

Fully and Doubly-heavy four-quarks within QCD Laplace sum rule[☆]

R. M. Albuquerque^a, S. Narison^{b,c}, A. Rabemananjara^c, D. Rabetiarivony^{c,1}

^aFaculty of Technology, Rio de Janeiro State University (FAT, UERJ), Brazil

^bLaboratoire Univers et Particules de Montpellier (LUPM), CNRS-IN2P3, Case 070, Place Eugène Bataillon, 34095 - Montpellier, France

^cInstitute of High-Energy Physics of Madagascar (iHEPMAD), University of Ankatso, Antananarivo 101, Madagascar

Abstract

We present a review of our results for the masses and couplings of the scalar fully heavy four-quarks and $T_{QQ\bar{q}\bar{q}}$ ($J^P = 0^\pm, 1^\pm$) tetraquarks states from (inverse) QCD Laplace sum rule (LSR), their ratios \mathcal{R} and double ratio of sum rules (DRSR) within stability criteria and including Factorized Next-to-Leading Order (FNLO) Perturbative (PT) corrections. As the Operator Product Expansion (OPE) usually converges for $d \leq 6 - 8$, we evaluated the QCD spectral functions at Lowest Order (LO) of PT QCD and up to $\langle G^3 \rangle$. Our results for the 0^{++} fully heavy four-quark states may explain the LHCb broad structure around (6.2 – 6.7) GeV which can be due to $\bar{\eta}_c \eta_c$, $\bar{\chi}_{c1} \chi_{c1}$ and $\bar{J}/\psi J/\psi$ molecules or/and their analogue $S_c S_c$, $A_c A_c$ and $V_c V_c$ tetraquarks. The peak at (6.8 – 6.9) GeV can be identified to the $\bar{\chi}_{c0} \chi_{c0}$ molecule or/and the $P_c P_c$ tetraquark state. Then, combining \mathcal{R} and DRSR we focus on the analysis of the four-quark nature of $T_{cc\bar{q}\bar{q}}$ 1^\pm and 0^\pm states. We show that combining \mathcal{R} and DRSR can provide more precise results: $M_{T_{cc}^{1^+}} = 3886(6)$ MeV and $M_{T_{cc}^{0^+}} = 3883(3)$ MeV. In a similar way, one obtain the improved mass predictions: $M_{T_{cc\bar{s}\bar{u}}^{1^+}} = 3931(7)$ MeV, $M_{T_{cc\bar{s}\bar{u}}^{0^+}} = 3983(7)$ MeV and $M_{T_{cc\bar{s}\bar{s}}^{0^+}} = 3993(11)$ MeV. From our estimates of the masses of the Pseudoscalar and Vector $T_{cc\bar{q}\bar{q}}$ states, we observe that the interpolating currents lead to two classes: Class H (Heavy) states with masses around 6 GeV and Class L (Light) states around (3.8 – 4.4) GeV where the pseudoscalar (resp. all vector states) are below the $\bar{D}D_0$, $\bar{D}_s D_{s0}$ (resp. $\bar{D}D_1$, $\bar{D}_s D_{s1}$) open charm thresholds. Finally, we extend the whole study to the bottom sector and confront our results with the ones from different LSR predictions and some other approaches (lattice, potential models, ...) in the literature.

Keywords: QCD Spectral Sum Rules, Perturbative and Non-perturbative QCD, Exotic hadrons, Masses and Decay constants.

1. Introduction

In this talk, we summarize the results of our original works [1–3].

Motivated by the LHCb-group discovery of exotic states around (6.2 – 6.9) GeV from the J/ψ -pair invariant

mass spectrum [4] and at 3875 MeV from the $D^0 D^0 \pi^+$ mass distribution [5] as we can see in Figs. 1 and 2, we use the inverse Laplace transform sum rules (LSR) [6–11] and its ratios \mathcal{R} to improve the existing QCD spectral sum rules (QSSR) ² estimates of the masses and couplings of the scalar $(\bar{Q}Q)(\bar{Q}Q)^3$ molecules and $(\bar{Q}Q)(QQ)$ tetraquarks states. Then, to interpret the peak at 3875 MeV (Fig. 2) which is a good candidate for $(I)J^P = (0)1^+$ state, we redo the analysis of the masses and couplings of $T_{QQ\bar{q}\bar{q}}$ by combining the direct

[☆]Talk given at QCD23 International Conference (10–14 July 2023, Montpellier–FR)

Email addresses: raphael.albuquerque@uerj.br (R. M. Albuquerque), snarison@yahoo.fr (S. Narison), achrissrab@gmail.com (A. Rabemananjara), rd.bidds@gmail.com (D. Rabetiarivony)

¹Speaker

²For reviews, see [12–23]

³ $Q \equiv c, b$

mass determinations from the ratios \mathcal{R} with the ratio of masses from the double ratio of sum rules (DRSR).




Figure 1: Invariant mass spectrum of J/ψ -pair candidate. Data (resp. background regions) in black (resp. blue) signal.




Figure 2: Distribution of $D^0 D^0 \pi^+$ mass.

2. The Laplace sum rule

We shall work with the finite energy version of the QCD inverse Laplace sum rules and their ratios:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_n^Q |_{\mathcal{H}}(\tau, \mu) &= \int_0^{\tau} dt t^n e^{-t\tau} \frac{1}{\pi} \text{Im} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}}^{(1,0)}(t, \mu); \\ \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{H}}^c(\tau) &= \frac{\mathcal{L}_{n+1}^Q |_{\mathcal{H}}}{\mathcal{L}_n^Q |_{\mathcal{H}}}, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $t_0 = 2M_Q + m_q + m_{q'}$ is the hadronic threshold, M_Q ($Q \equiv c, b$) and $m_q, m_{q'}$ ($q, q' \equiv u, d, s$) are respectively the heavy and light quarks masses (we shall neglect the u, d quark masses), τ is the LSR variable, $n = 0, \dots$ is the degree of moments and t_c is the "QCD continuum" threshold.

From the ratio of LSR, one can extract the mass squared at the optimization point τ_0 :

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{H}}^c(\tau_0) = M_{\mathcal{H}}^2. \quad (2)$$

We shall also work with the double ratio of sum rules (DRSR) [24]:

$$r_{\mathcal{H}'/\mathcal{H}}(\tau_0) \equiv \sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{H}'}^c}{\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{H}}^c}} = \frac{M_{\mathcal{H}'}}{M_{\mathcal{H}}}, \quad (3)$$

which can be free from systematics provided that $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{H}'}$ and $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{H}}$ optimize at the same values of τ and of t_c :

$$\tau_{0|\mathcal{H}} \simeq \tau_{0|\mathcal{H}'}, \quad t_{c|\mathcal{H}} \simeq t_{c|\mathcal{H}'}. \quad (4)$$

The spectral function $\text{Im} \Pi_{\mathcal{H}}^{(1,0)}(t, \mu)$ associated to the spin 1 and 0 interpolating operators can be evaluated from the two-point correlator:

$$\Pi_{\mathcal{H}}^{(1,0)}(q^2) = i \int d^4 x e^{-iqx} \langle 0 | \mathcal{T} O_{\mathcal{H}}^{(1,0)}(x) (O_{\mathcal{H}}^{(1,0)}(x))^\dagger | 0 \rangle, \quad (5)$$

where $O_{\mathcal{H}}^{(1,0)}(x)$ are the interpolating currents describing the four-quark states.

The QCD expressions of the leading order (LO) spectral functions up to dimension 6 condensates, details about the FNLO PT corrections and the different QCD input parameters are given in Ref. [14, 21, 25–27].

3. Optimization criteria

In our previous works [28–42], we have used the minimum sensitivity of the observables versus the variation of the external variables τ , t_c and μ to extract the optimal masses and couplings from the analysis.

- **τ -stability:** The optimal result is obtained around a minimum or inflexion point. These optimal values of τ are equivalent to the so-called plateau used in the literature using the Borel $M^2 \equiv 1/\tau$ variable. At this τ -stability region, one can check the lowest ground state dominance of the LSR and the convergence of the OPE.

- **t_c -stability:** One expects it to be around the mass of the first radial excitation. To be conservative, we take t_c from the beginning of τ -stability until the t_c -stability starts to be reached. The t_c -stability region corresponds to a complete dominance of the lowest ground state in the QSSR.

- **μ -stability:** This is used to fix in a rigorous optimal way, the arbitrary subtraction constant appearing in the PT calculation of the Wilson coefficients and in the QCD input renormalized parameters. From our previous works, we have observed that the value of μ -stability is (almost) universal for the different heavy-light four-quark states:

$$\mu_c = (4.65 \pm 0.05) \text{ GeV}; \quad \mu_b = (5.20 \pm 0.05) \text{ GeV}, \quad (6)$$

respectively for the charm and bottom channels.

• We shall also request that the Pole (P) contribution (resonance) to the spectral integral is larger than the QCD continuum (C) one:

$$R_{P/C} \equiv \frac{\int_{t_0}^{t_c} dt e^{-t\tau} \text{Im}\Pi(t)}{\int_{t_c}^{\infty} dt e^{-t\tau} \text{Im}\Pi(t)} \geq 1. \quad (7)$$

This condition is necessary to better restrict the conservative region of (τ, t_c) .

4. The $(\bar{Q}Q)(\bar{Q}Q)$ molecules and $(\bar{Q}\bar{Q})(QQ)$ tetraquarks states

We shall study the charm channels and their beauty analogue. As the shape of the different curves are similar, we shall illustrate it in the case of $\bar{\chi}_{c0}\chi_{c0}$. The final and conservative results are compiled in Table 4.

4.1. Interpolating currents

We shall be concerned with the scalar interpolating currents.

Table 1: Interpolating currents with a definite C-parity describing the molecules and tetraquarks states. $Q, q \equiv c, b$

Scalar States (0^{++})	Currents ($O_{\mu}^{(0)}$)
Molecules	
$\bar{\chi}_{q0}\chi_{q0}$	$(\bar{Q}Q)(\bar{Q}Q)$
$\bar{\eta}_q\eta_q$	$(\bar{Q}\gamma_5 Q)(\bar{Q}\gamma_5 Q)$
$\bar{J}/\psi J/\psi, \bar{\nu}\nu$	$(\bar{Q}\gamma_{\mu} Q)(\bar{Q}\gamma^{\mu} Q)$
$\bar{\chi}_{q1}\chi_{q1}$	$(\bar{Q}\gamma_{\mu}\gamma_5 Q)(\bar{Q}\gamma^{\mu}\gamma_5 Q)$
Tetraquarks	
$\bar{P}_q P_q$	$(Q_a^i C Q_b)(\bar{Q}_a C \bar{Q}_b^i)$
$\bar{S}_q S_q$	$(Q_a^i C\gamma_5 Q_b)(\bar{Q}_a\gamma_5 C \bar{Q}_b^i)$
$\bar{A}_q A_q$	$(Q_a^i C\gamma_{\mu} Q_b)(\bar{Q}_a\gamma^{\mu} C \bar{Q}_b^i)$
$\bar{V}_q V_q$	$(Q_a^i C\gamma_{\mu}\gamma_5 Q_b)(\bar{Q}_a\gamma^{\mu}\gamma_5 C \bar{Q}_b^i)$

4.2. $\bar{\chi}_{c0}\chi_{c0}$ molecule state

We study the behavior of the coupling and mass in term of the LSR variable τ for different values of t_c at NLO as shown in Fig. 3. We consider as final results the mean of the value corresponding to the beginning of τ stability for $[t_c(\text{GeV}), \tau(\text{GeV}^{-2})] \simeq [55, 0.36]$ and the one where the t_c stability starts to be reached for $[t_c(\text{GeV}), \tau(\text{GeV}^{-2})] \simeq [70, 0.38]$ from which we deduce:

$$M_{\chi_{c0}\chi_{c0}} = 6675(98) \text{ MeV}, \quad f_{\chi_{c0}\chi_{c0}} = 69(21) \text{ keV}. \quad (8)$$




Figure 3: The coupling $f_{\chi_{c0}\chi_{c0}}$ and mass $M_{\chi_{c0}\chi_{c0}}$ as a function of τ at NLO for # values of t_c and for $\mu=4.5$ GeV.

5. $T_{QQ\bar{q}\bar{q}'}$ states

We extend the study to the case of the (pseudo)scalar and (axial-)vector $T_{QQ\bar{q}\bar{q}'}$ tetraquarks states using the ratios \mathcal{R} of LSR and the double ratio DRSR. We do not consider the molecule assignment of the $T_{QQ\bar{q}\bar{q}'}$ states as the method cannot disentangle the molecule from the tetraquark states. As the analysis will be performed using the same techniques, we shall illustrate it in the case of $1^+ T_{cc\bar{u}\bar{d}}$. The final results are compiled in Tables 5, 6 and 7.

5.1. Interpolating currents

We shall be concerned with the interpolating currents in Table 2. We have also re-analyzed the results of Ref. [43] using the currents in Table 3.

5.2. $T_{cc\bar{u}\bar{d}}$ or $T_{cc}(1^+)$ state from LSR at NLO

The τ and t_c behavior of the mass and coupling are shown in Fig. 4. The optimal results are obtained for the set: $(\tau, t_c) = (0.31, 30)$ to $(0.34, 46)$ ($\text{GeV}^{-2}, \text{GeV}^2$) from which we deduce:

$$M_{T_{cc}^{1^+}} = 3885(123) \text{ MeV}, \quad f_{T_{cc}^{1^+}} = 491(48) \text{ keV}. \quad (9)$$




Figure 4: $f_{T_{cc}(1^+)}$ and $M_{T_{cc}(1^+)}$ as a function of τ at NLO for # values of t_c and for $\mu=4.65$ GeV.

5.3. $T_{cc}(1^+)$ state from DRSR

The optimal result is obtained for the set: $(\tau, t_c) = (0.31, 30)$ to $(0.34, 46)$ ($\text{GeV}^{-2}, \text{GeV}^2$) (Fig. 5) from which we deduce:

$$r_{T_{cc}^{1^+}/X_c} = 1.0035(10) \Rightarrow M_{T_{cc}^{1^+}} = 3886(4) \text{ MeV}, \quad (10)$$

where we have used the experimental mass of the $X_c(3872)$ [44].




Figure 5: Ratio of masses $r_{T_{cc}^{1^+}/X_c}$ as a function of τ at NLO for # values of t_c and for $\mu=4.65$ GeV.

◇ Final value of $M_{T_{cc}^{1^+}}$ from LSR⊕DRSR

As a final value of $M_{T_{cc}^{1^+}}$, we take the mean of the previous two determinations:

$$M_{T_{cc}^{1^+}} = 3886(4) \text{ MeV}. \quad (11)$$

This estimation is comparable with the LHCb data $T_{cc}(1^+) = 3875$ MeV which is slightly above the D^*D threshold of 3877 MeV.

6. Summary

We have presented improved predictions of QSSR for the masses and couplings of $J^{PC} = 0^{++}$ fully heavy molecules and tetraquarks states using LSR at NLO of PT series and including non-perturbative contribution condensates up to dimension $d \leq 6$. We have also improved the existing QSSR results of (pseudo)scalar and (axial-)vector $T_{QQ\bar{q}\bar{q}'}$ states by combining the direct mass determinations from the ratios \mathcal{R} of LSR with the ratio of masses from DRSR. Our analysis has been done within stability criteria with respect to the LSR variable τ , the QCD continuum threshold t_c and the subtraction constant μ . To better restrict the stability region of (τ, t_c) , we have also requested that the Pole contribution is larger than the QCD continuum ($R_{P/C} \geq 1$).

– From the previous analysis, we can conclude that the broad structure around $(6.2 \sim 6.7)$ GeV might be explained by the $\bar{\eta}_c\eta_c$, $\bar{\chi}_{c1}\chi_{c1}$ and $\bar{J}/\psi J/\psi$ molecules or/and their analogue S_cS_c , A_cA_c and V_cV_c tetraquarks. The narrow structure at 6.9 GeV can be identified with a $\bar{\chi}_{c0}\chi_{c0}$ molecule or P_cP_c tetraquark.

– The $\bar{\chi}_{c1}\chi_{c1}$ mass is below the $\chi_{c1}\chi_{c1}$ threshold, while all of the predicted masses of the beauty state are above the $\eta_b\eta_b$ and $\Upsilon(1S)\Upsilon(1S)$ thresholds.

– Our predictions for the X_c and Z_c states can reproduce quite well the observed masses of the $X_c(3872)$ and $Z_c(3900)$. However, as mentioned above and in [2], our method cannot distinguish the molecule and four-quark nature of a state. At the present stage, we can only provide a description of these states as *Tetramole* (\mathcal{T}).

– Comparing our results with different QSSR predictions in the literature, one can conclude that within the errors, there are (almost) good agreement among different determinations. Most of the approaches predict the scalar and axial $T_{ccq\bar{q}'}$ states to be above the hadronic thresholds while the $T_{bbq\bar{q}'}$ is expected to be below the physical thresholds.

– Confronted to different approaches in the literature (lattice calculations [51–54], light front holographic [55], quark and potential models ⊕ heavy quark symmetry [56–64]) one can also notice that our LSR⊕DRSR predictions are (almost) in agreement (within the errors). The 0^+ and 1^+ T_{cc} states is expected to be above the physical threshold while the T_{bb} ones are grouped around the threshold.

– Our different predictions for 0^+ and 1^+ states from LSR⊕DRSR are clustered in the range -250 to $+150$ MeV of the physical thresholds.

– From our results for the masses, we can divide the pseudoscalar and vector states into two classes: The Heavy (Class H) and Light (Class L) states. The masses

of the Class H $T_{cc\bar{q}\bar{q}'}$ (resp. $T_{bb\bar{q}\bar{q}'}$) states are around 6 (resp. 13) GeV which are about 2 GeV higher than the ones of their axial and scalar partners. This findings goes in line with our previous predictions for XYZ states [31, 38, 40, 41]. For the Class L states the masses of the charm channels are around (3.8 \sim 4.4) GeV, while for the bottom ones they are about 10.4 GeV and all of them are below the open beauty thresholds.

Due to space limitation, we did not include in this paper some results like the first radial excitations ones, ... For more details, refer to the original works [1–3].

References

- [1] R. M. Albuquerque et al., *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 094001 (2020).
- [2] R. M. Albuquerque, S. Narison and D. Rabetiarivony, *Nucl. Phys. A* **1023**, 122451 (2022).
- [3] R. M. Albuquerque, S. Narison and D. Rabetiarivony, *Nucl. Phys. A* **1034**, 122637 (2023).
- [4] [LHCb Collaboration] R. Aaij et al., *Science Bulletin* 65 (2020) 1983-1993.
- [5] R. Aaij et al. (LHCb Collaboration), *Nature Communications* **13**, (2022) 3351.
- [6] J.S. Bell and R.A. Bertlmann, *Nucl. Phys.* **B177** (1981) 218.
- [7] J.S. Bell and R.A. Bertlmann, *Nucl. Phys.* **B187** (1981) 285.
- [8] C. Becchi et al., *Z. Phys.* **C 8**, 335 (1981).
- [9] R.A. Bertlmann, *Acta Phys. Austriaca* **53**, 305 (1981) and references therein.
- [10] R.A. Bertlmann and H. Neufeld, *Z. Phys.* **C 27** (1985) 437.
- [11] S. Narison and E. de Rafael, *Phys. Lett.* **B 522** (1986) 266.
- [12] M.A. Shifman, A.I. Vainshtein and V.I. Zakharov, *Nucl. Phys.* **B147** (1979) 385, 448.
- [13] V.I. Zakharov, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **14**, 4865 (1999).
- [14] S. Narison, *Nucl. Part. Phys. Proc.* **324-329**, (2023) 94-106.
- [15] S. Narison, *QCD as a theory of hadrons, Cambridge Monogr. Part. Phys. Nucl. Phys. Cosmol.* **17** (2002) 1; [hep-ph/0205006].
- [16] S. Narison, *QCD spectral sum rules*, *World Sci. Lect. Notes Phys.* **26** (1989) 1.
- [17] S. Narison, *Phys. Rept.* **84** (1982) 263; *Acta Phys. Pol.* **B 26** (1995) 687.
- [18] E. de Rafael, hep-ph/9802448.
- [19] F. J. Yndurain, *The Theory of Quark and Gluon Interactions*, 3rd ed. (Springer, New York, 1999).
- [20] P. Pascual and R. Tarrach, *QCD: Renormalization for Practitioner* (Springer, New York, 1985).
- [21] L. J. Reinders, H. Rubinstein, and S. Yazaki, *Phys. Rep.* 127, 1(1985).
- [22] B. L. Ioffe, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* 56, 232(2006).
- [23] H. G. Dosch, *Non-Perturbative Methods*, edited by S. Narison (World Scientific, Singapor, 1985).
- [24] S. Narison, *Phys. Lett.* **B 210** (1988) 238.
- [25] A. Pich and E. de Rafael, *Phys. Lett.* **B158** (1985) 477.
- [26] S. Narison and A. Pivovarov, *Phys. Lett.* **B 327** (1994) 341.
- [27] K. Hagiwara, S. Narison and D. Namura, *Phys. Lett.* **B540** (2002) 233.
- [28] S. Li, S. Narison, T. Steele, D. Rabetiarivony, arXiv: 2309.01773.
- [29] R. M. Albuquerque, S. Narison and D. Rabetiarivony, *Nucl. Phys. A* **1039** (2023) 122743.
- [30] R. M. Albuquerque, S. Narison and D. Rabetiarivony, *Nucl. Phys. A* **1034** (2023) 122637.
- [31] R. M. Albuquerque, S. Narison and D. Rabetiarivony, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 074015 (2021); *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 114035 (2022).
- [32] S. Narison and D. Rabetiarivony, *Nucl. Part. Phys. Proc.* **324-329**, (2023) 54-58.
- [33] S. Narison and D. Rabetiarivony, *Nucl. Part. Phys. Proc.* **324-329**, (2023) 49-53.
- [34] S. Narison and D. Rabetiarivony, *Nucl. Part. Phys. Proc.* **318-323**, (2022) 96-101.
- [35] R. Albuquerque et al., *Nucl. Phys. A* **1007** (2021) 122113.
- [36] R. M. Albuquerque et al., *Nucl. Part. Phys. Proc.* **312-317**, (2021) 120-124.
- [37] R. M. Albuquerque et al., *Nucl. Part. Phys. Proc.* **300-302**, (2018) 186-195.
- [38] R. Albuquerque et al., *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **33** (2018), 1850082.
- [39] R. M. Albuquerque et al., *Nucl. Part. Phys. Proc.* **282-284**, (2017) 83.
- [40] R. Albuquerque et al., *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **31** (2016) no.17, 1650093.
- [41] R. Albuquerque et al., *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **31** (2016) no. 36, 1650196.
- [42] R. Albuquerque et al., *Phys. Lett.* **B 175**, (2012) 129.
- [43] M. L. Du, W. Chen, X. L. Chen, S. L. Zhu, *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 014003 (2013)
- [44] P.A. Zyla et al. (Particle Data Group), *Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys.* **2020**, 083C01 (2020).
- [45] R. M. Albuquerque et al., *J. Phys.* **G 46**, 093002 (2019).
- [46] J. M. Dias, S. Narison, F.S. Navarra, M. Nielsen and J.-M. Richard, *Phys. Lett.* **B 703** (2011) 274.
- [47] F. S. Navarra, M. Nielsen and S. H. Lee, *Phys. Lett.* **B 649** (2007) 166.
- [48] Z.-G. Wang and Z. H. Yan, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **78** (2018) 19; Z.-G. Wang, *Acta Phys. Pol.* **49** (2018) 1781.
- [49] M.-L. Du, W. Chen, X.-L. Chen and S. L. Zhu, *Phys. Rev. D* **87** (2013) 014003.
- [50] L. Tang, B.-D. Wan, K. Maltman and C.-F. Qiao, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020) 094032.
- [51] P. Junnarkar, N. Mathur, M. Padmanath, *Phys. Rev. D* **99(3)** (2019) 034507.
- [52] A. Francis, R.J. Hudspith, R. Lewis, K. Maltman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **118(14)** (2017) 142001.
- [53] P. Mohanta and S. Basak, *Phys. Rev. D* **102** (2020) 094516.
- [54] L. Leskovec, S. Meinel, M. Pflaumer and M. Wagner, *Phys. Rev. D* **100** (2019) 014503.
- [55] H.G. Dosch, S.J. Brodsky, G.F. de Téramond, M. Nielsen and L. Zou, *Nucl. Part. Phys. Proc.* **312-317** (2021) 135.
- [56] Q.Meng, E.Hiyama, A.Hosaka, M.Oka, P.Gubler, K.U.Can, T.T.Takahashi and H.S.Zong, *Phys. Lett.* **B 814**(2021)136095.
- [57] M. Karliner, J.L. Rosner, *Phys. Rev. D* **90 (9)** (2014) 094007.
- [58] E.J. Eichten, C. Quigg, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119 (20)** (2017) 202002.
- [59] E. Braaten, L.-P. He and A. Mohapatra, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **D 103** (2021) 016001.
- [60] J.-B. Cheng, S.-Y. Li, Y.-R. Liu, Z. G. Si, T. Yao, *Chin. Phys. C* **45** (2021) 043102.
- [61] E. Hernandez, J. Vijande, A. Valcarce and J.-M. Richard, *Phys. Lett.* **B 800** (2020) 135073.
- [62] X.-Z. Weng, W.-Z. Deng and S.-L. Zhu, arXiv: 2108.07242 [hep-ph].
- [63] Y. Wu, X. Jin, R. Liu, H. Huang and J. Ping, arXiv: 2112.05967 (2021).
- [64] P. Bicudo, K. Cichy, A. Peters, and M. Wagner, *Phys. Rev. D* **93** (2016) 034501.

Table 2: Interpolating operators describing the ZXT states where $b = 0$ is the optimized mixing parameter [31].

States	$I(J^P)$	$\bar{3}_c \bar{3}_c$ Four-quark Currents
Z_c	(1^+)	$O_{\Lambda_{cq}} = \epsilon_{ijk} \epsilon_{mnk} [(q_i^T C \gamma_5 c_j) (\bar{q}'_m \gamma_\mu C \bar{c}'_n) + b, (q_i^T C c_j) (\bar{q}'_m \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 C \bar{c}'_n)]$ $O_{D_q^* D_q} = (\bar{c} \gamma_\mu q) (\bar{q}' \gamma_5 c)$
X_c	(1^+)	$O_X^3 = \epsilon_{ijk} \epsilon_{mnk} [(q_i^T C \gamma_5 c_j) (\bar{c}_m \gamma^\mu C \bar{q}'_n) + (q_i^T C \gamma^\mu c_j) (\bar{c}_m \gamma_5 C \bar{q}'_n)]$ $O_X^6 = \epsilon_{ijk} \epsilon_{mnk} [(q_i^T C \gamma_5 \lambda_{ij}^a c_j) (\bar{c}_m \gamma^\mu C \lambda_{mn}^a \bar{q}'_n) + (q_i^T C \gamma^\mu \lambda_{ij}^a c_j) (\bar{c}_m \gamma_5 C \lambda_{mn}^a \bar{q}'_n)]$ $O_{D_q^* D_q} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} [(\bar{q} \gamma_5 c) (\bar{c} \gamma_\mu q) - (\bar{q} \gamma_\mu c) (\bar{c} \gamma_5 q)]$ $O_{\psi\pi} = (\bar{c} \gamma_\mu \lambda^a c) (\bar{q} \gamma_5 \lambda^a q)$
$T_{cc\bar{u}\bar{d}}$	$0(1^+)$	$O_T^{1+} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \epsilon_{ijk} \epsilon_{mnk} (c_i^T C \gamma^\mu c_j) [(\bar{u}_m \gamma_5 C \bar{d}'_n) - (\bar{d}_m \gamma_5 C \bar{u}'_n)]$
$T_{cc\bar{u}\bar{s}}$	$\frac{1}{2}(1^+)$	$O_{T_{us}^{1+}} = \epsilon_{ijk} \epsilon_{mnk} (c_i C \gamma^\mu c_j^T) (\bar{u}_m \gamma_5 C \bar{s}'_n)$
$T_{cc\bar{u}\bar{d}}$	$1(0^+)$	$O_T^{0+} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \epsilon_{ijk} \epsilon_{mnk} (c_i^T C \gamma^\mu c_j) [(\bar{u}_m \gamma_\mu C \bar{d}'_n) + (\bar{d}_m \gamma_\mu C \bar{u}'_n)]$
$T_{cc\bar{u}\bar{s}}$	$\frac{1}{2}(0^+)$	$O_{T_{us}^{0+}} = \epsilon_{ijk} \epsilon_{mnk} (c_i C \gamma_\mu c_j^T) (\bar{u}_m \gamma^\mu C \bar{s}'_n)$
$T_{cc\bar{s}\bar{s}}$	$0(0^+)$	$O_T^{0+} = \epsilon_{ijk} \epsilon_{mnk} (c_i C \gamma_\mu c_j^T) (\bar{s}_m \gamma^\mu C \bar{s}'_n)$
$T_{cc\bar{u}\bar{d}}$	(0^-)	$O_{T_{ud}^{0-}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \epsilon_{ijk} \epsilon_{mnk} (c_i^T C \gamma^\mu c_j) [(\bar{u}_m \gamma_5 \gamma_\mu C \bar{d}'_n) - (\bar{d}_m \gamma_5 \gamma_\mu C \bar{u}'_n)]$
$T_{cc\bar{u}\bar{s}}$	(0^-)	$O_{T_{us}^{0-}} = \epsilon_{ijk} \epsilon_{mnk} (c_i C \gamma_\mu c_j^T) (\bar{u}_m \gamma_5 \gamma^\mu C \bar{s}'_n)$
$T_{cc\bar{u}\bar{d}}$	(1^-)	$O_{T_{ud}^{1-}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \epsilon_{ijk} \epsilon_{mnk} (c_i^T C \gamma^\mu c_j) [(\bar{u}_m C \bar{d}'_n) - (\bar{d}_m C \bar{u}'_n)]$
$T_{cc\bar{u}\bar{s}}$	(1^-)	$O_{T_{us}^{1-}} = \epsilon_{ijk} \epsilon_{mnk} (c_i C \gamma^\mu c_j^T) (\bar{u}_m C \bar{s}'_n)$

Table 3: Interpolating operators describing the $T_{cc\bar{q}\bar{q}'}$ -like states used in Ref. [43].

States	Four-quark Currents	Light quarks q
<i>Pseudoscalar</i> 0^-		
$T_{cc\bar{q}\bar{q}}$	$\eta_1 = (c_a^T C c_b) [(\bar{q}_a \gamma_5 C \bar{q}'_b) + (\bar{q}_b \gamma_5 C \bar{q}'_a)]$	u, d, s
$T_{cc\bar{q}\bar{q}}$	$\eta_2 = (c_a^T C \gamma_5 c_b) [(\bar{q}_a C \bar{q}'_b) + (\bar{q}_b C \bar{q}'_a)]$	u, d, s
$T_{cc\bar{q}\bar{u}}$	$\eta_4 = (c_a^T C \gamma_\mu c_b) [(\bar{u}_a \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 C \bar{q}'_b) - (\bar{u}_b \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 C \bar{q}'_a)]$	d, s
$T_{cc\bar{q}\bar{u}}$	$\eta_5 = (c_a^T C \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 c_b) [(\bar{u}_a \gamma^\mu C \bar{q}'_b) + (\bar{u}_b \gamma^\mu C \bar{q}'_a)]$	d, s
<i>Vector</i> 1^-		
$T_{cc\bar{q}\bar{q}}$	$\eta_1 = (c_a^T C \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 c_b) [(\bar{q}_a \gamma_5 C \bar{q}'_b) + (\bar{q}_b \gamma_5 C \bar{q}'_a)]$	u, d, s
$T_{cc\bar{q}\bar{q}}$	$\eta_2 = (c_a^T C \gamma_5 c_b) [(\bar{q}_a \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 C \bar{q}'_b) + (\bar{q}_b \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 C \bar{q}'_a)]$	u, d, s
$T_{cc\bar{u}\bar{q}}$	$\eta_5 = (c_a^T C \gamma^\mu c_b) [(\bar{u}_a C \bar{q}'_b) - (\bar{u}_b C \bar{q}'_a)]$	d, s
$T_{cc\bar{u}\bar{q}}$	$\eta_6 = (c_a^T C c_b) [(\bar{u}_a \gamma^\mu C \bar{q}'_b) + (\bar{u}_b \gamma^\mu C \bar{q}'_a)]$	d, s

Table 4: Scalar fully heavy molecules/tetraquarks couplings and masses predictions from LSR at NLO. $|\Delta\mu| = 0.20$ (resp. 0.25) for the charm (resp. beauty) case. $|\Delta\tau| = 0.02 \text{ GeV}^{-2}$. In the case of asymmetric errors, we take the mean value.

Observables	Δt_c		$\Delta\tau$		$\Delta\mu$		Δm		$\Delta\alpha_s$		$\Delta\alpha_s G^2$		$\Delta G^3 - OPE$		$\Delta HO - PT$		Values		
	c	b	c	b	c	b	c	b	c	b	c	b	c	b	c	b	c	b	
$f_{M\mathcal{T}}$ [keV]																			
0^{++} Molecule																			
$\bar{\chi}_{q0}\chi_{q0}$	2.80	0.01	0.40	0.10	2.50	0.10	3.70	0.50	3.50	0.70	1.20	0.10	11.5	0.60	16.0	0.20	69±21	4.0±1.1	
$\bar{\eta}_q\eta_q$	0.80	0.40	0.20	0.10	3.0	0.20	10.0	1.20	5.0	2.0	0.70	0.10	12.2	0.80	0.90	0.20	56±17	9.8±2.4	
$\bar{J}\psi J\psi, \bar{\Upsilon}\Upsilon$	4.60	0.60	1.0	0.60	2.0	0.10	10.7	4.30	19.0	2.50	3.40	0.40	45.6	3.80	0.40	0.0	160±51	23.4±6.3	
$\bar{\chi}_{q1}\chi_{q1}$	0.90	1.60	1.10	0.90	0.90	0.20	6.0	3.0	9.0	4.80	10.0	0.0	4.0	3.0	5.0	19.0	162±16	48.9±20.1	
0^{++} Tetraquark																			
Table 1																			
$\bar{P}_q P_q$	1.40	1.80	0.40	2.30	3.40	0.50	7.20	1.0	3.50	1.0	1.30	0.10	8.90	3.50	4.80	1.20	60±14	6.5±4.9	
$\bar{S}_q S_q$	0.10	0.10	0.70	0.20	9.0	2.30	20.0	2.30	9.0	3.70	0.30	0.10	7.0	9.0	87.0	0.10	249±90	29.6±10.2	
$\bar{A}_q A_q$	1.40	4.10	1.0	7.20	1.50	3.40	19.2	4.0	8.80	6.40	0.40	0.0	10.0	2.80	65.0	27.0	220±69	87.4±29.5	
$\bar{V}_q V_q$	5.20	0.40	1.0	0.30	6.50	0.30	11.8	1.50	5.40	2.40	1.90	0.20	9.0	0.30	0.90	0.10	102±18	17.2±2.9	
Eq. 3																			
$\bar{A}_q A_q$	3.0	3.6	1.5	2.0	4.8	2.0	37.5	7.70	17.6	12.3	0.80	0.10	12.0	7.0	108	72.0	448±117	136±74	
$M_{M\mathcal{T}}$ [MeV]																			
0^{++} Molecule																			
$\bar{\chi}_{q0}\chi_{q0}$	11	39	8.0	28	10	24	47	36	19	18	29	13	76	112	9.0	8.0	6675±98	19653±131	
$\bar{\eta}_q\eta_q$	23	4.0	3.0	15	23	26	51	29	24	49	14	13	186	58	3.8	1.6	6029±198	19259±88	
$\bar{J}\psi J\psi, \bar{\Upsilon}\Upsilon$	34	31	11	42	24	27	27	52	49	30	31	22	359	116	1.3	0.0	6376±367	19430±145	
$\bar{\chi}_{q1}\chi_{q1}$	26	4.0	29	99	20	22	42	25	20	43	5.0	22	16	73	7.0	6.0	6494±66	19770±137	
0^{++} Tetraquark																			
Table 1																			
$\bar{P}_q P_q$	34	10	19	40	23	24	46	28	20	46	30	22	258	23	22	5.0	6795±268	19754±79	
$\bar{S}_q S_q$	12	1.0	28	38	21	26	54	29	43	59	1.0	2.0	25	89	9.0	9.0	6411±83	19217±120	
$\bar{A}_q A_q$	26	37	32	132	20	23	43	25	21	43	2.0	1.0	38	53	0.0	10	6450±75	19872±156	
$\bar{V}_q V_q$	59	27	10	22	26	4.0	47	29	25	50	21	15	152	39	1.0	0.10	6462±175	19489±79	
Eq. 3																			
$\bar{A}_q A_q$	4.0	21	3.0	95	21	25	43	27	21	47	2.0	0.0	39	30	16	2.0	6471±67	19717±118	

Table 5: Summary of the results of the XZT states masses in units of MeV obtained from LSR and DRSR. Our final values are in the column “LSR \oplus DRSR” which are the mean from LSR with the ones deduced from DRSR.

States	J^P	Decay	Thresholds	Mass			ΔE_B
				Data	Config.	LSR \oplus DRSR	
Z_c	1^+	$D^0 D^{*+}$	3876	3900	$D^* D$	3912(61) [31]	
					$\bar{3}_c 3_c$	3889(58)[31]	
Z_b	1^+	$\bar{B}^0 B^{*+}$	10605		\mathcal{T}_{Z_c}	3900(42) [31]	+24(42)
					\mathcal{T}_{Z_b}	10579(99)[31]	-26(99)
X_c	1^+	$\bar{D}^0 D^{*+}$	3876	3872	$\bar{3}_c 3_c$	3876(76)	
					$\bar{6}_c 6_c$		
X_b	1^+	$\bar{B}^0 B^{*+}$	10605		$\psi\pi$	3864(76)	+0(44)
					$D^* D$	3889(76)	-60(131)
$T_{cc\bar{u}\bar{d}}$	1^+	$\bar{D}^0 D^{*+}$	3876	3875	$\bar{3}_c 3_c$	3885(74)	3886(4)
$T_{cc\bar{u}\bar{s}}$	1^+	$D_s^0 D^*$	3975	–		3940(89)	3931(7)
$T_{cc\bar{q}\bar{q}}$	0^+	$\bar{D}^0 D^0$	3730	–		3882(81)	3883(3)
$T_{cc\bar{u}\bar{s}}$	0^+	$D_s^0 D$	3833	–		3936(90)	3927(6)
$T_{cc\bar{s}\bar{s}}$	0^+	$D_s^+ D_s^-$	3937	–		4063(72)	3993(11)
$T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{d}}$	1^+	$\bar{B}^0 B^{*+}$	10605	–		10441(147)	10501(98)
$T_{bb\bar{u}\bar{s}}$	1^+	$B_s^0 B^{*+}$	10692	–		10476(154)	10521(83)
$T_{bb\bar{q}\bar{q}}$	0^+	$\bar{B}^0 B^0$	10559	–		10419(146)	10484(63)
$T_{bb\bar{d}\bar{s}}$	0^+	$B_s^0 B^0$	10646	–		10454(153)	10511(58)
$T_{bb\bar{s}\bar{s}}$	0^+	$\bar{B}_s^0 B_s^0$	10734	–		10538(129)	10567(57)

Table 6: $T_{cc\bar{q}q'}$ Predictions of the couplings [keV] and masses [MeV] compared with the ones in Ref. [43].

States	Current	Our Work					Ref. [43]		
		t_c [GeV ²]	τ [GeV ⁻²]	$f_{T_{cc\bar{q}q'}}^{NLO}$	τ [GeV ⁻²]	$M_{T_{cc\bar{q}q'}}^{NLO}$	t_c	τ [GeV ⁻²]	$M_{T_{cc\bar{q}q'}}^{LO}$
Class H									
0⁻									
$T_{cc\bar{u}d}$	$O_{T_1}^{0-}, \eta_4$	50 → 60	0.12 → 0.18	1559(133)	0.16 → 0.18	6303(123)	22	0.29 → 0.37	4430(130)
$T_{cc\bar{d}d}$	η_2	48 → 60	0.14 → 0.18	1348(165)	0.16 → 0.18	6267(148)			–
$T_{cc\bar{u}s}$	$O_{T_{us}^{0-}}, \eta_4$	44 → 58	0.16 → 0.20	983(147)	0.15 → 0.20	6102(172)			–
$T_{cc\bar{s}s}$	η_2	42 → 58	0.16 → 0.22	1164(168)	0.18 → 0.22	5946(180)			–
1⁻									
$T_{cc\bar{u}d}$	$O_{T_1}^{1-}, \eta_5$	46 → 60	0.14 → 0.18	841(117)	0.15 → 0.18	6212(172)			–
$T_{cc\bar{d}d}$	η_2	48 → 60	0.13 → 0.16	1165(107)	0.14 → 0.16	6362(140)			–
$T_{cc\bar{u}s}$	$O_{T_{us}^{1-}}, \eta_5$	44 → 58	0.16 → 0.20	558(76)	0.17 → 0.20	6064(167)			–
$T_{cc\bar{s}s}$	η_2	46 → 58	0.15 → 0.20	1085(109)	0.17 → 0.20	6110(154)			–
Class L									
0⁻									
$T_{cc\bar{u}d}$	η_5	24 → 36	0.32 → 0.45	289(42)	0.41 → 0.47	4380(128)	23	0.27 → 0.40	4410(140)
$T_{cc\bar{d}d}$	η_1	24 → 36	0.25 → 0.35	402(45)	0.25 → 0.35	3965(76)	24	0.26 → 0.33	4430(120)
$T_{cc\bar{u}s}$	η_5	24 → 36	0.50 → 0.56	236(51)	0.50 → 0.56	4251(127)	24	0.24 → 0.39	4500(160)
$T_{cc\bar{s}s}$	η_1	24 → 36	0.25 → 0.36	322(42)	0.25 → 0.36	4096(96)	25	0.25 → 0.36	4460(130)
1⁻									
$T_{cc\bar{u}d}$	η_6	26 → 40	0.22 → 0.31	293(51)	0.22 → 0.31	4113(108)	23	0.27 → 0.32	4340(160)
$T_{cc\bar{d}d}$	η_1	26 → 40	0.23 → 0.32	380(39)	0.23 → 0.32	4170(110)	23	0.28 → 0.33	4350(140)
$T_{cc\bar{u}s}$	η_6	26 → 40	0.23 → 0.32	262(29)	0.23 → 0.32	4157(100)	23	0.27 → 0.35	4350(160)
$T_{cc\bar{s}s}$	η_1	26 → 40	0.26 → 0.35	289(37)	0.26 → 0.35	4210(103)	24	0.27 → 0.36	4470(130)

Table 7: $T_{bb\bar{q}q'}$ predictions of the couplings [keV] and masses [MeV] compared with the ones in Ref. [43].

States	Current	Our Work					Ref. [43]		
		t_c [GeV ²]	τ [GeV ⁻²]	$f_{T_{bb\bar{q}q'}}^{NLO}$	τ [GeV ⁻²]	$M_{T_{bb\bar{q}q'}}^{NLO}$	t_c	τ [GeV ⁻²]	$M_{T_{bb\bar{q}q'}}^{LO}$
Class H									
0⁻									
$T_{bb\bar{u}d}$	$O_{T_{ud}^{0-}}, \eta_4$	185 → 230	0.060 → 0.075	424(108)	0.060 → 0.075	13100(278)	–		?
$T_{bb\bar{u}d}$	η_5	180 → 220	0.080 → 0.090	165(31)	0.080 → 0.095	12730(207)	115	0.13 → 0.14	10300(300)
$T_{bb\bar{d}d}$	η_2	185 → 230	0.060 → 0.080	373(90)	0.065 → 0.080	13039(258)			–
$T_{bb\bar{u}s}$	$O_{T_{us}^{0-}}, \eta_4$	185 → 230	0.070 → 0.080	283(65)	0.070 → 0.080	13005(247)			–
$T_{bb\bar{u}s}$	η_5	175 → 210	0.085 → 0.090	144(40)	0.080 → 0.100	12553(252)	115	0.13 → 0.14	10400(200)
$T_{bb\bar{s}s}$	η_2	185 → 230	0.060 → 0.085	302(82)	0.080 → 0.085	12745(274)			–
1⁻									
$T_{bb\bar{u}d}$	$O_{T_{ud}^{1-}}, \eta_5$	190 → 230	0.065 → 0.080	246(59)	0.065 → 0.080	13053(262)			?
$T_{bb\bar{d}d}$	η_2	190 → 230	0.065 → 0.075	361(75)	0.065 → 0.075	13131(240)			–
$T_{bb\bar{u}s}$	$O_{T_{us}^{1-}}, \eta_5$	180 → 230	0.070 → 0.085	158(41)	0.070 → 0.085	12910(268)			–
$T_{bb\bar{s}s}$	η_2	180 → 230	0.075 → 0.090	294(69)	0.075 → 0.090	12834(246)			–
Class L									
0⁻									
$T_{bb\bar{d}d}$	η_1	130 → 160	0.120 → 0.160	14(2)	0.120 → 0.160	10407(124)	125	0.10 → 0.14	10600(300)
$T_{bb\bar{s}s}$	η_1	130 → 160	0.130 → 0.170	12(2)	0.130 → 0.170	10437(109)	125	0.10 → 0.15	10600(300)
1⁻									
$T_{bb\bar{u}d}$	η_6	130 → 160	0.110 → 0.150	11(2)	0.110 → 0.150	10469(110)	120	0.11 → 0.14	10400(200)
$T_{bb\bar{d}d}$	η_1	130 → 160	0.120 → 0.160	12(2)	0.120 → 0.160	10412(99)	125	0.11 → 0.14	10600(300)
$T_{bb\bar{u}s}$	η_6	130 → 160	0.120 → 0.160	10(2)	0.120 → 0.160	10438(97)	120	0.11 → 0.14	10400(200)
$T_{bb\bar{s}s}$	η_1	130 → 160	0.130 → 0.170	10(2)	0.130 → 0.170	10445(116)	125	0.10 → 0.15	10600(300)