

Two-Loop Anomalous Dimensions in the LEFT: Dimension-Six Four-Fermion Operators in NDR

Jason Aebischer^a, Pol Morell^{b,c}, Marko Pesut^d and Javier Virto^{b,c}

^a *Theoretical Physics Department, CERN, 1211 Geneva 23, Switzerland*

^b *Departament de Física Quàntica i Astrofísica, Universitat de Barcelona, Martí Franquès 1, E08028 Barcelona, Catalunya*

^c *Institut de Ciències del Cosmos (ICCUB), Universitat de Barcelona, Martí Franquès 1, E08028 Barcelona, Catalunya*

^d *Physik-Institut, Universität Zürich, CH-8057 Zürich, Switzerland*

E-mail: jason.aebischer@cern.ch, pmorell@icc.ub.edu,
marko.pesut@physik.uzh.ch, jvirto@icc.ub.edu

ABSTRACT: We derive the complete set of two-loop anomalous dimensions describing the mixing of four-fermion operators in the Low Energy Effective Field Theory (LEFT). The calculation is performed in Naive Dimensional Regularization with anticommuting γ_5 (the NDR scheme), and the results are given in the “JMS basis” of dimension-six operators. The derivation relies on known results for UV poles in two-loop diagrams in QCD, which are then used to derive the two-loop Anomalous Dimension Matrix (ADM) for the full set of four-fermion operators including $O(\alpha_s^2)$, $O(\alpha_s\alpha)$ and $O(\alpha^2)$ corrections. The method employed is an extension of a common approach to deal with traces containing γ_5 in NDR. Our results have been implemented in the public code `DsixTools`. We also discuss and provide the results in the LEFT with 5, 4 and 3 active quark flavors.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	The LEFT at two-loop Order	3
2.1	Definition of the Effective Theory	3
2.2	Renormalization and scale dependence	6
2.3	Change of Operator Basis	9
3	RG-invariant sectors	11
3.1	$\Delta F = 2$ transitions $(\bar{f}_i f_j \bar{f}_i f_j)$	11
3.2	$\Delta F = 1.5$ transitions $(\bar{f}_i f_j \bar{f}_k f_j)$	14
3.3	$\Delta F = 1$ transitions $(\bar{f}_i f_j \bar{f}'_k f'_l)$	14
3.4	$\Delta F = 1^{\bar{f}f}$ transitions $(\bar{f}_i f_j \bar{f}'_k f'_k)$	16
3.5	$\Delta F = 0$ transitions $(\bar{f}_i f_i \bar{f}'_j f'_j)$	19
3.6	$\Delta L = 2$ transitions $(\bar{\nu}_i^c \nu_j \bar{f}_k f_l)$ or $\bar{\nu}_i^c e_j \bar{d}_k u_l)$	20
3.7	$\Delta L = 4$ transitions $(\bar{\nu}_i^c \nu_j \bar{\nu}_k^c \nu_l)$	21
3.8	$ \Delta B = \Delta L = 1$ transitions: (baryon number violating)	21
4	Details of the calculation and results	22
4.1	Change of basis of known results into JMS	23
4.2	ADMs from Flavor Symmetries	26
4.3	Full ADM from Pole Coefficients	27
4.4	Results: Beta-Functions and DsixTools Ancillaries	42
5	Numerical Analysis	42
6	Conclusions	45
A	Evanescent Operator Basis	48
B	Tables of Pole Coefficients	49
C	Penguin ADM Seeds	52

1 Introduction

With the exception of the top quark, with a Yukawa coupling of order one, all the other fermions in the Standard Model (SM) have small Yukawa couplings. This leads to a hierarchy between the masses of Electroweak-scale particles (the W and Z bosons, the Higgs boson and the top quark) and the masses of all the other SM fermions, $\Lambda_{\text{EW}} \sim v \gg m_b$. Any observables where all kinematic invariants $s_{ij} \equiv p_i \cdot p_j$ are small with respect to Λ_{EW} can then be expanded in powers of $s_{ij}/\Lambda_{\text{EW}}^2$ and m/Λ_{EW} , with m the mass of a light fermion, and with expansion coefficients containing large logarithms of these ratios, e.g. $\log(m_b/m_W)$. This expansion can be framed in the context of an Effective Field Theory (EFT), which at the same time implements scale factorization and allows to resum the large logarithms.

This EFT is a generalization of Fermi’s theory of weak interactions [1], and it is described by an effective Lagrangian built out of “light” SM fields, with local operators invariant under $SU(3)_c \times U(1)_{\text{em}}$ gauge transformations, and organized in increasing canonical mass dimension. Leading terms of dimension four or less give rise to the renormalizable theory of light quarks and leptons interacting with photons and gluons; dimension-five terms give rise to electromagnetic and chromomagnetic dipole interactions, and dimension-six terms contain –for example– local four-fermion interactions of the Fermi type.

Since at the renormalizable level this EFT contains no weak interactions, it is in a sense a low-energy effective theory for weak interactions, and has therefore been called the “Weak effective Hamiltonian” [2], or the “Weak Effective Theory” (WET) [3]. However, it is also the low-energy EFT of any quantum field theory which shares the field content and gauge symmetry with the SM below the Electroweak (EW) scale. This includes Beyond-the-SM (BSM) theories where all the new particles are heavier than the EW scale. Thus, it has also recently been called the “Low-Energy Effective Field Theory” (LEFT) [4].

The LEFT has been studied in detail as the low-energy EFT of the SM [5–28]. In this case, only a subset of the most general set of effective operators is present. However, motivated by the contemporary automation philosophy [29, 30], efforts are now being made to set up the LEFT in its entirety both to higher orders in the EFT expansion [31, 32], and to higher orders in the loop expansion. In the latter case, a full one-loop calculation of anomalous dimensions was presented in Refs. [3, 33], and the complete one-loop matching to the Standard Model EFT (SMEFT) was presented in [34]. Two-loop anomalous dimensions for a set of flavor-changing four-quark operators can be found in Refs. [23, 35], and very recently, the full set of two-loop dimension-five contributions have been calculated [36, 37].

The purpose of this article is to complete the two-loop anomalous dimensions for the full set of four-fermion operators in the LEFT. This is not a trivial task due to the fact that, beyond the one-loop level, anomalous dimensions are scheme dependent. This means

that one needs to properly perform a change of scheme whenever necessary, for example in the cases where our operator basis differs from the one used in the calculation by a transformation involving evanescent terms [19, 38–41]. Furthermore, following the lead of the first complete account of the dimension-six LEFT [4] we will frame all our results in the so-called “JMS” operator basis. This is somewhat arbitrary, and other choices may appear advantageous in various contexts. For example, the “Bern” basis of [3, 42] (based on the earlier “CMM” basis for SM operators [20, 21]) has the advantage of avoiding closed fermion loops with γ_5 factors in flavor-changing transitions. However, this feature is no longer satisfied in flavor-conserving ones. The “BMU” basis [23] has the advantage of preserving the SM set of operators, but this also complicates significantly the structure of BSM operators, and hides certain flavor symmetries of matching conditions and anomalous dimensions [35]. Taking into account that the tools for EFT calculations are mostly automated already (e.g. [43–47]), we feel that the most convenient choice is to stick to JMS.

The structure of this paper is the following. We begin in Section 2 reviewing the LEFT, its renormalization at the two-loop level, and changes of basis at next-to-leading order. In Section 3 we provide the classification of all four-fermion dimension-six operators in the LEFT in terms of RG-invariant sectors. In Section 4.4 we discuss the various approaches followed to reconstruct the full set of two-loop anomalous dimensions for all four-fermion dimension-six operators in the LEFT. The results and their implementation are briefly explored numerically in Section 5, where we show a few examples. We conclude in Section 6. A few appendices at the end contain details concerning evanescent operators, the tables of pole coefficients, and a collection of the building blocks or ‘ADM seeds’ for the penguin contributions.

2 The LEFT at two-loop Order

2.1 Definition of the Effective Theory

The LEFT is the EFT invariant under the $SU(3)_c \times U(1)_{\text{em}}$ gauge group and containing the known degrees of freedom lighter than the EW scale: quarks, leptons, photons, and gluons. Depending on the cut-off scale, some of the fermions may be decoupled. One can thus distinguish between different versions of the theory, $\text{LEFT}(n_q)$, containing $n_q = n_u + n_d$ quarks (n_u up-type and n_d down-type quarks), n_e charged leptons, and n_ν left-handed neutrinos. We will consider three cases of interest:

- $\text{LEFT}(5)$: $n_u = 2, n_d = n_e = n_\nu = 3$, with matter fields $\{u, c, d, s, b, e, \mu, \tau, \nu_{e,\mu,\tau}\}$;
- $\text{LEFT}(4)$: $n_u = n_d = 2, n_e = n_\nu = 3$, with matter fields $\{u, c, d, s, e, \mu, \tau, \nu_{e,\mu,\tau}\}$;
- $\text{LEFT}(3)$: $n_u = 1, n_d = n_e = 2, n_\nu = 3$, with matter fields $\{u, d, s, e, \mu, \nu_{e,\mu,\tau}\}$.

The LEFT(5) contains the EFT of the SM below the EW scale after integrating out the Higgs boson, the massive W^\pm and Z gauge bosons and the top quark, but it is also the EFT of more general theories with new degrees of freedom at or above the EW scale. The LEFT(4) and LEFT(3) are obtained when crossing the b - and c -quark thresholds at around $\mu_b \sim 5$ GeV and $\mu_c \sim 1.5$ GeV. Given the closeness of charm-quark and tau-lepton masses, we will assume they are integrated out at the same threshold μ_c . By ‘LEFT’ we will from here on denote any of the LEFT(n_q) theories.

The Lagrangian of the LEFT is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{LEFT}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{QCD+QED}}^{(n_q)} + \sum_k L_k^{(3)} \mathcal{O}_k^{(3)} + \sum_k L_k^{(5)} \mathcal{O}_k^{(5)} + \sum_k L_k^{(6)} \mathcal{O}_k^{(6)} + O(1/\Lambda_{\text{EW}}^3). \quad (2.1)$$

The (dimensionful) Wilson coefficients $L_k^{(5)}$ and $L_k^{(6)}$ are implicitly suppressed by $1/\Lambda_{\text{EW}}$ and $1/\Lambda_{\text{EW}}^2$, respectively, where Λ_{EW} is the electroweak scale. A complete basis of operators up to dimension six was introduced in Ref. [4]. The explicit form of the operators $\mathcal{O}_k^{(d)}$ in this basis (the ‘‘JMS basis’’) and their symmetries can be checked easily from `DsixTools` [43, 44] (e.g. with the command `LEFTOperatorsGrid[]`).

We use the following conventions:¹ The QCD and QED Lagrangian is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{QCD+QED}}^{(n_q)} = & -\frac{1}{4} G_{\mu\nu}^A G^{A\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} + \theta_{\text{QCD}} \frac{g_s^2}{32\pi^2} \tilde{G}_{\mu\nu}^A G_A^{\mu\nu} + \theta_{\text{QED}} \frac{e^2}{32\pi^2} \tilde{F}_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} \\ & + \sum_{\psi=u,d,e,\nu_L} \bar{\psi} i \not{D} \psi - \sum_{\psi=u,d,e} (\bar{\psi}_L M_\psi \psi_R + \text{h.c.}), \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

where $\psi_{L,R} = P_{L,R} \psi = \frac{1}{2}(1 \mp \gamma_5)\psi$. Implicit in the second line is a sum over flavors: the Dirac mass matrices $M_{u,d,e}$ are, respectively, $n_u \times n_u$, $n_d \times n_d$ and $n_e \times n_e$ matrices in flavor space. The covariant derivative is defined as

$$D_\mu = \partial_\mu + i g_s T^A G_\mu^A + i e Q A_\mu, \quad (2.3)$$

where g_s and e are the $SU(3)_c$ and $U(1)_{\text{em}}$ gauge couplings, respectively. The gauge field tensors are defined as usual,

$$G_{\mu\nu}^A = \partial_\mu G_\nu^A - \partial_\nu G_\mu^A - g_s f^{ABC} G_\mu^B G_\nu^C, \quad (2.4)$$

$$F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu F_\nu - \partial_\nu F_\mu, \quad (2.5)$$

¹These conventions differ from those in [4, 33], in the definition of the fermion mass matrices and the name of the strong gauge coupling.

with covariant derivatives

$$(D_\rho G_{\mu\nu})^A = \partial_\rho G_{\mu\nu}^A - g_s f^{ABC} G_\rho^B G_{\mu\nu}^C, \quad (2.6)$$

$$(D_\rho F_{\mu\nu}) = \partial_\rho F_{\mu\nu}. \quad (2.7)$$

Finally, the dual tensors are defined as $\tilde{X} = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}X^{\rho\sigma}$ (with $\epsilon_{0123} = +1$).

At mass dimension three, aside from the Dirac mass terms inside the QCD+QED Lagrangian, there is one single operator (up to flavor): $(\mathcal{O}_\nu)_{ij} = \nu_{Li}^T C \nu_{Lj}$. The dimension-five operators $\mathcal{O}_k^{(5)}$ are QCD and QED dipole operators,

$$\mathcal{O}_{qG} = (\bar{q}_{Li} \sigma^{\mu\nu} T^A q_{Rj}) G_{\mu\nu}^A, \quad \mathcal{O}_{\psi\gamma} = (\bar{\psi}_{Li} \sigma^{\mu\nu} \psi_{Rj}) F_{\mu\nu}, \quad \mathcal{O}_{\nu\gamma} = (\nu_{Li}^T C \sigma^{\mu\nu} \nu_{Lj}) F_{\mu\nu}, \quad (2.8)$$

with $q = u, d$ and $\psi = u, d, e$. At dimension six there are two triple-gluon operators,

$$\mathcal{O}_G = f^{ABC} G_\mu^{A\nu} G_\nu^{B\rho} G_\rho^{C\mu}, \quad \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{G}} = f^{ABC} \tilde{G}_\mu^{A\nu} G_\nu^{B\rho} G_\rho^{C\mu}, \quad (2.9)$$

and a large number of four-fermion operators of the form

$$\mathcal{O}_{\psi^4} \sim \bar{\psi}_1 \Gamma \psi_2 \bar{\psi}_3 \Gamma \psi_4. \quad (2.10)$$

In this work we focus on these dimension-six four-fermion operators. There are 87 different types (2994 operators including fermion flavor indices for $n_q = 5$). In Section 3 we provide a complete classification of the four-fermion operators in sectors invariant under renormalization.

An important issue arises in the conventions used for the Wilson coefficients of operators of the form

$$\mathcal{O}_{\psi\psi}^{\Gamma_1\Gamma_2} \sim (\bar{\psi}_i \Gamma_1 \psi_j) (\bar{\psi}_k \Gamma_2 \psi_l), \quad (2.11)$$

as discussed e.g. in Refs. [44, 48]. For example, the set of operators

$$\mathcal{O}_{uu}^{V,LL} = (\bar{u}_i \gamma^\mu P_L u_j) (\bar{u}_k \gamma_\mu P_L u_l) \quad (2.12)$$

satisfies

$$\mathcal{O}_{uu}^{V,LL} = \mathcal{O}_{uu}^{V,LL}, \quad (2.13)$$

and in this sense the JMS basis is redundant. Thus the theory only knows about the

combination of Wilson coefficients

$$L_{ijkl}^{V,LL} + L_{klij}^{V,LL} . \quad (2.14)$$

JMS [4] choose to impose that these two Wilson coefficients be equal, and thus

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{LEFT}} \supset \sum_{i,j,k,l} L_{ijkl}^{V,LL} \mathcal{O}_{ijkl}^{V,LL} = \sum_S (2 - \delta_{ik}\delta_{jl}) L_{ijkl}^{V,LL} \mathcal{O}_{ijkl}^{V,LL} . \quad (2.15)$$

where $S = \{(i, j, k, l) \mid i < k\} \cup \{(i, j, k, l) \mid i = k \text{ and } j \leq l\}$. We prefer to restrict the operator basis to the operators appearing in the last term in the above equation, and to include the factors similar to $(2 - \delta_{ik}\delta_{jl})$ in the Wilson coefficients. This only affects the beta functions of the following sets of operators,

$$\mathcal{O}_{ijkl}^{V,LL} = \mathcal{O}_{klij}^{V,LL} , \quad (2.16)$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{ijkl}^{V,LL} = \mathcal{O}_{klij}^{V,LL} , \quad (2.17)$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{ijkl}^{V,LL} = \mathcal{O}_{klij}^{V,LL} = \mathcal{O}_{ilkj}^{V,LL} = \mathcal{O}_{kjil}^{V,LL} , \quad (2.18)$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{ijkl}^{V,LL} = \mathcal{O}_{klij}^{V,LL} = \mathcal{O}_{ilkj}^{V,LL} = \mathcal{O}_{kjil}^{V,LL} . \quad (2.19)$$

as well as the corresponding $\mathcal{O}^{V,RR}$ operators. Thus, we will work with the conventions

$$L_{ijkl}^{V,LL} \Big|_{\text{us}} = (2 - \delta_{ik}\delta_{jl}) L_{ijkl}^{V,LL} \Big|_{\text{JMS}} , \quad L_{ijkl}^{V,LL} \Big|_{\text{us}} = (2 - \delta_{ik}\delta_{jl}) L_{ijkl}^{V,LL} \Big|_{\text{JMS}} , \quad (2.20)$$

$$L_{ijkl}^{V,LL} \Big|_{\text{us}} = (4 - 2\delta_{ik} - 2\delta_{jl}) L_{ijkl}^{V,LL} \Big|_{\text{JMS}} , \quad L_{ijkl}^{V,LL} \Big|_{\text{us}} = (4 - 2\delta_{ik} - 2\delta_{jl}) L_{ijkl}^{V,LL} \Big|_{\text{JMS}} , \quad (2.21)$$

(and the same for $L^{V,RR}$) such that, for example,

$$\sum_{i,j,k,l} L_{ijkl}^{V,LL} \Big|_{\text{JMS}} \mathcal{O}_{ijkl}^{V,LL} = \sum_S L_{ijkl}^{V,LL} \Big|_{\text{us}} \mathcal{O}_{ijkl}^{V,LL} . \quad (2.22)$$

We will reintroduce these factors when presenting the beta functions in the ancillary files, in order to be consistent with the JMS conventions.

2.2 Renormalization and scale dependence

The renormalized Lagrangian of the LEFT(n_q) is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{LEFT}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{QCD+QED}} + \sum_{k,l} L_l Z_{lk} Z_{\mathcal{O}_k} \mathcal{O}_k + \sum_{k,l,s} L_s L_l Z_{slk} Z_{\mathcal{O}_k} \mathcal{O}_k + O(1/\Lambda_{\text{EW}}^3) , \quad (2.23)$$

where the last term quadratic in Wilson coefficients is due to double insertions of dimension-five operators. The (renormalized) operators $\mathcal{O}_k = \{Q_k, E_k\}$ include physical (Q_k) as well as evanescent (E_k) operators, the latter needed for renormalization in $d = 4 - 2\epsilon$ dimensions [11, 12, 19]. The L_k are now renormalized Wilson coefficients, and Z_{lk} (also Z_{slk}) denote the renormalization constants of the Wilson coefficients, which generate operator mixing. The renormalization factors $Z_{\mathcal{O}_k}$ take care of the wave-function renormalization of the fields contained in \mathcal{O}_k .

We regularize all UV divergencies in naive dimensional regularization (NDR) with anticommuting γ_5 , in $d = 4 - 2\epsilon$ dimensions. These divergencies are then subtracted using the BW- $\overline{\text{MS}}$ scheme, that is, $\overline{\text{MS}}$ for physical operators, and the ‘‘Buras-Weisz prescription’’ for evanescent operators [11, 12, 19]. Our choice of evanescent operators is given in Appendix A.

Multiple insertions do not contribute to the mixing among four-fermion operators at dimension six, and thus we drop these contributions from now on. The dependence of the renormalized Wilson coefficients on the renormalization scale (μ) is governed by the RGEs,

$$\frac{dL_i}{d \log \mu} = \gamma_{ji} L_j = \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \beta_i \equiv \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \dot{L}_i, \quad (2.24)$$

where γ_{ij} are the components of the Anomalous Dimension Matrix (ADM), denoted by $\hat{\gamma}$, and β_i are the beta functions.² Following Ref. [33] we also use the notation $\beta_i \equiv \dot{L}_i$. The ADM can be expanded perturbatively,

$$\hat{\gamma} = \tilde{\alpha}_s \hat{\gamma}^{(1,0)} + \tilde{\alpha} \hat{\gamma}^{(0,1)} + \tilde{\alpha}_s \tilde{\alpha} \hat{\gamma}^{(1,1)} + \tilde{\alpha}_s^2 \hat{\gamma}^{(2,0)} + \tilde{\alpha}^2 \hat{\gamma}^{(0,2)} + \dots, \quad (2.25)$$

where $\hat{\gamma}^{(n,m)}$ are the expansion coefficients of $\hat{\gamma}$ in powers of $\tilde{\alpha}_s \equiv \alpha_s/4\pi = g_s^2/16\pi^2$ and $\tilde{\alpha} \equiv \alpha/4\pi = e^2/16\pi^2$. Denoting by \hat{Z} the renormalization matrix with entries Z_{ij} , we have (see e.g. Ref. [24, 26])

$$\hat{\gamma} = \hat{Z} \frac{d\hat{Z}^{-1}}{d \log \mu}, \quad (2.26)$$

with \hat{Z} depending on the renormalization scale through its expansion in $\tilde{\alpha}_s(\mu)$ and $\tilde{\alpha}(\mu)$,

$$\hat{Z} = \sum_{n,m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\ell=0}^{n+m} \frac{\tilde{\alpha}_s^n \tilde{\alpha}^m}{\epsilon^\ell} \hat{Z}^{(n,m;\ell)}, \quad (2.27)$$

with $Z_{ij}^{(0,0;0)} = \delta_{ij}$, trivially. In the BW- $\overline{\text{MS}}$ scheme, $Z_{ij}^{(n,m;0)} = 0$ whenever i refers to a

²We will only consider beta functions and anomalous dimensions of physical operators, and $\hat{\gamma}$ will always refer to the matrix of coefficients γ_{ij} with (i, j) corresponding to physical operators [11].

physical operator or j refers to an evanescent one. With this notation at hand, one finds (see e.g. [24, 26])

$$\hat{\gamma}^{(1,0)} = 2\hat{Z}^{(1,0;1)} , \quad (2.28)$$

$$\hat{\gamma}^{(0,1)} = 2\hat{Z}^{(0,1;1)} , \quad (2.29)$$

$$\hat{\gamma}^{(2,0)} = 4\hat{Z}^{(2,0;1)} - 2\hat{Z}^{(1,0;1)}\hat{Z}^{(1,0;0)} , \quad (2.30)$$

$$\hat{\gamma}^{(0,2)} = 4\hat{Z}^{(0,2;1)} - 2\hat{Z}^{(0,1;1)}\hat{Z}^{(0,1;0)} , \quad (2.31)$$

$$\hat{\gamma}^{(1,1)} = 4\hat{Z}^{(1,1;1)} - 2\hat{Z}^{(1,0;1)}\hat{Z}^{(0,1;0)} - 2\hat{Z}^{(0,1;1)}\hat{Z}^{(1,0;0)} . \quad (2.32)$$

The renormalization constants can be calculated in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ scheme in terms of the (amputated) renormalized³ matrix elements of the operators Q_i . At any loop order, we write

$$\langle Q_i \rangle = \sum_{n,m=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\mu}^{2\epsilon(n+m)} \tilde{\alpha}_s^n \tilde{\alpha}^m \langle Q_i \rangle^{(n,m)} , \quad (2.33)$$

$$\langle Q_i \rangle^{(n,m)} = \sum_{k=0}^{n+m} \frac{1}{\epsilon^k} \left[a_{Q_i Q_j}^{(n,m;k)} \langle Q_j \rangle^{(0)} + a_{Q_i E_j}^{(n,m;k)} \langle E_j \rangle^{(0)} \right] , \quad (2.34)$$

where $\tilde{\mu}^2 \equiv \mu^2 e^{\gamma_E}/4\pi$, with μ the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ scale, and $a_{Q_i Q_j}^{(m,n;k)}$ being finite coefficient matrices. The $a_{Q_i Q_j}^{(m,n;k)}$ arise from the $1/\epsilon^k$ poles of the renormalized $(n+m)$ -loop diagrams with an insertion of operator Q_i . Renormalization then leads to [23, 26]:

$$\hat{Z}^{(1,0;1)} = -\hat{a}^{(1,0;1)} - \hat{Z}_{\mathcal{O}}^{(1,0;1)} , \quad (2.35)$$

$$\hat{Z}^{(0,1;1)} = -\hat{a}^{(0,1;1)} - \hat{Z}_{\mathcal{O}}^{(0,1;1)} , \quad (2.36)$$

$$\hat{Z}^{(2,0;1)} = -\hat{a}^{(2,0;1)} + \hat{a}^{(1,0;1)}\hat{a}^{(1,0;0)} - \hat{Z}^{(1,0;0)}\hat{a}^{(1,0;1)} - \hat{Z}_{\mathcal{O}}^{(2,0;1)} , \quad (2.37)$$

$$\hat{Z}^{(0,2;1)} = -\hat{a}^{(0,2;1)} + \hat{a}^{(0,1;1)}\hat{a}^{(0,1;0)} - \hat{Z}^{(0,1;0)}\hat{a}^{(0,1;1)} - \hat{Z}_{\mathcal{O}}^{(0,2;1)} , \quad (2.38)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{Z}^{(1,1;1)} &= -\hat{a}^{(1,1;1)} + \hat{a}^{(1,0;1)}\hat{a}^{(0,1;0)} + \hat{a}^{(0,1;1)}\hat{a}^{(1,0;0)} - \hat{Z}^{(1,0;0)}\hat{a}^{(0,1;1)} \\ &\quad - \hat{Z}^{(0,1;0)}\hat{a}^{(1,0;1)} - \hat{Z}_{\mathcal{O}}^{(1,1;1)} , \end{aligned} \quad (2.39)$$

up to two loops in $\tilde{\alpha}_s$ and $\tilde{\alpha}$. The wave-function renormalization constants are given by $(\hat{Z}_{\mathcal{O}})_{ij} = Z_{Q_i} \delta_{Q_i Q_j}$. In the case of four-fermion operators, $Q_i = \bar{\psi}_1 \Gamma \psi_2 \bar{\psi}_3 \Gamma' \psi_4$, one has

³By renormalized matrix elements or diagrams we mean with respect to $\mathcal{L}_{\text{QCD}+\text{QED}}$, i.e. including only the bare diagrams and the counterterms from the $\text{dim} \leq 4$ Lagrangian, and not including counterterms of higher dimension.

$Z_{Q_i} = Z_{\psi_1}^{1/2} Z_{\psi_2}^{1/2} Z_{\psi_3}^{1/2} Z_{\psi_4}^{1/2}$, and therefore

$$Z_{Q_i}^{(n,m;1)} = \frac{1}{2} Z_{\psi_1}^{(n,m;1)} + \frac{1}{2} Z_{\psi_2}^{(n,m;1)} + \frac{1}{2} Z_{\psi_3}^{(n,m;1)} + \frac{1}{2} Z_{\psi_4}^{(n,m;1)}, \quad (2.40)$$

with the notation of Eq. (2.27). The individual wave-function renormalization constants are flavor-universal (represented by a generic fermion field ψ), although only quarks are sensitive to $\tilde{\alpha}_s$ corrections, and α corrections depend on the electric charges Q_ψ ,

$$Z_q^{(1,0;1)} = -C_F, \quad Z_q^{(1,1;1)} = \frac{3}{2} C_F Q_q^2, \quad Z_q^{(2,0;1)} = C_F \left[\frac{3}{4} C_F - \frac{17}{4} N_c + \frac{1}{2} n_q \right], \quad (2.41)$$

$$Z_\psi^{(0,1;1)} = -Q_\psi^2, \quad Z_\psi^{(0,2;1)} = Q_\psi^2 \left[\frac{3}{4} Q_\psi^2 + \frac{1}{9} N_c (4n_u + n_d) + n_e \right], \quad (2.42)$$

Going back to Eqs. (2.37), (2.38) and (2.39), in the Buras-Weisz scheme for evanescent operators one has $Z_{ij}^{(1,0)} = -a_{E_i Q_j}^{(1,0)}$ for (i, j) being (evanescent, physical), and zero otherwise. Inserting the corresponding expressions for the renormalization matrices into Eqs. (2.28)-(2.32) one finds, again up to two-loop order,

$$\gamma_{ij}^{(1,0)} = -2\hat{a}_{Q_i Q_j}^{(1,0;1)} - 2Z_{Q_i}^{(1,0;1)} \delta_{Q_i Q_j}, \quad (2.43)$$

$$\gamma_{ij}^{(0,1)} = -2\hat{a}_{Q_i Q_j}^{(0,1;1)} - 2Z_{Q_i}^{(0,1;1)} \delta_{Q_i Q_j}, \quad (2.44)$$

$$\gamma_{ij}^{(2,0)} = -4\hat{a}_{Q_i Q_j}^{(2,0;1)} + 4\hat{a}_{Q_i Q_k}^{(1,0;1)} \hat{a}_{Q_k Q_j}^{(1,0;0)} + 2\hat{a}_{Q_i E_k}^{(1,0;1)} \hat{a}_{E_k Q_j}^{(1,0;0)} - 4Z_{Q_i}^{(2,0;1)} \delta_{Q_i Q_j}, \quad (2.45)$$

$$\gamma_{ij}^{(0,2)} = -4\hat{a}_{Q_i Q_j}^{(0,2;1)} + 4\hat{a}_{Q_i Q_k}^{(0,1;1)} \hat{a}_{Q_k Q_j}^{(0,1;0)} + 2\hat{a}_{Q_i E_k}^{(0,1;1)} \hat{a}_{E_k Q_j}^{(0,1;0)} - 4Z_{Q_i}^{(0,2;1)} \delta_{Q_i Q_j}, \quad (2.46)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{ij}^{(1,1)} = & -4\hat{a}_{Q_i Q_j}^{(1,1;1)} + 4\hat{a}_{Q_i Q_k}^{(1,0;1)} \hat{a}_{Q_k Q_j}^{(0,1;0)} + 4\hat{a}_{Q_i Q_k}^{(0,1;1)} \hat{a}_{Q_k Q_j}^{(1,0;0)} + 2\hat{a}_{Q_i E_k}^{(1,0;1)} \hat{a}_{E_k Q_j}^{(0,1;0)} \\ & + 2\hat{a}_{Q_i E_k}^{(0,1;1)} \hat{a}_{E_k Q_j}^{(1,0;0)} - 4Z_{Q_i}^{(1,1;1)} \delta_{Q_i Q_j}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.47)$$

The complete set of one-loop beta functions for the LEFT was computed in Ref. [33]. They can be obtained from `DsixTools` [43, 44] via the command `β [parameter]`.

2.3 Change of Operator Basis

It will be very relevant in the present paper to consider different bases of operators in the LEFT, and derive the two-loop ADM in one basis given the ADM in another. Given two different operator bases $\{Q_k, E_k\}$ and $\{Q'_k, E_k\}$, the physical operators Q'_k in the second basis can always be written as a linear combination of physical (Q_k) and evanescent (E_k) operators in the first one,

$$\vec{Q}' = \hat{R} \left(\vec{Q} + \hat{W} \vec{E} \right), \quad (2.48)$$

where \hat{R} and \hat{W} are numerical rotation matrices. As is well known [13, 19, 21, 26], a change of basis that mixes physical and evanescent operators introduces a shift in the renormalization scheme. The transformation rules for anomalous dimensions must then include a series of finite corrections that compensate for this effect in order to obtain the results in the original renormalization scheme. At one loop, the transformation of the ADMs turns out to be trivial,

$$\hat{\gamma}'^{(1,0)} = \hat{R} \hat{\gamma}^{(1,0)} \hat{R}^{-1} , \quad (2.49)$$

$$\hat{\gamma}'^{(0,1)} = \hat{R} \hat{\gamma}^{(0,1)} \hat{R}^{-1} , \quad (2.50)$$

reflecting the scheme-independence of the one-loop ADMs. At two loops, however, the ADMs depend on the renormalization scheme through the (scheme-dependent) one-loop finite amplitudes. The transformation rules read [14, 15]

$$\hat{\gamma}'^{(2,0)} = \hat{R} \hat{\gamma}^{(2,0)} \hat{R}^{-1} + 4Z_{g_s}^{(1,0;1)} \Delta \hat{r}^{(1,0)} - \left[\Delta \hat{r}^{(1,0)}, \hat{\gamma}^{(1,0)} \right] , \quad (2.51)$$

$$\hat{\gamma}'^{(0,2)} = \hat{R} \hat{\gamma}^{(0,2)} \hat{R}^{-1} + 4Z_e^{(0,1;1)} \Delta \hat{r}^{(0,1)} - \left[\Delta \hat{r}^{(0,1)}, \hat{\gamma}^{(0,1)} \right] , \quad (2.52)$$

$$\hat{\gamma}'^{(1,1)} = \hat{R} \hat{\gamma}^{(1,1)} \hat{R}^{-1} - \left[\Delta \hat{r}^{(1,0)}, \hat{\gamma}^{(0,1)} \right] - \left[\Delta \hat{r}^{(0,1)}, \hat{\gamma}^{(1,0)} \right] , \quad (2.53)$$

where

$$Z_{g_s}^{(1,0;1)} = \frac{1}{3} n_q - \frac{11}{6} N_c , \quad (2.54)$$

$$Z_e^{(0,1;1)} = \frac{2}{3} \left(Q_u^2 n_u N_c + Q_d^2 n_d N_c + Q_e^2 n_e \right) , \quad (2.55)$$

are the one-loop renormalization constants of g_s and e , respectively, defined by

$$\frac{d\tilde{\alpha}_s}{d \log \mu} = 4\tilde{\alpha}_s^2 Z_{g_s}^{(1,0;1)} + \dots , \quad (2.56)$$

$$\frac{d\tilde{\alpha}}{d \log \mu} = 4\tilde{\alpha}^2 Z_e^{(0,1;1)} + \dots . \quad (2.57)$$

The one-loop matrices $\Delta \hat{r}$ contain the shift in the renormalization scheme

$$\Delta r_{ij}^{(1,0)} \equiv - R_{Q'_i Q_k} W_{Q_k E_l} a_{E_l Q_r}^{(1,0;0)} R_{Q_r Q'_j}^{-1} = R_{Q'_i Q_k} a_{Q_k Q_l}^{(1,0;0)} R_{Q_l Q'_j}^{-1} - a_{Q'_i Q'_j}^{(1,0;0)} , \quad (2.58)$$

$$\Delta r_{ij}^{(0,1)} \equiv - R_{Q'_i Q_k} W_{Q_k E_l} a_{E_l Q_r}^{(0,1;0)} R_{Q_r Q'_j}^{-1} = R_{Q'_i Q_k} a_{Q_k Q_l}^{(0,1;0)} R_{Q_l Q'_j}^{-1} - a_{Q'_i Q'_j}^{(0,1;0)} , \quad (2.59)$$

where the equalities follow from Eq. (2.48). Working with the matrices $\Delta \hat{r}$ in the form of the right-hand side of the above equations allows for a change of basis at the two-loop order

without having to work directly with the evanescent operators, although the specification of an evanescent basis is still necessary to determine the finite amplitudes $\hat{a}^{(m,n;0)}$.

3 RG-invariant sectors

Given that all dimension-four couplings in the LEFT Lagrangian are flavor-conserving (and ignoring dimension-five terms), the ADM of four-fermion operators has a block-diagonal structure, with blocks corresponding to RG-invariant sectors defined by the flavor quantum numbers of the operators (see e.g. Ref. [3]). We will treat the different blocks in the four-fermion ADM as “separate” ADMs for the different RG-invariant sectors.

The sectors are classified in terms of the flavor transition they mediate, for which we use the following terminology:

- $\Delta F = 2$: e.g. $(\bar{d}s)(\bar{d}s)$,
- $\Delta F = 1.5$: e.g. $(\bar{d}b)(\bar{d}s)$,
- $\Delta F = 1$: e.g. $(\bar{d}c)(\bar{u}s)$,
- $\Delta F = 1^{\bar{f}f}$: e.g. $(\bar{d}s)(\bar{u}u)$,
- $\Delta F = 0$: e.g. $(\bar{d}d)(\bar{e}e)$.

The full list of sectors is given in Tables 1 and 2, which provide a summary of the sectors and the number of blocks in each of them. These sectors match those of Ref. [42]. We also remark that these sectors are defined for our non-redundant LEFT basis, which differs from the JMS conventions in Refs. [4, 33] as detailed at the end of Section 2.1. In the following, we list explicitly the full set of RG-invariant blocks for each sector.

3.1 $\Delta F = 2$ transitions $(\bar{f}_i f_j \bar{f}_i f_j)$

3.1.1 $\Delta F = 2$: d -type $(\bar{d}_i d_j \bar{d}_i d_j)$

The RG-invariant blocks of the $\Delta F = 2$ d -type sector read

$$\left\{ L_{ijij}^{V,LL} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijij}^{V,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijij}^{V1,LR}, L_{ijij}^{V8,LR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijij}^{S1,RR}, L_{ijij}^{S8,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{jiji}^{S1,RR}, L_{jiji}^{S8,RR} \right\},$$

where $i < j$. This sector exists for all versions of the LEFT, with $n_q \geq 3$.

3.1.2 $\Delta F = 2$: u -type $(\bar{u}_i u_j \bar{u}_i u_j)$

The RG-invariant blocks for the $\Delta F = 2$ u -type sector read

$$\left\{ L_{ijij}^{V,LL} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijij}^{V,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijij}^{V1,LR}, L_{ijij}^{V8,LR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijij}^{S1,RR}, L_{ijij}^{S8,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{jiji}^{S1,RR}, L_{jiji}^{S8,RR} \right\},$$

where $i < j$. This sector exists for $n_q \geq 4$.

Transition	Flavor	Multiplicity	Sector Structure
$\Delta F = 2$	$\bar{d}_i d_j \bar{d}_i d_j$	$\frac{1}{2} n_d (n_d - 1)$	$2 \times \{1\} + 3 \times \{2\}$
$\Delta F = 2$	$\bar{u}_i u_j \bar{u}_i u_j$	$\frac{1}{2} n_u (n_u - 1)$	$2 \times \{1\} + 3 \times \{2\}$
$\Delta F = 2$	$\bar{e}_i e_j \bar{e}_i e_j$	$\frac{1}{2} n_e (n_e - 1)$	$5 \times \{1\}$
$\Delta F = 2$	$\bar{\nu}_i \nu_j \bar{\nu}_i \nu_j$	$\frac{1}{2} n_\nu (n_\nu - 1)$	$1 \times \{1\}$
$\Delta F = 1.5$	$\bar{d}_i d_j \bar{d}_k d_j$	$\frac{1}{2} n_d (n_d - 1) (n_d - 2)$	$2 \times \{1\} + 4 \times \{2\}$
$\Delta F = 1.5$	$\bar{e}_i e_j \bar{e}_k e_j$	$\frac{1}{2} n_e (n_e - 1) (n_e - 2)$	$6 \times \{1\}$
$\Delta F = 1.5$	$\bar{\nu}_i \nu_j \bar{\nu}_k \nu_j$	$\frac{1}{2} n_\nu (n_\nu - 1) (n_\nu - 2)$	$1 \times \{1\}$
$\Delta F = 1$	$\bar{u}_i u_j \bar{d}_k d_l$	$\frac{1}{4} n_u (n_u - 1) n_d (n_d - 1)$	$6 \times \{2\} + 2 \times \{4\}$
$\Delta F = 1$	$\bar{e}_i e_j \bar{d}_k d_l$	$\frac{1}{4} n_e (n_e - 1) n_d (n_d - 1)$	$6 \times \{1\} + 2 \times \{2\}$
$\Delta F = 1$	$\bar{e}_i e_j \bar{u}_k u_l$	$\frac{1}{4} n_e (n_e - 1) n_u (n_u - 1)$	$6 \times \{1\} + 2 \times \{2\}$
$\Delta F = 1$	$\bar{\nu}_i \nu_j \bar{d}_k d_l$	$\frac{1}{4} n_\nu (n_\nu - 1) n_d (n_d - 1)$	$2 \times \{1\}$
$\Delta F = 1$	$\bar{\nu}_i \nu_j \bar{u}_k u_l$	$\frac{1}{4} n_\nu (n_\nu - 1) n_u (n_u - 1)$	$2 \times \{1\}$
$\Delta F = 1$	$\bar{\nu}_i \nu_j \bar{e}_k e_l$	$\frac{1}{4} n_\nu (n_\nu - 1) n_e (n_e - 1)$	$2 \times \{1\}$
$\Delta F = 1$	$\bar{\nu}_i e_j \bar{d}_k u_l$	$n_\nu n_e n_d n_u$	$3 \times \{1\} + 1 \times \{2\}$
$\Delta L = 2$	$\bar{\nu}_i^c \nu_j \bar{f}_k f_l$	$\frac{1}{2} n_\nu (n_\nu - 1) (n_d^2 + n_u^2 + n_e^2)$	$1 \times \{1\} + 1 \times \{2\}$
$\Delta L = 2$	$\bar{\nu}_i^c \nu_j \bar{f}_k f_l$	$n_\nu (n_d^2 + n_u^2 + n_e^2)$	$2 \times \{1\}$
$\Delta L = 2$	$\bar{\nu}_i^c e_j \bar{d}_k u_l$	$n_\nu n_e n_d n_u$	$3 \times \{1\} + 1 \times \{2\}$
$\Delta L = 4$	$\bar{\nu}_i^c \nu_j \bar{\nu}_k^c \nu_l$	$\frac{1}{12} n_\nu^2 (n_\nu^2 - 1)$	$1 \times \{1\}$
$ \Delta B = 1$	$\bar{d}_i^c u_j \bar{u}_k^c e_l$	$\frac{1}{2} n_u (n_u - 1) n_d n_e$	$6 \times \{1\} + 2 \times \{2\}$
$ \Delta B = 1$	$\bar{d}_i^c u_j \bar{u}_j^c e_l$	$n_u n_d n_e$	$4 \times \{1\}$
$ \Delta B = 1$	$\bar{u}_i^c d_j \bar{d}_k^c \nu_l$	$\frac{1}{2} n_d (n_d - 1) n_u n_\nu$	$3 \times \{1\} + 1 \times \{2\}$
$ \Delta B = 1$	$\bar{u}_i^c d_j \bar{d}_j^c \nu_l$	$n_d n_u n_\nu$	$2 \times \{1\}$
$ \Delta B = 1$	$\bar{d}_i^c d_j \bar{e}_l^c d_k$	$\frac{1}{6} n_d (n_d - 1) (n_d - 2) n_e$	$4 \times \{1\} + 2 \times \{2\}$
$ \Delta B = 1$	$\bar{d}_i^c d_j \bar{e}_l^c d_j$	$\frac{1}{2} n_d (n_d - 1) n_e$	$4 \times \{1\}$
$ \Delta B = 1$	$\bar{d}_i^c d_j \bar{e}_l^c d_i$	$\frac{1}{2} n_d (n_d - 1) n_e$	$4 \times \{1\}$
$ \Delta B = 1$	$\bar{u}_i^c d_j \bar{\nu}_l d_k$	$\frac{1}{2} n_d (n_d - 1) n_u n_\nu$	$3 \times \{1\} + 1 \times \{2\}$
$ \Delta B = 1$	$\bar{u}_i^c d_j \bar{\nu}_l^c d_j$	$n_d n_u n_\nu$	$2 \times \{1\}$

Table 1: Distribution of RG-invariant sectors, where $n \times \{k\}$ represents n different invariant blocks, each containing k operators. For instance, the ADM of the first sector contains two 1×1 blocks, and three 2×2 blocks. We use the notation $\bar{\psi}^c \equiv \psi^T C$.

Transition	Flavor	Multiplicity	Sector Structure
$\Delta F = 1^{\bar{f}f}$	$\bar{d}_i d_j \bar{f}_k f_k$	$\frac{1}{2} n_d (n_d - 1)$	$2n_e \times \{1\} + 2n_u \times \{4\}$ $+ 2(n_q + n_e) \times \{2\}$ $+ 2 \times \{4n_q + 2n_e + n_\nu - 2\}$
$\Delta F = 1^{\bar{f}f}$	$\bar{u}_i u_j \bar{f}_k f_k$	$\frac{1}{2} n_u (n_u - 1)$	$2n_e \times \{1\} + 2n_d \times \{4\}$ $+ 2(n_q + n_e) \times \{2\}$ $+ 2 \times \{4n_q + 2n_e + n_\nu - 2\}$
$\Delta F = 1^{\bar{f}f}$	$\bar{e}_i e_j \bar{f}_k f_k$	$\frac{1}{2} n_e (n_e - 1)$	$2(n_q + n_e) \times \{1\}$ $+ 2(n_q + n_e - 2) \times \{2\}$ $+ 2 \times \{2n_q + 2n_e + n_\nu\}$
$\Delta F = 1^{\bar{f}f}$	$\bar{\nu}_i \nu_j \bar{f}_k f_k$	$\frac{1}{2} n_\nu (n_\nu - 1)$	$1 \times \{2n_q + 2n_e + n_\nu\}$
$\Delta F = 0$	$\bar{f}_i f_i \bar{f}'_j f'_j$	1	$(n_q n_e + n_e^2 + n_\nu) \times \{1\}$ $+ (n_d n_u + n_e n_q + n_d^2 + n_u^2) \times \{2\}$ $+ (n_d n_u + n_d^2 + n_u^2 - n_q) \times \{4\}$ $+ 1 \times \{4n_q^2 + 4n_q n_e$ $+ n_e(2n_e + 1)$ $+ n_\nu(n_\nu + 1)/2$ $+ 2n_\nu(n_q + n_e)\}$

Table 2: Distribution of RG-invariant sectors, where $n \times \{k\}$ represents n different invariant sectors, each containing k operators. Here f, f' represent generic fermion fields of any type and flavor.

3.1.3 $\Delta F = 2$: e-type ($\bar{e}_i e_j \bar{e}_i e_j$)

The RG-invariant blocks of the $\Delta F = 2$ e-type sector read

$$\left\{ L_{ijij}^{V,LL} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijij}^{V,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijij}^{V,LR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijij}^{S,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{jiji}^{S,RR} \right\},$$

where $i < j$. This sector exists for $n_q \geq 4$.

3.1.4 $\Delta F = 2$: ν -type ($\bar{\nu}_i \nu_j \bar{\nu}_i \nu_j$)

The RG-invariant blocks of the $\Delta F = 2$ ν -type sector read

$$\left\{ L_{ijij}^{V,LL} \right\}.$$

where $i < j$. This sector exists for all versions of the LEFT with $n_q \geq 3$.

3.2 $\Delta F = 1.5$ transitions ($\bar{f}_i f_j \bar{f}_k f_j$)

3.2.1 $\Delta F = 1.5$: d -type ($\bar{d}_i d_j \bar{d}_k d_j$)

The RG-invariant blocks of the $\Delta F = 1.5$ d -type sector read

$$\left\{ L_{ijkj}^{V,LL} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijkj}^{V,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijkj}^{V1,LR}, L_{ijkj}^{V8,LR} \right\}, \\ \left\{ L_{kjij}^{V1,LR}, L_{kjij}^{V8,LR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijkj}^{S1,RR}, L_{ijkj}^{S8,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{jijk}^{S1,RR}, L_{jijk}^{S8,RR} \right\},$$

where $i \neq j \neq k$ and $i < k$. This sector exists only for $n_q = 5$. The up-type version of this sector does not exist, since there are only two up-type quark flavors in the LEFT.

3.2.2 $\Delta F = 1.5$: e -type ($\bar{e}_i e_j \bar{e}_k e_j$)

The RG-invariant blocks of the $\Delta F = 1.5$ e -type RG-invariant sector read

$$\left\{ L_{ijkj}^{V,LL} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijkj}^{V,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijkj}^{V,LR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{kjij}^{V,LR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijkj}^{S,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{jijk}^{S,RR} \right\},$$

where $i \neq j \neq k$ and $i < k$. These sector exists for $n_q \geq 4$.

3.2.3 $\Delta F = 1.5$: ν -type ($\bar{\nu}_i \nu_j \bar{\nu}_k \nu_j$)

The RG-invariant blocks of the $\Delta F = 1.5$ ν -type sector read

$$\left\{ L_{ijkj}^{V,LL} \right\},$$

where $i \neq j \neq k$ and $i < k$. This sector exists for all versions of the LEFT, with $n_q \geq 3$.

3.3 $\Delta F = 1$ transitions ($\bar{f}_i f_j \bar{f}'_k f'_l$)

3.3.1 $\Delta F = 1$: ud -type ($\bar{u}_i u_j \bar{d}_k d_l$)

The RG-invariant blocks of the $\Delta F = 1$ ud -type sector read

$$\left\{ L_{ijkl}^{V1,LL}, L_{ijkl}^{V8,LL} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijkl}^{V1,RR}, L_{ijkl}^{V8,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijkl}^{V1,LR}, L_{ijkl}^{V8,LR} \right\},$$

$$\left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} du \\ klj \end{smallmatrix}}^{V1,LR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} du \\ klj \end{smallmatrix}}^{V8,LR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} uddu \\ ilkj \end{smallmatrix}}^{V1,LR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} uddu \\ ilkj \end{smallmatrix}}^{V8,LR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} uddu \\ jkli \end{smallmatrix}}^{V1,LR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} uddu \\ jkli \end{smallmatrix}}^{V8,LR} \right\},$$

$$\left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ud \\ ijkl \end{smallmatrix}}^{S1,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ud \\ ijkl \end{smallmatrix}}^{S8,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} uddu \\ ilkj \end{smallmatrix}}^{S1,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} uddu \\ ilkj \end{smallmatrix}}^{S8,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ud \\ jilk \end{smallmatrix}}^{S1,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ud \\ jilk \end{smallmatrix}}^{S8,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} uddu \\ jkli \end{smallmatrix}}^{S1,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} uddu \\ jkli \end{smallmatrix}}^{S8,RR} \right\},$$

where $i < j$ and $k \neq l$. This sector exists for $n_q \geq 4$.

3.3.2 $\Delta F = 1$: ed -type ($\bar{e}_i e_j \bar{d}_k d_l$)

The RG-invariant blocks of the $\Delta F = 1$ ed -type sector read

$$\left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ed \\ ijkl \end{smallmatrix}}^{V,LL} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ed \\ ijkl \end{smallmatrix}}^{V,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ed \\ ijkl \end{smallmatrix}}^{V,LR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} de \\ klj \end{smallmatrix}}^{V,LR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ed \\ ijkl \end{smallmatrix}}^{S,RL} \right\},$$

$$\left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ed \\ jilk \end{smallmatrix}}^{S,RL} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ed \\ ijkl \end{smallmatrix}}^{S,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ed \\ ijkl \end{smallmatrix}}^{T,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ed \\ jilk \end{smallmatrix}}^{S,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ed \\ jilk \end{smallmatrix}}^{T,RR} \right\},$$

where $i < j$ and $k \neq l$. This sector exists for all versions of the LEFT, with $n_q \geq 3$.

3.3.3 $\Delta F = 1$: eu -type ($\bar{e}_i e_j \bar{u}_k u_l$)

The RG-invariant blocks of the $\Delta F = 1$ eu -type sector read

$$\left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} eu \\ ijkl \end{smallmatrix}}^{V,LL} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} eu \\ ijkl \end{smallmatrix}}^{V,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} eu \\ ijkl \end{smallmatrix}}^{V,LR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ue \\ klj \end{smallmatrix}}^{V,LR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} eu \\ ijkl \end{smallmatrix}}^{S,RL} \right\},$$

$$\left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} eu \\ jilk \end{smallmatrix}}^{S,RL} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} eu \\ ijkl \end{smallmatrix}}^{S,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} eu \\ ijkl \end{smallmatrix}}^{T,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} eu \\ jilk \end{smallmatrix}}^{S,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} eu \\ jilk \end{smallmatrix}}^{T,RR} \right\},$$

where $i < j$ and $k \neq l$. This sector exists for $n_q \geq 4$.

3.3.4 $\Delta F = 1$: νd -type ($\bar{\nu}_i \nu_j \bar{d}_k d_l$)

The RG-invariant blocks of the $\Delta F = 1$ νd -type sector read

$$\left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} \nu d \\ ijkl \end{smallmatrix}}^{V,LL} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} \nu d \\ ijkl \end{smallmatrix}}^{V,LR} \right\},$$

where $i < j$ and $k \neq l$. This sector exists for all versions of the LEFT, with $n_q \geq 3$.

3.3.5 $\Delta F = 1$: νu -type ($\bar{\nu}_i \nu_j \bar{u}_k u_l$)

The RG-invariant blocks of the $\Delta F = 1$ νu -type sector read

$$\left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} \nu u \\ ijkl \end{smallmatrix}}^{V,LL} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} \nu u \\ ijkl \end{smallmatrix}}^{V,LR} \right\},$$

where $i < j$ and $k \neq l$. This sector exists for all versions of the LEFT, with $n_q \geq 3$.

3.3.6 $\Delta F = 1$: νe -type ($\bar{\nu}_i \nu_j \bar{e}_k e_l$)

The RG-invariant blocks of the $\Delta F = 1$ νe -type RG-invariant sector read

$$\left\{ L_{\nu e}^{V,LL} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\nu e}^{V,LR} \right\},$$

where $i < j$ and $k \neq l$. This sector exists for all versions of the LEFT, with $n_q \geq 3$.

3.3.7 $\Delta F = 1$: νedu -type ($\bar{\nu}_i e_j \bar{d}_k u_l$)

The RG-invariant blocks of the $\Delta F = 1$ νedu -type sector read

$$\left\{ L_{\nu edu}^{V,LL} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\nu edu}^{V,LR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\nu edu}^{S,RL} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\nu edu}^{S,RR}, L_{\nu edu}^{T,RR} \right\},$$

for any indices i, j, k, l . This sector exists for all versions of the LEFT, with $n_q \geq 3$.

3.4 $\Delta F = 1^{\bar{f}f}$ transitions ($\bar{f}_i f_j \bar{f}_k f_l$)

3.4.1 $\Delta F = 1^{\bar{f}f}$: d -type ($\bar{d}_i d_j \bar{f}_k f_l$)

The RG-invariant blocks of the $\Delta F = 1^{\bar{f}f}$ d -type sector can be further separated into a vector and scalar part. The vector part contains two large invariant blocks, which for $i < j$ and $k \neq i, j$ read

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ L_{ed}^{V,LL}, L_{ed}^{V,LL}, L_{ed}^{V,LL}, L_{\nu d}^{V,LL}, L_{\nu d}^{V,LL}, L_{\nu d}^{V,LL}, L_{ud}^{V1,LL}, L_{ud}^{V8,LL}, L_{ud}^{V1,LL}, L_{ud}^{V8,LL}, \right. \\ & L_{dd}^{V,LL}, L_{dd}^{V,LL}, L_{dd}^{V,LL}, L_{dd}^{V,LL}, L_{de}^{V,LR}, L_{de}^{V,LR}, L_{de}^{V,LR}, L_{du}^{V1,LR}, L_{du}^{V8,LR}, \\ & \left. L_{du}^{V1,LR}, L_{du}^{V8,LR}, L_{dd}^{V1,LR}, L_{dd}^{V8,LR}, L_{dd}^{V1,LR}, L_{dd}^{V8,LR}, L_{dd}^{V1,LR}, L_{dd}^{V8,LR} \right\}, \\ & \left\{ L_{ed}^{V,RR}, L_{ed}^{V,RR}, L_{ed}^{V,RR}, L_{ud}^{V1,RR}, L_{ud}^{V8,RR}, L_{ud}^{V1,RR}, L_{ud}^{V8,RR}, L_{dd}^{V,RR}, L_{dd}^{V,RR}, \right. \\ & L_{dd}^{V,RR}, L_{dd}^{V,RR}, L_{ed}^{V,LR}, L_{ed}^{V,LR}, L_{ed}^{V,LR}, L_{\nu d}^{V,LR}, L_{\nu d}^{V,LR}, L_{\nu d}^{V,LR}, L_{ud}^{V1,LR}, L_{ud}^{V8,LR}, \\ & \left. L_{ud}^{V1,LR}, L_{ud}^{V8,LR}, L_{dd}^{V1,LR}, L_{dd}^{V8,LR}, L_{dd}^{V1,LR}, L_{dd}^{V8,LR}, L_{dd}^{V1,LR}, L_{dd}^{V8,LR} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The scalar part is separated into smaller independent blocks. For indices satisfying $i \neq j$ and $k \neq i, j$ they read

$$\left\{ L_{ed}^{S,RL} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ed}^{S,RL} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ed}^{S,RL} \right\}, \left\{ L_{uddu}^{V1,LR}, L_{uddu}^{V8,LR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{uddu}^{V1,LR}, L_{uddu}^{V8,LR} \right\},$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} dd \\ kjik \end{smallmatrix}}^{V1,LR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} dd \\ kjik \end{smallmatrix}}^{V8,LR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ed \\ 11ij \end{smallmatrix}}^{S,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ed \\ 11ij \end{smallmatrix}}^{T,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ed \\ 22ij \end{smallmatrix}}^{S,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ed \\ 22ij \end{smallmatrix}}^{T,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ed \\ 33ij \end{smallmatrix}}^{S,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ed \\ 33ij \end{smallmatrix}}^{T,RR} \right\}, \\
& \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ud \\ 11ij \end{smallmatrix}}^{S1,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ud \\ 11ij \end{smallmatrix}}^{S8,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} uddu \\ 1ji1 \end{smallmatrix}}^{S1,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} uddu \\ 1ji1 \end{smallmatrix}}^{S8,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ud \\ 22ij \end{smallmatrix}}^{S1,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ud \\ 22ij \end{smallmatrix}}^{S8,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} uddu \\ 2ji2 \end{smallmatrix}}^{S1,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} uddu \\ 2ji2 \end{smallmatrix}}^{S8,RR} \right\}, \\
& \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} dd \\ ijkk \end{smallmatrix}}^{S1,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} dd \\ ijkk \end{smallmatrix}}^{S8,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} dd \\ ikkj \end{smallmatrix}}^{S1,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} dd \\ ikkj \end{smallmatrix}}^{S8,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} dd \\ ijjj \end{smallmatrix}}^{S1,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} dd \\ ijjj \end{smallmatrix}}^{S8,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} dd \\ ijii \end{smallmatrix}}^{S1,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} dd \\ ijii \end{smallmatrix}}^{S8,RR} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

This sector exists for all versions of the LEFT, with $n_q \geq 3$, barring the removal of operators containing heavy flavors in each case.

3.4.2 $\Delta F = 1^{\bar{f}f}$: u -type ($\bar{u}_i u_j \bar{f}_k f_k$)

The RG-invariant blocks of the $\Delta F = 1^{\bar{f}f}$ u -type RG-invariant sector can be further separated in a vector part and a scalar one. The vector part forms two large invariant blocks, which read (always with $i < j$)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} eu \\ 11ij \end{smallmatrix}}^{V,LL}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} eu \\ 22ij \end{smallmatrix}}^{V,LL}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} eu \\ 33ij \end{smallmatrix}}^{V,LL}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} vu \\ 11ij \end{smallmatrix}}^{V,LL}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} vu \\ 22ij \end{smallmatrix}}^{V,LL}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} vu \\ 33ij \end{smallmatrix}}^{V,LL}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ud \\ ij11 \end{smallmatrix}}^{V1,LL}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ud \\ ij11 \end{smallmatrix}}^{V8,LL}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ud \\ ij22 \end{smallmatrix}}^{V1,LL}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ud \\ ij22 \end{smallmatrix}}^{V8,LL}, \right. \\
& L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ud \\ ij33 \end{smallmatrix}}^{V1,LL}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ud \\ ij33 \end{smallmatrix}}^{V8,LL}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} uu \\ ijij \end{smallmatrix}}^{V,LL}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} uu \\ ijii \end{smallmatrix}}^{V,LL}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ue \\ ij11 \end{smallmatrix}}^{V,LR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ue \\ ij22 \end{smallmatrix}}^{V,LR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ue \\ ij33 \end{smallmatrix}}^{V,LR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ud \\ ij11 \end{smallmatrix}}^{V1,LR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ud \\ ij11 \end{smallmatrix}}^{V8,LR}, \\
& \left. L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ud \\ ij22 \end{smallmatrix}}^{V1,LR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ud \\ ij22 \end{smallmatrix}}^{V8,LR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ud \\ ij33 \end{smallmatrix}}^{V1,LR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ud \\ ij33 \end{smallmatrix}}^{V8,LR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} uu \\ ijij \end{smallmatrix}}^{V1,LR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} uu \\ ijij \end{smallmatrix}}^{V8,LR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} uu \\ ijii \end{smallmatrix}}^{V1,LR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} uu \\ ijii \end{smallmatrix}}^{V8,LR} \right\}, \\
& \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} eu \\ 11ij \end{smallmatrix}}^{V,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} eu \\ 22ij \end{smallmatrix}}^{V,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} eu \\ 33ij \end{smallmatrix}}^{V,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ud \\ ij11 \end{smallmatrix}}^{V1,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ud \\ ij11 \end{smallmatrix}}^{V8,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ud \\ ij22 \end{smallmatrix}}^{V1,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ud \\ ij22 \end{smallmatrix}}^{V8,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ud \\ ij33 \end{smallmatrix}}^{V1,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ud \\ ij33 \end{smallmatrix}}^{V8,RR}, \right. \\
& L_{\begin{smallmatrix} uu \\ ijij \end{smallmatrix}}^{V,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} uu \\ ijii \end{smallmatrix}}^{V,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} eu \\ 11ij \end{smallmatrix}}^{V,LR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} eu \\ 22ij \end{smallmatrix}}^{V,LR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} eu \\ 33ij \end{smallmatrix}}^{V,LR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} vu \\ 11ij \end{smallmatrix}}^{V,LR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} vu \\ 22ij \end{smallmatrix}}^{V,LR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} vu \\ 33ij \end{smallmatrix}}^{V,LR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} du \\ 11ij \end{smallmatrix}}^{V1,LR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} du \\ 11ij \end{smallmatrix}}^{V8,LR}, \\
& \left. L_{\begin{smallmatrix} du \\ 22ij \end{smallmatrix}}^{V1,LR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} du \\ 22ij \end{smallmatrix}}^{V8,LR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} du \\ 33ij \end{smallmatrix}}^{V1,LR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} du \\ 33ij \end{smallmatrix}}^{V8,LR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} uu \\ jjij \end{smallmatrix}}^{V1,LR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} uu \\ jjij \end{smallmatrix}}^{V8,LR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} uu \\ iiij \end{smallmatrix}}^{V1,LR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} uu \\ iiij \end{smallmatrix}}^{V8,LR} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

The scalar part is separated into smaller independent blocks, with $i \neq j$. These blocks read

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} S,RL \\ 11ij \end{smallmatrix}} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} S,RL \\ 22ij \end{smallmatrix}} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} S,RL \\ 33ij \end{smallmatrix}} \right\} \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} uddu \\ i11j \end{smallmatrix}}^{V1,LR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} uddu \\ i11j \end{smallmatrix}}^{V8,LR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} uddu \\ i22j \end{smallmatrix}}^{V1,LR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} uddu \\ i22j \end{smallmatrix}}^{V8,LR} \right\}, \\
& \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} uddu \\ i33j \end{smallmatrix}}^{V1,LR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} uddu \\ i33j \end{smallmatrix}}^{V8,LR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} eu \\ 11ij \end{smallmatrix}}^{S,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} eu \\ 11ij \end{smallmatrix}}^{T,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} eu \\ 22ij \end{smallmatrix}}^{S,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} eu \\ 22ij \end{smallmatrix}}^{T,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} eu \\ 33ij \end{smallmatrix}}^{S,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} eu \\ 33ij \end{smallmatrix}}^{T,RR} \right\}, \\
& \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ud \\ ij11 \end{smallmatrix}}^{S1,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ud \\ ij11 \end{smallmatrix}}^{S8,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} uddu \\ i11j \end{smallmatrix}}^{S1,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} uddu \\ i11j \end{smallmatrix}}^{S8,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ud \\ ij22 \end{smallmatrix}}^{S1,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ud \\ ij22 \end{smallmatrix}}^{S8,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} uddu \\ i22j \end{smallmatrix}}^{S1,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} uddu \\ i22j \end{smallmatrix}}^{S8,RR} \right\}, \\
& \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ud \\ ij33 \end{smallmatrix}}^{S1,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} ud \\ ij33 \end{smallmatrix}}^{S8,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} uddu \\ i33j \end{smallmatrix}}^{S1,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} uddu \\ i33j \end{smallmatrix}}^{S8,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} uu \\ ijij \end{smallmatrix}}^{S1,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} uu \\ ijij \end{smallmatrix}}^{S8,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\begin{smallmatrix} uu \\ ijii \end{smallmatrix}}^{S1,RR}, L_{\begin{smallmatrix} uu \\ ijii \end{smallmatrix}}^{S8,RR} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

This sector exists for $n_q \geq 4$, barring the removal of operators containing heavy flavors in each case.

3.4.3 $\Delta F = 1^{\bar{f}f}$: e -type ($\bar{e}_i e_j \bar{f}_k f_k$)

The RG-invariant blocks of the $\Delta F = 1^{\bar{f}f}$ e -type RG-invariant sector can be further separated into a vector part and a scalar one. The vector part forms two large invariant blocks, which read

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ L_{ij11}^{V,LL}, L_{ij22}^{V,LL}, L_{ij33}^{V,LL}, L_{ij11}^{V,LL}, L_{ij22}^{V,LL}, L_{11ij}^{V,LL}, L_{22ij}^{V,LL}, L_{33ij}^{V,LL}, L_{ijkk}^{V,LL}, L_{ijjj}^{V,LL}, \right. \\ & \quad \left. L_{ijii}^{V,LL}, L_{ij11}^{V,LR}, L_{ij22}^{V,LR}, L_{ij33}^{V,LR}, L_{ij11}^{V,LR}, L_{ij22}^{V,LR}, L_{ijkk}^{V,LR}, L_{ijjj}^{V,LR}, L_{ijii}^{V,LR} \right\}, \\ & \left\{ L_{ij11}^{V,RR}, L_{ij22}^{V,RR}, L_{ij33}^{V,RR}, L_{ij11}^{V,RR}, L_{ij22}^{V,RR}, L_{ijkk}^{V,RR}, L_{ijjj}^{V,RR}, L_{ijii}^{V,RR}, L_{de}^{V,LR}, L_{de}^{V,LR}, \right. \\ & \quad \left. L_{33ij}^{V,LR}, L_{11ij}^{V,LR}, L_{22ij}^{V,LR}, L_{11ij}^{V,LR}, L_{22ij}^{V,LR}, L_{33ij}^{V,LR}, L_{kkij}^{V,LR}, L_{jjij}^{V,LR}, L_{iij}^{V,LR} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

with $i < j$ and $k \neq i, j$. The scalar part is separated into smaller independent blocks,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ L_{ij11}^{S,RL} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ij22}^{S,RL} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ij33}^{S,RL} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ij11}^{S,RL} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ij22}^{S,RL} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ij33}^{S,RL} \right\}, \\ & \left\{ L_{kkjk}^{V,LR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ij11}^{S,RR}, L_{ij11}^{T,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ij22}^{S,RR}, L_{ij22}^{T,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ij33}^{S,RR}, L_{ij33}^{T,RR} \right\}, \\ & \left\{ L_{ij11}^{S,RR}, L_{ij11}^{T,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ij22}^{S,RR}, L_{ij22}^{T,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijkk}^{S,RR}, L_{ikkj}^{S,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijjj}^{S,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijii}^{S,RR} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

with $i \neq j$ and $k \neq i, j$. This sector exists for all versions of the LEFT, with $n_q \geq 3$, barring the removal of operators containing heavy flavors in each case.

3.4.4 $\Delta F = 1^{\bar{f}f}$: ν -type ($\bar{\nu}_i \nu_j \bar{f}_k f_k$)

The $\Delta F = 1^{\bar{f}f}$ ν -type RG-invariant sector consists of a large invariant block,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ L_{ij11}^{V,LL}, L_{ij22}^{V,LL}, L_{ij33}^{V,LL}, L_{ij11}^{V,LL}, L_{ij22}^{V,LL}, L_{ij33}^{V,LL}, L_{ij11}^{V,LL}, L_{ij22}^{V,LL}, L_{ijkk}^{V,LL}, L_{ijjj}^{V,LL}, \right. \\ & \quad \left. L_{ijii}^{V,LL}, L_{ij11}^{V,LR}, L_{ij22}^{V,LR}, L_{ij33}^{V,LR}, L_{ij11}^{V,LR}, L_{ij22}^{V,LR}, L_{ij33}^{V,LR}, L_{ij11}^{V,LR}, L_{ij22}^{V,LR} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

with $i < j$ and $k \neq i, j$. This sector exists for all versions of the LEFT, with $n_q \geq 3$, barring the removal of operators containing heavy flavors in each case.

$$\begin{aligned}
& L_{1122}^{V1,LR}, L_{1122}^{V8,LR}, L_{2211}^{V1,LR}, L_{2211}^{V8,LR}, L_{2222}^{V1,LR}, L_{2222}^{V8,LR}, L_{3311}^{V1,LR}, L_{3311}^{V8,LR}, L_{3322}^{V1,LR}, \\
& L_{3322}^{V8,LR}, L_{1111}^{V,LR}, L_{1122}^{V,LR}, L_{1133}^{V,LR}, L_{2211}^{V,LR}, L_{2222}^{V,LR}, L_{2233}^{V,LR}, L_{3311}^{V,LR}, L_{3322}^{V,LR}, L_{3333}^{V,LR}, \\
& L_{1111}^{V,LR}, L_{1122}^{V,LR}, L_{2211}^{V,LR}, L_{2222}^{V,LR}, L_{3311}^{V,LR}, L_{3322}^{V,LR}, L_{1111}^{V,LR}, L_{1122}^{V,LR}, L_{1111}^{V,LR}, L_{1122}^{V,LR}, \\
& L_{1133}^{V,LR}, L_{1133}^{V,LR}, L_{2211}^{V,LR}, L_{2211}^{V,LR}, L_{2222}^{V,LR}, L_{2222}^{V,LR}, L_{2233}^{V,LR}, L_{2233}^{V,LR}, L_{1111}^{V,LR}, \\
& L_{1111}^{V,LR}, L_{1122}^{V,LR}, L_{1122}^{V,LR}, L_{1133}^{V,LR}, L_{1133}^{V,LR}, L_{2211}^{V,LR}, L_{2211}^{V,LR}, L_{2222}^{V,LR}, L_{2222}^{V,LR}, \\
& L_{2233}^{V,LR}, L_{2233}^{V,LR}, L_{3311}^{V,LR}, L_{3311}^{V,LR}, L_{3322}^{V,LR}, L_{3322}^{V,LR}, L_{3333}^{V,LR}, L_{3333}^{V,LR}, L_{1111}^{V,LR}, \\
& L_{1111}^{V,LR}, L_{1122}^{V,LR}, L_{1122}^{V,LR}, L_{2211}^{V,LR}, L_{2211}^{V,LR}, L_{2222}^{V,LR}, L_{2222}^{V,LR}, L_{1111}^{V,LR}, L_{1122}^{V,LR}, \\
& L_{1133}^{V,LR}, L_{2211}^{V,LR}, L_{2222}^{V,LR}, L_{2233}^{V,LR}, L_{3311}^{V,LR}, L_{3322}^{V,LR}, L_{3333}^{V,LR}, L_{1111}^{V,RR}, L_{1122}^{V,RR}, L_{1133}^{V,RR}, \\
& L_{2211}^{V,RR}, L_{2222}^{V,RR}, L_{2233}^{V,RR}, L_{3311}^{V,RR}, L_{3322}^{V,RR}, L_{3333}^{V,RR}, L_{1111}^{V,RR}, L_{1122}^{V,RR}, L_{2211}^{V,RR}, L_{2222}^{V,RR}, \\
& L_{3311}^{V,RR}, L_{3322}^{V,RR}, L_{1111}^{V,RR}, L_{1122}^{V,RR}, L_{1133}^{V,RR}, L_{1122}^{V,RR}, L_{1133}^{V,RR}, L_{1133}^{V,RR}, L_{1133}^{V,RR}, \\
& L_{2211}^{V,RR}, L_{2222}^{V,RR}, L_{2222}^{V,RR}, L_{2233}^{V,RR}, L_{2233}^{V,RR}, L_{1111}^{V,RR}, L_{1122}^{V,RR}, L_{1221}^{V,RR}, L_{1133}^{V,RR}, \\
& L_{1331}^{V,RR}, L_{2222}^{V,RR}, L_{2233}^{V,RR}, L_{2332}^{V,RR}, L_{3333}^{V,RR}, L_{1111}^{V,RR}, L_{1122}^{V,RR}, L_{1221}^{V,RR}, L_{2222}^{V,RR}, L_{1111}^{V,RR}, \\
& \left. L_{1122}^{V,RR}, L_{1133}^{V,RR}, L_{2222}^{V,RR}, L_{2233}^{V,RR}, L_{3333}^{V,RR} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

This sector exists for all versions of the LEFT, with $n_q \geq 3$, barring the removal of operators containing heavy flavors in each case.

3.6 $\Delta L = 2$ transitions ($\bar{\nu}_i^c \nu_j \bar{f}_k f_l$ or $\bar{\nu}_i^c e_j \bar{d}_k u_l$)

The RG-invariant blocks of the sector of operators violating lepton number by two units read

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\{ L_{ijkl}^{S,LR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijkl}^{S,LL}, L_{ijkl}^{T,LL} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijkl}^{S,LR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijkl}^{S,LL}, L_{ijkl}^{T,LL} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijkl}^{S,LR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijkl}^{S,LL}, L_{ijkl}^{T,LL} \right\}, \\
& \left\{ L_{ijkl}^{V,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijkl}^{V,RL} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijkl}^{S,LR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijkl}^{S,LL}, L_{ijkl}^{T,LL} \right\}, \\
& \left\{ L_{ijkl}^{V,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijkl}^{V,RL} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijkl}^{S,LR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijkl}^{S,LL}, L_{ijkl}^{T,LL} \right\},
\end{aligned}$$

with $i < j$ and any k, l . For $i = j$ the sector is reduced to

$$\left\{ L_{\nu d}^{S,LR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\nu d}^{S,LL} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\nu u}^{S,LR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\nu u}^{S,LL} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\nu e}^{S,LR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\nu e}^{S,LL} \right\},$$

$$\left\{ L_{\nu e d u}^{V,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\nu e d u}^{V,RL} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\nu e d u}^{S,LR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{\nu e d u}^{S,LL}, L_{\nu e d u}^{T,LL} \right\}.$$

This sector exists for all versions of the LEFT, with $n_q \geq 3$.

3.7 $\Delta L = 4$ transitions ($\bar{\nu}_i^c \nu_j \bar{\nu}_k^c \nu_l$)

There is only one type of operator violating lepton number by four units,

$$\left\{ L_{\nu\nu}^{S,LL} \right\},$$

with $i \leq j < l$ and $i < k \leq l$. This sector exists for all versions of the LEFT, with $n_q \geq 3$.

3.8 $|\Delta B| = |\Delta L| = 1$ transitions: (baryon number violating)

3.8.1 $\Delta B = \Delta L = 1$: e-type ($\bar{d}_i^c u_j \bar{u}_k^c e_l$ or $\bar{u}_k^c u_j \bar{d}_i^c e_l$)

The RG-invariant blocks of this baryon-number-violating RG-invariant sector read

$$\left\{ L_{d u u}^{S,LL}, L_{d u u}^{S,LL} \right\}, \left\{ L_{d u u}^{S,RR}, L_{d u u}^{S,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{d u u}^{S,LR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{d u u}^{S,RL} \right\},$$

$$\left\{ L_{d u u}^{S,LR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{d u u}^{S,RL} \right\}, \left\{ L_{u u d}^{S,LR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{u u d}^{S,RL} \right\},$$

for $j < k$ and any indices i, l . For $j = k$ this sector is reduced to

$$\left\{ L_{d u u}^{S,LL} \right\}, \left\{ L_{d u u}^{S,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{d u u}^{S,LR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{d u u}^{S,RL} \right\}.$$

This sector exists for all versions of the LEFT, with $n_q \geq 3$.

3.8.2 $\Delta B = \Delta L = 1$: ν -type ($\bar{u}_i^c d_j \bar{d}_k^c \nu_l$ or $\bar{d}_k^c u_i \bar{d}_j^c \nu_l$ or $\bar{d}_j^c d_k \bar{u}_i^c \nu_l$)

The RG-invariant blocks of this baryon-number-violating RG-invariant sector read

$$\left\{ L_{u d d}^{S,LL}, L_{u d d}^{S,LL} \right\}, \left\{ L_{d u d}^{S,RL} \right\}, \left\{ L_{d u d}^{S,RL} \right\}, \left\{ L_{d d u}^{S,RL} \right\}$$

for $j < k$ and any indices i, l . For $j = k$ this sector is reduced to

$$\left\{ L_{u d d}^{S,LL} \right\}, \left\{ L_{d u d}^{S,RL} \right\}.$$

This sector exists for all versions of the LEFT, with $n_q \geq 3$.

3.8.3 $\Delta B = -\Delta L = 1$: e -type $(\bar{d}_i^c d_j \bar{e}_i^c d_k)$

The RG-invariant blocks of this baryon-number-violating RG-invariant sector read

$$\left\{ L_{ijlk}^{S,LL}, L_{iklj}^{S,LL} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijlk}^{S,RR}, L_{iklj}^{S,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijlk}^{S,LR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijlk}^{S,RL} \right\},$$

$$\left\{ L_{iklj}^{S,LR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{iklj}^{S,RL} \right\}, \left\{ L_{jkli}^{S,LR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{jkli}^{S,RL} \right\},$$

for $i < j < k$ and any index l . This sector is reduced to

$$\left\{ L_{ijlj}^{S,LL} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijlj}^{S,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijlj}^{S,LR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijlj}^{S,RL} \right\},$$

for $i < j = k$ (for arbitrary l). It is instead reduced to

$$\left\{ L_{ijli}^{S,LL} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijli}^{S,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijli}^{S,LR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijli}^{S,RL} \right\},$$

for $i = k < j$ (for arbitrary l). This sector exists for all versions of the LEFT, with $n_q \geq 3$.

3.8.4 $\Delta B = -\Delta L = 1$: ν -type $(\bar{u}_i^c d_j \bar{\nu}_i^c d_k \text{ or } \bar{d}_k^c d_j \bar{\nu}_l^c u_i)$

The RG-invariant blocks of this baryon-number-violating RG-invariant sector read

$$\left\{ L_{ijlk}^{S,RR}, L_{iklj}^{S,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{kjli}^{S,LR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijlk}^{S,LR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{iklj}^{S,LR} \right\},$$

for $j < k$ and any indices i, l . For $j = k$ this sector is reduced to

$$\left\{ L_{ijlj}^{S,RR} \right\}, \left\{ L_{ijlj}^{S,LR} \right\}.$$

This sector exists for all versions of the LEFT, with $n_q \geq 3$.

4 Details of the calculation and results

In order to obtain the two-loop ADMs for the four-fermion operators in the LEFT we have followed three different approaches. First, we have collected all the results available in the literature. These are typically given in an operator basis (and/or evanescent renormalization scheme) that differs from the one in this work. Hence, we have translated these results to the JMS basis through NLO basis changes. Second, we have performed a series of operations in flavor space, consisting in flavor-symmetrizations of the different bases, in

order to extend the results in the literature to other sectors. Third, we have used certain coefficients of UV divergencies of two-loop diagrams (“pole coefficients”) that can be found in the literature. Combined with the corresponding charge and color factors, and with the use of NLO changes of basis, we have used these pole coefficients to obtain the complete set of two-loop ADMs for all four-fermion operators, at order $O(\alpha_s^2)$, $O(\alpha_s\alpha)$, and $O(\alpha^2)$. In doing so, we have verified the results obtained with the first and second approaches, and derived the two-loop ADMs of the sectors that remained to be computed.

4.1 Change of basis of known results into JMS

The list of RG-invariant sectors of the LEFT for which the two-loop ADMs have already been given in the literature includes:

- $\Delta F = 2 : d\text{-type}$

At order $O(\alpha_s^2)$ [23] in the BMU basis.

- $\Delta F = 1 : ud\text{-type}$

At order $O(\alpha_s^2)$ [23] in the BMU basis.

- $\Delta F = 1^{\bar{f}f} : d\text{-type}$

At order $O(\alpha_s^2)$ [23] in the BMU basis.

- $\Delta F = 1^{\bar{f}f} : d\text{-type (only SM operators)}$

At order $O(\alpha_s^2)$ [13, 14, 16, 17] and $O(\alpha_s\alpha)$ [15–17] in the BMU basis.

At order $O(\alpha_s^2)$ [20, 21, 24–27] and $O(\alpha_s\alpha)$ [25, 27] in the CMM basis.⁴

In all cases, the BMU basis is used together with the evanescent scheme corresponding to the “Greek projections” [23, 49], as indicated in Appendix A, while the CMM basis is used in combination with a scheme that makes all explicit $O(\epsilon)$ terms vanish in the definition of evanescent operators, corresponding to $a_{ev}, b_{ev}, c_{ev}, \dots = 0$ in Ref. [34]. In the $d\text{-type}$ $\Delta F = 1^{\bar{f}f}$ sector, the term “SM operators” refers to the 10 operators with non-vanishing SM matching conditions in either the BMU or CMM bases. They include two current-current, four QCD penguin and four QED penguin operators.

The known ADMs for the sectors $\Delta F = 2 : d\text{-type}$ and $\Delta F = 1 : ud\text{-type}$, can be transformed into the JMS basis by direct application of Eqs. (2.51)-(2.53). For the following JMS operators in the $\Delta F = 2 : d\text{-type}$ sector,

$$\left\{ \mathcal{O}_{ijij}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{ijij}^{V1,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{ijij}^{V8,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{ijij}^{S1,RR}, \mathcal{O}_{ijij}^{S8,RR} \right\},$$

⁴The CMM basis was later completed into the “Bern” basis [3], for all 4-fermion operators in the LEFT.

and the corresponding BMU operators in Section 2 of Ref. [23] we find,

$$\hat{R}_{\Delta F=2} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{6} & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{5}{12} & -\frac{1}{16} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Delta \hat{r}_{\Delta F=2}^{(1,0)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{32}{9} & \frac{29}{6} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.1)$$

leading to the following ADM in the JMS basis,

$$\hat{\gamma}_{\Delta F=2}^{(2,0)} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{4n_q}{9} - 7 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{28}{3} & \frac{44n_q}{3} - 198 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{88n_q}{27} - 92 & \frac{46n_q}{9} - \frac{1145}{6} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{656n_q}{81} - \frac{1432}{9} & -\frac{8n_q}{27} - \frac{8}{3} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{2240}{27} - \frac{160n_q}{243} & \frac{1081}{9} - \frac{650n_q}{81} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.2)$$

The operator $\mathcal{O}^{V,RR}$ has the same anomalous dimension as $\mathcal{O}^{V,LL}$. The ADM for the $\Delta F = 2 : u$ -type sector is trivially identical.

For the following JMS operators in the $\Delta F = 1 : ud$ -type sector,

$$\left\{ \mathcal{O}_{ijkl}^{V1,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{ijkl}^{V8,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{ijkl}^{V1,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{ijkl}^{V8,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{ilkj}^{V1,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{ilkj}^{V8,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{ijkl}^{S1,RR}, \mathcal{O}_{ijkl}^{S8,RR}, \mathcal{O}_{ilkj}^{S1,RR}, \mathcal{O}_{ilkj}^{S8,RR} \right\},$$

and the corresponding BMU operators in Section 3 of Ref. [23] we find,

$$\hat{R}_{\Delta F=1:ud\text{-type}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{6} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{6} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{3} & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{6} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & \frac{1}{8} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{12} & -\frac{1}{4} & -\frac{1}{48} & \frac{1}{16} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.3)$$

$$\Delta \hat{r}_{\Delta F=1: ud\text{-type}}^{(1,0)} = \left(\begin{array}{c|cccc} 0_{6 \times 6} & & & & \\ \hline & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0_{4 \times 6} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ & \frac{16}{3} & 2 & \frac{4}{3} & 3 \\ & \frac{16}{9} & \frac{11}{3} & \frac{2}{3} & \frac{1}{3} \end{array} \right). \quad (4.4)$$

leading to the following ADM in the JMS basis,

$$\hat{\gamma}_{\Delta F=1: ud\text{-type}}^{(2,0)} = \left(\begin{array}{cccccc} -\frac{28}{3} & \frac{4n_q}{3} + 7 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{8n_q}{27} + \frac{14}{9} - \frac{4n_q}{9} - \frac{35}{3} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{28}{3} & \frac{44n_q}{3} - 198 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{88n_q}{27} - 92 & \frac{46n_q}{9} - \frac{1145}{6} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{28}{3} & \frac{44n_q}{3} - 198 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{88n_q}{27} - 92 & \frac{46n_q}{9} - \frac{1145}{6} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ & & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ & & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ & & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ & & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ & & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ & & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ & & \frac{80n_q}{9} - 280 & 32 - \frac{8n_q}{9} & \frac{1088}{9} - \frac{64n_q}{81} & \frac{16n_q}{27} - \frac{104}{3} \\ & & \frac{112}{9} - \frac{16n_q}{81} & \frac{445}{3} - \frac{202n_q}{27} & \frac{1904}{27} - \frac{112n_q}{243} & -\frac{44n_q}{81} - \frac{254}{9} \\ & & \frac{1088}{9} - \frac{64n_q}{81} & \frac{16n_q}{27} - \frac{104}{3} & \frac{80n_q}{9} - 280 & 32 - \frac{8n_q}{9} \\ & & \frac{1904}{27} - \frac{112n_q}{243} & -\frac{44n_q}{81} - \frac{254}{9} & \frac{112}{9} - \frac{16n_q}{81} & \frac{445}{3} - \frac{202n_q}{27} \end{array} \right). \quad (4.5)$$

For the d -type $\Delta F = 1^{\bar{f}f}$ sector, the complete $O(\alpha_s^2)$ ADM is known from Ref. [23] (taking also into account the correction found recently in Ref. [35]), and a change of basis to JMS can thus be performed as before. Given their size, we refrain from writing the explicit matrices

here, but we remark that our matrix $\Delta\hat{r}^{(1,0)}$ has a discrepancy with respect to Eq. (22) in Ref. [50], where a similar transformation has been worked out.⁵ We thus limit ourselves to indicating the entries in which we disagree, and refer the reader to Ref. [50] for the remaining entries of the matrix, as well as for the rotation matrix \hat{R} . The relevant part of the matrix $\Delta\hat{r}^{(1,0)}$, where this discrepancy arises, is its first 8×18 sub-block, denoted by $\Delta\hat{A}^{(1,0)}$ in Ref. [50]. We find

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta\hat{A}^{(1,0)} = & \frac{1}{6} \left(\begin{array}{cccccc} 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & -6 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right)^T \\ & \times \left(\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccc} 0 & 2 & 0 & 2 & \frac{-1}{N_c} & 1 & \frac{N_c-1}{N_c} & \frac{N_c-1}{N_c} & 0 & 2 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 2 \end{array} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

where the discrepant terms result from the coefficient highlighted in red. Our final results for the ADM at $O(\alpha_s^2)$ can be read off the corresponding beta functions in the ancillary material (see Section 4.4).

Knowing the ADM for the SM operators only (e.g. in the CMM basis) is not enough to produce any useful results in the JMS basis (since the JMS basis does not contain a similar SM sub-block). Thus the known results for the ADM at $O(\alpha_s\alpha)$ [15–17, 25, 27] cannot be used to obtain the corresponding information in the JMS basis. We thus relegate the discussion of the corresponding results to later sections.

4.2 ADMs from Flavor Symmetries

We now follow a strategy similar to the one in Section 6 of Ref. [23] in order to derive the ADMs for the d -type $\Delta F = 1.5$ sectors from the one for $\Delta F = 1$.

We start by constructing a “symmetrized” basis for a 10-dimensional subsector of the ud -type $\Delta F = 1$ sector (the subsector in Eq. (4.5)), which we call the “ \pm ” basis:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathcal{O}_{ijkl}^{V1,LL} + \mathcal{O}_{uddu}^{V1,LL} \right), \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathcal{O}_{ijkl}^{V1,LR} + \mathcal{O}_{uddu}^{V1,LR} \right), \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathcal{O}_{ijkl}^{V8,LR} + \mathcal{O}_{uddu}^{V8,LR} \right), \right. \\ & \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathcal{O}_{ijkl}^{S1,RR} + \mathcal{O}_{uddu}^{S1,RR} \right), \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathcal{O}_{ijkl}^{S8,RR} + \mathcal{O}_{uddu}^{S8,RR} \right), \\ & \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathcal{O}_{ijkl}^{V1,LL} - \mathcal{O}_{uddu}^{V1,LL} \right), \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathcal{O}_{ijkl}^{V1,LR} - \mathcal{O}_{uddu}^{V1,LR} \right), \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathcal{O}_{ijkl}^{V8,LR} - \mathcal{O}_{uddu}^{V8,LR} \right), \\ & \left. \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathcal{O}_{ijkl}^{S1,RR} - \mathcal{O}_{uddu}^{S1,RR} \right), \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathcal{O}_{ijkl}^{S8,RR} - \mathcal{O}_{uddu}^{S8,RR} \right) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{O}_{uddu}^{V1,LL}$ is not a JMS operator but it is defined analogously. This basis is “sym-

⁵Our results, however, are consistent with the results in Ref. [51].

metrized” in the sense that, under the exchange $u_j \leftrightarrow d_l$, the first five ‘+’ operators are symmetric and the last five ‘-’ operators are antisymmetric. We then calculate the $O(\alpha_s^2)$ ADM in this basis by means of a basis change from the ADM in the JMS basis given in Eq. (4.5).

The key issue now is that, if we consider the set of operators obtained from the “ \pm ” basis by the replacements $u_i \rightarrow d_i$ and $u_j \rightarrow d_l$, then their ADM must be identical to the one just calculated, because of the $u_j \leftrightarrow d_l$ flavor symmetry. But the ones arising from the ‘+’ operators become,

$$\left\{ \mathcal{O}_{ijkj}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{ijkj}^{V1,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{ijkj}^{V8,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{ijkj}^{S1,RR}, \mathcal{O}_{ijkj}^{S8,RR} \right\},$$

which is a subset of the d -type $\Delta F = 1.5$ sector. The ADM for this set is identical to that in Eq. (4.2). The ADMs at $O(\alpha_s^2)$ of all the RG-invariant blocks in Section 3.2.1 thus follow.

4.3 Full ADM from Pole Coefficients

Aside from those two-loop results for ADMs that are already known, some additional information is available concerning the separate contributions from the various two-loop diagrams [11, 14, 23]. This information is given in the form of “tables of pole coefficients”, containing the $1/\epsilon^2$ and $1/\epsilon$ contributions from the sum of different two-loop diagrams and associated one-loop diagrams with counterterms. In a nutshell, the two-loop ADMs are written as

$$\gamma_{ij}^{(m,n)} = -4Z_{Q_i}^{(m,n,1)} \delta_{Q_i Q_j} - 4 \sum_{D \in \text{diags.}} C_{D, Q_i Q_j}^{(m,n)} T_{D, Q_i Q_j}^{(m,n;1)}, \quad (4.7)$$

where $T_{D, Q_i Q_j}^{(m,n;1)}$ represents a $1/\epsilon$ pole coefficient associated to a two-loop diagram of class D , complemented with an appropriate color/charge factor $C_{D, Q_i Q_j}^{(m,n)}$. In this section we will show how, knowing these coefficients $T_{D, Q_i Q_j}^{(2,0;1)}$ for certain Q_i, Q_j , is enough to reconstruct the full two-loop ADM in the LEFT.

We first clarify what the coefficients $T_{D, Q_i Q_j}^{(m,n;1)}$ are, and work out a representative example. Comparing to Eqs. (2.45)-(2.47) one finds that

$$\sum_{D \in \text{diags.}} C_{D, Q_i Q_j}^{(2,0)} T_{D, Q_i Q_j}^{(2,0;1)} = \hat{a}_{Q_i Q_j}^{(2,0;1)} - \hat{a}_{Q_i Q_k}^{(1,0;1)} \hat{a}_{Q_k Q_j}^{(1,0;0)} - \frac{1}{2} \hat{a}_{Q_i E_k}^{(1,0;1)} \hat{a}_{E_k Q_j}^{(1,0;0)}, \quad (4.8)$$

$$\sum_{D \in \text{diags.}} C_{D, Q_i Q_j}^{(0,2)} T_{D, Q_i Q_j}^{(0,2;1)} = \hat{a}_{Q_i Q_j}^{(0,2;1)} - \hat{a}_{Q_i Q_k}^{(0,1;1)} \hat{a}_{Q_k Q_j}^{(0,1;0)} - \frac{1}{2} \hat{a}_{Q_i E_k}^{(0,1;1)} \hat{a}_{E_k Q_j}^{(0,1;0)}, \quad (4.9)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{D \in \text{diags.}} C_{D, Q_i Q_j}^{(1,1)} T_{D, Q_i Q_j}^{(1,1;1)} &= \hat{a}_{Q_i Q_j}^{(1,1;1)} - \hat{a}_{Q_i Q_k}^{(1,0;1)} \hat{a}_{Q_k Q_j}^{(0,1;0)} - \hat{a}_{Q_i Q_k}^{(0,1;1)} \hat{a}_{Q_k Q_j}^{(1,0;0)} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} \left[\hat{a}_{Q_i E_k}^{(1,0;1)} \hat{a}_{E_k Q_j}^{(0,1;0)} + \hat{a}_{Q_i E_k}^{(0,1;1)} \hat{a}_{E_k Q_j}^{(1,0;0)} \right]. \tag{4.10}
\end{aligned}$$

How to group the different diagrammatic contributions into the classes D is arbitrary, but it needs to be specified in order to understand the tables of pole coefficients in Refs. [11, 14, 16, 23]. The general rule is that each type of two-loop diagram is grouped with the one-loop counterterms that renormalize its subdivergences.

For illustration, let us consider the $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^2)$ corrections to the $\Delta F = 1^{\bar{q}q}$ four-quark penguin operator $Q_1 = (\bar{s}\gamma^\mu P_L d)(\bar{u}\gamma_\mu P_L u)$, as discussed in Ref. [11], using the same numbering for the diagram types. For example:

.....

Diagrams $D = 4$: The diagrams of this class correspond to the ladder diagrams on each fermion current. There are two such two-loop diagrams, giving the same contribution to the pole coefficient, which corresponds to the multiplicity factor $M = 2$ in Ref. [11]. The color factor C_F^2 , which is by definition removed from the pole coefficient, will be suppressed in the following. One finds,

$$\hat{a}_{Q_1 Q_1}^{(2,0;1)} \Big|_{D=4} = \left[\text{diagram 1} \right]_{Q_1, 1/\epsilon} + \left[\text{diagram 2} \right]_{Q_1, 1/\epsilon} = -\frac{3}{2}, \tag{4.11}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{a}_{Q_1 Q_k}^{(1,0;1)} \hat{a}_{Q_k Q_1}^{(1,0;0)} \Big|_{D=4} &= \tag{4.12} \\
&= \left[\text{diagram 3} \right]_{Q_k, 1/\epsilon} \times \left[\text{diagram 4} \right]_{Q_1, \text{finite}} + \left[\text{diagram 5} \right]_{Q_k, 1/\epsilon} \times \left[\text{diagram 6} \right]_{Q_1, \text{finite}} = -4,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{a}_{Q_1 E_k}^{(1,0;1)} \hat{a}_{E_k Q_1}^{(1,0;0)} \Big|_{D=4} &= \tag{4.13} \\
&= \left[\text{diagram 7} \right]_{E_k, 1/\epsilon} \times \left[\text{diagram 8} \right]_{Q_1, \text{finite}} + \left[\text{diagram 9} \right]_{E_k, 1/\epsilon} \times \left[\text{diagram 10} \right]_{Q_1, \text{finite}} = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

This gives for the contribution from diagrams $D = 4$ to the $1/\epsilon$ pole coefficient:

$$T_{4,Q_i Q_j}^{(2,0;1)} = -\frac{3}{2} - (-4) - \frac{1}{2} \cdot 0 = \frac{5}{2}, \quad (4.14)$$

which is consistent with the NDR scheme result in Table 3 of Ref. [11] (see also Table 3 in Appendix B).

Several tables of pole coefficients for various sets of operators can be found in Ref. [11] (BW), Ref. [14] (BJLW) and Ref. [23] (BMU); all three references consider $O(\alpha_s^2)$ corrections. Following Eq. (4.7), it is thus straightforward to build the corresponding ADMs from the $1/\epsilon$ pole coefficients in the tables. For convenience, we have collected the various tables in Appendix B. In this section we show how one can use these pole coefficients to obtain the full set of two-loop ADMs to $O(\alpha_s^2)$, $O(\alpha_s \alpha)$ and $O(\alpha^2)$ for all four-fermion operators in the LEFT.

We will distinguish between the contributions to the two-loop ADMs coming from current-current diagrams only, i.e. including only current-current diagrams in all of the matrices \hat{a} in Eqs. (2.45)-(2.47), and the rest of the contributions. We refer to them as *current-current* and *penguin* ADMs, respectively:

$$\hat{\gamma}^{(m,n)} = \hat{\gamma}_{cc}^{(m,n)} + \hat{\gamma}_p^{(m,n)}. \quad (4.15)$$

By definition we include the term $Z_{Q_i} \delta_{Q_i Q_j}$ in $\hat{\gamma}_{cc}$. While the case of current-current contributions is relatively straightforward, the case of penguin contributions is more involved due to the difficulties related to Dirac traces containing γ_5 in the NDR scheme. When performing basis changes at NLO we will also split the matrix $\Delta \hat{r}^{(m,n)}$ into current-current and penguin contributions, and define $\Delta \hat{r}_{cc}$ and $\Delta \hat{r}_p$ by:

$$\hat{\gamma}'_{cc}{}^{(2,0)} = \hat{R} \hat{\gamma}_{cc}^{(2,0)} \hat{R}^{-1} + 4Z_g^{(1,0;1)} \Delta \hat{r}_{cc}^{(1,0)} - \left[\Delta \hat{r}_{cc}^{(1,0)}, \hat{\gamma}_{cc}^{(1,0)} \right], \quad (4.16)$$

$$\hat{\gamma}'_p{}^{(2,0)} = \hat{R} \hat{\gamma}_p^{(2,0)} \hat{R}^{-1} + 4Z_g^{(1,0;1)} \Delta \hat{r}_p^{(1,0)} - \left[\Delta \hat{r}_p^{(1,0)}, \hat{\gamma}_p^{(1,0)} \right] - \left[\Delta \hat{r}_{cc}^{(1,0)}, \hat{\gamma}_p^{(1,0)} \right], \quad (4.17)$$

with analogous expressions for $\hat{\gamma}^{(0,2)}$ and $\hat{\gamma}^{(1,1)}$. By definition, current-current ADMs transform under the change of basis independently of any penguin contribution at both one and two loops. Penguin ADMs at two loops transform with the full one-loop ADM in the commutator, and they also acquire an additional term (the last term in Eq. (4.17)). This additional term however vanishes in all considered basis changes. This is due to the fact that the VLL, VLR and SLR subsectors in $\Delta \hat{r}_{cc}^{(1,0)}$ are zero in all our cases, while the other subsectors SRR and TRR have vanishing $\hat{\gamma}_p^{(1,0)}$. The same applies to $\hat{\gamma}_p^{(0,2)}$ and $\hat{\gamma}_p^{(1,1)}$.

4.3.1 Current-Current Contributions

Direct application of Eq. (4.7), with the pole coefficients given in Tables 3 and 4 and the appropriate color/charge factors, gives the ADM for a generic sector in the following basis

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_1 &= (\bar{\psi}_1 \gamma^\mu P_L \psi_2)(\bar{\psi}_3 \gamma_\mu P_L \psi_4) , & Q_2 &= (\bar{\psi}_1 \gamma^\mu P_L T^A \psi_2)(\bar{\psi}_3 \gamma_\mu P_L T^A \psi_4) , \\
Q_3 &= (\bar{\psi}_1 \gamma^\mu P_L \psi_2)(\bar{\psi}_3 \gamma_\mu P_R \psi_4) , & Q_4 &= (\bar{\psi}_1 \gamma^\mu P_L T^A \psi_2)(\bar{\psi}_3 \gamma_\mu P_R T^A \psi_4) , \\
Q_5 &= (\bar{\psi}_1 P_L \psi_2)(\bar{\psi}_3 P_R \psi_4) , & Q_6 &= (\bar{\psi}_1 P_L T^A \psi_2)(\bar{\psi}_3 P_R T^A \psi_4) , \\
Q_7 &= (\bar{\psi}_1 P_R \psi_2)(\bar{\psi}_3 P_R \psi_4) , & Q_8 &= (\bar{\psi}_1 P_R T^A \psi_2)(\bar{\psi}_3 P_R T^A \psi_4) , \\
Q_9 &= (\bar{\psi}_1 \sigma^{\mu\nu} P_R \psi_2)(\bar{\psi}_3 \sigma_{\mu\nu} P_R \psi_4) , & Q_{10} &= (\bar{\psi}_1 \sigma^{\mu\nu} P_R T^A \psi_2)(\bar{\psi}_3 \sigma_{\mu\nu} P_R T^A \psi_4) ,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.18}$$

with $\psi_1, \psi_2, \psi_3, \psi_4$ being any four different fermion fields. Operators Q_i in Eq. (4.18) for even i are only present when all four fermion fields are quarks. From the generic ADM in this basis, one obtains the ADMs in the JMS basis for the different RG-invariant sectors as follows:

1. For the $\Delta F = 1$ sectors of type ed, eu, vd, vu, ve and $vedu$, as well as for the $\Delta L = 2$ sector, the generic ADM coincides with the ADM for each of these sectors in the JMS basis.
2. The JMS basis for the ud -type $\Delta F = 1$ sector is different from the one in Eq. (4.18). In this case, after obtaining the ADM from the pole coefficients in the basis $\{Q_i\}$, we perform a change of basis into the new basis $\{Q'_i\}$, given by $Q'_{1-6} = Q_{1-6}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
Q'_7 &= (\bar{\psi}_1 P_R \psi_2)(\bar{\psi}_3 P_R \psi_4) , & Q'_8 &= (\bar{\psi}_1 P_R T^A \psi_2)(\bar{\psi}_3 P_R T^A \psi_4) , \\
Q'_9 &= (\bar{\psi}_1 P_R \psi_4)(\bar{\psi}_3 P_R \psi_2) , & Q'_{10} &= (\bar{\psi}_1 P_R T^A \psi_4)(\bar{\psi}_3 P_R T^A \psi_2) .
\end{aligned} \tag{4.19}$$

This change of basis corresponds essentially to the one worked out in Eqs. (4.3)-(4.4) for the $O(\alpha_s^2)$ contributions.

3. For $\Delta F = 2$ and $\Delta F = 1.5$ sectors, in which $\psi_1 = \psi_3$ and/or $\psi_2 = \psi_4$, the basis in Eq. (4.18) is redundant. We then follow the same symmetrization procedure as in Section 4.2 (as introduced in Ref. [23]): we build the ADM in the redundant basis, and then perform a change of basis into a “ \pm ” basis. For example, in the case $\psi_2 = \psi_4$, we take

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_1^\pm &= \frac{1}{2} \left[(\bar{\psi}_1 \gamma^\mu P_L \psi_2)(\bar{\psi}_3 \gamma_\mu P_L \psi_4) \pm (\bar{\psi}_1 \gamma^\mu P_L \psi_4)(\bar{\psi}_3 \gamma_\mu P_L \psi_2) \right] , \\
Q_2^\pm &= \frac{1}{2} \left[(\bar{\psi}_1 \gamma^\mu P_L \psi_2)(\bar{\psi}_3 \gamma_\mu P_R \psi_4) \pm (\bar{\psi}_1 \gamma^\mu P_L \psi_4)(\bar{\psi}_3 \gamma_\mu P_R \psi_2) \right] , \\
Q_3^\pm &= \frac{1}{2} \left[(\bar{\psi}_1 P_L \psi_2)(\bar{\psi}_3 P_R \psi_4) \pm (\bar{\psi}_1 P_L \psi_4)(\bar{\psi}_3 P_R \psi_2) \right] ,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.20}$$

$$Q_4^\pm = \frac{1}{2} \left[(\bar{\psi}_1 P_R \psi_2) (\bar{\psi}_3 P_R \psi_4) \pm (\bar{\psi}_1 P_R \psi_4) (\bar{\psi}_3 P_R \psi_2) \right],$$

$$Q_5^\pm = \frac{1}{2} \left[(\bar{\psi}_1 P_R T^A \psi_2) (\bar{\psi}_3 P_R T^A \psi_4) \pm (\bar{\psi}_1 P_R T^A \psi_4) (\bar{\psi}_3 P_R T^A \psi_2) \right].$$

The ADM for the operators Q_i^+ coincides then with the one in the JMS basis for the corresponding $\Delta F = 2$ and $\Delta F = 1.5$ sectors, as explained in more detail in Section 4.2.

4. The ADMs for the sectors $\Delta F = 1^{\bar{f}f}$ and $\Delta F = 0$ have to be computed for $\psi_1 = \psi_2$, $\psi_1 = \psi_4$, $\psi_2 = \psi_3$ and/or $\psi_2 = \psi_4$. They receive contributions from penguin diagrams, which mix operators with different fermion content. The splitting into current-current and penguin contributions mentioned above is now relevant, with the property that γ_{cc} transforms independently from γ_p , and can therefore be constructed separately. We thus split the sectors into subsectors of operators containing the same fermion fields. These subsectors can then be treated separately as in the previous cases. There is one exception, however, namely the subsectors $(\bar{q}_i \Gamma q_j) (\bar{q}_k \Gamma q_k)$ with $q = u, d$ and $k \neq \{i, j\}$. In these exceptional cases the JMS basis has yet a different structure, and thus we perform a change of basis into a new basis $\{Q''_i\}$, given by $Q''_{3-10} = Q'_{3-10}$ and

$$Q''_1 = (\bar{\psi}_1 \gamma^\mu P_L \psi_2) (\bar{\psi}_3 \gamma_\mu P_L \psi_4), \quad Q''_2 = (\bar{\psi}_1 \gamma^\mu P_L \psi_4) (\bar{\psi}_3 \gamma_\mu P_L \psi_2). \quad (4.21)$$

Note that the change of basis $\{Q'_i\} \rightarrow \{Q''_i\}$ is trivial, given that $\Delta \hat{r}^{(1,0)} = \Delta \hat{r}^{(0,1)} = 0$. This is the reason for the vanishing of the last term in Eq. (4.17).

5. For the baryon-number-violating (BNV) sectors, the tables of pole coefficients provide the ADMs in the following two bases,

$$B_1 = \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma} (q_1^{\alpha T} C P_L q_2^\beta) (q_3^{\gamma T} C P_R \ell), \quad \tilde{B}_1 = \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma} (q_1^{\alpha T} C P_L q_2^\beta) (\bar{\ell} P_R q_3^\gamma),$$

$$B_2 = \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma} (q_1^{\alpha T} C P_R q_2^\beta) (\bar{q}_3^{\gamma T} P_R \ell), \quad \tilde{B}_2 = \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma} (q_1^{\alpha T} C P_R q_2^\beta) (\bar{\ell} P_R q_3^\gamma),$$

$$B_3 = \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma} (q_1^{\alpha T} C \sigma^{\mu\nu} P_R q_2^\beta) (q_3^{\gamma T} C \sigma_{\mu\nu} P_R \ell), \quad \tilde{B}_3 = \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma} (q_1^{\alpha T} C \sigma^{\mu\nu} P_R q_2^\beta) (\bar{\ell} \sigma_{\mu\nu} P_R q_3^\gamma). \quad (4.22)$$

The operators B_i correspond to $\Delta L = +1$ transitions, while \tilde{B}_i correspond to $\Delta L = -1$. Once again, these bases do not correspond to JMS operators and one needs to change them to the bases $B'_{1,2} = B_{1,2}$ and $\tilde{B}'_{1,2} = \tilde{B}_{1,2}$, together with

$$B'_3 = \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma} (q_1^{\alpha T} C P_R q_3^\beta) (q_2^{\gamma T} C P_R \ell), \quad \tilde{B}'_3 = \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma} (q_1^{\alpha T} C P_R q_3^\beta) (\bar{\ell} P_R q_2^\gamma). \quad (4.23)$$

Note that, for $q_2 = q_3$, one has $B'_3 = B'_2$ and $\tilde{B}'_3 = \tilde{B}'_2$, and thus this basis becomes redundant. In such cases, one can symmetrize the two operators by changing them into

a “ \pm ” basis (while leaving $B_1^{(\prime)}$ and $\tilde{B}_1^{(\prime)}$ unchanged), in the style of Eq. (4.20) for the $\Delta F = 1.5$ and $\Delta F = 2$ sectors,

$$B_2^\pm = \frac{1}{2}(B_2 \pm B_3), \quad \tilde{B}_2^\pm = \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{B}_2 \pm \tilde{B}_3), \quad (4.24)$$

and then focus on the “+” operators as to obtain the proper ADM.

6. All current-current ADMs discussed here can be trivially extended to the sectors with chirally-flipped operators (related by $P_L \leftrightarrow P_R$).

The above mentioned manipulations provide the full current-current ADM in the LEFT.

4.3.2 Penguin Contributions

Penguin diagrams contribute to the ADMs of $\Delta F = 1^{\bar{f}f}$ and $\Delta F = 0$ sectors. These contributions are only non-zero for insertions of VLL, VLR and SRL operators (and their chirality-flipped counterparts).

Although penguin contributions will introduce mixing among many sets of operators with different fermion content (i.e. different $\bar{f}f$ currents), we show in this section that the penguin ADMs can be reconstructed from a reduced set of small matrices, that we shall call “penguin ADM seeds”, and which can be read off from a single table of pole coefficients (from Table 5 in this case, extracted from Ref. [14]). A crucial ingredient in this operation is the property of flavor universality of anomalous dimensions [35]. For this purpose we will introduce the concepts of “flavor-symmetric” and “flavor-decoupled” operator bases.

We start by defining some nomenclature: for a $\Delta F = 1^{\bar{f}f}$ operator, we call “outer flavors” those characterizing the net $\Delta F = 1$ transition, while the remaining ones are referred to as “inner flavors”. Then:

- A basis $\{Q_i, E_i\}$ is said to be *flavor-symmetric in flavors f, f'* if

$$\{Q_i, E_i\}|_{f \leftrightarrow f'} = \{Q_i, E_i\} \quad (\text{up to reordering}). \quad (4.25)$$

Note that this can only be true if f, f' are inner flavors.

- A basis is said to be *flavor-decoupled* if, when decoupling any inner flavor f from the EFT, the set of operators obtained by removing from this basis any terms containing the flavor f defines a basis for the sector of the new EFT, whose penguin ADM is given by the old one with the appropriate rows and columns removed.

For an operator basis to be flavor decoupled it is sufficient that two conditions are simultaneously satisfied:

1. Each operator contains no more than one inner flavor. This guarantees that all operators that are not removed completely in the procedure are left unaltered.
2. When decomposing the penguin ADM into \hat{a} matrices as in Eqs. (2.43)-(2.47), each entry $(\hat{\gamma}_p)_{ij}$ depends only on flavors common to Q_i and Q_j , whereas any contribution involving other flavors vanishes. This ensures that the ADM entries for all operators not eliminated by the decoupling (i.e. not featuring the decoupled field) retain exactly the same expression. At NLO this second condition reads:

$$\left[-4\hat{p}_{Q_i Q_j}^{(2,0;1)} + 4\hat{p}_{Q_i Q_k}^{(1,0;1)}\hat{p}_{Q_k Q_j}^{(1,0;0)} + 2\hat{p}_{Q_i E_k}^{(1,0;1)}\hat{p}_{E_k Q_j}^{(1,0;0)} \right]_{\text{featuring fields } \notin Q_i, Q_j} = 0, \quad (4.26)$$

where we used $\hat{p} \equiv \hat{a}_p$ for notational simplicity. Given that the matrices \hat{a}_{cc} conserve flavor, the only products of one-loop \hat{a} matrices involving fields that are not present in Q_i or Q_j are products of two \hat{a}_p matrices.

A flavor-decoupled basis that is also flavor-symmetric in any two lepton flavors ℓ, ℓ' or quark flavors q, q' implies a set of special properties for its ADM, which we will refer to as “surface-level flavor universality”. Evidently, decoupling any flavor from the EFT will have a trivial effect on the penguin ADM. In addition, as dictated by flavor symmetry, for two operators Q_i and Q_j differing only in symmetric inner flavors one finds

$$\gamma_{ik} = \gamma_{jk}, \quad \gamma_{ki} = \gamma_{kj}, \quad \forall k, \quad (4.27)$$

up to QED charges. Finally, extending the basis with an extra inner flavor will also have a trivial effect on the penguin ADM, mainly duplicating a set of rows and columns.⁶

The complete procedure to obtain the full penguin ADM from the corresponding tables of pole coefficients is summarized in Figure 1, and consists of the following four steps:

1. Penguin ADM Seeds

We start by generalizing the approach followed originally in Ref. [14] for the $\Delta F = 1^{\bar{f}f}$ SM operators in the BMU basis. We define two operator sets, closed under renormalization:

⁶Technically speaking, the process of extending the basis with extra flavors (e.g. u_3 in the LEFT) is more complicated. It amounts to extending the EFT with the extra flavor, thus defining a new EFT, and then building a $\Delta F = 1^{\bar{f}f}$ basis being flavor-decoupled and flavor-symmetric in all lepton/quark flavors, such that decoupling the extra flavor leads to the original basis. Then, $\hat{\gamma}'_p$ in the basis of the extended EFT will have the same entries as the original $\hat{\gamma}_p$ for all flavors common in both EFTs, due to flavor-decoupling. Moreover, the new rows and columns will simply be copies of some of the others, which follows from flavor symmetry.




Figure 1: Flowchart outlining the full procedure to obtain the two-loop ADMs starting from the tables of pole coefficients of Appendix B. In the figure, “CoB” is short for “Change of Basis”, and the dashed arrows represent the steps which use surface-level flavor universality for the manipulation of the matrices.

the *lepton penguin basis*,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{O}_1^{(\ell)} &= (\bar{\ell}_i \gamma^\mu P_L \ell'_k) (\bar{\ell}'_k \gamma_\mu P_L \ell_j), & \mathcal{O}_2^{(\ell)} &= (\bar{\ell}_i P_R \ell'_k) (\bar{\ell}'_k P_R \ell_j), \\
\mathcal{O}_3^{(\ell)} &= (\bar{\ell}_i \gamma^\mu P_L q_k) (\bar{q}_k \gamma_\mu P_L \ell_j), & \mathcal{O}_4^{(\ell)} &= (\bar{\ell}_i P_L q_k) (\bar{q}_k P_R \ell_j), \\
\mathcal{O}_5^{(\ell)} &= \sum_w (\bar{\ell}_i \gamma^\mu P_L \ell_j) (\bar{e}_w \gamma_\mu P_L e_w), & \mathcal{O}_6^{(\ell)} &= \sum_w (\bar{\ell}_i \gamma^\mu P_L \ell_j) (\bar{e}_w \gamma_\mu P_R e_w), \\
\mathcal{O}_7^{(\ell)} &= \sum_w (\bar{\ell}_i \gamma^\mu P_L \ell_j) (\bar{u}_w \gamma_\mu P_L u_w), & \mathcal{O}_8^{(\ell)} &= \sum_w (\bar{\ell}_i \gamma^\mu P_L \ell_j) (\bar{u}_w \gamma_\mu P_R u_w), \\
\mathcal{O}_9^{(\ell)} &= \sum_w (\bar{\ell}_i \gamma^\mu P_L \ell_j) (\bar{d}_w \gamma_\mu P_L d_w), & \mathcal{O}_{10}^{(\ell)} &= \sum_w (\bar{\ell}_i \gamma^\mu P_L \ell_j) (\bar{d}_w \gamma_\mu P_R d_w),
\end{aligned} \tag{4.28}$$

and the *down-quark penguin basis*,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{O}_1^{(d)} &= (\bar{d}_i^\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L \ell_k) (\bar{\ell}_k \gamma_\mu P_L d_j^\alpha), & \mathcal{O}_2^{(d)} &= (\bar{d}_i^\alpha P_R \ell_k) (\bar{\ell}_k P_L d_j^\alpha), \\
\mathcal{O}_3^{(d)} &= (\bar{d}_i^\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L q_k^\alpha) (\bar{q}_k^\beta \gamma_\mu P_L d_j^\beta), & \mathcal{O}_4^{(d)} &= (\bar{d}_i^\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L q_k^\beta) (\bar{q}_k^\beta \gamma_\mu P_L d_j^\alpha), \\
\mathcal{O}_5^{(d)} &= (\bar{d}_i^\alpha P_R q_k^\alpha) (\bar{q}_k^\beta P_L d_j^\beta), & \mathcal{O}_6^{(d)} &= (\bar{d}_i^\alpha P_R q_k^\beta) (\bar{q}_k^\beta P_L d_j^\alpha), \\
\mathcal{O}_7^{(d)} &= \sum_w (\bar{d}_i^\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L d_j^\alpha) (\bar{e}_w \gamma_\mu P_L e_w), & \mathcal{O}_8^{(d)} &= \sum_w (\bar{d}_i^\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L d_j^\alpha) (\bar{e}_w \gamma_\mu P_R e_w), \\
\mathcal{O}_9^{(d)} &= \sum_w (\bar{d}_i^\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L d_j^\alpha) (\bar{u}_w^\beta \gamma_\mu P_L u_w^\beta), & \mathcal{O}_{10}^{(d)} &= \sum_w (\bar{d}_i^\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L d_j^\beta) (\bar{u}_w^\beta \gamma_\mu P_L u_w^\alpha), \\
\mathcal{O}_{11}^{(d)} &= \sum_w (\bar{d}_i^\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L d_j^\alpha) (\bar{u}_w^\beta \gamma_\mu P_R u_w^\beta), & \mathcal{O}_{12}^{(d)} &= \sum_w (\bar{d}_i^\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L d_j^\beta) (\bar{u}_w^\beta \gamma_\mu P_R u_w^\alpha), \\
\mathcal{O}_{13}^{(d)} &= \sum_w (\bar{d}_i^\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L d_j^\alpha) (\bar{d}_w^\beta \gamma_\mu P_L d_w^\beta), & \mathcal{O}_{14}^{(d)} &= \sum_w (\bar{d}_i^\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L d_j^\beta) (\bar{d}_w^\beta \gamma_\mu P_L d_w^\alpha), \\
\mathcal{O}_{15}^{(d)} &= \sum_w (\bar{d}_i^\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L d_j^\alpha) (\bar{d}_w^\beta \gamma_\mu P_R d_w^\beta), & \mathcal{O}_{16}^{(d)} &= \sum_w (\bar{d}_i^\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L d_j^\beta) (\bar{d}_w^\beta \gamma_\mu P_R d_w^\alpha),
\end{aligned} \tag{4.29}$$

where $\ell(\ell')$ and q are generic lepton and quark fields, respectively, and α, β are $SU(3)_c$ indices. The index w runs over the corresponding flavors, and k is a flavor index different from i, j . Two comments are in order. First, the lepton and down-quark penguin bases are not complete bases, but specific bases for certain blocks closed under renormalization. Second, there is one particular lepton and one down-quark penguin basis for each choice of $\ell_k = e_k, \nu_k$ and $q_k = d_k, u_k$.

The advantage of these bases is that the tables of pole coefficients directly provide the contributions to the penguin ADMs from each of the $\mathcal{O}_{1-4}^{(\ell)}$ and $\mathcal{O}_{1-6}^{(d)}$ operators via Eq. (4.7). Let us focus, for simplicity, on the simpler case of $O(\alpha_s^2)$ contributions to the 10×10 penguin ADM in the lepton penguin basis (for arbitrary flavor indices), which has the following structure:

$$\hat{\gamma}_P^{(2,0)} \Big|_{\text{Lepton Basis}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0_{4 \times 6} & \hat{O}_P & \hat{O}_P \\ 0_{4 \times 6} & \hat{M}_C \hat{C}_P & \hat{M}_C \hat{C}_P \\ 0_{2 \times 6} & \hat{N}_C \hat{C}_P & \hat{N}_C \hat{C}_P \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{aligned} \hat{M}_C &= \text{diag}(n_e, n_e, n_u, n_u), \\ \hat{N}_C &= n_d \begin{pmatrix} 0_{2 \times 2} & \hat{1}_{2 \times 2} \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.30}$$

where $\hat{1}_{2 \times 2}$ is the two-by-two identity matrix. We call the 4×2 matrices \hat{O}_P and \hat{C}_P the “*penguin ADM seeds*”. The matrix \hat{O}_P is obtained directly from the tables. However, \hat{C}_P cannot be directly computed in the NDR scheme because it requires the evaluation of “closed-penguin” two-loop diagrams (i.e. penguins with insertions of operators with flavor

indices $ijkk$) which contain traces that involve γ_5 . This is not the case for \hat{O}_P , which arises from “open-penguin” diagrams (with insertions of operators with flavor indices $ikkj$) alone.

The closed-penguin seed \hat{C}_P can be obtained through a change of basis at NLO into an alternative basis \tilde{O}_i where all current-current operators $\mathcal{O}_{1-4}^{(\ell)}$, which give rise to open-penguin diagrams, are replaced by their closed-penguin counterparts:

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{O}_1^{(\ell)} &= (\bar{\ell}_i \gamma^\mu P_L \ell_j) (\bar{\ell}_k \gamma_\mu P_L \ell_k), & \tilde{O}_2^{(\ell)} &= (\bar{\ell}_i \gamma^\mu P_L \ell_j) (\bar{\ell}_k \gamma_\mu P_R \ell_k), \\ \tilde{O}_3^{(\ell)} &= (\bar{\ell}_i \gamma^\mu P_L \ell_j) (\bar{q}_k^\alpha \gamma_\mu P_L q_k^\alpha), & \tilde{O}_4^{(\ell)} &= (\bar{\ell}_i \gamma^\mu P_L \ell_j) (\bar{q}_k^\alpha \gamma_\mu P_R q_k^\alpha),\end{aligned}\tag{4.31}$$

and $\tilde{O}_{5-10}^{(\ell)} = \mathcal{O}_{5-10}^{(\ell)}$. The penguin ADM in this alternative basis has the form

$$\hat{\gamma}_p^{(2,0)} \Big|_{\text{Alt. Lepton Basis}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0_{4 \times 6} & \hat{C}_P & \hat{C}_P \\ 0_{4 \times 6} & \hat{M}_C \hat{C}_P & \hat{M}_C \hat{C}_P \\ 0_{2 \times 6} & \hat{N}_C \hat{C}_P & \hat{N}_C \hat{C}_P \end{pmatrix}.\tag{4.32}$$

Comparing this structure with the result of the change of basis completely determines \hat{C}_P in terms of \hat{O}_P . Once both penguin seeds \hat{O}_P, \hat{C}_P are known, the rest of the ADM can be trivially assembled.

This procedure can be analogously followed in the case of the $O(\alpha_s \alpha)$ and $O(\alpha^2)$ ADMs to obtain the corresponding penguin ADM seeds. The main difference in these cases is that the ADMs in Eqs. (4.30) and (4.32) will be less sparse. Their form resembles more the general case displayed in Appendix C.

The seeds for the down-quark penguin basis are obtained completely analogously, albeit in a slightly larger basis. The penguin seeds will be contained in 6×2 and 6×4 matrices in this case, and the alternative penguin basis will change the first 6 operators in Eq. (4.29) into

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{O}_1^{\text{Quark}} &= (\bar{d}_i^\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L d_j^\alpha) (\bar{\ell}_k \gamma_\mu P_L \ell_k), & \tilde{O}_2^{\text{Quark}} &= (\bar{d}_i^\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L d_j^\alpha) (\bar{\ell}_k \gamma_\mu P_R \ell_k), \\ \tilde{O}_3^{\text{Quark}} &= (\bar{d}_i^\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L d_j^\alpha) (\bar{q}_k^\beta \gamma_\mu P_L q_k^\beta), & \tilde{O}_4^{\text{Quark}} &= (\bar{d}_i^\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L d_j^\alpha) (\bar{q}_k^\beta \gamma_\mu P_L q_k^\alpha), \\ \tilde{O}_5^{\text{Quark}} &= (\bar{d}_i^\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L d_j^\alpha) (\bar{q}_k^\beta \gamma_\mu P_R q_k^\beta), & \tilde{O}_6^{\text{Quark}} &= (\bar{d}_i^\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L d_j^\alpha) (\bar{q}_k^\beta \gamma_\mu P_R q_k^\alpha).\end{aligned}\tag{4.33}$$

The ADMs for both the lepton and down-quark penguin bases, their alternative versions and the corresponding penguin seeds are discussed in Appendix C.

2. Completion of the Penguin Bases

The next step in the procedure consists of completing the lepton and down-quark penguin bases in order to cover all possible operators in the penguin blocks in Sections 3.4.1 and 3.4.3. The procedure follows Ref. [23] for the d -type basis, where it is shown how all penguin contributions can be expressed trivially in terms of the penguin seeds obtained above, as long as the basis is built appropriately [35]. The basis is completed with all the different copies of the current-current operators, $\mathcal{O}_{1-4}^{(\ell)}$ and $\mathcal{O}_{1-6}^{(d)}$, one for each choice of ℓ_k and q_k , and then finally including the operators

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{O}_{11}^{(\ell)} &= (\bar{\ell}_i \gamma^\mu P_L \ell_j)(\bar{\ell}_j \gamma_\mu P_L \ell_j) + (\bar{\ell}_i \gamma^\mu P_L \ell_j)(\bar{\ell}_i^\alpha \gamma_\mu P_L \ell_i^\alpha), \\ \mathcal{O}_{12}^{(\ell)} &= (\bar{\ell}_i \gamma^\mu P_L \ell_j)(\bar{\ell}_j \gamma_\mu P_R \ell_j) + (\bar{\ell}_i \gamma^\mu P_L \ell_j)(\bar{\ell}_i \gamma_\mu P_R \ell_i),\end{aligned}\tag{4.34}$$

for the lepton penguin basis, and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{O}_{17}^{(d)} &= \frac{1}{2} \left[(\bar{d}_i^\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L d_j^\alpha)(\bar{d}_j^\beta \gamma_\mu P_L d_j^\beta) + (\bar{d}_i^\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L d_j^\beta)(\bar{d}_j^\beta \gamma_\mu P_L d_j^\alpha) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (\bar{d}_i^\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L d_j^\alpha)(\bar{d}_i^\beta \gamma_\mu P_L d_i^\beta) + (\bar{d}_i^\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L d_j^\beta)(\bar{d}_i^\beta \gamma_\mu P_L d_i^\alpha) \right],\end{aligned}\tag{4.35}$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{18}^{(d)} = (\bar{d}_i^\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L d_j^\alpha)(\bar{d}_j^\beta \gamma_\mu P_R d_j^\beta) + (\bar{d}_i^\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L d_j^\alpha)(\bar{d}_i^\beta \gamma_\mu P_R d_i^\beta),$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{19}^{(d)} = (\bar{d}_i^\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L d_j^\beta)(\bar{d}_j^\beta \gamma_\mu P_R d_j^\alpha) + (\bar{d}_i^\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L d_j^\beta)(\bar{d}_i^\beta \gamma_\mu P_R d_i^\alpha),$$

for the down-quark penguin basis. These extra operators contribute to the penguin ADM through \hat{O}_P and \hat{C}_P , since they generate both open and closed penguin diagrams. The contribution from $\mathcal{O}_{17}^{(d)}$ is slightly more involved, and can be obtained through a tree-level change of basis similar to the “ \pm ” symmetrization of Eq. (4.20). Using the notation of Appendix C the contributions of these additional operators are given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} \hat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{O}_{11}^{(\ell)}, \mathcal{O}_{5-6}^{(\ell)}} \\ \hat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{O}_{12}^{(\ell)}, \mathcal{O}_{5-6}^{(\ell)}} \end{pmatrix}_p = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \times [\hat{O}_{P_e} + \hat{C}_{P_e}]_{Q_\ell \rightarrow Q_f},\tag{4.36}$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \hat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{O}_{17}^{(d)}, \mathcal{O}_{7-8}^{(d)}} \\ \hat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{O}_{18}^{(d)}, \mathcal{O}_{7-8}^{(d)}} \\ \hat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{O}_{19}^{(d)}, \mathcal{O}_{7-8}^{(d)}} \end{pmatrix}_p = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \times [\hat{Q}_{P_e} + \hat{K}_{P_e}]_{Q_q \rightarrow Q_f},\tag{4.37}$$

with identical expressions for their mixing into $\mathcal{O}_{7-8}^{(\ell)}$ and $\mathcal{O}_{9-12}^{(d)}$ in combination with the P_u seeds, and into $\mathcal{O}_{9-10}^{(\ell)}$ and $\mathcal{O}_{13-16}^{(d)}$ combined with the P_d seeds. Again, these are the only

non-vanishing entries of the penguin ADM in the lepton and down-quark penguin bases.

3. Reconstruction of $\Delta F = 1^{\bar{f}f}$ in the JMS basis

We now define a new set of four flavor-symmetric and flavor-decoupled bases:

$$\begin{aligned} \{\mathcal{S}_i^{(e)}\} = & \left\{ \mathcal{O}_{ij11}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{ij22}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{ij33}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{ij11}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{ij22}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{11ij}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{22ij}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{33ij}^{V,LL}, \right. \\ & \mathcal{O}_{ijkk}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{ijjj}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{ijii}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{ij11}^{V,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{ij22}^{V,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{ij33}^{V,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{ij11}^{V,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{ij22}^{V,LR}, \\ & \left. \mathcal{O}_{ijkk}^{V,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{ijjj}^{V,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{ijii}^{V,LR} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.38)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \{\mathcal{S}_i^{(\nu)}\} = & \left\{ \mathcal{O}_{ij11}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{ij22}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{ij33}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{ij11}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{ij22}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{ij33}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{ij11}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{ij22}^{V,LL}, \right. \\ & \mathcal{O}_{ijkk}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{ijjj}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{ijii}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{ij11}^{V,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{ij22}^{V,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{ij33}^{V,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{ij11}^{V,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{ij22}^{V,LR}, \\ & \left. \mathcal{O}_{ij33}^{V,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{ij11}^{V,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{ij22}^{V,LR} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.39)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \{\mathcal{S}_i^{(u)}\} = & \left\{ \mathcal{O}_{11ij}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{22ij}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{33ij}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{11ij}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{22ij}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{33ij}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{ij11}^{V1,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{ij11}^{V8,LL}, \right. \\ & \mathcal{O}_{ij22}^{V1,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{ij22}^{V8,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{ij33}^{V1,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{ij33}^{V8,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{ijjj}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{ijii}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{ij11}^{V,LR}, \\ & \mathcal{O}_{ij22}^{V,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{ij33}^{V,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{ij11}^{V1,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{ij11}^{V8,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{ij22}^{V1,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{ij22}^{V8,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{ij33}^{V1,LR}, \\ & \left. \mathcal{O}_{ij33}^{V8,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{ijjj}^{V1,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{ijjj}^{V8,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{ijii}^{V1,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{ijii}^{V8,LR} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.40)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \{\mathcal{S}_i^{(d)}\} = & \left\{ \mathcal{O}_{11ij}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{22ij}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{33ij}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{11ij}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{22ij}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{33ij}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{11ij}^{V1,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{11ij}^{V8,LL}, \right. \\ & \mathcal{O}_{22ij}^{V1,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{22ij}^{V8,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{ijkk}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{ijkk}^{V8,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{ijjj}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{ijii}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{ij11}^{V,LR}, \\ & \mathcal{O}_{ij22}^{V,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{ij33}^{V,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{ij11}^{V1,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{ij11}^{V8,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{ij22}^{V1,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{ij22}^{V8,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{ijkk}^{V1,LR}, \\ & \left. \mathcal{O}_{ijkk}^{V8,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{ijjj}^{V1,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{ijjj}^{V8,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{ijii}^{V1,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{ijii}^{V8,LR} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.41)$$

where the bases $\{\mathcal{S}_i^{(e,\nu,u)}\}$ are built from operators in the JMS basis, while $\{\mathcal{S}_i^{(d)}\}$ contains an operator (highlighted in red above) which is not in the JMS basis:

$$\mathcal{S}_{ijkk}^{V8,LL} = (\bar{d}_i \gamma^\mu P_L T^A d_j) (\bar{d}_k \gamma_\mu P_L T^A d_k). \quad (4.42)$$




Figure 2: Diagrams contributing to the cancellation given in Eq. (4.26), with (a) contributing to the first term and (b) contributing to the second term. The square represents an insertion of Q_i , the black blob represents the gluon/photon self energy, and the crossed circle is an EFT counterterm corresponding to $\hat{p}_{Q_k Q_j}^{(1,0;0)}$.

This extra operator is necessary in order to make the basis $\{\mathcal{S}_i^{(d)}\}$ flavor-symmetric and flavor-decoupled. We call $\{\mathcal{S}_i^{(f)}\}$ the *f-type symmetric basis*.

Except for the *u*-type case, the two-loop penguin ADMs in these symmetric bases can be obtained by performing a change of basis at NLO from the completed lepton/down-quark bases. The penguin ADMs for the *u*-type as well as the penguin ADMs for the LEFT(4) and the LEFT(3) can be obtained through surface-level flavor universality, as we discuss below.

Before going on, however, it is necessary to prove that these symmetric bases are indeed flavor-decoupled, i.e. that Eq. (4.26) is satisfied:

$$\left[-4\hat{p}_{Q_i Q_j}^{(2,0;1)} + 4\hat{p}_{Q_i Q_k}^{(1,0;1)}\hat{p}_{Q_k Q_j}^{(1,0;0)} + 2\hat{p}_{Q_i E_k}^{(1,0;1)}\hat{p}_{E_k Q_j}^{(1,0;0)} \right]_{\text{featuring flavors } \notin Q_i, Q_j} = 0.$$

There is only one type of two-loop penguin diagram that can contribute to the first term in this equation, see Fig. 2 (a), and the second term corresponds also to a single EFT counterterm diagram, see Fig. 2 (b). It is simple to check that these terms lead to a complete cancellation [14]. The third term is zero in all four bases due to their closed-penguin structure. With this, Eq. (4.26) is satisfied and thus all symmetric bases realize surface-level flavor universality.

Let us now discuss the derivation of the ADM for the *u*-type operators. We start with the *d*-type symmetric basis and replace the flavor d_k by an additional *u*-type quark (i.e. a fictitious u_3). The flavors d_i and d_j are however left unaltered. Due to the basis being flavor-decoupled, the alterations in the resulting ADM are easy to track: The four columns/rows for the operators containing d_k are replaced by four new ones corresponding to u_3 . This modified basis is functionally equivalent to the up-type symmetric basis up to a relabeling of field names, $u \leftrightarrow d$. Hence, when replacing charges in the ADM, $Q_d \leftrightarrow Q_u$, one finds the desired ADM in the up-quark symmetric basis.

The two-loop ADMs in the symmetric bases, as obtained thus far, are only valid for $n_q = 5$, given that the structure of the basis itself depends on the number of active fermions. The symmetric bases also allow for a trivial transformation of the ADMs when decoupling heavy fermions from the LEFT. As already discussed, decoupling a flavor in a symmetric basis impacts the ADM in a trivial way, namely by removing the corresponding rows and columns. The penguin ADMs for the $\Delta F = 1^{\bar{f}f}$ sectors in the LEFT(4) and the LEFT(3) follow then quite straightforwardly.

In each case, once the full penguin ADMs have been obtained to NLO in the symmetric bases, one can perform a final change of basis to the JMS basis, and thus obtain the final result. This is only needed, however, in the case of the down-type basis, given that the lepton and up-quark symmetric bases correspond already to their JMS counterparts. Finally, the ADMs for the chirally-flipped sectors are identical to the ones derived above.

4. Reconstruction of $\Delta F = 0$ in the JMS basis

In the $\Delta F = 0$ sector the operators have a flavor structure of the form $\mathcal{O}_i = \bar{\psi}_1 \Gamma \psi_1 \bar{\psi}_2 \Gamma' \psi_2$ or $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_i = \bar{\psi}_1 \Gamma \psi_2 \bar{\psi}_2 \Gamma' \psi_1$, possibly with $\psi_1 = \psi_2$. Thus both fields ψ_1, ψ_2 play the role of “inner flavors” and can become part of fermion loops. This means that the beta function \dot{L}_{iikk} receives separate contributions proportional to L_{iijj} and to L_{jjkk} , for any j . These two contributions can be independently associated to the corresponding $\Delta F = 1^{\bar{f}f}$ operators with inner flavor j . Schematically we write:

$$\begin{aligned} \left[\dot{L}_{iikk} \right]_p &= \left[\dot{L}_{i4kk} \right]_p \Big|_{4 \rightarrow i} + \left[\dot{L}_{iik4} \right]_p \Big|_{4 \rightarrow k}, \\ \left[\dot{L}_{ikki} \right]_p &= \left[\dot{L}_{ikk4} \right]_p \Big|_{4 \rightarrow i} + \left[\dot{L}_{i4ki} \right]_p \Big|_{4 \rightarrow k}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.43)$$

where the index ‘4’ is an artificial flavor introduced for the purpose of the method, as explained below.

To apply the previous equation, our starting point is to define a set of $\Delta F = 1^{\bar{f}f}$ flavor-decoupled and fully flavor-symmetric bases, analogous to the symmetric bases in Eqs. (4.38)-(4.41). Each of these bases is defined in a separate theory with one extra fermion, which we arbitrarily call e_4, ν_4, u_4, d_4 , respectively, and refer to the $\Delta F = 1^{\bar{f}f}$ sector relative to the corresponding $4 \rightarrow i$ transition. These bases are:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{ \mathcal{S}'_i^{(e)} \right\} &= \left\{ \mathcal{O}_{i411}^{V,LL,ed}, \mathcal{O}_{i422}^{V,LL,ed}, \mathcal{O}_{i433}^{V,LL,ed}, \mathcal{O}_{i411}^{V,LL,eu}, \mathcal{O}_{i422}^{V,LL,eu}, \mathcal{O}_{11i4}^{V,LL,\nu e}, \mathcal{O}_{22i4}^{V,LL,\nu e}, \mathcal{O}_{33i4}^{V,LL,\nu e}, \right. \\ &\quad \mathcal{O}_{i4kk}^{V,LL,ee}, \mathcal{O}_{i4ll}^{V,LL,ee}, \mathcal{O}_{i444}^{V,LL,ee}, \mathcal{O}_{i4ii}^{V,LL,ee}, \mathcal{O}_{i411}^{V,LR,ed}, \mathcal{O}_{i422}^{V,LR,ed}, \mathcal{O}_{i433}^{V,LR,ed}, \mathcal{O}_{i411}^{V,LR,eu}, \\ &\quad \left. \mathcal{O}_{i422}^{V,LR,eu}, \mathcal{O}_{i4kk}^{V,LR,ee}, \mathcal{O}_{i4ll}^{V,LR,ee}, \mathcal{O}_{i444}^{V,LR,ee}, \mathcal{O}_{i4ii}^{V,LR,ee} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.44)$$

$$\left\{ \mathcal{S}_i^{(\nu)} \right\} = \left\{ \mathcal{O}_{i411}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{i422}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{i433}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{i411}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{i422}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{i433}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{i411}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{i422}^{V,LL}, \right. \\ \left. \mathcal{O}_{i4kk}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{i4ll}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{i444}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{i4ii}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{i411}^{V,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{i422}^{V,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{i433}^{V,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{i411}^{V,LR}, \right. \\ \left. \mathcal{O}_{i422}^{V,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{i433}^{V,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{i411}^{V,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{i422}^{V,LR} \right\}, \quad (4.45)$$

$$\left\{ \mathcal{S}_i^{(u)} \right\} = \left\{ \mathcal{O}_{11i4}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{22i4}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{33i4}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{11i4}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{22i4}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{33i4}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{i411}^{V1,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{i411}^{V8,LL}, \right. \\ \left. \mathcal{O}_{i422}^{V1,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{i422}^{V8,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{i433}^{V1,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{i433}^{V8,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{i4ll}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{S}_{i4ll}^{V8,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{i444}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{i4ii}^{V,LL}, \right. \\ \left. \mathcal{O}_{i411}^{V,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{i422}^{V,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{i433}^{V,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{i411}^{V1,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{i411}^{V8,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{i422}^{V1,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{i422}^{V8,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{i433}^{V1,LR}, \right. \\ \left. \mathcal{O}_{i433}^{V8,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{i4ll}^{V1,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{i4ll}^{V8,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{i444}^{V1,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{i444}^{V8,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{i4ii}^{V1,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{i4ii}^{V8,LR} \right\}, \quad (4.46)$$

$$\left\{ \mathcal{S}_i^{(d)} \right\} = \left\{ \mathcal{O}_{11i4}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{22i4}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{33i4}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{11i4}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{22i4}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{33i4}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{11i4}^{V1,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{11i4}^{V8,LL}, \right. \\ \left. \mathcal{O}_{22i4}^{V1,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{22i4}^{V8,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{i4kk}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{S}_{i4kk}^{V8,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{i4ll}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{S}_{i4ll}^{V8,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{i444}^{V,LL}, \mathcal{O}_{i4ii}^{V,LL}, \right. \\ \left. \mathcal{O}_{i411}^{V,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{i422}^{V,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{i433}^{V,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{i411}^{V1,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{i411}^{V8,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{i422}^{V1,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{i422}^{V8,LR}, \right. \\ \left. \mathcal{O}_{i4kk}^{V1,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{i4kk}^{V8,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{i444}^{V1,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{i444}^{V8,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{i4ii}^{V1,LR}, \mathcal{O}_{i4ii}^{V8,LR} \right\}, \quad (4.47)$$

where $k \neq l$ are flavor indices both different from $i, 4$. Obtaining the penguin ADMs for these bases from the ones in the previous section is a straightforward task given their surface-level flavor universality: again, the basis needs to be extended, this time including the extra flavor.

In order to avoid what will result in double-counting related to Wilson coefficients of the type L_{iiii} , we now put to zero the Wilson coefficients L_{i444} . These contributions are already accounted for by L_{i4ii} . Finally, in order to compensate for the symmetry factor of 2 in the tree-level matrix element of operators $\mathcal{O}_{iii}^{V,LL}$, we substitute $L_{i4ii}^{V,LL} \rightarrow 2L_{i4ii}^{V,LL}$ everywhere. The resulting beta functions are now ready to be introduced in Eq. (4.43). This provides the full two-loop penguin ADM for a particular $\Delta F = 0$ basis (specified below). A final change to the JMS basis provides the final result.

The aforementioned $\Delta F = 0$ basis is identical to the JMS basis, except for eight operators:

$$\mathcal{S}_{1122}^{V8,LL}, \mathcal{S}_{1133}^{V8,LL}, \mathcal{S}_{2233}^{V8,LL}, \mathcal{S}_{1122}^{V8,LL}, \mathcal{S}_{1122}^{V8,RR}, \mathcal{S}_{1133}^{V8,RR}, \mathcal{S}_{2233}^{V8,RR}, \mathcal{S}_{1122}^{V8,RR},$$

which under the change of basis will lead to the JMS operators

$$\mathcal{O}_{1221}^{V,LL,dd}, \mathcal{O}_{1331}^{V,LL,dd}, \mathcal{O}_{2332}^{V,LL,dd}, \mathcal{O}_{1221}^{V,LL,uu}, \mathcal{O}_{1221}^{V,RR,dd}, \mathcal{O}_{1331}^{V,RR,dd}, \mathcal{O}_{2332}^{V,RR,dd}, \mathcal{O}_{1221}^{V,RR,uu}.$$

The discussion above only holds for the $\Delta F = 0$ ADM with $n_q = 5$. To obtain the ADMs for $n_q < 5$ one can use the fact that the aforementioned $\Delta F = 0$ basis is flavor-decoupled and flavor symmetric in any two flavors of the same type e, ν or q (u or d). The ADM in this basis is therefore surface-level flavor universal, and thus simply removing the Wilson coefficients containing the heavy fields is enough to properly implement the decoupling. The ADM for $n_q < 5$ in the JMS basis follows after the appropriate change of basis.

4.4 Results: Beta-Functions and `DsixTools` Ancillaries

The complete four-fermion ADM at NLO is presented in an ancillary file attached to the arXiv submission of this article, where the beta-functions \dot{L}_i are given. Furthermore, the `Mathematica` file containing the complete set of four-fermion beta functions (including LO and NLO contributions) in `DsixTools` format can be found at [github](#).

We have checked that our results agree with those available in the literature. For the comparison the three methods described above were employed, namely performing direct NLO basis changes, using flavor symmetrization to relate ADMs of disconnected RG-invariant sectors, as well as building the ADMs from the available tables of pole coefficients. All three methods produce identical results in all available cases. To the best of our knowledge all NLO corrections to the BNV sector, part of the $\Delta F = 1^{\bar{f}f}$ sector at order $O(\alpha_s\alpha)$, most NLO ADMs for the $\Delta F = 0$ sector, and all four-fermion sectors at order $O(\alpha^2)$ are new. As a further consistency check we have tested all ADMs under flavor-symmetry transformations as discussed in Ref. [35], consisting in the renaming of two inner flavors (e.g. $u \leftrightarrow d$) followed by the change of basis needed to recover the initial basis. Such transformations must leave the ADM unchanged –up to the same swapping of QED charges in the ADM–, as long as the swapped flavors are in the same representation of $SU(3)_c$. We have checked that all ADMs satisfy this condition.

5 Numerical Analysis

Having obtained the full set of four-fermion beta functions at NLO, it is interesting to showcase some examples of the numerical impact of these corrections. For that, we present in this section a numerical comparison between the two-loop RGE and its one-loop counterpart, as implemented in the previous version of `DsixTools` [44]. We limit ourselves to the presentation of a few illustrative examples for which we compute the running from the electroweak scale ($\mu = M_Z$) down to the bottom mass scale ($\mu = m_b$). The solution to




Figure 3: Running of $L_{eu}^{V,LR}(\mu)$ from the EW scale $\mu = M_Z$ down to the bottom mass scale $\mu = m_b$ with LL (blue) and NLL (red) resummation and the corresponding LO (blue-dashed) and NLO (red-dashed) fixed-order approximations. The Wilson coefficient is shown normalized to 1 at the matching scale $\mu = M_Z$, that is $L_{eu}^{V,LR}(\mu)/L_{eu}^{V,LR}(M_Z)$.

the RGEs depend on the initial conditions at the electroweak scale, namely, the matching conditions from the underlying full theory (e.g. the SMEFT). For our purposes we simply set the initial conditions to be arbitrary real numbers in the range $(-10^{-5}, 10^{-5})$ GeV^{-2} .

We begin by studying the running of a VLR block in the eu -type $\Delta F = 1$ sector, with flavors $(\bar{e}\mu)(\bar{c}u)$. This block consists of a single operator, with its beta function given by

$$\dot{L}_{1221}^{V,LR} = 8e^2 L_{1221}^{V,LR} - 32\alpha_s \alpha L_{1221}^{V,LR} - \frac{4960}{27} \alpha^2 L_{1221}^{V,LR}. \quad (5.1)$$

Thus the next-to-leading-log (NLL) running is a α_s correction to the leading log (LL) one, and no mixing is present. We set the following matching condition at the EW scale,

$$L_{1221}^{V,LR}(M_Z) = 5 \cdot 10^{-6} \text{ GeV}^{-2}, \quad (5.2)$$

and study the μ dependence of the ratio of the coefficient to the matching condition (which ultimately only depends on the matching condition itself at a higher order in the EFT expansion). The running with LL and NLL resummation, together with the corresponding LO and NLO fixed-order approximations without resummation, are shown in Figure 3.

A more interesting case to study is the running of an SRR block in the ud -type $\Delta F = 1$ sector. This case features operator mixing, which can lead to greater effects in the running. As an example, the two-loop beta function of the first coefficient in the block is given by

$$\dot{L}_{ijkl}^{S1,RR} = g_s^2 \left[\frac{64}{9} L_{ilkj}^{S1,RR} + \frac{112}{27} L_{ilkj}^{S8,RR} - 16 L_{ijkl}^{S1,RR} + \frac{16}{9} L_{ijkl}^{S8,RR} \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + e^2 \left[\frac{4}{27} L_{uddu}^{S1,RR} + \frac{16}{81} L_{uddu}^{S8,RR} - \frac{46}{9} L_{ud}^{S1,RR} \right] \\
& + \alpha_s^2 \left[\frac{9472}{81} L_{uddu}^{S1,RR} + \frac{16576}{243} L_{uddu}^{S8,RR} - \frac{2120}{9} L_{ud}^{S1,RR} + \frac{928}{81} L_{ud}^{S8,RR} \right] \\
& + \alpha_s \alpha \left[\frac{1888}{81} L_{uddu}^{S1,RR} + \frac{3808}{243} L_{uddu}^{S8,RR} + \frac{136}{27} L_{ud}^{S1,RR} + \frac{224}{81} L_{ud}^{S8,RR} \right] \\
& + \alpha^2 \left[\frac{98}{729} L_{uddu}^{S1,RR} + \frac{392}{2187} L_{uddu}^{S8,RR} + \frac{6391}{243} L_{ud}^{S1,RR} \right]. \tag{5.3}
\end{aligned}$$

Although the ADM of this sector already includes mixing at the LO, notable effects can still emerge depending on the initial conditions. We assume the following matching conditions at the EW scale:

$$\begin{aligned}
L_{ud}^{S1,RR}(M_Z) &= 5.8 \cdot 10^{-6} \text{ GeV}^{-2}, & L_{ud}^{S8,RR}(M_Z) &= 9.3 \cdot 10^{-6} \text{ GeV}^{-2}, \\
L_{uddu}^{S1,RR}(M_Z) &= -8.4 \cdot 10^{-7} \text{ GeV}^{-2}, & L_{uddu}^{S8,RR}(M_Z) &= 2.5 \cdot 10^{-6} \text{ GeV}^{-2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

Their running with LL and NLL resummation, together with the corresponding LO and NLO fixed-order approximations are depicted in Figure 4. Up to a scale of ~ 40 GeV all four results are compatible within $\lesssim 5\%$. Below that scale, however, the differences start accumulating quite remarkably. It is interesting to note that the effects become quite sizable in going from LL to NLL running.

Finally, we study the running of four operators within the large vector block in $\Delta F = 0$, which receives penguin contributions. The two-loop ADM is fully populated as opposed to the one-loop ADM, mixing a large set of operators among themselves. The running depends strongly on the particular matching conditions at hand, with high variability between sets of initial conditions. In our case we choose a set of randomized initial conditions for all Wilson coefficients in the interval $(-10^{-5}, 10^{-5}) \text{ GeV}^2$.

The resulting running, as depicted in Figure 5, shows a varied picture. For many of the Wilson coefficients the NLL corrections are small, as for example for `LuuVLL[1,1,1,1]` (in `DsixTools` notation). Some operators, however, show large differences in their LL and NLL running. For instance, the running of `LeuVLL[2,2,1,1]` and `LedVLR[1,1,3,3]` diverges notably, even though the NLL effects remain moderate ($< 10\%$) compared to LL. In the case of `LudV1LL[2,2,3,3]` the difference between the running at LL and NLL amounts to a factor ~ 2 .




Figure 4: Running from the EW scale $\mu = M_Z$ down to the bottom mass scale $\mu = m_b$ with LL (blue) and NLL (red) resummation, and the corresponding LO (blue-dashed) and NLO (red-dashed) fixed-order approximations. The Wilson coefficients are shown normalized to 1 at the matching scale $\mu = M_Z$.

6 Conclusions

In this article we derived the complete set of two-loop four-fermion ADMs in the LEFT in the NDR scheme. For the derivation we have adopted three different approaches which are based on results available in the literature. The first approach consists of transforming ADMs already known from the literature into the JMS basis via NLO basis changes, which allow to obtain parts of the $\Delta F = 2$, $\Delta F = 1$ and $\Delta F = 1^{\bar{f}f}$ sectors. The second method is based on exploiting flavor-symmetric properties of ADMs, which allows to derive the ADMs for the sectors $\Delta F = 2$, $\Delta F = 1.5$ and $\Delta F = 1^{\bar{f}f}$. These two approaches provide the ADMs in the JMS basis only to $O(\alpha_s^2)$. The third approach employs “tables of pole coefficients”, available from the literature, from which the ADMs can be directly derived. This method provides the complete NLO four-fermion ADM in the JMS basis, including $O(\alpha_s^2)$, $O(\alpha_s\alpha)$ and $O(\alpha^2)$ corrections. With this method we have also verified the results from the two previous approaches. Regarding penguin contributions, this method seems necessary in order to tackle the issue of traces involving γ_5 in the NDR scheme. But it also illustrates that arguments based on flavor universality together with the proper treatment of evanescent operators are useful when deriving ADMs and provide powerful checks. Finally, as another consistency check we have recomputed several parts of the ADM via direct




Figure 5: Running from the EW scale $\mu = M_Z$ down to the bottom mass scale $\mu = m_b$ with LL (blue) and NLL (red) resummation, and the corresponding LO (blue-dashed) and NLO (red-dashed) fixed-order approximations. The Wilson coefficients are shown normalized to 1 at the matching scale $\mu = M_Z$.

calculations, finding full agreement.

Many of our results are new. To the best of our knowledge the complete BNV sector, parts of the $\Delta F = 1^{\bar{f}f}$ sector at order $O(\alpha_s\alpha)$, most of the $\Delta F = 0$ sector, as well as all four-fermion sectors at order $O(\alpha^2)$ have never been presented before. We have also provided an exhaustive list of all four-fermion flavor sectors in the LEFT, where each sector is further divided into RG-invariant blocks.

The results for the complete two-loop ADM are provided in an ancillary file, together with an implementation in `DsixTools` format [43, 44]. We plan to provide an analogous implementation for `wilson` [45] in the near future.

Finally, we have performed a numerical study of the NLO RGE effects in comparison to the running at LO. The two-loop corrections can be sizable, both in the $\Delta F = 1^{\bar{f}f}$ and $\Delta F = 0$ sectors, where penguin diagrams mix a large number of operators at NLO.

Acknowledgments

The work of J.A. is supported by the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No. 101145975-EFT-NLO. P.M. acknowledges funding from the Spanish MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033:

grant PRE2022-103999 funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and by "ESF Investing in your future", grant CEX2019-000918-M through the "Unit of Excellence María de Maeztu 2020-2023" award to the Institute of Cosmos Sciences. M.P acknowledges funding by the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement 833280 (FLAY), and by the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNF) under contract 200020-204428. J.V. acknowledges funding from grant 2021-SGR-249 (Generalitat de Catalunya), and from the Spanish MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 through the following grants: grant CNS2022-135262 funded by the "European Union NextGenerationEU/PRTR", grant CEX2019-000918-M through the "Unit of Excellence María de Maeztu 2020-2023" award to the Institute of Cosmos Sciences, and grant PID2022-136224NB-C21.

A Evanescent Operator Basis

The set of evanescent operators used to complete the JMS operator basis in the NDR scheme corresponds to $a_{ev}, b_{ev}, c_{ev}, \dots = 1$ in [34], which is equivalent to the method of “greek projections” [23, 49]. This choice also matches the evanescent basis used in [14–16]. For simplicity, we refrain from displaying the full form of the evanescent basis, but instead present the general structures built out of generic fermion fields $\psi_{i,j,k,l}$. The evanescent structures read:

$$E_1^{V,LL} \sim (\bar{\psi}_i \gamma^\mu P_L \psi_l)(\bar{\psi}_k \gamma_\mu P_L \psi_j) - (\bar{\psi}_i \gamma^\mu P_L \psi_j)(\bar{\psi}_k \gamma_\mu P_L \psi_l), \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$E_2^{V,LL} \sim (\bar{\psi}_i \gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu \gamma^\rho P_L \psi_j)(\bar{\psi}_k \gamma_\mu \gamma_\nu \gamma_\rho P_L \psi_l) - (16 - 4\epsilon)(\bar{\psi}_i \gamma^\mu P_L \psi_j)(\bar{\psi}_k \gamma_\mu P_L \psi_l), \quad (\text{A.2})$$

$$E_3^{V,LL} \sim (\bar{\psi}_i \gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu \gamma^\rho \gamma^\sigma \gamma^\lambda P_L \psi_j)(\bar{\psi}_k \gamma_\mu \gamma_\nu \gamma_\rho \gamma_\sigma \gamma_\lambda P_L \psi_l) \\ - (256 - 224\epsilon)(\bar{\psi}_i \gamma^\mu P_L \psi_j)(\bar{\psi}_k \gamma_\mu P_L \psi_l), \quad (\text{A.3})$$

$$E_1^{V,LR} \sim 2(\bar{\psi}_i P_R \psi_l)(\bar{\psi}_k P_L \psi_j) + (\bar{\psi}_i \gamma^\mu P_L \psi_j)(\bar{\psi}_k \gamma_\mu P_R \psi_l), \quad (\text{A.4})$$

$$E_2^{V,LR} \sim (\bar{\psi}_i \gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu \gamma^\rho P_L \psi_j)(\bar{\psi}_k \gamma_\mu \gamma_\nu \gamma_\rho P_R \psi_l) - (4 + 4\epsilon)(\bar{\psi}_i \gamma^\mu P_L \psi_j)(\bar{\psi}_k \gamma_\mu P_R \psi_l), \quad (\text{A.5})$$

$$E_3^{V,LR} \sim (\bar{\psi}_i \gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu \gamma^\rho \gamma^\sigma \gamma^\lambda P_L \psi_j)(\bar{\psi}_k \gamma_\mu \gamma_\nu \gamma_\rho \gamma_\sigma \gamma_\lambda P_R \psi_l) \\ - (16 + 128\epsilon)(\bar{\psi}_i \gamma^\mu P_L \psi_j)(\bar{\psi}_k \gamma_\mu P_R \psi_l), \quad (\text{A.6})$$

$$E_1^{S,RL} \sim (\bar{\psi}_i \sigma^{\mu\nu} P_R \psi_j)(\bar{\psi}_k \sigma_{\mu\nu} P_L \psi_l) + 6\epsilon(\bar{\psi}_i P_R \psi_j)(\bar{\psi}_k P_L \psi_l), \quad (\text{A.7})$$

$$E_2^{S,RL} \sim (\bar{\psi}_i \gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu \gamma^\rho \gamma^\sigma P_R \psi_j)(\bar{\psi}_k \gamma_\mu \gamma_\nu \gamma_\rho \gamma_\sigma P_L \psi_l) - (16 + 128\epsilon)(\bar{\psi}_i P_R \psi_j)(\bar{\psi}_k P_L \psi_l), \quad (\text{A.8})$$

$$E_3^{S,RL} \sim (\bar{\psi}_i \gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu \gamma^\rho \gamma^\sigma \gamma^\lambda \gamma^\eta P_R \psi_j)(\bar{\psi}_k \gamma_\mu \gamma_\nu \gamma_\rho \gamma_\sigma \gamma_\lambda \gamma_\eta P_L \psi_l) \\ - (64 + 2880\epsilon)(\bar{\psi}_i P_R \psi_j)(\bar{\psi}_k P_L \psi_l), \quad (\text{A.9})$$

$$E_1^{S,RR} \sim (\bar{\psi}_i \sigma^{\mu\nu} P_R \psi_j)(\bar{\psi}_k \sigma_{\mu\nu} P_R \psi_l) + 4(\bar{\psi}_i P_R \psi_j)(\bar{\psi}_k P_R \psi_l) + 8(\bar{\psi}_i P_R \psi_l)(\bar{\psi}_k P_R \psi_j), \quad (\text{A.10})$$

$$E_2^{S,RR} \sim (\bar{\psi}_i \gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu \gamma^\rho \gamma^\sigma P_R \psi_j)(\bar{\psi}_k \gamma_\mu \gamma_\nu \gamma_\rho \gamma_\sigma P_R \psi_l) - (64 - 96\epsilon)(\bar{\psi}_i P_R \psi_j)(\bar{\psi}_k P_R \psi_l) \\ + (16 - 8\epsilon)(\bar{\psi}_i \sigma^{\mu\nu} P_R \psi_j)(\bar{\psi}_k \sigma_{\mu\nu} P_R \psi_l), \quad (\text{A.11})$$

$$E_3^{S,RR} \sim (\bar{\psi}_i \gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu \gamma^\rho \gamma^\sigma \gamma^\lambda \gamma^\eta P_R \psi_j)(\bar{\psi}_k \gamma_\mu \gamma_\nu \gamma_\rho \gamma_\sigma \gamma_\lambda \gamma_\eta P_R \psi_l) \\ - (1024 - 2944\epsilon)(\bar{\psi}_i P_R \psi_j)(\bar{\psi}_k P_R \psi_l) \\ + (256 - 352\epsilon)(\bar{\psi}_i \sigma^{\mu\nu} P_R \psi_j)(\bar{\psi}_k \sigma_{\mu\nu} P_R \psi_l). \quad (\text{A.12})$$

The chirally-flipped sectors are obtained via $P_L \leftrightarrow P_R$. The symbol \sim is just an equal sign except in the case of four-quark operators, where each structure leads to two evanescent operators, for example:

$$E_1^{V,LL} \longrightarrow \begin{cases} E_{ijkl}^{V1,LL} = (\bar{d}_i^\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L u_l^\beta)(\bar{u}_k^\beta \gamma_\mu P_L d_j^\alpha) - (\bar{d}_i^\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L d_j^\alpha)(\bar{u}_k^\beta \gamma_\mu P_L u_l^\beta) \\ E_{ijkl}^{V2,LL} = (\bar{d}_i^\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L u_l^\alpha)(\bar{u}_k^\beta \gamma_\mu P_L d_j^\beta) - (\bar{d}_i^\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L d_j^\beta)(\bar{u}_k^\beta \gamma_\mu P_L u_l^\alpha) \end{cases}.$$

An evanescent basis defined in this manner together with analogous structures for each flavor ensures that the basis is “flavor-universal”, as argued in Section 4.3.2. Let us also note that any linear combination of the evanescent basis ($E'_i = M_{ij} E_j$) involving no physical operators, leaves the physical anomalous dimensions unchanged. Therefore, any choice of evanescent operators based on the above defined evanescent structures defines a completely equivalent renormalization scheme.

B Tables of Pole Coefficients

We collect all tables of pole coefficients present in the literature [11, 14, 16, 23], involved in the calculation of the two-loop four-fermion ADMs (in the NDR scheme), in Tables 3, 4, and 5. We have also recomputed some of them from scratch, as a cross-check. Just as in the literature, we refrain from including the color/charge factors. These poles depend only on the Dirac structure, regardless of the individual flavor indices (up to the selection rules for penguin diagrams), and thus they are written in terms of the bases in Eq. (4.18) for current-current and Eqs. (4.28)-(4.29) for penguin diagrams. In this respect, the tables are presented here in a slightly different manner than in the literature. The chirally-flipped coefficients (VRR, VRL, SRL, SRR) are identical, and thus omitted in the tables.

Diagrams are grouped and labeled according to the numbering in Ref. [14]. The multiplicity in each class is also included in the tables. Current-current diagrams are displayed in Tables 3 and 4, and penguin diagrams are shown in Table 5. In case of classes 29, 30 and 31 of the current-current diagrams, we use the compact notation for the coefficient functions:

$$\begin{aligned} F_1(N_c, n_q) &= \frac{5}{2}N_c - n_q; & F_2(N_c, n_q) &= \frac{2}{3}n_q - \frac{11}{3}N_c; & F_3(N_c, n_q) &= \frac{26}{3}N_c - \frac{8}{3}n_q; \\ F_4(N_c, n_q) &= \frac{4}{9}n_q - \frac{16}{9}N_c; & F_5(N_c, n_q) &= \frac{17}{72}N_c - \frac{1}{36}n_q; \\ F_6(N_c, n_q) &= \frac{134}{3}N_c - \frac{44}{3}n_q; & F_7(N_c, n_q) &= \frac{62}{9}N_c - \frac{20}{9}n_q; \end{aligned} \tag{B.1}$$

which are relevant for the $O(\alpha_s^2)$ results. The respective functions for the $O(\alpha^2)$ coefficients can be obtained by substituting $N_c \rightarrow 0$ and $n_q \rightarrow 2(Q_d^2 N_c n_d + Q_u^2 N_c n_u + Q_e^2 n_e)$.

Current-Current		VLL \rightarrow VLL		VLR \rightarrow VLR		SLR \rightarrow SLR	
Diagram	Mult.	$1/\epsilon^2$	$1/\epsilon$	$1/\epsilon^2$	$1/\epsilon$	$1/\epsilon^2$	$1/\epsilon$
4	2	-1	5/2	-1	5/2	-16	16
5	2	-16	16	-1	5/2	-1	5/2
6	2	-1	5/2	-16	16	-1	5/2
7	2	0	-4	0	-4	0	-4
8	2	0	-4	0	-4	0	-4
9	2	0	-4	0	-4	0	-4
10	4	-2	3	-2	3	-8	-8
11	4	8	14	2	3	2	3
12	4	-2	3	-8	-8	-2	3
13	4	2	-3	2	-3	8	-4
14	4	-8	-2	-2	-3	-2	-3
15	4	2	-3	8	-4	2	-3
16	4	8	-14	2	-9	8	-16
17	4	8	14	2	3	8	16
18	4	-2	3	-8	8	-8	-8
19	4	-2	3	-8	-8	-8	8
20	4	8	14	8	16	2	3
21	4	8	-14	8	-16	2	-9
22	1	-1	0	-1	0	-16	0
23	1	-16	0	-1	0	-1	0
24	1	-1	0	-16	0	-1	0
25	4	6	-11	6	-11	24	-20
26	4	-24	2	-6	-7	-6	-7
27	4	6	-11	24	-20	6	-11
28	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
29	2	0	F_1	0	F_1	$-2F_1$	F_3
30	2	$2F_1$	F_2	0	F_1	0	F_1
31	2	0	F_1	$-2F_1$	F_3	0	F_1

Table 3: Table of pole coefficients of the two-loop current-current diagrams with insertion of VLL, VLR and SLR operators. The multiplicity of each diagram is already taken into account in the coefficients: each coefficient combines already all diagrams in the same class.

Diagram	Current-Current Mult.	SRR \rightarrow SRR		SRR \rightarrow TRR		TRR \rightarrow SRR		TRR \rightarrow TRR	
		$1/\epsilon^2$	$1/\epsilon$	$1/\epsilon^2$	$1/\epsilon$	$1/\epsilon^2$	$1/\epsilon$	$1/\epsilon^2$	$1/\epsilon$
4	2	-16	16	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	2	-4	9	1	-5/4	48	-76	-12	7
6	2	-4	9	-1	7/4	-48	52	-12	7
7	2	0	-4	0	0	0	0	0	4
8	2	0	2	0	1/2	0	24	0	-2
9	2	0	2	0	-1/2	0	-24	0	-2
10	4	-8	-8	0	0	0	0	0	4
11	4	2	0	-1/2	-5/4	-24	-20	6	8
12	4	-2	0	-1/2	-5/4	-24	-20	-6	-4
13	4	8	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	4	-2	0	1/2	1/4	24	-28	-6	0
15	4	2	0	1/2	1/4	24	-28	6	-4
16	4	8	-4	0	0	-96	-64	0	0
17	4	8	4	-2	-2	0	0	0	0
18	4	-8	4	0	0	-96	-64	0	0
19	4	-8	-4	-2	-2	0	0	0	0
20	4	-4	10	1	-1	-48	64	12	2
21	4	-4	10	-1	2	48	-112	12	-22
22	1	-16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
23	1	-4	5	1	-1/4	48	-28	-12	-5
24	1	-4	5	-1	3/4	-48	4	-12	-5
25	4	24	-20	0	0	0	0	0	0
26	4	-6	2	3/2	1/4	72	-108	-18	6
27	4	6	-2	3/2	1/4	72	-108	18	-18
28	4	0	0	0	-3	0	144	0	0
29	4	$-2F_1$	F_3	0	0	0	0	$2F_1/3$	F_4
30	4	0	0	$-F_1/12$	F_5	$-8F_1$	F_6	$4F_1/3$	$2F_4$
31	4	0	0	$-F_1/12$	F_5	$-8F_1$	F_6	$-4F_1/3$	F_7

Table 4: Table of pole coefficients of the two-loop current-current diagrams with insertion of SRR and TRR operators. The multiplicity of each diagram is already taken into account in the coefficients: each coefficient combines already all diagrams in the same class.

Penguin		VLL \rightarrow VLL		VLL \rightarrow VLR		SLR \rightarrow VLL		SLR \rightarrow VLR	
Diagram	Mult.	$1/\epsilon^2$	$1/\epsilon$	$1/\epsilon^2$	$1/\epsilon$	$1/\epsilon^2$	$1/\epsilon$	$1/\epsilon^2$	$1/\epsilon$
1	1	2/3	0	2/3	0	2/3	0	2/3	0
2	1	2/3	-19/9	2/3	-19/9	2/3	-13/9	2/3	-13/9
3	2	0	-17/9	0	-17/9	2	10/9	2	10/9
4	2	-2	38/9	-2	38/9	0	23/9	0	23/9
5	2	-2/3	10/9	-2/3	10/9	-2/3	4/9	-2/3	4/9
6	1	-4/3	-29/9	-4/3	-29/9	-4/3	-11/9	-4/3	-11/9
7	2	11/9	35/54	11/9	35/54	11/9	-31/54	11/9	-31/54
8	2	-4/9	22/27	-4/9	22/27	-4/9	34/27	-4/9	34/27
9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	1	1	-5/6	1	13/6	1	7/6	1	-11/6
12	1	-1	-13/6	-1	5/6	-1	11/6	-1	-7/6
13	2	-2	-4/3	0	-1	-2	2/3	0	-1
14	2	0	-1	2	-2/3	0	-1	2	-8/3

Table 5: Table of pole coefficients of the two-loop penguin diagrams (open-penguin type) with insertion of VLL, and SLR operators. The multiplicity of each diagram is already taken into account in the coefficients: each coefficient combines already all diagrams in the same class.

C Penguin ADM Seeds

In this appendix we provide the set of two-loop penguin ADM seeds required for the derivation of the complete four-fermion ADM at NLO in the JMS basis. They are given as matrices in the format of Eq. (4.30) and (4.32). Let us first generalize their definition in order to include both the lepton and down-quark bases in Eqs. (4.28)-(4.29). The generalized $(n+m)$ -loop ADMs for these bases read:

$$\hat{\gamma}_p^{(n,m)} \Big|_{\text{Lepton Basis}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0_{4 \times 4} & \hat{O}_{P_e}^{(n,m)} & \hat{O}_{P_u}^{(n,m)} & \hat{O}_{P_d}^{(n,m)} \\ 0_{6 \times 4} & \hat{X}_e^{(n,m)} & \hat{X}_u^{(n,m)} & \hat{X}_d^{(n,m)} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{C.1})$$

$$\hat{\gamma}_p^{(n,m)} \Big|_{\text{Down-Quark Basis}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0_{6 \times 6} & \hat{Q}_{P_e}^{(n,m)} & \hat{Q}_{P_u}^{(n,m)} & \hat{Q}_{P_d}^{(n,m)} \\ 0_{10 \times 6} & \hat{Y}_e^{(n,m)} & \hat{Y}_u^{(n,m)} & \hat{Y}_d^{(n,m)} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{C.2})$$

while the corresponding results for the alternative bases in Eqs. (4.31) and (4.33) read:

$$\hat{\gamma}_p^{(n,m)} \Big|_{\text{Alt. Lep. Basis}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0_{4 \times 4} & \hat{C}_{P_e}^{(n,m)} & \hat{C}_{P_u}^{(n,m)} & \hat{C}_{P_d}^{(n,m)} \\ 0_{6 \times 4} & \hat{X}_e^{(n,m)} & \hat{X}_u^{(n,m)} & \hat{X}_d^{(n,m)} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{C.3})$$

$$\hat{\gamma}_p^{(n,m)} \Big|_{\text{Alt. Down-Quark Basis}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0_{6 \times 6} & \hat{K}_{P_e}^{(n,m)} & \hat{K}_{P_u}^{(n,m)} & \hat{K}_{P_d}^{(n,m)} \\ 0_{10 \times 6} & \hat{Y}_e^{(n,m)} & \hat{Y}_u^{(n,m)} & \hat{Y}_d^{(n,m)} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{C.4})$$

Note that the structure of all penguin contributions mixing only into $\mathcal{O}_{5-10}^{(\ell)}$ or $\mathcal{O}_{7-16}^{(d)}$ is maintained. Due to the structure of the penguin operators the corresponding seeds depend the fermion charges Q_f that characterize the $\Delta F = 1$ transition, $d_{i,j}$ or $\ell_{i,j}$ in Eqs. (4.28)-(4.29), i.e. the ‘‘outer flavors’’, as well as on the charges of the ‘‘inner’’ flavors. Neutrinos are included in the leptonic case, but their charge should be put to zero ($Q_\ell \rightarrow Q_\nu = 0$).

The matrices $\hat{X}_{e,u,d}^{(n,m)}$ and $\hat{Y}_{e,u,d}^{(n,m)}$ are not relevant for our purposes, since they do not affect the change of basis. For completeness, we report them in the following as a function of the penguin seeds

$$\hat{X}_\psi^{(n,m)} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{M}_C \left(n_e \hat{C}_{P_\psi}^{(n,m)} + 2 \hat{O}_{P_\psi}^{(n,m)} \right) \Big|_{Q_f \rightarrow Q_e} \\ n_u \hat{N}_C \hat{C}_{P_\psi}^{(n,m)} \Big|_{Q_f \rightarrow Q_u} \\ n_d \hat{N}_C \hat{C}_{P_\psi}^{(n,m)} \Big|_{Q_f \rightarrow Q_d} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{C.5})$$

$$\hat{Y}_\psi^{(n,m)} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{M}_K \hat{K}_{P_\psi}^{(n,m)} \Big|_{Q_f \rightarrow Q_e} \\ \hat{N}_K \left(n_u \hat{K}_{P_\psi}^{(n,m)} + 2 \delta_{qu} \hat{N}_K \hat{Q}_{P_\psi}^{(n,m)} \right) \Big|_{Q_f \rightarrow Q_u} \\ \hat{N}_K \left(n_d \hat{K}_{P_\psi}^{(n,m)} + 2 \delta_{qd} \hat{N}_K \hat{Q}_{P_\psi}^{(n,m)} \right) \Big|_{Q_f \rightarrow Q_d} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{C.6})$$

where $\psi = e, u, d$ and where the matrices \hat{M}_i and \hat{N}_i are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{M}_C &= \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mathbb{1}}_{2 \times 2} & 0_{2 \times 2} \end{pmatrix}, & \hat{M}_K &= \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mathbb{1}}_{2 \times 2} & 0_{2 \times 4} \end{pmatrix}, \\ \hat{N}_C &= \begin{pmatrix} 0_{2 \times 2} & \hat{\mathbb{1}}_{2 \times 2} \end{pmatrix}, & \hat{N}_K &= \begin{pmatrix} 0_{4 \times 2} & \hat{\mathbb{1}}_{4 \times 4} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.7})$$

The explicit lepton-basis and quark-basis penguin seeds, \hat{O}_{P_f} , \hat{Q}_{P_f} , \hat{C}_{P_f} and \hat{K}_{P_f} , are given in the supplementary material.

References

- [1] E. Fermi, “Tentativo di una teoria dell’emissione dei raggi beta,” *Ric. Sci.* **4**, 491-495 (1933)
- [2] G. Buchalla, A. J. Buras and M. E. Lautenbacher, “Weak decays beyond leading logarithms,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **68**, 1125-1144 (1996) [arXiv:hep-ph/9512380 [hep-ph]].
- [3] J. Aebischer, M. Fael, C. Greub and J. Virto, “B physics Beyond the Standard Model at One Loop: Complete Renormalization Group Evolution below the Electroweak Scale,” *JHEP* **09**, 158 (2017) [arXiv:1704.06639 [hep-ph]].
- [4] E. E. Jenkins, A. V. Manohar and P. Stoffer, “Low-Energy Effective Field Theory below the Electroweak Scale: Operators and Matching,” *JHEP* **03**, 016 (2018) [erratum: *JHEP* **12**, 043 (2023)] [arXiv:1709.04486 [hep-ph]].
- [5] B. Grinstein, R. P. Springer and M. B. Wise, “Effective Hamiltonian for Weak Radiative B Meson Decay,” *Phys. Lett. B* **202**, 138-144 (1988)
- [6] R. Grigjanis, P. J. O’Donnell, M. Sutherland and H. Navelet, “QCD corrected effective Lagrangian for $b \rightarrow s$ processes,” *Phys. Lett. B* **213**, 355 (1988) [erratum: *Phys. Lett. B* **286**, 413 (1992)]
- [7] R. Grigjanis, P. J. O’Donnell, M. Sutherland and H. Navelet, “QCD radiative corrections to $B \rightarrow X_s e^+ e^-$ processes,” *Phys. Lett. B* **223**, 239-244 (1989)
- [8] B. Grinstein, R. P. Springer and M. B. Wise, “Strong Interaction Effects in Weak Radiative B Meson Decay,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **339**, 269-309 (1990)
- [9] G. Cella, G. Curci, G. Ricciardi and A. Vicere, “QCD corrections to the weak radiative B meson decay,” *Phys. Lett. B* **248**, 181-187 (1990)
- [10] G. Cella, G. Ricciardi and A. Vicere, “QCD corrections to the $\bar{B} \rightarrow X_s e^+ e^-$ decay,” *Phys. Lett. B* **258**, 212-218 (1991)
- [11] A. J. Buras and P. H. Weisz, “QCD Nonleading Corrections to Weak Decays in Dimensional Regularization and ’t Hooft-Veltman Schemes,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **333**, 66-99 (1990)
- [12] M. J. Dugan and B. Grinstein, “On the vanishing of evanescent operators,” *Phys. Lett. B* **256**, 239-244 (1991)
- [13] A. J. Buras, M. Jamin, M. E. Lautenbacher and P. H. Weisz, “Effective Hamiltonians for $\Delta S = 1$ and $\Delta B = 1$ nonleptonic decays beyond the leading logarithmic approximation,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **370**, 69-104 (1992)
- [14] A. J. Buras, M. Jamin, M. E. Lautenbacher and P. H. Weisz, “Two loop anomalous dimension matrix for $\Delta S = 1$ weak nonleptonic decays I: $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^2)$,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **400**, 37-74 (1993) [arXiv:hep-ph/9211304 [hep-ph]].
- [15] A. J. Buras, M. Jamin and M. E. Lautenbacher, “Two loop anomalous dimension matrix for $\Delta S = 1$ weak nonleptonic decays II: $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s)$,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **400**, 75-102 (1993) [arXiv:hep-ph/9211321 [hep-ph]].

- [16] M. Ciuchini, E. Franco, G. Martinelli and L. Reina, “The $\Delta S = 1$ effective Hamiltonian including next-to-leading order QCD and QED corrections,” Nucl. Phys. B **415**, 403-462 (1994) [arXiv:hep-ph/9304257 [hep-ph]].
- [17] M. Ciuchini, E. Franco, G. Martinelli, L. Reina and L. Silvestrini, “Scheme independence of the effective Hamiltonian for $b \rightarrow s\gamma$ and $b \rightarrow sg$ decays,” Phys. Lett. B **316**, 127-136 (1993) [arXiv:hep-ph/9307364 [hep-ph]].
- [18] M. Misiak and M. Munz, “Two loop mixing of dimension five flavor changing operators,” Phys. Lett. B **344**, 308-318 (1995) [arXiv:hep-ph/9409454 [hep-ph]].
- [19] S. Herrlich and U. Nierste, “Evanescence operators, scheme dependences and double insertions,” Nucl. Phys. B **455**, 39-58 (1995) [arXiv:hep-ph/9412375 [hep-ph]].
- [20] K. G. Chetyrkin, M. Misiak and M. Munz, “Weak radiative B meson decay beyond leading logarithms,” Phys. Lett. B **400**, 206-219 (1997) [erratum: Phys. Lett. B **425**, 414 (1998)] [arXiv:hep-ph/9612313 [hep-ph]].
- [21] K. G. Chetyrkin, M. Misiak and M. Munz, “ $|\Delta F| = 1$ nonleptonic effective Hamiltonian in a simpler scheme,” Nucl. Phys. B **520**, 279-297 (1998) [arXiv:hep-ph/9711280 [hep-ph]].
- [22] C. Bobeth, M. Misiak and J. Urban, “Photonic penguins at two loops and m_t dependence of $BR[B \rightarrow X_s l^+ l^-]$,” Nucl. Phys. B **574**, 291-330 (2000) [arXiv:hep-ph/9910220 [hep-ph]].
- [23] 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**, 397-426 (2000) [arXiv:hep-ph/0005183 [hep-ph]].
- [24] P. Gambino, M. Gorbahn and U. Haisch, “Anomalous dimension matrix for radiative and rare semileptonic B decays up to three loops,” Nucl. Phys. B **673**, 238-262 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0306079 [hep-ph]].
- [25] C. Bobeth, P. Gambino, M. Gorbahn and U. Haisch, “Complete NNLO QCD Analysis of $\bar{B} \rightarrow X_s \ell^+ \ell^-$ and Higher Order Electroweak Effects,” JHEP **04**, 071 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0312090 [hep-ph]].
- [26] M. Gorbahn and U. Haisch, “Effective Hamiltonian for non-leptonic $|\Delta F| = 1$ decays at NNLO in QCD,” Nucl. Phys. B **713**, 291-332 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ph/0411071 [hep-ph]].
- [27] T. Huber, E. Lunghi, M. Misiak and D. Wyler, “Electromagnetic logarithms in $\bar{B} \rightarrow X_s l^+ l^-$,” Nucl. Phys. B **740**, 105-137 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ph/0512066 [hep-ph]].
- [28] C. Bobeth, M. Gorbahn and E. Stamou, “Electroweak Corrections to $B_{s,d} \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^-$,” Phys. Rev. D **89**, no.3, 034023 (2014) [arXiv:1311.1348 [hep-ph]].
- [29] J. Aebischer, M. Fael, A. Lenz, M. Spannowsky, J. Virto, I. Brivio, J. C. Criado, A. Dedes, J. Kumar and M. Misiak, *et al.* “Computing Tools for the SMEFT,” [arXiv:1910.11003 [hep-ph]].
- [30] J. Aebischer, M. Fael, J. Fuentes-Martín, A. E. Thomsen, J. Virto, L. Allwicher, S. Das Bakshi, H. Bélusca-Maïto, J. de Blas and M. Chala, *et al.* “Computing tools for effective field

theories: SMEFT-Tools 2022 Workshop Report, 14–16th September 2022, Zürich,” Eur. Phys. J. C **84**, no.2, 170 (2024) [arXiv:2307.08745 [hep-ph]].

- [31] C. W. Murphy, “Low-Energy Effective Field Theory below the Electroweak Scale: Dimension-8 Operators,” JHEP **04**, 101 (2021) [arXiv:2012.13291 [hep-ph]].
- [32] S. Hamoudou, J. Kumar and D. London, “Dimension-8 SMEFT matching conditions for the low-energy effective field theory,” JHEP **03**, 157 (2023) [arXiv:2207.08856 [hep-ph]].
- [33] E. E. Jenkins, A. V. Manohar and P. Stoffer, “Low-Energy Effective Field Theory below the Electroweak Scale: Anomalous Dimensions,” JHEP **01**, 084 (2018) [erratum: JHEP **12**, 042 (2023)] [arXiv:1711.05270 [hep-ph]].
- [34] W. Dekens and P. Stoffer, “Low-energy effective field theory below the electroweak scale: matching at one loop,” JHEP **10**, 197 (2019) [erratum: JHEP **11**, 148 (2022)] [arXiv:1908.05295 [hep-ph]].
- [35] P. Morell and J. Virto, “On the two-loop penguin contributions to the Anomalous Dimensions of four-quark operators,” JHEP **04**, 105 (2024) [arXiv:2402.00249 [hep-ph]].
- [36] L. Naterop and P. Stoffer, “Low-energy effective field theory below the electroweak scale: one-loop renormalization in the ’t Hooft-Veltman scheme,” JHEP **02**, 068 (2024) [arXiv:2310.13051 [hep-ph]].
- [37] L. Naterop and P. Stoffer, “Renormalization-group equations of the LEFT at two loops: dimension-five effects,” [arXiv:2412.13251 [hep-ph]].
- [38] J. Aebischer and M. Pesut, “One-loop Fierz transformations,” JHEP **10**, 090 (2022) [arXiv:2208.10513 [hep-ph]].
- [39] J. Aebischer, M. Pesut and Z. Polonsky, “Dipole operators in Fierz identities,” Phys. Lett. B **842**, 137968 (2023) [arXiv:2211.01379 [hep-ph]].
- [40] J. Aebischer, M. Pesut and Z. Polonsky, “Renormalization scheme factorization of one-loop Fierz identities,” JHEP **01**, 060 (2024) [arXiv:2306.16449 [hep-ph]].
- [41] J. Aebischer, M. Pesut and Z. Polonsky, “A simple dirac prescription for two-loop anomalous dimension matrices,” Eur. Phys. J. C **84**, no.7, 750 (2024) [arXiv:2401.16904 [hep-ph]].
- [42] J. Aebischer, I. Brivio, A. Celis, J. A. Evans, Y. Jiang, J. Kumar, X. Pan, W. Porod, J. Rosiek and D. Shih, *et al.* “WCxf: an exchange format for Wilson coefficients beyond the Standard Model,” Comput. Phys. Commun. **232**, 71-83 (2018) [arXiv:1712.05298 [hep-ph]].
- [43] A. Celis, J. Fuentes-Martin, A. Vicente and J. Virto, “DsixTools: The Standard Model Effective Field Theory Toolkit,” Eur. Phys. J. C **77**, no.6, 405 (2017) [arXiv:1704.04504 [hep-ph]].
- [44] J. Fuentes-Martin, P. Ruiz-Femenia, A. Vicente and J. Virto, “DsixTools 2.0: The Effective Field Theory Toolkit,” Eur. Phys. J. C **81**, no.2, 167 (2021) [arXiv:2010.16341 [hep-ph]].
- [45] J. Aebischer, J. Kumar and D. M. Straub, “Wilson: a Python package for the running and matching of Wilson coefficients above and below the electroweak scale,” Eur. Phys. J. C **78**, no.12, 1026 (2018) [arXiv:1804.05033 [hep-ph]].

- [46] J. Aebischer, T. Kapoor and J. Kumar, “wilson: A package for renormalization group running in the SMEFT with Sterile Neutrinos,” [arXiv:2411.07220 [hep-ph]].
- [47] S. Di Noi and L. Silvestrini, “RGESolver: a C++ library to perform renormalization group evolution in the Standard Model Effective Theory,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83**, no.3, 200 (2023) [arXiv:2210.06838 [hep-ph]].
- [48] J. Aebischer, J. Kumar, P. Stangl and D. M. Straub, “A Global Likelihood for Precision Constraints and Flavour Anomalies,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79**, no.6, 509 (2019) [arXiv:1810.07698 [hep-ph]].
- [49] N. Tracas and N. Vlachos, “Two Loop Calculations in QCD and the $\Delta I = 1/2$ Rule in Nonleptonic Weak Decays,” *Phys. Lett. B* **115**, 419 (1982)
- [50] J. Aebischer, C. Bobeth, A. J. Buras, J. Kumar and M. Misiak, “General non-leptonic $\Delta F = 1$ WET at the NLO in QCD,” *JHEP* **11**, 227 (2021) [arXiv:2107.10262 [hep-ph]].
- [51] J. Aebischer, A. J. Buras and J. Kumar, “Simple rules for evanescent operators in one-loop basis transformations,” *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, no.7, 075007 (2023) [arXiv:2202.01225 [hep-ph]].