

Heavy light mesons at a larger lattice spacing

Joachim Hein^a for the GLOK Collaboration*

^aDepartment of Physics & Astronomy, Glasgow G12 8QQ, UKQCD Collaboration.

We present results on the spectrum of B and D mesons including radial excitations and discuss the pseudoscalar decay constant. The results are obtained at $\beta = 5.7$ in the quenched approximation using NRQCD for the heavy quark. To study scaling violations we also compare to results obtained at $\beta = 6.0$.

1. INTRODUCTION

We want to detail our new and as yet preliminary simulation results on the spectrum and the renormalised decay constant of heavy light mesons. They were obtained on coarser lattices compared to previous analyses, see [1] for a review. This allows us to study scaling violations. A second motivation is the possibility of reaching the charm region with NRQCD for D mesons, which have a different power counting than J/ψ .

For the simulations we use 278 quenched $12^3 \times 24$ configurations at $\beta = 5.7$ generously provided by the UKQCD-Collaboration. To simulate the light quarks on the lattice we use the tadpole improved clover action with $\kappa_c = 0.1434$ from [2] and $\kappa_s|_K = 0.1398$ from [3]. The Hamiltonian of the heavy quarks is expanded around its non relativistic limit with tadpole improved gauge links and fields:

$$H = H_0 + \delta H, \quad (1)$$

were:

$$H_0 := -\frac{D^2}{2M_0}, \quad (2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \delta H := & -\frac{g}{2M_0} \vec{\sigma} \vec{B} + \frac{ig}{8M_0^2} (\vec{D} \vec{E} - \vec{E} \vec{D}) \\ & -\frac{g}{8M_0^2} \vec{\sigma} (\vec{D} \times \vec{E} - \vec{E} \times \vec{D}) \\ & -\frac{(D^2)^2}{8M_0^3} + a^2 \frac{D^{(4)}}{24M_0} - a \frac{(D^2)^2}{16nM_0^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

*In Collaboration with A. Ali Khan, T. Bhattacharya, S. Collins, C.T.H. Davies, R. Gupta, C. Morningstar, J. Shigemitsu, J. Sloan

This expansion is correct up to $\mathcal{O}(M_0^{-2})$ with the last two terms being corrections for finite lattice spacing. In the quenched approximation heavy or light quark physics deliver different lattice spacings: from m_ρ one gets $a^{-1} = 1.103(11)(50)$ GeV [2] and from the Υ -spectrum 1.4(1) GeV [4].

2. MESON SPECTROSCOPY

So far we have analysed correlators with the 1S_0 and 3S_1 quantum numbers and use two different smearing functions for each value of M_0 . When extracting masses we fit with two exponentials in case of the respective ground state and three in case of radial excitations. The position of the c and the b quark in the M_0 range is fixed from the requirement that the D and B masses must coincide with their physical values in GeV [5]. To correct the meson mass for the omitted M_0 in (1) we use perturbative shifts [6], which are in very good agreement with the non perturbative shifts from J/ψ and Υ [7,4].

In fig. 1 we give our results for the B spectrum together with preliminary results at $\beta = 6.0$ with the same action. For the comparison we set the scale from m_ρ , since the uncertainty in how to determine a cancels out between both lattice results. The error bars represent the statistical uncertainties and those arising in the determination of the bare b quark mass. The horizontal lines give the experimental values, quoted from [5], with exception of the radially excited $B(2S)$, where we quote a preliminary *DELPHI* result [8]. Comparing the results, no significant scaling violation can be observed within the error bars of $\approx 10\%$ in case of the hyperfine and $B_s - B$ splitting.




Figure 1. Scaling of the B spectrum with a .

Our result for the D spectrum is given in fig. 2. The arrows indicate the shift of the central values when taking the average of the above quoted a -values instead of $a(m_\rho)$, the other symbols are similar to fig. 1. When comparing to the experimental values, the splittings between the strange and non strange mesons are in very good agreement and also the result for the radial excited $B(2S)$ agrees within its fairly large error bar. However all hyperfine splittings are much too low when using a from m_ρ . When using a larger value of a^{-1} , for example from Υ , the hyperfine increases but the agreement of the $B_s - B$ and $D_s - D$ is lost. The cause of this trouble might be a systematic error of the quenched approximation, a quite large 1-loop correction to the coefficient in front of the $\vec{\sigma} \vec{B}$ term or neglected




Figure 2. Splittings in the D meson spectrum. The circles give the result for $a^{-1} = 1.10$ GeV and the arrows for 1.25 GeV. The experimental values are given by horizontal lines.

$\mathcal{O}(M^{-3})$ terms in eq. (3). This question definitely requires further investigation.

It is interesting to have a look at the ratio of the hyperfine splittings. We find:

$$\frac{D^* - D}{B^* - B} = 3.1(7), \quad \frac{D_s^* - D_s}{B_s^* - B_s} = 3.1(7), \quad (4)$$

which has to be compared to an experimental value of 2.95(2) resp. 3.06(17). The error in (4) is dominated by the uncertainty of the perturbative mass shifts in the determination of the bare c quark mass. However this might be too conservative and the agreement of the central values itself is quite impressive.

3. DECAY CONSTANT

In the effective theory one has to measure the matrix elements of the currents

$$\begin{aligned} J_A^{(0)} &= \bar{q} \gamma_5 \gamma_0 Q, \\ J_A^{(1)} &= -\frac{1}{2M_0} \bar{q} \gamma_5 \gamma_0 (\vec{\gamma} \vec{D}) Q, \\ J_A^{(2)} &= \frac{1}{2M_0} (\vec{D} \vec{q} \cdot \vec{\gamma}) \gamma_5 \gamma_0 Q, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

in order to calculate the pseudoscalar decay constant up to $\mathcal{O}(M_0^{-1})$. On the lattice for zero mo-




Figure 3. Pseudoscalar decay constant. The connecting lines are to guide the eye. The position of the B and the D meson are indicated. Statistical errors only are shown.

mentum we have $J_A^{(1)} = J_A^{(2)}$. Their renormalisation and matching to full QCD have recently been calculated to 1-loop order [9,10]. However as yet the matching scale q^* has not been calculated and we will give results for $aq^* = 1$ and π . We will also apply the $\mathcal{O}(a\alpha_s)$ improvement term as introduced in the references. For the $\log(aM)$ terms in the coefficients of $J_A^{(0)}$ and $J_A^{(1)}$ we insert $\frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} \log(aM_0)$, which will give the physical decay constant for B and D mesons correctly.

So far we have analysed the currents for $\kappa = 0.1400$ which is close to $\kappa_s|_K$. From our experience at smaller a we expect the effect of this mismatch to be 1% on f_{PS} , which is negligible compared to the other errors. Our result is given in fig. 3. In the B region f_{PS} is reduced quite largely by 15-25% due to renormalisation and improvement. We obtain

$$f_{B_s} = 211(7)(15)(37) \text{ MeV}. \quad (6)$$

In parenthesis we give the statistical uncertainty, the uncertainty of q^* and the shift of the central value for $a^{-1} = 1.25 \text{ GeV}$ instead of 1.10 GeV . In fig. 4 we discuss the scaling of this quantity. Since the correct q^* values need not to be equal at $\beta = 5.7$ and 6.0 , we average over $aq^* = 1$ and π . The difference is included into the error bars.




Figure 4. Scaling of f_{B_s} . The error bars contain statistical errors and the uncertainty of q^* .

At tree level we observe a scaling violation of $\approx 30\%$ which is reduced in case of the renormalised and improved result, so that they agree within error bars. Note that the result at larger a is more sensitive to q^* .

4. CONCLUSION

We observe no significant scaling violations for the B spectrum and the renormalised f_{B_s} . Our results on the D spectrum look encouraging.

A personal fellowship by the European commission under ERB FMB ICT 961729, and financial support of the collab. by NATO under CRG 941259 and by the US DOE. is gratefully acknowledged. The simulations were performed at NERSC.

REFERENCES

1. A. Ali Khan, these proceedings.
2. H. Shanahan, et. al., Phys. Rev. D55 (1997) 1548.
3. P. Rowland (UKQCD), priv. communication.
4. C. Davies, et. al., work in progress.
5. R. Barnett, et. al, Phys. Rev. D54 (1996) 1.
6. C. Morningstar, Phys. Rev. D50 (1994) 5902.
7. C. Davies, et. al., Phys. Rev. D52 (1995) 6519.
8. M. Feindt, et. al., Proceedings of ICHEP-96, Warsaw.
9. J. Shigemitsu, Preprint, hep-lat/9705017.
10. J. Shigemitsu and C. Morningstar, these proceedings.