

Benchmarks for the New Physics Search through CP Violation in $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 K_S$

Robert Fleischer,^a Sebastian Jäger,^a Daniel Pirjol^b and Jure Zupan^{a,c,d}

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

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

^c J. Stefan Institute, Jamova 39, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia

^d Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, University of Ljubljana, Jadranska 19, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia

Abstract

Using isospin relations, we predict the Standard Model correlation between $S_{\pi^0 K_S} / (\sin 2\beta)_{\pi^0 K_S}$ and $A_{\pi^0 K_S}$, the mixing-induced and direct CP asymmetries of $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 K_S$. The calculation uses only SU(3) to fix the isospin-3/2 amplitude through the $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^0$ branching ratio, and thus has a small irreducible theoretical error. It can reach percent level precision thanks to expected future lattice-QCD progress for the calculation of the relevant SU(3)-breaking form-factor ratio, and serves as a benchmark for new-physics searches. We obtain an interesting picture in the $A_{\pi^0 K_S} / S_{\pi^0 K_S}$ plane, where the current experimental data show a discrepancy with the Standard Model, and comment on the direct CP asymmetries of $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 K^+$ and $B^+ \rightarrow \pi^0 K^+$. A modified electroweak penguin with a large new CP-violating phase can explain the discrepancy and allows us to accommodate also the corresponding data for other $b \rightarrow s$ penguin-dominated decays.

Benchmarks for the New Physics Search through CP Violation in $B^0 \rightarrow 0K_S$

Robert Fleischer,¹ Sebastian Jager,¹ Dan Pirjol,² and Jure Zupan^{1,3,4}

¹Theory Division, Department of Physics, CERN, CH-1211 Geneva 23, Switzerland

²National Institute for Physics and Nuclear Engineering,

Department of Particle Physics, 077125 Bucharest, Romania

³J. Stefan Institute, Jamova 39, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia

⁴Faculty of mathematics and physics, University of Ljubljana, Jadranska 19, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia

(Dated: June 18, 2008)

Using isospin relations, we predict the Standard Model correlation between $S_{0K_S}(\sin 2\beta)_{0K_S}$ and A_{0K_S} , the mixing-induced and direct CP asymmetries of $B^0 \rightarrow 0K_S$. The calculation uses favour SU(3) only to fix the isospin-3/2 amplitude through the $B^0 \rightarrow 0K_S$ branching ratio, and thus has a small irreducible theoretical error. It can reach percent level precision thanks to expected future lattice-QCD progress for the calculation of the relevant SU(3)-breaking form-factor ratio, and serves as a benchmark for new-physics searches. We obtain an interesting picture in the $A_{0K_S}\{S_{0K_S}$ plane, where the current experimental data show a discrepancy with the Standard Model, and comment on the direct CP asymmetries of $B^0 \rightarrow K^+$ and $B^+ \rightarrow 0K^+$. A modified electroweak penguin with a large new CP-violating phase can explain the discrepancy and allows us to accommodate also the corresponding data for other $b \rightarrow s$ penguin-dominated decays.

Keywords: CP violation, non-leptonic B decays

Intriguing experimental results for observables of non-leptonic $b \rightarrow s$ decays [1] have been receiving considerable attention for several years, where the “ $B \rightarrow K$ puzzle” is an important example (see, e.g., [2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7]). The challenge is to disentangle possible signals of new physics (NP) from uncertainties that are related to strong interactions. In this context, a particularly interesting probe is offered by the time-dependent CP asymmetry in $B^0 \rightarrow 0K_S$,

$$\frac{\text{Im}(A_{0K_S}(t))}{\text{Re}(A_{0K_S}(t))} = A_{0K_S} \cos(M_d t) + S_{0K_S} \sin(M_d t); \quad (1)$$

where S_{0K_S} arises from interference between mixing and decay, and A_{0K_S} is the “direct” CP asymmetry. In the Standard Model (SM), we have (up to doubly Cabibbo-suppressed terms) the following expressions [8]:

$$A_{0K_S} = 0; \quad S_{0K_S} = (\sin 2\beta)_{0K_S} \sin 2\beta; \quad (2)$$

where β is one of the angles in the standard unitarity triangle (UT) of the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) matrix. The current world average is [1]

$$(\sin 2\beta)_{0K_S} = 0.58 \pm 0.17; \quad (3)$$

which should be compared with the “reference” value following from $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K_S$ and similar modes

$$(\sin 2\beta)_{J/\psi K_S} = 0.681 \pm 0.025; \quad (4)$$

The search for NP signals in the CP asymmetries of $B^0 \rightarrow 0K_S$ requires a reliable SM prediction of S_{0K_S} and/or A_{0K_S} . In this letter, we show that S_{0K_S} can be

calculated in the SM as a function of A_{0K_S} , with projected irreducible theoretical errors at the percent level. The starting point is the isospin relation [9]:

$$\frac{1}{2} A_{0K_S}(B^0 \rightarrow 0K^0) + A_{0K_S}(B^0 \rightarrow K^+) = (\hat{T} + \hat{C})e^i + \hat{P}_{EW}^i 3A_{3=2}; \quad (5)$$

a similar relation holds for the CP-conjugate amplitudes, with $A_{3=2} \rightarrow A_{3=2}^*$ and $\hat{P}_{EW} \rightarrow \hat{P}_{EW}^*$. Here \hat{T}, \hat{C} and \hat{P}_{EW} are, respectively, the colour-allowed tree, colour-suppressed tree and electroweak penguin (EWP) contributions [10]. The subscript of $A_{3=2}$ reminds us that the K final state has isospin $I = 3/2$, so that the individual QCD penguin contributions cancel in (5). S_{0K_S} can be written as

$$S_{0K_S} = \frac{2\text{Im}(A_{00}A_{00}^*)}{\text{Re}(A_{00}A_{00}^*)} \sin(2\beta)_{0K_S}; \quad (6)$$

with $A_{00} = A(B^0 \rightarrow 0K^0)$ and $A_{00} = A(B^0 \rightarrow 0K^0)$ [11]. If $A_{3=2}$ and $A_{3=2}^*$ are known, $(\sin 2\beta)_{0K_S} = \arg(A_{00}A_{00}^*)$ can be fixed through (5), as shown in Fig. 1. In order to determine $A_{3=2}$, we first rewrite the lower line of (5) as

$$3A_{3=2} = (\hat{T} + \hat{C})e^i - qe^{i1}; \quad (7)$$

In the SM, the ratio $qe^{i1} = \hat{P}_{EW}^i = (\hat{T} + \hat{C})$ is given by

$$qe^{i1} = \frac{3}{2} \frac{C_9(\mu) + C_{10}(\mu)}{2R_b C_1(\mu) + C_2(\mu)} R_q = 0.66 \frac{0.41}{R_b} R_q; \quad (8)$$

where $\text{Im}(V_{us}) = 0.22, R_b = 0.41 \pm 0.04 / \text{Im}(V_{cb})$ is a UT side (value follows from [13]), and the C s are Wilson coefficients. If we assume exact SU(3) flavour symmetry and neglect penguin contractions, we have $R_q = 1$




FIG. 1: The isospin relations (5) in the complex plane. The magnitudes of the amplitudes, \hat{A}_{ij} ($\hat{A}(B \rightarrow K^{i,j})$) and \hat{A}_{ij}^* ($\hat{A}(B \rightarrow K^{i,j})^*$), can be obtained from the corresponding branching ratios and direct CP asymmetries listed in Table I, while $A_{3=2}$ and $A_{3=2}$ are fixed through (8) and (9).

TABLE I: World averages of experimental data after ICHEP08 used in the numerical analyses (see also [1]).

Mode	BR [10^{-6}]	A_{CP}	S_{CP}
$B^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-$	19.4 ± 0.6	0.098 ± 0.012	
$B^0 \rightarrow K^0 K^0$	9.8 ± 0.6	0.01 ± 0.10	0.58 ± 0.17
$B^+ \rightarrow K^+ K^0$	5.59 ± 0.41	0	
$B^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^+$	5.16 ± 0.22	0.38 ± 0.06	0.65 ± 0.07
$B^0 \rightarrow K^0 K^0$	1.55 ± 0.19	0.43 ± 0.25	

[11, 12], while we shall use $R_q = 1 \pm 0.3$ for the numerical analysis (results are robust with respect to the strong phase!). Since $q\bar{e}^{i1}$ factorizes at leading order (LO) in the $1=m_b$ expansion, R_q can be well predicted using factorization techniques and future input from lattice QCD.

SU(3) flavour symmetry allows us furthermore to extract $\hat{f}^+ + \hat{C}^+$ through the $b \rightarrow d$ decay $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ K^0$ [14]:

$$\hat{f}^+ + \hat{C}^+ = R_{T+C} \hat{f}_{us} = V_{ud} \hat{f}^+ \hat{A}(B^+ \rightarrow K^+ K^0); \quad (9)$$

where the tiny EW P contributions to $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ K^0$ were neglected, but could be included using isospin [11, 15]. We stress that (9) does not rely on further dynamical assumptions. For the SU(3)-breaking parameter $R_{T+C} = f_K/f$ we use the value 1.22 ± 0.2 , where the error is quite conservative, as discussed below.

Relations (7)-(9) allow us to determine $A_{3=2}$ and $A_{3=2}$, thereby fixing the two isospin triangles in Fig. 1. Since the triangles can be flipped around the $A_{3=2}$ and $A_{3=2}$ sides, we encounter a fourfold ambiguity (not shown). Using (6), S_{0K_S} is determined as well. The corresponding prediction is shown in Fig. 2, where we keep A_{0K_S} as a free parameter. For the implementation of this construction, we express the curves in Fig. 2 in parametric form [2] as functions of a strong phase ϕ_c , defined through

$$r_c e^{i\phi_c} = \hat{f}^+ + \hat{C}^+ = \hat{P}^+; \quad (10)$$

where \hat{P}^+ is the $B^0 \rightarrow K^+$ penguin amplitude [10]. We find that no solutions exist for certain ranges of ϕ_c , separating the full $[0; 360]$ range into two regions. They contain $\phi_c = 0$ or 180 and correspond to the left and




FIG. 2: The SM constraints in the A_{0K_S} (S_{0K_S}) plane, as explained in the text. Left panel: contains $\phi_c = 0$ (consistent with QCD), with $\phi_c = 60$ (small circle), 30 (large circle), 0 (star), 30 (large square), 60 (small square). Right panel: contains $\phi_c = 180$ (not consistent with QCD), with $\phi_c = 120$ (small circle), 150 (large circle), 180 (star), 210 (large square), 240 (small square). The shaded horizontal bands represent the value of $(\sin 2 \phi)_{K_S}$ in (4).




FIG. 3: The constraints on $r_c e^{i\phi_c}$ that follow from the current data, as discussed in the text. Left panel: $B \rightarrow K$ and $B \rightarrow K^*$ constraints (the symbols to label ϕ_c correspond to those in Fig. 2). Right panel: $B \rightarrow K^*$ constraints for the BaBar and Belle data for A_+ and the HFAV average. The solid and dotted lines refer to 1 and 90% C.L. ranges, respectively.

right panels of Fig. 2, respectively. As one circles the trajectory in either panel by changing ϕ_c , each value of this strong phase in the respective interval is attained twice. In order to illustrate this feature, we show $\{ \}$ for central values of the input data/parameters (points corresponding to various choices of ϕ_c). The bands show the 1 variations obtained by adding in quadrature the errors due to all input data/parameters. Moreover, we assume $\phi_c = 65 \pm 10$ [16, 17]. This angle will be determined with excellent accuracy thanks to CP violation measurements in pure tree B decays at the LHCb experiment (CERN).

In order to resolve the fourfold ambiguity in Fig. 2, we need further information on r_c , ϕ_c : i) r_c can be determined if we extract $\hat{f}^+ + \hat{C}^+$ through $BR(B^+ \rightarrow K^+ K^0)$ (see (9)) and $\hat{f}^+ \hat{f}^+$ through $BR(B^+ \rightarrow K^+ K^0) / \hat{f}^+ \hat{f}^+ + \dots$, where the dots represent negligible doubly Cabibbo-suppressed terms that are already strongly constrained by data [18]. In the left panel of Fig. 3, the corresponding r_c constraint is shown at the "charged" circle. ii) Using the SU(3) flavour symmetry and other plausible dynamical assumptions [2], a fit to all available $B \rightarrow K^*$ data yields the




FIG. 4: The correlation in the $A_{0K_S}\{S_{0K_S}$ plane for a future benchmark scenario (narrow band) in comparison with the current situation (wider band), as explained in the text.

curves. Since BaBar and Belle do not fully agree on the measurement of the direct CP asymmetry in $B^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-$ [1], we show in the right panel of Fig. 3 the corresponding allowed regions separately. We observe that the data imply $\rho_c \approx 0\{30$, in agreement with the heavy-quark expansion analyses in [4, 19] and [20], differing in their treatment of non-perturbative charm-penguin contributions. Consequently, we can exclude the solutions shown in the right panel of Fig. 2, and are left with the twofold solution in the left panel. However, the lower band corresponds to ρ_c values of the "neutral" region in the left panel of Fig. 3 that are far to the right of the displayed region, drastically inconsistent both with the $B^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-$ data and with the heavy-quark limit.

Consequently, we are left with the thin horizontal part of the upper band in the left panel of Fig. 2, which we show enlarged in Fig. 4. Using the experimental value for A_{0K_S} , we obtain the SM prediction

$$S_{0K_S} = 0.99^{+0.01}_{-0.08} \exp^{+0.000}_{-0.001} R_{T+C}^{+0.00}_{-0.11} R_q^{+0.00}_{-0.07}; \quad (11)$$

which is about two standard deviations away from the experimental result in (3). It should be noted that (11) depends on the input data collected in Table I.

In Fig. 4, we show the future theory error benchmark for the SM constraint in the $A_{0K_S}\{S_{0K_S}$ plane. Both R_q (8) and R_{T+C} (9) factorize at LO in the $1/m_b$ expansion, and can be well predicted using input from lattice QCD. It should be stressed that "charm penguins" do not enter these ratios. As a working tool we use the approach of Ref. [4, 19] (BBNS), but similar conclusions can be reached using Ref. [20] (where also derivatives of form factors would be needed). The key parameter is R_q , which dominates the current theoretical error (11). Its uncertainty is governed by the SU(3)-breaking form-factor ratio $\frac{F^{B^0 \rightarrow K}(0)}{F^{B^0 \rightarrow K^0}(0)} = F^{B^0 \rightarrow K}(0)$. If we assume $\frac{F^{B^0 \rightarrow K}(0)}{F^{B^0 \rightarrow K^0}(0)} = 1.2(1 \pm 0.03)$, i.e. a 20% determination of the SU(3)-breaking corrections, as an optimistic (but achievable) goal for lattice QCD, we obtain the BBNS result $R_q = (0.908^{+0.052}_{-0.043})e^{i(0^{+1})}$, to be compared with the present value $R_q = (1.02^{+0.27}_{-0.22})e^{i(0^{+1})}$ [21]. Similarly, we find $R_{T+C} = 1.23^{+0.02}_{-0.03}$, where the increase of




FIG. 5: The SM correlation between $A_{0K^+} - A_{K^+}$ and A_{0K_S} for central values of inputs, with hadronic parameters fixed as for Fig. 2 (solid), or following from the sum rule for rate differences [24] (dashed). The dependence on ρ_c is as in Fig. 2 and is constrained to SM values (upper curve in Fig. 2a).

precision is very mild as the form-factor dependence essentially cancels out. Setting, moreover, the uncertainties of the experimental inputs to zero, while keeping central values fixed, we obtain a prediction of S_{0K_S} with errors at the percent level, as shown in Fig. 4. Consequently, the irreducible theory error of our proposed method for predicting S_{0K_S} in the SM is much smaller than in calculations using only the $1/m_b$ expansion, and makes it promising for a future e^+e^- super-B factory (for a review, see, e.g., Ref. [22]).

Before turning to the interpretation of the current experimental data in terms of NP, let us briefly comment on the difference of direct CP asymmetries $A_{0K^+} - A_{K^+}$, which recently received quite some attention as a possible sign of NP [23]. Fig. 5 shows the SM correlation between this difference and the CP asymmetry A_{0K_S} , keeping A_{K^+} fixed. It depends on CP-averaged $B^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-$ branching ratios and ρ_c , and becomes equivalent to the sum rule for rate differences [24] when neglecting higher orders in subleading amplitudes. We see that current data (cross) can be accommodated in the SM within the error on A_{0K_S} , although hadronic amplitudes then deviate from the $1/m_b$ pattern (see also Ref. [7]). It would be desirable to reduce this uncertainty in the future.

Let us now consider a NP scenario, which allows us to resolve the discrepancy between (3) and (11). Following [2], we assume that NP manifests itself effectively in the data as a modified EW P with a CP-violating NP phase ϕ , i.e. $q^1 \rightarrow q^1 e^{i\phi}$ in (7). Here q can differ from the SM value in (8). Since ρ_c is rather small, the impact of this type of NP on A_{0K_S} and A_{0K^+} is suppressed. In Fig. 6, we show constraints on q^1 from two $B^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-$ decays, using only the $B^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-$ data or both the $B^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-$ and $B^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^0$ data. The latter have a strong impact on the allowed region of q^1 [2, 7], yielding two almost degenerate minima, $q = 1.3 \pm 0.4$, $\phi = (63^{+10}_9)$ and $q = 0.8^{+0.2}_{-0.3}$, $\phi = (45^{+18}_{28})$. We also show the 90% C.L. regions (dashed curves) that correspond to a future scenario, assuming the benchmark value of R_q used in Fig. 4 and ten-times more data, with




FIG. 6: Constraints on qe^i . Left panel: $2\text{-}t$, using only the $B \rightarrow K$ data. Right panel: $2\text{-}t$, using both the $B \rightarrow K$ and $B \rightarrow \pi$ data. The inner and outer regions correspond to 1 and 90% C.L., respectively, while the stars denote the minimums of the fits. The 90% C.L. regions with 10 times more data lie inside the dotted lines (see also the text).




FIG. 7: Mixing-induced CP asymmetries for a set of penguin-dominated B^0 decays as functions of $q \sin(\phi)$, with $q \cos(\phi)$ fixed to 0.6. The vertical bars depict the experimental ranges [1]. The $1\text{-}\sigma$ range (vertical band) and best-fit values (dashed line) for $q \sin(\phi)$ from Fig. 6 are also shown.

central values fixed to the present $2\text{-}t$ minimum. In the $2\text{-}t$ fits we allow all ratios of SU(3)-related amplitudes to fluctuate freely around $f_K = f_\pi$ within 30% in magnitude and 30 in phase.

The possibility of resolving the discrepancy between (3) and (11) through a modified EW P is intriguing. We next illustrate that the observed pattern of the mixing-induced CP asymmetries in other penguin-dominated $b \rightarrow s$ decays [1] can also be accommodated in the same NP scenario. In Fig. 7, we show the results of a BBNS calculation of the S parameters for four channels of this kind: we assume that all electroweak Wilson coefficients are rescaled by the same factor qe^i , and use as input the preferred data set \mathcal{G}'' of [21]. The value of qe^i is then varied along a contour that runs vertically through the preferred region in Fig. 6. Unlike the SM, the modified EW P scenario allows us to accommodate the data well (see, e.g., also [7, 25]). The same is true for a more specific scenario where the effective FCNC couplings of the Z boson at the weak scale are suitably modified. Since S_{0K_S} receives a tiny, negative shift from $\sin 2\beta_{\text{eff}}$, in agreement with the data, we do not show this in Fig. 7.

In conclusion, we have demonstrated that the SM cor-

relation in the $A_{0K_S} \{S_{0K_S}\}$ plane can be predicted reliably in the SM, with small irreducible theoretical errors, and have shown that the resolution of the present discrepancy with the data can be achieved through a modified EW P sector, with a large CP-violating NP phase.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank D. Becirevic, M. Della Morte and A. Kronfeld for useful discussions of lattice QCD. S.J. is supported in part by the RTN European Program MRTN-CT-2004-503369.

-
- [1] E. Barbiero et al. [Heavy Flavour Averaging Group Collaboration], arXiv:0704.3575; updates are available at <http://www.slac.stanford.edu/xorg/hfag/>.
 - [2] A. J. Buras et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. 92, 101804 (2004); Nucl. Phys. B 697, 133 (2004).
 - [3] T. Yoshikawa, Phys. Rev. D 68, 054023 (2003); M. Gronau and J. L. Rosner, Phys. Lett. B 572, 43 (2003); A. J. Buras et al., Eur. Phys. J. C 32, 45 (2003); V. Barger et al., Phys. Lett. B 598, 218 (2004); Y. L. Wu and Y. F. Zhou, Phys. Rev. D 72, 034037 (2005); T. Feldmann et al., arXiv:0803.3729 [hep-ph], S. Baek et al., Phys. Rev. D 71, 057502 (2005) S. Baek and D. London, Phys. Lett. B 653, 249 (2007), K. A. Gashe et al., arXiv:hep-ph/0509117.
 - [4] M. Beneke and M. Neubert, Nucl. Phys. B 675, 333 (2003).
 - [5] M. Gronau and J. L. Rosner, Phys. Rev. D 71, 074019 (2005); Phys. Lett. B 644, 237 (2007).
 - [6] M. Gronau et al. Phys. Rev. D 74, 093003 (2006).
 - [7] R. Fleischer et al., Eur. Phys. J. C 51, 55 (2007).
 - [8] R. Fleischer, Phys. Lett. B 365, 399 (1996).
 - [9] Y. Nir and H. R. Quinn, Phys. Rev. Lett. 67, 541 (1991); M. Gronau et al., Phys. Rev. D 52, 6374 (1995).
 - [10] We are using a notation very similar to [2], with $\hat{T}^0 = \hat{J}_{ub}V_{us}^* \hat{T}^0$, $\hat{C}^0 = \hat{J}_{ub}V_{us}^* \hat{C}^0$ and $\hat{P}^0 = \hat{J}_{cb}V_{cs}^* \hat{P}^0$, while the quantities q, ϕ, r_c and r_s agree with [2].
 - [11] A. J. Buras and R. Fleischer, Eur. Phys. J. C 11, 93 (1999).
 - [12] M. Neubert and J. L. Rosner, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 5076 (1998).
 - [13] T. Mannel, seminar given at CERN, May 8th, 2008.
 - [14] M. Gronau et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. 73, 21 (1994).
 - [15] M. Gronau et al., Phys. Rev. D 60 (1999) 034021 [Erratum-ibid. D 69 (2004) 119901].
 - [16] M. Bona et al. [UTfit Collaboration], JHEP 0507, 028 (2005); updates: <http://utfit.roma1.infn.it/>.
 - [17] J. Charles et al. [CKMfitter Group], Eur. Phys. J. C 41, 1 (2005); updates: <http://ckmfitter.in2p3.fr/>.
 - [18] R. Fleischer, Eur. Phys. J. C 52, 267 (2007).
 - [19] M. Beneke et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 1914 (1999).
 - [20] C. W. Bauer et al., Phys. Rev. D 70, 054015 (2004), Phys. Rev. D 74, 034010 (2006); A. R. Williamson and J. Zupan, Phys. Rev. D 74, 014003 (2006).
 - [21] M. Beneke and S. Jager, Nucl. Phys. B 768, 51 (2007).
 - [22] T. E. Browder et al., arXiv:0802.3201 [hep-ph].
 - [23] S.-W. Lin et al. [Belle Collaboration], Nature 452, 332 (2008).
 - [24] M. Gronau and J. L. Rosner, Phys. Rev. D 74, 057503

(2006).

[25] G. Buchalla et al., JHEP 0509, 074 (2005). M. Beneke,

Phys. Lett. B 620, 143 (2005).