

## Lepton Flavor Violating $B \rightarrow K_2^*(1430)\mu^\pm\tau^\mp$ Decays

Suman Kumbhakar,<sup>1,\*</sup> Ria Sain,<sup>2,†</sup> and Juhi Vardani<sup>3,‡</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Physique des Particules, Université de Montréal,*

*1375 Ave. Thérèse-Lavoie-Roux, Montréal, QC H2V 0B3*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Physics, Indian Institute of Technology Guwahati, Assam 781039, India*

<sup>3</sup>*Indian Institute of Technology Jodhpur, Jodhpur 342037, India*

(Dated: August 11, 2022)

The measurements on the lepton flavor universality violation in semileptonic  $b \rightarrow s$  and  $b \rightarrow c$  transitions hint towards a possible role of new physics in both sectors. Motivated by these anomalies, we investigate the lepton flavor violating  $B \rightarrow K_2^*(1430)\mu^\pm\tau^\mp$  decays. We calculate the two-fold angular distribution of  $B \rightarrow K_2^*\ell_1\ell_2$  decay in presence of vector, axial-vector, scalar and pseudo-scalar new physics operators. Later, we compute the branching fraction and lepton forward-backward asymmetry in the framework of  $U_1^{2/3}$  vector leptoquark which is a viable solution to the  $B$  anomalies. We find that the upper limits are  $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow K_2^*\mu^-\tau^+) \leq 0.74 \times 10^{-8}$  and  $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow K_2^*\mu^+\tau^-) \leq 0.33 \times 10^{-7}$  at 90% C.L.

arXiv:2208.05923v1 [hep-ph] 11 Aug 2022

---

\*Electronic address: [suman.kumbhakar@umontreal.ca](mailto:suman.kumbhakar@umontreal.ca)

†Electronic address: [riasain@rnd.iitg.ac.in](mailto:riasain@rnd.iitg.ac.in)

‡Electronic address: [vardani.1@iitj.ac.in](mailto:vardani.1@iitj.ac.in)

## I. INTRODUCTION

In recent times, one of the most exciting results in the flavor physics is the violation of lepton flavor universality (LFU) in the semileptonic  $B$  meson decays (for a recent review, see Ref. [1]). These decays are mainly mediated by neutral current transition  $b \rightarrow s\ell^+\ell^-$  and charged current transition  $b \rightarrow c\ell\bar{\nu}$ . In  $b \rightarrow s\ell^+\ell^-$  sector, the measured values of LFU ratios  $R_{K^{(*)}} = \mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow K^{(*)}\mu^+\mu^-)/\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow K^{(*)}e^+e^-)$  deviate at the level of  $2.5\text{-}3.0\sigma$  from their Standard Model (SM) predictions [2–5]. In addition to  $R_{K^{(*)}}$ , some discrepancies are also reported in the observables related to  $b \rightarrow s\mu^+\mu^-$  decays such as  $\mathcal{B}(B_s \rightarrow \phi\mu^+\mu^-)$ ,  $\mathcal{B}(B_s \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-)$ , angular distribution of  $B \rightarrow K^*\mu^+\mu^-$  etc [6–9]. A number of studies has been performed to explain all these deviations in both model-independent (see for example Refs. [10–17]) as well as in specific new physics (NP) models such as  $Z'$  boson [18–23], Leptoquark [24–26] etc.

On the other hand, the flavor ratios in  $b \rightarrow c\ell\bar{\nu}$  transition are defined as  $R_{D^{(*)}} = \mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow D^{(*)}\tau\bar{\nu})/\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow D^{(*)}\ell\bar{\nu})$ , where  $\ell = e$  or  $\mu$  [27–35]. The present world averages of  $R_{D^{(*)}}$ , including the correlation, are  $\sim 3\sigma$  away from their SM predictions [36]. Besides, the measured value of the ratio  $R_{J/\psi} = \mathcal{B}(B_c \rightarrow J/\psi\tau\bar{\nu})/\mathcal{B}(B_c \rightarrow J/\psi\mu\bar{\nu})$  is found to be  $\sim 2\sigma$  higher than its SM value [37]. In this context, various groups have proposed explanations in a model-independent approach [38–45] and also in different NP models. Some of the simplified NP models may include a new vector boson [46–49], a charged scalar [50–57] or a Leptoquark [58–62].

Several attempts are made to come up with a combined explanation of anomalies in both neutral current and charged current transitions [63–69]. Among those, the Leptoquark (LQ) solution is quite interesting and popular. However, the LQ could be either a scalar or a vector depending on its spin. A review on all kinds of LQs can be found in Ref. [70]. Among all the LQs, the vector  $U_1$  with charge  $+2/3$ , a  $SU(2)_L$  singlet, is a very good candidate which can explain all these deviations.

The hints of LFU violation in  $B$  decays automatically lead to a possibility of having lepton flavor violation (LFV) in  $B$  decays [18, 71]. Recent works on flavor violating  $\Lambda_b$  baryonic decays can be found in Refs. [72, 73]. In this work, we study the flavor violation in  $B \rightarrow K_2^*\ell_1\ell_2$ , where  $K_2^*$  is higher excited spin-2 state of  $K^*$  meson. This decay is mediated by  $b \rightarrow s\ell_1\ell_2$  where we consider  $\ell_1, \ell_2 = \mu$  or  $\tau$ . The flavor conserving  $B \rightarrow K_2^*\ell^+\ell^-$  decay has already been well studied within the SM as well as in the NP models [74–80]. In particular, BaBar [81] and Belle [82] have already observed the radiative decay  $B \rightarrow K_2^*\gamma$  and the measured branching ratio is as comparable to that of  $B \rightarrow K^*\gamma$ . In this paper, we calculate the two-fold differential decay distribution of

$B \rightarrow K_2^* \ell_1 \ell_2$  in the presence of vector, axial-vector, scalar and pseudo-scalar NP operators. Then we investigate the sensitivity of the branching ratio and the forward-backward asymmetry in the  $U_1$  LQ model. In doing that, first we obtain the allowed NP parameter spaces of the model by using the most relevant constraints from the flavor observables. Finally, we compute the upper limits of these two observables in the  $U_1$  model.

The paper is organized as follows. In sec.II, we start with the  $b \rightarrow s \ell_1 \ell_2$  NP Hamiltonian and calculate two-fold decay distribution of  $B \rightarrow K_2^* \ell_1 \ell_2$  decay. In sec.III, we discuss the  $U_1$  LQ model and investigate its effect on the observables of  $B \rightarrow K_2^* \mu^\pm \tau^\mp$  decays. In sec. IV, we present our conclusions.

## II. DECAY DISTRIBUTION OF $B \rightarrow K_2^* \ell_1 \ell_2$

The LFV  $b \rightarrow s \ell_1 \ell_2$  decays are not allowed in the SM. Therefore, the NP effective Hamiltonian for  $b \rightarrow s \ell_1 \ell_2$  transition can be written as

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}} = -\frac{\alpha_{\text{em}} G_F}{\sqrt{2}\pi} V_{ts}^* V_{tb} \sum_{i=V,A,S,P} (C_i \mathcal{O}_i + C'_i \mathcal{O}'_i), \quad (1)$$

where  $\alpha_{\text{em}}$  is the fine-structure constant,  $G_F$  is the Fermi constant,  $V_{ts}$  and  $V_{tb}$  are the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) matrix elements. The  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}}$  contains four types of NP operators, vector(V), axial-vector(A), scalar(S) and pseudo-scalar(P), which can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_V^{(\prime)} &= [\bar{s} \gamma^\mu P_{L(R)} b][\ell_2 \gamma_\mu \ell_1], & \mathcal{O}_A^{(\prime)} &= [\bar{s} \gamma^\mu P_{L(R)} b][\ell_2 \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 \ell_1], \\ \mathcal{O}_S^{(\prime)} &= [\bar{s} P_{R(L)} b][\ell_2 \ell_1], & \mathcal{O}_P^{(\prime)} &= [\bar{s} P_{R(L)} b][\ell_2 \gamma_5 \ell_1]. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Here  $P_{L(R)} = (1 \mp \gamma_5)/2$  are the chirality operators. We note that the electromagnetic penguin operator  $\mathcal{O}_7$  (appears in  $b \rightarrow s \ell \ell$  decay):

$$\mathcal{O}_7 = \frac{m_b}{e} (\bar{s} \sigma_{\mu\nu} P_R b) F^{\mu\nu} \quad (3)$$

cannot generate LFV contributions due to the universality of electromagnetic interaction. The NP Wilson coefficients (WCs)  $C_{V,A,S,P}^{(\prime)}$  contain the short distance physics whereas the long-distance physics are embedded into the  $B \rightarrow K_2^*$  hadronic matrix elements. For  $B \rightarrow K_2^*$  transition, the hadronic matrix elements for V and A currents can be parameterized in terms of four form factors

$V(q^2)$  and  $A_{0,1,2}(q^2)$ . These can be written as [83]

$$\begin{aligned}\langle K_2^*(k, \epsilon^*) | \bar{s} \gamma^\mu b | \bar{B}(p) \rangle &= -\frac{2V(q^2)}{m_B + m_{K_2^*}} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \epsilon_{T\nu}^* p_\rho k_\sigma, \\ \langle K_2^*(k, \epsilon^*) | \bar{s} \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 b | \bar{B}(p) \rangle &= 2im_{K_2^*} A_0(q^2) \frac{\epsilon_T^* \cdot q}{q^2} q^\mu + i(m_B + m_{K_2^*}) A_1(q^2) \left[ \epsilon_T^{*\mu} - \frac{\epsilon_T^* \cdot q}{q^2} q^\mu \right] \\ &\quad - iA_2(q^2) \frac{\epsilon_T^* \cdot q}{m_B + m_{K_2^*}} \left[ (p+k)^\mu - \frac{m_B^2 - m_{K_2^*}^2}{q^2} q^\mu \right],\end{aligned}\quad (4)$$

where  $p$  and  $k$  are the four momentum of  $B$  and  $K_2^*$  mesons, respectively. However, applying equation of motion, it can be shown that the matrix element of  $B \rightarrow K_2^*$  transition for the scalar interaction ( $\bar{s}b$ ) vanishes and that for the pseudo-scalar interaction leads to

$$\langle K_2^*(k, \epsilon^*) | \bar{s} \gamma_5 b | \bar{B}(p) \rangle = -\frac{2im_{K_2^*} A_0(q^2)}{m_b + m_s} (\epsilon_T^* \cdot q). \quad (5)$$

The polarization vector of  $K_2^*$  is discussed in Appendix A. All form-factors have been calculated within the perturbative QCD approach [83] and also in Light-Cone QCD sum rule technique [84–86]. In this work, we follow the form factors derived using the QCD sum rule from Ref [86]. Within this technique, the  $q^2$ -dependent form factors are parameterized as

$$F^{B_q T}(q^2) = \frac{F^{B_q T}(0)}{1 - a(q^2/m_{B_q}^2) + b(q^2/m_{B_q}^2)^2}, \quad (6)$$

where  $F^{B_q T} \equiv A_{0,1,2}(q^2), V(q^2)$ . The values of three parameters, in Eq. (6),  $F^{BK_2^*}$ ,  $a$  and  $b$  are listed in Table I.

$F$	$[F^{BK_2^*}(0), a, b]$
$A_1$	$[0.14 \pm 0.02, 1.23, 0.49]$
$A_2$	$[0.05 \pm 0.02, 1.32, 14.9]$
$A_0$	$[0.25 \pm 0.04, 1.57, 0.10]$
$V$	$[0.16 \pm 0.02, 2.08, 1.50]$

TABLE I:  $B \rightarrow K_2^*$  form factors, obtained in the LCSR calculation, are fitted to the 3-parameter form in Eq. (6).

The three body  $B \rightarrow K_2^* \ell_1 \ell_2$  decay can be described by the leptonic polar angle  $\theta_\ell$  and leptonic mass squared  $q^2 = (p - k)^2$ . We take the  $\theta_\ell$  angle as the angle made by the  $\ell_1$  lepton w.r.t. to the di-lepton momentum in  $B$  rest frame. In terms of these two variables, we find the two-fold differential decay distribution as follows

$$\frac{d^2\Gamma}{dq^2 d\cos\theta_\ell} = A(q^2) + B(q^2) \cos\theta_\ell + C(q^2) \cos^2\theta_\ell, \quad (7)$$

where

$$C(q^2) = \frac{3}{8}\beta_+^2\beta_-^2 \left\{ \left( |A_L^\parallel|^2 + |A_L^\perp|^2 - 2|A_L^0|^2 \right) + (L \rightarrow R) \right\}, \quad (8)$$

$$B(q^2) = \frac{3}{2}\beta_-\beta_+ \left\{ \text{Re} \left[ A_L^\perp{}^* A_L^\parallel - (L \rightarrow R) \right] + \frac{m_+m_-}{q^2} \text{Re} \left[ A_L^{0*} A_L^t + (L \rightarrow R) \right] \right. \\ \left. + \frac{m_+}{\sqrt{q^2}} \text{Re} \left[ A_S^* (A_L^0 + A_R^0) \right] - \frac{m_-}{\sqrt{q^2}} \text{Re} \left[ A_{SP}^* (A_L^0 - A_R^0) \right] \right\}, \quad (9)$$

$$A(q^2) = \frac{3}{4} \left\{ \frac{1}{4} \left[ \left( 1 + \frac{m_+^2}{q^2} \right) \beta_-^2 + \left( 1 + \frac{m_-^2}{q^2} \right) \beta_+^2 \right] \left( |A_L^\parallel|^2 + |A_L^\perp|^2 + (L \rightarrow R) \right) \right. \\ \left. + \frac{1}{2} (\beta_+^2 + \beta_-^2) (|A_L^0|^2 + |A_R^0|^2) \right. \\ \left. + \frac{4m_1m_2}{q^2} \text{Re} \left[ A_R^0 A_L^{0*} + A_R^\parallel A_L^{\parallel*} + A_R^\perp A_L^{\perp*} - A_L^t A_R^{t*} \right] \right. \\ \left. + \frac{1}{2} (\beta_-^2 + \beta_+^2 - 2\beta_-^2\beta_+^2) (|A_L^t|^2 + |A_R^t|^2) + \frac{1}{2} (|A_{SP}|^2\beta_-^2 + |A_S|^2\beta_+^2) \right. \\ \left. + \frac{2m_-}{\sqrt{q^2}} \beta_+^2 \text{Re} \left[ A_S (A_L^t + A_R^t)^* \right] - \frac{2m_+}{\sqrt{q^2}} \beta_-^2 \text{Re} \left[ A_{SP} (A_L^t - A_R^t)^* \right] \right\}. \quad (10)$$

Here  $m_\pm = (m_1 \pm m_2)$ ,  $\beta_\pm = \sqrt{1 - \frac{(m_{\ell_1} \pm m_{\ell_2})^2}{q^2}}$  and the expressions of transversity amplitudes  $A$ 's are given in Appendix B. In Appendix C, we describe the lepton helicity amplitudes used in our analysis. Integrating Eq. (7) over  $\theta_\ell$ , we get the differential decay rate

$$\frac{d\Gamma}{dq^2} = 2 \left( A + \frac{C}{3} \right) \quad (11)$$

whereas the lepton forward-backward asymmetry is found to be

$$A_{\text{FB}}(q^2) = \frac{1}{d\Gamma/dq^2} \left( \int_0^1 d \cos \theta_\ell \frac{d\Gamma}{d \cos \theta_\ell dq^2} - \int_{-1}^0 d \cos \theta_\ell \frac{d\Gamma}{d \cos \theta_\ell dq^2} \right) = \frac{B}{2 \left( A + \frac{C}{3} \right)}. \quad (12)$$

### III. THE VECTOR $SU(2)_L$ SINGLET LQ

We consider the weak singlet vector LQ  $U_1^{2/3}$  since it can give rise to a good explanation of both types of anomalies in  $b \rightarrow c\ell\bar{\nu}$  and  $b \rightarrow s\mu^+\mu^-$  transitions, simultaneously [65, 66, 68]. In fact, this LQ model attracts a lot of attention in the literature. The interaction Lagrangian between the  $U_1$  LQ and the SM fermions can be written as [70]

$$\mathcal{L}_{U_1^{2/3}} = h_L^{ij} \bar{Q}_{iL} \gamma_\mu L_{jL} U_1^\mu + h_R^{ij} \bar{d}_{iR} \gamma_\mu \ell_{jR} U_1^\mu + \text{h.c.}, \quad (13)$$

where  $h_{L,R}^{ij}$  are the LQ couplings with the generation indexes  $i, j$ ,  $Q_L(L_L)$  is the SM left-handed quark (lepton) doublet and  $d_R(\ell_R)$  is the right-handed down quark (lepton) singlet. We consider

the minimal framework where  $h_R^{ij} = 0$ . We also assume that the LQ coupling to the first generation is zero. This leads to the following flavor structure of the LQ couplings

$$h_L = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & h_L^{22} & h_L^{23} \\ 0 & h_L^{32} & h_L^{33} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (14)$$

To calculate the NP parameters  $h_L$ 's, one needs to consider all the relevant constraints from low energy observables. In  $U_1$  LQ model, these constraints would include from  $2q2\ell$  processes. In Table II, we list the observables which gives potential constraints on the NP parameters. These observables mainly include all  $b \rightarrow s\mu^+\mu^-$  data, flavor ratios in  $b \rightarrow c\tau\bar{\nu}$  and measured LFV decays in  $b \rightarrow s\ell_1\ell_2$ .

Transforming the  $\mathcal{L}_{U_1}$  into mass basis and using the Fierz transformations, one can express the NP WCs of  $b \rightarrow s\ell_i^+\ell_j^-$  and  $b \rightarrow c\tau\bar{\nu}$  in terms of the LQ couplings. In presence of  $U_1$  LQ, the vector and axial-vector NP WCs of  $b \rightarrow s\ell_i^+\ell_j^-$  can be written as

$$C_V^{ij} = -C_A^{ij} = \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{2}G_F V_{tb} V_{ts}^* \alpha_{em}} \frac{h_L^{2i} h_L^{3j*}}{M_{U_1}^2}. \quad (15)$$

All observables in  $b \rightarrow s\mu^+\mu^-$  sector depend on  $h_L^{22}h_L^{32}$  combination. Here we use the constraint  $C_9^{\mu\mu} = -C_{10}^{\mu\mu}$  for all  $b \rightarrow s\mu^-\mu^+$  data which is already obtained from a global fit to the data. However, the LFV observables depend on  $h_L^{23}h_L^{32}$  ( $h_L^{22}h_L^{33}$ ) combination for  $b \rightarrow s\mu^-\tau^+$  ( $b \rightarrow s\mu^+\tau^-$ ) transition. We use the expressions of LFV observables from Ref. [65].

In case of  $b \rightarrow c\tau\bar{\nu}$ , the NP WC can also be expressed in following form

$$C_{V_L} = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}G_F M_{U_1}^2} h_L^{33*} [h_L^{33} + (V_{cs}/V_{cb})h_L^{23}], \quad (16)$$

where  $C_{V_L}$  is the NP WC of the NP operator  $\mathcal{O}_{V_L} = (\bar{c}\gamma_\mu P_L b)(\bar{\tau}\gamma^\mu P_L \nu)$ . The expressions for the flavor ratios in  $b \rightarrow c\ell\bar{\nu}$  can be found in Ref. [87]. In our analysis, we assume the LQ mass to be 1 TeV.

Now we perform a  $\chi^2$  fit to find the NP parameter space allowed by the current flavor data. The  $\chi^2$  function is defined as

$$\chi^2(h_L^{ij}) = \sum_k \frac{(\mathcal{O}_k^{\text{theory}}(h_L^{ij}) - \mathcal{O}_k^{\text{expt}})^2}{\sigma_{\text{total},k}^2}, \quad (17)$$

where  $\mathcal{O}_k^{\text{theory}}$  is the theoretical prediction,  $\mathcal{O}_k^{\text{expt}}$  is the experimental central value and  $\sigma_{\text{total},k}$  is the total uncertainty (theoretical and experimental errors are added in quadrature) for each observable. The measured values and the upper limits of each observable are listed in Table II which went into

Sector	Observable	Measurement
$b \rightarrow s\mu^+\mu^-$	All $b \rightarrow s\mu^+\mu^-$	$C_9^{\mu\mu} = -C_{10}^{\mu\mu} = -0.46 \pm 0.07$ [22]
$b \rightarrow c\tau\bar{\nu}$	$R_D$	$0.340 \pm 0.027 \pm 0.013$ [36]
	$R_{D^*}$	$0.295 \pm 0.011 \pm 0.008$ [36]
	$R_{J/\psi}$	$0.71 \pm 0.17 \pm 0.18$ [37]
LFV	$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow K^+\tau^-\mu^+)$	$< 4.5 \times 10^{-5}$ , 90% C.L. [88]
	$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow K^+\tau^+\mu^-)$	$< 2.8 \times 10^{-5}$ , 90% C.L. [88]
	$\mathcal{B}(\Upsilon \rightarrow \tau^\pm\mu^\mp)$	$< 3.3 \times 10^{-6}$ , 90% C.L. [88]
	$\mathcal{B}(\tau \rightarrow \tau\phi)$	$< 8.4 \times 10^{-8}$ , 90% C.L. [88]

TABLE II: List of observables and their measured values used into the  $U_1^{2/3}$  LQ fit.

the fit. In order to include the upper limits into the fit, we have calculated the central values and the error such that we get the same numbers at 90% CL (or at  $1.645\sigma$ ). The allowed NP couplings are obtained by minimizing the  $\chi^2$ . For the minimization, we use the CERN Minuit library [89]. We obtain the NP parameter space in the planes of  $h_L^{22}-h_L^{33}$  and  $h_L^{23}-h_L^{32}$  allowed at 90% C.L. which are shown in Fig. 1.




FIG. 1: The plot on the left (right) panel represents the allowed 90% C.L. region in the  $h_L^{22}-h_L^{33}$  ( $h_L^{23}-h_L^{32}$ ) plane for  $M_{U_1} = 1$  TeV.

We calculate the predictions of branching ratios and the forward-backward asymmetries of  $B \rightarrow K_2^*\mu^\pm\tau^\mp$  decays for the allowed NP parameter space. In order to do that, we choose a benchmark point from each of the plots which could give the maximum allowed values of the observables. From the left plot of Fig. 1, we pick  $h_L^{22}h_L^{33} = -0.007$  whereas from the right plot, we

choose  $h_L^{23}h_L^{32} = 0.033$ . At 90% C.L., we find the maximum values of branching fractions to be

$$\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow K_2^* \mu^- \tau^+) \leq 0.73 \times 10^{-8}, \quad \mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow K_2^* \mu^+ \tau^-) \leq 0.33 \times 10^{-7} \quad (18)$$

and the forward-backward asymmetries to be

$$A_{\text{FB}}(B \rightarrow K_2^* \mu^- \tau^+) \leq 0.36, \quad A_{\text{FB}}(B \rightarrow K_2^* \mu^+ \tau^-) \leq -0.12. \quad (19)$$

We also plot the differential branching ratio and the forward-backward asymmetry as a function of  $q^2$  for the same NP benchmark points. The plots are shown in Fig. 2. From both the differential branching ratio plot and Eq. (18), it is evident that  $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow K_2^* \mu^+ \tau^-) > \mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow K_2^* \mu^- \tau^+)$ . From the  $A_{\text{FB}}$  plot, we find that the  $A_{\text{FB}}(q^2)$  of  $B \rightarrow K_2^* \mu^- \tau^+$  is positive through out the all  $q^2$  region. However, the  $A_{\text{FB}}(q^2)$  of  $B \rightarrow K_2^* \mu^+ \tau^-$  has a zero-crossing point at  $q^2 = 11 \text{ GeV}^2$ .




FIG. 2: The plots on the left and right panels represent the differential branching ratio and the forward-backward asymmetry as a function of  $q^2$ , respectively. In each plot, the red and blue curves represent  $B \rightarrow K_2^* \tau^+ \mu^-$  and  $B \rightarrow K_2^* \tau^- \mu^+$  decays, respectively. These are the predictions for the benchmark points  $h_L^{23}h_L^{32} = 0.033$  and  $h_L^{22}h_L^{33} = -0.007$  which could give rise to a maximum values of two observables at 90% C.L.

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS

Inspired by the present  $B$  physics anomalies, we investigate the LFV  $B \rightarrow K_2^* \mu^\pm \tau^\mp$  decays. These decays are forbidden in the SM and hence any hint of these decays would imply a smoking gun signal of physics beyond the SM. In this work, we compute the two-fold angular distribution of  $B \rightarrow K_2^* \ell_1 \ell_2$  in presence of vector, axial-vector, scalar and pseudo-scalar NP interactions. From the differential decay distribution, we extract two observables the branching fraction and the lepton forward-backward asymmetry. Finally, we calculate these observables in the vector  $U_1$  LQ model



which is a very popular model in explaining all the  $B$  anomalies. In particular, we compute the upper limits of the branching fraction and the forward-backward asymmetry at the 90% confidence level. We hope these upper limits may be measurable at LHCb.

### Acknowledgments

We thank Ashutosh Kumar Alok for useful discussions. This work was financially supported by NSERC of Canada (SK). RS would like to acknowledge SERB sponsored project titled ‘‘Probing New Physics Interactions’’ (CRG/2018/004889) where this project started. RS would also acknowledge SERB National Postdoctoral Fellowship (NPDF) project PDF/2021/003328 for the support to complete the project.

### Appendix A: Polarization of $K_2^*$

The polarization  $\epsilon^{\mu\nu}(n)$  of tensor meson  $K_2^*$ , which has four momentum  $(k_0, 0, 0, \vec{k})$ , can be written in terms of the spin-1 polarization vectors [90]

$$\begin{aligned}\epsilon_{\mu\nu}(\pm 2) &= \epsilon_\mu(\pm 1)\epsilon_\nu(\pm 1), \\ \epsilon_{\mu\nu}(\pm 1) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} [\epsilon_\nu(\pm)\epsilon_\mu(0) + \epsilon_\nu(\pm)\epsilon_\mu(0)], \\ \epsilon_{\mu\nu}(0) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} [\epsilon_\mu(+)\epsilon_\nu(-) + \epsilon_\nu(+)\epsilon_\mu(-)] + \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\epsilon_\mu(0)\epsilon_\nu(0),\end{aligned}\tag{A1}$$

where the spin-1 polarization vectors are defined as

$$\epsilon_\mu(0) = \frac{1}{m_{K_2^*}} (\vec{k}_z, 0, 0, k_0), \quad \epsilon_\mu(\pm) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (0, 1, \pm i, 0)\tag{A2}$$

We study  $B \rightarrow K_2^* \ell_1 \ell_2$  decay where we have two leptons in the final state so in this case, the  $n = \pm 2$  helicity states of the  $K_2^*$  is not realized. Therefore a new polarization vector is introduced [85]

$$\epsilon_{T\mu}(h) = \frac{\epsilon_{\mu\nu} p^\nu}{m_B}\tag{A3}$$

The explicit expressions of polarization vectors are

$$\epsilon_{T\mu}(\pm 1) = \frac{1}{m_B} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \epsilon(0) \cdot p \epsilon_\mu(\pm) = \frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{\sqrt{8} m_B m_{K_2^*}} \epsilon_\mu(\pm),\tag{A4}$$

$$\epsilon_{T\mu}(0) = \frac{1}{m_B} \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \epsilon(0) \cdot p \epsilon_\mu(0) = \frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{\sqrt{6} m_B m_{K_2^*}} \epsilon_\mu(0),\tag{A5}$$

where  $\lambda(m_B^2, m_{K_2^*}^2, q^2) = m_B^4 + m_{K_2^*}^4 + q^4 - 2(m_B^2 m_{K_2^*}^2 + m_B^2 q^2 + m_{K_2^*}^2 q^2)$  is the usual Kallen function. On the other hand, the virtual gauge boson can have three types of polarization states, longitudinal, transverse and time-like, which have following components

$$\epsilon_V^\mu(0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{q^2}}(-|\vec{q}_z|, 0, 0, -q_0), \quad \epsilon_V^\mu(\pm) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(0, 1, \pm i, 0), \quad \epsilon_V^\mu(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{q^2}}(q_0, 0, 0, q_z) \quad (\text{A6})$$

where  $q^\mu = (q_0, 0, 0, q_z)$  is four momentum of gauge boson.

### Appendix B: Transversity Amplitudes

The vector and axial-vector transversity amplitudes can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} A_{0L,R} &= N \frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{\sqrt{6}m_B m_{K_2^*}} \frac{1}{2m_{K_2^*} \sqrt{q^2}} \left[ (C_{V-} \mp C_{A-}) \left[ (m_B^2 - m_{K_2^*}^2 - q^2)(m_B + m_{K_2^*})A_1 - \frac{\lambda}{m_B + m_{K_2^*}}A_2 \right] \right], \\ A_{\perp L,R} &= -\sqrt{2}N \frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{\sqrt{8}m_B m_{K_2^*}} \left[ (C_{V+} \mp C_{A+}) \frac{\sqrt{\lambda}V}{m_B + m_{K_2^*}} \right], \\ A_{\parallel L,R} &= \sqrt{2}N \frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{\sqrt{8}m_B m_{K_2^*}} \left[ (C_{V-} \mp C_{A-})(m_B + m_{K_2^*})A_1 \right], \\ A_{Lt} &= N \frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{\sqrt{q^2} \sqrt{6}m_B m_{K_2^*}} \left[ \sqrt{\lambda}(C_{V-} - C_{A-})A_0 \right], \\ A_{Rt} &= N \frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{\sqrt{q^2} \sqrt{6}m_B m_{K_2^*}} \left[ \sqrt{\lambda}(C_{V-} + C_{A-})A_0 \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B1})$$

where  $C_{V\pm} = (C_V \pm C'_V)$ , and  $C_{A\pm} = (C_A \pm C'_A)$ . The transversity amplitudes for scalar, pseudoscalar interactions can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} A_S &= 2N \frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{\sqrt{6}m_B m_{K_2^*}} \left[ \sqrt{\lambda}(C_S - C_{S'})A_0 \right], \\ A_{SP} &= 2N \frac{\sqrt{\lambda}}{\sqrt{6}m_B m_{K_2^*}} \left[ \sqrt{\lambda}(C_P - C_{P'})A_0 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B2})$$

The normalization constant  $N$  is given by

$$N = \left[ \frac{G_F^2 \alpha_e^2}{3 \cdot 2^{10} \pi^5 m_B^3} |V_{tb} V_{ts}^*|^2 q^2 \beta_+ \beta_- \lambda(m_B^2, m_{K_2^*}^2, q^2)^{1/2} \mathcal{B}(K_2^* \rightarrow K\pi) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (\text{B3})$$

### Appendix C: Lepton helicity amplitudes

Apart from the hadronic matrix elements, we also need the leptonic matrix elements to compute the decay distribution. To calculate these, we use the method outlined in refs. [91, 92]. The leptonic matrix elements are defined as  $\langle \ell_1(\lambda_1) \bar{\ell}_2(\lambda_2) | \bar{\ell} \Gamma^X \ell | 0 \rangle = \bar{u}(\lambda_1) \Gamma^X v(\lambda_2) = \mathcal{L}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$  where  $\Gamma^X$  are

actually the leptonic parts of the NP operators given in Eq. (2). The spinors of particle  $u$  and anti-particle  $v$  are defined as

$$u_{\frac{1}{2}} = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{E_1 + m_{\ell_1}} \\ 0 \\ \sqrt{E_1 - m_{\ell_1}} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, u_{-\frac{1}{2}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \sqrt{E_1 + m_{\ell_1}} \\ 0 \\ -\sqrt{E_1 - m_{\ell_1}} \end{pmatrix}, v_{\frac{1}{2}} = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{E_2 - m_{\ell_2}} \\ 0 \\ -\sqrt{E_2 + m_{\ell_2}} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, v_{-\frac{1}{2}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \sqrt{E_2 - m_{\ell_2}} \\ 0 \\ \sqrt{E_2 + m_{\ell_2}} \end{pmatrix}$$

where the lepton energies are defined as  $E_{1,2} = \sqrt{m_{1,2}^2 + \lambda(q^2, m_1^2, m_2^2)/4q^2}$  and it gives  $E_1 + E_2 = \sqrt{q^2}$ . The spinors are normalised as  $\bar{u}(\lambda_1)u(\lambda_2) = \delta_{\lambda_1\lambda_2}2m_{\ell_1}$  and  $\bar{v}(\lambda_1)v(\lambda_2) = -\delta_{\lambda_1\lambda_2}2m_{\ell_2}$ . Using these, we find the following expressions of lepton helicity amplitudes

$$\mathcal{L}^{L,R}(1/2, 1/2, 0) = (m_- \beta_+ \pm m_+ \beta_-)/2 \quad (\text{C1})$$

$$\mathcal{L}^{L,R}(-1/2, -1/2, 0) = (m_- \beta_+ \mp m_+ \beta_-)/2 \quad (\text{C2})$$

$$\mathcal{L}^{L,R}(1/2, 1/2, 1) = (m_+ \beta_- \pm m_- \beta_+)/2 \quad (\text{C3})$$

$$\mathcal{L}^{L,R}(-1/2, -1/2, 1) = (m_+ \beta_- \mp m_- \beta_+)/2 \quad (\text{C4})$$

$$\mathcal{L}^{L,R}(-1/2, 1/2, 1) = -\sqrt{q^2}(\beta_- \pm \beta_+)/\sqrt{2} \quad (\text{C5})$$

$$\mathcal{L}^{L,R}(1/2, -1/2, 1) = -\sqrt{q^2}(\beta_+ \mp \beta_-)/\sqrt{2} \quad (\text{C6})$$

$$\mathcal{L}^S(\pm 1/2, \pm 1/2) = \sqrt{q^2}\beta_+ \quad (\text{C7})$$

$$\mathcal{L}^P(\pm 1/2, \pm 1/2) = \mp \sqrt{q^2}\beta_- \quad (\text{C8})$$

where  $\beta_{\pm} = \sqrt{1 - \frac{(m_{\ell_1} \pm m_{\ell_2})^2}{q^2}}$  and  $m_{\pm} = (m_1 \pm m_2)$  as before. The lepton helicity amplitudes not mentioned above are all zero. Note that the scalar transitions  $S$  and  $P$  (also the timelike ones) are diagonal since  $\lambda_{\ell} = \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 = 0$ .

- 
- [1] D. London and J. Matias, [[arXiv:2110.13270](#)] [hep-ph].
  - [2] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb], JHEP **08** (2017), 055 [[arXiv:1705.05802](#)] [hep-ex].
  - [3] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb], Phys. Rev. Lett. **122** (2019) no.19, 191801 [[arXiv:1903.09252](#)] [hep-ex].
  - [4] A. Abdesselam *et al.* [Belle], Phys. Rev. Lett. **126** (2021) no.16, 161801 [[arXiv:1904.02440](#)] [hep-ex].
  - [5] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb], Nature Phys. **18** (2022) no.3, 277-282 [[arXiv:2103.11769](#)] [hep-ex].
  - [6] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb], JHEP **09** (2015), 179 [[arXiv:1506.08777](#)] [hep-ex].
  - [7] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb], Phys. Rev. Lett. **128** (2022) no.4, 041801 [[arXiv:2108.09284](#)] [hep-ex].
  - [8] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb], Phys. Rev. Lett. **111** (2013), 191801 [[arXiv:1308.1707](#)] [hep-ex].
  - [9] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb], Phys. Rev. Lett. **125** (2020) no.1, 011802 [[arXiv:2003.04831](#)] [hep-ex].

- [10] A. K. Alok, A. Dighe, S. Gangal and D. Kumar, JHEP **06** (2019), 089 [[arXiv:2103.13370](#) [hep-ph]].
- [11] K. Kowalska, D. Kumar and E. M. Sessolo, Eur. Phys. J. C **79** (2019) no.10, 840 [[arXiv:1903.10932](#) [hep-ph]].
- [12] M. Ciuchini, A. M. Coutinho, M. Fedele, E. Franco, A. Paul, L. Silvestrini and M. Valli, Eur. Phys. J. C **79** (2019) no.8, 719 [[arXiv:1903.09632](#) [hep-ph]].
- [13] M. Algueró, B. Capdevila, S. Descotes-Genon, J. Matias and M. Novoa-Brunet, Eur. Phys. J. C **82** (2022) no.4, 326 [[arXiv:2104.08921](#) [hep-ph]].
- [14] W. Altmannshofer and P. Stangl, Eur. Phys. J. C **81** (2021) no.10, 952 [[arXiv:2103.13370](#) [hep-ph]].
- [15] T. Hurth, F. Mahmoudi, D. M. Santos and S. Neshatpour, Phys. Lett. B **824** (2022), 136838 [[arXiv:2104.10058](#) [hep-ph]].
- [16] L. S. Geng, B. Grinstein, S. Jäger, S. Y. Li, J. Martin Camalich and R. X. Shi, Phys. Rev. D **104** (2021) no.3, 035029 [[arXiv:2103.12738](#) [hep-ph]]. [[arXiv:1903.09617](#) [hep-ph]].
- [17] N. R. Singh Chundawat, [[arXiv:2207.10613](#) [hep-ph]].
- [18] A. Crivellin, L. Hofer, J. Matias, U. Nierste, S. Pokorski and J. Rosiek, Phys. Rev. D **92** (2015) no.5, 054013 [[arXiv:1504.07928](#) [hep-ph]].
- [19] C. W. Chiang, X. G. He, J. Tandean and X. B. Yuan, Phys. Rev. D **96** (2017) no.11, 115022 [[arXiv:1706.02696](#) [hep-ph]].
- [20] A. Datta, J. Kumar, J. Liao and D. Marfatia, Phys. Rev. D **97** (2018) no.11, 115038 [[arXiv:1705.08423](#) [hep-ph]].
- [21] M. F. Navarro and S. F. King, Phys. Rev. D **105** (2022) no.3, 035015 [[arXiv:2109.08729](#) [hep-ph]].
- [22] A. K. Alok, N. R. S. Chundawat, S. Gangal and D. Kumar, [[arXiv:2203.13217](#) [hep-ph]].
- [23] H. Lee and A. E. Cárcamo Hernández, [[arXiv:2207.01710](#) [hep-ph]].
- [24] A. K. Alok, B. Bhattacharya, A. Datta, D. Kumar, J. Kumar and D. London, Phys. Rev. D **96** (2017) no.9, 095009 [[arXiv:1704.07397](#) [hep-ph]].
- [25] D. Bečirević and O. Sumensari, JHEP **08** (2017), 104 [[arXiv:1704.05835](#) [hep-ph]].
- [26] B. Fornal, S. A. Gadam and B. Grinstein, Phys. Rev. D **99** (2019) no.5, 055025 [[arXiv:1812.01603](#) [hep-ph]].
- [27] J. P. Lees *et al.* [BaBar Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 101802 (2012) [[arXiv:1205.5442](#) [hep-ex]].
- [28] J. P. Lees *et al.* [BaBar Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **88**, no. 7, 072012 (2013) [[arXiv:1303.0571](#) [hep-ex]].
- [29] M. Huschle *et al.* [Belle Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 7, 072014 (2015) [[arXiv:1507.03233](#) [hep-ex]].
- [30] Y. Sato *et al.* [Belle Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **94**, no. 7, 072007 (2016) [[arXiv:1607.07923](#) [hep-ex]].
- [31] S. Hirose *et al.* [Belle Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **118**, no. 21, 211801 (2017) [[arXiv:1612.00529](#) [hep-ex]].
- [32] A. Abdesselam *et al.* [Belle Collaboration], [[arXiv:1904.08794](#) [hep-ex]].
- [33] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, no. 11, 111803 (2015) [[arXiv:1506.08614](#) [hep-ex]].

- [34] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb], Phys. Rev. Lett. **120** (2018) no.17, 171802 [[arXiv:1708.08856](#) [hep-ex]].
- [35] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **97** (2018) no.7, 072013 [[arXiv:1711.02505](#) [hep-ex]].
- [36] Y. Amhis *et al.* [HFLAV], [[arXiv:2206.07501](#) [hep-ex]].
- [37] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb], Phys. Rev. Lett. **120** (2018) no.12, 121801 [[arXiv:1711.05623](#) [hep-ex]].
- [38] Q. Y. Hu, X. Q. Li and Y. D. Yang, Eur. Phys. J. C **79** (2019) no.3, 264 [[arXiv:1810.04939](#) [hep-ph]].
- [39] A. K. Alok, D. Kumar, S. Kumbhakar and S. Uma Sankar, Nucl. Phys. B **953** (2020), 114957 [[arXiv:1903.10486](#) [hep-ph]].
- [40] P. Asadi and D. Shih, Phys. Rev. D **100** (2019) no.11, 115013 [[arXiv:1905.03311](#) [hep-ph]].
- [41] C. Murgui, A. Peñuelas, M. Jung and A. Pich, JHEP **09** (2019), 103 [[arXiv:1904.09311](#) [hep-ph]].
- [42] D. Bardhan and D. Ghosh, Phys. Rev. D **100** (2019) no.1, 011701 [[arXiv:1904.10432](#) [hep-ph]].
- [43] M. Blanke, A. Crivellin, T. Kitahara, M. Moscati, U. Nierste and I. Nišandžić, Phys. Rev. D **100** (2019) no.3, 035035 [[arXiv:1905.08253](#) [hep-ph]].
- [44] R. X. Shi, L. S. Geng, B. Grinstein, S. Jäger and J. Martin Camalich, JHEP **12** (2019), 065 [[arXiv:1905.08498](#) [hep-ph]].
- [45] K. Cheung, Z. R. Huang, H. D. Li, C. D. Lü, Y. N. Mao and R. Y. Tang, Nucl. Phys. B **965** (2021), 115354 [[arXiv:2002.07272](#) [hep-ph]].
- [46] A. Greljo, G. Isidori and D. Marzocca, JHEP **1507**, 142 (2015) [[arXiv:1506.01705](#) [hep-ph]].
- [47] S. M. Boucenna, A. Celis, J. Fuentes-Martin, A. Vicente and J. Virto, Phys. Lett. B **760**, 214 (2016) [[arXiv:1604.03088](#) [hep-ph]].
- [48] S. Matsuzaki, K. Nishiwaki and R. Watanabe, JHEP **1708**, 145 (2017) [[arXiv:1706.01463](#) [hep-ph]].
- [49] P. Asadi, M. R. Buckley and D. Shih, JHEP **09** (2018), 010 [[arXiv:1804.04135](#) [hep-ph]].
- [50] A. Crivellin, C. Greub and A. Kokulu, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 054014 (2012) [[arXiv:1206.2634](#) [hep-ph]].
- [51] A. Celis, M. Jung, X. Q. Li and A. Pich, JHEP **1301**, 054 (2013) [[arXiv:1210.8443](#) [hep-ph]].
- [52] A. Crivellin, J. Heeck and P. Stoffer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, no. 8, 081801 (2016) [[arXiv:1507.07567](#) [hep-ph]].
- [53] A. Celis, M. Jung, X. Q. Li and A. Pich, Phys. Lett. B **771**, 168 (2017) [[arXiv:1612.07757](#) [hep-ph]].
- [54] P. Ko, Y. Omura, Y. Shigekami and C. Yu, Phys. Rev. D **95**, no. 11, 115040 (2017) [[arXiv:1702.08666](#) [hep-ph]].
- [55] S. Iguro and K. Tobe, Nucl. Phys. B **925** (2017), 560-606 [[arXiv:1708.06176](#) [hep-ph]].
- [56] A. Biswas, D. K. Ghosh, S. K. Patra and A. Shaw, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **34** (2019) no.21, 1950112 [[arXiv:1801.03375](#) [hep-ph]].
- [57] R. Martinez, C. F. Sierra and G. Valencia, Phys. Rev. D **98** (2018) no.11, 115012 [[arXiv:1805.04098](#) [hep-ph]].
- [58] Y. Sakaki, M. Tanaka, A. Tayduganov and R. Watanabe, Phys. Rev. D **88**, no. 9, 094012 (2013) [[arXiv:1309.0301](#) [hep-ph]].
- [59] S. Fajfer and N. Košnik, Phys. Lett. B **755**, 270 (2016) [[arXiv:1511.06024](#) [hep-ph]].
- [60] X. Q. Li, Y. D. Yang and X. Zhang, JHEP **1608**, 054 (2016) [[arXiv:1605.09308](#) [hep-ph]].

- [61] R. Barbieri, C. W. Murphy and F. Senia, Eur. Phys. J. C **77**, no. 1, 8 (2017) [[arXiv:1611.04930](#) [hep-ph]].
- [62] L. Calibbi, A. Crivellin and T. Li, Phys. Rev. D **98** (2018) no.11, 115002 [[arXiv:1709.00692](#) [hep-ph]].
- [63] B. Bhattacharya, A. Datta, J. P. Guévin, D. London and R. Watanabe, JHEP **01** (2017), 015 [[arXiv:1609.09078](#) [hep-ph]].
- [64] A. K. Alok, J. Kumar, D. Kumar and R. Sharma, Eur. Phys. J. C **79** (2019) no.8, 707 [[arXiv:1704.07347](#) [hep-ph]].
- [65] J. Kumar, D. London and R. Watanabe, Phys. Rev. D **99** (2019) no.1, 015007 [[arXiv:1806.07403](#) [hep-ph]].
- [66] C. Cornella, J. Fuentes-Martin and G. Isidori, JHEP **07** (2019), 168 [[arXiv:1903.11517](#) [hep-ph]].
- [67] A. Crivellin, D. Müller and F. Saturnino, JHEP **06** (2020), 020 [[arXiv:1912.04224](#) [hep-ph]].
- [68] A. Angelescu, D. Bečirević, D. A. Faroughy, F. Jaffredo and O. Sumensari, Phys. Rev. D **104** (2021) no.5, 055017 [[arXiv:2103.12504](#) [hep-ph]].
- [69] G. Bélanger, J. Kumar, D. London and A. Pukhov, [[arXiv:2206.11305](#) [hep-ph]].
- [70] I. Doršner, S. Fajfer, A. Greljo, J. F. Kamenik and N. Košnik, Phys. Rept. **641** (2016), 1-68 [[arXiv:1603.04993](#) [hep-ph]].
- [71] D. Bečirević, O. Sumensari and R. Zukanovich Funchal, Eur. Phys. J. C **76** (2016) no.3, 134 [[arXiv:1602.00881](#) [hep-ph]].
- [72] D. Das, Eur. Phys. J. C **79** (2019) no.12, 1005 [[arXiv:1909.08676](#) [hep-ph]].
- [73] M. Bordone, M. Rahimi and K. K. Vos, Eur. Phys. J. C **81** (2021) no.8, 756 [[arXiv:2106.05192](#) [hep-ph]].
- [74] S. Rai Choudhury, A. S. Cornell, G. C. Joshi and B. H. J. McKellar, Phys. Rev. D **74** (2006), 054031 [[arXiv:hep-ph/0607289](#) [hep-ph]].
- [75] H. Hatanaka and K. C. Yang, Phys. Rev. D **79** (2009), 114008 [[arXiv:0903.1917](#) [hep-ph]].
- [76] H. Hatanaka and K. C. Yang, Eur. Phys. J. C **67** (2010), 149-162 [[arXiv:0907.1496](#) [hep-ph]].
- [77] R. H. Li, C. D. Lu and W. Wang, Phys. Rev. D **83** (2011), 034034 [[arXiv:1012.2129](#) [hep-ph]].
- [78] C. D. Lu and W. Wang, Phys. Rev. D **85** (2012), 034014 [[arXiv:1111.1513](#) [hep-ph]].
- [79] T. M. Aliev and M. Savci, Phys. Rev. D **85** (2012), 015007 [[arXiv:1109.2738](#) [hep-ph]].
- [80] D. Das, B. Kindra, G. Kumar and N. Mahajan, Phys. Rev. D **99** (2019) no.9, 093012 [[arXiv:1812.11803](#) [hep-ph]].
- [81] B. Aubert *et al.* [BaBar], Phys. Rev. D **70** (2004), 091105 [[arXiv:hep-ex/0409035](#) [hep-ex]].
- [82] S. Nishida *et al.* [Belle], Phys. Rev. Lett. **89** (2002), 231801 [[arXiv:hep-ex/0205025](#) [hep-ex]].
- [83] W. Wang, Phys. Rev. D **83** (2011), 014008 [[arXiv:1008.5326](#) [hep-ph]].
- [84] H. Y. Cheng, Y. Koike and K. C. Yang, Phys. Rev. D **82** (2010), 054019 [[arXiv:1007.3541](#) [hep-ph]].
- [85] Z. G. Wang, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **26** (2011), 2761-2782 [[arXiv:1011.3200](#) [hep-ph]].
- [86] K. C. Yang, Phys. Lett. B **695** (2011), 444-448 [[arXiv:1010.2944](#) [hep-ph]].
- [87] A. K. Alok, D. Kumar, J. Kumar, S. Kumbhakar and S. U. Sankar, JHEP **09** (2018), 152 [[arXiv:1710.04127](#) [hep-ph]].
- [88] R. L. Workman [Particle Data Group], PTEP **2022** (2022), 083C01

- [89] F. James and M. Roos, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **10** (1975), 343-367
- [90] E. R. Berger, A. Donnachie, H. G. Dosch and O. Nachtmann, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **14** (2000), 673-682  
[[arXiv:hep-ph/0001270](#) [hep-ph]].
- [91] H. E. Haber, [[arXiv:hep-ph/9405376](#) [hep-ph]].
- [92] J. Gratex, M. Hopfer and R. Zwicky, *Phys. Rev. D* **93** (2016) no.5, 054008 [[arXiv:1506.03970](#) [hep-ph]].