Determination of the A_2 amplitude of $K \rightarrow \pi \pi$ decays

Tadeusz Janowski

RBC-UKQCD collaboration University of Southampton

tj1g11@soton.ac.uk

01 August 2013

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

RBC+UKQCD Collaboration

RBC

Ziyuan Bai, Thomas Blum, Norman Christ, Tomomi Ishikawa, Taku Izubuchi, Luchang Jin, Chulwoo Jung, Taichi Kawanai, Chris Kelly, Hyung-Jin Kim, Christoph Lehner, Jasper Lin, Meifeng Lin, Robert Mawhinney, Greg McGlynn, David Murphy, Shigemi Ohta, Eigo Shintani, Amarjit Soni, Oliver Witzel, Hantao Yin, Jianglei Yu, Daiqian Zhang

UKQCD

Rudy Arthur, Peter Boyle, Hei-Man Choi, Luigi Del Debbio, Shane Drury, Jonathan Flynn, Julien Frison, Nicolas Garron, Jamie Hudspith, Tadeusz Janowski, Andreas Jüttner, Richard Kenway, Andrew Lytle, Marina Marinkovic, Brian Pendleton, Antonin Portelli, Enrico Rinaldi, Chris Sachrajda, Ben Samways, Karthee Sivalingam, Matthew Spraggs, Tobi Tsang

Introduction

In the isospin limit one can classify two kaon decay channels:

•
$$K \to (\pi \pi)_{I=2}$$

• $K \rightarrow (\pi \pi)_{I=0}$

An experimental observation shows that the ratio of real parts of amplitudes for these decays is:

$$rac{\operatorname{Re}(A_0)}{\operatorname{Re}(A_2)}pprox$$
 22.5

This is known as ' $\Delta I = 1/2$ rule' In our recent work, we calculated the A_2 amplitude at physical kinematics (arXiv:1206.5142) This calculation was done using a single ensemble, which led to uncontrolled systematic errors related to cutoff effects.

Lattice parameters

Two new ensembles:

	$48^3 imes 96$	$64^3 imes 128$	
Size[fm]	5.49	5.48	
Gauge action	Iwasaki	Iwasaki	
Fermion action	DWF	DWF	
Ls	24	10	
Μ	1.8	1.8	
β	2.13	2.25	
a^{-1} [GeV]	1.73(1)	2.30(4)	
am _{ud}	0.00078	0.000678	
am₅	0.0362	0.02661	
am _{res}	$6.19(6) imes 10^{-4}$	$2.93(8) imes 10^{-4}$	
Pion mass [MeV]	139	135	
Kaon mass [MeV]	499	495.7	
Number of configurations	44	21	
We can get away with small number of configurations thanks to			
AMA procedure: arXiv:1208.4349			

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 - のへで

Operator product expansion

Weak Hamiltonian can be expanded using operator product expansion:

$$H_W = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{ud}^* V_{us} a^3 \sum_i C_i Q_i$$

Then the amplitudes can be written as:

$$A_{2/0} = F\langle (\pi\pi)_{I=2/0} \mid H_W \mid K \rangle$$

We are therefore interested in the following 3-point functions:

$$M_i^{I=2/0} \equiv \langle (\pi\pi)_{I=2/0} \mid Q_i^{\Delta I=(3/2)/(1/2)} \mid K \rangle$$

Only 3 operators contribute to $K \to (\pi \pi)_{I=2}$ process. We label them according to their chiral transformation properties (27,1), $(8,8), (8,8)_{mx}$

- (27,1) is the dominant contribution to $Re(A_2)$
- (8,8) operators are the dominant contributions to $Im(A_2)$

Renormalization

Wilson coefficients have been calculated in \overline{MS} scheme, so we need to express our lattice results in \overline{MS} scheme as well. This requires the use of an intermediate scheme, like RI-SMOM



Only operators in the same $SU(3)_L \times SU(3)_R$ operators mix under renormalization.

Two pion momentum

In centre of mass frame, the ground state for the two pion system will correspond to each pion being at rest. To avoid this problem we use antiperiodic boundary conditions for the d quark (and periodic for the u quark). The allowed momenta for the π^+ meson become:

$$p=\pm\frac{\pi}{L},\pm\frac{3\pi}{L},\ldots$$

In I=2 case only, we can use the Wigner-Eckart theorem:

$$\underbrace{\langle (\pi\pi)_{J_{3}=1}^{I=2} \mid }_{\sqrt{2}\langle \pi^{+}\pi^{0} \mid} Q_{\Delta I_{3}=1/2}^{\Delta I=3/2} \mid \mathcal{K}^{+} \rangle = \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \underbrace{\langle (\pi\pi)_{J_{3}=2}^{I=2} \mid }_{\langle \pi^{+}\pi^{+} \mid} Q_{\Delta I_{3}=3/2}^{\Delta I=3/2} \mid \mathcal{K}^{+} \rangle$$

Both 48³ and 64³ ensembles tuned so that antiperiodic boundary conditions in 3 directions (which induce momentum $p = \frac{\sqrt{3}\pi}{L}$) correspond to physical kinematics.

Finite volume effects

Need to take into account interactions in the final state.

$$F^{2} = 4\pi \left(q \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial q} + p \frac{\partial \delta}{\partial p} \right) \frac{m_{K} E_{\pi\pi}}{p^{3}}$$

with:

$$an \phi = rac{q \pi^{3/2}}{Z_{00}(1;q)}$$

- δ is the 2-pion s-wave phase shift
- δ can be computed from the lattice using Lüscher quantization condition, but...
- $\frac{\partial \delta(p)}{\partial p}$ can not, so we have to approximate

48³ K $\rightarrow \pi\pi$ 3-point correlation functions



メロト 不得 とくほ とくほ とうほう ト

$64^3 \text{ K} \rightarrow \pi\pi$ 3-point correlation functions



Summary of results (PRELIMINARY)

	48 ³	64 ³
Dispersion relation (c^2)	0.999(9)	1.008(10)
Pion mass [MeV]	139.4(3)	136.0(3)
Kaon mass [MeV]	498.9(4)	495.6(5)
$(\pi\pi)_{I2}$ energy [MeV]	497.8(43)	503.7(38)
$Re(A_2)[GeV]$	$1.368(41) imes 10^{-8}$	$1.358(28) imes 10^{-8}$
$Im(A_2)[GeV]$	-6.30(12) $ imes$ 10 ⁻¹³	$-6.31(10) imes 10^{-13}$

◆□ ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 • 의 Q @</p>

C.f.
$$32^3$$
 result:
Re $(A_2) = 1.381(41) \times 10^{-8}$ GeV
Im $(A_2) = -6.54(46) \times 10^{-13}$ GeV

Continuum extrapolation for A₂ amplitude (PRELIMINARY)

Values shown are the amplitudes in \overline{MS} scheme at 3GeV



э

Error budget (VERY PRELIMINARY)

	$Re(A_2)$	$Im(A_2)$
Lattice artefacts	$15\%\searrow 6\%_{+stat}$	$15\%\searrow5\%$ $_{+stat}$
Finite volume corrections	6.0% 📐 2%	6.5% 📐 2%
Partial quenching	3.5% 📐 0%	1.7% 📐 0%
Renormalization	1.8% (?)	5.6% (?)
Unphysical kinematics	0.4% =	0.8% =
Derivative of phase shift	0.97% =	0.97% =
Wilson coefficients	6.6% =	6.6% =
Total	18% 📐	19%

◆□ ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 • 의 Q @</p>

Cancellation of contractions in $Re(A_2)$

The dominant contribution comes from (27,1) operator. (27,1) operator is proportional to the sum of the following two contractions:



Cancellation of contractions in $Re(A_2)$



Cancellation of contractions in $Re(A_2)$

- Cancellation of contributions to Re(A₂) appears in all our simulations
- Investigation of Re(A₀) at threshold (arXiv:1212.1474) shows a that all contributions have the same sign resulting in small enhancement of Re(A₀)
- ► The main mechanism behind ΔI = 1/2 rule seems to be a cancellation in Re(A₂)!

Conclusions

- Many lattice parameters need to be fine tuned
- (Preliminary) Results from 48³ and 64³ ensembles are consistent with 32³ DSDR results
- Systematic errors due to lattice artefacts are smaller than anticipated
- Cancellation in $Re(A_2)$ has been confirmed in both ensembles

Systematic errors need to be estimated more carefully

Thank you for your attention!

<□ > < @ > < E > < E > E のQ @