arXiv:2310.20247v2 [hep-ph] 25 Apr 2024

Relativistic description of asymmetric fully heavy tetraquarks in the diquark–antidiquark model

V. O. Galkin^{1*} and E. M. Savchenko^{1,2†}

¹Federal Research Center "Computer Science and Control",

Russian Academy of Sciences, Vavilov Street 40, 119333 Moscow, Russia

²Faculty of Physics, M.V.Lomonosov Moscow State University, Leninskie Gory 1-2, 119991 Moscow, Russia

(Dated: April 26, 2024)

Masses of the ground, orbitally and radially excited states of the asymmetric fully heavy tetraquarks, composed of charm (c) and bottom (b) quarks and antiquarks are calculated in the relativistic diquark-antidiquark picture. The relativistic quark model based on the quasipotential approach and quantum chromodynamics is used to construct the quasipotentials of the quark-quark and diquark-antidiquark interactions. These quasipotentials consist of the short-range one-gluon exchange and long-distance linear confinement interactions. Relativistic effects are consistently taken into account. A tetraquark is considered as a bound state of a diquark and an antidiquark which are treated as a spatially extended colored objects and interact as a whole. It is shown that most of the investigated tetraquarks states (including all ground states) lie above the fall-apart strong decay thresholds into a meson pair. As a result they could be observed as wide resonances. Nevertheless, several orbitally excited states lie slightly above or even below these fall-apart thresholds, thus they could be narrow states.

I. INTRODUCTION

The possibility of the existence of hadrons with a content of valence quarks and antiquarks different from the quark-antiquark pair for mesons and three quarks for baryons has been considered since the first days of the existence of the quark model [1, 2]. Nevertheless the lack of convincing experimental evidence of such multiquark states reduced interest in their study. However, in the last two decades the situation has completely changed, as the first explicit experimental evidence of such exotic hadrons has finally been obtained (see the extensive reviews [3–5] and references therein). Currently, a several dozens of exotic hadron candidates and a number of reliably confirmed tetraquarks $qq\overline{qq}$ (cs \overline{ud} — LHCb 2020 [6]; $cud\bar{s}, cd\bar{u}\bar{s}$ — LHCb 2022 [7]; $cc\bar{u}\bar{d}$ — LHCb 2021 [8]; $cuc\bar{s}$ - LHCb 2021 [9]; $cd\overline{cs}$ - LHCb 2023 [10]; $cs\overline{cs}$ - CMS 2013 [11], LHCb 2016, 2021, 2022 [9, 12, 13]; cccc — LHCb 2020 [14], ATLAS 2023 [15], CMS 2023 [16]) and pentaquarks $qqqq\overline{q}$ (uudc \overline{c} — LHCb 2015, 2019 [17, 18]; $udsc\overline{c}$ — LHCb 2022 [19]) have been discovered. The most recent detailed review on the exotic hadrons can be found in Ref. [20].

Currently in the literature there is no consensus on the nature of experimentally observed states with exotic properties. Thus significantly different interpretations have been proposed for four-quark states. The main of them are the following.

• Compact tetraquark (i.e. exotic hadron) consisting of a diquark and an antidiquark, bound by the strong color interactions [21–23];

- Molecule consisting of two mesons loosely coupled by the meson exchange [24];
- Hadroquarkonium consisting of a heavy quarkonium embedded in a light meson [25, 26];
- Kinematic casp [27], etc.

Discriminating among these description is a very difficult experimental task.

The simplest exotic system is a tetraquark consisting of two quarks and two antiquarks. Heavy tetraquarks are of particular interest, because the presence of a heavy quark increases the binding energy of the bound system and, as a consequence, the probability that masses of such tetraquarks will be below the thresholds of decay into mesons with open or hidden heavy flavors. In such case the fall-apart strong decays occurring through the rearrangement of quarks and antiquarks are kinematically forbidden. Then the corresponding tetraquarks can decay only via the weak or electromagnetic interactions and, therefore, they must have a narrow decay width. If the predicted tetraquarks have masses slightly (by several MeV) exceeding these thresholds, then they could also be observed as resonances. The excited states of tetraquarks despite the large phase space could also be narrow resonances since their decays could be suppressed either by a centrifugal barrier between quarks and antiquarks for orbitally excited states or by nodes of the wave function for radially excited states or by both simultaneously.

The fully heavy tetraquark states have been studied in the literature since the beginning of 80s (see e.g. Refs. [28–32]).

In this paper we study the asymmetric in flavor fully heavy (containing only heavy quarks) tetraquarks. This choice significantly reduces the number of approaches used to describe them. There are already a number of theoretical calculations within the framework of a variety of models [33–52], but there is no consensus in them

^{*} galkin@ccas.ru

[†] savchenko.em16@physics.msu.ru

which of the predicted states can live long enough for their experimental detection.

Experimental searches for the fully heavy tetraquarks are actively conducted at the Large Hadron Collider (LHC). And a certain successes have already been achieved. The LHCb [14], ATLAS [15] and CMS [16] Collaborations have discovered the above mentioned fully charmed tetraquark $cc\overline{cc}$ (resonance X(6900), etc.), and its mass is consistent with our recent predictions from Refs. [53–55]. On the other hand, the searches for the fully bottom tetraquark bbbb by the LHCb [56] and CMS [57, 58] Collaborations has not yet yielded any results which is also consistent with our predictions. Note that production of the asymmetric fully heavy tetraquarks is much more difficult experimental task since it requires production of at least three heavy quark-antiquark pairs. Nevertheless, the search for the fully heavy tetraquarks of every possible flavor composition continues.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II we give a description and physical justification of the model we have chosen for studying these four-quark structures. In Sec. III we describe the Relativistic Quark Model and its application to the calculation of the tetraquark mass spectra. In Sec. IV we present the results of our calculations. In Sec. V we analyze our predictions by comparing them with the thresholds for the fall-apart strong decays into a pair of heavy mesons. In Sec. VI we give a comparison of our results with the predictions of other researchers. Finally, in Sec. VII the results and conclusions are summarized.

II. MODEL OF FULLY HEAVY TETRAQUARKS

A tetraquark is a bound system of two quarks and two antiquarks $q_1q_2\overline{q}_3\overline{q}_4$. There are 6 flavors of quarks which are classified by their current mass values [59] into two groups.

• Light (u, d, s) with $m_{\rm q} \ll \Lambda_{\rm QCD}$

$$- m_{\rm u} = 2.16^{+0.49}_{-0.26} \text{ MeV},$$

$$- m_{\rm d} = 4.67^{+0.48}_{-0.17} \text{ MeV},$$

$$- m_{\rm s} = 93.4^{+8.6}_{-3.4} \text{ MeV};$$

• Heavy (c, b, t) with $m_{\rm Q} \gg \Lambda_{\rm QCD}$

$$-m_{\rm c} = 1.27 \pm 0.02 \text{ GeV},$$

$$-m_{\rm b} = 4.18^{+0.03}_{-0.02} \text{ GeV},$$

$$-m_{\rm t} = 172.69 \pm 0.30 \text{ GeV}.$$

where $\Lambda_{\rm QCD}\approx 200~{\rm MeV}$ is the quark confinement mass scale. In this paper we focus on the tetraquarks consisting only of heavy flavor quarks and antiquarks. However, we don't consider the t-quark as one of the possible constituents. It is almost two orders of magnitude heavier than the other heavy quarks, and, due to its colossal mass, it decays too quickly $(\tau_{\rm t} \lesssim 10^{-23}~{\rm s})$ via the

weak interaction not having enough time to form a bound state [60].

Two heavy quark flavors can be arranged into 9 types of fully heavy tetraquarks as follows.

- 3 symmetric (with hidden charm and/or bottom)
 - fully charmed $cc\overline{cc}$,
 - doubly charmed-bottom $cb\overline{c}\overline{b}$,
 - fully bottom bbbb;
- 6 asymmetric (with open charm and bottom)
 - triple charmed and bottom $cc\overline{cb}$, $bc\overline{cc}$,
 - double charmed and double bottom $cc\overline{bb}$, $bb\overline{cc}$,
 - triple bottom and charmed $bb\overline{b}\overline{c}$, $cb\overline{b}\overline{b}$.

Calculations for the ground states of all compositions [53, 54] and excited states of symmetric compositions [55] have been done in previous papers. Here we continue our study and calculate excited states of asymmetric compositions.

Tetraquarks are formed from the closely produced quark–antiquark pairs. Formation of symmetric combinations requires the production of only two pairs $(2 \times c\overline{c}, c\overline{c} + b\overline{b} \text{ and } 2 \times b\overline{b})$, while the formation of asymmetric combinations requires the production of at least three pairs which is a less probable event. Thus, symmetric states are more convenient for the experimental searches and we already have experimental candidates for the fully charmed tetraquarks (additional discussion on this topic can be found in Sec. V).

We employ the diquark–antidiquark picture in which the tetraquark is considered as a bound state of two unobservable colored structures: the diquark $[Q_1Q_2]$ and the antidiquark $[\overline{Q}_3\overline{Q}_4]$. This model is not new and is widely used in the hadron spectroscopy giving good agreement between the calculations (for example, baryon masses) and experiments [61, 62].

Another widely used approach for the description of four-quark states is the meson-meson molecular model. We consider such a picture to be significantly less probable for the fully heavy tetraquarks. Indeed, the binding in the molecule is mainly provided by the meson exchange resulting in the Yukawa-type potential. In the case of fully heavy tetraquarks such a meson contains only heavy quarks, thus, it is too massive to provide the sufficient binding (see discussion in Ref. [55], Sec. 2).

When calculating in the diquark–antidiquark picture one must take into account that the diquark (the further discussion applies to the antidiquarks as well) is a bound system of fermions and therefore obeys the generalized Pauli principle requiring the overall diquark wave function to be antisymmetric

```
\Psi_{\text{diquark}} = \psi_{\text{space}} \times \psi_{\text{color}} \times \psi_{\text{flavor}} \times \psi_{\text{spin}} \equiv \Psi_{\text{antisym.}} (1)
```

• The parity of the spatial part of the wave function is determined by the angular momentum *L*. Considering only ground states of the diquarks (the justification of this assumption will be given further in Sec. IV) and allowing excitations in the diquarkantidiquark system we get

$$P_{\text{ground state}} = (-1)^{L_{\text{ground state}}} \equiv (-1)^0 = 1, \qquad (2)$$
$$\implies \psi_{\text{space}} \equiv \psi_{\text{sym.}}.$$

• The color part of the wave function depends on the choice of the color representation of the diquark. Two quarks are two color triplets, and in combination they can give either a color symmetric sextet or an antisymmetric antitriplet (symmetrically-reversed for antidiquarks)

$$3 \times 3 = 6 \oplus 3, \overline{3} \times \overline{3} = \overline{6} \oplus 3.$$
(3)

Note that in the color-sextet representation the internal interaction between the quarks within the diquark is repulsive, since the mean value of the product of the color SU(3) generators between sextet states is positive. Therefore, the color-sextet diquark cannot be a bound state. Contrarily, the interaction between the quarks within the colorantitriplet diquark is attractive, thus, it is reasonable to choose the color-antitriplet for the further considerations. As a result

$$\psi_{\text{color}} \equiv \psi_{\text{antisym.}}.$$
 (4)

Note that if the quark–antiquark cross diquark– antidiquark interactions are included then they could stabilize the sextet–antisextet diquarks in the tetraquark. However, such interactions are neglected in the pure diquark–antidiquark model which we adopt here. This approximation reduces the Hilbert space leading to an upper limit of the full result.

• Thus, the remaining combination of the flavor and spin parts of the diquark wave function should be

symmetric

$$\psi_{\text{flavor}} \times \psi_{\text{spin}} \equiv \psi_{\text{sym.}}.$$
 (5)

Therefore, two combinations are allowed

$$\begin{cases} \psi_{\text{flavor}} = \psi_{\text{sym.}}, \\ \psi_{\text{spin}} = \psi_{\text{sym.}}, \end{cases} \text{ or } \begin{cases} \psi_{\text{flavor}} = \psi_{\text{antisym.}}, \\ \psi_{\text{spin}} = \psi_{\text{antisym.}}. \end{cases}$$
(6)

This means that if a diquark consists of quarks of the same flavor with the symmetric flavor part it can only be axialvector with the symmetric spin part. If a diquark contains quarks of different flavors then both symmetric and antisymmetric flavor parts are possible and the diquark can be both axialvector (A) and scalar (S) with spins $S_d = 1$ and $S_d = 0$, respectively.

III. RELATIVISTIC DIQUARK-ANTIDIQUARK PICTURE

The considered tetraquarks should be treated relitivistically. Indeed, the estimates from Ref. [63] show that heavy quark velocities can reach up to half the speed of light. In particular, we use the relativistic kinematics and dynamics provided by the Relativistic Quark Model based on the quasipotential approach which has successfully been applied for calculating the mass spectra of ordinary three-quark baryons [62] and quarkantiquark mesons [64]. Moreover, for the calculation of the tetraquarks mass spectra we use the diquarkantidiquark picture of tetraquarks and treat constituent diquarks as non-pointlike, spatially extended objects which interact as a whole. Thus, we account for the diquark internal structure and do not consider cross interactions between a quark from the diquark with an antiquark from the antidiquark.

In this framework the mass of a bound state is the solution of the relativistic Schrödinger-type quasipotential equation [65–67] which describes this bound state of two particles in a given quasipotential. In particular, we reduce the four-body problem to two consecutive twobody problems, as we first apply this approach to the quark–quark system forming a diquark [23, 61, 68, 69], and then to the diquark–antidiquark system forming a tetraquark [23, 69]. The quasipotential equation has the following form

$$\left(\frac{b^2(M)}{2\mu_{\rm R}(M)} - \frac{\mathbf{p}^2}{2\mu_{\rm R}(M)}\right)\Psi_{\rm d,T}(\mathbf{p}) = \int \frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3} V(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}; M)\Psi_{\rm d,T}(\mathbf{q}).$$
(7)

Here:

- indexes d and T denote the diquark and the tetraquark, respectively;
- **p** is a vector of the relative momentum;

- *M* is the mass of the bound state;
- $\mu_{\rm R}$ is the relativistic reduced mass of the con-

stituents, given by

$$\mu_{\rm R} = \frac{E_1 E_2}{E_1 + E_2} = \frac{M^4 - (m_1^2 - m_2^2)^2}{4M^3},\tag{8}$$

where:

- $-m_{1,2}$ are masses of the constituents,
- $-E_{1,2}$ are the on-mass-shell energies of the constituents

$$E_{1,2} = \frac{M^2 + m_{1,2}^2 - m_{2,1}^2}{2M}; \qquad (9)$$

• $b^2(M)$ is the on-mass-shell relative momentum in the center-of-mass system squared

$$b^{2}(M) = \frac{[M^{2} - (m_{1} + m_{2})^{2}][M^{2} - (m_{1} - m_{2})^{2}]}{4M^{2}}; (10)$$

- $\Psi_{T,d}(\mathbf{p})$ are the bound state wave functions;
- V(**p**, **q**; M) is the quasipotential operator of the constituents.

Indeed, Eq. (7) is relativistic. Its left-hand side contains relativistic kinematics, since the reduced mass of the bound state $\mu_{\rm R}$ and the on-mass-shell relative momentum $b^2(M)$ are complicated functions of the bound state mass M (Eqs. (8), (10)). The relativistic dynamics is contained in the right-hand side of Eq. (7), as the quasipotential $V(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}; M)$ is constructed with the help of the off-mass-shell scattering amplitude, projected onto the positive-energy states and contains all relativistic spin-independent and spin-dependent contributions.

The quasipotential of the quark-quark interaction in a diquark, as a constituent of the tetraquark, was already thoroughly discussed in, e.g., Ref. [55] (see Eqs. (5)-(15)). On its basis the diquark masses were already calculated in Refs. [23, 61, 68] which we use here as an input. Thus we do not give here further details. On the other hand, calculation of the tetraquark mass spectra is the main goal of this paper. Therefore, we discuss the construction of the diquark-antidiquark quasipotential in detail. First, we use the same assumptions about the structure of the interaction as for the quark-quark case. The effective interaction is the sum of the usual one-gluon exchange term with the mixture of the long-range vector and scalar linear confining potentials, where the vector confining potential vertex contains the additional Pauli term. Second, we take into account the finite size of the diquarks and their integer spin. As a result, the quasipotential is given by [23, 69]

$$V(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}; M) = \underbrace{\frac{\langle d(\mathcal{P}) | J_{\mu} | d(\mathcal{Q}) \rangle}{2\sqrt{E_{d}}\sqrt{E_{d}}} \frac{4}{3} \alpha_{s} D^{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{k}) \frac{\langle d'(\mathcal{P}') | J_{\nu} | d'(\mathcal{Q}') \rangle}{2\sqrt{E_{d'}}\sqrt{E_{d'}}}}_{\text{diquark-gluon interation}} + \underbrace{\Psi_{d}^{*}(\mathcal{P})\Psi_{d'}^{*}(\mathcal{P}')[J_{d;\mu}J_{d'}^{\mu}V_{\text{conf.}}^{V}(\mathbf{k}) + V_{\text{conf.}}^{S}(\mathbf{k})]\Psi_{d}(\mathcal{Q})\Psi_{d'}(\mathcal{Q}')},$$
(11)

confinement

where the first term dominates at short distances while the second one is dominant at long distances. The main ingredients of Eq. (11) are as follows (for more details and their explicit forms see Eqs. (10)-(12), (16)-(23) in Ref. [55]).

- d and d' denote the diquark and the antidiquark (i.e. constituents);
- $Q = (E_d, \pm \mathbf{q})$ and $\mathcal{P} = (E_d, \pm \mathbf{p})$ are the initial and final diquark momenta, respectively;
- $k = \mathcal{P} \mathcal{Q} = (0, \mathbf{k});$
- $E_{d,d'}$ are the on-shell diquark energies defined by Eq. (9), where $m_{1,2} \equiv M_{d,d'}$ are the diquark and antidiquark masses and M is the tetraquark mass;
- α_s is the running QCD coupling constant with freezing [70, 71] that takes into account the number of open quark flavors and energy scale as the reduced constituents mass;

- $D_{\mu\nu}(\mathbf{k})$ is the gluon propagator in the Coulomb gauge;
- $\Psi_{d}(\mathcal{P})$ is the diquark wave function which is unit matrix for the scalar diquark and polarization vector for the axialvector diquark;
- $J_{d;\mu}$ is the effective long-range vector interaction vertex of the diquark with the total chromomagnetic moment of the diquark chosen to be equal to zero to vanish the long-range chromomagnetic interaction.

Let us briefly discuss the most important terms.

• $V_{\text{conf.}}^{\text{V,S}}$ are the vector and scalar confining potentials which in the nonrelativistic limit in configuration space have the form consistent with the lattice calculations

$$V_{\text{conf.}}^{\mathrm{V}}(r) = (1 - \varepsilon) V_{\text{conf.}}(r),$$



Figure 1. Form factors F(r) for the various doubly heavy diquarks. $\{Q, Q'\}$ denotes the axialvector and [Q, Q'] denotes the scalar diquarks, respectively.

$$V_{\text{conf.}}^{S}(r) = \varepsilon V_{\text{conf.}}(r), \qquad (12)$$
$$V_{\text{conf.}}(r) = V_{\text{conf.}}^{V}(r) + V_{\text{conf.}}^{S}(r) = Ar + B,$$

where ε is the mixing coefficient.

• $\langle d(\mathcal{P}) | J_{\mu} | d(\mathcal{Q}) \rangle$ is the diquark–gluon interaction vertex that accounts for the internal structure of the diquark and leads to the emergence of the form

factor F(r) smearing the one-gluon exchange potential (see Fig. 1 and Eqs. (24)-(27) in Ref. [55]).

It is necessary to calculate the matrix elements of quark currents between diquarks $\langle d(\mathcal{P}) | J_{\mu} | d(\mathcal{Q}) \rangle$ to take into account the finite size of the diquark. These matrix elements are elastic (diagonal) and can be parametrized by the set of form factors $h_{+,1,2,3}(k^2)$ (see Eqs. (28)-(29) in Ref. [55]). They, in turn, can be expressed by the form factor in the momentum space $F(\mathbf{k}^2)$ calculated as the overlap integral of the diquark wave functions (see Eqs. (30)-(31) in Ref. [55]). The form factor F(r), which accounts for the diquark size, was first introduced for the description of doubly heavy baryons in Ref. [68] as the Fourier transform of the $\frac{F(\mathbf{k}^2)}{\mathbf{k}^2}$ multiplied then by r. It can be parametrized with high accuracy as [68]

$$F(r) = 1 - e^{-\xi r - \zeta r^2}.$$
 (13)

These form factors for the doubly heavy diquarks are shown in Fig. 1. In the tetraquark case the convolution of the diquark and antidiquark form factors arises. The numerical calculation shows that it can be well approximated by modifying the Coulomb potential via the diquark and antidiquark form factors in the following way

$$V_{\text{Coul.}}(r) \equiv -\frac{4}{3}\alpha_{\text{s}}\frac{F_1(r)F_2(r)}{r}.$$
(14)

As can be seen from Fig. 1 the closer we are to the doubly heavy diquark the more of its internal structure is resolved, while at large distances (r > 0.5 fm) its internal structure cannot be resolved and it looks point-like. Thus it is not necessary to introduce the diquark form factor into the confining interaction.

Finally, we obtain the diquark–antidiquark interaction potential [54, 55, 69]

$$V(r) = \left[V_{\text{Coul.}}(r) + V_{\text{conf.}}(r) + \frac{1}{E_1 E_2} \left\{ \mathbf{p} \left[V_{\text{Coul.}}(r) + V_{\text{conf.}}^{\text{V}}(r) \right] \mathbf{p} - \frac{1}{4} \Delta V_{\text{conf.}}^{\text{V}}(r) + V_{\text{Coul.}}^{\prime}(r) \frac{\mathbf{L}^2}{2r} \right\} \right]$$
(15.1)
+ $\left[\left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{1}{E_1(E_1 + M_1)} + \frac{1}{E_2(E_2 + M_2)} \right] \frac{V_{\text{Coul.}}^{\prime}(r)}{r} - \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{1}{M_1(E_1 + M_1)} + \frac{1}{M_2(E_2 + M_2)} \right] \frac{V_{\text{conf.}}^{\prime}(r)}{r} + \frac{\mu_d}{4} \left[\frac{1}{M_1^2} + \frac{1}{M_2^2} \right] \frac{V_{\text{conf.}}^{\prime}(r)}{r} + \frac{1}{E_1 E_2} \left[V_{\text{Coul.}}^{\prime}(r) + \frac{\mu_d}{4} \left(\frac{E_1}{M_1} + \frac{E_2}{M_2} \right) V_{\text{conf.}}^{\prime}(r) \right] \frac{1}{r} \right\} \mathbf{L}(\mathbf{S_1} + \mathbf{S_2}) + \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{1}{E_1(E_1 + M_1)} - \frac{1}{E_2(E_2 + M_2)} \right] \frac{V_{\text{coul.}}^{\prime}(r)}{r} - \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{1}{M_1(E_1 + M_1)} - \frac{1}{M_2(E_2 + M_2)} \right] \frac{V_{\text{conf.}}^{\prime}(r)}{r} + \frac{\mu_d}{4} \left[\frac{1}{M_1^2} - \frac{1}{M_2^2} \right] \frac{V_{\text{conf.}}^{\prime}(r)}{r} + \frac{1}{E_1 E_2} \frac{\mu_d}{4} \left(\frac{E_1}{M_1} - \frac{E_2}{M_2} \right) \frac{V_{\text{conf.}}^{\prime}(r)}{r} \right\} \mathbf{L}(\mathbf{S_1} - \mathbf{S_2}) \right]$ (15.2)

$$+ \left[\frac{1}{3E_1E_2} \left\{ \frac{1}{r} V'_{\text{Coul.}}(r) - V''_{\text{Coul.}}(r) + \frac{\mu_d^2}{4} \frac{E_1E_2}{M_1M_2} \left(\frac{1}{r} V'_{\text{conf.}}(r) - V''_{\text{conf.}}(r) \right) \right\} \left[\frac{3}{r^2} \left(\mathbf{S_1r} \right) \left(\mathbf{S_2r} \right) - \mathbf{S_1S_2} \right] \right]$$
(15.3)

$$+ \left[\frac{2}{3E_1 E_2} \left\{ \Delta V_{\text{Coul.}}(r) + \frac{\mu_{d}^2}{4} \frac{E_1 E_2}{M_1 M_2} \Delta V_{\text{conf.}}^{\text{V}}(r) \right\} \mathbf{S_1 S_2} \right],$$
(15.4)
(15)

where indexes 1, 2 denote the diquark and antidiquark, **p** is the relative momentum, $M_{1,2}$ and $E_{1,2}$ are the masses and energies of the diquark and antidiquark, μ_d is the total chromomagnetic moment of the diquark (we chose it to be zero), $\mathbf{S}_{1,2}$ is the diquark spin, **L** is the relative orbital momentum of the system, $V_{\text{conf.}}$ is the confining potential in the nonrelativistic limit (12).

The quasipotential (15) contains the spinindependent (15.1) including orbit-orbit interaction and spin-dependent terms, namely, spin-orbit interaction (15.2), tensor interaction (15.3) and spin-spin interaction (15.4). To evaluate the mass of the state with particular quantum numbers we need to calculate the spin-orbit matrix elements of the quasipotential. Employing the known relations between the orbital momentum **L**, total **S** and constituent spins $\mathbf{S}_{1,2}$ and the total momentum **J**

and known matrix elements of the momenta squared

we obtain the following expressions for the considered spin–orbit matrix elements (for details see Ref. [72]).

• Orbit–orbit interaction
$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{L}^2 \end{bmatrix} \equiv \mathbf{LL}$$
:
 $\langle \mathbf{L} \mathbf{S} \mathbf{J} | \mathbf{LL} | \mathbf{L'} \mathbf{S'} \mathbf{J'} \rangle = L(L+1) \cdot \delta_{L,L'} \delta_{S,S'} \delta_{J,J'}.$ (18)

• Spin–orbit interactions
$$\left[\mathbf{L} (\mathbf{S_1} \pm \mathbf{S_2}) \right] \equiv LS_{\pm}$$
:

$$\langle \mathbf{L} \mathbf{S} \mathbf{J} | \mathbf{LS}_{\pm} | \mathbf{L}' \mathbf{S}' \mathbf{J}' \rangle = (-1)^{L+S+J+S_1+S_2+1} \sqrt{L(L+1)(2L+1)(2S+1)(2S'+1)} \begin{cases} L & S & J \\ S' & L & 1 \end{cases}$$

$$\times \left((-1)^{S'} \sqrt{S_1(S_1+1)(2S_1+1)} \begin{cases} S_1 & S_1 & 1 \\ S' & S & S_2 \end{cases} \right)$$

$$\pm (-1)^S \sqrt{S_2(S_2+1)(2S_2+1)} \begin{cases} S_2 & S_2 & 1 \\ S' & S & S_1 \end{cases} \right) \cdot \delta_{L,L'} \delta_{J,J'}.$$

$$(19)$$

• Tensor interaction $\left[\frac{3}{r^2} \left(\mathbf{S_1r} \right) \left(\mathbf{S_2r} \right) - \mathbf{S_1S_2} \right] \equiv \mathbf{T}:$

$$\langle \mathbf{L} \mathbf{S} \mathbf{J} | \mathbf{T} | \mathbf{L}' \mathbf{S}' \mathbf{J}' \rangle = (-1)^{\mathbf{S}+\mathbf{J}} \sqrt{30(2L+1)(2L'+1)(2S+1)(2S'+1)} \\ \times \sqrt{S_1(S_1+1)(2S_1+1)} \sqrt{S_2(S_2+1)(2S_2+1)} \\ \times \begin{pmatrix} L' & 2 & L \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} J & S' & L' \\ 2 & L & S \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} S_1 & S_2 & S \\ S_1 & S_2 & S' \\ 1 & 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \delta_{J,J'}.$$

$$(20)$$

• Spin-spin interaction
$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{S_1S_2} \end{bmatrix} \equiv SS:$$

$$\langle \mathbf{L} \ \mathbf{S} \ \mathbf{J} | \ \mathbf{SS} \ | \mathbf{L'} \ \mathbf{S'} \ \mathbf{J'} \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \Big(S(S+1) - S_1(S_1+1) - S_2(S_2+1) \Big) \cdot \delta_{L,L'} \delta_{S,S'} \delta_{J,J'}.$$
(21)

Eqs. (19)-(20) contain 3j-, 6j- and 9j-symbols which can be found in the literature [72].

Note, that the calculation of the masses of tetraquarks with the asymmetric compositions requires additional account for the significant mixing between the states with the same observable quantum numbers (total momentum and parity) J^P , but different full tetraquark spins S, S'within the same excitation nL: $n^{2S+1}L_J \leftrightarrow n^{2S'+1}L_J$. In particular, the spin–orbit matrix elements for the orbit–orbit LL- (18), spin–orbit LS₊- (19) and spin–spin SS- (21) terms are always diagonal, while the spin–orbit LS₋- (19) and tensor T- (20) terms are generally nondiagonal. In the case of a symmetric composition the numerical multiplier before the spin–orbit LS₋-term vanishes and it effectively drops out of the calculations while the tensor T-term introduces only numerically insignificant mixing for orbitally excited (e.g. P-,D-wave) states with $J^{PC} = 1^{--}, 2^{++}$ which can be neglected. In the case of an asymmetric composition the spin–orbit LS_term plays a substantial role in mixing of the orbitally excited tetraquark states with the axialvector both diquark and antidiquark.

The masses of the corresponding mixed states are the eigenvalues of the mixing matrices. We introduce the following notations:

$$M_{L=a, J=b} \equiv M_{a,b},$$

$$M_{L=a, J=b}(S = c, S' = d) \equiv M_{a,b}(c, d),$$

$$\Delta M_{a,b}(c, d) = [M_{a,b}(c, d)]_{\text{full}} - [M_{a,b}(c, d)]_{\text{spin-ind.}},$$
(22)

where $[M]_{\text{full}}$ denotes the mass calculated with the complete quasipotential (15), and $[M]_{\text{spin-ind.}}$ denotes the mass calculated with only its spin-independent

part (15.1). The mixing matrices then can be expressed as follows.

• For the P-wave states the masses for the given total momenta J are eigenvalues of the matrices

$$J = 1: \quad M_{1,1} = \lambda \begin{pmatrix} M_{1,1}(0,0) & \Delta M_{1,1}(0,1) & \Delta M_{1,1}(0,2) \\ \Delta M_{1,1}(1,0) & M_{1,1}(1,1) & \Delta M_{1,1}(1,2) \\ \Delta M_{1,1}(2,0) & \Delta M_{1,1}(2,1) & M_{1,1}(2,2) \end{pmatrix},
J = 2: \quad M_{1,2} = \lambda \begin{pmatrix} M_{1,2}(1,1) & \Delta M_{1,2}(1,2) \\ \Delta M_{1,2}(2,1) & M_{1,2}(2,2) \end{pmatrix}.$$
(23)

• Similarly, mixing matrices for the D-wave states

$$J = 1: \quad M_{2,1} = \lambda \begin{pmatrix} M_{2,1}(1,1) & \Delta M_{2,1}(1,2) \\ \Delta M_{2,1}(2,1) & M_{2,1}(2,2) \end{pmatrix},$$

$$J = 2: \quad M_{2,2} = \lambda \begin{pmatrix} M_{2,2}(0,0) & \Delta M_{2,2}(0,1) & \Delta M_{2,2}(0,2) \\ \Delta M_{2,2}(1,0) & M_{2,2}(1,1) & \Delta M_{2,2}(1,2) \\ \Delta M_{2,2}(2,0) & \Delta M_{2,2}(2,1) & M_{2,2}(2,2) \end{pmatrix},$$

$$J = 3: \quad M_{2,3} = \lambda \begin{pmatrix} M_{2,3}(1,1) & \Delta M_{2,3}(1,2) \\ \Delta M_{2,3}(2,1) & M_{2,3}(2,2) \end{pmatrix}.$$
(24)

The general algorithm of the calculations of the tetraquark masses is as follows. First, we calculate the masses and wave functions of the doubly heavy diquarks as the bound quark-quark states. It is done by solving Eq. (7) with the quark-quark interaction quasipo-

tential (see Eqs. (5)-(15) in Ref. [55]) numerically. The initial value of the relativistic reduced mass $\mu_{\rm R}$ (8) is fixed to its nonrelativistic value and Eq. (7) is solved as the Schrödinger equation (for details see Ref. [73]). Then the masses of the bound states are found by the succession.

sive approximations method (for details see Ref. [67]). The masses of the tetraquarks and their wave functions are calculated for the bound diquark–antidiquark states with the quasipotential (15) using the same procedure with the obtained diquark masses as constituent masses.

All free parameters of our model, such as the confinement potential mixing coefficient ε , anomalous chromomagnetic moment κ , parameter of the running coupling constant Λ , confining potential parameters A, Band quark masses $m_{\rm c,b}$ were fixed previously and are taken from the study of the properties of mesons and baryons [74–77]. They are listed in Table I. The diquark masses $M_{\rm cc,cb,bb}$ and the parameters of their form factors ξ and ζ were already calculated earlier [68, 69] and are given in Table II.

IV. MASSES OF ASYMMETRIC FULLY HEAVY TETRAQUARKS

The calculated mass spectra of ground states (1S) and orbitally and radially excited states (1P, 2S, 1D, 2P, 3S) of asymmetric fully heavy tetraquarks ($cc\overline{c}b$, $bc\overline{c}c$, ccbb, $bb\overline{cc}$, $bb\overline{bc}$, $c\overline{bbb}$) are presented in Table III. Note that the account of the finite size of the diquark weakens the one-gluon exchange potential thus increasing the predicted tetraquark mass. Masses of the ground states of all possible flavor compositions (i.e. three symmetric and six asymmetric), as well as the same excitations of symmetric fully heavy tetraquarks (cccc, cbcb, bbbb) have already been calculated in our previous papers [53–55]. Although, the mixing arising exclusively from the tensor term between the orbitally excited symmetric states was not taken into account since, as we just discussed in Sec. III, in the symmetric case mixing can be discarded without loss of accuracy.

As we discussed in Sec. II a diquark can be either in scalar state with spin $S_d = 0$ or in axialvector state with $S_d = 1$. According to the Pauli principle the scalar diquark must contain quarks of different flavors while all diquarks can be in axialvector state. Therefore, the ccbb, bbcc tetraquarks can contain only axialvector diquarks and antidiquarks while the cccb, bccc, bbbc, cbbb tetraquarks can consist both from the axialvector diquark–antidiquark pair or a mixture of axialvector and scalar diquarks and antidiquarks. As a result, the cccb, bccc, bbbc, cbbb tetraquarks have more possible states, an additional 12 mixed scalar–axialvector states are added to the 32 pure-axialvector states.

It can be seen from Table III that the predicted spectroscopy of the ground and excited states of tetraquarks within the diquark–antidiquark model is very rich. Nonetheless, not all of the predicted states can be reliably observed in experiments due to the fast fall-apart strong decays into two heavy mesons through the quark rearrangement. In order to determine states that are the most promising to live long enough to be observed, we can put a number of limitations.

- First, we consider diquarks only in the color-triplet state. This choice was explained in Sec. II and is based on the following argument. In the colorantitriplet diquarks the internal quark-quark interaction potential is attractive thus the bound state is possible. Contrary the color-sextet diquarks have the repulsive internal interaction potential which makes the bound state unlikely to exist. Nevertheless, some researchers argue that the color-sextet diquarks can also contribute to the observable spectroscopy (for the discussion related to the asymmetric fully heavy tetraquarks in particular, see Refs. [35, 39, 42, 44, 48, 49]) and sometimes even dominate it (see Refs. [42, 44, 49] for the argument on the some ground states being dominated by the $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -color configuration).
- Second, we consider only the ground state diquarks with excitations occurring only between the diquark and antidiquark. Such excitations lead to a larger separation between the diquark and antidiquark within the tetraquark, consequently increasing the mean distance between the heavy quarks of the diquark and antiquarks from the antidiquark. Such configuration reduces the probability of the rapid fall-apart strong decay process and, as a result, these states have more chances to be observed as resonances. Contrarily, excitations within the diquark and/or antidiquark increase the diquark mass and size thus providing a larger overlap between the diquark and antidiquark which enhances the rapid fall-apart strong decay processes.

Additionally, suppression by the phase space, which is determined by the difference between the tetraquark mass and the meson pair decay threshold, increases chances of the state to be observed experimentally as a relatively narrow resonance (more on this topic in the following section). However, the excited states of the tetraquarks could be narrow despite the large phase space since it is necessary to overcome the suppression in the fall-apart process, either due to the centrifugal barrier for the orbital excitations or due to the presence of the nodes in the wave function of the radially excited state.

V. THRESHOLD ANALYSIS

In the previous section we have calculated the masses of asymmetric fully heavy tetraquarks. Now we need to understand which of the predicted tetraquark states could be observed experimentally, i.e. could appear as narrow resonances in different decay modes. Note that whether the state is truly a resonance is a difficult question requiring additional complex analysis. Such analysis is beyond the scope of the present paper. In the following we only identify states which could be observed as resonances. The probability rate of different types of decays is as follows.

Table I. Parameters of the model from Refs. [74–77].

$m_{\rm c}, {\rm GeV}$	$m_{\rm b},{ m GeV}$	A, GeV^2	B, GeV	$\Lambda, { m MeV}$	ε	κ
1.55	4.88	0.18	-0.3	414	-1	-1

Table II. Masses $M_{QQ'}$ and form factor parameters ξ, ζ of the diquarks from Refs. [68, 69]. d is the axialvector (A) or scalar (S) diquark. [Q, Q'] and $\{Q, Q'\}$ denote combinations of quarks asymmetric and symmetric in flavor, respectively.

QQ'	d		Q = c			Q = b			
	u	$M_{\rm cQ'}, {\rm MeV}$	ξ, GeV	$\zeta, {\rm GeV}^2$	$M_{\rm bQ'}, {\rm MeV}$	ξ, GeV	$\zeta, {\rm GeV}^2$		
[Q, c]	S				6,519	1.50	0.59		
$\{Q, c\}$	Α	3,226	1.30	0.42	6,526	1.50	0.59		
$\{Q, b\}$	А	6,526	1.50	0.59	9,778	1.30	1.60		

• The most probable is the fall-apart strong decay, where the quarks and antiquarks from the initial tetraquark rearrange into two mesons

$$Q_1 Q_2 \overline{Q}_3 \overline{Q}_4 \longrightarrow Q_1 \overline{Q}_3 + Q_2 \overline{Q}_4.$$
 (25)

If energetically possible and isn't forbidden by the quantum numbers, this is the main decay channel. As the state can decay very rapidly, it could be observed as a broad resonance in this channel.

• Then there is the strong decay due to the heavy quark-antiquark annihilation into gluons (g), followed by their hadronization into lighter hadrons (h_i)

$$Q_1 Q_2 \overline{Q}_3 \overline{Q}_4 \longrightarrow g + g + ... \longrightarrow h_1 + h_2 +$$
 (26)

Such processes are strongly suppressed by the Okubo-Zweig-Iizuki rule. Nevertheless, such decays are always possible for the fully heavy tetraquarks which contain at least one quark—antiquark pair of the same flavor (we have only two heavy quark flavors). Thus, if the fall-apart strong decay is forbidden the state could be observed as narrow in this decay channel.

• Even less probable is the radiative decay which is determined by the radiative transition from the higher to the lower excitation of the tetraquark state

$$Q_1 Q_2 \overline{Q}_3 \overline{Q}_4 \longrightarrow Q_1 Q_2 \overline{Q}_3 \overline{Q}_4 + \gamma.$$
 (27)

These processes are suppressed by the significantly lower coupling constant of the electromagnetic interaction α ($\alpha \ll \alpha_S$). Thus, if the fall-apart strong decay is forbidden and and gluon-annihilation is significantly suppressed than the tetraquark could be observed as a very narrow state in this decay channel.

• In fact, the least probable is the weak decay which can be completely neglected in this discussion due to the smallness of the weak coupling constant $\alpha_{\rm W}$

 $(\alpha_{\rm W} \ll \alpha \ll \alpha_{\rm S})$. However, the possible weak decay channels of the ccbb, bbcc tetraquark in the ground state are discussed in Ref. [37].

Therefore, in order to analyze the possibility of the experimental observations it is useful to compare the calculated tetraquark masses with the fall-apart strong decay thresholds, i.e. masses of pairs of mesons composed of the same quarks and antiquarks as the initial tetraquark. This difference determines the phase space and, thus, the probability of the corresponding fall-apart strong decays. Hence, two cases can be distinguished.

- If a mass of the tetraquark exceeds the mass of the meson pair (energetically possible) and total momentum-parity J^P of the initial and final systems coincides (allowed by the quantum numbers), then the fall-apart strong decay (25) is possible and it is the main channel. As we have just discussed, generally such states could be observed as broad resonances. Note that the closer the tetraquark mass is to the threshold the narrower the state can be.
- If a mass of the tetraquark lies below the corresponding threshold then the fall-apart strong decay (25) is forbidden and the main channels will be either gluon-annihilation (26) or radiative decays (27), if allowed. Such processes are both strongly suppressed and, as a result, these tetraquark states are narrow and could be observed experimentally in other decay channels into hadrons composed of lighter quarks and antiquarks, or into the lower tetraquark excitation and a photon.

Note than an excited tetraquark can fall-apart into a meson pair, allowed by the total momentum-parity conservation, either in the S-wave with the orbital momentum between these mesons $L_{\text{thr.}} = 0$, or in the higher wave with $L_{\text{thr.}} > 0$. In the former case the final state contains orbitally excited mesons with heavier masses. In the latter case the final mesons have lower masses due to the lower orbital excitations. However, such decays are

$d\overline{d}'$	nL	n_r	L	S	J^P	$M_{\rm ccc\overline{b}, bc\overline{cc}}$	$M_{\rm cc\overline{b}\overline{b}, bb\overline{c}\overline{c}}$	$M_{\rm bb\overline{b}\overline{c},cb\overline{b}\overline{b}}$
				0	0^{+}	9,606	12,848	16,102
	1S	0	0	1	1^{+}	9,611	12,852	16,104
				2	2^{+}	9,620	12,859	16,108
				1	0-	9,875	13,106	16,326
				0		9,871	13,103	16,325
				1	1^{-}	$9,\!877$	13,108	16,326
	1P	0	1	2		9,881	13,111	16,329
				1	2^{-}	9,875	13,106	16,327
				2	2	9,882	13,112	16,329
				2	3-	9,881	$13,\!110$	16,330
				0	0+	10,063	13,282	$16,\!481$
	2S	1	0	1	1+	10,064	13,282	$16,\!481$
				2	2^+	10,064	13,283	$16,\!481$
				2	0^{+}	10,113	13,330	16,513
			2	1	1+	10,111	13,328	16,513
$A\overline{A}$				2	Ŧ	10,114	13,331	16,514
	_			0	2^{+}	10,108	13,324	16,513
	1D	0		1		10,113	13,330	16,514
				2		10,117	13,334	16,515
				1	3^{+}	10,111	13,327	16,515
				2		10,116	13,332	16,516
				2	4+	10,114	13,329	16,516
				1	0^{-}	10,265	13,468	16,631
				0		10,258	13,461	16,629
		_	1	1	1^{-}	10,264	13,468	16,630
	2P	1		2		10,270	13,472	16,633
				1	2^{-}	10,260	13,463	16,630
				2		10,268	13,470	16,632
				2	3	10,263	13,466	16,631
	90	0	0	0	0	10,442	13,629	16,765
	38	2	0	1	1'	10,442	13,629	16,765
	. ~			2	2+	10,440	13,628	16,764
	18	0	0		1+	9,608		16,099
	17				0-	9,873		16,320
	1P	0	1			9,872		16,321
					2-	9,871		16,322
	2S	1	0		1+	10,057		16,474
$S\overline{A}, A\overline{S}$		-	_	1	1+	10,108		16,507
,	1D	0	2		2+	10,107		16,508
					3+	10,105		16,509
					0-	10,262		16,624
	2P	1	1		1-	10,260		16,624
					2-	10,254		16,624
	3S	2	0		1^{+}	10,434		16,758

highly suppressed by the additional factor $(\mathbf{p}^2/M^2)^{L_{\text{thr.}}}$, where \mathbf{p} is the relative momentum. The estimates of these suppression factors for the fully heavy tetraquarks give values less than 10^{-2} . Thus in this paper we consider only the S-wave fall-apart strong decays. thresholds. As we just discussed, the values of the mass separation from the threshold Δ which determines the phase space volume are of special interest

$$\Delta = M_{\rm QQ'\overline{\rm QQ}'} - M_{\rm thr.}, \qquad (28)$$

In Tables IV-VI we compare our calculations for the asymmetric fully heavy tetraquarks masses from Table III with the meson-meson fall-apart strong decay

where $M_{\rm QQ'\overline{QQ'}}$ is the tetraquark mass and $M_{\rm thr.}$ is the threshold for the decay into a meson pair which is the

sum of the meson masses. We are interested in the most probable decay modes for each state. The rate of the fall-apart strong decay is governed by the phase space volume. The main principle is the following: the smaller the phase space is, the less energetically favorable the decay is. Consequently, at any given time, the probability of transition to the final state (i.e. decay) is small. Thus the main decay channel being the most probable decay mode corresponds to the largest of possible values of Δ : Δ_{max} . Therefore, in Tables IV-VI we compare the masses of tetraquarks only with the lowest fall-apart strong decay thresholds, as

 $[M_{\text{thr.}}]_{\min} \leftrightarrow \Delta_{\max} \leftrightarrow \text{more probable decay mode.}$

From the Tables IV-VI, a number of conclusions can be drawn. In particular, we can distinguish three types of tetraquark states: those lying significantly above, slightly above and below the fall-apart strong decay thresholds.

• For all of the considered ground and excited states of asymmetric fully heavy tetraquarks, with the exception of two higher excitations (they will be discussed separately), there is at least one heavy meson pair with a total mass less than the tetraquark mass ($\Delta_{\text{max}} > 0$). Therefore, for almost all of

the considered states of tetraquarks there is a possibility of such fall-apart strong decay. Moreover, for the vast majority of considered states of tetraquarks the value of the Δ_{max} significantly exceeds 100 MeV and for many of them it even exceeds 500 MeV. As we have discussed in the beginning of this section, experimentally such states could manifest themselves as wide resonances. However, this statement is true only for the ground states of tetraquarks. For the excited states the additional restrictions appear. In particular, these decays can be suppressed either by the centrifugal barrier between the quark and the antiquark (for the orbital excitations), or by the zeros of the wave function (for the radial excitations), or both, and therefore they still can end up being narrow resonances.

- Nonetheless, there is a number of states for which $\Delta_{max} \leq 100$ MeV. Although, such states lie above, they are already close to the threshold of the fall-apart strong decay into a pair of mesons. Thus, in Tables IV-VI they are highlighted in purple as promising to be relatively narrow.
- Finally, there are two states (highlighted in red in Tables IV-VI) which lie below any of the possible heavy meson pair thresholds with their $\Delta_{max} < 0$:

 $\operatorname{ccc\overline{b}}, \operatorname{bcc\overline{cc}} \quad A\overline{A} \quad 1D \quad J^P = 4^+ \quad M = 10,114 \text{ MeV},$ (29)

$$\operatorname{cc\overline{bb}}, \operatorname{bb}\overline{\operatorname{cc}}$$
 \overline{AA} $1D$ $J^P = 4^+$ $M = 13,329$ MeV. (30)

Note that our calculations have a theoretical error: the uncertainties of our calculations come from the quark model and diquark-antidiquark approximation. We roughly estimate them from our previous experience to be about 20 - 50 MeV. Thus, if Δ_{\max} is slightly negative, it does not mean for sure that the state cannot fall-apart into a meson pair. However, if the value of Δ_{\max} is sufficiently negative than the state definitely cannot decay via the strong fall-apart strong decay processes into two heavy mesons. In this case the main channels will be a strong decay due to the heavy guarkantiquark annihilation into gluons with their subsequent hadronization into the lighter hadrons or radiative decays, if allowed. As a result, this state could be a narrow state that could be observed experimentally in other decay channels, either to hadrons made up of lighter quarks and antiquarks or two heavy mesons and a photon.

In the Table VII we additionally present states of the asymmetric fully heavy tetraquarks which lie below or slightly above ($\Delta_{\max} \lesssim 100 \text{ MeV}$) the meson–meson fallapart strong decay thresholds. Such states have the most chances to be observed in experiments, as it was discussed above. Also in Tables IV-VI we highlight in bold all lowest thresholds containing the $B_c^{\pm}(1^1S_0)$ -meson. The reason is that currently only two charmed–bottom mesons were observed [59] — $B_c^{\pm}(1^1S_0)$ and $B_c^{\pm}(2^1S_0)$, both with total momentum–parity $J^P = 0^-$.

Let us discuss the recent experimental progress. As we have already mentioned in Sec. II the symmetric fully heavy flavor compositions are easier to obtain. Moreover, the first experimental data for the symmetric states of the fully charmed tetraquark (X(6900) and a few broad peaks in the 6.4-7.4 GeV mass region) were recently reported by the LHCb [14], ATLAS [15] and CMS [16] Collaborations. All experiments indicate the existence of at least three structures which can be denoted as X(6600), X(6900) and X(7200). In Table VIII we compare these data with our previous predictions from Ref. [55] and propose possible quantum numbers J^{PC} for the observed states.

Table IV. Masses $M_{QQ'\overline{QQ'}}$ of the ground (1S) and excited (1P, 2S, 1D, 2P, 3S) states of the triple charmed and bottom (cccb, bccc) fully heavy tetraquark, composed from the axialvector and/or scalar diquarks and the corresponding meson–meson fall-apart strong decay thresholds. d and $\overline{d'}$ are the axialvector (A) or scalar (S) diquark and antidiquark, respectively. nL denotes the overall excitation. S is the total spin of the diquark–antidiquark system. J^P is the total momentum-parity of the tetraquark. $M_{\text{thr.}}$ is the corresponding meson–meson threshold [59, 64]. Δ_{max} is the difference between the tetraquark mass and lowest fall-apart threshold $\Delta_{\text{max}} = M_{QQ'\overline{QQ'}} - [M_{\text{thr.}}]_{\text{min}}$. All masses are given in MeV. States with the $\Delta_{\text{max}} \leq 100 \text{ MeV}$ are additionally highlighted in violet and bold. States with the $\Delta_{\text{max}} < 0$ are additionally highlighted in red and bold. The lowest thresholds, containing the $B_c^{\pm}(1^{-1}S_0)$ -meson, are additionally highlighted in bold.

$\overline{\Omega \Omega' \overline{\Omega \Omega'}}$	$d\overline{d}'$	тI	S	I^P	M .	М.	Δ	Meson pair
44.44	uu	<i>n</i> L	0		$\frac{M_{QQ'}\overline{QQ'}}{0.606}$	0.259		$(1\mathbf{S}) \mathbf{D}^{\pm}(1^{1}\mathbf{S})$
		19	1	1+	9,000	9,208	<u> </u>	$\frac{\eta_{\rm c}(15) \mathbf{D}_{\rm c} (1 S_0)}{\pi (15) \mathrm{D}^{\pm}(1^{3} \mathrm{C})}$
		15	- 1	1 2 ⁺	9,011	9,317	294	$\frac{\eta_{\rm c}(15) {\rm D}_{\rm c} (1.51)}{1/\psi(15) {\rm B}^{\pm}(1.35.)}$
				<u></u>	9,020	9,430	190	$\frac{J/\psi(1S) D_{c} (1 S_{1})}{n (1S) B^{\pm}(1^{3}P_{c})}$
			$\frac{1}{0}$	0	9,875	9,005	192	$\eta_{\rm c}(15) {\rm D}_{\rm c} (1 1 0)$
			1	1-	9.877	9 727	150	$n_{\rm r}$ (1S) B [±] (1 P ₁)
		1P	2	1	9.881	0,121	154	$\eta_{\rm C}(10) D_{\rm C}(111)$
			1		9.875		130	$(12) = \pm (12)$
			2	2^{-}	9,882	9,745	137	$\eta_{\rm c}(1{\rm S}) \ {\rm B}_{\rm c}^{\perp}(1{\rm }^{3}{\rm P}_{2})$
			2	3^-	9,881	9,858	23	$J/\psi(1S) B_{c}^{\pm}(1^{3}P_{2})$
			0	0^{+}	10,063	9,258	805	$\eta_{\rm c}(1{\rm S}) {\rm B}_{\rm c}^{\pm}(1 {}^{1}{\rm S}_{\rm 0})$
		2S	1	1+	10,064	9,317	747	$\eta_{\rm c}(1{\rm S}) \ {\rm B}_{\rm c}^{\pm}(1^{3}{\rm S}_{1})$
			2	2^{+}	10,064	9,430	634	$J/\psi(1S) B_{c}^{\pm}(1^{3}S_{1})$
			2	0^{+}	10,113	9,258	855	$\eta_{\rm c}(1{ m S})~{ m B}_{ m c}^{\pm}(1~{ m }^1{ m S}_0)$
			1	1+	10,111	0.217	794	$m(10) D^{\pm}(130)$
	\overline{AA}		2	1	$10,\!114$	9,317	797	$\eta_{\rm c}(15) {\rm D}_{\rm c} (1 S_1)$
			0		10,108		678	
		$1\mathrm{D}$	1	2^{+}	10,113	$9,\!430$	683	$J/\psi(1S) B_{c}^{\pm}(1^{3}S_{1})$
			2		10,117		687	
			1	3^+	10,111	10.013	98	$n_{\rm c}(1{\rm S}) {\rm B}^{\pm}(1{\rm }^{3}{\rm D}_{2})$
			2		10,116	10,010	103	76(10) 26 (1 23)
been			2	4+	10,114	10,126	-12	$J/\psi(1S) B_{c}^{\pm}(1^{3}D_{3})$
DUU			1	0-	10,265	9,683	582	$\eta_{\rm c}(1{\rm S}) \ {\rm B}_{\rm c}^{\perp}(1{\rm }^{3}{\rm P}_{0})$
		2P	0		10,258	0 505	531	(10) $\mathbf{D}^{\pm}(1\mathbf{D})$
			1	1-	10,264	9,727	537	$\eta_{\rm c}(1{\rm S}) \; {\rm B}_{\rm c}^{\pm}(1{\rm P}_1)$
			2		10,270		543	
			1	2^{-}	10,200	9,745	515	$\eta_{\rm c}(1{\rm S}) \ {\rm B}_{\rm c}^{\pm}(1 \ {}^{3}{\rm P}_{2})$
			2	9-	10,208	0.959		$I/a/a/(1S) D^{\pm}(1^{3}D_{-})$
			2	0 ⁺	10,203	9,000	405	$\frac{J/\psi(15) D_c (1 \Gamma_2)}{m (1\mathbf{S}) \mathbf{P}^{\pm}(1^{1}\mathbf{S}_2)}$
		38	1	1+	10,442	9,238	$\frac{1,104}{1,125}$	$\frac{\eta_{\rm c}(13) \mathbf{D}_{\rm c} \left(1 30\right)}{n (15) \mathrm{B}^{\pm}(1 {}^{3}\mathrm{S}_{\rm c})}$
		35	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2^+}$	10,442	9.430	1,125	$\frac{\eta_{\rm c}(15) {\rm D}_{\rm c}(15)}{{\rm I}/{\rm s}(15) {\rm B}^{\pm}(1^{3}{\rm S}_{1})}$
		15	4	1+	9 608	9.317	201	$\frac{3}{\psi(15)} \frac{B_c(1^{-5}S_1)}{B_c(1^{-3}S_1)}$
				0-	9.873	9.683	190	$\frac{\eta_{\rm c}(15) \ {\rm B}_{\rm c}(1 \ {\rm S}_{\rm f})}{n_{\rm c}(1 \ {\rm S}_{\rm f}) \ {\rm B}^{\pm}(1 \ {\rm B}_{\rm f})}$
		1P		1-	9.872	9,727	145	$\frac{\eta_c(1S) B_c^{\pm}(1P_1)}{n_c(1S) B_c^{\pm}(1P_1)}$
				2-	9.871	9.745	126	$\frac{\eta_c(1S) B_c^{\pm}(1^3 P_2)}{n_c(1S) B_c^{\pm}(1^3 P_2)}$
		$\overline{2S}$		1+	10.057	9.317	740	$\frac{\eta_c(1S) B_c^{\pm}(1^3S_1)}{n_c(1S) B_c^{\pm}(1^3S_1)}$
			1	1+	10,108	9.317	791	$\frac{\eta_c(1S) B_c^{\pm}(1^{-3}S_1)}{n_c(1S) B_c^{\pm}(1^{-3}S_1)}$
	SA, AS	1D	1	$\frac{-}{2^+}$	10.107	9,430	677	$\frac{J}{\psi(1S)} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2$
				3^+	10,105	10.013	92	$\eta_{\rm c}(1{\rm S}) \ {\rm B}_{\rm c}^{\pm}(1^{3}{\rm D}_{3})$
				0-	10,262	9,683	579	$\frac{\eta_{\rm c}(1{\rm S})}{\eta_{\rm c}(1{\rm S})} {\rm B}_{\rm c}^{\pm}(1^{3}{\rm P}_{0})$
		2P		1-	10,260	9,727	533	$\eta_{\rm c}(1{\rm S}) \ {\rm B}_{\rm c}^{\pm}(1{\rm P}_1)$
				2^{-}	10,254	9,745	509	$\eta_{\rm c}(1{\rm S}) \ {\rm B}_{\rm c}^{\pm}(1^{3}{\rm P}_{2})$
		3S		1^{+}	10,434	9,317	1,117	$\eta_{\rm c}(1{\rm S}) \ {\rm B}_{\rm c}^{\pm}(1^{3}{\rm S}_{1})$
					/	/	,	

Unfortunately, no experimental data on asymmetric fully heavy tetraquark states are available yet. Nonetheless, our calculations (29), (30) show that there is a fair possibility to observe at least some of the higher excitations in D-wave in the future.

$QQ'\overline{QQ}'$	$d\overline{d}'$	nL	S	J^P	$M_{OO'\overline{OO'}}$	$M_{\rm thr.}$	Δ_{\max}	Meson pair
			0	0^{+}	12,848	12,549	299	${f B_c^{\pm}(1{}^1S_0)B_c^{\pm}(1{}^1S_0)}$
		1S	1	1+	12,852	$12,\!607$	245	$B_{c}^{\pm}(1^{1}S_{0}) B_{c}^{\pm}(1^{3}S_{1})$
			2	2^{+}	12,859	12,666	193	$B_{c}^{\pm}(1^{3}S_{1}) B_{c}^{\pm}(1^{3}S_{1})$
			1	0^{-}	13,106	12,973	133	$B_{c}^{\pm}(1^{1}S_{0}) B_{c}^{\pm}(1^{3}P_{0})$
			0		13,103		86	
			1	1-	13,108	$13,\!017$	91	$B_{c}^{\pm}(1 {}^{1}S_{0}) B_{c}^{\pm}(1 P_{1})$
		1P	2		$13,\!111$		94	
			1	9 ⁻	$13,\!106$	13 035	71	$B^{\pm}(1^{1}S_{a}) B^{\pm}(1^{3}P_{a})$
			2	4	$13,\!112$	15,055	77	D_{c} (1 50) D_{c} (1 1 2)
			2	3^-	13,110	13,094	16	$B_{c}^{\pm}(1^{3}S_{1}) B_{c}^{\pm}(1^{3}P_{2})$
			0	0^{+}	13,282	12,549	733	${f B_c^{\pm}(1{}^1S_0)B_c^{\pm}(1{}^1S_0)}$
		2S	1	1^{+}	13,282	$12,\!607$	675	$B_{c}^{\pm}(1^{1}S_{0}) B_{c}^{\pm}(1^{3}S_{1})$
			2	2^{+}	13,283	12,666	617	$B_{c}^{\pm}(1^{3}S_{1}) B_{c}^{\pm}(1^{3}S_{1})$
			2	0^{+}	13,330	12,549	781	$\frac{\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{c}}^{\pm}(1^{1}\mathbf{S}_{0}) \ \mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{c}}^{\pm}(1^{1}\mathbf{S}_{0})}{\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{c}}^{\pm}(1^{1}\mathbf{S}_{0})}$
			1	1+	13,328	12 607	721	$B^{\pm}(1^{1}S_{2}) B^{\pm}(1^{3}S_{2})$
ccbb,	$A\overline{A}$		2	1	$13,\!331$	12,007	724	$D_{c}(1 \ S_{0}) D_{c}(1 \ S_{1})$
bbcc			0	2^{+}	13,324	12,666	658	
		1D	1		$13,\!330$		664	${\rm B_c^{\pm}(1{}^3S_1)}~{\rm B_c^{\pm}(1{}^3S_1)}$
			2		13,334		668	
			1	3+	13,327	13 303	24	$B^{\pm}(1^{1}S_{2}) B^{\pm}(1^{3}D_{2})$
			2		13,332	10,000	29	$\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{c}}$ (1 50) $\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{c}}$ (1 \mathbf{D}_{3})
			2	4^+	13,329	13,362	-33	$\frac{B_{c}^{\pm}(1^{3}S_{1}) B_{c}^{\pm}(1^{3}D_{3})}{B_{c}^{\pm}(1^{3}D_{3})}$
			1	0-	13,468	12,973	495	$\underline{\mathbf{B}_{c}^{\pm}(1{}^{1}\mathrm{S}_{0})\mathbf{B}_{c}^{\pm}(1{}^{3}\mathrm{P}_{0})}$
			0		$13,\!461$		444	
			1	1-	13,468	$13,\!017$	451	$B_{c}^{\pm}(1 {}^{1}S_{0}) B_{c}^{\pm}(1 P_{1})$
		2P	2		13,472		455	
			1	2^{-}	13,463	13.035	428	$B_{\pm}^{\pm}(1^{1}S_{0}) B_{\pm}^{\pm}(1^{3}P_{2})$
			2	-	13,470		435	
			2	3-	13,466	13,094	372	$\frac{B_{c}^{\pm}(1^{3}S_{1}) B_{c}^{\pm}(1^{3}P_{2})}{B_{c}^{\pm}(1^{3}S_{1}) B_{c}^{\pm}(1^{3}S_{1}) B_{c}^{\pm}(1^{3}S_{1})}$
		- ~	0	0+	13,629	12,549	1,080	$\frac{\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{c}}^{\pm}(1 {}^{\scriptscriptstyle \mathbf{I}} \mathbf{S}_{0}) \mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{c}}^{\pm}(1 {}^{\scriptscriptstyle \mathbf{I}} \mathbf{S}_{0})}{\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{c}}^{\pm}(1 {}^{\scriptscriptstyle \mathbf{I}} \mathbf{S}_{0})}$
		3S	1	1+	13,629	12,607	1,022	$\frac{B_{c}^{\pm}(1^{1}S_{0}) B_{c}^{\pm}(1^{3}S_{1})}{2}$
			2	2^+	$13,\!628$	12,666	962	$B_{c}^{\pm}(1^{3}S_{1}) B_{c}^{\pm}(1^{3}S_{1})$

Table V. Same as in Table IV, but for the double charmed and double bottom ($cc\overline{bb}$, $bb\overline{cc}$) fully heavy tetraquark, composed from the axialvector diquarks.

VI. THEORETICAL PREDICTIONS

It is important to compare the predictions for the masses of the asymmetric fully heavy tetraquarks in different theoretical approaches in order to identify the most promising candidates for the experimental searches and their mass ranges. We present such comparison in the Tables IX-XVIII.

Approaches in the considered papers can be divided into the following general groups.

- Various quark models [34–42, 44, 45, 47–49];
- QCD sum rules [43, 46];
- Lattice QCD [33].

We can further distinguish several rather popular approaches which are used commonly. For them we introduce the following abbreviations which are utilized in the Tables IX-XVIII.

• Interpretations of the 4-quark state structure

- DA diquark-antidiquark picture,
- MM meson-meson model,
- mix mixture of the models above.
- Mathematical models
 - CM chromomagnetic model,
 - MCFTM multiquark color flux-tube model,
 - DDM dynamical diquark model,
 - RDM relativized diquark model,
 - NChQM nonrelativistic chiral quark model,
 - NCoQM nonrelativistic constituent quark model.
- Computational methods
 - DMCM diffusion Monte Carlo method,
 - QCDSR QCD sum rules,
 - VA variational approach.

Table VI. Same as in Table IV, but for the triple bottom and charmed $(bb\overline{b}\overline{c}, cb\overline{b}\overline{b})$ fully heavy tetraquark, composed from the axialvector and/or scalar diquarks.

$QQ'\overline{QQ}'$	$d\overline{d}'$	nL	S	J^P	$M_{\rm QQ'}\overline{\rm QQ'}$	$M_{\rm thr.}$	Δ_{\max}	Meson pair
			0	0^{+}	16,102	$15,\!673$	429	$\eta_{ m b}(1{ m S})~{ m B}_{ m c}^{\pm}(1~{ m ^1S_0})$
		1S	1	1^{+}	16,104	15,732	372	$\eta_{\rm b}(1{\rm S})~{\rm B_c^{\pm}}(1^{3}{\rm S_1})$
			2	2^{+}	16,108	15,793	315	$\Upsilon(1S) \ {\rm B}^{\pm}_{\rm c}(1{}^{3}{\rm S}_{1})$
			1	0-	16,326	16,098	228	$\eta_{\rm b}(1{\rm S})~{\rm B_c^{\pm}}(1{}^3{\rm P_0})$
			0		16,325		183	
			1	1^{-}	16,326	16,142	184	$\eta_{\rm b}(1{ m S}) \; { m B}_{ m c}^{\pm}(1{ m P}_{1})$
		1P	2		16,329		187	
			1	2-	16,327	16 160	167	$m(1S) B^{\pm}(1^{3}P_{a})$
			2	2	16,329	10,100	169	$\eta_{\rm B}(10) {\rm D_{\rm C}}(112)$
			2	3-	$16,\!330$	16,221	109	$\Upsilon(1S) \mathbf{B}_{\mathrm{c}}^{\pm}(1{}^{3}\mathbf{P}_{2})$
			0	0+	$16,\!481$	$15,\!673$	808	$\eta_{\mathrm{b}}(1\mathrm{S}) \; \mathrm{B}^{\pm}_{\mathrm{c}}(1^{\mathrm{T}}\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{0}})$
		2S	1	1+	$16,\!481$	15,732	749	$\eta_{\rm b}(1{\rm S}) \; {\rm B_c^{\pm}}(1{}^3{\rm S}_1)$
			2	2+	$16,\!481$	15,793	688	$\Upsilon(1S) \operatorname{B}^{\pm}_{\mathrm{c}}(1{}^{3}\mathrm{S}_{1})$
			2	0^{+}	16,513	$15,\!673$	840	$\eta_{ m b}(1{ m S})~{ m B}_{ m c}^{\pm}(1~{ m }^{ m I}{ m S}_{ m 0})$
			1	1+	16,513	15 732	781	$n_1(1S) B^{\pm}(1^3S_1)$
	$A\overline{A}$		2	1	16,514	10,102	782	$\eta_{\rm D}(10)$ $\mathbf{D}_{\rm C}(101)$
		_	0		16,513		720	
		1D	1	2^{+}	16,514	15,793	721	$\Upsilon(1S) \operatorname{B}^{\pm}_{\mathrm{c}}(1{}^{\mathrm{s}}\mathrm{S}_{1})$
			2		16,515		722	
			1	3^+	16,515	16,428	87	$\eta_{\rm b}(1{\rm S}) \ {\rm B}_{\rm c}^{\pm}(1 \ {}^{3}{\rm D}_{3})$
$bb\overline{b}\overline{c}$			2	.+	16,516	10,100	88	$\frac{1}{100}$
$cb\overline{bb}$			2	4	16,516	16,489	27	$\frac{I(1S) B_{c}^{\pm}(1^{\circ}D_{3})}{(10) D_{c}^{\pm}(1^{3}D_{3})}$
CDDD			1	0	16,631	16,098	533	$\eta_{\rm b}(1{\rm S}) \ {\rm B}_{\rm c}^{\pm}(1{\rm }^{\circ}{\rm P}_0)$
		9D	0	1 —	16,629	16 149	487	$(10) D^{\pm}(1D)$
			1	1	10,030	10,142	488	$\eta_{\rm b}(15) \ {\rm B_c^-}(1 \ {\rm P_1})$
		2P	<u>2</u>		16,033		491	
			1	2^{-}	16,050	16,160	470	$\eta_{\rm b}(1{ m S})~{ m B_c^{\pm}}(1{}^3{ m P_2})$
			2	2-	16,032	16 221	412	$\gamma(1S) B^{\pm}(1^{3}P_{a})$
			0	$\frac{1}{0^+}$	16,765	15,673	1002	$\frac{1(15) D_{c} (1 1 2)}{n (1S) B^{\pm} (1^{1}S_{c})}$
		38	1	1+	16 765	15,075	1032	$\frac{\eta_{\rm b}(15) {\bf B}_{\rm c} (1 50)}{n (15) {\rm B}^{\pm}(1 {}^{3}{\rm S}_{\rm c})}$
		35	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2^+}$	16 764	15,752	881	$\frac{\eta_{\rm b}(15) \mathrm{D_c}(1.51)}{\Upsilon(1.51) \mathrm{B}^{\pm}(1.3 \mathrm{S}_{\star})}$
		15	4	1+	16,099	15,732	367	$\frac{1(15) D_{c} (1^{-} S_{1})}{n_{c} (1S) B^{\pm} (1^{-3} S_{1})}$
				$\frac{1}{0^{-}}$	16 320	16,008	207	$\frac{\eta_{\rm b}(15) \ {\rm D_c}(1 \ {\rm S}_{\rm f})}{m(15) \ {\rm B}^{\pm}(1 \ {}^{3}{\rm P_{\rm o}})}$
		1P		1-	16 321	16,038	179	$\frac{\eta_{\rm B}(15) \ {\rm D_c} (1 \ 10)}{m(1S) \ {\rm B}^{\pm}(1 \ {\rm P_1})}$
		11		2-	16 322	16 160	162	$\frac{\eta_{\rm B}(15) {\rm B_c}(111)}{n_{\rm c}(15) {\rm B^{\pm}(1^{3}P_{\rm c})}}$
		28		1+	16,022	15,732	742	$\frac{\eta_{\rm b}(15) \ {\rm D_c} \ (1 \ 1 \ 2)}{n_{\rm b} \ (1S) \ {\rm B}^{\pm}(1 \ {}^{3}{\rm S_{1}})}$
	~			1+	16 507	15,732	775	$\frac{\eta_{\rm b}(15) \ {\rm B}_{\rm c}(1 \ {\rm S}_{\rm I})}{n_{\rm t}(18) \ {\rm B}^{\pm}(1 \ {\rm S}_{\rm I})}$
	SA, AS	1D	1	$\frac{1}{2^+}$	16,508	15,793	715	$\frac{\gamma_{\rm B}(1S) \ {\rm B}_{\rm c} (1 \ S_{\rm I})}{\Upsilon(1S) \ {\rm B}^{\pm}(1^{3}S_{\rm I})}$
		ID		3+	16,509	16 428	81	$\frac{1}{n_{\rm c}(1S)} \frac{{\rm B}_{\rm c}(1^{-}{\rm S}_{\rm f})}{n_{\rm c}(1S)}$
				0-	16 624	16 098	526	$\frac{n_{\rm P}(1S) {\rm B}_{\rm c} (1 {\rm B}_{\rm 3})}{n_{\rm E}(1S) {\rm B}^{\pm}(1^{3}{\rm P}_{\rm s})}$
		$2\mathbf{P}$		1-	16 624	16 142	482	$\frac{\eta_{\rm B}(1S) {\rm B}_{\rm c} (1 10)}{n_{\rm b}(1S) {\rm R}^{\pm}(1 {\rm P}_{\rm s})}$
		21		2-	16 624	16 160	464	$\frac{\eta_{\rm D}(15)}{m_{\rm c}(15)} \frac{{\rm D}_{\rm c}(111)}{{\rm D}_{\rm c}(13)}$
		35		1+	16 758	15 732	1026	$\frac{\eta_{\rm D}(10) {\rm D}_{\rm c} (1 12)}{n_{\rm c} (18) {\rm B}^{\pm}(1^{3}{\rm S}_{\rm c})}$
		35		T	10,100	10,102	1020	$\eta_{\rm b}(10)$ $D_{\rm c}$ (101)

Note, that in Ref. [48] the authors use for the spindependent interaction either the one-gluon exchange (OGE) or instanton-induced interaction (INS). Additionally, in Tables IX-XVIII we highlight results obtained in the diquark–antidiquark picture which is the same as ours interpretation of the four-quark state structure.

A few remarks on the results presented in the Tables IX-XVIII are necessary.

• The study of asymmetric $cc\overline{bb}$ tetraquark using the similar to ours assumptions was performed in the

relativized diquark model in Ref. [40]. The color- $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ diquarks and antidiquarks were considered with the excitations occurring only between them. The main difference from our approach consists in the construction of the relativistic interaction potential. We systematically include all spindependent and spin-independent contributions and take into account the finite diquark size while the authors of Ref. [40] take only spin-dependent relativistic corrections to the one-gluon exchange po-

$QQ'\overline{QQ}'$	$d\overline{d}'$	nL	S	J^P	$M_{\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}'\overline{\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}'}}$	$M_{\rm thr.}$	Δ_{\max}	Meson pair
		1P	2	3^{-}	9,881	9,858	23	$J/\psi(1S) B_{c}^{\pm}(1^{3}P_{2})$
$cc\overline{c}\overline{b},$	$A\overline{A}$	1D	$\frac{1}{2}$	3^{+}	$10,111 \\ 10,116$	10,013	$\frac{98}{103}$	$\eta_{\rm c}(1{ m S})~{ m B}_{\rm c}^{\pm}(1~{ m ^3D_3})$
Dece			2	4^{+}	10,114	10,126	-12	$J/\psi(1S) B_{c}^{\pm}(1^{3}D_{3})$
	$\overline{SA}, \overline{AS}$	1D	1	3^{+}	10,105	10,013	92	$\eta_{\rm c}(1{ m S})~{ m B}^{\pm}_{\rm c}(1~{}^{3}{ m D}_{3})$
			0		13,103		86	
			1	1^{-}	13,108	$13,\!017$	91	$B_{c}^{\pm}(1 {}^{1}S_{0}) B_{c}^{\pm}(1 P_{1})$
		1P	2		13,111		94	
achh		11	1	2-	13,106	13 035	71	$B^{\pm}(1^{1}S_{2}) B^{\pm}(1^{3}P_{2})$
bb aa	\overline{AA}		2	4	13,112	15,055	77	D_{c} (1 S0) D_{c} (1 1 2)
DDCC			2	3-	13,110	13,094	16	$B_{c}^{\pm}(1^{3}S_{1}) B_{c}^{\pm}(1^{3}P_{2})$
			1	2+	13,327	13 202	24	$B^{\pm}(1{}^{1}S_{2}) B^{\pm}(1{}^{3}D_{2})$
		1D	2	5	13,332	13,303	29	D_{c} (1 D_{0}) D_{c} (1 D_{3})
			2	4^{+}	13,329	13,362	-33	$B_{c}^{\pm}(1^{3}S_{1}) B_{c}^{\pm}(1^{3}D_{3})$
-			1	9+	16,515	16 498	87	$m(1S) P^{\pm}(1^{3}D)$
$bb\overline{b}\overline{c},$	$A\overline{A}$	1D	2	0	16,516	10,428	88	$\eta_{\rm b}(13) {\rm D_c} (1 {\rm D_3})$
$cb\overline{bb}$			2	4^{+}	16,516	16,489	27	$\Upsilon(1S) \mathbf{B}_{\mathrm{c}}^{\pm}(1^{3}\mathrm{D}_{3})$
	$\overline{SA}, \overline{AS}$	1D	1	3^{+}	16,509	16,428	81	$\eta_{\rm b}(1{\rm S}) \; {\rm B_c^{\pm}}(1{}^3{\rm D}_3)$

Table VII. Excited states of the asymmetric ($ccc\overline{b}$, $bcc\overline{c}$, $cc\overline{bb}$, $bb\overline{b}\overline{c}$, $cb\overline{b}\overline{b}$) fully heavy tetraquarks which lie slightly above or below the meson-meson fall-apart strong decay thresholds. All notations are explained in the caption of Table IV.

Table VIII. Exotic X states observed and hinted by the LHCb [14], ATLAS [15] and CMS [16] Collaborations in di- J/ψ and $J/\psi \psi(2S)$ invariant mass spectra and our candidates [55]. nL denotes the overall excitation. S is the total spin of the diquark– antidiquark system. All masses M and total widths Γ are given in MeV.

Cal	laboration	Decemence	Л	г		Our	candidate	s
Col		Resoliance	101	1	nL	S	$\mathbf{J}^{\mathbf{PC}}$	\mathbf{M}
	LHCb		$6,400 \div 6,600$					
	$m_0, model A$		$6,410 \pm 80^{+80}_{-30}$	$590 \pm 350^{+120}_{-200}$	1S	2	2^{++}	6,367
ATLAS	$m_0, model B$	X(6600)	$6,650 \pm 20^{+30}_{-20}$	$440 \pm 50^{+60}_{-50}$				
	$m_1, model A$	11(0000)	$6,630 \pm 50^{+80}_{-10}$	$350 \pm 110^{+110}_{-40}$				
CMS	BW ₁ , no interference		$6,552\pm10\pm12$	$124^{+32}_{-26} \pm 33$	2S	0	0^{++}	6,782
01010	$BW_1,$ interference		$6,638_{-38-31}^{+43+16}$	$440^{+230+110}_{-200-240}$				
LHCP	NRSPS, no interference		$6,905\pm11\pm7$	$80\pm19\pm33$				
LIIOD	NRSPS, interference		$6,886\pm11\pm11$	$168\pm33\pm69$	2S	2	2^{++}	6,868
	m ₂ , model A	V (6000)	$6,860 \pm 30^{+10}_{-20}$	$110 \pm 50^{+20}_{-10}$		0	2^{++}	6,921
ATLAS	m_2 , model B	$\mathbf{X}(6900)$	$6,910 \pm 10 \pm 10$	$150\pm30\pm10$	1D	2	0^{++}	$6,\!899$
	m ₃ , model β		$6,960 \pm 50 \pm 30$	$510 \pm 170^{+110}_{-100}$	ID	2	1^{++}	$6,\!904$
CMS	BW ₂ , no interference		$6,927\pm9\pm4$	$122^{+24}_{-21} \pm 18$		2	2^{++}	6,915
OWID	$^{\mathrm{BW}_2,}$ interference		$6,847^{+44+48}_{-28-20}$	191_{-49-17}^{+66+25}				
	LHCb		$7,200 \div 7,400$			0	0++	7 950
ATLAS	m ₃ , model α	X(7200)	$7,220 \pm 30^{+10}_{-30}$	$90 \pm 60^{+60}_{-30}$	38	0	0	1,209
CMS	BW ₃ , no interference	$\Lambda(1200)$	$7,287^{+20}_{-18}\pm 5$	$95^{+59}_{-40} \pm 19$	35	2	2^{++}	7.333
	$\mathrm{BW}_3,$ interference		$7,134_{-25-15}^{+48+41}$	97^{+40+29}_{-29-26}		-	_	.,000

tential and consider diquarks to be point-like. Note that the spin-orbit interaction term is missing in their potential. Moreover, while we solve numerically the quasipotential Eq. (7) with the quasipotential (15) in Ref. [40] the variational procedure with the harmonic oscillator trial wave functions is employed.

• Most of the researches within the diquark antidiquark picture consider both possible color structures (and sometimes also the mixture of them): diquark-antidiquark in the $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ and $(6 \times \overline{6})$ color configurations. In Secs. II, IV we have already thoroughly discussed why we consider the latter case inappropriate for our problem (to put it in a few words, the internal quark-quark interaction within the color-sextet diquark is repulsive, thus, it cannot be a bound state if diquarks interact as a whole). Additionally, the color-sextet diquarks and -antisextet antidiquarks

can simultaneously have $S_{\rm d} = 0$, making possible the color- $(6 \times \overline{6})$ tetraquarks of scalar-scalar spin configuration. On the contrary, the fully heavy color-antitriplet diquarks and -triplet antidiquarks can produce only axialvector-axialvector and/or scalar-axialvector tetraquarks. It is important, that in the Tables IX-XVIII we present the results within the specific diquark-antidiquark spin configurations. Hence, in these Tables we omit the results for the color- $(6 \times \overline{6})$ scalar-scalar tetraquarks which are impossible within our framework. Note, that in literature there is no consensus in how the color configuration should affect the mass spectra of fully heavy tetraquarks. For example in Ref. [38] the masses of the ground states of the fully heavy tetraquarks were calculated in the potential quark model with linear confinement, Coulomb and spin-spin interactions. Both color $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ and $(6 \times \overline{6})$ color components as well as their mixture were considered in a four-body fashion using Gaussian functions. In Refs. [35, 38, 48] the calculated masses of the sextet-antisextet color configurations lie approximately 5 - 200 MeV higher than their antitriplet-triplet counterparts. On the contrary, in Refs. [39, 44, 45, 49], the masses of the sextetantisextet color configurations are approximately 5-200 MeV lower than their antitriplet-triplet counterparts.

- In papers [43, 46] the excited P-wave diquarks (pseudoscalar, vector and pseudotensor with $J^P = 0^-, 1^-, 2^-$) were also considered. This leads to the emergence of more possible diquark–antidiquark spin configurations, not available within our framework. Also, recalling our discussion from Sec. IV, we consider the tetraquarks containing excited diquarks to be less stable due to the enhanced diquark–antiquark overlap leading to faster fall-apart strong decay. Therefore, in the Tables IX-XVIII we present results only for the axialvector–axialvector and scalar–axialvector tetraquarks which are built from the ground S-wave diquarks.
- Authors considering two constituent color structures, i.e. $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ and $(6 \times \overline{6})$ for the diquark antidiquark picture and (1×1) and (8×8) for the meson-meson model, usually assume them to be the pure states and/or allow their mixture (or coupling) with varying percentage of each component. If within one paper there are several results we explicitly identify the color state for which the result was obtained.

For the further analysis we additionally distinguish results obtained in the following models

- diquark-antidiquark picture [34-36, 38-49];
- meson-meson model [36, 45];

• mixture of those two [36].

We now can analyze how our predictions relate to those of the other scientific groups. From the Tables IX-XVIII it can be seen that our results agree within the ± 75 MeV range with the following predictions.

- For the $cc\overline{cb}$, $bc\overline{cc}$ tetraquarks.
 - In the diquark—antidiquark pure $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -color configuration: all predictions [47]; only $J^P =$ $0, 1^+$ [45]; $J^P = 2^+$ [48] [INS].
 - In the diquark—antidiquark $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ and $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -color configurations mixed or coupled for $J^P = 0, 1^+$: all predictions [41, 45], [42] [MCFTM], [48] [INS]; only $J^P = 0^+ A\overline{A}$ and $J^P = 1^+ S\overline{A}$ -, $A\overline{S}$ -spin configurations [48] [OGE]; only $S\overline{A}$ -, $A\overline{S}$ -spin configurations [49].
 - In the other models: all predictions [45] [meson-meson (8×8) -color configuration coupled, some other spatial configurations]; only SA-, AS-spin configurations [45] [diquarkantidiquark pure $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -color configuration].
- For the $cc\overline{bb}$, $bb\overline{cc}$ tetraquarks.
 - In the diquark—antidiquark pure (3×3)-color configuration: 1S, all predictions [36, 41, 45, 48]; 1S, 2S, all predictions [39].
 - In the diquark—antidiquark $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ and $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -color configurations mixed or coupled for $J^P = 0^+$: 1S, all predictions [36, 39, 41, 45, 48, 49], [42] [MCFTM].
 - In the other models: all predictions [45] [meson-meson (8×8) -color configuration coupled, some other spatial configurations].
- For the $bb\overline{b}\overline{c}$, $cb\overline{b}\overline{b}$ tetraquarks.
 - In the diquark—antidiquark pure (3 × 3)-color configuration: all predictions [38, 45, 47],
 [42] [MCFTM]; J^P = 2⁺ [41, 48, 49].
 - In the diquark—antidiquark $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ and (6 × $\overline{6}$)-color configurations mixed or coupled for $J^P = 0, 1^+$: all predictions [49], [42] [MCFTM, NCoQM], [48] [OGE]; only $J^P = 0^+$ [41]; only $J^P = 1^+$ [48] [INS].
 - In the other models: only $J^P = 2^+$ [45] [some other spatial configurations]; only SĀ-, AS̄-spin configurations [38, 45] [diquark antidiquark pure (6 × $\overline{6}$)-color configuration].

A number of other conclusions can be drawn from this comparison.

• Predictions of Ref. [39] (in particular, Model I) are in a good agreement with our results for the ground state ccbb, bbcc tetraquarks in the diquark-antidiquark picture;

Table IX. Comparison of different theoretical predictions for the masses of the triple charmed and bottom fully heavy tetraquark (cccb, bccc) with the axialvector-axialvector spin configuration in the ground state. d and \overline{d}' are the axialvector (A) or scalar (S) diquark and antidiquark, respectively. *n*L denotes the overall excitation. *S* is the total spin of the diquark-antidiquark system. J^P is the total momentum-parity of the tetraquark. $M_{\text{thr.}}$ is the corresponding meson-meson threshold [59, 64]. All masses are given in MeV. Results are sorted chronologically, oldest predictions first.

$\mathrm{d}\overline{\mathrm{d}}'$		$A\overline{A}$			
nL		1S			
S	0	1	2		
J^P	0^{+}	1+	2^{+}		
$M_{\rm thr.}$	9,258	9,317	9,430		
Our	9,606	9,611	9,620		
[34](VA DA)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	$\gtrsim 9,390$	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
	9,313 [MM threshold]	9,400 [MM threshold]	0.449.5554		
[35](CM)	10,144 [DA, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA mixed with	10,231 [DA, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA mixed with	9,442 [MM threshold]		
	$(6 \times \overline{6})$ -S \overline{S}]	$-\overline{AS}$ and $(6 \times \overline{6}) - \overline{SA}$]	10,273 [DA]		
[38](NCoQM DA)	9,740	9,749	9,768		
	9,615 $[(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA coupled with	9,610 $[(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA coupled with -SA	0.710		
[41](DMCM DA)	$(6 \times \overline{6})$ -S \overline{S}]	and $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -A \overline{S}]	9,719		
		9,343 [CM, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA coupled			
	9,314 [CM, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA coupled	with $-\overline{AS}$ and $(6 \times \overline{6}) - \overline{SA}$]			
[42](DA)	with $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -SS	9,683 [MCFTM, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -A \overline{A}			
	9,670 [MCFTM, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA	coupled with $-\overline{AS}$ and $(6 \times \overline{6}) - \overline{SA}$]	9,442 [CM]		
	coupled with $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -SS	9,705 [MCFTM, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA			
	9,705 [MCFTM, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA]	coupled with $-\overline{AS}$]	9,732 [MCFTM] 0.820 [NCCOM]		
	9,753 [NCoQM, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA coupled	9,766 [NCoQM, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA coupled	9,039 [NCoQM]		
	with $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -SS	with $-\overline{AS}$ and $(6 \times \overline{6}) - \overline{SA}$]			
	9,813 [NCoQM, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -A \overline{A}]	9,808 [NCoQM, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA coupled			
		with $-A\overline{S}]$			
[44](CM DA)	9,505.9 $[(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA mixed with	9,484.3 $[(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA mixed with	0 525 0		
[44](CM DA)	$(6 \times \overline{6})$ -S \overline{S}]	-A \overline{S} and $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -S \overline{A}]	9,525.9		
	$9,243 \text{ [MM, (1 \times 1) coupled]}$	$9,317 \text{ [MM, } (1 \times 1) \text{ coupled]}$			
	$9,559$ [MM, (8×8) coupled]	$9,587$ [MM, (8×8) coupled]	9,451 [MM, (1×1)]		
	$9,620 \text{ [DA, } (\overline{3} \times 3)\text{-AA coupled with}$	9,638 [DA, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA coupled with	9,650 [MM, (8×8)]		
[45](NCoQM)	$(6 \times \overline{6})$ -S \overline{S}]	-A \overline{S} and $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -S \overline{A}]	9,714 [DA, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$]		
	9,673 [DA, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA]	9,687 [DA, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA]	9,593, 9,688, 9,704, 9,717 [other		
	9,310, 9,551, 9,599, 9,621 [other	9,546, 9,568, 9,619, 9,640 [other	coupled spatial configurations]		
	coupled spatial configurations]	coupled spatial configurations]			
	9,560 [set II]	9,571 [set II]	9,594 [set II]		
[41](DDM DA)	9,579 [set I]	9,590 [set I]	9,613 [set I]		
	9,615 [INS, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA mixed with	9,646 [INS, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA mixed with			
[48] (NC=0M DA)	$(6 \times \overline{6})$ -S \overline{S}]	-A \overline{S} and $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -S \overline{A}]	9,645 [INS]		
[40](NCoQM DA)	9,665 [OGE, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA mixed	9,699 [OGE, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA mixed	9,713 [OGE]		
	with $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -S \overline{S}]	with $-\overline{AS}$ and $(6 \times \overline{6}) - \overline{SA}$]			
$[40](NC_{0}OM DA)$	9,766 $[(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA mixed with	9,706 $[(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA mixed with -AS	0 721		
[43](NCOQM DA)	$(6 \times \overline{6})$ -S \overline{S}]	and $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -SA	9,101		

- Predictions of Refs. [41, 45] give partial agreement for the ground state cccb, bccc and ccbb, bbcc tetraquarks in the diquark–antidiquark picture;
- Predictions of Refs. [48] (in particular, INS) give partial agreement for the ground state cccb, bccc tetraquarks in the diquark–antidiquark picture;
- Predictions of Ref. [45] give partial agreement for the ground state ccbb, bbcc tetraquarks in the meson-meson model;
- There are no predictions which are in good agreement for the ground state bbbc, cbbb tetraquarks.

In addition, the comparison of our results with those of other scientific groups shows the following.

- For the cccb, bccc tetraquarks, our results in general are slightly lighter than those of most other scientific groups;
- For the ccbb, bbcc tetraquarks, our results are generally median (there are many results giving both heavier and lighter masses);
- For the bbbc, cbbb tetraquarks, our results in general are slightly heavier than those of most other scientific groups.

$d\overline{d}'$	$S\overline{A}, A\overline{S}$
nL	1S
S	1
J^P	1+
M _{thr.}	9,317
Our	9,608
[34](VA DA)	$\lesssim 9,390$
	9,343, 9,451 [MM threshold]
[35](CM)	10,174 [DA, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AS mixed with -AA and $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -SA]
	10,282 [DA, $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -SA mixed with $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AS and -AA]
$[38](NC_{2}OM DA)$	$9,746 \ \left[(\overline{3} \times 3) \cdot \overline{SA} \right]$
	$9,757 \ [(6 imes \overline{6})-A\overline{S}]$
[41](DMCM DA)	9,610 $[(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -SA coupled with -AA and $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -AS]
	9,343 [CM, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -A \overline{S} coupled with -A \overline{A} and $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -S \overline{A}]
	9,683 [MCFTM, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AS coupled with -AA and $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -SA]
[42](DA)	9,705 [MCFTM, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AS coupled with -AA]
	9,766 [NCoQM, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AS coupled with -AA and $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -SA]
	9,808 [NCoQM, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AS coupled with -AA]
[44](CM DA)	$9,335.1 \ [(6 \times \overline{6})-S\overline{A} \text{ mixed with } (\overline{3} \times 3)-A\overline{S} \text{ and } -A\overline{A}]$
	9,498.5 $[(\overline{3} \times 3)-A\overline{S} \text{ mixed with } -A\overline{A} \text{ and } (6 \times \overline{6})-S\overline{A}]$
	$9,638 \ [(\overline{3} \times 3)-A\overline{A} \ \text{coupled with } -A\overline{S} \ \text{and} \ (6 \times \overline{6})-S\overline{A}]$
[45](NCoQM DA)	$9,665 \ \left[(6 \times \overline{6}) - \overline{SA} \right]$
	$9,675 \ [(\bar{3} \times 3)-A\bar{S}]$
	$9,605$ [INS, $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -SA mixed with $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AS and -AA]
$[48](NC_0OM DA)$	9,630 [INS, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AS mixed with -AA and $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -SA
	9,676 [OGE, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AS mixed with -AA and $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -SA]
	9,718 [OGE, $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -SA mixed with $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AS and -AA]
$[49](NC_0QM DA)$	9,625 $[(6 \times \overline{6}) - S\overline{A} \text{ mixed with } (\overline{3} \times 3) - A\overline{A} \text{ and } -A\overline{S}]$
[](9,729 $[(\overline{3} \times 3)-A\overline{S} \text{ mixed with }-A\overline{A} \text{ and } (6 \times \overline{6})-S\overline{A}]$

Table X. Same as in Table IX, but for the scalar–axialvector spin configuration in the ground state. Notations are explained in the caption of Table IX.

It is interesting, that the conclusions of different groups are sometimes quite contradictory. Namely, the following outlooks are made.

- For the $ccc\overline{b}$, $bc\overline{cc}$ tetraquarks.
 - In Ref. [50] there is an indication of possible weak binding for the ground $J^P = 1^+$ state (see Ref. [50], Fig. 8). The authors of Ref. [45] predict a number of narrow resonances with fall-apart strong decay widths lying in the range of 1 10 MeV (see Ref. [45], Table XII). Additionally, in Refs. [41, 42, 47] the tetraquark is predicted to be compact.
 - While the authors of Refs. [38, 39, 41, 44, 47, 49] come to the conclusion that narrow bound ground states are not favored since all of the masses lie significantly above the lowest fall-apart strong decay thresholds. Yet there is a possibility for the resonances. Note, that in Ref. [35] it is stated that "if this state does exist, it should be less stable than the lowest $J^P = 1^+$ bbbc". Also in Ref. [41] the $J^P = 0, 1^+$ ground states are almost degenerate and the $J^P = 2^+$ ground state lies ≈ 100 MeV above them.

• For the $cc\overline{bb}$, $bb\overline{cc}$ tetraquarks.

- The authors of Refs. [40, 43, 46, 47] conclude, that the ground (S-wave positive parity) states lie below the fall-apart strong decay thresholds, implying that these tetraquark states can only undergo radiative transitions or weak decavs and, thus, are expected to be narrow. Note that in Ref. [34] the authors argue that this tetraquark "remains stable against strong decay", because it cannot "decay strongly by annihilating at least a pair of quarks and antiquarks of the same flavor". Additionally, the authors of Ref. [45] predict a number of narrow resonances with fall-apart strong decay widths lying in the range of 1 - 20 MeV (see Ref. [45], Table XX). Also, in Refs. [41, 42, 47, 49] the tetraquark is predicted to be compact.
- At the same time the authors of Refs. [33, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 44, 49, 50, 52] argue that these tetraquarks should not be narrow and stable or should not be bound and exist at all [33, 50]. In Refs. [36, 38, 39, 41, 44] the masses in the ground states are all much lager than the relevant fall-apart strong decay thresholds indicating possibility only for the resonances.

		_	
dď		AA	
nL		1S	
S	0	1	2
J^P	0^{+}	1+	2^{+}
M _{thr} .	12,549	12,607	12,666
Our	12,848	12,852	12,859
[34](VA DA)		$\leq 12,580$	
	12,597 [MM threshold]	10.000 500 00 000	10.005 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5
[35](CM)	13,496 $[(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA mixed with	12,660 [MM threshold]	12,695 [MM threshold]
	$(6 \times \overline{6})$ -SS]	$13,560 \text{ [DA, } (3 \times 3)\text{]}$	13,595 [DA, (3×3)]
	$12,683.9$ [MM, (1×1) coupled with	10 505 4 5 5 5 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	10 500 5 5 5 5 6 6 9
	(8×8)]	$12,737.4$ [MM, (1×1) coupled with	12,790.7 [MM, (1×1) coupled with
[a a]	12.683.9 [mix]	(8×8)]	(8×8)]
[36](NChQM)	12,891.5 [DA, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA coupled	12,737.4 [mix]	12,790.7 [mix]
	with $(6 \times \overline{6}) - S\overline{S}$]	$12,897.6$ [DA, (3×3)]	$12,904.5$ [DA, (3×3)]
	13.140 [resonance]	13,180 [resonance]	13,230 [resonance]
[38](NCoQM DA)	12.953	12.960	12.972
	$\frac{12.863 \text{ [Model L} (\overline{3} \times 3) - A\overline{A}]}{12.863 \text{ [Model L} (\overline{3} \times 3) - A\overline{A}]}$,	
	12.866 [Model L $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA mixed		
	with $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -SS	12.864 [Model I]	12.868 [Model I]
[39](NCoQM DA)	12.886 [Model II $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA mixed	12 924 [Model II]	12,940 [Model II]
	with $(6 \times \overline{6}) - \overline{SS}$		
	12.915 [Model IL $(\overline{3} \times 3) - A\overline{A}$]		
[40](RDM DA)	$12,445 \pm 210$	12.536	12.614
	$12,865$ [($\overline{3} \times 3$)-AA coupled with	12,000	
[41](DMCM DA)	$(6 \times \overline{6}) - \overline{SS}$	12,908	12,926
	12.597 [CM $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA coupled		
	with $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -SS		
	$12\ 906\ [\text{MCFTM}\ (\overline{3} \times 3)_{-} \overline{4}\overline{4}$		
	coupled with $(6 \times \overline{6}) \overline{SS}$	12,660 [CM]	12,695 [CM]
[42](DA)	12 940 [MCETM $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ \overline{A}]	$12,945 \ [\text{MCFTM}]$	$12,960 \ [\text{MCFTM}]$
	12,940 [MOPTIM, (3×3) -AA] 12,963 [NCoOM $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ AA	13,024 [NCoQM]	13,041 [NCoQM]
	$12,505 [\text{NCOQM}, (5 \times 5)\text{-AA}]$		
	13 023 [NCoOM $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ \overline{A}]		
[43, 46](000000000000000000000000000000000000	$\frac{10,025 [\text{NCOQM}, (5 \times 3)\text{-AA}]}{12,320^{\pm 180}}$		$12 \ 370^{+190}$
[43, 40](QCD5h DA)	$\frac{12,350_{-150}}{12,711,0,[(\overline{2}\times2),\sqrt{\Lambda},m(1,1),1]}$		$12,570_{-160}$
[44](CM DA)	12,711.9 $[(3 \times 3)$ -AA mixed with	$12,\!671.7$	12,703.1
	$\frac{(0 \times 0) - 55}{12.550 [MM (1 \times 1) coupled]}$		
	$12,550$ [MM, (1×1) coupled]	19.694 [MOM (1 × 1) \rightarrow [1]	19.609 [MM (1×1)]
	12,855 [MM, (8×8) coupled]	$12,024$ [MM, (1×1) coupled]	$12,090 [MM, (1 \times 1)]$ 12.016 [MM, (2 × 2)]
	12,000 [DA, (3×3) -AA coupled	$12,001 \text{ [MM, } (8 \times 8) \text{ coupled}$	$12,910 \text{ [MM, } (8 \times 8)\text{]}$
[45](NCoQM)	with (6×6) -SS	$12,070 \text{ [DA, } (3 \times 3)\text{]}$	$12,099 [DA, (3 \times 3)-AA]$
	$12,007$ [DA, (3×3) -AA]	12,739, 12,788, 12,878, 12,880	12,800, 12,828, 12,900, 12,901
	12,089, 12,095, 12,852, 12,859	other coupled spatial	other coupled spatial
	other coupled spatial	configurations	configurations
	configurations]	10 200 to 171	10,400 (
[47](DDM DA)	12,381 [set II]	12,390 [set II]	12,408 [set II]
· · · ·	12,401 [set 1]	12,409 [set 1]	12,421 [set 1]
	12,191 [INS, (3×3) -AA mixed	10.010 [mmo]	19.020 march
[48](NCoQM DA)	with (6×6) -SS]	12,818 [INS]	12,838 [INS]
/	12,880 [OGE, (3×3) -AA mixed	12,890 [OGE]	12,902 [OGE]
	with (6×6) -SS		
[49](NCoQM DA)	12,920 $[(3 \times 3)$ -AA mixed with	12,940	12,961
	(6×6) -SS]	,) - -

Table XI. Same as in Table IX, but for the double charmed and double bottom fully heavy tetraquark ($cc\overline{bb}$, $bb\overline{cc}$) with the axialvector-axialvector spin configuration in the ground state. Notations are explained in the caption of Table IX.

$d\overline{d}'$				$A\overline{A}$			
nL				1P			
S	1	0	1	2	1	2	2
J^P	0^{-}		2	3-			
$M_{\rm thr.}$	12,973	13,017			13,	13,094	
Our	13,106	13,103	13,108	13,111	13,106	13,112	13,110
[40](RDM DA)	12,976	12,967		12,977			
		13,204 [MCFTM,					
		$(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -A \overline{A}]					
[42](DA)		13,204 [MCFTM,					
		$(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA coupled					
		with $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -SS]					

Table XII. Same as in Table XI, but for the first orbital excitation. Notations are explained in the caption of Table IX.

Table XIII. Same as in Table XI, but for the first radial excitation. Notations are explained in the caption of Table IX.

$d\overline{d}'$		$A\overline{A}$	
nL		2S	
S	0	1	2
J^P	0^{+}	1+	2^{+}
$M_{\rm thr.}$	12,549	12,607	12,666
Our	13,282	13,282	13,283
$[20](NC_{*}OM DA)$		13,259 [Model I]	13,262 [Model I]
[J9](NCOQM DA)		13,321 [Model II]	13,334 [Model II]
[40](RDM DA)	13,017	13,060	13,101

Moreover, the authors of Ref. [37] find a rather short lifetime $\tau(X_{cc\overline{bb}}) = (0.1 - 0.3) \times 10^{-12}$ s which is approximately 3 times smaller that that of the B_c-meson.

Note that in Ref. [36] the multiquark components in the ground states of such tetraquarks were studied in detail emphasizing the role played by the meson-meson and diquark-antidiquark configurations in the formation of the tetraquark states. The search for the resonances was performed with the real scaling method. In Ref. [51] the importance of studying such tetraquarks was claimed.

The masses of the ground and excited states of tetraquarks presented in Ref. [40] are systematically lower than our predictions by about 100 - 400 MeV. This is the result of different treatment of the relativistic effects and diquark structure (see the discussion above).

- For the $bb\overline{b}\overline{c}$, $cb\overline{b}\overline{b}$ tetraquarks.
 - In Ref. [50] there is an indication of possible weak binding which is slightly stronger than for the cccb tetraquark for the ground $J^P = 1^+$ state (see Ref. [50], Fig. 8). The authors of Refs. [35, 44] conclude that the lowest $J^P = 1^+$ ground state can be narrow. Note that in Ref. [35] the lowest $J^P = 1^+$ ground state is in the $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -A \overline{S} color-spin config-

uration. In Ref. [44] the corresponding state is in the $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -SA color-spin configuration. Despite this state lying above the fall-apart strong decay $\eta_{\rm b}\overline{\rm B}_{\rm c}$ channel such decay is forbidden due to the conservation of the angular momentum and parity. In addition, the authors of Ref. [45] predict a number of narrow resonances with fall-apart strong decay widths lying in the range of 1-30 MeV (see Ref. [45], Table XVI). Moreover, in Refs. [41, 42, 47] the tetraquark is predicted to be compact.

– Still the authors of Refs. [38, 39, 41, 47, 49] come to the conclusion that narrow bound ground states are not favored since all of the masses lie significantly above the lowest fall-apart strong decay thresholds. Yet there is a possibility for the resonances. Once again, in Ref. [41] the $J^P = 0, 1^+$ ground states are almost degenerate and the $J^P = 2^+$ ground state lies ≈ 100 MeV above them. Note, that in Ref. [49] the ground state is dominated by the $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -SA color–spin configuration and considering only the hyperfine potential one can expect to have a narrow $J^P = 1^+$ state which, however, still lies above the meson–meson threshold.

Comparing the results discussed above with our calculations we come to the following conclusions.

• Our results for the ground states of all compositions

$\mathrm{d}\overline{\mathrm{d}}'$					$A\overline{A}$				
nL					1D				
S	2	1	2	0	1	2	1	2	2
J^P	0^{+}	1	+		2^{+}		3	+	4^{+}
M _{thr.}	12,549	12,	607	1:	2,666		13,	303	13,362
Our	13,330	13,328	13,331	13,324	$13,\!330$	13,334	13,327	13,332	13,329
[40](RDM DA)	13,208	13,205	13,206	13,204		13,204			
				13,398 [MCFTM,					
				$(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA]					
[42](DA)				13,398 [MCFTM,					
				$(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA coupled					
				with $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -SS]					

Table XIV. Same as in Table XI, but for the second orbital excitation. Notations are explained in the caption of Table IX.

Table XV. Same as in Table XI, but for the first orbital-radial excitation. Notations are explained in the caption of Table IX.

$d\overline{d}'$				$A\overline{A}$			
nL				2P			
S	1	0	1	2	1	2	2
J^P	0-		1-		2	_	3^{-}
$M_{\rm thr.}$	12,973		13,017		13,	035	13,094
Our	13,468	13,461	13,468	13,472	13,463	13,470	13,466
[40](RDM DA)	13,311	13,304		13,311			

of tetraquarks agree with the arguments that these states lie highly above the meson–meson fall-apart thresholds (about 200 - 450 MeV, see Tables IX-XVIII) and thus they fall-apart rapidly.

- On the other hand
 - For the cccb, bccc and ccbb, bbcc tetraquarks we find a few orbitally excited states (1P and 1D, to be precise) lying just above the thresholds, and one state (1D $J^P = 4^+$) even below such a threshold (see Table VII and Exprs. (29), (30)), indicating a possibility of a long-living state. However, all these thresholds contain masses of the orbital excitations of the B_c^{\pm} -meson which were not observed yet but were theoretically calculated in Ref. [64].
 - For the bbbc, cbbb tetraquarks we again find a few states right above the meson-meson fall-apart thresholds but no states below such thresholds (see Table VII).

It is worth noting, that the authors of Refs. [39, 50, 52] did not predict any stable bound states for the fully charmed cccc tetraquarks. However, a few states of this composition were already observed (see Table VIII and related discussion in Sec. V).

VII. CONCLUSION

We calculated masses of the ground (1S) and excited (1P, 2S, 1D, 2P, 3S) states of the asymmetric fully heavy

tetraquarks on the basis of the relativistic quark model. The following compositions were studied: triple charmed and bottom (\overline{cccb} , \overline{bccc}), double charmed and double bottom (\overline{ccbb} , \overline{bbcc}) and triple bottom and charmed (\overline{bbbc} , \overline{cbbb}) tetraquarks.

Our model is discussed in Secs. II, III. The important feature of our calculations is the consistent account of the relativistic effects and the finite size of the diquark which leads to the weakening of the one-gluon exchange potential due to the form factors of the diquark--gluon interaction.

Additionally, a significant mixing of states with the same total momentum and parity J^P but different full tetraquark spins S occurs for the orbital excitations of the asymmetric compositions. It originates both from the spin–orbit and tensor terms of the quasipotential. In symmetrical compositions the mixing occurs from the tensor term only but just for a few orbitally excited states. Moreover, its magnitude is insignificant and thus this mixing can be completely neglected.

A detailed analysis of the calculated mass spectra is presented in Sec. V. We compared calculated tetraquark masses with the thresholds of the fall-apart strong decays into the meson pairs. It is shown that most of the tetraquark states lie significantly above the threshold of fall-apart strong decay into a meson pair. However, a few tetraquark states are found to lie slightly above or even below such thresholds. As a result, these states are most likely to be observed as narrow states. An argument is given, as to why the excited states in general could be narrow despite the large phase space.

We also present a comprehensive comparison of our re-

$d\overline{d}'$		$A\overline{A}$	
nL		3S	
S	0	1	2
J^P	0^{+}	1+	2^{+}
$M_{\rm thr.}$	12,549	12,607	12,666
Our	13,629	13,629	$13,\!628$
[30](NC=OM DA)		13,297 [Model I]	13,299 [Model I]
[39](NCOQM DA)		13,364 [Model II]	13,375 [Model II]
[40](RDM DA)	$13,\!349$	13,381	13,412

Table XVI. Same as in Table XI, but for the second radial excitation. Notations are explained in the caption of Table IX.

Table XVII. Same as in Table IX, but for the triple bottom and charmed fully heavy tetraquark ($bb\overline{b}\overline{c}$, $cb\overline{b}\overline{b}$) with the axialvector-axialvector spin configuration in the ground state. Notations are explained in the caption of Table IX.

$\mathrm{d}\overline{\mathrm{d}}'$		$A\overline{A}$	
nL		18	
S	0	1	2
J^P	0+	1+	2+
M _{thr.}	15,673	15,732	15,793
Our	16,102	16,104	16,108
[34](VA DA)		$\lesssim 15,770$	
	15,713 [MM threshold]	15,773 [MM threshold]	15 206 15 6 (1)
[35](CM)	16,823 [DA, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA mixed with	16,884 [DA, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA mixed with	15,800 [MM threshold]
	$(6 \times \overline{6})$ -S \overline{S}]	$-\overline{AS}$ and $(6 \times \overline{6}) - \overline{SA}$]	$10,917 \text{ [DA, } (3 \times 3)\text{]}$
[38](NCoQM DA)	16,158	16,164	16,176
	16,040 $[(\overline{3} \times 3)-A\overline{A} \text{ coupled with}]$	16,013 $[(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA coupled with	16 190
[41](DMCM DA)	$(6 \times \overline{6})$ -S \overline{S}]	$-\overline{SA}$ and $(6 \times \overline{6}) - \overline{AS}$]	16,129
		15,729 [CM, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA coupled	
	15,713 [CM, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA coupled	with $-\overline{AS}$ and $(6 \times \overline{6}) - \overline{SA}$]	
	with $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -S \overline{S}]	16,130 [MCFTM, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA	
	16,126 [MCFTM, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA	coupled with $-\overline{AS}$ and $(6 \times \overline{6}) - \overline{SA}$]	15 206 [0]
[40](5.4)	coupled with $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -SS	16,151 [MCFTM, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AĀ	16,189 [MCDTM]
[42](DA)	16,158 [MCFTM, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA]	coupled with $-\overline{AS}$]	10,182 [MCFTM]
	16,175 [NCoQM, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA	16,179 [NCoQM, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AĀ	10,274 [NCoQM]
	coupled with $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -SS	coupled with $-\overline{AS}$ and $(6 \times \overline{6}) - \overline{SA}$]	
	16,224 [NCoQM, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA]	16,230 [NCoQM, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -A \overline{A}	
		coupled with $-\overline{AS}$]	
[44](CM DA)	15,862.0 $[(\overline{3} \times 3)-A\overline{A} \text{ mixed with}]$	15,851.3 $[(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA mixed with	15 000 0
[44](CM DA)	$(6 \times \overline{6})$ -S \overline{S}]	$-\overline{AS}$ and $(6 \times \overline{6}) - \overline{SA}$]	15,002.5
	$15,676$ [MM, (1×1) coupled]	$15,738$ [MM, (1×1) coupled]	
	15,976 [MM, (8 × 8) coupled]	15,993 [MM, (8×8) coupled]	15,812 [MM, (1×1)]
	16,012 [DA, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA coupled	16,017 [DA, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA coupled	16,030 [MM, (8×8)]
[45] (NG, OM)	with $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -S \overline{S}]	with $-\overline{AS}$ and $(6 \times \overline{6}) - \overline{SA}$]	16,087 [DA, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$]
[40](NCoQM)	16,058 [DA, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -A \overline{A}]	16,068 [DA, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA]	15,980, 16,008, 16,065, 16,087
	15,892, 15,906, 15,977, 16,013	15,922, 15,944, 15,985, 16,018	[other coupled spatial
	[other coupled spatial	[other coupled coupled spatial	configurations]
	configurations]	configurations	
[47](DDM DA)	16,049 [set II]	16,052 [set II]	16,058 [set II]
	16,060 [set I]	16,062 [set I]	16,068 [set I]
[48](NCoQM DA)	16,019 [INS, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA mixed	16,053 [INS, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA mixed	
	with $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -SS]	with $-\overline{AS}$ and $(6 \times \overline{6}) - \overline{SA}$]	16,051 [INS]
	16,061 [OGE, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA mixed	16,079 [OGE, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AA mixed	16,089 [OGE]
	with $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -S \overline{S}]	with $-\overline{AS}$ and $(6 \times \overline{6}) - \overline{SA}$]	
[49](NCoQM DA)	16,163 $[(\overline{3} \times 3)-A\overline{A} \text{ mixed with}]$	16,125 [($\overline{3} \times 3$)-AA mixed with -AS	16 140
	$(6 \times \overline{6})$ -S \overline{S}]	and $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -SA]	10,149

$\mathrm{d}\overline{\mathrm{d}}'$	$S\overline{A}, A\overline{S}$		
nL	1S		
S	1		
J^P	1+		
$M_{\rm thr.}$	15,732		
Our	16,099		
[34](VA DA)	$\lesssim 15,770$		
	15,729, 15,804 [MM threshold]		
[35](CM)	16,840 [DA, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AS mixed with -AA and $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -SA]		
	16,915 [DA, $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -SA mixed with $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AS and -AA]		
$[38](NC_{2}OM DA)$	$16,157 \ [(\overline{3} \times 3)-S\overline{A}]$		
	$16,167 \ \left[(6 \times \overline{6}) - A\overline{S}\right]$		
[41](DMCM DA)	16,013 $[(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -SA coupled with -AA and $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -AS]		
	15,729 [CM, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AS coupled with -AA and $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -SA]		
	16,130 [MCFTM, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -A \overline{S} coupled with -A \overline{A} and $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -S \overline{A}]		
[42](DA)	16,151 [MCFTM, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AS coupled with -AA]		
	16,179 [NCoQM, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AS coupled with -AA and $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -SA]		
	16,230 [NCoQM, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AS coupled with -AA]		
[44](CM DA)	15,719.1 $[(6 \times \overline{6})-S\overline{A} \text{ mixed with } (\overline{3} \times 3)-A\overline{S} \text{ and } -A\overline{A}]$		
	15,854.4 [$(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -A \overline{S} mixed with -A \overline{A} and $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -S \overline{A}]		
	16,017 $[(\overline{3} \times 3)-A\overline{A} \text{ coupled with } -A\overline{S} \text{ and } (6 \times \overline{6})-S\overline{A}]$		
[45](NCoQM DA)	$16,032 \ \left[(6 \times \overline{6}) \cdot \overline{SA}\right]$		
	$16,049 \ [(\bar{3} \times 3)-A\bar{S}]$		
	16,009 [INS, $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -SA mixed with $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AS and -AA]		
$[48](NC_{0}OM DA)$	16,036 [INS, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AS mixed with -AA and $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -SA]		
	16,046 [OGE, $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AS mixed with -AA and $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -SA]		
	16,089 [OGE, $(6 \times \overline{6})$ -SA mixed with $(\overline{3} \times 3)$ -AS and -AA]		
$[49](NC_{0}OM DA)$	16,043 $[(6 \times \overline{6})-S\overline{A} \text{ mixed with } (\overline{3} \times 3)-A\overline{A} \text{ and } -A\overline{S}]$		
	16,144 $[(\overline{3} \times 3)-A\overline{S} \text{ mixed with } -A\overline{A} \text{ and } (6 \times \overline{6})-S\overline{A}]$		

Table XVIII. Same as in Table XVII, but for the scalar–axialvector spin configuration in ground state. Notations are explained in the caption of Table IX.

sults with the predictions of other theoretical calculations in Sec. VI. We find that these results do not agree with each other in general. Nevertheless, almost all calculations indicate that the ground states of the asymmetric fully heavy tetraquarks lie significantly above the corresponding meson–meson thresholds.

In conclusion, we note that experimental searches for the fully heavy tetraquarks are currently ongoing and should be continued. Therefore, it can be expected that new experimental candidates will appear in the near future.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors are grateful to D. Ebert and A.V. Berezhnoy for useful discussions. The work of Elena M. Savchenko was supported in part by the Foundation for the Advancement of Theoretical Physics and Mathematics "BASIS" grant number 22-2-10-3-1.

- M. Gell-Mann, A Schematic Model of Baryons and Mesons, Phys. Lett. 8, 214 (1964).
- [2] G. Zweig, An SU(3) model for strong interaction symmetry and its breaking. version 2, in *Developments in the Quark Theory of Hadrons. vol. 1. 1964 1978*, edited by D. B. Lichtenberg and S. P. Rosen (1964) pp. 22–101.
- [3] A. Ali, J. S. Lange, and S. Stone, Exotics: Heavy Pentaquarks and Tetraquarks, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. 97, 123 (2017).
- [4] Y.-R. Liu, H.-X. Chen, W. Chen, X. Liu, and S.-L. Zhu, Pentaquark and Tetraquark States, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. 107, 237 (2019).
- [5] N. Brambilla, S. Eidelman, C. Hanhart, A. Nefediev, C.-

P. Shen, C. E. Thomas, A. Vairo, and C.-Z. Yuan, The XYZ states: Experimental and theoretical status and perspectives, Phys. Rep. 873, 1 (2020).

- [6] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb Collaboration), Amplitude analysis of the $B^+ \rightarrow D^+D^-K^+$ decay, Phys. Rev. D **102**, 112003 (2020), arXiv:2009.00026 [hep-ex].
- [7] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb Collaboration), First Observation of a Doubly Charged Tetraquark and Its Neutral Partner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **131**, 041902 (2023), arXiv:2212.02716 [hep-ex].
- [8] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb Collaboration), Observation of an exotic narrow doubly charmed tetraquark, Nat. Phys. 18, 751 (2022), arXiv:2109.01038 [hep-ex].

- [9] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb Collaboration), Observation of New Resonances Decaying to $J/\psi K^+$ and $J/\psi \phi$, Phys. Rev. Lett. **127**, 082001 (2021), arXiv:2103.01803 [hep-ex].
- [10] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb Collaboration), Evidence of a $J/\psi K_S^0$ Structure in $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi \phi K_S^0$ Decays, Phys. Rev. Lett. **131**, 131901 (2023), arXiv:2301.04899 [hep-ex].
- [11] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* (CMS Collaboration), Observation of a peaking structure in the $J/\psi\phi$ mass spectrum from $B^{\pm} \rightarrow J/\psi\phi K^{\pm}$ decays, Phys. Lett. B **734**, 261 (2014), arXiv:1309.6920 [hep-ex].
- [12] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb Collaboration), Observation of $J/\psi\phi$ Structures Consistent with Exotic States from Amplitude Analysis of $B^+ \to J/\psi\phi K^+$ Decays, Phys. Rev. Lett. **118**, 022003 (2017).
- [13] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb Collaboration), Observation of a Resonant Structure near the $D_s^+ D_s^-$ Threshold in the $B^+ \rightarrow D_s^+ D_s^- K^+$ Decay, Phys. Rev. Lett. **131**, 071901 (2023), arXiv:2210.15153 [hep-ex].
- [14] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb Collaboration), Observation of structure in the J/ψ -pair mass spectrum, Sci. Bull. **65**, 1983 (2020).
- [15] G. Aad *et al.* (ATLAS Collaboration), Observation of an excess of di-charmonium events in the four-muon final state with the ATLAS detector, Phys. Rev. Lett. **131**, 151902 (2023), arXiv:2304.08962 [hep-ex].
- [16] CMS Collaboration (CMS Collaboration), Observation of new structure in the $J/\psi J/\psi$ mass spectrum in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV 10.48550/ARXIV.2306.07164 (2023), arXiv:2306.07164 [hep-ex].
- [17] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb Collaboration), Observation of $J/\psi p$ Resonances Consistent with Pentaquark States in $\Lambda_b^0 \to J/\psi K^- p$ Decays, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 072001 (2015), arXiv:1507.03414 [hep-ex].
- [18] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb Collaboration), Observation of a Narrow Pentaquark State, $P_c(4312)^+$, and of Two-Peak Structure of the $P_c(4450)^+$, Phys. Rev. Lett. **122**, 222001 (2019), arXiv:1904.03947 [hep-ex].
- [19] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb Collaboration), Observation of a $J/\psi\Lambda$ Resonance Consistent with a Strange Pentaquark Candidate in $B^- \to J/\psi\Lambda\bar{p}$ Decays, Phys. Rev. Lett. **131**, 031901 (2023), arXiv:2210.10346 [hep-ex].
- [20] H.-X. Chen, W. Chen, X. Liu, Y.-R. Liu, and S.-L. Zhu, An updated review of the new hadron states, Rep. Prog. Phys. 86, 026201 (2022), arXiv:2204.02649 [hep-ph].
- [21] M. Anselmino, E. Predazzi, S. Ekelin, S. Fredriksson, and D. B. Lichtenberg, Diquarks, Rev. Mod. Phys. 65, 1199 (1993).
- [22] L. Maiani, F. Piccinini, A. D. Polosa, and V. Riquer, Diquark–antidiquarks with hidden or open charm and the nature of X(3872), Phys. Rev. D 71, 014028 (2005), arXiv:hep-ph/0412098.
- [23] D. Ebert, R. N. Faustov, and V. O. Galkin, Masses of heavy tetraquarks in the relativistic quark model, Phys. Lett. B 634, 214 (2006), arXiv:hep-ph/0512230.
- [24] F.-K. Guo, C. Hanhart, U.-G. Meißner, Q. Wang, Q. Zhao, and B.-S. Zou, Hadronic molecules, Rev. Mod. Phys. **90**, 015004 (2018), [Erratum: Rev.Mod.Phys. 94, 029901 (2022)], arXiv:1705.00141 [hep-ph].
- [25] S. Dubynskiy and M. B. Voloshin, Hadro-Charmonium, Phys. Lett. B 666, 344 (2008), arXiv:0803.2224 [hep-ph].
- [26] M. B. Voloshin, Charmonium, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. 61, 455 (2008).
- [27] E. S. Swanson, Z_b and Z_c exotic states as coupled channel

cusps, Phys. Rev. D **91**, 034009 (2015), arXiv:1409.3291 [hep-ph].

- [28] K.-T. Chao, The $(cc) (\bar{c}\bar{c})$ (Diquark Antidiquark) States in e^+e^- Annihilation, Zeitschrift für Physik C: Particles and Fields **7**, 317 (1981).
- [29] J. P. Ader, J. M. Richard, and P. Taxil, Do narrow heavy multiquark states exist?, Physical Review D 25, 2370 (1982).
- [30] L. Heller and J. A. Tjon, On Bound States of Heavy $Q^2 \overline{Q}^2$ Systems, Physical Review D **32**, 755 (1985).
- [31] S. Zouzou, B. Silvestre-Brac, C. Gignoux, and J. M. Richard, Four-Quark Bound States, Zeitschrift für Physik C: Particles and Fields **30**, 457 (1986).
- [32] A. M. Badalian, B. L. Ioffe, and A. V. Smilga, Four-Quark States in Heavy Quark Systems, Nuclear Physics B 281, 85 (1987).
- [33] P. Bicudo, K. Cichy, A. Peters, B. Wagenbach, and M. Wagner, Evidence for the existence of udbb and the non-existence of ssbb and ccbb tetraquarks from lattice QCD, Phys. Rev. D 92, 014507 (2015), arXiv:1505.00613 [hep-lat].
- [34] M. N. Anwar, J. Ferretti, F.-K. Guo, E. Santopinto, and B.-S. Zou, Spectroscopy and decays of the fullyheavy tetraquarks, Eur. Phys. J. C 78, 647 (2018), arXiv:1710.02540 [hep-ph].
- [35] J. Wu, Y.-R. Liu, K. Chen, X. Liu, and S.-L. Zhu, Heavy-flavored tetraquark states with the $QQ\bar{Q}\bar{Q}$ configuration, Phys. Rev. D **97**, 094015 (2018).
- [36] X. Chen, Fully-heavy tetraquarks: bbccc and bcbc, Phys. Rev. D 100, 094009 (2019), arXiv:1908.08811 [hep-ph].
- [37] G. Li, X.-F. Wang, and Y. Xing, Fully heavy tetraquark $bb\bar{c}\bar{c}$: lifetimes and weak decays, Eur. Phys. J. C **79**, 10.1140/epjc/s10052-019-7150-4 (2019), arXiv:1902.05805 [hep-ph].
- [38] M.-S. Liu, Q.-F. Lü, X.-H. Zhong, and Q. Zhao, All-heavy tetraquarks, Phys. Rev. D 100, 016006 (2019).
- [39] G.-J. Wang, L. Meng, and S.-L. Zhu, Spectrum of the fully-heavy tetraquark state QQQQ'Q', Phys. Rev. D 100, 096013 (2019).
- [40] M. A. Bedolla, J. Ferretti, C. D. Roberts, and E. Santopinto, Spectrum of fully-heavy tetraquarks from a diquark+antidiquark perspective, Eur. Phys. J. C 80, 1004 (2020), arXiv:1911.00960 [hep-ph].
- [41] M. C. Gordillo, F. De Soto, and J. Segovia, Diffusion Monte Carlo calculations of fully-heavy multiquark bound states, Phys. Rev. D 102, 114007 (2020), arXiv:2009.11889 [hep-ph].
- [42] C. Deng, H. Chen, and J. Ping, Towards the understanding of fully-heavy tetraquark states from various models, Phys. Rev. D 103, 014001 (2021).
- [43] Q.-N. Wang, Z.-H. Yang, W. Chen, and H.-X. Chen, Mass spectra for the *ccbb* and *bbcc̄* tetraquark states, Phys. Rev. D **104**, 014020 (2021), arXiv:2106.05550 [hepph].
- [44] X.-Z. Weng, X.-L. Chen, W.-Z. Deng, and S.-L. Zhu, Systematics of fully heavy tetraquarks, Phys. Rev. D 103, 034001 (2021).
- [45] G. Yang, J. Ping, and J. Segovia, Exotic resonances of fully-heavy tetraquarks in a lattice-QCD insipired quark model, Phys. Rev. D 104, 014006 (2021).
- [46] W. Chen, Q.-N. Wang, Z.-Y. Yang, H.-X. Chen, X. Liu, T. G. Steele, and S.-L. Zhu, Searching for fully-heavy tetraquark states in QCD moment sum rules, Nucl. Part.

Phys. Proc. **318-323**, 73 (2022), arXiv:2212.03689 [hep-ph].

- [47] H. Mutuk, Spectrum of ccbb, bccc, and bcbb tetraquark states in the dynamical diquark model, Phys. Lett. B 834, 137404 (2022), arXiv:2208.11048 [hep-ph].
- [48] J. Zhang, J.-B. Wang, G. Li, C.-S. An, C.-R. Deng, and J.-J. Xie, Spectrum of the S-wave fully-heavy tetraquark states, Eur. Phys. J. C 82, 1126 (2022), arXiv:2209.13856 [hep-ph].
- [49] H.-T. An, S.-Q. Luo, Z.-W. Liu, and X. Liu, Spectroscopic behavior of fully heavy tetraquarks, Eur. Phys. J. C 83, 740 (2023), arXiv:2208.03899 [hep-ph].
- [50] B. Silvestre-Brac, Systematics of $Q^2(\overline{Q}^2)$ systems with a chromomagnetic interaction, Phys. Rev. D 46, 2179 (1992).
- [51] J.-M. Richard, A. Valcarce, and J. Vijande, String dynamics and metastability of all-heavy tetraquarks, Physical Review D 95, 054019 (2017), arXiv:1703.00783 [hepph].
- [52] A. Czarnecki, B. Leng, and M. B. Voloshin, Stability of tetrons, Physics Letters B 778, 233 (2018), arXiv:1708.04594 [hep-ph].
- [53] R. N. Faustov, V. O. Galkin, and E. M. Savchenko, Masses of the $QQ\bar{Q}\bar{Q}$ tetraquarks in the relativistic diquark-antidiquark picture, Phys. Rev. D **102**, 114030 (2020), arXiv:2009.13237 [hep-ph].
- [54] R. N. Faustov, V. O. Galkin, and E. M. Savchenko, Heavy Tetraquarks in the Relativistic Quark Model, Universe 7, 94 (2021), arXiv:2103.01763 [hep-ph].
- [55] R. N. Faustov, V. O. Galkin, and E. M. Savchenko, Fully Heavy Tetraquark Spectroscopy in the Relativistic Quark Model, Symmetry 14, 2504 (2022), arXiv:2210.16015 [hep-ph].
- [56] R. Aaij *et al.*, Search for beautiful tetraquarks in the $\Upsilon(1S)\mu^+\mu^-$ invariant-mass spectrum, J. High Energy Phys. **2018** (10), 1, arXiv:1806.09707 [hep-ex].
- [57] V. Khachatryan *et al.* (CMS Collaboration), Observation of $\Upsilon(1s)$ pair production in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV, J. High Energy Phys. **2017** (5), 1, arXiv:1610.07095 [hep-ex].
- [58] A. M. Sirunyan *et al.* (CMS Collaboration), Measurement of the $\Upsilon(1s)$ pair production cross section and search for resonances decaying to $\Upsilon(1S)\mu^+\mu^-$ in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV, Phys. Lett. B **808**, 135578 (2020), arXiv:2002.06393.
- [59] R. L. Workman, V. D. Burkert, V. Crede, E. Klempt, U. Thoma, L. Tiator, K. Agashe, G. Aielli, B. C. Allanach, C. Amsler, *et al.*, Review of Particle Physics, Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys. **2022**, 083C01 (2022).
- [60] I. Bigi, Y. Dokshitzer, V. Khoze, J. Kühn, and P. Zerwas, Production and decay properties of ultra-heavy quarks, Phys. Lett. B 181, 157 (1986).
- [61] D. Ebert, R. N. Faustov, and V. O. Galkin, Masses of heavy baryons in the relativistic quark model, Phys. Rev.

D 72, 034026 (2005), arXiv:hep-ph/0504112 [hep-ph].

- [62] D. Ebert, R. N. Faustov, and V. O. Galkin, Spectroscopy and Regge trajectories of heavy baryons in the relativistic quark-diquark picture, Phys. Rev. D 84, 014025 (2011), arXiv:1105.0583 [hep-ph].
- [63] D. Ebert, R. N. Faustov, and V. O. Galkin, Properties of heavy quarkonia and B_c mesons in the relativistic quark model, Phys. Rev. D 67, 014027 (2003), arXiv:hepph/0210381.
- [64] D. Ebert, R. N. Faustov, and V. O. Galkin, Spectroscopy and Regge trajectories of heavy quarkonia and B_c mesons, Eur. Phys. J. C 71, 1 (2011).
- [65] A. A. Logunov and A. N. Tavkhelidze, Quasi-Optical Approach in Quantum Field Theory, Il Nuovo Cimento 29, 380 (1963).
- [66] A. P. Martynenko and R. N. Faustov, Relativistic reduced mass and quasipotential equation, Theor. Math. Phys. 64, 765 (1985).
- [67] V. O. Galkin and R. N. Faustov, Some properties of the solutions of a quasipotential equation, Theor. Math. Phys. 85, 1119 (1990).
- [68] D. Ebert, R. N. Faustov, V. O. Galkin, and A. P. Martynenko, Mass spectra of doubly heavy baryons in the relativistic quark model, Phys. Rev. D 66, 014008 (2002), arXiv:hep-ph/0201217.
- [69] D. Ebert, R. N. Faustov, V. O. Galkin, and W. Lucha, Masses of tetraquarks with two heavy quarks in the relativistic quark model, Phys. Rev. D 76, 114015 (2007), 0706.3853.
- [70] Y. A. Simonov, Perturbation theory in the nonperturbative QCD vacuum, Phys. Atom. Nucl. 58, 107 (1995), arXiv:hep-ph/9311247 [hep-ph].
- [71] A. M. Badalian, A. I. Veselov, and B. L. G. Bakker, Restriction on the strong coupling constant in the IR region from the 1D-1P splitting in bottomonium, Phys. Rev. D 70, 016007 (2004).
- [72] A. De-Shalit and I. Talmi, *Nuclear shell theory* (Dover Publications, Mineola, New York, 2004) p. 592, originally published: New York : Academic Press, 1963.
- [73] W. Lucha and F. F. Schöberl, Solving the Schrödinger Equation for Bound States with Mathematica 3.0, Int. J. Mod. Phys. C 10, 607 (1999).
- [74] V. O. Galkin and R. N. Faustov, Relativistic corrections to radiative decay widths of vector mesons, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. 44, 1575 (1986).
- [75] V. O. Galkin, A. Y. Mishurov, and R. N. Faustov, Radiative E1 decays of quarkonium in the framework of relativistic quark model, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. 51, 705 (1990).
- [76] V. O. Galkin, A. Y. Mishurov, and R. N. Faustov, Meson masses in the relativistic quark model, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. 55, 1207 (1992).
- [77] R. N. Faustov and V. O. Galkin, Heavy quark $1/m_Q$ expansion of meson weak decay form-factors in the relativistic quark model, Z. Phys. C **66**, 119 (1995).