A New Estimate of "-"

S.Bertolin \mathbb{F} , J.O. Eeg^z and M. Fabbriches \mathbb{F}

 ^y INFN, Sezione di Trieste, and
 Scuola Internazionale Superiore di Studi Avanzati via Beinut 4, I-34013 Trieste, Italy.
 ^z Department of Physics, University of O slo N-0316 O slo, Norway.

Abstract

We discuss direct CP violation in the standard model by giving a new estimate of "⁰=" in kaon decays. Our analysis is based on the evaluation of the hadronic matrix elements of the S = 1 e ective quark lagrangian by means of the chiral quark model, with the inclusion of meson one-loop renormalization and NLO W ilson coe cients. Our estimate is fully consistent with the I = 1=2 selection rule in K ! decays which is well reproduced within the same framework. By varying all parameters in the allowed ranges and, in particular, taking the quark condensate | which is the major source of uncertainty | between (200 MeV)³ and (280 MeV)³ we nd

5:0 10
$$^{3} < "^{0}=" < 1:4$$
 10 3

A ssum ing for the quark condensate the improved PCAC result hqqi = $(221 \quad 17 \text{ MeV})^3$ and xing $\binom{(4)}{0 \text{ CD}}$ to its central value, we not the more restrictive prediction

$$"^{0}="=(4 5) 10^{4};$$

where the central value is de ned as the average over the allowed values of Im $_{t}$ in the rst and second quadrants. In these estimates the relevant mixing parameter Im $_{t}$ is self-consistently obtained from " and we take $m_{t}^{pole} = 180$ 12 GeV. Our result is, to a very good approximation, renormalization-scale and $_{5}$ -scheme independent.

SISSA 103/95/EP November 1995

1 Introduction

The realpart of " $^{\square}$ " m easures direct C P violation in the decays of a neutral kaon in two pions. It is a fundam ental quantity which has justly attracted a great dealof theoretical as well as experimental work. Its determination would answer the question of whether C P violation is present only in the mass matrix of neutral kaons (the superweak scenario) or is instead at work also directly in the decays.

On the experim ental front, the present results of CERN (NA31) [1]

$$\operatorname{Re}("^{0}=") = (23 \quad 7) \quad 10^{-4} \tag{1.1}$$

and Fermilab (E731) [2]

$$\operatorname{Re}\left(\operatorname{"}^{0}=\operatorname{"}\right) = (7:4 \quad 6:0) \quad 10^{-4} \tag{12}$$

are tantalizing insofar as the superweak scenario cannot be excluded and the disagreem ent between the two outcomes still haves a large uncertainty. The next generation of experiments presently under way at CERN, Ferm ilab and DA NE | will improve the sensitiveness to 1 10⁴ and hopefully reach a de nite result.

On the theoretical side, much has been accomplished, although the intrinsic diculty of a problem that encompasses scales as dierent as m $_t$ and m weights against any decisive progress in the eld.

A fundam ental step was recently covered by the M unich [3] and R om e [4] groups who computed the anom alous dimension matrix of the ten relevant operators to the next-to-leading order (NLO) in two $_5$ -schem es of dimensional regularization: 't H ooft-Veltm an (HV) and N aive D in ensional R egularization (NDR). This computation has brought the short-distance part of the e ective lagrangian under control.

The residual (and, unfortunately, largest) uncertainty is due to the longdistance part of the lagrangian, the computation of which implies evaluating the hadronic matrix elements of the quark operators. It is here that the nonperturbative regime of QCD is necessarily present and our understanding is accordingly blurred. At present, there exist two complete estimates of such hadronic matrix elements performed by the aforementioned groups, and recently updated in ref. [5] for the lattice (at least for som e of the operators), where the value

$$\operatorname{Re}\left(\overset{\mathbf{0}}{=}\right) = (3:1 \quad 2:5 \quad 0:3) \quad 10^{-4} \tag{1.3}$$

is found, and ref. [6] for the 1=N $_{c}$ approach (for all ten operators) in proved by tting the I = 1=2 rule, where " 0 =" is estimated to be within the range

The smaller error in eq. (1.3) originates in the Gaussian treatment of the uncertainty in the input parameters with respect to the at 1 error included in eq. (1.4).

Both groups seem to agree on the di culty of accommodating within the standard model a value substantially larger than $1 10^{-3}$. This unexpectedly small value is the result of the cancellation between gluon and electroweak penguin operators [7]. If that is actually the case, it is somewhat disappointing that the presence of direct CP violation in the standard model turns out to be hidden by an accidental cancellation that electrically minics the superweak scenario.

It seem ed to us that a third, independent estim ate of "⁰=" was desirable and we have taken the point of view that a reliable evaluation of the hadronic matrix elements should rst provide a consistent picture of kaon physics, starting from the CP -conserving am plitudes and, in particular, by reproducing the I = 1=2 selection rule, which governs most of these am plitudes as well as the quantity "⁰=" itself. We also felt that the same evaluation should pay particular attention to the problem of achieving a satisfactory 5-scheme and scale independence in the matching between the matrix elements and the W ilson coe cients, the absence of which would underm ine any estim ate.

In a prelim inary work [8], we studied "^Q=" within the chiral quark model (QM) [9] in a toy model that included the leading e ect of the two most important operators, and veried that the $_5$ -scheme independence could be achieved.

In a recent paper [10], hereafter referred as I, we have completed the study of the hadronic matrix elements of all the ten operator of the S = 1 e ective quark langrangian by means of the QM and veried in [11], hereafter referred as II, that the inclusion of non-perturbative O ($_{\rm s}N_{\rm c}$) corrections and one-loop meson renormalization provided an improved scale independence and, more importantly, a good to f the I = 1=2 selection rule.

These results put us in the position to provide a new estimate of " \subseteq " that is independent of the existing ones and that contains new features that, in our judgm ent, makes it more reliable.

W e sum marize here such features. Our estimate takes advantage, as the existing ones, of

NLO results for the W ilson coe cients;

up-to-date analysis of the constraints on the m ixing ∞e cient Im $_{\rm t}$.

Am ong the new elements introduced, the most relevant are

A consistent evaluation of all hadronic matrix elements in the QM (including non-perturbative gluon condensate e ects) in two schemes of dimensional regularization;

Inclusion in the S = 1 chiral lagrangian of the complete bosonization 0 (p²) of the electroweak operators Q_7 and Q_8 . Some relevant 0 (p²) terms have been neglected in all previous estimates;

Inclusion of the m eson-loop renorm alization and scale dependence of the m atrix elements;

Consistency with the I = 1=2 selection rule in kaon decays;

M atching-scale and $_5$ -scheme dependence of the results below the 20% level.

Even though our fram ework enjoys a high degree of reliability, any estim ate of " 0 =" necessarily su ers of a system atic uncertainty that cannot be easily reduced further. We nd that it is mainly parameterized in terms of the

value of the quark condensate, the input parameter that dom inates penguindiagram physics. For this reason, we discuss rst a inclusive estimate based on a conservative range of hqqi, as well as the variations of all the other inputs: m_t , Im_t (which depends, beside m_t and m_c , on \hat{B}_K and other mixing angles) and $_{QCD}$. Such a procedure provides us with the range of values for "⁰=" that we consider to be the unbiased theoretical prediction of the standard model. Unfortunately, this range turns out to be rather large, spanning, as it can be seen in the abstract, from 5 10 ³ to 1:4 10 ³. On the other hand, it is as small as we can get without making some further assumptions on the input parameters assumptions that all the other available estimates must make as well.

In order to provide such a more restrictive estimate, we have chosen the improved PCAC prediction for the quark condensate and $xed_{QCD}^{(4)}$ to its central value. This reasonable, but nevertheless arbitrary choice allows us to give the second, and more predictive estimate reported in the abstract. It is the latter that should be compared with the current estimates, while, at the same time, bearing in mind also the form er unrestricted range as a realistic measure of our ignorance.

Such uncertainty notwithstanding, we agree in the end with the main point of ref. [5], namely that it is dicult to accome modate within the standard model a value of "⁰=" larger than 1 10³. In fact, if our analysis points toward a de nite prediction, it points to even smaller values, if not negative ones. This can be understood not so much as a peculiar feature of the QM prediction as the neglect in other estimates of a class of contributions in the vacuum saturation approximation (VSA) of the matrix elements of the electroweak operators. This problem is discussed in detail in I. These new contributions are responsible for the onset of the superweak regime for values of m_t less than 200 G eV. In our computation, it is the meson renorm alization that in the end brings back "⁰=" around zero or positive values.

The outline of the paper is the following. In section 2 we write the e ective quark lagrangian, discuss the short-distance input parameters and give the W ilson coe cients. Section 3 contains a brief discussion of the QM evaluation of the hadronic matrix elements and their corresponding meson-loop renormalization. In section 4 we discuss the values of the input parameters and in section 5 the elective factors B_i 's that give the comparison between the VSA and the QM evaluation of the hadronic matrix elements. We begin in section 6 our discussion of "⁰=" by rst studying the 5-scheme independence and then the contribution of each operator taken by itself. In section 7, we give our estimate as a function of the most important input parameters in a series of gures and one table. The numerical value of all input parameters are collected in a table in the appendix.

2 The Quark Effective Lagrangian and the NLO W ilson Coefficients

The quark e extive lagrangian at a scale $< m_c$ can be written as [12]

$$L_{S=1} = \frac{G_{F}}{P} V_{ud} V_{us} \overset{X h}{z_{i}} () + Y_{i} () Q_{i} ()$$

$$\frac{G_{F}}{P} \overset{X}{z_{i}} C_{i} () Q_{i} () : \qquad (2.1)$$

The Q_i are four-quark operators obtained by integrating out in the standard m odel the vector bosons and the heavy quarks t; b and c. A convenient and by now standard basis includes the following ten quark operators:

$$Q_{1} = (\bar{s} u)_{VA} (\bar{u} d)_{VA};$$

$$Q_{2} = (\bar{s}u)_{VA} (\bar{u}d)_{VA};$$

$$Q_{3;5} = (\bar{s}d)_{VA} (\bar{q}q)_{VA};$$

$$Q_{4;6} = (\bar{s} d)_{VA} (\bar{q}q)_{VA};$$

$$Q_{7;9} = \frac{3}{2} (\bar{s}d)_{VA} (\bar{q}q)_{VA};$$

$$Q_{8;10} = \frac{3}{2} (\bar{s} d)_{VA} (\bar{q}q)_{VA};$$

$$(2.2)$$

where , denote color indices (; = 1;:::; N_c) and \hat{e}_q are quark charges. Color indices for the color singlet operators are om itted. The labels (V A) refer to $(1 _{5})$. We recall that $Q_{1;2}$ stand for the W -induced current{ current operators, Q_{3} for the QCD penguin operators and Q_{7} 10 for the electroweak penguin (and box) ones.

The functions $z_i()$ and $y_i()$ are the W ilson coe cients and V_{ij} the K obayashi-M askawa (KM) matrix elements; = $V_{td}V_{ts}=V_{ud}V_{us}$. Following the usual parametrization of the KM matrix, in order to determ ine "⁰=", we only need the $y_i()$, which control the CP-violating part of the am plitudes.

The size of the W ilson coe cients at the hadronic scale (1 GeV) depends on $_{\rm s}$ and the threshold masses m $_{\rm W}$, m $_{\rm b}$ and m $_{\rm c}$. In addition, the penguin coe cients y $_{\rm i}$ () depend on the top mass via the initial matching conditions.

The recent determ ination of the strong coupling at LEP and SLC gives [13]

$$_{\rm s}$$
 (m $_{\rm Z}$) = 0:119 0:006; (2.3)

which corresponds to

$$^{(4)}_{\rm OCD} = 350 \quad 100 \,\mathrm{M} \,\mathrm{eV}$$
 : (2.4)

W e will use the range in eq. (2.4) for our num erical estim ate of " 0 =".

For m_t we take the value [14]

$$m_{t}^{\text{pole}} = 180 \quad 12 \text{ GeV}$$
 (2.5)

The relation between the pole mass M and the MS running mass \overline{m} () is given at one loop in QCD by [17]:

$$\overline{m}$$
 (M) = M (q² = M²) 1 $\frac{4}{3}$ (M); ; (2.6)

For the running top quark mass, in the range of $\ _{\rm s}$ considered, we obtain

$$\overline{m}_{t} (m_{t}^{\text{pole}}) \,' \, 172 \, 12 \, \text{GeV}$$
 (2.7)

which, using the one-loop running, corresponds to

$$\overline{m}_{t}$$
 (m_W) ' 183 14 GeV ; (2.8)

which is the value to be used as input at the m_W scale for the NLO evolution of the W ilson coe cients. In eq. (2.8) we have averaged over the range of $\binom{4}{\text{OCD}}$

given in eq. (2.4). We have explicitly checked that taking $= m_t^{\text{pole}}$ as the initial matching scale in place of m_W and using correspondingly $\overline{m}_t (m_t^{\text{pole}})$ the electroweak W ilson coe cients at = 1 GeV remain stable up to the percent level, while the variation of the relevant gluon penguin coe cients stays below 15%. The stability worsen by keeping the top mass xed, while varying the matching scale.

Form _b we take the value

 $m_{b}^{\text{pole}} = 4:8 \text{ GeV}$ (2.9)

which falls in the range 4.5 4.9 given in [14], and for m_c

$$m_{c}^{\text{pole}} = 1.4 \text{ GeV}$$
 (2.10)

which is in the range 12 1:9 GeV quoted in [14]. These are the quark threshold values we use in evolving the W ilson coe cients down to the 1 GeV scale. We have checked that varying m_b^{pole} within the 4:5 4:9 GeV range a ects the nalvalues of the W ilson coe cients at the 0.1% level, while varying the charm pole mass between 1.2 and 1.9 GeV a ects the results at the 15% level at most.

Even though not all the operators in eq. (2.2) are independent, this basis is of particular interest for the present num erical analysis because it is that employed for the calculation of the W ilson coe cients to the NLO order in $_{\rm s}$ and $_{\rm e}$ [3, 4].

In tables 1 and 2 we give explicitly the W ilson coe cients $y_i()$ of the ten operators at the scale = 1.0 and 0.8 GeV, respectively, in the HV and NDR schemes. In the QM the chiral symmetry breaking scale turns out to be about 0.8 GeV. This sets a preferential scale for the matching of the hadronic matrix elements to the W ilson coe cients. We have checked that the QCD perturbative expansion is under control. In fact the dimense between LO and NLO results for all physical amplitudes considered | both real and imaginary parts | at = 0.8 GeV remains always smaller than 30%.

In order to test the independence of " 0 =" we vary the matching scale between 0.8 and 1.0 GeV, the highest energy up to which we trust the chiral

(4) Q C D	250 M eV		350 M eV		450 M eV	
s (m z) _{M S}	0.113		0.119		0.125	
	HV					
Уз	(0 : 0007)	0:0301	(0 : 0007)	0:0390	(0 : 0007)	0:0509
У4	(0:0011)	0:0513	(0:0012)	0:0610	(0:0012)	0 : 0723
У5	(0:0004)	0:0137	(0:0004)	0:0163	(0:0004)	0:0209
Уб	(0:0011)	0 : 0766	(0:0012)	0:103	(0:0012)	0:144
<u>у</u> 7=	(0:172)	0:0115	(0:172)	0:0103	(0:172)	0:0083
У8=	(0)	0:167	(0)	0230	(0)	0:328
у9=	(1:19)	1 : 71	(1:19)	1:83	(1:19)	2:00
y10=	(0)	0 : 750	(0)	0 : 859	(0)	1:10
N D R						
Уз	(0 : 0017)	0:0268	(0:0018)	0:0336	(0:0018)	0:0416
У4	(0:0019)	0:0491	(0:0021)	0:0574	(0:0022)	0 : 0660
У5	(0 : 0007)	0:0031	(0 : 0007)	0:0028	(0 : 0007)	0 : 0165
Уб	(0:0019)	0:0849	(0:0021)	0:119	(0:0022)	0:178
<u>у</u> 7=	(0:149)	0:0119	(0:149)	0:0118	(0:136)	0:0127
у8=	(0)	0:153	(0)	0212	(0)	0:304
у9=	(1:22)	1 : 71	(1:22)	1:83	(1:22)	1:99
y ₁₀ =	(0)	0 : 674	(0)	0 : 843	(0)	1:07

Table 1: NLO W ilson coe cients at = 1.0 GeV for \overline{m}_{t} (m_{W}) = 183 GeV, which corresponds to $m_{t}^{\text{pole}} = 180 \text{ GeV}$. The values of the coe cients at $= m_{W}$ are given in parenthesis (= 1=128). In addition one has $y_{1,2}$ () = 0.

(4) Q C D	250 M eV		350 M eV		450 M eV	
s (m z) _{MS}	0.113		0.119		0.125	
HV						
Уз	(0 : 0007)	0:0338	(0 : 0007)	0 : 0456	(0 : 0007)	0:0602
У4	(0:0011)	0:0522	(0:0012)	0:0626	(0:0012)	0:0741
У5	(0:0004)	0:0140	(0:0004)	0:0192	(0:0004)	0 : 0397
У6	(0:0011)	0:0904	(0:0012)	0:137	(0:0012)	0:242
<u>у</u> 7=	(0:172)	0:0131	(0:172)	0:0111	(0:172)	0:0039
У8=	(0)	0209	(0)	0:327	(0)	0:583
у9=	(1:19)	1:82	(1:19)	2:04	(1:19)	2 : 45
y ₁₀ =	(0)	0 : 835	(0)	1:14	(0)	1 : 66
NDR						
Уз	(0 : 0017)	0:0294	(0:0018)	0 : 0373	(0:0018)	0:0422
У4	(0:0019)	0:0493	(0:0021)	0 : 0569	(0:0022)	0:0603
У5	(0 : 0007)	0:0014	(0 : 0007)	0 : 0167	(0 : 0007)	0 : 0708
У6	(0:0019)	0:104	(0:0021)	0:171	(0:0022)	0:353
<u>у</u> 7=	(0:149)	0:0138	(0:149)	0:0156	(0:149)	0:0274
У8=	(0)	0:189	(0)	0294	(0)	0:511
у9=	(1:22)	1:81	(1:22)	2:03	(1:22)	2:42
y10=	(0)	0:819	(0)	1:11	(0)	1:60

Table 2: Same as in Table 1 at = 0.8 GeV.

loop corrections computed in I. We nd that, in spite of the fact that some of the W ilson coe cients vary in this range by up to 50%, the matching with our matrix elements reduces the -dependence in "⁰=" below 20% in most of the parameter space. We consider this improved stability a success of the approach.

3 The Hadronic Matrix Elements

In paper I we have computed all hadronic matrix elements of the e ective quark operators in eq. (2.2) in the framework of the QM. The matrix elements are obtained by the integration of the constituent quarks by means of dimensional regularization. The loop integration leads to results that depend on the scheme employed to deal with $_5$ but are scale independent. The renormalization-scale dependence is introduced in our approach by the mesonloop renormalization of the amplitudes, as explained in I. The meson-loop corrections together with the gluon-condensate contributions are the most relevant ingredients in reproducing the I = 1=2 selection rule in K ! decays, (as discussed in II).

The QM results are expressed in a double power expansion on M 2 = 2 and p²= 2 , where M is a dimensionful parameter of the model which is not determined (generically, it can be interpreted as the constituent quark mass in mesons) and p is a typical external momentum.

The value of M is constrained [15] by experimental data on the decay of 0 and to be

$$M = 223 \quad 9M \text{ eV}$$
 (3.1)

(and M = 243 9 M eV if higher order corrections are included). The value of

$$M = m = \frac{P}{12} / 222 M eV$$
(3.2)

is found by vector-m eson-dom inance estimates. Finally, in a recent t of all input parameteres of the extended Nambu-Jona-Lasinio model [16], it was found a value of

W hile we could simply take these values and thus make the QM predictive, our approach also allows for a self-consistent determ ination of a range for M that can be compared to the above values.

The idea is that in physical observables the 5-scheme and -dependences of the matrix elements should balance the corresponding dependences of the

NLO W ilson coe cients. In I we have constructed the complete O (p^2) chiral representation of the lagrangian in eq. (2.1), where the local quark operator Q_i is represented by a linear combination of bosonic operators B, namely Q_i ! G (Q_i)B. The electric quark lagrangian is therefore replaced by the following chiral representation

$$L^{S=1} = \frac{G_{F}}{\frac{P}{2}} C_{i}() G_{i}(Q_{i}) B : \qquad (3.4)$$

As mentioned above, and discussed at lenght in I, the chiral coe cients G determined via the QM approach are $_5$ -scheme dependent. While the $_5$ -scheme dependence arises in the QM from the integration of the chiral fermions, the explicit -dependence is entirely due to the chiral loop renorm alization of the matrix elements:

^D bj
$$S=1$$
 ja $E = \frac{G_F}{P} \frac{X}{2}$ $C_i(S_D) G (Q_i)$ hbj $jai(L_D)$; (3.5)

where we have labeled by a and b the initial and nalbosonic states. We remark that in our approach the -dependence of the chiral loops is not cancelled by higher order counterterms, as it is usually required in the strong chiral lagrangian.

The renorm alization scale dependence is therefore determ ined order by order in the energy expansion of the chiral lagrangian. In this respect there is no direct counterpart to the expansion in strong and electrom agnetic couplings on which the short-distance analysis is based and, accordingly, we refer to the explicit -dependence in the matrix elements as to the long-distance (LD) or \non-perturbative" scale dependence. A purely perturbative renorm alization scale dependence is introduced in the matrix elements by the NLO running of the quark condensate, which we include whenever a comparison between values at di erent scales is required. O therw ise, quark and gluon condensates are considered in our approach as phenom enological param eters.

O ur aim is to test whether the estimate of observables is consistently im – proved by matching the \long-distance" $_5$ -scheme and dependences so obtained with those present in the short-distance analysis (in particular we identify $_{SD}$ with $_{LD}$). Whether and to what extent such an improvement is

reproduced for m any observables and for a consistent set of param eters, m ight tell us how well low energy QCD is modelled in the QM -chiral lagrangian approach that we have devised.

In II, we have shown that minimizing the $_5$ -scheme dependence of the physical isospin I = 0 and 2 am plitudes determines a range for the parameter M between 160 and 220 MeV. In II, it was also found that the dependence induced by the W ilson coe cients is substantially reduced by that of the hadronic matrix elements.

These issues become crucial for "⁰=" where the $_5$ -scheme dependence induced by the W ilson coe cients determines an uncertainty as large as 80% when using the 1=N _c hadronic matrix elements (see for instance ref. [3]) which are scheme independent.

In the following, for the reader's convenience, we report from I the expressions for the isospin amplitudes for all ten operators in eq. (2.2):

$$hQ_{i}i_{0,2}$$
 $h2$; $I = 0; 2jQ_{i}K^{0}i$: (3.6)

The corresponding one-loop meson corrections are denoted by $a_{0,2}$ (Q i). The C lebsh-G ordan coe cients for the isospin projections can be found in I.

For the HV case we obtain:

$$hQ_{1}i_{0} = \frac{1}{3}X + \frac{2}{N_{c}} 1 + \frac{a_{0}}{N_{c}} (Q_{1})$$
(3.7)

$$hQ_1 i_2 = \frac{2}{3} X 1 + \frac{1}{N_c} 1_{hGGi} + a_2 (Q_1)$$
 (3.8)

$$hQ_{2}i_{0} = \frac{1}{3}X_{2} + \frac{1}{N_{c}}I_{hGGi} + a_{0}(Q_{2})$$
(3.9)

$$hQ_{2}i_{2} = \frac{2}{3}X + \frac{1}{N_{c}} + a_{2}(Q_{2})$$
 (3.10)

$$hQ_{3}i_{0} = \frac{1}{N_{c}}X + a_{0}(Q_{3})$$
 (3.11)

$$hQ_4 i_0 = X + a_0 (Q_4)$$
 (3.12)

$$hQ_{5}i_{0} = \frac{2}{N_{c}} \frac{hqqi}{M f^{2}} X^{0} + a_{0} (Q_{5})$$
(3.13)

$$hQ_{6}i_{0} = 2\frac{hqqi}{M f^{2}}X^{0} + a_{0}(Q_{6})$$
(3.14)

$$hQ_{7}i_{0} = \frac{2^{p}\overline{3}}{N_{c}}\frac{hqqi^{2}}{f^{3}} + \frac{1}{N_{c}}\frac{hqqi}{Mf^{2}}X^{0} + \frac{2}{N_{c}}\frac{hqqi}{Mf^{2}}Y + \frac{1}{2}X + a_{0}(Q_{7})$$
(3.15)

$$hQ_{7}i_{2} = {}^{p} - \frac{hqqi^{2}}{f^{3}} \frac{1}{N_{c}} + {}^{p} - \frac{1}{N_{c}} \frac{p}{M_{c}} \frac{1}{f^{2}} + \frac{p}{N_{c}} \frac{1}{M_{c}} + \frac{p}{M_{c}} + \frac{p$$

$$hQ_{8}i_{0} = 2^{p} \frac{1}{3} \frac{hqqi^{2}}{f^{3}} + \frac{hqqi}{M f^{2}} X^{0}$$

$$2 \frac{hqqi}{M f^{2}} Y + \frac{1}{2M} X + \frac{1}{hGGi} + a_{0} (Q_{8})$$
(3.17)

$$hQ_{8}i_{2} = \frac{p}{6}\frac{hqqi^{2}}{f^{3}} + \frac{p}{2}\frac{hqqi}{M f^{2}}Y + \frac{p}{2N_{c}}X + h_{GGi} + a_{2}(Q_{8}) \quad (3.18)$$

$$hQ_{9}i_{0} = \frac{1}{p^{2}}X + \frac{1}{N_{c}} + a_{0}(Q_{9})$$
 (3.19)

$$hQ_{9}i_{2} = \frac{r^{2}}{2}X_{1} + \frac{1}{N_{c}} 1_{hGGi} + a_{2}(Q_{9})$$
 (3.20)

$$hQ_{10}i_0 = \frac{1}{2}X \quad 1 \quad \frac{1}{N_c} \quad 1 \quad h_{GGi} + a_0 (Q_{10})$$
(3.21)

$$hQ_{10}i_2 = \frac{P}{2}X + \frac{1}{N_c} + \frac{1}{N_c} + a_2(Q_{10}):$$
 (3.22)

where

$$X = \frac{p_{-}}{3f} = m_{K}^{2} = m^{2}$$
; $X^{0} = X = 1 = 6 \frac{M^{2}}{2}^{1}$ (3.23)

and

Y
$$p \frac{1}{3} m^{2} + 3 m_{K}^{2} \frac{M^{2}}{2}^{\#}$$
; (3.24)

 $_{\rm hG\,G\,i}$ is given by

$$_{\text{hGGi}} = \frac{N_c}{2} \frac{h_s GG}{16^2 f^4} :$$
(3.25)

It is (3.25) that parameterizes the non-perturbative part of the computation by the contribution of the gluon condensate h $_{s}GG = i$, as discussed in I.

The renormalization of f is taken into account by replacing f with the one-loop parameter f_1 in the tree-level amplitudes, which amounts to replacing $1=f^3$ with $1=f^3$ multiplied by

$$1 + 3 \frac{f}{f} \frac{f_1}{f} / 1:18:$$
 (3.26)

In the NDR case we nd:

$$hQ_{1}i_{0} = \frac{1}{3}X + \frac{2}{N_{c}} 1 + \frac{2}{N_{c}} 1 + a_{0}(Q_{1})$$
(3.27)

$$hQ_1 i_2 = \frac{2}{3} X_1 + \frac{1}{N_c} 1_{hGGi} + a_2 (Q_1)$$
 (3.28)

$$hQ_{2}i_{0} = \frac{1}{3}X_{2} - \frac{1}{N_{c}}I_{BGi} + a_{0}(Q_{2})$$
(3.29)

$$hQ_{2}i_{2} = \frac{2}{3}X + \frac{1}{N_{c}} + a_{2}(Q_{2})$$
 (3.30)

$$hQ_{3}i_{0} = \frac{1}{N_{c}} X^{0} \qquad hGGiX + a_{0}(Q_{3})$$
(3.31)

$$hQ_{4}i_{0} = X^{0} + a_{0}(Q_{4})$$
(3.32)

2 hori

$$hQ_{5}i_{0} = \frac{2}{N_{c}} \frac{hQ_{1}}{M f^{2}} X^{0} + a_{0} (Q_{5})$$
(3.33)

$$hQ_{6}i_{0} = 2\frac{hQq_{1}}{M_{f}f^{2}}X^{0} + a_{0}(Q_{6})$$
(3.34)

$$hQ_{7}i_{0} = \frac{2^{P}\overline{3}}{N_{c}}\frac{hqqi^{2}}{f^{3}} + 1 + 3\frac{M^{3}f^{2}}{hqqi^{2}} + \frac{1}{N_{c}}\frac{hqqi}{Mf^{2}}X^{0}$$
$$\frac{2}{N_{c}}\frac{hqqi}{Mf^{2}}Y^{0} + \frac{1}{2}X + a_{0}(Q_{7})$$
(3.35)

$$hQ_{7}i_{2} = \frac{1}{N_{c}} \frac{P}{6} \frac{hqqi^{2}}{f^{3}} + \frac{1}{3} \frac{M^{3}f^{2}}{hqqi^{2}} + \frac{P}{2} \frac{1}{N_{c}} \frac{P}{M} \frac{1}{f^{2}} + \frac{P}{2} \frac{1}{2} X + a_{2} (Q_{7})$$
(3.36)

$$hQ_{8}i_{0} = 2^{p} \frac{1}{3} \frac{hqqi^{2}}{f^{3}} + 3 \frac{M^{3}f^{2}}{hqqi^{2}} + \frac{hqqi}{Mf^{2}} X^{0}$$

$$2 \frac{hqqi}{Mf^{2}} Y^{0} + \frac{1}{2N_{c}} X + h_{GGi} + a_{0} (Q_{8})$$
(3.37)

$$hQ_{8}i_{2} = {}^{p}\overline{6}\frac{hqqi^{2}}{f^{3}} 1 3 \frac{M^{3}f^{2}}{hqqi^{2}}$$

$${}^{p}\overline{2}\frac{hqqi}{M f^{2}} Y^{0} \frac{p^{2}}{2N_{c}} X 1 + {}_{hGGi} + a_{2}(Q_{8})$$
(3.38)

$$hQ_{9}i_{0} = \frac{1}{2}X + \frac{1}{N_{c}}X + a_{0}(Q_{9})$$
(3.39)

$$hQ_{9}i_{2} = \frac{2}{2}X + \frac{1}{N_{c}} + a_{2}(Q_{9})$$
 (3.40)

$$hQ_{10}i_0 = \frac{1}{2} 2X X^0 \frac{1}{N_c} 1_{hGGi} X + a_0 (Q_{10})$$
(3.41)

$$hQ_{10}i_2 = \frac{2}{2}X + \frac{1}{N_c} + a_2(Q_{10}):$$
 (3.42)

where

$$X^{0} = X = 1 - 9 \frac{M^{2}}{2}^{!}$$
; $Y^{0} = \frac{p}{3f} m^{2} + 3 m_{K}^{2} m^{2} \frac{M^{2}}{2}^{\#}$: (3.43)

 $hQ_ii_2 = 0$ for i = 3;4;5;6 in both schemes.

O fparticular interest are the matrix elements hQ $_6i_0$ and hQ $_8i_2$ which dom – inate any estimate of "⁰="; their leading e ect was included in the toy model of ref. [8].

The most striking feature concerning the gluon-penguin operators is the linear dependence on the quark condensate that is found in the QM in contrast to the quadratic one of the VSA. This di erence explains the di erent weight that these operators have in the two models.

Concerning the electrow eak-penguin operators, as discussed in I, the term s proportional to Y \mid so far neglected in allestim ates \mid give an important contribution that m akes the electrow eak-penguin operators larger and, accordingly, the cancellation between electrow eak and gluon penguins electric even for the present values of m_t. We shall come back to this point in section 5.

4 The Input Parameters

The quark and the gluon condensates are two input parameters of our computation. As discussed in I, their phenomenological determination is a

com plicated question (they param eterize the genuine non-perturbative part of the com putation) and the literature o ers di erent estim ates.

For guidance, we identify the condensates entering our computation with those obtained by thing the experimental data by means of the QCD sum rules (QCD $\{$ SR $\}$ or lattice computations.

A review of recent determ inations of these parameters, together with a justi cation of the range below, is given in I. Here we only report the ranges that we will explore in our num erical analysis.

For the gluon condensate, we take the scale independent range

$$h^{-s}GGi = (376 \quad 47 \,\mathrm{MeV})^4;$$
 (4.1)

which encom passes the results of recent QCD-SR analysis [18]. While this is a crucial input parameter in the physics of the I = 1=2 rule (see II), it plays only a minor role in a penguin-dom inated quantity like "⁰=".

For the quark condensate, we consider the range

$$(200 \text{ M eV})^3$$
 hqqi $(280 \text{ M eV})^3$ (4.2)

which includes the central values and the errors of the QCD -SR [19] and lattice estimates [21].

The rather conservative range (4.2) is the one advocated in I. In II it is shown that the I = 1=2 selection rule seems to prefer the upper half of this range.

For comparison, in most estimates of " 0 =" the PCAC value

hqqi () =
$$\frac{f_{K}^{2} m_{K}^{2} (1 \kappa)}{\overline{m}_{s} (1 + \overline{m}_{d} (1))};$$
 (4.3)

is taken (with $_{\rm K}$ equal to zero) and the error range is that of the determ ination of m $_{\rm s}$ [22]:

$$\overline{m}_{s} (1 \text{ GeV}) = 178 \quad 18 \text{ MeV} :$$
 (4.4)

This choice gives a quark condensate of

hqqi =
$$(261 \ 9 \,\text{MeV})^3$$
 (4.5)

at = 1.0 GeV that corresponds, via NLO renorm alization at xed $^{(4)}_{QCD}$ = 350 MeV, to

$$hqqi = (244 \ 9 M eV)^3$$
 (4.6)

at the m atching scale of = 0.8 GeV. The quark condensate in (4.6) has an uncertainty of only 9 M eV, that is perhaps too sm all a range to account for the actual uncertainty. For instance, if the QCD-SR in proved estimate [20]

$$_{\rm K} = 0.34^{+0.23}_{-0.17} \tag{4.7}$$

is taken into account, the range (at = 1 GeV) to be explored becomes comparable to that of (4.2):

$$(183 \text{ M eV})^3$$
 hqqi $(256 \text{ M eV})^3$; (4.8)

with a central value much smaller than in (4.6).

The range (4.8) is consistent with what one nds by the same PCAC value as in (4.3) but with f_K and m_K replaced by, respectively, f and m , and $\overline{m}_s() + \overline{m}_d()$ by

$$\overline{\mathbf{m}}_{u} (1 \,\mathrm{GeV}) + \overline{\mathbf{m}}_{d} (1 \,\mathrm{GeV}) = 12 \quad 2.5 \,\mathrm{MeV}; \qquad (4.9)$$

as given in [23]. By means of the latter, taken at = 0.8 GeV, we nd

hqqi =
$$(221 \ 17 \ \text{MeV})^3$$
: (4.10)

The range (4.10) su ers of a larger error with respect to that of (4.6), which however does not take into account (4.7) and, accordingly, the much broader range (4.8) which is more realistic.

Because of such uncertainties, we will consider in section 7 two possible ranges for the quark condensate: the range (4.2) for our most conservative estimate and the improved PCAC result (4.10) for a second, more restrictive one. As discussed in the introduction, these two ranges complete each other in providing, at the same time, a de nite prediction and a gauge of the overall uncertainty of the prediction itself.

In section 7, in order to m ake the comparison to other estimates easier, we will also give our result for the range (4.6).

5 The B_i Factors

Let us introduce the elective factors

$$B_{i}^{(0;2)} = \frac{hQ_{i}i_{0;2}^{QM}}{hQ_{i}i_{0;2}^{VSA}};$$
(5.1)

which give the ratios between our hadronic matrix elements and those of the VSA. They are a useful way of comparing di erent evaluations.

In table 3, we collect the B_i factors for the ten operators. The values of the B_i depend on the scale at which the matrix elements are evaluated, the input parameters and M ; moreover, in the QM they depend on the $_5$ -scheme employed. We have given in table 3 a representative example of their values and variations.

The values of $B_1^{(0)}$ and $B_2^{(0)}$ show that the corresponding hadronic matrix elements in the QM are, once non-factorizable contributions and meson renorm alization have been included, respectively about ten and three times larger than their VSA values. At the same time, $B_1^{(2)}$ and $B_2^{(2)}$ turn out to be at most half of what found in the VSA (for the starred entries see the comment at the end of the section). These features make it possible for the selection rule to be reproduced in the QM, as extensively discussed in II.

For comparison, in the 1=N_c approach of ref. [24], the inclusion of mesonloop renormalization through a cuto regularization, leads, at the scale of 1 GeV, to B₁⁽⁰⁾ = 52, B₂⁽⁰⁾ = 22 and B₁⁽²⁾ = B₂⁽²⁾ = 0.55, a result that is not su cient to reproduce the I = 1=2 rule. The similarity of the HV values B₁⁽²⁾ = B₂⁽²⁾ = 0.55 obtained in the QM with the corresponding 1=N_c results is remarkable, and yet a num erical coincidence, since the suppression originates from gluon condensate corrections in the QM, whereas it is the e ect of the meson loop renormalization (regularized via explicit cut-o) in the analysis of ref. [24].

The values of the penguin matrix elements hQ₃i and hQ₄i in the QM lead to rather large B_i factors. In the case of Q₃, the QM result has the opposite sign of the VSA result and B_3 is negative. This is the elect of the large non-perturbative gluon correction.

	Н	V	N D R			
	= 0:8 G eV	= 1:0 G eV	= 0:8 G eV	= 1:0 G eV		
B ₁ ⁽⁰⁾	10.6	11.1	10.6	11.1		
B ₂ ⁽⁰⁾	2.8	3.0	2.8	3.0		
B ₁ ⁽²⁾	0.52	0.55	0.52	0.55		
B ₂ ⁽²⁾	0.52	0.55	0.52	0.55		
B ₃	2:9	3 : 0	3 : 7	3 : 9		
B 4	1.8	1.9	1.0	11		
$B_{5} = B_{6}$	1 : 7 0 : 61	1:8 0:64	1:0 0:38	1:1 0:40		
B 7 ⁽⁰⁾	3:0 2:2	3:3 2:4	2:9 2:2	32 23		
B ⁽⁰⁾ ₈	3:3 2:2	3:6 2:4	32 22	3:5 2:4		
B 9 ⁽⁰⁾	3.9	4.0	3.5	3.6		
B (0) 10	4.4	4.7	5.6	5.9		
B ₇ ⁽²⁾	2:7 1:5	3:0 1:5	2 : 7 1 : 4	2:9 1:5		
B ₈ ⁽²⁾	2:1 1:4	23 15	2:1 1:4	23 15		
B 9 ⁽²⁾	0.52	0.55	0.52	0.55		
B (2) 10	0.52	0.55	0.52	0.55		

Table 3: The B_i factors in the QM (including m eson-loop renorm alizations) at two di erent scales: = 0.8 and 1.0 GeV and in the two $_5$ -schemes. We have taken the gluon condensate at the central value of eq. (4.1), while the range given for B₅ $_8$ corresponds to varying the quark condensate according to eq. (4.2). The results shown are given for M = 220 MeV.

Regarding the gluon penguin operator Q_6 (and Q_5), we not that the QM gives a result consistent with the VSA (and the 1=N_c approach), B₆ (B₅) being approximately equal to two for small values of the quark condensate and one-half at larger values. It is the quadratic dependence (to be contrasted to the linear dependence in the QM) of the VSA matrix element for the penguin operators that it responsible for the di erent weight of these operators at di erent values of the quark condensate. The lattice estimate at = 2 GeV for these operators gives $B_5 = B_6 = 1.0$ 0.2 [5]. A direct comparison in this

case is not possible.

The electroweak B_i factors are all larger in the QM than in the VSA, except for $B_{9;10}^{(2)}$ that are about 1/2 in the HV and about 0.4 in the NDR scheme. For comparison, the lattice estimate at = 2 GeV in this case yields $B_{7:8}^{(2)} = 1.0$ 0.2 and $B_{9}^{(2)} = 0.62$ 0.10 [5].

The most relevant result for "⁰=" is the value of B₈⁽²⁾ which ranges from 1.5 to 2 times that of the VSA. This increase is due to two independent reasons. On the one hand, we found two new terms in the chiral lagrangian that have not been included so far in the VSA estimate of them atrix elements. The chiral coe cients of these terms are computed in the QM approach as discussed in detail in I. It is an open question how they can be determined in the VSA fram ework.

From this point of view, what we have referred to as VSA | and used in table 3 as normalization for the Q_{7,8} operators | is not the complete VSA result. The inclusion of the new term s amounts up to a 60% increase of B_{7,8}⁽²⁾ for small values of hqqi in the chosen range and down to about 10% for large values; smaller e ects are found in the case of B_{7,8}⁽⁰⁾. On the other hand, the meson-loop renormalization associated with the new chiral terms is large (see I) and adds up to reproduce the results shown in table 3. The increase in importance of the operator Q₈ with respect to Q₆ turns into a more e ective cancellation between the two operators for large values of the quark condensate while at smaller values the gluon penguin contribution prevails.

The relations $B_{9}^{(2)} = B_{2}^{(2)}$, $B_{10}^{(2)} = B_{1}^{(2)}$ and $B_{1}^{(2)} = B_{2}^{(2)}$ hold true in both 5schemes. These relationships are a rem in iscent of those among the operators which are preserved by gluon corrections and meson renormalization. 6 Studying "⁰=" in the QM

The quantity " 0 =" can be written as

$$\frac{\mathbf{m}^{0}}{\mathbf{m}} = \frac{\mathbf{G}_{\mathrm{F}} !}{2 j j \mathbf{R} e \mathbf{A}_{0}} \operatorname{Im}_{\mathrm{t}} \mathbf{0} \frac{1}{!} \mathbf{2}; \qquad (6.1)$$

where, referring to the S = 1 quark lagrangian of eq. (2.1),

$$y_{1}hQ_{1}i_{0} \qquad (62)$$

$${}_{2} = \sum_{i}^{X^{\perp}} y_{i}hQ_{i}i_{2} + ! \sum_{i}^{X} y_{i}hQ_{i}i_{0} + 0;$$
(6.3)

and

$$\operatorname{Im}_{t} \operatorname{Im} V_{td} V_{ts}: \tag{6.4}$$

The quantity $_{+}$ $_{\circ}$ includes the e ect of the isospin-breaking mixing between 0 and the etas.

Since Im $_{u} = 0$ according to the standard conventions, the short-distance component of "⁰=" is determined by the W ilson coecients y_i. Following the approach of ref. [3], y₁() = y₂() = 0. As a consequence, the matrix elements of Q_{1,2} do not directly enter the determination of "⁰=". On the other hand, in the HV scheme the matrix elements of Q₄ Q₉ and Q₁₀ can be expressed in terms of those of Q_{1,2} and Q₃. The work of ref. [3] has taken advantage of this fact to determine some of the penguin matrix elements, after in posing the I = 1=2 rule. The QM determination of hQ_{1,2,3}i₀ gives for hQ₄i₀ a result that di ers substantially from that used in ref. [3], as we discuss at the end of section 6.3.

W e take, as input values for the relevant quantities, the central values given in appendix. W e thus have

$$\frac{G_{F}!}{2 j j R e A_{0}} ' 349 \text{ GeV}^{3}; ! = 1 = 222; + 0 = 0.25: (6.5)$$

The large value in eq. (6.5) for 1=! comes from the I = 1=2 selection rule. In II we have shown that such a rule is well reproduced by the QM evaluation of the hadronic matrix elements. As the precise values of ReA₀ and ! depend on the choice of the input parameters and of M | the selection rule being satis ed within a 20% approximation | we have taken the corresponding experimental values. Similarly, the value taken for " is the experimental one.

6.1 The M ixing Parameter Im $_{\rm t}$

A range for Im $_{t}$ is determined from the experimental value of " as a function of m $_{t}$ and the other relevant parameters involved in the theoretical estimate. We will use the most recent NLO results for the QCD correction factors $_{1;2;3}$ which are given in the NDR scheme [25] and vary the S = 2 hadronic parameter \hat{B}_{K} around the central value obtained in the QM using the same regularization scheme.

In order to restrict the allowed values of ${\rm Im}_{\rm t}$ we have solved the two equations

$$"_{th} (\dot{B}_{K}; \dot{y}_{cb}; \dot{y}_{us}; \dot{y}_{us}; \dot{y}_{ub}; \dot{y}_{ub}; y_{cD}; m_{t}; m_{c}; ;) = "$$
(6.6)

$${}^{2} + {}^{2} = \frac{1}{\dot{y}_{us} f} \frac{\dot{y}_{ub} f}{\dot{y}_{cb} f}$$
(6.7)

to nd the allowed values of $% 10^{-1}$ and $% 10^{-1}$ and [14]

$$\mathbf{j}^{*}\mathbf{j} = (2.266 \quad 0.023) \quad 10^{-3} \tag{6.8}$$

$$y_{us}j = 0.2205 \quad 0.0018$$
 (6.9)

$$y_{cb}j = 0.041 \quad 0.003$$
 (6.10)

$$y_{ub} = y_{cb} = 0.08 \quad 0.02:$$
 (6.11)

For the renorm alization group invariant parameter $\hat{B_K}$ we take the rather conservative range

$$\hat{B}_{K} = 0.55 \quad 0.25$$
 (6.12)

that encompasses both the QM model prediction [26] and other current determ inations [27].

For the NLO order -parameters for $^{(4)}_{QCD}$ = 350 MeV and m $^{(pole)}_{t}$ = 180 GeV, at = m $_{c}$ we nd

$$_{1} = 1.36$$
 $_{2} = 0.513$ $_{3} = 0.446$ (6.13)

We do not include bounds provided by the quantity x_d of B-physics that we nd to have a marginal in pact in the determ ination of "⁰=" once the large error in (6.12) is taken into account.

This procedure gives two possible ranges for Im $_{t}$ ' $y_{us} j y_{cb} j$, which correspond to having the KM phase in the I or II quadrant (positive or negative, respectively). For example, for $m_{t}^{pole} = 180 \text{ GeV}$ (\overline{m}_{t} (m_{W}) ' 183 GeV) and $^{(4)}_{QCD} = 350 \text{ MeV}$ we nd

1:1 10
4
 Im $_{+}$ 1:9 10 4 (6.14)

in the rst quadrant and

 $0.75 \ 10^{4} \ \text{Im} \ t \ 1.9 \ 10^{4}$ (6.15)

in the second quadrant. For the range of \hat{B}_{K} given in eq. (6.12) varying all the other parameters (including m_t and $_{QCD}$) a ects the above limits on Im $_{t}$ by less than 20%. In particular, the upper bound on Im $_{t}$ is stable and it is directly related to the maximum value of obtained from eq. (6.7) (= 0). The upper bound on Im $_{t}$ becomes a sensitive function of the input parameters only if we consider $\hat{B}_{K} > 0.5$. In other words, we agree with ref. [27] that it is the theoretical uncertainty on the hadronic S = 2 matrix element that controls the uncertainty on the determination of Im $_{t}$.

We have included the bounds provided by eqs. (6.6) { (6.7) in all the follow – ing tables and gures.

6.2 5-scheme Independence

In order to x M, we compare the computation in the HV $_5$ -schemewith that in the NDR.Figs. 1, 2 and 3 show how the intersection between the two results remains stable as we change the value of the quark condensate. Fig. 4 shows the change in stability that occurs as we change $_{OCD}^{(4)}$.

We nd that the values at which 5-scheme independence is achieved

$$M = 215 = 220 M eV$$
 (6.16)

are quite stable with respect to di erent values of the matching, the quark and the gluon condensates and m_t . Sm aller values of M are selected for sm aller



Figure 1: $_5$ -scheme dependence of "⁰=". The black (gray) line represents the HV (NDR) result. The results are shown for hopi (0:8 GeV) = (200 MeV)³, m_t^{pole} = 180 GeV, Im _t = 1:3 10⁴ and _{QCD}⁽⁴⁾ = 350 MeV. The stability is obtained at about M = 215 MeV. "⁰=" is given in units of 10³.

values of $_{QCD}$ (and a correspondingly higher value of "⁰="). These results are consistent with those found in II for the I = 1=2 selection rule, where stability is achieved in the range M = 160 220. They are also consistent with the independent estimates discussed in section 3.

As it is apparent from the gures, the nalvalue of " $^{\circ}$ =" strongly depends on the value of M we take. It is only through the device of requiring 5-scheme independence that we are able to reach a de nite prediction. This procedure has the precious pay-o of providing us with an improved estimate that does not su er of the uncertainty due to the 5-scheme dependence of the NLO W ilson coe cients, which may be as large as 80%.

Figs. 4 and 5 show how the intersection depends on $\frac{(4)}{QCD}$.



Figure 2: Sam e as Fig. 1 for hqqi (0:8 G eV) = $(240 \text{ M eV})^3$.



Figure 3: Sam e as Fig. 1 for hqpi (0:8 G eV) = $(280 \text{ M eV})^3$.



Figure 4: Sam e as Fig. 2 for $^{(4)}_{QCD}$ = 250 M eV.



Figure 5: Sam e as Fig. 2 for $^{(4)}_{QCD}$ = 450 M eV.

6.3 Anatomy of "-"

It is useful to consider the individual contribution to " 0 =" of each of the quark operators. We have depicted them as histogram s, where the grey (black) one stands for the contribution before (after) meson-loop renormalization. Henceforth all results are given for M = 220 MeV in the HV scheme.

It is clear from the histogram s of F ig. 6, 7 and 8 that the two dom inating operators are Q_6 and Q_8 . Yet, since they give contributions approximately of the same size and opposite in sign, the nal value turns out to be relatively smalland of size comparable to that of most of the other operators. This result is at the origin the large theoretical uncertainty as well as the unexpected smallness of "⁰=".



Figure 6: H istogram s of the partial contributions to "^Q=" of the height relevant operators for hqqi (0:8 G eV) = (200 M eV)³, $m_t^{\text{pole}} = 180 \text{ G eV}$, Im $_t = 1:3$ 10 ⁴ and $_{\text{QCD}}^{(4)} = 350 \text{ M eV}$. G ray (black) histogram s represent the contribution of each operator without (with) m eson-loop renorm alization. The last two histogram s correspond to the sum of all contributions.

The same histograms serve the purpose of showing that the meson-loop renormalizations are crucial not only in the overall size of each contribution but also in determining the sign of the nal result (see Fig. 7). These corrections



Figure 7: Sam e as Fig. 6 for hqqi (0:8 G eV) = $(240 \text{ M eV})^3$.



Figure 8: Sam e as Fig. 6 for hqqi (0:8 G eV) = $(280 \text{ M eV})^3$.

are here consistently included in the estimate for the st time.

The role of the operator Q_4 turns out to be marginal in our approach. In comparing this result with that of the 1=N_c fram ework [6] (see also the nal tables in ref. [8] where we reproduce the individual 1=N_c contributions for the standard ten operators), it should be recalled that in the above analysis the Q_4 operator is written in terms of Q_1 , Q_2 and Q_3 and that its values is therefore in unceed by the B₁ factors assigned to the form erm atrix elements. In particular, while B₁ and B₂ are in ref. [6] requested to be large in order to account for the I = 1=2 rule, B₃ is assigned the value of 1. Such a procedure produces a rather large value for the matrix element of Q_4 . In our approach, we see that in fact also B₃ is large (and negative!) and that Q_4 , once written in terms of the other operators, is small, as found in the direct estimate.

7 Estimating "⁰="

The prelim inary work of the previous sections allows us to estim ate "^Q=". The two most important sources of uncertainty are the quark condensate and the value of Im $_{t}$. A coordingly, we plot the values of "^Q=" as a function of these two quantities. Fig. 9 and 10 show our estimates, for m_t xed at its central value, in the rst and second quadrant respectively. As it can be seen by inspecting these gures, the larger the value of the quark condensate, the sw ifter is the change in "^Q=".



Figure 9: "^Q=" in units of 10⁻³ for $m_t^{\text{pole}} = 180 \text{ GeV}$ and $\binom{4}{QCD} = 350 \text{ MeV}$ as a function of Im t and the quark condensate hqqi hqqi¹⁼³ in units of GeV. Im t is taken in the rst quadrant. Black (grey) squares represent positive (negative) values.

To have an idea of the e ect of varying m $_t$, the third major source of uncertainty in the input parameters, we have included Fig. 11 where the top mass is varied in the given range.

Fig. 12 shows the stability of our prediction for di erent matching scales

= 0.8 and 1 G eV (the perturbative running of hqqi is included by taking the value of the condensate at = 0.8 G eV as the input value and than running it to = 1 G eV). The matching-scale dependence is below 20% in most of the



Figure 10: Same as Fig. 9 with Im $_{t}$ in quadrant II.

range, becoming alm ost 30% only for very large values of the quark condensate.

In order to provide the reader with a more analytical view, we have also collected in Table 4 the numerical results at the varying of all the relevant parameters.

A first welve gures and four tables, we hope to have convinced the reader that the quantity " 0 =" is di cult to estim ate with great precision. We think that only the order of magnitude can be predicted in a completely reliable manner. The reason is very simple: the nalvalue is the result of the cancellation between two, approximately equal in size, contributions. A coordingly, even a small uncertainty will be amplied and we are unfortunately dealing with rather large ones. And yet, the shear importance of this quantity impels us to provide the best estimate we can.

By varying all parameters in the allowed ranges and, in particular, taking the quark condensate | which is the major source of uncertainty | between (200 MeV)³ and (280 MeV)³ we nd

27 10
$$^{4} < "^{0}=" < 9$$
 10 4 ; (7.1)

where we have kept $Q_{CD}^{(4)}$ xed at its central value. A larger range,



Figure 11: Sam e as Fig. 9 for two di erent values of $m_t: m_t^{\text{pole}} = 168 \text{ GeV}$ (upper surface) and 192 GeV (low er surface).



Figure 12: Same as Fig. 9 for di erent m atching scales: = 0.8 GeV (upper surface) and 1.0 GeV (lower surface).

$^{(4)}_{O C D} = 250 \text{ M ev}$					
hqqi ⁽¹⁼³⁾ (MeV)	m_t^{pole} (GeV)	quadrant I		quadrant II	
	168	3 : 7	6:5	2 : 7	63
200	180	2:9	5 : 3	2:0	4 : 9
	192	2:1	3 : 9	1:4	4:1
	168	3:5	63	2 : 6	6:1
240	180	1 : 6	3 : 0	12	2:8
	192	0:2	0:4	0:1	0:4
	168	0:1	02	0:1	0:2
280	180	4:1	7 : 5	2:9	7 : 0
	192	8 : 0	15	0:5	16
	$\binom{(4)}{QCD} = 35$	50 M ev			
hqqi ⁽¹⁼³⁾ (MeV)	m_t^{pole} (GeV)	quad	rant I	quadr	ant II
	168	5 : 0	8:5	3 : 7	8 : 7
200	180	3:8	6 : 9	2:7	6 : 6
	192	2:6	4 : 7	1:7	4 : 9
	168	4:3	7 : 4	32	7 : 6
240	180	1:5	2 : 7	1:1	2 : 6
	192	13	2 : 4	0:9	2:5
	168	2:3	4 : 0	1:7	4:1
280	180	82	15	5 : 7	14
	192	14	26	9 : 4	27
$^{(4)}_{O C D} = 450 \text{ M ev}$					
hqqi ⁽¹⁼³⁾ (MeV)	m_t^{pole} (GeV)	quad	rant I	quadr	ant II
	168	8 : 4	14	62	14
200	180	62	11	4 : 4	11
	192	4:0	7 : 4	2 : 7	6 : 9
	168	6 : 5	11	4:8	11
240	180	1:5	2:7	1:1	2 : 6
	192	3:4	62	23	5 : 8
	168	6 : 9	12	5:1	11
280	180	17	30	12	30
	192	27	50	18	47

Table 4: Table of "⁰=" in units of 10⁴. Matching scale = 0.8 GeV. The two values corresponds to, respectively, the lower and upper bounds of Im $_{t}$, which are determined by consistency with ".

is obtained by varying $Q_{CD}^{(4)}$ as well.

It should be stressed that the large range of negative values that we obtain is a consequence of two characteristic features of our matrix elements: i) the enhancement of the size of the electroweak matrix elements hQ₈₇ i due to the coherent e ects of the additional (p^2) contributions so far neglected (see discussion in sect. 5) and the chiral bop corrections; ii) the linear dependence on hqpi of the leading gluon penguin matrix elements compared to the quadratic dependence of the leading terms in the electroweak matrix elements, which makes the latter prevail for large values of the quark condensate. The e ect of i) represents an enhancement of the leading electroweak matrix elements by a factor two with respect to the vacuum insertion approximation and present $1=N_c$ estimates (see table 3), while feature ii) is absent in the $1=N_c$ approach, the quark condensate dependence being always quadratic.

To provide a som ewhat m ore restrictive estimate we may assume for the quark condensate the improved PCAC result, namely hqqi = $(221 \ 17 \text{ M eV})^3$ at our matching scale = 0.8 GeV, and thus nd

$$\mathbf{"}^{0} = \mathbf{"} = \begin{cases} < 4 \cdot 5^{+4 \cdot 1}_{5 \cdot 4} & 10^{-4} \text{ quadrant I} \\ : 3 \cdot 9^{+5 \cdot 0}_{4 \cdot 5} & 10^{-4} \text{ quadrant II} \end{cases}$$
(7.3)

The value of " 0 =" = (4 5) 10 ⁴ quoted in the abstract is obtained by averaging over the two quadrants in eq. (7.3).

The range (4.10) for the quark condensate, on which the above estimate is based, is not the favorite one by our analysis of the I = 1=2 selection rule in the QM. The upper half of the more conservative range (4.2) seems to accommodate more naturally the rule, at least for a constituent mass M ' 220 MeV | the value we nd by requiring 5-scheme independence of "⁰=". For large values of the quark condensate the central values of "⁰=" shift toward the superweak regime, and the role of meson loop corrections becomes crucial.

By taking the quark condensate in the range (4.6), the QCD-SR in proved PCAC result, we nd

$$\mathbf{"}^{0} = \mathbf{"} = \begin{cases} < 1.4 + \frac{6.5}{5.5} & 10^{-4} \text{ quadrant I} \\ : 1.2 + \frac{9.3}{4.0} & 10^{-4} \text{ quadrant II} \end{cases}$$
(7.4)

A ctually, for such a range of hqqi, negative central values of " 0 =" in both quadrants are obtained due to the extra term s of the bosonization of the electrow eak operators Q₇ and Q₈ neglected in the previous estimates. Only after the inclusion of the meson-bop renormalization " 0 =" turns to the positive central values of eq. (7.4). In F ig 13 we have sum marized the present status of the theoretical



Theoretical Predictions

Figure 13: P resent status of theoretical predictions and experim ental values for "⁰=" (in units of 10⁴). The most recent 1=N_c [6] and lattice [5] estimates are compared to (a) our unbiased estimate (7.2), (b) our more restrictive estimate (7.3).

predictions for " 0 =", com pared to the present 1 experim ental results.

8 Outlook

O ur phenom enological analysis, based on the simplest implementation of the QM and chiral lagrangian methods, takes advantage of the observation that the I = 1=2 selection rule in kaon decays is well reproduced in terms of three basic parameters (the constituent quark mass M and the quark and gluon condensates) in terms of which all hadronic matrix elements of the S = 1lagrangian can be expressed. We have used the best t of the selection rule to constrain the allowed ranges of M , happi and hGG i and we have fed them in the analysis of " 0 -".

N onetheless, the error bars on the prediction of " 0 =" remain large. This is due to two conspiring features: 1) the destructive interference between the large hadronic matrix elements of Q₆ and Q₈ which enhances up to an order of magnitude any related uncertainty in the nalprediction (this feature is general and does not depend on the speci c approach); 2) the fact that large quark-condensate values are preferred in tting the isospin zero K 0 ! am plitude at 0 (p^{2}) (which is a model dependent result).

W hereas little can be done concerning point 1) which makes di cult any theoretical attempt to predict " 0 =" with a precision better than a factor two, an improvement on 2) can be pursued within the present approach.

Two lines of research are in progress. On the one hand, we are extending the analysis to O (p^4) in the chiral expansion to gain better precision on the hadronic matrix elements and to determ ine in a self-consistent way the polinom ial contributions from the chiral loops; preliminary results indicate that the I = 1=2 rule is reproduced for smaller values of the gluon and quark condensates, thus reducing our error bar, in the direction shown by our more restrictive estimate. On the other hand, we are studying the S = 2 sector to determ ine at the same order of accuracy \hat{B}_{K} and the K $_{L}$ {K $_{S}$ m ass dimense by including in the latter the interference with long-distance contributions that can be self-consistently computed in the present approach.

W hether this program is successfull may better determine how much of the long range dynamics of QCD is embedded in the present approach and increase our condence on the predictions of unknown observables.

A Input Parameters

param eter	value			
V _{ud}	0.9753			
Vus	0:2205 0:0018			
$\sin^2 w$	0,2247			
m _z	91.187 G eV			
m w	80.22 G eV			
m _b	4.8 G eV			
m _c	1.4 G eV			
j"j	(2:266 0:023) 10 ³			
ĴУ _{сb} ј	0:041 0:003			
∱v _{ub} =V _{cb} j	0:08 0:02			
m t pole	180 12 G eV			
Ък	0:55 0:25			
f = f +	92.4 M eV			
$f_{K} = f_{K^{+}}$	113 M eV			
m = (m + + m ∘)=2	138 M eV			
m $_{\rm K}$ = m $_{\rm K}$ °	498 M eV			
m	548 M eV			
	$2^{p}\overline{2}$ f			
+ 0	0:25 0:05			
(4) Q C D	350 100 M eV			
$\overline{m}_u + \overline{m}_d$ (1 GeV)	12 2:5 M eV			
$\overline{\rm m}_{\rm s}$ (1 G eV)	178 18 M eV			
hqqi	(200 280 MeV) ³			
h _s GG= i	(376 47 MeV) ⁴			

Table 5: Table of the num erical values of the input param eters.

References

- [1] G D.Barretal. (NA 31 Coll.), Phys. Lett. B 317 (1993) 233.
- [2] LK.Gibbons et al. (E731 Coll.), Phys. Rev. Lett. 70 (1993) 1203.
- [3] A J.Buras, M. Jam in and M. E. Lautenbacher, Nucl. Phys. B 408 (1993) 209.
- [4] M.Ciuchini, E.Franco, G.Martinelli and L.Reina, Nucl. Phys. B 415 (1994)
 403; Phys. Lett. B 301 (1993) 263.
- [5] M. Ciuchini, E. Franco, G. Martinelli and L. Reina, Estimates of "^Q=", in The Second DA NE Physics Handbook, eds. L. Maiani et al. (Frascati, 1995); Z. Phys. C 68 (1995) 239 and references therein.
- [6] G.Buchalla, A.J.Buras and M.E.Lautenbacher, W eak D ecays beyond Leading Logarithm s, hep-ph/95112380, to appear in Rev. M od. P hys..
- [7] J.Flynn and L.Randall, Phys.Lett. B 224 (1989) 221; Erratum, Phys.Lett. B 235 (1990) 412;
 M.Lusignoli, Nucl.Phys.B 325 (1989) 33;
 G.Buchalla, A.J.Buras and M.K.Harlander, Nucl.Phys.B 337 (1990) 313.
- [8] S.Bertolini, J.O. Eeg and M. Fabbrichesi, Nucl. Phys. B 449 (1995) 197.
- [9] K.Nishijim a, Nuovo Cim. 11 (1959) 698;
 F.Gursey, Nuovo Cim. 16 (1960) 230 and Ann.Phys. (NY) 12 (1961) 91;
 JA.Cronin, Phys. Rev. 161 (1967) 1483;
 S.W einberg, Physica 96A (1979) 327;
 A.Manohar and H.Georgi, Nucl. Phys. B 234 (1984) 189;
 A.Manohar and G.Moore, Nucl. Phys. B 243 (1984) 55.
- [10] V.Antonelli, S.Bertolini, J.O. Eeg, M. Fabbrichesi and E.I.Lashin, The S = 1 W eak Chiral Lagrangian as the E ective Theory of the Chiral Quark M odel, preprint SISSA 43/95/EP (September 1995), hep-ph/9511255, to appear in Nuclear Physics B.
- [11] V. Antonelli, S. Bertolini, M. Fabbrichesi and E.J. Lashin, The I = 1=2 Selection Rule, preprint SISSA 102/95/EP (October 1995), hep-ph/9511341, to appear in Nuclear Physics B.
- [12] M A.Shifman, A.J.Vainsthein and V.J.Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. B 120 (1977) 316;
 F.J.Gilman and M.B.Wise, Phys. Rev. D 20 (1979) 2392;

J.Bijnens and M B.W ise, Phys.Lett. B 137 (1984) 245; M.Lusignoli, Nucl.Phys.B 325 (1989) 33.

- [13] L3 Coll., Phys. Lett. B 248 (1990) 464, Phys. Lett. B 257 (1991) 469;
 ALEPH Coll., Phys. Lett. B 255 (1991) 623, Phys. Lett. B 257 (1991) 479;
 DELPHIColl., Z.Phys. C 54 (1992) 55;
 OPAL Coll., Z.Phys. C 55 (1992) 1;
 Mark-IIColl., Phys. Rev. Lett. 64 (1990) 987;
 SLD Coll., Phys. Rev. Lett. 71 (1993) 2528.
- [14] L.Montanet et al., Phys. Rev. D 50 (1994) 1173 and 1995 o -year partial update for the 1996 edition (http://pdg.blgov/).
- [15] J.Bijnens, Int. J. M od. Phys. A 8 (1993) 3045.
- [16] J.Bijnens, Ch.Bruno and E.de Rafael, Nucl. Phys. B 390 (1993) 501.
- [17] S.Narison, Phys. Lett. B 197 (1987) 405.
- [18] E.Braaten, S.Narison and A.Pich, Nucl. Phys. B 373 (1992) 581;
 S.Narison, Phys. Lett. B 361 (1995) 121;
 R A.Bertlm ann et al., Z.Phys. C 39 (1988) 231.
- [19] C A.Dom inguez and E.de Rafael, Ann. Phys. (NY) 174 (1987) 372.
- [20] S.Narison, hep-ph/9504333.
- [21] D.Danieletal, Phys.Rev.D 46 (1992) 3130;
 D.Weingarten, Nucl.Phys.B 34 (1994) 29 (Proc.Suppl.).
- [22] M.Jamin and M.Munz, Z.Phys.C 66 (1995) 633;
 C.Alton et al., Nucl.Phys.B 431 (1994) 667.
- [23] J.Bijnens, J.Prades and E. de Rafael, Phys. Lett. B 348 (1995) 226.
- [24] W A.Bardeen A J.Buras and J.M.Gerard, Phys.Lett. B 192 (1987) 138;
 W A.Bardeen, A J.Buras and J.M.Gerard, Nucl. Phys. B 293 (1987) 787.
- [25] A.J.Buras, M. Jam in and P.H. Weisz, Nucl. Phys. B 347 (1990) 491;
 S.Herrlich and U.Nierste, Nucl. Phys. B 419 (1994) 292;
 U.Nierste, Ph.D dissertation (Technische Universitat Munchen, 1995).
- [26] A.Pich and E. de Rafael, Nucl. Phys. B 358 (1991) 311;
 Ch.Bruno, Phys. Lett. B 320 (1994) 135;
 V.Antonelli, S.Bertolini, M. Fabbrichesi and E.I. Lashin, The B_K Parameter in the QM Including Chiral Loops, preprint SISSA 20/96/EP.

[27] A.Pich and J.Prades, Phys.Lett. B 346 (1995) 342.