

Memorino on the ‘1/2 vs. 3/2 Puzzle’ in $\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}X_c$

I.I. Bigi^a, B. Blossier^c, A. Le Yaouanc^c, L. Oliver^c, O. Pène^c,
J.-C. Raynal^c, A. Oyanguren^d, P. Roudeau^d

^a *Department of Physics, University of Notre Dame du Lac
Notre Dame, IN 46556, USA*

^c *LPTth, Univ. de Paris Sud, F-91405 Orsay CEDEX, France*

^d *LAL, F-91898 Orsay CEDEX, France*

Abstract

After the successes the OPE description has scored in describing $\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}X_c$ decays, we need to study what can be said about the composition of the hadronic final state X_c . The same OPE treatment yields sum rules implying the dominance of $j_q = 3/2$ charm states in X_c over their $j_q = 1/2$ counterparts. This prediction is supported by other general arguments as well as quark model calculations. At present it is unclear to which degree data conform to these predictions. More experimental information is essential. We want to ask our experimental colleagues for a redoubled effort to establish, which hadronic configurations – $D/D^* + \pi, D/D^* + 2\pi, \dots$ – make up $\Gamma(\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}X_c)$ beyond $\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}D/D^*$, what their quantum numbers are and their mass distributions. The latter is most relevant for the determination of hadronic mass moments in $\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}X_c$. Since all this will require considerable effort on their part, we want to explain the theoretical issues involved, why they carry ‘gravitas’ – i.e. are weighty – and why a better understanding of them will be of significant value. In this brief memo we sketch the underlying arguments based on heavy quark theory, the OPE, a special class of quark models and lattice QCD in a nutshell. After summarizing the experimental situation we conclude with two lists, namely one with measurements that need to be done and one with items of theoretical homework. Some of the latter can be done by employing existing theoretical tools, whereas others need new ideas.

1 Outline

This brief memo follows from discussions between theorists and experimentalists on the composition of semileptonic B decays *beyond* $\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}D/D^*$. Understanding the nature of the hadronic system in the final state – its quantum numbers as well as mass distributions – is important, since well grounded theoretical expectations and predictions can and have been given on these issues. In particular our theoretical understanding of semileptonic B decays tells us that hadronic charm states where the light degrees of freedom carry angular momentum $j_q = 3/2$ should be considerably more abundant in the final states than their $j_q = 1/2$ counterparts. This prediction appears to be at variance with some data. We refer to this apparent conflict as the ‘1/2 vs. 3/2 puzzle’ [1]. The aim of this note is to explain in a concise way what is involved in the argument to stimulate further studies.

We marshal the theoretical arsenal for treating semileptonic B decays into charm hadrons: the operator product expansion (OPE) in Sect.2, the BT model in Sect.3 and lattice QCD in Sect.4 before adding other general arguments in Sect.5; in Sect.6 we comment on the existing data on $\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}D^{(*)} + \pi$ ’s from ALEPH, BELLE, CDF, DELPHI and D0 before listing needed homework for both theorists and experimentalists in Sect.7. We aim at being as concise as reasonably possible, while providing a guide through the literature for the more committed reader.

2 The OPE treatment

Both our theoretical and experimental knowledge on semileptonic B decays have advanced considerably over the last 15 years. This progress can be illustrated most strikingly by the recent success in extracting the value of $|V(cb)|$ with better than 2 % accuracy from measurements of $\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}X_c$ transitions [2]. At the same time it has also brought various potential problems into sharper focus. One concerns the size of $BR_{SL}(B)$. However in this memo we want to focus on the composition of the hadronic final state in $\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}X_c$.

While the OPE allows to describe inclusive transitions, no *systematic* extension to exclusive modes has been given so far. Yet even so, the OPE allows to place important constraints on some exclusive rates: $\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}D^*$, $l\bar{\nu}D$ (the latter involving the ‘BPS’ expansion) are the most topical and elaborated examples [3, 4].

OPE results can be given also for subclasses of inclusive transitions due to various sum rules [5, 6] that can genuinely be derived from QCD; hence one can infer constraints on certain exclusive contributions. Those can be formulated most concisely when one adopts the heavy quark symmetry classification scheme also for the hadronic charm system in the final state of semileptonic B decays.

In the limit $m_Q \rightarrow \infty$ one has heavy quark symmetry controlling the spectroscopy for mesons as follows: The heavy quark spin decouples from the dynamics, and the hadrons can be labeled by their total spin S together with the angular momentum j_q carried by the light degrees of freedom, namely the light quarks and the gluons. The pseudoscalar and vector mesons D and D^* then form the ground states of heavy quark symmetry in

the charm sector with $j_q = 1/2$. The first excited states are four P wave configurations, namely two with $j_q = 3/2$ and $S = 2, 1 - D_2^{3/2}, D_1^{3/2}$ – and two with $j_q = 1/2$ and $S = 1, 0 - D_1^{1/2}, D_0^{1/2}$; the two 3/2 states are narrow resonances and the two 1/2 states wide ones. Then there are higher states still, namely radial excitations and higher orbital states; furthermore there are charm final states that cannot be properly called a hadronic resonance, but are D/D^* combinations with any number of pions etc. carrying any allowed J^{PC} quantum numbers.

The usual Isgur-Wise function $\xi(w)$ is the core element in describing $\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}D/D^*$. It can be generalized to describe also the production of excited charm final states in semileptonic B decays: $\tau_{1/2[3/2]}^{(n)}(w_n)$ with $w_n = v_B \cdot v_{D^{(n)}}$ is the amplitude for $\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}D_{1/2[3/2]}^{(n)}$, where $D_{1/2[3/2]}^{(n)}$ denotes a hadronic system with open charm carrying $j_q = 1/2[3/2]$ and label n ; it does *not* need to be a bona fide resonance.

Various sum rules can be derived from QCD proper relating the moduli of these amplitudes and powers of the excitation energies $\epsilon_n = M_{D^{(n)}} - M_D$ to heavy quark parameters. Adopting the so-called ‘kinetic scheme’, as we will throughout this memo, one obtains in particular [5]:

$$\frac{1}{4} = -\sum_n \left| \tau_{1/2}^{(n)}(1) \right|^2 + \sum_m \left| \tau_{3/2}^{(m)}(1) \right|^2 \quad (1)$$

$$\mu_\pi^2(\mu)/3 = \sum_n \epsilon_n^2 \left| \tau_{1/2}^{(n)}(1) \right|^2 + 2 \sum_m \epsilon_m^2 \left| \tau_{3/2}^{(m)}(1) \right|^2 \quad (2)$$

$$\mu_G^2(\mu)/3 = -2 \sum_n \epsilon_n^2 \left| \tau_{1/2}^{(n)}(1) \right|^2 + 2 \sum_m \epsilon_m^2 \left| \tau_{3/2}^{(m)}(1) \right|^2 \quad (3)$$

where the summations go over all hadronic systems with excitation energies $\epsilon_{n,m} \leq \mu$ ¹. The sum rules show that the heavy quark parameters μ_π^2 and μ_G^2 (and likewise for m_b, m_c) defined in the kinetic scheme are *observables*.

These sum rules allow us to make both general qualitative as well as (semi)quantitative statements. On the *qualitative* level we learn unequivocally that the ‘3/2’ transitions have to dominate over the ‘1/2’ ones, as can be read off from Eqs.(1,3). Furthermore we know that $\mu_\pi^2(\mu) \geq \mu_G^2(\mu)$ has to hold for any μ [7], as is actually obvious from Eqs.(2,3). On the *quantitative* level it is not a priori clear, at which scale μ these sum rules are saturated and by which kind of states.

To address those issues we can invoke some rules of thumb (not to be confused with sum rules) gleaned from previous experience. That tells us that the sum rules should saturate to a decent degree of accuracy at $\mu \sim 1$ GeV through the four P wave states.

We have learnt a lot about the numerical values of the heavy quark parameters: the most accurate value for the chromomagnetic moment μ_G^2 can be deduced from the $B^* - B$ hyperfine mass splitting:

$$\mu_G^2(1 \text{ GeV}) = (0.35 \pm 0.03) \text{ GeV}^2 \quad (4)$$

¹The sum rule of Eq.(1) does not require a cut-off or normalization scale μ , as is already implied by its left hand side [5].

A comprehensive study of energy and hadronic mass moments in $\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}X_c$ yields [2]:

$$\mu_\pi^2(1 \text{ GeV}) = (0.401 \pm 0.04) \text{ GeV}^2 \quad (5)$$

These values for $\mu_\pi^2(1 \text{ GeV})$ and $\mu_G^2(1 \text{ GeV})$ show that $\mu_\pi^2(1 \text{ GeV}) - \mu_G^2(1 \text{ GeV}) \ll \mu_\pi^2(1 \text{ GeV}) + \mu_G^2(1 \text{ GeV})$ holds, which forms one of the cornerstones of the BPS expansion. Inserting these values into

$$\mu_\pi^2(\mu) - \mu_G^2(\mu) = 9 \sum_n \epsilon_n^2 \left| \tau_{1/2}^{(n)}(1) \right|^2, \quad (6)$$

see Eqs.(2,3), shows the ‘1/2’ states contribute very little both to the sum rules and to semileptonic B decays. Moreover an upper bound can be placed on the production of the lowest ‘1/2’ states:

$$\frac{1}{9} [\mu_\pi^2(\mu) - \mu_G^2(\mu)] \geq \epsilon_0^2 \left| \tau_{1/2}^{(0)}(1) \right|^2. \quad (7)$$

The data tell us that $\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}D/D^*$ make up about three quarters of the inclusive semileptonic B width [8]:

$$\text{BR}(\bar{B}_d \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}X_c) = (10.31 \pm 0.15)\% \quad (8)$$

$$\text{BR}(\bar{B}_d \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}X_c) - \text{BR}(\bar{B}_d \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}D) - \text{BR}(\bar{B}_d \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}D^*) = (2.9 \pm 0.3)\% \quad (9)$$

The dominance of these two final states represents actually the most direct evidence that charm quarks act basically like heavy quarks in B decays. This can be invoked to justify the use of the heavy quark classification already to charm.

A natural ‘scenario’ for the implementation of the OPE description and its sum rules is provided by

$$\left| \tau_{3/2}^{(0)}(1) \right|^2 \simeq 0.3, \quad \epsilon_{3/2} \sim 450 \text{ MeV} \quad (10)$$

$$\left| \tau_{1/2}^{(0)}(1) \right|^2 \simeq 0.07 - 0.12, \quad \epsilon_{1/2} \sim (300 - 500) \text{ MeV} \quad (11)$$

Finally there is no reason why the six final states D , D^* , $D_{2,1}^{3/2}$ and $D_{1,0}^{1/2}$ should saturate $\Gamma_{SL}(B)$. One actually expects QCD radiative corrections to populate the higher hadronic mass region above the prominent resonances through a smooth spectrum dual to a superposition of broad resonances.

3 The BT model

Based on the OPE treatment alone one cannot be more specific numerically. To go further one relies on quark models for guidance. The dominance of the ‘3/2’ over the ‘1/2’ states emerges naturally in all quark models obeying known constraints from QCD as well as Lorentz covariance. This can be demonstrated explicitly with the Bakamjian-Thomas covariant quark model [9], which satisfies heavy quark symmetry and the Bjorken as well as spin sum rules referred to above. It allows to determine the masses of various charm

excitations and to compute the production rates in semileptonic [10, 11, 12] as well as nonleptonic B decays [11]. The BT model provides a quantitative illustration of the heavy quark limit, in particular concerning the sum rule of Eq.(1). One finds

$$\tau_{1/2}^{(0)}(1) = 0.22 \quad (12)$$

$$\tau_{3/2}^{(0)}(1) = 0.54 \quad (13)$$

together with predictions for the slopes. For the semileptonic modes the BT model yields:

$$\text{BR}(\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}D) = (1.95 \pm 0.45)\% , \quad (14)$$

$$\text{BR}(\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}D^*) = (5.90 \pm 1.10)\% \quad (15)$$

$$\text{BR}(\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}D_2^{3/2}) = (0.63_{-0.2}^{+0.3})\% \quad (16)$$

$$\text{BR}(\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}D_1^{3/2}) = (0.40_{-0.14}^{+0.12})\% \quad (17)$$

$$\text{BR}(\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}D_1^{1/2}) = (0.06 \pm 0.02)\% \quad (18)$$

$$\text{BR}(\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}D_0^{1/2}) = (0.06 \pm 0.02)\% \quad (19)$$

The following features of the model predictions should be noted in particular: they

- agree with the data on $\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}D/D^*$,
- exhibit a strong dominance of ‘3/2’ over ‘1/2’ production as inferred already from the Sum Rules and
- appear to fall somewhat short of saturating the observed $\Gamma_{SL}(B)$; this last feature is to be expected on general grounds as indicated at the end of the previous section.
- Last, but not least (although it is not the focus of this memo), the model provides a nice description of the nonleptonic modes $\bar{B} \rightarrow D/D^*\pi$. For our purposes this is particularly significant in the channel $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{**+}\pi^-$ measured recently [13], where factorization can be justified [11]; the rate thus provides direct information on $\tau_{1/2}^{(0)}(w)$ and $\tau_{3/2}^{(0)}(w)$.

4 Lattice QCD

In principle the two form factors $\tau_{1/2}(1)$ and $\tau_{3/2}(1)$ can be computed in a straightforward way using the HQET equation of motion ($v \cdot D$) $h_v = 0$ [14]:

$$\begin{aligned} {}_v\langle 0^+ | \bar{h}_v \gamma^i \gamma^5 D^j h_v | 0^- \rangle_v &= i g^{ij} \tau_{1/2}(1) (\bar{\Lambda}_{0^+} - \bar{\Lambda}_{0^-}), \\ {}_v\langle 2^+ | \bar{h}_v \left(\frac{\gamma^i \gamma^5 D^j + \gamma^j \gamma^5 D^i}{2} \right) h_v | 0^- \rangle_v &= -i\sqrt{3} \epsilon^{*ij} \tau_{3/2}(1) (\bar{\Lambda}_{2^+} - \bar{\Lambda}_{0^-}), \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where $v = (1, \vec{0})$ is the heavy quark velocity, ϵ^* the polarization tensor of the 2^+ state and $\bar{\Lambda}_{J^P}$ the dominant term in the OPE expression for the J^P heavy-light meson binding energy. On the lattice the covariant derivative D_i applied to the static quark field $h(\vec{x}, t)$ is

expressed as $D_i h(\vec{x}, t) \rightarrow \frac{1}{2a} \left(U_i(\vec{x}, t) h(\vec{x} + \hat{i}, t) - U_i^\dagger(\vec{x} - \hat{i}, t) h(\vec{x} - \hat{i}, t) \right)$; $U_i(\vec{x}, t)$ denotes the gauge link. One calculates as usual the two-point functions $C_{\text{JP}}^2(t) = \langle 0 | O_{\text{JP}}(t) O_{\text{JP}}^\dagger(0) | 0 \rangle$, the three-point functions $C_{\text{JP},0^-}^3(t_1, t_2) = \langle 0 | O_{\text{JP}}(t_2) O_\Gamma(t_1) O_{0^-}^\dagger(0) | 0 \rangle$ and $\langle J^P | O_\Gamma | 0^- \rangle \propto R(t_1, t_2) = \frac{C_{\text{JP},0^-}^3(t_1, t_2)}{C_{0^-}^2(t_1) C_{\text{JP}}^2(t_2 - t_1)}$.

Alas, numerical complications appear, because orbital as well as radial excitations can contribute. To extract properly the matrix element for the P wave state $\langle J^P | O_\Gamma | 0^- \rangle$, one has to effectively suppress the coupling of radial excitations (with quantum numbers $n > 1$, J^P) to the vacuum. This can be achieved by choosing an appropriate interpolating field O_{JP} such that $\langle n > 1 J^P | O_{\text{JP}} | 0 \rangle = 0$ holds or by having huge statistics to diminish statistical fluctuations at large times (where the fundamental state is no more contaminated by radial excitations). This poses a problem in particular for the 2^+ state, for which the usual interpolating field seems to couple also the first radial excitation quite strongly to the vacuum. Moreover reaching the required stability of $R(t_1, t_2)$ as a function of t_2 poses a serious challenge.

Therefore we will need very careful and dedicated lattice studies to obtain meaningful and reliable results for $\tau_{3/2,1/2}$. As an already highly relevant intermediate step one can concentrate first on $\tau_{1/2}$ to see whether lattice QCD confirms its suppression as inferred from both the sum rules and the BT model. A preliminary study in the quenched approximation with $\beta = 6.0$ ($a^{-1} = 2 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$) and $m_q \simeq m_s$ yields [15]:

$$\tau_{1/2}^{(0)}(1) \sim 0.3 \div 0.4 \quad (21)$$

$$\tau_{3/2}^{(0)}(1) \sim 0.5 \div 0.6 . \quad (22)$$

Apart from unquenching and lowering the value of m_q one can improve and refine this analysis also by simulating a *dynamical* charm quark, i.e. applying HQET to the B meson only. This would allow to evaluate $1/m_c$ corrections.

5 Two other general arguments on $|\tau_{1/2}/\tau_{3/2}|^2$

The numerics of the theoretical predictions on semileptonic B decays given above have to be taken ‘cum grano salis’. Yet their principal feature – the preponderance of ‘ $3/2$ ’ over ‘ $1/2$ ’ states – has to be taken very seriously, since it is supported by two rather general observations that point in the same direction as the detailed theoretical considerations given above:

- When interpreting data one should keep in mind that the contributions of $D_{1,0}^{1/2}$ to $\Gamma(\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu} D^{**})$ ² are suppressed relative to those from $D_{2,1}^{3/2}$ by a factor of two to three due to kinematics [10]. Thus one finds for reasonable values of $\tau_{1/2}^{(0)}$ that $\Gamma(\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu} D^{1/2})$ falls below $\Gamma(\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu} D^{3/2})$ by one order of magnitude, as illustrated below. For the two widths to become comparable, one would need a greatly enhanced $\tau_{1/2}^{(0)}$.

² D^{**} will be used as a short-hand for $D/D^* + \pi$'s final states.

- There is a whole body of evidence showing that in so-called class I nonleptonic B decays like $\bar{B}_d \rightarrow D^{(*)+}\pi^-$ naive factorization provides a very decent description of the data. Invoking this ansatz also for $\bar{B}_d \rightarrow D^{**+}\pi^- \rightarrow D^{(*)0}\pi^+\pi^-$ one infers from BELLE's data [13] that the production of '1/2' states appears to be strongly suppressed relative to that for '3/2' ones. It implies that $|\tau_{1/2}/\tau_{3/2}|^2$ is small and certainly less than unity. This agrees with the theoretical expectations described before; more importantly it shows in a rather model independent way that there is no large unexpected enhancement of $|\tau_{1/2}|$. Those values also allow to saturate the sum rule of Eq.(1) within errors already with the $n = 0$ states.

The form factors are actually probed at $w = 1.3$ in this nonleptonic transition; yet a natural functional dependence on w supports this conclusion to hold for $1 \leq w \leq 1.3$ in semileptonic channels.

These arguments are based on the heavy quark mass limit. The as yet unknown finite mass corrections could modify these conclusions somewhat.

6 Comparison with the data on semileptonic B decays

The measurements on the production of the '3/2' states are consistent and agree with the theoretical expectations of a total branching ratio of $\mathcal{O}(1\%)$. The disagreements concern the production of the '1/2' states as well as radial and higher orbital excitations as explained below.

ALEPH [16] has reconstructed D^{**} states decaying into $D^{(*)}\pi^\pm$. They did not observe a significant excess of events over the expected background in $D^{(*)+}\pi^+$ or $D^0\pi^-$ combinations (called 'wrong sign'). From the measured rate of 'right sign' combinations and assuming that only D^{**} decaying to $D^{(*)}\pi$ contribute (to correct for channels with a missing π^0) they get (with $\text{Prob}(b \rightarrow B) = (39.7 \pm 1.0)\%$):

$$\text{BR}(\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}D^{**}) = (2.2 \pm 0.3 \pm 0.3)\% \quad (23)$$

Assuming the $D_1^{3/2}$ state to decay only into $D^*\pi$ they find also:

$$\text{BR}(\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}D_1^{3/2}) = (0.70 \pm 0.15)\% \quad (24)$$

$$\text{BR}(\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}D_2^{3/2}) < 0.2\% , \quad (25)$$

numbers which are not in conflict with the BT predictions, Eqs.(16, 17). From their observed number of 'wrong sign' combinations one can infer (90% C.L.)

$$\text{BR}(\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}D^*\pi\pi) \leq 0.35\% , \quad \text{BR}(\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}D\pi\pi) \leq 0.9\% \quad (26)$$

DELPHI has published a re-analysis of their data [17] superseding their previous study [18]. Like ALEPH they have not found evidence for $\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}D^{**} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}D^{(*)}\pi\pi$; assuming only $D^{(*)}\pi$ to contribute (to correct for channels with a missing π^0), they obtain:

$$\text{BR}(\bar{B}_d \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}D^{**}) = (2.7 \pm 0.7 \pm 0.2)\% \quad (27)$$

This value is sufficient to saturate $\Gamma_{SL}(B)$, see Eq.(9). DELPHI has obtained clear evidence for two narrow states tentatively identified with $D^{3/2}$

$$\text{BR}(\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}D_1^{3/2}) = (0.56 \pm 0.10)\% , \text{BR}(\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}D_2^{3/2}) = (0.30 \pm 0.08) , \quad (28)$$

again in rough agreement with Eqs.(16, 17).

However they found a significant rate for producing a broad hadronic mass distribution:

$$\text{BR}(\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}D_{1''}) = (1.24 \pm 0.25 \pm 0.27)\% , \text{BR}(\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}D_{0''}) = (0.65 \pm 0.69)\% , \quad (29)$$

which appears to be in conflict with the predictions of Eqs.(18, 19).

From the analysis of ‘wrong sign’ combinations they infer the following limits

$$\text{BR}(\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}D^*\pi\pi) \leq 1.2\% , \text{BR}(\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}D\pi\pi) \leq 1.3\% \quad (30)$$

Considering that $1^+ D^{**}$ can decay into $D\pi\pi$ and analyzing the $D\pi$ mass distribution they fit a value of $(19 \pm 13)\%$ for this component. In their analysis of hadronic mass moments such a possibility has been included with $\text{BR}(\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}D\pi\pi) = (0.36 \pm 0.27)\%$. This turns out to be the dominant systematic uncertainty in their hadronic mass moment measurement.

The D0 collaboration has measured production rates of narrow D^{**} states in the decay $\bar{B} \rightarrow \mu^-\bar{\nu}D^*\pi$. Assuming $\text{BR}(D_1^{3/2} \rightarrow D^*\pi) = 100\%$ and $\text{BR}(D_2^{3/2} \rightarrow D^*\pi) = (30 \pm 6)\%$ they obtain [19]

$$\text{BR}(\bar{B} \rightarrow \mu^-\bar{\nu}D_1^{3/2}) = (0.33 \pm 0.06)\% , \text{BR}(\bar{B} \rightarrow \mu^-\bar{\nu}D_2^{3/2}) = (0.44 \pm 0.16)\% . \quad (31)$$

If the broad contributions were indeed to be identified with the $D_{1,0}^{1/2}$ as already implied in Eq.(29) – an a priori reasonable working hypothesis – one would have a clear cut and significant conflict with the OPE expectations as well as the numerically more specific BT model predictions. For DELPHI’s data would yield $\Gamma(\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}D^{1/2}) > \Gamma(\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}D^{3/2})$. This conflict has been referred to as the ‘1/2 > 3/2 puzzle’ [1]. Since, as sketched before, the theoretical predictions are based on a rather solid foundation, they should not be discarded easily. Of course there is no proof that the broad $D/D^* + \pi$ systems are indeed the $j_q = 1/2$ P wave states; they could be radial excitations or non-resonant combinations of undetermined quantum numbers. Thus the DELPHI data taken by themselves are *not necessarily* in conflict with theoretical expectations.

However the plot thickens in several respects:

- BELLE has presented an analysis this summer of $\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}D/D^*\pi$ [20], which appears to be in conflict with previous findings. Reconstructing one B completely in $\Upsilon(4S) \rightarrow B\bar{B}$, they analyze the decays of the other beauty meson and obtain:

$$\text{BR}(B^- \rightarrow l^-\bar{\nu}D\pi) = (0.81 \pm 0.18)\% \quad (32)$$

$$\text{BR}(B^- \rightarrow l^-\bar{\nu}D^*\pi) = (1.00 \pm 0.22)\% \quad (33)$$

$$\text{BR}(\bar{B}_d \rightarrow l^-\bar{\nu}D\pi) = (0.49 \pm 0.13)\% \quad (34)$$

$$\text{BR}(\bar{B}_d \rightarrow l^-\bar{\nu}D^*\pi) = (0.97 \pm 0.22)\% \quad (35)$$

BELLE's separation of final states with D and D^* is of significant value, since it provides information on the relative weight of '3/2' and '1/2' production.

Combining the two classes of final states they arrive at:

$$\text{BR}(B^- \rightarrow l^- \bar{\nu} D^{(*)} \pi) = (1.81 \pm 0.20 \pm 0.20)\% \quad (36)$$

$$\text{BR}(\bar{B}_d \rightarrow l^- \bar{\nu} D^{(*)} \pi) = (1.47 \pm 0.20 \pm 0.17)\% \quad (37)$$

leaving room for a large $D^{(*)}\pi\pi$ component of $\sim (1.3 \pm 0.4)\%$, whereas previous studies have obtained 90% C.L. upper limits ranging from 0.35 to 1.3 %.

BELLE's numbers are actually quite consistent with the theoretical predictions the BT model yields for '3/2' P wave production; yet BELLE has not determined the quantum numbers of their hadronic final states.

- The BT model predicts for $D\pi$ and $D^*\pi$ production:

$$\text{BR}(B^- \rightarrow l^- \bar{\nu} D\pi) = \text{BR}(\bar{B}_d \rightarrow l^- \bar{\nu} D\pi) = 0.51\% \quad (38)$$

$$\text{BR}(B^- \rightarrow l^- \bar{\nu} D^*\pi) = \text{BR}(\bar{B}_d \rightarrow l^- \bar{\nu} D^*\pi) = 0.65\% \quad (39)$$

in qualitative agreement with BELLE's numbers.

- In the BPS approximation [4] one has $\tau_{1/2}^{(n)} = 0$. Assuming that the sum rule of Eq.(1) saturates already with the $n = 0$ state, one obtains $\tau_{3/2}^{(0)} = \frac{1}{2}$ leading to

$$\text{BR}(B^- \rightarrow l^- \bar{\nu} D\pi) = \text{BR}(\bar{B}_d \rightarrow l^- \bar{\nu} D\pi) = 0.39\% \quad (40)$$

$$\text{BR}(B^- \rightarrow l^- \bar{\nu} D^*\pi) = \text{BR}(\bar{B}_d \rightarrow l^- \bar{\nu} D^*\pi) = 0.50\% . \quad (41)$$

- Using the experimental numbers stated in Eqs.(28, 29) and assuming that the "1" and "0" state decay 100 % into $D^*\pi$ and $D\pi$, respectively, one arrives at

$$\text{BR}(B^- \rightarrow l^- \bar{\nu} D\pi) = \text{BR}(\bar{B}_d \rightarrow l^- \bar{\nu} D\pi) \sim (0.9 \pm 0.7)\% \quad (42)$$

$$\text{BR}(B^- \rightarrow l^- \bar{\nu} D^*\pi) = \text{BR}(\bar{B}_d \rightarrow l^- \bar{\nu} D^*\pi) \sim (1.9 \pm 0.4)\% . \quad (43)$$

for a total of

$$\text{BR}(B^- \rightarrow l^- \bar{\nu} D^{(*)} \pi) = \text{BR}(\bar{B}_d \rightarrow l^- \bar{\nu} D^{(*)} \pi) \sim 2.8\% \quad (44)$$

One should note that the qualitative trend is the same as with BELLE's findings, Eqs.(32 - 35) – namely that $D^*\pi$ final states dominate over $D\pi$ ones – yet the total $D^{(*)}\pi$ rate exceeds that reported by BELLE and predicted by the BT model by about 1 percentage point. This is of course just a rephrasing of the '1/2 vs. 3/2' puzzle.

- Theoretically both in the framework of the BT model and purely of the OPE treatment one does *not* expect the D , D^* and four P wave D^{**} states to *completely* saturate the inclusive width, as mentioned above. This can be seen most explicitly in the BT quark model calculation. Likewise in the OPE treatment one expects a broad mass distribution at the higher end. As already mentioned at the end of Sect.2, already $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_S)$ perturbative corrections not included so far will generate a smooth tail in the mass distribution of the hadronic final state towards the upper end of the mass spectrum. Of course those will not be clear resonances, but a broad and continuous distribution of masses – in close analogy what happens in $e^+e^- \rightarrow had.$ when one goes more and more above charm threshold.

There is no sign of such high mass combinations in the CDF data [23] and no obvious one in the DELPHI data beyond the tail of their D^{**} states. More specifically one finds that about 6.4% and 18.3% of all D^{**} states have masses between 2.6 and 3.3 GeV for the CDF and DELPHI data, respectively, which drop to 3.2 % and 7.8% for the mass range 2.8 to 3.3 GeV and 0.3 % and 3.1 % for 3.0 to 3.3 GeV.

On the other hand, CDF seems to see more events below the $D^{3/2}$ peaks. Such low mass $D^{(*)}\pi$ events could be due to higher mass states decaying into $D^{(*)}\pi\pi$. CDF has not incorporated this scenario into their analysis, since previous measurements showed no evidence for such decays.

- One would conjecture that if the observed mass spectrum indeed differs significantly from theoretical expectations – in its center of gravity as well as its spread –, then the measured hadronic mass moments should not follow theoretical predictions – yet they do [2, 21, 22, 17, 23].

In summary: ALEPH, DELPHI and D0 agree in finding a rate of about 0.8 % of Γ_B for the production of the two *narrow* D^{**} states combined. This value is quite consistent with theoretical expectations for the $D^{3/2}$ rates. BELLE’s data also fit naturally into this picture. The problem arises in the production of the *broad* D^{**} states: The rate found by ALEPH and DELPHI suffice to saturate $\Gamma_{SL}(B)$, yet exceed the predictions for $\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}D^{1/2}$ by about an order of magnitude. BELLE’s numbers on the other hand agree reasonably well with predictions, yet fall short of saturating $\Gamma_{SL}(B)$.

7 Conclusions and call for action

The theoretical predictions on $\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}X_c$ described here have a solid foundation. The OPE treatment is genuinely based on QCD, and while the BT description invokes a model, it implements QCD dynamics for heavy flavour hadrons to a remarkable degree. Their prediction therefore deserve to be taken seriously and not discarded at the first sign of phenomenological trouble. Preliminary lattice studies show no significant enhancement of ‘1/2’ production. The numbers we have given for the theoretical expectations should be taken with quite a few grains of salt. Yet the predicted pattern that the abundance of

‘3/2’ P wave resonances dominates over that for ‘1/2’ states in semileptonic B decays is a sturdy one.

The B_d and B_u semileptonic widths have been well measured. Most if not even all of it has been identified in $\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}D/D^* + (0,1)\pi$. The next important steps are

- to clarify the size, mass distribution and quantum numbers of $\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}[D/D^*\pi]_{\text{broad}}$ and
- to search for $\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}D/D^* + 2\pi$ with even higher sensitivity.
- The data should be presented *separately* for $\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}D + \pi$'s and $\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}D^* + \pi$'s, since it provides more theoretical diagnostics.

These are challenging experimental tasks, yet highly rewarding ones as well:

- They probe our theoretical control over QCD's nonperturbative dynamics in novel and sensitive ways. This is an area where different theoretical technologies – the OPE, quark models and lattice QCD – are making closer and closer contact.

The lessons to be learnt will be very significant ones, no matter what the eventual experimental verdict will be:

- A confirmation of the OPE expectations and even the more specific BT predictions would reveal an even higher degree of theoretical control over nonperturbative QCD dynamics than has been shown through $\Gamma(\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}X_c)$.
- Otherwise we could infer that formally nonleading $1/m_Q$ corrections are highly significant numerically. Such an insight would be surprising – yet important as well. In particular it would provide a highly nontrivial challenge to lattice QCD. Meeting this challenge successfully would provide lattice QCD with significantly enhanced validation.
- On the more pragmatic side one should note that understanding the hadronic final state in semileptonic B decays is of crucial importance, when measuring moments of the hadronic recoil mass spectrum in $\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}X_c$. From those moments – the average, variance etc. – one extracts the values of the heavy quark parameters m_b , m_c , μ_π^2 etc. with high accuracy for their intrinsic interest and as input to determinations of $|V(cb)|$ and $|V(ub)|$.

The call for further action is directed to theorists as well:

- The impact of perturbative QCD corrections on the OPE description of higher states in $\bar{B} \rightarrow l\bar{\nu}X_c$ should be evaluated quantitatively.
- In the BT model one can – and should – compute the production rates for the higher orbital and radial excitations in semileptonic B decays.
- The strong decays $D^{**} \rightarrow D/D^* + \pi\pi$ should be estimated using heavy quark symmetry arguments augmented by quark model considerations.

- The BT model predictions were obtained in the heavy quark limit. Corrections to this limit could be quite important as suggested in Ref.[14], and they could significantly change the relative weight of $\tau_{1/2}^{(n)}$ and $\tau_{3/2}^{(n)}$. Calculating or at least constraining those corrections would be a most worthwhile undertaking – alas it requires some new ideas. A priori one can conceive of different ways of extending the BT description to include finite mass effects, yet they are unlikely to be equivalent. The foundations for a promising way have been laid in Ref.[7].
- Lattice QCD studies of ‘1/2’ and ‘3/2’ production in semileptonic B decays has to be pursued with vigour. Such studies could turn out to be veritable ‘gold mines’ as far as validation is concerned. One can evaluate the spectrum of the higher radial and orbital excitations D^{**} , for which some encouraging results have already been obtained [24]. Lattice calculations at finite values of m_c should be performed, which would teach us about $1/m_c$ corrections.

In other words: Since there is a lot to be done, we better get started!

Acknowledgments: This work was supported by the NSF under grant number PHY-0355098 and by the EC contract HPRN-CT-2002-00311 (EURIDICE).

References

- [1] N.Uraltsev, hep-ph/0409125.
- [2] O. Buchmueller, H. Flaecher, hep-ph/0507253.
- [3] I. Bigi, M. Shifman and N.G. Uraltsev, *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **47** (1997) 591.
- [4] N. Uraltsev, *Phys. Lett.* **B585** (2004) 253; *ibid.* **B545** (2002) 337.
- [5] N. Uraltsev, *Phys. Lett.* **B501** (2001) 86.
- [6] A. Le Yaouanc, L. Oliver, J.-C. Raynal, *Phys. Rev.* **D67** (2003) 114009; *Phys. Lett.* **B557** (2003) 207.
- [7] I.I. Bigi, M. Shifman, N.G. Uraltsev and A. Vainshtein, *Phys. Rev.* **D52** (1995) 196.
- [8] A. Oyanguren, talk given at EPS '05, Lisbon.
- [9] B. Bakamjian, L.H. Thomas, *Phys. Rev.* **92** (1953) 1300; A. Le Yaouanc, L. Oliver, O. Pène, J.-C. Raynal, *Phys. Lett.* **B365** (1996) 319.
- [10] V. Morénas, A. Le Yaouanc, L. Oliver, O. Pène, J.-C. Raynal, *Phys. Rev.* **D56** (1997) 5668.
- [11] F. Jugeau, A. Le Yaouanc, L. Oliver, J.-C. Raynal, *Phys. Rev.* **D72** (2005) 094010.

- [12] See also the ‘covariant light-front approach’ of H.-Y. Cheng, C.-K. Chua, C.-W. Hwang, *Phys. Rev.* **D69** (2004) 074025.
- [13] The BELLE Collab., K. Abe *et al.*, hep-ex/0412072.
- [14] A. K. Leibovich, Z. Ligeti, I. W. Stewart and M. B. Wise, *Phys. Rev.* **D57** (1998) 308, [hep-ph/9705467].
- [15] D. Becirevic *et al.*, *Phys. Lett.* **B609** (2005) 298; B. Blossier, A. Le Yaouanc, V. Morénas and O. Pène, hep-lat/0507024, accept. f. public. in *Phys. Lett.* **B**.
- [16] The ALEPH Collab., *Z. Phys.* **C 73** (1997) 601.
- [17] The DELPHI Collab., J. Abdallah *et al.*, CERN-EP-PH/2005-015, hep-ex/0510024, accept. f. publ. in *Eur. Phys. J.*
- [18] The DELPHI Collab., P. Abreu *et al.*, *Phys. Lett.* **B475** (2000) 407.
- [19] The D0 Collab., V.M. Abazov *et al.*, *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **95** (2005) 171803.
- [20] The BELLE Collab., K. Abe *et al.*, hep-ex/0507060.
- [21] The BABAR Collab.: B. Aubert *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93** (2004) 011803.
- [22] M. Battaglia *et al.*, *Phys. Lett.* **B556** (2003) 41.
- [23] The CDF Collab., D. Acosta *et al.*, *Phys.Rev.* **D71** (2005) 051103; hep-ex/0502003.
- [24] See for a recent example: the UKQCD Collab., A.M. Green *et al.*, hep-lat/0509161.