

Available online at www.sciencedirect.com



PHYSICS LETTERS B

Physics Letters B 639 (2006) 283-289

www.elsevier.com/locate/physletb

## $V_{us}$ from hadronic $\tau$ decays

Kim Maltman a,\*, Carl E. Wolfe b

a Department of Mathematics and Statistics, York University, 4700 Keele St., Toronto, ON, Canada M3J 1P3
b Department of Physics and Astronomy, York University, 4700 Keele St., Toronto, ON, Canada M3J 1P3

Received 4 May 2006; received in revised form 18 May 2006; accepted 23 May 2006

Available online 9 June 2006

Editor: M. Cvetič

#### **Abstract**

We study the reliability of extractions of  $|V_{us}|$  based on flavor-breaking hadronic  $\tau$  decay sum rules. The "(0,0) spectral weight", proposed previously as a favorable candidate for this extraction, is shown to produce results having poor stability with respect to  $s_0$ , the upper limit on the relevant spectral integral, suggesting theoretical errors much larger than previously anticipated. We argue that this instability is due to the poor convergence of the integrated D=2 OPE series. Alternate weight choices designed to bring this convergence under better control are shown to produce significantly improved stability, and determinations of  $|V_{us}|$  which are both mutually compatible, and consistent, within errors, with values obtained by other methods.

© 2006 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

PACS: 12.15.Hh; 13.35.Dx; 11.55.Hx

#### 1. Background

Three-family unitarity of the Cabibbo–Kobayashi–Maskawa (CKM) matrix implies

$$|V_{ud}|^2 + |V_{us}|^2 + |V_{ub}|^2 = 1, (1)$$

with the  $V_{ub}$  contribution playing a numerically negligible role [1]. Analyses of  $K_{\ell e3}$  incorporating recent updates to the  $K_L$  lifetime [2], the  $K^+$  [3],  $K_L$  [4] and  $K_s$  [5] branching fractions, and the  $K_{\ell 3}$  form factor slope parameters [6], together with strong isospin-breaking and long distance electromagnetic corrections computed in the framework of ChPT [7], lead to [8]

$$f_{+}(0)|V_{us}| = 0.2173 \pm 0.0008,$$
 (2)

which, with the Leutwyler–Roos estimate,  $f_+(0) = 0.961 \pm 0.008$  [9] (compatible within errors with recent quenched and unquenched lattice results [10]), yields [8]

$$|V_{us}| = 0.2261 \pm 0.0021. \tag{3}$$

This result is in good agreement with expectations based on unitarity and the most recent update of the average of superallowed  $0^+ \rightarrow 0^+$  nuclear  $\beta$  decay [11] and neutron decay [12] results,  $|V_{ud}| = 0.9738 \pm 0.0003$  [8]. The  $\sim 2\sigma$  discrepancy observed when earlier K decay results were employed thus appears finally to have been resolved. One should, however, bear in mind two recent developments relevant to  $|V_{ud}|$ : (i) a new measurement of the neutron lifetime, in strong disagreement with the previous world average [13], and (ii) a Penning trap measurement of the Q value of the superallowed  ${}^{46}V$  decay [14] in significant disagreement with the average used as input in Ref. [11], and with the potential to raise doubts about current evaluations of structure-dependent isospin-breaking corrections [15]. The potentially unsettled  $|V_{ud}|$  situation makes alternate (non- $K_{\ell 3}$ ) determinations of  $|V_{us}|$  of interest, both as a means of testing the Standard Model (SM) scenario for strangenesschanging interactions, and for reducing errors through averaging. Two such alternate methods have been proposed recently.

In the first,  $|V_{us}/V_{ud}|$  is extracted using lattice results for  $f_K/f_\pi$  in combination with experimental results for  $\Gamma[K_{\mu 2}]/\Gamma[\pi_{\mu 2}]$  [16]. With the recently updated MILC  $n_f=3$  unquenched lattice result,  $f_K/f_\pi=1.198^{+0.016}_{-0.006}$  [17], the first

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author.

E-mail address: kmaltman@yorku.ca (K. Maltman).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> CSSM, University of Adelaide, Adelaide, SA 5005, Australia.

method yields

$$|V_{us}| = 0.2245^{+0.0011}_{-0.0031},\tag{4}$$

compatible within errors with the  $K_{\ell 3}$  determination.

The second of these proposals involves the analysis of flavor-breaking sum rules employing strange and non-strange hadronic  $\tau$  decay data [18], and forms the subject of the rest of this Letter. Existing results, based on the "(0,0) spectral weight" version of this analysis [18], will be discussed in Section 3.1 below. The discussion to follow represents an update and extension of the preliminary results presented in Ref. [19].

#### 2. $V_{us}$ from hadronic $\tau$ decay data

With  $\Pi^{(J)}_{V/A;ij}$  the spin J parts of the flavor ij=ud,us vector/axial vector correlators,  $\rho^{(J)}_{V/A;ij}$  the corresponding spectral functions, and  $R_{V/A;ij} \equiv \Gamma[\tau^- \to \nu_{\tau} \text{hadrons}_{V/A;ij}(\gamma)]/\Gamma[\tau^- \to \nu_{\tau} e^- \bar{\nu}_e(\gamma)]$ , the kinematics of hadronic  $\tau$  decay imply [20]

$$R_{V/A;ij} = 12\pi^2 |V_{ij}|^2 S_{\text{EW}} \int_{\text{th}}^{m_{\tau}^2} \frac{ds}{m_{\tau}^2} (1 - y_{\tau})^2 \times \left[ (1 + 2y_{\tau}) \rho_{V/A;ij}^{(0+1)}(s) - 2y_{\tau} \rho_{V/A;ij}^{(0)}(s) \right], \tag{5}$$

where  $y_{\tau} = s/m_{\tau}^2$ ,  $V_{ij}$  is the flavor ij CKM matrix element,  $S_{\rm EW} = 1.0201 \pm 0.0003$  [21] is a short-distance electroweak correction, and the superscript (0+1) denotes the sum of J=0 and J=1 contributions. Eq. (5) is written in such a way that both terms on the RHS can be rewritten using the general finite energy sum rule (FESR) relation,

$$\int_{\text{th}}^{s_0} ds \, w(s) \rho(s) = \frac{-1}{2\pi i} \oint_{|s| = s_0} ds \, w(s) \Pi(s), \tag{6}$$

valid for any analytic weight w(s) and any correlator  $\Pi$  without kinematic singularities. Quantities  $R_{V/A;ij}^{(k,m)}$ , analogous to  $R_{V/A;ij}$ , are obtained by rescaling the experimental decay distribution with the factor  $(1-y_\tau)^k y_\tau^m$  before integrating. The corresponding FESR's are referred to as the "(k,m) spectral weight sum rules". Similar FESR's can be written down for general weights w(s), for  $s_0 < m_\tau^2$ , and for the separate correlator combinations  $\Pi_{V/A;ij}^{(0+1)}(s)$  and  $s\Pi_{V/A;ij}^{(0)}(s)$ . The corresponding spectral integrals,  $\int_{\rm th}^{s_0} ds \, w(s) \rho_{V/A;ij}^{(J)}(s)$ , will be denoted  $R_{ij}^w(s_0)$  in what follows. In FESR's involving both the J=0+1 and J=0 combinations, the purely J=0 contribution will be referred to as "longitudinal".

With this background, the  $\tau$ -based extraction of  $V_{us}$  works schematically as follows [18]. Given experimental values for the spectral integrals  $R_{ij}^w(s_0)$ , ij = ud, us, corresponding to the same w(s) and same  $s_0$ , the combination

$$\delta R^w(s_0) = \frac{R^w_{ud}(s_0)}{|V_{ud}|^2} - \frac{R^w_{us}(s_0)}{|V_{us}|^2} \tag{7}$$

vanishes in the SU(3) flavor limit and hence has an OPE representation,  $\delta R_{\text{OPE}}^w(s_0)$ , which begins at dimension D=2. Solving for  $|V_{us}|$ , one has

$$|V_{us}| = \sqrt{\frac{R_{us}^{w}(s_0)}{[R_{ud}^{w}(s_0)/|V_{ud}|^2] - \delta R_{\text{OPE}}^{w}(s_0)}}.$$
 (8)

At scales  $\sim 2\text{--}3~\text{GeV}^2$ , and for weights used in the literature, the dominant D=2 term in  $\delta R_{\text{OPE}}^w(s_0)$  is much smaller than the leading D=0 contribution and, as a consequence, similarly smaller than the separate ud, us spectral integrals (for physical  $m_s$ , typically at the few to several percent level). The OPE uncertainty,  $\Delta(\delta R_{\text{OPE}}^w(s_0))$ , thus produces a fractional  $|V_{us}|$  error  $\simeq \Delta(\delta R_{\text{OPE}}^w(s_0))/2R_{ud}^w(s_0)$ , much smaller than the fractional uncertainty on  $\delta R_{\text{OPE}}^w(s_0)$  itself. High accuracy for  $|V_{us}|$  is thus obtainable with only modest accuracy for  $\delta R_{\text{OPE}}^w(s_0)$  provided experimental spectral integral errors can be kept under control.

At present, the absence of a V/A separation of the us spectral data means one must work with sum rules based on the observed V + A combination. This combination also reduces the fractional ud spectral integral errors. With present ud spectral data [22–24], these errors are at the  $\sim 0.5\%$  level for weights used previously in the literature. The much smaller strange branching fraction leads to limited statistics and coarser binning for the us spectral distribution [25–27]. The K pole term is very accurately known, but errors are  $\sim 6-8\%$  in the  $K^*$  region and > 20-30% above 1 GeV<sup>2</sup>. For weights used in the literature, the result is us spectral integrals with  $\sim 3-4\%$  uncertainties [25,27,28]. Experimental errors on  $|V_{us}|$  are thus at the  $\sim 1.5-2\%$  level, and dominated by uncertainties in the us sector. The situation should improve dramatically with the increase in statistics and improved K identification available from the B factory experiments.

A number of points relevant to reducing OPE errors are outlined below. Note that use of the V+A sum rules has the added advantage of strongly suppressing duality violation at the scales considered [29]. Working with weights satisfying  $w(s=s_0)=0$  further suppresses such contributions [29,30], as does working at scales  $s_0 > 2$  GeV<sup>2</sup> [31].

A major, and irreducible, source of OPE uncertainty for "inclusive" sum rules (those involving both J=0+1 and J=0 contributions) is that produced by the bad behavior of the integrated longitudinal D=2 OPE series. This representation displays badly non-convergent behavior, order by order in  $\alpha_s$ , even at the maximum scale,  $s_0=m_{\tau}^2$ , allowed by kinematics [32]. Moreover, for the (k,0) spectral weights, those truncations of this series employed in the literature can be shown to strongly violate constraints associated with the positivity of the continuum (non-K-pole) part of  $\rho_{V+A;us}^{(0)}(s)$  [33].

The impossibility of making sensible use of the longitudinal OPE representation necessitates working with sum rules based on the J=0+1 combination. Since no complete J=0/1 spin separation of the spectral data exists, a phenomenological subtraction of the longitudinal parts of the experimental decay distribution is necessary. This can be done with good accuracy because the (very accurately known)  $\pi$  and K pole terms dominate the subtraction, for a combination of chiral

### Download English Version:

# https://daneshyari.com/en/article/8198653

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/8198653

<u>Daneshyari.com</u>