

HQET sum rules for matrix elements of dimension-six four-quark operators for meson lifetimes within and beyond the Standard Model

Matthew Black^{a,b} Martin Lang^a Alexander Lenz^a Zachary Wüthrich^a

^a*Theoretische Teilchenphysik, Center for Particle Physics Siegen, Physik Department, Universität Siegen, Walter-Flex-Strasse 3, 57072 Siegen, Germany*

^b*School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH9 3JZ, UK*

E-mail: matthew.black@ed.ac.uk, martin.lang@uni-siegen.de,
alexander.lenz@uni-siegen.de, zachary.wuethrich@uni-siegen.de

ABSTRACT: Theory predictions of heavy-hadron lifetime ratios critically depend on precise determinations of the dimension-six spectator effects arising from the double insertion of the weak effective $|\Delta B| = 1$ Hamiltonian. In the presence of beyond-standard-model (BSM) operators, the resulting $\Delta B = 0$ Hamiltonian features additional four-quark operators whose matrix elements need to be determined using non-perturbative methods. We present for the first time results for the non-perturbative hadronic matrix elements of the four-quark operators relevant for the description of the meson lifetime ratio $\tau(B^+)/\tau(B_d)$, obtained using heavy-quark effective theory (HQET) sum rules with the full BSM effective Hamiltonian. In addition, we recompute and update the bag parameters for the Standard Model operators.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	$\Delta B = 0$ effective four-fermion operators	4
2.1	Physical operators in QCD	5
2.2	Lifetime ratios	5
2.3	Physical operators and lifetime ratio in HQET	7
2.4	Evanescent operators	8
3	The sum rule	9
4	Details of the perturbative calculation	10
5	Details of the condensate calculation	12
6	Results	13
6.1	Perturbative contribution	13
6.2	Condensate contribution	14
6.3	Bag parameters	15
6.4	HQET–QCD matching for the Standard Model operators	18
7	Conclusion	20
A	Evanescent operators and anomalous dimension matrix in QCD	22
B	Note on the Double Discontinuity	23
C	Master Integrals	24
D	Anomalous dimension matrices for the HQET operators	24
E	Calculation of the mixed quark-gluon condensate contribution	26

1 Introduction

The Standard Model of particle physics (SM) is an extremely successful theory of the microscopic world, but it leaves some fundamental questions unanswered, such as the origin of the matter-antimatter asymmetry in the Universe or the nature of dark matter. A promising route for identifying effects beyond the SM (BSM) are so-called indirect searches, where precision measurements for observables are compared with corresponding precise theory predictions.

In this work we will determine mandatory theory input for using lifetimes of heavy hadrons for indirect BSM searches.

The lifetimes of the ground-state B mesons with one heavy quark have been determined experimentally with a high precision and HFLAV [1] quotes

$$\begin{aligned}\tau(B_d) &= (1.517 \pm 0.004) \text{ ps}^{-1}; \\ \tau(B^+) &= (1.638 \pm 0.004) \text{ ps}^{-1}; \quad \frac{\tau(B^+)}{\tau(B_d)} = 1.076 \pm 0.004; \\ \tau(B_s) &= (1.516 \pm 0.006) \text{ ps}^{-1}; \quad \frac{\tau(B_s)}{\tau(B_d)} = 1.0017 \pm 0.0034.\end{aligned}\tag{1.1}$$

Lifetimes and lifetime ratios can be determined theoretically with the heavy-quark expansion (HQE)¹. The HQE provides a systematic framework to express total decay rates of hadrons containing heavy (anti-)quarks Q through a series of terms of increasing mass suppression as²

$$\Gamma(B_q) = \Gamma_3 + \Gamma_5 \frac{\langle \mathcal{O}_5 \rangle}{m_b^2} + \Gamma_6 \frac{\langle \mathcal{O}_6 \rangle}{m_b^3} + \dots + 16\pi^2 \left(\tilde{\Gamma}_6 \frac{\langle \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_6 \rangle}{m_b^3} + \tilde{\Gamma}_7 \frac{\langle \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_7 \rangle}{m_b^4} + \dots \right),\tag{1.2}$$

with perturbatively-calculable short-distance coefficients

$$\Gamma_i = \Gamma_i^{(0)} + \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} \Gamma_i^{(1)} + \left(\frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} \right)^2 \Gamma_i^{(2)} + \dots,\tag{1.3}$$

and non-perturbative matrix elements $\langle \mathcal{O}_i \rangle \equiv \langle \mathcal{O}_i \rangle_{B_q} \equiv \langle B_q | \mathcal{O}_i | B_q \rangle / (2M_{B_q})$ of operators \mathcal{O}_i with mass-dimension i and no change of the b quantum number, i.e. $\Delta B = 0$, and M_{B_q} denoting the meson mass. The leading term in the HQE, Γ_3 , describes the free b -quark decay and is free of non-perturbative effects. First power-suppressed corrections, \mathcal{O}_5 , arise due to the kinetic and chromo-magnetic operators at order $1/m_b^2$. Operators with mass-dimension six can originate from either two-quark operators, e.g. the Darwin operator, denoted by \mathcal{O}_6 , or from four-quark operators, denoted by $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_6$. The latter contributions originate from loop-enhanced diagrams, indicated by the explicit factor of $16\pi^2$ in eq. (1.2). When considering lifetime ratios, the universal free b -quark decay cancels exactly and in the case of $\tau(B^+)/\tau(B_d)$ also all two-quark contributions cancel due to isospin symmetry of the matrix elements $\langle \mathcal{O}_i \rangle$, while in the case of $\tau(B_s)/\tau(B_d)$ two-quark contributions survive

¹See Refs. [2–11] for some early HQE references, Ref. [12] for a review of the historic development and Ref. [13] for a review of the state of the art.

²In this work we are concerned with the lifetimes of the heavy-light b -flavoured mesons B_q , $q = u, d, s$, and will discuss the HQE with these mesons in mind.

as $SU(3)_F$ breaking corrections,

$$\frac{\tau(B^+)}{\tau(B_d)} = 1 + \tau(B^+) \left\{ \begin{array}{c} 0 \end{array} \right. \quad (1.4)$$

$$+ 16\pi^2 \left[\left(\tilde{\Gamma}_6 \frac{\langle \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_6 \rangle}{m_b^3} + \tilde{\Gamma}_7 \frac{\langle \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_7 \rangle}{m_b^4} + \dots \right)_{B_d} - \left(\tilde{\Gamma}_6 \frac{\langle \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_6 \rangle}{m_b^3} + \tilde{\Gamma}_7 \frac{\langle \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_7 \rangle}{m_b^4} + \dots \right)_{B^+} \right] \Bigg\},$$

$$\frac{\tau(B_s)}{\tau(B_d)} = 1 + \tau(B_s) \left\{ \Gamma_5 \frac{\langle \mathcal{O}_5 \rangle_{B_d} - \langle \mathcal{O}_5 \rangle_{B_s}}{m_b^2} + \Gamma_6 \frac{\langle \mathcal{O}_6 \rangle_{B_d} - \langle \mathcal{O}_6 \rangle_{B_s}}{m_b^3} + \dots \right. \quad (1.5)$$

$$\left. + 16\pi^2 \left[\left(\tilde{\Gamma}_6 \frac{\langle \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_6 \rangle}{m_b^3} + \tilde{\Gamma}_7 \frac{\langle \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_7 \rangle}{m_b^4} + \dots \right)_{B_d} - \left(\tilde{\Gamma}_6 \frac{\langle \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_6 \rangle}{m_b^3} + \tilde{\Gamma}_7 \frac{\langle \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_7 \rangle}{m_b^4} + \dots \right)_{B_s} \right] \right\}.$$

Hence lifetime ratios are particularly sensitive to the contributions of four-quark operators $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_i$. The Wilson coefficients of the dimension-six four-quark operators have been determined with the full charm-quark mass dependence in leading-order (LO) QCD, i.e. $\tilde{\Gamma}_6^{(0)}$, in 1996 in Refs. [14, 15] and in next-to-leading-order (NLO) QCD i.e. $\tilde{\Gamma}_6^{(1)}$, in 2002 in Refs. [16, 17]. There were some exploratory studies of the matrix elements of corresponding four-quark operators $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_6$ within the framework of lattice QCD more than 20 years ago [18–20] and estimates within the framework of QCD sum rules [21, 22] for the subdominant contributions of condensates to the lifetime matrix elements [23, 24]. The leading sum rule contribution to $\langle \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_6 \rangle$ arises as a perturbative three-loop contribution and these corrections were only available after the determination of the corresponding master integrals within the heavy-quark effective theory (HQET) in Ref. [25]. Three-loop HQET sum rules were subsequently used to determine the four-quark matrix elements for B_d mixing [26–28], B_s mixing [29, 30], D mixing [27, 28], B_d and B^+ , as well as D^0 and D^+ lifetimes [27, 28] and B_s and D_s^+ lifetimes [30, 31]. Recently two new different lattice studies have been ongoing for these quantities: Ref. [32] describes preliminary work towards the lifetime-difference operators for heavy mesons and baryons using position-space renormalisation in HQET, whereas Refs. [33–35] report progress towards determining both the lifetime-difference and the absolute-lifetime operators for heavy mesons using gradient flow [36–38] to renormalise the operators in full QCD.

The Wilson coefficient of the dimension-seven four-quark operators has been determined in LO QCD, i.e. $\tilde{\Gamma}_7^{(0)}$, in 1996 in Ref. [39], while the corresponding matrix elements have so far only been estimated in the vacuum insertion approximation (VIA).

The current status of HQE predictions of the lifetime ratios within the SM [13, 40],

$$\frac{\tau(B^+)}{\tau(B_d)} = 1.086 \pm 0.022, \quad \frac{\tau(B_s)}{\tau(B_d)} = 1.003 \pm 0.006, \quad (1.6)$$

is in excellent agreement with the experimental measurements. Theory predictions for the total decay rates are typically not quoted (see Refs. [13, 40] for exceptions) due to large uncertainties originating from the m_b^5 dependence of Γ_3 . This will change, see Ref. [41], due to the recently-calculated next-to-next-to-leading order (NNLO) QCD corrections, $\Gamma_3^{(2)}$, for

the non-leptonic decay channels [42] and the NLO QCD corrections to the chromomagnetic operator for the $b \rightarrow c\bar{u}d$ transition [43].

BSM contributions to lifetime ratios arise either due to light new physics, see e.g. Ref. [44], or due to a modification of the effective $|\Delta B| = 1$ Hamiltonian, describing e.g. non-leptonic tree-level decays. The potential size of hypothetical BSM effects in non-leptonic tree-level decays was studied e.g. in Refs. [45–49]. Such effects could lead to a sizeable enhancement of the decay rate difference of neutral B_d mesons [45], $\Delta\Gamma_d$, which is not yet measured. It could further lead to substantial deviations in the experimental extraction of the CKM angle γ [46] and could be the origin of the B anomalies [47, 49] – an ultraviolet (UV) completion of such a scenario was worked out in Ref. [50]. Recently this idea received some further interest due to the observation that for hadronic tree-level decays like $B_s \rightarrow D_s^- \pi^+$, the expectations from QCD factorisation [51] differ significantly from experiment [52]; see Ref. [53] for an earlier observation of this discrepancy. Such a deviation could originate in underestimated corrections to QCD factorisation (see Refs. [54–56]) or in genuine BSM effects; see e.g. Refs. [57–64].

In order to study in a model-independent way potential BSM contributions to non-leptonic decays, the usual effective $|\Delta B| = 1$ Hamiltonian (see e.g. the review [65]) can be extended to 20 BSM operators; see e.g. Refs. [47, 49, 57]. With this new set of operators, the contributions to mixing and lifetimes ratios have been determined in LO QCD, i.e. $\tilde{\Gamma}_6^{(0),\text{BSM}}$, for the decay $b \rightarrow c\bar{c}s$ [47, 49] and the decay $b \rightarrow c\bar{u}d$ [66].³ For the case of lifetimes this leads also to new $\Delta B = 0$ four-quark operators, whose matrix elements will be determined for the first time in this work with HQET sum rules. In that respect we also recalculated the matrix elements for the SM case and found a typo in the original work [27, 31]. Updated expressions and numerical values will be given in this work.

The remainder of this paper is organised as follows. In section 2 we introduce the effective operators of the general $\Delta B = 0$ Hamiltonian within HQET, before setting up the sum rule for the object of interest in section 3. Section 4 is dedicated to a discussion of some aspects of the perturbative calculation, section 5 contains some details about the calculation of the condensate contributions, and then results are presented in section 6. Finally, we conclude in section 7.

2 $\Delta B = 0$ effective four-fermion operators

Generic effects of BSM particles interacting at some high-energy UV scale will affect low-energy observables through effective operators once they have been integrated out. The resulting effective $|\Delta B| = 1$ Hamiltonian (see e.g. Refs. [49, 57, 65, 66, 68])

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}}^{|\Delta B|=1} = \frac{4G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{q_1 b}^* V_{q_2 q_3} \sum_i C_i^{(\prime)} \mathcal{Q}_i^{(\prime)} \quad (2.1)$$

is parameterised in terms of the operators $\mathcal{Q}_i^{(\prime)}$ and the Wilson coefficients $C_i^{(\prime)}$ which we leave unspecified in absence of a specific model under consideration. Using the optical

³Currently the determination of $\Gamma_3^{(0),\text{BSM}}$, $\Gamma_5^{(0),\text{BSM}}$ and $\Gamma_6^{(0),\text{BSM}}$ for these new $|\Delta B| = 1$ operators is in progress [67]. Expressions for $\Gamma_3^{(0),\text{BSM}}$ for the $b \rightarrow c\bar{u}d$ channel have been presented in Ref. [64].

theorem, the total decay width of a meson B_q containing a heavy bottom quark and a light quark q is given by

$$\Gamma(B_q) = \frac{1}{2M_{B_q}} \text{Im} \left[\left\langle B_q \left| i \int d^4x \mathbf{T} \left\{ \mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}}^{|\Delta B|=1}(x) \mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}}^{|\Delta B|=1}(0) \right\} \right| B_q \right\rangle \right], \quad (2.2)$$

where \mathbf{T} denotes the time-ordering symbol and M_{B_q} is the mass of the unstable meson. The subsequent operator-product expansion (OPE), known as the HQE, gives rise at the scale $\mu \sim m_b$ to a series of operators as laid out in [section 1](#), among which four-quark $\Delta B = 0$ operators $\bar{b}\Gamma q \bar{q}\Gamma' b$ appear, suppressed by $(\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}/m_b)^3$ with respect to the leading term of the HQE [[12](#)]. The Wilson coefficients of these operators are sensitive to the flavour of the light quark q and these contributions are therefore referred to as *spectator effects*. These play a dominant role in the description of lifetime ratios of different bottom hadrons. In the following we set up the basis of operators considered in this paper.

2.1 Physical operators in QCD

A double insertion of the most general BSM $|\Delta B| = 1$ Hamiltonian induces at mass-dimension six a set of 20 physical $\Delta B = 0$ operators in QCD — denoted generically by $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_6$ in [eq. \(1.2\)](#). These are

$$\begin{aligned} Q_1^q &\equiv Q_1^q \equiv \bar{b}\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)q\bar{q}\gamma^\mu(1-\gamma_5)b, \\ Q_2^q &\equiv Q_2^q \equiv \bar{b}(1-\gamma_5)q\bar{q}(1+\gamma_5)b, \\ Q_3^q &\equiv T_1^q \equiv \bar{b}\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)T^a q\bar{q}\gamma^\mu(1-\gamma_5)T^a b, \\ Q_4^q &\equiv T_2^q \equiv \bar{b}(1-\gamma_5)T^a q\bar{q}(1+\gamma_5)T^a b, \\ Q_5^q &\equiv Q_3 \equiv \bar{b}\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)q\bar{q}\gamma^\mu(1+\gamma_5)b, \\ Q_6^q &\equiv Q_4 \equiv \bar{b}(1-\gamma_5)q\bar{q}(1-\gamma_5)b, \\ Q_7^q &\equiv T_3 \equiv \bar{b}\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)T^a q\bar{q}\gamma^\mu(1+\gamma_5)T^a b, \\ Q_8^q &\equiv T_4 \equiv \bar{b}(1-\gamma_5)T^a q\bar{q}(1-\gamma_5)T^a b, \\ Q_9^q &\equiv Q_5 \equiv \bar{b}\sigma_{\mu\nu}(1-\gamma_5)q\bar{q}\sigma^{\mu\nu}(1-\gamma_5)b, \\ Q_{10}^q &\equiv T_5 \equiv \bar{b}\sigma_{\mu\nu}(1-\gamma_5)T^a q\bar{q}\sigma^{\mu\nu}(1-\gamma_5)T^a b, \\ O_i^{\prime q} &\equiv O_i^q|_{1\mp\gamma_5\rightarrow 1\pm\gamma_5}, \quad i = 1, \dots, 10. \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

The operator labels Q and T have been used historically for the colour-singlet and colour-octet operators, and we use them or O interchangeably in order to make equations as compact as possible. In the SM only the four operators $\{Q_1^q, Q_2^q, T_1^q, T_2^q\}$ arise.

2.2 Lifetime ratios

Within this paper our focus will be the lifetime ratio $\tau(B^+)/\tau(B_d) = \Gamma(B_d)/\Gamma(B^+)$, where the expression of [eq. \(1.4\)](#) can be further specified in order to explicitly distinguish the contributions of different spectator quarks q as

$$\frac{\Gamma(B_d)}{\Gamma(B^+)} = 1 + \tau(B^+) \frac{16\pi^2}{m_b^3} \sum_{q=u,d,s,c} \sum_i \tilde{\Gamma}_{6,i}^q \left(\frac{\langle O_i^q \rangle_{B_d}}{2M_{B_d}} - \frac{\langle O_i^q \rangle_{B^+}}{2M_{B^+}} \right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{m_b^4}\right), \quad (2.4)$$

with a slightly modified notation for the matrix elements of the four-quark operators

$$\overline{\langle O_i^{q'} \rangle}_{B_q} \equiv \langle B_q | O_i^{q'} | B_q \rangle. \quad (2.5)$$

The different Dirac and colour structures are denoted by the index i . As expressed in eq. (1.4), contributions of two-quark operators (mass-dimensions three, five, six, ...) cancel to an excellent precision due to isospin symmetry in the difference of total decay rates. The coefficients $\tilde{\Gamma}_6^q$ denote all short-distance contributions at mass-dimension six obtained from a double insertion of the $|\Delta B| = 1$ Hamiltonian into the spectator-type diagrams.

Using the isospin relations

$$\frac{\overline{\langle O_i^s \rangle}_{B_d}}{2M_{B_d}} = \frac{\overline{\langle O_i^s \rangle}_{B^+}}{2M_{B^+}}, \quad \frac{\overline{\langle O_i^c \rangle}_{B_d}}{2M_{B_d}} = \frac{\overline{\langle O_i^c \rangle}_{B^+}}{2M_{B^+}}, \quad (2.6)$$

and

$$\frac{\overline{\langle O_i^u \rangle}_{B_d}}{2M_{B_d}} = \frac{\overline{\langle O_i^d \rangle}_{B^+}}{2M_{B^+}}, \quad \frac{\overline{\langle O_i^d \rangle}_{B_d}}{2M_{B_d}} = \frac{\overline{\langle O_i^u \rangle}_{B^+}}{2M_{B^+}}, \quad (2.7)$$

we find that the contributions due to strange and charm spectator quarks as well as all contributions due to eye-contractions cancel exactly. We are left with

$$\frac{\Gamma(B_d)}{\Gamma(B^+)} = 1 + \tau(B^+) \frac{16\pi^2}{m_b^3} \sum_i (\tilde{\Gamma}_{6,i}^d - \tilde{\Gamma}_{6,i}^u) \frac{\overline{\langle O_i^u - O_i^d \rangle}_{B^+}}{2M_{B^+}} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{m_b^4}\right). \quad (2.8)$$

Therefore, we introduce the isospin-breaking combinations of operators

$$O_i \equiv O_i^u - O_i^d, \quad (2.9)$$

whose matrix elements are parameterised in terms of the leptonic decay constants and *bag parameters* as

$$\overline{\langle Q_i \rangle}_{B^+}(\mu) = A_i f_{B^+}^2 M_{B^+}^2 B_i(\mu), \quad (2.10)$$

$$\overline{\langle T_i \rangle}_{B^+}(\mu) = A_i f_{B^+}^2 M_{B^+}^2 \epsilon_i(\mu), \quad (2.11)$$

where

$$A_1 = 1, \quad A_2 = \frac{M_{B^+}^2}{(m_b^{\text{OS}} + m_u)^2}. \quad (2.12)$$

We will neglect m_d in the following. The definition of the bag parameters is inspired by the *vacuum insertion (saturation) approximation* (VIA), which presumes that the matrix element of a four-quark operator factorises into the product of two-quark matrix elements:

$$\langle B_q | \bar{b} \Gamma q \bar{q} \Gamma' b | B_q \rangle \stackrel{\text{VIA}}{\equiv} \langle B_q | \bar{b} \Gamma q | 0 \rangle \langle 0 | \bar{q} \Gamma' b | B_q \rangle. \quad (2.13)$$

Therefore in the VIA, the bag parameters read

$$B_i(\mu) = 1, \quad \epsilon_i(\mu) = 0, \quad (2.14)$$

and in general their deviations from these values describe the violation of the VIA in these four-quark matrix elements. It is expected that this deviation is not large, however calculating its size is important for accurately and precisely predicting quantities such as the lifetime ratios of interest in this work.

The contributions from the isospin-breaking operators discussed here are the only ones relevant for the lifetime ratio $\tau(B^+)/\tau(B_d)$. They arise solely from the diagrams in which the four-quark operator $O_i^{q'}$ connects to both valence quark lines \bar{b} , q and therefore must have $q = q'$. In these diagrams one has $\langle O_i^u - O_i^d \rangle_{B^+} = \langle O_i^u \rangle_{B^+}$. The second class of diagrams in which the q' quark line of the effective operator is contracted with itself (the so-called ‘eye’ diagrams), gives the same contribution for all q and up to tiny $SU(3)_F$ -breaking corrections is therefore irrelevant for decay rate differences; these diagrams can have $q = q'$ or $q \neq q'$. For the matrix elements relevant to absolute meson lifetimes, these additional contributions have to be added, i.e. for the matrix elements relevant in absolute lifetimes the contributions from all diagrams with $q = q'$ and $q \neq q'$ have to be added on top of the matrix elements we determine in this work. For the absolute lifetime $\tau(B_s)$ or the lifetime ratio $\tau(B_s)/\tau(B_d)$, additional strange-quark mass corrections will arise as $SU(3)_F$ -breaking effects; see Refs. [30, 31].

2.3 Physical operators and lifetime ratio in HQET

In HQET, the b quark field will be replaced by the heavy quark field h with mass m_Q . We find four SM operators

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{O}_1^q &\equiv \tilde{Q}_1^q \equiv \bar{h}\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)q\bar{q}\gamma^\mu(1-\gamma_5)h, \\ \tilde{O}_2^q &\equiv \tilde{Q}_2^q \equiv \bar{h}(1-\gamma_5)q\bar{q}(1+\gamma_5)h, \\ \tilde{O}_3^q &\equiv \tilde{T}_1^q \equiv \bar{h}\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)T^aq\bar{q}\gamma^\mu(1-\gamma_5)T^ah, \\ \tilde{O}_4^q &\equiv \tilde{T}_2^q \equiv \bar{h}(1-\gamma_5)T^aq\bar{q}(1+\gamma_5)T^ah,\end{aligned}\tag{2.15}$$

supplemented by twelve BSM operators

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{O}_5^q &\equiv \tilde{Q}_3^q \equiv \bar{h}\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)q\bar{q}\gamma^\mu(1+\gamma_5)h, \\ \tilde{O}_6^q &\equiv \tilde{Q}_4^q \equiv \bar{h}(1-\gamma_5)q\bar{q}(1-\gamma_5)h, \\ \tilde{O}_7^q &\equiv \tilde{T}_3^q \equiv \bar{h}\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)T^aq\bar{q}\gamma^\mu(1+\gamma_5)T^ah, \\ \tilde{O}_8^q &\equiv \tilde{T}_4^q \equiv \bar{h}(1-\gamma_5)T^aq\bar{q}(1-\gamma_5)T^ah, \\ \tilde{O}_i^q &\equiv \tilde{O}_i^q \Big|_{1\mp\gamma_5\leftrightarrow 1\pm\gamma_5}, \quad i = 1, \dots, 8.\end{aligned}\tag{2.16}$$

The four additional operators $\bar{h}\sigma_{\mu\nu}P_\alpha(T^a)q\bar{q}\sigma^{\mu\nu}P_\alpha(T^a)h$, with $P_\alpha = 1 \mp \gamma_5$, that appear in the QCD case can be reduced to linear combinations of the operators $\tilde{O}_{5-8}^{(l)q}$ [66], such that the operators involving $\sigma_{\mu\nu}$ can be expressed as

$$\bar{h}\sigma_{\mu\nu}P_{L,R}q\bar{q}\sigma^{\mu\nu}P_{L,R}h = -4[\bar{h}P_{L,R}q\bar{q}P_{L,R}h - \bar{h}\gamma_\mu P_{L,R}q\bar{q}\gamma^\mu P_{R,L}h] + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{m_Q}\right).\tag{2.17}$$

By using short-distance Wilson coefficients calculated in HQET [17] rather than QCD as well as the HQET $\Delta B = 0$ operators in eq. (2.8), one can express the decay rate in terms

of isospin-breaking combinations of the HQET operators,

$$\tilde{O}_i \equiv \tilde{O}_i^u - \tilde{O}_i^d, \quad (2.18)$$

whose matrix elements we parameterise in terms of bag parameters and the HQET meson decay constant $F(\mu)$,

$$\overline{\langle \tilde{Q}_i \rangle}_{B^+}(\mu) = \tilde{A}_i F^2(\mu) \tilde{B}_i(\mu), \quad (2.19)$$

$$\overline{\langle \tilde{T}_i \rangle}_{B^+}(\mu) = \tilde{A}_i F^2(\mu) \tilde{\epsilon}_i(\mu), \quad (2.20)$$

with $\tilde{A}_{1,2} = +1$ and $\tilde{A}_{3,4} = -1$ in HQET. The HQET bag parameters $\tilde{B}_i(\mu)$, $\tilde{\epsilon}_i(\mu)$ are the main result of this paper. In the VIA, they read

$$\tilde{B}_i(\mu) = 1, \quad \tilde{\epsilon}_i(\mu) = 0. \quad (2.21)$$

2.4 Evanescent operators

Higher-order calculations involving four-fermion operators, if performed in dimensional regularisation with $d = 4 - 2\epsilon$, usually require the introduction of additional evanescent operators that vanish once the limit $d \rightarrow 4$ is taken, but contribute to the matrix elements of physical operators in the matching. For our calculation we need 6 + 6 evanescent operators defined in terms of HQET fields⁴,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{E}_1^q &\equiv \bar{h}\gamma_{\mu\nu\rho}(1 - \gamma_5)q\bar{q}\gamma^{\rho\nu\mu}(1 - \gamma_5)h - (4 + a_1\epsilon)\tilde{O}_1^q, \\ \tilde{E}_2^q &\equiv \bar{h}\gamma_{\mu\nu}(1 - \gamma_5)q\bar{q}\gamma^{\nu\mu}(1 + \gamma_5)h - (4 + a_2\epsilon)\tilde{O}_2^q, \\ \tilde{E}_3^q &\equiv \bar{h}\gamma_{\mu\nu\rho}(1 - \gamma_5)T^a q\bar{q}\gamma^{\rho\nu\mu}(1 - \gamma_5)T^a h - (4 + a_1\epsilon)\tilde{O}_3^q, \\ \tilde{E}_4^q &\equiv \bar{h}\gamma_{\mu\nu}(1 - \gamma_5)T^a q\bar{q}\gamma^{\nu\mu}(1 + \gamma_5)T^a h - (4 + a_2\epsilon)\tilde{O}_4^q, \\ \tilde{E}_5^q &\equiv \bar{h}\gamma_{\mu\nu\rho}(1 - \gamma_5)q\bar{q}\gamma^{\rho\nu\mu}(1 + \gamma_5)h - (16 + a_3\epsilon)\tilde{O}_5^q, \\ \tilde{E}_6^q &\equiv \bar{h}\gamma_{\mu\nu\rho}(1 - \gamma_5)T^a q\bar{q}\gamma^{\rho\nu\mu}(1 + \gamma_5)T^a h - (16 + a_3\epsilon)\tilde{O}_7^q, \end{aligned} \quad (2.22)$$

plus the corresponding primed operators. The fact that [eq. \(2.17\)](#) holds in d dimensions implies that no evanescent operators correcting for $\tilde{O}_{6,8}^{(l)q}$ have to be introduced for this calculation. In writing [eq. \(2.22\)](#) we have introduced the parameters $a_{1,2,3}$ in the definition of the evanescent operators. These parameters amount to redefinitions of the evanescent operators by terms of $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ and must therefore drop out of any physical observable consistently calculated at NLO. However, as the NLO anomalous dimension matrix for the HQET $\Delta B = 0$ operators has so far not been determined, a full independence of the scheme of evanescent operators is not achieved and we decide to keep these parameters, varying them in our numerical analysis as an estimate of uncertainty.

For the discussion of lifetime ratios we again define the isospin-breaking combinations

$$\tilde{E}_i \equiv \tilde{E}_i^u - \tilde{E}_i^d. \quad (2.23)$$

⁴Note that in QCD two additional evanescent operators have to be introduced; the basis of evanescent operators in QCD is listed in [appendix A](#).




Figure 1. Leading-order Feynman diagram of the three-point correlation function defined in eq. (3.1).

3 The sum rule

Our starting point for the HQET sum rule is the three-point correlator [26, 27]

$$K_{\tilde{O}_i}(\omega_1, \omega_2) = \int d^d x_1 d^d x_2 e^{i(p_1 \cdot x_1 - p_2 \cdot x_2)} \langle 0 | T [\tilde{j}(x_2) \tilde{O}_i(0) \tilde{j}^\dagger(x_1)] | 0 \rangle, \quad (3.1)$$

with the residual energies $\omega_{1,2} = p_{1,2} \cdot v$ and the interpolating current

$$\tilde{j} = \bar{q} \gamma_5 h. \quad (3.2)$$

For large and negative $\omega_{1,2}$, the correlator is highly virtual and can be computed in the OPE picture as a series of perturbative contributions and vacuum condensates. To relate this correlator to the continuous hadronic spectrum in a sum rule, we can translate from the highly-virtual regime to the positive, real axis via the dispersion relation

$$K_{\tilde{O}_i}(\omega_1, \omega_2) = \int_0^\infty d\nu_1 d\nu_2 \frac{\rho_{\tilde{O}_i}(\nu_1, \nu_2)}{(\nu_1 - \omega_1)(\nu_2 - \omega_2)} + [\text{subtraction terms}], \quad (3.3)$$

where $\rho_{\tilde{O}_i}$ is the *spectral density* of the correlator. When the correlator is analytic in the complex $\omega_{1,2}$ planes except for discontinuities along the positive, real axis, then the spectral density is defined as the double discontinuity of the correlator. Some important details on taking the double discontinuity of these correlators are given in [appendix B](#).

The leading Feynman diagram for the correlator in eq. (3.1) arises at two-loop order and is shown in [fig. 1](#). However, it is possible to split this diagram by a vertical cut through the effective operator, such that no momentum or state with non-vacuum quantum numbers crosses the cut. This diagram is therefore factorisable in both QCD/HQET and contributes to the decay constant, but not to the deviation of the bag parameters from the VIA. In fact, all diagrams in the OPE picture can be categorised into factorisable and non-factorisable contributions. The factorisable pieces obey the VIA and decompose to the product of two two-point correlators $\Pi(\omega)$, while the non-factorisable pieces describe the deviation from the VIA, i.e. the bag parameters. Therefore the spectral density can be written as

$$\rho_{\tilde{O}_i}(\nu_1, \nu_2) = A_{\tilde{O}_i} \rho_\Pi(\nu_1) \rho_\Pi(\nu_2) + \Delta \rho_{\tilde{O}_i}(\nu_1, \nu_2). \quad (3.4)$$

In this work, we are solely concerned with calculating $\Delta \rho_{\tilde{O}_i}$, while we take the result for ρ_Π at two-loop order [69–71].




Figure 2. Next-to-leading-order Feynman diagrams of the three-point correlation function defined in eq. (3.1). The non-factorisable diagrams are those in the last two rows where the gluon line crosses the operator insertion.

Using the decomposition of the spectral density and a double Borel transformation of the sum rule⁵, we can isolate the non-factorisable contributions and derive a sum rule for the deviations from the VIA $\Delta\tilde{B}_{\tilde{O}_i} = \tilde{B}_{\tilde{O}_i} - \tilde{B}_{\tilde{O}_i}^{\text{VIA}}$, reading

$$\Delta\tilde{B}_{\tilde{O}_i} = \frac{1}{\tilde{A}_{\tilde{O}_i}} \frac{\int_0^{\nu_c} d\nu_1 d\nu_2 e^{-\frac{\nu_1}{t_1} - \frac{\nu_2}{t_2}} \Delta\rho_{\tilde{O}_i}(\nu_1, \nu_2)}{\left[\int_0^{\nu_c} d\nu_1 e^{-\frac{\nu_1}{t_1}} \rho_{\Pi}(\nu_1) \right] \left[\int_0^{\nu_c} d\nu_2 e^{-\frac{\nu_2}{t_2}} \rho_{\Pi}(\nu_2) \right]}. \quad (3.5)$$

Following Ref. [27], for the perturbative contribution to the spectral density we can introduce an arbitrary weight function which allows us to remove the integration from the sum rule entirely, leading to a simple expression for the bag parameter as

$$\Delta\tilde{B}_{\tilde{O}_i}^{\text{pert}}(\mu_\rho) = \frac{C_F}{N_c \tilde{A}_{\tilde{O}_i}} \frac{\alpha_s(\mu_\rho)}{4\pi} r_{\tilde{O}_i} \left(1, \log \frac{\mu_\rho^2}{4\Lambda^2} \right), \quad (3.6)$$

where the r -functions are defined via the spectral densities through

$$\Delta\rho_{\tilde{O}_i}(\mu_\rho) = \frac{N_c C_F}{4} \frac{\nu_1^2 \nu_2^2}{\pi^4} \frac{\alpha_s(\mu_\rho)}{4\pi} r_{\tilde{O}_i}(x, L_\nu). \quad (3.7)$$

4 Details of the perturbative calculation

At NLO in QCD, additional diagrams beyond fig. 1 appear with a gluon exchange between fermion lines. These diagrams are shown in fig. 2, including the first non-factorisable diagrams which contribute to the bag parameters. When considering absolute lifetimes, there

⁵For further details, see for instance Refs. [26, 27, 30].




Figure 3. Example of a next-to-leading order ‘eye’ Feynman diagram of the three-point correlation function defined in eq. (3.1). This contribution cancels when considering the isospin-breaking operators.

are also additional ‘eye’ diagrams (see e.g. fig. 3), however these cancel when considering the isospin-breaking combinations introduced in eq. (2.18).

To compute the corrections to the bag parameters, we have to evaluate the non-factorisable three-loop Feynman diagrams with insertions of all possible physical HQET operators. However, the insertions of $\tilde{O}_{1,2,5,6}$ vanish due to their colour structure such that we are left with only contributions to $\tilde{\epsilon}_{3,4,7,8}$.

Since the diagrams to be evaluated are of three-loop order, they necessitate some degree of automatisation in solving them. We therefore compute the renormalised three-loop correlator using two different setups. In the first approach, Feynman diagrams were generated with `qgraf` [72] and then written into symbolic expressions and manipulated using `tapir` [73] and `FORM` [74–76] routines. Due to the nature of the HQET propagators involving the residual energy, the partial fraction decomposition as a preparatory step for the integration-by-parts (IBP) reduction was performed with the help of `Mathematica`. Dirac traces were computed in the Breitenlohner-Maison-’t Hooft-Veltman (BMHV) scheme using `TRACER` [77]. Finally, using IBP relations [78, 79] the Feynman integrals were reduced to a set of 11 master integrals using `Kira` [80, 81], listed in appendix C.

In the second approach, the non-factorisable Feynman diagrams were determined by hand and the symbolic expressions were manipulated using `Mathematica` where the program `FeynCalc` [82–84] was used to compute the Dirac traces in the BMHV scheme. The IBP reduction was then also performed using `Mathematica` in combination with `FeynCalc`, `LiteRed` [85, 86], and `FIRE` [87, 88]. We have verified that the bare correlators agree exactly in both approaches.

The renormalisation of the NLO correlators involves mixing amongst the physical operators and also mixing of evanescent operators into physical operators. In order to renormalise the three-loop bare correlator, one has to compute the two-loop factorisable diagrams with insertions of the physical and evanescent operators. Due to their colour structure, only the insertions of colour-singlet operators yield non-vanishing contributions. We can express the renormalised quantity as [27]

$$K_{\tilde{O}_i}^{(1)} = K_{\tilde{O}_i}^{(1),\text{bare}} + \frac{\alpha_s}{4\pi} \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \left[\left(\hat{\gamma}_{\tilde{O}_i \tilde{O}_j}^{(0)} - 2\hat{\gamma}_{\tilde{O}_i \tilde{O}_j}^{(0)} \delta_{ij} \right) K_{\tilde{O}_j}^{(0)} + \hat{\gamma}_{\tilde{O}_i \tilde{E}_j}^{(0)} K_{\tilde{E}_j}^{(0)} \right], \quad (4.1)$$

where $\hat{\gamma}_{\tilde{O}_i \tilde{O}_j}^{(0)} = -3C_F$ and \tilde{O}_i denotes any SM or BSM operator, and summation over j is

implied. The anomalous dimension matrices $\hat{\gamma}_{\tilde{O}\tilde{O}}^{(0)}$ and $\hat{\gamma}_{\tilde{O}\tilde{E}}^{(0)}$ are listed in [appendix D](#).

Finally, the master integrals have already been computed in Refs. [25, 26]. These expressions for the master integrals are then included in the result for the renormalised correlator, and the entire expression is expanded using `HypExp` [89, 90] before taking the double discontinuity to calculate the spectral densities.

We add a few words of caution here. The renormalised three-loop correlator is by no means “renormalised” in the sense of not having any $\frac{1}{\epsilon^n}$ poles. In fact, its poles begin at $\frac{1}{\epsilon^3}$ even after renormalisation. A simple argument shows that if the correlator has poles at most of order $\frac{1}{\epsilon^n}$ then the double discontinuity has poles of order $\frac{1}{\epsilon^{n-2}}$ or less. This still leaves the door open for potentially disastrous simple $\frac{1}{\epsilon}$ poles in what we call the renormalised double discontinuity, i.e. the discontinuity of the renormalised correlator. However, the $\frac{1}{\epsilon}$ poles in the double discontinuity stemming from the bare three-loop correlator and the renormalisation of the leading-order correlator cancel. This is a non-trivial check of our calculation, since the former result from intrinsically non-factorisable expressions whereas the latter originate from the factorisable leading-order correlator.

5 Details of the condensate calculation

We also perform an analysis of the condensate contributions for all operators in the basis. For the SM operators, this has been done previously in the massless limit in Refs. [23, 24, 27], and also including strange quark mass effects in Ref. [30, 31]. This is tackled with the standard method of the background field technique [91, 92] and utilising the Fock-Schwinger gauge [93–95] through which a fully-covariant expansion of the quark and gluon fields can be described such that condensates of increasing mass-dimension can be handled systematically.

Up to mass-dimension six and at leading order in α_s , since the quark condensates are factorisable, the only condensates which enter the non-factorisable contribution are $\langle \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} GG \rangle$ and $\langle g_s \bar{q} \sigma_{\mu\nu} G^{\mu\nu} q \rangle$; the diagrams corresponding to these are shown in [fig. 4](#). To evaluate these contributions, one needs only the first correction to the light quark propagator in its expansion, corresponding to an emission of one gluon from the propagator; cf. [eq. \(E.4\)](#). While one can also find similar condensate contributions from either expanding the quark fields or light quark propagator to higher orders, these will either add to the factorisable piece or only to the non-factorisable piece at higher orders in α_s .

With the introduction of the corrected propagator, the evaluation of the $\langle \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} GG \rangle$ diagram proceeds analogously to the procedure discussed above for the perturbative contributions, although this is technically simpler since it amounts to only a factorisable two-loop integral. While the diagrams leading to the $\langle g_s \bar{q} \sigma_{\mu\nu} G^{\mu\nu} q \rangle$ contribution are rather similar and actually only contain a one-loop integral, they are conceptually slightly different. We therefore present an example calculation of this contribution in [appendix E](#).




Figure 4. Condensate contributions to the bag parameter beyond the VIA. The diagram on the top row is proportional to $\langle \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} GG \rangle$ and those on the bottom row to $\langle g_s \bar{q} \sigma_{\mu\nu} G^{\mu\nu} q \rangle$.

6 Results

In this section we present the analytic and numerical results obtained for the perturbative and condensate contributions separately.

6.1 Perturbative contribution

Our results for the r -functions entering eq. (3.6) read

$$r_{\tilde{O}_1}(x, L_\nu) = r_{\tilde{O}_2}(x, L_\nu) = r_{\tilde{O}_5}(x, L_\nu) = r_{\tilde{O}_6}(x, L_\nu) = 0, \quad (6.1)$$

$$r_{\tilde{O}_3}(x, L_\nu) = r_{\tilde{T}_1}(x, L_\nu) = -7 + \frac{a_1}{8} + \frac{2\pi^2}{3} - \frac{3}{2}L_\nu - \frac{1}{4}\phi(x), \quad (6.2)$$

$$r_{\tilde{O}_4}(x, L_\nu) = r_{\tilde{T}_2}(x, L_\nu) = -\frac{29}{4} + \frac{a_2}{8} + \frac{2\pi^2}{3} - \frac{3}{2}L_\nu - \frac{1}{4}\phi(x), \quad (6.3)$$

$$r_{\tilde{O}_7}(x, L_\nu) = r_{\tilde{T}_3}(x, L_\nu) = 1 - \frac{a_3}{8} - \frac{2\pi^2}{3}, \quad (6.4)$$

$$r_{\tilde{O}_8}(x, L_\nu) = r_{\tilde{T}_4}(x, L_\nu) = \frac{15}{2} - \frac{2\pi^2}{3} + \frac{3}{2}L_\nu + \frac{1}{4}\phi(x), \quad (6.5)$$

where

$$L_\nu = \log\left(\frac{\mu^2}{4\nu_1\nu_2}\right) = \log\left(\frac{4\pi e^{-\gamma_E} \tilde{\mu}^2}{4\nu_1\nu_2}\right) \quad (6.6)$$

and

$$\phi(x) = \begin{cases} x^2 - 8x + 6 \log(x), & x \leq 1, \\ \frac{1}{x^2} - \frac{8}{x} - 6 \log(x), & x > 1 \end{cases}. \quad (6.7)$$

For the SM operators \tilde{O}_{1-4} these quantities have been computed in Ref. [27]. We confirm the expression for $\tilde{O}_4 \equiv \tilde{T}_2$, but find a small difference for $\tilde{O}_3 \equiv \tilde{T}_1$ (the old constant of -8 is replaced by -7). This updated expression, together with the entirely new contributions to the BSM operators \tilde{O}_{5-8} are the main results of this work.

Unfortunately it was not possible to determine the exact cause for the difference between our new result - obtained by two completely independent calculations - and the one presented in Ref. [27]. In this work, we present updated numerical bag parameters taking the shift in $r_{\tilde{T}_1}(x, L_\nu)$ into account.

We note that the function $\phi(x)$ is intrinsically non-factorisable and therefore cannot receive any contributions from the double discontinuity of the factorisable leading-order correlator through renormalisation. Hence, it must be present and its coefficient must be finite already if one were to compute the double discontinuity of the *bare* three-loop correlator.

6.2 Condensate contribution

Since there is no gluon line like in the three-loop perturbative calculation, the operator insertion into the diagrams in fig. 4 must be a colour octet such that the colour trace is not zero, and thus the colour-singlet operators \tilde{Q}_i have no condensate contribution. Furthermore, the calculations for the colour-octet operators $\tilde{T}_{2,4}$ either reduce to scaleless integrals or have Dirac traces equal to zero. Therefore the only operators for which the condensate diagrams are non-zero are $\tilde{T}_{1,3}$. As one might expect from their Dirac structures, their contributions are equal.

In Ref. [27], these terms were extracted from Ref. [24], where the interpolating current between the vacuum state and the valence-quark content of the meson has been taken as $\gamma_\mu\gamma_5$, which however interpolates 1^+ states in addition to the desired 0^- states [23]. We use the pseudoscalar interpolating current instead [23] and obtain vanishing condensate contributions to $\tilde{\epsilon}_{2,4}$. This current has also been used in Ref. [31], and we find full agreement of our analytical expressions for the condensate contributions.

In summary, the contributions to the non-factorisable part of the spectral density are therefore found to be

$$\Delta\rho_{\tilde{O}_i}^{\text{cond}} = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, \quad (6.8)$$

$$\Delta\rho_{\tilde{T}_1}^{\text{cond}} = \Delta\rho_{\tilde{T}_3}^{\text{cond}} = -\frac{\langle\frac{\alpha_s}{\pi}GG\rangle}{64\pi^2} + \frac{N_c\langle g_s\bar{q}\sigma_{\mu\nu}G^{\mu\nu}q\rangle}{192\pi^2} [\delta(\nu_1) + \delta(\nu_2)]. \quad (6.9)$$

Due to the presence of δ -functions, we cannot reduce the condensate contribution to the bag parameters to something like eq. (3.6) as for the perturbative part and must instead use the traditional sum rule in eq. (3.5). We find the value of these contributions to be

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\epsilon}_1^{\text{cond}} &= -\tilde{\epsilon}_3^{\text{cond}} &= -0.0067 \pm 0.0057, \\ \tilde{B}_i^{\text{cond}} &= \tilde{\epsilon}_2^{\text{cond}} = \tilde{\epsilon}_4^{\text{cond}} &= 0.0000 \pm 0.0020, \end{aligned} \quad (6.10)$$

where we have varied the input parameters within their uncertainties to find the total spread in $\tilde{\epsilon}^{\text{cond}}$ and take a central value with symmetric errors. We have used $\mu_\rho = 1.5$ GeV and chose

$$\omega_c = 1.2 \pm 0.2 \text{ GeV}, \quad (6.11)$$

$$t_1 = t_2 \equiv t = 1.5 \pm 0.3 \text{ GeV}. \quad (6.12)$$




Figure 5. Variation of the condensate contribution to the bag parameter with the threshold energy ω_c (left) and the Borel parameter t (right). The blue line shows the value as it is evolved for the single parameter, while the cyan data point indicates the final value after taking all variations into account. The dashed grey bands show the limits of the final ranges chosen.

To select these ranges, we vary the condensate contribution to the bag parameter in ω_c and t and find the regions where these parameters are sufficiently small before the sum rule becomes unstable; these variations are shown in [fig. 5](#). We find that the bag parameter does not vary much with the Borel parameter t in our chosen range, while it is more sensitive to ω_c . Furthermore, in our assessment of the condensate uncertainties we have included an additional intrinsic condensate error of ± 0.002 for all operators as an estimate of higher-dimensional condensates that have not been computed in this work.

6.3 Bag parameters

Combining the perturbative and condensate contributions presented in the previous subsections allows us to present numerical values for the bag parameters. By [eq. \(3.6\)](#) the perturbative contribution to the bag parameter depends on the scale μ_ρ and on $\bar{\Lambda}$, which is typically a few hundred MeV. The scale μ_ρ at which the bag parameters are evaluated should therefore be chosen close to $2\bar{\Lambda}$ to avoid large logarithms. At the same time, it should be a scale at which a perturbative definition of $\alpha_s(\mu_\rho)$ can still be justified, i.e. not too small either. A reasonable compromise is the choice $\mu_\rho \sim 1.5 \text{ GeV}$ and $\bar{\Lambda} \sim 0.5 \text{ GeV}$ [[27](#)], which we vary in our uncertainty estimates by 100 MeV,

$$\bar{\Lambda} = (0.5 \pm 0.1) \text{ GeV}. \quad (6.13)$$

The value of $\alpha_s(1.5 \text{ GeV})$ is determined from the strong coupling constant at the Z -boson mass, $\alpha_s(91.1880(20) \text{ GeV}) = 0.1180(9)$ [[96](#)], which is evolved to the b -quark $\overline{\text{MS}}$ mass $\bar{m}_b(\bar{m}_b) = 4.183(7) \text{ GeV}$ and decoupled with five-loop accuracy using RunDec [[97–99](#)]. The running of α_s from $\bar{m}_b(\bar{m}_b)$ to the scale at which the HQET bag parameter is determined is then performed with two-loop accuracy, yielding a value of

$$\alpha_s(1.5 \text{ GeV}) = 0.3443 \quad (6.14)$$

with all inputs being taken at their central values. The uncertainty of $\alpha_s(M_Z)$ propagates into a $\sim 3\%$ uncertainty of $\alpha_s(\mu_\rho)$, which is small compared to the other sources of

uncertainty discussed in this section. We will therefore neglect the α_s uncertainty in what follows.

In perturbative calculations, one typically tries to achieve scale independence through the computation of higher-order corrections, and the residual renormalisation-scale dependence as an estimate of neglected higher orders is assessed through variation of the scale μ in an interval $[\frac{1}{2}\mu_{\text{central}}, 2\mu_{\text{central}}]$. Unfortunately, the low overall energy scale of the HQET sum rule means that such a perturbative treatment with a lower value around $\mu_{\rho, \text{min.}} \sim 0.75 \text{ GeV}$ is not feasible. Instead, we fix the scale at which the bag parameter is evaluated in HQET to be

$$\mu_\rho = 1.5 \text{ GeV} \quad (6.15)$$

and estimate the uncertainty of neglected higher-order corrections by variation of $\mu_\rho \in [1, 2] \text{ GeV}$ and subsequently evolving back to the central scale $\mu_\rho = 1.5 \text{ GeV}$ using the renormalisation-group (RG) equations. Clearly, this is only a rough estimate, and in order to be conservative we inflate the associated uncertainty interval by a factor of 2.

The anomalous dimension matrix in eq. (D.2) describes the RG evolution of the operators \tilde{O}_i under renormalisation. In the case at hand we need, however, the RG evolution of the bag parameters themselves, i.e. the anomalous dimension of the scale-dependent HQET decay constant has to be subtracted, such that [27]

$$\vec{\tilde{B}}(\mu_1) = \left(\frac{\alpha_s(\mu_1)}{\alpha_s(\mu_0)} \right)^{\frac{\hat{\gamma}_{\vec{B}}^{(0)}}{2\beta_0}} \vec{\tilde{B}}(\mu_0), \quad (6.16)$$

with

$$\hat{\gamma}_{\vec{B}}^{(0)} = \left(\tilde{A}_{\vec{O}}^D \right)^{-1} \hat{\gamma}_{\vec{O}\vec{O}} \tilde{A}_{\vec{O}}^D - 2\tilde{\gamma}_{\vec{j}}. \quad (6.17)$$

Here, $\vec{\tilde{B}}(\mu)$ is the vector of all bag parameters and $\tilde{A}_{\vec{O}}^D$ the diagonal matrix with the elements \tilde{A}_i on its diagonal. Due to the operator mixing under renormalisation all contributions to the bag parameters — vacuum insertion approximation, perturbative contributions, and condensate terms — have to be summed before assessing the μ_ρ scale uncertainty.

Finally, the use of eq. (3.6) rather than eq. (3.5) for the perturbative part of the bag parameter potentially introduces an additional uncertainty. This issue has been discussed in Ref. [27], where an additional intrinsic uncertainty of ± 0.02 has been assigned to each bag parameter as an error estimate. For our analysis we choose to keep the same intrinsic uncertainty.

We finally obtain the HQET bag parameters evaluated at $\mu_\rho = 1.5 \text{ GeV}$, taking all

evanescent scheme-dependent constants as $a_{1,2,3} = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{B}_1(1.5 \text{ GeV}) &= 1.0000 \pm 0.0201 \\
&= 1.0000_{-0.02}^{+0.02} (\text{intr.})_{-0.0000}^{+0.0000} (\bar{\Lambda})_{-0.002}^{+0.002} (\text{cond.})_{-0.0009}^{+0.0002} (\mu_\rho) , \\
\tilde{B}_2(1.5 \text{ GeV}) &= 1.0000 \pm 0.0201 \\
&= 1.0000_{-0.02}^{+0.02} (\text{intr.})_{-0.0000}^{+0.0000} (\bar{\Lambda})_{-0.002}^{+0.002} (\text{cond.})_{-0.0011}^{+0.0000} (\mu_\rho) , \\
\tilde{\epsilon}_1(1.5 \text{ GeV}) &= -0.0053_{-0.0224}^{+0.0220} \\
&= -0.0053_{-0.02}^{+0.02} (\text{intr.})_{-0.0082}^{+0.0067} (\bar{\Lambda})_{-0.0057}^{+0.0057} (\text{cond.})_{-0.0018}^{+0.0029} (\mu_\rho) , \\
\tilde{\epsilon}_2(1.5 \text{ GeV}) &= -0.0017_{-0.0221}^{+0.0216} \\
&= -0.0017_{-0.02}^{+0.02} (\text{intr.})_{-0.0082}^{+0.0067} (\bar{\Lambda})_{-0.002}^{+0.002} (\text{cond.})_{-0.0041}^{+0.0042} (\mu_\rho) , \\
\tilde{B}_3(1.5 \text{ GeV}) &= 1.0000 \pm 0.0201 \\
&= 1.0000_{-0.02}^{+0.02} (\text{intr.})_{-0.0000}^{+0.0000} (\bar{\Lambda})_{-0.002}^{+0.002} (\text{cond.})_{-0.0000}^{+0.0000} (\mu_\rho) , \\
\tilde{B}_4(1.5 \text{ GeV}) &= 1.0000_{-0.0204}^{+0.0206} \\
&= 1.0000_{-0.02}^{+0.02} (\text{intr.})_{-0.0000}^{+0.0000} (\bar{\Lambda})_{-0.002}^{+0.002} (\text{cond.})_{-0.0034}^{+0.0046} (\mu_\rho) , \\
\tilde{\epsilon}_3(1.5 \text{ GeV}) &= 0.0747_{-0.0275}^{+0.0437} \\
&= 0.0747_{-0.02}^{+0.02} (\text{intr.})_{-0.0000}^{+0.0000} (\bar{\Lambda})_{-0.0057}^{+0.0057} (\text{cond.})_{-0.0179}^{+0.0384} (\mu_\rho) , \\
\tilde{\epsilon}_4(1.5 \text{ GeV}) &= -0.0047_{-0.0217}^{+0.0212} \\
&= -0.0047_{-0.02}^{+0.02} (\text{intr.})_{-0.0082}^{+0.0067} (\bar{\Lambda})_{-0.002}^{+0.002} (\text{cond.})_{-0.0003}^{+0.0016} (\mu_\rho) .
\end{aligned} \tag{6.18}$$

In the second line of each expression we have split the total uncertainty into its individual contributions from variation of $\bar{\Lambda}$ and μ_ρ as well as the additional condensate uncertainty and intrinsic sum rule uncertainty, respectively.

The SM bag parameters $\tilde{B}_{1,2}$ and $\tilde{\epsilon}_{1,2}$ have first been calculated in Ref. [27], and subsequently strange-quark mass corrections and non-valence (eye) diagrams have been computed in Refs. [30, 31]. We confirm the numerical values for $\tilde{B}_{1,2}$ of Ref. [27], while the values for $\tilde{\epsilon}_{1,2}$ differ. The difference in the bag parameter $\tilde{\epsilon}_1$ is to some extent due to the larger negative value of the condensate contributions, but mainly due to the updated analytical expression in eq. (6.2). Indeed, the perturbative contribution to $\tilde{\epsilon}_1$ now is positive at central input parameters, whereas it was negative before, as can be inferred by subtracting the condensate contributions from the total value of $\tilde{\epsilon}_1(1.5 \text{ GeV})$ both here and in Ref. [27]. With the addition of the condensates, the total bag parameter $\tilde{\epsilon}_1(1.5 \text{ GeV})$ becomes negative again, but remains much closer to zero. The difference in the bag parameter $\tilde{\epsilon}_2$, on the other hand, is due to a different treatment of condensate effects; see the discussion in section 6.2. Despite the differences compared to Ref. [27] we emphasise that our new central values for the bag parameters $\tilde{\epsilon}_{1,2}$ are within the uncertainties quoted in that publication.

Finally, we emphasise that the total uncertainties of all bag parameters with the exception of $\tilde{\epsilon}_3$ are dominated by the intrinsic sum rules uncertainty of 0.02. In particular, for the colour-octet bag parameters except $\tilde{\epsilon}_3$, the uncertainties are much larger than the magnitude of the bag parameters themselves. This is in contrast to the results of Ref. [27], where $\tilde{\epsilon}_1(1.5 \text{ GeV}) = -0.016_{-0.022}^{+0.021}$. It is possible that the intrinsic error of ± 0.02 is a severe

overestimation of the sum rule uncertainties, yet at the same time we cannot fully exclude slightly larger uncertainties for $\tilde{\epsilon}_3$. We therefore do not attempt to argue in favour of a smaller intrinsic uncertainty here.

The bag parameters presented here can be used in order to determine the lifetime ratio $\tau(B^+)/\tau(B_d)$ using the Wilson coefficients computed in Refs. [16, 17, 100]. In anticipation of a comprehensive numerical study of B -meson lifetimes [41] including the recently computed NNLO corrections to Γ_3 [42], respectively, we refrain from updating the lifetime ratios here and refer to the upcoming publication, but we expect a slight decrease of $\tau(B^+)/\tau(B_d)$ towards the experimental value.

6.4 HQET–QCD matching for the Standard Model operators

We also convert the HQET bag parameters to their QCD equivalents for the SM operators defined in eqs. (2.3) and (2.9), in order to facilitate comparison with existing results.

The QCD bag parameters are evaluated at a scale more natural to B -meson decays, which we choose to be $\bar{m}_b(\bar{m}_b)$. In order to convert the bag parameters from HQET to QCD, a matching step has to be performed at some scale μ_m typically somewhere between $\mu_\rho = 1.5 \text{ GeV}$ and $\mu_Q = \bar{m}_b(\bar{m}_b)$ in order to avoid large logarithms on either side of the matching calculation. The matching matrix $C_{O_i\tilde{O}_j}(\mu)$ between $\{\tilde{Q}_1, \tilde{Q}_2, \tilde{T}_1, \tilde{T}_2\}$ and $\{Q_1, Q_2, T_1, T_2\}$ has been computed including $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s)$ corrections in Ref. [27]. Thus, the bag parameters in QCD are determined by evolving the HQET bag parameters from 1.5 GeV to μ_m using eq. (6.16), performing the matching at the scale μ_m by use of the relation⁶[27]

$$B_{O_i}(\mu_m) = \sum_j \frac{\tilde{A}_j}{A_i} \frac{C_{O_i\tilde{O}_j}(\mu_m)}{(C(\mu_m))^2} \tilde{B}_j(\mu_m) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{m_b}\right), \quad (6.19)$$

with

$$C(\mu_m) = 1 - 2C_F \frac{\alpha_s(\mu_m)}{4\pi} + \mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^2), \quad (6.20)$$

and subsequently running the bag parameters from μ_m to $\bar{m}_b(\bar{m}_b)$ using the QCD version of eq. (6.16) which is analogous except for the absence of the $-2\tilde{\gamma}_j$ term in the anomalous dimension matrix, since the leptonic decay constants are scale independent in QCD. Since the HQET NLO anomalous dimension matrix of the operators, $\tilde{\gamma}_{\tilde{O}\tilde{O}}^{(1)}$, is currently not known, we cannot fully perform the matching at NLO. Instead, we use the LO anomalous dimension matrices on both the HQET and QCD sides for the RG evolution, while we perform the matching itself at $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s)$. Finally, we relate the on-shell mass m_b^{OS} in eq. (2.12) to the meson mass using the relation

$$m_b^{\text{OS}} = M_{B_d} - \bar{\Lambda} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{m_b}\right), \quad (6.21)$$

and expand the factor A_2 strictly as $A_2 = 1 + \mathcal{O}(1/m_b)$. The matching scale μ_m is varied between [3, 6] GeV and we allow the scheme constants a_1, a_2 of the evanescent HQET operators to float between $[-10, 10]$ in order to account for the neglected NLO corrections

⁶Here B denotes the bag parameter of any colour-singlet or colour-octet operator.

to the RG evolution and additional higher-order perturbative corrections to the relation between $B_i(\bar{m}_b(\bar{m}_b))$ and $\tilde{B}_i(1.5 \text{ GeV})$. The ‘‘QCD choice’’ corresponds to $a_1 = a_2 = -8$, but $a_3 = -16$; however, for the matching of the SM operators a_3 is irrelevant. Finally, we perform a ‘‘scheme conversion’’ such that the matrix elements $\overline{\langle Q_2 \rangle}, \overline{\langle T_2 \rangle}$ are expressed as

$$\overline{\langle Q_2 \rangle}_{B^+}(\mu) = \bar{A}_2(\mu) f_{B^+}^2 M_{B^+}^2 \bar{B}_2(\mu), \quad (6.22)$$

$$\overline{\langle T_2 \rangle}_{B^+}(\mu) = \bar{A}_2(\mu) f_{B^+}^2 M_{B^+}^2 \bar{\epsilon}_2(\mu), \quad (6.23)$$

with

$$\bar{A}_2(\mu) = \frac{M_{B^+}^2}{(\bar{m}_b(\mu))^2}. \quad (6.24)$$

We find the bag parameters in QCD to be

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{B}_1(\bar{m}_b(\bar{m}_b)) &= 1.013_{-0.059}^{+0.066} = 1.013_{-0.028}^{+0.028}(\text{HQET S.R.})_{-0.052}^{+0.059}(\text{match.}), \\ \bar{B}_2(\bar{m}_b(\bar{m}_b)) &= 1.004_{-0.081}^{+0.085} = 1.004_{-0.024}^{+0.024}(\text{HQET S.R.})_{-0.077}^{+0.082}(\text{match.}), \\ \bar{\epsilon}_1(\bar{m}_b(\bar{m}_b)) &= -0.098_{-0.032}^{+0.029} = -0.098_{-0.024}^{+0.024}(\text{HQET S.R.})_{-0.021}^{+0.016}(\text{match.}), \\ \bar{\epsilon}_2(\bar{m}_b(\bar{m}_b)) &= -0.037_{-0.020}^{+0.019} = -0.037_{-0.016}^{+0.016}(\text{HQET S.R.})_{-0.013}^{+0.010}(\text{match.}). \end{aligned} \quad (6.25)$$

We emphasise that despite the significant changes of the HQET bag parameters $\bar{\epsilon}_1, \bar{\epsilon}_2$, the QCD bag parameters at the scale $\bar{m}_b(\bar{m}_b)$ are very close to those determined in Ref. [27] and well within the uncertainties quoted in Ref. [27]. However the $\mathcal{O}(10\%)$ deviations of $\bar{\epsilon}_{1,2}$ with respect to the results of Ref. [27] deserve an explanation. We find that the central values of $\bar{B}_1(\bar{m}_b(\bar{m}_b))$ and $\bar{B}_2(\bar{m}_b(\bar{m}_b))$ differ by less than $\sim 1.6\%$ from those of Ref. [27], with slightly larger uncertainties. This difference is mostly due to slightly different input values translating into differences of about this size when performing the matching and RG evolution. The parameters $\bar{\epsilon}_{1,2}(\bar{m}_b(\bar{m}_b))$ on the other hand are dominated not by the values $\tilde{\epsilon}_{1,2}(1.5 \text{ GeV})$, but by $\tilde{B}_{1,2}(1.5 \text{ GeV})$ through operator mixing under RG evolution and the HQET-QCD matching. A tiny difference in the matching-evolution matrix can therefore lead to a sizeable relative deviation of $\bar{\epsilon}_{1,2}(\bar{m}_b(\bar{m}_b))$. Finally, for $\bar{\epsilon}_2$, part of the difference also stems from the updated treatment of the condensates; see section 5.

We are careful to keep our expressions through the matching procedure symbolic until the very end where we truncate at linear order in α_s before evaluating. If one evaluates the components of the matching equation independently before combining, higher-order α_s contributions will enter the final values, however as these are not the complete NNLO (or beyond) picture, we decide to truncate these terms. While this does not lead to extreme numerical effects in the matching for B mesons discussed here, it is significant in the matching for D mesons discussed below.

We also perform the HQET-QCD matching for the case of D mesons which we consider at the scale $\mu = 3 \text{ GeV}$. We find

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{B}_1(3 \text{ GeV}) &= 0.875_{-0.044}^{+0.070} = 0.875_{-0.027}^{+0.028}(\text{HQET S.R.})_{-0.035}^{+0.064}(\text{match.}), \\ \bar{B}_2(3 \text{ GeV}) &= 0.862_{-0.078}^{+0.138} = 0.862_{-0.018}^{+0.018}(\text{HQET S.R.})_{-0.076}^{+0.137}(\text{match.}), \\ \bar{\epsilon}_1(3 \text{ GeV}) &= -0.122_{-0.042}^{+0.033} = -0.122_{-0.027}^{+0.027}(\text{HQET S.R.})_{-0.033}^{+0.019}(\text{match.}), \\ \bar{\epsilon}_2(3 \text{ GeV}) &= 0.0002_{-0.0197}^{+0.0148} = 0.0002_{-0.0094}^{+0.0092}(\text{HQET S.R.})_{-0.0173}^{+0.0115}(\text{match.}). \end{aligned} \quad (6.26)$$

We have evaluated the matching uncertainty by varying the HQET-QCD matching scale in the interval $\mu_m \in [2, 4]$ GeV and allowing the scheme constants $a_{1,2}$ within $[-10, 10]$. These values agree with the previous results of Ref. [27] within uncertainties, but the coefficient \bar{B}_2 deserves attention and will be discussed below. Similarly to the discussion above for B mesons, we find $\mathcal{O}(10\%)$ deviations with respect to the previous results, which can largely be accounted for through the relatively small changes in the HQET bag parameters being amplified in the matching to QCD yielding larger differences. Furthermore, we find that the HQET-QCD matching for charm quarks is much more sensitive to the exact perturbative treatment in the numerical assessment discussed above. Due to the larger size of $\alpha_s(3 \text{ GeV})$ and more importantly, terms proportional to $\log\left(\mu^2/\bar{m}_c(\bar{m}_c)^2\right)$ appearing, the variations of the final values, if one is not consistent with the order of truncation, can be significant. As discussed above for the B mesons, we again keep our expressions symbolic in α_s until the conversion to the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ scheme for the prefactor A_2 has been performed. With this choice no partial $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^2)$ terms are included in $\bar{B}_i(3 \text{ GeV})$, which is the main reason why our central value for $\bar{B}_2(3 \text{ GeV})$ is larger than the one quoted in Ref. [27] by almost 17%. If we numerically evaluate the bag parameters before performing the conversion of A_2 , i.e. keep partial $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^2)$ results, we find a value very close to the one published in Ref. [27], and hence we expect this difference in perturbative treatment to be the source of discrepancy. It is interesting to note that our updated central value is at the very edge of the uncertainty estimate for $\bar{B}_2(3 \text{ GeV})$ presented in Ref. [27], while our lower uncertainty does not reach all the way down to the old central value. This clearly shows that the naive estimate for the matching uncertainty obtained via scale and scheme constant variation appears to be at best a lower bound for the total uncertainty.

In both the B -meson and D -meson cases improvement could possibly be achieved by a calculation of the NLO HQET anomalous dimension $\hat{\gamma}_{\tilde{O}\tilde{O}}^{(1)}$, which would allow for a fully consistent matching and RG evolution, as well as higher-order perturbative corrections to the matching matrix itself. Still, due to the bad convergence behaviour of the perturbative $m_c^{\text{OS}}/\bar{m}_c(\bar{m}_c)$ relation a precise determination of the bag parameters \bar{B}_i for D mesons within the HQET sum rule framework will be very difficult.

7 Conclusion

We have computed the hadronic matrix elements of the BSM $\Delta B = 0$ effective HQET dimension-six four-quark operators within the framework of HQET sum rules. More precisely, we have considered the isospin-breaking operator combinations $\tilde{O}_i^u - \tilde{O}_i^d$ that are relevant for the description of lifetime ratios. The technically most challenging part of the calculation involved the evaluation of three-loop HQET diagrams, but the condensate contributions play an equally important role numerically. As an intermediate step we have recomputed the previously known bag parameters for the SM subset of operators $\{\tilde{Q}_1, \tilde{Q}_2, \tilde{T}_1, \tilde{T}_2\}$ and found a difference in the perturbative part compared to the original publication [27], leading to an updated SM prediction for the lifetime ratio of charged to neutral B mesons [41]. In general, we find all bag parameters to be very close to the vacuum insertion approximation.

Our results for the BSM operators serve as an input for further studies within specific scenarios of new physics (NP). The $\Delta B = 0$ short-distance coefficients have been computed in Ref. [66] in terms of the Wilson coefficients C_i of the most general HQET effective $|\Delta B| = 1$ Hamiltonian relevant for meson lifetimes. Within a definite ultraviolet scenario that specifies the coefficients C_i , these $\Delta B = 0$ coefficients can be combined with the hadronic matrix elements presented in this work in order to obtain quantitative predictions for the lifetime ratio.

While older lattice results are available in Refs. [18–20], we do not directly compare to these as they were early studies performed on quenched ($n_f = 0$) lattices where the error stemming from this quenched approximation cannot be quantified. More recently, Ref. [35] presents preliminary values for the bag parameters $\bar{B}_1(3 \text{ GeV})$ and $\bar{\epsilon}_1(3 \text{ GeV})$ for the D_s meson system while the matching to $\overline{\text{MS}}$ assumes lifetime-difference operators. These values differ by $\sim 2 - 3\sigma$ from those quoted in eq. (6.26), however one must caveat this with the presence of the strange spectator quark in the lattice calculation which may cause such differences. Future updates on the lattice studies in Refs. [32, 35] are expected to result in values for both B and D meson systems with both light and strange spectator quarks where more direct comparisons to our results here can then be made.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank K. Brune, M. Egner, T. Huber, A. Khodjamirian, F. Lange, M.L. Piscopo, and A. Rusov for helpful discussions and M. Kirk for help in the attempt to understand the difference between our result and the ones in Ref. [27]. We would also like to thank M. Steinhauser for providing helpful information about the program `RunDec`. This project was supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under grant 396021762-TRR 257 and the BMBF project “Theoretische Methoden für LHCb und Belle II” (Förderkennzeichen 05H21PSCLA/ErUM-FSP T04). M.B. was additionally funded in part by UK STFC grant ST/X000494/1.

A Evanescent operators and anomalous dimension matrix in QCD

Here we list the operators needed to complete the set of physical operators in QCD at one loop. They are given as [27, 101]

$$\begin{aligned}
E_1^q &\equiv \bar{b}\gamma_{\mu\nu\rho}(1-\gamma_5)q\bar{q}\gamma^{\rho\nu\mu}(1-\gamma_5)b && -(4-8\epsilon)O_1^q, \\
E_2^q &\equiv \bar{b}\gamma_{\mu\nu}(1-\gamma_5)q\bar{q}\gamma^{\nu\mu}(1+\gamma_5)b && -(4-8\epsilon)O_2^q, \\
E_3^q &\equiv \bar{b}\gamma_{\mu\nu\rho}(1-\gamma_5)T^aq\bar{q}\gamma^{\rho\nu\mu}(1-\gamma_5)T^ab && -(4-8\epsilon)O_3^q, \\
E_4^q &\equiv \bar{b}\gamma_{\mu\nu}(1-\gamma_5)T^aq\bar{q}\gamma^{\nu\mu}(1+\gamma_5)T^ab && -(4-8\epsilon)O_4^q, \\
E_5^q &\equiv \bar{b}\gamma_{\mu\nu\rho}(1-\gamma_5)q\bar{q}\gamma^{\rho\nu\mu}(1+\gamma_5)b && -(16-16\epsilon)O_5^q, \\
E_6^q &\equiv \bar{b}\gamma_{\mu\nu\rho}(1-\gamma_5)T^aq\bar{q}\gamma^{\rho\nu\mu}(1+\gamma_5)T^ab && -(16-16\epsilon)O_7^q, \\
E_7^q &\equiv \bar{b}\sigma_{\mu\nu}\gamma_{\rho\sigma}(1-\gamma_5)q\bar{q}\gamma^{\sigma\rho}\sigma^{\mu\nu}(1-\gamma_5)b \\
&&& -(48-80\epsilon)O_6^q && -(12-14\epsilon)O_9^q, \\
E_8^q &\equiv \bar{b}\sigma_{\mu\nu}\gamma_{\rho\sigma}(1-\gamma_5)T^aq\bar{q}\gamma^{\sigma\rho}\sigma^{\mu\nu}(1-\gamma_5)T^ab \\
&&& -(48-80\epsilon)O_8^q && -(12-14\epsilon)O_{10}^q,
\end{aligned}$$

plus the corresponding primed counterparts.

For the QCD operators, the anomalous dimension matrices of the physical operators have been computed in Refs. [68, 102]. In our basis with operators $O_{i=1,\dots,10}^q$ and their respective evanescent operators $E_{i=1,\dots,8}^q$, they are given by⁷

$$\hat{\gamma}_{OO}^{(0)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 12 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{6}{N_c} - 6N_c & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 3 - \frac{3}{N_c^2} & 0 & -\frac{12}{N_c} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{6}{N_c} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -12 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{6}{N_c} - 6N_c & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -3 + \frac{3}{N_c^2} & 0 & \frac{12}{N_c} - 6N_c & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{6}{N_c} & -\frac{1}{2}\left(1 - \frac{1}{N_c^2}\right) & \frac{2}{N_c} - \frac{N_c}{2} & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -96 & -\frac{2}{N_c} + 2N_c & 0 & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 24\left(-1 + \frac{1}{N_c^2}\right) & 0 & \frac{96}{N_c} - 24N_c & 0 & -\frac{2}{N_c} - 4N_c & \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

and

$$\hat{\gamma}_{OE}^{(0)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2N_c^2} & 0 & \frac{2}{N_c} - \frac{N_c}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2N_c^2} & 0 & \frac{2}{N_c} - \frac{N_c}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2N_c^2} & \frac{2}{N_c} - \frac{N_c}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2N_c^2} & \frac{2}{N_c} - \frac{N_c}{2} & \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

⁷We recomputed them directly with vanishing external momenta and universal mass m for all quark propagator denominators and checked agreement with Refs. [68, 102]. The gluon propagator does not need IR regularisation in this case.

for the evanescent operators. Our result for the upper left (SM) subblock of eq. (A.2) agrees with Ref. [27]. The anomalous dimension matrices for the primed operators $O_i^{q'}$, $E_i^{q'}$ are identical to $\gamma_{QQ}^{(0)}$, $\gamma_{QE}^{(0)}$ since QCD preserves chirality.

B Note on the Double Discontinuity

Analyticity of the S-matrix requires the correlator $K(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ to be a complex analytic function of its variables, and we calculate K perturbatively in the unphysical regime $\omega_1, \omega_2 < 0$. In this region the correlator is analytic, whereas it has a cut for $\omega_1 > 0$ and a cut for $\omega_2 > 0$. The correlator is related to the physical regime via two implementations of Cauchy's integral formula, with Pac-Man-like contour integrals. We can ignore the integration over the circular parts of the contour integral, as the Borel transformation later in the calculation will remove any remaining artefacts of these. In the end, it is left to take the two discontinuities of the correlator over the two branch cuts.

We define the first discontinuity as

$$\rho_1(\omega_1, \omega_2) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} [K(\omega_1 + i\alpha, \omega_2) - K(\omega_1 - i\alpha, \omega_2)] \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where we hold $\omega_2 < 0$ and take $\omega_1 > 0$ to be on the branch cut, and $\alpha > 0$ is to be taken to go to zero.

The branch cut can be completely described by functions of the form $\{(-\omega)^{2-3\epsilon}$, $\log(-\omega)$, $\log(x)$, $\text{Li}_2(1-x)$, $\text{Li}_3(1-x)$, $\text{Li}_2(1-1/x)\}$, where ω can be either ω_1 or ω_2 and $x = \omega_2/\omega_1$. After adding and subtracting $i\alpha$, we implement the following replacements to take the discontinuity:

$$\begin{aligned} z^a &\rightarrow \begin{cases} e^{i\pi a}(-z)^a & \text{if } \text{Re}\{z\} < 0 \text{ and } \text{Im}\{z\} > 0, \\ e^{-i\pi a}(-z)^a & \text{if } \text{Re}\{z\} < 0 \text{ and } \text{Im}\{z\} < 0, \\ z^a & \text{else,} \end{cases} \\ \log(z) &\rightarrow \begin{cases} \log(-z) + i\pi & \text{if } \text{Re}\{z\} < 0 \text{ and } \text{Im}\{z\} > 0, \\ \log(-z) - i\pi & \text{if } \text{Re}\{z\} < 0 \text{ and } \text{Im}\{z\} < 0, \\ \log(z) & \text{else,} \end{cases} \\ \text{Li}_n(z) &\rightarrow \begin{cases} \text{Re}\{\text{Li}_n(z)\} + \frac{i\pi}{\Gamma(n)} \log^{n-1}(z) & \text{if } \text{Re}\{z\} < 0 \text{ and } \text{Im}\{z\} > 0, \\ \text{Re}\{\text{Li}_n(z)\} - \frac{i\pi}{\Gamma(n)} \log^{n-1}(z) & \text{if } \text{Re}\{z\} < 0 \text{ and } \text{Im}\{z\} < 0, \\ \text{Li}_n(z) & \text{else.} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

After the replacements are made, we take $\alpha \rightarrow 0$. There is an important subtlety here: as we need to take the discontinuity again, these replacement functions must be analytic on the entire complex plane. Thus, as the term $\log(x) \text{Li}_2(1-x)$ appears in the correlator, we require a formula for the analytic continuation of the real part of the polylogarithm function along the branch cut. For this we use

$$\text{Re}\{\text{Li}_2(z)\} = \pi^2/6 - \log(z-1) \log(z) - \text{Li}_2(1-z), \text{ for } z > 1, \quad (\text{B.3})$$

which is easily derived from one of Euler's identities for polylogarithms. As the right-hand side of this equation is complex analytic over the entire complex plane (except for the branch cut for $z < 1$), and agrees with the left-hand side for $z > 1$, we have found the analytic continuation.

The second discontinuity is then defined by

$$\rho_{\tilde{O}_i} = \rho_2(\omega_1, \omega_2) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} [\rho_1(\omega_1, \omega_2 + i\alpha) - \rho_1(\omega_1, \omega_2 - i\alpha)] \quad (\text{B.4})$$

where now we hold $\omega_1 > 0$ and assume $\omega_2 > 0$ is on the branch cut. The same replacements are then used as for the first discontinuity.

C Master Integrals

Using IBP reduction all Feynman integrals occurring in the three-loop perturbative calculation could be reduced to a set of 11 master integrals,

$$\begin{aligned} & I_a(0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 1; 0, 0; \omega_1, \omega_2) , \\ & I_a(1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1; 0, 0; \omega_1, \omega_2) , \\ & I_a(1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 1, 1; 0, 0; \omega_1, \omega_2) , \\ & I_a(1, 1, 0, 0, 2, 1, 1; 0, 0; \omega_1, \omega_2) , \\ & I_a(1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1; 0, 0; \omega_1, \omega_2) , \\ & I_a(1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 0; 0, 0; \omega_1, \omega_2) , \\ & I_a(1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 1; 0, 0; \omega_1, \omega_2) , \\ & I_a(1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1; 0, 0; \omega_1, \omega_2) , \\ & I_a(1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 1; 0, 0; \omega_1, \omega_2) , \\ & I_b(1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1; 0, 0; \omega_1, \omega_2) , \\ & I_{\tilde{b}}(1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1; 0, 0; \omega_1, \omega_2) , \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.1})$$

as defined in Refs. [25, 26] with $I_{\tilde{b}} = I_b(\omega_1 \leftrightarrow \omega_2)$, where they have been computed and expanded in ϵ . Note that the ϵ^4 term in the expansion of the master integral M_3 in Ref. [26] (first equation of appendix A) contains a typo: the term $+288L^2(x)$ should read $+288xL^2(x)$.

D Anomalous dimension matrices for the HQET operators

In this section we list the anomalous dimension matrices for the $\Delta B = 0$ operators within HQET. We computed the anomalous dimension matrix with vanishing external momenta, an infrared (IR) regulator $\tilde{\omega}/2$ for the HQET propagators and a mass m as IR regulator for the light quark and gluon propagators, keeping the gluon gauge parameter ξ_g symbolic.

The relevant integral is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
I(m, n) &= \int \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{1}{[k^2 - m^2]^\alpha [2k \cdot v + \tilde{\omega}]^\beta} \\
&= \frac{i(-1)^{-(\alpha+\beta)} 2^{1-\beta-d}}{\pi^{\frac{d-1}{2}}} \frac{\Gamma(2\alpha + \beta - d)}{\Gamma(\alpha) \Gamma(\alpha + \beta + \frac{1-d}{2})} [-\tilde{\omega}]^{d-(2\alpha+\beta)} \\
&\quad \times {}_2F_1\left(\frac{2\alpha + \beta - d}{2}, \frac{2\alpha + \beta + 1 - d}{2}; \frac{2\alpha + 2\beta + 1 - d}{2}; -\frac{4\tilde{m}^2}{\tilde{\omega}^2}\right), \quad (\text{D.1})
\end{aligned}$$

with $\tilde{m}^2 := m^2 - \frac{\tilde{\omega}^2}{4} - i\epsilon$ and $\text{Re}(d) < 2\alpha + \beta$. Of course, for the calculation of the one-loop anomalous dimension matrix only the UV pole is needed, which permits the neglect of the mass in the numerator of the fermion propagator, since it does not contribute to the pole. For the system $\{\tilde{O}_{i=1,\dots,8}^q, \tilde{E}_{i=1,\dots,6}^q\}$ the anomalous dimension matrices are given by

$$\hat{\gamma}_{\tilde{O}\tilde{O}}^{(0)} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{3}{N_c} - 3N_c & 0 & 6 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{3}{N_c} - 3N_c & 0 & 6 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{3}{2} - \frac{3}{2N_c^2} & 0 & -\frac{3}{N_c} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{3}{2} - \frac{3}{2N_c^2} & 0 & -\frac{3}{N_c} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{3}{N_c} - 3N_c & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{3}{N_c} - 3N_c & -2 & 8 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{3}{N_c} - 3N_c & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2}\left(-1 + \frac{1}{N_c^2}\right) & 2 - \frac{2}{N_c^2} & \frac{2}{N_c} - N_c & -\frac{5}{N_c} + N_c \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{D.2})$$

and

$$\hat{\gamma}_{\tilde{O}\tilde{E}}^{(0)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{8}\left(-1 + \frac{1}{N_c^2}\right) & 0 & -\frac{N_c^2-2}{4N_c} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{8}\left(-1 + \frac{1}{N_c^2}\right) & 0 & -\frac{N_c^2-2}{4N_c} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{8}\left(-1 + \frac{1}{N_c^2}\right) & -\frac{N_c^2-2}{4N_c} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{D.3})$$

For the corresponding system of primed operators the anomalous dimension matrices are identical. The upper-left 4×4 blocks correspond to the basis of SM HQET operators and have been computed in Refs. [15, 27, 100]; we find agreement with these previous results. The remaining entries are new. We note that the slightly more complicated structure of the last row of eq. (D.2) is due to the reduction of the tensor Dirac structures by means of eq. (2.17).

E Calculation of the mixed quark-gluon condensate contribution

To calculate the contribution from the mixed condensate $\langle g_s \bar{q} \sigma_{\mu\nu} G^{\mu\nu} q \rangle$, we consider the left bottom diagram in fig. 4 and start again with the usual definition of the correlator

$$K(\omega_1, \omega_2) = \int d^d x_1 d^d x_2 e^{ip_1 x_1 - ip_2 x_2} \times \langle 0 | \bar{q}(x_2) \gamma_5 h(x_2) \bar{h}(0) \Gamma q(0) \otimes \bar{q}(0) \Gamma' h(0) \bar{h}(x_1) \gamma_5 q(x_1) | 0 \rangle. \quad (\text{E.1})$$

However in this case, while we still contract the heavy quark fields, we only contract one pair of quark fields to form a light quark propagator with a gluon emission and treat the other two light quarks as soft external states, i.e.

$$K(\omega_1, \omega_2) = \int d^d x_1 d^d x_2 e^{ip_1 x_1 - ip_2 x_2} \times \langle 0 | \overbrace{\bar{q}(x_2) \gamma_5 h(x_2)} \overbrace{\bar{h}(0) \Gamma q(0)} \otimes \bar{q}(0) \Gamma' h(0) \overbrace{\bar{h}(x_1) \gamma_5 q(x_1)} | 0 \rangle. \quad (\text{E.2})$$

When writing the quark propagators, we would like to convert to momentum space as usual, however on the right-hand side of the operator insertion in eq. (E.2), we have only one propagator and consequently no closed loop. Introducing the momentum representation on the right-hand side and performing the $d^4 x_1$ integral then forces the heavy-quark propagator to become $1/(2\omega_2)$ by means of $p_2 \cdot v = \omega_2$.

With the HQET and NLO light quark propagators respectively defined

$$iS_{ij}^h(k) = \frac{i\delta_{ij}(1 + \not{v})}{2(k \cdot v)}, \quad (\text{E.3})$$

$$iS_{ij}^{(1)}(k) = -ig_s \frac{T_{ij}^b G_{\mu\rho}^b(0)}{4(p^2 - m^2)^2} ((\not{k} + m)\sigma_{\mu\rho} + \sigma_{\mu\rho}(\not{k} + m)), \quad (\text{E.4})$$

we write the full correlator for the \tilde{T}_1 operator as

$$K_{\tilde{T}_1}(\omega_1, \omega_2) = \mathbf{Colour} \times \int \frac{d^d k_2}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{\text{Tr}[(\not{k}_2 \sigma_{\mu\nu} + \sigma_{\mu\nu} \not{k}_2) \gamma_5 (1 + \not{v}) \gamma_\sigma (1 - \gamma_5)]}{4(k_2^2)^2 \cdot 2(k_2 \cdot v + \omega_2)} \times \left\{ \frac{[\gamma^\sigma (1 - \gamma_5)(1 + \not{v}) \gamma_5]_{\epsilon\lambda}}{2(k_1 \cdot v)} \right\}_{k_1=p_1} \langle 0 | \bar{q}_{l\epsilon}(0) q_{n\lambda}(x_1) | 0 \rangle. \quad (\text{E.5})$$

Taking the quark field expansion at leading order, i.e. $q(x_1) = q(0)$, the sought-after condensate can be constructed after some colour algebra:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Colour} \cdot \langle \dots \rangle &= g_s T_{ik}^b T_{jk}^a T_{lm}^a \delta_{ij} \delta_{mn} G_{\mu\nu}^b \langle 0 | \bar{q}_{l\epsilon}(0) q_{n\lambda}(x_1) | 0 \rangle \\ &= g_s \frac{\delta^{ab}}{2} T_{ln}^a G_{\mu\nu}^b \langle 0 | \bar{q}_{l\epsilon}(0) q_{n\lambda}(0) | 0 \rangle \\ &= \frac{\delta_{ll}}{24d(d-1)} \langle g_s \bar{q} \sigma_{\mu\nu} G^{\mu\nu} q \rangle \sigma_{\lambda\epsilon}^{\mu\nu}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.6})$$

where the last step uses the relation [92]

$$\langle 0 | \bar{q}_{i\alpha}(0) T_{ij}^a G^{a\mu\nu} q_{j\beta}(0) | 0 \rangle = \frac{\delta_{ii}}{12d(d-1)} \langle \bar{q} \sigma_{\mu\nu} G^{\mu\nu} q \rangle \sigma_{\beta\alpha}^{\mu\nu}. \quad (\text{E.7})$$

Inserting this into the correlator and performing the Dirac traces, we find

$$K_{\tilde{T}_1}(\omega_1, \omega_2) = \frac{N_c}{96d(d-1)} \times \frac{1}{2(k_1 \cdot v)} \Big|_{k_1=p_1} \langle g_s \bar{q} \sigma_{\mu\nu} G^{\mu\nu} q \rangle \times \int \frac{d^d k_2}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{-192(v \cdot k_2)}{(k_2^2)^2 2(k_2 \cdot v + \omega_2)}. \quad (\text{E.8})$$

This expression can be further reduced, leading to

$$K_{\tilde{T}_1}(\omega_1, \omega_2) = \frac{N_c}{2\omega_1} \frac{\langle g_s \bar{q} \sigma G q \rangle (d-3)}{\omega_2 d (d-1)} I(\omega_2), \quad (\text{E.9})$$

where the one-loop integral is defined [103]

$$I(\omega) = \int \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{1}{2(k \cdot v + \omega) k^2} = \frac{i}{(4\pi)^{d/2}} \frac{\Gamma(1-\epsilon)\Gamma(-1+2\epsilon)}{\Gamma(1)} (-2\omega)^{1-2\epsilon}. \quad (\text{E.10})$$

Note that while this correlator has a discontinuity for positive, real ω_2 , it is not discontinuous in ω_1 where it instead has a simple pole at $\omega_1 = 0$. In order to express the dispersion relation as an integral over the positive real line such that it can be used in the sum rule, we write

$$\oint d\nu \frac{A}{\nu(\nu-\omega)} = \int_0^\infty d\nu \frac{A}{\nu-\omega} \delta(\omega), \quad (\text{E.11})$$

where A is some constant. The spectral density contribution for the mixed quark-gluon condensate therefore reads

$$\Delta\rho_{\tilde{T}_1}^{\text{cond}} = \frac{N_c \langle g_s \bar{q} \sigma G q \rangle}{192\pi^2} [\delta(\nu_1) + \delta(\nu_2)], \quad (\text{E.12})$$

where we have further included the $\omega_1 \leftrightarrow \omega_2$ symmetric diagram on the bottom right in [fig. 4](#).

References

- [1] Heavy Flavor Averaging Group (HFLAV) collaboration, S. Banerjee et al., *Averages of b -hadron, c -hadron, and τ -lepton properties as of 2023*, [arXiv:2411.18639](#).
- [2] V. A. Khoze and M. A. Shifman, *HEAVY QUARKS*, [Sov. Phys. Usp.](#) **26** (1983) 387.
- [3] M. A. Shifman and M. B. Voloshin, *Preasymptotic Effects in Inclusive Weak Decays of Charmed Particles*, [Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.](#) **41** (1985) 120.
- [4] V. A. Khoze, M. A. Shifman, N. G. Uraltsev and M. B. Voloshin, *On Inclusive Hadronic Widths of Beautiful Particles*, [Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.](#) **46** (1987) 112.
- [5] J. Chay, H. Georgi and B. Grinstein, *Lepton energy distributions in heavy meson decays from QCD*, [Phys. Lett. B](#) **247** (1990) 399.
- [6] I. I. Y. Bigi and N. G. Uraltsev, *Gluonic enhancements in non-spectator beauty decays: An Inclusive mirage though an exclusive possibility*, [Phys. Lett. B](#) **280** (1992) 271.
- [7] I. I. Y. Bigi, N. G. Uraltsev and A. I. Vainshtein, *Nonperturbative corrections to inclusive beauty and charm decays: QCD versus phenomenological models*, [Phys. Lett. B](#) **293** (1992) 430 [[arXiv:hep-ph/9207214](#)], [Erratum: [Phys.Lett.B](#) 297, 477–477 (1992)].

- [8] I. I. Y. Bigi, M. A. Shifman, N. G. Uraltsev and A. I. Vainshtein, *QCD predictions for lepton spectra in inclusive heavy flavor decays*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **71** (1993) 496 [[arXiv:hep-ph/9304225](#)].
- [9] B. Blok, L. Koyrakh, M. A. Shifman and A. I. Vainshtein, *Differential distributions in semileptonic decays of the heavy flavors in QCD*, *Phys. Rev. D* **49** (1994) 3356 [[arXiv:hep-ph/9307247](#)], [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.D* 50, 3572 (1994)].
- [10] T. Mannel, *Operator product expansion for inclusive semileptonic decays in heavy quark effective field theory*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **413** (1994) 396 [[arXiv:hep-ph/9308262](#)].
- [11] A. V. Manohar and M. B. Wise, *Inclusive semileptonic B and polarized Lambda(b) decays from QCD*, *Phys. Rev. D* **49** (1994) 1310 [[arXiv:hep-ph/9308246](#)].
- [12] A. Lenz, *Lifetimes and heavy quark expansion*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **30** (2015) 1543005 [[arXiv:1405.3601](#)].
- [13] J. Albrecht, F. Bernlochner, A. Lenz and A. Rusov, *Lifetimes of b-hadrons and mixing of neutral B-mesons: theoretical and experimental status*, *Eur. Phys. J. ST* **233** (2024) 359 [[arXiv:2402.04224](#)].
- [14] N. G. Uraltsev, *On the problem of boosting nonleptonic b baryon decays*, *Phys. Lett. B* **376** (1996) 303 [[arXiv:hep-ph/9602324](#)].
- [15] M. Neubert and C. T. Sachrajda, *Spectator effects in inclusive decays of beauty hadrons*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **483** (1997) 339 [[arXiv:hep-ph/9603202](#)].
- [16] M. Beneke, G. Buchalla, C. Greub, A. Lenz and U. Nierste, *The $B^+ - B_d^0$ Lifetime Difference Beyond Leading Logarithms*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **639** (2002) 389 [[arXiv:hep-ph/0202106](#)].
- [17] E. Franco, V. Lubicz, F. Mescia and C. Tarantino, *Lifetime ratios of beauty hadrons at the next-to-leading order in QCD*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **633** (2002) 212 [[arXiv:hep-ph/0203089](#)].
- [18] UKQCD collaboration, M. Di Pierro and C. T. Sachrajda, *A Lattice study of spectator effects in inclusive decays of B mesons*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **534** (1998) 373 [[arXiv:hep-lat/9805028](#)].
- [19] UKQCD collaboration, M. Di Pierro, C. T. Sachrajda and C. Michael, *An Exploratory lattice study of spectator effects in inclusive decays of the Λ_b baryon*, *Phys. Lett. B* **468** (1999) 143 [[arXiv:hep-lat/9906031](#)], [Erratum: *Phys.Lett.B* 525, 360–360 (2002)].
- [20] D. Becirevic, *Theoretical progress in describing the B meson lifetimes*, *PoS HEP2001* (2001) 098 [[arXiv:hep-ph/0110124](#)].
- [21] M. A. Shifman, A. I. Vainshtein and V. I. Zakharov, *QCD and Resonance Physics. Theoretical Foundations*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **147** (1979) 385.
- [22] M. A. Shifman, A. I. Vainshtein and V. I. Zakharov, *QCD and Resonance Physics: Applications*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **147** (1979) 448.
- [23] H.-Y. Cheng and K.-C. Yang, *Nonspectator effects and B meson lifetimes from a field theoretic calculation*, *Phys. Rev. D* **59** (1999) 014011 [[arXiv:hep-ph/9805222](#)].
- [24] M. S. Baek, J. Lee, C. Liu and H. S. Song, *Four quark operators relevant to B meson lifetimes from QCD sum rules*, *Phys. Rev. D* **57** (1998) 4091 [[arXiv:hep-ph/9709386](#)].
- [25] A. G. Grozin and R. N. Lee, *Three-loop HQET vertex diagrams for $B^0 - \text{anti-}B^0$ mixing*, *JHEP* **02** (2009) 047 [[arXiv:0812.4522](#)].

- [26] A. G. Grozin, R. Klein, T. Mannel and A. A. Pivovarov, $B^0 - \bar{B}^0$ mixing at next-to-leading order, *Phys. Rev. D* **94** (2016) 034024 [arXiv:1606.06054].
- [27] M. Kirk, A. Lenz and T. Rauh, Dimension-six matrix elements for meson mixing and lifetimes from sum rules, *JHEP* **12** (2017) 068 [arXiv:1711.02100], [Erratum: *JHEP* 06, 162 (2020)].
- [28] M. J. Kirk, *Charming New Physics in Beautiful Processes?*, Ph.D. thesis, Durham U., IPPP, Charm, Switzerland, 6, 2018. 10.1007/978-3-030-19197-9.
- [29] D. King, A. Lenz and T. Rauh, B_s mixing observables and $-V_{td}/V_{ts}$ from sum rules, *JHEP* **05** (2019) 034 [arXiv:1904.00940].
- [30] D. J. King, *Three loop corrections to HQET Sum Rules for the Bag Parameter*, <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/14487/>, Ph.D. thesis, Durham University, 2022.
- [31] D. King, A. Lenz and T. Rauh, $SU(3)$ breaking effects in B and D meson lifetimes, *JHEP* **06** (2022) 134 [arXiv:2112.03691].
- [32] J. Lin, W. Detmold and S. Meinel, *Lattice Study of Spectator Effects in b -hadron Decays*, *PoS LATTICE2022* (2023) 417 [arXiv:2212.09275].
- [33] M. Black et al., *Using Gradient Flow to Renormalise Matrix Elements for Meson Mixing and Lifetimes*, *PoS LATTICE2023* (2024) 263 [arXiv:2310.18059].
- [34] M. Black, *Improving Precision for Hadronic Observables in the Standard Model and Beyond*, <https://dx.doi.org/10.25819/ubsi/10603>, Ph.D. thesis, Universität Siegen, 2024.
- [35] M. Black et al., *Gradient Flow Renormalisation for Meson Mixing and Lifetimes*, in *41st International Symposium on Lattice Field Theory*, 9, 2024, arXiv:2409.18891.
- [36] R. Narayanan and H. Neuberger, *Infinite N phase transitions in continuum Wilson loop operators*, *JHEP* **03** (2006) 064 [arXiv:hep-th/0601210].
- [37] M. Lüscher, *Properties and uses of the Wilson flow in lattice QCD*, *JHEP* **08** (2010) 071 [arXiv:1006.4518], [Erratum: *JHEP* 03, 092 (2014)].
- [38] M. Lüscher, *Chiral symmetry and the Yang–Mills gradient flow*, *JHEP* **04** (2013) 123 [arXiv:1302.5246].
- [39] F. Gabbiani, A. I. Onishchenko and A. A. Petrov, *Spectator effects and lifetimes of heavy hadrons*, *Phys. Rev. D* **70** (2004) 094031 [arXiv:hep-ph/0407004].
- [40] A. Lenz, M. L. Piscopo and A. V. Rusov, *Disintegration of beauty: a precision study*, *JHEP* **01** (2023) 004 [arXiv:2208.02643].
- [41] M. Egner, M. Fael, A. Lenz, M. Piscopo, A. Rusov, K. Schönwald et al., *Total decay rates of B mesons at NNLO-QCD*, arXiv:to appear.
- [42] M. Egner, M. Fael, K. Schönwald and M. Steinhauser, *Nonleptonic B -meson decays to next-to-next-to-leading order*, *JHEP* **10** (2024) 144 [arXiv:2406.19456].
- [43] T. Mannel, D. Moreno and A. A. Pivovarov, *QCD corrections at subleading power for inclusive nonleptonic $b \rightarrow c\bar{u}d$ decays*, *Phys. Rev. D* **110** (2024) 094011 [arXiv:2408.06767].
- [44] A. Lenz, A. Mohamed and Z. Wüthrich, *Constraining B -Mesogenesis models with B meson lifetimes, inclusive and exclusive B decays*, arXiv:to appear.
- [45] C. Bobeth, U. Haisch, A. Lenz, B. Pecjak and G. Tetlalmatzi-Xolocotzi, *On new physics in $\Delta\Gamma_d$* , *JHEP* **06** (2014) 040 [arXiv:1404.2531].

- [46] J. Brod, A. Lenz, G. Tetlalmatzi-Xolocotzi and M. Wiebusch, *New physics effects in tree-level decays and the precision in the determination of the quark mixing angle γ* , [*Phys. Rev. D* **92** \(2015\) 033002](#) [[arXiv:1412.1446](#)].
- [47] S. Jäger, M. Kirk, A. Lenz and K. Leslie, *Charming new physics in rare B-decays and mixing?*, [*Phys. Rev. D* **97** \(2018\) 015021](#) [[arXiv:1701.09183](#)].
- [48] A. Lenz and G. Tetlalmatzi-Xolocotzi, *Model-independent bounds on new physics effects in non-leptonic tree-level decays of B-mesons*, [*JHEP* **07** \(2020\) 177](#) [[arXiv:1912.07621](#)].
- [49] S. Jäger, M. Kirk, A. Lenz and K. Leslie, *Charming New B-Physics*, [*JHEP* **03** \(2020\) 122](#) [[arXiv:1910.12924](#)], [Erratum: *JHEP* 04, 094 (2023)].
- [50] A. Crivellin and M. Kirk, *Diquark explanation of $b \rightarrow s\ell + \ell^-$* , [*Phys. Rev. D* **108** \(2023\) L111701](#) [[arXiv:2309.07205](#)].
- [51] M. Beneke, G. Buchalla, M. Neubert and C. T. Sachrajda, *QCD factorization for exclusive, nonleptonic B meson decays: General arguments and the case of heavy light final states*, [*Nucl. Phys. B* **591** \(2000\) 313](#) [[arXiv:hep-ph/0006124](#)].
- [52] M. Bordone, N. Gubernari, T. Huber, M. Jung and D. van Dyk, *A puzzle in $\bar{B}_{(s)}^0 \rightarrow D_{(s)}^{(*)+} \{\pi^-, K^-\}$ decays and extraction of the f_s/f_d fragmentation fraction*, [*Eur. Phys. J. C* **80** \(2020\) 951](#) [[arXiv:2007.10338](#)].
- [53] T. Huber, S. Kränkl and X.-Q. Li, *Two-body non-leptonic heavy-to-heavy decays at NNLO in QCD factorization*, [*JHEP* **09** \(2016\) 112](#) [[arXiv:1606.02888](#)].
- [54] M. L. Piscopo and A. V. Rusov, *Non-factorisable effects in the decays $\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^+ \pi^-$ and $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^+ K^-$ from LCSR*, [*JHEP* **10** \(2023\) 180](#) [[arXiv:2307.07594](#)].
- [55] M. Beneke, P. Böer, G. Finauri and K. K. Vos, *QED factorization of two-body non-leptonic and semi-leptonic B to charm decays*, [*JHEP* **10** \(2021\) 223](#) [[arXiv:2107.03819](#)].
- [56] M. Endo, S. Iguro and S. Mishima, *Revisiting rescattering contributions to $\bar{B}_{(s)}^0 \rightarrow D_{(s)}^{(*)} M$ decays*, [*JHEP* **01** \(2022\) 147](#) [[arXiv:2109.10811](#)].
- [57] F.-M. Cai, W.-J. Deng, X.-Q. Li and Y.-D. Yang, *Probing new physics in class-I B-meson decays into heavy-light final states*, [*JHEP* **10** \(2021\) 235](#) [[arXiv:2103.04138](#)].
- [58] S. Iguro and T. Kitahara, *Implications for new physics from a novel puzzle in $\bar{B}_{(s)}^0 \rightarrow D_{(s)}^{(*)+} \{\pi^-, K^-\}$ decays*, [*Phys. Rev. D* **102** \(2020\) 071701](#) [[arXiv:2008.01086](#)].
- [59] T. Gershon, A. Lenz, A. V. Rusov and N. Skidmore, *Testing the Standard Model with CP asymmetries in flavor-specific nonleptonic decays*, [*Phys. Rev. D* **105** \(2022\) 115023](#) [[arXiv:2111.04478](#)].
- [60] R. Fleischer and E. Malami, *Using $B_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^\mp K^\pm$ Decays as a Portal to New Physics*, [*Phys. Rev. D* **106** \(2022\) 056004](#) [[arXiv:2109.04950](#)].
- [61] R. Fleischer and E. Malami, *Revealing new physics in $\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^\mp K^\pm$ decays*, [*Eur. Phys. J. C* **83** \(2023\) 420](#) [[arXiv:2110.04240](#)].
- [62] M. Bordone, A. Greljo and D. Marzocca, *Exploiting dijet resonance searches for flavor physics*, [*JHEP* **08** \(2021\) 036](#) [[arXiv:2103.10332](#)].
- [63] O. Atkinson, C. Englert, M. Kirk and G. Tetlalmatzi-Xolocotzi, *Collider-Flavour Complementarity from the bottom to the top*, [arXiv:2411.00940](#).

- [64] S. Meiser, D. van Dyk and J. Virto, *Towards a Global Analysis of the $b \rightarrow c\bar{u}q$ Puzzle*, [arXiv:2411.09458](#).
- [65] G. Buchalla, A. J. Buras and M. E. Lautenbacher, *Weak decays beyond leading logarithms*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **68** (1996) 1125 [[arXiv:hep-ph/9512380](#)].
- [66] A. Lenz, J. Müller, M. L. Piscopo and A. V. Rusov, *Taming new physics in $b \rightarrow c\bar{u}d(s)$ with $\tau(B^+)/\tau(B_d)$ and a_{sl}^d* , *JHEP* **09** (2023) 028 [[arXiv:2211.02724](#)].
- [67] M. Lang, A. Lenz, A. Mohamed, M. Piscopo and A. Rusov, *Contribution of the Darwin operator to non-leptonic decays beyond the standard model*, [arXiv:to appear](#).
- [68] A. J. Buras, M. Misiak and J. Urban, *Two loop QCD anomalous dimensions of flavor changing four quark operators within and beyond the standard model*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **586** (2000) 397 [[arXiv:hep-ph/0005183](#)].
- [69] D. J. Broadhurst and A. G. Grozin, *Operator product expansion in static quark effective field theory: Large perturbative correction*, *Phys. Lett. B* **274** (1992) 421 [[arXiv:hep-ph/9908363](#)].
- [70] E. Bagan, P. Ball, V. M. Braun and H. G. Dosch, *QCD sum rules in the effective heavy quark theory*, *Phys. Lett. B* **278** (1992) 457.
- [71] M. Neubert, *Heavy meson form-factors from QCD sum rules*, *Phys. Rev. D* **45** (1992) 2451.
- [72] P. Nogueira, *Automatic Feynman Graph Generation*, *J. Comput. Phys.* **105** (1993) 279.
- [73] M. Gerlach, F. Herren and M. Lang, *tapir: A tool for topologies, amplitudes, partial fraction decomposition and input for reductions*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **282** (2023) 108544 [[arXiv:2201.05618](#)].
- [74] J. A. M. Vermaseren, *New features of FORM*, [arXiv:math-ph/0010025](#).
- [75] J. Kuipers, T. Ueda, J. A. M. Vermaseren and J. Vollinga, *FORM version 4.0*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **184** (2013) 1453 [[arXiv:1203.6543](#)].
- [76] B. Ruijl, T. Ueda and J. Vermaseren, *FORM version 4.2*, [arXiv:1707.06453](#).
- [77] M. Jamin and M. E. Lautenbacher, *TRACER: Version 1.1: A Mathematica package for gamma algebra in arbitrary dimensions*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **74** (1993) 265.
- [78] K. G. Chetyrkin and F. V. Tkachov, *Integration by parts: The algorithm to calculate β -functions in 4 loops*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **192** (1981) 159.
- [79] S. Laporta, *High-precision calculation of multiloop Feynman integrals by difference equations*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **15** (2000) 5087 [[arXiv:hep-ph/0102033](#)].
- [80] P. Maierhöfer, J. Usovitsch and P. Uwer, *Kira—A Feynman integral reduction program*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **230** (2018) 99 [[arXiv:1705.05610](#)].
- [81] J. Klappert, F. Lange, P. Maierhöfer and J. Usovitsch, *Integral reduction with Kira 2.0 and finite field methods*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **266** (2021) 108024 [[arXiv:2008.06494](#)].
- [82] R. Mertig, M. Böhm and A. Denner, *FEYN CALC: Computer algebraic calculation of Feynman amplitudes*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **64** (1991) 345.
- [83] V. Shtabovenko, R. Mertig and F. Orellana, *New Developments in FeynCalc 9.0*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **207** (2016) 432 [[arXiv:1601.01167](#)].
- [84] V. Shtabovenko, R. Mertig and F. Orellana, *FeynCalc 10: Do multiloop integrals dream of computer codes?*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **306** (2025) 109357 [[arXiv:2312.14089](#)].

- [85] R. N. Lee, *Presenting LiteRed: a tool for the Loop InTEgrals REDuction*, [arXiv:1212.2685](#).
- [86] R. N. Lee, *LiteRed 1.4: a powerful tool for reduction of multiloop integrals*, *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **523** (2014) 012059 [[arXiv:1310.1145](#)].
- [87] A. V. Smirnov, *Algorithm FIRE – Feynman Integral REDuction*, *JHEP* **10** (2008) 107 [[arXiv:0807.3243](#)].
- [88] A. V. Smirnov and F. S. Chukharev, *FIRE6: Feynman Integral REDuction with modular arithmetic*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **247** (2020) 106877 [[arXiv:1901.07808](#)].
- [89] T. Huber and D. Maitre, *HypExp: A Mathematica package for expanding hypergeometric functions around integer-valued parameters*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **175** (2006) 122 [[arXiv:hep-ph/0507094](#)].
- [90] T. Huber and D. Maitre, *HypExp 2, Expanding Hypergeometric Functions about Half-Integer Parameters*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **178** (2008) 755 [[arXiv:0708.2443](#)].
- [91] V. A. Novikov, M. A. Shifman, A. I. Vainshtein and V. I. Zakharov, *Calculations in external fields in quantum chromodynamics. Technical review*, *Fortsch. Phys.* **32** (1984) 585.
- [92] P. Pascual and R. Tarrach, *QCD: RENORMALIZATION FOR THE PRACTITIONER*, vol. 194. 1984.
- [93] J. S. Schwinger, *On gauge invariance and vacuum polarization*, *Phys. Rev.* **82** (1951) 664.
- [94] V. Fock, *Proper time in classical and quantum mechanics*, *Phys. Z. Sowjetunion* **12** (1937) 404.
- [95] J. Schwinger, *Particles, Sources, And Fields*. CRC Press, 1998, [10.1201/9780429498480](#).
- [96] Particle Data Group collaboration, S. Navas et al., *Review of particle physics*, *Phys. Rev. D* **110** (2024) 030001.
- [97] K. G. Chetyrkin, J. H. Kuhn and M. Steinhauser, *RunDec: A Mathematica package for running and decoupling of the strong coupling and quark masses*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **133** (2000) 43 [[arXiv:hep-ph/0004189](#)].
- [98] B. Schmidt and M. Steinhauser, *CRunDec: a C++ package for running and decoupling of the strong coupling and quark masses*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **183** (2012) 1845 [[arXiv:1201.6149](#)].
- [99] F. Herren and M. Steinhauser, *Version 3 of RunDec and CRunDec*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **224** (2018) 333 [[arXiv:1703.03751](#)].
- [100] M. Ciuchini, E. Franco, V. Lubicz and F. Mescia, *Next-to-leading order QCD corrections to spectator effects in lifetimes of beauty hadrons*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **625** (2002) 211 [[arXiv:hep-ph/0110375](#)].
- [101] J. Aebischer and M. Pesut, *One-loop Fierz transformations*, *JHEP* **10** (2022) 090 [[arXiv:2208.10513](#)].
- [102] M. Ciuchini, E. Franco, V. Lubicz, G. Martinelli, I. Scimemi and L. Silvestrini, *Next-to-leading order QCD corrections to Delta F = 2 effective Hamiltonians*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **523** (1998) 501 [[arXiv:hep-ph/9711402](#)].
- [103] A. G. Grozin, *Lectures on multiloop calculations*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **19** (2004) 473 [[arXiv:hep-ph/0307297](#)].