

# Measurements of the branching fractions $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}\pi^-)$ and $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}K^-)$ and tests of QCD factorization

(The Belle Collaboration)

We report results for the branching fractions  $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}\pi^-) = (2.62 \pm 0.02 \pm 0.09) \times 10^{-3}$  and  $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}K^-) = (2.22 \pm 0.06 \pm 0.08) \times 10^{-4}$ . The quoted uncertainties are statistical and systematic, respectively. The measurements are performed using  $(771.6 \pm 10.6) \times 10^6$   $B$  meson pairs recorded by the Belle experiment. A measurement of the ratio of these branching fractions is also presented, cancelling systematic uncertainties arising due to the  $D^*$  meson reconstruction;  $\mathcal{R}_{K/\pi} = \mathcal{B}(\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{*+}K^-)/\mathcal{B}(\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{*+}\pi^-) = (8.41 \pm 0.24 \pm 0.13) \times 10^{-2}$ . We report a new QCD factorization test based on the measured ratios for  $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{*+}h^-$  and  $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{*+}\ell^- \nu$  decays at squared momentum transfer values equivalent to the mass of the hadron,  $h^-$ . The parameter  $|a_1(h)|$  is measured to be  $|a_1(\pi)| = 0.884 \pm 0.004 \pm 0.003 \pm 0.016$  in  $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{*+}\pi^-$  decays, and  $|a_1(K)| = 0.913 \pm 0.019 \pm 0.008 \pm 0.013$  in  $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{*+}K^-$  decays. The last uncertainties account for all external inputs. These values are approximately 15% lower than those expected from theoretical predictions. Subsequently, flavor  $SU(3)$  symmetry is tested by measuring the ratios for pions and kaons,  $|a_1(K)|^2/|a_1(\pi)|^2 = 1.066 \pm 0.042 \pm 0.018 \pm 0.023$ , as well as for different particle species. The value is consistent with unity and therefore no evidence for  $SU(3)$  symmetry breaking effects is found to 5% precision in this test.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Hadronic  $B$  decays such as  $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}h^-$ , where  $h = \{\pi, K\}$ , are interesting for a variety of reasons. Their branching fractions are large and therefore large data samples containing them are available for precision measurements. Since the  $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}K^-$  decay contains a virtual  $b \rightarrow cW^-$  and  $W^- \rightarrow \bar{u}s$  transition, its branching fraction is approximately five times smaller than that of  $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}\pi^-$ , which proceeds via a  $W^- \rightarrow \bar{u}d$  transition. Both branching fractions allow for high precision tests of the theoretical framework to calculate hadronic  $B$  decays and to probe for new phenomena in areas including the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) mechanism of quark flavor mixing. The branching fractions of these processes were measured by many experiments such as CLEO [1–5], OPAL [6], ARGUS [7–9], and more recently by BaBar [10–12] and Belle [13]. The ratios of branching fractions allow for a probe into the symmetries of the Standard Model, such as flavor  $SU(3)$ , in such a way that cancels the major systematic uncertainties e.g. those from  $D^{*+}$  reconstruction. Recent measurements of these ratios were reported by BaBar [12], Belle [13], and LHCb [14].

Using the semileptonic decay rates  $d\Gamma(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}\ell\bar{\nu})/dq^2$  at a fixed lepton-momentum transfer,  $q^2 = m_h^2$ , one can measure  $|a_1(q^2)| \equiv |a_1(h)|$ , a fundamental parameter in the description of hadronic  $B$  decays [15]. It is a complex number, whose absolute value can be measured. One finds

$$\Gamma(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}h^-) = 6\pi^2\tau_B|V_{uq}|^2 f_h^2 X_h |a_1(q^2)|^2 \times d\Gamma(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}\ell^-\bar{\nu})/dq^2|_{q^2=m_h^2}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\tau_B$  is the lifetime of the  $B^0$  meson,  $V_{uq}$  the CKM matrix element,  $f_h$  the decay constant of the respective meson, and  $X_h = 1 + \mathcal{O}(m_h^2/m_B^2)$ . Measurement

of  $|a_1(q^2)|$  requires inputs from hadronic and semileptonic branching fractions and has never been performed by a single experiment. Measurements based on results from different experimental sources are in tension with the theoretical predictions [16]. The semileptonic inputs for our measurement are taken from Refs. [17, 18].

### A. The Belle detector and data sample

The analysis is performed using the full  $\Upsilon(4S)$  data sample containing  $(771.6 \pm 10.6) \times 10^6$   $B$  meson pairs recorded with the Belle detector [19, 20] at the KEKB asymmetric-energy  $e^+e^-$  collider [21, 22]. The subdetectors relevant for our study are: a silicon vertex detector, a 50-layer central drift chamber (CDC), an array of aerogel threshold Cherenkov counters (ACC), a barrel-like arrangement of time-of-flight scintillation counters (TOF), and an electromagnetic calorimeter comprised of CsI(Tl) crystals. All these components are located inside a superconducting solenoid coil that provides a 1.5 T magnetic field. The  $z$ -axis is the direction opposite the  $e^+$  beam.

Monte Carlo (MC) simulation studies are performed using a sample corresponding to five times the integrated luminosity of this dataset. The MC sample is generated using the EVTGEN [23], PYTHIA [24], and PHOTOS [25] packages with interference effects due to final-state radiation switched on. We reconstruct candidate events using the Belle II analysis software framework [26], after converting them with the B2BII package [27].

## II. MEASUREMENT OF $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}\pi^-)$ AND $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}K^-)$

### A. Strategy and event reconstruction

We reconstruct  $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}h^-$  decays with a pion mass hypothesis for the charged hadron accompanying the  $D^{*+}$ , which we will refer to as the bachelor hadron. The sample is split into a  $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}\pi^-$  enhanced and a  $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}K^-$  enhanced subsample by suitably requiring kaon-pion identification criteria for the bachelor hadron. As the  $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}K^-$  mode is reconstructed with the pion mass hypothesis it peaks at approximately 48 MeV lower in the energy-difference variable,  $\Delta E = E_B^* - E_{\text{beam}}^*$ , where  $E_B^*$  is the energy of the  $B$  meson and  $E_{\text{beam}}^*$  is the beam energy, evaluated in the center-of-mass frame (denoted by  $*$ ). Thus, peaks from both decays can be fit to simultaneously, which allows for the distribution in a given enhanced subsample to constrain the shape of the distribution of the corresponding depleted subsample where it is considered as a background. We consider only  $D^{*+} \rightarrow D^0\pi^+$  and two specific  $D^0$  decay channels: the highly pure but smaller branching fraction  $D^0 \rightarrow K^-\pi^+$  channel and the less pure but larger branching fraction  $D^0 \rightarrow K^-2\pi^+\pi^-$  channel. When factoring in the efficiency of both channels the expected yields are of the same order of magnitude. This is a blind analysis where the measurement is first optimized using MC simulation and then performed on data with the same selection criteria. Differences between slow-pion reconstruction and particle identification efficiencies in MC simulation and data are corrected using control sample measurements.

Charged particle tracks originating from  $e^+e^-$  collisions are selected by requiring the track impact parameter along the  $z$  axis to be  $|dz| < 4$  cm and a radial distance to the interaction point of  $|dr| < 2$  cm. Information from the CDC, ACC and TOF is used to determine a  $K/\pi$  likelihood ratio  $\mathcal{L}_{K/\pi} = \mathcal{L}_K/(\mathcal{L}_\pi + \mathcal{L}_K)$  for charged particle identification, where  $\mathcal{L}_K$  and  $\mathcal{L}_\pi$  are the likelihoods that a particular track is either a kaon or a pion, respectively. For all high-momentum pions ( $p_T > 200$  MeV/ $c$ ), we require  $\mathcal{L}_{K/\pi} < 0.6$ . Low-momentum ‘slow’ pions ( $p_T \leq 200$  MeV/ $c$ ) from the  $D^{*+} \rightarrow D^0\pi^+$  decay are excluded from these requirements since they have only limited particle identification information. For all kaons, the opposite requirement of  $\mathcal{L}_{K/\pi} \geq 0.6$  is applied.  $D^0$  meson candidates are required to have an invariant mass,  $M$ , within a window of  $\mu(M) - 3\sigma_M < M < \mu(M) + 3\sigma_M$ . The central value,  $\mu(M)$ , is found by a fit to data, where the width,  $\sigma_M$ , is defined as the weighted average of the widths of a double Gaussian function used for the signal probability distribution function (PDF). The value of  $\sigma_M$  is approximately 6 MeV/ $c^2$  in the  $D^0 \rightarrow K^-\pi^+$  channel and 7 MeV/ $c^2$  in the  $D^0 \rightarrow K^-2\pi^+\pi^-$  channel. For the reconstruction of  $D^{*+}$  candidates we require an asymmetric window for the variable  $\Delta M = M(D^{*+}) - M(D^0)$  of  $\mu(\Delta M) - 3\sigma_{\text{left}} < \Delta M < \mu(\Delta M) + 3\sigma_{\text{right}}$ , where

the widths  $\sigma_{\text{left}}, \sigma_{\text{right}}$  are based on weighted averages of a Gaussian and an asymmetric Gaussian function. The widths are approximately 0.7 MeV/ $c^2$ . For  $B^0$  meson candidates we require the beam-energy constrained mass to be  $M_{\text{bc}} = \sqrt{E_{\text{beam}}^{*2}/c^4 - p_B^{*2}/c^2} > 5.27$  GeV/ $c^2$ , where  $p_B^*$  is the momentum of the  $B$  meson in the center-of-mass frame, and the energy difference to be  $-150$  MeV  $< \Delta E < 125$  MeV. The latter is a relatively wide window chosen to simultaneously reconstruct both  $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}\pi^-$  and  $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}K^-$ .

After applying the above selection criteria multiple  $D^{*+}$  candidates are found in approximately 2% of candidate  $B$  events. To select the best  $D^{*+}$  candidate, a minimal  $\chi^2$  based approach is used, with the  $\chi^2$  defined as:

$$\chi^2 = \left( \frac{M(D_{\text{meas}}^0) - m(D_{\text{PDG}}^0)}{\sigma(M)_{\text{meas}}} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{\Delta M(D_{\text{meas}}^{*+}) - \Delta m(D_{\text{PDG}}^{*+})}{\sigma(\Delta M)_{\text{meas}}} \right)^2. \quad (2)$$

Here  $M(D_{\text{meas}}^0)$  and  $m(D_{\text{PDG}}^0)$  denote the reconstructed invariant mass and the world-average mass of the  $D^0$  respectively [28], while  $\sigma(M)_{\text{meas}}$  is the resolution of the reconstructed invariant mass. The mass difference quantities  $\Delta M(D_{\text{meas}}^{*+})$ ,  $\Delta m(D_{\text{PDG}}^{*+})$  and  $\sigma(\Delta M)_{\text{meas}}$  are analogous. After this requirement the fraction of  $B$  candidate events with multiple candidates is much less than 1%. If two candidates have the same  $\chi^2$  value, one is chosen arbitrarily.

To correct for data-MC differences in the kaon-pion separation, two control samples are used:  $D^{*+} \rightarrow D^0(\rightarrow K^-\pi^+)\pi^+$  and  $K_S^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ . In the  $D^{*+}$  sample, efficiencies are obtained by fitting the  $\Delta M$  distributions with and without particle identification criteria using loose track selection, requiring that they originate from near the interaction point. For the  $K_S^0$  sample, a loose track selection is required followed by a requirement that the momentum vector of the  $K_S^0$  and the vector pointing from the interaction point to the decay vertex align. The efficiencies are determined in a simultaneous fit to the  $K_S^0$  invariant mass distributions for candidates that pass and fail the particle identification selection. Both methods are performed in bins of track polar angle and momentum. In the regions covered by the  $D^{*+}$  sample, these results are used, otherwise the results from the  $K_S^0$  sample are taken. If no corrections are available for a given polar angle and momentum then the event is not included in the analysis. Data-MC differences in the slow pion efficiencies are also corrected, and described in detail elsewhere [17]. The final reconstruction efficiencies include corrected particle identification efficiencies and are found to be  $\epsilon(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}\pi^-) = (32.67 \pm 0.12)\%$  and  $\epsilon(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}K^-) = (28.33 \pm 0.42)\%$  for the  $D^0 \rightarrow K^-\pi^+$  modes, and  $\epsilon(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}\pi^-) = (17.85 \pm 0.06)\%$  and  $\epsilon(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}K^-) = (14.98 \pm 0.20)\%$  for the  $D^0 \rightarrow$

$K^-2\pi^+\pi^-$  modes.

## B. Background

The remaining sources of background are from other  $B$  meson decays and from continuum quark-pair production processes ( $e^+e^- \rightarrow q\bar{q}$ ), where  $q$  denotes a light-flavor or (predominantly) charm quark. Continuum background is by far the largest background with relative contributions with respect to the total background of approximately 90% ( $D^0 \rightarrow K^-\pi^+$ ) and 85% ( $D^0 \rightarrow K^-2\pi^+\pi^-$ ) in  $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}K^-$  and approximately 70% ( $D^0 \rightarrow K^-\pi^+$ ) and 60% ( $D^0 \rightarrow K^-2\pi^+\pi^-$ ) in  $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}\pi^-$ .

For the  $D^0 \rightarrow K^-\pi^+$  modes, the largest background contributions from other  $B$  meson decays in  $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}\pi^-$  are due to  $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}\ell^-\bar{\nu}$  ( $\approx 8\%$ ),  $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}\rho^-$  ( $\approx 7\%$ ) and inclusive  $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*0}X$  ( $\approx 4\%$ ) while in  $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}K^-$  these are  $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*0}X$  ( $\approx 2\%$ ) and  $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}\rho^-$  ( $\approx 2\%$ ). In the  $D^0 \rightarrow K^-2\pi^+\pi^-$  modes the dominant non-continuum background contributions in  $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}\pi^-$  are  $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}\rho^-$  ( $\approx 13\%$ ), mis-reconstructed  $D^0$  ( $\approx 10\%$ ) candidates and  $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}\ell^-\bar{\nu}$  ( $\approx 8\%$ ), while in  $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}K^-$  misreconstructed  $D^0$  ( $\approx 5\%$ ) and  $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}\rho^-$  ( $\approx 3\%$ ) dominate.

## C. Signal extraction

The signal yields are determined by a simultaneous unbinned maximum-likelihood fit to the pion-enhanced and depleted samples in  $\Delta E$ , where the same signal PDFs are used in both samples. For  $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}\pi^-$  the signal PDF is modeled by a sum of two Gaussians and a Crystal Ball function [29], while the  $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}K^-$  mode uses a single Gaussian plus Crystal Ball function. The yields, means, and a width resolution parameter common to both modes are allowed to float. The widths of the respective channels are fixed to their MC values, but allowed to float through the common resolution factor,  $\beta$ , that is simultaneously fit, i.e.  $\sigma_i^{\text{data}} = \beta \times \sigma_i^{\text{MC}}$  for each PDF  $i$ . The ratios of the Gaussian and Crystal Ball contributions are fixed, which introduces a small bias ( $< 0.5\%$ ), incorporated as a source of systematic uncertainty.

Continuum background contributions are parameterized with a second-order Chebyshev polynomial where its coefficients are fixed based on fits to MC and verified using an  $M_{bc} < 5.27 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  sideband region. The yield remains free to float in the fit.

Background from  $B$  meson decays are all non-peaking in the  $\Delta E$  signal region and described with PDFs corresponding to each category defined in Sec. II B. Each component is parameterized with Gaussian plus Crystal Ball functions and a single yield is floated for their combined PDF.

The yields obtained from the simultaneous fits are listed in Table I and the fits are shown in Fig. 1 for  $D^0 \rightarrow K^-\pi^+$  and Fig. 2 for  $D^0 \rightarrow K^-2\pi^+\pi^-$ .

The branching fractions are then calculated from the measured signal yield of correctly identified candidates as

$$\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}h^-) = \frac{N_{\text{meas}}(h^-)}{N_{B^0\bar{B}^0} \times \epsilon_h \times \mathcal{B}(D^{*+}) \times \mathcal{B}(D^0)}, \quad (3)$$

where  $\epsilon_h$  is the reconstruction efficiency for a given hadron channel, derived from simulation and corrected for data-MC differences. It has an uncertainty due to the limited number of MC events that are used for its determination. The normalization parameters are the branching fractions  $\mathcal{B}(D^0 \rightarrow K^-2\pi^+\pi^-) = 0.0822 \pm 0.0014$ ,  $\mathcal{B}(D^0 \rightarrow K^-\pi^+) = 0.03946 \pm 0.00030$  and  $\mathcal{B}(D^{*+} \rightarrow D^0\pi^+) = 0.667 \pm 0.005$ , taken from Ref. [28]. The fraction of neutral  $B$  meson decays is  $f(B^0) = 0.486 \pm 0.006$  [28]; the total number of  $B^0$  mesons is given by

$$N(B^0\bar{B}^0) = 2 \times N(B\bar{B}) \times f(B^0), \quad (4)$$

where  $N(B\bar{B}) = (771.6 \pm 10.6) \times 10^6$  is the total number of  $B$  meson pairs recorded at Belle.

## D. Systematic uncertainties

There are five categories of systematic uncertainties: particle identification efficiencies, tracking efficiencies, PDFs, normalization parameters, and MC statistics. There are two types of measurement, branching fractions and ratios of branching fractions. For the latter it can be assumed that many sources of systematic uncertainty are fully correlated, as the only difference between the two channels is the  $K/\pi$  selection of the bachelor hadron. As a result, the correlated quantities cancel and do not need to be considered in the systematic uncertainty estimation.

The first category of systematic uncertainty is based on  $K/\pi$  identification corrections applied in bins of track polar angle and momentum, described in Sec. II A, which contain a statistical uncertainty, a run-independent and a run-dependent systematic uncertainty component. The uncertainty from  $K/\pi$  identification corrections is calculated by varying the measured value by its uncertainty in each correction bin obtained with the calibration samples, taking into account correlations.

An uncertainty associated with the slow pion tracking efficiencies is evaluated based on corrections from a partially reconstructed  $B^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}\pi^+$  calibration sample binned in momentum, with a statistical uncertainty, a bin-uncorrelated and a bin-correlated systematic component. The uncertainty from slow pion tracking efficiency is calculated by varying the measured value by its uncertainty in each correction bin obtained with the calibration sample, taking into account correlations. Track finding efficiencies for high-momentum tracks are attributed

TABLE I: The signal and background event yields and their statistical uncertainties as obtained from the simultaneous fit, broken down by reconstruction channel.

Component	$D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$		$D^0 \rightarrow K^- 2\pi^+ \pi^-$	
	$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+} \pi^-$	$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+} K^-$	$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+} \pi^-$	$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+} K^-$
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+} \pi^-$	$16494 \pm 142$	$1247 \pm 46$	$19500 \pm 162$	$1587 \pm 52$
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+} K^-$	$225 \pm 53$	$1182 \pm 49$	$731 \pm 71$	$1414 \pm 55$
Background	$3390 \pm 115$	$658 \pm 61$	$7067 \pm 185$	$1448 \pm 97$




FIG. 1: Results of the fits to the  $\Delta E$  distributions in the  $D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$  channel of (a)  $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+} K^-$  and (b)  $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+} \pi^-$ .

a flat systematic uncertainty of 0.35% per track, derived from a partially reconstructed  $D^*$  calibration sample.

Uncertainties arising due to PDF parameters determined from fits to MC simulation are considered, which include PDF fractions and shape parameters. The total uncertainty from this contribution is evaluated by varying each fixed parameter at a time by one standard deviation and summing the uncertainties in quadrature. Fit biases are determined with toy MC simulations and the full estimated bias value is assigned as the uncertainty.

The next categories of uncertainties are from normalization parameters, followed by MC statistics. For the branching fractions, the individual contributions are listed in Table II.

For the ratio, only the values indicated with a dagger (†) are considered, for  $K/\pi$  selection these are calculated using only the bachelor hadrons. The total systematic uncertainty is found by summing these contributions in quadrature, under the assumption they are uncorrelated. The  $D^0$  channels are combined by taking the average of measurements using the correlation coefficient,  $\rho$ , as given in Table II. There are three cases of possible correlation between related measurements: no correlation, partial or full correlation. For the tracking correlation coefficients we use the ratio of number of tracks:  $N_{\text{tracks}}(D^0 \rightarrow K\pi)/N_{\text{tracks}}(D^0 \rightarrow K3\pi) = 3/5$ . The slow pion from the  $D^{*+}$  decay is common to both channels and is treated separately due to its large uncer-

tainty. For the  $\pi$ -ID we use the ratio of the number of pions in the reconstructed decay channels, excluding the slow pion.

### E. Branching fraction results

The results of the fit, and a comparison to theoretical predictions and prior measurements are shown in Fig. 3 for the branching fraction and Fig. 4 for their ratio. The numerical values are listed in Table III. For future updates of the  $D^*$  and  $D^0$  meson branching fractions we give results for the products  $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+} h^-) \times \mathcal{B}(D^{*+}) \times \mathcal{B}(D^0) = N_{\text{meas}}(h^-)/(N_{B^0 \bar{B}^0} \times \epsilon_h)$  in Table IV.

For  $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+} K^-)$  the results are compatible with the previous Belle measurement performed on a  $10.6 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  dataset [13]. Both the statistical and systematic uncertainties improved due to a larger dataset and better understanding of the detector. The values are compared to two theory models, and when taking uncertainties from experiment and theory into account, the deviation is  $1.0\sigma$  for Huber et al. at Next-to-Next-to-Leading-Order (NNLO) [30] and  $2.7\sigma$  for the Bordone et al. [31] NNLO prediction. The same evaluation is made for  $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+} \pi^-)$ . The discrepancy with respect to the theoretical value is  $1.7\sigma$  for Huber et al. [30] at NNLO. For






FIG. 2: Results of the fits to the  $\Delta E$  distributions in the  $D^0 \rightarrow K^- 2\pi^+ \pi^-$  channel of (a)  $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+} K^-$  and (b)  $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+} \pi^-$ .

the ratio  $\mathcal{R}_{K/\pi} = \mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+} K^-) / \mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+} \pi^-)$  a discrepancy of  $2.7\sigma$  to Ref. [30] is found. The total experimental uncertainty on this ratio is 3.2%, which is lower than BaBar (5.7%) [12] and LHCb (5.5%) [14].

### III. MEASUREMENT OF $|a_1(h)|$

Quantum Chromodynamic (QCD) factorization predicts  $|a_1(h)| = 1$  in its most naive picture. Taking higher order corrections into account one expects a quasi-universal value of  $|a_1(h)| = 1.05$  [15], independent of the final state hadron,  $h$ .

The values for  $d\Gamma(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+} \ell^- \bar{\nu})/dq^2$  are directly extracted from an untagged Belle measurement [17]. The semileptonic differential decay rate is determined by fits using both the Caprini-Lellouch-Neubert (CLN) [32] and Boyd-Grinstein-Lebed (BGL) [33] parameterizations using additional constraints from Lattice QCD (LQCD) calculations of form factors at nonzero recoil, as described in Ref. [18]. Two independent sources of LQCD calculations were included so that any dependence on the inputs could be tested. These inputs were from the Fermilab-MILC collaboration [34], using nine different values, and JLQCD [35] with four. A comparison of the differential decay rates is shown in Fig. 5 for the CLN noHQs configuration using JLQCD inputs and BGL(2,2,2) in both JLQCD and Fermilab-MILC. Each of the differential decay rates is consistent within the uncertainty bands. The BGL(2,2,2) configuration was taken as the nominal result as it is more model-independent than CLN, and lattice inputs from Fermilab-MILC were included due to more values being available with a robust uncertainty estimation. Further inputs used in the evaluation of  $|a_1(h)|$  (Eq. 1) are listed in Table V, and are taken from Ref. [28]. The parameter  $X_h$  depends on the spin of  $h$ :  $X_h = 1$  for vector mesons and  $X_h = 1 \pm m_h^2/m_B^2$  for non-vector

mesons.

#### A. Testing $SU(3)$ symmetry

Further tests are performed to check whether  $|a_1(h)|$  is a universal factor independent of the quarks involved in the hadronic transition. A value of  $|a_1(K)|^2 / |a_1(\pi)|^2 = 1$  would imply that  $SU(3)$  symmetry holds as suggested in Ref. [15]. The test is done by measuring the ratios of  $|a_1(h)|$  for different particles species, i.e. for  $K$  and  $\pi$ :

$$\frac{|a_1(K)|^2}{|a_1(\pi)|^2} = \frac{|V_{ud}|^2 f_\pi^2 X_\pi R_{K/\pi}}{|V_{us}|^2 f_K^2 X_K} \left( \frac{d\Gamma(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+} \ell^- \bar{\nu})/dq^2|_{q^2=m_\pi^2}}{d\Gamma(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+} \ell^- \bar{\nu})/dq^2|_{q^2=m_K^2}} \right) \quad (5)$$

Two sets of ratios are performed: ratios based on hadronic branching fractions measured in this paper ( $h = K, \pi$ ), and ratios based on branching fractions listed in Ref. [28] ( $h = \rho, K^*, a_1$ )<sup>1</sup>.

#### B. Systematic uncertainties

For the ratios performed with Belle data ( $h = K, \pi$ ) many systematic uncertainties are fully correlated and

<sup>1</sup> Where  $a_1$  is written as a function of  $q^2$  or  $h$  it refers to the QCD factorization parameter, and when it is written alone it refers to the meson  $a_1^+(1260)$ .

TABLE II: Breakdown of the statistical and systematic uncertainties. The total is determined assuming zero correlations between the individual uncertainties. The entries marked with a † propagate into the ratio while others cancel. The correlation coefficient used to combine the channels is denoted as  $\rho$ . In the  $\rho$  column the first value for the  $\pi$ -ID systematic uncertainties is for the  $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{*+}\pi^-$  combination and the second is for the  $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{*+}K^-$  combination.

type	$D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$		$D^0 \rightarrow K^- 2\pi^+ \pi^-$		Combined		$\rho$
	$\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{*+}\pi^-$	$\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{*+}K^-$	$\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{*+}\pi^-$	$\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{*+}K^-$	$\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{*+}\pi^-$	$\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{*+}K^-$	
$\pi$ -ID stat.	0.78% 0.72%†	0.54%	0.95% 0.65%†	0.20%	0.75% 0.58%†	0.32%	2/4, 1/3
$\pi$ -ID sys.	0.60% 0.44%†	0.27%	0.52% 0.46%†	0.20%	0.49% 0.41%†	0.19%	2/4, 1/3
$K$ -ID stat.	0.76%	1.05% 0.72%†	0.72%	1.03% 0.72%†	0.74%	1.04% 0.64%†	1
$K$ -ID sys.	0.53%	1.15% 0.61%†	0.57%	0.62% 0.62%†	0.55%	0.89% 0.55%†	1
$K$ -ID run dep. sys.	0.30%	0.30%	0.30%	0.30%	0.30%	0.30%	1
$\pi_{\text{slow}}$ stat.	0.79%	0.79%	0.79%	0.79%	0.79%	0.79%	1
$\pi_{\text{slow}}$ sys.	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	1
$\pi_{\text{slow}}$ corr.	1.33%	1.33%	1.33%	1.33%	1.33%	1.33%	1
Tracking sys.	1.05%	1.05%	1.75%	1.75%	1.26%	1.26%	3/5
Fixed yields bkg. PDF	0.10%†	0.10%†	0.10%†	0.10%†	0.07%†	0.07%†	0
Fixed shapes bkg. PDF	0.10%†	0.10%†	0.10%†	0.10%†	0.07%†	0.07%†	0
Fit bias	0.15%†	0.15%†	0.08%†	0.74%†	0.09%†	0.37%†	0
$N_{\bar{B}^0 B^0}$	1.84%	1.84%	1.84%	1.84%	1.84%	1.84%	1
$\mathcal{B}(D^{*+} \rightarrow D^0 \pi^+)$	0.74%	0.74%	0.74%	0.74%	0.74%	0.74%	1
$\mathcal{B}(D^0)$	0.78%	0.78%	1.70%	1.70%	0.94%	0.94%	0
MC stat.	0.39%†	1.40%†	0.35%†	1.39%†	0.26%†	0.99%†	0
Total sys. ( $\mathcal{B}$ )	3.20%	3.60%	3.82%	4.06%	3.26%	3.47%	
Total sys. (ratio)	1.93%	1.93%	1.89%	1.89%	1.50%	1.50%	
Total stat. err.	0.84%	4.00%	0.78%	3.70%	0.57%	2.74%	

TABLE III: Results of the branching fraction and their ratios. The first uncertainty is statistical and the second is systematic. The last column lists the discrepancy with theoretical predictions in terms of standard deviations,  $\sigma$ , taking into account experimental and theoretical uncertainties. The comparisons without parentheses are with respect to Huber et al. [30], and those with parentheses are with respect to Bordone et al. [31].

$\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}\pi^-)$	Result	$n\sigma$ meas.–theo.
$D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$	$(2.607 \pm 0.023 \pm 0.083) \times 10^{-3}$	1.8
$D^0 \rightarrow K^- 2\pi^+ \pi^-$	$(2.640 \pm 0.022 \pm 0.101) \times 10^{-3}$	1.7
Combined	$(2.623 \pm 0.016 \pm 0.086) \times 10^{-3}$	1.7
$\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}K^-)$		
$D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$	$(2.154 \pm 0.089 \pm 0.078) \times 10^{-4}$	1.1 (2.7)
$D^0 \rightarrow K^- 2\pi^+ \pi^-$	$(2.287 \pm 0.088 \pm 0.093) \times 10^{-4}$	0.7 (2.4)
Combined	$(2.221 \pm 0.063 \pm 0.077) \times 10^{-4}$	0.9 (2.6)
$\mathcal{R}_{K/\pi}$		
$D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$	$(8.26 \pm 0.35 \pm 0.16) \times 10^{-2}$	1.8
$D^0 \rightarrow K^- 2\pi^+ \pi^-$	$(8.56 \pm 0.34 \pm 0.16) \times 10^{-2}$	2.5
Combined	$(8.41 \pm 0.24 \pm 0.13) \times 10^{-2}$	2.7

cancel in the evaluation of  $|a_1(h)|$  and the ratios of  $|a_1(h)|$  evaluated with different hadron species. Furthermore, it was verified that external input parameters match, in particular  $\mathcal{B}(D^*)$  and  $\mathcal{B}(D^0)$ . This means that for

$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}h^-$  only the  $K/\pi$  selection of the bachelor hadron, fit PDF parameters, fit bias, and MC statistical uncertainty are considered. For  $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}\ell^- \bar{\nu}$  we consider PDF related uncertainties, statistical uncertainties, as well as lepton identification, fake  $e/\mu$  rates and the  $D^{**}$

TABLE IV: Results for  $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+} h^-) \times \mathcal{B}(D^{*+}) \times \mathcal{B}(D^0) = N_{\text{meas}}(h^-)/(N_{B^0 \bar{B}^0} \times \epsilon_h)$ . The first uncertainty value is statistical and the second is systematic.

	$D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$	$D^0 \rightarrow K^- 2\pi^+ \pi^-$
$B^0 \rightarrow D^{*+} \pi^-$	$(6.862 \pm 0.058 \pm 0.206) \times 10^{-5}$	$(1.509 \pm 0.012 \pm 0.046) \times 10^{-4}$
$B^0 \rightarrow D^{*+} K^-$	$(5.671 \pm 0.227 \pm 0.195) \times 10^{-6}$	$(1.307 \pm 0.048 \pm 0.040) \times 10^{-5}$




FIG. 3: Comparison of the branching fraction ratio measurements using the full data sample and the data sub-samples with respect to previous measurements by (a) Belle [13] and BaBar [12], and (b) BaBar [10, 11] and CLEO-II [5]. The theoretical predictions are taken from Refs. [30, 31]. The inner uncertainty is the statistical uncertainty and the outer is the quadrature sum of both statistical and systematic uncertainties.

branching fractions and form factors as sources of systematic uncertainties. The numerical values can be found in Ref. [17]. For all calculations featuring the mesons  $h = \rho, K^*, a_1$ , the full systematic uncertainty is taken. For ratios of  $|a_1(h_1)|^2/|a_1(h_2)|^2$ , where  $h_1$  and  $h_2$  are different particle types, it is crucial to also account for the correlation between different  $q^2$  points in the  $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+} \ell^- \bar{\nu}$  spectrum. These correlations are found from the toy MC samples provided by the authors of Ref. [18] and are listed in Table VI. We also note that the hadronic recoil binning for the semileptonic differential decay rate has both  $q^2 = M^2(\pi^-)$  and  $M^2(K^-)$  contained within the same bin, resulting in a full correlation between their corresponding  $|a_1(h)|$  values. A breakdown of the relative error contributions for the  $|a_1(h)|$  and  $|a_1(h_1)|^2/|a_1(h_2)|^2$  measurements for pions and kaons is listed in Table VII.

### C. Results for $|a_1(h)|$

The results for  $|a_1(h)|$  are given in Table VIII, and compared to theoretical prediction and previous evaluations in Fig. 6.

For  $|a_1(\rho^-)|$ ,  $|a_1(K^{*-})|$  and  $|a_1(a_1^-)|$  the hadronic  $B$  decay branching fractions are taken from Ref. [28]. The values of the charm decay branching fractions in these channels have not been corrected to more recent values

as the assumed values are not provided in the respective publications. The results from these channels are shown only for reference.

The deviation between the values determined by experiment and the theoretical prediction is evaluated as  $d = x_{\text{meas.}} - x_{\text{theo.}}$ , where the uncertainties are propagated.

Nominal values of  $|a_1(\pi^-)| = 0.884 \pm 0.004 \pm 0.003 \pm 0.016$  from  $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{*+} \pi^-$  and  $|a_1(K^-)| = 0.913 \pm 0.019 \pm 0.008 \pm 0.013$  from  $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{*+} K^-$  are found based on BGL(2, 2, 2) using Fermilab-MILC LQCD input. The first uncertainty is the statistical one from the hadronic branching fraction measurement, the second is the systematic uncertainty, and the final includes the semileptonic input uncertainty and all other Standard Model uncertainties. Compared to values found by BaBar data in Ref. [16], of  $|a_1(\pi^-)| = 0.98 \pm 0.04$  and  $|a_1(K^-)| = 0.96 \pm 0.05$ , this corresponds to an improvement on the total uncertainty for the pion channel of 4.0% down to 2.2% and for the kaon channel from 5.2% down to 2.7%, and a shift of the central values towards lower values.

For  $|a_1(\pi^-)|$  and  $|a_1(K^-)|$  the large observed deviation can imply a large, 13–16% non-factorizable contribution to the matrix elements, new physics contributions to the Wilson Coefficients, [36, 37] or both. Theoretical analyses of non-factorizable contributions in  $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K_S^0$

TABLE V: Input parameters for the  $|a_1(h)|$  calculation taken from Ref. [28]. Values used exclusively in the determination of the semileptonic decay rates not listed here are taken from Ref. [18].

Description	Parameter	Value
Lifetime	$\tau_{B^0}$	$(1.519 \pm 0.004)$ ps
CKM matrix element	$ V_{ud} $	$0.97370 \pm 0.00010$
	$ V_{us} $	$0.02231 \pm 0.0004$
Decay constants	$f_\pi$	$(0.1302 \pm 0.0012)$ GeV/ $c^2$
	$f_K$	$(0.1556 \pm 0.0004)$ GeV/ $c^2$
	$f_\rho$	$(0.216 \pm 0.006)$ GeV/ $c^2$
	$f_{K^*}$	$(0.211 \pm 0.007)$ GeV/ $c^2$
	$f_{a_1}$	$(0.238 \pm 0.01)$ GeV/ $c^2$
	$f_D$	$(0.2119 \pm 0.0011)$ GeV/ $c^2$
	$X_h$	$1 \pm 0.0007$
Branching fraction	$\mathcal{B}(\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{*+} \rho^-)$	$(6.8 \pm 0.9) \times 10^{-3}$
	$\mathcal{B}(\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{*+} K^{*-})$	$(3.3 \pm 0.6) \times 10^{-4}$
	$\mathcal{B}(\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{*+} a_1^-)$	$(1.30 \pm 0.27) \times 10^{-2}$
Masses	$m(\pi^+)$	$(0.13957039 \pm 0.00000018)$ GeV/ $c^2$
	$m(K^+)$	$(0.493677 \pm 0.000016)$ GeV/ $c^2$
	$m(\rho^+)$	$(0.77526 \pm 0.00025)$ GeV/ $c^2$
	$m(K^{*+})$	$(0.89167 \pm 0.00026)$ GeV/ $c^2$
	$m(a_1^+)$	$(1.230 \pm 0.040)$ GeV/ $c^2$




FIG. 4: Comparison of the branching fraction ratio measurements using the full data sample and the data sub-samples with respect to previous measurements by BaBar [12], LHCb [14] and the theoretical prediction from Ref. [30]. The inner uncertainty is the statistical uncertainty and the outer is the quadrature sum of both statistical and systematic uncertainties.

decays suggest contributions of the size  $O(10^{-3})$  [38], which is also in clear disagreement with the result obtained above.

The results for  $|a_1(K^-)|^2/|a_1(\pi^-)|^2$  are listed in Table IX. The value of  $|a_1(K^-)|^2/|a_1(\pi^-)|^2 = 1.066 \pm 0.042 \pm 0.018 \pm 0.023$  is found to be consistent with  $SU(3)$  symmetry. Furthermore, the ratio is calculated for different particle species, which also agree with  $SU(3)$  symmetry. Systematic uncertainties related to  $D^*$  reconstruction cancel as both measurements are performed with the




FIG. 5: Semileptonic decay rates  $d\Gamma(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+} \ell^- \bar{\nu})/dq^2$  as a function of dilepton invariant mass squared determined from fits to Belle data and lattice QCD inputs from Fermilab-MILC and JLQCD, based on the method described in Ref. [18].

same Belle data set.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

Measurements of branching fractions of  $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+} \pi^-) = (2.62 \pm 0.02 \pm 0.09) \times 10^{-3}$  and  $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+} K^-) = (2.22 \pm 0.06 \pm 0.08) \times 10^{-4}$ , as well as their ratio  $R_{K/\pi} = \mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+} K^-)/\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+} \pi^-) = (8.41 \pm 0.24 \pm 0.13) \times 10^{-2}$  are presented. These are the first measurements of  $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+} \pi^-)$  and  $R_{K/\pi}$



TABLE VI: Correlations of  $d\Gamma(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+} \ell^- \bar{\nu})/dq^2$  between different  $q^2 = m_{\text{particle}}^2$  points.

BGL F-MILC	$\pi^-$	$K^-$	$\rho^-$	$K^{*-}$	$a_1^-$
$\pi^-$	1.000	0.996	0.977	0.960	0.874
$K^-$		1.000	0.991	0.980	0.911
$\rho^-$			1.000	0.998	0.957
$K^{*-}$				1.000	0.974
$a_1^-$					1.000
BGL JLQCD	$\pi^-$	$K^-$	$\rho^-$	$K^{*-}$	$a_1^-$
$\pi^-$	1.000	0.994	0.956	0.918	0.713
$K^-$		1.000	0.982	0.956	0.783
$\rho^-$			1.000	0.994	0.886
$K^{*-}$				1.000	0.931
$a_1^-$					1.000
CLN JLQCD	$\pi^-$	$K^-$	$\rho^-$	$K^{*-}$	$a_1^-$
$\pi^-$	1.000	0.992	0.941	0.891	0.623
$K^-$		1.000	0.976	0.940	0.713
$\rho^-$			1.000	0.992	0.848
$K^{*-}$				1.000	0.909
$a_1^-$					1.000




FIG. 6: The extracted values of  $|a_1(h)|$  from  $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+} h^-$ ,  $h = \pi, \rho, K^*, a_1$  using the three semileptonic input scenarios described in the text. The theory predictions are taken from Refs. [15, 30].

from Belle and the most precise on  $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+} K^-)$ , superseding previous results. They are used to measure  $|a_1(h)|$  with the aim of performing a high precision test of QCD factorization. The measurements of  $|a_1(\pi^-)| = 0.884 \pm 0.004 \pm 0.003 \pm 0.016$  and  $|a_1(K^-)| = 0.913 \pm 0.019 \pm 0.008 \pm 0.013$  are the first performed within a single experiment, cancelling many experimental systematic uncertainties. For the measurement of  $|a_1(h)|$  we use BGL(2, 2, 2) with Fermilab-MILC inputs as it provides the least model-dependent choice with the most robust error analysis. All measured values of  $|a_1(h)|$  are found to be several standard deviations smaller than the theory prediction. In the ratios of  $|a_1(h_1)|^2/|a_1(h_2)|^2$  for different particle types  $h$ , it is found that all of these are consistent with unity within one standard deviation. This indicates that  $|a_1(h)|$  is indeed a universal quantity and  $SU(3)$  symmetry holds in hadronic  $B$  decays.

## V. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank the KEKB group for the excellent operation of the accelerator; the KEK cryogenics group for the efficient operation of the solenoid.

- 
- [1] D. Bortoletto *et al.* (CLEO Collaboration), Inclusive and exclusive decays of  $B$  mesons to final states including charm and charmonium mesons, *Phys. Rev.* **D45**, 21 (1992).
  - [2] C. Bebek *et al.* (CLEO Collaboration), Exclusive decays and masses of the  $B$  mesons, *Phys. Rev.* **D36**, 1289 (1987).
  - [3] R. Giles *et al.* (CLEO Collaboration), Two-body decays of  $B$  mesons, *Phys. Rev.* **D30**, 2279 (1984).
  - [4] M. S. Alam *et al.* (CLEO Collaboration), Exclusive hadronic  $B$  decays to charm and charmonium final states, *Phys. Rev.* **D50**, 43 (1994), arXiv:hep-ph/9403295 [hep-ph].
  - [5] G. Brandenburg *et al.* (CLEO Collaboration), A New measurement of  $b \rightarrow D^* \pi$  branching fractions, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 2762 (1998), arXiv:hep-ex/9706019.
  - [6] R. Akers *et al.* (OPAL Collaboration), Observation of exclusive decays of  $B$  mesons at LEP, *Phys. Lett.* **B337**, 196 (1994).

TABLE VII: A breakdown of the contributions to the total error for  $|a_1(h)|$  and  $|a_1(h_1)|^2/|a_1(h_2)|^2$  measurements, given as a percentage relative to the corresponding nominal value. The hadronic uncertainties estimated from the  $\Gamma(\bar{B}_d \rightarrow D^{*+}h^-)$  study are separated into statistical and systematic categories, otherwise they are combined. The ‘Other’ category combines all uncertainties from Standard Model constants.

Measurement	Hadronic		Combined Semileptonic			Other
	stat.	sys.	BGL, F-MILC	BGL, JLQCD	CLN, JLQCD	
$ a_1(\pi^-) $	0.4	0.3	1.5	2.1	2.0	1.1
$ a_1(K^-) $	2.1	0.9	1.4	1.8	1.8	0.4
$ a_1(\rho^-) $	6.6		1.3	1.5	1.4	2.8
$ a_1(K^{*-}) $	9.1		1.3	1.4	1.3	3.3
$ a_1(a_1^-) $	10.4		1.2	1.1	1.1	4.2
$ a_1(K^-) ^2/ a_1(\pi^-) ^2$	4.2	1.8	0.3	0.7	0.7	2.2
$ a_1(\rho^-) ^2/ a_1(\pi^-) ^2$	13.3		0.7	1.5	1.7	6.0
$ a_1(K^{*-}) ^2/ a_1(\pi^-) ^2$	18.2		0.9	1.9	2.1	7.0
$ a_1(a_1^-) ^2/ a_1(\pi^-) ^2$	20.8		1.5	3.0	3.2	8.7
$ a_1(\rho^-) ^2/ a_1(K^-) ^2$	14.0		0.4	0.9	1.0	5.6
$ a_1(K^{*-}) ^2/ a_1(K^-) ^2$	18.7		0.6	1.3	1.4	6.7
$ a_1(a_1^-) ^2/ a_1(K^-) ^2$	21.2		1.2	2.3	2.5	8.4
$ a_1(K^{*-}) ^2/ a_1(\rho^-) ^2$	22.5		0.2	0.4	0.4	8.7
$ a_1(a_1^-) ^2/ a_1(\rho^-) ^2$	24.6		0.8	1.4	1.5	10.1
$ a_1(a_1^-) ^2/ a_1(K^{*-}) ^2$	27.6		0.6	1.0	1.1	10.7

TABLE VIII: The extracted values of  $|a_1(h)|$  for  $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}h^-$ ,  $h = \pi, \rho, K^*, a_1$ , and the three semileptonic input scenarios described in the text. The deviations are calculated with respect to predictions in Ref. [30] and take both the experimental and theoretical uncertainties into account.

	Model	$ a_1(h) $	$n\sigma$ (meas.-theo.)
$\pi^-$	BGL(2,2,2), F-MILC	$0.884 \pm 0.016$	8.9 ( $-18 \pm 2$ )%
$\pi^-$	BGL(2,2,2), JLQCD	$0.905 \pm 0.021$	6.7 ( $-16 \pm 2$ )%
$\pi^-$	CLNnoHQs, JLQCD	$0.897 \pm 0.021$	7.1 ( $-16 \pm 2$ )%
$K^-$	BGL(2,2,2), F-MILC	$0.913 \pm 0.024$	5.8 ( $-15 \pm 3$ )%
$K^-$	BGL(2,2,2), JLQCD	$0.930 \pm 0.027$	4.7 ( $-13 \pm 3$ )%
$K^-$	CLNnoHQs, JLQCD	$0.924 \pm 0.026$	5.0 ( $-14 \pm 3$ )%
$\rho^-$	BGL(2,2,2), F-MILC	$0.826 \pm 0.061$	3.6 ( $-22 \pm 5$ )%
$\rho^-$	BGL(2,2,2), JLQCD	$0.837 \pm 0.062$	3.4 ( $-21 \pm 6$ )%
$\rho^-$	CLNnoHQs, JLQCD	$0.834 \pm 0.062$	3.4 ( $-21 \pm 6$ )%
$K^{*-}$	BGL(2,2,2), F-MILC	$0.803 \pm 0.079$	3.1 ( $-24 \pm 8$ )%
$K^{*-}$	BGL(2,2,2), JLQCD	$0.812 \pm 0.080$	3.0 ( $-23 \pm 8$ )%
$K^{*-}$	CLNnoHQs, JLQCD	$0.810 \pm 0.080$	3.0 ( $-23 \pm 8$ )%
$a_1^-$	BGL(2,2,2), F-MILC	$0.980 \pm 0.111$	0.7 ( $-7 \pm 11$ )%
$a_1^-$	BGL(2,2,2), JLQCD	$0.983 \pm 0.111$	0.6 ( $-7 \pm 11$ )%
$a_1^-$	CLNnoHQs, JLQCD	$0.984 \pm 0.111$	0.6 ( $-7 \pm 11$ )%

- [7] H. Albrecht *et al.* (ARGUS Collaboration), Reconstruction of B Mesons, *Phys. Lett. B* **185**, 218 (1987).
- [8] H. Albrecht *et al.* (ARGUS Collaboration), Determination of the branching ratio for the decay  $B^0 \rightarrow D^{*-}\pi^+$ , *Phys. Lett. B* **182**, 95 (1986).
- [9] H. Albrecht *et al.* (ARGUS Collaboration), Exclusive hadronic decays of B mesons, *Z. Phys. C* **48**, 543 (1990).
- [10] B. Aubert *et al.* (BaBar Collaboration), Measurement of the absolute branching fractions  $B \rightarrow D\pi, D^*\pi$  with a missing mass method, *Phys. Rev. D* **74**, 111102 (2006), [arXiv:hep-ex/0609033 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [11] B. Aubert *et al.* (BaBar Collaboration), Branching fraction measurement of  $B^0 \rightarrow D^{(*)} + \pi^-$ ,  $B^- \rightarrow D^{(*)}0\pi^-$  and isospin analysis of  $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{(*)}\pi$  decays, *Phys. Rev. D* **75**, 031101 (2007), [arXiv:hep-ex/0610027](#).
- [12] B. Aubert *et al.* (BaBar Collaboration), Measurement of branching fractions and resonance contributions for  $B^0 \rightarrow \bar{D}^0 K^+ \pi^-$  and search for  $B^0 \rightarrow D^0 K^+ \pi^-$  decays, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 011803 (2006), [arXiv:hep-ex/0509036 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [13] K. Abe *et al.* (Belle Collaboration), Observation of Cabibbo suppressed  $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{(*)}K^-$  decays at Belle, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 111801 (2001), [arXiv:hep-ex/0104051 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [14] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb Collaboration), Study of  $B^0 \rightarrow D^{*-}\pi^+\pi^-\pi^+$  and  $B^0 \rightarrow D^{*-}K^+\pi^-\pi^+$  decays, *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 092001 (2013), [arXiv:1303.6861 \[hep-ex\]](#).

TABLE IX: The extracted values of the double ratio  $|a_1(h_1)|^2/|a_1(h_2)|^2$  for  $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}h^-$ ,  $h = \pi, \rho, K^*, a_1$  using the three semileptonic input scenarios described in the text.

Model	Ratio	Result
BGL(2,2,2), F-MILC	$ a_1(K^-) ^2/ a_1(\pi^-) ^2$	$1.066 \pm 0.054$
BGL(2,2,2), JLQCD	$ a_1(K^-) ^2/ a_1(\pi^-) ^2$	$1.057 \pm 0.054$
CLN noHQS, JLQCD	$ a_1(K^-) ^2/ a_1(\pi^-) ^2$	$1.061 \pm 0.054$
BGL(2,2,2), F-MILC	$ a_1(\rho^-) ^2/ a_1(\pi^-) ^2$	$0.87 \pm 0.13$
BGL(2,2,2), JLQCD	$ a_1(\rho^-) ^2/ a_1(\pi^-) ^2$	$0.86 \pm 0.13$
CLN noHQS, JLQCD	$ a_1(\rho^-) ^2/ a_1(\pi^-) ^2$	$0.87 \pm 0.13$
BGL(2,2,2), F-MILC	$ a_1(K^{*-}) ^2/ a_1(\pi^-) ^2$	$0.83 \pm 0.16$
BGL(2,2,2), JLQCD	$ a_1(K^{*-}) ^2/ a_1(\pi^-) ^2$	$0.81 \pm 0.16$
CLN noHQS, JLQCD	$ a_1(K^{*-}) ^2/ a_1(\pi^-) ^2$	$0.82 \pm 0.16$
BGL(2,2,2), F-MILC	$ a_1(a_1^-) ^2/ a_1(\pi^-) ^2$	$1.23 \pm 0.28$
BGL(2,2,2), JLQCD	$ a_1(a_1^-) ^2/ a_1(\pi^-) ^2$	$1.18 \pm 0.27$
CLN noHQS, JLQCD	$ a_1(a_1^-) ^2/ a_1(\pi^-) ^2$	$1.20 \pm 0.27$
BGL(2,2,2), F-MILC	$ a_1(\rho^-) ^2/ a_1(K^-) ^2$	$0.82 \pm 0.12$
BGL(2,2,2), JLQCD	$ a_1(\rho^-) ^2/ a_1(K^-) ^2$	$0.81 \pm 0.12$
CLN noHQS, JLQCD	$ a_1(\rho^-) ^2/ a_1(K^-) ^2$	$0.82 \pm 0.12$
BGL(2,2,2), F-MILC	$ a_1(K^{*-}) ^2/ a_1(K^-) ^2$	$0.77 \pm 0.15$
BGL(2,2,2), JLQCD	$ a_1(K^{*-}) ^2/ a_1(K^-) ^2$	$0.76 \pm 0.15$
CLN noHQS, JLQCD	$ a_1(K^{*-}) ^2/ a_1(K^-) ^2$	$0.77 \pm 0.15$
BGL(2,2,2), F-MILC	$ a_1(a_1^-) ^2/ a_1(K^-) ^2$	$1.15 \pm 0.26$
BGL(2,2,2), JLQCD	$ a_1(a_1^-) ^2/ a_1(K^-) ^2$	$1.12 \pm 0.26$
CLN noHQS, JLQCD	$ a_1(a_1^-) ^2/ a_1(K^-) ^2$	$1.13 \pm 0.26$
BGL(2,2,2), F-MILC	$ a_1(K^{*-}) ^2/ a_1(\rho^-) ^2$	$0.94 \pm 0.23$
BGL(2,2,2), JLQCD	$ a_1(K^{*-}) ^2/ a_1(\rho^-) ^2$	$0.94 \pm 0.23$
CLN noHQS, JLQCD	$ a_1(K^{*-}) ^2/ a_1(\rho^-) ^2$	$0.94 \pm 0.23$
BGL(2,2,2), F-MILC	$ a_1(a_1^-) ^2/ a_1(\rho^-) ^2$	$1.41 \pm 0.36$
BGL(2,2,2), JLQCD	$ a_1(a_1^-) ^2/ a_1(\rho^-) ^2$	$1.38 \pm 0.37$
CLN noHQS, JLQCD	$ a_1(a_1^-) ^2/ a_1(\rho^-) ^2$	$1.39 \pm 0.37$
BGL(2,2,2), F-MILC	$ a_1(a_1^-) ^2/ a_1(K^{*-}) ^2$	$1.49 \pm 0.44$
BGL(2,2,2), JLQCD	$ a_1(a_1^-) ^2/ a_1(K^{*-}) ^2$	$1.47 \pm 0.44$
CLN noHQS, JLQCD	$ a_1(a_1^-) ^2/ a_1(K^{*-}) ^2$	$1.48 \pm 0.44$

- [15] M. Beneke, G. Buchalla, M. Neubert, and C. T. Sachrajda, QCD factorization for exclusive, nonleptonic B meson decays: General arguments and the case of heavy light final states, *Nucl. Phys. B* **591**, 313 (2000), [arXiv:hep-ph/0006124](#).
- [16] R. Fleischer, N. Serra, and N. Tuning, Tests of factorization and  $SU(3)$  relations in  $B$  decays into heavy-light final states, *Phys. Rev. D* **83**, 014017 (2011), [arXiv:1012.2784 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [17] E. Waheed, P. Urquijo, D. Ferlewicz, *et al.* (Belle Collaboration), Measurement of the CKM matrix element  $|V_{cb}|$  from  $B^0 \rightarrow D^{*-}\ell^+\nu$  at Belle, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 052007 (2019).
- [18] D. Ferlewicz, P. Urquijo, and E. Waheed, Revisiting fits to  $B^0 \rightarrow D^{*-}\ell^+\nu_\ell$  to measure  $|V_{cb}|$  with novel methods and preliminary LQCD data at nonzero recoil, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 073005 (2021), [arXiv:2008.09341 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [19] A. Abashian *et al.*, The Belle Detector, *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A* **479**, 117 (2002).
- [20] J. Brodzicka *et al.* (Belle Collaboration), Physics Achievements from the Belle Experiment, *PTEP* **2012**, 04D001 (2012), [arXiv:1212.5342 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [21] S. Kurokawa and E. Kikutani, Overview of the KEKB accelerators, *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A* **499**, 1 (2003).
- [22] T. Abe *et al.*, Achievements of KEKB, *PTEP* **2013**, 03A001 (2013).
- [23] A. Ryd, D. L., N. Kuznetsova, S. Versille, M. Rotondo, D. Kirkby, F. Wuerthwein, and A. Ishikawa, EvtGen: A Monte Carlo Generator for B-Physics, (2005).
- [24] T. Sjöstrand, S. Mrenna, and P. Skands, PYTHIA 6.4 physics and manual, *JHEP* **2006** (05), 026–026.
- [25] E. Barberio and Z. Was, PHOTOS: A Universal Monte Carlo for QED radiative corrections. Version 2.0, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **79**, 291 (1994).
- [26] T. Kuhr, C. Pulvermacher, M. Ritter, T. Hauth, and N. Braun, The Belle II Core Software, Computing and Software for Big Science **3**, [10.1007/s41781-018-0017-9](#) (2018).
- [27] M. Gelb, T. Keck, *et al.*, B2BII: Data conversion from Belle to Belle II, Computing and Software for Big Science **2**, [10.1007/s41781-018-0016-x](#) (2018).
- [28] Particle Data Group, Review of Particle Physics, *PTEP* **2020**, [10.1093/ptep/ptaa104](#) (2020), 083C01.
- [29] M. Oreglia, A Study of the Reactions  $\psi' \rightarrow \gamma\gamma\psi$ , *SLAC-R-236* (1980).

- [30] T. Huber, S. Kränkl, and X.-Q. Li, Two-body non-leptonic heavy-to-heavy decays at NNLO in QCD factorization, *JHEP* **09**, 112, [arXiv:1606.02888 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [31] M. Bordone, N. Gubernari, T. Huber, M. Jung, and D. van Dyk, A puzzle in  $\bar{B}_{(s)}^0 \rightarrow D_{(s)}^{(*)+} \{\pi^-, K^-\}$  decays and extraction of the  $f_s/f_d$  fragmentation fraction, *The European Physical Journal C* **80**, [10.1140/epjc/s10052-020-08512-8](#) (2020).
- [32] I. Caprini, L. Lellouch, and M. Neubert, Dispersive bounds on the shape of  $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{(*)}$  lepton anti-neutrino form-factors, *Nucl. Phys. B* **530**, 153 (1998), [arXiv:hep-ph/9712417](#).
- [33] C. G. Boyd, B. Grinstein, and R. F. Lebed, Precision corrections to dispersive bounds on form factors, *Physical Review D* **56**, 6895–6911 (1997).
- [34] A. Bazavov *et al.* (Fermilab Lattice, MILC), Semileptonic form factors for  $B \rightarrow D^* \ell \nu$  at nonzero recoil from 2 + 1-flavor lattice QCD, (2021), [arXiv:2105.14019 \[hep-lat\]](#).
- [35] T. Kaneko, Y. Aoki, G. Bailas, B. Colquhoun, H. Fukaya, S. Hashimoto, and J. Koponen,  $B \rightarrow D^{(*)} \ell \nu$  form factors from lattice QCD with relativistic heavy quarks, *PoS LATTICE2019*, 139 (2020).
- [36] S. Iguro and T. Kitahara, Implications for new physics from novel puzzle in  $\bar{B}_{(s)}^0 \rightarrow D_{(s)}^{(*)+} \{\pi^-, K^-\}$  decays, *Physical Review D* **102** (2020).
- [37] F.-M. Cai, W.-J. Deng, X.-Q. Li, and Y.-D. Yang, Probing new physics in class-I B-meson decays into heavy-light final states, *JHEP* **10**, 235, [arXiv:2103.04138 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [38] H. Li and S. Mishima, Penguin pollution in the  $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K_S$  decay, *JHEP* **2007** (03), 009–009.