

Light-Cone Sum Rules for the $D_{(s)} \rightarrow \eta^{(\prime)} l \nu_l$ Form Factor

N. Offen, F.A. Porkert, A. Schäfer¹

¹*Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität Regensburg, D-93040 Regensburg, Germany*

We present an improved light-cone sum rule analysis of the decay form factors of D and D_s into η and η' and argue that these decays offer a very promising possibility to determine the leading Fock-state gluonic contribution of the η' at future experimental facilities as FAIR or Super-KEKB. We also give the corresponding branching ratios for B decays.

PACS numbers: aaa

Keywords: exclusive processes; form factor; sum rules

I. INTRODUCTION

With the advent of high luminosity accelerators weak decays of hadrons containing valence charm or bottom quarks can be measured with very high precision. In fact, such decays might even offer one of the best chances for the discovery of beyond the standard models physics, see the recent reviews [1–3] and the citations given there. So, there is strong motivation to improve on the theoretical description of the QCD input needed for such searches. One of the most important quantities for such exclusive channels are the hadron distribution amplitudes (DAs, often also called wave functions) and form factors. For each hadron DAs are characteristic nonperturbative quantities, just like PDFs. As for the latter, moments of DAs can be calculated on the lattice, see e.g. [4, 5] and rapid progress can be expected along these lines. Nevertheless input from many sides will be needed to understand in the long run the basic systematics of hadron DAs, even for the most important standard hadrons. The controversial theoretical discussion spawned by the surprising BABAR data for the photon-pion transition form factor [6–9] has illustrated that this field is still in a pioneering phase. Another non-perturbative approach, besides lattice QCD, to DAs and form factors are light-cone sum rules (LCSR) [10]. As both approaches are conceptually completely different the ideal situation is reached if both give the same results. We will show that this is what happens, e.g., for the decays $D_s \rightarrow \eta/\eta' + \ell + \nu_\ell$ we are analyzing in this contribution. This case is especially interesting because the singlet-octet mixing of the η and η' should be reflected by the respective form factors, e.g. by a substantially different size of the gluonic contribution, see e.g. [11, 12] for a recent review. As this debate is ongoing since many years it would be great news if the gluonic leading Fock-state contribution for the η' could be experimentally determined. (There always exist gluonic higher Fock-state components.) We will specify observables which are sensitive to this component and thus offer this opportunity. From a theoretical point of view B-mesons would be better suited for our purpose. There the light-cone expansion exhibits a stronger hierarchy due to the larger mass of the b-quark which in turn reduces the uncertainty coming from the truncation of this expansion. However in

practice this uncertainty is not the dominant one.

As for all three cases (D , D_s and B decays) the required increase in experimental accuracy looks very much feasible for next-generation experiments and we hope that in a few years from now data for this complete set of meson decays will provide undisputable experimental evidence for the gluonic component of the η' .

The decays $D_s \rightarrow \eta/\eta' + \ell + \nu_\ell$ have been analysed before both phenomenologically, e.g., [13, 14] and using leading order LCSRs with chiral currents including meson mass corrections [15]. We improved that LO twist-2 analysis by taking into account all two-particle twist-2 and twist-3 NLO quark contributions and in addition the NLO twist-2 gluon contribution. The latter allows to extract information on the leading gluon DA of the η' . To achieve this goal we made heavy use of NLO results existing in the literature [16, 17]. Our results for the decay formfactors agree within uncertainties with those of [15]. While this is encouraging, we also feel that it is somewhat fortuitous, because we have some doubts concerning the benefits of the chiral currents used in that work, since they eliminate important nonperturbative information and do not couple only to the pseudoscalar mesons in the hadronic sum.

The decays $B \rightarrow \eta/\eta' + \ell + \nu_\ell$ were analysed in [18] at leading order and in [16] at the same level of accuracy as in this note. We improve on the latter calculation by making an analysis of both the branching fractions and their ratios.

The paper is organized as follows: in section II we discuss the $\eta - \eta'$ mixing scheme used. In section III we outline the derivation of the LCSRs for the different form factors. In section IV we present our numerical results and in section V we summarize and conclude.

II. MIXING SCHEMES

Two different schemes for describing the $\eta - \eta'$ -mixing are commonly used: The singlet-octet (SO) [19] and the quark-flavour (QF)-scheme [20–24], see also [25] for a mixing scheme independent sum rule determination of the couplings of the $\eta^{(\prime)}$ to the axial currents. The SO-scheme defines two hypothetical pure singlet and octet states $|\eta_{1,8}\rangle$ and two mixing angles $\Theta_{1,8}$ to describe the

four decay constants

$$\begin{pmatrix} f_\eta^8 & f_\eta^1 \\ f_{\eta'}^8 & f_{\eta'}^1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta_8 & -\sin \theta_1 \\ \sin \theta_8 & \cos \theta_1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} f_8 & 0 \\ 0 & f_1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (1)$$

defined as

$$\langle 0 | J_{\mu 5}^i | P(p) \rangle = i f_P^i p_\mu, \quad (i = 1, 8, P = \eta, \eta'). \quad (2)$$

In this scheme f_1 describes the contribution of the $U(1)_A$ -anomaly via the divergence of the singlet current $J_{\mu 5}^1$ and the difference $\theta_i \neq 0$ and $f_8 \neq f_\pi$ is given by $SU(3)_F$ -violating effects. f_8 and θ_i are scale independent and f_1 renormalises multiplicatively.

In the QF-scheme the basic currents and couplings are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \langle 0 | J_{\mu 5}^a | \eta(p) \rangle &= i f_\eta^a p_\mu, \\ \langle 0 | J_{\mu 5}^a | \eta'(p) \rangle &= i f_{\eta'}^a p_\mu, \\ J_{\mu 5}^a &= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\bar{u} \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 u + \bar{d} \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 d), & a = q \\ \bar{s} \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 s, & a = s. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Here the angles are scale dependent and their difference is given by OZI-rule violating contributions. Phenomenologically this difference is very small. Thus the authors of [20] proposed to use within the QF-scheme the approximation

$$\phi \equiv \phi_{q,s}, \quad \phi_q - \phi_s = 0 \quad (4)$$

which has only three parameters with the phenomenological values

$$\begin{aligned} f_q &= (1.07 \pm 0.02) f_\pi, \\ f_s &= (1.34 \pm 0.06) f_\pi, \\ \phi &= 39.3^\circ \pm 1.0^\circ, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

and where the mixing of the states follows the same pattern as for the decay constants:

$$\begin{pmatrix} |\eta(p)\rangle \\ |\eta'(p)\rangle \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \phi & -\sin \phi \\ \sin \phi & \cos \phi \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} |\eta_q(p)\rangle \\ |\eta_s(p)\rangle \end{pmatrix}. \quad (6)$$

The masses of the states to the order in which we perform our calculations are given by [20]

$$m_{q\bar{q}}^2 = m_\pi^2, \quad m_{s\bar{s}}^2 = 2m_K^2 - m_\pi^2. \quad (7)$$

One important point to note is that in this version of the QF scheme there is no scale dependence left in the parameters. Since the mixing of the two different flavour states is given by OZI-rule violating contributions

$$|\eta_q(p)\rangle \propto \phi_2^q(u) |q\bar{q}\rangle + \phi_2^{\text{OZI}}(u) |s\bar{s}\rangle + \dots, \quad (8)$$

$$|\eta_s(p)\rangle \propto \phi_2^{\text{OZI}}(u) |q\bar{q}\rangle + \phi_2^s(u) |s\bar{s}\rangle + \dots, \quad (9)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_2^q &= \frac{1}{3}(\phi_2^8 + 2\phi_2^1), \quad \phi_2^s = \frac{1}{3}(2\phi_2^8 + \phi_2^1), \\ \phi_2^{\text{OZI}} &= \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3}(\phi_2^1 - \phi_2^8) \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

are leading twist distribution amplitudes, a consistent implementation requires to set

$$\phi_2^{\text{OZI}} = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3}(\phi_2^1 - \phi_2^8) = 0.$$

This implies that one has to ignore the different scale-dependence of the singlet and octet distribution amplitudes, because otherwise their evolution would generate a non-zero ϕ_2^{OZI} . We followed [16] and set $\phi_2^1 = \phi_2^8$ and evolved their lowest moment a_2 according to the octet scaling law. We confirm that the induced difference due to different renormalisation behavior is very small. We also confirm their finding that the mixing of the leading Gegenbauer-moment in the conformal expansion of the twist 2 quark and gluon distribution amplitudes

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{2;\eta}^1(u, \mu) &= 6u\bar{u} \left(1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_{2n}^{\eta,1}(\mu) C_{2n}^{3/2}(2u-1) \right), \\ \psi_{2;\eta}^g(u, \mu) &= u^2\bar{u}^2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} B_{2n}^{\eta,g}(\mu) C_{2n-1}^{5/2}(2u-1) \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

given by [26]

$$\mu \frac{d}{d\mu} \begin{pmatrix} a_2^{\eta,1} \\ B_2^{\eta,g} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{100}{9} & -\frac{10}{81} \\ -36 & 22 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a_2^{\eta,1} \\ B_2^{\eta,g} \end{pmatrix}.$$

has only small numerical influence. This led us to neglect this effect in accordance with remarks made above. Higher Gegenbauer-moments turned out to give only negligible contributions as well and therefore we restrict our analysis to the lowest moments. On the whole these effects are smaller than 3%. The main difference with respect to [16], besides using the \overline{MS} -mass for m_c , is that for the $D_s \rightarrow \eta^{(\prime)}$ decays we probe the $\bar{s}s$ -content of the $\eta^{(\prime)}$ which leads to a different dependence on the mixing angle, see eq. (21) while for the $D \rightarrow \eta^{(\prime)}$ the only difference is the change of Borel-parameter, continuum threshold and masses $m_c \leftrightarrow m_b$, $m_D \leftrightarrow m_B$.

III. OUTLINE OF THE LCSR METHOD

The idea behind LCSR calculations for decay matrix elements from heavy into light quark hadrons is illustrated in Fig. 1. For a detailed discussion of the original two-point sum rules and their extension consult, e.g., [27–32]. In short one uses the two-fold nature of the correlation function to equate two different representations: First one inserts a complete set of hadronic states, separates the ground state and expresses the rest via a dispersion integral over the hadronic spectral density. Second one uses that for large negative virtualities the correlation function is dominated by light like distances and makes an expansion around the light-cone leading to a convolution of perturbatively calculable hard scattering amplitudes and universal soft distribution amplitudes. After an analytic continuation of the light-cone expansion to physical momenta using a dispersion relation




FIG. 1: Structure of the light cone sum rule calculation: j is the interpolating current for the heavy meson. The weak matrix element is contained in V and the charm quark propagator is treated perturbatively. Thus, the factor T can be calculated purely perturbatively, which is done at NLO accuracy. At that level the parton lines coupling into the η can be either quark-antiquark or two gluons. The occurring matrix elements are parameterized in terms of the distribution amplitudes. A Borel transform serves to filter out the D and D_s contributions from T .

one equates these two representations by the assumption of quark-hadron duality. Finally it is customary to use a Borel transformation to suppress higher states in the hadronic sum and to get rid of subtraction terms which are necessary if the dispersion relation is divergent. We will illustrate these steps below. Starting point for the $D_{(s)}^+ \rightarrow \eta^{(\prime)} l^+ \nu_l$ form factor

$$\begin{aligned} \langle P(p) | \bar{q} \gamma_\mu c | D_{(s)}(p+q) \rangle &= 2f_{D_{(s)}P}^+(q^2) p_\mu \\ &+ \left(f_{D_{(s)}P}^+(q^2) + f_{D_{(s)}P}^-(q^2) \right) q_\mu \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

is the correlation function:

$$\begin{aligned} F_\mu^{HP}(p, q) &= i \int d^4x e^{iqx} \langle P(p) | T \left\{ V_\mu^P(x), j_H^\dagger(0) \right\} | 0 \rangle \\ &= F^{HP}(q^2, (p+q)^2) p_\mu + \tilde{F}^{HP}(q^2, (p+q)^2) q_\mu. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where P is the on-shell pseudoscalar meson, in our case $P = \eta, \eta', H = B, D_{(s)}, V^P$ is the local weak interaction vertex and j_H is a local interpolating current for the heavy quark system. In the present case we deal with the expressions collected in table I. The scalar form factor

$$f_{D_{(s)}P}^0(q^2) = f_{D_{(s)}P}^+(q^2) + \frac{q^2}{m_{D_{(s)}}^2 - m_{\eta^{(\prime)}}^2} f_{D_{(s)}P}^-(q^2)$$

enters the leptonic spectrum only with factors proportional to m_l^2 . Therefore we do not consider \tilde{F}^P which is needed to calculate $f_{D_{(s)}\eta^{(\prime)}}^0$.

Decay	interpolation current	weak current
$D_s^+ \rightarrow \eta^{(\prime)} l \nu_l$	$j_{D_s^+} = m_c \bar{s} i \gamma_5 c$	$V_\mu^{(\eta, \eta')} = \bar{s} \gamma_\mu c$
$D^+ \rightarrow \eta^{(\prime)} l^+ \nu_l$	$j_{D^+} = m_c \bar{d} i \gamma_5 c$	$V_\mu^{(\eta, \eta')} = \bar{d} \gamma_\mu c$

TABLE I: Currents entering the correlation function eq. (13).

Inserting a complete set of hadronic states between the two currents eq. (13) and separating the ground state leads to

$$\begin{aligned} F^{D_{(s)}P}(q^2, (p+q)^2) &= \frac{2m_{D_{(s)}}^2 f_{D_{(s)}} f_{D_{(s)}P}^+(q^2)}{(m_{D_{(s)}}^2 - (p+q)^2)} \\ &+ \int_{s_0}^\infty ds \frac{\rho^{h_{(s)}}(q^2, s)}{s - (p+q)^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where $s_0^{h_{(s)}}$ is a hadronic threshold, $\rho^{h_{(s)}}(s)$ is the hadronic spectral density and $f_{D_{(s)}}$ is the decay constant of the $D(D_s)$ -meson. Since the Borel transform will take care of subtraction terms in the end we won't write them anywhere.

The light-cone expansion for $q^2, (p+q)^2 \ll m_c^2$ can be written in the general form

$$\begin{aligned} [F^{D_{(s)}P}(q^2, (p+q)^2)]_{OPE} &= \sum_{t=2,3,4} F_0^{P,t}(q^2, (p+q)^2) \\ &+ \frac{\alpha_s C_F}{4\pi} \sum_{t=2,3} F_1^{P,t}(q^2, (p+q)^2) + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Here t denotes the twist which is taken into account at the current accuracy. The leading and next to leading order expressions $F_{0,1}$ are given as convolutions of hard scattering amplitudes and distribution amplitudes, see figure 1:

$$\begin{aligned} F_{0,1}^{D_{(s)}P,t}(q^2, (p+q)^2) &= \int du T_{0,1}^{(t)}(q^2, (p+q)^2, m_c^2, u, \mu) \phi_{\eta^{(\prime)}}^{(t)}(u, \mu). \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

u denotes a generic expression for the momentum fractions of the partons in the meson and μ the factorisation scale. The leading order term is given by contracting the c -quarks to generate the free propagator and taking into account only the twist 2 distribution amplitude, see eq. (41):

$$F_0^{D_{(s)}\eta^{(\prime)},2}(q^2, (p+q)^2) = f_\eta m_c^2 \int_0^1 \frac{du \phi_{\eta^{(\prime)}}(u)}{m_c^2 - q^2 \bar{u} - (p+q)^2 u}. \quad (17)$$

Analytic continuation of the momentum $(p+q)^2$ flowing through the interpolating current leads to

$$\begin{aligned} [F^{D_{(s)}P}(q^2, (p+q)^2)]_{OPE} &= \\ \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{m_c^2}^\infty \frac{ds}{s - (p+q)^2} \text{Im} [F^{D_{(s)}P}(q^2, s)]_{OPE} \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Now the two representations can be equated by using the semi local quark-hadron duality assumption that from a certain continuum threshold $s_0^{D(s)}$ on, the integral over the hadronic spectral density and over the partonic result should be the same:

$$\int_{s_0^{D(s)}}^{\infty} ds \frac{\text{Im} [F^{D(s)P}(q^2, s)]_{OPE}}{s - (p+q)^2} = \int_{s_0^{h(s)}}^{\infty} ds \frac{\rho^{h(s)}(q^2, s)}{s - (p+q)^2}.$$

This assumption and the final Borel transformation

$$B_{M^2} \frac{1}{s - (p+q)^2} \longrightarrow e^{-\frac{s}{M^2}},$$

lead to the sum rule

$$\begin{aligned} f_{D(s)P}^+(q^2) &= \frac{1}{2m_{D(s)}^2 f_{D(s)}} e^{\frac{m_{D(s)}^2}{M^2}} \\ &\times \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{m_c^2}^{s_0^{D(s)}} ds \text{Im} [F^{D(s)P}(q^2, s)]_{OPE} e^{-\frac{s}{M^2}}, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where M^2 is the Borel-parameter. It is important to note that every additional two units of twist are accompanied by another power of the denominator

$$D = m_c^2 - q^2 \bar{u} - (p+q)^2 u \quad (20)$$

which shows that for the processes in question the momentum transfer q^2 is severely constrained in order to have a converging light-cone expansion. Another point worth mentioning is that odd twists 3, 5, ... come from the mass term of the c-quark propagator and are formally subleading in $\frac{1}{m_c}$ compared to their even counterparts. However, due to chiral enhancement coming from the prefactor μ_η of the twist 3 distribution amplitudes they numerically exceed these. This would imply that the unknown twist 5 contributions might be larger than the twist 4 ones, which we analyse, and convergence cannot be taken for granted. To really assess the situation a dedicated study of these higher twist contributions would be needed which is a formidable task, far exceeding the scope of this note. To have at least a rough guess of the resulting uncertainty we follow [33] and assume that the ratio of the unknown twist 5 term to the twist 3 term is the same as the ratio of the twist 4 term and twist 2 term. This gives an additional uncertainty varying from 4% for $q^2 = -2$ GeV to 2.5% for $q^2 = 0$.

The inclusion of the gluonic part of the $\eta^{(\prime)}$ in the sum rules was already discussed in [16] and we do not repeat it here. It boils down to using relation (6) to calculate the correlation functions

$$\begin{aligned} F^{D_s \eta} &= -F^{D_s \eta_s} \sin \phi + F^{D_s \eta_q} \cos \phi, \\ F^{D_s \eta'} &= F^{D_s \eta_s} \cos \phi + F^{D_s \eta_q} \sin \phi, \\ F^{D \eta} &= F^{D \eta_q} \cos \phi - F^{D \eta_s} \sin \phi, \\ F^{D \eta'} &= F^{D \eta_q} \sin \phi + F^{D \eta_s} \cos \phi \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

and insert these into equation (19).

The second summand in each equation of (21) gets only contributions at NLO from the gluonic part while the first summand is a combination of quark and gluonic contributions. The quark contribution we take from [17, 33] with the replacements $f_\pi \rightarrow f_{q(s)}$, $f_\pi \frac{m_\pi^2}{2m_q} \rightarrow f_q \frac{m_\pi^2}{2m_q}$, $f_\pi \frac{m_\pi^2}{2m_q} \rightarrow f_s \frac{2m_K^2 - m_\pi^2}{2m_s}$ which means that we take $SU(3)$ -flavour-violation into account only via the decay constants. In [33, 34] it was shown, that for decays into kaons and pions this is indeed a good approximation. We checked that our results do not change significantly if we include meson and quark mass corrections. But keeping all $SU(3)$ -violating effects would force us to not only keep all quark- and meson mass dependences in the correlation function but to also use

$$\begin{aligned} h_q &= f_q(m_\eta^2 \cos^2 \phi + m_{\eta'}^2 \sin^2 \phi) \\ &- \sqrt{2} f_s(m_{\eta'}^2 - m_\eta^2) \sin \phi \cos \phi, \\ h_s &= f_s(m_{\eta'}^2 \cos^2 \phi + m_\eta^2 \sin^2 \phi) \\ &- \frac{f_q}{\sqrt{2}}(m_{\eta'}^2 - m_\eta^2) \sin \phi \cos \phi, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

[35] instead of $f_q m_\pi^2$ and $f_s(2m_K^2 - m_\pi^2)$ respectively. These quantities are, due to cancellations, very weakly constrained which would lead to uncertainties at the level of 200% if one assumes uncorrelated errors in the twist 3 part, see e.g. [16]. In the ratios these uncertainties cancel for the largest part but for the form factors and decay rates this seems to be a huge overestimation.

IV. NUMERICS

A. CHOICE OF INPUT

We follow [17, 33] in using the \overline{MS} -scheme and one universal scale throughout our calculation. The scale is set to be $\mu \approx \sqrt{m_{D(s)}^2 - m_c^2} = 1.4(1.5)$ GeV and all quantities are evolved to this scale using one-loop running for the quark masses and distribution amplitude parameters and two loop running for α_s .

The values for the Gegenbauer-moments need some discussion. In a recent perturbative analysis [36, 37] of the $\eta^{(\prime)}$ transition form factors P. Kroll and K. Passek-Kumerički got the values (for $\mu = 1$ GeV)

$$a_2^8 = -0.05 \pm 0.02, \quad a_2^1 = -0.12 \pm 0.01, \quad a_2^g = 19 \pm 5, \quad (23)$$

similar to their older results in [26], see also [38, 39]. Unfortunately, these numbers are at first sight in contradiction with the sum rule value $a_2^8 \approx 0.2$. The authors of [36, 37] state that there values are effective ones, contaminated by higher Gegenbauer-moments, while the effect of power corrections is neglected. Both effects were shown to be large in the accessible Q^2 -region for the pion transition form factor in [8, 9], where the value

$a_2^\pi = 0.13 - 0.16$ was obtained, in stark contrast to the value $a_2^\pi = -0.02 \pm 0.02$ obtained in [36, 37]. Including generic power corrections lead to $a_2^8 = 0.06 \pm 0.05$ which also suggests that the values given in (23) should be taken with a grain of salt. As we do not see how to correct for these effects we decided to ignore Eq. (23) and to use the average over sum rule fits to experimental data and direct lattice and sum rule calculations instead, leading to

$$a_2^8(1 \text{ GeV}) = 0.25 \pm 0.15. \quad (24)$$

We implement the quark-flavour scheme by setting $a_2^1(1 \text{ GeV}) = a_2^8(1 \text{ GeV})$ and evolving both via the renormalisation of the octet moment. This in turn implies $a_2^g = a_2^8$, see (10). As there is no hint for large $SU(3)$ -flavour violation in the even Gegenbauer-moments, (one finds, e.g., $a_2^\pi \approx a_2^K$) which should be an acceptable approximation. Since the impact of the mixing between a_2^1 and B_2^g is rather small, we treat the latter as a free parameter and vary it over the same very conservative range $B_2^g = 0 \pm 20$ as in [16]. We take the quark- and meson masses from the Particle Data Group [40]. Their current values are

$$\overline{m}_c(\overline{m}_c) = (1.275 \pm 0.025) \text{ GeV}, \quad (25)$$

$$m_u(\mu = 2 \text{ GeV}) = (2.3_{-0.5}^{+0.7}) \text{ MeV}, \quad (26)$$

$$m_d(\mu = 2 \text{ GeV}) = (4.8_{-0.3}^{+0.7}) \text{ MeV}, \quad (27)$$

$$m_s(\mu = 2 \text{ GeV}) = (95 \pm 5) \text{ MeV}. \quad (28)$$

and

$$m_{D^+} = 1869.6 \text{ MeV}, \quad m_{D_s^+} = 1968.5 \text{ MeV}, \quad (29)$$

$$m_{\pi^0} = 134.98 \text{ MeV}, \quad m_{K^0} = 497.61 \text{ MeV}. \quad (30)$$

The latter ones are related via flavour symmetry to the masses of the $|\eta_{q(s)}\rangle$ -states as given in eq. (7). For the pion decay constant we use $f_\pi = 130.4 \text{ MeV}$, for the $D_{(s)}$ decay constant we take the experimental values from [40]

$$\begin{aligned} f_D &= (206.7 \pm 8.5 \pm 2.5) \text{ MeV}, \\ f_{D_s} &= (260 \pm 5.4) \text{ MeV}, \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

while for the B-meson, in view of the existing large discrepancies in determinations of $|V_{ub}|$, which is in turn needed for the extraction of f_B , we use a two-point sum rule at order α_s [41]. For the continuum threshold and the Borel-parameter we choose

$$\begin{aligned} s_0^D &= (7 \pm 0.6) \text{ GeV}^2, \\ s_0^B &= (35.75 \pm 0.25) \text{ GeV}^2, \\ M_{D(s)}^2 &= (4.4 \pm 1.1) \text{ GeV}^2, \\ M_B^2 &= (18 \pm 3) \text{ GeV}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

and for the two point sum rule

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{s}_0^B &= (35.75 \pm 0.25) \text{ GeV}^2, \\ \overline{M}_B^2 &= (5 \pm 1) \text{ GeV}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

which fulfill the usual criteria for these parameters and are close to the ones used in [17, 33]. The quark, gluon and mixed condensates are given by [42, 43]

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \bar{q}q \rangle(2 \text{ GeV}) &= (-0.246_{+0.028}^{-0.019})^3 \text{ GeV}^3, \\ \langle \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} GG \rangle(2 \text{ GeV}) &= (0.012_{+0.006}^{-0.012}) \text{ GeV}^4, \\ m_0^2 &= \frac{g \langle \bar{q} \sigma_{\mu\nu} G^{\mu\nu} q \rangle}{\langle \bar{q}q \rangle}, \\ &= (0.8 \pm 0.2) \text{ GeV}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Finally we take for the the twist three and four parameters at $\mu = 1 \text{ GeV}$

$$\begin{aligned} f_3^\pi &= (0.0045 \pm 0.0015) \text{ GeV}^2, \\ \omega_3^\pi &= (-1.5 \pm 0.7) \text{ GeV}^2, \\ \epsilon_\pi &= \left(\frac{21}{8} \right) (0.2 \pm 0.1) \text{ GeV}^2, \\ \delta_\pi^2 &= (0.18 \pm 0.06) \text{ GeV}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

B. FORM FACTORS AND THEIR SHAPE

As can be seen from eq. (20) our sum rules for D and D_s decays are only applicable for $q^2 \ll m_c^2$. To be able to make a prediction for the shape of the form factor and for the value of the branching fractions we follow [33]: We calculate the form factors at $q^2 < 0$, where the twist expansion of the sum rules works perfectly well and then basically use a fit to extrapolate our results to $q^2 > 0$. We use the simple Ball-Zwicky parametrization [44] having in mind that all fit formulas work nearly equally well [33, 45, 53] and that unitarity constraints for more elaborate formulas are up to now not restrictive:

$$\begin{aligned} f_+^{\text{BZ}}(q^2) &= f_+(0) \left(\frac{1}{1 - q^2/m_{D(s)}^2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{r q^2/m_{D(s)}^2}{\left(1 - q^2/m_{D(s)}^2\right) \left(1 - \alpha q^2/m_{D(s)}^2\right)} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

The idea of this fit formula is basically to take the dispersive representation of the form factor, take out the known lowest lying resonance and approximate the dispersion integral over many particle states starting from $(m_{D(s)} + m_\pi)^2$ by an effective pole. r, α parametrize the residuum and position of this pole, while $f_+(0)$ gives the overall normalisation. Despite the resonances $D_{(s)}^*$ being very close to the two-particle threshold the fits are numerically perfectly stable.

The results for $f_+^{D_s \eta}(q^2)$ and $f_+^{D_s \eta'}(q^2)$ are shown in figure 3 and figure 4. To get the error bands we made a statistical analysis of all input parameters at each $q^2 \leq 0$ assuming Gaussian uncertainties and then extrapolated them in the same way as the central values. As can be

seen the uncertainty coming from the unknown gluon distribution amplitude is nearly negligible for the $f_+^{D_s\eta}(q^2)$ form factor which holds for $f_+^{D\eta}(q^2)$ and $f_+^{B\eta}(q^2)$ as well supporting the notion of a nearly total octet nature of the η . On the other hand there is a considerable impact on the $D_{(s)}(B) \rightarrow \eta'$ -form factors from the gluonic part. The fit-parameters can be found in Table II. Figure 3 and 4 also contain results from a first lattice simulation for this quantity [47] which were corrected in accordance with a private communication from the author. (The fact that one has to calculate disconnected contributions makes such lattice simulations very demanding [48])

Decay	r	α	$ f_+(0) $
$D_s^+ \rightarrow \eta l^+ \nu_l$	$0.284^{+0.003}_{-0.002}$	$0.252^{+0.107}_{-0.082}$	$0.432^{+0.033}_{-0.033}$
$D_s^+ \rightarrow \eta' l^+ \nu_l$	$0.284^{+0.137}_{-0.095}$	$0.252^{+0.382}_{-0.395}$	$0.520^{+0.080}_{-0.080}$
$D^+ \rightarrow \eta l^+ \nu_l$	$0.174^{+0.001}_{-0.001}$	$-0.043^{+0.068}_{-0.052}$	$0.552^{+0.051}_{-0.051}$
$D^+ \rightarrow \eta' l^+ \nu_l$	$0.174^{+0.243}_{-0.142}$	$-0.043^{+0.526}_{-0.596}$	$0.458^{+0.105}_{-0.105}$

TABLE II: Shape parameters for $f_+^{D(s)\eta^{(\prime)}}(q^2)$ as input for the BZ-model eq. (36) .

Our results for $q^2 = 0$ are shown in Table III. For illustration we show the dependence of the $D_s \rightarrow \eta^{(\prime)}$ form factors on the Borel-parameter in figure 2.




FIG. 2: $|f_+^{D_s\eta}(q^2=0)|$, $|f_+^{D_s\eta'}(q^2=0)|$ plotted as a function of the Borel parameter M^2 . The blue dashed line corresponds to $|f_+^{D_s\eta}(q^2=0)|$ and the brown dashed line to $|f_+^{D_s\eta'}(q^2=0)|$.

As can be seen the sum rules are stable for a very large range of parameter values.

Especially interesting are the ratios of the η' to η form factors since for such ratios most of the uncertainties cancel. For the gluonic part we made the assumption $B_2^{g,\eta} = B_2^{g,\eta'}$ since no large $SU(3)$ -breaking is expected in this Gegenbauer-moment. Note however that the contribution to the form factors is vastly different, due to the different admixture of the singlett part which is given by the decay constants

$$\begin{aligned} f_\eta^1 &= \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \cos \phi f_q - \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} \sin \phi f_s, \\ f_{\eta'}^1 &= \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \sin \phi f_q + \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} \cos \phi f_s, \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

see eq. (43), (44).

What can be seen from table (IV) is that almost the whole uncertainty comes from B_2^g which would give the possibility to constrain this quantity if more precise experimental data would be available. The result for the D_s -form factors in the considered q^2 -region is shown in figure 5. As can be seen the uncertainties are completely governed by the gluonic contribution. Table IV shows our results at $q^2 = 0$.




FIG. 3: $f_+^{D_s\eta'}(q^2)$ plotted as a function of q^2 . The black dots are the calculated sum rule values. The blue straight line is the fit to the central values. Blue dashed band: Full uncertainties of our result. Red lines: Uncertainty coming from the gluonic contribution which due to a very small impact nearly conceal the blue line. Brown line: Results of [15]. Orange Point: corrected lattice result from [47] in accordance with a private communication from the author.





FIG. 4: $f_+^{D_s\eta}(q^2)$ plotted as a function of q^2 . Same convention as in figure 3

TABLE III: Form factors $f_+^{D_s^+\eta^{(\prime)}}(0)$, $f_+^{D^+\eta^{(\prime)}}(0)$ and $f_+^{B^+\eta^{(\prime)}}(0)$ calculated from LCSRs eq.(21).

Formf. centr.value	M^2	μ	(s_0^D/s_0^B)	a_2	B_2^g	(fq, fs, ϕ)	twist-3	twist-4	(condensates, m_c/m_b)
$ f_+^{D_s^+\eta}(0) = 0.432$	± 0.003	± 0.026	± 0.010	± 0.013	± 0.001	± 0.025	± 0.014	± 0.002	± 0.005
$ f_+^{D_s^+\eta'}(0) = 0.520$	± 0.003	± 0.032	± 0.012	± 0.015	± 0.070	± 0.028	± 0.016	± 0.002	± 0.006
$ f_+^{D^+\eta}(0) = 0.552$	± 0.008	± 0.034	± 0.013	± 0.016	± 0.002	± 0.015	± 0.036	± 0.002	± 0.007
$ f_+^{D^+\eta'}(0) = 0.458$	± 0.007	± 0.028	± 0.011	± 0.013	± 0.096	± 0.025	± 0.030	± 0.002	± 0.006
$ f_+^{B^+\eta}(0) = 0.238$	± 0.002	± 0.013	± 0.002	± 0.004	± 0.001	± 0.006	± 0.011	± 0.0002	± 0.007
$ f_+^{B^+\eta'}(0) = 0.198$	± 0.001	± 0.011	± 0.002	± 0.003	± 0.061	± 0.007	± 0.009	± 0.0001	± 0.006

TABLE IV: Ratios $\left| \frac{f_+^{D(s)\eta'}(0)}{f_+^{D(s)\eta}(0)} \right|$ and $\left| \frac{f_+^{B^+\eta'}(0)}{f_+^{B^+\eta}(0)} \right|$ calculated from LCSRs eq.(21).

Formf. centr.value	M^2	μ	(s_0^D/s_0^B)	a_2	B_2^g	(fq, fs, ϕ)	twist-3	twist-4	(condensates, m_c/m_b)
$\frac{f_+^{D_s^+\eta'}(0)}{f_+^{D_s^+\eta}(0)} = 1.20$	$\pm 1 \cdot 10^{-13}$	$\pm 1 \cdot 10^{-12}$	$\pm 6 \cdot 10^{-13}$	$\pm 7 \cdot 10^{-14}$	± 0.16	± 0.06	$\pm 3 \cdot 10^{-12}$	$\pm 3 \cdot 10^{-14}$	$\pm 2 \cdot 10^{-14}$
$\frac{f_+^{D^+\eta'}(0)}{f_+^{D^+\eta}(0)} = 0.83$	$\pm 5 \cdot 10^{-13}$	$\pm 9 \cdot 10^{-13}$	$\pm 2 \cdot 10^{-13}$	$\pm 5 \cdot 10^{-15}$	± 0.18	± 0.04	$\pm 8 \cdot 10^{-13}$	$\pm 3 \cdot 10^{-14}$	$\pm 5 \cdot 10^{-14}$
$\frac{f_+^{B^+\eta'}(0)}{f_+^{B^+\eta}(0)} = 0.83$	$\pm 8 \cdot 10^{-13}$	$\pm 6 \cdot 10^{-13}$	$\pm 1 \cdot 10^{-13}$	$\pm 1 \cdot 10^{-13}$	± 0.26	± 0.04	$\pm 8 \cdot 10^{-13}$	$\pm 2 \cdot 10^{-14}$	$\pm 2 \cdot 10^{-13}$

FIG. 5: $|f_+^{D_s^+\eta'}(q^2)/f_+^{D_s^+\eta}(q^2)|$ plotted as a function of q^2 . Again the black dots are the calculated sum rule values. The blue straight line is the fit to the central values, while the blue dashed band corresponds to the uncertainties of our result. It is completely dominated by the gluonic contribution (red dashed lines).

C. Branching fractions and experimental results

With an extrapolation of the form factors to the whole kinematic region we are able to calculate the branching fractions and compare them to experimental results. For massless leptons the scalar form factor $f_{D(s)\eta^{(\prime)}}^0$ does not

contribute so the decay rate is given by

$$\Gamma(D_s^+ \rightarrow \eta^{(\prime)} l^+ \nu_l) = \frac{G_F^2 |V_{cs}|^2}{24\pi^3} \int_0^{q_{\max}^2} dq^2 \lambda^{\frac{3}{2}}(q^2) |f_+^{D_s^+\eta^{(\prime)}}(q^2)|^2, \quad (38)$$

where the kinematical function $\lambda(q^2)$ is defined via

$$\lambda(x) = \frac{1}{4m_H^2} \left[(m_H^2 + m_M^2 - x)^2 - 4m_H^2 m_M^2 \right], \quad (39)$$

with $(P = \eta, \eta'; H = B^+, D^+, D_s)$. After multiplication with the mean life time of the considered meson we get the relevant branching fractions. To extract the uncertainties we again assume Gaussian errors and extrapolate the error of $|f_+(q^2)|^2$ with different fit functions from $q^2 < 0$ to the physical region. The deviations found due to the change of the fit function are incorporated in the error budget. Our results and the experimental values are shown in table V.

Again the ratios turn out to be especially interesting since most of the uncertainties in the theoretical calculation cancel and they are dominated by the contribution of the gluonic Gegenbauer-moment B_2^g . Here we made the same assumption $B_2^{g,\eta} = B_2^{g,\eta'}$ as for the ratios of the form factors. Comparing them to the experimental

Decay	LSRs (this work)	Experiment
$D_s \rightarrow \eta' e \nu_e$	$(0.75 \pm 0.23)\%$	$(0.91 \pm 0.33)\%$ [49]
$D_s \rightarrow \eta e \nu_e$	$(2.00 \pm 0.32)\%$	$(2.48 \pm 0.29)\%$ [49]
$D \rightarrow \eta' e \nu_e$	$(3.86 \pm 1.77) \cdot 10^{-4}$	$(2.16 \pm 0.53 \pm 0.07) \cdot 10^{-4}$ [50]
$D \rightarrow \eta e \nu_e$	$(24.5 \pm 5.26) \cdot 10^{-4}$	$(11.4 \pm 0.9 \pm 0.4) \cdot 10^{-4}$ [50]
$B \rightarrow \eta' e \nu_e$	$(0.36 \pm 0.22) \cdot 10^{-4}$	$(2.66 \pm 0.80 \pm 0.56) \cdot 10^{-4}$ [51] $(0.24 \pm 0.08 \pm 0.03) \cdot 10^{-4}$ [52]
$B \rightarrow \eta e \nu_e$	$(0.73 \pm 0.20) \cdot 10^{-4}$	$(0.44 \pm 0.23 \pm 0.11) \cdot 10^{-4}$ [51] $(0.36 \pm 0.05 \pm 0.04) \cdot 10^{-4}$ [52]

TABLE V: Branching fractions for the different decays.

values,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\Gamma(D_s^+ \rightarrow \eta' e^+ \nu_e)}{\Gamma(D_s^+ \rightarrow \eta e^+ \nu_e)} &= 0.37 \pm 0.09 (B_2^g) \pm 0.04 (\text{rest}), \\
&\quad \text{Exp: } 0.36 \pm 0.14 \quad [49], \\
\frac{\Gamma(D^+ \rightarrow \eta' e^+ \nu_e)}{\Gamma(D^+ \rightarrow \eta e^+ \nu_e)} &= 0.16 \pm 0.06 (B_2^g) \pm 0.02 (\text{rest}), \\
&\quad \text{Exp: } 0.19 \pm 0.09 \quad [50], \\
\frac{\Gamma(B \rightarrow \eta' e^+ \nu_e)}{\Gamma(B \rightarrow \eta e^+ \nu_e)} &= 0.50 \pm 0.29 (B_2^g) \pm 0.05 (\text{rest}), \\
&\quad \text{Exp: } 0.67 \pm 0.24 \pm 0.1 \quad [52], \quad (40)
\end{aligned}$$

one can see good overall agreement but, as can clearly be

seen, the experimental precision is up to now not sufficient to draw any conclusion on B_2^g .

V. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

We have calculated the form factors and branching fractions of the decays $D_{(s)} \rightarrow \eta^{(\prime)} l \nu$ and $B \rightarrow \eta^{(\prime)} l \nu$ in the framework of light cone sum rules for massless leptons. The form factors were shown to agree with available lattice results and the branching ratios eq. (40) with experiment. So the overall picture is nicely consistent. Our main result is, however, the error budget given in eq. (40) clearly showing that B_2^g dominates the uncertainties in all cases. Therefore, already a moderate increase in experimental accuracy will allow to determine the gluonic contribution to η and η' from all three ratios, providing a sensitive consistency check. FAIR and Super-KEKB should even provide precision measurements of these ratios and thus allow to settle this long-standing issue.

Acknowledgements

We thank I. Kanamori for providing us an update of the results of [47]. This work was supported by Forschungszentrum Jülich (FFE contract 42008319).

Appendix

Definitions of distribution amplitudes

Here we give the definitions of the used distribution amplitudes. We follow the notation of [53], see also [33] for a minor correction, for the quark-antiquark

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \eta(p) | \bar{q}_\omega^i(x_1) q_\xi^j(x_2) | 0 \rangle_{x^2 \rightarrow 0} &= \frac{i \delta^{ij}}{12} f_\eta \int_0^1 du \, e^{i u p \cdot x_1 + i \bar{u} p \cdot x_2} \left([\not{p} \gamma_5]_{\xi \omega} \varphi_\eta(u) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - [\gamma_5]_{\xi \omega} \mu_\eta \phi_{3\eta}^p(u) + \frac{1}{6} [\sigma_{\beta\tau} \gamma_5]_{\xi \omega} p_\beta (x_1 - x_2)_\tau \mu_\eta \phi_{3\eta}^\sigma(u) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1}{16} [\not{p} \gamma_5]_{\xi \omega} (x_1 - x_2)^2 \phi_{4\eta}(u) - \frac{i}{2} [(\not{x}_1 - \not{x}_2) \gamma_5]_{\xi \omega} \int_0^u \psi_{4\eta}(v) dv \right) \quad (41)
\end{aligned}$$

and quark-antiquark-gluon distributions

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \eta(p) | \bar{q}_\omega^i(x_1) g_s G_{\mu\nu}^a(x_3) q_\xi^j(x_2) | 0 \rangle_{x^2 \rightarrow 0} &= \frac{\lambda_{ji}^a}{32} \int \mathcal{D}\alpha_i e^{ip(\alpha_1 x_1 + \alpha_2 x_2 + \alpha_3 x_3)} \\
&\times \left[i f_{3\eta} (\sigma_{\lambda\rho} \gamma_5)_{\xi\omega} (p_\mu p_\lambda g_{\nu\rho} - p_\nu p_\lambda g_{\mu\rho}) \Phi_{3\eta}(\alpha_i) \right. \\
&- f_\eta (\gamma_\lambda \gamma_5)_{\xi\omega} \left\{ (p_\nu g_{\mu\lambda} - p_\mu g_{\nu\lambda}) \Psi_{4\eta}(\alpha_i) + \frac{p_\lambda (p_\mu x_\nu - p_\nu x_\mu)}{(p \cdot x)} (\Phi_{4\eta}(\alpha_i) + \Psi_{4\eta}(\alpha_i)) \right\} \\
&\left. - \frac{i f_\eta}{2} \epsilon_{\mu\nu\delta\rho} (\gamma_\lambda)_{\xi\omega} \left\{ (p^\rho g^{\delta\lambda} - p^\delta g^{\rho\lambda}) \tilde{\Psi}_{4\eta}(\alpha_i) + \frac{p_\lambda (p^\delta x^\rho - p^\rho x^\delta)}{(p \cdot x)} (\tilde{\Phi}_{4\eta}(\alpha_i) + \tilde{\Psi}_{4\eta}(\alpha_i)) \right\} \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

For the gluon-gluon distribution amplitude we take over the notation of [16]

$$\langle \eta^{(\prime)}(p) | G_{\mu x}(x)[x, -x] \tilde{G}^{\mu x}(-x) | 0 \rangle = f_{\eta^{(\prime)}}^1 \frac{C_F}{2\sqrt{3}} (px)^2 \int_0^1 du e^{-i(2u-1)px} \psi_{2,\eta^{(\prime)}}^g(u) \quad . \tag{43}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
f_\eta^1 &= \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \cos \phi f_q - \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} \sin \phi f_s, \\
f_{\eta'}^1 &= \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \sin \phi f_q + \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} \cos \phi f_s
\end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

which differs by a normalisation factor of $\sigma = \sqrt{\frac{3}{C_F}}$ to the one used in [26]. The explicit conformal expansion of the different distribution amplitudes can be found in [16, 26, 33, 53] and we don't write them here in order not to lengthen this note further.

-
- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>[1] J. L. Rosner and S. Stone, arXiv:1201.2401 [hep-ex].</p> <p>[2] S. Stone, arXiv:1212.6374 [hep-ph].</p> <p>[3] RAaif <i>et al.</i> [LHCb Collaboration], Eur. Phys. J. C 73 (2013) 2373 [arXiv:1208.3355 [hep-ex]].</p> <p>[4] R. Arthur, P. A. Boyle, D. Brömmel, M. A. Donnellan, J. M. Flynn, A. Jüttner, T. D. Rae and C. T. C. Sachrajda, Phys. Rev. D 83 (2011) 074505 [arXiv:1011.5906 [hep-lat]].</p> <p>[5] V. M. Braun <i>et al.</i> [QCDSF Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D 79 (2009) 034504 [arXiv:0811.2712 [hep-lat]].</p> <p>[6] B. Aubert <i>et al.</i> [The BABAR Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D 80 (2009) 052002.</p> <p>[7] S. Uehara <i>et al.</i> [Belle Collaboration], arXiv:1205.3249 [hep-ex].</p> <p>[8] S. S. Agaev, V. M. Braun, N. Offen and F. A. Porkert, Phys. Rev. D 83 (2011) 054020 [arXiv:1012.4671 [hep-ph]].</p> <p>[9] S. S. Agaev, V. M. Braun, N. Offen and F. A. Porkert, Phys. Rev. D 86 (2012) 077504 [arXiv:1206.3968 [hep-ph]].</p> <p>[10] I. I. Balitsky, V. M. Braun and A. V. Kolesnichenko, Nucl. Phys. B 312 (1989) 509.</p> <p>[11] C. Di Donato, G. Ricciardi and I. Bigi, “$\eta - \eta'$ Mixing - From electromagnetic transitions to weak decays</p> | <p>of charm and beauty hadrons,” Phys. Rev. D 85 (2012) 013016 [arXiv:1105.3557 [hep-ph]].</p> <p>[12] G. Ricciardi, Phys. Rev. D 86 (2012) 117505 [arXiv:1209.3386 [hep-ph]].</p> <p>[13] P. Ball, J. M. Frere and M. Tytgat, Phys. Lett. B 365 (1996) 367 [hep-ph/9508359].</p> <p>[14] P. Colangelo and F. De Fazio, Phys. Lett. B 520 (2001) 78 [hep-ph/0107137].</p> <p>[15] K. Azizi, R. Khosravi and F. Falahati, J. Phys. G 38 (2011) 095001 [arXiv:1011.6046 [hep-ph]].</p> <p>[16] P. Ball and G. W. Jones, JHEP 0708 (2007) 025 [arXiv:0706.3628 [hep-ph]].</p> <p>[17] G. Duplancic, A. Khodjamirian, T. Mannel, B. Melic and N. Offen, JHEP 0804 (2008) 014 [arXiv:0801.1796 [hep-ph]].</p> <p>[18] T. M. Aliev, I. Kanik and A. Ozpineci, Phys. Rev. D 67 (2003) 094009 [hep-ph/0210403].</p> <p>[19] H. Leutwyler, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. 64 (1998) 223 [hep-ph/9709408].</p> <p>[20] T. Feldmann, P. Kroll and B. Stech, Phys. Rev. D 58 (1998) 114006.</p> <p>[21] T. Feldmann, P. Kroll and B. Stech, Phys. Lett. B 449 (1999) 339 [hep-ph/9812269].</p> <p>[22] T. Feldmann, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. 74 (1999) 151</p> |
|--|--|

- [hep-ph/9807367].
- [23] T. Feldmann, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **15** (2000) 159 [hep-ph/9907491].
- [24] T. Feldmann and P. Kroll, *Phys. Scripta T* **99** (2002) 13 [hep-ph/0201044].
- [25] F. De Fazio and M. R. Pennington, *JHEP* **0007** (2000) 051 [hep-ph/0006007].
- [26] P. Kroll and K. Passek-Kumericki, *Phys. Rev. D* **67** (2003) 054017 [hep-ph/0210045].
- [27] M. A. Shifman, A. I. Vainshtein and V. I. Zakharov, *Nucl. Phys. B* **147** (1979) 385.
- [28] M. A. Shifman, A. I. Vainshtein and V. I. Zakharov, *Nucl. Phys. B* **147** (1979) 448.
- [29] M. A. Shifman, A. I. Vainshtein and V. I. Zakharov, “QCD and Resonance Physics. The rho-omega Mixing,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **147** (1979) 519.
- [30] V. M. Belyaev, V. M. Braun, A. Khodjamirian and R. Ruckl, *Phys. Rev. D* **51** (1995) 6177 [hep-ph/9410280].
- [31] V. M. Braun, In *Rostock 1997, Progress in heavy quark physics* 105-118 [hep-ph/9801222].
- [32] P. Colangelo and A. Khodjamirian, In *Shifman, M. (ed.): At the frontier of particle physics, vol. 3* 1495-1576 [hep-ph/0010175].
- [33] A. Khodjamirian, C. Klein, T. Mannel and N. Offen, *Phys. Rev. D* **80** (2009) 114005 [arXiv:0907.2842 [hep-ph]].
- [34] G. Duplancic and B. Melic, *Phys. Rev. D* **78** (2008) 054015 [arXiv:0805.4170 [hep-ph]].
- [35] M. Beneke and M. Neubert, *Nucl. Phys. B* **651** (2003) 225 [hep-ph/0210085].
- [36] P. Kroll and K. Passek-Kumericki, arXiv:1206.4870 [hep-ph].
- [37] P. Kroll and K. Passek-Kumericki, *J. Phys. G* **40** (2013) 075005.
- [38] A. Ali and A. Y. Parkhomenko, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **30** (2003) 367 [hep-ph/0307092].
- [39] A. Ali and A. Y. Parkhomenko, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **33** (2004) S518 [hep-ph/0310256].
- [40] J. Beringer *et al.* [Particle Data Group Collaboration], *Phys. Rev. D* **86** (2012) 010001.
- [41] M. Jamin and B. O. Lange, *Phys. Rev. D* **65** (2002) 056005 [hep-ph/0108135].
- [42] B. L. Ioffe, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **56** (2006) 232 [hep-ph/0502148].
- [43] H. G. Dosch and S. Narison, *Phys. Lett. B* **417** (1998) 173 [hep-ph/9709215].
- [44] P. Ball and R. Zwicky, *Phys. Rev. D* **71** (2005) 014015 [hep-ph/0406232].
- [45] S. Descotes-Genon and A. Le Yaouanc, *J. Phys. G* **35** (2008) 115005 [arXiv:0804.0203 [hep-ph]].
- [46] P. Ball, *Phys. Lett. B* **644** (2007) 38 [hep-ph/0611108].
- [47] I. Kanamori, arXiv:1302.6087 [hep-lat].
- [48] G. S. Bali *et al.* [QCDSF Collaboration], *PoS LATTICE* **2011** (2011) 283 [arXiv:1111.4053 [hep-lat]].
- [49] J. Yelton *et al.* [CLEO Collaboration], *Phys. Rev. D* **80** (2009) 052007 [arXiv:0903.0601 [hep-ex]].
- [50] J. Yelton *et al.* [CLEO Collaboration], *Phys. Rev. D* **84** (2011) 032001 [arXiv:1011.1195 [hep-ex]].
- [51] N. E. Adam *et al.* [CLEO Collaboration], *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99** (2007) 041802 [hep-ex/0703041 [HEP-EX]].
- [52] P. del Amo Sanchez *et al.* [BaBar Collaboration], *Phys. Rev. D* **83** (2011) 052011 [arXiv:1010.0987 [hep-ex]].
- [53] P. Ball, V. M. Braun and A. Lenz, *JHEP* **0605** (2006) 004 [hep-ph/0603063].
- ;