



Kaon Theory

Emilie Passemar Indiana University/Jefferson Lab.

The XIIIth International Conference on Heavy Quarks and Leptons Centre for Neutrino Physics, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, Virginia

May 22-27, 2016

- 1. Introduction and Motivation
- 2. Leptonic decays: lepton universality and R_{K}
- 3. Semileptonic decays
 - CKM Unitarity and Callan-Treiman
 - Determinations of LECs
- 4. Non-leptonic Decays: ε'/ε
- 5. Rare and Radiative Decays.
- 6. Conclusion and outlook

See the review by Cirigliano, Ecker, Neufeld, Pich, Portoles'12, NA62 handbook workshop, Mainz

1. Introduction and Motivation

Goals:

- Test of the Standard Model:
 - Extraction of the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa matrix element V_{us}
 - Test of lepton universality
- Probe QCD at low energy
- Indirect searches of new physics, several possible high-precision tests

Tools: ChPT, OPE, ... & Lattice

Data: KLOE, KTeV, NA48 📥 KLOE2, NA62, KOTO, ORKA, TREK

1.2 Theoretical framework

Multi scale theoretical description

Pich@NA62 handbook workshop'16



1.2 Theoretical framework

Multi scale theoretical description

Pich@NA62 handbook workshop'16



Emilie Passemar

2. Leptonic decays

2.1 K₁₂ decays



Only the axial current contributes in the SM

• The branching ratio in the SM:

$$B(K \to \ell \nu) = \frac{G_F^2 |V_{us}|^2}{8\pi} f_K^2 m_K m_\ell^2 \left(1 - \frac{m_\ell^2}{M_K^2}\right)^2 \left(1 + 2\frac{\alpha}{\pi} \log \frac{M_Z}{M_\rho}\right)$$
$$\left(1 + \frac{\alpha}{\pi} F(m_\ell/m_K)\right) (1 + O(\alpha))$$
Marciano d

- Short distance effects (universal)
- Long distance effects (universal)
- Structure dependent effects (process dependent)

Marciano & Sirlin'93, Finkemeier'96, Cirigliano & Rosell'07 2.2 R_K



Define the RK ratio to reduce the theoretical uncertainties: most of the hadronic and radiative contributions cancel

$$R_{K}^{SM} = \frac{\Gamma(K^{+} \to e^{+}v_{e}[\gamma])}{\Gamma(K^{+} \to \mu^{+}v_{\mu}[\gamma])} \stackrel{\bullet}{=} \frac{m_{e}^{2}}{m_{\mu}^{2}} \left(\frac{m_{K}^{2} - m_{e}^{2}}{m_{K}^{2} - m_{\mu}^{2}}\right)^{2} (1 + \delta R_{QED}) = 2.477(1) \times 10^{-5}$$

$$Experimental result:$$

$$g_{e} / g_{\mu} = 1$$
in the standard model
$$NA62 - R_{K}:$$

$$R_{K} = (2.488 \pm 0.007_{\text{stat}} \pm 0.007_{\text{syst}}) \times 10^{-5}$$

$$R_{K} = (2.488 \pm 0.010) \times 10^{-5}$$

 Compatible with SM but experimental uncertainty one order of magnitude higher than theory NA62

Emilie Passemar

• Compare to other measurements:

$$R^{(P)}_{e/\mu} \equiv rac{\Gamma(P^- o e^- ar{
u}_e)}{\Gamma(P^- o \mu^- ar{
u}_\mu)}$$

$$\frac{|g_{\mu}|}{|g_{e}|} = \begin{cases} 1.0021 \pm 0.0016 & \pi \rightarrow \mu/e \\ 0.9978 \pm 0.0024 & \kappa \rightarrow \mu/e \\ 1.0010 \pm 0.0025 & \kappa \rightarrow \pi \mu/e \\ 1.0018 \pm 0.0014 & \tau \rightarrow \mu/e \end{cases}$$

2.3 Test of New Physics in R_K

- R_{K} sensitive to *lepton flavour violating effects*, $\Delta R/R \approx O(1\%)$
- 2HDM tree level: additional contribution due to charged Higgs, does not contribute to R_K
- Possibility to constrain LFV at one loop in MSSM

Masiero, Paradisi, Petronzio'06,'08

• Update and extension by Girrbach & Nierste'12

- *LFV*:
$$R_K^{LFV} \approx R_K^{SM} (1 + 0.013)$$

- Can become negative if interference with LFC effects:

 $R_K^{LFV} \approx R_K^{SM} (1 - 0.032)$ Ex : tan β =40, M_H = 500 GeV, Δ^{31}_R = 5×10⁻⁴.





2.3 Test of New Physics in R_K

- R_{K} sensitive to *lepton flavour violating effects*, $\Delta R/R \approx O(1\%)$
- If 0.05% effect on R_K found at NA62 (blue constraint): Girrbach & Nierste'12



 R_K sensitive to neutrino mixing parameters within SM extensions involving sterile neutrinos. Depends on masses, hierarchy, and mixings of new neutrino states
 Abada et al.'12

Emilie Passemar

3. CKM Unitarity from (semi)-leptonic decays

3.1 Paths to V_{ud} and V_{us}

• From kaon, pion, baryon and nuclear decays

V _{ud}	$egin{aligned} \mathbf{0^+} & ightarrow \mathbf{0^+} \ \pi^\pm & ightarrow \pi^0 \mathrm{ev}_\mathrm{e} \end{aligned}$	$n \rightarrow pev_e$	$\pi o \ell v_{\ell}$
V _{us}	$K o \pi \ell \nu_\ell$	$\Lambda \rightarrow \mathbf{pe} v_{e}$	$\mathbf{K} \to \ell \mathbf{v}_{\ell}$



3.1 Paths to V_{ud} and V_{us}

• From kaon, pion, baryon and nuclear decays



- These are the golden modes to extract V_{ud} and V_{us}
 - Only the vector current contributes
 - ➢ Normalization known in SU(2) [SU(3)] symmetry limit
 - Corrections start at 2nd order in SU(2) [SU(3)] breaking

Ademollo & Gato, Berhands & Sirlin

Currently the most precise determination of V_{ud} and V_{us}

 \implies V_{ud} (0.02 %) and V_{us} (0.5 %)

3.1 Paths to V_{ud} and V_{us}

• From kaon, pion, baryon and nuclear decays

V _{ud}	$egin{array}{l} \mathbf{0^+} & ightarrow \mathbf{0^+} \ \pi^\pm & ightarrow \pi^0 \mathrm{e} \nu_\mathrm{e} \end{array}$	$n \rightarrow pev_e$	$\pi o \ell v_{\ell}$	u _i g V _{ij}	e, μ
V _{us}	$K o \pi \ell \nu_\ell$	$\Lambda \rightarrow \mathbf{pe} \nu_{e}$	$\mathbf{K} \to \ell \boldsymbol{\nu}_{\ell}$	d _j	/

- K_{I2}/Π_{I2}
 - > Only the *axial current* contributes
 - > Need to know the decay constants F_K , F_{π} *Lattice QCD*
 - Probe different BSM operators than from the vector case
- Input on $F_K/F_{\pi} \implies V_{us}/V_{ud}$ very precisely

• From K_{12}/π_{12} :

$$\frac{\Gamma\left(K \to \mu \nu\left[\gamma\right]\right)}{\Gamma\left(\pi \to \mu \nu\left[\gamma\right]\right)} = \frac{m_{K^{\pm}}}{m_{\pi^{\pm}}} \frac{\left(1 - m_{\mu}^{2} / m_{K^{\pm}}^{2}\right)}{\left(1 - m_{\mu}^{2} / m_{\pi^{\pm}}^{2}\right)} \frac{f_{K}^{2}}{f_{\pi}^{2}} \frac{\left|V_{us}\right|^{2}}{\left|V_{ud}\right|^{2}} \left(1 + \delta_{\rm EM}\right)$$



→ Experimental BRs from FlaviaNet kaon WG review Antonelli et al.'10

 \rightarrow F_K/ F_{π} Lattice calculations

 \rightarrow Electromagnetic and isospin breaking corrections

Marciano'04, Knecht et al.'99

 F_{K}/F_{π} from lattice QCD



 Corrections for IB taken into account in FLAG averages

FLAG'13

$$\frac{F_{K}}{F_{\pi}} = 1.192 \pm 0.005$$

$$\frac{F_{K}}{F_{\pi}} = 1.194 \pm 0.005$$

3.2 V_{us}/V_{ud} from K_{12}/π_{12}

• From K_{12}/π_{12} :

$$\frac{\Gamma\left(K \to \mu \nu\left[\gamma\right]\right)}{\Gamma\left(\pi \to \mu \nu\left[\gamma\right]\right)} = \frac{m_{K^{\pm}}}{m_{\pi^{\pm}}} \frac{\left(1 - m_{\mu}^{2} / m_{K^{\pm}}^{2}\right)}{\left(1 - m_{\mu}^{2} / m_{\pi^{\pm}}^{2}\right)} \frac{f_{K}^{2}}{f_{\pi}^{2}} \frac{\left|V_{us}\right|^{2}}{\left|V_{ud}\right|^{2}} \left(1 + \delta_{\rm EM}\right)$$



Choice	V_{us}/V_{ud}	
$N_f = 2+1$	1.192(5)	0.2315(10)
<i>N_f</i> = 2+1+1	1.1960(25)	0.2308(6)

3.3 V_{us} from K_{l3} decays

• Master formula for $K \to \pi Iv_I$: $K = \{K^+, K^0\}, I=\{e, \mu\}$

$$\Gamma(K \to \pi l v [\gamma]) = Br(K_{13}) * \tau = C_{K}^{2} \frac{G_{F}^{2} m_{K}^{5}}{192\pi^{3}} S_{EW}^{K} |V_{us}|^{2} |f_{+}^{K^{0}\pi^{-}}(0)|^{2} I_{Kl} (1 + \delta_{EM}^{Kl} + \delta_{SU(2)}^{K\pi})^{2}$$

Experimental inputs:

 $\Gamma(K_{I3})$ Rates with well-determined treatment of radiative decays

- Branching ratios
- Kaon lifetimes

 $I_{_{KI}}(\lambda_{_{KI}})$

Integral of form factor over phase space: λ s parametrize evolution in t=q²

Inputs from theory:

 S_{EW}^{K} Universal short distance EW corrections

K(P)

t = (P - p)

 $\pi(p)$

- $f_{+}^{K^{0}\pi^{-}}(0)$ Hadronic matrix element (form factor) at zero momentum transfer (t=0)
- $\delta_{\rm EM}^{Kl}$ Form-factor correction for long-distance EM effects
- $\delta_{SU(2)}^{K\pi}$ Form-factor correction for SU(2) breaking

$K_{\ell 3}$ form-factor parameterizations

Parameterizations based on systematic expansions

Taylor expansion:

$$\tilde{f}_{+,0}(t) = 1 + \lambda_{+,0} \left(\frac{t}{m_{\pi^+}^2}\right)$$
$$\tilde{f}_{+,0}(t) = 1 + \lambda_{+,0}' \left(\frac{t}{m_{\pi^+}^2}\right) + \lambda_{+,0}'' \left(\frac{t}{m_{\pi^+}^2}\right)^2$$

Notes:

Many parameters: λ_+ ', λ_+ ", λ_0 ', λ_0 " Large correlations, unstable fits

Parameterizations incorporating physical constraints

Pole dominance: $ilde{f}_{+,0}(t)$

$$(T) = \frac{M_{V,S}^2}{M_{V,S}^2 - t}$$

Dispersion relations:

$$\tilde{f}_{+}(t) = \exp\left[\frac{t}{m_{\pi}^{2}}(\Lambda_{+} - H(t))\right]$$
$$\tilde{f}_{0}(t) = \exp\left[\frac{t}{m_{K}^{2} - m_{\pi}^{2}}(\ln C - G(t))\right]$$

Emilie Passemar

Notes:

What does M_S correspond to?

Notes:

Allows tests of ChPT & lowenergy dynamics

H(t), G(t) evaluated from $K\pi$ scattering data and given as polynomials

Bernard et al., PRD 80 (2009)

Fits to $K_{e3} + K_{\mu3}$ form-factor slopes: Update

KTeV KLOE ISTRA+ NA48/2 '12 prel 2010 fit Update

Moulson@CKM2014



Dispersive representation for the form factors

Moulson@CKM2014 Dispersive parameters for K_{ℓ_3} form-factors K_l avgs from **KTeV KLOE ISTRA+ NA48/2** '12 prel **2010** fit **Update** For NA48, only K_{e3} data included in fits 0.25 $\Lambda_+ imes 10^3$ $= 25.75 \pm 0.36$ 1σ contours C **Preliminary** ln = 0.1985(70)2014 update **In** *C* $\rho(\Lambda_+, \ln C)$ = -0.202= 5.9/7 (55%) χ^2 /ndf Integrals 0.2 Mode Update 2010 K^{0}_{e3} 0.15481(14) 0.15476(18) K^{+}_{e3} 0.15927(14) 0.15922(18) $K^{0}_{\ \mu 3}$ 0.10253(13) 0.10253(16)NB: NA48/2 does not provide Λ_+ and $\ln C!$ $K^{+}_{\ \mu 3}$ 0.10558(14) 0.10559(17)Estimates from NA48/2 guad-lin data plotted Only tiny changes in central values 25 26 27

 $\Lambda_+ imes 10^3$

Emilie Passemar

$|V_{us}| f_{+}(0)$ from world data: 2010

$ V_{us} f_+$	$ V_{us} f_{+}(0)$ Approx. contrib. to % err fr							r from:
0.214	0.216 0.2	18		% err	BR	τ	Δ	Int
1.		$K_L e3$	0.2163(6)	0.26	0.09	0.20	0.11	0.06
		$K_L \mu 3$	0.2166(6)	0.29	0.15	0.18	0.11	0.08
	K _s e3	0.2155(13)	0.61	0.60	0.03	0.11	0.06	
	_ 	K±e3	0.2160(11)	0.52	0.31	0.09	0.40	0.06
_		$K^{\pm}\mu 3$	0.2158(14)	0.63	0.47	0.08	0.39	0.08
0.214 0.216 0.218								
	Average: $ V_{us} f_+(0) = 0.2163(5)$				df = 0.	.77/4 (<mark>(94%)</mark>	

$|V_{us}| f_{+}(0)$ from world data: Update



Moulson@CKM2014



Choice	V _{us}	
<i>N_f</i> = 2+1	0.9661(32)	0.2241(9)
$N_f = 2 + 1 + 1$	0.9704(32)	0.2232(9)



$$V_{ud} = 0.97416(21)$$

 $V_{us} = 0.2248(7)$
 $\chi^2/ndf = 1.16/1 (28.1\%)$
 $\Delta_{CKM} = -0.0005(5)$
 -1.0σ



Emilie Passemar

• Effective Theory approach:

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{SM} + \frac{C^{(5)}}{\Lambda} O^{(5)} + \sum_{i} \frac{C_{i}^{(6)}}{\Lambda^{2}} O_{i}^{(6)} + \dots$$

• Δ_{CKM} a constraining quantity:

$$\frac{\left|V_{ud}\right|^{2}+\left|V_{us}\right|^{2}+\left|V_{ub}\right|^{2}=1+\Delta_{CKM}}{Negligible}$$
 (B decays)

	Operator	Observable	$K^+ \to \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$	$K_L o \pi^0 \nu \bar{ u}$	$K_L \to \pi^0 \ell^+ \ell^-$	$K_L o \ell^+ \ell^-$	$K^+ \to \ell^+ \nu$	$P_T(K^+ \to \pi^0 \mu^+ \nu)$	$\Delta_{ m CKM}$	ϵ'/ϵ	ϵ_K	from: SJ, talk at NA62 Handbook workshop 2009 in MSSM?
$O_{lq}^{(1)}$	$(\bar{D}_L \gamma^\mu S_L) (\bar{L}_L \gamma_\mu L_L)$		\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	hs	_		—	—		\checkmark
$O_{lq}^{(3)}$	$(\bar{D}_L \gamma^\mu \sigma^i S_L) (\bar{L}_L \gamma_\mu \sigma^i L_L)$		\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	hs	hs	\checkmark	\checkmark	—	—	\checkmark
O_{qe}	$(\bar{D}_L \gamma^\mu S_L) (\bar{l}_R \gamma_\mu l_R)$		—	_	\checkmark	hs	_	_	—	—	—	small
O_{ld}	$(\bar{d}_R \gamma^\mu s_R) (\bar{L}_L \gamma_\mu L_L)$		\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	hs	—	—	—	—	—	small
O_{ed}	$(ar{d}_R\gamma^\mu s_R)(ar{l}_R\gamma_\mu l_R)$		—	—	\checkmark	hs	—	—	—	—	—	small
O_{lq}^{\dagger}	$(\bar{u}_R S_L) \cdot (\bar{l}_R L_L)$		_	_	_	_	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	_	—	tiny
$(O_{lq}^t)^\dagger$	$(\bar{u}_R \sigma_{\mu\nu} S_L) \cdot (\bar{l}_R \sigma^{\mu\nu} L_L)$		—	_	_	_	_	?	?	_	—	tiny
O_{qde}	$(ar{d}_R S_L)(ar{L}_L l_R)$		—	_	\checkmark	\checkmark	_	_	—	—	—	tiny
O_{qde}^{\dagger}	$(ar{D}_L s_R)(ar{l}_R L_L)$		_		\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	—	_	large $\tan\beta$
$O^{(1)}_{\varphi q}$	$(\bar{D}_L \gamma^\mu S_L) (H^\dagger D_\mu H)$		\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	hs	—	_	—	\checkmark	(\checkmark)	\checkmark
$O^{(3)}_{\varphi q}$	$(\bar{D}_L \gamma^\mu \sigma^i S_L) (H^\dagger D_\mu \sigma^i H)$		\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	hs	hs	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	(\checkmark)	\checkmark
$O_{arphi d}$	$(\bar{d}_R \gamma^\mu s_R) (H^\dagger D_\mu H)$		\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	hs	—	—	_	\checkmark	(\checkmark)	large $\tan\beta$ (non-MFV)

Emilie Passemar



?

Emilie Passemar

NA48 (preliminary)



3.6 Test of Low-Energy QCD with K₁₄ Decays

3.6 Test of low energy QCD with K₁₄ decays

- Main interest:
 - access to $\pi\pi$ threshold region $\Rightarrow \pi\pi$ scattering lengths
 - form factors, LECs, . . .
- Standard problem of the NNLO treatment
 strong final state rescattering

Amoros, Bijnens, Talavera'00



• Use dispersion relations:

matching to CHPT at both one- and two-loop levels: LECs

$$\mathcal{L}_{eff} = \sum_{d \ge 2} \mathcal{L}_{d} , \mathcal{L}_{d} = \mathcal{O}(p^{d}) , p \equiv \{q, m_{q}\}$$

$$p \ll \Lambda_H = 4\pi F_\pi \sim 1 \text{ GeV}$$

Isospin breaking and radiative corrections have been computed

Chiral expansion

•
$$\mathcal{L}_{ChPT} = \mathcal{L}_{2} + \mathcal{L}_{4} + \mathcal{L}_{6} + \dots$$

LO: $\mathcal{O}(p^{2})$ NLO: $\mathcal{O}(p^{4})$ NNLO: $\mathcal{O}(p^{6})$

- The structure of the lagrangian is fixed by chiral symmetry but not the coupling constants → LECs appearing at each order
- The method has been rigorously established and can be formulated as a set of calculational rules:

 $\mathcal{L}_4 = \sum_{i=1}^{10} \underline{L}_i O_4^i,$

 $\mathcal{L}_6 = \sum_{i=1}^{90} \frac{C_i}{C_i} O_6^i$

- LO: tree level diagrams with \mathcal{L}_2 $\mathcal{L}_2: F_0, B_0$
- NLO: tree level diagrams with \mathcal{L}_4 1-loop diagrams with \mathcal{L}_2
- NNLO: tree level diagrams with \mathcal{L}_{6} $\mathcal{L}_{6} =$ 2-loop diagrams with \mathcal{L}_{2} 1-loop diagrams with one vertex from \mathcal{L}_{4}
- Renormalizable and unitary order by order in the expansion

3.6 Test of low energy QCD with K₁₄ decays



Colangelo, E.P., Stoffer'15

Contrary to ChPT, the dispersive measurement allows to take into account for the curvature in the form factor

	NLO	NNLO	Bijnens, Ecker (2014)
$10^{3} \cdot L_{1}^{r}$	0.51(2)(6)	0.69(16)(8)	0.53(6)
$10^{3} \cdot L_{2}^{r}$	0.89(5)(7)	0.63(9)(10)	0.81(4)
$10^3 \cdot L_3^r$	-2.82(10)(7)	-2.63(39)(24)	-3.07(20)
$\chi^2/{ m dof}$	141/116 = 1.2	124/122 = 1.0	

4. Non-leptonic Decays: \mathcal{E}'/\mathcal{E}

4.1 *ε* '/ *ε*

Octet Enhancement:

$$\frac{A(K \to \pi\pi)_{I=0}}{A(K \to \pi\pi)_{I=2}} \approx 22$$

 Short-distance: gluonic corrections, penguins



- Long-distance: large ChPT corrections (FSI) : $\pi\pi$ rescattering large
- On-going lattice effort very recent result from RBC-UKQCD!

4.1 *E* '/ *E*

Octet Enhancement:

$$\frac{A(K \to \pi \pi)_{I=0}}{A(K \to \pi \pi)_{I=2}} \approx 22$$

- Short-distance: gluonic corrections, penguins
- Long-distance: large ChPT corrections (FSI) : $\pi\pi$ rescattering large
- On-going lattice effort very recent result from RBC-UKQCD!
- Direct CP Violation:

$$\operatorname{Re}(\epsilon'/\epsilon) = \frac{1}{3}\left(1 - \left|\frac{\eta_{00}}{\eta_{+-}}\right|\right) = (16.8 \pm 1.4) \cdot 10^{-4}$$

• Lattice result: $\operatorname{Re}(\varepsilon'/\varepsilon) = (1.38 \pm 5.15 \pm 4.43) \cdot 10^{-4}$ RBC-UKQCD'15



4.1 *ε'/ε*

- Important discrepancy! 2.9σ
- Analytical result: Normalise to K⁺ decay (ω_+ , a) and ϵ_K , expand in A₂/A₀ and CP violation:

$$\operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{\epsilon'}{\epsilon}\right) \simeq \frac{\epsilon'}{\epsilon} = -\frac{\omega_{+}}{\sqrt{2}\left|\epsilon_{K}\right|} \begin{bmatrix} \operatorname{Im}A_{0} \\ \operatorname{Re}A_{0} \\ \uparrow \end{bmatrix} - \frac{1}{a} \frac{\operatorname{Im}A_{2}}{\operatorname{Re}A_{2}} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\begin{array}{c} \operatorname{Adjusted to \ keep \ electroweak} \\ \operatorname{penguins \ in \ Im \ A_{0}} \\ \end{array} \underbrace{\begin{array}{c} \operatorname{Cirigliano, \ et.al.\ `11}} \\ \end{array}$$

• Challenge: compute : $A_I = \langle (\pi \pi)_I | \mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}} | K \rangle$

$$\frac{\varepsilon_{\kappa}'}{\varepsilon_{\kappa}} \sim \left[\frac{105 \text{ MeV}}{m_s(2 \text{ GeV})}\right]^2 \left\{ B_6^{(1/2)} \left(1 - \Omega_{\text{eff}}\right) - 0.4 B_8^{(3/2)} \right\}$$

$$Pic$$

$$Re\left(\varepsilon'/\varepsilon\right) = \left(19 \pm 2\mu + 9 - 6\mu_s \pm 6\mu_{1/N_c}\right) \times 10^{-4}$$

Pich@NA62 handbook workshop'16

Based on Pallante, Pich, Scimemi'02

4.1 *ε* '/ *ε*

- Analytical result: $\operatorname{Re}(\varepsilon'/\varepsilon) =$
- $\operatorname{Re}\left(\varepsilon'/\varepsilon\right) = \left(19 \pm 2_{\mu} + 9_{-6_{m_s}} \pm 6_{1/N_c}\right) \times 10^{-4}$
 - O(p⁴) χ PT Loops: Large correction (FSI)

Pallante, Pich, Scimemi'02

- O(p⁴) LECs fixed at N_C → ∞: Small correction
- Isospin Breaking O[(mu md) p^2 , e^2p^2]: Sizeable corrections
- $O(p^4)$ LECs [Re(g₈), Re(g₂₇)] and phase-shifts fitted to data
- $m_s(2 \text{ GeV}) = 110 \pm 20 \text{ MeV}$
- 📫 To be updated
- Challenge: Control of subleading $1/N_{C}$ corrections to χPT couplings
- Work from *Buras & Gerard'15, Buras et al.'16* relying on 1/N_C arguments
 supports lattice result

New physics?

4.2 Comparison

RBC/UKQCD results in isospin limit:

Pich@NA62 handbook workshop'16

$$\begin{split} &\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \operatorname{Re} A_2 = (1.50 \pm 0.04 \pm 0.14) \cdot 10^{-8} \operatorname{GeV} & \exp : 1.482 \, (2) \cdot 10^{-8} \operatorname{GeV} \\ &\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \operatorname{Im} A_2 = -(6.99 \pm 0.20 \pm 0.84) \cdot 10^{-13} \operatorname{GeV} \\ &\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \operatorname{Re} A_0 = (4.66 \pm 1.00 \pm 1.21) \cdot 10^{-7} \operatorname{GeV} & \exp : 3.112 \, (1) \cdot 10^{-7} \operatorname{GeV} \\ &\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \operatorname{Im} A_0 = -(1.90 \pm 1.23 \pm 1.04) \cdot 10^{-11} \operatorname{GeV} \\ &\operatorname{Re} \left(\varepsilon' / \varepsilon \right) = (1.38 \pm 5.15 \pm 4.43) \cdot 10^{-4} & \exp : (16.8 \pm 1.4) \cdot 10^{-4} \\ &\delta_0 = (23.8 \pm 4.9 \pm 1.2)^\circ & \exp : (39.2 \pm 1.5)^\circ \\ &\delta_2 = -(11.6 \pm 2.5 \pm 1.2)^\circ & \exp : -(8.5 \pm 1.5)^\circ \end{split}$$

4.2 Comparison



- Result from the fit in isospin limit: $[\delta_0 \delta_2]_{K o \pi\pi} = (52.5 \pm 0.8_{exp} \pm 2.8_{th})^\circ$
- Result from Roy-Steiner : $\delta_0 \delta_2 = (47.7 \pm 1.5)^\circ$

Emilie Passemar

۲

5. Rare and Radiative Decays

5.1 LFV in Rare kaon decays

Crivellin, D'Ambrosio, Hoferichter, Tunstall'16





- Anomalies in the B physics sector
 - 2-3 σ from SM in $B \to K^* \mu^+ \mu^-$ Descotes-Genon et al.'13

 2.6σ evidence of LFUV •

 $R(K) = \frac{\text{Br}[B \to K\mu^+\mu^-]}{\text{Br}[B \to Ke^+e^-]} = 0.745^{+0.090}_{-0.074} \pm 0.036 \quad \text{LHCb.'14}$

 $R_{\rm SM}(K) = 1.003 \pm 0.0001$ Bobeth, Hiller, Piranishvili'07

Combined 3.9 σ evidence of LFUV in •

$$R(D)_{\rm exp} = 0.391 \pm 0.041 \pm 0.028$$
$$R(D^*)_{\rm exp} = 0.322 \pm 0.018 \pm 0.012$$

Emilie Passemar

HFAG

 $R_{\rm SM}(D) = 0.297 \pm 0.017$ $R_{\rm SM}(D^*) = 0.252 \pm 0.003$ Fajfer, Kamenik, Nisandzic'12 45

Crivellin, D'Ambrosio, Hoferichter, Tunstall'16

- Analogous process for kaon decays: $K^{\pm}
 ightarrow \pi^{\pm} \ell^+ \ell^-$
- Translate bounds of B physics in K physics assuming MFV
 Prediction for LFV modes because of correlations

	$K_L \to \mu^{\pm} e^{\mp}$	$K^+ \to \pi^+ \mu^\pm e^\mp$	$K_L \to \pi^0 \mu^\pm e^\mp$	$K^+ \to \pi^+ \mu^\pm e^\mp$ (NA62 projection)
$\left(C^{\mu e}_{7V} ^2+ C^{\mu e}_{7A} ^2 ight)^{1/2}$	$< 1.3 \times 10^{-6}$	$< 2.2 \times 10^{-5}$		$< 5.1 \times 10^{-6}$
$\left(y_{7V}^{\mu e} ^2+ y_{7A}^{\mu e} ^2 ight)^{1/2}$			< 0.040	
$\left(C_9^{B,\mu e} ^2 + C_{10}^{B,\mu e} ^2\right)^{1/2}$	< 0.71	< 12	< 35	< 2.7

- 3 possibilities:
 - New Physics explanations for B-anomalies + MFV
 - ➡ signal at NA62 sensitivies
 - Negative searches at NA62 \implies rule out MFV solutions
 - signal seen near current sensitivities \rightarrow also rule out MFV

5.2 K $\rightarrow \pi \nu \nu$

•
$$T \sim F\left(V_{is}^* V_{id}, \frac{m_i^2}{M_W^2}\right) \left(\bar{\nu}_L \gamma_\mu \nu_L\right) \langle \pi | \bar{s}_L \gamma^\mu d_L | K \rangle$$

- Very clean prediction in the SM: negligible long-distance contribution
- SM prediction very small:



$$Br(K^+ \to \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}) = (7.8 \pm 0.8) \cdot 10^{-11} \sim A^4 \left[\eta^2 + (1.4 - \rho)^2 \right]$$
$$Br(K_L \to \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}) = (2.4 \pm 0.4) \cdot 10^{-11} \sim A^4 \eta^2$$

Buras et al.'15

• Clear signature of BSM physics is direct CPV

BNL-E949: few events!
$$\longrightarrow$$
 Br $(K^+ \to \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}) = (1.73^{+1.15}_{-1.05}) \cdot 10^{-10}$
KEK-E391a: Br $(K_L \to \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}) < 2.6 \cdot 10^{-8}$ (90% CL)

• On going experiment: NA62, KOTO

Emilie Passemar

5.2 K $\rightarrow \pi \nu \nu$

• Stringent test of BSM scenarios

3σ **18**σ **45**σ 1.8 x B_{SM} **B**_{SM} 3.0 × B_{SM} 114.8 **600** σ 36 x B_{SM} 103.6 Excluded area Grossman-Nir bound Excl. 68% CL E787-949 b. 92.4 $B(K_{L}^{-} > \pi^{0} vv) \ge 10^{11}$ 28 x B_{SM} 81.2 MSSM-A, 70.0 20 x B_{SM} **300** σ 58.8 47.6 4-Gen. **210** σ 13 х В_{SM} 36.4 **150** σ 25.2 9 x B_{SM} **90** σ 331-Z 5 x B_{SM} 14.1 MEV-MSSN 68%CL Exp. Bound **30** σ SM **B**_{SM} 2.9 CMFV 5.8 8.0 10.2 12.4 14.6 16.8 19.0 21.2 23.4 25.6 27.8 $B(K^+ \to \pi^+ \nu \nu) \ge 10^{11}$

Mescia, Smith'08

Emilie Passemar

6. Conclusion and Outlook

Conclusion and Outlook

- Kaon decays very interesting to study: very rich phenomenology
 - Excellent testing ground of chiral dynamics
 - Interesting interplay of short and long-distances
 - Probe of flavour dynamics and violation of CP
 - Allow for tests of New Physics
- We have entered an era of precision:
 - Very impressive experimental sensitivities (K $\rightarrow \pi v v$)
 - Theoretical challenge: Precise control of QCD effects

Impressive progress in lattice QCD

7. Back-up

5.3
$$K_{L,S} \rightarrow \pi^0 \mathcal{U}$$

• Experimental results:

 $Br(K_L \to \pi^0 e^+ e^-) < 2.8 \cdot 10^{-10}$

 $Br(K_L \to \pi^0 \mu^+ \mu^-) < 3.8 \cdot 10^{-10}$



- Direct CP violation
- Indirect CP violation
- CP conserving (2γ)
- CP violation dominates for e+e-

 $Br(K_L \to \pi^0 e^+ e^-) = 3.1 \ (0.9) \cdot 10^{-11}$



5.1 $K^0 \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$

- Prediction at LO for K_{S} : Finite loop $\mathrm{Br}_{_{\mathrm{LO}}}=2.0\cdot10^{-6}$
- Measurement:

 $\mathrm{Br}(K_S
ightarrow \gamma \gamma) = (2.63 \pm 0.17) \cdot 10^{-6}$

• Understood because of FSI: \implies agreement at O(p⁶)

2

 $\sim \sim$

 $\sim \sim \sim$

 π^+, K

 K_S

5.1 $K^0 \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$

- Prediction at LO for K_S: Finite loop $Br_{\rm LO} = 2.0 \cdot 10^{-6}$
- Measurement:

 $\mathrm{Br}(K_S
ightarrow \gamma \gamma) = (2.63 \pm 0.17) \cdot 10^{-6}$

• Understood because of FSI: \implies agreement at O(p⁶)

 K_S

 π^0, η, η'

 K_L

• For K_L: WZW anomaly



- T_{LO}=0: At O(p⁴) GMO cancellation
- $O(p^6)$: SU(3) breaking, $\eta \eta'$ mixing well understood

5.1 $K_{LS} \rightarrow \ell \ell$

- Very usefull source of information on the structure of $\Delta S = 1$, FCNC transitions
- Both long distance and short distance components: Isidori, Unterdorfer'03 ٠



K_I transition measured: $Br(K_L \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-) = (6.84 \pm 0.11) \cdot 10^{-9}$

$${
m Br}(K_L o e^+e^-) = (9^{+6}_{-4}) \cdot 10^{-12}$$

- Theoretically saturated by absorptive part, prediction in agreement with measurement:
 - Long distance extracted from $\pi^0, \eta \to \ell^+ \ell^-$ Gomez-Dumm & Pich
 - Short distance contribution fitted

Emilie Passemar

5.1
$$K_{L,S} \rightarrow \ell \ell$$

• $K_{\rm S}$ not measured yet only an upper bound ${
m Br}(K_S \to e^+e^-)_{
m exp} < 9 \cdot 10^{-9}$ ${
m Br}(K_S \to \mu^+\mu^-)_{
m exp} < 3.2 \cdot 10^{-7}$ LHCb'13



- Very interesting process constrain the CP-violating part of the FCNC s \rightarrow dl⁺l⁻ $B(K_S \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)^{SM}_{short} = 10^{-5} |\operatorname{Im}(V^*_{ts}V_{td})|^2 \simeq \mathcal{O}(10^{-13})$
- Measurement of this mode :
 - New Physics
 - Bounds on CP-violating phase of $s \rightarrow dl^+l^-$
- Standard Model prediction: LO in ChPT is 2 loop diagram, finite

 $\operatorname{Br}(K_S \to e^+ e^-)_{\scriptscriptstyle \mathrm{LO}} = 2.1 \cdot 10^{-14}$ Ecker & Pich

$$Br(K_S \to \mu^+ \mu^-)_{LO} = 5.1 \cdot 10^{-12}$$

Emilie Passemar

5.1 $K_{L,S} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$

- Higher order in ChPT \implies lots of unknown LECs
- Dispersive calculation in progress allows to take into account FSI

Colangelo, Stucki, Tunstall in progress



$$Im A_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2} \int d\phi_2 A_{+-}(s) W^*_{\mu\nu}(s, q_1^2, q_2^2)$$
$$A_{+-} = \langle \pi^+ \pi^- | \mathcal{H}_w | K_S \rangle$$
$$\epsilon^\mu \epsilon^\nu W_{\mu\nu} = \langle \gamma^* \gamma^* | \pi^+ \pi^- \rangle$$

Computed in ChPT



• Chiral Dynamics contained in the electromagnetic vector FF

$$V_{+}(z) = a_{+} + b_{+}z + V_{+}^{\pi\pi}(z), \qquad z = q^{2}/m_{K}^{2}$$

• Probe LECs in a₊ and b₊ via spectrum:

$$\frac{d\Gamma}{dz} \propto |V_+(z)|^2$$

• Estimates using VMD Coluccio Leskow et al.'16

Emilie Passemar

5.2 $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \ell \ell$

• Experimental results:

Br($K^{\pm} \to \pi^{\pm} e^{+} e^{-}$) = 3.14 (10) \cdot 10⁻⁷ Br($K^{\pm} \to \pi^{\pm} \mu^{+} \mu^{-}$) = 9.62 (25) \cdot 10⁻⁸





2.3 Test of New Physics in R_K

- R_{K} sensitive to *lepton flavour violating effects*, $\Delta R/R \approx O(1\%)$
- 2HDM tree level: Additional contribution due to charged Higgs, does not contribute to R_K
- Possibility to constrain LFV at one loop in MSSM

Masiero, Paradisi, Petronzio'06,'08

• Update and extension by Girrbach & Nierste'12 - consider other constraints



