

Constraints on R -parity violating supersymmetry from leptonic and semileptonic τ , B_d , and B_s decays

Jyoti Prasad Saha* and Anirban Kundu†

Department of Physics, Jadavpur University, Kolkata 700032, India

(Received 6 May 2002; published 30 September 2002)

We put constraints on several products of R -parity violating $\lambda\lambda'$ and $\lambda'\lambda'$ type couplings from leptonic and semileptonic τ , B_d , and B_s decays. Most of them are one to two orders of magnitude better than the existing bounds, and almost free from theoretical uncertainties. A significant improvement of these bounds can be made in high luminosity tau charm or B factories.

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevD.66.054021

PACS number(s): 13.20.He, 11.30.Fs, 12.60.Jv, 13.35.Dx

I. INTRODUCTION

We live in a time when the standard model (SM) has been vindicated in a number of experiments and at the same time has left us with a feeling that it is incomplete, which makes the search for physics beyond the SM a holy grail for most of the particle physics community. We have absolutely no idea what the manifestation of the new physics will be; this forces us to consider all sorts of theoretically motivated new physics options. Since one does not have any experimental signal that definitely points to new physics, the best one can do is to constrain the parameter space of the new physics models. These constraints come mostly from experimental data (including astrophysical ones) but sometimes from theoretical considerations too.¹

As long as one does not produce the new particles directly, one has to look for their indirect effects in low-energy observables. All low-energy data are more or less consistent with the SM, taking into account the experimental and theoretical errors and uncertainties. Thus one can look at those observables which may be explained by the SM; the trick is to maximize the width of the window for new physics and put constraints on the parameter space of such models. Alternatively, one can look at those observables which are absolutely forbidden or highly suppressed in SM so that one does not expect any signal; here even one event will signal new physics and in the absence of any event, the parameter space for new physics may be constrained from the experimental upper bounds.

Among the new physics options that people consider, supersymmetry (SUSY), with all its variants, is the most popular one [1]. In the minimal and some nonminimal versions of SUSY, the action is so taken as to conserve the R quantum number defined as $R = (-1)^{3B+L+2S}$, where B , L , and S stand for baryon number, lepton number, and spin of the field, respectively. This ensures $R = +1$ for all particles and $R = -1$ for all superparticles, and conservation of R implies that superparticles must occur in pairs in all allowed Feynman vertices. However, R parity is a discrete symmetry im-

posed by hand (to make the parameter space of the model more restricted and tractable) and one can write an R -parity violating superpotential of the form

$$W = \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{ijk} L_i L_j E_k^c + \lambda'_{ijk} L_i Q_j D_k^c + \frac{1}{2} \lambda''_{ijk} U_i^c D_j^c D_k^c, \quad (1)$$

which does not violate any gauge symmetry. The factors of $1/2$ take care of the fact that λ and λ'' couplings are antisymmetric in their first two indices. Such R -parity violating terms can be motivated from some of the grand unified theories [2]. In Eq. (1) L , Q , U , D , and E denote, respectively, $SU(2)_L$ doublet lepton and quark superfields, and $SU(2)_L$ singlet up, down, and charged lepton superfields, and i, j, k are generation indices. Of course, B and L are both violated, and to forbid proton decay, one has to keep either L -violating λ and λ' terms or B -violating λ'' terms, but not both. There is also a bilinear R -parity violating term of the form $\epsilon_i L_i H_2$, which has a lot of interesting phenomenology [3], including possible leptonic flavor violation [4], but we will not consider that term in the present paper.

With 45 new couplings (and all of them can theoretically be complex) the phenomenology is immensely richer, but at the same time less predictive. There is, however, one major point to be noted: R -conserving SUSY can affect low-energy observables through loop effects and hence can hardly compete with SM effects (except in some of the cases where the SM process itself is loop-induced or, even better, forbidden); R -parity violating (RPV) SUSY, on the other hand, can show up in tree-level slepton or squark mediated processes which can successfully compete with the SM. This also ensures that for comparable coupling strength, RPV SUSY amplitudes are generally orders of magnitude higher than the R -conserving SUSY amplitudes.

The individual RPV couplings have been constrained from various low-energy processes [5], and upper limits on some of the product couplings, including their phases, have also been found [6–11]. Often one finds that the product coupling is much more constrained than the direct product of the upper bounds of the individual couplings.²

In this paper we find the upper limits on the products of some of the L -violating λ and λ' type couplings coming

*Electronic address: jyotip@juphys.ernet.in

†Electronic address: akundu@juphys.ernet.in

¹For example, from the consideration of the stability of the scalar potential.

²Constraints coming from Δm_K , Δm_B , $\mu \rightarrow 3e$, $\mu \rightarrow e$ conversion, etc. fall in this category.

from rare τ , B_d , and B_s decays. The leptonic flavor violating processes are forbidden in the SM, and the only contributing amplitude comes from RPV SUSY. The expected branching ratios (BR) of leptonic flavor conserving $\Delta B=1$ processes within the SM are so much below the experimental numbers (except $B \rightarrow K^{(*)} l^+ l^-$) that one can safely ignore the SM effects, as well as the R -conserving SUSY effects, to put bounds on the RPV couplings. Most of these decay modes are also theoretically clean and free from any hadronic uncertainties which plague nonleptonic decays. (The exception is again the semileptonic process $B \rightarrow K^{(*)} l^+ l^-$.)

There are three major sources of uncertainty, however. First, the decay constants of the neutral mesons, particularly that of η , B_d , and B_s , are yet to be cleanly determined. Fortunately, the bounds where these decay constants are relevant just scale with their values; this will be discussed in the appropriate section. Second, the $B \rightarrow K/\pi$ form factors allow a slight theoretical uncertainty. We use the BSW form factors with oscillator parameter $\omega=0.5$ GeV [12]. Lastly, the current masses of the light quarks cause the maximum uncertainty in $\lambda\lambda'$ type couplings; again, the bounds scale with the quark masses. The individual bounds in most of the cases are fairly weak and the bounds on the product couplings that we find are sometimes one to two orders of magnitude better than the existing ones. Some of these product couplings have been considered earlier [7,8]; these we update with better experimental numbers. These updated numbers, too, are vastly improved. We have not discussed leptonic and semileptonic D^0 decays since the bounds are much weaker than those which one gets from $\mu \rightarrow e$ conversion [6]. This in turn implies that such decay signals of D^0 , if observed in present and upcoming colliders, imply some new physics but not RPV SUSY.

When we say that these bounds are robust, we of course not only mean to alleviate the theoretical uncertainties of the SM. The fact that leptonic flavor-changing processes are absolutely forbidden in the SM imply that these bounds stand no matter what the phases of these RPV couplings may be. The same is true for all purely leptonic B decays, but not if there are competing SM amplitudes (as in $B \rightarrow Kl^+ l^-$), even if one takes the lowest possible SM number and saturates the experimental data by RPV contribution, which is the standard practice. The reason is simple: the two amplitudes are coherent and the bounds depend on the phase of the RPV couplings, while the standard prescription is true for incoherent amplitudes only. This we show explicitly for the $B \rightarrow Kl^+ l^-$ decays. One should note here that the most conservative bounds, not necessarily the true ones, come from such incoherent amplitude summation.

There is another point that we like to emphasize. Though it is true that observation of the SM-forbidden decays would be a definite signal of new physics, to show convincingly that it is RPV SUSY one needs to find some correlated signals (e.g., enhancement of BRs) in different decay channels. We briefly discuss how this can be done for explicit RPV models (spontaneous RPV models have been discussed in [13], including bounds coming from mesonic and leptonic flavor violating decays). If one finds such correlated signals, it will be an almost definite RPV signal, without the direct

observation of superparticles. Such signals occur from the fact that the same four-Fermi operators lead to different final states. Among leptonic and semileptonic B decays, one may mention the correlated channels (i) $B_d \rightarrow e\mu$ and $B_d \rightarrow \pi e\mu$; (ii) $B_s \rightarrow l_i^+ l_j^-$ and $B_d \rightarrow Kl_i^+ l_j^-$. More correlated channels are to be found in nonleptonic B decays, which will be discussed in a future paper [14]. In the absence of any correlated decay channel, the next best thing is to observe the decay distribution of the final state particles, since RPV SUSY has a different Lorentz structure from that of the SM. One may, for example, study the angular distribution of final state leptons in $B \rightarrow Kl^+ l^-$ decays, the crucial fact is that tree-level RPV has a Lorentz structure of the form $(V-A) \otimes (V+A)$. We do not go into any detailed discussion of this issue in the present work.

We consider only nonzero L -violating λ and λ' type couplings. Though it is true that leptonic τ decays can be mediated by λ type couplings alone, the individual bounds on these couplings are much tighter than one may hope to get from such decays. Thus $\tau \rightarrow 3$ lepton (there can be six different combinations) processes give a fairly weak bound [$\sim \mathcal{O}(1)$] on the relevant λ -type couplings. We do not consider such processes further; if they are observed in the near future, their explanation must lie somewhere else. It is obvious that λ'' type couplings cannot mediate leptonic and semileptonic decays.

To construct four-Fermi operators from λ and λ' type couplings that mediate such semileptonic and leptonic τ and B decays, one needs to integrate out the squark or the slepton propagator. Both the couplings coming in the product may be complex; one is free to absorb the phase of one coupling in the sfermion propagator but the other remains, making the overall coupling responsible for the process a complex one in general. However, since all these processes are one-amplitude (there is no SM counterpart) no scope of CP -violation exists; one only observes the nonzero branching ratios. By the same argument, we can take all couplings to be real without any loss of generality. The only exception to this statement, viz. $B \rightarrow K^{(*)} l^+ l^-$, will be dealt with in the proper place.

The paper is arranged as follows. In the next section we discuss the formalism for, and the bounds coming from, semileptonic τ decays. Section III discusses leptonic B_d and B_s decays, while Sec. IV is on semileptonic decays of these mesons. We summarize and conclude in Sec.V.

II. τ DECAYS

All the processes that we consider involve terms in the RPV Hamiltonian with two leptons and two quarks as external fields. The Hamiltonian can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_K = & -A_{jklm} [\bar{l}_j (1 + \gamma_5) l_k] [\bar{d}_m (1 - \gamma_5) d_l] \\ & + \frac{1}{2} B_{jklm} [\bar{l}_j \gamma^\mu (1 - \gamma_5) l_l] [\bar{d}_m \gamma_\mu (1 + \gamma_5) d_k] \\ & - \frac{1}{2} C_{jklm} [\bar{l}_j \gamma^\mu (1 - \gamma_5) l_l] [\bar{u}_k \gamma_\mu (1 + \gamma_5) u_m] + \text{H.c.}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where

$$A_{jklm} = \sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{\lambda_{ijk}^* \lambda'_{ilm}}{4m_{\tilde{\nu}_i}^2}; \quad B_{jklm} = \sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{\lambda'_{jik}^* \lambda'_{lim}}{4m_{u_{Li}}^2};$$

$$C_{jklm} = \sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{\lambda'_{jki}^* \lambda'_{lmi}}{4m_{d_{Ri}}^2}. \quad (3)$$

To put bounds, we will assume only one of the A , B , or C terms to be nonzero so that there is no interference effect between different RPV couplings. We will also take only one sfermion generation index i to be nonzero at a time.

Note that if the final state consists of two down-type quarks, both A and B terms may contribute, whereas for two up-type quarks, only the C term comes. For mesons like π^0 , ρ^0 , or η in the final state, all three terms may be important.

One thing that we do not consider is the running of the RPV couplings between the sfermion scale and the low-energy scale. The corrections are electroweak in origin and can be safely neglected. The only QCD correction may occur between the two quark fields; for τ decays, this pair hadronizes, absorbing all such uncertainties in the decay constant. The same is true for leptonic B or D decays. For semileptonic meson decays the form factors are supposed to take care of these short-distance corrections. However, this effect is important when we have four quarks as external fields and may contribute a multiplicative factor of ~ 2 to the effective Hamiltonian [15].

The generic process $\tau \rightarrow l + M$ is lepton-flavor violating and does not occur in the SM. Strong experimental upper limits exist on at least 14 modes that we consider here: $l = e, \mu$ and $M = \pi, \rho, \eta, K^0, K^{0*}, \bar{K}^{0*}, \phi$. Such modes are fairly clean from a theoretical point of view. In RPV SUSY, all such processes can occur with a squark or sneutrino propagator mediating the decay. Since the squark is very heavy, we do not consider any QCD effect that may take place between the squark and the final state quarks.

The only uncertainty, albeit small, appears in the decay constants of the neutral mesons. Our values for the decay constants are (in GeV) [16]:

$$f_\pi = 0.132, \quad f_\rho = 0.216, \quad f_K = 0.161,$$

$$f_{K^*} = 0.214, \quad f_\phi = 0.237. \quad (4)$$

The decay constants for η (and η') are obtained from the decay constants of the octet and singlet mesons $f_8 = 1.34 f_\pi$ and $f_1 = 1.10 f_\pi$ by a rotation:

$$f_\eta^u = f_\eta^d = f_8 \cos \theta / \sqrt{6} - f_1 \sin \theta / \sqrt{3},$$

$$f_\eta^s = -2f_8 \cos \theta / \sqrt{6} - f_1 \sin \theta / \sqrt{3},$$

$$f_{\eta'}^u = f_8 \sin \theta / \sqrt{6} + f_1 \cos \theta / \sqrt{3},$$

$$f_{\eta'}^s = -2f_8 \sin \theta / \sqrt{6} + f_1 \cos \theta / \sqrt{3}, \quad (5)$$

where the angle θ is estimated to be about -22° . The current quark masses are taken to be $m_d = 10$ MeV and $m_s = 200$ MeV.

Following the standard practice, we assume only one product of RPV coupling to be nonzero at a time. This eliminates the need to consider their phases and signs; without any loss of generality, we can assume all products to be real and positive since only the square of the absolute magnitude of the product enters in the expression for the decay width. If the final state quarks are of charge $-1/3$, the mediating squark must be a “left-handed” up-type one, and if the quarks are of charge $+2/3$, the mediating squark is a “right-handed” down-type one. Note that if two or more products are simultaneously nonzero, there can in principle be an interference effect for $M = \pi, \rho$, and η , and it becomes imperative to consider the signs and the phases of the product couplings. We neglect this complexity.

The experimental 90% C.L. upper limits on the BRs of various τ decay modes are taken from [17]

$$Br(\tau \rightarrow e \pi) < 3.7 \times 10^{-6},$$

$$Br(\tau \rightarrow \mu \pi) < 4.0 \times 10^{-6},$$

$$Br(\tau \rightarrow e \eta) < 8.2 \times 10^{-6},$$

$$Br(\tau \rightarrow \mu \eta) < 9.6 \times 10^{-6},$$

$$Br(\tau \rightarrow e K^0) < 1.3 \times 10^{-3},$$

$$Br(\tau \rightarrow \mu K^0) < 1.0 \times 10^{-3},$$

$$Br(\tau \rightarrow e \rho) < 2.0 \times 10^{-6},$$

$$Br(\tau \rightarrow \mu \rho) < 6.3 \times 10^{-6},$$

$$Br(\tau \rightarrow e \phi) < 6.9 \times 10^{-6},$$

$$Br(\tau \rightarrow \mu \phi) < 7.0 \times 10^{-6},$$

$$Br(\tau \rightarrow e K^{*0}) < 5.1 \times 10^{-6},$$

$$Br(\tau \rightarrow \mu K^{*0}) < 7.5 \times 10^{-6},$$

$$Br(\tau \rightarrow e \bar{K}^{*0}) < 7.4 \times 10^{-6}$$

$$Br(\tau \rightarrow \mu \bar{K}^{*0}) < 7.5 \times 10^{-6}. \quad (6)$$

The nonzero $\lambda \lambda'$ type couplings can mediate only $\tau \rightarrow l + P$ type decays where P is a generic pseudoscalar meson. That the production of vector mesons is forbidden is evident from the Lorentz structure of the corresponding four-fermi Hamiltonian. The decay width can be written as

$$\Gamma(\tau \rightarrow l_i + P[\equiv \bar{q}_j q_k])$$

$$= \frac{(m_\tau^2 + m_{l_i}^2 - m_P^2) C(m_\tau, m_{l_i}, m_P) F_P}{128 \pi m_\tau^3 \tilde{m}^4} |\lambda_{ni3} \lambda'_{njk}|^2, \quad (7)$$

TABLE I. Bounds on $\lambda\lambda'$ type products from $\tau \rightarrow l + M$ decays.

$\lambda\lambda'$	Final state	Bound	Previous bound	Final $\lambda\lambda'$	state	Bound	Previous bound
(123)(111)	$\mu\eta$	5.3×10^{-4}	2.5×10^{-5}	(123)(121)	μK^0	4.1×10^{-2}	1.0×10^{-3}
(123)(122)	$\mu\eta$	1.0×10^{-2}	2.1×10^{-3}	(123)(211)	$e\eta$	4.9×10^{-4}	2.9×10^{-3}
(123)(221)	eK^0	4.7×10^{-2}	8.8×10^{-3}	(123)(222)	$e\eta$	9.3×10^{-3}	1.0×10^{-2}
(131)(111)	$e\eta$	4.9×10^{-4}	3.2×10^{-5}	(131)(112)	eK^0	4.7×10^{-2}	1.3×10^{-3}
(131)(122)	$e\eta$	9.3×10^{-3}	2.7×10^{-3}	(132)(111)	$\mu\eta$	5.3×10^{-4}	3.2×10^{-5}
(132)(112)	μK^0	4.1×10^{-2}	1.3×10^{-3}	(132)(122)	$\mu\eta$	1.0×10^{-2}	2.7×10^{-3}
(133)(311)	$e\eta$	4.9×10^{-4}	6.6×10^{-4}	(133)(321)	eK^0	4.7×10^{-2}	3.1×10^{-3}
(133)(322)	$e\eta$	9.3×10^{-3}	1.3×10^{-3}	(231)(211)	$e\eta$	4.9×10^{-4}	4.1×10^{-3}
(231)(212)	eK^0	4.7×10^{-2}	4.1×10^{-3}	(231)(222)	$e\eta$	9.3×10^{-3}	1.5×10^{-2}
(232)(211)	$\mu\eta$	5.3×10^{-4}	4.1×10^{-3}	(232)(212)	μK^0	4.1×10^{-2}	4.1×10^{-3}
(232)(222)	$\mu\eta$	1.0×10^{-2}	1.5×10^{-2}	(233)(311)	$\mu\eta$	5.3×10^{-4}	7.7×10^{-3}
(233)(321)	μK^0	4.1×10^{-2}	3.6×10^{-2}	(233)(322)	$\mu\eta$	1.0×10^{-2}	3.6×10^{-4}

where

$$C(m_1, m_2, m_3) = \sqrt{m_1^4 + m_2^4 + m_3^4 - 2m_1^2 m_2^2 - 2m_1^2 m_3^2 - 2m_2^2 m_3^2}, \quad (8)$$

$$F_P = \frac{m_P^4 f_P^2}{(m_{q_j} + m_{q_k})^2}, \quad (9)$$

and \tilde{m} denotes the slepton mass. Note that due to our definition of the decay constants, the above expression is to be multiplied by a factor of 1/2 only if there is a π^0 in the final state. The combination $\lambda_{ni3}\lambda'_{njk}$ can be replaced by $\lambda_{n3i}\lambda'_{nkj}$ which will generate the same decay and hence the same bound applies to both these combinations.

The bounds are listed in Table I. Note that most of the numbers are at the same order of magnitude as the previous bounds coming from the direct product of the individual couplings, though some have been improved.³ We show only the best numbers; for example, the decay $\tau \rightarrow e + \pi^0$ puts a weaker bound on $\lambda_{231}\lambda'_{211}$ than that coming from $\tau \rightarrow e + \eta$, and hence is not shown separately. Here, and in all other cases, we take all squarks and sleptons to be degenerate at 100 GeV, and the bounds scale in a simple way: $(m_{\tilde{q},\tilde{l}}/100 \text{ GeV})^2$. For squarks of the first two generations this number is not allowed but used just as a benchmark value; for the lighter stop 100 GeV is still allowed, and light sbottom is of current phenomenological interest. Thus, as far as squark-mediated processes are concerned, the more realistic bounds for the first two generations of squarks should be the number quoted in our tables multiplied by a factor of ~ 10 .

³Previous bounds indicate the numbers coming from the direct product of individual bounds, or, in certain cases, bounds on the product coming from a different process. The bounds which are updated have not been considered as previous bounds.

Though we have relied on published experimental numbers only to obtain the bounds, let us also quote the Belle numbers for the modes $\tau \rightarrow eK^0$ and $\tau \rightarrow \mu K^0$ [18]:

$$Br(\tau \rightarrow eK^0) < 1.8 \times 10^{-6},$$

$$Br(\tau \rightarrow \mu K^0) < 1.8 \times 10^{-6}. \quad (10)$$

If we use the Belle data, all the eight $\lambda\lambda'$ type products in Table I where the final state is either eK^0 or μK^0 have upper bounds of 1.7×10^{-3} , which is better or compatible to the previous numbers.

The generic couplings B and C [Eq. (1)] mediate the decay $\tau \rightarrow l + M$ where M can be either pseudoscalar or vector. The expression for the decay widths in these two cases are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(\tau \rightarrow l_i + P[\equiv \overline{q_j q_k}]) &= \frac{f_P^2 C(m_\tau, m_{l_i}, m_P) P_0(m_\tau, m_{l_i}, m_P)}{512 \pi \tilde{m}^4 m_\tau^3} |\lambda'_{3nk} \lambda'_{inj}|^2, \\ \Gamma(\tau \rightarrow l_i + V[\equiv \overline{q_j q_k}]) &= \frac{f_V^2 C(m_\tau, m_{l_i}, m_V) V_0(m_\tau, m_{l_i}, m_V)}{512 \pi \tilde{m}^4 m_\tau^3} |\lambda'_{3nk} \lambda'_{inj}|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where $C(m_\tau, m_{l_i}, m_V)$ is defined in Eq. (8) and

$$P_0(x, y, z) = (x^2 - y^2)^2 - z^2(x^2 + y^2),$$

$$V_0(x, y, z) = z^2(x^2 + y^2 - z^2) + (x^2 - y^2)^2 - z^4. \quad (12)$$

The combination $\lambda'_{3nk} \lambda'_{inj}$ appears if both q_j and q_k are down-type quarks. In this case the mediating squark is \tilde{u}_{nL} . If the final-state quarks are up-type, the combination that appears is $\lambda'_{3jn} \lambda'_{ikn}$, with the rest of the formula remaining

TABLE II. Bounds on $\lambda'\lambda'$ products from $\tau \rightarrow l + M$ processes. Only the best bounds are shown.

$\lambda'\lambda'$	Final state	Bound	Previous bound	$\lambda'\lambda'$	Final state	Bound	Previous bound
(111)(311)	$e\rho$	2.5×10^{-3}	5.7×10^{-5}	(111)(312)	$e\bar{K}^{0*}$	3.5×10^{-3}	5.7×10^{-5}
(112)(311)	eK^{0*}	2.9×10^{-3}	2.3×10^{-3}	(112)(312)	$e\rho$	2.5×10^{-3}	2.3×10^{-3}
(113)(313)	$e\rho$	2.5×10^{-3}	2.3×10^{-3}	(121)(321)	$e\rho$	2.5×10^{-3}	22.4×10^{-3}
(121)(322)	$e\bar{K}^{0*}$	3.5×10^{-3}	22.4×10^{-3}	(122)(321)	eK^{0*}	2.9×10^{-3}	22.4×10^{-3}
(122)(322)	$e\phi$	3.3×10^{-3}	22.4×10^{-3}	(131)(331)	$e\rho$	2.5×10^{-3}	8.6×10^{-3}
(131)(332)	$e\bar{K}^{0*}$	3.5×10^{-3}	8.6×10^{-5}	(132)(331)	eK^{0*}	2.9×10^{-3}	0.126
(132)(332)	$e\phi$	3.3×10^{-3}	0.126	(211)(311)	$\mu\rho$	4.4×10^{-3}	6.5×10^{-3}
(211)(312)	$\mu\bar{K}^{0*}$	3.6×10^{-3}	6.5×10^{-3}	(212)(311)	μK^{0*}	3.6×10^{-3}	6.5×10^{-3}
(212)(312)	$\mu\phi$	3.3×10^{-3}	6.5×10^{-3}	(213)(313)	$\mu\rho$	4.4×10^{-3}	6.5×10^{-3}
(221)(321)	$\mu\rho$	4.4×10^{-3}	93.6×10^{-3}	(221)(322)	$\mu\bar{K}^{0*}$	3.6×10^{-3}	93.6×10^{-3}
(222)(321)	μK^{0*}	3.6×10^{-3}	0.109	(222)(322)	$\mu\phi$	3.3×10^{-3}	0.109
(231)(331)	$\mu\rho$	4.4×10^{-3}	81.0×10^{-3}	(231)(332)	$\mu\bar{K}^{0*}$	3.6×10^{-3}	81.0×10^{-3}
(232)(331)	μK^{0*}	3.6×10^{-3}	0.252	(232)(332)	$\mu\phi$	3.3×10^{-3}	0.252

unchanged. Again, the expressions are to be multiplied by a factor of 1/2 if one has π^0 or ρ^0 in the final state.

We list only the best bounds coming from these processes in Table II. Note that the best bounds always come from those decays where a vector meson is involved [if we do not consider the Belle data in Eq. (10)] in the final state; this is solely due to the better limits on the decay modes. Since some of the λ' type couplings have weak individual bounds, most of our bounds on the product couplings are one to two orders of magnitude improvement over the previous bounds.

Consideration of Belle data in Eq. (10) shows that the couplings $\lambda'_{1i2}\lambda'_{3i1}$ and $\lambda'_{2i2}\lambda'_{3i1}$ both have upper bounds of 2.3×10^{-3} coming from $\tau \rightarrow eK^0$ and $\tau \rightarrow \mu K^0$, respectively, all other bounds remain unchanged. Let us, at this point, highlight certain features of the analysis.

Mere observation of a single event in any of the decay modes will signal new physics.

However, in a dedicated tau-charm factory, one may hope to observe more events in different channels if the RPV couplings are close to their present bounds obtained in Tables I and II.

With only one nonzero $\lambda'\lambda'$ product, one should observe signals in different modes corresponding to the same quark-level subprocess: e.g., $\tau \rightarrow e\pi, e\eta, e\rho$ all should show some anomalous behavior. This is another example of correlated channels and is important to establish the nature of the new physics. If no such signals are observed in the $\tau \rightarrow \mu + M$ channels, flavor-specific nature of the new physics will all the more be established.

If signals are observed in the pseudoscalar channels but not in the vector channels, that will probably indicate the presence of a $\lambda\lambda'$ type coupling. If the opposite happens, RPV explanation of new physics will be more difficult to sustain; probably one has to invoke cancellation between different RPV contributions.

Finally, note that although the individual λ or λ' type couplings are L violating, the overall four-Fermi Hamiltonian

conserves L (it violates leptonic flavor). Thus one cannot explain processes like $\tau^- \rightarrow l^+ M_1^- M_2^-$ with RPV.

III. LEPTONIC B_d AND B_s DECAYS

The leptonic flavor-violating decays $B_{d,s} \rightarrow l_i^\pm l_j^\mp$ ($i \neq j$) are forbidden in the SM, and flavor-conserving decays ($i = j$) are so suppressed (except for $l = \tau$ which we do not consider anyway) that we can take them to be almost forbidden to a very good extent. Thus, the entire amplitude, if nonzero, is solely due to new physics. In RPV models, both slepton-mediated $\lambda\lambda'$ type and squark-mediated $\lambda'\lambda'$ type interactions can cause such purely leptonic decays. As already stressed, the bounds are robust in the sense that they are free from any theoretical uncertainties (except for the decay constants of B_d and B_s), and do not depend on the phase of the RPV couplings.

The decay width of $B_{d,s} \rightarrow l_l^- l_m^+$ is given by

$$\Gamma(B_{q_i} \rightarrow l_l^- l_m^+) = \frac{f_{B_{q_i}}^2}{16\pi\tilde{m}^4 M_{B_{q_i}}^3} C(M_{B_{q_i}}, m_{l_l}, m_{l_m}) \times P_1(M_{B_{q_i}}, m_{l_l}, m_{l_m}) |\lambda_{nlm}\lambda'_{ni3}|^2 \quad (13)$$

or

$$\Gamma(B_{q_i} \rightarrow l_l^+ l_m^-) = \frac{f_{B_{q_i}}^2}{256\pi\tilde{m}^4 M_{B_{q_i}}^3} C(M_{B_{q_i}}, m_{l_l}, m_{l_m}) \times P_2(M_{B_{q_i}}, m_{l_l}, m_{l_m}) |\lambda'_{lni}\lambda'_{mn3}|^2. \quad (14)$$

Here P_1 and P_2 are given by

TABLE III. $\lambda\lambda'$ bounds from leptonic B_d and B_s decays.

$\lambda\lambda'$	Process	Bound ($\times 10^5$)	Previous bound	$\lambda\lambda'$	Process	Bound ($\times 10^5$)	Previous bound
(121)(113)	$B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm e^\mp$	2.3	1.0×10^{-3}	(121)(123)	$B_s \rightarrow \mu^\pm e^\mp$	4.7	2.1×10^{-3}
(121)(131)	$B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm e^\mp$	2.3	9.3×10^{-4}	(121)(132)	$B_s \rightarrow \mu^\pm e^\mp$	4.7	1.4×10^{-2}
(121)(213)	$B_d \rightarrow e^\pm e^\mp$	1.7	2.9×10^{-3}	(121)(223)	$B_s \rightarrow e^\pm e^\mp$	14	1.0×10^{-3}
(121)(231)	$B_d \rightarrow e^\pm e^\mp$	1.7	8.8×10^{-3}	(121)(232)	$B_s \rightarrow e^\pm e^\mp$	14	7.3×10^{-3}
(122)(113)	$B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm \mu^\mp$	1.5	5.4×10^{-3}	(122)(123)	$B_s \rightarrow \mu^\pm \mu^\mp$	2.7	2.1×10^{-3}
(122)(131)	$B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm \mu^\mp$	1.5	9.3×10^{-4}	(122)(132)	$B_s \rightarrow \mu^\pm \mu^\mp$	2.7	1.4×10^{-2}
(122)(213)	$B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm e^\mp$	2.3	2.9×10^{-3}	(122)(223)	$B_s \rightarrow \mu^\pm e^\mp$	4.7	1.0×10^{-2}
(122)(231)	$B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm e^\mp$	2.3	8.8×10^{-3}	(122)(232)	$B_s \rightarrow \mu^\pm e^\mp$	4.7	2.7×10^{-2}
(123)(113)	$B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm \tau^\mp$	62	1.0×10^{-3}	(123)(131)	$B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm \tau^\mp$	62	9.3×10^{-4}
(123)(213)	$B_d \rightarrow e^\pm \tau^\mp$	49	2.9×10^{-3}	(123)(231)	$B_d \rightarrow e^\pm \tau^\mp$	49	8.8×10^{-3}
(131)(113)	$B_d \rightarrow e^\pm \tau^\mp$	49	1.3×10^{-3}	(131)(131)	$B_d \rightarrow e^\pm \tau^\mp$	49	1.1×10^{-3}
(131)(313)	$B_d \rightarrow e^\pm e^\mp$	1.7	6.8×10^{-3}	(131)(323)	$B_s \rightarrow e^\pm e^\mp$	14	3.2×10^{-3}
(131)(331)	$B_d \rightarrow e^\pm e^\mp$	1.7	2.8×10^{-2}	(131)(332)	$B_s \rightarrow e^\pm e^\mp$	14	2.8×10^{-2}
(132)(113)	$B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm \tau^\mp$	62	1.3×10^{-3}	(132)(131)	$B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm \tau^\mp$	62	1.2×10^{-3}
(132)(313)	$B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm e^\mp$	2.3	6.8×10^{-3}	(132)(323)	$B_s \rightarrow \mu^\pm e^\mp$	4.7	4.3×10^{-3}
(132)(331)	$B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm e^\mp$	2.3	2.8×10^{-2}	(132)(332)	$B_s \rightarrow \mu^\pm e^\mp$	4.7	2.8×10^{-2}
(133)(313)	$B_d \rightarrow e^\pm \tau^\mp$	49	3.6×10^{-5}	(133)(331)	$B_d \rightarrow e^\pm \tau^\mp$	49	2.7×10^{-3}
(231)(213)	$B_d \rightarrow e^\pm \tau^\mp$	49	4.1×10^{-3}	(231)(231)	$B_d \rightarrow e^\pm \tau^\mp$	49	1.3×10^{-3}
(231)(313)	$B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm e^\mp$	2.3	4.2×10^{-4}	(231)(323)	$B_s \rightarrow \mu^\pm e^\mp$	4.7	3.6×10^{-2}
(231)(331)	$B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm e^\mp$	2.3	2.2×10^{-2}	(231)(332)	$B_s \rightarrow \mu^\pm e^\mp$	4.7	3.2×10^{-2}
(232)(213)	$B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm \tau^\mp$	62	4.1×10^{-3}	(232)(231)	$B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm \tau^\mp$	62	1.3×10^{-2}
(232)(313)	$B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm \mu^\mp$	1.5	1.3×10^{-2}	(232)(323)	$B_s \rightarrow \mu^\pm \mu^\mp$	2.7	3.6×10^{-2}
(232)(331)	$B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm \mu^\mp$	1.5	3.5×10^{-3}	(232)(332)	$B_s \rightarrow \mu^\pm \mu^\mp$	2.7	3.2×10^{-2}
(233)(313)	$B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm \tau^\mp$	62	7.7×10^{-3}	(233)(331)	$B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm \tau^\mp$	62	3.2×10^{-2}

$$P_1(x, y, z) = x^4 - x^2 y^2 - x^2 z^2,$$

$$P_2(x, y, z) = x^2(y^2 + z^2) - (y^2 - z^2)^2 \quad (15)$$

and the C function is defined in Eq. (8). The generic slepton or squark mass is denoted by \tilde{m} . Note that the expression $\lambda_{nlm}\lambda'_{ni3}$ can be replaced by $\lambda_{nml}\lambda'_{n3i}$ in Eq. (13) and $\lambda'_{lni}\lambda'_{mn3}$ can be replaced by $\lambda'_{ln3}\lambda'_{mni}$ in Eq. (14). Since we consider only one combination to be present at a time, the same bound applies to all such combinations.

We present our numbers for $\lambda\lambda'$ couplings in Table III and $\lambda'\lambda'$ couplings in Table IV. Our input parameters are the experimental 90% C.L. upper bounds on the BRs of the following modes [17,19]:

$$Br(B_d \rightarrow e^\pm e^\mp) < 8.3 \times 10^{-7};$$

$$Br(B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm \mu^\mp) < 6.1 \times 10^{-7};$$

$$Br(B_d \rightarrow e^\pm \mu^\mp) < 1.5 \times 10^{-6};$$

$$Br(B_d \rightarrow e^\pm \tau^\mp) < 5.3 \times 10^{-4};$$

$$Br(B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm \tau^\mp) < 8.3 \times 10^{-4};$$

$$Br(B_s \rightarrow e^\pm e^\mp) < 5.4 \times 10^{-5};$$

$$Br(B_s \rightarrow \mu^\pm \mu^\mp) < 2.0 \times 10^{-6};$$

$$Br(B_s \rightarrow e^\pm \mu^\mp) < 6.1 \times 10^{-6}. \quad (16)$$

Furthermore, we take the decay constants of both B_d and B_s to be 200 MeV; the bounds just scale as $(f_{B_{d,s}}/200 \text{ MeV})^2$.

We also have Belle numbers for some of these modes [20]:

$$Br(B_d \rightarrow e^\pm e^\mp) < 6.3 \times 10^{-7};$$

$$Br(B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm \mu^\mp) < 2.8 \times 10^{-7};$$

$$Br(B_d \rightarrow e^\pm \mu^\mp) < 9.4 \times 10^{-7}. \quad (17)$$

If one takes these bounds, which are yet to be published, into account, some of the numbers in Tables III and IV get modified. In Table III, the $\lambda\lambda'$ combinations coming from $B_d \rightarrow e^\pm e^\mp$ have upper bounds of 1.5×10^{-5} instead of 1.7×10^{-5} ; those coming from $B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm \mu^\mp$ and $B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm e^\mp$ have upper bounds of 1.0×10^{-5} and 1.8×10^{-5} , respectively. In Table IV, the bounds on the $\lambda'\lambda'$ combinations coming from $B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm \mu^\mp$ and $B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm e^\mp$ are modified to 1.4×10^{-3} and 3.7×10^{-3} respectively. Obviously, these bounds scale as the square root of the upper bounds on respective branching fractions.

The present $e^\pm e^\mp$ B factories should improve these bounds by one order of magnitude at the end of their run, if

TABLE IV. $\lambda'\lambda'$ bounds from leptonic B_d and B_s decays.

$\lambda'\lambda'$	Process	Bound ($\times 10^3$)	Previous bound	$\lambda'\lambda'$	Process	Bound ($\times 10^3$)	Previous bound
(111)(213)	$B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm e^\mp$	4.7	3×10^{-5}	(111)(313)	$B_d \rightarrow e^\pm \tau^\mp$	5.9	5.7×10^{-5}
(112)(213)	$B_s \rightarrow \mu^\pm e^\mp$	9.6	1.2×10^{-3}	(113)(211)	$B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm e^\mp$	4.7	1.2×10^{-3}
(113)(212)	$B_s \rightarrow \mu^\pm e^\mp$	9.6	1.2×10^{-3}	(113)(311)	$B_d \rightarrow e^\pm \tau^\mp$	5.9	2.3×10^{-3}
(121)(223)	$B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm e^\mp$	4.7	9.0×10^{-3}	(121)(323)	$B_d \rightarrow e^\pm \tau^\mp$	5.9	22.4×10^{-3}
(122)(223)	$B_s \rightarrow \mu^\pm e^\mp$	9.6	9.0×10^{-3}	(123)(221)	$B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm e^\mp$	4.7	7.7×10^{-3}
(123)(222)	$B_s \rightarrow \mu^\pm e^\mp$	9.6	9.0×10^{-3}	(123)(321)	$B_d \rightarrow e^\pm \tau^\mp$	5.9	22.4×10^{-3}
(131)(233)	$B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm e^\mp$	4.7	2.9×10^{-3}	(131)(333)	$B_d \rightarrow e^\pm \tau^\mp$	5.9	7.6×10^{-3}
(132)(233)	$B_s \rightarrow \mu^\pm e^\mp$	9.6	42×10^{-3}	(133)(231)	$B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm e^\mp$	4.7	0.3×10^{-3}
(133)(232)	$B_s \rightarrow \mu^\pm e^\mp$	9.6	0.8×10^{-3}	(133)(331)	$B_d \rightarrow e^\pm \tau^\mp$	5.9	0.6×10^{-3}
(211)(213)	$B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm \mu^\mp$	2.1	3.5×10^{-3}	(211)(313)	$B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm \tau^\mp$	7.3	6.5×10^{-3}
(212)(213)	$B_s \rightarrow \mu^\pm \mu^\mp$	3.9	3.5×10^{-3}	(213)(311)	$B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm \tau^\mp$	7.3	6.5×10^{-3}
(221)(223)	$B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm \mu^\mp$	2.1	1.4×10^{-3}	(221)(323)	$B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm \tau^\mp$	7.3	93.6×10^{-3}
(222)(223)	$B_s \rightarrow \mu^\pm \mu^\mp$	3.9	2.7×10^{-3}	(223)(321)	$B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm \tau^\mp$	7.3	0.109
(231)(233)	$B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm \mu^\mp$	2.1	27×10^{-3}	(231)(333)	$B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm \tau^\mp$	7.3	81×10^{-3}
(232)(233)	$B_s \rightarrow \mu^\pm \mu^\mp$	3.9	84×10^{-3}	(233)(331)	$B_d \rightarrow \mu^\pm \tau^\mp$	7.3	67.5×10^{-3}

such modes are not observed. The hadronic machines or high-luminosity e^+e^- machines like the projected SuperBaBar [21] should see a large number of such leptonic decays if the actual values of the couplings are anywhere near the present bounds. Since the same couplings cause both $B_d \rightarrow l_i l_j$ and $B \rightarrow \pi l_i l_j$ (the same is true for $B_s \rightarrow l_i l_j$ and $B \rightarrow K l_i l_j$) decays, a simultaneous signal is expected.

IV. SEMILEPTONIC DECAYS: $B \rightarrow Ke^+e^-$, $B \rightarrow K\mu^+\mu^-$, $B \rightarrow Ke^\pm\mu^\mp$, $B \rightarrow \pi e^\pm\mu^\mp$

All three collaborations CLEO, BaBar, and Belle have set upper limits on the BRs of the above-mentioned semileptonic modes (and also modes with a vector meson in the final state) [22–25]. In fact, the modes $B \rightarrow K\mu^+\mu^-$ (and $B \rightarrow Ke^+e^-$ at less than 3σ) have been observed by Belle [24]. The present status is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 Br(B \rightarrow Kl^+l^-) &< 0.6 \times 10^{-6} \quad (\text{BaBar}), \\
 &1.49 \times 10^{-6} \quad (\text{CLEO}) \quad (l = e/\mu), \\
 Br(B \rightarrow Ke^+e^-) &= (0.48^{+0.32+0.09}_{-0.24-0.11}) \times 10^{-6} \quad (\text{Belle}), \\
 Br(B \rightarrow K\mu^+\mu^-) &= (0.99^{+0.40+0.13}_{-0.32-0.14}) \times 10^{-6} \quad (\text{Belle}), \\
 Br(B \rightarrow he^\pm\mu^\mp) &< 1.6 \times 10^{-6} \quad (\text{CLEO}) \quad (h = K/\pi). \quad (18)
 \end{aligned}$$

These numbers are in the same ballpark as the SM expectations. Unfortunately, the SM expectations are not precise; at least three different groups quoted three different numbers, which are all mutually compatible, but differ in their upper and lower limits [26–28]. For example, the predicted BR for the mode $B \rightarrow K\mu^+\mu^-$ is (i) $(0.57^{+0.16}_{-0.10}) \times 10^{-6}$ [26]; (ii) $(0.33 \pm 0.07) \times 10^{-6}$ [27]; and (iii) $(0.42 \pm 0.09) \times 10^{-6}$ [28]. As we know, the bounds on new physics depend sensitively on the theoretical predictions. Moreover, the situation is

complicated since we should not neglect the SM amplitudes (apart from the lepton flavor-violating cases).

We take a compromising approach: in Table V we quote the bounds on the relevant RPV couplings assuming (i) that the SM expectation is at its lowest possible value predicted by [26]; (ii) that the experimental number is at its highest possible value; (iii) that the difference is saturated by RPV contribution; and (iv) most important of all, that the total SM amplitude and the RPV amplitude add *incoherently*. This is certainly not true; for that, in Table VI, we show how the bounds relevant for a particular decay mode (viz., $B \rightarrow K\mu^+\mu^-$) change if (i) the RPV amplitude adds constructively to the SM one; (ii) the RPV amplitude adds destructively with the SM one (for this, we take the highest possible SM prediction and the lowest possible experimental number); and (iii) if we use the theoretical numbers in [27] or [28]. We draw the attention of the reader to the huge fluctuation of the RPV bounds. It is, however, heartening to note that the most conservative bounds come from incoherent amplitude summation, so that the bounds quoted in Table V are robust as far as the phases in the RPV couplings are concerned. This analysis also shows that to get any meaningful

TABLE V. $\lambda'\lambda'$ bounds from semileptonic B_d decays.

$\lambda'\lambda'$	Final state	Bound	$\lambda'\lambda'$	Final state	Bound
(111)(213)	$\pi\mu^\pm e^\mp$	5.0×10^{-4}	(113)(211)	$\pi\mu^\pm e^\mp$	5.0×10^{-4}
(121)(223)	$\pi\mu^\pm e^\mp$	5.0×10^{-4}	(123)(221)	$\pi\mu^\pm e^\mp$	5.0×10^{-4}
(131)(233)	$\pi\mu^\pm e^\mp$	5.0×10^{-4}	(133)(231)	$\pi\mu^\pm e^\mp$	5.0×10^{-4}
(112)(213)	$K\mu^\pm e^\mp$	3.3×10^{-4}	(113)(212)	$K\mu^\pm e^\mp$	3.3×10^{-4}
(122)(223)	$K\mu^\pm e^\mp$	3.3×10^{-4}	(123)(222)	$K\mu^\pm e^\mp$	3.3×10^{-4}
(132)(233)	$K\mu^\pm e^\mp$	3.3×10^{-4}	(133)(232)	$K\mu^\pm e^\mp$	3.3×10^{-4}
(212)(213)	$K\mu^+\mu^-$	9.7×10^{-5}	(222)(223)	$K\mu^+\mu^-$	9.7×10^{-5}
(232)(233)	$K\mu^+\mu^-$	9.7×10^{-5}	(112)(113)	Ke^+e^-	9.6×10^{-5}
(122)(123)	Ke^+e^-	9.6×10^{-5}	(132)(133)	Ke^+e^-	9.6×10^{-5}

TABLE VI. Bounds on $|\lambda'_{212}\lambda'_{213}|$ from the decay $B \rightarrow K\mu^+\mu^-$ with different schemes for evaluating the SM branching ratio and two sets of experimental values from BaBar and Belle. CC and CD stand for complete constructive and destructive interference between SM and RPV amplitudes respectively, and Inc means incoherent amplitude sum. For two theoretical schemes, a complete destructive interference is ruled out from the data.

	Ali <i>et al.</i> [26]	Greub <i>et al.</i> [27]	Melikhov <i>et al.</i> [28]
BaBar	CC: 2.4×10^{-5}	CC: 9.5×10^{-5}	CC: 6.4×10^{-5}
	CD: 1.7×10^{-5}	CD: Not possible	CD: Not possible
	Inc: 9.7×10^{-5}	Inc: 2.1×10^{-4}	Inc: 1.7×10^{-4}
	CC: 1.3×10^{-4}	CC: 2.4×10^{-4}	CC: 2.0×10^{-4}
Belle	CD: 1.2×10^{-5}	CD: Not possible	CD: Not possible
	Inc: 2.6×10^{-4}	Inc: 3.9×10^{-4}	Inc: 3.3×10^{-4}

signal of new physics from these modes, which is certainly feasible in the not-too-distant future, one must minimize the theoretical as well as the experimental uncertainties. Another signal of new physics, which we do not investigate here, is the forward-backward asymmetry of the final state leptons.

For our analysis, we take the most stringent experimental numbers, viz., the numbers quoted by BaBar for $B \rightarrow Kl^+l^-$ ($l=e, \mu$) and the numbers quoted by CLEO for $B \rightarrow Ke\mu, \pi e\mu$. The SM prediction for the first two modes can be as low as 0.47×10^{-6} [26] and zero for the last two; with incoherent addition of SM and RPV amplitudes, one gets the bounds on $\lambda'\lambda'$ type products as shown in Table V. We do not show the $\lambda\lambda'$ bounds as they are at least one order of magnitude weaker than those obtained from leptonic B_d and B_s decays, apart from being much less robust. We have also used the BSW form factors [12] for $B \rightarrow K$ and $B \rightarrow \pi$ transitions and taken $F_0 = F_1$ with minimal loss of accuracy: $F_0^{B \rightarrow \pi}(0) = 0.39$ GeV, $F_0^{B \rightarrow K}(0) = 0.42$ GeV.

Though the bounds in Table V appear to be better than those in Table IV, we warn the reader that they depend sensitively on the experimental number as well as the scheme for theoretical prediction. This is evident from Table VI. Thus any future analysis with these product couplings should use the numbers quoted in Table IV.

Is it possible to find other channels where one finds such RPV signals? If only one product coupling is nonzero, there are very few product couplings constrained here that may contribute to nonleptonic B decays. Such couplings are: (i) $\lambda'_{211}\lambda'_{213}$, mediating $b \rightarrow u\bar{u}d$ and $b \rightarrow d\bar{d}d$, and hence $B \rightarrow \pi\pi$ (this coupling also affects the B_d - B_d box diagram and thus the mixing-induced CP asymmetry coming from B_d decays); (ii) $\lambda'_{212}\lambda'_{213}$ and $\lambda'_{112}\lambda'_{113}$, mediating $b \rightarrow u\bar{u}s$ and $b \rightarrow d\bar{d}s$; (iii) $\lambda'_{221}\lambda'_{223}$, mediating $b \rightarrow c\bar{c}d$ and $b \rightarrow s\bar{s}d$; and

(iv) $\lambda'_{122}\lambda'_{123}$ and $\lambda'_{222}\lambda'_{223}$, giving rise to $b \rightarrow c\bar{c}s$ and $b \rightarrow s\bar{s}s$ (and hence $B_d \rightarrow J/\psi K_S$ and $B_d \rightarrow \phi K_S$). However, these processes are slepton mediated whereas the leptonic and semileptonic B decays discussed here are squark mediated, and hence the numbers quoted here should be scaled by $(m_{\tilde{q}}/m_{\tilde{l}})^2$. The conclusion is that one should look for any unusual change in CP asymmetry and/or branching fractions in the above-mentioned channels to get supporting evidence for RPV SUSY (though their absence does not rule out the model).

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we found the bounds on $\lambda\lambda'$ and $\lambda'\lambda'$ type product couplings coming from leptonic and semileptonic τ and B decays. Most of our bounds are robust and one to two orders of magnitude better than the existing bounds. Some of the updated bounds also have major improvement.

The bounds are only on the magnitude of the product couplings. The phase is irrelevant apart from the semileptonic penguin decays of B_d mesons. For the latter the most conservative bounds come from incoherent amplitude summation but depend sensitively on the theoretical prediction for SM BRs.

After this work was completed a paper came to the archive where some of these bounds have been discussed [29].

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The work of A.K. was supported by BRNS, Government of India (Project No. 2000/37/10/BRNS) and UGC, Government of India (Project No. F.10-14/2001 (SR-I)). J.P.S. thanks CSIR, India, for financial support.

[1] See, e.g., H.P. Nilles, Phys. Rep. **110**, 1 (1984); H.E. Haber and G.L. Kane, *ibid.* **117**, 75 (1985); M. Drees, hep-ph/9611409; J.D. Lykken, hep-ph/9612114; X. Tata, hep-ph/9706307; S.P. Martin, hep-ph/9709356; N. Polonsky, hep-ph/0108236.

[2] L.J. Hall and M. Suzuki, Nucl. Phys. **B231**, 419 (1984); D.E. Brahm and L.J. Hall, Phys. Rev. D **40**, 2449 (1989); T.G. Rizzo, *ibid.* **46**, 5102 (1992); K. Tamvakis, Phys. Lett. B **382**, 251 (1996); G.F. Giudice and R. Rattazzi, *ibid.* **406**, 321 (1997); R. Barbieri, A. Strumia, and Z. Berezhiani, *ibid.* **407**,

- 250 (1997).
- [3] See, e.g., S. Roy and B. Mukhopadhyaya, Phys. Rev. D **55**, 7020 (1997).
 - [4] A. Abada, S. Davidson, and M. Losada, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 075010 (2002).
 - [5] For reviews on bounds of individual R -parity violating couplings and original references, see, e.g., H. K. Dreiner, in *Perspectives on Supersymmetry*, edited by G. L. Kane (World Scientific, Singapore, 1997); G. Bhattacharyya, hep-ph/9709395; B.C. Allanach, A. Dedes and H.K. Dreiner, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 075014 (1999).
 - [6] K. Huitu *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **430**, 355 (1998).
 - [7] J.E. Kim, P. Ko, and D.-G. Lee, Phys. Rev. D **56**, 100 (1997).
 - [8] J.-H. Jang, J.K. Kim, and J.S. Lee, Phys. Rev. D **55**, 7296 (1997); **58**, 035006 (1998); J.-H. Jang, Y.G. Kim, and J.S. Lee, Phys. Lett. B **408**, 367 (1997).
 - [9] G. Bhattacharyya and A. Raychaudhuri, Phys. Rev. D **57**, 3837 (1998).
 - [10] H. Dreiner, G. Polesello, and M. Thormeier, hep-ph/0112228.
 - [11] S. Davidson and M. Losada, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 075025 (2002).
 - [12] M. Wirbel, B. Stech, and M. Bauer, Z. Phys. C **29**, 637 (1985).
 - [13] M. Frank and K. Huitu, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 095015 (2001).
 - [14] G. Bhattacharyya, A. Datta, and A. Kundu (work in progress).
 - [15] K. Huitu *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 4313 (1998).
 - [16] A. Ali and C. Greub, Phys. Rev. D **57**, 2996 (1998); P. Ball, J.M. Frère, and M. Tytgat, Phys. Lett. B **365**, 367 (1996).
 - [17] Particle Data Group, D.E. Groom *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. C **15**, 1 (2000).
 - [18] Belle Collaboration, K. Abe *et al.*, BELLE-CONF-0120.
 - [19] CLEO Collaboration, T. Bergfeld *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 091102 (2000).
 - [20] Belle Collaboration, K. Abe *et al.*, BELLE-CONF-0127.
 - [21] D. Hitlin, talk presented in WIN'02, <http://fermi.physics.uc.edu/HyperNews/get/forums/SuperBABAR.html>
 - [22] CLEO Collaboration, S. Anderson *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 181803 (2001).
 - [23] BaBar Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, hep-ex/0107026.
 - [24] Belle Collaboration, K. Abe *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 021801 (2002).
 - [25] CLEO Collaboration, K.W. Edwards *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 111102 (2002).
 - [26] A. Ali *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **61**, 074024 (2000).
 - [27] C. Greub, A. Ioannissian, and D. Wyler, Phys. Lett. B **346**, 149 (1995).
 - [28] D. Melikhov, N. Nikitin, and S. Simula, Phys. Lett. B **410**, 290 (1997).
 - [29] A. Akeroyd and S. Recksiegel, Phys. Lett. B **541**, 121 (2002).