

Determination of the Strong Coupling Constant α_s from Inclusive Semi-leptonic B Meson Decays

Yuzhi Che,^{1,2} Long Chen,³ Jinfei Wu,^{1,2} Xinchou Lou,^{1,4,5} Xiang Chen,⁶ Xin Guan,⁷ Yan-Qing Ma,^{8,9} and Manqi Ruan^{1,10,*}

¹*Institute of High Energy Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, 19B Yuquan Road, Shijingshan District, Beijing 100049, China*

²*China Center of Advanced Science and Technology, Beijing, 100190, Beijing, China*

³*School of Physics, Shandong University, Jinan 250100, China*

⁴*University of Texas at Dallas, Richardson, 75083, Texas, USA*

⁵*Center for High Energy Physics, Henan Academy of Sciences, Zhengzhou, 450046, Henan, China*

⁶*Physik-Institut, Universität Zürich, Winterthurerstrasse 190, CH-8057 Zürich, Switzerland*

⁷*SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94039, USA*

⁸*School of Physics, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China*

⁹*Center for High Energy Physics, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China*

¹⁰*University of Chinese Academy of Sciences,*

19A Yuquan Road, Shijingshan District, Beijing 100049, China

(Dated: December 4, 2024)

We present a new methodology for determining the strong coupling constant, α_s , from the inclusive semi-leptonic decay width of B mesons. We express the semi-leptonic B decay width as a function of $\alpha_s(5\text{ GeV})$, the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa matrix element $|V_{cb}|$, b - and c -quark masses in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ scheme. The method fixes the value of $|V_{cb}|$ according to the recent measurement from Belle based on exclusive B decays and uses the PDG averages for the b - and c -quark masses. By fitting $\alpha_s(5\text{ GeV})$ to current world averages of the B^\pm and B^0 semi-leptonic decay widths, the analysis obtains $\alpha_s(5\text{ GeV}) = 0.225 \pm 0.012$, corresponding to a 5-flavor extrapolation of $\alpha_s(m_Z) = 0.121 \pm 0.003$. Taking into account future results from higher-order perturbative QCD calculations, heavy quark masses derived from lattice QCD, and measurements of $|V_{cb}|$ as well as B decay widths from upcoming B and Z factory data, this method could yield a determination of $\alpha_s(m_Z)$ with a competitive precision of $\Delta\alpha_s(m_Z) \sim 0.0018$. This precision is comparable to the current accuracy of $\alpha_s(m_Z)$ measurements from τ decays, which is regarded as the most precise approach.

Introduction— The strong interaction, one of the fundamental interactions in nature, is described by quantum chromodynamics (QCD). The strong coupling constant, $\alpha_s(\mu)$, characterizes the strength of this interaction and exhibits a decreasing trend with increasing energy scale μ . This running behavior is described by the renormalization group equation (RGE) [1], reflecting essential properties of the strong interaction, such as quark confinement at long distances and asymptotic freedom at short distances. Consequently, precise knowledge of $\alpha_s(\mu)$ across the entire range of energy scale is crucial for a comprehensive understanding and testing of QCD. α_s at low energy scale has been studied through various methodologies, including hadron production in electron-positron annihilation [2], semi-leptonic charmed meson [3] and τ decays [2, 4–9], and inclusive hadronic decay of heavy quarkonia [10, 11]. However, there are relatively few measurements of α_s in the energy scale range around 5 GeV.

We consider measuring α_s from the inclusive semi-leptonic B decay which corresponds to the energy scale of B meson masses. Figure 1 shows the Feynman diagram for the inclusive semi-leptonic B decay ($B \rightarrow X\ell\nu$) at the tree level in the parton model. This process con-

sists of two components: $B \rightarrow X_c\ell\nu$ and $B \rightarrow X_u\ell\nu$, where X_c represents the charmed system and X_u the light hadron system. The ratio of $B \rightarrow X_u\ell\nu$ is approximately 65 times less than the former due to Cabibbo suppression. Using the Heavy Quark Expansion (HQE) method, the branching ratio and the spectral moments of kinematic observables have been parameterized as functions of the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) matrix elements, $|V_{cb}|$ and $|V_{ub}|$, the strong coupling constant (α_s), b -quark mass (m_b), c -quark mass (m_c) and non-perturbative HQE parameters [12–21]. On the experimental side, these observables have been measured by the BaBar, Belle, and Belle II collaborations over the past two decades [22–25].

The $B \rightarrow X_c\ell\nu$ process was used to determine $|V_{cb}|$, m_b and m_c , with α_s fixed at the value extrapolated from the world average of $\alpha_s(m_Z)$ [19, 26–28]. Nowadays, more precise determinations of the $|V_{cb}|$, m_b and m_c are available, for example, $|V_{cb}|$ from exclusive B decays [29–33] or W decays [34, 35]; heavy quark masses from lattice QCD [36–40], b - and c -meson masses [41–44], or $e^+e^- \rightarrow$ hadrons cross-section [45–49], etc. Therefore, by fixing the values of $|V_{cb}|$, m_b and m_c according to those progresses, we could extract α_s using the semi-leptonic

B decay width at the scale around the B meson masses.




FIG. 1. The parton level Feynman diagram of semi-leptonic B decay.

Theoretical model— In the framework of HQE, the semi-leptonic B decay width is expressed as [13, 50],

$$\Gamma(B \rightarrow X_c \ell \bar{\nu}_\ell) = \Gamma_0 \left[C_0 - C_{\mu_\pi} \frac{\mu_\pi^2}{2m_b^2} + C_{\mu_G} \frac{\mu_G^2}{2m_b^2} + \dots \right], \quad (1)$$

where Γ_0 is defined as $\Gamma_0 \equiv \frac{G_F^2 |V_{cb}|^2 m_b^5 A_{\text{ew}}}{192\pi^3}$, $G_F = 1.16637886 \times 10^{-5} \text{ GeV}^{-2}$ is the Fermi coupling constant, and $A_{\text{ew}} = 1.014$ is the electroweak correction factor [52]. The coefficients C_i ($i = 0, \mu_\pi, \mu_G$) depend on the ratio of the squared c - and b -quark masses, $\rho = \frac{m_c^2}{m_b^2}$, and have perturbative expansions in α_s . μ_π^2 and μ_G^2 are the expectation values of the kinetic and chromomagnetic operators in HQE, respectively.

The sensitivity of $\Gamma(B \rightarrow X_c \ell \bar{\nu}_\ell)$ to α_s mainly arises from C_0 , which can be expanded as a series in α_s/π : $C_0 = \mathbf{c}_0 + \mathbf{c}_1 \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} + \mathbf{c}_2 \left(\frac{\alpha_s}{\pi}\right)^2 + \mathbf{c}_3 \left(\frac{\alpha_s}{\pi}\right)^3 + \mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^4)$, where the leading term $\mathbf{c}_0 = 1 - 8\rho + 8\rho^3 - \rho^4 - 12\rho^2 \ln \rho$ is the tree-level phase space factor [13]. The results for the second-order [15–17] and third-order [20, 28] perturbative corrections have been provided in the on-shell scheme. For better perturbative convergence, these perturbative QCD results are reformulated in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ scheme, at the renormalization scale $\mu = 5 \text{ GeV}$ the mass scale of the decaying B meson. For the related parameters, $|V_{cb}|$ is fixed at the measurement from Belle, $|V_{cb}| = (41.0 \pm 0.7) \times 10^{-3}$ [33], which is extracted from the $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^* \ell \bar{\nu}_\ell$ decays (with $\ell = e, \mu$) along with the lattice QCD calculation of the form factors, independent of the perturbative α_s . For the purpose of extracting $\alpha_s(5 \text{ GeV})$ in 5-flavor scheme, the perturbative correction C_0 is reformulated consistently in terms of the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -renormalized quark masses $\bar{m}_b(\mu)$, $\bar{m}_c(\mu)$ and $\alpha_s(\mu)$. The values for the arguments $\bar{m}_b(5 \text{ GeV})$ and $\bar{m}_c(5 \text{ GeV})$ (in 5-flavor scheme) are derived by solving the RGE system with the boundary conditions for $\bar{m}_b(\mu)$, $\bar{m}_c(\mu)$ and $\alpha_s(\mu)$ set as following: the PDG average values of $\bar{m}_c(\bar{m}_c) = 1.27 \pm 0.02 \text{ GeV}$ and $\bar{m}_b(\bar{m}_b) = 4.18_{-0.02}^{+0.03} \text{ GeV}$, and the sampled values of $\alpha_s(5 \text{ GeV})$ in the fit. In this way the perturbative correction to $\Gamma(B \rightarrow X_c \ell \bar{\nu}_\ell)$ up to $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^3)$ in the leading-power correction is eventually expressed as a numerical function

of $\alpha_s(5 \text{ GeV})$.




FIG. 2. The numerical function of $\Gamma(B \rightarrow X_c \ell \nu)$ versus $\alpha_s(5 \text{ GeV})$, compared with the $\Gamma(B^\pm \rightarrow X_c \ell \nu) = (4.34 \pm 0.16) \times 10^{-14} \text{ GeV}$ derived from Eq. (4). The numerical function is parameterized by a polynomial function in the $\alpha_s(5 \text{ GeV})$ range from 0.16 to 0.26.

The numerical calculations for the coefficients C_{μ_π} and C_{μ_G} have been provided in the kinetic scheme (Eq. (4.1) in [53]),

$$C_{\mu_\pi} = 2\mathbf{c}_0 \left(\frac{1}{2} - 0.99 \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} \right), C_{\mu_G} = -2\mathbf{c}_0 \left(1.94 + 3.46 \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} \right). \quad (2)$$

The non-perturbative parameters μ_π^2 and μ_G^2 , along with the b -quark mass in the kinetic scheme, have been measured through a simultaneous fit using the spectral moments of semi-leptonic B decays [28].

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_\pi^2 &= 0.477 \pm 0.056 \text{ GeV}^2, \\ \mu_G^2 &= 0.306 \pm 0.050 \text{ GeV}^2, \\ m_b^{\text{kin}} &= 4.573 \pm 0.012 \text{ GeV}. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

In the theoretical model of our fit, non-perturbative corrections are approximated using the subleading-power corrections in (2), which reduce the tree-level contribution by about 4%. Given the relatively small magnitude of these corrections, their sensitivity to the perturbative α_s is marginal. Consequently, the non-perturbative corrections are treated as a global offset that is independent of the perturbative α_s . The errors on the μ_π^2 , μ_G^2 and m_b^{kin} in (3) propagated through (2) to an uncertainty of about 0.5% on the theoretical prediction for $\Gamma(B \rightarrow X_c \ell \bar{\nu}_\ell)$. The truncation uncertainty in the non-perturbative corrections is estimated to be 0.2%, derived from the magnitude of the sub-leading perturbative contribution in (2).

Overall, this theoretical model constructs a numerical mapping from the assumed values of $\alpha_s(5 \text{ GeV})$ to

TABLE I. The parameters used during the construction of the theoretical model.

Parameter	Notation	Value & error	Note
Fermi coupling constant	G_F	$1.16637886 \times 10^{-5} \text{ GeV}^{-2}$	[51]
Electroweak correction factor	A_{ew}	1.014	[52]
CKM matrix element	$ V_{cb} $	0.0410 ± 0.0007	[33]
b -quark mass in $\overline{\text{MS}}$	$\overline{m}_b(\overline{m}_b)$	$4.18^{+0.03}_{-0.02} \text{ GeV}$	[51]
c -quark mass in $\overline{\text{MS}}$	$\overline{m}_c(\overline{m}_c)$	$1.27 \pm 0.02 \text{ GeV}$	[51]
HQE parameters	μ_π^2	$0.477 \pm 0.056 \text{ GeV}^2$	[28]
	μ_G^2	$0.306 \pm 0.050 \text{ GeV}^2$	[28]
b -quark mass in kinetic scheme	m_b^{kin}	$4.573 \pm 0.012 \text{ GeV}$	[28]

the decay width $\Gamma(B \rightarrow X_c \ell \nu)$, shown in Fig. 2. The parameters involved in this theoretical model are summarized in Table I. Within the range of $\alpha_s(5 \text{ GeV}) \in [0.16, 0.26]$, the numerical function can be effectively parameterized by the polynomial $\Gamma(B \rightarrow X_c \ell \nu) = (9.82 \times 10^{-15} \text{ GeV}) (-1 + 96.95 \alpha_s^{\text{fit}} - 985.85 (\alpha_s^{\text{fit}})^2 + 5391.32 (\alpha_s^{\text{fit}})^3 - 14681.7 (\alpha_s^{\text{fit}})^4 + 16909 (\alpha_s^{\text{fit}})^5)$ with $\alpha_s^{\text{fit}} \equiv \alpha_s(5 \text{ GeV})$.

Result and discussion— We fit the value of $\alpha_s(5 \text{ GeV})$ to the inclusive semi-leptonic decay widths of the B^\pm and B^0 mesons. The theoretical model includes the leading-power correction mentioned in Eq. (1), using input from Eqs. (2) and (3). The experimental decay width can be obtained from measured values for the lifetime and semi-leptonic decay branching ratio:

$$\Gamma_{sl} = \frac{\hbar}{\tau} \mathcal{B}_{sl}. \quad (4)$$

Substituting to world average values summarized by the Particle Data Group [51],

$$\tau_{B^\pm} = 1.638 \pm 0.004 \text{ ps}, \quad \mathcal{B}(B^\pm \rightarrow X_c \ell \nu) = 10.8 \pm 0.4\%,$$

$$\tau_{B^0} = 1.517 \pm 0.004 \text{ ps}, \quad \mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow X_c \ell \nu) = 10.1 \pm 0.4\%$$

into Eq. (4), we obtain $\Gamma(B^\pm) = (4.34 \pm 0.16) \times 10^{-14} \text{ GeV}$ and $\Gamma(B^0) = (4.38 \pm 0.17) \times 10^{-14} \text{ GeV}$. The minimum- χ^2 fit incorporates the experimental errors in the decay widths, as well as the theoretical uncertainties introduced by $|V_{cb}|$, $\overline{m}_b(\overline{m}_b)$, $\overline{m}_c(\overline{m}_c)$, the renormalization group scale, and high-order power corrections. These uncertainties are considered to be independent of each other.

The fit yields $\alpha_s(5 \text{ GeV}) = 0.224 \pm 0.017$ from $\Gamma(B^\pm \rightarrow X_c \ell \nu)$, and $\alpha_s(5 \text{ GeV}) = 0.226 \pm 0.017$ from $\Gamma(B^0 \rightarrow X_c \ell \nu)$. Combining the two fits gives:

$$\alpha_s(5 \text{ GeV}) = 0.225 \pm 0.012. \quad (5)$$

The combined results are shown and compared with other determinations in Fig. 3, showing a good consistency to the other α_s measurements.

The theoretical and experimental contributions of the α_s uncertainty are listed in Table II. The theoretical contribution arises from the $|V_{cb}|$, quark masses, and the




FIG. 3. (Top) The combined $\alpha_s(5 \text{ GeV})$ result (Eq. (5)) compared with the α_s measurements at other energy scales [2, 3, 8, 9, 11, 55–62]. (Bottom) The comparison of the $\alpha_s(m_Z)$ pre-averages from six experimental sources in PDG [51] and the extrapolation value of this work.

remnant dependence on the renormalization scale μ . The uncertainty in $|V_{cb}|$ propagates to Γ_{sl} via Γ_0 as follows:

$$\left. \frac{\sigma(\Gamma)}{\Gamma} \right|_{|V_{cb}|} = 2 \frac{\sigma(|V_{cb}|)}{|V_{cb}|}$$

contributing a relative uncertainty of 3.4%. The errors induced by the uncertainties on the input values of $\overline{m}_c(\overline{m}_c)$ and $\overline{m}_b(\overline{m}_b)$ are estimated by taking the largest deviations from varying their values within the respective error bounds. The results show that uncertainties in

TABLE II. The relative uncertainty contributions to the theoretical prediction of Γ_{sl} and the $\alpha_s(5 \text{ GeV})$ fitting result using $\Gamma(B^\pm \rightarrow X_c \ell \nu)$. Values in the parenthesis are the perspective values considering future improvements. The V_{cb} will be measured from W decays [34]. The uncertainty of the branching ratio will be reduced by a factor of about 0.05 considering the 50 ab^{-1} data to be collected by Belle II [54]. The accuracy of b - and c -quark masses has been achieved by lattice QCD calculation [51]. The R-scale μ uncertainty will be further controlled by higher-order perturbative calculations. See body text for more details.

	Γ_{sl} prediction [%]	$\alpha_s(5 \text{ GeV})$ [%]
$ V_{cb} = 0.0410 \pm 0.0007$	3.4 (1.4)	3.1 (1.3)
$\overline{m}_b(\overline{m}_b) = 4.18^{+0.03}_{-0.02} \text{ GeV}$	3.0 (1.1)	2.7 (1.0)
$\overline{m}_c(\overline{m}_c) = 1.27 \pm 0.02 \text{ GeV}$	2.1 (1.4)	1.8 (1.2)
R-scale $\mu = 5^{+5}_{-2.5} \text{ GeV}$	4.4 (2.2)	4.0 (2.0)
High-order power corrections	0.5	0.5
$\tau_{B^\pm} = 1.638 \pm 0.004 \text{ ps}$	-	0.2
$\mathcal{B}(B^\pm \rightarrow X_c \ell \nu) = 10.8 \pm 0.4 \%$	-	2.4 (1.8)
Sum	6.7(3.2)	6.5 (3.4)

$\overline{m}_c(\overline{m}_c)$ and $\overline{m}_b(\overline{m}_b)$ contribute about 2% and 3% relative uncertainty to the Γ_{sl} prediction, respectively. The uncertainty due to the remnant renormalization scale dependence (R-scale uncertainty) is estimated by varying μ from 2.5 GeV to 10 GeV. It leads to about -2% to -4.4% variations in the perturbative corrections relative to the result at $\mu = 5 \text{ GeV}$. The larger variation is taken as the estimation of the uncertainty. The uncertainties on the μ_π^2 , μ_G^2 and m_b^{kin} and the $\mathcal{O}(\frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} \Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2/m_b^2)$ contributions are considered as a part of theoretical uncertainty, corresponding to a 0.5% uncertainty in the total width. All the mentioned theoretical uncertainty terms propagate to $\alpha_s(5 \text{ GeV})$ through the fit, as shown in Table II, taking the fit with $\Gamma(B^\pm \rightarrow X_c \ell \nu)$ as an example. Additionally, the experimental uncertainty of the branching ratio and life-time also contributes to $\alpha_s(5 \text{ GeV})$ uncertainty, and are included in Table II.

As shown in the bottom plot of Fig. 3, the equivalent $\alpha_s(m_Z)$ from this study exhibits accuracy comparable to the PDG pre-averages from other α_s determination fields. In addition, this measurement will be improved by future theoretical calculations as well as the determinations of the other parameters. Currently, the primary source of the uncertainty arises from the RG-scale uncertainty, which will be refined by future perturbative calculations. Based on the observed reduction in the conventional perturbative QCD scale uncertainty from $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^2)$ to $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^3)$ for $b \rightarrow c \ell \nu$ and $b \rightarrow u \ell \nu$, it is plausible to anticipate that the knowledge of the next order result may halve this perturbative uncertainty. The recent lattice QCD results have determined the quark mass with uncertainties around the 10 MeV level and further improvements are anticipated. The $|V_{cb}|$ measurements from W boson decays are expected to achieve the accuracy of $\sim 0.7\%$ on the future electron-positron collider [34, 35]. The current measurements of the semi-leptonic B decay branching ratios are derived from the 140 fb^{-1} of data collected by Belle [24], with statistical and systematic uncertainties being comparable. Among

these, the statistical term will decrease by a factor of approximately 20 when the data set increases to 50 ab^{-1} on the Belle II [54]. Assuming the systematic uncertainty remains at the same level, the experimental uncertainty of B decay width will be $\sim 0.3\%$. All these improvements are scaled to the perspective uncertainties on the Γ_{sl} and $\alpha_s(5 \text{ GeV})$, and marked in parenthesis in Table II. Taking into account those advancements, the $\alpha_s(m_Z)$ determination could eventually reach ~ 0.0018 , halving the precision conducted by this research. This precision is comparable to the current precision of α_s measurement from τ decays, which is considered one of the most precise approaches.

Summary and discussion— We present a new methodology to determine $\alpha_s(5 \text{ GeV})$ from the inclusive semi-leptonic B decay width. The theory model is based on the framework of HQE and uses the $|V_{cb}|$, $\overline{m}_b(\overline{m}_b)$, $\overline{m}_c(\overline{m}_c)$ as parameters. The involved parameters are fixed at the external determinations listed in Table I. We fit $\alpha_s(5 \text{ GeV})$ to match the world average semi-leptonic decay widths of B^\pm and B^0 mesons, yielding

$$\alpha_s(5 \text{ GeV}) = 0.225 \pm 0.012$$

Evolving this result to the scale of m_Z , we get:

$$\alpha_s(m_Z) = 0.121 \pm 0.003$$

which is consistent with its world average value.

The uncertainty is estimated to be comparable to the averages of $\alpha_s(m_Z)$ from other experimental methods. The main sources of the uncertainty are estimated in Table II. With further improvements in perturbation calculations and the measurement accuracy of related parameters, the uncertainty of this method could be halved.

It should be noted that as a fundamental parameter, α_s influences QCD predictions through multiple parameters and calculations. A challenge in α_s determination is that theoretical models correlate with prior α_s assumptions. To address this challenge, we use the measurement of $|V_{cb}|$ from exclusive B decays, which is, in prin-

ciple, independent of the perturbative α_s . We also include the α_s dependency of the scheme transformation and the scale evolution of the quark masses in the α_s fitting. However, the values of $\bar{m}_b(\bar{m}_b)$ and $\bar{m}_c(\bar{m}_c)$ used in our present analysis are taken from the PDG averages, which, in principle, depend on the assumptions of the perturbative α_s . To further mitigate this implicit correlation, one potential future avenue is to reformulate the perturbative corrections using the renormalized quark masses defined in the regularization-independent momentum-subtraction schemes [63–67], which can be directly extracted from lattice calculations independently of the perturbative α_s . Alternatively, it is also worth considering a future global fitting of α_s , m_b , and m_c using a broader range of observables, such as spectral moments of semi-leptonic B decays and the masses of B mesons.

Acknowledgments— The authors would like to thank Yuming Wang and Lu Cao for the fruitful discussion on the topic of HQE. This study was supported by the National Key R&D Program of China (Grant NO.: 2022YFE0116900), the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grants No. 12342502, No. 12325503, No. 12321005, No. 12235008, No. 12205171, No. 12042507), Natural Science Foundation of Shandong province under contract 2024HWYQ-005, tsqn202312052. the United States Department of Energy, Contract DE-AC02-76SF00515, and the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNF) under contract 200020_219367.

* ruanmq@ihep.ac.cn

- [1] G. M. Prospero, M. Raciti, and C. Simolo, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **58**, 387 (2007).
- [2] D. Boito, M. Golterman, A. Keshavarzi, K. Maltman, D. Nomura, S. Peris, and T. Teubner, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 074030 (2018).
- [3] J. Wu, X. Lou, Y. Che, G. Li, Y. Huang, M. RUAN, and J. Ye, *Chinese Physics C* (2024).
- [4] E. Braaten, S. Narison, and A. Pich, *Nucl. Phys. B* **373**, 581 (1992).
- [5] CLEO, *Physics Letters B* **356**, 580 (1995).
- [6] OPAL, *The European Physical Journal C* **7**, 571 (1999), [arxiv:hep-ex/9808019](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ex/9808019).
- [7] M. Davier, A. Höcker, B. Malaescu, C.-Z. Yuan, and Z. Zhang, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **74**, 2803 (2014).
- [8] D. Boito, M. Golterman, K. Maltman, S. Peris, M. V. Rodrigues, and W. Schaaf, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 034028 (2021), [arXiv:2012.10440](https://arxiv.org/abs/2012.10440) [hep-ph].
- [9] P. A. Baikov, K. G. Chetyrkin, and J. H. Kuhn, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 012002 (2008), [arXiv:0801.1821](https://arxiv.org/abs/0801.1821) [hep-ph].
- [10] J.-M. Shen, B.-H. Qin, J. Yan, *et al.*, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2023**, 109 (2023).
- [11] S. Narison, in *21st High-Energy Physics International Conference in Quantum Chromodynamics* (2018) [arXiv:1812.09360](https://arxiv.org/abs/1812.09360) [hep-ph].
- [12] P. Gambino and N. Uraltsev, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **34**, 181 (2004), [arXiv:hep-ph/0401063](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0401063).
- [13] D. Benson, I. Bigi, T. Mannel, and N. Uraltsev, *Nuclear Physics B* **665**, 367 (2003).
- [14] M. Dowling, J. H. Piclum, and A. Czarnecki, *Physical Review D* **78**, 074024 (2008).
- [15] A. Pak and A. Czarnecki, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 241807 (2008), [arXiv:0803.0960](https://arxiv.org/abs/0803.0960) [hep-ph].
- [16] A. Pak and A. Czarnecki, *Phys. Rev. D* **78**, 114015 (2008), [arXiv:0808.3509](https://arxiv.org/abs/0808.3509) [hep-ph].
- [17] K. Melnikov, *Phys. Lett. B* **666**, 336 (2008), [arXiv:0803.0951](https://arxiv.org/abs/0803.0951) [hep-ph].
- [18] P. Gambino, *JHEP* **09**, 055 (2011), [arXiv:1107.3100](https://arxiv.org/abs/1107.3100) [hep-ph].
- [19] M. Fael, T. Mannel, and K. K. Vos, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2019**, 177 (2019).
- [20] M. Fael, K. Schönwald, and M. Steinhauser, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 016003 (2021).
- [21] M. Fael and F. Herren, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2024**, 287 (2024).
- [22] T. Brandt and r. t. B. collaboration (BarBar), *AIP Conference Proceedings* **618**, 103 (2002).
- [23] B. Aubert *et al.* (BaBar), *Phys. Rev. D* **81**, 032003 (2010), [arXiv:0908.0415](https://arxiv.org/abs/0908.0415) [hep-ex].
- [24] Belle Collaboration, *Physical Review D* **75**, 032001 (2007).
- [25] “Measurement of the inclusive semileptonic B meson branching fraction in 62.8 fb⁻¹ of Belle II data,” <https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.09405v2> (2021).
- [26] P. Gambino and C. Schwanda, *Phys. Rev. D* **89**, 014022 (2014), [arXiv:1307.4551](https://arxiv.org/abs/1307.4551) [hep-ph].
- [27] P. Gambino, *International Journal of Modern Physics A* (2015), [10.1142/S0217751X15430022](https://arxiv.org/abs/10.1142/S0217751X15430022).
- [28] M. Bordone, B. Capdevila, and P. Gambino, *Physics Letters B* **822**, 136679 (2021).
- [29] B. Grinstein and A. Kobach, *Phys. Lett. B* **771**, 359 (2017), [arXiv:1703.08170](https://arxiv.org/abs/1703.08170) [hep-ph].
- [30] A. Bazavov *et al.* (Fermilab Lattice, MILC, Fermilab Lattice, MILC), *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82**, 1141 (2022), [Erratum: *Eur.Phys.J.C* 83, 21 (2023)], [arXiv:2105.14019](https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.14019) [hep-lat].
- [31] J. Gao, T. Huber, Y. Ji, C. Wang, Y.-M. Wang, and Y.-B. Wei, *JHEP* **05**, 024 (2022), [arXiv:2112.12674](https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.12674) [hep-ph].
- [32] B.-Y. Cui, Y.-K. Huang, Y.-M. Wang, and X.-C. Zhao, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, L071504 (2023), [arXiv:2301.12391](https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.12391) [hep-ph].
- [33] M. T. Prim, F. Bernlochner, *et al.* (Belle), “Measurement of Angular Coefficients of $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^* \ell \bar{\nu}_\ell$: Implications for $|V_{cb}|$ and Tests of Lepton Flavor Universality,” (2023), [arXiv:2310.20286](https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.20286) [hep-ex, physics:hep-ph].
- [34] H. Liang, L. Li, Y. Zhu, X. Shen, and M. Ruan, “Measurement of CKM Element $|V_{cb}|$ from W Boson Decays at the Future Higgs Factories,” (2024), [arXiv:2406.01675](https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.01675) [hep-ex, physics:hep-ph].
- [35] Aidan Richard Wiederhold, *Flavour and tau physics at FCC-ee*, Tech. Rep. (FCC Phys. & Exp. & Dets Flavour group, Prague, 2024).
- [36] D. Hatton, C. T. H. Davies, J. Koponen, G. P. Lepage, and A. T. Lytle, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 114508 (2021).
- [37] A. Bazavov *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 054517 (2018).
- [38] C. Alexandrou *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 074515 (2021).
- [39] D. Hatton, C. T. H. Davies, B. Galloway, J. Koponen, G. P. Lepage, and A. T. Lytle, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 054511 (2020).
- [40] J. Heitger, F. Joswig, and S. Kuberski, *JHEP* **05**, 288

- (2021).
- [41] Y. Kiyo, G. Mishima, and Y. Sumino, *Phys. Lett. B* **752**, 122 (2016), [Erratum: *Phys.Lett.B* 772, 878–878 (2017)], [arXiv:1510.07072 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [42] C. Ayala, G. Cvetič, and A. Pineda, *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **762**, 012063 (2016), [arXiv:1606.01741 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [43] S. Narison, *Phys. Lett. B* **802**, 135221 (2020).
- [44] C. Peset, A. Pineda, and J. Segovia, *JHEP* **09**, 167 (2018).
- [45] A. H. Hoang, *Phys. Rev. D* **61**, 034005 (2000), [arXiv:hep-ph/9905550](#).
- [46] K. Melnikov and A. Yelkhovsky, *Phys. Rev. D* **59**, 114009 (1999), [arXiv:hep-ph/9805270](#).
- [47] M. Beneke and A. Signer, *Phys. Lett. B* **471**, 233 (1999), [arXiv:hep-ph/9906475](#).
- [48] B. Dehnadi, A. H. Hoang, V. Mateu, and S. M. Zebarjad, *JHEP* **09**, 103 (2013), [arXiv:1102.2264 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [49] K. G. Chetyrkin, J. H. Kuhn, A. Maier, P. Maierhofer, P. Marquard, M. Steinhauser, and C. Sturm, *Nucl. Phys. B* (2017), 10.1103/PhysRevD.96.116007, [Addendum: *Phys.Rev.D* 96, 116007 (2017)], [arXiv:1710.04249 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [50] T. Mannel, D. Moreno, and A. A. Pivovarov, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 054033 (2022), [arXiv:2112.03875 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [51] R. L. Workman *et al.* (Particle Data Group), *PTEP* **2022**, 083C01 (2022).
- [52] A. Sirlin, *Nucl. Phys. B* **196**, 83 (1982).
- [53] A. Alberti, P. Gambino, and S. Nandi, *JHEP* **01**, 147 (2014), [arXiv:1311.7381 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [54] W. Altmannshofer *et al.* (Belle-II), *PTEP* **2019**, 123C01 (2019), [Erratum: *PTEP* 2020, 029201 (2020)], [arXiv:1808.10567 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [55] V. Khachatryan *et al.* (CMS), *JHEP* **03**, 156 (2017), [arXiv:1609.05331 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [56] V. M. Abazov *et al.* (D0), *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 111107 (2009), [arXiv:0911.2710 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [57] V. M. Abazov *et al.* (D0), *Phys. Lett. B* **718**, 56 (2012), [arXiv:1207.4957 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [58] M. Aaboud *et al.* (ATLAS), *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77**, 872 (2017), [arXiv:1707.02562 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [59] V. Khachatryan *et al.* (CMS), *Eur. Phys. J. C* **75**, 186 (2015), [arXiv:1412.1633 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [60] J. Schieck, S. Bethke, S. Kluth, C. Pahl, and Z. Trocsanyi (JADE), *Eur. Phys. J. C* **73**, 2332 (2013), [arXiv:1205.3714 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [61] G. Dissertori, A. Gehrmann-De Ridder, T. Gehrmann, E. W. N. Glover, G. Heinrich, G. Luisoni, and H. Stenzel, *JHEP* **08**, 036 (2009), [arXiv:0906.3436 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [62] S. Bethke, S. Kluth, C. Pahl, and J. Schieck (JADE), *Eur. Phys. J. C* **64**, 351 (2009), [arXiv:0810.1389 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [63] G. Martinelli, C. Pittori, C. T. Sachrajda, M. Testa, and A. Vladikas, *Nucl. Phys. B* **445**, 81 (1995), [arXiv:hep-lat/9411010](#).
- [64] C. Sturm, Y. Aoki, N. H. Christ, T. Izubuchi, C. T. C. Sachrajda, and A. Soni, *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 014501 (2009), [arXiv:0901.2599 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [65] P. Boyle, L. Del Debbio, and A. Khamseh, *Phys. Rev. D* **95**, 054505 (2017), [arXiv:1611.06908 \[hep-lat\]](#).
- [66] A. T. Lytle, C. T. H. Davies, D. Hatton, G. P. Lepage, and C. Sturm (HPQCD), *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 014513 (2018), [arXiv:1805.06225 \[hep-lat\]](#).
- [67] L. Del Debbio, F. Erben, J. M. Flynn, R. Mukherjee, and J. T. Tsang (RBC, UKQCD), *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 054512 (2024), [arXiv:2407.18700 \[hep-lat\]](#).