

$X(5568)$ and its partner states

Yan-Rui Liu^{1*}

¹*School of Physics and Key Laboratory of Particle Physics and Particle Irradiation (MOE), Shandong University, Jinan 250100, China*

Xiang Liu^{2,3†}

²*School of Physical Science and Technology, Lanzhou University, Lanzhou 730000, China*

³*Research Center for Hadron and CSR Physics, Lanzhou University and Institute of Modern Physics of CAS, Lanzhou 730000, China*

Shi-Lin Zhu^{4,5,6‡}

⁴*School of Physics and State Key Laboratory of Nuclear Physics and Technology, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China*

⁵*Collaborative Innovation Center of Quantum Matter, Beijing 100871, China*

⁶*Center of High Energy Physics, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China*

(Dated: March 7, 2022)

Stimulated by the recent observation of the $X(5568)$, we study the $X(5568)$ and its partners under the tetraquark scenario. In the framework of the color-magnetic interaction, we estimate the masses of the partner states of the $X(5568)$ and discuss their decay pattern, which provide valuable information on the future experimental search of these states.

PACS numbers: 14.40.Rt, 12.39.Jh

I. INTRODUCTION

Very recently, the DØ Collaboration observed a narrow structure by analyzing the $B_s^0\pi^\pm$ invariant mass spectrum, which was named as the $X(5568)$ [1]. The $X(5568)$ has a mass $m = 5567.8 \pm 2.9(\text{stat})_{-1.9}^{+0.9}(\text{syst})$ MeV and width $\Gamma = 21.9 \pm 6.4(\text{stat})_{-2.5}^{+5.0}(\text{syst})$ MeV [1]. Its discovery mode indicates that the valence quark component of the $X(5568)$ should be $\ell s \bar{\ell} \bar{b}$ ($\ell = u$ or d). Thus, the $X(5568)$ is a good candidate of the exotic tetraquark state. In the past decades, experimental search for the exotic states and the corresponding theoretical investigations have been an important research topic of hadron physic (see recent review on the study of the exotic states in Ref. [2]).

Under the general tetraquark scheme, there exist two possible configurations for the $X(5568)$, i.e., the $\bar{B}K$ molecular state and a compact tetraquark composed of a diquark and anti-diquark. In Ref. [3], Liu *et al.* studied the $\bar{B}K$ interaction in the framework of chiral perturbative theory. The authors found that the Weinberg-Tomozawa term for the $\bar{B}K$ interaction in the isovector sector is zero [3], which shows that the attraction between \bar{B} and K is not strong. If assigning the $X(5568)$ as the $\bar{B}K$ molecular state, the binding energy of the $\bar{B}K$ system should be around 200 MeV. In other words, this $\bar{B}K$ molecular state is a deeply bound state. It is obvious that the study from Ref. [3] does not support such a deeply bound $\bar{B}K$ molecular state scenario. We also notice a dynamical study of the interaction between \bar{B} and K by exchanging the ρ and ω mesons [4]. They did not find a bound state solution for the S-wave $\bar{B}K$ system [4].

The observation of $X(5568)$ has inspired extensive discus-

sions of the possibility of a compact tetraquark state. Chen *et al.* [5] constructed 0^+ and 1^+ tetraquark current, and adopted the QCD sum rule approach to calculate the corresponding masses. Their result supports the $X(5568)$ as tetraquark state with spin-parity quantum number $J^P = 0^+$ or 1^+ . Additionally, the charmed partner of the $X(5568)$ was predicted [5]. In Ref. [5], the authors considered the $X(5568)$ as a tetraquark state with $J^P = 0^+$ and calculated its mass [6] and decay width [7]. Zanetti, Nielsen and Khemchandani also adopted the QCD sum rule formalism to study the $X(5568)$ as a tetraquark state with $J^P = 0^+$ [8]. A similar QCD sum rule study was performed in Ref. [9]. Wang and Zhu applied the effective Hamiltonian approach to calculate the mass spectrum of the tetraquark state [10]. They found that a S-wave tetraquark with the quark component $[su][\bar{b}\bar{d}]$ and $J^P = 0^+$ lies 150 MeV higher than the $X(5568)$. There also exists the discussion of the $X(5568) \rightarrow B_s\pi^+$ and $X(5616) \rightarrow B_s^*\pi^+$ decay [11], where $X(5568)$ and $X(5616)$ was assumed as the S-wave $B\bar{K}$ and $B\bar{K}^*$ molecular states, respectively. In Ref. [12], Liu and Li explained the $X(5568)$ to be the near threshold rescattering effect.

Twelve years ago, in order to explain its exotic decay modes, Liu *et al.* once proposed a tetraquark structure for the $D_{sJ}(2632)$ signal observed by the SELEX collaboration [13]. The $X(5568)$ corresponds to the bottom partner of the $D_{s,\bar{6}}$ or $D_{s,15}$ state there. The discovery of the $X(5568)$ signal aroused our interest in the tetraquark candidates with four different flavors again. If the $X(5568)$ is a tetraquark state, its partner states within the same multiplet must also exist. In this work, we mainly focus on the partner states of $X(5568)$ under the tetraquark scenario. We will estimate the mass difference of these partner states based on the color-magnetic interaction. Thus, the present study hopefully provides valuable information on these partners of the $X(5568)$. Experimental search for them can further test the tetraquark assignment to the $X(5568)$.

At present, the LHCb collaboration [14] was unable to con-

*Electronic address: yrlu@sdu.edu.cn

†Electronic address: xiangliu@lzu.edu.cn

‡Electronic address: zhushl@pku.edu.cn

firm this X(5568) signal based on their own data. One should be aware of the different production mechanism at Tevatron and LHCb, The huge amount of anti-quarks within the antiproton at Tevatron should be helpful to the formation of this X(5568) with four-flavoured quarks and anti-quarks if this signal really exists. Under the extreme case that this X(5568) signal is real, it's highly probable that the current LHCb is unable to observe it. If one tetraquark signal is observed experimentally, all the other members within the same SU(3) flavor multiplet should also exist. Their mass splittings can be estimated using the chromomagnetic interaction Hamiltonian. In other words, the masses and decay modes of the partner states of the X(5568) can be used to cross-check whether the X(5568) is a real resonance or not. If these partner states are not observed, one should put a big question mark on the existence of the X(5568) signal.

This paper is organized as follows. After the introduction, we present the detailed formalism in Sec. II. In Sec. III, we present the numerical results of the tetraquark spectrum. In Sec. IV, we discuss their strong decay patterns. The paper ends with a short discussion in Sec. V.

II. FRAMEWORK

The low mass of X(5568) suggests the existence of the tightly bound four quark states in the presence of the heavy quark, which may help stabilize the tetraquark system. For such compact systems confined within one MIT bag, the short range interaction should be important. Here we adopt a simple chromomagnetic interaction model containing the contact interaction only. The model Hamiltonian reads [15]

$$H = H_0 + H_{CMI} \\ = \sum_i m_i + \sum_{i < j} \frac{C_{ij}}{m_i m_j} \left(-\frac{3}{32} \right) \lambda_i \cdot \lambda_j \sigma_i \cdot \sigma_j, \quad (1)$$

where $\lambda(\sigma)$ is the generator for the color (spin) symmetry and C 's are the parameters to be determined with known hadrons.

In order to calculate the color-spin matrix elements, we explicitly construct the *flavor* \otimes *color* \otimes *spin* wave functions for the tetraquark system $qq\bar{q}\bar{b}$. In discussing of the $D_{sJ}(2632)$, we have obtained the flavor wave functions in [13]. Here, we only need to extend formalism in [13] and include the spin degree of freedom. We mainly focus on the bottom mesons.

In the systems with one heavy quark, there exist degenerate spin doublets in the heavy quark limit. The properties of the tetraquark state is dominantly determined by the light quark cluster $qq\bar{q}$. The flavor-color-spin wave functions of two quarks is constrained by the Pauli principle. Therefore we mainly consider the light diquark and do not assume any structure for the two antiquark $\bar{q}\bar{Q}$. In other words, the tetraquark system is treated as a triquark plus a heavy antiquark.

According to the diquark classification, we consider four cases for the tetraquark structure $qq\bar{q}\bar{Q}$ in the present study:

(1) The representations for the qq diquark are $\bar{3}_f, \bar{3}_c$ and thus $S_{qq} = 0, S_{qq\bar{q}} = 1/2$. The final tetraquark states form two flavor multiplets 3_f and $\bar{6}_f$. In spin space, a degenerate

$(0^+, 1^+)$ doublet exists in the heavy quark limit. In this case the diquark is a “good” diquark.

(2) The representations for the qq diquark are $\bar{3}_f, 6_c$ and thus $S_{qq} = 1, S_{qq\bar{q}} = 3/2$ or $1/2$. The final flavor multiplets are 3_f and $\bar{6}_f$. Now in spin space, there are two degenerate doublets $(1^+, 2^+)$ and $(0^+, 1^+)$. The color-spin interaction for the two light quarks is weaker than the case (1) but is still attractive. One can see this from the calculated values below.

(3) The representation for the qq diquark are $6_f, \bar{3}_c$ and thus $S_{qq} = 1, S_{qq\bar{q}} = 3/2$ or $1/2$. The final flavor multiplets are 3_f and 15_f . The spin doublets are the same as the case (2). The color-spin interaction for the two light quarks is weakly repulsive.

(4) The representation for the qq diquark are $6_f, 6_c$ and thus $S_{qq} = 0, S_{qq\bar{q}} = 1/2$. The final flavor multiplets are 3_f and 15_f . There is one spin doublet $(0^+, 1^+)$. The color-spin interaction for the two light quarks is repulsive.

For the explicit flavor wave functions, one may consult Ref. [13]. The color wave functions for $qq\bar{q}$ are easily obtained with the replacement $u \rightarrow r, d \rightarrow g, \text{ and } s \rightarrow b$. The final color wave function for the tetraquark state depends on the color state of qq . In the cases (1) and (3), it reads

$$\frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}} [(rb\bar{b} - br\bar{b} - gr\bar{g} + rg\bar{g})\bar{r} + (gb\bar{b} - bg\bar{b} + gr\bar{r} - rg\bar{r})\bar{g} \\ - (gb\bar{g} - bg\bar{g} + rb\bar{r} - br\bar{r})\bar{b}]. \quad (2)$$

In the cases (2) and (4), one gets

$$\frac{1}{2\sqrt{6}} [(rb\bar{b} + br\bar{b} + gr\bar{g} + rg\bar{g} + 2rr\bar{r})\bar{r} + (gb\bar{b} + bg\bar{b} + gr\bar{r} \\ + rg\bar{r} + 2gg\bar{g})\bar{g} + (gb\bar{g} + bg\bar{g} + rb\bar{r} + br\bar{r} + 2bb\bar{b})\bar{b}]. \quad (3)$$

These wave functions are constructed with the SU(3) C.G. coefficients given in Refs. [16, 17]. The spin wave functions are easy to get and we do not show them explicitly.

The SU(3) flavor symmetry is actually violated by the unequal quark mass. Such a breaking effect might be large in the multi-quark systems. As a result, there may exist the mixing between the states with the same quantum numbers. In this work, we consider the “ideal” mixing. In the cases (1) and (2), the isospin one-half states in $\bar{6}_f$ and 3_f mix and one gets the following states

$$B^{\ell,+} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(ud - du)\bar{d}\bar{b}, \quad B^{\ell,0} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(ud - du)\bar{u}\bar{b}, \\ B^{h,+} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(us - su)\bar{s}\bar{b}, \quad B^{h,-} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(ds - sd)\bar{s}\bar{b}. \quad (4)$$

In the cases (3) and (4), the mixed isospin-half states are

$$B'^{\ell,+} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}(ud\bar{d} + du\bar{d} + 2uu\bar{u})\bar{b}, \\ B'^{\ell,0} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}(ud\bar{u} + du\bar{u} + 2dd\bar{d})\bar{b}, \\ B'^{h,+} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(us + su)\bar{s}\bar{b}, \quad B'^{h,0} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(ds + sd)\bar{s}\bar{b}, \quad (5)$$

and the mixed isoscalar states are

$$B_s^{\ell} = \frac{1}{2}(us\bar{u} + su\bar{u} + ds\bar{d} + sd\bar{d})\bar{b}, \\ B_s^h = ss\bar{s}\bar{b}. \quad (6)$$

Tetraquark	Quark Content	(Y,I)
$B_{\bar{s},\bar{6}}$	$ud\bar{s}\bar{b}$	$(\frac{4}{3}, 0)$
B^ℓ	$\ell\ell\bar{\ell}\bar{b}$	$(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{2})$
B^h	$\ell s\bar{s}\bar{b}$	$(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{2})$
$B_{s,\bar{6}}$	$s\ell\bar{\ell}\bar{b}$	$(-\frac{2}{3}, 1)$
$B_{s,3}$	$s\ell\bar{\ell}\bar{b}$	$(-\frac{2}{3}, 0)$
$B_{\bar{s},15}$	$\ell\ell\bar{s}\bar{b}$	$(\frac{4}{3}, 1)$
B_{15}	$\ell\ell\bar{\ell}\bar{b}$	$(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{3}{2})$
$B^{\ell\ell}$	$\ell\ell\bar{\ell}\bar{b}$	$(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{2})$
$B^{h\ell}$	$\ell s\bar{s}\bar{b}$	$(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{2})$
$B_{s,15}$	$s\ell\bar{\ell}\bar{b}$	$(-\frac{2}{3}, 1)$
$B_s^{\ell\ell}$	$s\ell\bar{\ell}\bar{b}$	$(-\frac{2}{3}, 0)$
$B_s^{h\ell}$	$ss\bar{s}\bar{b}$	$(-\frac{2}{3}, 0)$
$B_{ss,15}$	$ss\bar{\ell}\bar{b}$	$(-\frac{4}{3}, \frac{1}{2})$

TABLE I: Tetraquarks, their quark contents, hypercharge and isospin, where ℓ indicates u or d quark. The first five notations are used in the cases (1) and (2). The other notations are used in the cases (3) and (4).

We adopt the notations in Ref. [13] for the other tetraquarks and summarize them in Table I. With the explicit expressions for the generators λ and σ and the constructed wave functions, one can calculate the matrix element $CMI = \langle H_{CMI} \rangle$.

State	$(S_{qq\bar{q}}, J)$	$\frac{C_{qq}}{m_q^2}$	$\frac{C_{qs}}{m_q m_s}$	$\frac{C_{q\bar{b}}}{m_q m_b}$	$\frac{C_{s\bar{b}}}{m_s m_b}$	Mass	Charm case
$B_{\bar{s},\bar{6}}$	$(\frac{1}{2}, 1)$	8		$-\frac{8}{3}$		5560(-)	2365(-)
(5700)	$(\frac{1}{2}, 0)$	8		8		5534(-)	2316(-)
B^ℓ	$(\frac{1}{2}, 1)$	8		$-\frac{8}{3}$		5417(-)	2224(-)
(5560)	$(\frac{1}{2}, 0)$	8		8		5403(-)	2181(-)
B^h	$(\frac{1}{2}, 1)$		8	$-\frac{8}{3}$		5776(-)	2582(-)
(5840)	$(\frac{1}{2}, 0)$		8	8		5750(-)	2533(-)
$B_{s,\bar{6}}, B_{s,3}$	$(\frac{1}{2}, 1)$	8		$-\frac{8}{3}$		5633(-)	2440(-)
(5700)	$(\frac{1}{2}, 0)$	8		8		5619(-)	2397(-)

TABLE II: The obtained CMI's and estimated masses for the case (1) in units of MeV. The symbol “+” (“-”) after the tetraquark mass means that $H_{CMI} > 0$ ($H_{CMI} < 0$).

III. NUMERICAL RESULTS

We present the calculated CMI's in Tables II-V, where a multiplicative factor $-\frac{3}{32}$ is implicitly assumed. The mass below the state symbol in the first column in Tables II-V is simply the sum of the mass of the four quark without the chromomagnetic interaction. In order to estimate the rough masses of the tetraquark states, one has to determine the ten parameters in H_{CMI} . To do that, we calculate CMI's for the ground state baryons and mesons and extract the values of the ten parameters from the mass splittings. We collect the results in Table VI. In the extraction of the parameters of the light quark-antiquark interaction, we do not use the masses of the pseudoscalar mesons as input since they are influenced by the chiral symmetry and its spontaneous breaking. Here we adopt the light quark-quark CMI values: $\frac{C_{qq}}{m_q^2} = 196$ MeV, $\frac{C_{qs}}{m_q m_s} = 94$ MeV, and $\frac{C_{s\bar{s}}}{m_s^2} = 242$ MeV. The quark masses are taken from

our previous work $m_q = 310$ MeV, $m_s = 450$ MeV, $m_c = 1430$ MeV, and $m_b = 4630$ MeV [13]. We present the estimated tetraquark masses for the both bottom and charm cases in Tables II-V. We mainly discuss the bottom tetraquarks in the following. The charmed tetraquarks have very similar features.

In the case (1), one always gets $\langle H_{CMI} \rangle < 0$. From Table II and the value of the parameters, we notice that the attraction mainly arises from the color-magnetic interaction between the light quarks. The CMI's between quark and antiquark vanish in the present case. Although the interaction between the antiquarks is repulsive (negative values in Table II) for the vector case, the resulting total interaction is still attractive.

The state $B_{s,\bar{6}}$ with $J = 0$ corresponds to the $X(5568)$ although the mass is 51 MeV higher. Considering the model errors, the tetraquark interpretation for the $X(5568)$ is favored. If this state really exists, its tetraquark partners in Table II should all exist. For example, the CMI for the B^ℓ state with $J = 0$ is about -160 MeV while the CMI is -80 MeV for $B_{s,\bar{6}}$ with $J = 0$. The most attractive interaction occurs for $B_{s,\bar{6}}$ ($J=0$) with $CMI = -166$ MeV. The larger CMI's for B^ℓ and $B_{s,\bar{6}}$ lies in the fact that the $\ell\ell$ ($\ell = u$ or d) interaction is stronger than the ℓs interaction while the interaction for the antiquarks does not matter. We perform the calculation with flavor wave functions in the SU(3) symmetry limit. Since there does not exist a symmetry violating operator in the Hamiltonian, we get a degenerate result for $B_{s,\bar{6}}$ and $B_{s,3}$. One expects a lower $B_{s,3}$ tetraquark state once a more realistic model is adopted.

In the case (2), the color-magnetic interaction for the $(0^+, 1^+)$ doublet is always attractive. Although the quark-quark interaction is not so attractive, the nonvanishing $q\bar{q}$ interaction provides much stronger attraction. As a result, the obtained masses for the tetraquark states with $S_{qq\bar{q}} = \frac{1}{2}$ are lower than those in the case (1). Now the $B_{s,\bar{6}}$ state with $J = 1$ is close to the observed $X(5568)$, although the mass is 49 MeV lower. In this case, the largest CMI (-300 MeV) occurs for the B^ℓ state with $J = 0$, again not for $B_{s,\bar{6}}$, which indicates the existence of more stable non-strange tetraquark states.

From Table III, our results indicate that although a “good” diquark is always used to discuss hadron spectrum, there may exist a more attractive configuration for the multi-quark states. More tightly bound tetraquark states are possible with a not-so-good diquark because of the existence of a light antiquark, which means that a triquark structure seems more appropriate here.

In the case (3), the attractive color-magnetic interactions are possible only for states with $S_{qq\bar{q}} = \frac{1}{2}$. The interaction for the light quarks is weakly repulsive but the attractive interaction for the light quark and light antiquark may result in $\langle H_{CMI} \rangle < 0$. The mass of the state corresponding to the $X(5568)$ is about 80 MeV higher than the observation.

In the case (4), one always gets a positive $\langle H_{CMI} \rangle$. The color-spin interaction for the light quarks is always repulsive. The weaker attraction between the antiquarks does not affect the final interaction significantly. There does not exist a good candidate within the multiplet for the $X(5568)$ in this case.

From the above analysis, we notice that the interaction among the three light constituents dominantly affects the chro-

State	$(S_{qq\bar{q}\bar{q}}, J)$	$\frac{C_{qq}}{m_q^2}$	$\frac{C_{qs}}{m_q m_s}$	$\frac{C_{q\bar{q}}}{m_q^2}$	$\frac{C_{q\bar{s}}}{m_q m_s}$	$\frac{C_{s\bar{s}}}{m_s^2}$	$\frac{C_{qb}}{m_q m_b}$	$\frac{C_{sb}}{m_s m_b}$	$\frac{C_{q\bar{b}}}{m_q m_b}$	$\frac{C_{s\bar{b}}}{m_s m_b}$	Mass	Charm case
$B_{s,6}$ (5700)	$(\frac{3}{2}, 2)$	—	—	—	$-\frac{20}{3}$	—	$-\frac{20}{3}$	—	—	—	5745(+)	2573(+)
	$(\frac{3}{2}, 1)$	—	—	—	$-\frac{20}{3}$	—	$\frac{100}{9}$	—	—	$-\frac{20}{3}$	5716(+)	2469(-)
	$(\frac{1}{2}, 1)$	—	—	—	$\frac{40}{3}$	—	$-\frac{40}{9}$	—	—	$-\frac{40}{9}$	5569(-)	2390(-)
	$(\frac{1}{2}, 0)$	—	—	—	$\frac{40}{3}$	—	$\frac{40}{3}$	—	—	$-\frac{40}{3}$	5526(-)	2262(-)
B^ℓ (5560)	$(\frac{3}{2}, 2)$	—	—	$-\frac{20}{3}$	—	—	$-\frac{20}{3}$	—	—	—	5671(+)	2498(+)
	$(\frac{3}{2}, 1)$	—	—	$-\frac{20}{3}$	—	—	$\frac{100}{9}$	—	—	$-\frac{20}{3}$	5637(+)	2392(+)
	$(\frac{1}{2}, 1)$	—	—	$\frac{40}{3}$	—	—	$-\frac{40}{9}$	—	—	$-\frac{40}{9}$	5301(-)	2122(-)
	$(\frac{1}{2}, 0)$	—	—	$\frac{40}{3}$	—	—	$\frac{40}{3}$	—	—	$-\frac{40}{3}$	5260(-)	1995(-)
B^h (5840)	$(\frac{3}{2}, 2)$	—	—	—	$-\frac{10}{3}$	$-\frac{10}{3}$	$-\frac{10}{3}$	$-\frac{10}{3}$	—	—	5945(+)	2772(+)
	$(\frac{3}{2}, 1)$	—	—	—	$-\frac{10}{3}$	$-\frac{10}{3}$	$\frac{50}{9}$	$\frac{50}{9}$	—	$-\frac{20}{3}$	5914(+)	2668(+)
	$(\frac{1}{2}, 1)$	—	—	—	$\frac{20}{3}$	$\frac{20}{3}$	$-\frac{20}{9}$	$-\frac{20}{9}$	—	$-\frac{20}{9}$	5629(-)	2450(-)
	$(\frac{1}{2}, 0)$	—	—	—	$\frac{20}{3}$	$\frac{20}{3}$	$\frac{20}{3}$	$\frac{20}{3}$	—	$-\frac{20}{3}$	5585(-)	2322(-)
$B_{s,6}, B_{s,3}$ (5700)	$(\frac{3}{2}, 2)$	—	$-\frac{10}{3}$	$-\frac{10}{3}$	—	—	$-\frac{10}{3}$	$-\frac{10}{3}$	—	—	5793(+)	2619(+)
	$(\frac{3}{2}, 1)$	—	$-\frac{10}{3}$	$-\frac{10}{3}$	—	—	$\frac{50}{9}$	$\frac{50}{9}$	—	$-\frac{20}{3}$	5757(+)	2513(+)
	$(\frac{1}{2}, 1)$	—	$\frac{20}{3}$	$\frac{20}{3}$	—	—	$-\frac{20}{9}$	$-\frac{20}{9}$	—	$-\frac{20}{9}$	5518(-)	2339(-)
	$(\frac{1}{2}, 0)$	—	$\frac{20}{3}$	$\frac{20}{3}$	—	—	$\frac{20}{3}$	$\frac{20}{3}$	—	$-\frac{20}{3}$	5475(-)	2212(-)

TABLE III: The obtained CMI's and estimated masses for the case (2) in units of MeV. The symbol “+” (“-”) after the tetraquark mass means that $H_{CMI} > 0$ ($H_{CMI} < 0$).

State	$(S_{qq\bar{q}\bar{q}}, J)$	$\frac{C_{qq}}{m_q^2}$	$\frac{C_{qs}}{m_q m_s}$	$\frac{C_{ss}}{m_s^2}$	$\frac{C_{q\bar{q}}}{m_q^2}$	$\frac{C_{q\bar{s}}}{m_q m_s}$	$\frac{C_{s\bar{s}}}{m_s^2}$	$\frac{C_{qb}}{m_q m_b}$	$\frac{C_{sb}}{m_s m_b}$	$\frac{C_{q\bar{b}}}{m_q m_b}$	$\frac{C_{s\bar{b}}}{m_s m_b}$	Mass	Charm case
$B_{s,15}$ (5700)	$(\frac{3}{2}, 2)$	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5785(+)	2603(+)
	$(\frac{3}{2}, 1)$	—	—	—	—	—	—	$\frac{40}{9}$	—	$\frac{40}{9}$	—	5752(+)	2522(+)
	$(\frac{1}{2}, 1)$	—	—	—	$\frac{16}{3}$	—	—	$-\frac{16}{9}$	—	$-\frac{16}{9}$	—	5704(+)	2510(+)
	$(\frac{1}{2}, 0)$	—	—	—	$\frac{16}{3}$	—	—	$\frac{16}{3}$	—	$\frac{16}{3}$	—	5697(-)	2478(-)
B_{15}, B'^ℓ (5560)	$(\frac{3}{2}, 2)$	—	—	—	—	—	—	$\frac{40}{9}$	—	—	—	5667(+)	2487(+)
	$(\frac{3}{2}, 1)$	—	—	—	—	—	—	$\frac{40}{9}$	—	$\frac{40}{9}$	—	5643(+)	2410(+)
	$(\frac{1}{2}, 1)$	—	—	—	$\frac{16}{3}$	—	—	$-\frac{16}{9}$	—	$-\frac{16}{9}$	—	5514(-)	2319(-)
	$(\frac{1}{2}, 0)$	—	—	—	$\frac{16}{3}$	—	—	$\frac{16}{3}$	—	$\frac{16}{3}$	—	5503(-)	2286(-)
B'^h (5840)	$(\frac{3}{2}, 2)$	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5918(+)	2736(+)
	$(\frac{3}{2}, 1)$	—	—	—	—	—	—	$\frac{20}{9}$	—	$\frac{20}{9}$	—	5885(+)	2655(+)
	$(\frac{1}{2}, 1)$	—	—	—	—	—	—	$-\frac{20}{9}$	—	$-\frac{20}{9}$	—	5781(-)	2587(-)
	$(\frac{1}{2}, 0)$	—	—	—	—	—	—	$\frac{20}{3}$	—	$\frac{20}{3}$	—	5774(-)	2556(-)
$B_{s,15}, B_s'^\ell$ (5700)	$(\frac{3}{2}, 2)$	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5769(+)	2589(+)
	$(\frac{3}{2}, 1)$	—	—	—	—	—	—	$\frac{20}{9}$	—	$\frac{20}{9}$	—	5744(+)	2512(+)
	$(\frac{1}{2}, 1)$	—	—	—	—	—	—	$-\frac{20}{9}$	—	$-\frac{20}{9}$	—	5654(-)	2459(-)
	$(\frac{1}{2}, 0)$	—	—	—	—	—	—	$\frac{20}{3}$	—	$\frac{20}{3}$	—	5643(-)	2426(-)
$B_s'^h$ (5980)	$(\frac{3}{2}, 2)$	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	6114(+)	2931(+)
	$(\frac{3}{2}, 1)$	—	—	—	—	—	—	$\frac{16}{9}$	—	$\frac{16}{9}$	—	6080(+)	2851(+)
	$(\frac{1}{2}, 1)$	—	—	—	—	—	—	$-\frac{16}{9}$	—	$-\frac{16}{9}$	—	5922(-)	2727(-)
	$(\frac{1}{2}, 0)$	—	—	—	—	—	—	$\frac{16}{3}$	—	$\frac{16}{3}$	—	5914(-)	2696(-)
$B_{ss,15}$ (5840)	$(\frac{3}{2}, 2)$	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5934(+)	2753(+)
	$(\frac{3}{2}, 1)$	—	—	—	—	—	—	$\frac{16}{9}$	—	$\frac{16}{9}$	—	5908(+)	2676(+)
	$(\frac{1}{2}, 1)$	—	—	—	—	—	—	$-\frac{16}{9}$	—	$-\frac{16}{9}$	—	5857(+)	2662(+)
	$(\frac{1}{2}, 0)$	—	—	—	—	—	—	$\frac{16}{3}$	—	$\frac{16}{3}$	—	5845(+)	2628(-)

TABLE IV: The obtained CMI's and estimated masses for the case (3) in units of MeV. The symbol “+” (“-”) after the tetraquark mass means that $H_{CMI} > 0$ ($H_{CMI} < 0$).

chromomagnetic splitting and the stability of the tetraquark states. Moreover, the state corresponding to $X(5568)$ is not the most tightly bound tetraquark. A better triquark assumption may be more helpful for the stability of a multi-quark system than the “good” diquark assumption, where the triquark satisfies the condition: (a) qq in $3_f, 6_c$, and thus $S_{qq} = 1$ and (b) $S_{qq\bar{q}} = \frac{1}{2}$. The triquark cluster has been proposed by Karliner and Lipkin in discussion of the pentaquark Θ^+ [19]. Here, the flavor representation of the triquark is not constrained to be $\bar{6}_f$ only.

IV. DECAY PATTERNS

If the state $X(5568)$ does exist, the tetraquark interpretation is favored and its partners should also exist. It is worthwhile to search for such states in various channels. Now we turn to the decay properties of these tetraquarks. We mainly discuss those states with $\langle H_{CMI} \rangle < 0$.

(a) States with quark content $\ell\ell\bar{s}\bar{b}$ ($I = 1, 0$): $B_{\bar{s},6}, B_{\bar{s},15}$. The possible strong decay channel is BK . The BK threshold is around 5774 MeV ($> H_0 = 5700$ MeV), so the temporary conclusion is that no strong decay channel is allowed. In the charm case, although the $D_{\bar{s},6}$ with $J = 1$ in the case (2) is above the $\bar{D}K$ threshold (2365 MeV), the decay is forbidden by angular momentum conservation. In other words, these tetraquark states are stable once produced.

(b) States with quark content $\ell\ell\bar{\ell}\bar{b}$ ($I = \frac{3}{2}, \frac{1}{2}$): $B^\ell, B_{15}, B^{\ell\ell}$. Since the $B\pi$ threshold (5420 MeV) and the $B^*\pi$ threshold (5465 MeV) are both smaller than $H_0 = 5560$ MeV, it is possible to find tetraquark states in these channels. In the charmed case, the decay into $\bar{D}\pi$ (2010 MeV) or $\bar{D}^*\pi$ (2150 MeV) is also allowed.

(c) States with quark content $\ell s\bar{s}\bar{b}$ ($I = \frac{1}{2}$): $B^h, B^{h\ell}$. There are two types of strong decays: $B\eta$ and $B_s\bar{K}$. The thresholds are 5827 MeV and 5861 MeV, respectively. Only tetraquarks with repulsive color-magnetic interaction can possibly decay. However, in the charmed case, the tetraquark states decay into $\bar{D}\eta$ (2418 MeV), $\bar{D}^*\eta$ (2558 MeV), $D_s\bar{K}$ (2465 MeV), or even $D_s^*\bar{K}$ (2607 MeV). It is interesting to search for the charmed tetraquarks in these channels.

(d) States with quark content $s\ell\bar{\ell}\bar{b}$ ($I = 1, 0$): $B_{s,6}, B_{s,3}, B_{s,15}, B_s^\ell$. The $B\bar{K}$ threshold (5774 MeV) is larger than $H_0 = 5700$ MeV and the lower tetraquark states can only decay into $B_s\pi$ (5506 MeV) and $B_s^*\pi$ (5555 MeV). For the states below 5500 MeV, even the former channel is closed. Although the $B_{s,3}$ tetraquark state may be above the $B_s\pi$ threshold, its $B_s\pi$ decay mode is forbidden by isospin conservation. In the charmed case, the obtained scalar $D_{s,6}$ (2397), $D_{s,3}$ (2397), $D_{s,15}$ (2426), and D_s^ℓ (2426) are all above the $\bar{D}\bar{K}$ threshold (2365 MeV) and the $D_s\pi$ threshold (2109 MeV). The decay into these channels is allowed. The decay into $D_s^*\pi$ for the spin-1 partners of these D_s tetraquarks is also allowed. It is very interesting to search for the possible charmed

tetraquarks in the isovector channels. That is, the charmed partners of $X(5568)$ have more decay modes. Their ratios might be used to identify the tetraquark nature, like the unconfirmed $D_{sJ}(2632)$ [13].

(e) States with quark content $ss\bar{s}\bar{b}$ ($I = 0$): $B_s^{h\ell}$. The most possible channel is $B_s\eta$ whose threshold is 5914 MeV ($< H_0 = 5980$ MeV). But, the strong decay for the obtained tetraquarks with the attractive interaction is kinematically forbidden. In the charmed case, however, both $D_s\eta$ (2517 MeV) and $D_s^*\eta$ channels are kinematically allowed.

(f) States with quark content $ss\bar{\ell}\bar{b}$ ($I = \frac{1}{2}$): $B_{ss,15}$. If such tetraquarks with repulsive interaction exist, their decay into $B_s\bar{K}$ (5861 MeV) is probably kinematically allowed. Similar observation holds for the charmed case.

Therefore, our numerical results indicate that the bottom tetraquark states with the attractive interaction are stable. If one wants to search for them through strong decay, the only possible channels are $B\pi, B^*\pi$, or $B_s\pi$. On the other hand, the charmed tetraquarks may be searched for in the channels $D\pi, D^*\pi, D_s\pi, D_s^*\pi, D\eta, D^*\eta, D_s\eta, D_s^*\eta, DK, D_sK$, or even D_s^*K .

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this work, we have discussed the possible bottom tetraquark states with the chromomagnetic interaction model. We have considered four kinds of tetraquark structures according to the symmetry of the two light quarks. We find that the observed $X(5568)$ can be accommodated as a tetraquark candidate easily. Our analysis indicates that the other possible bottom tetraquarks should also exist and should be stable.

From the numerical results, we find that the stability of a $qq\bar{q}\bar{b}$ tetraquark state is dominantly determined by the interaction among the three light constituents. A triquark structure may result in lower tetraquark masses than a diquark assumption. Such a triquark structure is similar to that proposed in Ref. [19] but the flavor representation may also be 3_f .

In the charmed case, there also exist many $qq\bar{q}\bar{c}$ tetraquark states. They have more strong decay channels than the bottom partners. In particular, the experimental search for the charmed partners of the $X(5568)$ are strongly called for in the $D_s\pi, D_s^*\pi$, and isovector $\bar{D}\bar{K}$ channels.

Acknowledgments

This project is supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grants No. 11275115, No. 11222547, No. 11175073, No. 11261130311 and 973 program. XL is also supported by the National Youth Top-notch Talent Support Program (“Thousands-of-Talents Scheme”).

[1] V. M. Abazov *et al.* [DØ Collaboration], Observation of a new $B_s^0\pi^\pm$ state, [arXiv:1602.07588 [hep-ex]].

[2] H. X. Chen, W. Chen, X. Liu and S. L. Zhu, The hidden-charm

State	$(S_{qq\bar{q}}, J)$	$\frac{C_{qq}}{m_q^2}$	$\frac{C_{qs}}{m_q m_s}$	$\frac{C_{ss}}{m_s^2}$	$\frac{C_{q\bar{b}}}{m_q m_b}$	$\frac{C_{s\bar{b}}}{m_s m_b}$	Mass	Charm case
$B_{s,15}$ (5700)	$(\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ $(\frac{1}{2}, 0)$	-4				$\frac{4}{3}$ -4	5770(+) 5783(+)	2567(+) 2592(+)
B_{15}, B'^l (5560)	$(\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ $(\frac{1}{2}, 0)$	-4			$\frac{4}{3}$ -4		5632(+) 5639(+)	2428(+) 2450(+)
B'^h (5840)	$(\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ $(\frac{1}{2}, 0)$		-4			$\frac{4}{3}$ -4	5872(+) 5885(+)	2669(+) 2694(+)
$B_{s,15}, B'^l_s$ (5700)	$(\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ $(\frac{1}{2}, 0)$		-4		$\frac{4}{3}$ -4		5734(+) 5741(+)	2530(+) 2551(+)
B'^h_s (5980)	$(\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ $(\frac{1}{2}, 0)$			-4		$\frac{4}{3}$ -4	6068(+) 6081(+)	2865(+) 2889(+)
$B_{ss,15}$ (5840)	$(\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ $(\frac{1}{2}, 0)$			-4	$\frac{4}{3}$ -4		5929(+) 5936(+)	2725(+) 2747(+)

TABLE V: The obtained CMI's and estimated masses for the case (4) in units of MeV. The symbol “+” (“-”) after the tetraquark mass means that $H_{CMI} > 0$ ($H_{CMI} < 0$).

Hadron	CMI	Hadron	CMI	Parameter (MeV)
N	$-\frac{3}{4} \frac{C_{qq}}{m_q^2}$	Δ	$\frac{3}{4} \frac{C_{qq}}{m_q^2}$	$\frac{C_{qq}}{m_q^2} = 196$
Σ	$-\frac{1}{4} \frac{C_{qq}}{m_q^2} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{C_{qs}}{m_q m_s}$	Σ^*	$\frac{1}{4} \frac{C_{qq}}{m_q^2} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{C_{qs}}{m_q m_s}$	$\frac{C_{qs}}{m_q m_s} = 94$
Ξ	$-\frac{1}{2} \frac{C_{qs}}{m_q m_s} - \frac{1}{4} \frac{C_{ss}}{m_s^2}$	Ξ^*	$\frac{1}{2} \frac{C_{qs}}{m_q m_s} + \frac{1}{4} \frac{C_{ss}}{m_s^2}$	$\frac{C_{ss}}{m_s^2} = 242$
\bar{D}	$-\frac{3}{2} \frac{C_{q\bar{c}}}{m_c m_q}$	\bar{D}^*	$\frac{1}{2} \frac{C_{q\bar{c}}}{m_c m_q}$	$\frac{C_{q\bar{c}}}{m_c m_q} = 72$
\bar{D}_s	$-\frac{3}{2} \frac{C_{s\bar{c}}}{m_c m_s}$	\bar{D}_s^*	$\frac{1}{2} \frac{C_{s\bar{c}}}{m_c m_s}$	$\frac{C_{s\bar{c}}}{m_c m_s} = 72$
\bar{B}	$-\frac{3}{2} \frac{C_{q\bar{b}}}{m_b m_q}$	\bar{B}^*	$\frac{1}{2} \frac{C_{q\bar{b}}}{m_b m_q}$	$\frac{C_{q\bar{b}}}{m_b m_q} = 23$
\bar{B}_s	$-\frac{3}{2} \frac{C_{s\bar{b}}}{m_b m_s}$	\bar{B}_s^*	$\frac{1}{2} \frac{C_{s\bar{b}}}{m_b m_s}$	$\frac{C_{s\bar{b}}}{m_b m_s} = 25$
Σ_c	$\frac{1}{4} \frac{C_{qq}}{m_q^2} - \frac{C_{qc}}{m_c m_q}$	Σ_c^*	$\frac{1}{4} \frac{C_{qq}}{m_q^2} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{C_{qc}}{m_c m_q}$	$\frac{C_{q\bar{c}}}{m_c m_q} = 43$
Ξ'_c	$\frac{1}{4} \frac{C_{qs}}{m_q m_s} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{C_{qc}}{m_c m_q} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{C_{sc}}{m_c m_s}$	Ξ_c^*	$\frac{1}{4} \frac{C_{qs}}{m_q m_s} + \frac{1}{4} \frac{C_{qc}}{m_c m_q} + \frac{1}{4} \frac{C_{sc}}{m_c m_s}$	$\frac{C_{s\bar{c}}}{m_c m_s} = 49$
Σ_b	$\frac{1}{4} \frac{C_{qq}}{m_q^2} - \frac{C_{qb}}{m_b m_q}$	Σ_b^*	$\frac{1}{4} \frac{C_{qq}}{m_q^2} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{C_{qb}}{m_b m_q}$	$\frac{C_{q\bar{b}}}{m_b m_q} = 14$
Ξ'_b	$\frac{1}{4} \frac{C_{qs}}{m_q m_s} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{C_{qb}}{m_b m_q} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{C_{sb}}{m_b m_s}$	Ξ_b^*	$\frac{1}{4} \frac{C_{qs}}{m_q m_s} + \frac{1}{4} \frac{C_{qb}}{m_b m_q} + \frac{1}{4} \frac{C_{sb}}{m_b m_s}$	$\frac{C_{s\bar{b}}}{m_b m_s} = 26$

TABLE VI: The CMI's for baryons and mesons to determine the parameters in the model and obtained parameters. The parameter $\frac{C_{s\bar{b}}}{m_b m_s} = 26$ MeV is estimated with the mass difference $\Xi_b^* - \Xi'_b \approx 30$ MeV taken from Ref. [18].

- pentaquark and tetraquark states, arXiv:1601.02092 [hep-ph].
- [3] Y. R. Liu, X. Liu and S. L. Zhu, Light Pseudoscalar Meson and Heavy Meson Scattering Lengths, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 094026 (2009) [arXiv:0904.1770 [hep-ph]].
 - [4] Y. J. Zhang, H. C. Chiang, P. N. Shen and B. S. Zou, Possible S-wave bound-states of two pseudoscalar mesons, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 014013 (2006) [hep-ph/0604271].
 - [5] W. Chen, H. X. Chen, X. Liu, T. G. Steele and S. L. Zhu, Investigation of the $X(5568)$ as a fully open-flavor $sub\bar{d}$ tetraquark state, arXiv:1602.08916 [hep-ph].
 - [6] S. S. Agaev, K. Azizi and H. Sundu, Mass and decay constant of the newly observed exotic $X(5568)$ state, arXiv:1602.08642 [hep-ph].
 - [7] S. S. Agaev, K. Azizi and H. Sundu, Width of the exotic $X_b(5568)$ state through its strong decay to $B_s^0\pi^+$, arXiv:1603.00290 [hep-ph].
 - [8] C. M. Zanetti, M. Nielsen and K. P. Khemchandani, A QCD sum rule study for a charged bottom-strange scalar meson, arXiv:1602.09041 [hep-ph].
 - [9] Z. G. Wang, Analysis of the $X(5568)$ as scalar tetraquark state in the diquark-antidiquark model with QCD sum rules, arXiv:1602.08711 [hep-ph].
 - [10] W. Wang and R. Zhu, Can $X(5568)$ be a tetraquark state?, arXiv:1602.08806 [hep-ph].
 - [11] C. J. Xiao and D. Y. Chen, Possible $B^{(*)}\bar{K}$ hadronic molecule state, arXiv:1603.00228 [hep-ph].
 - [12] X. H. Liu and G. Li, Could the observation of $X(5568)$ be resulted by the near threshold rescattering effects?, arXiv:1603.00708 [hep-ph].
 - [13] Y. R. Liu, S. L. Zhu, Y. B. Dai and C. Liu, $D_{sJ}^+(2632)$: An Excellent candidate of tetraquarks, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 094009 (2004) [hep-ph/0407157].
 - [14] Talk given by Paolo Gandini at Rencontres de Moriond QCD and High Energy Interactions, <http://moriond.in2p3.fr/QCD/2016/WednesdayMorning/Gandini.pdf>
 - [15] T. Hyodo, Y. R. Liu, M. Oka, K. Sudoh and S. Yasui, Production of doubly charmed tetraquarks with exotic color configurations in electron-positron collisions, Phys. Lett. B **721**, 56 (2013), [arXiv:1209.6207 [hep-ph]].
 - [16] J. J. de Swart, The Octet model and its Clebsch-Gordan coefficients, Rev. Mod. Phys. **35**, 916 (1963) [Rev. Mod. Phys. **37**, 326 (1965)].
 - [17] T. A. Kaeding, Tables of SU(3) isoscalar factors, Atom. Data Nucl. Data Tabl. **61**, 233 (1995), [nucl-th/9502037].
 - [18] X. Liu, H. X. Chen, Y. R. Liu, A. Hosaka and S. L. Zhu, Bottom baryons, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 014031 (2008) [arXiv:0710.0123 [hep-ph]].
 - [19] M. Karliner and H. J. Lipkin, A Diquark-triquark model for the KN pentaquark, Phys. Lett. B **575**, 249 (2003) [hep-ph/0402260].