

B Physics Theory for Hadron Colliders

G. Buchalla

Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Fakultät für Physik,
Arnold Sommerfeld Center for Theoretical Physics, D-80333 München, Germany

A short overview of theoretical methods for B physics at hadron colliders is presented. The main emphasis is on the theory of two-body hadronic B decays, which provide a rich field of investigation in particular for the Tevatron and the LHC. The subject holds both interesting theoretical challenges as well as many opportunities for flavor studies and new physics tests. A brief review of the current status and recent developments is given. A few additional topics in B physics are also mentioned.

1. INTRODUCTION

Hadron colliders, such as the Tevatron at Fermilab and the upcoming LHC at CERN, produce large amounts of B hadrons of all varieties, B_u , B_d , B_s and B_c mesons, and b -flavored baryons. Their numerous decay channels probe the flavor sector of the Standard Model (SM) and of any scenario conceived to go beyond it. Of special interest are loop-induced processes and CP-violating observables, for example B - \bar{B} mixing, $B \rightarrow \psi K_S$, $B \rightarrow \rho\rho$, $B_s \rightarrow \phi\phi$, $B \rightarrow K^* \mu^+ \mu^-$ or $B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$, which determine CKM angles or have sensitivity to new physics through virtual particles (or both).

A major challenge for theory is to disentangle the quark-level flavor physics from the QCD dynamics and to control the nonperturbative sector of QCD as far as possible. Several tools are available for this task:

- perturbative calculations of inclusive rare decays ($B \rightarrow X_s \gamma$) based on the heavy-quark expansion.
- $SU(2)$, $SU(3)$ flavor symmetries based on the smallness of the light quark masses $m_u, m_d, m_s \ll \Lambda_{QCD}$.
- factorization of hadronic two-body and exclusive rare FCNC decays based on the heavy-quark limit $m_b \gg \Lambda_{QCD}$.
- lattice-QCD computations, especially suited for “static” quantities (decay constants f_B , bag factors B_B , $B \rightarrow \pi$ form factors at small recoil) [1].
- QCD sum rules on the light cone (LCSR), in particular for nonperturbative quantities with fast light hadrons (distribution amplitudes $\Phi_\pi(x)$, $B \rightarrow \pi$ form factors at large recoil) [2, 3].

These tools have been developed and refined over the years, a process that is still continuing. The methods are complementary and interdependent. For example, QCD sum rule or lattice results of hadronic form factors and decay constants are needed as input for factorization calculations, the latter in turn provide us with a framework to estimate $SU(3)$ breaking in amplitude relations based on flavor symmetries.

Of central importance for flavor physics is the determination of the CKM unitarity triangle. The current status is shown in Fig. 1. Different determinations of the CKM parameters test the consistency of the SM and their precise values are needed as input for rare decays with sensitivity to new physics. Theoretical studies are crucial to translate measurements into constraints on the unitarity triangle. An exceptionally clean quantity is $\sin 2\beta$, determined from CP violation in $B \rightarrow \psi K_S$ with negligible hadronic uncertainties. On the other hand, constraints from B - \bar{B} mixing ($\Delta m_{s,d}$) require input from lattice QCD and the extraction of α and γ benefits from progress in the theory of hadronic B -decays. We will focus on the latter topic, which has a wide range of applications both in two-body hadronic as well as in exclusive rare and radiative decays of B mesons. The remainder of this talk is organized into the sections:




Figure 1: Status of the unitarity triangle [4].

theory of hadronic B decays, phenomenology of $B \rightarrow M_1 M_2$, next-to-next-to-leading order (NNLO) calculations in QCD factorization, further highlights, and conclusions.

A comprehensive discussion of B , D , and K decays in the era of the LHC, covering both theoretical and experimental aspects, can be found in the recent review [5]. We refer to this article for further details on the present discussion, for an account of new physics scenarios and their implications and for an extensive list of references. Prospects for B physics at the LHC are also treated in [6].

2. THEORY OF HADRONIC B DECAYS

2.1. General Framework

To be specific we will discuss two-body hadronic B decays, but the same theoretical methods also apply to rare and radiative processes such as $B \rightarrow K^* \mu^+ \mu^-$ or $B \rightarrow \rho \gamma$.

The computation of the amplitude for the decay of a B meson into a pair of light, charmless mesons, $B \rightarrow M_1 M_2$, starts from the effective weak Hamiltonian at the scale $\mu \approx m_b$ [7]

$$\mathcal{H}_{eff}^{\Delta S=0} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \left[\lambda_u \left(\sum_{j=1,2} C_j Q_j^u + \sum_{\text{penguins}} C_P Q_P \right) + \lambda_c \left(\sum_{j=1,2} C_j Q_j^c + \sum_{\text{penguins}} C_P Q_P \right) \right] \quad (1)$$

$\lambda_p = V_{pb} V_{pd}^*$ ($p = u, c$) are CKM factors. The Hamiltonian for $\Delta S = 1$ transitions is obtained from the $\Delta S = 0$ case by interchanging $d \leftrightarrow s$. The C_i are Wilson coefficients, which include the physics at large scales, M_W , m_t , or some new physics scale M_{NP} , down to the scale $\mu \approx m_b$. They can be reliably computed in renormalization group (RG) improved perturbation theory and are routinely used at next-to-leading order (NLO). The Q_i are local operators of dimension 6, for instance $Q_1^p = (\bar{p}b)_{V-A} (\bar{d}p)_{V-A}$. The evaluation of their matrix elements $\langle M_1 M_2 | Q_i | \bar{B} \rangle$ is the essential problem in the theory of hadronic B decays. The matrix elements contain three relevant scales: m_b , $\sqrt{\Lambda_{QCD} m_b}$, Λ_{QCD} . Because of the large hierarchy $m_b \gg \Lambda_{QCD}$ a systematic factorization of the corresponding contribution is possible, and the hard ($\sim m_b$) and hard-collinear ($\sim \sqrt{\Lambda_{QCD} m_b}$) parts may be treated in perturbation theory. The nonperturbative effects from scales $\sim \Lambda_{QCD}$ can thus be separated from the perturbative ones and the computation simplifies considerably. While the effective Hamiltonian in (1) achieves a factorization of high-energy scales $\sim M_W$ (Wilson coefficients) from the m_b scale contained in the matrix elements $\langle Q_i \rangle$, the theory of the matrix elements in the heavy-quark limit extends the factorization of scales down to Λ_{QCD} .




Figure 2: Factorization formula.

The effective Hamiltonian, together with the matrix elements of the operators Q_i , dictates the structure of the various B -decay amplitudes. For instance, in the important case of B decays into a pair of light (charmless) mesons $M_1 M_2$ one has schematically

$$A(\bar{B} \rightarrow M_1 M_2) = \lambda_u T + \lambda_c P \quad (2)$$

This defines the tree and penguin amplitudes T and P , respectively. Their interplay, in conjunction with the magnitude and weak phase of the CKM factors determines the phenomenology of all charmless $\Delta S = 0$ and $\Delta S = 1$ transitions.

2.2. Factorization of Matrix Elements for $B \rightarrow M_1 M_2$

The factorization formula [8, 9] for matrix elements $\langle M_1 M_2 | Q_i | \bar{B} \rangle$ is shown graphically in Fig. 2. It holds to leading order in Λ_{QCD}/m_b and to all orders in α_s . The kernels T^I , T^{II} are determined by the hard scale m_b (T^I) and the hard-collinear scale $\sqrt{m_b \Lambda_{QCD}}$ (T^{II}). They are therefore calculable in perturbation theory. T^{II} describes the hard spectator interactions and starts at order α_s , whereas T^I starts at order unity. The kernels $T^{I,II}$ are systematically separated (factorized) from the nonperturbative form factors F_j and light-cone distribution amplitudes Φ_B , Φ_M . These hadronic quantities are universal properties of the mesons, or the $B \rightarrow M$ transition. The factorization formula thus achieves a substantial simplification of the $B \rightarrow M_1 M_2$ matrix elements, which can be systematically improved in perturbation theory. It is the basis for the theory of two-body hadronic B decays.

The factorization theorem can be formulated using soft-collinear effective theory (SCET) [10, 11]. This formalism is useful for proving factorization and for disentangling the hard and hard-collinear scale in explicit terms. QCD factorization and SCET are theoretical concepts that are fully consistent with each other, but they pertain to somewhat different aspects of the problem of B -decay matrix elements. QCD factorization [8, 9] refers to the separation of the matrix elements into simpler long-distance quantities and calculable hard interactions, while SCET is a general effective field theory formulation for the relevant QCD modes (hard, hard-collinear, collinear, soft) in the problem. A somewhat analogous relation exists between the heavy-quark expansion (HQE) and heavy-quark effective theory (HQET) in their application to *inclusive* B decays. It should be emphasized that in fact there is a single common theory of hadronic B decays, which is based on factorization in the heavy-quark limit. This should not be confused with differences in the phenomenological implementation of the theory that exist in the literature. Those concern, for example, the treatment of power corrections or the use of experimental input for certain quantities. A further variant of the basic idea of factorization is the so-called PQCD approach [12]. It is more ambitious in the attempt to calculate further hadronic quantities such as form factors or annihilation graphs. This comes, however, at the expense of additional assumptions (k_T factorization, Sudakov factors), which have been criticised in the literature [13].

A graphical representation of the various contributions to a matrix element $\langle M_1 M_2 | Q_i | \bar{B} \rangle$ within QCD factorization is given in Figs. 3-6. The leading order contribution is depicted in Fig. 3, vertex and penguin-type NLO corrections to the kernel T^I are shown in Figs. 4 and 5, respectively, and the NLO ($\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s)$) contributions to the hard-spectator scattering kernel T^{II} are illustrated in Fig. 6. Annihilation effects, shown in Fig. 7, have a power suppression




Figure 3: Leading order diagram.



Figure 4: $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s)$ vertex corrections.



Figure 5: $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s)$ penguin corrections.

$\sim \Lambda_{QCD}/m_b$ with respect to the contributions listed before. They are not calculable within the standard framework, but they may be estimated using model descriptions and should be part of the analysis of theory uncertainties.

3. PHENOMENOLOGY OF $B \rightarrow M_1 M_2$

3.1. General Remarks

All two-body B decays into light pseudoscalar (P) and longitudinal vector mesons (V_L), which are fully calculable at leading power in QCD factorization, have been systematically analyzed at NLO in α_s . The complete sets of decay modes $B \rightarrow PP$ [14, 15], $B \rightarrow PV$ [15] (where V is necessarily longitudinally polarized) and $B \rightarrow V_L V_L$ [16, 17] are thus available in the literature. Transverse polarization observables for $B \rightarrow VV$ modes are not entirely calculable in factorization. They have been discussed in [16, 18]. Final states with vector and axial vector mesons were considered recently in [19].

The multitude of decay channels is a big asset for the phenomenology of hadronic B decays. First, symmetry relations can be used to reduce the dependence on hadronic physics. Second, different modes are in general sensitive to different decay mechanisms and this may be exploited to selectively test the theoretical understanding of QCD in these processes. In order to illustrate this we show in Table I typical examples of decay modes that have a characteristic dependence on specific decay topologies. The first two lines show B decays that can be generated by tree diagrams. Here we distinguish the case where other, subdominant contributions (e.g. penguins) are possible from the “pure-tree” case, where those are forbidden by isospin. (In the latter case electroweak penguins, which violate isospin, can still appear.) The possible topologies can be read off from the flavor structure of the transition, which is given in the last column. The flavor of the spectator quark is indicated in brackets.

From the comparison of theoretical results for $B \rightarrow M_1 M_2$ with available data one finds a good overall agreement. However, the general picture, or the consideration of global fits, may conceal particular deviations, either due to




Figure 6: $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s)$ hard spectator interactions.




Figure 7: $\mathcal{O}(\Lambda/m_b)$ annihilation effects.

hadronic physics effects or from flavor dynamics beyond the SM. It is therefore mandatory to investigate and assess specific observables. We shall come back to this issue with the discussion of an example in section 3.2. In this context it is also important to aim, as far as possible, at a separation of hadronic and flavor physics effects by studying suitable observables.

Focussing on the QCD aspects of hadronic B decays, factorization is able to account, qualitatively at least and often in quantitative detail, for several remarkable features of these processes. Among them one may note: a) the relative size of pure penguin and tree amplitudes; b) the hierarchy between the penguin amplitudes for $V_L V_L$ and PP final states; c) the apparent smallness of pure annihilation modes; d) the small to moderate size of direct CP asymmetries, which are suppressed by strong phases predicted to be of order α_s or Λ/m_b .

The last point d) is rather qualitative in nature. Since power corrections are likely to compete with the calculable $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s)$ effects, the strong phases and hence direct CP asymmetries are very difficult to predict with good precision. Nevertheless, some trace of the expected parametric suppression should be visible in the data. In Fig. 8 we reproduce a compilation from HFAG [20] of the most precisely measured direct CP asymmetries. Most of the asymmetries are below 10% in magnitude, and all are compatible with being smaller than 20%. This quick glance can clearly be only a rough indication. One has to note for instance that some asymmetries are expected to (almost) vanish because of the (near) absence of a second, interfering amplitude. Examples are $B^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0$ or $K^0 \pi^+$. Also, experimental errors are still large in many cases. The most precisely measured direct CP asymmetry is

$$A_{CP}(K^+ \pi^-) = -0.097 \pm 0.012 \quad (3)$$

It is interesting to estimate the strong phase difference implied by this result (assuming the SM). We may write

$$A_{CP}(K^+ \pi^-) \equiv \frac{\Gamma(\bar{B}_d \rightarrow K^- \pi^+) - \Gamma(B_d \rightarrow K^+ \pi^-)}{\Gamma(\bar{B}_d \rightarrow K^- \pi^+) + \Gamma(B_d \rightarrow K^+ \pi^-)} = \frac{2d \sin \gamma \sin \phi}{1 + d^2 - 2d \cos \gamma \cos \phi} \approx 2d \sin \gamma \sin \phi \quad (4)$$

where γ is the CKM angle, ϕ is the strong phase difference between tree and penguin amplitude and

$$d \equiv \left| \frac{T}{P} \right| \left| \frac{V_{ub} V_{us}}{V_{cb} V_{cs}} \right| \quad (5)$$

Table I: Amplitude topologies and flavor composition.

tree dominated	$\bar{B}_d \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-, \rho^+ \rho^-$	$b(\bar{d}) \rightarrow d\bar{u}u(\bar{d})$
pure tree	$B^- \rightarrow \pi^- \pi^0, \rho^- \rho^0$	$b(\bar{u}) \rightarrow d\bar{u}u(\bar{u})$ (isospin)
pure penguin	$B^- \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 \pi^-$	$b(\bar{u}) \rightarrow s\bar{d}d(\bar{u})$
pure annihilation	$\bar{B}_d \rightarrow K^+ K^-$	$b(\bar{d}) \rightarrow u\bar{s}s\bar{u}$

The form of the decay amplitude is given by eq. (2). The S term in (7) arises from the interference of B - \bar{B} mixing with the dominant tree amplitude $\sim T$, with a small correction due to the penguin component $\sim P$. The C term signals direct CP violation and comes from the tree-penguin interference in (2). The formulas for $B \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ apply also to the case of $B \rightarrow \rho_L^+\rho_L^-$. The measured CP violation parameters for both channels are given in Table II. For C_π

Table II: CP violation in $B \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$, $\rho_L^+\rho_L^-$ [20].

	S	C
$B \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$	-0.61 ± 0.08	$-0.38 \pm 0.07^*$
$B \rightarrow \rho_L^+\rho_L^-$	-0.05 ± 0.17	-0.06 ± 0.13

the measurements of BaBar and Belle are not in very good agreement. BaBar finds $C_\pi = -0.21 \pm 0.09$, Belle obtains $C_\pi = -0.55 \pm 0.09$. Table II quotes the average without inflating the error. The Belle result appears somewhat large with respect to theory expectations, whereas the BaBar number is perfectly compatible. Independent measurements at LHCb will be very important.

Up to an irrelevant constant factor the amplitude in (2) can, for $\bar{B} \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$, also be written as

$$A(\bar{B} \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-) \sim \sqrt{\bar{\rho}^2 + \bar{\eta}^2} e^{-i\gamma} + r_\pi e^{i\phi_\pi} \quad (8)$$

which defines magnitude $r = r_\pi$ and phase $\phi = \phi_\pi$ of the penguin-to-tree ratio. $\bar{\rho}$, $\bar{\eta}$ are Wolfenstein parameters and γ is a CKM phase. A similar expression holds for $\bar{B} \rightarrow \rho_L^+\rho_L^-$ with the replacement of (r_π, ϕ_π) by (r_ρ, ϕ_ρ) .

Knowledge of S and of the CKM angle β or, equivalently,

$$\tau \equiv \cot \beta = 2.54 \pm 0.13 \quad (9)$$

from CP violation in $B \rightarrow \psi K_S$ [20], fixes the unitarity triangle in the form [22, 23]

$$\bar{\rho} = 1 - \tau \bar{\eta} \quad (10)$$

$$\bar{\eta} = \frac{1 + \tau S - \sqrt{1 - S^2}}{(1 + \tau^2)S} (1 + r \cos \phi) \quad (11)$$

Up to the hadronic correction $r \cos \phi$ from the penguin-to-tree ratio the unitarity triangle is entirely determined by the observables S and $\tau = \cot \beta$. From QCD factorization we have [17, 23]

$$r_\pi = 0.11 \pm 0.03 \quad (12)$$

$$r_\rho = 0.038 \pm 0.024 \quad (13)$$

The analysis can be performed in the same way for the $\pi^+\pi^-$ or the $\rho_L^+\rho_L^-$ case. The results are compatible within errors. Here we will concentrate on $B \rightarrow \rho_L^+\rho_L^-$, which from a theoretical point of view appears slightly preferred because of a smaller size of the penguin amplitude and because all three $B \rightarrow \rho_L\rho_L$ decays are very well described within QCD factorization [16, 17]. Also, for direct CP violation in $B \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ the experimental situation is still not completely clarified, as mentioned above, whereas C_ρ is measured to be small in agreement with theory expectations.

For $B \rightarrow \rho_L^+\rho_L^-$ we have $\cos \phi_\rho \approx 1$, which corresponds to a small phase, as confirmed empirically by the small direct CP violation C_ρ . From the parameters τ , S_ρ , r_ρ specified above we then obtain $\bar{\rho}$ (10) and $\bar{\eta}$ (11). This implies a value for $\gamma = \arctan(\bar{\eta}/\bar{\rho})$,

$$\gamma = 72.4^\circ \pm 1.3^\circ (\tau) \pm 5.1^\circ (S_\rho) \pm 3.2^\circ (r_\rho) \quad (14)$$

The uncertainty is still dominated by the experimental error in S_ρ . The theoretical quantity r_ρ may be cross-checked with the help of other measurements. The branching fraction for the pure penguin decay $B^- \rightarrow \bar{K}_L^{*0}\rho_L^-$ [24] can be used to extract a penguin-to-tree ratio $r_{K^*\rho} \approx 0.04$ (defined similarly as r_ρ) in agreement with QCD factorization. Employing $SU(3)$ symmetry, $r_\rho \approx 0.06$ can be obtained from $\bar{B}_d \rightarrow \bar{K}_L^{*0}K_L^{*0}$ [17]. Improved measurements of $\bar{B}_d \rightarrow \bar{K}_L^{*0}K_L^{*0}$ could help to further reduce the theory uncertainty in (14).

4. NNLO EFFECTS IN QCD FACTORIZATION

For several important classes of contributions in charmless two-body B decays the perturbative calculations in QCD factorization have recently been extended to the level of NNLO corrections. By NNLO we here mean the effects of order α_s^2 . In many cases this level of accuracy is probably below the size of uncertainties from other sources, most notably from power corrections. However, the explicit knowledge of NNLO corrections is of some conceptual interest as it extends the factorization formula to the next nontrivial level in perturbation theory. In addition, there are quantities for which the NNLO effects are likely to be also numerically important. These are cases where a contribution is absent at $\mathcal{O}(1)$ and thus the $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s)$ term, a NLO contribution in the general counting scheme, is effectively the lowest order. An example is hard spectator scattering. Another case is the coefficient of so-called color-suppressed amplitudes, a_2 , which is accidentally small at leading and next-to-leading order and therefore rather sensitive to NNLO effects.

We briefly summarize the NNLO corrections that have been computed so far. These are, first, the $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^2)$, one-loop hard spectator interactions for current-current operators [25, 26, 27] and for penguin contributions [28]. The calculations in [25, 26] are done in the SCET framework, whereas [27] employs factorization in full QCD. The agreement of the results is an example of the equivalence of the two formulations. Second, the two-loop vertex corrections (T^I) have been addressed for the first time in [29], where the imaginary part is computed explicitly. The real part is still unpublished.

The numerical impact of NNLO effects in comparison with other corrections for the coefficient $a_2(\pi\pi)$, which dominates the amplitude for $B \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0$, is illustrated by the following compilation [5]:

$$\begin{aligned} a_2(\pi\pi) &= 0.184 - [0.153 + 0.077i]_{\alpha_s} + [? - 0.049i]_{\alpha_s^2} \\ &\quad + \frac{9f_{M_1}f_B}{0.485 m_b \lambda_B F^{B \rightarrow M_1}} \left([0.122]_{\alpha_s} + [0.050 + 0.053i]_{\alpha_s^2} + [0.071]_{\text{twist-3}} \right) \\ &= 0.275^{+0.228}_{-0.135} + (-0.073^{+0.115}_{-0.082}) i \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

The first line lists the vertex corrections at various orders. The still unknown real part at order α_s^2 is indicated by the question mark. The second line shows the amplitude from hard spectator interactions. It includes an estimate of power corrections from twist-3 contributions to the light-cone wave function of the pion (last term). The normalization of the prefactor is such that it gives unity for default values of the parameters. The third line displays the full result together with the total uncertainty.

In (15) the cancellation of leading and next-to-leading vertex contributions is clearly visible. This implies the dominance of the hard spectator term and the relatively large impact of NNLO effects and power corrections. In addition, the important parameter λ_B , which characterizes spectator scattering, is not well known. An accurate prediction of the $B \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0$ branching ratio is therefore difficult. One may note that the NNLO term in the hard spectator interaction enhances the size of $a_2(\pi\pi)$, bringing the theory prediction for $B(B \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0)$ closer to the relatively large experimental result.

5. FURTHER HIGHLIGHTS

We briefly comment on some examples of further topics, which are of great interest for the Tevatron and the LHC. A comprehensive account is contained in [5].

5.1. $B_s \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$

In the SM the branching fraction for the leptonic FCNC decay $B_s \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ can be represented as

$$B(B_s \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-) = 3.9 \cdot 10^{-9} \left[\frac{f_{B_s}}{240 \text{ MeV}} \right]^2 \tag{16}$$

The branching fraction is sensitive to the decay constant f_{B_s} . Apart from that it is completely dominated by short distance physics from top-quark loops and can be predicted with very good accuracy. In the SM the branching ratio is very small because of a helicity suppression. This leaves room for large enhancements from new physics, which are possible for instance in the Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model with large $\tan\beta$, and could saturate the experimental bound. The current upper limit from CDF is [30]

$$B(B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-) < 47 \cdot 10^{-9} \quad \text{at } 90\% \text{ C.L.} \quad (17)$$

Since $B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ is theoretically very clean, has interesting sensitivity to new physics and a clear experimental signature, it is a prime goal for flavor studies at hadron colliders.

5.2. $B \rightarrow K^* l^+ l^-$

Rich possibilities to study short-distance flavor physics are also associated with the semileptonic rare decay $B \rightarrow K^* l^+ l^-$. Besides the differential branching ratio various other kinematical distributions may be measured in this decay. This would help to disentangle different sources of new physics. An interesting observable is, for example, the position of a zero in the forward-backward asymmetry A_{FB} as a function of the dilepton mass q^2 . A_{FB} is defined as the rate asymmetry between forward and backward going leptons l^+ in the dilepton center-of-mass frame. The position $q^2 = q_0^2$ of the zero in $A_{FB}(q^2)$ has the form

$$q_0^2 = \frac{F_1^{B \rightarrow K^*}}{F_2^{B \rightarrow K^*}} \frac{C_{7\gamma}}{C_9^{\text{eff}}} \quad (18)$$

In the heavy-quark limit a SCET relation ensures that unknown hadronic physics cancels in the ratio of form factors $F_{1,2}^{B \rightarrow K^*}$. This leads to a prediction of q_0^2 only in terms of calculable short-distance quantities ($\sim C_{7\gamma}/C_9^{\text{eff}}$). NLO QCD corrections have been computed in [31].

5.3. B_s - \bar{B}_s Mixing, $B_s \rightarrow \psi\phi$, $B_s \rightarrow \phi\phi$

Mixing and CP violation in the B_s - \bar{B}_s system can be investigated using decay asymmetries and distributions of the process $B_s \rightarrow \psi\phi$. In some sense this decay is the analogue of $B_d \rightarrow \psi K_S$ in the B_d system, but the vector-vector final state and the larger width difference $\Delta\Gamma_s$ in the B_s case make the analysis of $B_s \rightarrow \psi\phi$ more involved [32]. An analysis of recent measurements by CDF and D0 has been given in [33], suggesting indications for discrepancies with the SM. Definite conclusions about the presence of new physics appear still premature. A further recent discussion of related topics can be found in [34].

6. CONCLUSIONS

Flavor studies with K , D and, in particular, B -meson decays complement direct searches for new physics at colliders. Hadron machines deliver very large samples of B mesons. Their decay modes can be extracted from background if the final state is sufficiently clean, with charged tracks, typically few particles and one photon at most. In addition to improved measurements of known $B_{u,d}$ decay channels, the investigation of the rich and largely unexplored field of B_s decays is of special importance. Among the processes of interest are B_s - \bar{B}_s mixing, $B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$, the exclusive rare decays $B \rightarrow K^* l^+ l^-$, $B \rightarrow \rho\gamma$, $B \rightarrow K^* \gamma$, $B_s \rightarrow \phi\gamma$, and hadronic two-body modes such as $B \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-$, $B_s \rightarrow K^+ K^-$ or $B_s \rightarrow \phi\phi$. For the theoretical treatment of these decays and the control of hadronic physics it is necessary to use the systematic methods of factorization, SCET, flavor symmetries, lattice QCD and light-cone sum rules, which are in many ways complementary to each other. Presumably the most reliable results will be obtained when theory calculations enter only in small corrections to clean flavor observables. In these cases moderate precision in hadronic quantities will suffice to reach high accuracy in quantities of flavor physics. The

large variety of B decay channels will allow us to identify observables with this property or to construct them by a combination of several modes. With the available theoretical tools many opportunities exist at hadron colliders for precision tests and discoveries in B physics.

Acknowledgments

I thank the organizers for the invitation to this interesting and enjoyable conference. This work (LMU-ASC 47/08) is supported in part by the DFG cluster of excellence “Origin and Structure of the Universe”.

References

- [1] A. S. Kronfeld [USQCD Collaboration], arXiv:0807.2220 [physics.comp-ph]; E. Gamiz, arXiv:0807.0381 [hep-ph].
- [2] P. Ball and R. Zwicky, Phys. Rev. D **71** (2005) 014015 [arXiv:hep-ph/0406232].
- [3] P. Ball and R. Zwicky, Phys. Rev. D **71** (2005) 014029 [arXiv:hep-ph/0412079].
- [4] J. Charles *et al.* [CKMfitter Group], Eur. Phys. J. C **41** (2005) 1 [arXiv:hep-ph/0406184]; updates at: <http://ckmfitter.in2p3.fr>
- [5] M. Artuso *et al.*, arXiv:0801.1833 [hep-ph].
- [6] R. Fleischer, arXiv:0802.2882 [hep-ph].
- [7] G. Buchalla, A. J. Buras and M. E. Lautenbacher, Rev. Mod. Phys. **68** (1996) 1125 [arXiv:hep-ph/9512380].
- [8] M. Beneke, G. Buchalla, M. Neubert and C. T. Sachrajda, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83** (1999) 1914 [arXiv:hep-ph/9905312].
- [9] M. Beneke, G. Buchalla, M. Neubert and C. T. Sachrajda, Nucl. Phys. B **591** (2000) 313 [arXiv:hep-ph/0006124].
- [10] C. W. Bauer, S. Fleming, D. Pirjol and I. W. Stewart, Phys. Rev. D **63** (2001) 114020 [arXiv:hep-ph/0011336].
- [11] C. W. Bauer, D. Pirjol and I. W. Stewart, Phys. Rev. D **65** (2002) 054022 [arXiv:hep-ph/0109045].
- [12] Y. Y. Keum, H. N. Li and A. I. Sanda, Phys. Rev. D **63** (2001) 054008 [arXiv:hep-ph/0004173].
- [13] S. Descotes-Genon and C. T. Sachrajda, Nucl. Phys. B **625** (2002) 239 [arXiv:hep-ph/0109260].
- [14] M. Beneke, G. Buchalla, M. Neubert and C. T. Sachrajda, Nucl. Phys. B **606** (2001) 245 [arXiv:hep-ph/0104110].
- [15] M. Beneke and M. Neubert, Nucl. Phys. B **675** (2003) 333 [arXiv:hep-ph/0308039].
- [16] M. Beneke, J. Rohrer and D. Yang, Nucl. Phys. B **774** (2007) 64 [arXiv:hep-ph/0612290].
- [17] M. Bartsch, G. Buchalla and C. Kraus, LMU-ASC 43/08, in preparation.
- [18] A. L. Kagan, Phys. Lett. B **601** (2004) 151 [arXiv:hep-ph/0405134].
- [19] H. Y. Cheng and K. C. Yang, arXiv:0805.0329 [hep-ph].
- [20] E. Barberio *et al.*, arXiv:0808.1297 [hep-ex]; updates at: <http://www.slac.stanford.edu/xorg/hfag/>
- [21] [The Belle Collaboration], Nature **452** (2008) 332.
- [22] G. Buchalla and A. S. Safir, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93** (2004) 021801 [arXiv:hep-ph/0310218].
- [23] G. Buchalla and A. S. Safir, Eur. Phys. J. C **45** (2006) 109 [arXiv:hep-ph/0406016].
- [24] M. Beneke, M. Gronau, J. Rohrer and M. Spranger, Phys. Lett. B **638** (2006) 68 [arXiv:hep-ph/0604005].
- [25] M. Beneke and S. Jäger, Nucl. Phys. B **751** (2006) 160 [arXiv:hep-ph/0512351].
- [26] N. Kivel, JHEP **0705** (2007) 019 [arXiv:hep-ph/0608291].
- [27] V. Pilipp, Nucl. Phys. B **794** (2008) 154 [arXiv:0709.3214 [hep-ph]].
- [28] M. Beneke and S. Jäger, Nucl. Phys. B **768** (2007) 51 [arXiv:hep-ph/0610322].
- [29] G. Bell, Nucl. Phys. B **795** (2008) 1 [arXiv:0705.3127 [hep-ph]].
- [30] T. Aaltonen *et al.* [CDF Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **100** (2008) 101802 [arXiv:0712.1708 [hep-ex]].
- [31] M. Beneke, T. Feldmann and D. Seidel, Nucl. Phys. B **612** (2001) 25 [arXiv:hep-ph/0106067].
- [32] I. Dunietz, R. Fleischer and U. Nierste, Phys. Rev. D **63** (2001) 114015 [arXiv:hep-ph/0012219].
- [33] M. Bona *et al.* [UTfit Collaboration], arXiv:0803.0659 [hep-ph].
- [34] M. Gronau and J. L. Rosner, arXiv:0808.3761 [hep-ph].