigenstates of \( H_{QQ} \) can be chosen as scattering ‘in’ states labelled as \( |q^+_Q\rangle \) with eigenvalue \( h_{qQ} \), and \( qQ \) starts from \( Q \). So we have

\[ V_{e2}(p, k) = \int_Q^\infty \frac{q^2 dqQ}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{\langle p | V | q^+_Q \rangle \langle q^+_Q | V | k \rangle}{E_0 - h_{qQ}}, \]

\[ V_f(p, k; f) = -(E - E_0) \int_Q^\infty \frac{q^2 dqQ}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{\langle p | V | q^+_Q \rangle \langle q^+_Q | V | k \rangle}{(E - h_{qQ})(E_0 - h_{qQ})}. \tag{B9} \]
Because the states $|q^+_Q\rangle$ not only are linear combination of the free states $|q >Q\rangle$, but also have the same normalization convention with them, and recalling $\langle p|V|k\rangle = \mathcal{O}(M_V^{-2})$, we expect also $\langle p|V|q^+_Q\rangle = \mathcal{O}(M_V^{-2})$. The effective potential now scales as follows:

$$V_{e1}(p, k) = V(p, k) = \mathcal{O}\left[\frac{1}{m^2_V}\right],$$

$$V_{e2}(p, k) = \mathcal{O}\left[\frac{1}{m^2_V} \left(\frac{\mu Q}{M^2_V} + \frac{\mu}{M_V}\right)\right] = \mathcal{O}\left[\frac{1}{m^2_V} \frac{\mu}{M_V}\right],$$

$$V_f(p, k; E) = \mathcal{O}\left[\frac{1}{m^2_V} \left(\frac{\mu^2}{QM^2_V} + \frac{\mu^2}{M^2_V}\right)\right] = \mathcal{O}\left[\frac{1}{m^2_V} \frac{\mu^2}{QM^2_V}\right]. \quad (B10)$$

Here for $V_{e2}$ and $V_f$, we consider both $q_Q \sim Q$ and $q_Q \sim M_V$ regions in the $Q$-space integration. The $q_Q \sim M_V$ region dominates $V_{e2}$ while the $q_Q \sim Q$ region dominates $V_f$. We also note, it is the $q_Q \sim M_V$ region of $V_{e2}$ dominates the whole $V_{\text{eff}}$. When $H_{QQ}$ can form a shallow bound state, we expect that the above power counting still holds. When it can form a deep bound state, however, the factor $\frac{1}{E-H_{QQ}}$ can ruin our power counting analysis. The presence of a deep bound state of $H_{QQ}$ indicates that $V_{QQ}$ is a strong attractive interaction. Typically we expect that the attraction gets stronger for lower momentum as the case of one-boson-exchange potential. Therefore $H_{QQ}$ cannot form a deep bound state, if $H$ does not form one.

Considering that $V_e$ has been approximated up to the second order of momenta, and $V_f$ only the first order, the relative error should then scale as

$$\frac{\Delta V_e + \Delta V_f}{V_{\text{eff}}} = \mathcal{O}\left[\frac{Q^4}{M^4_V} + \frac{Q^2}{M^2_V} \frac{\beta^2}{QM_V}\right]. \quad (B11)$$

Recalling that $Q$ is an artificial scale, we can set $Q \sim \beta$ to get

$$\frac{\Delta V_{\text{eff}}}{V_{\text{eff}}} = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\beta^3}{M^3_V}\right), \quad (B12)$$

which holds for all $V_{\text{eff}}(p \leq Q, k \leq Q; E \leq \frac{\beta^2}{2m})$. We also note, we cannot set $Q = \beta$, because the factor $\frac{1}{E-H_{QQ}}$ can touch its singularity and ruin our power counting analysis. But we can set $Q$ a bit higher than $\beta$ so that $\frac{1}{E-h_{qQ}}$ is still of order $\mathcal{O}(\mu/\beta^2)$.
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