

FROM KONDO MODEL AND STRONG COUPLING LATTICE QCD
TO THE ISGUR-WISE FUNCTION^y

APOORVA PATEL
CTS and SERC, Indian Institute of Science
Bangalore-560012, India

ABSTRACT

Isgur-Wise functions parametrize the leading behaviour of weak decay form factors of mesons and baryons containing a single heavy quark. The form factors for the quark mass operator are calculated in strong coupling lattice QCD, and Isgur-Wise functions extracted from them. Based on renormalisation group invariance of the operators involved, it is argued that the Isgur-Wise functions would be the same in the weak coupling continuum theory.

Quantum Chromodynamics with heavy quarks possesses spin-flavour symmetries that become exact as the quark masses go to infinity. These symmetries give rise to relations amongst various matrix elements and form factors of hadrons containing heavy quarks¹. Such relations based on symmetry properties alone are genuine predictions of QCD, and do not suffer from the uncertainties of phenomenological models of hadrons. Of course, the leading order relations (i.e. those valid in the $M \rightarrow \infty$ limit) have to be corrected for symmetry breaking effects in order to connect them to properties of physical hadrons containing heavy quarks. These corrections arise from unequal quark masses and from terms suppressed by powers of $1/M$, and are in the range of 10–20% for many instances involving b and c quarks. Thus extracting the leading behaviour using heavy quark symmetries, and then estimating the corrections using some phenomenological model, is a practical solution to cut down our ignorance in dealing with QCD and to make useful predictions for fitting experimental results concerning hadrons containing heavy quarks².

Of particular phenomenological interest are the weak decay form factors of hadrons containing a single heavy quark. Together with the experimentally observed weak decay matrix elements, these form factors determine various elements of the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa quark mixing matrix. For example, a precise determination of the element V_{cb} is possible provided we know the form factors of vector and axial currents between B and D mesons and B \rightarrow D semileptonic decay rates. The approach outlined above predicts that in the leading order all such form

^y Invited talk presented at the International Colloquium on Modern Quantum Field Theory II, TIFR, Bombay, January 5-11, 1994.

E-mail: adpatel@cts.iisc.ernet.in

factors can be reduced to two unknown functions, one for mesons (Γ) and another for baryons (Γ_B). These two we refer to as the Isgur-Wise functions.

The symmetry properties of hadrons containing a single heavy quark are best expressed in the language of an effective field theory. In this formalism, factors of heavy quark mass are explicitly taken out by appropriately scaling all variables and the hadronic states are characterised by their four-velocities. In the $M \rightarrow \infty$ limit, the momentum carried by the QCD degrees of freedom (gluons and light quarks) that interact with the heavy quark is too small to alter v , and so v becomes a conserved quantum number. Of course, the large momentum transfer involved in a weak decay can change v by a finite amount. Γ and Γ_B are thus functions of the only Lorentz invariant combination available, $v \cdot v'$, where v and v' are the heavy hadron velocities in the initial and final states respectively. (Note that $v \cdot v'$ is nothing but the Lorentz contraction factor of special relativity, while $v^2 = 1 = v'^2$.)

In the rest frame of the heavy hadrons, the heavy quark just sits at one point, say the origin, while the light QCD degrees of freedom buzz around it. The situation corresponds to embedding a static colour impurity in the QCD vacuum. This picture provides explicit information about the functions Γ and Γ_B in two specific geometries, $v = v'$ and $v = -v'$. When $v = v'$, the heavy quark may decay at some instance of time, but the surrounding light QCD degrees of freedom do not feel any change at all. The flavour independence of QCD thus allows a convenient choice for the absolute normalisation of the Isgur-Wise functions, $(\Gamma(v \cdot v' = 1)) = 1 = (\Gamma_B(v \cdot v' = 1))$. When $v = -v'$, the actual physical process is heavy quark pair creation or annihilation. So we expect the Isgur-Wise functions to be singular at this kinematic point. Analytically continuing the Isgur-Wise functions to the full complex $v \cdot v'$ plane, a minimal scenario for their singularity structure is to have a pole at $v \cdot v' = 1$, followed by a branch cut for $v \cdot v' < 1$, and no other singularities in the rest of the complex plane. The physical situations of course correspond to $v \cdot v' \leq 1$ along the real axis. It is important to note that both these constraints on the Isgur-Wise functions remain unaffected by QCD renormalisation effects. An easy way to see this is to go to the temporal gauge $A_0 = 0$, in which the static heavy quark loses all its QCD interactions and behaves like a free fermion.

To go beyond these constraints and explicitly determine the Isgur-Wise functions requires knowledge of the dynamical behaviour of QCD. Formally the set up has several similarities to the Kondo problem of condensed matter physics, i.e. a static magnetic impurity embedded in a free electron conduction band. To name a few:

Both problems have a static impurity interacting with its polarisable surroundings. Kondo problem has spin interaction, while heavy quark QCD has colour interaction. Only s wave configurations feel the interaction in the leading order, and they are the cases of phenomenological importance.

The interaction is weak at short distances, but becomes strong at long distances completely screening the impurity. The change from asymptotic freedom to confinement is smooth without any intervening phase transition, and one can talk about renormalisation group (RG) flows leading from the weak coupling fixed point to the strong coupling one.

The unstable weak coupling fixed point is at zero coupling, with an essential singularity and a logarithmically running coupling governing the scaling behaviour. The stable strong coupling fixed point is at infinite coupling, and is of a trivial nature. There is no inherent mass scale in either problem (the light quark masses can be set to zero in case of QCD).

The scale characterising the cross-over from weak to strong coupling is dynamically generated. This dimensional transmutation can be described as the irrelevant operators determining the absolute scale of the theory. The Kondo temperature and Λ_{QCD} are defined in terms of the couplings of an ultraviolet regulated theory.

There are substantial differences between the two problems too:

In the Kondo problem, the electrons interacting with the magnetic impurity are free, with no interactions amongst themselves in the absence of the impurity. The electron energy spectrum extends continuously all the way down to $E = 0$. On the other hand, QCD is a non-trivial theory without any known solution even in the absence of a static impurity. Its states are discrete with a non-zero mass gap (ignoring the Goldstone bosons).

In the Kondo problem, the objects of study are the modifications of electronic properties caused by the static impurity. These can be studied in s wave configurations, while reducing the $3+1$ dimensional problem to a $1+1$ dimensional one. For heavy quarks in QCD, the objects of prime importance are not the changes in QCD excitation spectrum due to the heavy quarks, but the behaviour of the static colour sources themselves. This behaviour is too simple in the $v = v^0$ geometries, as discussed above. Dynamical features of interest involve $v \notin v^0$, and these geometries cannot be reduced from $3+1$ dimensions to $1+1$ dimensions.^x

The modern solution to the Kondo problem is described in the language of conformal field theory. The differences listed above, however, make it unlikely that the problem of heavy quarks in QCD can be solved by the same techniques. On the contrary, the first solution to the Kondo problem was provided by Wilson in the framework of the renormalisation group^{3,4}, and that is an approach which can definitely be applied to QCD. We thus turn our attention to the logic used by Wilson in solving the Kondo problem.

The weak coupling and strong coupling expansions for the quantities of interest were known in the case of the Kondo problem. Wilson used RG to interpolate between the two, fixing the ratio of the dimensionful scale parameters appearing in the two solutions. This needed numerical RG integration keeping track of the low lying states of the problem. The desired electronic properties could then be

^x It is possible to argue that arbitrary functions of $v \notin v^0$ can be Taylor expanded around the point $v \notin v^0 = 1$, and the derivatives can be evaluated in a purely s wave geometry. We then have to calculate matrix elements of the original operators plus their higher dimensional descendants defined by insertions of covariant derivatives in the original operators (such towers of operators are familiar objects in the operator product expansion and conformal field theories).

evaluated numerically. The problem of heavy quark QCD is simpler in a sense, because it has operators which are RG invariant. Among these operators are partially conserved vector and axial currents and their divergences — precisely the objects which are used to define the Isgur-Wise functions. The task is to implement the renormalisation group for QCD in such a way that the desired functions appear in RG invariant matrix elements, evaluate the matrix elements in the strong coupling limit, and then just read off the desired functions from the results by separating out the appropriate proportionality factors.

This procedure can be followed in the lattice formulation of QCD⁵. The formulation is non-perturbative, yet at any non-zero value of the lattice spacing one can define a partially conserved vector current⁶. The RG invariant divergence of the vector current is just the difference of the quark mass operators. The partially conserved vector current is a non-local object on the lattice and its precise form depends on the details of the lattice action (it is a 1 link long operator in the simplest lattice discretisations), but its divergence is a local operator whose structure can be chosen independent of the details of the lattice action.

For concreteness, let us consider the vector current form factor for $B \rightarrow D$ semileptonic decay and its limiting behaviour as the b and c quark masses go to infinity.

$$\langle D(p^0) \bar{\psi} b \bar{\psi} \rangle = \frac{(p+p^0) f_+ (q^2) + q f (q^2)}{M_B M_D (v+v^0)} \quad (1)$$

Here $q = p - p^0$ is the momentum transfer, and $v = (M_B^2 + M_D^2 - q^2)/2M_B M_D$. The divergence of the above expression gives

$$\frac{m_b - m_c}{M_B - M_D} \langle D(p^0) \bar{\psi} b \bar{\psi} \rangle = \frac{(M_B + M_D) f_+ (q^2) + \frac{q^2}{M_B - M_D} f (q^2)}{M_B M_D (1+v)} \quad (2)$$

Note that the operators appearing in the matrix elements on the left hand side of these equations are composed of the QCD fields, and not the rescaled fields of the heavy quark effective theory. This feature is essential to keep the RG evolution of the matrix elements simple, e.g. both sides of the equations are RG invariant and extracted from the above form factors does not have anomalous scale dependence.

These results are still in the continuum language. Following Bjorken, an upper bound on $f_+(0)$ is obtained by equating the inclusive sum of probabilities for decays into hadronic states to the probability for free quark transition. The matrix elements appearing in Eq. (1) give^{7,8} $f_+(0) \leq 1/4$, while those appearing in Eq. (2) yield a stronger constraint $f_+(0) \leq 1/2$. The improvement is due to the fact that the right hand side has a kinematic factor of $(1+v)$ in the divergence equation instead of $(v+v^0)$ in the vector current case.

Analogous expressions can be written down for form factors of baryons containing a single heavy quark. For instance, the vector current form factor in the

semileptonic $b \rightarrow c$ decay is

$$\langle c(p^0) \bar{c} \gamma_\mu b \rangle = \bar{u}(p^0) [f_1 \gamma_\mu + f_2 \not{p} + f_3 \not{v}] u(p) \quad (3)$$

where $\bar{u}(p^0)$ and $u(p)$ represent the spinor wavefunctions of the spin-half baryons. The divergence of this expression yields

$$\frac{m_b}{M_b} - \frac{m_c}{M_c} \langle c(p^0) \bar{c} \gamma_\mu b \rangle = \bar{u}(p^0) [f_1 + \frac{q^2}{M_b M_c} f_3] u(p) \quad (4)$$

Unlike the meson case, there are no kinematic factors here accompanying the function on the right hand side. Therefore, the sum rule analysis gives only a weak constraint $f_1 \approx 0$.

It is worthwhile to note that a degenerate heavy quark mass limit (i.e. $m_b = m_c$) can be smoothly taken for both Eqs. (2) and (4) after cancelling out the mass factors on the left hand side. This limit makes the heavy quark flavour symmetry exact, and prevents anomalous dimension factors (e.g. functions that behave as powers of m_c/m_b in leading order weak coupling perturbation theory) from appearing in the RG analysis of the form factors, thus simplifying the extraction of the Isgur-Wise functions.

Now we put QCD on a Euclidean lattice using staggered fermions⁹. The residual chiral symmetries of this implementation protect the quark mass operator from unwanted renormalisations. The formalism for performing strong coupling expansions in lattice QCD is well-known. To keep the matters simple, the expansion in $1-g^2$ is used often in conjunction with simultaneous expansions in $1/N_c$ and $1/d$. We follow this approach, i.e. first obtain results in the limit of infinite number of colours and infinite number of space-time dimensions and then look at the corrections due to finite N_c and d .

For our purpose, it suffices to look at the extreme strong coupling limit of the theory. It is described by a trivial fixed point of the RG evolution. This fixed point is reached by carrying to extreme the procedure of integrating out all the higher energy virtual states of the theory while lowering the cutoff. Only the lowest state, described by a perfectly screened delta-function wavefunction in position space, survives in each quantum number sector. All the radial excitations orthogonal to the lowest state, corresponding to extended wavefunctions, disappear. The interactions amongst the surviving states are of course altered from their weak coupling behaviour to compensate for the disappearance of the excited states. We evaluate the correlation functions in position space using the summation of hopping parameter expansion method^{10,11} to keep this intuitive picture clear.

The form factors of interest are rather trivial to calculate in the strong coupling limit. The Feynman diagrams are more conveniently drawn in terms of colour singlet hadron lines rather than the original quark lines. Lattice artifacts show up in the formulae (e.g. $\sin(p)$ and $\cos(p)$ functions appear in momentum space

propagators instead of p and p^2), but they are easy to keep track of. For $N_c \neq 1$, the 3 point correlation function between the external heavy hadrons and the quark mass operator corresponds to a tree level Y-shaped graph. For $B \neq D$ matrix elements, the three mesons meeting at the vertex are the incoming B , the outgoing D and the scalar $\bar{\phi}$. The full correlation function is merely the product of the three meson propagators, with the sum in position space over all possible locations of the vertex producing the constraint of momentum conservation.

In the $d \rightarrow 1$ limit, the 3 point correlation function after putting the external hadrons on mass-shell is:

$$G(D(p^0; t_1 \neq 1); \bar{\phi}(q; 0); \bar{B}(p; t_2 \neq 1)) = \frac{C_D e^{E_B t_1}}{2 \sinh E_D} \frac{C_B e^{E_B t_2}}{2 \sinh E_B} \frac{2}{1 + 2 \frac{p}{b c} \cos(q)} ; \quad (5)$$

where c 's are the state normalisation constants, E 's are the energies and a 's are hopping parameters representing the renormalised quark masses (in the notation of Ref. 11). Upon amputating the external legs of the correlation function we get the desired matrix element, which is the last factor on the right hand side of Eq. (5). It can be converted to the continuum notation by identifying various lattice expressions. With

$$M_B^2 = M_D^2 = \frac{1}{a} \frac{1}{b} \frac{1}{c} ; \quad m_b = m_c = \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{b} \frac{1}{c} ; \quad M_{sc}^2 = \frac{1}{b c} ; \quad (6)$$

and the scalar meson mass $M_{sc} = M_B + M_D$ in the $M \rightarrow 1$ limit, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle D(p^0) \bar{\phi}(b) \bar{B}(p) \rangle &= \frac{M_B}{m_b} \frac{M_D}{m_c} \frac{M_B + M_D}{1 - q^2 M_{sc}^2} \\ &\xrightarrow{M \rightarrow 1} \frac{M_B}{m_b} \frac{M_D}{m_c} \frac{(M_B + M_D)^3}{2 M_B M_D (1 + v \psi)} = 1 + O\left(\frac{1}{M}\right) ; \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Comparing Eq. (7) and Eq. (2), and taking the degenerate heavy quark mass limit (i.e. $M_B = M_D$), we identify

$$(v \psi) = \frac{2}{1 + v \psi} ; \quad (8)$$

Applying the same method to the quark mass form factor for the spin-half baryons, we obtain

$$(v \psi) = \frac{2}{1 + v \psi} ; \quad (9)$$

The difference between (8) and (9) arises entirely due to kinematic factors inherent in their definitions.

This analysis shows that in the strong coupling limit the functional form of the Isgur-Wise functions is completely determined by the $1 - (M_{sc}^2 - q^2)$ dependence, or scalar saturation, of the quark mass form factor. The remaining hadron mass factors just ensure that the Isgur-Wise functions are properly normalised, $(1) = 1 = (1)$. Indeed the fact that the normalisations turn out to be correct is a confirmation of

the RG invariance of the form factor evaluation. The singularity at $v^0 = 1$ is as per expectations, but no branch cut shows up in this leading order result.

It is straightforward to get rid of the $d \neq 4$ limit, and work directly in $d = 4$. The expressions for state normalisation constants, hadron masses, hopping parameters and correlation functions become different in terms of the bare parameters appearing in the lattice action¹¹. The phenomenon of scalar saturation, however, is not altered at all and the results of Eqs. (8) and (9) remain valid.

Scalar saturation no longer holds once processes suppressed by powers of $1=N_c$ are taken into account. Such processes are represented by diagrams containing hadron loops. For example, to include the most dominant correction from dynamical light quark loops we have to evaluate the Feynman diagram with a heavy-light meson loop attached to three hadron legs, two corresponding to the external states and one corresponding to the quark mass operator. This process can be looked upon as the scalar $\bar{\psi}\psi$ decaying into two heavy-light mesons which in turn interact with the two external hadrons. Evaluation of such diagrams is quite involved, but we can estimate their magnitude by simple dimensional analysis. The virtual processes contained in the corrections suppressed by powers of $1=N_c$ are strong interaction hadron vertices. The characteristic scale for these vertices (or decay widths) is Λ_{QCD} , which remains finite as $M \rightarrow \infty$. As a result, the $1=N_c$ corrections to scalar saturation are expected to be $O(\Lambda_{QCD}^3/M^3) = O(\Lambda_{QCD}^3/M^3)$. Such corrections do not contribute to the Isgur-Wise functions which are defined in the $M \rightarrow \infty$ limit. We thus argue that Eqs. (8) and (9) are correct even when N_c is finite. A particular instance of $1=N_c$ suppression is the branch cut for $v^0 < 1$, which we expect to be softer by a factor of Λ_{QCD}^3/M^3 compared to the pole at $v^0 = 1$.

Now we can complete the task of inferring what form factors at the weak coupling fixed point of QCD could have evolved to the strong coupling expressions obtained above. ξ and η are dimensionless functions with fixed absolute normalisations at the no-recoil point, v and v^0 are not affected by RG evolution, and the operator involved in the calculation above (i.e. the local divergence of the partially conserved vector current in the limit of degenerate heavy quark masses) was carefully chosen to be RG invariant to avoid anomalous dimension corrections. We conclude that the results of Eqs. (8) and (9) are exact even for the weak coupling fixed point of QCD.

We close with several comments regarding these results:

- (a) Since the quark mass operator and its RG evolution plays a crucial role in our analysis, staggered fermions were necessary in the lattice implementation. Wilson fermions¹² would not have been of much use, since in that case the quark mass operator undergoes additive renormalisation.
- (b) The strong coupling limit does not possess all the properties of the weak coupling fixed point of QCD, since different quantities follow different RG evolution patterns. The appropriate choice of an RG invariant quantity is a crucial ingredient in connecting the two limits. Here the choice of the vector current was essential; the axial current does not have as nice renormalisation properties on the lattice. The Isgur-Wise relations amongst the form factors of the vector and the axial currents, which hold in the weak coupling limit, are not expected to

hold in the strong coupling limit. This is not a disaster. As long as one of the form factors can be determined by connecting it from the strong coupling to the weak coupling limit, the rest can be fixed in the weak coupling limit by the usual continuum manipulations.

- (c) Scalar saturation of the quark mass form factor is a simple consequence of strong coupling and $N_c \rightarrow \infty$ limits. Explicit lattice formulation is not necessary to infer this behaviour. One can anticipate it just on the basis of perfect screening between quark and antiquark, removal of all excited states in the process of RG evolution and suppression of couplings to multi-hadron virtual states.
- (d) The series expansions in $1=g^2$ and $1=M$ have non-zero radii of convergence, although the one in $1=N_c$ does not. This is sufficient to avoid any problems while interchanging the order of limits. Anyhow, the procedure followed here is to first calculate the form factor in the strong coupling limit, then take the degenerate quark mass limit, then let M become large to extract the Isgur-Wise functions, and finally worry about $1=N_c$ corrections.
- (e) The light quark mass is kept finite and constant throughout. It is not at all necessary to take the chiral limit for the light quarks. The fact that the light quark mass remains a constant in the $M \rightarrow \infty$ limit is enough, for instance to justify the replacement $M_{sc} = M_B + M_D$.
- (f) In principle, the complete form factors, i.e. without the use of $M \rightarrow \infty$ limit, can be evaluated in the strong coupling limit. The subleading corrections suppressed by powers of $1=M$, however, are not universal and not easy to connect from the strong coupling to the weak coupling limits. For instance, the terms suppressed by $1=N_c$ have to be kept, and the results have to be converted to continuum language using light hadron masses, hadronic excitation energies and widths, and so on. It may be possible to keep track of all this in an elaborate numerical RG evolution scheme involving many low lying states, such as the one employed by Wilson to solve the Kondo problem.
- (g) The leading Isgur-Wise functions (which have $\chi^0(1) = 1$ and $\chi^0(1) = 1/2$) do a reasonable job in fitting the experimental data for semi-leptonic B decays^{13,14}. A better check needs estimates of symmetry breaking corrections (from unequal heavy quark masses and from terms suppressed by powers of $1=M$) that have to be added to the functions and extracted above. With the leading term already taken care of, these corrections can be found using phenomenological models without introducing too much uncertainty in the final results. Quantitative estimates of the corrections together with more precise experimental data would

provide an accurate test of the results presented here.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to H. R. Krishnamurthy and Anesh Manohar for helpful comments.

References

1. N. Isgur and M. Wise, Phys. Lett. B 232 (1989) 113; Phys. Lett. B 237 (1990) 527.
2. For a recent review of the subject, see M. Neubert, SLAC-PUB-6263 (1993), to appear in Physics Reports.
3. K. Wilson, Rev. Mod. Phys. 47 (1975) 773.
4. For a simple physical renormalisation group picture, see P. Nozieres, in Proceedings of the 14th Int. Conf. on Low Temperature Physics, Vol. 5, ed. M. Krusius and M. Vuorio, (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1975), p. 339.
5. K. Wilson, Phys. Rev. D 10 (1974) 2445.
6. See for instance, L. Karsten and J. Smith, Nucl. Phys. B 183 (1981) 103.
7. J. Bjorken, in Proceedings of the 18th SLAC Summer Institute of Particle Physics, 1990, ed. J. Hawthorne, (SLAC Report No. 378, Stanford, 1991), p. 167.
8. N. Isgur and M. Wise, Phys. Rev. D 43 (1991) 819.
9. L. Susskind, Phys. Rev. D 16 (1977) 3031;
N. Kawamoto and J. Smith, Nucl. Phys. B 192 (1981) 100.
10. J.-M. Blairon, R. Brout, F. Englert and J. Greensite, Nucl. Phys. B 180 (1981) 439;
N. Kawamoto, Nucl. Phys. B 190 (1981) 617.
11. O. Martin, Phys. Lett. B 130 (1983) 411;
O. Martin and A. Patel, Phys. Lett. B 174 (1986) 94.
12. K. Wilson, in New Phenomena in Subnuclear Physics, Erice lectures 1975, ed. A. Zichichi, (Plenum, New York, 1977).
13. H. Albrecht et al. (ARGUS collaboration), Zeit. Phys. C 57 (1993) 533.
14. G. Crawford et al. (CLEO collaboration), CLEO-CONF 93-30 (1993).