

The doubly heavies: $\bar{Q}Q\bar{q}q$ and $QQ\bar{q}\bar{q}$ tetraquarks and QQq baryons

Marek Karliner^{1*}
 and
 Shmuel Nussinov^{1,2**}

¹Raymond and Beverly Sackler School of Physics and Astronomy
 Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel

²Institute for Quantum Studies
 Chapman University, Orange, CA 92866, USA

Abstract

Recent discoveries by Belle and BESIII of charged exotic quarkonium-like resonances provide fresh impetus for study of heavy exotic hadrons. In the limit $N_c \rightarrow \infty$, $M_Q \rightarrow \infty$ the $\bar{Q}Q\bar{q}q'$ tetraquarks (TQ-s) are expected to be narrow and slightly below or above the $\bar{Q}q'$ and $Q\bar{q}$ two-meson threshold. The isoscalar TQ-s manifest themselves by decay to $(\bar{Q}Q)\pi\pi$, and the ~ 30 MeV heavier charged isotriplet TQ-s by decays into $(\bar{Q}Q)\pi$. The new data strongly suggest that the real world with $N_c = 3$, $Q = c, b$ and $q, q' = u, d$ is qualitatively described by the above limit. We discuss the relevant theoretical estimates and suggest new signatures for TQ-s in light of the recent discoveries. We also consider “baryon-like” states $QQ'\bar{q}\bar{q}'$, which if found will be direct evidence not just for near-threshold binding of two heavy mesons, but for genuine tetraquarks with novel color networks. We stress the importance of experimental search for doubly-heavy baryons in this context.

*marek@proton.tau.ac.il

**nussinov@post.tau.ac.il

It has been realized early on that quark models and QCD sustain a much richer pattern of different multi-quark and/or color network configurations, beyond the “non-exotic” standard $\bar{q}q$ mesons and qqq baryons. Still, production rates of such particles are often suppressed and the light pions will in most cases allow rapid decays of the exotics into final states with pion(s) – turning them into very broad resonances. This explains why the vast majority of known hadrons [1] are just simple mesons and baryons. There is, however, growing evidence for the existence of exotic mesons containing both heavy and light quark-antiquark pairs – $\bar{c}c\bar{q}q$ [2] and as well as manifestly exotic $\bar{b}b\bar{d}u$ [3], [4] and most recently $\bar{c}c\bar{d}u$ [5].

In a recent article [6] S. Weinberg made prescient observations on $qq\bar{q}\bar{q}$ tetraquarks (TQ-s) in the large- N_c limit, correcting some statements in S. Coleman’s Erice Lectures [7]. Specifically, TQ-s can be created from the vacuum, as in lattice calculations [8], in two ways, via products of color-singlet $\bar{q}q$ bilinears:

$$|\mathcal{T}\rangle = [\bar{q}_1(x)\Gamma_{Iq_2}(x)] \cdot [\bar{q}_3(x)\Gamma_{Jq_4}(x)]|0\rangle \quad (1)$$

and the “crossed” $2 \Leftrightarrow 4$ version, with Γ indicating a Dirac algebra matrix. TQ-s with a specific value of isospin can be constructed by taking linear combinations of the $\{1, 2\}$ or $\{3, 4\}$ terms with their $\{2, 1\}$ or $\{4, 3\}$ permutation, respectively.

The rapid two-pion decay of $f_0(980)$ and $\eta\pi$ decay of $a_0(980)$ are avoided if, (as first suggested in a bag model context by Jaffe [9]), the latter are $\bar{s}s(\bar{u}u \pm \bar{d}d)$ TQ-s. The above decays are then slowed by Zweig’s rule, $1/N^2$ suppression of $\bar{s}s \rightarrow \bar{u}u/\bar{d}d$ transitions, and the “natural” decay channel $\bar{K}K$ is above 980 MeV.

These features stem from the fact that the strange quark is somewhat heavier than the light u and d quarks, making the $f_0(980)$ and $a_0(980)$ the harbingers of recent and likely future TQ-s, $\bar{Q}Q\bar{q}q$ with $Q = c, b$; $q = u, d$. Such systems have an additional relevant small parameter, namely $m_q/M_Q \sim 1/5$ and $\sim 1/15$, respectively. Rearrangement of $\bar{Q}Q\bar{q}q$ subsystems with subsequent decay into J/ψ (or Υ) and pion(s) is always allowed by kinematics, even when the TQ is lighter than the sum of the masses of the $\bar{Q}q + Q\bar{q}$ mesons, but such rearrangements are $1/N_c$ suppressed.

This suppression is the key to the relatively small width of the manifestly exotic charged resonances recently discovered in both $\bar{b}b$ by Belle [4] – and just a few days ago, the remarkable peak $Z_c(3900)$ at $3899.0 \pm 3.6 \pm 4.9$ MeV

with $\Gamma = 46 \pm 10 \pm 20$ MeV in $\bar{c}c$ system by BESIII [5].[†]

The relatively slow decay of these exotic resonances implies that the dominant configuration of the $\bar{Q}Q\bar{q}q$ four-body system is *not* that of a low-lying $\bar{Q}Q$ quarkonium and pion(s). The latter have a much lower energy than the respective two-meson thresholds $\bar{M}M^*$ and \bar{M}^*M^* , ($M = D, B$), but do readily fall apart into $(\bar{Q}Q)$ and pion(s) and would result in very large decay widths.

Instead, just like in the case of $f_0(980)$ and $a_0(980)$, we should view these systems as loosely bound states and/or near threshold resonances in the two heavy-meson system.

Such “molecular” states, $\bar{D}D^*$, etc., were introduced in Ref. [19]. They were later extensively discussed [20, 21] in analogy with the deuteron which binds via exchange of pions and other light mesons, and were referred to as “*deusons*”. The key observation is that the coupling to the heavy mesons of the light mesons exchanged (π, ρ , etc.) becomes universal and independent of M_Q for $M_Q \rightarrow \infty$, and so does the resulting potential in any given J^{CP} and isospin channel. In this limit the kinetic energy $\sim p^2/(M_Q)$ vanishes, and the two heavy mesons bind with a binding energy \sim the maximal depth of the attractive meson-exchange potential.

For a long time it was an important open question whether these considerations apply in the real world with large but finite masses of the D and B mesons. The recent experimental results of Belle [4] and BESIII [5], together with theoretical analysis in Refs. [22] and [23] strongly indicate that such exotic states do exist – some were already found and more are predicted below.

Due to parity conservation, the pion cannot be exchanged in the $\bar{M}M$ system, but it does contribute in the $\bar{M}M^*$ and \bar{M}^*M^* channels. The $\vec{\tau}_1 \cdot \vec{\tau}_s$ isospin nature of the exchange implies that the binding is 3 times stronger in the isoscalar channel, experimentally accessed in the decay into $\Upsilon\pi\pi$ or $J/\psi\pi\pi$, than in the isovector channel, seen in decay into $\Upsilon\pi$ or $J/\psi\pi$. It was estimated [22, 23] that in the bottomonium system this difference in

[†]Note that a $\mathcal{O}(30)$ MeV energy implies a velocity of $\sim(1/8)c$ for \bar{D} and D^* in the final state. For a system of size $\sqrt{m_D \times 30 \text{ MeV}} \sim \mathcal{O}(0.8)$ fm, this implies traversal time of $6.4 \text{ fm}/c$, corresponding to a crude estimate of the S -wave state width $\Gamma \simeq c/(6.4 \text{ fm}) = 200 \text{ MeV}/6.4 \sim 30 \text{ MeV}$. The fact that this is close to the observed width suggests that we indeed have a loosely-bound $\bar{D}D^*$ resonance decaying mainly into its constituent mesons.

the binding potentials raises the $I=1$ exotics by up to 40-50 MeV above the $I=0$ exotics. In the charmonium system this splitting is expected to be slightly smaller, because the $\bar{D}D^*/\bar{D}^*D^*$ states are larger than $\bar{B}B^*/\bar{B}^*B^*$. This is because the reduced mass in the $\bar{B}B^*$ system is approximately 2.5 times larger than in the $\bar{D}D^*$ system. On the other hand, the net attractive potential due to the light mesons exchanged between the heavy-light mesons is approximately the same, since $m_c, m_b \gg \Lambda_{QCD}$. As usual in quantum mechanics, for a given potential the radius of a bound state or a resonance gets smaller when the reduced mass grows, so the $\bar{D}D^*$ states are larger than the $\bar{B}B^*$ states. Because of this difference in size the attraction in both $I=0$ and $I=1$ charmonium channels is expected to be somewhat smaller.

We are interested in the dependence of the binding energy on the heavy meson masses in the $\bar{M}M$, $\bar{M}M^*$ and \bar{M}^*M^* systems controlled by Hamiltonians of the form:

$$H = a \cdot p^2 + V(r) \quad (2)$$

where $a \equiv 1/2\mu_{\text{red}}$, with μ_{red} the reduced mass and the channel-specific potential $V(r)$ is assumed to be independent of the heavy-meson mass.

For Hamiltonians linear in a parameter a , the ground-state energy $E_0(a)$ is a convex function of a , since second-order perturbation makes a negative contribution to the ground state. For $H = \sum_i^n a_i H_i$, the function $E_0(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)$ describes a convex surface in n dimensions. With additional theoretical inputs or experimental results, the n -dimensional convexity might help estimating how the binding is affected by scaling various pieces of the potential.

Convexity implies that $E_0(a)$ at any point in the $(0, A)$ interval exceeds the linear interpolation

$$E_0(a) > E_0(0) + a \cdot \frac{E_0(A) - E_0(0)}{A} \quad (3)$$

Related arguments were used to prove flavor-dependent baryon-meson mass inequalities [24, 25]. Convexity was also used to predict the masses of doubly-heavy $b\bar{c}$ mesons [26].

Convexity is not affected by linear transformations of the a_i and we can use any unit of inverse mass to convert the parameter $a \sim 1/M_Q$ into a dimensionless parameter \tilde{a} .

Since we are comparing with the pion and with other light exchanges, we use the “natural” unit of ~ 0.8 Fermi ~ 4.0 GeV $^{-1}$ for the range and width of the corresponding potentials.

With $m_D \sim 2$ GeV and $m_B \sim 5.3$ GeV the relevant dimensionless parameters $\tilde{a}(D) = 1/8$ and $\tilde{a}(B) = 1/21$ are indeed small, suggesting that even the first-order perturbation linear interpolation may be satisfactory.

In the infinite mass case, corresponding to $\tilde{a} = 0$, the relative distance between the mesons is effectively fixed at the minimum of the potential and the binding $E_0(0)$ is then just the attractive V_{min} at this position.

We can use the existing data in order to make a very rough estimate of the isovector binding potential which is $E_b^{I=1}$ in the $m_Q \rightarrow \infty$ limit, i.e. at $\tilde{a} = 0$. We have two data points: $Z_c(3900)$ at $\tilde{a}(D)$ is approximately 27 MeV above $\bar{D}D^*$ threshold and $Z_b(10610)$ at $\tilde{a}(B)$ is approximately 3 MeV above $\bar{B}B^*$ threshold. Linear extrapolation to $\tilde{a} = 0$ yields $E_b^{I=1}(\tilde{a}=0) \approx -11.7$ MeV. In view of the convexity, the actual binding energy is likely to slightly exceed this linear extrapolation.

We can then use this result for the isovector channel to estimate the $\bar{B}B^*$ binding in the isoscalar channel. Assuming that the isoscalar binding energy in the $m_Q \rightarrow \infty$ limit is 3 times larger than for the isovector, i.e. $E_b^{I=0}(\tilde{a}=0) \approx 3 \cdot (-11.7) = -35$ MeV. $X(3872)$ is at $\bar{D}D^*$ threshold, providing an additional data point of $E_b^{I=0}(\tilde{a}(D)) \approx 0$ in the isoscalar channel.[‡] Linear extrapolation to $\tilde{a}(B)$ yields approximately -20 MeV as the $\bar{B}B^*$ binding energy in the isoscalar channel.

The upshot is that the newly discovered $Z_c(3900)$ isovector resonance confirms and refines the estimates in [22, 23] for the mass of the putative $\bar{B}B^*$ isoscalar bound state. This immediately leads to several predictions:

- a) two $I = 0$ narrow resonances in the bottomonium system, about 23 MeV below $Z_b(106010)$ and $Z_b(10650)$, i.e. about 20 MeV below the corresponding $\bar{B}B^*$ and \bar{B}^*B^* thresholds;
- b) an $I = 1$ resonance about 30 MeV above \bar{D}^*D^* threshold;
- c) an $I = 0$ resonance near \bar{D}^*D^* threshold.

[‡]For simplicity we assume $X(3872)$ is an isoscalar, since it has no charged partners, and we ignore here the issue of isospin breaking in its decays.

Various authors, e.g. [11],[12],[13] considered $QQ\bar{q}_1\bar{q}_2$ TQ-s. If such states do exist, producing and discovering even the lightest $cc\bar{u}\bar{d}$ is an extraordinary challenge. One needs to produce *two* $\bar{Q}Q$ pairs and then rearrange them, so as to form QQ and $\bar{Q}\bar{Q}$ diquarks, rather than the more favorable configuration of two $\bar{Q}Q$ and color singlets. *Then* the QQ diquark needs to pick up a $\bar{u}\bar{d}$ light diquark, rather than a q , to make a QQq baryon, suppressing the production rate of these TQ-s below the rate of QQq production.

A small ray of hope comes from the observation of the doubly-heavy $B_c = (\bar{b}c)$ mesons [14], suggesting that simultaneous production of $\bar{b}b$ and $\bar{c}c$ pairs which are close to each other in space and in rapidity and can coalesce to form doubly-heavy hadrons is not too rare. For example, in the last paper in Ref. [14] CDF reported 108 ± 15 candidate events in the $B_c^\pm \rightarrow J/\psi\pi^\pm$ channel. This is an encouraging sign for the prospects of producing and observing the ccq and bcs baryons and hopefully also the $cc\bar{u}\bar{d}$ TQ. ATLAS and CMS and especially LHCb probably have the best chance of discovering these states.

If the new TQ lies below say, the DD^* threshold, it will be stable under the strong interaction and will decay only weakly.[§] As we discuss below, if they lay above threshold, they may still may manifest themselves as narrow DD^* resonances.

The following theoretical considerations are relevant for the last point above. First, in clear contradistinction to the states discussed earlier, the new TQ-s are *unlikely* to be molecular. This is because both heavy mesons contain light antiquarks, rather than a \bar{q} in one and a q in the other, causing the ω and ρ exchange to be repulsive, rather than attractive. With no bound $\bar{D}D^*$ states, one might expect the new DD^* states to lay higher and manifest themselves as broad resonances, at best. It is interesting to point out that the above conclusion is at odds with results of a coupled-channel analysis carried out within the one-boson-exchange model in Ref. [17]. We look forward to an experimental resolution of this issue.

This bleak picture will change dramatically if the $QQ\bar{u}\bar{d}$ TQ is *not* a simple molecular state, but instead a connected color network, consisting of a QQ diquark coupled to a $\mathbf{3}_c^*$, with a matching $\bar{u}\bar{d}$ diquark coupled to a

[§]A statement slightly modified if the TQ mass is above the $2m_D$ threshold, as it can then first decay through an exceedingly narrow EM decay $D^* \rightarrow D^0\gamma$ [1],[15], followed by the weak decays of the the D -s [13].

3_c. The QQ diquark will then be bound by the large Coulombic interaction $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^2 M_Q)$, as discussed below. Finding such a novel color network would be particularly exciting [13],[18]. With some poetic license, we can compare it to the discovery of the C_{60} buckyballs.

The Coulombic binding of the QQ diquark,

$$E_b(QQ) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \alpha_s^2 M_Q = \frac{1}{8} \alpha_s^2 M_Q \quad (4)$$

is half as strong as that of a color-singlet $\bar{Q}Q$. Another $\frac{1}{2}$ factor reflects the need to use the reduced mass, and the $\frac{1}{2} \alpha_s^2 M_Q$ is the standard hydrogen binding formula. Thus the heavy diquark QQ becomes infinitely deeply bound as $M_Q \rightarrow \infty$. For $m_c \sim 1.6$ GeV and using 1/2 for the relevant α_s , the Coulombic binding ~ 50 MeV is moderate. However, the $\frac{1}{2}$ ratio of QCD Coulomb interaction in the diquark, versus its strength in the $\bar{Q}Q$ color singlet system likely extends to *all* QCD interactions, including the confining stringy potential [16].

If indeed the $cc\bar{u}\bar{d}$ TQ is mostly described by the new color network, then its decay into DD^* will be suppressed by the required rearrangement of the color.

In view of the above discussion, we now focus on the question whether the lowest state of the new color network is below or near the DD^* threshold.

There are interesting parallels between the $QQ\bar{q}\bar{q}$ TQ-s and doubly-heavy baryons QQq . In both types of systems there is a light color triplet – a quark or an anti-diquark – bound to a heavy diquark. Because of this similarity, *experimental observation of doubly-heavy baryons is very important not just in its own right, but as source of extremely valuable information for deducing the properties of the more exotic $QQ\bar{q}\bar{q}$ tetraquarks.* Such deduction can be carried out just as it was done for b -baryons.

In the last few years it became possible to accurately predict at the level of 2-3 MeV the masses of heavy baryons containing the b -quark: $\Sigma_b(bqq)$, $\Xi_b(bsq)$ and $\Omega_b(bss)$ [27, 28, 29]. These predictions used as input the masses of the B , B_s , D and D_s mesons, together with the masses of the corresponding c -baryons $\Sigma_c(cqq)$, $\Xi_c(csq)$ and $\Omega_c(css)$.

An analogous approach to the masses of the $QQ\bar{q}\bar{q}$, suggested the relation

$$m(cc\bar{u}\bar{d}) = m(\Xi_{ccu}) + m(\Lambda_c) - m(D^0) - \frac{1}{4}[m(D^*) - m(D)] \quad (5)$$

designed to optimally match interactions on both sides [13]. To date, only the SELEX experiment at Fermilab reported doubly charmed ccd and ccu baryons with mass ~ 3520 MeV [30] – a result not confirmed by other experiments [31, 32]. Substituting this mass in eq. (5) as a placeholder in a “proof of concept” estimate yields $M(cc\bar{u}\bar{d}) \sim 3900$ MeV, which is just 30 MeV above the D^*D threshold. One should keep in mind that, as implied by eq. (4), the binding in $(bb\bar{q}\bar{q})$ is expected to be significantly stronger than in $(cc\bar{q}\bar{q})$. In any case, reliable experimental information on QQq baryon masses is clearly essential for settling the issue.

Note added

While this work was being finalized, we became aware of several papers dealing with closely-related subjects, using different approaches [33],[34],[35],[36].

References

- [1] J. Beringer *et al.* [Particle Data Group Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **86**, 010001 (2012).
- [2] S. K. Choi *et al.* [Belle Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 262001 (2003) [hep-ex/0309032]; D. Acosta *et al.* [CDF Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 072001 (2004) [hep-ex/0312021]. B. Aubert *et al.* [BABAR Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **71**, 071103 (2005) [hep-ex/0406022]. V. M. Abazov *et al.* [D0 Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 162002 (2004) [hep-ex/0405004].
- [3] M. Karliner and H. J. Lipkin, arXiv:0802.0649 [hep-ph].
- [4] A. Bondar *et al.* [Belle Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 122001 (2012) [arXiv:1110.2251 [hep-ex]].
- [5] M. Ablikim *et al.* [BESIII Collaboration], arXiv:1303.5949 [hep-ex].
- [6] S. Weinberg, arXiv:1303.0342 [hep-ph].

- [7] S. Coleman. Aspects of Symmetry (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1985), pp. 377-378.
- [8] M. G. Alford and R. L. Jaffe, Nucl. Phys. B **578**, 367 (2000) [hep-lat/0001023]; AIP Conf. Proc. **688**, 208 (2004) [hep-lat/0306037].
- [9] R. L. Jaffe, Phys. Rev. D **15**, 281 (1977).
- [10] F. E. Close and N. A. Tornqvist, J. Phys. G **28**, R249 (2002) [hep-ph/0204205].
- [11] J. P. Ader, J. M. Richard and P. Taxil, Phys. Rev. D **25**, 2370 (1982).
- [12] A. V. Manohar and M. B. Wise, Nucl. Phys. B **399**, 17 (1993) [hep-ph/9212236].
- [13] B. A. Gelman, S. Nussinov, Phys. Lett. B **551**, 296 (2003) [hep-ph/0209095].
- [14] K. Ackerstaff *et al.* [OPAL Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **420**, 157 (1998) [hep-ex/9801026]; F. Abe *et al.* [CDF Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 2432 (1998) [hep-ex/9805034]; A. Abulencia *et al.* [CDF Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 082002 (2006) [hep-ex/0505076]; V. M. Abazov *et al.* [D0 Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 012001 (2008) [arXiv:0802.4258 [hep-ex]]; T. Aaltonen *et al.* [CDF Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 182002 (2008) [arXiv:0712.1506 [hep-ex]].
- [15] S. Nussinov, Phys. Lett. B **418**, 383 (1998).
- [16] S. Nussinov and M. A. Lampert, Phys. Rept. **362**, 193 (2002) [hep-ph/9911532].
- [17] N. Li, Z. -F. Sun, X. Liu and S. -L. Zhu, arXiv:1211.5007 [hep-ph].
- [18] M. Karliner, H. J. Lipkin, Phys. Lett. B **638**, 221 (2006) [hep-ph/0601193].
- [19] M. B. Voloshin and L. B. Okun, JETP Lett. **23**, 333 (1976) [Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **23**, 369 (1976)].
- [20] N. A. Tornqvist, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 556 (1991); N. A. Tornqvist, Z. Phys. C **61**, 525 (1994) [hep-ph/9310247].

- [21] N. A. Tornqvist, Phys. Lett. B **590**, 209 (2004) [hep-ph/0402237].
- [22] M. Karliner, H. J. Lipkin, N. A. Tornqvist, arXiv:1109.3472 [hep-ph].
- [23] M. Karliner, H. J. Lipkin, N. A. Tornqvist, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **225-227**, 102 (2012).
- [24] S. Nussinov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **51**, 2081 (1983).
- [25] E. H. Lieb, Phys. Rev. Lett. **54**, 1987 (1985).
- [26] S. Nussinov, Z. Phys. C **3**, 165 (1979).
- [27] M. Karliner and H.J. Lipkin, arXiv:hep-ph/0307243; condensed version in Phys. Lett. **B575** (2003) 249.
- [28] M. Karliner, B. Keren-Zur, H. J. Lipkin and J. L. Rosner, arXiv:0706.2163 [hep-ph].
- [29] M. Karliner, B. Keren-Zur, H. J. Lipkin and J. L. Rosner, Annals Phys. **324**, 2 (2009) [arXiv:0804.1575 [hep-ph]].
- [30] M. Mattson *et al.* [SELEX Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 112001 (2002) [hep-ex/0208014]; A. Ocherashvili *et al.* [SELEX Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **628**, 18 (2005) [hep-ex/0406033].
- [31] B. Aubert *et al.* [BABAR Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **74**, 011103 (2006) [hep-ex/0605075].
- [32] R. Chistov *et al.* [BELLE Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 162001 (2006) [hep-ex/0606051].
- [33] Q. Wang, C. Hanhart, Q. Zhao, arXiv:1303.6355 [hep-ph].
- [34] F. -K. Guo, C. Hidalgo-Duque, J. Nieves, M. P. Valderrama, arXiv:1303.6608 [hep-ph].
- [35] D. -Y. Chen, X. Liu, T. Matsuki, arXiv:1303.6842 [hep-ph].
- [36] R. Faccini, L. Maiani, F. Piccinini, A. Pilloni, A. D. Polosa, V. Riquer, arXiv:1303.6857 [hep-ph].