SMEFT top-quark effectson $\Delta F=2$ observable

Daiki Ueda

(KEK theory center, SOKENDAI)

Flavor Physics Workshop 2018@Kavli IPMU 2018.10.31

Based on on-going work with Motoi Endo(KEK) and Teppei Kitahara(KIT)

Introduction

・FCNCの計算における標準的な有効理論

 $\mathcal{H}_{\rm eff}^{\Delta F=2} = C_1(\bar{d}_{L,i}\gamma^{\mu}d_{L,j})(\bar{d}_{L,i}\gamma_{\mu}d_{L,j}) + C_2(\bar{d}_{R,i}d_{L,j})(\bar{d}_{R,i}d_{L,j}) + \cdots$

-ゲージ不変性が明白ではない

-NP粒子, top, W, Z, Higgsはdecouple (NP scale > O(100)GeV)

• Standard Model Effective Theory(SMEFT):

$$\mathcal{L}_{ ext{eff}} = \mathcal{L}_{ ext{SM}} + \sum_{i} C_{i} \mathcal{O}_{i}$$
 (NP粒子だけdecouple)
 \vec{r}
ゲージ不変

-ゲージ不変性が明白 e.g. KaonにおけるΔS=2の観測量

-operatorを評価するスケール不定性なし e.g. LRのΔB=2の観測量

Outline

Introduction

-標準的な有効理論における問題点

● SMEFTによるゲージ不変な扱い

-Kaon系におけるゲージ不変な扱い

[Endo, Kitahara, Mishima and Yamamoto]

● SMEFTにおけるトップクォークの量子補正

-Left-right symmetric modelにおけるSMEFT On-going work with Motoi Endo(KEK) and Teppei Kitahara(KIT, TTP)

3 /18

Flavor-changing Z penguin

- ・ε'/ε: K_L->ππにおけるCPを破る観測量
- SM:

 $(\epsilon'/\epsilon_{K})_{SM} = (1.1\pm5.1) \times 10^{-4}$ [T.Kitahara, U.Nierste and P.Tremper]



 $(\epsilon'/\epsilon_{\rm K})_{\rm EXP} = (16.6 \pm 2.3) \times 10^{-4}$ [NA48, KTeV]

・SMと実験値が合っていない:

 $(\epsilon'/\epsilon_{K})_{EXP} > (\epsilon'/\epsilon_{K})_{SM}$ at 2.8 σ level



・Z-penguinへのNPの寄与は魅力的なシナリオ

KaonにおけるSMEFT

・Z-penguinへのNPの寄与:



 $\mathcal{L} = \Delta_L(\bar{s}\gamma^{\mu}P_Ld)Z_{\mu} + \Delta_R(\bar{s}\gamma^{\mu}P_Rd)Z_{\mu}$ (ゲージ不変ではない)

$$(\epsilon'/\epsilon_K)_{NP} \propto \left(s_W^2 \mathrm{Im}\Delta_L + c_W^2 \mathrm{Im}\Delta_R\right)$$

KaonにおけるSMEFT

• SMEFT:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{SM}} + \sum_{i} C_{i} \mathcal{O}_{i}$$

i ゲージ不変

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{O}_{HQ}^{(1)} \end{bmatrix} = (H^{\dagger} i \overleftrightarrow{D}_{\mu} H) (\bar{q}_{2} \gamma^{\mu} q_{1}) \\ \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{O}_{HQ}^{(3)} \end{bmatrix} = (H^{\dagger} i \overleftrightarrow{D}_{\mu}^{a} H) (\bar{q}_{2} \tau^{a} \gamma^{\mu} q_{1}) \end{bmatrix} \longrightarrow \Delta_{L} (\bar{s} \gamma^{\mu} P_{L} d) Z_{\mu} \\ \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{O}_{HD} \end{bmatrix} = (H^{\dagger} i \overleftrightarrow{D}_{\mu} H) (\bar{s} \gamma^{\mu} d) \longrightarrow \Delta_{R} (\bar{s} \gamma^{\mu} P_{R} d) Z_{\mu} \\ \mathscr{L}_{\text{eff}} = \Delta_{L} \begin{bmatrix} Z_{\mu} - \frac{g}{M_{Z}} \left(\frac{W_{\mu}^{-} G^{+} + W_{\mu}^{+} G^{-}}{M_{Z}} + \cdots \right) (\bar{s}_{L} \gamma^{\mu} d_{L}) \\ \swarrow \Delta S = 2 \text{ \mathcal{O}} \text{\mathbbmathall$} \text{$\mathbbmat$$

KaonにおけるSMEFT

• $\Delta S=2の観測量 \sim \langle K^0 | \hat{H} | \bar{K}^0 \rangle$



・SMEFTによってゲージ不変な扱いが可能



Outline

Introduction

-標準的な有効理論における問題点

 SMEFTによるゲージ不変な扱い -Kaon系におけるゲージ不変な扱い

● SMEFTにおけるトップクォークの量子補正

-具体例としてLeft-right symmetric model

On-going work with Motoi Endo(KEK) and Teppei Kitahara(KIT, TTP)

10 /18

スケールの不定性

・NP粒子とSM粒子が寄与する:

e.g. LR model



・operatorをどのscaleで評価すべきかが決まらない

Left-right symmetric model

 $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L} \xrightarrow{\vee_R} SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$

- Flavor-changing相互作用:
 - -W_L, W_R(heavy)

$$\mathscr{L}_{\text{int}} = \frac{g_L}{\sqrt{2}} (V_L)_{ij} \bar{u}_i \gamma_\mu P_L d_j W_L^\mu + \frac{g_R}{\sqrt{2}} (V_R)_{ij} \bar{u}_i \gamma_\mu P_R d_j W_R^\mu$$

-H^o(heavy neutral higgs)

$$\mathscr{L}_{\text{int}} \simeq -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{v\cos 2\beta} \left[\bar{d}(V_L^{\dagger}M_u V_R) P_R dH^0 + \bar{d}(V_R^{\dagger}M_u V_L) P_L d(H^0)^* \right]$$

$$\mu = M_{W_R}$$

$$F$$

$$Y_{l}(V_{L}^{*})_{3i}(V_{R})_{3j}$$

$$\mu = \mu_{LR}$$

$$\mu = M_{W_{R}}$$

$$\Delta F = 1$$

$$F = 1$$

F \wedge

SMEFTへのmatching



SMEFTへのmatching

• EW scaleでのmatching:

one-loop matching



$$\begin{split} C_4)_{ij}^{1-\text{loop}} &= \frac{\alpha \lambda_t^{ij}}{\pi s_W^2} (C_{ud}^{(8)})_{33ij} I_1(x_t, \mu_W) + \frac{2\alpha \lambda_t^{ij}}{\pi s_W^2} (C_{qd}^{(8)})_{33ij} J(x_t) \\ &\quad - \frac{\alpha}{2\pi s_W^2} \sum_{m=1}^3 \left[\lambda_t^{im} (C_{qd}^{(8)})_{mjij} + \lambda_t^{mj} (C_{qd}^{(8)})_{imij} \right] K(x_t, \mu_W), \\ C_5)_{ij}^{1-\text{loop}} &= \frac{2\alpha \lambda_t^{ij}}{\pi s_W^2} \left[(C_{ud}^{(1)})_{33ij} - \frac{1}{2N_c} (C_{ud}^{(8)})_{33ij} - (C_{Hd})_{ij} \right] I_1(x_t, \mu_W) \\ &\quad + \frac{4\alpha \lambda_t^{ij}}{\pi s_W^2} \left[(C_{qd}^{(1)})_{33ij} - \frac{1}{2N_c} (C_{qd}^{(8)})_{33ij} \right] J(x_t) \\ &\quad - \frac{\alpha}{\pi s_W^2} \sum_{m=1}^3 \left[\lambda_t^{im} \left((C_{qd}^{(1)})_{mjij} - \frac{1}{2N_c} (C_{qd}^{(8)})_{mjij} \right) \\ &\quad + \lambda_t^{mj} \left((C_{qd}^{(1)})_{imij} - \frac{1}{2N_c} (C_{qd}^{(8)})_{imij} \right) \right] K(x_t, \mu_W), \end{split}$$

・SMEFTとconventionalな方法でどの程度違いがあるか?

Result(1)

・B_sのWilson係数(µ=M_{WL}):



 $\delta C_4 = (C_4(M_{W_L})^{\text{SMEFT}} - C_{4,\text{con}}(M_{W_L})^{\text{input=top},W_R}) / C_4(M_{W_L})^{\text{SMEFT}}$

16 /18

Result(2)

・B中間子のmass difference:



Summary

- ・SMEFTによってゲージ不変に物理量を扱える
- ・SMEFTによってスケールの不定性を改善できる

Back up slide





KaonのCPの破れ

$$|K_S\rangle = |K_+\rangle + \epsilon |K_-\rangle$$

 $|K_L\rangle = |K_-\rangle + \epsilon |K_+\rangle$
 $|CP を破る相互作用$
 $|\pi\pi\rangle$:CP even
 $\pi\pi\rangle$:CP even
 $\mu_{\pm} = \frac{\langle \pi^{+}\pi^{-}|\mathcal{H}|K_L\rangle}{\langle \pi^{+}\pi^{-}|\mathcal{H}|K_S\rangle}$
 $\eta_{\pm} \neq \eta_{00}$
 $\epsilon' \equiv \frac{\eta_{\pm} - \eta_{00}}{\frac{22}{3}}$

 ϵ'/ϵ

$$\operatorname{Re}\frac{\epsilon'}{\epsilon} = \frac{1}{6} \frac{|\eta_{\pm}|^2 - |\eta_{00}|^2}{|\eta_{\pm}|^2} = \frac{1}{6} \left(1 - \frac{\frac{\mathcal{B}(K_L \to \pi^0 \pi^0)}{\mathcal{B}(K_S \to \pi^0 \pi^0)}}{\frac{\mathcal{B}(K_L \to \pi^+ \pi^-)}{\mathcal{B}(K_S \to \pi^+ \pi^-)}} \right)$$

この量を測ることができる

$$\eta_{\pm} \equiv \frac{\langle \pi^{+} \pi^{-} | \mathcal{H} | K_{L} \rangle}{\langle \pi^{+} \pi^{-} | \mathcal{H} | K_{S} \rangle} \qquad \eta_{00} \equiv \frac{\langle \pi^{0} \pi^{0} | \mathcal{H} | K_{L} \rangle}{\langle \pi^{0} \pi^{0} | \mathcal{H} | K_{S} \rangle}$$

NA48実験 と KTeV実験 が測定を行った $(\epsilon'/\epsilon)_{exp} = (16.6 \pm 2.3) \times 10^{-4}$ [PDG]

 ϵ'/ϵ

$$\epsilon' \equiv \frac{\eta_{\pm} - \eta_{00}}{3} \quad \eta_{00} \equiv \frac{\langle \pi^0 \pi^0 | \mathcal{H} | K_L \rangle}{\langle \pi^0 \pi^0 | \mathcal{H} | K_S \rangle} \quad \eta_{\pm} \equiv \frac{\langle \pi^+ \pi^- | \mathcal{H} | K_L \rangle}{\langle \pi^+ \pi^- | \mathcal{H} | K_S \rangle}$$

$$\left\langle (\pi\pi)_I | \mathcal{H} | K^0 \right\rangle = A_I e^{i\delta_I} \qquad \left\langle (\pi\pi)_I | \mathcal{H} | \bar{K}^0 \right\rangle = A_I^* e^{i\delta_I}$$

Isospin : $I = 0, 2$

$$\epsilon' \simeq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\omega}{\operatorname{Re}A_0} \left(\operatorname{Im}A_0 - \frac{1}{\omega} \operatorname{Im}A_2 \right) \exp\left(i\left(\frac{\pi}{2} + \delta_2 - \delta_0\right)\right)$$

$$\omega \equiv \frac{\text{Re}A_2}{\underset{24}{\text{Re}}A_0}$$

$$\epsilon' \simeq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\omega}{\operatorname{Re}A_0} \left(\operatorname{Im}A_0 - \frac{1}{\omega} \operatorname{Im}A_2 \right) \exp \left(i \left(\frac{\pi}{2} + \delta_2 - \delta_0 \right) \right)$$
 $\epsilon = |\epsilon| \exp \left(i \operatorname{Tan}^{-1} \frac{2\Delta M}{\Delta \Gamma} \right) \leftarrow \text{acidental cancellation}$
が起きる

以下の量を評価する

$$\frac{\epsilon'}{\epsilon} \simeq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2} |\epsilon|_{exp}} \frac{\omega_{exp}}{(\operatorname{Re}A_0)_{exp}} \left(\operatorname{Im}A_0 - \frac{1}{\omega_{exp}} \operatorname{Im}A_2 \right)$$

The SM prediction of ϵ_K'/ϵ_K

$$\frac{\epsilon'_K}{\epsilon_K} \simeq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}|\epsilon_K|} \frac{\omega_{exp}}{(\text{Re}A_0)_{exp}} \left(\text{Im}A_0 - \frac{1}{\omega_{exp}}\text{Im}A_2\right)$$

They determine ImA_0 , ImA_2 by lattice QCD calculation.

The SM prediction of ϵ'_K/ϵ_K

Buras et al. A.J. Buras, M. Gorbahn, S. J[°]ager and M. Jamin, JHEP 11 (2015) 202 [arXiv:1507.06345]

 $\frac{\epsilon'_K}{\epsilon_K} \simeq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}|\epsilon_K|} \frac{\omega_{exp}}{(\text{Re}A_0)_{exp}} \left(\text{Im}A_0 - \frac{1}{\omega_{exp}}\text{Im}A_2\right)$ $\mathcal{H}_{eff} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{i=1}^{10} C_i(\mu) Q_i(\mu) \qquad A_I = \left\langle (\pi \pi)_I | \mathcal{H}_{eff} | K^0 \right\rangle$ $(\operatorname{Re}A_0)_{exp}, (\operatorname{Re}A_2)_{exp}$ determine $\langle Q_2(\mu) \rangle_0, \langle Q_2(\mu) \rangle_2$ by using suitable relation $\langle Q_{4,10}(\mu) \rangle_{0}, \langle Q_{1,9,10}(\mu) \rangle_{2}$ $\langle Q_i(\mu) \rangle_I \equiv \langle (\pi\pi)_I | Q_i(\mu) | K^0 \rangle$

The SM prediction of ϵ'_K/ϵ_K Kitahara et al.

$$\frac{\epsilon'_K}{\epsilon_K} \simeq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}|\epsilon_K|} \frac{\omega_{exp}}{(\text{Re}A_0)_{exp}} \left(\text{Im}A_0 - \frac{1}{\omega_{exp}} \text{Im}A_2 \right)$$

In addition to Buras's result they estimate subleading hadron matrix elements

$$\langle Q_3 \rangle_0, \langle Q_5 \rangle_0, \langle Q_7 \rangle_0$$

by using lattice QCD result.

Models solving ϵ'/ϵ anomaly

Several new physics models have been studied to explain ϵ'/ϵ anomaly **MSSM**

chargino Z penguin [M.Endo, S.Mishima, D.Ueda and K.Yamamoto, PLB762(2016)493]

gluino Z penguin [M.Tanimoto and K.Yamamoto, PTEP(2016)no.12,123B02]

gluino box [T.Kitahara, U.Nierste and P.Tremper, PRL117(2016)no.9, 091802 A.Crivellin, G.D'Ambrosio, T.Kitahara and U.Nierste, 1703.05786]

Vector-like quarks [C.Bobeth, A.J.Buras, A.Celis and M.Jung, JHEP1704(2017)079]

Little Higgs Model with T-parity [M.Blanke, A.J.Buras and S.Recksiegel, EPJ.C76 (2016)no.4,182]

331 model[A.J.Buras and F.De Fazio, JHEP 1603(2016)010 & JHEP1608 (2016) 115]

Right handed current [V.Cirigliano, W.Dekens, <u>J.de</u> Vries and E.Mereghetti, PLB 017)1 S.Alioli, V.Cirigliano, W.Dekens, <u>J.de</u> Vries and E.Mereghetti, JHEP1705 (2017)086]