

Anomalies in B Decays: A Sign of New Physics?¹

David London²

*Physique des Particules, Université de Montréal,
C.P. 6128, succ. centre-ville, Montréal, QC, Canada H3C 3J7*

(November 15, 2019)

Abstract

At the present time, there are a number of measurements of B -decay observables that disagree with the predictions of the standard model. These discrepancies have been seen in processes governed by two types of decay: (i) $b \rightarrow s\mu^+\mu^-$ and (ii) $b \rightarrow c\tau^-\bar{\nu}$. In this talk, I review the experimental results, as well as the proposed new-physics explanations. We may be seeing the first signs of physics beyond the standard model.

¹Talk given at the XIth International Symposium on Quantum Theory and Symmetries, July 1-5, Centre de recherches mathématiques, Montréal, Canada

²london@lps.umontreal.ca

1 Introduction

The development of the standard model (SM) in particle physics is one of the great triumphs in all of physics. The SM has made a great many predictions, almost all of which have been verified, including the existence of the Higgs boson. There is no question that the SM is correct.

However, there are many reasons to believe it is not complete, such as the large number of arbitrary parameters, the hierarchy problem, the matter-antimatter asymmetry in the universe, dark matter, etc. In order to address these issues, there must be physics beyond the SM. We don't know what the new physics (NP) is, nor where it is, so we have to search for it in all possible ways:

- Direct searches: in high-energy experiments, one task is to look for the production of new particles. Unfortunately, to date, such searches have revealed nothing. No SUSY, no direct dark matter detection, no new particles.
- Indirect searches: here the idea is to look for virtual effects of new particles. This method has been more promising.

2 B -Decay Anomalies

2.1 $b \rightarrow s\mu^+\mu^-$

$b \rightarrow s$ transitions, which have $\Delta Q_{em} = 0$, are flavour-changing neutral-current (FCNC) processes. In the SM, these can arise only at loop level. One such FCNC decay is $b \rightarrow s\mu^+\mu^-$, the diagram for which is shown in Fig. 1. The SM amplitude is suppressed by loop factors and small elements in the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) quark mixing matrix:

$$A \sim \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \frac{g^4}{M_W^2} \frac{m_t^2}{M_W^2} V_{tb}V_{ts}^* . \quad (1)$$

Processes whose rates are small in the SM are excellent places to search for NP. Indeed, there are a number of measurements of observables involving $b \rightarrow s\mu^+\mu^-$ that disagree with the predictions of the SM:




Figure 1: SM diagram for $b \rightarrow s\mu^+\mu^-$.

- The measured branching ratios of $B \rightarrow K^* \mu^+ \mu^-$ [1] and $B_s \rightarrow \phi \mu^+ \mu^-$ [2] have been found to be smaller than the predictions of the SM. Here there are significant theoretical uncertainties, related to the poorly-known values of the hadronic form factors [3–5].
- Deviations from the SM expectations have been found in measurements of the angular distribution of $B \rightarrow K^* \mu^+ \mu^-$ [6–9], particularly in the angular observable P'_5 [10]. Here, the form-factor uncertainties are smaller than for the branching ratios [11, 12], but they are still important.
- LHCb has measured

$$R_K \equiv \frac{\mathcal{B}(\bar{B} \rightarrow K \mu^+ \mu^-)}{\mathcal{B}(\bar{B} \rightarrow K e^+ e^-)} . \quad (2)$$

Using the Run 1 data (2014) [13], for $1 \leq q^2 \leq 6 \text{ GeV}^2$, where q^2 is the dilepton invariant mass-squared, it was found that

$$R_{K,\text{Run 1}}^{\text{old}} = 0.745_{-0.074}^{+0.090} \text{ (stat)} \pm 0.036 \text{ (syst)} . \quad (3)$$

The SM prediction is $R_K^{\text{SM}} = 1 \pm 0.01$ [14]. This measurement disagrees with the SM at the level of 2.6σ , suggesting a violation of lepton universality.

At the Rencontres de Moriond, 2019, LHCb presented new R_K results [15]: (i) the Run 1 data were reanalyzed using a new reconstruction selection method, and (ii) the Run 2 data were analyzed. The results are

$$\begin{aligned} R_{K,\text{Run 1}}^{\text{new}} &= 0.717_{-0.071}^{+0.083} \text{ (stat)}_{-0.016}^{+0.017} \text{ (syst)} , \\ R_{K,\text{Run 2}} &= 0.928_{-0.076}^{+0.089} \text{ (stat)} \pm_{-0.017}^{+0.020} \text{ (syst)} . \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Combining the Run 1 and Run 2 results gives

$$R_K = 0.846_{-0.054}^{+0.060} \text{ (stat)}_{-0.014}^{+0.016} \text{ (syst)} . \quad (5)$$

The central value is closer to the SM prediction, but, due to the smaller errors, the discrepancy with the SM is still $\sim 2.5\sigma$.

LHCb has also measured

$$R_{K^*} \equiv \frac{\mathcal{B}(\bar{B} \rightarrow K^* \mu^+ \mu^-)}{\mathcal{B}(\bar{B} \rightarrow K^* e^+ e^-)} , \quad (6)$$

finding [16]

$$R_{K^*} = \begin{cases} 0.660_{-0.070}^{+0.110} \text{ (stat)} \pm 0.024 \text{ (syst)} , & 0.045 \leq q^2 \leq 1.1 \text{ GeV}^2 , \\ 0.685_{-0.069}^{+0.113} \text{ (stat)} \pm 0.047 \text{ (syst)} , & 1.1 \leq q^2 \leq 6.0 \text{ GeV}^2 . \end{cases}$$

Compared to SM predictions, these correspond to discrepancies of 2.4σ and 2.5σ .

At the Rencontres de Moriond, 2019, Belle announced its measurement of R_{K^*} [17]:

$$R_{K^*} = \begin{cases} 0.52_{-0.26}^{+0.36} \pm 0.05, & 0.045 \leq q^2 \leq 1.1 \text{ GeV}^2, \\ 0.96_{-0.29}^{+0.45} \pm 0.11, & 1.1 \leq q^2 \leq 6.0 \text{ GeV}^2, \\ 0.90_{-0.21}^{+0.27} \pm 0.10, & 0.1 \leq q^2 \leq 8.0 \text{ GeV}^2, \\ 1.18_{-0.32}^{+0.52} \pm 0.10, & 15.0 \leq q^2 \leq 19.0 \text{ GeV}^2, \\ 0.94_{-0.14}^{+0.17} \pm 0.08, & 0.045 \leq q^2. \end{cases}$$

Although the central values are closer to the SM predictions, the errors are considerably larger than in the LHCb measurement.

- On average, older measurements of the branching ratio of $B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ were in agreement with the prediction of the SM [18–20]. However, a new measurement by ATLAS disagrees with SM by 2.4σ [21]. Combining all results leads to tension of $\sim 2\sigma$ with the SM.

There are therefore quite a few measurements of observables that are in disagreement with the predictions of the SM. All of these involve the decay $b \rightarrow s \mu^+ \mu^-$, which suggests trying to explain the data by allowing NP to contribute to this decay. The model-independent starting point is the effective Hamiltonian

$$H_{\text{eff}} = -\frac{\alpha G_F}{\sqrt{2}\pi} V_{tb} V_{ts}^* \sum_{a=9,10} (C_a O_a + C'_a O'_a), \quad (7)$$

where $O_{9(10)} = [\bar{s} \gamma_\mu P_L b][\bar{\mu} \gamma^\mu (\gamma_5) \mu]$, and the primed operators have $L \rightarrow R$. The Wilson coefficients include both SM and NP contributions: $C_X = C_{X,\text{SM}} + C_{X,\text{NP}}$.

Performing a combined fit to all the data, in the simplest scenarios it is found that the data can be explained if³

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(i)} \quad C_{9,\text{NP}}^{\mu\mu} &= -1.10 \pm 0.16, \\ \text{(ii)} \quad C_{9,\text{NP}}^{\mu\mu} &= -C_{10,\text{NP}}^{\mu\mu} = -0.53 \pm 0.08, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

with a pull of close to 6σ (!). (I note in passing that scenario (ii) involves purely left-handed NP.)

2.2 $b \rightarrow c \tau^- \bar{\nu}$

There is another set of observables whose measurements also exhibit discrepancies with the SM. They involve the decay $b \rightarrow c \tau^- \bar{\nu}$. This is a $\Delta Q_{em} = 1$ process, and proceeds in the SM via tree-level W exchange, see Fig. 2. The amplitude is given by

$$A \sim \frac{g_2^2}{M_W^2} V_{cb}, \quad (9)$$




Figure 2: SM diagram for $b \rightarrow c\tau^-\bar{\nu}_\tau$.

where $|V_{cb}| \simeq 0.04$.

Before the Rencontres de Moriond, 2019, BaBar, Belle and LHCb measured the quantities

$$R_{D^{(*)}} \equiv \frac{\mathcal{B}(\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{(*)}\tau^-\bar{\nu}_\tau)}{\mathcal{B}(\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{(*)}\ell^-\bar{\nu}_\ell)} \quad , \quad (\ell = e, \mu) . \quad (10)$$

Their measurements exhibited discrepancies with the predictions of the SM. Combining R_D and R_{D^*} , the deviation was $\sim 3.8\sigma$ [28]. At Moriond, 2019, Belle announced new results [29]:

$$\begin{aligned} R_{D^*}^{\tau/\ell} / (R_{D^*}^{\tau/\ell})_{\text{SM}} &= 1.10 \pm 0.09 , \\ R_D^{\tau/\ell} / (R_D^{\tau/\ell})_{\text{SM}} &= 1.03 \pm 0.13 . \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

These results are in better agreement with the SM, so that the deviation from the SM in R_D and R_{D^*} (combined) has been reduced from $\sim 3.8\sigma$ to 3.1σ [28].

LHCb has also measured

$$R_{J/\psi} \equiv \frac{\mathcal{B}(B_c^+ \rightarrow J/\psi\tau^+\nu_\tau)}{\mathcal{B}(B_c^+ \rightarrow J/\psi\mu^+\nu_\mu)} , \quad (12)$$

finding [30]

$$\frac{R_{J/\psi}}{(R_{J/\psi})_{\text{SM}}} = 2.51 \pm 0.97 . \quad (13)$$

Here the discrepancy with the SM is 1.7σ [31].

The discrepancies in R_D , R_{D^*} and $R_{J/\psi}$ are hints of τ - μ and τ - e universality violation in $b \rightarrow c\ell^-\bar{\nu}$, and suggest the presence of NP in $b \rightarrow c\tau^-\bar{\nu}$ decays.

3 Models of New Physics

For the $b \rightarrow s\mu^+\mu^-$ anomalies, there are two classes of NP models that contribute to the decay at tree level, and can explain the data.

³These numbers are taken from Ref. [22]. Other analyses [23–27] obtain similar results.




Figure 3: Z' (left) and LQ (right) contributions to $b \rightarrow s\mu^+\mu^-$.




Figure 4: W' (top left), charged-Higgs (top right) and LQ (bottom) contributions to $b \rightarrow c\tau^-\bar{\nu}$.

The first class involves a new Z' boson (see Fig. 3). The Z' must have a FCNC coupling to $\bar{s}b$ and must couple to $\mu^+\mu^-$. The model can follow scenarios (i) or (ii) [Eq. (8)]. A great many Z' models have been proposed (far too many to list here). Some combine explanations of the B anomalies with other weaknesses of the SM, such as dark matter, $(g-2)_\mu$ and neutrino masses.

The second class of NP models involves leptoquark (LQ) exchange (see Fig. 3). There are several different types of LQ that can explain the $b \rightarrow s\mu^+\mu^-$ data. All fit within scenario (ii) of Eq. (8 (purely LH NP) [32].

Turning to $b \rightarrow c\tau^-\bar{\nu}$, there are three types of NP whose contributions to this decay could explain the data: (1) a new W' boson, (2) a charged Higgs boson, and (3) a leptoquark (see Fig. 4). However, the H^- is disfavoured by (theoretical) constraints from $B_c^- \rightarrow \tau^-\bar{\nu}_\tau$ [33], leaving the W' or (several different types of) LQ as NP explanations. Here, the NP couplings can be left-handed (LH) and/or right-handed (RH).

3.1 Distinguishing NP Explanations

As we have seen, there are several NP explanations for the anomalies in $b \rightarrow s\mu^+\mu^-$. But this raises the question: how can we distinguish among them? One way is to look at CP violation in $B \rightarrow K^*\mu^+\mu^-$ [32]. Now, CP violation is generated by the interference of (at least) two amplitudes with different weak phases. In the presence of NP, this can arise due to SM-NP interference. Here the signal is not direct CP violation, but rather CP asymmetries in the angular distribution. The key point here is that SM- Z' and SM-LQ interferences are different, leading to different CP-violating effects. Thus, by measuring CP violation in $B \rightarrow K^*\mu^+\mu^-$, one can differentiate the NP models.

The situation is similar for the NP explanations of the $b \rightarrow c\tau^-\bar{\nu}$ anomalies. By looking at CP violation in $B \rightarrow D^*\tau^-\bar{\nu}$ (and also in $B \rightarrow D^*\mu^-\bar{\nu}$), one can distinguish NP models [34]. Once again, the signal involves CP asymmetries in the angular distribution. The measurement of CP violation in these decays allows us to differentiate the W' and LQ models. It also provides information about the LH/RH NP couplings.

3.2 Simultaneous explanations of $b \rightarrow s\mu^+\mu^-$ and $b \rightarrow c\tau^-\bar{\nu}$

Now, $(c, s)_L$ is a doublet of $SU(2)_L$. This suggests that, if the NP coupling is purely LH, $b \rightarrow s$ and $b \rightarrow c$ transitions are related. It should therefore be possible to find NP that can simultaneously explain both the $b \rightarrow s\mu^+\mu^-$ and $b \rightarrow c\tau^-\bar{\nu}$ anomalies [35].

There are two classes of models that, in principle, can do this:

- A new triplet of vector bosons (W'^{\pm}, Z'^0). The W' and Z' contribute respectively to $b \rightarrow c\tau^-\bar{\nu}$ and $b \rightarrow s\mu^+\mu^-$.
- A LQ of charge $Q_{em} = \frac{2}{3}$. It couples to $\bar{b}\mu^+$ and $\bar{s}\mu^+$ (for $b \rightarrow s\mu^+\mu^-$) and to $\bar{b}\tau^+$ and $c\bar{\nu}_\tau$ (for $b \rightarrow c\tau^-\bar{\nu}$).

It is found [36–39] that, when all constraints are taken into account, including those from direct searches at the LHC, the (W'^{\pm}, Z'^0) model is excluded. But the LQ model is viable!

4 Summary

The SM is certainly correct, but it is not complete: there must be physics beyond the SM. Recently, there have been several measurements of observables that are in disagreement with the predictions of the SM:

- $b \rightarrow s\mu^+\mu^-$: These include many observables involving this decay. Some are clean, while others have important theoretical uncertainties. Global fits allowing for NP in $b \rightarrow s\mu^+\mu^-$ find improvements over the SM at the level of close to 6σ . NP Models with an extra Z' or with different types of LQs have been proposed as explanations.

- $b \rightarrow c\tau^-\bar{\nu}$: here there are several clean observables, with a net deviation from the SM of $\sim 3\sigma$. These can be explained in models with an extra W' or with different types of LQs.

It is of course possible that these discrepancies with the SM are all statistical fluctuations, and will go away with more data. This said, their combined statistical significance is sizeable ($\gtrsim 4\sigma$), so they will not disappear soon. Hopefully, we are indeed seeing the first experimental signals of NP.

Acknowledgments: This work was financially supported in part by NSERC of Canada.

References

- [1] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], “Differential branching fractions and isospin asymmetries of $B \rightarrow K^{(*)}\mu^+\mu^-$ decays,” JHEP **1406**, 133 (2014) doi:10.1007/JHEP06(2014)133 [arXiv:1403.8044 [hep-ex]].
- [2] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], “Angular analysis and differential branching fraction of the decay $B_s^0 \rightarrow \phi\mu^+\mu^-$,” JHEP **1509**, 179 (2015) doi:10.1007/JHEP09(2015)179 [arXiv:1506.08777 [hep-ex]].
- [3] A. Bharucha, D. M. Straub and R. Zwicky, “ $B \rightarrow V\ell^+\ell^-$ in the Standard Model from light-cone sum rules,” JHEP **1608**, 098 (2016) doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2016)098 [arXiv:1503.05534 [hep-ph]].
- [4] R. R. Horgan, Z. Liu, S. Meinel and M. Wingate, “Rare B decays using lattice QCD form factors,” PoS LATTICE **2014**, 372 (2015) doi:10.22323/1.214.0372 [arXiv:1501.00367 [hep-lat]].
- [5] N. Gubernari, A. Kokulu and D. van Dyk, “ $B \rightarrow P$ and $B \rightarrow V$ Form Factors from B -Meson Light-Cone Sum Rules beyond Leading Twist,” JHEP **1901**, 150 (2019) doi:10.1007/JHEP01(2019)150 [arXiv:1811.00983 [hep-ph]].
- [6] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], “Angular analysis of the $B^0 \rightarrow K^{*0}\mu^+\mu^-$ decay using 3 fb^{-1} of integrated luminosity,” JHEP **1602**, 104 (2016) doi:10.1007/JHEP02(2016)104 [arXiv:1512.04442 [hep-ex]].
- [7] ATLAS Collaboration, “Angular analysis of $B_d^0 \rightarrow K^*\mu^+\mu^-$ decays in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8 \text{ TeV}$ with the ATLAS detector,” Tech. Rep. ATLAS-CONF-2017-023, CERN, Geneva, 2017.
- [8] CMS Collaboration, “Measurement of the P_1 and P'_5 angular parameters of the decay $B^0 \rightarrow K^{*0}\mu^+\mu^-$ in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8 \text{ TeV}$,” Tech. Rep. CMS-PAS-BPH-15-008, CERN, Geneva, 2017.

- [9] V. Khachatryan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], “Angular analysis of the decay $B^0 \rightarrow K^{*0}\mu^+\mu^-$ from pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV,” *Phys. Lett. B* **753**, 424 (2016) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2015.12.020 [arXiv:1507.08126 [hep-ex]].
- [10] S. Descotes-Genon, T. Hurth, J. Matias and J. Virto, “Optimizing the basis of $B \rightarrow K^*\ell\ell$ observables in the full kinematic range,” *JHEP* **1305**, 137 (2013) doi:10.1007/JHEP05(2013)137 [arXiv:1303.5794 [hep-ph]].
- [11] A. Khodjamirian, T. Mannel, A. A. Pivovarov and Y.-M. Wang, “Charm-loop effect in $B \rightarrow K^{(*)}\ell^+\ell^-$ and $B \rightarrow K^*\gamma$,” *JHEP* **1009**, 089 (2010) doi:10.1007/JHEP09(2010)089 [arXiv:1006.4945 [hep-ph]].
- [12] C. Bobeth, M. Chrzaszcz, D. van Dyk and J. Virto, “Long-distance effects in $B \rightarrow K^*\ell\ell$ from analyticity,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **78**, no. 6, 451 (2018) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-018-5918-6 [arXiv:1707.07305 [hep-ph]].
- [13] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], “Test of lepton universality using $B^+ \rightarrow K^+\ell^+\ell^-$ decays,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 151601 (2014) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.113.151601 [arXiv:1406.6482 [hep-ex]].
- [14] M. Bordone, G. Isidori and A. Pattori, “On the Standard Model predictions for R_K and R_{K^*} ,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76**, no. 8, 440 (2016) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-4274-7 [arXiv:1605.07633 [hep-ph]].
- [15] T. Humair (for the LHCb Collaboration), “Lepton Flavor Universality tests with heavy flavour decays at LHCb,” talk given at Moriond, March 22 2019. See also R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], “Search for lepton-universality violation in $B^+ \rightarrow K^+\ell^+\ell^-$ decays,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, no. 19, 191801 (2019) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.122.191801 [arXiv:1903.09252 [hep-ex]].
- [16] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], “Test of lepton universality with $B^0 \rightarrow K^{*0}\ell^+\ell^-$ decays,” *JHEP* **1708**, 055 (2017) doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2017)055 [arXiv:1705.05802 [hep-ex]].
- [17] M. Prim (for the Belle Collaboration), “Search for $B \rightarrow \ell\nu\gamma$ and $B \rightarrow \mu\nu\mu$ and Test of Lepton Universality with $R(K^*)$ at Belle,” talk given at Moriond, March 22 2019. See also A. Abdesselam *et al.* [Belle Collaboration], “Test of lepton flavor universality in $B \rightarrow K^*\ell^+\ell^-$ decays at Belle,” arXiv:1904.02440 [hep-ex].
- [18] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], “Measurement of the $B_s^0 \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ Branching Fraction and Search for $B^0 \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ with the CMS Experiment,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 101804 (2013) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.111.101804 [arXiv:1307.5025 [hep-ex]].
- [19] V. Khachatryan *et al.* [CMS and LHCb Collaborations], “Observation of the rare $B_s^0 \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ decay from the combined analysis of CMS and LHCb data,” *Nature* **522**, 68 (2015) doi:10.1038/nature14474 [arXiv:1411.4413 [hep-ex]].

- [20] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], “Measurement of the $B_s^0 \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ branching fraction and effective lifetime and search for $B^0 \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ decays,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **118**, no. 19, 191801 (2017) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.118.191801 [arXiv:1703.05747 [hep-ex]].
- [21] M. Aaboud *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], “Study of the rare decays of B_s^0 and B^0 mesons into muon pairs using data collected during 2015 and 2016 with the ATLAS detector,” *JHEP* **1904**, 098 (2019) doi:10.1007/JHEP04(2019)098 [arXiv:1812.03017 [hep-ex]].
- [22] A. Datta, J. Kumar and D. London, “The B Anomalies and New Physics in $b \rightarrow se^+e^-$,” *Phys. Lett. B* **797**, 134858 (2019) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2019.134858 [arXiv:1903.10086 [hep-ph]].
- [23] M. Algueró, B. Capdevila, A. Crivellin, S. Descotes-Genon, P. Masjuan, J. Matias and J. Virto, “Emerging patterns of New Physics with and without Lepton Flavour Universal contributions,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79**, no. 8, 714 (2019) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-019-7216-3 [arXiv:1903.09578 [hep-ph]].
- [24] M. Ciuchini, A. M. Coutinho, M. Fedele, E. Franco, A. Paul, L. Silvestrini and M. Valli, “New Physics in $b \rightarrow s\ell^+\ell^-$ confronts new data on Lepton Universality,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79**, no. 8, 719 (2019) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-019-7210-9 [arXiv:1903.09632 [hep-ph]].
- [25] J. Aebischer, W. Altmannshofer, D. Guadagnoli, M. Reboud, P. Stangl and D. M. Straub, “ B -decay discrepancies after Moriond 2019,” arXiv:1903.10434 [hep-ph].
- [26] K. Kowalska, D. Kumar and E. M. Sessolo, “Implications for new physics in $b \rightarrow s\mu\mu$ transitions after recent measurements by Belle and LHCb,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79**, no. 10, 840 (2019) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-019-7330-2 [arXiv:1903.10932 [hep-ph]].
- [27] A. Arbey, T. Hurth, F. Mahmoudi, D. M. Santos and S. Neshatpour, “Update on the $b \rightarrow s$ anomalies,” *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, no. 1, 015045 (2019) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.100.015045 [arXiv:1904.08399 [hep-ph]].
- [28] The Heavy Flavor Averaging Group, <https://hflav.web.cern.ch/>
- [29] A. Abdesselam *et al.* [Belle Collaboration], “Measurement of $\mathcal{R}(D)$ and $\mathcal{R}(D^*)$ with a semileptonic tagging method,” arXiv:1904.08794 [hep-ex].
- [30] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], “Measurement of the ratio of branching fractions $\mathcal{B}(B_c^+ \rightarrow J/\psi\tau^+\nu_\tau)/\mathcal{B}(B_c^+ \rightarrow J/\psi\mu^+\nu_\mu)$,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, no. 12, 121801 (2018) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.120.121801 [arXiv:1711.05623 [hep-ex]].
- [31] R. Watanabe, “New Physics effect on $B_c \rightarrow J/\psi\tau\bar{\nu}$ in relation to the $R_{D^{(*)}}$ anomaly,” *Phys. Lett. B* **776**, 5 (2018) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2017.11.016 [arXiv:1709.08644 [hep-ph]].

- [32] A. K. Alok, B. Bhattacharya, D. Kumar, J. Kumar, D. London and S. U. Sankar, “New physics in $b \rightarrow s\mu^+\mu^-$: Distinguishing models through CP-violating effects,” Phys. Rev. D **96**, no. 1, 015034 (2017) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.96.015034 [arXiv:1703.09247 [hep-ph]].
- [33] R. Alonso, B. Grinstein and J. Martin Camalich, “Lifetime of B_c^- Constrains Explanations for Anomalies in $B \rightarrow D^{(*)}\tau\nu$,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **118**, no. 8, 081802 (2017) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.118.081802 [arXiv:1611.06676 [hep-ph]].
- [34] B. Bhattacharya, A. Datta, S. Kamali and D. London, “CP Violation in $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}\mu^-\bar{\nu}_\mu$,” JHEP **1905**, 191 (2019) doi:10.1007/JHEP05(2019)191 [arXiv:1903.02567 [hep-ph]].
- [35] B. Bhattacharya, A. Datta, D. London and S. Shivashankara, “Simultaneous Explanation of the R_K and $R(D^{(*)})$ Puzzles,” Phys. Lett. B **742**, 370 (2015) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2015.02.011 [arXiv:1412.7164 [hep-ph]].
- [36] B. Bhattacharya, A. Datta, J. P. Guévin, D. London and R. Watanabe, “Simultaneous Explanation of the R_K and $R_{D^{(*)}}$ Puzzles: a Model Analysis,” JHEP **1701**, 015 (2017) doi:10.1007/JHEP01(2017)015 [arXiv:1609.09078 [hep-ph]].
- [37] D. Buttazzo, A. Greljo, G. Isidori and D. Marzocca, “ B -physics anomalies: a guide to combined explanations,” JHEP **1711**, 044 (2017) doi:10.1007/JHEP11(2017)044 [arXiv:1706.07808 [hep-ph]].
- [38] J. Kumar, D. London and R. Watanabe, “Combined Explanations of the $b \rightarrow s\mu^+\mu^-$ and $b \rightarrow c\tau^-\bar{\nu}$ Anomalies: a General Model Analysis,” Phys. Rev. D **99**, no. 1, 015007 (2019) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.99.015007 [arXiv:1806.07403 [hep-ph]].
- [39] C. Cornella, J. Fuentes-Martin and G. Isidori, “Revisiting the vector leptoquark explanation of the B -physics anomalies,” JHEP **1907**, 168 (2019) doi:10.1007/JHEP07(2019)168 [arXiv:1903.11517 [hep-ph]].