

# B-physics from lattice QCD...with a twist



Andrea Shindler



JHEP 1004 (2010) 049  
PoS LAT2009 (2009) 151  
JHEP 1008 (2010) 009  
JHEP 01 (2012) 046  
and in progress

## ETMCb group

B. Blossier, N. Carrasco, P. Dimopoulos, R. Frezzotti, V. Gimenez,  
G. Herdoiza, V. Lubicz, G. Martinelli, C. Michael, D. Palao,  
G. C. Rossi, F. Sanfilippo, A.S., S. Simula, C. Tarantino



# Ratio method

ETM**C**b: 2010-2011

- ⦿ Use relativistic quarks (Wilson twisted mass fermions)
- ⦿ For each observable b-mass point is reached through interpolation  $1/\mu_h$  from c-mass region to the static point
- ⦿ c-mass region computation is reliable
- ⦿ the b-mass point is related to its c-mass counterpart by a chain of suitable, HQET-inspired ratios at successive values of the heavy-mass
- ⦿ Ratios show a smooth chiral and continuum limit
- ⦿ Static limit value of ratios is exactly known

# Wilson twisted mass

Family of lattice actions parametrized by  $\omega$

$\omega = 0 \rightarrow$  Wilson fermions

$\omega = \pi/2 \rightarrow$  Wilson twisted mass at maximal twist

- Infrared cutoff to the spectrum of Wilson operator

R. Frezzotti, P. Grassi, S. Sint, P. Weisz: 2001

- No exceptional configurations in the quenched model

- Exact bound on the smallest eigenvalues

- Automatic  $O(a)$  improvement on physical correlators at  $\omega = \pi/2$

R. Frezzotti, G.C. Rossi: 2003

S. Sint: 2005; S. Aoki, O. Bär: 2005; A.S.: 2005

- The freedom in the choice of  $\omega$  for different quark flavours allows simplifications in the renormalization pattern

- No renormalization needed for decay constants (like with overlap)

R. Frezzotti, G.C. Rossi: 2004

C. Pena, S. Sint, A. Vladikas: 2004

- Multiplicative renormalization for bag parameters


# Ratio method: example

HQET expansion

$$M_{hl} = \mu_h + \bar{\Lambda} - \frac{\lambda_1 + 3\lambda_2}{2} \frac{1}{\mu_h} + O\left(\frac{1}{(\mu_h)^2}\right)$$

$$y(\mu_h, \lambda^{\text{pole}}) = \frac{1}{\lambda^{\text{pole}}} \frac{M_{hl}(\mu_h)}{M_{hl}(\mu_h/\lambda^{\text{pole}})}$$

$$y(\mu_h, \lambda) = 1 + \frac{\eta_1^{\text{pole}}}{\mu_h} + \frac{\eta_2^{\text{pole}}}{\mu_h^2}$$



$$y = 1 - \bar{\Lambda} \frac{\lambda^{\text{pole}} - 1}{\mu_h} + \left[ \frac{\lambda_1 + 3\lambda_2}{2} (\lambda^{\text{pole}} + 1) + \bar{\Lambda}^2 \lambda^{\text{pole}} \right] \frac{\lambda^{\text{pole}} - 1}{(\mu_h)^2}$$

# Simulation points

$\beta$	$a\mu_\ell$	$a\mu_s$	$a\mu_h$
3.80	0.0080, 0.0110	0.0175, 0.0194 0.0213	0.1982, 0.2331, 0.2742, 0.3225, 0.3793 0.4461 0.5246, 0.6170, 0.7257, 0.8536, 1.004
3.90	0.0030, 0.0040	0.0159, 0.0177	0.1828, 0.2150, 0.2529, 0.2974, 0.3498
	0.0064, 0.0085, 0.0100	0.0195	0.4114, 0.4839, 0.5691, 0.6694, 0.7873, 0.9260
4.05	0.0030, 0.0060	0.0139, 0.0154	0.1572, 0.1849, 0.2175, 0.2558, 0.3008
	0.0080	0.0169	0.3538, 0.4162, 0.4895, 0.5757, 0.6771, 0.7960
4.20	0.0020, 0.0065	0.0116, 0.0129 0.0142	0.13315, 0.1566, ,0.1842, 0.2166, 0.2548 0.2997, 0.3525, 0.4145, 0.4876, 0.5734,0.6745

$$0.098 \lesssim a \lesssim 0.054 \text{ fm} \quad m_s/6 \lesssim \bar{\mu}_l \lesssim m_s/2 \quad m_c \lesssim \bar{\mu}_h \lesssim 3 m_c$$

Computations on HLRN (Germany) & CINECA (Italy)


# Lattice implementation

$$\begin{aligned} y(\bar{\mu}_h^{(n)}, \lambda; \bar{\mu}_l, a) &\equiv \frac{M_{hl}(\bar{\mu}_h^{(n)}; \bar{\mu}_l, a)}{M_{hl}(\bar{\mu}_h^{(n-1)}; \bar{\mu}_l, a)} \cdot \frac{\bar{\mu}_h^{(n-1)}}{\bar{\mu}_h^{(n)}} \cdot \frac{\rho(\bar{\mu}_h^{(n-1)}, \mu^*)}{\rho(\bar{\mu}_h^{(n)}, \mu^*)} = \\ &= \lambda^{-1} \frac{M_{hl}(\bar{\mu}_h^{(n)}; \bar{\mu}_l, a)}{M_{hl}(\bar{\mu}_h^{(n)}/\lambda; \bar{\mu}_l, a)} \cdot \frac{\rho(\bar{\mu}_h^{(n)}/\lambda, \mu^*)}{\rho(\bar{\mu}_h^{(n)}, \mu^*)}, \quad n = 2, \dots, N \end{aligned}$$



$$\frac{\bar{\mu}_h^{(n)}}{\bar{\mu}_h^{(n-1)}} = \lambda \quad \mu_h = \rho(\bar{\mu}_h, \mu^*) \bar{\mu}_h(\mu^*) \quad \bar{\mu}_h \leftarrow \overline{MS} \text{ scheme}$$

$$\rho(\bar{\mu}_h, \mu^*) \rightsquigarrow N^3 LO$$


# Continuum-chiral limit



- Triggering input: PS meson mass at the charm region  
--> affected by tolerable cutoff effects
- Ratios have small cutoff effects



# Evolution determination



Fit ansatz valid at NP level

$$y(\bar{\mu}_h) = 1 + \frac{\eta_1}{\bar{\mu}_h} + \frac{\eta_2}{\bar{\mu}_h^2}$$

Strong cancellation of perturbative factors

- Resolve recursion


$$y(\bar{\mu}_h^{(2)})y(\bar{\mu}_h^{(3)}) \cdots y(\bar{\mu}_h^{(K+1)}) = \lambda^{-K} \frac{M_{hu/d}(\bar{\mu}_h^{(K+1)})}{M_{hu/d}(\bar{\mu}_h^{(1)})} \cdot \left[ \frac{\rho(\bar{\mu}_h^{(1)}, \mu^*)}{\rho(\bar{\mu}_h^{(K+1)}, \mu^*)} \right]$$

- Adjust  $(\lambda, \bar{\mu}_h^{(1)})$  such that  $M_{hu/d}(\bar{\mu}_h^{(K+1)}) \equiv M_B^{\text{expt}}$  for K integer

- Our calculation

$$\lambda = 1.1784, \quad \bar{\mu}_h^{(1)} = 1.14 \text{ GeV}(\overline{MS}, 2 \text{ GeV}) \rightsquigarrow \bar{\mu}_b = \lambda^K \bar{\mu}_h^{(1)} (K = 9)$$

# Phenomenological check




$$y(\bar{\mu}_h) = 1 + \frac{\eta_1}{\bar{\mu}_h} + \frac{\eta_2}{\bar{\mu}_h^2}$$

$$y = 1 - \bar{\Lambda} \frac{\lambda^{\text{pole}} - 1}{\bar{\mu}_h} + \left[ \frac{\lambda_1 + 3\lambda_2}{2} (\lambda^{\text{pole}} + 1) + \bar{\Lambda}^2 \lambda^{\text{pole}} \right] \frac{\lambda^{\text{pole}} - 1}{(\bar{\mu}_h)^2}$$

$$\bar{\Lambda} = 0.39(11) \text{ GeV}, \quad \lambda_1 = -0.19(10) \text{ GeV}^2, \quad \lambda_2 = 0.12(2) \text{ GeV}^2$$

# b-quark mass summary



- stat.  $\rightarrow 0.2 \%$
- ZP + scale setting  
2.1-2.8%
- y-ratios negligible

$$m_b^{\overline{MS}}(m_b)|_{N_f=2} = 4.35(12) \text{ GeV } (NLL \& LL)$$

$$m_b^{\overline{MS}}(m_b)|_{N_f=2} = 4.32(12) \text{ GeV } (TL)$$

Perfect agreement using Mhs as observable

$$m_b(m_b, \overline{MS})|_{N_f=2} = 4.29(14) \text{ GeV}$$

ETMC 2011

# Ratio method: $f_{B_s}$


$$\Phi_{hs}(\bar{\mu}_h, \mu_b^*) = [C_A^{stat}(\mu_b^*, \bar{\mu}_h)]^{-1} \cdot \Phi_{hs}^{\text{QCD}}(\bar{\mu}_h) \quad C_A^{\text{stat}}(\mu_b^*, \bar{\mu}_h) \rightsquigarrow N^2 LO$$

$$\Phi_{hs}(\bar{\mu}_h, \mu_b^*) = \frac{(f_{hs}\sqrt{M_{hs}})^{\text{QCD}}}{C_A^{stat}(\bar{\mu}_h, \mu_b^*)} = \Phi_0(\mu_b^*) \left( 1 + \frac{\Phi_1(\mu_b^*)}{\bar{\mu}_h} + \frac{\Phi_2(\mu_b^*)}{(\bar{\mu}_h)^2} \right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{(\bar{\mu}_h)^3}\right)$$

$$\begin{aligned} z(\bar{\mu}_h, \lambda; \bar{\mu}_l, a) &\equiv \lambda^{1/2} \frac{f_{hl}(\bar{\mu}_h, \bar{\mu}_l, a)}{f_{hl}(\bar{\mu}_h/\lambda, \bar{\mu}_l, a)} \cdot \frac{C_A^{stat}(\mu_b^*, \bar{\mu}_h/\lambda)}{C_A^{stat}(\mu_b^*, \bar{\mu}_h)} \frac{[\rho(\bar{\mu}_h, \mu^*)]^{1/2}}{[\rho(\bar{\mu}_h/\lambda, \mu^*)]^{1/2}} \\ z_s(\bar{\mu}_h, \lambda; \bar{\mu}_l, \bar{\mu}_s, a) &\equiv \lambda^{1/2} \frac{f_{hs}(\bar{\mu}_h, \bar{\mu}_l, \bar{\mu}_s, a)}{f_{hs}(\bar{\mu}_h/\lambda, \bar{\mu}_l, \bar{\mu}_s, a)} \cdot \frac{C_A^{stat}(\mu_b^*, \bar{\mu}_h/\lambda)}{C_A^{stat}(\mu_b^*, \bar{\mu}_h)} \frac{[\rho(\bar{\mu}_h, \mu^*)]^{1/2}}{[\rho(\bar{\mu}_h/\lambda, \mu^*)]^{1/2}} \end{aligned}$$


$$\zeta(\bar{\mu}_h, \lambda; \bar{\mu}_l, \bar{\mu}_s, a) \equiv \frac{z_s}{z} = \frac{f_{hs}(\bar{\mu}_h, \bar{\mu}_l, \bar{\mu}_s, a)}{f_{hs}(\bar{\mu}_h/\lambda, \bar{\mu}_l, \bar{\mu}_s, a)} \cdot \frac{f_{hl}(\bar{\mu}_h/\lambda, \bar{\mu}_l, \bar{\mu}_s, a)}{f_{hl}(\bar{\mu}_h, \bar{\mu}_l, \bar{\mu}_s, a)}$$

# Continuum-chiral extrapolation



- Ratios have small discretization effects 2%-3%
- Triggering pseudoscalar decay constant affected by tolerable cutoff effects

# Decay constant ratio



$$z_s(\bar{\mu}_h) = 1 + \frac{\zeta_1}{\bar{\mu}_h} + \frac{\zeta_1}{\bar{\mu}_h^2}$$



- ⌚ stat.  $\rightarrow 0.2\%$
- ⌚ ZP + scale setting 2.1-2.8%
- ⌚ z-ratios negligible

$$z_s(\bar{\mu}_h^{(2)}) z_s(\bar{\mu}_h^{(3)}) \cdots z_s(\bar{\mu}_h^{(K+1)}) = \\ \lambda^{K/2} \frac{f_{hs}(\bar{\mu}_h^{(K+1)})}{f_{hs}(\bar{\mu}_h^{(1)})} \cdot \left[ \frac{C_A^{\text{stat}}(\bar{\mu}_h^{(1)}, \mu^*)}{C_A^{\text{stat}}(\bar{\mu}_h^{(K+1)}, \mu^*)} \right] \cdot \left[ \frac{\rho(\bar{\mu}_h^{(K+1)}, \mu^*)}{\rho(\bar{\mu}_h^{(1)}, \mu^*)} \right]^{1/2}$$

$$\bar{\mu}_h^{(K+1)} \equiv m_b \implies f_{hs}(\bar{\mu}_h^{(K+1)}) = f_{B_s}$$

$$f_{B_s} = 232(6) \text{ MeV}$$



# $f_{Bs}/f_B$



$$f_{hs}/f_{hl} = A \left[ 1 - \frac{3(1 + 3\hat{g}^2)}{4} \frac{2B_0 \bar{\mu}_l}{(4\pi f_0)^2} \log \left( \frac{2B_0 \bar{\mu}_l}{(4\pi f_0)^2} \right) + B \bar{\mu}_l + C a^2 \right]$$

- ⦿ HMCHPT and linear fits increase systematic error
- ⦿ Ratios show very weak dependence on the light and heavy quark masses
- ⦿ Apply recursion for the ratio

# Comparison



$$f_{B_s} = 232(6) \text{ MeV } (NLL \& LL)$$

$$f_{B_s} = 229(6) \text{ MeV } (TL)$$

$$\frac{f_{B_s}}{f_B} = 1.17(2)(4)$$

$$\Rightarrow f_B = 198(7)(7) \text{ MeV}$$


$$f_B = 195(12) \text{ MeV} \quad f_{B_s} = 232(10) \text{ MeV} \quad f_{B_s}/f_B = 1.19(5) \quad ETMC \text{ 2011}$$

$$f_b = 194(9) \text{ MeV} \quad \text{PDG}$$

# B parameters

$$\Delta M_q = \frac{G_F^2 M_W^2}{6\pi^2} |V_{tq} V_{tb}^*|^2 \eta_2^B S_0(x_t) M_{B_q} f_{B_q}^2 \hat{B}_{B_q}$$

$$\langle \bar{B}_q | O | B_q \rangle^{\overline{MS}} = \frac{8}{3} f_{B_q}^2 B_{B_q}^2(\mu) M_{B_q}^2$$



$$O \equiv [\bar{b}^A \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) q^A] [\bar{b}^B \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) q^B]$$

$$\tilde{B}_{B_{d/s}}(\bar{\mu}_h, \mu_b^*) = [C(\bar{\mu}_h, \mu_b^*, \mu)]^{-1} B_{B_{d/s}}(\bar{\mu}_h, \mu)$$

$$\omega_{d/s}(\bar{\mu}_h, \lambda; \bar{\mu}_l, a) = \frac{B_{B_{d/s}}(\bar{\mu}_h, \bar{\mu}_l, a; \mu)}{B_{B_{d/s}}(\bar{\mu}_h/\lambda, \bar{\mu}_l, a; \mu)} \cdot \frac{C(\bar{\mu}_h/\lambda; \mu_b^*, \mu)}{C(\bar{\mu}_h; \mu_b^*, \mu)}$$



@ TL and LO there is no mixing

$$\omega(\bar{\mu}_h) = 1 + \frac{c_1}{\bar{\mu}_h}$$

$$\omega(\bar{\mu}_h, \lambda; \bar{\mu}_l, a) = \frac{B_{B_s}/B_{B_d}(\bar{\mu}_h, \bar{\mu}_l, a)}{B_{B_s}/B_{B_d}(\bar{\mu}_h/\lambda, \bar{\mu}_l, a)}$$

@TL and LO No renormalization or matching needed

# Chiral continuum extrapolation





$$\omega_s(\bar{\mu}_h^{(2)})\omega_s(\bar{\mu}_h^{(3)}) \cdots \omega_s(\bar{\mu}_h^{(K+1)}) =$$

$$\frac{B_{B_s}(\bar{\mu}_h^{(K+1)}; \bar{\mu}_b)}{B_{B_s}(\bar{\mu}_h^{(1)}; \mu)} \cdot \left[ \frac{C(\bar{\mu}_h^{(1)}; \bar{\mu}_b, \mu)}{C(\bar{\mu}_h^{(K+1)}; \bar{\mu}_b, \mu)} \right]$$

Cutoff effects well under control

# Ratios interpolation



$$B_{B_d}^{\overline{MS}}(\bar{\mu}_b) = 0.86(4)(3)$$

$$B_{B_s}^{\overline{MS}}(\bar{\mu}_b) = 0.89(4)(3)$$

$$\frac{B_{B_s}}{B_{B_d}} = 1.023(18)(2)$$

$$\xi = \frac{f_{B_s} \sqrt{B_{B_s}}}{f_B \sqrt{B_B}} = 1.183(22)(40)$$

Very Preliminary


# Conclusions

- ⦿ Better interpolating operators for heavy-light 2-point functions  
=> sub-percent statistical error
- ⦿ Very small statistical errors --> strong check on the validity of the ratio method
- ⦿ Precise determination of  $m_b$ ,  $f_B$ ,  $f_{Bs}$  for  $N_f=2$
- ⦿ Final error dominated by error in the scale setting and renormalization factor
- ⦿ Ratio method extended to the  $B$  parameters
- ⦿ First indications that ratio method is valid also in this case
- ⦿ Preliminary estimate of  $B$  parameters

Backup slides

# Improving projection


$$\beta = 3.80 \quad a\mu = 0.080 \quad a\mu_h = 0.5246 \sim 2.5 m_c$$



$$\frac{1}{L^3} \sum_{\mathbf{x}} \langle P_5(0, 0) P_5(\mathbf{x}, x_0) \rangle$$

# Improving projection

$$\beta = 3.80 \quad a\mu = 0.080 \quad a\mu_h = 0.5246 \sim 2.5 m_c$$




$$\psi^S = (1 + \kappa_G a^2 \nabla_{\text{APE}}^2)^{N_G} \psi^L \quad \kappa_G = 4 \quad N_G = 30$$

$$\alpha_{\text{APE}} = 0.5 \quad N_{\text{APE}} = 20$$

# Improving projection

$$\beta = 3.80 \quad a\mu = 0.080 \quad a\mu_h = 0.5246 \sim 2.5 m_c$$




$$\Phi_{source}(w) = w\Phi^S + (1-w)\Phi^L$$


$$\max [m_{\text{eff}}(w - L)] \simeq \min [m_{\text{eff}}(w - L)]$$

# Checks on smearing

$$\beta = 3.80 \quad a\mu = 0.0080 \quad a\mu_h = 0.5246 \sim 2.5 m_c$$



$$\beta = 3.80 \quad a\mu = 0.0080 \quad a\mu_h = 0.5246 \sim 2.5 m_c$$



Earlier plateau essential for 3-point functions  
Checked all the masses with GEVP