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#### Abstract

The status of heavy quark expansions for charm and beauty lifetim e ratios is review ed. T aking note of the surprising sem iquantitative success of th is description for charm hadrons I interprete the new data on ( $\mathrm{D} s$ ) and re-iterate the call for $m$ ore precise $m$ easurem ents of $\binom{0 ;^{+}}{c^{+}}$and ( $\left.c\right)$. A slightly larger $B$ than $B_{d}$ lifetim $e$ is starting to em erge as predicted; the largest lifetim e di erence in the beauty sector, nam ely in ( $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{c}}$ ) vs. (B) has correctly been predicted; the problem posed by the short $b$ lifetim e rem ains. T he need for $m$ ore accurate data also on $\left(B_{s}\right)$ and $\left(b^{; 0}\right)$ is em phasized. I discuss quark-hadron duality as the central theoretical issue at stake here.
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[^0]The lifetim e of a hadron represents an observable of fundam ental as well as practical im portance: (i) Its $m$ agnitude reveals whether the decay is driven by strong, electrom agnetic or weak forces; (ii) it constitutes an essential engineering num ber for translating $m$ easured branching ratios into $w$ idths. Yet a strong $m$ otivation to $m$ easure a quantity does not necessarily im ply a need for a precise theoretical description. Furtherm ore we all understand that nothing that is going to happen or not happen in the theory ofw eak lifetim es w illm ake anybody abandon QCD as the theory of the strong interactions. A fter all, it is the only gam e in tow $n$ after string theory has raised its am bition to becom e the theory of everything rather than $m$ erely the theory of the strong forces where it had rst em erged.

The central them e ofm $y$ talk $w$ ill be that developing such a theory represents a forum for addressing the next frontier in Q CD, nam ely quark-hadron duality or duality for short. The concept of duality constitutes an essential elem ent in any QCD based description and it has been invoked since the early days of the quark $m$ odel. For a long tim e little progress happened in this area; for a violation of duality can be discussed in a m eaningfulway only if one has a reliable theoretical treatm ent of nonperturbative e ects.

Let me ilhustrate that through an exam ple. A priori it would be quite reasonable to assume that relating the weak decay width of a heavy avour hadron to the $f$ ph power of its $m$ ass rather than the heavy quark $m$ ass \{
$\left(H_{Q}\right) / M^{5}\left(H_{Q}\right)$ \{ would incorporate boundstate e ects as the leading nonperturbative corrections (and that is indeed what we originally did ${ }^{\mathrm{L}}$ ). O nly after developing a consistent theory for the weak decays of such hadrons through the operator product expansion did we realize that such an ansatz would violate duality. For it leads to a large correction of order $1=\mathrm{m}_{Q}-\{$ $M^{5}\left(H_{Q}\right)^{\prime}\left(m_{Q}+\right)^{5 \prime} \mathrm{~m}_{2}^{5}\left(1+5=\mathrm{m}_{Q}\right)\left\{\right.$ which is anathem a to the OPE '2 ${ }^{2}$ !
$T$ his exam ple already indicates that the study of heavy avour decays had given new im petus to addressing duality: it has provided us w th new theoretical tools, and it has re-em phasized the need to understand the lim itations to duality since one aim $s$ at extracting fundam ental $K M$ param eters $w$ ith high num erical accuracy from sem ileptonic decays.

N onleptonic transitions provide a rich and multilayered lab to analyze duality and its lim itations; they can act as a m icroscope exactly because they are thought of containing larger duality violations than sem ileptonic reactions.

## 2 H eavy Q uark Expansions

The weak decay width for a heavy avour hadron $H_{Q}$ into an inchusive, nal state $f$ can be expressed through an operator product expansion (OPE) (2, 21:
"

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { \# } \\
& +{ }_{i}^{X} C_{6 ; i}^{(f)} \frac{h H_{Q} j(Q \quad i q)(q i Q) H_{Q} i}{m_{Q}^{3}}+O\left(1=m_{Q}^{4}\right) ; \tag{1}
\end{align*}
$$

 features:

The expansion involves
\{ c-num ber coe cients $\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{i}}^{(\mathrm{f})}$ calculable w ithin short-distance physics;
\{ expectation values of localoperators given by long distance physics; their values can be inferred from sym $m$ etry argum ents, other observables, QCD sum rules, lattice studies and quark m odels;
\{ inverse pow ers of the heavy quark $m$ ass $m @$ scaling $w$ th the know $n$ dim ensions of the various operators.

The nonperturbative e ects on the decay width \{ a dynam ical quantity \{ can thus be expressed through expectation values and quark $m$ asses. $T$ hose being static quantities can be calculated with decent reliability.

A crucialelem ent ofW ilson's prescription for this expansion is that it allow sa selfconsistent separation of short-distance dynam ics that is hum ped into the coe cients $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{i}}^{(\mathrm{f})}$ and long-distance dynam ics that enters through the expectation values of local operators. This is achieved through the introduction of the auxiliary scale that enters both in the coe cients and the $m$ atrix elem ents. A s a $m$ atter of principle observables have to be independant of since $N$ ature cannot be sensitive to how we arrange our com putationaltasks. In practise, how ever, has to be chosen judiciously for those very tasks: on one hand one would like to choose as high as possible to obtain a reliable perturbative expression in powers of $s$ ( ); on the other hand one likes to have it as low as possible to evaluate the expectation values in powers of $=m$, . This Scylla and Charybdis' dilem ma can be tackled by choosing $\quad 1 \mathrm{GeV}$. For sim plicity I will not state the dependance on explicitely although it is im plied.
$T$ he free quark $m$ odelor spectator expression em erges asym ptotically (for $m_{Q}!1$ ) from the $Q Q$ operator since $h H_{Q} Q \mathcal{H}_{Q} i=1+O\left(1=m_{Q}^{2}\right)$.
$\mathrm{N} \circ \mathrm{O}\left(1=\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{Q}}\right)$ contribution can arise in the OPE since there is no independant dim ension four operator (w ith colour described by a localgauge theory) ${ }_{\text {l }}^{\text {d. }}$. This has tw o im portant consequences:
\{ $W$ ith the leading nonperturbative corrections arising at order $1=\mathrm{m}_{Q}^{2}$, their size is typically around $5 \%$ in beauty decays. They had not been anticipated in the phenom enologicaldescriptions of the 1980's.
\{ A $1=m_{Q}$ contribution can arise only due to a $m$ assive duality violation. Thus one should set a rather high threshold before accepting such a statem ent.
 scattering ( W S) for baryons arise unam biguously and naturally in order $1=\mathrm{m}_{Q}^{3}$ w ith W A being helicity suppressed ${ }^{\text {LIL. }}$. They mainly drive the differences in the lifetim es of the various hadrons of a given heavy avour.

The expectation values of $Q Q$ and $Q \frac{i}{2} \quad G Q$ are known $w$ ith su cient accuracy for the present punposes from the hyper ne splittings and the charm and beauty hadron $m$ assest ${ }^{17}$.
$T$ he largest uncertainties enter in the expectation values for the dim ensionsix four-ferm ion operators in order $1=\mathrm{m}_{\ell}^{3}$. For m esons I w ill invoke approxim ate factorization at a low scale of around 1 GeV . O ne should note that factorizable contributions at a low scale 1 GeV w illbe partially nonfactorizable at the high scale $m_{Q}$ !

For baryons there is no concept of factorization, and we have to rely on quark $m$ odel results.

Below I w ill discuss m ainly hadron-speci c duality violations a ecting the ratios betw een di erent hadrons of a given heavy avour.

3 Lifetim es of $C$ harm $H$ adrons
O ne rough $m$ easure for the num erical stability of the $1=m_{c}$ expansion is provided by $\quad \underset{G}{2}(D)=m_{\mathrm{C}}^{2}, 0: 5 \mathrm{as}$ an e ectice expansion param eter which is not sm all com pared to one. Obviously one can expect $\{$ at best $\{$ a sem iquantitative description. The $m$ esonic four-quark $m$ atrix elem ents are calibrated by $f_{D} \quad 200 \mathrm{MeV}$ and $f_{\mathrm{f}}=f_{\mathrm{D}}$, 1:1 1:2.
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ T he operator $Q$ i $\oplus$ Q can be reduced to the leading operator $Q Q$ through the equation of $m$ otion.

|  | $1=\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{c}}$ expect. ${ }^{\text {T }}$ | theory comm ents | data |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\frac{\left(\mathrm{D}^{+}\right)}{\left(\mathrm{D}^{0}\right)^{\text {a }}}$ | 2 | P I dom inant | 2:55 0:034 (updated) |
| $\frac{\left(\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{s}}^{+}\right)}{\left(\mathrm{D}^{0}\right)}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.0-1.07 \\ & 0.9-1.3 \\ & 1: 08 \quad 0: 04 \end{aligned}$ | without W A ${ }^{\mathbf{B}}$ with W A ${ }^{81}$ QCD sum rule ${ }^{\text {and }}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 1: 125 & 0: 042 \text { PD G '98 } \\ 1: 211 \quad 0: 017 \\ \text { E 791, C LEO , FOCUS } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| $\frac{\left({ }_{c}^{+}\right)}{\left(\mathrm{D}^{0}\right)}$ | $0: 5$ | quark m odelm atrix elem ents | 0:489 0:008 (updated) |
|  | 1:3 | ditto | 1:75 0:36PDG '98 |
|  | 2:8 | ditto | 3:57 0:91PDG '98 |
| $\frac{\left({ }_{\text {c }}^{+}\right)}{\left(c_{c}\right)}$ | 4 | ditto | 3:9 1:7PDG 98 |
| $\mathrm{y}=\overline{2}^{\mathrm{D}} 0$ | O (1\%) | test bed for duality | 6\% y 0:3\% CLEQ |

Table 1: Lifetim e ratios in the charm sector

O $n$ general grounds one expects the follow ing hierarchy in lifetim esernin

$$
\left(\begin{array}{lllll}
\left(D^{+}\right)> & \left(D^{0}\right) & \left(\mathbb{D}_{\mathrm{s}}^{+}\right)
\end{array} \quad\binom{+}{\mathrm{c}}>\quad\binom{+}{\mathrm{c}}>\quad\binom{0}{\mathrm{c}}>\quad\left(\begin{array}{l}
\mathrm{c}
\end{array}\right)\right.
$$

Table'11" show $s$ the predictions and data. A few com $m$ ents are in order here:
You apply the $1=m_{c}$ expansion at your ow $n$ risk. It is easy to list reasons why it should fail to reproduce even the qualitative pattem expressed in Eq. $(\underline{Z})$. H ow ever com paring the data w ith the expectations show $s$ agreem ent even on the sem iquantitative level. This could be accidental; yet I w ill explore the possibility that it is not. O ne should note that the longest and shortest lifetim es di er by a factor of about tw enty!
$P I$ is the $m$ ain engine driving the $D^{+} \quad D^{0}$ lifetim e di erence as already anticipated in the bld' analysis of $G$ uberina et $a l$. ${ }^{\prime \frac{1}{4}}$; the $m$ ain im pact of the $H Q E$ for this point was to show that WA cannot constitute the leading e ect and that BRSL $\left(D^{0}\right)^{\prime} 7 \%$ is consistent with P I being the
 aw are that the $m$ easured value is di erent from two. Yet that num erical di erence is $w$ thin the theoretical noise level: one could use $f_{D}=220$ M eV rather than 200 M eV and $\mathrm{W} A$, which has been ignored here, could account for $10-20 \%$ of the $\mathrm{D}^{0} \mathrm{w}$ idth.

[^1]Since $\left(D_{s}\right)=\left(D^{0}\right)^{\prime}$ 1:07 can be generated w ithoutW A '8i', the bld' data on $\left(D_{s}\right)=\left(D^{0}\right)$ had provided an independant test for $W$ A notbeing the leading source for $\left(\mathrm{D}^{0}\right) \notin\left(\mathrm{D}^{+}\right)$; it actually allowed for it being quite irrelevant. The hew' data recon $m$ the rst conclusion; at the sam e time they point to $W$ A as a still signi cant process. A recent analysis of W A relying on QCD sum rules' is not quite able to reproduce the observed lifetim e ratio; further analysis along these lines is called for.

The $1=m_{E}^{2}$ contribution controlled by ${ }_{G}^{2}$ (D) reduces the sem ileptonic $w$ idth com $m$ on to $D^{0}$ and $D^{+} m$ esons; this brings the absolute values observed for $B R_{S L}\left(D^{0}\right)$ and $B R_{S L}\left(D^{+}\right)$in line $w$ th what is expected $w$ hen it is $m$ ainly P I that generates the $D^{+} \quad D^{0}$ lifetim e di erence.

The description of the baryonic lifetim es is helped by the forgiving experin ental errors. $M$ ore accurate $m$ easurem ents of ( $\left.{ }_{c}^{+; 0} ; ~ c\right)$ are needed. $T$ hey $m$ ight wellexhibit de ciencies in the theoretical description.

N onuniversal sem ileptonic widths \{ SL (D) SL (c) SL (c) SL (c) \{ are predicted with the $m$ ain e ect being constructive P I in c and c decays; the lifetim e ratios am ong the baryons w ill thus not get re ected in their sem ileptonic branching ratios; one estim ates $\mathbf{1}^{10}$ -

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left.B R_{S L}\binom{0}{c} \quad B R_{S L}\left(\begin{array}{l}
\text { c }
\end{array}\right) \$ \quad\binom{0}{c} \quad 0: 5 \text { ( }\right) \\
& B R_{S L}\binom{+}{c} \quad 2: 5 \quad B R_{E}\left(\begin{array}{c}
c
\end{array}\right) \$ \quad\binom{+}{c} \quad 1: 3 \quad \text { () }  \tag{4}\\
& B R_{S L}(c)<15 \% \tag{5}
\end{align*}
$$

O n generalgrounds one expects $\quad\left(D^{0}\right)=\left(D^{0}\right) \quad \operatorname{tg}^{2} \mathrm{C} \quad \mathrm{SU}(3)_{1}$ breaking $\quad 0(0: 01)$. If the data show that the lifetim e di erence for the tw o neutrald m ass eigenstates is signi cantly below this bound, one would have leamed an intriguing lesson on duality.

4 Lifetim es of $B$ eauty $H$ adrons

### 4.1 O rthodoxy

T he num ericalstability of the $1=m_{b}$ expansion is characterised by $p \underset{{ }_{G}^{2}(B)=m_{b}^{2}}{p}$ ' 0:13 1; i.e. such an expansion should yield rather reliable num erical results. M erely reproducing the quallative pattem would be quite unsatisfac-
 predictions $-12, \frac{1}{2}$ and data. A gain som e comments to elucidate these ndings:

|  | $1=\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{b}}$ expect. | theory com m ents | data |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\frac{\left(\mathrm{B}^{+}\right)}{\left(\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{d}}\right)}$ | $1+0: 05 \frac{\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{B}}}{200 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{eV}}$ | PI in ( $\mathrm{B}^{+}$) <br> factorization at 1 GeV | 1:066 0:024 |
| $\frac{\left(\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{s}}\right)}{\left(\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{d}}\right)}$ $\frac{(\mathrm{B}}{\mathrm{s})}$ $\left(\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{s}}\right)$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1: 0 \quad 0(0: 01) \\ & 0: 18 \quad \frac{\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{B}}}{200 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{eV}}{ }^{2} \end{aligned}$ | rst calculated in R ef. ${ }^{[1114}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0: 940: 04 \\ & 0.46 \text { (95 \% C L. .) } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\left(\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{c}}\right)$ | 0:5 psec | largest lifetim e di erence! | 0:46 0:17 psec |
| $\frac{(\mathrm{b})}{\left(\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{d}}\right)}$ | 0.9-1.0 | quark m odelm atrix elem ents | 0:79 0:05 |

Table 2: Lifetim e ratios in the beauty sector

The original predictions for the $m$ eson lifetim es, which had encountered theoreticalcriticism ${ }_{1}^{2} 31$, are on the $m$ ark. (i) A recent lattioe study $1_{1}^{141} \mathrm{nd}$. a result quite consistent $w$ th the original w ork based on factorization ${ }^{1 / 1}$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\left(\mathrm{B}^{+}\right)}{\left(\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{d}}\right)}=1: 03 \quad 0: 02 \quad 0: 03 \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

(ii) Sceptics will argue that predicting lifetim e ratios close to unity is not overly im pressive. In response one should point out that the largest lifetim e di erence by far $\left\{\frac{\left(\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{c}}\right)}{\left(\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{d}}\right)}\right.$, $\frac{1}{3}$ \{ has been predicted correctly and that the absence of contributions $O\left(1=m_{Q}\right)$ had been crucial there!

A serious challenge arises from the short' baryon lifetime. In term $s$ of
$1(\mathrm{~b})=\left(\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{d}}\right)$ the data can be expressed by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { experim }=0: 21 \quad 0: 05 \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$



$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { theor: }=0: 03 \quad 0: 12 \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

R eanalyses by other authors agree w ith Eq. (IG) study ${ }^{171}:$ lattice $=(0: 07$ 0:09). A recent analysis based on Q C D. sum rules arrives at a signi cantly larger value: $\quad$ QCDSR $=0: 13 \quad 0: 21^{1}-1!$. If true it would rem ove the problem. H ow ever, I w ould like to understand better how the sum rules analysis can di er so much from other studies given that it still uses the valence quark approxim ation.

An essential question for future studies concems the lifetim es of the beauty hyperons $b^{\text {;0 }}$. On general grounds one expects $\left(\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{b}}\right)>(\mathrm{b})$,
$\binom{0}{\mathrm{~b}}^{\overline{\eta_{1}}} \bar{\eta}_{1}$. M ore speci cally, using the observed charm hyperon_lifetim es and SU (3) sym $m$ etry a very sizeable e ect has been predicted 1 :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\left(\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{b}}\right)(\mathrm{b})}{(\mathrm{b})} \quad 0: 14 \quad 0: 21 \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

### 4.2 Heresy

A s said before, the ansatz $\left(\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{Q}}\right) / \mathrm{M}\left(\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{Q}}\right)_{-}^{5}$, which would yield $(\mathrm{b})=\left(\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{d}}\right)$ ' 0:75 and therefore has been re-surrected ${ }^{19}$. is anathem a to the OPE since it would imply the nonperturbative corrections to be of order $1=m_{Q}$ ! $T$ he B $\quad B_{d}$ lifetim e di erence is still a $O\left(1=m{ }_{b}^{3}\right)$ e ect. ${ }_{\mathrm{l}}^{\mathrm{I}, \mathrm{I}}$

Notw ithstanding $m y$ em ployer I am willing to consider heresy, though, since it $m$ akes som efurther prediction that di er from the OPE ndings:

$$
\begin{gather*}
\frac{\left(B_{s}\right)}{\left(B_{d}\right)}={\frac{M\left(B_{d}\right)}{M\left(B_{s}\right)}}^{5}, 0: 94  \tag{10}\\
(b)=\binom{0}{b}=\left(\begin{array}{l}
b
\end{array}\right) \quad 1=0: 85=0: 85 ; \tag{11}
\end{gather*}
$$

the expectation $M(b) M(b)^{\prime} M(c) M(c)$ has been used in Eq. (11 $\left.{ }_{1}^{\prime}\right)$.
On the dow $n$ side $I$ do not see how such an ansatz can yield a correct prediction for ( $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{c}}$ ) in a naturalway.

O ne can also add that such an ansatz helps to understand neither the pattem nor the size of the lifetim e di erences in the charm sector. A greem ent w ith the data can be enforced, though, by adjusting $\underline{1}^{19}$ \{ in an ad-hoc fashion I would say $\{$ the contributions from P I, W A and W S.

5 On Q uark H adron D uality

### 5.1 G eneral Rem arks

D uality has been an early and som ew hat fuzzy elem ent of quark model argu$m$ ents. It can be expressed as follow $s$ : "R ates evaluated on the parton level approxim ate' observable rates sum $m$ ed over a su cient num ber' of hadronic channels." It was never stated clearly how good an approxim ation it provided and what is $m$ eant by su cient number'; it was thought, though, that this num ber had to be larger than of order unity.

H eavy quark theory has opened up new theoretical tools as well as perspectives onto duality; it dem onstrated that duality can hold even with one or ${ }^{d}$ It has been shown ${ }_{2}^{2 d}$ (at least for sem ileptonic transitions) that duality is im plem ented as follow s: quark phase space + nonperturbative corrections $\xlongequal{\wedge}$ hadronic phase space + boundstate e ects'!
tw o channels dom inating \{ if an additional feature like heavy quark sym $m$ etry intervenes ${ }^{211}$. This has been dem onstrated for sem ileptonic b! c decays. The goal is to understand better the origins of lim itations to duality and to develop som e quantitative $m$ easures for it. The new tools that are being brought to bear on this problem are (a) the OPE; (b) the so-called sm all velocity sum rulesi- and (c) the 't H ooft m odel.

The results obtained so far show there are di erent categories of duality \{ local vs. global etc. duality \{ depending on the am ount of averaging or sm earing' that is involved and that duality can neither be universalnor exact.

D uality is typically based on dispersion relations expressing observable rates averaged over som e kinem atical variables through an OPE constructed in the Euclidean region. There are natural lim itations to the accuracy of such an expansion; am ong other things it $w$ illhave to be truncated. In any case, such a power expansion $w$ illexhibit no sensitivity to a term like $\exp \left(m_{Q}=Q c d\right)$. Yet upon analytical continuation from the Euclidean to the $M$ inskow skian dom ain this exponentially suppressed term tums into $\sin \left(m_{Q}=\rho C D\right)$ \{ which is not surpressed at all! I.e., the OPE cannot account for such term s that could becom e quite relevant in $M$ inkow ski space and duality violations can thus enter through these bscillating' term s ; the opening of thresholds provides a model for such a scenario. A ctually they $w$ ill be surpressed som ew hat like $\left(1=m_{Q}^{k}\right) \sin \left(m_{Q}=\right.$ QCD $)$ w ith the powerk depending on the dynam ics in general and the reaction in particular. This could produce also a heretical $1=\mathrm{m}_{\rho}$ contribution from a dim ension-ve operator:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{m_{Q}^{2}} \sin \frac{m_{Q}}{Q C D}=O\left(1=m_{Q}\right) \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

The colour ow in sem ileptonic as well as nonleptonic spectator decays and in W A is such that duality can arise naturally; i.e., nature had to be m alicious to create sizeable duality violations. Y et in P I \{ because it is an interference phenom enon $\{$ the situation is $m$ uch $m$ ore com plex leading to serious concems about the accuracy w ith which duality can apply here.

## 5.2 't H ooft M odel

The m ost relevant features of the 't H ooft m odel are: (1) Q CD in $1+1$ dim ensions obviously con nes. (2) It is solvable for $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{c}}$ ! 1 : its spectrum ofnarrow resonances can be calculated as can their w avefunctions.

D uality can then be probed directly by com paring the width evaluated through the OPE with a sum over the hadronic' resonances appropriately
sm eared over the threshold region:

$$
\text { OPE }\left(H_{Q}\right) \${ }_{n}^{X} \quad\left(H_{Q}!f_{n}\right)
$$

Such a program has been rst pursued using num ericalm ethods; it lead to claim s that duality violations arise in the tatalw idth through a $1=m_{e}$ term $\underline{2}^{23!}$ and quantitatively $m$ ore $m$ assively in W A $\underline{2}^{24}$.

H ow ever an analytical study has show $n$ that neither of these clain $s$ is correct: perfect $m$ atching of the OPE expression $w$ th the,sum over the hadronic resonances was found through high order in $1=m_{Q}-12$ obtained for the $m$ ore intriguing case of $P I_{-1}^{2} d 27$.

6 Sum $m$ ary and $O$ utlook
A $m$ ature form alism genuinely based on QCD hasbeen developed for describing inclusive nonleptonic heavy avour decays. It can tackle questions that could not be addressed before in a $m$ eaningfiulw ay; even faihures can teach us valuable lessons on nonperturbative aspects of Q CD, nam ely on lim itations to duality.

A fairly successfulsem iquantitative picture has em erged for the lifetim es of
 while this $m$ ight be a coincidence, it should be noted:

P I provides the leading e ect driving the $D^{+} \quad D^{0}$ lifetim e di erence; this conclusion is fully consistent $w$ th the absolute value for $B R_{\text {SL }}\left(D^{0}\right)$.

This year's precise new experim ental result

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\left(D_{s}\right)}{\left(D^{0}\right)}=1: 211 \quad 0: 017 \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

con m sthis picture: W A is nonleading, though still signi cant. It represents an interesting challem ge to nd the footprint of A in som e classes ofexclusive nalstates.
$M$ ore precise data on the ${ }_{c}^{0 ;+}$ and $c$ lifetim es are very $m$ uch needed. T hose m ight reveal serious de ciencies in the predictions. It should be noted that the sem ileptonic w idths for baryons are not universal!

The scorecard for beauty lifetim es looks as follow s:
The predictions for $(B)=\left(B_{d}\right)$ and even $m$ ore im pressively for $\left(B_{c}\right)$ appear to be bome out by experim ent.

The jury is still out on ( $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{s}}$ ).
The b lifetim e provides a sti challenge to theory. It should be noted that $m$ ost authors have show $n$ a rem arkable lack of exibility in accom $m$ odating $(b)=\left(B_{d}\right)<0: 9$, which is quite unusual in this line of w ork. $M$ aybe experim ent $w$ ill show $m$ ore exibility.

A ccurate data on ( $\left(^{\text {; }}\right.$ ) w illlbe essential to celeb rate success or diagnose failure.
$H$ aving developed a theoretical fram ew ork for treating nonperturbative e ects, we can address the issue of duality violations. W hile we have begun to understand better their origins, we have not (yet) found a m odel theory that could explain the short $b$ lifetim e as a duality lim itation.
$T$ here are, of course, di erent layers of failure conceivable and the lessons one would have to draw :

A refiusalby the data to $m$ ove up the value of ( $b$ ) could be interpreted as show ing that the quark $m$ odel provides a very inadequate tool to estim ate baryonic expectation values.

A low value of the average $B_{8}$ lifetime $\left\{\right.$ say $\left(B_{s}\right)<0: 96\left(B_{d}\right)$ \{ had to be seen as a very signi cant lim itation to duality.

C learly there is a lot we will leam from future data on lifetim es and other inclusive rates \{ one way or the other.
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[^0]:    ${ }^{a}$ Invited talk given at the 3rd Intemational C onference on B Physics and CP Violation, Taipeh, Taíw an, D ec. 3-7, 1999

[^1]:    ${ }^{c}\left(\mathrm{D}^{+}\right)$is guaranteed to rem ain positive if the range in $m$ om entum over which P I can occur is properly evaluated. To put it di erently: while one cannot count on obtaining a reliable value for ( $D^{+}$), a nonsensical result $w i l l$ arise only if one $m$ akes a $m$ istake.

