

**Measuring α using
 $B \rightarrow K^{(*)} \bar{K}^{(*)}$ Decays**

David London
Université de Montréal

May 17, 2002
Flavor Physics and CP Violation (FPCP)

Talk based on work done in collaboration with
Alakabha Datta

Measure CP violation in the B system \implies test the SM \implies find New Physics.

Smoking-gun signals for new physics:

- $B_d^0(t) \rightarrow \Psi K_S$ vs. $B_d^0(t) \rightarrow \phi K_S$ (β)
- $B^\pm \rightarrow DK^\pm$ vs. $B_s^0(t) \rightarrow D_s^\pm K^\mp$ (γ)
- $B_s^0(t) \rightarrow \Psi\phi$ (0)

Probes new physics in the $b \rightarrow s$ FCNC (B_s^0 - \bar{B}_s^0 mixing or the $b \rightarrow s$ penguin). **No hadronic uncertainties.**

Question: are there clean probes of new physics in the $b \rightarrow d$ FCNC?

NO.

Consider $b \rightarrow d$ penguin:

$$A = P_u V_{ub}^* V_{ud} + P_c V_{cb}^* V_{cd} + P_t V_{tb}^* V_{td}$$

Can eliminate any one CKM combination in terms of the other two:

$$(P_u - P_c) V_{ub}^* V_{ud} + (P_t - P_c) V_{tb}^* V_{td} \quad (\alpha)$$

$$(P_c - P_u) V_{cb}^* V_{cd} + (P_t - P_u) V_{tb}^* V_{td} \quad (\beta)$$

$$(P_u - P_t) V_{ub}^* V_{ud} + (P_c - P_t) V_{cb}^* V_{cd} \quad (\gamma)$$

There is a “CKM ambiguity”: don't know the relative weak phase.

In order to test for new physics in the $b \rightarrow d$ FCNC, need a theoretical assumption to break the CKM ambiguity.

(D.L., N. Sinha, R. Sinha)

$$B_d^0 \rightarrow K^0 \bar{K}^0$$

Pure $b \rightarrow d$ penguin:

$$\begin{aligned} A &= P_u V_{ub}^* V_{ud} + P_c V_{cb}^* V_{cd} + P_t V_{tb}^* V_{td} \\ &= \mathcal{P}_{uc} e^{i\gamma} e^{i\delta_{uc}} + \mathcal{P}_{tc} e^{-i\beta} e^{i\delta_{tc}} \end{aligned}$$

Note: \mathcal{P}_{uc} and \mathcal{P}_{tc} include CKM info.

4 parameters: \mathcal{P}_{uc} , \mathcal{P}_{tc} , $\Delta \equiv \delta_{uc} - \delta_{tc}$, α

Recall:

$$\Gamma(B_d^0(t) \rightarrow f) \sim X + Y \cos \Delta mt - Z_I \sin \Delta mt$$

where

$$X \equiv \frac{|A|^2 + |\bar{A}|^2}{2}, \quad Y \equiv \frac{|A|^2 - |\bar{A}|^2}{2},$$

$$Z_I \equiv \text{Im} \left(e^{-2i\beta} A^* \bar{A} \right), \quad Z_R \equiv \text{Re} \left(e^{-2i\beta} A^* \bar{A} \right).$$

$$(Z_R^2 = X^2 - Y^2 - Z_I^2.)$$

3 OBSERVABLES, 4 UNKNOWNNS.

Can express 3 theoretical parameters in terms of 4th:

$$\mathcal{P}_{tc}^2 = \frac{Z_R \cos 2\alpha + Z_I \sin 2\alpha - X}{\cos 2\alpha - 1}.$$

$$B_d^0 \rightarrow K^* \bar{K}^*$$

K^* is $K^*(892)$, $K_1(1270)$, ...

Similar analysis as for $B_d^0 \rightarrow K^0 \bar{K}^0$:

$$\mathcal{P}'_{tc}{}^2 = \frac{Z'_R \cos 2\alpha + Z'_I \sin 2\alpha - X'}{\cos 2\alpha - 1} .$$

Therefore

$$\frac{\mathcal{P}_{tc}^2}{\mathcal{P}'_{tc}{}^2} = \frac{Z_I \sin 2\alpha + Z_R \cos 2\alpha - X}{Z'_I \sin 2\alpha + Z'_R \cos 2\alpha - X'} .$$

Note: CKM info in \mathcal{P}_{tc} and \mathcal{P}'_{tc} cancels in the ratio.

If we knew the value of $\mathcal{P}_{tc}^2/\mathcal{P}'_{tc}{}^2$, we could extract α .

$$B_s^0 \rightarrow K^{(*)} \bar{K}^{(*)}$$

$B_s^0 \rightarrow K^0 \bar{K}^0$: pure $b \rightarrow s$ penguin:

$$\begin{aligned} A &= P_u^{(s)} V_{ub}^* V_{us} + P_c^{(s)} V_{cb}^* V_{cs} + P_t^{(s)} V_{tb}^* V_{ts} \\ &= \mathcal{P}_{uc}^{(s)} e^{i\gamma} e^{i\delta_{uc}^{(s)}} + \mathcal{P}_{tc}^{(s)} e^{i\delta_{tc}^{(s)}} \end{aligned}$$

Note: $\mathcal{P}_{uc}^{(s)}$ is negligible compared to $\mathcal{P}_{tc}^{(s)}$. Therefore the measurement of $B(B_s^0 \rightarrow K^0 \bar{K}^0)$ gives $|\mathcal{P}_{tc}^{(s)}|$.

Similarly, the measurement of $B(B_s^0 \rightarrow K^* \bar{K}^*)$ gives $|\mathcal{P}'_{tc}{}^{(s)}|$.

CLAIM:

$$\frac{\mathcal{P}_{tc}^{(s)2}}{\mathcal{P}'_{tc}{}^{(s)2}} = \frac{\mathcal{P}_{tc}^2}{\mathcal{P}'_{tc}{}^2}.$$

Note: CKM matrix elements cancel in ratios, so this is a statement about hadronic parameters – breaks CKM ambiguity.

A similar method applies to non-CP-conjugate decays of the form $K^0 \bar{K}^*$, $K^* \bar{K}^0$.

IN ALL CASES, THE THEORETICAL ERROR IS SMALL, AT MOST 5% (AND MAY WELL BE EVEN SMALLER).

Experimental considerations:

- Branching ratios $\sim 10^{-6}$.
- K^* , \bar{K}^* detected through their decays to charged π 's and K 's only \implies good K/π separation.
- No π^0 detection needed.

Discrete ambiguities:

Potentially a serious drawback: method allows extraction of α with a 16-fold (!) ambiguity.

- Can be reduced to 4-fold by considering two different pairs of $K^{(*)}\bar{K}^{(*)}$ final states (e.g. $K^0\bar{K}^0$ and $K^*\bar{K}^*$; $K^0\bar{K}^*$ and $K^*\bar{K}^0$).
- We expect P_u, P_c in $b \rightarrow d$ penguins to be at most 50% of $P_t \implies \mathcal{P}_{uc}/\mathcal{P}_{tc} < 0.5$ for all decays. This reduces the ambiguity to 2-fold: $\alpha, \alpha + \pi$.

Other methods for measuring α : $B_d^0(t) \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ (+ isospin analysis), $B \rightarrow \rho\pi$ (+ Dalitz-plot analysis). These methods have their difficulties. Could the $B \rightarrow K^{(*)}\bar{K}^{(*)}$ method be first? Unlikely. But: a discrepancy between the values of α would point to new physics in the $b \rightarrow d$ penguin.

Theoretical Error

We claim the equality of a double ratio of matrix elements:

$$\frac{r_t}{r_t^*} \equiv \frac{\langle K^0 \bar{K}^0 | H_d | B_d^0 \rangle / \langle K^0 \bar{K}^0 | H_s | B_s^0 \rangle}{\langle K^* \bar{K}^* | H_d | B_d^0 \rangle / \langle K^* \bar{K}^* | H_s | B_s^0 \rangle} = 1 .$$

The two decays in r_t are related by $SU(3)$ (U-spin). Same for r_t^* :

$$r_t = \frac{\langle K^0 \bar{K}^0 | H_d | B_d^0 \rangle}{\langle K^0 \bar{K}^0 | H_s | B_s^0 \rangle} = 1 + C_{SU(3)} ,$$
$$r_t^* = \frac{\langle K^* \bar{K}^* | H_d | B_d^0 \rangle}{\langle K^* \bar{K}^* | H_s | B_s^0 \rangle} = 1 + C_{SU(3)}^* ,$$

so that

$$\frac{r_t}{r_t^*} = 1 + (C_{SU(3)} - C_{SU(3)}^*) .$$

Although there is no symmetry limit in which $(C_{SU(3)} - C_{SU(3)}^*) \rightarrow 0$, we expect significant cancellations between $C_{SU(3)}$ and $C_{SU(3)}^*$.

We write

$$\begin{aligned} r_t &= \langle K^0 \bar{K}^0 | H_d | B_d^0 \rangle / \langle K^0 \bar{K}^0 | H_s | B_s^0 \rangle \\ &= \langle K^0 \bar{K}^0 | H_d | B_d^0 \rangle / \langle K^0 \bar{K}^0 | U^\dagger H_d U | B_s^0 \rangle , \end{aligned}$$

Two main sources of error:

- “final-state” corrections, $U |K^0 \bar{K}^0\rangle \neq |K^0 \bar{K}^0\rangle$
- “initial-state” corrections, $U |B_s^0\rangle \neq |B_d^0\rangle$

Will examine these in turn.

But note: sources of $SU(3)$ breaking in r_t^* are very similar to those in r_t : $U |K^* \bar{K}^*\rangle \neq |K^* \bar{K}^*\rangle$ and $U |B_s^0\rangle \neq |B_d^0\rangle \implies$ not unreasonable to expect sizeable cancellations between $C_{SU(3)}$ and $C_{SU(3)}^*$.

Final-state corrections

$K^0 = \bar{s}d \implies$ write

$$p_s \approx xp_K, \quad p_d \approx (1-x)p_K.$$

U-spin transformation exchanges \bar{s} and d quarks:

$$U\psi_K = \psi(d(xp_K)\bar{s}(1-xp_K)).$$

Final-state U-spin correction due to the presence of a piece in the kaon light-cone distribution (LCD) which is antisymmetric under the exchange $x \rightarrow 1-x$.

We know that the kaon LCD is symmetric in the high-energy limit $E_K \rightarrow \infty$. What about at $E_K \sim m_B/2$?

- Pion LCD is extremely close to its asymptotic form, $\phi_\pi(x) \sim x(1-x)$, at $\mu^2 \sim 10 \text{ GeV}^2 \implies$ kaon LCD may also be very close to its (symmetric) asymptotic form.
- Can test this experimentally: measure the kaon LCD. If symmetric, no final-state corrections. Model independent.
- Model calculations: an antisymmetric piece of the kaon LCD tends not to contribute much to the overall amplitude \implies final-state corrections unimportant.

Initial-state corrections

Need framework to perform calculations. Within QCD factorization, write

$$r_t = \frac{A_{fac}^d [1 + x^d]}{A_{fac}^s [1 + x^s]} .$$

A_{fac}^d and A_{fac}^s are the factorizable contributions to $B_d^0 \rightarrow K^0 \bar{K}^0$ and $B_s^0 \rightarrow K^0 \bar{K}^0$; x^d and x^s are the corresponding nonfactorizable contributions.

- $SU(3)$ corrections due to nonfactorizable corrections negligible.
- Write factorizable contributions as

$$A_{fac}^d = f_K F_{B_d \rightarrow K} \int T(x) \phi_{\bar{K}}(x) dx ,$$

$$A_{fac}^s = f_K F_{B_s \rightarrow \bar{K}} \int T(x) \phi_K(x) dx .$$

$SU(3)$ breaking due to kaon LCD's is negligible \implies main contribution to $SU(3)$ breaking comes from the form factors $F_{B_d \rightarrow K}$ and $F_{B_s \rightarrow \bar{K}}$.

Form factors

$B \rightarrow K$ form factors related to $D \rightarrow K$ form factors:
in chiral limit and heavy-quark limit

$$\frac{F_{B_d \rightarrow K} / F_{B_s \rightarrow \bar{K}}}{F_{\bar{D} \rightarrow K} / F_{\bar{D}_s \rightarrow \bar{K}}} = 1 .$$

\implies measurement of $D \rightarrow K$ form factors
determines $B \rightarrow K$ form factors to
 $O(\Delta M_D / M_D) \simeq 5\%$.

Also:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{F_{B_d \rightarrow K} / F_{B_s \rightarrow \bar{K}}}{F_{\bar{D} \rightarrow K} / F_{\bar{D}_s \rightarrow \bar{K}}} &= 1 + a \frac{\Delta M_D}{M_D} , \\ \frac{F_{B_d \rightarrow K^*} / F_{B_s \rightarrow \bar{K}^*}}{F_{\bar{D} \rightarrow K^*} / F_{\bar{D}_s \rightarrow \bar{K}^*}} &= 1 + a^* \frac{\Delta M_D}{M_D} . \end{aligned}$$

a and a^* are $O(1)$.

So:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{F_{B_d \rightarrow K} / F_{B_s \rightarrow \bar{K}}}{F_{B_d \rightarrow K^*} / F_{B_s \rightarrow \bar{K}^*}} &= \frac{F_{\bar{D} \rightarrow K} / F_{\bar{D}_s \rightarrow \bar{K}}}{F_{\bar{D} \rightarrow K^*} / F_{\bar{D}_s \rightarrow \bar{K}^*}} \times \\ &\quad \left[1 + (a - a^*) \frac{\Delta M_D}{M_D} \right] . \end{aligned}$$

But B decays similar, expect $a \simeq a^*$. Model calculations:

$$(a - a^*) \left(\frac{\Delta M_D}{M_D} \right) < 1\% .$$

\implies measurement of $D \rightarrow K$ form factors determines $B \rightarrow K$ form factors to $\lesssim 1\%$.

Theory: in limit $m_b \rightarrow \infty$ and $E_K \rightarrow \infty$, $B \rightarrow K$ and $B \rightarrow K^*$ transitions are described by 3 form factors. Calculate form factors in QCD sum rules. Find

$$\frac{F_{B_d \rightarrow K} / F_{B_s \rightarrow \bar{K}}}{F_{\bar{D} \rightarrow K} / F_{\bar{D}_s \rightarrow \bar{K}}} = 1 ,$$

i.e. initial-state $SU(3)$ breaking cancels in numerator and denominator \implies combined with QCD factorization, $r_t/r_t^* = 1$, up to corrections of $O(\Delta M_B/M_B) \simeq 2\%$.

Bottom line: cannot *prove* that initial-state corrections to $r_t/r_t^* = 1$ are small. However, all model calculations suggest this to be the case. This can be tested experimentally.

Conclusions

New method for measuring α : $B_{d,s}^0(t) \rightarrow K^{(*)} \bar{K}^{(*)}$ decays.

Good for hadron colliders: branching ratios $\sim 10^{-6}$; K^* , \bar{K}^* detected through their decays to charged particles; no π^0 detection needed.

Compare with α as obtained in $B \rightarrow \pi\pi$ or $B \rightarrow \rho\pi$. Can find new physics in $b \rightarrow d$ FCNC.

Requires theoretical input. But model calculations suggest that the error is at most 5%, and could well be quite a bit less. Can be tested experimentally. So the method is quite clean.