

# Establishing CP violation in $b$ -baryon decays

Ji-Xin Yu<sup>1</sup>, Jia-Jie Han<sup>1</sup> \*, Ya Li<sup>2</sup> †, Hsiang-nan Li<sup>3</sup>, Zhen-Jun Xiao<sup>4</sup>, Fu-Sheng Yu<sup>1</sup> ‡  
<sup>1</sup>MOE Frontiers Science Center for Rare Isotopes, and School of Nuclear Science and Technology,  
 Lanzhou University, Lanzhou 730000, People's Republic of China

<sup>2</sup>Department of Physics, College of Sciences, Nanjing Agricultural University, Nanjing 210095, People's Republic of China

<sup>3</sup>Institute of Physics, Academia Sinica, Taipei, Taiwan 115, Republic of China

<sup>4</sup>Department of Physics and Institute of Theoretical Physics,  
 Nanjing Normal University, Nanjing 210023, People's Republic of China

The CP violation (CPV) in the baryon system has not yet been definitively established. We demonstrate that individual partial-wave CPV in the  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\pi^-, pK^-$  decays can exceed 10%, but the destruction between different partial waves results in small net direct CPV as observed in current experiments. There is thus high possibility of identifying CPV in  $b$ -baryon decays through measurements of partial-wave CPV. The above observation is supported by the first full QCD calculation of two-body hadronic  $\Lambda_b$  baryon decays with controllable uncertainties in the perturbative QCD formalism.

*Introduction.*— The CP violation (CPV) plays a crucial role in explaining the matter-antimatter asymmetry in the Universe and in searching for New Physics. The CPVs in  $K$ [1],  $B$ [2, 3] and  $D$ [4] meson decays, which are attributed to an irreducible phase in the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) quark-mixing matrix, have been well established and found to be consistent with Standard Model (SM) predictions. By contrast, the CPV in the baryon system has not yet been identified, and numerous experiments have been conducted to search for baryon CPV. Recent efforts by BESIII yielded the most precise hyperon decay asymmetry  $A_{CP}^\alpha(\Lambda \rightarrow p\pi^-) = -0.002 \pm 0.004$ [5, 6]. LHCb achieved the most precise measurement of CPV in charm baryon decays,  $A_{CP}(\Lambda_c \rightarrow pK^+K^-) - A_{CP}(\Lambda_c \rightarrow p\pi^+\pi^-) = 0.003 \pm 0.011$ [7]. Nevertheless, the SM predictions for CPVs in hyperons and charm baryons are one or two orders of magnitude lower than current experimental sensitivities.

Bottom hadron decays involving a relatively large weak phase allow CPV at order of 10%, which has been confirmed in  $B$  meson decays. On the contrary, measurements of CPV in two-body  $\Lambda_b$  baryon decays gave[8]

$$\begin{aligned} A_{CP}(\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\pi^-) &= -0.025 \pm 0.029, \\ A_{CP}(\Lambda_b \rightarrow pK^-) &= -0.025 \pm 0.022, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

compatible with null asymmetries within precision of 1%. That is, The CPV in  $\Lambda_b$  baryon decays is much lower than in similar  $B$  meson decays, although both are induced by the  $b \rightarrow u\bar{u}q$  transition,  $q = d, s$ . The discrepancy remains a puzzle in heavy flavor physics. It seems that the dynamics in baryon and meson processes differs significantly, but there is a lack of convincing explanations for

this distinction. As a consequence, CPV in other baryon decay modes cannot be predicted accurately either.

A  $\Lambda_b$  baryon decay is a multi-scale process, and involves more diagrams owing to an additional spectator quark compared to a  $B$  meson decay. This results in lots of  $W$ -exchange topological diagrams and abundant sources of strong phases required for direct CPV. A precise evaluation of the strong phases in these topological diagrams poses a challenge in theory.

Three popular theoretical approaches to studies of two-body hadronic  $B$  meson decays have been developed, known as the QCD factorization (QCDF)[9, 10], the soft-collinear-effective theory (SCET)[11–13] and the perturbative QCD (PQCD) factorization[14–16]. The QCDF and SCET are based on the collinear factorization theorem, in which  $B$  meson transition form factors develop an endpoint singularity if they were computed perturbatively. The PQCD is based on the  $k_T$  factorization theorem, in which the endpoint contribution is absorbed into a transverse-momentum-dependent distribution amplitude (DA) or resummed into a Sudakov factor. The factorizable and nonfactorizable emission,  $W$ -exchange and annihilation diagrams are calculable in this framework free of the endpoint singularities. The CPV of two-body hadronic  $B$  meson decays has been successfully predicted in PQCD[14–16]. Recently, the  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p$  transition form factors with reasonable high-twist hadron DAs are reproduced in PQCD, and the results agree with those from lattice QCD and other nonperturbative methods[17]. Various exclusive heavy baryon decays can thus be analyzed systematically.

We will extend the above well-established PQCD formalism to hadronic  $\Lambda_b$  decays. Our full QCD calculation, including all the factorizable and nonfactorizable topological diagrams, demonstrates the presence of large partial-wave CPV, greater than 10%, in the  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\pi^-$  decay. This amount is close to that in the corresponding  $B$  meson decay, but the cancellation between different partial waves turns in small net di-

\*Corresponding author, Email: hanjj@lzu.edu.cn

†Corresponding author, Email: liyakelly@163.com

‡Corresponding author, Email: yufsh@lzu.edu.cn




FIG. 1: Schematic diagram for the PQCD factorization, where  $\phi_i$  is the DA for hadron  $i$ ,  $H$  stands for a hard scattering amplitude,  $S_{\Lambda_b, p, M}$  are the Sudakov factors and  $S_t$  is the jet function.

rect CPV. The  $P$ -wave CPV in the penguin-dominant  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow pK^-$  decay can also exceed 10%. However, its CPV is governed by the  $S$ -wave, which is only at the percent level. We further predict the CPVs in the  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\rho^-, pK^{*-}, pa_1^-(1260), pK_1^-(1270)$  and  $pK_1^-(1400)$  decays, examining their partial-wave CPVs. Overall speaking, the partial-wave CPV can reach 10%. Our investigation sheds light on the dynamical distinction between CPVs in bottom baryon and meson decays, and suggests high possibility of detecting baryon CPV through partial-wave CPV measurements.

$\Lambda_b$  decay in the PQCD.— Unlike meson decays, the decay amplitude of a baryon with non-zero spin is decomposed into two different structures. For the  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow ph$  decays,  $h = \pi^-, K^-$ , the amplitudes can be expressed as,

$$\mathcal{M}(\Lambda_b \rightarrow ph) = i\bar{u}_p(f_1 + f_2\gamma_5)u_{\Lambda_b}. \quad (2)$$

where  $u_p$  and  $u_{\Lambda_b}$  represent the proton and  $\Lambda_b$  baryon spinors, respectively. The partial-wave amplitudes  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  correspond to the parity-violating  $S$ -wave and parity-conserving  $P$ -wave, associated with the terms 1 and  $\gamma_5$ , respectively.

The partial-wave amplitudes  $f_{1,2}$  receive contributions from *tree* operators and *penguin* operators,

$$\begin{aligned} f_1 &= |f_1^T| e^{i\phi^T} e^{i\delta_1^T} + |f_1^P| e^{i\phi^P} e^{i\delta_1^P}, \\ f_2 &= |f_2^T| e^{i\phi^T} e^{i\delta_2^T} + |f_2^P| e^{i\phi^P} e^{i\delta_2^P}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where the superscripts  $T, P$  denote the *tree* and *penguin* contributions, the weak phase  $\phi$  from the CKM matrix takes the same value for the  $S$ - and  $P$ -waves, and the strong phase  $\delta$  varies with different partial-wave amplitudes. The direct CPV in the  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\pi^-, pK^-$  decays is

then defined as

$$\begin{aligned} A_{CP}(\Lambda_b \rightarrow ph) &\equiv \frac{Br(\Lambda_b \rightarrow ph) - Br(\bar{\Lambda}_b \rightarrow \bar{p}h)}{Br(\Lambda_b \rightarrow ph) + Br(\bar{\Lambda}_b \rightarrow \bar{p}h)} \\ &= -2 \left\{ A|f_1^T|^2 r_1 \sin \Delta\phi \sin \Delta\delta_1 + B|f_2^T|^2 r_2 \sin \Delta\phi \sin \Delta\delta_2 \right\} \\ &\left/ \left\{ A|f_1^T|^2 (1 + r_1^2 + 2r_1 \cos \Delta\phi \cos \Delta\delta_1) \right. \right. \\ &\left. \left. + B|f_2^T|^2 (1 + r_2^2 + 2r_2 \cos \Delta\phi \cos \Delta\delta_2) \right\} \right. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Here  $r_{1,2} \equiv |f_{1,2}^P|/|f_{1,2}^T|$  denote the ratios of *penguin* over *tree* contributions,  $A = ((M_{\Lambda_b} + M_p)^2 - M_h^2)/M_{\Lambda_b}^2$ ,  $B = ((M_{\Lambda_b} - M_p)^2 - M_h^2)/M_{\Lambda_b}^2$ ,  $\Delta\phi \equiv \phi^P - \phi^T$ ,  $\Delta\delta_{1,2} \equiv \delta_{1,2}^P - \delta_{1,2}^T$ .

A strong phase arises from the on-shellness of internal particles in Feynman diagrams, which differs between the parity-conserving and parity-violating contributions. This allows us to define the partial-wave CPV,

$$\begin{aligned} A_{CP}^S &= \frac{-2r_1 \sin \Delta\phi \sin \Delta\delta_1}{1 + r_1^2 + 2r_1 \cos \Delta\phi \cos \Delta\delta_1}, \\ A_{CP}^P &= \frac{-2r_2 \sin \Delta\phi \sin \Delta\delta_2}{1 + r_2^2 + 2r_2 \cos \Delta\phi \cos \Delta\delta_2}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

In the PQCD framework, a decay amplitude is expressed as a convolution of hadron DAs, hard scattering amplitudes  $H$ , Sudakov factors and jet functions as described in Fig. 1, and formulated as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}(\Lambda_b \rightarrow ph) &= \int_0^1 [dx][dx'] dy \int [db][db'] db_{\mathbf{q}} \\ &H([x], [x'], y, [\mathbf{b}], [\mathbf{b}'], \mathbf{b}_{\mathbf{q}}, \mu) S_t([x], [x'], y) \\ &\phi_{\Lambda_b}([x], [\mathbf{b}], \mu) \phi_p([x'], [\mathbf{b}'], \mu) \phi_h(y, \mathbf{b}_{\mathbf{q}}, \mu) \\ &e^{-S_{\Lambda_b}([x], [\mathbf{b}])} e^{-S_p([x], [\mathbf{b}'])} e^{-S_h(y, [\mathbf{b}_{\mathbf{q}}])}. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

The hadron DAs are inputted from Refs. [18, 19] for the  $\Lambda_b$  baryon, Refs. [20, 21] for the proton and Refs. [22, 23] for the pseudoscalar mesons.


Compared to meson decays, more types of topological diagrams contribute to the  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\pi^-, pK^-$  decays. The exchange of two hard gluons is necessary for  $H$  at leading order in  $\alpha_s$  to ensure the two light spectator quarks in the  $\Lambda_b$  baryon to form the energetic final state. A typical diagram responsible for the  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\pi^-$  decay is displayed in Fig. 2. We evaluate the contributions from all diagrams to the  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\pi^-, pK^-$  decays, and summarize the outcomes in Table. I and II, respectively. For clarity, we list only central values.

*Discussion.*— Tables. I and II manifest the hierarchy  $r_1 \gg r_2$  in the  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow ph$  decays, where the contributions from the factorizable penguin diagrams  $P_f^C$  dominate.

$\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\pi^-$	$ S $	$\phi(S)^\circ$	Real( $S$ )	Imag( $S$ )	$ P $	$\phi(P)^\circ$	Real( $P$ )	Imag( $P$ )
$T_f$	705.23	0.00	705.23	-0.00	999.83	0.00	999.83	-0.00
$T_{nf}$	59.39	-96.19	-6.40	-59.04	261.83	-98.04	-36.63	-259.26
$C'$	28.67	154.23	-25.82	12.46	41.12	177.74	-41.09	1.62
$E_2$	68.37	-143.60	-55.03	-40.57	74.29	122.16	-39.55	62.89
$B$	9.98	87.19	0.49	9.97	12.75	-115.34	-5.45	-11.52
Tree	623.26	-7.11	618.47	-77.19	901.03	-13.23	877.10	-206.27
$P_f^{C_1}$	58.38	0.00	58.38	0.00	2.90	0.00	2.90	0.00
$P_{nf}^{C_1}$	1.35	-109.77	-0.46	-1.27	10.71	-97.31	-1.36	-10.62
$P^{C_2}$	13.23	-115.55	-5.71	-11.94	15.15	69.75	5.24	14.21
$P^{E_u}$	8.92	-88.28	0.27	-8.91	8.59	112.64	-3.31	7.93
$P^B$	1.38	-43.29	1.00	-0.95	1.27	-177.04	-1.27	-0.07
$P^{E_1^d} + P^{E_2}$	3.55	-103.32	-0.82	-3.46	2.13	5.67	2.12	0.21
Penguin	58.97	-26.74	52.67	-26.53	12.44	69.67	4.32	11.67

TABLE I: Results for the  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\pi^-$  decay, which do not include the CKM matrix elements.

$\Lambda_b \rightarrow pK^-$	$ S $	$\phi(S)^\circ$	Real( $S$ )	Imag( $S$ )	$ P $	$\phi(P)^\circ$	Real( $P$ )	Imag( $P$ )
$T_f$	865.26	0.00	865.26	-0.00	1230.27	0.00	1230.27	-0.00
$T_{nf}$	59.55	-96.39	-6.63	-59.18	346.03	-97.78	-46.84	-342.85
$E_2$	89.83	-139.95	-68.77	-57.80	81.80	121.73	-43.02	69.57
Tree	798.47	-8.42	789.86	-116.98	1172.70	-13.48	1140.41	-273.27
$P_f^{C_1}$	76.56	0.00	76.56	0.00	3.29	180.00	-3.29	0.00
$P_{nf}^{C_1}$	0.96	-122.66	-0.52	-0.80	14.20	-93.96	-0.98	-14.17
$P^{E_u}$	11.73	-90.78	-0.16	-11.73	10.94	114.13	-4.47	9.98
$P^{E_1^d}$	7.33	-96.70	-0.86	-7.28	2.53	52.22	1.55	2.00
Penguin	77.61	-14.79	75.03	-19.81	7.52	-163.11	-7.19	-2.18

TABLE II: The same as Table. I but for the  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow pK^-$  decay.FIG. 2: A typical diagram for the  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\pi^-$  decay, where two hard-gluon exchanges are necessary for forming the energetic final state. This diagram dominates the contribution to the  $P^{C'}$  topology.

The S- and P-wave amplitudes  $P_f^{C_1}$  are expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}
 f_1(P_f^{C_1}) &= -\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} f_h V_{tb} V_{td}^* \left( \frac{C_3}{3} + C_4 + \frac{C_9}{3} + C_{10} \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + R_1^h \left( \frac{C_5}{3} + C_6 + \frac{C_7}{3} + C_8 \right) \right) \\
 &\quad \left[ F_1(m_h^2)(M_{\Lambda_b} - M_p) + F_3(m_h^2)m_h^2 \right] \\
 f_2(P_f^{C_1}) &= -\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} f_h V_{tb} V_{td}^* \left( \frac{C_3}{3} + C_4 + \frac{C_9}{3} + C_{10} \right. \\
 &\quad \left. - R_2^h \left( \frac{C_5}{3} + C_6 + \frac{C_7}{3} + C_8 \right) \right) \\
 &\quad \left[ G_1(m_h^2)(M_{\Lambda_b} + M_p) - G_3(m_h^2)m_h^2 \right]
 \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where the form factors  $F_{1,2,3}$  and  $G_{1,2,3}$  are defined in terms of  $\langle p | \bar{u} \gamma_\mu b | \Lambda_b \rangle = \bar{p} (F_1 \gamma_\mu + F_2 i \sigma_{\mu\nu} q^\nu + F_3 q_\mu) \Lambda_b$  and  $\langle p | \bar{u} \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 b | \Lambda_b \rangle = \bar{p} (G_1 \gamma_\mu + G_2 i \sigma_{\mu\nu} q^\nu + G_3 q_\mu) \gamma_5 \Lambda_b$ , and the chiral factors are given by  $R_1 = 2m_h^2 / [(m_b - m_u)(m_u + m_q)]$  and  $R_2 = 2m_h^2 / [(m_b + m_u)(m_u + m_q)]$  with  $R_1^\pi \approx R_2^\pi \approx 1.01$  and  $R_1^K \approx R_2^K \approx 0.89$ . Since the negative sign of  $R_2$  in Eq. (7) induces cancellations among different

	$\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\pi^-$	$\Lambda_b \rightarrow pK^-$
$Br$	$3.3 \times 10^{-6}$	$2.9 \times 10^{-6}$
$A_{CP}^{\text{dir}}$	4.1%	-5.8%
$A_{CP}^S$	0.15	-0.05
$A_{CP}^P$	-0.07	-0.23
$\alpha$	-0.81	0.38
$\beta$	0.26	-0.65
$\gamma$	-0.52	0.66
$A_{CP}^\alpha$	0.046	0.20
$A_{CP}^\beta$	2.12	-9.34
$A_{CP}^\gamma$	-0.12	0.10

TABLE III: Observables associated with the  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\pi^-$ ,  $pK^-$  decays predicted in the PQCD.

Wilson coefficients, the term  $f_2(P_f^{C1})$  and the ratio  $r_2$  are suppressed.

The calculated branching fractions and CPVs of the  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\pi^-$ ,  $pK^-$  decays are presented in Table. III. It is worth mentioning that the magnitudes of CPV are small, consistent with the experimental measurements. Note that the partial-wave CPV of the  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\pi^-$  decay can exceed 10%, similar to those in  $B$  meson decays. However, the opposite signs of the partial-wave contributions leads to the small direct CPV in this mode. The topology  $P^{C'}$ , which contains 40 Feynman diagrams, gives the most significant penguin contributions. Among these Feynman diagrams, Fig. 2 is the largest, whose strong phases exhibit an almost  $180^\circ$  difference between the S- and P-wave as indicated in Table. I.

For the  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow pK^-$  mode, the ratios  $r_1 = 4.94$  and  $r_2 = 0.33$  imply that the direct CPV is determined by the S-wave. Unlike the  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\pi^-$  decay, the  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow pK^-$  decay lacks the  $P^{C'}$  topology, such that the total penguin contributions are dominated by the factorizable penguin diagrams. These diagrams generate a small strong phase difference for the S-wave, i.e., a small S-wave CPV  $A_{CP}^S(\Lambda_b \rightarrow pK^-) = -0.05$ , and consequently a small direct CPV.

As indicated in Table III, the partial-wave CPV can be large in magnitude, with  $A_{CP}^S(\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\pi^-) = 0.17$  and  $A_{CP}^P(\Lambda_b \rightarrow pK^-) = -0.23$ . These large partial-wave CPVs closely resemble the corresponding processes in  $B$  meson decays. The partial-wave CPVs of baryon decays are directly related to the asymmetry parameters  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  [24], which can be probed experimentally to search for baryon CPVs. Table III also provides our predictions for the decay asymmetry parameters and their associated CPVs for further measurements at LHCb.

The cancellation between partial-wave CPVs as a differentiation between  $b$ -baryon and  $b$ -meson decays is the main highlight of the Letter. In order to explore the potential enhancements of partial-wave CPVs, we have

also analyzed the decays  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\rho^-, pK^{*-}$  with vector final states, and  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow pa_1^-(1260), pK_1^-(1270), pK_1^-(1400)$  with axial-vector final states in the PQCD approach. These modes involve four independent partial-wave amplitudes or helicity amplitudes. They share the same topological diagrams as the  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\pi^-, pK^-$  decays, but with different meson DAs.

The predictions for the CPVs in the above decays are shown in Table. IV. It is found that the CPVs of  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\rho^-, pa_1^-(1260)$  are small, while the others are relatively large. These modes are actually three-body or four-body decays  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\pi^-\pi^0, pK_S^0\pi^-$  or  $pK^-\pi^0, p\pi^+\pi^-\pi^-$ , and  $pK^-\pi^+\pi^-$ , all of which have large data sample at LHCb; the three-body decays have about 4000 events, and the four-body decays have about 20000 and 90000 events, respectively.

Furthermore, multi-body decays through two or more intermediate resonances may produce substantial interference effects, resulting in notable regional CPVs. Hence, there is a big chance to observe CPVs higher than 20% in these modes at LHCb. The rich data samples and complicated dynamics in multi-body decays offer promising opportunities to establish CPVs in bottom baryon decays.

*Conclusions.*— This Letter presented the first full QCD dynamical analysis on two-body hadronic  $\Lambda_b$  baryon decays in the PQCD approach. Our study elucidates the reason for the observed small CPVs in the  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\pi^-, pK^-$  decays, in contrast to the sizable CPVs in the similar  $B$  meson decays. The partial-wave CPVs in the  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\pi^-$  decay could reach 10% potentially, but the destruction between them leads to the small CPV. The direct CPV of the  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow pK^-$  mode is primarily attributed to the modest S-wave CPV. We have also extended our analysis by investigating the CPVs in the channels with vector and axial-vector final states. Our predictions suggest that certain partial-wave CPVs in bottom baryon decays can be large enough, and probed experimentally to search for baryon CPVs. This work opens up avenues for deeply understanding the dynamics involved in baryon decays and for unveiling CPV in these processes.

*Acknowledgement.*—The authors would like to express their gratitude to Pei-Rong Li for generously providing an access to computing resources. Special thanks are extended to Ding-Yu Shao, Yan-Qing Ma, Jian Wang and Jun Hua for their valuable comments. This work was supported in part by Natural Science Foundation of China under grant No. 12335003, and by the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities under No. lzujbky-2024-oy02.

	$\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\rho^-$	$\Lambda_b \rightarrow pK^{*-}$	$\Lambda_b \rightarrow pa_1^-(1260)$	$\Lambda_b \rightarrow pK_1^-(1270)$	$\Lambda_b \rightarrow pK_1^-(1400)$
$Br$	$15.13 \times 10^{-6}$	$3.02 \times 10^{-6}$	$17.58 \times 10^{-6}$	$5.58 \times 10^{-6}$	$1.48 \times 10^{-6}$
$A_{CP}^{dir}$	-0.020	0.057	-0.031	0.020	-0.39
$\alpha$	-0.71	-0.999	-0.90	-0.99	-0.999
$\beta$	-0.98	-0.92	-0.99	-0.98	-0.61
$\gamma$	0.04	0.11	0.15	0.015	0.14
$A_{CP}^\alpha$	-20.8	551.0	158.0	-387.9	60.6
$A_{CP}^\beta$	-125.1	244.3	-556.2	-275.2	4.23
$A_{CP}^\gamma$	-0.047	0.032	-0.059	0.14	-0.36

TABLE IV: The same as Table. III but for the  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\rho^-, pK^{*-}, pa_1^-(1260), pK_1^-(1270), pK_1^-(1400)$  decays.

- [1] J. H. Christenson, J. W. Cronin, V. L. Fitch and R. Turlay, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **13** (1964), 138-140
- [2] B. Aubert *et al.* [BaBar], *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86** (2001), 2515-2522 [arXiv:hep-ex/0102030 [hep-ex]].
- [3] K. Abe *et al.* [Belle], *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87** (2001), 091802 [arXiv:hep-ex/0107061 [hep-ex]].
- [4] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb], *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122** (2019) no.21, 211803 [arXiv:1903.08726 [hep-ex]].
- [5] M. Ablikim *et al.* [BESIII], *Nature* **606**, no.7912, 64-69 (2022) [arXiv:2105.11155 [hep-ex]].
- [6] M. Ablikim *et al.* [BESIII], *Nature Phys.* **15**, 631-634 (2019) [arXiv:1808.08917 [hep-ex]].
- [7] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb], *JHEP* **03**, 182 (2018) [arXiv:1712.07051 [hep-ex]].
- [8] R. L. Workman *et al.* [Particle Data Group], *PTEP* **2022**, 083C01 (2022)
- [9] M. Beneke, G. Buchalla, M. Neubert and C. T. Sachrajda, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83** (1999), 1914-1917 [arXiv:hep-ph/9905312 [hep-ph]].
- [10] M. Beneke, G. Buchalla, M. Neubert and C. T. Sachrajda, *Nucl. Phys. B* **591** (2000), 313-418 [arXiv:hep-ph/0006124 [hep-ph]].
- [11] C. W. Bauer, S. Fleming, D. Pirjol and I. W. Stewart, *Phys. Rev. D* **63** (2001), 114020 [arXiv:hep-ph/0011336 [hep-ph]].
- [12] C. W. Bauer, D. Pirjol and I. W. Stewart, *Phys. Rev. D* **65** (2002), 054022 [arXiv:hep-ph/0109045 [hep-ph]].
- [13] C. W. Bauer, S. Fleming, D. Pirjol, I. Z. Rothstein and I. W. Stewart, *Phys. Rev. D* **66** (2002), 014017 [arXiv:hep-ph/0202088 [hep-ph]].
- [14] Y. Y. Keum, H. N. Li and A. I. Sanda, *Phys. Rev. D* **63** (2001), 054008 [arXiv:hep-ph/0004173 [hep-ph]].
- [15] C. D. Lu, K. Ukai and M. Z. Yang, *Phys. Rev. D* **63** (2001), 074009 [arXiv:hep-ph/0004213 [hep-ph]].
- [16] Y. Y. Keum, H. n. Li and A. I. Sanda, *Phys. Lett. B* **504** (2001), 6-14 [arXiv:hep-ph/0004004 [hep-ph]].
- [17] J. J. Han, Y. Li, H. n. Li, Y. L. Shen, Z. J. Xiao and F. S. Yu, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82**, no.8, 686 (2022) [arXiv:2202.04804 [hep-ph]].
- [18] P. Ball, V. M. Braun and E. Gardi, *Phys. Lett. B* **665**, 197-204 (2008) [arXiv:0804.2424 [hep-ph]].
- [19] G. Bell, T. Feldmann, Y. M. Wang and M. W. Y. Yip, *JHEP* **11**, 191 (2013) [arXiv:1308.6114 [hep-ph]].
- [20] V. Braun, R. J. Fries, N. Mahnke and E. Stein, *Nucl. Phys. B* **589**, 381-409 (2000) [erratum: *Nucl. Phys. B* **607**, 433-433 (2001)] [arXiv:hep-ph/0007279 [hep-ph]].
- [21] V. M. Braun, A. Lenz and M. Wittmann, *Phys. Rev. D* **73**, 094019 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ph/0604050 [hep-ph]].
- [22] P. Ball and R. Zwicky, *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 014015 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ph/0406232 [hep-ph]].
- [23] P. Ball, V. M. Braun and A. Lenz, *JHEP* **05**, 004 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ph/0603063 [hep-ph]].
- [24] T. D. Lee and C. N. Yang, *Phys. Rev.* **108**, 1645-1647 (1957) doi:10.1103/PhysRev.108.1645