

# Kaon Theory: 50 Years Later\*

Andrzej J. Buras

TUM Institute for Advanced Study, Lichtenbergstr. 2a, D-85748 Garching, Germany

Physik Department, TUM School of Natural Sciences, TU München,  
James-Franck-Straße, D-85748 Garching, Germany

## Abstract

We summarize the status of the Kaon Theory 50 years after the seminal paper of Kobayashi and Maskawa who pointed out that six quarks are necessary to have CP violation in the Standard Model (SM) and presented a parametrization of a  $3 \times 3$  unitary matrix that after the discovery of the charm quark in 1974 and the  $b$  quark in 1977 dominated the field of flavour changing processes. One of the main goals of flavour physics since then was the determination of the four parameters of this matrix, which we will choose here to be  $|V_{us}|$ ,  $|V_{cb}|$  and the two angles of the unitarity triangle,  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  with  $|V_{us}|$  introduced by Cabibbo in 1963. I will summarize recent strategy for determination of these parameters without new physics (NP) infection. It is based on the conjecture of the absence of relevant NP contributions to  $\Delta F = 2$  processes that indeed can be demonstrated by a negative rapid test: the  $|V_{cb}| - \gamma$  plot. This in turn allows to obtain SM predictions for rare  $K$  and  $B$  decays that are most precise to date. We present strategies for the explanation of the anticipated anomaly in the ratio  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$  and the observed anomalies in  $b \rightarrow s\mu^+\mu^-$  transitions that are consistent with our  $\Delta F = 2$  conjecture. In particular, the absence of NP in the parameter  $\varepsilon_K$ , still allows for significant NP effects in  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$  and in rare Kaon decays, moreover in a correlated manner. Similar the absence of NP in  $\Delta M_s$  combined with anomalies in  $b \rightarrow s\mu^+\mu^-$  transitions hints for the presence of right-handed quark currents. We also discuss how the nature of neutrinos, Dirac vs. Majorana one, can be probed in  $K \rightarrow \pi\nu\bar{\nu}$  and  $B \rightarrow K(K^*)\nu\bar{\nu}$  decays. The present status of the  $\Delta I = 1/2$  rule and of  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$  is summarized.

\*) Talk given at the KM50 Symposium, KEK, Tsukuba, February 11th, 2023

# 1 Overture

Our story begins in 1963 when Cabibbo [1] introduced the angle  $\theta_C$  which could be determined in tree-level Kaon decays. This allowed to estimate roughly the  $K_L - K_S$  mass difference  $\Delta M_K$  and also the branching ratio for the  $K_L \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$  decay. With only the existence of three quarks,  $u, d, s$ , known in the 1960s, these estimates turned out to be significantly higher than the data. These days we would conclude that some new physics (NP) is required to suppress these observables to agree with the experimental data. This NP turned out to be the charm quark. Indeed, this problem has been solved by Glashow, Iliopoulos and Maiani (GIM) [2] who, adding the charm quark and requiring the resulting  $2 \times 2$  matrix to be unitary, outlined how the two observables could be suppressed. But only in 1974 Gaillard and Lee [3] presented explicit calculations of both observables in the four-quark model and with the help of the  $\Delta M_K$  could predict the charm quark mass prior to its discovery. In particular  $\Delta M_K$  was found to be suppressed by the ratio  $m_c^2/M_W^2$  in agreement with its experimental value.

However, already in February 1973, Kobayashi and Maskawa pointed out in a seminal paper [4] that with four quarks CP-violation in  $K_L \rightarrow \pi\pi$  decays, discovered in 1964 [5], could not be explained and that additional NP was required to do it: two additional quarks known these days under the names of the beauty quark and the top quark that were discovered in 1977 and 1995, respectively. In this context they generalized the unitary  $2 \times 2$  matrix used in the GIM paper to a unitary  $3 \times 3$  matrix that guaranteed the absence of FCNC processes at the tree-level and also their suppression at the loop level provided the masses of exchanged quarks were significantly smaller than  $M_W$ . To my knowledge the pioneering phenomenological analysis of the KM scenario has been performed by Ellis, Gaillard and Nanopoulos [6] in 1976, in fact during my CERN fellow days. Because the top quark mass was chosen to be below 20 GeV in this paper and the parameters of the CKM matrix [1, 4] were very weakly constrained, this analysis does not resemble similar analyses performed already in the 1980s after it has been found that  $|V_{cb}|$  is much smaller than  $|V_{us}|$ , and in particular after the top quark discovery in 1995. But this was the first analysis of this type.

Before I move to the year 2023 let me mention still the papers which certainly played an important role in the phenomenological flavour analyses already for many years

- The standard parametrization of the CKM matrix of Chau and Keung [7].
- Its very approximated form of Wolfenstein [8] in which the parameters  $\lambda$ ,  $A$ ,  $\varrho$  and  $\eta$  have been introduced.
- Important papers by Jarlskog on the invariant measure of CP violation in the SM [9,10].
- First papers on Unitarity Triangles [11,12].
- Much more precise Wolfenstein-like parametrization introduced in Munich in 1994 [13] in which in particular the apex of the unitarity triangle is described by  $(\bar{\varrho}, \bar{\eta})$ . A similar parametrization has been proposed by Branco and Lavoura [14].
- The concept of Minimal Flavour Violation [15–18] which implies strict correlations between flavour changing processes in different meson systems.

All these topics and many other are discussed in detail in my recent book [19]. See also other books [20–22].

Kaon physics is not as rich as  $B$  physics but still has a number of stars that have been considered by experimentalists and theorists in the last four decades. These are

$$K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}, \quad K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}, \quad K_{L,S} \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-, \quad K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \ell^+ \ell^-, \quad (1)$$

and

$$\Delta M_K, \quad \varepsilon_K, \quad \varepsilon'/\varepsilon, \quad \Delta I = 1/2 \text{ Rule}. \quad (2)$$

They all can give important information about very short distance scales but to identify NP, correlations with  $B_{s,d}$ ,  $B^+$  and  $D$  observables, electric dipole moments and lepton physics are crucial [19, 23]. The fortunate side of this field, with the exception of the ratio  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$  and the  $\Delta I = 1/2$  rule, is the theoretical cleanliness of these decays. On the other hand, the unfortunate side of it are very low branching ratios of the decays involved. As an example I am waiting already 30 years to be able to compare my results with experiment for a number of rare  $K$  and  $B$  decay branching ratios<sup>1</sup>. This is the case of the first papers on the next-to-leading order (NLO) strong interaction (QCD) corrections to rare decay branching ratios for  $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ ,  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$ ,  $B_{s,d} \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$  and alike calculated in collaboration with Gerhard Buchalla in 1993 [24, 25] and numerous papers with him and other collaborators in the last 30 years including two reviews in 2004 and 2022 [26, 27]. It is then evident that QCD plays a very important role in this field. It happens that also QCD celebrates its 50th birthday which is documented in [28].

There are a number of reviews that touch on the topics discussed here. This is in particular [29] and the talk by Taku Yamanaka at this symposium. On the other hand the search for feebly-interacting light particles like axions, axinos and dark matter are beyond the scope of our review. A nice description of this topic can be found in [30, 31].

The overture is finished and we move to the KM symphony.

Decay	NLO	NNLO
Current-Current ( $Q_1, Q_2$ )	[32, 33]	[34]
QCD penguins ( $Q_3, Q_4, Q_5, Q_6$ )	[35–40], [41]	[34, 42]
electroweak penguins ( $Q_7, Q_8, Q_9, Q_{10}$ )	[37–39, 43]	[44]
inclusive non-leptonic decays	[32, 45–49]; [50]	
Current-Current (BSM)	[51, 52]	
Penguins (BSM)	[52]	

Table 1: NLO and NNLO Calculations for Non-leptonic and Semi-Leptonic  $\Delta F = 1$  Transitions. References on semi-leptonic  $B$  decays can be found in my book [19] and in the recent review [53].

## 2 Kobayashi-Maskawa Symphony

### 2.1 Theoretical Framework

This framework is based on the operator product expansion [92–94] that allows to separate the calculation of various flavour observables like decay branching ratios into short distance

<sup>1</sup>My interest in rare Kaon decays increased by much during the 1988 Kaon conference in Vancouver, in particular after the talks of Larry Littenberg on  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$  and of Fred Gilman on  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \ell^+ \ell^-$ .

Decay	NLO QCD	NNLO QCD	EW
$\eta_1$	[54]	[55]	
$\eta_2, \eta_B$	[56]		[57, 58]
$\eta_3$	[59, 60]	[61]	[62]
$\eta_{tt}$	[63]		[58]
$\eta_{ut}$	[63]	[63]	[62]
ADMs BSM	[51, 52]		
$\Delta\Gamma_{B_s}$	[64–71]	[72]	
$\Delta\Gamma_{B_d}$	[65, 66]		
Lifetime Ratios	[73–78]		
$\Delta F = 2$ Tree-Level	[79]		

Table 2: NLO and NNLO Calculations for  $\Delta F = 2$  and  $\Delta F = 0$  Transitions.

Decay	NLO	NNLO
$K_L^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}, B \rightarrow X_s \nu \bar{\nu}$	[24, 25, 80, 81]	
$K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$	[81, 82]	[83]
$K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \ell^+ \ell^-$	[84]	
$B_{s,d} \rightarrow l^+ l^-$	[24, 25, 80, 81]	[85]
$K_L \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$	[81, 82]	[86]
$K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \mu \bar{\mu}$	[87]	
EW to Charm in $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$	[88]	
EW to Top in $K \rightarrow \pi \nu \bar{\nu}$	[89, 90]	
EW to Top in $B_{s,d} \rightarrow l^+ l^-$	[89, 91]	

Table 3: NLO and NNLO Calculations for Rare K and B decays.

ones represented by the Wilson coefficients of the involved local operators and the long distance ones contained in the hadronic matrix elements of these operators. I will be very brief about this topic because it is rather technical and is well documented in the literature. I do it despite the fact that I spent more than a decade calculating NLO QCD corrections to the Wilson coefficients relevant for quark mixing and rare  $K$  and  $B$  decays, not only in the SM but also beyond it. The first extensive review of this topic has been presented by Buchalla, Lautenbacher and myself in 1995 in [95] and more pedagogically in my Les Houches lectures in 1998 [96]. More up to date summary can be found in my book [19] and in particular in the most recent review with many anecdotes that has been just published in Physics Reports [53]. I would claim that presently the status of these corrections within the SM is very good and not too bad beyond the SM. All relevant references can be found in [53] but it is appropriate to collect in Tables 1, 2 and 3 those that fit best to this review.

Important progress has also been done for the extraction of short distance contribution to  $K_S \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$  [97–99] offering still another precision observable in addition to  $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$  and  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$  decays.

While these calculations improved considerably the precision of theoretical predictions in weak decays and can be considered as an important progress in this field, the pioneering LO QCD calculations for current-current operators [100, 101], penguin operators [102, 103],

$\Delta S = 2$  operators [104, 105] should not be forgotten. This also is the case of LO QCD calculations of rare  $K$  decays [106–109] and of the ratio  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$  [110, 111] for large  $m_t$ .

This takes care of short distance contributions. But also hadronic matrix elements, in particular the ones relevant for quark mixing are in a good shape. I refer to FLAG reports [112] and in particular to the article of Aida El-Khadra in this volume, where the references to the rich literature can be found. Some references will be given in the context of our presentation.

The final ingredients necessary to make predictions for  $K$  meson physics and also  $B$  physics are the CKM parameters that regularly are obtained from global fits performed by UTfitter [113], CKMfitter [114] and PDG [115]. My strategy for finding the CKM parameters differs presently from the ones of these groups and this is the topic of the second movement.

## 2.2 SM Predictions for Rare $K$ and $B$ Decays without NP Infection

### 2.2.1 Problems with Present Global Fits

In my view there are presently the following problems with global fits just listed [116]:

- In a global fit which contains processes that are infected by NP the resulting CKM parameters are also infected by it and consequently the resulting branching ratios cannot be considered as genuine SM predictions. Consequently the resulting deviations from the SM predictions obtained in this manner (the pulls) are not the deviations one would find if the CKM parameters were not infected by NP.
- Tensions in the determinations of  $|V_{cb}|$  and  $|V_{ub}|$  from inclusive and exclusive tree-level decays [112, 117]. Using these results lowers the precision with which CKM parameters can be determined and their inclusion in the fit should be avoided until theorists agree what the values of  $|V_{cb}|$  and  $|V_{ub}|$  are. This is also the view of a number of theorists who attempt to determine these parameters through tree-level exclusive and inclusive tree-level decays, although they did not state it in print.
- Hadronic uncertainties in some observables included in the fit are much larger than in many rare  $K$  and  $B$  decays. Even if they can be given a lower weight in the fit, they lower the precision and should be presently avoided.

### 2.2.2 Strategy

In what follows I want to summarize the strategy developed in two papers with Elena Venturini [118, 119] which generalized my 2003 strategy used for  $B_{s,d} \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$  decays [120] to all  $K$  and  $B$  decays. This strategy deals with the second and the third item above but as I realized in [116] it solves also the first problem. It consists of four steps.

#### Step 1

Remove CKM dependence by calculating suitable ratios of decay branching ratios to the mass differences  $\Delta M_s$  and  $\Delta M_d$  in the case of  $B_s$  and  $B_d$  decays, respectively and to the parameter  $|\varepsilon_K|$  in the case of Kaon decays. By suitable we mean for instance that in order to eliminate the  $|V_{cb}|$  dependences in the branching ratios for  $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$  and  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$ , the parameter  $|\varepsilon_K|$  has to be raised, as given later, to the power 0.82 and 1.18, respectively. For  $B_{s,d}$  decays one just divides the branching ratios by  $\Delta M_{s,d}$ , respectively.

In this manner CKM dependence can be fully eliminated for all  $B$  decay branching ratios. For  $K$  decays only the dependence on the angle  $\beta$  in the UT remains. The dependence on  $\gamma$  is practically absent so that future improvements on the measurements of  $\gamma$  by LHCb and Belle II collaborations will not have any impact on these particular ratios. On the other hand improved measurements of  $\beta$  and improved values of hadronic parameters will reduce the uncertainties in these ratios. It should be emphasized that already these ratios constitute very good tests of the SM.

### Step 2

Set  $\Delta M_s$ ,  $\Delta M_d$ ,  $|\varepsilon_K|$  and the mixing induced CP asymmetries  $S_{\psi K_S}$  and  $S_{\psi\phi}$  to their experimental values. This is done usually in global fits as well but here we confine the fit to these observables. The justification for this step is the fact that all these observables can be simultaneously described within the SM without any need for NP contributions and the theoretical and experimental status of these  $\Delta F = 2$  observables is exceptionally good. In turn this step not only avoids the tensions in the determinations of  $|V_{cb}|$  and  $|V_{ub}|$  in tree level decays, but also provides SM predictions for numerous rare  $K$  and  $B$  branching ratios that are most accurate to date [116, 118, 119].

### Step 3

In order to be sure that the  $\Delta F = 2$  archipelago is not infected by NP a rapid test has to be performed with the help of the  $|V_{cb}| - \gamma$  plot [118, 119]. This test turns out to be negative dominantly thanks to the 2+1+1 HPQCD lattice calculations of  $B_{s,d} - \bar{B}_{s,d}$  hadronic matrix elements [121]<sup>2</sup>. The superiority of the  $|V_{ub}| - \gamma$  plots over UT plots in this context has been emphasized in [124]. We will present these issues in more details soon.

### Step 4

As the previous step has lead to a negative rapid test we can now determine the CKM parameters without NP infection on the basis of  $\Delta F = 2$  observables alone. It should be noted that this step can be considered as a reduced global fit of CKM parameters in which only  $\Delta F = 2$  observables have been taken into account.

All the problems listed above are avoided in this manner and having CKM parameters at hand one can make rather precise SM predictions for the observables outside the  $\Delta F = 2$  archipelago and compare them with the experimental data. The pulls obtained in this manner are more reliable than the ones obtained from global fits that include several additional observables.


In this context let us recall the values of  $|V_{cb}|$  extracted from inclusive and exclusive tree-level semi-leptonic  $b \rightarrow c$  decays [112, 117]

$$|V_{cb}|_{\text{incl}} = (42.16 \pm 0.50) \cdot 10^{-3}, \quad |V_{cb}|_{\text{excl}} = (39.21 \pm 0.62) \cdot 10^{-3}. \quad (3)$$

As FCNC processes are sensitive functions of  $|V_{cb}|$ , varying it from  $39 \cdot 10^{-3}$  to  $42 \cdot 10^{-3}$  changes  $\Delta M_{s,d}$  and  $B$ -decay branching ratios by roughly 16%,  $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$  branching ratio by 23%,  $\varepsilon_K$  by 29% and  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$  and  $K_S \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$  branching ratios by 35%.

These uncertainties are clearly a disaster for those like me, my collaborators and other experts in NLO and NNLO calculations who spent decades to reduce theoretical uncertainties in basically all important rare  $K$  and  $B$  decays and quark mixing observables down to (1 – 2)%. It is also a disaster for lattice QCD experts who for quark mixing observables and in particular meson weak decay constants achieved the accuracy at the level of a few percents. See the article of Aida El-Khadra in this volume.

<sup>2</sup>Similar results for  $\Delta M_d$  and  $\Delta M_s$  hadronic matrix elements have been obtained within the HQET sum rules in [77] and [122, 123], respectively.

Figure 1: *The Unitarity Triangle.*

### 2.2.3 New Formulae for $\bar{\rho}$ and $\bar{\eta}$

Before describing the results of our strategy let us emphasize that it uses as basic CKM parameters [116, 118, 119, 125]

$$|V_{us}| = \lambda, \quad |V_{cb}|, \quad \beta, \quad \gamma, \quad (4)$$

with  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  being the two angles of the UT shown in Fig. 1.

It should be noted that all parametrizations listed at the beginning of this writing involve three real parameters and one complex phase. In particular in 1986 Harari and Leurer [126] recommended the standard parametrization because of the relations<sup>3</sup>

$$s_{12} = |V_{us}|, \quad s_{13} = |V_{ub}|, \quad s_{23} = |V_{cb}|, \quad \gamma, \quad (5)$$

that allow the determination of these four parameters separately in tree-level decays. Consequently, basically all flavour phenomenology in the last three decades used such sets of parameters. In particular the determination of the UT was dominated by the measurements of its sides  $R_b$  and  $R_t$  through tree-level  $B$  decays and the  $\Delta M_d/\Delta M_s$  ratio, respectively, with some participation of the measurements of the angle  $\beta$  through the mixing induced CP-asymmetries like  $S_{\psi K_S}$ , the parameter  $\varepsilon_K$  and much less precise angle  $\gamma$ . This is the case not only of global analyses by UTfitter [127] and CKMfitter [114] but also of less sophisticated determinations of the CKM matrix and of the UT.

However, as pointed out in [116, 118, 119], the most powerful strategy appears eventually to be the one which uses as basic CKM parameters the ones in (4), that is two mixing angles and two phases. This choice is superior to the one in which  $\beta$  is replaced by  $|V_{ub}|$  for several reasons:

- The known tensions between exclusive and inclusive determinations of  $|V_{cb}|$  and  $|V_{ub}|$  [112, 117] are represented only by  $|V_{cb}|$  which can be eliminated efficiently by constructing suitable ratios of flavour observables  $R_i(\beta, \gamma)$ , see below, which are free of the tensions in question.
- As pointed out already in 2002 [128], the most efficient strategy for a precise determination of the apex of the UT, that is  $(\bar{\rho}, \bar{\eta})$ , is to use the measurements of the angles  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$ . Indeed, among any pairs of two variables representing the sides and the

---

<sup>3</sup> $c_{13} = 1$  to an excellent accuracy.

angles of the UT that are assumed for this exercise to be known with the same precision, the measurement of  $(\beta, \gamma)$  results in the most accurate values of  $(\bar{\varrho}, \bar{\eta})$ . The second best strategy would be the measurements of  $R_b$  and  $\gamma$ . However, in view of the tensions between different determinations of  $|V_{ub}|$  and  $|V_{cb}|$ , that enter  $R_b$ , the  $(\beta, \gamma)$  strategy will be a clear winner once LHCb and Belle II collaborations will improve the measurements of these two angles.

- The  $|V_{cb}| - \gamma$  plots for fixed  $\beta$ , proposed in [118, 119] are, as emphasized in [124], useful companions to common unitarity triangle fits because they exhibit better possible inconsistencies between  $|V_{cb}|$  and  $(\beta, \gamma)$  determinations than the latter fits. We will demonstrate this below.

In this context let us present two simple formulae that are central in the  $(\beta, \gamma)$  strategy as they allow to calculate the apex of the UT in no time, but to my knowledge have not been presented in the literature before, not even in our 2002 paper [128]. They read

$$\boxed{\bar{\varrho} = \frac{\sin \beta \cos \gamma}{\sin(\beta + \gamma)}, \quad \bar{\eta} = \frac{\sin \beta \sin \gamma}{\sin(\beta + \gamma)}} \quad (6)$$

They follow simply from

$$\bar{\varrho} = R_b \cos \gamma, \quad \bar{\eta} = R_b \sin \gamma, \quad R_b = \frac{\sin \beta}{\sin(\beta + \gamma)} \quad (7)$$

with the first two relations representing  $(R_b, \gamma)$  strategy [128]. The expression for  $R_b$  has been presented already in [20] and possibly in other articles. Evidently the formulae in (6) can be derived by high-school students<sup>4</sup>, but the UT is unknown to them and somehow no flavour physicist got the idea to present them in print so far.

Several other useful relations can be found in [20, 128]. In particular the one of  $(R_t, \beta)$  strategy

$$\bar{\varrho} = 1 - R_t \cos \beta, \quad \bar{\eta} = R_t \sin \beta, \quad R_t = \frac{\sin \gamma}{\sin(\beta + \gamma)}. \quad (8)$$

It should be also realized that in the coming years through the precise measurements of both angles by the LHCb and Belle II collaborations the simple formulae in (6) should be very useful for the construction of the UT. Also  $R_b$  and  $R_t$  will be easily found using the expressions in (7) and (8).

In Tables 4 and 5 we show  $\bar{\varrho}$  and  $\bar{\eta}$  as functions of  $\gamma$  for different values of  $\beta$  in the expected ranges for the latter parameters<sup>5</sup>. The present experimental determinations of  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  read

$$\boxed{\beta = (22.2 \pm 0.7)^\circ, \quad \gamma = (63.8^{+3.5}_{-3.7})^\circ} \quad (9)$$

Here the value for  $\gamma$  is the most recent one from the LHCb which updates the one in [129]  $(65.4^{+3.8}_{-4.2})^\circ$ . It is not as precise as the one in (21) that follows from our strategy but fully consistent with it. In the coming years LHCb and Belle II should reduce the error in  $\gamma$  in the ballpark of  $1^\circ$  and also the error on  $\beta$  will be reduced. In fact for the strategies of [116, 118, 119] the reduction of the error on  $\beta$  is even more important than the one on  $\gamma$  because  $\beta$  is an input but  $\gamma$  an output.

<sup>4</sup>In fact I recall that I had to solve such a triangle problem in 1962.

<sup>5</sup>I would like to thank Mohamed Zied Jaber for checking these tables.

$\gamma/\beta$	21.6°	21.8°	22.0°	22.2°	22.4°	22.6°	22.8°	23.0°
60°	0.186	0.188	0.189	0.191	0.192	0.194	0.195	0.197
61°	0.180	0.181	0.183	0.184	0.186	0.187	0.189	0.190
62°	0.174	0.175	0.177	0.178	0.180	0.181	0.183	0.184
63°	0.168	0.169	0.171	0.172	0.174	0.175	0.176	0.178
64°	0.162	0.163	0.165	0.166	0.167	0.169	0.170	0.172
65°	0.156	0.157	0.159	0.160	0.161	0.163	0.164	0.165
66°	0.150	0.151	0.152	0.154	0.155	0.156	0.158	0.159
67°	0.144	0.145	0.146	0.148	0.149	0.150	0.151	0.153
68°	0.138	0.139	0.140	0.142	0.143	0.144	0.145	0.146

Table 4: Values of  $\bar{\rho}$  for different values of  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$ .

$\gamma/\beta$	21.6°	21.8°	22.0°	22.2°	22.4°	22.6°	22.8°	23.0°
60°	0.322	0.325	0.328	0.330	0.333	0.336	0.338	0.340
61°	0.325	0.327	0.330	0.333	0.336	0.338	0.341	0.344
62°	0.327	0.330	0.333	0.335	0.338	0.341	0.344	0.346
63°	0.329	0.332	0.335	0.338	0.341	0.343	0.346	0.349
64°	0.332	0.335	0.338	0.340	0.343	0.346	0.349	0.352
65°	0.334	0.337	0.340	0.343	0.346	0.349	0.351	0.354
66°	0.337	0.340	0.342	0.345	0.348	0.351	0.354	0.357
67°	0.339	0.342	0.345	0.348	0.351	0.354	0.357	0.360
68°	0.341	0.344	0.347	0.350	0.353	0.356	0.359	0.362

Table 5: Values of  $\bar{\eta}$  for different values of  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$ .

It is interesting to compare these tables with the most recent “angle-only fit” of UTfitter [113]

$$\bar{\rho} = 0.156(17), \quad \bar{\eta} = 0.341(12). \quad (10)$$

The significant error on  $\bar{\rho}$  will be reduced by much with the improved measurement of  $\gamma$ . Let us then anticipate future measurements with

$$\gamma = 64.0(10)^\circ, \quad \beta = 22.2(4)^\circ, \quad (2026). \quad (11)$$

Using (55) and adding the errors in quadrature one would find

$$\bar{\rho} = 0.166(7), \quad \bar{\eta} = 0.340(6), \quad (2026). \quad (12)$$

Once the tensions in the determination of  $|V_{cb}|$  and  $|V_{ub}|$  will be resolved the full fit will of course result in even more precise values.

## 2.2.4 Results

One constructs then a multitude of  $|V_{cb}|$ -independent ratios  $R_i$  not only of branching ratios to quark mixing observables but also of branching ratios themselves. Those which involve branching ratios from different meson systems depend generally on  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$ . Once  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  will be precisely measured, this multitude of  $R_i(\beta, \gamma)$  will provide very good tests of the SM. However, using Step 4 of our strategy it is possible to predict these ratios already now.

The details of the execution of this strategy can be found in [116, 118, 119]. In particular analytic expressions for  $R_i(\beta, \gamma)$  and plots for them can be found in [118]. Additional ratios, predictions for all ratios considered and for 26 individual branching ratios resulting from our strategy are presented in [116]. Here we just list few results obtained in these papers.

Presently the most interesting  $|V_{cb}|$ -independent ratios read

$$\boxed{\frac{\mathcal{B}(B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)}{\Delta M_s} = (2.13 \pm 0.07) \times 10^{-10} \text{ps},} \quad (13)$$

$$\boxed{\frac{\mathcal{B}(B_d \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)}{\Delta M_d} = (2.02 \pm 0.08) \times 10^{-10} \text{ps},} \quad (14)$$

$$\boxed{\frac{\mathcal{B}(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu})}{|\varepsilon_K|^{0.82}} = (1.31 \pm 0.05) \times 10^{-8} \left( \frac{\sin \gamma}{\sin 64.6^\circ} \right)^{0.015} \left( \frac{\sin 22.2^\circ}{\sin \beta} \right)^{0.71},} \quad (15)$$

$$\boxed{\frac{\mathcal{B}(K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu})}{|\varepsilon_K|^{1.18}} = (3.87 \pm 0.06) \times 10^{-8} \left( \frac{\sin \gamma}{\sin 64.6^\circ} \right)^{0.03} \left( \frac{\sin \beta}{\sin 22.2^\circ} \right)^{0.98}.} \quad (16)$$

Using the experimental values of  $\Delta M_s$ ,  $\Delta M_d$  and  $|\varepsilon_K|$  they imply the most accurate predictions for the four branching ratios in question in the SM to date [118, 119]. Moreover, they are independent of the value of  $|V_{cb}|$ . We find

$$\bar{\mathcal{B}}(B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)_{\text{SM}} = (3.78 \pm 0.12) \times 10^{-9}, \quad \mathcal{B}(B_d \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)_{\text{SM}} = (1.02 \pm 0.12) \times 10^{-9}, \quad (17)$$

and

$$\mathcal{B}(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu})_{\text{SM}} = (8.60 \pm 0.42) \times 10^{-11}, \quad \mathcal{B}(K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu})_{\text{SM}} = (2.94 \pm 0.15) \times 10^{-11}. \quad (18)$$

In particular, the uncertainties in the latter two branching ratios have been reduced relative to widely quoted 2015 values [130] by a factor of 2.4 and 4.0, respectively. In this context the reduction of theoretical uncertainties in  $\varepsilon_K$  [63] was important.

Comparing them with the experimental data

$$\mathcal{B}(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu})_{\text{SM}} = (10.9 \pm 3.8) \times 10^{-11}, \quad \mathcal{B}(K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu})_{\text{SM}} \leq 2.0 \times 10^{-9}, \quad (19)$$

from NA62 [131] and KOTO [132], respectively, it is clear that there is still a large room left for NP contributions. However, in order to identify it, it is crucial to measure both branching ratios with at least 5% accuracy. I hope that NA62 and KOTO collaborations will be supported in this important goal by CERN and J-PARC authorities.

Also there is a large room for NP in the case of  $B_d \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$  decay. But in the case of  $B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$  decay the HFLAV average of CMS, LHCb and ATLAS data reads

$$\bar{\mathcal{B}}(B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)_{\text{EXP}} = (3.45 \pm 0.29) \times 10^{-9}, \quad (\text{HFLAV}) \quad (20)$$

and consequently the room left for NP is much smaller. Therefore the precise value for this branching ratio obtained by us could one day, when the data improves, help to uncover some NP contributions.

Using this strategy we obtained SM predictions for 26 branching ratios for rare semileptonic and leptonic  $K$  and  $B$  decays with the  $\mu^+ \mu^-$  pair or the  $\nu \bar{\nu}$  pair in the final state. They are listed in the Tables in [116, 118].

### 2.2.5 Rapid Tests

Having set the SM expressions for  $\Delta F = 2$  observables to their experimental values we are now in the position to determine the CKM parameters. However, before doing it, it is mandatory to perform the third step of our strategy, namely the rapid test to be sure that the  $\Delta F = 2$  observables and the resulting CKM parameters are not infected by NP. To this end, instead of inserting the formulae in a computer program right away it is useful to construct first a  $|V_{cb}| - \gamma$  plot [118, 119] with three bands resulting separately from  $\Delta M_s$ ,  $\Delta M_d$  and  $|\varepsilon_K|$  and in the latter case imposing the constraint from  $S_{\psi K_S}$ .

The plots in Fig. 2, taken from [119], illustrate three *rapid tests* of NP infection of the  $\Delta F = 2$  sector. The test is *negative* if these three bands cross each other at a small common area in this plane so that unique values of  $|V_{cb}|$  and  $\gamma$  are found. Otherwise it is *positive* signalling NP infection. Indeed, as seen in the first  $|V_{cb}| - \gamma$  plot in Fig. 2 that is based on  $2 + 1 + 1$  LQCD hadronic matrix elements [121], the SM  $|V_{cb}| - \gamma$  bands resulting from  $\varepsilon_K$ ,  $\Delta M_d$  and  $\Delta M_s$  after imposition of the  $S_{\psi K_S}$  constraint, turn out to provide such unique values of  $|V_{cb}|$  and  $\gamma$ . No sign of NP infection in this case. On the other hand, as seen in the remaining two plots in Fig. 2, this is not the case if  $2 + 1$  or the average of  $2 + 1 + 1$  and  $2 + 1$  hadronic matrix elements LQCD are used. In these two cases the test turns out to be *positive*.

The superiority of the  $|V_{cb}| - \gamma$  plots in general with respect to  $|V_{cb}|$  and  $\gamma$  over UT plots has been emphasized in [124]. Indeed,

- They exhibit  $|V_{cb}|$  and its correlation with  $\gamma$  determined through a given observable in the SM, allowing thereby monitoring the progress on both parameters expected in the coming years. Violation of this correlation in experiment will clearly indicate NP at work.
- They utilize the strong sensitivity of rare  $K$  decay processes to  $|V_{cb}|$  thereby providing precise determination of  $|V_{cb}|$  even with modest experimental precision on their branching ratios.
- They exhibit, as shown below, the action of  $\Delta M_s$  and of  $B_s$  decays, like  $B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$  which is not possible in the common UT-plot.
- Once the accuracy of  $\gamma$  measurements will approach  $1^\circ$  it will be easier to monitor this progress on a  $|V_{cb}| - \gamma$  plot.

In order to illustrate this we show in Fig. 3 the results for a number of observables calculated in the SM setting all uncertainties for transparency reasons to zero. We make the following observations.

- For fixed  $\beta = 22.2^\circ$ ,  $\varepsilon_K$ ,  $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$  and  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$  are represented to an excellent approximation by the same line which is already a very good test of the SM. This is simply because the  $\gamma$  dependence in the three observables is practically the same, the fact pointed out first in [133] and strongly emphasized in [118]. The dependence on  $\beta$  is different and this allows to determine within the SM the angle  $\beta$  from any pair of these observables independently of the value of  $\gamma$ . For the pair of the rare  $K$  branching ratios this was pointed out in [133]. For the other two pairs in [118].




Figure 2: Three rapid tests of NP infection in the  $\Delta F = 2$  sector taken from [119] as explained in the text. The values of  $|V_{cb}|$  extracted from  $\epsilon_K$ ,  $\Delta M_d$  and  $\Delta M_s$  as functions of  $\gamma$ . 2 + 1 + 1 flavours (top), 2 + 1 flavours (middle), average of 2 + 1 + 1 and 2 + 1 cases (bottom). The green band represents experimental  $S_{\psi K_S}$  constraint on  $\beta$ .

- $\Delta M_d$  and  $B_d \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$  are represented by a single line and a different line represents  $\Delta M_s$  and  $B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ . This is precisely the illustration of the SM relations (13) and




Figure 3: *Schematic illustration of the action of the seven observables in the  $|V_{cb}| - \gamma$  plane in the context of the SM. We set  $\beta = 22.2^\circ$  and all uncertainties to zero.*

(14) pointed out long time ago in [120].

While SM describes  $\epsilon_K$ ,  $\Delta M_d$ ,  $\Delta M_s$  simultaneously very well, this not need to be the case for the rare decays in question. This is illustrated in Fig. 4. To obtain these results we have set the branching ratio for  $B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$  to the experimental world average from LHCb, CMS and ATLAS [134–136] but decreased its error from 8.4% down to 5%. For the remaining branching ratios we have chosen values resulting from hypothetical future measurements that differ from the SM predictions. We kept the errors at 5% as in the case of  $B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$  to exhibit the superiority of rare  $K$  decays over rare  $B$  decays as far as the determination of  $|V_{cb}|$  is concerned. While the experimental errors are futuristic, we expect that the theoretical errors will go down with time so that the bands in Fig. 4 could apply one day with less accurate measurements.

This plot confirms all the statements made above. The superiority of  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$  over the remaining decays is clearly seen. The blue band will be narrowed once the long distance charm contributions to  $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$  will be known with higher precision from lattice QCD calculations [137] than they are known now [138].

## 2.2.6 CKM Parameters

As the rapid test for the  $\Delta F = 2$  observables turned out to be negative we can now determine the CKM parameters using these observables without NP infection. We find [119]

$$\boxed{|V_{cb}| = 42.6(4) \times 10^{-3}, \quad \gamma = 64.6(16)^\circ, \quad \beta = 22.2(7)^\circ, \quad |V_{ub}| = 3.72(11) \times 10^{-3}} \quad (21)$$

and consequently

$$\boxed{|V_{ts}| = 41.9(4) \times 10^{-3}, \quad |V_{td}| = 8.66(14) \times 10^{-3}, \quad \text{Im}\lambda_t = 1.43(5) \times 10^{-4},} \quad (22)$$




Figure 4: *The impact of hypothetical future measurements of the branching ratios for  $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ ,  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$ ,  $B_d \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$  and  $B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$  on the  $|V_{cb}| - \gamma$  plane. All uncertainties are included. The yellow disc represents the SM as obtained in (21).*

$$\boxed{\bar{\varrho} = 0.164(12), \quad \bar{\eta} = 0.341(11),} \quad (23)$$

where  $\lambda_t = V_{ts}^* V_{td}$ .

The hierarchy

$$|V_{td} V_{ts}^*| \approx 3.6 \times 10^{-4}, \quad |V_{td} V_{tb}^*| \approx 8.7 \times 10^{-3}, \quad |V_{ts} V_{tb}^*| \approx 41.9 \times 10^{-3} \quad (24)$$

implies a hierarchy in FCNC processes in  $K$ ,  $B_d$  and  $B_s$  meson systems. The strong suppression of such processes in the  $K$  system in the SM allows in principle larger NP effects than in the  $B_d$  and  $B_s$  meson decays.

### 2.2.7 More Results

Having the values of the CKM parameters, all ratios  $R_i(\beta, \gamma)$  considered by us can be predicted in the SM. We quote here only [116]

$$\boxed{\frac{\mathcal{B}(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu})}{[\mathcal{B}(B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)]^{1.4}} = 53.69 \pm 2.75,} \quad (25)$$

$$\boxed{\frac{\mathcal{B}(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu})}{[\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu \bar{\nu})]^{1.4}} = (1.94 \pm 0.13) \times 10^{-3}.} \quad (26)$$

Of particular interest are also SM predictions for the  $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \mu^+ \mu^-$  and  $B_s \rightarrow \phi \mu^+ \mu^-$  branching ratios. In the low  $q^2$  bin they imply the pulls  $(-4.4\sigma)$  and  $(-4.8\sigma)$ , respectively [116]. Both branching ratios are measured to be suppressed relative to the SM predictions. To my knowledge these are the largest anomalies in single branching ratios found in the literature to date. The reason are not only more precise values of CKM parameters used by us than in other papers, but also the most recent form factors from HPQCD lattice collaboration [139, 140].

These findings together with the strong suppression of NP to  $\Delta F = 2$  observables put very strong constraints on NP models attempting to explain these  $B$  physics anomalies and other anomalies like the one in the ratio  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$ . Indeed, despite some controversies, it is likely that the SM prediction for  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$  has to be enhanced by NP to agree with data [141]. Also the most recent SM results for  $\Delta M_K$  from the RBC-UKQCD lattice collaboration [142, 143] are significantly larger than its very precise experimental value although due to large uncertainties this deviation is only around  $2.0\sigma$ .

The question then arises which NP could explain these anomalies without destroying good agreement of the SM with experimental data on the  $\Delta F = 2$  observables. This is the subject of the 3rd movement of this KM symphony.

## 2.3 $Z'$ at Work

### 2.3.1 Kaon Physics without New Physics in $\varepsilon_K$

Concentrating on the  $K$  system, one could at first sight start worrying that the absence of NP in a CP-violating observable like  $\varepsilon_K$  would exclude all NP effects in rare decays governed by CP violation such as  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$ ,  $K_S \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ ,  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \ell^+ \ell^-$  and also in the ratio  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$ . Fortunately, these worries are premature because  $\varepsilon_K$  is governed by CP violation in mixing while the remaining observables are either fully dominated by CP violation in decay (direct CP violation) or significantly affected by it. Indeed, as pointed out already in 2009, in an important paper by Monika Blanke [144], the absence of NP in  $\varepsilon_K$  does not preclude the absence of NP in these observables. This follows from the simple fact that

$$(\varepsilon_K)_{\text{BSM}} \propto [\text{Re}(g_{sd})\text{Im}(g_{sd})], \quad (27)$$

where  $g_{sd}$  is a complex coupling present in a given NP model. Setting  $\text{Re}(g_{sd}) = 0$ , that is making this coupling *imaginary*, eliminates NP contributions to  $\varepsilon_K$ , while still allowing for sizable CP-violating effects in rare decays and  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$ . This choice automatically eliminates the second solution considered in [144] ( $\text{Im}(g_{sd}) = 0$ ), which is clearly less interesting.

These two solutions are exhibited in Fig. 5 through two blue branches on which the correlation between two branching ratios takes place when only LH or RH couplings are present and NP contributions to  $\varepsilon_K$  are strongly suppressed. More details on this figure can be found in [145] where various simplified models have been considered.

A detailed analysis of  $K$  physics without NP in  $\varepsilon_K$  in a simple  $Z'$  model has been presented recently in [146]. It has been demonstrated that indeed significant NP contributions to  $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ ,  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$ ,  $K_S \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ ,  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \ell^+ \ell^-$ ,  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$  and  $\Delta M_K$  can be present despite no NP contributions to  $\varepsilon_K$ . This scenario implies very stringent correlations between the Kaon observables considered by us. In particular, the identification of NP in any of these observables implies automatically NP contributions to the remaining ones under the




Figure 5: Illustrations of common correlations in the  $\mathcal{B}(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu})$  versus  $\mathcal{B}(K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu})$  plane. The expanding red region illustrates the lack of correlation for models with general LH and RH NP couplings. The green region shows the correlation present in models obeying Constrained Minimal Flavour Violation (CMFV). The blue region shows the correlation induced by the constraint from  $\epsilon_K$  if only LH or RH couplings are present. From [145].

assumption of non-vanishing flavour conserving  $Z'$  couplings to  $q\bar{q}$ ,  $\nu\bar{\nu}$ , and  $\mu^+\mu^-$ . A characteristic feature of this scenario is a strict correlation between  $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$  and  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$  branching ratios on a branch parallel to the Grossman-Nir bound [147] pointed out in [144] and therefore usually called Monika Blanke (MB) branch. Moreover,  $\Delta M_K$  is automatically suppressed as it seems to be required by the results of the RBC-UKQCD lattice QCD collaboration [142, 143]. Furthermore, there is no NP contribution to  $K_L \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$  which otherwise would bound NP effects in  $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ . Of particular interest are the correlations of  $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$  and  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$  branching ratios and of  $\Delta M_K$  with the ratio  $\epsilon'/\epsilon$ . These correlations are summarized in Fig. 6, where we show the ratios of total branching ratios to the SM ones as the function of such ratio for  $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ . All ratios shown there are equal unity in the SM.  $R_{\nu\bar{\nu}}^+$  should be measured within 10% accuracy by NA62 collaboration in the coming years and hopefully with the accuracy of 5% still in this decade. Similar comments apply to  $R_{\nu\bar{\nu}}^0$  measured by KOTO. Note that for  $R_{\nu\bar{\nu}}^+ = 1.75$  we predict  $R_{\nu\bar{\nu}}^0 = 10$  but one should realize that in a different NP scenario these correlations could be different.

The parameter  $\kappa_{\epsilon'}$  is defined as follows [148]

$$\frac{\epsilon'}{\epsilon} = \left(\frac{\epsilon'}{\epsilon}\right)^{\text{SM}} + \left(\frac{\epsilon'}{\epsilon}\right)^{\text{BSM}}, \quad \left(\frac{\epsilon'}{\epsilon}\right)^{\text{BSM}} = \kappa_{\epsilon'} \cdot 10^{-3}, \quad 0.0 \leq \kappa_{\epsilon'} \leq 1.2. \quad (28)$$

In the case of  $\epsilon_K$  we allow only for very small NP contributions that could be generated by RG effects despite setting the real part of  $g_{sd}(Z')$  to zero at the NP scale that we take to be equal to  $M_{Z'}$ . Explicitly

$$(\epsilon)^{\text{BSM}} = \kappa_{\epsilon} \cdot 10^{-3}, \quad -0.025 \leq |\kappa_{\epsilon}| \leq 0.025, \quad (29)$$

which amounts to 1% of the experimental value.




Figure 6: The correlations between the  $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$  ratio  $R_{\nu\bar{\nu}}^+$  and various other ratios for other Kaon decays. All ratios are equal unity in the SM. From [146].

It should be noted that some ratios are enhanced so much that in order to show the results in one plot they had to be divided by a suitable factor. This is in particular the case of  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$  and  $K_S \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ .

### 2.3.2 B-Meson Physics without New Physics in $B_{s,d}^0 - \bar{B}_{s,d}^0$ Mixing

The strategy just outlined does not eliminate tree-level NP contributions to  $\Delta M_s$  and  $\Delta M_d$  because they are governed by the absolute values of the mixing amplitudes ( $ij$  are quark flavours)

$$M_{12}^{ij} = (M_{12}^{ij})^{\text{SM}} + M_{12}^{ij}(Z'), \quad (30)$$

with  $ij = bs, bd$  and not by their imaginary parts as is the case of  $\varepsilon_K$ . Therefore in order to remove NP contributions to observables in  $B_{s,d}^0 - \bar{B}_{s,d}^0$  systems at tree-level, we have to remove  $M_{12}^{ij}(Z')$  completely at this level, while keeping the  $Z'bs$  and  $Z'bd$  couplings non-zero which is required for the explanation of the observed anomalies in  $b \rightarrow s \mu^+ \mu^-$  transitions.

This is not possible with a single  $Z'$  gauge boson with only flavour-violating left-handed couplings. At present it appears that there are three possible strategies to solve this problem.

- Allow NP to enter the  $B_{s,d}^0 - \bar{B}_{s,d}^0$  systems at the 5% level and to lower a bit the value of  $|V_{cb}|$  relative to the one in (21). This is necessary in the 331 models as demonstrated recently in [149]. The remarkable feature of some of these models is the prediction of  $\Delta C_9 = -b \Delta C_{10}$  with  $2 \leq b \leq 5$  so that after most recent LHCb results for  $b \rightarrow s \ell^+ \ell^-$  decays [150, 151] and CMS result for  $B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ , the present  $B$  physics anomalies can be explained but NP effects in rare  $K$  decays and  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$  turn out to be small.

- Next, a recent suggestion made in [152]. Including a second  $Z'$  in the model allows to eliminate tree-level contributions to all  $\Delta F = 2$  observables while allowing for significant tree-level contributions to  $K$ ,  $D$  and  $B$  decays, including CP-violating ones. This allows to explain the existing anomalies in  $b \rightarrow s\mu^+\mu^-$  transitions and the anticipated anomaly in the ratio  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$  much easier than in  $Z'$ -Single scenarios because one does not have to worry about constraints from the  $B_{s,d}^0 - \bar{B}_{s,d}^0$  mixings. This strategy can also be used not only for  $B_{s,d}^0 - \bar{B}_{s,d}^0$  mixings but also for  $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$  and  $D^0 - \bar{D}^0$  systems if this turns out to be required. However, while just looking at Feynman diagrams these cancellations of NP contributions to  $\Delta F = 2$  processes can be easily arranged as described below, it is presently unclear whether such a construction can follow from a UV completion and possibly more  $Z'$  gauge bosons than just two are required.
- If the single  $Z'$  has both left-handed and right-handed flavour-violating quark couplings an interplay of the left-left, right-right and left-right  $Z'$  contributions can provide necessary suppression of NP to  $\Delta F = 2$  observables [153–155]. This requires some fine tuning between these three contributions. Fortunately, in the case of  $B$  physics this tuning is much smaller than in the case of  $K$  physics, where this tuning is not required to remove NP from  $\varepsilon_K$  as demonstrated above [146].

Let us briefly discuss the second and the third strategy.

**$Z'$ -Tandem** The proposed  $Z'$ -Tandem mechanism for the elimination of NP contributions to  $B_{s,d}^0 - \bar{B}_{s,d}^0$  mixing [152] bears some similarities to the GIM mechanism for the suppression of the FCNCs in the SM with the role of the charm quark played here by the second  $Z'$ . However, it differs from the latter profoundly in that only NP contributions to quark mixing are eliminated at tree-level, while GIM mechanism removes them from all FCNC processes at tree-level.

Denoting then the quark couplings of these two gauge bosons by

$$\Delta_L^{ij}(Z'_1) = |\Delta_L^{ij}(Z'_1)|e^{i\phi_1^{ij}}, \quad \Delta_L^{ij}(Z'_2) = |\Delta_L^{ij}(Z'_2)|e^{i\phi_2^{ij}}, \quad (31)$$

where  $(i, j)$  are quark flavour indices, either for down-quarks or up-quarks, the two conditions for the removal of the  $Z'_{1,2}$  contributions to  $M_{12}^{ij}$  at tree-level read as follows

$$\boxed{\frac{|\Delta_L^{ij}(Z'_1)|}{M_1} = \frac{|\Delta_L^{ij}(Z'_2)|}{M_2}, \quad \phi_2^{ij} = \phi_1^{ij} + 90^\circ,} \quad (32)$$

with  $M_{1,2}$  being the masses of  $Z'_{1,2}$ .

The following comments should be made.

- The cancellation in question implies the presence of new CP-violating phases which will be visible in  $B$ ,  $K$  and  $D$  decays. The phases  $\phi_1^{ij}$  and  $\phi_2^{ij}$  cannot all vanish simultaneously.
- In case of some signs of NP contributions to  $\Delta F = 2$ , the conditions in (32) could be relaxed. This could turn out to be the case of  $\Delta M_K$  analyzed in a  $Z'$ -Single scenario in [146].

The implied flavour patterns in  $K$  and  $B$  decay observables in this NP scenario have been only briefly discussed in [152]. Here we just mention one difference relative to the single  $Z'$  scenario. The correlation of  $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$  and  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$  branching ratios is predicted to take place *outside* the MB branch. If this turned out to be the case one day and no sign of NP in  $\Delta F = 2$  processes would be observed, this would be a hint for  $Z'$ -Tandem mechanism at work, in particular if the lighter  $Z'$  gauge boson had been discovered already.

Let us summarize the main structure of  $Z'$ -Tandem framework proposed in [152]

- The tandem collaborates to remove NP from quark mixing because NP is not required to fit data. In this manner CKM matrix can be determined without NP infection.
- The NP parameters are then determined exclusively from deviations of experimental results for  $B$ ,  $K$  and  $D$  decays from SM predictions without any worry about  $\Delta F = 2$  constraints. Moreover, only tree-level NP contributions have to be considered because of a very strong suppression of one-loop contributions in this scenario.

Yet, although I mentioned this idea here and I was excited about this solution while writing [152], my excitement decreased by now because it is difficult, if not impossible, to construct a UV completion which would imply such a  $Z'$ -Tandem and satisfy the conditions in (32). Possibly increasing the number of  $Z'$  gauge bosons would be helpful but I leave this for the future and will now describe the simplest solution.

**Right-handed Couplings at Work** Including both left-handed and right-handed couplings of  $Z'$  to quarks one finds the following shifts in the one-loop functions governing  $B_d^0 - \bar{B}_d^0$  and  $B_s^0 - \bar{B}_s^0$  mixings [154]

$$\Delta S(B_d) = 2.38 \left[ \frac{\Delta_L^{bd}(Z')}{V_{td}V_{tb}^*} \right]^2 \left( \frac{3\text{TeV}}{M_{Z'}} \right)^2 z^{bd}, \quad (33)$$

$$\Delta S(B_s) = 2.38 \left[ \frac{\Delta_L^{bs}(Z')}{V_{ts}V_{tb}^*} \right]^2 \left( \frac{3\text{TeV}}{M_{Z'}} \right)^2 z^{bs}, \quad (34)$$

where

$$z^{bq} = \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{\Delta_R^{bq}(Z')}{\Delta_L^{bq}(Z')} \right)^2 + 2\kappa_{bq} \frac{\Delta_R^{bq}(Z')}{\Delta_L^{bq}(Z')} \right], \quad \kappa_{bq} = \frac{\langle \hat{Q}_1^{\text{LR}}(M_{Z'}) \rangle^{bq}}{\langle \hat{Q}_1^{\text{VLL}}(M_{Z'}) \rangle^{bq}}. \quad (35)$$

Here  $\kappa_{bq} \approx -5$  is the ratio of left-left and left-right handronic matrix elements. It follows that for

$$\Delta_R^{bq}(Z') \approx 0.1 \Delta_L^{bq}(Z') \quad (36)$$

$Z'$  contributions to  $B_d^0 - \bar{B}_d^0$  and  $B_s^0 - \bar{B}_s^0$  mixings will be strongly suppressed. Simultaneously, the presence of the right-handed couplings will have some impact on rare  $B$  decays. In the case of  $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$  mixing the corresponding condition reads

$$\Delta_R^{sd}(Z') \approx 0.004 \Delta_L^{bq}(Z'), \quad (37)$$

implying large fine tuning required to remove NP contribution but then also negligible impact of right-handed currents on rare  $K$  decays. Here the solution proposed in [146] should be preferred unless eventually the SM  $\Delta M_K$  will agree with experiment.

The implications of this suppression of NP to  $B_d^0 - \bar{B}_d^0$  and  $B_s^0 - \bar{B}_s^0$  mixings can be tested in  $b \rightarrow s\nu\bar{\nu}$  transitions. Using our strategies together with  $B \rightarrow K$  form factor from HPQCD [139, 140, 156] we find first [116]

$$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow K^+\nu\bar{\nu})_{\text{SM}} = (5.59 \pm 0.31) \times 10^{-6}, \quad \mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow K^{0*}\nu\bar{\nu})_{\text{SM}} = (10.13 \pm 0.92) \times 10^{-6}. \quad (38)$$

The main uncertainty comes then from hadronic form factors that should be known with improved accuracy in coming years. However, we should remark that the result for  $B^+ \rightarrow K^+\nu\bar{\nu}$  includes 10% upward shift from a tree-level contribution pointed out in [157]. Otherwise it would be  $(4.98 \pm 0.31) \times 10^{-6}$ . In fact the latter result should be compared with the very recent result from Belle II:  $(24 \pm 7) \times 10^{-6}$ .

On the other hand the best current experimental bounds [158, 159] are set by the Belle collaboration

$$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow K^+\nu\bar{\nu}) = (24 \pm 7) \times 10^{-6}, \quad (39)$$

$$\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow K^0\nu\bar{\nu}) \leq 2.6 \times 10^{-5} \quad @ 90\% \text{ CL}, \quad (40)$$

$$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow K^{+*}\nu\bar{\nu}) \leq 4.0 \times 10^{-5} \quad @ 90\% \text{ CL}, \quad (41)$$

$$\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow K^{0*}\nu\bar{\nu}) \leq 1.8 \times 10^{-5} \quad @ 90\% \text{ CL}. \quad (42)$$

Defining

$$\mathcal{R}_{K\nu\nu} = \frac{\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow K\nu\bar{\nu})}{\mathcal{B}_{\text{SM}}(B \rightarrow K\nu\bar{\nu})}, \quad \mathcal{R}_{K^*\nu\nu} = \frac{\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow K^*\nu\bar{\nu})}{\mathcal{B}_{\text{SM}}(B \rightarrow K^*\nu\bar{\nu})}, \quad (43)$$

we have [160–163]

$$\mathcal{R}_{K\nu\nu} = (1 - 2\eta)\epsilon^2, \quad \mathcal{R}_{K^*\nu\nu} = (1 + \kappa_\eta\eta)\epsilon^2, \quad \mathcal{R}_{F_L}^\nu \equiv \frac{F_L}{F_L^{\text{SM}}} = \frac{1 + 2\eta}{1 + \kappa_\eta\eta}, \quad (44)$$

where

$$\epsilon = \frac{\sqrt{|C_L^\nu|^2 + |C_R^\nu|^2}}{|(C_L^\nu)^{\text{SM}}|}, \quad \eta = \frac{-\text{Re}(C_L^\nu C_R^{\nu*})}{|C_L^\nu|^2 + |C_R^\nu|^2}, \quad (45)$$

such that  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $\eta$  lies in the range  $[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$ .  $\epsilon = 1$  in the SM and  $\eta \neq 0$  signals the presence of right-handed currents. Presently  $\kappa_\eta = 1.33 \pm 0.05$ .  $F_L$  is the  $K^*$  longitudinal polarization fraction. For recent extensive analyses of dineutrino modes see [164–170].

The correlations between the ratios  $\mathcal{R}_{K\nu\nu}$  and  $\mathcal{R}_{K^*\nu\nu}$  with the corresponding ratios with  $\mu\bar{\mu}$  for various  $Z'$  couplings can be found in Figure 5 of [163]. Due to the dominance of left-handed  $Z'$  couplings over right-handed ones, as given in (36) in the present case, one finds anti-correlation between  $\nu\bar{\nu}$  and  $\mu\mu$  channels. The observed suppression of  $\mathcal{R}_{K\mu\mu}$  and  $\mathcal{R}_{K^*\mu\mu}$  below unity implies then the enhancements of  $\mathcal{R}_{K\nu\nu}$  and  $\mathcal{R}_{K^*\nu\nu}$  above unity. A detailed updated numerical analysis of these correlations should appear soon [171].

## 2.4 Cabibbo Angle Anomaly and the Unitarity of the CKM Matrix

There was recently a large activity in connection with the so-called Cabibbo Angle Anomaly (CAA) which is nicely reviewed in [172]. There exist tensions between different determinations of the elements  $|V_{us}|$  and  $|V_{ud}|$  in the CKM matrix from different decays. For instance,

the determination of  $|V_{ud}|$  from superallowed beta decays and of  $|V_{us}|$  from kaon decays imply a violation of the first row unitarity in the CKM matrix. There exist also tensions between determinations of  $|V_{us}|$  from leptonic  $K_{\mu 2}$  and semileptonic  $K_{l3}$  kaon decays. In the end a  $3\sigma$  deficit in the CKM unitarity relation corresponding to the first row of this matrix and less significant for the first column exist:

$$|V_{ud}|^2 + |V_{us}|^2 + |V_{ub}|^2 = 0.9985(5), \quad |V_{ud}|^2 + |V_{cd}|^2 + |V_{td}|^2 = 0.9970(18). \quad (46)$$

As reviewed in [172] numerous authors made efforts in the literature to find the origin of this anomaly and to remove it with the help of NP models containing  $W'$ , vector-like leptons, vector-like quarks, scalars,  $Z'$  gauge boson and leptoquarks.

Here we want to emphasize the following points:

- In the *absence* of new quarks, that must be vector-like, CKM unitarity *cannot* be violated. The violation in this case is only apparent due to possible contributions of bosons like  $Z'$  to decays used in the determination of  $|V_{ud}|$  and  $|V_{us}|$  or due to hadronic uncertainties or wrong measurements. Otherwise GIM mechanism would fail and moreover at one-loop level, as illustrated below, gauge dependences would be present.
- In the *presence* of vector-like quarks CKM unitarity *can* be violated with the CKM matrix being submatrix of a unitary matrix involving SM quarks and vector-like quarks. Adding then diagrams with quark and vector-like quark exchanges the GIM mechanism is recovered.

Let us illustrate this problem repeating the 1974 Gaillard-Lee calculation [3] of the  $K_L - K_S$  mass difference in the SM that was performed in the Feynman gauge.

The basic formula for the relevant Hamiltonian used to calculate  $\Delta M_K$  in the SM that allows to reach our goal can be found in equation (6.67) in [19]. It reads

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}}^{ij} = \frac{G_F^2}{16\pi^2} M_W^2 \lambda_i \lambda_j \left[ \left(1 + \frac{x_i x_j}{4}\right) T(x_i, x_j) - 2x_i x_j \tilde{T}(x_i, x_j) \right] (\bar{s}d)_{V-A} (\bar{s}d)_{V-A}, \quad (47)$$

with

$$\lambda_i = V_{is}^* V_{id}, \quad x_i = \frac{m_i^2}{M_W^2}, \quad i = u, c, t, \quad (48)$$

where  $V_{ij}$  are the elements of the CKM matrix. The functions  $T(x_i, x_j)$  and  $\tilde{T}(x_i, x_j)$  are given as follows

$$T(x_i, x_j) = \left[ \frac{x_i^2 \log x_i}{(1-x_i)^2(x_i-x_j)} + \frac{x_j^2 \log x_j}{(1-x_j)^2(x_j-x_i)} + \frac{1}{(1-x_i)(1-x_j)} \right], \quad (49)$$

$$T(x_i, x_i) = \left[ \frac{2x_i \log x_i}{(1-x_i)^3} + \frac{1+x_i}{(1-x_i)^2} \right], \quad (50)$$

$$\tilde{T}(x_i, x_j) = \left[ \frac{x_i \log x_i}{(1-x_i)^2(x_i-x_j)} + \frac{x_j \log x_j}{(1-x_j)^2(x_j-x_i)} + \frac{1}{(1-x_i)(1-x_j)} \right], \quad (51)$$

$$\tilde{T}(x_i, x_i) = \left[ \frac{(1+x_i) \log x_i}{(1-x_i)^3} + \frac{2}{(1-x_i)^2} \right]. \quad (52)$$

Detailed derivation of these formulae can be found in Section 6.2 of [19].

Summing over the internal up-quarks and using the relation

$$\lambda_u + \lambda_c + \lambda_t = 0, \quad (53)$$

that follows from the unitarity of the CKM matrix, we find the well known SM expressions. For our purposes it is sufficient to keep only the term involving  $\lambda_c^2$  because this term dominates the SM contribution to  $\Delta M_K$ . Using the standard formulae one finds then

$$\Delta M_K = \frac{G_F^2}{6\pi^2} \hat{B}_K F_K^2 M_W^2 \eta_1 \lambda_c^2 x_c, \quad (54)$$

where the mass of the up-quark has been set to zero.  $\eta_1$  is known at NNLO in QCD and is subject to a large uncertainty but this is not relevant for our main argument. Other factors are also well known.

On the other hand, not using (53) and keeping only mass-independent terms and  $\mathcal{O}(m_c^2/M_W^2)$  terms we find

$$\Delta M_K = 2.52 T(x_c) 10^{-10} \text{ GeV} \quad (55)$$

where

$$T(x_c) = (\lambda_u + \lambda_c)^2 + \lambda_c^2 F_1(x_c) + 2\lambda_u \lambda_c F_2(x_c) \quad (56)$$

with

$$F_1(x_c) = 2x_c \log x_c + 3x_c, \quad F_2(x_c) = x_c \log x_c + x_c. \quad (57)$$

Going back to 1974 and using the unitarity relation valid for two quark generations

$$\lambda_u + \lambda_c = 0, \quad (58)$$

instead of (53), we find  $T(x_c) = \lambda_c^2 x_c$  and consequently (54). However, if this relation is violated because of the CAA, the first mass independent contribution and in particular the logarithmic terms, that do not cancel each other, have a large impact on the final result. Indeed we find

$$F_1(x_c) = -41.4 \cdot 10^{-4} + 7.5 \cdot 10^{-4} = -33.9 \cdot 10^{-4}, \quad (59)$$

$$F_2(x_c) = -20.7 \cdot 10^{-4} + 2.5 \cdot 10^{-4} = -18.2 \cdot 10^{-4}. \quad (60)$$

We observe that the unitarity relation (58) is very important in cancelling the logarithmic terms that are roughly by an order of magnitude larger than the SM result for  $\Delta M_K$ . But also the modification due to the first term in (56), that is not mass suppressed, is important.

However, these are minor problems in comparison with the fact that these results are gauge dependent and the ones just presented correspond to the Feynman gauge with the gauge parameter  $\xi = 1$ . Concentrating on the massless limit and repeating the calculation in an arbitrary covariant gauge we find

$$T(0) = (\lambda_u + \lambda_c)^2 \left[ 1 - 2 \left( 1 + \frac{\xi}{1-\xi} \ln \xi \right) + \frac{1}{4} \left( 1 + \xi + \frac{2\xi}{1-\xi} \ln \xi \right) \right]. \quad (61)$$

We note that for  $\xi = 1$  we reproduce (56) for  $x_c = 0$  and that in the unitary gauge for which  $\xi \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $T(0)$  diverges. It vanishes only if the unitarity relation in (58) is imposed, the crucial property in the GIM mechanism.

Let us next return to the SM and consider three generations and the  $B_{s,d}^0 - \bar{B}_{s,d}^0$  mass differences  $\Delta M_{s,d}$ . In this case the well known unitarity relations apply

$$\lambda_u + \lambda_c + \lambda_t = 0, \quad \lambda_i = V_{ib}^* V_{iq}, \quad q = s, d. \quad (62)$$

If these relations are violated the results for  $\Delta M_{s,d}$  are gauge dependent and divergent in the unitary gauge. In fact this has been demonstrated already in 2004 [173] in the context of the analysis in the littlest Higgs Model in which CKM unitarity is violated due to the presence of a heavy vector-like quark  $T$  that mixes with the ordinary quarks.

In order to obtain gauge independent and finite results the CKM unitarity relation in (62) should be replaced by the new one that reads

$$\hat{\lambda}_u + \hat{\lambda}_c + \hat{\lambda}_t + \hat{\lambda}_T = 0 \quad \hat{\lambda}_i = \hat{V}_{ib}^* \hat{V}_{iq}, \quad q = s, d, \quad (63)$$

with  $\hat{V}_{ij}$  containing corrections from the mixing with  $T$  in question. Explicit formulae for  $\hat{V}_{ij}$  are given in [173]. To my knowledge this was the first paper which explicitly demonstrated that only after the imposition of this unitarity relation the divergences in the unitary gauge could be removed.

But now comes an important point made in [173]. In order for the relation in (63) to be effective it is crucial to include box diagrams involving both SM quarks and the vector-like quark  $T$  in addition to the usual box-diagrams involving ordinary quarks only and the ones that involve  $T$  only. This is evident from the expressions above and applies to all VLQ models. More recent calculations of this type in the context of vector-like models can be found in [174–177]. Most recent extensive review of the vector-like quarks can be found in [178] and in Chapter 16.3 of [19].

## 3 Dirac vs. Majorana in Rare $K$ and $B$ Decays

### 3.1 Preliminaries

Most of the analyses of  $K \rightarrow \pi \nu \bar{\nu}$  and  $B \rightarrow K(K^*) \nu \bar{\nu}$  decays in the literature assume that neutrinos are Dirac particles and consequently the conservation of the lepton number (LNC). This implies, as we have seen in Section 2.3, certain patterns of the correlations between  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$  and  $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$  branching ratios that depend on the NP scenario considered. Analogous correlations are found between branching ratios for  $B \rightarrow K \nu \bar{\nu}$  and  $B \rightarrow K^* \nu \bar{\nu}$  decays [162, 163]. In certain models correlations between all four decays are present. The question then arises how these correlations would be modified if neutrinos were Majorana particles.

Recently, the role of lepton number violating (LNV) scalar operators and specifically of Majorana neutrinos in the four decays in question has been addressed in a number of papers [179–182]. The main goal of these papers was to derive a number of useful formulae for the new contributions to  $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$  and  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$  that are represented by a single dimension-7 operator within the SM effective field theory (SMEFT). Having these formulae it was possible to derive the bounds on NP scale setting the relevant couplings to unity. Moreover in [180, 181] kinematic distributions for  $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$  and  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$  have been

demonstrated to be sensitive probes of LNV. A comprehensive survey of dimension-7 SMEFT operators in the context of LNV has been recently presented in [183].

Here I would like to report briefly preliminary results from a recent work [184] in collaboration with Julia Harz that developed new efficient strategies that would allow the experimentalists of NA62, KOTO and Belle II collaborations to tell us one day whether the footprints of Majorana neutrinos are present in their data. The major role in these strategies play the distributions in  $s$ , the invariant mass-squared of the neutrino system, that allow the separation of vector current (Dirac) contributions to all these decays from the scalar (Majorana) ones. Here we summarize the main results of this analysis.

### 3.2 $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ and $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$

Let us denote the Wilson coefficients representing vector and scalar operators as follows

$$C_V = |C_{\text{SM}}|e^{i\phi_{\text{SM}}} + |C_V^{\text{NP}}|e^{i\phi_V}, \quad C_S = |C_S|e^{i\phi_S}. \quad (64)$$

The outcome of the numerical analysis in our paper is presented in Fig. 7. In the upper plot we show the action of a pure NP *vector* contribution with  $C_S = 0$  in the  $\mathcal{B}(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}) - \mathcal{B}(K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu})$ -plane. In the lower plot we show the corresponding impact of a pure NP *scalar* contribution with  $C_V = 0$ . In both cases the SM contribution is represented by a dark point, the central experimental value of  $\mathcal{B}(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu})$  by a vertical black line and the GN bound by a red line.

Let us summarize the main observations concerning the above relations and the resulting plots in Fig. 7.

- The cases  $\phi_V = \pi/2$  (*green*) and  $\phi_V = 0$  (*blue*) are the two branches pointed out in [144] and discussed by us already in Section 2.3.1. For  $0 < \phi_V < \pi/2$  the correlation between the two branching ratios takes place on lines between the two branches found above with the slopes *increasing* with increasing  $\phi_V$ . The black solid line in the upper plot represents the case of Minimal Flavour Violation (MFV).
- The novel feature is the impact of pure *scalar* contributions shown in the lower part of Fig. 7. While for  $\phi_V = 0$  the NP vector contribution to  $\mathcal{B}(K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu})$  vanishes, in the scalar case it is maximal for  $\phi_S = 0$ . For a non-vanishing  $\phi_S$  the correlation between the two branching ratios proceeds on a line which is not parallel to the GN line but which has a slope which *decreases*, as opposed to the vector case, with increasing  $\phi_S$  for  $0 \leq \phi_S \leq 90^\circ$ .
- When comparing the two plots in Fig. 7, it becomes clear that a scalar contribution can only increase the branching ratios, while a vector contribution can also decrease them with respect to the SM model expectation. The scalar contribution is solely confined between the green ( $\phi_S = \pi/2$ ) and blue ( $\phi_S = 0$ ) lines, and does not extend to the parameter space where for example the yellow curve ( $\phi_V = 6/5\pi$ ) in the upper part in Fig. 7 is found. Hence a deviation from the SM to lower values would point towards a NP vector contribution, while excluding a NP contribution from a LNV scalar current *only*.
- When allowing for all four non-vanishing NP parameters

$$|C_V|, \quad \phi_V, \quad |C_S|, \quad \phi_S \quad (65)$$




Figure 7:  $\mathcal{B}(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}) - \mathcal{B}(K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu})$ -plane for the case of pure NP vector contribution with  $C_S = 0$  (top) and pure NP scalar contributions with  $C_V = 0$  (bottom). The red line indicates the Grossmann-Nir bound. The SM contribution is represented by a dark point. Additionally, we allow for NP contributions with  $\phi_V$  and  $\phi_S$  fixed to specific values and varying  $C_V$  and  $C_S$ , respectively. The grey region represents the present experimental  $1\sigma$  range. From [184].

at the same time, all the parameter space below the Grossmann-Nir bound (red solid line) in the  $\mathcal{B}(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}) - \mathcal{B}(K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu})$ -plane is possible, while a pure scalar NP contribution is confined to the area between the blue and green lines in the lower part in Fig. 7. Hence when measuring lower  $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$  and  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$  branching ratios than expected in the SM, a scalar current can only be present with an additional vector contribution.

These results demonstrate very clearly the different impact of vector and scalar contributions on the  $\mathcal{B}(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}) - \mathcal{B}(K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu})$ -plane. But they also make clear that the branching ratios alone will not allow us to identify a possible underlying vector or scalar current. Fortunately, as pointed out already in [179–181] this is possible with the help of kinematic distributions for  $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$  and  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$ , in particular with the help of the distributions in  $s$ , the invariant mass-squared of the neutrino system. They indeed allow the separation of vector current contributions from scalar ones without specifying a NP model.

A first look in this direction has been made in [179–181]. Here, I summarize the results obtained in collaboration with Julia Harz.

In Fig. 8, we depict the differential distribution of  $\Gamma(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\nu\bar{\nu})/ds$  (upper plot) and  $\Gamma(K_L \rightarrow \pi^0\nu\bar{\nu})/ds$  (lower plot) normalized to the total experimental decay width  $\Gamma_{K^+}^{\text{Exp}}$  and  $\Gamma_{K_L}^{\text{Exp}}$ , respectively. We show the expected SM contribution by the black dashed line. For the red (green) line we have assumed an additional scalar (vector) contribution besides the SM contribution, leading to a NP signal around the current experimental upper limit  $\mathcal{B}(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\nu\bar{\nu}) = 1.55 \times 10^{-10}$ . For the vector contribution a phase of  $\phi_V = \pi/2$  was chosen. For the scalar contribution (red) we fix  $\phi_S = 0$ , leading to the maximal contribution to  $\mathcal{B}(K_L \rightarrow \pi^0\nu\bar{\nu})$ . The following observations can be made:

- While the vector contribution follows the shape of the SM contribution, the scalar contribution features a distinct distribution, clearly different from the vector one, in particular for larger  $s$ . Even within the current possible range for NP (limited by the current experimental upper limit  $\mathcal{B}(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\nu\bar{\nu}) = 1.55 \times 10^{-10}$ ), the difference is strong enough to be visible in the distribution.
- Interestingly, we find that the scalar differential distribution  $\Gamma(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\nu\bar{\nu})/ds$  turns out to be independent of the scalar phase  $\phi_S$ , while  $\Gamma(K_L \rightarrow \pi^0\nu\bar{\nu})/ds$  is. Hence, for different  $\phi_S$ ,  $\Gamma(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\nu\bar{\nu})/ds$  does not change, while  $\Gamma(K_L \rightarrow \pi^0\nu\bar{\nu})/ds$  does. While it is maximal for  $\phi_S = 0$ , it follows the SM line for  $\phi_S = \pi/2$ . Therefore, a combined analysis of the differential distributions for  $\Gamma(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\nu\bar{\nu})$  and  $\Gamma(K_L \rightarrow \pi^0\nu\bar{\nu})$  is very powerful. In case  $\Gamma(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\nu\bar{\nu})$  would give a hint towards a new scalar contribution, a comparison with  $\Gamma(K_L \rightarrow \pi^0\nu\bar{\nu})$  could tell us if it features a non-zero scalar phase  $\phi_S$ .

### 3.3 $B \rightarrow K\nu\bar{\nu}$ and $B \rightarrow K^*\nu\bar{\nu}$

While the search for the footprints of Majorana neutrinos can also be done in this case with the help of  $s$ -distributions, it can also be performed with integrated quantities. To this end the following two model-independent relations pointed out in [163] can be used. The first one is

$$\langle F_L \rangle = \langle F_L^{\text{SM}} \rangle \left( \frac{(\kappa_\eta - 2)\mathcal{R}_{K\nu\nu} + 4\mathcal{R}_{K^*\nu\nu}}{(\kappa_\eta + 2)\mathcal{R}_{K^*\nu\nu}} \right) r_1^{\text{LNV}} \quad (66)$$

with  $\mathcal{R}_{K\nu\nu}$  and  $\mathcal{R}_{K^*\nu\nu}$  defined in (43). It is given here in the integrated form, but in principle it can be tested experimentally also on a bin-by-bin basis. It is valid in the presence of LFV and lepton flavour universality violation. As pointed out by us this relation is violated in the presence of lepton number violating (LNV) contributions which we indicated by introducing a new parameter  $r_1^{\text{LNV}}$  that equals unity in the case of lepton number conserving (LNC) contributions but differs from it in the case of LNV contributions, that is scalar contributions in our case. That this relation is violated in the presence of scalar contributions follows simply from the fact that the three observables in (44) depend only on two parameters  $\epsilon$  and  $\eta$ . The presence of scalar contributions introduces new parameters and the relation in (66) with  $r_1^{\text{LNV}} = 1$  does not apply any longer.

A similar relation can be obtained for the modification of the inclusive  $B \rightarrow X_s\nu\bar{\nu}$




Figure 8: Differential distribution of  $\Gamma(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu})/ds$  (upper plot) and  $\Gamma(K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu})/ds$  (lower plot) normalized to the total experimental decay width  $\Gamma_{K^+}^{\text{Exp}}$  and  $\Gamma_{K_L}^{\text{Exp}}$ , respectively. The SM contribution only is depicted in black dashed. For the red (green) line we have assumed an additional scalar (vector) contribution besides the SM contribution, leading to a NP signal around the current experimental upper limit  $\mathcal{B}(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}) = 1.55 \times 10^{-10}$ . For the vector contribution a phase of  $\phi_V = \pi/2$  was chosen. From [184].

branching ratio [163],

$$\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow X_s \nu \bar{\nu}) = \mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow X_s \nu \bar{\nu})_{\text{SM}} \left( \frac{\kappa_\eta \mathcal{R}_{K\nu\nu} + 2 \mathcal{R}_{K^*\nu\nu} + 0.09(\mathcal{R}_{K^*\nu\nu} - \mathcal{R}_{K\nu\nu})}{\kappa_\eta + 2} \right) r_2^{\text{LNV}}. \quad (67)$$

The new parameter  $r_2^{\text{LNV}}$  introduced here again allows to describe the effects of LNV contributions and equals unity in the LNC case.

We emphasize again that the relations (66) and (67) hold even in the case of lepton flavour non-universality and lepton flavour violation. Consequently, a violation of either of them unambiguously signals either the presence of particles other than neutrinos in the final state (as discussed e.g. in [162, 185]) or Majorana neutrinos. Detailed new analysis should be presented soon [184]

## 4 $\Delta I = 1/2$ rule and $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$

### 4.1 QCD dynamics and the $\Delta I = 1/2$ rule

One of the puzzles of the 1950s was a large disparity between the measured values of the real parts of the isospin amplitudes  $A_0$  and  $A_2$  in  $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$  decays, which on the basis of usual isospin considerations were expected to be of the same order.

In 2023 we know the experimental values of the real parts of these amplitudes very precisely [186]

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Re}A_0 &= 27.04(1) \times 10^{-8} \text{ GeV}, \\ \text{Re}A_2 &= 1.210(2) \times 10^{-8} \text{ GeV}. \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

As  $\text{Re}A_2$  is dominated by  $\Delta I = 3/2$  transitions but  $\text{Re}A_0$  receives contributions also from  $\Delta I = 1/2$  transitions, the latter transitions dominate  $\text{Re}A_0$  which expresses the so-called  $\Delta I = 1/2$  rule [187, 188]

$$R = \frac{\text{Re}A_0}{\text{Re}A_2} = 22.35. \quad (69)$$

Soon after the discovery of asymptotic freedom in 1973 Altarelli and Maiani [100] and Gaillard and Lee [101] made a first unsuccessful attempt to explain this huge enhancement through short distance QCD effects. As we already reported, the precision of the calculation of the short distance contributions increased considerably in the last fifty years since this first pioneering calculation. The basic QCD dynamics behind this rule - contained in the hadronic matrix elements of current-current operators - has been identified analytically first in 1986 in the framework of the Dual QCD in [189] with some improvements in 2014 [190]. This has been confirmed more than 30 years later by the RBC-UKQCD collaboration [191] although the modest accuracy of both approaches still allows for some NP contributions. See [141] for the most recent summary. Despite this summary it is appropriate to describe here briefly the present situation of this important rule that is governed by QCD dynamics.

Let us then start by evaluating the simple  $W^\pm$  boson exchange between the relevant quarks which after integrating out  $W^\pm$  generates the current-current operator  $Q_2$ :

$$Q_2 = (\bar{s}\gamma_\mu(1 - \gamma_5)u) (\bar{u}\gamma^\mu(1 - \gamma_5)d). \quad (70)$$

With only  $Q_2$  contributing we have

$$\text{Re}A_{0,2} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{ud} V_{us}^* \langle Q_2 \rangle_{0,2}. \quad (71)$$

Calculating the matrix elements  $\langle Q_2 \rangle_{0,2}$  in the strict large  $N$  limit, which corresponds to factorization of matrix elements of  $Q_2$  into the product of matrix elements of currents, we find

$$\langle Q_2 \rangle_0 = \sqrt{2} \langle Q_2 \rangle_2 = \frac{2}{3} F_\pi (m_K^2 - m_\pi^2), \quad (72)$$

with  $F_\pi$  being pion weak decay constant and consequently

$$\text{Re}A_0 = 3.59 \times 10^{-8} \text{ GeV}, \quad \text{Re}A_2 = 2.54 \times 10^{-8} \text{ GeV}, \quad R = \sqrt{2}, \quad (73)$$

in plain disagreement with the data in (68) and (69).

It should be emphasized that the explanation of the missing enhancement factor of 15.8 in  $R$  through some dynamics must simultaneously give the correct values for  $\text{Re}A_0$  and  $\text{Re}A_2$ . This means that this dynamics should suppress  $\text{Re}A_2$  by a factor of 2.1, not more, and enhance  $\text{Re}A_0$  by a factor of 7.5. This tells us that while the suppression of  $\text{Re}A_2$  is an important ingredient in the  $\Delta I = 1/2$  rule, it is not the main origin of this rule. It is the enhancement of  $\text{Re}A_0$  as already emphasized in [192]. However, in contrast to this paper, the current-current operators, like  $Q_2$ , are responsible dominantly for this rule and not QCD penguins. This was pointed out first in 1986 [189] and demonstrated in the context of the Dual QCD approach. An update and improvements over the 1986 analysis appeared in 2014 [190] with the result

$$R \approx 16.0 \pm 1.5, \quad \text{DQCD (1986, 2014)}, \quad (74)$$

that is one order of magnitude enhancement over the result in (73) without QCD up to confinement of quarks in mesons. The missing piece could come from final state interactions as stressed in particular by ChPT experts [193]. Also  $1/N^2$  corrections could change this result but are unknown.

Meanwhile the RBC-UKQCD LQCD collaboration confirmed in 2012 the 1986 DQCD finding that current-current operators dominate the  $\Delta I = 1/2$  rule. But the results from the series of their three papers show how difficult these calculations on the lattice are:  $R = 12.0 \pm 1.7$  [194],  $R = 31.0 \pm 11.1$  [195] and finally [191]

$$\frac{\text{Re}A_0}{\text{Re}A_2} = 19.9(2.3)(4.4), \quad \text{RBC - UKQCD (2020)} \quad (75)$$

that is consistent with the DQCD value and in agreement with the experimental value 22.4. While the RBC-UKQCD result is closer to the data than the DQCD one, the dynamics behind this rule, except for the statement that it is QCD, has not been provided by these authors. To this end it is necessary to switch off QCD interactions which can be done in the large  $N$  limit in DQCD but it seems to be impossible or very difficult on the lattice.

The anatomy of QCD dynamics as seen within the DQCD approach has been presented in [189, 190] and in particular in Section 7.2.3 of [19]. Here we just present an express view of this dynamics.

Starting with the values in (73), the first step is to include the short-distance RG-evolution of Wilson Coefficients (WCs) from scales  $\mathcal{O}(M_W)$  down to scales in the ballpark of

1 GeV. This is the step made already in the pioneering 1974 calculations in [100,101] except that they were done at LO in the RG-improved perturbation theory and now can be done at the NLO level. These 1974 papers have shown that the short distance QCD effects enhance  $\text{Re}A_0$  and suppress  $\text{Re}A_2$ . However, the inclusion of NLO QCD corrections to WCs of  $Q_2$  and  $Q_1$  operators [33,45] made it clear, as stressed in particular in [33], that the  $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$  amplitudes without the proper calculation of hadronic matrix elements of  $Q_i$  are both scale and renormalization-scheme dependent. Moreover, further enhancement of  $\text{Re}A_0$  and further suppression of  $\text{Re}A_2$  are needed in order to be able to understand the  $\Delta I = 1/2$  rule.

This brings us to the second step first performed in 1986 in [189] within the DQCD approach. Namely, the RG-evolution down to the scales  $\mathcal{O}(1 \text{ GeV})$  is continued as a short but fast *meson evolution* down to zero momentum scales at which the factorization of hadronic matrix elements is at work and one can in no time calculate the hadronic matrix elements in terms of meson masses and weak decay constants as seen in (72). Equivalently, starting with factorizable hadronic matrix elements of current-current operators at  $\mu \approx 0$  and evolving them to  $\mu = \mathcal{O}(1 \text{ GeV})$  at which the WCs are evaluated one is able to calculate the matrix elements of these operators at  $\mu = \mathcal{O}(1 \text{ GeV})$  and properly combine them with their WCs evaluated at this scale. The final step is the inclusion of QCD penguin operators that provide an additional enhancement of  $A_0$  by roughly 10% without changing  $A_2$ .

In [189] only the pseudoscalar meson contributions to meson evolution have been included and the *quark evolution*, RG evolution above  $\mu = \mathcal{O}(1 \text{ GeV})$ , has been performed at LO. The improvements in 2014 [190] were the inclusion of vector meson contributions to the meson evolution and the NLO corrections to quark evolution. These improvements practically removed scale and renormalization-scheme dependences and brought the theory closer to data.

Based on DQCD and RBC-UKQCD results we conclude that the QCD dynamics is dominantly responsible for the  $\Delta I = 1/2$  rule. However, in view of large uncertainties in both DQCD and RBC-UKQCD results, NP contributions at the level of 15% could still be present. See [153] to find out what this NP could be.

Finally other authors suggested different explanations of the  $\Delta I = 1/2$  rule within QCD that were published dominantly in the 1990s and their list can be found in [19]. But in my view the DQCD picture of what is going on is more beautiful and transparent as asymptotic freedom and related non-factorizable QCD interactions are primarily responsible for this rule. It is simply the *quark evolution* from  $M_W$  down to scale  $\mathcal{O}(1 \text{ GeV})$  as analysed first by Altarelli and Maiani [100] and Gaillard and Lee [101], followed by the *meson evolution* [189,190] down to very low scales at which QCD becomes a theory of weakly interacting mesons and a free theory of mesons in the strict large  $N$  limit, a point made by 'tHooft and Witten in the 1970s.

## 4.2 QCD Dynamics and the Ratio $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$

While the parameter  $\varepsilon \equiv \varepsilon_K$  measures the indirect CP-violation in  $K_L \rightarrow \pi\pi$  decays, that is originating in the  $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$  mixing, the parameter  $\varepsilon'$  describes the direct CP violation, that is in the decay itself.

The story of  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$  both in the theory and experiment has been described in detail in [196]. On the experimental side the chapter on  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$  seems to be closed for the near future. After heroic efforts, lasting 15 years, the experimental world average of  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$  from NA48 [197] and

KTeV [198, 199] collaborations reads

$$(\varepsilon'/\varepsilon)_{\text{exp}} = (16.6 \pm 2.3) \times 10^{-4}. \quad (76)$$

On the theoretical side the first calculation of  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$  that included RG QCD effects to QCD penguin (QC DP) contributions is due to Gilman and Wise [200] who - following Shifman, Vainshtein and Zakharov [192] - assumed that the  $\Delta I = 1/2$  rule is explained by QC DP. Using the required values of the QC DP matrix elements for the explanation of this rule, they predicted  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$  to be in the ballpark of  $5 \times 10^{-2}$ . During the 1980s this value decreased by roughly a factor of 50 dominantly due to three effects:

- The first calculation of hadronic matrix elements of QC DP operators in QCD, carried out in the framework of the DQCD [189, 201, 202] in the strict large  $N$  limit of colours, demonstrated, as already stated above, that QC DPs are not responsible for the  $\Delta I = 1/2$  rule and their hadronic matrix elements are much smaller than used in Gilman-Wise calculation.
- The QC DP contribution to  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$  through isospin breaking in the quark masses [203, 204] is significantly suppressed.
- The suppression of  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$  by electroweak penguin (EWP) contributions, that enter  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$  with the opposite sign to QC DP's contribution, is increased by the large top quark mass [110, 111].

In the 1990s these calculations have been refined through NLO QCD calculations to both QC DP and EWP contributions by the Munich and Rome teams: [35–37, 43] and [38, 39], respectively. In [44] the NNLO QCD effects on EWP contributions have been calculated. The NNLO QCD effects on QC DP contributions are expected to be known in 2023.

These NLO and NNLO QCD contributions decreased various scale and renormalization-scheme uncertainties and suppressed  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$  within the SM further so that already in 2000 we knew that this ratio should be of the order of  $1.0 \times 10^{-3}$ . Unfortunately even today the theorists do not agree on whether the SM agrees with the experimental value in (76) or not. The reason are different estimates of non-perturbative hadronic QCD effects. This has been summarized recently in [141]. We recall only the main points below.

$\varepsilon'$  is governed by the real and imaginary parts of the isospin amplitudes  $A_0$  and  $A_2$  so that  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$  is given by [205]

$$\frac{\varepsilon'}{\varepsilon} = -\frac{\omega_+}{\sqrt{2}|\varepsilon|} \left[ \frac{\text{Im}A_0}{\text{Re}A_0} (1 - \hat{\Omega}_{\text{eff}}) - \frac{1}{a} \frac{\text{Im}A_2}{\text{Re}A_2} \right], \quad (77)$$

with  $(\omega_+, a)$  and  $\hat{\Omega}_{\text{eff}}$  given in 2023 as follows

$$\omega_+ = a \frac{\text{Re}A_2}{\text{Re}A_0} = (4.53 \pm 0.02) \times 10^{-2} \quad (78)$$

with  $a = 1.017$  and

$$\hat{\Omega}_{\text{eff}} = (29 \pm 7) \times 10^{-2}. \quad (79)$$

Here  $a$  and  $\hat{\Omega}_{\text{eff}}$  summarize isospin breaking corrections and include strong isospin violation ( $m_u \neq m_d$ ), the correction to the isospin limit coming from  $\Delta I = 5/2$  transitions and

electromagnetic corrections [206–208]. The most recent value for  $\hat{\Omega}_{\text{eff}}$  given above includes the nonet of pseudoscalar mesons and  $\eta - \eta'$  mixing [209]. If only the octet of pseudoscalar mesons is included so that  $\eta - \eta'$  mixing does not enter, as presently done in ChPT, one finds  $\hat{\Omega}_{\text{eff}} = (17 \pm 9) 10^{-2}$  [210], a value called  $\hat{\Omega}_{\text{eff}}^{(8)}$  here. The inclusion of  $\eta - \eta'$  mixing yields  $\hat{\Omega}_{\text{eff}}^{(9)}$  in (79). This contribution is important, a fact known already for 35 years [203, 204].

In the SM  $\text{Im}A_0$  receives dominantly contributions from QCDP but also from EWP. The contributions from the chromo-magnetic penguins turn out to be negligible [211, 212].  $\text{Im}A_2$  receives contributions exclusively from EWP. Keeping this in mind it is useful to write [213]

$$\left(\frac{\varepsilon'}{\varepsilon}\right)_{\text{SM}} = \left(\frac{\varepsilon'}{\varepsilon}\right)_{\text{QCDP}} - \left(\frac{\varepsilon'}{\varepsilon}\right)_{\text{EWP}} \quad (80)$$

with

$$\left(\frac{\varepsilon'}{\varepsilon}\right)_{\text{QCDP}} = \text{Im}\lambda_t \cdot (1 - \hat{\Omega}_{\text{eff}}) [15.4 B_6^{(1/2)}(\mu^*) - 2.9], \quad (81)$$

$$\left(\frac{\varepsilon'}{\varepsilon}\right)_{\text{EWP}} = \text{Im}\lambda_t \cdot [8.0 B_8^{(3/2)}(\mu^*) - 2.0]. \quad (82)$$

This formula includes NLO QCD corrections to the QCDP contributions and NNLO contributions to EWP ones mentioned previously. The coefficients in this formula and the parameters  $B_6^{(1/2)}$  and  $B_8^{(3/2)}$ , conventionally normalized to unity at the factorization scale, are scale dependent. Here we will set  $\mu^* = 1 \text{ GeV}$  because at this scale it is most convenient to compare the values for  $B_6^{(1/2)}$  and  $B_8^{(3/2)}$  obtained in the three non-perturbative approaches LQCD, ChPT and DQCD that we already encountered in the context of the  $\Delta I = 1/2$  rule.

The  $B_6^{(1/2)}$  and  $B_8^{(3/2)}$  represent the relevant hadronic matrix elements of the dominant QCDP and EWP operators, respectively:

$$Q_6 = (\bar{s}_\alpha d_\beta)_{V-A} \sum_{q=u,d,s,c,b} (\bar{q}_\beta q_\alpha)_{V+A}, \quad (83)$$

$$Q_8 = \frac{3}{2} (\bar{s}_\alpha d_\beta)_{V-A} \sum_{q=u,d,s,c,b} e_q (\bar{q}_\beta q_\alpha)_{V+A}, \quad (84)$$

with  $V - A = \gamma_\mu(1 - \gamma_5)$  and  $V + A = \gamma_\mu(1 + \gamma_5)$ . They are then left-right operators with large hadronic matrix elements which assures their dominance over left-left operators. The remaining QCDP and EWP operators, represented here by  $-2.9$  and  $-2.0$ , respectively, play subleading roles. Current-current operators  $Q_{1,2}$  that played crucial role in the case of the  $\Delta I = 1/2$  rule do not contribute to  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$  because their WCs are real. In obtaining the formulae in (81) and (82) it is common to use the experimental values for the real parts of  $A_{0,2}$  in (68). Finally,  $\text{Im}\lambda_t = \text{Im}(V_{ts}^* V_{td}) \approx 1.4 \times 10^{-4}$ .

There are two main reasons why  $Q_8$  can compete with  $Q_6$  here despite the smallness of the electroweak couplings in the WC of  $Q_8$  relative to the QCD one in the WC of  $Q_6$ . In the basic formula (77) for  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$  its contribution is enhanced relative to the one of  $Q_6$  by the factor  $\text{Re}A_0/\text{Re}A_2 = 22.4$ . In addition its WC is enhanced for the large top-quark mass which is not the case for  $Q_6$  [110, 111].

In the three non-perturbative approaches the values of  $B_6^{(1/2)}$  and  $B_8^{(3/2)}$  were found at  $\mu = 1$  GeV to be:

$$B_6^{(1/2)}(1 \text{ GeV}) = 1.49 \pm 0.25, \quad B_8^{(3/2)}(1 \text{ GeV}) = 0.85 \pm 0.05, \quad (\text{RBC-UKQCD} - 2020) \quad (85)$$

$$B_6^{(1/2)}(1 \text{ GeV}) = 1.35 \pm 0.20, \quad B_8^{(3/2)}(1 \text{ GeV}) = 0.55 \pm 0.20, \quad (\text{ChPT} - 2019) \quad (86)$$

$$B_6^{(1/2)}(1 \text{ GeV}) \leq 0.6, \quad B_8^{(3/2)}(1 \text{ GeV}) = 0.80 \pm 0.10, \quad (\text{DQCD} - 2015) \quad (87)$$

While the large  $B_6^{(1/2)}$  and  $B_8^{(3/2)} < 1.0$  from LQCD has until now no physical interpretation, the pattern found in ChPT results apparently from final state interactions (FSI) that enhance  $B_6^{(1/2)}$  above unity and suppress  $B_8^{(3/2)}$  below it [214–217]. The suppression of  $B_6^{(1/2)}$  and  $B_8^{(3/2)}$  below unity in the DQCD approach comes from the meson evolution [218] which is required to have a proper matching with the WCs of QCDP and EWP operators. The meson evolution is absent in present ChPT calculations and it is argued in [219] that including it in ChPT calculations will lower  $B_6^{(1/2)}$  below unity. On the other hand adding non-leading FSI in the DQCD approach would raise  $B_6^{(1/2)}$  above 0.6. Nevertheless  $B_6^{(1/2)} \leq 1.0$  is expected to be satisfied even after the inclusion of FSI in DQCD.

Moreover, while ChPT and DQCD use  $\hat{\Omega}_{\text{eff}}^{(8)} = (17 \pm 9) 10^{-2}$  and  $\hat{\Omega}_{\text{eff}}^{(9)} = (29 \pm 7) 10^{-2}$ , respectively, as already stated above, RBC-UKQCD still uses  $\hat{\Omega}_{\text{eff}} = 0$ . These differences in the values of  $B_6^{(1/2)}$ ,  $B_8^{(3/2)}$  and  $\hat{\Omega}_{\text{eff}}$  imply significant differences in  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$  presented by these three groups:

$$(\varepsilon'/\varepsilon)_{\text{SM}} = (21.7 \pm 8.4) \times 10^{-4}, \quad (\text{RBC-UKQCD}) \quad (88)$$

from the RBC-UKQCD collaboration [191] which uses  $\hat{\Omega}_{\text{eff}} = 0$ . Here statistical, parametric and systematic uncertainties have been added in quadrature. Next

$$(\varepsilon'/\varepsilon)_{\text{SM}} = (14 \pm 5) \times 10^{-4}, \quad (\text{ChPT}) \quad (89)$$

from ChPT [210]. The large error is related to the problematic matching of LD and SD contributions in this approach which can be traced back to the absence of meson evolution in this approach. Finally

$$(\varepsilon'/\varepsilon)_{\text{SM}} = (5 \pm 2) \cdot 10^{-4}, \quad (\text{DQCD}) \quad (90)$$

from DQCD [196, 218, 219], where  $B_6^{(1/2)} \leq 1.0$  has been used.

While the results in (88) and (89) are fully consistent with the data shown in (76), the DQCD result in (90) implies a significant anomaly and NP at work. Clearly, the confirmation of the DQCD result by LQCD is highly important. However, to this end it is desired that other LQCD collaborations get involved in these calculations.

Let us end this presentation with good news. There is a very good agreement between LQCD and DQCD as far as EWP contribution to  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$  is concerned. This implies that this contribution to  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$ , that is unaffected by leading isospin breaking corrections, is already known within the SM with acceptable accuracy:

$$(\varepsilon'/\varepsilon)_{\text{SM}}^{\text{EWP}} = -(7 \pm 1) \times 10^{-4}, \quad (\text{LQCD and DQCD}). \quad (91)$$

Because both LQCD and DQCD can perform much better in the case of EWP than in the case of QCDP I expect that this result will remain with us for the coming years. On the

other hand, the value from ChPT of  $B_8^{(3/2)} \approx 0.55$  [210] implies using (82) that the EWP contribution is roughly by a factor of 2 below the result in (91). Let us hope that at KM60 we will know which prediction is right. Further summaries can be found in [19, 141, 196] and details in original references.

Let me finish this 2023 summary of the status of  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$  in the SM by the following comment. I have no doubt that the present DQCD result is significantly closer to the true value of  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$  in the SM than the ones obtained presently by LQCD and ChPT because this approach includes both the full isospin breaking effects and the meson evolution. Both play crucial role in the suppression of QCDP to  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$ . But LQCD did not take isospin breaking effects into account and ChPT did not include meson evolution. This evolution has been demonstrated in [220] to be crucial for the understanding of the pattern of the BSM hadronic matrix elements entering the  $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$  mixing obtained by ETM, SWME and RBC-UKQCD lattice collaborations [221–225]. Including the SM matrix element, five matrix elements are involved and not having the meson evolution one would miss the numerical values of some of them by factors of two. This means that the DQCD approach passed another very non-trivial test and that LQCD calculations include QCD dynamics represented by the meson evolution although it is hidden in their extensive numerical computations. However, it is another story that is summarized in Section 13.2.4 of my book [19] with further details in [220]. Also the fact that LQCD calculations [221, 226, 227] confirmed after many years the DQCD result for the  $\hat{B}_K$  parameter [190, 228] is a success for this approach. More on this in chapter 7 of my book.

If one day the anomaly in  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$  will be confirmed by LQCD, it will be important to take into account possible contributions of operators absent in the SM. Anticipating this, the matrix elements of such new operators have been calculated in DQCD in [229]. Let us hope that LQCD collaborations will also calculate these matrix elements one day. Having these matrix elements master formulae for  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$  beyond the SM have been derived and analysed in detail [230, 231]. Finally, the NLO QCD results for WCs in WET obtained in [232] allowed to derive NLO WET master formula for  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$  [233].

## 5 WET and SMEFT beyond Leading Order

We have just mentioned Weak Effective Theory (WET) and Standard Model Effective Field Theory (SMEFT) in the context of  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$  but it should be emphasized that both play these days very important roles in the tests of the SM and of the NP beyond it in the full particle physics with the pioneering work done in [234, 235]. Recent reviews can be found in [236] for Higgs physics and for flavour physics in Chapter 14 of [19]. An excellent review discussing the fundamentals of the SMEFT and various strategies for phenomenology appeared in [237].

The status of the short distance calculations in these theories is not yet at the level of the ones within the SM that we summarized briefly in Section 2.1. Most analyses these days are still performed in the LO approximation with the corresponding RG technology of all these operators presented for SMEFT in [238–240] and in [241, 242] for WET. However, also in this case, in order to increase the precision of the theory it is necessary to go beyond the LO analyses both in the WET and also in the SMEFT. To this end, it is mandatory to include first in the renormalization group (RG) analyses in these theories the one-loop matching contributions, both between these two theories as well as when passing thresholds at which heavy particles are integrated out. But this is not the whole story. To complete a

NLO analysis and remove various renormalization scheme (RS) dependences in the one-loop matching also two-loop anomalous dimensions of all operators in the WET and SMEFT have to be included. This is a big challenge because of the large number of operators involved in both theories. Yet, during the last years significant progress in reaching these goals has been made by various authors.

The present status of these efforts in the case of non-leptonic meson  $\Delta F = 1$  decays and  $\Delta F = 2$  quark mixing processes is as follows:

- The matchings in question are known by now both at tree-level [243] and one-loop level [244]. Previous partial results can be found, for example, in [245–250].
- The one-loop anomalous dimension matrices (ADMs) relevant for the RG in WET [241, 242] and SMEFT [238–240] are also known.
- The two-loop QCD ADMs relevant for RG evolutions for both  $\Delta F = 2$  and  $\Delta F = 1$  non-leptonic transitions in WET are also known [52, 232, 251].
- The two-loop QCD ADMs relevant for RG evolutions of  $\Delta F = 2$  transitions in SMEFT are also known [252] and the ones for  $\Delta F = 1$  transitions should be known soon.
- Master formulae for  $\Delta F = 2$  amplitudes both in WET and SMEFT have been presented in [251] and illustrated with tree-level exchanges of heavy gauge bosons ( $Z'$ ,  $G'$ ) and corresponding heavy scalars.
- On-shell methods for the computation of the one-loop and two-loop ADMs in the SMEFT have been developed in [253–255]. They allow a good insight into the flavour structure of the ADMs.
- Very recently NLO RG analysis for scalar leptoquarks has been performed in [256].

In view of many operators involved, it was crucial to develop sophisticated computing tools for the SMEFT. The most recent summary of the existing tools can be found in [257].

## 6 Summary and Shopping List

There is no question about that during last 50 years a dramatic progress has been made in the theory of Kaons. But as evident from last two chapters of my book [19] there is still a lot to be done if we want to reach Zeptouniverse with the help of FCNCs processes one day. Most important in this search will be in my view correlations between processes in different meson systems and also correlations with lepton flavour violation, electric dipole moments and anomalous magnetic moments. Also constraints from high energy processes have to be taken into account. Here the SMEFT will play a crucial role as well. In principle I could now make a list of many processes which will play crucial role in this expedition but I think a better idea is to ask interested readers to read the last two chapters of my book, in particular Chapter 20 in which one finds the shopping list.

While, in contrast to some theorists, I am optimistic that there is NP at scales lower than the Planck scale, the signs of no NP in  $\Delta F = 2$  processes and the absence of fully convincing anomalies in flavour changing processes, could be a warning that a desert up to Planck scale except possibly for right-handed neutrinos remains a possibility. Fortunately,

the numerous predictions for various flavour observables based on the assumption of no NP in the  $\Delta F = 2$  Archipelago [116, 119] prepare us not only for this possibility but also for demonstrating that such a nightmare scenario is not present in nature. Here Kaon physics will play the crucial role because as demonstrated in [154] rare  $K$  decays are more sensitive to very high scales than it is the case of rare  $B$  decays. Therefore I am looking forward to improved measurements of the branching ratios for  $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ ,  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$ ,  $K_{L,S} \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ ,  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \ell^+ \ell^-$  at CERN and J-PARC and their correlations with rare  $B$  decays measured at CERN and by Belle II. In this context it is of great interest to see whether various  $B$  physics anomalies will remain when new data from Belle II will be available. For recent updates see [258–260].

### Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the organizers for inviting me to give this talk at this very important event and my numerous collaborators listed in the references list for exciting time we spent together. I am also thankful to the unknown referee for finding several typos in the original version and very positive comments about my contribution. Financial support from the Excellence Cluster ORIGINS, funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation), Excellence Strategy, EXC-2094, 390783311 is acknowledged.

## References

- [1] N. Cabibbo, *Unitary Symmetry and Leptonic Decays*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **10** (1963) 531–533. [648(1963)].
- [2] S. L. Glashow, J. Iliopoulos, and L. Maiani, *Weak Interactions with Lepton-Hadron Symmetry*, *Phys. Rev.* **D2** (1970) 1285–1292.
- [3] M. Gaillard and B. W. Lee, *Rare Decay Modes of the K-Mesons in Gauge Theories*, *Phys. Rev.* **D10** (1974) 897.
- [4] M. Kobayashi and T. Maskawa, *CP Violation in the Renormalizable Theory of Weak Interaction*, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **49** (1973) 652–657.
- [5] J. H. Christenson, J. W. Cronin, V. L. Fitch, and R. Turlay, *Evidence for the  $2\pi$  Decay of the  $K_2^0$  Meson*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **13** (1964) 138–140.
- [6] J. R. Ellis, M. K. Gaillard, and D. V. Nanopoulos, *Lefthanded Currents and CP Violation*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **109** (1976) 213–243.
- [7] L.-L. Chau and W.-Y. Keung, *Comments on the Parametrization of the Kobayashi-Maskawa Matrix*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **53** (1984) 1802.
- [8] L. Wolfenstein, *Parametrization of the Kobayashi-Maskawa Matrix*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **51** (1983) 1945.
- [9] C. Jarlskog, *Commutator of the Quark Mass Matrices in the Standard Electroweak Model and a Measure of Maximal CP Violation*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **55** (1985) 1039.
- [10] C. Jarlskog, *A Basis Independent Formulation of the Connection Between Quark Mass Matrices, CP Violation and Experiment*, *Z. Phys.* **C29** (1985) 491–497.

- [11] C. Jarlskog and R. Stora, *Unitarity Polygons and CP Violation Areas and Phases in the Standard Electroweak Model*, *Phys. Lett.* **B208** (1988) 268–274.
- [12] R. Aleksan, B. Kayser, and D. London, *Determining the quark mixing matrix from CP violating asymmetries*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **73** (1994) 18–20, [hep-ph/9403341].
- [13] A. J. Buras, M. E. Lautenbacher, and G. Ostermaier, *Waiting for the top quark mass,  $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ ,  $B_s^0 - \bar{B}_s^0$  mixing and CP asymmetries in B decays*, *Phys. Rev.* **D50** (1994) 3433–3446, [hep-ph/9403384].
- [14] G. C. Branco and L. Lavoura, *Wolfenstein Type Parametrization of the Quark Mixing Matrix*, *Phys. Rev.* **D38** (1988) 2295.
- [15] R. S. Chivukula and H. Georgi, *Composite Technicolor Standard Model*, *Phys. Lett. B* **188** (1987) 99–104.
- [16] A. J. Buras, P. Gambino, M. Gorbahn, S. Jäger, and L. Silvestrini, *Universal unitarity triangle and physics beyond the standard model*, *Phys. Lett.* **B500** (2001) 161–167, [hep-ph/0007085].
- [17] G. D’Ambrosio, G. F. Giudice, G. Isidori, and A. Strumia, *Minimal flavor violation: An Effective field theory approach*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **645** (2002) 155–187, [hep-ph/0207036].
- [18] A. L. Kagan, G. Perez, T. Volansky, and J. Zupan, *General Minimal Flavor Violation*, *Phys. Rev. D* **80** (2009) 076002, [arXiv:0903.1794].
- [19] A. J. Buras, *Gauge Theory of Weak Decays*. Cambridge University Press, 6, 2020.
- [20] G. C. Branco, L. Lavoura, and J. P. Silva, *CP Violation*, *Int.Ser.Monogr.Phys.* **103** (1999) 1–536.
- [21] I. I. Bigi and A. Sanda, *CP violation*, *Camb.Monogr.Part.Phys.Nucl. Phys.Cosmol.* **9** (2000) 1–382.
- [22] I. I. Bigi, G. Ricciardi, and M. Pallavicini, *New Era for CP Asymmetries*. World Scientific, 7, 2021.
- [23] A. J. Buras and J. Girrbach, *Towards the Identification of New Physics through Quark Flavour Violating Processes*, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **77** (2014) 086201, [arXiv:1306.3775].
- [24] G. Buchalla and A. J. Buras, *QCD corrections to the  $\bar{s}dZ$  vertex for arbitrary top quark mass*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B398** (1993) 285–300.
- [25] G. Buchalla and A. J. Buras, *QCD corrections to rare K and B decays for arbitrary top quark mass*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B400** (1993) 225–239.
- [26] A. J. Buras, F. Schwab, and S. Uhlig, *Waiting for precise measurements of  $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$  and  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$* , *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **80** (2008) 965–1007, [hep-ph/0405132].

- [27] J. Aebischer, A. J. Buras, and J. Kumar, *On the Importance of Rare Kaon Decays: A Snowmass 2021 White Paper*, 3, 2022. [arXiv:2203.09524](#).
- [28] F. Gross et al., *50 Years of Quantum Chromodynamics*, [arXiv:2212.11107](#).
- [29] E. Goudzovski et al., *Weak Decays of Strange and Light Quarks*, [arXiv:2209.07156](#).
- [30] G. Lanfranchi, M. Pospelov, and P. Schuster, *The Search for Feebly Interacting Particles*, *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **71** (2021) 279–313, [[arXiv:2011.02157](#)].
- [31] E. Goudzovski et al., *New physics searches at kaon and hyperon factories*, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **86** (2023), no. 1 016201, [[arXiv:2201.07805](#)].
- [32] G. Altarelli, G. Curci, G. Martinelli, and S. Petrarca, *Weak Nonleptonic Decays Beyond Leading Logarithms in QCD*, *Phys. Lett. B* **99** (1981) 141–146.
- [33] A. J. Buras and P. H. Weisz, *QCD Nonleading Corrections to Weak Decays in Dimensional Regularization and 't Hooft-Veltman Schemes*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B333** (1990) 66–99.
- [34] M. Gorbahn and U. Haisch, *Effective Hamiltonian for non-leptonic  $|\Delta F| = 1$  decays at NNLO in QCD*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B713** (2005) 291–332, [[hep-ph/0411071](#)].
- [35] 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.* **B370** (1992) 69–104. [Addendum: *Nucl. Phys.*B375,501(1992)].
- [36] A. J. Buras, M. Jamin, M. E. Lautenbacher, and P. H. Weisz, *Two loop anomalous dimension matrix for  $\Delta S = 1$  weak nonleptonic decays. 1.  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^2)$* , *Nucl. Phys.* **B400** (1993) 37–74, [[hep-ph/9211304](#)].
- [37] A. J. Buras, M. Jamin, and M. E. Lautenbacher, *The Anatomy of  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$  beyond leading logarithms with improved hadronic matrix elements*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B408** (1993) 209–285, [[hep-ph/9303284](#)].
- [38] M. Ciuchini, E. Franco, G. Martinelli, and L. Reina,  *$\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$  at the Next-to-leading order in QCD and QED*, *Phys. Lett.* **B301** (1993) 263–271, [[hep-ph/9212203](#)].
- [39] 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.* **B415** (1994) 403–462, [[hep-ph/9304257](#)].
- [40] K. G. Chetyrkin, M. Misiak, and M. Munz,  *$|\Delta F| = 1$  nonleptonic effective Hamiltonian in a simpler scheme*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **520** (1998) 279–297, [[hep-ph/9711280](#)].
- [41] R. Fleischer, *CP violating asymmetries in penguin induced B meson decays beyond the leading logarithmic approximation*, *Z. Phys. C* **58** (1993) 483–498.
- [42] M. Cerdà-Sevilla, M. Gorbahn, S. Jäger, and A. Kokulu, *Towards NNLO accuracy for  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$* , *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **800** (2017), no. 1 012008, [[arXiv:1611.08276](#)].

- [43] A. J. Buras, M. Jamin, and M. E. Lautenbacher, *Two loop anomalous dimension matrix for  $\Delta S = 1$  weak nonleptonic decays. 2.  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s)$* , *Nucl. Phys.* **B400** (1993) 75–102, [[hep-ph/9211321](#)].
- [44] A. J. Buras, P. Gambino, and U. A. Haisch, *Electroweak penguin contributions to non-leptonic  $\Delta F = 1$  decays at NNLO*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B570** (2000) 117–154, [[hep-ph/9911250](#)].
- [45] G. Altarelli, G. Curci, G. Martinelli, and S. Petrarca, *QCD Nonleading Corrections to Weak Decays as an Application of Regularization by Dimensional Reduction*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B187** (1981) 461–513.
- [46] G. Buchalla,  *$\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s)$  QCD corrections to charm quark decay in dimensional regularization with nonanticommuting  $\gamma_5$* , *Nucl. Phys. B* **391** (1993) 501–514.
- [47] E. Bagan, P. Ball, V. M. Braun, and P. Gosdzinsky, *Charm quark mass dependence of QCD corrections to nonleptonic inclusive B decays*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **432** (1994) 3–38, [[hep-ph/9408306](#)].
- [48] E. Bagan, P. Ball, B. Fiol, and P. Gosdzinsky, *Next-to-leading order radiative corrections to the decay  $b \rightarrow ccs$* , *Phys. Lett. B* **351** (1995) 546–554, [[hep-ph/9502338](#)].
- [49] F. Krinner, A. Lenz, and T. Rauh, *The inclusive decay  $b \rightarrow c\bar{c}s$  revisited*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **876** (2013) 31–54, [[arXiv:1305.5390](#)].
- [50] M. Jamin and A. Pich, *QCD corrections to inclusive  $\Delta S = 1, 2$  transitions at the next-to-leading order*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **425** (1994) 15–38, [[hep-ph/9402363](#)].
- [51] M. Ciuchini, E. Franco, V. Lubicz, G. Martinelli, I. Scimemi, et al., *Next-to-leading order QCD corrections to  $\Delta F = 2$  effective Hamiltonians*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B523** (1998) 501–525, [[hep-ph/9711402](#)].
- [52] 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.* **B586** (2000) 397–426, [[hep-ph/0005183](#)].
- [53] A. J. Buras, *Climbing NLO and NNLO Summits of Weak Decays: 1988-2023*, [arXiv:1102.5650](#).
- [54] S. Herrlich and U. Nierste, *Enhancement of the  $K_L - K_S$  mass difference by short distance QCD corrections beyond leading logarithms*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B419** (1994) 292–322, [[hep-ph/9310311](#)].
- [55] J. Brod and M. Gorbahn, *Next-to-Next-to-Leading-Order Charm-Quark Contribution to the CP Violation Parameter  $\varepsilon_K$  and  $\Delta M_K$* , *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108** (2012) 121801, [[arXiv:1108.2036](#)].
- [56] A. J. Buras, M. Jamin, and P. H. Weisz, *Leading and next-to-leading QCD corrections to  $\varepsilon$  parameter and  $B^0 - \bar{B}^0$  mixing in the presence of a heavy top quark*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B347** (1990) 491–536.

- [57] P. Gambino, A. Kwiatkowski, and N. Pott, *Electroweak effects in the  $B^0 - \bar{B}^0$  mixing*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B544** (1999) 532–556, [[hep-ph/9810400](#)].
- [58] J. Brod, S. Kvedaraitė, and Z. Polonsky, *Two-loop electroweak corrections to the Top-Quark Contribution to  $\epsilon_K$* , *JHEP* **12** (2021) 198, [[arXiv:2108.00017](#)].
- [59] S. Herrlich and U. Nierste, *Indirect CP violation in the neutral kaon system beyond leading logarithms*, *Phys. Rev.* **D52** (1995) 6505–6518, [[hep-ph/9507262](#)].
- [60] S. Herrlich and U. Nierste, *The Complete  $|\Delta S| = 2$  Hamiltonian in the Next-To-Leading Order*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B476** (1996) 27–88, [[hep-ph/9604330](#)].
- [61] J. Brod and M. Gorbahn,  *$\epsilon_K$  at Next-to-Next-to-Leading Order: The Charm-Top-Quark Contribution*, *Phys. Rev.* **D82** (2010) 094026, [[arXiv:1007.0684](#)].
- [62] J. Brod, S. Kvedaraitė, Z. Polonsky, and A. Youssef, *Electroweak corrections to the Charm-Top-Quark Contribution to  $\epsilon_K$* , *JHEP* **12** (2022) 014, [[arXiv:2207.07669](#)].
- [63] J. Brod, M. Gorbahn, and E. Stamou, *Standard-Model Prediction of  $\epsilon_K$  with Manifest Quark-Mixing Unitarity*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125** (2020), no. 17 171803, [[arXiv:1911.06822](#)].
- [64] M. Beneke, G. Buchalla, C. Greub, A. Lenz, and U. Nierste, *Next-to-leading order QCD corrections to the lifetime difference of  $B_{d,s}$  mesons*, *Phys. Lett.* **B459** (1999) 631–640, [[hep-ph/9808385](#)].
- [65] M. Ciuchini, E. Franco, V. Lubicz, F. Mescia, and C. Tarantino, *Lifetime differences and CP violation parameters of neutral B mesons at the next-to-leading order in QCD*, *JHEP* **08** (2003) 031, [[hep-ph/0308029](#)].
- [66] M. Beneke, G. Buchalla, A. Lenz, and U. Nierste, *CP asymmetry in flavor specific B decays beyond leading logarithms*, *Phys. Lett. B* **576** (2003) 173–183, [[hep-ph/0307344](#)].
- [67] A. Lenz and U. Nierste, *Theoretical update of  $B_s - \bar{B}_s$  mixing*, *JHEP* **06** (2007) 072, [[hep-ph/0612167](#)].
- [68] H. M. Asatrian, A. Hovhannisyanyan, U. Nierste, and A. Yeghiazaryan, *Towards next-to-next-to-leading-log accuracy for the width difference in the  $B_s - \bar{B}_s$  system: fermionic contributions to order  $(m_c/m_b)^0$  and  $(m_c/m_b)^1$* , *JHEP* **10** (2017) 191, [[arXiv:1709.02160](#)].
- [69] H. M. Asatrian, H. H. Asatryan, A. Hovhannisyanyan, U. Nierste, S. Tumasyan, and A. Yeghiazaryan, *Penguin contribution to the width difference and CP asymmetry in  $B_q - \bar{B}_q$  mixing at order  $\alpha_s^2 N_f$* , *Phys. Rev. D* **102** (2020), no. 3 033007, [[arXiv:2006.13227](#)].
- [70] M. Gerlach, U. Nierste, V. Shtabovenko, and M. Steinhauser, *Two-loop QCD penguin contribution to the width difference in  $B_s - \bar{B}_s$  mixing*, *JHEP* **07** (2021) 043, [[arXiv:2106.05979](#)].

- [71] M. Gerlach, U. Nierste, V. Shtabovenko, and M. Steinhauser, *The width difference in  $B - \bar{B}$  mixing at order  $\alpha_s$  and beyond*, *JHEP* **04** (2022) 006, [arXiv:2202.12305].
- [72] M. Gerlach, U. Nierste, V. Shtabovenko, and M. Steinhauser, *Width Difference in the  $B - \bar{B}$  System at Next-to-Next-to-Leading Order of QCD*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **129** (2022), no. 10 102001, [arXiv:2205.07907].
- [73] Y.-Y. Keum and U. Nierste, *Probing penguin coefficients with the lifetime ratio  $\tau(B_s)/\tau(B_d)$* , *Phys. Rev. D* **57** (1998) 4282–4289, [hep-ph/9710512].
- [74] M. Ciuchini, E. Franco, V. Lubicz, and F. Mescia, *Next-to-leading order QCD corrections to spectator effects in lifetimes of beauty hadrons*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **625** (2002) 211–238, [hep-ph/0110375].
- [75] M. Beneke, G. Buchalla, C. Greub, A. Lenz, and U. Nierste, *The  $B^+ - B_d^0$  Lifetime Difference Beyond Leading Logarithms*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **639** (2002) 389–407, [hep-ph/0202106].
- [76] E. Franco, V. Lubicz, F. Mescia, and C. Tarantino, *Lifetime ratios of beauty hadrons at the next-to-leading order in QCD*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **633** (2002) 212–236, [hep-ph/0203089].
- [77] M. Kirk, A. Lenz, and T. Rauh, *Dimension-six matrix elements for meson mixing and lifetimes from sum rules*, *JHEP* **12** (2017) 068, [arXiv:1711.02100]. [Erratum: *JHEP* **06**, 162 (2020)].
- [78] D. King, A. Lenz, and T. Rauh,  *$SU(3)$  breaking effects in  $B$  and  $D$  meson lifetimes*, *JHEP* **06** (2022) 134, [arXiv:2112.03691].
- [79] A. J. Buras and J. Girrbach, *Complete NLO QCD Corrections for Tree Level  $\Delta F = 2$  FCNC Processes*, *JHEP* **1203** (2012) 052, [arXiv:1201.1302].
- [80] M. Misiak and J. Urban, *QCD corrections to FCNC decays mediated by  $Z$  penguins and  $W$  boxes*, *Phys. Lett.* **B451** (1999) 161–169, [hep-ph/9901278].
- [81] G. Buchalla and A. J. Buras, *The rare decays  $K \rightarrow \pi\nu\bar{\nu}$ ,  $B \rightarrow X\nu\bar{\nu}$  and  $B \rightarrow \ell^+\ell^-$ : An Update*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B548** (1999) 309–327, [hep-ph/9901288].
- [82] G. Buchalla and A. J. Buras, *The rare decays  $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\nu\bar{\nu}$  and  $K_L \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$  beyond leading logarithms*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B412** (1994) 106–142, [hep-ph/9308272].
- [83] A. J. Buras, M. Gorbahn, U. Haisch, and U. Nierste, *Charm quark contribution to  $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\nu\bar{\nu}$  at next-to-next-to-leading order*, *JHEP* **11** (2006) 002, [hep-ph/0603079].
- [84] A. J. Buras, M. E. Lautenbacher, M. Misiak, and M. Munz, *Direct CP violation in  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 e^+ e^-$  beyond leading logarithms*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B423** (1994) 349–383, [hep-ph/9402347].
- [85] T. Hermann, M. Misiak, and M. Steinhauser, *Three-loop QCD corrections to  $B_s \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$* , *JHEP* **1312** (2013) 097, [arXiv:1311.1347].

- [86] M. Gorbahn and U. Haisch, *Charm quark contribution to  $K_L \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$  at next-to-next-to-leading order*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97** (2006) 122002, [[hep-ph/0605203](#)].
- [87] G. Buchalla and A. J. Buras, *Parity violating longitudinal muon polarization in  $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \mu^+ \mu^-$  beyond leading logarithms*, *Phys. Lett. B* **336** (1994) 263–268, [[hep-ph/9407342](#)].
- [88] J. Brod and M. Gorbahn, *Electroweak Corrections to the Charm Quark Contribution to  $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$* , *Phys. Rev.* **D78** (2008) 034006, [[arXiv:0805.4119](#)].
- [89] G. Buchalla and A. J. Buras, *Two-loop large- $m_t$  electroweak corrections to  $K \rightarrow \pi \nu \bar{\nu}$  for arbitrary Higgs boson mass*, *Phys. Rev.* **D57** (1998) 216–223, [[hep-ph/9707243](#)].
- [90] J. Brod, M. Gorbahn, and E. Stamou, *Two-Loop Electroweak Corrections for the  $K \rightarrow \pi \nu \bar{\nu}$  Decays*, *Phys. Rev.* **D83** (2011) 034030, [[arXiv:1009.0947](#)].
- [91] C. Bobeth, M. Gorbahn, and E. Stamou, *Electroweak Corrections to  $B_{s,d} \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^-$* , *Phys. Rev.* **D89** (2014) 034023, [[arXiv:1311.1348](#)].
- [92] K. G. Wilson, *Nonlagrangian models of current algebra*, *Phys. Rev.* **179** (1969) 1499–1512.
- [93] K. G. Wilson and W. Zimmermann, *Operator product expansions and composite field operators in the general framework of quantum field theory*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **24** (1972) 87–106.
- [94] W. Zimmermann, *Normal products and the short distance expansion in the perturbation theory of renormalizable interactions*, *Annals Phys.* **77** (1973) 570–601. [Lect. Notes Phys.558,278(2000)].
- [95] G. Buchalla, A. J. Buras, and M. E. Lautenbacher, *Weak decays beyond leading logarithms*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **68** (1996) 1125–1144, [[hep-ph/9512380](#)].
- [96] A. J. Buras, *Weak Hamiltonian, CP violation and rare decays*, in *Probing the standard model of particle interactions. Proceedings, Summer School in Theoretical Physics, NATO Advanced Study Institute, 68th session, Les Houches, France, July 28-September 5, 1997. Pt. 1, 2*, pp. 281–539, 1998. [hep-ph/9806471](#).
- [97] G. D’Ambrosio and T. Kitahara, *Direct CP Violation in  $K \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$* , *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119** (2017), no. 20 201802, [[arXiv:1707.06999](#)].
- [98] A. Dery, M. Ghosh, Y. Grossman, and S. Schacht,  *$K \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$  as a clean probe of short-distance physics*, *JHEP* **07** (2021) 103, [[arXiv:2104.06427](#)].
- [99] J. Brod and E. Stamou, *Impact of indirect CP violation on  $Br(K_S \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)_{l=0}$* , *JHEP* **05** (2023) 155, [[arXiv:2209.07445](#)].
- [100] G. Altarelli and L. Maiani, *Octet Enhancement of Nonleptonic Weak Interactions in Asymptotically Free Gauge Theories*, *Phys. Lett.* **B52** (1974) 351–354.
- [101] M. Gaillard and B. W. Lee,  *$\Delta I = 1/2$  Rule for Nonleptonic Decays in Asymptotically Free Field Theories*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **33** (1974) 108.

- [102] M. A. Shifman, A. I. Vainshtein, and V. I. Zakharov, *Nonleptonic Decays of K Mesons and Hyperons*, *Sov. Phys. JETP* **45** (1977) 670. [*Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.*72,1275(1977)].
- [103] F. J. Gilman and M. B. Wise, *Effective Hamiltonian for  $\Delta s = 1$  Weak Nonleptonic Decays in the Six Quark Model*, *Phys. Rev.* **D20** (1979) 2392.
- [104] M. I. Vysotsky,  *$K^0 - \bar{K}^0$  TRANSITION IN THE STANDARD  $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$  MODEL*, *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **31** (1980) 797.
- [105] F. J. Gilman and M. B. Wise,  *$K^0 - \bar{K}^0$  Mixing in the Six Quark Model*, *Phys. Rev. D* **27** (1983) 1128.
- [106] C. Dib, I. Dunietz, and F. J. Gilman, *CP Violation in the  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \ell^+ \ell^-$  Decay Amplitude for Large  $M(t)$* , *Phys. Lett.* **B218** (1989) 487–492.
- [107] J. Flynn and L. Randall, *The CP Violating Contribution to the Decay  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 e^+ e^-$* , *Nucl. Phys.* **B326** (1989) 31. [Erratum: *Nucl. Phys.*B334,580(1990)].
- [108] C. Dib, I. Dunietz, and F. J. Gilman,  *$K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \ell^+ \ell^-$  Decays for Large  $m_t$* , *Phys. Rev. D* **39** (1989) 2639.
- [109] C. Dib, I. Dunietz, and F. J. Gilman, *Strong Interaction Corrections to the Decay  $K \rightarrow \pi$  Neutrino Anti-neutrino for Large  $M(t)$* , *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A6** (1991) 3573–3582.
- [110] J. M. Flynn and L. Randall, *The Electromagnetic Penguin Contribution to  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$  for Large Top Quark Mass*, *Phys. Lett.* **B224** (1989) 221.
- [111] G. Buchalla, A. J. Buras, and M. K. Harlander, *The Anatomy of  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$  in the Standard Model*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B337** (1990) 313–362.
- [112] **Flavour Lattice Averaging Group (FLAG) Collaboration**, Y. Aoki et al., *FLAG Review 2021*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82** (2022), no. 10 869, [[arXiv:2111.09849](https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.09849)].
- [113] **UTfit Collaboration**, M. Bona et al., *New UTfit Analysis of the Unitarity Triangle in the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa scheme*, *Rend. Lincei Sci. Fis. Nat.* **34** (2023) 37–57, [[arXiv:2212.03894](https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.03894)].
- [114] **CKMfitter Group Collaboration**, J. Charles et al., *CP violation and the CKM matrix: Assessing the impact of the asymmetric B factories*, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C41** (2005) 1–131, [[hep-ph/0406184](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0406184)].
- [115] **Particle Data Group Collaboration**, R. L. Workman, *Review of Particle Physics*, *PTEP* **2022** (2022) 083C01.
- [116] A. J. Buras, *Standard Model predictions for rare K and B decays without new physics infection*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83** (2023), no. 1 66, [[arXiv:2209.03968](https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.03968)].
- [117] M. Bordone, B. Capdevila, and P. Gambino, *Three loop calculations and inclusive  $|V_{cb}|$* , *Phys. Lett. B* **822** (2021) 136679, [[arXiv:2107.00604](https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.00604)].

- [118] A. J. Buras and E. Venturini, *Searching for New Physics in Rare  $K$  and  $B$  Decays without  $|V_{cb}|$  and  $|V_{ub}|$  Uncertainties*, *Acta Phys. Polon. B* **53** (9, 2021) A1, [arXiv:2109.11032].
- [119] A. J. Buras and E. Venturini, *The exclusive vision of rare  $K$  and  $B$  decays and of the quark mixing in the standard model*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82** (2022), no. 7 615, [arXiv:2203.11960].
- [120] A. J. Buras, *Relations between  $\Delta M_{s,d}$  and  $B_{s,d} \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$  in models with minimal flavour violation*, *Phys. Lett.* **B566** (2003) 115–119, [hep-ph/0303060].
- [121] R. J. Dowdall, C. T. H. Davies, R. R. Horgan, G. P. Lepage, C. J. Monahan, J. Shigemitsu, and M. Wingate, *Neutral  $B$ -meson mixing from full lattice QCD at the physical point*, *Phys. Rev. D* **100** (2019), no. 9 094508, [arXiv:1907.01025].
- [122] D. King, A. Lenz, and T. Rauh,  *$B_s$  mixing observables and  $|V_{td}/V_{ts}|$  from sum rules*, *JHEP* **05** (2019) 034, [arXiv:1904.00940].
- [123] D. King, M. Kirk, A. Lenz, and T. Rauh,  *$|V_{cb}|$  and  $\gamma$  from  $B$ -mixing - Addendum to "  $B_s$  mixing observables and  $|V_{td}/V_{ts}|$  from sum rules "*, arXiv:1911.07856. [Addendum: JHEP 03, 112 (2020)].
- [124] A. J. Buras, *On the superiority of the  $|V_{cb}| - \gamma$  plots over the unitarity triangle plots in the 2020s*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82** (2022), no. 7 612, [arXiv:2204.10337].
- [125] M. Blanke and A. J. Buras, *Emerging  $\Delta M_d$  -anomaly from tree-level determinations of  $|V_{cb}|$  and the angle  $\gamma$* , *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79** (2019), no. 2 159, [arXiv:1812.06963].
- [126] H. Harari and M. Leurer, *Recommending a Standard Choice of Cabibbo Angles and  $KM$  Phases for Any Number of Generations*, *Phys. Lett. B* **181** (1986) 123–128.
- [127] **UTfit** Collaboration, M. Bona et al., *Model-independent constraints on  $\Delta F=2$  operators and the scale of new physics*, *JHEP* **0803** (2008) 049, [arXiv:0707.0636].
- [128] A. J. Buras, F. Parodi, and A. Stocchi, *The CKM matrix and the unitarity triangle: Another look*, *JHEP* **0301** (2003) 029, [hep-ph/0207101].
- [129] **LHCb** Collaboration, R. Aaij et al., *Simultaneous determination of CKM angle  $\gamma$  and charm mixing parameters*, *JHEP* **12** (2021) 141, [arXiv:2110.02350].
- [130] A. J. Buras, D. Buttazzo, J. Girrbach-Noe, and R. Knegjens,  *$K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$  and  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$  in the Standard Model: status and perspectives*, *JHEP* **11** (2015) 033, [arXiv:1503.02693].
- [131] **NA62** Collaboration, M. Zamkovský et al., *Measurement of the very rare  $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$  decay*, *PoS DISCRETE2020-2021* (2022) 070.
- [132] **KOTO** Collaboration, J. Ahn et al., *Search for the  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$  and  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 X^0$  decays at the J-PARC KOTO experiment*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122** (2019), no. 2 021802, [arXiv:1810.09655].

- [133] G. Buchalla and A. J. Buras,  $\sin 2\beta$  from  $K \rightarrow \pi\nu\bar{\nu}$ , *Phys. Lett.* **B333** (1994) 221–227, [[hep-ph/9405259](#)].
- [134] **LHCb** Collaboration, R. Aaij et al., *Measurement of the  $B_s^0 \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$  decay properties and search for the  $B^0 \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$  and  $B_s^0 \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-\gamma$  decays*, *Phys. Rev. D* **105** (2022), no. 1 012010, [[arXiv:2108.09283](#)].
- [135] **CMS** Collaboration, *Combination of the ATLAS, CMS and LHCb results on the  $B_{(s)}^0 \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$  decays*, CMS-PAS-BPH-20-003.
- [136] **ATLAS** Collaboration, *Combination of the ATLAS, CMS and LHCb results on the  $B_{(s)}^0 \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$  decays.*, ATLAS-CONF-2020-049.
- [137] **RBC, UKQCD** Collaboration, N. H. Christ, X. Feng, A. Portelli, and C. T. Sachrajda, *Lattice QCD study of the rare kaon decay  $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\nu\bar{\nu}$  at a near-physical pion mass*, *Phys. Rev. D* **100** (2019), no. 11 114506, [[arXiv:1910.10644](#)].
- [138] G. Isidori, F. Mescia, and C. Smith, *Light-quark loops in  $K \rightarrow \pi\nu\bar{\nu}$* , *Nucl. Phys.* **B718** (2005) 319–338, [[hep-ph/0503107](#)].
- [139] **HPQCD** Collaboration, W. G. Parrott, C. Bouchard, and C. T. H. Davies,  *$B \rightarrow K$  and  $D \rightarrow K$  form factors from fully relativistic lattice QCD*, *Phys. Rev. D* **107** (2023), no. 1 014510, [[arXiv:2207.12468](#)].
- [140] **HPQCD** Collaboration, W. G. Parrott, C. Bouchard, and C. T. H. Davies, *Standard Model predictions for  $B \rightarrow K\ell^+\ell^-$ ,  $B \rightarrow K\ell_1^-\ell_2^+$  and  $B \rightarrow K\nu\bar{\nu}$  using form factors from  $N_f = 2 + 1 + 1$  lattice QCD*, *Phys. Rev. D* **107** (2023), no. 1 014511, [[arXiv:2207.13371](#)].
- [141] A. J. Buras,  $\epsilon'/\epsilon$  in the Standard Model and Beyond: 2021, in *11th International Workshop on the CKM Unitarity Triangle*, 3, 2022. [arXiv:2203.12632](#).
- [142] Z. Bai, N. H. Christ, and C. T. Sachrajda, *The  $K_L - K_S$  Mass Difference*, *EPJ Web Conf.* **175** (2018) 13017.
- [143] B. Wang, *Calculating  $\Delta m_K$  with lattice QCD*, *PoS LATTICE2021* (2022) 141, [[arXiv:2301.01387](#)].
- [144] M. Blanke, *Insights from the Interplay of  $K \rightarrow \pi\nu\bar{\nu}$  and  $\epsilon_K$  on the New Physics Flavour Structure*, *Acta Phys. Polon.* **B41** (2010) 127, [[arXiv:0904.2528](#)].
- [145] A. J. Buras, D. Buttazzo, and R. Knegjens,  *$K \rightarrow \pi\nu\bar{\nu}$  and  $\epsilon'/\epsilon$  in Simplified New Physics Models*, *JHEP* **11** (2015) 166, [[arXiv:1507.08672](#)].
- [146] J. Aebischer, A. J. Buras, and J. Kumar, *Kaon physics without new physics in  $\epsilon_K$* , *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83** (2023), no. 5 368, [[arXiv:2302.00013](#)].
- [147] Y. Grossman and Y. Nir,  *$K_L \rightarrow \pi^0\nu\bar{\nu}$  beyond the standard model*, *Phys. Lett.* **B398** (1997) 163–168, [[hep-ph/9701313](#)].
- [148] A. J. Buras, *New physics patterns in  $\epsilon'/\epsilon$  and  $\epsilon_K$  with implications for rare kaon decays and  $\Delta M_K$* , *JHEP* **04** (2016) 071, [[arXiv:1601.00005](#)].

- [149] A. J. Buras and F. De Fazio, *331 model predictions for rare B and K decays, and  $\Delta F = 2$  processes: an update*, *JHEP* **03** (2023) 219, [[arXiv:2301.02649](#)].
- [150] **LHCb** Collaboration, *Test of lepton universality in  $b \rightarrow s\ell^+\ell^-$  decays*, [arXiv:2212.09152](#).
- [151] **LHCb** Collaboration, *Measurement of lepton universality parameters in  $B^+ \rightarrow K^+\ell^+\ell^-$  and  $B^0 \rightarrow K^{*0}\ell^+\ell^-$  decays*, [arXiv:2212.09153](#).
- [152] A. J. Buras,  *$Z'$ -Tandem Mechanism for the Suppression of New Physics in Quark Mixing with Implications for K, D and B Decays*, [arXiv:2302.01354](#).
- [153] A. J. Buras, F. De Fazio, and J. Girrbach,  *$\Delta I = 1/2$  rule,  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$  and  $K \rightarrow \pi\nu\bar{\nu}$  in  $Z'(Z)$  and  $G'$  models with FCNC quark couplings*, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C74** (2014) 2950, [[arXiv:1404.3824](#)].
- [154] A. J. Buras, D. Buttazzo, J. Girrbach-Noe, and R. Knegjens, *Can we reach the Zeptouniverse with rare K and  $B_{s,d}$  decays?*, *JHEP* **1411** (2014) 121, [[arXiv:1408.0728](#)].
- [155] A. Crivellin, L. Hofer, J. Matias, U. Nierste, S. Pokorski, and J. Rosiek, *Lepton-flavour violating B decays in generic  $Z'$  models*, *Phys. Rev.* **D92** (2015), no. 5 054013, [[arXiv:1504.07928](#)].
- [156] W. G. Parrott, C. Bouchard, and C. T. H. Davies, *The search for new physics in  $B \rightarrow K\ell^+\ell^-$  and  $B \rightarrow K\nu\bar{\nu}$  using precise lattice QCD form factors*, in *39th International Symposium on Lattice Field Theory*, 10, 2022. [arXiv:2210.10898](#).
- [157] J. F. Kamenik and C. Smith, *Tree-level contributions to the rare decays  $B^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\nu\bar{\nu}$ ,  $B^+ \rightarrow K^+\nu\bar{\nu}$ , and  $B^+ \rightarrow K^{*+}\nu\bar{\nu}$  in the Standard Model*, *Phys. Lett. B* **680** (2009) 471–475, [[arXiv:0908.1174](#)].
- [158] **Particle Data Group** Collaboration, C. Patrignani et al., *Review of Particle Physics*, *Chin. Phys.* **C40** (2016 and 2017 update), no. 10 100001.
- [159] **Belle** Collaboration, J. Grygier et al., *Search for  $B \rightarrow h\nu\bar{\nu}$  decays with semileptonic tagging at Belle*, *Phys. Rev.* **D96** (2017), no. 9 091101, [[arXiv:1702.03224](#)]. [[Addendum: Phys. Rev.D97,no.9,099902\(2018\)](#)].
- [160] Y. Grossman, Z. Ligeti, and E. Nardi, *First limit on inclusive  $b \rightarrow x_s\nu\bar{\nu}$  decay and constraints on new physics*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B465** (1996) 369–398, [[hep-ph/9510378](#)].
- [161] D. Melikhov, N. Nikitin, and S. Simula, *Right-handed currents in rare exclusive  $B \rightarrow (K, K^*)$  neutrino anti-neutrino decays*, *Phys. Lett.* **B428** (1998) 171–178, [[hep-ph/9803269](#)].
- [162] W. Altmannshofer, A. J. Buras, D. M. Straub, and M. Wick, *New strategies for New Physics search in  $B \rightarrow K^*\nu\bar{\nu}$ ,  $B \rightarrow K\nu\bar{\nu}$  and  $B \rightarrow X_s\nu\bar{\nu}$  decays*, *JHEP* **04** (2009) 022, [[arXiv:0902.0160](#)].
- [163] A. J. Buras, J. Girrbach-Noe, C. Niehoff, and D. M. Straub,  *$B \rightarrow K^{(*)}\nu\bar{\nu}$  decays in the Standard Model and beyond*, *JHEP* **1502** (2015) 184, [[arXiv:1409.4557](#)].

- [164] R. Bause, H. Gisbert, M. Golz, and G. Hiller, *Interplay of dineutrino modes with semileptonic rare B-decays*, *JHEP* **12** (2021) 061, [[arXiv:2109.01675](#)].
- [165] X. G. He and G. Valencia,  *$R^\nu(K^{(*)}$  and non-standard neutrino interactions*, *Phys. Lett. B* **821** (2021) 136607, [[arXiv:2108.05033](#)].
- [166] R. Bause, H. Gisbert, M. Golz, and G. Hiller, *Model-independent analysis of  $b \rightarrow d$  processes*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83** (2023), no. 5 419, [[arXiv:2209.04457](#)].
- [167] D. Bećirević, G. Piazza, and O. Sumensari, *Revisiting  $B \rightarrow K^{(*)}\nu\bar{\nu}$  decays in the Standard Model and beyond*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83** (2023), no. 3 252, [[arXiv:2301.06990](#)].
- [168] R. Bause, H. Gisbert, and G. Hiller, *Implications of an enhanced  $B \rightarrow K\nu\bar{\nu}$  branching ratio*, [arXiv:2309.00075](#).
- [169] L. Allwicher, D. Becirevic, G. Piazza, S. Rosauro-Alcaraz, and O. Sumensari, *Understanding the first measurement of  $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow K\nu\bar{\nu})$* , [arXiv:2309.02246](#).
- [170] H. K. Dreiner, J. Y. Günther, and Z. S. Wang, *The Decay  $B \rightarrow K\nu\bar{\nu}$  at Belle II and a Massless Bino in R-parity-violating Supersymmetry*, [arXiv:2309.03727](#).
- [171] A. J. Buras and P. Stangl, *work in progress*, .
- [172] A. Crivellin, *Explaining the Cabibbo Angle Anomaly*, 7, 2022. [arXiv:2207.02507](#).
- [173] A. J. Buras, A. Poschenrieder, and S. Uhlig, *Particle-antiparticle mixing,  $\varepsilon_K$  and the unitarity triangle in the littlest Higgs model*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **716** (2005) 173–198, [[hep-ph/0410309](#)].
- [174] B. Belfatto, R. Beradze, and Z. Berezhiani, *The CKM unitarity problem: A trace of new physics at the TeV scale?*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80** (2020), no. 2 149, [[arXiv:1906.02714](#)].
- [175] B. Belfatto and Z. Berezhiani, *Are the CKM anomalies induced by vector-like quarks? Limits from flavor changing and Standard Model precision tests*, *JHEP* **10** (2021) 079, [[arXiv:2103.05549](#)].
- [176] F. J. Botella, G. C. Branco, M. N. Rebelo, J. I. Silva-Marcos, and J. F. Bastos, *Decays of the heavy top and new insights on  $\varepsilon_K$  in a one-VLQ minimal solution to the CKM unitarity problem*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82** (2022), no. 4 360, [[arXiv:2111.15401](#)].
- [177] A. Crivellin, M. Kirk, T. Kitahara, and F. Mescia, *Global Fit of Modified Quark Couplings to EW Gauge Bosons and Vector-Like Quarks in Light of the Cabibbo Angle Anomaly*, [arXiv:2212.06862](#).
- [178] J. M. Alves, G. C. Branco, A. L. Cherchiglia, C. C. Nishi, J. T. Penedo, P. M. F. Pereira, M. N. Rebelo, and J. I. Silva-Marcos, *Vector-like Singlet Quarks: a Roadmap*, [arXiv:2304.10561](#).
- [179] T. Li, X.-D. Ma, and M. A. Schmidt, *Implication of  $K \rightarrow \pi\nu\bar{\nu}$  for generic neutrino interactions in effective field theories*, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020), no. 5 055019, [[arXiv:1912.10433](#)].

- [180] F. F. Deppisch, K. Fridell, and J. Harz, *Probing lepton number violating interactions in rare kaon decays*, *JHEP* **12** (2020) 186, [arXiv:2009.04494].
- [181] F. F. Deppisch, K. Fridell, and J. Harz, *Implications of Rare Kaon Decays on Lepton Number Violating Interactions*, *PoS ICHEP2020* (2021) 130, [arXiv:2012.14825].
- [182] T. Felkl, S. L. Li, and M. A. Schmidt, *A tale of invisibility: constraints on new physics in  $b \rightarrow s\nu\nu$* , *JHEP* **12** (2021) 118, [arXiv:2111.04327].
- [183] K. Fridell, L. Gráf, J. Harz, and C. Hati, *Probing Lepton Number Violation: A Comprehensive Survey of Dimension-7 SMEFT*, arXiv:2306.08709.
- [184] A. J. Buras and J. Harz, *Searching for Footprints of Majorana Neutrinos in Rare  $K$  and  $B$  Decays*, in preparation, .
- [185] K. Schmidt-Hoberg, F. Staub, and M. W. Winkler, *Constraints on light mediators: confronting dark matter searches with  $B$  physics*, *Phys. Lett.* **B727** (2013) 506–510, [arXiv:1310.6752].
- [186] **Particle Data Group** Collaboration, M. Tanabashi et al., *Review of Particle Physics*, *Phys. Rev. D* **98** (2018), no. 3 030001.
- [187] M. Gell-Mann and A. Pais, *Behavior of neutral particles under charge conjugation*, *Phys. Rev.* **97** (1955) 1387–1389.
- [188] M. Gell-Mann and A. Rosenfeld, *Hyperons and heavy mesons (systematics and decay)*, *Ann.Rev.Nucl.Part.Sci.* **7** (1957) 407–478.
- [189] W. A. Bardeen, A. J. Buras, and J.-M. Gérard, *A Consistent Analysis of the  $\Delta I = 1/2$  Rule for  $K$  Decays*, *Phys. Lett.* **B192** (1987) 138.
- [190] A. J. Buras, J.-M. Gérard, and W. A. Bardeen, *Large  $N$  Approach to Kaon Decays and Mixing 28 Years Later:  $\Delta I = 1/2$  Rule,  $\hat{B}_K$  and  $\Delta M_K$* , *Eur. Phys. J.* **C74** (2014), no. 5 2871, [arXiv:1401.1385].
- [191] **RBC, UKQCD** Collaboration, R. Abbott et al., *Direct  $CP$  violation and the  $\Delta I = 1/2$  rule in  $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$  decay from the standard model*, *Phys. Rev. D* **102** (2020), no. 5 054509, [arXiv:2004.09440].
- [192] M. A. Shifman, A. Vainshtein, and V. I. Zakharov, *Light Quarks and the Origin of the  $\Delta I = 1/2$  Rule in the Nonleptonic Decays of Strange Particles*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B120** (1977) 316.
- [193] E. Pallante and A. Pich, *Final state interactions in kaon decays*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B592** (2001) 294–320, [hep-ph/0007208].
- [194] **RBC, UKQCD** Collaboration, P. Boyle et al., *Emerging understanding of the  $\Delta I = 1/2$  Rule from Lattice QCD*, arXiv:1212.1474.
- [195] T. Blum et al.,  *$K \rightarrow \pi\pi$   $\Delta I = 3/2$  decay amplitude in the continuum limit*, *Phys. Rev.* **D91** (2015), no. 7 074502, [arXiv:1502.00263].

- [196] A. J. Buras, *The  $\epsilon'/\epsilon$ -Story: 1976-2021*, *Acta Phys. Polon. B* **52** (2021), no. 1 7–41, [arXiv:2101.00020].
- [197] NA48 Collaboration, J. Batley et al., *A Precision measurement of direct CP violation in the decay of neutral kaons into two pions*, *Phys. Lett.* **B544** (2002) 97–112, [hep-ex/0208009].
- [198] KTeV Collaboration, A. Alavi-Harati et al., *Measurements of direct CP violation, CPT symmetry, and other parameters in the neutral kaon system*, *Phys. Rev.* **D67** (2003) 012005, [hep-ex/0208007].
- [199] KTeV Collaboration, E. Abouzaid et al., *Precise Measurements of Direct CP Violation, CPT Symmetry, and Other Parameters in the Neutral Kaon System*, *Phys. Rev.* **D83** (2011) 092001, [arXiv:1011.0127].
- [200] F. J. Gilman and M. B. Wise, *The  $\Delta I = 1/2$  Rule and Violation of CP in the Six Quark Model*, *Phys. Lett.* **B83** (1979) 83–86.
- [201] W. A. Bardeen, A. J. Buras, and J.-M. Gérard, *The  $\Delta I = 1/2$  Rule in the Large  $N$  Limit*, *Phys. Lett.* **B180** (1986) 133.
- [202] W. A. Bardeen, A. J. Buras, and J.-M. Gérard, *The  $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$  Decays in the Large  $N$  Limit: Quark Evolution*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B293** (1987) 787.
- [203] J. F. Donoghue, E. Golowich, B. R. Holstein, and J. Trampetic, *Electromagnetic and Isospin Breaking Effects Decrease  $\epsilon'/\epsilon$* , *Phys. Lett.* **B179** (1986) 361. [Erratum: *Phys. Lett.* **B188**, 511 (1987)].
- [204] A. J. Buras and J. M. Gérard, *Isospin Breaking Contributions to  $\epsilon'/\epsilon$* , *Phys. Lett.* **B192** (1987) 156.
- [205] A. J. Buras, M. Gorbahn, S. Jäger, and M. Jamin, *Improved anatomy of  $\epsilon'/\epsilon$  in the Standard Model*, *JHEP* **11** (2015) 202, [arXiv:1507.06345].
- [206] V. Cirigliano, A. Pich, G. Ecker, and H. Neufeld, *Isospin violation in  $\epsilon'$* , *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91** (2003) 162001, [hep-ph/0307030].
- [207] V. Cirigliano, G. Ecker, H. Neufeld, and A. Pich, *Isospin breaking in  $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$  decays*, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C33** (2004) 369–396, [hep-ph/0310351].
- [208] J. Bijnens and F. Borg, *Isospin breaking in  $K \rightarrow 3\pi$  decays III: Bremsstrahlung and fit to experiment*, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C40** (2005) 383–394, [hep-ph/0501163].
- [209] A. J. Buras and J.-M. Gérard, *Isospin-breaking in  $\epsilon'/\epsilon$ : impact of  $\eta_0$  at the dawn of the 2020s*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80** (2020), no. 8 701, [arXiv:2005.08976].
- [210] V. Cirigliano, H. Gisbert, A. Pich, and A. Rodríguez-Sánchez, *Theoretical status of  $\epsilon'/\epsilon$* , *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **1526** (2020) 012011, [arXiv:1912.04736].
- [211] ETM Collaboration, M. Constantinou, M. Costa, R. Frezzotti, V. Lubicz, G. Martinelli, D. Meloni, H. Panagopoulos, and S. Simula,  *$K \rightarrow \pi$  matrix elements of the chromomagnetic operator on the lattice*, *Phys. Rev.* **D97** (2018), no. 7 074501, [arXiv:1712.09824].

- [212] A. J. Buras and J.-M. Gérard, *K* →  $\pi\pi$  and *K* –  $\pi$  Matrix Elements of the Chromomagnetic Operators from Dual QCD, *JHEP* **07** (2018) 126, [arXiv:1803.08052].
- [213] J. Aebischer, C. Bobeth, and A. J. Buras,  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$  in the Standard Model at the Dawn of the 2020s, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80** (2020), no. 8 705, [arXiv:2005.05978].
- [214] V. Antonelli, S. Bertolini, M. Fabbrichesi, and E. I. Lashin, The  $\Delta I = 1/2$  selection rule, *Nucl. Phys.* **B469** (1996) 181–201, [hep-ph/9511341].
- [215] S. Bertolini, J. O. Eeg, and M. Fabbrichesi, A New estimate of  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$ , *Nucl. Phys.* **B476** (1996) 225–254, [hep-ph/9512356].
- [216] E. Pallante and A. Pich, Strong enhancement of  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$  through final state interactions, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84** (2000) 2568–2571, [hep-ph/9911233].
- [217] E. Pallante, A. Pich, and I. Scimemi, The Standard model prediction for  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$ , *Nucl. Phys.* **B617** (2001) 441–474, [hep-ph/0105011].
- [218] A. J. Buras and J.-M. Gérard, Upper Bounds on  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$  Parameters  $B_6^{(1/2)}$  and  $B_8^{(3/2)}$  from Large *N* QCD and other News, *JHEP* **12** (2015) 008, [arXiv:1507.06326].
- [219] A. J. Buras and J.-M. Gérard, Final state interactions in *K* →  $\pi\pi$  decays:  $\Delta I = 1/2$  rule vs.  $\varepsilon'/\varepsilon$ , *Eur. Phys. J.* **C77** (2017), no. 1 10, [arXiv:1603.05686].
- [220] A. J. Buras and J.-M. Gérard, Dual QCD Insight into BSM Hadronic Matrix Elements for *K*<sup>0</sup> –  $\bar{K}$ <sup>0</sup> Mixing from Lattice QCD, *Acta Phys. Polon. B* **50** (2019) 121, [arXiv:1804.02401].
- [221] **ETM** Collaboration, N. Carrasco, P. Dimopoulos, R. Frezzotti, V. Lubicz, G. C. Rossi, S. Simula, and C. Tarantino,  $\Delta S = 2$  and  $\Delta C = 2$  bag parameters in the standard model and beyond from  $N_f=2+1+1$  twisted-mass lattice QCD, *Phys. Rev.* **D92** (2015), no. 3 034516, [arXiv:1505.06639].
- [222] **SWME** Collaboration, B. J. Choi et al., Kaon BSM *B*-parameters using improved staggered fermions from  $N_f = 2 + 1$  unquenched QCD, *Phys. Rev.* **D93** (2016), no. 1 014511, [arXiv:1509.00592].
- [223] **RBC/UKQCD** Collaboration, N. Garron, R. J. Hudspith, and A. T. Lytle, Neutral Kaon Mixing Beyond the Standard Model with  $n_f = 2 + 1$  Chiral Fermions Part 1: Bare Matrix Elements and Physical Results, *JHEP* **11** (2016) 001, [arXiv:1609.03334].
- [224] **RBC, UKQCD** Collaboration, P. A. Boyle, N. Garron, R. J. Hudspith, C. Lehner, and A. T. Lytle, Neutral kaon mixing beyond the Standard Model with  $n_f = 2 + 1$  chiral fermions. Part 2: non perturbative renormalisation of the  $\Delta F = 2$  four-quark operators, *JHEP* **10** (2017) 054, [arXiv:1708.03552].
- [225] P. Boyle, N. Garron, J. Kettle, A. Khamseh, and J. T. Tsang, BSM Kaon Mixing at the Physical Point, *EPJ Web Conf.* **175** (2018) 13010, [arXiv:1710.09176].

- [226] **SWME** Collaboration, T. Bae et al., *Improved determination of  $\hat{B}_K$  with staggered quarks*, *Phys. Rev.* **D89** (2014), no. 7 074504, [[arXiv:1402.0048](#)].
- [227] P. Boyle, N. Garron, R. J. Hudspith, A. Juttner, J. Kettle, A. Khamseh, and J. T. Tsang, *Beyond the Standard Model Kaon Mixing with Physical Masses*, *PoS LATTICE2018* (2019) 285, [[arXiv:1812.04981](#)].
- [228] W. A. Bardeen, A. J. Buras, and J.-M. Gérard, *The B Parameter Beyond the Leading Order of  $1/N$  Expansion*, *Phys. Lett.* **B211** (1988) 343.
- [229] J. Aebischer, A. J. Buras, and J.-M. Gérard, *BSM hadronic matrix elements for  $\epsilon'/\epsilon$  and  $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$  decays in the Dual QCD approach*, *JHEP* **02** (2019) 021, [[arXiv:1807.01709](#)].
- [230] J. Aebischer, C. Bobeth, A. J. Buras, and D. M. Straub, *Anatomy of  $\epsilon'/\epsilon$  beyond the standard model*, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C79** (2019), no. 3 219, [[arXiv:1808.00466](#)].
- [231] J. Aebischer, C. Bobeth, A. J. Buras, J.-M. Gérard, and D. M. Straub, *Master formula for  $\epsilon'/\epsilon$  beyond the Standard Model*, *Phys. Lett.* **B792** (2019) 465–469, [[arXiv:1807.02520](#)].
- [232] 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** (2021) 227, [[arXiv:2107.10262](#)].
- [233] J. Aebischer, C. Bobeth, A. J. Buras, and J. Kumar, *BSM master formula for  $\epsilon'/\epsilon$  in the WET basis at NLO in QCD*, *JHEP* **12** (2021) 043, [[arXiv:2107.12391](#)].
- [234] W. Buchmuller and D. Wyler, *Effective Lagrangian Analysis of New Interactions and Flavor Conservation*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B268** (1986) 621–653.
- [235] B. Grzadkowski, M. Iskrzynski, M. Misiak, and J. Rosiek, *Dimension-Six Terms in the Standard Model Lagrangian*, *JHEP* **1010** (2010) 085, [[arXiv:1008.4884](#)].
- [236] I. Brivio and M. Trott, *The Standard Model as an Effective Field Theory*, *Phys. Rept.* **793** (2019) 1–98, [[arXiv:1706.08945](#)].
- [237] G. Isidori, F. Wilsch, and D. Wyler, *The Standard Model effective field theory at work*, [arXiv:2303.16922](#).
- [238] E. E. Jenkins, A. V. Manohar, and M. Trott, *Renormalization Group Evolution of the Standard Model Dimension Six Operators I: Formalism and lambda Dependence*, *JHEP* **10** (2013) 087, [[arXiv:1308.2627](#)].
- [239] E. E. Jenkins, A. V. Manohar, and M. Trott, *Renormalization Group Evolution of the Standard Model Dimension Six Operators II: Yukawa Dependence*, *JHEP* **01** (2014) 035, [[arXiv:1310.4838](#)].
- [240] R. Alonso, E. E. Jenkins, A. V. Manohar, and M. Trott, *Renormalization Group Evolution of the Standard Model Dimension Six Operators III: Gauge Coupling Dependence and Phenomenology*, *JHEP* **04** (2014) 159, [[arXiv:1312.2014](#)].

- [241] E. E. Jenkins, A. V. Manohar, and P. Stoffer, *Low-Energy Effective Field Theory below the Electroweak Scale: Anomalous Dimensions*, *JHEP* **01** (2018) 084, [arXiv:1711.05270].
- [242] 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** (2017) 158, [arXiv:1704.06639].
- [243] 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].
- [244] W. Dekens and P. Stoffer, *Low-energy effective field theory below the electroweak scale: matching at one loop*, *JHEP* **10** (2019) 197, [arXiv:1908.05295].
- [245] 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].
- [246] C. Bobeth, A. J. Buras, A. Celis, and M. Jung, *Patterns of Flavour Violation in Models with Vector-Like Quarks*, *JHEP* **04** (2017) 079, [arXiv:1609.04783].
- [247] C. Bobeth, A. J. Buras, A. Celis, and M. Jung, *Yukawa enhancement of  $Z$ -mediated new physics in  $\Delta S = 2$  and  $\Delta B = 2$  processes*, *JHEP* **07** (2017) 124, [arXiv:1703.04753].
- [248] T. Hurth, S. Renner, and W. Shepherd, *Matching for FCNC effects in the flavour-symmetric SMEFT*, *JHEP* **06** (2019) 029, [arXiv:1903.00500].
- [249] M. Endo, T. Kitahara, and D. Ueda, *SMEFT top-quark effects on  $\Delta F = 2$  observables*, *JHEP* **07** (2019) 182, [arXiv:1811.04961].
- [250] B. Grzadkowski and M. Misiak, *Anomalous  $Wtb$  coupling effects in the weak radiative  $B$ -meson decay*, *Phys. Rev.* **D78** (2008) 077501, [arXiv:0802.1413].
- [251] J. Aebischer, C. Bobeth, A. J. Buras, and J. Kumar, *SMEFT ATLAS of  $\Delta F = 2$  transitions*, *JHEP* **12** (2020) 187, [arXiv:2009.07276].
- [252] J. Aebischer, A. J. Buras, and J. Kumar, *NLO QCD renormalization group evolution for nonleptonic  $\Delta F=2$  transitions in the SMEFT*, *Phys. Rev. D* **106** (2022), no. 3 035003, [arXiv:2203.11224].
- [253] J. Elias Miró, J. Ingoldby, and M. Riemann, *EFT anomalous dimensions from the  $S$ -matrix*, *JHEP* **09** (2020) 163, [arXiv:2005.06983].
- [254] Z. Bern, J. Parra-Martinez, and E. Sawyer, *Structure of two-loop SMEFT anomalous dimensions via on-shell methods*, *JHEP* **10** (2020) 211, [arXiv:2005.12917].
- [255] C. S. Machado, S. Renner, and D. Sutherland, *Building blocks of the flavourful SMEFT RG*, *JHEP* **03** (2023) 226, [arXiv:2210.09316].

- 
- [256] S. Banik and A. Crivellin, *Renormalization Group Evolution with Scalar Leptoquarks*, [arXiv:2307.06800](#).
- [257] J. Aebischer et al., *Computing Tools for Effective Field Theories*, 7, 2023. [arXiv:2307.08745](#).
- [258] A. Greljo, J. Salko, A. Smolkovič, and P. Stangl, *Rare  $b$  decays meet high-mass Drell-Yan*, *JHEP* **05** (2023) 087, [[arXiv:2212.10497](#)].
- [259] M. Algueró, A. Biswas, B. Capdevila, S. Descotes-Genon, J. Matias, and M. Novoa-Brunet, *To  $(b)e$  or not to  $(b)e$ : No electrons at  $LHCb$* , [arXiv:2304.07330](#).
- [260] B. Capdevila, A. Crivellin, and J. Matias, *Review of Semileptonic  $B$  Anomalies*, [arXiv:2309.01311](#).