Theoretical Physics Institute University of Minnesota

TP I-M IN N -95/31-T UM N -TH -1413-95 O ctober, 1995

Lectures on Heavy Quarks in Quantum Chromodynam ics

Mikhail Shifman

Theoretical Physics Institute, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455

Abstract

A pedagogical introduction to the heavy quark theory is given. It is explained that various expansions in the inverse heavy quark mass $1=m_Q$ present a version of the W ilson operator product expansion in QCD. A system atic approach is developed and many practically interesting problems are considered. I show how the $1=m_Q$ expansions can be built using the background eld technique and how they work in particular applications. Interplay between perturbative and nonperturbative aspects of the heavy quark theory is discussed.

An extended version of the lectures given at Theoretical Advanced Study Institute QCD and Beyond, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado, June 1995.

1 Lecture 1. Heavy Quark Symmetry

The statement that Q uantum Chromodynamics (QCD) is the theory of hadrons has become common place. It is a very strange theory, since many questions concerning dynamics of the quarks and gluons at large distances { however simple they might seem { remain unanswered or, at best, understood only at a qualitative level. Progress in the direction of the quantitative description of the hadronic properties is slow { every step bringing us closer to such a description is painfully di cult. At the same time new results, even modest, have a special weight for obvious reasons { QCD, unlike many other trendy theories in the modern high energy physics, de nitely has a direct relation to Nature and will stay with us forever.

Every hadron in a sense is built from quarks and/or gluons. I say \in a sense" because these are no ordinary building blocks. The number of degrees of freedom uctuates and is not xed; this we know for sure. At large distances we have to dealwith a genuine strongly coupled eld theory, and, as usual, the strong coupling creates com plicated structures which can not be treated by perturbative m ethods. Then we feel helpless and are ready to use every opportunity, no m atter where it com es from , if only it gives the slightest hope of getting a solid quantitative approach based on QCD.

QCD has two faces, two components { hard and soft. The hard component is the realm of perturbative QCD.Notmuch will be said in these lectures about this aspect. Instead, we will concentrate on the soft component. Many years ago, at the dawn of the QCD era, it was noted [1] that heavy quarks are, probably, the best probe of the soft component of the gluon elds out of all probes we have at our disposal. The developments we witnessed in recent years con m this conclusion.

The dynam ics of soft degrees of freedom in QCD is the realm of non-perturbative phenomena. Having said this I hasten to add that there is an element of luck { transition from the perturbative regime to the non-perturbative one is very abrupt in QCD. In a sense the gauge coupling constant is abnorm ally small. I do not mean here the conventional logarithm ic suppression of the running constant but, rather, the fact that b, the rst coe cient in the Gell-M ann-Low function, is num erically large. This fact allows us to forget, in the rst approximation, about perturbative e ects and focus on non-perturbative ones in a wide range of problem s. It is more exact to say that we will concentrate on studying the soft degrees of freedom, but due to the fortunate circum stance of \abnorm all' sm allness of $_{\rm s}()$ = for as low norm alization point as 1 GeV, all e ects due to the soft degrees of freedom are essentially non-perturbative. I will elucidate the precise meaning of this statem ent later.

It would be great if we could just switch o { by adjusting some parameter { all hard processes in QCD without changing its soft component. Then we would be left with the con ning dynamics in a clean and uncontaminated form; formulation of the theory would be much easier. The only parameter which might do the job is b. If we could tend b ! 1 with $_{QCD}$ xed, the hard gluons would be suppressed

by powers of 1=b while the soft component would presum ably remain unaltered or alm ost unaltered. Unfortunately, nobody knows how to make the enhancement of b parametric. (The limit of the large number of colors, N_c! 1, does not work since, although b is de nitely proportional to N_c in this case, the perturbative expansion for all planar graphs goes in N_c=b, not in 1=b [2].) Therefore, we will have to rely on the numerical enhancement of b. In the rst lectures I will merely assume that the hard gluon exchanges are non-existent. Later on, at the very end, we will return to this issue and will brie y discuss the impact of hard gluons.

The purpose of these lectures is mainly pedagogical { the coverage of the topic is neither chronological nor comprehensive. Technically sophisticated issues and calculations are avoided whenever possible; instead I discuss particularly illum inating problem s, in a simplified setting. The readers interested in specific advanced applications (e.g. combining the $1=m_{0}$ expansions with the chiral perturbation theory [3]) are referred to the original publications and the review papers [4] summarizing a wealth of results obtained in the heavy quark theory after 1990. The presentation of the heavy quark theory below as a rule does not follow the standard pattern and is, rather, complementary with respect to the more traditional reviews [4]. We try to emphasize that the heavy quark theory and the heavy quark expansion is nothing else than a version of the W ilson operator product expansion (OPE) [5], an aspect which usually remains fogged.

1.1 W hy heavy quarks?

The quark-gluon dynamics is governed by the QCD Lagrangian

$$L = \frac{1}{4}G^{a}G^{a} + \frac{X}{qiB}q + \frac{X}{Q}(iB m_{Q})Q = \frac{q}{L_{light}} + \frac{X}{Q}(iB m_{Q})Q \qquad (1.1)$$

where G^a is the gluon eld strength tensor, the light quark elds (u;d and s) are generically denoted by q and are assumed, for simplicity, to be massless while the heavy quark elds are generically denoted by Q. To qualify as a heavy quark Q the corresponding mass term m_Q must be much larger than $_{QCD}$. The charmed quark c can be called heavy only with some reservations and, in discussing the heavy quark theory, it is more appropriate to keep in m ind b quarks. The hadrons to be considered are composed from one heavy quark Q, a light antiquark q, or diquark qq, and a gluon cloud which can also contain light quark-antiquark pairs. The role of the cloud is, of course, to keep all these objects together, in a colorless bound state which will be generically denoted by H_Q.

Quite naturally in the heavy quark theory, the gam m a m atrices used are those of the standard representation,

$${}^{0} = \begin{array}{c} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{array}; {}^{*} = \begin{array}{c} 0 & - \\ - & 0 \end{array}; {}^{5} = \begin{array}{c} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{array}; (1.2)$$

W ith these de nitions of the gam m a matrices the left-handed spinor has the form $_{\rm L}$ = (1 + $_5)$.

The light component of H_0 , its light cloud, ² has a complicated structure { the soft modes of the light elds are strongly coupled and strongly uctuate. Basically, the only fact which we know for sure is that the light cloud is indeed light; typical frequencies are of order of ocp. One can try to visualize the light cloud as a soft medium. The heavy quark Q is then submerged in this medium. If the hard gluon exchanges are discarded the momentum which the heavy quark can borrow from the light cloud is of order of $_{QCD}$, and the corresponding uncertainty in the energy of the heavy quark is of order $2_{\text{OCD}}^2 = m_Q$. Since these quantities are much smaller than m₀ this means, in particular, that the heavy quark-antiquark pairs can not play a role. In other words, the eld-theoretic (second-quantized) description of the heavy quark becomes redundant, and under the circum stances it is perfectly su cient to treat one single heavy quark Q within quantum mechanics, which is in nitely simpler, of course, than any eld theory. Moreover, one can system atically expand in $1=m_0$. Thus, in the lim it $m_0 = 0 \text{ CD}$! 1 the heavy quark component of H $_{\rm Q}$ becomes easily manageable allowing one to use the heavy quark as a probe of the light cloud dynam ics. The special advantages of this lim it in QCD were rst em phasized by Shuryak [6].

1.2 Descending Down

In eld theory one has to specify the norm alization point where all operators are de ned; in particular, the gauge coupling constant g and the quark m ass m $_{0}$ are functions of . The original QCD Lagrangian (1.1) is form ulated at very short distances, or, which is the same, at a high norm alization point $= M_0$ where M_0 is the m ass of an ultraviolet regulator. In other words, the norm alization point is assumed to be much higher than all mass scales in the theory, m_{0} . Constructing an e ective theory intended for description of the low energy properties of the heavy avor hadrons we must evolve the Lagrangian from the original high scale M $_{\rm 0}$ down lying below the heavy quark masses m_0 . By evolving to a normalization point down I mean that we integrate out, step by step, all high-frequency modes in the theory thus calculating the Lagrangian L () describing dynamics of the soft modes, with characteristic frequencies less than . The hard (high-frequency) modes determ ine the coe cient functions in L () while the contribution of the soft m odes is hidden in the matrix elements of (an in nite set) of operators appearing in L (). This approach, which in the context of QCD was put forward by K.W ilson long ago, has become common. It is widely recognized and exploited in countless applications { from the ancient problem of the K meson decays to fresh trends in the lattice

 $^{^{2}}$ In some papers devoted to the subject the light cloud is referred to as brown muck'. I think it is absolutely unfair with respect to the soft components of the quark and gluon elds to call them brown muck' only because we are not smart enough to fully understand the corresponding dynamics.

calculations [7]. The peculiarity of the heavy quark theory is due to the fact that the in and out states we deal with contain heavy quarks. Therefore, although we do integrate out the eld uctuations with the frequencies down to the heavy quark elds them selves are not integrated out since we will be interested in physics in the sector with the Q charge € 0. The eld ective Lagrangian L () acts in this sector.

If QCD was solved we could include in our explicit calculation of the e ective Lagrangian all modes, descending down to = 0. The Lagrangian obtained in this way would be built in terms of the elds of physical mesons and baryons, not in terms of quarks and gluons, since the latter become irrelevant degrees of freedom in the infrared limit ! 0. This Lagrangian would give us the full set of all conceivable amplitudes and would, thus, represent the nalanswer for the theory. There would be no need for any further calculations { one would just pick up the amplitude of interest and compare it with experimental data.

This picture is quite U topian, of course. The real QCD is not solved in the closed form, and in doing explicit calculations of the coe cients in the elective Lagrangian one can not put = 0. The lower the value of the larger part of dynam ics is accounted for in the explicit calculation. Therefore, we would like to have as low as possible; de nitely m_Q . The heavy quark can be treated as a non-relativistic object moving in the soft background eld only provided the latter condition is met. On the other hand, to keep theoretical control over the explicit calculations of the coe cient functions we must stop at some $_{QCD}$, so that $_{s}() =$ is stilla su ciently smallexpansion parameter. In practice thism eans that the best choice (which we will always stick to) is several units times $_{QCD}$. All coe cients in the elective Lagrangian obtained in this way will be functions of .

Since is an auxiliary parameter predictions for physical quantities must be independent, of course. The dependence of the coe cients must be canceled by that coming from the physical matrix elements of the operators in L (). However, in calculating in the hard and soft domains (i.e. above and below) we make di erent approximations, so that the exact independence of the physical quantities can be lost. Since the transition from the hard to soft physics is very steep one may hope that our predictions will be very insensitive to the precise choice of provided that several units times $_{QCD}$. Below, if not stated to the contrary we will assume that the norm alization point is chosen in this way.

In descending from M $_0$ down to the form of the Lagrangian (1.1) changes, and a series of operators of higher dimension appears. It is important that all these operators are Lorentz scalars. For instance, the heavy quark part of the Lagrangian takes the form

where c_{G} and $d_{Qq}^{()}$ are coe cient functions, G gG^{a} t^a and t^a is the color generator, (Trt^at^b = ^{ab}=2); below we will often use the short-hand notation i G =

i G = i G . The sum over the light quark avors is shown explicitly as well as the sum over possible structures of the four-ferm ion operators. All masses and couplings, as well as the coe cient functions c_G and $d^{()}$, depend on the normalization point. For example, the coe cient c_G in the leading logarithm ic approximation can be written as

$$c_{\rm G}() = \frac{s()}{s(m_Q)}^{!} \frac{3}{b} = 11 \frac{2}{3}n_{\rm f};$$
 (1.4)

where n_f is the number of the light avors. The power 3=b was rst calculated in Ref. [8]. In Sect. 5.3 I will explain how to derive Eq. (1.4).

The operators of dimension ve and higher in Eq. (1.3) are due to the contribution of hard gluons, with o shellness from up to M₀. Since we agreed that in this lecture we will ignore the existence of such gluons, we will forget about these operators for the time being. Does this mean that what remains from the Lagrangian (1.3) contains no $1=m_0$ term s?

The answer to this question is negative. The $1=m_{Q}$ expansion is generated by the rst (\tree-level") term in the Lagrangian (1.3),

$$L_{heavy}^{0} = Q (\mathcal{B} m_{Q})Q : \qquad (1.5)$$

A lthough the eld Q in this Lagrangian is normalized at a low point the eld Q carries a hidden large parameter, m_Q ; isolating this parameter opens the way to the 1=m_Q expansion. Indeed, the interaction of the heavy quark with the light degrees of freedom enters through P = iD, where

$$D = 0$$
 $igA^a t^a$:

The background gluon eld A is weak if measured in the scale m_Q , which means, of course, that there is a large m echanical" part in the x dependence of Q (x), known from the very beginning [9],

$$Q(\mathbf{x}) = e^{\operatorname{im}_{Q}t}Q'(\mathbf{x})$$
(1.6)

where $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{x})$ is a \rescaled" bispinor eld which, in the leading approximation, carries no information about the heavy quark mass. It describes a residual motion of the heavy quark inside the heavy hadron [10] with typical momenta of order $_{QCD}$. Remnants of the heavy quark mass appear in \mathcal{Q} only at the level of 1=m $_{Q}$ corrections.

Equation (1.6) is written in the rest frame of H $_{\rm Q}$. In the arbitrary frame one singles out the factor exp(im $_{\rm Q}$ v x) where v the four-velocity of the heavy hadron,

$$v = p = M_{H_0}$$
:

The covariant m om entum operator P acting on the original led Q, when acting on the rescaled eld Q, is substituted by the operator $m_Q v + r$,

$$i \mathbb{D} \ \mathcal{Q} (\mathbf{x}) = e^{i m_{\mathcal{Q}} \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{x}} \quad (\mathbf{m}_{\mathcal{Q}} \mathbf{v} + i \mathbb{D}) \ \mathcal{Q} (\mathbf{x}) \quad e^{i m_{\mathcal{Q}} \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{x}} \quad (\mathbf{m}_{\mathcal{Q}} \mathbf{v} +) \ \mathcal{Q} (\mathbf{x}) : \quad (1.7)$$

Below we will consistently use di erent letters, P and for the momentum operators iD acting on Q and Q, respectively. If not stated to the contrary, we will use the rescaled eld Q, om itting the tilde in all expressions where there is no risk of confusion ³. In the local colorless operators bilinear in the heavy quark elds it does not matter whether the original eld Q or the rescaled one is used, since, say,

$$QQ = Q\tilde{Q}; QP Q = Q\tilde{Q}; :::$$

and so on. Using these distinct notations for the momentum operator is convenient since all expressions written in terms of $\$ and \mathcal{Q} do not contain implicitly the large parameter m_Q.

Ipause here to make a reservation. The rescaled eld Q is a four-component D irac bispinor, not a two component non-relativistic spinor which is usually introduced in the heavy quark elective theory (HQET) [10]. HQET is a formalism invented in the very beginning of the 90's [10] which is very often used in connection with the heavy quark physics [4]. It is convenient in a range of problem s but can be quite m isleading in some other problem s. Iprefer to discuss the heavy quark expansions directly and systematically in full QCD in the fram ework of the W ilson OPE. In many instances the careful reader will certainly recognize a signi cant overlap, but the W ilson language, being more general, seem s to give a better understanding and command over the 1=m $_Q$ expansions. Moreover, some issues can not be addressed in the fram ework of HQET at all.

The D irac equation (6 m_Q)Q = 0 in terms of the rescaled eld can be written as follows:

$$\frac{1}{2} Q = \frac{6}{2m_Q} Q ; \qquad (1.8)$$

and

$$_{0}Q = \frac{^{2} + (i=2) G}{2m_{Q}}Q :$$
 (1.9)

The last equation is actually the squared D irac equation,

$$\frac{1}{2m_Q} (B + m_Q) (B - m_Q) Q = \frac{1}{2m_Q} P^2 + \frac{i}{2} G - m_Q^2 Q = 0:$$

In deriving Eq. (1.9) we used the fact that

$$[P;P] = [;] = igG^{a} t^{a}:$$
(1.10)

A rm ed with this know ledge one can easily obtain the $1=m_Q$ expansion of L_{heavy}^0 , up to term s $1=m_Q^2$,

$$L_{heavy}^{0} = Q (iB m_{Q})Q = Q \frac{1+0}{2} 1 + \frac{(\sim \sim)^{2}}{8m_{Q}^{2}} 0 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2m_{Q}} (\sim \sim)^{2}$$

 $^{^{3}}$ W henever one sees an expression containing 's one m ay be sure that it refers to the rescaled elds Q even if the tildes are not written out explicitly

$$\frac{1}{8m_Q^2} \qquad \mathbf{\vec{p}} \in \mathbf{\vec{E}} + 2 \sim \mathbf{\vec{E}} \sim \frac{\#}{1 + \frac{(\sim \sim)^2}{8m_Q^2}} \frac{1 + 0}{2} Q + O \frac{1}{m_Q^3} ; \quad (1.11)$$

where ~ denote the Paulim atrices and

$$(\sim \sim)^2 = \sim^2 + \sim \mathbb{B}';$$

E' and B' denote the background chrom oelectric and chrom om agnetic elds, respectively. The coupling constant g and the colorm atrix t^a are included in the de nition of these elds. The derivation of this Lagrangian is a good hom e exercise. I encourage everyone to obtain Eq. (1.11) by using the commutation relation (1.10) and the properties of the gamma matrices. Those who will have problem s with getting Eq. (1.11) should consult Chapter 4 of B jorken and D rell [11] or Sect. 33 of the Landau-Lifshitz course [12] from where this Lagrangian follows immediately. It is worth noting that

$$L_{heavy}^{0}$$
 '' (₀ H_Q)' (1.12)

where

$$' = 1 + \frac{(\sim \sim)^2}{8m_Q^2} \frac{1+0}{2} Q$$
 (1.13)

and H $_{\rm Q}$ is a non-relativistic H am iltonian, through second order in 1=m $_{\rm Q}$,

$$H_{Q} = \frac{1}{2m_{Q}} (\sim^{2} + \sim B') + \frac{1}{8m_{Q}^{2}} \qquad D'E') + 2\sim E' \sim (1.14)$$

well-known (in the Abelian case) from the text-book expressions [11, 12]. Equation (1.13) is merely the Foldy-W outhuysen transform ation which is necessary to keep the term linear in $_0$ in its canonic form.

1.3 m $_Q$! 1 ; The heavy quark symmetry

Let us not neglect all 1=m $_{\rm Q}$ corrections altogether. In this lim it m $_{\rm Q}$ drops out from L $_{\rm heavy}^0$,

$$L_{heavy}^{0} = Q \frac{1+0}{2} _{0}Q : \qquad (1.15)$$

This expression takes place in the rest fram $e \circ f H_Q$; in the arbitrary fram e [10]

$$L_{heavy}^{0} = Q \frac{1+6}{2} \quad v Q :$$
 (1.16)

In the lim it m $_{Q}$! 1 the masses of all Q -containing hadrons become equal to that of the heavy quark Q ,

$$M_{H_{Q}} = m_{Q} + O (Q_{CD})$$
:

The mass splittings between di erent hadrons are generically of order $_{QCD}$ m $_Q$. Soon, we will relate these mass splittings to the expectation values of certain operators.

The assertion that all Q-containing hadrons are degenerate to the zeroth order in m_Q is trivial. This \degeneracy" by no means implies that the internal structure of all Q-containing hadrons is the same. A little less trivial is the fact that there exist hadrons whose masses are degenerate to much better accuracy, 0 (m_Q¹), and whose internal structure is, indeed, identical in the lim it m_Q ! 1.

Since all e ects due to the heavy quark spin are, obviously, proportional to $1=m_0$, in this lim it the heavy quark spin becomes irrelevant, see Eqs. (1.11), (1.16). Correspondingly, there emerges a symmetry between the states which dier only by the spin orientation of the heavy quark. The pseudoscalar and vector mesons of the type B and B (both are the ground state S wave mesons) present an example of such spin family. In the lim it $m_0 ! 1$ their masses must be degenerate up to term $s O (m_0^{-1})$, and the light clouds of B and B coincide. If there is more than one heavy quark, say Q₁ and Q₂, the theory is sym metric with respect to the interchange Q_1 \$ Q_2 even if their masses are not close to each other (in physical applications we, of course, keep in m ind b and c). Indeed, the heavy quark Q_i plays the role of the static force center inside H₀; the light cloud is avor-blind and does not notice the substitution of Q₁ by Q₂ provided that the four-velocities of both quarks are the same. Notice that at this level the four-velocity of the heavy quark coincides with that of the heavy hadron. (Only when higher order corrections in $1=m_0$ are taken into account the di erence between the four-velocities becom es im portant and the symmetry $Q_1 \$ Q_2 is violated. At the level of $1=m_0$ also the spin symmetry is not valid any more.) If the hard gluon e ects are neglected the interaction with the light cloud can not change the heavy quark four-velocity; therefore, this quantity is conserved in the strong interactions [10]. (This conservation is, of course, destroyed by the hard gluons which can easily carry away a nite fraction of the heavy quark m om entum .)

The symmetry connecting Q_1 and Q_2 emerges in the limit $m_{Q_{1,2}}$! 1 even if the masses of the heavy quarks are not close to each other. What is important is that both must be much larger than $_{QCD}$. We encounter here a situation which is conceptually close to the problem of the isotopic symmetry of the strong interactions. Everybody knows that the strong amplitudes are isotopically invariant with the accuracy up to a few percent, and, at the same time, the masses of the d and u quarks are not too close to each other, $m_d = m_u$ 2. It is not the proximity of these masses which counts, but the fact that the both masses are much less than the QCD scale $_{QCD}$.

U sually the existence of an internal sym m etry in plies a degeneracy of the spectrum. For instance, the isotopic sym m etry mentioned above, apart from certain relations between the scattering am plitudes, predicts that the proton and neutron m asses are the same, up to sm all corrections due to the sym m etry breaking e ects. The heavy quark sym m etry does not manifest itself as a degeneracy in the spectrum { the D and B m asses are very far from each other. One has to subtract the m e-chanical part of the heavy quark m ass in order to see that all dynam ical param eters are insensitive to the substitution $Q_1 \$ Q_2$ in the lim it $m_{Q_{12}}$! 1 [13]. Perhaps,

this is the reason why it was discovered so late.

To elucidate the issue of the heavy quark symmetry let us consider a practical problem, sem ileptonic decay of the B m eson induced by the weak b! c transition. The initial B m eson decays into an electron-neutrino pair plus the D m eson. Since we do not now discuss the $1=m_Q$ corrections we may make no distinction between the four-velocities of the quark Q and the hadron H_Q , and between their m asses. A ssume that the B m eson is at rest. Furthermore, let us assume that the fourmomentum q carried away by the lepton pair is maximal, $q^2 = (M_B - M_D)^2$. This means that the D m eson produced is also at rest { the hadronic system experiences no recoil. The corresponding regime is sometimes called the point of zero recoil.

In this regime the B ! D transition form factor is exactly unity! M ore exactly,

$$hD jc_0 b_B^* i = (2M_B 2M_D)^{1=2}$$
 unity (at zero recoil) (1.17)

where the square root factors are due to the relativistic norm alization of our am plitudes. By the same token

where D_i is the polarization vector of D. As well-known, the exact relations of this type always relect an underlying symmetry. They can never emerge accidentally because only a symmetry can protect the form factors from renormalizations.

It is very easy to understand why Eqs. (1.17) and (1.18) take place. Indeed, the space-tim e picture is very transparent. The b quark at rest is surrounded by its light cloud, the latter being the eigenstate of the problem of color interaction with a static force center. At time zero the weak current instantaneously substitutes the b quark by c; the charmed quark is also at rest, and since the color interactions are avor-blind the same light cloud continues to be the eigenstate, this time with the c quark as the static center. If instead of the eld-theoretic light cloud we had a quantum -m echanical problem one could say that the overlap integral for these identical wave functions is 1. The light cloud will feel the substitution b! c only to the extent the heavy quark m om entum inside the heavy m eson does not vanish exactly { this e ect is, of course, suppressed by powers of $1=m_0$. A swe will see later corrections in the right-hand side of Eqs. (1.17) and (1.18) are actually of order $1=m_0^2$; there are no linear corrections in $1=m_Q$. In the B ! D transition generated by the axial-vector current the current, additionally, changes the orientation of the heavy quark spin. As was already mentioned, alle ects related to the heavy quark spin are suppressed by $1=m_{0}$; D and D are in the same multiplet, and the B! D transition is governed by the same symmetry. This symmetry allows one to rotate arbitrarily four states,

b spin up; b spin down; c spin up; c spin down;

therefore, we obviously deal here with an SU (4) invariance.

The symmetry relations (1.17) and (1.18) were not derived in Refs. [14, 15]. Shortly after it was realized [16] that the actual symmetry is much stronger { the SU (4) invariance takes place for any given value of v, the four-velocity of the recoiling c quark, not necessarily at the point of zero recoil or close to it. Thus, m any di erent form factors connecting (B;B) and (D;D) can be expressed in terms of one function depending only on the velocity of the recoiling hadron (in the rest fram e of the decaying hadron). The universal form factor is called the Isgur-W ise function.

1.4 The Isgur-W ise function

Now we are nally ready to discuss a very elegant observation due to Isgur and W ise [16]. Let us consider now the amplitudes induced by the transition c b o the zero recoil point. Here is any Lorentz matrix; of special interest are, of course, the vector and the axial-vector cases,

$$=$$
 or $_{5}$;

the weak decays of the B m eson are induced by the V A currents. The physically m easurable amplitudes are hD jc bB i and hD jc bB i; for completeness one can also consider the amplitudes of the type hD jc bB i, or hD jc bB i, or hB jb bB i { this adds nothing new. The four-velocity of the particle H₀ is de ned as

$$v = \frac{(p_{H_{Q}})}{M_{H_{Q}}}; \qquad (1.19)$$

the four-velocities of the initial particles will be denoted by v while those of the nal particles by v^0 . It is obvious that $v^2 = 1$, and, additionally, in the rest fram e v = f1;0;0;0g. In the most general case the amplitude hD jc bB i can be expressed in terms of two form factors, the amplitude hD jc $_5bB$ i in terms of three form factors and the amplitude hD jc bB i in terms of three form factors and the amplitude hD jc bB i in terms of one form factor. The heavy quark symmetry tells us that in the limit m_Q ! 1 these six functions, a priori independent, reduce to one and the same function which depends only on the scalar product vv^0 . Speci cally,

$$hD \ jc \ b \ B \ i = \frac{q}{M_{B} M_{D}} (v + v^{0})^{i} (y); \qquad (1.20)$$

$$hD \ jc \ _{5}b\beta \ i = \ {}^{q} \ {}^{h} \ {}^$$

hD jc bjB i =
$$M_B M_D$$
 D $v^0 v^1$ (y): (1.22)

where

$$y = vv^{0}$$

and (y) is the Isgur-W ise function, D is the polarization vector of D. The Isgur-W ise function is independent of the heavy quark m asses. The square root $P \frac{M_B M_D}{M_B M_D}$

re ects the relativistic norm alization of the states. The symmetry relations (1.17) and (1.18) imply that the norm alization of the Isgur-W ise function at zero recoil is xed,

$$(y = 1) = 1$$
: (1.23)

Perhaps, it is worth noting that the phases in Eqs. (1.21) and (1.22) di er from what you m ight see in the literature. They are, of course, a matter of convention and re ect the de nition of the states. The de nition I follow is in accord with the standard relativistic convention, see Eq. (1.25) and Sect. 3.5.

The fact that a large set of form factors degenerate into a single function depending only on y m ight seem a m iracle; but after the assertion is m ade, with the know ledge you already have, it should be not di cult to understand why it happens. Indeed, let us turn again to the space-time picture described above. A b quark at rest, surrounded by the light cloud, instantaneously converts into a c quark. This time the fourm om entum carried away by the lepton pair is not maximal; therefore, the c quark is not at rest. This force center ies away with the velocity v^0 . But the light cloud stays intact. So, the question is: \what is the amplitude for the ying c quark and the cloud at rest to form a D or D m eson?" W e can look at this process in another way. A fler the b! c transition happened let us proceed to the rest fram e of c. In this reference frame the c quark produced is at rest, but the cloud, as a whole, moves away with the velocity $\sqrt[4]{}$. It is clear that this system { the static charmed force center plus a moving light cloud { has a projection on D or D . The am plitude per se, with the kinem atic structures excluded, can depend only on $\frac{1}{2}v^0$ there is no preferred orientation in the space, and the direction of \mathbf{v}^0 is irrelevant. U sing covariant notations one can say that the amplitude depends only on vv^0 since in the B rest fram $e vv^0 =$ $(1 + \mathbf{v}^{(2)})$. There is simply no place for the dependence on the heavy quark masses, apart from the overall norm alization factors appearing because we stick to the relativistic norm alization of states 4.

Since the heavy quark spin is irrelevant in the limit m_Q ! 1 to warm up let us consider a toy model where the heavy quarks are deprived of their spins from the very beginning. In other words, I replace the genuine spin-1/2 heavy quarks of QCD by spin-0 color triplets with the same mass. We will turn to this toy model more than once below.

In QCD, B and B form a multiplet which includes 4 states: the total angular momentum of the light cloud (1/2) combines with the heavy quark spin (1/2) to produce either spin-0 state (B) or three spin-1 states (B). In our toy model the analog of this ground-state multiplet is obviously a baryon of spin 1/2; let us denote the corresponding eld by N_Q, where is the spinorial index. The current generating the transition N_b! N_c has the form c^yb, where the elds b and c are assumed to be scalar now. At rst sight the amplitude hN_c j^ybjN_b in ght contain four di erent

 $^{^{4}}$ W aming: an additional dependence on the heavy quark m asses m ay em erge if we include the hard gluon exchanges neglected so far. For details see R ef. [17]

kinem atic structures,

$$N_{c}N_{b}$$
; N_{c} & N_{b} ; N_{c} & N_{b} ; N_{c} $N_{b}v v^{0}$;

where I list only P-even structures, of course. On m ass shell they all reduce to the rst one, how ever; for instance, $\Re N_{\rm b} = N_{\rm b}$. Hence

$$hN_{c}jc^{y}bjN_{b}i = N_{c}N_{b}$$
 (y):

Returning to realQCD what remains to be done is to work out the consequences of spin. The most concise general formula can be written in terms of the matrices

$$M = B(i_5) + B$$
 and $M^0 = D(i_5) + D$; (1.24)

where B and D are the polarization vectors of B and D, respectively. The (heavy quark) spin independence of the strong interactions at m_Q ! 1 m anifests itself in the fact that the couplings of the ground state pseudoscalar to i 5 and the ground state vector to are the same, see Sect. 3.4. Now, the whole set of the transition am plitudes can be expressed by one compact cute form ula ⁵,

$$P \frac{1}{2M_{D} 2M_{B}} h_{u} (v^{0}) j b h_{b} (v) i = \frac{1}{2} TrfM_{0} \frac{1+6}{2} \frac{1+6}{2} M g (v = vv^{0}): \quad (1.25)$$

C om pleting the trace we recover Eqs. (1.20) { (1.22).

Equation (1.25) can be derived in m any di erent ways. O riginally it was obtained in Ref. [17] (see also [18]). In Sect. 3.5 we will discuss one of the possible derivations { perhaps, not the simplest, but very instructive. Before we will be able to do that it is necessary to make a digression and study som e elements of the background eld technique.

Equations (1.20) { (1.22) are valid not only in the space-like domain (the form factor kinem atics) but also in the time-like domain. The latter assertion calls for an immediate reservation, though. The heavy quark symmetry implies that $M_B = M_B$. In the real world this equality is not exact: the heavy quark symmetry is violated by small 1=m_Q terms. This small violation can be strongly enhanced in the near threshold domain, E $2M_B$, where the symmetry breaking parameter turns out to be of order one [19]. Indeed, let us consider a kinem atical point above the threshold of the BB production but below BB. In this domain all form factors describing three amplitudes

hBBjJjDi; hBB jJjDi; hBB jJjDi;

(here J is some heavy quark current, say, J = b b) have in aginary parts associated with the norm all thresholds due to the intermediate state BB. On the other hand, there is no contribution to the imaginary part from the intermediate state BB.

⁵Strictly speaking, for the outgoing particles one must use $\overline{M}^{0} = {}_{0} (M^{0})^{\gamma} {}_{0} \cdot W$ ith our conventions, how ever, $\overline{M}^{0} = M^{0}$.

and B B . In the pseudoscalar meson B the spin of the heavy quark Q is rigidly correlated with that of the light cloud. Hence, the spin independence of the heavy quark interaction is totally lost in the imaginary part in this point. In particular, in the amplitude hB B jJ jDi a kinematic structure forbidden by the IsgurW ise form ula appears. An even more pronounced e ect of the heavy quark symmetry violation takes place in the anom alous thresholds generated by the pion exchange which can start parametrically much below the the norm althresholds depending on the interplay between M $_{\rm B}^2$ M $_{\rm B}^2$ and the pion mass [20].

1.5 The mass form ula

To complete our st encounter with the basics of the heavy quark theory we will now derive a $1=m_Q$ expansion for the masses of the Q-containing hadrons.

It is intuitively clear that the heavy hadron m ass can be expanded in term s of that of the heavy quark as follows

$$M_{H_0} = m_Q + + O(m_0^{-1})$$
 (1.26)

where is a constant, of order of $_{QCD}$, which depends on the light quark content and the quantum numbers of H_Q but is independent of m_Q. (It rst appeared in Ref. [21]. Later on we will see that this expression is not as trivial as it m ight naively seem and requires thoughtful de nitions of all parameters involved. In particular, since the quarks are never observed as isolated objects, one may ask what the quark m ass m_Q actually means. In due time we will return to this question, of course. For the time being we agreed to disregard hard gluon exchanges; then m_Q is just the m ass parameter in the Lagrangian (1.1).

Form ally Eq. (1.26) can be most easily derived by analyzing the trace of the energy-momentum tensor in QCD,

$$= m_{Q}QQ + \frac{(s)}{4s}G^{a}G^{a}$$
 (1.27)

where $(_{s})$ is the Gell-M ann-Low function. For simplicity we assume the light quarks to be massless; introduction of the light quark masses changes only technical details at intermediate stages of our analysis. If the mass term of the light quarks is set equal to zero the light quark elds do not appear explicitly in the trace of the energy-momentum tensor. The expression (1.27) contains two terms: the rst one is a mechanical part while the second term is the fam ous trace anomaly of QCD [22] (for a review see e.g. Ref. [23]).

Furtherm ore, as well-known, for any given one-particle state the expectation value of the trace of the energy-m om entum tensor reduces to the mass of the state. Then, the hadron mass can be expressed in terms of two expectation values,

$$M_{H_{Q}} = \frac{1}{2M_{H_{Q}}} h H_{Q} j n_{Q} Q Q J H_{Q} i + \frac{1}{2M_{H_{Q}}} h H_{Q} j \frac{(s)}{4} G^{2} J H_{Q} i$$
(1.28)

where the relativistic norm alization of the states is in plied

in the rest frame; V is the norm alization volume. We will always use only the relativistic norm alization of states which will routinely result in the factors (2M $_{\rm H_{\,Q}}$) 1 in all expressions.

Let us discuss the expectation values of the operators in Eq. (1.28) in turn. The stone is explicitly proportional to m_Q . To be more quantitative we must determ ine the matrix element of the heavy quark density QQ. To this end it is convenient to use an argument suggested in Ref. [24] which will show us that the expectation value of QQ is very close to unity; as a matter of fact, with our present accuracy it is just equal to unity. The second expectation value reduces to .

Indeed, in the rest frame of H_Q a typical momentum of Q is of order $_{QCD}$, i.e. the heavy quark is very slow. This means that the lower components of the bispinor eld Q are small compared to the upper ones and, hence, the scalar density of the heavy quark is close to its vector charge, QQ Q $_{0}Q$. The di erence is only due to the lower components. The vector charge, how ever, just measures the number of the heavy quarks inside H_Q; therefore, its matrix element is exactly unity.

It is instructive to do the simple derivation outlined above in som e detail. C om - bining the equations of motion, (1.8) and (1.9), it is easy to get that

$$\frac{1}{2} Q = \frac{1}{2m_Q} \sim \frac{1+0}{2} Q + O(m_Q^2); \qquad (1.29)$$

which implies, in turn,

$$QQ = Q_{0}Q = \frac{1}{2m_{Q}^{2}}Q \sim^{2} + \sim B Q + higher orders$$
 (1.30)

where B is the chrom on agnetic eld, $B_i = _{ijk}G_{jk}$. Equation (1.30) is the desired result demonstrating that

$$\frac{1}{2M_{H_{Q}}} h_{H_{Q}} j_{Q} j_{H_{Q}} i = \frac{1}{2M_{H_{Q}}} h_{H_{Q}} j_{Q_{Q}} j_{H_{Q}} i + 0 (m_{Q}^{2}) = 1 + 0 (m_{Q}^{2}): (1.31)$$

The matrix element of the vector charge (appropriately normalized) is set equal to unity, as was discussed above.

This digression has been undertaken merely to fam iliarize the reader with the basics of the $1=m_Q$ expansion in QCD. As our understanding progresses the level of the explanatory remarks will be reduced so that in the subsequent lectures many derivations of a more technical nature will be suggested as an exercise.

Thus, we have established that the rst expectation value in Eq. (1.28) produces m_Q in the expansion for the heavy hadron mass. The second expectation value

which also has the dimension of mass obviously does not scale with m $_{\rm Q}\,$ in the limit m $_{\rm Q}\,$! 1 , so one can de ne 6

$$= \frac{1}{2M_{H_Q}} h_{H_Q} j_{4_s} G^2 j_{H_Q} j_{m_Q!1} : \qquad (1.32)$$

Thus, the parameter of the heavy quark theory is, in a sense, similar to the gluon condensate [27]. The latter is the expectation value of the same gluon operator over the vacuum state. In the case of the gluon operator is averaged over the lowest state of the system with the given (unit) value of the heavy quark charge. The lowest state is, of course, the ground state pseudoscalar meson, B. Generally speaking, H_Q can be any Q-containing hadron. B mesons are most interesting from the point of view of applications; of practical interest also are Q-containing baryons which are the lowest-lying states in the given channel with the baryon quantum numbers. Therefore, strictly speaking, unlike the gluon condensate, there exist m any di erent parameters , one for every channel considered. U sually we will tacitly assume that is de ned with respect to the B mesons.

Both expectation values,

$$\frac{1}{2M_{H_{Q}}}hH_{Q}jm_{Q}QQJH_{Q}iand\frac{1}{2M_{H_{Q}}}hH_{Q}j\frac{(s)}{4}G^{2}JH_{Q}i;$$

have $1=m_{Q}$ corrections which show up at the level 0 (m_Q¹) in Eq. (1.26). Later on we will derive the expansion for M_{H_Q} which takes into account these terms 0 (m_Q¹).

The $1=m_{Q}$ corrections in the expectation value of the gluon anomaly are due to the fact that in our approach the states H_{Q} i are physical heavy avor states, rather than the asymptotic states corresponding to $m_{Q} = 1$ which are usually considered within HQET. Instead of working with these ctitious states I prefer to explicitly keep track of all $1=m_{Q}$ corrections, both in the operators and in the densition of the states, appealing directly to the W ilsonean operator product expansion.

$$M_{N} = \frac{1}{2M_{N}}hN j \frac{(s)}{4s}G^{2} N j;$$

known from ancient tim es [26].

 $^{^{6}}$ T his expression relating to the expectation value of the gluon anomaly operator was obtained in Ref. [25]. Some subtleties left aside in the derivation presented here are discussed in detail in this paper. It is instructive to compare Eq. (1.32) with a similar expression for the nucleon mass,

2 Lecture 2. Basics of the Background Field Technique

The essence of our approach is separation of all momenta into two classes { hard and soft. For the time being we will continue to pretend that the role of the gluon degrees of freedom reduces to a soft gluon medium. This is an ideal situation where the gluons can be treated as a background eld. A powerful method allowing one to put calculations in the background elds on an industrial basis was developed by Schwinger in electrodynamics many years ago. In the eighties it was adapted to QCD.We will be unable to submerge in all details of this technique, and will, rather, present some basic elements in particular examples. The review paper [28] is recommended for further education. This lecture will be rather technical { its primary goal is to teach how the heavy quark mass expansions can be constructed in a system atic way in di erent problem s.

The starting point of the method is decomposition of elds into two parts { the quantum part and the background one. The propagation of quanta is described by the correlation functions of the quantum part of the elds considered in the external eld. Later on the external eld is to be considered as a uctuating eld of the light cloud, but this stage need not concern us at the moment.

Let us start with a brief review of the Schwinger m ethod, as it can be applied in QCD.We introduce the coordinate and momentum operators, X and p, respectively, [p;X] = ig; [p;p] = [X;X] = 0.M oreover, introduce a form alset of states j_X) which are the eigenstates of the coordinate operator X,

$$X \dot{y} = x \dot{y}$$
: (2.1)

P lease, note that j_x) has nothing to do with the eld-theoretic eigenstates, e.g. H_Q i. To emphasize this fact the use the regular bracket) in the notation instead of the angle one, which is reserved for the eld-theoretic eigenstates.

Then de ne the covariant ${\tt m}$ om entum operator P $\,$ satisfying the following com- mutation relations

$$[P;X] = ig; [P;P] = igt^{a}G^{a};$$
 (2.2)

where t^a are the generators of the color group, G^a is the external eld.

The algebra (2.2) is the basic tool of the Schwinger form align. We will expand the G reen functions in the background eld, and in each order of the expansion we will need to use only this algebra.

In the coordinate basis P acts as a covariant derivative, namely

$$(y \not P \dot{y} x) = i \frac{\theta}{\theta x} + g t^a A^a (x) \quad (x \quad y)$$
 (2.3)

ı.

if

$$(y \dot{y}) = (x \quad y):$$
 (2.4)

Now we can write form all expressions for the G reen functions. For instance, for the quark G reen function $(m \operatorname{ass} m_q)$ describing propagation from the point 0 to the point x we have

$$S(x;0) = (x + \frac{1}{16} - \frac{1}{m_q} - \frac{1}{10}):$$
 (2.5)

Eq. (2.5), rather obvious by itself, is readily veried by applying the D irac operator to both sides of Eq. (2.5). Furthermore, it can be identically rewritten as follows

$$S(x;0) = (xj(B + m_q)) \frac{1}{P^2 - m_q^2 + (i=2)G} j0;$$
 (2.6)

where

 $G q d G^a$:

P lease, note that the ordering is in portant here since P $\mbox{ does not commute with }P\mbox{ of }G$.

If we are aim ed at calculating the coe cient functions in the Born approximation we need nothing else { Eq. (2.6) is just system atically expanded in powers of the background eld by using the commutation relations (2.2).

Observe that one can always shift P by a c-num ber vector due to the fact that

$$e^{iqX} P e^{iqX} = P + q :$$
 (2.7)

Hence, the Fourier transform ed propagator reduces to

$${}^{Z} d^{4}x e^{iqx} S(x;0) = {}^{Z} d^{4}x (x j e^{iqx} \frac{1}{\mathbb{B} m_{q}} e^{iqx} j 0) = {}^{Z} d^{4}x (x j \frac{1}{\mathbb{B} + 6 m_{q}} j 0) :$$

This simple trick allows one to readily develop the expansion sought for. Indeed, assume that q is large (hard m om entum) and P represents soft m odes and is small in this sense. Then we can expand in P,

^Z
$$d^4x e^{iqx} S(x;0) ! \frac{1}{\epsilon_q m_q} \frac{1}{\epsilon_q m_q} \frac{1}{\epsilon_q m_q} \frac{1}{\epsilon_q m_q} + \dots$$
 (2.8)

Next, we transpose P to the right-most (left-most) position and act on the states using the equations of motion.

It may seem that so far we got almost nothing compared to the standard Feynman graph calculations. Let us demonstrate the e ciency of the background eld technique in a few examples.

2.1 Inclusive decay of the heavy quark { toy m odel

One of the most important practical problems in the heavy quark theory is the description of the inclusive decays of heavy avors. The sem ileptonic and radiative decays of the B mesons B ! X_cl and B ! X_s are particular examples. Both

are two key elements of the ongoing experimental e orts, in quest of new physics. Needless to say that a reliable QCD -based theory of such decays is badly needed. In this section we start discussing basics of such a theory.

Since this is our rst exercise, for pedagogical reasons, it seems reasonable to \peelo "all inessential technicalities, like the quark spins, and resort to a sim pli ed model. In this toy model we will consider the inclusive decay of a spinless heavy quark into a spinless lighter quark plus a photon. Of course, our photon is also a toy photon. We will assume it to be scalar and the corresponding eld will be denoted by .

The Lagrangian describing the transition of a heavy quark ${\tt Q}\,$ into a lighter quark q and a \photon" has the form

$$L = hQ q + hc;;$$
 (2.9)

where h is the coupling constant and $Q = Q^{y}$. The masses of the quarks Q and q are both large (and I rem ind that they are both spinless). Moreover, to further simplify the problem we will analyze a special lim it (the so called sm all velocity or SV lim it suggested in Ref. [15]) in which

$$QCD m_Q m_q m_Q$$
: (2.10)

The eld carries color charge zero; the reaction Q ! q + could be considered a toy model for the radiative decays of the type B ! X_s where X_s is an arbitrary inclusive hadronic state containing the s quark produced in the b quark decay.

It is very easy to calculate the total width for the free quark decay Q $\ ! \ q +$,

free quark (Q ! q) =
$$\frac{h^2 E_0}{8 m_0^2}$$
 (2.11)

where

$$E_{0} = \frac{m_{Q}^{2} - m_{q}^{2}}{2m_{Q}} :$$
 (2.12)

This free quark expression is valid for the total inclusive probability in the asym ptotic limit when $m_Q \ ! \ 1$. We are interested, however, in the preasym ptotic corrections proportional to powers of $1=m_Q$.

First of all we must form ulate what object we must deal with in order to be able to calculate these corrections system atically. Upon rejection one concludes that it can not be the decay amplitude Q ! q itself. Instead we must consider the Q ! Qforward \scattering" amplitude depicted on Fig. 1. By scattering I mean that Qscatters of the quantum and of the background gluon eld which is not shown on Fig. 1 explicitly but is implied. It is implied that all quark lines, Q and q, are submerged into this soft-gluon background eld. Through the optical theorem the imaginary part of the amplitude of Fig. 1 is related to the inclusive probability of the Q ! q transition. More specifically, if we introduce the transition operator

$$\hat{T} = i d^4 x e^{iqx} T fQ(x)q(x);q(0)Q(0)g:$$
 (2.13)

then the energy spectrum of the particle in the inclusive decay is obtained from \hat{T} in the following way:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{dE}} = \frac{\mathrm{h}^{2}\mathrm{E}}{4^{-2}\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{O}}}} \operatorname{Im} \mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{O}}} \mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{O}} \mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{O}} \mathrm{i}: \qquad (2.14)$$

Here as usual H_Q denotes a hadron built from the heavy quark Q and the light cloud (including the light antiquark), q in the exponent is the four-m om entum carried away by and E is the energy of the quantum.

Equation (2.14) immediately translates the $1=m_Q$ expansion for the transition operator in the $1=m_Q$ expansion for the inclusive decay rate. The fact that the transition operator must be the primary object of the analysis in all problems of this type was realized in Refs. [9, 29, 30].

Now we use what we have already learnt about the background eld technique to write the transition operator in the form

$$\hat{\mathbf{T}} = \begin{bmatrix} Z \\ d^{4}\mathbf{x} e^{iqx} (\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{p} \frac{1}{\mathbf{p}^{2} - m_{q}^{2}} \mathbf{p} (\mathbf{p}) = \\ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} Z \\ d^{4}\mathbf{x} (\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{p} \frac{1}{(\mathbf{p}_{0} - q + \beta - m_{q}^{2})} \mathbf{p} (\mathbf{p}) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} Z \\ d^{4}\mathbf{x} (\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{p} \frac{1}{(\mathbf{p}_{0} - q + \beta - m_{q}^{2})} \mathbf{p} (\mathbf{p}) \end{bmatrix}$$
(2.15)

where

$$(P_0) = m_0 v$$

The G reen function of the quark q di ers from the G reen function given in Eq. (2.6) in an obvious way since we assume for the time being that our quarks Q and q have spin zero, and, correspondingly, instead of Eq. (2.6) referring to the spinor quarks we have

$$S(x;0) = (x \frac{1}{P^2 - m_q^2} D):$$
 (2.16)

In the second line of Eq. (2.15) we proceeded to the rescaled elds \mathcal{Q} which singles out the mechanical part of the momentum operator.

O ne m ore thing which will be needed is the equation of m otion for the scalar eld Q substituting the D irac equation. Starting from (P 2 m_Q²)Q = 0 we obviously get

$$_{0}Q = \frac{2}{2m_{Q}}Q :$$
 (2.17)

Finally we are ready to begin constructing the $1=m_Q$ expansion. Since is of order $_{QCD}$ while P_0 q scales as m_Q , in the leading approximation in the denominator of Eq. (2.15) can be neglected altogether. Then, obviously,

$$\hat{T}^{(0)} = QQ \frac{1}{m_q^2 - k^2}$$
(2.18)

$$k = P_0 q$$
:

We see that the leading operator appearing in the expansion is QQ and it has dimension 2 (let us recall that the scalar Q eld has dimension 1 in contrast to the realquark elds of dimension 3=2, which leads in particular to dimension alization factors in the matrix elements). Taking the imaginary part we conclude that in the leading approximation

$$\frac{1}{2} \text{Im } hH_{Q} \, j\hat{\Gamma}^{(0)} \, jH_{Q} \, i = \frac{hQQ \, i}{2m_{Q}} \quad (E = E_{0}) : \qquad (2.19)$$

Here and below I will use a very convenient short-hand notation,

$$hQQi$$
 $hH_Q jQQ jH_Qi$:

The delta function in the imaginary part is characteristic of a two-body decay. As a matter of fact, combining Eq. (2.19) with the general expression (2.14) and approximating hQQ i by unity { which can and must be done in the leading order in $1=m_Q$ { we get the delta-function spectrum of the the free quark decay. Integrating over the energy we then arrive at the free quark decay width (2.11).

A lthough this little achievem ent is quite gratifying and shows that we are on the right track the real $1=m_Q$ expansion begins when the preasym ptotic term s switch on. To this end the term s with in the denom inator of Eq. (2.15) must be kept, and then the expansion in (k + 2) must be carried out. The general term of this expansion is

$$\hat{\mathbf{T}} = \frac{1}{m_q^2 - k^2} \sum_{n=0}^{k^2} Q - \frac{2m_Q - e^{-k^2}}{m_q^2 - k^2} Q : \qquad (2.20)$$

In Lecture 4 where the theory of the end point spectrum will be presented we will need the whole sum. At the moment our purpose is more limited { we are aimed at getting the rst correction in the total decay width. This task does not require the in nite sum; only two terms, with n = 1 and n = 2, are relevant. Both terms are especially simple.

Indeed, if n = 1 the combination $2m_Q_0 + {}^2$ in the numerator acting on Q is nothing else than the equation of motion, and can be dropped, see Eq. (2.17). We can further discard the q_{γ} part { since the H_Q spin is assumed to be zero there is no preferred orientation and, hence, $hQ \sim Q i = 0$. In this way we arrive at

$$hH_{Q} \stackrel{f}{}^{(1)} \stackrel{f}{}_{Q} \stackrel{i}{}= \frac{q_{0}}{m_{Q}} \frac{h^{2}}{(m_{q}^{2} - k^{2})^{2}}$$
(2.21)

plus terms of higher order in $1=m_Q$. Here the same equation of motion (2.17) was applied to eliminate $_0$ in favor of 2 which, in the given order in $1=m_Q$, coincides with \sim^2 . The notation is even more concise than previously, namely $h\sim^2 i$ stands for $hH_Q jQ \sim^2 Q jH_Q i$. You will often see sim ilar short-hand below.

I pause here to m ake a side rem ark. The physical meaning of the m atrix element $h^{-2}i$ is quite transparent { it merely represents the average value of the square of the momentum of the heavy quark Q inside the heavy hadron H_Q . This quantity is of order $^2_{QCD}$. This is one of the most in portant parameters of the heavy quark theory, along with . Note the gap in dimensions of the operators appearing in the expansion. The dimension-2 operatorQQ is followed by dimension-4 operatorQ $\sim^2 Q$. No relevant operator of dimension 3 exists. Due to this reason the contribution of $\hat{T}^{(1)}$ in the total width is \unnaturally" suppressed by two powers of the inverse heavy quark mass, not one power as one would expect apriori. The observation of the dimension gap was rst made in Ref. [30] in the context of HQET; it is crucial in phenomenological applications.

Let us return now to the construction of the $1=m_{Q}$ expansion, and consider the term with n = 2 in the sum (2.20). One of two factors $(2m_{Q-0} + 2)$ can be applied to the right, the other one to the left. The di erence between applied to the right and to the left is a total derivative which vanishes anyway in the forward matrix element hH_{Q} j::: H_{Q} i. This simple observation implies that the combination $(2m_{Q-0} + 2)$ in the numerator again vanishes by virtue of the equation of motion and we are left with

$$hH_{Q} \hat{J}^{(2)} H_{Q} i = \frac{4}{3} q^{2} \frac{1}{(m_{q}^{2} - k^{2})^{3}} h^{-2} i; \qquad (2.22)$$

where I have singled out and retained only the spin-0 part of the operator $Q_{ij}Q$! (1=3) $_{ij}Q \sim^2 Q$ for the reasons explained above.

We are almost done. The imaginary parts of $\hat{T}^{(1)}$ and $\hat{T}^{(2)}$ are expressible in terms of the rst and second derivatives of the delta function, and after some simple algebra it is not dicult to get

$$\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Im} h\hat{\Gamma} i = \frac{hQQi}{2m_{Q}} \frac{hQ^{2}Qi}{12m_{Q}^{3}} (E = E_{0})$$

$$\frac{E_{0}hQ^{2}Qi}{12m_{Q}^{3}} (E = E_{0}) + \frac{E_{0}^{2}hQ^{2}Qi}{12m_{Q}^{3}} (E = E_{0}) + \dots (2.23)$$

where operators of higher dimension are ignored; I have taken into account that $q_0 = E$ and $q^2 = E^2$ and played a little with the delta functions.

The expansion of Im \hat{T} into local operators generates more and more singular terms at the point where the spectrum would be concentrated in the free quark approximation. You should not be surprised by this circum stance which will be elucidated in every detail in due time. W hat is important is that the physical spectrum is a smooth function of E. One could derive a smooth spectrum by summing up the in nite set of operators in Eq. (2.20) { this will be the subject of Lecture 4. There is no need to carry out this summation now, however, since we are interested only in the integral characteristics of the type of the total probability. As far as such integral characteristics are concerned, the expansion in Eq. (2.23) is perfectly legitimate.

At rst, we calculate the total width by substituting eq. (2.23) into eq. (2.14) and integrating over E,

$$= {}^{Z} dE \frac{d}{dE} = {}_{0} \frac{m_{Q}}{M_{H_{Q}}} hQ Q i$$
 (2.24)

where the integration runs from 0 to the physical boundary E_0^{phys} , expressed in term s of the hadron m asses

$$E_{0}^{\text{phys}} = \frac{M_{H_{0}}^{2} M_{H_{q}}^{2}}{2M_{H_{0}}} : \qquad (2.25)$$

The power correction proportional to $hQ \sim ^2Q = m_Q^2$ which m ight have appeared cancels in the total width! Is this cancellation unexpected? No, we could have anticipated it on general grounds. Indeed, the total width is a Lorentz scalar, and, quite naturally, the $1=m_Q$ expansion for this quantity must run over the Lorentz scalar operators; QQ is Lorentz scalar while $Q \sim ^2Q$ is not. The fact that there are no explicit $1=m_Q$ corrections in Eq. (2.24) does not mean that they are absent in at all. They could appear through hQQ im $_Q=M_{H_Q}$. Hence, our next task is to nd the expansion for hQQ i in the toy model at hand. To solve the problem we will use the very same idea as in Sect. 1.5; the only di erence is the form of the heavy quark current. For the scalar quarks the current whose diagonal matrix element counts the number of quarks is Q in $Q = M_Q$. Hence, in the rest frame of H_Q we have:

$$\frac{1}{2M_{H_Q}} h_{H_Q} j_{Q} i_{D_0Q} j_{H_Q} i = 1 :$$
 (2.26)

Passing to the rescaled elds we arrive at the relation

$$1 = \frac{1}{M_{H_{Q}}} hH_{Q} jn_{Q}QQ + Q_{0}Q jH_{Q}i = \frac{m_{Q}}{M_{H_{Q}}} hH_{Q} jQQ jH_{Q}i + \frac{1}{2M_{H_{Q}}m_{Q}} hH_{Q} jQ^{2}Q jH_{Q}i; \qquad (2.27)$$

where the second line is due to the equation of m otion. Equation (2.27) leads us to the result sought for,

$$\frac{m_{Q}}{M_{H_{Q}}} hH_{Q} jQ jH_{Q} i = 1 \frac{2}{2m_{Q}^{2}} + :::;$$
 (2.28)

I have introduced here the standard notation for the expectation value of \sim^2 ,

$${}^{2} _{\text{toy m odel}} = \frac{1}{2M_{H_{Q}}} h H_{Q} f m_{Q} Q \sim {}^{2}Q f _{Q} :$$
 (2.29)

As was already mentioned, 2 is a crucial parameter of the heavy quark theory. Its de nition in QCD will be slightly dierent from that in our toy model, but the physical meaning will be the same.

Plugging in Eq. (228) in (224) we nally arrive at the desired expression,

$$= {}_{0} 1 \frac{2}{2m_{Q}^{2}} : \qquad (2.30)$$

The inclusive width coincides with the parton-model result up to terms of order $1=m_Q^2$. There is no correction of order $1=m_Q$! Moreover, the term $1=m_Q^2$ is calculable and its physical meaning is quite transparent: it rejects the time dilation for the moving quark inside the heavy hadron at rest (the Doppler e ect). The coe – cient (1=2) in front of $h^2 i=m_Q^2$ could, therefore, have been guessed from the very beginning, without explicit calculations, were we a little bit smarter.

This situation is quite general, it takes place not only in the toy model at hand but in realQCD as well. The absence of the correction of order $1=m_Q$ in the total inclusive widths (say, the sem ileptonic width of the B m esons, or (B ! X_s), and so on) is called the CGG/BUV theorem [30, 24].

I hasten to add, though, that the absence of the $1=m_Q$ correction is not merely a consequence of the dimension gap in the set of the relevant operators, as it is sometimes stated in the literature. Indeed, let me give a counterexample. Let us calculate the average energy of the particle, or, more exactly, the rst moment of the spectrum,

$$I_{1} = \int_{0}^{Z_{E_{0}^{phys}}} dE (E_{0}^{phys} E) \frac{1}{0} \frac{d}{dE} :$$
 (2.31)

In the parton m odel the spectrum is a pure delta function and, consequently, I_1 vanishes. The heavy quark expansion does generate a non-vanishing result, a $1=m_0$ e ect. To see that this is indeed the case we integrate the theoretical spectrum (2.23) which yields us

$$I_{1} = \frac{{}^{2}E_{0}^{phys}}{2m_{0}^{2}}$$
(2.32)

where is de ned as follows

$$= E_{0}^{\text{phys}} E_{0};$$
 (2.33)

and the parameters E_0 and E_0^{phys} are given in Eqs. (2.12) and (2.25). Now, invoking what we have already learnt in Sect. 1.5 about the heavy hadron masses we nd that

$$= \frac{1}{2}v_0^2 + O\left(\begin{array}{c} 2\\ QCD\end{array}\right)$$
 (2.34)

where

$$v_0 = \frac{M_{H_0} M_{H_q}}{M_{H_0}}$$
:

In the SV limit v_0 is small and coincides with the velocity of the $\mbox{ nal hadron produced in the transition } Q \ ! \ q$.

W ith all these de nitions

$$I_{1} = \frac{1}{2}v_{0}^{2} + O\left(\begin{array}{c}2\\QCD\end{array}\right)$$
(2.35)

i.e. the preasymptotic correction in the stm oment is of the order of $_{QCD}$, not $_{QCD}^2$. The reason for the occurrence of a \wrong" power of the QCD parameter is that the leading correction term in the 1=m $_Q$ expansion in this particular quantity is unrelated to any local operator. As we will see later on such a situation is not rare in the heavy quark theory. The sum rule (2.35) is just a version of Voloshin's optical sum rule [31], while that of Eq. (2.30) can be interpreted in term s of the B jorken sum rule [32]. W e will dwellon the both sum rules in the real QCD in Sect. 3.6.

I apologize for this little waterfall of new letters and de nitions and hope that a simple picture behind our results is not overshadowed. Notice that in the SV lim it E o^{phys} E reduces to the excitation energy of the nal hadron produced in the decay. The factor E_0^{phys} E in the integrand eliminates the \elastic" peak, so that the integral is saturated only by the inelastic contributions. Say, in the b! c transition the contribution of B ! D is eliminated, only the excited D mesons survive in the rst m om ent. Since the excitation energies are of order of $_{\text{OCD}}$, or , the prediction (2.35) m eans that the probabilities of the inelastic transitions B ! excited D 's are all proportional to v^2 . This is in full agreement with the theorem [15] discussed in Sect. 1.3 { that in the point of zero recoil the only transition that can occur is the elastic B ! D transition, with the unit probability. A way from the point of the zero recoil (but in the SV limit) the inelastic transitions are generated. However, Eq. (2.30) shows, that up to small corrections O ($_{OCD}^2 = m_0^2$) which can be neglected if we are interested only in the linear in OCD e ects, the total probability remains unity. In other words, the total probability is just reshued: a small v 2 part is taken away from the elastic transition and is given to the inelastic transitions. The QCD analog of this assertion is the essence of the B prken sum rule $\beta 2$].

It is quite evident that the series of such sum rules can readily be continued further. For the next moment, for instance, we get

$$I_{2} = \int_{0}^{Z_{E_{0}^{phys}}} dE (E_{0}^{phys} - E)^{2} \frac{1}{0} \frac{d}{dE} = 2 + \frac{2E_{0}^{2}}{3m_{0}^{2}} : \qquad (2.36)$$

A nalyzing this sum rule in the SV lim it one obtains, in principle, additional inform ation, not included in the results of Refs. [15, 31, 32]. It is worth emphasizing that in Eqs. (2.24), (2.32) and (2.36) we have collected all terms through order $^2_{QCD}$, whereas those of order $^3_{QCD}$ are system atically om itted. Predictions for higher m om ents would require calculating terms SO ($^3_{QCD}$) and higher.

Concluding this part let m e suggest to you an exercise which will show whether the technology introduced above is well understood by you. Try to repeat in real QCD, with the quark spins switched on, everything we have done in the toy model. Of particular interest to us will be the transition operator

$$\hat{T} = i d^4 x e^{iqx} T fQ(x) q(x); q(0) Q(0)g:$$
 (2.37)

where is either or $_5$. This transition operator is relevant for the sem ileptonic b to c decays. To facilitate the task consider special kinematics: (i) zero recoil (the vanishing spatial momentum of the lepton pair, q = 0; (ii) small velocity limit $q^2 m_Q^2$. To further facilitate the task limit yourself to the spatial components of . If you still have problem s go over this lecture again and consult the original works [33, 34, 35]. The full answer for the transition operator (2.37) is given, for instance, in Appendix of Ref. [33].

2.2 The Fock-Schwinger gauge

In some situations (especially when one deals with massless quarks) a variant of the background eld technique based on the so called Fock-Schwinger gauge for the external led turns out to very e cient (for a review and extensive list of references see [28]). The gauge condition on the background gluon eld has the form

$$x A (x) = 0$$
: (2.38)

W hat is remarkable in this condition is that in this gauge the gauge four-potential can be represented as an expansion which runs only over the gauge covariant quantities, the gluon eld strength tensor and its covariant derivatives,

A
$$(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x} \ G \ (0) + \frac{1}{3}\frac{1}{1!}\mathbf{x} \ \mathbf{x} \ \mathbf{D} \ \mathbf{G} \ (0) + \dots$$
 (2.39)

This expression implies, in particular, that A(0) = 0. It is worth noting that the gauge condition (2.38) singles out the origin and, hence, breaks the translational invariance. The latter is restored only in the nal answer for the gauge invariant amplitudes.

It is rather easy to show (see [28]) that the massless quark G reen function in the coordinate space is

$$S(x;0) = \frac{1}{2^{-2}} \frac{x}{x^4} - \frac{1}{8^{-2}} \frac{x}{x^2} \tilde{G} = \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2}$$
 (2.40)

O ne can also construct a similar expansion for the G reen function in the momentum space S (q).

If the quark is not massless, $m_q \in 0$, the expansion of the G reen function in the background eld becomes much more cumbersome. A lthough we will hardly need it in full I quote it here for the sake of completeness,

$$S(x;0) = \frac{1}{2^{2}} \frac{x}{x^{4}} f(\frac{1}{2}m^{2}x^{2}K_{2}(m^{p}-\frac{x}{x^{2}})g(\frac{1}{8^{2}}\frac{x}{x^{2}}G) = \frac{1}{5} \frac{x^{2}mK_{1}(m^{p}-\frac{x}{x^{2}})}{\frac{p}{x^{2}}}$$

$$\frac{\operatorname{im}^{2} K_{1} (\operatorname{m}^{p} - \frac{x^{2}}{x^{2}})}{p - \frac{x^{2}}{x^{2}}} \frac{m}{16^{2}} G \qquad K_{0} (\operatorname{m}^{p} - \frac{x^{2}}{x^{2}}) + \dots \qquad (2.41)$$

Here K is the M cD onald function. This result was obtained in Ref. [36]. Further education on the Fock-Schwinger gauge technique can be obtained from Ref. [28]. The best way to master those aspects which are most common in the heavy quark theory is merely to play with this toolkit. Let us see how it works in the calculation of the $1=m_Q^2$ correction in the total probability of the sem ileptonic decay of the heavy quark in the real QCD. Unlike Sect. 2.1 we will address directly the total width bypassing the stage of the spectrum. The rst calculation of the power correction in (B ! X_{cl}) along these lines was carried out in Ref. [24] (see also [37]).

2.3 The 1=m_Q corrections to the sem ileptonic inclusive width in QCD

In this section I will describe probably the most elegant application of the ideas developed above { calculation of the leading correction in the total sem ileptonic widths. In the toy model considered in the previous section it was established that the $1=m_Q$ correction was absent, and the rst non-trivial correction $1=m_Q^2$ was associated with the matrix element of PQQ i. As a matter of fact, through the heavy quark expansion, we managed to express it in terms of the matrix element PQQ i.

W hen we take the quark spins into account a new dimension-5 Lorentz scalar operator appears, hQ (i=2) GQ i. On general grounds one may expect that the main lesson abstracted from the toy model { the absence of the $1=m_Q$ term { persists but the $1=m_Q^2$ correction will receive a contribution from the operator Q (i=2) GQ. The conclusion will be con med by the analysis presented below. You will see how e ciently the Fock-Schwinger technique is in this case.

Thus, let us proceed to calculation of sem ileptonic widths. The nalquark mass m_q is arbitrary { we do not assume the SV limit now, nor is any other constraint imposed on m_q . The weak Lagrangian responsible for the sem ileptonic decays has the following generic form

$$L = \frac{G_F}{2} V_{Qq} (q Q) (l); = (1 + 5); \qquad (2.42)$$

where l is a charged lepton, electron for de niteness. The mass of the charged lepton will be neglected. Moreover, G_F and V_{Qq} are constants irrelevant for our purposes.

A susual, at the rst stage we construct the transition operator $\hat{T}(Q ! X ! Q)$,

$$\hat{T} = i d^4 x T f L(x) L(0) g = \sum_{i}^{X} C_i O_i$$
 (2.43)

describing a diagonal amplitude with the heavy quark Q in the initial and nal state (with identical momenta). The lowest-dimension operator in the expansion of \hat{T} (Q ! X ! Q) is QQ, and the complete perturbative prediction { the spectator

m odel { corresponds to the perturbative calculation of the coe cient of this operator. For the time being we are not interested in perturbative calculations. Our task is the analysis of the in uence of the soft modes in the gluon eld manifesting them selves as a series of higher-dimension operators in \hat{T} .

At the second stage we average \hat{T} over the hadronic state of interest, say, B m esons. At this stage the non-perturbative large distance dynam ics enters through m atrix elements of the operators of dimension 5 and higher.

F inally, the imaginary part of hH $_{\rm Q}$ JT H $_{\rm Q}$ i presents the H $_{\rm Q}\,$ sem ileptonic width sought for,

$$= \frac{1}{M_{H_{Q}}} \operatorname{Im} h H_{Q} \operatorname{Jr} H_{Q} i: \qquad (2.44)$$

The diagram determ ining the transition operator is depicted on Fig. 2. The lepton propagators are, of course, free { they do not feel the background gluon eld. Thick lines refer to the initial quark Q. A lthough the gluon eld is not shown one should understand that the lines corresponding to Q and q are submerged into a soft gluon background.

In the Fock-Schwinger gauge the line corresponding to the nalquark q (Fig. 2) remains free, and the only source of the dimension-5 operators is the external line corresponding to Q (or Q). Let us elaborate this point in more detail.

If we do not target corrections higher than $1=m_Q^2$ it is su cient to use the expression for the quark G reen function given in Eq. (2.40) or (2.41). The particular form is absolutely inessential; the only important point is the chiral structure of the vertices in the weak Lagrangian and the fact that the leptons are massless.

The currents in the weak Lagrangian (2.42) are left-handed. Therefore, the G reen function of the quark q is sandwiched between and . This means that $1 + _5$ projectors annihilate the part of the G reen function with the even number of the matrices. Then the only potential contribution is associated with the rst line in eq. (2.41).

The non-perturbative term is the one containing G . This term vanishes, how – ever, after convoluting it with the lepton part. Indeed, the lepton loop (with the massless leptons) has the form

L =
$$\frac{2}{4} \frac{1}{x^8} (2x \ x \ x^2 g)$$
: (2.45)

Here I take the product of two massless ferm ion propagators in the coordinate space, with the appropriate matrices inserted, and do the trace. A ctually we need to know only the last bracket. Now, convoluting it with the G term from the quark G reen function we get

qed. [24, 38].

Thus, if one uses the Fock-Schwinger gauge the only source for the $1=m_Q$ correction in the total sem ileptonic widths (at the level up to $1=m_Q^2$) is through the equations of motion for Q. Here is how it works.

The expression for the amplitude corresponding to the diagram of Fig. 2 can be generically written as follows:

$$A = d^{4}xQ (0)F (x)Q (x); \qquad (2.46)$$

where a function F(x) incorporates the lepton bop and the q quark G reen function. It m ay include Lorentz and color m atrices, etc. Now, let us single out the large, m echanical part of the m otion of the heavy quark,

$$Q(\mathbf{x}) = e^{i \mathbf{P}_0 \mathbf{x}} Q(\mathbf{x});$$

Then

$$A = \int_{a}^{Z} d^{4}x \quad \mathcal{Q}(0)F(x)e^{-iP_{0}x} \mathcal{Q}(0) + x \quad \emptyset \quad \mathcal{Q}(0) + \frac{1}{2}x \quad x \quad \emptyset \quad \emptyset \quad \mathcal{Q}(0) + \cdots = 1 =$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} (& \mathcal{Q}(0)F(P_{0})\mathcal{Q}(0) + i\frac{\theta}{\theta}F(P_{0})\mathcal{Q}(0) + i\frac{\theta}{\theta}F(P_{0})\mathcal{Q}(0) \\ + i^{2}\frac{1}{2}\frac{\theta^{2}}{\theta}F(P_{0})\mathcal{Q}(0) + i\frac{\theta}{\theta}F(P_{0})\mathcal{Q}(0) + \cdots = 1 =$$

$$\mathcal{Q}(0)F(P_{0} + i\theta)\mathcal{Q}(0) = \mathcal{Q}(0)F(i\theta)\mathcal{Q}(0); \qquad (2.47)$$

where F is the Fourier transform of F(x).

Our next goal is to convert i@ in the covariant derivative and then use the equation of motion, $i \mathcal{B} Q = m_Q Q$. More exactly, we start from the expressions of the form

$$Q(0) \[mathbf{p}(p^2)^k Q(0); \[mathbf{p} = i0]; \] (2.48)$$

rewrite p in terms of P = iD plus terms with the gluon eld strength tensor (in the Fock-Schwinger gauge) and then substitute B acting on Q by m_Q . Expressions (2.48) appear in Im \hat{T} . If the nalq quark is massless, $m_q = 0$, the only relevant power is k = 2. Switching on the quark mass, $m_q \in 0$, brings in other values of k as well. (W aming: in the procedure sketched above all operators p in Eq. (2.48) should be considered as acting either only to the right or only to the left. I will assume they act to the right. W e can not make some of them act to the right and others to the left and neglect full derivatives. Question: do you understand why?)

Since we focus now on Q GQ it is su cient to keep only the term s linear in the gluon eld strength tensor; the term s with derivatives of G are to be neglected as well. In this approximation in the Fock-Schwinger gauge $A = (1=2) \times G$.

Furtherm ore,

$$p^2 = P^2$$
 2Ap (2.49)

where we neglected the terms quadratic in A and used the fact that [p; A] = 0. Equation (2.49) should be substituted in Eq. (2.48), and then we start transposing Ap trying to put it in the left-most position, next to Q (0). If Ap appears in this position the result is zero since A (0) = 0. Notice that

$$[p^{2};Ap]/G pp = 0;$$

so, one can freely transpose Ap through p^2 . In this way we arrive at

$$Q(0) p (p^2)^k Q(0) = Q(0)^h (P^2)^k - 2k (AP) (P^2)^{k-1} Q(0):$$
 (2.50)

M oreover, with our accuracy the last term reduces to

$$\mathbb{P} ; \mathbb{A} \mathbb{P} (\mathbb{P}^{2})^{k-1} = \frac{i}{2} \mathbb{G} \mathbb{P} (\mathbb{P}^{2})^{k-1}$$
$$= \frac{i}{8} (\mathbb{B} \mathbb{G} \mathbb{G} \mathbb{B}) \mathbb{B}^{2k-2}$$
(2.51)

and, hence, using the equations of motion we conclude that

Q (0)
$$\mathbb{B}$$
 (AP) (P²)^k ¹Q (0) = 0: (2.52)

As a result, the G term s em erge only due to the fact that

$$P^{2} = \mathbb{E}^{2} - \frac{i}{2} G;$$

and the nalexpression is as follows:

$$Q(0) p (p^2)^k Q(0) ! m_Q^{2k+1} Q(0) Q(0) \frac{ik}{2} Q(0) GQ(0) m_Q^{2k-1}$$
: (2.53)

A fler these explanatory remarks the procedure of calculating the leading $1=m_Q^2$ correction in the total sem ileptonic width should be perfectly clear. Let us summarize it in the form of a prescription.

(i) Calculate the sem ileptonic width in the parton model. The result has the form

$$\frac{G_{F}^{2} \dot{y}_{Qq} \dot{J}}{192^{3}} m_{Q}^{5} F_{0} \left(\frac{m_{q}^{2}}{m_{Q}^{2}}\right)$$
(2.54)

where $F_0 (m_q^2 = m_Q^2)$ is the phase space factor, a function of the ratio $m_q^2 = m_Q^2$ well-known in the literature (see Eq. (2.57) below).

(ii) Then construct the expression for including the 0 (m $_{\rm Q}{}^2$) corrections in the following way [24]:

$$= \frac{G_{F}^{2} J_{Qq} J_{q}}{192^{3}} m_{Q}^{5} \left(\frac{1}{2M_{H_{Q}}} hH_{Q} J_{Q} J_{q} iF_{Q} iF_{0} \right)$$

$$+\frac{2}{m_Q^2}\left(\frac{d}{d}-2\right)F_0()$$
 (2.55)

where

$${}_{G}^{2} = \frac{1}{2M_{H_{Q}}} h H_{Q} j Q (i=2) G Q j H_{Q} i$$
(2.56)

and

$$= \frac{m_q^2}{m_Q^2}:$$

A few comments are in order concerning this beautiful expression for the total sem ileptonic width. The expansion contains two Lorentz scalar operators, QQ and Q (i=2) GQ, of dimension 3 and 5, respectively. The fact that only the Lorentz scalars contribute is obvious since is a Lorentz invariant quantity. We observe here the very same gap in dimensions mentioned previously in the context of the toy model { there is no operator of dimension 4 [30]. The only element still needed to complete the derivation is the matrix element hQQ i. Fortunately, the corresponding heavy quark expansion has been already built, see Eq. (1.30).

Borrowing the explicit expression for F_0 () from textbooks (it is singled out below in the braces) and assembling all other pieces together we nally get

$$= \frac{G_F^2 \mathbf{y}_{Qq} \mathbf{j}}{192^3} \mathbf{m}_Q^5$$

$$= \frac{G_F^2 \mathbf{j}_{Qq} \mathbf{j}}{192^3} \mathbf{m}_Q^5$$

where 2 is de ned in QCD as follows

$${}^{2} = \frac{1}{2M_{H_{Q}}} h_{H_{Q}} j_{Q} \sim {}^{2}Q j_{H_{Q}} i:$$
 (2.58)

This result is due to Bigi et al. [24]. The absence of the $1=m_Q$ correction is a manifestation of the CGG/BUV theorem.

If the mass of the nal charged lepton is non-negligible, the property of no soft gluon emission from the q quark line (in the Fock-Schwinger gauge) is lost. The expansion for (B ! X_c) in this case is much more cumbersome; it was constructed in Ref. [39].

D in ension-5 operators are responsible for the leading non-perturbative corrections in the total sem ileptonic widths. To assess the convergence of the expansion it may be instructive to have an idea of the higher order term s in the expansion. The $1=m_Q^3$ term s were estimated in R ef. [40]. This is a rather messy and time-consuming analysis, and it is hardly in order to comment on it in this lecture. Surprising though it is, from what we already know it is practically trivial to not the coe cient of the dimension-7 operator

with two gluon eld strength tensors fully contacted over the Lorentz indices for massless nalquarks (say, b! u transition). Of course, this is a purely academ ic exercise, for many reasons. In particular, because it is only one of a rather large number of dimension-7 operators. Since we do not know their matrix elements anyhow, it seems to be meaningless to carry out full classication and calculate all coe cients. The operator (2.59) is chosen since one can at least use factorization for a rough estimate of the corresponding matrix element and since we get its coe cient essentially for free.

The point is that the massless quark propagator (in the Fock-Scwinger gauge) does not contain G G term at all (see ref. [41]). This fact in plies that the only source of the operator (2.59) is the same as in the case of Q GQ. It is not dicult to get that

$$Q (0) \not{p} \not{p}^{4} Q (0) = Q (0) \not{p} P^{4} Q (0) + \frac{1}{2} Q (0) G G Q (0) = Q (0) \not{p}^{5} Q (0) + Q (0) G G Q (0); \qquad (2.60)$$

where we om itted structures of the type [G G (1=4)g G G].

2.4 Digression

This section is intended for curious readers { those who are anxious to nd out where and how else, beyond the theory of the H $_{\rm Q}$ states, the background eld technique can be used to obtain interesting predictions. Here I will discuss an estimate of the mass splittings between the levels of the highly excited quarkonium states. This part can be safely on itted in rst reading since it is unrelated to the remainder of these lectures.

The quarkonium states to be considered below consist of one quark Q, one antiquark Q and the soft gluon cloud connecting them together. To begin with we will assume that m_Q is large, $m_Q \qquad_{QCD}$ (later on this assumption will be relaxed). The QQ mesons can have di erent quantum numbers. We will analyze the excited S and P wave states with the quantum numbers 0 and 0⁺, respectively. The naive quark m odel language is used to name the states; this does not mean, of course, that we accept any of the dynam ical assumptions of the naive quark m odel. It would be more accurate to say that the mesons of interest are produced from the vacuum by the currents

$$J_P = Qi_5Q$$
 and $J_S = QQ$: (2.61)

The central object of our analysis is the di erence between the two-point functions in the pseudoscalar and scalar channels. In terms of the G reen functions in the background eld this di erence takes the form (see Fig. 3)

 $_{\rm P}$ $_{\rm S}$ = i dxe^{iqx} (hvac J fJ_P (x)J_P (0)gjvaci hvac J fJ_S (x)J_S (0)gjvaci) =

$$\frac{1}{12} + \frac{1}{16} + \frac{1}{16}$$

A comment is in order here concerning the trace operation in this expression. It is plies not only the trace over the Lorentz and color indices, as usual, but also the trace in the momentum space substituting $d^4p=(2)^4$ in the conventional Feynm an integral. With the help of Eq. (2.6) the difference $P_{\rm S}$ can be identically rewritten as ()

$$_{\rm P}$$
 $_{\rm S} = 2m_{\rm Q}^2 \, \text{iTr} \left(\frac{1}{D_+} \frac{1}{D_-} \right)^{\prime}$ (2.63)

where

 $D = [P (q=2)^2] m_Q^2 + (i=2) G :$

We continue to ignore hard gluons assuming that the only role of the gluon eld is to provide a soft cen enting background. This is certainly an idealization, but let us see how far one can go within the fram ework of this simplied picture. Neglecting hard gluons means, in particular, that we will be unable to analyze the low-lying levels of heavy quarkonium where an essential role is played by the short-distance C oulomb interaction. Each G insertion in the denom inator is of order of $^2_{QCD}$, i.e. does not scale with the external momentum q when q is large. Let us expand Eq. (2.63) in G and take the trace over the Lorentz indices. Then the rst order term drops out; the rst surviving term is bilinear in G,

$$P_{S} = 8m_{Q}^{2} \text{ if } r \left(\frac{1}{D_{+}} \frac{1}{D_{+}} + \frac{1}{D_{+}} \frac{1}{D_{+}} + \frac{1}{D_{+}} \frac{1}{D_{+}} + \frac{1}{D_{+}} \frac{1}{D_{+}} \frac{1}{D_{+}} - \frac{1}{D_{+}} \frac$$

A closer bok at this expression reveals some peculiar features. First of all, one can interpret each term as a certain correlation function in the theory where the quark Q is scalar, not spinor. Take, for instance, this rst line. It is nothing else than the two-point function of the L = 0 quarkonium in the scalar QCD (i.e. QCD with the scalar quarks; L is the total angularm on entum of the m eson). The current producing the scalar quarkonium from the vacuum in the scalar QCD is $Q^{Y}Q$ (Fig. 4). The second and the third line, together, represent the four-point function of the type depicted on Fig. 5. The current denoted by the dashed line on this gure is $Q^{Y}G$ Q; the momentum owing through this line vanishes. Two insertions of G in ply that this four-point function is explicitly proportional to $\frac{4}{0 \text{ CD}}$.

Now, let us exam in Eq. (2.64) in the complex q^2 plane. At some positive values of q^2 the two-point function of F ig. 4 has simple poles corresponding to positions of

the L = 0 quarkonium levels in the scalar QCD. The four-point function of Fig. 5 has double and single poles at the very same values of q^2 and single poles at some other values of q^2 corresponding to the production of L = 1 states in the scalar QCD. The latter are produced from the L = 0 states by applying to them the current Q^YG Q.

On the other hand, the original di erence $_{\rm P}$ s in real QCD has only single poles at the positions of the S and P wave states. These positions are shifted compared to the levels in the scalar QCD. Expanding in the shift one generates double poles. The L = 1 pole { the partner to the P wave meson states in $_{\rm P}$ s appears only in the four-point function of Fig. 5. From this gure it is quite clear that the residue of the L = 1 pole scales as $_{\rm QCD}^4 = (M^2)^2$ where (M^2) is a characteristic splitting between the L = 0 and L = 1 states. On the other hand, the residue of the P wave meson in $_{\rm P}$ s, on general grounds, scales as $p^2=M^2$ where p is a characteristic quark momentum, and I assume that $_{\rm QCD}$ jpj M. Equating these two estimates we nd that

M
$$^{2}_{QCD} = jpj:$$

One may observe, with satisfaction, that this is exactly the characteristic level splitting (between radial or orbital excitations) for two heavy quarks interacting through a string (\linear potential"). W hat is remarkable is that in no place our estimate invokes any reference to the linear potential or other models. It was based only on som e general features of QCD. For me this is a strong evidence that a string-like picture should take place in QCD, at least, approximately, for high excitations.

W hat changes if the quarks are light or even massless, m_Q ! 1 ? The only dimension is that now the residues of the P wave mesons in P_S are of the same order as those of the S wave mesons for highly excited states, which implies that

$$^{4}_{QCD} = ((M^{2}))^{2}$$
 1;

or

$$(M^2)$$
 $^2_{QCD}$:

In other words, we got the linear R egge trajectories, at least for highly excited states. M oreover, this analysis makes clear a potentially important point { the empirical observation that even the lowest states in every channel lie on the linear R egge trajectories looks like a num erical coincidence and can not be exact.

3 Lecture 3. Classic Problem swith Heavy Quarks

The number of problem s successfully solved within the heavy quark expansion is quite large. Even a brief review of the main applications is beyond the scope of these lectures. Some issues, how ever, are quite general and are in portant in a variety of applications. Everybody, not only the heavy quark practitioners, should know them. In this lecture we will discuss several such topics { the scaling of the heavy m eson coupling constants, som e properties of the IsgurW ise function, and, nally, analysis of corrections violating the heavy quark symm etry at the point of zero recoil. We begin, however, from a system atic classi cation of all bcal operators which appear in the heavy quark expansions are actually not expressible in terms of the bcal operators and are, rather, related to non-local correlation functions. A full classi cation of such correction also exists [42, 25], but we will not go into details only m arginally m entioning them here and there. The interested reader is referred to the original publications [42, 25].

3.1 Catalogue of relevant operators

The local operators in the heavy quark expansion are bilinear in the heavy quark eld. They are certainly gauge invariant, and in m any instances, when the expansion is built for scalar quantities, the operators m ust be Lorentz scalars. As in any operator product expansion in QCD they can be ordered according to their dim ension. W e will limit ourselves here to dimension 6 and lower. This leaves us with quite a few possibilities listed below. W e start with the Lorentz scalar operators. The only appropriate operators are

$$QQ; \frac{i}{2}Q \quad G \quad Q; \text{ and } Q \quad Qq \quad q$$
 (3.1)

where stands here for a combination of and color matrices. All other structures that m ight come to one's m ind reduce to those listed above and full derivatives by virtue of the equations of motion.

(E xercise: prove that this is the case, for instance, for the operators Q D 2 Q and Q G D Q .)

(i) The only operator of dimension 3 is QQ. This operator is related to the heavy quark current Q $_0$ Q plus terms suppressed by powers of $1=m_Q$. The leading term of this expansion has been already discussed, see Eq. (1.30). A ctually it is not di cult to continue this expansion one step further. The following relation is exact:

$$Q Q = Q_{0}Q + 2Q \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} Q = Q_{0}Q \qquad 2Q \frac{6}{2m_{Q}} \frac{1}{2m_{Q}}Q =$$
$$= Q_{0}Q + Q \frac{6^{2}}{2m_{Q}^{2}}Q + a \text{ total derivative }; \qquad (3.2)$$

in the rst relation above the operators $\arctan Q$ ed. K exping in m ind that we always consider only the forward m atrix elements, with the zero m om entum transfer, we can drop all term s with total derivatives. Applying now the equations of m otion (1.8) and (1.9) generates the $1=m_Q$ expansion for the scalar density,

$$Q Q = Q_{0}Q + \frac{1}{2m_{Q}^{2}}Q(^{2} + \frac{i}{2}G)Q = Q_{0}Q + \frac{1}{2m_{Q}^{2}}Q(^{\sim})^{2}Q$$
$$-\frac{1}{4m_{Q}^{3}}Q + (PE') + 2\sim E' - Q + O + \frac{1}{m_{Q}^{4}}! \qquad (3.3)$$

Here $E_i = G_{i0}$ is the chrom coelectric eld, and its covariant derivative is de ned as ⁷ $D_j E_k = i[_j; E_k]$; we have on itted the term $Q([_k; [_0;_i]] = [_i; [_0;_k]])Q$ using the Jacobi identity. Moreover,

$$\tilde{D}\tilde{E} = g^2 t^a J_0^a$$

by virtue of the QCD equation of motion (here $J^a = \int_{q}^{P} q t^a q$ is the color quark current). Therefore the rst of the $1=m_{Q}^{3}$ terms can be rewritten as a four-ferm ion operator.

(ii) As has been already mentioned, no operators of dimension 4 exist.

(iii) D in ension ve. There is only one such operator,

$$O_{G} = Q \frac{i}{2} \quad G \quad Q; \qquad (3.4)$$

where = (1=2) [;]. Again, it can be expanded in the powers of $1=m_Q$,

$$O_{G} = Q \sim B'Q = \frac{1}{2m_{Q}}Q = D'E' + 2 \sim E' \sim Q + O = \frac{1}{m_{Q}^{2}}$$
 (3.5)

where B is the chrom om agnetic eld, $B = \tilde{f}_{D}$ $A = (1=2)_{ijk}G_{jk}$.

(iv) D in ension 6 four-quark operators $_{i}Q_{i}Qq_{i}q$. G enerally speaking, the matrix $_{i}$ can be any Lorentz matrix (1; $_{5}$; ; $_{5}$ or) or any of the above multiplied by t^a. O fcourse, in speci c problem s only a subset of these matrices may appear. The four-quark operators di er by the chiral properties of the light quark eld q. Som e of them carry non-zero chirality (they are non-singlet with respect to SU (N_f)_L SU (N_f)_R). Hence, they do not show up in the transitions associated with the weak currents of the V A type.

Further remarks will concern operators that are spatial scalars but not Lorentz scalars. They appear in the low-energy elective Lagrangian (1.11) and in the expansions of the type (3.3) and (3.5). The most important operator from the class is

$$O = Q \sim^2 Q$$
; (3.6)

which we have already encountered more than once.

⁷Note that in our notations $\tilde{D} = 0 = 0 \times i \tilde{A}$, therefore $(\tilde{D} \tilde{E}) = \text{div} E$ in the Abelian case.
D in ension 4 operators are all reducible to those of dimension 5 and higher. For instance,

$$Q \sim \sim Q = \frac{1}{m_{Q}}Q (\sim^{2} \frac{i}{2} G)Q + O(m_{Q}^{2});$$
$$Q \sim \sim_{0}Q = O(m_{Q}^{2});$$
$$Q = \frac{1}{2m_{Q}}Q (\sim^{2} \frac{i}{2} G)Q + O(m_{Q}^{2}):$$

At the level of dimension 6 only one additional operator emerges (apart from the four-ferm ion operators), namely,

$$Q \sim \vec{E} \sim Q$$
: (3.7)

At rst sight it might seem that one could build extra operators of dimension 6, from the gluon elds, e.g.

$$Q_{i}E_{i}Q$$
 or $Q_{i}i_{jk}(D_{j}E_{k})Q$:

A ctually they are reducible to operators of higher dimension via the equations of motion. Indeed, using the fact that

$$E_i = i[_0 i]$$

one can rew rite

$$Q_{i}E_{i}Q = Q_{i}[_{0 i}]Q = Q(_{i 0 i} _{i 0 i} _{i$$

This is a four-ferm ion operator. By the same token,

$$Q_{i i jk} (D_{j}E_{k})Q = Q_{i}D_{0}B_{i}Q =$$

$$Q_{i}[_{0}B_{i}]Q = \frac{i}{2m_{0}}Q[(\sim \sim)^{2};\sim B_{i}]Q \qquad (3.9)$$

which is obviously of the next order in $1=m_Q$ (a dimension-seven operator).

3.2 Extracting/determ ining the matrix elements

C onstruction of the operator product expansion is only the rst step in any theoretical analysis. The heavy quark expansion must be converted into predictions for the physical quantities. To this end it is necessary to take the matrix elements of the operators involved in the expansion. The latter carry all information about the large distance dynamics responsible for the hadronic structure, in all its peculiarity. These matrix elements in our QCD -based approach play the same role as the wave functions in the non-relativistic quark models.

In this section we will summarize what is known about the matrix elements of the operators from the list presented above.

(i) The most favorable situation takes place at the level of dimension three. Indeed, the only Lorentz scalar operator of dimension 3 is QQ which has a nice expansion (3.3). The operator Q $_0Q$ is the time component of the conserved current, measuring the number of the quarks Q in H $_Q$. Therefore, both for mesons and baryons

$$\frac{1}{2M_{H}} hH_{Q} jQ_{0} JH_{Q} i = 1:$$
 (3.10)

(A s usual, we stick to the rest frame of H $_{Q}$; in the case of baryons averaging over the baryon spin is implied).

(ii) The status of two operators of dimension 5 is dimension. Let us consider not O_G whose matrix elements are expressible in terms of experimentally measurable quantities.

To leading order in 1=m $_{\rm Q}$ the parameter $_{\rm G}^2$ de ned in Eq. (2.56) reduces to 8

$${}^{2}_{G} = \frac{1}{2M_{H_{Q}}} h_{H_{Q}} j_{Q_{G}} j_{H_{Q}} i = \frac{1}{2M_{H_{Q}}} h_{H_{Q}} j_{Q} \sim BQ j_{H_{Q}} i:$$
(3.11)

For pseudoscalar mesons this quantity can be related to the measured hyper ne mass splittings. Indeed, $Q \sim BQ$ is the leading spin-dependent operator in the heavy quark Ham iltonian (1.14). Hence

$${}^{2}_{G}(B_{Q}) = \frac{3}{4}(M_{B}^{2} - M_{B}^{2})$$
 (3.12)

where B and B are generic notations for the vector and pseudoscalar mesons, respectively, and the lim it m_Q ! 1 is implied. Assuming that the b quark already belongs to this asymptotic lim it one estimates 2_G from the measured B meson masses,

$$^{2}_{3}$$
 0:35 GeV²:

Furtherm ore, in the baryon fam ily four baryons are expected to decay weakly and are, thus, long-living states: $_{Q}$; $_{Q}$; $_{Q}$ and $_{Q}$. In the rst three of them

 $^{^8}$ Som e authors prefer a di erent nom enclature [43]. The expectation values of the chrom om agnetic and kinetic energy operators are som etim es called $_2$ and $_1$.

the total angular m om entum of the light cloud is zero; hence the chrom om agnetic eld has no vector to be aligned with, and

$${}^{2}_{G}(Q) = {}^{2}_{G}(Q) = {}^{2}_{G}(Q) = {}^{2}_{G}(Q) = 0:$$
 (3.13)

In the case of $_{\rm Q}$ the total angular m om entum of the light cloud is 1. Hence,

$${}^{2}_{3}(_{Q}) = \frac{2}{3} M^{2}_{\substack{3=2\\Q}} M^{2}_{\substack{1=2\\Q}}$$
(3.14)

where the superscripts 3/2 and 1/2 mark the spin of the baryon. A lthough the mass splitting on the right-hand side of Eq. (3.14) is in principle measurable, it is not known at present, and if one wants to get an estimate one has to resort to quark models or lattice calculations. Both approaches are not mature enough at the moment to give reliable predictions for this quantity and I suggest we wait until experimental measurements appear.

Let us proceed now to the discussion of the matrix element of the operator O . The physical meaning of this matrix element is the average kinetic energy (more exactly, the spatial momentum squared) of the heavy quark Q inside H_Q. This operator is spin-independent, and it is much harder to extract ² (the parameter ² is de ned in Eq. (2.58)) from phenom enology, although such an extraction is possible, in principle (see Ref. [25] and Lectures 4 and 5 for details). Since the phenom enological analysis has not been carried out yet one has to rely on theoretical estimates. Several calculations of ² within the QCD sum rules yield [44, 45]

² (B) =
$$\frac{1}{2M_{B}}$$
 hB jD jB i= 0.5 0.1 G eV²:

A remarkable model-independent lower bound on 2 (B) exists in the literature,

2
 (B) > $^{2}_{G}$ (B) 0.35 GeV² (3.15)

The quantum -m echanical derivation of this inequality due to Voloshin (see Ref. [4]) is straightforward. Indeed, start from the square of the Herm itean operator $(\sim)^2$ and average it over the B m eson state. It is obvious then that $h(\sim)^2 i > 0$. U sing the fact that $(\sim)^2 = \sim^2 + \sim B'$ we immediately arrive at Eq. (3.15). A eld-theoretic derivation of the same result can be found in Ref. [25]. It is remarkable that the inequality (3.15) alm ost saturates the QCD sum rule estimate quoted above. A nother lower bound on 2 (B), obtained from a totally di erent line of reasoning, is discussed in Sect. 3.6. It turns out to be close to Eq. (3.15) num erically.

It is plausible that 2 for m esons and baryons is di erent { there is no reason why they should coincide. The task of estimating 2 for baryons remains open.

These parameters, 2 and 2_G , along with , are most important in applications. In most applications one deals with the expectation values over the B meson state. Therefore, let us agree that 2 ; 2_G , and , with no subscripts or arguments, are de ned with respect to the B m esons. This is a standard convention. In a few cases when these quantities are de ned with respect to other heavy avor hadrons we will mark them by the corresponding subscripts or indicate with parentheses.

(iii) Operators of dimension 6 are studied to a much lesser extent than those of dimension 5. Perhaps, the least favorable is the situation with the operator O_E given in Eq. (3.7). Let us parametrize its matrix element as follows:

$$\frac{1}{2M_{H}} h H_{Q} j Q \sim E \sim Q j H_{Q} i = {}_{E}^{3} :$$
 (3.16)

This operator in the heavy quark H am iltonian is responsible for the spin-orbit interactions and consequently generates the spin-orbit splittings between the masses of the ground states and the orbital excitations. Hence, in the non-relativistic limit (non-relativistic with respect to the spectator light quark) $\frac{3}{E}$ vanishes for the S wave states. O f course, the non-relativistic approximation with respect to the light quark is very bad. The estimate of $\frac{3}{E}$ existing in the literature [40] is so rough that it, probably, does not deserve to be discussed here.

As for the four-quark operators the only method of estimating their matrix elements which does not rely heavily on the most primitive (and hence totally unreliable) quark models is the old idea of factorization applicable only in mesons but { alas { not in baryons.

First of all let us observe that each of the four-quark operators exists in two variants di ering by the color ow. One can always rearrange the operators, using the Fierz identities, in the form

$$O_{4q} = Q \quad qq \quad Q \tag{3.17}$$

and

$$O_{4q}^{*} = Q t^{a} qqt^{a} Q : \qquad (3.18)$$

Take for de niteness = $_5$. (O ther matrices can also appear, of course.) In the rst operator color is transferred from the initial heavy to the nal light quark and from the initial light to the nal heavy quark. The second operator is essentially color-exchange. Now, if we are interested in the matrix elements over the meson states we can simply factorize the currents appearing in Eqs. (3.17) and (3.18) (i.e. saturate by the vacuum intermediate state),

$$\frac{1}{2M_{B}}hB_{Q} D_{4q}B_{Q}i = \frac{1}{2}M_{B}f_{B}^{2}; \frac{1}{2M_{B}}hB_{Q}D_{4q}B_{Q}i = 0$$
(3.19)

where f_B is the pseudoscalar decay constant,

$$h0j_{2} \quad {}_{5}q_{B_{Q}}i = if_{B}p \qquad (3.20)$$

As we will discuss shortly, in the lim it m_Q ! 1 the combination $M_B f_B^2$ scales as m_Q^0 (modulo logarithm ic corrections) so that the right-hand side of Eq. (3.19) is the cube of a typical hadronic mass, as it should be.

Factorization in Eq. (3.19) is justiled by $1=N_c$ arguments. Indeed, corrections to Eq. (3.19) are of the order of N_c^{-1} .

Thus, from the whole set of the four-quark operators we can say som ething about the meson expectation values of those operators which are reducible to

where stands for a Lorentz m atrix but not for the color one, and the color indices are contracted within each of two brackets separately. Up to term s O (N $_{\rm c}$ ¹) two brackets can be factorized.

To get an idea about the numerical value of $(1=2)f_B^2M_B$ we should substitute a numerical value for f_B which is not measured so far. Theoretical ideas about this fundamental constant will be discussed later. Now let me say only that $(1=2)f_B^2M_B$ 0:1 GeV³, with a signi cant uncertainty. Those matrix elements which are due to nonfactorizable contributions (see Eq. (3.18)) are essentially undeterm ined, although they are expected to be suppressed compared to the factorizable matrix elements (1=2)f_B^2M_B.

As for the baryon matrix elements of the four-quark operators next-to-nothing is known about them at the moment. Some very crude estimates within the naive quark model are available [46] but they are very unreliable.

In conclusion of this section a rem ark is in order concerning num erical estimates of the key parameter of the heavy quark theory, . Ipostponed discussing the issue because its value continues to be controversial. QCD sum rules indicate [48, 45, 49] that $0.5 \, \text{GeV}$. This number is in full agreement with the lower bound stemming from Voloshin's sum rule, see Sect. 3.6. However, some lattice calculations yield a factor of 2 lower estimate. I am inclined to think that there is something wrong in the lattice results. Perhaps, the lattice de nition of does not fully correspond to that of the continuum theory. It is inconceivable that such a low value of as 0.2 or even 0.3 GeV could be reconciled with the lower bound in plied by Voloshin's sum rule.

In the discussion above we have totally disregarded logarithm ic dependence of the operators and their matrix elements due to anom abus dimensions { i.e. the issue of the normalization point (including the normalization point of). This is in line with that so far we pretend that hard gluons do not exist. A brief excursion into this topic will be undertaken later; here it is only worth mentioning that all numerical estimates presented above refer to a low normalization point, of order of several units times QCD.

W e are ready now to review classic problem s of the heavy quark theory. W e will gradually m ove from simpler to m ore sophisticated problem s.

3.3 M ass form ula revisited

In Sect. 1.5 we have found the rst subleading term in the mass formula for the heavy avor hadrons. The parameter was related to the expectation value of

the gluon anomaly, see Eq. (1.32). It is very easy to continue the expansion one step further and nd the next subleading term, of order $1=m_Q$. One could have extended the derivation along the lines suggested in Sect. 1.5. This was done in Ref. [25]. This is not the fastest route, however. Instead, let us observe that the $1=m_Q$ term in the Ham iltonian (1.14) can be considered as the rst order perturbation; the corresponding correction to the mass is merely the expectation value of this perturbation,

$$M_{H_{Q}} = m_{Q} + + \frac{1}{2m_{Q}} (2M_{H_{Q}})^{-1} h_{H_{Q}} \dot{j}^{2} + \sim B \dot{j}_{H_{Q}} \dot{i} + :::=$$

$$m_{Q} + + \frac{(2^{2} - 2^{2}_{G})_{H_{Q}}}{2m_{Q}} + ::: \qquad (3.22)$$

The terms of order $1=m_Q^2$ are neglected. If we keep only the terms up to $1=m_Q$ it does not matter whether the state H_Q we average over is an asymptotic state (corresponding to $m_Q = 1$) or the real physical heavy avor state. I remind that, unlike HQET, we work with the physical states. The dimension becomes noticeable only at the level $1=m_Q^2$. In this order the mass form ula does not reduce any more to the expectation values of local operators. A part of the $1=m_Q^2$ correction is due to non-local correlation functions, see Ref. [25] for further details. Eq. (3.22) was rst presented in Ref. [43].

3.4 The scaling law of the pseudoscalar and vector coupling constants

The pseudoscalar and vector m eson constants $f_{P} \mbox{ and } f_{V}$ are dened as

$$h_0 j_0 = {}_{5}q_B^{\beta} j_0 i = if_P p \quad h_0 j_0 \quad q_B^{\beta} j_0 i = if_V M_V :$$
 (3.23)

An alternative de nition of the pseudoscalar constant can be given in terms of the pseudoscalar current,

$$h_{0} j_{2} i_{5} q_{B} j_{Q} i = f_{P}^{0} M_{B} :$$
 (3.24)

The constant f_B is one of the key parameters of the heavy quark physics, just in the same way the constant f is a key parameter of the soft pion physics. Below we will show that in the lim it m_Q ! 1 all three constants, f_P ; f_V and f_P^0 , coincide with each other and scale as $m_Q^{1=2}$ modulo a weak logarithm ic dependence on m_Q . (Needless to say, that both masses, M_P and M_V also coincide in this lim it.) For de niteness let us consider f_P^0 . Two other constants can be treated in a similar m anner. The subscripts will be om itted in the remainder of this section to avoid overbaded expressions.

Start from the two-point function

A (k) =
$$i e^{ikx} d^4 xhT fQ(x) i_5 q(x) q(0) i_5 Q(0) gi;$$
 (3.25)

where k is the external momentum . The two-point function A (k) develops a pole at $k^2 = M^2$, the position of the ground state pseudoscalar,

A (k) =
$$\frac{f^2 M^2}{k^2 M^2}$$
 + excitations; (3.26)

O f course, the currents produce from the vacuum not only the ground state m esons but also all excitations in the given channel. It is clear that to isolate the lowest-lying pole we should keep k^2 close to M². Keeping in m ind Eq. (1.26) it is natural to represent k as

$$k = fm_{0} + ;0;0;0g$$

where scales like $_{QCD}$ while m_Q ! 1 . W ith this parametrization of k we merely separate the mechanical (uninteresting) part of the momentum. The pole is achieved at = ; near the pole

A ()
$$\frac{f^2 M}{2()}$$
: (3.27)

The value of the coupling constant is obtained by am putating the pole,

$$f^{2} = \lim_{!} \left(\frac{2()}{M} A() \right) :$$
 (3.28)

Let us now exam ine the theoretical expression for the same two-point function. In the background eld technique (which is already pretty fam iliar, right?) we write

A (k) =
$$i Tr i_{5} \frac{1}{16} m_{q} i_{5} \frac{1}{16 + 16} m_{Q}$$
 : (3.29)

Super cially this expression books the same as if the quarks were treated as free; they are not, however; the coupling to the background eld is rejected in the fact that P is the momentum operator, not just a c-num ber four-vector.

Now we will take advantage of the fact that $m_Q ! 1$. As usual, we close our eyes on any possible hard contributions, assuming that P, the momentum operator of the light quark, is soft, i.e. does not scale with m_Q in the large mass limit but, rather P_{QCD} . (This is the reason, by the way, why the large external momentum k was directed through the heavy quark line in Eq. (3.29).) Intuitively it is clear that the hard components of P should be irrelevant for the lowest-lying state whose \excitation energy" measured from m_Q is of order $_{QCD}$.

If P is soft and m $_{\rm Q}$! 1 the heavy quark G reen function in the leading approximation takes the form

$$\frac{1}{16 + 16} = (6 + 16 + m_{Q}) \frac{1}{(k + P)^{2}} = \frac{1}{m_{Q}^{2} + (i=2)} = \frac{-1}{2} \frac{1}{(k + P)^{2}} = \frac{-1}{2} \frac{1}{(k + P)^$$

where in the second line all $1=m_Q$ term s are on itted. No explicit m_Q dependence is left! This means that A () scales as m_Q^0 . Equation (3.28) in mediately in plies then that f scales as

$$f m_Q^{1=2}$$
: (3.31)

Equation (3.30) for the heavy quark G reen function in the limit m_Q ! 1 is in one-to-one correspondence with the leading term $Q_0(1+_0)=2Q$ in the low-energy Lagrangian (1.11). The analysis of the scaling law of the coupling constants presented above is a simplified version of that carried out m any years ago by Shuryak [6]. Later it was established that the power dependence on m_Q in Eq. (3.31) is supplemented by a logarithm ic dependence appearing due to the hard gluon exchanges [50].

A few words about the numerical value of the coupling constants. A lthough in principle f_D and f_B are measurable experimentally, practically it is a very hard measurement, especially for B. No experimental number for f_B exists so far. Its value was estimated in the QCD sum rules and on lattices more than once. Leaving aside a dramatic evolution of the issue I will say only that the recent and most reliable results cluster around 160 M eV both, in the sum rules [47, 48] and in the lattice calculations [51]. It is curious to note that in $(m_D)^{1=2} f_B$ the preasymptotic $1=m_Q$ correction turned out to be unexpectedly large and negative [47, 45, 52, 51]; at the same time in $(m_D)^{1=2} f_B^0$ the preasymptotic $1=m_Q$ correction is much more modest [47, 48].

3.5 Proof of the Isgur-W ise form ula

I return to my prom ise to prove the IsgurW ise form ula (1.25). Consider the threepoint function depicted on Fig. 6. The sides of the triangle are the G reen functions of the quarks in the background gluon eld. The reduction theorem s tell us that in order to get the transition am plitudes hH $_{\rm c}$ jc bH $_{\rm b}$ i from this three-point function we must \amputate" it: multiply by (p² $M_{\rm B}^2$) and (p² $M_{\rm D}^2$), tending p² to M $_{\rm B}^2$ and p² to M $_{\rm D}^2$. This singles out the m eson states we want to pick up. For the vector m esons we must also multiply the three-point functions by its polarization vector . The last step necessary for amputation is dividing by the coupling constants (residues) connecting the currents bi $_5c$ and b $\,c$ to the respective m esons. If the currents are norm alized appropriately { and we will always do that { the corresponding coupling constants in the pseudoscalar and vector channels are the sam e, fM (see Sect. 3.4). It is convenient to combine the pseudoscalar and vector channels together by introducing the currents

$$J = Bbi_{5}q + Bb q and J^{0} = Dqi_{5}c + Dqc \qquad (3.32)$$

where B and D are external constants m arking the annihilation and creation of the initial and nalB's and D's (B and D denote the polarization vectors of B and D, respectively).

The expression for the three-point function of Fig. 6 takes the form

$$\operatorname{iTr} M \stackrel{0}{\underline{p}^{0+}} \stackrel{1}{\underline{\mathcal{B}}} m_{c} \frac{1}{\underline{p}^{6+}} \stackrel{1}{\underline{\mathcal{B}}} m_{b} \frac{1}{\underline{\mathcal{B}}} \frac{1}{\underline{m}_{q}}$$
 (3.33)

where the matrices M⁰ and M are introduced in Eq. (1.24). In Sect. 3.4 the m_Q ! 1 limit of the quark propagator was obtained in the rest frame. Here we have two heavy avor states, initial and nal, and both can not be at rest simultaneously. Therefore, we need the very same propagator in the arbitrary frame. Let $p = m_Q v + \ldots$ Then a trivial generalization of Eq. (3.30) is

$$\frac{1}{6 + 16} = (6 + 16 + m_Q) \frac{1}{(p + P)^2} \frac{1}{m_Q^2 + (i=2) G} !$$

$$\frac{6 + 1}{2} \frac{1}{(p + P)^2} \frac{1}{(p + P)^2}$$
(3.34)

Using this propagator in Eq. (3.34) we rewrite the three-point function of Fig. 6 as follows !

$$M^{0} \frac{6^{0} + 1}{2} \frac{6^{0} + 1}{2} M$$

$$iTr_{:}^{8} \frac{1}{(^{0} + P)v^{0}} \frac{1}{(+P)v} \frac{1}{16} m_{q}^{!} ; \qquad (3.35)$$

The expression in the braces is independent of the heavy quark masses; moreover, it is proportional to the three-point function in the theory with the scalar heavy quarks considered in Sect. 1.4. As was explained there, in this theory in the limit m_0 ! 1 only one form factor survives.

One subtle point deserves discussing here. When I speak about the heavy avor m esons I keep in m ind particles built from the heavy quark and a light antiquark, which is not always in line with the accepted nom enclature. Say, they call B m eson a particle with the b antiquark, not quark. Since this distinction plays no role in m y lectures I will continue to ignore this linguistic nuance referring to the bq states as B m esons. All equations presented above assume that the b quark in the initial state annihilates to produce the c quark in the nal state. Simultaneously a light antiquark in the initial m eson is annihilated and the sam e light antiquark reappears in the nalm eson.

Return now to the model with spinless heavy quarks. The heavy avor hadrons we now deal with are spin-1/2 baryons. More exactly, we have antibaryon in the initial state and antibaryon in the nal state. This means that near the mass shell the expression in the braces in Eq. (3.35) takes the form

$$\frac{6r+1}{2} - \frac{6r+1}{2} = \frac{q}{M_{B}M_{D}} f_{B} f_{D} \frac{1}{v^{0}} = \frac{1}{v} (y); \qquad (3.36)$$

the m inus sign between the unit term and the v term in the density m atrices is due to the fact that we deal with the antibaryons. A m putating the legs and com bining Eqs. (3.36) and (3.35) we get the Isgur-W ise form ula (1.25) since M (6+1) = (6+1)M, and so on.

3.6 The B jorken sum rule and all that

The Isgur-W ise function (y) carries inform ation about the structure of the light cloud. Needless to say that the heavy quark expansion per se does not help to calculate this function. One has to rely on m ethods applicable in the strong coupling regim e which are outside the scope of my lectures (QCD sum rules, lattices, ...). Still, some interesting and important relations emerge. Here we will discuss a sum rule for the slope of the Isgur-W ise function and related topics.

We are already familiar with the sum rule technology in the heavy quark theory. In Sect 2.1 we dwelled on a simplied problem : inclusive decays of a spinless heavy quark Q into a lighter spinless quark q and a ctitious spin-zero photon . The \photon" was assumed to be on m ass shell, $q^2 = 0$. The predictions obtained referred to the moments of the \photon" energy. Now you are mature enough to face actual problems from real life. We will concentrate on the decays of a b containing hadron into a c containing hadron plus the lepton pair 1. The fourm om entum of the lepton pair is a free parameter, in particular, $q^2 \in 0$. We can and will choose the value of q to our advantage.

Consider a transition H_b ! H_c induced by some particular current, say, axialvector. At zero recoil = 1. In the SV limit where the velocity of the recoiling hadron is small

$$(\mathbf{y}) = 1$$
 ² $(\mathbf{y} \quad 1) + \dots = 1$ ² $\frac{\mathbf{v}^2}{2} + \dots$ (3.37)

where $y = vv^0$, v is the spatial velocity of H_c in the H_b rest fram e, and the slope parameter ² was introduced in Ref. [32]. It plays the same role as, say, the charge radius of pions.

To get relations involving ² we start from consideration of the transition operator sim ilar to that of Eq. (2.13). The expectation value of the transition operator over the B m eson state yields the hadronic am plitude whose in aginary part is proportional to the probability of the inclusive decay B ! X_cl with the xed value of q, the m on entum carried away by the lepton pair l . (Here X_c denotes an inclusive hadronic state containing one c quark.) A new element compared to the toy m odel of Sect. 2.1 is the heavy quark spin. A nother distinction is the fact that, to achieve the SV limit, we do not need now to assume that m_c is close to m_b. In the sem ileptonic decay B ! X_cl one can ne-tune the lepton pair momentum in such a way that q² is close to its maxim al value, q²_{n ax} = (M_B M_D)²; then the c containing hadronic state produced is alm ost at rest, and we are in the SV limit even though the charm ed quark is signi cantly lighter than the b quark. In other words, for such values of q² the c quark is always slow. This transition operator describes the forward scattering of B to B via intermediate states D and \excitations". (We focus for de niteness on the axial-vector current, c $_5$ b. The vector current can be treated in a similar way.) The excitations can include, for instance, D , and so on. In general, all intermediate states except the lowest-lying D will be referred to as excitations. The transition operator

$$\hat{\Gamma} = i d^4 x e^{iqx} T fb(x) _{5}c(x); c _{5}bg \qquad (3.38)$$

in the Born approximation is given by the diagram of Fig. 1. The hadronic amplitude obtained by averaging \hat{T} over the B meson state,

$$h = \frac{1}{2M_{B}} hB f \hat{T} \hat{B} i \qquad (3.39)$$

contains various kinem atical factors. In the general case the hadronic tensor h consists of ve di erent covariant structures [30, 33]:

$$h = h_1 g + h_2 v v \quad ih_3 \quad v q + h_4 q q + h_5 (q v + q v): \quad (3.40)$$

M oreover, the invariant hadronic functions h_1 to h_5 depend on two variables, q_0 and q^2 , or q_0 and jq j. For q = 0 only one variable survives, and only two of ve tensor structures in h are independent.

Each of these hadronic invariant functions satis as a dispersion relation in q_0 ,

$$h_{i}(q_{0}) = \frac{1}{2}^{2} \frac{w_{i}(q_{0})dq_{0}}{q_{0}} + \text{polynom ial}$$
(3.41)

where w_i are observable structure functions,

 $w_i = 2 \text{Im} h_i$:

For our purposes it is quite su cient to analyze only one function, namely, h_1 . M oreover, for the time being we will disregard all non-perturbative corrections $O\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 2 \\ Q & C \\ D \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ which means that operators in the expansion of \hat{T} other than bb can be neglected, and the B meson expectation value of bb can be replaced by unity. Calculating h_1 in this approximation is a trivial problem (it was a part of the exercise suggested in Sect. 2.1). Speci cally,

$$h_{1}^{AA} = (m_{b} + m_{c} - q_{l})\frac{1}{z} + O((_{QCD}^{2}))$$
 (3.42)

where

$$z = (m_{b} q E_{c}) (m_{b} q + E_{c}); E_{c}^{2} = m_{c}^{2} + q^{2}:$$
(3.43)

I rem ind that q is assumed to be xed, and $_{QCD}$ jqj M $_D$, so that actually I will expand in q keeping only the term s up to second order. It is convenient to shift q by introducing a new variable

$$= q_{\text{Im}ax} \quad q \quad (3.44)$$

where

$$q_{Dmax} = M_B \quad E_D ; E_D = M_D + \frac{q^2}{2M_D} :$$
 (3.45)

W hen is real and positive we are on the physical cut where the actual interm ediate states (e.g. D) are produced. Here the imaginary part of h_1 is given by the \elastic" contribution of D plus inelastic excitations. For negative we are below the cut. The result for h_1 above can be trusted if $_{QCD}$ since the expansion actually runs in $_{QCD}$ = . The expansion in the inverse heavy quark mass also requires, of course, that j j m_{cb} . A bridge between the physical domain of positive and the Euclidean domain of negative where the calculation is done is provided by the dispersion relations.

At the next stage the amplitude h_1 is expanded in powers of $_{QCD}$ = and $=m_{byc}$. Polynomials in can be discarded since they have no imaginary part. We are interested only in negative powers of . The coe cients in front of 1 = n are related, through dispersion relations, to the integrals over the imaginary part of h_1 with the weight functions proportional to the excitation energy to the power n 1. Indeed,

$$h_{1}(;q^{2}) = \frac{1}{2}^{Z} d \sim \frac{w_{1}(\sim;q^{2})}{\sim} =$$

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} d^{2} w_{1}(\gamma; q^{2}) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} d^{2} d^{2} \sim w_{1}(\gamma; q^{2}) + \frac{1}{3} \frac{1}{2} d^{2} d^{2} w_{1}(\gamma; q^{2}) + \dots (3.46)$$

Thus, our immediate task is to built the $1 = \exp(3.42)$.

The theoretical expression for the amplitude h_1 above knows nothing, of course, about the meson masses; it contains only the quark masses. Correspondingly, it is very convenient to build set the expansion of h_1 in an auxiliary quantity,

$$_{q} = m_{b} \quad E_{c} \quad q; E_{c} = m_{c} + \frac{q^{2}}{2m_{c}}:$$
 (3.47)

Then, if necessary, we reexpress the expansion obtained in this way in term s of ,

$$\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{q} + \frac{(q)}{2} + \dots$$
(3.48)

The dierence between $_{q}$ and is 0 ($_{QCD}$ 2 erm $_{b;c}^{2}$) and 0 ($_{QCD}^{2}$ =m $_{b;c}$).

A first these introductory remarks, assembling all information in our disposal, we get !

$$h_1 = 1 \frac{v^2}{4} + \frac{v^2}{2} + \cdots$$
 (3.49)

plus term s of higher order in q^2 or $_{QCD}$. In deriving Eq. (3.49) I used the fact that $_q = v^2 = 2$ plus term s of higher order in q^2 or $_{QCD}$.

This completes the theoretical aspect of the calculation. The ∞ e cients in front of 1= and 1=² in h₁ are known; Eq. (3.46) tells us that these ∞ e cients are equal to

integrals over w₁, the spectral density. So, what remains to be done is to express the spectral density in terms of the contribution coming from the physical intermediate states. Let us assume for simplicity that the spectrum of the intermediate states is discrete. Denote the mass of the i-th state by M_i and the energy by E_i; the lowest lying meson, D_i, corresponds to i= 0. Then the propagator of the i-th meson

$$\frac{1}{(M_{B} \quad q \quad E_{i}) (M_{B} \quad q + E_{i})}$$

at positive has the im aginary part

$$(2E_{i})^{1}$$
 (_i)

where i is the excitation energy (including the corresponding kinetic energy),

$$i = E_i \quad E_D$$
 :

For the $\ensuremath{\ \ }$ B ! D transition $_0$ vanishes, of course.

Now it is rather obvious that the structure function w_1 reduces to

$$w_{1}() = \frac{x}{1} \frac{jE_{B!} \frac{j}{2}}{2E_{i}} 2 \quad (_{i}); \qquad (3.50)$$

where the sum runs over all possible nalhadronic states, the term with i = 0 corresponds to the \elastic" transition B ! D while i = 1;2;::: represent excited states with the energies $E_i = M_i + q^2 = (2M_i)$; furtherm ore, $f_{B! \ i} f$ books like the square of a form factor. Strictly speaking $f_{B! \ i} f$ is not exactly the square of a form factor; rather this is the (appropriately normalized) contribution to the given structure function coming from the multiplet of the degenerate states which includes summation over spin states as well. By appropriate normalization I mean that we routinely insert the normalization factor $(2M_B)^{-1}$. In the particular example considered (the axial-vector current) D is not produced in the elastic transition, so that in the elastic part one needs to sum only over polarizations of D. Say, at zero recoil $f_{B! \ D} = \frac{1}{2M_D} F_{B! \ D}$ where $F_{B! \ D}$ is the B ! D form factor at zero recoil, see Eq. (3.58) below.

Let us exam ine in m one detail the elastic contribution, i = 0. The form factor of the B ! D transition generated by the axial-vector current is given in Eq. (1.21). Using this expression we readily obtain

$$(2E_{D})^{1} j f_{B!D} j^{2} = \frac{M_{D}}{E_{D}} \frac{1 + v v^{0}}{2} j (v v^{0}) j^{2} 1 ^{2} v^{2} : \qquad (3.51)$$

C om paring the $1 = \cos \operatorname{cient}$ in the dispersion representation (3.46) with that of Eq. (3.49) we conclude that

$$\frac{1}{2} \overset{Z}{d} w_{1}() = 1 \qquad {}^{2}v^{2} + \frac{\lambda^{4}}{{}^{i}_{i=1}} \frac{jf_{B!i}}{2E_{i}} = 1 \qquad \frac{v^{2}}{4}: \qquad (3.52)$$

which implies, in turn

$${}^{2} = \frac{1}{4} + \frac{x^{4}}{{}_{i=1}} \frac{jf_{B!\ i}j^{2}}{2M\ i} \frac{y^{2}}{v^{2}} :$$
(3.53)

In Sect. 1.3 we learnt that at zero recoil (i.e. v = 0) only the elastic transition survives. As a consequence of the heavy quark symmetry for all non-elastic transitions $\mathbf{f}_{B! i} \mathbf{j}^2 = v^2$ stays nite in the limit of small v. Eq. (3.53) is the B jorken sum rule proper. Since the contribution of the excited states on the right-hand side is obviously positive it tells us, in particular, that $^2 > 1=4$. This inequality is not very informative, though, since both, the QCD sum rule [48, 53] and lattice calculations indicate that 2 is only slightly less than unity, perhaps, close to 0.8.

Leaving technicalities aside let m e sum m arize the physical m eaning of the result obtained. The coe cient in front of 1= in Eq. (3.49) does not contain $_{QCD}$. This m eans that we calculate the probability of the decay b! c\l "with given value of v^2 m erely in the parton m odel; this probability is equal to that of the physical decay B ! X_c\l "; the latter is comprised of the elastic transition B ! D \l " and the transition of B into excitations. (The quotation m arks are used to emphasize the fact that the decays that are m easured are induced by both, the axial-vector and vector, currents, while we focus now only on the transitions induced by the axial-vector current.) A llprobabilities of production of the elastic transition containing ². The sum of these two contributions must coincide with the v^2 term obtained in the parton m odel. The very sam e analysis, by the way, presents a proof of the fact that

(y = 1) = 1. (Do you see this?)

Now, we make the next step, proceeding to the 1=2 term s. The 1=2 term in Eq. (3.49) is proportional to , hence the result we are about to get evidently goes beyond the parton model. Combining Eq. (3.49) with the dispersion representation (3.46) we nd

$$\frac{\mathbf{v}^{2}}{2} = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \frac{j\mathbf{f}_{B} \cdot j}{2E_{i}} \quad i = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \frac{j\mathbf{f}_{B} \cdot j}{2M_{i}} \quad (M_{i} \quad M_{D}): \quad (3.54)$$

The sum runs not from zero to in nity but from 1 to in nity since $_0 = 0$. Moreover, since all $\mathcal{F}_{B!}$ if for i = 1;2; ... are proportional to v^2 , and we are interested only in the v^2 term, it is legitim at to substitute, as I did, E_i by M_i and $_i$ by M_i M_D .

Eq. (3.54) is the optical (or Voloshin's) sum rule; super cially it looks the same as in the toy model of Sect. 2.1. Please, remember this sum rule { it gives a unique opportunity to measure , one of the key parameters of the heavy quark theory. To this end one has to measure the inelastic transition probabilities in the sem ileptonic decays B ! X_cl in the SV limit. This is a di cult measurement, but not impossible, at least in principle. Before venturing into this noble task { extraction of from experimental data { Im ust warm you that acceptable accuracy can be achieved only provided that the perturbative corrections (hard gluons) as

well as nonperturbative ones, of the next order in $_{QCD}$, are included in the sum rules. We will brie y discuss the impact of the perturbative corrections in Lecture 5.

Those who are anxious to get something practical from the optical sum rule in the absence of the necessary measurements should not be discouraged. We can still get a lower bound on \cdot . Indeed, let us rewrite Eq. (3.54) as follows:

$$\frac{\mathbf{v}^{2}}{2} = \frac{\mathbf{x}^{1}}{\mathbf{x}^{2}} \frac{\mathbf{j}\mathbf{f}_{B} \cdot \mathbf{i} \mathbf{j}^{2}}{2\mathbf{M}_{i}} (\mathbf{M}_{1} + \mathbf{M}_{D}) + \frac{\mathbf{x}^{1}}{\mathbf{x}^{2}} \frac{\mathbf{j}\mathbf{f}_{B} \cdot \mathbf{i} \mathbf{j}^{2}}{2\mathbf{M}_{i}} (\mathbf{M}_{i} + \mathbf{M}_{1}) = \mathbf{M}_{1} + \mathbf{M}_{D} + \frac{\mathbf{x}^{2}}{4} + \frac{\mathbf{x}^{2}}{4} \frac{\mathbf{j}\mathbf{f}_{B} \cdot \mathbf{i} \mathbf{j}^{2}}{2\mathbf{M}_{i}} (\mathbf{M}_{i} + \mathbf{M}_{1});$$
(3.55)

where Eq. (3.53) is substituted. Since the second term on the right-hand side is obviously positive we conclude that

> 2 (M₁ M_D)
$$^2 \frac{1}{4}$$
 500 M eV (3.56)

where M₁ is the mass of the rst excited resonance with the quantum numbers of D M_1 M_D 0.5 GeV).

Following the same line of reasoning one can derive the \third" sum rule relating 2 to an appropriately weighted sum over excitations [54]. The corresponding inequality analogous to Eq. (3.56) takes the form

$$^{2} > 3 (M_{1} M_{D})^{2} \frac{2}{4} \frac{1}{4} = 0.45 \text{ GeV}^{2}$$
: (3.57)

3.7 Deviations of the B ! D form factor from unity at zero recoil

The heavy quark theory began from the observation that the B ! D axial-vector form factor at zero recoil is exactly unity in the lim it m_b ! 1 ; m_c ! 1 ; $m_b=m_c$ arbitrary, see Sect. 1.3. This is purely a symmetry statement, as usual, dynamics resides in the corrections. In this section we will discuss deviations from unity.

W hen the heavy quark mass is in nite it is nailed at the origin, both in the initial B meson and in the nalD . The light cloud then does not notice the replacement of one quark by another, the overlap is unity. If we make the quark masses nite they start jiggling inside the mesons, and this motion is dierent in B and D since the heavy quark velocities are dierent. On top of this the dierence in the relative spin orientations of the heavy quarks and light clouds show sup. These two elects lead to deviations from unity. At a heuristic level there is no doubt that the deviations are of order of (i) the square of the characteristic heavy quark momentum (p itself can not enter since there is no preferred orientation) or (ii) chrom om agnetic correlation $\sim B$. In both cases dimensional arguments prompt us that the deviation from unity

at zero recoil is proportional to $1=m_{c,b}^2$; linear e ects in $1=m_{c,b}$ are absent. The assertion was rst formulated in Ref. [15] and was cast in the form of a theorem (Luke's theorem) in Ref. [21]. The proof presented below is abstracted from the recent work [55].

Let us de ne the B ! D form factor at zero recoil as follows

hD jc
$${}_{5}b_{B}^{*}i = i \frac{4M_{B}M_{D}F_{B!D}}{4M_{B}M_{D}F_{B!D}}$$
; (3.58)

to be compared with Eq. (1.18). Conceptually our present derivation is very close to that leading to the B jorken and Voloshin sum rules (Sect. 3.6). We will again consider the transition operator induced by the axial-vector current limiting ourselves to the spatial components of the current. Technically it is simultaneously simpler and more involved. Simpler { because at the point of zero recoil one must put q = 0, so that kinematics is trivial. In particular, from the very beginning only one structure (h_1) survives in the general decomposition (3.40). The calculation is more complicated on the other hand since now one has to keep track of terms of order $^2_{QCD}$. Those of order $_{QCD}$ are simply absent!

The quantity is de ned now as

$$= M_{\rm B} \qquad M_{\rm D} \qquad q \qquad (3.59)$$

and we continue to assume that $_{QCD}$ jj $m_{c,b}$ and continue to exam ine our old acquaintance, h_1 , expanded in powers of 1 = and $= m_{c,b}$. The result of a relatively simple calculation (which the reader is encouraged to do) is

 $h_{i} = f1 \qquad g - \frac{1}{2} + O(\frac{3}{QCD}) - \frac{1}{2} + ...$ (3.60)

where

$$\frac{1}{3}\frac{\frac{2}{G}}{m_{c}^{2}} + \frac{\frac{2}{G}}{4}\frac{\frac{2}{G}}{m_{c}^{2}} + \frac{1}{m_{b}^{2}} + \frac{1}{m_{b}^{2}} + \frac{2}{3m_{c}m_{b}}$$

An explanatory remark is in order here concerning the $1=^2$ term in h_1 . The theoretical expression for h_1 , as it naturally emerges from the computations, depends on $_q$, not on where $_q$ is the energy measured from the \quark" threshold, see Eq. (3.47). In the kinematics at hand, when we are at the point of zero recoil,

$$_{q} = M_{B} \quad M_{D} \quad (m_{b} \quad m_{c}) =$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 2\\ G \end{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2m_{c}} \quad \frac{1}{2m_{b}} \quad \frac{2}{3m_{c}} \stackrel{2}{_{G}} + ::: \qquad (3.61)$$

where I invoked Eq. (3.22). (Can you gure out why the coe cients in this expression and in Eq. (3.61) are di erent? Hint: The parameters $^2_{G}$ and 2 in Eq. (3.61) are de ned as the expectation values of the corresponding operators over the pseudoscalar m eson. This is not the case in Eq. (3.22).)

We rst expand h_i in $1 = {}_q$ and then pass to the physical variable and rearrange the expansion. In the $1 = {}_q$ expansion the corrections of order O (${}_{QCD}$) are absent from the very beginning { an obvious fact hardly requiring further comments { while the term O (${}_{QCD}^2 = {}_q^2$) does appear explicitly. This term, how ever, is killed in passing from $1 = {}_q$ to $1 = {}_q$ see Eq. (3.61).

That is why I assert that the coe cient in front of 1 = 2 is 0 ($_{QCD}^3$). Moreover, as we will see shortly this coe cient in Eq. (3.60) is positive. In principle, it is calculable (more exactly, expressible in terms of several new phenom enological parameters) but this will be of no concern to us in this lecture.

Repeating, step by step, the derivation of Sect. 3.6 we conclude that

$$F_{B!D} \hat{j} + \sum_{i=1,2,...}^{X} F_{B!excit} \hat{j} = 1$$
(3.62)

and

$$F_{B! \text{ excit}} \stackrel{2}{\xrightarrow{}} M_{i} M_{D} = O\left(\begin{smallmatrix}3\\QCD\end{smallmatrix}\right):$$
(3.63)
$$\stackrel{i=1;2;:::}{\xrightarrow{}}$$

The latter sum rule, by the way, is the reason why we know that the coe cient $O\left(\begin{smallmatrix}3\\QCD\end{smallmatrix}\right)$ in front of $1=^2$ is positive { the left-hand side of the sum rule is obviously positive-de nite. These two relations, taken together, plus positivity of $\mathcal{F}_{B!\ i} \mathring{f}$, in ply that $\mathcal{F}_{B!\ D}$ \mathring{f} is limited from below and from above,

$$L \qquad \frac{O\left(\frac{3}{QCD}\right)}{M_{1} M_{D}} < \mathcal{F}_{B!D} \mathcal{J} < 1 \qquad (3.64)$$

where M₁ is the mass of the state produced by the axial-vector current, M₁ M_D = O ($_{QCD}$).

Not only is it seen that the deviation of $\mathbf{F}_{B!D}$ $\hat{\mathbf{f}}$ from unity starts from terms scaling like $1=m_{c,b}^2$, with no $1=m_{c,b}$ corrections, but we understand now the reasons lying behind this remarkable fact. Moreover, we have an idea of how large the actual deviations are since Eq. (3.64) establishes a lower limit for these deviations in terms of the parameter which is determined numerically rather well. In this aspect the derivation I present here goes beyond the more conventional analysis of Ref. [43, 42]. The reader is nevertheless advised to consult the latter works to get a broader perspective of the heavy quark theory { the more approaches you master the better for you.

Qualitatively it is quite clear why the deviation of $\mathcal{F}_{B!D}^{2}$ from unity starts from $2_{QCD}^{2} = m_{cb}^{2}$. Indeed, let us return to the B jorken form ula (3.37). In this form ula it is assumed $\mathbf{v}_{QCD} = m_Q$ so that actually we do not distinguish between the velocity of the recoiling nal heavy hadron and that of the nal quark. At zero recoil the heavy hadron is nailed, but not the heavy quark. The latter experiences a prim ordialm otion inside the nailed hadron, with the velocity \mathbf{v}^{2} $2_{QCD}^{2} = m_Q^{2}$. So, a reasonable guess would be to extrapolate Eq. (3.37) down to \mathbf{v}^{2} $2_{QCD}^{2} = m_Q^{2}$. As we see, this guess works. It is worth emphasizing that our analysis need not be conned to the transitions induced by the spatial components of the axial-vector current. We could consider the temporal components, or vector currents, or something else. Each time we get additional information. For instance, from the transition operator induced by the vector currents we get a sum rule proving the inequality $^2 > \frac{2}{G}$ obtained in Sect. 32 from a quantum -mechanical argument.

4 Lecture 4. Theory of the Line Shape

In this lecture I will discuss one of the most interesting and practically in portant applications of the heavy quark theory, the spectra in the end point domain in the inclusive decays. Inclusive weak decays of heavy avors, in particular, sem ileptonic decays, are close relatives of fam ous deep inelastic scattering { the processes where a highly virtual photon scatters o nucleons to produce an inclusive multiparticle state. The latter are related to the form er via channel crossing. Deep inelastic lepton-nucleon scattering was in the focus of theoretical activity in the late sixties and the beginning of seventies and was instrum ental in discovering and developing QCD [56]. It is thus quite surprising that for a long time there were hardly any attempts to treat the beauty decays in QCD proper along essentially the same lines as it was done in deep inelastic scattering. Realization of the idea that the $1=m_{0}$ expansion in the theory of the line shape can play the same role as the twist $1=Q^2$ expansion in D IS came with the 20 years delay [57, 58, 59] { I see absolutely no reasons why the corresponding theory was worked out only recently and not 20 years ago.

The theory of the line shape in QCD resembles that of the Mossbauer e ect. To explain what Im ean it is convenient to consider, for de niteness, the transition $B \ ! \ X_s$ where X_s denotes the inclusive hadronic state with the s quark. This decay has been recently observed experimentally. (Description of $B \ ! \ X_q l$ is conceptually sim ilar but is more technically involved).

Again, to avoid inessential technicalities I will neglect the quark and photon spins. So we will consider the transition Q ! q where all eds Q, q and are spinless. Thus, to begin with, we will limit ourselves to the toy model described in Sect. 2.1, see Eq. (2.9). The mass of the nal quark m_q will be treated as a free parameter which can vary from zero almost up to m_Q. For our approach to be valid we still need that m m_Q m_q _{QCD} although the mass difference may be small compared to the quark m asses.

To warm up we will put the nal quark mass to zero. At the level of the free quark decay the photon energy is then xed by the two-body kinematics of the decay $Q \ ! \ q$, namely, $E = m_Q = 2$. In other words, in the rest frame of the decaying Q quark the photon energy spectrum is a monochromatic line at $E = m_Q = 2$ (Fig. 7). On the other hand, in the actual hadronic decays $H_Q \ ! \ X_q$ the kinematical boundary of the spectrum lies at $M_{H_Q} = 2$. Moreover, due to multiparticle nal states (which are, of course, present at the level of the hadronic decays) the \photon" line will be smeared. In particular, the window { a gap between $m_Q = 2$ and $M_{H_Q} = 2$ { will be closed (Fig. 7). There are two mechanisms smearing the monochromatic line of the free-quark decay. The rst is purely perturbative: the nal quark q can shake o a hard gluon, thus leading to the three-body kinematics. This mechanism tends to dim inish the photon energy and may be important at $E < m_Q = 2$. W e will defer its discussion till later times. The second mechanism is due to the \prim ordial" motion

of the heavy quark Q inside H_Q and is non-perturbative. Even if the decaying B is nailed at the origin so that its velocity vanishes, the b quark moves inside the light cloud, its momentum being of order $_{QCD}$. This is the QCD analog of the Ferm im otion of the nucleons in the nuclei. It is quite clear that this motion a ects the decay spectra. Say, if the \prim ordial" heavy quark momentum is parallel to that of the photon, the photon produced gets more energy, and vice versa, for the antiparallel momenta it gets less. It is quite clear that this e ect is preasymptotic (suppressed by inverse powers of m_b): while typical energies of the decay products are of order m_b a shift due to the heavy quark motion is of order $_{QCD}$.

Only the second mechanism will be of interest for us in this lecture.

The window (i.e. the domain kinem atically inaccessible for free quarks) plus the adjacent domain below the window, of width several units $_{QCD}$, taken together, form what is called the end point domain. Below I will outline the main elements of the theory allowing one to translate an intuitive picture of the Q quark primordial motion inside H_Q in QCD-based predictions for the spectrum in the end point domain ⁹. The spectrum below the end point domain is the realm of the perturbative physics (hard gluon emission).

4.1 Form alism

Let us return back to Sect. 2.1 and consider the transition operator de ned there. Since we are interested in the energy spectrum the \photon" momentum q must be xed. Let us assemble Eqs. (2.14) and (2.23) together. For convenience I will reproduce the result here again, taking into account the fact that now m_q is assumed to vanish,

$$\frac{d}{dE} = \frac{m_Q}{M_{H_Q}} \, {}_0 \, hQQi E \frac{m_Q}{2} - \frac{hr^2 i}{4m_Q} \, {}_0 E \frac{m_Q}{2} + \frac{hr^2 i}{24} \, {}_0 E \frac{m_Q}{2} + \frac{m_Q}{2}$$

If in the leading approximation the spectrum is just a delta function, the corrections are more and more singular! The higher the correction the stronger the singularity. Nonsense? No, this was to be expected: the width of the line in the transition H_Q ! X_q is of order $_{QCD}$. We expand in the powers of $_{QCD} = m_Q$; hence we must expect the enhancement of the singularities in each successive order. Equation (4.1) gives all terms up to $_{QCD}^2$. It is clear that to describe the shape of the line one needs to sum up the in nite number of terms in this expansion.

Then in the approximation of Fig. 1 (no hard gluon exchanges) the transition operator is given by Eq. (2.15) with m_q set equal to zero. To construct the operator product expansion to all orders we observe that the momentum operator corresponding to the residual motion of the heavy quark is Q_{CD} and the expansion in =k is possible. Unlike the problem of the total widths, however, in the end

⁹Basics of the theory of the line shape were worked out in Refs. [57, 58, 59]. Further crucial steps were undertaken in Refs. [60, 61, 62, 63]. In my presentation I follow mainly Bigiet al. [59].

point dom ain k^2 is anom abusly sm all, the expansion parameter is of order unity, and there exists an in nite set of terms where all terms are of the same order of magnitude.

To elucidate this statem ent let us exam ine di erent term s in the denom inator of the propagator, $k^2 + 2 k + 2^2$:

In the end point dom ain

It is quite trivial to nd that in this dom ain

$$k_0$$
 jj $m_Q = 2$; k^2 m_Q ;

in particular, at the kinem atical boundary (for the maxim alvalue of the \photon" energy) $k_0 = M_0 = 2$ and $k^2 = m_0$. Hence, in the end point dom ain

$$k^2$$
 k ²:

In other words, when one expands the propagator of the nalquark in the transition operator,

$$Q \frac{1}{k^2 + 2 k + 2} Q$$
; (4.3)

in , in the leading approximation all terms $(2k = k^2)^n$ must be taken into account while terms containing ² can be omitted. The rst subleading correction would contain one ² and arbitrary number of 2k 's, etc.

Thus, in this problem it is twist of the operators (dimension - Lorentz spin) in the operator product expansion, not their dimension, that counts. For connoisseurs I will add that this aspect makes the theory of the line shape in the end point domain akin to that of deep inelastic scattering (D IS). Keeping only those terms in the expansion that do not vanish in the lim it m_Q ! 1 (analogs of the twist-2 operators in D IS) we get the following series for the transition operator

$$\hat{T} = \frac{1}{k^2} \frac{k^2}{n=0} + \frac{2}{k^2} k^1 ::: k^n Q_1 ::: _n Q \quad \text{traces}: \qquad (4.4)$$

Traces are subtracted by hand since they are irrelevant anyway; their contribution is suppressed as $k^2 = (k)^2 = (k)^2 = m_Q$ to a positive power. Another way to make the same statement is to say that in Eq. (4.4) the four-vector k can be considered as light-like, $k^2 = 0$.

4.2 The light cone distribution function

A fler the transition operator is built the next step is averaging of \hat{T} over the hadronic state H₀. U sing only the general arguments of the Lorentz covariance one can write

 $hH_{Q} \mathbf{j} Q_{1} ::: _{n} Q \quad \text{traces} \mathcal{H}_{Q} \mathbf{i} = a_{n} ^{n} (v_{1} ::: v_{n} \quad \text{traces}) \quad (4.5)$

where a_n are constants param etrizing the m atrix elements. Their physical meaning will become clear momentarily. Right now it is worth noting that the term with n = 1 drops out ($a_1 = 0$). Indeed, $hH_Q \downarrow Q \sim Q \downarrow H_Q i$ is obviously zero for spinless H_Q while $_0$ through the equation of motion reduces to $\sim^2 = (2m_Q)$ and is of the next order in $1=m_Q$. D is appearance of Q Q means that there is a gap in dimensions of the relevant operators.

Let us write a_n 's as m om ents of som e function F (x),

$$a_n = dxx^n F(x):$$
 (4.6)

Then, F(x) is nothing else than the primordial line-shape function! (That is to say, F(x) determines the shape of the line before it is deformed by hard gluon radiation; this latter deformation is controllable by perturbative QCD). The variable x is related to the photon energy,

$$\mathbf{x} = \frac{2}{2} \quad \mathbf{E} \quad \frac{\mathbf{m}_{Q}}{2} \quad \mathbf{:}$$

If this interpretation is accepted { and I will prove that it is correct { it im m ediately implies that (i) F (x) > 0, (ii) the upper limit of integration in Eq. (4.6) is 1, (iii) F (x) exponentially falls o at negative values of x so that practically the integration domain in Eq. (4.6) is limited from below at x_0 where x_0 is a positive number of order unity.

To see that the above statem ent is indeed valid we substitute Eqs. (4.5), (4.6) in \hat{T} ,

$$hH_{Q} \hat{T}H_{Q} i = \frac{1}{k^{2}} \sum_{n}^{X} dyF(y) y^{n} = \frac{2 kv}{k^{2} + i0} i^{n}; \qquad (4.7)$$

and sum up the series. The if regularization will prompt us how to take the im aginary part at the very end. In this way we arrive at

$$\frac{d}{dE} = -\frac{4}{0} \frac{m_{Q}E}{M_{H_{Q}}} \text{Im}^{Z} dyF (y) \frac{1}{k^{2} + 2y kv + i0} = (2 =)_{0}F (x); \quad (4.8)$$

where the variable $x = k^2 = (2 \text{ kv})$ was written out above in terms of the \photon" energy, and $_0$ is the total decay width in the parton approximation. Corrections to Eq. (4.8) are of order = m_0 .

Thus, we succeeded in getting the desired smearing: the monochromatic line of the parton approximation is replaced by a nite size line whose width is of order. The pre-asymptotic elective deal with is linear in $_{QCD} = m_Q$.

At this point you m ight ask me how this could possibly happen. We have already learnt that there is a gap in dimensions of the operators in the expansion { no operators of dimension 4 exist { and the correction to QQ is also quadratic in $1=m_Q$ (the CGG/BUV theorem). There are no miracles { the occurrence of the e ect linear in $_{QCD}=m_Q$ became possible due to the summation of the in nite series in Eq. (4.4); no individual term in this series gives rise to $_{QCD}=m_Q$.

To avoid m is understanding it is worth explicitly stating that the primordial distribution function F (x) is not calculated; rather F (x) is related to the light-cone distribution function of the heavy quark inside H_Q, namely hQ (n)ⁿQ i, n² = 0, or more explicitly

$$F(x) / dte^{ixt} hH_{Q} \mathbf{j} (x = 0)e^{\prod_{i=0}^{R_{t}} nA(n)d} Q(x = n t)\mathbf{j} H_{Q} \mathbf{i}; \qquad (4.9)$$

where n is a light-like vector¹⁰

$$n = (1;0;0;1):$$

Unfortunately, this prim ordial function is not the one that will be eventually measured from d = dE; the actual measured line shape will be essentially deformed by radiation of hard gluons. I will say a few words about this in Lecture 5.

The prim ordial distribution function F(x) which we de ned here can be called the light-cone distribution function. This is clear from the expression (4.9) which has a very transparent physical meaning. The quark q produced is massless and, therefore, propagates along the light cone from the point of emission to the point of absorption in the transition operator de ning the distribution function.

If we looked at the physical line shape sketched on Fig. 7 m ore attentively, through a m icroscope, we would notice that a sm ooth curve is obtained as a result of adding up m any channels, speci c decay m odes. A typical interval in E that contains already enough channels to yield a sm ooth curve after summation is ${}^2_{\rm QCD}$ =m $_{\rm Q}$. Roughly one can say that the spectrum of Fig. 7 covers altogether m $_{\rm Q}$ = $_{\rm QCD}$ resonance states produced in the H $_{\rm Q}$ decays and composed of q plus the spectator (I keep in m ind here that the nal hadronic state is produced through decays of highly excited resonances, as in the multicolor QCD). These states span the window between m $_{\rm Q}$ =2 and M $_{\rm H_Q}$ and the adjacent domain to the left of the maximum at E = m $_{\rm Q}$ =2.

4.3 Varying the mass of the nalquark

So far Iwas discussing the transition into a massless nalquark. It is very interesting to trace what happens with the line shape and the primordial distribution function as the nalquark mass m_{q} increases.

Inspection of the transition operator shows that as long as $m_q^2 = m_Q$ nothing changes in our form ulae at all in the leading-twist approximation. Since the characteristic values of k^2 in the end point domain are of order m_Q and $m_q^2 = m_Q$ one can merely neglect the nalquark mass altogether.

A more interesting regime is m_q (m_Q)¹⁼². In this regime one can not neglect m_q^2 in the denominator. It is not dicult to see, how ever [62], that, as in the massless

 $^{^{10}}$ Sim ilar light-cone distributions for light quarks are well known [64] in the theory of deep inelastic scattering, see also [65].

case, all traces can be neglected since $k^2 = (k)^2 \qquad_{QCD} = m_Q$. This means that the same light-cone distribution function F (x) that emerged in the massless case describes the line shape if $m_q m_Q$ as well. The only change that occurs is a shift of the end point spectrum, as a whole, to the left. Indeed, if previously the variable x was de ned as (2=) E (1=2)m_Q], now when $m_q \notin 0$

$$\mathbf{x} = \frac{2}{-} (\mathbf{E} \quad \mathbf{E}_0)$$

where $E_0 = (2m_Q)^{-1} (m_Q^2 - m_q^2)$. The maximum of the distribution, in particular, shifts from $m_Q = 2$ to $E_0 = m_q = 2$ O().

W hat happens if one continues to increase m_q ? Increasing the quark m as further results in m ore drastic changes. The trace term s can not be om itted any m ore, and the light-cone function gives place to other distribution functions. This is obvious already from a simple kinem atical argument. Indeed, with m_q increasing the window shrinks. When we eventually come to the SV lim it

$$QCD$$
 m m Q m q m $Q;q$

it shrinks to zero. In this limit the photon energy in the two-body quark decay, m (1+ m (2m $_{Q}$) ¹) di ers from the maxim alphoton energy in the hadronic decay, M (1+ M (2M $_{Q}$) ¹), only by a tiny amount inversely proportional to m $_{Q}$ (m and M stand for the quark and m eson m ass di erences, respectively).

Thus, the kinematical consideration prompts us that the line shape must essentially change. Anticipating the results of the calculation let me describe the situation pictorially. Simultaneously with the shrinkage of the window the peak becomes more asymmetric and develops a two-component structure (Fig. 8). The dominant component of the peak, on its right-hand side, becomes narrower and eventually collapses into a delta function when m_q becomes a nite fraction of m_Q . A shoulder develops on the left-hand side; the number of the hadronic states populating the end point dom ain becomes smaller { instead of $m_Q = QCD$ states at $m_q = 0$ we are speaking of just several states at $m_q = a$ nite fraction of m_Q . When we approach the SV limit the height of the shoulder corresponding to the production of the excited states becomes very small, proportional to $v^2 = 1$ (Fig. 9). This is the end of the evolution { starting from the light-cone distribution function at $m_q = 0$ we continuously pass to the tem poral distribution function in the SV limit. It is the tem poral distribution function function of Fig. 9.

This rather sophisticated picture, hardly reproducible in naive quark models, emerges from the operator product expansion (in the leading approximation) if one follows along the same lines as previously. The transition operator \hat{T} for $m_q \in 0$ is given in Eq. (2.20); I reproduce it here again for convenience,

$$\hat{T} = \frac{1}{m_q^2} \frac{k^2}{k^2} \sum_{n=0}^{n} Q = \frac{2m_Q + 2}{m_q^2 + k^2} Q; \qquad (4.10)$$

Notice that $2m_{Q=0} + 2^{-2}$ acting on Q yields zero (the equation of motion) and in the SV lim it q must be treated as a small parameter,

$$q_0 = m_Q \quad E = m_Q = v \quad 1;$$

v is the spatial velocity of the heavy quark produced. Although v is small the inclusive description is still valid provided that m $_{\rm QCD}$.

In the zeroth order in q the only term surviving in the sum (4.10) is that with n = 0, and we are left with the single pole, the elastic contribution depicted on F ig. 9. This is the extrem e realization of the quark-hadron duality. The inclusive width is fully saturated by a single elastic peak. We have already discussed this phenom enon in Lecture 2. W hat m ight seem to be a m iracle at rst sight has a symmetry explanation { the phenom enon is explained by the heavy quark symmetry. The fact that the parton-m odelm on ochrom atic line is a survivor of hadronization is akin to the M ossbauer elect.

If terms 0 (v^2) are switched on the transition operator acquires an additional part,

$$\hat{T}_{v^2} = \frac{4}{3} q^2 \frac{1}{(m_q^2 - k^2)^3} \sum_{n=0}^{k^2} \frac{2m_Q}{m_q^2 - k^2} Q_{i} Q_{i} Q_{i} Q$$
(4.11)

From this expression it is obvious that the shape of the v^2 shoulder is given by the tem poral distribution function G (x) whose m on ents are introduced through the matrix elements z

$$hH_{Q} jQ_{i} n_{0} Q_{j} H_{Q} i = n+2 \quad dxx^{n}G(x): \qquad (4.12)$$

A lternatively, G (x) can be written as a W ilson line along the time direction,

$$G(\mathbf{x}) / dt e^{i\mathbf{x}t} h H_{Q} \mathbf{j} (t = 0; \mathbf{x} = 0) = 0 \quad i e^{i \frac{R_{t}}{0} A_{Q}(\mathbf{x}) d} = i Q \quad (t; \mathbf{x} = 0) \mathbf{j} H_{Q} \quad (t = 0; \mathbf{x} = 0) \quad (4.13)$$

Intuitively it is quite clear why the light-cone distribution function gives place to the temporal one in the SV limit. Indeed, if the massless nal quark propagates along the light-cone, for m m the quark q is at rest in the rest frame of Q, i.e. propagates only in time.

In term sofG (x) our prediction for the line shape following from Eq. (4.11) takes the form " $_{2}$! #

$$\frac{d}{dE} / 1 \frac{v^2}{3} \frac{1}{y^2} + \frac{=E_{max}}{y} G(y) dy (x) + \frac{v^2}{3} \frac{1}{x^2} + \frac{=E_{max}}{x} G(x); \qquad (4.14)$$

where $x = (E = E_{max}) = .$ The v^2 corrections a ect both, the elastic peak (they reduce the height of the peak) and the shoulder (they create the shoulder). The total decay rate stays intact, however: the suppression of the elastic peak is compensated by the integral over the inelastic contributions in the shoulder. This is the B jorken

sum rule thoroughly considered in Lecture 3. It is important that we do not have to guess or make ad hoc assumptions { a situation typical for model-building { QCD itself tells us what distribution function enters in this or that case and in what particular way.

4.4 RealQCD: Inclusive sem ileptonic decays

From the analysis presented above the following remarkable fact should be clear. The very same primordial distribution functions that determ ine the line shape in the radiative transitions appear in the problem of the spectra in the semileptonic decays. In particular, in b! ul we deal with F(x).

Of course, kinem atical conditions are di erent. Now the hadronic part of the process, B! X_ul inclusive decay, depends on two variables, for instance, q and q^2 , or q_b and jqj. The probability of the decay, in the free quark approximation, is proportional to (m_{0}) đ jej) [66]. In other words, in this approximation only a line on the q; jejplane is populated (Fig. 10). (I assume that we are not interested in the individualm om enta of land and measure just the totalm om entum of the lepton pair. This is quite a fantastic formulation of the problem since experimentally the neutrino energy and momentum are not measured, of course; only the electron energy is usually measured. Nevermind, let us keep in mind a gedanken experiment.) The end point dom ain is de ned now as a band whose width is several units OCD adjacent to the above quark line (Fig. 10). Needless to say that in the physical decay the whole large triangle is populated; the inner part of the triangle, to the left of the end point band, is due to the hard gluon em ission. The sm earing of the delta-like spectrum in the band is due to the prim ordial motion of binside B, and is described by the light cone distribution.

A trivialm odi cation com pared to Sect. 4.3 is the occurrence of several structure functions. All ve structure functions are expressible, however, in terms of the same light cone primordial distribution function F(x) where, as previously, x =

 $^1k^2 {=} 2k_0$. Since q_0 and q are independent variables in the case at hand

$$\mathbf{x} = {}^{1}\mathbf{k}^{2} = 2\mathbf{k}_{0} = {}^{1}\mathbf{k}^{2} = (\mathbf{k}_{0} + \mathbf{j}\mathbf{\tilde{x}}\mathbf{j}) = {}^{1}(\mathbf{m}_{Q} + \mathbf{j}\mathbf{\tilde{x}}\mathbf{j})$$
(4.15)

where in the denom inator the di erence between k_0 and jkj is neglected which is perfectly legitim ate in the end point band. In this band k_0 jkj=0 ($_{QCD}$), and the di erence between k_0 and jkj becomes important only at the level of the subleading twists which are not included anyway.

Thus, we observe a scaling behavior: the structure functions that generally speaking could depend on two variables, q_0 and jgj actually depend only on the single light-cone combination (4.15). This is the analog of the B jorken scaling in deep inelastic scattering! In the rest of the phase space, outside the end point band, the approximate equality k_0 jjj is not valid, of course, and the above scaling is not going to take place. The primordial distribution falls o { presum ably exponentially { outside the end point band. The hard gluon emissions will populate the phase space outside this domain creating long logarithm ic tails. The primordial part is buried under these tails. Therefore, outside the band one can not expect that the structure functions depend on the single combination $q_0 + j_{\rm p}$ janyway.

Guesses about a scaling behavior in the inclusive sem ileptonic decays are known in the literature [66]. Now we are nally able to say for sure what sort of scaling takes place, where it is expected to hold and where and how it will be violated.

I will not go into further details which are certainly important if one addresses the problem of extraction of V_{ub} from experimental data. Some of them are discussed in the literature, others still have to be worked out. Applications of the theory to data analysis is a separate topic going beyond the scope of this lecture.

W hat can be said about the light cone distribution function F (x)? This function depends on the structure of the light cloud of the B m eson and, thus, belongs to the realm of the soft physics. Them on ents of this function are related to the expectation values of the operators Q_{-1} ::: $_{n}Q$ (see Eq. (4.5)); in real QCD the properly norm alized m atrix elements on the left-hand side include the factor (2M $_{\rm B}$) ¹). The know ledge of the in nite set of these expectation values would be equivalent to the know ledge of the structure of the light cloud. N eedless to say that this is beyond our abilities at present. Still, we know a few rst m on ents of F (x) and have a general idea of the shape of this function. It must be positive everywhere in the physical dom ain, vanish at x = 1 and have exponential fall-o at large negative x. The latter property ensures the existence of all m on ents. M oreover,

$$a_{0} = {}^{Z} dxF (x) = 1;$$

$$a_{1} = {}^{Z} dxxF (x) = 0;$$

$$a_{2} = {}^{Z} dx x^{2}F (x) = \frac{2}{2 \cdot 2};$$

and

E stim ates of the third m on ent also exist in the literature [59, 42]. I can not dwell on this issue now and will only m ention that a_3 is constrained by exact inequalities, i.e. [63]

$$a_2 < \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{4} = a_3; a_3 < \frac{1}{4} = a_2 = \frac{1}{2}^2:$$
 (4.16)

To derive these inequalities one merely observes that for any t the integral from

1 to 1 over x over the function $(1 \times)(x + tF(x))$ is positive; on the other hand this integral is a second order polynom ial in t and, hence, its discrim inant must be negative.

A sketch of a function satisfying all these requirements is given on Fig. 11.

A natural desire to extend the form alism described above to the sem ileptonic inclusive transitions b! cl encounters serious technical di culties. The essence of the problem is as follows. The nalquark c can be treated as heavy, although

at the same time, m_c^2 , m_b^2 . The ratio $m_c^2 = m_b^2$, 0.07 is a small parameter while $m_c^2 = (m_b)$. 1. Under the circum stances the type of the distribution function describing the primordial motion of b inside B and determining the measurable structure functions w_1 to w_5 will depend on the value of jgj and the scaling property { dependence on one particular combination of variables { is lost.

The q_b; jgj plane is shown on Fig. 12. In the free quark approximation the transition probability is proportional to $(m_b \quad q \quad E_c)$ where $E_q = (m_c^2 + q^2)^{1=2}$, and all events are concentrated along the line indicated on Fig. 12. At the hadronic level the phase space consists of the full triangle, with one side curved. The end point band is also curved.

The fact that one side of the triangle is distorted compared to b! ul is not crucial. W hat is important is the change of dynam ics as we move from the upper left corner to the lower right one. In the case of b! ul moving along the end point band in this direction does not a ect the measured structure functions (apart from the extrem e dom ain of soft u { the exclusive resonance dom ain { where our description fails altogether). The situation is di erent in the b! cl transition.

If jqf m²_c one recovers [62] the same light-cone function F (x) as in the transition b! ul or b! s. Modi cations are marginal. First, some extra terms explicitly proportional to m_c=m_b are generated in the structure functions due to the fact that $B + m_c$ replaces B in the num erator of the quark G reen function. M oreover, if in the b! ul transitions the scaling variable in the end-point dom ain is

$$x = {}^{1}(q_{\rm b} + j_{\rm g}j m_{\rm b}); \qquad (4.17)$$

in the b! cl transition it is shifted by a constant term of order 1,

$$\mathbf{x} = {}^{1}(\mathbf{q}_{0} + \mathbf{j}\mathbf{q}\mathbf{j} - \mathbf{m}_{b}) + \frac{{}^{m}{}^{2}_{c}}{{}^{m}{}_{b}}:$$
 (4.18)

To see how this shift occurs [62] and to reveal limitations of the approximation let us start from the parton model variable $m_b = q = E_c$. In the limit $jgf = m_c^2 ! 1$ inside the end point band form ally one may substitute E_c by

$$E_{c}$$
 ! $jgj + \frac{m_{c}^{2}}{2jgj}$! $jgj + \frac{m_{c}^{2}}{m_{b}}$ 1 + 0 ($m_{c}^{2} = m_{b}^{2}$) :

If $m_c^2 = 0$ (m_b) formally one may discard the 0 ($m_c^2 = m_b^2$) correction. In this way we arrive at the scaling variable (4.18).

It is worth emphasizing that the occurrence of the light-cone distribution function in this regime, the same as in the b! u transition, is a remarkable fact. Indeed, if we could exam ine the measured structure functions \in the microscope" in these two cases we would see that their microstructure is quite dierent. As was already mentioned, in the b! u transition the end point band is saturated by the production of m_b = states, with the spacing between the individual states of order 2 =m_b. In the b! c transition, even if we are in the upper left corner of the phase space where the light-cone distribution is relevant, the number of the states produced is

 $m_b=m_c$ $m_c=$ and the spacing is of order $^2=m_c$. We deal with a much coarser structure in the latter case, and still all resonance contributions being sum med up must add up to produce the light-cone distribution, form ally the same one that is created by a much larger number of resonances in the b! u transition. (Purely theoretically we can not predict ne grain versus coarse grain composition of the structure functions if we lim it ourselves to the leading twist. Only analysis of all twists could resolve these details, would this analysis be possible).

The word \form ally" is used above three times, not accidentally. Practically in the b! cl transition jgj can never be much larger than m_c . Indeed, the maximal value of jgj corresponding to $q^2 = 0$ is $(m_b^2 - m_c^2) = 2m_b - 2 \text{ GeV}$, that is only $1.5m_c$. Therefore, only by stretching a point and only in a narrow domain near $q^2 = 0$, one can expect that the light cone function of the variable (4.18) is, perhaps, more or less relevant.

As jqj decreases and becomes less than m_c (this regime takes place in a large part of the phase space) the light-cone distribution function becomes irrelevant. The measurable structure functions are determined by a dimensional distribution { the light-like vector n in Eq. (4.9) is replaced by

$$w = 1; \frac{q}{E_c};$$

and it becomes clear that the would be scaling variable $x = {}^{1}(q_{b} + E_{c} m_{b})$ fails to represent all dependence of the structure functions on q_{b} and jet. When q^{2} approaches its maximal value,

$$q_{max}^2 = (M_B M_D)^2;$$

jgj tends to zero and we eventually approach the SV regime which I have already discussed, with fascination, in the toy example above. In the SV lim it the velocity of H $_{\rm c}$ produced is small, and the structure functions probe the primordial motion described by the temporal distribution function G (x) where now

m is the quark mass di errence coinciding, to the leading order with M $_{\rm B}$ $\,$ M $_{\rm D}$.

Thus, changing q² from zero to q_{max}^2 results in an evolution of the distribution function appearing in theoretical form ulae for d (B ! X_cl), from light-cone to tem poral, through a series of interm ediate distributions. The physical reason for this evolution is quite clear { what distribution function is actually measured depends on the parton-model velocity of the quark produced in the b decay. In the limiting cases of very large recoil and very small recoil the problem is solved in the sense that the structure functions are expressed in terms of the light-cone and tem poral distribution functions, respectively. The interm ediate case jgj m_c is not worked out in detail so far. It is beyond any doubt, how ever, that the parton-m odel type scaling will not take place.

5 Lecture 5. Including H ard G luons. G eneralities of the O perator P roduct Expansion.

F inally the time comes when I can not ignore any more the existence of hard gluons. Hard gluons are mere nuisance from the point of view of the theory of hadrons since they play no, or very little, role in the structure of the low -lying hadronic states. Yet, if we want to go beyond purely academ ic exercises, however beautiful they might look, and descend down into a messy world of real hadronic physics, hard gluons can not be forgotten about since they \contam inate" nearly every experimentally measurable quantity. To make contact with the real world we have to consider interplay between the soft and hard physics.

The hard gluons manifest them selves in many ways. They contribute to the coe cient functions in the elective Lagrangian (1.3) obtained by integrating out all degrees of freedom with the characteristic frequencies down to . They show up in the calculations of the total decay rates and spectra discussed in Lectures 3 and 4 resulting in perturbative corrections which, in some instances, change the answer quite drastically. They result in the fact that allbasic parameters of the heavy quark physics { the heavy quark mass, 2 and so on { generally speaking, become dependent and can not be treated as universal constants. Here we will address som e of these issues in brief.

5.1 Calculation of the e ective Lagrangian

I have already started discussing this topic in Sect. 12. The original QCD Lagrangian (1.1) is formulated at very short distances. In principle, it codes all information necessary for calculation of all observable amplitudes. We just do the functional integral and ... A las, there are very few functional integrals that can be calculated analytically; num erical evaluation on lattices m ay take years, and I even dare to assert that some amplitudes will never be calculated that way. So, we take the original Lagrangian and start evolving it down, integrating out all uctuations with the frequencies $< ! < M_0$ where M_0 is the original normalization point, and

will be treated, for the time being, as a current parameter. In this way we get the Lagrangian which has the form

$$L = \sum_{n}^{X} C_{n} (M_{0};)O_{n}():$$
 (5.1)

The coe cient functions C_n represent the contribution of virtual momenta from to M_0 . The operators O_n enjoy full rights of the H eisenberg operators with respect to all eld uctuations with frequencies less than . The sum in Eq. (5.1) is in nite { it runs over all possible Lorentz singlet gauge invariant operators with the appropriate quantum numbers; for instance, if CP is conserved, only CP even operators will appear in (5.1). If, say, the electrom agnetic processes are included, the operators in the Lagrangian (5.1) may contain the photon and electron elds, and so on. All

operators can be ordered according to their dimension; moreover, we can use the equations of motion stemming from the original QCD Lagrangian to get rid of some of the operators in the sum. Those operators that are reducible to full derivatives give vanishing contributions to the physical (on mass shell) matrix elements and can thus be discarded as well.

If one just abstractly writes the expression (5.1) one is free to take any value of ; in particular, = 0 would mean that everything is calculated and we have the full S matrix, all conceivable amplitudes, at our disposal. Nothing is left to be done. In this case Eq. (5.1) is just a sum of all possible amplitudes. This sum then must be written in terms of the physical hadronic states, of course, not in terms of the quark and gluon operators since the latter degrees of freedom are simply non-existent at large distances.

This is day-dream inq, of course. Needless to say that in our explicit calculation of the coe cient functions we have to stop som ewhere, at such virtualities that the quark and gluon degrees of freedom are still relevant, and the coe cient functions $C_n M_0$;) are still explicitly calculable. On the other hand, for obvious reasons it is highly desirable to have as low as possible. In the heavy quark theory there is an additional requirement that must be much less than m_0 . The process of calculating the coe cients C $_{\rm n}$ (M $_{\rm 0};$) is called m atching in the more standard presentation of HQET. A ctually we see that this procedure is nothing else than a generalization of W ilson's idea of the renorm alization group and the (W ilsonean) operator product expansion. Using the standard OPE language has an evident advantage: all well-studied elements of the latter approach can be im mediately adapted in the environm ent of the heavy quark expansions. In particular all param eters one can read o from the Lagrangian (5.1) depend on (including, say, the heavy quark is large enough so that $_{s}()=$ mass). Let us assume that 1, on the one hand, and small enough so that there is no large gap between $_{\text{OCD}}$ and . The possibility to make such a choice of could not be anticipated apriori and is an extremely fortunate feature of QCD, a gift from the Gods. Quarks and gluons with the o shellness larger than chosen that way are called hard.

Needless to say that the parameter is in our minds, not in Nature. All observable amplitudes must be independent. The dependence of the coe cient functions C_n must conspire with that of the matrix elements of the operators O_n in such a way as to ensure this independence of the physical amplitudes.

W hat can be said about the calculation of the coe cients C $_n$? Since is su - ciently large, see above, the main contribution comes from perturbation theory. We just draw all relevant Feynm an graphs and calculate them, generating an expansion in $_s$ () which for brevity I will denote by $_s$, with the argument om itted,

$$C_n = \begin{bmatrix} X \\ a_1 \end{bmatrix}_{s}^{1}$$

Som etim es som e graphs will contain not only powers of $_{s}$ () but powers of $_{s} \ln (m_{Q} =)$. This happens if the anom alous dimension of the operator O $_{n}$ is nonvanishing { quite

a typical situation { or if a part of a contribution to C_n comes from characteristic momenta of order m_Q and is, thus, expressible in terms of ${}_{s}(m_Q)$, and we rewrite it in terms of ${}_{s}()$. Nevermind, this is a trivial technicality. You are supposed to know how to sum up these logarithms.

As a matter of fact the expression (5.1) is not quite accurate theoretically. One should not forget that, in doing the bop integrations, in C_n we must discard the dom ain of virtual momenta below , by de nition of C_n (). Subtracting this dom ain from the perturbative bop integrals we introduce in C_n power corrections of the type $(=m_Q)^n$ by hand. In principle, one should recognize the existence of such corrections and try to learn how to deal with them. The fact that they are there was realized long ago (see e.g. V. Novikov et al, Ref. [5]) and then largely ignored. If it is possible to choose su ciently small these corrections may be insigni cant num erically and can be om itted. This is what is actually done in practice. This is one of the elements of a simpli cation of the W ilsonean operator product expansion. The simpli ed version is called the practical version of OPE, see below. Certainly, at the modern stage of the theoretical development it is desirable to return to the issue to engineer a better procedure than just discarding these $=m_Q$ terms in the coe cient functions. Attempts in this direction are under way [67].

Even if perturbation theory dom inates in the coe cient functions they still contain also nonperturbative terms coming from short distances. Sometimes they are referred to as noncondensate nonperturbative terms. An example is provided by the so called direct instantons with the sizes of order m_Q^{-1} . These contributions fall o as high powers of $_{QCD} = m_Q$ and are very poorly controllable theoretically. Since the fall o of the noncondensate nonperturbative corrections is extremely steep, basically the only thing we need to know is a critical value of m_Q . For lower values of m_Q no reliable theoretical predictions are possible at present. For higher values of m_Q one can ignore the noncondensate nonperturbative contributions. There are good reasons to believe that the b quark, fortunately, lies above the critical point. A gain, I m ust add that the noncondensate nonperturbative contributions are neglected in the practical version of OPE.

(Do we see seeds of the nonperturbative contribution in Eq. (5.1)? Yes, we do. At any nite order the perturbative contribution is well-de ned. At the same time, if the coe cients in the series (5.1) grow factorially with 1 { and this is actually the case { the tail of the series, 1 > 1 = s, must be regularized which may bring in terms of order !

$$\exp\left(C = {}_{s}\left(m_{Q}\right)\right) \qquad \frac{QCD}{m_{Q}} \qquad (5.2)$$

where C is some positive constant and the exponent need not be integer. In a sense, one may say that contributions to C_n of this type are vaguely related to diagram s with 1 = s hard gluon loops.)

Thus, two sources of nonperturbative corrections in the physical am plitudes are indicated. Those due to nonperturbative terms in the coe cient functions are system atically ignored (and, perhaps, rightly so, as I tried to convince you) in these lectures and in allworks based on the practical version of OPE which constitute the overwhelm ing majority of all works devoted to the $1=m_{\odot}$ expansions. The second source is operators of higher dimensions in the Lagrangian (5.1), the so called condensate corrections. The latter were in the center of our attention; they generate the $1=m_0$ expansions discussed above. One new element which I would like to add here, is that the series of $1=m_0$ term s generated by higher-dimensional operators is also asymptotic and divergent in high orders [68]. Of course, we always calculate only one, at best two, rst $1=m_0$ corrections, truncating the series. If, however, one would ask what the impact of the high-order tail of the power series is, the answer would be: this tail is released in exponentially sm all terms $\exp(m_{\rm b})$. This type of contribution is certainly not seen in OPE truncated at any nite order. A transparent example is again provided by instantons. This time one has to \mathbf{x} ¹. Then their contribution to physical the size of the instanton by hand, $_0$ amplitudes is 0 (exp $(m_0 _0)$). The relation between exp $(m_0 _0)$ piece and the high-order term s of the power series is conceptually akin to the connection between exp (1 = s) term s and 1 = s orders in the perturbative expansion.

Sum marizing, W ilsonean OPE (5.1) leads to expansions in di erent param eters. Purely logarithm ic term s $(\ln m_Q)^{-1}$ are due to ordinary perturbation theory. Term s of the type $(m_Q^2)^{-k}(\ln m_Q)^{-1}$ re ect higher-dimension operators and direct instantons. In the former case the values of k are integer, the latter case may produce non-integer values of k. In the practical version of OPE we calculate the coe cient functions perturbatively. All non-perturbative term s com e from condensates within this approximation. The condensate power series is truncated: only those operators whose dimension is smaller than some number are retained.

The practical version of OPE was heavily used in connection with the QCD sum rule method. It was checked [27] that in the majority of channels this is a valid approximation allowing one to calculate in the Euclidean domain down to as low as 0.6 or 0.7 GeV. The validity of this approximation is an element of luck; it relies, among other things, on the fact that $_{QCD}$ is significantly smaller than 1 GeV, and $_{s}$ (1GeV) = is already a small parameter.

I hasten to add that some exceptional channels where the practical version of OPE fails at much larger values of were detected in the analysis of glueballs [69]. It would be interesting to explore the issue in the context of the heavy quark theory. The existing theory gives no clues for establishing the dom ain of validity of the practical version of OPE from rst principles, neither does it tell us about when the exponential terms, not visible by standard methods, become negligibly small. At this point we have to rely on indirect methods and phenomenological information.

5.2 Untangling hard gluons from soft ones

The coe cient functions C $_n$ in Eq. (5.1) contain, generally speaking, an in nite number of perturbative terms, and non-perturbative contributions of di erent types. Practically we often calculate them to the rst nontrivial order. For instance, in

Lecture 3 we treated the transition operator in the Born approximation; thus, all coe cients in OPE were found to order 0_s . For a number of purposes (although not always, of course) such a calculation, ignoring the hard gluon exchanges altogether, is quite su cient. Let me rem ind that by hard gluons Im ean those with o shellness from up to m_Q . Let us ask a question { can one nd a theoretical parameter which would justify the approximation of no hard gluon exchanges? In other words, does a parameter exist that would allow one to switch the hard gluons on/o?

Each extra hard loop contains the running gauge coupling $_{s}()$,

$$\frac{s()}{m} = \frac{2}{b} \ln \frac{! \#_{1}}{QCD}$$
(5.3)

where b is the rst coe cient of the Gell-M ann-Low function,

$$b = \frac{11}{3} N_{c} - \frac{2}{3} n_{f}$$
:

If we could make b very large the running law of s would be very steep e ectively switching o all hard gluons. Indeed, once is bigger than, say, 2 _{OCD} and b! 1 the gauge coupling constant $_{\rm s}$ ()! 0. The rst idea which immediately comes to one's m ind is to m ake b large by tending the number of $colors N_c$ to in nity. A las, this idea does not work. It is known from the early days of QCD that the expansion parameter in all planar diagrams is N_{c} , not sitelf [2]. Thus, the diagram of Fig. 13 is of the same order in N $_{\rm c}$ as the Born graph of Fig. 1. So, we have to rely on num erical sm allness of 1=b. For instance, in the theory with three light avors and three colors b = 9, quite a large number. This is not the rst time in physics we have to dealwith num erical enhancem ents. It is true that it is always better to have an adjustable parameter, which could be sent to in nity at will, than to deal with just a large xed number. It is quite unfortunate that we do not have such a parameter at our disposal in the real world QCD. If one still wants to have b as an adjustable parameter one could try a trick. Let us assume that, apart from quarks and gluons, our theory contain quark ghost elds. These ghost elds are perfectly the same as the quark elds, with a single exception { each ghost loop has an extra minus sign. The quark ghost elds may or may not have a mass term. Let us say that they do have a mass term m_{qh} equal to $_{OCD}$. Then they would automatically decouple in the soft contributions. The action of such a crazy theory has the form

$$iS = iS_{QCD} + \bigvee_{q} q_{gh} (iB m_{gh})q_{gh} =$$
$$iS_{QCD} N_{gh} \ln \det fiB m_{gh} g$$
(5.4)

where S_{QCD} is the action of quantum chromodynamics, see Eq. (1.1), and N_{gh} is the number of the quark ghosts, a free parameter assumed to be large. Notice the ghostly minus sign in front of the logarithm of the determinant. A fler some thinking one may conclude that, perhaps, this theory is not so crazy. Let us postulate that the initial particles we consider belong to our world { B, D and so on { i.e. they do not carry these quark ghosts. Of course, if B decays the quark ghosts do appear in the nal state, and the probability of their em ission is negative. This does not mean, however, that the total amplitude is not unitary, as one could suspect from the fact that we introduced the elds with a wrong metric. Indeed, it is obvious that the only role of the quark ghosts is to switch o all hard gluons in the limit $N_{\rm gh}$! 1 since in this limit

$$b = 11 \quad \frac{2}{3}N_{f} + \frac{2}{3}N_{gh} ! 1$$

and $_{\rm s}()$! 0, according to Eq. (5.3). In particular, the diagram of Fig. 13 where the gluon line is dressed with the bubble insertions vanishes. All soft contributions with $<_{\rm QCD}$ remain intact, however, and the positivity of the forward scattering am plitudes is not violated.

If there exists a stringy representation of QCD it should refer to the fake QCD", Eq. (5.2), rather than to the real one since in the string am plitudes there is no place for hard gluons.

The idea of treating b as a num erically large parameter is not new in QCD. In the purely perturbative calculations it constitutes the basis of the so called BLM approach [70]. O riginally the BLM approach was engineered as a scale-setting procedure intended as a substitute for full computations of 0 ($\frac{2}{s}$) corrections. A sum e that 0 ($_{\rm s}$) corrections in some amplitude are known exactly. In order $\frac{2}{s}$ typically one has to deal with a large number of graphs. The idea is to pick up only those which contain a \large parameter", b_{s}^{2} , presum ing that the graphs without b are num erically suppressed. Typically there are very few graphs producing b $^2_{\rm s}$. By doing so we can approximately determine the scale in the O ($_{\rm s}$) term without labor and time-consuming calculation of a large number of all $\frac{2}{s}$ contributions. Later, it was suggested [71, 72] to extend the prescription of the \b graph dom inance" to even higher orders, a more extrem ist and dangerous approach. In both cases the lim it of large b is used to get som e inform ation about perturbation theory. I use this limit in order to switch o the perturbative hard gluons in the rst place pushing the theory to the mode where only the soft gluons survive, hopefully providing a m ore transparent picture of the infrared dynam ics determ ining the regularities of the hadronic world.

5.3 Im pact of hard gluons

Having said all that let us return to the real world where b is xed, not in nity, and exam ine several examples of corrections due to hard gluons. An instructive example to begin with is the calculation of the coe cient in front of the chromom agnetic operator $O_{\rm G}$ in the elective Lagrangian $L_{\rm heavy}$ (), see Eq. (1.3) ¹¹ This coe cient

 $^{^{11}\,{\}rm In}$ the lim it b ! 1 the coe cient given in this expression does indeed vanish, in full accord with the argument of the previous section.

takes into account virtual gluons with o shellness from \circ to m $_{\circ}$.

The line of reasoning is as follows. Our starting point is $= m_Q$. At this norm alization point the Lagrangian we deal with is the QCD Lagrangian (1.1) with the coupling constant and heavy quark mass norm alized at m_Q . We then descend a little further, down to equal to a nite fraction of m_Q , say, $m_Q=5$. This is su cient to make the Q quark nonrelativistic and make all nonrelativistic expansions work. Being interested only in logarithm s of m_Q we ignore any nonlogarithm ic $_s$ corrections that may appear at this stage. The nonrelativistic expansion of the Lagrangian Q (in m_Q)Q implies that the operator Q (i=2) GQ appears with the coe cient C $_0 = 1 = (2m_Q)$. Further evolution down to = several units $_{QCD}$ will change C; in particular, at one loop

$$C_0 ! C() = C_0 1 + \frac{s}{4} \ln \frac{m_Q^2}{2} + \text{non-log term s}$$
 (5.5)

I

where is a number. Our goal is to nd and then sum up all leading logarithms. This is not the end of the story, however, if one wants to represent the result in the form (1.3), where the sum over the operators includes only the Lorentz invariant ones. The leading operator is L^0_{heavy} (). The coe cient C () should be represented as

$$C() = C_0 + (C() - C_0);$$

then C_0 is swallowed back in the de nition of L_{heavy}^0 () while the expression in the brackets represents c_G in Eq. (1.3).

The relevant one-bop graphs are depicted on Fig. 14. At st sight the number of diagram s is rather large, and the computation might seem rather cumbersom e. My task is to reduce it to a back-of-the-envelope calculation by using several smart observations and the background eld technique.

First of all, as it was already mentioned, we will be hunting only for the term s containing $_{\rm s} \ln m_{\rm Q} =$ om itting all $_{\rm s}$ term s without logarithm s. The logarithm s $\ln m_{\rm Q} =$ have a dual nature { they appear from the loop integrations where the integrands presents an infrared lim it with respect to heavy quarksQ while presenting simultaneously the ultraviolet lim it with respect to gluons. That is why they were called hybrid in Ref. [50], the paper where these logarithm s were discovered. In the language of HQET they are referred to as matching logarithm s.

Secondly, in this perturbative calculation we will naturally discard all 1=m $_{\rm Q}$ corrections.

The closed circle on the diagram s of Fig. 14 denotes the vertex (i=2) $^{\rm ij}{\rm G}_{\rm ij}$ =

~B'. Let us consider for de niteness only one term with i; j = 1; 2, i.e. $_zB_z$ keeping in m ind that other term s will give the sam e.

It is absolutely obvious that the graph of F ig. 14e gives no contribution in our approximation. Indeed, the very existence of this graph is due to the nonlinear term $[A_1A_2]$ in the denition of G_{12} . However, neither A_1 nor A_2 interact with the heavy quark in the leading in $1=m_Q$ approximation, as it is clear from Eq. (1.15), only A_0 . (We work in the rest frame of the heavy quark Q.)
Next, let us analyze the diagram s c and d. To this end it is convenient to write the gluon G reen function in the background eld. For a detailed exposition of the technique the reader is referred to the review paper [28]. For our purposes we need so little that it is quite in order to carry out all necessary derivations here. Let us split the four-potential A in two parts { the external eld (A)_{ext} and the quantum part a which will propagate in bops,

$$A = (A)_{ext} + a$$
 (5.6)

As explained in Ref. [28] the gauge conditions on (A)_{ext} and a may be di erent, for instance, the Fock-Schwinger gauge with respect to the background eld and the Feynman gauge with respect to the quantum eld. Here we do not need to discuss the gauge condition on (A)_{ext}. The quantum eld a will be treated in the Feynman gauge. The de nition of the gluon propagator in the background eld is standard:

$$D^{ab} = hT fa^{a} (x); a^{b} (0)gi:$$
 (5.7)

The Lagrangian of the quantum gluon eld in the Feynm an gauge has the form

$$L = \frac{1}{2} (D^{ext} a^{a})^{2} + g a^{a} (G^{b})_{ext} a^{c} f^{abc}$$
(5.8)

plus cubic and higher order term s in a plus the ghost term s { all irrelevant for the calculation at hand. Here

$$D^{ext}a^a = 0 a^a + gf^{abc}(A^b)_{ext}a^c$$
:

The second term in the Lagrangian (5.8) describes the interaction of the magnetic moment of the gluon quantum with the background edd. If we switch o this magnetic terms for a short while we immediately observe that both graphs, Fig. 14c and d, vanish. Indeed, the Lorentz structure of the rst term in Eq. (5.8) is such that the G reen function generated by it is obviously proportional to g . Hence the bops displayed on Figs. c and d can not be form ed. Say, the diagram c requires converting the a_i quantum leaving the vertex into the a_0 quantum coupled to the heavy quark. Let us now switch on the magnetic term and take into account the fact that the background eld is chrom om agnetic, not chrom oelectric (I rem ind that we are interested in the vertex $\neg B$.) This means that the graph c still vanishes since the conversion of a_i into a_0 can only take place in the chrom oelectric background (G $_{0i}^{\text{ext}}$). The diagram d is not vanishing, how ever, and is readily calculable. We start from the vertex

$$(i=2)Q^{12}G_{12}^{c}t^{c}Q!$$
 $(i=2)Q^{12}ga_{1}^{a}a_{2}^{b}f^{abc}t^{c}Q$;

make one insertion of the magnetic term in the Lagrangian (5.8),

and after that one can take the free gluon propagators, which yields

$$(i=2)2g^{2}Q^{-12}f^{abc}t^{c}Qf^{abb}G_{12}^{b}(i)^{2}i^{\frac{Z}{2}}\frac{1}{k^{4}}\frac{d^{4}k}{(2)^{4}}$$
(5.9)

where the factor 2 com es from two di erent ways of pairings. The integral over dk is evidently logarithm ically divergent both at the upper and lower ends and should be cut o at m_Q from above and at from below. This logarithm ic divergence should be welcome since in this way we are going to get the desired hybrid logarithm. Equation (5.9) immediately leads to

$$2\frac{N_{c}g^{2}}{16^{2}}$$
 (i=2) Q ¹²G^c₁₂t^cQ ln $\frac{m_{Q}^{2}}{2}$

where N_c is the number of colors (N_c = 3). In other words the factor produced by the one-loop graph of Fig. 14d is

$$j_{ig:14d} = 2N_c$$
: (5.10)

The last step in our exercise is calculation of the diagram s of Fig. 14a and b. The Feynm an integral for the diagram a is quite trivial,

$$g^{2} \frac{d^{4}k}{k^{4}} Q \frac{1}{k_{0}} t^{a} (- {}_{z}B_{z}^{b} t^{b}) t^{a} \frac{1}{k_{0}} Q (-i) \frac{1}{k^{2}}$$
(5.11)

where k is the virtual gluon m om entum. Now, a m inute relection shows that in the Abelian theory (i.e. if the gluons were photons and the diagram of Fig. 14a was considered in QED) this contribution must be exactly canceled by that coming from diagrams b. This assertion can be traced back to the nonrenormalization of the Q Q vertex in QED. (We should take into account the fact that the hybrid logarithms do not depend on the Lorentz structure of the vertex at all [50] and are the same for and .) This observation im plies that in QCD the net elect of the two diagrams 14b reduces to replacing Eq. (5.11) by

$$g^{2} \frac{d^{4}k}{k^{4}} \frac{1}{2} Q \quad t^{a} t^{b} t^{a}] + t^{a} t^{b} t^{a} \quad (\ _{z} B^{b}_{z}) Q \frac{i1}{k_{0}^{2}} \frac{i1}{k^{2}} = \frac{N_{c} g^{2}}{2} \frac{d^{4}k}{k^{4}} Q \quad (\ _{z} B^{b}_{z} t^{b}) Q \frac{i}{(k_{0} + i)^{2}} \frac{1}{k^{2} + i} :$$
(5.12)

The i prescription indicated explicitly de nes the integration contour (Fig. 15). We rst do the k_0 integration using the residue theorem, then the remaining d^3k integration and arrive at

$$\frac{N_{c}g^{2}}{16^{-2}} (i=2)Q (z^{2}B_{z}^{c}t^{c})Q \ln \frac{m_{Q}^{2}}{2}$$
(5.13)

leading to the following \dressing" factor due to diagram s 14b and c:

$$j_{ig:14a+b} = N_c ::$$
 (5.14)

The diagram 14f must be discarded in the background eld calculation { it merely renormalizes the gauge coupling constant included in the de nition of $O_{\rm G}$.

The overall one-loop dressing factor is obtained by adding up Eqs. (5.10) and (5.14),

$$= N_c = 3:$$
 (5.15)

Now the renormalization group allows us to sum up all leading log terms, in a standard manner; the summation leads to Eq. (1.4). The same result can be rephrased as follows: in the 1=m_Q expanded e ective Lagrangian L_{heavy} () the overall coe cient in front of O_G is

$$C() = \frac{s()}{s(m_{Q})}^{!} = \frac{3}{b} :$$
 (5.16)

This is nothing else than the relection of the hybrid anom alous dimension of the operator $O_{\rm G}$ found in Ref. [8].

It is curious to note that 0, the second operator of dimension 5 (see Eq. (3.6)), has vanishing anom alous dimension which can be proven with no calculations in no time.

To see that this is indeed the case we merely repeat the argument preceding and following Eq. (5.5). Let us assume for a short while that the hybrid anom alous dimension of the operator 0 is non-vanishing. Then after evolving to a low norm alization point its coe cient gets renormalized, and there is no way one could absorb 0 back into a Lorentz invariant expression Q ($\mathfrak{G} = \mathfrak{m}_Q$) in the elective Lagrangian. Needless to say that L_{heavy} () (before the 1=m_Q expansion) must be expressible in terms of the Lorentz invariant structures.

A close line of reasoning leading to the same conclusion takes advantage of the expansion (3.3),

$$QQ = \frac{1}{2m_{0}^{2}}Q\frac{i}{2} \quad GQ = Q_{0}Q = \frac{1}{2m_{0}^{2}}Q^{2} + \dots$$
(5.17)

where the dots denote terms of the higher order in $1=m_Q$. The left-hand side is Lorentz scalar while the right-hand side is written as a sum of terms that are not Lorentz scalars individually. Them atrix element of Q_0Q has the meaning of energy E (which at small velocities reduces to $m + p^2 = 2m$) while that of the second term on the right-hand side has the meaning of $p^2 = 2m$. The rst term is not renormalized by the gluon dressings, of course. If the coe cient of the second term was distorted by the anom alous dimension, the cancellation of the Lorentz noninvariant part would be ruined, and the right-hand side could not be equal to the left-hand side.

C oncluding this section let us discuss the impact of the hard gluons on the scaling law of, say, pseudoscalar coupling f_P de ned in Sect. 3.4. In this section it was

shown that $f_P = m_Q^{1=2} m$ odulo logarithm ic corrections. Now we address the issue of the logarithm ic corrections due to the hybrid anom alous dimension of the current Q₅q. Let us add to the original QCD Lagrangian the term $L = A Q_5 q$ where A is an auxiliary c-number eld and evolve L down to . The result of this evolution is the anom alous dimension

$$(Q _{5q})_{m_{Q}} = \frac{s()}{s(m_{Q})} (Q _{5q});$$

the subscript here indicates the norm alization point. The corresponding calculation is even simpler than that of the anom alous dimension of O_G and will not be discussed here. The interested reader is referred to Ref. [50] or to review papers [4]¹². Correspondingly the complete asymptotic scaling law of f_P is f_P $m_0^{1=2}$ ($_s$ (m_0)) ^{2=b}.

5.4 dependence of the basic parameters of the heavy quark theory. M easuring ()

The Lagrangian (1.3) summarizes the evolution from a high normalization point down to . Since all operators in this Lagrangian are normalized at it is perfectly natural that their matrix elements are also dependent. In particular, the matrix elements of O_G and O denoted by $_{\rm G}^2$ and 2 in Lecture 3 dependent . A ctually, $_{\rm G}^2$ depends on rather strongly, through logarithms of { this is explicitly demonstrated by the fact that (O_G)_{m_Q} = ($_{\rm s}$ () = $_{\rm s}$ (m_Q)) ^{3=b}(O_G). In this case hardly anybody would even think about tending ! O. As for the operator O , the situation here is trickier. As we saw, it has no diagonal anom alous dimension, still some dependence appears through mixing with QQ, see [25] for details.

Let us discuss now , another basic parameter of the heavy quark theory. The issue of its dependence was at the epicenter of a heated debate recently. By itself never appears in L_{heavy} ; moreover the quark mass m_Q appears in the $1=m_Q$ expanded e ective Lagrangian (1.11) only through $1=m_Q$ corrections. Therefore, in the lim it m_Q ! 1 (which is offen identied with HQET) it is quite tempting to say that $= M_{H_Q}$ m_Q is a universal constant. For a few years it was taken for granted that such a constant exists. W ithin the fram ework of our approach based on the W ilsonean treatment of fullQCD it is perfectly clear that this is not the case. The quark mass in Eq. (1.3) explicitly depends on resulting in a dependence of .

Since the issue is of importance let us rephrase this statement as follows. Since quarks are permanently conned the notion of the heavy quark mass becomes ambiguous. To eliminate this ambiguity one must explicitly specify the procedure of measuring \the heavy quark mass". The de nition through the elective Lagrangian

 $^{^{12}}$ The wording in these reviews is som ewhat di erent. You will read about the matching logarithms of HQET for the axial current. Technically this is perfectly the same as the anom alous dimension within our approach.

(1.3) is consistent. O ther de nitions are certainly conceivable; any consistent procedure will necessarily involve a cut-o parameter , and then () = M $_Q$ m $_Q$ ()¹³.

The e ective Lagrangian (1.3) is not something you directly measure, neither is m_Q . Dening or m_Q is equivalent to saying how they are measured, how the parameters in the elective Lagrangian are related to measurable quantities. To this end one can use any suitable prediction of the heavy quark theory, in particular, Voloshin's sum rule (2.35). To avoid inessential technicalities I will discuss the issue in the framework of the toy model of Sect. 2.1. All results can be immediately extended to the realQCD.Equation (2.35) gives a nice denition of in terms of a measurable quantity, the average value of E_0^{phys} E where E is the energy of the quantum. The problem is that in Sect. 2.1 we discussed the question switching o allhard gluons, so that the above average value looked like a independent number. To see where the dependence comes from we must include hard gluon corrections.

If the gluon eld is treated only as a soft medium the spectrum of the decay $H_Q \ ! \ X_q +$ boks roughly as on Fig. 9. The shoulder to the left of the elastic peak arises due to production of the excited states. It is important that in this approximation the spectrum rapidly (exponentially) decreases outside the end point domain, so that the entire region of E from zero up to E_0^{phys} several units $_{QCD}$ remains unpopulated. The average

$$\int_{0}^{Z_{E_{0}^{phys}}} dE (E_{0}^{phys}) E - \frac{1}{0} \frac{d}{dE}$$

is then a well-de ned number independent of m_Q or any cut-os.

The situation drastically changes once we include hard gluon emission. In calculating radiative gluon correction we can disregard, in the leading approximation, nonperturbative e ects, like the dierence between m_Q and M_{H_Q} or the motion of the initial quark inside H_Q. Thus we deal with the decay of the free quark Q at rest into q+ + gluon. The virtual gluon contribution merely renormalizes the constant h in the analysis presented above and is irrelevant.

The e ects from real gluon em ission are most simply calculated in the Coulomb gauge, where only the graph shown in Fig. 13 contributes. A straightforward computation yields [25, 31] to leading order in v^2

$$\frac{d^{(1)}}{dE} = -\frac{8}{9} \frac{8}{9} \frac{E^{3}}{E_{0}m_{0}^{2}} \frac{1}{E_{0} - E} :$$
(5.18)

 $^{^{13}}$ In the literature you can dissertions that an \absolute" heavy quark mass, or the so-called pole mass, can be defined and can be shown to be a universal number independent of any cutors. These assertions are false. The notion of the pole mass exists only to a given nite order of perturbation theory. No consistent definition of the pole mass can be given already at the level of the leading nonperturbative corrections O (1=m_Q). The notion of the pole mass is absolutely foreign to the approach I present here, therefore, I do not want to go into details, see [73]. I will only say that it assumes it is possible to separate perturbative contributions from nonperturbative (?!) in contradiction with our approach which separates soft contributions from hard.

H and gluon em ission obviously contributes to the spectrum in the entire interval $0 < E < E_0^{phys}$ creating a long \radiative" tail to the left of the end point dom ain. (note that in this calculation one can put E_0^{phys} to E_0). In the rst order calculation $_s$ does not run, of course. Its scale dependence shows up only in the two-loop calculation; it is quite evident, how ever, that it is $_s (E = E_0)$ that enters. Therefore, strictly speaking, one cannot apply Eq. (5.18) too close to E_0 . Even leaving aside the blow ing up of $_s (E = E_0)$, there exists another reason not to use Eq. (5.18) in the vicinity of E_0 : if E is close to E_0 , the em itted gluon is soft; such gluons are to be treated as belonging to the soft gluon medium in order to avoid double counting.

The separation between soft and hard gluons is achieved by explicitly introducing a norm alization point . The value of should be large enough to justify a small value for $_{\rm s}$ (). On the other hand we would like to choose as small as possible. We then draw a line: to the left of E $_0$ the gluon is considered to be hard, to the right soft. At E < E $_0$ the experimentally measured spectrum must follow the one-loop formula (5.18), see Fig. 16.

Let us return now to Voloshin's sum rule, i.e. the rst moment of E _0^{phys} E, with radiative corrections included. A qualitative sketch of how d =dE looks now is presented in Fig. 16. Because of the tail to the left of the end point dom ain we can not de ne as the value of E _0^{phys} E averaged over the entire range of the energy, $0 < E < E_0^{phys}$. The integral would be proportional to _sm_0 because of the dom ain of sm allE. Besides, this would contradict the physical meaning of what we want to de ne. By evolving the e ective Lagrangian down to we include all gluons harder than in m₀, thus excluding them from . Thus, we must accept that

$$() = \frac{\sum_{\substack{\text{phys}\\ \text{E}_{0}^{\text{phys}}}}{\sum_{\substack{\text{phys}\\ 0}}} \frac{2}{v_{0}^{2}} \frac{1}{u_{0}} \frac{d}{dE} (E_{0}^{\text{phys}} E) dE:$$
(5.19)

Since the explicit form of the tail to the left of the end point dom ain is known (for small $_{s}$ () = the physical spectrum is supposed to tend to the perturbative result) the dependence of becomes obvious,

$$= \frac{16}{9} \frac{()}{3} :$$
 (5.20)

Equation (5.19) provides us with one possible physical de nition of () (am ong others) relating this quantity to an integral over a physically measurable spectral density. The pole-m assbased de nition, being applied to our example, would involve three steps: (i) Take the radiative perturbative tail to the left of the shoulder and extrapolate it all the way to the point $E = E_0$; (ii) subtract the result from the measured spectrum; (iii) integrate the di erence over dE with the weight function $(E = E_0^{\text{phys}})$. The elastic peak drops out and the remaining integral is equal to $_0 (v^2=2)$. It is quite clear that this procedure cannot be carried out consistently { there exists no unam biguous way to extrapolate the perturbative tail too close to E_0^{phys} , the end point of the spectrum. Our procedure, with the norm alization point introduced explicitly, is free from this am biguity.

In practice, the dependence of () may turn out to be rather weak. This is the case if the spectral density is such as shown in Fig. 16, where the contribution of the rst excitations (lying within $_{QCD}$ from $E_0^{\rm phys}$) is numerically much larger than the radiative tail representing high excitations. It is quite clear that if the physical spectral density resembles that of Fig. 16 and = several units $_{QCD}$, the running () is rather insensitive to the particular choice of .

It remains to be added that a similar de nition of () works in realQCD. Here it may be de ned through an integral over the spectrum in the decay B ! X_{cl} measured in the domain where the recoil of the hadronic system is small, jgj m_c, i.e. in the SV limit.

5.5 Hard gluons and the line shape

A ctually we have already started considering this question in the previous section where the radiative correction to the spectrum in the decay H_Q ! X_q + was found in the SV lim it. In this case the impact of the hard gluons is mild { they provide a long but squeezed tailoutside the end point dom ain which could be evaluated in the leading (one-loop) approximation. The reason why there are no violent distortions of the spectrum is simple: the q quark produced is slow, and slow quarks do not like to emit hard gluons. If the nal quark was fast it would produce gluons like crazy through brem sstrahlung, and the impact of such brem sstrahlung on the line shape would be much more drastic. As a matter of fact, if m_q ! 0 one can not lim it oneself to any nite number of gluons { an in nite sequence of the so called Sudakov (or double-log) corrections must be summed over.

By de nition the Sudakov corrections are those in which each power of s is 2E). When one approaches accompanied by two powers of logarithm $\ln m_0 = (m_0)$ the end point dom ain the logarithm inevitably becom es large, and overcom pensates the sm allness of the gauge coupling constant $_{\rm s}$. So, the m ore gluons em itted the higher the probability. The phenom enon is classical in nature and has a transparent physical interpretation. Indeed, in the initial state H_0 the color eld in the light cloud corresponds to a static source. The nal quark produced is very fast. The stationary state of the color eld corresponding to a fast-moving color charge is strongly di erent from that of the stationary charge. Therefore, the excess of the color led is just shaken o in the form of the multiple emission of gluons. If you forbid to emit a large number of gluons and insist that the nal state is just \one quark" (this would correspond to the two-body decay kinem atics and the deltafunction-like narrow spectrum) then the probability of such an improbable event is terribly suppressed. This explains why for the massless nalquarks the narrow peak in the end point dom ain obtained in Sect. 42 will be drastically distorted, and a well-developed tail to the left of the end point dom ain will appear.

The theory of the Sudakov corrections constitutes a noticeable part of the perturbative QCD, and here, of course, I have no possibility even to scratch the surface. I will give just a few hints referring the interested reader to the original papers and textbooks [74].

The rst order probability of emission of the massless gluon in the b! s decay is

$$\frac{1}{d!}\frac{d^2}{d!}\frac{g}{d!} = \frac{2}{3}\frac{s}{!}\frac{1}{(1 \cos \#)}$$
(5.21)

where ! is the gluon m on entum and # is its angle relative to the m on entum of the q quark. In this expression it is assumed that ! m_Q . As a matter of fact it is perfectly legitim ate to make this assumption since the double logarithm comes only from this domain of integration. The energy in the presence of a gluon in the nal state is given by

$$E = \frac{m_{b}^{2}}{2m_{Q}} \frac{2!}{2!} (m_{b} !) (1 \cos), \frac{m_{Q}}{2} \frac{k_{2}^{2}}{4!};$$
(5.22)
$$k_{2} ! #:$$

One starts from computing the (rst order) probability w (E) for the gluon to be emitted with such momentum that the quantum gets energy below given E. This probability is obtained by integrating the distribution (5.21) with the constraint that (m $_{Q}$ =2) (k =4!) is less than the given E,

w (E) =
$$\begin{bmatrix} z \\ d! \\ d\#^2 \\ \frac{1}{d!} \\ \frac{d^2 \\ g}{d! \\ d\#^2} \\ \frac{k_2^2}{4!} \\ \frac{m_Q}{2} \\ E \\ \frac{m_Q}{2} \\ E \\ \frac{1}{3} \\ \frac{m_Q}{m_Q} \\ \frac{m_Q}{m_Q} \\ \frac{m_Q}{2E} \\ \frac{m_Q}{m_Q} \\ \frac{$$

I integrated over $\#^2$ rst; the upper lim it of integration is of order one, the lower lim it is determined from the function in Eq. (5.23). Then we can carry out the ! integration. The upper lim it is $m_Q = 2$ while the lower lim it is seen from the same function,

$$! < \frac{m_Q}{2} = E$$
:

The function w (E) has the meaning of the probability of emission of a su ciently hard gluon lowering the energy below E. The all-order summation of double logs amounts then to merely exponentiating this probability [74],

$$S(E) = e^{w(E)}$$
: (5.24)

The spectrum then takes the form

$$\frac{1}{dE} \frac{d}{dE} = \frac{dS}{dE} :$$
 (5.25)

W e see that as E approaches the end point, E close to $m_Q = 2$, the spectrum gets suppressed, in full accord with our expectations, since the presence of the very hard does not allow, purely kinem atically, the gluon shower to develop and the color eld to restructure itself. Notice that the Sudakov corrections merely redistribute

the probability, since the full integral over the spectrum remains unchanged. They pump events out from the end point domain to lower values of E .

The double log approximation per se does not allow us to determ ine the scale of $_{\rm s}$ in the Sudakov exponent S (E). For practical purposes the scale setting is of course very important since exp(w (E)) is a steep function. The question goes far beyond the scope of this lecture. Some partial answers can be found in Refs. [75, 76], see also [63]; su ce it to mention here that $_{\rm s}$ in Eq. (5.23) turns out to be [76] $_{\rm s}$ ($m_{\rm Q}$ 2E $m_{\rm Q}$). Another point deserving stressing is that with the classical Sudakov formula one can not travel over the energy axis too close to the end point E = $m_{\rm Q}$ =2 (even after the scale setting). Indeed, if E > ($m_{\rm Q}$ =2) the gluons em itted become too soft; such gluons constitute the soft gluon medium and have nothing to do with the perturbative calculation; they have to be referred to the prim ordial distribution function. Equation (5.23) is applicable provided that

 m_Q 2E m_Q :

If we come closer to the end point dom ain the classical Sudakov factor must be modi ed by cutting o and discarding the contribution of the soft gluons. This idea gained recognition only recently; it is obviously premature to further immerse into this topic for the time being.

If the e ect of the hard (perturbative) gluon em ission is known the full physical spectrum is obtained by convoluting the perturbative one with the prim ordial distribution function,

$$\frac{d (E)}{dE} = (E)^{Z} dyF(y) \frac{d_{Q}^{pert}(E (=2)y)}{dE} : (5.26)$$

Integration over y runs from 1 to 1 (m ore exactly, the lower lim it of integration is $y_0 = m_0 = but$ this di erence can be ignored). One should keep in m ind that $d_0^{\text{pert}} = dE$ is nonvanishing only in the interval $(0; m_0 = 2)$. The convolution form ula above is legitim ate only as long as one does not apply it to the very low energy part, E; further details are presented in Ref. [63].

A C K N O W LED G M E N T S: I am grateful to Prof. D. Soper and Prof. K. M ahanthappa for their kind invitation to deliver these lectures at TASI-95. The rst two lectures were prepared during my visit to N agoya U niversity in N ovem ber and D ecem ber 1994. The visit becam e possible due to R esearch Fellow ship provided by JSPS. It is my pleasure to thank Prof. S. Saw ada, Prof. T. Sanda, Prof. K. Yam awakiand otherm embers of the T heory G roup of the N agoya U niversity forkind hospitality. C ountless fruitful discussions on all topics touched upon in these lectures with N. U raltsev, A. Vainshtein and M. Voloshin are gratefully acknow ledged. This work was supported in part by DOE under the grant num ber DE-FG 02-94ER 40823.

6 Figure Captions

Fig.1. The forward scattering amplitude Q ! Q. The dashed line denotes the quantum. The solid line connecting two vertices is the q quark G reen function in the background gluon eld. The thick solid lines describe the Q quarks in the background eld.

Fig. 2. The transition operator relevant to the total sem ileptonic width of the heavy m esons. The dashed lines denote the leptons, l and . O ther notations are the same as on Fig. 1.

Fig. 3. The two-point function (2.63). The wavy line is the external scalar or pseudoscalar current; the quark propagator is in the background eld.

Fig. 4. The two-point function of two scalar currents in the scalar QCD.

Fig. 5. The four-point function appearing in Eq. (2.64). The dashed line denotes the current Q $^{\rm y}G$ $\,$ Q .

Fig. 6. The three-point function relevant to the proof of the Isgur-W ise form ula.

Fig. 7. The \photon" spectrum in the decay $H_Q \ ! \ X_q$. The nalquark is assumed to be massless. The thick line represents the delta-function spectrum of the free quark approximation. The solid line is a sketch of the actual hadronic spectrum in the end point domain (possible radiation of hard gluons is neglected).

Fig. 8. Evolution of the spectrum of Fig. 7 as the mass of the nal quark increases (the schematic plot refers to $m_q = m_Q = 2$. The e ects of the hard gluon brem strahhlung are not included.

Fig. 9. The photon spectrum in the SV $\lim it, v^2$ 1. The dashed line shows the would be spectrum of the free quark decay.

Fig. 10. K inem atically allowed dom ain in the transition B ! X_ul . The thick line indicates the populated phase space in the free quark decay. The shaded area of width is the end point dom ain populated due to the primordial motion of the b quark inside B. The shaded square in the lower right corner is the exclusive resonance dom ain where the inclusive approach developed here is inapplicable.

Fig. 11. M ore or less realistic light-cone prim ordial distribution function versus x (borrowed from Ref. [63]).

Fig. 12. Kinem atically allowed domain in the decay B ! X_cl. Two large

circles show the domains where description should be based on the light cone and tem poral distribution functions, respectively.

Fig. 13. Correction of the storder in $_{\rm s}$ to the transition operator of Fig. 1. Shown is the only graph contributing to the imaginary part in the Coulomb gauge. The gluon is denoted by the curly line.

Fig. 14. One-loop diagrams determ in ing the coe cient c_{G} . The wavy line denotes the gluon quanta, dashed line background glion eld.

Fig. 15. Integration contour in the k_0 plane.

Fig. 16. A sketch of the photon spectrum in the SV limit with the hard gluon radiation included.

References

- V.Novikov, L.Okun, M.Shifman, A.Vainshtein, M.Voloshin and V.Zakharov, Phys. Reports 41 (1978) 1.
- [2] G. 't Hooff, Nucl. Phys. B 72 (1974) 461;
 E.W itten, Nucl. Phys. B 149 (1979) 285;
 for a review see e.g. S. Coleman, A spects of Symmetry (Cambridge University Press, 1985), page 351.
- [3] M.B.W ise, Phys. Rev. D 45 (1992) 2188;

Tung-Mow Yan, Hai-Yang Cheng, Chi-Yee Cheung, Guey-Lin Lin, Y.C. Lin, and Hoi-Lai Yu, Phys. Rev. D 46 (1992) 1148;

G.Burdm an and J.F.D onoghue, Phys. Lett. B 280 (1992) 287-291;

E.Jenkins, Recent Results in Chiral Perturbation Theory for Mesons Containing a Single Heavy Quark, Talk given at 28th Rencontres de Moriond QCD and High Energy Hadronic Interactions, Les Arcs, France, March 1993 [hepph/9305235];

M.B.W ise, Combining Chiral and Heavy Quark Symmetry, Lectures given at CCAST Symp.on Particle Physics at the Ferm i Scale, M ay 27 – Jun 4, 1993 [hep-ph/9306277].

- [4] For recent reviews see e.g. N. Isgur and M. B. W ise, in B Decays, Ed. B Stone (W orld Scienti c, Singapore, 1992); H. Georgi, in Perspectives in the Standard M odel, P roceedings of the T heoretical A dvanced Study Instituite, B oulder, C olorado, 1991, Ed. R K. Ellis, C. T. Hill, and J. D. Lykken (W orld Scienti c, Singapore, 1992); T. M annel, Heavy Q uark M ass Expansions in QCD, in Proc. of the W orkshop QCD { 20 Years Later, Eds. P. M. Zerwas and H A. K astrup (W orld Scienti c, Singapore, 1993), vol. 2, page 634; B. G rinstein, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. 42 (1992) 101; M. Neubert, Phys. Reports 245 (1994) 259; M. Voloshin, Topics in Heavy Q uark Physics, Lectures given at 22nd ITEP W inter School of Physics, M oscow, Russia, 22 February { 2 M arch, 1994, Prepringt TP I-M INN-94-18-T; B. G rinstein, An Introduction to Heavy M esons, Lectures given at 6th M exican School of Particles and Fields, V illaherm osa, M exico, O ctober 1994, Preprint UCSD -PTH-95-05 [hep-ph/9508227].
- [5] K.W ilson, Phys. Rev. 179 (1969) 1499;
 K.W ilson and J.Kogut, Phys. Reports 12 (1974) 75;
 see also V.Novikov, M.Shifm an, A.Vainshtein and V.Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. B 249 (1985) 445.
- [6] E.Shuryak, Nucl. Phys. B 198 (1982) 83.
- [7] G.P. Lepage, Lattice QCD for SmallComputers, in The Building Blocks of Creation, Proceedings of the 1993 Theoretical Advanced Study Institute, Eds.

S.Raby and T.Walker (W orld Scienti c, Singapore, 1994) [hep-lat/9403018]; M.Alford, W.Dimm, G.P.Lepage, G.Hockney, and P.B.Mackenzie, Lattice QCD for SmallComputers, Preprint FERM ILAB-PUB-95-199-T, 1995 [heplat/9507010].

- [8] A.Falk, B.Grinstein and M. Luke, Nucl. Phys. B 357 (1991) 185.
- [9] M. Shifm an and M. Voloshin, 1982, see in V. Khoze and M. Shifm an, U spekhi Fiz. Nauk 140 (1983) 3 [Sov. Phys. U spekhi 26 (1983) 387].
- [10] E.Eichten and B.Hill, Phys. Lett. B 234 (1990) 511;
 H.Georgi, Phys. Lett. B 240 (1990) 447.
- [11] J.D.B jorken and S.D.D rell, Relativistic Quantum Mechanics (M c G raw Hill, 1964).
- [12] V B.Berestetskii, E M. Lifshitz and L P.Pitaevskii, Quantum Electrodynamics, 2nd Edition (Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1982).
- [13] E. Shuryak, Phys. Lett. B 93 (1980) 134.
- [14] S.Nussinov and W.Wetzel, Phys. Rev. D 36 (1987) 130.
- [15] M. Voloshin and M. Shifman, Yad. Fiz. 47 (1988) 801 [Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. 47 (1988) 511].
- [16] N. Isgur and M. W ise, Phys. Lett. B 232 (1989) 113; Phys. Lett. B 237 (1990) 527.
- [17] A.F.Falk, H.Georgi, B.Grinstein, and M.B.Wise, Nucl. Phys. B 343 (1990) 1.
- [18] JD. B jorken, in Proceedings of the 4th Rencontres de Physique de la Vallee d'Aoste, La Thuille, Italy, 1990 ed. M. Greco (Editions Frontieres, Gif-Sur-Y vette, France, 1990), p. 583.
- [19] T.M anneland Z.Ryzak, Phys. Lett. B 247 (1990) 412;
 A.Falk and B.G rinstein, Phys. Lett. B 249 (1990) 314;
 J.K omer, D.Pirjoland C.Dom inguez, Phys. Lett. B 301 (1993) 257;
 B.G rinstein and P.M ende, Phys. Lett. B 299 (1993) 127.
- [20] P.Ball, H.Dosch, and M.Shifm an, Phys. Rev. D 47 (1993) 4077.
- [21] M E.Luke, Phys. Lett B 252 (1990) 447.
- [22] R. Crew ther, Phys. Rev. Lett. 28 (1972) 1421;
 M. Chanow itz and J. Ellis, Phys. Lett. 40B (1972) 397;
 J. Collins, L. Duncan, and S. Joglekar, Phys. Rev. D 16 (1977) 438.

- [23] M . Shifm an, Phys. Reports 209 (1991) 341.
- [24] I.Bigi, N.Uraltsev and A.Vainshtein, Phys. Lett. B 293 (1992) 430; (E) B 297 (1993) 477.
- [25] I.Bigi, M. Shifman, N.G. Uraltzev and A. Vainshtein, Phys. Rev. D 52 (1995) 196.
- [26] M. Shifman, A. Vainshtein and V. Zakharov, Phys. Lett. 78B (1978) 443 Reprinted in The Standard Model Higgs Boson, Ed. M. Einhorn (North-Holland, Am sterdam, 1991), page 84].
- [27] M. Shifman, A. Vainshtein and V. Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. B 147 (1979) For a review see Vacuum Structure and QCD Sum Rules, Ed. M. Shifman (North-Holland, Am sterdam, 1992).
- [28] V. Novikov, M. Shifman, A. Vainshtein and V. Zakharov, Fortsch. Phys. 32 (1984) 585 [A part of this review is reprinted in Vacuum Structure and QCD Sum Rules, Ed. M. Shifman (North-Holland, Am sterdam, 1992), page 240.]
- [29] M. Voloshin and M. Shifm an, Yad. Fiz. 41 (1985) 187 [Sov. Journ. Nucl. Phys.
 41 (1985) 120]; ZhETF 91 (1986) 1180 [Sov. Phys. { JETP 64 (1986) 698].
- [30] J. Chay, H. Georgi and B. Grinstein, Phys. Lett. B 247 (1990) 399.
- [31] M. Voloshin, Phys. Rev. D 46 (1992) 3062.
- [32] JD. B jorken, in Proceedings of the 4th Rencontres de Physique de la Vallee d'Aoste, La Thuille, Italy, 1990 ed. M. Greco (Editions Frontieres, Gif-Sur-Y vette, France, 1990), p. 583; JD. B jorken, I. Dunietz, and J. Taron, Nucl. Phys. B 371 (1992) 111; see also N. Isgur and M. Wise, Phys. Rev. D 43 (1991) 819.
- [33] B.Blok, L.Koyrakh, M. Shifm an and A.Vainshtein, Phys. Rev. D 49 (1994)
 3356; (E) D 50 (1994) 3572.
- [34] A.Manohar and M.W ise, Phys. Rev. D 49 (1994) 1310.
- [35] T.Mannel, Nucl. Phys. B 413 (1994) 396.
- [36] V.Belyaev and B.Blok, Z.Phys.C 30 (1986) 151.
- [37] I.Bigi, M. Shiffman, N.G. Uraltsev and A. Vainshtein, Phys. Rev. Lett. 71 (1993) 496.
- [38] B.Blok and M. Shifm an, Nucl. Phys. B 399 (1993) 441.
- [39] L.Koyrakh, Phys. Rev. D 49 (1994) 3379.

- [40] B.Blok, R.Dikem an and M.Shifm an, Phys. Rev. D 51 (1995) 6167.
- [41] E.Shuryak and A.Vainshtein, Nucl. Phys. B199 (1982) 451; B201 (1982) 143.
- [42] T.Mannel, Phys. Rev. D 50 (1994) 428.
- [43] A.Falk and M. Neubert, Phys. Rev. D 47 (1993) 2965; 2982.
- [44] P.Balland V.Braun, Phys. Rev. D 49 (1994) 2472.
- [45] For a recent update see E. Bagan, P. Ball, V. Braun and P. Gosdzinsky, Phys. Lett. B 342 (1995) 362.
- [46] B.Blok and M. Shifman, in Proc. of the W orkshop on the Tau-Charm Factory, M arbella, Spain, 1993, Ed. J. Kirkby and R. Kirkby (Editions Frontieres, G ifsur-Y vette, 1994), page 247. For earlier estimates see e.g. B. Guberina, R. Ruckl and J. Tram petic, Z. Phys. C 33 (1986) 297.
- [47] V.Eletsky and V.Shuryak, Phys. Lett. B 276 (1992) 191.
- [48] M. Neubert, Phys. Rev. D 45 (1992) 2451.
- [49] S.Narison, Phys. Lett., B 308 (1993) 365.
- [50] M. Voloshin and M. Shifman, Yad. Fiz 45 (1987) 463 [Sov. J. Nucl. Phys., 45 (1987) 292]; H. D. Politzer and M. W ise, Phys. Lett. 206B (1988) 681.
- [51] H. W ittig, Lattice Results for Heavy Quark Physics, hep-ph/9509292; C. Bernard et al., f_B Quenched and Unquenched, hep-lat/9509045.
- [52] P.Ball, Nucl. Phys. B 421 (1994) 593.
- [53] P.Ball, Phys. Lett. B 281 (1992) 133; B.Blok and M. Shifm an, Phys. Rev. D 47 (1993) 2949; see also Ref. [β1].
- [54] I. Bigi, A.G. Grozin, M. Shifman, N. Uraltsev and A. Vainshtein, Phys. Lett. B 339 (1994) 160.
- [55] M. Shifman, N.G. Uraltsev and A. Vainshtein, Phys. Rev. D 51 (1995) 2217.
- [56] For reviews see e.g. B.L. Io e, VA. Khoze and LN. Lipatov, Hard Processes (North-Holland, Am sterdam, 1984); R.G. Roberts, The Structure of the Proton, (Cam bridge University Press, 1995).
- [57] R.Ja e and L.Randall, Nucl. Phys. B 412 (1994) 79.
- [58] M. Neubert, Phys. Rev. D 49 (1994) 3392.
- [59] I.Bigi, M. Shifman, N.G. Uraltæv and A. Vainshtein, Int. Journ. Mod. Phys., A 9 (1994) 2467.

- [60] A.Falk, E.Jenkins, A.Manohar and M.Wise, Phys. Rev. D 49 (1994) 4553.
- [61] M. Neubert, Phys. Rev. D 49 (1994) 4623.
- [62] T.Manneland M.Neubert, Phys. Rev. D 50 (1994) 2037.
- [63] R.Dikeman, M. Shifman and N.Uraltsev, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A, to appear [hep-ph/9505397].
- [64] J.Collins and D. Soper, Nucl. Phys. B 194 (1982) 445.
- [65] I.Balitsky and V.Braun, Nucl. Phys. B 311 (1988) 541; B 361 (1991) 93.
- [66] A. Bareiss and E. Paschos, Nucl. Phys. B 327 (1989) 353; C. Jin, W. Palmer and E. Paschos, Phys. Lett. B 329 (1994) 364.
- [67] X.Ji, W ilson's Expansion with Power Accuracy, Preprint M II-CTP-2437/1995 [hep-ph/9506216]; M atching Perturbative and Non-Perturbative Physics W ith Power Accuracy in Heavy-Quark E ective Theory, Preprint M II-CTP-2453/1995 [hep-ph/9507322].
- [68] M.Shifm an, Theory of Preasym ptotic E ects in W eak Inclusive D ecays, in Proc. of the W orkshop Continuous Advances in QCD, ed. A.Sm ilga, (W orld Scientic, Singapore, 1994), page 249 [hep-ph/9405246]; Recent Progress in the Heavy Quark Theory, Talk at the V Int. Sym p. on Particles, Strings and Cosm ology { PASCOS { M arch 1995, Preprint TPI-M INN -95/15-T [hep-ph/9505289].
- [69] V.Novikov, M. Shifman, A. Vainshtein and V. Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. B 191 (1981) 301.
- [70] S.J. Brodsky, G.P. Lepage and P.B. Mackenzie, Phys. Rev. D 28 (1983) 228;
 G.P. Lepage and P.B. Mackenzie, Phys. Rev. D 48 (1993) 2250.
- [71] M. Beneke and V. M. Braun, Phys. Lett. B 348 (1995) 513.
- [72] M. Neubert, Phys. Rev. D 51 (1995) 5924; attempts of applying these ideas are presented in M. Neubert, QCD Analysis of Hadronic Decays Revisited, Preprint CERN-TH-95-112 [hep-ph/9509432].
- [73] I. Bigi, M. Shifman, N. Uraltsev and A. Vainshtein, Phys. Rev. D 50 (1994) 2234;
 M. Beneke and V. Braun, Nucl. Phys. B 426 (1994) 301.
- [74] For initial exposure see Yu.Dokshitzer, V.K hoze, A.M ueller and S.Troyan, Basics of Perturbative QCD (Editions Frontieres, G if-su-Y vette, 1991); J.Collins, Sudakov Form Factors, in Perturbative Quantum Chromodynamics, Ed.A. M ueller (W orld Scientic, Singapore, 1989), page 573.

- [75] Yu L. Dokshitzer, D J. Dyakonov and S.I. Troyan, Phys. Reps. 58 (1980) 270;
 D. Amati, A. Bassetto, M. Ciafaloni, G. Marchesini and G. Veneziano, Nucl. Phys. B 173 (1980) 429.
- [76] A.Smilga, Nucl. Phys. B 161 (1979) 449;G.Korchem sky, Phys. Lett. B 217 (1989) 330.

This figure "fig1-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

This figure "fig2-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

This figure "fig3-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

This figure "fig4-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

This figure "fig1-2.png" is available in "png" format from:

This figure "fig2-2.png" is available in "png" format from:

This figure "fig3-2.png" is available in "png" format from:

This figure "fig4-2.png" is available in "png" format from:

This figure "fig1-3.png" is available in "png" format from:

This figure "fig2-3.png" is available in "png" format from: