The decay of $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p K^-$ in QCD factorization approach

Jie Zhu^{1,a}, Hong-Wei Ke^{2,b}, Zheng-Tao Wei^{1,c}

¹ School of Physics, Nankai University, Tianjin 300071, China

² School of Science, Tianjin University, Tianjin 300072, China

Received: 10 March 2016 / Accepted: 7 May 2016 / Published online: 20 May 2016
© The Author(s) 2016. This article is published with open access at Springerlink.com

Abstract With only the tree-level operator, the decay of $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p K$ is predicted to be one order smaller than the experimental data. The QCD penguin effects should be taken into account. In this paper, we explore the one-loop QCD corrections to the decay of $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p K$ within the framework of QCD factorization approach. For the baryon system, the diquark approximation is adopted. The transition hadronic matrix elements between Λ_b and p are calculated in the light-front quark model. The branching ratio of $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p K$ is predicted to be about 4.85×10^{-6} , which is consistent with experimental data $(4.9 \pm 0.9) \times 10^{-6}$. The CP violation is about 5 % in theory.

1 Introduction

The weak decays of the heavy baryon Λ_b provide an ideal place to extract information as regards the Cabibbo–Kobayashi–Maskawa (CKM) parameters and explore the mechanism of CP violation complementary to the B meson system. For the non-leptonic processes, the strong interaction dynamics is very complicated. Thus, these processes are also good probes to test different QCD models and factorization approaches. In early work of [1, 2], the weak decay of Λ_b to Λ_c and light baryons (p , Λ) are systematically studied. The hadronic transition matrix elements parameterized by form factors are calculated by use of a light-front quark model (LFQM) [3–15]. Since there are three valence quarks in a baryon, the quark–diquark picture was employed for simplification. It is found that the diquark approximation not only greatly simplifies the calculations, but also it gives good theoretical predictions.

With a simple factorization hypothesis, many non-leptonic processes of Λ_b to a light baryon and a meson are calcu-

lated in [1]. The theory predictions of branching ratios are well consistent with the experiment data except one process of $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p K^-$. The theoretical result is $Br(\Lambda_b \rightarrow p K^-) = 2.58 \times 10^{-7}$, which is one order smaller than the data $(4.9 \pm 0.9) \times 10^{-6}$ [16]. What is the reason? In fact, the physics reason had been discussed in [1]. The calculations are performed at the tree level. In most cases, the tree operator contribution is dominant. However, for the $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p K^-$ process, the tree-level contribution is suppressed by the CKM matrix elements $V_{ub}V_{us}^*$. For the penguin diagram, the main contribution comes from the loop where the top quark is the dominant intermediate fermion. The CKM entry would be $V_{tb}V_{ts}^*$, which is almost 50 times larger than $V_{ub}V_{us}^*$. Thus even though there is a loop suppression of order $\alpha_s/4\pi$, it is compensated by the much larger CKM parameter, so the contributions from penguin diagrams are dominant. The effects of the QCD penguin have been displayed in $B \rightarrow \pi K$ processes. For example, the process of $B^0 \rightarrow K^+\pi^-$ is QCD penguin dominated and its branching ratio is $(1.94 \pm 0.06) \times 10^{-5}$, while for a tree dominated process $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ with $Br(B^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-) = (5.15 \pm 0.22) \times 10^{-6}$, the ratio is a factor of three smaller than that of $B^0 \rightarrow K^+\pi^-$.

Using the method of perturbative QCD (pQCD), $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p K^-$ has been calculated in [17]. The result is 1.82×10^{-6} in the conventional pQCD approach and 2.02×10^{-6} in the hybrid pQCD approach. We can see that it is smaller than a half of the experimental data $(4.9 \pm 0.9) \times 10^{-6}$. In this paper, we will study the QCD corrections in the decay $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p K^-$ at one-loop order within the framework of QCD factorization approach [18–21]. This factorization approach provides a systematic method to treat the non-factorizable QCD effects. It has widely been applied to many B meson non-leptonic processes. We will employ this approach into the heavy baryon decays, the $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p K^-$ process in this study.

The paper is organized as follows: In Sect. 2, we list the effective Hamiltonian for the transition $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p K^-$, give

^a e-mail: zhujllwl@mail.nankai.edu.cn

^b e-mail: khw020056@hotmail.com

^c e-mail: weizt@nankai.edu.cn

the QCD factorization approach to $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p K^-$, the decay rate, and then we discuss CP asymmetry and the relation to decay of $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$. In Sect. 3, we will give the numerical calculations. In Sect. 4, a discussion and conclusion is provided.

2 The decay $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p K^-$

2.1 Effective Hamiltonian for $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p K^-$

In the decay $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p K^-$, the initial Λ_b and final p are baryons with three valence quarks. When the diquark picture is employed, i.e. the inner quark structure of Λ_b is $b[ud]$ and p is $u[ud]$ where $[ud]$ is a scalar diquark in this case and acting as a spectator. The effective Hamiltonian H_{eff} for $b \rightarrow s$ transitions can be written

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{q=u,c} V_{qb} V_{qs}^* \times \left(C_1 O_1^q + C_2 O_2^q + \sum_{i=3}^{10} C_i O_i + C_{7\gamma} O_{7\gamma} + C_{8g} O_{8g} \right), \quad (1)$$

where C_i are the Wilson coefficients evaluated at the renormalization scale μ ; the current–current operators O_1^u and O_2^u read

$$O_1^u = \bar{s}_\alpha \gamma^\mu L u_\alpha \cdot \bar{u}_\beta \gamma_\mu L b_\beta, \quad O_2^u = \bar{s}_\alpha \gamma^\mu L u_\beta \cdot \bar{u}_\beta \gamma_\mu L b_\alpha. \quad (2)$$

The usual tree-level W-exchange contribution in the effective theory corresponding to O_1 and O_2 emerges due to the QCD corrections. The QCD penguin operators O_3 – O_6 are

$$\begin{aligned} O_3 &= \bar{s}_\alpha \gamma^\mu L b_\alpha \cdot \sum_{q'} \bar{q}'_\beta \gamma_\mu L q'_\beta, \\ O_4 &= \bar{s}_\alpha \gamma^\mu L b_\beta \cdot \sum_{q'} \bar{q}'_\beta \gamma_\mu L q'_\alpha, \\ O_5 &= \bar{s}_\alpha \gamma^\mu L b_\alpha \cdot \sum_{q'} \bar{q}'_\beta \gamma_\mu R q'_\beta, \\ O_6 &= \bar{s}_\alpha \gamma^\mu L b_\beta \cdot \sum_{q'} \bar{q}'_\beta \gamma_\mu R q'_\alpha. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

They contribute in order α_s through the initial values of the Wilson coefficients at $\mu \approx M_W$ [22] and operator mixing due to the QCD correction [23–26]. Some operators $O_7, \dots, O_{10}$, which arise from the electroweak-penguin diagrams, are

$$\begin{aligned} O_7 &= \frac{3}{2} \bar{s}_\alpha \gamma^\mu L b_\alpha \cdot \sum_{q'} e_{q'} \bar{q}'_\beta \gamma_\mu R q'_\beta, \\ O_8 &= \frac{3}{2} \bar{s}_\alpha \gamma^\mu L b_\beta \cdot \sum_{q'} e_{q'} \bar{q}'_\beta \gamma_\mu R q'_\alpha, \\ O_9 &= \frac{3}{2} \bar{s}_\alpha \gamma^\mu L b_\alpha \cdot \sum_{q'} e_{q'} \bar{q}'_\beta \gamma_\mu L q'_\beta, \\ O_{10} &= \frac{3}{2} \bar{s}_\alpha \gamma^\mu L b_\beta \cdot \sum_{q'} e_{q'} \bar{q}'_\beta \gamma_\mu L q'_\alpha. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Here α and β are the SU(3) color indices. There are still two operators,

$$\begin{aligned} O_{7\gamma} &= \frac{-e}{8\pi^2} m_b \bar{s} \sigma_{\mu\nu} (1 + \gamma_5) F^{\mu\nu} b, \\ O_{8g} &= \frac{-g_s}{8\pi^2} m_b \bar{s} \sigma^{\mu\nu} R G^{\mu\nu} b. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

$O_{7\gamma}$ and O_{8g} are the electromagnetic, chromomagnetic dipole operators and $G^{\mu\nu}$ denotes the gluonic field strength tensor. In the above equations, L and R are the left- and right-handed projection operators with $L = 1 - \gamma_5$ and $R = 1 + \gamma_5$, respectively. The sum over q' runs over the quark fields that are active at the scale $\mu = O(m_b)$, i.e. $q' = u, d, s, c, b$. A difficult problem is how to calculate the hadronic matrix elements of the local effective operators.

2.2 $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p K^-$ in QCD factorization approach

The naive factorization neglects the strong interactions between the final K meson and two baryons. It is necessary to consider the non-factorizable contributions. There are several approaches which are beyond the naive factorization. In this study, we use the method called the QCD factorization approach [18–21]. The QCD factorization proves that, in the heavy quark limit, the decay amplitude can be factorized into a product of a hard-scattering kernel and a non-perturbative part. The K meson and proton are both light hadron and energetic. The interaction between them should be caused by a large momentum transfer. Although the proof is given for the B meson case, it would be valid for the baryon system, too. Since we adopt the diquark approximation, the complications caused by more valence quarks nearly vanish. The diquark, as a whole, seems to be a light quark (it should be noted that the diquark in our case is a scalar, while the quark is a fermion). Thus, we assume that QCD factorization can be applicable to $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p K^-$.

The diagram for the α_s order QCD corrections to $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p K^-$ is plotted in Fig. 1. The first two rows represents one-loop vertex corrections and α_s corrections to electromagnetic, chromomagnetic dipole operators. The last row represents the hard spectator scattering. At present, we do not know the wave function for a baryon with a quark and a diquark. One may use a meson like wave function, but a quantity like the decay constant is unknown. Thus, we will neglect the hard spectator contributions. After this simplifi-

Fig. 1 Order α_s corrections to the hard-scattering kernels T^1 (first two rows) and T^2 (last row)

cation, the decay amplitude of $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p K^-$ can be written

$$\langle p K^- | O_i | \Lambda_b \rangle = F^{\Lambda_b \rightarrow p} T_i^1 * f_K \Phi_K. \quad (6)$$

Here, $F^{\Lambda_b \rightarrow p}$ represents the $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p$ form factors which will be defined below; $*$ represents a convolution in the light-cone momentum fraction space; T_i^1 represents the four-quark hard-scattering kernel; Φ_K represents the kaon meson light-cone wave function.

In QCD factorization, the amplitude $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p K^-$ is obtained:

$$\mathcal{M} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \left\{ V_{ub} V_{us}^* a_1 + V_{qb} V_{qs}^* \left[a_4^q + a_{10}^q + R \left(a_6^q + a_8^q \right) \right] \right\} \times \langle p | \bar{u} \gamma_\mu L b | \Lambda_b \rangle \langle K^- | \bar{s} \gamma^\mu L u | 0 \rangle. \quad (7)$$

Here, a summation over $q = u, c$ is implicit. The a_i are written as

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 &= C_1 + \frac{C_2}{N_c} \left[1 + \frac{C_F \alpha_s}{4\pi} V_K \right], \\ a_4^q &= C_4 + \frac{C_3}{N_c} \left[1 + \frac{C_F \alpha_s}{4\pi} V_K \right] + \frac{C_F \alpha_s}{4\pi} \frac{P_{K,2}^q}{N_c}, \\ a_6^q &= C_6 + \frac{C_5}{N_c} \left(1 - 6 \frac{C_F \alpha_s}{4\pi} \right) + \frac{C_F \alpha_s}{4\pi} \frac{P_{K,3}^q}{N_c}, \\ a_8^q &= C_8 + \frac{C_7}{N_c} \left(1 - 6 \frac{C_F \alpha_s}{4\pi} \right) + \frac{\alpha}{9\pi} \frac{P_{K,3}^{q,EW}}{N_c}, \\ a_{10}^q &= C_{10} + \frac{C_9}{N_c} \left[1 + \frac{C_F \alpha_s}{4\pi} V_K \right] + \frac{\alpha}{9\pi} \frac{P_{K,2}^{q,EW}}{N_c}, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $C_i \equiv C_i(\mu)$, $\alpha_s \equiv \alpha_s(\mu)$, $C_F = (N_c^2 - 1)/(2N_c)$, and $N_c = 3$. The quantities V_K , $P_{K,2}^q$, $P_{K,3}^q$, $P_{K,2}^{q,EW}$, and $P_{K,3}^{q,EW}$ are hadronic parameters that contain all non-perturbative

dynamics. Their expressions are given in [20]. These quantities consist of convolutions of hard-scattering kernels with meson distribution amplitudes. The term V_K denotes the vertex corrections, $P_{K,2}^q$ and $P_{K,3}^q$ denote QCD penguin corrections and the contributions from the dipole operators. For penguin terms, the subscript 2 or 3 indicates the twist of the corresponding projections.

2.3 The decay rate

In Eq. (7), the first factor $\langle p | J_\mu | \Lambda_b \rangle$ in the hadronic matrix element is parameterized by form factors. The calculations of these non-perturbative form factors is one essential task of hadron physics. The form factors for the weak transition $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p$ are defined in the standard way by

$$\begin{aligned} \langle p(P') | \bar{u} \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) b | \Lambda_b(P) \rangle &= \bar{u}_p(P') \left[\gamma_\mu f_1(q^2) + i \sigma_{\mu\nu} \frac{q^\nu}{M_{\Lambda_b}} f_2(q^2) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{q_\mu}{M_{\Lambda_b}} f_3(q^2) \right] u_{\Lambda_b}(P) \\ &\quad - \bar{u}_p(P') \left[\gamma_\mu g_1(q^2) + i \sigma_{\mu\nu} \frac{q^\nu}{M_{\Lambda_b}} g_2(q^2) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{q_\mu}{M_{\Lambda_b}} g_3(q^2) \right] \gamma_5 u_{\Lambda_b}(P). \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

The second factor of matrix element in Eq. (7) defines the decay constants as follows:

$$\langle K^-(P) | A_\mu | 0 \rangle = f_K P_\mu. \quad (10)$$

In the above definition, we omit a factor $(-i)$ for the pseudoscalar meson decay constant for simplification.

Substituting the expressions of $\langle K^- | \bar{s}\gamma^\mu(1 - \gamma^5)u | 0 \rangle$ and $\langle p | \bar{u}\gamma_\mu(1 - \gamma^5)b | \Lambda_b \rangle$ one can obtain the decay amplitude of $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p K^-$ as

$$\mathcal{M}(\Lambda_b \rightarrow p K^-) = \bar{u}_p(A + B\gamma_5)u_{\Lambda_b}, \quad (11)$$

with

$$A = \lambda f_K(M_{\Lambda_b} - M_p)f_1(M_K^2),$$

$$B = \lambda f_K(M_{\Lambda_b} + M_p)g_1(M_K^2),$$

where

$$\lambda = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \left\{ V_{ub}V_{us}^*a_1 + V_{qb}V_{qs}^* [a_4^q + a_{10}^q + R(a_6^q + a_8^q)] \right\}.$$

Then we get the decay rate of $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p K^-$

$$\Gamma = \frac{p_c}{8\pi} \left[\frac{(M_{\Lambda_b} + M_p)^2 - M_K^2}{M_{\Lambda_b}^2} |A|^2 + \frac{(M_{\Lambda_b} - M_p)^2 - M_K^2}{M_{\Lambda_b}^2} |B|^2 \right], \quad (12)$$

where p_c is the proton momentum in the rest frame of Λ_b .

2.4 CP asymmetry and relation to decay of $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ K^-$

The CP violation is defined in the same way as in the PDG book [16]:

$$A_{CP} \equiv \frac{Br(\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p K^-) - Br(\bar{\Lambda}_b^0 \rightarrow \bar{p} K^+)}{Br(\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p K^-) + Br(\bar{\Lambda}_b^0 \rightarrow \bar{p} K^+)}. \quad (13)$$

At the quark level, the CP violation is represented by b quark decay minus $\bar{b}$ quark. The similar definition of CP violation for meson is

$$A_{CP} \equiv \frac{Br(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow f) - Br(B^0 \rightarrow \bar{f})}{Br(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow f) + Br(B^0 \rightarrow \bar{f})}. \quad (14)$$

Under the diquark approximation, the baryon is similar to a meson. In fact, at the quark level, $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p K^-$ has the same sub-processes $b \rightarrow su\bar{u}$ as that in $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ K^-$. The amplitude of $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ K^-$ is

$$\begin{aligned} M(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ K^-) &= \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \{ V_{ub}V_{us}^*a_1 \\ &+ V_{qb}V_{qs}^*[a_4^q + a_{10}^q + R(a_6^q + a_8^q)] \} \\ &\times \langle \pi^+ | \bar{u}\gamma_\mu Lb | \bar{B}^0 \rangle \langle K^- | \bar{s}\gamma^\mu Lu | 0 \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Comparing it to Eq. (7), we can obtain a relation between the baryon and meson processes,

$$\begin{aligned} Br(\Lambda_b \rightarrow p K^-) &= Br^{\text{Exp}}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ K^-) \\ &\times \frac{Br^{\text{tree}}(\Lambda_b \rightarrow p K^-)}{Br^{\text{tree}}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ K^-)}. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Here the “tree” represents the branching ratio with only the tree operator contribution. This relation will be used to estimate the branching ratio of $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p K^-$ from the meson process $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ K^-$. As regards the CP violation: under the above assumption, A_{CP} in the two processes should be equal.

3 Numerical results

First of all, we list some parameters used in the numerical calculations. The input parameters are taken from [16] and previous work. We have

$$\begin{aligned} m_u &= 0.3 \text{ GeV}, \quad m_s = 0.45 \text{ GeV}, \quad m_c = 1.3 \text{ GeV}, \\ m_K &= 0.4937 \text{ GeV}, \quad m_b = 4.4 \text{ GeV}, \quad m_{[ud]} = 0.5 \text{ GeV}, \\ M_{\Lambda_b} &= 5.619 \text{ GeV}, \quad M_p = 0.938 \text{ GeV}, \quad m_B = 5.280 \text{ GeV}, \\ m_\pi &= 0.1396 \text{ GeV}, \quad f_K = 0.160 \text{ GeV} \quad F_0^{B \rightarrow \pi}(0) = 0.3. \end{aligned}$$

The above quark masses of u , d are the constituting masses which are used in the LFQM. For the current quark masses, $m_u = 2.3 \text{ MeV}$ and $m_s = 95 \text{ MeV}$.

Following [1], we recalculate the form factors of $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p$ in the LFQM. The form factors at different q^2 are parametrized in a three-parameter form as

$$F(q^2) = \frac{F(0)}{\left(1 - \frac{q^2}{M_{\Lambda_b}^2}\right) \left[1 - a \left(\frac{q^2}{M_{\Lambda_b}^2}\right) + b \left(\frac{q^2}{M_{\Lambda_b}^2}\right)^2\right]}, \quad (17)$$

where the fitted values of a , b , and $F(0)$ are given in Table 1. Our results reproduce those given in [1].

For the Wilson coefficients C_i , we use the leading order (LO) results as given in [20] and list them in Table 2. As for the CKM matrix elements, we adopt the Wolfenstein parametrization beyond the LO from [27]:

$$\begin{aligned} V_{ud} &= 1 - \frac{1}{2}\lambda^2 - \frac{1}{8}\lambda_4 + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^6), \quad V_{us} = \lambda + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^7), \\ V_{ub} &= A\lambda(\rho - i\eta), \\ V_{cd} &= -\lambda + \frac{1}{2}A^2\lambda^5[1 - 2(\rho + i\eta)] + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^7), \\ V_{cs} &= 1 - \frac{1}{2}\lambda^2 - \frac{1}{8}\lambda^4(1 + 4A^2) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^6), \\ V_{cb} &= A\lambda^2 + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^8), \end{aligned}$$

Table 1 The value of a , b , and $F(0)$

F	$F(0)$	a	b
f_1	0.1131	1.70	1.60
f_2	-0.0356	2.50	2.57
g_1	0.1112	1.65	1.60
g_2	-0.0097	2.80	2.70

Table 2 The Wilson coefficients C_i in LO

	C_1	C_2	C_3	C_4	C_5	C_6
$\mu = m_b/2$	1.185	-0.387	0.018	-0.038	0.010	-0.053
$\mu = m_b$	1.117	-0.268	0.012	-0.027	0.008	-0.034
$\mu = 2m_b$	1.074	-0.181	0.008	-0.019	0.006	-0.022
	C_7/α	C_8/α	C_9/α	C_{10}/α		
$\mu = m_b/2$	-0.012	0.045	-1.358	0.418		
$\mu = m_b$	-0.001	0.029	-1.276	0.288		
$\mu = 2m_b$	0.018	0.019	-1.212	0.193		

Table 3 The numerical values of a_i in QCD factorization

	$\mu = m_b/2$	$\mu = m_b$	$\mu = 2m_b$
a_1	$1.089 + 0.047i$	$1.064 + 0.026i$	$1.044 + 0.015i$
a_4^u	$-0.033 - 0.018i$	$-0.031 - 0.016i$	$-0.029 - 0.014i$
a_4^c	$-0.034 - 0.006i$	$-0.036 - 0.005i$	$-0.033 - 0.005i$
a_6^u	$-0.049 - 0.018i$	$-0.038 - 0.015i$	$-0.031 - 0.013i$
a_6^c	$-0.054 - 0.007i$	$-0.041 - 0.006i$	$-0.034 - 0.006i$
a_8^u	3.3×10^{-4}	$(1.9 - 0.6i) \times 10^{-4}$	$(0.9 - 1.0i) \times 10^{-4}$
a_8^c	3.2×10^{-4}	$(1.8 - 0.3i) \times 10^{-4}$	$(0.7 - 0.5i) \times 10^{-4}$
a_{10}^u	$(6.4 + 12.9i) \times 10^{-4}$	$(2.3 + 9.1i) \times 10^{-4}$	$(-1.8 + 6.6i) \times 10^{-4}$
a_{10}^c	$(6.4 + 13.0i) \times 10^{-4}$	$(2.2 + 9.4i) \times 10^{-4}$	$(-2.0 + 7.2i) \times 10^{-4}$

Table 4 The branching ratios of $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p K^-$

	$\mu = m_b/2$	$\mu = m_b$	$\mu = 2m_b$
QCD factorization	4.85×10^{-6}	3.35×10^{-6}	2.57×10^{-6}
Estimation from meson data	4.82×10^{-6}		
Experimental data	$(4.9 \pm 0.9) \times 10^{-6}$		

$$\begin{aligned}
 V_{td} &= A\lambda^3 \left[1 - (\rho + i\eta) \left(1 - \frac{1}{2}\lambda^2 \right) \right] + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^7), \\
 V_{ts} &= -A\lambda^2 + \frac{1}{2}A(1 - 2\rho)\lambda^4 - i\eta A\lambda^4 + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^6), \\
 V_{tb} &= 1 - \frac{1}{2}A^2\lambda^4 + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^6).
 \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Here, we take the values $A = 0.822$, $\lambda = 0.22535$, $\rho = 0.155$, and $\eta = 0.358$.

By use of the above input parameters, we can get the Wilson coefficients a_i , relevant to the process of $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p K^-$ with the α_s order QCD corrections. The numerical results are given in Table 3. Considering the theoretical uncertainties, our results are consistent with those in [20]. The small difference can be ascribed to the input parameters and the hard spectator contributions we neglected. Although the scale μ dependence of the Wilson coefficients a_i is reduced compared to the LO ones, there is still an effect which is not neg-

ligible. This dependence implies the importance of higher order effects.

Now, we can obtain the branching ratio of $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p K^-$. The predicted results at a different scale μ are listed in Table 4. As discussed above, the results have a non-negligible dependence on the choice of scale μ . The higher the scale is, the lower the prediction is. The result at $\mu = m_b/2$ gives a prediction of 4.85×10^{-6} , which is very well in agreement with the recent LHCb data $(4.9 \pm 0.9) \times 10^{-6}$. The good coincidence indicates that $\mu = m_b/2$ is more appropriate. From a phenomenological point of view, m_b is the largest scale in the b quark decay subprocess and each quark in the final hadrons does not carry the total momentum. The momentum transfer between different quarks should be smaller than m_b . So the choice of μ at $\mu = m_b/2$ is more reasonable than at m_b .

Under the assumption of neglecting the strong interactions with the spectator quark (diquark for the baryon),

Table 5 The CP violation $A_{CP}(\Lambda_b \rightarrow p K^-)$

	$\mu = m_b/2$	$\mu = m_b$	$\mu = 2m_b$
QCD factorization	0.049	0.076	0.095
Experimental data	$0.37 \pm 0.17 \pm 0.03$		
$A_{CP}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ K^-)$	$-0.080 \pm 0.007 \pm 0.003$		

$\Lambda_b \rightarrow p K^-$ contains the same strong dynamics with $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ K^-$. We can use the data of the meson process to extract the strong interaction information. The advantage of this method is that the scale μ dependence is eliminated and the theoretical uncertainties of the QCD factorization approach are reduced by experiment. By the aid of the experimental data of $Br(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ K^-)$ and Eq. (16), we estimate the decay rate: $Br(\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p K^-) = 4.82 \times 10^{-6}$. It coincides with the experimental measurement very well.

The results of CP violation are displayed in Table 5. Contrary to the branching ratio, the numerical results of CP violation of $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p K^-$ become smaller as the scale μ decreases. At scale $\mu = m_b/2$, the CP violation is about 5 %. The experimental data from LHCb is $0.37 \pm 0.17 \pm 0.03$. The central value is several times larger than theory prediction. Because the experimental error is still large, it is too early to draw a conclusion as regards whether the theory coincides with the experiment or not. It is interesting and necessary to compare the CP violation to the meson case. The data of CP violation in $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ K^-$ is also provided in Table 5 for comparison. The value is $-0.080 \pm 0.007 \pm 0.003$ with a negative sign. In our calculations under the diquark approximation, the CP violation of $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ K^-$ and $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p K^-$ should be equal. However, we see that the experimental data for the two processes are quite different, especially the sign is opposite. In fact, the CP violation for the process of $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ K^-$ in the QCD factorization approach has been a challenging problem for a long time. The theoretical prediction is not only inconsistent with the experiment data but also is wrong in sign.

4 Discussion and conclusion

The weak decay of Λ_b contains fruitful information of the strong interaction and provides an important probe to test different theoretical approaches. In this work, we extend the QCD factorization approach to the heavy baryon decays, in particular the process of $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p K^-$. The previous literature considers only the tree diagram contribution and the theoretical result is one order smaller than the experiment. The $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p K^-$ is a type of $b \rightarrow s$ transition for which the QCD penguin diagram contribution is more important than the tree diagram because of the CKM parameter enhance-

ment. The QCD correction is calculated to α_s order and the Wilson coefficients at different renormalization scales are given. For the baryon, the diquark approximation is applied. The $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p$ form factors are calculated in the light-front quark model. The branching ratio of $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p K^-$ is predicted to be 4.85×10^{-6} at scale $\mu = m_b/2$. The theory coincides with the experimental data $(4.9 \pm 0.9) \times 10^{-6}$ very well.

From the coincidence of theory and experiment, we can obtain some conclusions as follows: (1) The perturbative contribution is dominant. The success provides confidence in the applicability of the QCD factorization method to the more complicated heavy baryon processes. (2) The choice of $\mu = m_b/2$ is appropriate. Because the largest scale is m_b in the b quark decay subprocess, the real momentum transfer cannot reach m_b and should be smaller. (3) The diquark ansatz works very well. The diquark approximation not only leads to a clear physics picture but also to a great simplification in the numerical calculations. From this study and the previous literature on heavy baryon decays, we may say that the diquark is really a working ansatz.

The main theory uncertainties come from several origins: the choice of scale μ , the $\Lambda \rightarrow p$ form factors, the neglected hard spectator interaction and the non-perturbative power corrections. The problem of scale μ has been discussed in the article. Its scale dependence is not negligible. The higher loop corrections may help to reduce the dependence but are usually difficult to be realized. Although the $\Lambda \rightarrow p$ form factors depend on the model calculations, the reliability can be fitted by experiment. In [1], one shows that our calculated $\Lambda \rightarrow p$ form factors give a good prediction for $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p \pi^-$: the theoretical result of the branching ratio is 3.15×10^{-6} and the experimental data is $(3.5 \pm 0.6(\text{stat}) \pm 0.9(\text{syst})) \times 10^{-6}$. Thus, the model-dependent form factors do not cause large theoretical uncertainties.

For the meson case, the hard spectator scattering contributes a leading power correction. It modifies the Wilson coefficient a_5 largely. For the coefficients a_4 and a_6 , relevant to this study, the hard spectator correction is either numerically small (about 10 %) or absent. Thus, for the baryon case, the contribution from the hard spectator interaction is small. The weak annihilation contribution is power suppressed. At the realistic m_b scale, it is necessary to consider its effect. The estimation of it suffers from the problem of the end-point singularity. According to the analysis in [20], the numerical values of annihilation correction is less than 25 % compared to the leading power term. Even so, the correction has included the chiral enhanced twist-3 contribution. For the baryon case, we might expect a similar small or even smaller weak annihilation contribution, because no such chiral enhancement exists for the baryon of proton.

The higher power correction is usually difficult to calculate. The consistence of the theory at $\mu = m_b/2$ with the

data indicates that the non-perturbative power correction is less important and the perturbative contribution is dominant. One can use the data from $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ K^-$ to reduce the theory uncertainties in the QCD factorization approach. In this way, we obtain the decay rate with $Br(\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p K^-) = 4.82 \times 10^{-6}$, which coincides with the experiment very well.

CP violation provides us with a very different physics picture. Under the diquark approximation and neglecting the spectator interactions, the theory predicts CP violation at the level of about 5 % for both the baryon process $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p K^-$ and the meson case $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ K^-$. The origin of the strong phase in the QCD factorization approach comes from the quark loop in the vertex corrections. For the meson case, the theory result is positive. But the experiment data is negative, about -10% . This obvious inconsistency implies the importance of non-perturbative corrections for CP violation. For the baryon $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p K^-$, the experiment data gives a very large result: $0.37 \pm 0.17 \pm 0.03$. In the QCD factorization approach, the perturbative contribution cannot reach 10 %. Because it is quite difficult to estimate the non-perturbative corrections, the prediction of CP violation in theory is a challenging research. We hope the future LHCb data can provide us with a more precise measurement of CP violation in $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p K^-$ to improve the development of theory.

Acknowledgments This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NNSFC) under the contract Nos. 11175091, 11375128.

Note added After we put the manuscript of this work on [arXiv:1603.02800](https://arxiv.org/abs/1603.02800) [hep-ph], we noticed a similar research [28]. The authors had studied $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p M$ within the generalized factorization approach. For the process of $\Lambda_b \rightarrow p K$, the predicted branching ratio and direct CP violation are similar to ours. But it should be noted that the form factors and the Wilson coefficients in the two works are different.

Open Access This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made. Funded by SCOAP³.

References

1. Z.-T. Wei, H.-W. Ke, X.-Q. Li, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 094016 (2009). [arXiv:0909.0100](https://arxiv.org/abs/0909.0100) [hep-ph]
2. H.-W. Ke, X.-Q. Li, Z.-T. Wei, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 014020 (2008). [arXiv:0710.1927](https://arxiv.org/abs/0710.1927) [hep-ph]
3. M.V. Terentev, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **24**, 106 (1976)
4. M.V. Terentev, Yad. Fiz. **24**, 207 (1976)
5. W. Jaus, Phys. Rev. D **41**, 3394 (1990)
6. W. Jaus, Phys. Rev. D **44**, 2851 (1991)
7. W. Jaus, Phys. Rev. D **53**, 1349 (1996) [Erratum-ibid. D **54**, 5904 (1996)]
8. W. Jaus, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 054026 (1999)
9. C.R. Ji, P.L. Chung, S.R. Cotanch, Phys. Rev. D **45**, 4214 (1992)
10. H.-Y. Cheng, C.-Y. Cheung, C.-W. Hwang, Phys. Rev. D **55**, 1559 (1997). [arXiv:hep-ph/9607332](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/9607332)
11. H.-Y. Cheng, C.-K. Chua, C.-W. Hwang, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 074025 (2004). [arXiv:hep-ph/0310359](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0310359)
12. C.-W. Hwang, Z.-T. Wei, J. Phys. G **34**, 687 (2007). [arXiv:hep-ph/0609036](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0609036)
13. C.-D. Lu, W. Wang, Z.-T. Wei, Phys. Rev. D **76**, 014013 (2007). [arXiv:hep-ph/0701265](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0701265) [hep-ph]
14. Z.-T. Wei, H.-W. Ke, X.-F. Yang, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 015022 (2009). [arXiv:0905.3069](https://arxiv.org/abs/0905.3069) [hep-ph]
15. H.-W. Ke, X.-Q. Li, Z.-T. Wei, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 074030 (2009). [arXiv:0907.5465](https://arxiv.org/abs/0907.5465) [hep-ph]
16. K.A. Olive et al. (Particle Data Group Collaboration), Chin. Phys. C **38**, 090001 (2014). doi:[10.1088/1674-1137/38/9/090001](https://doi.org/10.1088/1674-1137/38/9/090001)
17. C.-D. Lu, Y.-M. Wang, H. Zou, A. Ali, G. Kramer, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 034011 (2009). [arXiv:0906.1479](https://arxiv.org/abs/0906.1479) [hep-ph]
18. M. Beneke, G. Buchalla, M. Neubert, C.T. Sachrajda, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 1914 (1999). doi:[10.1103/PhysRevLett.83.1914](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.83.1914). [arXiv:hep-ph/9905312](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/9905312)
19. M. Beneke, G. Buchalla, M. Neubert, C.T. Sachrajda, Nucl. Phys. B **591**, 313 (2000). doi:[10.1016/S0550-3213\(00\)00559-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0550-3213(00)00559-9). [arXiv:hep-ph/0006124](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0006124)
20. M. Beneke, G. Buchalla, M. Neubert, C.T. Sachrajda, Nucl. Phys. B **606**, 245 (2001). doi:[10.1016/S0550-3213\(01\)00251-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0550-3213(01)00251-6). [arXiv:hep-ph/0104110](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0104110)
21. M. Beneke, M. Neubert, Nucl. Phys. B **675**, 333 (2003). doi:[10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2003.09.026](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2003.09.026). [arXiv:hep-ph/0308039](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0308039)
22. A.J. Buras, M. Jamin, M.E. Lautenbacher, P.H. Weisz, Nucl. Phys. B **370**, 69 (1992) [Addendum-ibid. B **375**, 501 (1992)]
23. M.A. Shifman, A.I. Vainshtein, V.I. Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. B **120**, 316 (1977)
24. M.A. Shifman, A.I. Vainshtein, V.I. Zakharov, Sov. Phys. JETP **45**, 670 (1977) [Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **72**, 1275 (1977)]
25. F.J. Gilman, M.B. Wise, Phys. Rev. D **20**, 2392 (1979)
26. W.A. Ponce, Phys. Rev. D **23**, 1134 (1981)
27. A.J. Buras, [arXiv:hep-ph/9806471](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/9806471)
28. Y.K. Hsiao, C.Q. Geng, Phys. Rev. D **91**(11), 116007 (2015). doi:[10.1103/PhysRevD.91.116007](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.91.116007). [arXiv:1412.1899](https://arxiv.org/abs/1412.1899) [hep-ph]