

Revisiting charmless hadronic B decays to scalar mesons

Hai-Yang Cheng¹, Chun-Khiang Chua², Kwei-Chou Yang², Zhi-Qing Zhang^{1,3}

¹ Institute of Physics, Academia Sinica
Taipei, Taiwan 115, Republic of China

² Department of Physics, Chung Yuan Christian University
Chung-Li, Taiwan 320, Republic of China

³ Department of Physics, Henan University of Technology
Zhengzhou, Henan 450052, P.R. China

Abstract

Hadronic charmless B decays to scalar mesons are studied within the framework of QCD factorization (QCDF). Considering two different scenarios for scalar mesons above 1 GeV, we find that the data favor the scenario in which the scalars $a_0(1450)$ and $K_0^*(1430)$ are the lowest lying $q\bar{q}$ bound states. This in turn implies a preferred four-quark nature for light scalars below 1 GeV. Assuming $K_0^*(1430)$ being a lowest lying $q\bar{s}$ state, we show that the data of $B \rightarrow K_0^*(1430)\eta^{(\prime)}$ and $B \rightarrow K_0^*(1430)(\rho, \omega, \phi)$ can be accommodated in QCDF without introducing power corrections induced from penguin annihilation, while the predicted $B^- \rightarrow \bar{K}_0^{*0}(1430)\pi^-$ and $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow K_0^{*-}(1430)\pi^+$ are too small compared to experiment. In principle, the data of $K_0^*(1430)\pi$ modes can be explained if penguin-annihilation induced power corrections are taken into account. However, this will destroy the agreement between theory and experiment for $B \rightarrow K_0^*(1430)(\eta^{(\prime)}, \rho, \omega, \phi)$. Contrary to the pseudoscalar meson sector where $B \rightarrow K\eta'$ has the largest rate in 2-body decays of the B meson, we show that $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow K_0^*\eta') < \mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow K_0^*\eta)$. The decay $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0(980)^+K^-$ is found to have a rate much smaller than that of $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0(980)^+\pi^-$ in QCDF, while it is the other way around in pQCD. Experimental measurements of these two modes will help discriminate between these two different approaches. Assuming 2-quark bound states for $f_0(980)$ and $f_0(500)$, the observed large rates of $f_0(980)K$ and $f_0(980)K^*$ modes can be explained in QCDF with the $f_0(980)$ – $f_0(500)$ mixing angle θ in the vicinity of 20° . However, this does not necessarily imply that a 4-quark assignment for $f_0(980)$ is ruled out because of extra diagrams contributing to $B \rightarrow f_0(980)K^{(*)}$. Irrespective of the mixing angle θ , the predicted branching fraction of $B^0 \rightarrow f_0(980)\rho^0$ is far below the Belle measurement and this needs to be clarified in the future.

I. INTRODUCTION

In the past few years there are some progresses in the study of charmless hadronic B decays with scalar mesons in the final state both experimentally and theoretically. On the experimental side, measurements of B decays to the scalar mesons such as $f_0(980)$, $f_0(1370)$, $f_0(1500)$, $f_0(1710)$, $a_0(980)$, $a_0(1450)$ and $K_0^*(1430)$ have been reported by BaBar and Belle; see Tables I and II for a summary of the experimental results. It is well known that the identification of scalar mesons is difficult experimentally and the underlying structure of scalar mesons is not well established theoretically. The experimental measurements of $B \rightarrow SP$ and $B \rightarrow SV$, where S, P, V stand for scalar, vector and pseudoscalar mesons, respectively, will provide valuable information on the nature of the even-parity mesons. On the theoretical side, hadronic B decays to scalar mesons have been studied in the QCD-inspired approaches: QCD factorization (QCDF) [6–10] and pQCD [11–20].

In this work, we would like to revisit the study of the 2-body charmless decays $B \rightarrow SP$ and $B \rightarrow SV$ within the framework of QCDF for the following reasons: (i) In [6] we have missed some factorizable terms (more precisely, the f_0 and a_0^0 emission terms) in the expressions for the decay amplitudes of $B \rightarrow f_0 K$, $a_0^0 \pi$, $a_0^0 K$. (ii) Attention has not been paid to the relative sign difference of the vector decay constants between a_0^- and a_0^+ and between K_0^* and \bar{K}_0^* or K_0^{*-} and K_0^{*+} in our previous study. (iii) There were some errors in our previous computer code which may significantly affect some of the calculations done before. (iv) Progress has been made in the past in the study of $B \rightarrow S$ transition form factors in various approaches [14, 21–26]. (v) Experimental data for some of $B \rightarrow SV$ decays such as $K_0^*(1430)\phi$, $K_0^*(1430)\rho$ and $K_0^*(1430)\omega$ are now available. (vi) It is known that in order to account for the penguin-dominated $B \rightarrow PP, VP, VV$ decay modes within the framework of QCDF, it is necessary to include power corrections due to penguin annihilation [27, 28]. In the present work, we wish to examine if the same effect holds in the scalar meson sector; that is, if the penguin-annihilation induced power corrections are also needed to explain the penguin dominated $B \rightarrow SP$ and $B \rightarrow SV$ decays.

This paper is organized as follows. We specify in Sec. 2 various input parameters for scalar mesons, such as decay constants, form factors and light-cone distribution amplitudes. The relevant decay amplitudes are briefly discussed in Sec. 3. Results and detailed discussions are presented in Sec. 4. Conclusions are given in Sec. 5. We lay out the explicit decay amplitudes of $B^0 \rightarrow (f_0, a_0^0)(K, \pi)$ in Appendix A.

II. PHYSICAL PROPERTIES OF SCALAR MESONS

In order to study the hadronic charmless B decays containing a scalar meson in the final state, it is necessary to specify the quark content of the scalar meson. For scalar mesons above 1 GeV we have explored in [6] two possible scenarios in the QCD sum rule method, depending on whether the light scalars $K_0^*(800)$, $a_0(980)$ and $f_0(980)$ are treated as the lowest lying $q\bar{q}$ states or four-quark particles: (i) In scenario 1, we treat $K_0^*(800)$, $a_0(980)$, $f_0(980)$ as the lowest lying $q\bar{q}$ states, and $K_0^*(1430)$, $a_0(1450)$, $f_0(1500)$ as the corresponding first excited states, respectively, and (ii)

TABLE I: Experimental branching fractions (in units of 10^{-6}) of B decays to scalar mesons [1].

Mode	BaBar	Belle	Average
$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow f_0(980)K^+)\mathcal{B}(f_0(980) \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-)$	$10.3 \pm 0.5^{+2.0}_{-1.4}$	$8.8 \pm 0.8^{+0.9}_{-1.8}$	$9.4^{+0.9}_{-1.0}$
$\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow f_0(980)K^0)\mathcal{B}(f_0(980) \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-)$	$6.9 \pm 0.8 \pm 0.6$	$7.6 \pm 1.7^{+0.9}_{-1.3}$	7.0 ± 0.9
$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow f_0(980)K^+)\mathcal{B}(f_0(980) \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0)$	$2.8 \pm 0.6 \pm 0.5$		2.8 ± 0.8
$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow f_0(980)K^+)\mathcal{B}(f_0(980) \rightarrow K^+K^-)$	$9.4 \pm 1.6 \pm 2.8$	< 2.9	
$\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow f_0(980)K^0)\mathcal{B}(f_0(980) \rightarrow K^+K^-)$	$7.0^{+3.5}_{-3.0}$		$7.0^{+3.5}_{-3.0}$
$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow f_0(980)\pi^+)\mathcal{B}(f_0(980) \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-)$	< 1.5		< 1.5
$\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow f_0(980)\eta')\mathcal{B}(f_0(980) \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-)$	< 0.9		< 0.9
$\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow f_0(980)\eta)\mathcal{B}(f_0(980) \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-)$	< 0.4		< 0.4
$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow a_0^0(980)K^+)\mathcal{B}(a_0(980)^0 \rightarrow \eta\pi^0)$	< 2.5		< 2.5
$\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow a_0^-(980)K^+)\mathcal{B}(a_0(980)^- \rightarrow \eta\pi^-)$	< 1.9		< 1.9
$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow a_0^+(980)K^0)\mathcal{B}(a_0(980)^+ \rightarrow \eta\pi^+)$	< 3.9		< 3.9
$\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow a_0^0(980)K^0)\mathcal{B}(a_0(980)^0 \rightarrow \eta\pi^0)$	< 7.8		< 7.8
$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow a_0^0(980)\pi^+)\mathcal{B}(a_0(980)^0 \rightarrow \eta\pi^0)$	< 5.8		< 5.8
$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow a_0^+(980)\pi^0)\mathcal{B}(a_0(980)^0 \rightarrow \eta\pi^0)$	< 1.4		< 1.4
$\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow a_0^+(980)\pi^\pm)\mathcal{B}(a_0(980)^\mp \rightarrow \eta\pi^\mp)$	< 3.1		< 3.1
$\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow a_0^+(1450)\pi^\pm)\mathcal{B}(a_0(1450)^\mp \rightarrow \eta\pi^\mp)$	< 2.3		< 2.3
$\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow a_0^-(1450)K^+)\mathcal{B}(a_0(1450)^- \rightarrow \eta\pi^-)$	< 3.1		< 3.1
$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow f_0(1370)K^+)\mathcal{B}(f_0(1370) \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-)$	< 10.7		< 10.7
$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow f_0(1370)\pi^+)\mathcal{B}(f_0(1370) \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-)$	$2.9 \pm 0.5 \pm 0.5^{+0.7}_{-0.5} < 4.0$		< 4.0
$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow f_0(1500)K^+)$	$17 \pm 4 \pm 12$		17.0 ± 12.6
$\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow f_0(1500)K^0)$	$13.3^{+5.8}_{-4.4} \pm 3.2$		$13.3^{+6.6}_{-5.4}$
$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow f_0(1710)K^+)\mathcal{B}(f_0(1710) \rightarrow K^+K^-)$	$1.12 \pm 0.25 \pm 0.50$	1.7 ± 1.0	1.26 ± 0.49
$\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow f_0(1710)K^0)\mathcal{B}(f_0(1710) \rightarrow K^+K^-)$	$4.4 \pm 0.7 \pm 0.5$		4.4 ± 0.9
$\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow f_0(1710)K_S)\mathcal{B}(f_0(1710) \rightarrow K_S K_S)$	$0.50^{+0.46}_{-0.24} \pm 0.11$		$0.50^{+0.47}_{-0.26}$
$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow K_0^{*0}(1430)\pi^+)$	$32.0 \pm 1.2^{+10.8}_{-6.0}$	$51.6 \pm 1.7^{+7.0}_{-7.5}$	45.1 ± 6.3
$\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow K_0^{*+}(1430)\pi^-)$	$29.9^{+2.3}_{-1.7} \pm 3.6^a$	$49.7 \pm 3.8^{+6.8}_{-8.2}$	$33.5^{+3.9}_{-3.8}$
$\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow K_0^{*0}(1430)\pi^0)$	$7.0 \pm 0.5 \pm 1.1^b$		7.0 ± 1.2
$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}_0^{*0}(1430)K^+)$	< 2.2		< 2.2
$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow K_0^{*+}(1430)\eta')$	$5.2 \pm 1.9 \pm 1.0$		5.2 ± 2.1
$\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow K_0^{*0}(1430)\eta')$	$6.3 \pm 1.3 \pm 0.9$		6.3 ± 1.6
$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow K_0^{*+}(1430)\eta)$	$15.8 \pm 2.2 \pm 2.2$		15.8 ± 3.1
$\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow K_0^{*0}(1430)\eta)$	$9.6 \pm 1.4 \pm 1.3$		9.6 ± 1.9
$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow f_0(980)K^{*+})\mathcal{B}(f_0(980) \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-)$	$4.2 \pm 0.6 \pm 0.3$		4.2 ± 0.7
$\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow f_0(980)K^{*0})\mathcal{B}(f_0(980) \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-)$	$5.7 \pm 0.6 \pm 0.3$	< 2.2	5.7 ± 0.7
$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow f_0(980)\rho^+)\mathcal{B}(f_0(980) \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-)$	< 2.0		< 2.0
$\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow f_0(980)\rho^0)\mathcal{B}(f_0(980) \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-)$	< 0.40	$0.87 \pm 0.27 \pm 0.15^c$	0.87 ± 0.31
$\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow f_0(980)\omega)\mathcal{B}(f_0(980) \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-)$	< 1.5		< 1.5
$\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow f_0(980)\phi)\mathcal{B}(f_0(980) \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-)$	< 0.38		< 0.38
$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow K_0^{*+}(1430)\omega)$	$24.0 \pm 2.6 \pm 4.4$		24.0 ± 5.1
$\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow K_0^{*0}(1430)\omega)$	$16.0 \pm 1.6 \pm 3.0$		16.0 ± 3.4
$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow K_0^{*+}(1430)\phi)$	$7.0 \pm 1.3 \pm 0.9$		7.0 ± 1.6
$\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow K_0^{*0}(1430)\phi)$	$3.9 \pm 0.5 \pm 0.6$		3.9 ± 0.8
$\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow K_0^{*0}(1430)\bar{K}^{*0})$		< 3.3	< 3.3
$\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow K_0^{*0}(1430)K^{*0})$	< 1.7		< 1.7
$\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow K_0^{*+}(1430)\rho^-)$	$28 \pm 10 \pm 5 \pm 3$		28.0 ± 11.6
$\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow K_0^{*0}(1430)\rho^0)$	$27 \pm 4 \pm 2 \pm 3$		27.0 ± 5.4
$\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow f_0(980)f_0(980))\mathcal{B}^2(f_0(980) \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-)$	< 0.19	< 0.1	< 0.1
$\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow f_0(980)K_0^{*0}(1430))\mathcal{B}(f_0(980) \rightarrow \pi\pi)$	$2.7 \pm 0.7 \pm 0.5 \pm 0.3$		2.7 ± 0.9
$\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow K_0^{*0}(1430)K_0^{*0}(1430))$		< 4.7	< 4.7
$\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow K_0^{*0}(1430)\bar{K}_0^{*0}(1430))$		< 8.4	< 8.4

^aThere is a new measurement of $(27.8 \pm 2.5 \pm 3.3) \times 10^{-6}$ extracted from $B^0 \rightarrow K^+\pi^-\pi^0$ by BaBar [2].

^bSee [2].

^cSee [3].

TABLE II: Experimental CP asymmetries (in units of %) of B decays to final states containing scalar mesons [1].

Mode	BaBar	Belle	Average
$B^+ \rightarrow f_0(980)K^+$	$-10.6 \pm 5.0^{+3.6}_{-1.5}$ ^a	$-7.7 \pm 6.5^{+4.6}_{-2.6}$	$-9.5^{+4.9}_{-4.2}$
$B^0 \rightarrow f_0(980)K^0$	$-28 \pm 24 \pm 9$ ^b	$-30 \pm 29 \pm 11 \pm 9$ ^b	-29 ± 20
	$-8 \pm 19 \pm 3 \pm 4$ ^c	$-6 \pm 17 \pm 7 \pm 9$ ^c	-7 ± 14
$B^+ \rightarrow f_0(1370)\pi^+$	$72 \pm 15 \pm 14^{+7}_{-8}$		72 ± 22
$B^+ \rightarrow f_0(1500)K^+$	$28 \pm 26^{+15}_{-14}$		28^{+30}_{-29}
$B^+ \rightarrow K_0^{*0}(1430)\pi^+$	$3.2 \pm 3.5^{+3.4}_{-2.8}$	$7.6 \pm 3.8^{+2.8}_{-2.2}$	$5.5^{+3.4}_{-2.2}$
$B^0 \rightarrow K_0^{*+}(1430)\pi^-$	$7 \pm 14 \pm 1$		7 ± 14
$B^0 \rightarrow K_0^{*0}(1430)\pi^0$	$-15 \pm 10 \pm 4$		-15 ± 11
$B^+ \rightarrow K_0^{*+}(1430)\eta'$	$6 \pm 20 \pm 2$		6 ± 20
$B^0 \rightarrow K_0^{*0}(1430)\eta'$	$-19 \pm 17 \pm 2$		-19 ± 17
$B^+ \rightarrow K_0^{*+}(1430)\eta$	$5 \pm 13 \pm 2$		5 ± 13
$B^0 \rightarrow K_0^{*0}(1430)\eta$	$6 \pm 13 \pm 2$		6 ± 13
$B^+ \rightarrow f_0(980)K^{*+}$	$-15 \pm 12 \pm 3$		-15 ± 12
$B^0 \rightarrow f_0(980)K^{*0}$	$7 \pm 10 \pm 2$		7 ± 10
$B^+ \rightarrow K_0^{*+}(1430)\omega$	$-10 \pm 9 \pm 2$		-10 ± 9
$B^0 \rightarrow K_0^{*0}(1430)\omega$	$-7 \pm 9 \pm 2$		-7 ± 9
$B^+ \rightarrow K_0^{*+}(1430)\phi$	$4 \pm 15 \pm 4$		4 ± 15
$B^0 \rightarrow K_0^{*0}(1430)\phi$	$20 \pm 14 \pm 6$		20 ± 15

^aThis data is from the measurement of $B^+ \rightarrow K^+\pi^+\pi^-$. BaBar's measurements of $B^+ \rightarrow K^+K^+K^-$ and $B^+ \rightarrow K^+\pi^0\pi^0$ yield $A_{CP}(B^+ \rightarrow f_0(980)K^+) = -(8 \pm 8 \pm 4)\%$ [4] and $A_{CP}(B^+ \rightarrow f_0(980)K^+) = (18 \pm 18 \pm 4)\%$ [5], respectively.

^bFrom $B^0 \rightarrow K^+K^-K_S$.

^cFrom $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-K_S$.

we assume in scenario 2 that $K_0^*(1430)$, $a_0(1450)$, $f_0(1500)$ are the lowest lying $q\bar{q}$ resonances and the corresponding first excited states lie between $(2.0 \sim 2.3)$ GeV. Scenario 2 corresponds to the case that light scalar mesons are four-quark bound states, while all scalar mesons are made of two quarks in scenario 1. Phenomenological studies in [6, 7] imply that scenario 2 is preferable, which will be also reinforced in this work. Indeed, lattice calculations have confirmed that $a_0(1450)$ and $K_0^*(1430)$ are lowest-lying P -wave $q\bar{q}$ mesons [29], and indicated that $f_0(500)$ (or σ) and $K_0^*(800)$ (or κ) are S -wave tetraquark mesonia [30]. ¹

¹ However, a recent lattice calculation [31] leads to an opposite conclusion.

TABLE III: The scalar decay constant \bar{f}_S (in units of MeV) and Gegenbauer moments B_1 , B_3 and in scenario 1 (left) and scenario 2 (right) at the scale $\mu = 1$ GeV obtained using the QCD sum rule method [6]. Decay constants and Gegenbauer moments for excited states in scenario 2 are not listed here.

	\bar{f}_S	B_1	B_3		\bar{f}_S	B_1	B_3
$f_0(980)$	370 ± 20	-0.78 ± 0.08	0.02 ± 0.07				
$a_0(980)$	365 ± 20	-0.93 ± 0.10	0.14 ± 0.08				
$K_0^*(800)$	340 ± 20	-0.92 ± 0.11	0.15 ± 0.09				
$f_0(1500)$	-255 ± 30	0.80 ± 0.40	-1.32 ± 0.14	490 ± 50	-0.48 ± 0.11	-0.37 ± 0.20	
$a_0(1450)$	-280 ± 30	0.89 ± 0.20	-1.38 ± 0.18	460 ± 50	-0.58 ± 0.12	-0.49 ± 0.15	
$K_0^*(1430)$	-300 ± 30	0.58 ± 0.07	-1.20 ± 0.08	445 ± 50	-0.57 ± 0.13	-0.42 ± 0.22	

TABLE IV: Form factors of $B \rightarrow a_0(1450), K_0^*(1430)$ transitions obtained in the covariant light-front model [32] in scenario 1 (upper entry) and scenario 2 (lower entry).

F	$F(0)$	a	b		F	$F(0)$	a	b
$F_1^{Ba_0(1450)}$	0.26	1.57	0.70		$F_0^{Ba_0(1450)}$	0.26	0.55	0.03
	0.21	1.66	1.00			0.21	0.73	0.09
$F_1^{BK_0^*(1430)}$	0.26	1.52	0.64		$F_0^{BK_0^*(1430)}$	0.26	0.44	0.05
	0.21	1.59	0.91			0.21	0.59	0.09

A. Decay constants and form factors

Decay constants of scalar, pseudoscalar and vector mesons are defined as

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle S(p) | \bar{q}_2 \gamma_\mu q_1 | 0 \rangle &= f_S p_\mu, & \langle S | \bar{q}_2 q_1 | 0 \rangle &= m_S \bar{f}_S, \\
\langle P(p) | \bar{q}_2 \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 q_1 | 0 \rangle &= -i f_P p_\mu, & \langle V(p) | \bar{q}_2 \gamma_\mu q_1 | 0 \rangle &= f_V m_V \varepsilon_\mu^*, \\
\langle V(p, \varepsilon^*) | \bar{q}_2 \sigma_{\mu\nu} q_1 | 0 \rangle &= f_V^\perp (p_\mu \varepsilon_\nu^* - p_\nu \varepsilon_\mu^*).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

For scalar mesons, the vector decay constant f_S and the scale-dependent scalar decay constant \bar{f}_S are related by equations of motion

$$\mu_S f_S = \bar{f}_S, \quad \text{with} \quad \mu_S = \frac{m_S}{m_2(\mu) - m_1(\mu)}, \tag{2.2}$$

where m_2 and m_1 are the running current quark masses and m_S is the scalar meson mass. For the neutral scalar mesons f_0 , a_0^0 and σ , f_S vanishes owing to charge conjugation invariance or conservation of vector current, but the quantity $\bar{f}_S = \mu_S f_S$ remains finite. It is straightforward to show from Eq. (2.1) that the decay constants of the scalar meson and its antiparticle are related by

$$\bar{f}_{\bar{S}} = \bar{f}_S, \quad f_{\bar{S}} = -f_S. \tag{2.3}$$

Indeed, from Eq. (2.2) we have, for example,

$$f_{a_0^-}(\mu) = \bar{f}_{a_0} \frac{m_d(\mu) - m_u(\mu)}{m_{a_0}}, \quad f_{a_0^+}(\mu) = \bar{f}_{a_0} \frac{m_u(\mu) - m_d(\mu)}{m_{a_0}}. \quad (2.4)$$

Therefore, the vector decay constants of a_0^- and a_0^+ are of opposite sign.

In [6] we have applied the QCD sum rule method to estimate the decay constant \bar{f}_S for various scalar mesons as summarized in Table III. Note that a recent sum rule calculation in [25] yields a smaller \bar{f}_S in scenario 2 for $S = f_0(1710), a_0(1450)$ and $K_0^*(1430)$. In this work we shall use the values of f_V and f_V^\perp taken from [33]. For the decay constants $f_{\eta^{(\prime)}}^q$ and $f_{\eta^{(\prime)}}^s$ of the η and η' mesons defined by

$$\langle 0 | \bar{q} \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 q | \eta^{(\prime)} \rangle = i \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} f_{\eta^{(\prime)}}^q p_\mu, \quad \langle 0 | \bar{s} \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 s | \eta^{(\prime)} \rangle = i f_{\eta^{(\prime)}}^s p_\mu, \quad (2.5)$$

we shall follow the results of [34].

For the $B \rightarrow P$ and $B \rightarrow V$ transition form factors defined in the conventional way [35], we will use the results obtained using the QCD sum rule method [36]. Form factors for $B \rightarrow S$ transitions are defined by [32]

$$\langle S(p') | A_\mu | B(p) \rangle = -i \left[\left(P_\mu - \frac{m_B^2 - m_S^2}{q^2} q_\mu \right) F_1^{BS}(q^2) + \frac{m_B^2 - m_S^2}{q^2} q_\mu F_0^{BS}(q^2) \right], \quad (2.6)$$

where $P_\mu = (p + p')_\mu$ and $q_\mu = (p - p')_\mu$. The momentum dependence of the form factor is usually parameterized in a 3-parameter form

$$F(q^2) = \frac{F(0)}{1 - a(q^2/m_B^2) + b(q^4/m_B^4)}. \quad (2.7)$$

The parameters $F(0)$, a and b for $B \rightarrow S$ transitions are summarized in Table IV obtained using the covariant light-front quark model [32]. Form factors are also available in other approaches, such as light-cone sum rule [21–25] and pQCD [14, 26]. In general, form factors calculated by sum rule and pQCD methods are larger than that obtained using the quark model. For example, $F_0^{BK_0^*}(0)$ is of order 0.26 in the covariant light-front quark model [32], while it is found to be 0.45 [25], 0.49 [22, 24] in the sum rule method and 0.60 [26] and 0.76 [14] in pQCD (all evaluated in scenario 2). We will come to this point later.

B. Distribution amplitudes

In general, the twist-2 light-cone distribution amplitude (LCDA) of the scalar meson Φ_S has the form

$$\Phi_S(x, \mu) = f_S 6x(1-x) \left[1 + \mu_S \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} B_m(\mu) C_m^{3/2}(2x-1) \right], \quad (2.8)$$

where B_m are Gegenbauer moments and $C_m^{3/2}$ are Gegenbauer polynomials. The general twist-3 LCDAs are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_S^s(x) &= \bar{f}_S \left[1 + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} a_m(\mu) C_m^{1/2}(2u-1) \right], \\ \Phi_S^\sigma(x) &= \bar{f}_S 6x(1-x) \left[1 + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} b_m(\mu) C_m^{1/2}(2u-1) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

Since $\mu_S \equiv 1/B_0 \gg 1$ and even Gegenbauer coefficients B_m are suppressed, it is clear that the twist-2 LCDA of the scalar meson is dominated by the odd Gegenbauer moments. In contrast, the odd Gegenbauer moments vanish for the π and ρ mesons. The Gegenbauer moments B_1 and B_3 in scenarios 1 and 2 obtained using the QCD sum rule method [6] are listed in Table III. The Gegenbauer moments $a_{1,2,4}$ and $b_{1,2,4}$ for twist-3 LCDAs have been computed in [25, 37].

Since the decay constants vanish for the neutral scalar mesons f_0 , a_0^0 and σ , it follows from Eq. (2.8) that

$$\Phi_S(x, \mu) = \bar{f}_S 6x(1-x) \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} B_m(\mu) C_m^{3/2}(2x-1) \quad (2.10)$$

for these neutral scalar mesons.

As stressed in [6], it is most suitable to define the LCDAs of scalar mesons including decay constants. However, it is more convenient in practical calculations to factor out the decay constants in the LCDAs and put them back in the appropriate places. In the ensuing discussions, we will use the LCDAs with the decay constants $f_S, \bar{f}_S, f_V, f_V^\perp, f_P$ being factored out.

C. Mixing angle between $f_0(980)$ and $f_0(500)$ and between η and η'

In the naive 2-quark model with ideal mixing for $f_0(980)$ and $f_0(500)$, $f_0(980)$ is purely an $s\bar{s}$ state, while $f_0(500)$ is a $n\bar{n}$ state with $n\bar{n} \equiv (\bar{u}u + \bar{d}d)/\sqrt{2}$. However, there also exist some experimental evidences indicating that $f_0(980)$ is not purely an $s\bar{s}$ state. For example, the observation of $\Gamma(J/\psi \rightarrow f_0\omega) \approx \frac{1}{2}\Gamma(J/\psi \rightarrow f_0\phi)$ [38] clearly shows the existence of the non-strange and strange quark content in $f_0(980)$. Therefore, isoscalars $f_0(500)$ and $f_0(980)$ must have a mixing

$$\begin{pmatrix} |f_0(980)\rangle \\ |f_0(500)\rangle \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\theta & \sin\theta \\ -\sin\theta & \cos\theta \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} |n\bar{n}\rangle \\ |s\bar{s}\rangle \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.11)$$

Various mixing angle measurements have been discussed in the literature and summarized in [6, 39]. A recent measurement of the upper limit on the branching fraction product $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow J/\psi f_0(980)) \times \mathcal{B}(f_0(980) \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-)$ by LHCb leads to $|\theta| < 30^\circ$ [40].

For the η and η' mesons, it is more convenient to consider the flavor states $q\bar{q} \equiv (u\bar{u} + d\bar{d})/\sqrt{2}$, $s\bar{s}$ and $c\bar{c}$ labeled by the η_q, η_s and η_c^0 , respectively. Neglecting the small mixing with η_c^0 , we write

$$\begin{pmatrix} |\eta\rangle \\ |\eta'\rangle \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\phi & -\sin\phi \\ \sin\phi & \cos\phi \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} |\eta_q\rangle \\ |\eta_s\rangle \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.12)$$

where $\phi = (39.3 \pm 1.0)^\circ$ [41] is the $\eta - \eta'$ mixing angle in the η_q and η_s flavor basis.

III. DECAY AMPLITUDES IN QCD FACTORIZATION

We shall use the QCD factorization approach [27, 28] to study the short-distance contributions to the $B \rightarrow SP, SV$ decays with $S = f_0(980), a_0(980), a_0(1450), K_0^*(1430)$. In QCD factorization, the factorizable amplitudes of above-mentioned decays can be found in [6] and [7]. However, the expressions for the decay amplitudes of $B \rightarrow f_0 K, a_0^0 \pi, a_0^0 K$ involving a neutral f_0 or a_0 given in [6]

are corrected in Appendix A as some factorizable contributions were missed before. The effective parameters a_i^p with $p = u, c$ appearing in Eq. (A1) can be calculated in the QCD factorization approach [27]. In general, they have the expressions

$$a_i^p(M_1 M_2) = \left(c_i + \frac{c_{i\pm 1}}{N_c} \right) N_i(M_2) + \frac{c_{i\pm 1}}{N_c} \frac{C_F \alpha_s}{4\pi} \left[V_i(M_2) + \frac{4\pi^2}{N_c} H_i(M_1 M_2) \right] + P_i^p(M_2), \quad (3.1)$$

where $i = 1, \dots, 10$, the upper (lower) signs apply when i is odd (even), c_i are the Wilson coefficients, $C_F = (N_c^2 - 1)/(2N_c)$ with $N_c = 3$, M_2 is the emitted meson and M_1 shares the same spectator quark with the B meson. The quantities $V_i(M_2)$ account for vertex corrections, $H_i(M_1 M_2)$ for hard spectator interactions with a hard gluon exchange between the emitted meson and the spectator quark of the B meson and $P_i(M_2)$ for penguin contractions. The expression of the quantities $N_i(M_2)$ reads

$$N_i(M_2) = \begin{cases} 0, & i = 6, 8 \text{ and } M_2 = V, \\ 1, & \text{else.} \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

The explicit expressions of $V_i(M)$, $H_i(M_1 M_2)$, and weak annihilation contributions described by the terms b_i and $b_{i,\text{EW}}$ are given in [6] and [7] for $B \rightarrow SP$ and $B \rightarrow SV$, respectively.²

Power corrections in QCDF always involve troublesome endpoint divergences. We shall follow [27] to model the endpoint divergence $X \equiv \int_0^1 dx/(1-x)$ in the annihilation and hard spectator scattering diagrams as

$$X_A = \ln \left(\frac{m_B}{\Lambda_h} \right) (1 + \rho_A e^{i\phi_A}), \quad X_H = \ln \left(\frac{m_B}{\Lambda_h} \right) (1 + \rho_H e^{i\phi_H}), \quad (3.3)$$

with Λ_h being a typical scale of order 500 MeV, and $\rho_{A,H}$, $\phi_{A,H}$ being the unknown real parameters.

In principle, physics should be independent of the choice of μ , but in practice there exists some residual μ dependence in the truncated calculations. However, we found that sometimes even the decay rates without annihilation are sensitive to the choice of μ . For example, we found that the measured branching fractions of $B \rightarrow K_0^*(1430)(\eta, \eta')$ cannot be accommodated for $\mu = m_b/2$. Indeed, this observation also occurs in our previous study of $B \rightarrow VV$ decays [42]. We found that if the renormalization scale is chosen to be $\mu = m_b(m_b)/2 = 2.1$ GeV, we cannot fit the branching fractions and polarization fractions simultaneously for both $B \rightarrow K^*\phi$ and $B \rightarrow K^*\rho$ decays. Therefore, we will confine ourselves to the renormalization scale $\mu = m_b(m_b)$ in the ensuing study. Note that the hard spectator and annihilation contributions should be evaluated at the hard-collinear scale $\mu_h = \sqrt{\mu \Lambda_h}$ with $\Lambda_h \approx 500$ MeV [27].

As discussed in [6] and [7], scenario 2 in which the scalar mesons above 1 GeV are lowest lying $q\bar{q}$ scalar state and the light scalar mesons are four-quark states is preferable, while all scalar mesons are made of $q\bar{q}$ quarks in scenario 1. It is widely believed that the $f_0(980)$ and the $a_0(980)$ are predominately four-quark states, but in practice it is difficult to make quantitative predictions on hadronic $B \rightarrow SP, SV$ decays based on the four-quark picture for light scalar mesons. Hence, we shall assume scenario 1 for the $f_0(980)$ and the $a_0(980)$ in order to apply QCDF.

² In Eq. (4.8) of [6], the second term of the annihilation amplitude A_3^f for $M_1 M_2 = SP$ should have an identical expression, including the sign, as that for $M_1 M_2 = PS$. Note that the expression was correct in the original archive version, arXiv:hep-ph/0508104.

TABLE V: Branching fractions (in units of 10^{-6}) of B decays to a scalar meson and a pseudoscalar meson. The predicted rates of $B \rightarrow f_0(980)K, f_0(980)\pi$ are for the $f_0(980) - f_0(500)$ mixing angle $\theta = 17^\circ$. We work in scenario 1 for the light scalar mesons $f_0(980)$ and $a_0(980)$ and scenario 2 for the scalar mesons $a_0(1450)$ and $K_0^*(1430)$; see the main text for explanation. Experimental results are taken from Table I. We have used $\mathcal{B}(f_0(980) \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-) = 0.50$ and $\mathcal{B}(a_0(980) \rightarrow \pi\eta) = 0.845 \pm 0.017$ to obtain the experimental branching fractions for $f_0(980)P$ and $a_0(980)P$. For comparison, predictions based on the pQCD approach are also exhibited.

Mode	QCDF (this work)	pQCD [11–14, 17]	Expt
$B^- \rightarrow f_0(980)K^-$	$16.1^{+1.9+1.2+30.8}_{-1.8-1.8-11.0}$	$16 \sim 18^a$	$18.8^{+1.8}_{-2.0}$
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow f_0(980)\bar{K}^0$	$14.8^{+1.7+1.1+28.6}_{-1.6-1.6-10.2}$	$13 \sim 16^a$	14.0 ± 1.8
$B^- \rightarrow f_0(980)\pi^-$	$0.26^{+0.04+0.05+0.18}_{-0.03-0.04-0.12}$	2.5 ± 1.0	< 3.0
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow f_0(980)\pi^0$	$0.08^{+0.01+0.01+0.08}_{-0.01-0.01-0.03}$	0.26 ± 0.06	
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^0(980)K^-$	$0.34^{+0.08+0.45+1.02}_{-0.06-0.13-0.07}$	$3.5^{+0.4+0.4+1.0}_{-0.4-0.6-1.0}$	< 3.0
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^-(980)\bar{K}^0$	$0.08^{+0.12+0.58+2.12}_{-0.07-0.08-0.02}$	$6.9^{+0.8+1.1+2.0}_{-0.7-1.1-1.7}$	< 4.6
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^+(980)K^-$	$0.34^{+0.05+0.62+2.27}_{-0.05-0.13-0.00}$	$9.7^{+1.1+1.6+2.7}_{-1.0-1.4-2.2}$	< 2.2
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^0(980)\bar{K}^0$	$0.05^{+0.05+0.28+0.86}_{-0.03-0.04-0.00}$	$4.7^{+0.5+0.7+1.1}_{-0.5-0.8-1.1}$	< 9.2
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^0(980)\pi^-$	$4.9^{+0.4+1.2+0.5}_{-0.3-1.1-0.7}$	$2.8^{+0.0+0.0+0.0}_{-0.8-0.9-0.6}$	< 6.9
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^-(980)\pi^0$	$0.70^{+0.22+0.09+0.22}_{-0.16-0.08-0.14}$	$0.41^{+0.00+0.00+0.00}_{-0.13-0.14-0.12}$	< 1.7
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^+(980)\pi^-$	$5.3^{+0.3+1.4+1.0}_{-0.4-1.3-0.4}$	$0.86^{+0.10+0.14+0.01}_{-0.09-0.14-0.00}$	
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^-(980)\pi^+$	$0.58^{+0.11+0.09+0.63}_{-0.09-0.08-0.22}$	$0.51^{+0.05+0.09+0.07}_{-0.06-0.09-0.06}$	
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^\pm(980)\pi^\mp$	$4.7^{+0.6+1.3+1.8}_{-0.6-1.1-0.5}$	$0.93^{+0.10+0.15+0.02}_{-0.10-0.14-0.00}$	< 3.7
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^0(980)\pi^0$	$1.0^{+0.5+0.1+0.2}_{-0.3-0.1-0.1}$	$0.51^{+0.08+0.09+0.00}_{-0.07-0.09-0.00}$	
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^0(1450)K^-$	$2.2^{+0.7+2.3+7.7}_{-0.5-1.0-1.9}$		
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^-(1450)\bar{K}^0$	$4.2^{+1.6+4.9+18.1}_{-1.2-2.1-4.2}$		
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^+(1450)K^-$	$3.5^{+1.0+4.5+16.9}_{-0.8-1.9-3.3}$		< 4.7
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^0(1450)\bar{K}^0$	$1.9^{+0.8+2.1+7.5}_{-0.6-0.9-1.9}$		
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^0(1450)\pi^-$	$5.1^{+0.5+1.2+1.3}_{-0.4-1.1-1.3}$		
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^-(1450)\pi^0$	$2.1^{+0.7+0.2+0.8}_{-0.5-0.2-0.6}$		
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^+(1450)\pi^-$	$2.5^{+0.5+0.9+3.7}_{-0.5-0.8-0.3}$		
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^-(1450)\pi^+$	$0.74^{+0.20+0.19+2.92}_{-0.16-0.17-0.51}$		
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^\pm(1450)\pi^\mp$	$1.3^{+0.7+0.7+8.3}_{-0.6-0.6-0.1}$		< 3.5
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^0(1450)\pi^0$	$3.3^{+1.4+0.3+2.8}_{-1.0-0.3-1.3}$		
$B^- \rightarrow \bar{K}_0^{*0}(1430)\pi^-$	$12.9^{+4.6+4.1+38.5}_{-3.7-3.4-9.1}$	$30.9^{+12.5}_{-9.2}^b$	45.1 ± 6.3
$B^- \rightarrow K_0^{*-}(1430)\pi^0$	$7.4^{+2.4+2.1+20.1}_{-1.9-1.8-5.0}$	$21.6^{+8.5}_{-6.6}^b$	
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow K_0^{*-}(1430)\pi^+$	$13.8^{+4.5+4.1+38.3}_{-3.6-3.5-9.5}$	$31.6^{+12.4}_{-9.3}^b$	$33.5^{+3.9}_{-3.8}$
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}_0^{*0}(1430)\pi^0$	$5.6^{+2.6+2.4+18.8}_{-1.3-1.2-3.9}$	$10.7^{+4.1}_{-3.2}^b$	7.0 ± 1.2
$B^- \rightarrow K_0^{*-}(1430)\eta$	$17.9^{+3.9+8.3+9.1}_{-3.4-5.3-12.3}$	$33.8^{+13.5+1.1+7.7+8.2}_{-9.0-1.1-7.0-7.3}$	15.8 ± 3.1
$B^- \rightarrow K_0^{*-}(1430)\eta'$	$9.3^{+4.7+4.0+51.6}_{-3.6-4.4-8.0}$	$77.5^{+15.8+6.2+21.0+18.0}_{-10.8-5.8-16.5-16.1}$	5.2 ± 2.1
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}_0^{*0}(1430)\eta$	$16.1^{+3.6+7.6+9.1}_{-3.1-4.9-11.7}$	$28.4^{+11.6+1.4+6.4+6.9}_{-7.8-1.4-5.9-6.2}$	9.6 ± 1.9
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}_0^{*0}(1430)\eta'$	$8.7^{+4.4+3.7+48.7}_{-3.3-4.1-7.5}$	$74.2^{+15.0+6.4+20.5+17.2}_{-10.3-5.7-16.2-15.5}$	6.3 ± 1.6

^aFor the mixing angle $140^\circ < \theta < 165^\circ$ [11].

^bResults based on the new Gegenbauer moments obtained in [14]. For previous pQCD calculations of $B \rightarrow K_0^*(1430)\pi$, see [12].

TABLE VI: Same as Table V except for B decays to a scalar meson and a vector meson.

Mode	QCDF (this work)	pQCD [15, 16, 18–20]	Expt
$B^- \rightarrow f_0(980)K^{*-}$	$10.7^{+0.3+0.2+4.8}_{-0.3-0.2-0.5}$	$11.7 \sim 14.6$	11.4 ± 1.4
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow f_0(980)\bar{K}^{*0}$	$9.1^{+1.0+1.0+5.3}_{-0.4-0.5-0.7}$	$11.2 \sim 13.7$	8.4 ± 1.4
$B^- \rightarrow f_0(980)\rho^-$	$0.35^{+0.01+0.08+0.09}_{-0.01-0.07-0.08}$	$0.7^{+0.1+0.2+0.2}_{-0.0-0.1-0.1}$	< 4.0
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow f_0(980)\rho^0$	$0.02^{+0.00+0.00+0.03}_{-0.00-0.00-0.00}$	$0.33^{+0.04+0.07+0.06}_{-0.03-0.05-0.06}$	1.7 ± 0.6
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow f_0(980)\omega$	$0.02^{+0.00+0.00+0.03}_{-0.00-0.00-0.01}$	$0.34^{+0.03+0.06+0.06}_{-0.04-0.06-0.05}$	< 3.0
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^0(980)K^{*-}$	$2.4^{+0.3+0.4+2.8}_{-0.3-0.4-0.0}$		
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^-(980)\bar{K}^{*0}$	$8.4^{+1.3+1.2+8.2}_{-1.1-1.1-0.2}$		
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^+(980)K^{*-}$	$5.6^{+1.2+1.4+7.9}_{-0.2-0.4-0.6}$		
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^0(980)\bar{K}^{*0}$	$3.2^{+2.5+2.7+2.8}_{-2.9-2.7-0.0}$		
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^0(980)\rho^-$	$6.8^{+0.6+1.7+0.9}_{-0.5-1.5-0.3}$		
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^-(980)\rho^0$	$2.1^{+0.6+0.0+0.9}_{-0.5-0.0-0.2}$		
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^+(980)\rho^-$	$22.5^{+4.0+6.8+5.0}_{-0.1-2.7-2.3}$		
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^-(980)\rho^+$	$0.60^{+0.14+0.05+0.47}_{-0.03-0.05-0.07}$		
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^0(980)\rho^0$	$1.3^{+0.8+0.1+0.4}_{-0.4-0.1-0.0}$		
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^-(980)\omega$	$1.0^{+0.4+0.0+0.5}_{-0.3-0.0-0.2}$		
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^0(980)\omega$	$0.4^{+0.3+0.0+0.2}_{-0.1-0.0-0.0}$		
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^0(1450)K^{*-}$	$2.5^{+0.3+0.4+5.6}_{-0.3-0.4-0.1}$	$7.0^{+0.9+1.6+1.7+0.2}_{-0.7-1.1-1.4-0.0}$	
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^-(1450)\bar{K}^{*0}$	$8.4^{+1.4+1.3+14.6}_{-1.1-1.2-0.4}$	$3.0^{+0.2+0.2+0.7+1.2}_{-0.1-0.1-0.6-0.7}$	
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^+(1450)K^{*-}$	$8.9^{+1.9+3.0+3.9}_{-0.3-1.4-0.5}$	$2.8^{+0.3+0.1+0.7+0.8}_{-0.3-0.0-0.5-0.6}$	
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^0(1450)\bar{K}^{*0}$	$3.4^{+0.8+0.9+6.7}_{-0.2-0.3-0.3}$	$1.4^{+0.1+0.0+0.3+0.5}_{-0.1-0.1-0.3-0.4}$	
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^0(1450)\rho^-$	$3.7^{+0.6+1.4+1.9}_{-0.5-1.1-0.3}$	$79.3^{+33.2+18.2+5.5+3.9}_{-22.1-16.3-4.7-3.5}$	
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^-(1450)\rho^0$	$3.2^{+0.8+0.2+2.3}_{-0.6-0.2-0.4}$	$1.9^{+0.9+0.4+0.1+0.4}_{-0.5-0.4-0.0-0.3}$	
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^+(1450)\rho^-$	$11.2^{+2.4+4.5+11.2}_{-0.4-2.3-1.0}$	$184.3^{+69.3+42.2+13.0+13.7}_{-47.9-37.9-13.3-14.1}$	
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^-(1450)\rho^+$	$1.2^{+0.3+0.1+1.3}_{-0.1-0.1-0.1}$	$3.6^{+0.7+0.8+0.8+0.4}_{-0.6-0.8-0.8-0.3}$	
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^0(1450)\rho^0$	$4.4^{+2.7+0.5+1.1}_{-1.3-0.2-1.2}$	$7.2^{+2.1+1.7+1.1+1.6}_{-1.6-1.3-0.9-1.3}$	
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^-(1450)\omega$	$1.5^{+0.6+0.0+1.5}_{-0.4-0.0-0.3}$	$0.3^{+0.4+0.1+0.1+0.1}_{-0.1-0.0-0.0-0.0}$	
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^0(1450)\omega$	$1.8^{+1.1+0.2+1.7}_{-0.5-0.1-0.3}$	$2.1^{+0.7+0.4+0.2+0.1}_{-0.6-0.5-0.2-0.2}$	
$B^- \rightarrow \bar{K}_0^{*0}(1430)\rho^-$	$39.0^{+34.5+35.2+41.6}_{-35.8-35.3-51.0}$	$12.1^{+2.8+3.9+0.5}_{-0.0-3.1-0.5}$	
$B^- \rightarrow K_0^{*-}(1430)\rho^0$	$14.8^{+3.7+0.4+6.7}_{-3.2-0.4-0.2}$	$8.4^{+2.3+3.3+0.9}_{-0.0-3.2-0.7}$	
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow K_0^{*-}(1430)\rho^+$	$36.3^{+8.5+0.8+16.7}_{-7.4-0.8-0.1}$	$10.5^{+2.7+3.5+0.3}_{-0.0-2.6-0.3}$	28.0 ± 11.6
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}_0^{*0}(1430)\rho^0$	$23.4^{+5.1+0.6+9.4}_{-4.5-0.5-0.4}$	$4.8^{+1.1+1.0+0.3}_{-0.0-1.0-0.3}$	27.0 ± 5.4
$B^- \rightarrow K_0^{*-}(1430)\omega$	$21.5^{+5.8+0.5+9.8}_{-4.9-0.5-3.4}$	$7.4^{+2.1+3.0+0.9}_{-1.5-2.3-0.4}$	24.0 ± 5.1
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}_0^{*0}(1430)\omega$	$21.9^{+5.9+0.6+10.5}_{-5.0-0.6-3.3}$	$9.3^{+2.1+3.6+1.2}_{-2.0-2.9-1.0}$	16.0 ± 3.4
$B^- \rightarrow K_0^{*-}(1430)\phi$	$3.8^{+0.7+0.1+11.2}_{-0.6-0.1-1.6}$	$25.6^{+6.2+0.9+12.1}_{-5.4-0.8-6.5}$	7.0 ± 1.6
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}_0^{*0}(1430)\phi$	$3.7^{+0.8+0.1+5.6}_{-0.6-0.1-0.1}$	$23.6^{+5.6+0.8+10.9}_{-5.0-0.6-5.8}$	3.9 ± 0.8

TABLE VII: Branching fractions (in units of 10^{-6}) of $B \rightarrow SP$ (upper) and $B \rightarrow SV$ (lower) decays with $S = a_0(1450), K_0^*(1430)$ in QCD factorization. Experimental results are taken from Table I. The scalar mesons $a_0(1450)$ and $K_0^*(1430)$ are treated as the first excited states of low lying light $q\bar{q}$ scalars $a_0(980)$ and $K_0^*(800)$, corresponding to scenario 1 as explained in the main text.

Mode	Theory	Expt	Mode	Theory	Expt
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^0(1450)K^-$	$0.7^{+0.7+0.3+3.1}_{-0.4-0.1-0.5}$		$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^+(1450)K^-$	$1.9^{+1.9+0.9+7.8}_{-1.1-0.4-1.4}$	< 4.7
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^-(1450)\bar{K}^0$	$2.7^{+2.8+1.2+9.6}_{-1.7-0.6-2.7}$		$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^0(1450)\bar{K}^0$	$0.9^{+1.0+0.4+3.6}_{-0.6-0.2-0.9}$	
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^0(1450)\pi^-$	$2.7^{+0.1+0.6+0.4}_{-0.1-0.5-0.5}$		$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^+(1450)\pi^-$	$11.2^{+2.0+1.8+4.5}_{-1.6-1.7-5.2}$	
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^-(1450)\pi^0$	$0.4^{+0.2+0.0+0.2}_{-0.2-0.0-0.2}$		$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^-(1450)\pi^+$	$0.02^{+0.05+0.01+0.75}_{-0.00-0.00-0.01}$	
			$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^\pm(1450)\pi^\mp$	$11.9^{+2.7+1.8+5.6}_{-2.3-1.6-3.7}$	< 3.5
			$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^0(1450)\pi^0$	$1.3^{+0.7+0.1+2.0}_{-0.5-0.1-1.0}$	
$B^- \rightarrow \bar{K}_0^{*0}(1430)\pi^-$	$1.3^{+0.7+1.0+15.9}_{-0.5-0.7-1.1}$	45.1 ± 6.3	$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow K_0^{*-}(1430)\pi^+$	$1.6^{+0.8+1.0+15.7}_{-0.6-0.8-1.3}$	32.1 ± 3.7
$B^- \rightarrow K_0^{*-}(1430)\pi^0$	$0.3^{+0.2+0.3+6.4}_{-0.1-0.2-0.3}$		$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}_0^{*0}(1430)\pi^0$	$1.3^{+0.7+0.8+9.4}_{-0.3-0.5-1.3}$	7.0 ± 1.2
$B^- \rightarrow K_0^{*-}(1430)\eta$	$5.4^{+1.9+1.2+3.7}_{-1.6-1.0-4.4}$	15.8 ± 3.1	$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}_0^{*0}\eta$	$5.8^{+2.1+1.4+4.9}_{-1.7-1.1-5.2}$	9.6 ± 1.9
$B^- \rightarrow K_0^{*-}(1430)\eta'$	$6.2^{+1.0+1.0+35.8}_{-0.8-1.0-6.1}$	5.2 ± 2.1	$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}_0^{*0}\eta'$	$5.9^{+0.9+0.9+33.6}_{-0.8-0.9-5.8}$	6.3 ± 1.6
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^0(1450)K^{*-}$	$0.7^{+0.1+0.2+1.7}_{-0.1-0.2-0.0}$		$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^+(1450)K^{*-}$	$4.8^{+0.9+2.1+7.3}_{-0.1-1.1-0.4}$	
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^-(1450)\bar{K}^{*0}$	$1.3^{+0.2+0.5+4.2}_{-0.1-0.4-0.2}$		$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^0(1450)\bar{K}^{*0}$	$0.6^{+0.1+0.3+1.9}_{-0.0-0.2-0.1}$	
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^0(1450)\rho^-$	$6.9^{+1.3+1.8+0.2}_{-1.1-1.6-1.1}$		$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^+(1450)\rho^-$	$17.3^{+4.2+5.6+2.3}_{-1.0-2.4-6.0}$	
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^-(1450)\rho^0$	$0.2^{+0.1+0.0+0.6}_{-0.1-0.0-0.1}$		$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^-(1450)\rho^+$	$0.2^{+0.1+0.0+0.3}_{-0.1-0.0-0.0}$	
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^-(1450)\omega$	$0.5^{+0.1+0.1+0.4}_{-0.1-0.1-0.1}$		$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^0(1450)\rho^0$	$1.4^{+1.6+0.2+0.3}_{-0.8-0.1-0.8}$	
			$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^0(1450)\omega$	$0.1^{+0.1+0.0+0.5}_{-0.0-0.0-0.0}$	
$B^- \rightarrow K_0^{*-}(1430)\phi$	$2.8^{+0.5+0.0+5.0}_{-0.4-0.0-0.5}$	7.0 ± 1.6	$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}_0^{*0}(1430)\phi$	$2.5^{+0.5+0.0+4.7}_{-0.3-0.0-0.5}$	3.9 ± 0.8
$B^- \rightarrow \bar{K}_0^{*0}(1430)\rho^-$	$13.2^{+9.9+10.4+10.8}_{-10.8-10.4-15.1}$		$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow K_0^{*-}(1430)\rho^+$	$10.9^{+2.5+0.3+5.5}_{-2.2-0.3-0.0}$	28.0 ± 11.6
$B^- \rightarrow K_0^{*-}(1430)\rho^0$	$8.4^{+1.7+0.2+2.1}_{-1.5-0.2-0.1}$		$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}_0^{*0}(1430)\rho^0$	$4.1^{+1.1+0.2+2.6}_{-1.0-0.2-0.1}$	27.0 ± 5.4
$B^- \rightarrow K_0^{*-}(1430)\omega$	$10.6^{+3.0+0.2+3.8}_{-2.4-0.2-1.4}$	24.0 ± 5.1	$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}_0^{*0}(1430)\omega$	$9.3^{+2.7+0.3+3.9}_{-2.2-0.3-1.3}$	16.0 ± 3.4

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The calculated branching fractions and CP asymmetries of $B \rightarrow SP$ and $B \rightarrow SV$ decays are summarized in Tables V–IX. The defaulted values of the parameters $\rho_{A,H}$ and $\phi_{A,H}$ introduced in Eq. (3.3) are set to zero; that is, the central values (or “default” results) correspond to $\rho_{A,H} = 0$ and $\phi_{A,H} = 0$. The first theoretical error shown in the Tables for QCDF results is due to the variation of $B_{1,3}$ and f_S , the second error comes from the uncertainties of form factors and the strange quark mass, while the third error from the power corrections due to weak annihilation and hard spectator interactions.

In order to compare theory with experiment for decays involving $f_0(980)$ or $a_0(980)$ and $a_0(1450)$, we need an input for $\mathcal{B}(f_0(980) \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-)$ or $\mathcal{B}(a_0 \rightarrow \pi\eta)$. To do this for $f_0(980)$, we shall use the

TABLE VIII: CP asymmetries (in units of %) of B decays to a scalar meson and a pseudoscalar meson. We work in scenario 1 for the light scalar mesons $f_0(980)$ and $a_0(980)$ and scenario 2 for the scalar mesons $a_0(1450)$ and $K_0^*(1450)$. Experimental results are taken from Table II.

Mode	Theory	Expt	Mode	Theory	Expt
$B^- \rightarrow f_0(980)K^-$	$1.4^{+0.2+0.5+1.1}_{-0.2-0.4-1.4}$	$-9.5^{+4.9}_{-4.2}$	$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow f_0(980)\bar{K}^0$	$2.9^{+0.4+0.5+4.8}_{-0.3-0.2-2.6}$	-14 ± 12^a
$B^- \rightarrow f_0(980)\pi^-$	$19.0^{+3.1+2.0+36.1}_{-2.6-2.4-28.4}$		$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow f_0(980)\pi^0$	$-34.0^{+3.5+3.1+65.5}_{-3.9-2.9-47.2}$	
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^0(980)K^-$	$-13.3^{+2.7+7.3+56.8}_{-2.7-6.1-40.1}$		$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^+(980)K^-$	$-19.1^{+5.3+10.1+75.2}_{-6.4-8.6-41.2}$	
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^0(980)\bar{K}^0$	$0.63^{+0.74+54.22+2.49}_{-0.57-0.49-2.86}$		$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^0(980)\bar{K}^0$	$-7.6^{+1.9+58.2+35.6}_{-3.9-3.0-30.5}$	
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^0(980)\pi^-$	$-8.8^{+0.6+0.0+0.9}_{-0.6-0.0-0.8}$		$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^+(980)\pi^-$	$1.1^{+0.1+0.1+16.5}_{-0.1-0.0-16.9}$	
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^-(980)\pi^0$	$-32.8^{+5.6+3.2+20.3}_{-6.2-2.8-21.6}$		$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^-(980)\pi^+$	$-5.0^{+1.0+0.6+16.6}_{-0.9-0.5-15.5}$	
			$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^0(980)\pi^0$	$-30.9^{+4.6+1.9+30.5}_{-5.6-1.8-24.7}$	
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^0(1450)K^-$	$-1.79^{+0.69+0.64+16.61}_{-0.82-0.06-17.75}$		$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^+(1450)K^-$	$-0.65^{+0.41+0.68+11.29}_{-0.54-0.23-23.80}$	
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^-(1450)\bar{K}^0$	$0.22^{+0.04+0.06+0.59}_{-0.03-0.03-47.94}$		$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^0(1450)\bar{K}^0$	$-0.74^{+0.32+0.23+8.2}_{-0.39-0.05-20.7}$	
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^0(1450)\pi^-$	$-13.1^{+0.9+0.0+4.9}_{-0.9-0.0-4.3}$		$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^+(1450)\pi^-$	$-0.21^{+0.37+0.18+82.8}_{-0.46-0.28-83.6}$	
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^-(1450)\pi^0$	$-24.6^{+3.4+2.4+25.3}_{-3.8-2.1-23.5}$		$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^-(1450)\pi^+$	$-5.2^{+3.4+2.3+62.0}_{-2.9-1.7-66.9}$	
			$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^0(1450)\pi^0$	$-13.8^{+3.1+2.1+35.7}_{-3.8-1.9-20.0}$	
$B^- \rightarrow \bar{K}_0^{*0}(1430)\pi^-$	$1.3^{+0.1+0.0+5.9}_{-0.1-0.0-4.8}$	$5.5^{+3.4}_{-2.2}$	$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow K_0^{*-}(1430)\pi^+$	$0.21^{+0.06+0.05+7.05}_{-0.06-0.04-7.21}$	7 ± 14
$B^- \rightarrow K_0^{*-}(1430)\pi^0$	$3.0^{+0.4+0.5+10.7}_{-0.4-0.4-7.8}$		$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}_0^{*0}(1430)\pi^0$	$-1.9^{+0.4+0.4+12.0}_{-0.5-0.5-14.9}$	-15 ± 11
$B^- \rightarrow K_0^{*-}(1430)\eta$	$1.5^{+0.1+0.2+1.7}_{-0.1-0.2-1.9}$	-19 ± 17	$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}_0^{*0}(1430)\eta$	$2.0^{+0.1+0.2+2.3}_{-0.1-0.2-1.3}$	6 ± 13
$B^- \rightarrow K_0^{*-}(1430)\eta'$	$1.2^{+0.3+0.1+8.7}_{-0.2-0.3-6.3}$	6 ± 20	$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}_0^{*0}(1430)\eta'$	$1.2^{+0.1+0.1+17.9}_{-0.1-0.4-13.5}$	-19 ± 17

^aThis is the naive (uncorrelated) average of the direct CP asymmetries -0.29 ± 0.20 obtained from $B^0 \rightarrow K^+K^-K_S$ and -0.07 ± 0.14 from $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-K_S$ (see Table II).

BES measurement [43]

$$\frac{\Gamma(f_0(980) \rightarrow \pi\pi)}{\Gamma(f_0(980) \rightarrow \pi\pi) + \Gamma(f_0(980) \rightarrow K\bar{K})} = 0.75^{+0.11}_{-0.13}. \quad (4.1)$$

Assuming the dominance of the $f_0(980)$ width by $\pi\pi$ and $K\bar{K}$ and applying isospin relation, we obtain ³

$$\mathcal{B}(f_0(980) \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-) = 0.50^{+0.07}_{-0.09}, \quad \mathcal{B}(f_0(980) \rightarrow K^+K^-) = 0.125^{+0.018}_{-0.022}. \quad (4.2)$$

For $a_0(980)$, we shall apply the Particle Data Group (PDG) average $\Gamma(a_0 \rightarrow K\bar{K})/\Gamma(a_0 \rightarrow \pi\eta) = 0.183 \pm 0.024$ [38] to obtain

$$\mathcal{B}(a_0(980) \rightarrow \eta\pi) = 0.845 \pm 0.017. \quad (4.3)$$

For $a_0(1450)$, we use $\Gamma(a_0(1450) \rightarrow \pi\eta')/\Gamma(a_0(1450) \rightarrow \pi\eta) = 0.35 \pm 0.16$ and $\Gamma(a_0(1450) \rightarrow K\bar{K})/\Gamma(a_0(1450) \rightarrow \pi\eta) = 0.88 \pm 0.23$ to obtain

$$1/\mathcal{B}(a_0(1450) \rightarrow \pi\eta) = 1.52 \pm 0.13. \quad (4.4)$$

³ This is in agreement with the value of $\mathcal{B}(f_0(980) \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-) = 0.46 \pm 0.06$ obtained in [40].

TABLE IX: Same as Table IX except for B decays to a scalar meson and a vector meson.

Mode	Theory	Expt	Mode	Theory	Expt
$B^- \rightarrow f_0(980)K^{*-}$	$-3.3^{+0.2+0.7+5.7}_{-0.2-0.8-0.9}$	-15 ± 12	$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow f_0(980)\bar{K}^{*0}$	$3.6^{+0.3+0.1+0.7}_{-0.2-0.1-1.3}$	7 ± 10
$B^- \rightarrow f_0(980)\rho^-$	$73.0^{+3.2+5.1+5.9}_{-3.4-7.0-6.1}$		$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow f_0(980)\rho^0$	$68.2^{+2.4+0.6+22.5}_{-2.3-0.5-138.3}$	
			$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow f_0(980)\omega$	$55.0^{+1.6+0.5+28.5}_{-1.5-0.4-108.4}$	
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^0(980)K^{*-}$	$4.6^{+0.6+0.3+2.0}_{-0.6-0.3-18.2}$		$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^+(980)K^{*-}$	$3.8^{+0.6+0.3+0.1}_{-0.6-0.3-21.6}$	
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^-(980)\bar{K}^{*0}$	$0.4^{+0.0+0.0+0.0}_{-0.0-0.0-0.3}$		$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^0(980)\bar{K}^{*0}$	$0.1^{+64.1+72.7+2.0}_{-79.3-73.3-18.2}$	
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^0(980)\rho^-$	$-10.7^{+0.6+1.1+19.0}_{-0.7-1.4-1.4}$		$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^+(980)\rho^-$	$-1.3^{+0.1+0.0+8.2}_{-0.1-0.0-0.0}$	
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^-(980)\rho^0$	$4.2^{+2.7+1.8+28.1}_{-2.1-1.8-12.4}$		$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^-(980)\rho^+$	$-12.7^{+0.7+0.0+6.3}_{-0.6-0.0-24.5}$	
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^-(980)\omega$	$6.2^{+2.9+0.6+47.5}_{-2.1-1.0-7.1}$		$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^0(980)\rho^0$	$7.8^{+0.7+0.2+12.5}_{-0.6-0.1-11.7}$	
			$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^0(980)\omega$	$-72.8^{+8.9+0.3+23.4}_{-6.4-0.3-22.0}$	
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^0(1450)K^{*-}$	$2.6^{+0.6+0.3+3.6}_{-0.5-0.4-20.2}$		$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^+(1450)K^{*-}$	$42.6^{+2.3+4.0+0.6}_{-2.5-5.1-140.4}$	
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^-(1450)\bar{K}^{*0}$	$0.36^{+0.02+0.02+0.08}_{-0.02-0.02-0.88}$		$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^0(1450)\bar{K}^{*0}$	$1.0^{+0.2+0.0+3.3}_{-0.2-0.1-9.6}$	
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^0(1450)\rho^-$	$-19.1^{+1.9+2.7+45.2}_{-2.3-3.8-5.4}$		$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^+(1450)\rho^-$	$-1.4^{+0.1+0.0+19.0}_{-0.1-0.0-0.4}$	
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^-(1450)\rho^0$	$-1.6^{+1.5+1.3+37.2}_{-1.2-1.3-18.4}$		$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^-(1450)\rho^+$	$-13.3^{+0.9+0.0+7.1}_{-0.8-0.0-22.9}$	
$B^- \rightarrow a_0^-(1450)\omega$	$1.6^{+2.3+1.5+54.7}_{-1.7-1.7-18.1}$		$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^0(1450)\rho^0$	$6.4^{+0.7+0.3+12.2}_{-0.6-0.3-5.3}$	
			$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^0(1450)\omega$	$-31.9^{+2.5+0.8+30.8}_{-2.9-1.0-21.3}$	
$B^- \rightarrow K_0^{*-}(1430)\phi$	$0.64^{+0.02+0.01+0.32}_{-0.03-0.01-1.49}$	4 ± 15	$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}_0^{*0}(1430)\phi$	$0.43^{+0.04+0.01+3.61}_{-0.04-0.00-20.2}$	20 ± 15
$B^- \rightarrow \bar{K}_0^{*0}(1430)\rho^-$	$0.32^{+0.34+0.33+0.71}_{-0.29-0.31+1.09}$		$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow K_0^{*-}(1430)\rho^+$	$1.1^{+0.0+0.2+0.2}_{-0.0-0.2-1.2}$	
$B^- \rightarrow K_0^{*-}(1430)\rho^0$	$1.6^{+0.6+0.1+2.8}_{-0.6-0.1-6.2}$		$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}_0^{*0}(1430)\rho^0$	$0.54^{+0.45+0.02+3.76}_{-0.46-0.02-1.80}$	
$B^- \rightarrow K_0^{*-}(1430)\omega$	$0.55^{+0.35+0.08+0.32}_{-0.34-0.08-2.49}$	-10 ± 9	$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}_0^{*0}(1430)\omega$	$0.03^{+0.37+0.01+0.29}_{-0.35-0.01-3.00}$	-7 ± 9

A. Decays involving a $K_0^*(1430)$ state

Among the hadronic 2-body B decays with a $K_0^*(1430)$ in the final state, only $B \rightarrow K_0^*\eta^{(\prime)}$ and $B \rightarrow K_0^*\phi$ are sensitive to the $B \rightarrow K_0^*(1430)$ transition form factors $F_0^{BK_0^*}$ and $F_1^{BK_0^*}$, respectively. It turns out that the measurement of $B \rightarrow K_0^*\eta^{(\prime)}$ favors a smaller $F_0^{BK_0^*}(0)$, while the data of $B \rightarrow K_0^*\phi$ prefer a smaller $F_1^{BK_0^*}(0)$ inferred from the neutral mode and a slightly larger $F_1^{BK_0^*}(0)$ from the charged mode. Since $F_1(0) = F_0(0)$, this means that it is preferable to fit the data of $B \rightarrow K_0^*\eta^{(\prime)}$ and $B \rightarrow K_0^*\phi$ by a smaller $B \rightarrow K_0^*(1430)$ transition form factor. In this work we shall use $F_0^{BK_0^*}(0) \sim 0.26$ obtained in the covariant light-front quark model [32].

1. $B \rightarrow K_0^*(1430)\eta^{(\prime)}$ decays

Following [8], we write

$$\begin{aligned}
 A_{B \rightarrow K_0^*\eta} &= X^{(BK_0^*, \eta_q)} C_1 + X^{(BK_0^*, \eta_s)} C_2 + X^{(B\eta_q, K_0^*)} C_3, \\
 A_{B \rightarrow K_0^*\eta'} &= X^{(BK_0^*, \eta'_q)} C_1 + X^{(BK_0^*, \eta'_s)} C_2 + X^{(B\eta'_q, K_0^*)} C_3,
 \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

where C_1 , C_2 and C_3 terms correspond to Figs. 1(a), 1(b) and 1(c), respectively, and $X^{(BS, P)}$, $X^{(BP, S)}$ are factorizable terms defined in Eq. (A6). The expressions of C_i 's in terms of the




FIG. 1: Three different penguin contributions to $\overline{B} \rightarrow \overline{K}_0^*(1430)\eta^{(\prime)}$. Fig. 1(a) is induced by the penguin operators $O_{3,5,7,9}$.

parameters α_i^p can be found in [8]. Because of the small vector decay constant of $K_0^*(1430)$, $X^{(B\eta_q^{(\prime)}, K_0^*)}$ is suppressed relative to $X^{(BK_0^*, \eta_q^{(\prime)})}$ and $X^{(BK_0^*, \eta_s^{(\prime)})}$. However, the C_3 term gains a large enhancement from $\alpha_4^c(\eta_q K_0^*)$ due to the fact that the chiral factor $r_\chi^{K_0^*} = 12.3$ at $\mu = 4.2$ GeV is larger than $r_\chi^K = 1.5$ by one order of magnitude owing to the large mass of $K_0^*(1430)$. It follows that $\alpha_4^c(\eta_q K_0^*)$ is much greater than $\alpha_4^c(K_0^* \eta_s)$ and $\alpha_4^c(K_0^* \eta_q)$. As a result, the amplitude of Fig. 1(c) is comparable to that of Fig. 1(a).

Because of the large magnitude of $\alpha_3(K_0^* \eta_{q,s})$ and the large cancellation between $\alpha_3(K_0^* \eta_s)$ and $\alpha_4(K_0^* \eta_s)$ in C_2 , $B \rightarrow K_0^* \eta^{(\prime)}$ decays are dominated by the contributions from Figs. 1(a) and 1(c) [8]. Therefore, the penguin diagrams Figs. 1(a) and 1(c) contribute constructively to both $K_0^* \eta$ and $K_0^* \eta'$ with comparable magnitudes. Since $X^{(BK_0^*, \eta_q)}/X^{(BK_0^*, \eta_q')} = X^{(B\eta_q, K_0^*)}/X^{(B\eta_q', K_0^*)} = \cot \phi \approx 1.23$, it is clear that $A_{B \rightarrow K_0^* \eta}/A_{B \rightarrow K_0^* \eta'} \approx \cot \phi$ and hence $B \rightarrow K_0^* \eta$ should have a rate larger than $B \rightarrow K_0^* \eta'$ in scenario 2 as the mixing angle ϕ is less than 45° .

As mentioned in the passing, we use the form factor $F_0^{BK_0^*}(0) \sim 0.26$ in this work. If a large form factor, say, $F_0^{BK_0^*}(0) \sim 0.45$ [25], is employed, we will have $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow K_0^*(1430)\eta) \sim 21 \times 10^{-6} \gg \mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow K_0^*(1430)\eta) \sim 3.2 \times 10^{-6}$. This indicates that a small form factor for $B \rightarrow K_0^*(1430)$ transition is preferable in this case.

A recent pQCD calculation [14] shows $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow K_0^* \eta') \approx 75 \times 10^{-6} \gg \mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow K_0^* \eta)$, in sharp contrast to the experimental measurements $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow K_0^* \eta') < \mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow K_0^* \eta)$ and $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow K_0^* \eta') \sim 6 \times 10^{-6}$ (see Table V).

2. $B \rightarrow K_0^*(1430)\pi$ decays

It is clear from Table V that while the predicted branching fraction of $\overline{B}^0 \rightarrow \overline{K}_0^{*0}(1430)\pi^0$ is consistent with the data, the calculated rates of $\overline{K}_0^{*0}(1430)\pi^-$ and $K_0^{*-}(1430)\pi^+$ are too small compared to experiment. Under the isospin limit, it is naively expected that

$$R_1 \equiv \frac{\mathcal{B}(\overline{B}^0 \rightarrow \overline{K}_0^{*0}(1430)\pi^0)}{\mathcal{B}(\overline{B}^0 \rightarrow K_0^{*-}(1430)\pi^+)} = \frac{1}{2}, \quad R_2 \equiv \frac{\mathcal{B}(B^- \rightarrow K_0^{*-}(1430)\pi^0)}{\mathcal{B}(B^- \rightarrow \overline{K}_0^{*0}(1430)\pi^-)} = \frac{1}{2},$$

$$R_3 \equiv \frac{\tau(B^0)\mathcal{B}(B^- \rightarrow \bar{K}_0^{*0}(1430)\pi^-)}{\tau(B^-)\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow K_0^{*-}(1430)\pi^+)} = 1. \quad (4.6)$$

However, the first two relations are not borne out by experiment. In principle, the data of $K_0^{*-}(1430)\pi^+$ and $\bar{K}_0^{*0}(1430)\pi^-$ can be accommodated by taking into account the power corrections due to the non-vanishing ρ_A and ρ_H from weak annihilation and hard spectator interactions, respectively. However, this will affect the agreement between theory and experiment for $B \rightarrow K_0^*(1430)\eta^{(\prime)}$ and $B \rightarrow K_0^*(1430)\rho$. Indeed, a global fit of ρ_A and ϕ_A to the $B \rightarrow SP$ data shown in Table V yields $\rho_A = 0.15$ and $\phi_A = 82^\circ$ with $\chi^2 = 8.3$. The best fitted results are $\mathcal{B}(B^- \rightarrow \bar{K}_0^{*0}(1430)\pi^-) \sim 13.4 \times 10^{-6}$ and $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow K_0^{*-}(1430)\pi^+) \sim 14.1 \times 10^{-6}$ which are very close to the QCDF predictions with $\rho_A = 0$ and $\phi_A = 0$.

The measured branching fractions of $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow K_0^{*-}(1430)\pi^+$ and $B^- \rightarrow \bar{K}_0^{*0}(1430)\pi^-$ are of order 30×10^{-6} and 50×10^{-6} by BaBar and Belle, respectively (see Table I), though they are consistent with each other within errors. This is probably ascribed to the fact that the definitions of the $K_0^*(1430)$ and nonresonant contributions by BaBar and Belle are different. While Belle employed the Breit-Wigner parametrization to describe the $K_0^*(1430)$ resonance, BaBar used the LASS parametrization to describe the $K\pi$ S -wave and the nonresonant component by a single amplitude suggested by the LASS collaboration [44] to describe the scalar amplitude in elastic $K\pi$ scattering. Since the LASS parametrization is valid up to the $K\pi$ invariant mass of order 1.8 GeV, BaBar introduced a phase-space nonresonant component to describe an excess of signal events at higher $K\pi$ invariant mass. Hence, the BaBar definition for the $K_0^*(1430)$ includes an effective range term to account for the low $K\pi$ S -wave while for the Belle parametrization, this component is absorbed into the nonresonant piece. In order to compare the BaBar results with the Belle ones determined from the Breit-Wigner parametrization, it would be more appropriate to consider the Breit-Wigner component only of the LASS parametrization. Indeed, the BaBar results for $B \rightarrow K_0^*(1430)\pi$ quoted in Table V are obtained from $(K\pi)_0^{*0}\pi^0$ and $(K\pi)_0^{*-}\pi^+$ by subtracting the elastic range term from the $K\pi$ S -wave [2, 45]. However, the discrepancy between BaBar and Belle for the $K_0^*\pi$ modes still remains and it is crucial to resolve this important issue.

Contrary to the decay mode $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow K_0^{*-}(1430)\pi^+$ whose rate is predicted too small compared to the data, the calculated $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow K_0^{*-}(1430)\rho^+)$ is in accordance with experiment. Therefore, it is a puzzle why the QCDF approach works well for $K_0^{*-}(1430)\rho^+$ but not for $K_0^{*-}(1430)\pi^+$, whereas it is the other way around for pQCD.

It appears that the calculated branching fractions of $\bar{K}_0^{*0}\pi^-$ and $K_0^{*-}\pi^+$ by pQCD [14] are in better agreement with the data (see Table V). However, the predicted rates of $B \rightarrow K_0^*\rho$ in this approach are too small as we shall see shortly below.

3. $B \rightarrow K_0^*(1430)(\rho, \omega, \phi)$ decays

We see from Table VI that the calculated $B \rightarrow K_0^*(1430)(\phi, \rho, \omega)$ rates are in good agreement with experiment, though the central value of $B^- \rightarrow K_0^{*-}(1430)\phi$ is smaller than the data. It is obvious that the data of $B \rightarrow K_0^*(1430)(\phi, \rho, \omega)$ can be well accommodated without introducing penguin annihilation effects characterized by the parameters ρ_A and ϕ_A to the central values.

Note that the predicted branching fractions of $B \rightarrow K_0^*(1430)\phi$ and $B \rightarrow K_0^*(1430)\rho$ in this work are substantially smaller than those shown in Table IV of [7]. We found that the rate of $B \rightarrow K_0^*(1430)\phi$ is sensitive to the scale of μ and is large at $\mu = m_b/2$ which is the scale used in [7]. While $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow K_0^*(1430)\rho)$ is stable against the choice of μ , we found a sign mistake in the computer code of the previous work [7]; the sign in front of $\Phi_{M_1}(\eta)$ in Eqs. (3.7) and (3.8) of [7] should read \mp instead of \pm . As a consequence, the calculated $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow K_0^*(1430)\rho)$ in [7] were too large.

As stated before, we use $F_0^{BK_0^*}(0) \sim 0.26$ in order to account for the data of $B \rightarrow K_0^*(1430)\eta^{(\prime)}$. The predicted $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}_0^{*0}(1430)\phi$ is in good agreement with experiment, while the central value of $\mathcal{B}(B^- \rightarrow K_0^{*-}(1430)\phi)$ is smaller than experiment. Nevertheless, we notice that the current data imply a large disparity between $K_0^{*0}(1430)\phi$ and $K_0^{*-}(1430)\phi$.

For comparison, we see from Table VI that in the pQCD approach [15, 18], the predicted branching fractions are too small for $B \rightarrow K_0^*(1430)(\rho, \omega)$ and too large for $B \rightarrow K_0^*(1430)\phi$ compared to experiment. It is interesting to see that the rates of $B \rightarrow K_0^*\pi$ are larger than that of $B \rightarrow K_0^*\rho$ within the pQCD framework, whereas it is the other way around in QCDF.

B. Decays involving a a_0 meson

As stated before, we shall work in scenario 1 for the light scalar meson $a_0(980)$ and scenario 2 for the heavy one $a_0(1450)$ so that both of them are ground $q\bar{q}$ bound states. We see from Table V that in general $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow a_0(980)K)$ is only of order 10^{-7} .⁴ This may explain why $a_0(980)$ has not been seen thus far in hadronic B decays, whereas plenty of $a_0(980)$ events have been observed in D decays. Notice that $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow a_0(980)K)$ are predicted to fall into the range of $(4 \sim 10) \times 10^{-6}$ in the pQCD approach [12] and all of them are ruled out by experiment except $\bar{B} \rightarrow a_0^0\bar{K}^0$.

Contrary to $B \rightarrow PP$ decays where the production of π^+K^- is substantially greater than $\pi^+\pi^-$, it is expected in QCDF that $a_0(980)^+K^-$ has a rate much smaller than $a_0(980)^+\pi^-$. Consider the interference between the QCD penguin amplitude governed by $a_4^P(a_0P) - r_\chi^P a_6^P(a_0P)$ and the penguin annihilation amplitude proportional to $(V_{ub}V_{uq}^* + V_{cb}V_{cq}^*)f_B f_{a_0} f_P b_3(a_0P)$ for $P = K, \pi$ with $q = d, s$. Since $a_{4,6}$, b_3 and $f_{a_0^+}$ are all negative, $\sum_p \lambda_p^{(s)} = 0.04$ and $\sum_p \lambda_p^{(d)} = -0.008 - 0.003i$, the interference is destructive for $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^+K^-$ and constructive for $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^+\pi^-$. This explains why the former has a rate much smaller than the latter in QCDF. By contrast, pQCD predicts the other way around [12, 17].

Since the decay amplitudes of the tree-dominated decays $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^+\pi^-$ and $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^-\pi^+$ are proportional to $a_1 f_\pi F_0^{Ba_0}$ and $a_1 f_{a_0^-} F_0^{B\pi}$, respectively, it is thus expected that $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^+\pi^-) \gg \mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^-\pi^+)$ for both $a_0 = a_0(980)$ and $a_0(1450)$ as the decay constant $f_{a_0^-}$ is very small. Moreover, the mode $a_0^+\pi^-$ should have the largest rate among various $\bar{B} \rightarrow a_0\pi$ decays. Therefore, the pQCD results for $a_0^0(980)\pi^-$ and $a_0^+(980)\pi^-$ [17] are at odd with the expectation: The rate of

⁴ In [6], the predicted rates are too large for $a_0(980)K$ in scenario 1 and too small for $a_0(1450)K$ in scenario 2. This is ascribed to a typo appearing in the computer code for the chiral factor r_χ^K .

$a_0^0(980)\pi^-$ is predicted to be larger than $a_0^+(980)\pi^-$ and $a_0^-(980)\pi^+$ is not very suppressed relative to $a_0^+(980)\pi^-$.

The decay rate of $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^\pm(980)\pi^\mp$ is not simply the sum of $\Gamma(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^+(980)\pi^-)$ and $\Gamma(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^-(980)\pi^+)$ because of the interference of $a_0^+(\rightarrow \eta\pi^+)\pi^-$ with $a_0^-(\rightarrow \eta\pi^-)\pi^+$. In principle, one should study the 3-body decay $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \eta\pi^+\pi^-$ and then apply the narrow-width approximation

$$\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \eta\pi^+\pi^-) = \mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^\pm\pi^\mp)\mathcal{B}(a_0^\pm \rightarrow \eta\pi^\pm) \quad (4.7)$$

to determine the branching fraction of $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^\pm\pi^\mp$. While a direct evaluation of the decay amplitude of $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \eta\pi^+\pi^-$ can be done in the factorization approach (see e.g. [46]), we will simplify the calculation by assuming that the amplitude $A(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^\pm\pi^\mp)$ is the sum of $A(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^+\pi^-)$ and $A(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^-\pi^+)$. Since the decay constants $f_{a_0^+}$ and $f_{a_0^-}$ are of opposite sign [see Eq. (2.4)], the interference between $a_0^+\pi^-$ and $a_0^-\pi^+$ is destructive and we find $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0(980)^\pm\pi^\mp) = (4.7_{-1.3}^{+2.3}) \times 10^{-6}$ in QCDF. Within theoretical uncertainties this is consistent with the current experimental limit 3.7×10^{-6} set by BaBar [47]. Likewise, the calculated $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0(1450)^\pm\pi^\mp) \sim 1.3 \times 10^{-6}$ is also in accordance with the limit 3.5×10^{-6} [47].

So far the results of $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow a_0(980)\pi)$ and $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow a_0(980)K)$ in QCDF are all consistent with the experimental limits. Hence, at this moment, we cannot conclude on the 2-quark or 4-quark nature of $a_0(980)$. Nevertheless, as stressed in [6], if the measured rate of $a_0^\pm(980)\pi^\mp$ is at the level of 1×10^{-6} or even smaller, this will imply a substantially smaller $B \rightarrow a_0(980)$ form factor than the $B \rightarrow \pi$ one. In this case, the four-quark explanation of the $a_0(980)$ will be preferred to account for the $B \rightarrow a_0(980)$ form factor suppression. Since $a_0(1450)$ can be described by the $q\bar{q}$ quark model, the study of $a_0^\pm(1450)\pi^\mp$ relative to $a_0^\pm(980)\pi^\mp$ can provide a more strong test on the quark content of $a_0(980)$. We see that if the branching fractions of both $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^\pm(1450)\pi^\mp$ and $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^\pm(980)\pi^\mp$ are measured at the level of 1×10^{-6} , it will be likely to imply a 2-quark nature for $a_0(1450)$ and a four-quark assignment for $a_0(980)$.

Among the decays $\bar{B} \rightarrow a_0(980)\rho$ and $\bar{B} \rightarrow a_0(1450)\rho$, it is clear that $a_0^+(980)\rho^-$ and $a_0^+(1450)\rho^-$ have the largest rates. Since the branching fraction of $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^\pm(980)\rho^\mp$ is predicted to be large in QCDF, of order 23×10^{-6} , a measurement of this mode may give the first observation of the $a_0(980)$ production in B decays. Notice that the calculated rates of $B^- \rightarrow a_0^0(1450)\rho^-$ and $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^+(1450)\rho^-$ in the pQCD approach [19] are unreasonably too large.

C. Scenario 1 for $a_0(1450)$ and $K_0^*(1430)$

In Table VII we show the branching fractions of $B \rightarrow SP, SV$ decays with $S = a_0(1450), K_0^*(1430)$ in scenario 1 where scalar mesons $a_0(1450)$ and $K_0^*(1430)$ are treated as the first excited states of low lying light $q\bar{q}$ scalars $a_0(980)$ and $K_0^*(800)$. It is evident that this scenario for heavy scalar mesons is ruled out by experiment.⁵ For example, the predicted $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^\pm(1450)\pi^\mp)$ is too large and the branching fractions of $B \rightarrow K_0^*(1430)(\rho, \omega)$ are too small compared to the data.

⁵ An exception is the decay $B \rightarrow K_0^*(1430)\eta'$: the calculated rates in scenario 1 are consistent with the data.

In Tables V and VI we have found a better agreement between theory and experiment for scalar mesons above 1 GeV in scenario 2 in which $a_0(1450)$ and $K_0^*(1450)$ are lowest lying $q\bar{q}$ states. This also implies that the light scalars $K_0^*(800)$, $a_0(980)$ and $f_0(980)$ are preferred to be four-quark bound states.

D. Decays involving a $f_0(980)$ meson

The penguin-dominated $B \rightarrow f_0(980)K^{(*)}$ decays receive three distinct types of factorizable contributions: one from the $K^{(*)}$ emission, one from the f_0 emission with the $s\bar{s}$ content, and the other from the f_0 emission with the $n\bar{n}$ component; see Eq. (A1). Therefore, $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow f_0(980)K^{(*)})$ depends on the mixing angle θ of strange and nonstrange components of the $f_0(980)$. In Fig. 2 branching fractions of $B^- \rightarrow f_0(980)K^-$ and $B^- \rightarrow f_0(980)K^{*-}$ are plotted versus the $f_0(980) - f_0(500)$ mixing angle θ defined in Eq. (2.11). We see that both f_0K^- and f_0K^{*-} rates can be accommodated with θ in the vicinity of 20° without introducing $1/m_b$ power corrections from penguin annihilation. This range of the mixing angle is consistent with the limit $|\theta| < 30^\circ$ set recently by LHCb.

For definiteness, we show in Tables V-IX the branching fractions and CP asymmetries of $B \rightarrow f_0(980)K^{(*)}$ for $\theta = 17^\circ$. With this mixing angle, the calculated branching fraction of $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow f_0(980)\rho^0$ by QCDF or pQCD is much smaller than the Belle measurement $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow f_0(980)\rho^0) = (1.7 \pm 0.6) \times 10^{-6}$ [3] as shown in Fig. 3. Since the BaBar measurement yielded only an upper bound $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow f_0(980)\rho^0) < 0.8 \times 10^{-6}$ [48], the experimental issue remains to be resolved.

In order to make quantitative calculations for $B \rightarrow f_0(980)K^{(*)}$, we have assumed the conventional 2-quark description of the light scalar mesons. However, the fact that their rates can be accommodated in the 2-quark picture for $f_0(980)$ does not mean that the measurements of $B \rightarrow f_0K^{(*)}$ can be used to distinguish between the 2-quark and 4-quark assignment for $f_0(980)$. As discussed in [6, 49], the number of the quark diagrams for the penguin contributions to $B \rightarrow f_0(980)K^{(*)}$ in the four-quark scheme for $f_0(980)$ is two times as many as that in the usual 2-quark picture. Therefore, there is no reason that the $B \rightarrow f_0(980)K^{(*)}$ rate will be suppressed if f_0 is a four-quark state. However, in practice, it is difficult to give quantitative predictions based on this scenario as the nonfactorizable diagrams are usually not amenable. Moreover, even for the factorizable contributions, the calculation of the $f_0(980)$ decay constant and its form factors in the four-quark scenario is beyond the conventional quark model.

E. CP violation

Thus far CP violation has not been observed in any B decays involving a scalar meson. The predictions based on QCD factorization are summarized in Tables VIII and IX. Mixing-induced CP asymmetry in $B \rightarrow f_0(980)K_S$ decays has been studied in [6, 50, 51].




FIG. 2: Branching fractions of (a) $B^- \rightarrow f_0(980)K^-$ and (b) $B^- \rightarrow f_0(980)K^{*-}$ versus the mixing angle θ of strange and nonstrange components of $f_0(980)$, where the middle bold solid curve inside the allowed region corresponds to the central value. Theoretical errors due to the penguin annihilation are taken into account. The horizontal band within the dashed lines shows the experimentally allowed region with one sigma error.




FIG. 3: Same as Fig. 2 except for the decay $B^0 \rightarrow f_0(980)\rho^0$.

V. CONCLUSION

We have studied the hadronic charmless B decays to scalar mesons within the framework of QCD factorization. The main results are:

- We have considered two possible scenarios for the scalar mesons above 1 GeV, depending on whether the light scalars $K_0^*(800)$, $a_0(980)$ and $f_0(980)$ are treated as the lowest lying $q\bar{q}$ states or four-quark particles. We found that the experimental data favor the scenario in which the scalar mesons $a_0(1450)$ and $K_0^*(1430)$ are the lowest lying $q\bar{q}$ bound states. This in turn implies a preferred four-quark nature for light scalars below 1 GeV.

- The data of $B \rightarrow K_0^*(1430)\eta^{(\prime)}$ and $B \rightarrow K_0^*(1430)(\rho, \omega, \phi)$ can be accommodated within the framework of QCD factorization without introducing power corrections from penguin annihilation, while the predicted $B^- \rightarrow \bar{K}_0^{*0}(1430)\pi^-$ and $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow K_0^{*-}(1430)\pi^+$ are too small compared to experiment. In view of the fact that the calculated $K_0^*\rho$ rates are in good agreement with experiment, it is very important to have more accurate measurements of $B \rightarrow K_0^*\pi$ decays to pin down the discrepancy between theory and experiment for $K_0^*\pi$ modes.
- If $K_0^*(1430)$ is made of the lowest-lying $q\bar{q}$, we found that Figs. 1(a) and 1(c) interfere constructively and that $A(B \rightarrow K_0^*\eta)/A(B \rightarrow K_0^*\eta') \approx \cot\phi$ with ϕ being the η - η' mixing angle in the η_q and η_s flavor basis. Hence, $K_0^*\eta$ has a rate slightly larger than $K_0^*\eta'$ owing to the fact that ϕ is less than 45° . This is in sharp contrast to the $B \rightarrow K\eta'$ decay which has the largest rate in 2-body decays of the B meson.
- To accommodate the data of $B \rightarrow K_0^*(1430)(\eta, \eta')$ and $B \rightarrow K_0^*(1430)\phi$ we found that a small form factor for $B \rightarrow K_0^*(1430)$ transition as obtained in the covariant light-front quark model is preferable, though other approaches such as pQCD and QCD sum rules tend to yield large form factors for B to S transitions.
- We have corrected the results for $a_0(980)K$ and $a_0(1450)K$ modes obtained in the previous study [6]. Branching fractions should be of order 10^{-7} for $B \rightarrow a_0(980)K$ in scenario 1 and of order 10^{-6} for $B \rightarrow a_0(1450)K$ in scenario 2 rather than 10^{-6} and 10^{-7} , respectively, as predicted before. It is expected in QCDF that $a_0(980)^+K^-$ has a rate much smaller than $a_0(980)^+\pi^-$, whereas it is the other way around in pQCD. Experimental measurements of these two modes will help discriminate between these two different approaches.
- Although it is widely perceived that light scalar mesons such as $f_0(980)$, $a_0(980)$ are predominately four-quark states, in practice it is difficult to make quantitative predictions on $B \rightarrow SP$ based on the four-quark picture for S . Hence, in practice we shall assume the two-quark scenario for light scalar mesons in calculations. So far the calculated $B \rightarrow a_0(980)\pi$ and $B \rightarrow a_0(980)K$ rates in QCDF are all consistent with the experimental limits. Hence, we cannot conclude on the 2-quark or 4-quark nature of $a_0(980)$. Nevertheless, if the branching fraction of $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^\pm(980)\pi^\mp$ rate is found to be smaller, say, of order 1×10^{-6} , it could imply a four-quark assignment for $a_0(980)$. Since $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^\pm(980)\rho^\mp)$ is predicted to be large in QCDF, of order 23×10^{-6} , a measurement of this mode may give the first observation of the $a_0(980)$ production in B decays.
- Assuming 2-quark bound states for $f_0(980)$ and $f_0(500)$, the observed large rates of $f_0(980)K$ and $f_0(980)K^*$ modes can be explained in QCDF with the $f_0(980)$ - $f_0(500)$ mixing angle θ in the vicinity of 20° . However, this does not necessarily imply that a 4-quark nature for $f_0(980)$ is ruled out because of extra diagrams contributing to $B \rightarrow f_0(980)K^{(*)}$. Irrespective of the mixing angle θ , the predicted rate of $B \rightarrow f_0(980)\rho^0$ is far below the Belle measurement and this needs to be clarified in the future.

- Contrary to the odd-parity meson sector, we found that penguin-annihilation induced power corrections are not needed to explain the penguin dominated $B \rightarrow SP$ and $B \rightarrow SV$ decays in QCDF except for $K_0^*(1430)\pi$ modes. How to understand both $K_0^*(1430)\pi$ and $K_0^*(1430)\rho$ simultaneously remains an issue in QCD-inspired approaches.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported in part by the National Science Council of R.O.C. under Grant Nos. NSC99-2112-M-033-005-MY3, NSC100-2112-M-001-009-MY3 and NSC100-2112-M-033-001-MY3 and by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 11147004.

Appendix A: Decay amplitudes of $B \rightarrow SP, SV$

Within the framework of QCD factorization, the decay amplitudes of $B \rightarrow SP, SV$ decays can be found in [6] and [7], respectively. However, some factorizable terms were missed in the expressions for the decay amplitudes of $B \rightarrow (f_0, a_0^0)(K, \pi)$ given before in [6]; that is, we did not take into account the contributions from the f_0 or the neutral a_0 emission induced from the four-quark operators other than O_6 and O_8 (see also [12]). They are corrected here: ⁶

$$\begin{aligned}
A(B^- \rightarrow f_0 K^-) &= \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{p=u,c} \lambda_p^{(s)} \left\{ \left(\bar{\alpha}_3^p + \bar{\alpha}_4^p - \frac{1}{2} \bar{\alpha}_{3,\text{EW}}^p - \frac{1}{2} \bar{\alpha}_{4,\text{EW}}^p \right)_{K f_0^s} \bar{X}^{(\bar{B}K, f_0^s)} \right. \\
&\quad + \left(a_1 \delta_u^p + \alpha_4^p + \alpha_{4,\text{EW}}^p \right)_{f_0^u K} X^{(\bar{B} f_0^u, K)} + \left(\bar{a}_2 \delta_u^p + 2 \bar{\alpha}_3^p + \frac{1}{2} \bar{\alpha}_{3,\text{EW}}^p \right)_{K f_0^u} \bar{X}^{(\bar{B}K, f_0^u)} \\
&\quad \left. + f_B f_K \left[\bar{f}_{f_0^u} (\bar{b}_2 \delta_u^p + \bar{b}_3 + \bar{b}_{3,\text{EW}})_{f_0^u K} + \bar{f}_{f_0^s} (\bar{b}_2 \delta_u^p + \bar{b}_3 + \bar{b}_{3,\text{EW}})_{K f_0^s} \right] \right\}, \\
A(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow f_0 \bar{K}^0) &= \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{p=u,c} \lambda_p^{(s)} \left\{ \left(\alpha_3^p + \alpha_4^p - \frac{1}{2} \alpha_{3,\text{EW}}^p - \frac{1}{2} \alpha_{4,\text{EW}}^p \right)_{K f_0^s} \bar{X}^{(\bar{B}K, f_0^s)} \right. \\
&\quad + \left(\bar{\alpha}_4^p - \frac{1}{2} \bar{\alpha}_{4,\text{EW}}^p \right)_{f_0^d K} X^{(\bar{B} f_0^u, K)} + \left(\bar{a}_2 \delta_u^p + 2 \bar{\alpha}_3^p + \frac{1}{2} \bar{\alpha}_{3,\text{EW}}^p \right)_{K f_0^u} \bar{X}^{(\bar{B}K, f_0^u)} \\
&\quad \left. + f_B f_K \left[\bar{f}_{f_0^d} (\bar{b}_3 - \frac{1}{2} \bar{b}_{3,\text{EW}})_{f_0^d K} + \bar{f}_{f_0^s} (\bar{b}_3 - \frac{1}{2} \bar{b}_{3,\text{EW}})_{K f_0^s} \right] \right\},
\end{aligned}$$

⁶ In Eq. (A1), when applying bar to α_4 and $\alpha_{4,\text{EW}}$, we do not apply bar to a_6 and a_8 ; that is, for those Wilson coefficients associated with r_χ , the bar applies only to r_χ itself. For example, $\bar{\alpha}_4 = \bar{a}_4 \mp \bar{r}_\chi a_6$. The $\bar{r}_\chi a_{6,8}$ terms in Eq. (A1) are in agreement with those in the formulas in Appendix A of [6].

$$\begin{aligned}
A(B^- \rightarrow a_0^0 K^-) &= \frac{G_F}{2} \sum_{p=u,c} \lambda_p^{(s)} \left\{ \left(a_1 \delta_u^p + \alpha_4^p + \alpha_{4,\text{EW}}^p \right)_{a_0 K} X^{(\bar{B}a_0, K)} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (\bar{a}_2)_{Ka_0} \bar{X}^{(\bar{B}K, a_0)} + f_B f_K \bar{f}_{a_0} (\bar{b}_2 \delta_u^p + \bar{b}_3 + \bar{b}_{3,\text{EW}})_{a_0 K} \right\}, \\
A(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^0 \bar{K}^0) &= \frac{G_F}{2} \sum_{p=u,c} \lambda_p^{(s)} \left\{ \left(\alpha_4^p - \frac{1}{2} \alpha_{4,\text{EW}}^p \right)_{a_0 K} X^{(\bar{B}a_0, K)} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (\bar{a}_2)_{Ka_0} \bar{X}^{(\bar{B}K, a_0)} + f_B f_K \bar{f}_{a_0} (\bar{b}_3 - \frac{1}{2} \bar{b}_{3,\text{EW}})_{a_0 K} \right\}, \\
A(B^- \rightarrow f_0 \pi^-) &= \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{p=u,c} \lambda_p^{(s)} \left\{ \left(\bar{a}_1 \delta_u^p + \bar{\alpha}_4^p + \bar{\alpha}_{4,\text{EW}}^p \right)_{f_0^u \pi} X^{(\bar{B}f_0^u, \pi)} \right. \\
&\quad + \left(\bar{a}_2 \delta^p + 2\bar{\alpha}_3^p + \frac{1}{2} \bar{\alpha}_{3,\text{EW}}^p + \bar{\alpha}_4^p - \frac{1}{2} \bar{\alpha}_{4,\text{EW}}^p \right)_{\pi f_0^u} \bar{X}^{(\bar{B}\pi, f_0^u)} \\
&\quad \left. - f_B f_\pi \bar{f}_{f_0^u} \left[(\bar{b}_2 \delta_u^p + \bar{b}_3 + \bar{b}_{3,\text{EW}})_{f_0^u \pi} + (\bar{b}_2 \delta_u^p + \bar{b}_3 + \bar{b}_{3,\text{EW}})_{\pi f_0^u} \right] \right\}, \\
A(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow f_0 \pi^0) &= \frac{G_F}{2} \sum_{p=u,c} \lambda_p^{(s)} \left\{ \left(-a_2 \delta_u^p + \alpha_4^p - \frac{3}{2} \alpha_{3,\text{EW}}^p - \frac{1}{2} \alpha_{4,\text{EW}}^p \right)_{f_0^d \pi} X^{(\bar{B}f_0^u, \pi)} \right. \\
&\quad + \left(\bar{a}_2 \delta_u^p + 2\bar{\alpha}_3^p + \bar{\alpha}_4^p + \frac{1}{2} \bar{\alpha}_{3,\text{EW}}^p - \frac{1}{2} \bar{\alpha}_{4,\text{EW}}^p \right)_{\pi f_0^d} \bar{X}^{(\bar{B}\pi, f_0^d)} - f_B f_\pi \bar{f}_{f_0^d} \\
&\quad \times \left[(\bar{b}_1 \delta_u^p - \bar{b}_3 + \frac{1}{2} \bar{b}_{3,\text{EW}} + \frac{3}{2} \bar{b}_{4,\text{EW}})_{f_0^d \pi} + (\bar{b}_1 \delta_u^p - \bar{b}_3 + \frac{1}{2} \bar{b}_{3,\text{EW}} + \frac{3}{2} \bar{b}_{4,\text{EW}})_{\pi f_0^d} \right] \Big\}, \\
A(B^- \rightarrow a_0^0 \pi^-) &= \frac{G_F}{2} \sum_{p=u,c} \lambda_p^{(d)} \left\{ \left(a_1 \delta_u^p + \alpha_4^p + \alpha_{4,\text{EW}}^p \right)_{a_0 \pi} X^{(\bar{B}a_0, \pi)} \right. \\
&\quad + \left(\bar{a}_2 \delta_u^p - \bar{\alpha}_4^p + \frac{1}{2} \bar{\alpha}_{4,\text{EW}}^p + \frac{3}{2} \bar{\alpha}_{3,\text{EW}}^p \right)_{\pi a_0} \bar{X}^{(\bar{B}\pi, a_0)} \\
&\quad \left. + f_B f_\pi \bar{f}_{a_0} \left[(\bar{b}_2 \delta_\mu^p + \bar{b}_3 + \bar{b}_{3,\text{EW}})_{a_0 \pi} - (\bar{b}_2 \delta_\mu^p + \bar{b}_3 + \bar{b}_{3,\text{EW}})_{\pi a_0} \right] \right\}, \\
A(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow a_0^0 \pi^0) &= -\frac{G_F}{2\sqrt{2}} \sum_{p=u,c} \lambda_p^{(d)} \left\{ \left(a_2 \delta_u^p - \alpha_4^p + \frac{1}{2} \alpha_{4,\text{EW}}^p + \frac{3}{2} \alpha_{3,\text{EW}}^p \right)_{a_0 \pi} X^{(\bar{B}a_0, \pi)} \right. \\
&\quad + \left(\bar{a}_2 \delta_u^p - \bar{\alpha}_4^p + \frac{1}{2} \bar{\alpha}_{4,\text{EW}}^p + \frac{3}{2} \bar{\alpha}_3^p \right)_{\pi a_0} \bar{X}^{(\bar{B}\pi, a_0)} \\
&\quad - f_B f_\pi \bar{f}_{a_0} \left[(\bar{b}_1 \delta_\mu^p + \bar{b}_3 + 2\bar{b}_4 - \frac{1}{2} (\bar{b}_{3,\text{EW}} - \bar{b}_{4,\text{EW}}))_{a_0 \pi} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (\bar{b}_1 \delta_\mu^p + \bar{b}_3 + 2\bar{b}_4 - \frac{1}{2} (\bar{b}_{3,\text{EW}} - \bar{b}_{4,\text{EW}}))_{\pi a_0} \right] \Big\}. \tag{A1}
\end{aligned}$$

Here a_0 stands for $a_0(980)$ or $a_0(1450)$, $\lambda_p^{(q)} \equiv V_{pb} V_{pq}^*$ with $q = d, s$,

$$\begin{aligned}
r_\chi^K(\mu) &= \frac{2m_K^2}{m_b(\mu)(m_u(\mu) + m_s(\mu))}, & r_\chi^{K^*}(\mu) &= \frac{2m_{K_0^*}^2}{m_b(\mu)(m_s(\mu) - m_q(\mu))}, \\
r_\chi^{a_0}(\mu) &= \frac{2m_{a_0}^2}{m_b(\mu)(m_d(\mu) - m_u(\mu))}, & \bar{r}_\chi^{a_0}(\mu) &= \frac{2m_{a_0}}{m_b(\mu)}, & \bar{r}_\chi^{f_0}(\mu) &= \frac{2m_{f_0}}{m_b(\mu)}, \tag{A2}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_3^p(M_1 M_2) &= \begin{cases} a_3^p(M_1 M_2) + a_5^p(M_1 M_2); & \text{for } M_1 M_2 = PS, SV, VS, \\ a_3^p(M_1 M_2) - a_5^p(M_1 M_2); & \text{for } M_1 M_2 = SP, \end{cases} \\
\alpha_4^p(M_1 M_2) &= \begin{cases} a_4^p(M_1 M_2) - r_\chi^{M_2} a_6^p(M_1 M_2); & \text{for } M_1 M_2 = PS, SP, SV, \\ a_4^p(M_1 M_2) + r_\chi^{M_2} a_6^p(M_1 M_2); & \text{for } M_1 M_2 = VS, \end{cases} \\
\alpha_{3,\text{EW}}^p(M_1 M_2) &= \begin{cases} a_9^p(M_1 M_2) + a_7^p(M_1 M_2); & \text{for } M_1 M_2 = PS, SV, VS, \\ a_9^p(M_1 M_2) - a_7^p(M_1 M_2); & \text{for } M_1 M_2 = SP, \end{cases} \\
\alpha_{4,\text{EW}}^p(M_1 M_2) &= \begin{cases} a_{10}^p(M_1 M_2) - r_\chi^{M_2} a_8^p(M_1 M_2); & \text{for } M_1 M_2 = PS, SP, SV, \\ a_{10}^p(M_1 M_2) + r_\chi^{M_2} a_8^p(M_1 M_2); & \text{for } M_1 M_2 = VS. \end{cases}
\end{aligned} \tag{A3}$$

The general expression of the effective Wilson coefficients a_i is given in Eq. (3.1), while the effective Wilson coefficients \bar{a}_i appearing in Eq. (A1) are defined as $a_i \mu_S^{-1}$ and they can be obtained from Eq. (3.1) by retaining only those terms that are proportional to μ_S . Specifically,

$$\bar{a}_i^p(M_1 M_2) = \frac{c_{i\pm 1}}{N_c} \frac{C_F \alpha_s}{4\pi} \left[\bar{V}_i(M_2) + \frac{4\pi^2}{N_c} \bar{H}_i(M_1 M_2) \right] + \bar{P}_i^p(M_2). \tag{A4}$$

The LCDA of the neutral scalar meson is replaced by $\bar{\Phi}_S$ which has the similar expression as Eq. (2.8) except that the first constant term does not contribute and the term $f_S \mu_S$ is factored out:

$$\bar{\Phi}_S(x, \mu) = 6x(1-x) \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} B_m(\mu) C_m^{3/2}(2x-1). \tag{A5}$$

The annihilation terms \bar{b}_i have the same expressions as b_i except that r_χ^S and $\mu_S B_i$ are replaced by \bar{r}_χ^S and B_i , respectively (see [7]).

In Eq. (A1), the quantity X is a factorizable term whose explicit expression is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
X^{(\bar{B}S,V)} &\equiv \langle V | J^\mu | 0 \rangle \langle S | J'_\mu | \bar{B} \rangle = 2f_V m_{Bp_c} F_1^{BS}(m_V^2), \\
X^{(\bar{B}V,S)} &\equiv \langle S | J^\mu | 0 \rangle \langle V | J'_\mu | \bar{B} \rangle = -2f_S m_{Bp_c} A_0^{BV}(m_S^2), \\
X^{(\bar{B}S,P)} &\equiv \langle P | J^\mu | 0 \rangle \langle S | J'_\mu | \bar{B} \rangle = -f_P (m_B^2 - m_S^2) F_0^{BS}(m_P^2), \\
X^{(\bar{B}P,S)} &\equiv \langle S | J^\mu | 0 \rangle \langle P | J'_\mu | \bar{B} \rangle = f_S (m_B^2 - m_P^2) F_0^{BP}(m_S^2),
\end{aligned} \tag{A6}$$

where p_c is the c.m. momentum.

Note that the $f_0(980)$ – $f_0(500)$ mixing angle (i.e. $\sin \theta$) and Clebsch-Gordon coefficient $1/\sqrt{2}$ have been included in the $f_0(980)$ form factors $F^{Bf_0^{u,d}}$ and decay constants $f_{f_0}^{u,d}$. Throughout, the order of the arguments of the $a_i^p(M_1 M_2)$ and $b_i(M_1 M_2)$ coefficients is dictated by the subscript $M_1 M_2$, where M_2 is the emitted meson and M_1 shares the same spectator quark with the B meson. For the annihilation diagram, M_1 is referred to the one containing an antiquark from the weak vertex, while M_2 contains a quark from the weak vertex.

-
- [1] Y. Amhis *et al.* [Heavy Flavor Averaging Group Collaboration], arXiv:1207.1158 [hep-ex] and online update at <http://www.slac.stanford.edu/xorg/hfag>.
 - [2] J. P. Lees *et al.* [BaBar Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **83**, 112010 (2011) [arXiv:1105.0125 [hep-ex]].

- [3] I. Adachi, K. Adamczyk, H. Aihara, K. Arinstein, Y. Arita, D. M. Asner, T. Aso and V. Aulchenko *et al.*, arXiv:1212.4015 [hep-ex].
- [4] J. P. Lees *et al.* [BaBar Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **85**, 112010 (2012) [arXiv:1201.5897 [hep-ex]].
- [5] J. P. Lees *et al.* [BaBar Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **84**, 092007 (2011) [arXiv:1109.0143 [hep-ex]].
- [6] H. Y. Cheng, C. K. Chua and K. C. Yang, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 014017 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ph/0508104].
- [7] H. Y. Cheng, C. K. Chua and K. C. Yang, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 014034 (2008) [arXiv:0705.3079 [hep-ph]].
- [8] H. Y. Cheng and C. K. Chua, Phys. Rev. D **82**, 034014 (2010) [arXiv:1005.1968 [hep-ph]].
- [9] Y. Li, X. J. Fan, J. Hua and E. L. Wang, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 074010 (2012) [arXiv:1111.7153 [hep-ph]].
- [10] Y. Li and E. L. Wang, arXiv:1206.4106 [hep-ph].
- [11] W. Wang, Y. L. Shen, Y. Li and C. D. Lu, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 114010 (2006) [hep-ph/0609082].
- [12] Y. L. Shen, W. Wang, J. Zhu and C. D. Lu, Eur. Phys. J. C **50**, 877 (2007) [hep-ph/0610380].
- [13] Z. Q. Zhang and Z. J. Xiao, Chin. Phys. C **33**, 508 (2009) [arXiv:0812.2314 [hep-ph]].
- [14] X. Liu, Z. Q. Zhang and Z. J. Xiao, Chin. Phys. C **34**, 157 (2010) [arXiv:0904.1955v2 [hep-ph]].
- [15] Z. Q. Zhang, Phys. Rev. D **82**, 034036 (2010) [arXiv:1006.5772 [hep-ph]].
- [16] Z. Q. Zhang and J. D. Zhang, Eur. Phys. J. C **67**, 163 (2010) [arXiv:1004.4426 [hep-ph]].
- [17] Z. Q. Zhang and Z. J. Xiao, Chin. Phys. C **34**, 528 (2010) [arXiv:0904.3375 [hep-ph]].
- [18] C. S. Kim, Y. Li and W. Wang, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 074014 (2010) [arXiv:0912.1718 [hep-ph]].
- [19] Z. Q. Zhang, Commun. Theor. Phys. **56**, 1063 (2011).
- [20] Z. Q. Zhang, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 054001 (2011) [arXiv:1106.0368 [hep-ph]].
- [21] T. M. Aliev, K. Azizi and M. Savci, Phys. Rev. D **76**, 074017 (2007) [arXiv:0710.1508 [hep-ph]].
- [22] Y. M. Wang, M. J. Aslam and C. D. Lu, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 014006 (2008) [arXiv:0804.2204 [hep-ph]].
- [23] Z. G. Wang and J. F. Li, arXiv:1012.1704 [hep-ph].
- [24] Y. J. Sun, Z. H. Li and T. Huang, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 025024 (2011) [arXiv:1011.3901 [hep-ph]].
- [25] H. Y. Han, X. G. Wu, H. B. Fu, Q. L. Zhang and T. Zhong, arXiv:1301.3978 [hep-ph].
- [26] R. H. Li, C. D. Lu, W. Wang and X. X. Wang, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 014013 (2009) [arXiv:0811.2648 [hep-ph]].
- [27] M. Beneke, G. Buchalla, M. Neubert and C.T. Sachrajda, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 1914 (1999); Nucl. Phys. B **591**, 313 (2000); Nucl. Phys. B **606**, 245 (2001).
- [28] M. Beneke and M. Neubert, Nucl. Phys. B **675**, 333 (2003).
- [29] N. Mathur, A. Alexandru, Y. Chen, S. J. Dong, T. Draper, I. Horvath, F. X. Lee and K. F. Liu *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **76**, 114505 (2007) [hep-ph/0607110].
- [30] S. Prelovsek, T. Draper, C. B. Lang, M. Limmer, K. F. Liu, N. Mathur and D. Mohler, Phys. Rev. D **82**, 094507 (2010) [arXiv:1005.0948 [hep-lat]].
- [31] C. Alexandrou, J. O. Daldrop, M. D. Brida, M. Gravina, L. Scorzato, C. Urbach and M. Wagner, arXiv:1212.1418 [hep-lat].

- [32] H. Y. Cheng, C. K. Chua and C. W. Hwang, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 074025 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0310359].
- [33] P. Ball, G.W. Jones, and R. Zwicky, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 054004 (2007).
- [34] M. Beneke and M. Neubert, Nucl. Phys. B **651**, 225 (2003).
- [35] M. Wirbel, S. Stech, and M. Bauer, Z. Phys. C **29**, 637 (1985); M. Bauer, B. Stech, and M. Wirbel, *ibid*, **34**, 103 (1987); M. Bauer, B. Stech, and M. Wirbel, *ibid*, **42**, 671 (1989).
- [36] P. Ball and G.W. Jones, JHEP **0703**, 069 (2007).
- [37] C. D. Lu, Y. M. Wang and H. Zou, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 056001 (2007) [hep-ph/0612210].
- [38] J. Beringer *et al.* [Particle Data Group], Phys. Rev. D **86**, 010001 (2012).
- [39] R. Fleischer, R. Knegjens and G. Ricciardi, Eur. Phys. J. C **71**, 1832 (2011) [arXiv:1109.1112 [hep-ph]].
- [40] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb collaboration], arXiv:1301.5347 [hep-ex].
- [41] T. Feldmann, P. Kroll, and B. Stech, Phys. Rev. D **58**, 114006 (1998); Phys. Lett. B **449**, 339 (1999).
- [42] H. Y. Cheng and K. C. Yang, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 094001 (2008) [arXiv:0805.0329 [hep-ph]].
- [43] M. Ablikim *et al.* [BES Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **72**, 092002 (2005).
- [44] D. Aston *et al.* [LASS Collaboration], Nucl. Phys. B **296**, 493 (1988).
- [45] B. Aubert *et al.* [BABAR Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **80**, 112001 (2009) [arXiv:0905.3615 [hep-ex]].
- [46] H. Y. Cheng, C. K. Chua and A. Soni, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 014030 (2005) [hep-ph/0409317].
- [47] B. Aubert *et al.* [BABAR Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **75**, 111102 (2007) [hep-ex/0703038 [hep-ex]].
- [48] B. Aubert *et al.* [BaBar Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 141802 (2009) [arXiv:0901.3522 [hep-ex]].
- [49] T.V. Brito, F.S. Navarra, M. Nielsen, and M.E. Bracco, Phys. Lett. B **608**, 69 (2005).
- [50] B. El-Bennich, A. Furman, R. Kaminski, L. Lesniak and B. Loiseau, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 114009 (2006) [hep-ph/0608205].
- [51] R. Dutta and S. Gardner, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 034021 (2008) [arXiv:0805.1963 [hep-ph]].