

The Heavy Quark Expansion for the Charm Quark

Th. Mannel,¹ D. Moreno,¹ and A. A. Pivovarov¹

¹*Center for Particle Physics Siegen, Theoretische Physik 1, Universität Siegen
57068 Siegen, Germany*

(Dated: January 5, 2022)

We show that one can re-arrange the Heavy Quark Expansion for inclusive weak decays of charmed hadrons in such a way that the resulting expansion is an expansion in Λ_{QCD}/m_c and $\alpha_s(m_c)$ with order-one coefficients. Unlike in the case of the bottom quark, the leading term includes not only the contribution of the free-quark decay, but also a tower of terms related to matrix elements of four quark operators.

The rigorous formulation of a systematic expansion of observables for hadrons containing a heavy quark Q in powers of Λ_{QCD}/m_Q [1–4] (for a textbook presentation and further references see [5]), in addition to the perturbative expansion in $\alpha_s(m_Q)$, has greatly extended the applicability of QCD to heavy hadron phenomenology. In particular, its application to inclusive processes in the form of the Heavy Quark Expansion (HQE) [6–8] i.e. the expansion of observables in powers of Λ_{QCD}/m_Q and $\alpha_s(m_Q)$ has become a standard tool to analyze inclusive heavy hadron decays, which has subsequently been refined over the last three decades, including the calculation of perturbative as well as Λ_{QCD}/m_Q corrections to higher orders.

While the HQE for bottom hadrons turns out to converge quite well, yielding precise predictions with controllable uncertainties (e.g. for inclusive semileptonic decays [9, 10]), it seems to be far less useful in the case of charmed hadrons. This is on the one hand due to the fact that Λ_{QCD}/m_c and $\alpha_s(m_c)$ are not particularly small. On the other hand, the HQE has contributions with enhanced coefficients which in the case of charm cause a breakdown of the HQE, leaving us only with the possibility to make qualitative statements.

However, for some charm observables the techniques of HQE are quite accurate at the quantitative level, yielding predictions with the precision of a few percent. Examples for such observables are the predictions for hadron masses and the exclusive semileptonic processes $B \rightarrow D^{(*)}\ell\nu$, both based on a $1/m_c$ expansion. We take this as a hint, that it might be possible to define a “charm Heavy Quark Expansion” (cHQE) which allows us to make more accurate predictions with controllable theoretical uncertainties.

Looking at the lifetimes of weakly-decaying charmed hadrons it is obvious that the standard HQE is in trouble: The lifetimes of the ground-state charmed particles differ by factors of two [11] and even more when including the ground state baryons. This can hardly be explained by a contribution suppressed by $(\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}/m_c)^n$, where in the standard HQE one finds $n = 3$. This is in sharp contrast to the case of bottom hadrons, where the relative lifetime differences are at the level of ten percent or less [11].

Already almost three decades ago it has been noticed that the HQE contains special contributions which lead to enhanced coefficients in the HQE [12]. Within the HQE, these contributions are related to matrix elements of four quark operators which have Wilson coefficients that are enhanced by a phase-space factor $16\pi^2$ relative to the leading term [13, 14]. Coefficients with this enhancement appear first at order $(\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}/m_c)^3$ in the HQE, and for the charm quark the phase space enhancement can overwhelm the smallness of the factor $(\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}/m_c)^3$.

The successful applications of the HQE to charm are all related to observables where the matrix elements of these four quark operators are suppressed. On the one hand, these can be suppressions by factors of $(\alpha_s(m_c)/4\pi)^2$. On the other hand, the matrix elements of the four quark operators are pretty well described by the “Vacuum Saturation Ansatz” (VSA, originally formulated in the context of nonleptonic B decays in [15]), which leads to a strong suppression of the dangerous four quark contributions in inclusive semileptonic decays.

In nonleptonic weak decays such enhanced contributions appear already at the leading order in $\alpha_s(m_c)$ and jeopardize the standard HQE for charmed hadrons. In the present letter we show that these terms can be readily identified, and the HQE can be reorganized.

Unlike in the case of bottom hadrons, the leading term in this cHQE is not just the decay of the “free” quark, it rather needs to be supplemented by a term which contains a matrix element of a nonlocal four quark operator. This contribution is sensitive to the flavour of the spectator quark and generates lifetime differences already at leading order. Physically this indicates that the presence of the spectator quark is essential for charm phenomenology.

In the following we sketch how to set up cHQE, which systematically treats these enhanced contributions. The remaining expansion is an expansion in powers of Λ_{QCD}/m_c and $\alpha_s(m_c)$, however, now with coefficients of order unity.

We start from the standard HQE for the decay rate,

which is set up using the optical theorem by writing

$$\Gamma \sim \text{Im} \int d^4x \langle D(v) | T [H_{\text{eff}}(x) H_{\text{eff}}(0)] | D(v) \rangle, \quad (1)$$

and a subsequent operator product expansion (OPE) which yields an expansion in inverse powers of the charm-quark mass

$$\int d^4x T [H_{\text{eff}}(x) H_{\text{eff}}(0)] = \sum_{d=3}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{m_c} \right)^{d-3} \sum_i C_i^{(d)} O_i^{(d)}, \quad (2)$$

where d is the dimension of the local operators $O_i^{(d)}$ and the index i counts the operators of dimension d . The coefficients $C_i^{(d)}$ can be computed perturbatively as a power series in $\alpha_s(m_c)$.

We consider first semileptonic charm decays, for which the effective Hamiltonian is given by

$$H_{\text{eff,sl}} = \frac{4G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{q=d,s} V_{cq} (\bar{c}_L \gamma_\mu q_L) (\bar{\ell}_L \gamma^\mu \nu_{\ell L}). \quad (3)$$

Inserting this into Eq. (1) and taking the forward matrix element with D meson states, we obtain

$$\Gamma^{sl} = \frac{G_F^2}{M_D} \sum_{q=d,s} |V_{cq}|^2 \int \frac{d^4q}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1}{3\pi} (q^\mu q^\nu - g^{\mu\nu} q^2) \quad (4)$$

$$\times \int d^4x e^{-iqx} \langle D(v) | (\bar{c}_L \gamma_\mu q_L)(x) (\bar{q}_L \gamma_\nu c_L)(0) | D(v) \rangle,$$

where we have contracted the leptonic part already.

The leading terms of the OPE appear at $d = 3$, and the coefficients $C_i^{(3)}$ are computed at tree level by contracting the light-quark line, leaving us with a two-quark operator of the form $\bar{c}\Gamma c$. Including the leptons, these coefficients are given in terms of the three-particle phase space of the (partonic) state consisting of ℓ , $\bar{\nu}$ and q . This is also true for the coefficients up to (and including) order $1/m_c^2$, while starting at order $1/m_c^3$ one obtains a set of Wilson coefficients where the leading term is determined from a two-particle phase space, implying a phase space enhancement of a factor of $16\pi^2$.

These contributions are related to four quark operators, which in the semileptonic case read

$$\Gamma_{4q}^{sl} = \frac{G_F^2}{M_D} \sum_{q=d,s} |V_{cq}|^2 \int \frac{d^4q}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1}{3\pi} (q^\mu q^\nu - g^{\mu\nu} q^2) \quad (5)$$

$$\times \int d^4x e^{-iqx} \langle D(v) | : (\bar{c}_L \gamma_\mu q_L)(x) (\bar{q}_L \gamma_\nu c_L)(0) : | D(v) \rangle,$$

where the symbols $: \dots :$ indicate that none of the quarks are contracted.

Expanding the operator product into local operators we obtain a tower of four quark operators, which at tree level can be explicitly constructed

$$\begin{aligned} & : (\bar{c}_L \gamma_\mu q_L)(x) (\bar{q}_L \gamma_\nu c_L)(0) := \bar{c}_L \gamma_\mu q_L \bar{q}_L \gamma_\nu c_L : \\ & + x_\alpha : [\partial^\alpha \bar{c}_L \gamma_\mu q_L] \bar{q}_L \gamma_\nu c_L : \\ & + \frac{1}{2} x_\alpha x_\beta : [\partial^\alpha \partial^\beta \bar{c}_L \gamma_\mu q_L] \bar{q}_L \gamma_\nu c_L : + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

This expansion generates all tree-level contributions which show a phase-space enhancement by a factor of $16\pi^2$ relative to the leading term. However, one could also use Eq. (5) with an input from lattice QCD for the non-local matrix element. This corresponds to a partial resummation of (tree-level) contributions of the four quark operators generated by the above expansion.

A commonly used ansatz for the evaluation of the non-local matrix element in Eq. (6) is VSA, which is defined through the replacement

$$\langle D(v) | : (\bar{c}_L \gamma_\mu q_L)(x) (\bar{q}_L \gamma_\nu c_L)(0) : | D(v) \rangle \quad (7)$$

$$\sim \langle D(v) | (\bar{c}_L \gamma_\mu q_L)(x) | 0 \rangle \langle 0 | (\bar{q}_L \gamma_\nu c_L)(0) | D(v) \rangle$$

$$= \frac{1}{4} f_D^2 M_D^2 v_\mu v_\nu \exp(iM_D vx). \quad (8)$$

Inserting this result into Eq. (5) shows that all these contributions vanish in VSA. Since phenomenology tells us that VSA is a reasonable ansatz, the HQE for semileptonic decays of the ground state D mesons is not spoiled by the phase-space enhanced terms.

The situation is different and a bit more involved in the case of nonleptonic D -meson decays. Keeping for simplicity only the Cabibbo allowed term we have

$$H_{\text{eff,nl}} = \frac{4G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cs} V_{ud}^* [C_1(\mu) R_1 + C_2(\mu) R_2], \quad (9)$$

with

$$R_1 = (\bar{c}_L^i \gamma_\mu s_L^i)(\bar{d}_L^j \gamma^\mu u_L^j), \quad R_2 = (\bar{c}_L^i \gamma_\mu s_L^j)(\bar{d}_L^j \gamma^\mu u_L^i), \quad (10)$$

where $i, j = 1, 2, 3$ are color indices. The Wilson coefficients depend on the scale μ .

In order to extract the four quark contributions at tree level it is required to contract two of the quarks, which yields in total three contributions corresponding to four quark operators with the quark content $(\bar{c}u)(\bar{u}c)$, $(\bar{c}s)(\bar{s}c)$ and $(\bar{c}d)(\bar{d}c)$. Since only two quarks are contracted, the Wilson coefficients of these contributions are phase-space enhanced compared to any other contribution.

The contributions involving $(\bar{c}u)(\bar{u}c)$, $(\bar{c}s)(\bar{s}c)$ are usually called Weak Annihilation (WA) and can be treated in the same way as the semileptonic case, the resulting expression reads

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{\text{WA}}^{nl} &= \frac{G_F^2}{M_D} |V_{cs} V_{ud}^*|^2 \int \frac{d^4q}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1}{3\pi} (q^\mu q^\nu - g^{\mu\nu} q^2) \quad (11) \\ &\times \int d^4x e^{-iqx} \left\{ \left(3C_1^2 + 2C_1 C_2 + \frac{1}{3} C_2^2 \right) \right. \\ &\times \langle D | : (\bar{c}_L \gamma_\mu s_L)(x) (\bar{s}_L \gamma_\nu c_L)(0) : | D \rangle \\ &\quad \left. + \left(\frac{1}{3} C_1^2 + 2C_1 C_2 + 3C_2^2 \right) \right. \\ &\times \langle D | : (\bar{c}_L \gamma_\mu u_L)(x) (\bar{u}_L \gamma_\nu c_L)(0) : | D \rangle \\ &+ 2C_2^2 \langle D | : (\bar{c}_L \gamma_\mu T^a s_L)(x) (\bar{s}_L \gamma_\nu T^a c_L)(0) : | D \rangle \\ &\left. + 2C_1^2 \langle D | : (\bar{c}_L \gamma_\mu T^a u_L)(x) (\bar{u}_L \gamma_\nu T^a c_L)(0) : | D \rangle \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

while contribution involving $(\bar{c}d)(\bar{d}c)$ corresponds to Pauli interference (PI)

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{\text{PI}}^{nl} = & \frac{G_F^2}{M_D} |V_{cs} V_{ud}^*|^2 \int \frac{d^4 q}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1}{3\pi} q^2 g^{\mu\nu} \int d^4 x e^{-iqx} \\ & \times \left\{ 6(C_1^2 + C_2^2) \right. \\ & \times \langle D | : \bar{c}_L(x) \gamma_\mu T^a d_L(0) \bar{d}_L(x) \gamma_\nu T^a c_L(0) : | D \rangle \\ & + (C_1^2 + 6C_1 C_2 + C_2^2) \\ & \left. \times \langle D | : \bar{c}_L(x) \gamma_\mu d_L(0) \bar{d}_L(x) \gamma_\nu c_L(0) : | D \rangle \right\}. \quad (12) \end{aligned}$$

Expanding the x dependence in the remaining field operators along the lines of Eq. (6) yields the tower of operators which have phase-space enhanced Wilson coefficients. To this end, the standard HQE takes the form

$$\Gamma = \Gamma_0 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k \left(\frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{m_Q} \right)^k + 16\pi^2 \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} b_l \left(\frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{m_Q} \right)^{l+3}, \quad (13)$$

where the second part originates from the (non-local) four quark operators for which the OPE generates a tower of local four quark operators. The coefficients a_k and b_l in Eq. (13) are assumed to be of order unity.

Inserting numerical values for the parameters we find for the charmed case (inserting $m_c = 1.5$ GeV and $\Lambda_{\text{QCD}} = 500$ MeV)

$$16\pi^2 \left(\frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{m_c} \right)^3 \sim 5, \quad (14)$$

which clearly shows the need to re-organize the HQE for the case of charm, since the phase-space enhanced terms are as large as the leading piece. In fact, if we consider only the leading dimension-six term, we find a large negative contribution which overwhelms the piece from the free quark decay, leading overall to a negative for these two terms. Thus we need to keep the non-local expressions in Eqs. (11) and (12), corresponding to a resummation of the full tower of four quark operators.

Thus, for the charm quark we suggest to rearrange the HQE in Eq. (13) into a cHQE by

$$\Gamma = \Gamma'_0 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k \left(\frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{m_Q} \right)^k, \quad (15)$$

with

$$\Gamma'_0 = \Gamma_0 + 16\pi^2 \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} b_l \left(\frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}}{m_Q} \right)^{l+3}, \quad (16)$$

where the second term at tree level within VSA is just Eq. (12). The key point of the cHQE is that all phase space enhanced terms are included into the leading term, while the remaining expansion in Eq. (15) has coefficients $a_k \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$.

For a quantitative discussion of the leading term one needs an input for these non-local matrix elements, which eventually will come from lattice QCD. However, one may as well just use a simple VSA based model for this, since the leading effect of this additional term is to fix the lifetime difference, and thus one could simply fit it to data.

For illustration we inject such a simple model, defined by the replacement

$$c(x) = e^{-im_c(vx)} c(0), \quad q(x) = e^{i\bar{\Lambda}(vx)} q(0), \quad (17)$$

with $\bar{\Lambda} = M_D - m_c$, which yields assuming VSA

$$\begin{aligned} \langle D^+(v) | : \bar{c}_L(x) \gamma_\mu d_L(0) \bar{d}_L(x) \gamma^\mu c_L(0) : | D^+(v) \rangle \\ = \frac{1}{4} f_D^2 M_D^2 \exp[i(m_c - \bar{\Lambda})vx], \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

while all other matrix elements (in particular all matrix elements involving neutral D mesons) are assumed to vanish. Evaluating this yields for the leading term

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma'_0 = & \frac{G_F^2 m_c^5 |V_{cs} V_{ud}^*|^2}{192\pi^3} \\ & \times \left[\kappa + \kappa' 16\pi^2 \left(\frac{f_D^2 M_D}{m_c^3} \right) \left(1 - \frac{\bar{\Lambda}}{m_c} \right)^2 \right], \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

with $\kappa = 3C_1^2 + 3C_2^2 + 2C_1 C_2$ and $\kappa' = C_1^2 + C_2^2 + 6C_1 C_2$.

In fact, the leading term of cHQE reproduces the non-leptonic lifetime ratio of the charged and neutral D meson. Using the numerical values for the Wilson coefficients at the relevant scale $\mu \sim m_c$, namely $C_1(m_c) = 1.25$ and $C_2(m_c) = -0.49$ [16], we obtain $\kappa = 4.18$ and $\kappa' = -1.89$. Inserting $m_c = 1.36$ GeV and $\bar{\Lambda} = 0.61$ GeV we can compute the nonleptonic width ratio

$$N^{(th)}(D^\pm, D^0) = \frac{\Gamma^{nl}(D^\pm)}{\Gamma^{nl}(D^0)} = 0.3, \quad (20)$$

which is to be compared to the experimental number

$$N^{(exp)}(D^\pm, D^0) = 0.301 \pm 0.005. \quad (21)$$

This shows that the corrections to this leading term will be small.

These corrections can be computed in an expansion in powers of Λ_{QCD}/m_c with coefficients of order unity. In addition, we have the usual perturbative expansion of the coefficients in powers of $\alpha_s(m_c)$, which also holds for the phase space enhanced terms. It is a matter of taste, if one includes these into Γ'_0 or keeps them as small terms in the expansion.

The problem that neither Λ_{QCD}/m_c nor $\alpha_s(m_c)$ is particularly small is not solved, rather we only tame the large $\mathcal{O}(1)$ terms in the HQE by switching to cHQE. The remaining problems manifest themselves in large uncertainties induced by the strong dependence on the charm mass for some of the observables, since the size of the QCD

corrections depends on the choice of the mass scheme. To what extent the cHQE can be turned into a precision tool, similar to what we have in the bottom sector, remains to be explored.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to Alexander Lenz for discussions on the HQE and its applications to charm physics, and Maria Laura Piscopo for valuable communications. This research was supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under grant 396021762 - TRR 257 “Particle Physics Phenomenology after the Higgs Discovery”.

-
- [1] M. A. Shifman and M. B. Voloshin, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **47** (1988), 511 ITEP-87-64.
 - [2] E. Eichten and B. R. Hill, Phys. Lett. B **234** (1990), 511-516 doi:10.1016/0370-2693(90)92049-O
 - [3] N. Isgur and M. B. Wise, Phys. Lett. B **232** (1989), 113-117 doi:10.1016/0370-2693(89)90566-2
 - [4] B. Grinstein, Nucl. Phys. B **339** (1990), 253-268 doi:10.1016/0550-3213(90)90349-I
 - [5] A. V. Manohar and M. B. Wise, Camb. Monogr. Part. Phys. Nucl. Phys. Cosmol. **10** (2000), 1-191
 - [6] J. Chay, H. Georgi and B. Grinstein, Phys. Lett. B **247** (1990), 399-405 doi:10.1016/0370-2693(90)90916-T
 - [7] I. I. Y. Bigi, N. G. Uraltsev and A. I. Vainshtein, Phys. Lett. B **293** (1992), 430-436 [erratum: Phys. Lett. B **297** (1992), 477-477] doi:10.1016/0370-2693(92)90908-M [arXiv:hep-ph/9207214 [hep-ph]].
 - [8] A. V. Manohar and M. B. Wise, Phys. Rev. D **49** (1994), 1310-1329 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.49.1310 [arXiv:hep-ph/9308246 [hep-ph]].
 - [9] D. Benson, I. I. Bigi, T. Mannel and N. Uraltsev, Nucl. Phys. B **665** (2003), 367-401 doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(03)00452-8 [arXiv:hep-ph/0302262 [hep-ph]].
 - [10] P. Gambino and C. Schwanda, Phys. Rev. D **89** (2014) no.1, 014022 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.89.014022 [arXiv:1307.4551 [hep-ph]].
 - [11] P. A. Zyla *et al.* [Particle Data Group], PTEP **2020** (2020) no.8, 083C01 doi:10.1093/ptep/ptaa104
 - [12] B. Guberina, S. Nussinov, R. D. Peccei and R. Ruckl, Phys. Lett. B **89** (1979), 111-115.
 - [13] M. Neubert and C. T. Sachrajda, Nucl. Phys. B **483** (1997), 339-370.
 - [14] A. Lenz and T. Rauh, Phys. Rev. D **88** (2013), 034004.
 - [15] M. Bauer, B. Stech and M. Wirbel, Z. Phys. C **34** (1987), 103 doi:10.1007/BF01561122
 - [16] G. Buchalla, A. J. Buras and M. E. Lautenbacher, Rev. Mod. Phys. **68** (1996), 1125-1144 doi:10.1103/RevModPhys.68.1125 [arXiv:hep-ph/9512380 [hep-ph]].