

CP Violation and New Physics in B_s Decays

Robert Fleischer

Theory Division, CERN, CH-1211 Geneva 23, Switzerland

Abstract

The B_s -meson system is a key element in the B -physics programme of hadron colliders, offering various avenues to explore CP violation and to search for new physics. One of the most prominent decays is $B_s \rightarrow J/\psi\phi$, the counterpart of $B_d \rightarrow J/\psi K_S$, providing a powerful tool to search for new-physics contributions to B_s^0 - \bar{B}_s^0 mixing. Another benchmark mode is $B_s \rightarrow K^+K^-$, which complements $B_d \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$, thereby allowing an extraction of the angle γ of the unitarity triangle that is sensitive to new-physics effects in the QCD penguin sector. Finally, we discuss new methods to constrain and determine γ with the help of $B_s \rightarrow D_s^{(*)\pm}K^\mp$ decays, which complement $B_d \rightarrow D^{(*)\pm}\pi^\mp$ modes. Since these strategies involve “tree” decays, the values of γ thus extracted exhibit a small sensitivity on new physics.

*Invited talk at FPCP 2003 – Flavour Physics & CP Violation
Ecole Polytechnique, Paris, France, 3–6 June 2003
To appear in the Proceedings*

CP Violation and New Physics in B_s Decays

Robert Fleischer

Theory Division, CERN
CH-1211 Geneva 23, Switzerland

The B_s -meson system is a key element in the B -physics programme of hadron colliders, offering various avenues to explore CP violation and to search for new physics. One of the most prominent decays is $B_s \rightarrow J/\psi\phi$, the counterpart of $B_d \rightarrow J/\psi K_S$, providing a powerful tool to search for new-physics contributions to $B_s^0-\overline{B}_s^0$ mixing. Another benchmark mode is $B_s \rightarrow K^+K^-$, which complements $B_d \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$, thereby allowing an extraction of the angle γ of the unitarity triangle that is sensitive to new-physics effects in the QCD penguin sector. Finally, we discuss new methods to constrain and determine γ with the help of $B_s \rightarrow D_s^{(*)\pm}K^\mp$ decays, which complement $B_d \rightarrow D^{(*)\pm}\pi^\mp$ modes. Since these strategies involve “tree” decays, the values of γ thus extracted exhibit a small sensitivity on new physics.

1 Setting the Stage

At the e^+e^- B factories operating at the $\Upsilon(4S)$ resonance, B_s mesons are not accessible, i.e. their decays cannot be explored by the BaBar, Belle and CLEO collaborations. On the other hand, plenty of B_s mesons will be produced at hadron colliders. Consequently, these particles are the “El Dorado” for B -decay studies at run II of the Tevatron [1], and later on at the LHC [2]. A detailed overview of the physics potential of B_s mesons can be found in [3].

An important aspect of B_s physics is the mass difference ΔM_s , which can be complemented with ΔM_d to determine the side $R_t \propto |V_{td}/V_{cb}|$ of the unitarity triangle (UT). To this end, we use that $|V_{cb}| = |V_{ts}|$ to a good accuracy in the Standard Model (SM), and require an $SU(3)$ -breaking parameter, which can be determined, e.g. on the lattice. At the moment, only experimental lower bounds on ΔM_s are available, which can be converted into upper bounds on R_t , implying $\gamma \lesssim 90^\circ$ [4]. Once ΔM_s is measured, more stringent constraints on γ will emerge.

Another interesting quantity is the width difference $\Delta\Gamma_s$. While $\Delta\Gamma_d/\Gamma_d$ is negligibly small, where Γ_d is the average decay width of the B_d mass eigenstates, $\Delta\Gamma_s/\Gamma_s$ may well be as large as $\mathcal{O}(10\%)$ [5], thereby allowing interesting studies with “untagged” B_s decay rates of the kind

$$\langle \Gamma(B_s(t) \rightarrow f) \rangle \equiv \Gamma(B_s^0(t) \rightarrow f) + \Gamma(\overline{B}_s^0(t) \rightarrow f), \quad (1)$$

where we do not distinguish between initially present B_s^0 or \overline{B}_s^0 mesons [6].

The focus of the following discussion will be CP violation. If we consider the decay of a neutral B_q meson ($q \in \{d, s\}$) into a final state $|f\rangle$, which is an eigenstate of the CP operator satisfying $(\mathcal{CP})|f\rangle = \pm|f\rangle$, we obtain the following time-dependent CP asymmetry [3]:

$$\frac{\Gamma(B_q^0(t) \rightarrow f) - \Gamma(\overline{B}_q^0(t) \rightarrow f)}{\Gamma(B_q^0(t) \rightarrow f) + \Gamma(\overline{B}_q^0(t) \rightarrow f)} = \left[\frac{\mathcal{A}_{\text{CP}}^{\text{dir}} \cos(\Delta M_q t) + \mathcal{A}_{\text{CP}}^{\text{mix}} \sin(\Delta M_q t)}{\cosh(\Delta\Gamma_q t/2) - \mathcal{A}_{\Delta\Gamma} \sinh(\Delta\Gamma_q t/2)} \right], \quad (2)$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{CP}}^{\text{dir}} \equiv \frac{1 - |\xi_f^{(q)}|^2}{1 + |\xi_f^{(q)}|^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{A}_{\text{CP}}^{\text{mix}} \equiv \frac{2 \text{Im} \xi_f^{(q)}}{1 + |\xi_f^{(q)}|^2}, \quad (3)$$

with

$$\xi_f^{(q)} = -e^{-i\phi_q} \left[\frac{A(\overline{B}_q^0 \rightarrow f)}{A(B_q^0 \rightarrow f)} \right], \quad (4)$$

describe the ‘‘direct’’ and ‘‘mixing-induced’’ CP-violating observables, respectively. In the SM, the CP-violating weak B_q^0 - \overline{B}_q^0 mixing phase ϕ_q is associated with the well-known box diagrams, and is given by

$$\phi_q = 2 \arg(V_{tq}^* V_{tb}) = \begin{cases} +2\beta & (q = d) \\ -2\lambda^2 \eta & (q = s), \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

where β is the usual angle of the UT. Looking at (2), we observe that $\Delta\Gamma_q$ provides another observable $\mathcal{A}_{\Delta\Gamma}$, which is, however, not independent from those in (3).

The preferred mechanism for new physics (NP) to manifest itself in (2) is through contributions to B_q^0 - \overline{B}_q^0 mixing, which is a CKM-suppressed, loop-induced, fourth-order weak-interaction process within the SM. Simple dimensional arguments suggest that NP in the TeV regime may well affect the ΔM_q , as well as the ϕ_q . If NP enters differently in ΔM_d and ΔM_s , the determination of R_t from $\Delta M_d/\Delta M_s$ would be affected. On the other hand, NP contributions to ϕ_q would affect the mixing-induced CP asymmetries $\mathcal{A}_{\text{CP}}^{\text{mix}}$. Scenarios of this kind were considered in several papers; for a selection, see [7]–[11]. Thanks to the ‘‘golden’’ mode $B_d \rightarrow J/\psi K_S$, direct measurements of $\sin \phi_d$ are already available. The current world average is given by $\sin \phi_d \sim 0.734$, which is in accordance with the indirect range following from the ‘‘CKM fits’’ [4]. Despite this remarkable feature, NP may still hide in the experimental value for $\sin \phi_d$, since it implies $\phi_d \sim 47^\circ \vee 133^\circ$, where the former solution would be consistent with the SM, while the second would require NP contributions to B_d^0 - \overline{B}_d^0 mixing. In order to explore these two solutions further, we may complement them with CP violation in $B_d \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-$ [12]. Following these lines [11], we obtain an allowed region in the $\overline{\rho}$ - $\overline{\eta}$ plane that is consistent with the SM for $\phi_d \sim 47^\circ$. In the case of $\phi_d \sim 133^\circ$, we arrive at a range in the second quadrant, which corresponds to $\gamma > 90$ and is consistent with the ε_K hyperbola. Interestingly, also this exciting possibility cannot be discarded. The current $B_d \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-$ data do not yet allow us to draw definite conclusions, but the situation will significantly improve in the future. As far as B_s decays are concerned, the burning question in this context is whether ϕ_s , which is tiny in the SM, as can be seen in (5), is made sizeable through NP effects. In order to address this issue, the $B_s \rightarrow J/\psi \phi$ channel plays the key rôle.

2 $B_s \rightarrow J/\psi \phi$

This decay is the counterpart of $B_d \rightarrow J/\psi K_S$, and exhibits an analogous amplitude structure:

$$A(B_s \rightarrow J/\psi \phi) \propto [1 + \lambda^2 a e^{i\vartheta} e^{i\gamma}]. \quad (6)$$

Here γ is the usual angle of the UT, and the hadronic parameter $a e^{i\vartheta}$ measures the ratio of penguin to tree contributions, which is naïvely expected to be of $\mathcal{O}(\overline{\lambda})$, where $\overline{\lambda} = \mathcal{O}(\lambda) =$

$\mathcal{O}(0.2)$ is a “generic” expansion parameter [10]. In contrast to $B_d \rightarrow J/\psi K_S$, the final state of $B_s \rightarrow J/\psi\phi$ is an admixture of different CP eigenstates, which can be disentangled through an angular analysis of the $J/\psi[\rightarrow \ell^+\ell^-]\phi[\rightarrow K^+K^-]$ decay products [13]. Their angular distribution exhibits tiny direct CP violation, whereas mixing-induced CP-violating effects allow the extraction of

$$\sin\phi_s + \mathcal{O}(\bar{\lambda}^3) = \sin\phi_s + \mathcal{O}(10^{-3}). \quad (7)$$

Since we have $\phi_s = -2\lambda^2\eta = \mathcal{O}(10^{-2})$ in the SM, the determination of this phase from (7) is affected by generic hadronic uncertainties of $\mathcal{O}(10\%)$, which may become important for the LHC era. These uncertainties can be controlled with the help of $B_d \rightarrow J/\psi\rho^0$ [14].

Another interesting aspect of the $B_s \rightarrow J/\psi\phi$ angular distribution is that it allows also the determination of $\cos\delta_f \cos\phi_s$, where δ_f is a CP-conserving strong phase. If we fix the *sign* of $\cos\delta_f$ through factorization, we may fix the sign of $\cos\phi_s$, which allows an *unambiguous* determination of ϕ_s [15]. In this context, $B_s \rightarrow D_\pm\eta^{(\prime)}, D_\pm\phi, \dots$ decays are also interesting [16].

The big hope is that experiments will find a *sizeable* value of $\sin\phi_s$, which would immediately signal NP. There are recent NP analyses where such a feature actually emerges, for example, within SUSY [17], or specific left–right-symmetric models [18].

3 $B_s \rightarrow K^+K^-$

The decay $B_s \rightarrow K^+K^-$ is dominated by QCD penguins and complements $B_d \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ nicely, thereby allowing a determination of γ with the help of U -spin flavour-symmetry arguments [19]. Within the SM, we may write the corresponding decay amplitudes as follows:

$$A(B_d^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-) \propto [e^{i\gamma} - de^{i\theta}], \quad A(B_s^0 \rightarrow K^+K^-) \propto \left[e^{i\gamma} + \left(\frac{1-\lambda^2}{\lambda^2} \right) d'e^{i\theta'} \right], \quad (8)$$

where the hadronic parameters $de^{i\theta}$ and $d'e^{i\theta'}$ measure the ratios of penguin to tree contributions to $B_d^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ and $B_s^0 \rightarrow K^+K^-$, respectively. Consequently, we obtain

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{CP}}^{\text{dir}}(B_d \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-) = \text{function}(d, \theta, \gamma), \quad \mathcal{A}_{\text{CP}}^{\text{mix}}(B_d \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-) = \text{function}(d, \theta, \gamma, \phi_d) \quad (9)$$

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{CP}}^{\text{dir}}(B_s \rightarrow K^+K^-) = \text{function}(d', \theta', \gamma), \quad \mathcal{A}_{\text{CP}}^{\text{mix}}(B_s \rightarrow K^+K^-) = \text{function}(d', \theta', \gamma, \phi_s). \quad (10)$$

As we saw above, ϕ_d and ϕ_s can “straightforwardly” be fixed, also if NP should contribute to $B_q^0\text{--}\overline{B}_q^0$ mixing. Consequently, $\mathcal{A}_{\text{CP}}^{\text{dir}}(B_d \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-)$ and $\mathcal{A}_{\text{CP}}^{\text{mix}}(B_d \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-)$ allow us to eliminate θ , thereby yielding d as a function of γ in a *theoretically clean* way. Analogously, we may fix d' as a function of γ with the help of $\mathcal{A}_{\text{CP}}^{\text{dir}}(B_s \rightarrow K^+K^-)$ and $\mathcal{A}_{\text{CP}}^{\text{mix}}(B_s \rightarrow K^+K^-)$.

If we look at the corresponding Feynman diagrams, we observe that $B_d \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ and $B_s \rightarrow K^+K^-$ are related to each other through an interchange of all down and strange quarks. Because of this feature, the U -spin flavour symmetry of strong interactions implies

$$d = d', \quad \theta = \theta'. \quad (11)$$

Applying the former relation, we may extract γ and d from the clean γ - d and γ - d' contours. Moreover, we may also determine θ and θ' , allowing an interesting check of the second relation.

This strategy is very promising from an experimental point of view: at CDF-II and LHCb, experimental accuracies for γ of $\mathcal{O}(10^\circ)$ and $\mathcal{O}(1^\circ)$, respectively, are expected [1, 2, 20]. As far as U -spin-breaking corrections are concerned, they enter the determination of γ through a relative shift of the γ - d and γ - d' contours; their impact on the extracted value of γ depends on the form of these curves, which is fixed through the measured observables. In the examples discussed in [3, 19], the result for γ would be very robust under such corrections.

As we have already noted, $B_s \rightarrow K^+K^-$ is not accessible at the BaBar and Belle detectors. However, since we obtain $B_s \rightarrow K^+K^-$ from $B_d \rightarrow \pi^\mp K^\pm$ through a replacement of the down spectator quark through a strange quark, we have $\text{BR}(B_s \rightarrow K^+K^-) \approx \text{BR}(B_d \rightarrow \pi^\mp K^\pm)$. In order to play with the B -factory data, we may then consider

$$H = \left(\frac{1 - \lambda^2}{\lambda^2} \right) \left(\frac{f_K}{f_\pi} \right)^2 \left[\frac{\text{BR}(B_d \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-)}{\text{BR}(B_d \rightarrow \pi^\mp K^\pm)} \right] \sim 7.5. \quad (12)$$

If we use (8) and (11), we may write

$$H = \text{function}(d, \theta, \gamma), \quad (13)$$

which complements (9) and provides sufficient information to extract γ , d and θ [19, 21]. This approach was applied in the UT analysis sketched at the end of Section 1, following [11]. Interestingly, H implies also a very narrow SM “target range” in the $\mathcal{A}_{\text{CP}}^{\text{mix}}(B_s \rightarrow K^+K^-)$ - $\mathcal{A}_{\text{CP}}^{\text{dir}}(B_s \rightarrow K^+K^-)$ plane [12]. The measurement of $\text{BR}(B_s \rightarrow K^+K^-)$, which is expected to be soon available from CDF-II [22], will already be an important achievement, allowing a better determination of H . Once also the CP asymmetries of this channel have been measured, we may fully exploit the physics potential of the $B_s \rightarrow K^+K^-$, $B_d \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ system [19].

4 $B_s \rightarrow D_s^{(*)\pm} K^\mp$

Let us finally turn to colour-allowed “tree” decays of the kind $B_s \rightarrow D_s^{(*)\pm} K^\mp$, which complement $B_d \rightarrow D^{(*)\pm} \pi^\mp$ transitions: these modes can be treated on the same theoretical basis, and provide new strategies to determine γ [23]. Following this paper, we may write these modes generically as $B_q \rightarrow D_q \bar{u}_q$. Their characteristic feature is that both a B_q^0 and a \bar{B}_q^0 may decay into $D_q \bar{u}_q$, thereby leading to interference between B_q^0 - \bar{B}_q^0 mixing and decay processes, involving the weak phase $\phi_q + \gamma$. In the case of $q = s$, i.e. $D_s \in \{D_s^+, D_s^{*+}, \dots\}$ and $u_s \in \{K^+, K^{*+}, \dots\}$, these interference effects are governed by a hadronic parameter $x_s e^{i\delta_s} \propto R_b \approx 0.4$, where $R_b \propto |V_{ub}/V_{cb}|$ is the usual UT side, and hence are large. On the other hand, for $q = d$, i.e. $D_d \in \{D^+, D^{*+}, \dots\}$ and $u_d \in \{\pi^+, \rho^+, \dots\}$, the interference effects are described by $x_d e^{i\delta_d} \propto -\lambda^2 R_b \approx -0.02$, and hence are tiny. In the following, we shall only consider $B_q \rightarrow D_q \bar{u}_q$ modes, where at least one of the D_q, \bar{u}_q states is a pseudoscalar meson; otherwise a complicated angular analysis has to be performed.

The time-dependent rate asymmetries of these decays take the same form as (2). It is well known that they allow a determination of $\phi_q + \gamma$, where the “conventional” approach works as follows [24, 25]: if we measure the observables $C(B_q \rightarrow D_q \bar{u}_q) \equiv C_q$ and $C(B_q \rightarrow \bar{D}_q u_q) \equiv \bar{C}_q$ provided by the $\cos(\Delta M_q t)$ pieces, we may determine the following quantities:

$$\langle C_q \rangle_+ \equiv (\bar{C}_q + C_q)/2 = 0, \quad \langle C_q \rangle_- \equiv (\bar{C}_q - C_q)/2 = (1 - x_q^2)/(1 + x_q^2), \quad (14)$$

where $\langle C_q \rangle_-$ allows us to extract x_q . However, to this end we have to resolve terms entering at the x_q^2 level. In the case of $q = s$, we have $x_s = \mathcal{O}(R_b)$, implying $x_s^2 = \mathcal{O}(0.16)$, so that this may actually be possible, though challenging. On the other hand, $x_d = \mathcal{O}(-\lambda^2 R_b)$ is doubly Cabibbo-suppressed. Although it should be possible to resolve terms of $\mathcal{O}(x_d)$, this will be impossible for the vanishingly small $x_d^2 = \mathcal{O}(0.0004)$ terms, so that other approaches to fix x_d are required [25]. In order to extract $\phi_q + \gamma$, the mixing-induced observables $S(B_q \rightarrow D_q \bar{u}_q) \equiv S_q$ and $S(B_q \rightarrow \bar{D}_q u_q) \equiv \bar{S}_q$ associated with the $\sin(\Delta M_q t)$ terms of the time-dependent rate asymmetry must be measured. In analogy to (14), it is convenient to introduce observable combinations $\langle S_q \rangle_{\pm}$. If we assume that x_q is known, we may consider the quantities

$$s_+ \equiv (-1)^L \left[\frac{1 + x_q^2}{2x_q} \right] \langle S_q \rangle_+ = + \cos \delta_q \sin(\phi_q + \gamma) \quad (15)$$

$$s_- \equiv (-1)^L \left[\frac{1 + x_q^2}{2x_q} \right] \langle S_q \rangle_- = - \sin \delta_q \cos(\phi_q + \gamma), \quad (16)$$

which yield

$$\sin^2(\phi_q + \gamma) = \frac{1}{2} \left[(1 + s_+^2 - s_-^2) \pm \sqrt{(1 + s_+^2 - s_-^2)^2 - 4s_+^2} \right]. \quad (17)$$

This expression implies an eightfold solution for $\phi_q + \gamma$. If we assume that $\text{sgn}(\cos \delta_q) > 0$, as suggested by factorization, a fourfold discrete ambiguity emerges. Note that this assumption allows us also to fix the sign of $\sin(\phi_q + \gamma)$ through $\langle S_q \rangle_+$. To this end, the factor $(-1)^L$, where L is the $D_q \bar{u}_q$ angular momentum, has to be properly taken into account [23]. This is a crucial issue for the extraction of the sign of $\sin(\phi_d + \gamma)$ from $B_d \rightarrow D^{*\pm} \pi^\mp$ decays.

Let us now discuss new strategies to explore CP violation through $B_q \rightarrow D_q \bar{u}_q$ modes, following [23]. If the width difference $\Delta\Gamma_s$ is sizeable, the ‘‘untagged’’ rates (see (1))

$$\langle \Gamma(B_q(t) \rightarrow D_q \bar{u}_q) \rangle = \langle \Gamma(B_q \rightarrow D_q \bar{u}_q) \rangle [\cosh(\Delta\Gamma_q t/2) - \mathcal{A}_{\Delta\Gamma}(B_q \rightarrow D_q \bar{u}_q) \sinh(\Delta\Gamma_q t/2)] e^{-\Gamma_q t} \quad (18)$$

and their CP conjugates provide $\mathcal{A}_{\Delta\Gamma}(B_s \rightarrow D_s \bar{u}_s) \equiv \mathcal{A}_{\Delta\Gamma_s}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{\Delta\Gamma}(B_s \rightarrow \bar{D}_s u_s) \equiv \bar{\mathcal{A}}_{\Delta\Gamma_s}$. Introducing, in analogy to (14), observable combinations $\langle \mathcal{A}_{\Delta\Gamma_s} \rangle_{\pm}$, we may derive the relations

$$\tan(\phi_s + \gamma) = - \left[\frac{\langle S_s \rangle_+}{\langle \mathcal{A}_{\Delta\Gamma_s} \rangle_+} \right] = + \left[\frac{\langle \bar{\mathcal{A}}_{\Delta\Gamma_s} \rangle_-}{\langle S_s \rangle_-} \right], \quad (19)$$

which allow an *unambiguous* extraction of $\phi_s + \gamma$ if we assume, in addition, that $\text{sgn}(\cos \delta_q) > 0$. Another important advantage of (19) is that we do *not* have to rely on $\mathcal{O}(x_s^2)$ terms, as $\langle S_s \rangle_{\pm}$ and $\langle \mathcal{A}_{\Delta\Gamma_s} \rangle_{\pm}$ are proportional to x_s . On the other hand, we need a sizeable value of $\Delta\Gamma_s$. Measurements of untagged rates are also very useful in the case of vanishingly small $\Delta\Gamma_q$, since the ‘‘unevolved’’ untagged rates in (18) offer various interesting strategies to determine x_q from the ratio of $\langle \Gamma(B_q \rightarrow D_q \bar{u}_q) \rangle + \langle \Gamma(B_q \rightarrow \bar{D}_q u_q) \rangle$ and CP-averaged rates of appropriate B^\pm or flavour-specific B_q decays.

If we keep the hadronic parameter x_q and the associated strong phase δ_q as ‘‘unknown’’, free parameters in the expressions for the $\langle S_q \rangle_{\pm}$, we may obtain bounds on $\phi_q + \gamma$ from

$$|\sin(\phi_q + \gamma)| \geq |\langle S_q \rangle_+|, \quad |\cos(\phi_q + \gamma)| \geq |\langle S_q \rangle_-|. \quad (20)$$

If x_q is known, stronger constraints are implied by

$$|\sin(\phi_q + \gamma)| \geq |s_+|, \quad |\cos(\phi_q + \gamma)| \geq |s_-|. \quad (21)$$

Once s_+ and s_- are known, we may of course determine $\phi_q + \gamma$ through the ‘‘conventional’’ approach, using (17). However, the bounds following from (21) provide essentially the same information and are much simpler to implement. Moreover, as discussed in detail in [23] for several examples within the SM, the bounds following from B_s and B_d modes may be highly complementary, thereby providing particularly narrow, theoretically clean ranges for γ .

Let us now further exploit the complementarity between the processes $B_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^{(*)+} K^-$ and $B_d^0 \rightarrow D^{(*)+} \pi^-$. If we look at the corresponding decay topologies, we observe that these channels are related to each other through an interchange of all down and strange quarks. Consequently, the U -spin symmetry implies $a_s = a_d$ and $\delta_s = \delta_d$, where $a_s = x_s/R_b$ and $a_d = -x_d/(\lambda^2 R_b)$ are the ratios of hadronic matrix elements entering x_s and x_d , respectively. There are various possibilities to implement these relations [23]. A particularly simple picture emerges if we assume that $a_s = a_d$ and $\delta_s = \delta_d$, which yields

$$\tan \gamma = - \left[\frac{\sin \phi_d - S \sin \phi_s}{\cos \phi_d - S \cos \phi_s} \right]_{\phi_s=0^\circ} - \left[\frac{\sin \phi_d}{\cos \phi_d - S} \right]. \quad (22)$$

Here we have introduced

$$S = -R \left[\frac{\langle S_d \rangle_+}{\langle S_s \rangle_+} \right] \quad (23)$$

with

$$R = \left(\frac{1 - \lambda^2}{\lambda^2} \right) \left[\frac{1}{1 + x_s^2} \right], \quad (24)$$

where R can be fixed with the help of untagged B_s rates through

$$R = \left(\frac{f_K}{f_\pi} \right)^2 \left[\frac{\Gamma(\overline{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^{(*)+} \pi^-) + \Gamma(B_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^{(*)-} \pi^+)}{\langle \Gamma(B_s \rightarrow D_s^{(*)+} K^-) \rangle + \langle \Gamma(B_s \rightarrow D_s^{(*)-} K^+) \rangle} \right]. \quad (25)$$

Alternatively, we may *only* assume that $\delta_s = \delta_d$ or that $a_s = a_d$, as discussed in detail in [23]. Apart from features related to multiple discrete ambiguities, the most important advantage with respect to the ‘‘conventional’’ approach is that the experimental resolution of the x_q^2 terms is not required. In particular, x_d does *not* have to be fixed, and x_s may only enter through a $1 + x_s^2$ correction, which can straightforwardly be determined through untagged B_s rate measurements. In the most refined implementation of this strategy, the measurement of x_d/x_s would *only* be interesting for the inclusion of U -spin-breaking effects in a_d/a_s . Moreover, we may obtain interesting insights into hadron dynamics and U -spin-breaking effects.

In order to explore CP violation, the colour-suppressed counterparts of the $B_q \rightarrow D_q \overline{u}_q$ modes are also very interesting. In the case of the $B_d \rightarrow DK_{S(L)}$, $B_s \rightarrow D\eta^{(\prime)}$, $D\phi$, ... modes, the interference effects between $B_q^0 - \overline{B}_q^0$ mixing and decay processes are governed by $x_{f_s} e^{i\delta_{f_s}} \propto R_b$. If we consider the CP eigenstates D_\pm , we obtain additional interference effects at the amplitude level, which involve γ , and may introduce the following ‘‘untagged’’ rate asymmetry [16]:

$$\Gamma_{+-}^{f_s} \equiv \frac{\langle \Gamma(B_q \rightarrow D_+ f_s) \rangle - \langle \Gamma(B_q \rightarrow D_- f_s) \rangle}{\langle \Gamma(B_q \rightarrow D_+ f_s) \rangle + \langle \Gamma(B_q \rightarrow D_- f_s) \rangle}, \quad (26)$$

which allows us to constrain γ through $|\cos \gamma| \geq |\Gamma_{+-}^{f_s}|$. Moreover, if we complement $\Gamma_{+-}^{f_s}$ with

$$\langle S_{f_s} \rangle_{\pm} \equiv (S_+^{f_s} \pm S_-^{f_s})/2, \quad (27)$$

where $S_{\pm}^{f_s} \equiv \mathcal{A}_{\text{CP}}^{\text{mix}}(B_q \rightarrow D_{\pm} f_s)$, we may derive the following simple but *exact* relation:

$$\tan \gamma \cos \phi_q = \left[\frac{\eta_{f_s} \langle S_{f_s} \rangle_+}{\Gamma_{+-}^{f_s}} \right] + [\eta_{f_s} \langle S_{f_s} \rangle_- - \sin \phi_q], \quad (28)$$

where $\eta_{f_s} \equiv (-1)^L \eta_{\text{CP}}^{f_s}$. This expression allows a conceptually simple, theoretically clean and essentially unambiguous determination of γ [16]; further applications, employing also D -meson decays into CP non-eigenstates, can be found in [26]. Since the interference effects are governed by the tiny parameter $x_{f_d} e^{i\delta_{f_d}} \propto -\lambda^2 R_b$ in the case of $B_s \rightarrow D_{\pm} K_{\text{S(L)}}$, $B_d \rightarrow D_{\pm} \pi^0, D_{\pm} \rho^0, \dots$, these modes are not as promising for the extraction of γ . However, they provide the relation

$$\eta_{f_d} \langle S_{f_d} \rangle_- = \sin \phi_q + \mathcal{O}(x_{f_d}^2) = \sin \phi_q + \mathcal{O}(4 \times 10^{-4}), \quad (29)$$

allowing very interesting determinations of ϕ_q with theoretical accuracies one order of magnitude higher than those of the conventional $B_d \rightarrow J/\psi K_{\text{S}}$, $B_s \rightarrow J/\psi \phi$ approaches (see Section 2). In particular, $\phi_s^{\text{SM}} = -2\lambda^2 \eta$ could be determined with only $\mathcal{O}(1\%)$ uncertainty [16].

5 Conclusions and Outlook

The most exciting question concerning $B_s \rightarrow J/\psi \phi$ is whether this mode will exhibit sizeable mixing-induced CP-violating effects, thereby indicating NP contributions to $B_s^0 - \overline{B}_s^0$ mixing. As we have seen, the B_s -meson system offers interesting avenues to extract γ . For example, we may employ $B_s \rightarrow K^+ K^-$, which is governed by QCD penguin processes, to complement $B_d \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-$, or may complement pure “tree” decays of the kind $B_s \rightarrow D_s^{(*)\pm} K^{\mp}$ with their $B_d \rightarrow D^{(*)\pm} \pi^{\mp}$ counterparts. Here the burning question is whether the corresponding results for γ will show discrepancies, which could indicate NP effects in the penguin sector. The exploration of B_s decays is the “El Dorado” for B -physics studies at hadron colliders. Important first steps are already expected in the near future at run II of the Tevatron, whereas the rich physics potential of the B_s -meson system can be fully exploited by LHCb and BTeV.

References

- [1] K. Anikeev *et al.*, hep-ph/0201071.
- [2] P. Ball *et al.*, CERN-TH/2000-101 [hep-ph/0003238], in CERN Report on *Standard Model physics (and more) at the LHC* (CERN, Geneva, 2000), p. 305.
- [3] R. Fleischer, Phys. Rep. **370** (2002) 537 [hep-ph/0207108].
- [4] M. Battaglia, A. J. Buras, P. Gambino and A. Stocchi, eds., Proceedings of the *First Workshop on the CKM Unitarity Triangle*, CERN, February 2002, hep-ph/0304132.

- [5] For an overview, see M. Beneke and A. Lenz, J. Phys. G **27** (2001) 1219 [hep-ph/0012222].
- [6] I. Dunietz, Phys. Rev. D **52** (1995) 3048 [hep-ph/9501287];
R. Fleischer and I. Dunietz, Phys. Rev. D **55** (1997) 259 [hep-ph/9605220], Phys. Lett. B **387** (1996) 361 [hep-ph/9605221].
- [7] Y. Nir and D. J. Silverman, Nucl. Phys. B **345** (1990) 301.
- [8] Y. Grossman, Y. Nir and M. P. Worah, Phys. Lett. B **407** (1997) 307 [hep-ph/9704287].
- [9] J. P. Silva and L. Wolfenstein, Phys. Rev. D **62** (2000) 014018 [hep-ph/0002122].
- [10] R. Fleischer and T. Mannel, Phys. Lett. B **506** (2001) 311 [hep-ph/0101276].
- [11] R. Fleischer, G. Isidori and J. Matias, JHEP **0305** (2003) 053 [hep-ph/0302229].
- [12] R. Fleischer and J. Matias, Phys. Rev. D **66** (2002) 054009 [hep-ph/0204101].
- [13] A. S. Dighe *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **369** (1996) 144 [hep-ph/9511363];
A. S. Dighe, I. Dunietz and R. Fleischer, Eur. Phys. J. C **6** (1999) 647 [hep-ph/9804253].
- [14] R. Fleischer, Phys. Rev. D **60** (1999) 073008 [hep-ph/9903540].
- [15] I. Dunietz, R. Fleischer and U. Nierste, Phys. Rev. D **63** (2001) 114015 [hep-ph/0012219].
- [16] R. Fleischer, Phys. Lett. B **562** (2003) 234 [hep-ph/0301255].
- [17] M. Ciuchini *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **67** (2003) 075016 [hep-ph/0212397].
- [18] K. Kiers, J. Kolb, J. Lee, A. Soni and G. H. Wu, Phys. Rev. D **66** (2002) 095002 [hep-ph/0205082]; D. Silverman, W. K. Sze and H. Yao, UCI-TR-2003-15 [hep-ph/0305013].
- [19] R. Fleischer, Phys. Lett. B **459** (1999) 306 [hep-ph/9903456].
- [20] A. Golutvin, “Reaching for γ (present and future)”, *these proceedings*.
- [21] R. Fleischer, Eur. Phys. J. C **16** (2000) 87 [hep-ph/0001253].
- [22] M. Martin, “Branching ratios from B_s and Λ_b ”, *these proceedings*.
- [23] R. Fleischer, CERN-TH/2003-084 [hep-ph/0304027].
- [24] R. Aleksan, I. Dunietz and B. Kayser, Z. Phys. C **54** (1992) 653.
- [25] I. Dunietz and R. G. Sachs, Phys. Rev. D **37** (1988) 3186 [E: D **39** (1989) 3515];
I. Dunietz, Phys. Lett. B **427** (1998) 179 [hep-ph/9712401];
M. Diehl and G. Hiller, Phys. Lett. B **517** (2001) 125 [hep-ph/0105213];
D. A. Suprun *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **65** (2002) 054025 [hep-ph/0110159].
- [26] R. Fleischer, Nucl. Phys. B **659** (2003) 321 [hep-ph/0301256].