Measurements of $e^+ e^- \rightarrow K_S^0 K^{\mp} \pi^0 \pi^0$ and $K_S^0 K^{\mp} \pi^\mp \eta$ at center-of-mass energies from 3.90 to 4.60 GeV
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Using 5.2 fb$^{-1}$ $e^+e^-$ annihilation data samples collected with the BESIII detector, we measure the cross sections of $e^+e^-\rightarrow K_0^0K^\mp\pi^\mp$ and $K_0^0K^\mp\pi^\mp\eta$ at center-of-mass energies from 3.90 to 4.60 GeV. In addition, we search for the charmoniumlike resonance $Y(4260)$ decays into $K_0^0K^\pm\pi^\mp$ and $K_0^0K^\pm\pi^\mp\eta$, and $Z_c^{0\pm}(3900)$ decays into $K_0^0K^\pm\pi^\mp0$ and $K_0^0K^\pm\eta$. Corresponding upper limits are provided since no clear signal is observed.
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I. INTRODUCTION

With the experimental progress in the past decade, many charmoniumlike $(XYZ)$ states were observed, which can not be accommodated within the naive quark model and are proposed as the candidate of the hidden-charm exotic mesons [1,2]. In this paper, we focus on the exotic states $Y(4260)$ and $Z_c(3900)$.

$Y(4260)$ was first observed in initial state radiation (ISR) process $e^+e^-\rightarrow \gamma_{ISR}\pi^+\pi^-J/\psi$ by BABAR [3] and confirmed by CLEO [4], Belle [5] and another study of BABAR [6] in its decay into $\pi^+\pi^-J/\psi$. In later experiments, $Y(4260)$ was also observed in $Y(4260)\rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0J/\psi$ [7].

Besides, some similar states are observed in final states, such as $\omega_{c_{10}}$ [8], $\pi^+\pi^-J/\psi$ [9], $\pi^+\pi^-\psi(3686)$ [10], $\pi^+\pi^-h_c$ [11], $\pi^+D^0\bar{D}^{*-}$ [12] around 4.23 GeV. No further open-charm [13–19], hidden-charm [20,21] and charmless [22–24] decay modes have been seen. Different interpretations were proposed to explain its structure, such as the charmonium states 4 $^3S_1$ [25–27] and 3 $^3D_1$ [28], hybrid charmonium [29,30], tetraquark state [31–34], molecular state [35–40], and nonresonance explanation [41–43].

The $Z_c(3900)$ was observed in the $J/\psi\pi^\pm$ invariant mass distribution of the $e^+e^-\rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-J/\psi$ process by the BESIII Collaboration [44]. Subsequently, additional $Z_c(3900)$ decay channels were observed in $D\bar{D}^* + c.c.$ [45–47]. The $J^P$ of $Z_c(3900)$ was determined to be $1^+$ with a partial wave analysis of the $\pi^+\pi^-J/\psi$ final state [48]. Since its discovery, many interpretations on the nature of the $Z_c(3900)$ have been proposed, such as a $D\bar{D}^*$ molecule [49], a tetraquark state [50], a cusp effect [51], and dynamical generation through threshold effects [52,53].
Despite many interpretations, the natures of the $Y(4260)$ and $Z_c(3900)$ are still unclear. To comprehend these states, it is necessary to study more decay modes. All of the observed decay modes of the $Y(4260)$ and $Z_c(3900)$ are associated with the charm sector and no light hadron decay modes have been found yet [54–56]. A search for light hadron decay modes of the $Y(4260)$ and $Z_c(3900)$ is complementary to previous studies and may help to distinguish between different theoretical models and to understand strong interaction effects in this energy region. Among the large number of potential light hadron decay modes, the branching fractions (BFs) of charmonium states decaying into $K_S K^±π^±π^0$ and $K_SK^±π^±π^0η$ are usually large [57]. In four-body final state, there should be abundant intermediate states, which may supply more possible decay channels for searching $Y(4260)$ and $Z_c(3900)$. Furthermore, the existence of charged and neutral pions in the final states enables a study of isospin multiplets. In this paper, we present a measurement of the Born cross sections ($σ_B$) for $e^+e^- → K^0_S K^±π^±π^0$ and $K^0_SK^±π^±π^0$. We also report upper limits of $e^+e^- → Y(4260) → K^±_S K^±π^±π^0$, $e^+e^- → Y(4260) → K^0_SK^±π^±π^0$, $e^+e^- → π^±Z_c(3900)^{±0} → K^0_SK^±π^±π^0$, and $e^+e^- → π^±Z_c(3900)^{±0} → K^0_SK^±π^±π^0$.

II. DETECTORS AND DATA SAMPLES

The BESIII detector [58], operating at the BEPCII collider [59], is a general purpose spectrometer with a geometrical acceptance of 93% of $4π$ solid angle. It has four main components: (1) a small-cell, helium-based (60% He, 40% C$_2$H$_6$) multilayer drift chamber with 43 layers providing an average single-hit resolution of 135 μm, a momentum resolution of 0.5% at 1.0 GeV/c in a 1.0 T magnetic field, and a specific ionization energy loss ($dE/dx$) resolution better than 6%. (2) a time-of-flight (TOF) detector constructed of 5 cm thick plastic scintillators, with 176 strips of 2.4 m length in two layers in the barrel and 96 fans of the end caps with time resolutions of 80 and 110 ps, respectively, which provide a 2π $K/π$ separation for momenta up to $\sim$1.0 GeV/c, (3) an electromagnetic calorimeter (EMC) consisting of 6240 CsI crystals in a cylindrical barrel structure and two end caps with an energy resolution of 2.5% (5%) at 1.0 GeV and a position resolution of 6 mm (9 mm) in the barrel (end caps), and (4) a muon counter consisting of resistive plate chambers in nine barrel and eight end-cap layers, which provide a 2 cm position resolution. More details of the BESIII detector can be found in Ref. [58].

This analysis is based on 5.2 fb$^{-1}$ $e^+e^-$-annihilation data samples [60] collected with the BESIII detector at center-of-mass energies ($\sqrt{s}$) from 3.90 to 4.60 GeV [61], which are listed in Table I. Monte Carlo (MC) simulations are used to optimize the event selection criteria, to study the detector acceptance and to understand the potential backgrounds. The GEANT4-based [62] simulation software BOOST [63] is implemented to simulate the detector response, describe geometry and material, realize digitization, and incorporate time-dependent beam backgrounds. Six generic MC samples, equivalent to the integrated luminosity of the data at the energy points 4.009, 4.230, 4.260, 4.360, 4.420 and 4.600 GeV are generated to study the backgrounds. The primary known decay channels are

| $\sqrt{s}$ (GeV) | $\mathcal{L}$ (pb$^{-1}$) | $N_{sig}$ | $\epsilon$ (%) | $(1 + \delta^{ISR})$ | $\frac{1}{\mathcal{L} \cdot \sigma_B}$ | $\sigma_B$ (pb) |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| 3.896           | 52.61           | 469 $±$ 22 | 16.76          | 1.03            | 1.05            | 74.41 $±$ 3.47 $±$ 3.35 |
| 4.008           | 481.96          | 3335 $±$ 58 | 16.41          | 1.05            | 1.04            | 58.02 $±$ 1.01 $±$ 2.61 |
| 4.086           | 52.63           | 307 $±$ 18 | 16.70          | 1.06            | 1.05            | 47.52 $±$ 2.73 $±$ 2.14 |
| 4.189           | 43.09           | 240 $±$ 16 | 16.31          | 1.08            | 1.06            | 45.38 $±$ 2.94 $±$ 2.04 |
| 4.208           | 54.55           | 269 $±$ 17 | 15.49          | 1.11            | 1.06            | 40.95 $±$ 2.50 $±$ 1.84 |
| 4.217           | 54.13           | 257 $±$ 16 | 16.03          | 1.11            | 1.06            | 38.28 $±$ 2.40 $±$ 1.72 |
| 4.226           | 1091.74         | 5235 $±$ 73 | 15.90          | 1.10            | 1.06            | 39.23 $±$ 0.55 $±$ 0.77 |
| 4.242           | 55.59           | 255 $±$ 16 | 16.02          | 1.10            | 1.06            | 37.46 $±$ 2.35 $±$ 1.69 |
| 4.258           | 825.67          | 3850 $±$ 63 | 15.52          | 1.12            | 1.06            | 38.65 $±$ 0.63 $±$ 0.74 |
| 4.308           | 44.90           | 199 $±$ 15 | 15.55          | 1.11            | 1.06            | 36.86 $±$ 2.62 $±$ 1.66 |
| 4.358           | 539.84          | 2167 $±$ 47 | 15.38          | 1.12            | 1.05            | 33.53 $±$ 0.72 $±$ 1.51 |
| 4.387           | 55.18           | 237 $±$ 16 | 16.00          | 1.15            | 1.05            | 33.68 $±$ 2.20 $±$ 1.52 |
| 4.416           | 1073.56         | 3934 $±$ 63 | 15.21          | 1.14            | 1.05            | 30.38 $±$ 0.49 $±$ 1.37 |
| 4.467           | 109.94          | 378 $±$ 20 | 15.87          | 1.17            | 1.06            | 26.70 $±$ 1.38 $±$ 1.20 |
| 4.527           | 109.98          | 364 $±$ 20 | 15.35          | 1.17            | 1.06            | 26.51 $±$ 1.40 $±$ 1.19 |
| 4.575           | 46.67           | 149 $±$ 13 | 15.15          | 1.19            | 1.06            | 24.87 $±$ 2.06 $±$ 1.12 |
| 4.600           | 566.93          | 1612 $±$ 41 | 15.49          | 1.16            | 1.06            | 22.71 $±$ 0.57 $±$ 1.02 |
generated using EVTGEN [64] with the BF s set to the world average values [57] while the unknown decay modes are generated with LUNDCHARM [65]. Continuum hadronic events are generated with KKMC [66] and QED processes such as Bhabha scattering, dimuon, and dimuon events are generated with KKMC and BABAYAGA [67]. To study the efficiency of each final state, a sample of $1 \times 10^5$ signal events is generated at each energy point using KKMC, which simulates $e^+e^-$ annihilation, including beam energy spread and ISR effects.

III. DATA ANALYSIS

A. Measurement of $\sigma_B(e^+e^- \rightarrow K^0_s K^+\pi^-\pi^0)$ and $\sigma_B(e^+e^- \rightarrow K^0_s K^+\pi^-\eta)$

Candidate events for $e^+e^- \rightarrow K^0_s K^+\pi^-\pi^0/\eta$, with $K^0_s \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ and $\pi^0/\eta \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ are selected according to the following steps. First, $K^0_s$ candidates are selected by looping over all pairs of oppositely charged tracks, which are assumed to be pions. Next, primary and secondary vertex fits [68] are generated with LUNDCHARM [65]. Continuum hadronic events are generated with KKMC and BABAYAGA [67]. To study the efficiency of each final state, a sample of $1 \times 10^5$ signal events is generated using EVTGEN [64] with the BF s set to the world average values [57] while the unknown decay modes are generated with LUNDCHARM [65]. Continuum hadronic events are generated with KKMC [66] and QED processes such as Bhabha scattering, dimuon, and dimuon events are generated with KKMC and BABAYAGA [67]. To study the efficiency of each final state, a sample of $1 \times 10^5$ signal events is generated at each energy point using KKMC, which simulates $e^+e^-$ annihilation, including beam energy spread and ISR effects.

In addition to the two charged tracks that make up the $K^0_s$, two oppositely charged tracks are required. For the latter two charged tracks, the polar angle $\theta$ must satisfy $|\cos \theta| < 0.93$ and the distance of closest approach to the interaction point must be less than 10.0 and 1.0 cm along the beam direction and in the plane perpendicular to the beam direction, respectively. The particle type for each charged track is determined by selecting the hypotheses with the highest probability, which is calculated with the combined information from TOF and $dE/dx$ measurements for different particle hypotheses. One charged track must be identified as a kaon and the other as a pion.

Photons are reconstructed from clusters deposited in the EMC, with the energy measured in the TOF included to improve reconstruction efficiency and energy resolution. At least two photons are required per event. The energy of a photon candidate is required to be larger than 25 MeV in the barrel region ($|\cos \theta| < 0.80$) or 50 MeV in the end-cap region ($0.86 < |\cos \theta| < 0.92$). The cluster timing is required to be between 0 and 700 ns to suppress electronic noise and energy depositions unrelated to the event of interest. To eliminate showers associated with charged particles, the opening angle between a photon candidate and the extrapolated position of the closest charged track should be larger than 20 degrees.

Finally, a four-constraint (4C) kinematic fit imposing energy-momentum conservation is performed to the final states. Only events with $\chi^2_{4C} < 60$ are accepted. For events with more than two photon candidates, the photon pair with the smallest $\chi^2_{4C}$ from the kinematic fit is accepted. After the 4C kinematic fit, no peaking background is observed in the generic MC samples. The invariant mass distributions of $\pi^+\pi^-$ versus $\gamma\gamma$ and the projections onto $M(\pi^+\pi^-)$ and $M(\gamma\gamma)$ after 4C fit are shown in Fig. 1 (at 4.258 GeV as an example), in which obvious $K^0_s$ and $\pi^0/\eta$ peaks are observed. The signal regions are defined as $M(\pi^+\pi^-) \in (0.488, 0.508) \text{ GeV}/c^2$, $M(\gamma\gamma) \in (0.12, 0.15) \text{ GeV}/c^2$ (for the $\pi^0$ mode) and $M(\gamma\gamma) \in (0.52, 0.58) \text{ GeV}/c^2$ (for the $\eta$ mode). The sideband regions are defined as $M(\pi^+\pi^-) \in (0.463, 0.483) \cup (0.513, 0.533) \text{ GeV}/c^2$, $M(\gamma\gamma) \in (0.08, 0.11) \cup (0.16, 0.19) \text{ GeV}/c^2$ (for the $\pi^0$ mode) and $M(\gamma\gamma) \in (0.44, 0.50) \cup (0.60, 0.66) \text{ GeV}/c^2$ (for the $\eta$ mode).

The signal yields at each energy, presented in Tables I and II, are obtained according to $N_{\text{sig}} = N_A - \sum N_B / 2 + \sum N_C / 4$, where $N$ is the number of events and the subscript A denotes the signal region, and the subscripts B and C denote the sideband regions.

The Born cross section is calculated from

\[
\sigma_B = \frac{N_{\text{sig}}}{\mathcal{L} \cdot \mathcal{B} \cdot e \cdot (1 - \delta^{\text{ISR}})} \cdot \frac{1}{|1 - \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{S})|},
\]
TABLE II. Same as Table I for $e^+e^- \rightarrow K_{S}^{0}K^{\pm}\pi^{\mp}\eta$.

| $\sqrt{s}$ (GeV) | $\mathcal{L}$ (pb$^{-1}$) | $N_{sig}$ | $\epsilon$ (%) | $(1 + \delta^{ISR})$ | $\frac{1}{[1-H(x)]^{2}}$ | $\sigma_{B}$ (pb) |
|------------------|--------------------------|---------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|
| 3.896            | 52.61                    | 76 ± 9  | 18.22          | 1.02             | 1.05                      | 27.23 ± 3.22 ± 1.26 |
| 4.008            | 481.96                   | 516 ± 24| 18.19          | 1.04             | 1.04                      | 19.88 ± 0.92 ± 0.94 |
| 4.085            | 52.63                    | 42 ± 7  | 18.07          | 1.05             | 1.05                      | 14.71 ± 2.45 ± 0.70 |
| 4.189            | 43.09                    | 43 ± 7  | 17.92          | 1.09             | 1.09                      | 17.75 ± 2.89 ± 0.84 |
| 4.208            | 54.55                    | 43 ± 7  | 17.76          | 1.08             | 1.06                      | 14.20 ± 2.31 ± 0.61 |
| 4.217            | 54.13                    | 31 ± 6  | 18.06          | 1.09             | 1.09                      | 10.05 ± 1.95 ± 0.41 |
| 4.226            | 1091.74                  | 942 ± 31| 17.85          | 1.08             | 1.06                      | 15.61 ± 0.51 ± 0.64 |
| 4.242            | 55.59                    | 45 ± 7  | 17.86          | 1.08             | 1.05                      | 14.35 ± 0.57 ± 0.66 |
| 4.258            | 825.67                   | 655 ± 26| 17.75          | 1.08             | 1.05                      | 12.67 ± 2.38 ± 0.55 |
| 4.308            | 44.90                    | 32 ± 6  | 17.59          | 1.12             | 1.05                      | 11.38 ± 0.62 ± 0.51 |
| 4.358            | 539.84                   | 349 ± 19| 17.79          | 1.12             | 1.05                      | 13.05 ± 1.96 ± 0.62 |
| 4.387            | 55.18                    | 40 ± 6  | 17.44          | 1.11             | 1.05                      | 10.62 ± 0.43 ± 0.49 |
| 4.416            | 1073.56                  | 638 ± 26| 17.56          | 1.11             | 1.05                      | 10.62 ± 0.43 ± 0.49 |
| 4.467            | 109.94                   | 66 ± 8  | 17.23          | 1.14             | 1.06                      | 10.62 ± 1.29 ± 0.52 |
| 4.527            | 109.98                   | 45 ± 7  | 17.20          | 1.14             | 1.06                      | 7.27 ± 1.31 ± 0.37 |
| 4.575            | 47.67                    | 27 ± 5  | 17.29          | 1.15             | 1.06                      | 9.23 ± 1.84 ± 0.49 |
| 4.600            | 566.93                   | 288 ± 18| 17.20          | 1.18             | 1.06                      | 8.67 ± 0.54 ± 0.43 |

where $\mathcal{L}$ is the integrated luminosity, $\epsilon$ is the detection efficiency, $B$ is the product of the BF of $K_{S}^{0} \rightarrow \pi^{+}\pi^{-}$ and that of $\pi^{0}/\eta \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ [57], $\frac{1}{[1-H(x)]^{2}}$ is the vacuum polarization correction factor [69], and $(1 + \delta^{ISR})$ is the ISR correction factor [70] which is determined by the MC simulation program KKM. The ISR factors are set to 1.0 to get the initial cross section line shape as input to KKM. From KKM, the updated ISR factors are obtained, then the cross section line shape is updated too. We repeat this process until both ISR factors and cross section converge.

The invariant mass distributions of some two or three final state particles at $\sqrt{s} = 4.258$ GeV are shown in Figs. 2 and 3 as examples. There are some intermediate states observed in this four-body decay. To estimate the detection efficiency, a data-driven method is implemented to produce an exclusive MC sample that more closely resembles the data. We generate a mixing MC sample includes intermediate resonances, such as $\rho (770)$ and $K^{*} (892)$, with couplings tuned to match those appear in the data sample and is weighted according to the momentum distributions observed in the data sample. We choose each mixing channel by the order of the intermediate state significance. Then we set the mixing fractions by a rough fit to the two or three body invariant mass distributions and a further tuning. The mixing fractions are identical for all energy points. All mixing channels are generated using phase space (PHSP) generator. As illustrated in Figs. 2 and 3, the reweighted MC sample gives a much better description of the data than a PHSP MC sample. We verify that the remaining invariant mass, momentum, and angular distributions show equally good agreement between the reweighted MC and data. The observed cross sections are presented in Tables I and II, and illustrated in Fig. 4.

B. Upper limits of $e^{+}e^{-} \rightarrow Y(4260) \rightarrow K_{S}^{0}K^{\pm}\pi^{\mp}\eta$ and $e^{+}e^{-} \rightarrow Y(4260) \rightarrow K_{S}^{0}K^{\pm}\pi^{0}\eta$

Since there is no obvious structure in the line shapes of the Born cross sections for $e^{+}e^{-} \rightarrow K_{S}^{0}K^{\pm}\pi^{\mp}\pi^{0}$ and $e^{+}e^{-} \rightarrow K_{S}^{0}K^{\pm}\pi^{0}\eta$, as shown in Fig. 4, the upper limits of $Y(4260) \rightarrow K_{S}^{0}K^{\pm}\pi^{0}\eta$ and $Y(4260) \rightarrow K_{S}^{0}K^{\pm}\pi^{\mp}\eta$ are determined by fitting the line shapes with the function $\sigma_{B}(\sqrt{s}) = f(\sqrt{s}) + BW(\sqrt{s})$. Here $f(\sqrt{s}) = \frac{p_{0}}{(\sqrt{s})^{2}}$ describes the continuum process $e^{+}e^{-} \rightarrow K_{S}^{0}K^{\pm}\pi^{0}/\eta$, the parameters $p_{0}$ is left free in the fit, while $p_{1}$ is fixed to the result from a fit that only uses $f(\sqrt{s})$ to fit the line shapes. $BW(\sqrt{s})$ given in Eq. (2)

$$BW(\sqrt{s}) = \frac{12\pi\Gamma_{e^{+}e^{-}B}\Gamma_{tot}}{(s-M^{2})^{2}+M^{2}F_{tot}^{2}} \tag{2}$$

is a Breit-Wigner function describing the resonance $Y(4260)$, where $M$, $\Gamma_{tot}$, and $\Gamma_{e^{+}e^{-}}$ are the mass, full width, and electronic width of $Y(4260)$, respectively; $B$ is the branching fraction of the decay $Y(4260) \rightarrow K_{S}^{0}K^{\pm}\pi^{\mp}\pi^{0}/\eta$.

The mass and the full width of $Y(4260)$ are set to the world average values $4230 \pm 8$ MeV/c$^{2}$ and $55 \pm 19$ MeV/c$^{2}$ [57]. The product $\Gamma_{e^{+}e^{-}}B$ increases from 0 to 0.5 eV in step length of 0.001 eV. For each value of it, a fitting estimator $Q^{2}$ defined by Eq. (3)

$$Q^{2} = \sum_{i}\left(\frac{\sigma_{B_{i}}-h \cdot \sigma_{B_{i}}^{fit}}{\delta_{i}^{2}}\right)^{2} + \frac{(h-1)^{2}}{\delta_{i}^{2}} \tag{3}$$

is obtained. Here $\sigma_{B}$ and $\sigma_{B_{i}}^{fit}$ are the measured and fitted Born cross sections, $\delta_{i}$ is the energy dependent part of the total uncertainty, which includes the statistical uncertainty and the energy dependent part of systematic uncertainty,
FIG. 2. Some invariant mass (M) distributions of two or three final state particles (a)–(f), momentum (P) distributions of final state particles (g),(h), polar angle (\(\theta\)) distributions of final state particles (i),(j), in process \(e^+ e^- \rightarrow K_0^\pm K^\mp \pi^\mp\pi^\mp\) at 4.258 GeV as examples. The black dots with error bars are the data. The red solid lines are the mixing MC sample. The blue dashed lines are the PHSP MC sample. The pink dash-dotted lines in plot (i) and plot (j) are the MC shape of the \(Z_c(3900)\) with an arbitrary scale.

FIG. 3. Some invariant mass (M) distributions of two or three final state particles (a)–(f), momentum (P) distributions of final state particles (g),(h), polar angle (\(\theta\)) distributions of final state particles (i),(j), in process \(e^+ e^- \rightarrow K_0^\pm K^\mp \pi^\mp\eta\) at 4.258 GeV as examples. The black dots with error bars are the data. The red solid lines are the mixing MC sample. The blue dashed lines are the PHSP MC sample. The pink dash-dotted lines in plot (i) are the MC shape of the \(Z_c(3900)\) with an arbitrary scale.
the δe is the energy independent part of the systematic uncertainty (the systematic uncertainties are described in detail in Sec. III D), h is a free parameter introduced to take into account the correlation of different energy points, and the subscript i indicates the index of each energy point [71].

The Q^2 is used to calculate the likelihood L = e^{-0.5Q^2}, whose normalized distribution is used to get the upper limits of Γ_{ee} B at the 90% confidence level (C.L.), which is determined to be 0.050 and 0.19 eV for the π^0 mode and the η mode, respectively.

### C. Upper limits on σ_B(e^+e^- → π^0±Z_c^0(3900), Z_c^0(3900) → K^0_s K^± π^0) / η)

Since there is no obvious Z_c(3900) signal in the invariant mass distributions of K^0_s K^± π^0 (π^± mode) and K^0_s K^± η (η mode), as shown in Figs. 2 and 3, the upper limits at the 90% C.L. for the production cross section σ_B(e^+e^- → πZ_c^0(3900)) with Z_c(3900) → K^0_s K^± η are determined with an unbinned maximum likelihood fit to the invariant mass of K^0_s K^± η. The fit is performed separately at five large integrated luminosity energy points 4.226, 4.258, 4.358, 4.416, and 4.600 GeV. The fit range is (3.7, 4.1) GeV/c^2. The contribution of non-K^0_s or non-π^0/η backgrounds is negligible. In the fit, the Z_c(3900) signal is described by the MC simulated shape, and the mass and width of the Z_c(3900) are set to theirs world average value 3886.6 ± 2.4 MeV/c^2 and 28.2 ± 2.6 MeV/c^2 [57], respectively. The background is described by a second order polynomial function. Fig. 5 shows the fit results at √s = 4.258 GeV as examples.

The normalized likelihood distribution of the Born cross section L(σ_B) is determined by changing the number of signal events from 0 to 150 with a step size of 1. The upper limit (UL) at the 90% C.L. is calculated by solving the equation

\[ 0.1 = \int_{UL}^{∞} L(σ_B)dσ_B. \]  

The final upper limits are shown in Table III, where all of the systematic uncertainties have been considered, the details of which are explained in Sec. III D. The ratio

\[ R = \frac{σ_B(e^+e^- → πZ_c(3900) → πK^0_s K^± π^0/η)}{σ_B(e^+e^- → πZ_c(3900) → πJ/ψ)} \]

is also given in Table III, where the cross sections for e^+e^- → π^±Z_c(3900)^± → π^±π^±J/ψ and e^+e^- → π^0Z_c(3900)^0 → π^0π^0J/ψ are from Refs. [48] and [72], respectively.
TABLE III. Upper limits on $\sigma_B(e^+e^- \to \pi Z_c(3900), Z_c(3900) \to K_0^0 K \pi/\eta)$, and its ratio (R) to $\sigma_B(e^+e^- \to \pi Z_{c}(3900), Z_{c}(3900) \to \pi J/\psi)$ at the 90% C.L.

| $e^+e^- \to \pi^0 Z_c(3900)^0$ | $\sqrt{s}$ (GeV) | $\sigma_B$ (pb) | R |
|------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---|
| $Z_c(3900)^0 \to K_0^0 K^+\pi^-$ | $e^+e^- \to \pi^0 Z_c(3900)^0$ | 4.226 | $\leq 0.24$ | $\leq 2.5 \times 10^{-2}$ |
| $Z_c(3900)^0 \to K_0^0 K^+\pi^-$ | $\leq 0.17$ | $9.1 \times 10^{-3}$ |
| $e^+e^- \to \pi^0 Z_c(3900)^0$, $Z_c(3900)^0 \to K_0^0 K^+\pi^-$ | $\leq 0.28$ | $5.6 \times 10^{-2}$ |
| $e^+e^- \to \pi^0 Z_c(3900)^0$, $Z_c(3900)^0 \to K_0^0 K^+\pi^-$ | $\leq 0.57$ | $\leq 0.34$ |
| $e^+e^- \to \pi^0 Z_c(3900)^0$, $Z_c(3900)^0 \to K_0^0 K^+\pi^-$ | $\leq 0.45$ | $\leq 0.45$ |

### D. Systematic uncertainties

Various sources of systematic uncertainty are investigated in the $e^+e^- \to K_0^0 K \pi^+\pi^-/\eta$ cross section measurements. We assume that the systematic uncertainties associated with the physics model used in the MC simulation, the luminosity, tracking, PID, $\gamma$ reconstruction efficiency, $K_0^0$ reconstruction efficiency, ISR correction factor, vacuum polarization factor and quoted BFs are energy independent, while the other systematic effects are energy dependent.

For the $\pi^0$ mode, a data-driven MC method is developed to obtain the efficiency. To estimate the uncertainty of this method, one thousand testing samples of $e^+e^- \to K_0^0 K^{+}\pi^{-}\pi^0$ are generated with eighteen different physics processes with random ratios, the ratio of each process is generated using uniform distribution between 0 to 1 and then normalized by the summation of these eighteen ratios.

The difference between the estimated and the real efficiencies is fitted with a Gaussian function. The fit results give a mean of 0.4% which is neglected, and a width of 0.9% which is taken as the systematic uncertainty from the data-driven MC method.

For the $\eta$ mode, which has much lower statistics than the $\pi^0$ mode, alternative mixing ratios are used to generate a new MC sample and the efficiency difference between the two MC samples is adopted as the systematic uncertainty.

The uncertainty on the integrated luminosity is estimated to be 1.0% using Bhabha events.

Both the uncertainties of tracking and particle identification (PID) for charged tracks originating at the interaction point are determined to be 1.0% per track using $J/\psi \to K_0^0 K^{\pm}\pi^\mp$, $J/\psi \to p\bar{p}\pi^+\pi^-$, and $J/\psi \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ [73] as control samples.

The uncertainty due to photon reconstruction efficiency is 1.0% per photon, which is derived from studies of $J/\psi \to \rho^0\pi^0$, $\rho^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-$, $\pi^0 \to \gamma\gamma$ [74].

The uncertainty associated with the $K_0^0$ reconstruction is studied using $J/\psi \to K^+(892)^\pm K^\mp$, $K^+(892)^\pm \to K_0^0 K^{\pm}\pi^\mp$ and $J/\psi \to \phi K_0^0 K^{\pm}\pi^\mp$ control samples and is estimated to be 1.2% [75].

The ISR correction factor introduces a 1.0% uncertainty since the termination condition of the recursion method used to get the correction factor is 1.0% between the last two iterations.

The uncertainty due to the vacuum polarization factor is found to be negligible [69]. The uncertainties of the quoted BFs are also considered.

The energy dependent ones include the systematic uncertainties from the choosing about mass window and sideband regions of $K_0^0$, $\pi^0$, and $\eta$ and the kinematic fit.

The uncertainties associated with the $K_0^0$, $\pi^0$, and $\eta$ invariant mass regions are determined by changing them from (0.488, 0.508) to (0.483, 0.513) GeV/$c^2$, (0.12, 0.15) to (0.115, 0.155) GeV/$c^2$ and (0.52, 0.58) to (0.51, 0.59) GeV/$c^2$ for the $K_0^0$, $\pi^0$, and $\eta$, respectively. The differences in the efficiencies are taken as the corresponding systematic uncertainties.

The uncertainties due to the side-band regions are determined by changing the side-band region to $M_\pi \in (0.44, 0.47) \cup (0.63, 0.66)$ GeV/$c^2$, $M_\pi \in (0.08, 0.095) \cup (0.175, 0.19)$ GeV/$c^2$ and $M_{K_0^0} \in (0.463, 0.473) \cup (0.523, 0.533)$ GeV/$c^2$. The differences are taken as the associated systematic uncertainties.

The uncertainty associated with the kinematic fit is determined by comparing the efficiencies with and without corrections to the track helix parameters.

Assuming all sources of systematic uncertainties are independent, the total uncertainties are the sums of the individual values in quadrature (Table IV).

The systematic uncertainties that affect the upper limits on $\sigma_B(e^+e^- \to \pi Z_c(3900), Z_c(3900) \to K_0^0 K \pi/\eta)$ are considered in two categories: multiplicative and non-multiplicative. The nonmultiplicative systematic uncertainties on the signal shape and the background shape are considered by changing the signal shape to a Breit-Wigner function and varying the fit range, the parameters of the $Z_c(3900)$, and the order of the polynomial functions in the fit. The maximum upper limits are adopted for all combinations of these variations. The intermediate states in the $Z_c(3900)$ decay are considered by generating signal MC samples with alternative processes $Z_c(3900) \to K^+(892)K^-$, $K^+(892) \to K(K_0^0)\pi$ ($\pi^0$ mode), and $Z_c(3900) \to a_0(980)\eta$, $a_0(980) \to K_0^0 K$ ($\eta$ mode). The efficiency difference is considered as a multiplicative systematic uncertainty. All of the systematic uncertainties, which are listed in Table IV, excluding the side-band item and mixing MC item, are considered as the multiplicative systematic uncertainties.
TABLE IV. Summary of systematic uncertainties (in %). The systematic uncertainties listed in this table are related to the Born cross section measurements of processes $e^+e^- \rightarrow K_S^0 K^+\pi^- \pi^0/\eta$ and the upper limits extracted on $e^+e^- \rightarrow Y(4260) \rightarrow K_S^0 K^+\pi^- \pi^0/\eta$ and $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi Z_c(3900) \rightarrow K_S^0 K^+\pi^- \pi^0/\eta$.

| $\sqrt{s}$ (GeV) | 3.896 | 4.008 | 4.085 | 4.189 | 4.208 | 4.217 | 4.226 | 4.242 | 4.258 | 4.308 | 4.358 | 4.387 | 4.416 | 4.467 | 4.527 | 4.575 | 4.600 |
|-----------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Both mode $\mathcal{L}$ | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0   |
| $K_S^0$ | 1.2   | 1.2   | 1.2   | 1.2   | 1.2   | 1.2   | 1.2   | 1.2   | 1.2   | 1.2   | 1.2   | 1.2   | 1.2   | 1.2   | 1.2   | 1.2   | 1.2   |
| Tracking | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   |
| PID | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   |
| $\gamma$ reconstruction | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   | 2.0   |
| $BF^\pm_{e^+e^-}$ | 0.1   | 0.1   | 0.1   | 0.1   | 0.1   | 0.1   | 0.1   | 0.1   | 0.1   | 0.1   | 0.1   | 0.1   | 0.1   | 0.1   | 0.1   | 0.1   | 0.1   |
| $(1 + \delta^{BR})$ | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0   | 1.0   |

The effects of multiplicative systematic uncertainties are taken into account by convolving the distribution of $L'(\sigma_B)$ with a probability distribution function of sensitivity ($S$), which is assumed to be a Gaussian function with central value $\hat{S}$ and standard deviation $\delta_S$ [77]:

$$ L'(\sigma_B) = \int_0^1 L\left(\frac{S}{\hat{S}} \sigma_B \right) \cdot e^{-\frac{(S - \hat{S})^2}{2\delta_S^2}} \, dS. \quad (5) $$

Here $S$ is the sensitivity that refers to the denominator of Eq. (1) and $\delta_S$ is the total multiplicative systematic uncertainty. $L'(\sigma_B)$ is the likelihood distribution of the Born cross section after the multiplicative systematic uncertainties are incorporated.

IV. SUMMARY

The Born cross sections for $e^+e^- \rightarrow K_S^0 K^+\pi^- \pi^0$ and $K_S^0 K^+\pi^- \pi^0/\eta$ are measured with data samples collected at center-of-mass energies from 3.90 to 4.60 GeV. Since no clear structure is observed, the upper limits of the product $\Gamma e^-e^- B(Y(4260) \rightarrow K_S^0 K^+\pi^- \pi^0)$ at 90% C.L. are estimated to be less than 0.05 eV and that of $\Gamma e^-e^- B(Y(4260) \rightarrow K_S^0 K^+\pi^- \eta)$ is estimated to be smaller than 0.19 eV. Reference [9] reported four solutions of the product $\Gamma e^-e^- B(Y(4260) \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-J/\psi)$, in which the maximum is 13.3 $\pm$ 1.4 eV and the minimum is 1.5 $\pm$ 0.3 eV. Comparing them with our results, the branching fraction of the $Y(4260)$ decaying into $K_S^0 K^+\pi^- \pi^0$ and $K_S^0 K^+\pi^- \eta$ is much smaller, which indicates a much smaller coupling of the $Y(4260)$ to the light hadrons $K_S^0 K^+\pi^- \pi^0$ and $K_S^0 K^+\pi^- \eta$. We also search for $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi Z_c(3900)$, $Z_c(3900) \rightarrow K_S^0 K^+\pi^- \eta$ and no obvious $Z_c(3900)$ signal is observed in the charged or neutral mode. The 90% C.L. upper limits on the cross sections are given at $\sqrt{s} = 4.226$, 4.258, 4.358, 4.416, and 4.600 GeV. The absence of a signal suggests that the cross sections for light hadron decay modes are small and that the annihilation of $c\bar{c}$ in the $Y(4260)$ and $Z_c(3900)$ is suppressed. Additional exploration of light hadron decay modes is needed to confirm the hypotheses.
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