UND-HEP-99-BIG 07 December 1999

THE LIFET IM ES OF HEAVY FLAVOUR HADRONS -A CASE STUDY IN QUARK HADRON DUALITY ^a

I.I.BIGI

Physics Dept., Univ. of Notre Dame duLac Notre Dame, IN 46556, U.S.A. E-mail: bigi@undhep.hep.nd.edu

The status of heavy quark expansions for charm and beauty lifetime ratios is reviewed. Taking note of the surprising sem iquantitative success of this description for charm hadrons I interprete the new data on (D_s) and re-iterate the call for m ore precise m easurements of $\binom{0,t}{c}$ and $\binom{0,t}{c}$. A slightly larger B than B_d lifetime is starting to emerge as predicted; the largest lifetime di erence in the beauty sector, namely in (B_c) vs. (B) has correctly been predicted; the problem posed by the short b lifetime remains. The need for more accurate data also on (B_s) and $\binom{t}{b}^{t0}$ is emphasized. I discuss quark-hadron duality as the central theoretical issue at stake here.

C ontents

1	Introduction	2
2	H eavy Q uark Expansions	3
3	Lifetim es of Charm Hadrons	4
4	Lifetim es of B eauty H adrons 4.1 Orthodoxy	6 6 8
5	OnQuark-HadronDuality 5.1 GeneralRemarks 5.2 'tHooftModel	8 8 9
6	Sum m ary and Outlook	10

^a Invited talk given at the 3rd International Conference on B Physics and CP Violation, Taipeh, Taiwan, Dec. 3 - 7, 1999

1 Introduction

The lifetime of a hadron represents an observable of fundamental as well as practical importance: (i) Its magnitude reveals whether the decay is driven by strong, electrom agnetic or weak forces; (ii) it constitutes an essential engineering number for translating measured branching ratios into widths. Yet a strong motivation to measure a quantity does not necessarily imply a need for a precise theoretical description. Furthermore we all understand that nothing that is going to happen or not happen in the theory of weak lifetimes willmake anybody abandon QCD as the theory of the strong interactions. A fter all, it is the only game in town after string theory has raised its ambition to become the theory of everything rather than merely the theory of the strong forces where it had rst emerged.

The central them e of my talk will be that developing such a theory represents a forum for addressing the next frontier in QCD, namely quark-hadron duality or duality for short. The concept of duality constitutes an essential element in any QCD based description and it has been invoked since the early days of the quark model. For a long time little progress happened in this area; for a violation of duality can be discussed in a meaningfulway only if one has a reliable theoretical treatment of nonperturbative elects.

Let me illustrate that through an example. A priori it would be quite reasonable to assume that relating the weak decay width of a heavy avour hadron to the ffh power of its mass rather than the heavy quark mass { (H $_{\rm Q}$) / M 5 (H $_{\rm Q}$) { would incorporate boundstate e ects as the leading non-perturbative corrections (and that is indeed what we originally did ¹). Only 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=m $_{\rm Q}$ { M 5 (H $_{\rm Q}$) ' (m $_{\rm Q}$ +) 5 ' m $_{\rm O}^5$ (1 + 5 =m $_{\rm Q}$) { which is anathem a to the OPE 2 !

This example already indicates that the study of heavy avour decays had given new impetus to addressing duality: it has provided us with new theoretical tools, and it has re-emphasized the need to understand the limitations to duality since one aim s at extracting fundamental KM parameters with high numerical accuracy from semileptonic decays.

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

2 Heavy Quark Expansions

The weak decay width for a heavy avour hadron H_Q into an inclusive nal state f can be expressed through an operator product expansion (OPE)^{2;3}:

$$(H_{Q} ! f) = \frac{G_{F}^{2} m_{Q}^{5}}{192^{-3}} J_{C K M} f_{Q} c_{3}^{(f)} h_{Q} J_{Q} J_{Q} J_{Q} i + c_{5}^{(f)} \frac{c_{G}^{2} (H_{Q})}{m_{Q}^{2}} + + \frac{X}{c_{6;i}^{(f)}} \frac{h_{Q} J_{Q} (q_{-i}q) (q_{-i}Q) J_{Q} i}{m_{Q}^{3}} + O (1 = m_{Q}^{4}) ;$$

$$(1)$$

where 2_G (H $_Q$) h_{H_Q}) $\frac{1}{2}$ GQ $\frac{1}{2}$ i. Eq.(1) exhibits the following in portant features:

The expansion involves

- { c-num ber coe cients $c_{i}^{(f)}$ calculable within short-distance physics;
- { expectation values of local operators given by long distance physics; their values can be inferred from symmetry arguments, other observables, QCD sum rules, lattice studies and quark models;
- { inverse powers of the heavy quark mass m $_{\rm Q}\,$ scaling with the known dimensions 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. Those being static quantities can be calculated with decent reliability.

A crucial element of W ilson's prescription for this expansion is that it allows a selfconsistent separation of short-distance dynam ics that is lum ped into the coe cients c₁^(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 them atrix elements. As a matter of principle observables have to be independent of since N ature cannot be sensitive to how we arrange our computational tasks. 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 $_{\rm S}$ (); on the other hand one likes to have it as low as possible to evaluate the expectation values in powers of = m_Q. This Scylla and Charybdis' dilemma can be tackled by choosing ' 1 G eV. For simplicity I will not state the dependance on explicitely although it is implied.

The free quark m odelor spectator expression emerges asymptotically (for m $_{\rm Q}$! 1) from the QQ operator since hH $_{\rm Q}$ DQ H $_{\rm Q}$ i = 1 + 0 (1=m $_{\rm Q}^2$).

No O $(1=m_0)$ contribution can arise in the OPE since there is no independant dimension four operator (with colour described by a local gauge theory)^b. This has two important consequences:

- { W ith the leading nonperturbative corrections arising at order $1=m_Q^2$, their size is typically around 5 % in beauty decays. They had not been anticipated in the phenom enological descriptions of the 1980's.
- { A $1=m_Q$ contribution can arise only due to a massive duality violation. Thus one should set a rather high threshold before accepting such a statement.

Pauli Interference (PI⁴, W eak Annihilation (WA)⁵ for mesons and W – scattering (WS) for baryons arise unambiguously and naturally in order $1=m_Q^3$ with WA being helicity suppressed¹. They mainly drive the differences in the lifetim es of the various hadrons of a given heavy avour.

The expectation values of QQ and $Q\frac{i}{2}$ GQ are known with su cient accuracy for the present purposes from the hyper ne splittings and the charm and beauty hadron m asses⁷.

The largest uncertainties enter in the expectation values for the dimensionsix four-ferm ion operators in order $1=m_Q^3$. For mesons I will invoke approxim ate factorization at a bw scale of around 1 GeV. One should note that factorizable contributions at a bw scale 1 GeV will be partially nonfactorizable at the high scale m_Q!

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

Below I will discuss mainly hadron-specic duality violations a ecting the ratios between di erent hadrons of a given heavy avour.

3 Lifetim es of Charm Hadrons

O ne rough <u>measure</u> for the numerical stability of the 1=m $_{\rm c}$ expansion is provided by $\frac{1}{G}$ (D)=m $_{\rm c}^2$ ' 0.5 as an electice expansion parameter which is not small compared to one. Obviously one can expect { at best { a sem iquantitative description. The mesonic four-quark matrix elements are calibrated by f_D 200 M eV and f_{D =}=f_D ' 1:1 1:2.

 $[^]bT$ he operator Q i (Q can be reduced to the leading operator Q Q through the equation of m otion.

	1=m _c expect. ⁷	theory com m ents	data
(D ⁺) (D ⁰)	2	PIdominant	2:55 0:034 (updated)
$\frac{(D_s^+)}{(D_s^0)}$	1.0 - 1.07	without W A ⁸	1:125 0:042 PDG '98
. ,	0.9-1.3	with WA ⁸	1:211 0:017
	1:08 0:04	QCD sum rules ⁹	E791,CLEO,FOCUS
$\frac{\binom{+}{c}}{(D^{0})}$	0:5	quark m odelm atrix elem ents	0:489 0:008 (updated)
$\begin{pmatrix} + \\ c \end{pmatrix}$	13	ditto	1:75 0:36 PDG '98
	2:8	ditto	3:57 0:91 PDG '98
	4	ditto	3:9 1:7 PDG '98
$y = \frac{1}{2} D^{0}$	이 (1%)	test bed for duality	6% y 0:3% CLEC

Table 1: Lifetim e ratios in the charm sector

On general grounds one expects the following hierarchy in lifetim $e^{6;7}$:

 $(D^{+}) > (D^{0}) \qquad (D^{+}_{s}) \qquad (C^{+}_{c}) > (C^{0}_{c}) > (C^{0}_{c}) > (C^{0}_{c})$ (2)

Table 1 shows the predictions and data. A few comments are in order here:

You apply the $1=m_{\rm e}$ expansion at your own risk. It is easy to list reasons why it should fail to reproduce even the qualitative pattern expressed in Eq.(2). However comparing the data with the expectations shows agreement even on the sem iquantitative level. This could be accidental; yet I will explore the possibility that it is not. One should note that the longest and shortest lifetim es di er by a factor of about twenty!

PI is the main engine driving the D^{\dagger} D^{0} lifetime dimensional et al. ⁴; the main impact of the HQE for this point was to show that WA cannot constitute the leading e ect and that BR_{SL} (D^{0})' 7% is consistent with PI being the leading e ect, see below ^c. In quoting a lifetime ratio of 2 I am well aware that the measured value is dimensional to the the measured value is dimensional to the theoretical dimensional constitute the theoretical noise level: one could use $f_{D} = 220$ M eV rather than 200 M eV and WA, which has been ignored here, could account for 10 - 20 % of the D⁰ width.

^c (D^{+}) is guaranteed to rem ain positive if the range in m om entum over which PI can occur is properly evaluated. To put it di erently: while one cannot count on obtaining a reliable value for (D^{+}) , a nonsensical result will arise only if one m akes a m istake.

Since $(D_s) = (D^0)'$ 1:07 can be generated without W A⁸, the bkl' data on $(D_s) = (D^0)$ had provided an independant test for W A not being the leading source for $(D^0) \in (D^+)$; it actually allowed for it being quite irrelevant. The hew' data recon m the rst conclusion; at the same time they point to W A as a still signi cant process. A recent analysis of W A relying on QCD sum rules⁹ is not quite able to reproduce the observed lifetime ratio; further analysis along these lines is called for.

The $1=n_{\rm f}^2$ contribution controlled by ${}^2_{\rm G}$ (D) reduces the sem ileptonic width common to D⁰ and D⁺ m esons; this brings the absolute values observed for BR_{SL} (D⁰) and BR_{SL} (D⁺) in line with what is expected when it is mainly PI that generates the D⁺ D⁰ lifetime di erence.

The description of the baryonic lifetim es is helped by the forgiving experim ental errors. M ore accurate m easurem ents of $\begin{pmatrix} + & ;^0 \\ c & \end{pmatrix}$ are needed. They m ight well exhibit de ciencies in the theoretical description.

Nonuniversal sem ileptonic widths { $_{SL}(D) \in _{SL}(c) \in _{SL}(c) \in _{SL}(c) \in _{SL}(c) \in _{SL}(c) \in _{SL}(c)$ { are predicted with the main e ect being constructive PI in $_{c}$ and $_{c}$ decays; the lifetime ratios among the baryons will thus not get re ected in their sem ileptonic branching ratios; one estimates¹⁰

$$BR_{SL}\begin{pmatrix} 0\\c \end{pmatrix} BR_{SL}\begin{pmatrix} c\\c \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0\\c \end{pmatrix} 0 \div \begin{pmatrix} 0\\c \end{pmatrix} (3)$$

 $BR_{SL}(^{+}_{c}) 25 B_{R}(_{c}) (^{+}_{c}) 13 () (4)$

$$BR_{SL}(_{c}) < 15\%$$
 (5)

On general grounds one expects $(D^0) = (D^0)$ tg^2_c SU $(a)_1$ breaking O (0.01). If the data show that the lifetime dimension for the two neutral D m ass eigenstates is significantly below this bound, one would have learned an intriguing lesson on duality.

4 Lifetim es of Beauty Hadrons

4.1 0 rthodoxy

The num erical stability of the 1=m $_{\rm b}$ expansion is characterised by $\frac{p}{2} \frac{2}{G}$ (B)=m $_{\rm b}^2$ ' 0:13 1; i.e. such an expansion should yield rather reliable num erical results. Merely reproducing the qualitative pattern would be quite unsatisfactory. I will also use f_B 200 MeV and $f_{B_s}=f_B$ ' 1:1 1:2. Table 2 shows predictions^{12;7} and data. Again some comments to elucidate these indiges:

	$1=m_{b}$ expect.	theory comments	data
(B ⁺) (B _d)	$1 + 0.05 \frac{f_{\rm B}}{200 {\rm M eV}}^2$	PIm (B ⁺)	1:066 0:024
		factorization at 1 G eV	
(B _s) (B _d)	1:0 0 (0:01)		0:94 0:04
(B s) (B s)	$0.18 \frac{f_{B_s}}{200 \text{ M eV}}^2$	rst calculated in Ref. ¹¹	0.46 (95% CL.)
(B _c)	0:5 pæc	largest lifetim e di erence!	0:46 0:17 psec
(b) (Bd)	0.9-1.0	quark m odel m atrix elem ents	0:79 0:05

Table 2: Lifetim e ratios in the beauty sector

The original predictions for the meson lifetimes, which had encountered theoretical criticism¹³, are on the mark. (i) A recent lattice study¹⁴ nds a result quite consistent with the original work based on factorization¹:

$$\frac{(B^+)}{(B_d)} = 1.03 \quad 0.02 \quad 0.03 \tag{6}$$

(ii) Sceptics will argue that predicting lifetime ratios close to unity is not overly in pressive. In response one should point out that the largest lifetime dimension by far { $\frac{(B_{c})}{(B_{d})}$ / $\frac{1}{3}$ { has been predicted correctly and that the absence of contributions 0 (1=m_Q) had been crucial there!

A serious challenge arises from the 'short' baryon lifetime. In terms of $1 (b) = (B_d)$ the data can be expressed by

$$experim = 0.21 \quad 0.05$$
 (7)

A detailed analysis of quark model calculations¹⁵ nds how ever

$$theor: = 0:03 \quad 0:12$$
 (8)

R eanalyses by other authors agree with Eq.(8)¹⁶ { as does a pilot lattice study¹⁷: $_{lattice} = (0.07 \quad 0.09)$. A recent analysis based on QCD sum rules arrives at a signi cantly larger value: $_{QCDSR} = 0.13 \quad 0.21^{18}$. If true it would rem ove the problem. How ever, I would 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 approximation.

An essential question for future studies concerns the lifetimes of the beauty hyperons b^{i^0} . On general grounds one expects $(b_{b}) > (b_{b})$,

 $\binom{0}{b}^7$. More speci cally, using the observed charm hyperon lifetimes and SU (3) symmetry a very sizeable e ect has been predicted ¹⁶:

$$\frac{(_{\rm b})}{(_{\rm b})} = 0.14 \quad 0.21 \tag{9}$$

4.2 Heresy

As said before, the ansatz $(H_Q) / M (H_Q)^5$ which would yield $(_b)=(B_d)$ ' 0:75 and therefore has been re-surrected¹⁹ is anathem a to the OPE since it would imply the nonperturbative corrections to be of order 1=m_Q! The B B_d lifetime dimension is still a O (1=m $\frac{3}{b}$) e ect.^d

Notwithstanding my employer I am willing to consider heresy, though, since it makes some further prediction that di er from the OPE ndings:

$$\frac{(B_{s})}{(B_{d})} = \frac{M_{s}(B_{d})}{M_{s}(B_{s})} \int_{0.94}^{5} (0.94)$$
(10)

$$(_{\rm b}) = (_{\rm b}^{0}) = (_{\rm b})' 1 = 0.85 = 0.85;$$
 (11)

the expectation M ($_{\rm b}$) M ($_{\rm b}$) ' M ($_{\rm c}$) M ($_{\rm c}$) has been used in Eq.(11). On the down side I do not see how such an ansatz can yield a correct prediction for (B $_{\rm c}$) in a natural way.

O ne can also add that such an ansatz helps to understand neither the pattern nor the size of the lifetime di erences in the charm sector. A green ent with the data can be enforced, though, by adjusting¹⁹ { in an ad-hoc fashion I would say { the contributions from PI, WA and WS.

5 On Quark-Hadron Duality

5.1 GeneralRemarks

D uality has been an early and som ewhat fuzzy element of quark model arguments. It can be expressed as follows: "Rates evaluated on the parton level "approximate' observable rates summed over a 'su cient number' of hadronic channels." It was never stated clearly how good an approximation it provided and what is meant by 'su cient number'; it was thought, though, that this number had to be larger than of order unity.

Heavy quark theory has opened up new theoretical tools as well as perspectives onto duality; it demonstrated that duality can hold even with one or

^d It has been shown ²⁰ (at least for sem ileptonic transitions) that duality is im plem ented as follows: 'quark phase space + nonperturbative corrections ≏ hadronic phase space + boundstate e ects'!

two channels dom inating { if an additional feature like heavy quark sym m etry intervenes²¹. 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 some 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 rules²² and (c) the 't Hooft m odel.

The results obtained so far show there are di erent categories of duality { local vs. global etc. duality { depending on the amount of averaging or `m earing' that is involved and that duality can neither be universal nor exact.

Duality 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 limitations to the accuracy of such an expansion; am ong other things it will have to be truncated. In any case, such a power expansion will exhibit no sensitivity to a term like exp($m_Q = _{QCD}$). Yet upon analytical continuation from the Euclidean to the M inskow skian dom ain this exponentially suppressed term turns into sin ($m_Q = _{QCD}$) (which is not surpressed at all! I.e., the OPE cannot account for such terms that could become equite relevant in M inkowski space and duality violations can thus enter through these bscillating' terms; the opening of thresholds provides a model for such a scenario. A ctually they will be surpressed som ewhat like ($1=m_Q^k$) sin ($m_Q = _{QCD}$) with the powerk depending on the dynam ics in general and the reaction in particular. This could produce also a heretical' $1=m_Q$ contribution from a dimension- ve operator:

$$\frac{1}{m_{Q}^{2}}\sin \frac{m_{Q}}{QCD} = O(1=m_{Q})$$
(12)

The colour ow in sem ileptonic as well as non leptonic spectator decays and in W A is such that duality can arise naturally; i.e., nature had to be malicious to create sizeable duality violations. Yet in PI { because it is an interference phenom enon { the situation is much more complex leading to serious concerns about the accuracy with which duality can apply here.

5.2 'tH coft M odel

The most relevant features of the 't Hooff model are: (1) QCD in 1+1 dimensions obviously connes. (2) It is solvable for N_C ! 1 : its spectrum of narrow resonances can be calculated as can their wavefunctions.

Duality can then be probed directly by comparing the width evaluated through the OPE with a sum over the hadronic' resonances appropriately

sm eared over the threshold region:

$$\begin{array}{c} X \\ \text{OPE}(H_Q) \\ \end{array} \begin{pmatrix} X \\ \text{(}H_Q \\ ! \\ f_n \\ \end{pmatrix} \qquad (13)$$

Such a program has been rst pursued using numerical methods; it lead to claim s that duality violations arise in the total width through a $1=m_Q$ term ²³ and quantitatively more massively in WA²⁴.

However an analytical study has shown that neither of these claims is correct: perfect m atching of the OPE expression with the sum over the hadronic resonances was found through high order in $1=m_Q^{25;26}$. The same result was obtained for the more intriguing case of PI^{26;27}.

6 Summary and Outlook

A mature form alism genuinely based on QCD has been developed for describing inclusive nonleptonic heavy avour decays. It can tackle questions that could not be addressed before in a meaningfulway; even failures can teach us valuable lessons on nonperturbative aspects of QCD, namely on limitations to duality.

A fairly successful sem iquantitative picture has emerged for the lifetim es of charm hadrons considering the wide span characterised by $(D^+)=(_c)$ 20; while this might be a coincidence, it should be noted:

P I provides the leading e ect driving the D^{\dagger} D^{0} lifetime di erence; this conclusion is fully consistent with the absolute value for B R_{SL} (D^{0}).

This year's precise new experimental result

$$\frac{(D_s)}{(D_s)} = 1.211 \quad 0.017 \tag{14}$$

con m sthispicture: W A is nonleading, though still signi cant. It represents an interesting challem ge to nd the footprint of W A in som e classes of exclusive nal states.

M ore precise data on the $_{c}^{0,+}$ and $_{c}$ lifetim es are very much needed. Those 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) = (B_d) and even m ore impressively for (B_c) appear to be borne out by experiment.

The jury is still out on (B3).

The $_{\rm b}$ lifetime provides a sti challenge to theory. It should be noted that most authors have shown a remarkable lack of exibility in accom - modating ($_{\rm b}$)= (B $_{\rm d}$) < 0.9, which is quite unusual in this line of work. Maybe experiment will show more exibility.

A courate data on (b^{i^0}) will be essential to celebrate success or diagnose failure.

Having developed a theoretical fram ework 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 model theory that could explain the short $_{\rm b}$ lifetim e as a duality limitation.

There are, of course, di erent layers of failure conceivable and the lessons one would have to draw :

A refusalby the data to m ove up the value of (b) could be interpreted as showing that the quark m odel provides a very inadequate tool to estimate baryonic expectation values.

A low value of the average B₂ lifetime { say $(B_s) < 0.96$ (B_d) { had to be seen as a very signi cant limitation to duality.

C learly there is a lot we will learn from future data on lifetimes and other inclusive rates { one way or the other.

A cknow ledgem ents

This truly inspiring and enjoyable meeting organized by Profs. H.-Y. Cheng and G. Hou clearly wetted the appetite of participants for the next incarnation of this series, namely BCP 4. I am grateful to my collaborators Profs. M. Shifm an, N. Uraltsev and A. Vainshtein for generously sharing their insights with me. This work has been supported by the NSF under the grant PHY 96-0508.

- 1. I.Bigi, N. Uraltsev, Phys. Lett. B 280 (1992) 271.
- 2. For a review with references to the earlier literature, see: I.I. Bigi, M. Shifm an, N.G. Uraltsev, Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. 47 (1997) 591.
- 3. For a som ewhat di erent approach, see: V.Chernyak, Nucl. Phys. B 457 (1995) 96.
- B.Guberina, S.Nussinov, R.Peccei, R.Ruckl, Phys. Lett. B 89 (1979) 261.

- 5. M. Bander, D. Silverm ann, A. Soni, Phys. Rev. Lett. 44 (1980) 7; H. Fritzsch, P. M inkowski, Phys. Lett. B 90 (1980) 455; W. Bemreuther, O. Nachtmann, B. Stech, Z. Phys. C 4 (1980) 257; I. Bigi, Z. Phys. C 5 (1980) 313.
- 6. N. Bilic, B. Guberina et al., J. Tram petic, Nucl. Phys. B 248 (1984) 33; M. Shifman, M. Voloshin, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. 41 (1985) 120.
- 7. For a review with references to the earlier literature, see: B.Bellini, I. Bigi and P.Doman, Phys. Rep. 289 (1997) 1.
- 8. I.I. Bigi, N.G. Uraltsev, Z. Phys. C 62 (1994) 623.
- 9. H.-Y. Cheng, K.-C. Yang, Phys. Rev. D 61 (2000) 014008.
- 10. M. Voloshin, Phys. Lett. B 385 (1996) 369.
- 11. M. Voloshin et al, Sov J. Nucl. Phys. 46 (1987) 112
- I.I.Bigi, B.Blok, M.Shifman, N.Uraltsev, A.Vainshtein, in: B Decays', S.Stone (ed.), W orld Scientic, 1994, Revised 2nd Ed., p. 132.
- 13. M Neubert, C. Sachrajda, Nucl. Phys. B 483 (1997) 339.
- 14. M. DiPierro, C. Sachrajda, Nucl. Phys. B 534 (1998) 373.
- 15. N.G. Uraltsev, Phys. Lett. B 376 (1996) 303.
- 16. M. Voloshin, preprint hep-ph/9901445; B. Guberina, B. Melic, H. Stefancic, preprint hep-ph/9907468; B. Melic, these Proceed.
- 17. M. DiPierro, C. Sachrajda, C. Michael, preprint hep-lat/9906031.
- 18. C.-S. Huang, C. Liu, S.-L. Zhu, preprint hep-ph/9906300.
- 19. G. A Larelli, G. Martinelli, S. Petrarca, F. Rapuano, Phys. Lett. B 382 (1996) 409.
- I.Bigi, M. Shifman, N. Uraltsev, A. Vainshtein, Phys. Rev. D 56 (1997) 4017.
- 21. M. Voloshin, M. Shifm an, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. 47 (1988) 511.
- I.Bigi, M. Shifman, N. Uraltsev, A. Vainshtein, Phys. Rev. D 52 (1995) 196.
- 23. B.Grinstein, R.Lebed, Phys. Rev. D 57 (1998) 1366.
- 24. B.Grinstein, R. Lebed, Phys. Rev. D 59 (1999) 054022.
- I.Bigi, M. Shifman, N. Uraltsev, A. Vainshtein, Phys. Rev. D 59 (1999) 054011.
- 26. I.I. Bigi, N.G. Uraltsev, Phys. Rev. D 60 (1999) 114034.
- 27. I.I. Bigi, N.G. Uraltsev, Phys.Lett. B 457 (1999) 163.