

Towards the Identification of New Physics through Correlations between Flavour Observables

Andrzej J. Buras*

TUM-IAS, Lichtenbergstr. 2a, D-85748 Garching, Germany

Technical University Munich, Physics Department, D-85748 Garching, Germany,

E-mail: Andrzej.Buras@ph.tum.de

We emphasize the power of correlations between flavour observables in the search for New Physics and identify a number of correlations that could allow to discover New Physics even if it would appear at the level of 20% of the Standard Model contributions. After presenting the simplest correlations in CMFV and $U(2)^3$ models we address the recent data on $B_{s,d} \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ and the anomalies in $B_d \rightarrow K^* \mu^+ \mu^-$ in the context of Z' -models and SM Z , both with flavour violating neutral couplings. A strategy consisting of twelve steps which concentrate on theoretically clean observables, to be measured in this decade, could one day allow us to reach the Zeptouniverse. The related DNA charts based on the correlations between enhancements and suppressions of various observables in a given New Physics scenario relative to the Standard Model predictions allow a transparent distinction between various extensions of this model. The present text is the extended version of the talk to be published in the proceedings of this symposium.

*The 2013 EPS Symposium on High Energy Physics
July 17-24, 2013
Stockholm, Sweden*

*Speaker.

1. Overture

In spite of tremendous efforts of experimentalists and theorists to find New Physics (NP) beyond the Standard Model (SM), no clear indications for NP beyond dark matter, neutrino masses and matter-antimatter asymmetry in the universe have been observed. Yet, the recent discovery of a Higgs-like particle and the overall agreement of the SM with the present data shows that our general approach of describing physics at very short distance scales with the help of exact (QED and QCD) and spontaneously broken (for weak interactions) gauge theories is correct.

As the SM on the theoretical side is not fully satisfactory and the three NP signals mentioned above are already present, we know that some new particles and new forces have to exist, hopefully within energy scales being presently directly explored by the LHC or not far above them. The upgrade in the energy of the LHC, the upgrade of the LHCb, SuperKEKB and dedicated Kaon physics experiments at CERN, J-PARC and Fermilab, as well as improved measurements of lepton flavour violation (LFV), electric dipole moments (EDMs) and $(g-2)_{\mu,e}$ will definitely shed light on the question whether NP is present below, say, 100 TeV. However in the coming decades to go beyond 10 TeV will require the study of very rare processes. These are in particular flavour violating and CP-violating rare decays of mesons, EDMs, LFV and $(g-2)_{\mu,e}$. As this is an indirect search for NP one has to develop special strategies to reach the Zeptouniverse, that is scales as short as 10^{-21} m or equivalently energy scales as high as several hundreds of TeV. The present talk discusses some of such strategies developed in my group at the Technical University in Munich during last ten years. They are summarized in [1]¹.

2. Main Strategy

The identification of NP through rare processes, that is through quantum fluctuations, will require

- many precise measurements of many observables and precise theory,
- intensive studies of correlations between many observables in a given extension of the SM with the goal to identify patterns of deviations from the SM expectations characteristic for this extension,
- intensive studies of correlations between low energy precision measurements and the measurements at the highest available energy, that is in the coming decades the measurements in proton-proton collisions at the LHC.

Now in the search for NP one distinguishes between *bottom-up* and *top-down* approaches. In my view both approaches should be pursued but I think that in the context of flavour physics and simultaneous exploration of short distance physics both through LHC and high precision experiments the top-down approach is more powerful. Here are my arguments.

In the bottom-up approach one constructs effective field theories involving only light degrees of freedom including the top quark and Higgs boson in which the structure of the effective Lagrangians is governed by the symmetries of the SM and often other hypothetical symmetries. This

¹The updated version of this review will appear in October this year.




Figure 1: Studying Multitude of Extensions of the Standard Model.

approach is rather powerful in the case of electroweak precision studies and definitely teaches us something about $\Delta F = 2$ transitions. In particular lower bounds on NP scales depending on the Lorentz structure of operators involved can be derived from the data [2, 3]. However, except for the case of minimal flavour violation (MFV) and closely related approaches based on flavour symmetries, the bottom-up approach ceases, in my view, to be useful in $\Delta F = 1$ decays, because of very many operators that are allowed to appear in the effective Lagrangians with coefficients that are basically unknown [4, 5]. In this approach then the correlations between various $\Delta F = 2$ and $\Delta F = 1$ observables in K , D , B_d and B_s systems are either not visible or very weak, again except MFV and closely related approaches. Moreover the correlations between flavour violation in low energy processes and flavour violation in high energy processes are lost. Again MFV is among few exceptions.

On the other hand in the top-down approach one constructs first a specific model with heavy degrees of freedom. For high energy processes, where the energy scales are of the order of the masses of heavy particles one can directly use this “full theory” to calculate various processes in terms of the fundamental parameters of a given theory. For low energy processes one again constructs the low energy theory by integrating out heavy particles. The advantage over the bottom-up approach is that now the Wilson coefficients of the resulting local operators are calculable in terms of the fundamental parameters of this theory. In this manner correlations between various observables belonging to different mesonic systems and correlations between low energy and high-energy observables are possible. Such correlations are less sensitive to free parameters than individual observables and represent patterns of flavour violation characteristic for a given theory. These correlations can in some models differ strikingly from the ones of the SM and of the MFV approach.

Having the latter strategy in mind I have in the last ten years investigated together with my young collaborators flavour violating and CP-violating processes in a multitude of models. The names of models analyzed by us until June 2012 are collected in Fig. 1. A summary of these studies with brief descriptions of all these models can be found in [6, 7]. Here, I will concentrate




Figure 2: $\mathcal{B}(B_d \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)$ vs $\mathcal{B}(B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)$ in models with CMFV. SM is represented by the light grey area with black dot. Dark gray region: Overlap of exp 1σ ranges for $\mathcal{B}(B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-) = (2.9 \pm 0.7) \cdot 10^{-9}$ and $\mathcal{B}(B_d \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-) = (3.6_{-1.4}^{+1.6}) \times 10^{-10}$. From [1].

on most recent analyses that have been performed after the second of these two reviews and are not shown in Fig. 1. They are reviewed in [1].

3. Simplest Correlations

I would like first to recall few correlations that are very simple and presently rather relevant. The first two are the ones in models with constrained Minimal Flavour Violation (CMFV) [8, 9]

$$\frac{\mathcal{B}(B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)}{\mathcal{B}(B_d \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)} = \frac{\tau(B_s)}{\tau(B_d)} \frac{m_{B_s}}{m_{B_d}} \frac{F_{B_s}^2}{F_{B_d}^2} \left| \frac{V_{ts}}{V_{td}} \right|^2, \quad (3.1)$$

and [10]²

$$\frac{\mathcal{B}(B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)}{\mathcal{B}(B_d \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)} = r \frac{\hat{B}_d}{\hat{B}_s} \frac{\tau(B_s)}{\tau(B_d)} \frac{\Delta M_s}{\Delta M_d} = r (34.3 \pm 0.8), \quad \frac{\hat{B}_d}{\hat{B}_s} = 0.99 \pm 0.02 \quad (3.2)$$

where the departure of r from unity measures effects which go beyond CMFV. This *golden* relation between $\Delta M_{s,d}$ and $B_{s,d} \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ does not involve F_{B_q} and CKM parameters and consequently contains smaller hadronic and parametric uncertainties than (3.1). It involves only measurable quantities except for the ratio \hat{B}_s/\hat{B}_d that is known from lattice calculations with impressive accuracy of roughly $\pm 2\%$ [15] as given in (3.2)³. Consequently the r.h.s of this equation is already rather precisely known and this precision should be improved within this decade. This would allow to identify possible NP in $B_{s,d} \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ decays and also in $\Delta M_{s,d}$ even if it was only at the level of 20% of the SM contributions. This is rather unique in the quark flavour physics and only the decays $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ and $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$ can compete with this precision.

²As emphasized in [11] the dependence of the ratio of branching ratios in (3.1) on the elements of the CKM is more general than CMFV and applies to MFV at large [12–14].

³This result is not included in the recent FLAG update which quotes 0.95 ± 0.10 .

Indeed, the most recent data on these very rare decays from LHCb and CMS collaborations give first indications that NP contributions to $B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ are much smaller than the SM contribution and in particular the relation (3.2) but also (3.1) could turn out to be an important tool in the coming years to identify NP. On the other hand the data on $B_d \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ exhibit some departure from SM expectations but we have to wait for improved data in order to see whether NP is here at work. We compare the relation (3.2) with present data in Fig. 2, where we included $\Delta\Gamma_s$ effects in $B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ as discussed below. We will soon investigate what kind of NP could give a better description of the data than it is presently the case of CMFV.

While experimentalists from CMS and LHCb should be congratulated on the measurements on such low branching ratios, their result for $B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ has been predicted by theorists more than a decade ago. The first NLO-QCD calculation of these decays has been performed 20 years ago in [16]. In contrast to what is stated usually in the literature, the most important result of this paper was not the reduction of the scale uncertainty due to the choice of the scale in m_t but the inclusion of a factor of two in the branching ratios for $B_{s,d} \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ which was missed in the previous literature. This factor of two can be appreciated for the first time this year. Indeed, the most recent predictions in the SM [17, 18] and the most recent averages from LHCb [19] and CMS [20] are given as follows:

$$\overline{\mathcal{B}}(B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)_{\text{SM}} = (3.56 \pm 0.18) \cdot 10^{-9}, \quad \overline{\mathcal{B}}(B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-) = (2.9 \pm 0.7) \times 10^{-9}, \quad (3.3)$$

$$\mathcal{B}(B_d \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)_{\text{SM}} = (1.05 \pm 0.07) \times 10^{-10}, \quad \mathcal{B}(B_d \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-) = (3.6^{+1.6}_{-1.4}) \times 10^{-10}. \quad (3.4)$$

The “bar” in the case of $B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ indicates that $\Delta\Gamma_s$ effects [21–23] have been taken into account. These two branching ratios are related through [23]

$$\mathcal{B}(B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-) = r(y_s) \overline{\mathcal{B}}(B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-), \quad (3.5)$$

where

$$r(y_s) \equiv \frac{1 - y_s^2}{1 + \mathcal{A}_{\Delta\Gamma}^{\mu^+ \mu^-} y_s}, \quad y_s \equiv \tau_{B_s} \frac{\Delta\Gamma_s}{2}. \quad (3.6)$$

The observable $\mathcal{A}_{\Delta\Gamma}^{\mu^+ \mu^-}$ can be extracted from the untagged time-dependent studies and generally depends on NP but knowing it experimentally allows to determine $\mathcal{B}(B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)$ which is usually calculated by theorists. In the SM and CMFV we have $\mathcal{A}_{\Delta\Gamma}^{\mu^+ \mu^-} = 1$ and the inclusion of $\Delta\Gamma_s$ effects rescales the branching ratio $\mathcal{B}(B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)$ upwards. The amount of this rescaling depends on the experimental value of y_s . While at the time of the analyses in [17, 18] one had $y_s = 0.088 \pm 0.014$, the most recent value is $y_s = 0.062 \pm 0.009$ [24]. This changes the SM value in (3.3) to 3.46 but we will not do it here as such small modifications should be included together with complete NLO electroweak corrections (Bobeth, Gorbahn and Stamou) and NNLO QCD corrections (Hermann, Misiak and Steinhauser) that should appear in the arxiv soon.

Clearly in the case of $B_d \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ large deviations from SM prediction are still possible. But in the case of $\overline{\mathcal{B}}(B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)$ deviations by more than 30% from its SM value seem rather unlikely. Yet, the reduction of the error in the SM prediction down to 3 – 4% is still possible and this would allow to see NP at the level of 20% provided the measurements improve.




Figure 3: $S_{\psi K_S}$ vs. $S_{\psi \phi}$ in models with $U(2)^3$ symmetry for different values of $|V_{ub}|$ and $\gamma \in [58^\circ, 78^\circ]$. From top to bottom: $|V_{ub}| = 0.0046$ (blue), 0.0043 (red), 0.0040 (green), 0.0037 (yellow), 0.0034 (cyan), 0.0031 (magenta), 0.0028 (purple). Light/dark gray: experimental $1\sigma/2\sigma$ region.

We observe that while the data for $\overline{\mathcal{B}}(B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)$ are by 1σ lower than the SM prediction, the data on $\mathcal{B}(B_d \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)$ are by 1.9σ above its SM value. Removing the $\Delta\Gamma_s$ effect by means of (3.5) from the experimental value for $\overline{\mathcal{B}}(B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)$ we find

$$r_{\text{exp}} = 0.22 \pm 0.11 \quad (3.7)$$

to be compared with $r = 1$ in CMFV. Even if in view of large experimental uncertainties one cannot claim that NP is at work here, the plot in Fig. 2 invites us to investigate whether the simplest models could cope with the future more precise experimental results in which the central values of the branching ratios in (3.3) and (3.4) would not change by much.

In CMFV and MFV at large [14], that are both based on the $U(3)^3$ flavour symmetry, the measurement of the mixing induced asymmetry $S_{\psi K_S}$ together with the unitarity of the CKM implies that the analogous asymmetry in the $B_s^0 - \bar{B}_s^0$ system, $S_{\psi \phi}$, is very small: 0.036 ± 0.002 . Presently the data give

$$S_{\psi K_S} = 0.679 \pm 0.020, \quad S_{\psi \phi} = -(0.04_{-0.13}^{+0.10}) \quad (3.8)$$

and although $S_{\psi \phi}$ is found to be small [24] it can still significantly differ from its SM value, in particular if it had negative sign⁴.

If this indeed turned out to be the case, one possible solution would be to decrease the flavour symmetry down to $U(2)^3$, the NP scenario studied in particular in [26–28]. As pointed out in [29] in the simplest versions of these models in which this symmetry is broken minimally, there is a stringent triple correlation $S_{\psi K_S} - S_{\psi \phi} - |V_{ub}|$ that constitutes an important test of this NP scenario. We show this correlation in Fig. 3 for γ between 58° and 78° . The latter dependence is very weak and is represented by the thickness of the lines. Note that in a $U(2)^3$ symmetric world, $|V_{ub}|$ could be determined with very small hadronic uncertainties by simply measuring $S_{\psi \phi}$ and $S_{\psi K_S}$. However, it is more interesting to extract $|V_{ub}|$ from tree level decays and check whether this triple correlation is satisfied.

⁴Our definition of $S_{\psi \phi}$ differs by sign from the one used by LHCb and HQAG.

But now comes an important point. In this simple scenario the relation (3.2) is still valid [29] even if the branching ratios and $\Delta M_{s,d}$ can all differ from their SM values. This means that if the experimental grey area in Fig. 2 will not move and it will decrease in the future our world is either not $U(2)^3$ symmetric or the breakdown of this symmetry is more involved. We will then have to look for other alternatives. One of the simplest alternatives that can cope with this challenge are models with tree level FCNCs which we will discuss next.

4. Correlations between Flavour Observables in Models with Tree Level FCNCs

During the last year we have studied flavour observables in models in which FCNC processes are mediated at tree-level by neutral gauge bosons [30–32] and neutral scalars or pseudoscalars [18,33]. While such processes have been studied in the literature for the last three decades⁵, we still could contribute to this field by identifying certain correlations between several flavour observables that have not been presented in the past. Moreover, in [44] we have calculated for the first time the complete NLO-QCD corrections to tree-level contributions of colourless gauge bosons and scalars to $\Delta F = 2$ transitions. The corresponding calculations for non-leptonic $\Delta F = 1$ transitions have been presented in [45].

The structure of such NP contributions is very simple. A tree level contribution to a $\Delta F = 2$ transition, like particle-antiparticle mixing, mediated by a gauge boson Z' is described by the amplitude

$$\mathcal{A}(\Delta F = 2) = a \bar{\Delta}_B^{ij}(Z') \bar{\Delta}_C^{ij}(Z'), \quad \bar{\Delta}_B^{ij}(Z') = \frac{\Delta_B^{ij}(Z')}{M_{Z'}}, \quad (4.1)$$

where $\Delta_{B,C}^{ij}$ with $(B,C) = (L,R)$ are left-handed or right-handed couplings of Z' to quarks with (i,j) equal to (s,d) , (b,d) and (b,s) for K^0 , B_d^0 and B_s^0 meson system, respectively. The overall flavour independent factor a is a numerical constant that generally depends on L and R but we suppress this dependence. If we assume that only left-handed or right-handed couplings are present or that left-handed and right-handed couplings are either equal to each other or differ by sign, then this amplitude for a fixed (i,j) is described only by two parameters, the magnitude and the phase of the reduced coupling $\bar{\Delta}_B^{ij}$.

On the other hand a tree-level amplitude for a $\Delta F = 1$ transition like a leptonic or semi-leptonic decay of a meson with $\mu\bar{\mu}$ in the final state has the structure

$$\mathcal{A}(\Delta F = 1) = b \bar{\Delta}_B^{ij}(Z') \bar{\Delta}_D^{\mu\bar{\mu}}(Z'), \quad \bar{\Delta}_D^{\mu\bar{\mu}}(Z') = \frac{\Delta_D^{\mu\bar{\mu}}(Z')}{M_{Z'}}, \quad (4.2)$$

with $\bar{\Delta}_B^{ij}(Z')$ being the same quark couplings as in (4.1) and b is again an overall factor. $D = (A,V)$ distinguishes between axial-vector and vector coupling to muons. Clearly the same formulae with different values of couplings and the factors a and b apply to a tree-level exchange of Z , a heavy pseudoscalar A , a heavy scalar H and the Higgs boson. In the latter case the contributions to rare decays are very small once the flavour violating couplings are constrained through mixing because of the small leptonic couplings with a possible exception of the τ . In what follows we do not assume that this suppression is valid for heavy pseudoscalar and scalar and that their couplings to

⁵A review of Z' models can be found in [34] and other recent studies in these models have been presented in [35–43].




Figure 4: $S_{\psi\phi}$ versus $\overline{\mathcal{B}}(B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)$ in different tree-level NP scenarios as explained in the text with $M_{Z'} = M_{A^0} = M_{H^0} = 1$ TeV. Gray region: $\exp 1\sigma$ range $\overline{\mathcal{B}}(B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-) = (2.9 \pm 0.7) \cdot 10^{-9}$. Red point: SM central value.

leptons are not proportional to lepton masses as is the case of the SM Higgs. Moreover it should be emphasized that in a particular NP scenario the FCNC couplings in question could be generated first at the one-loop level. Also in this case the formulae above would apply but then one should check whether genuine loop contributions to FCNC processes in this model are equally important or even more important. In what follows we assume that such contributions are subleading.

Now we can constrain the $\Delta_B^{bs}(Z')$ couplings by the data on ΔM_s and the CP-asymmetry $S_{\psi\phi}$ and the couplings $\Delta_B^{bd}(Z')$ by the data on ΔM_d and the CP-asymmetry $S_{\psi K_S}$. In the case of $\Delta_B^{sd}(Z')$ we have mainly ε_K to our disposal as ΔM_K being subject to significant hadronic uncertainties provides much weaker constraint than ε_K in the models in question.

Once these constraints on the magnitude and the phase of new couplings are imposed and the allowed values are used for the predictions for rare decays it is evident that correlations between various observables are present. It is particularly interesting that the pattern of these correlations depends on whether a gauge boson, a scalar or pseudoscalar mediates the FCNC transition. As the scalar contributions cannot interfere with SM contributions, only enhancements of branching ratios are possible in this case. A tree-level gauge boson contribution and pseudoscalar contribution interfere generally with the SM contribution but the resulting correlations between observables have different pattern because of the i in the coupling $i\gamma_5$ of a pseudoscalar to leptons. We refer for detailed analytic explanation of these differences to [33].

In Fig. 4 we show the correlation between $S_{\psi\phi}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{B}}(B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)$ in the case of pure left-




Figure 5: $\mathcal{B}(B_d \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)$ versus $\mathcal{B}(B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)$ in the Z' scenario for $|V_{ub}| = 0.0034$ (left) and $|V_{ub}| = 0.0040$ (right) and $C_{B_d} = 1.04 \pm 0.01$, $C_{B_s} = 1.00 \pm 0.01$, $\bar{\Delta}_A^{\mu\bar{\mu}} = 1 \text{ TeV}^{-1}$, $0.639 \leq S_{\psi K_s} \leq 0.719$ and $-0.15 \leq S_{\psi\phi} \leq 0.15$. SM is represented by the light gray area with black dot and the CMFV prediction by the blue line. Dark gray region: Combined exp 1σ range $\mathcal{B}(B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-) = (2.9 \pm 0.7) \cdot 10^{-9}$ and $\mathcal{B}(B_d \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-) = (3.6_{-1.4}^{+1.6}) \cdot 10^{-10}$.

handed Z' , pseudoscalar and scalar couplings. The blue and magenta regions correspond to two solutions for the phase of the involved coupling Δ_L^{bs} , differing by 180° , which cannot be distinguished by ΔM_s and $S_{\psi\phi}$ alone. In the Z' case they correspond to correlation and anticorrelation between $S_{\psi\phi}$ and $\mathcal{B}(B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)$. The smaller cyan and purple regions are obtained when $U(2)^3$ symmetry is imposed on the couplings. The same colour coding is used in the A^0 and H^0 case. The gray region corresponds to one σ in (3.3) and (3.8) and the green region is allowed by other data on $b \rightarrow sl^+ l^-$ transitions like $B \rightarrow K^* l l$. Further distinction between different regions can be obtained by studying other observables like CP-asymmetry $S_{\mu\mu}^s$ in $B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ and the transitions $b \rightarrow s \nu \bar{\nu}$ but the correlation with the latter decays requires the relative size of muon and neutrino couplings. There is no space to present these correlations here. They can be found in [33]. In particular simultaneous study of $B \rightarrow K(K^*) \nu \bar{\nu}$ and $B \rightarrow X_s \nu \bar{\nu}$ can provide information about the importance of right-handed couplings [46–48].

The three plots in Fig. 4 show rather spectacular differences between these three NP scenarios, that can be distinguished from each other provided the departures from SM values are sufficiently large. For instance in the case of the branching ratio for $B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ being smaller than its SM value, H^0 scenario would be excluded. The fact that there is no overlap between SM prediction and the allowed range in A^0 case is related to the requirement of suppressing ΔM_s below its SM value in order to obtain better agreement with experiment. In the Z' case the structure is still different and the latter requirement implies a non-vanishing CP-asymmetry $S_{\mu\mu}^s$ which vanishes in the SM. See [33] for corresponding plots.

Yet one should warn the reader that the particular pattern of correlations between $S_{\psi\phi}$ and $\mathcal{B}(B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)$ seen in Fig. 4 depends on whether the SM value for ΔM_s is above the data as used in [31] or smaller or equal to it. This has been emphasized and illustrated in [30] in the context of an explicit 3-3-1 model and recently analyzed more generally in view of the new data on $B_{s,d} \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ and anomalies in $B_d \rightarrow K^* \mu^+ \mu^-$ in [49]. Let us then briefly summarize the main findings of the latter paper.




Figure 6: $\mathcal{B}(B_d \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)$ versus $\mathcal{B}(B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)$ in the Z-scenario for $|V_{ub}| = 0.0034$ (left) and $|V_{ub}| = 0.0040$ (right) and $C_{B_d} = 0.96 \pm 0.01$, $C_{B_s} = 1.00 \pm 0.01$, $0.639 \leq S_{\psi K_s} \leq 0.719$ and $-0.15 \leq S_{\psi\phi} \leq 0.15$. SM is represented by the light gray area with black dot. Dark gray region: Combined exp 1σ range $\mathcal{B}(B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-) = (2.9 \pm 0.7) \cdot 10^{-9}$ and $\mathcal{B}(B_d \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-) = (3.6^{+1.6}_{-1.4}) \cdot 10^{-10}$.

5. Tree-Level FCNCs Facing New Data

In addition to new results on $B_{s,d} \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$, LHCb collaboration reported new results on angular observables in $B_d \rightarrow K^* \mu^+ \mu^-$ that show significant departures from SM expectations [50, 51]. Moreover, new data on the observable F_L , consistent with LHCb value in [50] have been presented by CMS [52]. These anomalies in $B_d \rightarrow K^* \mu^+ \mu^-$ triggered recently two sophisticated analyses [41, 42] with the goal to understand the data and to indicate what type of new physics could be responsible for these departures from the SM. Both analyses point toward NP contributions in the modified coefficients $C_{7\gamma}$ and C_9 with the following shifts with respect to their SM values:

$$C_{7\gamma}^{\text{NP}} < 0, \quad C_9^{\text{NP}} < 0. \quad (5.1)$$

Other possibilities, in particular involving right-handed currents, have been discussed in [42]. We are looking forward to the analysis of the authors of [53, 54] in order to see whether some consensus about the size of anomalies in question between these three groups has been reached. References to earlier papers on $B \rightarrow K^* \mu^+ \mu^-$ by all these authors can be found in [41, 42, 54] and [1].

It should be emphasized at this point that these analyses are subject to theoretical uncertainties, which have been discussed at length in [41, 55–59] and it remains to be seen whether the observed anomalies are only result of statistical fluctuations and/or underestimated error uncertainties. Assuming that this is not the case we have investigated in [49] whether tree-level Z' and Z -exchanges could simultaneously explain the $B_d \rightarrow K^* \mu^+ \mu^-$ anomalies and the most recent data on $B_{s,d} \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$. In this context we have investigated the correlation between these decays and $\Delta F = 2$ observables. The outcome of this rather extensive analysis can be briefly summarized as follows:

- The so-called LHS scenario for Z' or Z FCNC couplings (only left-handed quark couplings are flavour violating) provides a simple model that allows for the violation of the CMFV relation between the branching ratios for $B_{d,s} \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ and $\Delta M_{s,d}$. The plots in Figs. 5 and 6 for Z' and Z illustrate this.

- However, to achieve this in the case of Z' the experimental value of ΔM_s must be very close to its SM value and ΔM_d is favoured to be by 5% *larger* than $(\Delta M_d)_{\text{SM}}$. $S_{\psi\phi}$ can still deviate significantly from its SM value.
- In the case of Z , both ΔM_s and $S_{\psi\phi}$ must be rather close to their SM values while ΔM_d is favoured to be by 5% *smaller* than $(\Delta M_d)_{\text{SM}}$.
- As far as the anomalies in $B \rightarrow K^* \mu^+ \mu^-$ are concerned Z' with only left-handed couplings is capable of softening the anomalies in the observables F_L and S_5 in a correlated manner as proposed [41, 42]. However, a better description of the present data is obtained by including also right-handed contributions with the RH couplings of approximately the same magnitude but opposite sign. This is so-called ALRS scenario of [31]. We illustrate this in Fig. 7. This is in agreement with the findings in [42]. Several analogous correlations can be found in [49]. We should emphasize that if Z' is the only new particle at scales $\mathcal{O}(\text{TeV})$ than $C_{7\gamma}^{\text{NP}}$ can be neglected implying nice correlations shown in Fig. 7.
- Strict correlation between $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)$ and the branching ratio for $B_d \rightarrow K \mu^+ \mu^-$ at high q^2 as a function of C_9^{NP} in LHS has been found⁶. We show it in Fig. 8. The error in the SM prediction for $\mathcal{B}(B_d \rightarrow K \mu^+ \mu^-)$ is in the ballpark of 10% but the lattice calculations will certainly decrease it with time [60, 61]. This error should be taken into account in the lines corresponding to NP predictions with $C_9^{\text{NP}} \neq 0$. Indeed in agreement with [42] only $|C_9^{\text{NP}}| \leq 1.0$ is allowed at 1σ which is insufficient, as seen in Fig. 7, to remove completely $B_d \rightarrow K^* \mu^+ \mu^-$ anomalies in LHS. In ALRS NP contributions to $\mathcal{B}(B_d \rightarrow K \mu^+ \mu^-)$ vanish.
- The SM Z boson with FCNC couplings to quarks cannot describe the anomalies in $B \rightarrow K^* \mu^+ \mu^-$ due to its small vector coupling to muons.

Finally, let us emphasize that NP effects in $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ and $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$ can be very large in both Z' and Z scenarios but are bounded by the upper bound on $K_L \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ [31].

6. Towards the new SM in 12 Steps and DNA-Charts

The identification of NP indirectly will require many measurements. The most important are shown in Fig. 9 taken from [1], where we have outlined a strategy consisting of 12 steps for identifying the correct extension of the SM. Very important are the first two steps which should allow to obtain precise predictions for the observables considered in the remaining 10 steps within the SM. Finding the deviations from SM predictions for these observables in future measurements performed in this decade and studying correlations between these deviations should allow at least to identify some routes to be followed which one day could bring us to the Zeptouniverse. However, as we stressed above, the pattern of deviations from SM predictions depends crucially on the outcome of first two steps. The analyses in [49, 62] show this in explicit terms.

As emphasized in [1] already the pattern of signs of departures from SM expectations in various observables and the correlations or anti-correlations between these departures could exclude

⁶We thank David Straub for pointing it out.




Figure 7: Left: $\langle F_L \rangle$ versus $\langle S_5 \rangle$ in LHS where the magenta line corresponds to $C_9^{\text{NP}} = -1.6 \pm 0.3$ and the cyan line to $C_9^{\text{NP}} = -0.8 \pm 0.3$. Right: The same in ALRS for different values of C_9^{NP} : -2 (blue), -1 (red), 0 (green) and 1 (yellow). The light and dark gray area corresponds to the experimental range for $\langle F_L \rangle$ with all data and only LHCb+CMS data, taken into account, respectively. The black point and the gray box correspond to the SM predictions from [42].




Figure 8: $\mathcal{B}(B_d \rightarrow K \mu^+ \mu^-)$ versus $\bar{\mathcal{B}}(B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)$ in LHS for different values of C_9^{NP} : -2 (blue), -1 (red), 0 (green), 1 (yellow) and 2 (cyan) and $-0.8 \leq C_{10}^{\text{NP}} \leq 1.8$. The gray area corresponds to the experimental range. SM is represented by the black point.

or support certain NP scenarios. In order to depict various possibilities in a transparent manner a DNA-Chart has been proposed to be applied separately to each NP scenario. In Fig. 10 we show the DNA-chart of CMFV and the corresponding chart for $U(2)^3$ models is shown in Fig. 11. The DNA-charts representing models with left-handed and right-handed flavour violating couplings of Z and Z' can be found in Fig. 12.

The interested reader may check that these charts summarize compactly the correlations that are discussed in detail at various places in [1]. In particular we observe the following features:

- When going from the DNA-chart of CMFV in Fig. 10 to the one for the $U(2)^3$ models in Fig. 11, the correlations between K and $B_{s,d}$ systems are broken as the symmetry is reduced from $U(3)^3$ down to $U(2)^3$. The anti-correlation between $S_{\psi\phi}$ and $S_{\psi K_S}$ is just the one shown in Fig. 3.




Figure 9: Towards New Standard Model in 12 Steps.




Figure 10: DNA-chart of CMFV models. Yellow means **enhancement**, black means **suppression** and white means **no change**. Blue arrows \leftrightarrow indicate correlation and green arrows \leftrightarrow indicate anti-correlation.

- As the decays $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$, $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$ and $B \rightarrow K \nu \bar{\nu}$ are only sensitive to the vector quark currents, they do not change when the couplings are changed from left-handed to right-handed ones. On the other hand the remaining three decays in Fig. 12 are sensitive to axial-vector couplings implying interchange of enhancements and suppressions when going from L to R and also change of correlations to anti-correlations between the latter three and the former three decays. Note that the correlation between $B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ and $B \rightarrow K^* \mu^+ \mu^-$




Figure 11: DNA-chart of $U(2)^3$ models. Yellow means **enhancement**, black means **suppression** and white means **no change**. Blue arrows \leftrightarrow indicate correlation and green arrows \leftrightarrow indicate anti-correlation.




Figure 12: DNA-charts of Z' models with LH and RH currents. Yellow means **enhancement**, black means **suppression** and white means **no change**. Blue arrows \leftrightarrow indicate correlation and green arrows \leftrightarrow indicate anti-correlation.

does not change as both decays are sensitive only to axial-vector coupling.

- However, it should be remarked that in order to obtain the correlations or anti-correlations in LHS and RHS scenarios it was assumed in the DNA charts presented here that the signs of the left-handed couplings to neutrinos and the axial-vector couplings to muons are the same which does not have to be the case. If they are opposite the correlations between the decays with neutrinos and muons in the final state change to anti-correlations and vice versa.

- On the other hand due to $SU(2)_L$ symmetry the left-handed Z' couplings to muons and neutrinos are equal and this implies the relation

$$\Delta_L^{\nu\bar{\nu}}(Z') = \frac{\Delta_V^{\mu\bar{\mu}}(Z') - \Delta_A^{\mu\bar{\mu}}(Z')}{2}. \quad (6.1)$$

Therefore, once two of these couplings are determined the third follows uniquely without the freedom mentioned in the previous item.

- In the context of the DNA-charts in Fig. 12, the correlations involving $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$ apply only if NP contributions carry some CP-phases. If this is not the case the branching ratio for $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$ will remain unchanged relativ to the SM one.

If in the case of tree-level Z' and Z exchanges both LH and RH quark couplings are present which in addition are equal to each other (LRS scenario) or differ by sign (ALRS scenario) then one finds [31]

- In LRS NP contributions to $B_{s,d} \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ vanish but not to $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$, $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ and $B_d \rightarrow K \mu^+ \mu^-$.
- In ALRS NP contributions to $B_{s,d} \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ are non-vanishing and this also applies to $B_d \rightarrow K^* \mu^+ \mu^-$ as seen in the right panel of Fig. 7. On the other hand they vanish in the case of $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$, $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ and $B_d \rightarrow K \mu^+ \mu^-$.

In summary there are exciting times ahead of us and following the 12 Steps in Fig. 9 and studying correlations between various observables we may one day reach the Zeptouniverse.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank first of all Jennifer Girrbach for numerous studies of various aspects of NP models which resulted in the review in [1], in the 12 steps in Fig. 9 and DNA charts just discussed. I also thank all other collaborators for exciting time we spent together exploring the short distance scales with the help of flavour violating processes. Finally I would like to thank the organizers of the flavour session for being generous with the time given to this talk. This research was dominantly financed and done in the context of the ERC Advanced Grant project “FLAVOUR” (267104) and carries the number ERC-49. It was also partially supported by the DFG cluster of excellence “Origin and Structure of the Universe”.

References

- [1] A. J. Buras and J. Girrbach, arXiv:1306.3775 [hep-ph].
- [2] M. Bona *et al.* [UTfit Collaboration], JHEP **0803** (2008) 049 [arXiv:0707.0636 [hep-ph]].
- [3] G. Isidori, Y. Nir and G. Perez, arXiv:1002.0900 [hep-ph];
- [4] W. Buchmuller and D. Wyler, Nucl. Phys. B **268** (1986) 621.
- [5] B. Grzadkowski, M. Iskrzynski, M. Misiak and J. Rosiek, arXiv:1008.4884 [hep-ph].
- [6] A. J. Buras, Acta Phys. Polon. B **41** (2010) 2487 [arXiv:1012.1447 [hep-ph]].
- [7] A. J. Buras and J. Girrbach, Acta Phys. Polon. B **43** (2012) 1427 [arXiv:1204.5064 [hep-ph]].

- [8] A. J. Buras, P. Gambino, M. Gorbahn, S. Jager and L. Silvestrini, *Phys. Lett. B* **500** (2001) 161 [hep-ph/0007085].
- [9] A. J. Buras, *Acta Phys. Polon. B* **34** (2003) 5615 [hep-ph/0310208].
- [10] A. J. Buras, *Phys. Lett. B* **566** (2003) 115 [arXiv:hep-ph/0303060].
- [11] T. Hurth, G. Isidori, J. F. Kamenik and F. Mescia, *Nucl. Phys. B* **808** (2009) 326 [arXiv:0807.5039 [hep-ph]].
- [12] R. S. Chivukula and H. Georgi, *Phys. Lett. B* **188** (1987) 99.
- [13] L. J. Hall and L. Randall, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65** (1990) 2939.
- [14] G. D'Ambrosio, G. F. Giudice, G. Isidori and A. Strumia, *Nucl. Phys. B* **645** (2002) 155 [hep-ph/0207036].
- [15] N. Carrasco, M. Ciuchini, P. Dimopoulos, R. Frezzotti, V. Gimenez, G. Herdoiza, V. Lubicz and C. Michael *et al.*, arXiv:1308.1851 [hep-lat].
- [16] G. Buchalla and A. J. Buras, *Nucl. Phys. B* **400** (1993) 225.
- [17] A. J. Buras, J. Girrbach, D. Guadagnoli and G. Isidori, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **72** (2012) 2172 [arXiv:1208.0934 [hep-ph]].
- [18] A. J. Buras, R. Fleischer, J. Girrbach and R. Knegjens, arXiv:1303.3820 [hep-ph].
- [19] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], arXiv:1307.5024 [hep-ex].
- [20] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], arXiv:1307.5025 [hep-ex].
- [21] S. Descotes-Genon, J. Matias and J. Virto, *Phys. Rev. D* **85** (2012) 034010 [arXiv:1111.4882 [hep-ph]].
- [22] K. De Bruyn, R. Fleischer, R. Knegjens, P. Koppenburg, M. Merk and N. Tuning, *Phys. Rev. D* **86** (2012) 014027 [arXiv:1204.1735 [hep-ph]].
- [23] K. De Bruyn, R. Fleischer, R. Knegjens, P. Koppenburg, M. Merk, A. Pellegrino and N. Tuning, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109** (2012) 041801 [arXiv:1204.1737 [hep-ph]].
- [24] Y. Amhis *et al.* [Heavy Flavor Averaging Group Collaboration], arXiv:1207.1158 [hep-ex].
- [25] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], *Phys. Rev. D* **87** (2013) 112010 [arXiv:1304.2600 [hep-ex]].
- [26] R. Barbieri, P. Campli, G. Isidori, F. Sala and D. M. Straub, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **71** (2011) 1812 [arXiv:1108.5125 [hep-ph]].
- [27] R. Barbieri, D. Buttazzo, F. Sala and D. M. Straub, *JHEP* **1207** (2012) 181 [arXiv:1203.4218 [hep-ph]].
- [28] A. Crivellin, L. Hofer and U. Nierste, *PoS EPS -HEP2011* (2011) 145 [arXiv:1111.0246 [hep-ph]].
- [29] A. J. Buras and J. Girrbach, *JHEP* **1301** (2013) 007 [arXiv:1206.3878 [hep-ph]].
- [30] A. J. Buras, F. De Fazio, J. Girrbach and M. V. Carlucci, *JHEP* **1302** (2013) 023 [arXiv:1211.1237 [hep-ph]].
- [31] A. J. Buras, F. De Fazio and J. Girrbach, *JHEP* **1302** (2013) 116 [arXiv:1211.1896 [hep-ph]].
- [32] A. J. Buras, J. Girrbach and R. Ziegler, *JHEP* **1304** (2013) 168 [arXiv:1301.5498 [hep-ph]].
- [33] A. J. Buras, F. De Fazio, J. Girrbach, R. Knegjens and M. Nagai, *JHEP* **1306** (2013) 111 [arXiv:1303.3723 [hep-ph]].

- [34] P. Langacker, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81** (2009) 1199 [arXiv:0801.1345 [hep-ph]].
- [35] V. Barger, L. L. Everett, J. Jiang, P. Langacker, T. Liu and C. E. M. Wagner, *JHEP* **0912** (2009) 048 [arXiv:0906.3745 [hep-ph]].
- [36] P. J. Fox, J. Liu, D. Tucker-Smith and N. Weiner, *Phys. Rev. D* **84** (2011) 115006 [arXiv:1104.4127 [hep-ph]].
- [37] W. Altmannshofer, P. Paradisi and D. M. Straub, *JHEP* **1204** (2012) 008 [arXiv:1111.1257 [hep-ph]].
- [38] W. Altmannshofer and D. M. Straub, *JHEP* **1208** (2012) 121 [arXiv:1206.0273 [hep-ph]].
- [39] A. Dighe and D. Ghosh, *Phys. Rev. D* **86** (2012) 054023 [arXiv:1207.1324 [hep-ph]].
- [40] S. Sun, D. B. Kaplan and A. E. Nelson, *Phys. Rev. D* **87** (2013) 125036 [arXiv:1303.1811 [hep-ph]].
- [41] S. Descotes-Genon, J. Matias and J. Virto, arXiv:1307.5683 [hep-ph].
- [42] W. Altmannshofer and D. M. Straub, arXiv:1308.1501 [hep-ph].
- [43] R. Gauld, F. Goertz and U. Haisch, arXiv:1308.1959 [hep-ph].
- [44] A. J. Buras and J. Girrbach, *JHEP* **1203** (2012) 052 [arXiv:1201.1302 [hep-ph]].
- [45] A. J. Buras and J. Girrbach, *JHEP* **1202** (2012) 143 [arXiv:1201.2563 [hep-ph]].
- [46] P. Colangelo, F. De Fazio, P. Santorelli and E. Scrimieri, *Phys. Lett. B* **395** (1997) 339 [hep-ph/9610297].
- [47] G. Buchalla, G. Hiller and G. Isidori, *Phys. Rev. D* **63** (2000) 014015 [hep-ph/0006136].
- [48] W. Altmannshofer, A. J. Buras, D. M. Straub and M. Wick, *JHEP* **0904** (2009) 022 [arXiv:0902.0160 [hep-ph]].
- [49] A. J. Buras and J. Girrbach, arXiv:1309.2466 [hep-ph].
- [50] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], *JHEP* **1308** (2013) 131 [arXiv:1304.6325 [hep-ex]].
- [51] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], arXiv:1308.1707 [hep-ex].
- [52] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], arXiv:1308.3409 [hep-ex].
- [53] F. Beaujean, C. Bobeth, D. van Dyk and C. Wacker, *JHEP* **1208** (2012) 030 [arXiv:1205.1838 [hep-ph]].
- [54] C. Bobeth, G. Hiller and D. van Dyk, *Phys. Rev. D* **87** (2013) 034016 [arXiv:1212.2321 [hep-ph]].
- [55] A. Khodjamirian, T. Mannel, A. A. Pivovarov and Y. -M. Wang, *JHEP* **1009** (2010) 089 [arXiv:1006.4945 [hep-ph]].
- [56] M. Beylich, G. Buchalla and T. Feldmann, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **71** (2011) 1635 [arXiv:1101.5118 [hep-ph]].
- [57] J. Matias, *Phys. Rev. D* **86** (2012) 094024 [arXiv:1209.1525 [hep-ph]].
- [58] S. Jäger and J. Martin Camalich, *JHEP* **1305** (2013) 043 [arXiv:1212.2263 [hep-ph]].
- [59] C. Hambrock, G. Hiller, S. Schacht and R. Zwicky, arXiv:1308.4379 [hep-ph].
- [60] C. Bouchard, G. P. Lepage, C. Monahan, H. Na and J. Shigemitsu, arXiv:1306.0434 [hep-ph].
- [61] C. Bouchard, G. P. Lepage, C. Monahan, H. Na and J. Shigemitsu, arXiv:1306.2384 [hep-lat].
- [62] A. J. Buras and J. Girrbach, arXiv:1304.6835 [hep-ph].