

Constraint on $\tan \beta_{3=2}$; from $B \rightarrow K$

Michael Gronau,¹ Dan Pirjol,² Amarjit Soni,³ and Jure Zupan^{4,5,6}

¹Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94309

²National Institute for Physics and Nuclear Engineering, Department of Particle Physics, 077125 Bucharest, Romania

³Physics Department, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York 11973

⁴Theory Division, Department of Physics, CERN, CH-1211 Geneva 23, Switzerland

⁵Faculty of mathematics and physics, University of Ljubljana, Jadranska 19, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia

⁶J. Stefan Institute, Jamova 39, P.O. Box 3000, 1001 Ljubljana, Slovenia

A linear relation between Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa quark mixing parameters, $\tan \beta_{3=2} = 0.24 - 0.03$, involving a 1 range for $20 < \tan \beta_{3=2} < 115$, is obtained from $B \rightarrow K$ amplitudes measured in Dalitz plot analyses of $B \rightarrow K^+ K^0$ and $B \rightarrow K_S^+ K^0$. This relation is consistent within the large error on $\tan \beta_{3=2}$ with other CKM constraints. We discuss the high sensitivity of this method to a new physics contribution in the $S = I = 1$ amplitude.

I. INTRODUCTION

Two anomalous features measured in $b \rightarrow s$ penguin-dominated processes have attracted substantial interest in recent years [1]: (i) CP asymmetries S in $B \rightarrow K_S X$ decays ($X = K^0; K^+ K^0; K_S^+ K^0; K_S^+ K_S^0$) show a hint of systematic deviations from standard model predictions, and (ii) the pattern of direct CP asymmetries in $B \rightarrow K$ decays is hard to explain using dynamical approaches based on $1/m_b$ expansion. Are these merely statistical fluctuations, a sign of our inability to reliably calculate the relevant observables, or are they first hints of new flavor-dependent CP-violating contributions from new physics at a TeV scale?

In order to answer this question it is important to obtain precise model-independent constraints on the CKM parameters and β using penguin-dominated $S = 1$ B decays. Comparing these constraints with CKM constraints which are not affected by New Physics (NP) in $S = 1$ decays, e.g., the determination of β from tree-dominated processes $B \rightarrow D^{(*)} K^{(*)}$ [3], may provide a test for the presence of NP in $b \rightarrow s$ penguin transitions.

In the present note we study a linear constraint in the $(\beta; \gamma)$ plane following from a combination of $B \rightarrow K$ amplitudes. The method proposed in [4] and developed further in [5] will be summarized in Section II. The necessary observables required for applying the method have been measured recently in Dalitz plot analyses of $B \rightarrow K^+ K^0$ [6] and $B \rightarrow K_S^+ K^0$ [7]. They will be used in Section III to determine the slope of the linear constraint, comparing this constraint with other CKM constraints. Section IV discusses the sensitivity of this test to New Physics effects, while Section V concludes.

II. THE METHOD

The main idea of the method [4, 5] is studying $I = 1$ combinations of $B \rightarrow K$ amplitudes which do not receive dominant contributions from QCD penguin operators, and thus carry a weak phase in the absence of electroweak penguin (EWP) terms. In the present note we focus our attention on the $I = 3=2$ final state,

$$3A_{3=2} = A(B \rightarrow K^+ K^0) + \sqrt{2}A(B \rightarrow K^0 K^0) : (1)$$

In the absence of EWP terms would be given by

$$\beta_{3=2} = \frac{1}{2} \arg R_{3=2} ; \quad R_{3=2} = \frac{A_{3=2}}{A_{3=2}} ; (2)$$

where $A_{3=2}$ is the amplitude for charge-conjugated states.

The phase $\beta_{3=2}$ can be obtained by measuring magnitudes and relative phases of $B \rightarrow K^+ K^0$ and $B \rightarrow K^0 K^0$ amplitudes and their charge-conjugates. The advantage of $B \rightarrow K$ over $B \rightarrow K$ decays is that K quasi-two-body states occur in Dalitz plots of $B \rightarrow K$, where overlapping resonances permit determining both the magnitudes and relative phases of $B \rightarrow K$ amplitudes. In contrast, the relative phases of $B \rightarrow K$ amplitudes cannot be measured directly.

The inclusion of EWP contributions modifies the expression for $R_{3=2}$ which becomes [5]

$$R_{3=2} = e^{2i(\gamma + \arg(1 + \epsilon))} \frac{1 + c r_{3=2}}{1 + c \bar{r}_{3=2}} ; (3)$$

$$\frac{3C_9 + C_{10}}{2C_1 + C_2} \frac{V_{tb}V_{ts}}{V_{ub}V_{us}} ; \quad c = \frac{1}{1 + \epsilon} ; (4)$$

$$r_{3=2} = \frac{(C_1 - C_2)h(K)_{I=3=2} \mathcal{D}_1 + O_2 \mathcal{P}_1^0 i}{(C_1 + C_2)h(K)_{I=3=2} \mathcal{D}_1 + O_2 \mathcal{P}_1^0 i} : (5)$$

On sabbatical leave from the Physics Department, Technion-Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa 32000, Israel

Here $O_1 = (bs)_{VA} (uu)_{VA}$ and $O_2 = (bu)_{VA} (us)_{VA}$ are the $V-A$ current-current operators.

The straight line $\delta = \tan^{-1} r_{3=2}$, in the absence of EW P terms, is shifted by these contributions along the axis by a calculable finite amount. The actual constraint becomes [5]

$$\delta = \tan^{-1} r_{3=2} + C [1 - 2\text{Re}(r_{3=2})] + O(r_{3=2}^2); \quad (6)$$

where $C = 0.227$

$$C = \frac{3C_9 + C_{10}}{2C_1 + C_2} \frac{1}{2} = 0.27; \quad (7)$$

A finite positive shift of the straight line (6) along the axis, given by $C = 0.27$, is obtained using next to leading order values of Wilson coefficients C_i at $\mu = m_b$ [8]. The theoretical error in this parameter is smaller than 1%. The complex parameter $r_{3=2}$ was calculated in factorization, which gives a real result of the order of several percent, $r_{3=2} = 0.05$ [4].

A similar but more conservative result is obtained for $r_{3=2}$ by applying flavor SU(3) to corresponding $S = 0$ decay amplitudes. Noting that the operators in the numerator and denominator in (5) transform as 6 and $\bar{15}$ of SU(3), one finds [5],

$$r_{3=2} = \frac{\sum_j \frac{P}{B^0 \rightarrow K^+} \frac{P}{B^0 \rightarrow K^+}}{\sum_j \frac{P}{B^0 \rightarrow K^+} \frac{P}{B^0 \rightarrow K^+}} \quad (8)$$

$$= 0.054 \pm 0.045 \pm 0.023;$$

The first error is experimental. The second error is due to SU(3) breaking, small $S = 0$ penguin amplitudes and small strong phase difference between $B^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^0$ amplitudes which are neglected.

We have assumed that SU(3) breaking in ratios of $S = 1$ amplitudes and corresponding $S = 0$ amplitudes introduces an uncertainty of 30% in these ratios. The $B^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^0$ phase difference is expected to be suppressed by $1 - m_b$ and $s(m_b)$ [9, 10]. Indeed, evidence for a small phase difference is provided by an isospin pentagon relation obeyed by measured $B^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^0$ amplitudes [5]. The error in (6) from neglecting this small strong phase difference is negligible because $\text{Re}(r_{3=2})$ depends quadratically on this phase. We will use the calculation (8) for $r_{3=2}$ which is more conservative than the one using factorization. Combining in quadrature the two errors in $r_{3=2}$, the constraint (6) becomes

$$\delta = \tan^{-1} r_{3=2} [0.24 \pm 0.03]; \quad (9)$$

The dominant uncertainty in this linear constraint originates in $r_{3=2}$.

Eq. (3) and a real value of $r_{3=2}$ imply $\text{Re}(r_{3=2}) = 1$. The strong phase of $r_{3=2}$ is expected to be suppressed by $1 - m_b$ and $s(m_b)$ [9, 10]. Using (8) we take

$$|\text{Re}(r_{3=2})| < 0.11; \quad |\text{Im}(r_{3=2})| < 30; \quad (10)$$

leading to the bounds

$$0.8 < \text{Re}(r_{3=2}) < 1.2; \quad (11)$$




FIG. 1: Geometry for Eq. (1) and its charge-conjugate, using notations $A_{+} = A(B^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^0)$; $A_{00} = A(B^0 \rightarrow K^0 K^0)$ and similar notations for charge-conjugated modes.

Mode	Branching ratio	A_{CP}
K^+	10.4 ± 0.9	0.14 ± 0.12
$K^0 K^0$	3.6 ± 0.9	0.09 ± 0.24

TABLE I: Branching ratios in units of 10^{-6} and CP asymmetries in $B^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^0$ [6, 11].

III. DETERMINING $r_{3=2}$

The phase $\delta_{3=2}$ can be determined by measuring the magnitudes and relative phases of the $B^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^0$; $B^0 \rightarrow K^0 K^0$ amplitudes and their charge-conjugates. A graphical representation of the triangle relation Eq. (1) and its charge conjugate is given in Fig. 1.

The above four magnitudes of amplitudes and the two relative phases, $\arg[A(B^0 \rightarrow K^0 K^0)] = \arg[A(B^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^0)]$ and $\arg[A(B^0 \rightarrow K^0 K^0)] = \arg[A(B^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^0)]$, determine the two triangles separately. These quantities have been measured recently in a Dalitz plot analysis of $B^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^0$ and its charge-conjugate [6]. The relative phase $\arg[A(B^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^0)] = \arg[A(B^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^0)]$, which fixes the relative orientation of the two triangles, has been measured in a time-dependent Dalitz plot analysis of $B^0 \rightarrow K_S^+ K^0$ [7].

Table I quotes CP-averaged branching ratios and CP asymmetries for $B^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^0$; $B^0 \rightarrow K^0 K^0$ using Refs. [6] and [11]. A value $\delta = (164 \pm 30.7)^\circ$ was measured in $B^0(t) \rightarrow K_S^+ K^0$ [7]. The experimental situation is less clear for the phases δ and δ , measured recently in an amplitude analysis performed for $B^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^0$ and its charge-conjugate [6].

In order to calculate the $r_{3=2}^2$ dependence on $\delta_{3=2}$ we use the $r_{3=2}^2$ dependence on δ and δ given in Ref. [6], assuming gaussian errors for δ and for branching ratios and CP asymmetries in $B^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^0$ and $B^0 \rightarrow K^0 K^0$. Potential correlations between δ and δ and branching ratios

and asymmetries are neglected. Two resulting χ^2 plots as function of $\Phi_{3=2}$ are shown in Fig. 2. The broken purple curve corresponds to an unconstrained $\mathcal{R}_{3=2}j$, while the solid blue curve is obtained by imposing the bounds (11), expected to hold in the Standard Model. The latter curve defines a 1 range,

$$20 < \Phi_{3=2} < 115 : \quad (12)$$




FIG. 2: χ^2 dependence on $\Phi_{3=2}$ for unconstrained $\mathcal{R}_{3=2}j$ (broken purple line) and for $0.8 < \mathcal{R}_{3=2}j < 1.2$ (solid blue line). A black horizontal line at $\chi^2 = 1$ defines 1 ranges for $\Phi_{3=2}$.

Fig. 3 shows the linear constraint (9) with the large range of slopes (12) overlaid on CKM Fitter results following from [11, 12] $|V_{ub}| \approx |V_{cb}| = 0.086 - 0.009$, obtained in semileptonic B decays, and values $\delta = (21.5 \pm 1.0)$, $\gamma = (88 \pm 6)$ and $\beta = (53_{-18}^{+15} \pm 3 \pm 9)$ [13], obtained in $B \rightarrow J = K_S, B \rightarrow J = \pi; \pi$ and $B \rightarrow D^{(*)}K^{(*)+}$, respectively. The small theoretical error in the $B \rightarrow K$ constraint [0.03 in Eq. (9)] is described by the difference between dark and light shaded regions in Fig. 3. The large experimental error in $\Phi_{3=2}$ originates to a large extent in ambiguities in δ and γ measured in $B^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-$, using an integrated luminosity on the (4S) of only about 200 fb^{-1} [6]. This error is expected to be reduced considerably by analyses based on higher up-to-date and future luminosities.

IV. SENSITIVITY TO NEW PHYSICS

As has already been stressed, new physics (NP) $S = 1$ contributions may lead to an inconsistency between the linear constraint (6) in penguin dominated $B \rightarrow K$ decays and values of $|V_{ub}| \approx |V_{cb}|; \delta; \gamma$ and β obtained in the above-mentioned processes. The constraint (6) is affected by $I = 1$ NP operators, while NP contributions from potential $I = 0$ operators drop out. A general discussion of ways for distinguishing between NP in $I = 0$ and $I = 1$ $b \rightarrow s$ transitions can be found in Ref. [14].

The $I = 3=2$ amplitude consists of complex tree and EW P terms, T and P_{EW} , both of which involve strong




FIG. 3: Constraint in the $\rho\beta$ plane following from Eqs. (9) and (12). The dark shaded region marked $K^* 1$ corresponds to the experimental error on $\Phi_{3=2}$ given by the 1 range (12), while the light shaded region includes also the error on $r_{3=2}$ (8). Also shown are CKM Fitter constraints obtained using $|V_{ub}| \approx |V_{cb}|; \delta; \gamma$ and β [12].

phases,

$$A_{3=2} = T e^{i\delta} + P_{EW} : \quad (13)$$

The ratio [5]

$$\frac{P_{EW}}{T} = j \frac{1 - r_{3=2}}{1 + r_{3=2}} \quad (14)$$

involves the parameter δ defined in (4), which has some dependence on CKM matrix elements whose central values correspond to $j \approx j' \approx 0.66$.

Allowing for a NP term $A_{NP} \exp(i\gamma)$, where A_{NP} involves a CP conserving strong phase while γ is a new CP-violating phase, the $I = 1$ amplitude becomes

$$A_{3=2} = T e^{i\delta} + P_{EW} + A_{NP} e^{i\gamma} : \quad (15)$$

The NP term can be reabsorbed quite generally in redefined tree and electroweak penguin-like contributions, T and P_{EW} , without changing the structure (13) [15],

$$A_{3=2} = T e^{i\delta} + P_{EW} : \quad (16)$$

Here

$$T = T + A_{NP} \frac{\sin(\delta - \gamma)}{\sin \delta};$$

$$P_{EW} = P_{EW} + A_{NP} \frac{\sin(\delta - \gamma)}{\sin \delta} : \quad (17)$$

The amplitudes T and P_{EW} can be used to define a complex parameter r in analogy to Eq. (14),

$$\frac{P_{EW}}{T} = j \frac{1 - r}{1 + r} : \quad (18)$$

Thus, the parameter r replaces $r_{3=2}$ in the expression (3) for $\mathcal{R}_{3=2}$. Values of r outside the range (10) lead for




FIG. 4: Values of \tilde{r}_{NP} and ψ providing a signal for NP (at $\delta = 60^\circ$) are given by points outside the dark area, which is obtained by requiring values of $r_{3=2}$ and r in the range (10).

most such values (unless $\arg(r)$ is small) to a violation of the bounds (11). This would be likely evidence for New Physics.

A criterion for the sensitivity of the method to observing a NP amplitude is provided by requiring that r lies outside the range of values (10) allowed for $r_{3=2}$. Because of these small values this criterion is expected to hold also for values of A_{NP} which are small relative to T and P_{EW} . An exception is a singular case where the weak phases α and β are related by

$$\frac{\sin(\alpha)}{\sin(\beta)} = \frac{P_{EW}}{T}; \quad (19)$$

for which $P_{EW} = T = P_{EW} = T$ is independent of A_{NP} . In the following discussion we will assume a value $\delta = 60^\circ$.

Denoting $\alpha_{NP} = A_{NP} = P_{EW}$, we plot in the dark area in Fig. 4 points corresponding to values of \tilde{r}_{NP} and ψ , for which both $r_{3=2}$ and r are in the range (10). The region outside this area, including for most values of

rather small values of \tilde{r}_{NP} , $\tilde{r}_{NP} \approx 0.3$, implies a high sensitivity to an observable NP amplitude. The spikes around $\psi = 90^\circ$, implying very low sensitivity, correspond to solutions of (19) and nearby lying values of ψ .

V. CONCLUSION

Magnitudes and phases of $B^0 \rightarrow K$ decay amplitudes, extracted in Dalitz plot analyses for $B^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-$ and $B^0 \rightarrow K_S^+ K_S^-$, are used for obtaining the linear constraint (9) in the α - β plane, where $r_{3=2}$ lies in a 1% range (12). This constraint is consistent with other CKM constraints which are unaffected by NP $S = 1$ operators. The dominant error in the slope of the straight line is purely experimental, while a much smaller theoretical uncertainty occurs in a parallel shift along the α -axis. This small theoretical uncertainty is shown to imply in principle a high sensitivity to a New Physics $S = 1$; $I = 1$ amplitude.

We thank Jacques Chauveaux, Matthew Graham, Sebastian Jaeger, Jose Oscariz and Soeren Prell for useful discussions. We are indebted to Jacques Chauveaux and Jose Oscariz for providing us with numerical α - β dependence on α and β , and to Stephane T'Jam pens for providing CKM constraints for Fig. 3. The work of M.G. and A.S. was supported in part by the US Department of Energy under contracts DE-AC02-76SF00515, and DE-AC02-98CH10886, respectively. The work of J.Z. is supported in part by the European Commission RTN network, Contract No. MRTN-CT-2006-035482 (FLAVIA net) and by the Slovenian Research Agency.

Note added: After publication of this paper in Phys. Rev. D 77, 057504 (2008) the results of Ref. [6] were corrected. We updated our analysis in a separate addendum.

-
- [1] M. Gronau, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 22, 1953 (2007); E. Lunghi and A. Soni, JHEP 0709, 053 (2007); J. Zupan, Proceedings of 5th Flavor Physics and CP Violation Conference (FPCP 2007), Bled, Slovenia, 12-16 May 2007, pp 012.
- [2] L. Wolfenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. 51, 1945 (1983).
- [3] M. Gronau and D. London, Phys. Lett. B 253, 483 (1991); M. Gronau and D. Wyler, Phys. Lett. B 265, 172 (1991); D. Atwood, I. Dunietz and A. Soni, Phys. Rev. Lett. 78, 3257 (1997); A. Giri, Y. Grossman, A. Soer and J. Zupan, Phys. Rev. D 68, 054018 (2003); A. Bondar, Proceedings of BINP Special Analysis Meeting on Dalitz Analysis, 24-26 September 2002 (unpublished).
- [4] M. Ciuchini, M. Pierini and L. Silvestrini, Phys. Rev. D 74, 051301 (R) (2006); Phys. Lett. B 645, 201 (2007).
- [5] M. Gronau, D. Pirjol, A. Soni and J. Zupan, Phys. Rev. D 75, 014002 (2007).
- [6] B. Aubert et al. [BaBar Collaboration], arXiv:0711.4417.
- [7] B. Aubert et al. [BaBar Collaboration], arXiv:0708.2097.
- [8] G. Buchalla, A. J. Buras and M. E. Lautenbacher, Rev. Mod. Phys. 68, 1125 (1996).
- [9] M. Beneke, G. Buchalla, M. Neubert and C. T. Sachrajda, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 1914 (1999); Nucl. Phys. B 591, 313 (2000); Nucl. Phys. B 606, 245 (2001); M. Beneke and M. Neubert, Nucl. Phys. B 675, 333 (2003).
- [10] C. W. Bauer, D. Pirjol, I. Z. Rothstein and I. W. Stewart, Phys. Rev. D 70, 054015 (2004); C. W. Bauer and D. Pirjol, Phys. Lett. B 604, 183 (2004); C. W. Bauer, I. Z. Rothstein and I. W. Stewart, Phys. Rev. D 74, 034010 (2006); A. R. Williams and J. Zupan, Phys. Rev. D 74, 014003 (2006).
- [11] E. Barberio et al. [Heavy Flavor Averaging Group (HFAG) Collaboration], arXiv:0704.3575 [hep-ex], regularly updated in <http://www.slac.stanford.edu/xorg/hfag>.
- [12] J. Charles et al. [CKMitter Group], Eur. Phys.

- J. C 41, 1-131 (2005), regularly updated in <http://ckmfitter.in2p3.fr>.
- [13] A. Poluektov et al. [Belle Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D 73, 112009 (2006).
- [14] M. Gronau and J. L. Rosner, Phys. Rev. D 75, 094006 (2007).
- [15] See e.g. F. J. Botella and J. P. Silva, Phys. Rev. D 71, 094008 (2005).

Addendum to \Constraint on $\tan \beta_{3=2}$; from $B \rightarrow K^0$

Michael Gronau,¹ Dan Pirjol,² Amarjit Soni,³ and Jure Zupan^{4,5,6}

¹ Enrico Fermi Institute and Department of Physics, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL 60637

² National Institute for Physics and Nuclear Engineering, Department of Particle Physics, 077125 Bucharest, Romania

³ Physics Department, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York 11973

⁴ Theory Division, Department of Physics, CERN, CH-1211 Geneva 23, Switzerland

⁵ Faculty of Mathematics and physics, University of Ljubljana, Jadranska 19, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia

⁶ J. Stefan Institute, Jamova 39, P.O. Box 3000, 1001 Ljubljana, Slovenia

A 1σ range, $20 < \tan \beta_{3=2} < 115$, defining the slope of a linear CKM relation, $\tan \beta_{3=2} = 0.24 \pm 0.03$, was obtained from $B^0 \rightarrow K^0$ amplitudes measured in two Dalitz plot analyses of $B^0 \rightarrow K^0$. A correction reported recently by the BaBar Collaboration in results for $B^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-$ is shown to imply a somewhat narrower 1σ range for the slope parameter, $39 < \tan \beta_{3=2} < 112$.

A Dalitz analysis of $B^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-$ by the BaBar collaboration reported in Ref. [1] has been very recently corrected [2]. We had used the earlier uncorrected version of this analysis to obtain a CKM constraint [3]. In this addendum we recalculate the constraint using the corrected experimental results.

The following linear constraint between the Wolfenstein parameters [4] and $\tan \beta_{3=2}$ was first derived in Ref. [5]:

$$\tan \beta_{3=2} = 0.24 \pm 0.03 : \quad (1)$$

$2\theta_{3=2} = \arg(A_{3=2} / A_{3=2}^*)$ is the relative phase between the amplitude for $B^0 \rightarrow (K^+)_{I=3=2}$ and its charge-conjugate. This phase can be measured in Dalitz analyses of $B^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-$ and $B^0(t) \rightarrow K_S^+ K^-$. Two corresponding analyses, performed by the BaBar collaboration in Refs. [1] and [6], measured the magnitudes of amplitudes for $B^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-$; $B^0 \rightarrow K^0 K^0$, their charge-conjugates and three relative phases,

$$\begin{aligned} \arg \frac{A(B^0 \rightarrow K^0 K^0)}{A(B^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-)} & ; \\ \arg \frac{A(B^0 \rightarrow K^0 K^0)}{A(B^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-)} & ; \\ \arg \frac{A(B^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-)}{A(B^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-)} & : \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

In Ref. [3] we have used these measurements, including negative log-likelihood values for $\theta_{3=2}$ and [1], to calculate a χ^2 dependence on $\tan \beta_{3=2}$. The log-likelihood values for $\theta_{3=2}$ and $\tan \beta_{3=2}$ have been recently corrected for a missing factor of

two [2]. This affects the χ^2 dependence on $\tan \beta_{3=2}$. The corrected dependence is plotted in Fig. 1. The broken purple curve corresponds to an unconstrained $\Re_{3=2} = \mathcal{A}_{3=2} j$, while the solid blue curve is obtained by imposing the bounds $0.8 < \Re_{3=2} = \mathcal{A}_{3=2} j < 1.2$, expected to hold in the Standard Model [3]. The latter curve defines a 1σ range,

$$39 < \tan \beta_{3=2} < 112 : \quad (3)$$




FIG. 1: χ^2 dependence on $\tan \beta_{3=2}$ for unconstrained $\Re_{3=2} j$ (broken purple line) and for $0.8 < \Re_{3=2} j < 1.2$ (solid blue line). A black horizontal line at $\chi^2 = 1$ defines 1σ ranges for $\tan \beta_{3=2}$.

Fig. 2 shows the linear constraint (1) with the large range of slopes (3) overlaid on CKM Fitter results following from [7, 8] $|V_{ub} V_{cb}^*| = 0.086 \pm 0.009$, obtained in semileptonic B decays, and values $\theta_{3=2} = (21.5 \pm 1.0)^\circ$, $\theta_{3=2} = (88 \pm 6)^\circ$ and $\theta_{3=2} = (53_{-18}^{+15} \pm 3 \pm 9)^\circ$ [9], obtained in $B \rightarrow J = K_S, B \rightarrow K^+ K^-$; $B \rightarrow K^+ K^-$ and $B \rightarrow D^{(*)} K^{(*)+}$, respectively. The small theoretical error in the $B \rightarrow K^0$ constraint [± 0.03 in Eq. (1)] is described by the difference between dark and light shaded regions in Fig. 2.

M.G. would like to thank the Enrico Fermi Institute at

On sabbatical leave from the Physics Department, Technion-Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa 32000, Israel




FIG. 2: Constraint in the $\bar{\rho}$ plane following from Eqs. (1) and (3). The dark shaded region marked $K\pi 1\sigma$ corresponds to the experimental error on R_{32} given by the 1σ range (3), while the light shaded region includes also the error 0.03 in (1). Also shown are CKM fitter constraints obtained using $|V_{ub}|$, $|V_{cb}|$, β ; γ ; and m_d [8].

the University of Chicago for its kind and generous hospitality. We thank Jacques Chauveau and José Ocariz for pointing out the correction in the results of the analysis in Ref. [2]. The work of M.G. was supported in part by the United States Department of Energy through Grant No. DE-FG02-90ER40560. The work of J.Z. was supported in part by the European Commission RTN network, Contract No. MRTN-CT-2006-035482 (FLAVIA net) and by the Slovenian Research Agency.

-
- [1] B. Aubert et al. [BABAR Collaboration], arXiv:0711.4417v1 [hep-ex], November 28, 2007.
- [2] B. Aubert et al. [BABAR Collaboration], arXiv:0711.4417v2 [hep-ex], May 14, 2008.
- [3] M. Gronau, D. Pirjol, A. Soni and J. Zupan, Phys. Rev. D 77, 057504 (2008) [arXiv:0712.3751 [hep-ph]].
- [4] L. Wolfenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. 51, 1945 (1983).
- [5] M. Gronau, D. Pirjol, A. Soni and J. Zupan, Phys. Rev. D 75, 014002 (2007). [arXiv:hep-ph/0608243]. See also M. Ciuchini, M. Pierini and L. Silvestrini, Phys. Rev. D 74, 051301 (R) (2006) [arXiv:hep-ph/0601233].
- [6] B. Aubert et al. [BABAR Collaboration], arXiv:0708.2097 [hep-ex].
- [7] E. Barberio et al. [Heavy Flavor Averaging Group (HFAG) Collaboration], arXiv:0704.3575 [hep-ex], regularly updated in <http://www.slac.stanford.edu/xorg/hfag>.
- [8] J. Charles et al. [CKM fitter Group], Eur. Phys. J. C 41, 1-131 (2005), regularly updated in <http://ckmfitter.in2p3.fr>.
- [9] A. Poluektov et al. [Belle Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D 73, 112009 (2006).