

$B \rightarrow \chi_s$ in the Standard ModelXiao-Gang He^{ab} and Guey-Lin Lin^{c y}^a Department of Physics, National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan, 10764, R.O.C.^b School of Physics, University of Melbourne, Parkville, Vic. 3052, Australia.^c Institute of Physics, National Chiao-Tung University, Hsinchu, Taiwan, 300, R.O.C.

Abstract

We study $B \rightarrow \chi_s$ within the framework of the Standard Model. Several mechanisms such as $b \rightarrow s$ through the QCD anomaly, and $b \rightarrow s$ and $B \rightarrow s$ arising from four-quark operators are treated simultaneously. Using QCD equations of motion, we relate the effective Hamiltonian for the first mechanism to that for the latter two. By incorporating next-to-leading-logarithmic (NLL) contributions, the first mechanism is shown to give a significant branching ratio for $B \rightarrow \chi_s$, while the other two mechanisms account for about 15% of the experimental value. The Standard Model prediction for $B \rightarrow \chi_s$ is consistent with the CLEO data.

PACS numbers: 13.25.Hw, 13.40.Hq

Typeset using REVTeX

 e-mail address: hexg@phys.ntu.edu.tw

y e-mail address: glin@beauty.phys.nctu.edu.tw

The recent observation of $B \rightarrow \bar{K}^0$ [1] and $B \rightarrow \bar{X}_s^0$ [2] decays with high momentum mesons has stimulated many theoretical activities [3-10]. One of the mechanisms proposed to account for this decay is $b \rightarrow sg \rightarrow sg^0$ [3,4] where the 0 meson is produced via the anomalous $^0 g g$ coupling. According to a previous analysis [4], this mechanism within the Standard Model (SM) can only account for 1/3 of the measured branching ratio: $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow \bar{X}_s^0) = 6.2 \pm 1.6(\text{stat}) \pm 1.3(\text{syst})^{+0.0}_{-1.5} (\text{pkg}) \times 10^{-4}$ [2] with $2.0 < p_0 < 2.7 \text{ GeV}$. There are also other calculations of $B \rightarrow \bar{X}_s^0$ based on four-quark operators of the effective weak-Hamiltonian [5,6]. These contributions to the branching ratio, typically 10^{-4} , are also too small to account for $B \rightarrow \bar{X}_s^0$, although the four-quark-operator contribution is capable of explaining the branching ratio for the exclusive $B \rightarrow \bar{K}^0$ decays [8,9]. These results have inspired proposals for an enhanced $b \rightarrow sg$ and other mechanisms arising from physics beyond the Standard Model [4,6,7]. In order to see if new physics should play any role in $B \rightarrow \bar{X}_s^0$, one has to have a better understanding on the SM prediction. In this letter, we carry out a careful analysis on $B \rightarrow \bar{X}_s^0$ in the SM using next-to-leading effective Hamiltonian and consider several mechanisms simultaneously.

We have observed that all earlier calculations on $b \rightarrow sg^0$ were either based upon one-loop result [4] which neglects the running of QCD renormalization scale from M_W to M_b or only taking into account part of the running effect [3]. Since the short-distance QCD effect is generally significant in weak decays, it is therefore crucial to compute $b \rightarrow sg^0$ using the effective Hamiltonian approach. As will be shown later, the process $b \rightarrow sg^0$ alone contribute significantly to $B \rightarrow \bar{X}_s^0$ while contributions from $b \rightarrow s$ and $B \rightarrow s q$ are suppressed.

The effective Hamiltonian [11] for the $B \rightarrow \bar{X}_s^0$ decay is given by:

$$H_{\text{eff}}(B \rightarrow \bar{X}_s^0) = \frac{G_F}{2} \left[\sum_{f=u,c}^X V_{fb} V_{fs}^* (C_1(f) O_1^f + C_2(f) O_2^f) + \sum_{i=3}^{X^6} V_{ts} V_{tb}^* (C_i O_i + C_8 O_8) \right]; \quad (1)$$

with [12]

$$\begin{aligned} O_1^f &= (s_i f_j)_{V-A} (f_j b_i)_{V-A}; \quad O_2^f = (s_i f_i)_{V-A} (f_j b_j)_{V-A} \\ O_3 &= (s_i b_i)_{V-A} (q_j q_j)_{V-A}; \quad O_4 = (s_i b_j)_{V-A} (q_j q_i)_{V-A} \\ O_5 &= (s_i b_i)_{V-A} (q_j q_j)_{V+A}; \quad O_6 = (s_i b_j)_{V-A} (q_j q_i)_{V+A} \\ O_8 &= \frac{g_s}{4} s_i (m_s P_L + m_b P_R) T_{ij}^a b_j G^a; \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $V_{ij} = 1/5$. In the above, we have dropped O_7 since its contribution is negligible. For numerical analyses, we use the scheme-independent Wilson coefficients discussed in Ref. [13,14]. For $m_t = 175 \text{ GeV}$, $m_s(m_s^2) = 0.118$ and $m_b = 5 \text{ GeV}$, we have [14]

$$C_1 = -0.313; \quad C_2 = 1.150; \quad C_3 = 0.017; \quad C_4 = -0.037; \quad C_5 = 0.010; \quad C_6 = -0.045; \quad (3)$$

At the NLL level, the effective Hamiltonian is modified by one-loop matrix elements which effectively change $C_i(f)$ ($i=3; \dots; 6$) into $\bar{C}_i(f) + C_i(q^2)$ with

$$C_4(q^2;) = C_6(q^2;) = -3C_3(q^2;) = -3C_5(q^2;) = P_s(q^2;); \quad (4)$$

where

$$P_s(q^2;) = \frac{s}{8}C_2() - \frac{10}{9} + G(m_c^2; q^2;) ; \quad (5)$$

with

$$G(m_c^2; q^2;) = \frac{1}{4} \int_0^1 x(1-x) \log \frac{m_c^2 - x(1-x)q^2}{2} dx; \quad (6)$$

The coefficient C_8 is equal to -0.144 at $\mu = 5 \text{ GeV}$ [11], and m_c is taken to be 1.4 GeV .

Before we discuss the dominant $b \rightarrow sg^0$ process, let us first work out the four-quark-operator contribution to $B \rightarrow X_s$ using the above effective Hamiltonian. We follow the approach of Ref. [3,5,15] which uses factorization approximation to estimate various hadronic matrix elements. The four-quark operators can induce three types of processes represented by 1) $\langle 0j_1 b\bar{b} \rangle \langle X_s j_1^0 q\bar{q} \rangle$, 2) $\langle 0j_2 q\bar{q} \rangle \langle X_s j_2 b\bar{b} \rangle$, and 3) $\langle X_s j_3 q\bar{q} \rangle \langle 0j_3 b\bar{b} \rangle$. Here $j_i^{(0)}$ denotes appropriate gamma matrices. The contribution from 1) gives a "three-body" type of decay, $B \rightarrow 0sq$. The contribution from 2) gives a "two-body" type of decay $b \rightarrow s^0$. The contribution from 3) is the annihilation type which is relatively suppressed and will be neglected. Note that there are interferences between 1) and 2), so they must be coherently added together [5].

Several decay constants and form factors needed in the calculations are listed below:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle 0j_1 s u j^0 \rangle &= \langle 0j_1 s d j^0 \rangle = i f_s^u p^0 \\ \langle 0j_2 s s j^0 \rangle &= i f_s^s p^0; \quad \langle 0j_3 s s j^0 \rangle = i(f_s^u - f_s^s) \frac{m_{20}^2}{2m_s}; \\ f_s^u &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(f_1 \cos \theta_1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} f_8 \sin \theta_8); \quad f_s^s = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(f_1 \cos \theta_1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} f_8 \sin \theta_8); \\ \langle 0j_1 b\bar{b} \rangle &= \langle 0j_1 b\bar{b}^0 \rangle = F_1^{Bq}(p^B + p^0) + (F_0^{Bq} - F_1^{Bq}) \frac{m_B^2 - m_{20}^2}{q^2} q; \\ F_{1;0}^{Bq} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sin \theta_{1;0}^B + \cos \theta_{1;0}^B): \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

For the 0 mixing associated with decay constants above, we have used the two-angle parametrization. The numerical values of various parameters are obtained from Ref. [16] with $f_1 = 157 \text{ MeV}$, $f_8 = 168 \text{ MeV}$, and the mixing angles $\theta_1 = 9.1^\circ$, $\theta_8 = 22.1^\circ$. For the mixing angle associated with form factors, we use the one-angle parametrization with $\theta = 15.4^\circ$ [16], since these form factors were calculated in that formulation [5,15]. In the latter discussion of $b \rightarrow sg^0$, we shall use the same parametrization in order to compare our results with those of earlier works [3,4]. For form factors, we assume that $F^{B+} = F^{B^0} = F^B$ with dipole and monopole q^2 dependence for F_1 and F_0 , respectively. We used the running mass $m_s = 120 \text{ MeV}$ at $\mu = 2.5 \text{ GeV}$ and $F^B = 0.33$ following Ref. [9].

The branching ratios of the above processes also depend on two less well-determined KM matrix elements, V_{ts} and V_{ub} . The dependences on V_{ts} arise from the penguin-diagram

contributions while the dependences on V_{ub} and its phase occur through the tree-diagram contributions. We will use $|V_{ub}| = 64^\circ$ obtained from Ref. [17], $|V_{ts}| = |V_{cb}| = 0.038$ and $|V_{ub}| = |V_{cb}| = 0.08$ for an illustration. We find that, for $\sqrt{s} = 5 \text{ GeV}$, the branching ratio in the signal region $p_0 = 2.0 \text{ GeV}$ ($m_X = 2.35 \text{ GeV}$) is

$$\mathcal{B}(b \rightarrow \bar{X}_s) = 1.0 \times 10^{-4}; \quad (8)$$

The branching ratio can reach 2×10^{-4} if all parameters take values in favour of $B \rightarrow \bar{X}_s$. Clearly the mechanism by four-quark operator is not sufficient to explain the observed $B \rightarrow \bar{X}_s$ branching ratio.

We now turn to the major mechanism for $B \rightarrow \bar{X}_s: b \rightarrow \bar{s}g$ through the QCD anomaly. To see how the effective Hamiltonian in Eq. (1) can be applied to calculate this process, we rearrange part of the effective Hamiltonian such that

$$\sum_{i=3}^6 C_i O_i = (C_3 + \frac{C_4}{N_c}) O_3 + (C_5 + \frac{C_6}{N_c}) O_5 - 2(C_4 - C_6) O_A + 2(C_4 + C_6) O_V; \quad (9)$$

where

$$O_A = s \gamma_5 (1 - \gamma_5) T^a b^X_q \gamma_5 T^a q; \quad O_V = s (1 - \gamma_5) T^a b^X_q T^a q; \quad (10)$$

Since the light-quark bilinear in O_V carries the quantum number of a gluon, one expects [3] O_V give contribution to the $b \rightarrow \bar{s}g$ form factors. In fact, by applying the QCD equation of motion: $D_\mu G_a^\mu = g_s \bar{q} T^a q$, we have $O_V = (1 = g_s) s (1 - \gamma_5) T^a b D_\mu G_a^\mu$ [18]. In this form, O_V is easily seen to give rise to $b \rightarrow \bar{s}g$ vertex. Let us write the effective $b \rightarrow \bar{s}g$ vertex as

$$\Gamma_{b \rightarrow \bar{s}g} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{ts} V_{tb} \frac{g_s}{4} (F_1 s(q^2) \bar{s} \gamma_\mu T^a b - i F_2 m_b s \bar{s} \gamma_\mu T^a b); \quad (11)$$

In the above, we define the form factors F_1 and F_2 according to the convention in Ref. [4]. Inferring from Eq. (9), we arrive at

$$F_1 = \frac{4}{s} (C_4(\mu) + C_6(\mu)); \quad F_2 = -2C_8(\mu) \quad (12)$$

We note that our relative sign between F_1 and F_2 agree with those in Ref. [4,6], and shall result in a destructive interference for the rate of $b \rightarrow \bar{s}g$. We stress that this relative sign is fixed by treating the sign of O_8 and the convention of QCD covariant derivative consistently [19]. To ensure the sign, we also check against the result by Simma and Wyler [20] on $b \rightarrow \bar{s}g$ form factors. An agreement on sign is found. Finally, we remark that, at the NLL level, F_1 should be corrected by one-loop matrix elements. The dominant contribution arises from the operator O_2 where its charm-quark-pair meets to form a gluon. In fact, this contribution, denoted as \tilde{F}_1 for convenience, has been shown in Eqs. (4)–(6), namely $\tilde{F}_1 = \frac{4}{s} (C_4(q^2; \mu) + C_6(q^2; \mu))$.

To proceed further, we recall the distribution of the $b(p) \rightarrow s(p^0) + g(k) + \bar{X}_s(k^0)$ branching ratio [4]:

FIGURES




FIG. 1. The distribution of $B(b \rightarrow s + g + \eta)$ as a function of the recoil mass m_χ .

$$\frac{d^2 B(b \rightarrow sg\eta)}{dx dy} = 0.2 \cos^2 \theta \frac{g_s(\mu)^2}{4} \frac{a_g^2(\mu) m_b^2}{4} \left[\sum_i F_{1i}^2 c_0 + \text{Re}(F_1 F_2^*) \frac{c_1}{y} + \sum_i F_{2i}^2 \frac{c_2}{y^2} \right]; \quad (13)$$

where $a_g(\mu) = \sqrt{N_F} g_s(\mu) = f_0$ is the strength of η - g - g vertex: $a_g \cos \theta = q \cdot k$ with q and k the momenta of two gluons; $x = (p^0 + k)^2 = m_b^2$ and $y = (k + k^0)^2 = m_b^2$; c_0, c_1 and c_2 are functions of x and y as given by:

$$\begin{aligned} c_0 &= \frac{1}{h} [2x^2 y + (1-y)(y-x^0)(2x+y-x^0)] = 2; \\ c_1 &= \frac{1}{h} (1-y)(y-x^0)^2; \\ c_2 &= \frac{1}{h} [2x^2 y^2 - (1-y)(y-x^0)(2xy-y+x^0)] = 2; \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

with $x^0 = m_\eta^2 = m_b^2$; and the η - g - g mixing angle is taken to be 15° as noted earlier. Finally, in obtaining the normalization factor: 0.2, we have taken into account the one-loop QCD correction [21] to the semi-leptonic $b \rightarrow c$ decay for consistency.

In previous one-loop calculations without QCD corrections, it was found $F_1 = 5$ and $F_2 = 0.2$ [3,4]. In our approach, we obtain $F_1 = 4.86$ and $F_2 = 0.288$ from Eqs. (3) and (12). However, F_1 is enhanced significantly by the matrix-element correction $F_1(q^2; \mu)$.

The latter quantity develops an imaginary part as q^2 passes the charm-pair threshold, and the magnitude of its real part also becomes maximal at this threshold. From Eqs. (3), (4) and (5), one finds $\text{Re}(F_1(4m_c^2; \mu)) = 2.58$ at $\mu = 5 \text{ GeV}$. Including the contribution by $F_1(q^2; \mu)$ with $\mu = 5 \text{ GeV}$, and using Eq. (13), we find $B(b \rightarrow sg^0) = 5.6 \cdot 10^{-4}$ with the cut $m_X = (k + p^0)^2 = 2.35 \text{ GeV}$ imposed in the CLEO measurement [2]. This branching ratio is consistent with CLEO's measurement on the $B \rightarrow X_s$ branching ratio [2]. Without the kinematic cut, we obtain $B(b \rightarrow sg^0) = 1.0 \cdot 10^{-3}$, which is much larger than $4.3 \cdot 10^{-4}$ calculated previously [4]. We also obtain the spectrum $\text{dB}(b \rightarrow sg^0) = \text{d}m_X$ as depicted in Fig. 1. The peak of the spectrum corresponds to $m_X = 2.4 \text{ GeV}$.

It is interesting to note that the CLEO analysis [2] indicates that, without the anomaly-induced contribution, the recoil-mass (m_X) spectrum of $B \rightarrow X_s$ can not be well reproduced even if the four-quark operator contributions are normalized to fit the branching ratio of the process. On the other hand, if $b \rightarrow sg \rightarrow sg^0$ dominates the contributions to $B \rightarrow X_s$, as shown here, the m_X spectrum can be fitted better as shown in Fig. 2 of Ref. [2]. It is also interesting to remark that although the four-quark operator contributions can not fit the branching ratio nor the spectrum, it does play a role in producing a small peak in the spectrum, which corresponds to the $B \rightarrow K$ mode. Specially, the $B \rightarrow K$ mode is accounted for by the $b \rightarrow s^0$ type of decays discussed earlier. Based on results obtained so far, one concludes that the Standard Model is not in conflict with the experimental data on $B \rightarrow X_s$. It can produce not only the branching ratio for $B \rightarrow X_s$ but also the recoil-mass spectrum when contributions from the anomaly mechanism and the four-quark operators are properly treated.

Up to this point, $a_g(\mu)$ of the $g \rightarrow g$ vertex has been treated as a constant independent of invariant-masses of the gluons, and μ is set to be 5 GeV . In practice, $a_g(\mu)$ should behave like a form-factor which becomes suppressed as the gluons attached to it go farther off-shell [3,4,6]. However, it remains unclear how much the form-factor suppression might be. It is possible that the branching ratio we just obtained gets reduced significantly by the form-factor effect in $g \rightarrow g$ vertex. Should a large form-factor suppression occur, the additional contribution from $b \rightarrow s^0$ and $B \rightarrow sq$ discussed earlier would become crucial. We however like to stress that our estimate of $b \rightarrow sg^0$ with μ evaluated at $\mu = 5 \text{ GeV}$ is conservative. To illustrate this, let us compare branching ratios for $b \rightarrow sg^0$ obtained at $\mu = 5 \text{ GeV}$ and $\mu = 2.5 \text{ GeV}$ respectively. In NDR scheme [22], branching ratios at the above two scales with the cut $m_X = 2.35 \text{ GeV}$ are $4.9 \cdot 10^{-4}$ and $9.1 \cdot 10^{-4}$ respectively. One can clearly see the significant scale-dependence! With the enhancement resulting from lowering the renormalization scale, there seems to be some room for the form-factor suppression in the attempt of explaining $B \rightarrow X_s$ by $b \rightarrow sg^0$ [23].

It should be noted that the above scale-dependence is solely due to the coupling constant $g_s(\mu)$ appearing in the $g \rightarrow g$ vertex. In fact, the $b \rightarrow sg$ vertex is rather insensitive to the renormalization scale. Indeed, from Eq. (11), we compute in the NDR scheme the scale-dependence of $g_s \cdot (F_1 + F_1(q^2))$. We find that, as μ decreases from 5 GeV to 2.5 GeV , the peak value of the above quantity increases by only 10%. Therefore, to stabilize the scale-dependence, one should include corrections beyond those which simply renormalize the $b \rightarrow sg$ vertex. We shall leave this to a future investigation.

It is instructive to compare our results with those of Refs. [3,4]. With the kinematic cut, our numerical result for $B(b \rightarrow sg^0)$ is only slightly smaller than the branching ratio,

8.2×10^{-4} , reported in Ref. [3], where the $s(\gamma)$ coupling of $^0 \gamma \gamma$ vertex is evaluated at 1 GeV , and F_1 receives only short-distance contributions from the Wilson coefficients C_4 and C_6 . Although we have a much smaller $s(\gamma)$, which is evaluated at $\mu = 5 \text{ GeV}$, and the interference of F_1 and F_2 is destructive [4] rather than constructive [3], there exists a compensating enhancement in F_1 due to one-loop matrix elements. The branching ratio in Ref. [4] is 2–3 times smaller than ours since it is given by a F_1 smaller than ours but comparable to that of Ref. [3]. Concerning the relative importance of F_1 and F_2 , we find that F_1 alone gives $\mathcal{B}(b \rightarrow s \gamma^0) = 6.5 \times 10^{-4}$ with the kinematic cut $m_X = 2.35 \text{ GeV}$. Hence the inclusion of F_2 lowers down the branching ratio by only 14%. Such a small interference effect is quite distinct from results of Refs. [3,4] where 20%–50% of interference effects are found. We attribute this to the enhancement of F_1 in our calculation.

Before closing we would like to comment on the branching ratio for $B \rightarrow X_s$. It is interesting to note that the width of $b \rightarrow s \gamma$ is suppressed by $\tan^2 \theta$ compared to that of $b \rightarrow s \gamma^0$. Taking $\theta = 15.4^\circ$, we obtain $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow X_s) \sim 4 \times 10^{-5}$. The contribution from the four-quark operator can be larger. Depending on the choice of parameters, we find that $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow X_s)$ is in the range of $(6-10) \times 10^{-5}$.

In conclusion, we have calculated the branching ratio of $b \rightarrow s \gamma^0$ by including the NLL correction to the $b \rightarrow s \gamma$ vertex. By assuming a low-energy $^0 \gamma \gamma$ vertex, and cutting the recoil mass m_X at 2.35 GeV , we obtained $\mathcal{B}(b \rightarrow s \gamma^0) = (5-9) \times 10^{-4}$ depending on the choice of the QCD renormalization-scale. Although the form-factor suppression in the $^0 \gamma \gamma$ vertex is anticipated, it remains possible that the anomaly-induced process $b \rightarrow s \gamma^0$ could account for the CLEO measurement on $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow ^0 X_s)$. For the four-quark operator contribution, we obtain $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow ^0 X_s) \sim 1 \times 10^{-4}$. This accounts for roughly 15% of the experimental central-value and can reach 30% if favourable parameters are used. Finally, combining contributions from the anomaly-mechanism and the four-quark operators, the entire range of $B \rightarrow ^0 X_s$ spectrum can be well reproduced.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank W.-S. Hou, A. Kagan and A. Soni for discussions. The work of XGH is supported by Australian Research Council and National Science Council of R.O.C. under the grant numbers NSC 87-2811-M-002-046 and NSC 88-2112-M-002-041. The work of GLL is supported by National Science Council of R.O.C. under the grant numbers NSC 87-2112-M-009-038, NSC 88-2112-M-009-002, and National Center for Theoretical Sciences of R.O.C. under the topical program: PQCD, B and CP.

REFERENCES

- [1] CLEO collaboration, B.H. Behrens et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 80 (1998) 3710.
- [2] CLEO Collaboration T.E. Browder et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 81 (1998) 1786.
- [3] D. Atwood and A. Soni, Phys. Lett. B 405 (1997) 150.
- [4] W.-S. Hou and B. Tseng, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80 (1998) 434.
- [5] A. Datta, X.-G. He, and S. Pakvasa, Phys. Lett. B 419 (1998) 369.
- [6] A.L. Kagan and A. Petrov, Preprint hep-ph/9707354; Preprint hep-ph/9806266.
- [7] H. Fritzsch, Phys. Lett. B 415 (1997) 83; X.-G. He, W.-S. Hou and C.S. Huang, Phys. Lett. B 429 (1998) 99.
- [8] H.-Y. Cheng, and B. Tseng, Preprint hep-ph/9803457; A. Ali, J. Chay, C. Greub and P. Ko, Phys. Lett. B 424 (1998) 161; N. Deshpande, B. Dutta and S. Oh, Phys. Rev. D 57 (1998) 5723.
- [9] A. Ali, G. Kramer and C.-D. Lu, Preprint hep-ph/9804363.
- [10] I. Halperin and A. Zhitnitsky, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80 (1998) 438; F. A. Raki, M. Musakonov and H. Toki, Preprint hep-ph/9803356; D.S. Du, Y.-D. Yang and G.-H. Zhu, Preprint hep-ph/9805451; M. Ahamdy, E. Kou and A. Sugamoto, Phys. Rev. D 58 (1998) 014015; D.S. Du, C.S. Kim and Y.-D. Yang, Phys. Lett. B 426 (1998) 133; F. Yuan and K.-T. Chao, Phys. Rev. D 56 (1997) 2495; A. Dighe, M. Gronau and J. Rosner, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79 (1997) 4333.
- [11] For an extensive review on the subject of effective Hamiltonian, see G. Buchalla, A. J. Buras and M. E. Lautenbacher, Review of Modern Physics, 68 (1996) 1125, which contains a detailed list of original literatures.
- [12] The sign of O_8 is consistent with the covariant derivative, $D = \partial - igT^a A^a$, in the QCD Lagrangian. See, A. Lenz, U. Nierste and O. Stenmayer, Phys. Rev. D 56 (1997) 7228.
- [13] A. Buras, M. Jamn, M. Lautenbacher and P. Weisz, Nucl. Phys. B 370 (1992) 69.
- [14] N. G. Deshpande and X.-G. He, Phys. Lett. B 336 (1994) 471.
- [15] T.E. Browder, A. Datta, X.-G. He and S. Pakvasa, Phys. Rev. D 57 (1998) 6829.
- [16] T. Feldmann, P. Kroll and B. Stech, e-print hep-ph/9802409.
- [17] F. Parodi, P. Roudeau and A. Stocchi, e-print hep-ph/9802289.
- [18] By applying the QCD equation of motion or performing a direct calculation, it was shown that the operator basis of $O_3 - O_6$ are suitable to describe nonleptonic weak decays although effective vertices such as $s \rightarrow d + \text{gluons}$ are encountered. Here the operator basis on the r.h.s of Eq. (9) is more suitable for our purpose. For detail, see A. I. Vainshtein et al., JETP Lett. 22 (1975) 55; M. A. Shifman et al., Nucl. Phys. B 120 (1977) 316; M. B. Wise and E. Witten, Phys. Rev. D 20 (1979) 1216.
- [19] We thank A. Kagan for pointing out this to us, which helps us to detect a sign error in our earlier calculation.
- [20] H. Simma and D. Wyler, Nucl. Phys. B 344 (1990) 283.
- [21] G. Corbo, Nucl. Phys. B 212 (1983) 99; N. Cabibbo, G. Corbo and L. Maiani, ibid. B 155 (1979) 93.
- [22] In NDR scheme, apart from a different set of Wilson coefficients compared to Eq. (3), the constant term: $\frac{10}{9}$ at the r.h.s. of Eq. (5) is replaced by $\frac{2}{3}$. For details, see, for example, Ali and Greub, Phys. Rev. D 57 (1998) 2996.
- [23] We do notice that $B(b \rightarrow sg^0)$ is suppressed by more than one order of magnitude if

$a_g(\dots)$ in Eq. (13) is replaced by $a_g(m_0) = \frac{m_0^2}{(m_0^2 + q^2)}$ according to Ref. [6]. However, this prescription for a_g stems from the assumption that $g \rightarrow g^0$ form factor behaves in the same way as the QED-anomaly form factor $\rightarrow 0$. It remains unclear as raised in Refs. [3,4] that one could make such a connection between two distinct form factors.