TTP10-20
SFB/CPP-10-27

Matching heavy-quark fields in QCD and HQET at three loops

A.G. Grozin

Institut für Theoretische Teilchenphysik, Karlsruher Institut für Technologie, 76128 Karlsruhe, Germany

Abstract

The relation between the heavy-quark field in QCD and the corresponding field in HQET is derived up to three loops.

QCD problems with a single heavy quark Q can be treated in a simpler effective theory — HQET, if there exists a 4-velocity v such that the heavy-quark momentum is $p = mv + k$ (m is the on-shell mass) and the characteristic residual momentum is small: $k \ll m$. QCD operators can be written as series in $1/m$ via HQET operators; the coefficients in these series are determined by matching on-shell matrix elements in both theories. For example, the heavy–light quark currents have been considered at the leading (zeroth) order in $1/m$ up to three-loop accuracy [1,2].

Here we shall consider the heavy-quark field Q. At the tree level, it is related to the corresponding HQET field Q_v (satisfying $\not{v} Q_v = Q_v$) by [3–6]

$$Q(x) = e^{-imv\cdot x} \left(1 + \frac{i\not{D}_\perp}{2m} + \cdots \right) Q_v(x) \,, \quad D_\perp^\mu = D^\mu - v^\mu v \cdot D \,. \tag{1}$$

The matrix elements of the bare fields between the on-shell quark with momentum $p = mv + k$ and the vacuum in both theories are given by the on-shell wave-function renormalization constants:

$$<0|Q_0|Q(p)> = \left(Z_Q^{\mathrm{os}} \right)^{1/2} u(p) \,, \quad <0|Q_{v0}|Q(p)> = \left(\tilde{Z}_Q^{\mathrm{os}} \right)^{1/2} u_v(k) \tag{2}$$

(HQET renormalization constants are denoted by $\tilde{Z}$). The Dirac spinors are related by the Foldy–Wouthuysen transformation

$$u(mv + k) = \left[1 + \frac{\not{k}}{2m} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{k^2}{m^2} \right) \right] u_v(k) \,.$$

Therefore, the bare fields are related by

$$Q_0(x) = e^{-imv\cdot x}\left[z_0^{1/2}\left(1+\frac{i\not{D}_\perp}{2m}\right)Q_{v0}(x)+\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{m^2}\right)\right], \tag{3}$$

where the bare matching coefficient is

$$z_0 = \frac{Z_Q^{\mathrm{os}}(g_0^{(n_l+1)}, a_0^{(n_l+1)})}{\tilde{Z}_Q^{\mathrm{os}}(g_0^{(n_l)}, a_0^{(n_l)})} \tag{4}$$

(we use the covariant gauge: the gauge-fixing term in the Lagrangian is $-(\partial_\mu A_0^{a\mu})/(2a_0)$, and the free gluon propagator is $(-i/p^2)(g_{\mu\nu} - (1 - a_0)p_\mu p_\nu/p^2)$; the number of flavours in QCD is $n_f = n_l + 1$). The $\mathcal{O}(1/m)$ matching coefficient in (3) is equal to the leading one, z_0; this reflexes the reparametrization invariance [7]. The $\overline{\mathrm{MS}}$ renormalized fields are related by the formula similar to (3), with the renormalized decoupling coefficient

$$z(\mu) = \frac{\tilde{Z}_Q(\alpha_s^{(n_l)}(\mu), a^{(n_l)}(\mu))}{Z_Q(\alpha_s^{(n_l+1)}(\mu), a^{(n_l+1)}(\mu))} z_0 \,. \tag{5}$$

If there are no massive flavours except Q, then $\tilde{Z}_Q^{\mathrm{os}} = 1$ because all loop corrections are scale-free. The QCD on-shell renormalization constant Z_Q^{os} contains the single scale m in this case; it has been calculated [8] up to three loops. The three-loop $\overline{\mathrm{MS}}$ anomalous dimensions of Q_v [8,9] and Q [10] are also known. We have to express all three quantities $Z_Q^{\mathrm{os}}(g_0^{(n_l+1)}, a_0^{(n_l+1)})$, $Z_Q(\alpha_s^{(n_l+1)}(\mu), a^{(n_l+1)}(\mu))$, $\tilde{Z}_Q(\alpha_s^{(n_l)}(\mu), a^{(n_l)}(\mu))$ via the same variables, say, $\alpha_s^{(n_l)}(\mu)$, $a^{(n_l)}(\mu)$, see [11]. An explicit formula expressing $\alpha_s^{(n_l+1)}(\mu)$ via $\alpha_s^{(n_l)}(\mu)$ and $L = 2\log(\mu/m)$ (m is the on-shell mass) can be found in [12]. The corresponding relation between $a^{(n_l+1)}(\mu)$ and $a^{(n_l)}(\mu)$ is

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{a^{(n_l+1)}(\mu)}{a^{(n_l)}(\mu)} &= 1 - \left[\frac{4}{3}L + \frac{6L^2+\pi^2}{9}\varepsilon + \frac{2L^3+\pi^2 L - 4\zeta_3}{9}\varepsilon^2 + \cdots\right] T_F \frac{\alpha_s^{(n_l)}(\mu)}{4\pi} \\
&- \Bigg[C_A L^2 + (4C_F + 5C_A)\,L + 15 C_F - \frac{13}{12} C_A \\
&\quad + \Bigg(C_A L^3 + (4C_F+5C_A)\,L^2 + \left(30 C_F + \frac{\pi^2-13}{6} C_A\right) L \\
&\quad\quad + \left(\frac{\pi^2}{3} + \frac{31}{2}\right) C_F + \frac{5\pi^2+169}{12} C_A \Bigg)\varepsilon + \cdots \Bigg] T_F \left(\frac{\alpha_s^{(n_l)}(\mu)}{4\pi}\right)^2 + \cdots
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Our main result is the renormalized matching coefficient

$$
\begin{aligned}
z(\mu) =& 1 - (3L+4)C_F \frac{\alpha_s^{(n_l)}(\mu)}{4\pi} + \left(z_{22}L^2 + z_{21}L + z_{20}\right) C_F \left(\frac{\alpha_s^{(n_l)}(\mu)}{4\pi}\right)^2 \\
& + \left(z_{33}L^3 + z_{32}L^2 + z_{31}L + z_{30}\right) C_F \left(\frac{\alpha_s^{(n_l)}(\mu)}{4\pi}\right)^3 + \cdots
\end{aligned}
\tag{7}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
z_{22} =& \frac{9}{2}C_F - \frac{11}{2}C_A + 2T_F n_l\,, \\
z_{21} =& \frac{27}{2}C_F - \frac{215}{6}C_A + \frac{38}{3}T_F n_l + 2T_F\,, \\
z_{20} =& \left(16\pi^2\log 2 - 24\zeta_3 - 13\pi^2 + \frac{241}{8}\right) C_F \\
& + \left(-8\pi^2\log 2 + 12\zeta_3 + 5\pi^2 - \frac{1705}{24}\right) C_A \\
& + \left(\frac{4}{3}\pi^2 + \frac{113}{6}\right) T_F n_l + \left(-\frac{16}{3}\pi^2 + \frac{947}{18}\right) T_F\,, \\
z_{33} =& -\frac{9}{2}C_F^2 + \frac{33}{2}C_F C_A - \frac{121}{9}C_A^2 - 6C_F T_F n_l \\
& + \frac{88}{9}C_A T_F n_l + \frac{1}{3}a^{(n_l)}(\mu) C_A T_F - \frac{16}{9}T_F^2 n_l^2\,, \\
z_{32} =& -\frac{45}{2}C_F^2 + 135 C_F C_A - \frac{2671}{18}C_A^2 - 42 C_F T_F n_l - 4C_F T_F \\
& + \frac{938}{9}C_A T_F n_l - \left(\frac{13}{6}a^{(n_l)}(\mu) + 1\right) C_A T_F - \frac{152}{9}T_F^2 n_l^2 + \frac{8}{3}T_F^2\,, \\
z_{31} =& \left[-48\pi^2\log 2 + 72\zeta_3 + 39\pi^2 - \frac{783}{8}\right] C_F^2 \\
& + \left[\frac{424}{3}\pi^2\log 2 - 224\zeta_3 - \frac{331}{3}\pi^2 + \frac{13307}{24}\right] C_F C_A \\
& + \Bigg[\left(-\frac{2}{45}\pi^4 + \frac{9}{4}\zeta_3 + \frac{1}{4}\right) a^{(n_l)}(\mu) \\
& \quad - \frac{176}{3}\pi^2\log 2 + \frac{325}{4}\zeta_3 - \frac{2}{15}\pi^4 + \frac{110}{3}\pi^2 - \frac{73981}{108}\Bigg] C_A^2 \\
& + \left(-\frac{128}{3}\pi^2\log 2 + 16\zeta_3 + \frac{92}{3}\pi^2 - \frac{613}{6}\right) C_F T_F n_l + \left(16\pi^2 - \frac{1013}{6}\right) C_F T_F \\
& + \left(\frac{64}{3}\pi^2\log 2 + 16\zeta_3 - \frac{32}{9}\pi^2 + \frac{10816}{27}\right) C_A T_F n_l \\
& + \left(\frac{121}{18}a^{(n_l)}(\mu) - \frac{352}{9}\pi^2 + \frac{11278}{27}\right) C_A T_F \\
& - \left(\frac{32}{9}\pi^2 + \frac{1336}{27}\right) T_F^2 n_l^2 + \left(\frac{128}{9}\pi^2 - \frac{3908}{27}\right) T_F^2 n_l - \frac{20}{9}T_F^2\,,
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
a_{30} = &\biggl[-1792a_4 - \frac{224}{3}\log^4 2 + 96\pi^2\log^2 2 + \frac{3568}{3}\pi^2\log 2 - 20\zeta_5 \\
&\quad + 8\pi^2\zeta_3 - 1256\zeta_3 - \frac{76}{15}\pi^4 - \frac{4801}{9}\pi^2 - \frac{3023}{12}\biggr] C_F^2 \\
&+ \biggl[-\frac{32}{3}a_4 - \frac{4}{9}\log^4 2 - \frac{1448}{9}\pi^2\log^2 2 - \frac{2752}{9}\pi^2\log 2 + 580\zeta_5 \\
&\quad - 180\pi^2\zeta_3 - \frac{2312}{3}\zeta_3 + \frac{6697}{270}\pi^4 + \frac{2137}{9}\pi^2 + \frac{24131}{72}\biggr] C_F C_A \\
&+ \biggl[\left(-\frac{7}{6}\zeta_5 - \frac{4}{9}\pi^2\zeta_3 + \frac{13}{4}\zeta_3 - \frac{17}{432}\pi^4 + \frac{1}{4}\pi^2 + \frac{13}{12}\right) a^{(n_l)}(\mu) \\
&\quad + \frac{1360}{3}a_4 + \frac{170}{9}\log^4 2 + \frac{508}{9}\pi^2\log^2 2 - \frac{1300}{9}\pi^2\log 2 - \frac{787}{2}\zeta_5 \\
&\quad + \frac{340}{3}\pi^2\zeta_3 + \frac{23311}{36}\zeta_3 - \frac{20429}{2160}\pi^4 - \frac{8705}{108}\pi^2 - \frac{1656817}{1944}\biggr] C_A^2 \\
&+ \biggl[\frac{1024}{3}a_4 + \frac{128}{9}\log^4 2 + \frac{256}{9}\pi^2\log^2 2 - \frac{1504}{9}\pi^2\log 2 \\
&\quad + \frac{1096}{3}\zeta_3 - \frac{916}{135}\pi^4 + \frac{904}{9}\pi^2 + \frac{1120}{9}\biggr] C_F T_F n_l \\
&+ \biggl[768a_4 + 32\log^4 2 - 32\pi^2\log^2 2 + \frac{1088}{9}\pi^2\log 2 \\
&\quad + \frac{466}{9}\zeta_3 + \frac{124}{45}\pi^4 - \frac{8848}{81}\pi^2 - \frac{16811}{54}\biggr] C_F T_F \\
&+ \biggl[-\frac{512}{3}a_4 - \frac{64}{9}\log^4 2 - \frac{128}{9}\pi^2\log^2 2 + \frac{752}{9}\pi^2\log 2 \\
&\quad - \frac{280}{9}\zeta_3 + \frac{152}{135}\pi^4 + \frac{52}{3}\pi^2 + \frac{111791}{243}\biggr] C_A T_F n_l \\
&+ \biggl[\left(\frac{8}{3}\zeta_3 - \frac{2461}{108}\right) a^{(n_l)}(\mu) - 512a_4 - \frac{64}{3}\log^4 2 + \frac{64}{3}\pi^2\log^2 2 + \frac{5120}{9}\pi^2\log 2 \\
&\quad - 60\zeta_5 + \frac{44}{3}\pi^2\zeta_3 - \frac{2837}{9}\zeta_3 - \frac{136}{45}\pi^4 - \frac{36268}{81}\pi^2 + \frac{100627}{81}\biggr] C_A T_F \\
&- \left(\frac{224}{9}\zeta_3 + \frac{304}{27}\pi^2 + \frac{11534}{243}\right) T_F^2 n_l^2 + \left(\frac{208}{9}\pi^2 - \frac{18884}{81}\right) T_F^2 n_l \\
&+ \left(\frac{448}{3}\zeta_3 + \frac{128}{45}\pi^2 - \frac{16850}{81}\right) T_F^2
\end{aligned}
$$

(here $a_4 = \mathrm{Li}_4(1/2)$). Gauge dependence first appears at three loops, as in Z_Q^{os} [8]. The requirement of finiteness of the renormalized matching coefficient (5) at $\varepsilon \to 0$ has allowed the authors of [8] to extract $\tilde{Z}_Q$ from their result for Z_Q^{os}.

It would not be too difficult to take into account a lighter massive flavour, say,

$m_c \neq 0$ in b-quark HQET. $\tilde{Z}_Q^{\text{os}}$ is no longer equal to 1, but is known at three loops [13]; Z_Q^{os} contains two scales, and is a non-trivial function of m_c/m_b [14]. Both $\tilde{Z}_Q^{\text{os}}$ and Z_Q^{os} have no smooth limit at $m_c \to 0$, but the discontinuity cancels in the ratio (4).

Now let's consider $z(\mu)$ in the large-β_0 limit (see Chapter 8 in [15] for a pedagogical introduction):

$$z(\mu) = 1 + \int_0^\beta \frac{d\beta}{\beta} \left(\frac{\gamma(\beta)}{2\beta} - \frac{\gamma_0}{2\beta_0} \right) + \frac{1}{\beta_0} \int_0^\infty du\, e^{-u/\beta} S(u) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\beta_0^2} \right) , \quad (8)$$

where $\beta = \beta_0 \alpha_s/(4\pi)$, $\gamma = \gamma_0 \alpha_s/(4\pi) + \cdots$ (differences of n_l-flavour and (n_l+1)-flavour quantities can be neglected at the $1/\beta_0$ order). The difference of the QCD and HQET anomalous dimensions $\gamma = \gamma_Q - \tilde{\gamma}_Q$ and the Borel image $S(u)$ can be expressed as

$$\gamma(\beta) = -2\frac{\beta}{\beta_0} F(-\beta, 0) , \quad S(u) = \frac{F(0,u) - F(0,0)}{u} , \quad (9)$$

where the function $F(\varepsilon, u)$ has been calculated in [1] (see also [15]):

$$\begin{aligned} F(\varepsilon, u) ={}& -2C_F \left(\frac{\mu}{m} \right)^{2u} e^{\gamma_E \varepsilon} \frac{\Gamma(1+u)\Gamma(1-2u)}{\Gamma(3-u-\varepsilon)} D(\varepsilon)^{u/\varepsilon - 1} \\ & \times (3 - 2\varepsilon)(1-u)(1+u-\varepsilon) , \\ D(\varepsilon) ={}& 6 e^{\gamma_E \varepsilon} \Gamma(1+\varepsilon) B(2-\varepsilon, 2-\varepsilon) = 1 + \frac{5}{3}\varepsilon + \cdots \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

The anomalous dimension difference [1] is gauge invariant at this order:

$$\gamma(\beta) = 2C_F \frac{\beta}{\beta_0} \frac{(1+\beta)(1+\frac{2}{3}\beta)}{B(2+\beta, 2+\beta)\Gamma(3+\beta)\Gamma(1-\beta)} ; \quad (11)$$

the Borel image is [16,15]

$$S(u) = -6C_F \left[e^{(L+5/3)u} \frac{\Gamma(u)\Gamma(1-2u)}{\Gamma(3-u)} (1-u^2) - \frac{1}{2u} \right] . \quad (12)$$

This Borel image has infrared renormalon poles at each positive half-integer u and at $u = 2$. Therefore, the integral in (8) is not well defined. Comparing its residue at the leading pole $u = 1/2$ with the residue of the static-quark self-energy at its ultraviolet pole $u = 1/2$ [17], we can express the renormalon ambiguity of $z(\mu)$ as

$$\Delta z(\mu) = \frac{3}{2} \frac{\Delta\bar{\Lambda}}{m} \quad (13)$$

($\bar{\Lambda}$ is the ground-state meson residual energy). This ambiguity is compensated in physical matrix elements by ultraviolet renormalon ambiguities in the leading $1/m$ correction (matrix elements of both local and bilocal dimension-5/2 operators), see [16].

The matching coefficient is gauge invariant at the order $1/\beta_0$. Expanding $\gamma(\beta)$ and $S(u)$ and integrating, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
z(\mu) = 1 - C_F \frac{\alpha_s(\mu)}{4\pi} \Bigg\{ & 3L + 4 + \left[\frac{3}{2} L^2 + \frac{19}{2} L + \pi^2 + \frac{113}{8} \right] \frac{\beta_0 \alpha_s(\mu)}{4\pi} \\
+ & \left[L^3 + \frac{19}{2} L^2 + \left(2\pi^2 + \frac{167}{6} \right) L + 14\zeta_3 + \frac{19}{3}\pi^2 + \frac{5767}{216} \right] \left(\frac{\beta_0 \alpha_s(\mu)}{4\pi} \right)^2 \\
+ & \left[\frac{3}{4} L^4 + \frac{19}{2} L^3 + \left(3\pi^2 + \frac{167}{4} \right) L^2 + \left(36\zeta_3 + 19\pi^2 + \frac{2903}{36} \right) L \right. \\
& \left. + \frac{71}{40}\pi^4 + \frac{467}{4}\zeta_3 + \frac{167}{6}\pi^2 + \frac{103933}{1728} \right] \left(\frac{\beta_0 \alpha_s(\mu)}{4\pi} \right)^3 + \cdots \Bigg\} .
\end{aligned} \tag{14}
$$

Thus we have confirmed the contributions with the highest power of n_l in each term in (7), and predicted such a contribution at α_s^4.

Numerically, the matching coefficient (7) in the Landau gauge at $\mu = m$ and $n_l = 4$ can be written as

$$
\begin{aligned}
z(m) = {} & 1 - \frac{4}{3} \frac{\alpha_s^{(4)}(m)}{\pi} - (1.9996\beta_0 - 4.5421) \left(\frac{\alpha_s^{(4)}(m)}{\pi} \right)^2 \\
& - (2.2091\beta_0^2 + 5.1153\beta_0 - 61.5397) \left(\frac{\alpha_s^{(4)}(m)}{\pi} \right)^3 \\
& - (3.3755\beta_0^3 + \cdots) \left(\frac{\alpha_s^{(4)}(m)}{\pi} \right)^4 + \cdots \\
= {} & 1 - \frac{4}{3} \frac{\alpha_s^{(4)}(m)}{\pi} - (16.6629 - 4.5421) \left(\frac{\alpha_s^{(4)}(m)}{\pi} \right)^2 \\
& - (153.4076 + 42.6271 - 61.5397) \left(\frac{\alpha_s^{(4)}(m)}{\pi} \right)^3 \\
& - (1953.4013 + \cdots) \left(\frac{\alpha_s^{(4)}(m)}{\pi} \right)^4 + \cdots \\
= {} & 1 - \frac{4}{3} \frac{\alpha_s^{(4)}(m)}{\pi} - 12.1208 \left(\frac{\alpha_s^{(4)}(m)}{\pi} \right)^2 - 134.4950 \left(\frac{\alpha_s^{(4)}(m)}{\pi} \right)^3 \\
& - (1953.4013 + \cdots) \left(\frac{\alpha_s^{(4)}(m)}{\pi} \right)^4 + \cdots
\end{aligned} \tag{15}
$$

(β_0 is for $n_l = 4$ flavours). Naive nonabelianization [1] works rather well at two and three loops (in the latter case the $\mathcal{O}(\beta_0)$ and $\mathcal{O}(1)$ terms partially compensate each other, similarly to [2]). Therefore, we can expect that the estimate of the α_s^4 term is also reasonably good. Numerical convergence of the series is very poor; this is related to the infrared renormalon at $u = 1/2$.

In QED, the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ renormalized electron field is related to the Bloch–Nordsieck electron field by the gauge-invariant matching coefficient

$$\begin{aligned}
z(\mu) ={}&1 - (3L+4)\frac{\alpha}{4\pi}\\
&+ \left(\frac{9}{2}L^2 + \frac{31}{2}L + 16\pi^2\log 2 - 24\zeta_3 - \frac{55}{3}\pi^2 + \frac{5957}{72}\right)\left(\frac{\alpha}{4\pi}\right)^2\\
&- \left[\frac{9}{2}L^3 + \frac{143}{6}L^2 + \left(48\pi^2\log 2 - 72\zeta_3 - 55\pi^2 + \frac{19363}{72}\right)L\right.\\
&\quad + 1024a_4 + \frac{128}{3}\log^4 2 - 64\pi^2\log^2 2 - \frac{11792}{9}\pi^2\log 2 + 20\zeta_5\\
&\quad \left. - 8\pi^2\zeta_3 + \frac{9494}{9}\zeta_3 + \frac{104}{45}\pi^4 + \frac{259133}{405}\pi^2 + \frac{249887}{324}\right]\left(\frac{\alpha}{4\pi}\right)^3 + \cdots
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

where $\alpha \approx 1/137$ is in the on-shell scheme.

In conclusion: we have derived the QCD/HQET matching coefficient for the heavy-quark field with three-loop accuracy (7), and the corresponding QED coefficient (16).

Acknowledgements. I am grateful to K.G. Chetyrkin and M. Steinhauser for useful discussions and hospitality in Karlsruhe. The work was supported by DFG through SFB/TR9.

References

[1] D.J. Broadhurst, A.G. Grozin, Phys. Rev. **D 52** (1995) 4082 [arXiv:hep-ph/9410240].

[2] S. Bekavac, A.G. Grozin, P. Marquard, J.H. Piclum, D. Seidel, M. Steinhauser, Nucl. Phys. **B 833** (2010) 46 [arXiv:0911.3356 [hep-ph]].

[3] C.L.Y. Lee, Preprint CALT-68-1663, Caltech (1991); revised (1997).

[4] J.G. Körner, G. Thompson, Phys. Lett. **B 264** (1991) 185; S. Balk, J.G. Körner, D. Pirjol, Nucl. Phys. **B 428** (1994) 499 [arXiv:hep-ph/9307230].

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

[6] M. Neubert, Phys. Rep. **245** (1994) 259 [arXiv:hep-ph/9306320].

[7] M.E. Luke, A.V. Manohar, Phys. Lett. **B 286** (1992) 348.

[8] K. Melnikov, T. van Ritbergen, Nucl. Phys. **B 591** (2000) 515 [arXiv:hep-ph/0005131].

[9] K.G. Chetyrkin, A.G. Grozin, Nucl. Phys. **B 666** (2003) 289 [arXiv:hep-ph/0303113].

[10] S.A. Larin, J.A.M. Vermaseren, Phys. Lett. **B 303** (1993) 334 [arXiv:hep-ph/9302208].

[11] K.G. Chetyrkin, B.A. Kniehl, M. Steinhauser, Nucl. Phys. **B 510** (1998) 61 [arXiv:hep-ph/9708255].

[12] A.G. Grozin, P. Marquard, J.H. Piclum, M. Steinhauser, Nucl. Phys. **B 789** (2008) 277 [arXiv:0707.1388 [hep-ph]].

[13] A.G. Grozin, A.V. Smirnov, V.A. Smirnov, JHEP **11** (2006) 022 [arXiv:hep-ph/0609280].

[14] S. Bekavac, A.G. Grozin, D. Seidel, M. Steinhauser, JHEP **10** (2007) 006 [arXiv:0708.1729 [hep-ph]].

[15] A.G. Grozin, *Heavy Quark Effective Theory*, Springer Tracts in Modern Physics **201**, Springer (2004).

[16] M. Neubert, C.T. Sachrajda, Nucl. Phys. **B 438** (1995) 235 [arXiv:hep-ph/9407394].

[17] M. Beneke, V.M. Braun, Nucl. Phys. **B 426** (1994) 301 [arXiv:hep-ph/9402364].