CP asymmetry in the decays B ! (X $_{\rm s}$; X $_{\rm d}$)

with four generations

A shutosh Kum ar Alok,¹, Am ol Dighe,^{1, y} and Sham ay ita $Ray^{1, z}$

¹Tata Institute of Fundam ental Research, Hom i Bhabha Road, Mum bai 400005, India (Dated: February 21, 2024)

Abstract

We estimate the CP asymmetry $A_{CP} (q^2)$ in the decays B ! X_s ⁺ and B ! X_d ⁺ in the standard model (SM) with an additional fourth generation. We use a parametrization that allows us to explore the complete parameter space of the 4 4 quark mixing matrix, and constrain these parameters from the current data on B decays. We nd that the enhancement in $A_{CP} (q^2)$ depends strongly on the mass of the t⁰, the uptype quark in the fourth generation. For m t⁰ around 400 G eV, the CP asymmetry in the high-q² region (q² > 14:4 G eV²) can be enhanced by more than an order of magnitude for B ! X_s ⁺ and upto a factor of 6 for B ! X_d ⁺. There is no enhancement in the low -q² region (1 < q² < 6G eV²). With increasing m t⁰, $A_{CP} (q^2)$ in the high-q² (low -q²) region rst decreases (increases) and then saturates at a value a few times the SM prediction. In the high-q² region of B ! X_s ⁺ , this saturation value may be up to 25 times the SM expectation.

E lectronic address: alok@ theory.tifr.res.in

^yE lectronic address: am ol@ theory.tifr.res.in

^zE lectronic address: sham ay itar@ theory.tifr.res.in

I. IN TRODUCTION

Upcom ing high statistics experiments at the LHC and SuperB factories will provide stringent tests of the standard model (SM) via avor physics involving B decays. The large number of B hadrons anticipated to be produced at these facilities will allow us to measure various avor changing neutral current (FCNC) interactions. The quark level FCNC transition b ! $s(d)l^{+}l$, where l = e; ; , are forbidden at the tree level in the SM and can occur only via one or more loops. Therefore they have the potential to test higher order corrections to the SM and also to constrain m any of its possible extensions. The quark level FCNC transitions. The quark level FCNC transitions is to the SM and also to constrain m any of its possible extensions. The quark level FCNC transitions b ! $s(d)l^{+}l$.

It is always good to consider new physics e ects in the observables which are either zero or highly suppressed in the SM. The reason is that any nite or large m easurement of such an observable will conment the existence of new physics. The CP asymmetry in B ! $(X_s; X_d)$ I^t 1 is one such observable. The CP asymmetry in B ! $(X_s; X_d)$ I^t 1 has been widely studied within the framework of the SM and its possible extensions [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7]. In the SM, the CP asymmetry in B ! X_s I^t 1 is 10³ [1, 2] whereas in B ! X_d I^t 1 it is (3 6)% [2, 3, 4]. In the SM with three generations (SM 3), the only source of CP violation is the unique phase in the Cabibbo-K obayashi-M askawa (CKM) quark mixing matrix. However in many possible extensions of the SM, there can be extra phases contributing to the CP asymmetry.

In this paper we study the CP asymmetry in B ! $(X_s; X_d)^+$ within the framework of the SM with an additional fourth generation (SM 4). There is no clear theoretical argument to restrict the number of generations to three in the SM. Therefore in principle we can have four or more generations. The elects of the extra generation have been studied in the literature in detail [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18]. The existence of new generation fermions that are lighter than $M_z = 2$ 45 GeV has been excluded by the data on the width of the Z boson [19], whereas the existence of fermions heavier than $M_z = 91$ GeV has been excluded by the existing data on the Z boson parameters combined with the masses of the W boson and the top quark [20]. However using the same data one can show that a

2

few extra generations are possible provided the neutral leptons have m asses around 50 G eV [21, 22].

The electroweak (EW) precision m easurements in pose severe constraints on the fourth generation [20, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27]. A considerable amount of netuning is required to accommodate a heavy fourth generation top quark t^0 (m $_{t^0} > 400 \text{ GeV}$) in order not to violate the experimental constraints from the S and T parameters [27]. The parameter space of fourth generation m asses with minimal contributions to the EW precision oblique parameters, and in agreement with all experimental constraints, is [27]

$$m_{1^{0}} m_{0}' (30 \ 60) \, \text{GeV}$$

 $m_{t^{0}} m_{b^{0}}' 1 + \frac{1}{5115 \, \text{GeV}} 50 \, \text{GeV};$ (1)

where m_{H} is the H iggs mass and $m_{1^{0}}$; $m_{b^{0}}$ are the masses of the fourth generation charged lepton 1^{0} , neutrino 0 and the down type quark b^{0} respectively. We see that the EW precision data constrain the mass splitting between t^{0} and b^{0} (1^{0} and 0) to be small, around 50 GeV.

The fourth generation has a signi cant e ect on the Higgs sector of the SM. For example, the t⁰ and b⁰ quarks increase the elective ggH coupling by a factor of roughly 3 which will increase the production cross section $_{gg! H}$ by almost an order of magnitude [28, 29]. The elect of the fourth generation on Higgs physics has been studied in [27, 30, 31, 32]. In [27], it was shown that in the SM 4, Higgs m asses between 115 315 (115 750) G eV are allowed by the EW precision data at the 68% (95%) C L. Thus the EW precision data favor a heavy Higgs boson if the fourth generation is introduced.

Rare decays of B mesons occur at loop level and hence they are sensitive to the generic extensions of the SM. The e ects of the fourth generation on inclusive B decays have been studied in the literature [33, 34, 35, 36, 37]. We employ the D ighe-K in parametrization [17] of the 4 4 quark mixing matrix (CKM 4) that allow s us to treat the e ects of the fourth generation perturbatively and explore the complete parameter space available. We generalize the notion of unitarity triangles to unitarity quadrilaterals, and calculate the CP asymmetry.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we present the theoretical expres-

sions for the decay rate and CP asymmetry in B ! $(X_s; X_d)^+$. In Sec. III, we study constraints on the elements of CKM 4, whereas in Sec. IV and V we present the estimates of CP asymmetry in B ! X_s^+ and B ! X_d^+ respectively. Finally in Sec. VI, we present our conclusions.

II. DECAY RATE AND CP ASYMMETRY IN B ! (X $_{s}$;X $_{d}$) $^{+}$

A. E ective H am iltonian and decay rate

The elective Hamiltonian in the SM for the decay b ! q + , where q = s;d, may be written as

$$H_{eff} = \frac{4G_{F}}{P} V_{tb} V_{tq} C_{i} () O_{i} (); \qquad (2)$$

where the form of operators O_i and the expressions for calculating the coe cients C_i () are given in [38]. The fourth generation only changes values of the W ilson coe cients C $_{7;8;9;10}$ via the virtual exchange of t⁰. The W ilson coe cients in the SM 4 can be written as

$$C_{i}^{tot}(b) = C_{i}(b) + \frac{V_{t_{b}^{0}}V_{t_{q}^{0}q}}{V_{t_{b}}V_{tq}}C_{i}^{t^{0}}(b);$$
(3)

where i = 7;8;9;10. The new W ilson coe cients C $_{i}^{t^{0}}(_{b})$ can easily be calculated by substituting $m_{t^{0}}$ for m_{t} in the SM 3 expressions involving the t quark.

The amplitude for the decay B $\, ! \,$ X $_{\rm q} \, ^{+}$ $\,$ in the SM 4 is given by

$$M = \frac{G_{F}}{P} V_{tb} V_{tq} C_{9}^{tot} s_{L} b_{L} + C_{10}^{tot} s_{L} b_{L}^{5} + 2C_{7}^{tot} m_{b} s_{L} i \frac{q}{q^{2}} b_{R} ; \qquad (4)$$

where the W ilson coe cients are evaluated at $_{b}=m_{b}$. The calculation of the di erential decay rate gives

$$\frac{dB (B ! X_{q}^{+})}{dz} = \frac{{}^{2}B (B ! X_{c}e)}{4 {}^{2}f (m_{c}^{-}) (m_{c}^{-})} (1 z)^{2} 1 \frac{4t^{2}}{z} \frac{{}^{1=2}}{\frac{1}{z}} \frac{\frac{1}{y_{tb}}V_{tq}}{\frac{1}{y}_{cb}} D (z); (5)$$

where

$$D(z) = j c_{9}^{\text{tot}} j 1 + \frac{2t^{2}}{z} (1 + 2z) + 4j c_{7}^{\text{tot}} j 1 + \frac{2t^{2}}{z} 1 + \frac{2}{z} + j c_{10}^{\text{tot}} j (1 + 2z) + \frac{2t^{2}}{z} (1 - 4z) + 12 \text{Re}(c_{7}^{\text{tot}} c_{9}^{\text{tot}}) 1 + \frac{2t^{2}}{z} : (6)$$

Here $z = q^2 = m_b^2$, $t = m_b$ and $m_q = m_q = m_b$ for all quarks q. The phase space factor f (m_c) in B (B ! X_ce) is given by [B9]

$$f(m_{c}) = 1 \quad 8m_{c}^{2} + 8m_{c}^{6} \quad m_{c}^{8} \quad 24m_{c}^{4} \ln m_{c} :$$
(7)

 (m_c) is the 1-loop QCD correction factor [39]

$$(\mathfrak{m}_{c}) = 1 \quad \frac{2_{s} (\mathfrak{m}_{b})}{3} \qquad {}^{2} \quad \frac{31}{4} \quad (1 \quad \mathfrak{m}_{c})^{2} + \frac{3}{2} \quad :$$
 (8)

W ithin the SM 3, the W ilson coe cients C $_7$ and C $_{10}$ are real. However the W ilson coe cient C $_9$ becomes slightly complex due to the non-negligible terms induced by the continuum part of uu and co bops proportional to $V_{ub}V_{uq}$ and $V_{cb}V_{cq}$, respectively. This complex nature of C $_9$ gives rise to the CP asymmetry in B ! (X $_s$;X $_d$) ⁺ in the SM 3.

In the fram ework of the SM 4, the W ilson coe cients C $_{7}^{tot}$, C $_{9}^{tot}$, and C $_{10}^{tot}$ are given by

$$C_{7}^{\text{tot}} = C_{7}(\mathfrak{m}_{b}) + \frac{q}{tt^{0}}C_{7}^{t^{0}}(\mathfrak{m}_{b});$$
 (9)

$$C_{9}^{\text{tot}} = {}_{1} + {}_{\text{tu} 2}^{q} + {}_{\text{tu}}^{q} C_{9}^{t^{0}} (m_{b}) ; \qquad (10)$$

$$C_{10}^{\text{tot}} = C_{10} (m_{b}) + \frac{q}{t^{0}} C_{10}^{t^{0}} (m_{b}) ; \qquad (11)$$

where

$${}^{q}_{tt^{0}} = \frac{{}^{q}_{t^{0}}}{{}^{q}_{t}} = \frac{V_{t^{0}b}V_{t^{0}q}}{V_{tb}V_{tq}};$$
(13)

so that all three relevant W ilson coe cients are complex in general. The parameters $_{i}$ are given by [38]

$$1 = C_{9} (m_{b}) + 0:138! (z) + g(m_{c};z) (3C_{1} + C_{2} + 3C_{3} + C_{4} + 3C_{5} + C_{6})$$

$$\frac{1}{2}g(m_{d};z) (C_{3} + 3C_{4}) = \frac{1}{2}g(m_{b};z) (4C_{3} + 4C_{4} + 3C_{5} + C_{6})$$

$$+ \frac{2}{9} (3C_{3} + C_{4} + 3C_{5} + C_{6}); \qquad (14)$$

$$_{2} = [g(m_{c};z) g(m_{u};z)](3C_{1} + C_{2}):$$
 (15)

Here

$$! (z) = \frac{2}{9} \frac{2}{3} \frac{4}{3} \operatorname{Li}_{2} (z) \frac{2}{3} \ln z \ln (1 - z) \frac{5 + 4z}{3(1 + 2z)} \ln (1 - z)$$
$$\frac{2z(1 + z)(1 - 2z)}{3(1 - z)^{2}(1 + 2z)} \ln z + \frac{5 + 9z - 6z^{2}}{6(1 - z)(1 + 2z)}; \qquad (16)$$

with

$$Li_{2}(z) = \int_{0}^{Z} dt \frac{\ln(1 t)}{t}$$
 (17)

The function g (ff;z) represents the one loop corrections to the four-quark operators $O_1 = O_6$ and is given by [38]

$$g(\hat{m};z) = \frac{8}{9} \ln \frac{m_{b}}{b} + \frac{8}{9} \ln \hat{m} + \frac{8}{27} + \frac{4}{9}x$$

$$(18)$$

$$\frac{2}{9}(2+x)j + xj^{3-2} + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{1} + \frac{1}$$

For light quarks, we have \mathfrak{m}_u ' \mathfrak{m}_d ' 0. In this lim it,

$$g(0;z) = \frac{8}{27} \quad \frac{8}{9} \ln \frac{m_{b}}{m_{b}} \quad \frac{4}{9} \ln z + \frac{4}{9}i \quad : \tag{19}$$

We compute g(m; z) at $b = m_b$.

B. CP asymmetry in B ! X $_{\rm q}$ $^+$

The CP asymmetry in B $! X_q^+$ is dened as

$$A_{CP}(z) = \frac{(dB = dz)}{(dB = dz) + (d\overline{B} = dz)} = \frac{D(z)}{D(z) + D(z)};$$
(20)

where B and \overline{B} represents the branching ratio of B ! $X_q I^{\dagger} I$ and its complex conjugate B ! $X_q I^{\dagger} I$ respectively. $d\overline{B} = dz$ can be obtained from dB = dz by making the following replacements:

$$C_{7}^{tot} = C_{7} (m_{b}) + \frac{q}{tt^{0}} C_{7}^{t^{0}} (m_{b}) ! \overline{C_{7}^{tot}} = C_{7} (m_{b}) + \frac{q}{tt^{0}} C_{7}^{t^{0}} (m_{b}) ;$$
(21)

$$C_{9}^{\text{tot}} = {}_{1} + {}_{\text{tu}}{}_{2} + {}_{\text{tt}}{}_{0}{}_{9}{}_{0}{}_{\text{tot}}{}_{\text{b}}) ! \quad \overline{C_{9}^{\text{tot}}} = {}_{1} + {}_{\text{tu}}{}_{2} + {}_{\text{tt}}{}_{0}{}_{0}{}_{9}{}_{\text{tot}}{}_{\text{b}}); \quad (22)$$

$$C_{10}^{\text{tot}} = C_{10} (\mathfrak{m}_{b}) + \frac{q}{tt^{0}} C_{10}^{t^{0}} (\mathfrak{m}_{b}) ! \overline{C_{10}^{\text{tot}}} = C_{10} (\mathfrak{m}_{b}) + \frac{q}{tt^{0}} C_{10}^{t^{0}} (\mathfrak{m}_{b}) :$$
(23)

Then

$$D(z) \quad \overline{D(z)} = 2 \quad 1 + \frac{2t^2}{z} \qquad \text{Im} \left(\begin{smallmatrix} q \\ tu \end{smallmatrix} \right) f2(1 + 2z) \text{Im} \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right) \qquad 12C_7 \text{Im} \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 2 \\ 2 \end{smallmatrix} \right) g + X_{im} \qquad (1 + 2z) C_9^{t^0} + 6C_7^{t^0} ; \qquad (24)$$
$$D(z) + \overline{D(z)} = 1 + \frac{2t^2}{z} \qquad h \qquad n \qquad 0 \\+ 12 \quad B_2 + 2C_7 C_9^{t^0} \text{Re} \left(\begin{smallmatrix} q \\ tt^0 \end{smallmatrix} \right) + C_7^{t^0} \qquad 2j \begin{smallmatrix} q & 2 \\ tt^0 \end{smallmatrix} \right) C_9^{t^0} + X_{re} \qquad \text{oi}$$

+8
$$1 + \frac{2t^2}{z}$$
 $1 + \frac{2}{z}$ c_7^{tot}
+2 $(1 + 2z) + \frac{2t^2}{z}$ $(1 + 4z)$ c_{10}^{tot} ; (25)

where

$$X_{re} = 2 \operatorname{Re}\left(\begin{smallmatrix}q\\tt^{0}\end{smallmatrix}\right) \operatorname{Re}\left(\begin{smallmatrix}1\\t\end{smallmatrix}\right) + \operatorname{Re} \begin{smallmatrix}q&q\\tt^{0}&tu \end{array} \operatorname{Re}\left(\begin{smallmatrix}2\\t\end{smallmatrix}\right) ;$$
(26)

$$X_{im} = 2 \operatorname{Im} \left(\begin{array}{c} q \\ tt^{0} \end{array} \right) \operatorname{Im} \left(\begin{array}{c} 1 \end{array} \right) + \operatorname{Im} \begin{array}{c} q & q \\ tt^{0} & tu \end{array} \operatorname{Im} \left(\begin{array}{c} 2 \end{array} \right) ; \qquad (27)$$

$$B_{1} = 2 j_{1}j_{+}j_{tu}^{q} j_{+}^{2} + 2Re(q_{tu}^{q})Re(1_{2}) ; \qquad (28)$$

$$B_2 = 2C_7 fRe(_1) + Re(_{tu}^q)Re(_2)g;$$
 (29)

$$\mathbf{j}_{10}^{\text{tot}} \mathbf{j}^{2} = (C_{10})^{2} + \mathbf{j}_{tt^{0}}^{q} \mathbf{j}^{2} C_{10}^{t^{0}} + 2C_{10}C_{10}^{t^{0}} \text{Re}(\mathbf{j}_{tt^{0}}^{q});$$
(30)

$$\mathbf{\dot{r}}_{7}^{\text{tot}}\mathbf{\dot{f}} = (\mathbf{C}_{7})^{2} + \mathbf{j}_{tt^{0}}^{q}\mathbf{\dot{f}} \mathbf{C}_{7}^{t^{0}} + 2\mathbf{C}_{7}\mathbf{C}_{7}^{t^{0}}\mathbf{Re}\left(\mathbf{q}_{tt^{0}}^{q}\right):$$
(31)

The theoretical calculations shown above for the branching ratio of B ! X_q ⁺ are rather uncertain in the interm ediate q² region (7 G eV² < q² < 12 G eV²) owing to the vicinity of charm ed resonances. The predictions are relatively more robust in the low er and higher q² regions. We therefore concentrate on calculating A_{CP} (q²) in the low -q² (1 G eV² < q² < 6 G eV²) and the high-q² (14:4 G eV² < q² < m_b²) regions. In term s of the dimensionless parameter $z = q^2 = m_b^2$, the low -q² region corresponds to 0:043 < z < 0.26 whereas the high q² region corresponds to 0:62 < z < 1.

In order to estimate A_{CP} , we need to know the magnitude and phase of $\frac{q}{tu}$ and $\frac{q}{tt^0}$. For this we use the Dighe-K im (DK) parametrization of the CKM 4 matrix elements, introduced in [17].

A. DK param etrization for the 4 M atrix CKM 4

The Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) matrix in the SM is a 3 3 unitary matrix represented as 0 1

$$V_{CKM3} = \begin{cases} B \\ B \\ B \\ C_{cd} \\ V_{cd} \\ V_{cs} \\ V_{cs} \\ V_{cb} \\ V_{cb} \end{cases}$$
(32)

In the SM 4, a general CKM matrix can be written as follows:

$$V_{CKM4} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & & 1 \\ \nabla_{ud} & \nabla_{us} & \nabla_{ub} & \nabla_{ub'} \\ B & \nabla_{cd} & \nabla_{cs} & \nabla_{cb} & \nabla_{cb'} \\ B & \nabla_{td} & \nabla_{ts} & \nabla_{tb} & \nabla_{cb'} \\ \nabla_{td} & \nabla_{ts} & \nabla_{tb} & \nabla_{tb'} \\ \nabla_{t''d} & \nabla_{t''s} & \nabla_{t''b} & \nabla_{t''b''} \end{bmatrix}$$
(33)

The above matrix can be described, with appropriate choices for the quark phases, in term s of 6 real quantities and 3 phases. The DK parametrization de nes

The CKM 4 m atrix now looks like

The elements denoted by \# " can be determined uniquely from the unitarity condition $V_{CKM 4}^{Y}V_{CKM 4} = I$ on CKM 4. They can be calculated in the form of an expansion in the powers of such that each element is accurate up to a multiplicative factor of [1 + 0 (³)]. The matrix elements \mathfrak{F}_{ud} , \mathfrak{F}_{cd} and \mathfrak{F}_{cs} retain their SM 3 values

$$\mathfrak{F}_{ud} = 1 \quad \frac{2}{2} + O(4);$$
(36)

$$\mathfrak{F}_{cd} = + \mathcal{O}\left(\begin{smallmatrix}5\\\\\\2\end{smallmatrix}\right);$$
(37)

$$\mathfrak{P}_{cs} = 1 \quad \frac{2}{2} + 0 \quad (4);$$
(38)

whereas the values of the matrix elements V_{td} , V_{ts} and V_{tb} are modiled due to the presence of the additional quark generation:

$$\mathfrak{F}_{td} = A^{3} 1 C e^{i_{ub}} + r^{4} q e^{i_{cb}0} p e^{i_{ub}0} + \frac{A}{2}^{5} r^{2} + (C + C r^{2}) e^{i_{ub}} + O(^{6});$$
(39)

$$\mathfrak{F}_{ts} = A^{2} qr^{3}e^{i_{cb}0} + \frac{A}{2}^{4} 1 + r^{2} 2Ce^{i_{ub}} + O(5); \qquad (40)$$

$$\mathfrak{F}_{tb} = 1 \quad \frac{r^{2}}{2} + 0 \ (^{4}) :$$
(41)

In the limit p = q = r = 0, only the elements present in the 3 3 CKM matrix retain nontrivial values, and the above expansion corresponds to the W olfenstein parametrization [40] with $C = \frac{p}{2} + \frac{2}{2}$ and $ub = tan^{1} (=)$. The remaining new CKM 4 matrix elements are:

$$\mathfrak{F}_{t^{0}d} = {}^{3} q e^{i_{cb^{0}}} p e^{i_{ub^{0}}} + Ar {}^{4} 1 + C e^{i_{ub}} + \frac{5}{2} p e^{i_{ub^{0}}} q r^{2} e^{i_{cb^{0}}} + p r^{2} e^{i_{ub^{0}}} + O({}^{6}); \qquad (42)$$

$$\mathfrak{F}_{t^0 s} = q^2 e^{i_{cb^0}} + Ar^3 + {}^4 p e^{i_{ub^0}} + \frac{q}{2} e^{i_{cb^0}} + \frac{qr^2}{2} e^{i_{cb^0}} + O(5);$$
(43)

$$\mathfrak{E}_{t^0 b} = r + O(^4); \qquad (44)$$

$$\mathfrak{F}_{t^0b^0} = 1 \frac{r^2}{2} + 0 (4) :$$
 (45)

We already have strong direct bounds on the magnitudes of the elements of the CKM 3 matrix. From the direct measurements of $\mathcal{F}_{us}j = \mathcal{Y}_{us}j$, $\mathcal{F}_{ds}j = \mathcal{Y}_{ds}j$ and $\mathcal{F}_{ub} = \mathcal{F}_{ds}j = \mathcal{Y}_{ub} = \mathcal{V}_{ds}j$ [19], which do not assume the unitarity of the CKM matrix, one can derive [17]

$$0.216 < 0.223; 0.76 < A < 0.90; 0.23 < C < 0.59$$
 (46)

at 90% C L. A lso, the phase $_{ub}$ can be constrained through the measurement of Arg($V_{ub}V_{ud}$)=($V_{cb}V_{cd}$) since from (34), (36) and (37),

Arg
$$\frac{V_{ub}V_{ud}}{V_{cb}V_{cd}}$$
 Arg $\frac{\mathcal{P}_{ub}\mathcal{P}_{ud}}{\mathcal{P}_{cb}\mathcal{P}_{cd}}$ ub: (47)

The value of $_{\rm ub}$ is therefore restricted to lie between (26 {125) at 90% C L ..

D irect bounds on p and q can be obtained by combining the direct m easurem ents of the magnitudes of the elements in the rst two rows with the unitarity constraints. We get the 90% C L. bounds on \mathcal{F}_{ub^0} j and \mathcal{F}_{db^0} j as

$$\mathbf{\hat{F}}_{ub^0}\mathbf{j} < 0.094 \; ; \; \mathbf{\hat{F}}_{cb^0}\mathbf{j} < 0.147 \; ; \tag{48}$$

which correspond to p < 9:0; q < 3:05. In addition, a strong constraint is obtained on the combination X_{bb}^{L} $(V_{CKM 4}^{Y}V_{CKM 4})_{bb}$ through the measurements involving Z! bb, which give $X_{bb}^{L} = 0:996$ 0:005 [41]. This translates to $\mathcal{P}_{t^{0}b}j < 0:11$ at 90% C L., which corresponds to r < 0:5.

The observables M $_{B_s}$, M $_{B_d}$, B ! X $_s$, B ! X $_s$ + , and sin 2 are com – plicated functions of the CKM parameters ;A;C;p;q;r; $_{ub^0}$; $_{ub}$; and $_{db^0}$. Hence we take care of the constraints on these parameters num erically, without giving the analytic expressions explicitly here.

IV. CPASYMMETRY IN B ! X $_{\rm s}$ $^+$

A. Unitarity quadrilateral relevant for B $\,!\,$ X $_{\rm s}\,$ $^+$

The \squashed" unitarity triangle in the SM 3 that arises from the equation

$$V_{cb}V_{cs} + V_{ub}V_{us} + V_{tb}V_{ts} = 0$$
 : (49)

is shown in Fig. 1. The angles of this unitarity triangle are

Arg
$$\frac{V_{cb}V_{cs}}{V_{tb}V_{ts}}$$
; Arg $\frac{V_{tb}V_{ts}}{V_{ub}V_{us}}$ = ; (50)

The corresponding unitarity \quadrilateral" relation in the SM 4 is

$$\widehat{\Psi}_{cb} \widehat{\Psi}_{cs} + \widehat{\Psi}_{ub} \widehat{\Psi}_{us} + \widehat{\Psi}_{tb} \widehat{\Psi}_{ts} + \widehat{\Psi}_{t^0 b} \widehat{\Psi}_{t^0 s} = 0 ;$$
 (51)

This quadrilateral may be superimposed on the SM unitarity triangle as shown in Fig.1.

The CP asymmetry in the SM 3 depends on Im ($_{tu}^{s}$), as can be seen from eq. (24). This quantity may be written as

$$Im ({}^{s}_{tu}) = C {}^{2} sin {}_{ub} + O ({}^{3});$$
 (52)



FIG. 1: The "squashed" unitarity triangle (PQR) in the SM 3 and the corresponding unitarity quadrilateral (QRPT) in the SM 4.

which is the same as the sine of the angle shown in Fig.1.W ith the introduction of the fourth generation, the contribution to the CP asymmetry also comes from the quantity Im ($\frac{s}{tt^0}$), which may be written as

$$Im (_{tt^{0}}^{s}) = \frac{qr \sin _{cb^{0}}}{A} + O (^{2});$$
 (53)

which is the same as the sine of the angle e in the gure. Thus, the new CKM 4 elements them selves tend to magnify the CP violation by a factor of 1=5. There can of course be additional factors due to the modi ed W ilson coe cients in SM 4, which we will take care of in our complete numerical analysis in the next section.

B. Numerical calculation of $A_{\,C\,P}~(\!q^2)$ in B ! X $_{\rm s}$ $^+$

In order to calculate $A_{CP}(q^2)$ from the procedure outlined in Sec. IIB, we need to know $\begin{array}{c} q\\ tu \end{array}$ and $\begin{array}{c} q\\ tt^0 \end{array}$. Using the DK parametrization, we have

$$s_{tt^0} = \frac{e^{i_{cb^0}}qr}{A} + r \frac{e^{2i_{cb^0}}q^2r^2}{A^2} + 0 (3);$$
 (54)

$$s_{tu} = C e^{i_{ub} 2} + O (^{3}) :$$
 (55)

$G_F = 1.166$ 10 ⁵ GeV ²	$m_{c} = m_{b} = 0.29$ [43]
= 1:0=129:0	$f_{B_s} \stackrel{p}{\xrightarrow{B_s}} = (0.270 0.030) \text{ GeV} [44]$
$_{\rm s}$ (m $_{\rm b}$) = 0.220 [42]	$f_{B_d} = (0.225 0.025) \text{GeV} [44]$
$_{B_s} = 1.45 10^{12} s$	m $_{\rm s}$ = (1:17 0:008) 10 ¹¹ GeV
$B_{d} = 1.53 10^{12} s$	m $_{\rm d}$ = (3:337 0:033) 10 13 GeV
m = 0:105 G eV	$\sin 2 = 0.681 0.025$
$m_W = 80:40 \text{ GeV}$	$_{ub}() = 77^{+30}_{32}$
m _t = 172 : 5 GeV	B (B ! X _c ') = 0:1061 0:0016 0:0006 [45]
m _b = 4:80 GeV [43]	B (B ! X_s +) _{q²>14:4 G eV} = (0:44 0:12) 10 ⁶ [46, 47]
m _{B_s} = 5:366 G eV	B (B ! X_s) = (3.55 0.25) 10 ⁴ [48]
$m_{B} = 5279 \text{GeV}$	

TABLE I: Numerical inputs used in our analysis. Unless explicitly specied, they are taken from the Review of Particle Physics [19].

Putting these values of s_{tu}^s and $s_{tt^0}^s$ in the relevant expressions in Sec. IIB, we obtain A_{CP} (q²) in B ! X_s ⁺ . The inputs used in the num erical analysis are shown in Table I.

Fig. 2 shows A_{CP} (q²) in the low and high q² regions for the decay B ! X_s ⁺ for m_{t⁰} = (400; 800; 1200) G eV. C learly for m_{t⁰} = 400 G eV, for m ost of the allowed regions of the parameter space, the SM 4 prediction for A_{CP} (q²) in the low-q² region is either below the SM 3 prediction or consistent with it. However in the high-q² region, the SM 4 prediction can be as high as 2:5%, which is about 40 times the SM 3 prediction. There is thus a signi cant enhancement in A_{CP} (q²) in the high-q² region.

Table II shows the ratio of the maximum $A_{CP}(q^2)$ allowed within the SM 4 and that allowed in the SM 3. It can be seen that with increasing m_{t^0} , the enhancement in $A_{CP}(q^2)$ at low $-q^2$ (high- q^2) increases (decreases) and then saturates at 1.2 (25) times the SM value. Thus, while the low $-q^2$ region is rather insensitive to the elects



FIG.2: A_{CP} (z) vs z plot in the low $-q^2$ (left panel) and the high $-q^2$ (right panel) regions for the decay B ! X_s ⁺ for $m_{t^0} = (400; 800; 1200) \text{ GeV}$. The blue band represents the SM 3 prediction whereas the grey circles correspond to the possible values that can be obtained in the SM 4.

	[A c	\mathbb{A}_{CP}^{s} (q ²) \mathbb{I}_{max} (low q ²)			\mathbb{A}_{CP}^{s} (q ²) \mathbb{I}_{max} (high q ²)		
m $_{t^0}$ (GeV)	SM 3	SM 4	SM 4/SM 3	SM 3	SM 4	SM 4/SM 3	
400	0:25%	0:25%	1:0	0:05%	2:3%	46	
800	0:25%	0:3%	12	0:05%	1:4%	28	
1200	0:25%	0:3%	12	0:05%	1:3%	26	

TABLE II: Comparison of A_{CP} (q²) in the SM 3 and in the SM 4 for B ! X_s ⁺ at di erent m t⁰ values

of the fourth generation, the high- q^2 region m ay show a signi cant asymmetry that can easily be shown to be beyond the lim its of the SM 3.

The saturation in A_{CP} (q²) at large m t⁰ m ay be understood as follows. The W ilson coe cient C ₁₀ becomes very large as compared to C₇ and C₉ for large m t⁰. Hence from eq. (11), it is obvious that $s_{tt^0}^s$ must be very small for large m t⁰ so as to keep the branching ratio within the experimental range. Hence in the limit of large m t⁰, we have $s_{tt^0}^s$! 0. In this limit, the X immune in eq. (24) vanishes and the numerator of A_{CP} (q²) becomes

D (z)
$$\overline{D(z)} = 2 + \frac{2t^2}{z}$$
 [Im $\binom{q}{tu}$ f2 $(1 + 2z)$ Im $\binom{1}{2}$ 12C $_7$ Im $\binom{2}{2}$]:(56)

The right hand side of eq. (56) has only a weak dependence on m $_{t^0}$ and hence rem ains alm ost constant for large m $_{t^0}$. D (z) + \overline{D} (z), on the other hand, is just obtained from the branching ratio of B ! X_s ⁺, an experimentally measured value. The ratio of these two quantities, A_{CP} (q²), is therefore rather independent of m $_{t^0}$ at large m $_{t^0}$. This fact is rejected in the A_{CP} plots: there is not much difference in the A_{CP} (q²) prediction for m $_{t^0} = 800 \,\text{GeV}$ and m $_{t^0} = 1200 \,\text{GeV}$.

V. CPASYMMETRY IN B ! X_d +

A. Unitarity quadrilateral relevant for B $\,!\,$ X $_{d}\,$ $^{+}$

The \standard" unitarity triangle in the SM 3, which arises from the equation

$$V_{ub}V_{ud} + V_{cb}V_{cd} + V_{tb}V_{td} = 0$$
; (57)

is shown in Fig. 3 The angles of this unitarity triangle are de ned as

Arg
$$\frac{V_{tb}V_{td}}{V_{ub}V_{ud}}$$
; Arg $\frac{V_{cb}V_{cd}}{V_{tb}V_{td}}$; Arg $\frac{V_{ub}V_{ud}}{V_{cb}V_{cd}}$: (58)

The corresponding unitarity relation in the SM 4 is

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}_{ub}\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}_{ud} + \boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}_{cb}\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}_{cd} + \boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}_{tb}\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}_{td} + \boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}_{t^0b}\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}_{t^0d} = 0 \quad ; \tag{59}$$

This quadrilateral may be superimposed on the SM unitarity triangle as shown in Fig.3.



FIG.3: The unitarity triangle (ABC) in the SM 3 and the corresponding unitarity quadrilateral (ACBD) in the SM 4.

The CP asymmetry in SM 3 depends on Im ($_{tu}^{d}$), as can be seen from eq. (24). This quantity may be written as

$$\operatorname{Im}\left(\begin{array}{c} d \\ tu \end{array}\right) = \operatorname{Arg} \frac{e^{i_{ub}}}{1 \quad C e^{i_{ub}}} + O(); \qquad (60)$$

which is the same as the sine of the angle shown in Fig.3.W ith the introduction of the fourth generation, contribution to the CP asymmetry also comes from the quantity Im $\begin{pmatrix} d \\ tt^0 \end{pmatrix}$, which may be written as

$$Im \left(\begin{array}{c} d \\ tt^{0} \end{array} \right) = O \left(\begin{array}{c} \end{array} \right) : \tag{61}$$

Thus, the additional contribution to the CP violation from the complex nature of the CKM 4 elements is rather small. The enhancement in A_{CP} (q^2), if any, therefore has to come from the modi ed values of the W ilson coe cients. We calculate the enhancement numerically in the next section.

B. Numerical calculation of $A_{\,C\,P}\;(\!q^{2})$ in B ! X $_{d}$ $^{+}$

We now consider d_{tu}^{d} and d_{tt}^{d} for the calculation of A_{CP} (q^{2}) in B ! X_d + using the procedure outlined in Sec. IIB. Using the DK parametrization, we obtain

$${}^{d}_{tt^{0}} = \frac{p e^{i_{ub^{0}}} q e^{i_{cb^{0}}} r}{A (1 C e^{i_{ub}})} + O (2);$$
(62)

$${}^{d}_{tu} = \frac{e^{i}{}_{ub}}{1 \quad C e^{i}{}_{ub}} + \frac{e^{i}{}_{ub} \quad p e^{i}{}_{ub}{}^{0} \quad q e^{i}{}_{cb}{}^{0} \quad r}{A \left(1 \quad C e^{i}{}_{ub}\right)^{2}} + O \left({}^{2}\right):$$
(63)

For our num erical analysis, we use the expressions correct up to 0 (2).

Fig. 4 shows the $A_{CP}(q^2)$ distribution in the low $-q^2$ and the high $-q^2$ regions for $m_{t^0} = (400; 800; 1200) \text{ GeV}$. Here we nd that for $m_{t^0} = 400 \text{ GeV}$, the low $-q^2$ prediction in the SM 4 is either consistent with or below the SM 3 prediction whereas in the high $-q^2$ region, the SM 4 prediction can be as high as 6%, which is about 6 tim es the SM 3 prediction. There is thus a signi cant enhancement in $A_{CP}(q^2)$ in the high $-q^2$ region.

Table III shows the ratio of the maximal values of A_{CP} (q²) allowed within the SM 4 and that allowed in the SM 3. It can be seen that with increasing m_t, the enhancement in A_{CP} (q²) at low-q² (high q²) increases (decreases) and then saturates at 2.5 (3) times the SM 3 value. At low m_t, the enhancement in the high-q² region is rather large, and makes this region more suitable for the detection of a deviation from the SM 3 expectation, just like in the case of B ! X_s ⁺. However at high m_t, the enhancement over the SM 3 value is similar in both the regions, so that the higher branching ratio at low-q² and the higher value of A_{CP} (q²) therein makes the analysis of B ! X_d ⁺ at low q² an interesting prospect.

The same arguments as given in Sec. IV B in the case of B ! X_s ⁺ for the saturation of A_{CP} (q²) at large m t⁰ also apply to B ! X_d ⁺ . The allowed range A_{CP} (q²) at 800 G eV and 1200 G eV is then almost identical, as can be seen in Fig. 4.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we study the CP asymmetry in the decays $B ! X_s + and B ! X_d + in the standard model with an additional fourth generation using the D ighe-K in parametrization, which allows us to treat the problem as a perturbative$



FIG. 4: $A_{CP}(z)$ vs z plot in (a) the low $-q^2$ and (b) the high $-q^2$ region for the decay B ! X_d + for $m_{t^0} = (400; 800; 1200) \text{ GeV}$.

	A	\mathbb{A}_{CP}^{d} (q ²) \ln_{ax} (low q ²)			\mathbb{A}^{d}_{CP} (q ²) l_{max} (high q ²)		
m $_{t^0}$ (G eV)	SM 3	SM 4	SM 4/SM 3	SM 3	SM 4	SM 4/SM 3	
400	5:5%	5:5%	1:0	1:0%	6 : 0%	6 : 0	
800	5:5%	13:5%	2 : 45	1:0%	4:0%	4:0	
1200	5:5%	13:5%	2 : 45	1:0%	3:0%	3:0	

TABLE III: Comparison of A_{CP} (q²) in the SM 3 and in the SM 4 for B ! X_d ⁺ at dimension of A_{CP} (q²) in the SM 3 and in the SM 4 for B ! X_d ⁺

expansion in the Cabibbo angle , and explore the complete parameter space of the 4 quark mixing matrix. We use constraints from the present measurements of M $_{B_s}$, M $_{B_d}$, sin 2, and the branching ratios of B ! X $_{ce}$, B ! X $_{s}$, B ! X $_{s}$ $^+$. The results may be sum marized as follows:

1. For the decay B ! X_s ⁺ , the fourth generation of quarks may provide more than an order of magnitude enhancement in A_{CP} (q²) in the high-q² region (for m_{t⁰} > 400 G eV), whereas practically no enhancement in the low-q² region is obtained. Therefore the high-q² region is more sensitive to new physics of this kind.

2. For the decay B ! X_d ⁺ , the fourth generation of quarks m ay provide an enhancem ent up to 6 tim es in A_{CP} (q²) in the high-q² region. W hile no enhancem ent is possible in the low-q² region for m_t around 400 G eV, at large m_t (> 800 G eV) the enhancem ent in both low and high q² region in the SM 4 is about 3 times the corresponding SM 3 prediction. Since the branching ratio in high-q² region is sm all com pared to the one in the low-q² region, the low-q² region becomes more attractive at large m_t.

3. For both the decays B ! $(X_s; X_d)^+$, the e ect of increasing m_{t⁰} is to increase (decrease) the values of A_{CP} (q²) in the low -q² (high-q²) region. At large m_{t⁰}, the value of A_{CP} (q²) is almost independent of m_{t⁰}.

For a branching ratio of 10^{6} , a m easurem ent of a CP asym m etry of 1% at the 3 level would require 10^{10} B m esons. Hence the m easurem ent of a CP asym m etry at the level of a few per cent should be feasible at the future colliders like Super-B factories [49, 50]. A ny enhancem ent observed beyond the standard m odel, com bined with its q²-dependence, can o er clues about the nature of new physics involved.

A cknow ledgm ents

- A D.would like to thank C.S.K im for useful discussions.
- [1] D.S.Du and M.Z.Yang, \CP-Violation For B ! X_sl+1 Including Long-Distance
 E ects", Phys. Rev. D 54, 882 (1996) [arXiv:hep-ph/9510267].
- [2] A.Aliand G.Hiller, \A theoretical reappraisal of branching ratios and CP asymmetries in the decays B ! $(X_d; X_s)$ l⁺l and determination of the CKM parameters", Eur.Phys.J.C 8, 619 (1999) [arXiv:hep-ph/9812267].
- [3] F.K ruger and L.M. Sehgal, \CP violation in the decay B ! X_de⁺ e ", Phys.Rev.
 D 55, 2799 (1997) [arX iv:hep-ph/9608361].
- [4] Z.D.Eygi and G.Turan, \Standard ModelCP violation in B ! X_dl⁺ 1 decays", Mod.Phys.Lett.A 18, 2735 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0403031].
- [5] L.T.Handoko, \D eterm ination of the CKM unitarity triangle by B ! X_dl⁺ 1 decay", Phys. Rev. D 57, 1776 (1998) [arX iv hep-ph/9707222].
- [6] S.Fukae, \CP asymmetry of B ! X_sl⁺l in low invariant mass region", Phys.Rev.
 D 64,054010 (2001) [arX iv hep-ph/0102041].
- [7] V. Bashiry, \CP-violation in b! sl⁺1 transition beyond the standard model", J.
 Phys.G 32, 1073 (2006) [arX iv:hep-ph/0605061].
- [8] D.London, \FOURTH GENERATION EFFECTS IN B PHYSICS", Phys.Lett.B 234, 354 (1990).
- [9] W .S.Hou and R.G. Stuart, \SEM ILEPTONIC FLAVOR CHANGING NEUTRAL CURRENT DECAYS OF THE FOURTH GENERATION b-primeQUARK", Nucl. Phys.B 349, 91 (1991).
- [10] P.Bam ert and C.P.Burgess, \N egative S and light new physics", Z.Phys.C 66, 495 (1995) [arX iv hep-ph/9407203].
- [11] T. Inam i, T. Kawakam i and C. S. Lim, \Constraints on the number of heavy generations from the S and T parameters", Mod. Phys. Lett. A 10, 1471 (1995).
- [12] A. Masiero, F. Feruglio, S. Rigolin and R. Strocchi, \Bounds on heavy chiral ferm ions", Phys. Lett. B 355, 329 (1995) [arXiv:hep-ph/9506407].

- [13] V.A.Novikov, L.B.Okun, A.N.Rozanov and M.I.Vysotsky, \Theory of Z boson decays", Rept. Prog. Phys. 62, 1275 (1999) [arXiv:hep-ph/9906465].
- [14] J. Erler and P. Langacker, \Electroweak M odel and Constraints on New Physics: in Review of Particle Physics (RPP 1998)", Eur. Phys. J.C 3, 90 (1998).
- [15] W. S. Hou, M. Nagashim a and A. Soddu, \Di erence in B⁺ and B⁰ direct CP asymmetry as e ect of a fourth generation", Phys. Rev. Lett. 95, 141601 (2005) [arX iv:hep-ph/0503072].
- [16] W .S.Hou, H.n.Li, S.M ishim a and M .N agashim a, \Fourth generation CP violation e ect on B ! K ; K and K in NLO PQCD ", Phys. Rev. Lett. 98, 131801 (2007) [arX iv hep-ph/0611107].
- [17] C.S.Kim and A.S.Dighe, \Tree FCNC and non-unitarity of CKM matrix", Int.J. Mod.Phys.E 16, 1445 (2007) [arXiv:0710.1681 [hep-ph]].
- [18] A. Soni, A. K. Alok, A. Giri, R. Mohanta and S. Nandi, \The fourth family: a natural explanation for the observed pattern of anomalies in B-CP asymmetries", arX iv:0807.1971 [hep-ph].
- [19] C. Am sler et al. [Particle Data G roup], \Review of particle physics", Phys. Lett. B 667, 1 (2008).
- [20] M. Maltoni, V. A. Novikov, L. B. Okun, A. N. Rozanov and M. I. Vysotsky, \Extra quark-lepton generations and precision measurements", Phys.Lett.B 476, 107 (2000) [arX iv hep-ph/9911535].
- [21] P.H. Frampton, P.Q. Hung and M. Sher, \Quarks and leptons beyond the third generation", Phys. Rept. 330, 263 (2000) [arX iv hep-ph/9903387].
- [22] J.I.Silva-M arcos, \Symmetries, large leptonic mixing and a fourth generation", JHEP 0212, 036 (2002) [arX iv:hep-ph/0204217].
- [23] V.A.Novikov, L.B.Okun, A.N.Rozanov, M.I.Vysotsky and V.P.Yurov, \Do the present electroweak precision measurements leave room for extra generations?", Mod.Phys.Lett.A 10, 1915 (1995) [Erratum-ibid.A 11, 687 (1996)].
- [24] N.J.Evans, \Additional ferm ion fam ilies and precision electroweak data", Phys.Lett.
 B 340, 81 (1994) [arX iv hep-ph/9408308].
- [25] H.J.He, N.Polonsky and S.f.Su, \Extra families, Higgs spectrum and oblique corrections", Phys.Rev.D 64, 053004 (2001) [arXiv:hep-ph/0102144].

- [26] V.A. Novikov, L.B. Okun, A.N. Rozanov and M. I. Vysotsky, \Extra generations and discrepancies of electroweak precision data", Phys. Lett. B 529, 111 (2002) [arX iv hep-ph/0111028].
- [27] G.D.Kribs, T.Plehn, M. Spannowsky and T.M.P.Tait, \Four Generations and Higgs Physics", Phys. Rev. D 76, 075016 (2007) [arXiv:0706.3718 [hep-ph]].
- [28] J.F.Gunion, D.W. McKay and H.Pois, \Gauge Coupling Unication And The Minimal Susy Model: A Fourth Generation Below The Top?", Phys. Lett. B 334, 339 (1994) [arXiv:hep-ph/9406249].
- [29] J.F.Gunion, D.W. McKay and H.Pois, \A M inim alfour fam ily supergravity model", Phys.Rev.D 53, 1616 (1996) [arX iv:hep-ph/9507323].
- [30] E.Arik, M.Arik, S.A.Cetin, T.Conka, A.Mailov and S.Sultansoy, \Can the Higgs boson be discovered at the LHC with integrated lum inosity of order fb¹ ?", Eur. Phys. J.C 26, 9 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0109037].
- [31] E. Arik, O. Cakir, S. A. Cetin and S. Sultansoy, \Consequences of the extra SM families on the Higgs boson production at Tevatron and LHC", Phys. Rev. D 66, 033003 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0203257].
- [32] E.Arik, O.Cakir, S.A.Cetin and S.Sultansoy, Acta Phys. Polon. B 37, 2839 (2006) [arX iv hep-ph/0502050].
- [33] W.S.Hou, A.Soni and H.Steger, \E ects Of A Fourth Fam ily On b! s And A Useful Param etrization Of Quark M ixing For Rare B Decays", Phys. Lett. B 192, 441 (1987).
- [34] C.S.Huang, W.J.Huo and Y.L.Wu, \The B ! X_sI⁺1 and B ! X_s decays with the fourth generation", Mod. Phys. Lett. A 14, 2453 (1999) [arXiv:hep-ph/9911203].
- [35] A. Arhrib and W. S. Hou, \E ect of fourth generation CP phase on b! s transitions", Eur. Phys. J. C 27, 555 (2003) [arX iv:hep-ph/0211267].
- [36] T.M.Aliev, A.Ozpineciand M.Savci, \Fourth generation e ects in processes induced by b! stransition", Eur. Phys. J.C 29, 265 (2003) [arX iv:hep-ph/0301078].
- [37] L solm az, $A simple approach to fourth generation e ects in B ! <math>X_s l^+ l$ decay", Phys.Rev.D 69,015003 (2004) [arX iv:hep-ph/0310132].
- [38] A.J.Buras and M.Munz, \E ective Hamiltonian for B ! X_sl⁺l beyond leading logarithms in the NDR and HV schemes", Phys. Rev. D 52, 186 (1995)

[arX iv hep-ph/9501281].

- [39] Y.Nir, \The Mass Ratio m (c)=m (b) in Sem ileptonic B Decays", Phys.Lett.B 221, 184 (1989).
- [40] L.W olfenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. 51, 1945 (1983).
- [41] F. del Aguila, M. Perez-Victoria and J. Santiago, \Observable contributions of new exotic quarks to quark mixing", JHEP 0009 (2000) 011 [arX iv:hep-ph/0007316].
- [42] M. Beneke, F. Maltoni and I.Z. Rothstein, \QCD analysis of inclusive B decay into charmonium ", Phys. Rev. D 59, 054003 (1999) [arX iv hep-ph/9808360].
- [43] A. Ali, E. Lunghi, C. Greub and G. Hiller, \Improved model-independent analysis of sem ileptonic and radiative rare B decays", Phys. Rev. D 66, 034002 (2002) [arX iv hep-ph/0112300].
- [44] M. Blanke, A. J. Buras, S. Recksiegel and C. Tarantino, \The Littlest Higgs Model with T-Parity Facing CP-Violation in B_s B_s Mixing", arX iv:0805.4393 [hep-ph].
- [45] B. Aubert et al. [BABAR Collaboration], \D eterm ination of the branching fraction for B ! X_c` decays and of y_{cb} j from hadronic mass and lepton energy moments", Phys. Rev. Lett. 93, 011803 (2004) [arX iv hep-ex/0404017].
- [46] B.Aubert et al. [BABAR Collaboration], \M easurement of the B ! X_s^{**} branching fraction with a sum over exclusive modes", Phys. Rev. Lett. 93, 081802 (2004) [arX iv hep-ex/0404006].
- [47] M. Iwasaki et al. [Belle Collaboration], \Improved measurement of the electroweak penguin process B ! X_s⁺, ", Phys. Rev. D 72, 092005 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ex/0503044].
- [48] E. Barberio et al. [Heavy Flavor Averaging Group], \Averages of b-hadron and chadron Properties at the End of 2007", arX iv:0808.1297 [hep-ex].
- [49] T.E.Browder, T.Gershon, D.Pirjol, A.Soniand J.Zupan, New Physics at a Super Flavor Factory", arX iv:0802.3201 [hep-ph].
- [50] M.Bona et al., \SuperB: A H igh-Lum inosity A symmetric e⁺ e SuperF lavor Factory.
 Conceptual D esign Report", arX iv:0709.0451 [hep-ex].