

Study of $s \rightarrow d\nu\bar{\nu}$ rare hyperon decays within the standard model and new physics

Xiao-Hui Hu¹ *, Zhen-Xing Zhao¹ †

¹ *INPAC, Shanghai Key Laboratory for Particle Physics and Cosmology,
MOE Key Laboratory for Particle Physics, Astrophysics and Cosmology,
School of Physics and Astronomy, Shanghai Jiao-Tong University, Shanghai 200240, P.R. China*

FCNC processes offer important tools to test the standard model, and to search for possible new physics. In this work, we investigate the $s \rightarrow d\nu\bar{\nu}$ rare hyperon decays within the standard model and beyond. The hadronic matrix elements, parametrized in terms of form factors, are calculated in the light-front approach. We find branching ratios for these rare hyperon decays range from 10^{-14} to 10^{-11} within the standard model. And after taking into account the contribution from the new physics, the generalized SUSY extension of the SM and the minimal 331 model, the decay widths for these channels can be enhanced by a factor of 2 and 7, respectively. Uncertainties are discussed.

I. INTRODUCTION

The flavor changing neutral current (FCNC) transition provides a critical test of the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) mechanism in the standard model (SM), and allows one to search for the possible new physics. Within the SM, FCNC transition $s \rightarrow d\nu\bar{\nu}$ proceeds through Z -penguin and electroweak box diagrams, and thus the decay probabilities are strongly suppressed. In this case, the precise study allows to perform very stringent tests of the SM and ensures a large sensitivity to potential new degrees of freedom.

A large number of studies have been performed on $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\nu\bar{\nu}$ and $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0\nu\bar{\nu}$, reviews of these two decays can be found in [1–6]. On the theoretical side, using the most recent determinations of the input parameters, the SM predictions for the two branching ratios are predicted as [7]

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{B}(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\nu\bar{\nu})_{\text{SM}} &= (8.4 \pm 1.0) \times 10^{-11}, \\ \mathcal{B}(K_L \rightarrow \pi^0\nu\bar{\nu})_{\text{SM}} &= (3.4 \pm 0.6) \times 10^{-11}.\end{aligned}$$

The dominant uncertainty comes from the CKM matrix elements and the charm contribution. On the experimental side, E949 Collaboration has measured the branching ratio as [8]

$$\mathcal{B}(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\nu\bar{\nu})_{\text{exp}} = 17.3_{-10.5}^{+11.5} \times 10^{-11},$$

and E391a Collaboration reported the 90% C.L. upper bound [9]

$$\mathcal{B}(K_L \rightarrow \pi^0\nu\bar{\nu})_{\text{exp}} \leq 2.6 \times 10^{-8}.$$

The NA62 Experiment at CERN aims to measure the $\mathcal{B}(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\nu\bar{\nu})$ with a 10% precision by the end of 2018 [10, 11]. The KOTO experiment, an upgrade of the E391a experiment, aims at the first observation of the $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0\nu\bar{\nu}$ decay at J-PARC around 2020 [3, 12]. Given the goal of 10% precision by NA62, the authors of Ref. [13] intend to carry out the lattice QCD calculation to determine the long-distance contributions to the $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\nu\bar{\nu}$ amplitude.

Analogous to $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\nu\bar{\nu}$ and $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0\nu\bar{\nu}$, the rare hyperon decays $B_i \rightarrow B_f\nu\bar{\nu}$ also proceed via $s \rightarrow d\nu\bar{\nu}$ in the quark level, and thus offer important tools to test the SM, and to search for possible new physics. While compared to widely concerned $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\nu\bar{\nu}$ and $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0\nu\bar{\nu}$, there are few studies devoted to the rare hyperon decays $B_i \rightarrow B_f\nu\bar{\nu}$. This work aims to do some preliminary research on the rare hyperon decays theoretically both within and beyond the SM.

Study of the hyperon decays at the BESIII experiment is proposed using the hyperon parents from J/ψ decay. The electron-positron collider BEPCII provides a clean experimental environment. About 10^6 - 10^8 hyperons, Λ , Σ , Ξ and Ω , will be produced in the J/ψ and $\psi(2S)$ decays with the proposed data samples at the BESIII experiment. Based on those samples, the sensitivity for the measurements of the branching ratios of the hyperon decays is in the range of 10^{-5} - 10^{-8} . The author of Ref. [14] proposed that rare decays and decays with invisible final states may be probed.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Sec. 2, our computing framework is present. Sec. 3 is devoted to performing the numerical calculations. The branching ratios of several rare hyperon decays are calculated within

* Email: huxiaohui@sjtu.edu.cn

† Email: star_0027@sjtu.edu.cn

the SM. The new physic contribution, the generalized SUSY extension of the SM and the minimal 331 model, are considered. We also discuss the possible uncertainties from the form factors. The last section contains a short summary.

II. DECAY WIDTHS

The Next-to-Leading Order (NLO) effective Hamiltonian for $s \rightarrow d\nu\bar{\nu}$ reads [15]:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\alpha}{2\pi \sin^2 \theta_W} \sum_{l=e,\mu,\tau} [V_{cs}^* V_{cd} X_{\text{NL}}^l + V_{ts}^* V_{td} X(x_t)] (\bar{s}d)_{V-A} (\bar{\nu}_l \nu_l)_{V-A} + \text{h.c.}, \quad (1)$$

where $X(x_t)$ and X_{NL}^l are relevant for the top and the charm contribution respectively. Their explicit expressions can be found in Ref. [15].

The form factors for the $B \rightarrow B'$ transition are defined in the standard way as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle B'(P', S'_z) | \bar{d} \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) s | B(P, S_z) \rangle &= \bar{u}(P', S'_z) \left[\gamma_\mu f_1(q^2) + i \sigma_{\mu\nu} \frac{q^\nu}{M} f_2(q^2) + \frac{q_\mu}{M} f_3(q^2) \right] u(P, S_z) \\ &\quad - \bar{u}(P', S'_z) \left[\gamma_\mu g_1(q^2) + i \sigma_{\mu\nu} \frac{q^\nu}{M} g_2(q^2) + \frac{q_\mu}{M} g_3(q^2) \right] \gamma_5 u(P, S_z), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $q = P - P'$, and M denotes the mass of the parent baryon B . It is a good approximation to take $f_1 = g_1 = 1$ and $f_{2,3} = g_{2,3} = 0$ for small q^2 . The uncertainties from the form factors will be discussed in detail in the next section. Hence Eq. (2) is reduced to

$$\langle B'(P', S'_z) | \bar{d} \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) s | B(P, S_z) \rangle = \bar{u}(P', S'_z) \gamma_\mu u(P, S_z) - \bar{u}(P', S'_z) \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 u(P, S_z). \quad (3)$$

The helicity amplitudes of hadronic part are defined as

$$H_{\lambda', \lambda_V}^V \equiv \langle B'(P', \lambda') | \bar{d} \gamma^\mu s | B(P, \lambda) \rangle \epsilon_{V\mu}^*(\lambda_V) \quad (4)$$

and

$$H_{\lambda', \lambda_V}^A \equiv \langle B'(P', \lambda') | \bar{d} \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 s | B(P, \lambda) \rangle \epsilon_{V\mu}^*(\lambda_V). \quad (5)$$

Here $\lambda^{(\prime)}$ denotes the helicity of the parent (daughter) baryon in the initial (final) state, and λ_V is the helicity of the virtual intermediate vector particle. It can be shown that the helicity amplitudes $H_{\lambda', \lambda_V}^{V,A}$ have the following neat forms [16]:

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\frac{1}{2}, 0}^V &= -i \frac{\sqrt{Q_-}}{\sqrt{q^2}} (M + M'), \\ H_{\frac{1}{2}, 1}^V &= -i \sqrt{2Q_-}, \\ H_{\frac{1}{2}, 0}^A &= -i \frac{\sqrt{Q_+}}{\sqrt{q^2}} (M - M'), \\ H_{\frac{1}{2}, 1}^A &= -i \sqrt{2Q_+}. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

In the above, $Q_\pm = (M \pm M')^2 - q^2$, and M (M') is the parent (daughter) baryon mass in the initial (final) state. The amplitudes for the negative helicities are obtained in terms of the relations

$$H_{-\lambda', -\lambda_V}^V = H_{\lambda', \lambda_V}^V, \quad H_{-\lambda', -\lambda_V}^A = -H_{\lambda', \lambda_V}^A. \quad (7)$$

The complete helicity amplitudes are obtained by

$$H_{\lambda', \lambda_V} = H_{\lambda', \lambda_V}^V - H_{\lambda', \lambda_V}^A. \quad (8)$$

The differential decay width of $B \rightarrow B'$ is

$$\frac{d\Gamma}{dq^2} = \frac{d\Gamma_L}{dq^2} + \frac{d\Gamma_T}{dq^2}.$$

Here $d\Gamma_L/dq^2$ and $d\Gamma_T/dq^2$ are the longitudinal and transverse parts of the decay width, and their explicit expressions are given by

$$\frac{d\Gamma_L}{dq^2} = N \frac{q^2 p'}{12(2\pi)^3 M^2} (|H_{\frac{1}{2},0}|^2 + |H_{-\frac{1}{2},0}|^2), \quad (9)$$

$$\frac{d\Gamma_T}{dq^2} = N \frac{q^2 p'}{12(2\pi)^3 M^2} (|H_{\frac{1}{2},1}|^2 + |H_{-\frac{1}{2},-1}|^2). \quad (10)$$

In Eqs. (9) and (10), $p' = \sqrt{Q_+ Q_-}/2M$ is the magnitude of the momentum of B' in the rest frame of B , and $N = 2N_1(0) + N_1(m_\tau)$ with

$$N_1(m_l) = \left| \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\alpha}{2\pi \sin^2 \Theta_W} (V_{cd}^* V_{cs} X_{NL}^l(m_l) + V_{td}^* V_{ts} X(x_t)) \right|^2. \quad (11)$$

Note that we have neglected the electron and muon masses.

One can then obtain the decay width

$$\Gamma = \int_0^{(M-M')^2} dq^2 \frac{d\Gamma}{dq^2}. \quad (12)$$

III. NUMERICAL RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

A. Calculation within the Standard Model

The following inputs are used [17, 18]:

$$G_F = 1.1663787 \times 10^{-5} \text{ GeV}^{-2}, \quad \alpha \equiv \alpha(m_Z) = \frac{1}{128}, \quad \alpha_s(m_Z) = 0.1181, \quad \sin^2 \theta_W = 0.23122, \\ m_t = 173.0 \text{ GeV}, \quad m_c = 1.275 \text{ GeV}, \quad m_W = 80.379 \text{ GeV}, \quad m_Z = 91.1876 \text{ GeV}, \quad m_\tau = 1.77686 \text{ GeV}. \quad (13)$$

The masses and lifetimes of baryons in the initial and final states are listed as follows [17]:

$$m_\Lambda = 1.115683 \text{ GeV}, \quad m_{\Sigma^+} = 1.18937 \text{ GeV}, \quad m_{\Xi^0} = 1.31486 \text{ GeV}, \quad m_{\Xi^-} = 1.32171 \text{ GeV}, \quad m_{\Omega^-} = 1.67245 \text{ GeV}, \\ \tau_\Lambda = 2.632 \times 10^{-10} \text{ s}, \quad \tau_{\Sigma^+} = 0.8018 \times 10^{-10} \text{ s}, \quad \tau_{\Xi^0} = 2.90 \times 10^{-10} \text{ s}, \quad \tau_{\Xi^-} = 1.639 \times 10^{-10} \text{ s}, \quad \tau_{\Omega^-} = 0.821 \times 10^{-10} \text{ s}, \\ m_n = 0.9395654133 \text{ GeV}, \quad m_p = 0.9382720813 \text{ GeV}, \quad m_{\Sigma^0} = 1.192642 \text{ GeV}, \quad m_{\Sigma^-} = 1.19745 \text{ GeV}. \quad (14)$$

The following CKM parameters are used [17]:

$$\lambda = 0.22453, \quad A = 0.836, \quad \bar{\rho} = 0.122, \quad \bar{\eta} = 0.355. \quad (15)$$

With the above inputs and the formulae given in the last section, we have for $\mu_c = 1\text{GeV}, \mu_t = 100\text{GeV}$ and $\mu_c = 3\text{GeV}, \mu_t = 300\text{GeV}$ the LO and NLO results listed in Table I.

One can see from the corresponding results in Table I that:

- The branching fractions of $s \rightarrow d\nu\bar{\nu}$ rare hyperon decays range from 10^{-14} to 10^{-11} .
- For $\mu_c = 1\text{GeV}, \mu_t = 100\text{GeV}$ the NLO results are smaller than the corresponding LO ones by about 30%, while for $\mu_c = 3\text{GeV}, \mu_t = 300\text{GeV}$ the NLO results are larger than the corresponding LO ones by about 10%.
- The LO results vary over 50% from $\mu_c = 1\text{GeV}, \mu_t = 100\text{GeV}$ to $\mu_c = 3\text{GeV}, \mu_t = 300\text{GeV}$, while the NLO ones vary about 30%. As expected, the NLO results depend less on the mass scales.
- The branching fraction of $\Omega^- \rightarrow \Xi^- \nu\bar{\nu}$ is the largest among those of the 6 channels. And it is in the same order of $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu\bar{\nu}$ and $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu\bar{\nu}$.

TABLE I: The LO, NLO, NLO+SUSY and NLO+M331 results for the branching ratio of rare hyperon decays for $\mu_c = 1$ GeV, $\mu_t = 100$ GeV and $\mu_c = 3$ GeV, $\mu_t = 300$ GeV.

Decay mode	$\mu_c = 1$ GeV, $\mu_t = 100$ GeV				$\mu_c = 3$ GeV, $\mu_t = 300$ GeV			
	LO	NLO	NLO+SUSY	NLO+M331	LO	NLO	NLO+SUSY	NLO+M331
$\Lambda \rightarrow n\nu\bar{\nu}$	1.23×10^{-12}	8.51×10^{-13}	1.62×10^{-12}	5.31×10^{-12}	4.72×10^{-13}	5.16×10^{-13}	1.01×10^{-12}	4.39×10^{-12}
$\Sigma^+ \rightarrow p\nu\bar{\nu}$	2.01×10^{-12}	1.39×10^{-12}	2.66×10^{-12}	8.70×10^{-12}	7.73×10^{-13}	8.46×10^{-13}	1.65×10^{-12}	7.19×10^{-12}
$\Xi^0 \rightarrow \Lambda\nu\bar{\nu}$	2.52×10^{-12}	1.75×10^{-12}	3.34×10^{-12}	1.09×10^{-11}	9.71×10^{-13}	1.06×10^{-12}	2.08×10^{-12}	9.03×10^{-12}
$\Xi^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^0\nu\bar{\nu}$	2.42×10^{-13}	1.68×10^{-13}	3.20×10^{-13}	1.05×10^{-12}	9.30×10^{-14}	1.02×10^{-13}	1.99×10^{-13}	8.65×10^{-13}
$\Xi^- \rightarrow \Sigma^-\nu\bar{\nu}$	1.48×10^{-13}	1.03×10^{-13}	1.96×10^{-13}	6.42×10^{-13}	5.70×10^{-14}	6.24×10^{-14}	1.22×10^{-13}	5.30×10^{-13}
$\Omega^- \rightarrow \Xi^-\nu\bar{\nu}$	1.10×10^{-11}	7.61×10^{-12}	1.45×10^{-11}	4.75×10^{-11}	4.22×10^{-12}	4.62×10^{-12}	9.02×10^{-12}	3.92×10^{-11}

TABLE II: Upper limits for the R parameters. Notice that the phase of $R_{s_L t_R}^U$ and $R_{t_R d_L}^U$ is unconstrained.

quantity	upper limit
$R_{s_L d_L}^D$	$(-112 - 55i) \frac{m_{\bar{d}_L}}{500\text{GeV}}$
$R_{s_L d_L}^U$	$(-112 - 54i) \frac{m_{\bar{d}_L}}{500\text{GeV}}$
$R_{s_L t_R}^U$	$\text{Min}\{231 \left(\frac{m_{\bar{d}_L}}{500\text{GeV}}\right)^3, 43\} \times e^{i\phi}, 0 < \phi < 2\pi$
$R_{t_R d_L}^U$	$37 \left(\frac{m_{\bar{d}_L}}{500\text{GeV}}\right)^2 \times e^{i\phi}, 0 < \phi < 2\pi$

B. Contribution from MSSM

The effective Hamiltonian for $s \rightarrow d\nu\bar{\nu}$ in a generalized SUSY extension of the SM is given in Eq. (1) with $X(x_t)$ replaced by [19]

$$X_{\text{new}} = X(x_t) + X_H(x_{tH}) + C_\chi + C_N. \quad (16)$$

Here $x_{tH} = m_t^2/m_{H^\pm}^2$ and $X_H(x_{tH})$ corresponds to the charged Higgs contribution. The C_χ and C_N denote the chargino and neutralino contributions

$$C_\chi = X_\chi^0 + X_\chi^{LL} R_{s_L d_L}^U + X_\chi^{LR} R_{s_L t_R}^U + X_\chi^{LR*} R_{t_R d_L}^U,$$

$$C_N = X_N R_{s_L d_L}^D,$$

where X_χ^i and X_N depend on SUSY masses and respectively on chargino and neutralino mixing angles. The explicit expressions of $X_H(x)$, C_χ and C_N can be found in Ref. [19]. The R parameters are defined in terms of the mass insertions, and their upper limits are listed in Table II [19]. It should be mentioned that the phase ϕ of $R_{s_L t_R}^U$ and $R_{t_R d_L}^U$ is a free parameter which ranges from 0 to 2π . We set $\phi = 0$ as a central result.

The following parameters are adopted [20]:

$$\tan\beta = 20, \quad M_A = 260, \quad \mu = -344, \quad M_2 = 750, \quad M_{sq} = 608, \quad M_{\tilde{t}_R} = 338, \quad M_{sl} = 884, \quad (17)$$

where all mass parameters are in GeV. The assumption $M_1 \approx 0.5M_2$ has been made [21]. Our calculation results are listed in Table I. Comparing the results of NLO+SUSY with the corresponding ones of NLO, one can see that after taking account of the contribution from new physics, all the branching fractions are roughly enhanced by a factor of 2.

C. Contribution from minimal 331 model

The so-called minimal 331 model is an extension of the SM at the TeV scale, by extending the weak gauge group of the SM $SU(2)_L$ to a $SU(3)_L$. In this model, a new neutral Z' gauge boson could give a by far important additional

contributions, for it can transmit FCNCs at tree level. In Table I, we denote this model as M331. Many more details of this model could be found in Ref. [22]. For the effective Hamilton, the minimal 331 model leads to a new term in the following form [23]:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}}^{Z'} = \sum_{l=e,\mu,\tau} \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\tilde{V}_{32}^* \tilde{V}_{31}}{3} \left(\frac{M_Z}{M_{Z'}} \right)^2 \cos^2 \theta_W (\bar{s}d)_{V-A} (\bar{\nu}_l \nu_l)_{V-A} + \text{h.c.}, \quad (18)$$

with $M_{Z'} = 1$ TeV, $\text{Re}[(\tilde{V}_{32}^* \tilde{V}_{31})^2] = 9.2 \times 10^{-6}$ and $\text{Im}[(\tilde{V}_{32}^* \tilde{V}_{31})^2] = 4.8 \times 10^{-8}$. And the other parameters are the same as the SM inputs [17, 18]. Then the function $X(x_t)$ in Eq. (1) could be redefined as $X(x_t) = X^{\text{SM}}(x_t) + \Delta X$ with

$$\Delta X = \frac{\sin^2 \theta_W \cos^2 \theta_W}{\alpha} \frac{2\pi}{3} \frac{\tilde{V}_{32}^* \tilde{V}_{31}}{V_{ts}^* V_{td}} \left(\frac{M_Z}{M_{Z'}} \right)^2. \quad (19)$$

Using the modified function $X(x_t)$ and considering the NLO contribution, we calculate the branching ratios of rare hyperon decays in the minimal 331 model as shown in Table I. We find that the numerical results of the minimal 331 model are 7 times larger than the NLO results in the SM and three times larger than the NLO+SUSY results.

D. Form factors uncertainties

In the last section, we have set $f_1 = g_1 = 1$ and $f_{2,3} = g_{2,3} = 0$ in Eq. (2) as an approximation for q^2 small. In fact, it can be shown that f_3 and g_3 do not contribute to the decay width since the neutrino's mass is negligible. To explore the errors caused by this approximation, we turn to the Light-Front Quark Model (LFQM) [24]. This approach has been adopted in Refs. [16, 25, 26] to study baryon decays using a quark-diquark picture, and we refer the reader to these references for the explicit expressions of transition form factors. For simplicity, we only consider the process $\Lambda \rightarrow n \nu \bar{\nu}$. The following input parameters in this approach are used:

$$m_s = 0.37 \text{ GeV}, \quad m_d = 0.25 \text{ GeV}, \quad m_{[ud]} = 0.37 \text{ GeV}, \quad \beta_\Lambda = 0.3073 \text{ GeV}, \quad \beta_n = 0.2737 \text{ GeV}. \quad (20)$$

Several comments are in order:

- Constituent quark masses $m_s = 0.37$ GeV and $m_d = 0.25$ GeV are widely used in Refs. [27–36].
- In this calculation, we consider the two spectator quarks u and d to be a diquark with $J^P = 0^+$, which is denoted by $[ud]$. According to Refs. [16, 37], the mass of the diquark $[ud]$ should be close to the mass of s quark, so we take $m_{[ud]} = 0.37$ GeV.
- The parameter β describes the internal momentum distribution of the hadron. We choose $\beta_{s\bar{s}} = \beta_\phi$ ($\beta_{d\bar{s}} = \beta_{K^*}$) to approximate β_Λ (β_n). Another reason we choose ϕ (K^*) meson is that it has a similar mass to Λ (n) baryon. $f_\phi = 237$ MeV and $f_{K^*} = 210$ MeV are taken from Ref. [24].

The explicit expressions of the form factors $f_{1,2}$ and $g_{1,2}$ are given in Ref. [16]. Using those formulae and adopting the following fit formula

$$F(q^2) = \frac{F(0)}{1 - \frac{q^2}{m_{\text{fit}}^2} + \delta \left(\frac{q^2}{m_{\text{fit}}^2} \right)^2}, \quad (21)$$

the parameters $(F(0), m_{\text{fit}}, \delta)$ are given in Table III. One can see from Table III that:

- f_1 , which ranges from $f_1(0) = 0.98$ to $f_1(q_{\text{max}}^2) = 1.02$, agrees well with our approximation $f_1 = 1$. Here $q_{\text{max}}^2 = (m_\Lambda - m_n)^2 \approx 0.03 \text{ GeV}^2$.
- g_1 , which ranges from $g_1(0) = 0.75$ to $g_1(q_{\text{max}}^2) = 0.77$, deviates from the approximation $g_1 = 1$ by about 1/4.
- f_2 , which ranges from $f_2(0) = -0.71$ to $f_2(q_{\text{max}}^2) = -0.75$, was considered to be small.
- g_2 , which ranges from $g_2(0) = -0.0037$ to $g_2(q_{\text{max}}^2) = -0.0049$, agrees well with our approximation $g_2 = 0$.

TABLE III: The form factors of $\Lambda \rightarrow n$ fitted to Eq. (21).

F	$F(0)$	m_{fit}	δ
f_1	0.98	0.85	-0.06
f_2	-0.71	0.72	0.22
g_1	0.75	1.11	0.10
g_2	-0.0037	0.33	0.59

From the above analysis, it is clear that the dominant deviations come from g_1 and f_2 . Thus in the following analysis, we will only consider the uncertainties from them.

Instead of the simplified Eq. (6), the full expressions for the helicity amplitudes are given as [16]:

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{\frac{1}{2},0}^V &= -i \frac{\sqrt{Q_-}}{\sqrt{q^2}} \left((M + M')f_1 - \frac{q^2}{M}f_2 \right), \\
H_{\frac{1}{2},1}^V &= -i \sqrt{2Q_-} \left(f_1 - \frac{M + M'}{M}f_2 \right), \\
H_{\frac{1}{2},0}^A &= -i \frac{\sqrt{Q_+}}{\sqrt{q^2}} \left((M - M')g_1 + \frac{q^2}{M}g_2 \right), \\
H_{\frac{1}{2},1}^A &= -i \sqrt{2Q_+} \left(g_1 + \frac{M - M'}{M}g_2 \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

We neglect the terms proportional to q^2/M since the momentum transfer q^2 is small compared to the baryon mass. As a good approximation we set $f_1 = 1, g_1 = 0.76, f_2 = -0.73, g_2 = 0$.

Using the above approximations, we find that the branching fraction deviates by about 30% from the original one.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

FCNC processes offer important tools to test the SM, and to search for possible new physics. The two decays $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ and $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$ have been widely studied while the corresponding baryon sector has not been explored.

In this work we have studied the $s \rightarrow d \nu \bar{\nu}$ rare hyperon decays. We adopt the leading order approximations for the form factors for the q^2 is small, and finally we arrive at our expression of decay width. After that, we apply the decay width formula to both the SM and the new physics contribution. Different energy scales are considered. The branching fractions within the SM range from 10^{-14} to 10^{-11} , and the largest one is at the same order as those of $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ and $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$. After taking into account the contribution from the new physics, the generalized SUSY extension of SM and the minimal 331 model, the branching fractions can be enhanced by a factor of 2 and 7 respectively. The uncertainties coming from the form factors are also discussed using the light-front approach under a diquark picture. We find that the uncertainties are large, which signifies some more efficient computing methods are needed to improve the evaluation of the form factors.

Acknowledgement

The authors are grateful to Profs. Hai-Bo Li and Wei Wang for useful discussions. This work is supported in part by National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No.11575110, 11655002, Natural Science Foundation of Shanghai under Grant No. 15DZ2272100 and No. 15ZR1423100, and by Key Laboratory for Particle Physics, Astrophysics and Cosmology, Ministry of Education.

[1] A. J. Buras and J. Girsch, Rept. Prog. Phys. **77**, 086201 (2014) doi:10.1088/0034-4885/77/8/086201 [arXiv:1306.3775 [hep-ph]].

- [2] A. J. Buras, F. Schwab and S. Uhlig, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **80**, 965 (2008) doi:10.1103/RevModPhys.80.965 [hep-ph/0405132].
- [3] T. K. Komatsubara, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **67**, 995 (2012) doi:10.1016/j.ppnp.2012.04.001 [arXiv:1203.6437 [hep-ex]].
- [4] M. Blanke, *PoS KAON* **13**, 010 (2013) [arXiv:1305.5671 [hep-ph]].
- [5] C. Smith, arXiv:1409.6162 [hep-ph].
- [6] A. J. Buras, *PoS EPS -HEP2015*, 602 (2015) [arXiv:1510.00128 [hep-ph]].
- [7] A. J. Buras, D. Buttazzo, J. Girrbach-Noe and R. Knegijens, *JHEP* **1511**, 033 (2015) doi:10.1007/JHEP11(2015)033 [arXiv:1503.02693 [hep-ph]].
- [8] A. V. Artamonov *et al.* [E949 Collaboration], *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 191802 (2008) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.101.191802 [arXiv:0808.2459 [hep-ex]].
- [9] J. K. Ahn *et al.* [E391a Collaboration], *Phys. Rev. D* **81**, 072004 (2010) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.81.072004 [arXiv:0911.4789 [hep-ex]].
- [10] F. Newson *et al.*, arXiv:1411.0109 [hep-ex].
- [11] A. Romano, arXiv:1411.6546 [hep-ex].
- [12] K. Shiomi [KOTO Collaboration], arXiv:1411.4250 [hep-ex].
- [13] N. H. Christ, X. Feng, A. Lawson, A. Portelli and C. Sachrajda, *PoS LATTICE* **2016**, 306 (2016).
- [14] H. B. Li, *Front. Phys.* **12**, 121301 (2017) doi:10.1007/s11467-017-0691-9 [arXiv:1612.01775 [hep-ex]].
- [15] G. Buchalla, A. J. Buras and M. E. Lautenbacher, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **68**, 1125 (1996) doi:10.1103/RevModPhys.68.1125 [hep-ph/9512380].
- [16] H. W. Ke, X. Q. Li and Z. T. Wei, *Phys. Rev. D* **77**, 014020 (2008) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.77.014020 [arXiv:0710.1927 [hep-ph]].
- [17] M. Tanabashi *et al.* [Particle Data Group], *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, no. 3, 030001 (2018). doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.98.030001
- [18] A. J. Buras, M. Gorbahn, U. Haisch and U. Nierste, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 261805 (2005) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.95.261805 [hep-ph/0508165].
- [19] A. J. Buras, A. Romanino and L. Silvestrini, *Nucl. Phys. B* **520**, 3 (1998) doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(98)00169-2 [hep-ph/9712398].
- [20] A. J. Buras, T. Ewerth, S. Jager and J. Rosiek, *Nucl. Phys. B* **714**, 103 (2005) doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2005.02.014 [hep-ph/0408142].
- [21] S. P. Martin, *Adv. Ser. Direct. High Energy Phys.* **21**, 1 (2010) [Adv. Ser. Direct. High Energy Phys. **18**, 1 (1998)] doi:10.1142/9789812839657_0001, 10.1142/9789814307505_0001 [hep-ph/9709356].
- [22] D. Ng, *Phys. Rev. D* **49**, 4805 (1994) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.49.4805 [hep-ph/9212284].
- [23] C. Promberger, S. Schatt and F. Schwab, *Phys. Rev. D* **75**, 115007 (2007) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.75.115007 [hep-ph/0702169 [HEP-PH]].
- [24] H. Y. Cheng, C. K. Chua and C. W. Hwang, *Phys. Rev. D* **69**, 074025 (2004) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.69.074025 [hep-ph/0310359].
- [25] Z. T. Wei, H. W. Ke and X. Q. Li, *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 094016 (2009) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.80.094016 [arXiv:0909.0100 [hep-ph]].
- [26] H. W. Ke, X. H. Yuan, X. Q. Li, Z. T. Wei and Y. X. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 114005 (2012) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.86.114005 [arXiv:1207.3477 [hep-ph]].
- [27] C. D. Lu, W. Wang and Z. T. Wei, *Phys. Rev. D* **76**, 014013 (2007) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.76.014013 [hep-ph/0701265 [HEP-PH]].
- [28] W. Wang, Y. L. Shen and C. D. Lu, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **51**, 841 (2007) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-007-0334-3 [arXiv:0704.2493 [hep-ph]].
- [29] W. Wang, Y. L. Shen and C. D. Lu, *Phys. Rev. D* **79**, 054012 (2009) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.79.054012 [arXiv:0811.3748 [hep-ph]].
- [30] W. Wang and Y. L. Shen, *Phys. Rev. D* **78**, 054002 (2008). doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.78.054002
- [31] X. X. Wang, W. Wang and C. D. Lu, *Phys. Rev. D* **79**, 114018 (2009) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.79.114018 [arXiv:0901.1934 [hep-ph]].
- [32] C. H. Chen, Y. L. Shen and W. Wang, *Phys. Lett. B* **686**, 118 (2010) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2010.02.056 [arXiv:0911.2875 [hep-ph]].
- [33] G. Li, F. I. Shao and W. Wang, *Phys. Rev. D* **82**, 094031 (2010) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.82.094031 [arXiv:1008.3696 [hep-ph]].
- [34] R. C. Verma, *J. Phys. G* **39**, 025005 (2012) doi:10.1088/0954-3899/39/2/025005 [arXiv:1103.2973 [hep-ph]].
- [35] Y. J. Shi, W. Wang and Z. X. Zhao, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76**, no. 10, 555 (2016) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-4405-1 [arXiv:1607.00622 [hep-ph]].
- [36] F. S. Yu, H. Y. Jiang, R. H. Li, C. D. L, W. Wang and Z. X. Zhao, arXiv:1703.09086 [hep-ph].
- [37] H. Y. Cheng, C. K. Chua and C. W. Hwang, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 034007 (2004) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.70.034007 [hep-ph/0403232].