

Alberta Thy-1-95

January, 1995

Nonfactorization and the decays $D_s^+ \rightarrow \ell^+ \bar{\nu}_\ell$; π^+ and $L^+_{\pi 1}$

A . N . K am al and A . B . Santra¹

Theoretical Physics Institute and Department of Physics,
 University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta T6G 2J1, Canada.

Abstract

In six chosen scenarios for the q^2 dependence of the form factors involved in $D_s^+ \rightarrow \ell^+ \bar{\nu}_\ell$ transition, we have determined the allowed domain of $x = A_2(0)/A_1(0)$ and $y = V(0)/A_1(0)$ from the experimentally measured ratios $R_{s1} = (D_s^+ \rightarrow \ell^+ \bar{\nu}_\ell) / (D_s^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \bar{\nu}_\ell)$ and $R_h = (D_s^+ \rightarrow \ell^+ \bar{\nu}_\ell) / (D_s^+ \rightarrow L^+_{\pi 1})$ in a scheme that uses the $N_c = 3$ value of the phenomenological parameter a_1 and includes nonfactorized contribution. We find that the experimentally measured values of x and y from semileptonic decays of D_s^+ favor solutions which have significant nonfactorized contribution, and, in particular, R_{s1} favors solutions in scenarios where $A_1(q^2)$ is either flat or decreasing with q^2 .

PACS index: 13.25Hw, 14.40Nd

¹on leave of absence from Nuclear Physics Division, Bhabha Atomic Research Centre, Bombay 400085, India.

I. Introduction

The phenomenological parameters a_1 and a_2 , appearing in the description of charm- and bottom meson hadronic decays, are related, for N_c colors, to the perturbatively calculable Wilson coefficients C_1 and C_2 by [1, 2],

$$a_{1,2} = C_{1,2} + \frac{C_{2,1}}{N_c} : \quad (1)$$

In the description of two-body hadronic decays of D mesons, phenomenology seemed to support the view that $N_c \rightarrow 1$ limit applied [3]. This implied that $a_1(m_c) = C_1(m_c) = 1.26$ and $a_2(m_c) = C_2(m_c) = 0.51$ [4]. However, the same idea ($N_c \rightarrow 1$ limit) carried over to hadronic B decays failed. $N_c \rightarrow 1$ limit would have implied $a_1(m_b) = 1.12$ and $a_2(m_c) = 0.26$ [4], yet two-body B decay data leave no doubt that $a_2(m_b)$ is positive [5, 6].

We have recently proposed [7] that in $B \rightarrow ((2S)) + K(K)$ decays, one ought to use $N_c = 3$ values of a_1 and a_2 , $a_1(m_b) = 1.03$ and $a_2(m_b) = 0.09$, and absorb the nonfactorized contributions in the definition of effective, and process-dependent, a_1 and a_2 for processes such as $B \rightarrow PP; VP$ (P and V represent 0 and 1 mesons, respectively) which involve only a single Lorentz scalar. The idea of effective a_1 and a_2 is not new; it has been proposed and discussed by various authors in the past [8, 9, 10, 11]. For processes of kind $B \rightarrow VV$, involving three independent Lorentz structures (as three partial waves, S, P , and D , come into play), it is not possible to define effective a_1 and a_2 [7]. Pursuing this idea, we [7] had shown that color-suppressed decays $B \rightarrow ((2S)) + K(K)$ and the longitudinal polarization fraction in $B \rightarrow \pi + K$ could be understood in all commonly used models provided one included a small nonfactorized amplitude, the amount depending on the model. This ameliorates the conundrum posed in [12] where it was shown that none of the commonly used models explained the polarization data in $B \rightarrow \pi + K$ decay within the factorization assumption.

In the present paper we have carried this idea into the realm of charm ed meson decays; in particular, we investigate the decays $D_s^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0$; $\pi^+ \pi^+$ and $\pi^+ \pi^-$. Experimentally, only relative rates are measured (following the notation introduced in [13]),

$$R_h = \frac{(\mathcal{B}(D_s^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0))}{(\mathcal{B}(D_s^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^+))};$$

$$R_{sl} = \frac{(\mathcal{B}(D_s^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-))}{(\mathcal{B}(D_s^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^+))}; \quad (2)$$

Though the problem has been discussed in [13], we revisit it with the purpose of investigating the role of nonfactorized contribution in a formalism that uses the $N_c = 3$ values of $a_1(m_c)$ and $a_2(m_c)$. The reason for choosing the Cabibbo-favored decays of D_s^+ is that the hadronic final states involve only a single isospin and, consequently, one does not have to worry about the interference effects due to final state interactions.

To the best of our knowledge nonfactorization contributions were first discussed in charm decays by Deshpande et al. [14].

In Section II, we describe the method and the calculation of the three decay rates out of which R_h and R_{sl} are constructed. The results are presented and discussed in Section III.

II. Method and Calculations

A. Definitions

The effective Hamiltonian for Cabibbo-favored hadronic charm decays is given by

$$H_w = \frac{G_F}{2} V_{cs} V_{ud} [C_1 (ud)(sc) + C_2 (uc)(sd)] g; \quad (3)$$

where (ud) etc. represent color-singlet $(V - A)$ Dirac currents and C_1 and C_2 are the Wilson coefficients for which we adopt the following values,

$$C_1 = 1.26 \pm 0.04; \quad C_2 = -0.51 \pm 0.05; \quad (4)$$

The central values of C_1 and C_2 are taken from [4], though the error assignments are ours.

Fierz-transforming in color space with $N_c = 3$, we get

$$(uc)(sd) = \frac{1}{3} (ud)(sc) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{a=1}^8 (u^a c)(s^a d); \quad (5)$$

where t^a are the Gell-Mann matrices. We define, for $N_c = 3$,

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 &= C_1 + \frac{C_2}{3} = 1.09 \pm 0.04; \\ a_2 &= C_2 + \frac{C_1}{3} = -0.09 \pm 0.05; \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

We also define [3, 4] the relevant hadronic matrix elements and form factors,

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle h^+ j(u\bar{d}) | \bar{D} | i \rangle &= \sqrt{m} f; \\
\langle h^+ j(u\bar{d}) | \bar{D} | i \rangle &= \begin{cases} \text{if } p; \end{cases} \\
\langle h^+ j(sc) | \bar{D}_s^+ | i \rangle &= i \sqrt{(m_{D_s} + m)} \left[A_1(q^2) - \frac{\sqrt{q}}{m_{D_s} + m} (p_{D_s} + p) A_2(q^2) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 2m \frac{\sqrt{q}}{q^2} q A_3(q^2) + \frac{\sqrt{q}}{q^2} (2m - q) A_0(q^2) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{2}{m_{D_s} + m} \sqrt{p_{D_s} p} V(q^2) \right]; \tag{7}
\end{aligned}$$

where $q = (p_{D_s} - p)$. In addition, the following constraints apply at $q^2 = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
A_0(0) &= A_3(0); \\
2m A_3(0) &= (m_{D_s} + m) A_1(0) - (m_{D_s} - m) A_2(0); \tag{8}
\end{aligned}$$

With these preliminaries, we now study the rates for the processes $D_s^+ \rightarrow I_1^+ \pi^+$ and $D_s^+ \rightarrow I_1^+ \pi^0$.

$B \rightarrow D_s^+ \rightarrow I_1^+ \pi^+$ decay

In the notation of [13],

$$\frac{d}{dt^2} D_s^+ \rightarrow I_1^+ \pi^+ = \frac{G_F^2 m_{D_s}^5}{192 \pi^3} |V_{cs}|^2 k(t^2)^X |H(t^2)|^2; \tag{9}$$

where, $H(t^2)$ in each helicity state are defined by,

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{00}(t^2) &= \frac{1+r}{2r} (1-r^2-t^2) A_1(t^2) - \frac{k^2(t^2)}{(1+r)^2} A_2(t^2)^2; \\
H_{\parallel}(t^2) &= (1+r)^2 t^2 A_1(t^2) - \frac{k(t^2)}{(1+r)^2} V(t^2)^2; \tag{10}
\end{aligned}$$

with

$$r = \frac{m}{m_{D_s}}; \quad t^2 = \frac{q^2}{m_{D_s}^2}; \quad 0 \leq t^2 \leq (1-r)^2; \tag{11}$$

In the rest frame of D_s^+ , the magnitude of meson 3-momentum is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
p(t^2) &= \frac{m_{D_s}}{2} k(t^2); \\
\text{with } k(t^2) &= [(1+r^2-t^2)^2 - 4r^2]^{1/2}; \tag{12}
\end{aligned}$$

$C \cdot D_s^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0$ decay

Using (3), (5) and (6), the decay amplitude for $D_s^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0$ is written as

$$A(D_s^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0) = \frac{G_F}{2} V_{cs} V_{ud} [a_1^{(D)} + j(u\bar{d})(s\bar{c})] \mathcal{P}_s^+ + C_2^{(D)} + \mathcal{H}_w^{(8)} \mathcal{P}_s^+; \quad (13)$$

where, from (5)

$$\mathcal{H}_w^{(8)} = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} (u \bar{a} c) (s \bar{a} d); \quad (14)$$

We calculate the first term in the brackets of (13) in the factorization approximation using the definitions in (6) and parametrize the second, the nonfactorized term for convenience of combining it with the first term, as follows,

$$C_2^{(D)} + \mathcal{H}_w^{(8)} \mathcal{P}_s^+ = 2m_f \text{Tr} [\mathcal{P}_{D_s} A_0^{NF}(m^2)]; \quad (15)$$

This nonfactorized parameter, A_0^{NF} , represents a spurion scattering $H_w^{(8)} + D_s^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0$, at the Mandelstam point $s = m_{D_s}^2$, $t = m^2$ and $u = m^2$.

Combining the factorized and the nonfactorized terms we obtain,

$$A(D_s^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0) = \frac{G_F}{2} V_{cs} V_{ud} m [a_1^{eff} A_0(m^2) \text{Tr} \mathcal{P}_{D_s}]; \quad (16)$$

where,

$$a_1^{eff} = a_1 [1 + \frac{C_2 A_0^{NF}(m^2)}{A_0(m^2)}]; \quad (17)$$

In terms of the quantities defined in (10) – (12), the decay rate $D_s^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0$ is given by [13],

$$\Gamma(D_s^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0) = \frac{G_F^2 m_{D_s}^5}{32} |V_{cs}|^2 |V_{ud}|^2 |a_1^{eff}|^2 \frac{f_{\pi^0}^2}{m_{D_s}} k(0) H_{00}(0); \quad (18)$$

where we have approximated $m^2 = m_{D_s}^2 \rightarrow 0$ and

$$k(0) H_{00}(0) = (1 - r^2)^3 \frac{1+r}{2r} A_1(0) - \frac{1}{1+r} A_2(0)^2; \quad (19)$$

We choose not to work with the form (18) which involves $A_0(0)$ in the definition of a_1^{eff} but rather with a form in which $A_0(0)$ is eliminated altogether in favor of $A_1(0)$ and $A_2(0)$ via (8). In doing so, we obtain,

$$\mathcal{D}_s^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ = \frac{G_F^2 m_{D_s}^5}{32} \mathcal{J}_{cs} \mathcal{J}_{ud} \mathcal{J}_{a_1}^2 \frac{f_{\pi^+}^2}{m_{D_s}} k(0) \hat{H}_{00}(0); \quad (20)$$

where,

$$k(0) \hat{H}_{00}(0) = (1 - r^2)^3 \frac{1 + r^2}{2r} A_1(0) - \frac{1}{1 + r} A_2(0) + \frac{2r}{1 + r} \frac{C_2}{a_1} A_0^{\text{NF}}(0)^2; \quad (21)$$

$\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_s^+ \pi^+$ decay with a zero width meson

From (3), (5) and (6), the decay amplitude for $\mathcal{D}_s^+ \rightarrow \pi^+$ is written as,

$$A(\mathcal{D}_s^+ \rightarrow \pi^+) = \frac{G_F}{2} V_{cs} V_{ud} a_1^n \mathcal{D} + j(\text{ud})(\text{sc}) \mathcal{D}_s^{\text{E}} + C_2^{\text{D}} + H_w^{(8)} \mathcal{D}_s^{\text{Eo}}; \quad (22)$$

where $H_w^{(8)}$ is defined in (14).

Again we calculate the first term in the brackets of (22) in the factorization approximation and define the nonfactorized second term, for ease of combining it with the factorized first term, as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D} + H_w^{(8)} \mathcal{D}_s^{\text{E}} &= \int d^3p \, (m_{D_s} + m_{\pi}) (p_{\pi}^0 - p_{D_s}^0) A_1^{\text{NF}}(m^2) \\ &\quad - \frac{2}{m_{D_s} + m_{\pi}} (p_{\pi}^0 - p_{D_s}^0) (p_{\pi}^0 - p_{D_s}^0) A_2^{\text{NF}}(m^2) \\ &\quad - \frac{2i}{m_{D_s} + m_{\pi}} (p_{\pi}^0 - p_{D_s}^0) (p_{\pi}^0 - p_{D_s}^0) p_{D_s} p_{\pi} V^{\text{NF}}(m^2); \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Further, because of lack of phase space in this decay mode, we retain nonfactorized contribution only to S-waves, that is,

$$\begin{aligned} A_1^{\text{NF}}(m^2) &\neq 0; \\ A_2^{\text{NF}}(m^2) &= V^{\text{NF}}(m^2) = 0; \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

The decay amplitudes in each helicity state are then given by

$$\begin{aligned} A_{00}(\mathcal{D}_s^+ \rightarrow \pi^+) &= \frac{G_F}{2} V_{cs} V_{ud} m \int d^3p \, (m_{D_s} + m_{\pi}) a_1^n A_1(m^2) - b A_2(m^2)^0; \\ A(\mathcal{D}_s^+ \rightarrow \pi^+) &= \frac{G_F}{2} V_{cs} V_{ud} m \int d^3p \, (m_{D_s} + m_{\pi}) a_1^n A_1(m^2) - c V(m^2)^0; \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where, with $t = m_{D_s}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 a &= \frac{m_{D_s}^2 m^2 m^2}{2m m} = \frac{1}{2rt} \frac{r^2 t^2}{t^2}; \\
 b &= \frac{2\mathcal{P} \mathcal{J} m_{D_s}^2}{(m_{D_s} + m)^2 m m} = \frac{k^2(t^2)}{2rt(1+r)^2}; \\
 c &= \frac{2\mathcal{P} \mathcal{J} m_{D_s}}{(m_{D_s} + m)^2} = \frac{k(t^2)}{(1+r)^2}; \\
 &= 1 + \frac{C_2}{a_1}; \\
 &= \frac{A_1^{NF}(m^2)}{A_1(m^2)};
 \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

The decay rate can then be expressed in a form resembling the expression given in [13],

$$\Gamma(D_s^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0) = \frac{G_F^2 m_{D_s}^5}{32} \mathcal{V}_{cs}^2 \mathcal{V}_{ud}^2 a_1^2 \frac{f_{\pi^0}^2}{m_{D_s}} k(t^2)^X H^0(t^2); \tag{27}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
 H_{00}^0(t^2) &= \frac{1+r}{2r} (1-r^2 t^2) A_1(t^2) - \frac{k^2(t^2)}{(1+r)^2} A_2(t^2)^2; \\
 H^0(t^2) &= (1+r)^2 t^2 A_1(t^2) - \frac{k(t^2)}{(1+r)^2} V(t^2)^2;
 \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

$\Gamma(D_s^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0)$ decay with a finite width meson.

The finite width of meson is taken into account by smearing the rates given in (27) and (28) over the width by using a unit normalized Breit-Wigner measure, $\delta(t^2)$. This is accomplished by the replacement [13, 15, 16],

$$k(t^2) H(t^2) \rightarrow \int_{4t^2}^Z \frac{(1-r)^2}{4t^2} k(t^2) H(t^2) (t^2) dt^2 \tag{29}$$

with

$$\int_{4t^2}^Z \delta(t^2) dt^2 = 1; \quad t = \frac{m}{m_{D_s}} \tag{30}$$

Two measures that have been used in the past are [15, 16],

$$_1(t^2) = \frac{N_1}{(t^2 - t^2)^2 + t^2}; \quad (31)$$

and

$$_2(t^2) = \frac{N_2}{(t^2 - t^2)^2 + t^2(t^2)}; \quad (32)$$

with

$$\frac{1}{N_{1,2}} = \int_{-t^2}^{t^2} _{1,2}(t^2) dt^2; \quad (33)$$

The appearance of $N_{1,2}$ in (31) and (32) ensures that $_1(t^2)$ are unit normalized. In (31), $t^2 = m_{D_s^+}$, where t^2 is the width. In (32), (t^2) is so chosen as to reflect the P-wave nature of the meson

$$(t^2) = \frac{t^2}{t^2} \frac{t^2 - 4t^2}{t^2 - 4t^2}^{\#_{3=2}}; \quad (34)$$

For a width of 151.2 MeV and $m = 769.1$ MeV, we found $N_1 = 1.0758$ and $N_2 = 0.9946$. In our calculation we have used the smearing function $_2(t^2)$ with energy-dependent width.

III. Results and Discussions

In the results presented below we have used $V_{cs} = V_{ud} = 0.975$ and only the central values of a_1, a_2 and C_2 given in (4) and (6): $a_1 = 1.09, a_2 = -0.09$ and $C_2 = -0.51$. Denoting

$$x = \frac{A_2(0)}{A_1(0)}; \quad y = \frac{V(0)}{A_1(0)}; \quad (35)$$

we can write the decay rate for $D_s^+ \rightarrow \pi^+$ as

$$(\mathcal{B}_s^+ \rightarrow \pi^+) = 0.2341 \cdot 10^{12} A_1(0)^2 (1 - 0.3177x - 0.3192y^2) s^{-1}; \quad (36)$$

where,

$$= \frac{A_0^{NF}}{A_1(0)}; \quad (37)$$

We calculate $\langle D_s^+ | I^+ | 1 \rangle$ and the smeared $\langle D_s^+ | I^+ \rangle$ in six different scenarios listed below.

Scenario 1: All form factors extrapolate in q^2 as monopoles; $A_1(q^2)$ and $A_2(q^2)$ with pole mass 2.53 GeV and $V(q^2)$ with a pole mass 2.11 GeV (BSW I [3]). We get

$$\begin{aligned}\langle D_s^+ | I^+ | 1 \rangle &= 0.1615 \cdot 10^{12} \mathcal{A}_1(0) f_1^2 = 0.2840x + 0.0344x^2 + 0.0144y^2 \text{ s}^{-1}; \\ \langle D_s^+ | I^+ \rangle &= 0.3972 \cdot 10^{12} \mathcal{A}_1(0) f_1^2 = 0.1493x + 0.0118x^2 + 0.0167y^2 \text{ s}^{-1};\end{aligned}\quad (38)$$

Scenario 2: $A_1(q^2)$ extrapolates in q^2 as monopole with pole mass 2.53 GeV and $A_2(q^2)$ and $V(q^2)$ as dipoles with pole masses 2.53 and 2.11 GeV, respectively (BSW II [4]). We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\langle D_s^+ | I^+ | 1 \rangle &= 0.1615 \cdot 10^{12} \mathcal{A}_1(0) f_1^2 = 0.2958x + 0.0367x^2 + 0.0176y^2 \text{ s}^{-1}; \\ \langle D_s^+ | I^+ \rangle &= 0.3972 \cdot 10^{12} \mathcal{A}_1(0) f_1^2 = 0.1623x + 0.0137x^2 + 0.0218y^2 \text{ s}^{-1};\end{aligned}\quad (39)$$

Scenario 3: $A_1(q^2)$ at, $A_2(q^2)$ and $V(q^2)$ extrapolate in q^2 as monopoles with pole masses 2.53 and 2.11 GeV, respectively. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\langle D_s^+ | I^+ | 1 \rangle &= 0.1423 \cdot 10^{12} \mathcal{A}_1(0) f_1^2 = 0.3098x + 0.0390x^2 + 0.0163y^2 \text{ s}^{-1}; \\ \langle D_s^+ | I^+ \rangle &= 0.3297 \cdot 10^{12} \mathcal{A}_1(0) f_1^2 = 0.1656x + 0.0142x^2 + 0.0202y^2 \text{ s}^{-1};\end{aligned}\quad (40)$$

Scenario 4: $A_1(q^2)$ decreasing linearly in q^2 ,

$$A_1(q^2) = A_1(0) \left(1 - \frac{q^2}{2.53} \right); \quad (41)$$

and $A_2(q^2)$ and $V(q^2)$ extrapolate in q^2 as monopoles with pole masses 2.53 and 2.11 GeV, respectively. This yields

$$\begin{aligned}\langle D_s^+ | I^+ | 1 \rangle &= 0.1262 \cdot 10^{12} \mathcal{A}_1(0) f_1^2 = 0.3361x + 0.0440x^2 + 0.0184y^2 \text{ s}^{-1}; \\ \langle D_s^+ | I^+ \rangle &= 0.2742 \cdot 10^{12} \mathcal{A}_1(0) f_1^2 = 0.1835x + 0.0171x^2 + 0.0243y^2 \text{ s}^{-1};\end{aligned}\quad (42)$$

Scenario 5: $A_1(q^2)$ and $A_2(q^2)$ at and $V(q^2)$ extrapolates in q^2 as monopole with pole mass 2.11 GeV [13]. We get

$$\begin{aligned}\langle D_s^+ | I^+ | 1 \rangle &= 0.1423 \cdot 10^{12} \mathcal{A}_1(0) f_1^2 = 0.2980x + 0.0366x^2 + 0.0163y^2 \text{ s}^{-1}; \\ \langle D_s^+ | I^+ \rangle &= 0.3297 \cdot 10^{12} \mathcal{A}_1(0) f_1^2 = 0.1526x + 0.0122x^2 + 0.0202y^2 \text{ s}^{-1};\end{aligned}\quad (43)$$

Scenario 6: $A_1(q^2)$ decreasing linearly in q^2 according to [13],

$$A_1(q^2) = A_1(0) \left(1 - \frac{q^2}{3.5} \right); \quad (44)$$

and $A_2(q^2)$ and $V(q^2)$ extrapolate in q^2 as monopoles with pole masses 2.53 and 2.11 GeV, respectively. This yields

$$\begin{aligned} \langle D_s^+ | \bar{l} \Gamma l \rangle &= 0.1337 \cdot 10^{12} A_1(0) f_1^2 \left(0.3172x + 0.0403x^2 + 0.0174y^2 \right) s^{-1}; \\ \langle D_s^+ | \bar{l} \Gamma l \rangle &= 0.3000 \cdot 10^{12} A_1(0) f_1^2 \left(0.1667x + 0.0145x^2 + 0.0222y^2 \right) s^{-1}; \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

For data, we use

$$R_h = 1.86 \pm_{0.40}^{0.29}; \quad [17] \quad (46)$$

$$R_{sl} = 0.54 \pm_{0.10}^{0.10}; \quad [18] \quad (47)$$

In the following, we discuss the analysis of the ratios R_{sl} and R_h separately.

R_{sl} : We reiterate that we are using the $N_c = 3$ value of $a_1 = 1.09$ (central value only). R_{sl} is constructed from (36) for $\langle D_s^+ | \bar{l} \Gamma l \rangle$ and (38)–(45) for $\langle D_s^+ | \bar{l} \Gamma l \rangle$ in various scenarios. The allowed region in $(x; y)$ plane are shown in Fig.1 for some selected scenarios as explained below. Firstly, we observe that no solutions were found for $\epsilon = 0$ (see (37)) in scenarios 1 and 2 (BSW I and BSW II, respectively). In contrast, solutions were found in these scenarios in [13]; the difference lies in our use of $a_1 = 1.09$ while $a_1 = 1.26$ was used in [13]. Solutions, however, were found for $\epsilon = 0$ in all the other four scenarios. Secondly, the scenarios for $A_1(q^2)$ at, and $A_1(q^2)$ and $A_2(q^2)$ at, for $\epsilon = 0$ or $\epsilon \neq 0$ were almost indistinguishable, while those for BSW I and BSW II with $\epsilon \neq 0$ were very similar. Consequently, we have chosen to plot only the results using scenarios 1, 3 and 4 to keep Fig.1 uncluttered. The experimental points are from Refs. [19], [20] and [21] and the plots are made for $\epsilon = 0$ and -0.5 .

The absolute rate, $\langle D_s^+ | \bar{l} \Gamma l \rangle$ and the branching ratio, $B(D_s^+ | \bar{l} \Gamma l)$ can not be calculated in a model-independent way, but, for the record, in BSW model [3], one gets

$$\begin{aligned} B(D_s^+ | \bar{l} \Gamma l) &= 2.48\% \quad (\epsilon = 0); \\ &= 4.03\% \quad (\epsilon = -0.5); \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

Particle Data Group [22] list $B(D_s^+ \rightarrow \pi^+) = (3.5 \pm 0.4)\%$, though a direct measurement of the branching ratio does not exist.

Clearly from Fig.1 one notes that data prefer solutions with $A_1(q^2)$ at or $A_1(q^2)$ decreasing with q^2 (scenarios 3 to 6). Further, solutions with a nonfactorized contribution, $\alpha = 0.5$, fare much better than those with $\alpha = 0$. In particular, E-687 data [20] are consistent with all the six scenarios with $\alpha = 0.5$. CLEO data [21] are consistent with scenarios 3 to 6 ($A_1(q^2)$ at or decreasing with q^2) with $\alpha = 0.5$. E-653 data [19] do not admit a solution with $\alpha = 0.5$ or 0 .

R_h : The ratio R_h , eq.(2), is constructed from the rates $\Gamma(D_s^+ \rightarrow \pi^+)$ given in (36) and $\Gamma(D_s^+ \rightarrow \pi^+)$, for finite width meson, given in (38) to (45). The allowed regions in $(x; y)$ plane for the six scenarios are shown in Figs. 2, 3 and 4. We find that with $\alpha = 0$, solutions accommodate E-687 data [20] in all scenarios, while CLEO data [21] are accommodated in scenarios 4 and 6 ($A_1(q^2)$ decreasing with q^2).

However with $\alpha = 0.5$ and $\alpha = 0.5$, all three data points [19, 20, 21] are accommodated in all six scenarios. The allowed region in the $(x; y)$ plane is now a band with an upper and lower branch.

For the record, with $\alpha = 0.5$, and using BSW II model [4], one gets

$$B(D_s^+ \rightarrow \pi^+) = 6.23\% : \quad (49)$$

Again, though this branching ratio is not directly measured, Particle Data Group [22] list

$$B(D_s^+ \rightarrow \pi^+) = (6.5^{+1.6}_{-1.8})\% \quad (50)$$

In conclusion, taking the $N_c = 3$ value of a_1 seriously, we have asked: What is the domain of x and y allowed by the ratios R_h and R_{sl} in six chosen scenarios for the q^2 dependence of the form factors, with and without nonfactorization contribution? And, what is the size and the sign of the nonfactorization contribution in order that the measured values of x and y fall within the allowed domain obtained from R_h and R_{sl} ? We should emphasize that the experimental determination of x and y from semileptonic data is not model free as monopole extrapolation is assumed for all the form factors in data analysis. We find that an analysis with the inclusion of nonfactorized contribution fares much better in selecting an allowed domain of x and y consistent with the data. This is particularly true of R_{sl} where, in addition, the scenarios in which $A_1(q^2)$ is at, or

decreasing with q^2 are favored over the scenarios where it rises with q^2 . As to the size and sign of the nonfactorized contribution, we have no explanation.

Acknowledgements

ANK wishes to acknowledge a research grant from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada which partially supported this research.

Figure Captions

Fig.1: The regions enclosed by various curves and the axes are the domains of $(x;y)$ allowed by R_{sl} (eqn. (47)) in different scenarios. The solid curve is for scenario 1 with $\alpha = 0.5$; the dashed (second from the right) and the dash-dashed (innermost) are for scenario 3 with $\alpha = 0.5$ and 0 , respectively; the dotted (outermost) and the dot-dashed (second from left) are for scenario 4 with $\alpha = 0.5$ and 0 , respectively. The corresponding curves for scenario 6 (not shown to avoid cluttering) lie between the curves for scenarios 3 and 4. Also shown are the data points; A : E-687 [20], B : E-653 [19] and C : CLEO [17].

Fig.2: The domain (between two solid lines) of $(x;y)$ allowed by R_h (eqn. (46)) with $\alpha = 0.5$ and $\beta = 0.5$. (a) in scenario 1; (b) in scenario 2. The region enclosed by the dashed lines and the axes both in (a) and (b) is the allowed domain of $(x;y)$ with $\alpha = \beta = 0$. Also shown are the data points; A : E-687 [20], B : E-653 [19] and C : CLEO [17].

Fig.3: Same as Fig. 2. (a) in scenario 3; (b) in scenario 5.

Fig.4: Same as Fig. 2. (a) in scenario 4; (b) in scenario 6.

References

- [1] R. Rückl, Habilitationsschrift, University of Munich, 1983.
- [2] M. Wirbel, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. 21, 33 (1988)
- [3] M. Bauer, B. Stech and M. Wirbel, Z. Phys. C 34, 103 (1987); see also, M. Wirbel, B. Stech and M. Bauer, Z. Phys. C 29, 637 (1985) M. Bauer and M. Wirbel, Z. Phys. C 42, 671 (1989)
- [4] M. Neubert, V. Rieckert, B. Stech and Q. P. Xu in Heavy Flavours, ed. by A. J. Buras and M. Lindner, World Scientific, Singapore, 1992.
- [5] T. E. Browder, K. Honscheid and S. Playfer, Report CLNS 93/1261, to appear in B Decays, 2nd Edition, ed. by S. Stone. World Scientific, Singapore.
- [6] M. S. Alam et al. (CLEO collaboration) Phys. Rev. D 50, 43 (1994).
- [7] A. N. Kamal and A. B. Santra, University of Alberta Report No. Alberta-Thy 31-94.
- [8] B. Blok and M. Shifman, Nucl. Phys. B 399, 441, 459 (1993), *ibid* B 389, 534 (1993) and references therein.
- [9] H.-Y. Cheng, Taipei Report No. IP-ASTP-11-94.
- [10] H.-Y. Cheng and B. Tseng, Taipei Report No. IP-ASTP-21-94.
- [11] J. M. Soares, TRUMF Report No. TRI-PP-94-78.
- [12] M. Gourdin, A. N. Kamal and X. Y. Pham, Paris Report No. PAR/LPTHE/94-19, to appear in Phys. Rev. Lett.
- [13] M. Gourdin, A. N. Kamal, Y. Y. Keum and X. Y. Pham, Phys. Lett. B 339 173 (1994).
- [14] N. Deshpande, M. Gronau and D. Sutherland, Phys. Lett. 90B, 431 (1980).
- [15] X. Y. Pham and X. C. Vu, Phys. Rev. D 46, 261 (1992)
- [16] A. N. Kamal and R. C. Verma, Phys. Rev. D 45, 982 (1992)

- [17] P. Avery et al. CLEO collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett. 68, 1279 (1992)
- [18] M. S. Witherell, in Lepton Photon Interaction, XVI International Symposium, Ithaca, N. Y. 1993, ed. by P. Drell and D. Rubin, AIP conference Proceedings 302, p198, American Institute of Physics, New York (1994).
- [19] K. Kodama et al., E-653 Collaboration, Phys. Lett. B 309, 483 (1993).
- [20] P. L. Frabetti et al., E-687 Collaboration, Phys. Lett. B 328, 187 (1994).
- [21] P. Avery et al., CLEO Collaboration, Phys. Lett. B 337, 405 (1994).
- [22] L. Montanet et al., Particle Data Group, Review of Particle Properties, Phys. Rev. D 50, 1173 (1994).

This figure "fig1-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9501246v1>

This figure "fig2-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9501246v1>

This figure "fig1-2.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9501246v1>

This figure "fig2-2.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9501246v1>