Harry J.Lipkin

D epartm ent of Nuclear Physics W eizm ann Institute of Science Rehovot 76100, Israel and School of Physics and A stronom y Raym ond and Beverly Sackler Faculty of Exact Sciences TelA viv University TelA viv, Israel January 26, 1993

ABSTRACT

Sum rules originally derived for the M ossbauer E ect are applied to weak sem ileptonic B decays. The sum rules follow from assuming that the decay by electroweak boson emission of an unstable nucleus or heavy quark in a bound system is described by a pointlike coupling to a current which acts only on the decaying object, that the H am iltonian of the bound state depends on the momentum of the decaying object only in the kinetic energy and that the boson has no nal state interactions. The decay rate and the rst and second moments of the boson energy spectrum for xed momentum transfer are shown to be the same as for a noninteracting gas of such unstable objects with a momentum distribution the same as that of the bound state. B m eson semileptonic decays are shown to be dominated by the lowest-lying states in the charm ed m eson spectrum.

Simple features of the spectroscopy and weak transitions of hadron states containing heavy quarks have recently been discussed in detail [1,2]. The contributions to a B jorken sum rule [3] have been exam ined [4,5]. The B jorken sum rule recalls similar sum rules derived for the M ossbauer e ect [6-8] which can also be viewed as the emission of an electroweak boson in a pointlike vertex by a heavy object bound to a complicated system, where the transition involves a change in the momentum and the mass of the heavy object without a change in the interactions between the heavy object and the rest of the system. We derive sum rules for the momentum of the emitted boson for decays of bound heavy quarks, analogous to those previously derived for the M ossbauer e ect [9]. In addition to the B jorken sum rule for the decay rate we nd two additional sum rules showing that the mean and mean square energies of the emitted boson or lepton pair are independent of the detailed dynam ics of the bound state, depend only on the momentum spectrum of the heavy quark in a gas with the same momentum spectrum as in the bound state.

The weak decay from an initial state denoted by ito a nalstate denoted by f is described by the Fermigolden rule of time dependent perturbation theory

$$W_{i! f} = jhf jH_{weak} jii \hat{f} (E_f)$$
 (1a)

where H_{weak} denotes the weak Ham iltonian and (E_f) is the density of nal states. For the case of a sem ileptonic decay where a lepton pair is emitted with momentum q, the matrix element for a transition from an initial hadron state at rest j_{bi} containing a b quark to a nal state $j_c(q)L(q)$ i of a hadron f_c with total momentum q containing a c quark and a lepton pair with momentum q factorizes into a leptonic factor depending only on the lepton variables and a weak vertex describing the heavy quark transition,

$$hf_{c}(q)L(q)jH_{weak}j_{b}i = g_{k}(q)hf_{c}jJ_{k}(q)j_{b}i$$
(1b)

where $g_k(q)$ is a function of the lepton variables and $J_k(q)$ is the fourier component of the avor-changing weak current form on entum transfer q and the index k=0,1 describes the spin character of the heavy quark transition; i.e. J_1 transforms like a vector under spin rotations and describes spin- ip transitions while J_0 is simply the identity operator and describes non ip transitions.

The result (1) is exact to rst order in the electroweak interaction described by the standard model and exact to allorders in strong interactions if the initial and nalstates considered j_{b} i and j_{c} i are exact eigenstates of the strong interaction ham iltonian. We do not need to assume the validity of QCD, perturbative or otherwise, or even the validity of local eld theory at this stage. All we need is the existence of a ham iltonian for strong interactions and its eigenstates.

In heavy quark transitions this description applies to sem ileptonic decays and also to nonleptonic decays in cases where factorization holds; i.e. there are no nalstate interactions between the hadrons produced by the W and the nalbound state.

We now derive the sum rules explicitly for the case of a heavy quark transition (1). The relevant matrix elements of the weak current $hf_c jJ_k$ (q) $jj_b i$ depend only on the variables of the heavy quark and determ ine completely the dependence of the transition on the hadronic wave functions.

It is convenient to normalize the current and the coe cient $g_k(q)$

$$g_k(q) hf_c jJ_k(q) j_b i = g_k(q) hf_c j_k e^{iq X} j_b i$$
 (2a)

where the factor g_k (q) depends upon the strength of the interaction and depends upon the kinem atic variables only via the magnitude of the momentum transfer q and not upon the initial momentum of the heavy quark and $_k$ is a spin factor acting on the spin of the heavy quark and normalized to satisfy the relation

The transition probability or branching ratio is proportional to the square of this matrix element and multiplied by kinematic; e.g. phase space factors which do not depend on the explicit form of the hadron wave functions but only on hadron masses and the momenta of the external particles. This matrix element is seen to satisfy the sum rule

X

$$jg_k(q) hf_c jJ_k(q) j_b j_c j^2 = jg_k(q) j^2$$
(2c)
 j_{c^1}

This is just the Bjorken sum rule. To obtain additional sum rules it is convenient to de ne the reduced matrix element

$$hf_{c}jM_{k}(q) j_{b}i = hf_{c}j_{k}e^{iqX} j_{b}i$$
(3a)

which expresses the B jorken sum rule in the form

X

$$jhf_c jM_k (q) j_b i f = 1$$
 (3b)
 $f_c i$

The H am iltonian of the bound state of a heavy quark of avor f and light quark \brown muck" can be written as a function of the ∞ -ordinate X, the momentum P and the mass m f

of the heavy quark, and all the degrees of freedom in the brown muck denoted by ,

$$H_{f} = H (\mathcal{P}; m_{f}; X;)$$

$$(4)$$

where all the avor dependence is in the heavy quark mass m $_{\rm f}$. The transition operator (3a) contains a momentum displacement operator,

$$e^{iq X} \tilde{Y} e^{iq X} = \tilde{Y} + q$$
 (5a)

$$e^{iq X} H_{f} e^{iq X} = H_{f} [(P + q); m_{f}; X;]$$
(5b)

We now derive sum rules for the moments of the energy distribution E $_{\rm c}$ of the charmed nal state,

$$h \mathbb{E}_{c} (\mathbf{q}) \int^{n} \mathbf{i}_{k} \qquad (\mathbb{E}_{c})^{n} \mathbf{j} h \mathbf{f}_{c} \mathbf{j} \mathbb{M}_{k} (\mathbf{q}) \mathbf{j}_{b} \mathbf{i} \mathbf{j}^{2} = h \mathbf{i}_{b} \mathbf{j}_{k} (\mathbf{e}^{i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{X}} \mathbf{H}_{c} \mathbf{e}^{i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{X}})^{n} \mathbf{k} \mathbf{j}_{b} \mathbf{i} = \mathbf{j}_{c} \mathbf{i}$$

$$= hi_{b}j_{k}fH [(\mathcal{P} + q); m_{c}; \mathcal{X};]g^{n}_{k} j_{b}i$$
 (6a)

$$h[E_{c}(q)]^{n}i_{k} = hB_{k}jfH_{b} + H[(P + q);m_{c};X;] H[(P);m_{b};X;]g^{n}B_{k}i$$
(6b)

$$h \mathbb{E}_{c}(\mathbf{q})^{n} \mathbf{i}_{k} = h \mathbb{B}_{k} \mathbf{j} \mathbf{f} \mathbb{H}_{c} + \mathbb{H} \left[(\mathbf{P} + \mathbf{q}) \mathbf{m}_{c} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{x} \right] \qquad \mathbb{H} \left[(\mathbf{P}) \mathbf{m}_{c} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{x} \mathbf{x} \right] \mathbf{g}^{n} \mathbf{B}_{k} \mathbf{i} \qquad (6c)$$

where β_k i denotes the state produced by the operator k acting on the initial state i_b .

We have thus obtained sum rules form on ents of the nalstate energy distribution at a xed momentum transferq in terms of expectation values calculated in the initial state j_{b} i.

The case n = 0 is just the B jorken sum rule, showing that the sum of the squares of all transition matrix elements at xed momentum transfer q is completely independent of the ham iltonian H describing the dynamics of the bound state and is the same as for a free b quark decaying to charm.

The sum rules reduce to a particularly simple form for the rst and second moments, n=1 and n=2, if one simple additional assumption is made which holds in all conventional models; namely that the state B_k , produced by the operator $_k$ acting on the initial state i_b is an eigenfunction of the bound state H am iltonian H $_b$

$$H_{b} \mathcal{B}_{k} i \quad H_{b} \quad k \not j_{b} i = M \quad (B_{k}) \mathcal{B}_{k} i \tag{8}$$

This assumption holds trivially for the case k = 0 where the spin operator $_{o}$ is just the identity. It is a good approximation for the case k = 1 if spin e ects are neglected as well as in all models where ipping the spin of the heavy b quark in the B m eson produces the vector B state. These include both simple constituent quark models as well as more general models which assume the approximation of heavy quark symmetry. It also holds in all simple models for the $_{b}$ baryon where the b quark carries the spin of the baryon, all other degrees of freedom are coupled to zero angularmomentum and ipping the spin of the b quark simply ips the spin of the whole baryon.

For the set and second moments, n=1 and n=2, the operator H_b appears in eq. (6b) only as acting either to the right on β_k i or to the left on hB_k j to give the mass eigenvalue M (B_k). Thus for n=1 and 2,

$$h \mathbb{E}_{c}(q) \int^{n} i_{k} = h \mathbb{B}_{k} j f \mathbb{M} (\mathbb{B}_{k}) + \mathbb{R}(q) + \mathbb{I}_{cc} \quad m q^{n} \mathcal{B}_{k} i \qquad (9a)$$

where

$$m = m_b \quad m_c \tag{9b}$$

$$R (q) = H [(P' + q); m_{c}; X';] H [(P'); m_{c}; X';] =$$

$$= \frac{q}{(P' + q)^{2} + m_{c}^{2}} \frac{q}{P'^{2} + m_{c}^{2}} \frac{q^{2}}{2m_{c}}$$
(9c)

$$I_{bc} = m + H \mathcal{P}; m_{c}; \mathcal{X};] H \mathcal{P}; m_{b}; \mathcal{X};] \mathcal{P}^{2} \frac{m}{2m_{c}m_{b}}$$
(9d)

where the approximate equalities hold for the case where the nonrelativistic approximation is used for the heavy quark kinetic energy, which is assumed to contain all the dependence of H on P and the heavy quark mass. The quantity R (q) is just the free recoil energy; i.e. the change in kinetic energy of a free charm ed quark when its momentum changes from P to P + q. The quantity I_{bc} is just the \isom er" or \isotope" shift; i.e. the change in the binding energy of the bound state when the mass of the heavy quark changes from m_b to m_c.

The two sum rules are expressed in terms of expectation values of operators depending only on the change in the Ham iltonian when the heavy quark m om entum P is replaced by P + q and the heavy quark m ass is changed from m_b to m_c . They thus depend only on the m om entum distribution of the heavy quark in the initial state and are independent of the brown muck in all models where P enters only into the kinetic energy term in the bound state Ham iltonian and the change in hyper ne energy with quark mass is neglected. They are therefore the same as for the decay of free b quarks in a gas with the same momentum distribution as in the bound state.

The sum rules can be written in various ways appropriate for di erent applications. These depend upon which experim ental quantities are measured and upon assumptions about values of parameters which are not directly measured like quark masses and hyper ne energy contributions.

The sum rules can be expressed in terms of the energy E_W (q) carried o by the W and observed as the energy of the lepton pair or hadrons produced from the W which must have momentum q for momentum conservation. From energy conservation

$$E_{W} (q) = M (i_{b}) E_{c} (q)$$
(10)

T hus

$$= h \mathbb{E}_{W} (q) \mathbb{I}_{k}^{2} + h \mathbb{B}_{k} \mathbb{j} f \mathbb{R} (q) + \mathbb{I}_{bc} g^{2} \mathbb{B}_{k} \mathbb{i} \quad h \mathbb{B}_{k} \mathbb{j} f \mathbb{R} (q) + \mathbb{I}_{bc} g \mathbb{B}_{k} \mathbb{i}^{2}$$

$$h E_{W} (q) j_{k}^{2} + \frac{h B_{k} j P^{2} B_{k} i q}{3m_{c}^{2}} + \frac{(m)^{2}}{4m_{c}^{2}m_{b}^{2}} (h B_{k} j P^{4} B_{k} i h B_{k} j P^{2} B_{k} i^{2})$$
(11b)

The mean energy carried by the W is seen to dier from the heavy quark mass dierence m by three corrections: the free recoil kinetic energy, the \isomer shift" and a spin correction

M (i_b) M (B_k) which is present in the case of spin- ip transitions and is equal to the hyper ne splitting. If we make the nonrelativistic approximation for the heavy quark motion, and neglect the dependence of the hyper ne energy on the heavy quark mass the two sum rules reduce to simple expressions for the mean energy and the dispersion of the energy distribution of the emitted W at xed momentum q when appropriate kinematic factors (i.e. phase space) are taken out of the observed distributions.

When the momentum transfer q and the mean momentum P of the heavy quark in the bound state are both small in comparison with the heavy quark mass, the dispersion vanishes and the mean lepton energy is just the quark mass difference $m_b m_c$. The transition is always to the ground state of the charmed system and the differences in the brown muck wave functions in the two cases is negligible. When the momentum transfer q is negligibly small, the correction resulting from the nite momentum of the heavy quark in the bound state is just the difference in the heavy quark kinetic energies in the initial and nal ground states. This is just equal to the difference in binding energies to rst order in the mass difference.

We now derive a sum rule for the mean excitation energy of the charm ed nal state above the ground state of the charm ed system. The the exact ground state energy is not known since it depends upon the binding energy of the brown muck to the heavy quark. We express this ignorance by writing

$$hB_{k}jH_{c}B_{k}i = M(D_{k}) +$$
(12)

where M (D_k) is the mass of the charm ed analogue of the state B_k. The LHS of eq. (12) is just the mass M (D_k) in the heavy quark symmetry limit and is exact to instorder in the di erence $(\frac{1}{m_c} - \frac{1}{m_b})$. The correction is therefore second order and can also be seen to be positive, since the perturbation result is also variational and gives an upper bound for the mass,

The mean excitation energy E $_{\rm c}$ of the observed spectrum above the ground state is obtained by combining eqs. (6c), (9c) and (12) to obtain

In nearly all models generally considered all the dependence of H on the heavy quark m om entum P is in the kinetic energy; i.e. all dependence of the forces between the heavy quark and the brown muck upon the velocity of the heavy quark is neglected. In that case R (q) is just the free recoil energy; the kinetic energy gained by a free quark with m om entum P as a result of absorbing a m om entum transfer q. Thus the m ean excitation energy including corrections to the binding energies which are rst order in the di erence of 1/m is just the free recoil energy R (q). In contrast to the M ossbauer e ect, where the whole system has a very high m ass and the recoil kinetic energy of the whole system is negligible, the contribution of the recoil kinetic energy of the nal charmed state to the mean excitation energy (13) is appreciable. We therefore express the sum rule (13) in terms of the invariant mass M $_{\rm f}$ of the nal state jf_ci and the excitation energy of the rst p-wave resonance in the charmed system denoted by E $_{\rm 1k}$.

$$\frac{\frac{p_{\text{m}}^{2}}{M_{\text{f}}^{2} + q^{2}} i_{\text{k}}}{E_{1\text{k}}} = \frac{\frac{p_{\text{m}}^{2}}{M_{\text{f}}^{2} + q^{2}}}{E_{1\text{k}}} = \frac{\frac{p_{\text{k}}^{2} j_{\text{k}}^{2} (q) j_{\text{k}}^{2} i_{\text{k}}}{E_{1\text{k}}} = \frac{p_{\text{k}}^{2} (q) j_{\text{k}}}{E_{1\text{k}}} = \frac{p_{\text{k}}^{2} (q) j_$$

The sum rule (14) can be simplied by introducing parameters

$$\frac{P}{\frac{M}{M} (D_{k})^{2} + q^{2}}{M} (D_{k})$$
(15a)

Then

$$q \frac{q}{M_{f}^{2} + q^{2}} = q \frac{M_{f}^{2} - M_{f}^{2}}{M_{f}^{2} + q^{2}} = q \frac{M_{f}^{2} - M_{f}^{2}}{M_{f}^{2} + q^{2} + P_{f}^{2}} \frac{M_{f} - M_{f}^{2}}{M_{f}^{2} + q^{2}} = \frac{M_{f}^{2} - M_{f}^{2}}{M_{f}^{2} + q^{2} + P_{f}^{2}}$$
(16)

$$hB_{k}jR(q) B_{k}i (1)M(D_{k}) = \frac{2}{2}M(D_{k})^{2} 2M(D_{k}) + \frac{2}{2}M(D_{k}) + \frac{2}{2}M(D_{k}) + \frac{2}{2}M(D_{k})^{2} 2M(D_{k}) + \frac{2}{2}M(D_{k}) + \frac{2$$

$$hB_{k}jR(q) B_{k}i (1)M(D_{k}) \frac{(1)M(D_{k})}{M(D_{k})}$$
(17b)

where we have assumed that P' = q which averages to zero over the angular distribution of P' can be neglected and that the correction to the rst order result for M (D_k) is negligible in

com parison with excitation energies,

..,

$$<$$
 E _{1k} (18)

Substituting eqs. (15-18) into the sum rule (14) gives

$$\frac{\text{HM}_{f} \dot{i}_{k} \quad \text{M}_{k} (D_{k})}{\text{E}_{1k}} = \frac{(1)\text{M}_{k} (D_{k})}{\text{M}_{k} (D_{k})} = \frac{\text{M}_{k} (D_{k}) \quad \text{m}_{c}}{\text{E}_{1k}} = \frac{(1)\text{M}_{k} (D_{k})}{(1)\text{M}_{k} (D_{k}) + \text{m}_{c}}$$
(19)

The excitation spectrum of the nal charmed states is seen to have a mean excitation energy above the ground state D_k whose scale is set by the parameter . This parameter is just the di erence between the charmed hadron mass and the energy of the charmed quark and is roughly equal to a light constituent quark mass and bounded by eq. (15b). For low values of q² the mean excitation energy is even lower by the ratio q²=2M (D_k)².

From these inequalities (19) we obtain upper bounds for the probability of B decays into excited charm ed states.

$$\int_{\mathbf{f}_{c} \mathbf{i} \mathbf{f}_{c}} \mathbf{j}_{k} \mathbf{k} (\mathbf{q}) \mathbf{j}_{b} \mathbf{i} \mathbf{f} \frac{\mathbf{M} (\mathbf{D}_{k}) \mathbf{m}_{c}}{\mathbf{E}_{1k}} \frac{(1)\mathbf{M} (\mathbf{D}_{k})}{(1)\mathbf{M} (\mathbf{D}_{k}) + \mathbf{m}_{c}}$$
(20a)

$$X = \int \int f_{c} \int M_{k}(q) = \int \int f_{c} \int f_{c}$$

while for any given excited nal state other than \mathcal{D}_{k1} i $f_c i \notin \mathcal{D}_k i$,

$$jhf_{c}jM_{k}(q) jj_{b}if \frac{M(D_{k}) m_{c}}{M_{c} M(D_{k})} \frac{(1)M(D_{k})}{(1)M(D_{k}) + m_{c}}$$
(21)

This result eqs. (20) is an upper bound for the total probability of decays into states other than the ground state, when the phase space factors are assumed to be equal for all nalstates. Including phase space factors will give an even stronger upper bound. The maximum value of q^2 which haves the energy available just at the threshold for producing the lowest p-wave charmed state[10], D (2420) is $q^2 = 1.25M$ (D $_k$)², which gives = 1.5. This occurs when the lepton m on enta are exactly parallel and they carry the minimum possible energy for a given

value of q^2 . This gives an upper bound on the probability of producing an excited charm ed m eson state of less than 56% for the quoted values[10], M (D) = 1.87 GeV, m_c = 1.35 GeV, E_{1k} = 0.55 GeV. An even smaller upper bound is obtainable if some estimate of the kinetic energy of the heavy quark can be used in eq. (15b). An upper bound for the probability of producing a given state jf_ci with higher mass is given by eq. (21) for the extrem e case where no lower excited states are produced. The probability of producing the ground state is thus

50% even under these extrem e conditions and increases rapidly with more realistic lower values of q^2 . Thus the excitation spectrum will be dominated by the ground state D_k and the rst low-lying D 's.

Stimulating and clarifying discussions with Nathan Isgur and Jonathan L. Rosner are gratefully adknowledged. This research was partially supported by the Basic Research Foundation administered by the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities and by grant No. 90-00342 from the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation (BSF), Jerusalem, Israel.

REFERENCES

- 1. Nathan Isgur and Mark B.W ise, Phys. Lett. B 232 (1989) 113; B237 (1990) 527
- 2. Nathan Isgur and Mark B.W ise, Phys. Rev. Lett. 66 (1991) 1130
- 3. J.D.B jorken, in Proceedings of the Rencontre de Physique de la Vallee D'Aoste, La Thuile, Italy, [SLAC Report No.SLAC-PUB-5278, 1990 (to be published)]
- 4. Nathan Isqur, Mark B.W ise and Michael Youssefin ir, Phys. Lett. B 254 (1991) 215
- 5. Nathan Isgur and Mark B.W ise, Phys. Lett. D 43 (1991) 819
- 6. Harry J. Lipkin, Ann. Phys. 9 (1960) 332
- 7. Harry J. Lipkin, Ann. Phys. 18 (1962) 182
- 8. For a general review see H arry J.Lipkin, Q uantum M echanics, N orth-H olland P ublishing C o.Am sterdam (1973) pp.33-110
- 9. For a general introduction see Harry J. Lipkin, Argonne preprint ANL-HEP-PR-92-86 Submitted to Nuclear Physics A
- 10. Particle Data Group, Phys. Lett. B239 (1990) 1