

Updated NLL Results for $\bar{B} \rightarrow X_{s,d}\gamma$ in and beyond the SM*

T. Hurth^{a1}, E. Lunghi², and W. Porod²

¹ Theoretical Physics Division, CERN, CH-1211 Geneva 23, Switzerland and
SLAC, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94309, USA

² Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Zurich, CH-8057 Zurich, Switzerland

Abstract. We present general model-independent formulae for the branching ratios and the direct tagged CP asymmetries for the inclusive $\bar{B} \rightarrow X_d\gamma$ and $\bar{B} \rightarrow X_s\gamma$ modes. We also update the corresponding SM predictions.

PACS. 12.38.Cy, 13.66.Jn, 13.20.He, 11.30.Er

1 Introduction

In the near future more precise data on the inclusive decay $B \rightarrow X_s\gamma$ is expected from the B factories, but also the present experimental accuracy already reached the 10% level as reflected [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6] in the world average of the present measurements:

$$\mathcal{B}(\bar{B} \rightarrow X_s\gamma) = (3.34 \pm 0.38) \times 10^{-4}. \quad (1)$$

In addition, direct CP asymmetries within this mode are now within experimental reach [7, 8]:

$$A_{\text{CP}}(\bar{B} \rightarrow X_s\gamma) = \begin{cases} -0.079 \pm 0.108_{\text{stat}} \pm 0.022_{\text{syst}} \\ -0.004 \pm 0.051_{\text{stat}} \pm 0.038_{\text{syst}} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

In the first measurement of CLEO, and also in the more recent measurement of BELLE, there is a small contamination of the $\bar{B} \rightarrow X_d\gamma$ mode.

All these measurements are compatible with the standard model (SM) predictions and thus lead to severe constraints on new physics models [9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14], which represents very valuable information for the direct search for physics beyond the SM (for recent reviews, see [15, 16, 17]).

A direct measurement of the inclusive $\bar{B} \rightarrow X_d\gamma$ mode is rather difficult, but perhaps still within the reach of the present high-luminosity B factories. However, the CP violation within that mode can be perhaps tested indirectly by an untagged CP measurement (see below).

In this letter we present general model-independent formulae for the branching ratios and the direct tagged CP asymmetries for the inclusive $\bar{B} \rightarrow X_{s,d}\gamma$ modes as explicit

numerical expressions for these observables as functions of Wilson coefficients and CKM angles. The extraction of the latter from experimental data depends critically on the assumptions about the presence and the structure of new physics contributions to several key observables.

For this purpose we update and generalize the SM results at NLL level given in Refs. [18, 19] and [20, 21, 22] in order to accommodate new physics models with new CP-violating phases and also implement several improvements. For a detailed discussion of our results we refer the reader to a forthcoming paper [23].

2 NLL Predictions

The general effective hamiltonian that governs the inclusive $\bar{B} \rightarrow X_q\gamma$ decays ($q = d, s$) in the SM is

$$H_{\text{eff}}(b \rightarrow q\gamma) = -\frac{4G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{tb} V_{tq}^* \times \quad (3)$$

$$\times \left(\sum_{i=1}^8 C_i \mathcal{O}_i + \epsilon_q \sum_{i=1}^2 C_i (\mathcal{O}_i - \mathcal{O}_i^u) \right)$$

where $\epsilon_q = (V_{ub} V_{uq}^*) / (V_{tb} V_{tq}^*)$ and the most relevant operators are:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_1 &= (\bar{q}_L \gamma_\mu T^a c_L) (\bar{c}_L \gamma^\mu T^a b_L), \\ \mathcal{O}_1^u &= (\bar{q}_L \gamma_\mu T^a u_L) (\bar{u}_L \gamma^\mu T^a b_L), \\ \mathcal{O}_2 &= (\bar{s}_L \gamma_\mu c_L) (\bar{c}_L \gamma^\mu b_L), \\ \mathcal{O}_2^u &= (\bar{s}_L \gamma_\mu u_L) (\bar{u}_L \gamma^\mu b_L), \\ \mathcal{O}_7 &= (e/16\pi^2) m_b (\bar{s}_L \sigma^{\mu\nu} b_R) F_{\mu\nu} \\ \mathcal{O}_8 &= (g_s/16\pi^2) m_b (\bar{s}_L \sigma^{\mu\nu} T^a b_R) G_{\mu\nu}^a. \end{aligned}$$

The subscripts L and R refer to left- and right-handed components of the fermion fields. In $b \rightarrow s$ transitions the

* Contribution to the International Europhysics Conference on High Energy Physics EPS03, 17-23 July 2003, Aachen, Germany, presented by T.H.

^a Heisenberg Fellow

contributions proportional to ϵ_s are rather small, while in $b \rightarrow d$ decays the ϵ_d term is of the same order as the first term in effective hamiltonian.

Regarding the input parameters we focus here on the issue of the charm mass definition in the matrix element of \mathcal{O}_2 : In Ref. [18], it is argued that all the factors of m_c come from propagators corresponding to charm quarks that are off-shell by an amount $\mu^2 \sim m_b^2$. It seems, therefore, more reasonable to use the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ running charm mass at a scale μ in the range (m_c, m_b) . The reference values of the charm and bottom masses are $m_c = m_c^{\overline{\text{MS}}}(m_c^{\overline{\text{MS}}}) = (1.25 \pm 0.10)$ GeV and $m_b = m_b^{1S}$, where the $1S$ mass of the b meson is defined as half of the perturbative contribution to the Υ mass as usual: $m_b^{1S} = (4.69 \pm 0.03)$ GeV. We first fix the central value of $m_c = 1.25$ GeV and vary μ ; then we add in quadrature the error on m_c ($\delta_{m_c} = 8\%$). The resulting determination is:

$$\frac{m_c}{m_b} = 0.23 \pm 0.05. \quad (4)$$

The pole mass choice corresponds, on the other hand, to $\frac{m_c}{m_b} = 0.29 \pm 0.02$. Note that the question whether to use the running or the pole mass is, strictly speaking, a NNLL issue. The most conservative position consists in accepting any value of m_c/m_b that is compatible with any of these two determinations: $0.18 \leq m_c/m_b \leq 0.31$. Taking into account our experience on higher-loop computations, we are led to the educated guess that the central value $m_c/m_b = 0.23$ represents the best possible choice, but we allow for a large asymmetric error that fully covers the above range (and that reminds us of this problem that can be solved only via a NNLL computation):

$$\frac{m_c}{m_b} = 0.23_{-0.05}^{+0.08}. \quad (5)$$

We present our SM updates for two different energy cuts within the photon spectrum $E_0 = (1.6 \text{ GeV}, m_b/20)$. There are four sources of uncertainties: the charm mass (δ_{m_c/m_b}), the CKM factors ($\delta_{\text{CKM}}(s) = 0.5\%$, $\delta_{\text{CKM}}(d) = 11\%$), the parametric uncertainty, including that of the overall normalization, α_s and m_t (δ_{param}), and the perturbative scale uncertainty (δ_{scale}):

$$\mathcal{B}(\bar{B} \rightarrow X_s\gamma; E_\gamma > 1.6 \text{ GeV}) \times 10^4 = (3.56 \pm 0.24_{-0.40}^{+0.24} \left| \frac{m_c}{m_b} \right. \pm 0.02_{\text{CKM}} \pm 0.24_{\text{param.}} \pm 0.14_{\text{scale}}) \quad (6)$$

$$\mathcal{B}(\bar{B} \rightarrow X_d\gamma; E_\gamma > 1.6 \text{ GeV}) \times 10^5 = (1.36 \pm 0.14_{-0.21}^{+0.14} \left| \frac{m_c}{m_b} \right. \pm 0.15_{\text{CKM}} \pm 0.09_{\text{param.}} \pm 0.05_{\text{scale}}) \quad (7)$$

$$\mathcal{B}(\bar{B} \rightarrow X_s\gamma; E_\gamma > m_b/20) \times 10^4 = (3.74 \pm 0.26_{-0.44}^{+0.26} \left| \frac{m_c}{m_b} \right. \pm 0.02_{\text{CKM}} \pm 0.25_{\text{param.}} \pm 0.15_{\text{scale}}) \quad (8)$$

$$\mathcal{B}(\bar{B} \rightarrow X_d\gamma; E_\gamma > m_b/20) \times 10^5 = (1.44 \pm 0.15_{-0.23}^{+0.15} \left| \frac{m_c}{m_b} \right. \pm 0.16_{\text{CKM}} \pm 0.10_{\text{param.}} \pm 0.06_{\text{scale}}). \quad (9)$$

The CKM uncertainties are almost negligible in $b \rightarrow s\gamma$ transitions but play an important role in $b \rightarrow d\gamma$ ones. This implies the large impact on the CKM phenomenology of the latter.

The direct CP asymmetries in $\bar{B} \rightarrow X_q\gamma$ are defined by

$$A_{CP}^{b \rightarrow q\gamma} \equiv \frac{\Gamma[\bar{B} \rightarrow X_q\gamma] - \Gamma[B \rightarrow X_{\bar{q}}\gamma]}{\Gamma[\bar{B} \rightarrow X_q\gamma] + \Gamma[B \rightarrow X_{\bar{q}}\gamma]}. \quad (10)$$

It was shown that the CP asymmetry in the $b \rightarrow s$ mode is below 1% [20,21,22] within the SM. This small value is a result of three suppression factors. There is an α_s factor needed in order to have a strong phase; moreover, there is a CKM suppression of order λ^2 and there is a GIM suppression of order $(m_c/m_b)^2$, reflecting the fact that in the limit $m_c = m_u$ any CP asymmetry in the SM would vanish. Within the SM the CP asymmetry in the $b \rightarrow d$ mode is enhanced, with respect to the one in the $b \rightarrow s$ mode, by the CKM factor $[\lambda^2((1-\rho)^2 + \eta^2)]^{-1}$.

We update the SM predictions, which are essentially independent of the photon energy cut-off (E_0) and get (for $E_0 = 1.6 \text{ GeV}$):

$$A_{CP}^{b \rightarrow s\gamma} = (0.42 \pm 0.08_{-0.08}^{+0.08} \left| \frac{m_c}{m_b} \right. \pm 0.03_{\text{CKM}} \pm 0.15_{-0.08}^{+0.15} \left| \text{scale} \right.)\% \quad (11)$$

$$A_{CP}^{b \rightarrow d\gamma} = (-9.9 \pm 1.8_{-1.9}^{+1.8} \left| \frac{m_c}{m_b} \right. \pm 1.0_{\text{CKM}} \pm 3.5_{-3.5}^{+1.9} \left| \text{scale} \right.)\%. \quad (12)$$

The additional parametric uncertainties are subdominant. However, the scale uncertainties are rather large because the CP asymmetries arise at the $O(\alpha_s)$ only. This purely perturbative uncertainty can be removed by a NNLL QCD calculation.

The so-called untagged CP asymmetry $A_{CP}^{b \rightarrow (s+d)\gamma}$ is the favoured observable, at least from the theoretical point of view. A simple expression of this observable is given by

$$A_{CP}^{b \rightarrow (s+d)\gamma} = \frac{A_{CP}^{b \rightarrow s\gamma} + R_{ds} A_{CP}^{b \rightarrow d\gamma}}{1 + R_{ds}}, \quad (13)$$

$$R_{ds} = \Sigma\Gamma_d/\Sigma\Gamma_s, \quad \Sigma\Gamma_q := \Gamma(\bar{B} \rightarrow X_q\gamma) + \Gamma(B \rightarrow X_{\bar{q}}\gamma).$$

As was first noticed in [24], the untagged CP asymmetry vanishes within the SM if the U-spin limit is considered. This is a direct consequence of CKM unitarity. Within the inclusive channels, one can rely on parton-hadron duality and can actually compute the U-spin breaking by keeping a non-vanishing strange quark mass [25]. In [26] U-spin breaking effects were estimated and found to be completely negligible, even beyond the leading partonic contribution within the heavy mass expansion. Thus, the measurement of the untagged CP asymmetry provides a very clean SM test, whether generic new CP phases are active or not. Any significant deviation from the SM zero prediction would be a direct hint of non-CKM contributions to CP violation. An analysis of the untagged asymmetry within various new physics scenarios will be presented in [23].

3 Model-independent Formulae

We assume within our model-independent analysis of new physics effects that the dominant ones only modify the Wilson coefficients of the dipole operators \mathcal{O}_7 and \mathcal{O}_8 and also

introduce contributions proportional to the corresponding operators with opposite chirality:

$$\mathcal{O}_7^R = (e/16\pi^2) m_b (\bar{q}_R \sigma_{\mu\nu} b_L) F^{\mu\nu}, \quad (14)$$

$$\mathcal{O}_8^R = (g_s/16\pi^2) m_b (\bar{q}_R T^a \sigma_{\mu\nu} b_L) G^{a\mu\nu}. \quad (15)$$

This is known as a very good approximation for the most relevant new physics scenarios.

Within our model-independent formulae for the branching ratios and CP asymmetries, the Wilson coefficients $C_{7,8(R)}$ and $C_{7,8}$ and all the CKM ratios are left unspecified. The explicit derivation of the formulae given below can be found in [23]. The branching ratio can be written as

$$\mathcal{B}(\bar{B} \rightarrow X_q \gamma) = \frac{\mathcal{N}}{100} \left| \frac{V_{tq}^* V_{tb}}{V_{cb}} \right|^2 \mathcal{B}^{\text{unn}}, \quad (16)$$

where $\mathcal{N} = 2.567 (1 \pm 0.064) \times 10^{-3}$ is an overall normalization factor, the ratios $R_{7,8}$ and $\tilde{R}_{7,8}$ are

$$R_{7,8} = \frac{(C_{7,8}^{(0)\text{SM}} + C_{7,8}^{(0)\text{NP}})(\mu_0)}{C_{7,8}^{(0)\text{SM}}(m_t)}, \quad \tilde{R}_{7,8} = \frac{C_{7,8}^{(0)\text{NP}}(\mu_0)}{C_{7,8}^{(0)\text{SM}}(m_t)},$$

and the unnormalized branching ratio is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}^{\text{unn}} = & \left[a + a_{77} (|R_7|^2 + |\tilde{R}_7|^2) + a_7^r \text{Re}(R_7) + a_7^i \text{Im}(R_7) \right. \\ & + a_{88} (|R_8|^2 + |\tilde{R}_8|^2) + a_8^r \text{Re}(R_8) + a_8^i \text{Im}(R_8) \\ & + a_{e\epsilon} |\epsilon_q|^2 + a_\epsilon^r \text{Re}(\epsilon_q) + a_\epsilon^i \text{Im}(\epsilon_q) + a_{87}^r \text{Re}(R_8 R_7^* + \tilde{R}_8 \tilde{R}_7^*) \\ & + a_{7\epsilon}^r \text{Re}(R_7 \epsilon_q^*) + a_{8\epsilon}^r \text{Re}(R_8 \epsilon_q^*) + a_{87}^i \text{Im}(R_8 R_7^* + \tilde{R}_8 \tilde{R}_7^*) \\ & \left. + a_{7\epsilon}^i \text{Im}(R_7 \epsilon_q^*) + a_{8\epsilon}^i \text{Im}(R_8 \epsilon_q^*) \right]. \quad (17) \end{aligned}$$

The CP asymmetry is given by

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\text{CP}}^{b \rightarrow q \gamma} = & \frac{1}{\mathcal{B}_{\text{LL}}^{\text{unn}}} \text{Im} \left[a_7^i R_7 + a_8^i R_8 + a_\epsilon^i \epsilon_q \right. \\ & \left. + a_{87}^i (R_8 R_7^* + \tilde{R}_8 \tilde{R}_7^*) + a_{7\epsilon}^i R_7 \epsilon_q^* + a_{8\epsilon}^i R_8 \epsilon_q^* \right]. \quad (18) \end{aligned}$$

The numerical values of the coefficient functions are collected in Table 1.

Acknowledgments

This work is supported by the Swiss ‘Nationalfonds’. W.P. is supported by the ‘Erwin Schrödinger fellowship No. J2272’ of the ‘Fonds zur Förderung der wissenschaftlichen Forschung’ of Austria.

References

1. R. Barate *et al.* [ALEPH Coll.], Phys. Lett. B **429** (1998) 169.
2. K. Abe *et al.* [Belle Coll.], Phys. Lett. B **511** (2001) 151.
3. S. Chen *et al.* [CLEO Coll.], Phys. Rev. Lett. **87** (2001) 251807.

E_0 m_c/m_b	NLL				LL
	1.6 GeV		$m_b/20$		-
	0.23	0.29	0.23	0.29	-
a	7.8221	6.9120	8.1819	7.1714	7.9699
a_{77}	0.8161	0.8161	0.8283	0.8283	0.9338
a_7^r	4.8802	4.5689	4.9228	4.6035	5.3314
a_7^i	0.3546	0.2167	0.3322	0.2029	0
a_{88}	0.0197	0.0197	0.0986	0.0986	0.0066
a_8^r	0.5680	0.5463	0.7810	0.7600	0.4498
a_8^i	-0.0987	-0.1105	-0.0963	-0.1091	0
$a_{e\epsilon}$	0.4384	0.3787	0.8598	0.7097	0
a_ϵ^r	-1.6981	-2.6679	-1.3329	-2.4935	0
a_ϵ^i	2.4997	2.8956	2.5274	2.9127	0
a_{87}^r	0.1923	0.1923	0.2025	0.2025	0.1576
$a_{7\epsilon}^r$	-0.7827	-1.0940	-0.8092	-1.1285	0
$a_{8\epsilon}^r$	-0.0601	-0.0819	-0.0573	-0.0783	0
a_{87}^i	-0.0487	-0.0487	-0.0487	-0.0487	0
$a_{7\epsilon}^i$	-0.9067	-1.0447	-0.9291	-1.0585	0
$a_{8\epsilon}^i$	-0.0661	-0.0779	-0.0637	-0.0765	0

Table 1. Numerical values of the coefficients introduced in Eq. (17). We give the values corresponding to $E_0 = (1.6 \text{ GeV}, m_b/20)$ and to $m_c/m_b = (0.23, 0.29)$. In the last column we give the values obtained at LL (to be used in the computation of the CP asymmetries).

4. B. Aubert *et al.* [BABAR Coll.], hep-ex/0207074.
5. B. Aubert *et al.* [BaBar Coll.], hep-ex/0207076.
6. C. Jessop, SLAC-PUB-9610.
7. T. E. Coan *et al.* [CLEO Coll.], Phys. Rev. Lett. **86** (2001) 5661.
8. K. Abe *et al.* [Belle Coll.], BELLE-CONF-0348.
9. M. Carena, D. Garcia, U. Nierste and C. E. Wagner, Phys. Lett. B **499** (2001) 141.
10. G. Degrandi, P. Gambino and G. F. Giudice, JHEP **0012** (2000) 009.
11. G. D’Ambrosio, G. F. Giudice, G. Isidori and A. Strumia, Nucl. Phys. B **645** (2002) 155.
12. F. Borzumati, C. Greub, T. Hurth and D. Wyler, Phys. Rev. D **62** (2000) 075005; hep-ph/9912420.
13. T. Besmer, C. Greub and T. Hurth, Nucl. Phys. B **609** (2001) 359.
14. M. Ciuchini, E. Franco, A. Masiero and L. Silvestrini, Phys. Rev. D **67** (2003) 075016.
15. T. Hurth, Rev. Mod. Phys. **75** (2003) 1159.
16. M. Battaglia *et al.*, hep-ph/0304132.
17. T. Hurth and E. Lunghi, eConf **C0304052** (2003) WG206 [hep-ph/0307142].
18. P. Gambino and M. Misiak, Nucl. Phys. B **611** (2001) 338.
19. A. J. Buras, A. Czarnecki, M. Misiak and J. Urban, Nucl. Phys. B **631** (2002) 219.
20. A. Ali, H. Asatrian and C. Greub, Phys. Lett. B **429** (1998) 87.
21. A. L. Kagan and M. Neubert, Phys. Rev. D **58** (1998) 094012.
22. K. Kiers, A. Soni and G. H. Wu, Phys. Rev. D **62** (2000) 116004.
23. T. Hurth, E. Lunghi and W. Porod, in preparation.
24. J. M. Soares, Nucl. Phys. B **367** (1991) 575.
25. T. Hurth and T. Mannel, Phys. Lett. B **511** (2001) 196.
26. T. Hurth and T. Mannel, AIP Conf. Proc. **602** (2001) 212.