Analysis of the X(4475), X(4500), $Z_{c\bar{s}}(4600)$ and related tetraquark states with the QCD sum rules

Zhi-Gang Wang¹

Department of Physics, North China Electric Power University, Baoding 071003, P. R. China

Abstract

In this work, we introduce explicit P-waves to construct the diquark operators, then construct the local four-quark currents to explore the hidden-charm tetraquark states with the $J^{PC} = 0^{++}$, 1^{+-} and 2^{++} in the framework of the QCD sum rules at length. Our calculations indicate tiny light-flavor SU(3) breaking effects on the tetraquark masses due to the special currents and the predictions support assigning the X(4775) and X(4500) as the $[uc]_{\widehat{V}}[\overline{uc}]_{\widehat{V}} - [dc]_{\widehat{V}}[\overline{dc}]_{\widehat{V}}$ and $[sc]_{\widehat{V}}[\overline{sc}]_{\widehat{V}}$ tetraquark states with the $J^{PC} = 0^{++}$ respectively, and assigning the $Z_c(4600)$ and $Z_{\overline{cs}}(4600)$ as the $[uc]_{\widehat{V}}[\overline{dc}]_{\widehat{V}}$ and $[qc]_{\widehat{V}}[\overline{sc}]_{\widehat{V}}$ tetraquark states with the $J^{PC} = 1^{+-}$ respectively, and thus account for the LHCb's data.

PACS number: 12.39.Mk, 12.38.Lg Key words: Tetraquark state, QCD sum rules

1 Introduction

In 2016, the LHCb collaboration performed the first full amplitude analysis of the decays $B^+ \rightarrow J/\psi\phi K^+$ with $J/\psi \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$, $\phi \rightarrow K^+K^-$ with a data sample of 3 fb⁻¹ of the proton-proton collision data at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ and 8 TeV [1, 2]. And observed four $J/\psi\phi$ structures, two old particles X(4140) and X(4274) and two new particles X(4500) and X(4700). The statistical significances of the X(4140), X(4274), X(4500) and X(4700) are 8.4 σ , 6.0 σ , 6.1 σ and 5.6 σ , respectively. While the statistical significances of the quantum numbers $J^{PC} = 1^{++}$, 1^{++} , 0^{++} and 0^{++} are 5.7 σ , 5.8 σ , 4.0 σ and 4.5 σ , respectively [1, 2]. The measured Breit-Wigner masses and widths are

$$\begin{split} X(4140) &: M = 4146.5 \pm 4.5^{+4.6}_{-2.8} \text{ MeV}, \ \Gamma = 83 \pm 21^{+21}_{-14} \text{ MeV}, \\ X(4274) &: M = 4273.3 \pm 8.3^{+17.2}_{-3.6} \text{ MeV}, \ \Gamma = 56 \pm 11^{+8}_{-11} \text{ MeV}, \\ X(4500) &: M = 4506 \pm 11^{+12}_{-15} \text{ MeV}, \ \Gamma = 92 \pm 21^{+21}_{-20} \text{ MeV}, \\ X(4700) &: M = 4704 \pm 10^{+14}_{-24} \text{ MeV}, \ \Gamma = 120 \pm 31^{+42}_{-33} \text{ MeV}. \end{split}$$
(1)

The LHCb collaboration determined the J^{PC} of the X(4140) to be 1⁺⁺, thus ruling out the 0⁺⁺ or 2⁺⁺ $D_s^{*+}D_s^{*-}$ molecule assignments.

In 2021, the LHCb collaboration performed an improved full amplitude analysis of the exclusive $B^+ \to J/\psi \phi K^+$ decays using the proton-proton collision data (6 times larger signal yield than previously analyzed) corresponding to a total integrated luminosity of 9fb⁻¹ at $\sqrt{s} = 7$, 8 and 13 TeV, observed the $Z_{cs}(4000)$ with the $J^P = 1^+$ in the $J/\psi K^+$ mass spectrum with the statistical significance of 15 σ , and the X(4685) (X(4630)) in the $J/\psi \phi$ mass spectrum with the $J^P = 1^+$ (1⁻) with the statistical significance of 15 σ (5.5 σ) [3], furthermore, they confirmed the old particles X(4140), X(4274), X(4500) and X(4700). The measured Breit-Wigner masses and widths are,

$$\begin{split} X(4140) &: M = 4118 \pm 11^{+19}_{-36} \text{ MeV}, \ \Gamma = 162 \pm 21^{+24}_{-49} \text{ MeV}, \\ X(4274) &: M = 4294 \pm 4^{+3}_{-6} \text{ MeV}, \ \Gamma = 53 \pm 5 \pm 5 \text{ MeV}, \\ X(4685) &: M = 4684 \pm 7^{+13}_{-16} \text{ MeV}, \ \Gamma = 126 \pm 15^{+37}_{-41} \text{ MeV}, \\ X(4500) &: M = 4474 \pm 3 \pm 3 \text{ MeV}, \ \Gamma = 77 \pm 6^{+10}_{-8} \text{ MeV}, \\ X(4700) &: M = 4694 \pm 4^{+16}_{-3} \text{ MeV}, \ \Gamma = 87 \pm 8^{+16}_{-6} \text{ MeV}, \\ X(4630) &: M = 4626 \pm 16^{+18}_{-110} \text{ MeV}, \ \Gamma = 174 \pm 27^{+134}_{-73} \text{ MeV}. \end{split}$$

¹E-mail: zgwang@aliyun.com.

In 2024, the LHCb collaboration performed the first full amplitude analysis of the decays $B^+ \rightarrow \psi(2S)K^+\pi^+\pi^-$ using the proton-proton collision data corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 9 fb⁻¹, and they developed an amplitude model with 53 components comprising 11 hidden-charm exotic states, $Z_c(4055)$, $Z_c(4200)$, $Z_c(4430)$, X(4475), X(4710), X(4650), X(4800), $Z_{\bar{cs}}(4000)$, $Z_{\bar{cs}}(4000)$, $Z_{\bar{cs}}(4900)$, $Z_{\bar{cs}}(5200)$ [4]. They confirmed the $Z_c(4200)$ and $Z_c(4430)$ in the $\psi(2S)\pi^+$ mass spectrum, and determined the spin-parity of the $Z_c(4200)$ to be 1⁺ for the first time with a significance exceeding 5σ , and observed the $Z_{\bar{cs}}(4600)$ and $Z_{\bar{cs}}(4900)$ in the $\psi(2S)K^*(892)$ mass spectrum, which might be the radial excitations of the $Z_{\bar{cs}}(4000)$.

In addition, they observed that the $\psi(2S)\pi^+\pi^-$ mass spectrum are dominated by the $X^0 \rightarrow \psi(2S)\rho^0(770)$ decays with the $X^0 = X(4475), X(4650), X(4710)$ and X(4800), which are similar to the previously observed $J/\psi\phi$ resonances X(4500), X(4685), X(4700) and X(4630), respectively. The spin-parity of the X(4630) have not been unambiguously determined yet, the assignment $J^P = 1^-$ is favored over $J^P = 2^-$ with a significance of 3σ and other assignments are disfavored by more than 5σ . The X(4475), X(4650), X(4710) and X(4800) have the isospin $(I, I_3) = (1, 0)$, while the X(4500), X(4685), X(4700) and X(4630) have the isospin $(I, I_3) = (0, 0)$ according the final states $\psi(2S)\rho^0(770)$ and $J/\psi\phi$. A possible explanation is that those states are genuinely different states, however, for example, if the X(4475) state is the $c\bar{c}(u\bar{u} - d\bar{d})$ isospin partner of the X(4500) interpreted as the $c\bar{c}s\bar{s}$ state, one would generally expect a larger mass difference of $M_{X(4500)} - M_{X(4475)} \approx 200$ MeV rather than several MeV (or degenerated masses).

On the other hand, we should bear in mind, the observation of the $Z_c(4055)$, X(4800) and $Z_{\bar{c}\bar{s}}(5200)$ should not be considered as confirmations of specific states but rather effective descriptions of the generic $\psi(2S)\pi^+$, $\psi(2S)\rho^0(770)$ and $\psi(2S)[K^+\pi^-]_S$ contributions respectively with the spin-parity $J^P = 1^-$ [4].

The measured Breit-Wigner masses and widths are,

$$\begin{split} X(4475) &: M = 4475 \pm 7 \pm 12 \text{ MeV}, \ \Gamma = 231 \pm 19 \pm 32 \text{ MeV}, \\ X(4650) &: M = 4653 \pm 14 \pm 27 \text{ MeV}, \ \Gamma = 227 \pm 26 \pm 22 \text{ MeV}, \\ X(4710) &: M = 4710 \pm 4 \pm 5 \text{ MeV}, \ \Gamma = 64 \pm 9 \pm 10 \text{ MeV}, \\ Z_c(4200) &: M = 4257 \pm 11 \pm 17 \text{ MeV}, \ \Gamma = 308 \pm 20 \pm 32 \text{ MeV}, \\ Z_c(4430) &: M = 4468 \pm 21 \pm 80 \text{ MeV}, \ \Gamma = 251 \pm 42 \pm 82 \text{ MeV}, \\ Z_{\bar{c}\bar{s}}(4600) &: M = 4578 \pm 10 \pm 18 \text{ MeV}, \ \Gamma = 133 \pm 28 \pm 69 \text{ MeV}, \\ Z_{\bar{c}\bar{s}}(4900) &: M = 4925 \pm 22 \pm 47 \text{ MeV}, \ \Gamma = 255 \pm 55 \pm 127 \text{ MeV}. \end{split}$$

Also in 2024, the LHCb collaboration accomplished the first investigation of the $J/\psi\phi$ production in diffractive processes in the proton-proton collisions, which is based on a data-set recorded at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 5 fb⁻¹ [5]. The data are consistent with a resonant model including several resonant states observed previously in the $B^+ \rightarrow J/\psi\phi K^+$ decays. The X(4500) and X(4274) were observed with significances over 5 σ and 4 σ , respectively.

Now we reach a short summary, the X(4140), X(4274), X(4500), X(4630), X(4685) and X(4700) were observed in the $J/\psi\phi$ mass spectrum with the symbolic valence quark structures $c\bar{c}s\bar{s}$ and isospin $(I, I_3) = (0, 0)$, $J^{PC} = 0^{++}$, 1^{++} , 2^{++} for the S-wave systems, and 0^{-+} , 1^{-+} , 2^{-+} , 3^{-+} for the P-wave systems. The X(4475), X(4650), X(4710) and X(4800) were observed in the $\psi(2S)\rho^0(770)$ mass spectrum with the symbolic valence quark structures $c\bar{c}(u\bar{u} - d\bar{d})$ and isospin $(I, I_3) = (1, 0)$, $J^{PC} = 0^{++}$, 1^{++} , 2^{++} for the S-wave systems, and 0^{-+} , 1^{-+} , 2^{-+} , 3^{-+} for the P-wave systems. The $Z_{\bar{c}\bar{s}}(4600)$ and $Z_{\bar{c}\bar{s}}(4900)$ ($Z_{\bar{c}\bar{s}}(4000)$) were observed in the $\psi(2S)K^*(892)$ ($\psi(2S)K$) mass spectrum with the symbolic valence quark structures $c\bar{c}u\bar{s}$ and isospin $(I, I_3) = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$, $J^{PC} = 1^{+-}$ for the S-wave systems.

Now we would like to see from the angle of the tetraquark picture for the X, Y and Z states and resort to the QCD sum rules. We often take the diquarks as the basic valence constituents to study the tetraquark states. The diquarks $\varepsilon^{abc}q_b^T C\Gamma q'_c$ have five spinor structures, where $C\Gamma = C\gamma_5$, C, $C\gamma_\mu\gamma_5$, $C\gamma_\mu$ and $C\sigma_{\mu\nu}$ (or $C\sigma_{\mu\nu}\gamma_5$) for the scalar (S), pseudoscalar (P), vector (V), axialvector (A) and tensor (T) diquarks (which have both the $J^P = 1^+$ (\tilde{A}) and 1^- (\tilde{V}) components), respectively, and the a, b, c are color indexes.

In Ref.[6], we explore the energy scale dependence of the QCD sum rules for the X, Y and Z states for the first time, then we suggest an energy scale formula,

$$\mu = \sqrt{M_{X/Y/Z}^2 - (2\mathbb{M}_Q)^2}, \qquad (4)$$

via introducing effective heavy quark masses \mathbb{M}_Q to obtain the suitable energy scales of the QCD spectral densities for the hidden-charm (hidden-bottom) tetraquark states [7, 8, 9], which can magnify the ground state contributions substantially and improve convergence of the operator product expansion substantially. If there exist valence s-quarks, we modify the energy scale formula,

$$\mu = \sqrt{M_{X/Y/Z}^2 - (2\mathbb{M}_Q)^2} - \kappa \mathbb{M}_s , \qquad (5)$$

to count for the light-flavor SU(3) breaking effects via introducing the effective s-quark mass \mathbb{M}_s , where the κ is the valence s-quark's number. The modified energy scale formula plays an important role in exploring the light-flavor SU(3) breaking effects in the multiquark states, especially those X states [10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19].

There exist other theoretical schemes and possible assignments for those X states, irrespective in the tetraquark picture [20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25], molecule picture [26, 27, 28], or charmonium picture [29, 30, 31, 32], which can count for some experimental data in some extent, however, no definite conclusion can be obtained up to now, more theoretical and experimental works are still needed.

In the theoretical scheme of the QCD sum rules having our unique feature, we have performed comprehensive analysis of the hidden-charm/hidden-charm-hidden-strange tetraquark states with the $J^{PC} = 0^{++}$, 0^{-+} , 0^{--} , 1^{--} , 1^{-+} , 1^{+-} , 2^{++} [14, 18, 19, 33, 34], hidden-bottom tetraquark states with the $J^{PC} = 0^{++}$, 1^{+-} , 2^{++} [35], hidden-charm molecular states with the $J^{PC} = 0^{++}$, 1^{+-} , 2^{++} [35], hidden-charm molecular states with the $J^{PC} = 0^{++}$, 1^{+-} , 2^{++} [11], doubly-charm tetraquark (molecular) states with the $J^P = 0^+$, 1^+ , 2^+ [36] ([13]), hidden-charm pentaquark (molecular) states with the $J^P = \frac{1}{2}^-$, $\frac{3}{2}^-$, $\frac{5}{2}^-$ [37]([38]), and make suitable assignments based on the predicted masses.

In Ref.[19], we take account of the light-flavor SU(3) breaking effects comprehensively, and revisit the assignments of the potential hidden-charm-hidden-strange tetraquark candidates and supersede the old assignments [39, 40, 41, 42], the calculations support assigning the X(3960)and X(4500) as the 1S and 2S $[sc]_S[\overline{sc}]_S^*$ tetraquark states with the $J^{PC} = 0^{++}$ respectively; assigning the X(4700) as the 2S $[sc]_A[\overline{sc}]_A$ or $[sc]_{\tilde{A}}[\overline{sc}]_{\tilde{A}}$ (or 1S $[sc]_V[\overline{sc}]_V^*$) tetraquark state with the $J^{PC} = 0^{++}$; assigning the X(4140) and X(4685) as the 1S and 2S $[sc]_S[\overline{sc}]_A + [sc]_A[\overline{sc}]_S$ or $[sc]_S[\overline{sc}]_{\tilde{A}} + [sc]_{\tilde{A}}[\overline{sc}]_S$ tetraquark states with the $J^{PC} = 1^{++}$ respectively; assigning the X(4274)as the $[sc]_{\tilde{V}}[\overline{sc}]_V - [sc]_V[\overline{sc}]_{\tilde{V}}$ tetraquark state with the $J^{PC} = 1^{++}$. All in all, the light-flavor SU(3) breaking effects on the tetraquark masses are remarkable.

If the X(4500), X(4685), X(4700) and X(4630) have the same Dirac spinor structures with the X(4475), X(4650), X(4710) and X(4800) respectively, but different Isospin structures, the light-flavor SU(3) breaking effects on the hadron masses should be very small, we would like to explore the odd phenomenon.

In Ref.[43], we introduce an explicit P-wave to construct the doubly-heavy diquark operators $\varepsilon^{abc}Q_b^T C\gamma_5 \stackrel{\leftrightarrow}{\partial}_{\mu} Q_c(\hat{V})$, where the derivative $\stackrel{\leftrightarrow}{\partial}_{\mu} = \stackrel{\rightarrow}{\partial}_{\mu} - \stackrel{\leftarrow}{\partial}_{\mu}$ embodies the net P-wave effect, then we take the vector operators \hat{V} as the basic constituent to construct the four-quark currents to study the fully-charm tetraquark states at length with the QCD sum rules. In this work, we take the diquarks $\varepsilon^{abc}c_b^T C\gamma_5 \stackrel{\leftrightarrow}{D}_{\mu} q_c(\hat{V})$ with q = u, d, s and $D_{\mu} = \partial_{\mu} - ig_s G_{\mu}$ as the elementary constituents and extend our previous works to explore the $cq\bar{c}\bar{q}'$ tetraquark states with the $J^{PC} = 0^{++}, 1^{+-}$ and 2^{++} comprehensively, and examine the light-flavor SU(3) breaking effects in this special case, and make reasonable assignments of the new LHCb X states. In the heavy quark limit, the c-quark

is static, the operators $\varepsilon^{abc} c_b^T C \gamma_5 \stackrel{\leftrightarrow}{D}_{\mu} q_c$ are reduced to the form $\varepsilon^{abc} c_b^T C \gamma_5 D_{\mu} q_c$, and we would like take the reduced operators. In Ref.[20], Chen et al choose a D-wave diquark $c_b^T C \gamma_{\alpha} D_{\mu} D_{\nu} s_c$ in the color antitriplet (sextet) and an S-wave antidiquark $\bar{c}_b^T \gamma_{\beta} C \bar{s}_c$ in the color triplet (antisextet) to construct the four-quark current to interpolate the tetraquark state with the $J^P = 0^+$, and obtain the tetraquark mass $4.55^{+0.19}_{-0.13} \text{ GeV}$ ($4.66^{+0.20}_{-0.14} \text{ GeV}$) by requiring the pole contribution $\geq 20\%$, then assign them as the X(4500) and X(4700), respectively. While in this work, we choose the $[cq]_{\hat{V}}[\bar{c}\bar{q}']_{\hat{V}}$ -type currents, which have two P-waves (an effective D-wave) in stead of a D-wave.

The article is arranged as follows: we obtain the QCD sum rules for the hidden-charm tetraquark states in section 2; in section 3, we present the numerical results and discussions; section 4 is reserved for our conclusion.

2 QCD sum rules for the hidden-charm tetraquark states

At the beginning, we write down the two-point correlation functions $\Pi(p)$ and $\Pi_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}(p)$,

$$\Pi(p) = i \int d^4 x e^{ip \cdot x} \langle 0|T \left\{ J(x) J^{\dagger}(0) \right\} |0\rangle ,$$

$$_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}(p) = i \int d^4 x e^{ip \cdot x} \langle 0|T \left\{ J_{\mu\nu}(x) J^{\dagger}_{\alpha\beta}(0) \right\} |0\rangle , \qquad (6)$$

where $J_{\mu\nu}(x) = J^{\pm}_{\mu\nu}(x)$,

Π

$$J(x) = \varepsilon^{ijk} \varepsilon^{imn} D_{\mu} q_j^T(x) C \gamma_5 c_k(x) D^{\mu} \bar{q}'_m(x) \gamma_5 C \bar{c}_n^T(x) , \qquad (7)$$

$$J_{\mu\nu}^{\pm}(x) = \frac{\varepsilon^{ijk}\varepsilon^{imn}}{\sqrt{2}} \Big[D_{\mu}q_j^T(x)C\gamma_5 c_k(x) D_{\nu}\bar{q}'_m(x)\gamma_5 C\bar{c}_n^T(x) \pm D_{\nu}q_j^T(x)C\gamma_5 c_k(x) D_{\mu}\bar{q}'_m(x)\gamma_5 C\bar{c}_n^T(x) \Big], \qquad (8)$$

the *i*, *j*, *k*, *m*, *n* are color indexes, q, q' = u, *d* or *s*, the charge conjugation matrix $C = i\gamma^2\gamma^0$, the superscripts \pm denote the \pm charge conjugation, respectively. We check the parity and charge-conjugation properties,

$$\widehat{P}J(x)\widehat{P}^{-1} = +J(\widetilde{x}),
\widehat{P}J^{\pm}_{\mu\nu}(x)\widehat{P}^{-1} = +J^{\mu\nu}_{\pm}(\widetilde{x}),$$
(9)

where the coordinates $x^{\mu} = (t, \vec{x})$ and $\tilde{x}^{\mu} = (t, -\vec{x})$, and

$$\widehat{C}J(x)\widehat{C}^{-1} = +J(x),
\widehat{C}J^{\pm}_{\mu\nu}(x)\widehat{C}^{-1} = \pm J^{\pm}_{\mu\nu}(x).$$
(10)

In the isospin limit, the currents with the symbolic quark constituents $\bar{c}c\bar{d}u$, $\bar{c}c\bar{u}d$, $\bar{c}c\frac{\bar{u}u-\bar{d}d}{\sqrt{2}}$, $\bar{c}c\frac{\bar{u}u+\bar{d}d}{\sqrt{2}}$ couple potentially to the tetraquark states with degenerated masses, the currents with the isospin I = 1 and 0 lead to the same QCD sum rules, while the currents with the symbolic quark constituents $\bar{c}c\bar{q}s$ and $\bar{c}c\bar{s}q$ (with q = u and d) couple potentially to the tetraquark states with degenerated masses, and lead to the same QCD sum rules. In this work, we would like choose the quark configurations $\bar{c}c\bar{d}u$, $\bar{c}c\bar{s}q$ and $\bar{c}c\bar{s}s$ to explore the mass spectrum.

At the hadron side, we insert a complete set of intermediate hadronic states with the same spinparity-charge-conjugation as the current operators J(x) and $J_{\mu\nu}(x)$ into the correlation functions $\Pi(p)$ and $\Pi_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}(p)$ to reach the hadronic representation, and isolate the ground state contributions,

$$\Pi(p) = \frac{\lambda_{X^+}^2}{M_{X^+}^2 - p^2} + \dots = \Pi_+(p^2), \qquad (11)$$

$$\Pi_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}^{-}(p) = \frac{\lambda_{X^{+}}^{2}}{M_{X^{+}}^{2}(M_{X^{+}}^{2}-p^{2})} \left(p^{2}g_{\mu\alpha}g_{\nu\beta}-p^{2}g_{\mu\beta}g_{\nu\alpha}-g_{\mu\alpha}p_{\nu}p_{\beta}-g_{\nu\beta}p_{\mu}p_{\alpha}+g_{\mu\beta}p_{\nu}p_{\alpha}+g_{\mu\beta}p_{\nu}p_{\alpha}+g_{\mu\beta}p_{\nu}p_{\alpha}+g_{\mu\beta}p_{\nu}p_{\alpha}+g_{\mu\beta}p_{\nu}p_{\alpha}+g_{\mu\beta}p_{\nu}p_{\alpha}+g_{\mu\alpha}p_{\mu}p_{\beta}\right) + \cdots
= \tilde{\Pi}_{+}(p^{2}) \left(p^{2}g_{\mu\alpha}g_{\nu\beta}-p^{2}g_{\mu\beta}g_{\nu\alpha}-g_{\mu\alpha}p_{\nu}p_{\beta}-g_{\nu\beta}p_{\mu}p_{\alpha}+g_{\mu\beta}p_{\nu}p_{\alpha}+g_{\mu\beta}p_{\nu}p_{\alpha}+g_{\mu\alpha}p_{\mu}p_{\beta}\right)
+\tilde{\Pi}_{-}(p^{2}) \left(-g_{\mu\alpha}p_{\nu}p_{\beta}-g_{\nu\beta}p_{\mu}p_{\alpha}+g_{\mu\beta}p_{\nu}p_{\alpha}+g_{\nu\alpha}p_{\mu}p_{\beta}\right),
\Pi_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}^{+}(p) = \frac{\lambda_{X^{+}}^{2}}{M_{X^{+}}^{2}-p^{2}} \left(\frac{\tilde{g}_{\mu\alpha}\tilde{g}_{\nu\beta}+\tilde{g}_{\mu\beta}\tilde{g}_{\nu\alpha}}{2}-\frac{\tilde{g}_{\mu\nu}\tilde{g}_{\alpha\beta}}{3}\right) + \cdots,$$

$$(12)$$

where $\tilde{g}_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu} - \frac{p_{\mu}p_{\nu}}{p^2}$. We use the superscripts \pm in the $\Pi^{\pm}_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}(p)$ to denote \pm charge conjugation, respectively, and use the superscripts/subscripts \pm in the $X^{\pm}/\Pi_{\pm}(p^2)/\widetilde{\Pi}_{\pm}(p^2)$ to denote \pm parity, respectively. We define the pole residues $\lambda_{X^{\pm}}$,

$$\langle 0|J(0)|X^{+}(p)\rangle = \lambda_{X^{+}},$$

$$\langle 0|J^{+}_{\mu\nu}(0)|X^{+}(p)\rangle = \frac{\lambda_{X^{+}}}{M_{X^{+}}} \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \varepsilon^{\alpha} p^{\beta},$$

$$\langle 0|J^{-}_{\mu\nu}(0)|X^{-}(p)\rangle = \frac{\lambda_{X^{-}}}{M_{X^{-}}} (\varepsilon_{\mu} p_{\nu} - \varepsilon_{\nu} p_{\mu}),$$

$$\langle 0|J^{+}_{\mu\nu}(0)|X^{+}(p)\rangle = \lambda_{X^{+}} \varepsilon_{\mu\nu},$$

$$(13)$$

where the $\varepsilon_{\mu/\alpha}$ and $\varepsilon_{\mu\nu}$ are the hadron polarization vectors. We choose the components $\Pi_+(p^2)$ and $p^2 \widetilde{\Pi}_+(p^2)$ to explore the tetraquark states without contaminations from other states. The quantum filed theory does not forbid the currents J(x) and $J_{\mu\nu}(x)$ coupling to the two-meson scattering states if they have the same quantum numbers, there maybe exist contaminations from the two-meson scattering states. In Refs.[44, 45], we illustrate that the two-meson scattering states play an unimportant role and cannot saturate the QCD sum rules by themselves, on the other hand, the tetraquark (molecular) states play an irreplaceable role, and we can saturate the QCD sum rules with or without the two-particle scattering states, it is reliable to study the tetraquark (molecular) states radii $\sqrt{\langle r^2 \rangle}$, the net effects of the small overlapping of the wave-functions can be absorbed into the pole residues safely [46].

We accomplish the operator product expansion up to the condensates of dimension 10 consistently based on our unique counting rules and adopt truncation $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^k)$ with $k \leq 1$ for the quark-gluon operators so as to estimate reliability and feasibility [14, 18, 33, 34], and compute the condensates $\langle \bar{q}q \rangle$, $\langle \bar{q}g_s \sigma Gq \rangle$, $\langle \bar{q}q \rangle^2$, $\langle \bar{q}q \rangle^2$, $\langle \bar{q}q \rangle \langle \frac{\alpha_s GG}{\pi} \rangle$, $\langle \bar{q}q \rangle \langle \bar{q}g_s \sigma Gq \rangle$, $\langle \bar{q}q \rangle^2 \langle \frac{\alpha_s GG}{\pi} \rangle$, $\langle \bar{q}q \rangle \langle \bar{q}g_s \sigma Gq \rangle$, $\langle \bar{q}q \rangle^2 \langle \frac{\alpha_s GG}{\pi} \rangle$ with q = u, d or s. Then we obtain the QCD spectral densities $\rho_{QCD}(s)$ through dispersion relation directly. In computations, we take the full quark propagators,

$$S^{ij}(x) = \frac{i\delta_{ij}\not x}{2\pi^2x^4} - \frac{\delta_{ij}m_q}{4\pi^2x^2} - \frac{\delta_{ij}\langle\bar{q}q\rangle}{12} + \frac{i\delta_{ij}\not xm_q\langle\bar{q}q\rangle}{48} - \frac{\delta_{ij}x^2\langle\bar{q}g_s\sigma Gq\rangle}{192} + \frac{i\delta_{ij}x^2\not xm_q\langle\bar{q}g_s\sigma Gq\rangle}{1152} - \frac{ig_sG^a_{\alpha\beta}t^a_{ij}(\not x\sigma^{\alpha\beta} + \sigma^{\alpha\beta}\not x)}{32\pi^2x^2} - \frac{\delta_{ij}x^4\langle\bar{q}q\rangle\langle g^2_sGG\rangle}{27648} - \frac{1}{8}\langle\bar{q}_j\sigma^{\mu\nu}q_i\rangle\sigma_{\mu\nu} + \cdots,$$
(14)

$$\begin{split} S_Q^{ij}(x) &= \frac{i}{(2\pi)^4} \int d^4 k e^{-ik \cdot x} \left\{ \frac{\delta_{ij}}{\not k - m_Q} - \frac{g_s G_{\alpha\beta}^n t_{ij}^n}{4} \frac{\sigma^{\alpha\beta} (\not k + m_Q) + (\not k + m_Q) \sigma^{\alpha\beta}}{(k^2 - m_Q^2)^2} \right. \\ &+ \frac{g_s D_\alpha G_{\beta\lambda}^n t_{ij}^n (f^{\lambda\beta\alpha} + f^{\lambda\alpha\beta})}{3(k^2 - m_Q^2)^4} - \frac{g_s^2 (t^a t^b)_{ij} G_{\alpha\beta}^a G_{\mu\nu}^b (f^{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} + f^{\alpha\mu\beta\nu} + f^{\alpha\mu\nu\beta})}{4(k^2 - m_Q^2)^5} + \cdots \right\} \,,$$

$$f^{\lambda\alpha\beta} = (\not\!k + m_Q)\gamma^{\lambda}(\not\!k + m_Q)\gamma^{\alpha}(\not\!k + m_Q)\gamma^{\beta}(\not\!k + m_Q),$$

$$f^{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} = (\not\!k + m_Q)\gamma^{\alpha}(\not\!k + m_Q)\gamma^{\beta}(\not\!k + m_Q)\gamma^{\mu}(\not\!k + m_Q)\gamma^{\nu}(\not\!k + m_Q),$$
(15)

and $D_{\alpha} = \partial_{\alpha} - ig_s G_{\alpha}^n t^n$ [6, 47, 48]. We introduce the new terms $\langle \bar{q}_j \sigma_{\mu\nu} q_i \rangle$ in the full light-quark propagators through the Fierz re-arrangement [6], which absorb the gluons emitted from the other quark lines and result in the mixed condensate $\langle \bar{q}g_s\sigma Gq \rangle$.

We match the hadron side with the QCD side for the components $\Pi_+(p^2)$ and $p^2 \widetilde{\Pi}_+(p^2)$ in the spectral representation below the continuum thresholds s_0 and carry out the Borel transform in regard to the $P^2 = -p^2$ to obtain the QCD sum rules:

$$\lambda_{X^{+}}^{2} \exp\left(-\frac{M_{X^{+}}^{2}}{T^{2}}\right) = \int_{4m_{c}^{2}}^{s_{0}} ds \,\rho_{QCD}(s) \,\exp\left(-\frac{s}{T^{2}}\right)\,,\tag{16}$$

where the T^2 is the Borel parameter.

As last, we differentiate the QCD sum rules in Eq.(16) with respect to the variable $\tau = \frac{1}{T^2}$, and obtain the QCD sum rules for the masses of the $cq\bar{cq}$ tetraquark states X^+ with the positive parity,

$$M_{X^+}^2 = -\frac{\int_{4m_c^2}^{s_0} ds \frac{d}{d\tau} \rho_{QCD}(s) \exp(-\tau s)}{\int_{4m_c^2}^{s_0} ds \rho_{QCD}(s) \exp(-\tau s)}.$$
 (17)

3 Numerical results and discussions

At first, we write down the energy-scale dependence of the input parameters,

$$\langle \bar{q}q \rangle(\mu) = \langle \bar{q}q \rangle(1 \text{GeV}) \left[\frac{\alpha_s(1 \text{GeV})}{\alpha_s(\mu)} \right]^{\frac{12}{33-2n_f}},$$

$$\langle \bar{q}g_s \sigma Gq \rangle(\mu) = \langle \bar{q}g_s \sigma Gq \rangle(1 \text{GeV}) \left[\frac{\alpha_s(1 \text{GeV})}{\alpha_s(\mu)} \right]^{\frac{2}{33-2n_f}},$$

$$m_c(\mu) = m_c(m_c) \left[\frac{\alpha_s(\mu)}{\alpha_s(m_c)} \right]^{\frac{12}{33-2n_f}},$$

$$m_s(\mu) = m_s(2 \text{GeV}) \left[\frac{\alpha_s(\mu)}{\alpha_s(2 \text{GeV})} \right]^{\frac{12}{33-2n_f}},$$

$$\alpha_s(\mu) = \frac{1}{b_0 t} \left[1 - \frac{b_1}{b_0^2} \frac{\log t}{t} + \frac{b_1^2(\log^2 t - \log t - 1) + b_0 b_2}{b_0^4 t^2} \right],$$

$$(18)$$

where the quarks q = u, d and $s, t = \log \frac{\mu^2}{\Lambda_{QCD}^2}, b_0 = \frac{33 - 2n_f}{12\pi}, b_1 = \frac{153 - 19n_f}{24\pi^2}, b_2 = \frac{2857 - \frac{5033}{9}n_f + \frac{325}{27}n_f^2}{128\pi^3}, \Lambda_{QCD} = 210 \text{ MeV}, 292 \text{ MeV} \text{ and } 332 \text{ MeV} \text{ for the flavors } n_f = 5, 4 \text{ and } 3, \text{ respectively [49, 50]}.$ And we choose $n_f = 4$ in the present analysis.

At the initial points, we adopt the standard values $\langle \bar{q}q \rangle = -(0.24 \pm 0.01 \,\text{GeV})^3$, $\langle \bar{s}s \rangle = (0.8 \pm 0.1) \langle \bar{q}q \rangle$, $\langle \bar{q}g_s\sigma Gq \rangle = m_0^2 \langle \bar{q}q \rangle$, $\langle \bar{s}g_s\sigma Gs \rangle = m_0^2 \langle \bar{s}s \rangle$, $m_0^2 = (0.8 \pm 0.1) \,\text{GeV}^2$, $\langle \frac{\alpha_s GG}{\pi} \rangle = (0.012 \pm 0.004) \,\text{GeV}^4$ at the particular energy scale $\mu = 1 \,\text{GeV}$ with q = u and d [47, 51, 52], and adopt the modified-minimal-subtraction masses $m_c(m_c) = (1.275 \pm 0.025) \,\text{GeV}$ and $m_s(2 \,\text{GeV}) = (0.095 \pm 0.005) \,\text{GeV}$ from the Particle Data Group [49], and set $m_u = m_d = 0$ considering the tiny values.

In our previous works, we adopt the modified energy scale formula $\mu = \sqrt{M_{X/Y/Z}^2 - (2\mathbb{M}_c)^2} - \kappa \mathbb{M}_s$ to choose the suitable energy scales of the QCD spectral densities [8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19], where the \mathbb{M}_c and \mathbb{M}_s are the effective c and s-quark masses respectively, and have common values, and we take $\mathbb{M}_c = 1.82 \text{ GeV}$ [53] and $\mathbb{M}_s = 0.20 \text{ GeV}$ (0.12 GeV) for the S-wave (P-wave) tetraquark states [11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19].

In the picture of tetraquark states, we can assign the X(3960) and X(4500) as the 1S and 2S $[sc]_S[\overline{sc}]_S^*$ tetraquark states with the $J^{PC} = 0^{++}$ [19], assign the $Z_c(3900)$ and $Z_c(4430)$ as the 1S and 2S $[uc]_S[\overline{dc}]_A - [uc]_A[\overline{dc}]_S$ tetraquark states with the $J^{PC} = 1^{+-}$, respectively [54, 55, 56], assign the $Z_c(4020)$ and $Z_c(4600)$ as the 1S and 2S $[uc]_A[\overline{dc}]_A$, $[uc]_S[\overline{dc}]_{\widetilde{A}} - [uc]_{\widetilde{A}}[\overline{dc}]_S$ or $[uc]_{\widetilde{A}}[\overline{dc}]_A - [uc]_A[\overline{dc}]_A$ tetraquark states with the $J^{PC} = 1^{+-}$, respectively [57, 58], and assign the X(4140) and X(4685) as the 1S and 2S $[sc]_S[\overline{sc}]_A + [sc]_A[\overline{sc}]_S$ or $[sc]_S[\overline{sc}]_{\widetilde{A}} + [sc]_{\widetilde{A}}[\overline{sc}]_S$ tetraquark states with the $J^{PC} = 1^{++}$, respectively [19]. Up to now, we draw the conclusion approximately that the mass gaps between the 1S and 2S tetraquark states are about 0.55 ~ 0.59 GeV.

In the present analysis, we would like set the continuum threshold parameters as $\sqrt{s_0} = M_X + 0.60 \pm 0.10 \text{ GeV}$, then vary the continuum threshold parameters s_0 and Borel parameters T^2 to meet with the four criteria:

- Pole dominance at the hadron side;
- Convergence of the operator product expansion;
- Appearance of the enough flat Borel platforms;
- Satisfying the modified energy scale formula,

via trial and error. We define the pole contributions (PC),

PC =
$$\frac{\int_{4m_c^2}^{s_0} ds \rho_{QCD}(s) \exp\left(-\frac{s}{T^2}\right)}{\int_{4m_c^2}^{\infty} ds \rho_{QCD}(s) \exp\left(-\frac{s}{T^2}\right)},$$
(19)

and the contributions of the vacuum condensates D(n) of dimension n,

$$D(n) = \frac{\int_{4m_c^2}^{s_0} ds \rho_{QCD,n}(s) \exp\left(-\frac{s}{T^2}\right)}{\int_{4m_c^2}^{s_0} ds \rho_{QCD}(s) \exp\left(-\frac{s}{T^2}\right)},$$
(20)

in the same way as in our previous works.

The condensates $\langle \frac{\alpha_s GG}{\pi} \rangle$, $\langle \bar{q}q \rangle \langle \frac{\alpha_s GG}{\pi} \rangle$, $\langle \bar{s}s \rangle \langle \frac{\alpha_s GG}{\pi} \rangle$, $m_s \langle \bar{q}g_s \sigma Gq \rangle$, $m_s \langle \bar{s}g_s \sigma Gs \rangle$, $m_s m_c \langle \bar{s}g_s \sigma Gs \rangle$ and $m_s m_c \langle \bar{q}g_s \sigma Gq \rangle \langle \bar{s}g_s \sigma Gs \rangle$ are not companied with inverse powers of the Borel parameter $\frac{1}{T^2}$, $\frac{1}{T^4} \cdots$ and play an unimportant (tiny) role. Although the condensates $m_c \langle \bar{q}g_s \sigma Gq \rangle$, $m_c \langle \bar{s}g_s \sigma Gs \rangle$, $m_c^2 \langle \bar{q}g_s \sigma Gs \rangle^2$ and $m_c^2 \langle \bar{q}g_s \sigma Gq \rangle \langle \bar{s}g_s \sigma Gs \rangle$ play an important role, they are also not companied with inverse powers of the Borel parameter $\frac{1}{T^2}$, $\frac{1}{T^4} \cdots$, and thus they cannot manifest themselves at small values of T^2 to result in very flat platforms. As the dominant contributions originate from the perturbative terms plus $m_c \langle \bar{q}g_s \sigma Gq \rangle$ plus $m_c \langle \bar{s}g_s \sigma Gs \rangle^2$ and $m_c^2 \langle \bar{q}g_s \sigma Gq \rangle \langle \bar{s}g_s \sigma Gs \rangle$ almost make no difference, which leads to very small light-flavor SU(3)-breaking effects on the tetraquark masses in contrary to the behaviors of that from the fourquark currents without explicit P-waves [11, 13, 14, 18, 19]. The modified energy scale formula $\mu = \sqrt{M_{X/Y/Z}^2 - (2M_c)^2} - \kappa M_s$ with $\kappa = 0$, 1 and 2 cannot be satisfied, we have to set the effective s-quark mass M_s to be zero, in other words, we have to resort to the energy scale formula $\mu = \sqrt{M_{X/Y/Z}^2 - (2M_c)^2}$ to restrict the QCD sum rules.

After tedious trial and error, at last, we obtain the Borel windows, continuum threshold parameters, energy scales of the spectral densities, pole contributions, and contributions of the condensates of dimension 10, and show them explicitly in Table 1, where we can see explicitly that the ground state contributions are about (37-65)% for the tetraquark states with the $J^{PC} = 0^{++}$ and (34-55)% for the tetraquark states with the $J^{PC} = 1^{+-}$ and 2^{++} . For the tetraquark states with the $J^{PC} = 0^{++}$, the pole dominance is satisfied certainly, while for the tetraquark states



Figure 1: The masses of the $[uc]_{\widehat{V}}[\overline{dc}]_{\widehat{V}}$ (A) and $[sc]_{\widehat{V}}[\overline{sc}]_{\widehat{V}}$ (B) tetraquark states with the $J^{PC} = 0^{++}$ via variations of the Borel parameter T^2 , where the isospin limit is taken.

with the $J^{PC} = 1^{+-}$ and 2^{++} , the pole dominance is only satisfied marginally. On the other hand, the contributions of the vacuum condensates |D(10)| are about 1%, the operator product expansion is convergent in all the sum rules. As the largest power of the QCD spectral densities $\rho(s) \sim s^6$ (for the tetraquark states with explicit two P-waves or a D-wave) in stead of s^4 (for the tetraquark states without explicit P/D-waves), the convergent behaviors of the operator product expansion become worse, the ground state or pole contributions become smaller. In Ref.[20], the pole contributions only $\geq 20\%$ in the QCD sum rules for the X(4500) and X(4700).

We take account of all uncertainties of the parameters and obtain the masses and pole residues of the hidden-charm tetraquark states with the $J^{PC} = 0^{++}$, 1^{+-} and 2^{++} , and show them explicitly in Table 2. From Tables 1–2, we can observe explicitly that the modified energy scale formula $\mu = \sqrt{M_{X/Y/Z}^2 - (2M_c)^2} - \kappa M_s$ is satisfied (by setting $M_s = 0$), the light-flavor SU(3) breaking effects on the tetraquark masses are tiny and can be neglected safely.

In Fig.1, we plot the masses of the $[uc]_{\widehat{V}}[\overline{dc}]_{\widehat{V}}$ and $[sc]_{\widehat{V}}[\overline{sc}]_{\widehat{V}}$ tetraquark states with the $J^{PC} = 0^{++}$ according to variations of the Borel parameters at much larger regions than the Borel widows, which are characterized by two short vertical lines. For comparison, we present the experimental values of the masses of the X(4475) and X(4500) from the LHCb collaboration [3, 4]. The predicted masses increase monotonically and quickly with increase of the Borel parameters, at the point $T^2 = 2.4 \,\mathrm{GeV}^2$, the beginning of the Borel windows, the masses begin to increase slowly, it is feasible to fix lower bounds of the Borel windows. Other Borel windows shown in Table 1 are fixed in the same way. The energy gaps $\sqrt{s_0} - M_X \sim 0.55 \,\mathrm{GeV}$ for the tetraquark states with the $J^{PC} = 0^{++}$ and $\sim 0.65 \,\mathrm{GeV}$ for the tetraquark states with the $J^{PC} = 1^{+-}$ and 2^{++} , although the value 0.65 GeV is somewhat large [19, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58].

In Table 3, we present the assignments of the LHCb's new tetraquark candidates.

The predictions $M_X = 4.50 \pm 0.12 \text{ GeV}$ and $4.50 \pm 0.12 \text{ GeV}$ for the X(4775) and X(4500)respectively support assigning them as the $[uc]_{\widehat{V}}[\overline{uc}]_{\widehat{V}} - [dc]_{\widehat{V}}[\overline{dc}]_{\widehat{V}}$ and $[sc]_{\widehat{V}}[\overline{sc}]_{\widehat{V}}$ tetraquark states with the $J^{PC} = 0^{++}$ respectively, the light-flavor SU(3) breaking effect on the tetraquark masses is tiny and can be neglected safely. In Ref.[19], we assign the X(3960) and X(4500) as the 1S and $2S [sc]_S[\overline{sc}]_S^*$ tetraquark states with the $J^{PC} = 0^{++}$ respectively, where the light-flavor SU(3)breaking effect $M_{X(4140)} - M_{X(3872)} = 275 \text{ MeV}$ is consistent with the mass difference $m_s - m_q =$ 135 MeV and is normal. The X(4500) maybe have several significant Fock components. As for the X(4700), we assign it as the first radial excitation of the $[sc]_A[\overline{sc}]_A$ or $[sc]_{\widetilde{A}}[\overline{sc}]_{\widetilde{A}}$ tetraquark state with the $J^{PC} = 0^{++}$, or the $[sc]_V[\overline{sc}]_V^*$ tetraquark state with the $J^{PC} = 0^{++}$ [19]. However, there is no room for the X(4710) with the symbolic valence quarks $c\overline{c}(u\overline{u} - d\overline{d})$ without introducing explicit P-waves in the diquarks [18]. We should resort to other diquark operators with explicit P-waves to construct the four-quark currents to interpolate the X(4710) and X(4700) consistently.

X(Z)	J^{PC}	$T^2(\text{GeV}^2)$	$\sqrt{s_0}(\text{GeV})$	$\mu(\text{GeV})$	pole	D(10)
$[uc]_{\widehat{V}}[\overline{dc}]_{\widehat{V}}$	0^{++}	2.4 - 2.8	5.05 ± 0.10	2.6	(37 - 65)%	$(1 \sim 3)\%$
$[qc]_{\widehat{V}}[\overline{sc}]_{\widehat{V}}$	0^{++}	2.4 - 2.8	5.05 ± 0.10	2.6	(38 - 66)%	$(1 \sim 2)\%$
$[sc]_{\widehat{V}}[\overline{sc}]_{\widehat{V}}$	0^{++}	2.4 - 2.8	5.05 ± 0.10	2.6	(37 - 65)%	$(1 \sim 1)\%$
$[uc]_{\widehat{V}}[\overline{dc}]_{\widehat{V}}$	1+-	3.2 - 3.6	5.25 ± 0.10	2.8	(35 - 57)%	$(1 \sim 1)\%$
$[qc]_{\widehat{V}}[\overline{sc}]_{\widehat{V}}$	1^{+-}	3.2 - 3.6	5.25 ± 0.10	2.8	(35-56)%	$(1 \sim 1)\%$
$[sc]_{\widehat{V}}[\overline{sc}]_{\widehat{V}}$	1+-	3.2 - 3.6	5.25 ± 0.10	2.8	(34 - 55)%	$(0 \sim 1)\%$
$[uc]_{\widehat{V}}[\overline{dc}]_{\widehat{V}}$	2^{++}	3.3 - 3.7	5.30 ± 0.10	2.9	(34 - 55)%	$(1 \sim 1)\%$
$[qc]_{\widehat{V}}[\overline{sc}]_{\widehat{V}}$	2^{++}	3.3 - 3.7	5.30 ± 0.10	2.9	(33 - 54)%	$(1 \sim 1)\%$
$[sc]_{\widehat{V}}[\overline{sc}]_{\widehat{V}}$	2^{++}	3.3 - 3.7	5.30 ± 0.10	2.9	(32 - 53)%	$(0 \sim 1)\%$

Table 1: The Borel windows, continuum threshold parameters, energy scales, pole contributions, and contributions of the condensates of dimension 10 for the hidden-charm tetraquark states.

X(Z)	J^{PC}	$M_X(\text{GeV})$	$\lambda_X({ m GeV}^7)$
$[uc]_{\widehat{V}}[\overline{uc}]_{\widehat{V}}$	0^{++}	4.50 ± 0.12	$(4.96 \pm 1.39) \times 10^{-2}$
$[qc]_{\widehat{V}}[\overline{sc}]_{\widehat{V}}$	0^{++}	4.50 ± 0.12	$(5.18 \pm 1.41) \times 10^{-2}$
$[sc]_{\widehat{V}}[\overline{sc}]_{\widehat{V}}$	0^{++}	4.50 ± 0.12	$(5.38 \pm 1.42) \times 10^{-2}$
$[uc]_{\widehat{V}}[\overline{dc}]_{\widehat{V}}$	1^{+-}	4.59 ± 0.11	$(2.15 \pm 0.44) \times 10^{-2}$
$[qc]_{\widehat{V}}[\overline{sc}]_{\widehat{V}}$	1^{+-}	4.61 ± 0.11	$(2.20 \pm 0.45) \times 10^{-2}$
$[sc]_{\widehat{V}}[\overline{sc}]_{\widehat{V}}$	1^{+-}	4.63 ± 0.11	$(2.20 \pm 0.45) \times 10^{-2}$
$[uc]_{\widehat{V}}[\overline{dc}]_{\widehat{V}}$	2^{++}	4.65 ± 0.11	$(3.52 \pm 0.71) \times 10^{-2}$
$[qc]_{\widehat{V}}[\overline{sc}]_{\widehat{V}}$	2^{++}	4.67 ± 0.11	$(3.61 \pm 0.73) \times 10^{-2}$
$[sc]_{\widehat{V}}[\overline{sc}]_{\widehat{V}}$	2^{++}	4.69 ± 0.11	$(3.70 \pm 0.74) \times 10^{-2}$

Table 2: The masses and pole residues of the hidden-charm tetraquark states.

The predictions $M_Z = 4.59 \pm 0.11$ MeV and 4.61 ± 0.11 MeV for the $Z_c(4600)$ and $Z_{\bar{c}\bar{s}}(4600)$ respectively support assigning them as the $[uc]_{\hat{V}}[\overline{dc}]_{\hat{V}}$ and $[qc]_{\hat{V}}[\overline{sc}]_{\hat{V}}$ tetraquark states with the $J^{PC} = 1^{+-}$ respectively. Again, the light-flavor SU(3) breaking effect on the tetraquark masses is tiny and can be neglected safely. While in Refs.[18, 19, 57, 58], the $Z_c(4020)$ and $Z_c(4600)$ are assigned as the 1S and 2S $[uc]_A[\overline{dc}]_A$, $[uc]_S[\overline{dc}]_{\tilde{A}} - [uc]_{\tilde{A}}[\overline{dc}]_S$ or $[uc]_{\tilde{A}}[\overline{dc}]_A - [uc]_A[\overline{dc}]_{\tilde{A}}$ tetraquark states with the $J^{PC} = 1^{+-}$, respectively, and the X(4140) and X(4685) are assigned as the 1S and 2S $[sc]_S[\overline{sc}]_A + [sc]_A[\overline{sc}]_S$ or $[sc]_S[\overline{sc}]_{\tilde{A}} + [sc]_{\tilde{A}}[\overline{sc}]_S$ tetraquark states with the $J^{PC} = 1^{++}$, respectively; the light-flavor SU(3) breaking effects on the tetraquark masses are normal. On the other hand, the $Z_{cs}(3985/4000)$ can be assigned as the 1S $[sc]_A[\overline{sc}]_A$ tetraquark state with the $J^{PC} = 1^{+-}$ [15], then the $Z_{\bar{c}\bar{s}}(4600)$ and $Z_{\bar{c}\bar{s}}(4900)$ can be assigned as the 2S and 3S $[sc]_A[\overline{sc}]_A$ tetraquark states with the $J^{PC} = 1^{+-}$, respectively, such a possibility also exists. The $Z_c(4600)$ and $Z_{\bar{c}\bar{s}}(4600)$ maybe also have several significant Fock components.

In 2019, the LHCb collaboration performed an angular analysis of the decays $B^0 \to J/\psi K^+\pi^$ using the proton-proton collision data corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 3 fb⁻¹, examined the $m(J/\psi\pi^-)$ versus the $m(K^+\pi^-)$ plane, and observed two structures in the vicinity of the energies $m(J/\psi\pi^-) = 4200$ MeV and 4600 MeV, respectively [59]. However, the $Z_c(4600)$ has not been confirmed yet.

We can take the pole residues λ_X in Table 2 as input parameters to explore the strong decays of those tetraquark states with the (light-cone) QCD sum rules, and acquire the partial decay widths and branching fractions to diagnose the nature of those exotic states.

X(Z)	J^{PC}	$M_X({ m GeV})$	Assignments
$[uc]_{\widehat{V}}[\overline{dc}]_{\widehat{V}}$	0^{++}	4.50 ± 0.12	?X(4775)
$[qc]_{\widehat{V}}[\overline{sc}]_{\widehat{V}}$	0^{++}	4.50 ± 0.12	
$[sc]_{\widehat{V}}[\overline{sc}]_{\widehat{V}}$	0^{++}	4.50 ± 0.12	?X(4500)
$[uc]_{\widehat{V}}[\overline{dc}]_{\widehat{V}}$	1+-	4.59 ± 0.11	$? Z_c(4600)$
$[qc]_{\widehat{V}}[\overline{sc}]_{\widehat{V}}$	1+-	4.61 ± 0.11	$? Z_{\bar{c}\bar{s}}(4600)$
$[sc]_{\widehat{V}}[\overline{sc}]_{\widehat{V}}$	1+-	4.63 ± 0.11	
$[uc]_{\widehat{V}}[\overline{dc}]_{\widehat{V}}$	2^{++}	4.65 ± 0.11	
$[qc]_{\widehat{V}}[\overline{sc}]_{\widehat{V}}$	2^{++}	4.67 ± 0.11	
$[sc]_{\widehat{V}}[\overline{sc}]_{\widehat{V}}$	2^{++}	4.69 ± 0.11	

Table 3: The assignments of the hidden-charm tetraquark states, where the isospin limit is taken.

4 Conclusion

In this work, we introduce explicit P-waves to construct the diquark operators, then construct the local four-quark currents to explore the hidden-charm tetraquark states with the $J^{PC} = 0^{++}$, 1^{+-} and 2^{++} in the framework of the QCD sum rules at length. We carry out the operator product expansion up to the condensates of dimension 10 in a consistent way. Direct calculations indicate tiny light-flavor SU(3) breaking effects on the tetraquark masses and the modified energy scale formula $\mu = \sqrt{M_{X/Y/Z}^2 - (2M_c)^2} - \kappa M_s$ can only be satisfied by setting $M_s = 0$. The present calculations support assigning the X(4775) and X(4500) as the $[uc]_{\widehat{V}} [\overline{uc}]_{\widehat{V}} - [dc]_{\widehat{V}} [\overline{dc}]_{\widehat{V}}$ and $[sc]_{\widehat{V}} [\overline{sc}]_{\widehat{V}}$ tetraquark states with the $J^{PC} = 0^{++}$, respectively, support assigning the $Z_c(4600)$ and $Z_{\overline{cs}}(4600)$ as the $[uc]_{\widehat{V}} [\overline{dc}]_{\widehat{V}}$ and $[qc]_{\widehat{V}} [\overline{sc}]_{\widehat{V}}$ tetraquark states with the $J^{PC} = 1^{+-}$, respectively. In other words, those tetraquark candidates have some $\widehat{V} - \widehat{V}$ type under-structures, and could account for the experimental data from the LHCb collaboration. Other predictions can be confronted to the experimental data in the future to examine the exotic states.

Acknowledgements

This work is supported by National Natural Science Foundation, Grant Number 12175068.

References

- [1] R. Aaij et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. **118** (2017) 022003.
- [2] R. Aaij et al, Phys. Rev. **D95** (2017) 012002.
- [3] R. Aaij et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. **127** (2021) 082001.
- [4] R. Aaij et al, arXiv: 2407.12475 [hep-ex].
- [5] R. Aaij et al, arXiv: 2407.14301 [hep-ex].
- [6] Z. G. Wang and T. Huang, Phys. Rev. **D89** (2014) 054019.
- [7] Z. G. Wang, Commun. Theor. Phys. 63 (2015) 466.
- [8] Z. G. Wang, Eur. Phys. J. C74 (2014) 2874.
- [9] Z. G. Wang and T. Huang, Nucl. Phys. A930 (2014) 63.

- [10] Z. G. Wang, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A36 (2021) 2150071.
- [11] Z. G. Wang, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A36 (2021) 2150107.
- [12] Z. G. Wang and Q. Xin, Chin. Phys. C45 (2021) 123105.
- [13] Q. Xin and Z. G. Wang, Eur. Phys. J. A58 (2022) 110.
- [14] Z. G. Wang and Q. Xin, Nucl. Phys. B978 (2022) 115761.
- [15] Z. G. Wang, Chin. Phys. C46 (2022) 123106.
- [16] Z. G. Wang, Nucl. Phys. B973 (2021) 115592.
- [17] Z. G. Wang, Nucl. Phys. **B1002** (2024) 116514.
- [18] Z. G. Wang, Phys. Rev. **D102** (2020) 014018.
- [19] Z. G. Wang, Nucl. Phys. **B1007** (2024) 116661.
- [20] H. X. Chen, E. L. Cui, W. Chen, X. Liu and S. L. Zhu, Eur. Phys. J. C77 (2017) 160.
- [21] Q. F. Lu and Y. B. Dong, Phys. Rev. **D94** (2016) 074007.
- [22] P. P. Shi, F. Huang and W. L. Wang, Phys. Rev. D103 (2021) 094038.
- [23] J. Wu, Y. R. Liu, K. Chen, X. Liu and S. L. Zhu, Phys. Rev. D94 (2016) 094031.
- [24] M. N. Anwar, J. Ferretti and E. Santopinto, Phys. Rev. D98 (2018) 094015.
- [25] X. Liu, H. X. Huang, J. L. Ping, D. Y. Chen and X. M. Zhu, Eur. Phys. J. C81 (2021) 950.
- [26] F. Z. Peng, M. J. Yan, M. Sanchez and M. P. Valderrama, Phys. Rev. D107 (2023) 016001.
- [27] E. Wang, J. J. Xie, L. S. Geng and E. Oset, Phys. Rev. D97 (2018) 014017.
- [28] X. K. Dong, F. K. Guo and B. S. Zou, Progr. Phys. 41 (2021) 65.
- [29] Q. Deng, R. H. Ni, Q. Li and X. H. Zhong, Phys. Rev. D110 (2024) 056034.
- [30] D. Y. Chen, Eur. Phys. J. C76 (2016) 671.
- [31] X. H. Liu, Phys. Lett. **B766** (2017) 117.
- [32] T. Barnes, S. Godfrey and E. S. Swanson, Phys. Rev. D72 (2005) 054026.
- [33] Z. G. Wang, Eur. Phys. J. C79 (2019) 29.
- [34] Z. G. Wang, Chin. Phys. C48 (2024) 103103.
- [35] Z. G. Wang, Eur. Phys. J. C79 (2019) 489.
- [36] Z. G. Wang and Z. H. Yan, Eur. Phys. J. C78 (2018) 19.
- [37] Z. G. Wang, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A35 (2020) 2050003.
- [38] X. W. Wang, Z. G. Wang, G. L. Yu and Q. Xin, Sci. China-Phys. Mech. Astron. 65 (2022) 291011.
- [39] Z. G. Wang and Z. Y. Di, Eur. Phys. J. C79 (2019) 72.
- [40] Z. G. Wang, Adv. High Energy Phys. 2021 (2021) 4426163.

- [41] Z. G. Wang, Eur. Phys. J. A53 (2017) 19.
- [42] Z. G. Wang, Eur. Phys. J. C77 (2017) 78.
- [43] Z. G. Wang, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A36 (2021) 2150014.
- [44] Z. G. Wang, Phys. Rev. **D101** (2020) 074011.
- [45] Z. G. Wang, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A35 (2020) 2050138.
- [46] Z. G. Wang, arXiv: 2005.12735 [hep-ph].
- [47] L. J. Reinders, H. Rubinstein and S. Yazaki, Phys. Rept. 127 (1985) 1.
- [48] P. Pascual and R. Tarrach, "QCD: Renormalization for the practitioner", Springer Berlin Heidelberg (1984).
- [49] S. Navas et al, Phys. Rev. **D110** (2024) 030001.
- [50] S. Narison and R. Tarrach, Phys. Lett. B125 (1983) 217.
- [51] M. A. Shifman, A. I. Vainshtein and V. I. Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. B147 (1979) 385; Nucl. Phys. B147 (1979) 448.
- [52] P. Colangelo and A. Khodjamirian, hep-ph/0010175.
- [53] Z. G. Wang, Eur. Phys. J. C76 (2016) 387.
- [54] L. Maiani, F. Piccinini, A. D. Polosa and V. Riquer, Phys. Rev. D89 (2014) 114010.
- [55] M. Nielsen and F. S. Navarra, Mod. Phys. Lett. A29 (2014) 1430005.
- [56] Z. G. Wang, Commun. Theor. Phys. 63 (2015) 325.
- [57] H. X. Chen and W. Chen, Phys. Rev. **D99** (2019) 074022.
- [58] Z. G. Wang, Chin. Phys. C44 (2020) 063105.
- [59] R. Aaij et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. **122** (2019) 152002.