

Model dependence in SMEFT

Alakabha Datta ^{a,1}, Jean-François Fortin ^{b,2}, Jacky Kumar ^{c,3},
David London ^{d,4}, Danny Marfatia ^{e,5} and Nicolas Sanfaçon ^{d,6}

- a: Department of Physics and Astronomy,
108 Lewis Hall, University of Mississippi, Oxford, MS 38677, USA*
- b: Département de Physique, de Génie Physique et d'Optique,
Université Laval, Québec, QC, Canada G1V 0A6*
- c: Theoretical Division, Los Alamos National Laboratory,
Los Alamos, NM 87545, USA*
- d: Physique des Particules, Université de Montréal,
1375, ave Thérèse-Lavoie-Roux, Montréal, QC, Canada H2V 0B3*
- e: Department of Physics and Astronomy,
University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, HI 96822, USA*

(February 10, 2025)

Abstract

We point out that, although SMEFT is constructed to be model-independent, this holds only if complete sets of operators are used. SMEFT analyses that focus on subsets of operators are only semi-model-independent. They probe classes of ultraviolet models, opening a window to the underlying new physics. This model dependence originates from the need to choose a weak basis, usually taken to be the down or up basis. This naturally leads to the introduction of a third SMEFT weak basis, the generic basis, which interpolates between the above two bases. Due to its generality, we argue that the generic weak basis is the most natural for new physics. In the down and up weak bases, only a specific product of the two transformation matrices from the weak to the mass basis is observable – the CKM matrix. However, in the generic weak basis, both transformation matrices are measurable in principle, possibly up to some phases.

¹datta@phy.olemiss.edu

²Jean-Francois.Fortin@phy.ulaval.ca

³jacky.kumar@lanl.gov

⁴london@lps.umontreal.ca

⁵dmarf8@hawaii.edu

⁶nicolas.sanfacon@umontreal.ca

Introduction — Although the standard model (SM) of particle physics has been enormously successful in describing the physics up to energy scales of $O(\text{TeV})$, it is not complete: it cannot explain a number of observations (e.g., neutrino masses, dark matter, the baryon asymmetry of the universe, etc.). We therefore conclude that there must be physics beyond the SM.

The LHC has searched for new particles for many years, but none have been observed. This implies that this new physics (NP), whatever it is, must be heavy (or extremely weakly coupled). One approach to analyzing such NP is to build models. Another approach uses model-independent effective field theories (EFTs). When the NP is integrated out, one obtains the Standard Model EFT, SMEFT [1–3]. This EFT obeys the SM gauge symmetry, $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ and contains only SM particles. The leading-order (dimension-4) terms in SMEFT are those of the SM; higher-order terms are suppressed by powers of the NP scale Λ .

As SMEFT is valid above the weak scale, its operators are defined in the weak basis. That is, they are written as functions of the fermions q_i^0 (LH quark doublets), ℓ_i^0 (LH lepton doublets), u_i^0 , d_i^0 and e_i^0 (all three RH singlets), $i = 1, 2, 3$. (Here, LH and RH denote left- and right-handed, and the superscript 0 indicates the weak basis.)

The $[U(3)]^5$ “symmetry” — It is often said that SMEFT possesses a $[U(3)]^5$ “symmetry,” where one $U(3)$ describes transformations of the three generations of q_i^0 among themselves, and the other $U(3)$ s act similarly on ℓ_i^0 , u_i^0 , d_i^0 and e_i^0 [4]. However, this is not precise – the SMEFT Hamiltonian is not *invariant* under these transformations. Rather, each operator is transformed into a number of other operators, producing a new Hamiltonian with the same operators as the original one, but in which the new coefficients are linear combinations of the old coefficients. The new Hamiltonian is therefore *equivalent* to the first Hamiltonian.

To see this explicitly, consider the semileptonic SMEFT operator,

$$\mathcal{O}_{\ell q}^{(1)} = C_{\ell q}^{(1)}|_{prst} (\bar{\ell}_p^0 \gamma_\mu \ell_r^0) (\bar{q}_s^0 \gamma^\mu q_t^0) . \quad (1)$$

To simplify things, we focus only on transformations of the quark fields. For a given (p, r) , the Hamiltonian is

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{s,t} C_{\ell q}^{(1)}|_{prst} (\bar{\ell}_p^0 \gamma_\mu \ell_r^0) (\bar{q}_s^0 \gamma^\mu q_t^0) . \quad (2)$$

This corresponds to nine operators ($s, t = 1, 2, 3$). We now perform a $U(3)$ transformation on the LH quark fields:

$$q'^0 = S_L^\dagger q^0 . \quad (3)$$

The Hamiltonian becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H} &= \sum_{s,t} C_{\ell q}^{(1)}|_{prst} (\bar{\ell}_p^0 \gamma_\mu \ell_r^0) (\bar{q}_i'^0 (S_L^\dagger)_{is} \gamma^\mu (S_L)_{tj} q_j'^0) \\ &= \sum_{i,j} \tilde{C}_{\ell q}^{(1)}|_{pri j} (\bar{\ell}_p^0 \gamma_\mu \ell_r^0) (\bar{q}_i'^0 \gamma^\mu q_j'^0) , \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where

$$\tilde{C}_{\ell q}^{(1)}|_{prij} = (S_L^\dagger)_{is} C_{\ell q}^{(1)}|_{prst} (S_L)_{tj} . \quad (5)$$

We see that, after the transformation, the new Hamiltonian has the same operators as before the transformation, but the new coefficients are linear combinations of the old coefficients. This is what is meant when people refer to a $[U(3)]^5$ “symmetry.” We stress that this holds only if all nine SMEFT operators, i.e., all possible values of the weak (generation) indices (s, t) or (i, j) , are involved in the transformations.

The down and up bases — As noted above, the dimension-4 operators in SMEFT are those of the SM. Higher-order, non-SM operators can provide new contributions to low-energy processes. Measurements of low-energy observables can therefore give information about the coefficients of these SMEFT operators. Below the weak scale, the physics is described by the Weak Effective Theory (WET), obtained by further integrating out the SM particles heavier than the b quark. The WET operators obey the $SU(3)_C \times U(1)_{em}$ gauge symmetry. In order to get information about the SMEFT operators from WET observables, it is necessary to match SMEFT to WET.

One complication is that, while the SMEFT operators are defined in the weak basis, the WET operators are in the mass basis. It is therefore necessary to transform between the two bases. For quarks, this is done as follows. The (leading-order) Yukawa terms in SMEFT are as in the SM:

$$\bar{q}_i^0 \lambda_{ij}^u i \sigma_2 H u_j^0 + \bar{q}_i^0 \lambda_{ij}^d H d_j^0 . \quad (6)$$

When the Higgs gets a vacuum expectation value v , breaking the $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ symmetry to $U(1)_{em}$, this leads to the up- and down-quark mass matrices $M_u \equiv \lambda^u v$ and $M_d \equiv \lambda^d v$. Each of these is diagonalized by a bi-unitary transformation. For M_u , we have $(S_L^u)^\dagger M_u S_R^u = M_u^{diag}$. This implies that $U_L^0 = S_L^u U_L$ and $U_R^0 = S_R^u U_R$, where $U \equiv (u, c, t)^T$ and the absence of superscripts indicates the mass basis. Similarly, $(S_L^d)^\dagger M_d S_R^d = M_d^{diag}$, so that $D_L^0 = S_L^d D_L$ and $D_R^0 = S_R^d D_R$, where $D \equiv (d, s, b)^T$. The Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) matrix is $V = (S_L^u)^\dagger S_L^d$. The diagonalization of both mass matrices can only be done once the electroweak symmetry is broken.

Above the weak scale, where SMEFT is valid, we can use the $U(3)$ transformations to diagonalize either λ^d or λ^u . We begin with a “generic” SMEFT Hamiltonian in which neither of the Yukawa coupling matrices is diagonal. We can use one $U(3)$ symmetry to transform $U_R^0 = S_R^u U_R$ and another for $D_R^0 = S_R^d D_R$. The RH quarks in the SMEFT Hamiltonian are now in the mass basis. At the SMEFT level, we can now use another $U(3)$ to transform $q^0 \rightarrow S_L^d q^0$. This implies that the down-quark Yukawa term $\bar{q}_i^0 \lambda_{ij}^d H d_j^0 \rightarrow \bar{q}_i^0 (S_L^d)_{ik}^\dagger \lambda_{kl}^d (S_R^d)_{lj} H d_j = \bar{q}_i^0 \lambda_{ij}^{d,diag} H d_j$. That is, the down-quark Yukawa coupling matrix has been diagonalized. The upshot is that the LH down-quark weak eigenstates are now the same as the mass eigenstates. In summary, we have

$$q^0 \rightarrow S_L^d q^0 , \quad \begin{pmatrix} u_L^0 \\ d_L^0 \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} V^\dagger u_L \\ d_L \end{pmatrix} . \quad (7)$$

On the left we show the $U(3)$ transformation applied to q^0 and on the right we show how the weak eigenstates u_L^0 and d_L^0 are converted to the mass eigenstates u_L and d_L after symmetry breaking.

Alternatively, we can transform $q^0 \rightarrow S_L^u q$. This diagonalizes the up-quark Yukawa coupling matrix, so that the LH up-quark weak eigenstates are the same as the mass eigenstates. In this case, we have

$$q^0 \rightarrow S_L^u q^0, \quad \begin{pmatrix} u_L^0 \\ d_L^0 \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} u_L \\ V d_L \end{pmatrix}. \quad (8)$$

Equations (7) and (8) are sometimes referred to as the “down-quark convention” and “up-quark convention,” respectively. This is a misnomer. Normally we expect the physics to be independent of the convention. However, as we will see, the predictions of the two scenarios can be quite different under certain circumstances. Henceforth, we refer to Eqs. (7) and (8) respectively as the “down basis” and “up basis.”

Both of these bases are quite useful for matching SMEFT to WET, because there is no dependence on the (unknown) transformation matrices $S_L^{u,d}$ – only the (known) CKM matrix is involved [5–7]. These bases are also convenient for performing renormalization-group running of the SMEFT Hamiltonian from the scale Λ down to the electroweak scale. The reason is that the Yukawa couplings, which figure in the calculation of the running, are *a priori* unknown. However, in these two bases, one of the Yukawa matrices is diagonal, i.e., it is proportional to the matrix of quark masses, while the other is a product of the other matrix of quark masses and the CKM matrix.⁷ In these bases, there are therefore no longer any unknown parameters coming from the $S_L^{u,d}$ matrices.

Subsets of SMEFT operators — Above, we showed that, for a given SMEFT operator, the $[U(3)]^5$ “symmetry” holds only if the Hamiltonian includes operators with all the values of the weak (generation) indices. However, it is often assumed that only a subset of such operators is present. In this case, things change substantially.

Consider again the SMEFT operator $\mathcal{O}_{\ell q}^{(1)}$ of Eq. (1), and suppose now that the generation indices take only the values $prst = 2222$ and 2233 , i.e., not all nine quark operators are present (and the leptonic indices are fixed). We are interested in the matching of these $\mathcal{O}_{\ell q}^{(1)}$ operators to WET. We have already described how the quarks transform between the weak and mass bases. For the leptons, we can again use one $U(3)$ symmetry to transform $e_R^0 = S_R^e e_R$, so that the RH charged leptons in the SMEFT Hamiltonian are now in the mass basis. For the LH leptons, if we neglect neutrino masses, we can also take the LH charged-lepton fields in the weak basis to be the same as in the mass basis.

In the down basis (Eq. 7), the WET operators involve only two down-quark transitions, but nine up-quark transitions. For the two SMEFT operators, this gives

$$\sum_{k=2,3} C_{\ell q}^{(1)}|_{22kk} [\bar{\mu}_L \gamma_\mu \mu_L + \bar{\nu}_{\mu L} \gamma_\mu \nu_{\mu L}] \left[\bar{d}_{kL} \gamma^\mu d_{kL} + \bar{u}_{i,L} V_{ik} \gamma^\mu V_{kj}^\dagger u_{j,L} \right]. \quad (9)$$

⁷Note, however, that this choice is not stable under renormalization-group running. At the electroweak scale a *back-rotation* has to be performed to return to the initial choice of basis [8,9].

However, in the up basis (Eq. 8), we have the opposite situation: the WET operators involve nine down-quark transitions, but only two up-quark transitions:

$$\sum_{k=2,3} C_{\ell q}^{(1)}|_{22kk} [\bar{\mu}_L \gamma_\mu \mu_L + \bar{\nu}_{\mu L} \gamma_\mu \nu_{\mu L}] \left[\bar{d}_{i,L} V_{ik}^\dagger \gamma^\mu V_{kj} d_{j,L} + \bar{u}_{kL} \gamma^\mu u_{kL} \right] . \quad (10)$$

This shows that the predictions in the two bases are very different.

This should not come as a surprise. The down and up bases are defined by applying a $U(3)$ transformation, either S_L^d or S_L^u , to q^0 . But the new bases produced in this way are equivalent only if all the SMEFT operators are present. Here this is not the case, so the two bases are not equivalent from the beginning.

Let us be very clear about what we are saying: although the Hamiltonian with all nine SMEFT operators in the down basis is equivalent to the Hamiltonian with all nine SMEFT operators in the up basis, the Hamiltonian with only two SMEFT operators in the down basis is *not* equivalent to the Hamiltonian with only the *same* two SMEFT operators in the up basis. The point here is that, if one is analyzing a scenario in which only a subset of SMEFT operators is being used, one has to also specify the basis for the analysis. (This statement can be found elsewhere in the literature, see e.g., Refs. [10, 11].)

Semi-model-independent analyses — There is another way to look at this. By construction, SMEFT is meant to be model-independent. But this holds only if full sets of operators are included. Once one considers only a subset of operators, this immediately raises the question: what forced the other operators to vanish? The answer is simple: although we are using the language of SMEFT, this is really an assumption about the underlying NP model. In the present case, the idea is that, when the NP is integrated out, the only $\mathcal{O}_{\ell q}^{(1)}$ operators produced have indices 2222 and 2233 (though other SMEFT operators may also be present).

But this is not all. If one chooses to do the analysis in the down basis, one has also assumed that the down-quark Yukawa coupling matrix is diagonal when the NP is integrated out. A similar observation applies if the up basis is used.

The point is that, whenever an analysis uses only a subset of SMEFT operators – and most “SMEFT” analyses are of this type – it is effectively a model-like analysis. That is, the focus is really on that class of models that, when the NP is integrated out, (i) produces the chosen subset of SMEFT operators, and (ii) is naturally in the chosen (down or up) basis. Thus, even if the SMEFT language is used, the analysis is only semi-model-independent. In other words, there can be some model dependence in SMEFT.

Producing a subset of operators — Here is an example of a NP model that produces the desired subset of $\mathcal{O}_{\ell q}^{(1)}$ operators. The SM gauge symmetry is extended by a $U(1)'$ symmetry at the TeV scale, in which the Z' gauge boson couples only to LH SM fermions. In the weak basis, its couplings are given by

$$-\mathcal{L}_{Z'} \supset g' [C_\ell^i \bar{\ell}_i^0 \gamma^\mu \ell_i^0 + C_q^j \bar{q}_j^0 \gamma^\mu q_j^0] Z'_\mu , \quad (11)$$

where C_ℓ^i and C_q^j are respectively the $U(1)'$ charges for the i^{th} and j^{th} generations of leptons and quarks. When the Z' is integrated out at scale $\Lambda = M_{Z'}$, three types of four-fermion

operators are generated at tree level, those with four leptons, four quarks, and two leptons and two quarks:

$$-\frac{g'^2}{2M_{Z'}^2} [C_\ell^i C_\ell^j (\bar{\ell}_i^0 \gamma^\mu \ell_i^0) (\bar{\ell}_j^0 \gamma_\mu \ell_j^0) + C_q^i C_q^j (\bar{q}_i^0 \gamma^\mu q_i^0) (\bar{q}_j^0 \gamma_\mu q_j^0) + 2C_\ell^i C_q^j (\bar{\ell}_i^0 \gamma^\mu \ell_i^0) (\bar{q}_j^0 \gamma_\mu q_j^0)] . \quad (12)$$

The key point is that this defines the weak basis. Unlike in SMEFT, here the flavour indices have a physical meaning, i.e., these fermions are the eigenstates of the NP. If the $U(1)'$ charges are different for all three generations, then this basis is unique. We suppose that only C_ℓ^2 , C_q^2 and C_q^3 are nonzero, and that $C_q^2 \neq C_q^3$, so that the only $\mathcal{O}_{\ell q}^{(1)}$ operators produced have indices 2222 and 2233.

The generic basis — Although this model produces the desired subset of $\mathcal{O}_{\ell q}^{(1)}$ operators when the NP is integrated out, note that neither of the down-quark and up-quark Yukawa couplings is diagonal. Thus, these two SMEFT operators are defined in a new basis, different from the down or the up basis. We call this the “generic” basis.

Above, we argued that, whenever an analysis includes only a subset of SMEFT operators, it is necessary to also specify the basis for the analysis. Furthermore, these are fundamentally model-like analyses, in which the focus is on that class of models that (i) produces the chosen subset of SMEFT operators, and (ii) is naturally in the chosen basis. In the literature, almost all such analyses are done in the down or up basis. However, there are a great many (most?) models that are in neither the down nor up basis when the NP is integrated out. If one wants to explore the possible predictions when only a subset of SMEFT operators is present, it is necessary to also consider the generic basis.

In the generic basis,

$$q^0 = \begin{pmatrix} u_L^0 \\ d_L^0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (13)$$

and the matching to WET is done via

$$\begin{pmatrix} u_L^0 \\ d_L^0 \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} S_L^u u_L \\ S_L^d d_L \end{pmatrix} . \quad (14)$$

Given that only the $\mathcal{O}_{\ell q}^{(1)}$ operators with indices 2222 and 2233 are present, what is predicted for the WET operators? These operators involve nine down-quark transitions and nine up-quark transitions:

$$\sum_{k=2,3} C_{\ell q}^{(1)} |_{22kk} [\bar{\mu}_L \gamma_\mu \mu_L + \bar{\nu}_{\mu L} \gamma_\mu \nu_{\mu L}] \left[\bar{d}_{i,L} (S_L^d)_{ik}^\dagger \gamma^\mu (S_L^d)_{kj} d_{j,L} + \bar{u}_{i,L} (S_L^u)_{ik}^\dagger \gamma^\mu (S_L^u)_{kj} u_{j,L} \right] . \quad (15)$$

This is like a combination of the down and up bases, except that the coefficients are not the same. Here they involve elements of the transformation matrices S_L^d and S_L^u , rather than the CKM matrix.

Extracting S_L^d and S_L^u — This is potentially of great importance. Suppose that the coefficients of all these WET operators could be extracted from measurements of low-energy observables. (Of course, this is very difficult in practice, but we are interested in what information is available in principle.)

Consider first those operators involving the down-quark transitions. Writing $C_{\ell q}^{(1)}|_{22kk} = (C_q^{(1)})_{kk}$ for notational simplicity, the measurements of the coefficients of these WET operators provide the elements of the matrix $(S_L^d)^\dagger C_q^{(1)} S_L^d$. With this, one can (numerically) find the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of this matrix. Since $C_q^{(1)}$ is Hermitian, the eigenvectors can be chosen (up to phases) to form an orthonormal basis. But the eigenvalues are the same as the eigenvalues of the original coupling matrix $C_q^{(1)}$. And if the eigenvectors of $C_q^{(1)}$ are $W_i^{(a)}$ with $a = 1, 2, 3$, the eigenvectors of $(S_L^d)^\dagger C_q^{(1)} S_L^d$ are $W_i^{d(a)} = ((S_L^d)^\dagger)_{ij} W_j^{(a)}$. Given that $C_q^{(1)} = \text{diag}(0, C_{22}, C_{33})$, with $C_{22} \neq C_{33}$, we can easily compute its eigenvalues and eigenvectors (modulo phases). The relation between the eigenvectors $W_i^{d(a)}$ and $W_i^{(a)}$ then fixes $(S_L^d)^\dagger$ up to the three phases associated with the phase freedom in the definition of $W_i^{d(a)}$.

A similar exercise can be performed on the operators involving the up-quark transitions. This fixes $(S_L^u)^\dagger$, again up to three phases. Finally, we use the relation $V = (S_L^u)^\dagger S_L^d$. As the CKM matrix is known, this gives additional constraints on the six free phases, fixing three of them. Putting all this information together, we can obtain both S_L^d and S_L^u , up to three phases.⁸

The bottom line is that, in this example, the transformation matrices S_L^d and S_L^u can in principle be extracted from the data! This is in contrast to the SM, where these matrices are unmeasurable. In the charged current, they only show up in the definition of the CKM matrix. And they cancel in the neutral current, so that there are no tree-level flavour-changing neutral currents (FCNCs). This is because all three generations of quarks have the same charges under $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$. On the other hand, in SMEFT, the couplings involving different generations can be different, and indeed SMEFT allows FCNCs. So it should not come as a surprise that S_L^d and S_L^u are potentially measurable in SMEFT.

The above analysis was “top-down.” That is, we first defined the NP model at scale Λ and then worked out the low-energy consequences. But it is also possible to reverse the steps and perform a “bottom-up” analysis. The starting point is the measurement of the elements of the matrix $(S_L^d)^\dagger C_q^{(1)} S_L^d$ from the WET operators involving the down-quark transitions. We can again obtain the eigenvalues of this matrix, which are the same as the eigenvalues of the original coupling matrix $C_q^{(1)}$. With only the eigenvalues, we cannot say what $C_q^{(1)}$ is. But this knowledge does allow us to say what it is *not*: any NP model that does not produce a $C_q^{(1)}$ with these eigenvalues is ruled out.

Summary — To recap, it is generally taken for granted that SMEFT analyses are model-independent. In this paper, we have shown that this is not necessarily true. In SMEFT operators involving fermions, the fermions have weak (generation) indices. If a

⁸Considering more sets of SMEFT operators can determine both transformation matrices completely.

given analysis involves full sets of such operators, i.e., the indices take all possible values, then the analysis is indeed model-independent. However, if only a subset of operators is used, the analysis is only semi-model-independent.

There are two issues here. First, the scenario is basis-dependent: the Hamiltonian with a subset of operators in one weak basis is not equivalent to the same Hamiltonian in another weak basis. In other words, it is necessary to specify the weak basis in which the analysis is done. Most analyses use either the down or up bases, in which the down-quark or up-quark Yukawa couplings are taken to be diagonal. Second, if only a subset of operators is used, this raises the question: what forced the other operators to vanish?

The point is that, whenever only a subset of operators is used, one is necessarily making an assumption about the underlying NP. To be specific, in the above scenario it is assumed that, when the NP particles are integrated out, the Hamiltonian is produced in a particular weak basis, and that only the desired subset of operators is generated. Note that this does not point to any one model of NP, but rather to a class of NP models.

Furthermore, when the NP is integrated out, it will generally not produce a Hamiltonian in the down or up weak basis, i.e., the down-quark or up-quark Yukawa couplings will not be diagonal. Instead, the operators will be defined in a new weak basis, the generic basis, in which neither of the Yukawa couplings is diagonal.

The transformation from the weak to the mass basis typically involves two transformation matrices involving the LH down and up quarks. In the down and up bases, only a specific combination of these matrices (the CKM matrix) appears. However, in the generic basis, both matrices appear and are measurable in principle, possibly up to some phases.

Acknowledgements

This work was financially supported by the U.S. National Science Foundation under Grant No. PHY-2309937 (AD), by NSERC of Canada (JFF, DL, NS), by the US Department of Energy Office and by the Laboratory Directed Research and Development (LDRD) program of Los Alamos National Laboratory under project numbers 20230047DR, 20220706PRD1 (JK), by the U.S. Department of Energy under Grant No.DE-SC0010504 (DM), and by FRQNT (NS). Los Alamos National Laboratory is operated by Triad National Security, LLC, for the National Nuclear Security Administration of the U.S. Department of Energy (Contract No. 89233218CNA000001).

References

- [1] W. Buchmuller and D. Wyler, *Effective Lagrangian Analysis of New Interactions and Flavor Conservation*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **268** (1986) 621–653.
- [2] B. Grzadkowski, M. Iskrzynski, M. Misiak, and J. Rosiek, *Dimension-Six Terms in the Standard Model Lagrangian*, *JHEP* **10** (2010) 085, [[arXiv:1008.4884](https://arxiv.org/abs/1008.4884)].

- [3] I. Brivio and M. Trott, *The Standard Model as an Effective Field Theory*, *Phys. Rept.* **793** (2019) 1–98, [[arXiv:1706.08945](#)].
- [4] D. A. Faroughy, G. Isidori, F. Wilsch, and K. Yamamoto, *Flavour symmetries in the SMEFT*, *JHEP* **08** (2020) 166, [[arXiv:2005.05366](#)].
- [5] J. Aebischer, A. Crivellin, M. Fael, and C. Greub, *Matching of gauge invariant dimension-six operators for $b \rightarrow s$ and $b \rightarrow c$ transitions*, *JHEP* **05** (2016) 037, [[arXiv:1512.02830](#)].
- [6] J. Aebischer et al., *WCxf: an exchange format for Wilson coefficients beyond the Standard Model*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **232** (2018) 71–83, [[arXiv:1712.05298](#)].
- [7] E. E. Jenkins, A. V. Manohar, and P. Stoffer, *Low-Energy Effective Field Theory below the Electroweak Scale: Operators and Matching*, *JHEP* **03** (2018) 016, [[arXiv:1709.04486](#)]. [Erratum: *JHEP* 12, 043 (2023)].
- [8] 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** (2018), no. 12 1026, [[arXiv:1804.05033](#)].
- [9] J. Aebischer and J. Kumar, *Flavour violating effects of Yukawa running in SMEFT*, *JHEP* **09** (2020) 187, [[arXiv:2005.12283](#)].
- [10] L. Silvestrini and M. Valli, *Model-independent Bounds on the Standard Model Effective Theory from Flavour Physics*, *Phys. Lett. B* **799** (2019) 135062, [[arXiv:1812.10913](#)].
- [11] J. Aebischer, C. Bobeth, A. J. Buras, and J. Kumar, *SMEFT ATLAS of $\Delta F = 2$ transitions*, *JHEP* **12** (2020) 187, [[arXiv:2009.07276](#)].