TTP 95–18

RECENT PROGRESS IN THE THEORY OF HEAVY FLAVOUR DECAYS

THOMAS MANNEL

Institut für Theoretische Teilchenphysik, University of Karlsruhe
Kaiserstraße 12, D – 76128 Karlsruhe, Germany.

Abstract

The expansion in powers of the inverse heavy quark mass has led to considerable progress in the theoretical description of heavy flavour decays. The recent developments in that subject are reviewed.

Contents

1 Introduction **1**

2 The Heavy Mass Limit as an Effective Theory **2**
2.1 Formulation of the Infinite Mass Limit 3
2.2 Heavy Quark Symmetry 7
2.3 Corrections to the Heavy Mass Limit 10

3 Exclusive Decays **15**
3.1 Heavy to Heavy Transitions 16
3.2 Heavy to Light Transitions 18

4 Inclusive Decays **21**
4.1 Operator Product Expansion 22
4.2 Total Decay Rates 24
4.3 Lepton Energy Spectra 25
4.4 Resummation in the Endpoint Region 27
4.5 Semileptonic Branching Fraction and Charm Counting 28
4.6 Lifetimes 31

5 Conclusions and Open Questions **33**

1 Introduction

The theory of heavy flavour decays has attracted renewed attention in the last few years. From the theoretical side there has been an enormous progress based on the expansion in inverse powers of the heavy quark mass m_Q, which allows to reduce the uncertainties due to the QCD bound state problem drastically. From the experimental side the running experiments as well as the ones planned in the near future constitute a large effort to explore the CKM sector of the standard model (SM), which is not yet tested with good accuracy.

The theoretical progress is based on the infinite mass limit of QCD, which has been used for some time for various purposes [1]. But the main observation, which started the enormous development of this field, is that in the infinite mass limit two additional symmetries appear, which are not present in full QCD [2]. Furthermore, the heavy mass limit may be regarded as the leading term of a $1/m_Q$ expansion, which is formulated as an effective theory, the so called Heavy Quark Effective Theory (HQET) [3]. The implications of the heavy mass limit and the applications of HQET have been extensively studied in numerous publications, and the development of the field is documented in more or less extensive reviews [4].

Corrections to the limit $m_Q \to \infty$ may be studied systematically in the framework of HQET. The corrections are given as power series expansions in two small parameters. The first small parameter is the strong coupling constant, taken at the scale of the heavy quark $\alpha_s(m_Q)$. This type of correction may be calculated systematically using perturbation theory in HQET. The second type of correction is characterized by the small parameter $\bar{\Lambda}/m_Q$, where $\bar{\Lambda}$ is a scale of the light QCD degrees of freedom, e.g. $\bar{\Lambda} \sim m_{hadron} - m_Q$. In the effective theory approach this type of corrections enter through operators of higher dimension, the matrix elements of which in general have to be parametrized by additional form factors.

Heavy quark symmetries may be used to reduce the hadronic uncertainties in exclusive decays where these symmetries imply a drastic reduction of the numbers of independent form factors in weak decays. In heavy to heavy decays these additional symmetries work most efficiently; for certain sets of transitions only a single form factor appears, of which the absolute normalization at a specific kinematic point is fixed by the symmetries. In heavy to light decays heavy quark symmetries may be applied only the the decaying quark, still relations between form factors and relative normalizations may be derived.

Over the last three years methods have been developed to apply the heavy mass expansion also to inclusive decays [5]-[7],[8]-[13]. The heavy quark mass sets a scale that is large compared to Λ_{QCD}, and one may use a similar setup as in deep inelastic scattering for the inclusive decays; in particular, the operator product expansion for the inclusive decays yields an expansion in inverse powers of the heavy quark mass. In this way one may not only study total rates, but also differential distributions such as the lepton energy spectra in inclusive semileptonic decays.

This review intends to summarize these recent developments in heavy flavour weak decays, which are based on the heavy mass expansion. It consists of three main sections. In the next section the formulation of HQET as an effective theory is reviewed, including a discussion of heavy quark symmetries and of the systematics of the corrections. Section 3 reviews the theoretical status of exclusive decays, heavy to heavy as well as heavy to light transitions. Section 4 surveys the appications of the $1/m_Q$ expansion for inclusive decays; it contains a brief review of the theoretical method and its application to total rates as well as to differential distributions, in particular to lepton energy spectra of inclusive semileptonic decays of heavy hadrons. Finally, in the conclusions section we shall summarize and discuss open questions and further prospects of this field.

2 The Heavy Mass Limit as an Effective Theory

Effective field theories [14] have become a widely used tool in modern elementary particle physics. An effective theory treatment is convenient if the problem under consideration involves very disparate mass scales such that the physics that is to be described happens at much lower energies than the scale set by some heavy particles in the theory. In such a case it is useful to switch to an effective theory in which the heavy degrees of freedom do not appear explicitely; they only reappear in the effective theory as higher dimensional operators, which are multiplied by coupling constants with negative mass dimension. The scale of the coupling constants is set by the large mass and thus these contributions are small, if the scale of the physics described with the help of the effective theory is small compared to this large mass.

An effective theory is always valid only in a limited region of scales, a natural cut off is given by the mass of the particle which has been removed by switching from the full to the effective theory. As mentioned above an effective theory involves interactions which would lead to a non-renormalizable theory, if one would consider the theory to all orders in these higher dimensional operators. However, working to a definite order of the expansion in inverse powers of the large scale one does not face any problem concerning renormalization. Starting from the renormalizable dimension-4 piece of the effective theory Lagrangian we may use its renormalization group properties to study the cut-off dependence of the effective theory, which is determined by the short distance properties of the effective theory.

Applying effective theory methods corresponds to an expansion of the Greens functions of the full theory in inverse powers of the large mass scale; such an expansion is only possible up to logarithmic dependences on this large scale. These logarithms may be accessed using a properly constructed effective theory, where these logarithms correspond to the renormalization group logarithms of the cut off. In this way one may even achieve a resummation of the logarithmic terms using renormalization group methods in the effective theory.

In the case at hand the large scale is the mass m_Q of the heavy quark, and the leading term of this expansion is the static limit. This effective theory (Heavy Quark Effective Theory, HQET) is a a powerful tool, allowing for numerous purely QCD based calculations. Renormalization in this effective theory implies a factorization theorem for the Greens function of full QCD, which means that to any order in the $1/m_Q$ expansion one may factorize the short distance physics from the long distance effects. Explicitly this means for a Greens function G_{full} calculated in full QCD that one may rewrite it as

$$G_{full}(p_1 \cdots p_n, m_Q, \mu_0 = m_Q) = \sum_j \left(\frac{1}{m_Q}\right)^j Z^{(j)}(m_Q, \mu) G^{(j)}_{eff}(p_1 \cdots p_n, \mu). \qquad (1)$$

where μ_0 is the renormalization point of the full QCD function. Here the constants $Z^{(j)}(m_Q, \mu)$ depend on the factorization scale μ and on logarithms of m_Q; it contains all the short distance effects, which may be calculated perturbatively. Using the renormalization group of the effective theory, one may perform a systematic resummation of logarithmic dependences on the heavy quark mass.

The Greens functions $G^{(j)}_{eff}$ are calculated in HQET and do not depend on the heavy mass any more; they contain the long distance effects which are not calcualable via perturbation theory. However, as we shall see below, they are constrained by heavy quark symmetries. Consequently one gains complete control over the mass dependence by switching from full QCD to HQET, the effective theory obtained in the heavy mass limit.

In this section we shall discuss the formulation of this effective theory. First we shall review and compare some of the different possibilities to formulate the infinite mass limit. In this limit new symmetries appear which are the key to various model independent statements concerning weak decay matrix elements; these symmetries are reviewed in paragraph 3.1. Finally, we shall consider the systematic approach to the calculation of corrections to the infinite mass limit.

2.1 Formulation of the Infinite Mass Limit

This issue has been discussed repeatedly and various formulations of the infinite mass limit are available. Of course, as far as physical quantities are concerned, all approaches yield the same result. However, for some special applications one approach may be more convenient than another.

The equivalence of all different approaches is ensured by a theorem well established in the field of effective theories. It has been shown that in an effective theory involving a field ϕ one may perform redefinitions of the fields , such that

$$\phi \to P(\phi, \partial\phi) \tag{2}$$

where P is an arbitrary polynomial function [15, 16].

Such a redefinition will not change the S-matrix, although the Lagrangian (and Greens function) expressed in the redefined fields may look completely different. In this sense that the different formulations of HQET are equivalent.

In the following we shall consider two formulations of HQET. The first one nicely exhibits the fact that HQET is an effective theory in the sense that one integrates out a heavy degree of freedom and performs an expansion of the remaining action functional in the large mass scale, which is for the case at hand the heavy quark mass. The process of integrating out the heavy degree of freedom may be performed explicitly as a Gaussian functional integral, and one may construct a formulation of HQET be expanding the result in powers of $1/m_Q$. In this way one obtains a $1/m_Q$ expansion of both the heavy quark field as well as for the Lagrangian.

The second formulation is based on the standard way of separating "upper" and "lower" components of the spinor fields by performing a sequence of Foldy Wouthuysen transformations. These transformations lead to an expansion in $1/m_Q$ for the heavy quark field and for the Lagrangian, which is different for each of these quantities from the other formulation. However, if one calculates a physical quantity, both approaches will yield the same answer, because the $1/m_Q$ expansion has to be unique for an observable.

Integrating out heavy degrees of freedom

One may obtain a formulation of the heavy mass limit by integrating out heavy degrees of freedom from the functional integral of QCD Greens functions [17]. This integration may in fact be done explicitly, since for the case at hand it amounts to a Gaussian functional integration. Formulating the heavy mass limit in this way clearly exhibits that it corresponds to an effective theory in the usual sense. We start from the generating functional of the QCD Greens functions

$$Z(\eta,\bar{\eta},\lambda) = \int [dQ][d\bar{Q}][d\phi_\lambda] \exp\Big\{ iS + iS_\lambda + i\int d^4x \,(\bar{\eta}Q + \bar{Q}\eta + \phi_\lambda\lambda)\Big\}, \tag{3}$$

where $\phi_\lambda = q$, A^a_μ denotes the light degrees of freedom (light quarks q and gluons A_μ) with the action S_λ, while S denotes the piece of the action for the heavy quark Q including its coupling

to the gluons

$$S = \int d^4x\, \bar{Q}(i\not{D} - m_Q)Q. \tag{4}$$

where

$$D_\mu = \partial_\mu + igA_\mu, \tag{5}$$

is the covariant derivative of QCD. We have introduced source terms η for the heavy quark and λ for the light degrees of freedom.

We shall consider hadrons containing a single heavy quark, and we assume that this heavy hadron moves with a velocity v

$$v = \frac{p_{\rm hadron}}{m_{\rm hadron}}, \quad v^2 = 1, \quad v_0 > 0 \tag{6}$$

This velocity vector may be used to split the heavy quark field Q into an "upper" component ϕ and a "lower" one χ

$$\phi_v = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \not{v})Q, \;\; \not{v}\phi_v = \phi, \tag{7}$$

$$\chi_v = \frac{1}{2}(1 - \not{v})Q, \;\; \not{v}\chi_v = -\chi, \tag{8}$$

and to define a decomposition of the covariant derivative into a "longitudinal" and a "transverse" ($\perp$) part

$$D_\mu = v_\mu(v \cdot D) + D_\mu^\perp\,, \quad D_\mu^\perp = (g_{\mu\nu} - v_\mu v_\nu)D^\nu, \quad \left\{\not{D}^\perp\,,\, \not{v}\right\} = 0. \tag{9}$$

Using (7-9) the action (4) of the heavy quark field takes the form

$$S = \int d^4x \left[\bar{\phi}\{i(v \cdot D) - m_Q\}\phi - \bar{\chi}\{i(v \cdot D) + m_Q\}\chi + \bar{\phi}i\not{D}^\perp\chi + \bar{\chi}i\not{D}^\perp\phi\right]. \tag{10}$$

The heavy quark in the meson is very close to being on shell, and thus the space time dependence of the heavy quark field is mainly that of a free particle moving with velocity v. This suggests a reparametrization of the fields by removing the space time dependence of a solution of the free Dirac equation. We shall chose the "particle-type" parametrization corresponding to the "positive energy solution" of the Dirac equation

$$\phi_v = e^{-im_Q(v\cdot x)}h_v\,, \qquad \chi_v = e^{-im_Q(v\cdot x)}H_v, \tag{11}$$

such that the space time dependence of the remaining fields h_v and H_v is determined by the residual momentum $k = p - m_Q v$, which is due to binding effects of the heavy quark inside the heavy hadron, and which is a "small" quantity of order Λ_{QCD}.

Expressed in these fields the action of the heavy quark becomes

$$S = \int d^4x\, \left[\bar{h}_v i(v \cdot D)h_v - \bar{H}_v\{i(v \cdot D) + 2m_Q\}H_v + \bar{h}_v i\not{D}^\perp H_v + \bar{H}_v i\not{D}^\perp h_v\right], \tag{12}$$

The term containing the sources is also rewritten in terms of the fields h_v and H_v

$$\int d^4x\, (\bar{\eta}\psi + \bar{\psi}\eta) = \int d^4x\, (\bar{\rho}_v h_v + \bar{h}_v\rho_v + \bar{R}_v H_v + \bar{H}_v R_v), \tag{13}$$

where ρ_v and R_v are now source terms for the upper component field h_v and the lower componenent part H_v respectively.

In terms of the new variables the generating functional reads

$$Z(\rho_v,\bar{\rho}_v,R_v,\bar{R}_v,\lambda)=\int[dh_v][d\bar{h}_v][dH_v][d\bar{H}_v][d\phi_\lambda] \tag{14}$$
$$\exp\left\{iS+S_\lambda+i\int d^4x\left(\bar{\rho}_v h_v+\bar{h}_v\rho_v+\bar{R}_v H_v+\bar{H}_v R_v+\phi_\lambda\lambda\right)\right\},$$

where the action S for the heavy quark is given in eq.(12).

From (12) it is obvious that the heavy degree of freedom is the lower component field H_v, since it has a mass term $2m_Q$, while the upper component field h_v is a massless field describing the static heavy quark. In the heavy mass limit only the Greens functions involving the field h_v have to be calculated, and hence we integrate over H_v in the functional integral (14) with the sources of the lower component field R_v and $\bar{R}_v$ set to zero. This can be done explicitly, since it is a Gaussian integration

$$Z(\rho_v,\bar{\rho}_v,\lambda)=\int[dh_v][d\bar{h}_v][d\lambda]\Delta\exp\left\{iS+S_\lambda+i\int d^4x\left(\bar{\rho}_v^+h_v^++\bar{h}_v^+\rho_v^++\phi_\lambda\lambda\right)\right\}, \tag{15}$$

where now the action functional for the heavy quark becomes a non-local object

$$S=\int d^4x\left[\bar{h}_v^+ i(v\cdot D)h_v^+-\bar{h}_v^+\not{D}^\perp\left(\frac{1}{i(v\cdot D)+2m_Q-i\epsilon}\right)\not{D}^\perp h_v^+\right]. \tag{16}$$

This Gaussian integration corresponds to the replacement

$$H_v=\left(\frac{1}{2m_Q+ivD}\right)i\not{D}_\perp h_v \tag{17}$$

for the lower compponent field. Furthermore, the Gaussian integration yields a determinant Δ. In the full theory one may also perform this Gaussian integration, and the determinant obtained contains all the closed loops of heavy quarks. After renormalization of the full theory their contribution starts at order $1/m^2$ with an Uehling potential like term. In the effective theory one may take the determinant Δ to be a constant, if the terms of order $1/m_Q^2$ and higher comming from the closed heavy quark loops are included by matching to the full theory. Since we shall discuss only the leading term of the $1/m_Q$ expansion in this section, we may drop the determinant in what follows.

The non-locality of the action functional is connected to the large scale set by the heavy quark mass, and the non-local terms may be expanded in terms of an infinite series of local operators, which come with increasing powers of $1/m_Q$. In the context of a field theory this corresponds to a short distance expansion and hence these operators have to be renormalized. The tree level relations may be read off from the geometric series expansion of the non-local term in (16). In this way we obtain the expansion of the field and the Lagrangian

$$\begin{aligned} Q(x) &= e^{-im_Q vx}\left[1+\left(\frac{1}{2m+ivD}\right)i\not{D}_\perp\right]h_v \qquad (18)\\ &= e^{-im_Q vx}\left[1+\frac{1}{2m_Q}\not{D}_\perp+\left(\frac{1}{2m_Q}\right)^2(-ivD)\not{D}_\perp+\cdots\right]h_v \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} &= \bar{h}_v(ivD)h_v+\bar{h}_v i\not{D}_\perp\left(\frac{1}{2m+ivD}\right)i\not{D}_\perp h_v \qquad (19)\\ &= \bar{h}_v(ivD)h_v+\frac{1}{2m}\bar{h}_v(i\not{D}_\perp)^2 ih_v+\left(\frac{1}{2m}\right)\bar{h}_v(i\not{D}_\perp)(-ivD)(i\not{D}_\perp)h_v+\cdots \end{aligned}$$

A Greens function with an operator insertion is treated in a similar way; the heavy quark fields entering the inserted operator are dealt with in the same way. The net effect of this is that the heavy quark fields in the operator insertion are replaced by the expansion (18).

Foldy Wouthuysen Transformation

A second way of formulating the heavy mass limit proceed along the well known steps performed in deriving the non-relativistic limit of the Dirac equation [18]. The reasoning used here is motivated by quantum mechanics; as a first step one rewrites the equation of motion in a Hamiltonian form

$$iv\partial Q = HQ, \quad H = \not{v}(\not{D}_\perp + m_Q + gvA) \tag{20}$$

where A is the gluon field. Note that in the rest frame we have $v = (1,0,0,0)$, and thus (20) takes the usual form, since $v\partial = \partial_0$ and $vA = A_0$.

In general the Hamiltonian couples the upper and the lower component of the heavy quark field Q, projected out by $P_\pm = (1 \pm \not{v})$. The Foldy Wouthuysen transformation is a transformation of the form

$$Q \to Q' = \exp(iF)Q \quad H \to H' = \exp(iF)\,[H - iv\partial]\exp(-iF) \tag{21}$$

where F is a hermitian matrix in the space of the Dirac spinors, such that $\exp(iF)$ is unitary in that space. This requirement is motivated by quantum mechanics where the spinor is interpreted as a wave function, but this interpretation becomes meaningless once we switch to a field theory.

The transformation (21) is designed such that the resulting Hamiltonian H' does not couple upper and lower components of the field Q any more. The generator F of this transformation may be expanded in powers of $1/m_Q$, from which one may construct a $1/m_Q$ expansion of the Hamiltonian and the transformed fields. Removing the mass term of the hamiltonian by a phase redefinition as in (18), one obtains for the fields and the Lagrangian

$$Q(x) = e^{-im_Q v\cdot x}\left[1 + \frac{1}{2m_Q}(i\not{D}_\perp) + \frac{1}{4m_Q^2}\left(v\cdot D\not{D}_\perp - \frac{1}{2}\not{D}_\perp^2\right) + \cdots\right] h_v(x)\,, \tag{22}$$

$$\mathcal{L} = \bar{h}_v\left[iv\cdot D - \frac{1}{2m_Q}\not{D}_\perp^2 + \frac{i}{4m_Q^2}\left(-\frac{1}{2}\not{D}_\perp^2 v\cdot D + \not{D}_\perp v\cdot D\not{D}_\perp - \frac{1}{2}v\cdot D\not{D}_\perp^2\right) + \cdots\right] h_v\,. \tag{23}$$

We note that the leading order term as well as the terms of order $1/m_Q$ are identical in the two approaches. Differences start to appear at order $1/m_Q^2$, which are terms involving a factor which would vanish by leading order equations of motion. In the Fouldy Wouthuysen formulation the Lagrangian does not contain such terms, while these terms appear in the approach of integrating out the lower components of the heavy quark field. However, subleading terms of a physical matrix element will consist of local contributions originating from the expansion of the field Q as well as of non-local pieces involving time-ordered products of the leading order currents with the subleading terms of the Lagrangian (see below). If the time-ordered products are taken with a term that would vanish by a naive application of the leading-order equation of motion, these will lead to a contact terms, i.e. effectively to a local contribution. In this way the terms in the first approach rearrange in such a way that the final result for an observable quantity is the same in both cases. For some practical applications the Foldy-Wouthuysen approach has an advantage that all the time-ordered product with the Lagrangian are truly nonlocal contributions, in other words, none of the contributions will lead to a contact term.

2.2 Heavy Quark Symmetry

The main impact of the heavy quark limit is due to two additional symmetries which are not present in full QCD; the first is a heavy flavour symmetry and the second one is the so called spin symmetry.

We shall first study the heavy flavour symmetry. The interaction of the quarks with the gluons is flavour independent; all flavour dependence in QCD is only due to the different quark masses. In the $1/m_Q$ expansion the leading order Lagrangian is mass independent and hence a flavour symmetry appears relating heavy quarks moving with the same velocity.

For the case of two heavy flavours b and c one has to leading order the Lagrangian [3]

$$\mathcal{L}_{heavy} = \bar{b}_v(v \cdot D)b_v + \bar{c}_v(v \cdot D)c_v, \tag{24}$$

where b_v (c_v) is the field operator h_v for the b (c) quark moving with velocity v and $D = \partial + igA$ is the QCD covariant derivative. This Lagrangian is obviously invariant under the $SU(2)_{HF}$ rotations

$$\begin{pmatrix} b_v \\ c_v \end{pmatrix} \to U_v \begin{pmatrix} b_v \\ c_v \end{pmatrix} \quad U_v \in SU(2)_{HF}. \tag{25}$$

We have put a subscript v for the transformation matrix U, since this symmetry only relates heavy quarks moving with the same velocity.

The second symmetry is the heavy-quark spin symmetry. As is clear form the Lagrangian in the heavy-mass limit, both spin degrees of freedom of the heavy quark couple in the same way to the gluons; we may rewrite the leading-order Lagrangian as

$$\mathcal{L} = \bar{h}_v^{+s}(ivD)h_v^{+s} + \bar{h}_v^{-s}(ivD)h_v^{-s}, \tag{26}$$

where $h_v^{\pm s}$ are the projections of the heavy quark field on a definite spin direction s

$$h_v^{\pm s} = \frac{1}{2}(1 \pm \gamma_5 \not{s})h_v, \quad s \cdot v = 0. \tag{27}$$

This Lagrangian has a symmetry under the rotations of the heavy quark spin and hence all the heavy hadron states moving with the velocity v fall into spin-symmetry doublets as $m_Q \to \infty$. In Hilbert space this symmetry is generated by operators $S_v(\epsilon)$ as

$$[h_v, S_v(\epsilon)] = i \not{\epsilon} \not{v} \gamma_5 h_v \tag{28}$$

where ϵ with $\epsilon^2 = -1$ is the rotation axis. The simplest spin-symmetry doublet in the mesonic case consists of the pseudoscalar meson $H(v)$ and the corresponding vector meson $H^*(v, \epsilon)$, since a spin rotation yields

$$\exp\left(iS_v(\epsilon)\frac{\pi}{2}\right)|H(v)\rangle = (-i)|H^*(v, \epsilon)\rangle, \tag{29}$$

where we have chosen an arbitrary phase to be $(-i)$.

In the heavy-mass limit the spin symmetry partners have to be degenerate and their splitting has to scale as $1/m_Q$. In other words, the quantity

$$\lambda_2 = \frac{1}{4}(M_{H^*}^2 - M_H^2) \tag{30}$$

has to be the same for all spin symmetry doublets of heavy ground state mesons. This is well supported by data: For both the (B, B^*) and the (D, D^*) doublets one finds a value of

$\lambda_2 \sim 0.12$ GeV^2. This shows that the spin-symmetry partners become degenerate in the infinite mass limit and the splitting between them scales as $1/m_Q$.

In the infinite mass limit the symmetries imply relations between matrix elements involving heavy quarks. For a transition between heavy ground-state mesons H (either pseudoscalar or vector) with heavy flavour f (f') moving with velocities v (v'), one obtains in the heavy-quark limit

$$\langle H^{(f')}(v')|\bar{h}_{v'}^{(f')}\Gamma h_v^{(f)}|H^{(f)}(v)\rangle = \xi(vv')\ \mathrm{Tr}\ \left\{\overline{\mathcal{H}(v)}\Gamma\mathcal{H}(v)\right\}, \tag{31}$$

where Γ is some arbitrary Dirac matrix and $H(v)$ are the representation matrices for the two possibilities of coupling the heavy quark spin to the spin of the light degrees of freedom, which are in a spin-1/2 state for ground state mesons

$$\mathcal{H}(v) = \frac{\sqrt{M_H}}{2}\begin{cases}(1+\not{v})\gamma_5 & 0^-,\ (\bar{q}Q)\ \text{meson}\\ (1+\not{v})\not{\epsilon} & 1^-,\ (\bar{q}Q)\ \text{meson}\\ & \text{with polarization } \epsilon.\end{cases} \tag{32}$$

Due to the spin and flavour independence of the heavy mass limit the Isgur–Wise function ξ is the only nonperturbative information needed to describe all heavy to heavy transitions within a spin-flavour symmetry multiplet.

Excited mesons have been studied in [19]. They may be classified by the angular momentum of the light degrees of freedom j_l, which is coupled with the heavy quark spin S to the total angular momentum J of the meson. Furthermore, the orbital angular momentum ℓ determines the parity $P = (-1)^{\ell+1}$ of the meson. For a given $\ell > 0$ we can have $j_l = \ell \pm 1/2$ and the coupling of the heavy quark spin yields two spin symmetry doublets ($J = \ell - 1, J = \ell$) and ($J = \ell, J = \ell+1$). For example, the lowest positive parity $\ell = 1$ mesons are two spin symmetry doublets $(0^+, 1^+)$ and $(1^+, 2^+)$. In the D meson system these states have been observed [20] and behave as predicted by heavy quark symmetry [21]

Similarly as for the mesons heavy-quark symmetries imply that only one form factor is needed to describe heavy to heavy transitions within a spin flavour symmetry multiplet; in other words, there is an Isgur Wise function for each multiplet.

The ground state baryons have been studied in [22, 23, 24]. According to the particle data group they are classified as follows

$$\Lambda_h = [(qq')_0 h]_{1/2} \qquad \Xi'_h = [(qs)_0 h]_{1/2} \tag{33}$$

$$\Sigma_h = [(qq')_1 h]_{1/2} \qquad \Xi_h = [(qs)_1 h]_{1/2} \qquad \Omega_h = [(ss)_1 h]_{1/2} \tag{34}$$

$$\Sigma^*_h = [(qq')_1 h]_{3/2} \qquad \Xi^*_h = [(qs)_1 h]_{3/2} \qquad \Omega^*_h = [(ss)_1 h]_{3/2}. \tag{35}$$

Here, q, q' refer to u and d quarks, $q \neq q'$ for the Λ_h, but q may be the same as q' for the Σ_h and Σ^*_h. The first subscript (0, 1) is the total spin of the light degrees of freedom, while the second subscript (1/2, 3/2) is the total spin of the baryon.

Spin symmetry forces these baryons into spin symmetry doublets. For the Λ-type baryons (33) the spin rotations are simply a subset of the Lorentz transformations, since the light degrees of freedom are in a spin-0 state. The corresponding spin symmetry doublet is in this case given by the two polarization directions of the heavy baryon. From the point of view of heavy quark symmetries the Λ-type baryons are the simplest hadrons, although from the quark model point of view they are composed of three quarks.

The baryons with the light degrees of freedom in a spin one state may be represented by a pseudovector-spinor object R^μ with $v_\mu R^\mu = 0$ [1]. In general $\gamma_\mu R^\mu \neq 0$ because R^μ contains spin

[1] One could as well represent the light degrees of freedom by an antisymmetric tensor instead of a pseudovector; this is a completely equivalent formulation [24].

1/2 contributions as well as spin 3/2 parts. In other words, R^μ contains a Rarita-Schwinger field as well as a Dirac field. Under Lorentz transformations R^μ behaves as

$$R^\mu(v) \to \Lambda^\mu{}_\nu D(\Lambda) R^\nu(\Lambda v), \tag{36}$$

where $\Lambda_{\mu\nu}$ and $D(\Lambda)$ are the Lorentz transformations in the vector and spinor representation respectively, while under spin rotations we have

$$R^\mu(v) \to -\gamma_5 \not{v} R^\mu(v). \tag{37}$$

The spin-3/2 component of the the pseudovector-spinor object corresponding to the Σ_h^* is projected out by contracting with γ_μ

$$\gamma_\mu R^\mu_{\Sigma_h^*} = 0. \tag{38}$$

The rest of the independent components of R correspond to Σ_h baryon:

$$R^\mu_{\Sigma_h} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(\gamma^\mu + v^\mu)\gamma_5 u_{\Sigma_h}, \tag{39}$$

where u_{Σ_h} is the Dirac spinor of the Σ_h state. Similar expressions hold for the nonstrange baryons $\Xi_h^{(*)}$ and $\Omega_h^{(*)}$.

The spin rotation (37) transform the Σ-like baryons into the Σ^* states and vice versa. Thus the spin symmetry doublets for the ground state baryons are given by the two polarization directions of the baryons in (33), and by the two states with corresponding light quark flavour numbers in (34) and (35).

Similar to the case of mesons one may derive a Wigner-Eckart theorem for the spin symmetry doublets of the baryons

$$\langle \Lambda_h(v)|\bar{h}\Gamma h'|\Lambda_{h'}(v')\rangle = A(v\cdot v')\bar{u}_{\xi_h}(v)\Gamma u_{\xi_{h'}}(v'), \tag{40}$$

where we have allowed for the possibility of two heavy quark flavours h and h'. In the same way, one obtains two form factors for the $\Sigma_h^{(*)} \to \Sigma_{h'}^{(*)}$.

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \Sigma_h^{(*)}(v)|\bar{h}_v\Gamma h_{v'}|\Sigma_h^{(*)}\rangle \\ &= \bar{R}^\mu_{\Sigma_h^{(*)}}(v)\Gamma R^\nu_{\Sigma_h^{(*)}}(v') \left[B(v\cdot v')g_{\mu\nu} + C(v\cdot v')v'_\mu v_\nu\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

Finally, parity does not allow for transitions between Λ and $\Sigma^{(*)}$ type baryons

$$\langle \Sigma_h^{(*)}(v)|\bar{h}_v\Gamma h_{v'}|\Lambda_h(v)\rangle = 0, \tag{42}$$

and hence these transitions are not only suppressed by the flavour symmetry of the light degrees of freedom, but additionally by heavy quark symmetry.

Excited baryons my be studied along the same lines as for the mesons. The spin symmetry doublets as well as the restrictions on transition matrix elements have been studied in [19].

Heavy quark symmetries thus lead to a strong reduction of the number of independent from factors that describe current induced transitions among heavy hadrons. In addition to that the symmetries even allow us to obtain the normalization of some of these form factors. Since the currents

$$J^{hh'} = \bar{h}_v\gamma_\mu h'_v = v_\mu \bar{h}_v h'_v \tag{43}$$

are the generators of heavy flavour symmetry in the velocity sector v, the normalization of the Wigner-Eckard theorems (31,40,41) is known at the nonrecoil point $v = v'$. By standard arguments one obtains for the mesons

$$\xi(vv' = 1) = 1, \tag{44}$$

while the corresponding relation for the baryons is

$$A(vv' = 1) = \sqrt{m_{\Lambda_h} m_{\Lambda_{h'}}} \tag{45}$$

$$B(vv' = 1) = \sqrt{m_{\Sigma_h^{(*)}} m_{\Sigma_{h'}^{(*)}}}, \tag{46}$$

where the factor involving the square root of the masses means that the hadron states in (40) are normalized relativistically.

2.3 Corrections to the Heavy Mass Limit

The heavy quark symmetries allow us to obtain relations which hold in the heavy mass limit, such as the Wigner-Eckart theorems (31,40,41) and the normalization statements (44, 45, 46). Corrections due to finite masses may be calculated systematically using the machinery of HQET. In this section we consider the strategy of how the corrections are studied.

In general there are two types of corrections. The short-distance corrections may be calculated in perturbation theory, based on the leading order of the $1/m_Q$ expansion of the Lagrangian. The logarithmic ultraviolet divergences in the effective theory correspond to logarithmic dependences on the heavy-quark mass m_Q in the full theory, and renormalization group methods may be employed to perform resummations of these logarithms.

The starting point of a QCD corrections calculation are the Feynman rules of full QCD and the ones of HQET. In HQET there are only two of Feynman rules modified compared to full QCD:

	full QCD		HQET	
Propagator of the heavy quark	$\dfrac{i}{\not{p} - m_Q + i\epsilon}$	$\longrightarrow$	$\dfrac{i}{\not{v}k + i\epsilon}$,	$p = mv + k$
Heavy quark gluon vertex	$ig\gamma_\mu T^a$	$\longrightarrow$	$igv_\mu T^a$	

For the sake of simplicity and clarity we shall consider the matrix element of some operator $\mathcal{O}$ corresponding to some observable quantity, e.g. a current mediating a weak decay. Since HQET is an effective theory, the machinery of effective theory guarantees the factorization of long distance effects from the short distance ones, which are related to the large mass m_Q. Neglecting $1/m_Q$ corrections, this factorization takes the form

$$\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle_{full} = Z\left(\frac{m_Q}{\mu}\right) \langle \mathcal{O} \rangle_{static}(\mu) + \mathcal{O}(1/m_Q), \tag{47}$$

where the dependence on m_Q of the coefficient Z is given as a combined expansion in the coupling strength $\alpha_s = g^2/(4\pi)$ and logarithms of m_Q

$$Z\left(\frac{m_Q}{\mu}\right) = a_{00} \tag{48}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+ a_{11}\left(\alpha_s \ln\left(\frac{m_Q}{\mu}\right)\right) + a_{10}\alpha_s \\
&+ a_{22}\left(\alpha_s \ln\left(\frac{m_Q}{\mu}\right)\right)^2 + a_{21}\alpha_s\left(\alpha_s \ln\left(\frac{m_Q}{\mu}\right)\right) + a_{20}\alpha_s^2 \\
&+ a_{33}\left(\alpha_s \ln\left(\frac{m_Q}{\mu}\right)\right)^3 + a_{32}\alpha_s\left(\alpha_s \ln\left(\frac{m_Q}{\mu}\right)\right)^2 + a_{31}\alpha_s^2\left(\alpha_s \ln\left(\frac{m_Q}{\mu}\right)\right) \\
&\qquad + a_{30}\alpha_s^3 + \cdots
\end{aligned}
$$

This factorization theorem corresponds to the statement that the ultraviolet divergencies in the effective theory have to match the logarithmic mass dependences of full QCD. The factorization scale μ is an arbitrary parameter, and the physical quantity $\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle_{full}$ does not depend on this parameter. However, calculating the matrix element of this operator in the effective theory and studying its ultraviolet behaviour allows us to access the mass dependence of the observable $\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle$.

The ultraviolet behaviour of the effective theory is investigated by the renormalization group equations. Differentiating (47) with respect to the factorization scale μ yields the renormalization group equation

$$
\frac{d}{d\ln\mu}\left\{ Z\left(\frac{m_Q}{\mu}\right) \langle \mathcal{O} \rangle_{static}(\mu) \right\} = 0 \tag{49}
$$

from which we may obtain an equation which determines the change of the coefficient Z when the scale is changed

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left(\frac{d}{d\ln\mu} + \gamma_{\mathcal{O}}(\mu)\right) Z\left(\frac{m_Q}{\mu}\right) = 0 \qquad (50)\\
&\gamma_{\mathcal{O}}(\mu) = \frac{d}{d\ln\mu} \ln(\langle \mathcal{O} \rangle_{static}(\mu)).
\end{aligned}
$$

The quantity $\gamma_{\mathcal{O}}$ is called the anomalous dimension of the operator $\mathcal{O}$ which is universal for all matrix elements of $\mathcal{O}$, since it is connected with the short distance behaviour of the insertion of the operator $\mathcal{O}$.

Eq.(50) describes the renormalization group scaling in the effective theory. It allows to shift logarithms of the large mass scale from the matrix element of $\mathcal{O}$ into the coefficient Z: If the matrix element is renormalized at the large scale m_Q the logarithms of the type $\ln m_Q$ will apear in the matrix element of $\mathcal{O}$ while the coefficient Z at this scale will simply be

$$
Z(1) = a_{00} + a_{10}\alpha_s(m_Q) + a_{20}\alpha_s^2(m_Q) + a_{30}\alpha_s^3(m_Q) + \cdots \tag{51}
$$

The renormalization group equation (50) allows to lower the renormalization point from m_Q to μ; the matrix element renormalized at μ will not contain any logarithms of m_Q any more, they will appear in the coefficient Z in the way shown in (48).

In all cases relevant in the present context the matrix elements will be matrix elements involving hadronic states, which are in most cases impossible to calculate from first principles. However, eq.(50) allows to extract the short distance piece, i.e. the logarithms of the large mass m_Q and to separate it into the Wilson coefficients.

The anomalous dimension may be calculated in perturbation theory in powers of the coupling constant g of the theory. In general, in a renormalizable theory the coupling constant

depends on the scale μ at which the theory is renormalized. The scale dependence of the coupling constant is determined by the β function

$$\frac{d}{d\ln\mu}g(\mu) = \beta(\mu). \tag{52}$$

In a mass independent scheme the renormalization group functions $\gamma_{\mathcal{O}}$ and β will depend on the scale μ only through their dependence on the coupling constant

$$\beta = \beta(g(\mu)) \qquad \gamma_{\mathcal{O}} = \gamma_{\mathcal{O}}(g(\mu)). \tag{53}$$

Hence we may rewrite the renormalization group equation (50) as

$$\left(\mu\frac{\partial}{\partial\mu} + \beta(g)\frac{\partial}{\partial g} + \gamma_{\mathcal{O}}(g)\right) Z\left(\frac{m_Q}{\mu}, g\right) = 0. \tag{54}$$

The renormalization group functions β and $\gamma_{\mathcal{O}}$ are calculated in perturbation theory; the first term of the β function on QCD is obtained from a one-loop calculation and is given by

$$\beta(g) = -\frac{1}{(4\pi)^2}\left(11 - \frac{2}{3}n_f\right)g^3 + \cdots, \tag{55}$$

where n_f is the number of active flavors, i.e. the number of flavors with a mass less than m_Q.

With this input the renormalization group equation may be solved to yield

$$Z\left(\frac{m_Q}{\mu}\right) = a_{00}\left(\frac{\alpha_s(\mu)}{\alpha_s(m_Q)}\right)^{-\frac{48\pi^2}{33-2n_f}\gamma_1} \tag{56}$$

where γ_1 is the first coefficient in the perturbative expansion of the anomalous dimension $\gamma_{\mathcal{O}} = \gamma_1 g^2 + \cdots$ and $\alpha_s(\mu)$ is the one loop expression for the running coupling constant of QCD

$$\alpha_s(\mu) = \frac{12\pi}{(33-2n_f)\ln(\mu^2/\Lambda^2_{QCD})} \tag{57}$$

which is obtained from solving (52) using (55). This expression corresponds to a summation of the leading logarithms $(\alpha_s \ln m_Q)^n$ which is achieved by a one-loop calculation of the renormalization group functions β and $\gamma_{\mathcal{O}}$; in other words, in this way a resummation of the first column of the expansion (48) is obtained.

In a similar way one may also resum the second column of (48), if the renormalization group functions β and γ are calculated to two loops and the finite terms of the one loop expression are included.

The second type of corrections are the power corrections of order $1/m_Q^n$, which in general involve long-distance physics and hence may in general not be calculated, but have to be parametrized. As an example, consider a matrix element of a current $\bar{q}\Gamma Q$ mediating a transition between a heavy meson and some arbitrary state $|A\rangle$. The full QCD Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}$ and the fields Q are expanded in terms of a power series in $1/m_Q$ in the way described in section 2.1, and the matrix element under consideration up to order $1/m_Q$ takes the form:

$$\begin{aligned}\langle A|\bar{q}\Gamma Q|M(v)\rangle &= \langle A|\bar{q}\Gamma h_v|H(v)\rangle \\ &+\frac{1}{2m_Q}\langle A|\bar{q}\Gamma P_- i\not{D} h_v|H(v)\rangle - i\int d^4x\langle A|T\{L_1(x)\bar{q}\Gamma h_v\}|H(v)\rangle + \mathcal{O}(1/m^2)\end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

where L_1 are the first-order corrections to the Lagrangian as given in (19) or (23). Furthermore, $|M(v)\rangle$ is the state of the heavy meson in full QCD, including all its mass dependence, while $|H(v)\rangle$ is the corresponding state in the infinite mass limit.

Expression (58) displays the generic structure of the higher-order corrections as they appear in any HQET calculation. There will be local contributions coming from the expansion of the full QCD field; these may be interpreted as the corrections to the currents. The nonlocal contributions, i.e. the time-ordered products, are the corresponding corrections to the states and thus in the r.h.s. of (58) only the states of the infinite-mass limit appear.

As a relevant example we consider the mass of a heavy hadron. In the infinite mass limit this mass is given in terms of the quark mass plus some "binding energy" $\bar{\Lambda}$. The corrections are of order $1/m_Q$ and are given by the matrix elements of the leading correction term of the Lagrangian. One obtains [25]

$$m_H = m_Q \left(1 + \frac{\bar{\Lambda}}{m_Q} + \frac{1}{2m_Q^2}\left(\lambda_1 + d_H \lambda_2\right) + \mathcal{O}(1/m_Q^3)\right) \tag{59}$$

where $d_H = 3$ for the 0^- and $d_H = -1$ for the 1^- meson. Up to this order no nonlocal terms appear; such terms show up the first time at order $1/m_Q^3$. The parameters $\bar{\Lambda}$, λ_1 and λ_2 correspond to matrix elements involving higher order terms that appear in the effective theory Lagrangian

$$\bar{\Lambda} = \frac{\langle 0|q \overleftarrow{iv\!D}\, \gamma_5 h_v|H(v)\rangle}{\langle 0|q\gamma_5 h_v|H(v)\rangle} \tag{60}$$

$$\lambda_1 = \frac{\langle H(v)|\bar{h}_v (iD)^2 h_v|H(v)\rangle}{2M_H} \tag{61}$$

$$\lambda_2 = \frac{\langle H(v)|\bar{h}_v \sigma_{\mu\nu} iD^\mu iD^\nu h_v|H(v)\rangle}{2M_H} \tag{62}$$

where the normalization of the states is chosen to be $\langle H(v)|\bar{h}_v h_v|H(v)\rangle = 2M_H = 2(m_Q + \bar{\Lambda})$. These parameters may be interpreted as the binding energy of the heavy meson in the infinite mass limit ($\bar{\Lambda}$), the expectation value of the kinetic energy of the heavy quark (λ_1) and its energy due to the chromomagnetic moment of the heavy quark (λ_2) inside the heavy meson. The latter two parameters play an important role since they parametrize the non-perturbative input needed in the subleading order of the $1/m_Q$ expansion.

All the parameters appearing in the mass relation are subject to renormalization or suffer from ambiguities from renormalons, the latter subject is discussed in [26]. Hence quoting values for these parameters requires a procedure how to deal with these problems [27].

The only parameter which is easy to access is λ_2, since it is related to the mass splitting between $H(v)$ and $H^*(v,\epsilon)$. From the B-meson system we obtain

$$\lambda_2(m_b) = \frac{1}{4}(M_{H^*} - M_H) = 0.12 \text{ GeV}^2; \tag{63}$$

from the charm system the same value is obtained. This shows that indeed the spin-symmetry partners are degenerate in the infinite mass limit and the splitting between them scales as $1/m_Q$.

The other parameters appearing in (59) are not simply related to the hadron spectrum. Using the pole mass for m_Q in (59), QCD sum rules yield for a value of $\bar{\Lambda} = 570 \pm 70$ MeV [4].

More problematic is the parameter λ_1; from its definition one is led to assume $\lambda_1 < 0$; a more restrictive inequality

$$-\lambda_1 > 3\lambda_2 \tag{64}$$

has been derived in a quantum mechanical framework in [53] and using heavy-flavour sum rules [29]. Furthermore, there exists also a sum rule estimate [30] for this parameter:

$$\lambda_1 = -0.52 \pm 0.12 \text{ GeV}^2. \tag{65}$$

This value is compatible with the bounds; however, it is unexpectedly large, since it corresponds to a rms-momentum of the heavy quark inside the meson of

$$\sqrt{\langle \vec{p}^2 \rangle} \sim 720 \text{ MeV} \tag{66}$$

which is large compared to the naive guess of $-\lambda_1 \sim (\Lambda_{QCD})^2$ This is the reason why also smaller values of λ_1 have been used in the literature.

Finally we shall review briefly two important results concerning $1/m_Q$ corrections, one of which is called Lukes theorem [31]. It is a generalization of the Ademollo Gatto theorem [32], which states that in the presence of explicit symmetry breaking the matrix elements of the currents that generate the symmetry are still normalized up to terms which are second order in the symmetry breaking interaction.

For the case at hand the relevant symmetry is the heavy flavor symmetry. This symmetry is an $SU(2)$ symmetry and is generated by three operators $Q_\pm$ and Q_3 with

$$\begin{aligned} &Q_+ = \int d^3x\, \bar{b}_v(x) c_v(x) \quad Q_- = \int d^3x\, \bar{c}_v(x) b_v(x) \\ &Q_3 = \int d^3x\, (\bar{b}_v(x) b_v(x) - \bar{c}_v(x) c_v(x)) \\ &[Q_+, Q_-] = Q_3 \qquad [Q_+, Q_3] = -2Q_+ \qquad (Q_+)^\dagger = Q_- \end{aligned} \tag{67}$$

Let us denote the ground state flavour symmetry multiplet as $|B\rangle$ and $|D\rangle$. Then the operators act in the following way

$$\begin{aligned} &Q_3|B\rangle = |B\rangle \qquad Q_3|D\rangle = -|D\rangle \\ &Q_+|D\rangle = |B\rangle \qquad Q_-|B\rangle = |D\rangle \\ &Q_+|B\rangle = Q_-|D\rangle = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

The Hamiltonian of this system has a $1/m_Q$ expansion of the form

$$\begin{aligned} H &= H_0^{(b)} + H_0^{(c)} + \frac{1}{2m_b} H_1^{(b)} + \frac{1}{2m_c} H_1^{(c)} + \cdots \\ &= H_0^{(b)} + H_0^{(c)} + \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{2m_b} + \frac{1}{2m_c}\right)(H_1^{(b)} + H_1^{(c)}) \\ &\qquad + \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{2m_b} - \frac{1}{2m_c}\right)(H_1^{(b)} - H_1^{(c)}) + \cdots \\ &= H_{symm} + H_{break}. \end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

In the second equation, the first line is still symmetric under heavy flavour $SU(2)$ while the term in the second line does not commute any more with $Q_\pm$, but it still commutes with Q_3.

In other words, to order $1/m_Q$ we still have common eigenstates of H and Q_3, which we shall denote as $|\tilde{B}\rangle$ and $|\tilde{D}\rangle$. Sandwiching the commutation relation we get

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \langle\tilde{B}|Q_3|\tilde{B}\rangle = \langle\tilde{B}|[Q_+,Q_-]|\tilde{B}\rangle \\ &= \sum_n \left[\langle\tilde{B}|Q_+|\tilde{n}\rangle\langle\tilde{n}|Q_-|\tilde{B}\rangle - \langle\tilde{B}|Q_-|\tilde{n}\rangle\langle\tilde{n}|Q_+|\tilde{B}\rangle\right] \\ &= \sum_n \left[|\langle\tilde{B}|Q_+|\tilde{n}\rangle|^2 - |\langle\tilde{B}|Q_-|\tilde{n}\rangle|^2\right] \end{aligned} \tag{70}$$

where $|\tilde{n}\rangle$ form a complete set of states of the Hamiltonian $H_{symm}+H_{break}$. The matrix elements may be written as

$$\langle\tilde{B}|Q_\pm|\tilde{n}\rangle = \frac{1}{E_B - E_n}\langle\tilde{B}|[H_{break},Q_\pm]|\tilde{n}\rangle \tag{71}$$

where E_B and E_n are the energies of the states $|\tilde{B}\rangle$ and $|\tilde{n}\rangle$ repectively. In the case $|\tilde{n}\rangle = |\tilde{D}\rangle$ the matrix element will be of order unity, since both the numerator as well as the energy difference in the denominator are of the order of the symmetry breaking. For all other states the energy difference in the denomiantor is nonvanishing in the symmetry limit, and hence this difference is of order unity; thus the matrix element for these states will be of the order of the symmetry breaking. From this we conclude

$$\langle\tilde{B}|Q_+|\tilde{D}\rangle = 1 + \mathcal{O}\left[\left(\frac{1}{2m_b} - \frac{1}{2m_c}\right)^2\right]. \tag{72}$$

In particular, the weak transition currents at the nonrecoil point $v = v'$ are proportional to these symmetry generators and hence we may conclude that for some of these matrix elements we only have corrections of the order $1/m_Q^2$.

Another restriction on the $1/m_Q$ expansion is imposed by the so called reparametrization invariance [33]. Full QCD depends only on the momentum of the heavy quark P, and the splitting of this momentum in an on-shell part $m_Q v$ and a residual momentum k corresponding to the covariant derivative acting on the heavy static field h_v is arbitrary. Formally this means that the Lagrangian does not depend on the velocity v, if all orders of the $1/m_Q$ expansion are included; the v dependence only enters once the expansion is truncated.

Using the representation (19) and (18) the Lagrangian is invariant under the transformation

$$\begin{aligned} &v \to v + \delta v \qquad v\cdot\delta v = 0 \\ &h_v \to h_v + \frac{\delta\!\!\!/ v}{2}\left(1 + P_- \frac{1}{2m + iv\!\cdot\! D} i\not{D}\right) h_v \\ &iD \to -m\,\delta v. \end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

This invariance is the so-called reparametrization invariance, which has non-trivial consequences, since it relates terms of different orders of the $1/m$ expansion.

3 Exclusive Decays

The heavy mass limit and the resulting additional symmetries allow us to restrict the matrix elements which occur in weak transitions of heavy hadrons. We shall consider in the following in some detail the semileptonic $b \to c$ transition, which we shall treat as a heavy to heavy decay. In section 3.2 we investigate the consequences of heavy quark symmetries for transitions of the heavy to light type.

3.1 Heavy to Heavy Transitions

For the case of a heavy to heavy transition the Wigner Eckart theorem (31) implies that there is only a single form factor which describe the weak decays of heavy hadrons; furthermore, the heavy mass limit yields the normalization of this form factor at the kinematic point $v = v'$.

Treating both the b and the c quark as heavy, the semileptonic decays $B \to D^{(*)}\ell\nu$ are the phenomenologically relevant examples. The matrix elements for these transitions are in general parametrized in terms of six form factors

$$\langle D(v')|\bar{c}\gamma_\mu b|B(v)\rangle = \sqrt{m_B m_D}\left[\xi_+(y)(v_\mu + v'_\mu) + \xi_-(y)(v_\mu - v'_\mu)\right] \tag{74}$$

$$\langle D^*(v',\epsilon)|\bar{c}\gamma_\mu b|B(v)\rangle = i\sqrt{m_B m_{D^*}}\xi_V(y)\varepsilon_{\mu\alpha\beta\rho}\epsilon^{*\alpha}v'^{\beta}v^{\rho} \tag{75}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\langle D^*(v',\epsilon)|\bar{c}\gamma_\mu\gamma_5 b|B(v)\rangle = \sqrt{m_B m_{D^*}}\Big[&\xi_{A1}(y)(vv'+1)\epsilon^*_\mu - \xi_{A2}(y)(\epsilon^* v)v_\mu \\ &-\xi_{A2}(y)(\epsilon^* v)v'_\mu\Big],\end{aligned} \tag{76}$$

where we have defined $y = vv'$. Due to the Wigner Eckart theorem (31) these six from factors are related to the Isgur Wise function by

$$\xi_i(y) = \xi(y) \text{ for } i = +, V, A1, A3, \qquad \xi_i(y) = 0 \text{ for } i = -, A2. \tag{77}$$

Since heavy quark symmetries also yield the normalization of the Isgur Wise function, we know the absolute value of the differential rate at the point $v = v'$ in terms of the meson masses and V_{cb}. Hence we may use this to extract V_{cb} from these decays in a model independent way by extrapolating the lepton spectrum to the kinematic endpoint $v = v'$. Using the mode $B \to D^{(*)}\ell\nu$ one obtains the relation

$$\lim_{v\to v'} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(vv')^2-1}}\frac{d\Gamma}{d(vv')} = \frac{G_F^2}{4\pi^3}|V_{cb}|^2(m_B - m_{D^*})^2 m_{D^*}^3|\xi_{A1}(1)|^2, \tag{78}$$

where ξ_{A1} is equal to the Isgur Wise function in the heavy mass limit, and hence $\xi_{A1}(1) = 1$.

Corrections to this relation have been calculated along the lines outlined above in leading and subleading order. A complete discussion may be found in more extensive review articles (see e.g. Neubert's review [4]), including reference to the original papers. Here we only state the final result

$$\begin{aligned}\xi_{A1}(1) = x^{6/25}\Bigg[1 + 1.561\frac{\alpha_s(m_c)-\alpha_s(m_b)}{\pi} - \frac{8\alpha_s(m_c)}{3\pi} \\ + z\left\{\frac{25}{54} - \frac{14}{27}x^{-9/25} + \frac{1}{18}x^{-12/25} + \frac{8}{25}\ln x\right\} - \frac{\alpha_s(\bar{m})}{\pi}\frac{z^2}{1-z}\ln z\Bigg] + \delta_{1/m^2},\end{aligned} \tag{79}$$

where we use the abbreviations

$$x = \frac{\alpha_s(m_c)}{\alpha_s(m_b)}, \quad z = \frac{m_c}{m_b}$$

and $\bar{m}$ is a scale somewhere between m_b and m_c.

Up to the term δ_{1/m^2} all these contributions may be calculated perturbatively, including the dependence on z. The quantity δ_{1/m^2} parametrizes the nonperturbative contributions, which enter here at order $1/m^2$. These corrections may be expressed in terms of the kinetic energy λ_1, the chromomagnetic moment λ_2, which are given in (61) and (62) respectively, and

———— FIG 1 ————

Figure 1: Latest data [38] for the product $|V_{cb}|\xi(vv')$ as a function of $y = vv'$.

matrix elements involving time-ordered products between the current and the corrections of the Lagrangian

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_{1/m^2} = &-\left(\frac{1}{2m_c}\right)^2 \frac{1}{2}\Big(-\lambda_1+\lambda_2 \\ &+ (-i)^2\frac{1}{2\sqrt{M_B M_D}}\int d^4x\, d^4y\, \langle B^*(v,\epsilon)|T\left[\mathcal{L}_b^{(1)}(x)\bar{b}_v c_v \mathcal{L}_c^{(1)}(y)\right]|D^*(v,\epsilon)\rangle\Big) \\ &+ \mathcal{O}(1/m_c^3, 1/m_b^2, 1/(m_c m_b)),\end{aligned} \tag{80}$$

where $\mathcal{L}_Q^{(1)}$ is the first order Lagangian for the quark Q as given in (19) or (23) and M_B (M_D) are the masses of the B (D) meson in the heavy quark limit. Here we display only the largest contribution of order $1/m_c^2$; the complete expression, including the $1/m_b^2$ and $1/(m_c m_b)$ terms, may be found in [34, 35].

Thus the correction δ_{1/m^2} is given in terms of λ_1 defined in (61), λ_2 given in (62) and a nonlocal matrix element involving a time-ordered product. The problem concerning the determintion of λ_1 has been considered already above; similarly it is not easy to obtain information on the matrix element involving the time-ordered product, and thus the corrections of order $1/m^2$ will finally limit our ability to determine the CKM matrix element V_{cb} in a model independent way, at least using the approach described here.

Various estimates for δ_{1/m^2} have been given in the literature. The first estimate of this correction has been given in [34] using the GISW model [36], which is based on a wave function for the light quark. In this work $\delta_{m^2} = -2\% \ldots -3\%$ has been obtained. Another estimate with weaker assumptions yields $\delta_{m^2} = 0 \ldots -5\%$ [35], but both estimates have been criticized recently as being too small. Based on heavy flavour sum rules it has been argued in [37] that the $1/m^2$ corrections can be quite large $\delta_{m^2} = 0\% \ldots -8\%$ [37]. These various estimates indicate the size of the theoretical error involved in the determination of V_{cb} from the exclusive channel $B \to D^* \ell\bar{\nu}_\ell$.

This result has been used to extract V_{cb} from data. In figure 1 the latest data [38] are shown. From this fit one obtains [38]

$$|V_{cb}| = 0.0362 \pm 0.0019 \pm 0.0020 \pm 0.0014, \tag{81}$$

where $\xi(1) = 0.97 \pm 0.04$ has been used. The third error in $|V_{cb}|$ is due to the theoretical uncertainties, which by now almost match the experimental ones.

Similar statements can be made for the semileptonic decays of heavy baryons. The decay $\Lambda_b \to \Lambda_c \ell\bar{\nu}$ is again parametrized by a single form factor, and this even remains true for the $1/m_Q$ correction terms [39, 40]. However, at present data on these decays are still sparse, although first measurements have been performed [41].

The Σ-type baryons will in general decay either strongly or electromagnetically and hence a weak decay will be completely unobservable. The only candidate where a weak decay may be observable is the Ω_Q baryon, since a strong decay would require the emission of a kaon and this may be suppressed due to the too small phase space.

3.2 Heavy to Light Transitions

Heavy quark symmetries may also be used to restrict the independent form factors appearing in heavy to light decays. For the decays of heavy mesons into light 0^- and 1^- particles heavy quark symmetries restrict the number of independent form factors to six, which is just the number needed to parametrize the semileptonic decays of this type. Furthermore, no absolute normalization of form factors may be obtained from heavy quark symmetries in the heavy to light case; only the relative normalization of B meson decays heavy to light transitions may be obtained from the corresponding D decays.

In general we shall discuss matrix elements of a heavy to light current which have the following structure

$$J = \langle A|\bar{\ell}\Gamma h_v|H(v)\rangle, \tag{82}$$

where Γ is an arbitrary Dirac matrix, ℓ is a light quark (u, d or s) and A is a state involving only light degrees of freedom.

Spin symmetry implies that the heavy quark index hooks directly the to the heavy quark index of the Dirac matrix of the current. Thus one may write for the transition matrix element (88)

$$\langle A|\bar{\ell}\Gamma h_v|H(v)\rangle = \text{ Tr } (\mathcal{M}_A\Gamma H(v)) \tag{83}$$

where the matrix $H(v)$ representing the heavy meson has been given in (32). The matrix $\mathcal{M}_A$ describes the light degrees of freedom and is the most general matrix which may be formed from the kinematical variables involved. Furthermore, if the energies of the particles in the state A are small, i.e. of the order of Λ_{QCD}, the matrix $\mathcal{M}_A$ does not depend on the heavy quark; in particular it does not depend on the heavy mass m_H. In the following we shall discuss some examples.

The first example is the heavy meson decay constant, where the state A is simply the vacuum state. The heavy meson decay constant is defined by

$$\langle 0|\bar{\ell}\gamma_\mu\gamma_5 h_v|H(v)\rangle = f_H m_H v_\mu, \tag{84}$$

and since $|A\rangle = |0\rangle$ the matrix $\mathcal{M}_0$ is simply the unit matrix times a dimensionful constant[2] and one has, using (83)

$$\langle 0|\bar{\ell}\gamma_\mu\gamma_5 h_v|H(v)\rangle = \kappa \text{ Tr } (\gamma\gamma_5 H(v)) = 2\kappa\sqrt{m_H}v_\mu. \tag{85}$$

As discussed above the constant κ does not depend on the heavy mass and thus on infers the well-known scaling law for the heavy meson decay constant from the last two equation

$$f_H \propto \frac{1}{\sqrt{m_H}} \tag{86}$$

Including the leading and subleading QCD radiative corrections one obtains a relation between f_B and f_D

$$f_B = \sqrt{\frac{m_c}{m_b}}\left(\frac{\alpha_s(m_b)}{\alpha_s(m_c)}\right)^{-6/25}\left[1 + 0.894\frac{\alpha_s(m_c) - \alpha_s(m_b)}{\pi}\right] f_D \sim 0.69 f_D. \tag{87}$$

[2]Note that contributions proportional to $\not{v}$ may be eliminated using

$$H(v)\not{v} = -H(v).$$

The second example are transitions of a heavy meson into a light pseudoscalar meson, which we shall denote as π. The matrix element corresponding to (82) is

$$J_P = \langle \pi(p)|\bar{\ell}\Gamma h_v|H(v)\rangle, \tag{88}$$

where p is the momentum of the light quark,

The Dirac marix $\mathcal{M}_P$ for the light degrees of freedom appearing now in (83) depends on p and v. It may be expanded in terms of the sixteen independent Dirac matrices 1, γ_5, γ_μ, $\gamma_5\gamma_\mu$, and $\sigma_{\mu\nu}$ taking into account that it has to behave like a pseudoscalar. The form factors appearing in the decomposition of $\mathcal{M}_P$ depend on the variable $v\cdot p$, the energy of the light meson in the rest frame of the heavy one. In order to compare different heavy to light transition by employing heavy flavor symmetry this energy must be sufficiently small, since the typical scale for the light degrees of freedom has to be of the order of Λ_{QCD} to apply heavy quark symmetry[3]. For the case of a light pseudoscalar meson the most general decomposition of $\mathcal{M}_P$ is

$$\mathcal{M}_P = \sqrt{v\cdot p}A(\eta)\gamma_5 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{v\cdot p}}B(\eta)\gamma_5\not{p}, \tag{89}$$

where we have defined the dimensionless variable

$$\eta = \frac{v\cdot p}{\Lambda_{QCD}}. \tag{90}$$

The form factors A and B are universal in the kinematic range of small energy of the light meson, i.e. where the momentum transfer to the light degrees of freedom is of the order Λ_{QCD}; in this region η is of order unity. This universality of the form factors may be used to relate various kinds of heavy to light transitions, e.g. the semileptonic decays like $D\to\pi e\nu$, $D\to Ke\nu$ or $B\to\pi e\nu$ and also the rare decays like $B\to K\ell^+\ell^-$ or $B\to\pi\ell^+\ell^-$ where ℓ denotes an electron or a muon.

As an example we give the relations between exclusive semileptonic heavy to light decays. The relvant hadronic current for this case may be expressed in terms of two form factors

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \pi(p)|\bar{\ell}\gamma(1-\gamma_5)h_v|H(v)\rangle &= F_1(v\cdot p)m_H v_\mu + F_2(v\cdot p)p_\mu \\ &= F_+(v\cdot p)(m_H v_\mu + p_\mu) + F_-(v\cdot p)q_\mu\end{aligned} \tag{91}$$

where

$$F_\pm(v\cdot p) = \frac{1}{2}\left(F_1(v\cdot p) \pm F_2(v\cdot p)\right) \tag{92}$$

Inserting this into (88) one may express $F_\pm$ in terms of the universal form factors A and B

$$F_1(v\cdot p) = F_+(v\cdot p) + F_-(v\cdot p) = -2\sqrt{\frac{v\cdot p}{m_H}}A(\eta) \tag{93}$$

$$F_2(v\cdot p) = F_+(v\cdot p) - F_-(v\cdot p) = -2\sqrt{\frac{m_H}{v\cdot p}}B(\eta) \tag{94}$$

From these relations one may read off the scaling of the form factors with the heavy mass which was already derived in [42].

[3]Note that in this case the variable $v\cdot p$ ranges between 0 and $m_H/2$ where we have neglected the pion mass. Thus at the upper end of phase space the variable $v\cdot p$ scales with the heavy mass and heavy quark symmetries are not applicable any more.

This may be used to normalize the semileptonic B decays into light mesons relative to the semileptonic D decays. One obtains

$$F_\pm^B(v\cdot p)=\frac{1}{2}\left(\sqrt{\frac{m_D}{m_B}}\pm\sqrt{\frac{m_B}{m_D}}\right)F_+^D(v\cdot p)+\frac{1}{2}\left(\sqrt{\frac{m_D}{m_B}}\mp\sqrt{\frac{m_B}{m_D}}\right)F_-^D(v\cdot p) \tag{95}$$

Note that F_+ for the B decay is expressed in terms of F_+ *and* F_- for the D decays. In the limit of vanishing fermion masses only F_+ contributes, which means that the F_- contribution to the rate is of the order of m_{lepton}/m_H. Thus it will be extremely difficult to determine experimentally.

The case of a heavy meson decaying into a light vector meson may be treated similarly. The matrix element for the transition of a heavy meson into a light vector meson (denoted generically as ρ in the following) is given again by (82) and is in this case

$$J_V=\langle\rho(p,\epsilon)|\bar{\ell}\Gamma h_v|H(v)\rangle. \tag{96}$$

Using (83) one has

$$\langle\rho(p,\epsilon)|\bar{\ell}\Gamma h_v|H(v)\rangle=\ \mathrm{Tr}\ \left(\mathcal{M}_V\Gamma H(v)\right), \tag{97}$$

where now the Dirac matrix $\mathcal{M}_V$ has to be a linear function of the polarization of the light vector meson.

The most general decomposition is given in terms of four dimensionless form factors

$$\mathcal{M}_V=\sqrt{v\cdot p}C(\eta)(v\cdot\epsilon)+\frac{1}{\sqrt{v\cdot p}}D(\eta)(v\cdot\epsilon)\not{p}+\sqrt{v\cdot p}E(\eta)\not{\epsilon}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{v\cdot p}}F(\eta)\not{p}\not{\epsilon} \tag{98}$$

where the variable η has been defined in (90).

Similar to the case of the decays into a light pseudoscalar meson (97) may be used to relate various exclusive heavy to light processes in the kinematic range where the energy of the outgoing vector meson is small. For example, the semileptonic decays $D\to\rho e\nu$, $D\to K^*e\nu$ and $B\to\rho e\nu$ are related among themselves and all of them may be related to the rare heavy to light decays $B\to K^*\ell^+\ell^-$ and $B\to\rho\ell^+\ell^-$ with $\ell=e,\mu$.

Finally we comment on the heavy to light transitions of baryons. For the Λ-type heavy baryons (33) spin symmetry relates different polarizations of the same particle and thus imposes interesting constraints. Consider for example the matrix element of an operator $\bar{\ell}\Gamma h_v$ between a heavy Λ_Q and a light spin-1/2 baryon B_ℓ. It is described by only two form factors,

$$\langle B_\ell(p)|\bar{\ell}\Gamma h_v|\Lambda_Q(v)\rangle=\bar{u}_\ell(p)\{F_1(v\cdot p)+\not{v}F_2(v\cdot p)\}\Gamma u_{\Lambda_Q}(v). \tag{99}$$

Thus in this particular case spin symmetry greatly reduces the number of independent Lorentz-invariant amplitudes which describe the heavy to light transitions.

This has some interesting implications for exclusive semileptonic Λ_c decays. For the case of a left handed current $\Gamma=\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)$, the semileptonic decay $\Lambda_c\to\Lambda\ell\bar{\nu}_\ell$ is in general parametrized in terms of six form factors

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\Lambda(p)|\bar{q}\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)c|\Lambda_c(v)\rangle=&\ \bar{u}(p)\left[f_1\gamma_\mu+if_2\sigma_{\mu\nu}q^\nu+f_3q^\mu\right]u(p')\\&+\bar{u}(p)\left[g_1\gamma_\mu+ig_2\sigma_{\mu\nu}q^\nu+g_3q^\mu\right]\gamma_5u(p'),\end{aligned} \tag{100}$$

where $p'=m_{\Lambda_c}v$ is the momentum of the Λ_c whereas $q=m_{\Lambda_c}v-p$ is the momentum transfer. From this one defines the ratio G_A/G_V by

$$\frac{G_A}{G_V}=\frac{g_1(q^2=0)}{f_1(q^2=0)}. \tag{101}$$

In the heavy c quark limit one may relate the six form factors f_i and g_i $(i = 1, 2, 3)$ to the two form factors F_j $(j = 1, 2)$

$$f_1 = -g_1 = F_1 + \frac{m_\Lambda}{m_{\Lambda_c}} F_2 \tag{102}$$

$$f_2 = f_3 = -g_2 = -g_3 = \frac{1}{m_{\Lambda_c}} F_2 \tag{103}$$

from which one reads off $G_A/G_V = -1$. This ratio is acessible by measuring in semileptonic decays $\Lambda_c \to \lambda \ell \bar{\nu}_\ell$ the polarization variable α

$$\alpha = \frac{2 G_A G_V}{G_A^2 + G_V^2} \tag{104}$$

which is predicted to be $\alpha = -1$ in the heavy c quark limit. The subleading corrections to the heavy c quark limit have been estimated and found to be small [43]

$$\alpha < -0.95, \tag{105}$$

and recent measurements yield

$$\alpha = -0.91 \pm 0.49 \quad \text{ARGUS [44]} \tag{106}$$

$$\alpha = -0.89^{+0.17+0.09}_{-0.11-0.05} \quad \text{CLEO[45]} \tag{107}$$

and are in satisfactory agreement with the theoretical predictions.

Recently the CLEO collaboration also measured the ratio of the form factors F_1 and F_2, averaged over phase space. Heavy quark symmetries do not fix this form factor ratio, at least not for a heavy to light decay, while for a heavy to heavy decay the form factor F_2 vanishes in the heavy mass limit for the final state quark. CLEO measures [47]

$$\left\langle \frac{F_2}{F_2} \right\rangle_{\text{phase space}} = -0.25 \pm 0.14 \pm 0.08 \tag{108}$$

which is in good agreement with model estimates [46].

4 Inclusive Decays

For inclusive decays a $1/m_Q$ expansion is obtained for the rates by an approach similar to the one known from deep inelastic scattering [5]-[13]. The first step consists of an operator product expansion which yields an infinite sum of operators with increasing dimension. The dimensions of the operators are compensated by inverse powers of a large scale, which is in general of the order of the heavy mass scale. The decay probability is then given as forward matrix elements of these operators between the state of the decaying heavy hadron; these matrix elements still have a mass dependence, which then may be extracted in terms of a $1/m_Q$ expansion using HQET as for exclusive decays.

The method described below also allows us to deal with inclusive non-leptonic processes and hence in principle opens the possibility for a calculation of lifetimes and branching fractions in the framework of the $1/m_Q$ expansion. However, comparing the results of the $1/m_Q$ for lifetimes and branching fractions reveals some potential problems of this approach which will be discussed in the last paragraph of this section.

Applying this idea to the energy spectra of the charged lepton in inclusive semileptonic decays of heavy mesons, the relevant expansion parameter is not $1/m_Q$, but rather $1/(m_Q - 2E_\ell)$; the denominator is thus the energy release of the decay. In almost all phase space the energy release is of the order of the heavy mass; it is only in the endpoint region that it becomes small and hence the expansion breaks down. This problem may be fixed by a resummation of terms in the operator product expansion, which strongly resembles the summation corresponding to leading twist in deep inelastic scattering. Analogously to the parton-distribution function, a universal function appears, which determines all inclusive heavy-to-light decays.

4.1 Operator Product Expansion

The effective Hamiltonian for a decay of a heavy (down-type) quark is in general linear in the decaying heavy flavoured quark

$$\mathcal{H}_{eff} = \bar{Q} R \tag{109}$$

where the operator R describes the decay products. In the following we shall consider semileptonic decays, for which

$$R_{sl} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{Qq}\ \gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)q\ (\bar{\nu}_\ell \gamma^\mu(1-\gamma_5)\ell), \tag{110}$$

where q is an up-type quark (c or u, since we shall consider b decays). Similarly, for nonleptonic decays the Cabbibo allowed contribution corresponds to

$$\begin{aligned} R_{nl} = \frac{G_F}{2\sqrt{2}} V_{Qq} V^*_{q'q''} \left[(C_+(m_b) + C_-(m_b))\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)q\ (\bar{q}'\gamma^\mu(1-\gamma_5)q'') \right. \\ \left. + (C_+(m_b) - C_-(m_b))\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)q''\ (\bar{q}'\gamma^\mu(1-\gamma_5)q) \right], \end{aligned} \tag{111}$$

where q' (q'') is a down-type (up-type) quark and V_{Qq} the corresponding CKM matrix element. The coefficients $C_\pm(m_b)$ are the QCD corrections obtained from the renormalization group running between M_W and m_b; in leading logarithmic approximation these coefficients are [48]

$$C_\pm(m_b) = \left[\frac{\alpha_S(M_W^2)}{\alpha_S(m_b^2)}\right]^{\gamma_\pm}, \text{ with } \gamma_+ = \frac{6}{33-2N_f} = -\frac{1}{2}\gamma_- \tag{112}$$

where $\alpha_s(\mu)$ is the onle-loop expression (57) for the running coupling coupling constant of QCD.

Finally, for radiative rare decays we have

$$R_{rare} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{tb} V^*_{ts} C_7(m_b) \frac{e}{16\pi^2} m_b \sigma_{\mu\nu}(1+\gamma_5) s F^{\mu\nu} \tag{113}$$

where $C_7(m_b)$ is again a coefficient obtained from running between M_W and m_b. Its value is $C_7(m_b) \sim 0.3$, the corresponding analytical expression may be found in [49].

The inclusive decay rate for a heavy hadron H containing the quark Q may be related to a forward matrix element by

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma \propto \sum_X (2\pi)^4 \delta^4(P_B - P_X) |\langle X|\mathcal{H}_{eff}|H(v)\rangle|^2 = \int d^4x\, \langle H(v)|\mathcal{H}_{eff}(x)\mathcal{H}^\dagger_{eff}(0)|H(v)\rangle \\ = 2\ \mathrm{Im} \int d^4x\, \langle H(v)|T\{\mathcal{H}_{eff}(x)\mathcal{H}^\dagger_{eff}(0)\}|H(v)\rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{114}$$

where $|X\rangle$ is the final state, which is summed over to obtain the inclusive rate.

The matrix element appearing in (114) contains a large scale, namely the mass of the heavy quark. The first step towards a $1/m_Q$ expansion is to make this large scale explicit. This may be done by a phase redefinition. This leads to

$$\Gamma \propto 2\ \mathrm{Im} \int d^4x\, e^{-im_Q vx}\, \langle H(v)|T\{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_{eff}(x)\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^\dagger_{eff}(0)\}|H(v)\rangle \tag{115}$$

where

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_{eff} = \bar{Q}_v R \qquad Q_v = e^{-im_Q vx} Q \tag{116}$$

This relation exhibits the similarity between the cross-section calculation in deep inelastic scattering and the present approach to total rates. In deep inelastic scattering there appears a large scale, which is the momentum transfer to the leptons, while here the mass of the heavy quark appears as a large scale.

The next step is to perform an operator product expansion of the product of the two Hamiltonians. After the phase redefinition the remaining matrix element does not involve large momenta of the order of the heavy quark mass any more and hence a short-distance expansion becomes useful, if the mass m_Q is large compared to the scale $\bar{\Lambda}$ determining the matrix element. The next step is thus to perform an operator-product expansion, which has the general form

$$\int d^4x\, e^{im_Q vx}\, \langle H(v)|T\{\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_{eff}(x)\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}^\dagger_{eff}(0)\}|H(v)\rangle = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{2m_Q}\right)^n \hat{C}_{n+3}(\mu)\langle H(v)|\mathcal{O}_{n+3}|H(v)\rangle_\mu,$$

where $\mathcal{O}_n$ are operators of dimension n, with their matrix elements renormalized at scale μ, and $\hat{C}_n$ are the corresponding Wilson coefficients. These coefficients encode the short distance physics related to the heavy quark mass scale and may be calculated in perturbation theory. All long distance contributions connected to the hadronic scale $\bar{\Lambda}$ are contained in the matrix elements of the operators $\mathcal{O}_{n+3}$.

Still the matrix elements of $\mathcal{O}_{n+3}$ are not independent of the heavy quark mass scale, but this mass dependence may be expanded in powers of $1/m_Q$ by means of heavy quark effective theory. This is achived by expanding the heavy quark fields appearing in the operators $\mathcal{O}_n$ using (18) (or, equivalently, (22)) as well as the states by including the corrections to the Lagrangian given in (19) (or (23)) as time-ordered products. In this way the mass dependence of the total decay rate may be accessed completely within an expansion in $1/m_Q$.

The lowest-order term of the operator product expansion are the dimension-3 operators. Due to Lorentz invariance and parity there are only two combinations which may appear, namely $\bar{Q}_v \not{v} Q_v$ or $\bar{Q}_v Q_v$. Note that the Q_v operators differ from the full QCD operators only by a phase redefinition, and hence $\bar{Q}_v \not{v} Q_v = \bar{Q} \not{v} Q$ and $\bar{Q}_v Q_v = \bar{Q} Q$. The first combination is proportional to the Q-number current $\bar{Q}\gamma_\mu Q$, which is normalized even in full QCD, while the second differs from the first one only by terms of order $1/m_Q^2$

$$\bar{Q}_v Q_v = v_\mu \bar{Q}_v \gamma_\mu Q_v + \frac{1}{2m_Q^2}\bar{h}_v \left[(iD)^2 - (ivD)^2 + \frac{i}{2}\sigma_{\mu\nu}G^{\mu\nu}\right] h_v + \mathcal{O}(1/m_Q^3). \tag{117}$$

where $G_{\mu\nu}$ is the gluon field strength.

Thus the matrix elements of the dimension-3 contribution is known to be normalized; in the standard normalization of the states this implies

$$\langle H(v)|\mathcal{O}_3|H(v)\rangle = \langle H(v)|\bar{Q}_v \not{v} H_v|B(v)\rangle = 2m_H \tag{118}$$

where m_H is the mass of the heavy hadron. To lowest order in the heavy mass expansion we may furthermore replace $m_B = m_Q$ and hence we may evaluate the leading term in the $1/m_q$

expansion without any hadronic uncertainty. Generically the dimension-3 contribution yields the free quark decay rate. This has been previously used as a model for inclusive decays, but now it turns out to be the first term in a systematic $1/m_Q$ expansion of total rates.

A dimension-four operators contains an additional covariant derivative, and thus one has matrix elements of the type

$$\langle H(v)|\mathcal{O}_4|H(v)\rangle \propto \langle H(v)|\bar{Q}_v \Gamma D_\mu Q_v|H(v)\rangle = \mathcal{A}_\Gamma v_\mu \tag{119}$$

Since the equations of motion apply for this tree level matrix element, one finds that the constant $\mathcal{A}_\Gamma$ has to vanish, and thus there are no dimension-four contributions. This statement is completely equaivalent to Lukes theorem [31], since we are considering a forward matrix element, i.e. a matrix element at zero recoil [35].

The first non-trivial non-perturbative contribution comes from dimension-5 operators and are of order $1/m_Q^2$. For mesonic decays there are only the two parameters λ_1 and λ_2 given in (61) and (62), which correspond to matrix elements of the subleading terms of the Lagrangian. They parametrize the non-perturbative input in the order $1/m_Q^2$. For Λ_Q-type baryons the parameter λ_2 vanishes due to heavy quark spin symmetry, while the kinetic energy parameter λ_1 is nonzero as well. In the framework of the $1/m_Q$ expansion this leads to a difference in lifetimes between mesons and baryons.

4.2 Total Decay Rates

In this subsection we shall collect the results for the total rates including the first non-trivial non-perturbative correction.

Inserting R_{sl} as given in (110) one obtains for the total inclusive semileptonic decay rate $B \to X_c \ell \nu$

$$\Gamma(B \to X_c \ell \nu) = \frac{G_F^2 m_b^5}{192\pi^3}|V_{cb}|^2 \left[\left(1 + \frac{\lambda_1}{2m_c^2}\right) f_1\left(\frac{m_c}{m_b}\right) - \frac{9\lambda_2}{2m_c^2} f_2\left(\frac{m_c}{m_b}\right)\right], \tag{120}$$

where the two f_j are phase-space functions

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(x) &= 1 - 8x^2 + 8x^6 - x^8 - 24x^4 \log x, \\ f_2(x) &= 1 - \frac{8}{3}x^2 - 8x^4 + 8x^6 + \frac{5}{3}x^8 + 8x^4 \log x. \end{aligned} \tag{121}$$

The result for $B \to X_u \ell \nu_\ell$ is obtained from (120) as the limit $m_c \to 0$ and the replacement $V_{cb} \to V_{ub}$

$$\Gamma(B \to X_u \ell \nu) = \frac{G_F^2 m_b^5}{192\pi^3}|V_{ub}|^2 \left[1 + \frac{\lambda_1 - 9\lambda_2}{2m_b^2}\right]. \tag{122}$$

As it has been discussed above, the leading non-perturbative corrections in (120) and (122) are parametrized by λ_1 and λ_2. Estimates for these parameters have been discussed in section 2; in order to estimate the total effect of the non-perturbative effects we shall insert a range of values $-0.3 > \lambda_1 > -0.6$ GeV^2; from this we obtain

$$\frac{\lambda_1 - 9\lambda_2}{2m_b^2} \sim -(3 \cdots 4)\% \tag{123}$$

This means that the non-perturbative contributions are small, in particular compared to the perturbative ones, which have been calculated some time ago [50, 51]. For the decay $B \to X_u \ell \bar{\nu}_\ell$ the lowest order QCD corrections are given by

$$\Gamma(B \to X_u \ell \bar{\nu}_\ell) = \frac{G_F^2 m_b^5}{192\pi^3} |V_{ub}|^2 \left[1 + \frac{2\alpha}{3\pi}\left(\frac{25}{4} - \pi^2\right)\right] = 0.85 |V_{ub}|^2 \Gamma_b, \tag{124}$$

and thus the typical size of QCD radiative corrections is of the order of ten to twenty percent.

Similarly, one obtains the result for non-leptonic decays as

$$\Gamma(B \to X_c) = 3\frac{G_F^2 m_b^5}{192\pi^3}\left\{A_1 f_1\left(\frac{m_c}{m_b}\right)\left[1 + \frac{1}{2m_b^2}(\lambda_1 - 9\lambda_2)\right] - 48 A_2 f_3\left(\frac{m_c}{m_b}\right)\frac{1}{2m_b^2}\lambda_2\right\} \tag{125}$$

where the coefficients A_i are given by combination of the Wilson coefficents $C_\pm(m_b)$ (112)

$$A_1 = \frac{1}{3}[C_-^2(m_b) + 2C_+^2(m_b)], \qquad A_2 = \frac{1}{6}[C_+^2(m_b) - C_-^2(m_b)], \tag{126}$$

and $f_3(x) = (1-x^2)^3$ is another phase space function. Again the non-perturbative corrections turn out to be small, in the region of a few percent compared to the leading term, and the perturbative corrections turn out to be much larger than this.

Finally, for the rare decay $B \to X_s\gamma$ one may as well calculate the non-perturbative contribution in terms of λ_1 and λ_2. One obtains

$$\Gamma(B \to X_s\gamma) = \frac{\alpha G_F^2}{16\pi^4} m_b^5 |V_{ts}V_{td}^*|^2 |C_7(m_b)|^2 \left[1 + \frac{1}{2m_b^2}(\lambda_1 - 9\lambda_2)\right], \tag{127}$$

and the relative size of the nonperturbative corrections is the same as in the $B \to X_u \ell \bar{\nu}_\ell$ decays.

Typically the non-pertubative corrections are much smaller than the radiative corrections. The only exception is the endpoint region of lepton energy spectra which receives both large perturbative as well as nonperturbative corrections. However, this is only a small region in phase space and the corections to the total rates remain moderate.

4.3 Lepton Energy Spectra

The method of the operator-product expansion may also be used to obtain the non-perturbative corrections to the charged lepton energy spectrum [8]. In this case the operator product expansion is applied not to the full effective Hamiltonian, but rather only to the hadronic currents. The rate is written as a product of the hadronic and leptonic tensor

$$d\Gamma = \frac{G_F^2}{4m_B}|V_{Qq}|^2 W_{\mu\nu}\Lambda^{\mu\nu} d(PS), \tag{128}$$

where $d(PS)$ is the phase-space differential. The short-distance expansion is then performed for the two currents appearing in the hadronic tensor. Redefining the phase of the heavy-quark fields as in (11) one finds that the momentum transfer variable relevant for the short-distance expansion is $m_Q v - q$, where q is the momentum transfer to the leptons.

The structure of the expansion for the spectrum is identical to the one of the total rate. The contribution of the dimension-3 operators yields the free-quark decay spectrum, there are no

———————- FIG 2 ———————–

Figure 2: The electron spectrum for free quark $b \to c$ decay (dashed line), free quark $b \to u$ decay (grey line), and $B \to X_c e \bar{\nu}_e$ decay including $1/m_b^2$ corrections (solid line) with $\lambda_1 = -0.5$ GeV^2 and $\lambda_2 = 0.12$ GeV^2. The figure is from [11].

contributions from dimension-4 operators, and the $1/m_b^2$ corrections are parametrized in terms of λ_1 and λ_2. Calculating the spectrum for $B \to X_c \ell \nu$ yields [9]-[12]

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d\Gamma}{dy} = & \frac{G_F^2 \,|\, V_{cb}|^2 \, m_b^5}{192\pi^3}\Theta(1-y-\rho)y^2 \left[\left\{3(1-\rho)(1-R^2) - 2y(1-R^3)\right\}\right. \\ & + \frac{\lambda_1}{[m_b(1-y)]^2}(3R^2 - 4R^3) - \frac{\lambda_1}{m_b^2(1-y)}(R^2 - 2R^3) \\ & - \frac{3\lambda_2}{m_b^2(1-y)}(2R + 3R^2 - 5R^3) + \frac{\lambda_1}{3m_b^2}[5y - 2(3-\rho)R^2 + 4R^3] \\ & \left. + \frac{\lambda_2}{m_b^2}[(6+5y) - 12R - (9-5\rho)R^2 + 10R^3]\right] + \mathcal{O}\left[(\Lambda/[m_b(1-y)])^3\right]\end{aligned} \tag{129}$$

where we have defined

$$\rho = \left(\frac{m_c}{m_b}\right)^2 \qquad R = \frac{\rho}{1-y} \tag{130}$$

and

$$y = 2E_\ell / m_b \tag{131}$$

is the rescaled energy of the charged lepton.

This expression is somewhat complicated, but it simplifies for the decay $B \to X_u \ell \nu$ since then the mass of the quark in the final state may be neglected. One finds

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d\Gamma}{dy} = & \frac{G_F^2 \,|\, V_{ub}|^2 \, m_b^5}{192\pi^3}\left[\left(2y^2(3-2y) + \frac{10y^2}{3}\frac{\lambda_1}{m_b^2} + 2y(6+5y)\frac{\lambda_2}{m_b^2}\right)\Theta(1-y)\right. \\ & \left. - \frac{\lambda_1 + 33\lambda_2}{3m_b^2}\delta(1-y) - \frac{\lambda_1}{3m_b^2}\delta'(1-y)\right]\end{aligned} \tag{132}$$

Figure 2 shows the distributions for inclusive semileptonic decays of B mesons. The spectrum close to the endpoint, where the lepton energy becomes maximal, exhibits a sharp spike as $y \to y_{max}$. In this region we have we have

$$\frac{d\Gamma}{dy} \propto \Theta(1-y-\rho)\left[2 + \frac{\lambda_1}{(m_Q(1-y))^2}\left(\frac{\rho}{1-\rho}\right)^2\left\{3 - 4\left(\frac{\rho}{1-\rho}\right)\right\}\right], \tag{133}$$

which behaves like δ-functions and its derivatives as $\rho \to 0$, which can be seen in (132). This behaviour indicates a breakdown of the operator product expansion close to the endpoint, since for the spectra the expansion parameter is not $1/m_Q$, but rather $1/(m_Q - qv)$, which becomes $1/(m_Q[1-y])$ after the integration over the neutrino momentum. In order to obtain a description of the endpoint region, one has to perform some resummation of the operator product expansion.

4.4 Resummation in the Endpoint Region

Very close to the endpoint of the inclusive semileptonic decay spectra only a few resonances contribute. In this resonance region one may not expect to have a good description of the spectrum using an approach based on parton-hadron duality; here a sum over a few resonances will be appropriate.

In the variable y the size of this resonance region is however of the order of $(\bar{\Lambda}/m_Q)^2$ and thus small. In a larger region of the order $\bar{\Lambda}/m_Q$, which we shall call the endpoint region, many resonances contribute and one may hope to describe the spectrum in this region using parton-hadron duality.

It has been argued in [52] that the δ-function-like singularities appearing in (132) may be reinterpreted as the expansion of a non-perturbative function describing the spectrum in the endpoint region. Keeping only the singular terms of (132) we write

$$\frac{1}{\Gamma_b}\frac{d\Gamma}{dy} = 2y^2(3-2y)S(y), \tag{134}$$

where

$$S(y) = \Theta(1-y) + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n \delta^{(n)}(1-y) \tag{135}$$

is a non-perturbative function given in terms of the moments a_n of the spectrum, taken over the endpoint region. These moments themselves have an expansion in $1/m_Q$ such that $a_n \sim 1/m_Q^{n+1}$, and we shall consider only the leading term in the expansion of the moments, corresponding to the most singular contribution to the endpoint region.

Comparing (132) with (134) and (135) one obtains that

$$a_0 = \int dy (S(y) - \Theta(1-y)) = \mathcal{O}(1/m_Q^2) \tag{136}$$

$$a_1 = \int y (S(y) - \Theta(1-y)) = -\frac{\lambda_1}{3m_Q^2} \tag{137}$$

where the integral extends over the endpoint region.

The non-perturbative function implements a resummation of the most singular terms contributing to the endpoint and, in the language of deep inelastic scattering, corresponds to the leading twist contribution. This resummation has been studied in QCD [54, 53] and the function $S(y)$ may be related to the distribution of the light cone component of the heavy quark residual momentum inside the heavy meson. The latter is a fundamental function for inclusive heavy-to-light transitions, which has been defined in [53]

$$f(k_+) = \frac{1}{2M_H}\langle H(v)|\, \bar{h}_v\, \delta(k_+ - iD_+)\, h_v\, |H(v)\rangle, \tag{138}$$

where $k_+ = k_0 + k_3$ is the positive light cone component of the residual momentum k. The relation between the two functions S and f is given by

$$S(y) = \frac{1}{m_Q} \int_{-m_Q(1-y)}^{\bar{\Lambda}} dk_+ f(k_+) \tag{139}$$

from which we infer that the n^{th} moment of the endpoint region is given in terms of the matrix element $\langle H(v)|\bar{h}_v (iD_+)^n h_v|H(v)\rangle$.

———————- FIG 3 ———————

Figure 3: Charged-lepton spectrum in $B \to X_u \ell \bar{\nu}$ decays. The solid line is (134) with the ansatz (140), the dashed line shows the prediction of the free-quark decay model. The figure is from [54].

The function f is a universal distribution function, which appears in all heavy-to-light inclusive decays; another example is the decay $B \to X_s \gamma$ [55, 53], where this function determines the photon-energy spectrum in a region of order $1/m_Q$ around the K^* peak.

In principle f has to be determined by other methods than the $1/m_Q$ expansion, e.g. from lattice calculations or from a model, or it has to be determined from experiment by measuring the photon spectrum in $B \to X_s \gamma$ or the lepton spectrum in $B \to X_u \ell \bar{\nu}$. In the context of the model ACCMM model [51] f has been calculated in [56].

Some of the properties of f are known. Its support is $-\infty < k_+ < \bar{\Lambda}$, it is normalized to unity, and its first moment vanishes. Its second moment is given by a_1, and its third moment has been estimated [53, 35]. A one-parameter model for f has been suggested in [54], which incorporates the known features of f

$$f(k_+) = \frac{32}{\pi^2 \bar{\Lambda}} (1-x)^2 \exp\left\{ -\frac{4}{\pi} (1-x)^2 \right\} \Theta(1-x), \tag{140}$$

where $x = k_+/\bar{\Lambda}$, and the choice $\bar{\Lambda} = 570$ MeV yields reasonable values for the moments. In fig. 3 we show the spectrum for $B \to X_u \ell \nu_\ell$ using the ansatz (140).

Including the non-perturbative effects yields a reasonably behaved spectrum in the endpoint region and the δ-function-like singularities have disappeared. Furthermore, the spectrum now extends beyond the parton model endpoint; it is shifted from $E_\ell^{max} = m_Q/2$ to the physical endpoint $E_\ell^{max} = M_H/2$, since f is non-vanishing for positive values of $k_+ < \bar{\Lambda} = M_H - m_Q$.

4.5 Semileptonic Branching Fraction and Charm Counting

The calculation of the total non-leptonic width in the framework of the $1/m_Q$ allows us to obtain lifetimes and the semileptonic branching fraction. However, at the moment there still seems to be some problem concerning the semileptonic branching fraction which we shall discuss in this section, following the line of argument as given in [57].

The total decay rate is composed of three contributions

$$\Gamma_{tot} = \Gamma(b \to c \ell \nu) + \Gamma(b \to c \bar{u} d') + \Gamma(b \to c \bar{c} s') \tag{141}$$

where the prime indicates the CKM rotated fields

$$d' = V_{ud} d + V_{us} s + V_{ub} b \tag{142}$$

$$s' = V_{cd} d + V_{cs} s + V_{cb} b \tag{143}$$

For further use it is useful to define the ratios

$$R_{ud} = \frac{\Gamma(b \to c \bar{u} d')}{3\Gamma(b \to c e \nu)} \quad R_{cs} = \frac{\Gamma(b \to c \bar{c} s')}{3\Gamma(b \to c e \nu)} \tag{144}$$

where the semielectronic rate is given in terms of the semielectronic one by

$$\Gamma(b \to c\ell\nu) = 3f(m_\tau)\Gamma(b \to ce\nu) \tag{145}$$

where $f(m_\tau)$ is a known function that takes into account phase space effects due to the non-negligible τ mass, $f(m_\tau = 1777 \text{ MeV}) = 0.74$. These relations allow us to express the sum of the ratios $R_{ud} + R_{cs}$ in terms of the semileptonic branching fraction

$$R_{ud} + R_{cs} = f(m_\tau)\frac{1 - Br(b \to c\ell\nu)}{Br(b \to c\ell\nu)} \tag{146}$$

Using the 1994 Particle Data Group data [58]

$$Br(B \to Xe\nu) = (10.7 \pm 0.5)\% \tag{147}$$
$$Br(B \to X\mu\nu) = (10.3 \pm 0.5)\% \tag{148}$$
$$Br(B \to X\tau\nu) = (2.8 \pm 0.6)\% \tag{149}$$

one obtains the result

$$R_{ud} + R_{cs} = 2.37 \pm 0.12 \tag{150}$$

Up to here we have only used data, and now we discuss the theoretical predictions for the sum $R_{ud} + R_{cs}$. Due to the mass of the c quark one intuitively expects that the calculation of R_{ud} might be more reliable as the evaluation of R_{cs}, since the latter channel has two heavy quarks in the final state and one is thus closer to the resonance region.

Furthermore, as has been mentioned already several times, the non-perturbative corrections are small compared to the perturbative ones, and hence the latter will contribute the bulk part of the effect, while the non-perturbative corrections are almost negligible. The leading and subleading perturbative corrections have been available for some time, neglecting the masses of the final state quarks [59]. Recently the complete calculation of the subleading terms including the masses of the final state quarks has been performed [60, 61]. However, the mass effects are not drastic and do not change the conclusions drawn from the massless case, as far as he semileptonic branching fraction is concerned.

The theoretical expressions for R_{ud} and R_{cs} depend on both quark masses m_b and m_c. In the following analysis we shall exploit the fact that the mass difference $m_b - m_c$ is quite well known; in the heavy mass limit it simply becomes $< M_B > - < M_D >$, where $< M_H >$ denotes the spin averaged mass on the heavy ground state meson

$$< M_H >= \frac{1}{4}(m_H + 3m_{H^*}) \tag{151}$$

such that the mass difference is of the order $1/m_Q^2$ with

$$m_b - m_c = \lambda_1 \left(\frac{1}{2m_b} - \frac{1}{2m_c}\right) \tag{152}$$

Hence a good choice of input parameters is the b quark mass m_b, the renormalization scale μ entering the expressions for the QCD radiative corrections and the QCD scale parameter $\Lambda^{(5)}_{\overline{\rm MS}}$.

First we shall put in some "reasonable" values $\mu = m_b = 4.8$ GeV and $\Lambda^{(5)}_{\overline{\rm MS}} = 180$ MeV and evaluate from this the sum $R_{ud} + R_{cs}$; we obtain

$$R_{ud} + R_{cs} = 1.73, \tag{153}$$

while for each individual contribution we have $R_{ud} = 1.27$ and $R_{cs} = 0.46$. As we have argued above we expect that R_{ud} may be calculated more reliably in the $1/m_Q$ expansion, so we may take this calculation and vary the renormalization scale. Since R_{ud} becomes larger as the scale is lowered, we may think of $\mu = m_b/3$ as a reasonable choice of the renormalization scale, since the energy release is shared among the three quarks in the final state. For this choice one obtains $R_{ud} = 1.52$; using the data we would conclude $R_{cs} = 0.85$ which is from the theoretical estimates on the large side.

Large values like that may be obtained for instance by lowering the value of the b quark mass m_b; for a value $m_b = 4.4$ GeV one would obtain a R_{cs} in the region as discussed above; however, this would imply a value of the c quark mass as low as $m_c = 1.1$ GeV, which is at the lower edge of the commonly accepted values of this parameter.

Another possibility are potentially large QCD radiative corrections appearing in the $c\bar{c}s$ channel. These corrections have been studied previously by Ball et al.[60, 61], who find larger QCD radiative corrections in this channel due to the long range coulomb-like interaction between the two heavy c quarks in the final state. These corrections shift the result into the right direction, but they do not seem sufficiently large to explain the data.

Finally, all the calculations of the non-leptonic rate are based on the concept of parton-hadron duality, which is expected to hold on intuitive grounds; however, it may fail for yet unknown reasons, rendering the calculation of the non-leptonic inclusive rates useless. On the other hand, it has been pointed out [63] that such a failure should show up somehow in the $1/m_Q$ expansion, but the $1/m_Q^3$ terms considered so far do not give any hint that local duality may fail.

A large value of R_{cs} has phenomenological implications on its own, since it will enhance the number of charm and anticharm quarks produced in b decays. Defining the number n_c of charm quarks produced per b decay as (note that it is the sum of c and $\bar{c}$)

$$n_c = Br(b \to c\ell\nu) + Br(b \to c\bar{u}d') + 2Br(b \to c\bar{c}s') \tag{154}$$

we may express this quantity in terms of the ratio R_{cs} as

$$n_c = 1 + R_{cs}\frac{Br(b \to c\ell\nu)}{f(m_\tau)}. \tag{155}$$

Thus we conclude that for a value of R_{cs} large enough to explain the semileptonic branching ratio we have to have $n_c \sim 1.3$.

On the other hand, we may obtain n_c experimentally by summing over the various semi-inclusive modes. Taking the numbers of [62], one obtains $n_c \approx 1.04 \pm 0.07$, which is lower than what one has from the semileptonic branching fraction, but this discrepancy is not yet significant.

Thus the potential problem is not the semileptonic branching fraction alone, but rather the semileptonic branching fraction in combination with the charm counting in b decays. Possible resolutions of this problem are that the data on charm counting improve and indeed indicate a larger value such as $n_c \sim 1.3$.. However, if future data confirm a value of n_c as low as $n_c = 1.1$ with significantly smaller errors, this would either imply a failure of parton-hadron duality even in the "safe" channel $c\bar{u}d$, or, if duality were shown to hold in this channel, could indicate a large branching fraction of B mesons into non-charmed final states, as large as

$$Br(b \to charmless\ final\ states) \sim 20\%.$$

This is very unlikely in the SM, but possible in non-SM scenarios, which enhance the channel $b \to sg$.

———————— FIG 4 ————————-

Figure 4: Diagrams for non-leptonic decays of B mesons. The upper diagram corresponds to the leading term in the $1/m_Q$ expansion, the middle one to weak anihilation, and the lower one to Pauli interference. Diagrams taken from [63].

4.6 Lifetimes

The subject of heavy hadron lifetimes is strongly related to nonleptonic processes, which have been considered already some time ago [64]-[67]; however the application of the $1/m_Q$ expansion has turned many assumptions into quantitative arguments. As outlined in the last section the $1/m_Q$ expansion allows to calculate total rates, even for non-leptonic processes, and hence a QCD-based calculation of lifetimes becomes possible. A recent review of this subject is give in [63].

Studying the formulae obtained in the $1/m_Q$ expansion up to order $1/m_Q^2$ one finds that lifetime differences between B mesons do not occur up to this level of the expansion; in other words, any difference between the $B^\pm$ and the B^0 or the B_s lifetimes are induced by effects of the order $1/m_b^3$. These effects are due to dimension six operators of the four-quark form

$$\mathcal{O}_6 = (\bar{b}\Gamma q)(\bar{q}\Gamma b). \tag{156}$$

In fig.4 the relevant diagramms are shown. The two lower ones yield dimension six operators of the from (156); comparing to the terminology used in phenomenological models the middle diagram is called weak anihilation (WA) and the lower one Pauli interference (PI).

The four quark operators appearing at order $1/m_Q^3$ are usually estimated applying the vacuum insertion approximation, such that we replace

$$\langle B|(\bar{b}\Gamma q)(\bar{q}\Gamma b)|B\rangle \to \langle B|(\bar{b}\Gamma q)|0\rangle\langle 0|(\bar{q}\Gamma b)|B\rangle$$

and hence the parameter entering the estimates of the lifetime differences is the decay constant f_B.

The WA piece has been considered in [65]-[68] and has been found to be small, of the order of one percent. The dominant contribution comes from the PI diagram. For the lifetime of the B^- one obtains [63]

$$\Gamma(B^-) = \Gamma_{1/m_Q^2}(B) + \Delta\Gamma_{PI}(B^-) \tag{157}$$

where the PI contribution is

$$\Delta\Gamma_{PI}(B^-) = \frac{G_F^2 m_b^5}{192\pi^3}|V_{cb}|^2 \cdot 24\pi^2 \frac{f_B^2}{M_B^2}[C_+^2(m_b) - C_-^2(m_b) + \frac{1}{N_C}(C_+^2(m_b) + C_-^2(m_b))] \tag{158}$$

where $C_\pm$ have been given in (112). QCD radiative corrections change the sign of the PI contribution; the constructive interference at the scale M_W is turned into a destructive one at the scale m_b prolonging the lifetime of the B^- relative to the B_0. Using HQET the running of the coefficients below m_b has also been calculated; it has been found that the destructive interference is amplified by the running below m_b, since

$$\Delta\Gamma_{PI}(B^-) = \frac{G_F^2 m_b^5}{192\pi^3}|V_{cb}|^2 \cdot 24\pi^2 \frac{f_B^2}{M_B^2}\kappa^{-4} \quad [(C_+^2(m_b) - C_-^2(m_b))\kappa^{9/2} + \frac{C_+^2(m_b) + C_-^2(m_b)}{3}$$
$$-\frac{1}{9}(\kappa^{9/2} - 1)(C_+^2(m_b) - C_-^2(m_b))], \tag{159}$$

where

$$\kappa = [\frac{\alpha_S(\mu_{had}^2)}{\alpha_S(m_b^2)}]^{1/b}, \text{ with } b = 11 - \frac{2}{3}n_F \tag{160}$$

and μ_{had} is some small hadronic scale, which may be defined e.g. by $\alpha_s(\mu_{had}) = 1$. Putting in numbers the result is [63]

$$\frac{\tau(B^-)}{\tau(B_d)} = 1 + 0.05 \cdot \frac{f_B^2}{(200 \text{ MeV})^2} \tag{161}$$

Hence the $1/m_Q$ expansion (in combination with vacuum insertion) predicts a slightly longer lifetime for the charged B meson compared to the neutral one. This estimate is compatible with data; the latest compilation yields [62]

$$\frac{\tau(B^-)}{\tau(B_d)} = 1.009 \pm 0.069 \tag{162}$$

Applying the $1/m_Q$ expansion for the lifetimes also to the D system one finds large corrections. From the experimental side it is knwon that the lifetime differences are very large and that the naive parton model expectation fails by a large margin. This may be taken as an indication that the c quark mass is indeed not large enough to justify a $1/m_Q$ expansion, at least for the nonleptonic processes.

The lifetimes of the two neutral B mesons are equal up to terms of order $1/m_b^3$, hence one expects

$$\bar{\tau}(B_d) = \bar{\tau}(B_s) \tag{163}$$

to a good accuracy. Here $\bar{\tau}$ denotes the average lifetime of the two mass eigenstates of the $B^0 - \bar{B}^0$ system. While the lifetimes in the B_d system are practically the same such that the difference may be neglected, it has been pointed out that this is not necessarily the case in the B_s system; the lifetime difference has been estimated in [69] to be

$$\frac{\Delta\Gamma(B_s)}{\bar{\Gamma}(B_s)} = \frac{\Gamma(B_{s,short}) - \Gamma(B_{s,long})}{\bar{\Gamma}(B_s)} = 0.18 \cdot \frac{f_{B_s}^2}{(200 \text{ MeV})^2} \tag{164}$$

Hence this difference may be as large twenty percent and thus it cannot be neglected any more e.g. in an analysis of B_s-$\bar{B}_s$ mixing.

Finally we shall consider the b baryon lifetimes. Here we expect the differences between the meson and the baryon lifetimes to be of order $1/m^2$, since the matrix elements of the kinetic energy operator as well as of the chromomagnetic moment operator are different between baryons and mesons; in particular, due to spin symmetry the matrix element of the chromomagnetic moment operator vanishes for Λ-type baryons, since the light degrees of freedom are in a spin-0 state. Probably only the Λ-type baryons will be stable against electromagnetic and strong decays, and hence their lifetime will be determined by the weak decay of the heavy quark.

There has not yet been any detailed analysis of the Λ_b lifetime, but simple estimates based on the data of the charmed baryons lead to an expectation of the form [63]

$$\frac{\tau(\Lambda_b)}{\tau(B_d)} \sim 0.9. \tag{165}$$

This has to be confronted with the recent data [62]

$$\frac{\tau(\Lambda_b)}{\tau(B_d)} = 0.72 \pm 0.11. \tag{166}$$

Thus the lifetime is slightly below the expectation, although this is not yet a significant deviation from the prediction.

5 Conclusions and Open Questions

The field of heavy quark physics has gone through a remarkable development over the last few years due to new theoretical ideas as well as to a major improvement of data. In particular the progress in the technology of detectors (e.g. silicon vertex detectors) opened the possibility to study b physics even at machines which originally were not designed for this kind of research. In this way also the high energy colliders (in particular LEP and TEVATRON) could contribute substantially in this area, since they allow to measure states (such as the B_s and the b flavoured baryons) which lie above the threshold of the $\Upsilon(4s)$-B-factories.

From the theoretical side the heavy quark limit and HQET brought an important success, since it provides a model independent and QCD based framework for the description of processes involving heavy quarks. The effective theory approach has originally been formulated for exclusive decays but in the past few years a heavy mass expansion has been set up also for inclusive transitions.

As far as exclusive heavy to heavy decays are concerned, the additional symmetries of the heavy mass limit restrict the number of nonperturbative functions in a model independent way; furthermore, heavy quark symmetries fix the absolute normalization of some of the transition amplitudes at the point of maximum momentum transfer. In heavy to light decays heavy quark symmetries do not work as efficiently; in this case only the relative normalization of B decays versus the corresponding D decays may be obtained.

HQET does not yet have much to say about exclusive nonleptonic decays; even for the decays $B \to D^{(*)} D_s^{(*)}$, which involves three heavy quarks, heavy quark symmetries are not sufficient to yield useful relations between the decay rates [70]. Of course, with additional assumptions such as factorization one can go ahead and relate the nonleptonic decays to the semileptonic ones; however, this is a very strong assumption and it is not clear in what sense factorization is an approximation. On the other side, the data on the nonleptonic B decays support factorization, and first attempts to understand this from QCD and HQET have been untertaken [71]; however, the problem of the exclusive nonleptonic decays still needs clarification and hopefully the heavy mass expansion will also be useful here.

The $1/m_Q$ expansion obtained from the OPE and HQET offers the unique possibility to calculate the transition rates for inclusive decays in a QCD based and model independent framework. The leading term of this expansion is always the free quark decay, and the first non-trivial corrections are in general given by the mean kinetic energy of the heavy quark inside the heavy hadron λ_1 and the matrix element λ_2 of the chromomagnetic moment operator.

The method also allows us to calculate differential distributions, such as the charged lepton energy spectrum in inclusive semileptonic decays of heavy hadrons. For this case, the expansion parameter is the inverse of the energy release $m_b - 2E_\ell$, where E_ℓ is the lepton energy. Close to the endpoint, the energy release is small and thus the expansion in its inverse powers becomes useless. In this kinematic region one may partially resume the $1/m_Q$ expansion, obtaining a result closely analogous to the leading twist term in deep inelastic scattering. Particularly in the endpoint region a non-perturbative function is needed which corresponds to the parton distributions parametrizing the deep inelastic scattering.

The leading term of the $1/m_Q$ expansion is the free quark decay, and it is known that the semileptonic branching fraction calculated in the parton model is too large by a few percent. The first non-perturbative corrections turn out to be much too small to explain the low semileptonic branching fraction. The perturbative corrections are larger and indeed tend to lower the semileptonic branching fraction, but the effect is still too small to explain the data. Recent

calculations [60, 61] indicate that there are some effects originating from the finite mass of the final state quarks, in particular in the channel $b \to c\bar{c}s$. However, enlarging this channel relative to $b \to c\bar{u}d$ will increase the average number n_c of charm quarks produced per b decay. Experimentally, n_c is close to unity, $n_c = 1.04 \pm 0.07$ [62], while an explanation of the low semileptonic branching fraction via an enhancement of the channel $b \to c\bar{c}s$ would lead to $n_c \sim 1.3$.

The problem of the semileptonic branching fraction is at the level of a two standard deviation discrepancy, and another problem of about the same significance are the lifetimes of b hadrons. Lifetime differences between B mesons should show up a the level of the $1/m_b^3$ corrections and thus should be small. This is supported by data; however, the situation is different for the lifetime of b baryons. Their lifetime may differ at the $1/m_b^2$ level and hence are expected to be of the order of a few percent. Experimentally one finds a large lifetime difference between the Λ_b and the B mesons; again this problem is not yet very significant. If with new and improved data these two problems persist, they will need clarification and perhaps will lead to new insights into the strong interaction aspects of heavy flavour weak decays.

Acknowledgement

I am grateful to Wolfgang Kilian for a careful reading of the manuscript.

References

[1] M. Voloshin and M. Shifman, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **45** (1987) 292 and **47** (1988) 511; E. Eichten and B. Hill, Phys. Lett. **B234** (1990) 511; a more complete set of references can be found in one of the reviews [4].

[2] N. Isgur and M. Wise, Phys. Lett. **B232** (1989) 113 and **B237** (1990) 527.

[3] B. Grinstein, Nucl. Phys. **B339** (1990) 253; H. Georgi, Phys. Lett. **B240** (1990) 447; A. Falk, H. Georgi, B. Grinstein and M. Wise, Nucl. Phys. **B343** (1990) 1.

[4] H. Georgi: contribution to the *Proceedings of TASI–91*, by R. K. Ellis et al. (eds.) (World Scientific, Singapore, 1991); B. Grinstein: contribution to *High Energy Phenomenology*, R. Huerta and M. A. Peres (eds.) (World Scientific, Singapore, 1991); N. Isgur and M. Wise: contribution to *Heavy Flavors*, A. Buras and M. Lindner (eds.) (World Scientific, Singapore, 1992); M. Neubert, Phys. Rept. **245** (1994) 259; T. Mannel, contribution to *QCD–20 years later*, P. Zerwas and H. Kastrup (eds.) (World Scientific, Singapore 1993).

[5] I. Bigi et al., preprint TPI-MINN-92-67-T, Talk given at *Particles & Fields 92*: 7th Meeting of the Division of Particles Fields of the APS (DPF 92), Batavia, IL, 10-14 Nov. 1992.

[6] I. Bigi, preprint UND-HEP-92-BIG06, Talk given at *26th International Conference on High Energy Physics (ICHEP 92)*, Dallas, TX, 6-12 Aug. 1992.

[7] I. Bigi et al., Phys. Lett. **B293** (1992) 430, (E) Phys. Lett. **B297** (1993) 477.

[8] J. Chay, H. Georgi and B. Grinstein, Phys. Lett. **B247** (1990) 399.

[9] I. Bigi, N. Uraltsev and A. Vainshtein, Phys. Lett. **B293** (1992) 430; I. Bigi et al., Minnesota TPI-MINN-92/67-T (1992) and Phys. Rev. Lett. **71** (1993) 496.

[10] B. Blok et al., Phys. Rev. **D49** (1994) 3356.

[11] A. Manohar and M. Wise, Phys. Rev. **D49** (1994) 1310.

[12] T. Mannel, Nucl. Phys. **B423** (1994) 396.

[13] A. Falk, M. Luke and M. Savage, Phys. Rev. **D49** (1994) 3367.

[14] E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. **B122** (1977) 109; S. Weinberg, Physica **96A** (1979) 327; J. Polchinski, Nucl. Phys. **B231** (1984) 269; H. Georgi, *Weak INteractions and Modern Particle Theory*, Benjamin/Cummings, Menlo Park (1984).

[15] S. Coleman, J. Wess and B. Zumino, Phys. Rev. **177** (1969) 2239; C. G. Callan, S. Coleman, J. Wess and B. Zumino, Phys. Rev. **177** (1969) 2247.

[16] W. Kilian and T. Ohl, Phys. Rev. **D50** (1994) 4649.

[17] T. Mannel, W. Roberts and Z. Ryzak, Nucl. Phys. **B 368** (1992) 204.

[18] J. Körner and G. Thompson, Phys. Lett. **B264** (1991) 185.

[19] A. Falk, Nucl. Phys. **B 378** (1992) 79.

[20] T. Bergfeld et al. (CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Lett. **B340** (1994) 194.

[21] E. Eichten, C. Hill and C. Quigg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71** (1993) 4116.

[22] N. Isgur and M. Wise, Nucl. Phys. **B348** (1991) 276

[23] H. Georgi, Nucl. Phys. **B348** (1991) 293

[24] T. Mannel, W. Roberts and Z. Ryzak, Nucl. Phys. **B355** (1991) 38.

[25] A. Falk, B. Grinstein and M. Luke, Nucl. Phys. **B357** (1991) 185.

[26] M. Beneke and V. Braun, Munich preprint MPI-PHT-94-9 (1994), hep-ph/9402364; I.I. Bigi et al., Minnesota preprint TPI-MINN-94-4-T (1994), hep-ph/9402360; M. Neubert and C. Sachrajda, preprint CERN-TH-7312-94 (1994), hep-ph/ 9407394; M. Luke, A. Manohar and M. Savage, Toronto preprint UTPT-94-21 (1994); hep-ph/9407407.

[27] G. Martinelli and C. Sachrajda, preprint CERN-TH.7517/94.

[28] I. Bigi et al., Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A9** (1994) 2467.

[29] I. Bigi et al., preprint CERN-TH-7250/94 (1994), hep-ph/9405410.

[30] P. Ball and V. Braun, Phys. Rev. **D49** (1994) 2472.

[31] M. Luke, Phys. Lett. **B252** (1990) 447.

[32] M. Ademollo and R. Gatto, Phys. Rev. Lett. **13** (1964) 264.

[33] M. Luke and A. Manohar, Phys. Lett. **B286** (1992) 348; Y. Chen, Phys. Lett. **B317** (1993) 421.

[34] A. Falk and M. Neubert, Phys. Rev. **D47** (1993) 2965.

[35] T. Mannel, Phys. Rev. **D50** (1994) 428.

[36] N. Isgur, D. Scora, B. Grinstein and M. Wise, Phys. Rev. **D39** (1989) 799.

[37] M. Shifman, N.G. Uraltsev and A. Vainshtein, Minnesota Preprint TPI-MINN-94-13-T (1994).

[38] B. Barish et al., (CLEO Collaboration), Cornell preprint CLNS-94-1285, (1994).

[39] H. Georgi, B. Grinstein and M. Wise, Phys. Lett. **B252** (1990) 456.

[40] P. Cho and B. Grinstein, Phys. Lett. **B285** (1992) 153.

[41] C. Albajar et al. (UA1 Collaboration), Phys. Lett. **B273** (1991) 540;
D. Buskulic et al. (ALEPH Collaboration), Phys. Lett. **B294** (1992) 145;
P. Abreu et al. (DELPHI Collaboration), Phys. Lett. bf B311 (1993) 379;
R. Akers et al. (OPAL Collaboration), Phys. Lett. **B316** (1993) 435.

[42] N. Isgur and M. Wise, Phys. Rev. **D42** (1990) 2388.

[43] G. Lin and T. Mannel, Phys. Lett. **B321** (1994) 417.

[44] H. Albrecht, et al. (ARGUS Collaboration) Phys. Lett. **B326** (1994) 320.

[45] T. Bergfeld, et al. (CLEO Collaboration) Phys. Lett. **B323** (1994) 219.

[46] J. Körner and M. Krämer, Phys. Lett. **B275** (1992) 495.

[47] G. Crawford et al, (CLEO COllaboration), Cornell preprint CLNS 94/1306, CLEO 94/24 (1994).

[48] F. Gilman and M. Wise, Phys. Rev. **D20** (1979) 2392; A. Buras et al., Nucl. Phys. **B370** (1992) 69.

[49] B. Grinstein, R. Springer and M. Wise, Nucl. Phys. **B319** (1988) 271; M. Misiak, Nucl. Phys. **B393** (1993) 23.

[50] A. Ali and E. Pietarinen, Nucl. Phys. **B154** (1979) 519; N. Cabibbo, G. Corbo and L. Maiani, Nucl. Phys. **B155** (1979) 83; G. Corbo, Nucl. Phys. **B212** (1983) 99; M. Jezabek and J. H. Kühn, Nucl. Phys. **B320** (1989) 20; A. Falk et al., Phys. Rev. **D49** (1994) 3367.

[51] G. Altarelli et al., Nucl. Phys. **B208** (1982) 365.

[52] M. Neubert, Phys. Rev. **D49** (1994) 2472.

[53] I. Bigi et al., Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A9** (1994) 2467.

[54] T. Mannel and M. Neubert, preprint CERN-TH.7156/94 Glasr (1994).

[55] M. Neubert, Phys. Rev. **D49** (1994) 4623.

[56] I. Bigi et al, preprint CERN-TH.7159/94.

[57] A. Falk, preprint JHU-TIPAC-940016, contribution to the *18th Johns Hopkins Workshop on Current Problems in Particle Theory: Theory Meets Experiment*, Florence, Italy, 31 Aug - 2 Sep 1994.

[58] Particle Data Group, Phys. Rev. **D50** (1994).

[59] Altarelli et al., Nucl. Phys. **B187** (1981) 461; G. Buchalla, Nucl. Phys. **B391** (1993) 501.

[60] E. Bagan et al., Phys. Lett. **B342** (1995) 362.

[61] E. Bagan et al., preprint CERN-TH.95–25.

[62] P. Roudeau, Rapporteur talk at the ICHEP 94 Conference, Glasgow, Scottland.

[63] I. Bigi et al., preprint CERN-TH.7132/94, to appear in *B Decays*, S. Stone (ed.), World Scientific.

[64] R. Rückl, CERN preprint Print-83-1063 1983 (unpublished)

[65] B. Guberina et al., Phys. Lett. **89B** (1979) 111.

[66] J. Ellis, M. Gaillard and D. Nanopoulos, Nucl. Phys. **B100** (1975) 313.

[67] N. Cabibbo and L. Maiani, Phys. Lett. **89B** (1979) 111.

[68] I. Bigi and N. Uraltsev, Phys. Lett. **B280** (1992) 120.

[69] M. Voloshin et al., Sov. J. Phys. **46** (1987) 112.

[70] T. Mannel, W. Roberts and Z. Ryzak, Phys. Lett. **B248** (1990) 392.

[71] M. Dugan and B. Grinstein, Phys. Lett. **B255** (1991) 583.

Figure Captions

Figure 1 Latest data [38] for the product $|V_{cb}|\xi(vv')$ as a function of $y = vv'$.

Figure 2 The electron spectrum for free quark $b \to c$ decay (dashed line), free quark $b \to u$ decay (grey line), and $B \to X_c e\bar{\nu}_e$ decay including $1/m_b^2$ corrections (solid line) with $\lambda_1 = -0.5$ GeV^2 and $\lambda_2 = 0.12$ GeV^2. The figure is from [11].

Figure 3 Charged-lepton spectrum in $B \to X_u \ell\bar{\nu}$ decays. The solid line is (134) with the ansatz (140), the dashed line shows the prediction of the free-quark decay model. The figure is from [54].

Figure 4 Diagrams for non-leptonic decays of B mesons. The upper diagram corresponds to the leading term in the $1/m_Q$ expansion, the middle one to weak anihilation, and the lower one to Pauli interference. Diagrams taken from [63].