

CERN-TH/2000-309

A sum rule from the shape function

Ugo Aglietti ^{a1}*^aTH Division, CERN, Geneva, Switzerland*

Abstract

We present a sum rule relating the electron energy spectrum to the hadron mass distribution in semileptonic $b \rightarrow u$ decays close to threshold. The relation found is free from non-perturbative effects in leading twist, so the theoretical error is expected to be $O(5\%)$. An experimental confirmation of this prediction can provide a check of the basic assumptions at the root of the theory of the shape function.

CERN-TH/2000-309

October 2000

¹On leave of absence from Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Roma I, Piazzale Aldo Moro 2, 00185, Roma; *e-mail*: ugo.aglietti@cern.ch

In this note we present a sum rule that can be directly compared with data on the semileptonic decay

$$B \rightarrow X_u + l + \nu. \quad (1)$$

The comparison allows a verification of the theory of the structure function for the heavy flavours, usually called the shape function [1, 2]. This sum rule relates the electron spectrum to the integrated (also called cumulative) hadron-mass distribution and reads

$$\frac{d\Gamma_B}{dx} = 2C(\alpha_S) \int_0^{m_B\sqrt{1-x}} \frac{d\Gamma_B}{dm_X} dm_X + O\left(\frac{\Lambda_{QCD}}{m_B}\right), \quad (2)$$

where the coefficient function is, to one loop,

$$C(\alpha_S) = 1 + \frac{C_F \alpha_S}{2\pi} \frac{97}{72} + O(\alpha_S^2). \quad (3)$$

The adimensional electron energy is defined, as usual, as

$$x \equiv \frac{2E_e}{m_B} \quad (0 \leq x \leq 1). \quad (4)$$

Relation (2) holds in the region

$$1 - x \sim \frac{\Lambda_{QCD}}{m_B}. \quad (5)$$

Assuming $\Lambda_{QCD} \sim 300$ MeV, this means ¹

$$E_e \sim 2.5 \text{ GeV}. \quad (7)$$

The condition (5) corresponds to a final invariant hadronic mass in the region [1, 2]

$$m_X \sim \sqrt{\Lambda_{QCD} m_B} \sim m_X \sim 1.3 \text{ GeV}. \quad (8)$$

¹In practice, to kill the large $b \rightarrow cl\nu$ background, one has to satisfy the experimental constraint [3]

$$x > \frac{m_B^2 - m_D^2}{2m_B} \simeq 0.88. \quad (6)$$

As stated in eq. (2), the sum rule holds only if the upper invariant mass m_{cut} in the hadron distribution is related to the electron energy by

$$m_{cut} = m_B \sqrt{1 - x}. \quad (9)$$

A typical value for the experimental analysis is $m_{cut} = 1.6$ GeV, for which $E_e = 2.4$ GeV. One can actually decrease the cut mass to something like $m_{cut} = 1.3$ GeV, for which $E_e = 2.48$ GeV (the end-point is at $E_e^{\max} = 2.64$ GeV).

The coefficient function has the numerical value

$$C(\alpha_S) \cong 1.06 \quad (10)$$

for $\alpha_S \equiv \alpha_S(m_B) = 0.2$. Taking instead, for example, $\alpha_S \equiv \alpha_S(\mu = m_B/2) = 0.28$, the coefficient function rises to 1.08, a 2% variation: this can be taken as a crude estimate of the higher-order terms, $\sim (\alpha_S/\pi)^2$. In general, the main corrections to eq. (2) originate from the so-called higher-twist effects, related to the matrix elements of power-suppressed operators. Their size is [1, 2], as anticipated:

$$(\text{higher twist contrib.}) \sim \frac{\Lambda_{QCD}}{m_B} \sim 5\%. \quad (11)$$

The proof of eq. (2) is the following. Any distribution in the threshold region (8) satisfies the factorization formula (for a derivation, see for example [2])

$$d\Gamma_B = \int_0^{m_B} dm_* \varphi(m_*) d\Gamma_* + O\left(\frac{\Lambda_{QCD}}{m_B}\right), \quad (12)$$

where $d\Gamma_*$ is the distribution for a hypothetical heavy quark with mass m_* and $\varphi(m_*)$ is the shape function in the notation of ref. [2].

The tree-level electron spectrum is, close to the end-point:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\Gamma_0} \frac{d\Gamma_*}{dx_*} &= 2x_*^2 (3 - 2x_*) \theta(1 - x_*) \\ &\cong 2 [1 - 3(1 - x_*)^2] \theta(1 - x_*), \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where

$$x_* \equiv \frac{2E_e}{m_*} \quad (0 \leq x_* \leq 1) \quad (14)$$

and²

$$\Gamma_0 \equiv \frac{G_F^2 m_b^5 |V_{ub}|^2}{192\pi^3}. \quad (15)$$

The term quadratic in $1 - x_*$ in the last member of eq. (13) can be neglected because

$$(1 - x_*)^2 \sim \left(\frac{\Lambda_{QCD}}{m_B} \right)^2. \quad (16)$$

Performing then the linearization and inserting the r.h.s. of eq. (13) into eq. (12), one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\Gamma_0} \frac{d\Gamma_B}{dx} &= 2 \int_{2E_e}^{m_B} dm_* \varphi(m_*) \frac{m_B}{m_*} \\ &= 2 \int_{2E_e}^{m_B} dm_* \varphi(m_*) + O\left(\frac{\Lambda_{QCD}}{m_B}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where eq. (5) has been used in the last line. An analogous factorization of the hadron-mass distribution gives

$$\frac{d\Gamma_B}{dm_X^2} = \int_0^{m_B} dm_* \varphi(m_*) \frac{d\Gamma_*}{dm_X^2}. \quad (18)$$

At tree level, the parton distribution reads

$$\frac{1}{\Gamma_0} \frac{d\Gamma_*}{dm_X^2} = \delta(m_X^2 + 2E_X(m_* - m_B)), \quad (19)$$

where E_X is the final hadronic energy. The latter has a range, for fixed m_X^2 ,

$$m_X \leq E_X \leq \frac{m_B}{2} \left(1 + \frac{m_X^2}{m_B^2} \right). \quad (20)$$

We now introduce an approximation analogous to the one leading to the factorization in terms of the variable mass m_* ; we set³:

$$E_X \sim \frac{m_B}{2}. \quad (21)$$

²The actual value of the heavy mass entering Γ_0 is irrelevant, as this dependence cancels in taking the ratio of the widths (see later).

³This step is not very rigorous. The main justification for neglecting the region $E_X \gtrsim m_X$ is that infrared logarithms turn out to cancel in the coefficient function $C(\alpha_S)$ (see later). For a general discussion on this point, see ref. [4].

Integrating over m_X^2 , we obtain for the cumulative hadron-mass distribution

$$\frac{1}{\Gamma_0} \int_0^{m_{cut}} \frac{d\Gamma_B}{dm_X} dm_X = \int_{m_B(1-m_{cut}^2/m_B^2)}^{m_B} dm_* \varphi(m_*). \quad (22)$$

Comparing the expressions for the two distributions and assuming eq. (9), we obtain the tree-level approximation to eq. (2), i.e. the equation with $\alpha_S = 0$ in $C(\alpha_S)$.

Let us now discuss the one-loop correction to $C(\alpha_S)$. As is well known, the coefficient function is independent of the external state chosen to perform the computation. Therefore, instead of taking an external state containing a B -meson, we can take an external state containing an on-shell b -quark. Then, we just need to consider the decay distributions at the parton level to order α_S . The electron spectrum reads [5]

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2\Gamma_0} \frac{d\Gamma_b}{dx} = & 1 - \frac{\alpha_S C_F}{2\pi} \left[\log^2(1-x) + \frac{31}{6} \log(1-x) + \pi^2 + \frac{5}{4} + \right. \\ & \left. + O(1-x) \right]. \quad (23) \end{aligned}$$

The mass distribution is [6]:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\Gamma_0} \frac{d\Gamma_b}{dm_X^2} = & \delta(m_X^2) \left[1 - \frac{\alpha_S C_F}{2\pi} \left(\pi^2 + \frac{187}{72} \right) \right] + \\ & - \frac{\alpha_S C_F}{2\pi} \left[2 \left(\frac{\log[m_X^2/m_b^2]}{m_X^2/m_b^2} \right)_+ + \frac{31}{6} \left(\frac{1}{m_X^2/m_b^2} \right)_+ + O(1) \right], \quad (24) \end{aligned}$$

where the plus prescription regularizes the infrared singularity at $m_X^2 = 0$, which comes from real gluon emission. Integrating over the mass, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\Gamma_0} \int_0^{m_{cut}} \frac{d\Gamma_b}{dm_X} dm_X = & 1 - \frac{\alpha_S C_F}{2\pi} \left[\log^2(1-z) + \frac{31}{6} \log(1-z) + \right. \\ & \left. + \pi^2 + \frac{187}{72} + O(1-z) \right], \quad (25) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$z \equiv 1 - \frac{m_{cut}^2}{m_b^2}. \quad (26)$$

Dividing eq. (23) by eq. (25) under the condition in eq. (9), i.e. $z = x$, the logarithmic terms cancel and the one-loop correction to $C(\alpha_S)$ in eq. (2) results. Note also the cancellation of the π^2 terms in taking the ratio of the widths.

Let us now comment on the result represented by eq. (2). The dependence on the non-perturbative effects related to Fermi motion — described by the shape function — cancels in taking the ratio of the widths. Cancellation occurs also for the CKM matrix element $|V_{ub}|^2$ and for the heavy mass power m_b^5 , both entering Γ_0 . It is the cancellation of all these unknown or poorly known quantities that makes the sum rule quite accurate.

An equation similar to (2), with the replacement $m_B \rightarrow m_{\Lambda_b}$, applies also to the hyperon decay

$$\Lambda_b \rightarrow X_u + l + \nu. \quad (27)$$

The experimental analysis is more difficult in this case, because hyperon production cross sections are generally much smaller than the corresponding mesonic ones. The relevance of a combined analysis is that higher-twist corrections are expected to be different in the two cases (1) and (27), because for example the B -meson has $1/m_B$ spin-dependent corrections, which vanish instead in the Λ_b case [7].

In general, we would like to stress the simplicity of the result (2). The latter is however non-trivial, as the presence of non-vanishing perturbative corrections and higher-twist effects indicates. Using only a general parametrization of the hadronic tensor that describes the decay (1), it does not seem possible to derive eq. (2). Let us remark that the prediction (2) does not involve either a parametrization of the shape function or an evaluation of the Mellin moments of the distributions — the latter requiring a knowledge of the spectra in the whole kinematical range. On the experimental side, both the rates entering eq. (2) can be easily measured — they are actually measured — because the background coming from $b \rightarrow c$ transitions is kinematically forbidden⁴ [3, 8]. The sum rule (2) also allows a consistency check between the electron spectrum computed inside the AC²M² model [3] and the hadron-mass distribution computed inside the shape-function theory [8]. Both these models are currently used for the experimental determination of $|V_{ub}|$.

⁴See footnote 1.

To conclude, the experimental confirmation of eq. (2) can provide a check at the 5% level of the theory of the shape function and of its basic assumptions: infinite-mass limit for the beauty quark, infinite-energy limit for the light final quark and local parton hadron duality. Finally, a comparison with accurate experimental data can provide an estimate of the higher-twist effects.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank S. Catani and M. Luke for discussions.

References

- [1] I. Bigi, M. Shifman, N. Uraltsev and A. Vainshtein, Phys. Rev. Lett. 71, 496 (1993); Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 9, 2467 (1994); A. Manohar and M. Wise, Phys. Rev. D 49, 1310 (1994); M. Neubert, Phys. Rev. D 49, 3392 and 4623 (1994); T. Mannel and M. Neubert, Phys. Rev. D 50, 2037 (1994).
- [2] U. Aglietti and G. Ricciardi, CERN-TH/2000-071, DSF-T/2000-7, hep-ph/0003146, to appear in Nucl. Phys. B.
- [3] G. Altarelli, N. Cabibbo, G. Corbó, L. Maiani and G. Martinelli, Nucl. Phys. B 208, 365 (1982).
- [4] U. Aglietti, hep-ph/0009214, invited talk at the QCD00 Euroconference, Montpellier, 6–12 July 2000, to appear in the Proceedings.
- [5] M. Jezabek and J. Kuhn, Nucl. Phys. B 320, 204 (1989).
- [6] A. Falk, M. Luke and M. Savage, Phys. Rev. D 53, 2491 (1996); M. Neubert and F. De Fazio, JHEP 06, 017 (1999).
- [7] U. Aglietti, Phys. Lett. B 281, 341 (1992).
- [8] V. Barger, C. Kim and J. Phillips, Phys. Lett. B 251, 629 (1990); R. Dikeman and N. Uraltsev, Nucl. Phys. B 509, 378 (1998); A. Falk, Z. Ligeti and M. Wise, Phys. Lett. B 406, 225 (1997).