

Doubly Heavy Tetraquarks in the Born-Oppenheimer approximation

Luciano Maiani,^{1,2} Alessandro Pilloni,^{3,4} Antonio D. Polosa,¹ and Veronica Riquer^{1,2}

¹*Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, Sapienza Università di Roma, Piazzale Aldo Moro 2, I-00185 Roma, Italy*

²*CERN, 1211 Geneva 23, Switzerland*

³*Università degli Studi di Messina, Viale Ferdinando Stagno d'Alcontres 31, I-98166 Messina, Italy*

⁴*INFN Sezione di Catania, Via Santa Sofia 64, I-95123 Catania, Italy*

(Dated: January 8, 2024)

Tetraquarks $QQ\bar{q}\bar{q}$ are found to be described remarkably well with the Quantum Chromodynamics version of the Hydrogen bond, as treated with the Born-Oppenheimer approximation. We show the robustness of the method by computing the mass of the observed \mathcal{T}_{cc} tetraquark following two different paths. Relying on this, we provide a prediction for the mass of the expected \mathcal{T}_{bb} particle.

Introduction. The discovery of a doubly charm meson [1, 2], as well as the theoretical consensus on the existence of a doubly bottom counterpart [3–7], is moving the spotlight on heavy-light $QQ\bar{q}\bar{q}$ tetraquarks. Since they cannot mix with ordinary charmonia, they turn out to be the simplest exotic system to study, see [8].

Given the separation of masses $M_Q \gg m_q$, one finds a situation similar to that encountered in the hydrogen molecule. The fast motion of the light quarks in the field of the heavy color sources generates an effective potential, dependent on the relative distance R separating the QQ pair. The potential, in turn, regulates the slower motion of the heavy quarks. Such an effective potential, known as the Born-Oppenheimer potential (BO), is obtained by solving the eigenvalue equation for the light particles at fixed values of the coordinates of the heavy particles (see e.g. [9–13]). The energy \mathcal{E} will be a function of the relative distance R between heavy particles and corresponds to the core of the full BO potential, which includes the direct interaction between the sources.

When solving the Schrödinger equation of the heavy particles, one neglects the momentum of the heavy particles computed as the gradient of the eigenfunction related to \mathcal{E} . This is the content of the *Born-Oppenheimer approximation*, illustrated in detail for QED in [14, 15].

Recently, we have applied the Born-Oppenheimer approximation to calculate the mass of the lowest lying doubly heavy tetraquarks, \mathcal{T}_{cc} and \mathcal{T}_{bb} [16]. In synthesis, the calculation gave a mass of \mathcal{T}_{cc} close to the DD threshold and a mass for \mathcal{T}_{bb} considerably below the $\bar{B}\bar{B}$ threshold, deep in the stability region against weak and electromagnetic decays. Previous calculations based on constituent quark model [6, 17, 18] had rather indicated a \mathcal{T}_{cc} mass close to the D^*D threshold and, for \mathcal{T}_{bb} , a Q -value well inside the stability region.

The observation of $\mathcal{T}_{cc}(3875)^+$ at the D^*D threshold calls for a closer examination of our calculation [16]. We find room for improvement with respect to the use of the hyperfine $\kappa[(ud)\bar{3}]$ coupling taken from baryon spectrum, the coupling which regulates the mass splitting of Σ_Q - Λ_Q baryons.

As already demonstrated in previous cases,¹ the extension to tetraquarks of hyperfine couplings taken from meson and baryon spectra is, in fact, a weak assumption. Hyperfine couplings depend crucially from the overlap probability of the quark pair involved, which, in tetraquarks cannot be *a priori* assumed to be equal to the overlap probabilities of the same pair in mesons and baryons.

Within the Born-Oppenheimer scheme, we can improve our calculation in two ways:

- **Method 1: scaling baryon and mesons hyperfine couplings with the dimensions of the BO bound state.** We use the spin-independent BO formalism to evaluate the average separations of light quarks and of heavy quarks to obtain realistic estimates of the corresponding hyperfine couplings by scaling with respect to the separations in baryons (for $\bar{q}\bar{q}'$) and in charmonium/bottomonium (for QQ).
- **Method 2: QCD approach.** We start from the hyperfine quark-quark QCD interaction [20–22]. Its first order effect on the energy of the light quark system depends on the separation of the heavy sources, R , and it adds a contribution to the Born-Oppenheimer potential, which depends on the light quark spin $S_{\bar{q}\bar{q}}$ and on the total angular momentum J of the tetraquark, taking fully into account the effect of light-to-light and light-to-heavy quarks hyperfine interactions². The effect of the remaining heavy-to-heavy hyperfine interaction can be evaluated from the same formula applied to the final wave function of the heavy quarks.

This calculation leads to three new results.

¹ See, Ref. [19] for the suppression in $Z_c(3900)$, $Z'_c(4020)$ mass spectrum of $\kappa[(u\bar{u})_1]$ hyperfine coupling, dominant in meson spectra.

² This method is followed in lattice calculations, where the computed Born-Oppenheimer potential takes full account of flavor and spin properties of the light quarks, see e.g. [23].

1. For the $I = 0$, $J^P = 1^+$ state, the two methods give remarkably similar values, close to the observed mass of $\mathcal{T}_{cc}(3875)^+$.
2. With Method 2, we compute the masses of the remaining, double charm states with $I = S_{\bar{q}\bar{q}} = 1$ and $J^P = 0^+, 1^+, 2^+$. Unlike the familiar Λ_Q , Σ_Q cases, the doubly heavy, $I = 1$, $J^P = 1^+$ tetraquark is predicted to be *lighter than the $I = 0$ tetraquark* by 15–20 MeV, which may be compatible with it not having been seen by LHCb yet.
3. Concerning the $[bb\bar{q}\bar{q}]$, $I = 0$ tetraquark, the new evaluation gives a mass below the $\bar{B}\bar{B}$ threshold but rather close to it, not allowing a definite decision about the issue of stability against strong decays.

Color couplings. In pursuing the analogy with the treatment of the hydrogen molecule, the coulombic potential terms are rescaled by the appropriate color factors. Quarks are treated as non-relativistic and weakly interacting so that the determination of color factors is done in the one-gluon-exchange approximation.

In [16] we have considered doubly flavored bb and cc tetraquarks, assuming the doubly heavy pair in color $\bar{\mathbf{3}}$. The lowest energy state corresponds to QQ in spin one and light antiquarks in spin and isospin zero. The tetraquark state is $|T\rangle = |(QQ)_{\bar{\mathbf{3}}}, (\bar{q}\bar{q})_{\mathbf{3}}\rangle_1$. From the Fierz identity

$$|T\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} |(\bar{q}Q)_{\mathbf{1}}, (\bar{q}Q)_{\mathbf{1}}\rangle_1 - \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} |(\bar{q}Q)_{\mathbf{8}}, (\bar{q}Q)_{\mathbf{8}}\rangle_1 \quad (1)$$

weighting with the squared amplitudes in (1), one derives the attractive color factors ³

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{QQ} &= \lambda_{\bar{q}\bar{q}} = -\frac{2}{3}\alpha_s \\ \lambda_{Q\bar{q}} &= \left[\frac{1}{3} \times \frac{1}{2} \left(-\frac{8}{3} \right) + \frac{2}{3} \times \frac{1}{2} \left(3 - \frac{8}{3} \right) \right] \alpha_s = -\frac{1}{3}\alpha_s \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

We shall add to the Coulombic, QCD, potential a linearly rising, confining, potential, $V = k_{Q\bar{q}} r$. The string tension k , in the $Q\bar{q}$ orbital, can be taken as

$$k_{Q\bar{q}} = \frac{3}{4\alpha_s} |\lambda_{Q\bar{q}}| k = \frac{1}{4} k \quad (3)$$

where $k = 0.15 \text{ GeV}^2$ is the string tension derived from quarkonium spectrum (in color singlet $|\lambda_{Q\bar{Q}}| = 4/3$ so that $k_{Q\bar{Q}} = k$), according to the so-called ‘Casimir scaling’ [24]. However, as shown in (1), $Q\bar{q}$ is in a superposition of color singlet and color octet. The charge of $(\bar{q}Q)_{\mathbf{8}}$ is represented by an $SU(3)$ tensor v_j^i , traceless. In the QCD vacuum this charge might be neutralized by soft gluons, as in $A_i^j v_j^i$: therefore only the singlet component matters, and $k_{Q\bar{q}} = k$. We call this possibility ‘triality scaling’.⁴ We will show the results of both hypotheses for the string tension.

Orbitals. We consider at first the heavy quarks as fixed color sources at a distance R . Light antiquarks are bound each to a heavy quark in orbitals with wave functions $\psi(\xi)$ and $\phi(\eta)$ and the ground state of the $\bar{q}\bar{q}$ system is assumed to be symmetric under the exchange of light quarks coordinates (the notation is defined in Fig. 1).

³ We use the rule based on quadratic Casimir coefficients $\lambda_{12} = 1/2(C(\mathbf{S}) - C(\mathbf{R}_1) - C(\mathbf{R}_2))$ where \mathbf{S} is one of the representations contained in the Kronecker product $\mathbf{R}_1 \otimes \mathbf{R}_2$. $C(\mathbf{3}) = C(\bar{\mathbf{3}}) = 4/3$, $C(\mathbf{6}) = 10/3$ and $C(\mathbf{8}) = 3$.

⁴ Consider a generic color charge described by a $SU(3)$ tensor $v_{j_1 \dots j_m}^{i_1 \dots i_n}$, having triality $\mathcal{T} = n - m - 3[(n - m)/3]$. It can be lowered to $v^{i_1 \dots i_{n-m}}_{j_1 \dots j_m}$ by repeated contraction with soft gluons $A_{i_n}^{j_m}$. If $n - m = 1$ we get a $\mathbf{3}$ tensor. If $n - m = 2$ we get a $\mathbf{6}$. If $n - m \geq 3$, $v^{i_1 \dots i_{n-m}}_{j_1 \dots j_m}$ can be further reduced by contraction with the $\bar{\mathbf{10}}$ tensors $A_{i_1}^r A_{i_2}^s \epsilon_{i_3 r s}$ (i_1, i_2, i_3 symmetrized) to finally get either one of $\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{3}, \mathbf{6}$. Therefore the product of a charge $v_{j_1 \dots j_m}^{i_1 \dots i_n}$ and its conjugate can be reduced to the non-trivial cases $\mathbf{3} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{3}}$ as in (1), or $\mathbf{6} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{6}}$. The Kronecker decomposition of $\mathbf{6} \otimes \mathbf{8}$ contains the $\bar{\mathbf{3}}$ representation as well as $\bar{\mathbf{6}} \otimes \mathbf{8}$ contains the $\mathbf{3}$. Therefore, by the effect of the contraction with gluons, also $\mathbf{6} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{6}}$ behaves like $\mathbf{3} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{3}}$ and we still might use k rather than the Casimir scaled value.




FIG. 1. The heavy quarks are separated by the vector \mathbf{R} . The vectors $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ and $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ have their application points at the two heavy quarks.

$$\Psi = \frac{\psi(\boldsymbol{\xi})\phi(\boldsymbol{\eta}) + \psi(\boldsymbol{\eta})\phi(\boldsymbol{\xi})}{\sqrt{2[1 + S^2(R)]}} \quad (4)$$

Normalization, $(\Psi, \Psi) = 1$, is obtained with the overlap function given by⁵

$$S(R) = \int_{\boldsymbol{\xi}} \psi(\boldsymbol{\xi})\phi(\boldsymbol{\xi}) \quad (5)$$

The wave function $\psi(\boldsymbol{\xi})$ gives the amplitude of \bar{q} at a distance $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ from Q , as represented in Fig. 1. The wavefunction $\phi(\boldsymbol{\eta})$ is the amplitude of the other light quark \bar{q} at a distance $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ from the second heavy quark (which is at distance \mathbf{R} from the former). The vectors $\boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\eta}$ have the application points in the positions of the two heavy quarks respectively. The ψ and ϕ wavefunctions are written in terms of the radial functions $\mathcal{R} = R_{00}/\sqrt{4\pi}$ in the following way

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\boldsymbol{\xi}) &= \mathcal{R}(|\boldsymbol{\xi}|) & \psi(\boldsymbol{\eta}) &= \mathcal{R}(|\mathbf{R} + \boldsymbol{\eta}|) \\ \phi(\boldsymbol{\eta}) &= \mathcal{R}(|\boldsymbol{\eta}|) & \phi(\boldsymbol{\xi}) &= \mathcal{R}(|\boldsymbol{\xi} - \mathbf{R}|) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

$\mathcal{R}(r)$ is the radial wave function obtained by solving variationally the Schrödinger equation of the heavy quark-light antiquark system with the potential,

$$V(r) = \frac{\lambda_{Q\bar{q}}}{r} + k_{Q\bar{q}} r + V_0 = -\frac{1}{3} \frac{\alpha_s}{r} + \frac{1}{4} k r + V_0 \quad (7)$$

$$\mathcal{R}(r) = \frac{A^{3/2}}{\sqrt{\pi}} e^{-Ar} \quad (8)$$

We have included a constant V_0 , to be discussed below, that defines the offset of the energy for confined systems. The determination of A comes from the minimization of $(\mathcal{R}, H \mathcal{R}) = \langle H \rangle$: the value of A used in computations corresponds to $\langle H \rangle_{\min}$. The light quarks energy, to zeroth order when we restrict to the interactions that define the orbitals, is

$$\mathcal{E}_0 = 2(\langle H \rangle_{\min} + V_0) \quad (9)$$

where $\langle H \rangle_{\min}$ is the orbital energy eigenvalue (and the minimum of the Schrödinger functional).

In Ref. [16] and in the following, we use the numerical values:

$$\alpha_s(2M_c) = 0.30 \quad \alpha_s(2M_b) = 0.21 \quad k = 0.15 \text{ GeV}^2 \quad (10)$$

Determination of the BO potential. We include in a perturbation Hamiltonian the interactions left out from the construction of the orbitals, namely the interaction of each light quark with the other heavy quark and the interaction among light quarks. Following Fig. 1

$$\delta H = \lambda_{Q\bar{q}} \left(\frac{1}{|\boldsymbol{\xi} - \mathbf{R}|} + \frac{1}{|\boldsymbol{\eta} + \mathbf{R}|} \right) + \frac{\lambda_{q\bar{q}}}{|\boldsymbol{\xi} - \mathbf{R} - \boldsymbol{\eta}|} \quad (11)$$

⁵ Considering ground states only, we restrict ψ and ϕ to be real functions.

with color factors taken from (2). We compute the total energy of the light system in the presence of fixed sources, $\mathcal{E}(R)$, to first order in δH

$$\mathcal{E}(R) = \mathcal{E}_0 + \Delta E(R)$$

$$\Delta E(R) = (\Psi, \delta H \Psi) = \frac{1}{1 + S^2(R)} \left[-\frac{1}{3} \alpha_s (2I_1(R) + 2S(R)I_2(R)) - \frac{2}{3} \alpha_s (I_4(R) + I_6(R)) \right] \quad (12)$$

The $I_i(R)$ are integrals over the orbital wave functions are defined and computed in [16],⁶

$$\begin{aligned} I_1(R) &\equiv \int_{\xi} \psi(\xi)^2 \frac{1}{|\xi - \mathbf{R}|} = \int_{\eta} \phi(\eta)^2 \frac{1}{|\eta + \mathbf{R}|} \\ I_2(R) &\equiv \int_{\xi} \psi(\xi) \phi(\xi) \frac{1}{|\xi - \mathbf{R}|} = \int_{\eta} \psi(\eta) \phi(\eta) \frac{1}{|\eta + \mathbf{R}|} \\ I_4(R) &\equiv \int_{\xi, \eta} \psi(\xi)^2 \phi(\eta)^2 \frac{1}{|\xi - \mathbf{R} - \eta|} = \int_{\xi, \eta} \psi(\eta)^2 \phi(\xi)^2 \frac{1}{|\xi - \mathbf{R} - \eta|} \\ I_6(R) &\equiv \int_{\xi, \eta} \psi(\xi) \phi(\xi) \psi(\eta) \phi(\eta) \frac{1}{|\xi - \mathbf{R} - \eta|} \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Results in the first three lines are derived from the symmetry transformation $\xi \rightarrow \eta$, $\mathbf{R} \rightarrow -\mathbf{R}$, $\psi \rightarrow \phi$. With these definitions at hand the result (12) for $\Delta E(R)$ is readily derived from the definition (11) of δH .

The Born-Oppenheimer potential, to be used in the Schrödinger equation of the heavy quarks, is then

$$V_{\text{BO}}(R) = -\frac{2}{3} \alpha_s \frac{1}{R} + \mathcal{E}(R) \quad (14)$$

At large separations $V_{\text{BO}}(R)$ tends to the constant value

$$V_{\text{BO}}(R) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_0 = 2(\langle H \rangle_{\min} + V_0) \quad \text{for } R \rightarrow \infty \quad (15)$$

As noted in [16], at infinity the two orbitals tend to a superposition of color **8-8** and color **1-1**. The color of a triality zero pair can be screened by soft gluons from the vacuum, as first noticed in [24] and supported by lattice QCD calculations (see [23] for recent results). The upshot is that, including the constituent quark rest masses taken from the meson spectrum, Tab. I, the limit $V_{\text{BO}}(\infty) + 2(M_Q + M_q)$ must coincide with the mass of a pair of non-interacting beauty (charmed) mesons with spin-spin interaction subtracted, which is just $2(M_Q + M_q)$. Thus, we derive the boundary condition

$$\langle H \rangle_{\min} + V_0 = 0 \quad (16)$$

which fixes V_0 .

Tetraquark spectrum and Q values. The negative eigenvalue E of the Schrödinger equation with $V_{\text{BO}}(R)$ (including the condition on V_0 just found) is the binding energy associated with the BO potential. With the values in (10) and in Table I we obtained [16]:

$$\begin{aligned} E &= -70 \text{ } (-87) \text{ MeV} & \text{for } cc, \\ E &= -67 \text{ } (-85) \text{ MeV} & \text{for } bb. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Where the first result assumes the Casimir scaling for the string tension ($k_{Q\bar{q}} = k/4$), while the result in parenthesis assumes the triality scaling ($k_{Q\bar{q}} = k$). The masses of the lowest tetraquark with $[(QQ)_{S=1}(\bar{q}\bar{q})_{S=0}]$ and of the pseudoscalar mesons $P = Q\bar{q}$ are

$$M(T) = 2(M_Q + M_q) + E + \frac{1}{2} \kappa_{QQ} - \frac{3}{2} \kappa_{\bar{q}\bar{q}} \quad (18)$$

$$M(P) = M_Q + M_q - \frac{3}{2} \kappa_{Q\bar{q}} \quad (19)$$

⁶ When computing e.g. I_1 , the angle between ξ and \mathbf{R} corresponds to the polar angle θ in the ξ integration. The distance between light quarks $|\xi - \mathbf{R} - \eta| = d_{\bar{q}\bar{q}}$, occurring in $I_{4,6}$ can be computed by shifting along x or y as in

$$d_{\bar{q}\bar{q}} = \sqrt{(\xi \sin(\theta_\xi) \cos(\phi_\xi) - \eta \sin(\theta_\eta) \cos(\phi_\eta))^2 + (\xi \cos(\theta_\xi) - \eta \cos(\theta_\eta))^2 + (-\eta \sin(\theta_\eta) \sin(\phi_\eta) + \xi \sin(\theta_\xi) \sin(\phi_\xi) - R)^2}$$

where the polar and azimuthal angles are related to ξ and η .

Flavors	q	s	c	b
$M(\text{MeV})$	308	484	1667	5005

TABLE I. Constituent quark masses from S -wave mesons [25], with $q = u, d$.

Mesons	$(q\bar{q})_1$	$(q\bar{s})_1$	$(q\bar{c})_1$	$(s\bar{c})_1$	$(q\bar{b})_1$	$(c\bar{c})_1$	$(b\bar{b})_1$
κ (MeV)	318	200	70	72	23	56	30
Baryons	$(qq)_{\bar{3}}$	$(qs)_{\bar{3}}$	$(qc)_{\bar{3}}$	$(sc)_{\bar{3}}$	$(qb)_{\bar{3}}$	$(cc)_3$	$(bb)_3$
κ (MeV)	98	59	15	50	2.5	28	15
Ratio $\frac{\kappa_{MES}}{\kappa_{BAR}}$	3.2	3.4	4.7	1.6	9.2	—	—

TABLE II. S -wave Mesons and Baryons: spin-spin interactions of the lightest quarks with the heavier flavours [25]. Values for $\kappa[(Q\bar{Q})_1]$ are taken from the mass differences of ortho- and para-quarkonia. Following the one-gluon exchange prescription one then takes $\kappa[(QQ)_3] = 1/2\kappa[(Q\bar{Q})_1]$.

The resulting Q -values with respect to the PP thresholds are

$$Q_{QQ} = M(T) - 2M(P) = E + \frac{1}{2}\kappa_{QQ} - \frac{3}{2}\kappa_{q\bar{q}} + 3\kappa_{Q\bar{q}} \quad (20)$$

and numerically, for the $[(QQ)_{S=1}(\bar{q}\bar{q})_{S=0}]$ state [16],

$$Q_{cc} = +7(-10) \text{ MeV} \quad (21)$$

$$Q_{bb} = -138(-156) \text{ MeV} \quad (22)$$

Eq. (21) is the result mentioned in the Introduction, which needs a closer examination.

To obtain (21) and (22) one has used values of quark masses and hyperfine couplings obtained from meson and baryon spectra and reported in Tabs. I and II [25]. However, as mentioned in the Introduction, hyperfine couplings depend crucially from the overlap probability of the quark pair involved, which, in tetraquarks cannot be *a priori* assumed to be equal to the overlap probabilities of the same pair in mesons and baryons.

Within the Born-Oppenheimer scheme we can improve the calculation following the two lines described in the Introduction.

Hyperfine couplings from rescaling the overlap probabilities: Method 1. The average distance of the light quarks as a function of R , the heavy quarks distance, is given by the integral [16]:

$$d_{\bar{q}\bar{q}}(R) = (\Psi, |\boldsymbol{\xi} - \mathbf{R} - \boldsymbol{\eta}| \Psi) = \int_{\boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\eta}} \frac{\psi(\boldsymbol{\xi})^2 \phi(\boldsymbol{\eta})^2 + \psi(\boldsymbol{\xi})\phi(\boldsymbol{\xi})\psi(\boldsymbol{\eta})\phi(\boldsymbol{\eta})}{1 + S^2(R)} |\boldsymbol{\xi} - \mathbf{R} - \boldsymbol{\eta}| \quad (23)$$

The average distance between light quarks in the tetraquark is then given by

$$\bar{d}_{\bar{q}\bar{q}} = \int dR \chi^2(R) d_{\bar{q}\bar{q}}(R) \quad (24)$$

where $\chi(R)$ is the normalized radial wave function of the QQ pair, solution of the Schrödinger equation in the Born-Oppenheimer potential $V_{BO}(R)$. In correspondence, we scale the hyperfine coupling in the tetraquark by rescaling κ_{qq} in Tab. II as with the inverse cube of $\bar{d}_{\bar{q}\bar{q}}$.

The inverse radius of diquarks $[qq]$ in baryons is estimated in Ref. [26] from the electrostatic contributions to the isospin breaking mass differences of baryons. They quote a parameter a from which the radius is derived according to

$$a = \alpha \left\langle R_{[qq]}^{-1} \right\rangle \simeq 2.83 \text{ MeV} \implies R_{[qq]} \simeq 2.58 \text{ GeV}^{-1} \quad (25)$$

This leads to estimate the rescaled coupling

$$\kappa'_{qq} = \kappa_{qq} (R_{[qq]}/\bar{d}_{\bar{q}\bar{q}})^3 \quad (26)$$

We proceed analogously for the hyperfine QQ coupling in the tetraquark, defining

$$\bar{d}_{QQ} = \int dR \chi^2(R) R \quad (27)$$

We scale with the quarkonium average radius $R_{Q\bar{Q}}$, obtained variationally from the wave function of the Cornell potential

$$V(r) = -\frac{4}{3} \frac{\alpha_s(M_Q)}{r} + k r \quad (28)$$

to obtain

$$\kappa'_{QQ} = \kappa_{QQ} (R_{Q\bar{Q}}/\bar{d}_{QQ})^3 \quad (29)$$

with κ_{QQ} from Tab. II.

From the treatment of charmed baryons which can be found in [27] we extract

$$R_{Qq} \simeq 2.64 \text{ GeV}^{-1} \quad (30)$$

A quark pair $Q\bar{q}$ in $QQ\bar{q}\bar{q}$ has two alternatives: A) Q and \bar{q} belong to the same orbital, and lie at an average distance $\bar{d}_{Q\bar{q}}^A$; B) Q and \bar{q} belong to different orbitals, being at a relative distance $\bar{d}_{Q\bar{q}}^B$. One has to rescale the couplings by the appropriate distances, i.e.

$$\kappa'_{Q\bar{q}} = \frac{\kappa_{Q\bar{q}}}{4} \left[\frac{1}{2} (R_{Qq}/\bar{d}_{Q\bar{q}}^A)^3 + \frac{1}{2} (R_{Qq}/\bar{d}_{Q\bar{q}}^B)^3 \right] \quad (31)$$

where $\kappa_{Q\bar{q}}$ is taken from Tab. II, $1/4$ is the color factor of $Q\bar{q}$ in the tetraquark with respect to the meson, and the average distances are

$$\bar{d}_{Q\bar{q}}^A(R) = \int dR \chi^2(R) \int_{\xi} \frac{\psi(\xi)^2 + \psi(\xi)\phi(\xi)}{1 + S^2(R)} |\xi| \quad (32a)$$

and

$$\bar{d}_{Q\bar{q}}^B(R) = \int dR \chi^2(R) \int_{\xi} \frac{\psi(\xi)^2 + \psi(\xi)\phi(\xi)}{1 + S^2(R)} |\xi - \mathbf{R}| \quad (32b)$$

The resulting Q -values with respect to the PP thresholds are finally

$$Q_{QQ} = E + \frac{1}{2} \kappa'_{QQ} + \kappa'_{\bar{q}\bar{q}} \left[S_{\bar{q}\bar{q}}(S_{\bar{q}\bar{q}} + 1) - \frac{3}{2} \right] + \kappa'_{Q\bar{q}} [J(J+1) - S_{\bar{q}\bar{q}}(S_{\bar{q}\bar{q}} + 1) - 2] + 3\kappa_{Q\bar{q}} \quad (33)$$

Hyperfine couplings from QCD: Method 2. We start from the interaction Hamiltonian at the quark level,

$$H_{ij} = -\frac{\lambda_{ij}}{M_i M_j} \frac{8\pi}{3} \mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j \delta^3(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j) \equiv K_{ij} \mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j \delta^3(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j) \quad (34)$$

with λ_{ij} given in Eq. (1). Following [21], the light quark interaction Hamiltonian is

$$H_{\bar{q}\bar{q}} = K_{q\bar{q}} \mathbf{S}_{\bar{q}} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{\bar{q}} \delta^3(\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2) \quad (35)$$

where $\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2$ is the distance between the light quarks. According to the δ^3 -function in (35) we have that $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \boldsymbol{\xi} - \mathbf{R}$ and

$$\eta = \sqrt{\xi^2 + R^2 - 2R\xi \cos \theta} \quad (36)$$

In particular we find

$$V_{\bar{q}\bar{q}}(R) = (\Psi, H_{\bar{q}\bar{q}} \Psi) = \frac{8\pi\alpha_s}{9M_q^2} \int_{\xi} \frac{\psi(\xi)^2 \phi(\mathbf{R} - \xi)^2}{1 + S^2(R)} \times \begin{cases} -3 & (S_{\bar{q}\bar{q}} = 0) \\ +1 & (S_{\bar{q}\bar{q}} = 1) \end{cases} \quad (37)$$

In the heavy-light case we have (with an obvious notation we distinguish the two heavy quarks as A, B and the light quarks as 1, 2)

$$H_{Q\bar{q}} = K_{Q\bar{q}} \left[\mathbf{S}_A \cdot \mathbf{S}_1 \delta^3(\mathbf{x}_A - \mathbf{x}_1) + \mathbf{S}_A \cdot \mathbf{S}_2 \delta^3(\mathbf{x}_A - \mathbf{x}_2) + (A \rightarrow B) \right] = H_{A1} + H_{A2} + (A \rightarrow B) \quad (38)$$

	$\kappa'_{\bar{q}\bar{q}}$	κ'_{QQ}	$\kappa'_{Q\bar{q}}$	E	Q -value	BO Mass
cc	+1.9 (+5.0)	+0.4 (+0.7)	+0.7 (+2.0)	-70.3 (-86.8)	+137.0 (+116.1)	3872 (3851)
bb	+2.7 (+8.6)	+0.3 (+0.4)	+3.0 (+1.1)	-72.5 (-91.7)	-7.4 (-35.5)	10553 (10525)

TABLE III. Scaling of couplings, $S_{\bar{q}\bar{q}} = 0$, $J = 1$. All units are in MeV. The number in parentheses correspond to the triality scaling: in Eq. (3) use k in place of $k/4$. The Q -value is taken from the PP meson pair threshold.

	$\kappa''_{\bar{q}\bar{q}}$	κ''_{QQ}	$\kappa''_{Q\bar{q}}$	E	Q -value	BO Mass
cc	+3.1 (+9.4)	+1.2 (+2.0)	+2.1 (+7.9)	-74.8 (-100.2)	+135.8 (+110.8)	3871 (3846)
bb	+3.2 (+10.7)	+0.5 (+0.7)	+0.6 (+2.2)	-77.3 (-107.4)	-8.0 (-38.0)	10552 (10522)

TABLE IV. Couplings from QCD, $S_{\bar{q}\bar{q}} = 0$, $J = 1$. All units are in MeV. For comparison with the other table, we also calculate the contributions to E from $\kappa''_{\bar{q}\bar{q}}$ and $\kappa''_{Q\bar{q}}$, averaging the correspondent terms with the BO wave function. The number in parentheses correspond to the triality scaling: in Eq. (3) use k in place of $k/4$.

Therefore

$$(\Psi, H_{A1} \Psi) = \frac{K_{Q\bar{q}}}{2[1 + S^2(R)]} \cdot \left[\psi(0)^2 + \psi(R)^2 + 2S \psi(0)\psi(R) \right] (\mathbf{S}_A \cdot \mathbf{S}_1) \quad (39)$$

where we used the fact that $\boldsymbol{\xi} = 0$ thus $\boldsymbol{\eta} = -\mathbf{R}$ (and $\phi(-\mathbf{R}) = \phi(\mathbf{R}) = \psi(\mathbf{R})$ from (6) and (8)).

Adding all terms, one finds

$$V_{Q\bar{q}}(R) = K_{Q\bar{q}} \frac{\psi(0)^2 + \psi(R)^2 + 2S \psi(0)\psi(R)}{2(1 + S^2)} \mathbf{S}_{QQ} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{\bar{q}\bar{q}} \quad (40)$$

We have

$$V_{Q\bar{q}}(R) = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad S_{\bar{q}\bar{q}} = 0 \quad (41)$$

whereas for $S_{\bar{q}\bar{q}} = 1$ we have

$$V_{Q\bar{q}}(R) = \frac{4\pi\alpha_s}{9M_q M_Q} \frac{\psi(0)^2 + \psi(R)^2 + 2S \psi(0)\psi(R)}{2[1 + S^2(R)]} \times \begin{cases} -4 & (J = 0) \\ -2 & (J = 1) \\ +2 & (J = 2) \end{cases} \quad (42)$$

Both $V_{\bar{q}\bar{q}}(R)$ and $V_{Q\bar{q}}(R)$ are added to $V_{\text{BO}}(R)$ in Eq. (14) before solving the Schrödinger equation. Finally the contribution of the QQ interaction is added perturbatively,

$$Q_{QQ} = E + \frac{1}{2} \kappa''_{QQ} \quad (43)$$

where

$$\kappa''_{QQ} = \frac{K_{QQ}}{2} \int_{\mathbf{R}} \frac{1}{4\pi} \left(\frac{\chi(R)}{R} \right)^2 \delta^3(\mathbf{R}) = \frac{2\alpha_s}{9M_Q^2} \chi'(0)^2 \quad (44)$$

Results. We consider the cases $S_{QQ} = 1$ and $S_{\bar{q}\bar{q}} = 0, 1$.

$\mathbf{I} = \mathbf{S}_{\bar{q}\bar{q}} = 0$. The comparison between Table III (the case of $S_{\bar{q}\bar{q}} = 0$ and total spin $J = 1$ as obtained with Method 1) and Table IV (again $S_{\bar{q}\bar{q}} = 0$ and total spin $J = 1$, but obtained with Method 2) is encouraging. There is a remarkable agreement between the two results on the \mathcal{T}_{cc} mass which are very well consistent with the mass value $\mathcal{T}_{cc}^+(3875)$ observed by LHCb [1, 2]. This allows to provide a prediction for the \mathcal{T}_{bb} mass as reported in Tables III, IV

$$M(\mathcal{T}_{bb}) \sim 10552 \text{ MeV} \quad (45)$$

Also notice that the Q -value of \mathcal{T}_{bb} with respect to the $\bar{B}\bar{B}$ threshold compares well to the recent lattice QCD determination $Q = M(\mathcal{T}_{bb}) - 2M(B) = -13_{-30}^{+38} \text{ MeV}$ [23].

$\mathbf{I} = \mathbf{S}_{\bar{q}\bar{q}} = 1$. When studying the $S_{\bar{q}\bar{q}} = 1$, $J = 1$ case, as well as the cases $J = 0, 2$ (with $S_{QQ} = 1$) we appreciate the fact that in the BO description of the system we have all quarks at higher average relative distances than in the diquark-antidiquark picture for example. This translates in the fact that the difference in mass between the

$\mathcal{T}_{QQ}(S_{\bar{q}\bar{q}} = 0, J = 1)$ and $\mathcal{T}_{QQ}(S_{\bar{q}\bar{q}} = 1, J = 1)$ turns out to be negligible, following either Method 1 or Method 2. In taking $S_{\bar{q}\bar{q}} = 1$ we also have states with $J = 0, 2$, but still with no appreciable mass differences.

In giving the result (45), as well as in the discussion on the spectrum at different J values, the only source of theoretical error is in the difference we get when using either the Casimir or the ‘triality’ scaling (see the results reported in parentheses in Tables III, IV). Clearly the Casimir scaling of the string tension agrees better with the $\mathcal{T}_{cc}^+(3875)$ determination.

As commented below Eq. (8), the value of the characteristic distance $1/A$ used in orbital wave functions is determined by a variational principle. However we observe that $\langle H \rangle$ as a function of A is rather flat around the minimum. We find that a 5% variation of $\langle H \rangle$ at the minimum induces an error on the masses of approximately ± 7 MeV in the determination of the masses. This might be compatible with a spectrum having a lighter $J = 0$ state, above DD threshold and a heavier $J = 2$ state, still too light to be seen.

Conclusions. We have presented the prediction of the double-beauty tetraquark mass, see Tables III and IV, based on a picture of the tetraquark system which is well described in the Born-Oppenheimer approximation. In this scheme the mass of the \mathcal{T}_{cc} state is found with very good agreement with data and the prediction on the \mathcal{T}_{bb} state agrees with some lattice studies, as commented in the text. With the approximations used we are not able at this stage to provide the fine structure of the whole spectrum of $J = 0, 1, 2$ states, but our results are not in contradiction with a lighter $J = 0$ state and a slightly heavier $J = 2$ state.

Within the Born-Oppenheimer scheme, we have improved our calculation in two ways: *i*) scaling baryon and mesons hyperfine couplings with the dimensions of the BO bound state and *ii*) using the plain hyperfine quark-quark QCD interaction. In both ways we get very close numerical results, which adds to the solidity of the BO approach.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge interesting discussions with Ahmed Ali, Misha Mikhasenko, Giovanni Passaleva, Marco Pappagallo and Alexis Pompili. We are indebted to Vanya Belyaev for valuable information about the current search of $I = J = 1$ doubly charmed tetraquarks in LHCb. AP and ADP thank the CERN-TH Division for kind hospitality during the completion of this work.

-
- [1] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb), Nature Phys. **18**, 751 (2022), arXiv:2109.01038 [hep-ex].
 - [2] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb), Nature Commun. **13**, 3351 (2022), arXiv:2109.01056 [hep-ex].
 - [3] P. Bicudo and M. Wagner (European Twisted Mass), Phys.Rev. **D87**, 114511 (2013), arXiv:1209.6274 [hep-ph].
 - [4] M. Karliner and S. Nussinov, JHEP **07**, 153, arXiv:1304.0345 [hep-ph].
 - [5] A. Francis, R. J. Hudspith, R. Lewis, and K. Maltman, Phys.Rev.Lett. **118**, 142001 (2017), arXiv:1607.05214 [hep-lat].
 - [6] E. J. Eichten and C. Quigg, Phys.Rev.Lett. **119**, 202002 (2017), arXiv:1707.09575 [hep-ph].
 - [7] L. Leskovec, S. Meinel, M. Pflaumer, and M. Wagner, Phys.Rev. **D100**, 014503 (2019), arXiv:1904.04197 [hep-lat].
 - [8] A. Esposito, M. Papinutto, A. Pilloni, A. D. Polosa, and N. Tantalo, Phys. Rev. D **88**, 054029 (2013), arXiv:1307.2873 [hep-ph].
 - [9] E. Braaten, C. Langmack, and D. H. Smith, Phys.Rev. **D90**, 014044 (2014), arXiv:1402.0438 [hep-ph].
 - [10] N. Brambilla, G. a. Krein, J. Tarrús Castellà, and A. Vairo, Phys.Rev. **D97**, 016016 (2018), arXiv:1707.09647 [hep-ph].
 - [11] P. Bicudo, M. Cardoso, A. Peters, M. Pflaumer, and M. Wagner, Phys.Rev. **D96**, 054510 (2017), arXiv:1704.02383 [hep-lat].
 - [12] J. F. Giron, R. F. Lebed, and C. T. Peterson, JHEP **05**, 061, arXiv:1903.04551 [hep-ph].
 - [13] S. Prelovsek, H. Bahtiyar, and J. Petkovic, Phys.Lett. **B805**, 135467 (2020), arXiv:1912.02656 [hep-lat].
 - [14] S. Weinberg, *Lectures on Quantum Mechanics* (Cambridge University Press, 2015).
 - [15] L. Pauling and E. Wilson, *Introduction to Quantum Mechanics: With Applications to Chemistry*, Dover Books on Physics (Dover Publications, 1985).
 - [16] L. Maiani, A. D. Polosa, and V. Riquer, Phys.Rev. **D100**, 074002 (2019), arXiv:1908.03244 [hep-ph].
 - [17] M. Karliner and J. L. Rosner, Phys.Rev.Lett. **119**, 202001 (2017), arXiv:1707.07666 [hep-ph].
 - [18] S.-Q. Luo, K. Chen, X. Liu, Y.-R. Liu, and S.-L. Zhu, Eur.Phys.J. **C77**, 709 (2017), arXiv:1707.01180 [hep-ph].
 - [19] L. Maiani, F. Piccinini, A. Polosa, and V. Riquer, Phys.Rev. **D89**, 114010 (2014), arXiv:1405.1551 [hep-ph].
 - [20] A. De Rujula, H. Georgi, and S. L. Glashow, Phys.Rev. **D12**, 147 (1975).
 - [21] S. Godfrey and N. Isgur, Phys.Rev. **D32**, 189 (1985).
 - [22] S. Capstick and N. Isgur, Phys.Rev. **D34**, 2809 (1986).
 - [23] P. Bicudo, A. Peters, S. Velten, and M. Wagner, Phys.Rev. **D103**, 114506 (2021), arXiv:2101.00723 [hep-lat].
 - [24] G. S. Bali, Phys.Rept. **343**, 1 (2001), arXiv:hep-ph/0001312.
 - [25] A. Ali, L. Maiani, and A. D. Polosa, *Multiquark Hadrons* (Cambridge University Press, 2019).
 - [26] M. Karliner and J. L. Rosner, Phys.Rev. **D96**, 033004 (2017), arXiv:1706.06961 [hep-ph].
 - [27] M. Karliner and J. L. Rosner, Phys.Rev. **D100**, 073006 (2019), arXiv:1906.07799 [hep-ph].