

PM/98–22
BUTP–98/24
hep-ph/9809438
September 20, 2018

**Addendum to: “Two Higgs Doublet Model
predictions for $\overline{B} \rightarrow X_s \gamma$ in NLO QCD” ***

Francesca M. Borzumati^a and Christoph Greub^b

^a *Laboratoire de Physique Mathématique et Théorique, Université Montpellier II, F-34095
Montpellier Cedex 5, France*

^b *Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität Bern, Sidlerstrasse 5, 3012 Bern, Switzerland*

Typeset using REVTeX

*Work supported in part by CNRS and Schweizerischer Nationalfonds




FIG. 1. Contour plot in $(\tan \beta, m_H)$ obtained by using the NLO expression for the branching ratio $\text{BR}(\overline{B} \rightarrow X_s \gamma)$ and possible experimental upper bounds. The allowed region is above the corresponding curves.

Recently, several papers appeared that include different classes of electroweak corrections [1,2,3] to the process $\text{BR}(\overline{B} \rightarrow X_s \gamma)$. In [3], corrections to the Wilson coefficients at the matching scale due to the top quark and the neutral higgs boson were calculated and found to be negligible. The analysis [1] concluded that the most appropriate value of α_{em}^{-1} to be used for this problem is the fine structure constant $\alpha^{-1} = 137.036$ instead of the value $\alpha_{em}^{-1} = 130.3 \pm 2.3$ previously used. In [2], the leading logarithmic QED corrections of the form $\alpha \log(\mu_W/\mu_b) (\alpha_s \log(\mu_W/\mu_b))^n$ (with resummation in n) were given.

We update our results of [4] for the branching ratio $\text{BR}(\overline{B} \rightarrow X_s \gamma)$ in the SM and for the exclusion contour plot $(\tan \beta, m_H)$ in a 2HDM of Type II, by changing the value of α_{em} and by including the class of QED corrections presented in [2]. They can be used to improve $\text{BR}(\overline{B} \rightarrow X_s \gamma)$ in any extension of the SM which does not increase the set of effective operators relevant for the problem.

In the SM, we obtain:

$$\text{BR}(\overline{B} \rightarrow X_s \gamma) = \left(3.32 \pm_{0.11}^{0.00} (\mu_b) \pm_{0.08}^{0.00} (\mu_w) \pm_{0.25}^{0.26} (\text{param}) \right) \times 10^{-4}. \quad (1)$$

The bulk of the change with respect to the value presented in [4] is due to the different value of α_{em}^{-1} used. In a 2HDM of Type II, the new exclusion plot in $(\tan \beta, m_H)$, obtained for different possible experimental upper bounds for $\text{BR}(\overline{B} \rightarrow X_s \gamma)$, is shown in Fig. 1. Each curve is obtained minimizing $\text{BR}(\overline{B} \rightarrow X_s \gamma)/\text{BR}(b \rightarrow c l \nu_l)|_{\text{theor}}$ by varying the input parameters within their range of errors and the two scales μ_b and μ_w as described in [4], for

each value of $\text{BR}(\overline{B} \rightarrow X_s \gamma)|_{exp}$ considered.

As already mentioned in [4], one should bear in mind that the error in (1) as well as that considered to obtain the exclusion curves in Fig. 1 does not include all possible uncertainties in the theoretical estimate of $\text{BR}(\overline{B} \rightarrow X_s \gamma)$. A different way of handling the semileptonic width Γ_{SL} , for example, retaining only the first term in the α_s expansion of $1/\Gamma_{SL}$ lowers the central value of $\text{BR}(\overline{B} \rightarrow X_s \gamma)$ from 3.32×10^{-4} to 3.22×10^{-4} in the standard model. Similarly, the different treatment of $1/\Gamma_{SL}$ leads to shifts of the exclusion curves in Fig. 1 by tens of GeV for $\text{BR}(\overline{B} \rightarrow X_s \gamma) \sim 4 \times 10^{-4}$ or more for smaller values of $\text{BR}(\overline{B} \rightarrow X_s \gamma)$.

A similar effect has to be expected for additional electroweak corrections not included here, which presumably will not exceed the 2% level [1,3].

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Czarnecki and W.J. Marciano, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81** (1998) 277.
- [2] A.L. Kagan and M. Neubert, hep-ph/9805303
- [3] A. Strumia, hep-ph/9804274
- [4] F. Borzumati and C. Greub, hep-ph/9802391