

Penguin $b \rightarrow s\ell'^+\ell'^-$ and B -meson anomalies in a gauged $L_\mu - L_\tau$

Chuan-Hung Chen^{1,*} and Takaaki Nomura^{2,†}

¹*Department of Physics, National Cheng-Kung University, Tainan 70101, Taiwan*

²*School of Physics, KIAS, Seoul 130-722, Korea*

(Dated: December 25, 2021)

Abstract

The Z' -gauge boson in an $U(1)_{L_\mu-L_\tau}$ gauge symmetry has two interesting features: one is its vector couplings to the charged leptons, and the other is the decoupling from the electron. Based on these properties, we investigate the feasibility to simultaneously resolve the $R_{K^{(*)}} = BR(B \rightarrow K^{(*)}\mu^+\mu^-)/BR(B \rightarrow K^{(*)}e^+e^-)$ and $R_{D^{(*)}} = BR(\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{(*)}\tau\bar{\nu}_\tau)/BR(\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{(*)}\ell\bar{\nu}_\ell)$ anomalies in an $U(1)_{L_\mu-L_\tau}$ model, where the former is expected to arise from the Z' -penguin-induced $b \rightarrow s\mu^+\mu^-$ process and the latter from the tree-level $b \rightarrow c\tau\bar{\nu}_\tau$ decay. In order to achieve the intended purpose, we employ one vector-like doublet lepton and one singlet scalar leptoquark (LQ), in which the new particles all carry the $U(1)_{L_\mu-L_\tau}$ charges; the $b \rightarrow sZ'$ effective interaction is generated from the vector-like lepton and LQ loop, and the $b \rightarrow c\tau\bar{\nu}_\tau$ decay is induced from the LQ. When the constraints from the $b \rightarrow s\gamma$, $B^+ \rightarrow K^+\nu\bar{\nu}$, $B_c^- \rightarrow \tau\bar{\nu}_\tau$, $\Delta F = 2$, and $\tau \rightarrow \mu\ell\bar{\ell}$ processes are included, it is found that R_D and R_{D^*} can be enhanced to fit the experimental data, and the Wilson coefficient C_9 from the LQ-loop can reach $C_9^{LQ,\mu} \sim -1$, which can explain the R_K and R_{K^*} anomalies. In addition, in this simple model, the Higgs lepton-flavor violating $h \rightarrow \mu\tau$ decay can occur at the tree level, and its branching ratio can be as large as the current experimental upper limit.

*Electronic address: physchen@mail.ncku.edu.tw

†Electronic address: nomura@kias.re.kr

I. INTRODUCTION

A 2.6σ deviation from the standard model (SM) prediction in $R_K = BR(B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \mu^+ \mu^-)/BR(B^+ \rightarrow K^+ e^+ e^-)$ with $R_K = 0.745_{-0.074}^{+0.090} \pm 0.036$ was earlier reported by the LHCb collaboration in [1], where $BR(B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \ell^+ \ell^-)$ ($\ell = e, \mu$) denotes the branching ratio (BR) of the B decay; the integrated dilepton invariant mass square range is $1 < q^2 < 6$ GeV^2 , and the SM prediction is unity in that region [2]. Intriguingly, LHCb recently finds a similar deviation in $R_{K^*} = BR(B^0 \rightarrow K^{*0} \mu^+ \mu^-)/BR(B^0 \rightarrow K^{*0} e^+ e^-)$ as [3]:

$$R_{K^*} = \begin{cases} 0.66_{-0.07}^{+0.11} \pm 0.03 & \text{for } 0.0045 < q^2 < 1.1 \text{ GeV}^2, \\ 0.69_{-0.07}^{+0.11} \pm 0.05 & \text{for } 1.1 < q^2 < 6.0 \text{ GeV}^2. \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

The SM prediction at leading order is $R_K \approx R_{K^*} \approx 1$. When QED radiative corrections are included, it is found that the influence on R_{K,K^*} does not exceed a few percent [4]. Thus, the importance of $R_{K^{(*)}}^{\text{exp}} < R_{K^{(*)}}^{\text{SM}}$ indicates a violation of lepton-flavor universality [2].

The lepton-flavor universality is also confronting a test in the terms of $b \rightarrow c \tau \bar{\nu}_\tau$ decay. BaBar [5, 6], Belle [7–9], and LHCb [10, 11] experimentally observed excesses in the ratios of $BR(\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{(*)} \tau \bar{\nu}_\tau)$ to $BR(\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{(*)} \ell \bar{\nu}_\ell)$, and the averaged values are obtained as [12]:

$$\begin{aligned} R_D &= 0.407 \pm 0.039 \pm 0.024, \\ R_{D^*} &= 0.304 \pm 0.013 \pm 0.007, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where the SM predictions using different approaches are closed to each other, and they are given as: $R_D = 0.299 \pm 0.011$ [13], $R_D = 0.300 \pm 0.008$ [14] in lattice calculations, and $R_D = 0.299 \pm 0.003$ [15]; $R_{D^*} = 0.252 \pm 0.003$ [16], $R_{D^*} = 0.262 \pm 0.010$ [17], and $R_{D^*} = 0.257 \pm 0.003$ [15]. The measurements of R_D and R_{D^*} exceed the SM results by around 2.3σ and 3.4σ , respectively. When the correlation between R_D and R_{D^*} is considered, the deviation from the SM is about 4.1σ [12]. Based on these observations, various interesting extensions of the SM have been proposed to explain anomalies [18–79].

It is known that the $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{(*)} \ell' \bar{\nu}_{\ell'}$ ($\ell' = e, \mu, \tau$) decays are the W -mediated tree processes in the SM; however, the $B \rightarrow K^{(*)} \ell'^+ \ell'^-$ decays are flavor-changing neutral current (FCNC) processes, and are generated at the one-loop level, including box and penguin diagrams. If the $R_{D^{(*)}}$ and $R_{K^{(*)}}$ anomalies simultaneously arise from the tree diagrams from the same source (e.g., a scalar leptoquark), inevitably, they will encounter the strict bounds from the $\Delta F = 2$ [20, 27, 44, 58], $B_c^- \rightarrow \tau \bar{\nu}_\tau$ [31, 39, 79], and $b \rightarrow s \nu \bar{\nu}$ decays [27, 34, 44]. Therefore,

if a unified resolution to $R_{D^{(*)}}$ and $R_{K^{(*)}}$ is from the tree level, which is the approach most frequently used in the literature, it is better that the interactions involved are from different media.

In this study, we propose that, like the situation in the SM, the $b \rightarrow s\mu^+\mu^-(\tau^+\tau^-)$ decay arises from a penguin diagram, whereas the $b \rightarrow c\tau\bar{\nu}_\tau$ decay is produced through a tree-level charged current. It is found that the proposed effects can be easily achieved in a gauged $U(1)_{L_\mu-L_\tau}$ model, where the associated Z' -gauge boson only couples to the μ - and τ -lepton, but not to the electron [80, 81]. In the literature, an $U(1)_{L_\mu-L_\tau}$ model with vector-like quarks (VLQs), which is used to resolve the $B \rightarrow K^{(*)}\mu^+\mu^-$ anomalies arising from tree effects, was studied in [20, 25, 35]. Although the loop-induced $b \rightarrow s\mu^+\mu^-$ decay can be generated by the Z_2 -odd VLQs and scalar [42], the new physics effects cannot be applied to the $b \rightarrow c\tau\bar{\nu}_\tau$ decay. The authors in [21] resolved the $b \rightarrow s\mu^+\mu^-$ decay issue with the gauged $L_\mu - L_\tau$ symmetry when doublet and singlet VLQs and a second Higgs doublet were introduced to the model. In spite of the attractive implications on other flavor physics, the FCNC $b \rightarrow s\mu^+\mu^-$ process was induced at the tree level through the mixing between VLQs and the SM quarks. Here, we provide an alternative version without the vector-like quarks and second Higgs doublet.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. We introduce the model and the resulting effective interactions for $b \rightarrow c\tau\bar{\nu}$ and $b \rightarrow s\ell'^+\ell'^-$ in section II. We discuss possible potential constraints in section III, where they include the neutrino trident production, $b \rightarrow s\gamma$, $B_c \rightarrow \tau\nu$, $\Delta F = 2$, and $\tau \rightarrow \mu\ell\bar{\ell}$ processes. The physical implications on $R_{D^{(*)}}$, C_9 Wilson coefficient, $h \rightarrow \mu\tau$ decay, and muon anomalous magnetic dipole moment (muon $g - 2$) are also shown in this section. The summary is given in section IV.

II. THE MODEL AND THE EFFECTIVE INTERACTIONS FOR $b \rightarrow c\tau\bar{\nu}_\tau$ AND $b \rightarrow s\ell'^+\ell'^-$

Since violation of lepton-universality concerns lepton properties, we assume that the breaking effects only occur in the lepton sector; that is, only leptons or particles carrying a lepton-number can have the $U(1)_{L_\mu-L_\tau}$ charges. If the flavor-changing $b \rightarrow sZ'$ and $b \rightarrow c\tau\bar{\nu}_\tau$ arise from the same origin, the most promising mediator is a leptoquark (LQ), which can couple to a quark and a lepton at the same vertex. Thus, in order to generate

the $b \rightarrow sZ'$ and $b \rightarrow c\tau\bar{\nu}_\tau$ decays from the same mediator via a loop and a tree diagram, respectively, we introduce the vector-like doublet lepton $L_4^T = (2, -1/2)$, the singlet scalar LQ $\Phi^{-1/3} = (1, -1/3)$, and the singlet scalar $S = (1, 0)$ under $(SU(2)_L, U(1)_Y)$ gauge symmetry, where S is responsible for the spontaneous $U(1)_{L_\mu-L_\tau}$ symmetry breaking, for which the $U(1)_{L_\mu-L_\tau}$ charges of the relevant particles are given in Table I. Particles not shown in the table have no $U(1)_{L_\mu-L_\tau}$ charges. The earlier studies using the same singlet leptoquark to explain the $R_{D^{(*)}}$ anomalies can be found in [27, 44, 56]. Accordingly, the gauge invariant Yukawa couplings are expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned}
-\mathcal{L}_Y = & \bar{L}_\ell Y^\ell H \ell_R + (\bar{L}_\tau i\tau_2 \mathbf{g} P_R Q_L^c + \bar{\tau}_R \mathbf{w} P_L u_R^c + \bar{L}_{4L} \mathbf{f} i\tau_2 P_R Q_L^c) \Phi^{-1/3} \\
& + y_\tau \bar{L}_{4L} H \tau_R + y'_\mu \bar{L}_\mu L_{4R} S + m_L \bar{L}_{4L} L_{4R} + H.c. ,
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where we suppressed the quark-flavor indices, $L_\ell^T = (\nu_\ell, \ell)_L$ and $Q_L^T = (u, d)_L$ are the left-handed doublet lepton and quark, respectively, Q_L^c is the charge-conjugate of Q_L , $L_4^T \equiv (N_{\tau'}, \tau')$, and H is the SM Higgs doublet. From Eq. (3), it can be seen that only τ and vector-like leptons can couple to the scalar LQ. Since the scalar potential was discussed in [82, 83], we skip this explanation. If we take $S = (v_S + \phi_S)/\sqrt{2}$ with v_S being the vacuum expectation value (VEV) of S , the Z' mass can be obtained as $m_{Z'} = 2g_{Z'}v_S$ in this model [82]. Although these new Yukawa couplings generally are complex, in the following analysis, we take these parameters to be real numbers.

TABLE I: $U(1)_{L_\mu-L_\tau}$ charges of involving leptons, scalar LQ, and S .

| | e | μ | τ | L_4 | $\Phi^{-1/3}$ | S |
|------------------|-----|-------|--------|-------|---------------|-----|
| $L_\mu - L_\tau$ | 0 | 1 | -1 | -1 | -1 | 2 |

If we decompose Eq. (3) and use the quark mass eigenstates, the relevant Yukawa couplings can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned}
-\mathcal{L}_Y \supset & (\bar{\nu}_\tau \mathbf{g} P_R d_L^c - \bar{\tau} \mathbf{g}' P_R u_L^c + \bar{\tau} \mathbf{w} P_L u_R^c) \Phi^{-1/3} + (\bar{N}_{\tau'} \mathbf{f} P_R d_L^c - \bar{\tau}' \mathbf{f}' P_R u_L^c) \Phi^{-1/3} \\
& + \frac{y_\tau}{\sqrt{2}} (v + h) \bar{\tau}' P_R \tau + \frac{y'_\mu}{\sqrt{2}} (v_S + \phi_S) (\bar{\nu}_\mu P_R N_{\tau'} + \bar{\mu} P_R \tau') + H.c. ,
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where $\mathbf{g}' \equiv \mathbf{g} \mathbf{V}^T$, $\mathbf{f}' \equiv \mathbf{f} \mathbf{V}^T$, $\mathbf{V} = U_L^u U_L^{d\dagger}$ denotes the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) matrix, $U_L^{u,d}$ are the quark-flavor mixing matrices for diagonalizing the quark mass matrices, and the flavor mixing matrices of U_L^d and U_R^u can be absorbed into $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{f})$ and \mathbf{w} ,

respectively. Following Eq. (4), the tree diagram for $b \rightarrow c\tau\bar{\nu}_\tau$ and the penguin diagram for $b \rightarrow s\mu^+\mu^-(\tau^+\tau^-)$ are sketched in Fig. 1. Accordingly, the effective Hamiltonian for $b \rightarrow c\tau\bar{\nu}_\tau$ can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}_{b \rightarrow c}^{LQ} = & \frac{g_2 g_3'^*}{2m_\Phi^2} \bar{c} \gamma_\mu P_L b \bar{\tau} \gamma^\mu P_L \nu_\tau \\ & + \frac{w_2 g_3^*}{2m_\Phi^2} \left(-\bar{c} P_L b \bar{\tau} P_L \nu_\tau + \frac{1}{4} \bar{c} \sigma_{\mu\nu} P_L b \bar{\tau} \sigma^{\mu\nu} P_L \nu_\tau \right),\end{aligned}\quad (5)$$

where m_Φ is the LQ mass, and the Fierz transformations have been used. The four-Fermi interactions for the penguin $b \rightarrow s\ell'^+\ell'^-$ can be formulated as:

$$\mathcal{H}_{b \rightarrow s}^{LQ} = -\frac{G_F V_{ts}^* V_{tb}}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\alpha_{\text{em}}}{\pi} C_9^{LQ, \ell'} \bar{s} \gamma_\mu P_L b \bar{\ell}' \gamma^\mu \ell', \quad (6)$$

$$C_9^{LQ, \ell'} = \frac{f_2 f_3^* X_{\ell'}}{(4\pi)^2 C_{SM}} \frac{g_{Z'}^2 m_L^2}{m_\Phi^2 (q^2 - m_{Z'}^2)} J_0 \left(\frac{m_L^2}{m_\Phi^2} \right), \quad (7)$$

$$J_0(x) = \frac{1}{x-1} - \frac{\ln x}{(x-1)^2},$$

where $X_{e, \mu, \tau} = (0, 1, -1)$ are the lepton $U(1)_{L_\mu - L_\tau}$ charges, $C_{SM} = G_F V_{ts}^* V_{tb} \alpha_{\text{em}} / (\sqrt{2}\pi) \approx -8.14 \times 10^{-10} \text{ GeV}^{-2}$, and q^2 is the dilepton invariant mass. It can be seen that like the enhancement factor m_t^2/m_W^2 in the SM, we have the potential enhancement factor m_L^2/m_Φ^2 in $C_9^{LQ, \ell'}$. Although the Z' -gauge boson can emit from the LQ inside the loop, since the diagram is suppressed by m_b/m_L , we have ignored its contribution. We note that the lepton current in Eq. (6) has no axial-vector current, the $B_s \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ decay cannot provide a strict bound on the parameters. In the following discussions, we focus on $C_9^{LQ, \mu}$ in Eq. (7) since we consider the $b \rightarrow s\mu^+\mu^-$ process.




FIG. 1: Sketched Feynman diagrams for the $b \rightarrow c\tau\bar{\nu}_\tau$ and $b \rightarrow s(\mu^+\mu^-, \tau^+\tau^-)$ decays.

III. PHENOMENOLOGICAL DISCUSSIONS AND NUMERICAL ANALYSIS

In the following numerical estimations, we take the values of the parameters as:

$$\begin{aligned} G_F &\approx 1.166 \times 10^{-5} \text{ GeV}^{-2}, \quad V_{cb} \approx 0.04, \quad V_{ts} \approx -0.04, \quad V_{tb} \approx 1, \\ m_t &\approx 174 \text{ GeV}, \quad m_{B, B_s, B_c} \approx (5.28, 5.37, 6.28) \text{ GeV}, \quad m_{b(c)} \approx 4.6(1.3) \text{ GeV}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

For illustrating the constraints of new free parameters, we fix the LQ mass to be $m_\Phi = 1000$ GeV, unless stated otherwise.

A. Constraint from the neutrino trident production

To calculate the penguin contribution, we need to know the constraints of $g_{Z'}$ and $m_{Z'}$. If we focus on $m_{Z'} > 10$ GeV, basically, two main experiments are involved: one is neutrino trident production [20, 84], and the other is the $Z \rightarrow 4\ell$ measurement [35, 85]. According to the results in [35], the limit from the neutrino trident production can be expressed as $g_{Z'}/m_{Z'} < 1.9 \times 10^{-3} \text{ GeV}^{-1}$ and is stronger than that from the $Z \rightarrow 4\ell$ process when $m_{Z'} > 40$ GeV. If we take $g_{Z'}/m_{Z'} \sim 1.8 \times 10^{-3} \text{ GeV}^{-1}$ and $m_L/m_\Phi \sim 2$, then $C_9^{Z', \mu} \sim -1.1$, which is used to explain $R_{K^{(*)}}$ anomalies, can be achieved when $f_2 f_3^* \sim 0.06$ is taken. However, we need to further investigate if the required value of $f_2 f_3^*$ can be satisfied by the current data. We note that when $g_{Z'}/m_{Z'} \sim 10^{-3} \text{ GeV}^{-1}$ is used, we have $m_{Z'} \lesssim 3.5$ TeV for $g_{Z'} \leq \sqrt{4\pi}$ due to the perturbativity requirement. In addition, due to $v_S = m_{Z'}/(2g_{Z'})$, we obtain $v_S \geq 263$ GeV from the neutrino trident production constraint.

B. Constraints from flavor physics and LHC

In the following, we discuss the possible constraints from flavor physics, such as the $b \rightarrow s\gamma$, $b \rightarrow s\nu\bar{\nu}$, $B_c^- \rightarrow \tau\bar{\nu}_\tau$, $\Delta F = 2$, and $\tau \rightarrow \mu\ell\bar{\ell}$ processes. Since our motivation is to demonstrate whether $b \rightarrow sZ'$ and $b \rightarrow c\tau\bar{\nu}_\tau$, which are induced from the same mediator, can simultaneously resolve the $R_{K^{(*)}}$ and $R_{D^{(*)}}$ anomalies in the gauged $L_\mu - L_\tau$ model, but not to give global fitting to all experimental data, for simplicity, we will take the irrelevant parameters to be small or non-existent in the following discussions.

The similar loop effects for $b \rightarrow sZ'$ shown in Fig. 1 can also contribute to the radiative $b \rightarrow s\gamma$ decay, but the photon can only be emitted from the charged LQ. Hence, the

dimension-5 electromagnetic dipole operator from the LQ loop can be easily obtained as:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}_{b \rightarrow s\gamma}^{LQ} &= -\frac{V_{ts}^* V_{tb}}{\sqrt{2}} C_{7\gamma}^{LQ} \left[\frac{m_b e}{4\pi^2} \bar{s} \sigma_{\mu\nu} P_R b F^{\mu\nu} \right], \\ C_{7\gamma}^{LQ} &= -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{G_F V_{ts}^* V_{tb}} \frac{Q_\Phi f_2 f_3^*}{4m_\Phi^2} J_1 \left(\frac{m_L^2}{m_\Phi^2} \right), \\ J_1(x) &= \frac{1}{12(x-1)^2} + \frac{x(x+2)}{6(x-1)^3} - \frac{x^2 \ln x}{2(x-1)^4},\end{aligned}\tag{9}$$

where $Q_\Phi = -1/3$ is the electric charge of $\Phi^{-1/3}$. With the values of parameters used in Sec. III A and $|f_2 f_3^*| \sim 0.06$ for $C_9^{LQ,\mu} \sim -1$, we get $|C_{7\gamma}^{LQ}| \sim 4.5 \times 10^{-4}$, which is three orders of magnitude smaller than the SM result of $|C_{7\gamma}^{SM}| \sim 0.3$. Clearly, the $b \rightarrow s\gamma$ decay cannot significantly bound the parameter $f_2 f_3^*$.

Next, we discuss the limit from the $b \rightarrow s\nu\bar{\nu}$ decay. Compared with the inclusive decay mode, the experimental measurement in the exclusive channel is more closer to the theoretical prediction; therefore, we consider the constraint from $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu\bar{\nu}$, where the SM prediction is $BR^{\text{SM}}(B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu\bar{\nu}) \approx 4 \times 10^{-6}$ [86], and the current upper limit is $BR^{\text{exp}}(B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu\bar{\nu}) < 1.6 \times 10^{-5}$ [87]; that is, the new physics effects can at most enhance the SM result by a factor of 4. In this model, it is found that the $b \rightarrow s\nu\bar{\nu}$ can be induced from tree and loop diagrams. Except where only the left-handed neutrinos are involved, the loop contribution is the same as that for $b \rightarrow s\ell'^+ \ell'^-$. Thus, from Eqs. (4) and (6), the tree and loop effective interactions can be combined as:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}_{b \rightarrow s\nu\bar{\nu}}^{LQ} &= -C_{LQ}^\nu (\bar{s}b)_{V-A} (\bar{\nu}\nu)_{V-A}, \\ C_{LQ}^{\nu\ell'} &= \frac{g_2 g_3^*}{8m_\Phi^2} C_\nu + \frac{C_9^{LQ,\nu\ell'} C_{SM}}{4}\end{aligned}\tag{10}$$

with $C_{\nu_e, \nu_\mu, \nu_\tau} = (0, 0, 1)$, $(\bar{f}f')_{V-A} = \bar{f}\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)f'$. Since the induced four-Fermi operators are the same as those in the SM, the BR for the $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu\bar{\nu}$ decay can be simply formulated as:

$$\begin{aligned}BR(B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu\bar{\nu}) &= \frac{1}{3} \left(\sum_\nu \left| 1 - \frac{C_{LQ}^\nu}{C_{SM}^\nu} \right|^2 \right) BR^{\text{SM}}(B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu\bar{\nu}), \\ C_{SM}^\nu &= \frac{G_F V_{ts}^* V_{tb}}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\alpha_{\text{em}}}{2\pi \sin^2 \theta_W} X \left(\frac{m_t^2}{m_W^2} \right) \approx -2.81 \times 10^{-9}\end{aligned}\tag{11}$$

with $X(y) \approx 0.65y^{0.575}$ [88]. Using $|C_9^{LQ,\nu}| \sim 1$, it can be seen that the loop contribution in C_{LQ}^ν/C_{SM}^ν is $C_9^{LQ,\nu}C_{SM}^\nu/(4C_{SM}^\nu) \sim 0.07$; that is, the Z' -mediated penguin cannot

significantly contribute to $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$. If we take the tree diagram as the dominant effect, to satisfy the current upper limit, the magnitude of $g_2 g_3^*$ can be in the range of $-0.096 < g_2 g_3^* < 0.048$. If we ignore the small CKM matrix elements, it can be seen $g_2 g_3'^* \approx g_2 g_3^*$. Then, the contribution of the first term in Eq. (5) to $R_{D^{(*)}}$ can be written as:

$$R_{D^{(*)}} = |1 + \delta|^2 R_{D^{(*)}}^{\text{SM}}, \quad \delta \approx \frac{\sqrt{2} g_2 g_3^*}{8 m_\Phi^2 G_F V_{cb}}. \quad (12)$$

The magnitude of $g_2 g_3^*$ can be determined as:

$$|g_2 g_3^*| \approx \frac{8 m_\Phi^2 G_F |V_{cb}|}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{R_{D^{(*)}}}{R_{D^{(*)}}^{\text{SM}}}} - 1 \right). \quad (13)$$

Accordingly, we obtain $|g_2 g_3^*| \approx 0.41$ for $R_D = 0.4$ and $|g_2 g_3^*| \approx 0.25$ for $R_{D^*} = 0.3$. It is clear that the $g_2 g_3^*$ effects bounded by the $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ decay cannot suffice to explain the observed $R_{D^{(*)}}$. Thus, we need to rely on the scalar- and tensor-type four-Fermi interactions shown in Eq. (5) to resolve the $R_{D^{(*)}}$ excesses.

In addition to the $B^- \rightarrow D^{(*)} \tau \bar{\nu}_\tau$ decays, the effective interactions in Eq. (5) can also contribute to the $B_c \rightarrow \tau \bar{\nu}_\tau$ decay, and the BR can be formulated as:

$$BR(B_c \rightarrow \tau \bar{\nu}_\tau) = BR^{\text{SM}}(B_c \rightarrow \tau \bar{\nu}_\tau) \left| 1 + \frac{m_{B_c}^2}{m_\tau (m_b + m_c)} \epsilon_P \right|^2, \quad (14)$$

where $BR^{\text{SM}}(B_c \rightarrow \tau \bar{\nu}_\tau) \approx 2.1\%$, $\epsilon_P = \sqrt{2} w_2 g_3^* / (8 G_F V_{cb} m_\Phi^2)$, and the contribution from $g_2 g_3'^*$ has been dropped. As pointed out by the authors in [31, 39, 79], due to the enhancement factor $m_{B_c}^2 / m_\tau (m_b + m_c) \sim 3.6$, the $B_c \rightarrow \tau \bar{\nu}_\tau$ decay can give a strict bound on the associated parameter. Since the sign of $w_2 g_3^*$ for enhancing $R_{D^{(*)}}$ is negative, with $w_2 g_3^* \sim -0.3$, we obtain $\epsilon_P \sim -0.114$. In this case, we get $BR(B_c \rightarrow \tau \bar{\nu}_\tau) \sim 0.7\%$. It can be seen that the preferred values of $w_2 g_3^*$ will destructively interfere with the SM so that $BR(B_c \rightarrow \tau \bar{\nu}_\tau) < BR^{\text{SM}}(B_c \rightarrow \tau \bar{\nu}_\tau)$. Hence, the upper limit of $BR(B_c \rightarrow \tau \bar{\nu}_\tau) < 10\%$ obtained in [79] cannot severely bound the LQ couplings in this model.

The next constraint that we would like to focus on is the $\Delta F = 2$ process in the neutral meson system, where the associated observable is meson mass difference Δm_F . Based on the analysis above, what we are concerned with is whether the parameters $f_2 f_3^*$ and $w_2 g_3^*$ can largely suffice to explain the $R_{K^{(*)}}$ and $R_{D^{(*)}}$ anomalies. In order to focus on the Yukawa couplings $f_{2,3}$, g_3 , and w_2 , we can suppress the irrelevant parameters by using the scheme with $g_{1,2}, f_1, w_{1,3} \ll 1$. Then, we can ignore the constraints from Δm_K and Δm_{B_d} and only

need to focus on $D - \bar{D}$ and $B_s - \bar{B}_s$ mixings. With the taken scheme, Δm_D and Δm_{B_s} can be formulated as:

$$\Delta m_D^{LQ} \approx \frac{B_D f_D^2 m_D}{3(4\pi)^2 m_\Phi^2} \left| (f'_1 f'_2)^2 J_2 \left(\frac{m_L^2}{m_\Phi^2} \right) \right|, \quad (15)$$

$$\Delta m_{B_s}^{LQ} \approx \frac{B_{B_s} f_{B_s}^2 m_{B_s}}{3(4\pi)^2 m_\Phi^2} \left| (f_2 f_3^*)^2 J_2 \left(\frac{m_L^2}{m_\Phi^2} \right) \right|, \quad (16)$$

$$J_2(x) = -\frac{1}{x-1} + \frac{x \ln x}{(x-1)^2},$$

where the hadronic bag parameters B_F and the meson decay constant f_F are $B_D \approx 1.18$ [89], $B_s \approx 1.28$, $f_D \approx 0.222$ GeV [87], and $f_{B_s} \approx 0.231$ GeV [90]. Due to $f_1, V_{ub}, V_{cb} \ll 1$, the Yukawa couplings $f'_{1,2}$ can be approximately expressed as $f'_1 \approx f_2 V_{us}$ and $f'_2 \approx f_2$; that is $f'_1 f'_2 \approx |f_2|^2 V_{us}$. It can be seen that the $D - \bar{D}$ mixing can directly constrain the f_2 parameter. Taking $\Delta m_D^{\text{exp}} \approx 6.4 \times 10^{-15}$ GeV and $\Delta m_{B_s} \approx 1.17 \times 10^{-11}$ GeV [87] as the upper bounds, the limits on $|f_2|$ and $|f_2 f_3^*|$ can be obtained as:

$$\begin{aligned} |f_2| &< 4.84 \times 10^{-3} \left(\frac{m_\Phi^2}{J_2(m_L^2/m_\Phi^2)} \right)^{1/4}, \\ |f_2 f_3^*| &< 1.23 \times 10^{-4} \left(\frac{m_\Phi^2}{J_2(m_L^2/m_\Phi^2)} \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

With $m_L/m_\Phi \sim 2$, it can be seen that $|f_2| < 0.21$ and $|f_2 f_3^*| < 0.23$. Compared to the requirement of $f_2 f_3^* \sim 0.06$ for $C_9^{LQ,\mu} \sim -1$, the bounds from Δm_D and Δm_{B_s} are mild.

It has been investigated that the lepton-flavor violating (LFV) effects for explaining $R_{D^{(*)}}$ and $R_{K^{(*)}}$ excesses can be constrained by the precision measurements, such as $Z \rightarrow \tau\mu$, $\tau \rightarrow \mu(\pi, \rho)$, and $\tau \rightarrow 3\mu$ [91, 92]. We examine these constraints in our model. From Eq. (4), it can be seen that the right-handed τ -lepton and left-handed muon can couple to the heavy VLL. Therefore, the coupling $Z\tau\mu$ can be generated at the tree level via the lepton Yukawa couplings. However, in order to obtain the same chiralities in both tau-lepton and muon when they couple to the Z -boson, one of leptons has to flip the chirality; as a result, the tree-induced $Z\tau\mu$ coupling is suppressed by $m_{\tau,\mu}/v$. Using $y_\tau \sim y'_\mu \sim 0.1$ and $v_S \sim 264$ GeV, the resulted BR for $Z \rightarrow \mu\tau$ is $BR(Z \rightarrow \mu\tau) \sim 3.9 \times 10^{-13}$, which is far below the current upper limit with $BR(Z \rightarrow \mu\tau) < 1.2 \times 10^{-5}$ [87]. In addition to the tree effects, the $Z\tau\mu$ coupling can be induced through the loop penguin diagrams, where the main Feynman diagram is shown in Fig. 2. We note that since the Z' -boson does not couple to the quarks, the similar diagram for $Z'\tau\mu$, where the Z' is emitted from the LQ, is suppressed by $m_{\tau,\mu}/v$;

therefore, their effects can be neglected. Accordingly, the effective interaction for $Z\tau\mu$ can be expressed as:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mu\tau Z} = \frac{gC_L^u f'_t g_t'^*}{2 \cos \theta_W} \left(\frac{y'_\mu v_S}{\sqrt{2} m_L} \right) J_3 \left(\frac{m_t^2}{m_\Phi^2} \right) \bar{\mu} \gamma_\mu P_L \tau Z^\mu$$

$$C_L^u = 1 - \frac{4}{3} \sin^2 \theta_W, \quad J_3(x) = -\frac{x}{1-x} - \frac{x \ln x}{(1-x)^2}, \quad (18)$$

where C_L^u is the Z-boson coupling to the up-type quarks. Since the induced $Z\tau\mu$ coupling is related to the up-type quark mass, we only show the top-quark contributions due to $m_{u,c} \ll m_t$. Although the $Z\tau\mu$ interaction can contribute to $Z \rightarrow \tau\mu$ and $\tau \rightarrow \mu\ell\bar{\ell}$, since the current upper limit of $Z \rightarrow \mu\tau$ is much larger than that of $\tau \rightarrow 3\mu$ with $BR(\tau \rightarrow 3\mu) < 2.1 \times 10^{-8}$ [87], we focus on the analysis of $\tau \rightarrow \mu\ell\bar{\ell}$, where ℓ can be the neutrinos and charged leptons. Thus, the Z-mediated BR for $\tau \rightarrow \mu\ell\bar{\ell}$ is given as:

$$BR(\tau \rightarrow \mu\ell\bar{\ell}) = \frac{\tau_\tau m_\tau^5 G_F^2}{192\pi^3} (|C_R^\ell|^2 + |C_L^\ell|^2) |X_{\tau\mu}|^2,$$

$$X_{\tau\mu} = \frac{C_L^u f'_3 g_3'^*}{2(4\pi)^2} \left(\frac{y'_\mu v_S}{\sqrt{2} m_L} \right) J_3 \left(\frac{m_t^2}{m_\Phi^2} \right), \quad (19)$$

where $C_{R,L}^\ell$ are the Z-boson couplings to the leptons, and they are given as $C_R^\nu = 0$, $C_L^\nu = 1$, $C_R^{\ell-} = 2 \sin^2 \theta_W$, and $C_L^{\ell-} = -1 + 2 \sin^2 \theta_W$. Using $f' \sim g' \sim 1$, $y'_\mu \sim 0.1$, and $v_S \sim 264$ GeV, we get $BR(\tau \rightarrow \mu\nu\bar{\nu}) \sim 9 \times 10^{-10}$ and $BR(\tau \rightarrow 3\mu) \sim 1.5 \times 10^{-10}$. It is clear that with a smaller y'_μ , the f'_3 and g'_3 parameters can scape from the strict constraints of the rare tau decays.




FIG. 2: Sketched Feynman diagrams for the induced $Z\tau\mu$ coupling.

Finally, we briefly discuss the constraints from the LQ production at the LHC [103]. According to Eq. (4), the LQ couplings to $\nu_\tau b$, $\tau(t, c)$ are g_3 , g'_3 , and w_2 , respectively. If we assume that the scalar LQ predominantly couples to the third-generation leptons and quarks, the upper limits on the LQ mass in pair production at the LHC are as follows: using

the $\nu_\tau b$ channel [104], ATLAS obtained $m_\Phi < 625$ GeV, and CMS got $m_\Phi < 634$ GeV when the τt channel [105] is used. That is, the LQ with a mass of TeV in our case still satisfies the LHC limits, which are from the LQ-pair production [106]. In addition, the single $\Phi^{-1/3}$ production can be produced via the $gb \rightarrow \Phi^{-1/3}\bar{\nu}_\tau$ and $gc \rightarrow \Phi^{-1/3}\tau^+$ processes. If we take $BR(\Phi^{-1/3} \rightarrow f) \sim 1/2$ with $f = \nu_\tau b$ and τt , using the values of w_2 and g_3 which can explain $R_{D^{(*)}}$, the single production cross section can be calculated to be around 1 fb for $m_\Phi \sim 1$ TeV [44]. The result is below the CMS upper limit of 4.2 fb [107], where the $\mu\mu j$ channel is used to search for the second-generation LQ.

C. Numerical analysis for $R_{D^{(*)}}$, $C_9^{LQ,\mu}$, muon $g-2$, and $h \rightarrow \mu\tau$

To estimate the numerical results for the $B^- \rightarrow D^{(*)}\ell'\bar{\nu}_{\ell'}$ decays, we use the $B \rightarrow D^{(*)}$ form factors based on the heavy quark effective theory (HQET) [93, 94]. The BRs for $B^- \rightarrow D^{(*)}\ell'\bar{\nu}_{\ell'}$ in the SM are obtained as:

$$BR(B^- \rightarrow [D, D^*]\ell\bar{\nu}_\ell) \approx [2.33, 5.46]\%, \quad (20)$$

$$BR(B^- \rightarrow [D, D^*]\tau\bar{\nu}_\tau) \approx [0.72, 1.39]\%, \quad (21)$$

where the experimental data are $BR^{\text{exp}}(B^- \rightarrow [D, D^*]\ell\bar{\nu}_\ell) = [2.27 \pm 0.11, 5.69 \pm 0.19]\%$ and $BR^{\text{exp}}(B^- \rightarrow [D, D^*]\tau\bar{\nu}_\tau) = [0.77 \pm 0.25, 1.88 \pm 0.20]\%$ [87]. It can be seen that the $\tau\bar{\nu}_\tau$ measurements are somewhat larger than the theoretical estimations. Hence, our calculation ratios R_D and R_{D^*} in the SM are given as:

$$R_D \approx 0.307, \quad R_{D^*} \approx 0.254. \quad (22)$$

The obtained results are consistent with those shown in [13–17]. To understand the influence of scalar LQ on the $b \rightarrow c\tau\bar{\nu}_\tau$ decay, we show the contours for $BR(B^- \rightarrow [D, D^*]\tau\bar{\nu}_\tau)$ and R_{D,D^*} as a function of w_2g_3 and m_Φ in Fig. 3 (a) and (b), respectively, where due to the $B^+ \rightarrow K^+\nu\bar{\nu}$ constraint, we have ignored the $g_2g_3^*$ contributions, and the renormalization group (RG) running effects from LQ scale to m_b scale have been included [94]. From the results, when R_D and R_{D^*} are enhanced by the singlet scalar LQ, the $BR(B^- \rightarrow D^{(*)}\tau\bar{\nu}_\tau)$ can be consistent with the current data within 2σ errors. In addition, we also put R_D (solid) and R_{D^*} (dashed) together as a function of w_2g_3 and m_Φ in Fig. 4. From the plot, it can be clearly seen that the LQ contributions can simultaneously explain the R_D and R_{D^*} excesses in the same parameter region.




FIG. 3: Contours for (a) $BR(B^- \rightarrow D\tau\bar{\nu}_\tau)$ (in units of 10^{-2}) and R_D and (b) $BR(B^- \rightarrow D^*\tau\bar{\nu}_\tau)$ (in units of 10^{-2}) and R_{D^*} as a function of $w_2 g_3$ and m_Φ .




FIG. 4: Contours for R_D (solid) and R_{D^*} (dashed) as a function of $w_2 g_3$ and m_Φ .

In addition to the $R_{D^{(*)}}$ observables, BaBar also reported q^2 distributions of the detected events for $B \rightarrow (D, D^*)\tau\nu$ in [6]. To understand the LQ influence, we show $(1/\Gamma)d\Gamma/dq^2$ as a function of q^2 for $B \rightarrow D\tau\bar{\nu}_\tau$ in Fig. 5(a) and for $B \rightarrow D^*\tau\bar{\nu}_\tau$ in Fig. 5(b), where the solid, dashed, and dot-dashed lines denote the results of the SM and LQ with $w_2 g_3^* = -0.2, -0.3$, respectively. The experimental data are obtained from [37]. It can be seen that the LQ curves are slightly different from the SM results. That is, the q^2 distribution of the differential decay rate may not be a good candidate for testing the new physics. Belle recently measures the tau-lepton polarization, defined as $P_\tau = (\Gamma^{h=+} - \Gamma^{h=-1})/(\Gamma^{h=+} + \Gamma^{h=-1})$, in

$B \rightarrow D^* \tau \bar{\nu}_\tau$, and the result is $P_\tau(D^*) = -0.38 \pm 0.51^{+0.21}_{-0.16}$ [9], where the SM prediction is $P_\tau^{\text{SM}} \approx -0.497$ [37, 95]. According to the formulas in [37], we find that the LQ contributions to tau polarization in $B \rightarrow D^* \tau \bar{\nu}_\tau$ are $P_\tau(D^*) \approx -0.488$ for $w_2 g_3^* = -0.2$ and $P_\tau(D^*) \approx -0.479$ for $w_2 g_3^* = -0.3$. Clearly, $P_\tau(D^*)$ is not sensitive to the LQ effects in our model. In addition, we also calculate the tau polarization in $B \rightarrow D \tau \bar{\nu}_\tau$ as $P_\tau(D) \approx 0.401$ for $w_2 g_3^* = -0.2$ and $P_\tau(D) \approx 0.434$ for $w_2 g_3^* = -0.3$, where the SM result is $P_\tau^{\text{SM}}(D) \approx 0.324$. In our model, the deviation of $P_\tau(D)$ from the SM can be $\sim 30\%$.




FIG. 5: $(1/\Gamma)d\Gamma/dq^2$ (in units of GeV^{-2}) with respect to q^2 for (a) $B \rightarrow D\tau\bar{\nu}_\tau$ and (b) $B \rightarrow D^*\tau\bar{\nu}_\tau$, where the solid, dashed, and dot-dashed lines denote the results of the SM and LQ with $w_2 g_3^* = -0.2, -0.3$, respectively. The BarBar data are quoted from [37].

To analyze the R_K and R_{K^*} issues, we take the results obtained from a global fitting to the experimental data [47], where the required Wilson coefficient C_9^{NP} from new physics used to explain the $b \rightarrow s\mu^+\mu^-$ anomalies can be in the region of $C_9^{NP} = [-1.61, -0.77]$. According to Eq. (7), we then show $C_9^{LQ,\mu}$ as a function of $f_2 f_3$ and $g_{Z'}/m_{Z'}$ in Fig. 6, where the solid and dashed lines denote $m_L/m_\Phi = 2$ and $m_L/m_\Phi = 3$, respectively; the constraints from the neutrino trident production and Δm_{B_s} are included, and the shown range for the Wilson coefficient is taken as $C_9^{LQ,\mu} \subset [-1.61, -0.77]$. From the plot, it can be seen that the allowed parameter spaces are still wide.

After showing the contributions to $R_{D^{(*)}}$ and $C_9^{LQ,\mu}$ in the model, in the remainder of this paper, we discuss some interesting implications on the muon $g - 2$ and the Higgs LFV $h \rightarrow \mu\tau$ decay. Since we concentrate on the case with $m_{Z'} \gg m_\mu$, the Z' -mediated muon




FIG. 6: Contours for $C_9^{LQ,\mu}$ as a function of $f_2 f_3$ and $g_{Z'}/m_{Z'}$ (in units of 10^{-3}), where blue and red region respectively denote $m_L/m_\Phi = 2$ (solid) and 3 (dashed). The bounds from the neutrino trident production and Δm_{B_s} with $m_L/m_\Phi = 2, 3$ are also given.

$g - 2$ can be simplified as:

$$\Delta a_\mu^{Z'} \approx \frac{g_{Z'}^2 m_\mu^2}{12 m_{Z'}^2} < 3.4 \times 10^{-10}, \quad (23)$$

where the upper limit is from the neutrino trident production constraint [96, 97]. Although the resulted muon $g - 2$ is smaller than the current experimental value of $\Delta a_\mu = (28.7 \pm 8.0) \times 10^{-10}$ [87], a factor of around 5 improved measurements will be performed in the E989 experiment at Fermilab [98] and the E34 experiment at J-PARC [99]. The result in Eq. (23) falls within 3σ accuracy of the new muon $g - 2$ measurements and can still be tested.

In addition to the explanation of the $R_{D^{(*)}}$ and $R_{K^{(*)}}$ anomalies, from Eq. (4), the Higgs lepton-flavor changing $h \rightarrow \mu\tau$ decay can be induced at the tree level in this simple model, and the associated BR can be expressed as:

$$BR(h \rightarrow \mu\tau) \approx \frac{m_h v_S^2 |y_\tau y'_\mu|^2}{32\pi m_L^2 \Gamma_h}, \quad (24)$$

where $\Gamma_h \approx 4.21$ MeV is the Higgs width. From the limit of the neutrino trident production and $m_{Z'} = 2g_{Z'} v_S$, it is known $v_S \geq 263$ GeV. Thus, with $v_S \sim 264$ GeV and $y_\tau \sim y'_\mu \sim 0.1$, the BR for $h \rightarrow \mu\tau$ can be $BR(h \rightarrow \mu\tau) \sim 0.20\%$, which is close to the CMS upper bound of $BR^{\text{exp}}(h \rightarrow \mu\tau) < 0.25\%$ [100]. Intriguingly, the tree-induced coupling $h\mu\tau$ can generate the radiative LFV $\tau \rightarrow \mu\gamma$ process via Higgs-mediated one-loop and two-loop

Feynman diagrams [101, 102]. Since the one-loop effects are suppressed by the factor m_ℓ/v , which is from the SM coupling $h\ell\ell$, the loop-induced BR for $\tau \rightarrow \mu\gamma$ is dominated by the two-loop effects. With above values of parameters and the results in [102], we obtain $BR(\tau \rightarrow \mu\gamma) \sim 3.2 \times 10^{-10}$, and the result is well below the current experimental upper limit with $BR(\tau \rightarrow \mu\gamma) < 4.4 \times 10^{-8}$ [87]. We note that $\tau \rightarrow \mu\gamma$ can be also produced through top-quark and LQ loop, where the related couplings are w_3 , f'_3 , and y'_μ , since we have taken $w_3 \ll 1$, such loop contribution could be taken to be small.

IV. SUMMARY

We studied the $U(1)_{L_\mu-L_\tau}$ extension of the SM to resolve the $R_{D^{(*)}}$ and $R_{K^{(*)}}$ anomalies. In order to achieve this purpose, we introduce one vector-like doublet lepton, one scalar leptoquark, and one singlet scalar, in which they all carry $U(1)_{L_\mu-L_\tau}$ charges. As a result, the $b \rightarrow s\mu^+\mu^-$ process can arise from the Z' -penguin diagram via the leptoquark loop, whereas the $b \rightarrow c\tau\bar{\nu}_\tau$ decay can be induced from the same leptoquark. When considering the constraints from the flavor physics, such as the $b \rightarrow s\gamma$, $B^+ \rightarrow K^+\nu\bar{\nu}$, $B_c \rightarrow \tau\bar{\nu}_\tau$, $\Delta F = 2$, and $\tau \rightarrow \mu\ell\bar{\ell}$ processes, it is found that R_D and R_{D^*} can simultaneously fit the data in the same parameter space, and the Z' -penguin induced Wilson coefficient can be $C_9^{LQ,\mu} = [-1.61, -0.77]$, for which the result is from the χ^2 analysis and can be used to explain the $b \rightarrow s\mu^+\mu^-$ anomalies. In this model, due to the vector Z' coupling, the Wilson coefficient $C_{10}^{LQ,\mu}$ automatically vanishes; therefore, the rare $B_s \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ process cannot give a strict bound on the parameters. The BR for the Higgs lepton-flavor violating $h \rightarrow \mu\tau$ decay can be as large as the current experimental upper limit. The Z' -mediated muon $g-2$ can reach the 3×10^{-10} level, which can be tested in future new muon $g-2$ experiments. In addition, we find that the tau polarization in $B \rightarrow D\tau\bar{\nu}_\tau$ is more sensitive to the LQ effects and can have a deviation of 30% in our model.

Acknowledgments

This work was partially supported by the Ministry of Science and Technology of Taiwan R.O.C., under grant MOST-103-2112-M-006-004-MY3 (CHC).

- [1] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 151601 (2014) [arXiv:1406.6482 [hep-ex]].
- [2] G. Hiller and F. Kruger, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 074020 (2004) [hep-ph/0310219].
- [3] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], arXiv:1705.05802 [hep-ex].
- [4] M. Bordone, G. Isidori and A. Pattori, Eur. Phys. J. C **76**, no. 8, 440 (2016) [arXiv:1605.07633 [hep-ph]].
- [5] J. P. Lees *et al.* [BaBar Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 101802 (2012) [arXiv:1205.5442 [hep-ex]].
- [6] J. P. Lees *et al.* [BaBar Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **88**, no. 7, 072012 (2013) [arXiv:1303.0571 [hep-ex]].
- [7] M. Huschle *et al.* [Belle Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 7, 072014 (2015) [arXiv:1507.03233 [hep-ex]].
- [8] A. Abdesselam *et al.* [Belle Collaboration], arXiv:1603.06711 [hep-ex].
- [9] S. Hirose *et al.* [Belle Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **118**, no. 21, 211801 (2017) [arXiv:1612.00529 [hep-ex]].
- [10] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, no. 11, 111803 (2015) Erratum: [Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, no. 15, 159901 (2015)] [arXiv:1506.08614 [hep-ex]].
- [11] LHCb Collaboration [LHCb Collaboration], CERN-LHCb-PROC-2017-025.
- [12] Y. Amhis *et al.*, arXiv:1612.07233 [hep-ex].
- [13] J. A. Bailey *et al.* [MILC Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **92** (2015) no.3, 034506 [arXiv:1503.07237 [hep-lat]].
- [14] H. Na *et al.* [HPQCD Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 5, 054510 (2015) Erratum: [Phys. Rev. D **93**, no. 11, 119906 (2016)] [arXiv:1505.03925 [hep-lat]].
- [15] F. U. Bernlochner, Z. Ligeti, M. Papucci and D. J. Robinson, Phys. Rev. D **95**, no. 11, 115008 (2017) [arXiv:1703.05330 [hep-ph]].

- [16] S. Fajfer, J. F. Kamenik and I. Nisandzic, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 094025 (2012) [arXiv:1203.2654 [hep-ph]].
- [17] D. Bigi, P. Gambino and S. Schacht, arXiv:1707.09509 [hep-ph].
- [18] I. Dorsner, S. Fajfer, N. Kosnik and I. Nisandzic, JHEP **1311**, 084 (2013) [arXiv:1306.6493 [hep-ph]].
- [19] S. Descotes-Genon, J. Matias and J. Virto, Phys. Rev. D **88**, 074002 (2013) [arXiv:1307.5683 [hep-ph]].
- [20] W. Altmannshofer, S. Gori, M. Pospelov and I. Yavin, Phys. Rev. D **89**, 095033 (2014) [arXiv:1403.1269 [hep-ph]].
- [21] A. Crivellin, G. D'Ambrosio and J. Heeck, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 151801 (2015) [arXiv:1501.00993 [hep-ph]].
- [22] A. Crivellin, G. D'Ambrosio and J. Heeck, Phys. Rev. D **91**, no. 7, 075006 (2015) [arXiv:1503.03477 [hep-ph]].
- [23] D. Becirevic, S. Fajfer and N. Kosnik, Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 1, 014016 (2015) [arXiv:1503.09024 [hep-ph]].
- [24] G. Belanger, C. Delaunay and S. Westhoff, Phys. Rev. D **92**, 055021 (2015) [arXiv:1507.06660 [hep-ph]].
- [25] W. Altmannshofer and I. Yavin, Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 7, 075022 (2015) [arXiv:1508.07009 [hep-ph]].
- [26] A. Carmona and F. Goertz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, no. 25, 251801 (2016) [arXiv:1510.07658 [hep-ph]].
- [27] M. Bauer and M. Neubert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, no. 14, 141802 (2016) [arXiv:1511.01900 [hep-ph]].
- [28] I. Dorsner, S. Fajfer, A. Greljo, J. F. Kamenik and N. Kosnik, Phys. Rept. **641**, 1 (2016) [arXiv:1603.04993 [hep-ph]].
- [29] S. M. Boucenna, A. Celis, J. Fuentes-Martin, A. Vicente and J. Virto, Phys. Lett. B **760**, 214 (2016) [arXiv:1604.03088 [hep-ph]].
- [30] D. Das, C. Hati, G. Kumar and N. Mahajan, Phys. Rev. D **94**, 055034 (2016) [arXiv:1605.06313 [hep-ph]].
- [31] X. Q. Li, Y. D. Yang and X. Zhang, JHEP **1608**, 054 (2016) [arXiv:1605.09308 [hep-ph]].
- [32] C. H. Chen, T. Nomura and H. Okada, Phys. Rev. D **94**, no. 11, 115005 (2016)

- [arXiv:1607.04857 [hep-ph]].
- [33] S. M. Boucenna, A. Celis, J. Fuentes-Martin, A. Vicente and J. Virto, JHEP **1612**, 059 (2016) [arXiv:1608.01349 [hep-ph]].
 - [34] D. Becirevic, S. Fajfer, N. Kosnik and O. Sumensari, Phys. Rev. D **94**, no. 11, 115021 (2016) [arXiv:1608.08501 [hep-ph]].
 - [35] W. Altmannshofer, S. Gori, S. Profumo and F. S. Queiroz, JHEP **1612**, 106 (2016) [arXiv:1609.04026 [hep-ph]].
 - [36] K. Cheung, T. Nomura and H. Okada, Phys. Rev. D **94**, no. 11, 115024 (2016) [arXiv:1610.02322 [hep-ph]].
 - [37] D. Bardhan, P. Byakti and D. Ghosh, JHEP **1701**, 125 (2017) [arXiv:1610.03038 [hep-ph]].
 - [38] K. Cheung, T. Nomura and H. Okada, Phys. Rev. D **95**, no. 1, 015026 (2017) [arXiv:1610.04986 [hep-ph]].
 - [39] R. Alonso, B. Grinstein and J. Martin Camalich, Phys. Rev. Lett. **118**, no. 8, 081802 (2017) [arXiv:1611.06676 [hep-ph]].
 - [40] K. Cheung, T. Nomura and H. Okada, Phys. Lett. B **768**, 359 (2017) [arXiv:1701.01080 [hep-ph]].
 - [41] P. Ko, T. Nomura and H. Okada, arXiv:1701.05788 [hep-ph].
 - [42] P. Ko, T. Nomura and H. Okada, Phys. Rev. D **95**, no. 11, 111701 (2017) [arXiv:1702.02699 [hep-ph]].
 - [43] P. Ko, Y. Omura, Y. Shigekami and C. Yu, Phys. Rev. D **95**, no. 11, 115040 (2017) [arXiv:1702.08666 [hep-ph]].
 - [44] C. H. Chen, T. Nomura and H. Okada, Phys. Lett. B **774**, 456 (2017) [arXiv:1703.03251 [hep-ph]].
 - [45] C. H. Chen and T. Nomura, Eur. Phys. J. C **77**, no. 9, 631 (2017) [arXiv:1703.03646 [hep-ph]].
 - [46] E. Megias, M. Quiros and L. Salas, arXiv:1703.06019 [hep-ph].
 - [47] W. Altmannshofer, C. Niehoff, P. Stangl and D. M. Straub, Eur. Phys. J. C **77**, no. 6, 377 (2017) [arXiv:1703.09189 [hep-ph]].
 - [48] A. Crivellin, D. Muller and T. Ota, arXiv:1703.09226 [hep-ph].
 - [49] B. Capdevila, A. Crivellin, S. Descotes-Genon, J. Matias and J. Virto, arXiv:1704.05340 [hep-ph].
 - [50] W. Altmannshofer, P. Stangl and D. M. Straub, arXiv:1704.05435 [hep-ph].

- [51] G. Hiller and I. Nisandzic, arXiv:1704.05444 [hep-ph].
- [52] M. Ciuchini, A. M. Coutinho, M. Fedele, E. Franco, A. Paul, L. Silvestrini and M. Valli, arXiv:1704.05447 [hep-ph].
- [53] A. Celis, J. Fuentes-Martin, A. Vicente and J. Virto, arXiv:1704.05672 [hep-ph].
- [54] J. F. Kamenik, Y. Soreq and J. Zupan, arXiv:1704.06005 [hep-ph].
- [55] D. Ghosh, arXiv:1704.06240 [hep-ph].
- [56] W. Altmannshofer, P. S. B. Dev and A. Soni, arXiv:1704.06659 [hep-ph].
- [57] A. K. Alok, D. Kumar, J. Kumar and R. Sharma, arXiv:1704.07347 [hep-ph].
- [58] A. K. Alok, B. Bhattacharya, A. Datta, D. Kumar, J. Kumar and D. London, arXiv:1704.07397 [hep-ph].
- [59] R. Alonso, P. Cox, C. Han and T. T. Yanagida, arXiv:1704.08158 [hep-ph].
- [60] C. Bonilla, T. Modak, R. Srivastava and J. W. F. Valle, arXiv:1705.00915 [hep-ph].
- [61] R. Alonso, P. Cox, C. Han and T. T. Yanagida, arXiv:1705.03858 [hep-ph].
- [62] Y. Tang and Y. L. Wu, arXiv:1705.05643 [hep-ph].
- [63] O. Sumensari, arXiv:1705.07591 [hep-ph].
- [64] A. Datta, J. Kumar, J. Liao and D. Marfatia, arXiv:1705.08423 [hep-ph].
- [65] D. Bardhan, P. Byakti and D. Ghosh, arXiv:1705.09305 [hep-ph].
- [66] D. Das, C. Hati, G. Kumar and N. Mahajan, arXiv:1705.09188 [hep-ph].
- [67] S. Matsuzaki, K. Nishiwaki and R. Watanabe, arXiv:1706.01463 [hep-ph].
- [68] C. W. Chiang, X. G. He, J. Tandean and X. B. Yuan, arXiv:1706.02696 [hep-ph].
- [69] J. Kawamura, S. Okawa and Y. Omura, arXiv:1706.04344 [hep-ph].
- [70] B. Chauhan, B. Kindra and A. Narang, arXiv:1706.04598 [hep-ph].
- [71] S. Khalil, arXiv:1706.07337 [hep-ph].
- [72] I. Dorsner, S. Fajfer, D. A. Farougy and N. Kosnik, arXiv:1706.07779 [hep-ph].
- [73] D. Choudhury, A. Kundu, R. Mandal and R. Sinha, arXiv:1706.08437 [hep-ph].
- [74] D. Buttazzo, A. Greljo, G. Isidori and D. Marzocca, arXiv:1706.07808 [hep-ph].
- [75] J. M. Cline and J. Martin Camalich, arXiv:1706.08510 [hep-ph].
- [76] A. Crivellin, D. Mueller, A. Signer and Y. Ulrich, arXiv:1706.08511 [hep-ph].
- [77] S. Y. Guo, Z. L. Han, B. Li, Y. Liao and X. D. Ma, arXiv:1707.00522 [hep-ph].
- [78] L. Bian, S. M. Choi, Y. J. Kang and H. M. Lee, arXiv:1707.04811 [hep-ph].
- [79] A. G. Akeroyd and C. H. Chen, Phys. Rev. D **96**, no. 7, 075011 (2017) [arXiv:1708.04072].

- [hep-ph]].
- [80] X. G. He, G. C. Joshi, H. Lew and R. R. Volkas, Phys. Rev. D **44**, 2118 (1991).
 - [81] X. G. He, G. C. Joshi, H. Lew and R. R. Volkas, Phys. Rev. D **43**, 22 (1991).
 - [82] C. H. Chen and T. Nomura, arXiv:1704.04407 [hep-ph].
 - [83] C. H. Chen and T. Nomura, arXiv:1705.10620 [hep-ph].
 - [84] S. R. Mishra *et al.* [CCFR Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 3117 (1991).
 - [85] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, no. 23, 231806 (2014) [arXiv:1403.5657 [hep-ex]].
 - [86] A. J. Buras, J. Girrbach-Noe, C. Niehoff and D. M. Straub, JHEP **1502**, 184 (2015) [arXiv:1409.4557 [hep-ph]].
 - [87] C. Patrignani *et al.* (Particle Data Group), Chin. Phys. C **40**, 100001 (2016).
 - [88] G. Buchalla, A. J. Buras and M. E. Lautenbacher, Rev. Mod. Phys. **68**, 1125 (1996) [hep-ph/9512380].
 - [89] A. J. Buras, B. Duling, T. Feldmann, T. Heidsieck, C. Promberger and S. Recksiegel, JHEP **1007**, 094 (2010) [arXiv:1004.4565 [hep-ph]].
 - [90] A. Lenz *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 036004 (2011) [arXiv:1008.1593 [hep-ph]].
 - [91] F. Feruglio, P. Paradisi and A. Pattori, Phys. Rev. Lett. **118**, no. 1, 011801 (2017) [arXiv:1606.00524 [hep-ph]].
 - [92] F. Feruglio, P. Paradisi and A. Pattori, JHEP **1709**, 061 (2017) [arXiv:1705.00929 [hep-ph]].
 - [93] I. Caprini, L. Lellouch and M. Neubert, Nucl. Phys. B **530**, 153 (1998) [hep-ph/9712417].
 - [94] Y. Sakaki, M. Tanaka, A. Tayduganov and R. Watanabe, Phys. Rev. D **88**, no. 9, 094012 (2013) [arXiv:1309.0301 [hep-ph]].
 - [95] M. Tanaka and R. Watanabe, Phys. Rev. D **87**, no. 3, 034028 (2013) [arXiv:1212.1878 [hep-ph]].
 - [96] W. Altmannshofer, S. Gori, M. Pospelov and I. Yavin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 091801 (2014) [arXiv:1406.2332 [hep-ph]].
 - [97] J. Kile, A. Kobach and A. Soni, Phys. Lett. B **744**, 330 (2015) [arXiv:1411.1407 [hep-ph]].
 - [98] J. Grange *et al.* [Muon g-2 Collaboration], arXiv:1501.06858 [physics.ins-det].
 - [99] M. Otani [E34 Collaboration], JPS Conf. Proc. **8**, 025008 (2015).
 - [100] CMS Collaboration [CMS Collaboration], CMS-PAS-HIG-17-001.
 - [101] A. Falkowski, D. M. Straub and A. Vicente, JHEP **1405**, 092 (2014) [arXiv:1312.5329 [hep-]]

- ph]].
- [102] I. Dorsner, S. Fajfer, A. Greljo, J. F. Kamenik, N. Kosnik and I. Nisandzic, JHEP **1506**, 108 (2015) [arXiv:1502.07784 [hep-ph]].
 - [103] D. A. Faroughy, A. Greljo and J. F. Kamenik, Phys. Lett. B **764**, 126 (2017) [arXiv:1609.07138 [hep-ph]].
 - [104] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], Eur. Phys. J. C **76**, no. 1, 5 (2016) [arXiv:1508.04735 [hep-ex]].
 - [105] CMS Collaboration [CMS Collaboration], CMS-PAS-EXO-13-010.
 - [106] B. Diaz, M. Schmaltz and Y. M. Zhong, arXiv:1706.05033 [hep-ph].
 - [107] V. Khachatryan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **93**, no. 3, 032005 (2016) Erratum: [Phys. Rev. D **95**, no. 3, 039906 (2017)] [arXiv:1509.03750 [hep-ex]].