




Flavor Violations in B -Mesons within Non-Minimal SU(5)

Bhubanjyoti Bhattacharya ^{1,*} Alakabha Datta ^{2,†}
 Gaber Faisal ^{3,‡} Shaaban Khalil^{4,§} and Shibasis Roy^{5,¶}

¹*Department of Natural Sciences, Lawrence*

Technological University, Southfield, MI 48075, USA

²*Department of Physics and Astronomy, 108 Lewis Hall,*

University of Mississippi, Oxford, MS 38677-1848, USA

³*Department of Physics, Faculty of Engineering and Natural Sciences,*

Süleyman Demirel University, Isparta, Turkey 32260

⁴*Center for Fundamental Physics, Zewail City of Science and Technology,*

6th of October City, Giza 12578, Egypt

⁵*Chennai Mathematical Institute, Siruseri 603103, Tamil Nadu, India*

(Dated: December 23, 2024)

Abstract

Recent anomalies in B -meson decays, such as deviations in $R_{D^{(*)}}$ and $B \rightarrow K\nu\bar{\nu}$, suggest possible lepton flavor universality violation and new exotic interactions. In this work, we explore these anomalies within a non-minimal SU(5) grand unified theory (GUT) framework, which introduces a 45-dimensional Higgs representation predicting exotic scalar particles, including the leptoquark R_2 and diquark S_6 . The R_2 leptoquark addresses charged current anomalies in $b \rightarrow c\tau\nu$ transitions, the S_6 diquark contributes to nonleptonic neutral current processes, such as $B \rightarrow K\pi$ while at the loop level, the exchange of a leptoquark and diquark contributes to $B \rightarrow K\nu\bar{\nu}$ offering solutions to longstanding puzzles.

* bbhattach@ltu.edu

† datta@phy.olemiss.edu

‡ gaberfaisal@sdu.edu.tr

§ skhalil@zewailcity.edu.eg

¶ shibasis.cmi@gmail.com

I. INTRODUCTION

The masses and mixing of the quarks and leptons along with the unknown reason for three generations are the pressing flavor puzzles in the standard model (SM) that remain unresolved. In addition, the gauge interactions of the three families of quarks and leptons are the same. This forbids tree-level flavor-changing neutral current (FCNC) processes. At the loop level, FCNC effects in b quark decays are enhanced due to contributions from the heavy top quark. However, these processes are still rare in the SM allowing for new physics effects to be present. Hence, understanding FCNC effects in B -meson decays provides crucial insights into the physics beyond the SM. Among the various theoretical extensions of the SM, the SU(5) grand unified theory (GUT) stands out as one of the most compelling. It unifies the SM gauge groups into a single framework and, combines quarks and leptons into a single multiplet, thereby predicting electric charge quantization. SU(5) provides a promising avenue for understanding fundamental interactions by linking the strong, weak, and electromagnetic forces. However, minimal SU(5) faces several significant challenges. For instance, it does not successfully unify the SM gauge couplings and predicts incorrect fermion mass relations that conflict with experimental data. A potential solution to address some of these issues is to introduce an additional Higgs multiplet with a 45-dimensional representation [1, 2]. This model also enables a richer flavor structure and introduces potential new sources of flavor violation. In particular, the inclusion of exotic scalars, such as the leptoquark R_2 and diquark S_6 , significantly broadens the scope of potential flavor-violating interactions in non-minimal SU(5) models. These particles, which emerge naturally in the extended SU(5) framework, introduce interactions beyond those allowed in the SM, offering a pathway to address key experimental anomalies and deepen our understanding of flavor physics.

Studies of B -meson decays have played an important role in establishing the flavor structure of the SM. FCNC processes in b -quark decays are also crucial in the search for new physics, as they are highly sensitive to new sources of CP violation and exotic particles. Over several decades many B -decay measurements have shown deviations from their SM predictions – these are known as the B anomalies. The anomalies can be classified as charged-current and neutral-current anomalies. In the charged-current sector, the measurements of interest are the ratios $R_{D^{(*)}} \equiv \mathcal{B}(\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{(*)}\tau^-\bar{\nu}_\tau)/\mathcal{B}(\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{(*)}\ell^-\bar{\nu}_\ell)$ (here $\ell = e, \mu$)

and $R_{J/\psi} \equiv \mathcal{B}(B_c^+ \rightarrow J/\psi \tau^+ \nu_\tau) / \mathcal{B}(B_c^+ \rightarrow J/\psi \mu^+ \nu_\mu)$. The first of these ratios, $R_{D^{(*)}}$, has been measured with a precision of 5-8% [3–16], by the BaBar, Belle, and LHCb experiments. These measurements show a combined deviation of 3.31σ [17] from the SM. The second ratio, $R_{J/\psi}$, has been measured by the LHCb experiment with a precision of 35% [18] and displays a 1.7σ deviation from its SM prediction. Together these measurements provide strong hints of lepton universality violating new physics in charged-current b decays.

In the neutral-current sector, there are anomalies in semileptonic and nonleptonic B decays. In the semileptonic B decays, there are several hints of deviations from the SM in the FCNC $b \rightarrow s$ transitions with charged leptons and neutrinos in the final state. A recent first measurement of the branching ratio $\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu \bar{\nu}) = (2.3 \pm 0.7) \times 10^{-5}$ by the Belle II experiment [19] is 2.7σ higher than the SM expectation $\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu \bar{\nu})_{\text{SM}} = (5.58 \pm 0.38) \times 10^{-6}$ [20]. Furthermore, even though the recently updated measurements of $R_{K^{(*)}} = \mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow K^{(*)} \mu^+ \mu^-) / \mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow K^{(*)} e^+ e^-)$ are now fully consistent with their SM expectations [21], the individual branching fractions in both the electron and muon channels remain discrepant [22]). There have also been recent interests in several anomalies in neutral-current hadronic B decays [23–31]. In particular, we will focus on the hadronic B -decay anomaly that has been around for about 20 years, known as the $B \rightarrow K\pi$ puzzle (see Refs. [23, 25, 32, 33] and references therein). Here the amplitudes for the four decays $B^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ K^0$, $B^+ \rightarrow \pi^0 K^+$, $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^- K^+$ and $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 K^0$ obey a quadrilateral isospin relation. However, the measurements of the observables in these decays are not completely consistent with one another – there is a discrepancy at the level of $\sim 3\sigma$.

The non-minimal SU(5) model proposed in this work has several new states that can potentially resolve the various B anomalies. The leptoquark R_2 , with its ability to mediate interactions between quarks and leptons, can explain observed anomalies in semileptonic decays, particularly the $R_{D^{(*)}}^{\tau/\ell}$ ratios in $b \rightarrow c\tau\nu$ transitions. The R_2 leptoquark, with its distinct coupling patterns, presents a viable candidate for reconciling these discrepancies and, if confirmed, could establish a direct link between grand unification and lepton-flavor universality violation. On the other hand, the diquark S_6 enables novel quark-quark interactions that are absent in the SM. This scalar diquark has the potential to contribute significantly to flavor-changing neutral current processes in B -meson decays, including rare channels like $B \rightarrow K\pi$ and $B \rightarrow K\nu\nu$, thereby resolving the anomalies in these decays. A model with diquarks and leptoquarks that resolve the B anomalies was discussed in Ref. [34].

In this work, we investigate the role of exotic scalar fields in flavor-violating B -meson decays within the non-minimal SU(5) model. We focus on the contributions of the diquark S_6 and leptoquark R_2 to rare decay channels, aiming to shed light on their potential to address current experimental anomalies. By analyzing the $B \rightarrow K\pi$, $b \rightarrow c\tau\nu$, and $B \rightarrow K\nu\nu$ processes, we provide insights into how these exotic scalars may offer a promising avenue for discovering new physics through flavor violation.

The paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we briefly introduce minimal SU(5), focusing on the main features of the light exotic 45-dimensional scalars, specifically the leptoquark R_2 and diquark S_6 . In Section 3, we examine the contributions of the diquark S_6 to the $B \rightarrow K\pi$ processes and determine the best-fit parameters consistent with experimental measurements. Section 4 addresses the contribution of the leptoquark R_2 to the $b \rightarrow c\tau\nu$ process, highlighting its potential to account for the R_D and R_{D^*} anomalies. In Section 5, we consider the combined contributions of both S_6 and R_2 to $B \rightarrow K\nu\nu$, a process with a very small SM prediction, making it a promising channel for probing new physics through flavor violation. Finally, we present our conclusions and future prospects in Section 6.

II. NON-MINIMAL SU(5)

In this section, we describe the Non-Minimal SU(5) model which includes a Higgs in the 45 representation. Starting from the Lagrangian for the model, we discuss constraints on the model parameters from FCNC $b \rightarrow s(d)\gamma$ processes.

As advocated, extending the Higgs sector of SU(5) by 45_H helps solve some of the problems that the minimal SU(5) GUT faces [35–38]. The 45_H transforms under the SM gauge group, $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$, as follows.

$$45_H = (8, 2)_{1/2} \oplus (1, 2)_{1/2} \oplus (3, 1)_{-1/3} \oplus (3, 3)_{-1/3} \oplus (6^*, 1)_{-1/3} \oplus (3^*, 2)_{-7/6} \oplus (3^*, 1)_{4/3}. \quad (1)$$

It also satisfies the following constraints: $45_\gamma^{\alpha\beta} = -45_\gamma^{\beta\alpha}$ and $\sum_\alpha^5 (45)_\alpha^{\alpha\beta} = 0$. Through non-vanishing Vacuum Expectation Values (VEVs) of 5_H and 45_H : $\langle 5_H \rangle = v_5$, $\langle 45_H \rangle_1^{15} = \langle 45_H \rangle_2^{25} = \langle 45_H \rangle_3^{35} = v_{45}$, $\langle 45_H \rangle_4^{45} = -3v_{45}$, the electroweak symmetry $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ is spontaneously broken into $U(1)_{EM}$. We present the decomposition of the 45_H scalar field in Table I.

$(\bar{6}, 1, -1/3)_k^{ij}$	S_6^*	$\phi_k^{ij} \equiv \frac{1}{6} \epsilon^{ijl} \phi_{lk}$
$(\bar{3}, 2, -7/6)_c^{ij}$	R_2^*	$\phi_c^{ij} \equiv \frac{1}{6} \epsilon^{ijl} \phi_{lc} = \frac{1}{6} \epsilon^{ijl} 45_{lc}$
$(\bar{3}, 1, 4/3)_k^{ab}$	\tilde{S}_1	$\phi_k^{ab} \equiv \frac{1}{2} \delta^{ab} 45_k$
$(3, 1, -1/3)_c^{ib}$	S_1	$\phi_c^{ib} \equiv \frac{1}{2} \delta_c^b 45^i = -\frac{1}{2} \delta_k^j 45^i$
$(3, 1, 1/3)_k^{ij}$		
$(3, 3, -1/3)_c^{ib}$	S_3	$\phi_c^{ib} \equiv 45_c^{ib} - \frac{1}{2} \delta_c^b 45_d^{id}$
$(1, 2, 1/2)_c^{ab}$	D_2	$\phi_c^{ab}(\phi_k^{ib}) \equiv \frac{1}{2} \delta_c^a 45^b \equiv -\frac{1}{2} \delta_k^i 45^b$
$(1, 2, 1/2)_k^{ib}$		
$(8, 2, 1/2)_j^{ia}$	S_8	$\phi_j^{ia} \equiv (45_H)_j^{ia} - \frac{1}{3} \delta_j^i (45_H)_k^{ka}$

TABLE I. 45-Higgs scalar spectrum, with $SU(3)$ indices i, j, k and $SU(2)$ indices a, b, c .

In general, the Yukawa interactions of the 45_H field can be expressed as [39]:

$$-\mathcal{L}_Y = \frac{1}{4} (Y_{45}^U)_{ij} \epsilon_{ABCDE} (\Psi_{10i})^{AB} (\Phi_{45})_F^{CD} (\Psi_{10j})^{EF} + \frac{1}{2} (Y_{45}^D)_{ij} (\Psi_{10i})^{AB} (\Phi_{45}^\dagger)_{AB}^C (\Psi_{\bar{5}j})_C + \text{h.c.}, \quad (2)$$

where ϵ_{ABCDE} is the totally antisymmetric tensor with $\epsilon_{12345} = 1$, and Y_{45}^U is an antisymmetric matrix in generation space that satisfies

$$(Y_{45}^U)_{ij} = -(Y_{45}^U)_{ji}, \quad (3)$$

where i, j are generation indices.

After $SU(5)$ symmetry breaking, the Lagrangian in Eq. (2) can be expanded as [39]

$$-\mathcal{L}_Y = (Y_2^{UL})_{ij} \epsilon_{\alpha\beta} \bar{u}_{Rai} R_2^{a\alpha} \ell_{Lj}^\beta + (Y_2^{EQ})_{ij} \bar{e}_{Ri} R_{2a\alpha}^* q_{Lj}^{a\alpha} + (Y_6^{DU})_{ij} \bar{d}_{Rai} (\eta^A)^{ab} S_6^A u_{Rbj}^c + \frac{(Y_6^{QQ})_{ij}}{2} \epsilon_{\alpha\beta} \bar{q}_{Li}^{c\alpha\alpha} (\eta^A)_{ab} S_6^{A*} q_{Lj}^{b\beta} + \text{h.c.}, \quad (4)$$

where $\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}$ is an antisymmetric tensor with $\epsilon^{12} = \epsilon_{12} = 1$, $a, b = 1, 2, 3$ are $SU(3)$ indices and $\alpha, \beta = 1, 2$ are $SU(2)$ indices. Recall that the $SU(5)$ fields can be decomposed into SM fields as follows:

$$\mathbf{10} \rightarrow (q_L, u_R^c, e_R^c), \quad \bar{\mathbf{5}} \rightarrow (d_R^c, \ell_L), \quad \mathbf{5}_H \rightarrow (H_u, T), \quad \bar{\mathbf{5}}_H \rightarrow (H_d, \bar{T}), \quad (5)$$

where q_L and ℓ_L are the left-handed quark and lepton doublets in the SM, u_R^c, d_R^c , and e_R^c are their right-handed charge conjugate counterparts, H_u and H_d represent the up- and

down-type Higgs doublets, and T and \bar{T} are heavy color-triplet fields. The symmetric 3×3 matrices, η^A , are as defined in [40] – they play a key role in encoding the structure of interactions between the various fields.

The quark and lepton fields in Eq. (4) were written in the flavor basis. In order to transform these fields to the physical (mass) basis it is sufficient to rotate the left-handed down type quark fields by the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) matrix. We can rewrite the flavor-basis quark and lepton fields as

$$q_{Li} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{u}_{Li} \\ (V_{\text{CKM}})_{ij} \hat{d}_{Lj} \end{pmatrix}, \quad u_{Ri} = \hat{u}_{Ri}, \quad d_{Ri} = \hat{d}_{Ri}, \quad \ell_{Li} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\nu}_{Li} \\ \hat{e}_{Li} \end{pmatrix}, \quad e_{Ri} = \hat{e}_{Ri}, \quad (6)$$

where \hat{x} denotes the mass eigenstate corresponding to the flavor-basis field x and V_{CKM} represents the CKM matrix. We will use the Particle Data Group (PDG) phase convention [41, 42] when computing the CKM matrix elements. The couplings Y_6^{QQ} that appear in Eq. (4) form an antisymmetric matrix over the generation indices i, j . This antisymmetry of Y_6^{QQ} arises naturally from the GUT-scale matching conditions of the couplings, which impose the following relationship:

$$Y_6^{QQ} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} Y_{45}^U, \quad (7)$$

where Y_{45}^U represents the Yukawa coupling associated with the **45** representation in SU(5).

Expanding the Lagrangian in Eq.(4) in terms of fermion fields in the mass basis using Eq. (6), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} -\mathcal{L}_Y &= (Y_2^{UL})_{ij} \left[(\bar{\hat{u}}_{Rai} R_2^{a1} \hat{e}_{Lj}) - (\bar{\hat{u}}_{Rai} R_2^{a2} \hat{\nu}_{Lj}) \right] + (Y_6^{DU})_{ij} \bar{\hat{d}}_{Rai} (\eta^A)^{ab} S_6^A \hat{u}_{Rbj}^c \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} (Y_6^{QQ})_{ij} \left[\bar{\hat{u}}_{Li}^{ca} (\eta^A)_{ab} S_6^{A*} (V_{\text{CKM}})_{jk} \hat{d}_{Lk}^b - (V_{\text{CKM}})_{ik}^* \bar{\hat{d}}_{Lk}^{ca} (\eta^A)_{ab} S_6^{A*} \hat{u}_{Lj}^b \right] \\ &+ (Y_2^{EQ})_{ij} \left[\bar{\hat{e}}_{Ri} R_{2a1}^* \hat{u}_{Lj}^a + \bar{\hat{e}}_{Ri} R_{2a2}^* (V_{\text{CKM}})_{jk} \hat{d}_{Lk}^a \right] + \text{h.c.} \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

The diquark and leptoquark couplings, $Y_2^{UL,EQ}$ and $Y_6^{QQ,DU}$, in the above Lagrangian can be constrained using experimental limits on FCNC processes, such as $b \rightarrow s(d)\gamma$. This is because the diquark and leptoquark fields can replace the W boson in loop diagrams analogous to the SM penguin and box diagrams. After integrating out the heavier scalar fields, S_6 and R_2 , one can compute their effects on effective operators. Focusing on the electromagnetic and chromomagnetic dipole operators,

$$O_7 = \frac{e}{16\pi^2} m_b(\mu) (\bar{q}_L \sigma_{\mu\nu} b_R) F^{\mu\nu}, \quad O_8 = \frac{g_s}{16\pi^2} m_b(\mu) (\bar{q}_L T^a \sigma_{\mu\nu} b_R) G^{a\mu\nu}, \quad (9)$$

$$\tilde{O}_7 = \frac{e}{16\pi^2} m_b(\mu) (\bar{q}_R \sigma_{\mu\nu} b_L) F^{\mu\nu}, \quad \tilde{O}_8 = \frac{g_s}{16\pi^2} m_b(\mu) (\bar{q}_R T^a \sigma_{\mu\nu} b_L) G^{a\mu\nu}, \quad (10)$$

one can readily show that S_6 not only introduces new contributions to both O_7 and O_8 but also generates additional contributions to their chirality-flipped counterparts \tilde{O}_7 and \tilde{O}_8 . The Wilson coefficients (WCs) corresponding to these operators obtained by integrating out S_6 are given as,

$$C_7^{S_6} = \frac{v^2}{4\lambda_{tq} m_{S_6}^2} \sum_{j,A,D=1}^3 (Y_6^{QQ})_{jA}^* V_{Aq}^{CKM*} (Y_6^{QQ})_{jD} V_{Db}^{CKM} f_7(y_j) + \frac{v^2}{2\lambda_{tq} m_{S_6}^2} \frac{1}{m_b} \sum_{j,A=1}^3 m_{u_j} (Y_6^{QQ})_{jA}^* V_{Aq}^{CKM*} (Y_6^{DU})_{bj}^* \tilde{f}_7(y_j), \quad (11)$$

$$C_8^{S_6} = \frac{v^2}{4\lambda_{tq} m_{S_6}^2} \sum_{j,A,D=1}^3 (Y_6^{QQ})_{jA}^* V_{Aq}^{CKM*} (Y_6^{QQ})_{jD} V_{Db}^{CKM} f_8(y_j) + \frac{v^2}{2\lambda_{tq} m_{S_6}^2} \frac{1}{m_b} \sum_{j,A=1}^3 m_{u_j} (Y_6^{QQ})_{jA}^* V_{Aq}^{CKM*} (Y_6^{DU})_{bj}^* \tilde{f}_8(y_j), \quad (12)$$

$$\tilde{C}_7^{S_6} = \frac{v^2}{\lambda_{tq} m_{S_6}^2} \sum_{j=1}^3 (Y_6^{DU})_{bj}^* (Y_6^{DU})_{aj} f_7(y_j) + \frac{v^2}{2\lambda_{tq} m_{S_6}^2} \frac{1}{m_b} \sum_{j,A=1}^3 m_{u_j} (Y_6^{QQ})_{jA} V_{Ab}^{CKM} (Y_6^{DU})_{aj} \tilde{f}_7(y_j), \quad (13)$$

$$\tilde{C}_8^{S_6} = \frac{v^2}{\lambda_{tq} m_{S_6}^2} \sum_{j=1}^3 (Y_6^{DU})_{bj}^* (Y_6^{DU})_{aj} f_8(y_j) + \frac{v^2}{2\lambda_{tq} m_{S_6}^2} \frac{1}{m_b} \sum_{j,A=1}^3 m_{u_j} (Y_6^{QQ})_{jA} V_{Ab}^{CKM} (Y_6^{DU})_{aj} \tilde{f}_8(y_j), \quad (14)$$

where $v = (246/\sqrt{2})$ GeV is the SM Higgs VEV, $y_j = m_{u_j}^2/m_{S_6}^2$, and $f_{7,8}(y_j)$ and $\tilde{f}_{7,8}(y_j)$ are loop functions that take the following explicit forms.

$$f_7(y_j) = \frac{1}{72} \left[\frac{4y_j^3 - 9y_j^2 + 5 - 6y_j(y_j - 2) \ln y_j}{(y_j - 1)^4} \right], \quad (15)$$

$$\tilde{f}_7(y_j) = \frac{1}{12} \left[\frac{3y_j^2 - 8y_j + 5 - 2(y_j - 2) \ln y_j}{(y_j - 1)^3} \right], \quad (16)$$

$$f_8(y_j) = \frac{1}{24} \left[\frac{-y_j^3 + 6y_j^2 - 3y_j - 2 - 6y_j \ln y_j}{(y_j - 1)^4} \right], \quad (17)$$

$$\tilde{f}_8(y_j) = \frac{1}{4} \left[\frac{-y_j^2 + 4y_j - 3 - 2 \ln y_j}{(y_j - 1)^3} \right]. \quad (18)$$

Focusing specifically on $b \rightarrow s\gamma$, assuming a TeV scale mass for the diquark, and plugging in numerical values of measured parameters such as the CKM matrix elements, we

can expand sums in Eqs. (11)–(14) in terms of products of Yukawa couplings. We find that the dominant contributions to the WCs come from the two products $(Y_6^{DU})_{33}(Y_6^{QQ})_{32}$ and $(Y_6^{QQ})_{33}(Y_6^{DU})_{23}$, while the contributions from all other products of two Yukawas are subdominant. Following Refs. [43, 44], one can show that experimental bounds on $b \rightarrow s\gamma$ can be used to constrain $C_{7,8}$ and $\tilde{C}_{7,8}$. In turn, these can be used to put bounds on products of Yukawa couplings in our model. We find that the most stringent of these bounds is $|(Y_6^{DU})_{33}(Y_6^{QQ})_{32}| \lesssim 2.7 \times 10^{-3}$, while less stringent bounds apply to all other products of two Yukawa couplings. On the other hand, the product $(Y_6^{DU})_{33}(Y_6^{QQ})_{32}$ does not contribute to the B anomalies we discuss in this paper. Furthermore, we find that similar, albeit slightly weaker, constraints on products of Yukawa couplings can also be obtained from $b \rightarrow d\gamma$. Consequently, it is still possible to use the S_6 diquark in our model to analyze the B -anomalies without running afoul of constraints from $b \rightarrow s(d)\gamma$.

We now turn to the leptoquark, R_2 . The Wilson coefficients corresponding to $O_{7,8}$ and $\tilde{O}_{7,8}$ obtained by integrating out R_2 can be summarized as follows.

$$C_7^{R_{2a2}} = \frac{v^2}{9\lambda_{tq}m_{R_{2a2}}^2} \sum_{j,k,\ell=1}^3 (Y_2^{EQ})_{jk}^* V_{kq}^{CKM*} (Y_2^{EQ})_{j\ell} V_{\ell b}^{CKM}, \quad (19)$$

$$C_8^{R_{2a2}} = -\frac{v^2}{12\lambda_{tq}m_{R_{2a2}}^2} \sum_{j,k,\ell=1}^3 (Y_2^{EQ})_{jk}^* V_{kq}^{CKM*} (Y_2^{EQ})_{j\ell} V_{\ell b}^{CKM}, \quad (20)$$

$$\tilde{C}_7^{R_{2a2}} = \tilde{C}_8^{R_{2a2}} = 0, \quad (21)$$

where we have neglected the mass of the charged lepton running in the loop compared to the leptoquark mass. Here we find that, for $|(Y_2^{EQ})_{ij}^*(Y_2^{EQ})_{k\ell}| \lesssim 10^{-1}$, leptoquark contributions to these Wilson coefficients are small compared to their SM values. Thus, constraints on the leptoquark Yukawa couplings appear to be even weaker than those on the diquark Yukawa couplings.

Other flavor-violating processes, such as $B - \bar{B}$, $K - \bar{K}$ and $D - \bar{D}$ mixing can receive new contributions from box diagrams with the diquark or leptoquark running in the loop. However, in addition to being loop-suppressed these new contributions are proportional to products of four new Yukawa couplings associated with the diquark or leptoquark. Since each Yukawa coupling can be modified independently, obtaining meaningful constraints on any one of them from meson mixing is not possible. Moreover, in the following sections, we focus on processes that receive new contributions from the diquark and/or leptoquark

states involving only products of two new Yukawa couplings. Consequently, meson-mixing constraints on products of four new Yukawa couplings do not affect our results.

We have introduced a non-minimal SU(5) model with an R_2 leptoquark and an S_6 diquark. Both the diquark and the leptoquark are heavy. Additionally, numerous Yukawa couplings parameterize the interactions of the SM particles with R_2 and S_6 . We have shown that, with couplings ranging from 10^{-1} to 10^{-2} or smaller, one can avoid experimental bounds from FCNC processes such as $b \rightarrow s(d)\gamma$ and meson mixing. In what follows, we will discuss the effects of the diquark and leptoquark on the anomalies in B decays.

III. SU(5) DIQUARK CONTRIBUTIONS TO $B \rightarrow K\pi$

In this section, we consider the contributions of the diquark to $B \rightarrow K\pi$ decays and discuss a path for the resolution of the $B \rightarrow K\pi$ puzzle. In order to understand the puzzle, it is advantageous to express the $B \rightarrow K\pi$ decay amplitudes in terms of topological flavor-flow amplitudes [45–51] commonly referred to as the penguin (P), color-favored tree (T), color-suppressed tree (C), and annihilation (A) amplitudes. The penguin amplitudes are further categorized as the QCD penguin amplitude P , electroweak penguin (EWP) amplitude P_{EW} , and color-suppressed EWP amplitude P_{EW}^C originating respectively from the QCD penguin and electroweak penguin operators in the dimension-6 hadronic effective Hamiltonian [52, 53]. In general, individual flavor-flow amplitudes carry a strong phase and a weak phase and the relative phases between different amplitudes become important at the level of decay observables.

The decay amplitudes for $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$, $B^- \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 \pi^-$, $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 \pi^0$, and $B^- \rightarrow K^- \pi^0$ are expressed as [45, 46, 54, 55],

$$\mathcal{A}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+) = -\lambda_u (P_{uc} + T) - \lambda_t \left(P_{tc} + \frac{2}{3} P_{EW}^C \right), \quad (22)$$

$$\mathcal{A}(B^- \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 \pi^-) = \lambda_u (P_{uc} + A) + \lambda_t \left(P_{tc} - \frac{1}{3} P_{EW}^C \right), \quad (23)$$

$$\sqrt{2}\mathcal{A}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 \pi^0) = \lambda_u (P_{uc} - C) + \lambda_t \left(P_{tc} - P_{EW} - \frac{1}{3} P_{EW}^C \right), \quad (24)$$

$$\sqrt{2}\mathcal{A}(B^- \rightarrow K^- \pi^0) = -\lambda_u (P_{uc} + T + C + A) - \lambda_t \left(P_{tc} + P_{EW} + \frac{2}{3} P_{EW}^C \right), \quad (25)$$

where $\lambda_q = V_{qs}^* V_{qb}$, $P_{uc} = P_u - P_c$, and $P_{tc} = P_t - P_c$. The subscript (u, c, t) on the penguin amplitude denotes the up-type quark running in the loop. The expected hierarchy

of magnitudes among the flavor-flow amplitudes is typically

$$|\lambda_t P_{tc}| > |\lambda_u T| > |\lambda_u C| > |\lambda_u A|, |\lambda_u P_{uc}|. \quad (26)$$

Here each successive amplitude from left to right is suppressed by a factor of the order of $\lambda \approx \sin \theta_C = 0.22$. This hierarchy is a combined effect of the magnitudes of the respective CKM matrix elements, the additional loop suppression of the penguin amplitudes, and the small ratio of the B meson decay constant to the B meson mass. The ratio $|P_{tc}/T|$ can be as large as 0.1 when estimated in the pQCD approach [56]. The numerical estimate of this ratio obtained using pQCD differs from that obtained using QCD factorization [57, 58]. Another ratio, $|C/T|$, also takes disparate numerical values depending on the scenario. $|C/T|$ can be $\sim \lambda$ [58], or ~ 0.5 [59]. In some scenarios, the value of this ratio can even approach unity [60, 61]. The annihilation amplitude, A , is suppressed by a factor of $f_B/m_B \sim 0.05 \sim \lambda^2$ when compared to T . In the SM, the EWP amplitudes can be estimated using the following relationship between the tree and EWP amplitudes [53].

$$P_{EW} \pm P_{EW}^C = -\frac{3}{2} \frac{C_9 \pm C_{10}}{C_1 \pm C_2} (T \pm C). \quad (27)$$

The above relationship uses $SU(3)$ -flavor symmetry of the dimension-6 weak Hamiltonian [52, 53]. Using numerical values of the Wilson coefficients $C_{1,2}$ and $C_{9,10}$ to the leading-log order at the m_b scale [52], one gets

$$P_{EW} \sim \kappa T, \quad P_{EW}^C \sim \kappa C, \quad (28)$$

to a good approximation, where

$$\kappa = -\frac{3}{2} \frac{C_9 + C_{10}}{C_1 + C_2} \simeq -\frac{3}{2} \frac{C_9 - C_{10}}{C_1 - C_2} \simeq 0.0135 \pm 0.0012. \quad (29)$$

Based on the relevant flavor-flow amplitudes contributing upto $\mathcal{O}(\lambda)$, one finds that direct CP asymmetries in $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$ and $B^- \rightarrow K^- \pi^0$ are identical, i.e. [62]

$$A_{\text{CP}}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+) = A_{\text{CP}}(B^- \rightarrow K^- \pi^0). \quad (30)$$

This follows from the common T - P_{tc} interference term in both of the decay modes having a nonzero relative strong phase, as well as a weak phase difference. It is worth mentioning that the interference between P_{EW} and T does not generate an A_{CP} in the case of $B^- \rightarrow K^- \pi^0$

despite the relative weak-phase difference between these two amplitudes as they share the same strong phase apparent from Eq. (29) in the SM.

In experiments [63–65], a deviation from the above CP-asymmetry relation given in Eq. (30) is measured by the quantity ΔA_{CP} ,

$$\Delta A_{\text{CP}} = A_{\text{CP}}(B^- \rightarrow K^- \pi^0) - A_{\text{CP}}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+), \quad (31)$$

In addition to the non-zero value of ΔA_{CP} , the relative sign of A_{CP} in the two decay modes is in contradiction with the SM expectation. In fact, by going beyond $\mathcal{O}(\lambda)$, one can construct a more theoretically robust sum-rule relationship [55] connecting the branching ratios (\mathcal{B}) and CP asymmetries in all four $B \rightarrow K\pi$ decay channels, expressed as [55],

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_4 = & A_{\text{CP}}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+) + A_{\text{CP}}(B^- \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 \pi^-) \frac{\mathcal{B}(B^- \rightarrow K^0 \pi^-) \tau_{B^0}}{\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+) \tau_{B^-}} \\ & - A_{\text{CP}}(B^- \rightarrow K^- \pi^0) \frac{2\mathcal{B}(B^- \rightarrow K^- \pi^0) \tau_{B^0}}{\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+) \tau_{B^-}} - A_{\text{CP}}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 \pi^0) \frac{2\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 \pi^0)}{Br(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+)}, \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where τ_{B^-} and $\tau_{\bar{B}^0}$ are the lifetimes of the B^- and \bar{B}^0 mesons, respectively. Further assuming that the annihilation amplitude, A , is suppressed relative to the color-favored tree amplitude, T , and the relative strong phase between the T and C amplitudes is small, one infers that Δ_4 vanishes and the result holds up to a few percent.

Interestingly, a previous measurement of $\Delta_4 = -0.270 \pm 0.132 \pm 0.060$ at Belle [63] deviated from zero (albeit with large errors), whereas a recent measurement of $\Delta_4 = -0.03 \pm 0.13 \pm 0.04$ at Belle II [65] is in good agreement with zero. In light of these experimental observations, we adopt an approach in which new physics (NP) contributions to the $B \rightarrow K\pi$ decays improve the explanation of the available data. The contribution from NP is modeled in terms of the NP matrix elements $\langle K\pi | Q_k^{\text{NP}} | B \rangle$. In general, each matrix element has its own NP weak and strong phases. Conveniently, the complete amplitude for all the $B \rightarrow K\pi$ decays can be written in terms of the previously indicated SM diagrams and these NP matrix elements.

Starting from the Lagrangian describing the color sextet diquark-quark interaction in Eq.8, we find that integrating the diquark S_6^A leads to the effective Lagrangian contributing to $\Delta B = |\Delta S| = 1$ transition at tree level. The relevant dimension-6 effective operators Q_k^{ij} and their corresponding NP Wilson coefficients C_k^{ij} mediating $b \rightarrow us\bar{u}$ transition relevant to our study can be expressed as:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}}^{\text{NP}} = -\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{k=1}^6 (Q_k^{ij} C_k^{ij} + \tilde{Q}_k^{ij} \tilde{C}_k^{ij}), \quad (33)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_1^{ij} &= (\bar{u}_i^\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L b^\alpha) (\bar{s}^\beta \gamma_\mu P_L u_j^\beta) \\
Q_2^{ij} &= (\bar{u}_i^\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L b^\beta) (\bar{s}^\beta \gamma_\mu P_L u_j^\alpha) \\
Q_3^{ij} &= (\bar{u}_i^\alpha P_L b^\alpha) (\bar{s}^\beta P_L u_j^\beta) \\
Q_4^{ij} &= (\bar{u}_i^\alpha P_L b^\beta) (s^\beta P_L \bar{u}_j^\alpha) \\
Q_5^{ij} &= (\bar{u}_i^\alpha \sigma^{\mu\nu} P_L b^\alpha) (\bar{s}^\beta \sigma_{\mu\nu} P_L u_j^\beta) \\
Q_6^{ij} &= (\bar{u}_i^\alpha \sigma^{\mu\nu} P_L b^\beta) (s^\beta \sigma_{\mu\nu} P_L \bar{u}_j^\alpha)
\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

The operators \tilde{Q}_k^{ij} can be obtained from Q_k^{ij} (i, j are the generation indices of the up-type quark), for $k = 1, 2, \dots, 6$, by exchanging the chirality operator P_L by P_R .

The Wilson coefficients C_k^{ij} corresponding to the operators Q_k^{ij} can be expressed as,

$$C_1^{ij} = C_2^{ij} = -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{8G_F m_{S_6}^2} \sum_{k,\ell=1}^3 (Y_6^{QQ*})_{i\ell} V_{\ell 2}^{CKM*} (Y_6^{QQ})_{jk} V_{k3}^{CKM}, \tag{35}$$

$$C_3^{ij} = C_4^{ij} = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{4G_F m_{S_6}^2} \sum_{k=1}^3 (Y_6^{DU})_{2i} (Y_6^{QQ})_{jk} V_{k3}^{CKM}, \tag{36}$$

$$C_5^{ij} = C_6^{ij} = -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{16G_F m_{S_6}^2} \sum_{k=1}^3 (Y_6^{DU})_{2i} (Y_6^{QQ})_{jk} V_{k3}^{CKM}, \tag{37}$$

where m_{S_6} is the mass of the sextet diquark. On the other hand, the Wilson coefficients \tilde{C}_i^{ij} , corresponding to the operators \tilde{Q}_k^{ij} with $k = 1, 2, \dots, 6$, are given as,

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{C}_1^{ij} &= \tilde{C}_2^{ij} = -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2G_F m_{S_6}^2} (Y_6^{DU})_{2i} (Y_6^{DU})_{3j}^* \\
\tilde{C}_3^{ij} &= \tilde{C}_4^{ij} = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{4G_F m_{S_6}^2} \sum_{k=1}^3 (Y_6^{QQ})_{ik}^* V_{k2}^{CKM*} (Y_6^{DU})_{3j}^* \\
\tilde{C}_5^{ij} &= \tilde{C}_6^{ij} = -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{16G_F m_{S_6}^2} \sum_{k=1}^3 (Y_6^{QQ})_{ik}^* V_{k2}^{CKM*} (Y_6^{DU})_{3j}^*
\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

Using the effective Hamiltonian listed in Eq.(33), in the factorization approach, the NP amplitudes of the different $B \rightarrow K\pi$ processes can be expressed as,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}^\phi(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ K^-) &= \langle \pi^+ K^- | \mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}}^{\text{NP}} | \bar{B}^0 \rangle = -\frac{i G_F}{4\sqrt{2}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{N_c} \right) f_K (m_B^2 - m_\pi^2) \\
&\quad \left[(C_1^{uu} - \tilde{C}_1^{uu}) - \frac{m_K^2}{(m_u + m_s)(m_b - m_u)} (C_3^{uu} - \tilde{C}_3^{uu}) \right] F_0^{\bar{B} \rightarrow \pi}(q^2 = m_K^2), \tag{39}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\mathcal{A}^\phi(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \bar{K}^0) = \langle \pi^0 \bar{K}^0 | \mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}}^{\text{NP}} | \bar{B}^0 \rangle = \frac{i G_F}{16} \left(1 + \frac{1}{N_c} \right) f_\pi (m_B^2 - m_K^2) \left[(C_1^{uu} - \tilde{C}_1^{uu}) + \frac{m_\pi^2}{4m_u(m_b - m_s)} (C_3^{uu} - \tilde{C}_3^{uu}) \right] F_0^{\bar{B} \rightarrow K}(q^2 = m_\pi^2), \quad (40)$$

$$\mathcal{A}^\phi(B^- \rightarrow \pi^0 K^-) = \langle \pi^0 K^- | \mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}}^{\text{NP}} | \bar{B}^- \rangle = -\frac{i G_F}{4\sqrt{2}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{N_c} \right) \left\{ f_K (m_B^2 - m_\pi^2) \left[(C_1^{uu} - \tilde{C}_1^{uu}) - \frac{m_K^2}{(m_u + m_s)(m_b - m_u)} (C_3^{uu} - \tilde{C}_3^{uu}) \right] F_0^{\bar{B} \rightarrow \pi}(q^2 = m_K^2) + \frac{f_\pi (m_B^2 - m_K^2)}{\sqrt{2}} \left[(C_1^{uu} - \tilde{C}_1^{uu}) + \frac{m_\pi^2}{4m_u(m_b - m_s)} (C_3^{uu} - \tilde{C}_3^{uu}) \right] F_0^{\bar{B} \rightarrow K}(q^2 = m_\pi^2) \right\}, \quad (41)$$

whereas $B^- \rightarrow \pi^- \bar{K}^0$ decay amplitude does not receive an NP contribution in the factorization approximation. The $B \rightarrow K\pi$ decay amplitudes still satisfy the isospin relation,

$$\sqrt{2}\mathcal{A}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \bar{K}^0) - \sqrt{2}\mathcal{A}(B^- \rightarrow \pi^0 K^-) = \mathcal{A}(B^- \rightarrow \pi^- \bar{K}^0) - \mathcal{A}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ K^-), \quad (42)$$

which ensures that only three combinations of NP amplitudes can be extracted from the data. In order to make the correspondence between NP amplitudes and the NP hadronic matrix elements more transparent we parametrize the $B \rightarrow K\pi$ decay amplitudes as follows.

$$\mathcal{A}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ K^-) = -\lambda_u T - \lambda_t (P_{tc} + \frac{2}{3} P_C^{EW}) - T^\phi, \quad (43)$$

$$\mathcal{A}(B^- \rightarrow \pi^- \bar{K}^0) = \lambda_t (P_{tc} - \frac{1}{3} P_C^{EW}), \quad (44)$$

$$\sqrt{2}\mathcal{A}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \bar{K}^0) = -\lambda_u C + \lambda_t (P_{tc} - \frac{1}{3} P_C^{EW} - P_{EW}) - C^\phi, \quad (45)$$

$$\sqrt{2}\mathcal{A}(B^- \rightarrow \pi^0 K^-) = -\lambda_u (T + C) - \lambda_t (P_{tc} + \frac{2}{3} P_C^{EW} + P_{EW}) - (T^\phi + C^\phi), \quad (46)$$

where the NP amplitudes T^ϕ and C^ϕ are defined as,

$$T^\phi \equiv \frac{i G_F}{4\sqrt{2}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{N_c} \right) f_K (m_B^2 - m_\pi^2) F_0^{\bar{B} \rightarrow \pi}(q^2 = m_K^2) \left[(C_1^{uu} - \tilde{C}_1^{uu}) - \frac{m_K^2}{(m_u + m_s)(m_b - m_u)} (C_3^{uu} - \tilde{C}_3^{uu}) \right], \quad (47)$$

$$C^\phi \equiv -\frac{i G_F}{16} \left(1 + \frac{1}{N_c} \right) f_\pi (m_B^2 - m_K^2) F_0^{\bar{B} \rightarrow K}(q^2 = m_\pi^2) \left[(C_1^{uu} - \tilde{C}_1^{uu}) + \frac{m_\pi^2}{4m_u(m_b - m_s)} (C_3^{uu} - \tilde{C}_3^{uu}) \right]. \quad (48)$$

We expect that strong phases associated with T^ϕ and C^ϕ to be very small [66] as self-scattering of these NP amplitudes are intrinsically feeble [66]. However, there may be NP weak phases contributing to the NP amplitudes. For the sake of simplicity, we assume a

single NP weak phase to appear both in case of T^ϕ and C^ϕ that is denoted by ϕ_{NP} which can potentially generate CP -violation through interference with the SM amplitudes. We make

Modes	Avg. BR [10^{-6}]	Avg. A_{CP}	S_{CP}
$B^0 \rightarrow \pi^- K^+$	20.00 ± 0.04	-0.0831 ± 0.0031	
$B^+ \rightarrow \pi^0 K^+$	13.2 ± 0.4	0.027 ± 0.012	
$B^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ K^0$	23.9 ± 0.6	-0.003 ± 0.015	
$B^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 K^0$	10.1 ± 0.4	0.00 ± 0.08	0.64 ± 0.13

TABLE II. Experimental inputs used in this work taken from PDG.

use of the PDG averaged data [67] consisting of the four branching ratios for the $B \rightarrow K\pi$ modes, the four direct CP asymmetries A_{CP} , and the mixing-induced CP asymmetry S_{CP} measured for the $B \rightarrow K^0\pi^0$ decay from BaBar, Belle, Belle II and LHCb [64, 65] and perform a fit to the magnitude and strong phases contributing to Eqs. (43). The input data is summarized in Table II. First we perform the SM fit setting NP amplitudes to zero using five free fit parameters: the three magnitudes P_{tc} , $|T|$, $|C|$ and two relative phases δ_T , δ_C . The parameter κ is treated as a prior around the central value. We have defined the relative phases with respect to the P_{tc} diagram whose absolute phase is set to zero in this convention [68]. Apart from these free parameters, the magnitude of the CKM elements $|V_{ub}|$, $|V_{us}|$, $|V_{tb}|$, $|V_{ts}|$, and the CKM angles β and γ , enter the analysis as uncertain theoretical inputs concurring with HFLAV averages [69] tabulated in Table III.

Parameter	Value
$ V_{us} $	0.2245 ± 0.0008
$ V_{ub} $	$(3.82 \pm 0.24) \times 10^{-3}$
$ V_{ts} $	$(41.5 \pm 0.9) \times 10^{-3}$
γ	$(65.9 \pm 3.3 \pm 3.5)^\circ$
β	$(22.14 \pm 0.69 \pm 0.67)^\circ$

TABLE III. Relevant theoretical CKM input parameters from HFLAV averages [69].

These values are incorporated as SM priors while the uncertainties of the meson masses and the B meson lifetimes are inconsequential for the current analysis. The results of the

SM fit (NP set to 0) are given in Scenario I of Table IV. In case $|C/T|$ is restricted to be less than 0.2, one finds essentially a very poor fit (Scenario Ia) to the available data. Relaxing this requirement results in a better fit (Scenario Ib) with a somewhat acceptable p -value but the preferred $|C/T|$ value shifts towards a larger value of 0.5. Additionally, it is worth mentioning that if the CKM angle γ is set to the recently measured value of $78.6^{+7.2}_{-7.3}$ at Belle II [70], we find that the C/T ratio shifting towards larger value of 0.68 with an increased $\Delta\chi^2/d.o.f$ and a reduction in p -value. Using the priors obtained for P_{tc} , $|T|$ and κ from Scenario Ia and adding the two NP amplitudes T^ϕ and C^ϕ and the NP weak phase ϕ_{NP} as fit parameters, we find the resultant fit (Scenario IIa) prefers a C/T ratio to be more aligned with SM expectation. The quality of the fit also improves with $\Delta\chi^2/d.o.f = 0.93$ and a p -value of 0.42. The T^ϕ and C^ϕ best-fit values can be recast in terms of NP Wilson coefficients using the relation provided in Eq (47). Plugging in values for the decay constants [71], $B \rightarrow \pi, K$ form factors [72] and masses [71] we infer the numerical values of the combinations of NP Wilson coefficients ($C_1^{uu} - \tilde{C}_1^{uu}$) and ($C_3^{uu} - \tilde{C}_3^{uu}$) to be,

$$C_1^{uu} - \tilde{C}_1^{uu} = 0.004 \pm 0.003 \quad (49)$$

$$C_3^{uu} - \tilde{C}_3^{uu} = -0.011 \pm 0.007 \quad (50)$$

This estimate effectively constraints the Yukawa matrices Y_6^{QQ} and Y_6^{DU} . For illustration, we can choose $(Y_6^{QQ})_{13}$ and $(Y_6^{DU})_{21}$ to be the only two non-zero entries in Y_6^{QQ} and Y_6^{DU} matrices respectively and find,

$$C_1^{uu} = -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{8G_F m_{S_6}^2} (Y_6^{QQ*})_{13} V_{32}^{CKM*} (Y_6^{QQ})_{13} V_{33}^{CKM}, \quad \tilde{C}_1^{uu} = 0, \quad (51)$$

$$C_3^{uu} = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{4G_F m_{S_6}^2} (Y_6^{DU})_{21} (Y_6^{QQ})_{13} V_{33}^{CKM}, \quad \tilde{C}_3^{uu} = 0. \quad (52)$$

While this choice may turn out to be unrealistic, we note that the numbers of free parameters present in the case of the most general form of Y_6^{QQ} and Y_6^{DU} matrices allow us to satisfy the constraints given in Eq. (49). For a benchmark value of the sextet diquark mass, $m_{S_6} = 400$ GeV, we find the following relations between the entries of the Y_6^{QQ} and Y_6^{DU} matrices.

$$-0.094 \sum_{k,\ell=1}^3 (Y_6^{QQ*})_{1\ell} V_{\ell 2}^{CKM*} (Y_6^{QQ})_{1k} V_{k3}^{CKM} + 0.37 (Y_6^{DU})_{21} (Y_6^{DU})_{31}^* \simeq 0.004, \quad (53)$$

$$0.18 \sum_{k=1}^3 (Y_6^{DU})_{21} (Y_6^{QQ})_{1k} V_{k3}^{CKM} - 0.18 (Y_6^{QQ})_{1k}^* V_{k2}^{CKM*} (Y_6^{DU})_{31}^* \simeq -0.011. \quad (54)$$

Scenario	$\chi^2/d.o.f$	p -value	Fit parameter	Fit value
Ia (SM fit: $\frac{C}{T} \leq 0.2$)	4.2	0.002	P_{tc}	-0.150 ± 0.001
			κ	0.0134 ± 0.001
			$ T $	1.21 ± 0.15
			$ C $	0.24 ± 0.04
			δ_T	3.36 ± 0.03
			δ_C	1.58 ± 0.26
Ib (SM fit)	1.4	0.23	P_{tc}	-0.149 ± 0.001
			κ	0.0134 ± 0.001
			$ T $	0.84 ± 0.20
			$ C $	0.41 ± 0.09
			δ_T	3.48 ± 0.09
			δ_C	1.14 ± 0.45
IIa (NP fit) NP amplitudes T^ϕ, C^ϕ 1 NP weak phase ϕ_{NP}	0.93	0.42	P_{tc}	-0.149 ± 0.001
			κ	0.0134 ± 0.001
			$ T $	1.12 ± 0.37
			$ C $	0.31 ± 0.09
			δ_T	3.32 ± 0.06
			δ_C	1.50 ± 0.95
			T^ϕ	0.0042 ± 0.0029
			C^ϕ	0.00062 ± 0.00039
			ϕ_{NP}	4.20 ± 0.31

TABLE IV. Best fit values for the topological flavor-flow amplitudes and strong phases. The topological amplitudes are defined by factoring out $G_F/\sqrt{2}$ and therefore the amplitudes are given in units of $(\text{GeV})^3$.

The above relationships must be satisfied to be consistent with available data. In addition, we also calculate the value for $A_{\text{CP}}(B^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}^0\pi^0)$ and Δ_4 with the fit parameters in the

presence of NP contributions and find,

$$A_{\text{CP}}(B^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 \pi^0) = -0.077 \pm 0.035, \\ \Delta_4 = -0.04 \pm 0.14. \quad (55)$$

IV. SU(5) LEPTOQUARK CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE B ANOMALIES AT TREE LEVEL

In this section, we explore the contributions of the R_2 leptoquark arising in non-minimal SU(5) to semileptonic B decays. The relevant quark-level processes are $b \rightarrow c \ell \bar{\nu}_\ell$ and $b \rightarrow s \ell^+ \ell^-$. These decays proceed through a tree-level exchange of leptoquarks. In presence of NP, the effective Hamiltonian for $|\Delta c| = 1$ semileptonic B decays can be written as,

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}} = \frac{4G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cb} \sum_{i,j}^{1,2,3} \left[\sum_{X,Y}^{L,R} \left\{ (\delta^{XL} \delta^{YL} + g_V^{XYij}) (\bar{c} \gamma_\mu P_X b) (\bar{\ell}_j \gamma_\mu P_Y \nu_i) + g_S^{XYij} (\bar{c} P_X b) (\bar{\ell}_j P_Y \nu_i) \right\} \right. \\ \left. + \sum_X^{L,R} g_T^{XXij} (\bar{c} \sigma_{\mu\nu} P_X b) (\bar{\ell}_j \sigma_{\mu\nu} P_X \nu_i) \right], \quad (56)$$

where g_Z^{XYij} represent effective NP Wilson Coefficients with $Z = S, V, T$ referring to Scalar, Vector, or Tensor, $X, Y = L, R$ referring to left-handed and right-handed fermion currents, and $i, j = 1, 2, 3$ referring to lepton family number (generation). Here, $P_{L,R}$ are projection operators defined as $P_{L,R} = (1 \mp \gamma_5)/2$. Note that, unlike in the scalar (S) and vector (V) operators, the quark and lepton currents in the tensor (T) operators necessarily have the same chirality. In what follows, we only consider NP in τ . Therefore, we suppress the generation indices by rewriting g_Z^{XY33} as g_Z^{XY} .

In our non-minimal SU(5) model, \mathcal{H}_{eff} receives contributions from tree-level diagrams mediated by the exchange of the R_2 leptoquark. The Lagrangian that describes the interactions of R_2 with SM fermions can be expressed as,

$$\mathcal{L}_{R_2} = (Y_2^{UL})_{ij} \bar{u}_{ai} P_L \hat{\nu}_j R_2^{a2} + (Y_2^{EQ})_{ij} (V_{\text{CKM}})_{jk} \bar{e}_i P_L \hat{d}_k^a R_2^{*a2} + \text{h.c.} \quad (57)$$

Once the R_2 leptoquark is integrated out, we obtain the following contributions to \mathcal{H}_{eff} .

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}} = -\frac{1}{2m_{R_2}^2} \sum_{i=1}^3 (Y_2^{UL})_{23} (Y_2^{EQ})_{3i} (V_{\text{CKM}})_{i3} \left[(\bar{\tau} P_L \nu_\tau) (\bar{c} P_L b) \right]$$

$$+ \frac{1}{4}(\bar{\tau}\sigma_{\mu\nu}P_L\nu_\tau)(\bar{c}\sigma^{\mu\nu}P_Lb) \Big]. \quad (58)$$

Comparing this with Eq. (56) at the Leptoquark mass scale, $\mu = m_{R_2}$, we find,

$$g_S^{LL} = \frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}G_F V_{cb} m_{R_2}^2} \sum_{i=1}^3 (Y_2^{UL})_{23} (Y_2^{EQ})_{3i} (V_{\text{CKM}})_{i3}, \quad g_T^{LL} = \frac{1}{4} g_S^{LL}, \quad (59)$$

Note that all coefficients except g_S^{LL} and g_T^{LL} vanish in this model. We take these as the respective Wilson coefficients also at the bottom quark mass scale, $\mu = m_b$. Following Refs. [73–76], with NP restricted to the third generation leptons (τ, ν_τ) , one can show that the ratios $R_{D^{(*)}}$ take the following forms.

$$R_D = R_D^{\text{SM}} \left[1 + 1.01 |g_S^{LL}|^2 + 0.84 |g_T^{LL}|^2 + 1.49 \text{Re}(g_S^{LL}) + 1.08 \text{Re}(g_T^{LL}) \right], \quad (60)$$

$$R_{D^*} = R_{D^*}^{\text{SM}} \left[1 + 0.04 |g_S^{LL}|^2 + 16.0 |g_T^{LL}|^2 - 0.11 \text{Re}(g_S^{LL}) - 5.17 \text{Re}(g_T^{LL}) \right]. \quad (61)$$

The assumption used to arrive at the above expressions, that NP only affects the third-generation leptons, is motivated by the absence of deviations from the SM in modes involving the light leptons ($\ell = e, \mu$). The SM predictions for $R_{D^{(*)}}$ are [76]

$$R_D^{\text{SM}} = 0.290 \pm 0.003, \quad (62)$$

$$R_{D^*}^{\text{SM}} = 0.248 \pm 0.001.$$

In contrast, the experimental world averages of $R_{D^{(*)}}$ are given by HFLAV [17] as

$$R_D = 0.342 \pm 0.026, \quad (63)$$

$$R_{D^*} = 0.287 \pm 0.012.$$

Tree-level leptoquark exchange also modifies the branching ratio (\mathcal{B}) of the decay $B_c^- \rightarrow \tau^- \bar{\nu}_\tau$, as follows [73–75].

$$\mathcal{B}(B_c^- \rightarrow \tau^- \bar{\nu}_\tau) = \mathcal{B}(B_c^- \rightarrow \tau^- \bar{\nu}_\tau)_{\text{SM}} \left| 1 - \frac{m_{B_c}^2 g_S^{LL}}{m_\tau (m_b + m_c)} \right|^2, \quad (64)$$

where $m_{B_c}^2/m_\tau(m_b + m_c) = 4.065$ and

$$\mathcal{B}(B_c^- \rightarrow \tau^- \bar{\nu}_\tau)_{\text{SM}} = \tau_{B_c} \frac{G_F^2}{8\pi} |V_{cb}|^2 f_{B_c}^2 m_{B_c} m_\tau^2 \left(1 - \frac{m_\tau^2}{m_{B_c}^2} \right)^2, \quad (65)$$

with τ_{B_c} and f_{B_c} respectively denoting the lifetime of the B_c^- meson and its decay constant.

Direct constraints on the leptonic B_c branching ratios are not available from searches at the LHC. However, an estimate based on LEP data provides a strong upper bound of $\mathcal{B}(B_c^- \rightarrow \tau^- \bar{\nu}_\tau) \leq 10\%$ [77]. Subsequent studies using the measured B_c lifetime have suggested that this bound could be considerably relaxed to $\leq 39\%$ [78] and $\leq 60\%$ [79, 80]. In our analysis, we adopt the upper bound $\mathcal{B}(B_c^- \rightarrow \tau^- \bar{\nu}_\tau)_{\text{UB}} = 60\%$. Using this upper bound and $\mathcal{B}(B_c \rightarrow \tau \bar{\nu})_{\text{SM}} \simeq 0.022$, one finds [79],

$$|1 - 4.35 g_S^{LL}|^2 = \frac{\mathcal{B}(B_c \rightarrow \tau \bar{\nu})}{\mathcal{B}(B_c \rightarrow \tau \bar{\nu})_{\text{SM}}} < 27.1 \left(\frac{\mathcal{B}(B_c \rightarrow \tau \bar{\nu})_{\text{UB}}}{0.6} \right). \quad (66)$$

The longitudinal polarization fractions of the D^* in $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^* \tau^- \bar{\nu}$, denoted by $F_L^{D^*}$, and the τ in $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{(*)} \tau^- \bar{\nu}$, given by $P_\tau^{D^{(*)}}$, are additional observables that receive contributions from the effective Hamiltonian, \mathcal{H}_{eff} , of Eq. (56). Since some of these observables have been measured, they can provide crucial complementary constraints on the relevant WCs in our model. While their explicit definitions can be found in Refs. [73, 75, 81], with non-vanishing WCs g_S^{LL} and g_T^{LL} , we find [73–76],

$$F_L^{D^*} = \frac{F_{L,\text{SM}}^{D^*}}{r_{D^*}} \left[1 + 0.08 |g_S^{LL}|^2 + 6.90 |g_T^{LL}|^2 - 0.25 \text{Re}(g_S^{LL}) - 4.30 \text{Re}(g_T^{LL}) \right], \quad (67)$$

$$P_\tau^D = \frac{P_{\tau,\text{SM}}^D}{r_D} \left[1 + 3.04 |g_S^{LL}|^2 + 0.17 |g_T^{LL}|^2 + 4.50 \text{Re}(g_S^{LL}) - 1.09 \text{Re}(g_T^{LL}) \right], \quad (68)$$

$$P_\tau^{D^*} = \frac{P_{\tau,\text{SM}}^{D^*}}{r_{D^*}} \left[1 - 0.07 |g_S^{LL}|^2 - 1.85 |g_T^{LL}|^2 + 0.23 \text{Re}(g_S^{LL}) - 3.47 \text{Re}(g_T^{LL}) \right], \quad (69)$$

where $r_{D^*} = R_{D^{(*)}} / R_{D^{(*)}}^{\text{SM}}$. The SM predictions for the above observables are [76],

$$F_{L,\text{SM}}^{D^*} = 0.464 \pm 0.003, \quad (70)$$

$$P_{\tau,\text{SM}}^D = 0.331 \pm 0.004, \quad (71)$$

$$P_{\tau,\text{SM}}^{D^*} = -0.497 \pm 0.007. \quad (72)$$

In our analysis, we use $F_{L,\text{Expt}}^{D^*} = 0.49 \pm 0.05$ [76], which is the average of the measured values $F_{L,\text{Belle}}^{D^*} = 0.60 \pm 0.08_{\text{stat}} \pm 0.04_{\text{syst}}$ [82] and $F_{L,\text{LHCb}}^{D^*} = 0.43 \pm 0.06_{\text{stat}} \pm 0.03_{\text{syst}}$ [83]. Note that the latter is obtained from a combined LHCb dataset that includes Run 1 and part of Run 2. For the τ longitudinal polarization, experimental measurements of P_τ^D are not available to date. However, we do have $P_{\tau,\text{Expt}}^{D^*} = -0.38^{+0.53}_{-0.55}$ [8, 10, 84]. It is important to note that the large experimental uncertainties in P_τ^D result in weak constraints on the relevant WCs in our analysis.

The baryonic decay mode $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c \tau \bar{\nu}$ is also governed by the transition $b \rightarrow c \tau \bar{\nu}$ and, therefore, receives new contributions from the effective Hamiltonian, \mathcal{H}_{eff} , given in Eq. (56). This decay can also be a sensitive probe of new physics [85] and we investigate the size of the leptoquark contributions to the ratio R_{Λ_c} , defined as

$$R_{\Lambda_c} \equiv \frac{\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c \tau \bar{\nu})}{\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c \ell \bar{\nu})}. \quad (73)$$

An expression for R_{Λ_c} , incorporating lattice QCD results for the transition $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c$ [86–88] as well as numerical values of other measurable quantities, is provided in Refs. [76, 89]. Keeping only terms that depend on g_S^{LL} and g_T^{LL} , the only relevant nonzero WCs in our model, we find,

$$R_{\Lambda_c}^{R_2} = R_{\Lambda_c}^{\text{SM}} \left[1 + 0.32 |g_S^{LL}|^2 + 10.4 |g_T^{LL}|^2 + 0.33 \text{Re}(g_S^{LL*}) - 3.11 \text{Re}(g_T^{LL*}) \right], \quad (74)$$

where $R_{\Lambda_c}^{\text{SM}} = 0.324 \pm 0.004$ accounts for the SM prediction [90, 91]. The LHCb collaboration has reported the observed value of the ratio as $R_{\Lambda_c}^{\text{LHCb}} = 0.242 \pm 0.026_{\text{stat}} \pm 0.071_{\text{syst}}$ [92]. As discussed in Ref.[76], normalizing with the SM prediction of $\Gamma(\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c \mu \bar{\nu})$ refines the accuracy and marginally raises the central value, $R_{\Lambda_c} = |0.041/V_{cb}|^2 (0.271 \pm 0.069) = 0.271 \pm 0.072$ [93].

The several observables discussed thus far can now be simultaneously used to constrain the WCs g_S^{LL} and g_T^{LL} . Since these WCs can be expressed in terms of the Yukawa couplings of the R_2 leptoquark, as shown in Eq. (59), one can in turn put constraints on the Yukawa couplings. Here we note that the dominant contribution to the WCs comes from the term proportional to $(V_{\text{CKM}})_{33} = V_{tb} = 1$. Thus, ignoring the CKM suppressed terms in Eq. (59) and using 1σ bounds for the observables discussed above, we obtain an allowed region of parameter space spanned by the real and imaginary parts of the product $(Y_2^{EQ})_{33}(Y_2^{UL})_{23}$. We present our results in Figure 1.

We also perform a fit to the data (excluding R_{Λ_c}) to constrain the complex-valued product $(Y_2^{UL})_{23}(Y_2^{EQ})_{33}$ and find the following best-fit values for its real and imaginary parts,

$$\text{Re} \left[(Y_2^{UL})_{23}(Y_2^{EQ})_{33} \right] = 0.005 \pm 0.019, \quad (75)$$

$$\text{Im} \left[(Y_2^{UL})_{23}(Y_2^{EQ})_{33} \right] = 0.30 \pm 0.02, \quad (76)$$

with $\chi_{\text{min}}^2/\text{d.o.f} = 2.3$ for a p -value of 0.09. Note that bounds from LHC direct searches can be reduced to [76] the following constraint,

$$|(Y_2^{UL})_{23}(Y_2^{EQ})_{33}| |g_S^{LL}(m_b)| \leq 0.52. \quad (77)$$




FIG. 1. Allowed parameter space spanned by the real and imaginary parts of the product $(Y_2^{EQ})_{33}(Y_2^{UL})_{23}$ for an R_2 leptoquark with mass $m_{R_2} = 0.5$ TeV. The top panel shows the allowed region based on various measurements: the upper bound on $\mathcal{B}(B_c \rightarrow \tau \bar{\nu})$ (in green), R_D (in red), R_{D^*} (in blue), $F_L(D^*)$ (in yellow), and R_{Λ_c} (in magenta). Due to large errors in the measurement of $P_\tau(D^*)$, it does not lead to additional constraints and is therefore omitted in the top panel. The bottom-left panel shows the allowed region (in green) of real and imaginary parts of $(Y_2^{EQ})_{33}(Y_2^{UL})_{23}$ collectively satisfying all relevant bounds from B -meson decays – the upper bound on $\mathcal{B}(B_c \rightarrow \tau \bar{\nu})$, R_D , R_{D^*} , $F_L(D^*)$, and $P_\tau(D^*)$. The bottom-right panel overlays the 1σ bound on R_{Λ_c} on top of the parameter space allowed by all other relevant B -decay bounds, resulting in the exclusion of the region marked in yellow.

This constraint is easily satisfied by the best-fit values of the real and imaginary parts of $(Y_2^{UL})_{23}(Y_2^{EQ})_{33}$ presented in Eqs. (75) and (76). Using these best-fit values we find,

$$R_{\Lambda_c} = 0.391 \pm 0.007. \quad (78)$$

Comparing the above value of R_{Λ_c} with its measured value from LHCb, $R_{\Lambda_c} = 0.242 \pm 0.026 \pm 0.071$ [92], one notices that the central value of the measurement is almost 1.5σ smaller than that obtained in Eq. (78). This aligns well with the observation that the suppression in the experimental value of R_{Λ_c} is in tension with the NP scenarios preferred by the $R_{D^{(*)}}$ anomaly. However, a large experimental uncertainty in R_{Λ_c} prevents us from reaching a firm conclusion in this case.

One final point deserves further attention. In addition to charged-current transitions, the R_2 leptoquark can also mediate neutral-current B -decays at tree level. In particular, the neutral-current transition $b \rightarrow s\ell_i^-\ell_j^+$ will receive contributions from the following interaction Lagrangian.

$$\mathcal{L}_{R_2} = -(Y_2^{EQ})_{ij}(V_{\text{CKM}})_j^k \bar{e}_i P_L \hat{d}_k^a R_{2a2}^* - (Y_2^{EQ})_{ij}^*(V_{\text{CKM}})_j^{k*} \bar{d}_k^a P_R \hat{e}_i R_{2a2}. \quad (79)$$

Once the leptoquark, R_2 , is integrated out, the effective Hamiltonian takes the form,

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}} = \frac{1}{2m_{R_2}^2} \sum_{k,\ell=1}^3 (Y_2^{EQ})_{ik}(V_{\text{CKM}})_{k3}(Y_2^{EQ})_{j\ell}^*(V_{\text{CKM}}^*)_{\ell 2}(\bar{s}\gamma^\mu P_L b)(\bar{\ell}_i\gamma^\mu P_R \ell_j). \quad (80)$$

Comparing this with the standard dimension-6 effective Hamiltonian for $b \rightarrow s\ell_i^+\ell_j^-$ [52], one finds the relevant WCs to be,

$$C_9^{ij} = C_{10}^{ij} = -\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{2}G_F V_{tb} V_{ts}^* \alpha m_{R_2}^2} \sum_{k,\ell=1}^3 (Y_2^{EQ})_{ik}(V_{\text{CKM}})_{k3}(Y_2^{EQ})_{j\ell}^*(V_{\text{CKM}}^*)_{\ell 2}. \quad (81)$$

Once again several Yukawa couplings are involved in the above relations and we can use this to our advantage. Assuming the Y_2^{EQ} couplings irrelevant for the charged-current B -anomalies to be small, we can suppress any contribution to $b \rightarrow s\ell_i^+\ell_j^-$. Thus, in this scenario, no conflict with existing data will arise.

V. $B^+ \rightarrow K^+\nu\bar{\nu}$ IN NON-MINIMAL SU(5)

In this section, we compute the contribution from the non-minimal SU(5) model to $b \rightarrow s\nu\bar{\nu}$. This contribution arises at the one-loop level through the exchange of both a diquark

and a leptoquark. The SM prediction for the branching fraction of $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu \nu$ is [20]:

$$\mathcal{B}_{\text{SM}}(B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu \nu) = (5.58 \pm 0.37) \times 10^{-6}. \quad (82)$$

Recently, the Belle II collaboration reported using the novel Inclusive Tagging Analysis (ITA) method to measure [19]:

$$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu \nu) = (2.7 \pm 0.5 (\text{stat}) \pm 0.5 (\text{syst})) \times 10^{-5}. \quad (83)$$

The measured value of $\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu \bar{\nu})$ exceeds the SM prediction by approximately 2.7σ . This observed excess could be due to NP, and as such it has generated significant theoretical interest in potential NP explanations for the discrepancy [94–118].

In our non-minimal SU(5) model with a **45**-dimensional Higgs, the primary contribution to this transition arises from a box diagram mediated by the diquark, S_6 , and the leptoquark, R_2 , as illustrated in Fig. 2.




FIG. 2. Box diagram contribution to $b \rightarrow s \nu \bar{\nu}$ through the exchange of an S_6 diquark and an R_2 leptoquark.

Once the heavy particles in the box diagram of Fig. 2 – the diquark, leptoquark, and top quark – are integrated out, the following effective Hamiltonian governing the $b \rightarrow s \nu \bar{\nu}$ transition [119] emerges.

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}} = -\frac{4 G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{tb} V_{ts}^* (C_L \mathcal{O}_L + C_R \mathcal{O}_R) + \text{h.c.}, \quad (84)$$

where the operators $\mathcal{O}_{L,R}$ are given as,

$$\mathcal{O}_L = \frac{e^2}{16\pi^2} (\bar{s} \gamma_\mu P_L b) (\bar{\nu} \gamma^\mu (1 - \gamma_5) \nu), \quad \mathcal{O}_R = \frac{e^2}{16\pi^2} (\bar{s} \gamma_\mu P_R b) (\bar{\nu} \gamma^\mu (1 - \gamma_5) \nu). \quad (85)$$

The WCs, $C_{L,R}$, in the above effective Hamiltonian can be expressed as $C_L = C_L^{\text{SM}} + C_L^{\text{NP}}$ and $C_R = C_R^{\text{NP}}$. The SM contribution to the WC, C_L^{SM} , is well known, with high precision, including next-to-leading order QCD corrections [120–122] and two-loop electroweak contributions

[123]. It can be expressed as $C_L^{\text{SM}} = -X_t/s_w^2$ with $X_t = 1.469 \pm 0.017$ and $s_w^2 = 0.23121$, so that $C_L^{\text{SM}} \approx -6.35$. The non-minimal SU(5) model introduces new contributions to the WCs C_L^{NP} and C_R^{NP} .

$$C_L^{\text{NP}} = -\frac{\pi}{16\sqrt{2} G_F \alpha V_{tb} V_{ts}^*} f(x_{S_6}, x_{R_2}) (Y_6^{QQ})_{33} (Y_6^{QQ})_{32}^* \sum_{i=1}^3 |(Y_2^{UL})_{3i}|^2 \quad (86)$$

$$C_R^{\text{NP}} = \frac{\pi}{8\sqrt{2} G_F \alpha V_{tb} V_{ts}^*} g(x_{S_6}, x_{R_2}) (Y_6^{DU})_{33}^* (Y_6^{DU})_{23} \sum_{i=1}^3 |(Y_2^{UL})_{3i}|^2, \quad (87)$$

where $x_{S_6(R_2)} = m_t^2/m_{S_6(R_2)}^2$ and $f(x_{S_6}, x_{R_2})$ and $g(x_{S_6}, x_{R_2})$ are loop functions that can be expressed as,

$$f(x, y) = -\frac{1}{16\pi^2 m_t^2} \frac{xy}{x-y} \left[\frac{1-x+x \ln x}{(1-x)^2} - x \rightarrow y \right], \quad (88)$$

$$g(x, y) = -\frac{1}{16\pi^2 m_t^2} \frac{xy}{x-y} \left[\frac{1-x+\ln x}{(1-x)^2} - x \rightarrow y \right]. \quad (89)$$

Note that the loop functions, $f(x, y)$ and $g(x, y)$ are symmetric under the interchange of x and y . In the limiting case obtained when the diquark and leptoquark have the same mass, the loop functions take the forms,

$$f(x, x) = -\frac{x^2}{16\pi^2 m_t^2} \frac{2(1-x) + (1+x) \ln x}{(1-x)^3}, \quad (90)$$

$$g(x, x) = -\frac{x}{16\pi^2 m_t^2} \frac{1-x^2 + 2x \ln x}{(1-x)^3}. \quad (91)$$

In Fig. 3, assuming the diquark and leptoquark masses to be identical, we plot C_L^{NP} and C_R^{NP} as functions of the common mass. Here, we also assume the relevant products of the Yukawa couplings given in Eqs. (86) and (87) to be unity.

It is worth noting that neither $B_{s(d)}$ mixing nor $b \rightarrow s(d)\gamma$ impose constraints on the quantity $|(Y_2^{UL})_{3i}|^2$ appearing in $C_{L,R}^{\text{NP}}$. Similarly, $|(Y_2^{UL})_{3i}|^2$ is not constrained by D meson mixing, as the relevant constraint applies to the combination $(Y_2^{UL})_{2i} (Y_2^{UL})_{2j} (Y_2^{UL})_{1i}^* (Y_2^{UL})_{1j}^*$. Additionally, tree-level processes involving B -meson decays, such as $B_c^- \rightarrow \tau^- \bar{\nu}_\tau$, do not constrain $|(Y_2^{UL})_{3i}|^2$ (see Eqs. (59) and (64).) Consequently, $|(Y_2^{UL})_{3i}|^2$ can be taken to be of order one. For diquark masses greater than or equal to 500 GeV, the bound from $b \rightarrow s\gamma$ constrains $|(Y_6^{DU})_{33} (Y_6^{QQ})_{32}| \lesssim 2.7 \times 10^{-3}$ (see the discussion in Section II.) Retaining only the products of Yukawa couplings $(Y_6^{QQ})_{33} (Y_6^{QQ})_{32}^*$ and $(Y_6^{DU})_{33}^* (Y_6^{DU})_{23}$, which appear in $C_{L,R}^{\text{NP}}$ in Eqs. (86) and (87), while setting all other couplings to zero, we find that the




FIG. 3. New physics Wilson coefficients for the effective Hamiltonian for $b \rightarrow s\nu\bar{\nu}$ in the non-minimal SU(5) model, plotted as functions of the heavy mediator (S_6, R_2) mass. Here we only consider the limiting case $m_{S_6} = m_{R_2}$ and set the relevant products of Yukawa couplings to unity. The dashed (solid) line represents C_L^{NP} (C_R^{NP}).

constraints on these products become less restrictive. This allows us to choose the relevant products of Yukawa couplings appearing in Eqs. (86) and (87) to be unity.

In calculating the amplitude for $B^+ \rightarrow K^+\nu\bar{\nu}$ using the effective Hamiltonian, one notices that the hadronic matrix elements $\langle K|\bar{s}\gamma^\mu P_L b|B\rangle$ and $\langle K|\bar{s}\gamma^\mu P_R b|B\rangle$ are equal, since the axial-vector current, $\langle K|\bar{s}\gamma^\mu\gamma^5 b|B\rangle$, vanishes. Therefore, the total amplitude for $B^+ \rightarrow K^+\nu\bar{\nu}$ is proportional to $C_L + C_R$ and consequently its branching ratio is proportional to $|C_L + C_R|^2$. In the SM, this factor is $|C_L^{\text{SM}}|^2$, while in our non-minimal SU(5) model it is $|C_L^{\text{SM}} + C_L^{\text{NP}} + C_R^{\text{NP}}|^2$. Thus, one can express the NP-enhanced branching ratio for $B^+ \rightarrow K^+\nu\bar{\nu}$ as,

$$\mathcal{B}_{\text{NP}}(B^+ \rightarrow K^+\nu\bar{\nu}) = \mathcal{B}_{\text{SM}}(B^+ \rightarrow K^+\nu\bar{\nu}) \left| 1 + \frac{C_L^{\text{NP}} + C_R^{\text{NP}}}{C_L^{\text{SM}}} \right|^2. \quad (92)$$

As one can see from the above equation, an enhancement in $\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow K^+\nu\bar{\nu})$ over its SM value can be obtained for reasonable real-valued NP WCs if $C_L^{\text{NP}} + C_R^{\text{NP}}$ has the same sign as C_L^{SM} . Once again, thanks to our model's large parameter space, this enhancement can be achieved in many ways. For example, taking $m_{S_6} = 500$ GeV and $m_{R_2} = 600$ GeV, along with the relevant products of Yukawa couplings that appear in the expressions for the NP WCs to be unity, we find the following results.

$$C_L^{\text{NP}} = -0.077, \quad C_R^{\text{NP}} = -1.120, \quad \mathcal{B}_{\text{NP}}(B^+ \rightarrow K^+\nu\bar{\nu}) = (7.9 \pm 0.5) \times 10^{-6}. \quad (93)$$

This represents a $\sim 41.2\%$ enhancement of $\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu \bar{\nu})$ over its SM value.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

Understanding the masses and mixing of the quarks and leptons as well as the flavor structure of the SM is one of the key challenges in particle physics. A proposed class of solutions to address this problem are the grand unified theory (GUT) models of which the SU(5) model is well known. In this work, we considered a non-minimal SU(5) GUT framework, which introduces a 45-dimensional Higgs representation that includes new scalar states such as the leptoquark, R_2 , and the diquark S_6 . We discussed the effect of these new states in flavor-changing neutral current (FCNC) decays of the b quark. In particular, we focussed on the B anomalies which have generated a lot of interest over the past decade. We showed that the exchange of the diquark at the tree level can lead to new structures in the FCNC effective Hamiltonian for non-leptonic decays. These new contributions can explain the long-standing $B \rightarrow K\pi$ puzzle without conflicting with constraints from other FCNC processes like B mixing and $b \rightarrow s\gamma$. In the charged current sector, we demonstrated that the tree-level exchange of the leptoquark, R_2 , can explain the anomalies in the $b \rightarrow c\tau^-\bar{\nu}_\tau$ decays such as the R_D and R_{D^*} measurements. Finally, we showed that the loop-level contribution, though the diquark and leptoquark exchange, can contribute to the $b \rightarrow s\nu\bar{\nu}$ processes and can potentially cause an enhancement in the rate of $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ + \text{inv}$. This enhancement is consistent with the recent observation of this mode by Belle II with a branching ratio that deviates from the SM prediction by 2.7σ .

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was financially supported by the U.S. National Science Foundation under Grant No. PHY-2310627 (BB) and PHY-2309937 (AD). The work of S. K. is partially supported by Science, Technology & Innovation Funding Authority (STDF) under grant number 48173.

Appendix A: Inputs used for $B \rightarrow K\pi$ NP fits

The non-zero hadronic matrix elements important to express the $B \rightarrow K\pi$ decay amplitudes are given by,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \pi^+(p_{\pi^+}, m_{\pi^+}) | \bar{u}\gamma^\mu b | \bar{B}^0(p_{\bar{B}^0}, m_{\bar{B}^0}) \rangle &= F_+^{\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \pi^+}(q^2) \left[(p_{\bar{B}^0} + p_{\pi^+})^\mu - \frac{(m_{\bar{B}^0}^2 - m_{\pi^+}^2)}{q^2} q^\mu \right] \\ &+ F_0^{\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \pi^+}(q^2) \frac{(m_{\bar{B}^0}^2 - m_{\pi^+}^2)}{q^2} q^\mu \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A1})$$

$$\langle \pi^+(p_{\pi^+}, m_{\pi^+}) | \bar{u}b | \bar{B}^0(p_{\bar{B}^0}, m_{\bar{B}^0}) \rangle = F_0^{\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \pi^+}(q^2) \frac{m_{\bar{B}^0}^2 - m_{\pi^+}^2}{m_b - m_u} \quad (\text{A2})$$

$$\langle 0 | \bar{s}\gamma^\mu \gamma_5 u | K^+(p_{K^+}, m_{K^+}) \rangle = if_{K^+} p_{K^+}^\mu \quad (\text{A3})$$

$$\langle 0 | \bar{s}\gamma_5 u | K^+(p_{K^+}, m_{K^+}) \rangle = -if_{K^+} \frac{m_{K^+}^2}{m_u + m_s} \quad (\text{A4})$$

where $q^\mu = (p_{\bar{B}^0} - p_{\pi^+})^\mu$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \bar{K}^0(p_{\bar{K}^0}, m_{\bar{K}^0}) | \bar{s}\gamma^\mu b | \bar{B}^0(p_{\bar{B}^0}, m_{\bar{B}^0}) \rangle &= F_+^{\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}^0}(\tilde{q}^2) \left[(p_{\bar{B}^0} + p_{\bar{K}^0})^\mu - \frac{(m_{\bar{B}^0}^2 - m_{\bar{K}^0}^2)}{\tilde{q}^2} \tilde{q}^\mu \right] \\ &+ F_0^{\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}^0}(\tilde{q}^2) \frac{(m_{\bar{B}^0}^2 - m_{\bar{K}^0}^2)}{\tilde{q}^2} \tilde{q}^\mu \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A5})$$

$$\langle \bar{K}^0(p_{\bar{K}^0}, m_{\bar{K}^0}) | \bar{s}b | \bar{B}^0(p_{\bar{B}^0}, m_{\bar{B}^0}) \rangle = F_0^{\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}^0}(\tilde{q}^2) \frac{m_{\bar{B}^0}^2 - m_{\bar{K}^0}^2}{m_b - m_s} \quad (\text{A6})$$

$$\langle 0 | \bar{u}\gamma^\mu \gamma_5 u | \pi^0(p_{\pi^0}, m_{\pi^0}) \rangle = \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} f_{\pi^0} p_{\pi^0}^\mu \quad (\text{A7})$$

$$\langle 0 | \bar{u}\gamma_5 u | \pi^0(p_{\pi^0}, m_{\pi^0}) \rangle = -if_{\pi^0} \frac{m_{\pi^0}^2}{2\sqrt{2}m_u} \quad (\text{A8})$$

where $\tilde{q}^\mu = (p_{\bar{B}^0} - p_{\bar{K}^0})^\mu$. The numerical values of $F_+^{\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \pi^+}$ and $F_+^{\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}^0}$ are taken from Ref [72].

-
- [1] H. Georgi and C. Jarlskog, A New Lepton - Quark Mass Relation in a Unified Theory, Phys. Lett. B **86**, 297 (1979).
 - [2] K. S. Babu and E. Ma, Suppression of Proton Decay in SU(5) Grand Unification, Phys. Lett. B **144**, 381 (1984).
 - [3] J. Lees *et al.* (BaBar), Evidence for an excess of $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{(*)}\tau^-\bar{\nu}_\tau$ decays, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 101802 (2012), arXiv:1205.5442 [hep-ex].
 - [4] J. Lees *et al.* (BaBar), Measurement of an Excess of $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{(*)}\tau^-\bar{\nu}_\tau$ Decays and Implications for Charged Higgs Bosons, Phys. Rev. D **88**, 072012 (2013), arXiv:1303.0571 [hep-ex].

- [5] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb), Measurement of the ratio of branching fractions $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}\tau^-\bar{\nu}_\tau)/\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}\mu^-\bar{\nu}_\mu)$, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 111803 (2015), [Erratum: Phys.Rev.Lett. 115, 159901 (2015)], arXiv:1506.08614 [hep-ex].
- [6] M. Huschle *et al.* (Belle), Measurement of the branching ratio of $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{(*)}\tau^-\bar{\nu}_\tau$ relative to $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{(*)}\ell^-\bar{\nu}_\ell$ decays with hadronic tagging at Belle, Phys. Rev. D **92**, 072014 (2015), arXiv:1507.03233 [hep-ex].
- [7] Y. Sato *et al.* (Belle), Measurement of the branching ratio of $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}\tau^-\bar{\nu}_\tau$ relative to $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}\ell^-\bar{\nu}_\ell$ decays with a semileptonic tagging method, Phys. Rev. D **94**, 072007 (2016), arXiv:1607.07923 [hep-ex].
- [8] S. Hirose *et al.* (Belle), Measurement of the τ lepton polarization and $R(D^*)$ in the decay $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^*\tau^-\bar{\nu}_\tau$, Phys. Rev. Lett. **118**, 211801 (2017), arXiv:1612.00529 [hep-ex].
- [9] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb), Measurement of the ratio of the $B^0 \rightarrow D^{*-}\tau^+\nu_\tau$ and $B^0 \rightarrow D^{*-}\mu^+\nu_\mu$ branching fractions using three-prong τ -lepton decays, Phys. Rev. Lett. **120**, 171802 (2018), arXiv:1708.08856 [hep-ex].
- [10] S. Hirose *et al.* (Belle), Measurement of the τ lepton polarization and $R(D^*)$ in the decay $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^*\tau^-\bar{\nu}_\tau$ with one-prong hadronic τ decays at Belle, Phys. Rev. D **97**, 012004 (2018), arXiv:1709.00129 [hep-ex].
- [11] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb), Test of Lepton Flavor Universality by the measurement of the $B^0 \rightarrow D^{*-}\tau^+\nu_\tau$ branching fraction using three-prong τ decays, Phys. Rev. D **97**, 072013 (2018), arXiv:1711.02505 [hep-ex].
- [12] A. Abdesselam *et al.* (Belle), Measurement of $\mathcal{R}(D)$ and $\mathcal{R}(D^*)$ with a semileptonic tagging method, (2019), arXiv:1904.08794 [hep-ex].
- [13] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb), Measurement of the ratios of branching fractions $\mathcal{R}(D^*)$ and $\mathcal{R}(D^0)$, Phys. Rev. Lett. **131**, 111802 (2023), arXiv:2302.02886 [hep-ex].
- [14] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb), Test of lepton flavor universality using $B^0 \rightarrow D^{*-}\tau^+\nu_\tau$ decays with hadronic τ channels, Phys. Rev. D **108**, 012018 (2023), [Erratum: Phys.Rev.D 109, 119902 (2024)], arXiv:2305.01463 [hep-ex].
- [15] I. Adachi *et al.* (Belle-II), Test of lepton flavor universality with a measurement of $R(D^*)$ using hadronic B tagging at the Belle II experiment, Phys. Rev. D **110**, 072020 (2024), arXiv:2401.02840 [hep-ex].

- [16] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb), Measurement of the branching fraction ratios $R(D^+)$ and $R(D^{*+})$ using muonic τ decays, (2024), arXiv:2406.03387 [hep-ex].
- [17] Y. S. Amhis *et al.* (HFLAV), Preliminary average of $R(D)$ and $R(D^*)$ for Moriond 2024, <https://hflav-eos.web.cern.ch/hflav-eos/semi/moriond24/html/RDsDsstar/RDRDs.html> (2024).
- [18] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb), Measurement of the ratio of branching fractions $\mathcal{B}(B_c^+ \rightarrow J/\psi\tau^+\nu_\tau)/\mathcal{B}(B_c^+ \rightarrow J/\psi\mu^+\nu_\mu)$, Phys. Rev. Lett. **120**, 121801 (2018), arXiv:1711.05623 [hep-ex].
- [19] I. Adachi *et al.* (Belle-II), Evidence for $B^+ \rightarrow K^+\nu\nu^-$ decays, Phys. Rev. D **109**, 112006 (2024), arXiv:2311.14647 [hep-ex].
- [20] W. G. Parrott, C. Bouchard, and C. T. H. Davies (HPQCD), Standard Model predictions for $B \rightarrow K\ell^+\ell^-$, $B \rightarrow K\ell^1\ell^2$ and $B \rightarrow K\nu\nu^-$ using form factors from Nf=2+1+1 lattice QCD, Phys. Rev. D **107**, 014511 (2023), [Erratum: Phys.Rev.D 107, 119903 (2023)], arXiv:2207.13371 [hep-ph].
- [21] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb), Test of lepton universality in $b \rightarrow s\ell^+\ell^-$ decays, Phys. Rev. Lett. **131**, 051803 (2023), arXiv:2212.09152 [hep-ex].
- [22] B. Capdevila, A. Crivellin, and J. Matias, Review of semileptonic B anomalies, Eur. Phys. J. ST **1**, 20 (2023), arXiv:2309.01311 [hep-ph].
- [23] N. B. Beaudry, A. Datta, D. London, A. Rashed, and J.-S. Roux, The $B \rightarrow \pi K$ puzzle revisited, JHEP **01**, 074, arXiv:1709.07142 [hep-ph].
- [24] A. Kundu, S. K. Patra, and S. Roy, Complete analysis of all $B \rightarrow \pi K$ decays, Phys. Rev. D **104**, 095025 (2021), arXiv:2106.15633 [hep-ph].
- [25] B. Bhattacharya, A. Datta, D. Marfatia, S. Nandi, and J. Waite, Axion-like particles resolve the $B \rightarrow \pi K$ and $g - 2$ anomalies, Phys. Rev. D **104**, L051701 (2021), arXiv:2104.03947 [hep-ph].
- [26] B. Bhattacharya, S. Kumbhakar, D. London, and N. Payot, U-spin puzzle in B decays, Phys. Rev. D **107**, L011505 (2023), arXiv:2211.06994 [hep-ph].
- [27] Y. Amhis, Y. Grossman, and Y. Nir, The branching fraction of $B_s^0 \rightarrow K^0\bar{K}^0$: three puzzles, JHEP **02**, 113, arXiv:2212.03874 [hep-ph].
- [28] A. Biswas, S. Descotes-Genon, J. Matias, and G. Tetlalmatzi-Xolocotzi, A new puzzle in non-leptonic B decays, JHEP **06**, 108, arXiv:2301.10542 [hep-ph].

- [29] R. Berthiaume, B. Bhattacharya, R. Boumris, A. Jean, S. Kumbhakar, and D. London, Anomalies in Hadronic B Decays, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **133**, 211802 (2024), arXiv:2311.18011 [hep-ph].
- [30] W. Altmannshofer and S. Roy, A joint explanation of the $B \rightarrow \pi K$ puzzle and the $B \rightarrow K\nu\bar{\nu}$ excess, (2024), arXiv:2411.06592 [hep-ph].
- [31] Y. Grossman, Y. Nir, M. Neubert, Y. Shpilman, and Y. Viernik, $B_s^0 \rightarrow K^0\bar{K}^0$ beyond the Standard Model, (2024), arXiv:2407.13506 [hep-ph].
- [32] A. J. Buras, R. Fleischer, S. Recksiegel, and F. Schwab, The $B \rightarrow \pi K$ puzzle and its relation to rare B and K decays, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **32**, 45 (2003), arXiv:hep-ph/0309012.
- [33] S. Baek, P. Hamel, D. London, A. Datta, and D. A. Suprun, The $B \rightarrow \pi K$ puzzle and new physics, *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 057502 (2005), arXiv:hep-ph/0412086.
- [34] A. Datta, D. Sachdeva, and J. Waite, Unified explanation of $b \rightarrow s\mu^+\mu^-$ anomalies, neutrino masses, and $B \rightarrow \pi K$ puzzle, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 055015 (2019), arXiv:1905.04046 [hep-ph].
- [35] I. Dorsner and P. Fileviez Perez, Unification versus proton decay in SU(5), *Phys. Lett. B* **642**, 248 (2006), arXiv:hep-ph/0606062.
- [36] P. Fileviez Perez, Unification with and without Supersymmetry: Adjoint SU(5), in *15th International Conference on Supersymmetry and the Unification of Fundamental Interactions (SUSY07)* (2007) pp. 678–681, arXiv:0710.1321 [hep-ph].
- [37] S. Khalil, S. Salem, and M. Allam, SU(5) Octet Scalar at the LHC, *Phys. Rev. D* **89**, 095011 (2014), [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.D* 91, 119908 (2015)], arXiv:1401.1482 [hep-ph].
- [38] A. Ismael and S. Khalil, Resolving R_D and R_{D^*} anomalies in adjoint SU(5), *JHEP* **11**, 143, arXiv:2301.02226 [hep-ph].
- [39] T. Goto, S. Mishima, and T. Shindou, Flavor physics in SU(5) GUT with scalar fields in the 45 representation, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 095012 (2023), arXiv:2308.13329 [hep-ph].
- [40] T. Han, I. Lewis, and T. McElmurry, QCD Corrections to Scalar Diquark Production at Hadron Colliders, *JHEP* **01**, 123, arXiv:0909.2666 [hep-ph].
- [41] L.-L. Chau and W.-Y. Keung, Comments on the Parametrization of the Kobayashi-Maskawa Matrix, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **53**, 1802 (1984).
- [42] P. A. Zyla *et al.* (Particle Data Group), Review of Particle Physics, *PTEP* **2020**, 083C01 (2020).

- [43] P. Arnan, A. Crivellin, M. Fedele, and F. Mescia, Generic Loop Effects of New Scalars and Fermions in $b \rightarrow s\ell^+\ell^-$, $(g-2)_\mu$ and a Vector-like 4th Generation, JHEP **06**, 118, arXiv:1904.05890 [hep-ph].
- [44] M. Misiak *et al.*, Updated NNLO QCD predictions for the weak radiative B-meson decays, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 221801 (2015), arXiv:1503.01789 [hep-ph].
- [45] M. Gronau, O. F. Hernandez, D. London, and J. L. Rosner, Decays of B mesons to two light pseudoscalars, Phys. Rev. D **50**, 4529 (1994), arXiv:hep-ph/9404283.
- [46] M. Gronau, O. F. Hernandez, D. London, and J. L. Rosner, Electroweak penguins and two-body B decays, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 6374 (1995), arXiv:hep-ph/9504327.
- [47] R. Fleischer and T. Mannel, Constraining the CKM angle γ and penguin contributions through combined $B \rightarrow \pi K$ branching ratios, Phys. Rev. D **57**, 2752 (1998), arXiv:hep-ph/9704423.
- [48] M. Gronau and J. L. Rosner, Weak phase γ from ratio of $B \rightarrow K\pi$ rates, Phys. Rev. D **57**, 6843 (1998), arXiv:hep-ph/9711246.
- [49] M. Neubert and J. L. Rosner, New bound on γ from $B^\pm \rightarrow \pi K$ decays, Phys. Lett. B **441**, 403 (1998), arXiv:hep-ph/9808493.
- [50] M. Neubert and J. L. Rosner, Determination of the weak phase γ from rate measurements in $B^\pm \rightarrow \pi K$, $\pi\pi$ decays, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 5076 (1998), arXiv:hep-ph/9809311.
- [51] M. Gronau and J. L. Rosner, Rate and CP-asymmetry sum rules in $B \rightarrow K\pi$, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 057503 (2006), arXiv:hep-ph/0608040.
- [52] G. Buchalla, A. J. Buras, and M. E. Lautenbacher, Weak decays beyond leading logarithms, Rev. Mod. Phys. **68**, 1125 (1996), arXiv:hep-ph/9512380.
- [53] M. Gronau, D. Pirjol, and T.-M. Yan, Model independent electroweak penguins in B decays to two pseudoscalars, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 034021 (1999), [Erratum: Phys.Rev.D 69, 119901 (2004)], arXiv:hep-ph/9810482.
- [54] L.-L. Chau, H.-Y. Cheng, W. K. Sze, H. Yao, and B. Tseng, Charmless nonleptonic rare decays of B mesons, Phys. Rev. D **43**, 2176 (1991), [Erratum: Phys.Rev.D 58, 019902 (1998)].
- [55] M. Gronau, A Precise sum rule among four $B \rightarrow K\pi$ CP asymmetries, Phys. Lett. B **627**, 82 (2005), arXiv:hep-ph/0508047.
- [56] Y.-Y. Keum and H.-n. Li, Nonleptonic charmless B decays: Factorization versus perturbative QCD, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 074006 (2001), arXiv:hep-ph/0006001.

- [57] M. Beneke, G. Buchalla, M. Neubert, and C. T. Sachrajda, QCD factorization for exclusive, nonleptonic B meson decays: General arguments and the case of heavy light final states, Nucl. Phys. B **591**, 313 (2000), arXiv:hep-ph/0006124.
- [58] M. Beneke, G. Buchalla, M. Neubert, and C. T. Sachrajda, QCD factorization in $B \rightarrow \pi K, \pi\pi$ decays and extraction of Wolfenstein parameters, Nucl. Phys. B **606**, 245 (2001), arXiv:hep-ph/0104110.
- [59] H.-n. Li and S. Mishima, Possible resolution of the $B \rightarrow \pi\pi, \pi K$ puzzles, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 034023 (2011), arXiv:0901.1272 [hep-ph].
- [60] C. W. Bauer, I. Z. Rothstein, and I. W. Stewart, SCET analysis of $B \rightarrow K\pi, B \rightarrow K\bar{K}$, and $B \rightarrow \pi\pi$ decays, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 034010 (2006), arXiv:hep-ph/0510241.
- [61] K. Huitu and S. Khalil, New Physics contribution to $B \rightarrow K\pi$ decays in SCET, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 095008 (2010), arXiv:0911.1868 [hep-ph].
- [62] M. Gronau and J. L. Rosner, Combining CP asymmetries in $B \rightarrow K\pi$ decays, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 113002 (1999), arXiv:hep-ph/9809384.
- [63] Y. T. Duh *et al.* (Belle), Measurements of branching fractions and direct CP asymmetries for $B \rightarrow K\pi, B \rightarrow \pi\pi$ and $B \rightarrow KK$ decays, Phys. Rev. D **87**, 031103 (2013), arXiv:1210.1348 [hep-ex].
- [64] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb), Measurement of CP Violation in the Decay $B^+ \rightarrow K^+\pi^0$, Phys. Rev. Lett. **126**, 091802 (2021), arXiv:2012.12789 [hep-ex].
- [65] I. Adachi *et al.* (Belle-II), Measurement of branching fractions and direct CP asymmetries for $B \rightarrow K\pi$ and $B \rightarrow \pi\pi$ decays at Belle II, Phys. Rev. D **109**, 012001 (2024), arXiv:2310.06381 [hep-ex].
- [66] A. Datta and D. London, Measuring new physics parameters in B penguin decays, Phys. Lett. B **595**, 453 (2004), arXiv:hep-ph/0404130.
- [67] S. Navas *et al.* (Particle Data Group), Review of particle physics, Phys. Rev. D **110**, 030001 (2024).
- [68] C. S. Kim, S. Oh, and Y. W. Yoon, Analytic resolution of puzzle in $B \rightarrow K\pi$ decays, Phys. Lett. B **665**, 231 (2008), arXiv:0707.2967 [hep-ph].
- [69] Y. S. Amhis *et al.* (HFLAV), Averages of b-hadron, c-hadron, and τ -lepton properties as of 2021, Phys. Rev. D **107**, 052008 (2023), arXiv:2206.07501 [hep-ex].

- [70] I. Adachi *et al.* (Belle, Belle-II), Determination of the CKM angle ϕ_3 from a combination of Belle and Belle II results, *JHEP* **10**, 143, arXiv:2404.12817 [hep-ex].
- [71] R. L. Workman *et al.* (Particle Data Group), Review of Particle Physics, *PTEP* **2022**, 083C01 (2022).
- [72] P. Ball and R. Zwicky, New results on $B \rightarrow \pi, K, \eta$ decay formfactors from light-cone sum rules, *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 014015 (2005), arXiv:hep-ph/0406232.
- [73] S. Iguro, T. Kitahara, Y. Omura, R. Watanabe, and K. Yamamoto, D^* polarization vs. $R_{D^{(*)}}$ anomalies in the leptoquark models, *JHEP* **02**, 194, arXiv:1811.08899 [hep-ph].
- [74] P. Asadi, M. R. Buckley, and D. Shih, It's all right(-handed neutrinos): a new W' model for the $R_{D^{(*)}}$ anomaly, *JHEP* **09**, 010, arXiv:1804.04135 [hep-ph].
- [75] P. Asadi, M. R. Buckley, and D. Shih, Asymmetry Observables and the Origin of $R_{D^{(*)}}$ Anomalies, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 035015 (2019), arXiv:1810.06597 [hep-ph].
- [76] S. Iguro, T. Kitahara, and R. Watanabe, Global fit to $b \rightarrow c\tau\nu$ anomalies as of Spring 2024, *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 075005 (2024), arXiv:2405.06062 [hep-ph].
- [77] A. G. Akeroyd and C.-H. Chen, Constraint on the branching ratio of $B_c \rightarrow \tau\bar{\nu}$ from LEP1 and consequences for $R(D^{(*)})$ anomaly, *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, 075011 (2017), arXiv:1708.04072 [hep-ph].
- [78] D. Bardhan and D. Ghosh, B -meson charged current anomalies: The post-Moriond 2019 status, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 011701 (2019), arXiv:1904.10432 [hep-ph].
- [79] M. Blanke, A. Crivellin, S. de Boer, T. Kitahara, M. Moscati, U. Nierste, and I. Nišandžić, Impact of polarization observables and $B_c \rightarrow \tau\nu$ on new physics explanations of the $b \rightarrow c\tau\nu$ anomaly, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 075006 (2019), arXiv:1811.09603 [hep-ph].
- [80] M. Blanke, A. Crivellin, T. Kitahara, M. Moscati, U. Nierste, and I. Nišandžić, Addendum to “Impact of polarization observables and $B_c \rightarrow \tau\nu$ on new physics explanations of the $b \rightarrow c\tau\nu$ anomaly”, *Phys. Rev. D* 10.1103/PhysRevD.100.035035 (2019), [Addendum: *Phys.Rev.D* 100, 035035 (2019)], arXiv:1905.08253 [hep-ph].
- [81] M. Tanaka and R. Watanabe, New physics in the weak interaction of $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{(*)}\tau\bar{\nu}$, *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 034028 (2013), arXiv:1212.1878 [hep-ph].
- [82] A. Abdesselam *et al.* (Belle), Measurement of the D^{*-} polarization in the decay $B^0 \rightarrow D^{*-}\tau^+\nu_\tau$, in *10th International Workshop on the CKM Unitarity Triangle* (2019) arXiv:1903.03102 [hep-ex].

- [83] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb), Measurement of the D^* longitudinal polarization in $B^0 \rightarrow D^{*-} \tau^+ \nu \tau$ decays, *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 092007 (2024), arXiv:2311.05224 [hep-ex].
- [84] K. Adamczyk (Belle, Belle-II), Semitauonic B decays at Belle/Belle II, in *10th International Workshop on the CKM Unitarity Triangle* (2019) arXiv:1901.06380 [hep-ex].
- [85] S. Shivashankara, W. Wu, and A. Datta, $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c \tau \bar{\nu}_\tau$ Decay in the Standard Model and with New Physics, *Phys. Rev. D* **91**, 115003 (2015), [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.D* 109, 119904 (2024)], arXiv:1502.07230 [hep-ph].
- [86] W. Detmold, C. Lehner, and S. Meinel, $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p \ell^- \bar{\nu}_\ell$ and $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c \ell^- \bar{\nu}_\ell$ form factors from lattice QCD with relativistic heavy quarks, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 034503 (2015), arXiv:1503.01421 [hep-lat].
- [87] A. Datta, S. Kamali, S. Meinel, and A. Rashed, Phenomenology of $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c \tau \bar{\nu}_\tau$ using lattice QCD calculations, *JHEP* **08**, 131, arXiv:1702.02243 [hep-ph].
- [88] C. Murgui, A. Peñuelas, M. Jung, and A. Pich, Global fit to $b \rightarrow c \tau \nu$ transitions, *JHEP* **09**, 103, arXiv:1904.09311 [hep-ph].
- [89] M. Fedele, M. Blanke, A. Crivellin, S. Iguro, T. Kitahara, U. Nierste, and R. Watanabe, Impact of $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c \tau \nu$ measurement on new physics in $b \rightarrow c \ell \nu$ transitions, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 055005 (2023), arXiv:2211.14172 [hep-ph].
- [90] F. U. Bernlochner, Z. Ligeti, D. J. Robinson, and W. L. Sutcliffe, New predictions for $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c$ semileptonic decays and tests of heavy quark symmetry, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, 202001 (2018), arXiv:1808.09464 [hep-ph].
- [91] F. U. Bernlochner, Z. Ligeti, D. J. Robinson, and W. L. Sutcliffe, Precise predictions for $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c$ semileptonic decays, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 055008 (2019), arXiv:1812.07593 [hep-ph].
- [92] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb), Observation of the decay $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ \tau^- \bar{\nu}_\tau$, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128**, 191803 (2022), arXiv:2201.03497 [hep-ex].
- [93] F. U. Bernlochner, Z. Ligeti, M. Papucci, and D. J. Robinson, Interpreting LHCb's $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c \tau \bar{\nu}$ measurement and puzzles in semileptonic Λ_b decays, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, L011502 (2023), arXiv:2206.11282 [hep-ph].
- [94] P. Athron, R. Martinez, and C. Sierra, B meson anomalies and large $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ in non-universal $U(1)'$ models, *JHEP* **02**, 121, arXiv:2308.13426 [hep-ph].
- [95] R. Bause, H. Gisbert, and G. Hiller, Implications of an enhanced $B \rightarrow K \nu \nu^-$ branching ratio, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 015006 (2024), arXiv:2309.00075 [hep-ph].

- [96] L. Allwicher, D. Becirevic, G. Piazza, S. Rosauero-Alcaraz, and O. Sumensari, Understanding the first measurement of $B(B \rightarrow K\nu\nu^-)$, *Phys. Lett. B* **848**, 138411 (2024), arXiv:2309.02246 [hep-ph].
- [97] T. Felkl, A. Giri, R. Mohanta, and M. A. Schmidt, When energy goes missing: new physics in $b \rightarrow s\nu\nu$ with sterile neutrinos, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83**, 1135 (2023), arXiv:2309.02940 [hep-ph].
- [98] H. K. Dreiner, J. Y. Günther, and Z. S. Wang, The Decay $B \rightarrow K\nu\bar{\nu}$ at Belle II and a Massless Bino in R-parity-violating Supersymmetry, (2023), arXiv:2309.03727 [hep-ph].
- [99] M. Abdughani and Y. Reyimuaji, Constraining light dark matter and mediator with $B^+ \rightarrow K^+\nu\bar{\nu}$ data, *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 055013 (2024), arXiv:2309.03706 [hep-ph].
- [100] X.-G. He, X.-D. Ma, and G. Valencia, Revisiting models that enhance $B^+ \rightarrow K^+\nu\bar{\nu}$ in light of the new Belle II measurement, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 075019 (2024), arXiv:2309.12741 [hep-ph].
- [101] A. Berezhnoy and D. Melikhov, $B \rightarrow K^*M_X$ vs $B \rightarrow KM_X$ as a probe of a scalar-mediator dark matter scenario, *EPL* **145**, 14001 (2024), arXiv:2309.17191 [hep-ph].
- [102] A. Datta, D. Marfatia, and L. Mukherjee, $B \rightarrow K\nu\nu^-$, MiniBooNE and muon $g-2$ anomalies from a dark sector, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, L031701 (2024), arXiv:2310.15136 [hep-ph].
- [103] W. Altmannshofer, A. Crivellin, H. Haigh, G. Inguglia, and J. Martin Camalich, Light new physics in $B \rightarrow K^*\nu\bar{\nu}$?, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 075008 (2024), arXiv:2311.14629 [hep-ph].
- [104] D. McKeen, J. N. Ng, and D. Tucker, Higgs portal interpretation of the Belle II $B^+ \rightarrow K^+\nu\bar{\nu}$ measurement, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 075006 (2024), arXiv:2312.00982 [hep-ph].
- [105] K. Fridell, M. Ghosh, T. Okui, and K. Tobioka, Decoding the $B \rightarrow K\nu\nu$ excess at Belle II: Kinematics, operators, and masses, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 115006 (2024), arXiv:2312.12507 [hep-ph].
- [106] S.-Y. Ho, J. Kim, and P. Ko, Recent $B^+ \rightarrow K^+\nu\bar{\nu}$ Excess and Muon $g-2$ Illuminating Light Dark Sector with Higgs Portal, (2024), arXiv:2401.10112 [hep-ph].
- [107] E. Gabrielli, L. Marzola, K. Mürsepp, and M. Raidal, Explaining the $B^+ \rightarrow K^+\nu\bar{\nu}$ excess via a massless dark photon, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **84**, 460 (2024), arXiv:2402.05901 [hep-ph].
- [108] T. Li, Z. Qian, M. A. Schmidt, and M. Yuan, The quark flavor-violating ALPs in light of B mesons and hadron colliders, *JHEP* **05**, 232, arXiv:2402.14232 [hep-ph].
- [109] B.-F. Hou, X.-Q. Li, M. Shen, Y.-D. Yang, and X.-B. Yuan, Deciphering the Belle II data on $B \rightarrow K\nu\bar{\nu}$ decay in the (dark) SMEFT with minimal flavour violation, *JHEP* **06**, 172, arXiv:2402.19208 [hep-ph].

- [110] X.-G. He, X.-D. Ma, M. A. Schmidt, G. Valencia, and R. R. Volkas, Scalar dark matter explanation of the excess in the Belle II $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ +$ invisible measurement, *JHEP* **07**, 168, arXiv:2403.12485 [hep-ph].
- [111] P. D. Bolton, S. Fajfer, J. F. Kamenik, and M. Novoa-Brunet, Signatures of light new particles in $B \rightarrow K^{(*)} \text{Emiss}$, *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 055001 (2024), arXiv:2403.13887 [hep-ph].
- [112] D. Marzocca, M. Nardecchia, A. Stanzione, and C. Toni, Implications of $B \rightarrow K \nu \bar{\nu}$ under Rank-One Flavor Violation hypothesis, (2024), arXiv:2404.06533 [hep-ph].
- [113] M. Aghaie, G. Armando, A. Conaci, A. Dondarini, P. Matak, P. Panci, Z. Sinska, and R. Ziegler, Axion dark matter from heavy quarks, *Phys. Lett. B* **856**, 138923 (2024), arXiv:2404.12199 [hep-ph].
- [114] S. Rosauero-Alcaraz and L. P. S. Leal, Disentangling left and right-handed neutrino effects in $B \rightarrow K^{(*)} \nu \nu$, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **84**, 795 (2024), arXiv:2404.17440 [hep-ph].
- [115] J. F. Eguren, S. Klingel, E. Stamou, M. Tabet, and R. Ziegler, Flavor phenomenology of light dark vectors, *JHEP* **08**, 111, arXiv:2405.00108 [hep-ph].
- [116] A. J. Buras, J. Harz, and M. A. Mojahed, Disentangling new physics in $K \rightarrow \pi \nu \bar{\nu}$ and $B \rightarrow K (K^*) \nu \bar{\nu}$ observables, *JHEP* **10**, 087, arXiv:2405.06742 [hep-ph].
- [117] C. Hati, J. Leite, N. Nath, and J. W. F. Valle, The QCD axion, colour-mediated neutrino masses, and $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ + E_{\text{miss}}$ anomaly, (2024), arXiv:2408.00060 [hep-ph].
- [118] Z. S. Wang, Y. Zhang, and W. Liu, Long-lived sterile neutrinos from an axionlike particle at Belle II, (2024), arXiv:2410.00491 [hep-ph].
- [119] A. J. Buras, J. Girrbach-Noe, C. Niehoff, and D. M. Straub, $B \rightarrow K^{(*)} \nu \bar{\nu}$ decays in the Standard Model and beyond, *JHEP* **02**, 184, arXiv:1409.4557 [hep-ph].
- [120] G. Buchalla and A. J. Buras, QCD corrections to rare K and B decays for arbitrary top quark mass, *Nucl. Phys. B* **400**, 225 (1993).
- [121] M. Misiak and J. Urban, QCD corrections to FCNC decays mediated by Z penguins and W boxes, *Phys. Lett. B* **451**, 161 (1999), arXiv:hep-ph/9901278.
- [122] G. Buchalla and A. J. Buras, The rare decays $K \rightarrow \pi \nu \bar{\nu}$, $B \rightarrow X \nu \bar{\nu}$ and $B \rightarrow l^+ l^-$: An Update, *Nucl. Phys. B* **548**, 309 (1999), arXiv:hep-ph/9901288.
- [123] J. Brod, M. Gorbahn, and E. Stamou, Two-Loop Electroweak Corrections for the $K \rightarrow \pi \nu \bar{\nu}$ Decays, *Phys. Rev. D* **83**, 034030 (2011), arXiv:1009.0947 [hep-ph].