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## Abstract

We give improved results for B meson masses using NRQCD $b$ quarks and HISQ light valence quarks for a range of lattice spacings and sea quark masses enabling controlled extrapolation to the physical point.

## Introduction

The precise calculation of the charmonium and bottomium spectra is an important goal of lattice QCD for several reasons:

- There are many 'gold-plated' states: narrow, stable, and experimentally accessible
- The splittings have particularly good properties for determining the lattice scale
- It is an important test of the actions used for $b$ and $c$, which can then be used to calculate decay constants which in turn are crucial for determining CKM matrix elements
- Control of systematic errors are well developed in calculations of the $B$ and $D$ spectrum on the lattice due to relative insensitivity to heavy-quark polarisation effects and to light quark masses.

The Highly Improved Staggered Quark (HISQ) action [1], allows unprecedented control of discretization errors in numerical lattice calculations. We use HISQ $s$ and $c$ valence quarks with NRQCD $b$ quarks on MILC lattices with $N_{f}=2+1$ flavors of ASQTAD sea quarks to calculate the masses of the $B_{s}$ and $B_{c}$ mesons

## Heavy-light 2-point functions

For increased statistics, we use random sources $\eta\left(x, t_{0}\right)$, defined as a three-component random complex unit-vector defined on each point in the source time slice $t_{0}$. These are the sources for the inversion of the HISQ strange and charmed valence quark propagators

We convolute the noise source with a collection of smearing functions (e.g., Gaussian), of varying radii chosen to allow resolution of different ground and excited $B_{S}$ and $B_{c}$ states. We then initialize $N_{\text {smear }}$ NRQCD $b$ quark propagators by setting

$$
\left.G_{i}(x, t=0)=\sum_{r^{\prime}} S\left(\left|x-x^{\prime}\right| ; r_{i}\right) \eta\left(x^{\prime}, t_{0}\right)\right)
$$

From this, dynamical HISQ propagators for the $s$ and $c$ quarks are generated. We evolve NRQCD $b$ quark propagators from the same noise source:

$$
G_{i}(x, t+1)=\left(1-\frac{\delta H}{2}\right)\left(1-\frac{H_{0}}{2 n}\right)^{n} U_{t}^{\dagger}(x)\left(1-\frac{H_{0}}{2 n}\right)^{n}\left(1-\frac{\delta H}{2}\right) G_{i}(x, t)
$$

We use an improved lattice NRQCD Hamiltonian [2]:

$$
H_{0}=-\frac{\Delta^{(2)}}{2 M^{0}}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\delta H & =-c_{1} \frac{\left(\Delta^{(2)}\right)^{2}}{8\left(M^{0}\right)^{3}}+c_{2} \frac{i g}{8\left(M^{0}\right)^{3}}(\boldsymbol{\Delta} \cdot \mathbf{E}-\mathbf{E} \cdot \boldsymbol{\Delta})-c_{3} \frac{i g}{8\left(M^{0}\right)^{3}} \sigma \cdot(\boldsymbol{\Delta} \times \tilde{\mathbf{E}}-\tilde{\mathbf{E}} \times \boldsymbol{\Delta}) \\
& -c_{4} \frac{g}{2 M^{0}} \sigma \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{B}}+c_{5} \frac{a^{2} \Delta^{(4)}}{24 M^{0}}-c_{6} \frac{a\left(\delta^{(2)}\right)^{2}}{16 n\left(M^{0}\right)^{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

Finally, at each time-slice, we combine the $N_{\text {smear }}$ NRQCD propagators and the valence $s$ or $c$ quark propagator with the same smearing functions at the sink end, giving us $N_{\text {smear }} \times N_{\text {smear }} B_{s}$ and $B_{c}$ meson correlators

## 2-point function effective masses and noise

The expression

$$
\left[\left\langle G_{B_{s}}\left(i, j ; t-t_{0}\right) G_{B_{s}}\left(i, j ; t-t_{0}\right)\right\rangle-\left\langle G_{B_{s}}\left(i, j ; t-t_{0}\right)\right\rangle^{2}\right]
$$

contains in it propagators for $\bar{b} \bar{s} b s$ four-quark states. The lightest combination on the lattice is $\eta_{b}+\eta_{s}$. Therefore the error on the propagator falls like $e^{\frac{1}{2}\left(M_{\eta_{b}}+M_{\eta_{s}}\right)}$ as can be seen in Figure 1. This figure also illustrates that effective masses of propagators $G_{B_{s}}\left(i, i ; t-t_{0}\right)$ with Gaussian smearing with radius 2 and 4 ( $G 2 G 2$ and $G 4 G 4$ ) approach the $M_{B_{s}}$ plateau rapidly compared to the local source-sink combination ( $L 0 L 0$ )


Figure 1: Plot of effective masses of (local-local) $B_{s}$ correlator and $B_{s}$ correlator error. While effective mass of the correlator matches the experimental $M_{B_{s}}$ (corrected for the energy shift), the effective mass of the correlator error gives $\frac{1}{2}\left(M_{\eta_{b}}+M_{\eta_{s}}\right)$. Several source-sink smearing combinations are shown.

Extracting $M_{B_{s}}$ and $M_{B_{c}}$
We fit the measured $B_{s}$ and $B_{c}$ correlators to the form

$$
G_{\text {meson }}\left(i, j ; t-t_{0}\right)=\sum_{k=1}^{N_{\text {exp }}} a_{i, k} a_{j, k}^{*} e^{-E_{k}\left(t-t_{0}\right)}+\sum_{k^{\prime}=1}^{N_{\text {exp }}-1} b_{i, k^{\prime}} b_{j, k^{\prime}}^{*}(-1)^{\left(t-t_{0}\right)} e^{-E_{k^{\prime}}^{\prime}\left(t-t_{0}\right)}
$$

where $i$ and $j$ respectively index the source and sink smearing functions. The second term is an oscillating parity partner state. We perform simultaneous Bayesian fits of the $G_{\text {meson }}\left(i, j ; t-t_{0}\right)$, looking for stability with respect to fit range and $N_{\text {exp }}$.
Since the NRQCD Hamiltonian does not include a mass term, there is a shift in the energy of the $p=0$ states relative to the continuum mass. To correct for the energy shift in $M_{B_{s}}$ and $M_{B_{c}}$ we use the relationship

$$
\begin{equation*}
M_{B_{s / c}}=\left(E_{B_{s / c}}-\frac{1}{2} E_{\Upsilon}\right)_{\text {latt }}+\frac{1}{2} M_{\Upsilon}, \tag{I}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $E_{B}$ is the ground-state $E_{0}$, and $E_{\Upsilon}$ is calculated with two NRQCD $b$ quark propagators on the same configurations.[3] The $M$ s on the right hand side are experimental values. For $M_{B_{c}}$ we also explore two other methods for cancelling the energy shift:

$$
\begin{gather*}
M_{B_{c}}=\left(E_{B_{c}}-\frac{1}{2}\left(E_{\Upsilon}+E_{\eta_{c}}\right)\right)_{\text {latt }}+\frac{1}{2}\left(M_{\Upsilon}+M_{\eta_{c}}\right)  \tag{II}\\
M_{B_{c}}=\left(E_{B_{c}}-\left(E_{B_{s}}+E_{D_{s}}\right)\right)_{\mathrm{latt}}+\left(M_{B_{s}}+M_{D_{s}}\right) \tag{III}
\end{gather*}
$$

We show results for $M_{B_{s}}$ and $M_{B_{c}}$ on several ensembles at three lattice spacings and different light sea quark masses in Figure 2. The statistical error (shown in figure) is dominated by the uncertainty in $a^{-1}$. Expression (II) minimizes the statistical uncertainty by using $\left(E_{B_{c}}-\frac{1}{2}\left(E_{\Upsilon}+E_{\eta_{c}}\right)\right.$, which is small relative to the ()$_{\text {latt }}$ quantities in the other expressions.


Figure 2: Lattice calculations and experiment for $M_{B_{s}}$ and $M_{B_{c}}$ on "very coarse" $16^{3} \times 48 a \approx$ 1.3 GeV and "coarse" $20^{3} \times 64$ and $24^{3} \times 64 a \approx 1.6 \mathrm{GeV}$ configurations. We extracted $M_{B}$ separately with expressions with relations I, II, and III. All $M_{B}$ values come from I. Only statistica uncertainties are shown. The smaller error bars from II are enhanced in width for visibility.

## Conclusions

While preliminary, these results show the potential for precise calculations of $M_{B_{s}}$ and $M_{B_{c}}$ using HISQ valence quarks and NRQCD $b$ quarks on a $2+1$ flavor ASQTAD sea. The lattice result show little sensitivity to sea quark mass and only a small dependence on the discretization scale. The $\sim 20 \mathrm{MeV}$ discrepancy in $M_{B}$ and the $\sim 30 \mathrm{MeV}$ discrepancy between III and the other methods for getting $M_{B_{C}}$ (also noted in [4]) indicate systematic error that will hopefully be understood with further work. Relativistic corrections and electromagnetic effects are two possible sources of systematic error. Future efforts will improve statistics and include finer lattices.

|  | Ensemble | $N_{\text {cfg }}$ | $M_{B_{s}}$ | $M_{B_{c}}$ (I) | $M_{B_{c}}$ (II) | $M_{B_{c}}$ (III) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $10^{3} \times 48$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | | $16^{3} \times 48$ | $\beta=6.572 \mathrm{am}=0.0097,0.0484$ | 628 | $5.3826(39)$ | $6.3109(84)$ | $6.3127(9)$ | $6.2787(59)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $16^{3} \times 48$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | | $16^{3} \times 48$ | $\beta=6.586 \mathrm{am}=0.0194,0.0484$ | 628 | $5.3857(37)$ | $6.3056(84)$ | $6.3112(9)$ | $6.2741(60)$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $20^{3} \times 64$ | $\beta=6.76 \mathrm{am}=0.010$ | 0.050 | 592 | $53873(32)$ | $63048(69$ | $62938(8)$ | $62621(50)$ | $\begin{array}{llllllll}20^{\circ} \times 64 & \beta=6.76 \mathrm{am}=0.010,0.050 & 592 & 5.3873(32) & 6.3048(69) & 6.2938(8) & 6.2621(50) \\ 24^{3} \times 64 & \beta=6.76 \mathrm{am}=0.005 / 0.050 & 191 & 5.3857(81) & 6.2999(78) & 6.2945(8) & 6.2663(57)\end{array}$ | $24^{9} \times 64$ | $\beta=6.76 \mathrm{am}=0.005 / 0.050$ | 191 | $5.3857(81)$ | $6.2999(78)$ | $6.2945(8)$ | $6.2663(57)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $28^{3} \times 96$ | $\beta=7.09 \mathrm{am}=0.0062,0.031$ | 149 | $5.3792(31)$ | - | - | - | | $28^{3} \times 96$ | $\beta=7.09 \mathrm{am}=0.0062,0.031$ | 149 | $5.3792(31)$ | - | - | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EXPERIMENT |  | $5.3661(6)$ | $6.286(5)$ | $6.286(5)$ | $6.286(5)$ |

Table 1: All errors are statistical only. All masses are in GeV .
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