

# $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c P(V)$ Nonleptonic Weak Decays

X.-H. Guo<sup>1,2</sup>

1. Department of Physics and Mathematical Physics,  
and Special Research Center for the Subatomic Structure of Matter,  
University of Adelaide, SA 5005, Australia
2. Institute of High Energy Physics, Academia Sinica, Beijing, China

## Abstract

The two-body nonleptonic weak decays of  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c P(V)$  ( $P$  and  $V$  represent pseudoscalar and vector mesons respectively) are analyzed in two models, one is the Bethe-Salpeter (B-S) model and the other is the hadronic wave function model. The calculations are carried out in the factorization approach. The obtained results are compared with other model calculations.

**PACS Numbers:** 11.10.St, 12.39.Ki, 12.39.Hg, 13.30.-a

## I. Introduction

Recently, experimental measurements for the heavy baryon  $\Lambda_b$  begin to be available. For example, OPAL has measured some physical quantities for  $\Lambda_b$  such as its lifetime and the product branching ratio for the inclusive semileptonic decay  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda l^- \bar{\nu} X$  [1]. Furthermore, the measurements for the nonleptonic decay of  $\Lambda_b$  also appeared. This is the well-known process  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda J/\psi$ . The discrepancy between the measurements made by UA1 [2] and CDF, LEP [3][4] has been settled down by the new measurement from CDF [5]. However, comparing with the data of D, B and  $\Lambda_c$  the data for  $\Lambda_b$  is still very limited. But we certainly expect more and more data coming out in the near future.

On the other hand, there have been also some progress in the theoretical study on heavy baryon decays. In comparison with the case of heavy mesons the situation for heavy baryons becomes more complicated since there are three quarks in a baryon instead of two in a meson. Fortunately the establishment of the heavy quark effective theory (HQET) [6] makes the study on heavy flavor hadrons simpler since the HQET can reduce the independent number of weak transition form factors. It can be shown that in the leading order of  $1/m_Q$  expansion there is only one form factor, the Isgur-Wise function, for  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c$  weak transition. Furthermore, HQET can also be applied to relate some nonleptonic decay processes in the heavy quark limit. For instance, the decay widths of  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c D_s$  and  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c D_s^*$  are related to each other by the heavy quark symmetry [7]. The decay widths of these two processes are expressed by two common scalar functions in the heavy quark limit.

Although the heavy quark symmetry can be used to simplify the physical processes where heavy hadrons are involved, in most cases HQET itself cannot give the final phenomenological predictions for the decay properties. Hence one still has to adopt nonperturbative QCD models in the end. Among them we have, for instance, QCD sum rules, the Bethe-Salpeter (B-S) equation, chiral perturbation theory, po-

tential model, bag model, instanton model, relativistic and nonrelativistic quark model, etc. By applying these models one can calculate the weak transition form factors such as  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c$ . Consequently the semileptonic decay widths are drawn out directly since the lepton pair can be extracted from the hadronic weak transition form factor.

For nonleptonic decays, things become much more complicated. To simplify the calculations the factorization assumption is applied so that one of the currents in the nonleptonic decay Hamiltonian is factorized out and generates a meson. Thus the decay amplitude of the two body nonleptonic decay becomes the product of two matrix elements, one is related to the decay constant of the factorized meson and the other is the weak transition matrix element between two hadrons. There have been some discussions about the plausibility of the factorization approach. In the energetic weak decays the quark pair generated by one current in the weak Hamiltonian moves very fast away from the weak interaction point. Therefore, by the time this quark pair hadronizes into a meson it is far away from other quarks and it almost does not interact with the remaining quarks. Hence this quark pair is factorized out and generates a meson. This argument is based on the ideas of “color transparency” given by Bjorken [8]. Dugan and Grinstein proposed a formal proof for factorization approach by constructing a large energy effective theory [9]. It is shown that when the energy of the generated meson is very large the meson can be factorized out and the deviation from the factorization amplitude is suppressed by the energy of the factorized meson. In the  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c P(V)$  decays the W-exchange diagram is also involved besides factorization diagrams. However, it is argued that in the bottom baryon case the W-exchange diagram’s contribution is suppressed by one order caused by a factor  $32\pi|\psi(0)|^2/m_b^3$  with respect to the spectator diagram [10][11]. From the above arguments the factorization approach is a good approximation for  $\Lambda_b$  nonleptonic decays. In fact in the B meson nonleptonic decays it has

been shown that the factorization approach works well since it leads to theoretical predictions which in general are consistent with experimental data [12].

In the nonrelativistic quark model Cheng calculated the decay widths for many processes of  $\Lambda_b$  in the factorization approach [11]. Actually the factorization contribution had been considered by Mannel and Roberts [13]. By simply applying the Isgur-Wise function for  $B \rightarrow D$  to  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c$  they gave the Cabibbo-allowed decay branching ratios. Because the light degrees of freedom in a heavy meson and a heavy baryon has different dynamics, their Isgur-Wise functions should also be different. For instance, in the B-S equation model it is shown that the Isgur-Wise function for  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c$  drops faster than that for  $B \rightarrow D$  [14]. In the factorization approach, the essential point is the weak transition form factors for  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c$ . In our previous papers we dealt with this transition in the B-S equation approach to the leading order in  $1/m_Q$  ( $Q=b$  or  $c$ ) expansion [14] and in the hadronic wave function model in the infinite momentum frame (IMF) to the order  $1/m_Q$  [15]. It is the motivation of the present paper to apply these results to the nonleptonic decays of  $\Lambda_b$ .

When the quark mass is very heavy comparing with the QCD scale  $\Lambda_{QCD}$ , the light degrees of freedom in a heavy baryon  $\Lambda_Q$  becomes blind to the flavor and spin quantum numbers of the heavy quark because of the  $SU(2)_f \times SU(2)_s$  symmetries. Therefore, the angular momentum and flavor quantum numbers of the light degrees of freedom (the light diquark) become good quantum numbers which can be used to classify heavy baryons. It is thus reasonable to assume that the heavy baryon  $\Lambda_Q$  is composed of a heavy quark and a scalar diquark. In this picture, the three body system is simplified to two body system. Based on this simple picture, we established the B-S equation for  $\Lambda_Q$  in the heavy quark limit and solved out the Isgur-Wise function [14]. Also in this two body-system picture, in IMF we combined the Drell-Yan type overlap integrals with the results from the HQET to calculate all the six form factors which describe the transition  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c$  to the order of  $1/m_Q$ .

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Sect. II we give the formulation to deal with the  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c P(V)$  decays. Then in Sect. III we present the results from the B-S approach and the hadronic wave function model. Other model calculations are also listed for comparison. Finally, Sect. VI is served for summary and discussions.

## II. Formulation

In this section we briefly review the standard formulation for calculating the decays  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c P(V)$ .

The Hamiltonian describing the two body nonleptonic decays of a bottom baryon reads

$$H_{eff} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cb} V_{UD}^* (a_1 O_1 + a_2 O_2), \quad (1)$$

with  $O_1 = (\bar{D}U)(\bar{c}b)$  and  $O_2 = (\bar{c}U)(\bar{D}b)$ , where  $U$  and  $D$  are the fields for light quarks involved in the decay, and  $(\bar{q}_1 q_2) = \bar{q}_1 \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) q_2$  is understood. The parameters  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  are treated as free parameters since they involve hadronization effects. In literatures usually  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  are expressed in terms of the QCD coefficients  $c_1$  and  $c_2$

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 &= c_1 + \zeta c_2, \\ a_2 &= c_2 + \zeta c_1, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where  $c_1(m_b) = 1.11$  and  $c_2(m_b) = -0.26$ . In the naive factorization approach  $\zeta = 1/N_c$  with  $N_c = 3$ . However, because of the color-octet contributions the value of  $\zeta$  differs from  $1/3$ . In the charm decays  $\zeta \sim 0$  and in the bottom case it is still not very clear. In ref. [16] it is proposed that in the bottom case  $\zeta \sim 1/2$ . The values of  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  need to be clarified when more data on the bottom hadrons are available. In the present work we simply treat them as free parameters.

The general form for the amplitudes of  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c P(V)$  are [11]

$$\begin{aligned}
M(\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c P) &= i\bar{u}_{\Lambda_c}(p_{\Lambda_c})(A + B\gamma_5)u_{\Lambda_b}(p_{\Lambda_b}), \\
M(\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c V) &= \bar{u}_{\Lambda_c}(p_{\Lambda_c})\epsilon^{*\mu}[A_1\gamma_\mu\gamma_5 + A_2(p_{\Lambda_c})_\mu\gamma_5 + B_1\gamma_\mu + B_2(p_{\Lambda_c})_\mu]u_{\Lambda_b}(p_{\Lambda_b}),
\end{aligned}
\tag{3}$$

where  $u_{\Lambda_c}$ ,  $u_{\Lambda_b}$  are dirac spinors of  $\Lambda_c$ ,  $\Lambda_b$  respectively and  $\epsilon_\mu$  is the polarization vector of the emitted vector meson.

In the factorization approach the amplitudes for  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c P(V)$  is

$$M^{fac}(\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c P(V)) = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}}V_{cb}V_{UD}^*a_1 \langle P(V)|A_\mu(V_\mu)|0 \rangle \langle \Lambda_c(p_{\Lambda_c})|J^\mu|\Lambda_b(p_{\Lambda_b}) \rangle,
\tag{4}$$

where  $J_\mu$  is the  $V - A$  weak current and  $\langle 0|A_\mu(V_\mu)|P(V) \rangle$  are related to the decay constants of the pseudoscalar meson or vector meson by

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle 0|A_\mu|P \rangle &= if_P q_\mu, \\
\langle 0|V_\mu|V \rangle &= f_V m_V \epsilon_\mu,
\end{aligned}
\tag{5}$$

where  $q_\mu$  is the momentum of the emitted meson from W-boson and the normalization is chosen so that  $f_\pi = 132\text{MeV}$ . It is noted that in the two-body nonleptonic weak decays  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c P(V)$  there is no contribution from the  $a_2$  term since such a term corresponds to the transition of  $\Lambda_b$  to a light baryon instead of  $\Lambda_c$ .

The matrix element for  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c$  can be expressed as the following on the ground of Laurantance invariance

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \Lambda_c(p_{\Lambda_c})|J_\mu|\Lambda_b(p_{\Lambda_b}) \rangle &= \bar{u}_{\Lambda_c}(p_{\Lambda_c})[f_1(q^2)\gamma_\mu + if_2(q^2)\sigma_{\mu\nu}q^\nu + f_3(q^2)q_\mu \\
&\quad - (g_1(q^2)\gamma_\mu + ig_2(q^2)\sigma_{\mu\nu}q^\nu + g_3(q^2)q_\mu)\gamma_5]u_{\Lambda_b}(p_{\Lambda_b}),
\end{aligned}
\tag{6}$$

where  $f_i$ ,  $g_i$  ( $i=1,2,3$ ) are the Laurantance scalars. Alternatively, in the heavy baryon case we the above matrix element can be expressed in terms of the velocities of  $\Lambda_b$

and  $\Lambda_c$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Lambda_c(v_{\Lambda_c}) | J_\mu | \Lambda_b(v_{\Lambda_b}) \rangle &= \bar{u}_{\Lambda_c}(v_{\Lambda_c}) [F_1(\omega)\gamma_\mu + F_2(\omega)v_{\Lambda_b\mu} + F_3(\omega)v_{\Lambda_c\mu} \\ &\quad - (G_1(\omega)\gamma_\mu + G_2(\omega)v_{\Lambda_b\mu} + G_3(\omega)v_{\Lambda_b\mu})\gamma_5], \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where  $\omega = v_{\Lambda_c} \cdot v_{\Lambda_b}$ . The relations between  $f_i$ ,  $g_i$  and  $F_i$ ,  $G_i$  are

$$\begin{aligned} f_1 &= F_1 + \frac{1}{2}(m_{\Lambda_b} + m_{\Lambda_c}) \left( \frac{F_2}{m_{\Lambda_b}} + \frac{F_3}{m_{\Lambda_c}} \right), \\ f_2 &= \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{F_2}{m_{\Lambda_b}} + \frac{F_3}{m_{\Lambda_c}} \right), \\ f_3 &= \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{F_2}{m_{\Lambda_b}} - \frac{F_3}{m_{\Lambda_c}} \right), \\ g_1 &= G_1 - \frac{1}{2}(m_{\Lambda_b} - m_{\Lambda_c}) \left( \frac{G_2}{m_{\Lambda_b}} + \frac{G_3}{m_{\Lambda_c}} \right), \\ g_2 &= \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{G_2}{m_{\Lambda_b}} + \frac{G_3}{m_{\Lambda_c}} \right), \\ g_3 &= \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{G_2}{m_{\Lambda_b}} - \frac{G_3}{m_{\Lambda_c}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

In the heavy quark limit  $m_Q \rightarrow \infty$

$$F_1 = G_1 = \xi(\omega), \quad F_2 = F_3 = G_2 = G_3 = 0,$$

where  $\xi(\omega)$  is the Isgur-Wise function.

The decay widths and the up-down asymmetries for  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c P(V)$  are available in literatures [11][18].

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c P) &= \frac{p_c}{8\pi} \left[ \frac{(m_{\Lambda_b} + m_{\Lambda_c})^2 - m_P^2}{m_{\Lambda_b}^2} |A|^2 + \frac{(m_{\Lambda_b} - m_{\Lambda_c})^2 - m_P^2}{m_{\Lambda_b}^2} |B|^2 \right], \\ \alpha(\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c P) &= -\frac{2\delta \text{Re}(A^*B)}{|A|^2 + \delta^2 |B|^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where  $p_c$  is the c.m. momentum and  $\delta = \sqrt{(E_{\Lambda_c} - m_{\Lambda_c})/(E_{\Lambda_c} + m_{\Lambda_c})}$ . A and B are related to the form factors by

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cb} V_{UD}^* a_1 f_P(m_{\Lambda_b} - m_{\Lambda_c}) f_1(m_P^2), \\ B &= \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cb} V_{UD}^* a_1 f_P(m_{\Lambda_b} + m_{\Lambda_c}) g_1(m_P^2). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma(\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c V) &= \frac{p_c}{8\pi} \frac{E_{\Lambda_c} + m_{\Lambda_c}}{m_{\Lambda_b}} \left[ 2(|S|^2 + |P_2|^2) + \frac{E_V^2}{m_V^2} (|S + D|^2 + |P_1|^2) \right], \\
\alpha(\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c V) &= \frac{4m_V^2 \text{Re}(S^* P_2) + 2E_V^2 \text{Re}(S + D)^* P_1}{2m_V^2 (|S|^2 + |P_2|^2) + E_V^2 (|S + D|^2 + |P_1|^2)}, \tag{11}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
S &= -A_1, \\
D &= -\frac{p_c^2}{E_V(E_{\Lambda_c} + m_{\Lambda_c})} (A_1 - m_{\Lambda_b} A_2), \\
P_1 &= -\frac{p_c}{E_V} \left( \frac{m_{\Lambda_b} + m_{\Lambda_c}}{E_{\Lambda_c} + m_{\Lambda_c}} B_1 + m_{\Lambda_b} B_2 \right), \\
P_2 &= \frac{p_c}{E_{\Lambda_c} + m_{\Lambda_c}} B_1, \tag{12}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
A_1 &= -\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cb} V_{UD}^* a_1 f_V m_V [g_1(m_V^2) + g_2(m_V^2)(m_{\Lambda_b} - m_{\Lambda_c})], \\
A_2 &= -2\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cb} V_{UD}^* a_1 f_V m_V g_2(m_V^2), \\
B_1 &= \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cb} V_{UD}^* a_1 f_V m_V [f_1(m_V^2) - f_2(m_V^2)(m_{\Lambda_b} + m_{\Lambda_c})], \\
B_2 &= 2\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cb} V_{UD}^* a_1 f_V m_V f_2(m_V^2). \tag{13}
\end{aligned}$$

### III. The results

In the B-S equation approach [14]  $\Lambda_Q$  is regarded as the bound state of a heavy quark and a light scalar diquark. The B-S wave function  $\chi_P(p)$  satisfies the following B-S equation

$$\chi_P(p) = S_F(\lambda_1 P + p) \int \frac{d^4 q}{(2\pi)^4} G(P, p, q) \chi_P(q) S_D(-\lambda_2 P + p), \tag{14}$$

where  $P = m_{\Lambda_Q} v$  is the momentum of  $\Lambda_Q$ , the two parameters  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$  are defined in terms of the heavy quark mass  $m_Q$  and the light diquark mass  $m_D$  in the baryon,  $\lambda_1 = \frac{m_Q}{m_Q + m_D}$ ,  $\lambda_2 = \frac{m_D}{m_Q + m_D}$ ,  $p$  is the relative momentum of the two constituents. The momentum of the heavy quark is  $p_1 = \lambda_1 P + p$  and that of the diquark is

$p_2 = -\lambda_2 P + p$ . In eq. (14)  $S_F$  and  $S_D$  are the propagators of the heavy quark and the diquark respectively and  $G(P, p, q)$  is the kernel which is the sum of the two particle irreducible diagrams. The kernel is assumed to have the form

$$-iG = I \otimes IV_1 + v_\mu \otimes (p_2 + p'_2)^\mu V_2, \quad (15)$$

where the first term arises from scalar confinement and the second one is from one gluon exchange diagram,  $p_2$  and  $p'_2$  are the momenta of the diquark. For convenience we introduce the longitudinal and transverse momentum variables  $p_l = v \cdot p - \lambda_2 m_{\Lambda_Q}$ ,  $p_t = p - (v \cdot p)v$ . In the heavy quark limit the heavy quark is almost on-shell, hence we can make the covariant instantaneous approximation  $p_l = q_l$  in the kernel. Thus  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  are of the following forms

$$\begin{aligned} V_1 &= \frac{8\pi\kappa}{[(p_t - q_t)^2 + \mu^2]^2} - (2\pi)^3 \delta^3(p_t - q_t) \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{8\pi\kappa}{(k^2 + \mu^2)^2}, \\ V_2 &= -\frac{16\pi}{3} \frac{\alpha_{seff}^2 Q_0^2}{[(p_t - q_t)^2 + \mu^2][(p_t - q_t)^2 + Q_0^2]}. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where the parameter  $\kappa$  which describes the strength of linear confinement varies from  $0.02\text{GeV}^3$  to  $0.1\text{GeV}^3$  and  $\alpha_{seff}$  changes correspondingly. The parameter  $Q_0^2$  is introduced since the diquark is not point-like and we use the value  $Q_0^2 = 3.2\text{GeV}^2$  [17].

In the limit  $m_Q \rightarrow \infty$   $\chi_P(p)$  is only related to a scalar function  $\phi_P(p)$  which controls the dynamics

$$\chi_P(p) = \phi_P(p) u_{\Lambda_Q}(v, s). \quad (17)$$

Defining  $\tilde{\phi}_P(p_t) = \int \frac{d p_l}{2\pi} \phi_P(p)$  we have the B-S equation for  $\tilde{\phi}_P(p_t)$

$$\tilde{\phi}_P(p_t) = -\frac{1}{2(E_0 - W_p + m_D)W_p} \int \frac{d^3 q_t}{(2\pi)^3} (V_1 - 2W_p V_2) \tilde{\phi}_P(q_t). \quad (18)$$

where  $W_p = \sqrt{p_t^2 + m_D^2}$  and  $E_0$  is the binding energy.

The solutions for the B-S wave function  $\chi_P(p)$  can be applied to obtain the numerical result for the Isgur-Wise function for  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c$

$$\xi(\omega) = \int \frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4} \phi_{P'}(p') \phi_P(p) S_D^{-1}(p_2). \quad (19)$$

The numerical values for the Isgur-Wise function depend on the parameters  $\kappa$  and  $m_D$ . We let  $m_D$  vary from 650MeV to 800MeV.

In the limit  $m_{b,c} \rightarrow \infty$  A and B in eq.(10) are given by the value of the Isgur-Wise function at  $m_P^2$ ,  $\xi(m_P^2)$ . Then from eq.(9) we obtain the decay widths, branching ratios and the asymmetry parameters. The results for different final pseudoscalar or vector mesons are listed in Table 1.

**Table 1. Predictions for  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c P(V)$  in B-S approach ( $m_{b,c} \rightarrow \infty$ )**

	$\Gamma(10^{10} s^{-1})$	B (%)	$\alpha$
$\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ \pi^-$	$0.16a_1^2 \sim 0.28a_1^2$	$0.18a_1^2 \sim 0.32a_1^2$	-1.000
$\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ \rho^-$	$0.23a_1^2 \sim 0.40a_1^2$	$0.26a_1^2 \sim 0.46a_1^2$	-0.899
$\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ D_s^-$	$0.62a_1^2 \sim 0.93a_1^2$	$0.71a_1^2 \sim 1.06a_1^2$	-0.984
$\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ D_s^{*-}$	$0.48a_1^2 \sim 0.70a_1^2$	$0.55a_1^2 \sim 0.80a_1^2$	-0.423
$\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ K^-$	$0.011a_1^2 \sim 0.020a_1^2$	$0.013a_1^2 \sim 0.023a_1^2$	-1.000
$\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ K^{*-}$	$0.012a_1^2 \sim 0.018a_1^2$	$0.014a_1^2 \sim 0.021a_1^2$	-0.866
$\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ D^-$	$0.022a_1^2 \sim 0.033a_1^2$	$0.025a_1^2 \sim 0.038a_1^2$	-0.988
$\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ D^{*-}$	$0.016a_1^2 \sim 0.024a_1^2$	$0.019a_1^2 \sim 0.028a_1^2$	-0.463

It is noted that in Table 1 the range of the prediction values corresponds to  $\kappa$  from  $0.02\text{GeV}^3$  to  $0.1\text{GeV}^3$ .  $m_D$  is chosen to 700MeV. The numerical results for  $m_D$  from 650MeV to 800MeV change very little. Furthermore, in the calculations we use the following decay constants

$$f_\pi = 132\text{MeV}, \quad f_K = 156\text{MeV}, \quad f_D = 200\text{MeV}[19][20], \quad f_{D_s} = 241\text{MeV}[20],$$

$$f_\rho = 216\text{MeV}, \quad f_{K^*} = f_\rho, \quad f_D = f_{D^*}, \quad f_{D_s} = f_{D_s^*}.$$

The masses for  $\Lambda_b^0$  and  $\Lambda_c^+$  are 5.641GeV and 2.285GeV respectively [21] and the lifetime of  $\Lambda_b$  is  $1.14 \times 10^{-12}\text{s}$ [21].

In ref. [15] Guo and Kroll use the Drell-Yan type overlap integrals for the model hadronic wave functions of  $\Lambda_b$  and  $\Lambda_c$  to obtain the form factors  $F_i, G_i (i = 1, 2, 3)$  in eq. (7). It is noted from the HQET that to the order  $1/m_b, 1/m_c$  expansion all the six form factors are related with each other

$$\begin{aligned} F_1 &= G_1 \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{1}{m_b} + \frac{1}{m_c} \right) \frac{\bar{\Lambda}}{1 + \omega} \right], \\ F_2 &= G_2 = -G_1 \frac{1}{m_c} \frac{\bar{\Lambda}}{1 + \omega}, \\ F_3 &= -G_3 = -G_1 \frac{1}{m_b} \frac{\bar{\Lambda}}{1 + \omega}, \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where  $\bar{\Lambda}$  is the unknown parameter which is the difference between the mass of the heavy baryon and that of the heavy quark. Therefore, if one determines one form factor all the six form factors are known.

Just as in the case of the B-S approach,  $\Lambda_Q$  is regarded as composed of a heavy quark and a scalar light diquark in IMF.

$$|\Lambda_Q(\vec{P}, \lambda \rangle = \sqrt{\frac{m_Q}{2m_{\Lambda_Q}}} \int \frac{d^3k}{\sqrt{E_Q E_D}} \Psi_{\Lambda_Q}(\vec{k}) |Q(\vec{P} - \vec{k}, \lambda; D(\vec{k}) \rangle, \quad (21)$$

where color indices have been omitted,  $E_Q$  and  $E_D$  are the IMF energies of the heavy quark and scalar-particle, respectively,  $\lambda$  represents the helicity of the baryon. The renormalization of the wave function is

$$\int dx_1 d^2k_{\perp} |\Psi_{\Lambda_Q}(x_1, \vec{k}_{\perp})|^2 = 1, \quad (22)$$

where the longitudinal momentum fraction  $x_1$  carried by the heavy quark and the heavy quark's transverse momentum corresponding to its parent baryon  $\vec{k}_{\perp}$  are introduced. Obviously, the scalar diquark carries  $x_2 = 1 - x_1$  and  $-\vec{k}_{\perp}$ . The baryon wave function  $\Psi_{\Lambda_Q}(x_1, \vec{k}_{\perp})$  is a generalization of the Bauer-Stech-Wirbel [22] meson wave function to the quark-diquark case

$$\Psi_{\Lambda_Q}(x_1, \vec{k}_{\perp}) = N_{\Lambda_Q} x_1 x_2^3 \exp[-b^2(\vec{k}_{\perp}^2 + m_{\Lambda_Q}^2(x_1 - x_0)^2)], \quad (23)$$

where  $N_{\Lambda_Q}$  is the normalization constant. The peak position of the wave function is at  $x_0 = 1 - \bar{\Lambda}/m_{\Lambda_Q}$  and the width is of the order  $\bar{\Lambda}/m_{\Lambda_Q}$ . In the calculations  $\bar{\Lambda} = 600\text{MeV}$  is used. Another parameter  $b$  in the wave function is related to the mean  $k_{\perp}$  or the radius of the baryon and its precise value is not known. However, we expect the radius of a heavy baryon to be smaller than that of proton. In the following calculations, as in [15], we use  $b=1.77\text{GeV}$  and  $b=1.18\text{ GeV}$ , corresponding to  $\langle k_{\perp}^2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} = 400\text{ MeV}$  and  $\langle k_{\perp}^2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} = 600\text{MeV}$  respectively.

The form factor, say  $F_1$ , is related to the overlap integral of the hadronic wave functions of  $\Lambda_b$  and  $\Lambda_c$ . To the leading order in  $1/m_Q$  expansion it is just the Isgur-Wise function which has the following form

$$\xi(\omega) = \left(\frac{2}{\omega+1}\right) \exp\left(-2\bar{\Lambda}^2 b^2 \frac{\omega-1}{\omega+1}\right) \frac{K_6(2\bar{\Lambda}b/\sqrt{\omega+1})}{K_6(\sqrt{2}\bar{\Lambda}b)}. \quad (24)$$

where  $K_l$  is defined as

$$K_l(x) = \int_{-x}^{\infty} dz e^{-z^2} (z+x)^l.$$

With the above form of the Isgur-Wise function we obtain the decay widths, branching ratios and the asymmetry parameters in the hadronic wave function model. The results are listed in Table 2(a).

**Table 2(a). Predictions for  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c P(V)$  in hadronic wave function model ( $m_{b,c} \rightarrow \infty$ )**

	$\Gamma(10^{10} s^{-1})$	B (%)	$\alpha$
$\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ \pi^-$	$0.064a_1^2 \sim 0.12a_1^2$	$0.073a_1^2 \sim 0.14a_1^2$	-1.000
$\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ \rho^-$	$0.098a_1^2 \sim 0.18a_1^2$	$0.11a_1^2 \sim 0.20a_1^2$	-0.899
$\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ D_s^-$	$0.33a_1^2 \sim 0.50a_1^2$	$0.38a_1^2 \sim 0.57a_1^2$	-0.984
$\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ D_s^{*-}$	$0.27a_1^2 \sim 0.40a_1^2$	$0.31a_1^2 \sim 0.45a_1^2$	-0.423
$\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ K^-$	$0.0047a_1^2 \sim 0.0086a_1^2$	$0.0054a_1^2 \sim 0.0098a_1^2$	-1.000
$\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ K^{*-}$	$0.0053a_1^2 \sim 0.0093a_1^2$	$0.0060a_1^2 \sim 0.011a_1^2$	-0.866
$\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ D^-$	$0.011a_1^2 \sim 0.017a_1^2$	$0.013a_1^2 \sim 0.020a_1^2$	-0.988
$\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ D^{*-}$	$0.0088a_1^2 \sim 0.013a_1^2$	$0.010a_1^2 \sim 0.015a_1^2$	-0.463

By using eq. (20) all the six form factors are obtained to the order  $1/m_b, 1/m_c$

$$F_1 = \xi(\omega) \left[ 1 + \bar{\Lambda} \left( \frac{1}{m_b} + \frac{1}{m_c} \right) \left[ g(\omega) + \frac{1}{1+\omega} \right] \right],$$

$$\begin{aligned}
G_1 &= \xi(\omega) \left[ 1 + \bar{\Lambda} \left( \frac{1}{m_b} + \frac{1}{m_c} \right) g(\omega) \right], \\
F_2 &= G_2 = \frac{m_b}{m_c} F_3 = -\frac{m_b}{m_c} G_3 = -\frac{\bar{\Lambda}}{m_c} \frac{\xi(\omega)}{1 + \omega},
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

where  $g(\omega)$  is the  $1/m_Q$  correction term

$$g(\omega) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\bar{\Lambda}b}} \left[ \frac{K_7(\sqrt{2\bar{\Lambda}b})}{K_6(\sqrt{2\bar{\Lambda}b})} - \sqrt{\frac{2}{1+\omega}} \frac{K_7(2\bar{\Lambda}b/\sqrt{\omega+1})}{K_6(2\bar{\Lambda}b/\sqrt{\omega+1})} \right]. \tag{26}$$

After including the  $1/m_Q$  corrections we obtain Table 2(b).

**Table 2(b). Predictions for  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c P(V)$  in hadronic wave function model (with  $1/m_Q$  corrections)**

	$\Gamma(10^{10}s^{-1})$	B (%)	$\alpha$
$\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ \pi^-$	$0.077a_1^2 \sim 0.34a_1^2$	$0.088a_1^2 \sim 0.39a_1^2$	-1.000
$\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ \rho^-$	$0.11a_1^2 \sim 0.48a_1^2$	$0.13a_1^2 \sim 0.55a_1^2$	-0.890 $\sim$ 0.893
$\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ D_s^-$	$0.37a_1^2 \sim 1.10a_1^2$	$0.42a_1^2 \sim 1.25a_1^2$	-0.984
$\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ D_s^{*-}$	$0.30a_1^2 \sim 0.84a_1^2$	$0.35a_1^2 \sim 0.96a_1^2$	-0.390 $\sim$ 0.403
$\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ K^-$	$0.0059a_1^2 \sim 0.024a_1^2$	$0.0063a_1^2 \sim 0.027a_1^2$	-1.000
$\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ K^{*-}$	$0.0061a_1^2 \sim 0.025a_1^2$	$0.0070a_1^2 \sim 0.029a_1^2$	-0.856 $\sim$ 0.859
$\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ D^-$	$0.013a_1^2 \sim 0.039a_1^2$	$0.014a_1^2 \sim 0.045a_1^2$	-0.988
$\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ D^{*-}$	$0.010a_1^2 \sim 0.029a_1^2$	$0.011a_1^2 \sim 0.033a_1^2$	-0.431 $\sim$ 0.440

The Isgur-Wise functions for  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c$  are also calculated in other models. From the soliton model Jenkins, Manohar and Wise get the following form[23]

$$\xi(\omega) = 0.99 \exp[-1.3(\omega - 1)]. \tag{27}$$

The MIT bag model calculation by Sadzikowski and Zalewski [24]) gives the following result

$$\xi(\omega) = \left( \frac{2}{\omega + 1} \right)^{3.5+1.2/\omega}. \tag{28}$$

In ref. [11] the authors calculated the Cabibbo-favored two-body nonleptonic decays in the nonrelativistic quark model. The advantage of this approach is that the daughter baryon can also be light. So this approach gives predictions for many processes. The weak transition form factors for  $\Lambda_b$  to the daughter baryon are first calculated at the zero recoil point at which the daughter baryon is also at rest in

the rest frame of  $\Lambda_b$ . Then the  $q^2$  dependence is introduced by the assumption of the dipole behavior of the form factors. It is noted that in this approach the  $1/m_Q$  corrections are included.

The decay widths and asymmetry parameters from these three models are listed in Table 3.

**Table 3. Predictions for  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c P(V)$  in soliton ( $\Gamma_1, \alpha_1$ ) ( $m_{b,c} \rightarrow \infty$ ) and MIT bag model ( $\Gamma_2, \alpha_2$ ) ( $m_{b,c} \rightarrow \infty$ ) and nonrelativistic quark model ( $\Gamma_3, \alpha_3$ ) ( $1/m_Q$  corrections included)**

	$\Gamma_1(10^{10}s^{-1})$	$\Gamma_2(10^{10}s^{-1})$	$\Gamma_3(10^{10}s^{-1})$	$\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$	$\alpha_3$
$\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ \pi^-$	$0.36a_1^2$	$0.20a_1^2$	$0.31a_1^2$	-1.000	-0.99
$\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ \rho^-$	$0.50a_1^2$	$0.29a_1^2$	$0.44a_1^2$	-0.899	-0.88
$\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ D_s^-$	$1.10a_1^2$	$0.72a_1^2$	$0.93a_1^2$	-0.984	-0.99
$\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ D_s^{*-}$	$0.82a_1^2$	$0.55a_1^2$	$0.74a_1^2$	-0.423	-0.36
$\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ K^-$	$0.025a_1^2$	$0.015a_1^2$		-1.000	
$\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ K^{*-}$	$0.026a_1^2$	$0.016a_1^2$		-0.866	
$\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ D^-$	$0.039a_1^2$	$0.025a_1^2$		-0.988	
$\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ D^{*-}$	$0.029a_1^2$	$0.019a_1^2$		-0.463	

## IV. Summary and discussions

From the numerical results in Section III we can see the following conclusions.

(i) In the heavy quark limit  $m_{b,c} \rightarrow \infty$  the decay widths are determined by the Isgur-Wise function. The asymmetry parameter does not depend the form of the Isgur-Wise function since it is canceled in eqs. (9) and (11). The results for  $m_{b,c} \rightarrow \infty$  in different models are listed in Table 1, Table 2(a) and  $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \alpha_1 (= \alpha_2)$  in Table 3. We can see that only the B-S approach is consistent with the MIT bag model, but they are not consistent with the hadronic wave function model and the soliton model. This is because the Isgur-Wise functions in these models are different. It is noted that the asymmetry parameter is independent of the models we used in the leading order of  $1/m_Q$  expansion. The reason is that to this order we only have the Isgur-Wise function and it is canceled in the expression of the

asymmetry parameter.

(ii) In the hadronic wave function model and the nonrelativistic quark model the  $1/m_Q$  corrections are taken into account. We can see from Table 2(b) and  $\Gamma_3$  in Table 3 that the decay widths in these two models are consistent with each other. Furthermore the asymmetry parameter  $\alpha$  depends on the form factors to the order  $1/m_Q$ .

(iii) In our B-S and hadronic wave function models the predictions vary in a large range because of the uncertainty parameter  $\kappa$  in the B-S approach and  $\langle k_\perp \rangle$  in the hadronic wave function model. The forthcoming experimental data are needed to determine these parameters.

(iv) From the hadronic wave function model we can see that the  $1/m_Q$  corrections could be important. This is because the the correction from the  $1/m_c$  is of the order  $\bar{\Lambda}/m_c$ . Taking  $\bar{\Lambda} \sim 600\text{MeV}$  and  $m_c \sim 1.5\text{GeV}$  the  $1/m_c$  correction could be about 50%. In the hadronic wave function model the  $1/m_Q$  correction makes the decay widths bigger. It is not clear yet in other models whether the  $1/m_Q$  correction will make the results bigger or smaller. This needs further study.

(v) Our calculations are carried out in the factorization approach. In the bottom baryon case it is a good approximation. However, how large the nonfactorization contributions are is still a problem. In ref. [10] it is estimated that the W-exchange diagram contribution is about 15% of the spectator diagram. In a recent paper [25] the nonfactorization contributions are calculated in a relativistic quark model and they amount up to about 30% of the factorization contribution in  $b \rightarrow c$  transition. In our approach we do not calculate the nonfactorization contributions. However, in the following, we try to give a discussion about the consistency of the factorization approach with the relation between  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c D_s$  and  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c D_s^*$  given by the heavy quark symmetry.

Because of the heavy quark symmetry in the limit  $m_{b,c} \rightarrow \infty$  the amplitudes for

$\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c D_s$  and  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c D_s^*$  are [7]

$$\mathcal{A}(\Lambda_b(v_{\Lambda_b}) \rightarrow \Lambda_c(v_{\Lambda_c})D_s(\bar{v})) = i\bar{u}(v_{\Lambda_c})(S + P\gamma_5)u(v_{\Lambda_b}), \quad (29)$$

$$\mathcal{A}(\Lambda_b(v_{\Lambda_b}) \rightarrow \Lambda_c(v_{\Lambda_c})D_s^*(\bar{v})) = 2\bar{u}(v_{\Lambda_c})(1+\gamma_5)[(A+2Bv_{\Lambda_b}\cdot\bar{v})\not{\epsilon}^* - 2B(\epsilon^*\cdot v_{\Lambda_b})\not{v} + B\not{v}\not{\epsilon}^*]u(v_{\Lambda_b}), \quad (30)$$

where  $\bar{v}$  is the velocity of  $D_s$  or  $D_s^*$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \frac{S - P}{4}, \\ B &= -\frac{m_b}{m_c} \frac{S - P}{4} - \frac{S + P}{4}. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

The equations (29) and (30) are general forms in the limit  $m_{b,c} \rightarrow \infty$  and hence no factorization assumption is made.

To show the consistency of the factorization approach with the eqs. (29, 30) we first use eq. (29) to find the expressions for S and P in the factorization approximation. Comparing the amplitudes for  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c D_s$  in eqs. (4) and (29) in the leading order of  $1/m_Q$  expansion we find

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cb} V_{UD}^* a_1 f_{D_s} (m_{\Lambda_b} - m_{\Lambda_c}) \xi(\omega), \\ P &= \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cb} V_{UD}^* a_1 f_{D_s} (m_{\Lambda_b} + m_{\Lambda_c}) \xi(\omega). \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Hence from eq. (31) we find that in the factorization approximation

$$\begin{aligned} A &= -\frac{1}{2} \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cb} V_{UD}^* a_1 f_{D_s} m_{\Lambda_c} \xi(\omega), \\ B &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Substituting eq. (33) into eq. (30) we get the decay width  $\tilde{\Gamma}(\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c D_s^*)$ . On the other hand, if we simply calculate the decay width for  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c D_s^*$  from eq. (4) in the factorization approach we get  $\Gamma^{fac}(\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c D_s^*)$ . If the factorization approach is completely consistent with the relations between the decay widths of  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c D_s$  and  $\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c D_s^*$  provided by the heavy quark symmetry then  $\Gamma^{fac}(\Lambda_b \rightarrow$

$\Lambda_c D_s^*$ ) should be equal to  $\tilde{\Gamma}(\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c D_s^*)$ . We find that the ratio of  $\Gamma^{fac}(\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c D_s^*)$  and  $\tilde{\Gamma}(\Lambda_b \rightarrow \Lambda_c D_s^*)$  is 0.86 which is close to 1. This ratio is independent of the nonperturbative QCD models since the Isgur-Wise function is canceled. So it seems that the factorization approach is satisfactorily consistent with the general requirements from the heavy quark symmetry.

**Acknowledgment:**

This work was supported in part by the Australian Research Council and the National Science Foundation of China.

## References

- [1] R. Akers et al., OPAL collaboration, Z. Phys. **C69** (1996) 195; Phys. Lett. **B353** (1995) 402.
- [2] UA1 Collaboration, C. Albarjar et al., Phys. Lett. **B273** (1991) 540.
- [3] CDF Collaboration, F. Abe et al., Phys.Rev. **D47** (1993) 2639.
- [4] S.E.Tzmarias, invited talk presented in the 27th International Conference on High Energy Physics, Glasgow, July 20-27, 1994; P. Abreu et al., Phys. Lett. **B374** (1996) 351.
- [5] CDF Collaboration, F.Abe et al., Phys. Rev. **D55** (1997) 1142.
- [6] N. Isgur and M.B. Wise, Phys. Lett. **B232** (1989) 113, **B237** (1990) 527; H. Georgi, Phys. Lett. **B264** (1991) 447; see also M. Neubert, Phys. Rep. **245** (1994) 259 for the review.
- [7] B. Grinstein, W. Kilian, T. Mannel and M.B. Wise, Nucl. Phys. **B363** (1991) 19.
- [8] J.D. Bjorken, Nucl. Phys. **B11** (Proc. Suppl.) (1989) 325.
- [9] M.J. Dugan and B. Grinstein, Phys. Lett. **B255** (1991) 583.
- [10] H.Y. Cheng, Phys. Lett. **B289** (1992) 455.
- [11] H.Y. Cheng, Phys. Lett. **B289** (1992) 455; H.Y. Cheng, Phys. Rev. **D56** (1997) 2799; H.Y. Cheng and B. Tseng, Phys. Rev. **D53** (1996) 1457.
- [12] M. Neubert and B. Stech, CERN-TH/97-99, HD-THEP-97-23, hep-ph/9705292; M. Bauer, B. Stech and M. Wirbel, Z. Phys. **C34** (1987) 103; X.-H. Guo and T. Huang, Phys. Rev. **D43** (1991) 2931.
- [13] T. Mannel and W. Roberts, Z. Phys. **C59** (1993) 179.
- [14] X.-H. Guo and T. Muta, Phys. Rev. **D54** (1996) 4629; Mod. Phys. Lett. **A11** (1996) 1523.

- [15] X.-H. Guo and P. Kroll, *Z. Phys.* **C59** (1993) 567.
- [16] H.Y. Cheng and B. Tseng, IP-ASTP-04-97, NTU-TH-97-09.
- [17] M. Anselmino, P. Kroll and B. Pire, *Z. Phys.* **C36** (1987) 89.
- [18] S. Pakvasa, S.F. Tuan and S.P. Rosen, *Phys. Rev.* **D42** (1990) 3746.
- [19] Y.-B. Dai, X.-H. Guo, C.-S. Huang and H.-Y. Jin, *Commun. Theor. Phys.* **24** (1995) 453.
- [20] C.T. Sachrajda, CERN-TH-96-257, Talk given at Beauty 96, Rome, Italy, 17-21 Jun 1996. Published in *Nucl.Instrum.Meth.* **A384** (1996) 26.
- [21] Particle Data Group, *Phys. Rev.* **D54** (1996) 1.
- [22] M. Wirbel, B. Stech and M. Bauer, *Z. Phys.* **C29** (1985) 637; M.Bauer, B.Stech and M.Wirbel, *Z. Phys.* **C34** (1987) 103.
- [23] E. Jenkins A. Manohar and M.B. Wise, *Nucl. Phys.* **B396** (1996) 38.
- [24] M. Sadzikowski and K. Zalewski, *Z. Phys.* **C59** (1993) 677.
- [25] V.E. Lyubovitskij, M.A. Ivanov, J.G. Körner and A.G. Rusetsky, hep-ph/9710523.