Searching for Beauty-fully Bound Tetraquarks Using Lattice NRQCD

Ciaran Hughes, Estia Eichten, Christine Davies



Confinement, 2018

Searching for Beauty-fully Bound Tetraquarks Using Lattice NRQCD

Ciaran Hughes, Estia Eichten, Christine Davies



Searching for Beauty-fully Bound Tetraquarks Using Lattice NRQCD

Ciaran Hughes, Estia Eichten, Christine Davies



tetraquarks



But is it strong enough to confine $2b2\bar{b}$ into a stable state below the $2\eta_b$ threshold.

What Does Experiments Have To Say

What Does Experiments Have To Say



What Does Experiments Have To Say





What Does Experiments Have To Say: LHCb

What Does Experiments Have To Say: LHCb



arxiv: 1806.09707

What Does Experiments Have To Say: LHCb

$\sigma(pp \to X) \times \mathcal{B}(X \to \Upsilon(1S)\mu^+\mu^-) \times \mathcal{B}(\Upsilon(1S) \to \mu^+\mu^-)$



arxiv: 1806.09707

- Total number of events (signal+bkgrnd) low: Don't see 2Υ signal.

What Does Experiments Have To Say: LHCb

$\sigma(pp \to X) \times \mathcal{B}(X \to \Upsilon(1S)\mu^+\mu^-) \times \mathcal{B}(\Upsilon(1S) \to \mu^+\mu^-)$



arxiv: 1806.09707

- Total number of events (signal+bkgrnd) low: Don't see 2Υ signal.
- CMS have clear signal for 2Υ (arxiv:1610.07095). Why CMS and not LHCb?

What Does Experiments Have To Say: LHCb

$\sigma(pp \to X) \times \mathcal{B}(X \to \Upsilon(1S)\mu^+\mu^-) \times \mathcal{B}(\Upsilon(1S) \to \mu^+\mu^-)$



arxiv: 1806.09707

- Total number of events (signal+bkgrnd) low: Don't see 2Υ signal.
- CMS have clear signal for 2Υ (arxiv:1610.07095). Why CMS and not LHCb?
- CMS/Atlas have much larger luminosity

What Does Experiments Have To Say: LHCb



arxiv: 1806.09707

- Total number of events (signal+bkgrnd) low: Don't see 2Υ signal.

- CMS have clear signal for 2Υ (arxiv:1610.07095). Why CMS and not LHCb?
- CMS/Atlas have much larger luminosity
- CMS/Atlas have larger fiducial volume for lepton pairs

What Does Experiments Have To Say

"http://meetings.aps.org/Meeting/APR18/Session/U09.6"

- Note: The results are taken from my thesis work and they are not approved by CMS yet. The analysis is still in review.

What Does Experiments Have To Say

"http://meetings.aps.org/Meeting/APR18/Session/U09.6"

- Note: The results are taken from my thesis work and they are not approved by CMS yet. The analysis is still in review.

4/15/18 Suleyman Durgut 2

Combined Result



- Do a simultaneous fit to both channels, with fixed signal shapes but floating mass value.
- Best mass : 18.4 ± 0.1 (stat.) ± 0.2 (syst.) GeV
- Local Significance: 4.86σ ($p\_value = 5.8\times10^{-7}$)

What Does Experiments Have To Say

"http://meetings.aps.org/Meeting/APR18/Session/U09.6"

- Note: The results are taken from my thesis work and they are not approved by CMS yet. The analysis is still in review.

4/15/18 Suleyman Durgut 2

Combined Result



- Do a simultaneous fit to both channels, with fixed signal shapes but floating mass value.
- Best mass : 18.4 ± 0.1 (stat.) ± 0.2 (syst.) GeV
- Local Significance: 4.86σ ($p\_value = 5.8 \times 10^{-7}$)

- In order to calculate global significance, Look-Elsewhere-Effect must be taken into account. Lots of toy MC generations are required, not an efficient method.
- Global significance is calculated using Gross-Vitells method which is used in Higgs discovery.

Eur.Phys.J.C70:525-530,2010

- The returned global significance was 3.6σ.

Model Predictions for 0^{++} $\mathbf{2b2\bar{b}}$ tetraquark



Model Predictions for 0^{++} $\mathbf{2b2\bar{b}}$ tetraquark



- Results Very Model Dependent!!
  - Not from first-principles
  - Inconclusive whether tetraquark bound or not?

What Is In The Literature (as of Dec 2017)?

Reference	Model
1110.1867	Diquark
1710.0254	Diquark
1605.01647	Sum-rules
1701.04285	Sum-rules
1710.0254	Schrodinger
1612.00012	Schrodinger
1605.01134	Pheno.
1611.00348	Pheno.
1703.00783	String
1709.0965	Production
1710.02738	Production

Quantum Chromodynamics

"The fundamental theory of the strong nuclear force"

- QCD is non-perturbative
  - Solution: 'solve' numerically via LQCD

Quantum Chromodynamics

"The fundamental theory of the strong nuclear force"

- QCD is non-perturbative
  - Solution: 'solve' numerically via LQCD
- The Lattice is **not** a model: the Lattice is a UV regulator of a QFT
- Lattice QCD results are from first-principles

Quantum Chromodynamics

"The fundamental theory of the strong nuclear force"

- QCD is non-perturbative
  - Solution: 'solve' numerically via LQCD
- The Lattice is **not** a model: the Lattice is a UV regulator of a QFT
- Lattice QCD results are from first-principles

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{QCD}} = \bar{\psi}_{\mathbf{f}} \left(\mathbf{i} \not{\mathbf{D}} - \mathrm{m_f} \right) \psi_{\mathbf{f}} - \frac{1}{4} \mathrm{tr} \left(\mathrm{GG} \right)$$

Quantum Chromodynamics

"The fundamental theory of the strong nuclear force"

- QCD is non-perturbative
  - Solution: 'solve' numerically via LQCD
- The Lattice is **not** a model: the Lattice is a UV regulator of a QFT
- Lattice QCD results are from first-principles

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{QCD}} = \bar{\psi}_{\mathbf{f}} \left(\mathbf{i} \, \not{\mathbf{D}} - \mathrm{m_f} \right) \psi_{\mathbf{f}} - \frac{1}{4} \mathrm{tr} \left(\mathrm{GG} \right)$$





Quantum Chromodynamics

"The fundamental theory of the strong nuclear force"

- QCD is non-perturbative
  - Solution: 'solve' numerically via LQCD
- The Lattice is **not** a model: the Lattice is a UV regulator of a QFT
- Lattice QCD results are from first-principles

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{QCD}} = \bar{\psi}_{\mathbf{f}} \left(\mathbf{i} \not{D} - \mathrm{m_f} \right) \psi_{\mathbf{f}} - \frac{1}{4} \mathrm{tr} \left(\mathrm{G G} \right)$$

??



??



Lattice QCD Methodology

Searching for Beauty-fully Bound Tetraquarks Using Lattice NRQCD

Ciaran Hughes, Estia Eichten, Christine Davies

- This talk will be a bigger picture sketch of results from arxiv:1710.03236
- For more details, please contact me (chughes@fnal.gov)!



A (Bigger Picture) Lattice Spectrum Calculation: The Two-Point Correlator $C_{ab}^{\mathrm{2pt.}}(t) = \langle 0|\mathcal{O}_b(y_4)\mathcal{O}_a^\dagger(x_4)|0\rangle$

$$C_{ab}^{\mathrm{2pt.}}(x_4 - y_4) = \Bigg\langle \qquad \Bigg\rangle$$

A (Bigger Picture) Lattice Spectrum Calculation: The Two-Point Correlator $C_{ab}^{\mathrm{2pt.}}(t) = \langle 0|\mathcal{O}_b(y_4)\mathcal{O}_a^\dagger(x_4)|0\rangle$

- **Feynman Path Integral** Approach to QFT: (Numerically) Integrate over all field configurations

$$C_{ab}^{\mathrm{2pt.}}(x_4 - y_4) = \Big\langle \qquad \Big\rangle$$

A (Bigger Picture) Lattice Spectrum Calculation: The Two-Point Correlator $C^{\text{2pt.}}_{ab}(t) = \langle 0|\mathcal{O}_b(y_4)\mathcal{O}^\dagger_a(x_4)|0\rangle$

- **Feynman Path Integral** Approach to QFT: (Numerically) Integrate over all field configurations
  - Create some (superposition of) state with $\mathcal{O}^\dagger_a(x_4)$

$$C^{\text{2pt.}}_{ab}(x_4 - y_4) = \Big\langle$$



$$\Big\rangle$$

$t = x_4$

A (Bigger Picture) Lattice Spectrum Calculation: The Two-Point Correlator $C_{ab}^{\text{2pt.}}(t) = \langle 0|\mathcal{O}_b(y_4)\mathcal{O}_a^\dagger(x_4)|0\rangle$

- **Feynman Path Integral** Approach to QFT: (Numerically) Integrate over all field configurations
  - Create some (superposition of) state with $\mathcal{O}_a^\dagger(x_4)$
  - Propagate elementary fields for time t

$$C_{ab}^{\text{2pt.}}(x_4 - y_4) = \Bigg\langle$$



$$\Bigg\rangle$$

A (Bigger Picture) Lattice Spectrum Calculation: The Two-Point Correlator $C^{\text{2pt.}}_{ab}(t) = \langle 0|\mathcal{O}_b(y_4)\mathcal{O}^\dagger_a(x_4)|0\rangle$

- **Feynman Path Integral** Approach to QFT: (Numerically) Integrate over all field configurations
  - Create some (superposition of) state with $\mathcal{O}^\dagger_a(x_4)$
  - Propagate elementary fields for time t
  - Destroy some (superposition of) state with $\mathcal{O}_b(y_4)$

$$C^{\text{2pt.}}_{ab}(x_4 - y_4) = \Big\langle \quad \Big\rangle$$



A (Bigger Picture) Lattice Spectrum Calculation: The Two-Point Correlator $C_{ab}^{\mathrm{2pt.}}(t) = \langle 0|\mathcal{O}_b(y_4)\mathcal{O}_a^\dagger(x_4)|0\rangle$

- **Hilbert Space Formalism**:
  - Insert a complete set of QCD eigenstates

$C_{ab}^{\mathrm{2pt.}}(x_4 - y_4) =$



A (Bigger Picture) Lattice Spectrum Calculation: The Two-Point Correlator $C^{2\text{pt.}}_{ab}(t) = \langle 0|\mathcal{O}_b(y_4)\mathcal{O}^\dagger_a(x_4)|0\rangle$

- **Hilbert Space Formalism:**
  - Insert a complete set of QCD eigenstates

$$C^{2pt.}_{ab}(t,\mathbf{P}) \equiv \langle 0|\mathcal{O}_b(t,\mathbf{P})\mathcal{O}^\dagger_a(0,\mathbf{P})|0\rangle = \sum_n Z_{b,n} Z^\dagger_{a,n} e^{-E_n t}$$



A (Bigger Picture) Lattice Spectrum Calculation: The Two-Point Correlator $C^{2\text{pt.}}_{ab}(t) = \langle 0|\mathcal{O}_b(y_4)\mathcal{O}^\dagger_a(x_4)|0\rangle$

- **Hilbert Space Formalism:**
  - Insert a complete set of QCD eigenstates

$$C^{2pt.}_{ab}(t,\mathbf{P}) \equiv \langle 0|\mathcal{O}_b(t,\mathbf{P})\mathcal{O}^\dagger_a(0,\mathbf{P})|0\rangle = \sum_n Z_{b,n}Z^\dagger_{a,n}e^{-E_n t}$$

Extract QCD Energy Eigenstates

$C^{2\text{pt.}}_{ab}(x_4 - y_4) =$



Operators Used for 0^{++} $\mathbf{2b2\bar{b}}$ State

0^{++}	
source	sink
$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(\eta_b,\eta_b)}$	

$C^{2\mathrm{pt.}}_{ab}(x_4 - y_4) = \Big\langle$  $\Big\rangle$

Operators Used for 0^{++} $\mathbf{2b2\bar{b}}$ State

0^{++}	
source	sink
$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(\eta_b,\eta_b)}$	



Operators Used for 0^{++} $\mathbf{2b2\bar{b}}$ State

0^{++}	
source	sink
$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(\eta_b,\eta_b)}$	$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(\eta_b,\eta_b)}$



Operators Used for 0^{++} $\mathbf{2b2\bar{b}}$ State

0^{++}	
source	sink
$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(\eta_b,\eta_b)}$	$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(\eta_b,\eta_b)}$
$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(\eta_b,\eta_b)}$	$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(\Upsilon,\Upsilon)}$



Operators Used for 0^{++} $\mathbf{2b2\bar{b}}$ State

0^{++}	
source	sink
$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(\eta_b,\eta_b)}$	$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(\eta_b,\eta_b)}$
$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(\eta_b,\eta_b)}$	$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(\Upsilon,\Upsilon)}$
$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(\Upsilon,\Upsilon)}$	$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(\eta_b,\eta_b)}$

$C^{2\text{pt.}}_{ab}(x_4 - y_4) =$



Operators Used for 0^{++} $\mathbf{2b2\bar{b}}$ State

0^{++}	
source	sink
$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(\eta_b,\eta_b)}$	$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(\eta_b,\eta_b)}$
$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(\eta_b,\eta_b)}$	$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(\Upsilon,\Upsilon)}$
$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(\Upsilon,\Upsilon)}$	$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(\eta_b,\eta_b)}$
$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(\Upsilon,\Upsilon)}$	$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(\Upsilon,\Upsilon)}$

$$C^{2\text{pt.}}_{ab}(x_4 - y_4) = \Big\langle \quad \Big\rangle$$



Fierz Relations

Table 1: Fierz relations in the $\bar{b}\bar{b}bb$ system relating the two-meson and the diquark-antidiquark bilinears.

J^{PC}	Diquark-AntiDiquark	Two-Meson
0^{++}	$\bar{3}_c \times 3_c$	$-\frac{1}{2}\|0;\Upsilon\Upsilon\rangle + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\|0;\eta_b\eta_b\rangle$
0^{++}	$6_c \times \bar{6}_c$	$\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\|0;\Upsilon\Upsilon\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\|0;\eta_b\eta_b\rangle$
1^{+-}	$\bar{3}_c \times 3_c$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\|1;\Upsilon\eta_b\rangle + \|1;\eta_b\Upsilon\rangle\right)$
2^{++}	$\bar{3}_c \times 3_c$	$\|2;\Upsilon\Upsilon\rangle$

Operators Used for 0^{++} $\mathbf{2b2\bar{b}}$ State

0^{++}	
source	sink
$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(\eta_b,\eta_b)}$	$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(\eta_b,\eta_b)}$
$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(\eta_b,\eta_b)}$	$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(\Upsilon,\Upsilon)}$
$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(\Upsilon,\Upsilon)}$	$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(\eta_b,\eta_b)}$
$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(\Upsilon,\Upsilon)}$	$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(\Upsilon,\Upsilon)}$
$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(D_{3_c},A_{3_c})}$	$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(D_{3_c},A_{3_c})}$



Operators Used for 0^{++} $\mathbf{2b2\bar{b}}$ State

0^{++}	
source	sink
$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(\eta_b,\eta_b)}$	$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(\eta_b,\eta_b)}$
$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(\eta_b,\eta_b)}$	$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(\Upsilon,\Upsilon)}$
$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(\Upsilon,\Upsilon)}$	$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(\eta_b,\eta_b)}$
$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(\Upsilon,\Upsilon)}$	$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(\Upsilon,\Upsilon)}$
$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(D_{\bar{3}_c},A_{3_c})}$	$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(D_{\bar{3}_c},A_{3_c})}$
$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(D_{6_c},A_{\bar{6}_c})}$	$\mathcal{O}^{A_1}_{(D_{6_c},A_{\bar{6}_c})}$



- We perform a Bayesian fit to all the data within a certain channel

- We perform a Bayesian fit to all the data within a certain channel
- But you want to see the actual data! What can we easily show?

The Lattice Effective Mass

$$aE^{\mathrm{eff}} = \log\left(\frac{C(t)}{C(t+1)}\right)$$

The Lattice Effective Mass

$$aE^{\text{eff}} = \log\left(\frac{C(t)}{C(t+1)}\right)$$

$$= aE_0 + \frac{Z_1^2}{Z_0^2} e^{-(E_1 - E_0)t}(1 - e^{-(E_1 - E_0)}) + \ldots$$

The Lattice Effective Mass

$$aE^{\text{eff}} = \log\left(\frac{C(t)}{C(t+1)}\right)$$

$$= aE_0 + \frac{Z_1^2}{Z_0^2} e^{-(E_1-E_0)t}(1 - e^{-(E_1-E_0)}) + \dots$$

Excited State Contributions Exponentially decay away with time

The Lattice Effective Mass

$$aE^{\text{eff}} = \log\left(\frac{C(t)}{C(t+1)}\right)$$

$$= aE_0 + \frac{Z_1^2}{Z_0^2} e^{-(E_1 - E_0)t} (1 - e^{-(E_1 - E_0)}) + \ldots \xrightarrow{t \to \infty} aE_0$$

Excited State Contributions Exponentially decay away with time

The Lattice Effective Mass

$$aE^{\text{eff}} = \log\left(\frac{C(t)}{C(t+1)}\right)$$

$$= aE_0 + \frac{Z_1^2}{Z_0^2} e^{-(E_1-E_0)t}\left(1 - e^{-(E_1-E_0)}\right) + \dots \xrightarrow{t\to\infty} aE_0$$

Excited State Contributions Exponentially decay away with time



Fake 0^{++} data on the $a \approx 0.06$ fm ensemble

"What might you expect to see?"

Fake 0^{++} data on the $a \approx 0.06$ fm ensemble

"What might you expect to see?"



The non-interacting $2\eta_b$ and 2Υ thresholds for reference

Fake 0^{++} data on the $a \approx 0.06$ fm ensemble

"What might you expect to see?"



If there was no new stable tetraquark

Fake 0^{++} data on the $a \approx 0.06$ fm ensemble

"What might you expect to see?"



If there was <u>ONLY</u> a new state 100 MeV below threshold

Fake 0^{++} data on the $a \approx 0.06$ fm ensemble

"What might you expect to see?"



If the new state was 100 MeV below threshold and had $Z_0 = Z_1$

Fake 0^{++} data on the $a \approx 0.06$ fm ensemble

"What might you expect to see?"



If the new state was 100 MeV below threshold and had different Z_0, Z_1

Fake 0^{++} data on the $a \approx 0.06$ fm ensemble

"What might you expect to see?"



If the new state was 100 MeV below threshold and had different Z_0, Z_1

If tetraquark exists we should see a fall below threshold and a clean signal as in blue curve!

The 0^{++} data on the $a \approx 0.06$ fm ensemble



- For this talk, focus on red data points
- Then compare to $2\eta_b$ non-interacting threshold to determine binding

The 0^{++} data on the $a \approx 0.06$ fm ensemble

$2\eta_b \to 2\eta_b$



The 0^{++} data on the $a \approx 0.06$ fm ensemble







The 0^{++} data on the $a \approx 0.06$ fm ensemble



The 0^{++} data on the $a \approx 0.06$ fm ensemble





Summary of Energies from Lattice



Summary of Energies from Lattice



No evidence of 0^{++} below $2\eta_b$ threshold

Summary of Energies from Lattice



No evidence of 0^{++} below $2\eta_b$ threshold

If you don't observe a process, need to determine a bound, e.g, proton decay.

Bound on 0^{++} $\mathbf{2b2\bar{b}}$ state to be stable

"How would it have missed?"

- If stable tetraquark exists, at a particular time t^*,

$$C(t^*) = |\langle 0|\mathcal{O}|4b\rangle|^2 e^{-aE_{4b}t^*} + |\langle 0|\mathcal{O}|2\eta_b\rangle|^2 e^{-aE_{2\eta_b}t^*}$$

$$= \quad Z_{4b}^2 \; e^{-aE_{4b}t^*} + \quad \tilde{Z}_{2\eta_b}^2 \, e^{-aE_{2\eta_b}t^*}$$

Bound on 0^{++} $\mathbf{2b2\bar{b}}$ state to be stable

"How would it have missed?"

- If stable tetraquark exists, at a particular time t^*,

$$C(t^*) = |\langle 0|\mathcal{O}|4b\rangle|^2 e^{-aE_{4b}t^*} + |\langle 0|\mathcal{O}|2\eta_b\rangle|^2 e^{-aE_{2\eta_b}t^*}$$

Input Data

$$= Z_{4b}^2 \; e^{-aE_{4b}t^*} + \tilde{Z}_{2\eta_b}^2 \, e^{-aE_{2\eta_b}t^*}$$

Bound on 0^{++} $\mathbf{2b2\bar{b}}$ state to be stable

"How would it have missed?"

If stable tetraquark exists, at a particular time t^*,

$$C(t^*) = |\langle 0|\mathcal{O}|4b\rangle|^2 e^{-aE_{4b}t^*} + |\langle 0|\mathcal{O}|2\eta_b\rangle|^2 e^{-aE_{2\eta_b}t^*}$$

Input Data

$$= Z_{4b}^2 \; e^{-aE_{4b}t^*} + \tilde{Z}_{2\eta_b}^2 \, e^{-aE_{2\eta_b}t^*}$$

Output Constraint

Bound on 0^{++} $\mathbf{2b2\bar{b}}$ state to be stable

"How would it have missed?"

- If stable tetraquark exists, at a particular time t^*,

$$C(t^*) = |\langle 0|\mathcal{O}|4b\rangle|^2 e^{-aE_{4b}t^*} + |\langle 0|\mathcal{O}|2\eta_b\rangle|^2 e^{-aE_{2\eta_b}t^*}$$

Input Data

Output Constraint

$$= Z_{4b}^2 \; e^{-aE_{4b}t^*} + \tilde{Z}_{2\eta_b}^2 \, e^{-aE_{2\eta_b}t^*}$$



Summary

In Summary, lattice QCD finds no evidence of a stable $2b2\bar{b}$ tetraquark



What The Models Need!

	Have quarks as elementary particles?	Full 2×2 potential matrix (including mixing between different color components)?	Both Short and Long distance effects in Gluon exchange?



What The Models Need!

Diquarks

	Have quarks as elementary particles?	Full 2×2 potential matrix (including mixing between different color components)?	Both Short and Long distance effects in Gluon exchange?
1110.1867	✗	✓	✗
1710.0254	✗	✓	✓



What The Models Need!

		Have quarks as elementary particles?	Full 2×2 potential matrix (including mixing between different color components)?	Both Short and Long distance effects in Gluon exchange?
Diquarks	1110.1867	✗	✓	✗
	1710.0254	✗	✓	✓
Sum-Rules	1605.01647	✓	✓	✗
	1701.04285	✓	✓	✗



What The Models Need!

		Have quarks as elementary particles?	Full 2×2 potential matrix (including mixing between different color components)?	Both Short and Long distance effects in Gluon exchange?
Diquarks	1110.1867	✗	✓	✗
	1710.0254	✗	✓	✓
Sum-Rules	1605.01647	✓	✓	✗
	1701.04285	✓	✓	✗
Schrodinger Equation	1710.0254	✓	✗	✗
	1612.00012	✓	✗	✓



What The Models Need!

		Have quarks as elementary particles?	Full 2×2 potential matrix (including mixing between different color components)?	Both Short and Long distance effects in Gluon exchange?
Diquarks	1110.1867	✗	✓	✗
	1710.0254	✗	✓	✓
Sum-Rules	1605.01647	✓	✓	✗
	1701.04285	✓	✓	✗
Schrodinger Equation	1710.0254	✓	✗	✗
	1612.00012	✓	✗	✓
Pheno.	1605.01134	✓	✗	✗
	1611.00348	✓	✗	✓



What The Models Need!

		Have quarks as elementary particles?	Full 2×2 potential matrix (including mixing between different color components)?	Both Short and Long distance effects in Gluon exchange?
Diquarks	1110.1867	✗	✓	✗
	1710.0254	✗	✓	✓
Sum-Rules	1605.01647	✓	✓	✗
	1701.04285	✓	✓	✗
Schrodinger Equation	1710.0254	✓	✗	✗
	1612.00012	✓	✗	✓
Pheno.	1605.01134	✓	✗	✗
	1611.00348	✓	✗	✓
String	1703.00783	✓	✓	✗



What The Models Need!

	N.B., The lattice is **NOT** a model	Have quarks as elementary particles?	Full 2×2 potential matrix (including mixing between different color components)?	Both Short and Long distance effects in Gluon exchange?
Diquarks	1110.1867	✗	✓	✗
	1710.0254	✗	✓	✓
Sum-Rules	1605.01647	✓	✓	✗
	1701.04285	✓	✓	✗
Schrodinger Equation	1710.0254	✓	✗	✗
	1612.00012	✓	✗	✓
Pheno.	1605.01134	✓	✗	✗
	1611.00348	✓	✗	✓
String	1703.00783	✓	✓	✗



Possible But Not Probable Future Work



Possible But Not Probable Future Work





Possible But Not Probable Future Work







Ongoing Work



Ongoing Work

Nucleon properties



BSM



Ongoing Work

Nucleon properties



BSM



Quantum Computing



Thank you!

Thank You to Raul Briceno for slide template and pretty graphics!

Back-Up Slides

Diquark-Antidiquark Wick Contractions



Two-Meson Wick Contractions



Two-Meson Wick Contractions



Diquark-Antidiquark Wick Contractions



Individual Wick Contraction Correlator Data





Correlator Data With Harmonic Oscillator

- Add to the NRQCD Hamiltonian the harmonic oscillator scalar potential

$$\delta H_{HO} = \frac{m_b \omega^2}{2} |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x_0}|^2$$

This would bind a hypothetical compact tetraquark more, relative to the lowest threshold, and hence this hypothetical tetraquark would show up more easily in our calculation

Correlator Data With Harmonic Oscillator

$$C_{i,j}^{JPC}(t,\omega) = \sum_n \frac{Z_n^i Z_n^{j,*}}{(1+e^{-2\omega t})^{\frac{3}{2}}} e^{-(M(\omega)_n + \frac{3}{2}\omega)t}$$

$$C_{i,j}^{JPC}(t,\omega) = \sum_{X_2} Z_{X_2}^i Z_{X_2}^{j,*} \left(\frac{2\omega\mu_r\pi^{-1}}{1-e^{-4\omega t}}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}} \times e^{-(M_1^S(\omega)+M_2^S(\omega)+3\omega)t} + \cdots$$

The single and two-particle correlators get modified in the presence of the HO

$\eta_b \to \eta_b$





Correlator Data With Harmonic Oscillator



- No indication of a new bound state despite the addition of the scalar potential!!!

Individual Wick Contraction Correlator Data HO





Lattice QCD Methodology

4. Numerically evaluate the Feynman Path Integral (the first-principles approach to QFT)

Lattice QCD Methodology

4. Numerically evaluate the Feynman Path Integral (the first-principles approach to QFT)

$$\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle = \frac{1}{Z} \int \mathcal{D}U \mathcal{D}\psi \mathcal{D}\bar{\psi} e^{-S} \mathcal{O}[U, \psi, \bar{\psi}]$$

Lattice QCD Methodology

4. Numerically evaluate the Feynman Path Integral (the first-principles approach to QFT)

$$\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle = \frac{1}{Z} \int \mathcal{D}U \mathcal{D}\psi \mathcal{D}\bar{\psi} e^{-S} \mathcal{O}[U, \psi, \bar{\psi}]$$

$$\approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{O}[G^{(i)}]$$

Lattice QCD Methodology

4. Numerically evaluate the Feynman Path Integral (the first-principles approach to QFT)

$$\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle = \frac{1}{Z} \int \mathcal{D}U \mathcal{D}\psi \mathcal{D}\bar{\psi} e^{-S} \mathcal{O}[U, \psi, \bar{\psi}]$$

$$\approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{O}[G^{(i)}]$$

- where the integral is approximated as a sum over configurations $\{\mathbf{G}^{(\mathbf{i})}\}$ distributed according to the probability density: $\exp(-S_{YM}) \prod \det(D + m_q)$

Bottomonium Elastic Scattering States in FV



"only a discrete number of modes can exist in a finite volume"

Spatially Periodic Box:

$$p_i \in \frac{2\pi}{L} \times \mathbb{Z}$$

Bottomonium Elastic Scattering States in FV

$$E(X^2) = \sqrt{M_1^2 + |\mathbf{k}|^2} + \sqrt{M_2^2 + |\mathbf{k}|^2}$$
$$\approx M_1^S + M_2^S + \frac{|\mathbf{k}|^2}{2\mu_r}$$

where we have defined the static, kinetic and reduced masses by M^S, M^K and $\mu_r = M_1^K M_2^K/(M_1^K + M_2^K)$

back-to-back states on our ensembles. As an example, examining the $a = 0.09$ fm ensemble, and taking $M_{\eta_b} = 9.399(2)$ GeV from the PDG [4], the smallest allowed $|\mathbf{k}|^2/2\mu_r \approx 20$ MeV or 0.0092 in lattice units with all other back-to-back states separated by multiples of

$$C(t) = \sum_{X^2} \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} Z_{X^2}(\mathbf{k})^2 e^{-E(X^2)t}$$

$$C(t) = \sum_{X^2} e^{-(M_1^S+M_2^S)t} \sum_k \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} Z_{X^2}^{2l} \frac{|\mathbf{k}|^{2l}}{\mu_r^{2l}} \right\} e^{-\frac{|\mathbf{k}|^2}{2\mu_r}t} \qquad \text{(A5)}$$

Bottomonium Elastic Scattering States in FV

When does the two-body scattering states look like a continuum within stat. precision?

$$I^{(l)}(t) = \frac{1}{\mu_r^{2l}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d|\mathbf{k}||\mathbf{k}|^{2l+2} e^{-\frac{|\mathbf{k}|^2}{2\mu_r}t}$$

$$D^{(l)}(t) = \frac{1}{\mu_r^{2l}} \sum_{|\mathbf{k}|} |\mathbf{k}|^{2l+2} e^{-\frac{|\mathbf{k}|^2}{2\mu_r}t}.$$

$$\left| \frac{\sum_{l=0}^{l_{max}} Z^{2,(l)} I^{(l)}(t) - \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} Z^{2,(l)} D^{(l)}(t)}{\sum_{l=0}^{l_{max}} Z^{2,(l)} I^{(l)}(t)} \right|$$

$$\leq \sum_{l=0}^{l_{max}} \frac{\left|I^{(l)}(t) - D^{(l)}(t)\right|}{I^{(0)}} + \sum_{l=l_{max}+1}^{\infty} \frac{D^{(l)}(t)}{I^{(0)}}$$

$$\leq \frac{\delta C(t)}{C(t)}$$

Bottomonium Elastic Scattering States in FV

When does the two-body scattering states look like a continuum within stat. precision?





After 1 fm!!

Lattice for Near Term Quantum Computing Era

- How many qubits are needed for SU(3) glue and how can lattice help?

- 10x10x10 Spatial volume dof

Lattice methodological techniques can reduce the number of quits needed: Symanzik Improvement, lattice symmetries, etc

- 8 Gluon dof
- x Occupation number dof (Not known)

Lattice can help find x

- x^{8000} Total dof $\Longrightarrow$ $8000 log_2 x$ qubits

Currently

- *Small number of qubits*
- *Sparse qubit connectivity*
- *Noisy quantum gates*
- *Short coherence times*

→

Lattice can be used as a testbed for tech, and determined ideal initial wave function (remove adiabatic starting) to remove gate fidelity.

Arxiv:1803.03326v2

- *State of the art: 1+1 Schwinger model: 6 qubits reduced to 2 qubits*

QCD - The Spectrum Enigma

“We don’t understand XYZ since 2003”

QCD - The Spectrum Enigma

“We don’t understand XYZ since 2003”

TABLE 9: As in Table 4, but for new *unconventional* states in the $c\bar{c}$ and $b\bar{b}$ regions, ordered by mass. For $X(3872)$, the values given are based only upon decays to $\pi^+\pi^- J/\psi$. $X(3945)$ and $Y(3940)$ have been subsumed under $X(3915)$ due to compatible properties. The state known as $Z(3930)$ appears as the $\chi_{c2}(2P)$ in Table 4. See also the reviews in [81–84]

State	m (MeV)	Γ (MeV)	J^{PC}	Process (mode)	Experiment (#σ)	Year	Status
$X(3872)$	3871.52±0.20	1.3±0.6	$1^{++}/2^{-+}$	$B \to K(\pi^+\pi^- J/\psi)$	Belle [85, 86] (12.8), *BABAR* [87] (8.6)	2003	OK
		(<2.2)		$p\bar{p} \to (\pi^+\pi^- J/\psi) + ...$	CDF [88–90] (np), DØ [91] (5.2)		
				$B \to K(\omega J/\psi)$	Belle [92] (4.3), *BABAR* [93] (4.0)		
				$B \to K(D^{*0}\bar{D}^0)$	Belle [94, 95] (6.4), *BABAR* [96] (4.9)		
				$B \to K(\gamma J/\psi)$	Belle [92] (4.0), *BABAR* [97, 98] (3.6)		
				$B \to K(\gamma\psi(2S))$	*BABAR* [98] (3.5), Belle [99] (0.4)		
$X(3915)$	3915.6 ± 3.1	28±10	$0/2^{?+}$	$B \to K(\omega J/\psi)$	Belle [100] (8.1), *BABAR* [101] (19)	2004	OK
				$e^+e^- \to e^+e^-(\omega J/\psi)$	Belle [102] (7.7)		
$X(3940)$	3942^{+9}_{-8}	37^{+27}_{-17}	$?^{?+}$	$e^+e^- \to J/\psi(D\bar{D}^*)$	Belle [103] (6.0)	2007	NC!
				$e^+e^- \to J/\psi\ (...)$	Belle [54] (5.0)		
$G(3900)$	3943 ± 21	52±11	1^{--}	$e^+e^- \to \gamma(D\bar{D})$	*BABAR* [27] (np), Belle [21] (np)	2007	OK
$Y(4008)$	$4008^{+121}_{-\ 49}$	226±97	1^{--}	$e^+e^- \to \gamma(\pi^+\pi^- J/\psi)$	Belle [104] (7.4)	2007	NC!
$Z_1(4050)^+$	4051^{+24}_{-43}	82^{+51}_{-55}	?	$B \to K(\pi^+\chi_{c1}(1P))$	Belle [105] (5.0)	2008	NC!
$Y(4140)$	4143.4 ± 3.0	$15^{+11}_{-\ 7}$	$?^{?+}$	$B \to K(\phi J/\psi)$	CDF [106, 107] (5.0)	2009	NC!
$X(4160)$	4156^{+29}_{-25}	139^{+113}_{-65}	$?^{?+}$	$e^+e^- \to J/\psi(D\bar{D}^*)$	Belle [103] (5.5)	2007	NC!
$Z_2(4250)^+$	$4248^{+185}_{-\ 45}$	$177^{+321}_{-\ 72}$	?	$B \to K(\pi^+\chi_{c1}(1P))$	Belle [105] (5.0)	2008	NC!
$Y(4260)$	4263 ± 5	108±14	1^{--}	$e^+e^- \to \gamma(\pi^+\pi^- J/\psi)$	*BABAR* [108, 109] (8.0)	2005	OK
					CLEO [110] (5.4)		
					Belle [104] (15)		
				$e^+e^- \to (\pi^+\pi^- J/\psi)$	CLEO [111] (11)		
				$e^+e^- \to (\pi^0\pi^0 J/\psi)$	CLEO [111] (5.1)		
$Y(4274)$	$4274.4^{+8.4}_{-6.7}$	32^{+22}_{-15}	$?^{?+}$	$B \to K(\phi J/\psi)$	CDF [107] (3.1)	2010	NC!
$X(4350)$	$4350.6^{+4.6}_{-5.1}$	$13.3^{+18.4}_{-10.0}$	$0,2^{++}$	$e^+e^- \to e^+e^-(\phi J/\psi)$	Belle [112] (3.2)	2009	NC!
$Y(4360)$	4353 ± 11	96±42	1^{--}	$e^+e^- \to \gamma(\pi^+\pi^-\psi(2S))$	*BABAR* [113] (np), Belle [114] (8.0)	2007	OK
$Z(4430)^+$	4443^{+24}_{-18}	$107^{+113}_{-\ 71}$	?	$B \to K(\pi^+\psi(2S))$	Belle [115, 116] (6.4)	2007	NC!
$X(4630)$	$4634^{+\ 9}_{-11}$	92^{+41}_{-32}	1^{--}	$e^+e^- \to \gamma(\Lambda_c^+\Lambda_c^-)$	Belle [25] (8.2)	2007	NC!
$Y(4660)$	4664±12	48±15	1^{--}	$e^+e^- \to \gamma(\pi^+\pi^-\psi(2S))$	Belle [114] (5.8)	2007	NC!
$Y_b(10888)$	10888.4±3.0	$30.7^{+8.9}_{-7.7}$	1^{--}	$e^+e^- \to (\pi^+\pi^-\Upsilon(nS))$	Belle [37, 117] (3.2)	2010	NC!

Quarkonium Working Group - 2010



S. Olsen - 2015

Quantum Chromodynamics

"We don't understand XYZ since 2003"

- No general consensus for XYZ's despite being over a decade!!!
    - Compact tetraquark
    - Loosely bound molecular state
    - Kinematical effect - Cusps
    - Hydro-quarkonium
    - Diquark-quarkonium
    - Hybrids
    - ....

Simplest Extended System



$\mathbf{2q2\bar{q}}$ *tetraquarks* → *Take* $\mathbf{m_q \gg \Lambda_{QCD}}$

Lattice QCD Methodology

1. Take Euclidean QCD and discretise it on a **Finite-Volume Lattice** of length **L** and spacing $\mathbf{a}$



Lattice QCD Methodology

1. Take Euclidean QCD and discretise it on a **Finite-Volume Lattice** of length **L** and spacing **a**

Complication: b***-quarks do not fit on current lattices!!***

Lattice QCD Methodology

1. Take Euclidean QCD and discretise it on a **Finite-Volume Lattice** of length **L** and spacing **a**

Complication: ***b-quarks do not fit on current lattices!!***

Solution: Use a Non-Relativistic Effective Field Theory to simulate the b-quarks

Lattice QCD Methodology

1. Take Euclidean QCD and discretise it on a **Finite-Volume Lattice** of length **L** and spacing $\mathbf{a}$

Complication:** b-**quarks do not fit on current lattices!!

Solution: Use a Non-Relativistic Effective Field Theory to simulate the** b-**quarks

- Has Expansion Parameter $\mathbf{v^2 \sim 0.1}$
- N.B.: Matching Coefficients Need to be Calculated in Lattice Perturbation Theory

Lattice QCD Methodology

1. Take Euclidean QCD and discretise it on a **Finite-Volume Lattice** of length **L** and spacing $\mathbf{a}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
a\delta H &= aH_0 + a\delta H_{v^4} + a\delta H_{v^6}; \\
aH_0 &= -\frac{\Delta^{(2)}}{2am_b} \\
a\delta H_{v^4} &= -c_1 \frac{(\Delta^{(2)})^2}{8(am_b)^3} + c_2 \frac{i}{8(am_b)^2}\left(\nabla \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{E}} - \tilde{\mathbf{E}} \cdot \nabla\right) \\
&- c_3 \frac{1}{8(am_b)^2} \sigma \cdot \left(\tilde{\nabla} \times \tilde{\mathbf{E}} - \tilde{\mathbf{E}} \times \tilde{\nabla}\right) \\
&- c_4 \frac{1}{2am_b} \sigma \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{B}} + c_5 \frac{\Delta^{(4)}}{24am_b} - c_6 \frac{(\Delta^{(2)})^2}{16n(am_b)^2} \\
a\delta H_{v^6} &= -c_7 \frac{1}{8(am_b)^3}\left\{\boldsymbol{\Delta}^{(\mathbf{2})}, \sigma \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{B}}\right\} \\
&- c_8 \frac{3}{64(am_b)^4}\left\{\boldsymbol{\Delta}^{(\mathbf{2})}, \sigma \cdot \left(\tilde{\nabla} \times \tilde{\mathbf{E}} - \tilde{\mathbf{E}} \times \tilde{\nabla}\right)\right\} \\
&- c_9 \frac{i}{8(am_b)^3} \sigma \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{E}} \times \tilde{\mathbf{E}}
\end{aligned}
$$

Lattice QCD Methodology

1. Take Euclidean QCD and discretise it on a **Finite-Volume Lattice** of length $\mathbf{L}$ and spacing $\mathbf{a}$

Lattice QCD Methodology

1. Take Euclidean QCD and discretise it on a **Finite-Volume Lattice** of length **L** and spacing **a**
2. Get one of these:

Lattice QCD Methodology

1. Take Euclidean QCD and discretise it on a **Finite-Volume Lattice** of length **L** and spacing **a**
2. Get one of these:

3. Buy one of these:

Lattice QCD Methodology

1. Take Euclidean QCD and discretise it on a **Finite-Volume Lattice** of length **L** and spacing **a**
2. Get one of these:

3. Buy one of these:

4. Numerically evaluate the Feynman Path Integral (the first-principles approach to QFT)!!

Lattice QCD Methodology

4. Numerically evaluate the Feynman Path Integral (the first-principles approach to QFT)

Lattice QCD Methodology

4. Numerically evaluate the Feynman Path Integral (the first-principles approach to QFT)

$$\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle = \frac{1}{Z} \int \mathcal{D}U \mathcal{D}\psi \mathcal{D}\bar{\psi} e^{-S} \mathcal{O}[U, \psi, \bar{\psi}]$$

Lattice QCD Methodology

4. Numerically evaluate the Feynman Path Integral (the first-principles approach to QFT)

$$\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle = \frac{1}{Z} \int \mathcal{D}U \mathcal{D}\psi \mathcal{D}\bar{\psi} e^{-S} \mathcal{O}[U, \psi, \bar{\psi}]$$

$$\approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{O}[G^{(i)}]$$

Lattice QCD Methodology

4. Numerically evaluate the Feynman Path Integral (the first-principles approach to QFT)

$$\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle = \frac{1}{Z} \int \mathcal{D}U \mathcal{D}\psi \mathcal{D}\bar{\psi} e^{-S} \mathcal{O}[U, \psi, \bar{\psi}]$$

$$\approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{O}[G^{(i)}]$$

- where the integral is approximated as a sum over configurations $\{\mathbf{G^{(i)}}\}$ distributed according to the probability density: $\exp(-S_{YM}) \prod \det(D + m_q)$

Lattice QCD Methodology

1. Take Euclidean QCD and discretise it on a **Finite-Volume Lattice** of length **L** and spacing **a**
2. Get one of these:

3. Buy one of these:

4. Numerically evaluate the Feynman Path Integral (the first-principles approach to QFT)

Lattice QCD Methodology

1. Take Euclidean QCD and discretise it on a **Finite-Volume Lattice** of length **L** and spacing **a**
2. Get one of these:

3. Buy one of these:

4. Numerically evaluate the Feynman Path Integral (the first-principles approach to QFT)
5. Do all the computations/analysis

Lattice QCD Methodology

1. Take Euclidean QCD and discretise it on a **Finite-Volume Lattice** of length **L** and spacing **a**
2. Get one of these:

3. Buy one of these:

4. Numerically evaluate the Feynman Path Integral (the first-principles approach to QFT)
5. Do all the computations/analysis
6. Pay the Electricity Bill….