

# Final-state rescattering mechanism of bottom-baryon decays

Zhu-Ding Duan,<sup>\*1</sup> Jian-Peng Wang<sup>†2</sup>, Run-Hui Li<sup>‡1</sup>, Cai-Dian Lü<sup>§3,4</sup>, and Fu-Sheng Yu<sup>¶2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Center for Quantum Physics and Technologies, School of Physical Science and Technology, Inner Mongolia University, Hohhot 010021, China*

<sup>2</sup>*Frontiers Science Center for Rare Isotopes, and School of Nuclear Science and Technology, Lanzhou University, Lanzhou 730000, China*

<sup>3</sup>*Institute of High Energy Physics, CAS, P.O. Box 918(4) Beijing 100049, China*

<sup>4</sup>*School of Physical Sciences, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China*

December 31, 2024

## Abstract

We perform an analysis on the non-leptonic two-body weak decays of  $\Lambda_b^0$  within the framework of the final-state rescattering mechanism. The strong phases can be obtained by realizing complete hadronic triangle loop integrations. Then the CP violation and decay asymmetry parameters can be predicted. In this work, we focus on the exclusive decays of  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p\pi^-/K^-/\rho^-/K^{*-}$  and  $\Lambda\phi$  and achieve numerical predictions for many observables, including branching ratios, direct and partial-wave CP asymmetries, and decay asymmetry parameters. The results are very consistent with the current data, showing the validity of the final-state rescattering mechanism for  $b$ -baryon decays. It is therefore expected to be applied to predict CP asymmetries in many other channels of  $b$ -baryon decays.

---

\*Email: 32246002@mail.imu.edu.cn

†Email: wangjp20@lzu.edu.cn, corresponding author

‡Email: lrh@imu.edu.cn, corresponding author

§Email: lucd@ihep.ac.cn

¶Email: yufsh@lzu.edu.cn, corresponding author

# 1 Introduction

The principal motivation of studying the weak decays of bottom hadrons, in the context of heavy flavor physics, is that it can provide an ideal platform to extract the quark-mixing Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) matrix elements, explore various aspects of methods and models on strong dynamics developed in the past decades. Furthermore, it can be used to test the Standard Model (SM) and search for signals of new physics from an aspect of accuracy.  $CP$  violation ( $CPV$ ), implemented through an unique irreducible phase in the CKM matrix of SM [1, 2], is essential when one wants to understand the dynamical origin of baryon anti-baryon asymmetry observed in the universe [3], and also sensitive to the strong phases whose theoretical values are usually model-dependent. Therefore, how to make reliable calculations on strong interaction dynamics is very important.  $CPV$ s have been well established in experiments in the past two decades for the  $B, D, K$  meson decays, however, not yet in any baryon decay [4]. Inspired and encouraged by the successful  $CPV$  research in  $B$  meson charmless decays [4], physicists believe that it is worth paying attentions and efforts to  $b$ -baryon hadronic decays and especially the  $CP$  asymmetries that may exist in these decays. The investigations on  $b$ -baryon weak decays will reveal rich dynamical information of baryon exclusive decays, some of which may be quite different from those of mesonic systems. The theoretical frameworks of baryon decays are expected to be more complicated than those of meson decays since each baryon has three valence quarks. Additionally, the non-zero spin of the baryons brings in opportunities to analyze the helicity structures of effective Hamiltonian and some observables, and construct more triple products observables as well [15–21]. As an distinctive example, the possible cancellation between  $S$  and  $P$  wave  $CP$  asymmetries in  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p\pi^-$  and  $pK^-$  which is firstly discovered in Ref. [5] and also confirmed in this work. Meanwhile, there are some tensions in  $B$  decays [6–14], which might indicate the existence of new physics. It is necessary and meaningful to check these phenomena in  $b$ -baryon systems.

More and more bottom baryons are generated at the Large Hadron Collider (LHC), and several  $\Lambda_b^0$  charmless non-leptonic decays are observed [21–26]. It is anticipated that more precise investigations, especially the first confirmation of  $CP$  violation in the baryon decays, can be performed. Analogous to  $B \rightarrow \pi\pi$  and  $K\pi$  decays, whose  $CPV$ s are caused by the interference of amplitudes with different weak and strong phases,  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p\pi^-$  and  $pK^-$  are highly promised to search for baryon  $CPV$ , and the associated experimental observation has been performed within uncertainty of the order 1% [23]. Nevertheless, it is not enough to lead to a definite confirmation of baryon  $CPV$ , which is out of expectation from trivial extension of  $B$  meson experience.

In recent years, in order to observe the  $CPV$  in baryon system, experimentalists checked a lot of exclusive  $b$ - baryon multibody decays, such as  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow pK\pi\pi, pK\bar{K}K, p\pi\pi\pi\dots$ . An evidence with the

confidence level of  $3.3\sigma$  gained in  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p\pi\pi\pi$  decay inspires largely the interests on these decays in theoretical studies [27–30]. Many phenomenological methods are proposed, such as complete angular distribution analysis with polarization,  $T$ -odd triple product correlations, and possible observation of  $CPV$  from interference among different intermediate resonances appearing in some decays [16, 18, 20, 31–33]. However, the absence of definitive dynamical predictions brings in a lot of controversies for these phenomenological opinions. The discovery of large  $CP$  asymmetry in  $B \rightarrow \pi\pi\pi$  decay [34–39] indicates that one can investigate  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p\pi\pi^-/K^-, p2\pi\pi^-/K^-$  decays by employing the experimental data of low energy  $N\pi$  scatterings to reduce theoretical uncertainties [40]. Unfortunately, because of the lack of experimental data, a theoretical approach based on dynamical calculation is still required in order to make the  $CPV$  predictions for multibody  $\Lambda_b^0$  decays.

On the theoretical side, many advances have been made in both semi-leptonic and non-leptonic decays. The main task in calculation of the semi-leptonic decays is the determination of heavy to light form factors, which are non-perturbative and extensively studied with various QCD approaches and quark models such as Lattice QCD [41], QCD sum rules [42–44], light cone QCD sum rules (LCSR) [45–49], perturbative QCD approach (PQCD) [50–52], soft-collinear effective theory (SCET) [53], light front quark model (LFQM) [54], non-relativistic quark model [55], and MIT bag model [56]. It is interesting that high twist contributions are dominating in  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda, p$  transition form factors, which challenges the naive power counting of SCET [50, 53]. It implies that the QCD dynamics is indeed different between baryonic and mesonic systems, and that the power suppression of  $1/m_b$  is not strictly respected. As stressed in Ref. [50], the leading power diagrams with two hard collinear gluons exchanging are largely suppressed by  $O(\alpha_s^2)$  due to the fact that a baryon contains three valence quarks. Therefore, it is necessary to develop an insightful and comprehensive treatment on  $b$ -baryon non-leptonic decays in order to further improve our understandings.

The QCD dynamics in baryon non-leptonic decays are very complicated and laborious to calculate, and various methods are developed in order to finish this task. Compared with the case of meson decays, the non-factorizable contribution and charm penguin are involved more frequently in the baryon decays. Although they are expected to be suppressed [57–61], their effects are proven to be critical in the  $B$  meson  $CPV$  and can not be simply neglected [62–64]. Hence, it is definitely required to well estimate these contributions for reliable predictions about  $\Lambda_b^0$  decays. A theoretical approach of QCD factorization based on collinear factorization [54] is developed to study the  $b$ -baryon hadronic decays, while its approximation under the diquark hypothesis encounters serious challenges and need to be further tested in charmless  $\Lambda_b^0$  decays. There are also some research on relations between decay rates and  $CP$  asymmetries with the  $SU(3)$  flavor symmetry [65–67]. Generalised factorization approach is employed to make some

predictions for  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p\pi^-/K^-/\rho^-/K^{*-}$  and  $\Lambda\phi/\eta$  decays, where the NLO improved effective Hamiltonian and color parameter  $N_c$  is used to incorporate the possible non-factorizable contributions [68–70]. In [59], many Cabibbo-allowed two-body hadronic weak decays of bottom baryons are analyzed within the naive factorization approach by using form factors under nonrelativistic quark model. PQCD is used to calculate  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p\pi^-/K^-$  in Ref. [51] and improved in Ref. [5] by adding the high twist contributions. It is well known that a complete prediction based on the factorization schemes requires some non-perturbative inputs, such as the light cone distribution amplitudes (LCDAs) of hadrons whose determination with the first principle calculation of QCD is full of challenges. Particularly, the multibody  $\Lambda_b^0$  decays are always calculated in quasi two body picture and many intermediate resonances like  $N^*(1520)$ ,  $\Delta$ ,  $\Lambda(1520)$ ... need to be included. Precise predictions are hard to made because of the limited knowledge about related LCDAs. However, it is these multibody decays that have remarkable potential in probing  $b$ -baryon  $CPVs$ .

The important role of final state interactions (FSIs) are easily accepted in hadronic charm decays due to the relatively small energy release and the fact that there exist many resonances nearby this energy scale [72–82]. In bottom charmless decays the conventional viewpoint is that FSIs are expected to play a mirror role due to the large energy release. Nevertheless, in the non-leptonic  $B$  meson decays [83] it is indicated that soft FSIs might have some essential effects. Meanwhile, the FSIs in baryon system also worth to be investigated. We would like to talk more about the final states rescattering method as follows. **(i)** It provides a systematical approach to collect the non-factorizable contributions from  $W$  internal emission, exchanging and charm penguin diagrams by calculating the long distance amplitudes at hadron level [83, 84]. It has been shown that these contributions may play an indispensable role in illustrating  $B$  mesonic  $CPV$ , although some certain model dependencies are introduced in the treatment of strong interactions [83]. Nevertheless, the dependence of parameters could be significantly cancelled in the direct  $CP$  asymmetries, asymmetry parameters and ratios of branching fractions of charm baryon decays [77, 78, 82]. As a result these predictions are not so sensitive to the phenomenological parameters. **(ii)** It provides a natural picture for compound  $CPV$  [83] where the strong phases originate from hadronic scatterings. It is different from that of quark anti-quark loop contributions in QCD factorization called BSS mechanism [85]. This statement can be easily verified through referring the discussions based on optical theorem. Hence the presence of FSIs can have an interesting impact on the direct  $CP$  violation phenomenology [83]. **(iii)** It provides an effective way for calculating multibody decays of baryons by including quasi-two-body intermediate subprocesses where resonance states are involved. In this calculation, the short distance naive factorization amplitudes are combined with the long distance hadronic loop integrals in form of heavy to light form factors and effective strong couplings, fortunately, which are studied extensively [86–98]. **(iv)** It can be improved step by step in future by imposing more and

more precise inputs of high excited states at hadron level. Another point we want to stress is that the parameters determined in this work are expected to be applied in the other  $b$ -baryon charmless decays since it is protected under some approximate symmetries such as heavy quark symmetry and flavor  $SU(3)$  symmetry. It means that more predictions can be made after we show it's validity here.

In this work, we employ the FSIs with loop mechanism to study five representative charmless decays of  $\Lambda_b^0$ . We show that this approach works well in  $b$ -baryon decays. Firstly we fix two parameters with the help of experimental data of  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p\pi^-, pK^-$ , and make predictions for the other observables. Our method to study  $b$ -baryon decays in this work can be applied to calculation of more decays. In section II, the theoretical framework is introduced, including the introduction of effective Hamiltonian, topological diagrams of baryon weak decays, short distance contributions described by the naive factorization hypothesis, long distance dynamics estimated using FSIs. Our fundamental inputs and numerical results are listed and discussed in section III. We investigate the helicity amplitudes, branching ratios, the direct CP asymmetries and asymmetry parameters. The complex formulations are collected in the appendixes. The effective Lagrangian and some cumbersome formula such as loop amplitudes are listed in the Appendix A,B, and C.

## 2 Theoretical framework

In this section, we will give a concise introduction to the essential points used in our work including effective weak Hamiltonian, quark topological diagrams, naive factorization estimation of short distance amplitude, and rescattering picture for long distance strong dynamics.

### 2.1 Effective Hamiltonian and topological diagrams

There are three separated energy scales in the heavy  $b$ -baryon decays, i.e.,  $m_W \gg m_b \gg \Lambda_{QCD}$ , and an efficient and conventional idea is effective field theory by integrating out some heavy degrees of freedom, and then performing local operator product expansion to get a series of local composite operators. After this, all high energy information above scale  $m_b$  are integrated into Wilson coefficients which is independent from specific external states, and therefore can be determined perturbatively order by order through matching at quark level. The weak effective Hamiltonian for  $b \rightarrow u$  transition is given by

$$\mathcal{H}_{eff} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \left\{ V_{ub}V_{uq}^* [C_1(\mu)\mathcal{O}_1^u(\mu) + C_2(\mu)\mathcal{O}_2^u(\mu)] - V_{tb}V_{tq}^* \left[ \sum_{i=3}^{10} C_i(\mu)\mathcal{O}_i(\mu) \right] \right\} + \text{H.c.} \quad (2.1)$$

where  $q = d, s$ . The  $C_i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, 10$ ) are Wilson coefficients given at renormalization scale  $\mu$  and  $\mathcal{O}_i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, 10$ ) are four quark composite operators [51]. We exclusively list them below:

- Current-Current tree operators

$$\begin{aligned} O_1^u &= (\bar{u}_\alpha b_\alpha)_{V-A} (\bar{q}_\beta u_\beta)_{V-A}, \\ O_2^u &= (\bar{u}_\alpha b_\beta)_{V-A} (\bar{q}_\beta u_\alpha)_{V-A}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

- QCD penguin operators

$$\begin{aligned} O_3 &= (\bar{q}_\alpha b_\alpha)_{V-A} \sum_{q'} (\bar{q}'_\beta q'_\beta)_{V-A}, \\ O_4 &= (\bar{q}_\beta b_\alpha)_{V-A} \sum_{q'} (\bar{q}'_\alpha q'_\beta)_{V-A}, \\ O_5 &= (\bar{q}_\alpha b_\alpha)_{V-A} \sum_{q'} (\bar{q}'_\beta q'_\beta)_{V+A}, \\ O_6 &= (\bar{q}_\beta b_\alpha)_{V-A} \sum_{q'} (\bar{q}'_\alpha q'_\beta)_{V+A}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

- Electroweak penguin operators

$$\begin{aligned} O_7 &= \frac{3}{2} (\bar{q}_\alpha b_\alpha)_{V-A} \sum_{q'} e_{q'} (\bar{q}'_\beta q'_\beta)_{V+A}, \\ O_8 &= \frac{3}{2} (\bar{q}_\beta b_\alpha)_{V-A} \sum_{q'} e_{q'} (\bar{q}'_\alpha q'_\beta)_{V+A}, \\ O_9 &= \frac{3}{2} (\bar{q}_\alpha b_\alpha)_{V-A} \sum_{q'} e_{q'} (\bar{q}'_\beta q'_\beta)_{V-A}, \\ O_{10} &= \frac{3}{2} (\bar{q}_\beta b_\alpha)_{V-A} \sum_{q'} e_{q'} (\bar{q}'_\alpha q'_\beta)_{V-A}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

where  $\alpha, \beta$  are color indices and  $q' = (u, d, s, c, b)$  are active quark field in  $m_b$  scale. The corresponding left and right handed currents are defined by  $(\bar{q}_\alpha b_\alpha)_{V-A} = \bar{q}_\alpha \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) b_\alpha$  and  $(\bar{q}_\alpha b_\alpha)_{V+A} = \bar{q}_\alpha \gamma_\mu (1 + \gamma_5) b_\alpha$ , respectively. It is more convenient to define some combinations of Wilson coefficients for the phenomenological applications as following [54]

$$\begin{aligned} a_i &= C_i + \frac{1}{N_c} C_{i+1}, \quad (i = 1, 3, 5, 7, 9), \\ a_i &= C_i + \frac{1}{N_c} C_{i-1}, \quad (i = 2, 4, 6, 8, 10). \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

The theoretical realization of non-leptonic hadron decays is to calculate the matrix element of these local effective operators with some definite external states, and the topological diagrams are viewed as an intuitive representation of these elements that involve all possible strong dynamics including both perturbative and non-perturbative parts [83]. As depicted in Fig.1, we introduce all possible topological diagrams of  $\Lambda_b^0$  decays which are sorted according to the typologies of weak vertex. Specifically, they are

- $T$ : color-allowed diagram with external  $W$ -emission.




Figure 1: The topological diagrams for two body hadronic decays of  $\Lambda_b^0$  baryon, where the first two rows are tree diagrams and the third row are penguin type diagrams.

- $C$  and  $C'$ : color-suppressed internal  $W$ -emission diagrams, where the difference between them is that the quark generated from bottom quark weak decay flows into the final-state meson ( $C$ ) or baryon ( $C'$ ).
- $E_1$ ,  $E_2$  and  $B$ : three distinct types of  $W$ -exchange diagrams, distinguished by the flow of quarks produced from the weak vertex.
- $P$  and  $P'$ : two types of diagrams with penguin operators.

Although the topological diagrams are classified by the structure of weak operators, they also involve all the strong interaction dynamics of both perturbative and nonperturbative. The  $T$  amplitude can be effectively estimated using the naive factorization approach, under which it can be expressed as the product of baryon weak transition form factors and meson decay constants. Under the naive factorization,  $W$  internal emission  $C$  and exchanging  $E$  are expected to be largely suppressed in  $B$  mesonic decays

by the small Wilson coefficient  $a_2$ , and thus are insufficient to explain the experimental data for  $C, E$  dominated processes [83]. Meanwhile, the extraction of amplitudes ratios  $C/T$  and  $E/T$  in  $B$  meson decays from the experiment data indicated that non-factorizable long-distance contributions of them play a significant role [83]. The calculation of  $B$  decays in QCDF implies  $a_2 \approx 0.2$  by taking the hard spectator contribution into account, and hence gain a large enhancement compared to naive estimation [99]. The power counting rules derived from the soft-collinear effective theory give the ratios among the different topological diagrams as  $\frac{|C|}{|T|} \sim \frac{|C'|}{|C|} \sim \frac{|E_1|}{|C|} \sim \frac{|E_2|}{|C|} \sim \frac{|B|}{|C|} \sim \mathcal{O}(\frac{\Lambda_{QCD}}{m_b})$ , which implies the contributions from  $C, E$  diagrams can be ignored in  $b$ -decays [57, 58]. With these counting rules one can safely obtain an estimation for the branching ratios without worrying about the non-factorizable contributions. However, when one studies the baryonic  $CPV$ , their effects become very critical and should be calculated reliably. In this work we reach this goal by considering long distance FSIs effects.

## 2.2 Short distance contributions under the factorization hypothesis

In this subsection, we will give a concise introduction to the naive factorization approach for estimating the short distance contributions of  $T, C, P$ . The decay amplitudes of  $\mathcal{B}_b \rightarrow \mathcal{B}M$  is generally given using matrix elements of effective operators

$$\langle \mathcal{B}M | \mathcal{H}_{eff} | \mathcal{B}_b \rangle = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{CKM} \sum_i C_i \langle \mathcal{B}M | \mathcal{O}_i | \mathcal{B}_b \rangle. \quad (2.6)$$

With the naive factorization, the associated amplitudes can be expressed as the product of two parts: the decay constant of meson  $M$  and heavy to light baryonic form factors. We take  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p\pi^-$  and  $p\rho^-$  as examples. The general form of their amplitudes are classified into  $\mathcal{B}_b(p_i) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(p_f)P$  and  $\mathcal{B}_b(p_i) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(p_f)V$  respectively, which can be parameterized as [100, 101]

$$\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{B}_b(p_i) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(p_f)P) = \bar{u}(p_f) [A + B\gamma_5] u(p_i), \quad (2.7)$$

and

$$\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{B}_b(p_i) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(p_f)V) = \bar{u}(p_f) \left[ A_1 \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 + A_2 \frac{P_{f,\mu}}{M_i} \gamma_5 + B_1 \gamma_\mu + B_2 \frac{P_{f,\mu}}{M_i} \right] \epsilon^{*\mu} u(p_i), \quad (2.8)$$

where  $u(p_f), u(p_i)$  are the Dirac spinors of initial  $\mathcal{B}_b(p_i)$  and final  $\mathcal{B}(p_f)$ ;  $\epsilon^\mu$  is the polarization vector of final vector meson  $V$ .  $A$  is  $S$  wave with parity violating and  $B$  is  $P$  wave with parity conserving, respectively. Next, we want to evaluate the matrix elements  $\langle \mathcal{B}M | \mathcal{O}_i | \mathcal{B}_b \rangle$  in Eq.(2.6) under the factorization approximation where Fierz transformation is used to match the flavor quantum number of current to those of associated hadrons. The insertion of current-current tree operators  $\mathcal{O}_{1,2}$  in Eq.(2.6) is easy to be evaluated as

$$\langle \mathcal{B}M | (C_1 \mathcal{O}_1 + C_2 \mathcal{O}_2) | \mathcal{B}_b \rangle_{T(C)} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{ub} V_{uq}^* a_{1(2)}(\mu) \langle M | \bar{q} \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) u | 0 \rangle \times \langle \mathcal{B} | \bar{u} \gamma^\mu (1 - \gamma_5) b | \mathcal{B}_b \rangle, \quad (2.9)$$

where we take  $\mu = m_b$  and the effective Wilson coefficients  $a_i$  can be found in Ref. [51]. The derivations of QCD as well as electroweak penguin operators  $O_{5,6,7,8}$  additionally require the application of equation of motion of quark field. For simplicity, we take  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p\pi^-$  with the insertion of  $O_5, O_6$  as an example,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle p\pi^- | (C_5 O_5 + C_6 O_6) | \Lambda_b^0 \rangle &= \langle p\pi^- | [C_5 (\bar{d}_\alpha b_\alpha)_{V-A} (\bar{u}_\beta u_\beta)_{V+A} + C_6 (\bar{d}_\beta b_\alpha)_{V-A} (\bar{u}_\alpha u_\beta)_{V+A}] | \Lambda_b^0 \rangle \\ &= \left( \frac{1}{N_c} C_5 + C_6 \right) R_\pi \langle \pi^- | \bar{d} \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) u | 0 \rangle \times \langle p | \bar{u} \gamma^\mu (1 - \gamma_5) b | \mathcal{B}_b \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

with  $R_\pi = \frac{2m_\pi}{m_b(m_u+m_d)}$  usually called chiral enhancement factor. In the above Eq.(2.9) and Eq.(2.10), the first matrix element is parameterised as meson decay constant

$$\langle P(q) | \bar{q} \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) u | 0 \rangle = i f_P q_\mu, \quad (2.11)$$

$$\langle V(q, \epsilon) | \bar{q} \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) u | 0 \rangle = m_V f_V \epsilon_\mu^*, \quad (2.12)$$

where  $P, V$  are pseudo-scalar and vector meson, respectively; The second one gives the definition of six heavy to light form factors [102]

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{B}(p_f) | \bar{u} \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) b | \mathcal{B}_b(p_i) \rangle &= \bar{u}_{\mathcal{B}}(p_f) \left[ f_1(q^2) \gamma_\mu + i \frac{\sigma_{\mu\nu} q^\nu}{M_i} f_2(q^2) + \frac{q_\mu}{M_i} f_3(q^2) \right] u_{\mathcal{B}_b}(p_i), \\ &- \bar{u}_{\mathcal{B}}(p_f) \left[ g_1(q^2) \gamma_\mu + i \frac{\sigma_{\mu\nu} q^\nu}{M_i} g_2(q^2) + \frac{q_\mu}{M_i} g_3(q^2) \right] u_{\mathcal{B}_b}(p_i), \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

where  $q = p_i - p_f$ . The heavy to light form factors have been evaluated extensively in various QCD methods and models as mentioned in the previous section. In our work, we will use the results from Ref. [54], where the form factors for  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p, n, \Lambda_c^+, \Lambda$  that are used in this work are derived under a uniform model. Combining Eqs. (2.11), (2.12), and (2.13), one gets

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \lambda f_P (M_i - M_f) f_1(q^2) \\ B &= \lambda f_P (M_i + M_f) g_1(q^2) \\ A_1 &= -\lambda m_V f_V \left[ g_1(q^2) + \frac{M_i - M_f}{M_i} g_2(q^2) \right] \\ B_1 &= \lambda m_V f_V \left[ f_1(q^2) - \frac{M_i + M_f}{M_i} f_2(q^2) \right] \\ A_2 &= -2\lambda m_V f_V f_2(q^2) \\ B_2 &= 2\lambda m_V f_V g_2(q^2) \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

where  $M_i, M_f$  are masses of initial and final state baryons, respectively. The  $\lambda$  functions are process dependent, and their values for  $p\pi^-, p\rho^-$  decay channels are given as

- For  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p\pi^-$

– A term:

$$\lambda = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} [V_{ub} V_{ud}^* a_1 - V_{tb} V_{td}^* (a_4 + a_{10} + R_\pi (a_6 + a_8))] \quad (2.15)$$




Figure 2: The long distance re-scattering contributions of  $\Lambda_b^0$  decays at hadron level under single particle exchange approximation, where the  $B_b, B_c, B_8, B_{10}$  denote bottom, charm, octet and decuplet baryons, and  $P, V, D, D^*$  are pseudo-scalar octet and vector,  $D$  and  $D^*$  mesons, respectively.

– B term:

$$\lambda = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} [V_{ub}V_{ud}^*a_1 - V_{tb}V_{td}^*(a_4 + a_{10} - R_\pi(a_6 + a_8))] . \quad (2.16)$$

• For  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p\rho^-$

$$\lambda = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} [V_{ub}V_{ud}^*a_1 - V_{tb}V_{td}^*(a_4 + a_{10})] . \quad (2.17)$$

The results for the other decays are also derived and collected in Ref. [54]. The short-distance amplitudes are also essential in understanding the long-distance contributions, as can be seen in the following discussion.

### 2.3 Long-distance contributions with the re-scattering mechanism

The non-factorization contributions of color-suppressed  $C$  and  $W$ -exchange  $E$  topology graphs, which accounts for the relative strong phases, are important for predicting  $CP$  asymmetries. Final-state re-scatterings provide a natural physical picture for the long-distance contributions in heavy hadron decays. Wolfenstein and Suzuki proposed a formalism for final-state interactions at the hadron level, based on  $CPT$  invariance and unitarity [103, 104]. A comprehensive study was performed on  $B$ -meson two-body decays to examine the  $B$  decay rates and their impacts on direct  $CP$  asymmetries by incorporating FSIs effects [83]. Employing time evolution picture of scatterings, the short-distance interactions occur rapidly and violently at the beginning of weak decays, while the long-distance ones take place at a much later




Figure 3: The long distance contribution through a resonance propagation.

time. The full amplitude is expressed as [37]

$$\mathcal{A}(\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow f) = \sum_i \langle f | U(+\infty, \tau) | i \rangle \langle i | \mathcal{H}_{eff} | \Lambda_b^0 \rangle, \quad (2.18)$$

where  $\tau$  is a very short time interval characterising the weak decay scale. Calculated with naive factorization, the matrix element  $\langle i | \mathcal{H}_{eff} | \Lambda_b^0 \rangle$  is free from any strong phases. The re-scattering part  $\langle f | U(+\infty, \tau) | i \rangle$  introduces a complex amplitude with non-zero phase, just as  $\pi\pi \rightarrow KK$  inelastic scattering in the  $B$  meson three body decays [37]. It has been manifested that the final-state re-scatterings are very important for the  $CPV$  of three-body  $B$  meson decays and also for charmed meson decays.

Estimation of these non-factorization effects is challenging since they are non-perturbative in nature. Nevertheless, they can be calculated in a phenomenological way with the approximation of single particle exchanging picture at hadron level. Specifically, the strong scattering matrix element  $\langle f | U(+\infty, \tau) | i \rangle$  is treated as the re-scatterings of two intermediate hadrons following  $\Lambda_b^0$  weak decays. Under this mechanism, the long distance contributions of  $\Lambda_b^0$  two-body hadronic decays are described by triangle diagrams as depicted in Fig.2 and 3. In order to calculate these triangle diagrams, one need to combine the derivation of weak vertex treated as short distance amplitudes under the naive factorization and hadronic re-scatterings governed by the effective Lagrangian collected in Appendix A. The corresponding Feynman rules of strong vertex are obtained by inserting effective operators for definite initial and final

hadron states

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle P_8(p_3)D(k, \lambda_k) | i\mathcal{L} | D^*(p_1, \lambda_1) \rangle &= ig_{D^*DP_8} p_3^\mu \varepsilon_\mu(p_1, \lambda_1) \\
\langle P_8(p_3)D^*(k, \lambda_k) | i\mathcal{L} | D^*(p_1, \lambda_1) \rangle &= \frac{i}{2} g_{D^*D^*P_8} \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \varepsilon^{*\mu}(k, \lambda_k) \varepsilon^\beta(p_1, \lambda_1) p_3^\nu p_1^\alpha \\
\langle V(p_3, \lambda_3)D^*(k, \lambda_k) | i\mathcal{L} | D^*(p_1, \lambda_1) \rangle &= 2ig_{D^*D^*V} \varepsilon^{*\nu}(k, \lambda_k) \varepsilon_\nu(p_1, \lambda_1) k_\mu \varepsilon^{*\mu}(p_3, \lambda_3) \\
&\quad - 4if_{D^*D^*V} \varepsilon_\mu^*(k, \lambda_k) \left( p_3^\mu \varepsilon^{*\nu}(p_3, \lambda_3) - p_3^\nu \varepsilon^{*\mu}(p_3, \lambda_3) \right) \varepsilon_\nu(p_1, \lambda_1) \\
\langle V(p_3, \lambda_3)D^*(k, \lambda_k) | i\mathcal{L} | D(p_1) \rangle &= 2if_{D^*DV} \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \varepsilon^{*\nu}(p_3, \lambda_3) \varepsilon^{*\beta}(k, \lambda_k) p_3^\mu (k^\alpha + p_1^\alpha) \\
\langle V(p_3, \lambda_3)D(k) | i\mathcal{L} | D(p_1) \rangle &= -ig_{DDV} \varepsilon^{*\mu}(p_3, \lambda_3) (p_{1,\mu} + k_\mu),
\end{aligned} \tag{2.19}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle V(k, \lambda_k)P(p_2) | i\mathcal{L}_{VPP} | P(p_1) \rangle &= -ig_{VVP} \varepsilon^{*\mu}(k, \lambda_k) (p_1 + p_2)_\mu, \\
\langle \mathcal{B}_2(p_2)P(q) | i\mathcal{L}_{PBB} | \mathcal{B}_1(p_1) \rangle &= g_{BBP} \bar{u}(p_2) i\gamma_5 u(p_1), \\
\langle \mathcal{B}_2(p_2)V(q, \lambda_q) | i\mathcal{L}_{VBB} | \mathcal{B}_1(p_1) \rangle &= \bar{u}(p_2) \left[ f_1 \gamma_\nu + f_2 \frac{i}{m_1 + m_2} \sigma_{\mu\nu} q^\mu \right] \varepsilon^{*\nu}(q, \lambda_q) u(p_1), \\
\langle V(p_3, \lambda_3)V(k, \lambda_k) | i\mathcal{L}_{VVP} | P(p_1) \rangle &= -i \frac{g_{VVP}}{f_p} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} p_{3\mu} \varepsilon_\nu^*(\lambda_3, p_3) k_\alpha \varepsilon_\beta^*(k, \lambda_k), \\
\langle B(p_4, \lambda_4) | i\mathcal{L}_{VBD} | D(k, \lambda_k)V(p_1, \lambda_1) \rangle &= -i \frac{g_{\rho N \Delta}}{m_\rho} \bar{u}(p_4, \lambda_4) \gamma^5 \gamma^\nu u^\mu(k, \lambda_k) \\
&\quad \times [p_{1\mu} \varepsilon_\nu(p_1, \lambda_1) - p_{1\nu} \varepsilon_\mu(p_1, \lambda_1)], \\
\langle B(p_4, \lambda_4) | i\mathcal{L}_{VBD} | D(k, \lambda_k)P(p_1, \lambda_1) \rangle &= \frac{g_{\rho N \Delta}}{m_\pi} \bar{u}(p_4, \lambda_4) p_{1\mu} u^\mu(k, \lambda_k), \\
\langle V(p_3, \lambda_3)V(k, \lambda_k) | i\mathcal{L}_{VVV} | V(p_1, \lambda_1) \rangle &= -\frac{ig_{VVV}}{\sqrt{2}} \varepsilon_\mu(p_1, \lambda_1) \varepsilon^{*\mu}(p_3, \lambda_3) \varepsilon_\nu^*(k, \lambda_k) (p_3^\nu + p_1^\nu) \\
&\quad - \frac{ig_{VVV}}{\sqrt{2}} \varepsilon_\mu^*(k, \lambda_k) \varepsilon^\mu(p_1, \lambda_1) \varepsilon_\nu^*(p_3, \lambda_3) (-p_1^\nu - p_3^\nu) \\
&\quad - \frac{ig_{VVV}}{\sqrt{2}} \varepsilon_\mu^*(p_3, \lambda_3) \varepsilon^{*\mu}(k, \lambda_k) \varepsilon_\nu(p_1, \lambda_1) (p_3^\nu - p_1^\nu).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.20}$$

Then, one can get the analytical amplitudes of triangle diagrams by a loop integral with these weak and strong vertices as well as hadron propagators. Next, we use an example to illustrate our derivation and conventions of symbols. Considering the decay of  $\Lambda_b^0(p_i, \lambda_i) \rightarrow p(p_3, \lambda_3) \rho^-(p_4, \lambda_4)$ , with intermediate state particles  $B(p_2, \lambda_2)V(p_1)$  re-scattering by exchanging  $V(k, \lambda_k)$  as depicted in diagram (b) of Fig.2. Its final analytical amplitude is expressed as an integral of inner momentum  $k$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}[P_8, B_8; V] &= \int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{4g_{P_8VV}}{f_{P_8}} \bar{u}(p_4, \lambda_4) (f_{1VB_8B_8} \gamma_\delta - \frac{if_{2VB_8B_8}}{m_2 + m_4} \sigma_{\rho\delta} k^\rho) (p_2 + m_2)(A + B\gamma_5) u(p_i, \lambda_i) \\
&\quad \times \left( -g^{\delta\nu} + \frac{k^\delta k^\nu}{m_k^2} \right) \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \varepsilon_\beta^*(p_3, \lambda_3) k_\mu p_{3\alpha} \cdot \frac{\mathcal{F}}{(p_1^2 - m_1^2 + i\varepsilon)(p_2^2 - m_2^2 + i\varepsilon)(k^2 - m_k^2 + i\varepsilon)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.22}$$

We use the label  $\mathcal{M}[P_8, B_8; V]$  to represent the amplitude of the scattering of an octet pseudoscalar meson ( $P_8$ ) and an octet baryon ( $B_8$ ) by exchanging a vector meson  $V$ . In App.B, expressions of all the triangle amplitudes used in this work are reorganized exclusively. The form factor  $\mathcal{F}$  is introduced to take care of the off-shell and sub-structure effects of exchanged particles, and meanwhile regularize the potential UV divergence in the loop integral. Here, we adopt the following model [105]

$$\mathcal{F}(\Lambda, m_k) = \frac{\Lambda^4}{(k^2 - m_k^2)^2 + \Lambda^4}, \quad (2.23)$$

where the model parameter  $\Lambda$  is introduced as  $\eta$  in the conventional treatment of FSIs. In recent work on charm baryon decays, many  $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow BV$  decaying channels are predicted and interpreted by employing one model parameter  $\eta$  [82]. This is because all re-scattering and final state particles are light and located nearly on the same energy scale. Therefore, they can be connected with each other under  $SU(3)$  flavor symmetry. For  $b$ -baryon decays, it is however not a sensible prescription, as the charmed hadronic rescatterings associated with charm loop effects have to be taken into account for a reasonable treatment of  $CP$  asymmetries. It makes sense that the regularization parameters  $\Lambda$  are not universal in scatterings of light particles like  $p\pi^- \rightarrow p\pi^-$  and the scatterings of charmed heavy particles like  $\Lambda_c^+ D^- \rightarrow p\pi^-$ . Hence, we employ two different parameters, namely  $\Lambda_{\text{charmless}}$  and  $\Lambda_{\text{charm}}$ , to characterize these two distinct scattering modes. Both parameters will be determined by imposing the experimental data of branching ratios and  $CP$  asymmetries of  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p\pi^-$  and  $pK^-$ . We make some key points clear as follows.

- In principle, the whole amplitudes  $\mathcal{A}(\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow f)$  in the Eq.(2.18) should be treated by reorganizing contributions from all symmetry allowed intermediate states as required by unitarity. However, it is full of challenge to incorporate multibody hadronic scatterings since they are very complicated and in general not under theoretical control. Hence, we firstly assume it is prominent by  $2 \rightarrow 2$  processes, and thus view this treatment as a working tool as in [83]. We work out the consequences of this tool to see if it is empirically working.
- The regulator form factor in Eq.(2.23) is free from potential poles, and thus the imaginary part of amplitudes in our calculation is completely induced by physical states in loops according to Cutkosky's rule [106]. There is hence no unphysical strong phases involved under this regulator.
- In our work, the bubble contribution, as depicted in Fig.(3), will be ignored since it is expected to be suppressed relative to that arising from triangle diagrams due to the lack of resonances near the threshold of the  $b$ -baryon mass, although it plays an important role in charm decays [83].
- The contributions with charmonia intermediate states, for example  $\Lambda J/\psi \rightarrow pK^-$ , are largely suppressed owing to the small Wilson coefficients in weak vertex and negligible strong couplings of  $J/\psi \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  [107, 108]. Hence, we ignore them in this work.

Table 1: The decay constants of pseudoscalar and vector mesons used in this work [54, 83].

Decay constant	$f_\pi$	$f_K$	$f_\rho$	$f_\omega$	$f_\phi$	$f_{K^*}$	$f_{D^*}$	$f_D$	$f_{D_s}$
Value [MeV]	130.3	155.7	216	187	215	210	230	212	250
Decay constant	$f_{D_s^*}$	$f_{J/\psi}$	$f_{\eta_c}$	$f_{\eta_u}$	$f_{\eta_d}$	$f_{\eta_s}$	$f_{\eta'_u}$	$f_{\eta'_d}$	$f_{\eta'_s}$
Value [MeV]	271	418	387	54	54	-111	44	44	136

### 3 Numerical Results

In this section, we first give a list of the input parameters used in our numerical calculations. The helicity amplitudes of five decay channels are then evaluated by considering both short and long distance contributions. Finally, the phenomenological analysis and observables are given and their comparison to the results from other papers are performed.

#### 3.1 Input parameters

The baryon masses we employed are  $m_{\Lambda_b^0} = 5.619$  GeV,  $m_{\Lambda_c^+} = 2.286$  GeV,  $m_p = 0.938$  GeV, and meson masses  $m_D = 1.869$  GeV,  $m_\pi = 0.140$  GeV,  $m_K = 0.490$  GeV,  $m_\rho = 0.770$  GeV,  $m_{K^*} = 0.892$  GeV. The quark masses are current masses. Here, we take the values as  $m_u = 2.16$  MeV,  $m_d = 4.70$  MeV,  $m_s = 93.5$  MeV,  $m_c = 1.27$  GeV,  $m_b = 4.18$  GeV [4].

The CKM quark-mixing matrix elements are adopted under Wolfenstein parameterization with leading expansion  $V_{ud} = 1 - \frac{\lambda_W^2}{2}$ ,  $V_{us} = \lambda_W$ ,  $V_{ub} = A\lambda_W^3(\rho - i\eta)$ ,  $V_{cd} = -\lambda_W$ ,  $V_{cs} = 1 - \frac{\lambda_W^2}{2}$ ,  $V_{cb} = A\lambda_W^2$  and  $V_{td} = A\lambda_W^3(1 - \rho - i\eta)$ ,  $V_{ts} = -A\lambda_W^2$ ,  $V_{tb} = 1$ , where the Wolfenstein parameters are taken as  $A = 0.823$ ,  $\rho = 0.141$ ,  $\eta = 0.349$  and  $\lambda_W = 0.225$ . Here, we sign  $\lambda_W$  to distinguish it from  $\lambda$  functions we used before [4].

The heavy-to-light form factors for  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p, n, \Lambda, \Lambda_c^+$  are used as inputs in our calculation, which have been extensively investigated. We use the data of form factors in Ref. [54]. The decay constants of pseudoscalar and vector mesons are listed in Table 1, where the definition of  $f_{\eta_{u,d,s}}^{(\prime)}$  is the same as that in Ref. [54].

In addition, the strong coupling constants are crucial non-perturbative parameters. For the strong couplings between octet baryons and light mesons, we use their values obtained with the method of LCSRs under the  $SU(3)$  flavor symmetry [87, 89]. The couplings among decuplet baryons, octet baryons and light mesons are obtained with the experiment data, that are  $g_{\Delta N \pi}^2/(4\pi) = 0.36$  and  $g_{\Delta N \rho}^2/(4\pi) = 20.45$  [88],

the remaining of this type of couplings are determined with the  $SU(3)$  flavor symmetry. Three kinds of meson couplings are determined by using the values of three representative couplings  $g_{\rho\pi\pi}$ ,  $g_{\rho\rho\rho}$ ,  $g_{\omega\rho\pi}$  under the  $SU(3)$  flavor symmetry. The on shell coupling constant  $g_{\rho\pi\pi} = 6.05$  is determined by the decay rate of  $\rho \rightarrow \pi\pi$  [83]. The hidden local symmetry theory [109] relates the  $\rho\rho\rho$  coupling constant,  $g_{\rho\rho\rho}$ , to the  $\rho$  meson mass ( $m_\rho$ ) and the pion physical decay constant ( $f_\pi = 93\text{MeV}$ ), given by  $g_{\rho\rho\rho} = \frac{m_\rho}{2f_\pi}$ . Additionally, the coupling constant  $g_{\omega\rho\pi}$  can be expressed as  $g_{\omega\rho\pi} = \frac{3}{16\pi^2} g_{\rho\rho\rho}^2$ , describing the interaction between the  $\omega$  meson,  $\rho$  meson, and a pion. The strong couplings of two charm mesons and a light meson are given as [83]

$$g_{D^*D^*P_8} = \frac{g_{D^*DP_8}}{\sqrt{m_D m_{D^*}}}, \quad g_{DDV} = g_{D^*D^*V} = \frac{\beta g_V}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad f_{D^*DV} = \frac{f_{D^*D^*V}}{m_{D^*}} = \frac{\lambda g_V}{\sqrt{2}},$$

where  $g_V = \frac{m_\rho}{f_\pi}$ ,  $\beta = 0.9$ ,  $\lambda = 0.56 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$  and  $g_{D^*DP_8} = 17.9$  extracted from the experimental data of  $D^*$  width. Finally, the strong couplings described charm baryons, charm mesons and light octet baryons can be found in Ref. [79]. The effective Lagrangians to describe strong scatterings at hadron level are collected in App.A.

### 3.2 Helicity amplitudes

In our work the regulator form factor  $\mathcal{F}(m_k, \Lambda)$  is necessary, because the effective strong couplings are determined with physical on-shell states and the exchanged particles in loops are off-shell which may brings in divergences in loop integrals. We determine the model parameters as  $\Lambda_{\text{charm}} = 1.0$  and  $\Lambda_{\text{charmless}} = 0.5$  with the experimental data of branching ratios (BR) and CP asymmetry (CPA) of  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p\pi^-$  and  $pK^-$  [4].

With the model parameters we perform our calculation in the helicity basis under which the asymmetry parameters are easier to be defined [111, 116]. Here, we exclusively list our results of each helicity amplitude for five decay channels, which can be tested by experiments after the partial wave analysis being implemented in the future. We take the numerical results of  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow pK^-$  as shown in Table 2 as an example to illustrate, where  $\mathcal{S}$ ,  $\mathcal{NC}$ , and  $\mathcal{C}$  represent short-distance amplitudes, re-scattering amplitudes with charmless loop and charm triangle loop, respectively. We also show the contributions with different CKM factors separately for comparison. The short-distance and charmless loop amplitudes of  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow pK^-$  contain both tree ( $V_{ub}V_{us}^*$ ) and penguin ( $V_{tb}V_{ts}^*$ ) components. The charm triangle loops, which are associated with  $V_{cb}V_{cs}^*$ , incorporate the re-scatterings of  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ D_s^{(*)-} \rightarrow pK^-$ , and in fact recognize the long distance contributions of charm penguin diagram as  $B \rightarrow D_s D \rightarrow K\pi$  for  $B$  meson system [83, 118–123]. We want to remind that the numerical results in five tables collecting helicity amplitudes does not include the CKM matrix elements. Some essential discussions are in order:

- First of all, one can see that the short distance amplitudes of tree and penguin are both of purely imaginary for  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p\pi^-/K^-$ , and real for  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow pK^*/\rho^-, \Lambda\phi$ . It means that there is no relative strong phase to derive  $CP$  asymmetry if only short distance contribution is considered. On the contrary, the long distance ones investigated with final state re-scattering mechanism are generally complex, and an obvious strong phase source is provided.
- The long-distance charm triangle loop re-scattering contributions, as a component of non-factorizable penguin amplitudes, are found to be comparable and non-negligible relative to short-distance penguin amplitudes. This is particularly essential for the  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow pK^{*-}/\rho^-$  and  $\Lambda\phi$  channels. As we will see, these contributions play an indispensable role in predicting the decay rate and triple product asymmetry of  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda\phi$ . Both the charmless and charm triangle loop re-scattering amplitudes, which belong to  $V_{tb}V_{tq}^*$  ( $q = d, s$ ) are small and negligible due to the large suppression from the small Wilson coefficients  $a_{4,6}$  relative to  $a_1$  [51].
- It is stressed that the decays  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow pK^-$  and  $pK^{*-}$  are penguin dominant after incorporating the CKM enhancement factor although the strong dynamics contribution involved in external  $W$ -emission  $T$  topological graph is much larger than penguin  $P$ . This can be easily seen from the ratio  $\left| \frac{V_{tb}V_{ts}^*}{V_{ub}V_{us}^*} \right| \approx 50$  which indicates the penguin amplitude is enhanced almost 50 times. Hence, the branching ratio of  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow pK^-$  predicted from the calculation with only tree operators is one order smaller than the experimental measurement [124, 125]. The decay  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda\phi$  is also dominated by penguin ones like  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow pK^-$  since the  $W$ -exchanged tree amplitude is largely CKM suppressed [19]. While it is different for  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p\pi^-/\rho^-$  where  $\left| \frac{V_{tb}V_{td}^*}{V_{ub}V_{ud}^*} \right| \approx 2$ , no remarkable enhancement emerges for penguin contribution hence the tree diagram is over dominant.
- It is remarkably observed that the strong dynamics amplitude of  $W$ -exchange in  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda\phi$  is not suppressed compared to penguin ones. This is similar to  $B$  meson decays where an obvious long-distance contribution to  $W$ -exchange is induced from final-state interactions, even if its short-distance amplitudes are vanishing, for example,  $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^0\pi^0$  in [83]. Additionally, the highlighted non-factorizable contribution of charm penguin amplitude demonstrates again that long-distance re-scatterings are important for processes without over-dominated  $T$  diagrams.
- The power counting rule based on the SCET analysis is numerically verified in our work. Specifically, the  $T$  topological diagram is dominant due to short-distance contributions, while the other tree diagrams  $C, C', E, B$  are mainly induced by long-distance amplitudes. In our results, we find that the charmless triangle loop contributions, which give rise to non-factorizable long-distance tree amplitudes, are all one order of magnitude smaller than the short-distance ones in  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p\pi^-/\rho^-/K^-/K^{*-}$

channels. This behavior is consistent with the expectations from the power counting rule [57, 58]. Additionally, it is also reasonable that the total penguin amplitude  $P$  is one order of magnitude smaller than  $T$  for the aforementioned channels.

- The relative magnitude of amplitudes with different helicity configurations of the external  $W$ -emission  $T$  diagram can be implemented by imposing the chiral property of weak interactions, for the decay modes of  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow BP, BV$ . For the simpler case of  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p\pi^-/K^-$ , where the final meson is pseudoscalar and thus trivial for helicity analysis, the corresponding final proton spin is more preferable to be anti-parallel to its moving direction due to the chiral current  $(V - A) \times (V - A)$ . This indicates that the helicity amplitude  $H_{-\frac{1}{2}}$  should be over dominant compared to  $H_{+\frac{1}{2}}$  in the short-distance contribution from the  $T$  topology. An approximate estimation of the relative ratio of  $|H_{+\frac{1}{2}}|/|H_{-\frac{1}{2}}|$  can be implemented within the naive picture of helicity flip, and is eventually given by a factor of  $\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}/m_b$ . This is indeed confirmed through comparing our results shown in Table 2 and 3. The analogical intuition can be generalised to the decays  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p\rho^-/K^*$ , which in fact had been discussed in  $B \rightarrow VV$  decays and finally summarized by a naive power counting rule of helicity amplitudes via  $H_0 : H_- : H_+ = 1 : (\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}/m_b) : (\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}/m_b)^2$  [126], where  $0, \pm$  are helicity symbols of vector meson. For  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\rho^-$  and  $pK^{*-}$ , we conclude different helicity amplitudes of the  $T$  graph are expected to satisfy

$$H_{0,-\frac{1}{2}} : H_{-1,-\frac{1}{2}} : H_{0,+\frac{1}{2}} : H_{+1,+\frac{1}{2}} \sim 1 : \frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{m_b} : \frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{m_b} : \left(\frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{m_b}\right)^2. \quad (3.1)$$

One can see that the above power relation is approximately consistent with our numerical results in Tab.5 and Tab.6.

### 3.3 $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p\pi^-$ and $pK^-$ decay

The branching ratios and direct CP asymmetries for  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p\pi^-/K^-$  are given as

$$BR [\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p\pi^-/K^-] = \frac{|p_c|}{8\pi M_{\Lambda_b}^2 \Gamma_{\Lambda_b^0}} \frac{1}{2} \left( |H_{+1/2}|^2 + |H_{-1/2}|^2 \right), \quad a_{CP}^{dir} = \frac{\Gamma - \bar{\Gamma}}{\Gamma + \bar{\Gamma}}, \quad (3.2)$$

where  $p_c$  is the final proton momentum in the  $\Lambda_b^0$  rest frame, and the factor  $1/2$  in  $BR [\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p\pi^-/K^-]$  is from the initial spin average.  $H_{\pm\frac{1}{2}}$  are the helicity amplitudes listed in Tables 2 and 3. As stressed before, the branching ratios and direct CP asymmetry of CKM-suppressed decay  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p\pi^-$  and  $pK^-$  provide us with fruitful implications for controlling the final-state interactions of  $\Lambda_b^0$  baryon decay. A global analysis is performed, thus the model parameters  $\Lambda_{\text{charm}}$  and  $\Lambda_{\text{charmless}}$  are uniquely determined. Hence, the final numerical results of these two decays are naturally close to the experimental measurements.

Table 2: Helicity amplitudes of  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow pK^-(10^{-7})$  with different  $CKM$  factors

decay modes	$H_{-\frac{1}{2}}(V_{ub}V_{us}^*)$	$H_{-\frac{1}{2}}(V_{cb}V_{cs}^*)$	$H_{-\frac{1}{2}}(V_{tb}V_{ts}^*)$	$H_{\frac{1}{2}}(V_{ub}V_{us}^*)$	$H_{\frac{1}{2}}(V_{cb}V_{cs}^*)$	$H_{\frac{1}{2}}(V_{tb}V_{ts}^*)$
$S(\Lambda_b \rightarrow pK^-)$	104.66 $i$	—	3.06 $i$	21.07 $i$	—	4.16 $i$
$NC(\Lambda_b \rightarrow pK^-)$	-11.15 - 7.66 $i$	—	-0.42 - 0.29 $i$	-8.29 - 4.76 $i$	—	-0.59 - 0.38 $i$
$C(\Lambda_b \rightarrow pK^-)$	—	-2.80 + 0.73 $i$	0.08 - 0.14 $i$	—	5.30 - 2.65 $i$	0.003 + 0.09 $i$

 Table 3: Helicity amplitudes of  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\pi^-(10^{-7})$ 

decay modes	$H_{-\frac{1}{2}}(V_{ub}V_{ud}^*)$	$H_{-\frac{1}{2}}(V_{cb}V_{cd}^*)$	$H_{-\frac{1}{2}}(V_{tb}V_{td}^*)$	$H_{\frac{1}{2}}(V_{ub}V_{ud}^*)$	$H_{\frac{1}{2}}(V_{cb}V_{cd}^*)$	$H_{\frac{1}{2}}(V_{tb}V_{td}^*)$
$S(\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\pi^-)$	85.00 $i$	—	2.56 $i$	17.01 $i$	—	3.73 $i$
$NC(\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\pi^-)$	-9.18 - 2.31 $i$	—	0.01 - 0.04 $i$	3.11 - 4.56 $i$	—	-0.002 - 0.17 $i$
$C(\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\pi^-)$	—	0.53 - 1.78 $i$	0.15 - 0.17 $i$	—	8.74 - 6.90 $i$	0.11 - 0.04 $i$

 Table 4: Helicity amplitudes of  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda\phi(10^{-7})$ 

decay modes	$H_{0,-\frac{1}{2}}(V_{ub}V_{us}^*)$	$H_{0,-\frac{1}{2}}(V_{cb}V_{cs}^*)$	$H_{0,-\frac{1}{2}}(V_{tb}V_{ts}^*)$	$H_{-1,-\frac{1}{2}}(V_{ub}V_{us}^*)$	$H_{-1,-\frac{1}{2}}(V_{cb}V_{cs}^*)$	$H_{-1,-\frac{1}{2}}(V_{tb}V_{ts}^*)$
$S(\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda\phi)$	—	—	2.58	—	—	0.75
$NC(\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda\phi)$	4.81 - 8.94 $i$	—	0.13 - 0.21 $i$	1.76 - 1.86 $i$	—	0.21 - 0.25 $i$
$C(\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda\phi)$	—	5.41 + 2.12 $i$	0.10 - 0.02 $i$	—	2.11 + 2.00 $i$	0.09 + 0.15 $i$
decay modes	$H_{1,\frac{1}{2}}(V_{ub}V_{us}^*)$	$H_{1,\frac{1}{2}}(V_{cb}V_{cs}^*)$	$H_{1,\frac{1}{2}}(V_{tb}V_{ts}^*)$	$H_{0,\frac{1}{2}}(V_{ub}V_{us}^*)$	$H_{0,\frac{1}{2}}(V_{cb}V_{cs}^*)$	$H_{0,\frac{1}{2}}(V_{tb}V_{ts}^*)$
$S(\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda\phi)$	—	—	-0.03	—	—	-0.01
$NC(\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda\phi)$	5.45 - 5.75 $i$	—	0.17 - 0.17 $i$	1.17 - 7.99 $i$	—	-0.01 - 0.16 $i$
$C(\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda\phi)$	—	-5.35 - 1.67 $i$	-0.10 + 0.03 $i$	—	0.84 - 1.22 $i$	-0.03 + 0.01 $i$

Table 5: Helicity amplitudes of  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow pK^{*-}(10^{-7})$ 

decay modes	$H_{0,-\frac{1}{2}}(V_{ub}V_{us}^*)$	$H_{0,-\frac{1}{2}}(V_{cb}V_{cs}^*)$	$H_{0,-\frac{1}{2}}(V_{tb}V_{ts}^*)$	$H_{-1,-\frac{1}{2}}(V_{ub}V_{us}^*)$	$H_{-1,-\frac{1}{2}}(V_{cb}V_{cs}^*)$	$H_{-1,-\frac{1}{2}}(V_{tb}V_{ts}^*)$
$S(\Lambda_b \rightarrow pK^{*-})$	138.21	—	3.06	31.58	—	0.70
$NC(\Lambda_b \rightarrow pK^{*-})$	$-13.54 + 25.90 i$	—	$-0.36 + 0.58 i$	$-2.78 + 4.77 i$	—	$-0.26 + 0.30 i$
$C(\Lambda_b \rightarrow pK^{*-})$	—	$-9.23 - 2.69 i$	$-0.18 + 0.05 i$	—	$-2.69 - 2.28 i$	$-0.13 - 0.22 i$
decay modes	$H_{1,\frac{1}{2}}(V_{ub}V_{us}^*)$	$H_{1,\frac{1}{2}}(V_{cb}V_{cs}^*)$	$H_{1,\frac{1}{2}}(V_{tb}V_{ts}^*)$	$H_{0,\frac{1}{2}}(V_{ub}V_{us}^*)$	$H_{0,\frac{1}{2}}(V_{cb}V_{cs}^*)$	$H_{0,\frac{1}{2}}(V_{tb}V_{ts}^*)$
$S(\Lambda_b \rightarrow pK^{*-})$	-10.36	—	-0.23	28.13	—	0.62
$NC(\Lambda_b \rightarrow pK^{*-})$	$-5.14 + 4.07 i$	—	$-0.16 + 0.13 i$	$-3.14 + 16.76 i$	—	$0.05 + 0.36 i$
$C(\Lambda_b \rightarrow pK^{*-})$	—	$7.30 + 1.82 i$	$0.14 - 0.05 i$	—	$-2.34 + 2.49 i$	$0.02 - 0.03 i$

Table 6: Helicity amplitudes of  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow pp^-(10^{-7})$ 

decay modes	$H_{0,-\frac{1}{2}}(V_{ub}V_{ud}^*)$	$H_{0,-\frac{1}{2}}(V_{cb}V_{cd}^*)$	$H_{0,-\frac{1}{2}}(V_{tb}V_{td}^*)$	$H_{-1,-\frac{1}{2}}(V_{ub}V_{ud}^*)$	$H_{-1,-\frac{1}{2}}(V_{cb}V_{cd}^*)$	$H_{-1,-\frac{1}{2}}(V_{tb}V_{td}^*)$
$S(\Lambda_b \rightarrow pp^-)$	141.80	—	3.14	28.02	—	0.62
$NC(\Lambda_b \rightarrow pp^-)$	$-13.08 + 8.54 i$	—	$-0.47 + 0.19 i$	$14.45 - 27.06 i$	—	$0.01 - 0.46 i$
$C(\Lambda_b \rightarrow pp^-)$	—	$-21.12 - 12.71 i$	$-0.37 - 0.09 i$	—	$-9.45 - 4.37 i$	$-0.30 - 0.19 i$
decay modes	$H_{1,\frac{1}{2}}(V_{ub}V_{ud}^*)$	$H_{1,\frac{1}{2}}(V_{cb}V_{cd}^*)$	$H_{1,\frac{1}{2}}(V_{tb}V_{td}^*)$	$H_{0,\frac{1}{2}}(V_{ub}V_{ud}^*)$	$H_{0,\frac{1}{2}}(V_{cb}V_{cd}^*)$	$H_{0,\frac{1}{2}}(V_{tb}V_{td}^*)$
$S(\Lambda_b \rightarrow pp^-)$	-9.25	—	-0.20	28.75	—	0.64
$NC(\Lambda_b \rightarrow pp^-)$	$-12.31 + 6.38 i$	—	$-0.10 - 0.79 i$	$2.22 + 13.81 i$	—	$0.32 + 0.31 i$
$C(\Lambda_b \rightarrow pp^-)$	—	$11.81 + 6.52 i$	$0.31 + 0.17 i$	—	$-10.11 + 0.39 i$	$-0.11 - 0.08 i$

Besides for the branching ratios and direct CP asymmetries, there are many other asymmetry parameters incorporating the interference terms of different partial waves that are of interest in baryon decays. These parameters are expected to reveal more about the helicity structure of the weak Hamiltonian as discussed before and are more sensitive to different strong dynamical approaches. Hence, they provide powerful tests on theoretical sides. For example, the asymmetry parameters measured in  $\Lambda_c^+$  decay eventually impose an important test for non-perturbative methods [110]. Here, we list the decay asymmetry parameters for  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p\pi^-/K^-$  defined as [111]

$$\alpha = \frac{|H_{+1/2}|^2 - |H_{-1/2}|^2}{|H_{+1/2}|^2 + |H_{-1/2}|^2}, \quad \beta = \frac{2\text{Im}(H_{+1/2}H_{-1/2}^*)}{|H_{+1/2}|^2 + |H_{-1/2}|^2}, \quad \gamma = \frac{2\text{Re}(H_{+1/2}H_{-1/2}^*)}{|H_{+1/2}|^2 + |H_{-1/2}|^2}. \quad (3.3)$$

Then, one also defines the average asymmetry parameters and their associated CP asymmetries as [127]

$$\langle\alpha\rangle = \frac{\alpha - \bar{\alpha}}{2}, \quad \langle\beta\rangle = \frac{\beta - \bar{\beta}}{2}, \quad \langle\gamma\rangle = \frac{\gamma + \bar{\gamma}}{2}, \quad (3.4)$$

$$a_{CP}^\alpha = \frac{\alpha + \bar{\alpha}}{2}, \quad a_{CP}^\beta = \frac{\beta + \bar{\beta}}{2}, \quad a_{CP}^\gamma = \frac{\gamma - \bar{\gamma}}{2}. \quad (3.5)$$

Their measurements could be realized by exploring angular distribution with initial  $\Lambda_b^0$  polarization  $\mathcal{P}$  [112]

$$\frac{d\Gamma}{d\cos\theta} \propto 1 + \mathcal{P}\alpha \cos\theta, \quad (3.6)$$

with angle  $\theta$  between the direction of  $\Lambda_b^0$  polarization and final proton moving direction defined in the rest frame of  $\Lambda_b^0$ . The other two parameters  $\beta, \gamma$  could be determined by measuring final proton polarization as in early works [113–115]. The relation between partial wave and helicity amplitudes are linear and trivial [111]

$$\mathcal{H}_{+\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(S + P), \quad \mathcal{H}_{-\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(S - P). \quad (3.7)$$

Next, one can define the CPV observables associated with each partial wave amplitude analogy to the direct CP asymmetry [65]

$$a_{CP}^S = \frac{|S|^2 - |\bar{S}|^2}{|S|^2 + |\bar{S}|^2}, \quad a_{CP}^P = \frac{|P|^2 - |\bar{P}|^2}{|P|^2 + |\bar{P}|^2}. \quad (3.8)$$

The global direct CP asymmetry is

$$a_{CP}^{dir} = \frac{\Gamma - \bar{\Gamma}}{\Gamma + \bar{\Gamma}} = \frac{|S|^2 - |\bar{S}|^2 + |P|^2 - |\bar{P}|^2}{|S|^2 + |\bar{S}|^2 + |P|^2 + |\bar{P}|^2}, \quad (3.9)$$

which indicates the global CP asymmetry might be suppressed if the cancellation of CP asymmetries between  $a_{CP}^S$  and  $a_{CP}^P$  arises. From Table 7, it is easy to note that the partial wave CP asymmetries of  $a_{CP}^S$  and  $a_{CP}^P$  are salient, while the global CPV are small owing to the remarkable cancellation between them. It is very distinctive comparing to mesonic decays due to the helicity property of baryons. This phenomenon is firstly discovered in the recent work [5], where a complete PQCD calculation is performed

Table 7: **BRs, Direct CPAs, S- and P-wave CPAs of  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\pi^-/K^-$  decays calculated in this work comparing with other works.**

	BR( $10^{-6}$ )	$\alpha$	Direct CP( $10^{-2}$ )	$a_{CP}^S$	$a_{CP}^P$
$\Lambda_b \rightarrow pK^-$					
FSI (This work)	$4.98^{+3.61}_{-1.98}$	$0.97^{+0.02}_{-0.05}$	$-9^{+2}_{-2}$	$0.12^{+0.03}_{-0.04}$	$-0.24^{+0.07}_{-0.09}$
PQCD [5]	2.9	0.38	-5.8	-0.05	-0.23
QCDF [54]	$2.17^{+0.98+0.60+0.33}_{-0.47-0.58-0.23}$	$0.27^{+0.19}_{-0.14}$	10	—	—
Bag model [56]	6.0	0.297	-19.6	—	—
GFA [70]	$4.49^{+0.84}_{-0.39} \pm 0.26 \pm 0.59$	—	$6.7^{+0.3}_{-0.2} \pm 0.3$	—	—
Exp [71]	$5.5 \pm 1.0$	—	$-1.1 \pm 0.7 \pm 0.4$	—	—
$\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\pi^-$					
FSI (This work)	$4.28^{+0.66}_{-0.30}$	$-0.75^{+0.18}_{-0.13}$	$-2^{+6}_{-5}$	$-0.22^{+0.15}_{-0.11}$	$0.51^{+0.25}_{-0.25}$
PQCD [5]	3.3	-0.81	4.1	0.15	-0.07
QCDF [54]	$4.30^{+0.27+1.18+0.69}_{-0.19-1.16-0.45}$	$-0.98^{+0.00}_{-0.01}$	-0.337	—	—
Bag model [56]	5.0	-0.856	1.4	—	—
GFA [70]	4.25	—	$-3.9 \pm 0.4$	—	—
Exp [71]	$4.6 \pm 0.8$	—	$0.2 \pm 0.8 \pm 0.4$	—	—

on  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p\pi^-/K^-$ . Here, this cancellation is confirmed again under the framework of FSIs with hadronic loop method. In Table 7 and 8, we list our results of BRs, direct  $CP$ Vs, asymmetry parameters  $\langle\alpha\rangle, \langle\beta\rangle, \langle\gamma\rangle$  and their associated  $CP$ Vs  $a_{CP}^\alpha, a_{CP}^\beta, a_{CP}^\gamma$  and partial wave  $CP$  asymmetries with the model parameters  $\Lambda_{\text{charmless}} = 0.5 \pm 0.1$  and  $\Lambda_{\text{charm}} = 1.0 \pm 0.1$ , comparing with results from the other works. Some essential discussions are in order:

- The regulated parameter of charm hadronic loops  $\Lambda_{\text{charm}} = 1.0$  is obviously larger than that of charmless loops  $\Lambda_{\text{charmless}} = 0.5$ . One might understand this qualitatively by observing that the form factor  $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda, m_k)$  we employed approaches 1 as  $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$ , indicating that the particles involved in re-scatterings are completely point-like under this limit. Taking  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p\pi^-$  as an example, the residual energy via  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ D^{(*)-} \rightarrow p\pi^-$  is significantly lower than that via  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p\pi^-/\rho^- \rightarrow p\pi^-$ . Consequently, the latter process proceeds due to higher energies, implying that the QCD substructure of proton and  $\pi/\rho$  mesons are more considerable. Hence, the charmless loop parameter  $\Lambda_{\text{charmless}}$  is expected to be smaller.
- The model parameters  $\Lambda_{\text{charm}}$  and  $\Lambda_{\text{charmless}}$  determined in this work are expected to be applicable to similar re-scattering triangle loops in other channels of  $\Lambda_b^0$  and even other  $b$ -baryon charmless hadronic decays. This expectation is based on the approximate  $SU(3)$  flavor symmetry for light hadron groups and heavy quark symmetry for heavy baryon sets. For example, it is anticipated that these parameters will show similar capability in calculating decays such as  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow pa_1, pK_1, f_0(980), \Lambda(1520)\phi$ , and potentially many more decays within this framework in the future.
- The dependence of  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p\pi^-$  and  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow pK^-$  branching ratios on the parameters  $\Lambda_{\text{charm}}$  and  $\Lambda_{\text{charmless}}$  can be well understood by recognizing that these decays are dominated by tree and penguin operators, respectively. As previously emphasized,  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p\pi^-$  is primarily driven by external  $W$ -emission amplitudes, which are short-distance interactions and thus not sensitive to the model parameter  $\Lambda_{\text{charm}}$ , but slightly sensitive to  $\Lambda_{\text{charmless}}$ . Conversely,  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow pK^-$  is dominated by penguin amplitudes, where the corresponding long-distance charm penguin contributions depend quartically on  $\Lambda_{\text{charm}}$ . Consequently, its branching ratio depends on  $\Lambda_{\text{charm}}^8$ , leading to a remarkable variation with the model parameter. Although the  $BR(\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow pK^-)$  suffers from large uncertainties, its variation does not strictly follow  $\Lambda_{\text{charm}}^8$  with  $1 \pm 0.1$  since the short penguin amplitude is also comparable. As mentioned before, direct  $CP$  asymmetries are expected to be insensitive to model parameters because the dependence on the parameters is largely canceled out in the ratios, thereby reducing the theoretical uncertainties on these observables [82].
- The strong couplings used to describe the effective hadronic interactions in re-scatterings suffer

significant uncertainties and can vary widely in different references [86–98]. While we have chosen values based on the extractions from experimental data and LCSRs calculations, enhancing the precision of these couplings is essential for improving our theoretical predictions, thereby advancing our understanding of the dynamics of  $b$ -baryon decays in the future.

- The comparison of our results with those obtained from different theoretical methods is presented in Tables 7 and 8. The branching ratios (BRs) calculated by various studies show good agreement, while our prediction for the asymmetry parameter  $\alpha$  in the  $pK^-$  channel stands out as notably different, thereby offering a distinct test for final-state interactions (FSIs) in future experiments. The partial wave CP asymmetries in our study also differ from those predicted by the PQCD approach. In PQCD, the CP asymmetry in  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p\pi^-$  is small due to the cancellation between the  $a_{CP}^S$  and  $a_{CP}^P$  terms, while the CPA in  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow pK^-$  is small since it is dominated by the  $S$ -wave contribution. In our analysis, both decays exhibit CPAs that result from the cancellations between  $a_{CP}^S$  and  $a_{CP}^P$ . Furthermore, the average asymmetry parameters  $\langle\beta\rangle$  and  $\langle\gamma\rangle$ , along with their associated CP asymmetries, are listed in Table 8 for the first time.
- The cancellation between  $a_{CP}^S$  and  $a_{CP}^P$  can be further confirmed by examining Table 9, where the CP asymmetries from each helicity amplitude are presented. It is evident that the CP violation in  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p\pi^-$  is expected to be small due to the dominance of  $H_{-\frac{1}{2}}$ , while the CP violation in  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow pK^-$  is also anticipated to be small as a result of the dominance of  $H_{+\frac{1}{2}}$  that can be verified by analyzing the asymmetry parameter  $\alpha(\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow pK^-)$ .
- The asymmetry parameter  $\alpha$  for  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p\pi^-$  is approaching to  $-1$  under the heavy quark symmetry and  $(V-A)$  current interaction [133]. The result obtained in this work,  $-0.75$ , is in close agreement with this theoretical prediction. However, there is still a 20% deviation, which can be attributed to the power correction of heavy quark expansion. In our work, we actually consider the power-suppressed effects of  $C, E, P...$  diagrams by estimating FSIs contributions. We hope a more comprehensive understanding of the bottom baryon charmless non-leptonic dynamics could be achieved.

### 3.4 $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p\rho^-, pK^{*-}$ and $\Lambda\phi$ decays

Next, we will explore the decay mode of  $\Lambda_b^0$  to a light baryon  $B$  and a vector meson  $V$ , including the three channels  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p\rho^-, pK^*$ , and  $\Lambda\phi$ . The branching ratios for these associated decays are defined as

$$BR[\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow BV] = \frac{|p_c|}{8\pi M_{\Lambda_b}^2 \Gamma_{\Lambda_b^0}} \frac{1}{2} \left( |H_{0,+1/2}|^2 + |H_{0,-1/2}|^2 + |H_{+1,+1/2}|^2 + |H_{-1,-1/2}|^2 \right), \quad (3.10)$$

Table 8: Average asymmetry parameters and their  $CPV$  for  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\pi^-$  and  $pK^-$  decays.

	$\langle\alpha\rangle$	$a_{CP}^\alpha$	$\langle\beta\rangle$	$a_{CP}^\beta$	$\langle\gamma\rangle$	$a_{CP}^\gamma$
$\Lambda_b \rightarrow pK^-$	$0.20^{+0.02}_{-0.05}$	$0.77^{+0.05}_{-0.07}$	$-0.25^{+0.08}_{-0.10}$	$0.50^{+0.05}_{-0.11}$	$0.18^{+0.04}_{-0.06}$	$-0.15^{+0.28}_{-0.21}$
$\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\pi^-$	$-0.08^{+0.02}_{-0.01}$	$-0.67^{+0.20}_{-0.15}$	$0.49^{+0.14}_{-0.11}$	$0.15^{+0.14}_{-0.17}$	$-0.29^{+0.14}_{-0.11}$	$0.44^{+0.05}_{-0.14}$

 Table 9:  $CP$  violation of helicity amplitude of  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow B_8 P_8$  decays.

Decay modes	$CPV(H_{-\frac{1}{2}})$	$CPV(H_{\frac{1}{2}})$
$\Lambda_b \rightarrow pK^-$	$-0.88^{+0.13}_{-0.07}$	$0.02^{+0.02}_{-0.04}$
$\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\pi^-$	$0.03^{+0.05}_{-0.03}$	$-0.27^{+0.10}_{-0.05}$

where four independent helicity amplitudes are involved in the  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow BV$  channels. The decay asymmetry parameters are [116]

$$\alpha' = \frac{|H_{+1,+\frac{1}{2}}|^2 - |H_{-1,-\frac{1}{2}}|^2}{|H_{+1,+\frac{1}{2}}|^2 + |H_{-1,-\frac{1}{2}}|^2}, \quad \beta' = \frac{|H_{0,+\frac{1}{2}}|^2 - |H_{0,-\frac{1}{2}}|^2}{|H_{0,+\frac{1}{2}}|^2 + |H_{0,-\frac{1}{2}}|^2}, \quad \gamma' = \frac{|H_{+1,+\frac{1}{2}}|^2 + |H_{-1,-\frac{1}{2}}|^2}{|H_{0,+\frac{1}{2}}|^2 + |H_{0,-\frac{1}{2}}|^2}, \quad (3.11)$$

and longitudinal polarization of final baryon  $B$

$$P_L = \frac{|H_{+1,+\frac{1}{2}}|^2 - |H_{-1,-\frac{1}{2}}|^2 + |H_{0,+\frac{1}{2}}|^2 - |H_{0,-\frac{1}{2}}|^2}{|H_{+1,+\frac{1}{2}}|^2 + |H_{-1,-\frac{1}{2}}|^2 + |H_{0,+\frac{1}{2}}|^2 + |H_{0,-\frac{1}{2}}|^2}. \quad (3.12)$$

These parameters are not all independent, and they are related to each other as

$$P_L = \frac{\beta + \alpha \cdot \gamma}{1 + \gamma}. \quad (3.13)$$

These asymmetry parameters could be extracted through complete polarized angular analysis as done for  $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p\phi$  decays in Ref. [116], or partial wave analysis as for  $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Lambda\rho^+$  [117]. The corresponding average asymmetry parameters and their  $CP$  asymmetries will be defined by taking the difference and summation of these parameters and their  $CP$  conjugates as

$$\langle\alpha'\rangle = \frac{\alpha' - \bar{\alpha}'}{2}, \quad \langle\beta'\rangle = \frac{\beta' - \bar{\beta}'}{2}, \quad \langle\gamma'\rangle = \frac{\gamma' + \bar{\gamma}'}{2}, \quad \langle P_L \rangle = \frac{P_L - \bar{P}_L}{2} \quad (3.14)$$

$$a_{CP}^{\alpha'} = \frac{\alpha' + \bar{\alpha}'}{2}, \quad a_{CP}^{\beta'} = \frac{\beta' + \bar{\beta}'}{2}, \quad a_{CP}^{\gamma'} = \frac{\gamma' - \bar{\gamma}'}{2}, \quad a_{CP}^{P_L} = \frac{P_L + \bar{P}_L}{2}. \quad (3.15)$$

For the decay  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda\phi$ , additional observables known as  $T$ -odd triple product asymmetries ( $TPAs$ ) can be involved if considering the secondary decays  $\phi \rightarrow K^+K^-$  and  $\Lambda \rightarrow p\pi^-$ , as this introduces more

Table 10: BRs, Direct CPAs and asymmetric parameters in  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow B_8 V$  decays.

	BR( $10^{-5}$ )	Direct CP	$\alpha$	$\beta$	$\gamma$	$P_L$
$\Lambda_b \rightarrow pK^{*-}$						
FSI (this work)	$1.35^{+1.36}_{-0.71}$	$0.02^{+0.04}_{-0.04}$	$0.60^{+0.03}_{-0.06}$	$-0.85^{+0.03}_{-0.05}$	$0.55^{+0.11}_{-0.12}$	$-0.34^{+0.08}_{-0.10}$
PQCD [5]	0.302	0.057	-0.999	-0.92	0.11	—
QCDF [54]	0.101	0.311	—	—	—	-0.79
GFA [70]	0.286	0.197	—	—	—	—
$\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\rho^-$						
FSI (this work)	$1.34^{+0.53}_{-0.19}$	$-0.24^{+0.07}_{-0.03}$	$-0.26^{+0.37}_{-0.44}$	$-0.71^{+0.14}_{-0.10}$	$0.12^{+0.15}_{-0.04}$	$-0.66^{+0.13}_{-0.11}$
PQCD [5]	1.513	-0.020	-0.71	-0.98	0.04	—
QCDF [54]	0.747	-0.319	—	—	—	-0.81
GFA [70]	1.1	-0.038	—	—	—	—
$\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda\phi$						
FSI (this work)	$0.31^{+0.43}_{-0.19}$	$-0.005^{+0.02}_{-0.01}$	$0.72^{+0.03}_{-0.06}$	$-0.61^{+0.43}_{-0.13}$	$3.10^{+4.2}_{-1.1}$	$0.39^{+0.17}_{-0.18}$
PQCD [19]	0.69	-0.01	—	-0.71	—	-0.79
QCDF [54]	0.0633	0.016	—	—	—	-0.80
GFA [70]	0.177	0.014	—	—	—	—

angular variables. The specific definitions based on the helicity formalism and associated complete angular distribution function can be found in Ref. [16, 19]. In our analysis, we provide numerical predictions for these asymmetries within the framework of final state re-scattering mechanism.

$$\begin{aligned}
 A_T^1 &= -\frac{\alpha_\Lambda}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\text{Im} \left[ H_{0\frac{1}{2}} H_{-1-\frac{1}{2}}^* + H_{0-\frac{1}{2}} H_{1\frac{1}{2}}^* \right]}{H_N}, & A_T^2 &= -\frac{P_b}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\text{Im} \left[ H_{-1-\frac{1}{2}} H_{0-\frac{1}{2}}^* + H_{1\frac{1}{2}} H_{0\frac{1}{2}}^* \right]}{H_N}, \\
 A_T^3 &= \frac{P_b \alpha_\Lambda}{2\sqrt{2}} \frac{\text{Im} \left[ H_{-1-\frac{1}{2}} H_{0\frac{1}{2}}^* - H_{1\frac{1}{2}} H_{0-\frac{1}{2}}^* \right]}{H_N}, & A_T^4 &= \frac{P_b \alpha_\Lambda}{2\sqrt{2}} \frac{\text{Im} \left[ H_{-1-\frac{1}{2}} H_{0-\frac{1}{2}} - H_{1\frac{1}{2}} H_{0\frac{1}{2}}^* \right]}{H_N}, \\
 A_T^5 &= -\frac{P_b \pi \alpha_\Lambda}{4} \frac{\text{Im} \left[ H_{0-\frac{1}{2}} H_{0\frac{1}{2}}^* \right]}{H_N}, & A_T^6 &= -\frac{P_b \pi \alpha_\Lambda}{4} \frac{\text{Im} \left[ H_{1\frac{1}{2}} H_{-1-\frac{1}{2}}^* \right]}{H_N},
 \end{aligned}$$

where  $H_N$  is a normalization factor

$$H_N = \left| H_{1\frac{1}{2}} \right|^2 + \left| H_{-1-\frac{1}{2}} \right|^2 + \left| H_{0\frac{1}{2}} \right|^2 + \left| H_{0-\frac{1}{2}} \right|^2. \quad (3.16)$$

One can define the true  $T$ -odd  $CP$  asymmetries by taking off the pollution from strong interactions

$$a_{T,CP}^i = \frac{A_T^i - \bar{A}_T^i}{2}, \quad (3.17)$$

where the quantities  $\bar{A}_T^i$  with  $i = 1, \dots, 6$  correspond to the charge conjugates of the triple products. Utilizing the latest experimental data for the asymmetry parameters  $\alpha_\Lambda = 0.732 \pm 0.014$  and  $\alpha_{\bar{\Lambda}} = -0.758 \pm 0.012$  associated with  $\Lambda$  and  $\bar{\Lambda}$  decays [128], we can analyze these triple product asymmetries (TPAs). It is important to note that some of these observables are influenced by the initial polarization of the  $\Lambda_b^0$ , denoted as  $P_b$ , which has not yet been firmly established by experimental data [129–132]. As an illustrative example, we consider  $P_b = 0.1$  in our numerical predictions for these observables, as discussed in [19]. The numerical results for the BRs, direct CPAs, average asymmetry parameters  $\langle\alpha'\rangle, \langle\beta'\rangle, \langle\gamma'\rangle, \langle P_L\rangle$  and their associated CPAs for three channels and TPAs in the decay  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda\phi$  are summarized in the tables 10, 11, 12, 13 below. Some essential discussions are in order:

- Our prediction for the decay rate of  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow pK^{*-}$  closely matches the experimental measurement of  $BR(\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p\bar{K}^0\pi^-) = (1.3 \pm 0.4) \times 10^{-5}$  [22], indicating that the  $pK^{*-}$  channel might be the most dominant subprocess in the three-body decay  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p\bar{K}^0\pi^-$ . This dominance can be tested in future experiments. The branching ratios of  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p\rho^-$  and  $\Lambda\phi$  are consistent with other's predictions, except for that based on the QCDF with the diquark hypothesis. Under the diquark picture, some non-factorizable hard spectator contributions are missing, hence it's reasonability requires more experimental tests. In the Generalized Factorization Approach (GFA), the branching ratio of  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda\phi$  is enhanced by introducing an effective color number  $N_{\text{eff}} = 2$  to account for non-factorizable amplitudes, implying again that non-factorizable contributions may play a crucial role in decays without over dominated tree amplitudes.
- The direct CP asymmetry of  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow pK^{*-}$  is anticipated to be significant in the QCDF and GFA, while it is expected to be small in PQCD and our current work. Therefore, a precise measurement of this asymmetry is crucial for definitive testing in future experiments. Furthermore, the CP asymmetries stemming from each asymmetry parameter and helicity amplitude are provided in PQCD and our work. This information is essential not only for a more comprehensive dynamical analysis but also for potential experimental investigations, particularly if partial wave analysis is realized in future experiments. In the case of  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p\rho^-$ , a significant CP violation is predicted in our work and in the QCDF approach. This prediction could serve as a valuable guideline for exploring CP violation in baryon decays through the  $p\rho^-$  channel. It is worth noting that the  $p\rho^-$  channel is predominantly governed by the helicity amplitude  $H_{0,-\frac{1}{2}}$ , implying that the total CP violation in  $p\rho^-$  is nearly equivalent to that of  $H_{0,-\frac{1}{2}}$  by comparing to Table 12. On the other hand,

the CP violation in the  $\Lambda\phi$  decay is expected to be minimal as it is predominantly influenced by penguin contributions. This expectation aligns with the results presented in our work, as indicated by the amplitudes listed in Table 3.

- Asymmetry parameters, as previously emphasized, are highly sensitive to the phases of amplitudes, making them valuable indicators for testing various dynamical methods and models. In our analysis, we provide predictions for four parameters:  $\alpha', \beta', \gamma'$ , and  $P_L$ . It is evident that these parameters exhibit variations across different dynamical approaches, highlighting the importance of experimental measurements to discern between the predictions. For the longitudinal polarization parameter  $P_L$  in the  $p\rho^-$  decay, it is expected to approach  $-1$  based on heavy quark symmetry and the chiral properties of the charged weak current [133]. This expectation is consistent with our results. However, in the case of  $\Lambda\phi$  decay, our prediction for  $P_L$  differs in sign from the predictions of PQCD and the QCDF. This discrepancy requires further experimental investigations to clarify the true nature of these asymmetry parameters and their implications for the underlying dynamics of the decays.
- The CP asymmetries defined in Eqs.(3.5),(3.15) are indeed more robust and preferable compared to a direct extension like  $\frac{\alpha+\bar{\alpha}}{\alpha-\bar{\alpha}}, \frac{\beta+\bar{\beta}}{\beta-\bar{\beta}}, \frac{\gamma+\bar{\gamma}}{\gamma-\bar{\gamma}}$  since they are already dimensionless. Moreover, there is no inherent principle that ensures these definitions to yield numerical results within the range of  $-1$  to  $1$ . It is also worth considering that the direct extension definitions may introduce large uncertainties when the denominators are very small. Hence, we adopt the definitions in Eqs.(3.5),(3.15) in the current work.
- The triple product asymmetry parameter is a scalar quantity that is defined by the combination of three SO(3) vectors, such as momentum, polarization, and spin. This parameter has been widely utilized in meson and baryon decays to explore new physics-sensitive observables. The CP asymmetry induced by triple products demonstrates a unique cosine type dependence on strong phases, which has been established through a general definition and proof [18]. In order to determine these observables in experiments, it is essential to have additional more than three independent momentum variables, as polarization and spin are typically not directly measured in modern colliders. As previously mentioned, it is feasible to construct these quantities in the context of the  $\Lambda\phi$  decay channels. In Table 13, we have specifically presented the triple products and their corresponding asymmetries calculated in our work and in the PQCD approach. It is evident that the triple products  $A_T^1$  and  $\bar{A}_T^1$  exhibit significant values, primarily due to the notable strong phases associated with the helicity amplitudes. On the other hand, the remaining triple products are

Table 11: Average asymmetry parameters and their  $CPV$  on  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow pK^{*-}, p\rho^-$  and  $\Lambda\phi$  decays.

	$\langle\alpha'\rangle$	$a_{CP}^{\alpha'}$	$\langle\beta'\rangle$	$a_{CP}^{\beta'}$	$\langle\gamma'\rangle$	$a_{CP}^{\gamma'}$	$\langle PL\rangle$	$a_{CP}^{PL}$
$\Lambda_b \rightarrow pK^{*-}$	$-0.04^{+0.02}_{-0.03}$	$0.65^{+0.01}_{-0.04}$	$-0.06^{+0.02}_{-0.03}$	$-0.80^{+0.01}_{-0.02}$	$0.03^{+0.08}_{-0.03}$	$0.52^{+0.08}_{-0.09}$	$-0.31^{+0.05}_{-0.07}$	$-0.03^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$
$\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\rho^-$	$0.01^{+0.10}_{-0.13}$	$-0.28^{+0.27}_{-0.31}$	$0.09^{+0.07}_{-0.05}$	$-0.81^{+0.07}_{-0.05}$	$-0.07^{+0.05}_{-0.11}$	$0.20^{+0.22}_{-0.08}$	$-0.72^{+0.11}_{-0.09}$	$0.05^{+0.03}_{-0.02}$
$\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda\phi$	$0.02^{+0.04}_{-0.01}$	$0.70^{+0.04}_{-0.10}$	$0.01^{+0.05}_{-0.01}$	$-0.62^{+0.37}_{-0.13}$	$0.38^{+1.70}_{-0.31}$	$2.72^{+2.53}_{-0.80}$	$0.34^{+0.17}_{-0.15}$	$0.05^{+0.06}_{-0.04}$

Table 12:  $CP$  violation of each helicity amplitude for  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow B_s V$  decays.

Decay modes	$CPV(H_{0,-\frac{1}{2}})$	$CPV(H_{-1,-\frac{1}{2}})$	$CPV(H_{1,\frac{1}{2}})$	$CPV(H_{0,\frac{1}{2}})$
$\Lambda_b \rightarrow pK^{*-}$	$0.03^{+0.06}_{-0.08}$	$0.18^{+0.09}_{-0.07}$	$0.03^{+0.04}_{-0.02}$	$-0.28^{+0.12}_{-0.28}$
$\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\rho^-$	$-0.23^{+0.09}_{-0.06}$	$-0.53^{+0.18}_{-0.07}$	$-0.51^{+0.24}_{-0.13}$	$0.33^{+0.20}_{-0.17}$
$\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda\phi$	$-0.11^{+0.08}_{-0.25}$	$-0.04^{+0.03}_{-0.02}$	$0.05^{+0.08}_{-0.03}$	$-0.09^{+0.06}_{-0.15}$

suppressed by the parameter  $P_b$  that we have employed in our analysis. Overall, the triple product asymmetries are observed to be very small. This is attributed to the substantial suppression of the interference terms arising from the tree and penguin contributions as discussed in the  $\Lambda\phi$  direct  $CP$  asymmetry. We therefore can conclude that the detection of significant triple product asymmetries in the  $\Lambda\phi$  decay process would serve as a compelling signal of potential new physics beyond the Standard Model [134–136].

Table 13: **Triple products and its asymmetries in  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda \phi$  decay from FSIs and PQCD approach [19].**

	$A_T^i$	$\bar{A}_T^i$	$a_{T,CP}^i$
$i = 1$			
FSI (This work)	$1.1_{-0.2}^{+0.3} \times 10^{-1}$	$1.2_{-0.3}^{+0.5} \times 10^{-1}$	$-6.2_{-17.9}^{+4.6} \times 10^{-3}$
PQCD	$-1.4 \times 10^{-2}$	$1.3 \times 10^{-2}$	$-1.4 \times 10^{-2}$
$i = 2$			
FSI (This work)	$7.0_{-2.8}^{+4.6} \times 10^{-3}$	$5.8_{-3.2}^{+5.1} \times 10^{-3}$	$6.2_{-4.8}^{+20.4} \times 10^{-4}$
PQCD	$-6.9 \times 10^{-3}$	$3.5 \times 10^{-3}$	$-1.7 \times 10^{-3}$
$i = 3$			
FSI (This work)	$-2.4_{-2.2}^{+1.4} \times 10^{-3}$	$-2.2_{-1.7}^{+1.2} \times 10^{-3}$	$-6.8_{-35.7}^{+6.9} \times 10^{-5}$
PQCD	$-1.8 \times 10^{-3}$	$-5.7 \times 10^{-4}$	$-0.6 \times 10^{-3}$
$i = 4$			
FSI (This work)	$6.1_{-0.6}^{+0.5} \times 10^{-3}$	$6.3_{-0.7}^{+0.7} \times 10^{-3}$	$-5.4_{-38.8}^{+5.1} \times 10^{-5}$
PQCD	$2.8 \times 10^{-3}$	$1.8 \times 10^{-3}$	$0.5 \times 10^{-3}$
$i = 5$			
FSI (This work)	$-5.5_{-0.9}^{+3.3} \times 10^{-3}$	$-6.7_{-0.6}^{+1.5} \times 10^{-3}$	$6.0_{-4.7}^{+15.3} \times 10^{-4}$
PQCD	$2.4 \times 10^{-3}$	$-3.6 \times 10^{-3}$	$3.0 \times 10^{-3}$
$i = 6$			
FSI (This work)	$-1.2_{-0.7}^{+0.4} \times 10^{-2}$	$-1.2_{-0.6}^{+0.3} \times 10^{-2}$	$-7.7_{-23.5}^{+9.7} \times 10^{-5}$
PQCD	$-5.9 \times 10^{-4}$	$-5.5 \times 10^{-4}$	$-0.2 \times 10^{-4}$

## 4 Summary

In this study, we have conducted a comprehensive analysis of five key  $\Lambda_b^0$  charmless decays using the method of final state interaction with the hadronic triangle mechanism. Unlike conventional approaches that only consider the imaginary parts of amplitudes through the imposition of the optical theorem, our methodology involves the calculation of the complete long-distance amplitudes.

The analysis begins with a global analysis to determine two model parameters  $\Lambda_{\text{charm}}$  and  $\Lambda_{\text{charmless}}$ , utilizing existing experimental data on  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\pi^-/K^-$  branching ratios and CP asymmetries. These parameters serve as a theoretical foundation for our subsequent predictions and provide a systematic exploration of b-baryon decays. Furthermore, we provide a detailed listing of all helicity amplitudes for

each decay process, incorporating various CKM components to implement the comparison between tree and penguin contributions. These amplitudes not only improve the theoretical analyses but also offer valuable insights for future experimental validations. Our investigation includes numerous observables, including branching ratios, direct CP asymmetries, decaying asymmetry parameters, CP-violating effects, and partial wave amplitude CP asymmetries for  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\pi^-/K^-/K^{*-}/\rho^-$  decays, as well as triple product correlations for  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda\phi$  decay.

Importantly, the formalism developed in this work can be readily applied to other charmless decay channels of  $\Lambda_b^0$ , as well as the decays of  $\Xi_b$  and  $\Omega_b$ . This opens up avenues for exploring multibody decays such as  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda(1520)\phi/\rho$ ,  $N^*(1520)K^*$ ..., which are challenging for the perturbative QCD scheme based on factorization due to limited inputs. The formulas established in this study allow for the investigation of additional CP observables in multi-body decays, including interference effects from different intermediate resonances. With the formalism established in this work, we are ready to study various exclusive bottom baryon decays systematically, and more applications in  $b$ -baryon decays are expected.

## Acknowledgment

The authors would like to express their gratitude to Cai-Ping Jia for helpful discussions and support with the computing program. Special thanks are extended to Wen-Jie Song for pointing out some typos in our draft. This work is supported in part by the National Key Research and Development Program of China (2023YFA1606000) and Natural Science Foundation of China under grant No. 12335003, 12075126, 12275277 and 12435004 and by the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities under No. lzujbky-2024-oy02 and lzujbky-2023-it12.

## A Effective Lagrangian

Effective Lagrangians for the hadronic interactions are [79, 83, 87, 89]:

- The effective Lagrangians for vector and pseudoscalar meson octet  $V, P_8$ , and baryon octet, decuplet

$B_8, B_{10}$ :

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{VP_8P_8} &= \frac{ig_{\rho\pi\pi}}{\sqrt{2}} \text{Tr} [V^\mu [P_8, \partial_\mu P_8]] \\ \mathcal{L}_{VVV} &= \frac{ig_{\rho\rho\rho}}{\sqrt{2}} \text{Tr} [(\partial_\nu V_\mu V^\mu - V^\mu \partial_\nu V_\mu) V^\nu] = \frac{ig_{\rho\rho\rho}}{\sqrt{2}} \text{Tr} [(\partial_\nu V_\mu - \partial_\mu V_\nu) V^\mu V^\nu] \\ \mathcal{L}_{VVP_8} &= \frac{4g_{VVP_8}}{f_{P_8}} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \text{Tr} (\partial_\mu V_\nu \partial_\alpha V_\beta P_8) \\ \mathcal{L}_{P_8B_8B_8} &= \sqrt{2} (D \text{Tr} [\bar{B}_8\{P_8, B_8\}] + F \text{Tr} [\bar{B}_8[P_8, B_8]]) \\ \mathcal{L}_{VB_8B_8} &= \sqrt{2} (F \text{Tr} [\bar{B}[V, B_8]] + D \text{Tr} [\bar{B}_8\{V, B_8\}] + (F - D) \text{Tr}[\bar{B}_8B_8] \text{Tr}[V]) \\ \mathcal{L}_{P_8B_8B_{10}} &= \frac{g_{\pi N\Delta}}{m_\pi} \bar{B}_{10}^\mu \partial_\mu P_8 B_8 + h.c. \\ \mathcal{L}_{VB_8B_{10}} &= -i \frac{g_{\rho N\Delta}}{m_\rho} \bar{B}_{10}^\mu \gamma^5 \gamma^\nu B_8 (\partial_\mu V_\nu - \partial_\nu V_\mu) + h.c.\end{aligned}$$

- The Lagrangians involving  $D^{(*)}$ -mesons, pseudoscalar meson octet  $P_8$  and vector meson octet  $V$  :

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{D^*DP_8} &= -ig_{D^*DP_8} (D^i \partial^\mu P_{8ij} D_\mu^{*j\dagger} - D_\mu^{*i} \partial^\mu P_{8ij} D^{j\dagger}) \\ \mathcal{L}_{D^*D^*P_8} &= \frac{1}{2} g_{D^*D^*P_8} \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} D_i^{*\mu} \partial^\nu P_8^{ij} \overleftrightarrow{\partial}^\alpha D_j^{*\beta\dagger} \\ \mathcal{L}_{DDV} &= -ig_{DDV} D_i \overleftrightarrow{\partial}_\mu D^{j\dagger} (V^\mu)_j^i \\ \mathcal{L}_{D^*DV} &= -2f_{D^*DV} \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} (\partial^\mu V^\nu)_j^i (D_i \overleftrightarrow{\partial}^\alpha D^{*j\dagger} - D_i^{*\beta} \overleftrightarrow{\partial}^\alpha D^{j\dagger}) \\ \mathcal{L}_{D^*D^*V} &= ig_{D^*D^*V} D_i^{*\nu} \overleftrightarrow{\partial}_\mu D_\nu^{*j\dagger} (V^\mu)_j^i + 4if_{D^*D^*V} D_{i\mu}^* (\partial^\mu V^\nu - \partial^\nu V^\mu)_j^i D_\nu^{*j\dagger}\end{aligned}$$

- The Lagrangians involving charmed baryon sextets  $B_6$ , anti-triplets  $B_{\bar{3}}$ , vector and pseudo-scalar mesons octet  $V, P_8$ :

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{Vhh} &= \left\{ f_{1VB_6B_6} \text{Tr} [\bar{B}_6 \gamma_\mu V^\mu B_6] + \frac{f_{2VB_6B_6}}{m_6 + m'_6} \text{Tr} [\bar{B}_6 \sigma_{\mu\nu} \partial^\mu V^\nu B_6] \right\} \\ &+ \left\{ f_{1VB_3B_3} \text{Tr} [\bar{B}_{\bar{3}} \gamma_\mu V^\mu B_{\bar{3}}] + \frac{f_{2VB_3B_3}}{m_{\bar{3}} + m'_{\bar{3}}} \text{Tr} [\bar{B}_{\bar{3}} \sigma_{\mu\nu} \partial^\mu V^\nu B_{\bar{3}}] \right\} \\ &+ \left\{ f_{1VB_6B_{\bar{3}}} \text{Tr} [\bar{B}_6 \gamma_\mu V^\mu B_{\bar{3}}] + \frac{f_{2VB_6B_{\bar{3}}}}{m_6 + m_{\bar{3}}} \text{Tr} [\bar{B}_6 \sigma_{\mu\nu} \partial^\mu V^\nu B_{\bar{3}}] + h.c. \right\} \\ \mathcal{L}_{Phh} &= g_{P_8B_6B_6} \text{Tr} [\bar{B}_6 i\gamma_5 P_8 B_6] + g_{P_8B_{\bar{3}}B_{\bar{3}}} \text{Tr} [\bar{B}_{\bar{3}} i\gamma_5 P_8 B_{\bar{3}}] + \{g_{P_8B_6B_{\bar{3}}} \text{Tr} [\bar{B}_6 i\gamma_5 P_8 B_{\bar{3}}] + h.c.\}\end{aligned}$$

- The Lagrangians for charmed baryon sextets  $B_6$ , anti-triplets  $B_{\bar{3}}$ , baryon octet  $B_8$  and  $D^{(*)}$ -mesons:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\Lambda_c ND} = g_{\Lambda_c ND} (\bar{\Lambda}_c i\gamma_5 DN + h.c.)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\Lambda_c ND^*} = f_{1\Lambda_c ND^*} (\bar{\Lambda}_c \gamma_\mu D^{*\mu} N + h.c.) + \frac{f_{2\Lambda_c ND^*}}{m_{\Lambda_c} + m_N} (\bar{\Lambda}_c \sigma_{\mu\nu} \partial^\mu D^{*\nu} N + h.c.),$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\Sigma_c ND} = g_{\Sigma_c ND} (\bar{\Sigma}_c i\gamma_5 DN + h.c.)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\Sigma_c ND^*} = f_{1\Sigma_c ND^*} (\bar{\Sigma}_c \gamma_\mu D^{*\mu} N + h.c.) + \frac{f_{2\Sigma_c ND^*}}{m_{\Sigma_c} + m_N} (\bar{\Sigma}_c \sigma_{\mu\nu} \partial^\mu D^{*\nu} N + h.c.)$$

The matrices under SU(3) flavor group representations are given:

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\pi^0}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{\eta}{\sqrt{6}} & \pi^+ & K^+ \\ \pi^- & -\frac{\pi^0}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{\eta}{\sqrt{6}} & K^0 \\ K^- & \bar{K}^0 & -\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\eta \end{pmatrix}, \quad B_6 = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_c^{++} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Sigma_c^+ & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Xi_c'^+ \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Sigma_c^+ & \Sigma_c^0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Xi_c'^0 \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Xi_c'^+ & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Xi_c'^0 & \Omega_c \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\rho^0}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{\omega}{\sqrt{2}} & \rho^+ & K^{*+} \\ \rho^- & -\frac{\rho^0}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{\omega}{\sqrt{2}} & K^{*0} \\ K^{*-} & \bar{K}^{*0} & \phi \end{pmatrix}, \quad B_{\bar{3}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \Lambda_c^+ & \Xi_c^+ \\ -\Lambda_c^+ & 0 & \Xi_c^0 \\ -\Xi_c^+ & -\Xi_c^0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

$$B_8 = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\Sigma^0}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{\Lambda}{\sqrt{6}} & \Sigma^+ & p \\ \Sigma^- & -\frac{\Sigma^0}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{\Lambda}{\sqrt{6}} & n \\ \Xi^- & \Xi^0 & -\frac{2}{\sqrt{6}}\Lambda \end{pmatrix}, \quad D = (D^0, D^+, D_s^+) \quad (\text{A.3})$$

## B Amplitudes of triangle diagram

The amplitudes of  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow B_8 P_8$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}[P_8, B_8; V] &= \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} (-1) g_{VP_8 P_8} \cdot \bar{u}(p_4, \lambda_4) (f_{1VB_8 B_8} \cdot \gamma_\mu - \frac{if_{2VB_8 B_8}}{m_2 + m_4} \sigma_{\nu\mu} k^\nu) (p_2 + m_2) (A + B\gamma_5) u(p_i, \lambda_i) \\ &\quad (-g^{\alpha\mu} + \frac{k^\alpha k^\mu}{m_k^2}) (p_{1\alpha} + p_{3\alpha}) \frac{\mathcal{F}}{(p_1^2 - m_1^2 + i\varepsilon)(p_2^2 - m_2^2 + i\varepsilon)(k^2 - m_k^2 + i\varepsilon)} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}[P_8, B_8; B_8] &= \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} g_{P_8 B_8 B_8} \cdot g'_{P_8 B_8 B_8} \bar{u}(p_4, \lambda_4) \gamma_5 (\not{k} + m_k) \gamma_5 (p_2 + m_2) (A + B\gamma_5) u(p_i, \lambda_i) \cdot \frac{1}{(p_1^2 - m_1^2 + i\varepsilon)} \\ &\quad \cdot \frac{\mathcal{F}}{(p_2^2 - m_2^2 + i\varepsilon)(k^2 - m_k^2 + i\varepsilon)} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

$$\mathcal{M}[V, B_8; P_8] = \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} g_{P_8 B_8 B_8} \cdot g_{VP_8 P_8} \bar{u}(p_4, \lambda_4) \gamma_5 (\not{p}_2 + m_2) \left( A_1 \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 + A_2 \frac{p_{2\mu}}{m_i} \gamma_5 + B_1 \gamma_\mu + B_2 \frac{p_{2\mu}}{m_i} \right) u(p_i, \lambda_i) \\ (-g^{\mu\nu} + \frac{p_1^\mu p_1^\nu}{m_1^2}) (p_{3\nu} - k_\nu) \frac{\mathcal{F}}{(p_1^2 - m_1^2 + i\varepsilon)(p_2^2 - m_2^2 + i\varepsilon)(k^2 - m_k^2 + i\varepsilon)} \quad (\text{B.3})$$

$$\mathcal{M}[V, B_8; V] = \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} i \cdot \frac{4g_{VVP_8}}{f_{P_8}} \cdot \bar{u}(p_4, \lambda_4) \left( f_{1VBB} \cdot \gamma^\sigma - \frac{if_{2VBB}}{m_2 + m_4} \cdot \sigma^{\nu\sigma} k_\nu \right) (\not{p}_2 + m_2) \cdot \left( A_1 \gamma^\delta \gamma_5 \right. \\ \left. + A_2 \frac{p_2^\delta}{m_i} \gamma_5 + B_1 \gamma^\delta + B_2 \frac{p_2^\delta}{m_i} \right) u(p_i, \lambda_i) p_1^\beta k^\rho \varepsilon_{\beta\delta\rho\sigma} \cdot \frac{\mathcal{F}}{(p_1^2 - m_1^2 + i\varepsilon)(p_2^2 - m_2^2 + i\varepsilon)(k^2 - m_k^2 + i\varepsilon)} \quad (\text{B.4})$$

$$\mathcal{M}[V, B_8; B_8] = \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} (-1) g_{P_8 B_8 B_8} \cdot \bar{u}(p_4, \lambda_4) \left( f_{1VBB} \cdot \gamma_\mu - \frac{if_{2VBB}}{m_k + m_4} \cdot \sigma_{\nu\mu} p_1^\nu \right) (\not{k} + m_k) \gamma_5 (\not{p}_2 + m_2) \left( A_1 \gamma_\alpha \gamma_5 \right. \\ \left. + A_2 \frac{p_{2\alpha}}{m_i} \gamma_5 + B_1 \gamma_\alpha + B_2 \frac{p_{2\alpha}}{m_i} \right) u(p_i, \lambda_i) \left( -g^{\alpha\mu} + \frac{p_1^\alpha p_1^\mu}{m_1^2} \right) \frac{\mathcal{F}}{(p_1^2 - m_1^2 + i\varepsilon)(p_2^2 - m_2^2 + i\varepsilon)(k^2 - m_k^2 + i\varepsilon)} \quad (\text{B.5})$$

$$\mathcal{M}[P_8, B_8; B_{10}] = \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} \left( -\frac{1}{m_1 m_3} \cdot g_{1P_8 B_8 B_{10}} \cdot g_{2P_8 B_8 B_{10}} \right) \cdot \bar{u}(p_4, \lambda_4) (\not{k} + m_k) \cdot \left\{ -g_{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{3} \gamma_\mu \gamma_\nu + \frac{2}{3m_k^2} k_\mu k_\nu \right. \\ \left. - \frac{1}{3m_k} (k_\mu \gamma_\nu - k_\nu \gamma_\mu) \right\} (\not{p}_2 + m_2) (A + B\gamma_5) u(p_i, \lambda_i) p_1^\mu p_3^\nu \cdot \frac{\mathcal{F}}{(p_1^2 - m_1^2 + i\varepsilon)(p_2^2 - m_2^2 + i\varepsilon)(k^2 - m_k^2 + i\varepsilon)} \quad (\text{B.6})$$

$$\mathcal{M}[V, B_8; B_{10}] = \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{g_{PB_8 B_{10}} \cdot g_{VB_8 B_{10}}}{m_1 \cdot m_3} \cdot \bar{u}(p_4, \lambda_4) \gamma_5 \gamma_\alpha (\not{k} + m_k) \left\{ -g_{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{3} \gamma_\mu \gamma_\nu + \frac{2}{3m_k^2} k_\mu k_\nu - \frac{1}{3m_k} (k_\mu \gamma_\nu - k_\nu \gamma_\mu) \right\} \\ (\not{p}_2 + m_2) \left( A_1 \gamma_\beta \gamma_5 + A_2 \frac{p_{2\beta}}{m_i} \gamma_5 + B_1 \gamma_\beta + B_2 \frac{p_{2\beta}}{m_i} \right) u(p_i, \lambda_i) (p_1^\alpha g^{\mu\beta} - p_1^\mu g^{\alpha\beta}) p_3^\nu \cdot \frac{1}{(p_1^2 - m_1^2 + i\varepsilon)} \\ \cdot \frac{\mathcal{F}}{(p_2^2 - m_2^2 + i\varepsilon)(k^2 - m_k^2 + i\varepsilon)} \quad (\text{B.7})$$

$$\mathcal{M}[D^*, B_3, D] = \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} (-1) g_{B_3 B_8 D} \cdot g_{D^* DP_8} \bar{u}(p_4, \lambda_4) \gamma_5 (\not{p}_2 + m_2) \left( A_1 \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 + A_2 \frac{p_{2\mu}}{m_i} \gamma_5 + B_1 \gamma_\mu + B_2 \frac{p_{2\mu}}{m_i} \right) u(p_i, \lambda_i) \\ (-g^{\mu\nu} + \frac{p_1^\mu p_1^\nu}{m_1^2}) p_{3\nu} \cdot \frac{\mathcal{F}}{(p_1^2 - m_1^2 + i\varepsilon)(p_2^2 - m_2^2 + i\varepsilon)(k^2 - m_k^2 + i\varepsilon)} \quad (\text{B.8})$$

$$\mathcal{M}[D, B_3, D^*] = \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} (-1) g_{D^* D P_8} \cdot \bar{u}(p_4, \lambda_4) \left( f_{1B_3 B_8 D^*} \cdot \gamma_\mu - \frac{i f_{2B_3 B D^*}}{m_2 + m_4} \cdot \sigma_{\alpha\mu} k^\alpha \right) (p_2 + m_2)(A + B\gamma_5) u(p_i, \lambda_i) \\ \cdot \frac{\mathcal{F}}{(-g^{\mu\nu} + \frac{k^\mu k^\nu}{m_k^2}) p_{3\nu} \cdot (p_1^2 - m_1^2 + i\varepsilon)(p_2^2 - m_2^2 + i\varepsilon)(k^2 - m_k^2 + i\varepsilon)} \quad (\text{B.9})$$

The general formalism of  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow B_8 V$  amplitudes:

$$\mathcal{M}[P_8, B_8; P_8] = \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} i g_{P_8 B_8 B_8} \cdot g_{V P_8 P_8} \bar{u}(p_4, \lambda_4) \gamma_5 (p_2 + m_2)(A + B\gamma_5) u(p_i, \lambda_i) \varepsilon^{*\mu}(p_3, \lambda_3) (k_\mu + p_{1\mu}) \\ \cdot \frac{\mathcal{F}}{(p_1^2 - m_1^2 + i\varepsilon)(p_2^2 - m_2^2 + i\varepsilon)(k^2 - m_k^2 + i\varepsilon)} \quad (\text{B.10})$$

$$\mathcal{M}[V, B_8; P_8] = \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} (-1) g_{P_8 B_8 B_8} \cdot \frac{4 g_{P_8 V V}}{f_p} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \varepsilon_\beta^*(p_3, \lambda_3) p_{1\mu} p_{3\alpha} (-g_{\nu\delta} + \frac{p_{1\nu} p_{1\delta}}{m_1^2}) \bar{u}(p_4, \lambda_4) \gamma_5 (p_2 + m_2) \\ \cdot (A_1 \gamma^\delta \gamma_5 + A_2 \frac{p_2^\delta}{m_i} \gamma_5 + B_1 \gamma_\delta + B_2 \frac{p_2^\delta}{m_i}) u(p_i, \lambda_i) \cdot \frac{\mathcal{F}}{(p_1^2 - m_1^2 + i\varepsilon)(p_2^2 - m_2^2 + i\varepsilon)(k^2 - m_k^2 + i\varepsilon)} \quad (\text{B.11})$$

$$\mathcal{M}[P_8, B_8; V] = \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{4 g_{P_8 V V}}{f_{P_8}} \bar{u}(p_4, \lambda_4) (f_{1V B_8 B_8} \gamma_\delta - \frac{i f_{2V B_8 B_8}}{m_2 + m_4} \sigma_{\rho\delta} k^\rho) (p_2 + m_2)(A + B\gamma_5) u(p_i, \lambda_i) (-g^{\delta\nu} + \frac{k^\delta k^\nu}{m_k^2}) \\ \cdot \frac{\mathcal{F}}{\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \varepsilon_\beta^*(p_3, \lambda_3) k_\mu p_{3\alpha} \cdot (p_1^2 - m_1^2 + i\varepsilon)(p_2^2 - m_2^2 + i\varepsilon)(k^2 - m_k^2 + i\varepsilon)} \quad (\text{B.12})$$

$$\mathcal{M}[V, B_8, V] = \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} (-\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}) g_{V V V} \bar{u}(p_4, \lambda_4) (f_{1V B_8 B_8} \gamma_\alpha - \frac{i f_{2V B_8 B_8}}{m_2 + m_4} \sigma_{\beta\alpha} k^\beta) (p_2 + m_2) \cdot \left( A_1 \gamma^\delta \gamma_5 + A_2 \frac{p_2^\delta}{m_i} \gamma_5 + B_1 \gamma^\delta \right. \\ \left. + B_2 \frac{p_2^\delta}{m_i} \right) u(p_i, \lambda_i) \cdot \left\{ 2 k_\nu \varepsilon^{*\nu}(p_3, \lambda_3) (-g_{\mu\delta} + \frac{p_{1\mu} p_{1\delta}}{m_1^2}) (-g^{\alpha\mu} + \frac{k^\alpha k^\mu}{m_k^2}) + \left( -p_{1\nu} \varepsilon^{*\mu}(p_3, \lambda_3) + p_3^\mu \varepsilon_\nu^*(p_3, \lambda_3) \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. - p_{3\nu} \varepsilon^{*\mu}(p_3, \lambda_3) - k^\mu \varepsilon_\nu^*(p_3, \lambda_3) \right) \cdot (-g_{\mu\delta} + \frac{p_{1\mu} p_{1\delta}}{m_1^2}) (-g^{\alpha\nu} + \frac{k^\alpha k^\nu}{m_k^2}) \right\} \cdot \frac{1}{(p_1^2 - m_1^2 + i\varepsilon)(p_2^2 - m_2^2 + i\varepsilon)} \\ \cdot \frac{\mathcal{F}}{(k^2 - m_k^2 + i\varepsilon)} \quad (\text{B.13})$$

$$\mathcal{M}[P_8, B_8; B_8] = \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} (-i) g_{P_8 B_8 B_8} \bar{u}(p_4, \lambda_4) \gamma_5 (k + m_k) \left( f_{1V B_8 B_8} \gamma_\mu + \frac{i f_{2V B_8 B_8}}{m_2 + m_k} \sigma_{\nu\mu} p_3^\nu \right) (p_2 + m_2)(A + B\gamma_5) \\ \cdot \frac{\mathcal{F}}{\varepsilon^{*\mu}(p_3, \lambda_3) u(p_i, \lambda_i) \cdot (p_1^2 - m_1^2 + i\varepsilon)(p_2^2 - m_2^2 + i\varepsilon)(k^2 - m_k^2 + i\varepsilon)} \quad (\text{B.14})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}[V, B_8; B_8] &= \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} i\bar{u}(p_4, \lambda_4) \left( f_{1VB_8B_8} \gamma_\mu - \frac{if_{2VB_8B_8}}{m_k + m_4} \sigma_{\nu\mu} p_1^\nu \right) (\not{k} + m_k) \left( f'_{1VB_8B_8} \gamma_\alpha + \frac{if'_{2VB_8B_8}}{m_2 + m_k} \sigma_{\beta\alpha} p_3^\beta \right) \\
&\cdot \left( -g^{\mu\delta} + \frac{p_1^\delta p_1^\mu}{m_1^2} \right) \mathcal{E}^{*\alpha}(p_3, \lambda_3) (p_2 + m_2) \left( A_1 \gamma_\delta \gamma_5 + A_2 \frac{p_{2\delta}}{m_i} \gamma_5 + B_1 \gamma_\delta + B_2 \frac{p_{2\delta}}{m_i} \right) u(p_i, \lambda_i) \cdot \frac{1}{(p_1^2 - m_1^2 + i\varepsilon)} \\
&\cdot \frac{\mathcal{F}}{(p_2^2 - m_2^2 + i\varepsilon)(k^2 - m_k^2 + i\varepsilon)}
\end{aligned} \tag{B.15}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}[D^*, B_3; D^*] &= \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} i\bar{u}(p_4, \lambda_4) \left( f_{1VB_8B_8} \gamma_\alpha - \frac{if_{2VB_8B_8}}{m_2 + m_4} \sigma_{\beta\alpha} k^\beta \right) (p_2 + m_2) \left( A_1 \gamma_\delta \gamma_5 + A_2 \frac{p_{2\delta}}{m_i} \gamma_5 + B_1 \gamma_\delta + B_2 \frac{p_{2\delta}}{m_i} \right) \\
&\cdot u(p_i, \lambda_i) \cdot \left\{ 2g_{D^*D^*V} (-g_{\nu\delta} + \frac{p_{1\nu} p_{1\delta}}{m_1^2}) (-g^{\nu\alpha} + \frac{k^\alpha k^\nu}{m_k^2}) \mathcal{E}^{*\mu}(p_3, \lambda_3) k_\mu - 4f_{D^*D^*V} (-g_{\nu\delta} + \frac{p_{1\nu} p_{1\delta}}{m_1^2}) \right. \\
&\cdot \left. \left( -g^{\mu\alpha} + \frac{k^\mu k^\alpha}{m_k^2} \right) \left( p_3^\mu \mathcal{E}^{*\nu}(p_3, \lambda_3) - p_3^\nu \mathcal{E}^{*\mu}(p_3, \lambda_3) \right) \right\} \cdot \frac{\mathcal{F}}{(p_1^2 - m_1^2 + i\varepsilon)(p_2^2 - m_2^2 + i\varepsilon)(k^2 - m_k^2 + i\varepsilon)}
\end{aligned} \tag{B.16}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}[P_8, B_8; B_{10}] &= \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} i \frac{g_{P_8B_8B_{10}}}{m_1} \frac{g_{VB_8B_{10}}}{m_3} \bar{u}(p_4, \lambda_4) p_1^\alpha (\not{k} + m_k) \left\{ -g_{\alpha\mu} + \frac{1}{3} \gamma_\alpha \gamma_\mu + \frac{2}{3m_k^2} k_\alpha k_\mu - \frac{1}{3m_k} (k_\alpha \gamma_\mu - k_\mu \gamma_\alpha) \right\} \\
&\cdot \gamma_5 \gamma^\nu (p_2 + m_2) \left( p_3^\mu \mathcal{E}_\nu^*(p_3, \lambda_3) - p_{3\nu} \mathcal{E}^{*\mu}(p_3, \lambda_3) \right) (A + B\gamma_5) u(p_i, \lambda_i) \cdot \frac{1}{(p_1^2 - m_1^2 + i\varepsilon)(p_2^2 - m_2^2 + i\varepsilon)} \\
&\cdot \frac{\mathcal{F}}{(k^2 - m_k^2 + i\varepsilon)}
\end{aligned} \tag{B.17}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}[V, B_8; B_{10}] &= \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} (-i) \frac{g_{VB_8B_{10}}}{m_1} \frac{g'_{VB_8B_{10}}}{m_3} \bar{u}(p_4, \lambda_4) \gamma_5 \gamma_\nu (\not{k} + m_k) \cdot \left\{ -g_{\mu\alpha} + \frac{1}{3} \gamma_\mu \gamma_\alpha + \frac{2}{3m_k^2} k_\mu k_\alpha \right. \\
&- \left. \frac{1}{3m_k} (k_\mu \gamma_\alpha - k_\alpha \gamma_\mu) \right\} \cdot \gamma_5 \gamma^\beta \left( p_{3\alpha} \mathcal{E}_\beta^*(p_3, \lambda_3) - p_{3\beta} \mathcal{E}_\alpha^*(p_3, \lambda_3) \right) (p_2 + m_2) \left\{ p_1^\mu \left( -g^{\delta\nu} + \frac{p_1^\delta p_1^\nu}{m_1^2} \right) \right. \\
&- \left. p_1^\nu \left( -g^{\mu\delta} + \frac{p_1^\delta p_1^\mu}{m_1^2} \right) \right\} \cdot \left\{ A_1 \gamma_\delta \gamma_5 + A_2 \frac{p_{2\delta}}{m_i} \gamma_5 + B_1 \gamma_\delta + B_2 \frac{p_{2\delta}}{m_i} \right\} u(p_i, \lambda_i) \cdot \frac{1}{(p_1^2 - m_1^2 + i\varepsilon)(p_2^2 - m_2^2 + i\varepsilon)} \\
&\cdot \frac{\mathcal{F}}{(k^2 - m_k^2 + i\varepsilon)}
\end{aligned} \tag{B.18}$$

In the above complete derivation, the spinor summation formula is required

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_s u(p, s) \bar{u}(p, s) &= \not{p} + m, \\
\sum_s u_\mu(p, s) \bar{u}_\nu(p, s) &= (\not{p} + m) \left\{ -g_{\mu\nu} + \frac{\gamma_\mu \gamma_\nu}{3} + \frac{2p_\mu p_\nu}{3m^2} - \frac{p_\mu \gamma_\nu - p_\nu \gamma_\mu}{3m} \right\},
\end{aligned} \tag{B.19}$$

for spin  $\frac{1}{2}$  and  $\frac{3}{2}$  respectively, and the polarization summation for massive vector meson is

$$\sum_{\lambda_1} \mathcal{E}^{*\rho}(p_1, \lambda_1) \mathcal{E}^\nu(p_1, \lambda_1) = -g^{\rho\nu} + \frac{p_1^\rho p_1^\nu}{m_1^2}, \tag{B.20}$$

## C Full expressions of amplitudes

Here, we give the full amplitudes of five  $\Lambda_b^0$  decay channels we consider in this work:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}(\Lambda_b \rightarrow pK^-) &= \mathcal{S}(\Lambda_b \rightarrow pK^-) + \mathcal{M}(D_s^{*-}, \Lambda_c^+; \bar{D}^0) + \mathcal{M}(D_s^{*-}, \Lambda_c^+; \bar{D}^{*0}) + \mathcal{M}(D_s^-, \Lambda_c^+; \bar{D}^{*0}) + \mathcal{M}(K^-, p; \rho^0) \\
&+ \mathcal{M}(K^{*-}, p; \rho^0) + \mathcal{M}(K^{*-}, p; \pi^0) + \mathcal{M}(K^{*-}, p; \eta) + \mathcal{M}(K^-, p; \omega) + \mathcal{M}(K^{*-}, p; \omega) \\
&+ \mathcal{M}(\pi^0, \Lambda^0; K^{*+}) + \mathcal{M}(\rho^0, \Lambda^0; K^{*+}) + \mathcal{M}(\eta, \Lambda^0; K^{*+}) + \mathcal{M}(\omega, \Lambda^0; K^{*+}) + \mathcal{M}(\phi, \Lambda^0; K^{*+}) \\
&+ \mathcal{M}(\bar{K}^{*0}, n; \pi^+) + \mathcal{M}(\bar{K}^{*0}, n; \rho^+) + \mathcal{M}(\bar{K}^0, n; \rho^+) + \mathcal{M}(\pi^0, \Lambda^0; p) + \mathcal{M}(\eta, \Lambda^0; p) + \mathcal{M}(\rho^0, \Lambda^0; p) \\
&+ \mathcal{M}(\omega, \Lambda^0; p) + \mathcal{M}(\rho^0, \Lambda^0; K^+) + \mathcal{M}(\omega, \Lambda^0; K^+) + \mathcal{M}(\phi, \Lambda^0; K^+)
\end{aligned} \tag{C.1}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}(\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\pi^-) &= \mathcal{S}(\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\pi^-) + \mathcal{M}(D^-, \Lambda_c^+; \bar{D}^{*0}) + \mathcal{M}(D^{*-}, \Lambda_c^+; \bar{D}^{*0}) + \mathcal{M}(D^{*-}, \Lambda_c^+; \bar{D}^0) + \mathcal{M}(D^-, \Lambda_c^+; \Sigma_c^{++}) \\
&+ \mathcal{M}(D^{*-}, \Lambda_c^+; \Sigma_c^{++}) + \mathcal{M}(\pi^-, p; \rho^0) + \mathcal{M}(\rho^-, p; \pi^0) + \mathcal{M}(\rho^-, p; \omega) + \mathcal{M}(\pi^-, p; \Delta^{++}) \\
&+ \mathcal{M}(\rho^-, p; \Delta^{++}) + \mathcal{M}(\pi^0, n; \rho^+) + \mathcal{M}(\rho^0, n; \pi^+) + \mathcal{M}(\omega, n; \rho^+) + \mathcal{M}(\pi^0, n; p) \mathcal{M}(\eta, n; p) \\
&+ \mathcal{M}(\rho^0, n; p) + \mathcal{M}(\omega, n; p) + \mathcal{M}(K^0, \Lambda^0; K^{*+}) + \mathcal{M}(K^{*0}, \Lambda^0; K^+) + \mathcal{M}(K^{*0}, \Lambda^0; K^{*+}) \\
&+ \mathcal{M}(K^0, \Lambda^0; \Sigma^+) + \mathcal{M}(K^{*0}, \Lambda^0; \Sigma^+) + \mathcal{M}(K^0, \Lambda^0; \Sigma^{*+}) + \mathcal{M}(K^{*0}, \Lambda^0; \Sigma^{*+}) + \mathcal{M}(\pi^0, n; \Delta^+) \\
&+ \mathcal{M}(\rho^0, n; \Delta^+)
\end{aligned} \tag{C.2}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}(\Lambda_b \rightarrow pK^{*-}) &= \mathcal{S}(\Lambda_b \rightarrow pK^{*-}) + \mathcal{M}(D_s^-, \Lambda_c^+; \bar{D}^0) + \mathcal{M}(D_s^-, \Lambda_c^+; \bar{D}^{*0}) + \mathcal{M}(D_s^{*-}, \Lambda_c^+; \bar{D}^0) + \mathcal{M}(D_s^{*-}, \Lambda_c^+; \bar{D}^{*0}) \\
&+ \mathcal{M}(K^-, p; \pi^0) + \mathcal{M}(K^-, p; \rho^0) + \mathcal{M}(K^-, p; \eta) + \mathcal{M}(K^{*-}, p; \pi^0) + \mathcal{M}(K^{*-}, p; \eta) + \mathcal{M}(K^{*-}, p; \rho^0) \\
&+ \mathcal{M}(K^{*-}, p; \omega) + \mathcal{M}(\eta, \Lambda^0; K^+) + \mathcal{M}(\eta, \Lambda^0; K^{*+}) + \mathcal{M}(\pi^0, \Lambda^0; K^+) + \mathcal{M}(\pi^0, \Lambda^0; K^{*+}) + \mathcal{M}(\rho^0, \Lambda^0; K^+) \\
&+ \mathcal{M}(\rho^0, \Lambda^0; K^{*+}) + \mathcal{M}(\phi, \Lambda^0; K^+) + \mathcal{M}(\phi, \Lambda^0; K^{*+}) + \mathcal{M}(\omega, \Lambda^0; K^+) + \mathcal{M}(\omega, \Lambda^0; K^{*+}) + \mathcal{M}(\eta, \Lambda^0; p) \\
&+ \mathcal{M}(\pi^0, \Lambda^0; p) + \mathcal{M}(\rho^0, \Lambda^0; p) + \mathcal{M}(\omega, \Lambda^0; p) + \mathcal{M}(\bar{K}^0, n; \pi^+) + \mathcal{M}(\bar{K}^0, n; \rho^+) + \mathcal{M}(\bar{K}^{*0}, n; \pi^+) \\
&+ \mathcal{M}(\bar{K}^{*0}, n; \rho^+)
\end{aligned} \tag{C.3}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}(\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\rho^-) &= \mathcal{S}(\Lambda_b \rightarrow p\rho^-) + \mathcal{M}(D^-, \Lambda_c^+; \bar{D}^0) + \mathcal{M}(D^-, \Lambda_c^+; \bar{D}^{*0}) + \mathcal{M}(D^{*-}, \Lambda_c^+; \bar{D}^0) + \mathcal{M}(D^{*-}, \Lambda_c^+; \bar{D}^{*0}) \\
&+ \mathcal{M}(D^-, \Lambda_c^+; \Sigma_c^{++}) + \mathcal{M}(D^{*-}, \Lambda_c^+; \Sigma_c^{++}) + \mathcal{M}(\pi^-, p; \pi^0) + \mathcal{M}(\pi^-, p; \omega) + \mathcal{M}(\rho^-, p; \eta) \\
&+ \mathcal{M}(\rho^-, p; \rho^0) + \mathcal{M}(\pi^-, p; \Delta^{++}) + \mathcal{M}(\rho^-, p; \Delta^{++}) + \mathcal{M}(\pi^0, n; \pi^+) + \mathcal{M}(\pi^0, n; p) + \mathcal{M}(\pi^0, n; \Delta^+) \\
&+ \mathcal{M}(\eta, n; \rho^+) + \mathcal{M}(\eta, n; p) + \mathcal{M}(\rho^0, n; \rho^+) + \mathcal{M}(\rho^0, n; p) + \mathcal{M}(\rho^0, n; \Delta^+) + \mathcal{M}(\omega, n; \pi^+) \\
&+ \mathcal{M}(\omega, n; p) + \mathcal{M}(K^0, \Lambda^0; K^+) + \mathcal{M}(K^0, \Lambda^0; K^{*+}) + \mathcal{M}(K^0, \Lambda^0; \Sigma^+) + \mathcal{M}(K^0, \Lambda^0; \Sigma^{*+}) \\
&+ \mathcal{M}(K^{*0}, \Lambda^0; K^+) + \mathcal{M}(K^{*0}, \Lambda^0; K^{*+}) + \mathcal{M}(K^{*0}, \Lambda^0; \Sigma^+) + \mathcal{M}(K^{*0}, \Lambda^0; \Sigma^{*+})
\end{aligned} \tag{C.4}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}(\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda^0\phi) &= \mathcal{S}(\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda^0\phi) + \mathcal{M}(D_s^-, \Lambda_c^+; D_s^-) + \mathcal{M}(D_s^{*-}, \Lambda_c^+; D_s^{*-}) + \mathcal{M}(D_s^{*-}, \Lambda_c^+; D_s^-) + \mathcal{M}(D_s^-, \Lambda_c^+; D_s^{*-}) \\
&+ \mathcal{M}(K^-, p; K^-) + \mathcal{M}(K^-, p; K^{*-}) + \mathcal{M}(K^{*-}, p; K^-) + \mathcal{M}(K^{*-}, p; K^{*-}) + \mathcal{M}(\eta, \Lambda^0; \phi) \\
&+ \mathcal{M}(\phi, \Lambda^0; \eta) + \mathcal{M}(\bar{K}^0, n; \bar{K}^0) + \mathcal{M}(\bar{K}^0, n; \bar{K}^{*0}) + \mathcal{M}(\bar{K}^{*0}, n; \bar{K}^0) + \mathcal{M}(\bar{K}^{*0}, n; \bar{K}^{*0}) + \mathcal{M}(\eta, \Lambda^0; \Lambda^0) \\
&+ \mathcal{M}(\omega, \Lambda^0; \Lambda^0) + \mathcal{M}(\phi, \Lambda^0; \Lambda^0)
\end{aligned} \tag{C.5}$$

## References

- [1] N. Cabibbo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **10**, 531-533 (1963) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.10.531
- [2] M. Kobayashi and T. Maskawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. **49**, 652-657 (1973) doi:10.1143/PTP.49.652
- [3] A. D. Sakharov, Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **5**, 32-35 (1967) doi:10.1070/PU1991v034n05ABEH002497
- [4] R. L. Workman *et al.* [Particle Data Group], PTEP **2022**, 083C01 (2022) doi:10.1093/ptep/ptac097
- [5] J. X. Yu, J. J. Han, Y. Li, H. n. Li, Z. J. Xiao and F. S. Yu, [arXiv:2409.02821 [hep-ph]].
- [6] M. Huschle *et al.* [Belle], Phys. Rev. D **92**, no.7, 072014 (2015) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.072014 [arXiv:1507.03233 [hep-ex]].
- [7] S. Hirose *et al.* [Belle], Phys. Rev. Lett. **118**, no.21, 211801 (2017) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.118.211801 [arXiv:1612.00529 [hep-ex]].
- [8] J. T. Wei *et al.* [Belle], Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 171801 (2009) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.103.171801 [arXiv:0904.0770 [hep-ex]].

- [9] S. Wehle *et al.* [Belle], Phys. Rev. Lett. **118**, no.11, 111801 (2017) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.118.111801 [arXiv:1612.05014 [hep-ex]].
- [10] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb], Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 151601 (2014) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.113.151601 [arXiv:1406.6482 [hep-ex]].
- [11] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb], JHEP **08**, 055 (2017) doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2017)055 [arXiv:1705.05802 [hep-ex]].
- [12] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb], Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, no.11, 111803 (2015) [erratum: Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, no.15, 159901 (2015)] doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.115.111803 [arXiv:1506.08614 [hep-ex]].
- [13] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb], JHEP **02**, 104 (2016) doi:10.1007/JHEP02(2016)104 [arXiv:1512.04442 [hep-ex]].
- [14] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb], Nature Phys. **18**, no.3, 277-282 (2022) doi:10.1038/s41567-023-02095-3 [arXiv:2103.11769 [hep-ex]].
- [15] M. Gronau and J. L. Rosner, Phys. Lett. B **749**, 104-107 (2015) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2015.07.060 [arXiv:1506.01346 [hep-ph]].
- [16] C. Q. Geng and C. W. Liu, JHEP **11**, 104 (2021) doi:10.1007/JHEP11(2021)104 [arXiv:2109.09524 [hep-ph]].
- [17] Z. J. Ajaltouni, E. Conte and O. Leitner, Phys. Lett. B **614**, 165-173 (2005) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2005.04.014 [arXiv:hep-ph/0412116 [hep-ph]].
- [18] J. P. Wang, Q. Qin and F. S. Yu, [arXiv:2211.07332 [hep-ph]].
- [19] Z. Rui, J. M. Li and C. Q. Zhang, Phys. Rev. D **107**, no.5, 053009 (2023) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.107.053009 [arXiv:2210.15357 [hep-ph]].
- [20] G. Durieux, JHEP **10**, 005 (2016) doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2016)005 [arXiv:1608.03288 [hep-ph]].
- [21] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb], Phys. Lett. B **759**, 282-292 (2016) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2016.05.077 [arXiv:1603.02870 [hep-ex]].
- [22] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb], JHEP **04**, 087 (2014) doi:10.1007/JHEP04(2014)087 [arXiv:1402.0770 [hep-ex]].
- [23] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb], Phys. Lett. B **787**, 124-133 (2018) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2018.10.039 [arXiv:1807.06544 [hep-ex]].

- [24] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb], JHEP **09**, 006 (2015) doi:10.1007/JHEP09(2015)006 [arXiv:1505.03295 [hep-ex]].
- [25] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb], JHEP **05**, 081 (2016) doi:10.1007/JHEP05(2016)081 [arXiv:1603.00413 [hep-ex]].
- [26] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb], JHEP **02**, 098 (2018) doi:10.1007/JHEP02(2018)098 [arXiv:1711.05490 [hep-ex]].
- [27] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb], Phys. Rev. D **102**, no.5, 051101 (2020) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.102.051101 [arXiv:1912.10741 [hep-ex]].
- [28] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb], JHEP **08**, 039 (2018) doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2018)039 [arXiv:1805.03941 [hep-ex]].
- [29] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb], Nature Phys. **13**, 391-396 (2017) doi:10.1038/nphys4021 [arXiv:1609.05216 [hep-ex]].
- [30] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb], JHEP **06**, 108 (2017) doi:10.1007/JHEP06(2017)108 [arXiv:1703.00256 [hep-ex]].
- [31] Y. J. Zhao, Z. H. Zhang and X. H. Guo, Phys. Rev. D **110**, no.1, 013007 (2024) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.110.013007 [arXiv:2403.05011 [hep-ph]].
- [32] Z. H. Zhang, Phys. Rev. D **107**, no.1, L011301 (2023) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.107.L011301 [arXiv:2209.13196 [hep-ph]].
- [33] Z. H. Zhang and J. J. Qi, Eur. Phys. J. C **83**, no.2, 133 (2023) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-023-11267-7 [arXiv:2208.13411 [hep-ph]].
- [34] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb], Phys. Rev. Lett. **124**, no.3, 031801 (2020) doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.124.031801 [arXiv:1909.05211 [hep-ex]].
- [35] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb], Phys. Rev. D **108**, no.1, 012008 (2023) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.108.012008 [arXiv:2206.07622 [hep-ex]].
- [36] J. H. Alvarenga Nogueira, I. Bediaga, A. B. R. Cavalcante, T. Frederico and O. Lourenço, Phys. Rev. D **92**, no.5, 054010 (2015) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.054010 [arXiv:1506.08332 [hep-ph]].
- [37] H. Y. Cheng and C. K. Chua, Phys. Rev. D **102**, no.5, 053006 (2020) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.102.053006 [arXiv:2007.02558 [hep-ph]].

- [38] R. A. Garrote, J. Cuervo, P. C. Magalhães and J. R. Peláez, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **130**, no.20, 201901 (2023) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.130.201901 [arXiv:2210.08354 [hep-ph]].
- [39] I. Bediaga, T. Frederico and P. C. Magalhães, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, no.5, 051802 (2023) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.131.051802 [arXiv:2203.04056 [hep-ph]].
- [40] J. P. Wang and F. S. Yu, *Chin. Phys. C* **48**, no.10, 101002 (2024) doi:10.1088/1674-1137/ad75f4 [arXiv:2407.04110 [hep-ph]].
- [41] W. Detmold, C. Lehner and S. Meinel, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, no.3, 034503 (2015) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.034503 [arXiv:1503.01421 [hep-lat]].
- [42] H. G. Dosch, E. Ferreira, M. Nielsen and R. Rosenfeld, *Phys. Lett. B* **431**, 173-178 (1998) doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(98)00566-8 [arXiv:hep-ph/9712350 [hep-ph]].
- [43] C. S. Huang, C. F. Qiao and H. G. Yan, *Phys. Lett. B* **437**, 403-407 (1998) doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(98)00909-5 [arXiv:hep-ph/9805452 [hep-ph]].
- [44] R. S. Marques de Carvalho, F. S. Navarra, M. Nielsen, E. Ferreira and H. G. Dosch, *Phys. Rev. D* **60**, 034009 (1999) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.60.034009 [arXiv:hep-ph/9903326 [hep-ph]].
- [45] M. q. Huang and D. W. Wang, *Phys. Rev. D* **69**, 094003 (2004) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.69.094003 [arXiv:hep-ph/0401094 [hep-ph]].
- [46] Y. M. Wang, Y. L. Shen and C. D. Lu, *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 074012 (2009) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.80.074012 [arXiv:0907.4008 [hep-ph]].
- [47] K. Azizi, M. Bayar, Y. Sarac and H. Sundu, *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 096007 (2009) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.80.096007 [arXiv:0908.1758 [hep-ph]].
- [48] A. Khodjamirian, C. Klein, T. Mannel and Y. M. Wang, *JHEP* **09**, 106 (2011) doi:10.1007/JHEP09(2011)106 [arXiv:1108.2971 [hep-ph]].
- [49] K. S. Huang, W. Liu, Y. L. Shen and F. S. Yu, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83**, no.4, 272 (2023) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-023-11349-6 [arXiv:2205.06095 [hep-ph]].
- [50] 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) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-022-10642-0 [arXiv:2202.04804 [hep-ph]].
- [51] C. D. Lu, Y. M. Wang, H. Zou, A. Ali and G. Kramer, *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 034011 (2009) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.80.034011 [arXiv:0906.1479 [hep-ph]].

- [52] H. H. Shih, S. C. Lee and H. n. Li, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 094014 (1999) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.59.094014 [arXiv:hep-ph/9810515 [hep-ph]].
- [53] T. Feldmann and M. W. Y. Yip, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 014035 (2012) [erratum: Phys. Rev. D **86**, 079901 (2012)] doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.85.014035 [arXiv:1111.1844 [hep-ph]].
- [54] J. Zhu, Z. T. Wei and H. W. Ke, Phys. Rev. D **99**, no.5, 054020 (2019) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.99.054020 [arXiv:1803.01297 [hep-ph]].
- [55] H. Y. Cheng and B. Tseng, Phys. Rev. D **53**, 1457 (1996) [erratum: Phys. Rev. D **55**, 1697 (1997)] doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.53.1457 [arXiv:hep-ph/9502391 [hep-ph]].
- [56] C. Q. Geng, C. W. Liu and T. H. Tsai, Phys. Rev. D **102**, no.3, 034033 (2020) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.102.034033 [arXiv:2007.09897 [hep-ph]].
- [57] A. K. Leibovich, Z. Ligeti, I. W. Stewart and M. B. Wise, Phys. Lett. B **586**, 337-344 (2004) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2004.02.033 [arXiv:hep-ph/0312319 [hep-ph]].
- [58] S. Mantry, D. Pirjol and I. W. Stewart, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 114009 (2003) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.68.114009 [arXiv:hep-ph/0306254 [hep-ph]].
- [59] H. Y. Cheng, Phys. Rev. D **56**, 2799-2811 (1997) [erratum: Phys. Rev. D **99**, no.7, 079901 (2019)] doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.56.2799 [arXiv:hep-ph/9612223 [hep-ph]].
- [60] R. Mohanta, A. K. Giri and M. P. Khanna, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 074001 (2001) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.63.074001 [arXiv:hep-ph/0006109 [hep-ph]].
- [61] H. Y. Cheng, Phys. Lett. B **289**, 455-462 (1992) doi:10.1016/0370-2693(92)91248-8
- [62] C. D. Lu, K. Ukai and M. Z. Yang, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 074009 (2001) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.63.074009 [arXiv:hep-ph/0004213 [hep-ph]].
- [63] Y. Y. Keum, H. N. Li and A. I. Sanda, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 054008 (2001) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.63.054008 [arXiv:hep-ph/0004173 [hep-ph]].
- [64] M. Beneke and M. Neubert, Nucl. Phys. B **675**, 333-415 (2003) doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2003.09.026 [arXiv:hep-ph/0308039 [hep-ph]].
- [65] S. Roy, R. Sinha and N. G. Deshpande, Phys. Rev. D **101**, no.3, 036018 (2020) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.101.036018 [arXiv:1911.01121 [hep-ph]].

- [66] X. G. He and G. N. Li, Phys. Lett. B **750**, 82-88 (2015) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2015.08.048 [arXiv:1501.00646 [hep-ph]].
- [67] M. He, X. G. He and G. N. Li, Phys. Rev. D **92**, no.3, 036010 (2015) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.036010 [arXiv:1507.07990 [hep-ph]].
- [68] C. Q. Geng, Y. K. Hsiao, Y. H. Lin and Y. Yu, Eur. Phys. J. C **76**, no.7, 399 (2016) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-4255-x [arXiv:1603.06682 [hep-ph]].
- [69] Y. K. Hsiao and C. Q. Geng, PoS **FPCP2015**, 073 (2015) doi:10.22323/1.248.0073
- [70] Y. K. Hsiao, Y. Yao and C. Q. Geng, Phys. Rev. D **95**, no.9, 093001 (2017) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.95.093001 [arXiv:1702.05263 [hep-ph]].
- [71] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb], [arXiv:2412.13958 [hep-ex]].
- [72] E. h. El aaoud and A. N. Kamal, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **15**, 4163-4178 (2000) doi:10.1016/S0217-751X(00)00137-0 [arXiv:hep-ph/9910327 [hep-ph]].
- [73] R. H. Li, J. J. Hou, B. He and Y. R. Wang, Chin. Phys. C **45**, no.4, 043108 (2021) doi:10.1088/1674-1137/abe0bc [arXiv:2010.09362 [hep-ph]].
- [74] L. J. Jiang, B. He and R. H. Li, Eur. Phys. J. C **78**, no.11, 961 (2018) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-018-6445-1 [arXiv:1810.00541 [hep-ph]].
- [75] R. H. Li and C. D. Lu, [arXiv:1805.09064 [hep-ph]].
- [76] H. Y. Cheng, Eur. Phys. J. C **26**, 551-565 (2003) doi:10.1140/epjc/s2002-01065-6 [arXiv:hep-ph/0202254 [hep-ph]].
- [77] J. J. Han, R. X. Zhang, H. Y. Jiang, Z. J. Xiao and F. S. Yu, Eur. Phys. J. C **81**, no.6, 539 (2021) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-021-09239-w [arXiv:2102.00961 [hep-ph]].
- [78] J. J. Han, H. Y. Jiang, W. Liu, Z. J. Xiao and F. S. Yu, Chin. Phys. C **45**, no.5, 053105 (2021) doi:10.1088/1674-1137/abec68 [arXiv:2101.12019 [hep-ph]].
- [79] F. S. Yu, H. Y. Jiang, R. H. Li, C. D. Lü, W. Wang and Z. X. Zhao, Chin. Phys. C **42**, no.5, 051001 (2018) doi:10.1088/1674-1137/42/5/051001 [arXiv:1703.09086 [hep-ph]].
- [80] M. Ablikim, D. S. Du and M. Z. Yang, Phys. Lett. B **536**, 34-42 (2002) doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(02)01812-9 [arXiv:hep-ph/0201168 [hep-ph]].

- [81] J. W. Li, M. Z. Yang and D. S. Du, HEPNP **27**, 665-672 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0206154 [hep-ph]].
- [82] C. P. Jia, H. Y. Jiang, J. P. Wang and F. S. Yu, [arXiv:2408.14959 [hep-ph]].
- [83] H. Y. Cheng, C. K. Chua and A. Soni, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 014030 (2005) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.71.014030 [arXiv:hep-ph/0409317 [hep-ph]].
- [84] D. Wang, C. P. Jia and F. S. Yu, JHEP **21**, 126 (2020) doi:10.1007/JHEP09(2021)126 [arXiv:2001.09460 [hep-ph]].
- [85] M. Bander, D. Silverman and A. Soni, Phys. Rev. Lett. **43**, 242 (1979) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.43.242
- [86] T. M. Aliev, K. Azizi and M. Savci, Phys. Lett. B **696**, 220-226 (2011) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2010.12.027 [arXiv:1009.3658 [hep-ph]].
- [87] T. M. Aliev, A. Ozpineci, S. B. Yakovlev and V. Zamiralov, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 116001 (2006) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.74.116001
- [88] G. Janssen, K. Holinde and J. Speth, Phys. Rev. C **54**, 2218-2234 (1996) doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.54.2218
- [89] T. M. Aliev, A. Ozpineci, M. Savci and V. S. Zamiralov, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 016010 (2009) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.80.016010 [arXiv:0905.4664 [hep-ph]].
- [90] T. M. Aliev, K. Azizi and M. Savci, Nucl. Phys. A **852**, 141-154 (2011) doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysa.2011.01.011 [arXiv:1011.0086 [hep-ph]].
- [91] K. Azizi, Y. Sarac and H. Sundu, Phys. Rev. D **90**, no.11, 114011 (2014) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.90.114011 [arXiv:1410.7548 [hep-ph]].
- [92] G. L. Yu, Z. G. Wang and Z. Y. Li, Chin. Phys. C **41**, no.8, 083104 (2017) doi:10.1088/1674-1137/41/8/083104 [arXiv:1608.03460 [hep-ph]].
- [93] K. Azizi, Y. Sarac and H. Sundu, Nucl. Phys. A **943**, 159-167 (2015) doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysa.2015.09.005 [arXiv:1501.05084 [hep-ph]].
- [94] A. Ballon-Bayona, G. Krein and C. Miller, Phys. Rev. D **96**, no.1, 014017 (2017) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.96.014017 [arXiv:1702.08417 [hep-ph]].
- [95] H. Y. Jiang and S. P. Jin, [arXiv:2406.06209 [hep-ph]].

- [96] S. P. Jin and H. Y. Jiang, Eur. Phys. J. C **84**, no.6, 598 (2024) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-024-12867-7 [arXiv:2403.13087 [hep-ph]].
- [97] R. Casalbuoni, A. Deandrea, N. Di Bartolomeo, R. Gatto, F. Feruglio and G. Nardulli, Phys. Rept. **281**, 145-238 (1997) doi:10.1016/S0370-1573(96)00027-0 [arXiv:hep-ph/9605342 [hep-ph]].
- [98] D. Ronchen, M. Doring, F. Huang, H. Habertzettl, J. Haidenbauer, C. Hanhart, S. Krewald, U. G. Meissner and K. Nakayama, Eur. Phys. J. A **49**, 44 (2013) doi:10.1140/epja/i2013-13044-5 [arXiv:1211.6998 [nucl-th]].
- [99] M. Beneke, G. Buchalla, M. Neubert and C. T. Sachrajda, Nucl. Phys. B **606**, 245-321 (2001) doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(01)00251-6 [arXiv:hep-ph/0104110 [hep-ph]].
- [100] T. D. Lee and C. N. Yang, Phys. Rev. **108**, 1645-1647 (1957) doi:10.1103/PhysRev.108.1645
- [101] S. Pakvasa, S. P. Rosen and S. F. Tuan, Phys. Rev. D **42**, 3746-3754 (1990) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.42.3746
- [102] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. **112**, 1375-1379 (1958) doi:10.1103/PhysRev.112.1375
- [103] L. Wolfenstein, Phys. Rev. D **43**, 151-156 (1991) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.43.151
- [104] M. Suzuki and L. Wolfenstein, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 074019 (1999) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.60.074019 [arXiv:hep-ph/9903477 [hep-ph]].
- [105] Z. L. Yue, Q. Y. Guo and D. Y. Chen, Phys. Rev. D **109**, no.9, 094049 (2024) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.109.094049 [arXiv:2402.10594 [hep-ph]].
- [106] M. E. Peskin and D. V. Schroeder, Addison-Wesley, 1995, ISBN 978-0-201-50397-5, 978-0-429-50355-9, 978-0-429-49417-8 doi:10.1201/9780429503559
- [107] J. Fu, H. B. Li, J. P. Wang, F. S. Yu and J. Zhang, Phys. Rev. D **108**, no.9, 9 (2023) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.108.L091301 [arXiv:2307.04364 [hep-ex]].
- [108] X. G. He and J. P. Ma, Phys. Lett. B **839**, 137834 (2023) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2023.137834 [arXiv:2212.08243 [hep-ph]].
- [109] U. G. Meissner, Phys. Rept. **161**, 213 (1988) doi:10.1016/0370-1573(88)90090-7
- [110] M. Ablikim *et al.* [BESIII], Phys. Rev. Lett. **132**, no.3, 031801 (2024) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.132.031801 [arXiv:2309.02774 [hep-ex]].

- [111] H. Chen and R. G. Ping, Phys. Rev. D **99**, no.11, 114027 (2019) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.99.114027
- [112] J. P. Wang and F. S. Yu, Phys. Lett. B **849**, 138460 (2024) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2024.138460 [arXiv:2208.01589 [hep-ph]].
- [113] J. W. Cronin and O. E. Overseth, Phys. Rev. **129**, 1795-1807 (1963) doi:10.1103/PhysRev.129.1795
- [114] O. E. Overseth and R. F. Roth, Phys. Rev. Lett. **19**, 391-393 (1967) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.19.391
- [115] W. E. Cleland, G. Conforto, G. H. Eaton, H. J. Gerber, M. Reinharz, A. Gautschi, E. Heer, C. Revillard and G. Von Dardel, Nucl. Phys. B **40**, 221-254 (1972) doi:10.1016/0550-3213(72)90544-5
- [116] P. C. Hong, F. Yan, R. G. Ping and T. Luo, Chin. Phys. C **47**, no.5, 053101 (2023) doi:10.1088/1674-1137/acb7ce [arXiv:2211.16014 [hep-ph]].
- [117] M. Ablikim *et al.* [BESIII], JHEP **12**, 033 (2022) doi:10.1007/JHEP12(2022)033 [arXiv:2209.08464 [hep-ex]].
- [118] M. Ciuchini, R. Contino, E. Franco, G. Martinelli and L. Silvestrini, Nucl. Phys. B **512**, 3-18 (1998) [erratum: Nucl. Phys. B **531**, 656-660 (1998)] doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(97)00768-2 [arXiv:hep-ph/9708222 [hep-ph]].
- [119] M. Ciuchini, E. Franco, G. Martinelli, A. Masiero, M. Pierini and L. Silvestrini, [arXiv:hep-ph/0407073 [hep-ph]].
- [120] P. Colangelo, G. Nardulli, N. Paver and Riazuddin, Z. Phys. C **45**, 575 (1990) doi:10.1007/BF01556270
- [121] C. Isola, M. Ladisa, G. Nardulli, T. N. Pham and P. Santorelli, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 014029 (2001) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.64.014029 [arXiv:hep-ph/0101118 [hep-ph]].
- [122] C. Isola, M. Ladisa, G. Nardulli, T. N. Pham and P. Santorelli, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 094005 (2002) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.65.094005 [arXiv:hep-ph/0110411 [hep-ph]].
- [123] C. Isola, M. Ladisa, G. Nardulli and P. Santorelli, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 114001 (2003) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.68.114001 [arXiv:hep-ph/0307367 [hep-ph]].
- [124] J. Zhu, H. W. Ke and Z. T. Wei, Eur. Phys. J. C **76**, no.5, 284 (2016) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-4134-5 [arXiv:1603.02800 [hep-ph]].

- [125] Z. T. Wei, H. W. Ke and X. Q. Li, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 094016 (2009) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.80.094016 [arXiv:0909.0100 [hep-ph]].
- [126] Z. T. Zou, A. Ali, C. D. Lu, X. Liu and Y. Li, Phys. Rev. D **91**, 054033 (2015) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.91.054033 [arXiv:1501.00784 [hep-ph]].
- [127] J. F. Donoghue, X. G. He and S. Pakvasa, Phys. Rev. D **34**, 833 (1986) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.34.833
- [128] M. Ablikim *et al.* [BESIII], Nature Phys. **15**, 631-634 (2019) doi:10.1038/s41567-019-0494-8 [arXiv:1808.08917 [hep-ex]].
- [129] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb], Phys. Lett. B **724** (2013), 27-35 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2013.05.041 [arXiv:1302.5578 [hep-ex]].
- [130] A. M. Sirunyan *et al.* [CMS], Phys. Rev. D **97** (2018) no.7, 072010 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.97.072010 [arXiv:1802.04867 [hep-ex]].
- [131] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb], “Measurement of the  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow J/\psi\Lambda$  angular distribution and the  $\Lambda_b^0$  polarisation in  $pp$  collisions,” JHEP **06**, 110 (2020) [arXiv:2004.10563 [hep-ex]].
- [132] Z. H. Zhang, Phys. Rev. D **109**, no.1, L011103 (2024) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.109.L011103 [arXiv:2310.11388 [hep-ph]].
- [133] A. V. Manohar and M. B. Wise, Camb. Monogr. Part. Phys. Nucl. Phys. Cosmol. **10**, 1-191 (2000)
- [134] W. Bensalem, A. Datta and D. London, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 094004 (2002) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.66.094004 [arXiv:hep-ph/0208054 [hep-ph]].
- [135] W. Bensalem and D. London, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 116003 (2001) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.64.116003 [arXiv:hep-ph/0005018 [hep-ph]].
- [136] W. Bensalem, A. Datta and D. London, Phys. Lett. B **538**, 309-320 (2002) doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(02)02028-2 [arXiv:hep-ph/0205009 [hep-ph]].