

Heavy Quarks on the Lattice

Craig McNeile¹

Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Liverpool, L69 3BX, UK

Abstract. I review the basic ideas behind lattice QCD calculations that involve charm and bottom quarks. I report on the progress in getting the correct hyperfine splitting in charmonium from lattice QCD. Some of the basic technology behind numerical lattice QCD calculations is explained by studying some specific examples: computation of the charm quark mass, and the calculation of f_B .

1 Introduction

The B factories at KEK and SLAC are producing a wealth of new data on the decays of the B meson. One of the main goals of the current heavy flavor program is to check the CKM matrix formalism by measuring the matrix elements with sufficient accuracy. To convert the experimental data into information about the quarks requires the accurate computation of hadronic matrix elements. The best (and some would say only) way of computing the required matrix elements is to use lattice QCD.

In this paper I will explain the generic features of lattice QCD calculations that involve heavy quarks. Heavy quark lattice calculations share many common features to continuum calculations, such as matching to effective field theories. However, the more general formalism of lattice QCD allows a richer set of tools beyond just using perturbation theory. As most lattice QCD calculations share generic features, I will work through an example of computing the charm quark mass to show the important parts of the calculation. I will then discuss the calculation of the f_B decay constant. I assume the reader is already familiar with the basic ideas of heavy quark effective field theory [1,2].

The latest results on heavy quark physics from the lattice are reported in the reviews at the annual lattice conference [3,4,5]. The contents of the proceedings of the lattice conference have been put on hep-lat for the past couple of years [6,7]. The longer reviews by Kronfeld [8], Davies [9,10] and Flynn and Sachrajda [11] contain other perspectives on heavy quarks on the lattice. Gupta gives a general overview of lattice QCD [12]. There have been recent (political) developments to set up a working group on producing a “particle data table” for lattice QCD results [13].

2 A brief introduction to numerical lattice QCD

Most lattice QCD calculations start from the calculation of the correlator $c_{ij}(t)$ defined in terms of the path integral as:

$$c_{ij}(t) = \frac{1}{Z} \int dU \int d\psi d\bar{\psi} O(t)_i O(0)_j^\dagger e^{-S_F - S_G} \quad (1)$$

where S_F is the action of the fermions and S_G is the action of pure gauge theory.

The path integral is regulated by the introduction of a four dimensional space-time lattice. A typical lattice volume would be $24^3 \cdot 48$. The path integral is evaluated in Euclidean space for convergence. The fermion action is

$$S_F = \bar{\psi} M \psi \quad (2)$$

where M is called the fermion operator, a lattice approximation to the Dirac operator. The quadratic structure of the fermion action in equation 2 allows the integration over the fermion fields to be done explicitly.

$$c_{ij}(t) = \frac{1}{Z} \int dU O(t)_i O(0)_j^\dagger \det(M) e^{-S_G} \quad (3)$$

The $\det(M)$ term controls the dynamics of the sea quarks. The $O(t)$ operator controls the valence content of the state. For example an operator ($O(t)$) for a B meson would be:

$$O(t) = \bar{b}(t) \gamma_5 q(t) \quad (4)$$

where b and q are operators for the bottom and light quarks respectively. The operators in the path integral are Wick contracted to form a combination of quark propagators inside the path integral over the gauge fields.

$$c(t) = \frac{1}{Z} \int dU \bar{b}(t) \gamma_5 q(t) \bar{q}(0) \gamma_5 b(0) \det(M) e^{-S_G} \quad (5)$$

The physical picture for the expression in 5 is a B meson created at time 0 and propagating to time t where it is destroyed. Figure 1 shows the propagation of the light and heavy quark in the vacuum.

The path integral expression for the correlator in equation 1 is calculated using Monte Carlo techniques on the computer. The ideas are sophisticated variants of the Monte Carlo method used to compute integrals.

The algorithms, usually based on importance sampling, produce N samples of the gauge fields on the lattice. Each gauge field is a snapshot of the vacuum. The QCD vacuum is a complicated structure. There is a community of people who are trying to describe the QCD vacuum in terms of objects such as a liquid of instantons (for example [14]). The correlator $c(t)$ is a function of the bottom ($M(U(i))_b^{-1}$) and light quark ($M(U(i))_q^{-1}$) propagators averaged over the samples of the gauge fields.

$$c(t) \sim \frac{1}{N} \sum_i^N f(M(U(i))_b^{-1}, M(U(i))_q^{-1}) \quad (6)$$

The quark propagator is the inverse of the fermion operator. In perturbative calculations the quark propagator can be computed analytically from the fermion operator. In lattice QCD calculations the gauge fields have complicated space-time dependence so the quark propagator is computed numerically using variants of conjugate gradient algorithms.

The physics is extracted from the correlators by fitting the correlator to a functional form such as 7.

$$c_{ij}(t) = c_{ij}^0 e^{-m_0 t} + c_{ij}^1 e^{-m_1 t} + \dots \quad (7)$$

To visually judge the quality of the data, the correlators are often displayed as effective mass plots

$$m_{eff}(t) = \log\left(\frac{c(t)}{c(t+1)}\right) \quad (8)$$

An example of an effective mass plot (using the data generated for [15]) is in figure 2.

The computationally expensive part of lattice QCD calculations is generating the samples of gauge fields. The most expensive part of a lattice calculation is incorporating the determinant in equation 3. The SESAM collaboration [16] estimated that the number of floating point operations (N_{flop}) needed for $n_f = 2$ full QCD calculations as:

$$N_{flop} \propto \left(\frac{L}{a}\right)^5 \left(\frac{1}{am_{pi}}\right)^{2.8} \quad (9)$$

A flop is a floating point operation such as a multiplication or addition. The value of N_{flop} represents amount of calculation required on the computer and even more importantly the cost of the computer required.

In some sense equation 9 (or some variant of it) is the most important equation in numerical lattice QCD. To half the size of the pion mass used in the calculations requires essentially a computer that is seven times faster. Equation 9 is not a hard physical limit. Improved algorithms or techniques may be




Fig. 1. Two point correlator

Collaboration	n_f	a fm	L fm	$\frac{M_{PS}}{M_V}$
MILC [21]	2+1	0.09	2.5	0.4
CP-PACS [22]	2	0.11	2.5	0.6
UKQCD [23]	2	0.1	1.6	0.58
SESAM [24]	2	0.08	2.0	0.56

Table 1. Typical parameters in recent unquenched lattice QCD calculations.

cheaper. In fact the ‘‘Asqtad’’ fermion action designed by the MILC collaboration is already computationally cheaper [17] than the cost estimates in equation 9.

The cost formula in equation 9 is for the generation of the gauge configurations. Once the gauge configurations have been generated, correlators for many different processes can be computed using some generalization of equation 6. This class of calculation can be carried out on a farm of workstations. The lattice QCD community are starting to create publicly available source code [18] and gauge configurations [19,20].

Table 1 shows the parameters of some recent large scale unquenched calculations. It is not considered necessary to do lattice calculations with physical light masses $M_{PS}/M_V = M_\pi/M_\rho \sim 0.18$. The aim is calculate with light enough quarks so that chiral perturbation theory can be used to make contact with the experiment. Sharpe [25] estimates that going as light as $M_{PS}/M_V \sim 0.3$ may be necessary.

The high computational cost of the fermion determinant led to development of quenched QCD, where the dynamics of the determinant is not included in equation 5, hence the dynamics of the sea quarks is omitted. Until recently the majority of lattice QCD calculations were done in quenched QCD. When the dynamics of the sea quarks are included I will call the calculation unquenched.

Lattice QCD calculations produce results in units of the lattice spacing. One experimental number must be used to calculate the lattice spacing from:

$$a = am_{latt}^X / m_{expt}^X \quad (10)$$

As the lattice spacing goes to zero any choice of m_{expt}^X should produce the same lattice spacing – this is known scaling. Unfortunately, no calculations are in this regime yet. The recent unquenched calculations by the MILC collaboration [26] may be close.

Popular choices to set the scale are the mass of the rho, mass splitting between the S and P wave mesons in charmonium, and a quantity defined from the lattice potential called r_0 . The quantity r_0 is defined by r_0 [27].

$$r_0^2 \frac{dV}{dr} \Big|_{r_0} = 1.65 \quad (11)$$

Many potential [27] models predict $r_0 \sim 0.5$ fm. There is no perfect way to compute the lattice spacing. Although it may seem a little strange to use r_0 to calculate the lattice spacing, when it is not directly known from experiment,

there are problems with all methods to set the lattice spacing. For example, to set the scale from the mass of the rho meson requires a long extrapolation in light quark mass. Also it is not clear how to deal with the decay width of the rho in Euclidean space.

2.1 Fermion actions for light quarks

The lattice QCD formalism has the quark fields on the nodes of the lattice. The gauge fields are $SU(3)$ matrices and lie between the nodes of the lattice. There are a variety of different ways of writing a lattice approximation to the Dirac operator on the lattice. Gupta [12] reviews the problems and possibilities of fermion actions on the lattice. Discussions between lattice gauge theorists over which lattice fermion action is best must seem to outsiders to have the flavour of fanatical religious discussions, with the lattice “community” breaking into various sects, and accusations of “idolatry” being flung around. In the continuum limit all the fermion actions should produce the same results. This is clearly a good check on the results.

As a starting point I will consider the Wilson fermion action.

$$S_f^W = \sum_x (\kappa \sum_\mu \{ \bar{\psi}_x (\gamma_\mu - 1) U_\mu(x) \psi_{x+\mu} - \bar{\psi}_{x+\mu} (\gamma_\mu + 1) U_\mu^\dagger(x) \psi_x \} + \bar{\psi}_x \psi_x) \quad (12)$$

The tree level relation between κ and the quark mass m is $\kappa = \frac{1}{2(4+m)}$.

There is a lot of effort in the lattice gauge community on designing new fermion actions for light quarks (with masses lighter than the strange quark mass). There has been a long standing concern about fermion doubling on the lattice [12]. There are a number of pragmatic solutions to the doubling problem. For example the action in equation 12 breaks chiral symmetry with an $O(a)$ term. Chiral symmetry will be restored as the continuum limit ($a \rightarrow 0$) is taken, but lack of chiral symmetry at finite lattice spacing causes problems, such as the difficulty of reaching light quark masses.

Our understanding of chiral symmetry on the lattice has increased by the rediscovery of the Ginsparg-Wilson relation [28]:

$$M\gamma_5 + \gamma_5 M = aM\gamma_5 M \quad (13)$$

where M is the fermion operator in equation 2 at zero mass.

Lattice fermion operators that obey the Ginsparg-Wilson relation (equation 13) have a form of lattice chiral symmetry [29]. Explicit solutions, such as overlap-Dirac [30] or perfect actions [31], to equation 13 are known. Actions that obey the Ginsparg-Wilson relation are increasingly being used for quenched QCD calculations [32]. This class of actions have not been used for heavy quark calculations (see [33] for some speculations). Domain Wall actions, that can loosely be thought of as being approximate solutions to the Ginsparg-Wilson relation are being used in calculations [34,35] of the matrix elements for the ϵ'/ϵ . Unfortunately, solutions of the Ginsparg-Wilson relation are too expensive computationally to be used for unquenched calculations [36].

n_f	input	m_s MeV
2	ϕ	90^{+5}_{-11}
2	K	88^{+4}_{-6}
0	ϕ	132^{+4}_{-6}
0	K	110^{+3}_{-4}

Table 2. Mass of the strange quark from CP-PACS [22] in the \overline{MS} scheme at a scale of 2 GeV.

A more pragmatic development in the design of light fermion actions is the development of improved staggered fermion actions [37,21]. This class of action is being used for unquenched lattice QCD calculations with very light quarks (see table 1) by the MILC collaboration. The improved staggered quark formalism is quite ugly compared to actions that are solutions of the Ginsparg-Wilson relation. It is not understood why calculations using improved staggered quarks are much faster [17] than calculations using Wilson fermions [16].

The largest systematic study of light hadron spectroscopy in quenched QCD has been carried out by the CP-PACS collaboration [38]. CP-PACS controlled the systematic errors by using $a \approx 0.1 - 0.05$ fm, $m_\pi/m_\rho \approx 0.75 - 0.4$, and box sizes greater than 3 fm. A summary of CP-PACS's results is in figure 3 CP-PACS [38] summarize their calculation of the light hadron spectrum in quenched QCD by the masses showed a deviation from experiment of less than 11%.

Although an agreement between experiment and the results of quenched QCD at the 11% level might seem impressive, many heavy-light matrix elements need to be computed to an accuracy of under 5% to have an impact on tests of the CKM matrix.

There are now indications of the effects of the sea quarks. For example, the CP-PACS collaboration [22] have used $n_f = 2$ lattice QCD to calculate the strange quark mass. CP-PACS's results are in table 2. The results show a sizable reduction in the mass of the strange quark between quenched and two flavour QCD. See the review by Lubicz [39] for a discussion of the results of CP-PACS in comparison to those from other groups. The results from CP-PACS for the strange quark mass need to be checked by other calculations with lighter quarks and finer lattice spacings,

3 The different ways of treating heavy quarks on the lattice

In principle all the above formalism can be used to do calculations that include charm and bottom quarks. Unfortunately, in practice there is a restriction that the quark mass should be much less than the lattice spacing.

$$aM_Q \ll 1 \tag{14}$$

As the lattice spacings accessible to current calculations are $\frac{1}{a} \sim 2$ GeV (see table 1) and 4 GeV [40] for unquenched and quenched QCD respectively. Hence

calculations using traditional techniques will just about work for the charm mass ($m_c \sim 1.3$ GeV), but will not work for the bottom quark ($m_b \sim 5$ GeV). It is computationally expensive (see equation 9) to reduce the lattice spacing, so that a b quark will be resolved by the lattice. There are a variety of special techniques for including the bottom quark in lattice QCD calculations, all of them are based on heavy quark effective field theory.

I do not discuss the method of using the potentials measured in lattice QCD with Schrödinger's equation to compute the mass spectrum of heavy-heavy mesons. This subject is reviewed by Bali [41]. The potential based approach is not applicable to computing matrix elements, so is not useful for checks of the CKM matrix.

Various subsets of the lattice QCD community have strong opinions on the right (and wrong) approach to including heavy quarks in lattice calculations. Obtaining consistent results from calculations that use different heavy quark actions is a good check on the systematic errors. In the next sections, I describe some of the more popular techniques used for heavy quarks on the lattice. I report on the results from this class of methods in section 3.5.

3.1 The improvement view

There are concerns that the results from lattice calculations have large lattice spacing errors because $aM_Q \sim 1$ even for charm quarks. The Wilson action in equation 12 has $O(a)$ lattice spacing errors. If the $O(a)$ term is removed then perhaps larger quark masses could be used in the lattice QCD calculations.

A standard technique from numerical analysis is to use derivatives that are closer approximations to the continuum derivatives. For example the lattice derivative in equation 16 should be more accurate with a larger lattice spacing than derivative in equation 15.

$$\frac{f(x+a) - f(x-a)}{2a} = \frac{df}{dx} + O(a^2) \quad (15)$$

$$\frac{4}{3} \left\{ \frac{f(x+a) - f(x-a)}{2a} - \frac{f(x+2a) - f(x-2a)}{16a} \right\} = \frac{df}{dx} + O(a^4) \quad (16)$$

However in a quantum field theory there are additional complications, such as operators mixing under renormalization.

There is a formalism due to Symanzik [42,43] called improvement where new terms are added to the lattice action that cancel $O(a)$ terms in a way that is consistent with quantum field theory. The "simplest" improvement [44] to the Wilson action is to add the clover term 17 to remove tree level lattice spacing errors:

$$S_f^{clover} = S_f^W + c_{SW} \frac{ia\kappa}{2} \sum_x (\bar{\psi}_x \sigma_{\nu\mu} F_{\nu\mu} \psi_x) \quad (17)$$

where $F_{\nu\mu}$ is the lattice field strength tensor.

If the c_{SW} coefficient is computed in perturbation theory is used then the errors are $O(ag^4)$. The ALPHA collaboration [45] have computed c_{SW} to all orders in g^2 using a numerical technique. The result for c_{SW} from ALPHA is:

$$c_{SW} = \frac{1 - 0.656g^2 - 0.152g^4 - 0.054g^6}{1 - 0.922g^2} \quad (18)$$

for $0 < g < 1$, where g is the coupling. The estimate of c_{SW} , by ALPHA collaboration, agrees with the one loop perturbation theory for $g < 1/2$.

Some groups tried to use the results from lattice QCD calculations with quark masses around charm with the scaling laws from heavy quark effective field theory to compute matrix elements for the b quark. An example tried by the UKQCD collaboration [46] was to extrapolate the f_B decay constant from masses around charm, where the clover action can be legitimately used, to the bottom mass, using a functional form based on HQET [2].

$$\Phi(M_P) \equiv \left(\frac{\alpha(M_P)}{\alpha(M_B)}\right)^{2/\beta_0} f_P \sqrt{M_P} = \gamma_P \left(1 + \frac{\delta_P}{M_P} + \frac{\eta_P}{M_P^2} + \dots\right) \quad (19)$$

The review by Bernard [4] describes the potential problems with this approach. An extrapolation in mass from 2 GeV to around the bottom quark mass at 5 GeV is problematic. Note that UKQCD [46] did address some of Bernard's criticism [4].

Computers are fast enough to directly include quark masses close to the bottom mass in quenched calculations. However, this approach will not work for unquenched calculations for some time.

3.2 The static limit of QCD

It would clearly be better to interpolate in the heavy quark mass rather than use extrapolations. The static theory of QCD can be used to compute the properties mesons with light ante-quark and static (infinitely heavy) quarks. A combined analysis of data from static-light and heavy-light calculations can be used to interpolate to the b quark mass. This was the approach taken by the MILC collaboration [47] in one of the largest calculations of the f_B decay constant.

The lattice static theory of Eichten and Hill [48]

$$S_{static} = ia^3 \sum_x b^\dagger(x)(b(x) - U_0(x - \hat{t})b(x - \hat{t})) \quad (20)$$

has been used for B meson physics.

One of the reasons that static quarks have not been included in many calculations is that it can be difficult to extract masses and amplitudes using equation 7 because the signal to noise ratio is poor. However there are numerical techniques [49] that are better, but not in wide spread use in matrix element determinations.

To extract matrix elements from static-light calculations requires the static-light operators to be matched to QCD. The ALPHA collaboration have started [50] a program to compute the matching and renormalization factors numerically. The one loop matching factors are available.

3.3 Nonrelativistic QCD

It would be better to actually do lattice calculations at the physical bottom or charm quark masses, rather than extrapolate or interpolate to the physical points. The formalism called nonrelativistic QCD(NRQCD) allows this [51,52]. NRQCD is an effective field approximation to QCD for heavy quarks. The operators in the NRQCD Lagrangian are ordered by the velocity v .

A low order Lagrangian for NRQCD is

$$\mathcal{L}_0 = \bar{Q}(\Delta_t - \sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{\Delta_i \Delta_{-i}}{2M_Q a} - c_{NR} \frac{\sigma \cdot B}{2M_Q a} + \dots)Q \quad (21)$$

where Δ_μ are the covariant derivatives on the lattice and B is the chromomagnetic field.

The NRQCD formalism works both for both heavy-light (B) and heavy-heavy systems (Υ). Estimates from potential models [53] suggest that the $v^2 \sim 0.1$ in Υ and $v^2 \sim 0.3$ in charmonium. In section 3.5, I review the evidence that shows that the NRQCD is not as convergent in charmonium as the naive power counting arguments suggest.

The main theoretical disadvantage of NRQCD is that the continuum limit can not be taken because of the $\frac{1}{M_Q a}$ terms in the Lagrangian. In practice improvement techniques can be used.

The coefficients, such as c_{NR} in equation 21, in the Lagrangian are fixed by matching to QCD. The matching calculations involve lattice perturbation theory that is harder than continuum perturbation theory because the Feynman rules are more complicated [54].

A physically motivated (but not rigorous) way of improving the convergence of lattice perturbation theory is to use tadpole improvement [53]. Tadpole perturbation theory can be used to produce “reasonable” tree level estimates for coefficients in the Lagrangian.

To do perturbation theory the gauge links are expanded in terms of the gauge potential:

$$U_\mu(x) = e^{iagA_\mu(x)} \rightarrow 1 + iagA_\mu(x) + \dots \quad (22)$$

Equation 22 suggests that the $\langle U \rangle \sim 1$, however this is not seen in numerical lattice calculations. Also the complicated vacuum structure of QCD would make $\langle U \rangle \sim 1$ unlikely. Lepage and Mackenzie [53] suggest:

$$U_\mu(x) = e^{iagA_\mu(x)} \rightarrow u_0(1 + iagA_\mu(x)) \quad (23)$$

where u_0 is the “mean gauge link”. Unfortunately there is no unique way of defining the mean gauge link. The expectation value of the mean link is zero because it is not gauge invariant. Some estimates are based on taking the quartic root of the plaquette

$$u_{0,P} = \langle \frac{1}{3} \text{ReTr}(U_{plaq}) \rangle^{1/4} \quad (24)$$

or computing the mean link in Landau gauge.

There are projects [55] under way that attempt to estimate the coefficients such as c_{NR} to order α^2 . The basic idea [56] is to try to use weak coupling numerical lattice QCD calculations to obtain information on perturbative quantities.

A similar approach to NRQCD is taken by the Fermilab group [57,58], except that they match to a relativistic fermion action, essentially the clover action with mass dependent coefficients.

3.4 Anisotropic lattices.

A technique that has been used for heavy quarks [59,60,61] is to use a lattice spacing that is smaller in the time direction than in the space direction to circumvent the restriction $am_Q \ll 1$. A finer lattice spacing is used in the time direction such that $a_t m_q \leq 1$ but a larger lattice spacing a_s is used in the spatial direction to keep the cost down and stop any problems with finite size effects. This approach assumes that the discretization error is only weakly dependent on $a_s m_q$.

The anisotropic clover operator [61] is

$$M = m_0 + \nu_0 \widehat{W}_0 \gamma_0 + \frac{\nu}{\xi_0} \sum_i \widehat{W}_i \gamma_i + \frac{i}{2} (w_0 \sum_{x,i} \sigma_{0i} \widehat{F}_{0i}(x) + \frac{w}{\xi_0} \sum_{x,i < j} \sigma_{ij} F_{ij}(x)) \quad (25)$$

The clover action (equation 12 plus 17) is reproduced by the conditions: $\xi_0 = 1$, $\nu = \nu_0$, and $w = w_0$.

The parameters: w_0 , w_i , ν_0 , and ν need to be correctly chosen. For example Klassen [59] proposed to tune ν , by computing the pseudoscalar meson mass at nonzero momentum, and to choose the value of ν that gave $c(\underline{p}) = 1$.

$$E(\underline{p})^2 = E(0)^2 + c(\underline{p})^2 \underline{p}^2 \quad (26)$$

Klassen's [59] original motivation for using this class of action was that it was potentially easier to tune the unknown parameters using the techniques developed by the ALPHA collaboration [45] than for the Fermilab heavy quark action [57].

The pure gauge action is also modified [61]

$$S_g = \beta \left(\frac{1}{\xi_0} \sum_{x,s > s'} [1 - P_{ss'}(x)] + \xi_0 \sum_{x,s} [1 - P_{ss}(x)] \right) \quad (27)$$

where P_{ss} are purely spatial plaquettes and $P_{ss'}$ are plaquettes in space and time. The renormalized anisotropy $\xi_0 = a_s/a_t$ (ratio of lattice spacings in time and space) can be measured by comparing the lattice potential in space and time [62].

A practical problem in lattice calculations is that the signal in equation 7 is lost in the noise for large times. The smaller lattice spacing in the time direction from anisotropic lattices means that the region in lattice units, where there is a signal, is longer, thus it is easier to fit equation 7 to the data. Collins et al. [63] used this feature of anisotropic lattices to get improved signals for form factors. Although the fit region in lattice units is longer, the actual fit region in physical units may be smaller, this may cause problems.

3.5 The hyperfine splitting in charmonium

It is obviously important to test the methods used to solve lattice QCD by comparing the results against experiment. This validation procedure ensures that the various errors in the calculations are under control. Figure 4 shows the charmonium spectrum from lattice QCD calculations by the CP-PACS collaboration [61]. The overall agreement with experiment is quite good.

A particularly good test of lattice QCD techniques is to compute the mass splitting between the J/ψ and η_c . In the section I will use Δm_H to denote the mass difference between J/ψ and η_c . The masses of these two meson can usually be computed with the smallest statistical error bars. Also, as these masses are independent of light valence quarks, this splitting does not depend on a chiral extrapolation of the valence quarks. Hein et al. [64] discuss the various systematic errors in the mass splittings between other heavy hadrons.

I will start by discussing the results from quenched QCD. I will use Δm_H as the mass splitting between the J/ψ and η_c . The experimental value for the mass splitting between the J/ψ and η_c is 116 MeV. It was therefore disappointing that some of the lattice QCD calculations in the early 90's were: $\Delta m_H = 28(2)$ MeV and $52(4)$ MeV from the Wilson action and tree level clover action respectively [65] ($a^{-1} = 2.73$ GeV from the string tension).

Using the clover action with the a value of the clover coefficient c_{SW} (see equation 17) motivated by tadpole perturbation theory, the Fermilab group [66] obtained $\Delta m_H = 93 \pm 10$ MeV.

The hyperfine splitting is sensitive c_{SW} at nonzero lattice spacing, but the hyperfine splitting should be independent of the c_{SW} as the continuum limit is taken, because the clover term is an irrelevant operator.

Recently the QCD-TARO collaboration [67] have studied the charmonium spectrum using the clover action at a smaller lattice spacing ($a^{-1} \sim 5$ GeV) than previously used. Using the clover action QCD-TARO collaboration [67] obtained $\Delta m_H = 99 \pm 7$ MeV, $\Delta M = 87 \pm 2$ MeV, for quadratic and linear extrapolations in the lattice spacing to the continuum.

The NRQCD collaboration calculated Δm_H to be $96(2)$ MeV [68] using an NRQCD action that included terms of $O(m_c v^4)$. The lattice spacing was $a^{-1} = 1.23(4)$ GeV. Using power accounting arguments the size of the next order in the NRQCD expansion was estimated to be 30 to 40 MeV. Unfortunately, when Trottier [69] included the $O(m_c v^6)$ relativistic corrections, he obtained $\Delta m_H = 55(5)$ MeV. The hyperfine splitting is sensitive to the c_{NR} coefficient (see equation 21). Further work by Shakespeare and Trottier [70] showed that the hyperfine splitting was sensitive to the tadpole prescription used to estimate c_{NR} , so the final word on the utility of NRQCD for charm quarks may have to wait for c_{NR} to be computed beyond one loop. The caveat is that the current estimates for c_{NR} seem to produce good agreement with the hyperfine splittings in the baryon sector [71].

Although NRQCD is clearly not the technique to use to compute the hyperfine splitting in charmonium, NRQCD may be valid for hadrons with charm

quarks, such as the mass splittings between the S-wave states and the speculated 1^{-+} state [72] and D mesons [64].

There was a preliminary attempt [73] to use an action motivated by renormalisation group arguments (perfect action [74]) to compute the charmonium spectrum. This class of action should produce results with reduced lattice spacing dependence. Unfortunately the action used in [73] did not produce a result for the hyperfine splitting closer to experiment than any other approach.

Klassen [59] first used anisotropic lattices to study the charmonium system. Using spatial lattice spacings in the range 0.17 to 0.3 fm (the scale was set using $r_0 = 0.5 fm$) and two anisotropies 2 and 3, Klassen obtained a hyperfine splitting of just over 90 MeV in the charmonium system. Chen [60] obtained $\Delta m_H = 71.8(2.0)$ MeV with anisotropy $\xi_0 = a_s/a_t = 2$.

The definitive study of the anisotropic lattice technique for charmonium spectroscopy was carried out by CP-PACS [61]. They fixed the anisotropy at 3 and used spatial lattice spacings between 0.07 and 2 fm (finer than both Chen [60] and Klassen [59]). The results from CP-PACS [61] were: $\Delta m_H = 73(4)$ MeV using r_0 to set the scale and $85(8)$ MeV using the P - S splitting for the lattice spacing. I have combined the different errors using quadrature. CP-PACS concluded that $a_s m_q < 1$ is still required for a reliable continuum extrapolation.

A qualitative explanation for the low value of the hyperfine splitting in charmonium from quenched QCD was given by El-khadra [66] using potential model ideas. In El-khadra's model the Richardson potential [75] is used

$$V(q^2) = C_F \frac{4\pi}{\beta_0^{n_f}} \frac{1}{q^2 \log(1 + q^2/\lambda^2)} \quad (28)$$

with

$$\beta_0^{n_f} = 11 - 2n_f/3 \quad (29)$$

to solve for the wave function of the charm quark. The wave function depends on the number of flavours n_f . El-khadra obtained the result

$$\frac{\Psi^0(0)}{\Psi^3(0)} = 0.86 \quad (30)$$

In this model the hyperfine splitting is related to the wave function and coupling (α_s) as

$$\Delta m_H \sim \frac{\alpha_s(m_c)}{m_c^2} |\Psi(0)|^2 \quad (31)$$

Including the suppression of the coupling in the quenched theory, El-khadra estimated

$$\Delta m_H^{quenched} \sim 70 MeV. \quad (32)$$

There have been a number of unquenched lattice QCD calculations [24,76,23,77] that have seen evidence for the n_f dependence of the heavy quark potential at small distances. The MILC collaboration [77] have systematically studied the wave functions from the measured heavy quark potential from quenched and unquenched calculations.

There has not been much work on the charmonium spectrum from unquenched lattice QCD calculations. El-Khadra et al. [78] did look at the charmonium spectrum on (unimproved) staggered gauge configurations from the MILC collaboration. No significant increase in the hyperfine splitting was reported. The m_π/m_ρ was 0.6 and the lattice spacing was $a^{-1} \sim 0.99(4)$ GeV.

Stewart and Koniuk [79] studied the charmonium spectrum using NRQCD on unquenched (unimproved) staggered gauge configurations ($m_\pi/m_\rho \sim 0.45$ and $a \sim 0.16$ fm). Any signal for the effect of unquenching was hidden beneath the other systematic uncertainties in using NRQCD for charmonium.

Although the potential model argument of El-Khadra for the effect of quenching on the hyperfine splitting gives some insight, it does not explain the sea quark mass dependence of the splitting. Grinstein and Rothstein [80] have developed a formalism based on Chiral Lagrangian for the dependence of quarkonium mass splittings between 1P-1S and 2S-1S on the sea quark mass. Up to chiral logs they predict for the splitting δm

$$\delta m \sim A + Bm_\pi^2 \quad (33)$$

where A and B are unknown parameters and m_π is the mass of the pion made out of light sea quarks.

In my opinion a decade's worth of lattice QCD calculations of the $J/\psi - \eta_c$ mass splitting can be summarized as waiting for unquenched gauge configurations with light sea quark masses. Recently, progress has been made in the Upsilon system using the gauge configurations generated by the MILC collaboration. The preliminary work by Gray et al [81] found that the correct ratio was produced for the (P-S)/(2S-1S) mass splittings in Upsilon. It will be interesting to see the charmonium spectrum on these lattices, particularly if relations such as 33 can be tested and used.

There is another possible reason that the hyperfine mass splitting between the J/ψ and η_c is smaller than experiment in current simulations. All lattice calculations have computed the non-singlet correlator (see figure 1). However, charmonium interpolating operators are actually singlet, so the Wick contractions contain bubble diagrams (see figure 5). The bubble diagrams are OZI suppressed so should be small. However, this argument will fail if there is additional nonperturbative physics. For light mesons [82], it has been found that the effects of the bubbles can be large for the pseudoscalar and scalar mesons where the additional physics is the anomaly and the 0^{++} glueball, but not for other channels.

Morningstar and Peardon [83] have computed the glueball spectrum in quenched QCD. They obtained masses of 2590(40)(130) MeV and 3640(60)(180) MeV for the ground and first excited states of the 0^{-+} glueball respectively. Morningstar and Peardon computed the mass of the 1^{--} glueball to be 3850(50)(190) MeV. So it is not inconceivable that the η_c mass (2980 MeV) is effected more by glueball states than the J/ψ state. The above comments are speculations and can be checked by explicit lattice calculations. As the effect of the bubble diagrams is almost certainly less than 50 MeV, hence this will be a very hard mass splitting to estimate.

Group	Method	$M_{D^*} - M_D$ MeV
Boyle [84]	clover	124(5)(15)
Boyle [85]	$\beta=6.0$ tadpole clover	106(8)
Hein et al. [64]	NRQCD $\beta = 5.7$	$103_{-0-0}^{+3+22} (3)(6)(5)$
UKQCD [46]	NP clover $\beta = 6.2$	130_{-6-35}^{+6+15}
PDG [86]	Experiment	140.64(10)

Table 3. Collection of hyperfine splittings between the D and D^* .

The mass spectrum of heavy-light mesons introduces the additional complication of the light valence quark. Lattice QCD calculations can be done with quark masses around charm, but for computational reasons the light quarks have masses that are typically greater than half the strange quark mass. The lattice data is extrapolated in the light quark mass to the physical points using a fit model based on chiral symmetry.

In table 3 I have collected some results for the $D^* - D$ mass splitting. Currently there is a lot of effort in the lattice gauge theory community to study the chiral extrapolations of quantities with the light quark mass. The Adelaide group [87,88] have developed various phenomenological forms for the light quark mass dependence of hadron masses loosely motivated by effective field theories. The fit models have had some empirical success with extrapolating the masses of the rho and nucleon [87,88], with the caveat that lattice spacing errors were not taken into account. Similar techniques were applied to the $B^* - B$ and $D^* - D$ mass splittings by Guo and Thomas [89]. No improvement with the agreement between experiment and the lattice data was seen.

4 Case study: calculating the charm mass from lattice QCD

The general steps involved in many lattice QCD calculations are fairly similar. To explain the component parts of a lattice QCD calculation, I will explain the use of lattice QCD data to extract the charm quark mass from experimental data. Full details of the calculation of the charm quark mass can be found in [90,91]. I will not discuss the approach [92,93] to computing the charm quark mass based on Fermilab's heavy quark action [57]) and the pole mass. There is a useful review by El-Khadra and Luke [94] on computing the mass of bottom quark.

The error for the mass of the charm quark quoted in the particle data table is 8% - an unbelievably large error for a basic parameter of the standard model that was discovered in 1974. The experimental mass of the D meson is 1869.3 ± 0.5 , hence the error on the charm quark mass is predominantly from theory. There are many places in particle physics where a more accurate value of the charm mass would be useful. Some models of quark matrices predict relationships between quark masses and CKM matrix elements. For example Fritzsche and Xing [95]

κ_H	κ_L	aM_P	aM_V
0.1200	0.1346	0.841^{+1}_{-1}	0.871^{+2}_{-2}
0.1200	0.1351	0.823^{+2}_{-1}	0.856^{+2}_{-2}
0.1233	0.1346	0.739^{+1}_{-1}	0.775^{+2}_{-2}

Table 4. Heavy-light meson mass from UKQCD [46] as a function of κ value. M_{PS} and M_V are the pseudoscalar and vector meson masses

predict

$$\frac{|V_{ub}|}{|V_{cb}|} = \sqrt{\frac{m_u}{m_c}} \quad (34)$$

To test such relations we need to accurately determine all the component parameters of the standard model.

The starting point, I shall take is the masses of the heavy-light mesons as a function of lattice parameters. The hadron masses come from a fit of the correlator in equation 7. For example, table 4 contains the masses of a heavy-light meson in lattice units $\beta = 6.2$ from UKQCD [46]. The κ value is defined in the action in equation 12. After this point no supercomputers are required, just a nonlinear χ^2 fitting program, physical insight and theoretical physics.

To start the journey from the lattice to the real world, the lattice parameters need to be converted to more physical parameters. The first job is to convert from the kappa value into the quark mass. There are a number of different expressions for the quark mass in terms of the lattice parameters.

One definition of the quark mass is based on the vector ward identity.

$$m_V = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\kappa} - \frac{1}{\kappa_{crit}} \right) \quad (35)$$

The m_V quark mass suffers from an additive renormalisation for Wilson like fermions. The value of $\frac{1}{\kappa_{crit}}$ is obtained by the value of κ that gives zero pion mass. To remove $O(a)$ corrections the improvement formalism requires that

$$\hat{m} = m(1 + b_m m a) \quad (36)$$

The perturbative value of b_m is $-\frac{1}{2} - 0.096g^2$ [96].

The quark mass can also be defined in terms of the PCAC relation.

$$m_{AW} = \frac{\langle \partial_4 A_4(t) P(0) \rangle}{2 \langle P(t) P(0) \rangle} \quad (37)$$

There are also $O(a)$ corrections to equation 37, see [91] for details.

In principle the masses m_V and m_{AW} should agree, however at finite lattice spacing, where the calculations are actually done they disagree. For quark masses below strange, it has been shown that the two definitions agree as the lattice spacing is taken to zero (see [97] for a review).

The masses must be converted from lattice units into MeV. As explained in section 2, one quantity must be sacrificed to find the lattice spacing. For example

at $\beta = 6.2$ in quenched QCD, UKQCD find $a^{-1} = 2.66_{-7}^{+7}$, 2.91_{+1}^{-1} , 2.54_{+4}^{-9} , GeV from f_π , r_0 , and m_ρ respectively. The spread in different choices should reduce as the continuum limit is taken in an unquenched lattice QCD calculation. If there are different choices of lattice spacing, this is usually included in the systematic error.

Now we have a table of data heavy-light meson masses in GeV versus the lattice quark masses in GeV. The meson masses must be interpolated and extrapolated to the physical meson masses. The theory behind the extrapolations is an effective Lagrangian for mesons with heavy quark and chiral symmetry [2].

The value of κ corresponding to the strange quark mass is usually determined from light quark spectroscopy by interpolating to the mass of kaon or phi meson. Becirevic et al. [90] investigated using three different fit models to extrapolate the meson masses in the heavy quark mass.

$$M_{HL}^1(m_Q) = A_1 + B_1(m_Q) + C_1 m_Q^2 \quad (38)$$

$$M_{HL}^2(m_Q) = A_2 + B_2\left(\frac{1}{m_Q}\right) + C_2\left(\frac{1}{m_Q^2}\right) \quad (39)$$

$$M_{HL}^3(m_Q) = A_3 + B_3\left(\frac{1}{m_Q}\right) + C_3 m_Q \quad (40)$$

The $1/M_Q$ terms are motivated by heavy quark symmetry [2]. Kronfeld and Simone [98] have used the fit model in equation 39 to estimate λ_1 and λ_2 parameters of HQET.

4.1 Quark mass renormalization factors

In the last section I showed how to find the charm quark mass in the lattice scheme. However, normally quark masses are used in application in the \overline{MS} scheme. Also, a consistent scheme is also required to compare the results from different calculations.

The quark mass in the lattice scheme ($m_L(a)$) is matched to the \overline{MS} scheme $m_{\overline{MS}}(\mu)$.

$$m_{\overline{MS}}(\mu) = Z_m(a\mu)m_L(a) \quad (41)$$

where $Z_m(a\mu)$ is the matching factor.

The matching factor has been computed in perturbation theory to one loop order.

$$Z_m(a\mu) = 1 - \frac{\alpha(\mu)}{4\pi}(8 \ln(\mu a) - C_M) \quad (42)$$

The value of C_M depends on the fermion action. For the clover action, $C_M = 25.8$ [99].

As usual with one loop calculations, there is an ambiguity as to what scale (μ) to evaluate the matching at. The “best guess scale” for the μ (called q^*) can in principle be computed using the formalism described by Lepage and Mackenzie [53]. Most people include the effect of varying μ in some range from $1/a$ to π/a in the systematic errors.

The accuracy of the quark mass determination would improve if the matching could be done to higher order than one loop. The Feynman rules on the lattice are more complicated than in the continuum, hence calculations beyond one loop are very hard. Some groups are starting to try to automate lattice perturbation theory [100].

The general framework of lattice QCD allows other approaches to computing matching factors without using Feynman diagrams on the lattice. Sint [101] and Sommer [50] review some of the ways that matching factors are computed on the lattice. For example the α^3 term of the residual mass (important for the extraction of the bottom quark mass) of static theory in quenched QCD was computed using a numerical technique [102].

A general technique [103] for matching between the lattice and \overline{MS} schemes has been developed by the Rome and Southampton groups. The basic idea is to use the quark propagator calculated in lattice QCD to do the lattice part of the matching. The gauge has to be fixed in this approach. Usually Landau gauge is chosen.

4.2 Evolving the quark mass to a reference scale

The matching procedure produces the charm mass at the matching scale. To compare different mass determinations, the quark mass has to be evolved to a standard reference scale, essentially the same as that used by the particle data table. The reference scale chosen for the charm quark is the charm quark mass itself.

The running quark mass equation is used to evolve the quark mass to the standard reference scale of the charm quark mass.

$$\mu^2 \frac{d}{d\mu^2} m^{n_f}(\mu) = m^{n_f}(\mu) \gamma_m^{n_f}(\alpha_s^{n_f}) = - \sum_{i \geq 0} \gamma_{m,i}^{n_f} \left(\frac{\alpha_s^{n_f}(\mu)}{\pi} \right)^{i+1} \quad (43)$$

The coefficients $\gamma_{m,i}^{n_f}$ are known to four loop order. The required equations are conveniently packaged in the RunDec Mathematica package [104]. The ALPHA collaboration have a method to do the evolution of the quark mass numerically [105,50]. The method is starting to be used for unquenched QCD [104].

4.3 Comparison of the results

I have outlined the basic ideas behind a lattice QCD calculation of the charm quark mass. In table 5 I collect the state-of-the art results for the charm quark mass from (quenched) lattice QCD. These should be compared with the result quoted in the particle data table of $m_c^{\overline{MS}}(m_c)$ between 1.0 to 1.4 GeV.

5 The f_B decay constant

A crucial quantity for tests of the CKM matrix formalism is equation 44

$$\frac{\Delta m_s}{\Delta m_d} = \left| \frac{V_{ts}}{V_{td}} \right|^2 \frac{m_{B_s}}{m_{B_d}} \xi^2 \quad (44)$$

Group	$m_c^{MS}(m_c) GeV$
Becirevic et al. [90]	1.26(4)(12)
Rolf and Sint [91]	1.301(34)
Juge [93]	1.27(5)
Kronfeld [92]	1.33(8)

Table 5. The charm quark mass from quenched lattice QCD.

N_f	Decay constant
0	$f_B = 173(23)$ MeV
2	$f_B = 198(30)$ MeV
0	$f_{D_s} = 230(14)$ MeV
2	$f_{D_s} = 250(30)$ MeV

Table 6. Summary [5] of the results for heavy-light decay constants from quenched $N_f = 0$ and ($N_f = 2$) unquenched lattice QCD.

The value of Δm_d has been measured experimentally, while Δm_s is expected to be measured at run II of the Tevatron [106]. There are already useful experimental limits on Δm_s . The hard part is extracting the ratios of QCD matrix elements in

$$\xi^2 = \frac{f_{B_s}^2 B_s}{f_B^2 B} \quad (45)$$

The quantity ξ can not be extracted from experiment and is non-perturbative.

The f_B decay is the QCD matrix element for the semi-leptonic decay of the B meson. It is analogous to the pion decay constant. It is claimed that f_B will never be measured experimentally, hence it must be computed from QCD. The B (bag) factors are also QCD matrix elements that have been computed from lattice QCD.

The computation of f_B shares many features to the calculation of the charm quark mass. The same data from supercomputers could be used for both the f_B and charm quark mass calculation. f_B is extracted from the matrix element

$$\langle 0 | A_0 | Qq, p = 0 \rangle = -i f_{Qq} M_{Qq} \quad (46)$$

This matrix element is simply related to the amplitudes (c_{ij}) in equation 7. The main additional complication over the charm mass calculation is the extrapolation of the decay constant to the bottom mass.

Sinead Ryan reviewed the latest results for the f_B decay constant at the lattice 2001 conference [5]. Ryan's world average of the lattice data for heavy light decay constants is in table 6.

The lattice methods can be checked by computing the f_{D_s} decay constant. The current experimental result for $f_{D_s} = 280 (40)(19)$ MeV [86]. The CLEO-c experiment plans to reduce the experimental errors on f_{D_s} to the few percent

Group	method	g_π
UKQCD [110]	Lattice QCD	0.42(4)(8)
Abada et al. [111]	Lattice QCD	0.69(18)
CLEO [112]	Experiment $D \star D\pi$	$0.59 \pm 0.01 \pm 0.07$

Table 7. Summary of some results for g_π

level [107] to test lattice QCD. The actual comparison between theory and experiment will be ratios of matrix elements for leptonic and semi-leptonic decays, so that the test is independent of CKM matrix elements.

In her review article Ryan [5] quoted the errors on ξ from lattice QCD as

$$\xi = 1.15(6)_{-0}^{+7} \quad (47)$$

The first error in equation 47 is the statistical and systematic errors from quenched QCD. The asymmetric errors are from unquenching. It is instructive to compare the errors on ξ with the experimental errors on $\Delta m_d = 0.503 \pm 0.006 ps$. Although Δm_s has not yet been measured, it is expected to be measured to a few percent accuracy at the Tevatron. The final errors on $|\frac{V_{ts}}{V_{td}}|^2$ will be limited by the theoretical errors on ξ .

Unfortunately, during the last year the errors on ξ have gone up again, based on some observations by the JLQCD collaboration [108]. Kronfeld and Ryan [109] have suggested that a more realistic value of ξ is 1.32 ± 0.10 rather than the estimate in equation 47.

The key problem is that the light quarks in the current unquenched lattice QCD calculations are not so light. Lattice QCD calculations are typically done at unphysically large mass parameters. Physical results are obtained by extrapolating the results using effective field theories.

The effective field theory for heavy-light systems contains the light particles: π , K , and η , and a pseudoscalar and vector heavy-light state [2]. The Lagrangian is written so that it is invariant under heavy quark symmetry and $SU(3)_L \times SU(3)_R$ symmetry. This Lagrangian is for static quarks. The Lagrangian can be used to calculate masses of hadrons and decay constants in terms of the couplings in the Lagrangian.

The most important coupling at tree level is the g_π coupling that describes the $D^* \rightarrow D + \pi$ decay (suitably extrapolated to the heavy quark limit). Table 7 contains some estimates of g_π from experiment and lattice QCD.

The first loop correction to the decay constant has the form

$$\sqrt{m_B} f_B = \Phi(1 + \Delta f_q) \quad (48)$$

where Φ is the quantity with zero light quark mass and Δf_q represents the deviation from the chiral limit due to the finite size of the light quark mass.

The problems with the chiral extrapolations of ξ are due to the ratio of the decay constants, so consider:

$$\xi_f - 1 \equiv \frac{f_{B_s}}{f_B} - 1 \quad (49)$$

$$= \delta f_s - \delta f_d \quad (50)$$

$$= (m_K^2 - m_\pi^2) f_2(\mu) + C \quad (51)$$

where $f_2(\mu)$ is a low energy constant of the effective field theory. The form of C is

$$C = \frac{1 + 3g_\pi^2}{(4\pi)^2} \left(\frac{1}{2} m_K^2 \ln\left(\frac{m_K^2}{\mu^2}\right) + \frac{1}{4} m_\eta^2 \ln\left(\frac{m_\eta^2}{\mu^2}\right) - \frac{3}{4} m_\pi^2 \ln\left(\frac{m_\pi^2}{\mu^2}\right) \right) \quad (52)$$

The equivalent expression for the bag parameters B has the coefficient $1 - 3g_\pi^2$ in front of the chiral logs, from the values of g_π in table 7, the $m_\pi^2 \ln(\frac{m_\pi^2}{\mu^2})$ term has a negligible effect.

Until recently most lattice QCD calculations extrapolated ξ with the C function set to zero. For example, the MILC collaboration used linear and quadratic chiral extrapolations into their fits for their original results [47]. The JLQCD collaboration tried to fit equation 51 to their unquenched data.

Kronfeld and Ryan [109] noted that once the g_π is known, then the chiral log term in C is known. Hence, they used the lattice data that is essentially consistent with linear quark mass dependence and add the log term by hand. The problem with this type of approach is that it assumes that the current lattice data is in the regime where there are no higher order corrections to equation 51. The definitive answer for the value of ξ will come from unquenched calculations with light quarks that explicitly see the chiral logs in f_B .

This ‘‘case study’’ demonstrates the importance of the parameters of the dynamical quarks to the computation of heavy-light matrix elements, particularly the masses of the sea quarks. This study also demonstrates that the use of quenched QCD to compute heavy-light matrix elements is coming to an end. The chiral structure of matrix elements in quenched QCD can be very different to that in unquenched QCD.

5.1 Computation of form factors from lattice QCD

One of the best ways to extract the $|V_{cb}|$ CKM matrix element from experiment is to use the $B \rightarrow D^* l \nu_l$ semi-leptonic decays [1,2]. The differential decay rate [113], based on HQET 53 is

$$\frac{d\Gamma}{dw}(B \rightarrow D^* l \nu_l) = \frac{G_F^2 |V_{cb}|^2}{48\pi^2} \mathcal{K}(w) \mathcal{F}(w)^2 \quad (53)$$

where $\mathcal{K}(w)$ is a known phase space factor and $\mathcal{F}(w)^2$ a form factor. The value of w is the dot product of the velocities of the two heavy-light mesons. The expression in equation is based on heavy quark effective field theory.

As the masses of the b and c quarks go to infinity the normalization point of the Isgur-Wise function is obtained $\mathcal{F}(1) = 1$. The form factor at zero recoil is broken into the following

$$\mathcal{F}(1) = \eta_{QED} \eta_A (1 + \delta_{1/m_Q^2} + \dots) \quad (54)$$

where η_{QED} is a perturbative QED factor and η_A is the perturbative matching factor between QCD and HQET. The δ_{1/m_Q^2} term represents the breaking of heavy quark effective field theory. A term of the form $\frac{1}{m_Q}$ is forbidden by Luke's theorem [114].

The value of $|V_{cb}|$ in the particle data table [113] from $B \rightarrow D^* l \nu$ decays is:

$$|V_{cb}|_{exclusive} = (42.1 \pm 1.1_{expt} \pm 1.9_{theory}) \times 10^{-3} \quad (55)$$

The theoretical error is dominated by the theoretical uncertainty in δ_{1/m_Q^2} . In the past δ_{1/m_Q^2} has been computed using sum rules and quark models. Without a systematic way of improving the results, 5% will be a lower limit on the accuracy of this CKM matrix element.

In figure 6 I show a space-time diagram that is used to calculate form factors for semi-leptonic using the path integral. The initial lattice studies [115,116,117,118] mapped out the dependence of the $B \rightarrow D$ form factors on w . The experimental data is taken at nonzero recoil $w \neq 1$. However, the extrapolation to $w = 1$ [119] is either done using a simple ansatz or using the results of a dispersion relation [120,121].

The Fermilab group [122] have concentrated on estimating δ_{1/m_Q^2} in equation 54. They compute the matrix element in figure 6 with all the mesons at rest. By taking clever combinations of matrix elements they can get a precise estimate of the form factor at zero recoil. The mass dependence of the form factor can be mapped out by varying the masses of the heavy quarks. The matching to the continuum is quite involved. The final results [122] have errors with the same order of magnitude as other approaches. Their error includes a 10% estimate for unquenching.

There are other ways that lattice QCD can contribute to the extraction of the $|V_{cb}|$ CKM matrix element from experimental data. There have been calculations of the semi-leptonic decays of the Λ_b baryon [123] from lattice QCD. There have been two calculation of the mass of the B_c meson [124,125]. Jones and Woloshyn [124] computed the decay constant for the leptonic decay of B_c to be 420(13) MeV (the error is statistical only), using NRQCD at a lattice spacing of 0.163(3) fm. Whether these additional channels can help reduce the theoretical uncertainty of $|V_{cb}|$ to below the 5% level is not clear.

6 Nonleptonic decays

One of the main goals of the B physics experimental program is to check the CKM matrix formalism by measuring the CKM matrix elements many different ways [126,127]. For example, the experimental measurements for $B^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0$ could be used to extract $\sin(2\alpha)$ if the hadronic uncertainties could be controlled.

The path integral in equation 1 is calculated in Euclidean space to regulate the oscillations in Minkowski space. This means that the amplitudes extracted from lattice QCD calculations are always real. Recently, there has been some

theoretical work (see [128] for a review) on the non-leptonic decays of the kaons, motivated by the attempts to compute the hadronic matrix elements for ϵ'/ϵ .

There were some early attempts to study the decays $D \rightarrow K\pi$ on the lattice [129,130,131]. These type of lattice calculations stopped when the theoretical problems with making contact with experiment became apparent. In this section I briefly describe some of the old work on the $D \rightarrow K\pi$ decays and provide pointers to the new theoretical developments.

The correlator required is

$$G(t) = \langle 0 | (\pi K)(t) H_{eff}(0) D(t_K) | 0 \rangle \quad (56)$$

where $D(t_K)$ is the interpolating field for the D meson at time t_K and πK is the interpolating operator for the pion and kaon. The effective Hamiltonian is

$$H_{eff} = c_+(\mu) O_+^{cont} + c_-(\mu) O_-^{cont} \quad (57)$$

$$O_{\pm}^{cont} = (\overline{s_L} \gamma_{\mu} c_L)(\overline{u_L} \gamma_{\mu} d_L) \pm (\overline{s_L} \gamma_{\mu} d_L)(\overline{u_L} \gamma_{\mu} c_L) \quad (58)$$

where $c_{\pm}(\mu)$ are perturbative coefficients.

The diagrams for the Wick contraction of equation 56 are in figure 7. Although the diagrams are more complicated to compute than those for leptonic or semileptonic decays they can be calculated on a supercomputer. The problems occur trying to extract the pertinent amplitudes from $G(t)$ in equation 56.

As pointed out by Michael [132] and, Maiani and Testa [133] there is a complication with creating a pion and kaon state with definitive momentum. The operator

$$O_{\pi K}(t) = \pi(\underline{p}, t) K(-\underline{p}, t) \quad (59)$$

has the same quantum numbers as πK with all possible momentum values. The ground state of the operator in equation 59 will be the pion and kaon at rest. Hence, in the analogue of equation 7 for this graph, the required amplitude will not be the ground state. It is not easy to fit a multi-exponential model to data, although it is possible with a basis of interpolating operators [128].

Theoretical work, in the context of $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$ decays has shown how to get matrix elements in infinite volume from matrix elements computed in finite volumes [134,135]. There have also been proposals [132,136] to introduce some model independence to extract the complex phases of the matrix elements.

The methodology for non-leptonic decays will be further developed and tested on $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$ decays, before any attempts are made at the decays $D \rightarrow K\pi$,

7 Conclusions

The consumers of lattice QCD results need the error bars on current matrix elements to be reduced below 5%. The hardest error to reduce is from quenching. Improved staggered quarks look like they will be the first to explore unquenched QCD with light sea quarks. This should motivate the champions of other light quark formalisms to speed up their unquenched calculations. The techniques

that will reduce the error bars of heavy-light matrix elements will lie outside the domain of heavy quarks, in areas such as algorithms, improved computer hardware, and better grant writing.

My own, admittedly biased view, is that quenched QCD calculations are now of limited use for lattice QCD calculations with heavy quarks. As every experimentalist I have ever met has held this view, I am sure it will prevail.

The computation of matrix elements for two body hadronic decays still looks quite hard. Interesting things seem to be happening for kaon decays and in theory. It is not clear, whether these developments will be useful for non-leptonic decays of the B meson. It would obviously be a major breakthrough if this problem could be solved, however Mark Wise's wise [127] words, on the career ending nature of working on nonleptonic decays should be heeded.

The computation of the QCD matrix elements for the heavy flavour program is a well defined task. If we can't compute them reliably, then we will have failed. We will have to admit that we can't compute anything from QCD outside perturbation theory from first principles. I hope this doesn't happen.

8 Acknowledgments

I thank Chris Michael and Alex Dougall for discussions.

References

1. M. Neubert, Phys. Rept. **245**, 259 (1994), hep-ph/9306320,
2. A. V. Manohar and M. B. Wise, Cambridge Monogr. Part. Phys. Nucl. Phys. Cosmol. **10**, 1 (2000),
3. T. Draper, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **73**, 43 (1999), hep-lat/9810065,
4. C. W. Bernard, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **94**, 159 (2001), hep-lat/0011064,
5. S. M. Ryan, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **106**, 86 (2002), hep-lat/0111010,
6. C. T. H. Davies *et al.*, (1998), hep-lat/9801024,
7. M. Mueller-Preussker *et al.*, (2002), hep-lat/0203004,
8. A. S. Kronfeld, (2002), hep-lat/0205021,
9. C. Davies, (1997), hep-ph/9710394,
10. C. Davies, (2002), hep-ph/0205181,
11. J. M. Flynn and C. T. Sachrajda, Adv. Ser. Direct. High Energy Phys. **15**, 402 (1998), hep-lat/9710057,
12. R. Gupta, (1997), hep-lat/9807028,
13. J. Flynn, L. Lellouch, and G. Martinelli, (2002), hep-lat/0209167,
14. J. W. Negele, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **73**, 92 (1999), hep-lat/9810053,
15. UKQCD, C. M. Maynard, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **106**, 388 (2002), hep-lat/0109026,
16. TXL, T. Lippert, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **106**, 193 (2002), hep-lat/0203009,
17. S. Gottlieb, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **106**, 189 (2002), hep-lat/0112039,
18. M. Di Pierro, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **106**, 1034 (2002), hep-lat/0110116,
19. UKQCD, C. McNeile, (2000), hep-lat/0003009,
20. UKQCD, C. T. H. Davies, A. C. Irving, R. D. Kenway, and C. M. Maynard, (2002), hep-lat/0209121,

21. MILC, C. W. Bernard *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D61**, 111502 (2000), hep-lat/9912018,
22. CP-PACS, A. Ali Khan *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 4674 (2000), hep-lat/0004010,
23. UKQCD, C. R. Allton *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D65**, 054502 (2002), hep-lat/0107021,
24. TXL, U. Glassner *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B383**, 98 (1996), hep-lat/9604014,
25. S. R. Sharpe, (1998), hep-lat/9811006,
26. N. Gray, D. J. Broadhurst, W. Grafe, and K. Schilcher, Z. Phys. **C48**, 673 (1990),
27. R. Sommer, Nucl. Phys. **B411**, 839 (1994), hep-lat/9310022,
28. P. H. Ginsparg and K. G. Wilson, Phys. Rev. **D25**, 2649 (1982),
29. M. Luscher, Phys. Lett. **B428**, 342 (1998), hep-lat/9802011,
30. H. Neuberger, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **51**, 23 (2001), hep-lat/0101006,
31. P. Hasenfratz, Nucl. Phys. **B525**, 401 (1998), hep-lat/9802007,
32. P. Hernandez, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **106**, 80 (2002), hep-lat/0110218,
33. K.-F. Liu, (2002), hep-lat/0206002,
34. CP-PACS, J. I. Noaki *et al.*, (2001), hep-lat/0108013,
35. RBC, T. Blum *et al.*, (2001), hep-lat/0110075,
36. K. Jansen, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **106**, 191 (2002), hep-lat/0111062,
37. MILC, K. Orginos and D. Toussaint, Phys. Rev. **D59**, 014501 (1999), hep-lat/9805009,
38. CP-PACS, S. Aoki *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 238 (2000), hep-lat/9904012,
39. V. Lubicz, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **94**, 116 (2001), hep-lat/0012003,
40. SPQ(CD)R, D. Becirevic, V. Lubicz, and C. Tarantino, (2002), hep-lat/0208003,
41. G. S. Bali, Phys. Rept. **343**, 1 (2001), hep-ph/0001312,
42. K. Symanzik, Nucl. Phys. **B226**, 187 (1983),
43. K. Symanzik, Nucl. Phys. **B226**, 205 (1983),
44. B. Sheikholeslami and R. Wohlert, Nucl. Phys. **B259**, 572 (1985),
45. M. Luscher, S. Sint, R. Sommer, P. Weisz, and U. Wolff, Nucl. Phys. **B491**, 323 (1997), hep-lat/9609035,
46. UKQCD, K. C. Bowler *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **B619**, 507 (2001), hep-lat/0007020,
47. C. W. Bernard *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 4812 (1998), hep-ph/9806412,
48. E. Eichten and B. Hill, Phys. Lett. **B234**, 511 (1990),
49. UKQCD, C. Michael and J. Peisa, Phys. Rev. **D58**, 034506 (1998), hep-lat/9802015,
50. R. Sommer, (2002), hep-lat/0209162,
51. B. A. Thacker and G. P. Lepage, Phys. Rev. **D43**, 196 (1991),
52. G. P. Lepage, L. Magnea, C. Nakhleh, U. Magnea, and K. Hornbostel, Phys. Rev. **D46**, 4052 (1992), hep-lat/9205007,
53. G. P. Lepage and P. B. Mackenzie, Phys. Rev. **D48**, 2250 (1993), hep-lat/9209022,
54. C. J. Morningstar, Phys. Rev. **D50**, 5902 (1994), hep-lat/9406002,
55. H. D. Trottier and G. P. Lepage, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **63**, 865 (1998), hep-lat/9710015,
56. H. D. Trottier, N. H. Shakespeare, G. P. Lepage, and P. B. Mackenzie, Phys. Rev. **D65**, 094502 (2002), hep-lat/0111028,
57. A. X. El-Khadra, A. S. Kronfeld, and P. B. Mackenzie, Phys. Rev. **D55**, 3933 (1997), hep-lat/9604004,
58. A. S. Kronfeld, Phys. Rev. **D62**, 014505 (2000), hep-lat/0002008,
59. T. R. Klassen, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **73**, 918 (1999), hep-lat/9809174,
60. P. Chen, Phys. Rev. **D64**, 034509 (2001), hep-lat/0006019,
61. CP-PACS, M. Okamoto *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D65**, 094508 (2002), hep-lat/0112020,
62. M. G. Alford, I. T. Drummond, R. R. Horgan, H. Shanahan, and M. J. Peardon, Phys. Rev. **D63**, 074501 (2001), hep-lat/0003019,

63. UKQCD, S. Collins *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D64**, 055002 (2001), hep-lat/0101019,
64. J. Hein *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D62**, 074503 (2000), hep-ph/0003130,
65. UKQCD, C. R. Allton *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B292**, 408 (1992), hep-lat/9208018,
66. A. X. El-Khadra, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **30**, 449 (1993), hep-lat/9211046,
67. QCD-TARO, S. Choe *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **106**, 361 (2002), hep-lat/0110104,
68. C. T. H. Davies *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D52**, 6519 (1995), hep-lat/9506026,
69. H. D. Trottier, Phys. Rev. **D55**, 6844 (1997), hep-lat/9611026,
70. N. H. Shakespeare and H. D. Trottier, Phys. Rev. **D58**, 034502 (1998), hep-lat/9802038,
71. N. Mathur, R. Lewis, and R. M. Woloshyn, Phys. Rev. **D66**, 014502 (2002), hep-ph/0203253,
72. CP-PACS, T. Manke *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 4396 (1999), hep-lat/9812017,
73. K. Orginos, W. Bietenholz, R. Brower, S. Chandrasekharan, and U. J. Wiese, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **63**, 904 (1998), hep-lat/9709100,
74. P. Hasenfratz, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **63**, 53 (1998), hep-lat/9709110,
75. J. L. Richardson, Phys. Lett. **B82**, 272 (1979),
76. UKQCD, C. R. Allton *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D60**, 034507 (1999), hep-lat/9808016,
77. C. W. Bernard *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D62**, 034503 (2000), hep-lat/0002028,
78. A. X. El-Khadra, S. Gottlieb, A. S. Kronfeld, P. B. Mackenzie, and J. N. Simone, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **83**, 283 (2000),
79. C. Stewart and R. Koniuk, Phys. Rev. **D63**, 054503 (2001), hep-lat/0005024,
80. B. Grinstein and I. Z. Rothstein, Phys. Lett. **B385**, 265 (1996), hep-ph/9605260,
81. HPQCD, A. Gray *et al.*, (2002), hep-lat/0209022,
82. UKQCD, C. McNeile, C. Michael, and K. J. Sharkey, Phys. Rev. **D65**, 014508 (2002), hep-lat/0107003,
83. C. J. Morningstar and M. J. Peardon, Phys. Rev. **D60**, 034509 (1999), hep-lat/9901004,
84. UKQCD, P. Boyle, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **53**, 398 (1997),
85. UKQCD, P. Boyle, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **63**, 314 (1998), hep-lat/9710036,
86. Particle Data Group, D. E. Groom *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. **C15**, 1 (2000),
87. D. B. Leinweber, A. W. Thomas, K. Tsushima, and S. V. Wright, Phys. Rev. **D61**, 074502 (2000), hep-lat/9906027,
88. D. B. Leinweber, A. W. Thomas, K. Tsushima, and S. V. Wright, Phys. Rev. **D64**, 094502 (2001), hep-lat/0104013,
89. X. H. Guo and A. W. Thomas, Phys. Rev. **D65**, 074019 (2002), hep-ph/0112040,
90. D. Becirevic, V. Lubicz, and G. Martinelli, Phys. Lett. **B524**, 115 (2002), hep-ph/0107124,
91. ALPHA, J. Rolf and S. Sint, (2002), hep-ph/0209255,
92. A. S. Kronfeld, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **63**, 311 (1998), hep-lat/9710007,
93. K. J. Juge, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **106**, 847 (2002), hep-lat/0110131,
94. A. X. El-Khadra and M. Luke, (2002), hep-ph/0208114,
95. H. Fritzsche and Z.-z. Xing, Phys. Lett. **B506**, 109 (2001), hep-ph/0102295,
96. S. Sint and P. Weisz, Nucl. Phys. **B502**, 251 (1997), hep-lat/9704001,
97. R. Gupta and T. Bhattacharya, Phys. Rev. **D55**, 7203 (1997), hep-lat/9605039,
98. A. S. Kronfeld and J. N. Simone, Phys. Lett. **B490**, 228 (2000), hep-ph/0006345,
99. M. Gockeler *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D57**, 5562 (1998), hep-lat/9707021,
100. I. T. Drummond, A. Hart, R. R. Horgan, and L. C. Stononi, (2002), hep-lat/0208010,
101. S. Sint, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **94**, 79 (2001), hep-lat/0011081,

102. F. Di Renzo and L. Scorzato, JHEP **02**, 020 (2001), hep-lat/0012011,
103. G. Martinelli, C. Pittori, C. T. Sachrajda, M. Testa, and A. Vladikas, Nucl. Phys. **B445**, 81 (1995), hep-lat/9411010,
104. K. G. Chetyrkin, J. H. Kuhn, and M. Steinhauser, Comput. Phys. Commun. **133**, 43 (2000), hep-ph/0004189,
105. ALPHA, S. Capitani, M. Luscher, R. Sommer, and H. Wittig, Nucl. Phys. **B544**, 669 (1999), hep-lat/9810063,
106. K. Anikeev *et al.*, (2001), hep-ph/0201071,
107. I. Shipsey, (2002), hep-ex/0207091,
108. JLQCD, N. Yamada *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **106**, 397 (2002), hep-lat/0110087,
109. A. S. Kronfeld and S. M. Ryan, Phys. Lett. **B543**, 59 (2002), hep-ph/0206058,
110. UKQCD, G. M. de Divitiis *et al.*, JHEP **10**, 010 (1998), hep-lat/9807032,
111. A. Abada *et al.*, (2002), hep-ph/0206237,
112. CLEO, A. Anastassov *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D65**, 032003 (2002), hep-ex/0108043,
113. M. Artuso and E. Barberio, (2002), hep-ph/0205163,
114. M. E. Luke, Phys. Lett. **B252**, 447 (1990),
115. C. W. Bernard, Y. Shen, and A. Soni, Phys. Lett. **B317**, 164 (1993), hep-lat/9307005,
116. UKQCD, S. P. Booth *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 462 (1994), hep-lat/9308019,
117. UKQCD, K. C. Bowler *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D52**, 5067 (1995), hep-ph/9504231,
118. UKQCD, K. C. Bowler, G. Douglas, R. D. Kenway, G. N. Lacagnina, and C. M. Maynard, Nucl. Phys. **B637**, 293 (2002), hep-lat/0202029,
119. CLEO, R. A. Briere *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 081803 (2002), hep-ex/0203032,
120. I. Caprini, L. Lellouch, and M. Neubert, Nucl. Phys. **B530**, 153 (1998), hep-ph/9712417,
121. C. G. Boyd, B. Grinstein, and R. F. Lebed, Phys. Rev. **D56**, 6895 (1997), hep-ph/9705252,
122. S. Hashimoto, A. S. Kronfeld, P. B. Mackenzie, S. M. Ryan, and J. N. Simone, Phys. Rev. **D66**, 014503 (2002), hep-ph/0110253,
123. UKQCD, K. C. Bowler *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D57**, 6948 (1998), hep-lat/9709028,
124. B. D. Jones and R. M. Woloshyn, Phys. Rev. **D60**, 014502 (1999), hep-lat/9812008,
125. UKQCD, H. P. Shanahan, P. Boyle, C. T. H. Davies, and H. Newton, Phys. Lett. **B453**, 289 (1999), hep-lat/9902025,
126. S. Stone, (2001), hep-ph/0112008,
127. M. B. Wise, (2001), hep-ph/0111167,
128. N. Ishizuka, (2002), hep-lat/0209108,
129. C. W. Bernard, J. Simone, and A. Soni, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **17**, 504 (1990),
130. European Lattice, A. Abada *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **17**, 518 (1990),
131. C. W. Bernard, J. N. Simone, and A. Soni, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **20**, 434 (1991),
132. C. Michael, Nucl. Phys. **B327**, 515 (1989),
133. L. Maiani and M. Testa, Phys. Lett. **B245**, 585 (1990),
134. L. Lellouch and M. Luscher, Commun. Math. Phys. **219**, 31 (2001), hep-lat/0003023,
135. C. J. D. Lin, G. Martinelli, C. T. Sachrajda, and M. Testa, Nucl. Phys. **B619**, 467 (2001), hep-lat/0104006,
136. M. Ciuchini, E. Franco, G. Martinelli, and L. Silvestrini, Phys. Lett. **B380**, 353 (1996), hep-ph/9604240,




Fig. 2. Effective mass plot




Fig. 3. Spectrum of light hadrons from CP-PACS [38]




Fig. 4. Spectrum of charmonium from CP-PACS [61]




Fig. 5. Two point correlator




Fig. 6. Space time diagram of three point function




Fig. 7. Wick contractions for equation 56