

1 Unitarity Triangle Fitter Results for CKM Angles

2 *D. Derkach*

3 *INFN, Sezione di Bologna, I-40127 Bologna, ITALY*

4 *and*

5 *LAL, Orsay, F-91898, FRANCE*

6 *On behalf of the UTfit collaboration:*

7 *A. Bevan, M. Bona, M. Ciuchini, D. Derkach, E. Franco, L. Silvestrini, V. Lubicz,*

8 *C. Tarantino, G. Martinelli, F. Parodi, C. Schiavi, M. Pierini, V. Sordini, A.*

9 *Stocchi, V. Vagnoni*

10 Proceedings of CKM 2012, the 7th International Workshop on the CKM Unitarity
11 Triangle, University of Cincinnati, USA, 28 September - 2 October 2012

12 Abstract

13 We present the status of the Unitarity Triangle analysis focused on the analyses
14 connected to the CKM angles extraction. The angle values are found to be
15 $\alpha = (90.6 \pm 6.6)^\circ$, $\sin(2\beta) = 0.68 \pm 0.023$, and $\gamma = (72.2 \pm 9.2)^\circ$.

16 1 Introduction

17 The Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) matrix V_{ij} [1] has to be unitary, which im-
18 plies several relations between its elements. In the Wolfenstein parameterizations [2],
19 each of these relations can be represented as a triangle in the $(\bar{\rho}, \bar{\eta})$ plane. The trian-
20 gles obtained by product of neighboring rows or columns are nearly degenerate. The
21 particular interest is driven by the unitarity condition

$$V_{ud}V_{ub}^* + V_{cd}V_{cb}^* + V_{td}V_{tb}^* = 0, \quad (1)$$

22 with each item approximately proportional to λ^3 . This equation is connected to B
23 meson decays due to the presence of V_{ub} and V_{cb} matrix elements. Figure 1 shows
24 the triangle, which angles, denoted by α , β , and γ , are¹:

$$\alpha = \arg\left(\frac{V_{td}V_{tb}^*}{V_{ud}V_{ub}^*}\right), \beta = \arg\left(\frac{V_{cd}V_{cb}^*}{V_{td}V_{tb}^*}\right), \quad (2)$$

$$\gamma = \arg\left(\frac{V_{ud}V_{ub}^*}{V_{cd}V_{cb}^*}\right) = \pi - \alpha - \beta. \quad (3)$$




Figure 1: Unitarity Triangle in the $\bar{\rho} - \bar{\eta}$ plane.

25 These proceedings show the combination of angle measurement and their imple-
 26 mentation as seen by the UTfit group [3]. The combination is performed in the
 27 Bayesian approach and uses the most recent results available by the time of the con-
 28 ference.

29 **2 CKM angle α extraction**

30 The CKM angle α is extracted from charmless hadronic B decays. We use the method
 31 described in [4]. The decays $B \rightarrow \pi\pi$ are analyzed using the $SU(2)$ isospin symmetry
 32 to cleanly disentangle the penguin contribution. This method relates the isospin
 33 amplitudes of $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$, $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0$, and $B^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^0$ processes and their complex
 34 conjugates as two triangles in a complex plane. We use the CP -averaged branching
 35 fractions of the processes as well as the available time-dependent asymmetries. The
 36 input values are taken from HFAG [5]. The same procedure is applied to the $B \rightarrow$
 37 $\rho\rho$ system with an additional complication of a relative orbital angular momentum.
 38 A more complicated analysis is used to extract the angle α from the $B^0 \rightarrow \rho^0\pi^0$
 39 decays. Here, we measure α using a time-dependent Dalitz analysis, which includes
 40 the variation of the strong phase of interfering ρ resonances.

41 Figure 2 shows the combination of the above mentioned methods. This combina-
 42 tion gives $\alpha = (90.6 \pm 6.6)^\circ$.

43 **3 CKM angle β extraction**

44 The golden mode to measure the angle β is the $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^0$ decay. This mode gives
 45 a value of $\sin(2\beta)$ which is considered practically free of theoretical uncertainties
 46 and thus serves as a benchmark for indirect searches for new physics. We estimate
 47 the deviation of the measured sine coefficient of the time-dependent CP asymmetry
 48 induced by the long-distance contributions from penguin contractions and by the

¹Another notation for angles, which is also used, is $\phi_1 \equiv \alpha$, $\phi_2 \equiv \beta$, and $\phi_3 \equiv \gamma$. This notation is commonly used by Belle experiment.




Figure 2: (color online) One-dimensional probability density functions for α (left), $\sin(2\beta)$ (middle), and γ (right) experimental results. The plots for α and γ also show the contribution from different channels and methods.

49 penguin operators using a data-driven technique [6]. Figure 2 shows the combination
 50 of all the information about the angle β . This combination gives $\sin(2\beta) = 0.68 \pm$
 51 0.023 .

52 4 CKM angle γ extraction

53 The CKM angle γ is one of the least precisely known parameters of the unitarity
 54 triangle. The methods of measurements [7, 8, 9] are using charged B meson
 55 decays into $D^{(*)}K^{(*)}$ final states which have no penguin contribution. This gives an
 56 important difference from most of other direct measurements of the angles. These
 57 processes are theoretically clean provided that hadronic unknowns are determined
 58 from experiment. The $\rightarrow \bar{u}s$ and $\rightarrow u\bar{c}s$ tree amplitudes are used to construct the
 59 observables that depend on their relative weak phase γ , on the magnitude ratio
 60 $r_B \equiv |\mathcal{A}(\rightarrow u\bar{c}s)/\mathcal{A}(\rightarrow \bar{u}s)|$ and on the relative strong phase difference δ_B between
 61 the two amplitudes.

62 The Atwood-Dunietz-Soni method [9] needs input from the D meson observables:
 63 amplitudes ratio r_D , strong phase difference δ_D , and coherence factor k_D . We perform
 64 a fit to the charm sector information allowing for CP violation in the singly-Cabibbo
 65 suppressed decays [10] and receive the following results that are used in the γ recon-
 66 struction: $\delta_D(K\pi) = (18 \pm 12)^\circ$ and $\delta_D(K\pi\pi^0) = (31 \pm 20)^\circ$. Combining the results
 67 obtained by LHCb, BaBar, Belle, and CDF collaborations we obtain $\gamma = (72.2 \pm 9.2)^\circ$.

68 The resulting combination is shown in Fig 2. We have also tested the influence of
 69 the prior probability distributions and found it to be negligible given the statistical
 70 uncertainty of the γ combination.

71 5 Overall Fits

72 Using the angle inputs and our Bayesian framework, we perform the fit to the infor-
 73 mation on angles to extract the CKM matrix parameters. We obtain $\bar{\rho} = 0.130 \pm 0.027$
 74 and $\bar{\eta} = 0.338 \pm 0.016$. The resulting fit is shown in Fig 3. The fit precision can be
 75 improved by adding constraints on other parameters: $|V_{ub}|/|V_{cb}|$ from semileptonic
 76 B decays, Δm_d and Δm_s from $B_{d,s}^0$ oscillations, ϵ_K from K mixing. This approach
 77 yields $\bar{\rho} = 0.132 \pm 0.021$ and $\bar{\eta} = 0.348 \pm 0.015$. The results of the full fit are shown
 78 in Fig. 3. This approach also allows one to obtain the SM predictions for different
 79 observables. The comparisons to the predictions of the angle values are shown in
 80 Fig 4. The predictions for the angles are: $\alpha = (87.8 \pm 3.7)^\circ$, $\beta = (24.3 \pm 1.9)^\circ$, and
 81 $\gamma = (68.8 \pm 3.4)^\circ$. We do not see big discrepancies between the SM predictions and
 82 experimental measurements (for more information, see the web-site www.utfit.org).




Figure 3: (color online) $\bar{\rho} - \bar{\eta}$ planes where the black contours display the 68% and 95% probability regions selected by the SM global fit. The 95% probability regions selected by the single constraints are also shown. Left: the angle-only fit. Right: the global SM fit using all the inputs described in the text.

83 References

- 84 [1] N. Cabibbo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **10**, 531 (1963); M. Kobayashi and T. Maskawa,
 85 Prog. Th. Phys. **49**, 652 (1973).
- 86 [2] L. Wolfenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **51**, 1945 (1983).
- 87 [3] M. Ciuchini, G. D’Agostini, E. Franco, V. Lubicz, G. Martinelli, F. Parodi,
 88 P. Roudeau and A. Stocchi, JHEP **0107**, 013 (2001) [[hep-ph/0012308](http://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0012308)].




Figure 4: (color online) Compatibility plots for α , $\sin(2\beta)$, and γ .

- 89 [4] M. Bona *et al.* [UTfit Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **76**, 014015 (2007)
 90 [hep-ph/0701204].
- 91 [5] Y. Amhis *et al.* [Heavy Flavor Averaging Group Collaboration], arXiv:1207.1158
 92 [hep-ex].
- 93 [6] M. Ciuchini, M. Pierini and L. Silvestrini, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95** (2005) 221804
 94 [hep-ph/0507290].
- 95 [7] A. Giri, Y. Grossman, A. Soffer, J. Zupan, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 054018 (2003).
- 96 [8] M. Gronau, D. London, Phys. Lett. B **253**, 483 (1991); M. Gronau and D. Wyler,
 97 Phys. Lett. B **265**, 172 (1991).
- 98 [9] D. Atwood, I. Dunietz, A. Soni, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 3257 (1997); Phys. Rev.
 99 D **63**, 036005 (2001);
- 100 [10] A. J. Bevan *et al.* [UTfit Collaboration], JHEP **1210**, 068 (2012) arXiv:1206.6245
 101 [hep-ph].