### Model-Independent Constraints on Lepton-Flavor-Violating Decays of the Top Quark

Jennifer Kile, Amarjit Soni

Brookhaven National Laboratory Pheno '08, April 28, 2008

### Introduction

- LHC: huge top physics potential ( $10^8 t$ 's!).
- t unique, good place to look for New Physics (NP).
- Neutrino osc: Nature has lepton flavor violation.
- $t \to u(c)e^{\pm}\mu^{\mp}$ : distinctive experimental signature.
- Are there experimental constraints on NP contributions to  $t \to u(c)e^{\pm}\mu^{\mp}$ ?
- Take set of effective operators

$$\mathcal{L}_{eff} = \sum_{i} \frac{C_i}{\Lambda^{d-4}} \mathcal{O}_i + h.c.$$

to get constraints from B,K decays and  $\mu \to e \gamma.$ 

#### **Operators Contributing to** $t \rightarrow u(c)e^{\pm}\mu^{\mp}$

- Take dimension-6,  $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ -invariant op's.
- Separate into 2 classes, depending on  $T_L$  or  $t_R$  in operator. **Class One:** Class Two:

a, b = SU(2) indices

Model-Independent Constraints on Lepton-Flavor-Violating Decays of the Top Quark – p.2/10

#### **Contributions of Op's to** $t \to u(c)e^{\pm}\mu^{\mp}$

Top decay for all op's proceeds via



- Assume can measure branching ratio of  $10^{-7}$ .
- Taking  $m_t = 170$  GeV and  $|C_{n,ijk}| = 1$ ,

 $\begin{array}{lll} 2.1 & {\rm TeV} & (n=1,\,2,\,5,\,{\rm and}\,\,6) \\ \Lambda \geq & 1.5 & {\rm TeV} & (n=3\,\,{\rm and}\,\,7) \\ & 4.0 & {\rm TeV} & (n=4\,\,{\rm and}\,\,8) \end{array}$ 

• Results independent of flavor indices i, j, k.

# **Constraints from** B **decays**

Class Two op's contain  $T_L$ , include terms with b quarks. ex:  $\mathcal{O}_{6,ijk} = \bar{Q}_L^i \gamma^{\mu} T_L \bar{l}_R^j \gamma_{\mu} l_R^k = (\bar{u}_L^i \gamma^{\mu} t_L + \bar{d}_L^i \gamma^{\mu} b_L) \bar{l}_R^j \gamma_{\mu} l_R^k$ 

 $\rightarrow$  contribute at tree-level to *B* decay.



## **Constraints from 2-body** *B* **decays**

The Class Two op's contribute to  $(\langle 0|\bar{d}\gamma^{\mu}\gamma_5 b|B^0(p)\rangle = i\sqrt{2}F_B p^{\mu})$ :

- Op's 5, 6:  $B^0, B_s \to e^{\pm} \mu^{\mp}, \quad \Gamma = \frac{1}{32\pi} \frac{|C_{n,ijk}|^2}{\Lambda^4} F_B^2 m_B m_{\mu}^2$ (helicity-suppressed)
- Op 7:  $B^+, B_c \to \ell^+ \nu, \quad \Gamma = \frac{1}{32\pi} \frac{|C_{n,ijk}|^2}{\Lambda^4} F_B^2 \frac{m_B^5}{(m_b + m_{u(c)})^2}$

$$\begin{array}{lll} \mathsf{Br}(B^0 \to e^{\pm} \mu^{\mp}) &\leq & 1.7 \times 10^{-7} (90\% \mathrm{CL}) \to \frac{|C_{5(6), ujk}|}{\Lambda^2} \leq \frac{1}{(3.7 \ \mathrm{TeV})^2} \\ \mathsf{Br}(B_s \to e^{\pm} \mu^{\mp}) &\leq & 6.1 \times 10^{-6} (90\% \mathrm{CL}) \to \frac{|C_{5(6), cjk}|}{\Lambda^2} \leq \frac{1}{(1.6 \ \mathrm{TeV})^2} \\ \mathsf{Br}(B^+ \to e^+ \nu) &\leq & 9.8 \times 10^{-6} (90\% \mathrm{CL}) \to \frac{|C_{7, u\mu e}|}{\Lambda^2} \leq \frac{1}{(17 \ \mathrm{TeV})^2} \\ \mathsf{Br}(B^+ \to \mu^+ \nu) &\leq & 1.7 \times 10^{-6} (90\% \mathrm{CL}) \to \frac{|C_{7, ue\mu}|}{\Lambda^2} \leq \frac{1}{(11 \ \mathrm{TeV})^2} \end{array}$$

Model-Independent Constraints on Lepton-Flavor-Violating Decays of the Top Quark - p.5/10

# **Constraints from 3-body** *B* **decays**

 $\rightarrow$  No helicity suppression, op 8 can contribute. **Op's 5,6**: Compare to exclusive via  $B \to \pi \ell^+ \nu$ .  $\mathsf{Br}(B^+ \to \pi^+ e^+ \mu^-) \le 6.4 \times 10^{-3} \to \frac{|C_{5(6), ujk}|}{\Lambda^2} \le \frac{1}{(1 \text{ TeV})^2}$  $\mathsf{Br}(B^+ \to K^+ e^{\pm} \mu^{\mp}) \le 9.1 \times 10^{-8} \to \frac{|C_{5(6),cjk}|}{\Lambda^2} \le \frac{1}{(16 \text{ TeV})^2}$ **Op's 7,8**: Take  $2 \times$  exp. error as estimate of NP contribution.  $Br(B \to X_u \ell^+ \nu) = 2.33 \pm .22 \times 10^{-3} \to \frac{|C_{7,ujk}|}{\Lambda^2} \le \frac{1}{(3 \text{ TeV})^2}$  $\frac{|C_{8,ujk}|}{\Lambda^2} \le \frac{1}{(7 \text{ TeV})^2}$  $\rightarrow \quad \frac{|C_{7,ce\mu}|}{\Lambda^2} \le \frac{1}{(1 \quad \text{TeV})^2}$  $Br(B^- \to X_c e^+ \nu) = 10.8 \pm 0.4$  $\frac{|C_{8,ce\mu}|}{\Lambda^2} \le \frac{1}{(3 \text{ TeV})^2}$ 

Model-Independent Constraints on Lepton-Flavor-Violating Decays of the Top Quark – p.6/10

## **Constraints from** *K* **decays**

Op's of both classes can contribute at one loop to  $K_L \rightarrow e^{\pm} \mu^{\mp}$ :



$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{Br}(K_L \to e^{\pm} \mu^{\mp}) &\leq 4.7 \times 10^{-12} \quad \to \quad \frac{|C_{5(6), ujk}(\Lambda)|}{\Lambda^2} \ln \frac{v^2}{\Lambda^2} < \frac{1}{(2.3 \mathrm{TeV})^2} \\ &\qquad \frac{|C_{5(6), cjk}(\Lambda)|}{\Lambda^2} \ln \frac{v^2}{\Lambda^2} < \frac{1}{(1.6 \mathrm{TeV})^2} \\ &\qquad \frac{|C_{4, ujk}|}{\Lambda^2} \lesssim \frac{1}{(1 \mathrm{TeV})^2} \end{aligned}$$

Constraints from 3-body K decays weaker.



Ops 3, 4 can contribute to  $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$  at 2 loops, i.e.,



 $Br(\mu \rightarrow e\gamma) < 1.2 \times 10^{-11} \rightarrow$  yet to come

#### Results

Operator	$t \to u(c) e^{\pm} \mu^{\mp}$	<i>B</i> , <b>2-body</b>	B, 3-body	K	$\mu  ightarrow e \gamma$
$\mathcal{O}_{1(2),ijk}$	2.1	-	-	-	-
$\mathcal{O}_{3,ijk}$	1.5	-	-	-	maybe
$\mathcal{O}_{4,ujk}$	4.0	-	-	1	maybe
$\mathcal{O}_{4,cjk}$	4.0	-	-	-	maybe
$\mathcal{O}_{5(6),ujk}$	2.1	3.7	1	6	-
$\mathcal{O}_{5(6),cjk}$	2.1	1.6	16	3.7	-
$\mathcal{O}_{7,ue\mu}$	1.5	11	3	-	-
$\mathcal{O}_{7,u\mu e}$	1.5	17	3	-	-
$\mathcal{O}_{7,ce\mu}$	1.5	-	1	-	-
$\mathcal{O}_{7,c\mu e}$	1.5	-	-	-	-
$\mathcal{O}_{8,ujk}$	4.0	-	7	-	-
$\mathcal{O}_{8,ce\mu}$	4.0	-	3	-	-
$\mathcal{O}_{8,c\mu e}$	4.0	-	-	-	-



# Conclusions

- Operators which can give  $t \to u(c)e^{\pm}\mu^{\mp}$  probe  $\sim$  few TeV range.
- Several operators constrained by B, K decays, possibly  $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$ .
- Some operators currently not constrained.
- $t \to u(c)e^{\pm}\mu^{\mp}$  could occur at LHC!