## Fragm entation production of doubly heavy baryons

MichaelA.Doncheski

O ttawa-Carleton Institute for Physics, Department of Physics, Carleton University, O ttawa, O ntario K 1S 5B 6, Canada

and

J. Stægborn and M. L. Stong Institut fur Theoretische Teikhenphysik, Universitat, D-76128 Karlsruhe, Germany

## Abstract

Baryons with a single heavy quark are being studied experimentally at present. Baryons with two units of heavy avor will be abundantly produced not only at future colliders, but also at existing facilities. In this paper we study the production via heavy quark fragmentation of baryons containing two heavy quarks at the Tevatron, the LHC, HERA, and the NLC. The production rate is woeffully sm all at HERA and at the NLC, but signi cant at pp and pp m achines. We present distributions in various kinematical variables in addition to the integrated cross sections at hadron colliders. The constituent quark model has been remarkably successful in describing the observed hadronic states. This includes mesons with one heavy and one light quark (i.e., B and D mesons), baryons with one heavy and two light quarks, and the J= and mesons, which contain a heavy quark and heavy antiquark. Recent experiments have made great progress in the observations of the c and b baryons[1, 2] and their decays[3, 4]. The constituent quark model predicts the existence of baryons containing two heavy quarks (cc, bc, or bb) and one light quark, and we are on the verge of obtaining the necessary experimental sensitivity to observe these states. The energies necessary to produce these particles are already reached; the di culty remaining is in their reconstruction. These states have in general a large number of decay modes, so that their observation and a measurement of their properties will require a large number of them to be produced. This di culty is increased by the fact that the production rates at  $e^+ e$  colliders are extrem ely sm all, so that the identi cation of these particles must take place in the messier environment of hadronic collisions.

Were the heavy quark of in nite mass, the two heavy quarks would be bound in a point-like diquark, and the light degrees of freedom would \see" this diquark as a static antitriplet color source. In this lim it, the interactions of the light degrees of freedom with the heavy diquark are quite sim ilar to interactions of the light degrees of freedom with the b quark in a B m eson [5, 6]. For realistic heavy quark m asses, this sim ple picture is not yet valid. In particular, the hyper ne splittings of these baryons are not yet well described by the heavy-m ass lim it[7]. The states m ay nonetheless be accurately treated as a combination of light degrees of freedom and heavy although not-pointlike diquark. The interactions between the two heavy quarks are analogous to the  $Q\overline{Q}$  system fam iliar from J= and spectroscopy. At short distances, the interaction will be dom inated by one-gluon-exchange, although with a color factor 2/3 from the QQ interaction rather than 4/3 from  $Q\overline{Q}$ , and at long distances it will be con ning [8].

The production of these states is reliably calculable as a hard process. One takes the full set of Feynm an diagram s for the production of two pairs of heavy quarks and heavy antiquarks and requires that the momenta of the two heavy quarks be nearly equal, then projects out the correct quantum numbers for the relevant  $Q_1Q_2$  state. This is similar to the

1

calculation of the hard production of heavy quarkonium states[9], though m ore complicated as an additional  $Q \overline{Q}$  pair is needed. On the other hand, because the quarks are heavy, fragmentation functions for a heavy quark to produce a doubly heavy diquark can be predicted in perturbative QCD [10, 11]. The fragmentation description of the  $Q_1Q_2$  production process is not valid where the masses of the heavy quarks become important, that is, for small p. or small energies, but for high-energy colliders such as LEP or Tevatron it should be applicable. The calculation is similar to that described in [11] for J= production. The form of the matrix element is dierent in the two cases, requiring a somewhat changed method of projection onto the proper spin states. For the production of a  $Q \overline{Q}$  bound state, the standard procedure is to replace the heavy quark production  $m = 1 r (0 v) w \pm 1$ the trace Tr (O P<sub>SSz</sub>), where P<sub>SSz</sub> is the proper projection onto the spin of the  $Q\overline{Q}$  state [12]. This procedure is, however, not simply applicable to the  $Q_1Q_2$  bound states due to the form of the matrix element, which contains not u and v as in the production of  $Q\overline{Q}$  but  $u_1$  and u<sub>2</sub>. The projection procedure described above is nothing more than a clever method of performing the sum over the quark spins. This sum can also be performed by summing over helicity amplitudes with the proper C lebsch-G ordan coe cients. A lthough the procedure is som ewhat di erent, the calculations are identical in their essentials, and the fragm entation function is simply proportional to that for a  $Q \overline{Q}$  pair. The di erences reject the changed color and statistical factors. The fragm entation function for  $Q_1$  to produce a spin-1 diquark  $(Q_1Q_2)$  is

$$D_{Q_{1}! \ (Q_{1}Q_{2})}(z; = (m_{1} + 2m_{2})) = \frac{2N_{12}}{9} \frac{\Re_{(Q_{1}Q_{2})}(0)}{m_{2}^{3}} \frac{2}{s} (2m_{2})F(z); \qquad (1)$$

$$F(z) = \frac{rz(1-z)^{2}}{4(1-z+rz)^{6}} \frac{h}{2} - 2z(3-2r) + 3z^{2}(3-2r+4r^{2})$$

$$-2z^{3}(1-r)(4-r+2r^{2}) - z^{4}(1-r)^{2}(3-2r+2r^{2})^{\frac{1}{s}}; \qquad (2)$$

where  $r = m_2 = (m_1 + m_2)$ . The factor  $N_{12} = (1)^2$  for (un)equal quark m asses, and re ects the presence of identical fermions in the nal state. For production of a spin-0 state,  $(Q_1 Q_2)^0$ ,

the function F (z) must be replaced by

$$F^{0}(z) = \frac{rz(1 z)^{2}}{12(1 z + rz)^{6}} f^{6} = 18z(1 2r) + z^{2}(21 74r + 68r^{2})$$
$$2z^{3}(1 r)(6 19r + 18r^{2}) + 3z^{4}(1 r)^{2}(1 2r + 2r^{2})^{i}: (3)$$

As in the case of hard quarkonium production, the requirement of nearly equal momenta and the projection onto the proper  $Q_1Q_2$  quantum numbers will modify the  $p_T$  spectrum of the diquark; it will fall more rapidly than that of single heavy quark production. For heavy quarkonium production, the faster fall-o in  $p_T$  of the hard production process means that fragmentation production will dominate for su ciently large  $p_T$  despite the suppression of the fragmentation production by powers of s[13]. For the  $Q_1Q_2$  states, no hard production processes of lower order in s exist. We assume that the doubly heavy diquarks will always hadronize into baryons with two heavy quarks, so that the fragmentation function  $D_{Q_1! \text{ baryon}} = D_{Q_1! (Q_1Q_2)}$ .

A  $Q_1Q_2$  diquark in the ground state has a symmetric spatial wavefunction. Because the  $Q_1Q_2$  must combine with a light quark to produce a colorless baryon, the diquark must be a color antitriplet (antisymmetric) state. For identical quarks the wavefunction must satisfy Ferm i-D irac statistics, and thus the cc and bb ground state diquarks have spin 1. The bc states are not restricted by statistics, and we denote the spin singlet (triplet) state by bc<sup>0</sup> (cc). The spin triplet can hadronize into a spin-1/2 or -3/2 baryon, bc and bc, respectively; the spin singlet can produce only the spin-1/2  $^{0}_{bc}$ . The probabilities for the fragmentation of heavy quarks into these baryons are: c !  $_{cc}$ ;  $_{cc}$ , about 2 10  $^{5}$ ; b !  $^{0}_{bc}$ , about 4 10  $^{5}$ ; b !  $_{bc}$ ; bc, about 5 10  $^{5}$ . The remaining probabilities are suppressed by (m c=m b)<sup>3</sup> and therefore approximately two orders of magnitude smaller[10].

In addition to these probabilities, it is desirable to have predictions of the  $p_{T}$  (or other kinem atical variables) distributions for the production of these states. The fragmentation functions given above at low momentum scale  $_{0}$  must be evolved to higher scales in order to be of use in calculations for high energy colliders:

$$d (A + B ! (Q_1Q_2) + X) = \int_{1}^{X} dz d (A + B ! i(\frac{p_T}{z}; ) + X; ^2) D_{i! (Q_1Q_2)}(z; ^2): (4)$$

The evolution occurs via an Altarelli-Parisi equation:

$${}^{2}\frac{@}{@ {}^{2}}D_{i!} \otimes_{(Q_{1}Q_{2})} (z; {}^{2}) = \frac{s}{2} {}^{X} {}^{2} {}^{1}\frac{dy}{y} P_{ij} (z=y) D_{j!} \otimes_{(Q_{1}Q_{2})} (y; {}^{2}):$$
(5)

which does not change the overall probabilities given above. In the evolution of the fragm entation functions via (5), we include only the  $P_{QQ}$  splitting function. The fragm entation of gluons to heavy diquarks is suppressed relative to that of heavy quarks by  $_{s}$ , and m ay be neglected. A separate num erical evolution of the fragm entation functions to each z and

needed in the course of a num erical sinulation would be an extrem ely computer-intensive approach; instead we generate values of the fragm entation function for a reasonably-spaced set of and z values and interpolate to the desired points. The unevolved fragm entation functions depend on  $\Re(0)$  f, the non-relativistic radial wavefunction at the origin, the heavy quark m asses, and  $_{s}(_{0})$ . These input parameters are given in Table 1.

		s	m <sub>Q</sub>	<u></u> 承(0)
с!	(CC)	0.238	1.5 G eV	(0 <b>.</b> 65 G eV ) <sup>3</sup>
c!	(bc)	0173	4.5 G eV	(0.80 G eV ) <sup>3</sup>
c!	(bc) <sup>0</sup>	0173	4.5 G eV	(0.80 G eV ) <sup>3</sup>
b!	(bb)	0.173	4.5 G eV	(1.20 G eV ) <sup>3</sup>
b!	(bc)	0.238	1.5 G eV	(0.80 G eV ) <sup>3</sup>
b!	(bc) <sup>0</sup>	0.238	1 <b>.</b> 5 G eV	(0.80 G eV) <sup>3</sup>

Table 1: Param eters used to calculate the unevolved fragm entation functions

The J= and decays to lepton pairs give the wavefunctions  $\Re(0)j^2$  for these states relatively accurately [16] and independently of phenom enological potential models. The QCD-corrected expression for the leptonic decay of heavy quarkonium states

$$(V ! '' ) = \frac{4^{2} e_{Q}^{2}}{M_{V}^{2}} \Re_{V} (0) f 1 \frac{16}{3} s(m_{Q})$$
(6)

is used to extract the and J= radial wavefunction at the origin. There is no information on the B<sub>c</sub> m eson to determ ine the wavefunction for the bc states, and the annihilation of this state into lepton pairs would not exist in any case to provide the measurement. However, there is an empirical relationship am ong leptonic decays of the , J= and m esons, (V !  $e^+e$ ) '  $12e_0^2$  keV, which indicates that  $\Re(0)f^2 = 2^2$  is approximately constant.

The one-gluon exchange contribution for  $Q_1Q_2$  di ers from that for  $Q_1\overline{Q_2}$  by a relative color factor 1/2. In a C oulom b potential, therefore, the relation  $\Re_{J^{\pm}}(0) f = 8 \Re_{\infty}(0) f$  must hold. The heavy quarks are, however, not in a pure C oulom b potential, so that we must rely on phenom enological potentials to better estimate the radial wavefunction. W hile many functional forms for the potential provide quite good to the heavy quarkonium data, the tted potentials all have very similar shapes in the region of r  $1 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$ . We use 1/2 the  $Q_1\overline{Q_2}$  potential for the  $Q_1Q_2$  potential, and not the wavefunction at the origin using a

num erical solution of the Schrödinger equation. We compare in Table 2 the results of this calculation for two familiar potentials with the values extracted from the J= and decay rates.

	Indiana [14]	Richardson [15]	data [22]
CC	(0.95 G eV ) <sup>3</sup>	(0 <b>.</b> 93 G eV ) <sup>3</sup>	(0.98 G eV ) <sup>3</sup>
CC	(0.67 G eV ) <sup>3</sup>	(0.65 G eV ) <sup>3</sup>	
bc	(1.18 G eV ) <sup>3</sup>	(1.18 G eV ) <sup>3</sup>	
bc	(0.82 G eV) <sup>3</sup>	(0.81 G eV ) <sup>3</sup>	
bb	(1.72 G eV ) <sup>3</sup>	(1.88 G eV ) <sup>3</sup>	(1.96 G eV ) <sup>3</sup>
bb	(1.15 G eV ) <sup>3</sup>	(1 23 G eV ) <sup>3</sup>	

Table 2: Radial wavefunctions at the origin,  $\Re(0)$  f, for  $Q_1 \overline{Q}_2$  and  $Q_1 Q_2$  states for two interquark potentials compared to values extracted from data, see (6).

D oubly heavy baryons will be produced at all present and future accelerators where there is su cient energy. The results presented here include both baryon and antibaryon production. We consider rst the e<sup>+</sup> e colliders LEP, LEP II, and NLC.At LEP, the only subprocess for the production of a heavy quark Q is e<sup>+</sup> e ! Z, with the Z decaying to  $Q\overline{Q}$ . The production rates in this case are quite sm all, a few events per year. For LEP II and NLC the additional processes e<sup>+</sup> e ! W <sup>+</sup>W where one W decays to a c quark and e<sup>+</sup> e ! ZZ where one Z decays to cc or bb also contribute (depending on the LEP II energy, of course). D espite the additional subprocesses, of which W <sup>+</sup>W dom inates for NLC, the event rates rem ain woefilly sm all. At LEP II, only a few events/year can be expected, and a 60 fb <sup>1</sup>/yr, 500 G eV linear collider will produce only of order 30 events per year. The production rates at colliders and e colliders were also calculated, including backscattered and W eizsacker-W illiam s photons and the contributions from resolved-photon processes. The cross sections for production of these particles at these colliders are also hopelessly sm all.

The results at HERA are similar. The main subprocesses here are  $g \mid Q\overline{Q}$  and  $Q \mid gQ$ . Assuming the design luminosity of 200 pb<sup>1</sup>/yr, we again nd that the event rate is rather small, of order 30 events/year. The resolved photon processes are likewise negligible.

The situation is considerably more hopeful at hadron colliders. The relevant subprocesses are gg !  $Q\overline{Q}$ , qq !  $Q\overline{Q}$ , gQ ! gQ, and qQ ! qQ (in the latter two subprocesses, q and Q stand for both quarks and antiquarks), although the main contribution is from the gluon-fusion subprocess. For the Tevatron, with an integrated lum inosity of 100 pb <sup>1</sup>/yr, we anticipate of order 8  $10^4$  events/year ( $p_r > 5 \text{ GeV}$ , j j < 0.5), while the LHC, with 100 fb <sup>1</sup>/yr, should produce of order 1:3  $10^8$  events per year ( $p_r > 10 \text{ GeV}$ , j j < 0.5). Total production cross sections per unit rapidity for the various diquarks at the Tevatron and the LHC (operating at both 10 TeV and 14 TeV) are given in Table 3. The rates for production of the bc-type states are sim ilar to those expected for the B<sub>c</sub> m eson, where rates of  $10^4 \text{ B}_c$ 's have been predicted at the Tevatron ( $p_r > 10 \text{ GeV}$ ) and  $10^7$  at LHC ( $p_r > 20 \text{ GeV}$ )[I7]. On the other hand, the production rate for cc-type states is signi cantly sm aller than that for J= production at the Tevatron which is expected to be 5  $10^6 (p_r > 5 \text{ GeV})$ [I3].

		Tevatron	LHC	(10 TeV)	LHC	(14 TeV)
<sub>cc</sub> +	СС	430 pb		330 pb		470 pb
0 bc		145 pb		220 pb		330 pb
bc +	bc	215 pb		350 pb		490 pb
bb +	bb	16 pb		27 pb		36 pb

Table 3: Production cross sections per unit rapidity in the central region.

Some results are given in Figs. 1 and 2. Fig. 1 shows  $d = dp_{T} = d j_{=0}$  vs.  $p_{T}$ . A kinem atical cut of 5 GeV for the baryon  $p_{T}$  has been in posed here. Fig. 2 gives the rapidity distribution of  $Q_{1}Q_{2}$  baryons, again with  $p_{T} > 5$  GeV. The rapidity distributions are

rather at in the central region, so that  $d = dp_{T}$  may be estimated from  $d = dp_{T} = d j_{=0}$  by multiplying with the -region desired.





Figure 1:  $p_{T}$  distributions (at sm all rapidity) for doubly heavy baryon production at the doubly heavy baryon production at the Teva-Tevatron.

Figure 2: Pseudorapidity distributions for tron.



Figure 3: p. distributions (at sm all rapidity) Figure 4: p. distributions (at sm all rapidity) LHC,14 TeV.

for doubly heavy baryon production at the for doubly heavy baryon production at the LHC,10 TeV.

Figs. 3 and 4 show d =dp<sub>r</sub> =d  $j_{=0}$  vs.  $p_r$  for the LHC operating at 14 TeV (Fig. 3) and 10 TeV (Fig. 4). A kinem atical cut of  $p_r > 10$  GeV is placed on the Q<sub>1</sub>Q<sub>2</sub> baryon. The production rate at the lower center-of-m ass energy is slightly lower, but even at the lower energy, the LHC will produce  $Q_1Q_2$  baryons copiously. The rapidity distributions are again relatively at in the central region (j j < 3), and event rates for any speci c detector can be estimated by simply multiplying the results in Table 3 by the coverage of the detector.

In order to estim ate the uncertainties due to the choice of factorization and fragm entation scales, we vary these scales (all chosen to be equal) by a factor of 2 from our nom inal choice =  $p_{\tau}$ . The e ect of varying the scale on d =  $dp_{\tau}$  = d  $j_{=0}$  vs.  $p_{\tau}$  can be seen in Fig. 5, and the e ect on d = d vs. can be seen in Fig. 6. The processes shown are representative of all the processes. The behavior seen in Fig. 6 is som ewhat counter-intuitive in that one expects the rate with  $= p_r = 2$  to be larger than that for  $= p_r$ . However, the fragmentation functions are cut o at low frag. This causes the drop at low  $p_{T}$  for this choice seen in Fig. 5 and the lower cross sections in Fig. 6. We use MRSA [18] parton distribution functions. The e ect of changing the parton distribution set choice is negligible far smaller than the e ect of varying the choice of . O ther sources of theoretical uncertainty include the parameters used for the unevolved fragmentation functions, primarily  $\Re$  (0)  $\mathring{f}$  where different phenom enological potentials give about 10% di erences in the result, unknown QCD corrections to the parton-level cross sections, the fragm entation function and the evolution equations, and unknown relativistic corrections to the initial fragm entation functions.



Figure 5: p, distributions (at sm all rapidity) di erent choices of scale

Figure 6: Pseudorapidity distributions for bb for bb and bc production at the Tevatron for and bc production at the Tevatron for di erent choices of scale

Recently there has been some concern that the fragmentation approximation may not work as well as anticipated for B<sub>c</sub> production. This assertion is based on a comparison between the full calculation and the fragm entation approximation for  $B_c$  in collisions[19]. There is, of course, a signi cant di erence between and gg initial states, and the convolution of the gluon distributions with the parton-level subprocess can have a large e ect.

The calculation of gg !  $B_cX$  is much more complex than that of !  $B_cX$ , but is necessary to understand the validity of the fragmentation approximation. The authors of [19] went on to study  $B_c$  production at hadron colliders[17]. They found that the fragmentation approximation still diers from the full calculation at the parton level (^ [gg ! bb(!  $B_cX$ )] vs. ^ [gg !  $B_cbc$ ]) except at high  $p_r$ , but after the convolution of ^ with the gluon distribution functions, the full calculation and the fragmentation approximation agree quite well for  $p_r > 10 \text{ GeV}$  both at Tevatron and LHC energies. Fig. 6 of [17] shows that the agreement between the full calculation and the fragmentation approximation is acceptable down to  $p_r^{m in} = 5 \text{ GeV}$  at the Tevatron and  $p_r^{m in} = 10 \text{ GeV}$  at LHC. As the fragmentation functions, our calculation of the production of doubly heavy baryons should also be accurate in this  $p_r$  range.

The decay modes of doubly charmed baryons have been studied in [20] using SU (3) avor symmetry. This approach relates the decays of these particles, and could be used to nd relations among the decays of the bb baryons and among the bc baryons. The transitions between the doubly heavy baryons [6] and some decays of the bc baryons [21] have been discussed in the heavy quark lim it. The lifetim es of c and b quarks are not very di erent  $0.2 \quad 10^{12} \text{ swhile}$   $1.07 \quad 10^{12} \text{ s[22]}$ , so that the weak decays of both b and c ( are in portant when considering the decays of the bc baryons. bc baryons will decay weakly (both hadronically and sem i-leptonically) to single b quark baryons as well as doubly charm ed baryons. Both of these possibilities have been discussed in the literature [20, 23, 24]. E ither a single b baryon or a doubly charm ed baryon traced back to a displaced vertex using a vertex detector will be a clear sign of doubly heavy baryon production [25]. In the case of b baryons, the production of a doubly charm ed baryon (possibly with sam e sign di-lepton!), with both b-quark decays tagged by a vertex detector, would be an impressive signal. Unfortunately, the bb baryons are produced less frequently than the other doubly heavy baryons, and two sem i-leptonic decays will severely reduce the event rate.

In conclusion, the production via fragmentation of baryons containing two heavy quarks has been calculated in the fragmentation approximation. The fragmentation approximation reproduces well the full calculation of  $B_c$  production at hadron colliders for the

9

 $p_{T}$  studied here[17]; it is expected that the fragmentation approximation will work well for doubly heavy diquark production as well. The production rates of these baryons at e<sup>+</sup> e colliders and at the ep collider HERA are found to be negligible. The situation is much better at hadron colliders, with approximately 8 10<sup>4</sup> events/yr expected at Tevatron and 1:3 10<sup>8</sup> events/year at LHC. In addition to predictions for total production cross sections (j j < 0.5 and  $p_{T}$  > 5(10) G eV at the Tevatron (LHC)), the distributions d =dp<sub>T</sub>=d j=0 and d =d for  $p_{T}$  > 5(10) G eV at the Tevatron (LHC) are studied. The detection of these particles and measurements of their properties will provide an experimental challenge due to the large number of their decay modes, but will be a rich testing ground, e.g., for HQET and QCD potentialm odels.

## A cknow ledgm ents

The work of MAD.was supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) | Canada.

## References

- [1] H.Albrecht et al., (ARGUS Coll.) Phys. Lett. B 317 (1993) 227.
- [2] J.Dom inick et al., (CLEO Coll.) Phys. Rev. D 50 (1994) 4265.
- [3] H.Albrecht, et al., (ARGUS Coll.) Phys. Lett. B 326 (1994) 320.
- [4] P.Avery et al., (CLEO Coll.) Phys. Rev. Lett. 71 (1993) 2391; Y.K ubota et al., (CLEO Coll.) Phys. Rev. Lett. 71 (1993) 3255; T.Bergfeld et al., (CLEO Coll.) Phys. Lett. B 323 (1994) 219; P.Avery et al., (CLEO Coll.) Phys. Lett. B 325 (1994) 257.
- [5] M.J.Savage and M.B.W ise, Phys. Lett. B 248 (1990) 151.
- [6] M.J.W hite and M.J.Savage, Phys. Lett. B 271 (1991) 410.
- [7] M.L.Stong, TTP 95-02 (hep-ph/9505217).
- [8] S.Fleck, B.Silvestre-Brac and J.M.Richard, Phys. Rev. D 38 (1988) 1519.

- [9] R.Baier and R.Ruckl, Z.Phys. C 19 (1983) 251; R.Gastmans, W. Troost and T.T.Wu, Nucl. Phys. B 291 (1987) 731.
- [10] A.F.Falk, M.Luke, M.J.Savage and M.B.W ise, Phys. Rev. D 49 (1994) 555.
- [11] E.Braaten, K.Cheung and T.C.Yuan, Phys. Rev. D 48 (1993) 4230.
- [12] J.H.Kuhn, J.Kaplan, and E.G.O.Sa ani, Nucl. Phys. B 157 (1979) 125; B. Guberina, J.H.Kuhn, R.D. Peccei, and R.Ruckl, Nucl. Phys. B 174 (1980) 317.
- [13] E.Braaten, M.A.Doncheski, S.Fleming and M.Mangano, Phys. Lett. B 333 (1994) 548.
- [14] G. Foglem an, D. B. Lichtenberg, and J. G. W ills, Lett. Nuovo Cim. 26 (1979) 369;
   D. B. Lichtenberg et al., Z. Phys. C 46 (1990) 75.
- [15] J.L.Richardson, Phys. Lett. 82B (1979) 272.
- [16] G.A.Schuler, preprint CERN-TH.7170/94 (hep-ph/9403387) and references therein.
- [17] K.Kolodziej, A.Leike and R.Ruckl, MPI-PhT/95-36 (hep-ph/9505298).
- [18] A.D.Martin, R.G.Roberts and W.J.Stirling, Phys. Rev. D 50 (1994) 6734.
- [19] K. Kolodziej A. Leike and R. Ruckl, MPI-PhT/94-84, to appear in Phys. Lett. B;
   A. Leike and R. Ruckl, Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) 37B (1994) 215.
- [20] M.J.Savage and R.P.Springer, Int. J. of M od. Phys. A 6 (1992) 1701; Phys. Rev. D 42 (1990) 1527.
- [21] M. A. Sanchis-Lozano, preprint FTUV: 94-45 (hep-ph/9502359), to appear in Nucl. Phys. B; Phys. Lett. B 321 (1994) 407.
- [22] L.Montanet, et al. (Particle Data Group), Phys. Rev. D 50 (1994) 1.
- [23] S.Fleck and J.M. Richard, Prog. Theo. Phys. 82 (1989) 760.
- [24] A.Datta, UH-511-824-95 (hep-ph/9504428).

[25] It should be possible to tag c-quarks with a vertex detector with a som ewhat reduced e ciency compared to b-quark tagging; b-quark tagging e ciency with the SVX at CDF is 10-20%. See e.g., U.Baur et al., Phys. Lett. B 318 (1993) 544.