arXiv:hep-ph/9912349v2 21 Jan 2000

NIKHEF/99-032

Heavy Flavours at Colliders

Eric Laenen†

† NIKHEF Theory Group, Kruislaan 409, 1009 DB, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Abstract. I review some topics in the production and decays of heavy flavours that are relevant for collider physics. In particular, I discuss the present status and some recent progress related to masses, parton densities and fragmentation functions of heavy quarks, as well as threshold resummation, polarized onium production at high transverse momentum, and a factorization theorem for $B \to \pi\pi$ decays.

1. Introduction

When we consider the main physics goals of present and upcoming high energy colliders, we may justly distinguish the heavy quarks charm, bottom and top from their light brethren up, down and strange as being especially important.

In the Standard Model (SM), on the electroweak side, the ability to individually identify (tag) various types of heavy-flavoured hadrons allows detailed scrutiny of its family structure, via e.g. measurements of the CKM matrix elements, couplings to the Z-boson, production asymmetries etc. The large Higgs Yukawa couplings of the heavy quarks are central to many Higgs search strategies. On the QCD side, this same ability gives us a closer look into hard scattering production mechanisms than more average quantities like jets. Moreover, the fact that their masses are larger than the scale where the strong coupling regime in QCD begins means that physics involving these heavy quarks is much more amenable to perturbative analysis.

Concerning physics beyond the SM, experience with SM heavy flavour production helps in predicting production rates for non-SM heavy particles. Also, certain B-decays (e.g. $B \to X_s\gamma$) are sensitive to the virtual presence of non-SM particles (see e.g. [1] and references therein).

Thus there is a large arena in which heavy flavours play a key role. I will discuss a QCD-biased selection of topics that are chosen for being fundamental to (heavy flavour) physics, and for either recently having undergone significant progress, or for showing clear potential for such. Consequently, what follows is somewhat of an itemized list, rather than an story with a plot.

2. Heavy Quark Mass

Central to all heavy flavour physics at high energy colliders is the need for knowing their masses accurately. But the concept of mass for a confined, unstable fermion needs careful definition and consideration. Let us review some definitions and discuss their relations.

2.1. Pole Mass M

This is the most common and natural definition of the electron or muon mass in QED. In QCD, the heavy quark pole mass is defined via the inverse heavy quark Feynman propagator

$$S_F^{-1}(p) = \not{p} - m_0 - \not{\Sigma}(p, g_0, m_0)\,, \tag{1}$$

where $\not{\Sigma}$ is the sum of all one-particle irreducible QCD corrections to the propagator, m_0 is the bare heavy quark mass, and g_0 is the bare coupling. For this discussion I ignore electroweak corrections which give the heavy quark a finite width. The pole mass M is defined by the requirement that the propagator has a pole at $p^2 = M^2$. It is related to the bare mass by

$$M = Z_m m_0\,, \tag{2}$$

with the UV-regulator dependent Z_m a series in g_0. To determine this series, one puts the right hand side of (1) to zero at $p^2 = M^2$, and solves for M iteratively. UV divergences in Z_m are cancelled by those of the bare mass and coupling. Thus defined, M is also infrared-finite and gauge-independent to all orders [2, 3].

There are a number of attractive features to this definition, besides its correspondence with QED and its intuitive nature: it is essentially the pole mass that is directly reconstructed from the heavy quark decay products, it can be calculated not just in full QCD, but also in effective theories such as non-relativistic QCD (NRQCD) and heavy-quark effective theory (HQET), and it is the required definition in renormalization schemes [4] in which heavy particles manifestly decouple in Green's functions with small external momenta.

There is also a problem with the pole mass definition. A renormalon analysis [5, 6] shows that the pole mass of a heavy quark has an intrinsic uncertainty of order $\Lambda_{\rm QCD}$. A heuristic argument for this intrinsic uncertainty, valid also if the heavy quark has a finite width, may be given based on confinement [7]: if the pole mass M could be known to arbitrary precision, then the closer to M^2 the (momentum)^2 of a produced heavy quark would be, the longer-lived it would be, ultimately leading to it being freely observable. But because we know quarks are confined, it must be impossible to know the pole mass to a precision greater than the confinement scale $\Lambda_{\rm QCD}$.

For the top quark this ambiguity has no impact on any physics analysis, since the top decays long before any confinement effects come into play [8, 9, 10].

This uncertainty does however matter for the charm and bottom masses, and for precise mass determinations other definitions are required. There is a particular need

for a precisely known heavy quark mass in heavy meson decay rates, which scale as $(\text{mass})^5$ and are needed to infer the CKM element V_{cb}.

2.2. $\overline{\text{MS}}$ *mass* $m(\mu)$

One may also treat the bare mass m_0 in the QCD Lagrangian as a two-particle coupling constant, which upon UV $\overline{\text{MS}}$ renormalization,

$$m(\mu) = z_m(\mu) m_0 \tag{3}$$

becomes a running $\overline{\text{MS}}$ mass $m(\mu)$. This more formal mass definition lacks the intuitive character of the pole mass, but does not suffer from non-perturbative ambiguities. It is thus a better definition for precision measurement.

Both mass definitions can be viewed as different renormalizations of the same bare mass, so one may express $m(m)$ in M. This relation reads to N^{3}LO [11, 12]

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{M}{m(m)} = 1 &+ 1.333\left(\frac{\alpha_s(m)}{\pi}\right) + (13.44 - 1.041 n_l)\left(\frac{\alpha_s(m)}{\pi}\right)^2 \\ &+ (194(5) - 27.0(7) n_l + 0.653 n_l^2)\left(\frac{\alpha_s(m)}{\pi}\right)^3 + \mathcal{O}(\Lambda_{\text{QCD}})\end{aligned}$$

with n_l the number of light flavours, and the numbers in brackets in the last term reflect an uncertainty in Padé approximations used to obtain the $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^3)$ [12] results. Very recently, the relation also been computed exactly [13].

2.3. Other mass definitions

There has been much recent development in determining the heavy quark masses from $Q\bar{Q}$ systems near threshold. Their properties may be computed in an effective theory, non-relativistic QCD (NRQCD) [14]. Observables in these systems are in general less infrared-sensitive than the pole mass, so that this mass definition is not preferred.

To determine $m(m)$ accurately, other, intermediate mass definitions or schemes are very valuable. In [15] the Potential Subtraction (PS) scheme was proposed. It was shown in [15, 16] that the nonrelativistic Coulomb $Q\bar{Q}$ potential $V(r)$ has precisely the same infrared sensitivity as $-2M$. The combination $2M + V(r)$ occurs naturally in the process $e^+e^- \to Q\bar{Q}X$ near-threshold, which is governed by the Schrödinger operator $H - E$, with

$$H = \frac{-\nabla^2}{2M} + V(r), \qquad E = \sqrt{s} - 2M\,. \tag{4}$$

This suggests to redefine a potential and mass both with much less infrared sensitivity

$$V(r, \mu_f) = V(r) + 2\delta m(\mu_f), \;\; m_{PS}(\mu_f) = M - \delta m(\mu_f)\,, \tag{5}$$

with μ_f a subtraction scale, and $2\delta m(\mu_f)$ the IR-sensitive part of the potential. Solutions to the Schrödinger equation may be expressed in $m_{PS}(\mu_f)$, but are as a whole independent of μ_f. Comparing with data leads to a determation of $m_{PS}(\mu_f)$, at $\mu_f = 2$ GeV e.g. The relation of $m_{PS}(\mu_f)$ to $m(m)$ is known to order α_s^3 [12, 17].

Other schemes, e.g. based on the $\Upsilon(1S)$ mass [18], and on the B-meson mass [19] exist. An extensive review of these issues together with a detailed comparison between various schemes, as well as results for the heavy quark masses can be found in [20, 21].

The $\overline{\rm MS}$ masses of the heavy quarks are at present known to about 4% for the case of top [22, 23] (from direct reconstruction), to within 2% for the case of the bottom [20] (from sum rules), i.e. the error is already much less than $\Lambda_{\rm QCD}$, and to within 10% for the case of charm [24] (extracted from the charmonium spectrum).

3. Variable Flavour Number Schemes

It is a subtle issue to choose a model for heavy flavour production in collisions with initial hadrons, such as deep-inelastic scattering. One must decide whether one wants to employ a fixed number of light flavours in the evolution of the parton densities and α_s and treat the heavy flavour as an external quantum field: the "fixed flavour-number scheme" (FFNS); or whether one wishes to change the number of dynamical flavours depending on the scale present in the parton subprocess, and introduce heavy quark parton densities: the "variable flavour-number scheme" (VFNS). The past few years have seen much progress in the development of such schemes, which began in [25]. Their development is leading to a considerable increase in understanding field theoretic treatments of heavy quarks in high energy scattering.

Although the FFNS is more straightforward in use, and has been the scheme of choice for almost all available NLO calculations of heavy flavour production, it can suffer from large perturbative corrections proportional to $\alpha_s \ln(Q^2/m^2)$ when the hard scale Q of the reaction is significantly larger than the heavy quark mass m. In a VFNS one views such terms as collinear divergences, which one may consistently factorize into the set of parton densities at hand, augmented by one for the heavy quark. An all order proof for this was given in [26]. In so doing one may control such logarithms to all orders, without relinquishing control over the region $Q \simeq m$.

From an effective field theory viewpoint, one must match a theory with $n_f = n_l + 1$ dynamic quark species, to one with only n_l dynamic ones, in which the heavy quark is not treated as a parton. The coefficient functions of the former are the residues of the latter after subtracting all $\ln(\mu^2/m^2)$ terms via the appropriate operator matrix elements [27]. Their absorption into the n_l set of parton densities leads to matching conditions between these two sets of densities, (as well as the QCD coupling $\alpha_s(\mu)$) at a matching scale, which is conveniently (but not necessarily) chosen to be the heavy quark mass m. These conditions are now known for α_s, in the $\overline{\rm MS}$ scheme, to N^{3}LO [28, 29, 30] and for the $\overline{\rm MS}$ parton densities to NNLO [27]. Both quantities develop a discontinuity at the matching point from NNLO onwards.

Various VFNS implementations now exist [25, 31, 32], mostly in the context of deep-inelastic heavy quark production, i.e. for the structure functions $F_{2,L}^{\rm charm}$. They differ mainly in the order in α_s, in the treatment of the matching conditions, and in the extent to which finite mass effects are retained in the coefficient functions. The latter

are relevant for the formation of actual thresholds in the partonic cross sections.

In [33] a NNLO VFNS scheme was constructed for $F_{2,L}^{\rm charm}$ with $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^2)$ matching conditions and full mass dependence in all coefficient functions. It was compared with a NNLO VFNS scheme in which the subtraction terms, combinations of matrix elements and lower order coefficient functions, have only logarithmic mass dependence [31]. Incidentally, not that in a VFNS in which logarithms of m are viewed as divergences so $F_{2,L}^{\rm charm}$ are no longer infrared-safe observables, since mixing occurs with the $F_{2,L}^{\rm u,d,s,g}$ from $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^2)$ onwards. Jet definitions or fragmentation functions are required (a $Q\bar{Q}$ invariant-mass cut was used in [33]). The two schemes give essentially the same result for $F_2^{\rm charm}$. Both tend to the three-flavour FFNS results at low scale, and to a four-flavour massless-charm result at high scale. The NNLO charm density was found to start off negative at small x at the matching scale (a consequence of the NNLO matching conditions). In [34] four- and five-flavour NLO and NNLO PDF sets were constructed from the GRV98 [35] three-flavour set by using the NNLO matching conditions.

The practical necessity of using VFNS schemes in understanding present collider data is not yet clear (e.g. deep-inelastic charm production at HERA is well described by a three-flavour number scheme for all scales). But if we wish to have accurate predictions for heavy flavour production cross sections for future high energy colliders, free from large logarithms in their perturbative series, further development of higher-order VFNS implementations is very important.

4. Threshold Resummation

Semi-inclusive hadronic cross sections factorize in perturbative QCD into universal, non-perturbative parton distribution functions and fragmentation functions, summarizing long-distance dynamics, and perturbatively calculable hard scattering coefficient functions, which organize all short-distance effects. However, sizable long distance effects remain at higher orders in the hard scattering functions even after infrared divergences have cancelled. These so-called Sudakov corrections assume the form of double-logarithmically enhanced distributions that become singular at partonic threshold. The goal of threshold resummation is to resum these corrections to all orders in perturbation theory, thereby regaining control over the perturbation expansion, a program that has been advanced considerably in the last couple of years. See [36] for a recent review.

Striving for accuracy in this context means resumming not only leading logarithmic (LL) corrections, but also next-to-leading ones and so on. How to achieve this for processes that are electroweak at lowest order, such as Drell-Yan, has been known for a while [37, 38].

It has recently been understood how to do this for general QCD processes, of which the Born amplitudes may comprise various colour structures. For example, in the production of a heavy quark-antiquark pair in a gluon-gluon collision, the final state has the SU(3) representations $\mathbf{3}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{3}}$ and the initial state two octets. Denoting the heavy quark colour labels by k and $\bar{l}$ ($k, \bar{l} = 1, \ldots 3$) and the gluon colour labels by a, b

$(a, b = 1, \ldots, 8)$ the external particles in the Born amplitude can be colour-coupled in three ways

$$\delta_{ab}\delta_{k\bar{l}}, \qquad f_{abc}(t^c)_{k\bar{l}}, \qquad d_{abc}(t^c)_{k\bar{l}}\,. \tag{6}$$

The Sudakov corrections are expressed in terms of functions that are singular at partonic threshold, but give (large) finite results when integrated against smooth functions such as parton densities. They occur in general for each of these colour structures. To resum them to NLL accuracy and beyond requires understanding how these structures mix under soft gluon radiation. [39, 40, 41]. Correspondingly, the all-order threshold-resummed cross section for this channel is a 3 by 3 matrix.

In general, threshold resummation is based on a refactorization of a partonic cross section near threshold [37, 42, 43] into various classes of functions, or effective theories: the double logs are resummed in a colour-diagonal theory for high-momentum collinear incoming partons moving in particular direction, and a similar one for outgoing ones; the single-logarithmic colour-coherence effects are resummed in a colour-mixing theory for soft (eikonal) gluons. The matching to full QCD happens via hard, far off-shell partons. Evolution equations in these effective theories are given in [37, 42, 44]. How to contruct in general NLL resummed cross sections in phenomenologically common one-particle inclusive kinematics was explained in [45].

Various threshold-resummed heavy quark production cross sections have thus been built and phenomenological studies performed. Earlier partially-NLL threshold resummations results for top quark production at the Tevatron were performed [46, 47, 48]. For heavy quarks, full NLL resummations now exist for hadroproduction [39, 41, 49] and electroproduction [50].

Besides having intrinsic value for providing more insight in the nature of perturbative cross sections in near-elastic regions of phase space, there are quite practical benefits to threshold resummation: the ability to assess or predict, in appropriate kinematic regions, the higher order corrections to the cross section [50, 49], and a general reduction in the scale dependence of resummed cross sections [51, 41, 52, 53].

5. Heavy Quark Fragmentation

Fragmentation functions (FF's) match parton production cross sections to ones in which a specified hadron, such as a heavy-flavoured meson or baryon, is produced. As such they are in principle as essential as parton densities in the comparison of QCD calculations to data. Heavy quark FF's are special for two reasons. First, since QCD cannot change flavours, there is a direct link between the flavour of a produced heavy meson and a produced heavy quark, so that we may flavour-tag heavy quarks. Second, collinear divergences associated with radiation from the hard parton are screened by the heavy quark mass, hence, loosely speaking, a large part of the fragmentation process is actually perturbative. In the last few years (perturbative) heavy quark fragmentation has reached a quite mature understanding, and has now been applied in its fully developed form to a few heavy quark production cross sections.

For the description of the nonperturbative transition of a heavy quark (Q) to a heavy hadron ($Q\bar{q}$), the Peterson fragmentation function [54] is often still adequate. It contains in essence one parameter, the mass ratio squared $\epsilon = m_{\bar{q}}^2/m_Q^2$. But heavy quark FF's have a perturbative component as well. The perturbative FF (PFF) satisfies the DGLAP [55, 56, 57] evolution equation:

$$\frac{dD_{i,\mathrm{pert}}(x,\mu)}{d\ln\mu} = \sum_j \int_x^1 \frac{dz}{z} P_{ij}(\frac{x}{z}, \alpha_s(\mu)) D_{j,\mathrm{pert}}(z,\mu)\,, \tag{7}$$

where i, j label parton flavours. With an initial condition at $\mu_0 \simeq m$, (7) determines the PFF at x, μ, and resums $\ln(\mu/\mu_0)$ to all orders. This initial condition for the PFF was first computed in [58] and is, for $i = Q$

$$D_{Q,\mathrm{pert}}(z,\mu_0) = \delta(1-z) + \frac{\alpha_s(\mu_0)C_F}{2\pi}\left[\left(\frac{1+z^2}{1-z}\right)\left(\ln(\frac{\mu_0^2}{m^2}) - 1 - 2\ln(1-z)\right)\right]_+ . \tag{8}$$

For heavy quark production at $p_T \gg m$, the choice $\mu = p_T$ in the solution of (7) then resums the $\ln(p_T/m)$ logarithms to all orders. The full fragmentation function requires combining the perturbative FF with a non-perturbative part modelling the final hadronization.

Heavy flavour production in e^+e^- collisions has been thoroughly studied both at fixed order [59, 60, 61] and in a combined fixed order plus next-to-leading logarithmic (here $\ln(E/m)$ with E the beam energy) resummed approach [62], using the Peterson function for the non-perturbative transition. This combined approach is actually a VFNS scheme for heavy quark fragmentation. Increasing the order in perturbation theory turns out [62] to reduce the Peterson parameter ϵ, which corresponds to a harder non-perturbative fragmentation function. The importance of $\mathcal{O}(m/E)$ terms in the fixed-order part of the calculation is found to be minor.

This formalism has been applied as well to the Tevatron b-quark p_T cross section, for which the data exceed the central NLO-theory estimate by a factor of two, in [63] and more recently in [64]. At large p_T the theoretical uncertainty due to scale variations was found to be reduced with respect to the fixed-order approach, but the cross section decreased. At moderate p_T, the cross section gets somewhat enhanced, but not enough to explain the data-theory discrepancy. Another study involving FF's in heavy quark hadroproduction, in the context of the ACOT VFNS, was performed in [65]. A full VFNS implementation with all available knowledge about heavy quark parton densities and fragmentation functions included would be interesting. I note that the PFF formalism was also applied to γp [66] and $\gamma\gamma$ [67] charm production. Similar conclusions were reached as for $p\bar{p}$ b-quark production.

A puzzling situation has arisen in charm electroproduction and photoproduction at HERA. The data are well-described by NLO QCD plus Peterson fragmentation, except at low p_T and large rapidity It is surmised that remnant-beam drag effects, which have been modelled in the string fragmentation model [68], may exert influence here. It is important to understand this effect, as it affects $B - \bar{B}$ asymmetries at e.g. HERA-B

[69], and thus CP violation measurements. An open problem is how to match the string model for beam drag to leading twist QCD.

6. Polarized Onium Production at the Tevatron

Non-relativistic QCD (NRQCD) [14] is the effective field theory for light quarks, gluons and heavy quark-antiquark bound states (onia). This effective theory allows besides an expansion in α_s, a systematic expansion in v, the heavy quark velocity inside the onium bound state. Besides the QCD confinement scale Λ, and the heavy flavour mass m, the inverse onium size mv and binding energy mv^2 are important scales in this theory.

A few years ago a Tevatron measurement [70] of the production rates of the $J/\psi, \psi'$ states revealed an enormous excess over the prediction of the colour-singlet model [71]. The measurement may however be understood in a NRQCD framework [72]. Onia production at the Tevatron is described in NRQCD by

$$d\sigma(p + \bar{p} \to \psi(P, \lambda) + X) = \sum_{ij} f_i \otimes f_j \otimes \sum_n d\sigma(i + j \to Q\bar{Q}[n] + X) \langle O_n^{\psi(\lambda)} \rangle \,, \tag{9}$$

where the sum is over all allowed states, labeled by the spectroscopic notation $^{2S+1}L_J$. Note the colour label $(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{8}, \ldots)$. E.g. $n =^3 S_1^{(\mathbf{8})}, ^2 S_0^{(\mathbf{8})}, ^3 P_J^{(\mathbf{8})}$. The operators $O_n^{\psi(\lambda)}$ are ordered in the expansion parameters α_s and v. The content of this expression can be stated in physical terms as follows. The onium production time scale is of order $1/m$, whereas the much longer onium binding time scale is of order $1/(mv^2)$. The physics of the binding is encoded in the operator matrix elements. The fact that coloured channels, in particular the octet ones, are thus open to scatter into, leads to large increase in the cross section [72], allowing an explanation of the Tevatron data.

A test of the importance of these colour-octet states is the polarization of the vector onium octet-state produced, J/ψ and ψ' [73, 74, 75]. A heuristic argument says that at large p_T/m, this state results in essence from the fragmentation of a nearly on-shell and transverse gluon, leading to a transversely polarized onium state, at large p_T/m, as soft-gluon binding effects do not flip the spin. The polarization α of the produced onium may be inferred from the angular distribution of the lepton pair into which it decays:

$$\frac{d\Gamma}{d\cos\theta} \propto 1 + \alpha \cos^2\theta \,, \tag{10}$$

where θ is the angle between the μ^+ (say) momentum in the onium rest frame and the onium momentum in the lab frame, and with $\alpha = -1, 0, 1$ corresponding to a longitudinally polarized, unpolarized and transversely polarized onium state, respectively. A careful theoretical assessment of the expected polarization, based on (9), was made in [76].

A very recent CDF measurement [77] of the $\psi(2S)$ polarization versus its transverse momentum indicates no preference for $\alpha \to 1$ as p_T increases! But before we get really worried we should wait for more Tevatron data. Additionally, lepto- and photoproduction data from HERA may shed more light [78, 79].

7. Factorization for $B \to \pi\pi$ decays

Establishing CP violation in B-meson decays is one of the main physics goals at present and future colliders. In the SM, CP violation is accommodated via a complex phase in the CKM matrix, which is possible by having 3 families. The intention is not just to see that CP is violated in B-decays, but also to determine all entries of the CKM mixing matrix, expressible in four angles $\alpha, \beta, \chi, \chi'$, with $\gamma \equiv \pi - \alpha - \beta$. See e.g. [80] for their definitions.

One of the main methods thereto is the measurement of the time-dependent asymmetry

$$\mathrm{Asym}(t) = \frac{\Gamma_{B_d \to \mathrm{f}}(t) - \Gamma_{\bar{B}_d \to \mathrm{f}}(t)}{\text{“} \quad + \quad \text{”}} \tag{11}$$

A very important set of decay channels f are the two-body hadronic states $J/\psi K_s$, $\rho^+\pi^-$, $\pi^+\pi^-$, denoted collectively $\pi\pi'$ for short. In the simplest case, if the decay is dominated by one diagram and the final state is a CP eigenstate, then

$$\mathrm{Asym}(t) \propto \sin(2\alpha) \tag{12}$$

But when there is more than one diagram contributing, leading to more interference terms in $|A(B_d \to \mathrm{f})|^2$, the disentanglement of CP-violating weak phases from strong phases is complicated. Hence calculational control over hadronization and strong phases is very desirable. An important new development is a factorization of $B \to \pi\pi$ amplitudes [81], allowing their calculation from first principles. (QCD factorization for $B \to D\pi$ decays was discussed in [82]).

$B \to \pi\pi'$ decays are described by the effective Hamiltonian [83]

$$H_{\mathrm{eff}} = G_F \sum_i C_i \, O_i \,, \tag{13}$$

where G_F is the Fermi constant, the O_i are $\Delta B = 1$, $\Delta S = 0$ four quark operators, and C_i their Wilson coefficient functions. To compute the decay rates and their asymmetries one must know the matrix elements $\langle \pi\pi | O_i | B \rangle$. The proposed QCD factorization [81] for these amplitudes reads

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \pi'\pi | O_i | B \rangle = {} & f^{B\to\pi} \int dx T_i^I(x) \Phi'_\pi(x) \\ & + \int d\xi dx dy \, T_i^{II}(\xi, x, y) \, \Phi_B(\xi) \Phi'_\pi(x) \Phi_\pi(y) \\ & + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\Lambda_{\mathrm{QCD}}}{m_b}\right) \end{aligned}$$

with $T_i^{I,II}$ calculable kernels, and the $\Phi_{\pi,B}$'s light-cone distribution amplitudes. The first term corresponds to the $B \to \pi$ form factor (see e.g. [84, 85, 86] for its determination) evaluated at the mass squared of the other pion (π'). It benefits from the fact that soft gluons do not couple to a small-size $q\bar{q}$ (π') pair escaping from the system. The second term is a “standard” Brodsky-Lepage [87] term for exclusive scattering. The analysis [81] shows that the strong interaction phases for $B \to \pi\pi$ are $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s)$ or $\mathcal{O}(\Lambda_{\mathrm{QCD}}/m_b)$. If

this theorem can be proven to all orders, the strong phases are calculable so that CKM phases can be better extracted.

8. Conclusions and Outlook

We have just had a brief look at a few, mostly QCD-related, topics in the physics of heavy flavours at colliders. A common thread in the theoretical approach to these topics is perhaps that of effective field theories. The value of using such a framework is in some cases very high. Thus, our grasp of $Q\bar{Q}$ systems has been revolutionized by NRQCD. Likewise the physics of heavy-light system has been understood much deeper in HQET, where new symmetries are present. In other cases, taking an effective theory viewpoint is at present interesting, but not yet quite as revealing.

I hope to have left an impression of the substantial progress made in a variety of areas in heavy flavour physics, and that conceptual understanding in many cases is quite mature, but also to have conveyed a notion that much is still left to explore. With heavy flavours such an important component to many analyses at future colliders, we may be confident that such explorations will take place.

I would like to end by thanking the workshop organizers and conveners for providing for such a stimulating and truly enjoyable atmosphere, and the heavy flavour working group members for the pleasant and educational discussions.

References

[1] A. J. Buras, (1998), hep-ph/9806471.
[2] R. Tarrach, Nucl. Phys. **B183**, 384 (1981).
[3] A. S. Kronfeld, Phys. Rev. **D58**, 051501 (1998), hep-ph/9805215.
[4] J. Collins, F. Wilczek, and A. Zee, Phys. Rev. **D18**, 242 (1978).
[5] M. Beneke and V. M. Braun, Nucl. Phys. **B426**, 301 (1994), hep-ph/9402364.
[6] I. I. Bigi, M. A. Shifman, N. G. Uraltsev, and A. I. Vainshtein, Phys. Rev. **D50**, 2234 (1994), hep-ph/9402360.
[7] M. C. Smith and S. S. Willenbrock, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 3825 (1997), hep-ph/9612329.
[8] I. I. Y. Bigi, Y. L. Dokshitzer, V. Khoze, J. Kuhn, and P. Zerwas, Phys. Lett. **B181**, 157 (1986).
[9] V. S. Fadin and V. A. Khoze, JETP Lett. **46**, 525 (1987).
[10] V. S. Fadin and V. A. Khoze, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **48**, 309 (1988).
[11] N. Gray, D. J. Broadhurst, W. Grafe, and K. Schilcher, Z. Phys. **C48**, 673 (1990).
[12] K. G. Chetyrkin and M. Steinhauser, (1999), hep-ph/9911434.
[13] K. Melnikov and T. van Ritbergen, (2000), hep-ph/9912391.
[14] G. T. Bodwin, E. Braaten, and G. P. Lepage, Phys. Rev. **D51**, 1125 (1995), hep-ph/9407339.
[15] M. Beneke, Phys. Lett. **B434**, 115 (1998), hep-ph/9804241.
[16] A. H. Hoang, M. C. Smith, T. Stelzer, and S. Willenbrock, Phys. Rev. **D59**, 114014 (1999), hep-ph/9804227.
[17] Y. Schroder, Phys. Lett. **B447**, 321 (1999), hep-ph/9812205.
[18] A. H. Hoang, Z. Ligeti, and A. V. Manohar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 277 (1999), hep-ph/9809423.
[19] I. Bigi, M. Shifman, and N. Uraltsev, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **47**, 591 (1997), hep-ph/9703290.
[20] M. Beneke and A. Signer, (1999), hep-ph/9906475.
[21] M. Beneke, (1999), hep-ph/9911490.
[22] CDF, F. Abe *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 2626 (1995), hep-ex/9503002.

[23] D0, S. Abachi *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 2632 (1995), hep-ex/9503003.
[24] A. Pineda and F. J. Yndurain, (1998), hep-ph/9812371.
[25] M. A. G. Aivazis, J. C. Collins, F. I. Olness, and W.-K. Tung, Phys. Rev. **D50**, 3102 (1994), hep-ph/9312319.
[26] J. C. Collins, Phys. Rev. **D58**, 094002 (1998), hep-ph/9806259.
[27] M. Buza, Y. Matiounine, J. Smith, R. Migneron, and W. L. van Neerven, Nucl. Phys. **B472**, 611 (1996), hep-ph/9601302.
[28] W. Bernreuther and W. Wetzel, Nucl. Phys. **B197**, 228 (1982).
[29] K. G. Chetyrkin, B. A. Kniehl, and M. Steinhauser, Nucl. Phys. **B510**, 61 (1998), hep-ph/9708255.
[30] S. A. Larin, T. van Ritbergen, and J. A. M. Vermaseren, Nucl. Phys. **B438**, 278 (1995), hep-ph/9411260.
[31] M. Buza, Y. Matiounine, J. Smith, and W. L. van Neerven, Eur. Phys. J. **C1**, 301 (1998), hep-ph/9612398.
[32] R. S. Thorne and R. G. Roberts, Phys. Rev. **D57**, 6871 (1998), hep-ph/9709442.
[33] A. Chuvakin, J. Smith, and W. L. van Neerven, (1999), hep-ph/9910250.
[34] A. Chuvakin and J. Smith, (1999), hep-ph/9911504.
[35] M. Gluck, E. Reya, and A. Vogt, Eur. Phys. J. **C5**, 461 (1998), hep-ph/9806404.
[36] N. Kidonakis, (1999), hep-ph/9902484.
[37] G. Sterman, Nucl. Phys. **B281**, 310 (1987).
[38] S. Catani and L. Trentadue, Nucl. Phys. **B327**, 323 (1989).
[39] N. Kidonakis and G. Sterman, Phys. Lett. **B387**, 867 (1996).
[40] N. Kidonakis, G. Oderda, and G. Sterman, Nucl. Phys. **B525**, 299 (1998), hep-ph/9801268.
[41] R. Bonciani, S. Catani, M. L. Mangano, and P. Nason, Nucl. Phys. **B529**, 424 (1998), hep-ph/9801375.
[42] H. Contopanagos, E. Laenen, and G. Sterman, Nucl. Phys. **B484**, 303 (1997), hep-ph/9604313.
[43] J. C. Collins, Sudakov form-factors, in *Perturbative QCD*.
[44] N. Kidonakis, G. Oderda, and G. Sterman, Nucl. Phys. **B531**, 365 (1998), hep-ph/9803241.
[45] E. Laenen, G. Oderda, and G. Sterman, Phys. Lett. **B438**, 173 (1998), hep-ph/9806467.
[46] E. Laenen, J. Smith, and W. L. van Neerven, Phys. Lett. **B321**, 254 (1994), hep-ph/9310233.
[47] E. L. Berger and H. Contopanagos, Phys. Rev. **D54**, 3085 (1996), hep-ph/9603326.
[48] S. Catani, M. L. Mangano, P. Nason, and L. Trentadue, Nucl. Phys. **B478**, 273 (1996), hep-ph/9604351.
[49] N. Kidonakis, E. Laenen, S.-O. Moch, and R. Vogt, in preparation.
[50] E. Laenen and S.-O. Moch, Phys. Rev. **D59**, 034027 (1999), hep-ph/9809550.
[51] G. Sterman and W. Vogelsang, (1999), hep-ph/9910371.
[52] S. Catani, M. L. Mangano, and P. Nason, JHEP **07**, 024 (1998), hep-ph/9806484.
[53] S. Catani, M. L. Mangano, P. Nason, C. Oleari, and W. Vogelsang, JHEP **03**, 025 (1999), hep-ph/9903436.
[54] C. Peterson, D. Schlatter, I. Schmitt, and P. Zerwas, Phys. Rev. **D27**, 105 (1983).
[55] G. Altarelli and G. Parisi, Nucl. Phys. **B126**, 298 (1977).
[56] V. N. Gribov and L. N. Lipatov, Yad. Fiz. **15**, 781 (1972).
[57] Y. L. Dokshitzer, Sov. Phys. JETP **46**, 641 (1977).
[58] B. Mele and P. Nason, Nucl. Phys. **B361**, 626 (1991).
[59] P. Nason and C. Oleari, Nucl. Phys. **B521**, 237 (1998), hep-ph/9709360.
[60] G. Rodrigo, M. Bilenky, and A. Santamaria, Nucl. Phys. **B554**, 257 (1999), hep-ph/9905276.
[61] W. Bernreuther, A. Brandenburg, and P. Uwer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 189 (1997), hep-ph/9703305.
[62] P. Nason and C. Oleari, (1999), hep-ph/9903541.
[63] M. Cacciari and M. Greco, Nucl. Phys. **B421**, 530 (1994), hep-ph/9311260.
[64] M. Cacciari, M. Greco, and P. Nason, JHEP **05**, 007 (1998), hep-ph/9803400.
[65] F. I. Olness, R. J. Scalise, and W.-K. Tung, Phys. Rev. **D59**, 014506 (1999), hep-ph/9712494.
[66] M. Cacciari and M. Greco, Z. Phys. **C69**, 459 (1996), hep-ph/9505419.

[67] M. Cacciari *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **B466**, 173 (1996), hep-ph/9512246.
[68] E. Norrbin and T. Sjostrand, Phys. Lett. **B442**, 407 (1998), hep-ph/9809266.
[69] E. Norrbin, (1999), hep-ph/9909437.
[70] CDF, F. Abe *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 3704 (1992).
[71] G. A. Schuler, (1994), hep-ph/9403387, and references therein.
[72] E. Braaten and S. Fleming, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 3327 (1995), hep-ph/9411365.
[73] P. Cho and M. B. Wise, Phys. Lett. **B346**, 129 (1995), hep-ph/9411303.
[74] P. Cho, M. B. Wise, and S. P. Trivedi, Phys. Rev. **D51**, 2039 (1995), hep-ph/9408352.
[75] M. Beneke and I. Z. Rothstein, Phys. Lett. **B372**, 157 (1996), hep-ph/9509375.
[76] M. Beneke and M. Kramer, Phys. Rev. **D55**, 5269 (1997), hep-ph/9611218.
[77] CDF, R. Cropp, To be published in the proceedings of International Europhysics Conference on High-Energy Physics (EPS-HEP 99), Tampere, Finland, July 1999.
[78] M. Beneke, M. Kramer, and M. Vanttinen, Phys. Rev. **D57**, 4258 (1998), hep-ph/9709376.
[79] S. Fleming and T. Mehen, Phys. Rev. **D57**, 1846 (1998), hep-ph/9707365.
[80] B. Kayser, (1996), hep-ph/9702264.
[81] M. Beneke, G. Buchalla, M. Neubert, and C. T. Sachrajda, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 1914 (1999), hep-ph/9905312, and references therein.
[82] M. J. Dugan and B. Grinstein, Phys. Lett. **B255**, 583 (1991).
[83] G. Buchalla, A. J. Buras, and M. E. Lautenbacher, Rev. Mod. Phys. **68**, 1125 (1996), hep-ph/9512380.
[84] S. Weinzierl and O. Yakovlev, (1999), hep-ph/9911530, these proceedings.
[85] A. Khodjamirian, R. Ruckl, S. Weinzierl, and O. Yakovlev, Phys. Lett. **B410**, 275 (1997), hep-ph/9706303.
[86] E. Bagan, P. Ball, and V. M. Braun, Phys. Lett. **B417**, 154 (1998), hep-ph/9709243.
[87] G. P. Lepage and S. J. Brodsky, Phys. Rev. **D22**, 2157 (1980).