### New Strategies to Extract Weak Phases from Neutral B Decays

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

#### Abstract

We discuss new, theoretically clean strategies to determine the angle  $\gamma$  of the unitarity triangle from  $B_d \to DK_{\rm S(L)}, \ B_s \to D\eta^{(\prime)}, D\phi, \dots$  decays, and point out that the  $B_s \to DK_{\rm S(L)}$  and  $B_d \to D\pi^0, D\rho^0, \dots$  modes allow very interesting determinations of the  $B_q^0 - \overline{B_q^0}$  mixing phases  $\phi_s$  and  $\phi_d$ , respectively. Their colour-allowed counterparts  $B_s \to D_s^{(*)\pm}K^{\mp}, \dots$  and  $B_d \to D^{(*)\pm}\pi^{\mp}, \dots$  also offer new methods to probe  $\gamma$ .

Invited talk at the HEP2003 Europhysics Conference Aachen, Germany, 17–23 July 2003 To appear in the Proceedings

## 1 Introduction

The time-dependent CP asymmetries of neutral  $B_q$ -meson decays  $(q \in \{d, s\})$  into CP eigenstates, which satisfy  $(\mathcal{CP})|f\rangle = \pm |f\rangle$ , provide valuable information [1]:

$$\frac{\Gamma(B_q^0(t) \to f) - \Gamma(\overline{B_q^0}(t) \to f)}{\Gamma(B_q^0(t) \to f) + \Gamma(\overline{B_q^0}(t) \to f)}$$

$$= \frac{\mathcal{A}_{CP}^{dir} \cos(\Delta M_q t) + \mathcal{A}_{CP}^{mix} \sin(\Delta M_q t)}{\cosh(\Delta \Gamma_q t/2) - \mathcal{A}_{\Delta \Gamma} \sinh(\Delta \Gamma_q t/2)}.$$
(1)

Here the CP-violating observables

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

originate from "direct" and "mixing-induced" CP violation, respectively, and are governed by

$$\xi_f^{(q)} = -e^{-i\phi_q} \left[ \frac{A(\overline{B_q^0} \to f)}{A(B_q^0 \to f)} \right], \tag{3}$$

where

$$\phi_q \stackrel{\text{SM}}{=} 2 \arg(V_{tq}^* V_{tb}) = \begin{cases} +2\beta & (q=d) \\ -2\lambda^2 \eta & (q=s) \end{cases}$$
 (4)

is the CP-violating weak  $B_q^0 - \overline{B_q^0}$  mixing phase. The width difference  $\Delta \Gamma_q$ , which may be sizeable in the q=s case, offers another observable  $\mathcal{A}_{\Delta\Gamma}$ , which is, however, not independent from those in (2), and can be extracted from the following "untagged" rates:

$$\langle \Gamma(B_q(t) \to f) \rangle \equiv \Gamma(B_q^0(t) \to f) + \Gamma(\overline{B_q^0}(t) \to f)$$

$$\propto \left[ \cosh(\Delta \Gamma_q t/2) - \mathcal{A}_{\Delta \Gamma} \sinh(\Delta \Gamma_q t/2) \right] e^{-\Gamma_q t}. \tag{5}$$

$$egin{array}{lll} 2 & B_d 
ightarrow DK_{\mathrm{S(L)}}, \ B_s 
ightarrow D\eta^{(\prime)}, D\phi, ... \ \ \mathrm{and} \ B_s 
ightarrow DK_{\mathrm{S(L)}}, B_d 
ightarrow D\pi^0, D
ho^0, ... \end{array}$$

Let us consider in this section  $B_q^0 \to D^0 f_r$  transitions, where  $r \in \{s, d\}$  distinguishes between  $b \to Ds$  and  $b \to Dd$  processes [2, 3]. If we require  $(\mathcal{CP})|f_r\rangle = \eta_{\mathrm{CP}}^{f_r}|f_r\rangle$ ,  $B_q^0$  and  $\overline{B_q^0}$  mesons may both decay into  $D^0 f_r$ , thereby leading to interference effects between  $B_q^0 - \overline{B_q^0}$  mixing and decay processes, which involve the weak phase  $\phi_q + \gamma$ :

- For r = s, i.e.  $B_d \to DK_{S(L)}$ ,  $B_s \to D\eta^{(\prime)}$ ,  $D\phi$ , ..., these effects are governed by a hadronic parameter  $x_{f_s}e^{i\delta_{f_s}} \propto R_b \approx 0.4$ , and are hence favourably large.
- For r = d, i.e.  $B_s \to DK_{S(L)}$ ,  $B_d \to D\pi^0$ ,  $D\rho^0$  ..., these effects are tiny because of  $x_{f,t}e^{i\delta_{f_d}} \propto -\lambda^2 R_b \approx -0.02$ .

# $2.1 \quad B_d o DK_{\mathrm{S(L)}}, \, B_s o D\eta^{(\prime)}, D\phi, ...$

Let us first focus on r=s. If we make use of the CP eigenstates  $D_{\pm}$  of the neutral D-meson system satisfying  $(\mathcal{CP})|D_{\pm}\rangle = \pm |D_{\pm}\rangle$ , we obtain additional interference effects between  $B_q^0 \to D^0 f_s$  and  $B_q^0 \to \overline{D^0} f_s$  at the decay-amplitude level, which involve  $\gamma$ . The most straightforward observable we may measure is the "untagged" rate

$$\langle \Gamma(B_q(t) \to D_{\pm} f_s) \rangle \equiv$$

$$\Gamma(B_q^0(t) \to D_{\pm} f_s) + \Gamma(\overline{B_q^0}(t) \to D_{\pm} f_s)$$

$$\stackrel{\Delta \Gamma_q = 0}{=} \left[ \Gamma(B_q^0 \to D_{\pm} f_s) + \Gamma(\overline{B_q^0} \to D_{\pm} f_s) \right] e^{-\Gamma_q t}$$

$$\equiv \langle \Gamma(B_q \to D_{\pm} f_s) \rangle e^{-\Gamma_q t},$$
(6)

providing the following "untagged" rate asymmetry:

$$\Gamma_{+-}^{f_s} \equiv \frac{\langle \Gamma(B_q \to D_+ f_s) \rangle - \langle \Gamma(B_q \to D_- f_s) \rangle}{\langle \Gamma(B_q \to D_+ f_s) \rangle + \langle \Gamma(B_q \to D_- f_s) \rangle}.$$
 (7)

Interestingly, already this quantity offers valuable information on  $\gamma$ , since bounds on this angle are implied by

$$|\cos\gamma| \ge |\Gamma_{+-}^{f_s}|. \tag{8}$$

Moreover, if we fix the sign of  $\cos \delta_{f_s}$  with the help of the factorization approach, we obtain

$$\operatorname{sgn}(\cos \gamma) = -\operatorname{sgn}(\Gamma_{+-}^{f_s}),\tag{9}$$

i.e. we may decide whether  $\gamma$  is smaller or larger than 90°. If we employ, in addition, the mixing-induced observables  $S_{\pm}^{f_s} \equiv \mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{CP}}^{\mathrm{mix}}(B_q \to D_{\pm} f_s)$ , we may determine  $\gamma$ . To this end, it is convenient to introduce the quantities

$$\langle S_{f_s} \rangle_{\pm} \equiv \frac{S_+^{f_s} \pm S_-^{f_s}}{2}.$$
 (10)

Expressing the  $\langle S_{f_s} \rangle_{\pm}$  in terms of the  $B_q \to D_{\pm} f_s$  decay parameters gives rather complicated formulae. However, complementing the  $\langle S_{f_s} \rangle_{\pm}$  with  $\Gamma_{+-}^{f_s}$  yields

$$\tan \gamma \cos \phi_q = \left[ \frac{\eta_{f_s} \langle S_{f_s} \rangle_+}{\Gamma_{+-}^{f_s}} \right] + \left[ \eta_{f_s} \langle S_{f_s} \rangle_- - \sin \phi_q \right], \tag{11}$$

where  $\eta_{f_s} \equiv (-1)^L \eta_{\text{CP}}^{f_s}$ , with L denoting the  $Df_s$  angular momentum [2]. If we use this simple – but exact – relation, we obtain the twofold solution  $\gamma = \gamma_1 \vee \gamma_2$ , with  $\gamma_1 \in [0^\circ, 180^\circ]$  and  $\gamma_2 = \gamma_1 + 180^\circ$ . Since  $\cos \gamma_1$  and  $\cos \gamma_2$  have opposite signs, (9) allows us to fix  $\gamma$  unambiguously. Another advantage of (11) is that  $\langle S_{f_s} \rangle_+$  and  $\Gamma_{+-}^{f_s}$  are both proportional to  $x_{f_s} \approx 0.4$ , so that the first term in square brackets is of  $\mathcal{O}(1)$ , whereas the second one is of  $\mathcal{O}(x_{f_s}^2)$ , hence playing a minor rôle. In order to extract  $\gamma$ , we may also employ D decays into CP non-eigenstates  $f_{\text{NE}}$ , where we have to deal with complications originating from  $D^0, \overline{D^0} \to f_{\text{NE}}$  interference effects [4]. Also in this case,  $\Gamma_{+-}^{f_s}$  is a very powerful ingredient, offering an efficient, analytical strategy to include these interference effects in the extraction of  $\gamma$  [3].

$$2.2 \quad B_s o DK_{
m S(L)},\, B_d o D\pi^0, D
ho^0,...$$

The r=d case also has interesting features. It corresponds to  $B_s \to DK_{\rm S(L)}, B_d \to D\pi^0, D\rho^0$  ... decays, which can be described through the same formulae as their r=s counterparts. Since the relevant interference effects are governed by  $x_{fd} \approx -0.02$ , these channels are not as attractive for the extraction of  $\gamma$  as the r=s modes. On the other hand, the relation

$$\eta_{f_d} \langle S_{f_d} \rangle_- = \sin \phi_q + \mathcal{O}(x_{f_d}^2) = \sin \phi_q + \mathcal{O}(4 \times 10^{-4}) \tag{12}$$

offers very interesting determinations of  $\sin \phi_q$  [2]. Following this avenue, there are no penguin uncertainties, and the theoretical accuracy is one order of magnitude better than in the "conventional"  $B_d \to J/\psi K_S$ ,  $B_s \to J/\psi \phi$  strategies. In particular,  $\phi_s^{\rm SM} = -2\lambda^2 \eta$  could, in principle, be determined with a theoretical uncertainty of only  $\mathcal{O}(1\%)$ , in contrast to the extraction from the  $B_s \to J/\psi \phi$  angular distribution, which suffers from generic penguin uncertainties at the 10% level.

$$B_s o D_s^{(*)\pm} K^{\mp}, ... ext{ and } B_d o D^{(*)\pm} \pi^{\mp}, ...$$

Let us now consider the colour-allowed counterparts of the  $B_q \to Df_q$  modes discussed above, which we may write generically as  $B_q \to D_q \overline{u}_q$  [5]. The characteristic feature of these transitions is that both a  $B_q^0$  and a  $\overline{B_q^0}$  meson may decay into  $D_q \overline{u}_q$ , thereby leading to interference between  $B_q^0 - \overline{B_q^0}$  mixing and decay processes, which involve the weak phase  $\phi_q + \gamma$ :

- In the case of q = s, i.e.  $D_s \in \{D_s^+, D_s^{*+}, ...\}$  and  $u_s \in \{K^+, K^{*+}, ...\}$ , these effects are favourably large as they are governed by  $x_s e^{i\delta_s} \propto R_b \approx 0.4$ .
- In the case of q = d, i.e.  $D_d \in \{D^+, D^{*+}, ...\}$  and  $u_d \in \{\pi^+, \rho^+, ...\}$ , the interference effects are described by  $x_d e^{i\delta_d} \propto -\lambda^2 R_b \approx -0.02$ , and hence are tiny.

We shall only consider  $B_q \to D_q \overline{u}_q$  modes, where at least one of the  $D_q$ ,  $\overline{u}_q$  states is a pseudoscalar meson; otherwise a complicated angular analysis has to be performed.

It is well known that such decays allow determinations of the weak phases  $\phi_q + \gamma$ , where the "conventional" approach works as follows [6, 7]: if we measure the observables  $C(B_q \to D_q \overline{u}_q) \equiv C_q$  and  $C(B_q \to \overline{D}_q u_q) \equiv \overline{C}_q$  provided by the  $\cos(\Delta M_q t)$  pieces of the time-dependent rate asymmetries, we may determine  $x_q$  from 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, although 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 [6]. In order to extract  $\phi_q + \gamma$ , the mixing-induced observables  $S(B_q \to D_q \overline{u}_q) \equiv S_q$  and  $S(B_q \to \overline{D}_q u_q) \equiv \overline{S}_q$  associated with the  $\sin(\Delta M_q t)$ 

terms of the time-dependent rate asymmetries must be measured, where it is convenient to introduce

$$\langle S_q \rangle_{\pm} \equiv \frac{\overline{S}_q \pm S_q}{2}.\tag{13}$$

If we assume that  $x_q$  is known, we may consider

$$s_{+} \equiv (-1)^{L} \left[ \frac{1 + x_q^2}{2x_q} \right] \langle S_q \rangle_{+} = +\cos \delta_q \sin(\phi_q + \gamma)$$
 (14)

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

yielding

$$\sin^2(\phi_q + \gamma) = \frac{1 + s_+^2 - s_-^2}{2} \pm \sqrt{\frac{(1 + s_+^2 - s_-^2)^2 - 4s_+^2}{4}},\tag{16}$$

which implies an eightfold solution for  $\phi_q + \gamma$ . If we fix the sign of  $\cos \delta_q$  with the help of factorization, a fourfold discrete ambiguity emerges. Note that this assumption allows us to extract also the sign of  $\sin(\phi_q + \gamma)$  from  $\langle S_q \rangle_+$ , which is of particular interest, as discussed in [5]. To this end, the factor  $(-1)^L$ , where L is the  $D_q \overline{u}_q$  angular momentum, has to be properly taken into account.

Let us now discuss the new strategies to explore the  $B_q \to D_q \overline{u}_q$  modes proposed in [5]. If  $\Delta \Gamma_s$  is sizeable, the time-dependent "untagged" rates introduced in (5)

$$\langle \Gamma(B_q(t) \to D_q \overline{u}_q) \rangle = \langle \Gamma(B_q \to D_q \overline{u}_q) \rangle e^{-\Gamma_q t}$$

$$\times \left[ \cosh(\Delta \Gamma_q t/2) - \mathcal{A}_{\Delta \Gamma}(B_q \to D_q \overline{u}_q) \sinh(\Delta \Gamma_q t/2) \right]$$
(17)

and their CP conjugates provide  $\mathcal{A}_{\Delta\Gamma}(B_s \to D_s \overline{u}_s) \equiv \mathcal{A}_{\Delta\Gamma_s}$  and  $\mathcal{A}_{\Delta\Gamma}(B_s \to \overline{D}_s u_s) \equiv \overline{\mathcal{A}}_{\Delta\Gamma_s}$ , which yield

$$\tan(\phi_s + \gamma) = -\left[\frac{\langle S_s \rangle_+}{\langle \mathcal{A}_{\Delta \Gamma_s} \rangle_+}\right] = +\left[\frac{\langle \mathcal{A}_{\Delta \Gamma_s} \rangle_-}{\langle S_s \rangle_-}\right],\tag{18}$$

where the  $\langle \mathcal{A}_{\Delta\Gamma_s} \rangle_{\pm}$  are defined in analogy to (13). These relations allow an unambiguous extraction of  $\phi_s + \gamma$  if we fix again the sign of  $\cos \delta_q$  through factorization. Another important advantage of (18) 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 (17) offer various interesting strategies to determine  $x_q$  from the ratio of  $\langle \Gamma(B_q \to D_q \overline{u}_q) \rangle + \langle \Gamma(B_q \to \overline{D}_q u_q) \rangle$  to 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  $\delta_q$  as "unknown", free parameters in the expressions for the  $\langle S_q \rangle_{\pm}$ , we obtain

$$|\sin(\phi_q + \gamma)| \ge |\langle S_q \rangle_+|, \quad |\cos(\phi_q + \gamma)| \ge |\langle S_q \rangle_-|, \tag{19}$$

which can straightforwardly be converted into bounds on  $\phi_q + \gamma$ . If  $x_q$  is known, stronger constraints are implied by

$$|\sin(\phi_q + \gamma)| \ge |s_+|, \quad |\cos(\phi_q + \gamma)| \ge |s_-|. \tag{20}$$

Once  $s_+$  and  $s_-$  are known, we may of course determine  $\phi_q + \gamma$  through the "conventional" approach, using (16). However, the bounds following from (20) provide essentially the same information and are much simpler to implement. Moreover, as discussed in detail in [5] for several examples, the bounds following from the  $B_s$  and  $B_d$  modes may be highly complementary, thereby providing particularly narrow, theoretically clean ranges for  $\gamma$ .

Let us now further exploit the complementarity between the  $B_s^0 \to D_s^{(*)+}K^-$  and  $B_d^0 \to D^{(*)+}\pi^-$  modes. If we look at their 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 flavour symmetry of strong interactions 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. A particularly simple picture emerges if we assume that  $a_s = a_d$  and  $\delta_s = \delta_d$ , which yields

$$\tan \gamma = -\left[\frac{\sin \phi_d - S \sin \phi_s}{\cos \phi_d - S \cos \phi_s}\right] \stackrel{\phi_s = 0^{\circ}}{=} -\left[\frac{\sin \phi_d}{\cos \phi_d - S}\right]. \tag{21}$$

Here we have introduced

$$S = -R \left[ \frac{\langle S_d \rangle_+}{\langle S_s \rangle_+} \right] \tag{22}$$

with

$$R = \left(\frac{1-\lambda^2}{\lambda^2}\right) \left[\frac{1}{1+x_s^2}\right],\tag{23}$$

which can be fixed from untagged  $B_s$  rates through

$$R = \left(\frac{f_K}{f_\pi}\right)^2 \left[ \frac{\Gamma(\overline{B_s^0} \to D_s^{(*)+}\pi^-) + \Gamma(B_s^0 \to D_s^{(*)-}\pi^+)}{\langle \Gamma(B_s \to D_s^{(*)+}K^-) \rangle + \langle \Gamma(B_s \to D_s^{(*)-}K^+) \rangle} \right]. \tag{24}$$

Alternatively, we may only assume that  $\delta_s = \delta_d$  or that  $a_s = a_d$ . 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.

## 4 Conclusions

We have discussed new strategies to explore CP violation through neutral  $B_q$  decays. In the first part, we have shown that  $B_d \to DK_{S(L)}$ ,  $B_s \to D\eta^{(\prime)}$ ,  $D\phi$ , ... modes provide theoretically clean, efficient and unambiguous extractions of  $\tan \gamma$  if we combine an "untagged" rate asymmetry with mixing-induced observables. On the other hand, their  $B_s \to D_{\pm}K_{S(L)}$ ,  $B_d \to D_{\pm}\pi^0$ ,  $D_{\pm}\rho^0$ , ... counterparts are not as attractive for the determination of  $\gamma$ , but allow extremely clean extractions of the mixing phases  $\phi_s$  and  $\phi_d$ , which may be particularly interesting for the  $\phi_s$  case. In the second part, we have discussed interesting new aspects of  $B_s \to D_s^{(*)\pm}K^{\mp}$ , ... and  $B_d \to D^{(*)\pm}\pi^{\mp}$ , ... decays. The observables of these modes provide clean bounds on  $\phi_q + \gamma$ , where the resulting ranges for  $\gamma$  may be highly complementary in the  $B_s$  and  $B_d$  cases, thereby yielding stringent constraints on  $\gamma$ . Moreover, it is of great advantage to combine the  $B_d \to D^{(*)\pm}\pi^{\mp}$  modes with their U-spin counterparts  $B_s \to D_s^{(*)\pm}K^{\mp}$ , allowing us to overcome the main problems of the "conventional" strategies to deal with these modes. We strongly encourage detailed feasibility studies of these new strategies.

# References

- [1] R. Fleischer, Phys. Rep. **370** (2002) 537.
- [2] R. Fleischer, Phys. Lett. B **562** (2003) 234.
- [3] R. Fleischer, Nucl. Phys. B **659** (2003) 321.
- [4] B. Kayser and D. London, Phys. Rev. D **61** (2000) 116013.
- [5] R. Fleischer, hep-ph/0304027, to appear in Nucl. Phys. B.
- [6] 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; D.A. Suprun et al., Phys. Rev. D 65 (2002) 054025.
- [7] R. Aleksan *et al.*, Z. Phys. C **54** (1992) 653.