# NNLO QCD CORRECTIONS TO THE B-MESON MIXING

P3H Project C1b

Vladyslav Shtabovenko

Karlsruhe Institute of Technology
Institute for Theoretical Particle Physics

in collaboration with M. Gerlach, U. Nierste and M. Steinhauser

Annual Meeting of the CRC TRR 257 (virtual)
26th of May 2021

Outline

1 **Flavor physics and the precision frontier**

2 **B-meson mixing**
- Theory
- Building blocks
- Technicalities
- Master integrals
- Phenomenology

3 **Summary and Outlook**

- Ongoing direct and indirect new physics searches
- No new physics on the high-energy frontier: growing importance of the precision frontier
- An increasing number of anomalies (still below 5σ-level) that challenge the validity of the SM
- Necessary conditions for a meaningful discussion:
  - All theoretical uncertainties (perturbative and nonperturbative) must be well under control.
  - All required higher-order perturbative corrections must be worked out
- NP searches not the only reason for doing flavor physics
  - QCD corrections to flavor observables: probe our understanding of strong interactions
  - Precise measurements of SM parameters: impossible without taking full account of the EW sector
  - CP-Violation, matter-antimatter asymmetry

Who is hiding inside this (nesting) box?

- Neutral meson mixing in the SM : Loop-induced FCNC processes.
- $B_s^0 - \bar{B}_s^0$ oscillations

$$\begin{pmatrix} |B_s(t)\rangle \\ |\bar{B}_s(t)\rangle \end{pmatrix} = \left(\hat{M} - \frac{i}{2}\hat{\Gamma} \right) \begin{pmatrix} |B_s(t)\rangle \\ |\bar{B}_s(t)\rangle \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\hat{M} = \begin{pmatrix} M_{11} & M_{12} \\ M_{12}^* & M_{22} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{\Gamma} = \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_{11} & \Gamma_{12} \\ \Gamma_{12}^* & \Gamma_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$

- Diagonalizing the matrices leads to the mass eigenstates $|B_L\rangle$ (lighter, CP-even) and $|B_H\rangle$ (heavier, CP-odd) with M_L, Γ_L and M_H, Γ_H.
- Physical observables depend on: $|M_{12}|$, $|\Gamma_{12}|$, ϕ
- ΔM_s: $B_s^0 - \bar{B}_s^0$ oscillation frequency $\Rightarrow |M_{12}|$ from $\mathrm{Re}(A_{\mathrm{mixing}})$ t quark is dominant in SM, sensitivity to NP in the loops
- $\Delta\Gamma_s$: $B_s^0 - \bar{B}_s^0$ width difference $\Rightarrow |\Gamma_{12}|$ from $\mathrm{Im}(A_{\mathrm{mixing}})$ only u and c contribute (linked to $b \to s c \bar{c}$ via optical theorem), precision probe of SM, little room for NP
- ϕ_s: CP-asymmetry in the mixing $a_{\mathrm{fs}} = \mathrm{Im}\left(\frac{\Gamma_{12}}{M_{12}} \right) = \left| \frac{\Gamma_{12}}{M_{12}} \right| \sin\phi_s$

$$\Delta M_s = M_H - M_L \approx 2|M_{12}|$$
$$\Delta\Gamma_s = \Gamma_L - \Gamma_H \approx 2|\Gamma_{12}|\cos\phi_s$$
$$\phi_s \equiv \arg(-M_{12}/\Gamma_{12}) \approx 0$$

- In this project we are interested in $\Delta\Gamma$ from $B_s^0 - \bar{B}_s^0$

- Experimental value (HFLAV 2020 average on LHCb, ATLAS, CMS and CDF measurements)

$$\Delta\Gamma^{\text{exp}} = (0.085 \pm 0.004) \text{ ps}^{-1}$$

- Theory prediction (NLO + n_f-piece of NNLO QCD corrections)
  [Beneke et al., 1999; Ciuchini et al., 2002, 2003; Lenz & Nierste, 2007; Asatrian et al., 2020, 2017]

$$\Delta\Gamma_{\text{OS}} = (0.077 \pm 0.015_{\text{pert.}} \pm 0.002_{B,\tilde{B}_S} \pm 0.0017_{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}/m_b}) \text{ ps}^{-1}$$

$$\Delta\Gamma_{\overline{\text{MS}}} = (0.088 \pm 0.011_{\text{pert.}} \pm 0.002_{B,\tilde{B}_S} \pm 0.0014_{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}/m_b}) \text{ ps}^{-1}$$

- Substantial uncertainty from uncalculated NNLO corrections (pert.), much larger than experimental errors

- Theory under pressure, full NNLO corrections highly desirable

$$\Delta M_s = M_H - M_L \approx 2|M_{12}|$$

$$\Delta\Gamma_s = \Gamma_L - \Gamma_H \approx 2|\Gamma_{12}|\cos\phi_s$$

$$\phi_s \equiv \arg(-M_{12}/\Gamma_{12}) \approx 0$$

- Since $m_b \ll m_W, m_t$, we can integrate out W bosons and t quarks to obtain $\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}}^{|\Delta B|=1}$
- Need to evaluate nonlocal products of effective operators $\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}}^{|\Delta B|=1}$

$$\Gamma_{12} = \frac{1}{2M_{B_s}} \text{Im}| \langle B_s^0 | i \int d^4 x \, \mathcal{T}\{\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}}^{|\Delta B|=1}(x)\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}}^{\Delta F=1}(0)\}|\bar{B}_s^0\rangle |$$

- Using Heavy Quark Expansion [Khoze & Shifman, 1983; Shifman & Voloshin, 1985; Khoze et al., 1987; Chay et al., 1990; Bigi & Uraltsev, 1992; Bigi et al., 1992, 1993; Blok et al., 1994; Manohar & Wise, 1994] (expansion in Λ_{QCD}/m_b) one arrives at

$$\Gamma_{12} = \frac{G_F^2 m_b^2}{24\pi M_{B_s}} \left[H(z)\langle B_s|Q|\bar{B}_s\rangle + \widetilde{H}_S(z)\langle B_s|\widetilde{Q}_S|\bar{B}_s\rangle \right]$$
$$+ \mathcal{O}(\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}/m_b)$$

  in the $|\Delta B| = 2$ effective theory.
- $H(z)$ and $\widetilde{H}_S(z)$ are the Wilson coefficients from the perturbative matching of $|\Delta B| = 1$ to $|\Delta B| = 2$.
- Nonperturbative ME $\langle B_s|Q|\bar{B}_s\rangle$ and $\langle B_s|\widetilde{Q}_S|\bar{B}_s\rangle$ (also for B_d mesons) from QCD/HQET sum rules [Ovchinnikov & Pivovarov, 1988; Reinders & Yazaki, 1988; Korner et al., 2003; Mannel et al., 2011; Grozin et al., 2016; Kirk et al., 2017; King et al., 2019], lattice QCD [Bazavov et al., 2016; Dowdall et al., 2019] or combined [Di Luzio et al., 2019]

$|\Delta B = 1|$ effective theory

$|\Delta B = 2|$ effective theory

$$\Gamma_{12} \sim \frac{1}{m_b^3} \sum_i \left(\frac{\alpha_s}{4\pi}\right)^j \Gamma_3^{(i)} + \frac{1}{m_b^4} \sum_i \left(\frac{\alpha_s}{4\pi}\right)^j \Gamma_4^{(i)} + \dots$$

$|\Delta B| = 1$ effective Hamiltonian in the CMM basis for $b \to sc\bar{c}$ decays [Chetyrkin et al., 1998]

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}}^{|\Delta B|=1} = \frac{4G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \left[-V_{ts}^* V_{tb}^\dagger \Big(\sum_{i=1}^{6} C_i Q_i + C_8 Q_8 \Big) - V_{us}^* V_{ub}^\dagger \sum_{i=1}^{2} C_i (Q_i - Q_i^u) \right.$$

$$\left. + V_{us}^* V_{cb} \sum_{i=1}^{2} C_i Q_i^{cu} + V_{cs}^* V_{ub} \sum_{i=1}^{2} C_i Q_i^{uc} \right] + \text{h.c.} ,$$

🔴 Current operators

$Q_1 = \bar{s}_L \gamma_\mu T^a c_L \ \bar{c}_L \gamma^\mu T^a b_L,$

$Q_2 = \bar{s}_L \gamma_\mu c_L \ \bar{c}_L \gamma^\mu b_L,$

$Q_1^u = \bar{s}_L \gamma_\mu T^a u_L \ \bar{u}_L \gamma^\mu T^a b_L,$

$Q_2^u = \bar{s}_L \gamma_\mu u_L \ \bar{u}_L \gamma^\mu b_L,$

$Q_1^{cu} = \bar{s}_L \gamma_\mu T^a u_L \ \bar{c}_L \gamma^\mu T^a b_L,$

$Q_2^{cu} = \bar{s}_L \gamma_\mu u_L \ \bar{c}_L \gamma^\mu b_L,$

$Q_1^{uc} = \bar{s}_L \gamma_\mu T^a c_L \ \bar{u}_L \gamma^\mu T^a b_L,$

$Q_2^{uc} = \bar{s}_L \gamma_\mu c_L \ \bar{u}_L \gamma^\mu b_L,$

🔴 Penguin operators

$Q_3 = \bar{s}_L \gamma_\mu b_L \sum_q \bar{q} \gamma^\mu q ,$

$Q_4 = \bar{s}_L \gamma_\mu T^a b_L \sum_q \bar{q} \gamma^\mu T^a q ,$

$Q_5 = \bar{s}_L \gamma_{\mu_1} \gamma_{\mu_2} \gamma_{\mu_3} b_L \sum_q \bar{q} \gamma^{\mu_1} \gamma^{\mu_2} \gamma^{\mu_3} q ,$

$Q_6 = \bar{s}_L \gamma_{\mu_1} \gamma_{\mu_2} \gamma_{\mu_3} T^a b_L \sum_q \bar{q} \gamma^{\mu_1} \gamma^{\mu_2} \gamma^{\mu_3} T^a q ,$

$Q_8 = \frac{g_s}{16\pi^2} m_b \ \bar{s}_L \sigma^{\mu\nu} T^a b_R \ G_{\mu\nu}^a ,$

$|\Delta B| = 1$ contributions needed for NNLO

$$C_i O_i \sim \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } i = 1, 2 \\ \alpha_s & \text{for } i = 3, 4, 5, 6 \quad (C_{3-6} \text{ numerically small}) \\ \alpha_s & \text{for } i = 8 \quad (\text{explicit strong coupling in the definition of } O_8 \end{cases}$$

Important scale: $z \equiv m_c^2/m_b^2$

🐾 LO contributions to $\Delta\Gamma_s$
   🔴 1-loop $O_{1-2} \times O_{1-2}$ correlators (z-exact) [Hagelin, 1981; Franco et al., 1982; Chau, 1983; Buras et al., 1984; Khoze et al., 1987; Datta et al., 1987, 1988]

🐾 NLO contributions to $\Delta\Gamma_s$ (z-exact)
   🔴 2-loop $O_{1-2} \times O_{1-2}$ correlators (z-exact) [Beneke et al., 1999]
   🔴 1-loop $O_{1-2} \times O_{3-6}$ correlators (z-exact) [Beneke et al., 1999]
   🔴 1-loop $O_{1-2} \times O_8$ correlators (z-exact) [Beneke et al., 1999]

$|\Delta B| = 1$ contributions needed for NNLO

$$
C_i O_i \sim \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } i = 1, 2 \\ \alpha_s & \text{for } i = 3, 4, 5, 6 \quad (C_{3-6} \text{ numerically small}) \\ \alpha_s & \text{for } i = 8 \quad (\text{explicit strong coupling in the definition of } O_8 \end{cases}
$$

Important scale: $z \equiv m_c^2/m_b^2$

- ✎ NNLO contributions to $\Delta\Gamma_s$
  - 🔴 3-loop $O_{1-2} \times O_{1-2}$ correlators [Asatrian et al., 2017, 2020] (n_f piece only, $\mathcal{O}(z^3)$)
  - 🔴 2-loop $O_{1-2} \times O_{3-6}$ correlators [Asatrian et al., 2017, 2020] (n_f piece only, z-exact)
  - 🔴 2-loop $O_{1-2} \times O_8$ correlators [Asatrian et al., 2017, 2020] (n_f piece only, z-exact)
  - 🔴 1-loop $O_{3-6} \times O_{3-6}$ correlators (z-exact) [Beneke et al., 1996]
  - 🔴 1-loop $O_{3-6} \times O_8$ correlators [Asatrian et al., 2017, 2020] (n_f piece only, z-exact)
  - 🔴 1-loop $O_8 \times O_8$ correlators [Asatrian et al., 2017, 2020] (n_f piece only, z-exact)
- 🎁 This work
  - 🔴 Full (n_f + non-n_f) results for all 2-loop NNLO correlators at $\mathcal{O}(z)$
  - 🔴 Full (n_f + non-n_f) results for the 3-loop $O_{1-2} \times O_{1-2}$ at $\mathcal{O}(z^0)$
  - 🔴 Full (n_f + non-n_f) results for some N³LO correlators e. g. the 2-loop $O_{3-6} \times O_{3-6}$ at $\mathcal{O}(z^0)$
  - 🔴 WIP: Final checks for the 3-loop result, higher order expansions in z, possibly z-exact results for selected correlators, computation of some (2-loop) N³LO correlators

Representative diagrams for 3-loop $O_{1,2} \times O_{1,2}$ correlators

Representative diagrams for
2-loop $O_{1,2} \times O_{3-6}$ correlators

Representative diagrams for
2-loop $O_{1,2} \times O_8$ correlators

$\Delta\Gamma_s$ described by local $|\Delta B| = 2$ operators [Beneke et al., 1999; Lenz & Nierste, 2007; Asatrian et al., 2017]

$$\Gamma_{12} = -(\lambda_c^q)^2 \Gamma_{12}^{cc} - 2\lambda_c^q \lambda_u^q \Gamma_{12}^{uc} - (\lambda_u^q)^2 \Gamma_{12}^{uu}, \quad \lambda_{q'}^q \equiv V_{q'q}^* V_{q'b}$$

$$\Gamma_{12}^{ab} = \frac{G_F^2 m_b^2}{24\pi M_{B_s}} \left[H^{ab}(z)\langle B_s|Q|\bar{B}_s\rangle + \tilde{H}_S^{ab}(z)\langle B_s|\widetilde{Q}_S|\bar{B}_s\rangle \right] + \mathcal{O}\left(\Lambda_{\mathrm{QCD}}/m_b\right)$$

- Matching coefficients from various $|\Delta B| = 1$ correlators

$$H^{ab}(z) = H^{(c)ab}(z) + H^{(cp)ab}(z) + H^{(p)ab}(z)$$

$$\tilde{H}_S^{ab}(z) = \tilde{H}_S^{(c)ab}(z) + \tilde{H}_S^{(cp)ab}(z) + \tilde{H}_S^{(p)ab}(z)$$

- Physical $|\Delta B| = 2$ operators

$$Q = \bar{s}_i \gamma^\mu (1 - \gamma^5) b_i \, \bar{s}_j \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma^5) b_j \, ,$$

$$\widetilde{Q}_S = \bar{s}_i (1 - \gamma^5) b_j \, \bar{s}_j (1 - \gamma^5) b_i$$

- Additional operators needed at intermediate stages (e. g. basis changes, def. of ev. operators)

$$\widetilde{Q} = \bar{s}_i \gamma^\mu (1 - \gamma^5) b_j \, \bar{s}_j \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma^5) b_i \, ,$$

$$Q_S = \bar{s}_i (1 - \gamma^5) b_i \, \bar{s}_j (1 - \gamma^5) b_j \, ,$$

$$R_0 = Q_S + \alpha_1 \tilde{Q}_S + \alpha_2 \frac{1}{2} Q$$

Representative diagrams in the $|\Delta B| = 2$ theory (tree-level, 1-loop, 2-loop)

Wilson coefficients of the $|\Delta B| = 2$ theory determined in the matching to $|\Delta B| = 1$

🍋 Calculational strategy

- 🍒 Matching done on-shell: $p_b^2 = m_b^2$
- 🍒 The s-quark mass is neglected $\Rightarrow p_s = 0$
- 🍒 Asymptotic expansion in $z \equiv m_c^2/m_b^2$ (at first up to $\mathcal{O}(z)$ for 2-loop and $\mathcal{O}(z^0)$ for 3-loop)
- 🍒 Only the imaginary part of the $|\Delta B| = 1$ diagrams enters the matching

🍋 Regularization

- 🍒 Dimensional regularization used both for UV- and IR-divergences
- 🍒 Additionally, massive gluons in IR-divergent diagrams at 2-loops as a cross-check
- 🍒 When IR-divergences are regularized with m_g, the renormalized amplitudes are manifestly finite $\Rightarrow$ the limit $d \to 4$ is safe
- 🍒 Not so when the amplitudes are UV-finite but IR-divergent $\Rightarrow$ every product of $1/\varepsilon_{\mathrm{IR}}$ and an evanescent matrix element is $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^0)$, the amplitude must be kept d-dimensional
- 🍒 The matching must be done also to higher orders in ε [Ciuchini et al., 2002]
- 🍒 Nontrivial cross-check of the result: the IR poles and the gauge dependence cancel only in

$$A_{\mathrm{ren}}^{|\Delta B|=1} - A_{\mathrm{ren}}^{|\Delta B|=2}$$

- All computations done using our well-tested automatic setup
  - Diagram generation with **QGRAF** [Nogueira, 1993]
  - Insertion of Feynman rules and topology identification using **Q2E/EXP** [Seidensticker, 1999; Harlander et al., 1998] or **TAPIR** [Gerlach, Herren, 2021]
  - Feynman amplitude evaluation: in-house **CALC** setup written in **FORM** [Ruijl et al., 2017]
  - IBP-reduction: **FIRE** 6 [A. V. Smirnov & Chuharev, 2020]
  - Analytic computation of master integrals: **HYPERINT** [Panzer, 2015], **HYPERLOGPROCEEDINGS** [Schnetz], **POLYLOGTOOLS** [Duhr & Dulat, 2019]
  - All master integrals checked numerically using **FIESTA** [A. V. Smirnov, 2016] and **PYSECDEC** [Borowka et al., 2018]
- Cross-checks of selected intermediate results using **FEYNARTS** [Hahn, 2001], **FEYNRULES** [Christensen & Duhr, 2009; Alloul et al., 2014] and **FEYNCALC** [VS et al., 2020]
- Two complementary approaches to the treatment of tensor integrals in **FORM**
  - Explicit decomposition formulas (1 ext. momentum, max. rank 10), calculated using **FEYNCALC** and **FERMAT** [Lewis]
  - Projections to the occurring 4-fermion Dirac structures

  $$\{(P_L)_{ij}, (\gamma^\mu P_L)_{ij}, (\gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu P_L)_{ij}, \ldots\} \otimes \{(P_L)_{kl}, (\gamma_\mu P_L)_{kl}, (\gamma_\mu \gamma_\nu P_L)_{kl}, \ldots\}$$

  - Both methods lead to the same results!

Master integrals encountered up to 2-loops are all well known [Fleischer & Kalmykov, 2000; V. A. Smirnov, 2006]

Out[ ]=

- solid black line - m_b
- dashed black line - massless
- dashed red line - m_g
- dashed blue line - m_c

3-loop master integrals (modulo factorizing ones) are more interesting

Out[∘]=

- 27 integrals, first 4 contain only massless (dashed) internal lines ⇒ **MINCER** [Gorishnii et al., 1989; Larin et al., 1991]
- of the 23 remaining integrals only few available in the literature [Asatrian et al., 2017]

- All 23 integrals with massive (solid) lines can be calculated analytically
- We can directly integrate the Feynman parameter integrals using HyperInt [Panzer, 2015]
- In most cases complicated intermediate expressions with GPLs containing 6th root of unity [Kalmykov & Kniehl, 2010; Ablinger et al., 2011; Bloch & Vanhove, 2015; Bloch et al., 2015; Henn et al., 2017; Panzer & Schnetz, 2017]

$$\frac{1 \pm i\sqrt{3}}{2}, \frac{-1 \pm i\sqrt{3}}{2}, e^{i\pi/3}$$

- Use HyperlogProceedings [Schnetz] and PolyLogTools [Duhr & Dulat, 2019] to simplify the results

Out[∘]=

prop3L3topo010000000(0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 0)   prop3L3topo010000000(0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0)   prop3L3topo010000000(0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0)   prop3L3topo010000000(0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0)

prop3L1topo010000100(0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0)   prop3L1topo100100100(1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0)   prop3L2topo000011000(1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0)   prop3L3topo011000000(1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0)

prop3L3topo011000000(1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1, 0)   prop3L3topo011000000(1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0)   prop3L3topo011000000(1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0)   prop3L3topo101000000(1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0)

prop3L3topo101000000(1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0)   prop3L2topo000011000(1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0)   prop3L3topo001000000(1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0)   prop3L3topo001000000(1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0)

prop3L3topo011000000(1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 2, 0, 0)   prop3L3topo011000000(1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0)   prop3L3topo101000000(1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0)   prop3L3topo101000000(1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 2, 0, 0)

prop3L3topo101000000(1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0)   prop3L3topo011000000(1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0)   prop3L3topo101000000(1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0)

- The imaginary parts of the integrals turn out to be very simple

- Appearing constants

$$\pi, \ln(2), \zeta_2, \zeta_3, \zeta_4, \text{Cl}_2(\pi/3), \sqrt{3},$$
$$\text{Li}_4(1/2), \ln\left((1+\sqrt{5})/2\right)$$

$$\text{Cl}_2(x) = \frac{i}{2}\left(\text{Li}_2(e^{-ix}) - \text{Li}_2(e^{ix})\right)$$

- The golden ratio appears in

 - analytic result already available in [Asatrian et al., 2017]

- Real parts more complicated but irrelevant for $\Delta\Gamma_s$

Out[ ]=

prop3L3topo010000000(0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 0)
prop3L3topo010000000(0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0)
prop3L3topo010000000(0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0)
prop3L3topo010000000(0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0)

prop3L1topo010000100(0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0)
prop3L1topo100100100(1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0)
prop3L2topo000011000(1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 0)
prop3L3topo011000000(1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0)

prop3L3topo011000000(1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0)
prop3L3topo011000000(1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0)
prop3L3topo011000000(1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0)
prop3L3topo101000000(1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0)

prop3L3topo101000000(1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0)
prop3L2topo000011000(1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0)
prop3L3topo001000000(1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0)
prop3L3topo001000000(1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0)

prop3L3topo011000000(1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 2, 0)
prop3L3topo011000000(1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0)
prop3L3topo101000000(1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 0)
prop3L3topo101000000(1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 2, 0)

prop3L3topo101000000(1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0)
prop3L3topo011000000(1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0)
prop3L3topo101000000(1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0)

Results for selected master integrals (only imaginary parts are shown)

$$\frac{1}{\pi}\text{Im}\left[\quad\right] = -2\sqrt{3}\,\mathsf{Cl}_2\left(\frac{\pi}{3}\right) + \zeta_2 + 2$$

$$\frac{1}{\pi}\text{Im}\left[\quad\right] = \frac{1}{2\varepsilon^2} + \frac{7}{2\varepsilon} + \frac{33}{2} - \frac{5\zeta_2}{4} - 2\zeta_3 + \varepsilon\left(\frac{131}{2} - \frac{35\zeta_2}{4} - \frac{21\zeta_3}{2} - \frac{7\zeta_4}{2}\right)$$

$$\frac{1}{\pi}\text{Im}\left[\quad\right] = \frac{\zeta_2}{\varepsilon} + 2\zeta_2 + 3\zeta_2\ln(2) + \frac{39\zeta_3}{4}$$
$$+ \varepsilon\left(4\zeta_2 + \frac{39\zeta_3}{2} + 6\zeta_2\ln(2) - 40\text{Li}_4\left(1/2\right) + \frac{629\zeta_4}{8} + 10\zeta_2\ln^2(2) - \frac{5\ln^4(2)}{3}\right)$$

A glimpse of the new matching coefficients

$n_c = 3$, OS scheme; N_H, N_V, N_L are flags to mark the contributions of b, c and the light quarks

● A contribution to the matching coefficient from the 2-loop $O_{1,2} \times O_{3-6}$ correlator

$$p_{24}^{cc,(1)}(z) = -\frac{1}{9}\ln\left(\frac{\mu_1^2}{m_b^2}\right)$$

$$+ \left(\frac{10}{9} - \frac{5N_H}{9} - \frac{20N_L}{9} - \frac{10N_V}{9} + 26z\right)\ln\left(\frac{\mu_2^2}{m_b^2}\right)$$

$$+ \left(\frac{1729}{18} - \frac{20N_L}{3} - \frac{20N_V}{3} - \frac{10\pi^2}{3}\right)z$$

$$+ \frac{137}{27} - \frac{70N_L}{27} - \frac{35N_V}{27} - \frac{5\pi}{18\sqrt{3}} - \frac{5\pi^2}{3}$$

$$+ N_H\left(-\frac{85}{27} + \frac{5\pi}{3\sqrt{3}}\right),$$

$$\Gamma_{12}^{ab} = \frac{G_F^2 m_b^2}{24\pi M_{B_s}}\left[H^{ab}(z)\langle B_s|Q|\bar{B}_s\rangle \right.$$

$$\left. + \tilde{H}_S^{ab}(z)\langle B_s|\tilde{Q}_S|\bar{B}_s\rangle\right] + \mathcal{O}\left(\Lambda_{\mathrm{QCD}}/m_b\right)$$

$$H^{ab}(z) = H^{(c)ab}(z) + H^{(cp)ab}(z) + H^{(p)ab}(z)$$

$$\tilde{H}_S^{ab}(z) = \tilde{H}_S^{(c)ab}(z) + \tilde{H}_S^{(cp)ab}(z) + \tilde{H}_S^{(p)ab}(z)$$

$$H^{ab}(z) = H^{(c)ab}(z) + H^{(cp)ab}(z) + H^{(p)ab}(z)$$

$$\tilde{H}_S^{ab}(z) = \tilde{H}_S^{(c)ab}(z) + \tilde{H}_S^{(cp)ab}(z) + \tilde{H}_S^{(p)ab}(z)$$

$$H^{(c)ab}(z) = \sum_{i,j=1}^2 C_i C_j\, p_{ij}^{ab}(z),$$

$$\tilde{H}_S^{(c)ab}(z) = \sum_{i,j=1}^2 C_i C_j\, p_{ij}^{S,ab}(z),$$

$$H^{(cp)ab}(z) = \sum_{i=3,\ldots 6,8} C_i\left[C_1 p_{1i}^{ab}(z) + C_2 p_{2i}^{ab}(z)\right],$$

$$\tilde{H}_S^{(cp)ab}(z) = \sum_{i=3,\ldots 6,8} C_i\left[C_1 p_{1i}^{S,ab}(z) + C_2 p_{2i}^{S,ab}(z)\right],$$

$$H^{(p)ab}(z) = \sum_{i,j=3,\ldots 6,8} C_i C_j\, p_{ij}^{ab}(z)$$

$$\tilde{H}_S^{(p)ab}(z) = \sum_{i,j=3,\ldots 6,8} C_i C_j\, p_{ij}^{S,ab}(z)$$

A glimpse of the new matching coefficients

$n_c = 3$, OS scheme; N_H, N_V, N_L are flags to mark the contributions of b, c and the light quarks

🔴 Contribution to the matching coefficient from the 2-loop $O_{1,2} \times O_8$ correlator

$$p_{18}^{cc,(1)}(z) = -\frac{1}{27} \ln\left(\frac{\mu_1^2}{m_b^2}\right)$$

$$+ \left(\frac{343}{81} - \frac{5N_H}{27} - \frac{20N_L}{27} - \frac{10N_V}{27}\right) \ln\left(\frac{\mu_2^2}{m_b^2}\right)$$

$$+ \left(\frac{2915}{54} - \frac{20N_L}{9} - \frac{20N_V}{9} - \frac{10\pi^2}{9}\right) z$$

$$+ \left(\frac{685}{243} - \frac{70N_L}{81} - \frac{35N_V}{81}\right.$$

$$\left. - \frac{5\pi}{54\sqrt{3}} - \frac{5\pi^2}{9} + N_H\left(-\frac{85}{81} + \frac{5\pi}{9\sqrt{3}}\right)\right)$$

$$\Gamma_{12}^{ab} = \frac{G_F^2 m_b^2}{24\pi M_{B_s}} \left[H^{ab}(z)\langle B_s|Q|\bar{B}_s\rangle \right.$$

$$\left. + \tilde{H}_S^{ab}(z)\langle B_s|\tilde{Q}_S|\bar{B}_s\rangle \right] + \mathcal{O}\left(\Lambda_{\mathrm{QCD}}/m_b\right)$$

$$H^{ab}(z) = H^{(c)ab}(z) + H^{(cp)ab}(z) + H^{(p)ab}(z)$$

$$\tilde{H}_S^{ab}(z) = \tilde{H}_S^{(c)ab}(z) + \tilde{H}_S^{(cp)ab}(z) + \tilde{H}_S^{(p)ab}(z)$$

$$H^{ab}(z) = H^{(c)ab}(z) + H^{(cp)ab}(z) + H^{(p)ab}(z)$$

$$\tilde{H}_S^{ab}(z) = \tilde{H}_S^{(c)ab}(z) + \tilde{H}_S^{(cp)ab}(z) + \tilde{H}_S^{(p)ab}(z)$$

$$H^{(c)ab}(z) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} C_i C_j \, p_{ij}^{ab}(z),$$

$$\tilde{H}_S^{(c)ab}(z) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} C_i C_j \, p_{ij}^{S,ab}(z),$$

$$H^{(cp)ab}(z) = \sum_{i=3,\ldots6,8} C_i \left[C_1 p_{1i}^{ab}(z) + C_2 p_{2i}^{ab}(z) \right],$$

$$\tilde{H}_S^{(cp)ab}(z) = \sum_{i=3,\ldots6,8} C_i \left[C_1 p_{1i}^{S,ab}(z) + C_2 p_{2i}^{S,ab}(z) \right],$$

$$H^{(p)ab}(z) = \sum_{i,j=3,\ldots6,8} C_i C_j \, p_{ij}^{ab}(z)$$

$$\tilde{H}_S^{(p)ab}(z) = \sum_{i,j=3,\ldots6,8} C_i C_j \, p_{ij}^{S,ab}(z)$$

- All the 2-loop contributions to the NNLO correction already computed and cross-checked
- The 3-loop contribution is already computed, currently being checked
- **Preliminary** numerical estimate on the impact of the new 2-loop $O_{1,2} \times O_{3-6}$ contribution

$$1\text{-loop (already known):} \quad \frac{\Delta\Gamma_s^{p,12\times36,\alpha_s^0}}{\Delta\Gamma_s} = 7.7\% \quad (\text{pole}) \qquad \frac{\Delta\Gamma_s^{p,12\times36,\alpha_s^0}}{\Delta\Gamma_s} = 6.1\% \quad (\overline{\text{MS}}),$$

$$\text{full 2-loops (new):} \quad \frac{\Delta\Gamma_s^{p,12\times36,\alpha_s}}{\Delta\Gamma_s} = 0.3\% \quad (\text{pole}), \qquad \frac{\Delta\Gamma_s^{p,12\times36,\alpha_s}}{\Delta\Gamma_s} = 1.4\% \quad (\overline{\text{MS}}),$$

- For both schemes we use $\bar{z} = (m_c^{\text{MS}}(m_b)/m_b^{\text{MS}}(m_b))^2$
- m_b^2 in the prefactor of Γ_{12} treated as m_b^{OS} in the pole scheme and $m_b^{\text{MS}}(m_b)$ in the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ scheme
- Numerical input [Tanabashi et al., 2018; Dowdall et al., 2019; Bazazov et al., 2018]

$$M_{B_s} = 5366.88 \text{ MeV} \quad f_{B_s} = (0.2307 \pm 0.0013) \text{ GeV},$$
$$B_{B_s} = 0.813 \pm 0.034, \quad \widetilde{B}'_{S,B_s} = 1.31 \pm 0.09,$$
$$\frac{\lambda_u^d}{\lambda_t^d} = (0.0122 \pm 0.0097) - (0.4203 \pm 0.0090)i,$$
$$\frac{\lambda_u^s}{\lambda_t^s} = -(0.00865 \pm 0.00042) + (0.01832 \pm 0.00039)i.$$

Summary

- We calculated all building blocks needed to obtain the full NNLO correction to $B_s^0 - \bar{B}_s^0$ mixing
- All the occurring 3-loop master integrals (for $m_c = 0$) can be calculated analytically

Outlook

- These results should be published soon $\Rightarrow$ new theory prediction for $\Delta\Gamma_s$
- Higher order expansions in $z \equiv m_c^2/m_b^2$, ideally z-exact results at least for 2-loop contributions
- NNLO corrections to the $B_d^0 - \bar{B}_d^0$ meson mixing as the next step

Anomalies in the flavor physics (incomplete list)

- 🐞 Hints for Lepton Flavor Universality (LFU) violation in semileptonic decays
  - 🐞 Loop-level (FCNC): $b \to s\ell\ell$ (e. g. $B_d \to K^*\mu^+\mu^-$) [Aaij et al., 2017, 2019; Abdesselam et al., 2021; Choudhury et al., 2021; Aaij et al., 2021]
  - 🐞 Tree-level: $b \to c\tau\nu$ (e. g. $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\tau^-\bar{\nu}_\tau$) [?, ?; Hirose et al., 2017; Aaij et al., 2015, 2018]
- 🐞 Dimuon charge asymmetry (related to CP-asymmetry in B-mixing) [Abazov et al., 2006, 2010a, 2010b, 2011, 2014]
- 🐞 $g-2$ of the muon [Abi et al., 2021]
- 🐞 CP-violation in the neutral kaon system (ε/ε') [Alavi-Harati et al., 1999; Fanti et al., 1999]
- 🐞 a_{fb} in $Zb\bar{b}$ decays [Abbaneo et al., 1996]
- 🐞 LFU violation in leptonic τ decays [Aubert et al., 2010; Anastassov et al., 1997; Albrecht et al., 1992]
- 🐞 $B \to \pi K$ puzzle [Buras et al., 2003, 2004b, 2004a]
- 🐞 Inclusive vs exclusive determinations of V_{cb} [Waheed et al., 2019; Lees et al., 2019]

$|\Delta B| = 1$ effective Hamiltonian in the CMM basis for $b \to sc\bar{c}$ decays [Chetyrkin et al., 1998]

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}}^{|\Delta B|=1} = \frac{4G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \left[-V_{ts}^* V_{tb}^\dagger \Big(\sum_{i=1}^{6} C_i Q_i + C_8 Q_8 \Big) - V_{us}^* V_{ub}^\dagger \sum_{i=1}^{2} C_i(Q_i - Q_i^u) \right.$$

$$\left. + V_{us}^* V_{cb} \sum_{i=1}^{2} C_i Q_i^{cu} + V_{cs}^* V_{ub} \sum_{i=1}^{2} C_i Q_i^{uc} \right] + \text{h.c.} ,$$

🔴 Current operators

$Q_1 = \bar{s}_L \gamma_\mu T^a c_L \ \bar{c}_L \gamma^\mu T^a b_L,$

$Q_2 = \bar{s}_L \gamma_\mu c_L \ \bar{c}_L \gamma^\mu b_L,$

$Q_1^u = \bar{s}_L \gamma_\mu T^a u_L \ \bar{u}_L \gamma^\mu T^a b_L,$

$Q_2^u = \bar{s}_L \gamma_\mu u_L \ \bar{u}_L \gamma^\mu b_L,$

$Q_1^{cu} = \bar{s}_L \gamma_\mu T^a u_L \ \bar{c}_L \gamma^\mu T^a b_L,$

$Q_2^{cu} = \bar{s}_L \gamma_\mu u_L \ \bar{c}_L \gamma^\mu b_L,$

$Q_1^{uc} = \bar{s}_L \gamma_\mu T^a c_L \ \bar{u}_L \gamma^\mu T^a b_L,$

$Q_2^{uc} = \bar{s}_L \gamma_\mu c_L \ \bar{u}_L \gamma^\mu b_L,$

🔴 Penguin operators

$Q_3 = \bar{s}_L \gamma_\mu b_L \sum_q \bar{q} \gamma^\mu q,$

$Q_4 = \bar{s}_L \gamma_\mu T^a b_L \sum_q \bar{q} \gamma^\mu T^a q,$

$Q_5 = \bar{s}_L \gamma_{\mu_1} \gamma_{\mu_2} \gamma_{\mu_3} b_L \sum_q \bar{q} \gamma^{\mu_1} \gamma^{\mu_2} \gamma^{\mu_3} q,$

$Q_6 = \bar{s}_L \gamma_{\mu_1} \gamma_{\mu_2} \gamma_{\mu_3} T^a b_L \sum_q \bar{q} \gamma^{\mu_1} \gamma^{\mu_2} \gamma^{\mu_3} T^a q,$

$Q_8 = \frac{g_s}{16\pi^2} m_b \, \bar{s}_L \sigma^{\mu\nu} T^a b_R \, G_{\mu\nu}^a,$

$|\Delta B| = 1$ effective Hamiltonian in the CMM basis for $b \to s c \bar{c}$ decays [Chetyrkin et al., 1998]

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}}^{|\Delta B|=1} = \frac{4 G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \Bigg[-V_{ts}^* V_{tb}^\dagger \Big(\sum_{i=1}^6 C_i Q_i + C_8 Q_8 \Big) - V_{us}^* V_{ub}^\dagger \sum_{i=1}^2 C_i (Q_i - Q_i^u)$$

$$+ V_{us}^* V_{cb} \sum_{i=1}^2 C_i Q_i^{cu} + V_{cs}^* V_{ub} \sum_{i=1}^2 C_i Q_i^{uc} \Bigg] + \text{h.c.},$$

🔴 4-fermion vertices generate Dirac structures with multiple insertions of γ matrices

$$(P_L)_{ij} \times (P_L)_{kl}, \quad (\gamma^\mu P_L)_{ij} \times (\gamma_\mu P_L)_{kl}, \quad (\gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu P_L)_{ij} \times (\gamma_\mu \gamma_\nu P_L)_{kl},$$
$$(\gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu \gamma^\rho P_L)_{ij} \times (\gamma_\mu \gamma_\nu \gamma_\rho P_L)_{kl}, \quad (\gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu \gamma^\rho \gamma^\sigma P_L)_{ij} \times (\gamma_\mu \gamma_\nu \gamma_\rho \gamma_\sigma P_L)_{kl},$$
$$(\gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu \gamma^\rho \gamma^\sigma \gamma^\tau P_L)_{ij} \times (\gamma_\mu \gamma_\nu \gamma_\rho \gamma_\sigma \gamma_\tau P_L)_{kl}, \ldots$$

🔴 4-dimensions: Products of γ matrices reducible via the Chisholm identity

$$\gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu \gamma^\rho = g^{\mu\nu} \gamma^\rho + g^{\nu\rho} \gamma^\mu - g^{\mu\rho} \gamma^\nu + i \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \gamma_\sigma \gamma^5$$

🔴 In d-dimensions such a reduction is not possible (unambiguously).

🔴 Proper way to handle this issue: evanescent operators [Dugan & Grinstein, 1991; Herrlich & Nierste, 1995]

$|\Delta B| = 1$ effective Hamiltonian in the CMM basis for $b \to sc\bar{c}$ decays [Chetyrkin et al., 1998]

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}}^{|\Delta B|=1} = \frac{4G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \left[-V_{ts}^* V_{tb}^\dagger \Big(\sum_{i=1}^{6} C_i Q_i + C_8 Q_8 \Big) - V_{us}^* V_{ub}^\dagger \sum_{i=1}^{2} C_i (Q_i - Q_i^u) \right.$$

$$\left. + V_{us}^* V_{cb} \sum_{i=1}^{2} C_i Q_i^{cu} + V_{cs}^* V_{ub} \sum_{i=1}^{2} C_i Q_i^{uc} \right] + \text{h.c.}\,,$$

🔴 LO evanescent operators

$$E_1^{(1)} = \bar{s}_L \gamma^{\mu_1} \gamma^{\mu_2} \gamma^{\mu_3} T^a c_L \; \bar{c}_L \gamma_{\mu_1} \gamma_{\mu_2} \gamma_{\mu_3} T^a b_L - 16 Q_1 \,,$$

$$E_2^{(1)} = \bar{s}_L \gamma^{\mu_1} \gamma^{\mu_2} \gamma^{\mu_3} c_L \; \bar{c}_L \gamma_{\mu_1} \gamma_{\mu_2} \gamma_{\mu_3} b_L - 16 Q_2 \,,$$

$$E_3^{(1)} = \bar{s}_L \gamma^{\mu_1} \gamma^{\mu_2} \gamma^{\mu_3} \gamma^{\mu_4} \gamma^{\mu_5} b_L \sum_q \bar{q} \gamma_{\mu_1} \gamma_{\mu_2} \gamma_{\mu_3} \gamma_{\mu_4} \gamma_{\mu_5} q - 20 Q_5 + 64 Q_3 \,,$$

$$E_4^{(1)} = \bar{s}_L \gamma^{\mu_1} \gamma^{\mu_2} \gamma^{\mu_3} \gamma^{\mu_4} \gamma^{\mu_5} T^a b_L \sum_q \bar{q} \gamma_{\mu_1} \gamma_{\mu_2} \gamma_{\mu_3} \gamma_{\mu_4} \gamma_{\mu_5} T^a q - 20 Q_6 + 64 Q_4$$

$|\Delta B| = 1$ effective Hamiltonian in the CMM basis for $b \to sc\bar{c}$ decays [Chetyrkin et al., 1998]

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}}^{|\Delta B|=1} = \frac{4G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \Big[-V_{ts}^* V_{tb}^\dagger \Big(\sum_{i=1}^{6} C_i Q_i + C_8 Q_8 \Big) - V_{us}^* V_{ub}^\dagger \sum_{i=1}^{2} C_i (Q_i - Q_i^u)$$

$$+ V_{us}^* V_{cb} \sum_{i=1}^{2} C_i Q_i^{cu} + V_{cs}^* V_{ub} \sum_{i=1}^{2} C_i Q_i^{uc} \Big] + \text{h.c.} \,,$$

● NLO evanescent operators

$$E_1^{(2)} = \bar{s}_L \gamma^{\mu_1} \gamma^{\mu_2} \gamma^{\mu_3} \gamma^{\mu_4} \gamma^{\mu_5} T^a c_L \ \bar{c} \gamma_{\mu_1} \gamma_{\mu_2} \gamma_{\mu_3} \gamma_{\mu_4} \gamma_{\mu_5} T^a b_L - 20 E_1^{(1)} - 256 Q_1 \,,$$

$$E_2^{(2)} = \bar{s}_L \gamma^{\mu_1} \gamma^{\mu_2} \gamma^{\mu_3} \gamma^{\mu_4} \gamma^{\mu_5} c_L \ \bar{c}_L \gamma_{\mu_1} \gamma_{\mu_2} \gamma_{\mu_3} \gamma_{\mu_4} \gamma_{\mu_5} b_L - 20 E_2^{(1)} - 256 Q_2 \,,$$

$$E_3^{(2)} = \bar{s}_L \gamma^{\mu_1} \gamma^{\mu_2} \gamma^{\mu_3} \gamma^{\mu_4} \gamma^{\mu_5} \gamma^{\mu_6} \gamma^{\mu_7} b_L \sum_q \bar{q} \gamma_{\mu_1} \gamma_{\mu_2} \gamma_{\mu_3} \gamma_{\mu_4} \gamma_{\mu_5} \gamma_{\mu_6} \gamma_{\mu_7} q - 336 Q_5 + 1280 Q_3 \,,$$

$$E_4^{(2)} = \bar{s}_L \gamma^{\mu_1} \gamma^{\mu_2} \gamma^{\mu_3} \gamma^{\mu_4} \gamma^{\mu_5} T^a b_L \sum_q \bar{q} \gamma_{\mu_1} \gamma_{\mu_2} \gamma_{\mu_3} \gamma_{\mu_4} \gamma_{\mu_5} T^a q - 336 Q_6 + 1280 Q_4$$

$\Delta\Gamma_s$ described by local $|\Delta B| = 2$ operators [Beneke et al., 1999; Lenz & Nierste, 2007; Asatrian et al., 2017]

$$\Gamma_{12} = -(\lambda_c^q)^2 \Gamma_{12}^{cc} - 2\lambda_c^q \lambda_u^q \Gamma_{12}^{uc} - (\lambda_u^q)^2 \Gamma_{12}^{uu}, \quad \lambda_{q'}^q \equiv V_{q'q}^* V_{q'b}$$

$$\Gamma_{12}^{ab} = \frac{G_F^2 m_b^2}{24\pi M_{B_s}} \left[H^{ab}(z)\langle B_s|Q|\bar{B}_s\rangle + \tilde{H}_S^{ab}(z)\langle B_s|\widetilde{Q}_S|\bar{B}_s\rangle \right] + \mathcal{O}\left(\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}/m_b\right)$$

- Matching coefficients from various $|\Delta B| = 1$ correlators

$$H^{ab}(z) = H^{(c)ab}(z) + H^{(cp)ab}(z) + H^{(p)ab}(z)$$

$$\tilde{H}_S^{ab}(z) = \tilde{H}_S^{(c)ab}(z) + \tilde{H}_S^{(cp)ab}(z) + \tilde{H}_S^{(p)ab}(z)$$

$$H^{(c)ab}(z) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} C_i C_j\, p_{ij}^{ab}(z),$$

$$\tilde{H}_S^{(c)ab}(z) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} C_i C_j\, p_{ij}^{S,ab}(z),$$

$$H^{(cp)ab}(z) = \sum_{i=3,\ldots 6,8} C_i \left[C_1 p_{1i}^{ab}(z) + C_2 p_{2i}^{ab}(z) \right],$$

$$\tilde{H}_S^{(cp)ab}(z) = \sum_{i=3,\ldots 6,8} C_i \left[C_1 p_{1i}^{S,ab}(z) + C_2 p_{2i}^{S,ab}(z) \right],$$

$$H^{(p)ab}(z) = \sum_{i,j=3,\ldots 6,8} C_i C_j\, p_{ij}^{ab}(z)$$

$$\tilde{H}_S^{(p)ab}(z) = \sum_{i,j=3,\ldots 6,8} C_i C_j\, p_{ij}^{S,ab}(z)$$

- Physical $|\Delta B| = 2$ operators

$$Q = \bar{s}_i \gamma^\mu \left(1 - \gamma^5\right) b_i\ \bar{s}_j \gamma_\mu \left(1 - \gamma^5\right) b_j,$$

$$\widetilde{Q}_S = \bar{s}_i \left(1 - \gamma^5\right) b_j\ \bar{s}_j \left(1 - \gamma^5\right) b_i$$

- Additional operators needed at intermediate stages (e. g. basis changes, def. of ev. operators)

$$\widetilde{Q} = \bar{s}_i \gamma^\mu \left(1 - \gamma^5\right) b_j\ \bar{s}_j \gamma_\mu \left(1 - \gamma^5\right) b_i,$$

$$Q_S = \bar{s}_i \left(1 - \gamma^5\right) b_i\ \bar{s}_j \left(1 - \gamma^5\right) b_j,$$

$\Delta\Gamma_s$ described by local $|\Delta B| = 2$ operators [Beneke et al., 1999; Lenz & Nierste, 2007; Asatrian et al., 2017]

$$\Gamma_{12} = -(\lambda_c^q)^2 \Gamma_{12}^{cc} - 2\lambda_c^q \lambda_u^q \Gamma_{12}^{uc} - (\lambda_u^q)^2 \Gamma_{12}^{uu}, \quad \lambda_{q'}^q \equiv V_{q'q}^* V_{q'b}$$

$$\Gamma_{12}^{ab} = \frac{G_F^2 m_b^2}{24\pi M_{B_s}} \left[H^{ab}(z)\langle B_s|Q|\bar{B}_s\rangle + \tilde{H}_S^{ab}(z)\langle B_s|\widetilde{Q}_S|\bar{B}_s\rangle \right] + \mathcal{O}\left(\Lambda_{\rm QCD}/m_b\right)$$

- Matching coefficients from various $|\Delta B| = 1$ correlators

$$H^{ab}(z) = H^{(c)ab}(z) + H^{(cp)ab}(z) + H^{(p)ab}(z)$$

$$\tilde{H}_S^{ab}(z) = \tilde{H}_S^{(c)ab}(z) + \tilde{H}_S^{(cp)ab}(z) + \tilde{H}_S^{(p)ab}(z)$$

$$H^{(c)ab}(z) = \sum_{i,j=1}^2 C_i C_j \, p_{ij}^{ab}(z),$$

$$\tilde{H}_S^{(c)ab}(z) = \sum_{i,j=1}^2 C_i C_j \, p_{ij}^{S,ab}(z),$$

$$H^{(cp)ab}(z) = \sum_{i=3,\dots6,8} C_i \left[C_1 p_{1i}^{ab}(z) + C_2 p_{2i}^{ab}(z) \right],$$

$$\tilde{H}_S^{(cp)ab}(z) = \sum_{i=3,\dots6,8} C_i \left[C_1 p_{1i}^{S,ab}(z) + C_2 p_{2i}^{S,ab}(z) \right],$$

$$H^{(p)ab}(z) = \sum_{i,j=3,\dots6,8} C_i C_j \, p_{ij}^{ab}(z)$$

$$\tilde{H}_S^{(p)ab}(z) = \sum_{i,j=3,\dots6,8} C_i C_j \, p_{ij}^{S,ab}(z)$$

- LO evanescent operators

$$E_1^{(1)} = \widetilde{Q} - Q,$$

$$E_2^{(1)} = \bar{b}_i \gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu \gamma^\rho P_L \, s_j \bar{b}_j \gamma_\mu \gamma_\nu \gamma_\rho P_L \, s_i - (16 - 4\epsilon)\widetilde{Q},$$

$$E_3^{(1)} = \bar{b}_i \gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu \gamma^\rho P_L \, s_i \bar{b}_j \gamma_\mu \gamma_\nu \gamma_\rho P_L \, s_j - (16 - 4\epsilon)Q,$$

$$E_4^{(1)} = \bar{b}_i \gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu P_L \, s_j \bar{b}_j \gamma_\nu \gamma_\mu P_L \, s_i + (8 - 8\epsilon)Q_s,$$

$$E_5^{(1)} = \bar{b}_i \gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu P_L \, s_i \bar{b}_j \gamma_\nu \gamma_\mu P_L \, s_j + (8 - 8\epsilon)\widetilde{Q}_s,$$

- Higher order evanescent operators (not shown here) needed for the NNLO calculation but also for the renormalization of LO evanescent operators

$\Delta\Gamma_s$ described by local $|\Delta B| = 2$ operators [Beneke et al., 1999; Lenz & Nierste, 2007; Asatrian et al., 2017]

$$\Gamma_{12} = -(\lambda_c^q)^2 \Gamma_{12}^{cc} - 2\lambda_c^q \lambda_u^q \Gamma_{12}^{uc} - (\lambda_u^q)^2 \Gamma_{12}^{uu}, \quad \lambda_{q'}^q \equiv V_{q'q}^* V_{q'b}$$

$$\Gamma_{12}^{ab} = \frac{G_F^2 m_b^2}{24\pi M_{B_s}} \left[H^{ab}(z) \langle B_s | Q | \bar{B}_s \rangle + \tilde{H}_S^{ab}(z) \langle B_s | \widetilde{Q}_S | \bar{B}_s \rangle \right] + \mathcal{O}\left(\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}/m_b \right)$$

- Matching coefficients from various $|\Delta B| = 1$ correlators

$$H^{ab}(z) = H^{(c)ab}(z) + H^{(cp)ab}(z) + H^{(p)ab}(z)$$

$$\tilde{H}_S^{ab}(z) = \tilde{H}_S^{(c)ab}(z) + \tilde{H}_S^{(cp)ab}(z) + \tilde{H}_S^{(p)ab}(z)$$

$$H^{(c)ab}(z) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} C_i C_j \, p_{ij}^{ab}(z),$$

$$\tilde{H}_S^{(c)ab}(z) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} C_i C_j \, p_{ij}^{S,ab}(z),$$

$$H^{(cp)ab}(z) = \sum_{i=3,\dots 6,8} C_i \left[C_1 p_{1i}^{ab}(z) + C_2 p_{2i}^{ab}(z) \right],$$

$$\tilde{H}_S^{(cp)ab}(z) = \sum_{i=3,\dots 6,8} C_i \left[C_1 p_{1i}^{S,ab}(z) + C_2 p_{2i}^{S,ab}(z) \right],$$

$$H^{(p)ab}(z) = \sum_{i,j=3,\dots 6,8} C_i C_j \, p_{ij}^{ab}(z)$$

$$\tilde{H}_S^{(p)ab}(z) = \sum_{i,j=3,\dots 6,8} C_i C_j \, p_{ij}^{S,ab}(z)$$

- Another subtlety: $1/m_b$ suppressed operator R_0

$$R_0 = Q_S + \alpha_1 \tilde{Q}_S + \alpha_2 \frac{1}{2} Q$$

- $\alpha_{1,2} = 1$ at LO
- $\alpha_{1,2}$ receive $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s)$ corrections at higher loop orders [Beneke et al., 1999]
- One must take into account that the combination

$$Q_S + \alpha_1 \tilde{Q}_S + \alpha_2 \frac{1}{2} Q$$

is $1/m_b$ suppressed. Ignoring it leads to incorrect matching coefficients!

- Conceptional overview of the NNLO calculation
  - Matching between two EFTs, large number of operators contributing on both sides
  - Mixing of operators (on both sides) under renormalization (also between physical and evanescent operators)

$$(\vec{C}^{\text{bare}}, \vec{C}_E^{\text{bare}}) = (\vec{C}^{\text{ren}}, \vec{C}_E^{\text{ren}})Z \equiv (\vec{C}^{\text{ren}}, \vec{C}_E^{\text{ren}}) \begin{pmatrix} Z_{QQ} & Z_{QE} \\ Z_{EQ} & Z_{EE} \end{pmatrix},$$

  - Example: The 3-loop $O_{1,2} \times O_{1,2}$ correlator receives contributions from $O_{1,2} \times O_{3-6}$ (1- and 2-loops), $O_{3-6} \times O_{3-6}$ (1-loop) and $O_{1-2} \times O_8$ (1-loop)
  - Comparisons to the existing literature results requires switching between different bases
    - "historical" [Buras et al., 1993] $\Leftrightarrow$ CMM bases for $|\Delta B| = 1$
    - $(Q, Q_S, \tilde{Q}_S) \Leftrightarrow (Q, \tilde{Q}_S, R_0)$ for $|\Delta B| = 2$
  - Extra care needed when IR-divergences are regularized dimensionally

NLO matching with $\varepsilon_{\mathrm{IR}} = \varepsilon_{\mathrm{UV}} = \varepsilon$ (no gluon mass) [Ciuchini et al., 2002]

- Normally, only the matching coefficients of physical $|\Delta B| = 2$ operators are relevant
- Here matching coefficients of evanescent operators are also needed (at intermediate stages)
- $|\Delta B| = 2$ matching coefficients obtain $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ pieces

$$C = f_0^{(0)} + \varepsilon\, f_1^{(0)} + \frac{\alpha_s}{4\pi} f_0^{(1)}, \qquad C_E = f_{E,0}^{(0)} + \varepsilon\, f_{E,1}^{(0)} + \frac{\alpha_s}{4\pi} f_{E,0}^{(1)}$$

- LO matching must be carried out up to $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$: fixes $f_0^{(0)}, f_1^{(0)}, f_{E,0}^{(0)}, f_{E,1}^{(0)}$
- At NLO we only need $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^0)$
- Upon inserting $f_0^{(0)}, f_1^{(0)}, f_{E,0}^{(0)}, f_{E,1}^{(0)}$ at NLO all $1/\varepsilon_{\mathrm{IR}}$ poles must cancel.
- Finally, the difference

$$A_{\mathrm{ren}}^{|\Delta B|=1} - A_{\mathrm{ren}}^{|\Delta B|=2}$$

  is manifestly finite $\Rightarrow$ determine $f_0^{(1)}$
- Only $f_0^{(0)}$ and $f_0^{(1)}$ enter the physical matching coefficient
- What about $f_{E,1}^{(0)}$? Not needed at NLO, must be determined for the NNLO calculation!
- At NNLO, the LO matching must be done up $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)$, the NLO matching up to $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$
- The explicit cancellation of IR poles (and of ξ) is a highly nontrivial cross-check of the whole calculation