

# Signature decay modes of the compact doubly-heavy tetraquarks $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}$ and $T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}$

Ahmed Ali ,

Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron DESY, Notkestr. 85, 22607 Hamburg, Germany

Ishtiaq Ahmed ,

National Center for Physics, Quaid-i-Azam University Campus, Islamabad, 44000, Pakistan

Muhammad Jamil Aslam ,

Department of Physics, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, 45320, Pakistan

## Abstract

Based on the expectations that the lowest-lying double-bottom tetraquark  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}$  ( $J^P = 1^+$ ) and the bottom-charm tetraquark  $T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}$  ( $J^P = 0^+$ ) are stable against strong and electromagnetic decays, we work out a number of semileptonic and non-leptonic weak decays of these hadrons, making use of the heavy quark symmetry. In doing this, we concentrate on the exclusive decays involving also tetraquarks in the final states, i.e., transitions such as  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}} \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(\ell^- \nu_\ell, h^-)$  and  $T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}} \rightarrow T_{cc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(\ell^- \nu_\ell, h^-)$ , where  $h^- = \pi^-, \rho^-, a_1^-$ . So far, only the  $J^P = 1^+$  tetraquark  $T_{cc\bar{u}\bar{d}}$  has been discovered, which we identify with the  $I = 0$   $T_{cc}^+$  object, compatible with  $J^P = 1^+$  and having the mass and decay widths  $\delta m = M(T_{cc}^+) - (M(D^{*+}) - M(D^0)) = -360 \pm 40_{-0}^{+4}$  keV and  $\Gamma(T_{cc}^+) = 48_{-14}^{+2}$  keV. Experimental discoveries of the transitions worked out here will go a long way in establishing the nature of these tetraquarks as (mainly) compact four-quark objects.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The physics of the multi-quark hadrons has emerged as a recurrent theme in high-energy physics, in particular, at the LHC. Prominent among these hadrons is the double-charm tetraquark  $T_{cc\bar{u}\bar{d}}^+$ , called  $T_{cc}^+$  (3875), discovered by LHCb [1] in prompt proton-proton collisions as a very narrow state (FWHM = 48 keV) in the final state  $D^0 D^0 \pi^+$ . It is found just below the  $D^{*+} D^0$  threshold, has a mass  $m(T_{cc\bar{u}\bar{d}}^+) \simeq 3,875$  GeV, and is compatible with being an isoscalar ( $I = 0$ ) with the spin-parity  $J^P = 1^+$ . Its characteristic size, calculated from the binding energy  $\Delta E = -360 \pm 40_{-0}^{+4}$  keV, yields  $R_{\Delta E} = 7.49 \pm 0.42$  fm, too large for a compact hadron, nevertheless having a sizeable cross-section, estimated as  $\sigma(pp \rightarrow T_{cc\bar{u}\bar{d}} + X) = (45 \pm 20)$  nb at  $\sqrt{s} = 13$  TeV for the typical LHCb acceptance ( $2 < p_T < 20$  GeV;  $2 < y < 4.5$ ) [2]. Its nature (hadron molecule or a compact tetraquark) is still being debated.

With this discovery, as well as that of the double-charm ( $C = 2$ ) baryon  $\Xi_{cc}^{++}$ , having the quark content ( $ucc$ ) [3], the focus of the experimental and theoretical research is now on their heavier counterparts, the bottom-charm hadrons ( $C = 1, B = 1$ ),  $\Xi_{bcq}$  and  $T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}$ , and eventually on the double-bottom ( $B = 2$ ) baryons  $\Xi_{bbq}$ , ( $q = u, d, s$ ), and the double-bottom tetraquarks  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}$  and  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{s}}$ . Theoretically, stable (w.r.t. strong decays) heavy multi-quark states were predicted a long time ago [4–6]. Their phenomenology has been studied in several competing theoretical approaches. Among other frameworks, the ones based on diquarks [7, 8] have been extensively used to model compact multi-quark states [9]. More recently, heavy quark-heavy diquark symmetry has been invoked to relate singly heavy mesons, anti-baryons, and double-heavy baryons and tetraquarks [10, 11]. Lately, the role of the local diquark-antidiquark operators in the spectroscopy of tetraquark hadrons has also been investigated using the Lattice-QCD framework [12–15]. In particular, the masses of the ground-state doubly-heavy tetraquarks have been calculated using both the meson-meson and the diquark-antidiquark operators. In one such study, carried out for the  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}$  and  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{s}}$  tetraquarks, an approximately even mix of meson-meson and diquark-antidiquark component are found [12]. Further studies are needed to quantify this prediction, and experimental proofs of the compact nature of the multi-quark states unambiguously are required. We argue here that the weak transitions of doubly-heavy tetraquarks may also reveal the existence of heavy diquarks (and antidiquarks), and we work out some characteristic decays reflecting the underlying compact structures.

We note that the lowest-mass double-bottom tetraquarks  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}$  and  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{s}}$  are estimated lie below their respective strong-decay thresholds. A recent Lattice-QCD simulation [15], puts their masses (measured w.r.t. their respective thresholds) as  $\delta m = -100 \pm 10_{-43}^{+36}$  MeV for the  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}$  and  $\delta m = -30 \pm 3_{-31}^{+11}$  MeV for the  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{s}}$ , similar to earlier estimates [16]. Some weak decays of these tetraquarks have been worked out in a number of papers [17–20], providing estimates for the lifetimes and branching ratios. Of particular interest are the inclusive decays of doubly-bottom tetraquarks  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}} \rightarrow B_c^{(*)} + X$ , as well as of the corresponding baryons [21, 22]  $\Xi_{bbq} \rightarrow B_c^{(*)} + X$ , with detached

$B_c$ -vertex [23] due to the predicted long lifetimes of these hadrons, estimated to lie in the range 0.4 – 0.8 ps [17, 22, 24, 25].

Until recently, there was no consensus on the issue of whether the lowest-mass ( $C = 1, B = 1$ ) tetraquark state is stable against strong and electromagnetic decays, as well as on the assignment of the quantum numbers [26]. However, two recent Lattice-based estimates [13, 14] have posted the mass of the lowest-lying state, with spin-parity  $J^P = 0^+$ , below the  $DB$ -threshold. If confirmed by further theoretical developments, this would make a strong case for the  $T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}$  tetraquark as the first multi-quark state to decay weakly. The corresponding  $J^P = 1^+$  tetraquark is also found in these studies [13, 14] to be below the  $DB^*$ -threshold, though it would decay via electromagnetic transition to  $DB\gamma$  or radiatively to the lower-mass  $J^P = 0^+$  state. This information is helpful for the experimental searches of  $T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}$  tetraquark in focusing on the final states, which can only be reached by charged current weak interactions.

With this hindsight, we shall concentrate here on the weak decays of the double-bottom  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}$  and the bottom-charm  $T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}$  tetraquarks in which the meson-meson and the diquark-antidiquark components are established on the Lattice. Weak decays from the meson-meson components (such as  $BB^{(*)}$ ,  $DB^{(*)}$ ) follow the known patterns, well documented in the Particle data Group tables [27] and are included in the current experimental search strategies [28, 29]. The ones, following from the diquark-antidiquark component discussed in this Letter are new, or at least have not been studied so far quantitatively. In particular, they lead to weak decays involving tetraquarks both in the initial and final states, i.e., they induce transitions, such as  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}} \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}} + X$  and  $T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}} \rightarrow T_{cc\bar{u}\bar{d}} + X$ . We work out some exclusive decays,  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}} \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(\ell^- \nu_\ell, h^-)$  and  $T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}} \rightarrow T_{cc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(\ell^- \nu_\ell, h^-)$ , where  $\ell^- \nu_\ell = e^- \nu_e, \mu^- \nu_\mu, \tau^- \nu_\tau$  and  $h^- = \pi^-, \rho^-, a_1^-$ . They represent signature decay modes of compact tetraquarks, reflecting the heavy diquark configurations in their wave-functions, which dominate over the mesonic configurations at short inter-heavy quark distances [12]. We hope that these weak decay modes of the doubly-heavy hadrons reflecting their diquark components will be included in the experimental search strategies.

Since there is no annihilation or  $W$ -exchange diagrams allowed in these transitions, these decays take place via the so-called color-allowed tree diagrams, shown in Figs. 1, 2. Here,  $b$ -quark acts as the active (or valence) quark. There are two of them in the double-bottom tetraquarks  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}$  and one in  $T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}$ . Weak interaction induces the (dominant)  $b \rightarrow c$  transition, but the crucial difference is that the  $bb$ -diquark emerges in the weak decays as an intact  $bc$  diquark. Invoking the heavy diquark - heavy quark symmetry, we relate the weak decays of these tetraquarks to the corresponding  $B \rightarrow (D, D^*)$  weak decays of the  $B$ -mesons. The decay rates are worked out in the heavy quark symmetry limit, using the HQET (heavy quark effective theory) framework. The reported branching ratios are encouraging to be measured. We note that the High-luminosity LHC (HL-LHC) at CERN [30, 31], and the planned Tera- $Z$  factories [32, 33] are estimated to have large enough data samples [17, 34] to carry out the required measurements.

In Section II, we calculate the semileptonic decays  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}(J^P = 1^+) \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(J^P = 0^+) \ell^- \nu_\ell$ . The decay  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}(J^P = 1^+) \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(J^P = 1^+) \ell^- \nu_\ell$  are presented in Section III. Non-Leptonic decays  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}} \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}} h^-$  ( $h^- = \pi^-, \rho^-, a_1^-$ ) are discussed in Section IV. The semileptonic and non-leptonic decays  $T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(J^P = 0^+) \rightarrow T_{cc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(J^P = 1^+) (\ell^- \nu_\ell, h^-)$  are discussed in Section V. We conclude with a summary in Section VI.

## II. SEMILEPTONIC DECAYS $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}(J^P = 1^+) \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(J^P = 0^+) \ell^- \nu_\ell$

The decay  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}} \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}} \ell^- \nu_\ell$  is governed by the following effective Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}} = 4 \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cb} (\bar{c} \gamma^\mu P_L b) (\bar{\ell} \gamma_\mu P_L \nu_\ell), \quad (1)$$

where  $P_L = \frac{1-\gamma_5}{2}$ , and the corresponding Feynman diagram is shown in Fig. 1 (a).




FIG. 1: Feynman diagram for (a)  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}} \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(\ell^- \nu_\ell)$ , and (b)  $T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}} \rightarrow T_{cc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(\ell^- \nu_\ell)$  where  $\ell, e, \mu, \tau$ .

As discussed in the introduction, we assume that the initial state tetraquark  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}$  has the spin-parity  $J^P = 1^+$  (axial-vector) and the final state  $T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}$  has  $J^P = 0^+$  (scalar).

We shall use the heavy quark effective theory (HQET) [35, 36] to calculate the matrix elements  $\langle T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(p') | \bar{c}\gamma^\mu b | T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}(p, \varepsilon) \rangle$  and  $\langle T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(p') | \bar{c}\gamma^\mu \gamma_5 b | T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}(p, \varepsilon) \rangle$ . To that end, we recall that the superfield combining the pseudo-scalar and vector mesons in HQET can be written as

$$\mathcal{H}_v^{(Q)} = \frac{1 + \not{v}}{2} \left[ P_v^{*\mu(Q)} \gamma_\mu - P_v^{(Q)} \gamma_5 \right], \quad (2)$$

where  $Q = b, c$  and for the vector field  $v \cdot P_v^{(Q)} = 0$ . Similarly, for the axial-vector and the scalar, we just have to multiply it with  $\gamma_5$  from the right, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{H}_v^{(Q)} = \frac{1 + \not{v}}{2} \left[ P_v^{*\mu(Q)} \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 - P_v^{(Q)} \right], \quad (3)$$

where the axial vector part is

$$\mathcal{H}_A^{(Q)} = \frac{1 + \not{v}}{2} \left[ P_v^{*\mu(Q)} \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 \right]. \quad (4)$$

The corresponding conjugate field can be obtained as

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathcal{H}}_A^{(Q)} &= \gamma^0 \mathcal{H}_A^{\dagger(Q)} \gamma^0 = \left[ P_v^{*\mu\dagger(Q)} \gamma^0 \gamma_5 \gamma_\mu^\dagger \right] \frac{1 + \not{v}^\dagger}{2} \gamma^0 = - \left[ P_v^{*\mu\dagger(Q)} \gamma_5 \gamma^0 \gamma_\mu \right] \gamma^0 \gamma^0 \frac{1 + \not{v}^\dagger}{2} \gamma^0, \\ &= \left[ P_v^{*\mu\dagger(Q)} \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 \right] \frac{1 + \not{v}}{2} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

since  $\gamma^0 \gamma_\mu^\dagger \gamma^0 = \gamma_\mu$  and  $\{\gamma_{0,\mu}, \gamma_5\} = 0$ . The important properties are

$$\not{v} \mathcal{H}_A^{(Q)} = \mathcal{H}_A^{(Q)}, \quad \mathcal{H}_A^{(Q)} \not{v} = \mathcal{H}_A^{(Q)}. \quad (6)$$

The conjugate of the scalar part can be written as

$$\bar{\mathcal{H}}_S^{(Q)} = \gamma^0 \frac{1 + \not{v}^\dagger}{2} P_v^{\dagger(Q)} \gamma^0 = \frac{1 + \not{v}}{2} P_v^{\dagger(Q)}. \quad (7)$$

In the HQET, the matrix elements can be parameterized as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\langle T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(v') | \bar{c}\gamma^\mu b | T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}(v, \varepsilon) \rangle}{\sqrt{m_T m_{T'}}} &= h_1(w) i\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \varepsilon_\nu v_\alpha v'_\beta, \\ \frac{\langle T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(v') | \bar{c}\gamma^\mu \gamma_5 b | T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}(v, \varepsilon) \rangle}{\sqrt{m_T m_{T'}}} &= (h_2(w) (w+1) \varepsilon^\mu - h_3(w) (\varepsilon \cdot v') v^\mu - h_4(w) (\varepsilon \cdot v) v'^\mu). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where  $m_T$  and  $m_{T'}$  denote the masses of initial ( $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}$ ) and final state ( $T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}$ ) tetraquarks, respectively. The corresponding form factors for the transitions  $B \rightarrow (D, D^*) \ell^- \nu_\ell$  have been investigated at length, but the ones for the tetraquarks are yet to be studied.

Using the spin symmetry to relate the various form factors, at the leading order (LO) in heavy quark mass, we can write

$$\left\langle \mathcal{H}_S^{(Q')} | \bar{Q}' \Gamma Q | \mathcal{H}_A^{(Q)} \right\rangle = -\xi(w) \text{Tr} \left\{ \bar{\mathcal{H}}_S^{(Q')} \Gamma \mathcal{H}_A^{(Q)} \right\}, \quad (9)$$

where  $\Gamma$  is a particular combination of  $\gamma$ -matrices and  $Q', Q$  are the  $c, b$  quarks with velocities  $v', v$ , respectively. It involves a single non-perturbative function  $\xi(w \equiv v \cdot v')$ , i.e., the Isgur-Wise function. We note that there are two  $b$  quarks present in  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}$ , and in the weak transition only one active  $b$ -quark is involved at a time, with the other treated as a spectator. There are no annihilation or  $W^\pm$ -exchange diagrams involving the two  $b$  quarks. However, due to the multiplicity of the  $b$ -quarks in the initial hadron, the decay rate is to be multiplied by 2.

Using Eqs. (4) and (7) in Eq. (9), for vector and axial-vector currents, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \mathcal{H}_S^{(Q')} | \bar{c}_{v'} \gamma^\mu b_v | \mathcal{H}_A^{(Q)} \right\rangle &= -\xi(w) \text{Tr} \left\{ P_{v'}^{\dagger(Q)} \frac{1 + \not{v}'}{2} \gamma_\mu \frac{1 + \not{v}}{2} \left[ P_v^{*\alpha(Q)} \gamma_\alpha \gamma_5 \right] \right\} \\ &= i\xi(w) \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \varepsilon_\nu v_\alpha v'_\beta, \\ \left\langle \mathcal{H}_S^{(Q')} | \bar{c}_{v'} \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 b_v | \mathcal{H}_A^{(Q)} \right\rangle &= -\xi(w) \text{Tr} \left\{ P_{v'}^{\dagger(Q)} \frac{1 + \not{v}'}{2} \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 \frac{1 + \not{v}}{2} \left[ P_v^{*\alpha(Q)} \gamma_\alpha \gamma_5 \right] \right\} \\ &= \xi(w) [(w+1) \varepsilon^\mu - (\varepsilon \cdot v') v^\mu]. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Comparing Eq. (8) and Eq. (10), one gets

$$h_1 = h_2 = h_3 = \xi(w) \quad (11)$$

and  $h_4 = 0$ .

Therefore, the hadronic part of the transition amplitude becomes

$$\mathcal{M}^\mu = -\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cb} \xi(w) \sqrt{m_T m_{T'}} [(w+1) \varepsilon^\mu - (\varepsilon \cdot v') v^\mu - i \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \varepsilon_\nu v_\alpha v'_\beta]. \quad (12)$$

In  $B \rightarrow (D, D^*) \ell^- \nu_\ell$  decays, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\langle D(v') | \bar{c} \gamma^\mu b | B(v) \rangle}{\sqrt{m_B m_D}} &= h_+(w) (v + v')^\mu + h_-(w) (v - v')^\mu, \\ \frac{\langle D^*(v', \varepsilon') | \bar{c} \gamma^\mu b | B(v) \rangle}{\sqrt{m_B m_{D^*}}} &= i h_V(w) \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \varepsilon^{*\nu} v'^\alpha v^\beta, \\ \frac{\langle D^*(v', \varepsilon') | \bar{c} \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 b | B(v) \rangle}{\sqrt{m_B m_{D^*}}} &= h_{A_1}(w) (w+1) \varepsilon^{*\mu} - h_{A_2}(w) \varepsilon^{*\nu} \cdot v v^\mu - h_{A_3}(w) \varepsilon^{*\nu} \cdot v v'^\mu. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Using the procedure adopted in Eq. (10), with the field defined in Eq. (2), one gets the well-known Isgur-Wise function for the weak transitions in  $B$ -meson decays [37, 38], i.e.,

$$h_+(w) = h_1(w) = h_2(w) = h_3(w) = \xi^{B \rightarrow D^{(*)}}(w). \quad (14)$$

In the symmetry limit, there is a single Isgur-Wise function, for both the  $B \rightarrow D$  and  $B \rightarrow D^*$  transitions, which is normalised at the symmetry-point:  $\xi^{B \rightarrow D^{(*)}}(w=1) = 1$ . Symmetry-breaking corrections of  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s(m_b))$  and power corrections of  $\mathcal{O}(\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}/m_b)$  have been calculated [39]. They yield  $\xi^{B \rightarrow D}(w=1) = 0.98 \pm 0.07$  [40]. For the  $B \rightarrow D^* \ell^- \nu_\ell$ , Luke's theorem protects the leading order corrections [41], with the second-order yielding  $\xi^{B \rightarrow D^*}(w=1) = 0.91 \pm 0.03$  [42–44]. They have been used in the precise determination of the CKM matrix element  $|V_{cb}|$  from the exclusive  $B$ -meson decays [45].

Thus, in the symmetry limit, HQET relates the two form factors appearing in the semileptonic decays of the double-bottom tetraquark and  $B$  mesons

$$\xi_{T \rightarrow T'}(w) = \frac{\sqrt{m_B m_{D^{(*)}}}}{\sqrt{m_T m_{T'}}} \xi^{B \rightarrow D^{(*)}}(w). \quad (15)$$

This relation will be modified including the process-dependent symmetry-breaking effects. They pertain to the interactions involving the spectators, which differ for the  $B$ -mesons and the double-heavy tetraquarks. We expect them to be subdominant and the relation in Eq. (15) a good approximation. Given a model for the double-heavy tetraquark wave-functions, they can be calculated, in principle, but are beyond the scope of this Letter.

We now discuss the overall normalization related to the Fock-space composition of the tetraquarks in question. This is also related to the tetraquark wave-function. In this, we follow the formulation used in the study of the creation operators for the  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}$  tetraquark, whose ground state has the quantum numbers  $J^P = 1^+$  [12], as also assumed here. The wave-function  $|\Phi_{b,d}\rangle$  of this tetraquark is spanned by the two components in question, meson-meson  $|\Phi_{BB,(1+\gamma_0)\gamma_5}\rangle$ , and diquark-antidiquark  $|\Phi_{Dd,(1+\gamma_0)\gamma_5}\rangle$ . Writing the wave-function

$$|\Phi_{b,d}\rangle = b |\Phi_{b,d}\rangle + d |\Phi_{Dd,(1+\gamma_0)\gamma_5}\rangle, \quad (16)$$

allows to define the ratios

$$\omega_{BB}(r) = \frac{|b|^2}{|b|^2 + |d|^2}; \quad \omega_{Dd}(r) = \frac{|d|^2}{|b|^2 + |d|^2}, \quad (17)$$

with  $\omega_{Dd}(r) = 1 - \omega_{BB}(r)$ , which can be interpreted as the relative weights of a meson-meson and diquark-antidiquark at the  $bb$ -separation  $r$  in the ground state with  $J^P = 1^+$ . Lattice studies yield that the diquark-antidiquark component  $\omega_{Dd}(r)$  dominates over the meson-meson component for  $r < 0.20$  fm.

For the general case in which both the diquarkonic and mesonic components are present in the Fock-space of the tetraquarks, one has to project out the diquark component to determine the normalization of the decay rates discussed here. It is related to the fraction  $\omega_{Dd}(r)$ , being its integral obtained by integrating  $\omega_{Dd}(r)$  over the size of the tetraquarks. This is *a priori* not known, but the general expectations are that the compact double-bottom tetrahadrons should have a similar hadronic size as a  $B$  meson, and the diquarkonic fraction could even be dominant. We call this quantity  $f_{Dd}(bb)^2$ , where we admit the possibility that this fraction may depend on the heavy quark

flavor, and take that into account as the compact-hadronic fraction of the tetraquark in estimating the transition rates. Thus, for the  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}} \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}$  transition, Eq. (12) takes the form

$$\mathcal{M}_{T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}} \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}}^\mu = -\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cb} \sqrt{m_T m_{T'}} \xi_{T \rightarrow T'}(w) (f_{Dd}(bb)) [(w+1)\varepsilon^\mu - (\varepsilon \cdot v') v^\mu - i\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \varepsilon_\nu v_\alpha v'_\beta]. \quad (18)$$

The corresponding leptonic part is

$$\mathcal{L}_\mu = \bar{u}(p_1, m_\ell) \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) v(p_2, m_{\nu_\ell}). \quad (19)$$

The decay rate is determined by the expression

$$\frac{d\Gamma}{dw} = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{32m_T^3} |\bar{\mathcal{A}}_{T \rightarrow T'}|^2, \quad (20)$$

where  $|\bar{\mathcal{A}}_{T \rightarrow T'}|^2$  can be calculated from the square of the amplitude (18) after summing over the polarizations of initial state tetraquark, i.e.,  $\sum_\lambda \varepsilon_\mu(v, \lambda) \varepsilon_\nu^*(v, \lambda) = -g_{\mu\nu} + v_\mu v_\nu / v^2$ , and contracting it with the square of the spin-summed leptonic amplitude.

Using this, along with the decay kinematics in Eq. (20), the differential decay rate is expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\Gamma}{dw} = & N_b \frac{G_F^2 |V_{bc}|^2 m_{T'}}{384\pi^3 m_T^2} |\xi_{T \rightarrow T'}(w)|^2 (f_{Dd}(bb))^2 \sqrt{w^2 - 1} \sqrt{1 - \frac{m_\ell^2}{s}} \left[ 3m_\ell^4 \left( (m_T + m_{T'})^2 + 4m_T m_{T'} \right) \right. \\ & - \frac{4m_\ell^2}{s} m_T m_{T'} (w+1) (6m_T^4 + m_T^3 m_{T'} (5 - 11w) - 2m_T^2 m_{T'}^2 (2w^2 + 5w - 1) + m_T m_{T'}^3 (13w + 5) - 6m_{T'}^4) \\ & \left. + 8m_T^2 m_{T'}^2 (w+1) ((m_T^2 + m_{T'}^2) (5w + 1) - 2m_T m_{T'} (4w^2 + w + 1)) \right], \quad (21) \end{aligned}$$

where  $s = q^2 = m_T^2 + m_{T'}^2 - 2m_T m_{T'} w$  is the square of momentum transfer, and  $N_b = 2$  for  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}$  state.

In the massless lepton case, Eq. (21) simplifies to

$$\frac{d\Gamma}{dw} = N_b \frac{G_F^2}{48\pi^3} V_{cb}^2 m_{T'}^3 |\xi_{T \rightarrow T'}(w)|^2 (w+1)^{\frac{3}{2}} \sqrt{w-1} (f_{Dd}(bb))^2 [(m_T^2 + m_{T'}^2) (5w + 1) - 2m_T m_{T'} (4w^2 + w + 1)]. \quad (22)$$

Using the form factors relation defined in Eq. (15), Eq. (22) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\Gamma}{dw} = & N_b \frac{G_F^2}{48\pi^3} V_{cb}^2 \frac{m_B m_D}{m_T} m_{T'}^2 |\xi^{B \rightarrow D}(w)|^2 (w+1)^{\frac{3}{2}} \sqrt{w-1} (f_{Dd}(bb))^2 \\ & \times [(m_T^2 + m_{T'}^2) (5w + 1) - 2m_T m_{T'} (4w^2 + w + 1)]. \quad (23) \end{aligned}$$

To calculate the lepton energy spectrum, and the semileptonic decay rate, we need to parametrize the Isgur-Wise function for the weak decays of the heavy-to-heavy tetraquarks. We use the corresponding form for the  $B \rightarrow (D, D^*)$  form factors in the zero recoil expansion (c.f. Eq. (41) [46]):

$$\xi^{B \rightarrow D}(w) = \xi^{B \rightarrow D}(1) [1 - 8\rho_1^2 z + (51\rho_1^2 - 10) z^2 - (252\rho_1^2 - 84) z^3], \quad (24)$$

where  $z = (\sqrt{w+1} - \sqrt{2}) / (\sqrt{w+1} + \sqrt{2})$ , and  $\rho_1^2$  is a slope parameter at zero-recoil, bounded between  $-0.14 < \rho_1^2 < 1.54$ . We anticipate that the slope of the Isgur-Wise functions in the two cases, namely  $B \rightarrow (D, D^*)$  and  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}} \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}$ , are expected to differ from each other, but for the sake of definiteness, we shall use the same range for the two cases. The rationale behind this assumption is that in both cases, the recoil momenta of the spectators are similar and small.

Using the numerical values for the various input parameters given in Table I, and with  $(f_{Dd}(bb))^2 = 1$ , yields the following decay rates:

$$\Gamma(T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}(J^P = 1^+) \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(J^P = 0^+) \ell^- \nu_\ell) = (1.94, 0.68) \times 10^{-11} \text{MeV}. \quad (25)$$

The first number corresponds to the  $e^- \nu_e$  and  $\mu^- \nu_\mu$  cases, and the second for the  $\tau^- \nu_\tau$  case. In a more realistic case,  $(f_{Dd}(bb))^2 < 1$ , and the decay rates will be decreased by this amount. Further studies are needed to quantify this quantity. However, this can also be determined by the branching ratios discussed here, once they are measured.

Using the total width  $\Gamma_{\text{total}}(T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}) = 8.2 \times 10^{-10} \text{MeV}$ , which is derived from the lifetime  $\tau(T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}) = 0.8 \text{ps}$  [17], we get the following branching ratios:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}(T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}(J^P = 1^+) \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(J^P = 0^+) \ell^- \nu_\ell) &= 2.4\% \text{ (for } \ell^- \nu_\ell = e^- \nu_e, \mu^- \nu_\mu), \\ \mathcal{B}(T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}(J^P = 1^+) \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(J^P = 0^+) \tau^- \nu_\tau) &= 8.2 \times 10^{-3}. \quad (26) \end{aligned}$$

### III. SEMILEPTONIC DECAYS $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}(J^P = 1^+) \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(J^P = 1^+) \ell^- \nu_\ell$

In this section, we will consider the final state tetraquark  $T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}$  with  $J^P = 1^+$ , therefore,  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}} \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}$  correspond to an axial-vector to axial-vector transition. With the effective Hamiltonian describing the  $b \rightarrow c \ell^- \nu_\ell$  transition given in Eq. (1), the matrix elements in HQET can be parameterized as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\langle T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(v', \varepsilon') | \bar{c} \gamma^\mu b | T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}(v, \varepsilon) \rangle}{\sqrt{m_T m_{T'}}} &= -\varepsilon^{*'} \cdot \varepsilon [h_1(w) (v + v')^\mu + h_2(w) (v - v')^\mu] \\ &\quad + h_3(w) \varepsilon^{*'} \cdot v \varepsilon^\mu + h_4(w) \varepsilon \cdot v' \varepsilon^{*\prime\mu} - \varepsilon \cdot v' \varepsilon^{*'} \cdot v [h_5(w) v^\mu + h_6(w) v'^\mu], \\ \frac{\langle T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(v', \varepsilon') | \bar{c} \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 b | T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}(v, \varepsilon) \rangle}{\sqrt{m_T m_{T'}}} &= i\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \{ \varepsilon_\alpha \varepsilon_\beta^{*'} [h_7(w) (v + v')_\nu + h_8(w) (v - v')_\nu] \\ &\quad + v'_\alpha v_\beta [h_9(w) \varepsilon^{*'} \cdot v \varepsilon_\nu + h_{10}(w) \varepsilon \cdot v' \varepsilon_\nu^*] \}, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where  $m_T$  and  $m_{T'}$  denote the masses of the initial and final state tetraquarks,  $T_{bbud}$  and  $T_{bcud}$ , respectively.

For  $1^+ \rightarrow 1^+$  transitions, the heavy quark spin symmetry implies

$$\left\langle \mathcal{H}_A^{(Q')} | \bar{Q}' \Gamma Q | \mathcal{H}_A^{(Q)} \right\rangle = -\xi(w) \text{Tr} \left\{ \bar{\mathcal{H}}_A^{(Q')} \Gamma \mathcal{H}_A^{(Q)} \right\}, \quad (28)$$

which on using Eqs. (4) and (5) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \mathcal{H}_A^{(Q')} | \bar{c}_{v'} \gamma^\mu b_v | \mathcal{H}_A^{(Q)} \right\rangle &= -\xi(w) \text{Tr} \left\{ \left[ P_{v'}^{*\nu\dagger(Q')} \gamma_\nu \gamma_5 \right] \frac{1 + \not{v}}{2} \gamma^\mu \frac{1 + \not{v}'}{2} \left[ P_v^{*\alpha(Q)} \gamma_\alpha \gamma_5 \right] \right\} \\ &= \xi(w) \{ \varepsilon^{*'} \cdot \varepsilon (v + v')^\mu - \varepsilon^{*'} \cdot v \varepsilon^\mu - \varepsilon \cdot v' \varepsilon^{*\prime\mu} \} \\ \left\langle \mathcal{H}_A^{(Q')} | \bar{c}_{v'} \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 b_v | \mathcal{H}_A^{(Q)} \right\rangle &= -\xi(w) \text{Tr} \left\{ \left[ P_{v'}^{*\nu\dagger(Q')} \gamma_\nu \gamma_5 \right] \frac{1 + \not{v}}{2} \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 \frac{1 + \not{v}'}{2} \left[ P_v^{*\alpha(Q)} \gamma_\alpha \gamma_5 \right] \right\}, \\ &= i\xi(w) \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \varepsilon_\alpha \varepsilon_\beta^{*'} (v + v')_\nu. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Here, we have written  $P_{v'}^{*\nu\dagger(Q')}$  and  $P_v^{*\alpha(Q)}$  as the polarization vectors  $\varepsilon^{*'}$  and  $\varepsilon$  and used  $\varepsilon^{*' \cdot v'} = \varepsilon \cdot v = 0$ .

Comparing Eq. (27) and Eq. (29), we get

$$h_1 = h_3 = h_4 = h_7 = \xi(w),$$

and the others vanish in this limit. Hence, the relation given in Eq. (15) holds in this case too.

The corresponding hadronic part of transition amplitude can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_{T_{bb} \rightarrow T_{bc}}^\mu &= \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cb} \langle T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(v', \varepsilon') | \bar{c}_{v'} \gamma^\mu (1 - \gamma_5) b_v | T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}(v, \varepsilon) \rangle \\ &= -\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cb} \xi_{T \rightarrow T'}(w) [\varepsilon^{*' \cdot \varepsilon (v + v')^\mu - \varepsilon^{*' \cdot v \varepsilon^\mu - \varepsilon \cdot v' \varepsilon^{*\prime\mu} + i\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \varepsilon_\alpha \varepsilon_\beta^{*'} (v + v')_\nu] f_{Dd}(bb). \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Contracting the above hadronic amplitude with the leptonic part (19) and summing over the polarization, i.e.,  $\sum_\lambda \varepsilon_\mu(v^{(\lambda)}, \lambda) \varepsilon_\nu^*(v^{(\lambda)}, \lambda) = -g_{\mu\nu} + v_\mu^{(\lambda)} v_\nu^{(\lambda)}/v^{(\lambda)2}$  and spins of the leptons, the differential decay rate becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\Gamma^{1^+ \rightarrow 1^+}}{dw} &= N_b \frac{G_F^2 |V_{bc}|^2 m_{T'}}{384\pi^3 m_T^2} |\xi_{T \rightarrow T'}(w)|^2 \sqrt{w^2 - 1} \sqrt{1 - \frac{m_\ell^2}{s}} \left[ -3m_\ell^4 (m_T^2 + m_{T'}^2 + 2m_T m_{T'} (4w + 5)) \right. \\ &\quad - \frac{4m_\ell^2}{s} m_T m_{T'} (w + 1) (12m_T^4 + m_T m_{T'} (m_T^2 + m_{T'}^2) (1 - 49w) + 2m_T^2 m_{T'}^2 (20w^2 - w + 17) + 12m_T^4) \\ &\quad \left. + 8m_T^2 m_{T'}^2 (w + 1) ((m_T^2 + m_{T'}^2) (13w - 1) - 2m_T m_{T'} (8w^2 - w + 5)) \right] (f_{Dd}(bb))^2, \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

which in the massless lepton case reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\Gamma^{1^+ \rightarrow 1^+}}{dw} &= N_b \frac{G_F^2 |V_{bc}|^2}{48\pi^3} |\xi_{T \rightarrow T'}(w)|^2 m_{T'}^3 (1 + w)^{3/2} \sqrt{w - 1} \times \\ &\quad [(m_{T'}^2 + m_T^2) (13w - 1) - 2m_T m_{T'} (8w^2 - w + 5)] (f_{Dd}(bb))^2. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Using the numerical values of the input parameters from Table I, and integrating over  $w$  in the allowed kinematic range gives

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}(J^P = 1^+) \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(J^P = 1^+) \ell^- \nu_\ell) &= 5.77 \times 10^{-11} \text{ MeV}; \text{ (for } \ell^- \nu_\ell = e^- \nu_e, \mu^- \nu_\mu) \\ \Gamma(T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}(J^P = 1^+) \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(J^P = 1^+) \tau^- \nu_\tau) &= 2.64 \times 10^{-11} \text{ MeV}. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

$m_{T_{bb\bar{u}d}}(1^+) = 10,504.4_{-44.15}^{+37.36}$ MeV , $m_{T_{bc\bar{u}d}}(0^+) = 7155_{-19}^{+9}$ MeV , $m_{T_{bc\bar{u}d}}(1^+) = 7152_{-19}^{+9}$ MeV , $m_{T_{cc\bar{u}d}}(1^+) = 3875$ MeV $m_\pi = (139.57 \pm 0.00018)$ MeV , $m_\rho = (775.26 \pm 0.23)$ MeV , $m_{a_1} = (1230 \pm 40)$ MeV , $m_D = (1869.61 \pm 0.10)$ MeV $m_B = (5279.66 \pm 0.12)$ MeV , $m_{B^*} = (5324.71 \pm 0.21)$ MeV , $f_\pi = (130.41 \pm 0.03 \pm 0.20)$ MeV , $f_\rho = (210 \pm 4)$ MeV $f_{a_1} = 234$ MeV , $\rho_1^2 = 1.3$ , $C_1(m_b)[C_2(m_b)] = 1.117[-0.257]$ , $G_F = 1.16637 \times 10^{-11}$ MeV $^{-2}$ , $m_e = 0.511$ MeV $m_\mu = 105.7$ MeV , $m_\tau = 1777$ MeV , $V_{ud} = 0.97420 \pm 0.3021$ , $V_{cb} = (39.5 \pm 0.08) \times 10^{-3}$
--

TABLE I: Numerical values of the input parameters. The decay rates are calculated for the central values in this table.

They yield the following branching ratios:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}(T_{bb\bar{u}d}(J^P = 1^+) \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}d}(J^P = 1^+) \ell^- \nu_\ell) &= 7.0\% \text{ (for } \ell^- \nu_\ell = e^- \nu_e, \mu^- \nu_\mu), \\ \mathcal{B}(T_{bb\bar{u}d}(J^P = 1^+) \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}d}(J^P = 1^+) \tau^- \nu_\tau) &= 3.2\%. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Thus,  $\mathcal{B}(T_{bb\bar{u}d}(J^P = 0^+) \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}d}(J^P = 1^+) \ell^- \nu_\ell)$  and  $\mathcal{B}(T_{bb\bar{u}d}(J^P = 1^+) \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}d}(J^P = 1^+) \ell^- \nu_\ell)$  almost saturate the inclusive semileptonic branching ratios for the double-bottom tetraquarks. As anticipated, this is not too dissimilar to the corresponding  $B$ -meson decays  $B \rightarrow D^{(*)} \ell \nu_\ell$  [27]. However, these transitions are not foreseen for the hadron molecular picture, as in this case, the  $BB^*$  mesons will decay essentially independently.

#### IV. NON-LEPTONIC DECAYS $T_{bb\bar{u}d} \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}d} h^-$

The simplest non-leptonic decay of the double-bottom tetraquark is  $T_{bb\bar{u}d} \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}d} h^-$ , where  $h^-$  is a light meson, such as  $h^- = \pi^-, \rho^-, a_1^-$ . At the quark level, these decays take place via the weak transition  $b \rightarrow c W^- (\rightarrow \bar{u} d)$ . This is similar to the  $B$ -meson decays, such as  $B \rightarrow D^{(*)} \pi$ , which were calculated in the so-called "naive factorization approach" [47]. Subsequent improvements have provided a QCD basis for this class of factorized amplitudes, and the resulting corrections are found to be small [48]. We assume that this factorization approach can also be used to study the non-leptonic decays of the tetraquarks, though a formal proof is lacking.

The effective Hamiltonian for this decay at the tree level is given by

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cb} V_{ud}^* [C_1(\mu) \mathcal{O}_1 + C_2(\mu) \mathcal{O}_2], \quad (35)$$

where  $C_{1,2}(\mu)$  are the Wilson coefficients, calculated at the factorization scale  $\mu$ . The operators are:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_1 &= (\bar{d}_i \gamma_\mu P_L u_i) (\bar{c}_j \gamma^\mu P_L b_j) \\ \mathcal{O}_2 &= (\bar{d}_i \gamma_\mu P_L u_j) (\bar{c}_j \gamma^\mu P_L b_i), \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

with  $i, j$  representing the color indices. The current in each bracket for  $\mathcal{O}_1$  and  $\mathcal{O}_2$  is a color singlet and octet, respectively. The corresponding Feynman diagrams are shown in Figure 2(a). For the color-allowed tree amplitudes,




FIG. 2: Feynman diagrams for (a)  $T_{bb\bar{u}d} \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}d} h^-$ , and (b)  $T_{bc\bar{u}d} \rightarrow T_{cc\bar{u}d} h^-$ , where  $h^- = \pi^-, \rho^-, a_1^-$ .

factorization of the decay amplitude is expected to be a good approximation, and the decay amplitude for  $T_{bb}(1^+) \rightarrow$

$T_{bc}(0^+; 1^+) \pi^-$  can be written in the form:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M} &= 4 \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cb} V_{ud}^* a_1(\mu) \langle \pi^-(q) | (\bar{d}_i \gamma_\mu P_L u_i) | 0 \rangle \langle T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(p') | (\bar{c}_j \gamma^\mu P_L b_j) | T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}(p) \rangle. \\
&= -2 \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cb} V_{ud}^* a_1(\mu) \langle \pi^-(q) | (\bar{d}_i \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 u_i) | 0 \rangle \langle T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(p') | (\bar{c}_j \gamma^\mu P_L b_j) | T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}(p) \rangle \\
&= -2i \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cb} V_{ud}^* a_1(\mu) f_\pi q_\mu \langle T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(p') | (\bar{c}_j \gamma^\mu P_L b_j) | T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}(p) \rangle,
\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

where  $f_\pi$  is the decay constant of  $\pi^-$ ,  $q = p - p'$ , and  $a_1(\mu) = C_1(\mu) + C_2(\mu)/3$ . Using the result of the matrix element from Eq. (18), which holds in the heavy quark symmetry limit, and noting that the tetraquark in the final state has  $J^P = 0^+$ , the HQET version of the amplitude given in Eq. (37) takes the form

$$\mathcal{M}^{1^+ \rightarrow 0^+} = -i \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cb} V_{ud}^* a_1(\mu) f_\pi \xi_{T \rightarrow T'}(w) q_\mu (f_{Dd}(bb)) [(w+1)\varepsilon^\mu - (\varepsilon \cdot v') v^\mu - i\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \varepsilon_\nu v_\alpha v'_\beta]. \tag{38}$$

Along the same lines, for the final state  $T_{bcud}$  having  $J^P = 1^+$ , we use Eq. (30) in Eq. (37), which gives

$$\mathcal{M}^{1^+ \rightarrow 1^+} = i \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cb} V_{ud}^* a_1(\mu) f_\pi \xi_{T \rightarrow T'}(w) q_\mu (f_{Dd}(bb)) [\varepsilon^{*\nu} \cdot \varepsilon (v + v')^\mu - \varepsilon^{*\nu} \cdot v \varepsilon^\mu - \varepsilon \cdot v' \varepsilon^{*\mu} + i\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \varepsilon_\alpha \varepsilon_\beta^* (v + v')_\nu]. \tag{39}$$

For  $h^- = \rho^-$  and  $h^- = a_1$ , which are light vector and axial-vector mesons, respectively, the relevant matrix elements are

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \rho(q) | (\bar{d}_i \gamma_\mu u_i) | 0 \rangle &= f_\rho m_\rho \varepsilon_{1\mu}^*(q), \\
\langle a_1(q) | (\bar{d}_i \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 u_i) | 0 \rangle &= f_{a_1} m_{a_1} \varepsilon_{1\mu}^*(q),
\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

where  $f_\rho$  and  $f_{a_1}$  are their respective decay constants and  $\varepsilon_{1\mu}^*(q)$  denote their polarization vector. The corresponding amplitudes involving spin-1 particles in the final state can be obtained by replacing  $f_\pi$  with  $f_\rho$  and  $f_{a_1}$  for  $\rho$  and  $a_1$  mesons in Eqs. (38) and (39), respectively. Also, the momentum vector  $q_\mu$  is to be replaced with their mass times the polarization vector  $\varepsilon_{1\mu}^*(q)$ .

The decay rate of a two-body process has the standard form:

$$d\Gamma = \frac{1}{8\pi} |\bar{\mathcal{M}}|^2 \frac{|\mathbf{p}_1|}{M^2}, \tag{41}$$

with the three-momenta of the final state particle in the rest frame of the parent hadron given by

$$|\mathbf{p}_1| = |\mathbf{p}_2| = \frac{\left[ (M^2 - (m_1 + m_2)^2) (M^2 - (m_1 - m_2)^2) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2M}, \tag{42}$$

where  $m_1$  and  $m_2$  are the masses of final state particles and  $M$  is the mass of the decaying particle. Using Eq. (38), we get the decay rate for  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}} \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}} \pi^-$

$$\Gamma^{1^+ \rightarrow 0^+} = N_b \frac{G_F^2 |V_{cb} V_{ud}^*|^2 a_1(\mu)^2 f_\pi^2 (f_{Dd}(bb))^2}{512\pi m_T^6 m_{T'}} |\xi_{T \rightarrow T'}(w)|^2 \lambda(m_T^2, m_{T'}^2, m_{\pi^-}^2)^{\frac{3}{2}} (m_T^2 + 2m_T m_{T'} (w+1) - m_{T'}^2 + m_{\pi^-}^2)^2, \tag{43}$$

where  $\lambda(m_T^2, m_{T'}^2, m_{\pi^-}^2) = (m_T^2 - (m_{T'} + m_{\pi^-})^2) (m_T^2 - (m_{T'} - m_{\pi^-})^2)$ , and  $w$  is evaluated at the final state hadron ( $\pi^-$ ) mass, i.e.,

$$w = \frac{m_T^2 + m_{T'}^2 - m_{\pi^-}^2}{2m_T m_{T'}}. \tag{44}$$

For the  $1^+ \rightarrow 1^+$  decay, we use Eq. (39) to get

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma^{1^+ \rightarrow 1^+} &= N_b \frac{G_F^2 |V_{cb} V_{ud}^*|^2 a_1(\mu)^2 f_\pi^2 (f_{Dd}(bb))^2}{128\pi m_T^4 m_{T'}} |\xi_{T \rightarrow T'}(w)|^2 \times \\
&\lambda(m_T^2, m_{T'}^2, m_{\pi^-}^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( (m_T + m_{T'})^2 - m_{\pi^-}^2 \right) \left( m_{\pi^-}^2 - (2m_T m_{T'} - 5(m_T^2 + m_{T'}^2)) + 5(m_T^2 - m_{T'}^2) \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

Using the values of decay constant  $f_\pi$  and the other input parameters from Table I, setting  $N_b = 2$  and  $(f_{Dd}(bb))^2 = 1$ , we get

Decay Process	$T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}} \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}} \ell^- \nu_\ell$	$T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}} \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}} \tau^- \nu_\tau$	$T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}} \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}} \pi^-$	$T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}} \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}} \rho^-$	$T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}} \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}} a_1^-$
$\mathcal{B}(1^+ \rightarrow 0^+)$	$2.4 \times 10^{-2}$	$8.2 \times 10^{-3}$	$1.7 \times 10^{-3}$	$4.8 \times 10^{-3}$	$6.6 \times 10^{-3}$
Decay Process	$T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}} \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}} \ell^- \nu_\ell$	$T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}} \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}} \tau^- \nu_\tau$	$T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}} \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}} \pi^-$	$T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}} \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}} \rho^-$	$T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}} \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}} a_1^-$
$\mathcal{B}(1^+ \rightarrow 1^+)$	$7.0 \times 10^{-2}$	$3.2 \times 10^{-2}$	$8.5 \times 10^{-3}$	$2.2 \times 10^{-2}$	$2.7 \times 10^{-2}$
Decay Process	$T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}} \rightarrow T_{cc\bar{u}\bar{d}} \ell^- \nu_\ell$	$T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}} \rightarrow T_{cc\bar{u}\bar{d}} \tau^- \nu_\tau$	$T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}} \rightarrow T_{cc\bar{u}\bar{d}} \pi^-$	$T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}} \rightarrow T_{cc\bar{u}\bar{d}} \rho^-$	$T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}} \rightarrow T_{cc\bar{u}\bar{d}} a_1^-$
$\mathcal{B}(0^+ \rightarrow 1^+)$	$7.1 \times 10^{-3}$	$2.2 \times 10^{-3}$	$5.0 \times 10^{-4}$	$1.4 \times 10^{-3}$	$2.0 \times 10^{-3}$

TABLE II: Semileptonic and Non-leptonic branching ratios of the double-bottom  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}$  and bottom-charm  $T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}$  tetraquarks with the indicated spin-parity.

$$\Gamma(T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}(1^+) \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(0^+) \pi^-) = 1.40 \times 10^{-12} \text{ MeV}. \quad (46)$$

Similarly for the  $1^+ \rightarrow 1^+$  case, the result from Eq. (45) is:

$$\Gamma(T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}(1^+) \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(1^+) \pi^-) = 6.94 \times 10^{-12} \text{ MeV}. \quad (47)$$

In the case of a vector or an axial-vector meson in the final state, the expressions for the decay rates are:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma^{1^+ \rightarrow 0^+} &= \frac{G_F^2 |V_{cb} V_{ud}^*|^2 a_1(\mu)^2 f_V^2 (f_{Dd}(bb))^2}{64\pi m_T^4 m_{T'}} |\xi_{T \rightarrow T'}(w)|^2 \lambda(m_T^2, m_{T'}^2, m_V^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( (m_T + m_{T'})^2 - m_V^2 \right) \\ &\quad \left( (m_T^2 + m_{T'}^2)^2 - 4m_V^4 + m_V^2 (3m_T^2 + 2m_T m_{T'} + 3m_{T'}^2) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma^{1^+ \rightarrow 1^+} &= \frac{G_F^2 |V_{cb} V_{ud}^*|^2 a_1(\mu)^2 f_V^2 (f_{Dd}(bb))^2}{64\pi m_T^4 m_{T'}} |\xi_{T \rightarrow T'}(w)|^2 \lambda(m_T^2, m_{T'}^2, m_V^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( (m_T + m_{T'})^2 - m_V^2 \right) \\ &\quad \left( 5(m_T^2 + m_{T'}^2)^2 - 8m_V^4 + m_V^2 (3m_T^2 - 2m_T m_{T'} + 3m_{T'}^2) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

where the subscript  $V$  defines  $\rho^-$ ,  $a_1^-$ . Using the numerical values from Table I, we get the partial decay rates for the  $1^+ \rightarrow 0^+$  transitions

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}(1^+) \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(0^+) \rho^-) &= 3.94 \times 10^{-12} \text{ MeV} \\ \Gamma(T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}(1^+) \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(0^+) a_1^-) &= 5.43 \times 10^{-12} \text{ MeV} \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

The numerical values of the decay rates for the  $1^+ \rightarrow 1^+$  transitions are:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}(1^+) \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(1^+) \rho^-) &= 1.80 \times 10^{-11} \text{ MeV}, \\ \Gamma(T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}(1^+) \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(1^+) a_1^-) &= 2.20 \times 10^{-11} \text{ MeV}. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

The resulting branching ratios for the decays  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}(1^+) \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(0^+) (\pi^-, \rho^-, a_1^-)$  and  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}(1^+) \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(1^+) (\pi^-, \rho^-, a_1^-)$  are given in Table II. As for the semileptonic branching ratios, we use the total width  $\Gamma_{\text{total}}(T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}) = 8.2 \times 10^{-10} \text{ MeV}$ , derived from the lifetime  $\tau(T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}) = 0.8 \text{ ps}$  [17]. Since the  $J^P = 1^+$  tetraquark  $T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(0^+)$  is expected to decay radiatively to the  $J^P = 0^+$  state, the branching ratios for  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}(1^+) \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(0^+) (\pi^-, \rho^-, a_1^-) + (\gamma)$  are in the range of (1–3)%.

## V. SEMILEPTONIC AND NON-LEPTONIC DECAYS $T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(J^P = 0^+) \rightarrow T_{cc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(J^P = 1^+) (\ell^- \nu_\ell, h^-)$

The decay  $T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}} \rightarrow T_{cc\bar{u}\bar{d}} \ell^- \nu_\ell$  is governed by the effective Hamiltonian given in Eq. (1), and the corresponding Feynman diagram is drawn in Fig. 1(b). We identify the tetraquark  $T_{cc\bar{u}\bar{d}}$  with the double-charm hadron  $T_{cc}^+(3875)$ , discovered by the LHCb, having  $J^P = 1^+$  [1], which implies that we have a scalar to axial-vector transition. The HQET matrix element in this case is parameterized as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\langle T_{cc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(v', \varepsilon') | \bar{c} \gamma^\mu b | T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(v) \rangle}{\sqrt{m_T m_{T'}}} &= h_1(w) i \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \varepsilon'_\nu v_\alpha v'_\beta \\ \frac{\langle T_{cc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(v', \varepsilon') | \bar{c} \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 b | T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}(v) \rangle}{\sqrt{m_T m_{T'}}} &= (h_2(w) (w+1) \varepsilon'^\mu - h_3(w) (\varepsilon' \cdot v) v'^\mu - h_4(w) (\varepsilon' \cdot v') v^\mu). \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

The spin symmetry relating the form factors in this case becomes

$$\left\langle \mathcal{H}_A^{(Q')} | \bar{Q}' \Gamma Q | \mathcal{H}_S^{(Q)} \right\rangle = -\xi(w) \text{Tr} \left\{ \bar{\mathcal{H}}_A^{(Q')} \Gamma \mathcal{H}_S^{(Q)} \right\}, \quad (53)$$

and by using Eqs. (5) and (8) in Eq. (53), the matrix elements for vector and axial-vector currents become

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \mathcal{H}_A^{(Q')} | \bar{c}_{v'} \gamma^\mu b_v | \mathcal{H}_S^{(Q)} \right\rangle &= -\xi(w) \text{Tr} \left\{ P_{v'}^{*\alpha\dagger(Q')} \gamma_\alpha \gamma_5 \frac{1+\not{v}'}{2} \gamma^\mu \frac{1+\not{v}}{2} P_v^{*(Q)} \right\} \\ &= i\xi(w) \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \varepsilon'_\nu v_\alpha v'_\beta \\ \left\langle \mathcal{H}_A^{(Q')} | \bar{c}_{v'} \gamma^\mu b_v | \mathcal{H}_S^{(Q)} \right\rangle &= -\xi(w) \text{Tr} \left\{ P_{v'}^{*\alpha\dagger(Q')} \gamma_\alpha \gamma_5 \frac{1+\not{v}'}{2} \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 \frac{1+\not{v}}{2} P_v^{*(Q)} \right\} \\ &= \xi(w) [(w+1) \varepsilon'^\mu - (\varepsilon' \cdot v) v'^\mu], \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

Comparing Eq. (53) and Eq. (54), one gets

$$h_1 = h_2 = h_3 = \xi(w) \quad (55)$$

and  $h_4 = 0$ .

Therefore, the hadronic transition amplitude in this case becomes

$$\mathcal{M}^\mu = -\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cb} \xi(w) \sqrt{m_T m_{T'}} [(w+1) \varepsilon'^\mu - (\varepsilon' \cdot v) v'^\mu - i\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \varepsilon'_\nu v_\alpha v'_\beta]. \quad (56)$$

As discussed earlier, the wave-function of the tetraquark  $T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}$  may involve both the compact and hadron molecular component. Including the compact fraction  $f_{Dd}(bc)$ , the above equation takes the form

$$\mathcal{M}_{T_{bc} \rightarrow T_{cc}}^\mu = -\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cb} \xi_{T \rightarrow T'}(w) (f_{Dd}(bc)) \sqrt{m_T m_{T'}} [(w+1) \varepsilon'^\mu - (\varepsilon' \cdot v) v'^\mu - i\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \varepsilon'_\nu v_\alpha v'_\beta]. \quad (57)$$

The relation between the form factors given in Eq. (15) holds in this case as well. Contracting the hadronic part with the leptonic part given in Eq. (19), and summing over the polarization, i.e.,  $\sum_\lambda \varepsilon'_\mu(v', \lambda) \varepsilon_\nu^*(v', \lambda) = -g_{\mu\nu} + v'_\mu v'_\nu / v'^2$ , it is easy to see that the expression for the decay rate is again given by Eq. (21), but one has to replace  $(f_{Dd}(bb))$  with  $(f_{Dd}(bc))$ .

Using the numerical values of the various input parameters from Table I, the total width  $\Gamma_{\text{total}}(T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}) = 2.2 \times 10^{-9}$  MeV, which is derived from the lifetime  $\tau(T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}) = 0.3\text{ps}$ , based on the assumption that it is expected to be similar to the one calculated for the bottom-charm baryon  $\tau(\Xi(cbu)) = (0.28 \pm 0.33)\text{ps}$  [22], together with  $N_b = 1$ , and setting  $(f_{Dd}(bc)) = 1$ , we get the following branching ratios:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}(T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(J^P = 0^+) \rightarrow T_{cc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(J^P = 1^+) \ell^- \nu_\ell) &= 7.1 \times 10^{-3} \text{ (for } \ell^- \nu_\ell = e^- \nu_e, \mu^- \nu_\mu) \\ \mathcal{B}(T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}(J^P = 0^+) \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(J^P = 1^+) \tau^- \nu_\tau) &= 2.2 \times 10^{-3} \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

In the case of the non-leptonic decays, following the same procedure as adopted for the  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}} \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}$  case, the amplitude for  $h^- = \pi^-$  becomes

$$\mathcal{M}^{0^+ \rightarrow 1^+} = -i \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cb} V_{ud}^* a_1(\mu) f_\pi \xi_{T \rightarrow T'}(w) q_\mu (f_{Dd}(bc)) [(w+1) \varepsilon'^\mu - (\varepsilon' \cdot v) v'^\mu - i\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \varepsilon'_\nu v_\alpha v'_\beta]. \quad (59)$$

From Eq. (41), after performing the polarization sum, one gets the expression for the decay rate given in Eq. (43) with the obvious replacements:  $(f_{Dd}(bb))$  with  $(f_{Dd}(bc))$ , and  $N_b = 1$ . Using the values of the input parameters from Table I, we get

$$\Gamma(T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(0^+) \rightarrow T_{cc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(1^+) \pi^-) = 1.10 \times 10^{-12} \text{ MeV}, \quad (60)$$

where we have set  $(f_{Dd}(bc)) = 1$ . Similarly, for the cases  $h^- = \rho^-$ ,  $a_1^-$ , from Eq. (48), the numerical values of the decay rates are:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(0^+) \rightarrow T_{cc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(1^+) \rho^-) &= 3.11 \times 10^{-12} \text{ MeV} \\ \Gamma(T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(0^+) \rightarrow T_{cc\bar{u}\bar{d}}(1^+) a_1^-) &= 4.37 \times 10^{-12} \text{ MeV}. \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

This completes the numerical part of this Letter.

## VI. SUMMARY AND PROSPECTS OF EXPERIMENTAL MEASUREMENTS

Spectroscopic calculations based on Lattice QCD support a substantial diquark-antidiquark component in the Fock space of the tetraquarks  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}$  and  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{s}}$ . Motivated by this input and the theoretical consensus that the double-bottom tetraquarks  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}$  and  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{s}}$  are stable against strong and electromagnetic interactions, we have worked out some signature decays, reflecting the diquark-antidiquark component of the  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}$  tetraquark wave-function. They are characterised by the semi-inclusive transitions  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}} \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}} + X$ , where  $X = \ell^- \nu_\ell$ , hadrons. We work out the branching ratios for the semileptonic decays for the assumed  $J^P$  quantum numbers of the initial and the final state tetraquarks. This requires the knowledge of the weak current matrix elements (form factors) for the tetraquarks, which are not at hand. We use heavy quark symmetry to relate the corresponding form factors at the symmetry point and have argued that this should be a good approximation, as the underlying weak Hamiltonian for the  $B \rightarrow (D, D^*)\ell\nu_\ell$  and  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}} \rightarrow T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}\ell\nu_\ell$  is the same, resulting from the  $b \rightarrow cW^-$  transition, involving heavy quarks in the initial and final states. This implies that the momentum-transfer to the spectators is small in both cases. A relation between the Isgur-Wise form factors of the double-bottom tetraquarks and the  $B$ -mesons follows in the symmetry limit.

For the non-leptonic decays, we have concentrated for the cases where  $X$  is a single light hadron  $X = \pi^-, \rho^-, a_1^-$ , which represent the so-called color-allowed tree diagrams, and have used factorization to write the hadronic matrix elements - a method well-known from the decays  $B \rightarrow (D, D^*)\pi$ . Of course, it remains to be seen if the QCD corrections are small in this case as well. The largest uncertainty in the decay rates presented here, however, lies in the composition of the tetraquark wave-function. Following a Lattice-QCD study [12], this is composed of diquarkonic and mesonic components. In the present context, we parametrize it by the diquarkonic fraction  $(f_{Dd}(bb))^2$ , with the mesonic fraction given by  $1 - (f_{Dd}(bb))^2$ . Further studies using the Lattice-QCD techniques are needed to quantify this fraction. We argue that experimental measurements of some of the branching ratios presented here may also determine this fraction. Assuming the dominance of the diquarkonic component, i.e., setting  $(f_{Dd}(bb))^2 = 1$ , the decay rates are shown in Table II. They are large enough to be measured at the HL-LHC, and in the long run at the proposed Tera- $Z$  factories. Since these measurements involve the bottom-charm tetraquarks in the final state, they have to be measured first in sufficient numbers. Detailed studies at the LHCb are encouraging [28, 29]. There are good prospects at the two large experiments (ATLAS and CMS) at the LHC due to their larger acceptance and much higher integrated luminosity. The extension to the non-leptonic decays of the tetraquarks resulting from the weak decay  $b \rightarrow c\bar{c}s$  are obvious. Of course, many more decay modes of the tetraquarks following from the  $b$ -quark decays  $b \rightarrow c(\bar{u}\bar{d}, \bar{c}s)$  can be calculated.

We have also worked out the weak decays of the  $J^P = 0^+$  bottom-charm tetraquark  $T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}} \rightarrow T_{cc\bar{u}\bar{d}} + X$ , where  $X = \ell^- \nu_\ell$ , hadrons, with the final-state tetraquark identified with the observed double-charm narrow state  $T_{cc}^+(3875)$ , having  $J^P = 1^+$ , decaying to  $DD^*$  [1]. Their branching ratios are also shown in Table 2. Compared to the corresponding decays of the double-bottom tetraquarks, they are smaller due to the anticipated larger decay width of the  $T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}$  tetraquark. We recall that there are three branches of the weak decays of  $T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}$ . Their relative fractions, based on the anticipated similarities with the bottom-charm baryon  $\Xi_{bcu}$  decays [22] are estimated as  $b \rightarrow c$ ;  $f_b = 0.22 \pm 0.04$ ,  $c \rightarrow s$ ;  $f_c = 0.72 \pm 0.04$ , and  $W^\pm$ -exchange,  $f_W = 0.06 \pm 0.04$  [29]. Of these, only the  $b \rightarrow c$  transition will yield the observed tetraquark  $T_{cc}^+(3875)$ . Other branches will lead to different final states, of which we expect that the  $c \rightarrow s$  transition may also lead to a tetraquark with the quark content  $T_{bs\bar{u}\bar{d}}$  from the decays  $T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}} \rightarrow T_{bs\bar{u}\bar{d}} + (\ell^+ \nu_\ell, X)$ . Due to the larger fraction of the  $c \rightarrow s$  decay,  $f_c$ , this might be a promising place to discover a tetraquark with four different quark flavors.

In summary, weak decays of the double-heavy tetraquarks, some of which are discussed here, are anticipated to induce tetraquark  $\rightarrow$  tetraquark transitions. This is due to the presence of a doubly-heavy diquark component in the Fock-space of these hadrons. These signature decays of the compact tetraquarks may be observed at the high-luminosity LHC experiments (LHCb, ATLAS and CMS) [30, 31, 49], and eventually at the Tera- $Z$  factories, being considered at the future circular  $e^+e^-$  machines at CERN [32] and China [33]. Establishing these decays will provide a proof of the existence of double-heavy diquarks, long anticipated in the context of the heavy tetraquarks [5], which have now received additional support from the Lattice-QCD studies.

### Acknowledgements

This project was initiated during the 5th. International Workshop on Heavy Quark Physics at NCP, Islamabad. One of us (AA) would like to thank NCP for the kind hospitality. We acknowledge helpful discussions with Timothy Gershon, Luciano Maiani and Ivan Polyakov.

- 
- [1] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb], Nature Phys. **18** (2022) no.7, 751-754 doi:10.1038/s41567-022-01614-y [arXiv:2109.01038 [hep-ex]].  
[2] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb], Nature Commun. **13** (2022) no.1, 3351 doi:10.1038/s41467-022-30206-w [arXiv:2109.01056 [hep-ex]].

- [3] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb], Phys. Rev. Lett. **119** (2017) no.11, 112001 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.119.112001 [arXiv:1707.01621 [hep-ex]].
- [4] J. P. Ader, J. M. Richard and P. Taxil, Phys. Rev. D **25** (1982), 2370 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.25.2370
- [5] A. V. Manohar and M. B. Wise, Nucl. Phys. B **399** (1993), 17-33 doi:10.1016/0550-3213(93)90614-U [arXiv:hep-ph/9212236 [hep-ph]].
- [6] D. Ebert, R. N. Faustov, V. O. Galkin and W. Lucha, Phys. Rev. D **76** (2007), 114015 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.76.114015 [arXiv:0706.3853 [hep-ph]].
- [7] R. L. Jaffe, Phys. Rev. D **15** (1977), 267 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.15.267
- [8] R. L. Jaffe and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91** (2003), 232003 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.91.232003 [arXiv:hep-ph/0307341 [hep-ph]].
- [9] For a review and references to earlier literature, see, for example, A. Ali, L. Maiani and A. D. Polosa, Cambridge University Press, 2019, ISBN 978-1-316-76146-5, 978-1-107-17158-9, 978-1-316-77419-9 doi:10.1017/9781316761465
- [10] T. Mehen, Phys. Rev. D **96** (2017) no.9, 094028 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.96.094028 [arXiv:1708.05020 [hep-ph]].
- [11] E. J. Eichten and C. Quigg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **119** (2017) no.20, 202002 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.119.202002 [arXiv:1707.09575 [hep-ph]].
- [12] P. Bicudo, A. Peters, S. Veltan and M. Wagner, Phys. Rev. D **103** (2021) no.11, 114506 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.103.114506 [arXiv:2101.00723 [hep-lat]].
- [13] C. Alexandrou, J. Finkenrath, T. Leontiou, S. Meinel, M. Pflaumer and M. Wagner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **132** (2024) no.15, 151902 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.132.151902 [arXiv:2312.02925 [hep-lat]].
- [14] A. Radhakrishnan, M. Padmanath and N. Mathur, [arXiv:2404.08109 [hep-lat]].
- [15] C. Alexandrou, J. Finkenrath, T. Leontiou, S. Meinel, M. Pflaumer and M. Wagner, [arXiv:2404.03588 [hep-lat]].
- [16] For a comprehensive comparison of binding energies for the  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}$  and  $T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{s}}$  tetraquarks in the Lattice and other model approaches, see, for example, Fig. 13 of [15].
- [17] A. Ali, A. Y. Parkhomenko, Q. Qin and W. Wang, Phys. Lett. B **782** (2018), 412-420 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2018.05.055 [arXiv:1805.02535 [hep-ph]].
- [18] S. S. Agaev, K. Azizi, B. Barsbay and H. Sundu, Eur. Phys. J. A **56** (2020), 177 doi:10.1140/epja/s10050-020-00187-9 [arXiv:2001.01446 [hep-ph]].
- [19] S. S. Agaev, K. Azizi, B. Barsbay and H. Sundu, Eur. Phys. J. A **57** (2021) no.3, 106 doi:10.1140/epja/s10050-021-00428-5 [arXiv:2008.02049 [hep-ph]].
- [20] E. Hernández, J. Vijande, A. Valcarce and J. M. Richard, Phys. Lett. B **800** (2020), 135073 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2019.135073 [arXiv:1910.13394 [hep-ph]].
- [21] A. K. Ridgway and M. B. Wise, Phys. Lett. B **793** (2019), 181-184 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2019.04.020 [arXiv:1902.04582 [hep-ph]].
- [22] V. V. Kiselev and A. K. Likhoded, Phys. Usp. **45** (2002), 455-506 doi:10.1070/PU2002v045n05ABEH000958 [arXiv:hep-ph/0103169 [hep-ph]].
- [23] T. Gershon and A. Poluektov, JHEP **01** (2019), 019 doi:10.1007/JHEP01(2019)019 [arXiv:1810.06657 [hep-ph]].
- [24] M. Karliner and J. L. Rosner, Phys. Rev. D **90** (2014) no.9, 094007 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.90.094007 [arXiv:1408.5877 [hep-ph]].
- [25] A. V. Berezhnoy, A. K. Likhoded and A. V. Luchinsky, Phys. Rev. D **98** (2018) no.11, 113004 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.98.113004 [arXiv:1809.10058 [hep-ph]].
- [26] For a comprehensive comparison of binding energies for the  $T_{bc\bar{u}\bar{d}}$  tetraquark in Lattice and other model approaches, see, for example, Fig.8 of [14].
- [27] R. L. Workman *et al.* [Particle Data Group], PTEP **2022** (2022), 083C01 doi:10.1093/ptep/ptac097
- [28] Steven Blusk, LHCb mini-workshop: $T_{cc}$  and Beyond (Sept. 2021).
- [29] Ivan Polyakov, LHCb mini-workshop: $T_{bc}$  (2023).
- [30] P. Azzi, S. Farry, P. Nason, A. Tricoli, D. Zeppenfeld, R. Abdul Khalek, J. Alimena, N. Andari, L. Aperio Bella and A. J. Armbruster, *et al.* CERN Yellow Rep. Monogr. **7** (2019), 1-220 doi:10.23731/CYRM-2019-007.1 [arXiv:1902.04070 [hep-ph]].
- [31] A. Cerri, V. V. Gligorov, S. Malvezzi, J. Martin Camalich, J. Zupan, S. Akar, J. Alimena, B. C. Allanach, W. Altmannshofer and L. Anderlini, *et al.* CERN Yellow Rep. Monogr. **7** (2019), 867-1158 doi:10.23731/CYRM-2019-007.867 [arXiv:1812.07638 [hep-ph]].
- [32] A. Abada *et al.* [FCC], Eur. Phys. J. ST **228** (2019) no.2, 261-623 doi:10.1140/epjst/e2019-900045-4
- [33] J. B. Guimarães da Costa *et al.* [CEPC Study Group], [arXiv:1811.10545 [hep-ex]].
- [34] A. Ali, Q. Qin and W. Wang, Phys. Lett. B **785** (2018), 605-609 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2018.09.018 [arXiv:1806.09288 [hep-ph]].
- [35] A. V. Manohar and M. B. Wise, Camb. Monogr. Part. Phys. Nucl. Phys. Cosmol. **10** (2000), 1-191
- [36] M. Neubert, Phys. Rept. **245** (1994), 259-396 doi:10.1016/0370-1573(94)90091-4 [arXiv:hep-ph/9306320 [hep-ph]].
- [37] N. Isgur and M. B. Wise, Phys. Lett. B **232** (1989), 113-117 doi:10.1016/0370-2693(89)90566-2
- [38] N. Isgur and M. B. Wise, Phys. Lett. B **237** (1990), 527-530 doi:10.1016/0370-2693(90)91219-2
- [39] A. F. Falk, H. Georgi, B. Grinstein and M. B. Wise, Nucl. Phys. B **343** (1990), 1-13 doi:10.1016/0550-3213(90)90591-Z
- [40] Z. Ligeti, Y. Nir and M. Neubert, Phys. Rev. D **49** (1994), 1302-1309 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.49.1302 [arXiv:hep-ph/9305304 [hep-ph]].
- [41] M. E. Luke, Phys. Lett. B **252** (1990), 447-455 doi:10.1016/0370-2693(90)90568-Q
- [42] M. Neubert, Phys. Lett. B **264** (1991), 455-461 doi:10.1016/0370-2693(91)90377-3
- [43] M. A. Shifman, N. G. Uraltsev and A. I. Vainshtein, Phys. Rev. D **51** (1995), 2217 [erratum: Phys. Rev. D **52** (1995), 3149] doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.52.3149 [arXiv:hep-ph/9405207 [hep-ph]].
- [44] A. Czarnecki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76** (1996), 4124-4127 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.76.4124 [arXiv:hep-ph/9603261 [hep-ph]].
- [45] See, for example, the mini-review by T. Mannel and P. Urquijo, in R. L. Workman *et al.* [Particle Data Group], PTEP

**2022** (2022), 083C01 doi:10.1093/ptep/ptac097

- [46] I. Caprini, L. Lellouch and M. Neubert, Nucl. Phys. B **530**, 153-181 (1998) doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(98)00350-2 [arXiv:hep-ph/9712417 [hep-ph]].
- [47] M. Bauer, B. Stech and M. Wirbel, Z. Phys. C **34** (1987), 103 doi:10.1007/BF01561122
- [48] M. J. Dugan and B. Grinstein, Phys. Lett. B **255** (1991), 583-588 doi:10.1016/0370-2693(91)90271-Q
- [49] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb], [arXiv:1808.08865 [hep-ex]].