

Hadronic Weak Decays of Heavy Mesons and Nonfactorization

Hai-Yang Cheng

Institute of Physics, Academia Sinica
Taipei, Taiwan 11529, Republic of China

Abstract

The parameters $\chi_{1,2}$, which measure nonfactorizable soft gluon contributions to hadronic weak decays of mesons, are updated by extracting them from the data of $D, B \rightarrow PP, VP$ decays (P : pseudoscalar meson, V : vector meson). It is found that χ_2 ranges from -0.36 to -0.60 in the decays from $D \rightarrow \bar{K}\pi$ to $D^+ \rightarrow \phi\pi^+$, $D \rightarrow \bar{K}^*\pi$, while it is of order 10% with a positive sign in $B \rightarrow \psi K, D\pi, D^*\pi, D\rho$ decays. Therefore, the effective parameter a_2 is process dependent in charm decay, whereas it stays fairly stable in B decay. This implies the picture that nonfactorizable effects become stronger when the decay particles become less energetic after hadronization. As for $D, B \rightarrow VV$ decays, the presence of nonfactorizable terms in general prevents a possible definition of effective a_1 and a_2 . This is reenforced by the observation of a large longitudinal polarization fraction in $B \rightarrow \psi K^*$ decay, implying S -wave dominated nonfactorizable effects. The nonfactorizable term dominated by the S -wave is also essential for understanding the decay rate of $B^- \rightarrow D^{*0}\rho^-$. It is found that all nonfactorizable effects $A_1^{nf}/A_1^{BK^*}, A_1^{nf}/A_1^{B\rho}, A_1^{nf}/A_1^{BD^*}$ (nf standing for nonfactorization) are positive and of order 10%, in accordance with $\chi_2(B \rightarrow D(D^*)\pi(\rho))$ and $\chi_2(B \rightarrow \psi K)$. However, we show that in $D \rightarrow \bar{K}^*\rho$ decay nonfactorizable effects cannot be dominated by the S -wave. A polarization measurement in the color- and Cabibbo-suppressed decay mode $D^+ \rightarrow \phi\rho^+$ is strongly urged in order to test if A_2^{nf}/A_2 plays a more pivotal role than A_1^{nf}/A_1 in charm decay.

1. Introduction

It is customary to assume that two-body nonleptonic weak decays of heavy mesons are dominated by factorizable contributions. Under this assumption, the spectator meson decay amplitude is the product of the universal parameter a_1 (for external W -emission) or a_2 (for internal W -emission), which is channel independent in D or B decays, and hadronic matrix elements which can be factorized as the product of two independent hadronic currents. The universal parameters a_1 and a_2 are related to the Wilson coefficient functions c_1 and c_2 by

$$a_1 = c_1 + \frac{1}{N_c}c_2, \quad a_2 = c_2 + \frac{1}{N_c}c_1, \quad (1)$$

with N_c being the number of colors. It is known that the bulk of exclusive nonleptonic charm decay data cannot be explained by this factorization approach [1]. For example, the predicted ratio of the color-suppressed mode $D^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}^0\pi^0$ and color-favored decay $D^0 \rightarrow K^-\pi^+$ is in violent disagreement with experiment. This signals the importance of the nonfactorizable effects.

The leading nonfactorizable contribution arises from the soft gluon exchange between two color-octet currents

$$O_c = \frac{1}{2}(\bar{q}_1\lambda^a q_2)(\bar{q}_3\lambda^a q_4), \quad (2)$$

where $(\bar{q}_1\lambda^a q_2)$ stands for $\bar{q}_1\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)\lambda^a q_2$. For $M \rightarrow PP$, VP decays (P : pseudoscalar meson, V : vector meson), the nonfactorizable effect amounts to a redefinition of the parameters a_1 and a_2 [2],¹

$$a_1 \rightarrow c_1 + c_2\left(\frac{1}{N_c} + \chi_1\right), \quad a_2 \rightarrow c_2 + c_1\left(\frac{1}{N_c} + \chi_2\right), \quad (3)$$

where χ_1 and χ_2 denote the contributions of O_c to color-favored and color-suppressed decay amplitudes respectively relative to the factorizable ones. For example, for $D_s^+ \rightarrow \phi\pi^+$, $D^+ \rightarrow \phi\pi^+$ decays,

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_1(D_s^+ \rightarrow \phi\pi^+) &= \frac{\langle \phi\pi^+ | \frac{1}{2}(\bar{u}\lambda^a d)(\bar{s}\lambda^a c) | D_s^+ \rangle}{\langle \phi\pi^+ | (\bar{u}d)(\bar{s}c) | D_s^+ \rangle_f}, \\ \chi_2(D^+ \rightarrow \phi\pi^+) &= \frac{\langle \phi\pi^+ | \frac{1}{2}(\bar{u}\lambda^a c)(\bar{s}\lambda^a s) | D^+ \rangle}{\langle \phi\pi^+ | (\bar{u}c)(\bar{s}s) | D^+ \rangle_f}. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

The subscript f in Eq.(4) denotes a factorizable contribution:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \phi\pi^+ | (\bar{u}d)(\bar{s}c) | D_s^+ \rangle_f &= 2m_\phi f_\pi (\varepsilon^* \cdot p_{D_s}) A_0^{D_s\phi}(m_\pi^2), \\ \langle \phi\pi^+ | (\bar{u}c)(\bar{s}s) | D^+ \rangle_f &= m_\phi f_\phi (\varepsilon^* \cdot p_D) F_1^{D\pi}(m_\phi^2), \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

¹Note that our definition of χ_1 and χ_2 is different from r_1 and r_2 defined in [3] by a factor of 2.

where ε_μ is the polarization vector of the ϕ meson, and we have followed Ref.[4] for the definition of form factors. The nonfactorizable contributions have the expressions

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\phi\pi^+|\frac{1}{2}(\bar{u}\lambda^a d)(\bar{s}\lambda^a c)|D_s^+\rangle &= 2m_\phi f_\pi(\varepsilon^* \cdot p_{D_s})A_0^{nf}(m_\pi^2), \\ \langle\phi\pi^+|\frac{1}{2}(\bar{u}\lambda^a c)(\bar{s}\lambda^a s)|D^+\rangle &= m_\phi f_\phi(\varepsilon^* \cdot p_D)F_1^{nf}(m_\phi^2),\end{aligned}\quad (6)$$

with the superscript nf referring to nonfactorizable contributions. It is clear that

$$\chi_1(D_s^+ \rightarrow \phi\pi^+) = \frac{A_0^{nf}(m_\pi^2)}{A_0^{D_s\phi}(m_\pi^2)}, \quad \chi_2(D^+ \rightarrow \phi\pi^+) = \frac{F_1^{nf}(m_\phi^2)}{F_1^{D\pi}(m_\phi^2)}.\quad (7)$$

That is, χ simply measures the fraction of nonfactorizable contributions to the form factor under consideration.

Although we do not know how to calculate χ_1 and χ_2 from first principles, we do anticipate that [3]

$$|\chi(B \rightarrow PP)| < |\chi(D \rightarrow PP)| < |\chi(D \rightarrow VP)|,\quad (8)$$

based on the reason that nonperturbative soft gluon effects become more important when the final-state particles move slower, allowing more time for significant final-state interactions after hadronization. As a consequence, it is obvious that $a_{1,2}$ are in general not universal and that the rule of discarding $1/N_c$ terms [5], which works empirically well in $D \rightarrow \bar{K}\pi$ decay, cannot be safely extrapolated to $B \rightarrow D\pi$ decay as $|\chi(B \rightarrow D\pi)|$ is expected to be much smaller than $|\chi(D \rightarrow \bar{K}\pi) \sim -\frac{1}{3}|$ (the c.m. momentum in $D \rightarrow \bar{K}\pi$ being 861 MeV, to be compared with 2307 MeV in $B \rightarrow D\pi$) and hence a large cancellation between $1/N_c$ and $\chi(B \rightarrow D\pi)$ is not expected to happen. The recent CLEO observation [6] that the rule of discarding $1/N_c$ terms is not operative in $B \rightarrow D(D^*)\pi(\rho)$ decays is therefore not stunning. Only the fact that $\chi(B \rightarrow D\pi)$ is positive turns out to be striking.

Unlike the PP or VP case, it is not pertinent to define $\chi_{1,2}$ for $M \rightarrow VV$ decay as its general amplitude consists of three independent Lorentz scalars:

$$A[M(p) \rightarrow V_1(\varepsilon_1, p_1)V_2(\varepsilon_2, p_2)] \propto \varepsilon_\mu^*(\lambda_1)\varepsilon_\nu^*(\lambda_2)(\hat{A}_1 g^{\mu\nu} + \hat{A}_2 p^\mu p^\nu + i\hat{V}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}p_{1\alpha}p_{2\beta}),\quad (9)$$

where \hat{A}_1 , \hat{A}_2 , \hat{V} are related to the form factors A_1 , A_2 and V respectively. Since *a priori* there is no reason to expect that nonfactorizable terms weight in the same way to S -, P - and D -waves, namely $A_1^{nf}/A_1 = A_2^{nf}/A_2 = V^{nf}/V$, we thus cannot define χ_1 and χ_2 . Consequently, it is in general not possible to define an effective a_1 or a_2 for $M \rightarrow VV$ decays once nonfactorizable effects are taken into account [7]. In the factorization approach, the fraction of polarization, say Γ_L/Γ (L : longitudinal polarization) in $B \rightarrow \psi K^*$ decay, is independent

of the parameter a_2 . As a result, if an effective a_2 can be defined for $B \rightarrow \psi K^*$, it will lead to the conclusion that nonfactorizable terms cannot affect the factorization prediction of Γ_L/Γ at all. It was realized recently that all the known models in the literature in conjunction with the factorization hypothesis fail to reproduce the data of Γ_L/Γ or the production ratio $\Gamma(B \rightarrow \psi K^*)/\Gamma(B \rightarrow \psi K)$ or both [8,9]. Evidently, if we wish to utilize nonfactorizable effects to resolve the puzzle with Γ_L/Γ , a key ingredient will be the nonexistence of an effective a_2 for $B \rightarrow \psi K^*$.

In short, there are two places where the factorization hypothesis can be unambiguously tested: (i) To extract the parameters a_1 and a_2 from the experimental measurements of $M \rightarrow PP$, VP to see if they are process independent. (ii) To measure the fraction of longitudinal polarization in $M \rightarrow VV$ decay and compare with the factorization prediction. Any failure of them will indicate a breakdown of factorization.

The purpose of the present paper is threefold. (i) The parameters χ_1 and χ_2 have been extracted in Ref.[3] (see also [10]). Here we wish to update the values of $\chi_{1,2}$ using the q^2 dependence of form factors suggested by QCD-sum-rule calculations and other theoretical arguments. (ii) It was recently advocated by Kamal and Sandra [7] that the assumption that in $B \rightarrow \psi K^*$ decay the nonfactorizable amplitude contributes only to S -wave final states, namely $A_1^{nf} \neq 0$, $A_2^{nf} = V^{nf} = 0$, will lead to a satisfactory explanation of the data of $\Gamma(B \rightarrow \psi K^*)/\Gamma(B \rightarrow \psi K)$ and Γ_L/Γ . We would like to show that this very assumption is also essential for understanding the ratio $\mathcal{B}(B^- \rightarrow D^{*0}\rho^-)/\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}\rho^-)$, which cannot be explained satisfactorily in previous work. (iii) Contrary to the B meson case, we will demonstrate that the assumption of S -wave dominated nonfactorizable terms does not work in $D \rightarrow VV$ decay.

2. Nonfactorizable contributions in D , $B \rightarrow PP$, VP decays

Because of the presence of final-state interactions (FSI) and the nonspectator contributions (W -exchange and W -annihilation), it is generally not possible to extract the nonfactorization parameters $\chi_{1,2}$ except for a very few channels. Though color-suppressed decays, for example, $D^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}^0(\bar{K}^{*0})\pi^0(\rho^0)$ are conventionally classified as Class II modes [11], color-flavored decay $D^0 \rightarrow K^-\pi^+$ will bring some important contribution to $D^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}^0\pi^0$ via FSI. This together with the small but not negligible W -exchange amplitude renders the determination of a_2 from $D^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}^0\pi^0$ impossible. Therefore, in order to determine a_1 and especially a_2 we should focus on the exotic channels e.g. $D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0\pi^+$, $\pi^+\pi^0$, and the decay modes with one single isospin component, e.g. $D^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\phi$, $D_s^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\phi$, where nonspectator contributions are absent and FSI are presumably negligible.

We next write down the relations between $\chi_{1,2}$ and form factors

$$\begin{aligned}
\chi_1(D \rightarrow \bar{K}\pi) &= \frac{F_0^{nf}(m_\pi^2)}{F_0^{DK}(m_\pi^2)}, & \chi_2(D \rightarrow \bar{K}\pi) &= \frac{F_0^{nf}(m_K^2)}{F_0^{D\pi}(m_K^2)}, \\
\chi_1(D \rightarrow \bar{K}^*\pi) &= \frac{A_0^{nf}(m_\pi^2)}{A_0^{DK^*}(m_\pi^2)}, & \chi_2(D \rightarrow \bar{K}^*\pi) &= \frac{F_1^{nf}(m_{K^*}^2)}{F_1^{D\pi}(m_{K^*}^2)}, \\
\chi_1(D \rightarrow \bar{K}\rho) &= \frac{F_1^{nf}(m_\rho^2)}{F_1^{DK}(m_\rho^2)}, & \chi_2(D \rightarrow \bar{K}\rho) &= \frac{A_0^{nf}(m_K^2)}{A_0^{D\rho}(m_K^2)}, \\
\chi_1(D_s^+ \rightarrow \phi\pi^+) &= \frac{A_0^{nf}(m_\pi^2)}{A_0^{D_s\phi}(m_\pi^2)}, & \chi_2(D^+ \rightarrow \phi\pi^+) &= \frac{F_1^{nf}(m_\phi^2)}{F_1^{D\pi}(m_\phi^2)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

It is clear that only the three form factors F_0 , F_1 and A_0 entering into the decay amplitudes of $M \rightarrow PP$, VP . A consideration of the heavy quark limit behavior of the form factors suggests that the q^2 dependence of F_1 (A_2) is different from that of F_0 (A_0 and A_1) by an additional pole factor [12]. Indeed, QCD-sum-rule calculations have implied a monopole behavior for $F_1(q^2)$ [13-16] and an approximately constant F_0 [15]. With a dipole form factor A_2 , as shown by a recent QCD-sum-rule analysis [16], we will thus assume a monopole behavior for A_0 .

Unlike the decays $D^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\phi$, $D_s^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\phi$ which are described by a single quark diagram, we cannot extract $\chi_{1,2}$ from the data of $D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0\pi^+$, $\bar{K}^0\rho^+$, $\bar{K}^{*0}\pi^+$ alone without providing further information. For example, the decay amplitude of $D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0\pi^+$ reads

$$A(D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0\pi^+) = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cs}^* V_{ud} [a_1(m_D^2 - m_K^2) f_\pi F_0^{DK}(m_\pi^2) + a_2(m_D^2 - m_\pi^2) f_K F_0^{D\pi}(m_K^2)], \tag{11}$$

which consists of external W -emission and internal W -emission amplitudes. We will therefore make a plausible assumption that $\chi_1 \sim \chi_2$ so that $\chi(D \rightarrow \bar{K}\pi)$ can be determined from the measured rate of $D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0\pi^+$. Since the extraction procedure is already elucidated in Ref.[3], here we will simply present the results (only the central values being quoted) followed by several remarks

$$\begin{aligned}
\chi_2(D \rightarrow \bar{K}\pi) &\simeq -0.36, \\
\chi_2(D \rightarrow \bar{K}^*\pi) &\simeq -0.61, \\
\chi_2(D^+ \rightarrow \phi\pi^+) &\simeq -0.44,
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where we have used the following quantities:

$$\begin{aligned}
c_1(m_c) &= 1.26, & c_2(m_c) &= -0.51, \\
f_\pi &= 132 \text{ MeV}, & f_K &= 160 \text{ MeV}, & f_{K^*} &= 220 \text{ MeV}, & f_\phi &= 237 \text{ MeV}, \\
F_0^{DK}(0) &= F_1^{DK}(0) = 0.77 \pm 0.04 [17], & F_0^{D\pi}(0) &= F_1^{D\pi}(0) = 0.83 [18], \\
A_1^{DK^*}(0) &= 0.61 \pm 0.05, & A_2^{DK^*}(0) &= 0.45 \pm 0.09 [17], & \Rightarrow & A_0^{DK^*}(0) = 0.70,
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

and the Particle Data Group [19] for the decay rates of various decay modes.

Several remarks are in order. (i) As pointed out by Soares [10], the solutions for χ are not uniquely determined. For example, the other possible solution for $\chi_2(D \rightarrow \bar{K}\pi)$ is -1.18 . To remove the ambiguities, we have assumed that nonfactorizable corrections are small compared to the factorizable ones. (ii) Assuming $A_0^{D\rho}(0) = A_0^{DK^*}(0)$, we find from the decay $D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0\rho^+$ that $\chi(D \rightarrow \bar{K}\rho) \approx -1.5$, which is unreasonably too large. We do not know how to resolve this problem except for noting that thus far there is only one measurement of this decay mode [20]. (iii) To determine $\chi_1(D_s^+ \rightarrow \phi\pi^+)$ requires a better knowledge of the form factor $A_0^{D_s\phi}$ and the branching ratio of $D_s^+ \rightarrow \phi\pi^+$. Unfortunately, a direct measurement of them is still not available. Assuming $A_0^{D_s\phi}(0) \approx A_0^{DK^*}(0)$ and $\mathcal{B}(D_s^+ \rightarrow \phi\pi^+) = (3.5 \pm 0.4)\%$ [19], we get $\chi_1(D_s^+ \rightarrow \phi\pi^+) \approx -0.60$. So in general nonfactorizable terms are process or class dependent, and satisfy the relation $|\chi(D \rightarrow PP)| < |\chi(D \rightarrow VP)|$ as expected. (iv) Since $\chi_2(D \rightarrow \bar{K}\pi)$ is close to $-\frac{1}{3}$, it is evident that a large cancellation between $1/N_c$ and $\chi_2(D \rightarrow \bar{K}\pi)$ occurs. This is the dynamic reason why the large- N_c approach operates well for $D \rightarrow \bar{K}\pi$ decay. However, this is no longer the case for $D \rightarrow VP$ decays. The predicted branching ratios in $1/N_c$ expansion are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}(D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^+) &= 0.3\%, & \mathcal{B}(D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0\rho^+) &= 16\%, \\ \mathcal{B}(D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^{*0}\rho^+) &= 17\%, & \mathcal{B}(D^+ \rightarrow \phi\pi^+) &= 0.4\%, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

to be compared with data [19]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}(D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^+)_{\text{expt}} &= (2.2 \pm 0.4)\%, & \mathcal{B}(D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0\rho^+)_{\text{expt}} &= (6.6 \pm 2.5)\%, \\ \mathcal{B}(D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^{*0}\rho^+)_{\text{expt}} &= (4.8 \pm 1.8)\%, & \mathcal{B}(D^+ \rightarrow \phi\pi^+)_{\text{expt}} &= (0.67 \pm 0.08)\%. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Consider the decay $D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^+$ as an example. Its amplitude is given by

$$A(D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^+) = \sqrt{2}G_F V_{cs}^* V_{ud} [a_1 f_\pi m_{K^*} A_0^{DK^*}(m_\pi^2) + a_2 f_{K^*} m_{K^*} F_1^{D\pi}(m_{K^*}^2)]. \quad (16)$$

Since the interference is destructive and $f_{K^*} F_1^{D\pi} > f_\pi A_0^{DK^*}$, a large $|a_2|$ is needed in order to enhance the branching ratio of $D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^+$ from 0.3% to 2.2%. (Note that a_1 is relatively insensitive to the nonfactorizable effects.) This in turn implies a negative $(\frac{1}{N_c} + \chi_2)$ and hence $\chi_2(D \rightarrow \bar{K}^*\pi) < -\frac{1}{3}$. Therefore, we are led to conclude that the leading $1/N_c$ expansion cannot be a universal approach for the nonleptonic weak decays of the meson. However, the fact that substantial nonfactorizable effects which contribute destructively with the subleading $1/N_c$ factorizable contributions are required to accommodate the data of charm decay means that, as far as charm decays are concerned, the large- N_c approach greatly improves the naive factorization method in which $\chi_{1,2} = 0$; the former approach amounts to having a universal nonfactorizable term $\chi_{1,2} = -1/N_c$.

We next turn to $B \rightarrow D(D^*)\pi(\rho)$ decays. Though both nonspectator and FSI effects are known to be important in charm decays, it is generally believed that they do not play a significant role in bottom decays as the decay particles are moving fast, not allowing adequate time for FSI. This gives the enormous advantage that it is conceivable to determine a_1 and a_2 separately from $B \rightarrow D(D^*)\pi(\rho)$ decays. Using the heavy-flavor-symmetry approach for heavy-light form factors and assuming a monopole extrapolation for F_1 , A_0 , A_1 , a dipole behavior for A_2 , V , and an approximately constant F_0 , as suggested by QCD-sum-rule calculations and some theoretical arguments [21], we found from the CLEO data that [21]²

$$\begin{aligned} a_1(B \rightarrow D^{(*)}\pi(\rho)) &= 1.01 \pm 0.06, \\ a_2(B \rightarrow D^{(*)}\pi(\rho)) &= 0.23 \pm 0.06. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Taking $c_1(m_b) = 1.11$ and $c_2(m_b) = -0.26$ leads to

$$\chi_1(B \rightarrow D^{(*)}\pi(\rho)) \simeq 0.05, \quad \chi_2(B \rightarrow D^{(*)}\pi(\rho)) \simeq 0.11. \quad (18)$$

Since $(\frac{1}{N_c} + \chi_{1,2}) = (a_{1,2} - c_{1,2})/c_{2,1}$ and $|c_2| \ll |c_1|$, it is clear that the determination of χ_1 is far more uncertain than χ_2 : it is very sensitive to the values of a_1 , c_1 and c_2 . We see from (18) that nonfactorizable effects become less important in B decays, as what expected [see (8)]. However, a positive $\chi_2(B \rightarrow D(D^*)\pi(\rho))$, which is necessary to explain the constructive interference in $B^- \rightarrow D^0(D^{*0})\pi^-(\rho^-)$ decays, appears to be rather striking. A recent light cone QCD-sum-rule calculation [22] following the framework outlined in [23] fails to reproduce a positive $\chi_2(B \rightarrow D\pi)$. This tantalizing issue should be resolved in the near future.

For $B \rightarrow \psi K$ decays, we found [21]

$$|a_2(B^- \rightarrow \psi K^-)| = 0.235 \pm 0.018, \quad |a_2(B^0 \rightarrow \psi K^0)| = 0.192 \pm 0.032. \quad (19)$$

The combined value is

$$a_2(B \rightarrow \psi K) = 0.225 \pm 0.016, \quad (20)$$

where its sign should be positive, as we have argued in [21]. (It was advocated by Soares [10] that an analysis of the contribution of $B \rightarrow \psi K$ to the decay $B \rightarrow K\ell^+\ell^-$ can be used to remove the sign ambiguity of a_2 .) It follows that

$$\chi_2(B \rightarrow \psi K) = \frac{F_1^{nf}(m_\psi^2)}{F_1^{BK}(m_\psi^2)} \simeq 0.10, \quad (21)$$

²Contrary to the charmed meson case, the variation of $a_{1,2}$ from $B \rightarrow D\pi$ to $D^*\pi$ and $D\rho$ decays is negligible (see Table IV of [21]).

which is in accordance with $\chi_2(B \rightarrow D^{(*)}\pi(\rho))$.

Finally, it is very interesting to note that, in contrast to charm decays, the large- N_c approach is even worse than the naive factorization method in describing $B \rightarrow D(D^*)\pi(\rho)$ decays as $\chi_2(B \rightarrow D^{(*)}\pi(\rho))$ is small but positive.

3. Nonfactorizable contributions in $B \rightarrow \psi K^*$, $D^*\rho$ decays

As stressed in the Introduction, in general one cannot define $\chi_{1,2}$ and hence an effective $a_{1,2}$ for $M \rightarrow VV$ decays unless the nonfactorizable terms weight in the same manner in all three partial waves. It was pointed out recently that there are two experimental data, namely the production ratio $R \equiv \Gamma(B \rightarrow \psi K^*)/\Gamma(B \rightarrow \psi K)$ and the fraction of longitudinal polarization Γ_L/Γ in $B \rightarrow \psi K^*$, which cannot be accounted for simultaneously by all commonly used models within the framework of factorization [8,9]. The experimental results are

$$R = 1.74 \pm 0.39 [6], \quad \frac{\Gamma_L}{\Gamma} = 0.78 \pm 0.07, \quad (22)$$

where the latter is the combined average of the three measurements:

$$\left(\frac{\Gamma_L}{\Gamma}\right)_{B \rightarrow \psi K^*} = \begin{cases} 0.97 \pm 0.16 \pm 0.15, & \text{ARGUS [24];} \\ 0.80 \pm 0.08 \pm 0.05, & \text{CLEO [6];} \\ 0.66 \pm 0.10^{+0.08}_{-0.10}, & \text{CDF [25].} \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

Irrespective of the production ratio R , all the existing models fail to produce a large longitudinal polarization fraction [8,9]. This strongly implies that the puzzle with Γ_L/Γ can only be resolved by appealing to nonfactorizable effects.³ However, if the relation $A_1^{nf}/A_1 = A_2^{nf}/A_2 = V^{nf}/V$ holds, then an effective a_2 can be defined for $B \rightarrow \psi K^*$ and the prediction of Γ_L/Γ will be the same as that in the factorization approach as the polarization fraction is independent of a_2 . Consequently, nonfactorizable terms should contribute differently to S -, P - and D -wave amplitudes if we wish to explain the observed Γ_L/Γ .

The large longitudinal polarization fraction observed by ARGUS and CLEO suggests that the decay $B \rightarrow \psi K^*$ is almost all S -wave. To see this, we write down the $B \rightarrow \psi K^*$

³An interesting observation was made recently in [26] that the factorization assumption in $B \rightarrow \psi K(K^*)$ is not ruled out and the data can be accommodated by the heavy-flavor-symmetry approach for heavy-light form factors provided that the $A_1(q^2)$ form factor is frankly decreasing. To our knowledge, a decreasing A_1 with q^2 is ruled out by several recent QCD-sum-rule analyses (see e.g. [16]). Using the same approach for heavy-light form factors but the q^2 dependence of form factors given in [21], we found that $R = 1.84$ and $\Gamma_L/\Gamma = 0.56$ [21]. Evidently, the factorization approach is still difficult to explain the observed large polarization fraction.

amplitude

$$\begin{aligned}
A[B(p) \rightarrow \psi(p_1)K^*(p_2)] &= \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cs}^* V_{ud} \left(c_2 + \frac{c_1}{3} \right) f_\psi m_\psi \varepsilon_\mu^*(\psi) \varepsilon_\nu^*(K^*) [\hat{A}_1 g^{\mu\nu} + \hat{A}_2 p^\mu p^\nu \\
&+ i \hat{V} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} p_{1\alpha} p_{2\beta}],
\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{A}_1 &= (m_B + m_{K^*}) A_1^{BK^*}(m_\psi^2) \left[1 + \kappa \frac{A_1^{nf}(m_\psi^2)}{A_1^{BK^*}(m_\psi^2)} \right], \\
\hat{A}_2 &= -\frac{2}{(m_B + m_{K^*})} A_2^{BK^*}(m_\psi^2) \left[1 + \kappa \frac{A_2^{nf}(m_\psi^2)}{A_2^{BK^*}(m_\psi^2)} \right], \\
\hat{V} &= -\frac{2}{(m_B + m_{K^*})} V^{BK^*}(m_\psi^2) \left[1 + \kappa \frac{V^{nf}(m_\psi^2)}{V^{BK^*}(m_\psi^2)} \right],
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

and $\kappa = c_1/(c_2 + \frac{1}{3}c_1)$. It is easily seen that we will have an effective $a_2 = c_2 + c_1(\frac{1}{3} + \chi_2)$ if the nonfactorizable terms happen to satisfy the relation $A_1^{nf}/A_1 = A_2^{nf}/A_2 = V^{nf}/V = \chi_2$. The decay rate of this mode is of the form

$$\Gamma(B \rightarrow \psi K^*) \propto (a - b\tilde{x})^2 + 2(1 + c^2\tilde{y}^2), \tag{26}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
a &= \frac{m_B^2 - m_\psi^2 - m_{K^*}^2}{2m_\psi m_{K^*}}, & b &= \frac{2m_B^2 p_c^2}{m_\psi m_{K^*} (m_B + m_{K^*})^2}, & c &= \frac{2m_B p_c}{(m_B + m_{K^*})^2}, \\
\tilde{x} &= \frac{A_2^{BK^*}(m_\psi^2) + \kappa A_2^{nf}(m_\psi^2)}{A_1^{BK^*}(m_\psi^2) + \kappa A_1^{nf}(m_\psi^2)}, & \tilde{y} &= \frac{V^{BK^*}(m_\psi^2) + \kappa V^{nf}(m_\psi^2)}{A_1^{BK^*}(m_\psi^2) + \kappa A_1^{nf}(m_\psi^2)},
\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

with p_c being the c.m. momentum. The longitudinal polarization fraction is then given by

$$\frac{\Gamma_L}{\Gamma} = \frac{(a - b\tilde{x})^2}{(a - b\tilde{x})^2 + 2(1 + c^2\tilde{y}^2)}. \tag{28}$$

If the decay is an almost S -wave, one will have $\Gamma_L/\Gamma \sim a^2/(a^2 + 2) = 0.83$. Since $\kappa \gg 1$, \tilde{x} (D -wave) and \tilde{y} (P -wave) can be suppressed by assuming that, as first postulated in [7], in $B \rightarrow \psi K^*$ decay the nonfactorizable amplitude contributes only to S -wave final states; that

is,⁴

$$A_1^{nf} \neq 0, \quad A_2^{nf} = V^{nf} = 0. \quad (29)$$

The rational for this assumption is given in [7].

With the assumption (29), the branching ratio followed from (24) is

$$\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow \psi K^*) = 0.0288 \left| \left(c_2 + \frac{c_1}{3} \right) A_1^{BK^*}(m_\psi^2) \right|^2 [(a\xi - bx)^2 + 2(\xi^2 + c^2y^2)] \quad (30)$$

with

$$x = \frac{A_2^{BK^*}(m_\psi^2)}{A_1^{BK^*}(m_\psi^2)}, \quad y = \frac{V^{BK^*}(m_\psi^2)}{A_1^{BK^*}(m_\psi^2)}, \quad \xi = 1 + \kappa \frac{A_1^{nf}(m_\psi^2)}{A_1^{BK^*}(m_\psi^2)}, \quad (31)$$

where uses of $|V_{cb}| = 0.040$ and $\tau(B) = 1.52 \times 10^{-12}s$ have been made. It follows that

$$\frac{\Gamma_L}{\Gamma} = \frac{(a\xi - bx)^2}{(a\xi - bx)^2 + 2(1 + c^2y^2)}. \quad (32)$$

We use the measured branching ratio $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow \psi K^*) = (0.172 \pm 0.030)\%$ [6] to determine the ratio $A_1^{nf}(m_\psi^2)/A_1^{BK^*}(m_\psi^2)$, which is found to be

$$\frac{A_1^{nf}(m_\psi^2)}{A_1^{BK^*}(m_\psi^2)} \simeq 0.08, \quad (33)$$

which we have used $A_1^{BK^*}(m_\psi^2) = 0.41$, $A_2^{BK^*}(m_\psi^2) = 0.36$, $V^{BK^*}(m_\psi^2) = 0.72$ [21] and discarded the other possible solution $A_1^{nf}/A_1^{BK^*} = -0.22$ for its “wrong” sign, recalling that F_1^{nf}/F_1^{BK} is positive [cf. Eq.(21)]. The predicted longitudinal polarization fraction is $\Gamma_L/\Gamma = 0.73$, which is in accordance with experiment.

The assumption of negligible nonfactorizable contributions to P - and D -waves also turns out to be essential for understanding the decay rate of $B^- \rightarrow D^{*0}\rho^-$ or the ratio $R_4 \equiv \mathcal{B}(B^- \rightarrow D^{*0}\rho^-)/\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}\rho^-)$. The issue arises as follows. In Ref.[21] we have determined a_1 and a_2 from $B \rightarrow D\pi$, $D^*\pi$, $D\rho$ decays and obtained a consistent ratio a_2/a_1 from

⁴ A different approach for nonfactorizable effects adopted in Ref.[27] amounts to $A_1^{nf} = A_2^{nf} = 0$ and $V^{nf} \neq 0$. It follows from Eq.(28) that

$$\frac{\Gamma_L}{\Gamma} = \frac{(a - bx)^2}{(a - bx)^2 + 2(1 + c^2\bar{y}^2)},$$

with $\bar{y} = (V^{BK^*}(m_\psi^2) + \kappa V^{nf}(m_\psi^2))/A_1^{BK^*}(m_\psi^2)$ and x being defined in (31). It is clear that in order to get a large longitudinal polarization fraction one needs a *negative* V^{nf}/V ! Using the numerical values $a = 3.164$, $b = 1.304$, $x = 0.89$, we find $(\Gamma_L/\Gamma)_{\max} = 0.67$. The prediction $\Gamma_L/\Gamma = 0.65$ given by [27] is one standard deviation from experiment (22).

channel to channel: 0.24 ± 0.10 , 0.24 ± 0.14 , 0.21 ± 0.08 (see Table IV of [21]). Assuming factorization, we got $a_2/a_1 = 0.34 \pm 0.13$ from $B \rightarrow D^*\rho$ decay, which deviates somewhat from above values. In the presence of S -wave dominated nonfactorizable contributions, it is no longer possible to define an effective a_1 and a_2 for $B \rightarrow D^*\rho$ decay. Therefore, the quantities to be compared with are A_1^{nf}/A_1 in $B \rightarrow D^*\rho$ decay and χ_2 in $B \rightarrow D\pi$, $D^*\pi$, $D\rho$. A straightforward calculation yields (see [21] for the factorizable case)

$$R_4 = \frac{\tau(B^-)}{\tau(B^0)} \left(1 + 2\eta \frac{H_1}{H} + \eta^2 \frac{H_2}{H} \right), \quad (34)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} H &= (\hat{a}\hat{\xi} - \hat{b}\hat{x})^2 + 2(\hat{\xi}^2 + \hat{c}^2\hat{y}^2), \\ H_1 &= (\hat{a}\hat{\xi} - \hat{b}\hat{x})(\hat{a}\hat{\xi}' - \hat{b}'\hat{x}') + 2(\hat{\xi}\hat{\xi}' + \hat{c}\hat{c}'\hat{y}\hat{y}'), \\ H_2 &= (\hat{a}\hat{\xi}' - \hat{b}'\hat{x}')^2 + 2(\hat{\xi}'^2 + \hat{c}'^2\hat{y}'^2), \\ \eta &= \frac{m_{D^*}(m_B + m_\rho)}{m_\rho(m_B + m_{D^*})} \frac{f_{D^*}}{f_\rho} \frac{A_1^{B\rho}(m_{D^*}^2)}{A_1^{BD^*}(m_\rho^2)} \frac{c_2 + \frac{1}{3}c_1}{c_1 + \frac{1}{3}c_2}, \\ \hat{\xi} &= 1 + \frac{c_2}{c_1 + \frac{1}{3}c_2} \frac{A_1^{nf}(m_\rho^2)}{A_1^{BD^*}(m_\rho^2)}, \\ \hat{\xi}' &= 1 + \frac{c_1}{c_2 + \frac{1}{3}c_1} \frac{A_1^{nf}(m_{D^*}^2)}{A_1^{B\rho}(m_{D^*}^2)}, \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

where \hat{a} , \hat{b} , \hat{c} are obtained from a , b , c respectively in (27), \hat{x} , \hat{y} from x , y in (31) by replacing $\psi \rightarrow D^*$, $K^* \rightarrow \rho$, and \hat{b}' , \hat{c}' , \hat{x}' , \hat{y}' are obtained from \hat{b} , \hat{c} , \hat{x} , \hat{y} respectively by replacing $D^* \leftrightarrow \rho$; for instance $\hat{x}' = A_2^{B\rho}(m_{D^*}^2)/A_1^{B\rho}(m_{D^*}^2)$. Assuming $A_1^{nf}/A_1^{BD^*} \sim A_1^{nf}/A_1^{B\rho}$ and fitting (34) to the experimental value $R_4 = (1.68 \pm 0.35)\%$ [6], we get

$$\frac{A_1^{nf}(m_{D^*}^2)}{A_1^{B\rho}(m_{D^*}^2)} \sim \frac{A_1^{nf}(m_\rho^2)}{A_1^{BD^*}(m_\rho^2)} \simeq 0.12. \quad (36)$$

We see that the S -wave dominated nonfactorizable effect in $B \rightarrow \psi K^*$ and $B \rightarrow D^*\rho$ decays is of order 10%, consistent with $\chi_2(B \rightarrow \psi K)$ and $\chi_2(B \rightarrow D(D^*)\pi(\rho))$.

4. Nonfactorizable contributions in $D \rightarrow \bar{K}^*\rho$ decay

We have shown in the previous section that S -wave dominated nonfactorizable terms are needed to explain the large longitudinal polarization fraction observed in $B \rightarrow \psi K^*$ and the ratio $\mathcal{B}(B^- \rightarrow D^{*0}\rho^-)/\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}\rho^-)$. However, we shall see in this section that the assumption (29) is no longer applicable to $D \rightarrow \bar{K}^*\rho$ decay. An experimental measurement of $D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^{*0}\rho^+$ and $D^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}^{*0}\rho^0$ by Mark III [28] shows that (i) the decay $D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^{*0}\rho^+$ is a mixture of longitudinal and transverse polarization consistent with a pure

S -wave amplitude,⁵ and (ii) $D^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}^{*0}\rho^0$ is almost all transverse, requiring a cancellation between the longitudinal S -wave and D -wave.

We first consider the decay $D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^{*0}\rho^+$, whose amplitude is given by

$$A(D^+(p) \rightarrow \bar{K}^{*0}(p_1)\rho^+(p_2)) = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cs}^* V_{ud} \varepsilon_\mu^*(K^*) \varepsilon_\nu^*(\rho) [\tilde{A}_1 g^{\mu\nu} + \tilde{A}_2 p^\mu p^\nu + i\tilde{V} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} p_{1\alpha} p_{2\beta}], \quad (38)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{A}_1 &= \left(c_1 + \frac{c_2}{3}\right) f_\rho m_\rho (m_D + m_{K^*}) \left(1 + \frac{c_2}{c_1 + \frac{1}{3}c_2} \frac{A_1^{nf}(m_\rho^2)}{A_1^{DK^*}(m_\rho^2)}\right) A_1^{DK^*}(m_\rho^2) \\ &+ \left(c_2 + \frac{c_1}{3}\right) f_{K^*} m_{K^*} (m_D + m_\rho) \left(1 + \frac{c_1}{c_2 + \frac{1}{3}c_1} \frac{A_1^{nf}(m_{K^*}^2)}{A_1^{D\rho}(m_{K^*}^2)}\right) A_1^{D\rho}(m_{K^*}^2), \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

and \tilde{A}_2 (\tilde{V}) is obtained from \tilde{A}_1 with the replacements $A_1 \rightarrow A_2$ ($A_1 \rightarrow V$), $(m_D + m_{K^*}) \rightarrow -2/(m_D + m_{K^*})$ and $(m_D + m_\rho) \rightarrow -2/(m_D + m_\rho)$. Since $A_1^{nf}/A_1^{DK^*}$ and $A_1^{nf}/A_1^{D\rho}$ are expected to be negative [see Eq.(12)], it is obvious that if nonfactorizable terms are dominated by the S -wave, it will imply a more severe destructive interference in the S -wave amplitude than in P - and D -wave amplitudes, in contradiction to the observation that this decay is almost all S -wave. The branching ratio is calculated to be

$$\mathcal{B}(D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^{*0}\rho^+) = 0.10 \left| \left(c_1 + \frac{1}{3}c_2\right) A_1^{DK^*}(m_\rho^2) \right|^2 (H' + 2\eta' H'_1 + \eta'^2 H'_2), \quad (40)$$

with the expressions of η' , H' , $H'_{1,2}$ analogous to η , H , $H_{1,2}$ in (35). A fit of (40) to the Mark III data for the branching ratio (37) gives rise to (assuming $A_1^{nf}/A_1^{DK^*} \sim A_1^{nf}/A_1^{D\rho}$)

$$\frac{A_1^{nf}(m_\rho^2)}{A_1^{DK^*}(m_\rho^2)} \sim \frac{A_1^{nf}(m_{K^*}^2)}{A_1^{D\rho}(m_{K^*}^2)} \approx -0.98, \quad (41)$$

which is uncomfortably too large.⁶ Moreover, the P -wave branching ratio is predicted to be 2.0×10^{-2} , in disagreement with experiment [28]

$$\mathcal{B}(D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^{*0}\rho^+)_{P\text{-wave}} < 0.5 \times 10^{-2}. \quad (42)$$

It thus appears to us that an almost S -wave $D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^{*0}\rho^+$ implies that

$$\left| \frac{A_2^{nf}}{A_2^{DK^*}(\rho)} \right|, \quad \left| \frac{V^{nf}}{V^{DK^*}(\rho)} \right| \gtrsim \left| \frac{A_1^{nf}}{A_1^{DK^*}(\rho)} \right|. \quad (43)$$

⁵The other measurement by E691 [29] disagrees severely with Mark III on the branching ratio

$$\mathcal{B}(D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^{*0}\rho^+) = \begin{cases} (4.8 \pm 1.2 \pm 1.4)\%, & \text{Mark III [28];} \\ (2.3 \pm 1.2 \pm 0.9)\%, & \text{E691 [29].} \end{cases} \quad (37)$$

Recall that model calculations tend to give a very large branching ratio of 17% [see Eq.(14)].

⁶A fit to the E691 measurement (37) for the branching ratio yields an even larger value: $A_1^{nf}/A_1^{DK^*} \sim A_1^{nf}/A_1^{D\rho} \approx -1.41$.

Taking $A_1^{nf}/A_1 = A_2^{nf}/A_2 = V^{nf}/V = \chi(D \rightarrow \bar{K}^*\rho)$ as an illustration, we obtain

$$\chi(D \rightarrow \bar{K}^*\rho) \approx -0.65 \quad (44)$$

and $\mathcal{B}(D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^{*0}\rho^+)_{P\text{-wave}} = 2.0 \times 10^{-3}$, which are certainly more plausible than before.

Another indication for the failure of the S -wave dominated hypothesis for nonfactorizable effects comes from the decay $D^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}^{*0}\rho^0$, where \bar{K}^{*0} and ρ^0 are completely transversely polarized, implying a large D -wave which is compensated by the longitudinal S -wave. Recall that the factorizable $D \rightarrow VV$ amplitudes have the salient feature :

$$|S\text{-wave amplitude}| > |P\text{-wave amplitude}| > |D\text{-wave amplitude}|. \quad (45)$$

Since the color-suppressed D -wave amplitude of $D^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}^{*0}\rho^0$ is proportional to $[1 + c_1/(c_2 + \frac{1}{3}c_1)(A_2^{nf}/A_2^{D\rho})]$, a large D -wave thus indicates a negative A_2^{nf}/A_2 and

$$\left| \frac{A_1^{nf}}{A_1} \right| \ll \left| \frac{A_2^{nf}}{A_2} \right|, \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{A_1^{nf}}{A_1} \approx 0, \quad \frac{A_2^{nf}}{A_2} \neq 0. \quad (46)$$

Therefore, we see that nonfactorizable terms in charm decay are consistently to be negative [cf. Eqs.(12) and (44)]. Unfortunately, at this point we cannot make a further quantitative analysis due to unknown final-state interactions and W -exchange contributions. A measurement of helicities in $D^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}^{*0}\rho^0$, $D^+ \rightarrow \phi\rho^+$ will be greatly helpful to pin down the issue. In particular, the color- and Cabibbo-suppressed mode $D^+ \rightarrow \phi\rho^+$ is very ideal for this purpose since it is not subject to FSI and nonspectator effects. A polarization measurement in this decay is thus strongly urged (though difficult) in order to test if A_2^{nf}/A_2 plays a more essential role than A_1^{nf}/A_1 in charm decay.

5. Discussion and conclusion

The factorization assumption for hadronic weak decays of mesons can be tested on two different grounds: (i) to extract the effective parameters a_1 and especially a_2 from $M \rightarrow PP$, VP decays to see if they are process independent, and (ii) to measure helicities in $M \rightarrow VV$ decay. Using the q^2 dependence of form factors suggested by QCD-sum-rule calculations and by some theoretical arguments, we have updated our previous work. It is found that a_2 is evidently not universal in charm decay. The parameter χ_2 , which measures the nonfactorizable soft-gluon effect on the color-suppressed decay amplitude relative to the factorizable one, ranges from $-\frac{1}{3}$ to -0.60 in the decays from $D \rightarrow \bar{K}\pi$ to $D^+ \rightarrow \phi\pi^+$, $D \rightarrow \bar{K}^*\pi$. By contrast, the variation of a_2 in $B \rightarrow \psi K$, $B \rightarrow D(D^*)\pi(\rho)$ is negligible and nonfactorizable terms $\chi_2(B \rightarrow \psi K)$, $\chi_2(B \rightarrow D^{(*)}\pi(\rho))$ are of order 10% with a positive sign. The pattern for the relative magnitudes of nonfactorizable effects

$$|\chi(B \rightarrow PP, VP)| < |\chi(D \rightarrow PP)| < |\chi(D \rightarrow VP)|$$

is thus well established. This means that nonperturbative soft gluon effects become more important when the final states are less energetic, allowing more time for final-state interactions. This explains why a_2 is class (PP or VP mode) dependent in charm decay, whereas it stays fairly stable in B decay.

Taking factorization as a benchmark, we see that the nonfactorizable terms necessary for describing nonleptonic D and B decays are in opposite directions from the factorization framework. On the one hand, the leading $1/N_c$ expansion, which amounts to a universal $\chi = -\frac{1}{3}$, improves the naive factorization method for charm decays. On the other hand, the naive factorization hypothesis works better than the large- N_c assumption for B decays because nonfactorizable effects are small, being of order 10%. The fact that χ is positive makes it even more clear that the large- N_c approach cannot be extrapolated from D to B physics. Theoretically, the next important task for us is to understand why χ is negative in D decay, while it becomes positive in B decay.

As for $M \rightarrow VV$ decay, *a priori* effective $a_{1,2}$ cannot be defined since, as pointed out by Kamal and Sandra, its amplitude (factorizable and nonfactorizable) involves three independent Lorentz scalars, corresponding to S , P and D waves. This turns out to be a nice trade-off for solving the puzzle with the large longitudinal polarization fraction Γ_L/Γ observed in $B \rightarrow \psi K^*$, which cannot be accounted for by the factorization hypothesis or by nonfactorizable effects weighted in the same way in all three partial waves, namely $A_1^{nf}/A_1 = A_2^{nf}/A_2 = V^{nf}/V$. A large Γ_L/Γ can be achieved if $B \rightarrow \psi K^*$ is almost all S -wave, implying that nonfactorizable contributions are dominated by the S -wave. The same assumption is also needed for understanding the ratio $\mathcal{B}(B^- \rightarrow D^{*0}\rho^-)/\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}\rho^-)$. We found that all nonfactorizable terms $A_1^{nf}/A_1^{BK^*}$, $A_1^{nf}/A_1^{B\rho}$, $A_1^{nf}/A_1^{BD^*}$ are of order 10% consistent with $\chi_2(B \rightarrow D(D^*)\pi(\rho))$ and $\chi_2(B \rightarrow \psi K)$.

Surprisingly, the assumption of S -wave dominated nonfactorizable effects is not operative in $D \rightarrow \bar{K}^*\rho$ decay, which exhibits again another disparity between B and D physics. We found that A_2^{nf}/A_2 should play a more pivotal role than A_1^{nf}/A_1 in charm decay. We thus urge experimentalists to measure helicities in the color- and Cabibbo-suppressed decay mode $D^+ \rightarrow \phi\rho^+$ decay to gain insight in the nonfactorizable effects in $D \rightarrow VV$ decay.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was supported in part by the National Science Council of ROC under Contract No. NSC84-2112-M-001-014.

REFERENCES

1. See e.g. H.Y. Cheng, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A4**, 495 (1989).
2. N. Deshpande, M. Gronau, and D. Sutherland, *Phys. Lett.* **90B**, 431 (1980); M. Gronau and D. Sutherland, *Nucl. Phys.* **B183**, 367 (1981).
3. H.Y. Cheng, *Phys. Lett.* **B335**, 428 (1994).
4. M. Wirbel, B. Stech, and M. Bauer, *Z. Phys.* **C29**, 637 (1985).
5. A.J. Buras, J.-M. Gérard, and R. Rückl, *Nucl. Phys.* **B268**, 16 (1986).
6. CLEO Collaboration, M.S. Alam *et al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **D50**, 43 (1994).
7. A.N. Kamal and A.B. Santra, Aberta Thy-31-94 (1994).
8. M. Gourdin, A.N. Kamal, and X.Y. Pham, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **73**, 3355 (1994).
9. R. Aleksan, A. Le Yaouanc, L. Oliver, O. Pène, and J.-C. Raynal, DAPNIA/SPP/94-24, LPTHE-Orsay 94/15 (1994).
10. J.M. Soares, TRI-PP-94-78 (1994).
11. M. Bauer, B. Stech, and M. Wirbel, *Z. Phys.* **C34**, 103 (1987).
12. Q.P. Xu, *Phys. Lett.* **B306**, 363 (1993).
13. C.A. Dominguez and N. Paver, *Z. Phys.* **C41**, 217 (1988); A.A. Ovchinnikov, *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **50**, 519 (1989); *Phys. Lett.* **B229**, 127 (1989); V.L. Chernyak and I.R. Zhitnitski, *Nucl. Phys.* **B345**, 137 (1990); S. Narison, *Phys. Lett.* **B283**, 384 (1992); V.M. Belyaev, A. Khodjamirian, and R. Rückl, *Z. Phys.* **C60**, 349 (1993); P. Colangelo, BARI-TH/93-152 (1993).
14. P. Ball, V.M. Braun, and H.G. Dosch, *Phys. Lett.* **B273**, 316 (1991); *Phys. Rev.* **D44**, 3567 (1991); P. Ball, *Phys. Rev.* **D48**, 3190 (1993).
15. P. Colangelo and P. Santorelli, *Phys. Lett.* **B327**, 123 (1994).
16. K.C. Yang and W-Y.P. Hwang, NUTHU-94-17 (1994).
17. M. Witherell, in *Proceedings of the XVI International Symposium on Lepton-Photon Interactions*, Ithaca, 10-15 August 1993, eds. P. Drell and D. Rubin (AIP, New York, 1994).

18. L.L. Chau and H.Y. Cheng, *Phys. Lett.* **B333**, 514 (1994).
19. Particle Data Group, *Phys. Rev.* **D50**, 1173 (1994).
20. Mark III Collaboration, J. Adler *et al.*, *Phys. Lett.* **B196**, 107 (1987).
21. H.Y. Cheng and B. Tseng, IP-ASTP-21-94, hep-ph/9409408 (revised) (1994).
22. I. Halperin, TECHNION-PHYS-94-16 (1994).
23. B. Blok and M. Shifman, *Nucl. Phys.* **B389**, 534 (1993).
24. ARGUS Collabotation, H. Albrecht *et al.*, DESY 94-139 (1994).
25. CDF Collaboration, FERMILAB Conf-94/127-E (1994).
26. M. Gourdin, Y.Y. Keum, and X.Y. Pham, PAR/LPTHE/95-01 (1995).
27. C.E. Carlson and J. Milana, WM-94-110 (1994).
28. Mark III Collaboration, D. Coffman *et al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **D45**, 2196 (1992).
29. E691 Collaboration, J.C. Anjos *et al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **D46**, 1941 (1992).