Subleading Shape Functions and the Determination of V_{ub}

Thomas Mannel, University of Karlsruhe

Work in Collaboration with

C. W. Bauer and M. Luke (hep-ph/0102089, hep-ph/0205150) see also A. Leibovitch, Z. Ligeti and M. Wise (hep-ph/0205148)

- $B \to X_u \ell \bar{\nu}_\ell$ versus $B \to X_s \gamma$
- Subleading shape functions
- V_{ub} from $B \to X_u \ell \bar{\nu}_\ell$ and $B \to X_s \gamma$



 $\mathbf{2}$



- End-point region of $B \to X_s \gamma$ and $B \to X_u \ell \bar{\nu}_\ell$:
 - The invariant mass of the final state hadrons is "small"

$$(p_B - q)^2 \sim \mathcal{O}\sqrt{\Lambda_{QCD}m_b}$$

- The hadronic energy is "large"

$$M_B - v \cdot q \sim \mathcal{O}(m_b)$$

• Expand in $m_b - n \cdot q$: Twist Expansion (analogous to Deep Inelsatic Scattering) ICHEP2002 SUBLEADING SHAPE FUNCTIONS AND THE DETERMINATION OF V_{ub} Thomas Mannel

3

• In this region and to leading twist and leading order $\alpha_s(m_b)$: Both the Photon spectrum in $B \to X_s \gamma$ and the Lepton-Energy Spectrum in $B \to X_u \ell \bar{\nu}_\ell$ depend on the same non-perturbative input:

$$\frac{d\Gamma^{B\to X_s\gamma}}{dx} = \frac{G_F^2 \alpha m_b^5}{32\pi^4} |V_{ts}V_{tb^*}|^2 |C_7|^2 f(m_b[1-x]) \qquad x = \frac{2E_\gamma}{m_b}$$
$$\frac{d\Gamma^{B\to X_u\ell\bar{\nu}_\ell}}{dy} = \frac{G_F^2 m_b^5}{96\pi^3} |V_{ub}|^2 \int_{-m_b(1-y)}^{M_B-m_b} d\omega f(\omega) \qquad y = \frac{2E_\ell}{m_b}$$

where

 $2M_B f(\omega) = \langle B(v) | \bar{Q}_v \delta(\omega + iD_+) Q_v | B(v) \rangle$: Shape Function

 D_+ : light-cone component of the heavy quark residual momentum.



- Model independent determination of $V_{ub}/(V_{ts}^*V_{tb})$
- \rightarrow Define Observables (E_c : Energy cut)

$$\Gamma_s(E_c) = \frac{2}{m_b} \int_{E_c}^{m_B/2} dE_{\gamma}(E_{\gamma} - E_c) \frac{d\Gamma^{B \to X_s \gamma}}{dE_{\gamma}}$$
$$\Gamma_u(E_c) = \int_{E_c}^{m_B/2} dE_{\ell} \frac{d\Gamma^{B \to X_u \ell \bar{\nu}_{\ell}}}{dE_{\ell}}$$

• To leading order we have

$$\left|\frac{V_{ub}}{V_{tb}V_{ts}^*}\right|^2 = \rho^2 + \eta^2 = \frac{3\alpha}{\pi}|C_7|^2\frac{\Gamma_u(E_c)}{\Gamma_s(E_c)} + O(\alpha_s) + O\left(\frac{\Lambda_{QCD}}{m_B}\right)$$

Subleading Shape Functions

• Leading order shape function: Fourier transform of a Wilson line:

$$f(\omega) = \int \frac{dt}{2\pi} \langle B(v) | \bar{Q}_v(0) \mathcal{P} \exp\left(-i \int_0^t ds \, n \cdot A(n \cdot s)\right) Q_v(n \cdot t) | B(v) \rangle$$

• Subleading shape functions: Fourier Transforms of Wilson lines with insertions of derivatives: e.g.

$$\int \frac{dt}{2\pi} \langle B(v) | \bar{Q}_v(0) \mathcal{P} \exp\left(-i \int_0^t ds \, n \cdot A(n \cdot s)\right) \frac{(iD_\mu)Q_v(n \cdot t)}{|B(v)\rangle}$$

• Subleading shape functions:

Matrix elements of these non-local operators

- $G_2(\omega)$: Generalized kinetic energy operator
- $t(\omega)$: Insertions of the $1/m_b$ terms of the Lagrangian
- $H_2(\omega)$ and $h_1(\omega)$: Spin dependent functions
- f(ω) is linked to subleading functions via reparametrization invariance: _{Campanario, M.,}...

$$F(\omega) = f(\omega) + \frac{1}{2m_b} \left[t(\omega) - 2 G_2(\omega) \right]$$

In total three non-perturbative functions up to $1/m_b$

Moment Expansion

• From the usual $1/m_b$ Expansion we know the moments:

$$f(\omega) = \delta(\omega) - \frac{\lambda_1}{6} \delta''(\omega) - \frac{\rho_1}{18} \delta'''(\omega) + \dots$$
$$G_2(\omega) = -\frac{2\lambda_1}{3} \delta'(\omega) + \dots$$
$$t(\omega) = -(\lambda_1 + 3\lambda_2) \delta'(\omega) + \frac{\tau}{2} \delta''(\omega) + \dots$$
$$h_1(\omega) = \lambda_2 \delta'(\omega) + \frac{\rho_2}{2} \delta''(\omega) + \dots$$
$$H_2(\omega) = -\lambda_2 \delta'(\omega) + \dots$$



8



• Model the subleading shape functions: (Keeping the correct moments)

 $\delta(E_c)_{0.3}$ 0.2 0.1 0 2.4 2.1 2.2 2.3 2 $E_{\mathcal{C}}(GeV)$

Conclusions

- Lowering E_c : Less sensitivity to (the higher moments of) the (subleading) shape functions !
- \rightarrow Transitons region from the shape function regime to the regime of the $1/m_b$ expansion
 - Taking the size of the modelled subleading terms may be too conservative: leads to sizable uncertainties $\Delta V_{ub}/V_{ub} \sim 15 \%$
 - Moments are known: May lead to lower uncertainties if E_c can be lowered Neubert
 - More investigations are needed / underway: Finally $\Delta V_{ub}/V_{ub} \leq 10$ % may become possible.