







Constraining the DDD^* three-body bound state via the $Z_c(3900)$ pole

Hai-Xiang Zhu ¹, Lu Meng ^{2,*}, Yao Ma ^{3,†}, Ning Li ^{1,‡}, Wei Chen ^{1,4,§} and Shi-Lin Zhu ^{3,¶}

¹*School of Physics, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou 510275, China*

²*Institut für Theoretische Physik II, Ruhr-Universität Bochum, D-44780 Bochum, Germany*

³*School of Physics and Center of High Energy Physics, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China*

⁴*Southern Center for Nuclear-Science Theory (SCNT), Institute of Modern Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Huizhou 516000, Guangdong Province, China*

In this study, we propose using the $Z_c(3900)$ pole position to constrain the existence of the DDD^* three-body bound state within the one-boson-exchange (OBE) model. The existence of the DDD^* bound state remains uncertain due to significant variations in the OBE interaction, particularly in the strength of scalar-meson-exchange interactions, which can differ by a factor about 20 between two commonly used OBE models. This discrepancy renders the DDD^* system highly model-dependent. To address this issue, we constrain the scalar-meson-exchange interaction using the $Z_c(3900)$ pole position, where the pseudoscalar-meson coupling is well-determined, and the ρ - and ω -exchange interactions nearly cancel each other out, leaving the coupling constant of the σ -exchange as the only unknown parameter. Our results indicate that the isospin- $\frac{1}{2}$ DDD^* bound states exist when $Z_c(3900)$ is a virtual state of $D\bar{D}^*/\bar{D}D^*$ located within approximately -15 MeV of the threshold. However, the three-body bound state is gone when the $Z_c(3900)$ virtual state pole is more than 20 MeV away from the threshold. Each experimental progress, either on the DDD^* state or the $Z_c(3900)$, can shed light on the nature of the other state. Another significant outcome is a refined set of OBE model parameters calibrated using the pole positions of $X(3872)$, $T_{cc}(3875)$, and $Z_c(3900)$, rigorously addressing the cutoff dependence. These parameters provide a valuable resource for more accurate calculations of systems involving few-body D , D^* and their antiparticles. Additionally, we find no evidence of the DDD^* three-body resonances after extensive search using a combination of the Gaussian expansion method and the complex scaling method.

I. INTRODUCTION

Over the past two decades, doubly heavy (either the hidden flavor or the open flavor) di-hadron systems have become a hot topic in hadron physics. This interest stems from the experimental discovery of numerous multiquark candidates since 2003, many of which are frequently interpreted as molecular states formed by two heavy-flavor hadrons, see Refs. [1–7] for reviews. Among these di-hadron states, the $X(3872)$ (also referred to as $\chi_{c1}(3872)$) [8], $Z_c(3900)$ [9, 10], and $T_{cc}(3875)$ [11, 12], stand out as the “star” examples, which are considered as two-body systems of $[D\bar{D}^*/\bar{D}D^*]^{C=+1}$, $[D\bar{D}^*/\bar{D}D^*]^{C=-1}$ and DD^* respectively. Theorists’ interests in doubly charmed hadronic molecular states can be traced back to an even earlier time [13–15].

In the di-hadron scenario, the interactions forming doubly heavy molecules are studied using various frameworks, including meson-exchange models [14–30], quark models [31–35], QCD sum rules [36–39], effective field theories [40–46], and lattice QCD [47–51] etc. Notably, the meson-exchange model—often referred to as the one-boson-exchange (OBE) model—has achieved significant success in elucidating heavy-flavor hadronic molecules [14, 15, 17–23], just like its high-precision description of nuclear forces [52]. This model considers the exchange of mesons such as π , η , ρ , ω , and σ . Prior

to the discovery of $T_{cc}(3875)$, Li *et al.* had predicted a very loosely bound DD^* state using the OBE model, employing parameters initially developed in their study of $X(3872)$ [53, 54]. The interactions governing T_{cc} and $X(3872)$ are consistent with G-parity rules. It should be noticed that while doubly heavy tetraquark states have been predicted for over 40 years [55] (see a concise review in Ref. [56]), explicit predictions of molecular-type doubly charmed tetraquark states were scarce before the landmark LHCb observations [11, 12]. Recently, the OBE model was extended to P-wave DD^* and $D\bar{D}^*/\bar{D}D^*$ systems, suggesting that the $G(3900)$ structure, recently observed by BESIII and previously reported by the BaBar [57] and Belle [58] collaborations, corresponds to a P-wave $D\bar{D}^*/\bar{D}D^*$ resonance [59].

Discussions on heavy-flavor di-hadron systems have naturally been extended to three-body systems, particularly given that three-body systems exhibit fascinating features not seen in two-body systems, such as the Efimov effect and the three-body force effect, which remain mysterious even in nucleon systems [60, 61]. In Refs. [62, 63], the three-body universality was explored in the charmed and bottom sectors, respectively. The existence of three-body bound states such as BBB^* [64] and DDD^* [65] was reported based on interactions modeled using the OBE framework, with the latter prediction inspired by the observation of the $T_{cc}(3875)$ state. Additionally, investigations have been conducted into systems like $D^{(*)}D^{(*)}D^{(*)}$ [66–69], $D^{(*)}D^{(*)}\bar{D}^{(*)}$ [70, 71], and $D^{(*)}B^{(*)}\bar{B}^{(*)}$ [72], as well as systems where one, two, or three heavy mesons are replaced by kaons [73–79]. In Ref. [80], the prediction of three-body and four-body bound states composed of $X(3872)$ was discussed. For a comprehensive review of three-body heavy-flavor systems, one can

* lu.meng@rub.de

† yaoma@pku.edu.cn

‡ lining59@mail.sysu.edu.cn

§ chenwei29@mail.sysu.edu.cn

¶ zhushi@pku.edu.cn

refer to Refs. [81, 82].

From a theoretical perspective, there are two complexities which may hinder our ability to make reliable predictions for three-body heavy flavor systems: the uncertain interactions and the computational challenges associated with three-body systems, particularly in the case of resonance states. Even neglecting the complexity from the unknown three-body interactions, the two-body interaction for the heavy hadrons systems can vary significantly across different models. For example, the OBE models for the DD^* and $DD^*/\bar{D}D^*$ systems presented in Refs. [53, 54] (referred to as model-I) and Refs. [65, 83] (model-II) share very similar analytical expressions. However, the scalar-meson-exchange potential in model-II is nearly 20 times stronger than that in model-I, as illustrated in Table I. Consequently, the model-II predicts a bound DDD^* state [65], whereas calculations using the model-I yield an unbound result (see Sec. III). Notably, both interactions provide reasonable and consistent results for the $X(3872)$ and $T_{cc}(3875)$. Meanwhile, exactly solving the Faddeev equations [84] for three-body systems is notoriously challenging, particularly for resonance states with finite lifetimes. In such cases, the analyticity of the three-body scattering amplitude becomes highly complex [85].

In this work, we focus on the DDD^* three-body system. While the existence of three-body bound states in this system has been explored in Ref. [65], it has not yet been definitively established, especially considering possible variations in the OBE interaction, particularly the scalar-exchange contributions. To address this, we constrain the scalar-meson-exchange interactions using the pole position of the $Z_c(3900)$. For $Z_c(3900)$, the pseudoscalar-meson coupling is well-determined and the ρ - and ω -exchange interactions are expected to largely cancel each other, leaving the coupling constant of the σ exchange as the unique unknown parameter. Additionally, the coupling constants in OBE models are inherently cutoff-dependent, a factor often overlooked in previous literature, leading to ambiguity in predictions. In this work, we address this issue by adopting definite cutoffs and recalibrating the coupling constants for vector meson and scalar meson exchanges using the pole positions of $X(3872)$, $T_{cc}(3875)$, and $Z_c(3900)$. Coupling constants corresponding to cutoff values ranging from 1.00 to 1.35 GeV, in increments of 0.05 GeV, are provided, which serve as a valuable resource for more precise calculations in few-body systems involving D , D^* and their antiparticles. Meanwhile, the combination of the Gaussian expansion method (GEM) [86] and the complex scaling method (CSM) [35, 87–99] has proven to be a powerful tool for studying few-body resonance systems. In this work, we also investigate the potential existence of DDD^* resonances using CSM within Gaussian bases.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, the OBE interaction is introduced, and the model parameters are determined. In Sec. III methodology for studying DDD^* three-body systems along with the numerical results is presented. The final conclusions are provided in Sec. IV. Appendix A details the Fourier transformation used to derive the potential in coordinate space from its momentum-space representation. Appendix B offers supplementary information on the spatial

structures of the DDD^* and $T_{cc}(3875)$ systems.

II. ONE-BOSON-EXCHANGE INTERACTION

A. Analytical results

Using the heavy quark spin symmetry, the pseudoscalar meson D and vector meson D^* can be formulated in a superfield \mathcal{H} [17, 18, 53, 54, 100–102],

$$\mathcal{H} = \frac{1 + \not{v}}{2} (P_\mu^* \gamma^\mu - P \gamma_5), \quad (1)$$

where $P = (D^0, D^+)$ and $P_\mu^* = (D^{*0}, D^{*+})_\mu$. The velocity of the heavy meson is denoted by $v = (1, 0, 0, 0)$. Similarly, their antiparticles can be described by the superfield $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$, defined as,

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}} = (\tilde{P}_\mu^* \gamma^\mu - \tilde{P} \gamma_5) \frac{1 - \not{v}}{2}, \quad (2)$$

with $\tilde{P} = (\bar{D}^0, D^-)^T$ and $\tilde{P}_\mu^* = (\bar{D}^{*0}, D^{*-})_\mu^T$. Here, we choose the convention of charge conjugation, $D \xrightarrow{C} \bar{D}$ and $D^* \xrightarrow{C} -\bar{D}^*$, namely $\mathcal{H} \xrightarrow{C} C^{-1} \tilde{\mathcal{H}}^T C$, where $C = i\gamma^2 \gamma^0$ is the charged conjugation matrix. The conjugations of \mathcal{H} and $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$ are defined as $\bar{\mathcal{H}} = \gamma_0 \mathcal{H}^\dagger \gamma_0$ and $\tilde{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}} = \gamma_0 \tilde{\mathcal{H}}^\dagger \gamma_0$.

The Lagrangians in the OBE model read,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & g_s \text{Tr} [\mathcal{H} \sigma \bar{\mathcal{H}}] + i g_a \text{Tr} [\mathcal{H} \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 \mathcal{A}^\mu \bar{\mathcal{H}}] \\ & + i \beta \text{Tr} [\mathcal{H} v_\mu (\mathcal{V}^\mu - \rho^\mu) \bar{\mathcal{H}}] + i \lambda \text{Tr} [\mathcal{H} \sigma_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} \bar{\mathcal{H}}] \\ & + \text{c.c. terms } (\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{H}}, \bar{\mathcal{H}} \rightarrow \tilde{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}}), \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where $F^{\mu\nu} = \partial^\mu \rho^\nu - \partial^\nu \rho^\mu - [\rho^\mu, \rho^\nu]$ represents the field strength tensor of vector mesons, \mathcal{V}^μ and \mathcal{A}^μ are the vector and axial building blocks of pseudoscalar mesons respectively,

$$\mathcal{V}^\mu = \frac{1}{2} [\xi^\dagger, \partial_\mu \xi], \quad \mathcal{A}^\mu = \frac{1}{2} \{ \xi^\dagger, \partial_\mu \xi \}, \quad \xi = \exp(i\mathbb{P}/f_\pi) \mathbb{1}$$

The pseudoscalar meson matrix \mathbb{P} is defined as

$$\mathbb{P} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\pi^0}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{\eta}{\sqrt{6}} & \pi^+ \\ \pi^- & -\frac{\pi^0}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{\eta}{\sqrt{6}} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (5)$$

The multiplet of the vector meson fields ρ^μ is

$$\rho^\mu = \frac{ig_V}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\rho^0 + \omega}{\sqrt{2}} & \rho^+ \\ \rho^- & \frac{-\rho^0 + \omega}{\sqrt{2}} \end{bmatrix}^\mu. \quad (6)$$

TABLE I. Momentum space potentials for the DD , DD^* , and $D\bar{D}^*/\bar{D}D^*$ systems. The superscripts D and C denote the direct and cross diagrams, respectively. Two sets of C_{coupling} values are provided: model-I from Refs. [53, 54], used as the baseline for this work, and model-II from Refs. [65, 83]. The terms ϵ'^* and ϵ represent the polarization vectors of the final and initial vector mesons, respectively. For DD systems, the substitution $\epsilon'^* \cdot \epsilon \rightarrow 1$ is required. In the direct diagram, $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{p}' - \mathbf{p}$, while in the cross diagram, $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{p}' + \mathbf{p}$, where \mathbf{p}' and \mathbf{p} are the momenta of the final and initial states, respectively. Here, u denotes the effective mass of the exchanged meson. Two additional isospin operators are defined as $\tau_1 \cdot \tau_2^C \equiv (3I - \tau_1 \cdot \tau_2)/2$ and $I^C \equiv (I + \tau_1 \cdot \tau_2)/2$. The potential in coordinate space can be obtained through Fourier transformation, as detailed in Appendix A.

V	C_{coupling}		$\mathcal{O}_{r,s}$	\mathcal{O}_{iso}					
	Model-I[53, 54]	Model-II[65, 83]		DD^*	DD	$[D\bar{D}^*/\bar{D}D^*]^{C=+1}$	$[D\bar{D}^*/\bar{D}D^*]^{C=-1}$		
V_ρ^D	$\frac{\beta^2 g_v^2}{2}$	13.62	$2g_\rho^2$	13.52	$-\frac{\tau_1 \cdot \tau_2}{2}$	$-\frac{\tau_1 \cdot \tau_2}{2}$	$-\frac{\tau_1 \cdot \tau_2}{2}$	$-\frac{\tau_1 \cdot \tau_2}{2}$	
V_ω^D	$\frac{\beta^2 g_v^2}{2}$	13.62	$2g_\omega^2$	13.52	$-\frac{\epsilon' \cdot \epsilon}{u^2 + q^2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}I$	$-\frac{1}{2}I$	$\frac{1}{2}I$	$\frac{1}{2}I$
V_σ^D	g_s^2	0.58	g_σ^2	11.56	I	I	I	I	
V_π^C	$\frac{g_a^2}{f_\pi^2}$	19.15	$\frac{g^2}{f_\pi^2}$	20.66	$\frac{(\mathbf{k} \cdot \epsilon'^*)(\mathbf{k} \cdot \epsilon)}{u^2 + k^2}$	$-\frac{\tau_1 \cdot \tau_2^C}{2}$	0	$\frac{\tau_1 \cdot \tau_2}{2}$	$-\frac{\tau_1 \cdot \tau_2}{2}$
V_η^C	$\frac{g_a^2}{f_\pi^2}$	19.15	0	0	$-\frac{1}{6}I^C$	0	$-\frac{1}{6}I$	$\frac{1}{6}I$	
V_ρ^C	$2\lambda^2 g_v^2$	21.10	$\frac{f_\rho^2}{2M^2}$	19.64	$\frac{(\mathbf{k} \cdot \epsilon'^*)(\mathbf{k} \cdot \epsilon) - k^2(\epsilon'^* \cdot \epsilon)}{u^2 + k^2}$	$\frac{\tau_1 \cdot \tau_2^C}{2}$	0	$\frac{\tau_1 \cdot \tau_2}{2}$	$-\frac{\tau_1 \cdot \tau_2}{2}$
V_ω^C	$2\lambda^2 g_v^2$	21.10	$\frac{f_\omega^2}{2M^2}$	19.64	$\frac{1}{2}I^C$	0	$-\frac{1}{2}I$	$\frac{1}{2}I$	

TABLE II. Hadron masses and coupling constants in model-I [53, 54, 103]. All masses and f_π are given in units of GeV, while λ is expressed in GeV^{-1} . The present values of g_a and f_π have been updated based on recent experimental results, leading to slight differences compared to those in Refs. [53, 54]. The values of g_s , λ , and β are used as baseline parameters, where a rescaling factor can be applied, as specified in Eq. (7).

Mass	m_D	m_{D^*}	m_π	m_η	m_ρ	m_ω	m_σ
		1.867	2.009	0.137	0.548	0.775	0.783
Coupling	f_π	g_a	g_V	β	λ	g_s	
	0.13025	0.57	5.8	0.9	0.56	0.76	

In principle, the iso-triplet ρ (π) and the iso-singlet ω (η) belong to different multiplets under the flavor $SU(2)$ symmetry. However, to reduce the number of coupling constants, we group them into the same matrix, taking into account their relationship within the flavor $SU(3)$ symmetry.

In the pseudoscalar sector of the Lagrangians, the parameters are well-determined. The pion decay constant f_π is a well-known quantity, and the axial coupling constant g_a can be accurately extracted from the D^* width. However, the remaining parameters can only be determined through model-dependent methods. As an example, we adopt the values from Refs. [53, 54] (model-I), which are summarized in Table II. In the vector sector, there are three parameters: g_V , β , λ , and an additional scalar coupling g_s . However, only three of them are independent, as g_V acts as an overall factor in the vector sector. In model-I [53, 54], these couplings are determined using vector meson dominance, combined with results from lattice QCD and light-cone sum rules [104]. In the

scalar sector, the σ mass and couplings are derived from the Σ -model [19, 105]. Notably, the determination of these parameters is not achieved within an unified framework. In other studies, such as Refs. [20, 83, 106], similar Lagrangians have been constructed, but the coupling constants were determined using different approaches, leading to variations in numerical values. In this work, we adopt the values of model-I listed in Table II as a baseline. To explore the impact of varying coupling constants in the scalar and vector sectors, we introduce three ratio factors,

$$\lambda \rightarrow \lambda R_\lambda, \quad \beta \rightarrow \beta R_\beta, \quad g_s \rightarrow g_s R_s. \quad (7)$$

The OBE potentials can be derived from two-body scattering Feynman diagrams, as shown in Fig. 1: (a) for DD , (b1) and (b2) for DD^* , and (c1) and (c2) for $D\bar{D}^*/\bar{D}D^*$. Diagrams (b1) and (c1) are referred to as direct diagrams, while (b2) and (c2) are referred to as cross diagrams. The analytical expressions for the potentials in momentum space can be represented as

$$V = C_{\text{coupling}} \times \mathcal{O}_{r,s} \times \mathcal{O}_{\text{iso}}, \quad (8)$$

where the ingredients are detailed in Table I. It is important to note that the exchanged momenta differ between the direct and cross diagrams: for the direct diagram, $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{p}' - \mathbf{p}$, while for the cross diagram, $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{p}' + \mathbf{p}$. This distinction affects systems with P-wave (and other odd partial waves), as discussed in the Supplemental Materials of Ref. [59] and Appendix A. In Table I, u represents the effective mass of the exchanged meson, derived as follows:

$$-\frac{1}{k_0^2 - \mathbf{k}^2 - m^2} = \frac{1}{\mathbf{k}^2 + (m^2 - k_0^2)} = \frac{1}{\mathbf{k}^2 + u^2}, \quad (9)$$

using the cross diagram as an example. In the static limit, k_0 and q_0 are determined by the mass differences between




FIG. 1. Feynman diagrams to derive OBE potentials: (a) for DD , (b1) and (b2) for DD^* , and (c1) and (c2) for $D\bar{D}^*/\bar{D}D^*$. Diagrams (b1) and (c1) are referred to as direct diagrams, while (b2) and (c2) are referred to as cross diagrams.

the initial and final states. Specifically, $q_0^2 = 0$ and $k_0^2 = (m_{D^*} - m_D)^2$. Notably, k_0^2 is very close to m_π^2 ¹ and much smaller than other meson masses. Thus, we set $u = 0$ for one-pion-exchange (OPE) interaction and $u = m$ for other cases. The isospin-averaged particle masses are taken from the Review of Particle Physics [103] and are listed in Table II. In principle, the masses of the exchanged mesons in OBE do not correspond exactly to their pole masses. This is particularly true for vector and scalar mesons, which are resonances with finite widths, however, only real masses are adopted in OBE interactions. These masses should be viewed as parameters that model medium- and short-range interactions. Vector and scalar meson masses and their couplings can be derived by matching the OBE amplitude to the correlated two-pion contribution in effective field theories at low energy [106, 107]. However, in this work, we fix the meson masses to reduce the number of parameters.

The potential in coordinate space can be readily derived from its counterpart in momentum space; see Appendix A for details. Potentials obtained directly from Feynman diagrams are often singular, featuring terms like the δ function. To regulate these singularities, this work introduces a regulator to suppress contributions from the high-momentum region:

$$\begin{aligned} V^D(\mathbf{q}, u) &\rightarrow V^D(\mathbf{q}, u)F^2(u, \Lambda, \mathbf{q}^2), \\ V^C(\mathbf{k}, u) &\rightarrow V^C(\mathbf{k}, u)F^2(u, \Lambda, \mathbf{k}^2), \\ F(u, \Lambda, \mathbf{q}^2) &= \frac{\Lambda^2 - u^2}{\Lambda^2 + \mathbf{q}^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

¹ In channels with specific charges, $k_0^2 > m_\pi^2$ indicates the opening of $D\bar{D}\pi$ three-body threshold. Such effects are neglected in this work.

Here, Λ acts as a new parameter, introducing additional model dependence.

In Table III, the specific values of isospin factors are presented. Given the significant isospin violation observed in the decay patterns of $X(3872)$ [108–110], the DD^* and $D\bar{D}^*/\bar{D}D^*$ systems can be studied under two scenarios: the exact isospin symmetry limit one and the isospin symmetry violating one. In the isospin-violating scenario, the mass differences between channels with different charges are taken into account, rendering isospin no longer a quantum number of the energy eigenstates. Conversely, in the isospin symmetry limit, these mass splittings are neglected. For example, the relevant mass splittings for the $X(3872)$ and $T_{cc}(3875)$ systems are:

$$\delta_X = m_{D^+} + m_{D^{*+}} - m_{D^0} - m_{D^{*0}} = 8.2 \text{ MeV}, \quad (11)$$

$$\delta_T = m_{D^+} + m_{D^{*0}} - m_{D^0} - m_{D^{*+}} = 1.4 \text{ MeV}. \quad (12)$$

In Fig. 2, the coordinate space potentials in the isospin symmetry limit for the systems corresponding to the $X(3872)$, $T_{cc}(3875)$, and $Z_c(3900)$ states are presented. One can clearly observe the contributions to the potential from different meson exchanges. In Table III, both the isospin factors in the isospin symmetry limit scenario and the isospin-violating scenarios are given. Notably, for the isovector $[D\bar{D}^*/\bar{D}D^*]_{I=1}^{C=-1}$ system, which corresponds to the $Z_c(3900)$ state, the isospin factors for ρ and ω exchanges are equal in magnitude but opposite in sign for both cross and direct diagrams. As a result, if the mass difference between ρ and ω is neglected, the vector-meson exchange vanishes entirely. Consequently, the structure of $Z_c(3900)$ becomes sensitive to the σ -exchange interactions. The σ -exchange interaction is isospin-independent, as shown in Table III, and provides an attractive force (as shown in Fig. 2) for all types of particle pairs. This suggests that the strong σ -interaction facilitates the formation of the few-body bound states.

B. Fix the parameters

Even though one set of parameters for the OBE potential (model-I) is provided in Table II, the model dependence and uncertainties associated with these parameters have not been seriously evaluated. Notably, the coupling constants reported in the literature exhibit significant variation [20, 53, 54, 83, 106]. As shown in Table I, the strength of the σ -exchange potential in model-II [83] are almost 20 times larger than that in model-I [53, 54]. Consequently, the interaction of model-II predicts a bound DDD^* state [65], whereas calculations using the interaction of model-I yield an unbound result (see Sec. III). Additionally, uncertainties arising from cutoff dependence remain largely unaddressed. A compromise approach is to fix the coupling constants and vary the cutoff within a reasonably assumed range to examine the changes in predictions. This leads to the fact that many theoretical predictions based on the OBE model are highly sensitive to the cutoff. In fact, during the determination of nuclear forces using the OBE model, the coupling constants themselves are cutoff-dependent. Only when the cutoff associated with the




FIG. 2. The coordinate space potentials in the isospin limit for the systems corresponding to the $X(3872)$, $T_{cc}(3875)$, and $Z_c(3900)$ states. The parameter Λ is set to 1.20 GeV, with R_β , R_λ , and R_s fixed at 1.

TABLE III. Isospin factor for $DD^*/\bar{D}\bar{D}^*$ and DD^* systems. The “diag.” and “off.” are the diagonal and off-diagonal matrix element in the isospin violating scenario.

$\langle \mathcal{O}_{iso} \rangle$	DD^*				$D\bar{D}^*/\bar{D}D^*, C = +1$				$D\bar{D}^*/\bar{D}D^*, C = -1$			
	diag.	off.	$I = 0$	$I = 1$	diag.	off.	$I = 0$	$I = 1$	diag.	off.	$I = 0$	$I = 1$
V_ρ^D	$\frac{1}{2}$	-1	$\frac{3}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	1	$\frac{3}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	1	$\frac{3}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$
V_ω^D	$-\frac{1}{2}$	0	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$
V_σ^D	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1
V_π^C	-1	$\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{3}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	-1	$-\frac{3}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	1	$\frac{3}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$
V_η^C	0	$-\frac{1}{6}$	$\frac{1}{6}$	$-\frac{1}{6}$	$-\frac{1}{6}$	0	$-\frac{1}{6}$	$-\frac{1}{6}$	$\frac{1}{6}$	0	$\frac{1}{6}$	$\frac{1}{6}$
V_ρ^C	1	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{3}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	-1	$-\frac{3}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	1	$\frac{3}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$
V_ω^C	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	0	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$

coupling constants is explicitly specified does the OBE model possess genuine predictive power.

In this work, we propose using the pole positions of $X(3872)$, $T_{cc}(3875)$, and $Z_c(3900)$ to determine the three independent coupling constants in the OBE models—equivalently, the parameters R_λ , R_β , and R_s in Eq. (7). Recent refined analyses of the line shapes by LHCb [111] and BESIII [112] suggest that the pole of $X(3872)$ is located on the physical sheet of the $D^0\bar{D}^{*0}/\bar{D}^0D^{*0}$ channel. This implies that $X(3872)$ is likely a loosely bound state of $D\bar{D}^*/\bar{D}D^*$, assuming the effects of other coupled channels such as $D\bar{D}\pi$, $D\bar{D}\gamma$, $J/\psi\pi\pi$, and $J/\psi\pi\pi\pi$ are negligible. For $T_{cc}(3875)$, the experimental pole lies approximately 0.4 MeV below the D^0D^{*+} threshold [11, 12], strongly indicating that it is a bound state candidate of DD^* . Compared to $X(3872)$ and $T_{cc}(3875)$, the pole properties of $Z_c(3900)$ are less definite. However, several recent studies suggest that the pole of $Z_c(3900)$ corresponds to a virtual state [113–115].

This virtual state is located on the unphysical Riemann sheet and lies several tens of MeV below the $D\bar{D}^*/\bar{D}D^*$ threshold, though alternative theoretical interpretations remain [116].

Building on the above progress, we treat $X(3872)$ and $T_{cc}(3875)$ as bound states of $D\bar{D}^*/\bar{D}D^*$ and DD^* , respectively, and $Z_c(3900)$ as a virtual state of $D\bar{D}^*/\bar{D}D^*$. Specifically, we adopt the following pole positions relative to their respective thresholds:

$$\begin{aligned}
 X(3872) &: (-1) \times (0.2, 0.4, 0.6)^B \text{ MeV}, \\
 T_{cc}(3875) &: (-1) \times (0.2, 0.4, 0.6)^B \text{ MeV}, \\
 Z_c(3900) &: (-1) \times (5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35)^V \text{ MeV},
 \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

here the superscripts “B” and “V” denote bound states and virtual states, respectively. Based on these positions, we generate a total of $3 \times 3 \times 7 = 63$ different combinations, allowing us to numerically determine 63 sets of R_λ , R_β , and R_s . Notably, the binding energies of $X(3872)$ and $T_{cc}(3875)$ are set to be below 1 MeV. This is valid only in the isospin-

violating scenario, as the isospin mass splitting exceeds the binding energies. Thus, for $X(3872)$ and $T_{cc}(3875)$, a two-channel formalism that incorporates the isospin mass splitting is employed. The specified pole positions are defined relative to the lower thresholds. For $Z_c(3900)$, whose pole varies across a wide range, the isospin-violating effect is neglected due to the larger uncertainties in its pole position. Therefore, $Z_c(3900)$ is evaluated within the isospin-limit scenario. To address the virtual state pole, we adopt the method outlined in Ref. [96]. In this calculation, the small imaginary part of the pole arising from the left-hand cut is ignored. While studies such as Refs. [113–115] suggest that the $Z_c(3900)$ pole may locate lower than -35 MeV relative to the threshold, we consider such poles unlikely to have observable significance in the line shape. Therefore, we restrict the pole to no more than 35 MeV below the threshold.

To address the cutoff dependence, we vary the cutoff from 1.00 GeV to 1.35 GeV in steps of 0.05 GeV. For each cutoff and each pole set, we determine a corresponding set of R_λ , R_β , and R_s . The resulting coupling constants for different cutoffs are shown in Fig. 3. It is worth noting that among the three poles, the $Z_c(3900)$ exhibits the largest variation in its position. Therefore, we focus on the coupling constants associated with the $Z_c(3900)$ poles. For a very small number of combinations of cutoff and pole position, there are no real solutions for R_λ , R_β , and R_s . For these instances, we provide the closest achievable results to the target poles. From Fig. 3, it is evident that the scalar meson coupling constant varies significantly, ranging from 2 to 5 times the baseline values in Table II (model-I). This implies that the strength of the scalar meson potential varies between 4 and 25 times the baseline. For $Z_c(3900)$, the ρ - and ω -exchange interactions almost cancel each other out, rendering the $Z_c(3900)$ pole primarily sensitive to R_s . The substantial uncertainties in the $Z_c(3900)$ pole position contribute to a wide range of possible scalar meson coupling values.

The scalar exchange interaction is attractive as shown in Fig. 2, meaning that a larger scalar meson coupling constant moves the $Z_c(3900)$ virtual state pole closer to the threshold. The strong scalar-meson coupling in model-II, with $R_s \approx 4.5$, corresponds to a near-threshold $Z_c(3900)$ pole. In contrast, the weaker scalar coupling in the model-I results in a pole position farther than -35 MeV from the threshold. Notably, the $Z_c(3900)$ pole positions, which are reported to be several tens of MeV below the threshold in Refs. [113–115], qualitatively support the scenario of weaker scalar coupling. In comparison to the scalar-meson-exchange interaction, the variation in the vector-meson exchanges is much smaller, remaining consistently around 1. This indicates that the baseline choice for vector-meson exchange is relatively reasonable.

The coupling constants determined in this work can be accessed via Zenodo repository [117]. These parameters can be utilized to investigate other systems. Additionally, we have calculated the pole positions of $T_{cc}(3875)$ and $X(3872)$ in the isospin symmetry limit scenario and compared them with those in the isospin-violating scenario, as shown in Fig. 4. It can be observed that $X(3872)$ and $T_{cc}(3875)$, with binding energies around 0.2-0.6 MeV, would become bound states

with binding energies around 2-3.5 MeV and 0.5-1.5 MeV, respectively. Apparently, the isospin violation effect appears to play a more significant role in $X(3872)$ than in $T_{cc}(3875)$.

III. DDD^* THREE-BODY SYSTEMS

A. Methodology

The three-body DDD^* system was studied using the non-relativistic Hamiltonian given by:

$$H = \sum_{i=1}^3 \left(m_i + \frac{p_i^2}{2m_i} \right) + \sum_{i<j} V_{ij}. \quad (14)$$

where m_i and p_i are the mass and momentum of D/D^* . V_{ij} is the pair interaction of OBE which has been discussed in Sec. II. In Ref. [65], the isospin violation effects from the mass splitting and Coulomb interactions were included. However, the uncertainties of the three-body systems mainly arise from the indefinite strong interaction even in the isospin symmetry limit. Therefore, in this work, we will not consider the minor effect from the isospin violation and Coulomb interaction.

The total wave function of the DDD^* system can be expressed as the direct product of the spatial wave function ϕ , the isospin wave function χ_f , and the spin wave function χ_s :

$$\Psi = \mathcal{S}(\phi \otimes \chi_f \otimes \chi_s), \quad (15)$$

where $\mathcal{S} = 1 + P_{ij}$ is the symmetrization operator, which ensures the wave function is symmetric under the exchange of two identical D mesons. Here, P_{ij} is the exchange operator. During the symmetrization process, the wave functions in different spaces are symmetrized simultaneously. In our approach, there is no exchange symmetry constraint imposed before applying the \mathcal{S} operator, which differs from the strategy used in Ref. [65]. An advantage of our method is that the wave function space is more general, and wave functions that do not conform to exchange symmetry are automatically excluded. See Ref. [33] for further details. In this work, we focus solely on the ground-state solution, where the total angular momentum $L = 0$ is assumed for the spatial component. The D meson has a spin of 0, while the D^* meson has a spin of 1, resulting in a total spin of 1 for the system. The isospin of either the D or D^* meson is 1/2, which allows the total isospin of the system to be either 1/2 or 3/2. Both cases are investigated in this study. For the isospin-3/2 system, there is only one channel: two particles form an isospin triplet, which then combines with the third particle to create an $I = 3/2$ system. The isospin-1/2 system, however, consists of two possible isospin channels. Using the state $|I, I_3\rangle = |\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\rangle$ as an example, the isospin wave functions are given by:

$$\left| \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} \right\rangle : \begin{cases} \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} D^+ D^+ D^{*0} - \sqrt{\frac{1}{6}} (D^+ D^0 + D^0 D^+) D^{*+}, \\ \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} (D^+ D^0 - D^0 D^+) D^{*+}, \end{cases} \quad (16)$$




FIG. 3. The coupling constants for the scalar- and vector-meson-exchange interactions determined by the pole positions of $X(3872)$, $T_{cc}(3875)$, and $Z_c(3900)$, as specified in Eq. (13). The ratios R_β , R_λ , and R_s are defined relative to the baseline values, as detailed in Eq. (7) and Table II. Variations at the same Z_c pole position arise from different fitting parameters for the $T_{cc}(3875)$ and $X(3872)$ pole positions.




FIG. 4. Comparison of the pole positions of $T_{cc}(3875)$ and $X(3872)$ in isospin-violating scenario and the isospin limit scenario.

where the two D mesons can form either an isospin singlet or triplet. Each configuration can then combine with the D^* to produce a total isospin-1/2 system. It is important to note that other isospin bases can be chosen, as long as the isospin wave functions form a complete set. These bases are equivalent in describing the system [33].

The spatial wave function is addressed in GEM, which is widely employed in few-body calculations and has been demonstrated to be a highly effective technique [86]. We employ Jacobi coordinates as shown in Fig. 5 and work in the center-of-mass frame to eliminate the motion of the center of mass. In GEM, each wave function of a Jacobi coordinate is expanded with the following basis:

$$\phi_{nlm}(\mathbf{r}) = \sqrt{\frac{2^{l+5/2}}{\Gamma(l+\frac{3}{2})r_n^3}} \left(\frac{r}{r_n}\right)^l e^{-\frac{r^2}{r_n^2}} Y_{lm}(\hat{r}), \quad (17)$$

where Y_{lm} represents the spherical harmonic function, and the Gaussian size parameter r_n is taken in the form of geometric progression, $r_n = r_1 a^{n-1}$. If we only use one single set of Jacobi coordinates, the wave function completeness requires an infinite number of Gaussian wave functions including orbital excited basis functions. However, it has been demonstrated that a finite set of Gaussian basis functions in a geometric progression, covering both long-range and short-range correlations, provides an efficient approximation of the general radial part of the wave functions [86]. For the angular momentum component, since the ground-state solutions are primarily dominated by S-wave functions, we employ S-wave Gaussian basis functions in all relevant Jacobi coordinates of the system. Additionally, including S-wave functions from all Jacobi coordinates compensates for contributions from higher partial-wave angular momentum components in a single coordinate to some extent. Therefore, we adopt a finite set of Gaussian bases in all Jacobi coordinates to achieve rapid convergence of the results. In this work, the corresponding parameter values of bases are:

$$\begin{cases} r_1^{AB} = 0.015 \text{ fm}, & r_{n_{\max}}^{AB} = 5 \text{ fm}, & n_{\max} = 16 \\ R_1^{AB,C} = 0.07 \text{ fm}, & R_{n_{\max}}^{AB,C} = 10 \text{ fm}, & n_{\max} = 16 \end{cases}, \quad (18)$$

where A, B, C represent D or D^* meson.

In the GEM, the wave function of the DDD^* system with total angular momentum J and isospin I , can be expressed as:

$$\Psi^{IJ} = \mathcal{S} \sum_{\text{jac}} \sum_{\alpha, n_i} C_{\alpha, n_i}^{(\text{jac})} \left[\chi_f^I \left[\chi_s^S \phi_{n_1, n_2}^{(\text{jac})} \right]^J \right]. \quad (19)$$

The notation $(\text{jac}) = (\text{a}), (\text{b})$ denotes the two Jacobi coordinate channels (See Fig. 5). α specifies the isospin channel (See Eq. (16) for an example), n_1 and n_2 correspond to the parameters of the Jacobi basis sets in Eq. (18), and $C_{\alpha, n_i}^{(\text{jac})}$ denotes the expansion coefficients, which are determined using the Rayleigh-Ritz variational method. J and I represent the total spin and total isospin respectively. $\phi_{n_1, n_2}^{(\text{jac})}$ is total spacial wave function defined as

$$\phi_{n_1, n_2}^{(\text{jac})} = \phi_{n_1}(r^{\text{jac}}) \phi_{n_2}(R^{\text{jac}}), \quad (20)$$




FIG. 5. The two sets of Jacobi coordinates corresponding to different spatial configurations, where blue disks indicate two identical bosonic D mesons and red disk the D^* meson. The third set of Jacobi coordinates by exchanging two D mesons in (b) is not shown, however, it is included in the calculation.

where r^{jac} and R^{jac} represent two independent Jacobi coordinates in (jac). The expression for Gaussian function ϕ is given by Eq. (17). Notably, before the symmetrization only two sets of Jacobi coordinates are adopted. However, after symmetrization, the third set by exchanging two D mesons in set (b) will be included automatically.

Based on the form of the constructed total wave function, the Schrödinger equation,

$$H\Psi^{IJ} = E\Psi^{IJ}, \quad (21)$$

can be reformulated as a generalized eigenvalue problem using the Rayleigh-Ritz variational method,

$$\sum_j [H_{ij} - EN_{ij}] C_j = 0, \quad (22)$$

where H_{ij} is the matrix element of Hamiltonian, and N_{ij} is the normalization matrix element, i, j are indices from $\{\text{jac}, \alpha, n_i\}$.

The GEM performs the expansion in a set of square-integrable wave functions, which is efficient for the bound state solution. However, it cannot be used directly to probe the resonant state with finite lifetime, since its wave function is not square-integrable. However, by using the CSM [87, 88, 90], rescaling the Schrödinger equation with a phase factor, the resonant state solution with finite lifetime can also be determined within GEM. By introducing a rotation to the momentum p and the radial coordinate r in the Hamiltonian, namely:

$$U(\theta)\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r}e^{i\theta}, \quad U(\theta)\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{p}e^{-i\theta}, \quad (23)$$

$$H(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^3 \left(m_i + \frac{p_i^2 e^{-2i\theta}}{2m_i} \right) + \sum_{i < j} V_{ij}(r_{ij} e^{i\theta}), \quad (24)$$

thereby resonant states can be treated in a manner similar to bound states as shown in Eqs. (19)-(22). The results are presented in the complex energy plane, where bound states appear on the negative real axis, and continuum states lie along rays extending from various energy thresholds. A resonance with mass M_R and width γ_R is located at $E_R = M_R - i\gamma_R/2$ in the complex energy plane, where R denotes the resonance. The resonance can be solved when $\theta > |\text{Arg}(E_R)/2|$. As the

rotation angle θ varies, the positions of both bound states and resonant states remain unchanged, whereas continuum states rotate clockwise by an angle of 2θ . This property is utilized to distinguish resonant states from continuum states. When employing the CSM, the rotation angle θ is chosen to be less than $\pi/4$.

The root-mean-square (RMS) radius serves as a significant physical quantity for characterizing the spatial structure of the studied system. Moreover, it is widely utilized to determine whether a multi-quark system corresponds to a molecular state or a compact state [35, 99]. For a bound state, the RMS radius is:

$$r_{ij}^{\text{rms}} \equiv \sqrt{\frac{\langle \Psi^{IJ} | r_{ij}^2 | \Psi^{IJ} \rangle}{\langle \Psi^{IJ} | \Psi^{IJ} \rangle}}. \quad (25)$$

For the resonant state in CSM, one can introduce the RMS radius

$$r_{ij}^{\text{rms}} \equiv \text{Re} \left[\sqrt{\frac{(\Psi^{IJ}(\theta) | r_{ij}^2 e^{2i\theta} | \Psi^{IJ}(\theta))}{(\Psi^{IJ}(\theta) | \Psi^{IJ}(\theta))}} \right], \quad (26)$$

where the c-product [118] in the following form is introduced to ensure the analyticity of the integral:

$$(\Psi_i | \Psi_j) \equiv \int \Psi_i(\mathbf{r}) \Psi_j(\mathbf{r}) d^3\mathbf{r}. \quad (27)$$

B. Numerical results and discussions

In our three-body calculations, neither the isospin-breaking effects nor the channel-coupling effects involving configurations like D^*D^*D and $D^*D^*D^*$ are considered. The binding energy of the isospin- $\frac{1}{2}$ three-body system is defined relative to the $T_{cc}D$ threshold, where T_{cc} is treated as a single-channel DD^* bound state in the isospin limit. The systematic uncertainties due to isospin violation and channel-coupling effects are expected to largely cancel out, provided that two-body and three-body calculations are performed in a consistent manner.

In the calculation of the DDD^* system, we first employ the coupling constants in model-II [83], yielding consistent results with Ref. [65] and confirming the presence of a bound state in the parameter set. However, when using the parameters in model-I [53, 54], no bound state is observed, indicating that the existence of a bound state is strongly parameter-dependent. Comparing the two parameter sets given in Table II, it is apparent that the strengths of the scalar-meson-exchange interaction differ by approximately 20 times, which plays a significant role. The differences in the pseudoscalar-meson- and vector-meson-exchange strength are tiny. Additionally, another distinction is that the model-II does not include the η exchange, whereas it is considered in model-I. However, since the η -exchange interaction is weak, it is not a key point.

To investigate the possible variation of the DDD^* , we employ the refined parameters recalibrated by the $X(3872)$,

$T_{cc}(3875)$, and $Z_c(3900)$ pole positions in Sec. II. The results for $I = 1/2$ system are shown in Fig. 6, focusing on the connection between the DDD^* system and $Z_c(3900)$. One can see the existence of the three-body bound state is closely tied to the pole position of the $Z_c(3900)$: As the $Z_c(3900)$ pole position moves toward its threshold, the three-body system's binding energy increases, while the $Z_c(3900)$ pole moves away from its threshold, the three-body binding energy decreases until no bound state exists. This connection can be easily understood through the variation in the strength of the σ -meson-exchange interaction. A near-threshold $Z_c(3900)$ pole corresponds to a strong attractive σ -meson-exchange interaction, which tends to form a bound state. Conversely, a distant $Z_c(3900)$ pole corresponds to a weak attractive σ -meson-exchange interaction, resulting in an unbound three-body system. In Fig. 7, examples of strong σ -exchange ($R_s = 4.0$) and weak σ -exchange ($R_s = 2.1$) interactions are shown in subfigures (a) and (b), respectively. Both subfigures exhibit the continuous spectrum of the $T_{cc}D$ system, indicating the existence of two-body DD^* bound state. However, only the strong coupling case in subfigure (a) demonstrates the presence of DDD^* bound states. It is unsurprising that the two parameter sets in Table II yield different results for bound and unbound DDD^* states, as the σ -exchange interactions in model-II (model-I) are stronger (weaker) than the strong (weak) example illustrated in Fig. 7. To investigate the spatial structures of the possible DDD^* bound states, the RMS radii of DD^* and DD are presented in Appendix B.

In Fig. 6, the small variations in E_{DDD^*} at the same Z_c pole position result from different fitting parameters for the $T_{cc}(3875)$ and $X(3872)$ pole positions. This indicates that the uncertainties in the $T_{cc}(3875)$ and $X(3872)$ pole positions have minor impact on the existence of the DDD^* state. In Fig. 6, results under different cutoffs are shown. Notably, varying the cutoff would not alter the results qualitatively. Considering the uncertainties of $T_{cc}(3875)$ and $X(3872)$ and the dependence on the cutoffs, the boundary between the bound and unbound DDD^* systems is approximately located where the virtual state pole of Z_c lies between -15 and -20 MeV. The recent analyses in Refs. [113–115] indicate the virtual state pole of $Z_c(3900)$ is far below the threshold at least about 40 MeV. These analyses support the weak σ -exchange scenario and the unbound DDD^* conclusion.

In addition to the isospin- $\frac{1}{2}$ DDD^* systems, the isospin- $\frac{3}{2}$ system is also investigated. Using the parameters determined from the pole positions in Eq. (13), we find no evidence of isospin-1 DD^* or DD bound states, nor any isospin- $\frac{3}{2}$ DDD^* bound states. Furthermore, we explore the potential existence of an isospin- $\frac{3}{2}$ three-body resonance state using the complex scaling method but find no such resonance. Two representative results are presented in Fig. 7(c) and (d).

IV. CONCLUSION

The existence of the DDD^* bound state remains uncertain due to significant variations in the OBE interaction, partic-




FIG. 6. Variation of the three-body ($I = 1/2$) binding energy ΔE_{DDD^*} with the $Z_c(3900)$ pole position. ΔE_{DDD^*} is measured relative to the $T_{cc}D$ threshold, while the $Z_c(3900)$ pole position is defined relative to the $DD^*/\bar{D}\bar{D}^*$ threshold. Filled circles indicate bound states ($\Delta E_{DDD^*} < 0$), and hollow circles represent unbound states ($\Delta E_{DDD^*} > 0$). Variations at the same $Z_c(3900)$ pole position arise from different fitting parameters for the $T_{cc}(3875)$ and $X(3872)$ pole positions.

ularly in the strength of scalar-meson-exchange interactions. We address this issue by constraining the bound DDD^* system using the $Z_c(3900)$ pole positions, assuming it to be a virtual state. For the $Z_c(3900)$ state, the pseudoscalar-meson coupling is well-determined, and the ρ - and ω -exchange interactions nearly cancel each other out, leaving the coupling constant of the σ -exchange as the only unknown parameter. We solve the Schrödinger equation for the DDD^* three-body system via the Gaussian expansion method. The results reveal that the isospin- $I = 1/2$ DDD^* bound state exists when the virtual state of $Z_c(3900)$ in the $DD^*/\bar{D}\bar{D}^*$ system lies near its threshold, within approximately -15 MeV. However, the three-body system ceases to be bound when the $Z_c(3900)$ pole is shifted farther away from the threshold, beyond about -20 MeV.

To pin down or rule out the existence of the DDD^* three-body bound state requires determining the strength of scalar-meson-exchange interaction in higher precision. However, it can be linked to the $Z_c(3900)$ state from another perspective. If the three-body bound state is observed experimentally, the position of the $Z_c(3900)$ pole can be inferred. Conversely, if the position of the $Z_c(3900)$ pole is measured, the existence or nonexistence of the three-body bound state can be determined.

Experimentally, the search for this three-body bound state can be pursued through the decay channels $DDD^* \rightarrow DDD\pi$ and $DDD^* \rightarrow DDD\gamma$ [65].

Additionally, the potential existence of DDD^* three-body resonances in isospin-1/2 and isospin-3/2 channels is explored using a combination of the Gaussian expansion method and the complex scaling method. However, no resonance state for the DDD^* system was found in any of the channels.

As another significant outcome, we recalibrate the coupling constants in the OBE model based on the pole positions of $X(3872)$, $T_{cc}(3875)$, and $Z_c(3900)$, rigorously addressing the dependence on the cutoff. Eight sets of coupling constants corresponding to cutoff values ranging from 1.00 to 1.35 GeV in steps of 0.05 GeV are provided. These parameters provide a valuable resource for more accurate calculations of few-body systems involving D , D^* , and their antiparticles.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Zi-Yang Lin and Jian-Bo Cheng for helpful discussions. This project was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 12475137 and No.




FIG. 7. Variation of the three-body energy E_{DDD^*} with the angle θ of the CSM for the $I = 1/2$ and $I = 3/2$ channels with a cutoff of 1.20 GeV. The subfigures (a) and (c) are examples of the strong scalar-meson exchange while (b) and (d) are the examples of the weak scalar-meson exchange. The solid rays and dashed rays start from the $T_{cc}D$ threshold and the three-body DDD^* threshold, respectively. Three-body bound states are marked by black circles.

12175318), ERC NuclearTheory (Grant No. 885150), and the Natural Science Foundation of Guangdong Province of China (Grant No. 2023A15150117 and No. 2022A1515011922).

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The data supporting the findings of this study is available on Zenodo repository [117] or can be obtained directly from the authors upon reasonable request.

Appendix A: Fourier transformation

In this section, we adopt the following normalization conventions:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{r} | \mathbf{r}' \rangle &= \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'), \\ \langle \mathbf{p} | \mathbf{p}' \rangle &= (2\pi)^3 \delta(\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}'). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A1})$$

Thus, the plane wave function is given by $\langle \mathbf{r} | \mathbf{p} \rangle = e^{i\mathbf{p}\cdot\mathbf{r}}$. The general nonlocal potential in coordinate space can be related to the potential in momentum space via Fourier transforma-

tion [119]:

$$\begin{aligned} V(\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r}) &= \langle \mathbf{r}' | \hat{V} | \mathbf{r} \rangle \\ &= \int \frac{d^3\mathbf{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{d^3\mathbf{p}'}{(2\pi)^3} \langle \mathbf{r}' | \mathbf{p}' \rangle \langle \mathbf{p}' | V | \mathbf{p} \rangle \langle \mathbf{p} | \mathbf{r} \rangle \\ &= \int \frac{d^3\mathbf{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{d^3\mathbf{p}'}{(2\pi)^3} V(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}) e^{i(\mathbf{p}'\cdot\mathbf{r}' - \mathbf{p}\cdot\mathbf{r})} \\ &= \int \frac{d^3(\mathbf{k}/2)}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{d^3\mathbf{q}}{(2\pi)^3} V(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}) e^{i(\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{s}/2 + \mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{R})} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A2})$$

In the last step of the above derivation, we introduce new sets of coordinates and momenta:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{R} = \frac{\mathbf{r} + \mathbf{r}'}{2}, & \mathbf{q} = \mathbf{p}' - \mathbf{p}, \\ \mathbf{s} = \mathbf{r}' - \mathbf{r}, & \frac{\mathbf{k}}{2} = \frac{\mathbf{p}' + \mathbf{p}}{2}. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A3})$$

When $V(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}) = \tilde{V}(\mathbf{q})$ depends only on the momentum \mathbf{q} , we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} V(\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r}) &= \tilde{V}(\mathbf{R}) \delta(\mathbf{s}), \\ \tilde{V}(\mathbf{R}) &= \int \frac{d^3\mathbf{q}}{(2\pi)^3} e^{i\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{R}} \tilde{V}(\mathbf{q}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A4})$$

The coordinate space representation of the potential acting on the wave function is:

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \mathbf{r} | \hat{V} | \psi \rangle &= \int d^3 \mathbf{r}' V(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \psi(\mathbf{r}') \\ &= \int d^3 \mathbf{r}' \tilde{V} \left(\frac{\mathbf{r} + \mathbf{r}'}{2} \right) \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \psi(\mathbf{r}') \\ &= \tilde{V}(\mathbf{r}) \psi(\mathbf{r}).\end{aligned}\quad (\text{A5})$$

Therefore, we obtain the results for local interactions. When $V(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}) = \tilde{V}(\mathbf{k})$ depends only on \mathbf{k} , the potential in coordinate space is:

$$\begin{aligned}V(\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r}) &= \int \frac{d^3 \mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{d^3(\mathbf{q}/2)}{(2\pi)^3} \tilde{V}(\mathbf{k}) e^{i(\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{s}/2 + \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{R})} \\ &= \tilde{V} \left(\frac{\mathbf{s}}{2} \right) \delta(2\mathbf{R}),\end{aligned}\quad (\text{A6})$$

with

$$\tilde{V} \left(\frac{\mathbf{s}}{2} \right) = \int \frac{d^3 \mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3} e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{s}/2} \tilde{V}(\mathbf{k}).\quad (\text{A7})$$

Therefore, the potential acting on a wave function becomes:

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \mathbf{r} | \hat{V} | \psi \rangle &= \int d^3 \mathbf{r}' \tilde{V} \left(\frac{\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'}{2} \right) \delta \left(\frac{\mathbf{r} + \mathbf{r}'}{2} \right) \psi(\mathbf{r}') \\ &= \tilde{V}(\mathbf{r}) \psi(-\mathbf{r}).\end{aligned}\quad (\text{A8})$$

It is interesting to note the additional sign that appears for the argument of the wave function compared to the local potential. If $\psi(\mathbf{r})$ contains only even partial wave components, then $\psi(-\mathbf{r}) = \psi(\mathbf{r})$. Conversely, for odd partial wave states, $\psi(-\mathbf{r}) = -\psi(\mathbf{r})$.

For the specific potential in this work, the Fourier transfor-

mation reads:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{u^2 + \mathbf{q}^2} F(u, \Lambda, q^2)^2 &\rightarrow H_0(u, \Lambda, r), \\ \frac{\mathbf{q}^2}{u^2 + \mathbf{q}^2} F(u, \Lambda, q^2)^2 &\rightarrow -H_1(u, \Lambda, r), \\ \frac{q_i q_j}{u^2 + \mathbf{q}^2} F(u, \Lambda, q^2)^2 &\rightarrow -[H_3(u, \Lambda, r) T_{ij} + H_1(u, \Lambda, r) \frac{\delta_{ij}}{3}],\end{aligned}\quad (\text{A9})$$

where $T_{ij} = \frac{3r_i r_j}{r^2} - \delta_{ij}$. One can also easily obtain the transformation for the case where $V(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}) = \tilde{V}(\mathbf{k})$. The explicit expressions of H_0 , H_1 , and H_3 are:

$$\begin{aligned}H_0(u, \Lambda, r) &= \frac{u}{4\pi} \left[\frac{e^{-ur} - e^{-\Lambda r}}{ur} - \frac{\Lambda^2 - u^2}{2u\Lambda} e^{-\Lambda r} \right], \\ H_1(u, \Lambda, r) &= \frac{u^3}{4\pi} \left[\frac{e^{-ur} - e^{-\Lambda r}}{ur} - \frac{(\Lambda^2 - u^2)\Lambda^2}{2u^3\Lambda} e^{-\Lambda r} \right], \\ H_3(u, \Lambda, r) &= \frac{u^3}{12\pi} \left[-\frac{e^{-\Lambda r} \Lambda^2 \left(\frac{3}{\Lambda^2 r^2} + \frac{3}{\Lambda r} + 1 \right)}{ru^3} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{e^{-\Lambda r} (\Lambda r + 1) (\Lambda^2 - u^2)}{2ru^3} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{e^{-ur} \left(\frac{3}{r^2 u^2} + \frac{3}{ru} + 1 \right)}{ru} \right].\end{aligned}\quad (\text{A10})$$

Appendix B: Root-mean-square radii

To investigate the spatial structures of the possible DDD^* bound states, the RMS radii of DD^* and DD compared with that of T_{cc} (3875) are presented in Fig. 8. It should be noticed that the RMS radii results are based on the Gaussian bases in Eq. (18).

-
- [1] H.-X. Chen, W. Chen, X. Liu, and S.-L. Zhu, The hidden-charm pentaquark and tetraquark states, *Phys. Rept.* **639**, 1 (2016), arXiv:1601.02092 [hep-ph].
- [2] A. Esposito, A. Pilloni, and A. D. Polosa, Multiquark Resonances, *Phys. Rept.* **668**, 1 (2017), arXiv:1611.07920 [hep-ph].
- [3] F.-K. Guo, C. Hanhart, U.-G. Meißner, Q. Wang, Q. Zhao, and B.-S. Zou, Hadronic molecules, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **90**, 015004 (2018), arXiv:1705.00141 [hep-ph].
- [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), arXiv:1903.11976 [hep-ph].
- [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. Rept.* **873**, 1 (2020), arXiv:1907.07583 [hep-ex].
- [6] H.-X. Chen, W. Chen, X. Liu, Y.-R. Liu, and S.-L. Zhu, An updated review of the new hadron states, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **86**, 026201 (2023), arXiv:2204.02649 [hep-ph].
- [7] L. Meng, B. Wang, G.-J. Wang, and S.-L. Zhu, Chiral perturbation theory for heavy hadrons and chiral effective field theory for heavy hadronic molecules, *Phys. Rept.* **1019**, 1 (2023), arXiv:2204.08716 [hep-ph].
- [8] S. K. Choi *et al.* (Belle), Observation of a narrow charmonium-like state in exclusive $B^\pm \rightarrow K^\pm \pi^+ \pi^- J/\psi$ decays, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 262001 (2003), arXiv:hep-ex/0309032.
- [9] M. Ablikim *et al.* (BESIII), Observation of a charged charmoniumlike structure in $e^+ e^- \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- J/\psi$ at $\sqrt{s} = 4.26$ GeV, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 252001 (2013), arXiv:1303.5949 [hep-ex].
- [10] Z. Q. Liu *et al.* (Belle), Study of $e^+ e^- \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- J/\psi$ and observation of a charged charmoniumlike state at Belle, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 252002 (2013), [Erratum: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 019901 (2013)], arXiv:1304.0121 [hep-ex].
- [11] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb), Observation of an exotic narrow doubly charmed tetraquark, *Nature Phys.* **18**, 751 (2022), arXiv:2109.01038 [hep-ex].
- [12] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb), Study of the doubly charmed tetraquark T_{cc}^+ , *Nature Commun.* **13**, 3351 (2022), arXiv:2109.01056 [hep-ex].




FIG. 8. The relationship between the RMS radii of DD^* , DD in three-body bound state system DDD^* , DD^* in two-body bound state system $T_{cc}(3875)$ and the position of the $Z_c(3900)$ pole, under eight different sets of cutoff Λ .

- [13] M. B. Voloshin and L. B. Okun, Hadron molecules and charmonium atom, *JETP Lett.* **23**, 333 (1976).
- [14] N. A. Tornqvist, Possible large deuteron - like meson meson states bound by pions, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 556 (1991).
- [15] N. A. Tornqvist, From the deuteron to deusons, an analysis of deuteron - like meson meson bound states, *Z. Phys. C* **61**, 525 (1994), [arXiv:hep-ph/9310247](#).
- [16] D. Gamermann, E. Oset, D. Strottman, and M. J. Vicente Vacas, Dynamically generated open and hidden charm meson systems, *Phys. Rev. D* **76**, 074016 (2007), [arXiv:hep-ph/0612179](#).
- [17] X. Liu, Z.-G. Luo, Y.-R. Liu, and S.-L. Zhu, $X(3872)$ and Other Possible Heavy Molecular States, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **61**, 411 (2009), [arXiv:0808.0073 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [18] Y.-R. Liu, X. Liu, W.-Z. Deng, and S.-L. Zhu, Is $X(3872)$ Really a Molecular State?, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **56**, 63 (2008), [arXiv:0801.3540 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [19] X. Liu, Y.-R. Liu, W.-Z. Deng, and S.-L. Zhu, $Z^+(4430)$ as a $D(1)$ -prime D^* ($D(1) D^*$) molecular state, *Phys. Rev. D* **77**, 094015 (2008), [arXiv:0803.1295 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [20] G.-J. Ding, J.-F. Liu, and M.-L. Yan, Dynamics of Hadronic Molecule in One-Boson Exchange Approach and Possible Heavy Flavor Molecules, *Phys. Rev. D* **79**, 054005 (2009), [arXiv:0901.0426 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [21] Z.-F. Sun, J. He, X. Liu, Z.-G. Luo, and S.-L. Zhu, $Z_b(10610)^\pm$ and $Z_b(10650)^\pm$ as the $B^* \bar{B}$ and $B^* \bar{B}^*$ molecular states, *Phys. Rev. D* **84**, 054002 (2011), [arXiv:1106.2968 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [22] C. E. Thomas and F. E. Close, Is $X(3872)$ a molecule?, *Phys. Rev. D* **78**, 034007 (2008), [arXiv:0805.3653 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [23] I. W. Lee, A. Faessler, T. Gutsche, and V. E. Lyubovitskij, $X(3872)$ as a molecular DD^* state in a potential model, *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 094005 (2009), [arXiv:0910.1009 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [24] R. Chen, A. Hosaka, and X. Liu, Heavy molecules and one- σ/ω -exchange model, *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, 116012 (2017), [arXiv:1707.08306 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [25] R. Chen and Q. Huang, $Z_{cs}(3985)^-$: A strange hidden-charm tetraquark resonance or not?, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 034008 (2021), [arXiv:2011.09156 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [26] R. Chen, Q. Huang, X. Liu, and S.-L. Zhu, Predicting another doubly charmed molecular resonance $T_{cc}^+(3876)$, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 114042 (2021), [arXiv:2108.01911 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [27] X.-K. Dong, F.-K. Guo, and B.-S. Zou, A survey of heavy-heavy hadronic molecules, *Commun. Theor. Phys.* **73**, 125201 (2021), [arXiv:2108.02673 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [28] X.-K. Dong, F.-K. Guo, and B.-S. Zou, A survey of heavy-antiheavy hadronic molecules, *Progr. Phys.* **41**, 65 (2021), [arXiv:2101.01021 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [29] F.-Z. Peng, M.-J. Yan, and M. Pavon Valderrama, Heavy- and light-flavor symmetry partners of the $T_{cc}(3875)$, the $X(3872)$, and the $X(3960)$ from light-meson exchange saturation, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 114001 (2023), [arXiv:2304.13515](#)

- [hep-ph].
- [30] J.-B. Cheng, Z.-Y. Lin, and S.-L. Zhu, Double-charm tetraquark under the complex scaling method, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 016012 (2022), arXiv:2205.13354 [hep-ph].
- [31] C.-R. Deng and S.-L. Zhu, Decoding the double heavy tetraquark state T_{cc}^+ , *Sci. Bull.* **67**, 1522 (2022), arXiv:2204.11079 [hep-ph].
- [32] P. G. Ortega, J. Segovia, D. R. Entem, and F. Fernandez, Nature of the doubly-charmed tetraquark T_{cc}^+ in a constituent quark model, *Phys. Lett. B* **841**, 137918 (2023), [Erratum: *Phys.Lett.B* 847, 138308 (2023)], arXiv:2211.06118 [hep-ph].
- [33] L. Meng, Y.-K. Chen, Y. Ma, and S.-L. Zhu, Tetraquark bound states in constituent quark models: Benchmark test calculations, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 114016 (2023), arXiv:2310.13354 [hep-ph].
- [34] Y. Ma, L. Meng, Y.-K. Chen, and S.-L. Zhu, Doubly heavy tetraquark states in the constituent quark model using diffusion Monte Carlo method, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 074001 (2024), arXiv:2309.17068 [hep-ph].
- [35] W.-L. Wu, Y. Ma, Y.-K. Chen, L. Meng, and S.-L. Zhu, Doubly heavy tetraquark bound and resonant states, *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 094041 (2024), arXiv:2409.03373 [hep-ph].
- [36] M.-L. Du, W. Chen, X.-L. Chen, and S.-L. Zhu, Exotic $QQ\bar{q}\bar{q}$, $QQ\bar{q}\bar{s}$ and $QQ\bar{s}\bar{s}$ states, *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 014003 (2013), arXiv:1209.5134 [hep-ph].
- [37] Z.-G. Wang and T. Huang, Possible assignments of the $X(3872)$, $Z_c(3900)$ and $Z_b(10610)$ as axial-vector molecular states, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **74**, 2891 (2014), arXiv:1312.7489 [hep-ph].
- [38] Z.-G. Wang, Reanalysis of the $Y(3940)$, $Y(4140)$, $Z_c(4020)$, $Z_c(4025)$ and $Z_b(10650)$ as molecular states with QCD sum rules, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **74**, 2963 (2014), arXiv:1403.0810 [hep-ph].
- [39] W. Chen, H.-X. Chen, X. Liu, T. G. Steele, and S.-L. Zhu, Hunting for exotic doubly hidden-charm/bottom tetraquark states, *Phys. Lett. B* **773**, 247 (2017), arXiv:1605.01647 [hep-ph].
- [40] B. Wang, L. Meng, and S.-L. Zhu, Spectrum of the strange hidden charm molecular pentaquarks in chiral effective field theory, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 034018 (2020), arXiv:1912.12592 [hep-ph].
- [41] B. Wang, L. Meng, and S.-L. Zhu, Hidden-charm and hidden-bottom molecular pentaquarks in chiral effective field theory, *JHEP* **11**, 108, arXiv:1909.13054 [hep-ph].
- [42] E. Braaten, L.-P. He, and J. Jiang, Galilean-invariant effective field theory for the $X(3872)$ at next-to-leading order, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 036014 (2021), arXiv:2010.05801 [hep-ph].
- [43] M.-L. Du, V. Baru, X.-K. Dong, A. Filin, F.-K. Guo, C. Hanhart, A. Nefediev, J. Nieves, and Q. Wang, Coupled-channel approach to T_{cc}^+ including three-body effects, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 014024 (2022), arXiv:2110.13765 [hep-ph].
- [44] B. Wang and L. Meng, Revisiting the DD^* chiral interactions with the local momentum-space regularization up to the third order and the nature of T_{cc}^+ , *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 094002 (2023), arXiv:2212.08447 [hep-ph].
- [45] M. Abolnikov, V. Baru, E. Epelbaum, A. A. Filin, C. Hanhart, and L. Meng, Internal structure of the $T_{cc}(3875)^+$ from its light-quark mass dependence, (2024), arXiv:2407.04649 [hep-ph].
- [46] J. T. Chacko, V. Baru, C. Hanhart, and S. L. Krug, Two-pion exchange for coupled-channel heavy-meson heavy-(anti)meson scattering, (2024), arXiv:2411.13303 [hep-ph].
- [47] S. Chen, C. Shi, Y. Chen, M. Gong, Z. Liu, W. Sun, and R. Zhang, $T_{cc}^+(3875)$ relevant DD^* scattering from $N_f=2$ lattice QCD, *Phys. Lett. B* **833**, 137391 (2022), arXiv:2206.06185 [hep-lat].
- [48] Y. Lyu, S. Aoki, T. Doi, T. Hatsuda, Y. Ikeda, and J. Meng, Doubly Charmed Tetraquark T_{cc}^+ from Lattice QCD near Physical Point, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 161901 (2023), arXiv:2302.04505 [hep-lat].
- [49] L. Meng, V. Baru, E. Epelbaum, A. A. Filin, and A. M. Gasparyan, Solving the left-hand cut problem in lattice QCD: $T_{cc}(3875)^+$ from finite volume energy levels, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, L071506 (2024), arXiv:2312.01930 [hep-lat].
- [50] L. Meng, E. Ortiz-Pacheco, V. Baru, E. Epelbaum, M. Padmanath, and S. Prelovsek, Doubly charm tetraquark channel with isospin 1 from lattice QCD, (2024), arXiv:2411.06266 [hep-lat].
- [51] T. Whyte, D. J. Wilson, and C. E. Thomas, Near-threshold states in coupled $DD^* - D^*D^*$ scattering from lattice QCD, (2024), arXiv:2405.15741 [hep-lat].
- [52] R. Machleidt, K. Holinde, and C. Elster, The Bonn meson exchange model for the nucleon nucleon interaction, *Phys. Rept.* **149**, 1 (1987).
- [53] N. Li and S.-L. Zhu, Isospin breaking, coupled-channel effects and diagnosis of $X(3872)$, *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 074022 (2012), arXiv:1207.3954 [hep-ph].
- [54] N. Li, Z.-F. Sun, X. Liu, and S.-L. Zhu, Coupled-channel analysis of the possible $D^{(*)}D^{(*)}$, $\bar{B}^{(*)}\bar{B}^{(*)}$ and $D^{(*)}\bar{B}^{(*)}$ molecular states, *Phys. Rev. D* **88**, 114008 (2013), arXiv:1211.5007 [hep-ph].
- [55] J. P. Ader, J. M. Richard, and P. Taxil, Do narrow heavy multi-quark states exist?, *Phys. Rev. D* **25**, 2370 (1982).
- [56] J.-M. Richard, A. Valcarce, and J. Vijande, Doubly-heavy tetraquark bound states and resonances, *Nucl. Part. Phys. Proc.* **324-329**, 64 (2023), arXiv:2209.07372 [hep-ph].
- [57] B. Aubert *et al.* (BaBar), Study of the exclusive initial-state-radiation production of the $D\bar{D}$ system, (2008), arXiv:0710.1371 [hep-ex].
- [58] G. Pakhlova *et al.* (Belle), Measurement of the near-threshold $e^+e^- \rightarrow D\bar{D}$ cross section using initial-state radiation, *Phys. Rev. D* **77**, 011103 (2008), arXiv:0708.0082 [hep-ex].
- [59] Z.-Y. Lin, J.-Z. Wang, J.-B. Cheng, L. Meng, and S.-L. Zhu, Identify the new state $Y(3872)$ as the P-wave $D\bar{D}^*/\bar{D}D^*$ resonance, (2024), arXiv:2403.01727 [hep-ph].
- [60] N. Kalantar-Nayestanaki, E. Epelbaum, J. G. Messchendorp, and A. Nogga, Signatures of three-nucleon interactions in few-nucleon systems, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **75**, 016301 (2012), arXiv:1108.1227 [nucl-th].
- [61] S. Endo, E. Epelbaum, P. Naidon, Y. Nishida, K. Sekiguchi, and Y. Takahashi, Three-body forces and Efimov physics in nuclei and atoms, (2024), arXiv:2405.09807 [nucl-th].
- [62] D. L. Canham, H. W. Hammer, and R. P. Springer, On the scattering of D and D^* mesons off the $X(3872)$, *Physical Review D: Particles and Fields* **80**, 014009 (2009), arXiv:0906.1263 [hep-ph].
- [63] E. Wilbring, H. W. Hammer, and U.-G. Meißner, Three-body universality in the B meson sector, (2017), arXiv:1705.06176 [hep-ph].
- [64] L. Ma, Q. Wang, and U.-G. Meißner, Trimeson bound state BBB^* via a delocalized π bond, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 014028 (2019), arXiv:1812.09750 [hep-ph].
- [65] T.-W. Wu, Y.-W. Pan, M.-Z. Liu, S.-Q. Luo, L.-S. Geng, and X. Liu, Discovery of the doubly charmed T_{cc}^+ state implies a triply charmed H_{ccc} hexaquark state, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, L031505 (2022), arXiv:2108.00923 [hep-ph].

- [66] M. Bayar, A. Martínez Torres, K. P. Khemchandani, R. Molina, and E. Oset, Exotic states with triple charm, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83**, 46 (2023), arXiv:2211.09294 [hep-ph].
- [67] Y.-W. Pan, T.-W. Wu, M.-Z. Liu, and L.-S. Geng, Hadronic molecules composed of a doubly charmed tetraquark state and a charmed meson, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82**, 908 (2022), arXiv:2208.05385 [hep-ph].
- [68] P. G. Ortega, Exploring the Efimov effect in the $D^*D^*D^*$ system, *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 034015 (2024), arXiv:2403.10244 [hep-ph].
- [69] S.-Q. Luo, T.-W. Wu, M.-Z. Liu, L.-S. Geng, and X. Liu, Triple-charm molecular states composed of $D^*D^*D^*$ and $D^*D^*D^*$, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 074033 (2022), arXiv:2111.15079 [hep-ph].
- [70] Y. Tan, X. Liu, X. Chen, Y. Yang, H. Huang, and J. Ping, Dynamical study of $D\bar{K}^*$ and $D\bar{D}^*$ systems at quark level, *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 016005 (2024), arXiv:2404.02048 [hep-ph].
- [71] M. P. Valderrama, $D^*D^*\bar{D}$ and $D^*D^*\bar{D}^*$ three-body systems, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 034017 (2018), arXiv:1805.10584 [hep-ph].
- [72] J. M. Dias, L. Roca, and S. Sakai, Prediction of new states from $D^{(*)}B^{(*)}\bar{B}^{(*)}$ three-body interactions, *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 056019 (2018), arXiv:1801.03504 [hep-ph].
- [73] L. Ma, Q. Wang, and U.-G. Meißner, Double heavy tri-hadron bound state via delocalized π bond, *Chin. Phys. C* **43**, 014102 (2019), arXiv:1711.06143 [hep-ph].
- [74] X.-L. Ren and Z.-F. Sun, Possible bound states with hidden bottom from $\bar{B}K^*B^*$ systems, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 094041 (2019), arXiv:1812.09931 [hep-ph].
- [75] T.-W. Wu, M.-Z. Liu, L.-S. Geng, E. Hiyama, and M. P. Valderrama, DK, DDK, and DDDK molecules—understanding the nature of the $D_{s0}^*(2317)$, *Physical Review D: Particles and Fields* **100**, 034029 (2019), arXiv:1906.11995 [hep-ph].
- [76] X. Zhang, C. Hanhart, U.-G. Meißner, and J.-J. Xie, Remarks on non-perturbative three-body dynamics and its application to the $KK\bar{K}$ system, *Eur. Phys. J. A* **58**, 20 (2022), arXiv:2107.03168 [hep-ph].
- [77] Z. Zhang, X.-Y. Hu, G. He, J. Liu, J.-A. Shi, B.-N. Lu, and Q. Wang, Binding of the three-hadron DD^*K system from the lattice effective field theory, (2024), arXiv:2409.01325 [hep-ph].
- [78] Q.-Y. Zhai, R. Molina, E. Oset, and L.-S. Geng, Study of the exotic three-body $ND^*\bar{K}^*$ system, (2024), arXiv:2411.18285 [hep-ph].
- [79] X.-L. Ren, K. P. Khemchandani, and A. Martínez Torres, Heavy K^* mesons with open charm from $KD^{(*)}D^*$ interactions, (2024), arXiv:2409.16281 [hep-ph].
- [80] L. Contessi, J. Kirscher, and M. Pavon Valderrama, Triple-X and beyond: Hadronic systems of three and more $X(3872)$, *Physical Review D: Particles and Fields* **103**, 056001 (2021), arXiv:2008.12268 [hep-ph].
- [81] A. Martínez Torres, K. P. Khemchandani, L. Roca, and E. Oset, Few-body systems consisting of mesons, *Few Body Syst.* **61**, 35 (2020), arXiv:2005.14357 [nucl-th].
- [82] M.-Z. Liu, Y.-W. Pan, Z.-W. Liu, T.-W. Wu, J.-X. Lu, and L.-S. Geng, Three ways to decipher the nature of exotic hadrons: multiplets, three-body hadronic molecules, and correlation functions, (2024), arXiv:2404.06399 [hep-ph].
- [83] M.-Z. Liu, T.-W. Wu, M. Pavon Valderrama, J.-J. Xie, and L.-S. Geng, Heavy-quark spin and flavor symmetry partners of the $X(3872)$ revisited: What can we learn from the one boson exchange model?, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 094018 (2019), arXiv:1902.03044 [hep-ph].
- [84] L. Faddeev, Scattering theory for a three particle system, *Sov. Phys. JETP* **12**, 1014 (1961).
- [85] S. M. Dawid, M. H. E. Islam, and R. A. Briceño, Analytic continuation of the relativistic three-particle scattering amplitudes, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 034016 (2023), arXiv:2303.04394 [nucl-th].
- [86] E. Hiyama, Y. Kino, and M. Kamimura, Gaussian expansion method for few-body systems, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **51**, 223 (2003).
- [87] J. Aguilar and J. M. Combes, A class of analytic perturbations for one-body schrodinger hamiltonians, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **22**, 269 (1971).
- [88] E. Balslev and J. M. Combes, Spectral properties of many-body schrodinger operators with dilatation-analytic interactions, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **22**, 280 (1971).
- [89] N. Moiseyev, Quantum theory of resonances: calculating energies, widths and cross-sections by complex scaling, *Phys. Rept.* **302**, 212 (1998).
- [90] S. Aoyama, T. Myo, K. Katō, and K. Ikeda, The Complex Scaling Method for Many-Body Resonances and Its Applications to Three-Body Resonances, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **116**, 1 (2006).
- [91] J. Carbonell, A. Deltuva, A. C. Fonseca, and R. Lazauskas, Bound state techniques to solve the multiparticle scattering problem, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **74**, 55 (2014), arXiv:1310.6631 [nucl-th].
- [92] E. Hiyama, R. Lazauskas, J. Carbonell, and M. Kamimura, Possibility of generating a 4-neutron resonance with a $T = 3/2$ isospin 3-neutron force, *Phys. Rev. C* **93**, 044004 (2016), arXiv:1604.04363 [nucl-th].
- [93] A. Doté, T. Inoue, and T. Myo, Fully coupled-channel study of K^-pp resonance in a chiral $SU(3)$ -based $\bar{K}N$ potential, *Phys. Lett. B* **784**, 405 (2018), arXiv:1710.07589 [nucl-th].
- [94] Z.-Y. Lin, J.-B. Cheng, and S.-L. Zhu, T_{cc}^+ and $\chi_{c1}(3872)$ with the complex scaling method and $DD(\bar{D})\pi$ three-body effect, *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 054008 (2024), arXiv:2205.14628 [hep-ph].
- [95] L. Happ, P. Naidon, and E. Hiyama, Mass Ratio Dependence of Three-Body Resonance Lifetimes in 1D and 3D, *Few Body Syst.* **65**, 38 (2024), arXiv:2312.04080 [quant-ph].
- [96] Y.-K. Chen, L. Meng, Z.-Y. Lin, and S.-L. Zhu, Virtual states in the coupled-channel problems with an improved complex scaling method, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 034006 (2024), arXiv:2308.12424 [hep-ph].
- [97] Q. Meng, G.-J. Wang, and M. Oka, Mass Spectra of Full-Heavy and Double-Heavy Tetraquark States in the Conventional Quark Model, (2024), arXiv:2404.01238 [hep-ph].
- [98] Y. Ma, W.-L. Wu, L. Meng, Y.-K. Chen, and S.-L. Zhu, Fully strange tetraquark resonant states as the cousins of $X(6900)$, *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 074026 (2024), arXiv:2408.00503 [hep-ph].
- [99] W.-L. Wu, Y.-K. Chen, L. Meng, and S.-L. Zhu, Benchmark calculations of fully heavy compact and molecular tetraquark states, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 054034 (2024), arXiv:2401.14899 [hep-ph].
- [100] H. Georgi, Comment on heavy baryon weak form-factors, *Nucl. Phys. B* **348**, 293 (1991).
- [101] T. Mannel, W. Roberts, and Z. Ryzak, Baryons in the heavy quark effective theory, *Nucl. Phys. B* **355**, 38 (1991).
- [102] A. F. Falk, Hadrons of arbitrary spin in the heavy quark effective theory, *Nucl. Phys. B* **378**, 79 (1992).
- [103] S. Navas *et al.* (Particle Data Group), Review of particle physics, *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 030001 (2024).
- [104] C. Isola, M. Ladisa, G. Nardulli, and P. Santorelli, Charming penguins in $B \rightarrow K^*\pi$, $K(\rho, \omega, \phi)$ decays, *Phys. Rev. D* **68**, 114001 (2003), arXiv:hep-ph/0307367.

- [105] W. A. Bardeen, E. J. Eichten, and C. T. Hill, Chiral multiplets of heavy-light mesons, *Phys. Rev. D* **68**, 054024 (2003), [arXiv:hep-ph/0305049](#).
- [106] H.-J. Kim and H.-C. Kim, σ and ρ coupling constants for the charmed and beauty mesons, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 014026 (2020), [arXiv:1912.11622 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [107] B. Wu, X.-H. Cao, X.-K. Dong, and F.-K. Guo, σ exchange in the one-boson exchange model involving the ground state octet baryons, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 034026 (2024), [arXiv:2312.01013 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [108] K. Abe *et al.* (Belle), Evidence for $X(3872) \rightarrow \gamma J/\psi$ and the sub-threshold decay $X(3872) \rightarrow \omega J/\psi$, in *22nd International Symposium on Lepton-Photon Interactions at High Energy (LP 2005)* (2005) [arXiv:hep-ex/0505037](#).
- [109] P. del Amo Sanchez *et al.* (BaBar), Evidence for the decay $X(3872) \rightarrow J/\psi \omega$, *Phys. Rev. D* **82**, 011101 (2010), [arXiv:1005.5190 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [110] M. Ablikim *et al.* (BESIII), Study of $e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma\omega J/\psi$ and Observation of $X(3872) \rightarrow \omega J/\psi$, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 232002 (2019), [arXiv:1903.04695 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [111] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb), Study of the lineshape of the $\chi_{c1}(3872)$ state, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 092005 (2020), [arXiv:2005.13419 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [112] M. Ablikim *et al.* (BESIII), Coupled-Channel Analysis of the $\chi_{c1}(3872)$ Line Shape with BESIII Data, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **132**, 151903 (2024), [arXiv:2309.01502 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [113] M. Albaladejo, F.-K. Guo, C. Hidalgo-Duque, and J. Nieves, $Z_c(3900)$: What has been really seen?, *Phys. Lett. B* **755**, 337 (2016), [arXiv:1512.03638 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [114] S. X. Nakamura, X. H. Li, H. P. Peng, Z. T. Sun, and X. R. Zhou, Global coupled-channel analysis of $e^+e^- \rightarrow c\bar{c}$ processes in $\sqrt{s} = 3.75 - 4.7$ GeV, (2023), [arXiv:2312.17658 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [115] K. Yu, G.-J. Wang, J.-J. Wu, and Z. Yang, A Three-Coupled-Channel Analysis of $Z_c(3900)$ Involving $D\bar{D}^*$, $\pi J/\psi$, and $\rho\eta_c$, (2024), [arXiv:2409.10865 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [116] Y.-H. Chen, M.-L. Du, and F.-K. Guo, Precise determination of the pole position of the exotic $Z_c(3900)$, *Sci. China Phys. Mech. Astron.* **67**, 291011 (2024), [arXiv:2310.15965 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [117] H.-X. Zhu, L. Meng, Y. Ma, N. Li, W. Chen, and S.-L. Zhu, Coupling constants of one-boson-exchange interactions determined by $X(3872)$, $T_{cc}(3875)$ and $Z_c(3900)$ poles, [10.5281/zenodo.14464767](#) (2024).
- [118] W. J. Romo, Inner product for resonant states and shell-model applications, *Nucl. Phys. A* **116**, 617 (1968).
- [119] N. Hoshizaki and S. Machida, Two Nucleon Potential with Full Recoil. I, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **24**, 1325 (1960).