## $B \rightarrow D^{*} \ell \nu$ at non-zero recoil
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We present preliminary blinded results from our analysis of the form factors for $B \rightarrow D^{*} \ell \nu$ decay at non-zero recoil. Our analysis includes 15 MILC asqtad ensembles with $N_{f}=2+1$ flavors of sea quarks and lattice spacings ranging from $a \approx 0.15 \mathrm{fm}$ down to 0.045 fm . The valence light quarks employ the asqtad action, whereas the $b$ and $c$ quarks are treated using the Fermilab action. We discuss the impact that our results will have on $\left|V_{c b}\right|$ and $R\left(D^{*}\right)$.
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## 1. Introduction

During the last few years the CKM [1,2] matrix element $V_{c b}$ has been at the center of a discussion regarding the unitarity triangle and the search for new physics. According to the latest HFLAV report [3], there is a $2 \sigma$ tension between the inclusive and the exclusive determinations, as well as a combined $\sim 4 \sigma$ tension between the Standard Model (SM) predictions and experimental measurements in the $R(D)-R\left(D^{*}\right)$ plane. Recent developments [4, 5] point, however, towards a simple resolution for the first of these tensions. There is some evidence that the CLN parametrization [6] is not the optimal one, and might be responsible for the inclusive-exclusive discrepancy (for a review on the current understanding of the tensions, see [7]). On the other hand, none of the existing calculations of $R\left(D^{*}\right)$ [8, 9, 10, 11] comes from lattice gauge theory, the only firstprinciples, non-perturbative tool available to tackle QCD. To solve these matters, a calculation of the form factors of the decay at non-zero recoil is urgently needed. This work aims to address this issue by performing the first ${ }^{1}$ complete analysis of the $B \rightarrow D^{*} \ell v$ at non-zero recoil on the lattice. Here we present a preliminary result for the form factors, whose normalization is blinded by an overall multiplicative factor.

## 2. Notation and definitions

The Standard Model prediction for the differential rate for exclusive $B \rightarrow D^{*} \ell v$ decay can be written in terms of the recoil parameter $w=v_{D^{*}} \cdot v_{B}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{d \Gamma}{d w}\left(B \rightarrow D^{*} \ell v\right)=\frac{G_{F} M_{B}^{5}}{48 \pi^{2}}\left(1-r^{2}\right) \sqrt{w^{2}-1} \chi(w)\left|\eta_{\mathrm{EW}}\right|^{2}\left|V_{c b}\right|^{2}|\mathscr{F}(w)|^{2} \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $v_{X}=p_{X} / m_{X}$ are the four velocities of the $B$ and $D^{*}$ mesons, $\eta_{\mathrm{EW}}$ is a correction factor that accounts for electroweak effects, $r=M_{D^{*}} / M_{B}, \mathscr{F}(w)$ is a function that represents the probability amplitude, to be calculated in lattice QCD , and $\chi(w)$ gathers all the remaining kinematic factors. The function $\mathscr{F}$ can be expressed in terms of the helicity amplitudes $H_{ \pm, 0}$ as,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\chi(w)|\mathscr{F}(w)|^{2}=\frac{1-2 w r+r^{2}}{12 M_{B} M_{D^{*}}(1-r)^{2}}\left(H_{0}^{2}(w)+H_{+}^{2}(w)+H_{-}^{2}(w)\right) \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

The helicity amplitudes, in turn, depend on the $h_{X}(w)$ form factors, motivated by heavy quark effective theory (HQET),

$$
\begin{align*}
& H_{0}(w)=\frac{\sqrt{M_{B} M_{D^{*}}}}{1-2 w r+r^{2}}(w+1)\left[(w-r) h_{A_{1}}(w)-(w-1)\left(r h_{A_{2}}(w)+h_{A_{3}}(2)\right)\right]  \tag{2.3}\\
& H_{ \pm}(w)=\sqrt{M_{B} M_{D^{*}}}(w+1)\left(h_{A_{1}}(w) \pm \sqrt{\frac{w-1}{w+1}} h_{V}(w)\right) \tag{2.4}
\end{align*}
$$

The form factors are defined following the standard decomposition of the matrix elements of the $V-A$ weak current that mediates the transition,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{\left\langle D^{*}\left(p_{D^{*}}, \varepsilon^{v}\right)\right| \mathscr{V}^{\mu}|B(0)\rangle}{2 \sqrt{M_{B} M_{D^{*}}}}=\frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_{v}^{*} \varepsilon_{\sigma \rho}^{\mu v} v_{D^{*}}^{\sigma} v_{B}^{\rho} h_{V}(w),  \tag{2.5}\\
& \frac{\left\langle D^{*}\left(p_{D^{*}}, \varepsilon^{v}\right)\right| \mathscr{A}^{\mu}|B(0)\rangle}{2 \sqrt{M_{B} M_{D^{*}}}}=\frac{i}{2} \varepsilon_{v}^{*}\left[g^{\mu v}(1+w) h_{A_{1}}(w)-v_{B}^{v}\left(v_{B}^{\mu} h_{A_{2}}(w)+v_{D^{*}}^{\mu} h_{A_{3}}(w)\right)\right] . \tag{2.6}
\end{align*}
$$
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Figure 1: Ensembles used in this calculation. The size of the point gives information about the total statistics available per ensemble, and the vertical axis shows the ratio between the light and the strange quark masses. Our smallest pion mass is $M_{\pi} \approx 180 \mathrm{MeV}$.

In this work we compute the $h_{X}$ form factors defined in Eqs. (2.5), (2.6) for several recoil values and use them to reconstruct the function $\mathscr{F}(w)$ as a function of $w$.

## 3. Simulation details

For this calculation we employ 15 ensembles of $N_{f}=2+1$ asqtad [13] sea quarks [14]. The strange quark is approximately tuned to its physical value, whereas the available light quark masses and the lattice spacings are shown in Fig. 1. The heavy quarks use the clover action with the Fermilab interpretation [15]. In our correlators, the $B$ meson is always at rest, whereas the $D^{*}$ meson carries the momentum. Our calculations are done at $\mathbf{p}^{2}=0,(2 \pi / L)^{2},(4 \pi / L)^{2}$ in lattice units, where $L$ is the spatial size of our lattice. For the non-zero momentum case, we distinguish between the different orientations of the momentum with respect to the polarization of the $D^{*}$ meson $\varepsilon^{V}$ and the current, in order to isolate the form factors in (2.5) and (2.6).

## 4. Lattice results

For the analysis we largely follow the procedures outlined in our previous works [16, 17, 18]. We extract the values of the unrenormalized form factors $h_{X}(w)$ from the analysis of the twoand three-point functions, then our results are first renormalized and then corrected to adjust the values of the heavy quark masses to their physical value. Blinding is introduced at the level of the renormalization factors $\rho_{V, A}{ }^{2}$ : all our $\rho_{V, A}$ factors are multiplied by an undisclosed random factor close to one. This random factor is known only to one collaboration member who is not working on the analysis. At the present stage of the analysis, we are still working with blinded data.
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Figure 2: Preliminary results for $h_{V}(w)$ and $h_{A_{1}}(w)$ in the upper row, and $h_{A_{2}}(w)$ and $h_{A_{3}}(w)$ in the lower row. The points are the lattice data for different lattice spacings, light quark masses and volumes, whereas the band represents the result of the chiral-continuum fit.

Figure 2 gathers all the data for the form factors, after the blinded renormalization factors and the correction to the heavy quark masses have been applied. The chiral-continuum fit is done following the ansatz

$$
\begin{align*}
& h_{X}=1+\frac{X\left(\Lambda_{\mathrm{QCD}}\right)}{m_{c}}+\frac{g_{D^{*} D \pi}}{48 \pi^{2} f_{\pi}^{2} r_{1}^{2}} \operatorname{logs}_{\mathrm{SU}(3)}\left(w, m_{l}, m_{s}, \Lambda_{\mathrm{QCD}}\right)-\rho^{2}(w-1)+k(w-1)^{2} \\
&+c_{1} x_{l}+c_{2} x_{l}^{2}+c_{a_{1}} x_{a^{2}}+c_{a_{2}} x_{a^{2}}^{2}+c_{a, m} x_{l} x_{a^{2}} \tag{4.1}
\end{align*}
$$

were $x_{l}=B_{0} m_{l} /\left(2 \pi f_{\pi}\right)^{2}$ and $x_{a^{2}}=a^{2} /\left(4 \pi f_{\pi} r_{1}^{2}\right)^{2}$. All the form factors are fitted simultaneously, taking into account all the correlations among them. There are slight variations depending on the
form factor: $h_{A_{3}}$ and $h_{V}$ follow exactly Eq. (4.1), but in $h_{A_{1}}(1)$ Luke's theorem suggests that the leading HQET term should be proportional to $1 / m_{c}^{2}$, and $h_{A_{2}}$ is not normalized to 1 at tree level, but to zero. The result of the chiral-continuum fits is used in the $z$ expansion to predict the form of $|\mathscr{F}|^{2}$.

## 5. $z$ Expansion

The fact that $|\mathscr{F}(w)|^{2}$ is well known only at zero recoil and that the phase space of the decay vanishes as $\sqrt{w^{2}-1}$ when $w \rightarrow 1$ (see Eq. (2.1)) makes an extrapolation to zero recoil necessary. Even if we can compute the function $\mathscr{F}$ at small recoil (which is the aim of this work), the $z$ expansion provides a model-independent ansatz for a joint fit with experimental data, involving points at low and high recoil. In our $z$ expansion we use the BGL parametrization [19], following Refs. [4, 5]. In particular, we take the inputs from Ref. [4], but we don't see any difference in the final result if the inputs from Ref. [5] are used. Since the output of the chiral-continuum fit described in Eq. (4.1) is a function (and an uncertainty band), we need an extra step in order to generate inputs for the $z$ expansion fit. Here we generate synthetic data points from the chiralcontinuum fit, where we choose for each form factor three independent points and include the correlations between them. We also explore the functional method outlined in Ref. [20]. The results for the function $|\mathscr{F}|^{2}$ are shown on the left pane of Fig. 3. This is a purely lattice prediction that doesn't incorporate any light-cone sum rules (LCSR). We perform a joint fit of synthetic data and experimental data coming from Belle [21]. In this fit we use information only from the experimental $w$ bins, ignoring the angular distribution. As a test case comparing both parametrizations, we also perform a fit using the CLN parametrization, defined by

$$
\begin{align*}
h_{A_{1}}(w) & =h_{A_{1}}(1)\left[1-8 \rho^{2} z+\left(53 \rho^{2}-15\right) z^{2}-\left(231 \rho^{2}-91\right) z^{3}\right]+O\left(z^{4}\right),  \tag{5.1}\\
R_{1}(w) & =R_{1}(1)-0.12(w-1)+0.05(w-1)^{2},  \tag{5.2}\\
R_{2}(w) & =R_{2}(1)+0.11(w-1)-0.06(w-1)^{2} . \tag{5.3}
\end{align*}
$$

The relationship between $R_{1,2}$ and the BGL form factors can be checked in Ref. [4]. A comparison between our CLN and BGL fits is shown in the right pane of Fig. 3. The CLN parametrization imposes strict constraints on the behavior of $h_{A_{1}}(w)$, which seem to be incompatible with our lattice QCD + Belle data: the high slope at small recoil predicted by lattice QCD and the mild slope determined by experiment at large recoil are difficult to accomodate to Eq. (5.1).

## 6. Summary and future work

In this work we show preliminary blinded results for the form factors of the $B \rightarrow D^{*} \ell v$ decay at non-zero recoil. While our systematic error analysis is not yet complete, our preliminary results appear to be in tension with the constraints from the CLN parameterization. We expect that our final results will shed light on the tension between exclusive and inclusive determinations of $\left|V_{c b}\right|$.

We expect to finalize this analysis and the paper describing it in the coming months. We don't expect that our calculation will yield a $\left|V_{c b}\right|$ determination that is more precise than previous ones that rely on CLN fits to extrapolate the experimental data to zero recoil. Instead, our calculation will provide new model-independent information on the shape of the form factors at low recoil.


Figure 3: On the left, pure lattice results for the function $\mathscr{F}$; on the right, joint fit of Belle + lattice data for $\left|V_{c b}\right|^{2}\left|\eta_{E W}^{2}\right||\mathscr{F}(w)|^{2}$ using both the CLN and the BGL parametrizations. $\left|V_{c b}\right|$ is a fit parameter and multiplies the lattice data. For that reason (i) the lattice points for BGL and CLN are slightly different and (ii) the error on the lattice points is much larger than what expected from the left plot.

We plan in the coming years to reduce the errors from lattice-QCD, not only for $\left|V_{c b}\right|$, but also for other CKM matrix elements. Our plans include using improved fermionic discretizations for light and heavy quarks, in order to reduce the chiral, discretization and renormalization errors.

## 7. Acknowledgments

Computations for this work were carried out with resources provided by the USQCD Collaboration, the National Energy Research Scientific Computing Center and the Argonne Leadership Computing Facility, which are funded by the Office of Science of the U.S. Department of Energy; and with resources provided by the National Institute for Computational Science and the Texas Advanced Computing Center, which are funded through the National Science Foundation's Teragrid/XSEDE Program. This work was supported in part by the U.S. Department of Energy under grants No. DE-FC02-06ER41446 (C.D.) and No. DE-SC0015655 (A.X.K.), by the U.S. National Science Foundation under grants PHY10-67881 and PHY14-17805 (J.L.), PHY14-14614 (C.D., A.V.); by the Fermilab Distinguished Scholars program (A.X.K.); by the German Excellence Initiative and the European Union Seventh Framework Program under grant agreement No. 291763 as well as the European Union's Marie Curie COFUND program (A.S.K.). Fermilab is operated by Fermi Research Alliance, LLC, under Contract No. DE-AC02-07CH11359 with the United States Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of High Energy Physics.

## References

[1] N. Cabibbo, Unitary symmetry and leptonic decays, Phys. Rev. Lett. 10 (1963) 531.
[2] M. Kobayashi and T. Maskawa, CP Violation in the renormalizable theory of weak interaction, Prog. Theor. Phys. 49 (1973) 652.
[3] HFLAV collaboration, Y. Amhis et al., Averages of b-hadron, $c$-hadron, and $\tau$-lepton properties as of summer 2016, 1612.07233.
[4] D. Bigi, P. Gambino and S. Schacht, A fresh look at the determination of $\left|V_{c b}\right|$ from $B \rightarrow D^{*} \ell \nu$, Physics Letters B 769 (2017) 441 .
[5] B. Grinstein and A. Kobach, Model-independent extraction of $\left|V_{c b}\right|$ from $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{*} \ell \bar{\nu}$, Physics Letters $B$ 771 (2017) 359 .
[6] I. Caprini, L. Lellouch and M. Neubert, Dispersive bounds on the shape of $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{*} \ell \bar{v}$ form-factors, Nucl. Phys. B530 (1998) 153 [hep-ph/9712417].
[7] Particle Data Group collaboration, M. Tanabashi et al., Review of particle physics, Phys. Rev. D98 (2018) 030001.
[8] S. Fajfer, J. F. Kamenik and I. Nisandzic, On the $B \rightarrow D^{*} \tau \bar{v}_{\tau}$ Sensitivity to New Physics, Phys. Rev. D85 (2012) 094025 [1203.2654].
[9] F. U. Bernlochner, Z. Ligeti, M. Papucci and D. J. Robinson, Combined analysis of semileptonic B decays to $D$ and $D^{*}: R\left(D^{(*)}\right),\left|V_{c b}\right|$, and new physics, Phys. Rev. D95 (2017) 115008 [1703.05330].
[10] D. Bigi, P. Gambino and S. Schacht, $R\left(D^{*}\right),\left|V_{c b}\right|$, and the Heavy Quark Symmetry relations between form factors, JHEP 11 (2017) 061 [1707. 09509 ].
[11] S. Jaiswal, S. Nandi and S. K. Patra, Extraction of $\left|V_{c b}\right|$ from $B \rightarrow D^{(*)} \ell \boldsymbol{v}_{\ell}$ and the Standard Model predictions of $R\left(D^{(*)}\right)$, JHEP 12 (2017) 060 [1707.09977].
[12] JLQCD collaboration, T. Kaneko, Y. Aoki, B. Colquhoun, H. Fukaya and S. Hashimoto, $B \rightarrow D^{(*)} \ell v$ form factors from $N_{f}=2+1$ QCD with Möbius domain-wall quarks, vol. LATTICE2018, p. 311, 2018, 1811.00794.
[13] G. P. Lepage, Flavor symmetry restoration and Symanzik improvement for staggered quarks, Phys. Rev. D59 (1999) 074502 [hep-lat / 9809157 ].
[14] Fermilab Lattice, MILC collaboration, A. Bazavov et al., Nonperturbative QCD simulations with 2+1 flavors of improved staggered quarks, Rev. Mod. Phys. 82 (2010) 1349 [0903.3598].
[15] A. X. El-Khadra, A. S. Kronfeld and P. B. Mackenzie, Massive fermions in lattice gauge theory, Phys. Rev. D55 (1997) 3933 [hep-lat/9604004].
[16] Fermilab Lattice, MILC collaboration, J. A. Bailey et al., $B \rightarrow D \ell v$ form factors at nonzero recoil and $\left|V_{c b}\right|$ from 2+1-flavor lattice QCD, Phys. Rev. D92 (2015) 034506 [1503.07237].
[17] Fermilab Lattice, MILC collaboration, J. A. Bailey et al., Update of $\left|V_{c b}\right|$ from the $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{*} \ell \bar{v}$ form factor at zero recoil with three-flavor lattice QCD, Phys. Rev. D89 (2014) 114504 [1403.0635].
[18] A. Vaquero Avilés-Casco, C. DeTar, D. Du, A. El-Khadra, A. S. Kronfeld, J. Laiho et al., $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{*} \ell \bar{v}$ at non-zero recoil, EPJ Web Conf. 175 (2018) 13003 [1710.09817].
[19] C. G. Boyd, B. Grinstein and R. F. Lebed, Precision corrections to dispersive bounds on form-factors, Phys. Rev. D56 (1997) 6895 [hep-ph/9705252].
[20] Fermilab Lattice, MILC collaboration, J. A. Bailey et al., $\left|V_{u b}\right|$ from $B \rightarrow \pi \ell v$ decays and (2+1)-flavor lattice QCD, Phys. Rev. D92 (2015) 014024 [1503.07839].
[21] Belle collaboration, A. Abdesselam et al., Precise determination of the CKM matrix element $\left|V_{c b}\right|$ with $\bar{B}^{0} \rightarrow D^{*+} \ell^{-} \bar{v}_{\ell}$ decays with hadronic tagging at Belle, 1702.01521.


[^0]:    *Speaker.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ At this conference another lattice QCD group presented another calculation at an advanced stage, see Ref. [12].

[^2]:    ${ }^{2}$ In this work we use the mostly non-perturbative renormalization scheme. The $\rho_{V, A}$ factors mentioned here correspond to the perturbative component of the renormalization factor for our vector $(V)$ and axial $(A)$ currents. Our ratios are constructed in such a way that the non-perturbative part cancels out.

