A CONSISTENT SCENARIO FOR B^+ PS DECAYS
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We consider B^+ PS decays where P stands for pseudoscalar and S for a heavy (1500 MeV) scalar meson. We achieve agreement with available experimental data (which includes a two orders of magnitude hierarchy (assuming the scalars mesons are two quark states. The contribution of the dipolar penguin operator O_11 is quantified.

I. INTRODUCTION

The scalar sector below two GeV is poorly understood, nevertheless several features (like the presence of two multiplets and several of their properties naturally arise in the analysis of a number of authors. A rst set of scalars with masses around 1.5 GeV are grouped in a heavy multiplet, including the K_0 (1430), a_0 (1450), f_0 (1500) for the octet, f_2 (1370) which is identied with the singlet and the f_0 (1710) which seems to be mainly glueball. The octet is nearly degenerate, like similar pseudoscalar, vector, axial vector and tensor multiplets, their widths are small ( 100 MeV). The mixing angles seem to be small except by the singlet-glueball which is around 20°, according to H. Y. Cheng in ref. [2]. It has been more difficult to establish the lighter multiplet, even the existence and nature of some of their members is in doubt. The light multiplet should include the a_0 (980), f_0 (980) and the K_0 (800) in the octet; while the singlet could be identied with the f_0 (600). The mixing is not clear and their widths are very large. Ideally, the former multiplet can be identied as the ground state of quark antiquark bound states with angular momentum one while the latter with the ground state of four quarks system with zero angular momentum. In the real world an undetermined mixing between the two multiplets is expected. Alternatively both multiplets could be identied as quark-antiquark states with angular momentum one, the lighter being the ground state while the heavier the rst excited state.

The full understanding of the scalar multiplets previously described remain a challenge, both from the experimental perspective as well as from the theoretical point of view [3]. To start with, there is not enough and conclusive experimental information regarding the existence and properties of the scalars. Notice that the information is poor because of the lack of sources of scalar mesons, for example any of the decays of particles containing c or b quarks involves the production of scalar mesons. The information on the scalars is scarce because of the large width they have since that produces a large overlap with nearby resonances and with the background. In spite of those problems, precise experimental results are available [1,3,4] for the mass and width of the f_0 and K_0, for the angle [5] of the CKM matrix and for several partial widths. It has been speculated that the angle can be extracted in processes involving scalars [6] and new projects like the LHC B.
will improve the old measurements and obtain new results. Relevant to our work are the branching ratios for the B!PS decays measured by different groups, which show a non-trivial hierarchy. The experimental data collected in Table I suggest that, for B!PS decays including members of the heavy scalar multiplet, the order of magnitude of the branching ratios involving the K0 (1430), the f0 (1370); fS (1500) and the a0 (1450) are different.

On the theoretical side the situation is not better. The origin of the difficulties are the non-perturbative regime of QCD and the limited computer capacity for the lattice approach. The nature of the observed scalars has been discussed at length and proposals exist to identify them as 2 or 4 quark states, glueballs, molecules, etc. and several theoretical formalisms have been developed to calculate non-leptonic decays. The simplest one is the so-called ‘Naive Factorization Approach’ (NFA), which in general produces the correct order of magnitude and its predictions are in rough agreement with the experimental results. Discrepancies are known to occur in two cases, for “color suppressed” processes and when in certain re-scattering effects are involved, for example processes where direct CP violation is relevant [5,6]. The advantage of form factors where a systematic expansion is implemented and where higher order corrections can be organized and controlled are of great importance (QCDF, SCET, PQCD, LCSR, etc. [11,12,13,14]), in particular when high accuracy predictions are required.

Additional reasons to study the B!PS decays are: they offer a window to study the spectroscopy and the dynamics of the scalar sector, the B!3P decays get a contribution from the B!PS; PV; PT, so that in order to achieve an appropriate estimate for the form factor decay of the latter must be well known [15]. In a similar way one can in order to extract signals of possible new physics, the contribution of low lying conventional physics has to be known in detail, including the contributions of the scalar mesons [16]. We believe that the understanding of the physical origin of the hierarchy of scales appearing in the B!PS decays can shed some light on the nature of the scalars [15,16]. Complete entry information on the nature of the scalars may be obtained from D!PS physics [16]: in the first case through the decay constants, fS while in the latter through the F0̅S form factors. The purpose of the present work is to consider the B!PS decays with S a member of the heavy scalar multiplet. We assume the absence of contribution to these processes is given by the NFA and that, in first approximation, contributions other than the leading one can be safely neglected. In these conditions the dominant contribution can be clearly identified and the existence of the scalars in the branching ratios naturally arises. Besides the NFA our approach can be summarized along the following lines: we include ten dimension six four quark operators and the dimension seven chromomagnetic operator 011 [20]. Annihilation contributions are included and the form factors required are obtained by using sum rules, so infrared divergences are absent. This approach, together with SU(3) symmetry, allows us to reproduce the pattern observed experimentally.

II. BRANCHING RATIOS AND MIXING

Our results are summarized in Table I. It is worth remarking that both the experimental data and our results points to the existence of branching ratios that range from 45 to 0.5 (in units of 10%). In the following paragraphs we introduce the notation, conventions and explain the procedure we follow to obtain these branching ratios. Within the NFA the hadronic matrix elements can be reduced to products of decay constants and form factors. In order to achieve this one uses the "vacuum saturation" approximation and neglect other intermediate states. This seems to be a reasonable assumption since the hadronic resonances have masses in the 2 GeV range, far from the mb region. For the invariant amplitudes we write M f; i = ~f ̈ j i = GF A f; i = 2 while the branching ratios are given by B = BGF A f=16 m2 b = BGF A f=32 mb , with the B lifetime. The decay constants and form factors are defined as [3,11,16]:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{hP (p)A} \cdot \mathbf{j} = \mathbf{f}_{5} \\ &\text{hS (p)Y} \cdot \mathbf{j} = \mathbf{f}_{5} \\ &\text{hS (p)LY} \cdot \mathbf{j} = \mathbf{f}_{5}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{hF} \cdot \mathbf{j} = \mathbf{f}_{5} \\ &\text{hP (p)A} \cdot \mathbf{j} = \mathbf{f}_{5} \\
&hS (p_{1}p_{2} \mathbf{P}_{L} (\mathbf{p}) i = i \\
&hS (p_{2} \mathbf{P}_{L} (\mathbf{p}) i = \mathbf{p}_{1} + \mathbf{p}_{2}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{hS (p)Y} \cdot \mathbf{j} = \mathbf{f}_{5} \\
&hS (p)LY \cdot \mathbf{j} = \mathbf{f}_{5} \\
&hS (p_{1}p_{2} \mathbf{P}_{L} (\mathbf{p}) i = \mathbf{p}_{1} + \mathbf{p}_{2}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{hF} \cdot \mathbf{j} = \mathbf{f}_{5} \\
&\text{hP (p)A} \cdot \mathbf{j} = \mathbf{f}_{5} \\
&hS (p_{1}p_{2} \mathbf{P}_{L} (\mathbf{p}) i = i \\
&hS (p_{2} \mathbf{P}_{L} (\mathbf{p}) i = \mathbf{p}_{1} + \mathbf{p}_{2}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{hS (p)Y} \cdot \mathbf{j} = \mathbf{f}_{5} \\
&hS (p)LY \cdot \mathbf{j} = \mathbf{f}_{5} \\
&hS (p_{1}p_{2} \mathbf{P}_{L} (\mathbf{p}) i = \mathbf{p}_{1} + \mathbf{p}_{2}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{hF} \cdot \mathbf{j} = \mathbf{f}_{5} \\
&\text{hP (p)A} \cdot \mathbf{j} = \mathbf{f}_{5} \\
&hS (p_{1}p_{2} \mathbf{P}_{L} (\mathbf{p}) i = i \\
&hS (p_{2} \mathbf{P}_{L} (\mathbf{p}) i = \mathbf{p}_{1} + \mathbf{p}_{2}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{hS (p)Y} \cdot \mathbf{j} = \mathbf{f}_{5} \\
&hS (p)LY \cdot \mathbf{j} = \mathbf{f}_{5} \\
&hS (p_{1}p_{2} \mathbf{P}_{L} (\mathbf{p}) i = \mathbf{p}_{1} + \mathbf{p}_{2}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{hF} \cdot \mathbf{j} = \mathbf{f}_{5} \\
&\text{hP (p)A} \cdot \mathbf{j} = \mathbf{f}_{5} \\
&hS (p_{1}p_{2} \mathbf{P}_{L} (\mathbf{p}) i = i \\
&hS (p_{2} \mathbf{P}_{L} (\mathbf{p}) i = \mathbf{p}_{1} + \mathbf{p}_{2}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{hS (p)Y} \cdot \mathbf{j} = \mathbf{f}_{5} \\
&hS (p)LY \cdot \mathbf{j} = \mathbf{f}_{5} \\
&hS (p_{1}p_{2} \mathbf{P}_{L} (\mathbf{p}) i = \mathbf{p}_{1} + \mathbf{p}_{2}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{hF} \cdot \mathbf{j} = \mathbf{f}_{5} \\
&\text{hP (p)A} \cdot \mathbf{j} = \mathbf{f}_{5} \\
&hS (p_{1}p_{2} \mathbf{P}_{L} (\mathbf{p}) i = i \\
&hS (p_{2} \mathbf{P}_{L} (\mathbf{p}) i = \mathbf{p}_{1} + \mathbf{p}_{2}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{hS (p)Y} \cdot \mathbf{j} = \mathbf{f}_{5} \\
&hS (p)LY \cdot \mathbf{j} = \mathbf{f}_{5} \\
&hS (p_{1}p_{2} \mathbf{P}_{L} (\mathbf{p}) i = \mathbf{p}_{1} + \mathbf{p}_{2}
\end{align*}
\]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decay</th>
<th>BELLE</th>
<th>BABAR</th>
<th>HAG</th>
<th>B exp</th>
<th>NFA</th>
<th>NFA + O11</th>
<th>QCDF</th>
<th>pQCD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a0(1450)</td>
<td>&lt; 23</td>
<td>&lt; 23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a0(1450)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a0(1450)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f0(1370)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f0(1500)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K + a0(1450)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K + a0(1450)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K f0(1370)</td>
<td>&lt; 10.7</td>
<td>&lt; 10.7</td>
<td>&lt; 41</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K f0(1500)</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.75(5)</td>
<td>2(1)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K0 a0(1450)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K0 a0(1450)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K0 f0(1370)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K0 f0(1500)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K0(K+→)</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K0(K+→)</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>45(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K0(K+→)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K0(K→0)</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16(3)</td>
<td>16(3)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K0(K→0)</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>12(4)</td>
<td>12(4)</td>
<td>12(4)</td>
<td>12(4)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K0(K→0)</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10(2)</td>
<td>10(2)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table I: Branching ratios for the B → PS decays (in units of 10^-6), for the heavier scalar multiplet. The values reported for the widths marked with include the corresponding branching of the scalar decaying channel. To obtain the NFA predictions we used B (f0(1370) ! 2 ) = 0.26(1), B (f0(1500) ! 2 ) = 0.25(2) and for the a0(1450) ! no reliable value exists.**

With q = p1, p2.

We have left to the appendix details regarding the effective Hamiltonian we use—which includes ten dimension six operators and the so-called O11 operator—and the matrix elements evaluation. The most interesting decays are those involving the S = K0 (1430) both because they have the largest branching ratio (around 40, in units of 10^-6) and because the theoretical predictions are the cleanest. The a0 term is by far the dominant one. The amplitudes are proportional to \( a_0 m_K \) and therefore the branching ratios calculated from the numerical analysis are included in Table I. Notice that the value obtained for \( f_0(K^0 !) \) is not far from the theoretical predictions (see Table II).

We now consider the decays involving S = f0(1370); f0(1500) and f0(1700). Their relevance stems from the large branching ratios predicted for them (see Appendix) (of the same order as the K0 (1430) ! and also due to the Possible glueball nature of the f0(1700). Their amplitudes are proportional to \( a_0 m_K \) and therefore the branching ratios calculated from the numerical analysis are still inconclusive. Note that except the f0(1500) decay channel, the NFA plus SU(3) symmetry for the heavy scalar multiplet leads predictions for the branching ratios in rough agreement with
the experimental values. However, even if the experimental data is poor the discrepancy between our results and experimental data is evident, there is a one order of magnitude difference. In this sense it is important to remark that in order to obtain the results of table 1 we assumed, following H.Y. Cheng [2] a mixing between the glueball, singlet and octet components given by:

\[
0 \quad 1 \quad 0 \quad 1 \quad 0 \quad 1
\]

\[
f_0(1370) = \begin{bmatrix}
0.78 & 0.51 & 0.36 & N \\
0.54 & 0.84 & 0.33 & C_A \\
0.32 & 0.18 & 0.93 & G
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
f_0(1500) = \begin{bmatrix}
C_{12}C_{13} & S_{12}C_{13} & S_{13} & S_{12}S_{23}S_{13} & S_{12}S_{23}S_{13} & S_{23}C_{13} & S_{23}C_{13}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
f_0(1700) = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & q & q & 1 & 0 & 1 & G
\end{bmatrix}
\]

where \( s_i = \sin \frac{i}{2} \) and so on. The angles \( 12, 20, 21, 23 \) are the mixing between singlet-octet, singlet-glueball and octet-glueball, respectively. The singlet and the octet are \( f_0(1370) \) \( f_\text{mix}_{1} = \frac{2u3N + S}{3}, f_\text{mix}_{2} = N = \frac{3}{3}, S = \frac{3}{3} \), \( S = \frac{3}{3} \), \( S = ss, N = uu + dd = \frac{2}{2} \) and \( G = gg \) the glueball. Thus, in this approach [2], there is only an small mixing between the singlet and the glueball. Using these values the prediction for \( B \) \( f_0(1500)K \) is in conflict with the experimental data. One way to avoid this problem is to leave \( 12 \) as a free parameter, keeping the others fixed. Using the experimental data we obtain the following inequality for the mixing between the singlet and the octet:

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
f_0(1500) \\
f_0(1700)
\end{pmatrix} < \begin{pmatrix}
0.34
\end{pmatrix}
\]

These constraints lead two possible values:

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
35 \\
215
\end{pmatrix} \quad \begin{pmatrix}
12 \\
12
\end{pmatrix} \quad \begin{pmatrix}
74 \\
254
\end{pmatrix}
\]

It is worth noticing that these values for the mixing are close to those mentioned by several groups [3].

Finally for the decays involving the \( a_0(1450), B \) \( a_0(1450) \) \( a_0(1450)K \) the terms proportional to \( a_4, a_6 \) almost vanish and the branching ratios are smaller. Two different cases must be considered. The first when the amplitude is dominated by the tree level contribution \( a_4 \) (The amplitudes are proportional to \( u_4 a_4 m_\frac{2}{2} f \)), then the theoretical prediction is reliable and the branchings are predicted to be around 10 (in units of \( 10^{-6} \)). The second case arises when no tree level contribution exist and terms like annihilation are dominant. In this case the branchings are of order 0.1-1 (in units of \( 10^{-6} \)) but the theoretical uncertainties are larger since other contributions (FSI for example) may be important. Unfortunately little is known about these corrections.

### III. SUMMARY

In this work we studied the \( B \) \( PS \) decay where \( S \) stands for a member of the heavy scalar multiplet. The computation has been done assuming the heavy scalar multiplet is a two quark states, using SU (3) symmetry and the naive factorization approach. Our conclusions can be summarized as follows:

With the error bars, it is possible to reproduce the hierarchy of branching ratios experimentally observed in the \( B \) \( PS \) decays, whether or not the operator \( O_{11} \) is included.
TABLE II: Decay constants for scalars (in MeV). The heavy scalars are assumed to be two quark states. Notice that the constants computed by Cheng were obtained by using sum rules, OPE and Renormalization Group equations that render \( f \) scale dependent.

When the singlet-octet mixing given by [1] is used, we obtain a prediction for the \( f_0(1500) \) which is one order of magnitude above the experimental limit. A solution to this problem can be obtained by modifying the mixing matrix. In such a case one obtains a constraint on the singlet-octet mixing and its s-quark content.

The contribution of the \( O_{11} \) operator is around 30% in decay channels involving the \( K_0 \). The \( O_{11} \) contributions approximately keep the SU(3) relations between different decay channels.

The chiral enhancement predicted by the NFA could be used to test the quark structure of the heavy multiplet. Strong deviations from the NFA results could be interpreted as a signal that the heavy scalars are not pure two quark state.
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CKM Fitter: www.slac.stanford.edu/xorg/cm3/ckm/ckmfit.cm3/
The effective Hamiltonian is given by [3]:

\[ H_{\text{eff}} = \frac{G_F}{2} \sum_{u,d,s} V_{ub} V_{cq} (C_1 U + C_2 U^*) V_{ub} V_{cq} X^0 l \bar{\nu} \]

where \( q^0_l = V_{q'b} V_{q'q} \), with \( q = d,s \), while \( q^0 = u; c; t \). The Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) matrix elements are denoted by \( V_{ij} \). \( O_1 \) stand for the following four fermion operators:

\[
O_1 = (qu)_L (ub)_L, O_2 = (ub)_L (qu)_L, O_3 = (qb)_L q^0 (q'q^0)_L, O_4 = (qb)_L (q'q^0)_L, O_5 = (qb)_L q^0 (q'q^0)_L, O_6 = (qb)_L q^0 (q'q^0)_L = 2 q^0 (q'q^0)_L, O_7 = \frac{3}{2} (qb)_L q^0 (q'q^0)_L, O_8 = \frac{3}{2} (qb)_L q^0 (q'q^0)_L, O_9 = \frac{3}{2} (qb)_L q^0 (q'q^0)_L, O_{10} = \frac{3}{2} (qb)_L q^0 (q'q^0)_L = \frac{3}{2} q^0 (q'q^0)_L \]

and the dipole penguin operator:

\[
O_{11} = \frac{q^0}{16} m_{bL} R T_a \bar{G}_a \]

with \( T_a = q^0 = 2 \) the \( SU(3)_c \) generators. The Wilson coefficients \( C_i \) appear in the combinations \( a_{21} = C_{21,1} + C_{21,2} \), \( a_{22} = C_{21,1} + C_{21,2} \). The numerical values are taken from [3]. Similarly we define \( a_{11} = (8-9) \sum_{i=2}^{6} C_{2i} (m_i^2 = 4 \Delta^2) \). The gluon momentum we use \( q' = q \). With \( k^2 = 2 \) and \( C_{11} = 0.29 \) one obtains \( a_{11} = 5.7 \times 10^{-10} \). Chiral projections are \( L R = 1 \). Using the relation \( (T_1) (T_1) = 1 = (1=N) \) and the Fierz reordering one obtains for \( O_{11} \):

\[
H_{11} = \frac{1}{2} m_{bL} \sum_{k} T_a (3i q R) q^0 q^0 R b + q R q^0 q^0 R b \]

where \( k^2 = m^2 = 8 \). The amplitudes, including \( O_{11} \) contribution, in the NFA are given by:

\[
A_{B^0} \sim X^{B^0} l \bar{\nu} (a_1 X^{a_1} a_{b_0} + a_2 X^{a_2} a_{b_0}) + a_4 + a_{10} \frac{(a_6 + a_8) m^2}{m (m_b + m_u)} X^{B^0} \]

\[
+ 2 (a_4 + a_9) \frac{a_7}{2} (a_6 + a_8) m^2 \frac{m_u (m_b + m_d)}{m (m_b + m_u)} X^{B^0} \]

\[
\sim X^{B^0} l \bar{\nu} (a_1 X^{a_1} a_{b_0} + a_2 X^{a_2} a_{b_0}) (a_4 + a_{10}) \frac{(a_6 + a_8) m^2}{m (m_b + m_u)} X^{B^0} \]

\[
+ 2 (a_4 + a_9) \frac{a_7}{2} (a_6 + a_8) m^2 \frac{m_u (m_b + m_d)}{m (m_b + m_u)} X^{B^0} \]
\[
A_{B! \cdot a_8} \quad ud_0 (a_1 X_{B S}^0 + a_2 X_{B a_8}^0) \quad \text{td} \quad (a_4 + a_{10}) X_{B a_0}^0 + 2 (a_6 + a_8) X_{B a_0}^a + 2 (a_3 + a_5) + a_4 + a_2 + \frac{\left( a_6 + a_8 \right) m_B^2}{m (m_b + m_u)} + \frac{\left( a_6 + a_8 \right) m_B}{m (m_b + m_u)} \quad X_{B a_0}^0
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
&+ a_4 \frac{1}{2} a_{10} \frac{(2a_6 + a_8) m_B^2}{(m_B + m_d)(m_s + m_d)} X_{B_0,0}^0 \# \\
A_{B^0 \to K^0} &
\begin{cases}
\varepsilon \rightarrow a_1 X_{K^0}^0 \\
\tau \rightarrow a_4 \frac{1}{2} a_{10} (a_6^e + a_8) r \ X_{B_0,0}^0 \\
+ a_4 + a_{10} \frac{2(a_6 + a_8) m_B^2}{(m_B + m_u)(m_s + m_d)} X_{B_0,0}^0 \\
+ a_4 + a_{10} \frac{2m_B^2 (a_6 + a_8)}{(m_B + m_u)(m_s + m_d)} X_{B_0,0}^0 \\
A_{B^0 \to K^0} &
\begin{cases}
\varepsilon \rightarrow a_1 X_{K^0}^0 + X_{B^0,0}^0 + a_2 X_{K^0}^0 \\
\tau \rightarrow a_4 + a_{10} (a_6^e + a_8) r \ X_{B_0,0}^0 \\
+ a_4 + a_{10} \frac{2m_B^2 (a_6 + a_8)}{(m_B + m_u)(m_s + m_d)} X_{B_0,0}^0 \\
+ a_4 + a_{10} \frac{2m_B^2 (a_6 + a_8)}{(m_B + m_u)(m_s + m_d)} X_{K^0,0}^0 \\
A_{B^0 \to K^0} &
\begin{cases}
\varepsilon \rightarrow a_1 X_{B^0,0}^0 + X_{B^0,0}^0 + a_2 X_{B^0,0}^0 \\
\tau \rightarrow a_4 + a_{10} (a_6^e + a_8) r \ X_{B_0,0}^0 \\
+ a_4 + a_{10} \frac{2m_B^2 (a_6 + a_8)}{(m_B + m_u)(m_s + m_d)} X_{B_0,0}^0 \\
+ a_4 + a_{10} \frac{2m_B^2 (a_6 + a_8)}{(m_B + m_u)(m_s + m_d)} X_{B_0,0}^0 \\
\end{cases}
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]

and \(A_{B^0 \to K^0} = 0, \varepsilon^0 = a_0^0, \) and \( f_0, \tau \leftarrow 2m_B^2 = m_B m_s, r = m_s - m_B m_s \) and \( a_6^e : r^M = a_6^e r^M, \)
\(a_{11} = 12(1 \ \#^M) \) and \(a_{12} = 32.\)
\[ X_{\frac{K_0}{B}}^0 = \langle 0 \langle uu \rangle_h \rangle < K_0^0 \langle j(s) \rangle_h \rangle B^0 > = \frac{f}{Z} (m_0^2 - m_{K_0}^2) F_{0}^{B^0} K_0^0 (m^2) \]
\[ X_{\frac{K_0}{B}}^0 = \langle K_0^0 \langle j(s) \rangle_h \rangle > < j (s) \rangle_h \rangle B^0 > = f_{K_0^0} (m_0^2 - m_{K_0}^2) F_{0}^{B^0} K_0^0 (m^2) = f_{K_0} m_0^2 m_{K_0}^2 F_{0}^{B^0} K_0^0 (m^2) \]
\[ X_{\frac{K_0}{B}}^{e_{f_0}} = f_{0} j(s) \rangle_h \rangle < j (s) \rangle_h \rangle B^0 > = m_{s} f_{f_0} \frac{m_0^2}{m_s} m_{s} F_{0}^{B^0} K_0^0 (m_{f_0}) = \frac{1}{Z} \frac{m_{s}}{m_s} m_{s} m_{f_0} F_{0}^{B^0} K_0^0 (m_{f_0}) \]
\[ X_{\frac{K_0}{B}}^{e_{f_0}} = f_{0} j(s) \rangle_h \rangle < j (s) \rangle_h \rangle B^0 > = m_{f_0} f_{f_0} \frac{m_0^2}{m_s} m_{s} F_{0}^{B^0} K_0^0 (m_{f_0}) = X_{\frac{K_0}{B}}^{e_{f_0}} \]

for annihilation:

\[ X_{\frac{K_0}{B}}^{e_{f_0}} = f_{0} j(s) \rangle_h \rangle < j (s) \rangle_h \rangle B^0 > = f_{B} (m_0^2 - m_{K_0}^2) F_{0}^{B^0} K_0^0 (m^2) \]
\[ X_{\frac{K_0}{B}}^{e_{f_0}} = f_{0} j(s) \rangle_h \rangle < j (s) \rangle_h \rangle B^0 > = f_{B} (m_0^2 - m_{K_0}^2) F_{0}^{B^0} K_0^0 (m^2) = X_{\frac{K_0}{B}}^{e_{f_0}} \]
\[ X_{\frac{K_0}{B}}^{e_{f_0}} = f_{0} j(s) \rangle_h \rangle < j (s) \rangle_h \rangle B^0 > = f_{B} (m_0^2 - m_{K_0}^2) F_{0}^{B^0} K_0^0 (m^2) = X_{\frac{K_0}{B}}^{e_{f_0}} \]
\[ X_{\frac{K_0}{B}}^{e_{f_0}} = f_{0} j(s) \rangle_h \rangle < j (s) \rangle_h \rangle B^0 > = f_{B} (m_0^2 - m_{K_0}^2) F_{0}^{B^0} K_0^0 (m^2) = X_{\frac{K_0}{B}}^{e_{f_0}} \]

with \( K_0 = F^{B^0} \), \( f_{K_0} = f \), 121(9)