arXiv:1308.5242v1 [hep-ph] 23 Aug 2013

CP violation induced by the interference of scalar and vector resonances in three-body decays of bottom mesons

Zhen-Hua Zhang (张振华),[1,*] Xin-Heng Guo (郭新恒),[2,†] and Ya-Dong Yang (杨亚东)[3,‡]

[1] *School of Nuclear Science and Technology, University of South China, Hengyang, Hunan 421001, China*

[2] *College of Nuclear Science and Technology, Beijing Normal University, Beijing 100875, China*

[3] *Institute of Particle Physics, Huazhong Normal University, Wuhan 430079, China*

(Dated: February 27, 2024)

Abstract

Large CP violation is an interesting phenomenon both theoretically and experimentally. Last year, LHCb Collaboration found in some three-body decays of bottom mesons that large CP violations appear in regions of the Dalitz plots that are not dominated by contributions from narrow resonances. In this paper, we present a mechanism which can induce such kind of large CP violations. In this mechanism, large localized CP asymmetries in phase space can be induced by the interference of two intermediate resonances with different spins. We also apply this mechanism to the decay channel $B^{\pm} \to K^{\pm}\pi^{+}\pi^{-}$.

PACS numbers: 11.30.Er, 13.25.Hw, 13.30.Eg, 14.40.Nd

* Email:zhangzh@iopp.ccnu.edu.cn

† Email: xhguo@bnu.edu.cn

‡ Email:yangyd@iopp.ccnu.edu.cn

I. INTRODUCTION

Charge-Parity (CP) violation is one of the most fundamental and important properties of weak interactions. It was first discovered in $K^0 - \overline{K^0}$ systems in 1964 [1]. In Standard Model (SM), CP violation is originated from the weak phase in Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) matrix which describes the mixing of different generations of quarks [2, 3]. Besides the weak phase, in order to have a CP asymmetry that is large enough to detect, a large strong phase is needed. Usually, this large phase is provided by QCD loop corrections.

It was suggested long time ago that large CP violation should be observed in B meson systems [4, 5]. Last year, LHCb Collaboration found clear evidence for CP violation in some three-body decay channels of B mesons [6–8]. Intriguingly, large direct CP asymmetries were found in some localized phase spaces of the decay channel $B^\pm \to \pi^\pm\pi^+\pi^-$, which dose not clearly correspond to any resonance [7, 8]. The observed large localized CP asymmetry lies in the region $m^2_{\pi^+\pi^-\ \mathrm{low}} < 0.4\ \mathrm{GeV}^2$ and $m^2_{\pi^+\pi^-\ \mathrm{high}} > 15\ \mathrm{GeV}^2$ [1], and takes the value:

$$A_{CP} = +0.622 \pm 0.075 \pm 0.032 \pm 0.007, \tag{1}$$

while in the region $m^2_{\pi^+\pi^-\ \mathrm{low}} < 0.4\ \mathrm{GeV}^2$ and $m^2_{\pi^+\pi^-\ \mathrm{high}} < 15\ \mathrm{GeV}^2$, no large CP asymmetry is observed.

In our previous paper [9], we proposed a mechanism which can generate large localized CP asymmetries in phase space of three-body decay by the interference of two intermediate resonances with different spins. With this mechanism, we showed that the large CP asymmetry difference between the aforementioned two regions can be interpreted as the interference of amplitudes which correspond to two intermediate resonances, $\rho^0(770)$ and $f_0(500)$, respectively.

In fact, similar CP asymmetry behavior was also observed in $B^\pm \to K^\pm\pi^+\pi^-$ [6, 8]. When the invariant mass of the $\pi^+\pi^-$ pair is around the vicinity of $f_0(500)$, a CP asymmetry larger than about 30% was observed for smaller invariant mass of the $K^\mp\pi^\pm$ system, while a CP asymmetry that is slightly smaller than 0 (about 0 to -10%) was observed for larger invariant mass of the $K^\mp\pi^\pm$ system. In this paper, we will first give a more general analysis of the aforementioned mechanism, and then apply it to the channel $B^\pm \to K^\pm\pi^+\pi^-$.

[1] For the decay channel $B^- \to \pi^-\pi^+\pi^-$, there are two identical pions with negative charge. When combining the momentum of each π^- meson with that of the π^+ meson, we will have two Lorentz invariant masses squared which are usually different in values and are denoted as $m^2_{\pi^+\pi^-\ \mathrm{low}}$ and $m^2_{\pi^+\pi^-\ \mathrm{high}}$ in Ref. [8], respectively.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we first present a detailed analysis of the aforementioned mechanism which can be generate large localized CP asymmetries in three-body decays of bottom mesons. In Sec. III, we apply the mechanism to the decay channel $B^{\pm} \to K^{\pm}\pi^{+}\pi^{-}$. In Sec. IV, we present our conclusions.

II. GENERAL CONSIDERATION ON THE INTERFERENCE OF TWO NEARBY RESONANCES WITH DIFFERENT SPINS

For a cascade decay process, $B \to XM_3$, $X \to M_1M_2$, with all the initial and final particles being spin-0 ones, the transition amplitude is proportional to $P_{J_X}\big(g_{s_{12}}(s_{13})\big)$ [10], where P_{J_X} is the (J_X+1)-th Legendre Polynomial, s_{ij} $(i,j=1,2,3)$ is the invariant mass squared of M_i and M_j, J_X is the spin of X, and

$$g_{s_{12}}(s_{13}) = \frac{\hat{s}_{13} - s_{13}}{\Delta_{13}}, \tag{2}$$

with $\hat{s}_{13} = (s_{13,\max} + s_{13,\min})/2$, $\Delta_{13} = (s_{13,\max} - s_{13,\min})/2$, and $s_{13,\max(\min)}$ being the maximum (minimum) value of s_{13} for fixed s_{12}.

Inspired by the above statement, we can expand the transition amplitude of the decay process, $B \to M_1M_2M_3$, in terms of Legendre polynomials for fixed s_{12}:

$$\mathcal{M}(s_{12}, s_{13}) = \sum_l a_l P_l\big(g_{s_{12}}(s_{13})\big). \tag{3}$$

Note that a_l, Δ_{13}, and $\hat{s}_{13}$ may depend on s_{12}, but all of them are independent of s_{13}. For certain value of s_{12} (denoted by $\bar{s}_{12}$) when a_J is much larger than other a_l's, the transition amplitude $\mathcal{M}$ will be dominated by the $(J+1)$-th Legendre Polynomial:

$$\mathcal{M}(\bar{s}_{12}, s_{13}) \simeq a_J P_J\big(g_{\bar{s}_{12}}(s_{13})\big). \tag{4}$$

One would observe a spin-J resonance lying around $s_{12} = \bar{s}_{12}$, which is in fact responsible for the aforementioned cascade decay.

Another interesting situation arises when two different Legendre Polynomials with $l = J_1$ and $l = J_2$ are dominant for fixed $s_{12} = \bar{s}_{12}$. The decay amplitude $\mathcal{M}$ will take the form

$$\mathcal{M}(\bar{s}_{12}, s_{13}) \simeq a_{J_1} P_{J_1}\big(g_{\bar{s}_{12}}(s_{13})\big) + a_{J_2} P_{J_2}\big(g_{\bar{s}_{12}}(s_{13})\big). \tag{5}$$

If this decay process is a weak one, a_l's may take a general form

$$a_l = \left[\mathcal{T}_l + \mathcal{P}_l e^{i(\alpha_l+\phi)}\right] e^{i\delta_l}, \tag{6}$$

where ϕ is the weak phase, while δ_l and α_l are strong phases, $\mathcal{T}_l$ and $\mathcal{P}_l$ represent tree and penguin amplitudes, respectively. The strong phases δ_l and α_l can be properly chosen so that both $\mathcal{T}_l$ and $\mathcal{P}_l$ are real. The differential CP violation parameter, which is defined as

$$A_{CP} = \frac{|\mathcal{M}|^2 - |\overline{\mathcal{M}}|^2}{|\mathcal{M}|^2 + |\overline{\mathcal{M}}|^2}, \tag{7}$$

can then be expressed as $A_{CP} = D/F$, where

$$D = -2\sin\phi\Big\{\Big[P_{J_1}P_{J_2}\mathcal{T}_{J_1}\mathcal{P}_{J_2}\sin(\delta_{J_2} - \delta_{J_1} + \alpha_{J_2}) + P_{J_1}^2\mathcal{T}_{J_1}\mathcal{P}_{J_1}\sin\alpha_{J_1}\Big] + [J_1 \leftrightarrow J_2]\Big\}, \tag{8}$$

$$\begin{aligned} F = &\Big\{P_{J_1}^2(\mathcal{T}_{J_1}^2 + \mathcal{P}_{J_1}^2) + P_{J_1}P_{J_2}\Big[\mathcal{T}_{J_1}\mathcal{T}_{J_2}\cos(\delta_{J_1} - \delta_{J_2}) + \mathcal{P}_{J_1}\mathcal{P}_{J_2}\cos(\delta_{J_1} - \delta_{J_2} + \alpha_{J_1} - \alpha_{J_2})\Big] \\ &+2\cos\phi\Big[P_{J_1}P_{J_2}\mathcal{T}_{J_1}\mathcal{P}_{J_2}\cos(\delta_{J_2} - \delta_{J_1} + \alpha_{J_2}) + P_{J_1}^2\mathcal{T}_{J_1}\mathcal{P}_{J_1}\cos\alpha_{J_1}\Big]\Big\} + \{J_1 \leftrightarrow J_2\}, \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

with P_{J_i} $(i = 1, 2)$ being the abbreviation for $P_{J_i}\big(g_{\bar{s}_{12}}(s_{13})\big)$. One can see that the CP asymmetry depends on s_{13} through P_{J_1} and P_{J_2}. This is a very interesting behavior. On the other hand, no s_{13}-dependence of the CP asymmetry appears if only one Legendre Polynomial dominates because the common factor P_J^2 will be cancelled between D and F. When α_1 and α_2 equal zero, only one strong phase $\delta \equiv (\delta_{J_1} - \delta_{J_2})$ contributes to CP violation, and D and F reduce to

$$D = -2\sin\phi\Big\{\Big[P_{J_1}P_{J_2}\mathcal{T}_{J_1}\mathcal{P}_{J_2}\sin(\delta_{J_2} - \delta_{J_1})\Big] + [J_1 \leftrightarrow J_2]\Big\}, \tag{10}$$

$$\begin{aligned} F = &\Big\{P_{J_1}^2(\mathcal{T}_{J_1}^2 + \mathcal{P}_{J_1}^2) + P_{J_1}P_{J_2}\Big[\mathcal{T}_{J_1}\mathcal{T}_{J_2} + \mathcal{P}_{J_1}\mathcal{P}_{J_2} + 2\mathcal{T}_{J_1}\mathcal{P}_{J_2}\cos\phi\Big]\cos(\delta_{J_1} - \delta_{J_2})\Big\} \\ &+\{J_1 \leftrightarrow J_2\}. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

In the following of this section, we will focus on the situation when $J_1 = 0$ and $J_2 = 1$. Since the zero point for $P_1\left(g_{s_{12}}(s_{13})\right)$ lies at $s_{13} = \hat{s}_{13}$, this allows us to divide the allowed region of s_{13} into two parts: Ω and $\bar{\Omega}$, where in Ω $s_{13} > \hat{s}_{13}$ and in $\bar{\Omega}$ $s_{13} < \hat{s}_{13}$. The CP asymmetries in the regions Ω and $\bar{\Omega}$, after integration over s_{13}, are found to be

$$A_{CP}^{\Omega} = \frac{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_-^{\Omega} + \hat{\mathcal{A}}_-^{\Omega}}{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_+^{\Omega} + \hat{\mathcal{A}}_+^{\Omega}}, \qquad A_{CP}^{\bar{\Omega}} = \frac{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_-^{\bar{\Omega}} + \hat{\mathcal{A}}_-^{\bar{\Omega}}}{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_+^{\bar{\Omega}} + \hat{\mathcal{A}}_+^{\bar{\Omega}}}, \tag{12}$$

where

$$\hat{\mathcal{S}}_{-}^{\Omega} = -2\sin\phi\left[\mathcal{T}_0\mathcal{P}_0\sin\alpha_0 + \frac{1}{3}\mathcal{T}_1\mathcal{P}_1\sin\alpha_1\right], \tag{13}$$

$$\hat{\mathcal{S}}_{+}^{\Omega} = \left[\mathcal{T}_0^2 + \mathcal{P}_0^2 + 2\mathcal{T}_0\mathcal{P}_0\cos\alpha_0\cos\phi + \frac{1}{3}\left(\mathcal{T}_1^2 + \mathcal{P}_1^2 + 2\mathcal{T}_1\mathcal{P}_1\cos\alpha_1\cos\phi\right)\right], \tag{14}$$

$$\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{-}^{\Omega} = \sin\phi\Big[\mathcal{T}_0\mathcal{P}_1\sin(\alpha_1+\delta_1-\delta_0) + \mathcal{T}_1\mathcal{P}_0\sin(\alpha_0+\delta_0-\delta_1)\Big], \tag{15}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{+}^{\Omega} = -\Big\{&\mathcal{T}_0\mathcal{T}_1\cos(\delta_0-\delta_1) + \mathcal{P}_0\mathcal{P}_1\cos(\alpha_0-\alpha_1+\delta_0-\delta_1)\\ &+\cos\phi\Big[\mathcal{T}_0\mathcal{P}_1\cos(\alpha_1+\delta_1-\delta_0) + \mathcal{T}_1\mathcal{P}_0\cos(\alpha_0+\delta_0-\delta_1)\Big]\Big\}.\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

From the above expressions, one can check that under the interchange of Ω and $\bar{\Omega}$, $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_{\pm}^{\bar{\Omega}}$ are symmetric while $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\pm}^{\bar{\Omega}}$ are antisymmetric, i.e.,

$$\hat{\mathcal{S}}_{\pm}^{\bar{\Omega}} = \hat{\mathcal{S}}_{\pm}^{\Omega}, \quad \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\pm}^{\bar{\Omega}} = -\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{\pm}^{\Omega}. \tag{17}$$

Because of the presence of the antisymmetric terms, CP asymmetries in the two regions can be very different.

In practice, the two regions Ω and $\bar{\Omega}$ are not defined for fixed s_{12}. In stead, s_{12} lies in a small interval where both of the two resonances are dominant, for example, $\bar{s}_{12}-\lambda_1 < s_{12} < \bar{s}_{12}+\lambda_2$ (λ_1 and λ_2 are small). Then the localized CP asymmetry in the region ω ($\omega = \Omega, \bar{\Omega}$) takes the form

$$A_{CP}^{\omega} = \frac{\int_{\bar{s}_{12}-\lambda_1}^{\bar{s}_{12}+\lambda_2} \mathrm{d}s_{12}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_{-}^{\omega} + \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{-}^{\omega})}{\int_{\bar{s}_{12}-\lambda_1}^{\bar{s}_{12}+\lambda_2} \mathrm{d}s_{12}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_{+}^{\omega} + \hat{\mathcal{A}}_{+}^{\omega})}, \tag{18}$$

which is exactly the case in Ref. [9].

Besides the CP asymmetry, other quantities may also have interesting behaviors. For example, one can check that the quality R_+, which is defined as

$$R_+ = \frac{\int_\Omega ds_{13}(|\mathcal{M}|^2 + |\overline{\mathcal{M}}|^2) - \int_{\bar{\Omega}} ds_{13}(|\mathcal{M}|^2 + |\overline{\mathcal{M}}|^2)}{\int_\Omega ds_{13}(|\mathcal{M}|^2 + |\overline{\mathcal{M}}|^2) + \int_{\bar{\Omega}} ds_{13}(|\mathcal{M}|^2 + |\overline{\mathcal{M}}|^2)} \tag{19}$$

equals to A_+^Ω/S_+^Ω and is nonzero. Even if the decay process $B \to M_1M_2M_3$ is not a weak one, the interference of spin-0 and spin-1 resonances also leads to interesting phenomenology. The quantity R_+ is again nonzero. The nonzero value of R_+ is originated from the interference of the spin-0 and spin-1 resonances. If one (no matter which one) of the resonances dominates over the other one, R_+ will equal to zero.

III. APPLICATION TO $B^{\pm} \to K^{\pm}\pi^{+}\pi^{-}$

In this section, we will apply the mechanism which was considered in last section to the decay $B^{\pm} \to K^{\pm}\pi^{+}\pi^{-}$. We will show that the interference of the two resonances, $f_0(500)$ and $\rho^0(770)$, which are spin-0 and spin-1, respectively, can lead to large localized CP asymmetry difference around the vicinity of $f_0(500)$ in the phase space. The corresponding effective Hamiltonian can be expressed as [11]

$$\mathcal{H}_{\rm eff} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}}\Big[V_{ub}V_{uq}^*\big(C_1O_1^u + C_2O_2^u\big) + V_{cb}V_{cq}^*\big(C_1O_1^c + C_2O_2^c\big) - V_{tb}V_{tq}^*\sum_{i=3}^{10}C_iO_i\Big] + h.c.\ , \quad (20)$$

where G_F is the Fermi constant, $V_{qq'}$ is the CKM matrix element, $C_i(\mu)$ $(i = 1, \cdots, 10)$ are the Wilson coefficients, $O_i(\mu)$ are the operators from Operator Product Expansion, μ is the typical energy scale for the decay process. The local four quark operators O_i can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
O_1^{q'} &= \bar{q}_\alpha\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)q'_\beta\bar{q}'_\beta\gamma^\mu(1-\gamma_5)b_\alpha\ , & O_2^{q'} &= \bar{q}\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)q'\bar{q}'\gamma^\mu(1-\gamma_5)b\ ,\\
O_3 &= \bar{q}\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)b\sum_{q'}\bar{q}'\gamma^\mu(1-\gamma_5)q'\ , & O_4 &= \bar{q}_\alpha\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)b_\beta\sum_{q'}\bar{q}'_\beta\gamma^\mu(1-\gamma_5)q'_\alpha\ ,\\
O_5 &= \bar{q}\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)b\sum_{q'}\bar{q}'\gamma^\mu(1+\gamma_5)q'\ , & O_6 &= \bar{q}_\alpha\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)b_\beta\sum_{q'}\bar{q}'_\beta\gamma^\mu(1+\gamma_5)q'_\alpha\ ,\\
O_7 &= \frac{3}{2}\bar{q}\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)b\sum_{q'}e_{q'}\bar{q}'\gamma^\mu(1+\gamma_5)q'\ , & O_8 &= \frac{3}{2}\bar{q}_\alpha\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)b_\beta\sum_{q'}e_{q'}\bar{q}'_\beta\gamma^\mu(1+\gamma_5)q'_\alpha\ ,\\
O_9 &= \frac{3}{2}\bar{q}\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)b\sum_{q'}e_{q'}\bar{q}'\gamma^\mu(1-\gamma_5)q'\ , & O_{10} &= \frac{3}{2}\bar{q}_\alpha\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)b_\beta\sum_{q'}e_{q'}\bar{q}'_\beta\gamma^\mu(1-\gamma_5)q'_\alpha\ ,
\end{aligned}$$

where α and β represent color indices, $e_{q'}$ is the charge of the quark q' in unit of the absolute electron charge. With the effective Hamiltonian at hand, we can derive the matrix element for $B^- \to \rho^0\pi^-$ and $B^- \to f_0(500)\pi^-$ via the factorization approach.

We also need the effective Hamiltonian for $\rho^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-$ and $f_0(500) \to \pi^+\pi^-$, which can be formally expressed as

$$\mathcal{H}_{\rho^0\pi\pi} = -ig_{\rho\pi\pi}\rho^0_\mu\pi^+\overleftrightarrow{\partial}\pi^-, \quad (21)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_{f_0\pi\pi} = g_{f_0\pi\pi}f_0(2\pi^+\pi^- + \pi^0\pi^0), \quad (22)$$

where ρ^0_μ, f_0 and $\pi^\pm$ are the field operators for ρ^0, $f_0(500)$ and π mesons, $g_{\rho\pi\pi}$ and $g_{f_0\pi\pi}$ are the effective coupling constants, which should be in principle determined by the underling

theory, i.e., QCD. The effective coupling constants can be expressed in terms of the decay constants:

$$g^2_{\rho\pi\pi} = \frac{48\pi}{\left(1-\frac{4m_\pi^2}{m_\rho^2}\right)^{3/2}} \cdot \frac{\Gamma_{\rho^0\to\pi^+\pi^-}}{m_\rho}, \tag{23}$$

$$g^2_{f_0\pi\pi} = \frac{4\pi m_{f_0}\Gamma_{f_0\to\pi^+\pi^-}}{\left(1-\frac{4m_\pi^2}{m_{f_0}^2}\right)^{1/2}}. \tag{24}$$

Both $f_0(500)$ and $\rho^0(770)$ decay into one pion pair dominantly. One can easily check that $\Gamma_{\rho^0} \simeq \Gamma_{\rho^0\to\pi^+\pi^-}$, and $\Gamma_{f_0} \simeq \frac{3}{2}\Gamma_{f_0\to\pi^+\pi^-}$

The vector meson $\rho^0(770)$ are usually the dominant resonance for B meson decay channels with one $\pi^+\pi^-$ pair in the final state, while $f_0(500)$ is not. This makes both the two resonances, $f_0(500)$ and $\rho^0(770)$, are dominant when the invariant mass of the $\pi^+\pi^-$ pair is around the mass of $f_0(500)$. As a result, the decay amplitude for $B^- \to K^-\pi^+\pi^-$ can be expressed as

$$\mathcal{M}_{B^-\to K^-\pi^+\pi^-} = \mathcal{M}_{f_0} + \mathcal{M}_{\rho^0}e^{i\tilde{\delta}}, \tag{25}$$

when the invariant mass of the $\pi^+\pi^-$ pair is around the vicinity of $f_0(500)$, where $\mathcal{M}_{f_0(\rho^0)}$ is the transition amplitude for the cascade decay $B^- \to K^- f_0(\rho^0)$, $f_0(\rho^0) \to \pi^+\pi^-$, $\tilde{\delta}$ is the relative strong phase between $\mathcal{M}_{\rho^0}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{f_0}$.

With the effective Hamiltonians at hand, one can in principle calculate the transition amplitude via the QCD factorization approach [12] or perturbative QCD approach [13], etc.. These approaches will generate complex phases in the effective Wilson coefficients. However, these strong phases usually result in a small net strong phase between the penguin and tree parts of the amplitude. Besides, since we are working in the vicinity of $f_0(500)$, any factorization approach seems not to be accurate for $B^\pm \to K^\pm\rho^0$ when ρ^0 is off shell. In view of this, we will use a naive factorization approach for both $B^\pm \to K^\pm\rho^0$ and $B^\pm \to K^\pm f_0(500)$. As a result, the amplitudes take the form [2]

[2] Just as the case of $B^\pm \to \pi^\pm\pi^+\pi^-$ in Ref. [9], for the decay $B^\pm \to K^\pm\pi^+\pi^-$, there are also annihilation terms which are also chiral enhancement terms in the meantime. However, these terms are about four times smaller for $B^\pm \to K^\pm\pi^+\pi^-$ than $B^\pm \to \pi^\pm\pi^+\pi^-$. Because of this, we simply neglect these terms here.

$$\mathcal{M}_{\rho^0} = \frac{2m_\rho g_{\rho\pi\pi}(\hat{s}_{K^-\pi^+} - s_{K^-\pi^+})}{s - m_{\rho^2} + im_\rho\Gamma_\rho} \cdot \Big\{ V_{ub}V_{us}^* \Big[\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} a_1 f_\rho F_1 + a_2 f_K A_0 \Big]$$
$$- V_{tb}V_{ts}^* \Big[\frac{3}{2\sqrt{2}}(a_7 + a_9) f_\rho F_1 + \Big(a_4 + a_{10} - \frac{2(a_6 + a_8)m_K^2}{(m_s + m_u)(m_b + m_u)} \Big) f_K A_0 \Big] \Big\}, \quad (26)$$
$$\mathcal{M}_{f_0} = \frac{2g_{f_0\pi\pi}}{s - m_{f_0^2} + im_{f_0}\Gamma_{f_0}} f_\pi m_B^2 F_0^{B\to f_0}(m_K^2)$$
$$\cdot \Big\{ V_{ub}V_{us}^* a_2 - V_{tb}V_{ts}^* \Big[(a_4 + a_{10}) - \frac{2(a_6 + a_8)m_K^2}{(m_s + m_u)(m_b + m_u)} \Big] \Big\}, \quad (27)$$

where F_1 and A_0 are short for the form factors $F_1^{(B\to K)}(m_\rho^2)$ and $A_0^{(B\to\rho)}(m_K^2)$, respectively, all the a_i's are built up from the Wilson coefficients C_i's, and take the form $a_i = C_i + C_{i+1}/N_c$ for odd i and $a_i = C_i + C_{i-1}/N_c$ for even i. In deriving the above expression for the amplitudes, we have assumed that both $f_0(500)$ and $\rho^0(770)$ do not have the $s\bar{s}$ component (or at least negligible). This is a rough estimation, especially for $f_0(500)$, because the structure of $f_0(500)$ is still unclear [3].

We use a set of Wilson coefficients from Ref. [11]:

$$C_1 = -0.185,\ C_2 = 1.082,\ C_3 = 0.014,\ C_4 = -0.035,$$
$$C_5 = 0.009,\ C_6 = -0.041,\ C_7 = -0.002\alpha,$$
$$C_8 = 0.054\alpha,\ C_9 = -1.292\alpha,\ C_{10} = 0.263\alpha,$$

where α is the fine structure constant and all the Wilson coefficients are taken in the naive dimensional regularization scheme for $\mu = \overline{m}_b(m_b) = 4.40$ GeV, $m_t = 170$ GeV, $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(5)} = 225$ MeV. We also need three form factors, $F_1^{(B^-\to K^-)}$, $A_0^{(B^-\to\rho^0)}$ and $F_0^{(B^-\to f_0)}$. In our numerical calculation, we use [15]

$$F_1^{(B\to K)}(0) = 0.35, \quad (28)$$
$$A_0^{(B\to\rho)}(0) = 0.28. \quad (29)$$

Since most of the models indicate that the B meson to a light meson form factor at zero recoil lies around 0.3, we simply set

$$F_0^{(B\to f_0)}(0) = 0.3. \quad (30)$$

[3] Theoretical analysis shows that it has a large $qq\bar{q}\bar{q}$ component [14].

One of the commonly used approximations for these form factors is the monopole approximation:

$$f(s) = \frac{f(0)}{1 - \frac{s}{m_{\rm p}^2}}, \tag{31}$$

where $f = F_1^{(B\to K)}$, $A_0^{(B\to\rho)}$, or $F_0^{(B\to f_0)}$, $m_{\rm p}$ is the pole mass. The pole mass should be different for different form factors (around 5 to 6 GeV). However, since s_L and m_π^2 are small compared with the pole mass squared, we will simply replace $f(s)$ or $f(m_K^2)$ by $f(0)$.

We confront with two resonances, $\rho^0(770)$ and $f_0(500)$. The masses and total decay widths of these two resonances in our numerical calculation are (in GeV) [16]

$$m_{\rho^0(770)} = 0.775, \quad \Gamma_{\rho^0(770)} = 0.149,$$
$$m_{f_0(500)} = 0.500, \quad \Gamma_{f_0(500)} = 0.500.$$

With all the above considerations, one can see that we have only one free parameter, which is the strong phase $\tilde{\delta}$. The latest experimental CP asymmetry data for the decay channel $B^\pm \to K^\pm\pi^+\pi^-$ is from LHCb Collaboration [6]. Their experimental results indicate that when the invariant mass of $\pi^+\pi^-$ is around the vicinity of $f_0(500)$, the CP asymmetry can be larger than about 30% for small invariant mass of the $K^\mp\pi^\pm$ pair, and lies between 0 to -10% for large invariant mass of the $K^\mp\pi^\pm$ pair. These experimental constraints imply that the strong phase $\tilde{\delta}$ should be between 200° and 249°. In FIG. 1, we show the differential CP asymmetry as a function of $g_s(s_{K^\mp\pi^\pm})$ when $s = m_{f_0}^2$ for $\tilde{\delta} = 200°$, 220°, and 240°, respectively. One can see that when g is smaller than 0 (corresponding to $\hat{s}_{K^\mp\pi^\pm} < s_{K^\mp\pi^\pm} < s_{K^\mp\pi^\pm,\rm max}$, which is just the region Ω), the CP asymmetry is very small, while when g is larger than about 0.5 (corresponding to $s_{K^\mp\pi^\pm,\rm min} < s_{K^\mp\pi^\pm} < \hat{s}_{K^\mp\pi^\pm} - 0.5\Delta_{K^\mp\pi^\pm}$), the CP asymmetry becomes very large. This is exactly what the LHCb experimental results showed.

IV. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we presented a general analysis of the mechanism that induces CP violation by the interference of two resonances with different spins. We applied this mechanism to the decay process $B^\pm \to K^\pm\pi^+\pi^-$. When the invariant mass of the $\pi^+\pi^-$ pair is around the vicinity of $f_0(500)$, we found that a large CP asymmetry difference may exist between large and small invariant masses of the $K^\pm\pi^\mp$ system. A key observation of this large CP




FIG. 1. The differential CP asymmetry (curved lines) as a function of $g = g_{m^2_{f_0}}(s_{K^\mp\pi^\pm})$. We also show the localized CP asymmetries (straight lines) averaged over the regions Ω and $\bar{\Omega}$, respectively. Dash-dotted lines, solid lines, and dashed lines are for $\tilde{\delta} = 200^\circ$, 220° and 240°, respectively.

asymmetry difference is that it can be interpreted as the interference of the amplitudes induced by ρ^0 and $f_0(500)$ as the intermediate resonances, respectively.

Unlike the $B^\pm \to \pi^\pm\pi^+\pi^-$ case where there are up to five free parameters [9], we have only one parameter for the case $B^\pm \to K^\pm\pi^+\pi^-$, which is the relative strong phase $\tilde{\delta}$. This makes our analysis of the decay channel $B^\pm \to K^\pm\pi^+\pi^-$ much more simplified. We found that when the relative strong phase $\tilde{\delta}$ lies between 200° and 249°, theoretical analysis is consistent with the data.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was partially supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China under Contract No. 10975018, No. 11175020, No. 11225523, No. 11275025 and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities in China. One of us (Z.H.Z.) also thank

the hospitality of Professor Xin-Nian Wang at Huazhong Normal University.

---

[1] J. Christenson, J. Cronin, V. Fitch, and R. Turlay, Phys. Rev. Lett. **13**, 138 (1964).

[2] N. Cabibbo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **10**, 531 (1963).

[3] M. Kobayashi and T. Maskawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. **49**, 652 (1973).

[4] A. B. Carter and A. Sanda, Phys. Rev. **D23**, 1567 (1981).

[5] I. I. Bigi and A. Sanda, Nucl. Phys. **B193**, 85 (1981).

[6] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb Collaboration), (2012), LHCb-CONF-2012-018.

[7] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb Collaboration), (2012), LHCb-CONF-2012-028.

[8] J. M. de Miranda (LHCb Collaboration), (2013), arXiv:1301.0283 [hep-ex].

[9] Z.-H. Zhang, X.-H. Guo, and Y.-D. Yang, Phys. Rev. **D87**, 076007 (2013), arXiv:1303.3676 [hep-ph].

[10] S. U. Chung, "Spin formalisms," CERN Yellow Report: CERN-71-08 (1971).

[11] G. Buchalla, A. J. Buras, and M. E. Lautenbacher, Rev. Mod. Phys. **68**, 1125 (1996), arXiv:hep-ph/9512380.

[12] M. Beneke, G. Buchalla, M. Neubert, and C. T. Sachrajda, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 1914 (1999), arXiv:hep-ph/9905312.

[13] H.-n. Li and H.-L. Yu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 4388 (1995), arXiv:hep-ph/9409313.

[14] J. Schechter, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **197**, 64 (2012), arXiv:1202.3176 [hep-ph].

[15] H.-Y. Cheng, C.-K. Chua, and C.-W. Hwang, Phys. Rev. **D 69**, 074025 (2004), arXiv:hep-ph/0310359.

[16] J. Beringer *et al.* (Particle Data Group), Phys. Rev. **D 86**, 010001 (2012).