The Theory of B-Decays

Iain Stewart MIT

Aspen Winter Conference February, 2005

Outline

- Why B decay's ?
- Scales and Expansions (e-weak H, HQET, SCET, ...)
- Precision Measurements
- Recent Results (V_{ub}, γ)
- Outlook

Motivation

• Heavy Stable Hadrons —> lots of decays

BOTTOM MESONS

$$(B = \pm 1)$$

 $B^+ = u\overline{b}, B^0 = d\overline{b}, \overline{B}^0 = \overline{d}b, B^- = \overline{u}b, \text{ similarly for } B^*\text{'s}$

B-particle organization

Many measurements of *B* decays involve admixtures of *B* hadrons. Previously we arbitrarily included such admixtures in the B^{\pm} section, but because of their importance we have created two new sections: " B^{\pm}/B^0 Admixture" for $\Upsilon(4S)$ results and " $B^{\pm}/B^0/B_s^0/b$ -baryon Admixture" for results at higher energies. Most inclusive decay branching fractions and χ_b at high energy are found in the Admixture sections. $B^0-\overline{B}^0$ mixing data are found in the B^0 section, while $B_s^0-\overline{B}_s^0$ mixing data and $B-\overline{B}$ mixing data for a B^0/B_s^0 admixture are found in the B_s^0 section. CP-violation data are found in the B^{\pm} , B^0 , and B^{\pm} B^0 Admixture sections. b-baryons are found near the end of the Baryon section.

The organization of the *B* sections is now as follows, where bullets indicate particle sections and brackets indicate reviews. • B^{\pm}

```
mass, mean life, branching fractions CP violation
    \bullet B^0
         mass, mean life, branching fractions
         polarization in B^0 decay, B^0-\overline{B}^0 mixing, CP violation
    • B^{\pm} B^0 Admixtures
         branching fractions, CP violation
    • B^{\pm}/B^{0}/B^{0}_{s}/b-baryon Admixtures
         mean life, production fractions, branching fractions
         \chi_b at high energy, V_{cb} measurements
         • B*
              mass
         • B<sup>0</sup>
             mass, mean life, branching fractions
             polarization in B_s^0 decay, B_s^0 - \overline{B}_s^0 mixing
         • B^{\pm}_{a}
             mass, mean life, branching fractions
At end of Baryon Listings:
         \bullet \Lambda_h
              mass, mean life, branching fractions
         • b-baryon Admixture
              mean life, branching fractions
```

B±

 $I(J^P) = \tfrac{1}{2}(0^-)$

I, *J*, *P* need confirmation. Quantum numbers shown are quark-model predictions.

Mass
$$m_{B^{\pm}} = 5279.0 \pm 0.5$$
 MeV
Mean life $\tau_{B^{\pm}} = (1.671 \pm 0.018) \times 10^{-12}$ s
 $c\tau = 501 \ \mu$ m

CP violation

```
A_{CP}(B^+ \rightarrow J/\psi(1S)K^+) = -0.007 \pm 0.019
A_{CP}(B^+ \rightarrow J/\psi(1S)\pi^+) = -0.01 \pm 0.13
A_{CP}(B^+ \rightarrow \psi(2S)K^+) = -0.037 \pm 0.025
A_{CP}(B^+ \rightarrow \overline{D}{}^0 K^+) = 0.04 \pm 0.07
A_{CP}^{CP}(B^+ \rightarrow D_{CP(+1)}K^+) = 0.06 \pm 0.19
A_{CP}(B^+ \rightarrow D_{CP(-1)}K^+) = -0.19 \pm 0.18
A_{CP}(B^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0) = 0.05 \pm 0.15
A_{CP}(B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \pi^0) = -0.10 \pm 0.08
A_{CP}(B^+ \rightarrow K_S^0 \pi^+) = 0.03 \pm 0.08 \quad (S = 1.1)
A_{CP}(B^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+) = -0.39 \pm 0.35
A_{CP}(B^+ \rightarrow \rho^+ \rho^0) = -0.09 \pm 0.16
A_{CP}(B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \pi^- \pi^+) = 0.01 \pm 0.08
A_{CP}(B^+ \rightarrow K^+ K^- K^+) = 0.02 \pm 0.08
A_{CP}(B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \eta') = 0.009 \pm 0.035
A_{CP}(B^+ \to \omega \pi^+) = -0.21 \pm 0.19
A_{CP}(B^+ \rightarrow \omega K^+) = -0.21 \pm 0.28
A_{CP}(B^+ \rightarrow \phi K^+) = 0.03 \pm 0.07
A_{CP}(B^+ \rightarrow \phi K^*(892)^+) = 0.09 \pm 0.15
A_{CP}(B^+ \rightarrow \rho^0 K^*(892)^+) = 0.20 \pm 0.31
```

 B^- modes are charge conjugates of the modes below. Modes which do not identify the charge state of the B are listed in the B^\pm/B^0 ADMIXTURE section.

The branching fractions listed below assume 50% $B^0 \overline{B}^0$ and 50% $B^+ B^$ production at the $\Upsilon(4S)$. We have attempted to bring older measurements up to date by rescaling their assumed $\Upsilon(4S)$ production ratio to 50:50 and their assumed D, D_s , D^* , and ψ branching ratios to current values whenever this would affect our averages and best limits significantly.

Indentation is used to indicate a subchannel of a previous reaction. All resonant subchannels have been corrected for resonance branching fractions to the final state so the sum of the subchannel branching fractions can exceed that of the final state.

For inclusive branching fractions, e.g., $B \rightarrow D^{\pm}$ anything, the values usually are multiplicities, not branching fractions. They can be greater than one.

	Fraction (F./F	So So	cale factor/	p (MoV/c)
	Traction (1/1) Com	idence level	(101e V/C)
Semilep	tonic and leptonic n	nodes		
$\ell^+ \underline{\nu_{\ell}}$ anything	[a] $(10.2 \pm 0.9$) %		-
$\underline{D}^{0}\ell^{+}\nu_{\ell}$	[a] (2.15±0.22	2) %		2310
$D^{*}(2007)^{0}\ell^{+}\nu_{\ell}$	$[a]$ (6.5 \pm 0.5)%		2258
$D_1(2420)^0 \ell^+ \nu_\ell$	(5.6 ± 1.6	$) \times 10^{-3}$		2084
$D_2^*(2460)^0 \ell^+ \nu_\ell$	< 8	$\times 10^{-3}$	CL=90%	2067
$\pi^0 e^+ \nu_e$	(9.0 \pm 2.8) × 10 ⁻⁵		2638
$\eta \ell^+ u_\ell$	(8 ±4) × 10 ⁻⁵		2611
$\omega \ell^+ \nu_\ell$	[a] < 2.1	imes 10 ⁻⁴	CL=90%	2582
$\rho^0 \ell^+ \nu_\ell$	$[a]$ ($1.34^{+0.32}_{-0.35}$	$(\frac{2}{5}) \times 10^{-4}$		2583
$p \overline{p} e^+ \nu_e$	< 5.2	imes 10 ⁻³	CL=90%	2467
$e^+ \nu_e$	< 1.5	imes 10 ⁻⁵	CL=90%	2640
$\mu^+ \nu_{\mu}$	< 2.1	imes 10 ⁻⁵	CL=90%	2638
$\tau^+ \nu_{\tau}$	< 5.7	imes 10 ⁻⁴	CL=90%	2340
$e^+ \nu_e \gamma$	< 2.0	imes 10 ⁻⁴	CL=90%	2640
$\mu^+ \nu_\mu \gamma$	< 5.2	imes 10 ⁻⁵	CL=90%	2638
D	$D, D^*, \text{ or } D_{\epsilon} \text{ modes}$			
$\overline{D}{}^0\pi^+$	(4.98±0.29	$(0) \times 10^{-3}$		2308
$\overline{D}^0 \rho^+$	(1.34±0.18)%		2236
$\overline{D}^{0}K^{+}$	(3.7 ±0.6	$) \times 10^{-4}$	S=1.1	2280
$\overline{D}{}^{0} K^{*}(892)^{+}$	(6.1 ± 2.3)) × 10 ⁻⁴		2213
$\overline{D}^0 K^+ \overline{K}^0$	(5.5 ± 1.6)	$) \times 10^{-4}$		2189
$\overline{D}{}^0 \kappa^+ \overline{\kappa}{}^* (892)^0$	(7.5 ± 1.7)) $\times 10^{-4}$		2071
$\overline{D}^0 \pi^+ \pi^+ \pi^-$	(1.1 ±0.4)%		2289
$\overline{D}{}^0 \pi^+ \pi^+ \pi^-$ nonresonant	(5 ±4) × 10 ⁻³		2289
$\overline{D}{}^{0}\pi^{+}\rho^{0}$	(4.2 ±3.0) × 10 ⁻³		2207
$\overline{D}{}^0 a_1(1260)^+$	(5 ±4) × 10 ⁻³		2123
$\overline{D}{}^{0}\omega\pi^{+}$	(4.1 ± 0.9)	$) \times 10^{-3}$		2206
$D^*(2010)^- \pi^+ \pi^+$	(2.1 ± 0.6)) × 10 ⁻³		2247
$D^-\pi^+\pi^+$	< 1.4	$\times 10^{-3}$	CL=90%	2299
$\overline{D}^{*}(2007)^{0}\pi^{+}$	(4.6 ± 0.4)	$) \times 10^{-3}$		2256
$\overline{D}^{*}(2007)^{0}\omega\pi^{+}$	(4.5 ± 1.2)	$) \times 10^{-3}$		2149
$\overline{D}^{*}(2007)^{0}\rho^{+}$	(9.8 ± 1.7)	$) \times 10^{-3}$		2181
$\overline{D}^{*}(2007)^{0}K^{+}$	(3.6 ±1.0	$) \times 10^{-4}$		2227
$\overline{D}^{*}(2007)^{0} K^{*}(892)^{+}$	(7.2 ±3.4	$) \times 10^{-4}$		2156
$\overline{D}^*(2007)^0 K^+ \overline{K}^0$	< 1.06	imes 10 ⁻³	CL=90%	2132
$\overline{D}^{*}(2007)^{0}K^{+}K^{*}(892)^{0}$	(1.5 ± 0.4	$) imes 10^{-3}$		2008
HTTP://PDG.LBL.GOV	Page 3	Created:	12/9/2004	16:47

$\overline{D}^{*}(2007)^{0}\pi^{+}\pi^{+}\pi^{-}$	$(9.4 \pm$	2.6) $\times 10^{-3}$		2236
$\overline{D}^{*}(2007)^{0} a_{1}(1260)^{+}$	$(1.9 \pm$	0.5)%		2062
$\overline{D}^{*}(2007)^{0}\pi^{-}\pi^{+}\pi^{+}\pi^{0}$	$(1.8 \pm$	0.4)%		2219
$D^{*}(2010)^{+}\pi^{0}$	< 1.7	$\times 10^{-4}$	CL=90%	2255
$\overline{D}^{*}(2010)^{+}K^{0}$	< 9.5	imes 10 ⁻⁵	CL=90%	2225
$D^{*}(2010)^{-}\pi^{+}\pi^{+}\pi^{0}$	(1.5 \pm	0.7)%		2235
$D^{*}(2010)^{-}\pi^{+}\pi^{+}\pi^{+}\pi^{-}$	< 1	%	CL=90%	2217
$\overline{D}_{1}^{*}(2420)^{0}\pi^{+}$	(1.5 \pm	0.6) $\times 10^{-3}$	S=1.3	2081
$\overline{D}_{1}^{1}(2420)^{0}\rho^{+}$	< 1.4	× 10 ⁻³	CL=90%	1995
$\overline{D}_{2}^{1}(2460)^{0}\pi^{+}$	< 1.3	imes 10 ⁻³	CL=90%	2064
$\overline{D}_{2}^{*}(2460)^{0}\rho^{+}$	< 4.7	imes 10 ⁻³	CL=90%	1977
$\overline{D}^{\bar{0}}D^+_{\epsilon}$	(1.3 \pm	0.4)%		1815
$\overline{D}^0 D_{sI}^{\prime}(2317)^+$	seen			1605
$\overline{D}^{0} D_{s,I}^{0}(2457)^{+}$	seen			_
$\overline{D}^0 D_{s,I}^{(2536)+}$	not see	n		1447
$\overline{D}^{*}(2007)^{0} D_{s,I}(2536)^{+}$	not see	n		1338
$\overline{D}^0 D_{sJ}(2573)^+$	not see	n		1417
$\overline{D}^{*}(2007)^{0} D_{s,I}(2573)^{+}$	not see	n		1306
$\overline{D}^0 D_s^{*+}$	(9 ±	4) $\times 10^{-3}$		1734
$\overline{D}^{*}(2007)^{0}D_{s}^{+}$	(1.2 \pm	0.5)%		1737
$\overline{D}^{*}(2007)^{0}D_{s}^{*+}$	$(2.7 \pm$	1.0)%		1651
$D^{(*)+}\overline{D}^{**0}$	(2.7 ±	1.2) %		_
$\overline{D}^{*}(2007)^{0} D^{*}(2010)^{+}$	< 1.1	%	CL=90%	1713
$\overline{D}^{0} D^{*} (2010)^{+} +$	< 1.3	%	CL=90%	1792
$\overline{D}^{*}(2007)^{0}D^{+}$				
$\overline{D}^0 D^+$	< 6.7	imes 10 ⁻³	CL=90%	1866
$\overline{D}{}^0 D^+ K^0$	< 2.8	imes 10 ⁻³	CL=90%	1571
$\overline{D}^{*}(2007)^{0} D^{+} K^{0}$	< 6.1	imes 10 ⁻³	CL=90%	1475
$\overline{D}^0 \overline{D}^* (2010)^+ K^0$	(5.2 \pm	1.2) $\times 10^{-3}$		1476
$\overline{D}^{*}(2007)^{0} D^{*}(2010)^{+} K^{0}$	(7.8 \pm	2.6) $\times 10^{-3}$		1362
$\overline{D}{}^0 D^0 K^+$	(1.9 \pm	0.4) $ imes$ 10 ⁻³		1577
$\overline{D}^{*}(2010)^{0} D^{0} K^{+}$	< 3.8	imes 10 ⁻³	CL=90%	-
$\overline{D}{}^{0} D^{*} (2007)^{0} K^{+}$	$(4.7 \pm$	1.0) $\times 10^{-3}$		1481
$\overline{D}^{*}(2007)^{0} D^{*}(2007)^{0} K^{+}$	(5.3 \pm	1.6) $\times 10^{-3}$		1368
$D^{-}D^{+}K^{+}$	< 4	imes 10 ⁻⁴	CL=90%	1571
$D^- D^* (2010)^+ K^+$	< 7	$\times 10^{-4}$	CL=90%	1475
$D^*(2010)^- D^+ K^+$	(1.5 \pm	$(0.4) \times 10^{-3}$		1475
$D_{-}^{*}(2010)^{-}D^{*}(2010)^{+}K^{+}$	< 1.8	imes 10 ⁻³	CL=90%	1363
$(D+D^*)(D+D^*)K$	$(3.5 \pm$	0.6)%		-
$D_{s}^{+}\pi^{0}$	< 2.0	$\times 10^{-4}$	CL=90%	2270
$D_{s}^{*+}\pi^{0}$	< 3.3	imes 10 ⁻⁴	CL=90%	2215
$D_s^+ \eta$	< 5	imes 10 ⁻⁴	CL=90%	2235
$D_{s}^{*+}\eta$	< 8	imes 10 ⁻⁴	CL=90%	2178
HTTP://PDG.LBL.GOV	Page 4	Created:	12/9/2004	16:47

$D^{+}_{-}\rho^{0}$	< 4	$\times 10^{-4}$	CL=90%	2197	nK^+
$D^{*+}\rho^{0}$	< 5	$\times 10^{-4}$	CL=90%	2138	$n K^*(8)$
$D_{-}^{s}\omega$	< 5	$\times 10^{-4}$	CL=90%	2195	<i>i</i> , <i>i</i> , (0
$D^{*+}_{-}\omega$	< 7	$\times 10^{-4}$	CL=90%	2136	ωK^+
$D^{s}_{+}a_{1}(1260)^{0}$	< 2.2	$\times 10^{-3}$	CL=90%	2079	$\omega {\sf K}^*$ (8
$D^{*+}a_1(1260)^0$	< 1.6	$\times 10^{-3}$	CL=90%	2014	K*(89
$D^+\phi$	< 3.2	$\times 10^{-4}$	CL=90%	2141	K*(89
$D^{s+\phi}$	< 4	$\times 10^{-4}$	CL=90%	2079	$K^+\pi^-$
$D^+ \overline{K}^0$	< 1.1	$\times 10^{-3}$	CL=90%	2241	K^+
$D^{*+}\overline{K}^0$	< 1.1	$\times 10^{-3}$	CL=90%	2184	K^+
$D^{+} \overline{K}^{*}(892)^{0}$	< 5	× 10 ⁻⁴	CI = 90%	2172	K ₂ *(
$D_{s}^{*+}\overline{K}^{*}(892)^{0}$	< 4	× 10 ⁻⁴	CI = 90%	2112	$K^{-}\pi^{+}$
$D_s \pi^+ K^+$	< 8	× 10 ⁻⁴	CL -90%	2222	K ⁻
$D_{s}^{*-}\pi^{+}K^{+}$	< 12	× 10 × 10 [−] 3	CL = 30%	2164	$K_1(140)$
$D_{s}^{-}\pi^{+}K^{*}(802)^{+}$	< 1.2	× 10 × 10 ⁻³	CL = 90%	2104	$K^{\circ}\pi^{+}$
$D_{s}^{*-}\pi^{+}K^{*}(802)^{+}$	< 0	× 10 × 10 ⁻³	CL = 90%	2130	K*(80
$D_s = \pi \pi (0.92)$	< 0	× 10	CL—9070	2010	K*(
	Charmonium mode	es			K*(89
$\eta_c K^+$	(9.0 ±2	$2.7) \times 10^{-4}$		1754	$K_1(140)$
$J/\psi(1S) K^+ \pi^+ \pi^-$	(1.00±0	$(0.04) \times 10^{-4}$		1683	$K_{2}^{*}(14)$
$J/\psi(13)K + \pi + \pi$ X(3872)K ⁺	(7.7 ±2	2.0)×10 ·		1012	$K^{\frac{1}{2}}\overline{K}^{0}$
$I/\psi(1.S) K^*(892)^+$	(1.35+($(10) \times 10^{-3}$		1571	$\overline{K}^0 K^+$
$J/\psi(1S)K(1270)^+$	(1.00 ± 0)	$(10) \times 10^{-3}$		1390	$K^+K_0^0$
$J/\psi(1S) K(1400)^+$	< 5	× 10 ⁻⁴	CL=90%	1308	$K_{S}^{0}K_{S}^{0}$
$J/\psi(1S)\phi K^+$	(5.2 ±1	L.7) $\times 10^{-5}$	S=1.2	1227	K^+K^-
$J/\psi(1S)\pi^+$	(4.0 ±0	$(0.5) \times 10^{-5}$		1727	K^+
$J/\psi(1S) ho^+$	< 7.7	imes 10 ⁻⁴	CL=90%	1611	K+ K-
$J/\psi(1S)a_1(1260)^+$	< 1.2	imes 10 ⁻³	CL=90%	1414	K^+
$J/\psi(1S) p \overline{\Lambda}$	(1.2 + 0)	$(0.9)_{6} \times 10^{-5}$		567	K^+K^-
$\psi(2S)K^+$	(6.8±0	$(0.4) \times 10^{-4}$		1284	K+
$\psi(2S) K^*(892)^+$	(9.2 ±2	$(2.2) \times 10^{-4}$		1115	К+ К+
$\psi(2S)K^+\pi^+\pi^-$	(1.9 ±1	$(1.2) \times 10^{-3}$		1178	K*(89
$\gamma_{c0}(1P)K^+$	(6.0 + 2)	$(2.4) \times 10^{-4}$		1478	K*(
$\chi_{c0}(1, D) K^{+}$		$2.1 / 10^{-4}$		1411	$K_1(14)$
$\chi_{c1}(1P) K^*(802)^+$	(0.8 ± 1	$(1.2) \times 10^{-3}$	CI00%	1411	$K_{2}^{*}(14)$
$\chi_{c1}(17) \pi (092)$	< 2.1	× 10	CL—9070	1205	$K^+\phi d$
	K or K* modes	-			K*(80
$K^{\circ}\pi^{+}$	(1.88±0	$(0.21) \times 10^{-5}$		2614	$K_{1}(12)$
$\kappa \cdot \pi^{\circ}$	(1.29±0	$(12) \times 10^{-5}$		2615	$\phi K^+ \gamma$
リハ ッ/ K*(802)+	(7.8 ±0	$(1.5) \times 10^{-5}$		2528	¥+
1/ N (092)	< 3.5	× 10 5	CL=90%	2412	N ' 7
HTTP://PDG.LBL.GOV	Page 5	Created:	12/9/2004	16:47	HTTP

K^+	< 6.9	imes 10 ⁻⁶	CL=90%	2588
K*(892) ⁺	(2.6 $^{+1}_{-0}$	$^{.0}_{.9}$) $ imes$ 10 $^{-5}$		2534
K^+	(9.2 +2	$(1.8)_{5} \times 10^{-6}$		2557
K*(892) ⁺	< 8.7	× 10 ⁻⁵	CL=90%	2503
$(*(892)^0 \pi^+)$	(1.9 + 0)	$^{0.6}_{1.8}$) $\times 10^{-5}$		2562
$(*(892)^+ \pi^0)$	< 3.1	× 10 ⁻⁵	CL=90%	2562
$+\pi^{-}\pi^{+}$	(5.7 \pm 0	0.4) $\times 10^{-5}$		2609
$K^+ \pi^- \pi^+$ nonresonant	< 2.8	$\times 10^{-5}$	CL=90%	2609
$K^+ ho^0$	< 1.2	imes 10 ⁻⁵	CL=90%	2558
$K_2^*(1430)^0 \pi^+$	< 6.8	imes 10 ⁻⁴	CL=90%	2445
$x - \pi + \pi +$	< 1.8	imes 10 ⁻⁶	CL=90%	2609
$K^-\pi^+\pi^+$ nonresonant	< 5.6	imes 10 ⁻⁵	CL=90%	2609
$(1400)^0 \pi^+$	< 2.6	imes 10 ⁻³	CL=90%	2451
$^{0}\pi^{+}\pi^{0}$	< 6.6	imes 10 ⁻⁵	CL=90%	2609
$\kappa^0 \rho^+$	< 4.8	imes 10 ⁻⁵	CL=90%	2558
$(*(892)^+ \pi^+ \pi^-)$	< 1.1	imes 10 ⁻³	CL=90%	2556
$K^{*}(892)^{+} \rho^{0}$	(1.1 ± 0	0.4) $ imes$ 10 ⁻⁵		2504
$(*(892)^+ K^*(892)^0)$	< 7.1	imes 10 ⁻⁵	CL=90%	2484
$f_1(1400)^+ \rho^0$	< 7.8	imes 10 ⁻⁴	CL=90%	2387
$\Gamma_2^*(1430)^+ \rho^0$	< 1.5	imes 10 ⁻³	CL=90%	2381
$(+\overline{K}^{0})$	< 2.0	imes 10 ⁻⁶	CL=90%	2593
$K^{0}K^{+}\pi^{0}$	< 2.4	imes 10 ⁻⁵	CL=90%	2578
$K^{+} K^{0}_{S} K^{0}_{S}$	(1.34 ± 0)	$(.24) \times 10^{-5}$		2521
$S_S^0 K_S^0 \pi^+$	< 3.2	imes 10 ⁻⁶	CL=90%	2577
$K^+ K^- \pi^+$	< 6.3	imes 10 ⁻⁶	CL=90%	2578
$K^+ K^- \pi^+$ nonresonant	< 7.5	imes 10 ⁻⁵	CL=90%	2578
$K^{+}K^{+}\pi^{-}$	< 1.3	imes 10 ⁻⁶	CL=90%	2578
$K^+K^+\pi^-$ nonresonant	< 8.79	imes 10 ⁻⁵	CL=90%	2578
$(K^{+} K^{*}(892))^{0}$	< 5.3	$\times 10^{-6}$	CL=90%	2540
$K^+ K^- K^+$	(3.08±0	$(.21) \times 10^{-5}$		2522
$K^+\phi$	(9.3 ± 1	$0) \times 10^{-6}$	S=1.3	2516
$K^+ K^- K^+$ nonresonant	< 3.8	$\times 10^{-5}$	CL=90%	2522
$(*(892)^+ K^+ K^-)$	< 1.6	$\times 10^{-3}$	CL=90%	2466
$K^{*}(892)^{+}\phi$	(9.6 ± 3)	$(0.0) \times 10^{-6}$	S=1.9	2460
$f_1(1400)^+ \phi$	< 1.1	$\times 10^{-3}$	CL=90%	2339
$^{*}_{2}(1430)^{+}\phi$	< 3.4	$\times 10^{-3}$	CL=90%	2332
$f^+\phi\phi$	(2.6 $^{+1}_{-0}$	$^{.1}_{.9}$) $ imes$ 10 ⁻⁶		2306
$(*(892)^+ \gamma)$	(3.8 \pm 0	0.5) $ imes$ 10 $^{-5}$		2564
$(1270)^+ \gamma$	< 9.9	imes 10 ⁻⁵	CL=90%	2486
$K^+\gamma$	(3.4 ± 1	0) $ imes$ 10 ⁻⁶		2516
$(+\pi^-\pi^+\gamma)$	(2.4 + 0)	$^{0.6}_{0.5}$) $ imes$ 10 $^{-5}$		2609
TTP://PDG.LBL.GOV	Page 6	Created:	12/9/2004	16:47

$K^*(892)^0 \pi^+ \gamma$	(2.0 + 0.0)	$^{.7}_{.6}$) $ imes$ 10 ⁻⁵		2562
$\mathcal{K}^+ \rho^0 \gamma$	< 2.0	$\times 10^{-5}$	CL=90%	2558
${\cal K}^+\pi^-\pi^+\gamma$ nonresonant	< 9.2	imes 10 ⁻⁶	CL=90%	2609
$K_1(1400)^+ \gamma$	< 5.0	imes 10 ⁻⁵	CL=90%	2453
$K_{2}^{*}(1430)^{+}\gamma$	< 1.4	imes 10 ⁻³	CL=90%	2447
$\overline{K^{*}}(1680)^{+}\gamma$	< 1.9	imes 10 ⁻³	CL=90%	2360
$K_{3}^{*}(1780)^{+}\gamma$	< 5.5	imes 10 ⁻³	CL=90%	2341
$\tilde{K_{4}^{*}}(2045)^{+}\gamma$	< 9.9	imes 10 ⁻³	CL=90%	2243
Light unflav	ored meson	modes		
$\rho^+\gamma$	< 2.1	imes 10 ⁻⁶	CL=90%	2583
$\pi^+\pi^0$	(5.6 +0.	$(.9)_{1} \times 10^{-6}$		2636
$\pi^{+}\pi^{+}\pi^{-}$	(11 + 0)	$(4) \times 10^{-5}$		2630
$\rho^0 \pi^+$	(3.6 ± 2)	$(0) \times 10^{-6}$		2581
$\pi^+ f_0(980)$	< 1.4	× 10 ⁻⁴	CL=90%	2547
$\pi^+ f_2(1270)$	< 2.4	imes 10 ⁻⁴	CL=90%	2483
$\pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+$ nonresonant	< 4.1	imes 10 ⁻⁵	CL=90%	2630
$\pi^+\pi^0\pi^0$	< 8.9	imes 10 ⁻⁴	CL=90%	2631
$ ho^+\pi^0$	< 4.3	imes 10 ⁻⁵	CL=90%	2581
$\pi^+\pi^-\pi^+\pi^0$	< 4.0	imes 10 ⁻³	CL=90%	2621
$\rho^+ \rho^0$	(2.6 ± 0.1)	.6) $\times 10^{-5}$		2523
$a_1(1260)^+ \pi^0$	< 1.7	imes 10 ⁻³	CL=90%	2494
$a_1(1260)^0 \pi^+$	< 9.0	$\times 10^{-4}$	CL=90%	2494
$\omega \pi^+$	(6.4 + 1)	$^{.8}_{.6}$) $ imes$ 10 ⁻⁶	S=1.3	2580
$\omega \rho^+$	< 6.1	imes 10 ⁻⁵	CL=90%	2522
$\eta \pi^+$	< 5.7	imes 10 ⁻⁶	CL=90%	2609
$\eta' \pi^+$	< 7.0	imes 10 ⁻⁶	CL=90%	2551
$\eta' \rho_{\perp}^+$	< 3.3	$\times 10^{-5}$	CL=90%	2492
$\eta \rho^+$	< 1.5	$\times 10^{-5}$	CL=90%	2553
$\phi \pi^+$	< 4.1	$\times 10^{-7}$	CL=90%	2539
$\phi \rho^+$	< 1.6	× 10 ⁻⁵		2480
$\pi^+\pi^+\pi^+\pi^-\pi^-$	< 8.6	$\times 10^{-4}$	CL=90%	2608
$\rho^{0} a_{1}(1260)^{+}$	< 6.2	× 10 ⁻⁴	CL=90%	2433
$\rho^{\circ} a_{2}(1320)$	< 7.2	$\times 10^{-4}$	CL=90%	2410
$\pi' \pi' \pi' \pi \pi \pi \pi^{\circ}$	< 6.3	$\times 10^{-5}$	CL=90%	2592
$a_1(1200) + a_1(1200)^2$	< 1.3	%	CL=90%	2335
Charged pa	nticle (h^{\pm}) n	nodes		
$h^{\pm}={\it K}^{\pm}$ or π^{\pm}				
$h^+ \pi^0$	(1.6 + 0.0)	$(7) \times 10^{-5}$		2636

$h^{\pm}=K^{\pm}$ or π^{\pm}				
$h^+ \pi^0$	(1.6 $\substack{+0.7\\-0.6}$	$) imes 10^{-5}$		2636
ωh^+	(1.38 + 0.27)	$(1) \times 10^{-5}$		2580
$h^+ X^0$ (Familon)	< 4.9	imes 10 ⁻⁵	CL=90%	-
HTTP://PDG.LBL.GOV	Page 7	Created:	12/9/2004	16:47

Baryon modes						
$p\overline{p}\pi^+$	< 3.7	imes 10 ⁻⁶	CL=90%	2439		
$p \overline{p} \pi^+$ nonresonant	< 5.3	imes 10 ⁻⁵	CL=90%	2439		
$ ho \overline{ ho} \pi^+ \pi^+ \pi^-$	< 5.2	imes 10 ⁻⁴	CL=90%	2369		
р р К ⁺	(4.3 + 1.)	2_0) $ imes$ 10 ⁻⁶		2348		
$p\overline{p}K^+$ nonresonant	< 8.9	imes 10 ⁻⁵	CL=90%	2348		
рЛ	< 1.5	imes 10 ⁻⁶	CL=90%	2430		
$p\overline{\Lambda}\pi^+\pi^-$	< 2.0	imes 10 ⁻⁴	CL=90%	2367		
$\overline{\Delta}^0 p$	< 3.8	imes 10 ⁻⁴	CL=90%	2402		
$\Delta^{++}\overline{ ho}$	< 1.5	imes 10 ⁻⁴	CL=90%	2402		
$D^+ p \overline{p}$	< 1.5	imes 10 ⁻⁵	CL=90%	1860		
$D^{*}(2010)^{+} \rho \overline{\rho}$	< 1.5	imes 10 ⁻⁵	CL=90%	1786		
$\overline{\Lambda}_{c}^{-} p \pi^{+}$	(2.1 ± 0.1)	7) $ imes$ 10 $^{-4}$		1981		
$\overline{\Lambda}_{c}^{-} p \pi^{+} \pi^{0}$	(1.8 \pm 0.	6) $ imes$ 10 $^{-3}$		1936		
$\overline{\Lambda}_{c}^{-} p \pi^{+} \pi^{+} \pi^{-}$	(2.3 $\pm 0.$	7) $ imes$ 10 $^{-3}$		1881		
$\overline{\Lambda}_c^- p \pi^+ \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0$	< 1.34	%	CL=90%	1823		
$\overline{\Sigma}_{c}(2455)^{0}p$	< 8	imes 10 ⁻⁵	CL=90%	1939		
$\overline{\Sigma}_{c}(2520)^{0} p$	< 4.6	imes 10 ⁻⁵	CL=90%	1905		
$\overline{\Sigma}_{c}(2455)^{0} p \pi^{0}$	$(4.4 \pm 1.)$	8) $ imes$ 10 $^{-4}$		1897		
$\overline{\Sigma}_{c}(2455)^{0} p \pi^{-} \pi^{+}$	$(4.4 \pm 1.)$	7) $ imes$ 10 $^{-4}$		1845		
$\overline{\Sigma}_{c}(2455)^{}p\pi^{+}\pi^{+}$	(2.8 $\pm 1.$	2) $ imes$ 10 $^{-4}$		1845		
$\overline{\Lambda}_c(2593)^-/\overline{\Lambda}_c(2625)^-p\pi^+$	< 1.9	imes 10 ⁻⁴	CL=90%	-		

Lepton Family number (*LF*) or Lepton number (*L*) violating modes, or $\Delta B = 1$ weak neutral current (*B1*) modes

$\pi^+ e^+ e^-$	B1	< 3.9	imes 10 ⁻³	CL=90%	2638
$\pi^+\mu^+\mu^-$	B1	< 9.1	imes 10 ⁻³	CL=90%	2633
$K^+ e^+ e^-$	B1	(6.3 + 1)	$^{1.9}_{1.7}$) $ imes$ 10 $^{-7}$		2616
$K^+ \mu^+ \mu^-$	B1	(4.5 + 1)	$^{1.4}_{1.2}$) $ imes$ 10 $^{-7}$		2612
$K^+\ell^+\ell^-$	B1	[a] (5.3 \pm 1	1.1) $ imes$ 10 $^{-7}$		2616
$K^+\overline{\nu}\nu$	B1	< 2.4	imes 10 ⁻⁴	CL=90%	2616
K*(892) ⁺ e ⁺ e ⁻	B1	< 4.6	imes 10 ⁻⁶	CL=90%	2564
$K^{*}(892)^{+}\mu^{+}\mu^{-}$	B1	< 2.2	imes 10 ⁻⁶	CL=90%	2560
$K^{*}(892)^{+}\ell^{+}\ell$	B1	[a] < 2.2	imes 10 ⁻⁶	CL=90%	2564
$\pi^+ e^+ \mu^-$	LF	< 6.4	imes 10 ⁻³	CL=90%	2637
$\pi^+ e^- \mu^+$	LF	< 6.4	imes 10 ⁻³	CL=90%	2637
$K^+ e^+ \mu^-$	LF	< 8	imes 10 ⁻⁷	CL=90%	2615
$K^+ e^- \mu^+$	LF	< 6.4	imes 10 ⁻³	CL=90%	2615
$K^{*}(892)^{+} e^{\pm} \mu^{\mp}$	LF	< 7.9	imes 10 ⁻⁶	CL=90%	2563
$\pi^- e^+ e^+$	L	< 1.6	imes 10 ⁻⁶	CL=90%	2638
$\pi^-\mu^+\mu^+$	L	< 1.4	× 10 ⁻⁶	CL=90%	2633

 $\mathsf{HTTP:}//\mathsf{PDG.LBL.GOV}$

Created: 12/9/2004 16:47

Motivation

- Heavy Stable Hadrons —> lots of decays
- Probe the flavor sector of the SM



Motivation

- Heavy Stable Hadrons —> lots of decays
- Probe the flavor sector of the SM; CKM matrix
- Look for new physics: redundant measurements, precision measurements, rare decays $A \rightarrow X_s \gamma$ $B \rightarrow X_s \gamma$ $B \rightarrow K\pi$ (forbidden decays)
- Measure fundamental hadronic parameters & improve our understanding of QCD



Electroweak Hamiltonian

 $m_W, m_t \gg m_b$

$$H_{\text{weak}} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_i \lambda^i \frac{C_i(\mu)}{O_i(\mu)} O_i(\mu)$$





trees

$$O_{1} = (\bar{u}b)_{V-A}(\bar{d}u)_{V-A}$$
$$O_{2} = (\bar{u}_{i}b_{j})_{V-A}(\bar{d}_{j}u_{i})_{V-A}$$

 $\lambda^i = CKM$ factors

 $\lambda^1 = V_{ub}V_{ud}^* \quad \lambda^3 = V_{tb}V_{td}^*$

penguins

$$O_{3} = (\bar{d}b)_{V-A} \sum_{q} (\bar{q}q)_{V-A}$$

$$O_{4,5,6} = \dots$$

$$O_{7\gamma,8G} = \dots$$

$$O_{7,\dots,10}^{ew} = \dots$$

B-meson Effective Field Theory Heavy Quark Effective Theory • Separate physics at different momentum sca m_W Model independent, systematically improvable • Power expansion, can estimate uncertainty • Exploit symmetries • Resum Sudakgelogarithmons Soft-Collinear **Effective Theory** egs. H_W , HQET, ChPT m_b $p^2 \sim \Lambda^2$ $p^2 \sim Q^2$ $p^2 \sim \Lambda^2$ $p^2 \sim \Lambda^2$ $p^2 \sim O\Lambda$

Need expansion parameters to make model independent predictions

$$\alpha_s(m_b) \simeq 0.2 \qquad \frac{\Lambda}{m_b} \simeq 0.1 \qquad \frac{\Lambda}{E_M} \simeq 0.2 \qquad \frac{m_s}{\Lambda} \simeq 0.3$$

QCD is a predictive theory

- For a given systematic expansion the terms in the series are unique and model independent
- Model dependence arises from assumptions about nonperturbative parameters

Proof of Factorization means Known to be Model Independent once hadronic parameters are determined

Factorization Example π • $\bar{B}^0 \to D^+ \pi^-$, $B^- \to D^0 \pi^-$ B, D are soft, π collinear $\mathcal{L}_{\text{SCET}} = \mathcal{L}_s^{(0)} + \mathcal{L}_c^{(0)}$ Factorization if $\mathcal{O} = O_c \times O_s$ Calculate Bauer, Pirjol, I.S. $\langle D\pi | (\bar{c}b)(\bar{u}d) | B \rangle = N \, \xi(v \cdot v') \int_{0}^{1} dx$ $T(x,\mu) \phi_{\pi}(x,\mu)$ • $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{(*)0} \pi^0$ (power suppressed) Mantry, Pirjol, I.S. $A_{00}^{D^{(*)}\pi} = N_0^{(*)} \int dx \, dz \, dk_1^+ dk_2^+$) $J^{(i)}(z, x, k_1^+, k_2^+) S^{(i)}(k_1^+, k_2^+) \phi_{\pi}(x)$ $+A_{long}^{D^{(*)}\pi}$ Λ^2

Expt Average (Cleo, Belle, Babar):



 $\delta(D\pi) = 30.4 \pm 4.8^{\circ}$ $\delta(D^*\pi) = 31.0 \pm 5.0^{\circ}$

- can predict other ratios of amplitudes, some not yet tested by data
- can relate different channels eg. π to ρ

FKS mixing angle

Extension to isosinglets: Blechman, Mantry, I.S.

$$\frac{Br(\bar{B} \to D^{(*)}\eta')}{Br(\bar{B} \to D^{(*)}\eta)} = \tan^2(\theta) = 0.67 + \mathcal{O}(\alpha_s(\sqrt{E\Lambda}))$$

data = $0.61 \pm 0.12(D)$, $0.51 \pm 0.18(D^*)$

Precision Measurements

Some decays are clean

 $b \to c\bar{c}s \qquad (B^0, \bar{B}^0 \to J/\Psi K_s, \Psi' K_s, J/\Psi K_L, \ldots)$ A dominant weak phase $(V_{cb}V_{cs}^* \sim \lambda^2 , V_{ub}V_{us}^* \sim \lambda^4)$ Strong effects cancel in $A^{\overline{CP}}/A$ $a_{CP}(t) \propto sin(2\beta) \qquad [we now know \beta at -5\% level]$

Note: do not need to untangle scales $\leq m_b$



QCD effects: precision measurements are still possible

Inclusive: $B \to X_c \ell \bar{\nu}_\ell$

Operator Product Expansion in $\frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{m_b} \simeq 0.1$

• $m_b \rightarrow \infty$ is free quark decay, $\alpha_s(m_b)$ computable

• No
$$\frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{m_b}$$
 corrections — uses HQET

• At $\frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2}{m_b^2}$ two hadronic parameters λ_1, λ_2

[gives $|V_{cb}|$ at -3% level]

Recent Results

Inclusive Decays $B \to X_u \ell \bar{\nu}$ $B \to X_s \gamma$

• With enough phase space can use local OPE, known to $\frac{1}{m_b^3}$

• But some cuts put us in endpoint region:



$$d\Gamma = H(m_b, p_X^-) \int dk^+ J(p_X^- k^+) f(k^+ + \overline{\Lambda} - p_X^+)$$

 $\frac{\text{SCET gives systematic}}{\text{expansion in this region}} \quad \lambda^2 = \frac{\Lambda}{m_b}$



shape function for $B \to X_s \gamma$, f



LO endpoint factorization

- triple differential known
- summation of double logs known
- full α_s now known

Bauer, Manohar Bosch, Lange, Neubert, Paz

NLO endpoint

- some $1/m_b$ terms known
- annihilation effects

Bauer, Luke, Mannel Leibovich, Ligeti, Wise Bigi, Uraltsev; Voloshin



Inclusive



$B \to X_s \gamma$

• Ongoing NNLO calculations in local OPE will reduce pert. uncertainty to - 5%

Bobeth, Misiak, Urban, Steinhauser, Haisch, Gorban, Gambino, Schroeder, Czakon, Bieri, Greub, Hurth, Asatrian, ...

• Photon cut dependence, $1.0 \,\text{GeV} \le E_0 \le 1.9 \,\text{GeV}$, is significant unknown $\alpha_s^2(m_b - 2E_0)$ terms can be ~ 10% Neubert

Right-handed photon polarization may be larger than expected

 $\frac{A(\bar{B} \to X_s \gamma_R)}{A(\bar{B} \to X_s \gamma_L)} \sim 0.1$

Grinstein, Grossman, Ligeti, Pirjol



$B \to M_1 M_2$

"The Landscape"





Phenomenology for $B \rightarrow \pi \pi$

CP Asymmetries

 $\mathcal{A}_{\rm CP}(t) = -S_{\pi\pi} \sin(\Delta m_B t) + C_{\pi\pi} \cos(\Delta m_B t)$

World Averages (BABAR, BELLE)

	$\overline{\mathrm{Br}} \times 10^6$	$C_{\pi\pi}$	$S_{\pi\pi}$
$\pi^+\pi^-$	4.6 ± 0.4	-0.37 ± 0.11	-0.61 ± 0.13
$\pi^0\pi^0$	1.51 ± 0.28	-0.28 ± 0.39	
$\pi^+\pi^0$	5.61 ± 0.63		



Test

Warning: The BaBar and Belle asymmetries do not agree.

	$C_{\pi^+\pi^-}$	$S_{\pi^+\pi^-}$
Babar	-0.09 ± 0.15	-0.30 ± 0.17
Belle	-0.58 ± 0.17	-1.00 ± 0.22

Pure Isospin Analysis

Gronau, London

 $A(\bar{B}^0 \to \pi^+ \pi^-) = e^{-i\gamma} |\lambda_u| T - |\lambda_c| P$ $A(\bar{B}^0 \to \pi^0 \pi^0) = e^{-i\gamma} |\lambda_u| C + |\lambda_c| P$ $\sqrt{2}A(B^- \to \pi^0 \pi^-) = e^{-i\gamma} |\lambda_u| (T + C)$

Parameters: γ +4 from isospin β known $p_c \equiv -\frac{|\lambda_c|}{|\lambda_u|} \operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{P}{T}\right), \quad p_s \equiv -\frac{|\lambda_c|}{|\lambda_u|} \operatorname{Im}\left(\frac{P}{T}\right),$ $t_c \equiv \frac{|T|}{|T+C|}, \quad \epsilon \equiv \operatorname{Im}\left(\frac{C}{T}\right).$



Data: $S_{\pi^+\pi^-}, C_{\pi^+\pi^-} \Rightarrow p_c, p_s$ $\frac{Br(\pi^+\pi^-)}{Br(\pi^0\pi^-)} \Rightarrow t_c \qquad \frac{Br(\pi^0\pi^0)}{Br(\pi^0\pi^-)} \Rightarrow \epsilon_{1,2}$ $C_{\pi^0\pi^0} \Rightarrow \epsilon_{3,4}$



Problem is that $C_{\pi^0\pi^0}$ will remain uncertain for quite some time

$B \rightarrow M_1 M_2$ Factorization in SCET

Chay, Kim



Bauer, Pirjol, Rothstein, I.S. (earlier work by Beneke et al.)



Ciuchini et al, Colangelo et al

- possible long distance charming penguin amplitude

 $\Lambda^2 \ll E\Lambda \ll E^2, m_b^2$

Same Jet function as $B \to M$ form factors Nonperturbative Result in $\alpha_{\mathcal{S}}(\sqrt{E\Lambda})$: $A(B \to M_1M_2) = A^{c\bar{c}} + N \left\{ f_{M_2} \zeta^{BM_1} \int_0^1 du T_{2\zeta}(u) \phi^{M_2}(u) + f_{M_1} \zeta^{BM_2} \int_0^1 du T_{1\zeta}(u) \phi^{M_1}(u) + f_{M_2} \int_0^1 du \int_0^1 dz T_{2J}(u,z) \zeta^{BM_1}_J(z) \phi^{M_2}(u) + f_{M_1} \int_0^1 du \int_0^1 dz T_{1J}(u,z) \zeta^{BM_2}_J(z) \phi^{M_1}(u) \right\}$

where $\zeta^{BM} \sim \zeta_J^{BM}(z) \sim (\Lambda/Q)^{3/2}$ and appear in $B \to M$

Hard Coefficients

M_1M_2	$T_{1\zeta}(u)$	$T_{2\zeta}(u)$	M_1M_2	$T_{1\zeta}(u)$	$T_{2\zeta}(u)$
$\pi^{-}\pi^{+}, \rho^{-}\pi^{+}, \pi^{-}\rho^{+}, \rho_{\parallel}^{-}\rho_{\parallel}^{+}$	$c_1^{(d)} + c_4^{(d)}$	0	$\pi^+ K^{(*)-}, \rho^+ K^-, \rho_{\parallel}^+ K_{\parallel}^{*-}$	0	$c_1^{(s)} + c_4^{(s)}$
$\pi^{-}\pi^{0}, \rho^{-}\pi^{0}$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(c_1^{(d)}+c_4^{(d)})$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(c_2^{(d)}-c_3^{(d)}-c_4^{(d)})$	$\pi^0 K^{(*)-}$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(c_2^{(s)}-c_3^{(s)})$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(c_1^{(s)}+c_4^{(s)})$
$\pi^- ho^0, ho_\parallel^- ho_\parallel^0$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(c_1^{(d)}+c_4^{(d)})$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(c_2^{(d)}+c_3^{(d)}-c_4^{(d)})$	$ ho^0 K^-, ho^0_\parallel K^{st-}_\parallel$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(c_2^{(s)}+c_3^{(s)})$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(c_1^{(s)}+c_4^{(s)})$
$\pi^0\pi^0$	$rac{1}{2}(c_2^{(d)}-c_3^{(d)}-c_4^{(d)})$	$\frac{\frac{1}{2}(c_2^{(d)} - c_3^{(d)} - c_4^{(d)})}{\frac{1}{2}(c_2^{(d)} - c_3^{(d)} - c_4^{(d)})}$	$\pi^{-}\bar{K}^{(*)0}, ho^{-}\bar{K}^{0}, ho_{\parallel}^{-}\bar{K}_{\parallel}^{*0}$	0	$-c_4^{(s)}$
$ ho^0\pi^0$	$\tfrac{1}{2}(c_2^{(d)}\!+\!c_3^{(d)}\!-\!c_4^{(d)})$	$\frac{1}{2}(c_2^{(d)}-c_3^{(d)}-c_4^{(d)})$	$\pi^0ar{K}^{(*)0}$ " "	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(c_2^{(s)}-c_3^{(s)})$	$-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}c_{4}^{(s)}$
$ ho_{\parallel}^0 ho_{\parallel}^0$	$\tfrac{1}{2}(c_2^{(d)}\!+\!c_3^{(d)}\!-\!c_4^{(d)})$	$\frac{1}{2}(c_2^{(d)}\!+\!c_3^{(d)}\!-\!c_4^{(d)})$	$ ho^0ar{K}^0, ho^0_\parallelar{K}^{st 0}_\parallel$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(c_2^{(s)}+c_3^{(s)})$	$-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}c_4^{(s)}$
$K^{(*)0}K^{(*)-}, K^{(*)0}ar{K}^{(*)0}$	$-c_4^{(d)}$	0	$K^{(*)-}K^{(*)+}$	0	0

similar for T_J 's in terms of $b_i^{(f)}$'s Matching

Note: have not used isospin yet

$$\begin{split} c_1^{(f)} &= \lambda_u^{(f)} \left(C_1 + \frac{C_2}{N_c} \right) - \lambda_t^{(f)} \frac{3}{2} \left(C_{10} + \frac{C_9}{N_c} \right) + \Delta c_1^{(f)} ,\\ b_1^{(f)} &= \lambda_u^{(f)} \left[C_1 + \left(1 - \frac{m_b}{\omega_3} \right) \frac{C_2}{N_c} \right] - \lambda_t^{(f)} \left[\frac{3}{2} C_{10} + \left(1 - \frac{m_b}{\omega_3} \right) \frac{3C_9}{2N_c} \right] + \Delta b_1^{(f)} \end{split}$$

A New Method for Determining γ

Bauer, Rothstein, I.S.

Isospin + bare minimum from Λ/m_b expansion Factorization from SCET: $\epsilon \sim O\left(\frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{m_b}, \alpha_s(m_b)\right)$. This gives



 $\gamma = 74.9^{\circ} \pm 2^{\circ + 9.4^{\circ}}_{-13.3^{\circ}}$.

 $(\text{or}_{-52^{\circ}}^{+2^{\circ}})$

2nd solution $\gamma = 21.5^{\circ +8.7^{\circ} +11.1^{\circ}}_{-4.4^{\circ} -7.9^{\circ}}$ global fits give

 $\gamma \simeq 62^\circ \pm 12^\circ$

Theory uncertainty is small since curves are steep near $\epsilon = 0$

Future?

Sample data for central values (4000 pts shown) Assume $C_{\pi^0\pi^0}$ error dominates GL analysis



Relation to Form Factors in SCET

 $B \rightarrow$ pseudoscalar: f_+, f_0, f_T $B \rightarrow$ vector: $V, A_0, A_1, A_2, T_1, T_2, T_3$

 $f(E) = \int_{0}^{1} dz T(z, E, m_b) \zeta_J^{BM}(z, E) \}$ "hard spectator", "factorizable"

+ $C(E, m_b) \zeta^{BM}(Q\Lambda, \Lambda^2)$ } "soft form factor", "non-factorizable"



result at LO in λ , all orders in α_s , where $Q = \{m_b, E_M\}$

 $\Lambda/Q \ll 1$

power corrections are $\sim 20\%$

Which of ζ^{BM} , ζ^{BM}_{I} is bigger?

Relation to Form Factors in SCET

One Loop
Matching
Known: $C_k(E,m_b)$ Bauer, Fleming, Pirjol, I.S. $T_i(z,E,m_b)$ Beneke, Kiyo, Yang $J(z,x,r_+,E)$ Becher, Hill, Lee, Neubert

Log Resummation:

Sudakov suppression of "soft" relative to "hard" form factors

Lange, Neubert



small for physical b-quark mass



Possible explanations for small value of $f^+(0)$:

- its correct
- current $B \rightarrow \pi \pi$ WA should not be trusted
- there are large corrections to the above analysis

Note: a smaller $f^+(0)$ would increase exclusive Vub determinations, bringing them closer to the inclusive result

Outlook

• The theory of B decays is challenging, but progress is begin made

SCET

- Allows power corrections to be addressed in a model independent way
- Lots of theory left to work out: **new** factorization theorems, **one-loop** Wilson coefficient calculations
- Lots of data to study, phenomenology to do

We have only seen the tip of the iceberg

