Rare leptonic B and D decays

Sebastian Jaeger

UNIVERSITY of Sussex



6th International Workshop on the CKM Unitarity Triangle University of Warwick, 06-10 September 2010

Contents

- Why rare leptonic decays
- Standard Model
- New Physics

Why rare leptonic decays ?

Meson decays are the simpler, the fewer hadrons there are in the final state. Here "simple" refers to theory, particularly QCD

decay type	strong dynamics	# observables	
Leptonic	decay constant		
B → Iv, B → I ⁺ I ⁻	$\langle 0 j^{\mu} B\rangle \propto f_{B}$	th c	O(1)
semileptonic, radiative	form factors	diffic	O(10)
B → K [*] Iν, K [*] γ	⟨π J ^μ B⟩ ∝ f ^{Βπ} (q²)	culty	
Nonleptonic 2-body	full matrix element		O(100)
Β→ππ, πΚ, ρρ,	〈ππ Q _i B〉	\bigvee	

Decay constants are accessible by first principle methods (lattice QCD). Price to pay: small branching fractions, few observables

Leptonic decay, NP and LHC







3σ sensitivity BG only, 90%CL $\mathcal{B}(B_s \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{m}} \mu^+ \mu^-) = (3.2 \pm 0.2) \times 10^{-9}$ Buras et al 2010 Yukawa suppressed in SM

5σ sensitivity

in 2HDM (or MSSM) Yukawas can be very and geninosity, fb⁻¹

Loop suppression and possible removal of helicity/Yukawa suppression imply strong sensitivity to new physics



Donnerstag, 9. September 2010

Standard Model

- Mediated by short-distance
 Z penguin and box long distance strongly CKM / GIM suppressed
- including QCD corrections, matches onto single relevant effective operator

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\alpha}{\pi \sin^2 \theta_W} V_{tb}^* V_{tq} Y Q_A$$

$$Y(\bar{m}_t(m_t)) = 0.9636 \left[\frac{80.4 \text{ GeV}}{M_W} \frac{\bar{m}_t}{164 \text{ GeV}}\right]^{1.52}$$

(approximates NLO to <10⁻⁴)

higher orders negligible

[Buchalla&Buras 93, Misiak&Urban 99; Artuso et al 0801.1833]

 B_s



 $Q_A = \overline{b}_L \gamma^\mu q_L \,\overline{\ell} \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 \ell$

• branching fraction

$$B(B_s \to l^+ l^-) = \tau(B_s) \frac{G_F^2}{\pi} \left(\frac{\alpha}{4\pi \sin^2 \Theta_W}\right)^2 F_{B_s}^2 m_l^2 m_{B_s} \sqrt{1 - 4\frac{m_l^2}{m_{B_s}^2}} |V_{tb}^* V_{ts}|^2 \mathbf{Y^2}$$

main uncertainties: decay constant, CKM for D or K decays long-distance contributions are important

Standard Model

 B_s

• error can be reduced by normalizing to $B_s - \bar{B}_s$ mixing

$$B(B_q \to \ell^+ \ell^-) = C \frac{\tau_{B_q}}{\hat{B}_q} \frac{Y^2(\overline{m}_t^2/M_W^2)}{S(\overline{m}_t^2/M_W^2)} \Delta M_q \qquad \text{Buras 2003}$$

where S is the Δ F=2 box function and C a numerical const and in the bag factor $\hat{B}_{B_s} = 1.33 \pm 0.06$, some systematic uncertainties cancel. Then

 $\mathcal{B}(B_s \to \mu^+ \mu^-) = (3.2 \pm 0.2) \times 10^{-9}$ Buras et al 2010

- Very precise test of SM from hadronic observables at LHC!
- same trick for $B_d \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$, $B_{s,d} \rightarrow e^+ e^-$, $e^+ \mu^-$, etc
- not for $D \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ or $K \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ as mixing is not calculable

Long distance

see earlier talk by Stamou

- For $B_{s,d} \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ long distance effects are CKM suppressed
- for $D \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ (or $K \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$), short-distance itself GIM suppressed, so LD relevant and in this case dominant



 "background" effects such as undetected soft photons are not included in uncertainties quoted before and are traditionally left to experimentalists... see arXiv:0801.1833 sect. 3.4.

Experiment

• present upper bounds

	CDF		D0		SM theory
B₅ → µ⁺µ⁻	4.3 10 ⁻⁸	95% CL	5.2 10 ⁻⁸	95% CL	(3.2±0.2) 10 ⁻⁹
B _d →µ⁺µ⁻	7.6 10 ⁻⁹	95% CL			(1.0±0.1) 10 ⁻¹⁰
D → µ⁺µ⁻	3.0 10-7	95% CL			~ 10 ^{−13}

25

 $BR(B_{s}^{0}->\mu^{+}\mu^{-}) \quad (x10^{-9})$

5.

 CDF public note 9892
 D0 arXiv:1006.3469
 D0 arXiv:1008.5077

 Kreps arXiv:1008.0247
 Buras et al arXiv:1007.1993

@ 3.5 + 3.5 TeV

5σ observation

 3σ evidence

SM prediction

0.0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1.0 1.2 1.4 1.6 1.8 2.0

 $L(fb^{-1})$

• early LHCb prospects

@ 3.5 + 3.5 TeV

SM prediction ×

Exclusion limit @ 90% C.L.

 $D0 (6.1 \text{ fb}^{-1})$

CDF (3.7fb⁻¹)

0.9 1.0

 $L(fb^{-1})$

Burdman et al 2001

(Guy Wilkinson's plenary talk at this conference)

...I look forward to the following, experimental talks !



50

40 -

30 -

20

10

0

 $BR(B_{s}^{\ \theta} - >\mu^{+}\mu^{-}) \ (x10^{-9})$

Beyond the SM

• New physics can modify the Z penguin

... induce a Higgs penguin ...



... or induce (or comprise) four-fermion contact interactions directly E



could also violate lepton flavour

most general effective hamiltonian

$$\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\alpha}{\pi \sin^2 \theta_W} V_{tb}^* V_{tq} \left[C_S Q_S + C_P Q_P + C_A Q_A \right]$$

$$B\left(B_{q} \to \ell^{+}\ell^{-}\right) = \frac{G_{F}^{2} \alpha^{2}}{64 \pi^{3} \sin^{4} \theta_{W}} |V_{tb}^{*}V_{tq}|^{2} \tau_{B_{q}} M_{B_{q}}^{3} f_{B_{q}}^{2} \sqrt{1 - \frac{4m_{\ell}^{2}}{M_{B_{q}}^{2}}}$$
could violate
lepton flavour !
$$\times \left[\left(1 - \frac{4m_{\ell}^{2}}{M_{B_{q}}^{2}}\right) M_{B_{q}}^{2} C_{S}^{2} + \left(M_{B_{q}} C_{P} - \frac{2m_{\ell}}{M_{B_{q}}} C_{A}\right)^{2} \right]$$

In SM, higgs couplings flavour diagonal (proportional mass matrix)

$$M^d_{ij} = v \ Y^d_{ij}$$

In SM, higgs couplings flavour diagonal (proportional mass matrix)

In MSSM, 3 neutral higgses, 2 vevs vu, vd





In SM, higgs couplings flavour diagonal (proportional mass matrix)

In MSSM, 3 neutral higgses, 2 vevs v_u , v_d tan $\beta = v_u/v_d$







MSSM - large tan β - MFV

- huge rates possible, even for minimal flavour violation
- correlation (for MFV) [Buras et al 2002] with ΔM_{B_s} [Gorbahn, SJ, Nierste, Trine 2009]

bound on BR(B_s $\rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$) in these models implies closeness of ΔM_{B_s} to SM. In turn, ΔM_{B_s} at present does not constrain B_s $\rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$

 beyond MFV, no correlations ! not necessarily suppression of B_d→µ⁺µ⁻ with respect to B_s→µ⁺µ



MSSM - small tan β

• Z penguin contributions now relatively more important and interference effects possible



complete 1-loop calculation in general MSSM

[Dedes, Rosiek, Tanedo 2008]

implemented in public computer program "SUSY_FLAVOR" [Rosiek, Chankowski, Dedes, SJ, Tanedo 2010]



Randall-Sundrum

• Warped extra-dimensional models "explain" SM flavour structure by localizing the SM degrees of freedom differently in the extra dimension. Higher Kaluza-Klein states of the gauge bosons have tree-level FCNC couplings to the SM particles



Little(st) Higgs (with T parity)

- Higgs is pseudo-Goldstone boson. Implies new particles with non-MFV couplings
- enter at 1 loop through Z penguin, finite calculable contribution

[Goto et al 0809.4753] [de Aguila et al 0811.2891]

- effect less pronounced than in MSSM or RS but should be distinguishable from Standard Model
- no observable effects in
 D→µ⁺µ⁻

[Paul et al 1008.3141]





[Blanke et al 0906.5454]

Fourth generation

• (in simplest form:) one extra family of fermions with SM quantum numbers same diagrams as in SM extra masses and "CKM" elements provide rich non-minimal source of flavour violation [eg Hou and Ma, 1004.2186]



$D \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$

 Generically, this receives contributions from a Z penguin (negligible in SM due to GIM) which might not be small; Z' etc would also contribute



- Generic discussion and correlation with D mixing in [Golowich et al 0903.2830] BR(D→µ⁺µ⁻) of up to 10⁻⁹ in some scenarios
- However, analysis in LHT model shows unobservably small effects, reason are constraints in B and K physics (for any values of NP masses and mixings) [Paul et al 1008.3141] The authors ask whether this might be generically so.

(why) is e.g. this diagram (not) accompanied by a contribution to neutral Kaon mixing ?



 I think depending on experimental prospects this deserves further study

Conclusions

- Rare leptonic decays are theoretically clean
- They can be new physics dominated
- and LHCb can measure BR(B_s→µ⁺µ⁻) down to the SM value (and below)
- Without a theory of flavour, we cannot predict hierarchies between BR(B_s→µ⁺µ⁻) and BR(B_d→µ⁺µ⁻), or even between lepton-flavour-conserving and violating modes
- I encourage experimenters to look beyond B_s→µ⁺µ⁻ where feasible (µ⁺e⁻, e⁺e⁻ ? B_d !). (If encouragement is needed.)
- if D⁰→µ⁺µ⁻ were observed in an experiment, it would be an unambiguous new physics discovery and/or measurement