

A joint explanation of the $B \rightarrow \pi K$ puzzle and the $B \rightarrow K\nu\bar{\nu}$ excess

W. Altmannshofer^{1,*} and S. Roy^{2,†}

¹*Department of Physics, University of California Santa Cruz,
and Santa Cruz Institute for Particle Physics,
1156 High St., Santa Cruz, CA 95064, US*

²*Chennai Mathematical Institute, Siruseri 603103, Tamil Nadu, India*

In light of the recent branching fraction measurement of the $B^+ \rightarrow K^+\nu\bar{\nu}$ decay by Belle II and its poor agreement with the SM expectation, we analyze the effects of an axion-like particle (ALP) in B meson decays. We assume a long-lived ALP with a mass of the order of the pion mass that decays to two photons. We focus on a scenario where the ALP decay length is of the order of meters such that the ALP has a non-negligible probability to decay outside the detector volume of Belle II, mimicking the $B^+ \rightarrow K^+\nu\bar{\nu}$ signal. Remarkably, such an arrangement is also relevant for the long-standing $B \rightarrow \pi K$ puzzle by noting that the measured $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 K^0$ and $B^+ \rightarrow \pi^0 K^+$ decays could have a $B^0 \rightarrow aK^0$ and $B^+ \rightarrow aK^+$ component, respectively. We also argue based on our results that the required ALP-photon effective coupling belongs to a region of parameter space that can be extensively probed in future beam dump experiments like SHiP.

I. INTRODUCTION

The presence of flavor-violating quark decays is the most significant prediction of the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) mechanism [1] within the Standard Model (SM) that was firmly established by the B factories BaBar [2, 3] and Belle [3, 4] as well as by LHCb [5] and Belle II [6] more recently. As the theory predictions and experimental observations [7, 8] are becoming more and more precise, flavor violating decays have come under increased scrutiny as any discrepancy can be interpreted as potential hint of physics beyond the SM (BSM). Since these decays may get affected by contributions coming from new physics above the electroweak symmetry breaking

* waltmann@ucsc.edu

† shibasis.cmi@gmail.com

scale, they could provide indirect evidence of new heavy particles. In this context, semileptonic B meson decays are particularly useful because they have clean experimental signatures, fairly well-controlled theoretical uncertainties, and suppressed SM rates, making them sensitive probes of BSM physics. Interestingly, there exist a number of deviations from the SM predictions that involve $b \rightarrow c \ell^- \bar{\nu}_\ell$ and $b \rightarrow s \ell^+ \ell^-$ transitions [9] inferred from global fits to available data.

At the same time, B meson decays are also well suited to search for feebly coupled light BSM particles with masses smaller than m_B [10–38]. Detecting these light particles can be challenging even if they have nonzero coupling to SM particles as the light particles can be long-lived, i.e. the decay happens outside the detector volume. In terms of experimental signature, this gives rise to a signal where a B meson decays for example to a kaon and missing energy. Alternatively, if the mass of the light particle is within the mass window of a known SM resonance [39, 40] then disentangling the signal from the SM background may be difficult in the case when both decay to the same final state. An illustrative example of this scenario is the two photon decay of a light particle with mass close to the pion mass. For the specific example of an axion-like particle (ALP) in the MeV-GeV mass range, multiple complementary search strategies have been explored employing for example collider and beam dump experiments, and searches at flavor factories [41–61].

Recently, the Belle II Collaboration released an analysis [62] of the flavor-changing neutral current (FCNC) process $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ that suggests a 2.8σ excess over the predicted SM branching ratio. Since the final state neutrinos are not observed, the $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ signal is similar to $B^+ \rightarrow a K^+$, with a escaping the detector. Moreover, it is well known that the theoretical uncertainty of the $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ branching ratio prediction [63–70] is nominal compared to the closely related decays based on the $b \rightarrow s \ell^+ \ell^-$ process, which may have sizeable non-local contributions. The combination of both of these facts has resulted in a number of analyses that interpret the experimental result in the context of models with dark matter, sterile neutrinos, axion-like particles, new neutral light gauge bosons, massless dark photons, and other new FCNC-inducing light particles weakly coupled to the SM [71–95].

In this work, we propose a simplified model with an axion-like particle that mediates the $b \rightarrow s$ flavor-changing transition and also has an effective coupling to photons. Such an ALP may decay outside the detector volume and therefore escape detection for a sufficiently long decay length in case it acquires a large boost during its production. As shown in Ref [80], our assumptions are consistent with the hypothesis of a 2-body of decay of B meson to a kaon and an invisible particle

as a resolution to the $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ result.

If some of the ALPs decay inside the detector, one also has an additional visible signature $B \rightarrow aK$, with $a \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$. Such a signal has been searched for [96] in the mass range $0.175 < m_a \leq (m_{B^+} - m_{K^+}) \sim 4.78 \text{ GeV}$ and away from the vicinity of π^0 , η , η' -mass windows.

Remarkably, such a setup also provides a simple resolution to the puzzle involving $B \rightarrow \pi K$ decays if one considers the possibility that the ALP has a mass close the pion mass and a fraction of the reconstructed neutral pions in $B^+ \rightarrow \pi^0 K^+$ and $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 K^0$ are actually $a \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ candidates. As we will see, this exploration points to a decay length of the ALP that falls within the sensitivity range of existing and future beam dump experiments. For an alternative attempt to address the $B \rightarrow \pi K$ puzzle with ALPs, see [97]. In this paper, we first strive to provide a status update of the $B \rightarrow \pi K$ puzzle in Section II based on the latest averages of branching fraction and CP -violation data involving the four $B \rightarrow \pi K$ decay modes. We also discuss how an ALP can address the puzzle. Section III is devoted to an overview of $B \rightarrow K$ decays with missing energy and demonstrates how a displaced ALP can jointly accommodate the $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ excess events and alleviate the $B \rightarrow \pi K$ puzzle. In Section IV, we use the inferred ALP-photon coupling to provide an estimate of the number of ALPs that can be produced through B decays and through the Primakoff process in past and future beam dump experiments, in particular CHARM and SHiP. We conclude in Section V.

II. ADDRESSING THE $B \rightarrow \pi K$ PUZZLE WITH AXION-LIKE PARTICLES




FIG. 1: Topological flavor-flow amplitudes contributing to $B \rightarrow \pi K$ decays.

The hadronic $B \rightarrow \pi K$ decay amplitudes can be conveniently expressed in terms of the topological flavor flow amplitudes [98–104] P , T , C , A illustrated in Figure 1. These amplitudes correspond to the penguin, color-allowed tree, color-suppressed tree, and annihilation amplitudes, respectively. The penguin amplitudes are further classified into three categories, namely the QCD

penguin amplitudes P , color-allowed electroweak penguin (EWP) amplitudes P_{EW} , and color-suppressed EWP amplitudes P_{EW}^C originating respectively from the QCD penguin operators and the electroweak penguin operator in the dim-6 hadronic effective Hamiltonian [105, 106]

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}} = \frac{4G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \left[\lambda_u^{(s)} \left(C_1(O_1^{(u)} - O_1^{(c)}) + C_2(O_2^{(u)} - O_2^{(c)}) \right) - \lambda_t^{(s)} \sum_{i=1,2} C_i O_i^{(c)} - \lambda_t^{(s)} \sum_{i=3}^{10} C_i O_i^{(s)} \right]. \quad (1)$$

where Q_{1-2} are the tree, Q_{3-6} are the QCD penguin and Q_9, Q_{10} are the two non-negligible EWP operators in the SM. The flavor-flow amplitudes carry a strong phase and a weak phase, where only the relative phases between different amplitudes have implications on the decay observables. To disentangle the weak phase information, we factor out the CKM elements $\lambda_q = V_{qb}^* V_{qs}$ from the flavor-flow amplitudes and note that the penguin amplitude P receives contributions from all the three up-type quarks in the loop,

$$P = \lambda_u P_u + \lambda_c P_c + \lambda_t P_t, \quad (2)$$

that can be recast in the final form using the unitarity of the CKM matrix,

$$P = \lambda_u (P_u - P_c) + \lambda_t (P_t - P_c). \quad (3)$$

The decay amplitudes [98, 99, 107, 108] for $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^- K^+$, $B^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ K^0$, $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 K^0$, and $B^+ \rightarrow \pi^0 K^+$, in a shorthand notation are denoted by \mathcal{A}^{-+} , \mathcal{A}^{+0} , \mathcal{A}^{00} , \mathcal{A}^{0+} respectively and expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}^{-+} &= -\lambda_u (P_{uc} + T) - \lambda_t \left(P_{tc} + \frac{2}{3} P_{EW}^C \right), \\ \mathcal{A}^{+0} &= \lambda_u (P_{uc} + A) + \lambda_t \left(P_{tc} - \frac{1}{3} P_{EW}^C \right), \\ \sqrt{2} \mathcal{A}^{00} &= \lambda_u (P_{uc} - C) + \lambda_t \left(P_{tc} - P_{EW} - \frac{1}{3} P_{EW}^C \right), \\ \sqrt{2} \mathcal{A}^{0+} &= -\lambda_u (P_{uc} + T + C + A) - \lambda_t \left(P_{tc} + P_{EW} + \frac{2}{3} P_{EW}^C \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where P_{uc} and P_{tc} are short-hand notations for $P_u - P_c$ and $P_t - P_c$. Naively, the expected hierarchy in the magnitude among the flavor-flow amplitudes go as

$$|\lambda_t P_{tc}| > |\lambda_u T| > |\lambda_u C| > |\lambda_u A|, |\lambda_u P_{uc}|. \quad (5)$$

Numerically, a suppression factor of the order of $\lambda \approx \sin \theta_C = 0.22$, θ_C being the Cabibbo angle, is expected at every subsequent step when these amplitudes are considered from left to right.

This hierarchy is a joint effect of the magnitudes of the respective CKM elements, the extra loop suppression of the penguin amplitudes, color factors, and the small ratio of the B meson decay constant to the B meson mass. For example, $\lambda_u/\lambda_t \sim \lambda^2$, but P_{tc} is loop-suppressed compared to T , conservatively estimated by an order of λ in [109]. The ratio of P_{tc} and T can be as large as 0.1 as estimated in the PQCD approach [110] and differs from the numerical estimate using QCD factorization [111, 112]. It also turns out that $|C/T| \sim \lambda$ [112]. However, even within the SM, $|C/T| \sim 0.5$ is allowed [113] and this ratio approaching unity [114, 115] is also not ruled out. The annihilation amplitude A is suppressed by a factor of $f_B/m_B \sim 0.05 \sim \lambda^2$ when compared to T . The EWP amplitudes can be estimated using a relation between the tree and the EWP amplitudes with the help of the $SU(3)$ -flavour symmetry of the dimension-6 weak Hamiltonian given in Eq. (1) [105, 106]

$$P_{EW} \pm P_{EW}^C = -\frac{3}{2} \frac{C_9 \pm C_{10}}{C_1 \pm C_2} (T \pm C). \quad (6)$$

Using the numerical values of the Wilson coefficients C_1 , C_2 , C_9 , and C_{10} to the leading log order at the m_b scale [105], one gets

$$P_{EW} \sim \kappa T, \quad P_{EW}^C \sim \kappa C, \quad (7)$$

to a good approximation, where

$$\kappa = -\frac{3}{2} \frac{C_9 + C_{10}}{C_1 + C_2} \simeq -\frac{3}{2} \frac{C_9 - C_{10}}{C_1 - C_2} \simeq 0.0135 \pm 0.0012. \quad (8)$$

To understand the $B \rightarrow \pi K$ puzzle it can be illuminating to consider the diagrams up to $\mathcal{O}(\lambda)$ which reduce the $B \rightarrow \pi K$ amplitudes to the following form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}^{-+} &= -\lambda_u T - \lambda_t P_{tc}, \\ \mathcal{A}^{+0} &= \lambda_t P_{tc}, \\ \sqrt{2} \mathcal{A}^{00} &= \lambda_t (P_{tc} - P_{EW}), \\ \sqrt{2} \mathcal{A}^{0+} &= -\lambda_u T - \lambda_t (P_{tc} + P_{EW}). \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

The branching ratio for a $B \rightarrow \pi K$ decay is given in terms of the corresponding decay amplitude by

$$\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow \pi K) = \mathcal{B}(\pi K) = \tau_B \frac{p_d}{8\pi m_B^2} \frac{G_F^2}{2} |\mathcal{A}|^2, \quad (10)$$

where the Fermi coupling constant $\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}}$ is factored out of the topological amplitudes and the daughter meson momentum of the 2-body decay is expressed as $p_d = \frac{1}{2m_B}(m_B^4 + m_K^4 + m_\pi^4 - 2m_B^2m_K^2 - 2m_B^2m_\pi^2 - 2m_\pi^2m_K^2)^{1/2}$ in the B meson rest frame.

Direct CP asymmetries, defined as

$$A_{\text{CP}} = \frac{\Gamma(B(b) \rightarrow \pi K) - \Gamma(B(\bar{b}) \rightarrow \pi K)}{\Gamma(B(b) \rightarrow \pi K) + \Gamma(B(\bar{b}) \rightarrow \pi K)}, \quad (11)$$

arise in $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^- K^+$ and $B^+ \rightarrow \pi^0 K^+$ because of the T - P_{tc} interference leading to a nonzero relative strong phase, as well as a weak phase difference between the two topological amplitudes. In contrast, P_{EW} and T carry the same strong phase as they are related to good approximation by a real number as shown in Eq. (8). Therefore, P_{EW} - T interference for $B^+ \rightarrow \pi^0 K^+$ does not contribute to A_{CP} . Thus, one expects a simplified relation [116]

$$A_{\text{CP}}(B^0 \rightarrow \pi^- K^+) = A_{\text{CP}}(B^+ \rightarrow \pi^0 K^+). \quad (12)$$

Experimentally, a deviation, numerically expressed by the quantity ΔA_{CP}

$$\Delta A_{\text{CP}} = A_{\text{CP}}(B^+ \rightarrow \pi^0 K^+) - A_{\text{CP}}(B^0 \rightarrow \pi^- K^+), \quad (13)$$

is found to be nonzero [117–119]. In addition, also the relative sign of A_{CP} of the two decay modes is in contradiction with the SM expectation. It is instructive to express the four $B \rightarrow \pi K$ rate asymmetries, $\Delta(\pi K) = A_{\text{CP}}(\pi K)\Gamma(\pi K)$, in terms of the topological amplitudes

$$\Delta(\pi^- K^+) = -4 \text{Im}(\lambda_u^* \lambda_t) \text{Im}[(T + P_{uc})^*(P_{tc} + \frac{2}{3}P_{EW}^C)], \quad (14)$$

$$2\Delta(\pi^0 K^+) = -4 \text{Im}(\lambda_u^* \lambda_t) \text{Im}[(T + C + A + P_{uc})^*(P_{tc} + P_{EW} + \frac{2}{3}P_{EW}^C)], \quad (15)$$

$$2\Delta(\pi^0 K^0) = -4 \text{Im}(\lambda_u^* \lambda_t) \text{Im}[(P_{uc} - C)^*(P_{tc} - P_{EW} - \frac{1}{3}P_{EW}^C)], \quad (16)$$

$$\Delta(\pi^+ K^0) = -4 \text{Im}(\lambda_u^* \lambda_t) \text{Im}[(A + P_{uc})^*(P_{tc} - \frac{1}{3}P_{EW}^C)]. \quad (17)$$

and retain only the color-suppressed amplitude C as the leading subdominant flavor-flow amplitude. With the additional assumptions that the annihilation amplitude A is suppressed relative to the color-allowed tree amplitude T and the relative strong phase difference between the T and C amplitudes is small, from Eqs. (14)-(17) one infers a more theoretically robust CP sum rule relation [108] connecting all the four $B \rightarrow \pi K$ CP asymmetries in Eq. (18)

$$\Delta_4 = A_{\text{CP}}(\pi^- K^+) + A_{\text{CP}}(\pi^+ K^0) \frac{\mathcal{B}(\pi^+ K^0)\tau_0}{\mathcal{B}(\pi^- K^+)\tau_+}$$

$$-A_{\text{CP}}(\pi^0 K^+) \frac{2\mathcal{B}(\pi^0 K^+) \tau_0}{\mathcal{B}(\pi^- K^+) \tau_+} - A_{\text{CP}}(\pi^0 K^0) \frac{2\mathcal{B}(\pi^0 K^0)}{\mathcal{B}(\pi^- K^+)}, \quad (18)$$

that vanishes and the result holds up to a few percent where $\mathcal{B}(\pi K)$ are the branching ratios introduced earlier and τ_+ and τ_0 are the lifetimes of the B^+ and B^0 mesons, respectively. It is interesting to note that an early measurement of $\Delta_4 = -0.270 \pm 0.132 \pm 0.060$ at Belle [117] deviated from zero (albeit with large errors), while a recent measurement $\Delta_4 = -0.03 \pm 0.13 \pm 0.04$ at Belle II [119] is perfectly compatible with zero.

Some comments are in order. Firstly, a large annihilation contribution to the $B \rightarrow \pi K$ decays is an unexpected solution to the $B \rightarrow \pi K$ puzzle, as the branching fractions do not favor a sizable annihilation amplitude [112, 120, 121] which is also supported by model-independent $B \rightarrow PP$ fits to available data [122, 123]. Secondly, long-distance re-scattering effects [124–129] can not only contribute to sizable strong phases but also modify the naive hierarchy in relative size for the topological amplitudes [111, 112, 114, 115, 130–132] but is not expected to entirely resolve [133, 134] the $B \rightarrow \pi K$ puzzle. (See also [135, 136] for a discussion on charming penguin resolution to the $B \rightarrow \pi K$ puzzle and [137–140] for an up-to-date analysis). Therefore, following [111–113, 130, 141–147] we ignore both the P_{uc} and A contributions while allowing a non-negligible color-suppressed tree contribution to the $B \rightarrow \pi K$ decays and treat the strong phases as free parameters in the SM as expressed in Eq. (4)

$$\mathcal{A}^{-+} = -\lambda_u T - \lambda_t \left(P_{tc} + \frac{2}{3} P_{EW}^C \right), \quad (19)$$

$$\mathcal{A}^{+0} = \lambda_t \left(P_{tc} - \frac{1}{3} P_{EW}^C \right), \quad (20)$$

$$\sqrt{2} \mathcal{A}^{00} = -\lambda_u C + \lambda_t \left(P_{tc} - P_{EW} - \frac{1}{3} P_{EW}^C \right), \quad (21)$$

$$\sqrt{2} \mathcal{A}^{0+} = -\lambda_u (T + C) - \lambda_t \left(P_{tc} + P_{EW} + \frac{2}{3} P_{EW}^C \right). \quad (22)$$

We make use of the PDG averaged data [8] consisting of the four branching ratios for the $B \rightarrow \pi K$ modes, the four direct CP asymmetries A_{CP} , and the mixing-induced CP asymmetry S_{CP} measured for the $B \rightarrow \pi^0 K^0$ decay from BaBar, Belle, Belle II and LHCb [118, 119] and perform a fit to the magnitude and strong phases contributing to Eqs. (19)–(22). The input data is summarized in Table I.

We have five free fit parameters: the three magnitudes P_{tc} , $|T|$, $|C|$ and two relative phases δ_T , δ_C . The parameter κ is treated as a prior around the central value. We have defined the relative phases with respect to the P_{tc} diagram whose absolute phase is set to zero in this convention [148].

Modes	Avg. BR [10^{-6}]	Avg. A_{CP}	S_{CP}
$B^0 \rightarrow \pi^- K^+$	20.00 ± 0.04	-0.0831 ± 0.0031	
$B^+ \rightarrow \pi^0 K^+$	13.2 ± 0.4	0.027 ± 0.012	
$B^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ K^0$	23.9 ± 0.6	-0.003 ± 0.015	
$B^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 K^0$	10.1 ± 0.4	0.00 ± 0.08	0.64 ± 0.13

TABLE I: Experimental inputs used in this work taken from the PDG [8].

Parameter	Value
$ V_{us} $	0.2245 ± 0.0008
$ V_{ub} $	$(3.82 \pm 0.24) \times 10^{-3}$
$ V_{ts} $	$(41.5 \pm 0.9) \times 10^{-3}$
γ	$(65.9 \pm 3.3 \pm 3.5)^\circ$
β	$(22.14 \pm 0.69 \pm 0.67)^\circ$

TABLE II: Relevant theoretical CKM input parameters from HFLAV averages [7].

Apart from these free parameters, the magnitude of the CKM elements $|V_{ub}|$, $|V_{us}|$, $|V_{tb}|$, $|V_{ts}|$, and the CKM angles β and γ , enter the analysis as uncertain theoretical inputs. We use the HFLAV averages [7] that are collected in Table II. These values are incorporated as SM priors while the uncertainties of the meson masses and the B meson lifetimes are neglected in the current analysis. It is imperative to note that the input parameters β and γ are correlated through the CKM unitarity relation [149]

$$\cot \beta = \frac{1 - \left| \frac{V_{ud}V_{ub}^*}{V_{cd}V_{cb}^*} \right| \cos \gamma}{\left| \frac{V_{ud}V_{ub}^*}{V_{cd}V_{cb}^*} \right| \sin \gamma}, \quad (23)$$

and therefore should not be used as independent parameters. However, through explicit checks, we confirmed that the fit results are insensitive to this choice.

The results of the Standard Model fit are given in Scenario I of Table III. While the χ^2 per

Scenario	$\chi^2/d.o.f$	p -value	Fit parameter	Fit value
I (SM fit)	1.4	0.23	P_{tc}	-0.149 ± 0.001
			κ	0.0134 ± 0.001
			$ T $	0.84 ± 0.20
			$ C $	0.41 ± 0.09
			δ_T	3.48 ± 0.09
			δ_C	1.14 ± 0.45
II (SM + ALP)	0.75	0.52	P_{tc}	-0.148 ± 0.001
			κ	0.0130 ± 0.001
			$ T $	0.98 ± 0.20
			$ C $	0.32 ± 0.03
			δ_T	3.42 ± 0.06
			δ_C	1.46 ± 0.42
			$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow aK^+)_{\text{mistag}}$	$(6.50^{+3.92}_{-3.00}) \times 10^{-7}$

TABLE III: Best fit values for the topological flavor-flow amplitudes and strong phases.

Scenario **I**: SM-fit, Scenario **II**: Fit in the presence of a neutral pseudoscalar mimicking a π^0 . The topological amplitudes are defined by factoring out $G_F/\sqrt{2}$ as indicated in Eq. (10) and the amplitudes are therefore given in units of GeV^3 . The branching ratio of mistagged $B^+ \rightarrow \pi^0 K^+$ that alleviates the $B \rightarrow \pi K$ puzzle is quoted as $\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow aK^+)_{\text{mistag}}$.

degree of freedom and the p -value are not unacceptable, the SM fit prefers a somewhat large value of $C/T \simeq 0.5$. Interestingly, if the CKM angle γ is set to the recent measured value of $78.6^{+7.2}_{-7.3}$ at Belle II [150], we find that the C/T ratio shifting towards even larger value of 0.68 with increased $\Delta\chi^2/d.o.f = 1.47$ and a reduced p -value of 0.20.

In our attempt to obtain a C/T ratio consistent with the SM expectation, we postulate that an axion-like particle with a mass close to that of a pion is produced in the $B \rightarrow K$ transition

and that it subsequently decays to two photons mimicking a neutral pion decay. This implies that the measured $B^+ \rightarrow \pi^0 K^+$ and $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 K^0$ have $B^+ \rightarrow aK^+$ and $B^0 \rightarrow aK^0$ components. The experimentally observed branching fraction of $B^+ \rightarrow \pi^0 K^+$ and $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 K^0$ is therefore expressed as,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow \pi^0 K^+)|_{\text{exp}} &= \mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow \pi^0 K^+) + \mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow aK^+), \\ \mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 K^0)|_{\text{exp}} &= \mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 K^0) + \mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow aK^0),\end{aligned}\tag{24}$$

and a similar relation holds for the CP -conjugate modes. We do not consider the ALP-neutral pion mixing in this work as the dominant mechanism for its decay to two photons in contrast to Ref. [40, 53] and therefore are not susceptible to the bounds on the ALP-pion mixing angle from kaon decays (see, e.g. [44]). In our setup, the ALPs are long lived and can in principle be distinguished from the $B \rightarrow \pi K$ decays. We therefore do not need to consider the interference between the $B \rightarrow \pi K$ and $B \rightarrow aK$ decay amplitudes. We also ignore potential new sources of CP -violation in the $B \rightarrow aK$ decays.

Since we are interested in the $b \rightarrow sa$ transition, the relevant flavor-changing interaction terms are parameterized as,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{FCNC}} \supset \bar{s}(h_{sb}^S + h_{sb}^P \gamma_5)ba + \text{h.c.}\tag{25}$$

where a is the ALP field. We note that the existence of such a term in the Lagrangian necessitates introduction of additional new states and interactions in order to couple SM quarks to a pseudoscalar singlet in a gauge-invariant way such that the couplings between the pseudoscalar and quarks actually arise from higher-dimensional operators. At the moment, we interpret Eq. (25) as low-energy limit of a more complete theory and do not attempt to provide a complete description of that full theory. For our purpose, we use Eq. (25) to obtain the decay rate for $B \rightarrow aK$ (see e.g. [10, 13, 21, 31, 45])

$$\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow aK) = \tau_B \frac{p_K}{8\pi m_B^2} \frac{(m_B^2 - m_K^2)^2}{(m_b - m_s)^2} |f_0^{B \rightarrow K}(m_a^2)|^2 |h_{sb}^S|^2.\tag{26}$$

where $p_K = \frac{1}{2m_B} \lambda^{1/2}(m_B^2, m_K^2, m_a^2)$ is the momentum of the kaon with $\lambda(x, y, z) = x^2 + y^2 + z^2 - 2xy - 2yz - 2zx$, and $f_0^{B \rightarrow K}$ is the form factor relevant for the $B \rightarrow K$ transition. For our purposes, it is sufficient to approximate this form factor as [151] (see [152] for a recent state-of-the-art evaluation)

$$f_0^{B \rightarrow K}(q^2) = \frac{0.33}{1 - \frac{q^2}{38\text{GeV}^2}}.\tag{27}$$

The results of the fit where the ALP mediated $b \rightarrow sa$ transition is modeled using a single parameter h_{sb}^S in addition to the SM fit parameters are given in Scenario II of Table III. Fit results in Scenario II indicate that the $|C|/|T|$ ratio prefers a lower value < 0.3 with a significant reduction in $\Delta\chi^2/d.o.f = 0.75$ while the p -value increases to 0.52 compared to the SM fit. The best fit value of h_{sb}^S yields a mistagged branching ratio of

$$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow aK^+)_{\text{mistag}} = 6.50_{-3.00}^{+3.92} \times 10^{-7} . \quad (28)$$

It is worth to keep in mind that the inferred branching fractions of $B^+ \rightarrow aK^+$ and $B^0 \rightarrow aK^0$ from the fits to $B \rightarrow \pi K$ data need not coincide with the true $B^+ \rightarrow aK^+$ and $B^0 \rightarrow aK^0$ branching fractions in the case the $a \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ decay is displaced. An ALP decaying to $\gamma\gamma$ via an effective ALP-photon interaction $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$ has a decay rate given by

$$\Gamma(a \rightarrow \gamma\gamma) = \frac{g_{a\gamma\gamma}^2}{64\pi} m_a^3 . \quad (29)$$

The effective interaction $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$ therefore determines the lifetime of the ALP given by $\tau_0 = \Gamma^{-1}$. For our assumed mass of the ALP of the order of the pion mass $m_\pi \simeq 130$ MeV and $g_{a\gamma\gamma} \ll 1$ TeV $^{-1}$, the decay length can be macroscopic, and an ALP that is produced in the lab frame with a large boost may decay outside a detector such as Belle II and give a missing energy signature. Therefore, a potential $B \rightarrow aK$ event in Belle II can either provide a signature that resembles $B \rightarrow \pi^0 K$ (if the ALP decays shortly after the B decay) or $B \rightarrow K\nu\bar{\nu}$ (if the ALP decays outside the detector). Both signatures can occur with an $\mathcal{O}(1)$ probability if the ALP decay length approximately matches the size of the Belle II detector.

Interestingly, Belle II has recently measured [62] a branching fraction for the $B^+ \rightarrow K^+\nu\bar{\nu}$ decay which is somewhat higher than the SM expectation. As the $B^+ \rightarrow K^+\nu\bar{\nu}$ decay and the $B^+ \rightarrow aK^+$ decay with the $a \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ decay outside the detector volume have the same visible signature, it has been suggested that the $B^+ \rightarrow K^+\nu\bar{\nu}$ excess events may be explained in terms of new long-lived particles.

III. LONG-LIVED ALPS AND $B \rightarrow K\nu\bar{\nu}$

In this section, we investigate the role of $B \rightarrow aK$ decays as a potential source of contamination to $B^+ \rightarrow K^+\nu\bar{\nu}$ signal when the ALP decays invisibly or escapes the detector before decaying. In this context, the ALP must be light with mass in the range $m_a \leq m_B - m_K$. Additionally,

the on-shell production of such a particle in the above-mentioned mass range would result in a resonant feature in the missing invariant mass spectrum. This fact has important consequences for the recent branching fraction measurement of $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ at Belle II [62]

$$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu \bar{\nu}) = (2.3 \pm 0.5^{+0.5}_{-0.4}) \times 10^{-5} , \quad (30)$$

where an excess of 2.7σ is observed from the SM expectation [153]

$$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu \bar{\nu})_{\text{SM}} = (5.58 \pm 0.37) \times 10^{-6} . \quad (31)$$

In order to interpret a $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \cancel{E}$ signal as an incoherent sum of the branching fractions of $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ and $B \rightarrow aK^+$ we need to recast the $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \cancel{E}$ experimental information in the kinematic regions corresponding to an ALP with mass $m_a \simeq m_{\pi^0}$. Therefore, we should consider $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ events exclusively from the $q^2 \simeq m_{\pi^0}^2$ bin. In a recent analysis [80], the measured $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ decay is interpreted to be a signal for $B \rightarrow K X$ as a function of the mass of the particle X . In the region where $m_X \leq 500$ MeV, the branching ratio is found to be [80]

$$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow K^+ X)|_{m_X \leq 500 \text{ MeV}} = (0.4 \pm 0.2) \times 10^{-5} . \quad (32)$$

We use this estimate as the branching fraction for $B^+ \rightarrow aK^+$. However, in order to interpret this branching fraction to coincide with the theoretical estimate for a hypothetical ALP produced in a $B^+ \rightarrow aK^+$ decay which then escapes the detector undetected, we need to calculate the probability of such an ALP to remain stable within the detector volume. The probability of the ALP to not decay within the detector is given by

$$\text{Prob}(l \geq l_{\text{max}}) = \exp \left[- \frac{l_{\text{max}}}{l_a} \right] , \quad (33)$$

where l_{max} is the maximum distance of the displaced ALP decay vertex from the point of production that can be unambiguously reconstructed in the detector. For our calculation, we assume this length (l_{max}) to be of the order of 2 meters which is the longitudinal distance from the primary point of interaction to the forward endcap region of the Belle II electromagnetic calorimeter [6]. The ALP decay length l_a is determined in the lab frame from its momentum p_a^{lab} and proper lifetime of τ_0

$$l_a = \beta_a^{\text{lab}} \gamma_a^{\text{lab}} c \tau_0 = \frac{|p_a^{\text{lab}}|}{m_a} c \tau_0 . \quad (34)$$

The initial B meson produced in Belle II is longitudinally boosted in the lab frame which results in the majority of ALPs produced in B decays to likely propagate in the forward direction in

the lab frame. The fraction of ALPs produced in B decays which escape the Belle II detector longitudinal length is given by the quantity $(1 - f_L)$ where f_L denotes the probability that an ALP decays within the detector volume yielding a sufficiently high quality vertex. The expression for f_L can be written as

$$f_L(m_B, m_K, m_a \simeq m_{\pi^0}, l_{\max}) = \int_0^{\pi/2} \sin \theta_a d\theta_a \left(1 - \exp \left(- \frac{m_a l_{\max}}{c\tau_0 |p_{aL}^{\text{lab}}|} \right) \right), \quad (35)$$

where p_{aL}^{lab} is the longitudinal component of the ALP momentum.

In the limit where the ALP decays just outside the decay volume we postulate,

$$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow aK^+) |_{\text{theo}} \times (1 - f_L) \simeq \mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow aK^+) |_{\text{exp}} \simeq \mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu \bar{\nu}) |_{q^2=m_{\pi^0}^2}^{\text{exp}}, \quad (36)$$

with $\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu \bar{\nu}) |_{q^2=m_{\pi^0}^2}^{\text{exp}}$ approximately given by the value in Eq. (32).

On the other hand, a resolution to the $B \rightarrow \pi K$ puzzle requires some of the $B^{+,0} \rightarrow aK^{+,0}$ decays to be misidentified as $B^+ \rightarrow \pi^0 K^+$ and $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 K^0$ decays respectively, which necessitates the ALP to decay to two photons that can be reconstructed in the detector

$$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow aK^+) |_{\text{theo}} \times f_L \simeq \mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow aK^+) |_{\text{mistag}}, \quad (37)$$

yielding a value for $\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow aK^+) |_{\text{mistag}}$ given in Eq. (28). We have once again assumed as the limiting case that the two photons can be resolved by the detector originating from the ALP decay vertex displaced all the way to l_{\max} from the point of production in order to be identified as a neutral pion. The initial B mesons are boosted in the $+z$ -axis along the e^- direction with $\gamma_B \beta_B \approx 0.28$ [24]. The subsequent ALP decay, coming from $B \rightarrow aK$ decay in the most general case makes a polar angle θ_a and an azimuthal angle ϕ_a with the direction of the B meson. The B meson itself flies at an unknown angle θ with respect to the asymmetric beam. Focusing on the longitudinal distance (l_{aL}) traveled by the ALP before decaying to two photons as shown in Fig. 2 we find,

$$l_{aL} = \frac{c\tau_0 p_{aL}^{\text{lab}}}{m_a}; \quad p_{aL}^{\text{lab}} = (\gamma_B(p_a \cos \theta_a + \beta_B E_a) \cos \theta + p_a \sin \theta_a \cos \phi_a \sin \theta). \quad (38)$$

The analytical results required to evaluate Eq. (35) are provided in Appendix A. We assume the ALP dominantly decays to two photons and to no other SM particles. In principle, from phase space considerations, the ALP can decay to e^+e^- or $\nu\bar{\nu}$ as well. In order to connect the ALP-photon coupling to ALP-electron coupling once again requires a concrete description of the full theory which has been described elsewhere (see e.g. [31, 154]). In our chosen setup, the expected




FIG. 2: Production of an ALP in B decays.

event rate for the ALP produced in $B^+ \rightarrow aK^+$ decay and its subsequent decay to two photons is given by

$$N_a(B^+ \rightarrow \pi^0 K^+) |_{\text{mistag}} = N_B \mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow K^+ a) f_L \times \epsilon . \quad (39)$$

Similarly, the event rate for ALP escaping the detector mimicking a $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ is given by

$$N_a(B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \cancel{E}) = N_B \mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow K^+ a) (1 - f_L) . \quad (40)$$

It is likely that not all the $a \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ decays pass the experimental selection criteria to be identified as a π^0 . Therefore, we included an additional parameter in the form of detection efficiency ϵ in Eq. (39). The $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ branching fraction measurement on the other hand requires to veto any additional calorimeter activity involving photons [62].

In case of all the $a \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ events identified as π^0 decays (corresponding to $\epsilon = 1$), we infer from the upper plot in Fig. 3 that the minimum value for the ALP decay length in its rest frame is around 34 centimeters and extends to several meters. To cover also other options, we assume two additional benchmark values of the detection efficiency ϵ to be **a)** $\epsilon = 0.5$ and **b)** $\epsilon = 0.1$ and estimate the ALP decay length in its rest frame. For $\epsilon = 0.5$ the minimum and maximum value of $c\tau_0$ turn out to be 22 cm and 1.78 m respectively. Similarly we find the minimum and maximum value of $c\tau_0$ to be 22 cm and 42 cm respectively in case of ϵ to be 0.1.

Moreover, we anticipate that a displaced ALP decaying to two photons can give rise to substantial bias in the measurement of the di-photon invariant mass ($m_{\gamma\gamma}$) and therefore introduce large uncertainty in the estimation of the ALP mass [96]. It is also possible that the two photons emerging from the ALP decay vertex end up as a merged track on the detector leading to rejection




FIG. 3: Estimate of the $B^+ \rightarrow aK^+$ decay rate as a function of the ALP lifetime. The magenta band corresponds to $B^+ \rightarrow aK^+$ decay rate being misidentified as $B^+ \rightarrow \pi^0 K^+$ decay where both a and π^0 decay to two photons. The green band corresponds to the $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ decay rate excess above the SM background ($B^+ \rightarrow K^+ a$ decay where the a escapes the detector). The effect of the detection efficiency of $a \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ decays inside the detector is indicated by the factor ϵ which is chosen to be 1, 0.5 and 0.1 for the three cases. The bands correspond to 1σ uncertainties.

of signal events if the angular separation at the electromagnetic calorimeter is less than 3° [155]. Both of these scenarios would thus require a dedicated analysis with precise modeling of the detector response at Belle II that is not attempted in this work. We encourage a future experimental analysis from Belle II probing the $B^\pm \rightarrow K^\pm a(\rightarrow \gamma\gamma)$ signal for an ALP mass around m_{π^0} as this provides a direct constraints on the $B^+ \rightarrow aK^+$ branching fraction in our scenario. In order to find the true $B^+ \rightarrow aK^+$ branching fraction we use Eq. (39) and Eq. (40) and get, assuming $\epsilon = 1$

$$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow aK^+) = (4.64^{+2.40}_{-2.29}) \times 10^{-6}, \quad \epsilon = 1. \quad (41)$$




FIG. 4: Left: the decay length ($0.25\text{m} < l < 3.5\text{m}$) of the ALP for a range of mass values around the pion mass. Right: the corresponding value of the ALP-photon coupling.

For the lower efficiencies $\epsilon = 0.5$ and $\epsilon = 0.1$, we find instead

$$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow aK^+) = (5.29_{-2.60}^{+2.79}) \times 10^{-6}, \quad \epsilon = 0.5, \quad (42)$$

$$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow aK^+) = (10.56_{-5.14}^{+5.83}) \times 10^{-6}, \quad \epsilon = 0.1. \quad (43)$$

We infer the flavor-changing coupling h_{sb}^S introduced in Eq. (25) in case of $\epsilon = 1$ using Eq. (26),

$$h_{sb}^S = (10.01_{-2.88}^{+2.32}) \times 10^{-9}, \quad (44)$$

and slightly larger values for $\epsilon = 1$ and $\epsilon = 0.1$. The flavor-changing coupling h_{sb}^S easily satisfies the constraints from $\Delta F = 2$ observable [23] as well as constraints from previous $B \rightarrow K +$ missing energy experimental searches [96, 156]. The ALP lifetime that we find can be readily translated into the ALP decay rate and the ALP-photon coupling using Eq. (29).

In Fig. 4 we show the 1σ range of the preferred decay length and the corresponding ALP-photon coupling as a function of the ALP mass in the vicinity of the pion mass, assuming $\epsilon = 1$. The decay length is smaller and the ALP-photon coupling is larger for $\epsilon < 1$.

IV. SENSITIVITY TO FUTURE BEAM DUMP EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we turn our attention towards the preferred parameter space for the ALP-photon coupling $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$ for ALP masses in the MeV-GeV range and discuss existing constraints from previous beam dump experiments [157–160] shown in Fig. 5, as well as the prospects to probe the parameter space [59, 161] at future experiments.

Interestingly, a number of upcoming experiments like LUXE [162, 163], SHiP [164], FASER [165], DarkQuest [56] are sensitive to a region of parameter space with an ALP mass close to the pion mass and an ALP-photon coupling preferred by the joint explanation of the $B \rightarrow \pi K$ puzzle and $B \rightarrow K\nu\bar{\nu}$ excess events that we identified.

It is worth emphasizing that the constraints shown in Fig. 5 only take into account the ALP-photon coupling ($g_{a\gamma\gamma}$) independently of the additional effective flavor-changing $b-s-a$ coupling considered in our work. In the presence of the flavor-changing coupling, complementary constraints are provided by ongoing experimental efforts at the B factories. In particular, the search in [96] constrains additional parameter space for ALP masses above the pion mass. At beam dump experiments, additional ALP production modes from B meson decays open up, as we now discuss.

With a proton beam energy of 400 GeV, both the CHARM experiment and the planned SHiP experiment have a sufficient center of mass energy to produce energetic b hadrons. We will focus on these two experiments in the following. In fact, the production of b hadrons in previous proton beam dump experiments are known to be moderate [167, 168] and SHiP [164] with its higher total number of proton-nucleus collisions is ideally suited to detect a significant number of long-lived ALPs produced in B meson decays.

To estimate the total number of B mesons that will be produced at SHiP, we follow [169]

$$N_B = N_{\text{PoT}} \times X_{\bar{b}b} \times f_{\text{cascade}} \times (f_{B^+} + f_{B^0}) \simeq 9.1 \times 10^{13} , \quad (45)$$

where $N_{\text{PoT}} \simeq 2 \times 10^{20}$ is the number of protons on target, $X_{\bar{b}b} \simeq 1.6 \times 10^{-7}$ is the beauty production fraction, $f_{\text{cascade}} \simeq 1.7$ a cascade enhancement factor, and $f_{B^+} \simeq 0.417$ and $f_{B^0} \simeq 0.418$ are the B meson hadronization fractions.

We estimate the number of detectable $a \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ events (assuming no SM background) based on the experimental setup proposed in the SPS ECN3 high-intensity beam facility with [170, 171]. We use the differential distribution of B^+ production by a proton beam hitting a Molybdenum target from [161, 172] and calculate the number of events intersecting the surface area of the detector assuming ideal reconstruction efficiency

$$N_{\gamma\gamma}^{\text{obs}} = N_{\text{PoT}} \int \frac{d\sigma(pN \rightarrow B)}{dE_B d\theta_B} \mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow aK) \varepsilon_{\text{det}}(z, \theta_a) \frac{dP_{\text{dec}}}{dz} dz dE_B d\theta_B \quad (46)$$

where $P_{\text{dec}} = \exp(-\frac{\Delta l(z, \theta_a)}{\gamma\beta c\tau_0})$, ε_{det} is the geometrical acceptance for the di-photon signal and $\gamma\beta$ is the boost factor for the ALP in the laboratory frame. The probability of the $a \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ decay happening within the detector volume at a distance Δl from the point of production is given by the




FIG. 5: Bounds on the $g_{a\gamma\gamma} - m_a$ parameter space presented using `AxionLimits` [166]. The purple ($\epsilon = 1$) and light blue ($\epsilon = 0.1$) regions corresponds to the preferred 1σ region based on an ALP having a mass and a $g_{a\gamma\gamma}$ coupling consistent with a joint explanation of $B \rightarrow K\nu\bar{\nu}$ excess and $B \rightarrow \pi K$ -puzzle. The two black triangles indicate two benchmark points that are discussed in more detail in the text.

last factor (assuming a detection efficiency of $\epsilon = 1$). We have used a Monte Carlo simulation to calculate the number of detectable events in two benchmark scenarios indicated by black triangles in the plot of Fig. 5

- **Scenario (a)** an ALP decay length at the upper 1σ boundary of the preferred range for $\epsilon = 1$, $c\tau_0 = 2.67$ m ($g_{a\gamma\gamma} = 2.51 \times 10^{-6}$ GeV $^{-1}$) corresponding to a branching ratio $\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow aK^+) = 6.34 \times 10^{-6}$;
- **Scenario (b)** an ALP decay length at the lower 1σ boundary of the preferred range for $\epsilon = 1$, $c\tau_0 = 0.34$ m ($g_{a\gamma\gamma} = 7.02 \times 10^{-6}$ GeV $^{-1}$) corresponding to a branching ratio of $\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow aK^+) = 3.04 \times 10^{-6}$, respectively.

We find that the number of detectable $a \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ produced in $B \rightarrow aK$ decay in **Scenario (a)** is $N_{\gamma\gamma}^{\text{obs}} \approx 1.14 \times 10^6$ and in **Scenario (b)** is $N_{\gamma\gamma}^{\text{obs}} \approx 4.93 \times 10^6$ respectively. Such large event numbers would unambiguously point to new physics, even in the presence of SM backgrounds.

Given the large numbers of expected events at SHiP, we also attempted an estimate of the number of $B \rightarrow a(\rightarrow \gamma\gamma)K$ events passing the selection criteria in the CHARM experiment. Based on the luminosity, location of the decay volume and mean geometric acceptance of the CHARM experiment [157, 158] our estimate of the number of events for **Scenario (a)** is $N_{\gamma\gamma}^{\text{obs}} = 68$ and for **Scenario (b)** is $N_{\gamma\gamma}^{\text{obs}} = 99$ events assuming ideal detector efficiency. We note that these numbers come with $\mathcal{O}(1)$ uncertainties in part due to the limited sample size of our Monte Carlo run and in part due to partially known event selection criteria at CHARM. The considered benchmark points may very well be allowed by the non-observation of a long-lived ALP at CHARM.

It is also important to note that for a fixed value of the ALP lifetime $c\tau_0$, the ALP-photon coupling is correlated with the mass of the ALP which is chosen to be the π^0 mass in both of the benchmark cases. In reality, as already mentioned above, the uncertainty in the inferred ALP mass is likely non-negligible in the case that the decay to two photons happens significantly away from the point of the ALP production. For ALP masses slightly away from π^0 , the preferred parameter space for the ALP-photon coupling opens up further, as we illustrate in Fig .5. Also note that the shown regions for $\epsilon = 1$ and $\epsilon = 0.1$ correspond to the 1σ regions. It is likely that part of the preferred region predicts event numbers at the CHARM experiment that are consistent with zero. However, we expect that the shown preferred parameter space will be fully explored by the SHiP experiment in the future, given our estimate of $\mathcal{O}(10^6)$ events at SHiP for the benchmark points.

Moreover, we note that an auxiliary handle to change the lifetime of the ALP is an additional invisible decay width into a dark sector. Switching on an $\mathcal{O}(1)$ invisible branching ratio will need to be compensated by a larger ALP-photon coupling to produce a sufficient number of events to address the $B \rightarrow \pi K$ puzzle. Both the additional invisible decay width and the increased partial decay width to photons reduce the lifetime of the ALP. In that way, one can arbitrarily suppress the event numbers in the CHARM experiment (with its decay volume ~ 500 m away from the target). We found no events at CHARM for a lifetime of $c\tau_0 < 0.1$ m. The suppression of events is much less pronounced for SHiP as its decay volume is much closer to the target.

Finally, we should note that the presence of the ALP-photon coupling by itself induces photo-production of the ALP through Primakoff conversion independently of B decays [51, 165, 173–179]. (See Appendix (B) for details of our implementation of the Primakoff production.)

Once again, using Monte Carlo simulations we estimate the number of signal candidates at SHiP passing the experimental cuts for the two above mentioned scenarios and find $N_{\gamma\gamma}^{\text{obs}} \approx 70$ for **Scenario (a)** and $N_{\gamma\gamma}^{\text{obs}} \approx 695$ for **Scenario (b)** respectively. Clearly in both scenarios, the number of ALPs produced through the Primakoff process and decaying to $a \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ is orders of magnitude smaller than the number one can expect from the B decays. To a very good approximation, the sensitivity of SHiP to the ALPs in our scenario is determined by the ALP production through B decays. We expect the same conclusion to hold also for the CHARM experiment.

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have discussed the production of an ALP in B decays that can account for the $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ excess events and at the same time mitigate the longstanding $B \rightarrow \pi K$ puzzle. The main idea is that an ALP with a lifetime of the order of meters will decay occasionally inside and sometimes outside a detector like Belle II. If the ALP decays outside the detector, it mimics the $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ decay signature. If it decays inside the detector into two photons and if it has a mass close to the pion mass, it might get reconstructed as a neutral pion and thus mimic the $B \rightarrow \pi^0 K$ decay.

We find that a $B \rightarrow aK$ branching fraction of the order of 3.0×10^{-6} - 6×10^{-6} and an ALP lifetime ranging from ~ 0.3 m - 3 m provides a consistent explanation of both the $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ excess events and the $B \rightarrow \pi K$ puzzle, if ALP decays to two photons are reconstructed as neutral pions with an efficiency of $\epsilon = 1$. It is conceivable that an ALP that decays to two photons inside the detector but significantly displaced from the B decay vertex might not be reconstructed as a neutral pion. We find that for a smaller efficiency of $\epsilon = 0.1$, the preferred lifetime is only slightly shorter, around ~ 0.2 m. A more detailed study of the reconstruction efficiency would be desirable and is left for future work.

We considered a minimal ALP setup, taking into account the only two necessary couplings of the ALP, namely a flavor-changing coupling to bottom and strange quarks (which sets the $B \rightarrow aK$ branching fraction) and the coupling to photons (which sets the ALP lifetime). Interestingly, the preferred coupling to photons, $g_{a\gamma\gamma} \simeq 10^{-6} \text{ GeV}^{-1}$ - 10^{-5} GeV^{-1} is in a region of parameter space that can be probed by beam dump experiments. We find that the CHARM experiment might have had sensitivity to the interesting parameter space and we estimate that the planned SHiP

experiment might produce millions of ALPs that decay to photons in the SHiP detector.

In non-minimal setups, the interesting parameter space opens up considerably. In particular, if the ALP has an additional invisible decay width, larger couplings to photons are required to provide sufficient events that mimic $B \rightarrow \pi^0 K$ decays. With a larger coupling to photons, the ALP decay length decreases, requiring a shorter baseline distance for effective detection at beam dump experiments. A systematic study of such non-minimal setups will be presented elsewhere.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

SR is indebted to Ulrik Egede, Rueven Balkin, Stefania Gori for discussions that helped improving the manuscript. SR also acknowledges valuable communications with Ciaran O'Hare and Jan Jerhot regarding clarifications on the limits derived from the beam dump experiments. SR is grateful to the organizers of BEACH 2024 for the opportunity to present part of this work and for the insightful feedback from the participants. Additionally, SR would like to thank the Santa Cruz Institute for Particle Physics (SCIPP) and its members for their hospitality during the completion of this work. During the initial phase of the project, SR was financially supported by a postdoctoral fellowship from Chennai Mathematical Institute. The research of WA is supported by the U.S. Department of Energy grant number DE-SC0010107.

Appendix A: ALP Decay Probability

In this appendix we provide a simple analytical approximation for the probability that an ALP produced from B mesons decays within a distance l_{\max} from the production point, see Eq. 35. Setting the production angle (θ) of the B mesons close to 0 we find

$$f_L = 1 - \int_0^{\pi/2} \sin \theta_a d\theta_a \exp\left(-\frac{m_a l_{\max}}{c\tau_0 \gamma_B (p_a \cos \theta_a + \beta_B E_a)}\right). \quad (\text{A1})$$

This integral can be recast in the form

$$\int_{z_1}^{z_2} dz \frac{\exp(-Az)}{z^2} = \frac{\exp(-Az_1)}{z_1} - \frac{\exp(-Az_2)}{z_2} - A(Ei(-Az_2) - Ei(-Az_1)), \quad (\text{A2})$$

where $Ei(-z) = -E_1(z)$, and the definition of exponential integral is

$$E_n(z) = \int_1^\infty \exp(-zt) t^{-n} dt, \quad n = 0, 1, \dots, \quad \text{Re}(z) > 0. \quad (\text{A3})$$

Appendix B: Primakoff production of the ALP at proton beam-dump experiments

Following [174, 179] we calculate the differential cross-section for $\gamma + N \rightarrow a + N$ [165]

$$\frac{d\sigma(\gamma N \rightarrow aN)}{d\theta_a} = \frac{\alpha g_{\alpha\gamma\gamma}^2 Z^2 F(|t|)^2 k_a^4 \sin^3 \theta_a}{4 t^2}, \quad (\text{B1})$$

and use the equivalent photon approximation [180, 181] to obtain total $p + N \rightarrow p + N + a$ cross section. The 4-vectors in laboratory frame for the almost on-shell incoming photon, the nucleus at rest, the outgoing ALP, and the scattered nucleus are respectively,

$$p^\mu = \begin{pmatrix} E_\gamma \\ p_t \\ 0 \\ E_\gamma \end{pmatrix}, \quad P_i^\mu = \begin{pmatrix} m_N \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad k^\mu = \begin{pmatrix} E_a \\ k_a \sin \theta_a \\ 0 \\ k_a \cos \theta_a \end{pmatrix}, \quad P_f^\mu = p^\mu + P_i^\mu - k^\mu. \quad (\text{B2})$$

Here m_a, m_N are the mass of the ALP and the mass of the scattering nucleus, E_γ, E_a the incoming photon and outgoing ALP energy in the laboratory frame, p_t is the transverse photon momentum, θ_a the angle between the ALP momentum and the beam direction, and $E_\gamma \simeq E_a$ for $\theta_a \ll 1$ and $m_a, p_t \ll E_a, m_N$. In the case of elastic scattering, $P_i^2 = P_f^2 = m_N^2$ and the complete expression for E_γ is given by,

$$E_\gamma = \frac{m_N(k_a^2 + m_a^2)^{1/2} - \frac{m_a^2 - p_t^2 + 2k_a p_t \sin \theta_a}{2}}{m_N - (k_a^2 + m_a^2)^{1/2} + k_a \cos \theta_a}. \quad (\text{B3})$$

For $\frac{m_a}{\sqrt{m_N(E_\gamma + m_N)}}$, $\theta_a \ll 1$ we can write down an approximate expression for k_a as,

$$k_a \simeq E_\gamma \left(1 - \frac{m_a^2}{2E_\gamma^2} - \frac{p_t^2}{2E_\gamma m_N} \right) - \frac{m_a^4}{8E_\gamma m_N^2} - \frac{E_\gamma \theta_a^2}{2m_N} \left(E_\gamma - \frac{m_a^2}{2m_N} \right), \quad (\text{B4})$$

and the momentum transfer t ,

$$t = (P_i^\mu - P_f^\mu)^2 = (k^\mu - p^\mu)^2 \simeq -\frac{m_a^4}{4E_\gamma^2} - E_\gamma^2 \theta^2 - p_t^2 + 2E_\gamma p_t \theta_a, \quad (\text{B5})$$

is suppressed for a limiting value $t > t_0$ in case of elastic scattering. The numerical value of t_0 is inferred from the vanishing of the charge form factor $F(q^2 = |t_0|)$ where $F(q^2)$ is given by,

$$F(q^2) = \frac{3j_1(\sqrt{q^2}R_1)}{\sqrt{q^2}R_1} \exp \left[-\frac{(\sqrt{q^2}s)^2}{2} \right] \quad (\text{B6})$$

, where j_1 is the first spherical Bessel function of the first kind and

$$R_1 = \sqrt{(1.23 \text{ fm } A^{1/3} - 0.6 \text{ fm})^2 + 7\pi^2(0.52 \text{ fm})^2/3 - 5s^2}, \quad s = 0.9 \text{ fm}. \quad (\text{B7})$$

To obtain the total cross section for the photoproduction of the ALPs in a proton beam dump experiment, we use the equivalent photon spectrum of the proton beam in the laboratory frame and estimate the distribution of photon momenta q by $\gamma_p(x = \frac{E_\gamma}{E_{\text{beam}}}, p_t^2)$ [173, 182, 183],

$$\gamma(x, p_t^2) = \frac{\alpha}{\pi^2 x} \frac{1}{(p_t^2 + x^2 m_p^2)} \left[\frac{p_t^2}{(p_t^2 + x^2 m_p^2)} (1-x) D(q^2) + \frac{x^2}{2} C(q^2) \right], \quad (\text{B8})$$

where for protons,

$$D(q^2) = \frac{4m_p^2 G_E^2(q^2) + q^2 G_M^2(q^2)}{4m_p^2 + q^2}, \quad C(q^2) = G_M^2(q^2). \quad (\text{B9})$$

The form factors $G_E(q^2)$ and $G_M(q^2)$ are set to vanish for $q^2 > 1 \text{ GeV}$ and are expressed as

$$G_E(q^2) = \frac{1}{(1 + q^2/q_0^2)^2}, \quad G_M(q^2) = \frac{\mu_p}{(1 + q^2/q_0^2)^2}, \quad (\text{B10})$$

where $q_0^2 = 0.71 \text{ GeV}^2$ and $\mu_p = 7.78$ is the magnetic moment of the proton. Finally the total cross section can be expressed as,

$$\sigma_{\text{Primakoff}} = \frac{1}{E_{\text{beam}} \sigma_{pN}} \int \gamma_p(E_a/E_{\text{beam}}, p_t^2) \frac{d\sigma(\gamma N \rightarrow aN)}{d\theta_a} d\theta_a dE_a dp_t^2, \quad (\text{B11})$$

where $\sigma_{pN} = 53 \text{ mb} \times A^{0.77}$. The expected number of detectable ALP in its decay to two photons through Primakoff production is obtained by plugging in the proton beam energy ($E_{\text{beam}} = 400 \text{ GeV}$), the atomic number and mass of the target nucleus ($Z = 42$, $A = 96$) in the differential distribution and weighing in the geometry factor that ensures that ALP and its decay products both remain within the detector volume.

- [1] M. Kobayashi and T. Maskawa, *CP Violation in the Renormalizable Theory of Weak Interaction*, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **49** (1973) 652.
- [2] BABAR collaboration, *The BABAR physics book: Physics at an asymmetric B factory* (10, 1998), 10.2172/979931.
- [3] BABAR, BELLE collaboration, *The Physics of the B Factories*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **74** (2014) 3026 [1406.6311].
- [4] BELLE collaboration, *The Belle Detector*, *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A* **479** (2002) 117.
- [5] LHCb collaboration, *Implications of LHCb measurements and future prospects*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **73** (2013) 2373 [1208.3355].

- [6] BELLE-II collaboration, *The Belle II Physics Book*, *PTEP* **2019** (2019) 123C01 [1808.10567].
- [7] HFLAV collaboration, *Averages of b -hadron, c -hadron, and τ -lepton properties as of 2021*, *Phys. Rev. D* **107** (2023) 052008 [2206.07501].
- [8] PARTICLE DATA GROUP collaboration, *Review of particle physics*, *Phys. Rev. D* **110** (2024) 030001.
- [9] B. Capdevila, A. Crivellin and J. Matias, *Review of semileptonic B anomalies*, *Eur. Phys. J. ST* **1** (2023) 20 [2309.01311].
- [10] B. Batell, M. Pospelov and A. Ritz, *Multi-lepton Signatures of a Hidden Sector in Rare B Decays*, *Phys. Rev. D* **83** (2011) 054005 [0911.4938].
- [11] M. Freytsis, Z. Ligeti and J. Thaler, *Constraining the Axion Portal with $B \rightarrow Kl^+l^-$* , *Phys. Rev. D* **81** (2010) 034001 [0911.5355].
- [12] K. Schmidt-Hoberg, F. Staub and M.W. Winkler, *Constraints on light mediators: confronting dark matter searches with B physics*, *Phys. Lett. B* **727** (2013) 506 [1310.6752].
- [13] M.J. Dolan, F. Kahlhoefer, C. McCabe and K. Schmidt-Hoberg, *A taste of dark matter: Flavour constraints on pseudoscalar mediators*, *JHEP* **03** (2015) 171 [1412.5174].
- [14] E. Izaguirre, T. Lin and B. Shuve, *Searching for Axionlike Particles in Flavor-Changing Neutral Current Processes*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **118** (2017) 111802 [1611.09355].
- [15] F. Sala and D.M. Straub, *A New Light Particle in B Decays?*, *Phys. Lett. B* **774** (2017) 205 [1704.06188].
- [16] A. Datta, J. Kumar, J. Liao and D. Marfatia, *New light mediators for the R_K and R_{K^*} puzzles*, *Phys. Rev. D* **97** (2018) 115038 [1705.08423].
- [17] J.A. Dror, R. Lasenby and M. Pospelov, *New constraints on light vectors coupled to anomalous currents*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119** (2017) 141803 [1705.06726].
- [18] J.A. Dror, R. Lasenby and M. Pospelov, *Dark forces coupled to nonconserved currents*, *Phys. Rev. D* **96** (2017) 075036 [1707.01503].
- [19] W. Altmannshofer, M.J. Baker, S. Gori, R. Harnik, M. Pospelov, E. Stamou et al., *Light resonances and the low- q^2 bin of R_{K^*}* , *JHEP* **03** (2018) 188 [1711.07494].
- [20] M.W. Winkler, *Decay and detection of a light scalar boson mixing with the Higgs boson*, *Phys. Rev. D* **99** (2019) 015018 [1809.01876].
- [21] B. Döbrich, F. Ertas, F. Kahlhoefer and T. Spadaro, *Model-independent bounds on light pseudoscalars from rare B -meson decays*, *Phys. Lett. B* **790** (2019) 537 [1810.11336].

- [22] D. Aloni, Y. Soreq and M. Williams, *Coupling QCD-Scale Axionlike Particles to Gluons*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123** (2019) 031803 [1811.03474].
- [23] M.B. Gavela, R. Houtz, P. Quilez, R. Del Rey and O. Sumensari, *Flavor constraints on electroweak ALP couplings*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79** (2019) 369 [1901.02031].
- [24] A. Filimonova, R. Schäfer and S. Westhoff, *Probing dark sectors with long-lived particles at BELLE II*, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020) 095006 [1911.03490].
- [25] J. Martin Camalich, M. Pospelov, P.N.H. Vuong, R. Ziegler and J. Zupan, *Quark Flavor Phenomenology of the QCD Axion*, *Phys. Rev. D* **102** (2020) 015023 [2002.04623].
- [26] A. Kachanovich, U. Nierste and I. Nišandžić, *Higgs portal to dark matter and $B \rightarrow K^{(*)}$ decays*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80** (2020) 669 [2003.01788].
- [27] S. Chakraborty, M. Kraus, V. Loladze, T. Okui and K. Tobioka, *Heavy QCD axion in $b \rightarrow s$ transition: Enhanced limits and projections*, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021) 055036 [2102.04474].
- [28] B. Dutta, S. Ghosh, P. Huang and J. Kumar, *Explaining $g\mu-2$ and $RK^{(*)}$ using the light mediators of $U(1)T3R$* , *Phys. Rev. D* **105** (2022) 015011 [2105.07655].
- [29] L. Darmé, M. Fedele, K. Kowalska and E.M. Sessolo, *Flavour anomalies and the muon $g - 2$ from feebly interacting particles*, *JHEP* **03** (2022) 085 [2106.12582].
- [30] E. Bertholet, S. Chakraborty, V. Loladze, T. Okui, A. Soffer and K. Tobioka, *Heavy QCD axion at Belle II: Displaced and prompt signals*, *Phys. Rev. D* **105** (2022) L071701 [2108.10331].
- [31] M. Bauer, M. Neubert, S. Renner, M. Schnubel and A. Thamm, *Flavor probes of axion-like particles*, *JHEP* **09** (2022) 056 [2110.10698].
- [32] T. Ferber, A. Filimonova, R. Schäfer and S. Westhoff, *Displaced or invisible? ALPs from B decays at Belle II*, *JHEP* **04** (2023) 131 [2201.06580].
- [33] A. Crivellin, C.A. Manzari, W. Altmannshofer, G. Inguglia, P. Feichtinger and J. Martin Camalich, *Toward excluding a light Z' explanation of $b \rightarrow sl + \ell^-$* , *Phys. Rev. D* **106** (2022) L031703 [2202.12900].
- [34] J. Bonilla, A. de Giorgi, B. Gavela, L. Merlo and M. Ramos, *The cost of an ALP solution to the neutral B -anomalies*, *JHEP* **02** (2023) 138 [2209.11247].
- [35] J. Bonilla, A. de Giorgi and M. Ramos, *Neutral B -anomalies from an on-shell scalar exchange*, 2211.05135.
- [36] X.-G. He, X.-D. Ma and G. Valencia, *FCNC B and K meson decays with light bosonic Dark Matter*, *JHEP* **03** (2023) 037 [2209.05223].

- [37] Y. Zhang, A. Ishikawa, E. Kou, D.T. Marcantonio and P. Urquijo, *Belle II observation prospects for axionlike particle production from B meson annihilation decay*, *Phys. Rev. D* **109** (2024) 016008 [2306.03464].
- [38] M. Ovchinnikov, M.A. Schmidt and T. Schwetz, *Complementarity of $B \rightarrow K^{(*)}\mu\bar{\mu}$ and $B \rightarrow K^{(*)} + inv$ for searches of GeV-scale Higgs-like scalars*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83** (2023) 791 [2306.09508].
- [39] H. Ishida, S. Matsuzaki and Y. Shigekami, *New perspective in searching for axionlike particles from flavor physics*, *Phys. Rev. D* **103** (2021) 095022 [2006.02725].
- [40] B. Bhattacharya, A. Datta, D. Marfatia, S. Nandi and J. Waite, *Axion-like particles resolve the $B \rightarrow \pi K$ and $g - 2$ anomalies*, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021) L051701 [2104.03947].
- [41] K. Mimasu and V. Sanz, *ALPs at Colliders*, *JHEP* **06** (2015) 173 [1409.4792].
- [42] J. Jaeckel and M. Spannowsky, *Probing MeV to 90 GeV axion-like particles with LEP and LHC*, *Phys. Lett. B* **753** (2016) 482 [1509.00476].
- [43] S. Knapen, T. Lin, H.K. Lou and T. Melia, *Searching for Axionlike Particles with Ultrapерipheral Heavy-Ion Collisions*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **118** (2017) 171801 [1607.06083].
- [44] D.S.M. Alves and N. Weiner, *A viable QCD axion in the MeV mass range*, *JHEP* **07** (2018) 092 [1710.03764].
- [45] M.J. Dolan, T. Ferber, C. Hearty, F. Kahlhoefer and K. Schmidt-Hoberg, *Revised constraints and Belle II sensitivity for visible and invisible axion-like particles*, *JHEP* **12** (2017) 094 [1709.00009].
- [46] I. Brivio, M.B. Gavela, L. Merlo, K. Mimasu, J.M. No, R. del Rey et al., *ALPs Effective Field Theory and Collider Signatures*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77** (2017) 572 [1701.05379].
- [47] M. Bauer, M. Neubert and A. Thamm, *Collider Probes of Axion-Like Particles*, *JHEP* **12** (2017) 044 [1708.00443].
- [48] F. Björkeröth, E.J. Chun and S.F. King, *Flavourful Axion Phenomenology*, *JHEP* **08** (2018) 117 [1806.00660].
- [49] M. Bauer, M. Heiles, M. Neubert and A. Thamm, *Axion-Like Particles at Future Colliders*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79** (2019) 74 [1808.10323].
- [50] X. Cid Vidal, A. Mariotti, D. Redigolo, F. Sala and K. Tobioka, *New Axion Searches at Flavor Factories*, *JHEP* **01** (2019) 113 [1810.09452].
- [51] B. Döbrich, J. Jaeckel and T. Spadaro, *Light in the beam dump - ALP production from decay photons in proton beam-dumps*, *JHEP* **05** (2019) 213 [1904.02091].

- [52] L. Merlo, F. Pobbe, S. Rigolin and O. Sumensari, *Revisiting the production of ALPs at B-factories*, *JHEP* **06** (2019) 091 [1905.03259].
- [53] W. Altmannshofer, S. Gori and D.J. Robinson, *Constraining axionlike particles from rare pion decays*, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020) 075002 [1909.00005].
- [54] A. Hook, S. Kumar, Z. Liu and R. Sundrum, *High Quality QCD Axion and the LHC*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124** (2020) 221801 [1911.12364].
- [55] S. Gori, G. Perez and K. Tobioka, *KOTO vs. NA62 Dark Scalar Searches*, *JHEP* **08** (2020) 110 [2005.05170].
- [56] N. Blinov, E. Kowalczyk and M. Wynne, *Axion-like particle searches at DarkQuest*, *JHEP* **02** (2022) 036 [2112.09814].
- [57] S. Dreyer et al., *Physics reach of a long-lived particle detector at Belle II*, 2105.12962.
- [58] T. Bandyopadhyay, S. Ghosh and T.S. Roy, *ALP-Pions generalized*, *Phys. Rev. D* **105** (2022) 115039 [2112.13147].
- [59] J. Jerhot, B. Döbrich, F. Ertas, F. Kahlhoefer and T. Spadaro, *ALPINIST: Axion-Like Particles In Numerous Interactions Simulated and Tabulated*, *JHEP* **07** (2022) 094 [2201.05170].
- [60] W. Altmannshofer, J.A. Dror and S. Gori, *New Opportunities for Detecting Axion-Lepton Interactions*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **130** (2023) 241801 [2209.00665].
- [61] F. Acanfora, R. Franceschini, A. Mastroddi and D. Redigolo, *Fusing photons into nothing, a new search for invisible ALPs and Dark Matter at Belle II*, 2307.06369.
- [62] BELLE-II collaboration, *Evidence for $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ decays*, *Phys. Rev. D* **109** (2024) 112006 [2311.14647].
- [63] P. Colangelo, F. De Fazio, P. Santorelli and E. Scrimieri, *Rare $B \rightarrow K^{(*)} \nu \bar{\nu}$ decays at B factories*, *Phys. Lett. B* **395** (1997) 339 [hep-ph/9610297].
- [64] G. Buchalla, G. Hiller and G. Isidori, *Phenomenology of nonstandard Z couplings in exclusive semileptonic $b \rightarrow s$ transitions*, *Phys. Rev. D* **63** (2000) 014015 [hep-ph/0006136].
- [65] W. Altmannshofer, A.J. Buras, D.M. Straub and M. Wick, *New strategies for New Physics search in $B \rightarrow K^* \nu \bar{\nu}$, $B \rightarrow K \nu \bar{\nu}$ and $B \rightarrow X_s \nu \bar{\nu}$ decays*, *JHEP* **04** (2009) 022 [0902.0160].
- [66] A.J. Buras, J. Girrbach-Noe, C. Niehoff and D.M. Straub, *$B \rightarrow K^{(*)} \nu \bar{\nu}$ decays in the Standard Model and beyond*, *JHEP* **02** (2015) 184 [1409.4557].
- [67] T.E. Browder, N.G. Deshpande, R. Mandal and R. Sinha, *Impact of $B \rightarrow K \nu \bar{\nu}$ measurements on beyond the Standard Model theories*, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021) 053007 [2107.01080].

- [68] R. Bause, H. Gisbert, M. Golz and G. Hiller, *Interplay of dineutrino modes with semileptonic rare B -decays*, *JHEP* **12** (2021) 061 [2109.01675].
- [69] T. Felkl, S.L. Li and M.A. Schmidt, *A tale of invisibility: constraints on new physics in $b \rightarrow s\nu\nu$* , *JHEP* **12** (2021) 118 [2111.04327].
- [70] D. Bečirević, G. Piazza and O. Sumensari, *Revisiting $B \rightarrow K^{(*)}\nu\bar{\nu}$ decays in the Standard Model and beyond*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83** (2023) 252 [2301.06990].
- [71] P. Athron, R. Martinez and C. Sierra, *B meson anomalies and large $B^+ \rightarrow K^+\nu\bar{\nu}$ in non-universal $U(1)'$ models*, *JHEP* **02** (2024) 121 [2308.13426].
- [72] R. Bause, H. Gisbert and G. Hiller, *Implications of an enhanced $B \rightarrow K\nu\nu^-$ branching ratio*, *Phys. Rev. D* **109** (2024) 015006 [2309.00075].
- [73] L. Allwicher, D. Becirevic, G. Piazza, S. Rosauero-Alcaraz and O. Sumensari, *Understanding the first measurement of $B(B \rightarrow K\nu\nu^-)$* , *Phys. Lett. B* **848** (2024) 138411 [2309.02246].
- [74] T. Felkl, A. Giri, R. Mohanta and M.A. Schmidt, *When energy goes missing: new physics in $b \rightarrow s\nu\nu$ with sterile neutrinos*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83** (2023) 1135 [2309.02940].
- [75] H.K. Dreiner, J.Y. Günther and Z.S. Wang, *The Decay $B \rightarrow K\nu\bar{\nu}$ at Belle II and a Massless Bino in R -parity-violating Supersymmetry*, 2309.03727.
- [76] M. Abdughani and Y. Reyimuaji, *Constraining light dark matter and mediator with $B^+ \rightarrow K^+\nu\bar{\nu}$ data*, *Phys. Rev. D* **110** (2024) 055013 [2309.03706].
- [77] X.-G. He, X.-D. Ma and G. Valencia, *Revisiting models that enhance $B^+ \rightarrow K^+\nu\bar{\nu}$ in light of the new Belle II measurement*, *Phys. Rev. D* **109** (2024) 075019 [2309.12741].
- [78] A. Berezhnoy and D. Melikhov, *$B \rightarrow K^*M_X$ vs $B \rightarrow KM_X$ as a probe of a scalar-mediator dark matter scenario*, *EPL* **145** (2024) 14001 [2309.17191].
- [79] A. Datta, D. Marfatia and L. Mukherjee, *$B \rightarrow K\nu\nu^-$, MiniBooNE and muon $g-2$ anomalies from a dark sector*, *Phys. Rev. D* **109** (2024) L031701 [2310.15136].
- [80] W. Altmannshofer, A. Crivellin, H. Haigh, G. Inguglia and J. Martin Camalich, *Light new physics in $B \rightarrow K^{(*)}\nu\nu^-$?*, *Phys. Rev. D* **109** (2024) 075008 [2311.14629].
- [81] D. McKeen, J.N. Ng and D. Tuckler, *Higgs portal interpretation of the Belle II $B^+ \rightarrow K^+\nu\nu$ measurement*, *Phys. Rev. D* **109** (2024) 075006 [2312.00982].
- [82] K. Fridell, M. Ghosh, T. Okui and K. Tobioka, *Decoding the $B \rightarrow K\nu\nu$ excess at Belle II: Kinematics, operators, and masses*, *Phys. Rev. D* **109** (2024) 115006 [2312.12507].

- [83] S.-Y. Ho, J. Kim and P. Ko, *Recent $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ Excess and Muon $g - 2$ Illuminating Light Dark Sector with Higgs Portal*, 2401.10112.
- [84] E. Gabrielli, L. Marzola, K. Mürsepp and M. Raidal, *Explaining the $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ excess via a massless dark photon*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **84** (2024) 460 [2402.05901].
- [85] T. Li, Z. Qian, M.A. Schmidt and M. Yuan, *The quark flavor-violating ALPs in light of B mesons and hadron colliders*, *JHEP* **05** (2024) 232 [2402.14232].
- [86] B.-F. Hou, X.-Q. Li, M. Shen, Y.-D. Yang and X.-B. Yuan, *Deciphering the Belle II data on $B \rightarrow K \nu \bar{\nu}$ decay in the (dark) SMEFT with minimal flavour violation*, *JHEP* **06** (2024) 172 [2402.19208].
- [87] X.-G. He, X.-D. Ma, M.A. Schmidt, G. Valencia and R.R. Volkas, *Scalar dark matter explanation of the excess in the Belle II $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ +$ invisible measurement*, *JHEP* **07** (2024) 168 [2403.12485].
- [88] P.D. Bolton, S. Fajfer, J.F. Kamenik and M. Novoa-Brunet, *Signatures of light new particles in $B \rightarrow K^{(*)} E_{miss}$* , *Phys. Rev. D* **110** (2024) 055001 [2403.13887].
- [89] D. Marzocca, M. Nardecchia, A. Stanzione and C. Toni, *Implications of $B \rightarrow K \nu \bar{\nu}$ under Rank-One Flavor Violation hypothesis*, 2404.06533.
- [90] M. Aghaie, G. Armando, A. Conaci, A. Dondarini, P. Matak, P. Panci et al., *Axion dark matter from heavy quarks*, *Phys. Lett. B* **856** (2024) 138923 [2404.12199].
- [91] S. Rosauero-Alcaraz and L.P.S. Leal, *Disentangling left and right-handed neutrino effects in $B \rightarrow K^{(*)} \nu \nu$* , *Eur. Phys. J. C* **84** (2024) 795 [2404.17440].
- [92] J.F. Eguren, S. Klingel, E. Stamou, M. Tabet and R. Ziegler, *Flavor phenomenology of light dark vectors*, *JHEP* **08** (2024) 111 [2405.00108].
- [93] A.J. Buras, J. Harz and M.A. Mojahed, *Disentangling new physics in $K \rightarrow \pi \nu \bar{\nu}$ and $B \rightarrow K (K^*) \nu \bar{\nu}$ observables*, *JHEP* **10** (2024) 087 [2405.06742].
- [94] C. Hati, J. Leite, N. Nath and J.W.F. Valle, *The QCD axion, colour-mediated neutrino masses, and $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ + E_{miss}$ anomaly*, 2408.00060.
- [95] Z.S. Wang, Y. Zhang and W. Liu, *Long-lived sterile neutrinos from an axionlike particle at Belle II*, 2410.00491.
- [96] BABAR collaboration, *Search for an Axionlike Particle in B Meson Decays*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128** (2022) 131802 [2111.01800].
- [97] B. Bhattacharya, A. Datta, D. Marfatia, S. Nandi and J. Waite, *Axion-like particles resolve the $B \rightarrow \pi K$ and $g - 2$ anomalies*, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021) L051701 [2104.03947].

- [98] M. Gronau, O.F. Hernandez, D. London and J.L. Rosner, *Decays of B mesons to two light pseudoscalars*, *Phys. Rev. D* **50** (1994) 4529 [[hep-ph/9404283](#)].
- [99] M. Gronau, O.F. Hernandez, D. London and J.L. Rosner, *Electroweak penguins and two-body B decays*, *Phys. Rev. D* **52** (1995) 6374 [[hep-ph/9504327](#)].
- [100] R. Fleischer and T. Mannel, *Constraining the CKM angle γ and penguin contributions through combined $B \rightarrow \pi K$ branching ratios*, *Phys. Rev. D* **57** (1998) 2752 [[hep-ph/9704423](#)].
- [101] M. Gronau and J.L. Rosner, *Weak phase γ from ratio of $B \rightarrow K\pi$ rates*, *Phys. Rev. D* **57** (1998) 6843 [[hep-ph/9711246](#)].
- [102] M. Neubert and J.L. Rosner, *New bound on γ from $B^\pm \rightarrow \pi K$ decays*, *Phys. Lett. B* **441** (1998) 403 [[hep-ph/9808493](#)].
- [103] M. Neubert and J.L. Rosner, *Determination of the weak phase γ from rate measurements in $B^\pm \rightarrow \pi K$, $\pi\pi$ decays*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81** (1998) 5076 [[hep-ph/9809311](#)].
- [104] M. Gronau and J.L. Rosner, *Rate and CP-asymmetry sum rules in $B \rightarrow K\pi$* , *Phys. Rev. D* **74** (2006) 057503 [[hep-ph/0608040](#)].
- [105] G. Buchalla, A.J. Buras and M.E. Lautenbacher, *Weak decays beyond leading logarithms*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **68** (1996) 1125 [[hep-ph/9512380](#)].
- [106] M. Gronau, D. Pirjol and T.-M. Yan, *Model independent electroweak penguins in B decays to two pseudoscalars*, *Phys. Rev. D* **60** (1999) 034021 [[hep-ph/9810482](#)].
- [107] L.-L. Chau, H.-Y. Cheng, W.K. Sze, H. Yao and B. Tseng, *Charmless nonleptonic rare decays of B mesons*, *Phys. Rev. D* **43** (1991) 2176.
- [108] M. Gronau, *A Precise sum rule among four $B \rightarrow K\pi$ CP asymmetries*, *Phys. Lett. B* **627** (2005) 82 [[hep-ph/0508047](#)].
- [109] M. Gronau, O.F. Hernandez, D. London and J.L. Rosner, *Broken $SU(3)$ symmetry in two-body B decays*, *Phys. Rev. D* **52** (1995) 6356 [[hep-ph/9504326](#)].
- [110] Y.-Y. Keum and H.-n. Li, *Nonleptonic charmless B decays: Factorization versus perturbative QCD*, *Phys. Rev. D* **63** (2001) 074006 [[hep-ph/0006001](#)].
- [111] M. Beneke, G. Buchalla, M. Neubert and C.T. Sachrajda, *QCD factorization for exclusive, nonleptonic B meson decays: General arguments and the case of heavy light final states*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **591** (2000) 313 [[hep-ph/0006124](#)].
- [112] M. Beneke, G. Buchalla, M. Neubert and C.T. Sachrajda, *QCD factorization in $B \rightarrow \pi K$, $\pi\pi$ decays and extraction of Wolfenstein parameters*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **606** (2001) 245

- [hep-ph/0104110].
- [113] H.-n. Li and S. Mishima, *Possible resolution of the $B \rightarrow \pi\pi$, πK puzzles*, *Phys. Rev. D* **83** (2011) 034023 [0901.1272].
- [114] C.W. Bauer, I.Z. Rothstein and I.W. Stewart, *SCET analysis of $B \rightarrow K\pi$, $B \rightarrow K\bar{K}$, and $B \rightarrow \pi\pi$ decays*, *Phys. Rev. D* **74** (2006) 034010 [hep-ph/0510241].
- [115] K. Huitu and S. Khalil, *New Physics contribution to $B \rightarrow K\pi$ decays in SCET*, *Phys. Rev. D* **81** (2010) 095008 [0911.1868].
- [116] M. Gronau and J.L. Rosner, *Combining CP asymmetries in $B \rightarrow K\pi$ decays*, *Phys. Rev. D* **59** (1999) 113002 [hep-ph/9809384].
- [117] BELLE collaboration, *Measurements of branching fractions and direct CP asymmetries for $B \rightarrow K\pi$, $B \rightarrow \pi\pi$ and $B \rightarrow KK$ decays*, *Phys. Rev. D* **87** (2013) 031103 [1210.1348].
- [118] LHCb collaboration, *Measurement of CP Violation in the Decay $B^+ \rightarrow K^+\pi^0$* , *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126** (2021) 091802 [2012.12789].
- [119] BELLE-II collaboration, *Measurement of branching fractions and direct CP asymmetries for $B \rightarrow K\pi$ and $B \rightarrow \pi\pi$ decays at Belle II*, *Phys. Rev. D* **109** (2024) 012001 [2310.06381].
- [120] C. Bobeth, M. Gorbahn and S. Vickers, *Weak annihilation and new physics in charmless $B \rightarrow MM$ decays*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **75** (2015) 340 [1409.3252].
- [121] T. Huber and G. Tetlalmatzi-Xolocotzi, *Estimating QCD-factorization amplitudes through $SU(3)$ symmetry in $B \rightarrow PP$ decays*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82** (2022) 210 [2111.06418].
- [122] S. Baek, P. Hamel, D. London, A. Datta and D.A. Suprun, *The $B \rightarrow \pi K$ puzzle and new physics*, *Phys. Rev. D* **71** (2005) 057502 [hep-ph/0412086].
- [123] A. Datta and D. London, *Measuring new physics parameters in B penguin decays*, *Phys. Lett. B* **595** (2004) 453 [hep-ph/0404130].
- [124] M. Neubert, *Rescattering effects, isospin relations and electroweak penguins in $B \rightarrow \pi K$ decays*, *Phys. Lett. B* **424** (1998) 152 [hep-ph/9712224].
- [125] D. Atwood and A. Soni, *The Possibility of large direct CP violation in $B \rightarrow K\pi$ - like modes due to long distance rescattering effects and implications for the angle γ* , *Phys. Rev. D* **58** (1998) 036005 [hep-ph/9712287].
- [126] A.J. Buras, R. Fleischer and T. Mannel, *Penguin topologies, rescattering effects and penguin hunting with $B_{u,d} \rightarrow K\bar{K}$ and $B^\pm \rightarrow \pi^\pm K$* , *Nucl. Phys. B* **533** (1998) 3 [hep-ph/9711262].

- [127] A.J. Buras and R. Fleischer, *Constraints on the CKM angle γ and strong phases from $B \rightarrow \pi K$ decays*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **16** (2000) 97 [[hep-ph/0003323](#)].
- [128] A.F. Falk, A.L. Kagan, Y. Nir and A.A. Petrov, *Final state interactions and new physics in $B \rightarrow \pi K$ decays*, *Phys. Rev. D* **57** (1998) 4290 [[hep-ph/9712225](#)].
- [129] H.-Y. Cheng, C.-K. Chua and A. Soni, *Final state interactions in hadronic B decays*, *Phys. Rev. D* **71** (2005) 014030 [[hep-ph/0409317](#)].
- [130] A.J. Buras and L. Silvestrini, *Nonleptonic two-body B decays beyond factorization*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **569** (2000) 3 [[hep-ph/9812392](#)].
- [131] C.W. Bauer and D. Pirjol, *Graphical amplitudes from SCET*, *Phys. Lett. B* **604** (2004) 183 [[hep-ph/0408161](#)].
- [132] C.W. Bauer, D. Pirjol, I.Z. Rothstein and I.W. Stewart, *$B \rightarrow M_1 M_2$: Factorization, charming penguins, strong phases, and polarization*, *Phys. Rev. D* **70** (2004) 054015 [[hep-ph/0401188](#)].
- [133] A.N. Kamal, *Long range final state interactions and direct CP asymmetry in $B^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ K^0$ decay*, *Phys. Rev. D* **60** (1999) 094018 [[hep-ph/9901342](#)].
- [134] H.-Y. Cheng, C.-K. Chua and A. Soni, *Effects of final-state interactions on mixing-induced CP violation in penguin-dominated B decays*, *Phys. Rev. D* **72** (2005) 014006 [[hep-ph/0502235](#)].
- [135] M. Ciuchini, E. Franco, G. Martinelli, M. Pierini and L. Silvestrini, *Charming penguins strike back*, *Phys. Lett. B* **515** (2001) 33 [[hep-ph/0104126](#)].
- [136] M. Ciuchini, E. Franco, G. Martinelli, M. Pierini and L. Silvestrini, *Searching For New Physics With $B \rightarrow K\pi$ Decays*, *Phys. Lett. B* **674** (2009) 197 [[0811.0341](#)].
- [137] N.B. Beaudry, A. Datta, D. London, A. Rashed and J.-S. Roux, *The $B \rightarrow \pi K$ puzzle revisited*, *JHEP* **01** (2018) 074 [[1709.07142](#)].
- [138] R. Fleischer, R. Jaarsma and K.K. Vos, *Towards new frontiers with $B \rightarrow \pi K$ decays*, *Phys. Lett. B* **785** (2018) 525 [[1712.02323](#)].
- [139] R. Fleischer, R. Jaarsma, E. Malami and K.K. Vos, *Exploring $B \rightarrow \pi\pi, \pi K$ decays at the high-precision frontier*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **78** (2018) 943 [[1806.08783](#)].
- [140] A. Kundu, S.K. Patra and S. Roy, *Complete analysis of all $B \rightarrow \pi K$ decays*, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021) 095025 [[2106.15633](#)].
- [141] Y.Y. Keum, H.-N. Li and A.I. Sanda, *Penguin enhancement and $B \rightarrow K\pi$ decays in perturbative QCD*, *Phys. Rev. D* **63** (2001) 054008 [[hep-ph/0004173](#)].

- [142] M. Beneke and M. Neubert, *QCD factorization for $B \rightarrow PP$ and $B \rightarrow PV$ decays*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **675** (2003) 333 [hep-ph/0308039].
- [143] Q. Chang, X.-Q. Li and Y.-D. Yang, *Revisiting $B \rightarrow \pi K$, πK^* and ρK Decays: Direct CP Violation and Implication for New Physics*, *JHEP* **09** (2008) 038 [0807.4295].
- [144] H.-Y. Cheng and C.-K. Chua, *Resolving B-CP Puzzles in QCD Factorization*, *Phys. Rev. D* **80** (2009) 074031 [0908.3506].
- [145] H.-n. Li and S. Mishima, *Glauber gluons in spectator amplitudes for $B \rightarrow \pi M$ decays*, *Phys. Rev. D* **90** (2014) 074018 [1407.7647].
- [146] X. Liu, H.-n. Li and Z.-J. Xiao, *Resolving the $B \rightarrow K\pi$ puzzle by Glauber-gluon effects*, *Phys. Rev. D* **93** (2016) 014024 [1510.05910].
- [147] H.-n. Li, S. Mishima and A.I. Sanda, *Resolution to the $B \rightarrow \pi K$ puzzle*, *Phys. Rev. D* **72** (2005) 114005 [hep-ph/0508041].
- [148] C.S. Kim, S. Oh and Y.W. Yoon, *Analytic resolution of puzzle in $B \rightarrow K\pi$ decays*, *Phys. Lett. B* **665** (2008) 231 [0707.2967].
- [149] A.J. Buras, F. Parodi and A. Stocchi, *The CKM matrix and the unitarity triangle: Another look*, *JHEP* **01** (2003) 029 [hep-ph/0207101].
- [150] BELLE-II, BELLE collaboration, *Determination of the CKM angle ϕ_3 from a combination of Belle and Belle II results*, 2404.12817.
- [151] P. Ball and R. Zwicky, *New results on $B \rightarrow \pi, K, \eta$ decay formfactors from light-cone sum rules*, *Phys. Rev. D* **71** (2005) 014015 [hep-ph/0406232].
- [152] N. Gubernari, M. Reboud, D. van Dyk and J. Virto, *Dispersive analysis of $B \rightarrow K^{(*)}$ and $B_s \rightarrow \phi$ form factors*, *JHEP* **12** (2023) 153 [2305.06301].
- [153] W. Parrott, C. Bouchard and C. Davies, *The search for new physics in $B \rightarrow K\ell^+\ell^-$ and $B \rightarrow K\nu\bar{\nu}$ using precise lattice QCD form factors*, *PoS LATTICE2022* (2023) 421 [2210.10898].
- [154] M. Bauer, M. Neubert, S. Renner, M. Schnubel and A. Thamm, *The Low-Energy Effective Theory of Axions and ALPs*, *JHEP* **04** (2021) 063 [2012.12272].
- [155] A. Heidelberg, *Sensitivity Study in the Search for $B^\pm \rightarrow K^\pm a$ (displaced $a \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$) decays at Belle II*, .
- [156] BABAR collaboration, *Search for $B \rightarrow K^{(*)}\nu\bar{\nu}$ and invisible quarkonium decays*, *Phys. Rev. D* **87** (2013) 112005 [1303.7465].

- [157] CHARM collaboration, *A Search for Decays of Heavy Neutrinos in the Mass Range 0.5-GeV to 2.8-GeV*, *Phys. Lett. B* **166** (1986) 473.
- [158] CHARM collaboration, *Search for Axion Like Particle Production in 400-GeV Proton - Copper Interactions*, *Phys. Lett. B* **157** (1985) 458.
- [159] J. Blumlein et al., *Limits on neutral light scalar and pseudoscalar particles in a proton beam dump experiment*, *Z. Phys. C* **51** (1991) 341.
- [160] M.E. Duffy et al., *Neutrino Production by 400-GeV/c Protons in a Beam-dump Experiment*, *Phys. Rev. D* **38** (1988) 2032.
- [161] M. Ovchinnikov, J.-L. Tastet, O. Mikulenko and K. Bondarenko, *Sensitivities to feebly interacting particles: Public and unified calculations*, *Phys. Rev. D* **108** (2023) 075028 [2305.13383].
- [162] H. Abramowicz et al., *Conceptual design report for the LUXE experiment*, *Eur. Phys. J. ST* **230** (2021) 2445 [2102.02032].
- [163] Z. Bai et al., *New physics searches with an optical dump at LUXE*, *Phys. Rev. D* **106** (2022) 115034 [2107.13554].
- [164] S. Alekhin et al., *A facility to Search for Hidden Particles at the CERN SPS: the SHiP physics case*, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **79** (2016) 124201 [1504.04855].
- [165] J.L. Feng, I. Galon, F. Kling and S. Trojanowski, *Axionlike particles at FASER: The LHC as a photon beam dump*, *Phys. Rev. D* **98** (2018) 055021 [1806.02348].
- [166] C. O'Hare, "cajohare/axionlimits: Axionlimits." <https://cajohare.github.io/AxionLimits/>, July, 2020. 10.5281/zenodo.3932430.
- [167] C. Lourenco and H.K. Wohri, *Heavy flavour hadro-production from fixed-target to collider energies*, *Phys. Rept.* **433** (2006) 127 [hep-ph/0609101].
- [168] J.D. Clarke, R. Foot and R.R. Volkas, *Phenomenology of a very light scalar ($100 \text{ MeV} < m_h < 10 \text{ GeV}$) mixing with the SM Higgs*, *JHEP* **02** (2014) 123 [1310.8042].
- [169] SHiP collaboration, *Sensitivity of the SHiP experiment to Heavy Neutral Leptons*, *JHEP* **04** (2019) 077 [1811.00930].
- [170] C.e.a. Ahdida, *Post-LS3 Experimental Options in ECN3*, .
- [171] SHiP collaboration, *BDF/SHiP at the ECN3 high-intensity beam facility*, .
- [172] SHiPCOLLABORATION collaboration, *Heavy Flavour Cascade Production in a Beam Dump*, .
- [173] V.M. Budnev, I.F. Ginzburg, G.V. Meledin and V.G. Serbo, *The Two photon particle production mechanism. Physical problems. Applications. Equivalent photon approximation*, *Phys. Rept.* **15**

- (1975) 181.
- [174] B. Döbrich, J. Jaeckel, F. Kahlhoefer, A. Ringwald and K. Schmidt-Hoberg, *ALPtraum: ALP production in proton beam dump experiments*, *JHEP* **02** (2016) 018 [1512.03069].
- [175] D. Aloni, C. Fanelli, Y. Soreq and M. Williams, *Photoproduction of Axionlike Particles*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123** (2019) 071801 [1903.03586].
- [176] L. Harland-Lang, J. Jaeckel and M. Spannowsky, *A fresh look at ALP searches in fixed target experiments*, *Phys. Lett. B* **793** (2019) 281 [1902.04878].
- [177] R.R. Dusaev, D.V. Kirpichnikov and M.M. Kirsanov, *Photoproduction of axionlike particles in the NA64 experiment*, *Phys. Rev. D* **102** (2020) 055018 [2004.04469].
- [178] R. Balkin, O. Hen, W. Li, H. Liu, T. Ma, Y. Soreq et al., *Probing axion-like particles at the Electron-Ion Collider*, *JHEP* **02** (2024) 123 [2310.08827].
- [179] Q.-f. Wu and X.-J. Xu, *A comprehensive calculation of the Primakoff process and the solar axion flux*, 2402.16083.
- [180] Y.-S. Liu, D. McKeen and G.A. Miller, *Validity of the Weizsäcker-Williams approximation and the analysis of beam dump experiments: Production of a new scalar boson*, *Phys. Rev. D* **95** (2017) 036010 [1609.06781].
- [181] Y.-S. Liu and G.A. Miller, *Validity of the Weizsäcker-Williams approximation and the analysis of beam dump experiments: Production of an axion, a dark photon, or a new axial-vector boson*, *Phys. Rev. D* **96** (2017) 016004 [1705.01633].
- [182] M.I. Vysotskii and E. Zhemchugov, *Equivalent photons in proton and ion—ion collisions at the LHC*, *Phys. Usp.* **62** (2019) 910 [1806.07238].
- [183] Z.-L. Ma, Z. Lu and L. Zhang, *Validity of equivalent photon spectra and the photoproduction processes in p-p collisions*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **974** (2022) 115645 [2112.14399].