

Sum Rules of Charm CP Asymmetries beyond the $SU(3)_F$ Limit*

Sarah Müller^{a,b,†} Ulrich Nierste^{b,‡} and Stefan Schacht^{b,§}

^a *Institut für Experimentelle Kernphysik, Karlsruher Institut für Technologie, 76021 Karlsruhe, Germany*

^b *Institut für Theoretische Teilchenphysik, Karlsruher Institut für Technologie, 76128 Karlsruhe, Germany*

We find new sum rules between direct CP asymmetries in D meson decays with coefficients that can be determined from a global fit to branching ratio data. Our sum rules eliminate the penguin topologies P and PA , which cannot be determined from branching ratios. In this way we can make predictions about direct CP asymmetries in the standard model without *ad hoc* assumptions on the sizes of penguin diagrams. We consistently include first-order $SU(3)_F$ breaking in the topological amplitudes extracted from the branching ratios. By confronting our sum rules with future precise data from LHCb and Belle II one will identify or constrain new-physics contributions to P or PA . The first sum rule correlates the CP asymmetries a_{CP}^{dir} in $D^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-$, $D^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-$, and $D^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0$. We study the region of the $a_{CP}^{\text{dir}}(D^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-) - a_{CP}^{\text{dir}}(D^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0)$ plane allowed by current data and find that our sum rule excludes more than half of the allowed region at 95% C.L. Our second sum rule correlates the direct CP asymmetries in $D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 K^+$, $D_s^+ \rightarrow K^0 \pi^+$, and $D_s^+ \rightarrow K^+ \pi^0$.

INTRODUCTION

Decays of charmed mesons are currently the only way to probe flavor violation in the up-quark sector. A major goal of experimental charm physics is the discovery of CP violation in nonleptonic charm decays (see, e.g., [1–4]). To this end, it is promising to study singly Cabibbo-suppressed (SCS) decays d whose direct CP asymmetries may be large enough to be detected in the near future

$$a_{CP}^{\text{dir}}(d) \equiv \frac{|\mathcal{A}^{\text{SCS}}(d)|^2 - |\overline{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{SCS}}(\bar{d})|^2}{|\mathcal{A}^{\text{SCS}}(d)|^2 + |\overline{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{SCS}}(\bar{d})|^2}. \quad (1)$$

Here, $\mathcal{A}^{\text{SCS}}(d)$ is a D^0 decay amplitude and $\overline{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{SCS}}(\bar{d})$ is the amplitude of the CP-conjugate $\bar{D}^0$ decay. We write $\mathcal{A}^{\text{SCS}}(d) = \mathcal{A}_{sd}^{\text{SCS}}(d) + \mathcal{A}_b^{\text{SCS}}(d)$ with

$$\mathcal{A}_{sd}^{\text{SCS}}(d) = \lambda_{sd} \mathcal{A}_{sd}(d), \quad \mathcal{A}_b^{\text{SCS}}(d) = -\frac{\lambda_b}{2} \mathcal{A}_b(d),$$

and the shorthand notation $\lambda_q \equiv V_{cq}^* V_{uq}$ and $\lambda_{sd} \equiv (\lambda_s - \lambda_d)/2$ for the elements of the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa matrix involved. The contribution of $\mathcal{A}_b(d)$ to branching ratios $\mathcal{B}(d)$ is negligible, which essentially entails $\mathcal{B}(d) \propto |\mathcal{A}_{sd}(d)|^2$.

Adopting the Particle Data Group convention (with $\lambda_s > 0$) one may safely neglect subleading powers of $\lambda_b/\lambda_{sd} \sim 10^{-3}$. Eq. (1) reads

$$a_{CP}^{\text{dir}}(d) = \frac{\text{Im } \lambda_b \text{Im} [e^{-i\delta(d)} \mathcal{A}_b(d)]}{|\mathcal{A}_{sd}^{\text{SCS}}(d)|} \quad (2)$$

in terms of the strong phase $\delta(d) \equiv \arg[\mathcal{A}_{sd}(d)]$. The smallness of $\text{Im } \lambda_b$ renders $a_{CP}^{\text{dir}}(d)$ highly sensitive to physics beyond the standard model (SM). To establish a “smoking gun” signal of new physics one needs reliable SM predictions for $a_{CP}^{\text{dir}}(d)$ or at least robust theoretical upper bounds on $|a_{CP}^{\text{dir}}(d)|$ which cannot be exceeded within the SM. The difficulty of such theory predictions can be witnessed from $\Delta a_{CP}^{\text{dir}} \equiv a_{CP}^{\text{dir}}(D^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-) - a_{CP}^{\text{dir}}(D^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-)$: estimates vary between $\mathcal{O}(0.01\%)$ [5], $\mathcal{O}(0.1\%)$ [6–10], $\sim -0.25\%$ [11] and $\sim -0.4\%$ [12], not excluding an enhanced SM value between $\sim -0.6\%$ and $\sim -0.8\%$ [12–17]. There are claims that CP-violating effects in charm physics can be $\mathcal{O}(1\%)$ [18]. The situation is not any better in CP violation induced by $D - \bar{D}$ mixing [19]. The key problem is our lack of knowledge of the penguin amplitude entering $\mathcal{A}_b(d)$ in Eq. (2) [12, 14, 15].

All theoretical analyses of $D \rightarrow PP'$ decays, where P, P' denote pseudoscalar mesons, rely on the approximate $SU(3)_F$ symmetry of the strong interaction [7, 10–18, 20–41]. In analyses of branching ratios one can include first-order $SU(3)_F$ breaking [7, 10–17, 27, 28, 30, 32, 33, 35, 37, 38, 40, 41]. An intuitive way to exploit $SU(3)_F$ relations involves topological amplitudes (pioneered in Refs. [25, 26, 42]) which characterize the flavor flow in terms of tree (T), color-suppressed tree (C), exchange (E), annihilation (A), penguin ($P_{d,s,b}$), and penguin annihilation ($PA_{d,s,b}$) diagrams. This method has been extended to include linear $SU(3)_F$ breaking in applications to B [43] and D [41] decays. The first-order $SU(3)_F$ -breaking corrections are parametrized by $C_i^{(1)}, A_i^{(1)}, \dots$, with $i = 1, 2, 3$ labeling which d -quark line is replaced by an s line.

With our inability to predict individual CP asymmetries it is natural to study correlations among several asymmetries. There are two sum rules which hold in the

* dedicated to the memory of Lincoln Wolfenstein (1923-2015)

† sarah.mueller2@kit.edu

‡ ulrich.nierste@kit.edu

§ stefan.schacht@kit.edu

limit of exact $SU(3)_F$ symmetry [7, 16, 44]:

$$a_{CP}^{\text{dir}}(D^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-) + a_{CP}^{\text{dir}}(D^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-) = 0, \quad (3)$$

$$a_{CP}^{\text{dir}}(D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 K^+) + a_{CP}^{\text{dir}}(D_s^+ \rightarrow K^0 \pi^+) = 0. \quad (4)$$

Analyses of branching ratios permit the determination of $|\mathcal{A}_{sd}^{\text{SCS}}(d)|$ in Eq. (2) and, through global fits, also to constrain the phase $\delta(d)$. The branching ratios of the decays entering Eqs. (3) and (4) exhibit sizable $SU(3)_F$ breaking which limits the power of these $SU(3)_F$ -limit sum rules to test the SM. In this Letter, we derive new sum rules which incorporate $SU(3)_F$ breaking in $\mathcal{A}_{sd}^{\text{SCS}}(d)$ to linear order. To this end, we use the result of our global fit to $D \rightarrow PP'$ branching ratios in Ref. [41] in two ways: On one hand, we extract $|\mathcal{A}_{sd}^{\text{SCS}}(d)|$ and $\delta(d)$ for the decays of interest from the fit to find the numerical relation between $a_{CP}^{\text{dir}}(d)$ and $\mathcal{A}_b(d)$ in Eq. (2). On the other hand, the same fit also returns the values of the topological amplitudes entering the fitted branching ratios. However, the desired $\mathcal{A}_b(d)$ of individual decay modes involve additional topological amplitudes (new combinations of $P_{d,s,b}$ and $PA_{d,s,b}$) which do not appear in the branching ratios. Our sum rules are constructed in a way to eliminate these unknowns. Unlike Eqs. (3) and (4), these new sum rules use the $SU(3)_F$ limit for the eliminated $P_{d,s,b}$, $PA_{d,s,b}$ in $\mathcal{A}_b(d)$ only, while consistently including $SU(3)_F$ breaking in the SM-dominated quantities T , A , C , E . Since no relations among direct CP asymmetries hold to first order in $SU(3)_F$ breaking [44], this is the best which can be achieved.

CP ASYMMETRY SUM RULES

Our analysis starts with the decomposition of $\mathcal{A}_{sd}(d)$ and $\mathcal{A}_b(d)$ in terms of topological amplitudes. As an example consider

$$\mathcal{A}_{sd}(D^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-) = -T - E + P_{\text{break}} \quad (5)$$

$$\mathcal{A}_b(D^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-) = T + E + P + PA \quad (6)$$

with the $SU(3)_F$ -breaking penguin topology $P_{\text{break}} \equiv P_s - P_d$ and s, d denoting the quark flavor in the penguin loop. $\mathcal{A}_b$ involves the new penguin topologies $P \equiv P_d + P_s - 2P_b$ and $PA \equiv PA_d + PA_s - 2PA_b$, which do not appear in $\mathcal{A}_{sd}(d)$ of any decay d and, consequently, cannot be constrained by data on branching ratios. Next we combine Eqs. (5) and (6) to eliminate the numerically large parameters T and E from $\mathcal{A}_b$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_b(D^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-) \\ = -\mathcal{A}_{sd}(D^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-) + P_{\text{break}} + P + PA. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Trading T and E for $\mathcal{A}_{sd}$ is possible for all decays d considered in this Letter: With $\mathcal{T}_i = C, P_{\text{break}}, \dots$, we write

$$\mathcal{A}_b(d) = c_{sd}^d \mathcal{A}_{sd}(d) + \sum_i c_i^d \mathcal{T}_i, \quad (8)$$

with c_i^d specified in Table I. Since $e^{-i\delta(d)} \mathcal{A}_{sd}(d) = |\mathcal{A}_{sd}(d)|$ is real, $c_{sd}^d \mathcal{A}_{sd}(d)$ does not contribute to $a_{CP}^{\text{dir}}(d)$ in Eq. (2).

Our strategy involves three steps: In step 1, we determine all quantities entering $a_{CP}^{\text{dir}}(d)$ in Eq. (2) except for P and PA from a global fit to branching ratio data as described in Ref. [41]. These fitted quantities are the topological amplitudes $A_i^{(1)}$, C , $C_3^{(1)}$, and P_{break} entering Eq. (8) as well as $|\mathcal{A}_{sd}(d)|$ and the phases $\delta(d)$. Note that $|\mathcal{A}_{sd}(d)|$ is trivially found from $\mathcal{B}(d) \propto |\mathcal{A}_{sd}(d)|^2$. As an important feature of charm physics, the large number of different branching fractions gives useful information not only on the magnitudes of the topological amplitudes, but also on their phases (up to an overall unphysical phase). By plugging the results back into $\mathcal{A}_{sd}(d)$, we find $\delta(d)$ (up to discrete ambiguities).

In step 2 we eliminate all hadronic parameters but P and PA from $a_{CP}^{\text{dir}}(d)$. To this end, we define

$$\mathcal{S}(d) \equiv 2ie^{i\delta(d)} \left[\frac{|\mathcal{A}_{sd}^{\text{SCS}}(d)| a_{CP}^{\text{dir}}(d)}{\text{Im } \lambda_b} - \text{Im } X(d) \right], \quad (9)$$

with $X(d)$ given in Table II. $\mathcal{S}(d)$ is calculated solely from experimental input, as all ingredients of Eq. (9) are found from the global fit to branching ratios. To relate $\mathcal{S}(d)$ to theoretical quantities, we use Eq. (2)

$$\mathcal{S}(d) = 2ie^{i\delta(d)} \text{Im} \left[e^{-i\delta(d)} \mathcal{A}_b(d) - X(d) \right]. \quad (10)$$

For our example above the subtraction term $-\text{Im } X(d)$ removes P_{break} and Eq. (10) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}(D^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-) \\ = 2ie^{i\delta(D^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-)} \text{Im} \left[e^{-i\delta(D^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-)} (P + PA) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

The right column of Table II shows $\mathcal{S}(d)$ in terms of P , PA , their complex conjugates P^* , PA^* , and $\delta(d)$ (which is determined from the fit) for all decays. (To relate Eq. (11) to the entry in Table II, use $2i\text{Im}z = z - z^*$ for $z = e^{-i\delta(D^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-)} (P + PA)$.)

In step 3 of our analysis we construct two sum rules eliminating P , PA , P^* , and PA^* , each of which connects three $a_{CP}^{\text{dir}}(d)$. Table II reveals that the combined information from $\mathcal{S}(D^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-)$ and $\mathcal{S}(D^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0)$ determines the complex quantity $P + PA$. Any additional CP asymmetry depending on $P + PA$ will then probe the standard model; i.e., with three CP asymmetries we can construct the desired sum rule eliminating $P + PA$:

CP Asymmetry Sum Rule 1:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathcal{S}(D^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-) - \mathcal{S}(D^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-)}{e^{2i\delta(D^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-)} - e^{2i\delta(D^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-)}} - \\ \frac{\mathcal{S}(D^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-) + \sqrt{2}\mathcal{S}(D^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0)}{e^{2i\delta(D^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-)} - e^{2i\delta(D^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0)}} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Decay amplitude $\mathcal{A}(d)$	$A_{sd}(d)$	$A_1^{(1)}$	$A_2^{(1)}$	$A_3^{(1)}$	$C + A$	$C_3^{(1)}$	P_{break}	$P+2A$	$P+PA$
$\mathcal{A}(D^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-)$	1	0	0	0	0	0	-1	0	1
$\mathcal{A}(D^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-)$	-1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
$\mathcal{A}(D^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0)$	-1	0	0	0	0	0	$-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$	0	$-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$
$\mathcal{A}(D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 K^+)$	1	0	0	2	0	0	-1	1	0
$\mathcal{A}(D_s^+ \rightarrow K^0 \pi^+)$	-1	2	2	0	0	0	1	1	0
$\mathcal{A}(D_s^+ \rightarrow K^+ \pi^0)$	1	0	0	0	$\sqrt{2}$	$\sqrt{2}$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$	$-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$	0

TABLE I. The coefficients c_i^d of the topological decomposition of $\mathcal{A}_b(d)$ in Eq. (8). $A_{1,2,3}^{(1)}$ and $C_3^{(1)}$ are first-order $SU(3)_F$ -breaking corrections to A and C , respectively, as defined in [41].

Decay d	$X(d)$	$\mathcal{S}(d)$
$D^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-$	$e^{-i\delta(D^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-)} (-P_{\text{break}})$	$(P + PA) - e^{2i\delta(D^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-)} (P + PA)^*$
$D^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-$	$e^{-i\delta(D^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-)} (P_{\text{break}})$	$(P + PA) - e^{2i\delta(D^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-)} (P + PA)^*$
$D^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0$	$e^{-i\delta(D^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0)} \left(-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} P_{\text{break}}\right)$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (-P - PA) - e^{2i\delta(D^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (-P - PA)^*$
$D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 K^+$	$e^{-i\delta(D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 K^+)} \left(-2A_{D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 K^+}^{\text{fac}} + 2\delta_A - P_{\text{break}}\right)$	$P - e^{2i\delta(D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 K^+)} P^*$
$D_s^+ \rightarrow K^0 \pi^+$	$e^{-i\delta(D_s^+ \rightarrow K^0 \pi^+)} \left(2A_{D_s^+ \rightarrow K^0 \pi^+}^{\text{fac}} + 2\delta_A + P_{\text{break}}\right)$	$P - e^{2i\delta(D_s^+ \rightarrow K^0 \pi^+)} P^*$
$D_s^+ \rightarrow K^+ \pi^0$	$e^{-i\delta(D_s^+ \rightarrow K^+ \pi^0)} \left(\sqrt{2}C + \sqrt{2}C_3^{(1)} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} P_{\text{break}}\right)$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (-P) - e^{2i\delta(D_s^+ \rightarrow K^+ \pi^0)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (-P)^*$

TABLE II. Definitions of $X(d)$ and results for $\mathcal{S}(d)$ as used and defined in Eq. (9) in case of the $SU(3)_F$ fit including $1/N_c$ counting. For the sign conventions of $A^{\text{fac}}(d)$ see Ref. [41]. Note that $A_{D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 K^+}^{\text{fac}} = 0$ by isospin symmetry.

In this last step $SU(3)_F$ breaking in P , PA is neglected. The second sum rule, which correlates three CP asymmetries depending on P , is

CP Asymmetry Sum Rule 2:

$$\frac{\mathcal{S}(D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 K^+) - \mathcal{S}(D_s^+ \rightarrow K^0 \pi^+)}{e^{2i\delta(D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 K^+)} - e^{2i\delta(D_s^+ \rightarrow K^0 \pi^+)}} - \frac{\mathcal{S}(D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 K^+) + \sqrt{2}\mathcal{S}(D_s^+ \rightarrow K^+ \pi^0)}{e^{2i\delta(D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 K^+)} - e^{2i\delta(D_s^+ \rightarrow K^+ \pi^0)}} = 0. \quad (13)$$

By inserting the expressions in the right column of Table II one readily verifies Eqs. (12) and (13). If some of the phases in the denominators of the sum rules are equal (covering the $SU(3)_F$ limit as a special case) one finds: for $e^{2i\delta(D^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-)} = e^{2i\delta(D^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-)}$ Eq. (12) collapses to

$$\mathcal{S}(D^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-) - \mathcal{S}(D^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-) = 0, \quad (14)$$

while for $e^{2i\delta(D^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-)} = e^{2i\delta(D^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0)}$ the sum rule becomes

$$\mathcal{S}(D^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-) + \sqrt{2}\mathcal{S}(D^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0) = 0. \quad (15)$$

If all three phase factors are equal, Eqs. (14) and (15) hold simultaneously. The special cases of sum rule 2 are obtained from those in Eqs. (14) and (15) by obvious replacements.

When linking sum rule 2 to experimental quantities, we use $a_{CP}^{\text{dir}}(D^+ \rightarrow K_S K^+) = a_{CP}^{\text{dir}}(D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 K^+)$ and

$a_{CP}^{\text{dir}}(D_s^+ \rightarrow K_S \pi^+) = a_{CP}^{\text{dir}}(D_s^+ \rightarrow K^0 \pi^+)$, meaning that, in our definition of a_{CP}^{dir} kaon CP violation is properly subtracted [45]. The two sum rules probe the $SU(3)_F$ limit in P and $P + PA$. If future experiments find deviations of order 30%, one will ascribe those to $SU(3)_F$ -breaking hadronic effects. The smallness of $\text{Im } \lambda_b$ makes the sum rules highly sensitive to new physics, which may well violate the sum rules at a far higher level.

SM PREDICTION OF CP ASYMMETRIES

We combine the sum rules Eqs. (12) and (13) with the branching ratio fit presented in Ref. [41]: for each point in the parameter space complying with all measured branching fractions (and the strong phase $\delta_{K\pi}$), we determine $\mathcal{S}(d)$ for the decays entering the sum rules. In the same step Eqs. (9), (12), and (13) are used to predict one CP asymmetry in terms of the other two. In our fit, we demand $|(C + \delta_A)/T^{\text{fac}}|, |(E + \delta_A)/T^{\text{fac}}| \leq 1.3$ to enforce proper $1/N_c$ counting. (T^{fac} and A^{fac} are the factorized tree and annihilation amplitudes and $\delta_A \equiv A(D_s^+ \rightarrow K^0 \pi^+) - A^{\text{fac}}(D_s^+ \rightarrow K^0 \pi^+) = \mathcal{O}(1/N_c^2)$. The very conservative choice ≤ 1.3 accounts for a large Wilson coefficient in E , C offsetting the suppression factor of $1/N_c \sim 0.3$ [41].) Apart from the fit with current data (see Table X of Ref. [41]), we also consider a hypothetical future scenario with improved branching ratios by

Observable	Measurement	References
$\Delta a_{CP}^{\text{dir}}$	-0.00253 ± 0.00104	[1–3, 46–51]
$\Sigma a_{CP}^{\text{dir}}$	-0.0011 ± 0.0026	† [1, 2, 47, 49, 52]
$a_{CP}^{\text{dir}}(D^0 \rightarrow K_S K_S)$	-0.23 ± 0.19	[53]
$a_{CP}^{\text{dir}}(D^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0)$	-0.0004 ± 0.0064	† [4, 53]
$a_{CP}^{\text{dir}}(D^+ \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^+)$	$+0.029 \pm 0.029$	[54]
$a_{CP}^{\text{dir}}(D^+ \rightarrow K_S K^+)$	$+0.0011 \pm 0.0017$	† [54–58]
$a_{CP}^{\text{dir}}(D_s^+ \rightarrow K_S \pi^+)$	$+0.006 \pm 0.005$	† [54, 56, 58–60]
$a_{CP}^{\text{dir}}(D_s^+ \rightarrow K^+ \pi^0)$	$+0.266 \pm 0.228$	[54]

TABLE III. Current data on SCS charm CP asymmetries with subtracted indirect CP violation from kaon and charm mixing [45, 61], see Appendix A of Ref. [16]. We use the notation $\Sigma a_{CP}^{\text{dir}} \equiv a_{CP}^{\text{dir}}(D^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-) + a_{CP}^{\text{dir}}(D^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-)$. No correlations between CP asymmetries are taken into account in the fits. † Our average. Table adapted from Ref. [62].

scaling their errors with a factor $1/\sqrt{50}$. To illustrate the impact of the $1/N_c$ counting for the SM predictions, we perform an additional fit without $1/N_c$ input. This plain $\text{SU}(3)_F$ fit relies on the topological parametrization of Table III in Ref. [41] with the $\text{SU}(3)_F$ counting described in Sec. IIIB of Ref. [41]. The redundancy of the four $\text{SU}(3)_F$ -limit topologies [41] is removed by absorbing A into T , C , and E . We further demand $|A_i^{(1)}/T| \leq 50\%$ to respect the $\text{SU}(3)_F$ counting.

The experimental values of the CP asymmetries included in the fit are summarized in Table III. Our global fit results are shown in Fig. 1. The χ^2 of the global minima range from 0.0 to 2.0 in the considered scenarios, i.e., with or without $1/N_c$ counting and with current or future data, indicating an excellent fit. The sum rules have nontrivial implications for direct CP asymmetries, especially when combined with the input from $1/N_c$ counting. With current data, we see the largest impact of the sum rules in Fig. 1(a): roughly 47% of the 95% C.L. region allowed by the measurements of the CP asymmetries is excluded by our global fit result.

Our results show that future improved measurements of branching ratios will play a key role to sharpen our predictions: drastic examples are the prediction of $a_{CP}^{\text{dir}}(D_s^+ \rightarrow K^+ \pi^0)$ in Figs. 1(c) and 1(d) and the correlation of $a_{CP}^{\text{dir}}(D^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0)$ and $a_{CP}^{\text{dir}}(D^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-)$ in Fig. 1(a), where one of the two overlapping ellipses vanishes in our future-data scenario. In Fig. 1(b), a smaller portion of the experimentally allowed region is excluded than in Fig. 1(a), because $a_{CP}^{\text{dir}}(D^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0)$ is measured less precisely than $\Delta a_{CP}^{\text{dir}}$ (see Table III), rendering the sum rule less powerful in Fig. 1(b). In general, the correlation of two CP asymmetries can be better predicted once improved data for the third one appearing in Eqs. (12) and (13) becomes available. In the case of the fit without $1/N_c$ counting the smaller errors of the

branching ratios in our future scenario do not improve the predictions for CP asymmetries. Note that, with current data, the predicted ranges barely depend on the additional input from $1/N_c$ counting.


In principle, one can obtain the quantities P and $P + PA$, which we eliminate through our sum rules, from the individual CP asymmetries. If future data challenge our sum rules at a level which cannot be explained with $\text{SU}(3)_F$ breaking in P and $P + PA$, this will point to new physics which couples differently to s and d quarks. (For an $\text{SU}(3)_F$ analysis of such models see, e.g., Ref. [16].) However, $\text{SU}(3)_F$ -symmetric new physics in P and $P + PA$ vanishes from the sum rules. (A similar situation can be found in the isospin sum rules of Ref. [63] which are insensitive to new physics in $\Delta I = 1/2$ amplitudes.)

CONCLUSIONS


To find reliable SM predictions for charm CP asymmetries, we derive two sum rules which treat T , A , C , E , P_{break} correctly to linear order in $\text{SU}(3)_F$ breaking and eliminate the penguin topologies P and $P + PA$ to leading order in $\text{SU}(3)_F$. Thus, we treat large tree-level parameters at subleading order to increase the precision in the extraction of loop-induced quantities sensitive to new physics. Unlike previously known $\text{SU}(3)_F$ -limit sum rules, our new sum rules correlate three CP asymmetries each. The interplay of the two sum rules probes both the quality of $\text{SU}(3)_F$ for penguin topologies and new physics. Future branching ratio measurements play a key role in order to reduce the uncertainties of the consequent SM predictions for charm CP asymmetries.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS


We thank Michael Gronau, Yuval Grossman, Alexander Kagan, Luca Silvestrini, Gudrun Hiller, Martin Jung, Dean Robinson and Jure Zupan for useful discussions and Michael Gronau for a critical proofreading of our Letter. UN acknowledges the kind hospitality of the *Munich Institute for Astro- and Particle Physics*. The fits are performed using the `python` version of the software package `myFitter` [64]. StS thanks Martin Wiebusch for `myFitter` support and the provision of `myFitter-python-0.2-beta`. Parts of the computations were performed on the NEMO cluster of Baden-Württemberg (framework program bwHPC). The presented work is supported by BMBF under contract no. 05H12VKF.




(a) Fit including $1/N_c$ counting in the topological amplitudes with current (future) branching ratio data in blue (green). The black (magenta) line delimits the 95% C.L. region found in a fit without using $1/N_c$ counting in the topological amplitudes for current (future) branching ratio data. Note that the black and magenta curves lie on top of each other.




(b) Color coding as in Fig. 1(a). The dash-dotted line denotes the $SU(3)_F$ -limit sum rule of Eq. (3).



(c) Prediction from current branching ratio data. The dashed, solid, and dash-dotted lines correspond to the 1σ , 2σ , and 3σ intervals, respectively. The blue bars show our fit results for current branching ratio data. The corresponding result without $1/N_c$ counting (i.e. only using $SU(3)_F$) is shown in black.



(d) Same as in Fig. (c), but for our future scenario with smaller errors of the branching ratios. The green (magenta) bars correspond to the analysis with (without) $1/N_c$ counting.



(e) Future scenario assuming $a_{CP}^{dir}(D_s^+ \to K^+ \pi^0) = -1\%$ and branching ratios with current (future) errors including $1/N_c$ counting in blue (green). The corresponding allowed area found in a fit without $1/N_c$ counting is delimited by the black (magenta) line. Note that the black, magenta, and red curves lie on top of each other. The dash-dotted line denotes the $SU(3)_F$ -limit sum rule of Eq. (4).

FIG. 1. SM predictions for CP asymmetries obtained from our global fit. In Figures (a),(b),(e) the dashed (solid) red lines delimit the experimental 68% (95%) C.L. regions. The other dashed (solid) lines are the 68% (95%) C.L. regions of the respective fit scenarios explained in the captions of the subfigures. The generic error of order $\sim 30\%$ from $SU(3)_F$ breaking in P and $P + PA$ is not shown. The experimental error ellipses are obtained by scaling the errors quoted in Table III by factors of $\sqrt{2.28}$ and $\sqrt{5.99}$ in order to obtain the two-dimensional 68% and 95% C.L. regions from the corresponding one-dimensional ranges. The experimental error ellipse shown in Fig. 1(b) is calculated from the corresponding one for Δa_{CP}^{dir} and Σa_{CP}^{dir} .

-
- [1] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb Collaboration), Phys.Rev.Lett. **108**, 111602 (2012), arXiv:1112.0938 [hep-ex].
- [2] T. Aaltonen *et al.* (CDF Collaboration), Phys.Rev.Lett. **109**, 111801 (2012), arXiv:1207.2158 [hep-ex].
- [3] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb collaboration), JHEP **1407**, 041 (2014), arXiv:1405.2797 [hep-ex].
- [4] N. Nisar *et al.* (Belle Collaboration), Phys.Rev.Lett. **112**, 211601 (2014), arXiv:1404.1266 [hep-ex].
- [5] I. I. Bigi, A. Paul, and S. Recksiegel, JHEP **1106**, 089 (2011), arXiv:1103.5785 [hep-ph].
- [6] F. Buccella, M. Lusignoli, G. Miele, A. Pugliese, and P. Santorelli, Phys.Rev. **D51**, 3478 (1995), arXiv:hep-ph/9411286 [hep-ph].
- [7] Y. Grossman, A. L. Kagan, and Y. Nir, Phys.Rev. **D75**, 036008 (2007), arXiv:hep-ph/0609178 [hep-ph].
- [8] M. Artuso, B. Meadows, and A. A. Petrov, Ann.Rev.Nucl.Part.Sci. **58**, 249 (2008), arXiv:0802.2934 [hep-ph].
- [9] A. A. Petrov, PoS **BEAUTY2009**, 024 (2009), arXiv:1003.0906 [hep-ph].
- [10] H.-n. Li, C.-D. Lu, and F.-S. Yu, Phys.Rev. **D86**, 036012 (2012), arXiv:1203.3120 [hep-ph].
- [11] H.-Y. Cheng and C.-W. Chiang, Phys.Rev. **D85**, 034036 (2012), arXiv:1201.0785 [hep-ph].
- [12] J. Brod, A. L. Kagan, and J. Zupan, Phys.Rev. **D86**, 014023 (2012), arXiv:1111.5000 [hep-ph].
- [13] D. Pirtskhalava and P. Uttayarat, Phys.Lett. **B712**, 81 (2012), arXiv:1112.5451 [hep-ph].
- [14] J. Brod, Y. Grossman, A. L. Kagan, and J. Zupan, JHEP **1210**, 161 (2012), arXiv:1203.6659 [hep-ph].
- [15] T. Feldmann, S. Nandi, and A. Soni, JHEP **1206**, 007 (2012), arXiv:1202.3795 [hep-ph].
- [16] G. Hiller, M. Jung, and S. Schacht, Phys.Rev. **D87**, 014024 (2013), arXiv:1211.3734 [hep-ph].
- [17] E. Franco, S. Mishima, and L. Silvestrini, JHEP **1205**, 140 (2012), arXiv:1203.3131 [hep-ph].
- [18] M. Golden and B. Grinstein, Phys.Lett. **B222**, 501 (1989).
- [19] M. Bobrowski, A. Lenz, J. Riedl, and J. Rohrwild, JHEP **1003**, 009 (2010), arXiv:1002.4794 [hep-ph].
- [20] G. Altarelli, N. Cabibbo, and L. Maiani, Nucl.Phys. **B88**, 285 (1975).
- [21] R. Kingsley, S. Treiman, F. Wilczek, and A. Zee, Phys.Rev. **D11**, 1919 (1975).
- [22] M. Einhorn and C. Quigg, Phys.Rev. **D12**, 2015 (1975).
- [23] M. Voloshin, V. Zakharov, and L. Okun, JETP Lett. **21**, 183 (1975).
- [24] C. Quigg, Z.Phys. **C4**, 55 (1980).
- [25] L.-L. Chau Wang, “Flavor Mixing and Charm Decay,” (1980), BNL-27615, C80-01-05-20, Talk at the Conference on Theoretical Particle Physics, 5-14 January 1980, Guangzhou (Canton), China, p. 1218.
- [26] L.-L. Chau, Phys.Rept. **95**, 1 (1983).
- [27] M. J. Savage, Phys.Lett. **B257**, 414 (1991).
- [28] L.-L. Chau and H.-Y. Cheng, Phys.Lett. **B280**, 281 (1992).
- [29] G. Isidori, J. F. Kamenik, Z. Ligeti, and G. Perez, Phys.Lett. **B711**, 46 (2012), arXiv:1111.4987 [hep-ph].
- [30] B. Bhattacharya, M. Gronau, and J. L. Rosner, Phys.Rev. **D85**, 054014 (2012), arXiv:1201.2351 [hep-ph].
- [31] W. Altmannshofer, R. Primulando, C.-T. Yu, and F. Yu, JHEP **1204**, 049 (2012), arXiv:1202.2866 [hep-ph].
- [32] B. Bhattacharya, M. Gronau, and J. L. Rosner, (2012), arXiv:1207.6390 [hep-ph].
- [33] B. Bhattacharya, M. Gronau, and J. L. Rosner, (2012), arXiv:1207.0761 [hep-ph].
- [34] D. Atwood and A. Soni, PTEP **2013**, 0903B05 (2013), arXiv:1211.1026 [hep-ph].
- [35] Y. Grossman and D. J. Robinson, JHEP **1304**, 067 (2013), arXiv:1211.3361 [hep-ph].
- [36] G. Hiller, Y. Hochberg, and Y. Nir, Phys.Rev. **D85**, 116008 (2012), arXiv:1204.1046 [hep-ph].
- [37] F. Buccella, M. Lusignoli, A. Pugliese, and P. Santorelli, Phys.Rev. **D88**, 074011 (2013), arXiv:1305.7343 [hep-ph].
- [38] M. Gronau, Phys.Lett. **B730**, 221 (2014), arXiv:1311.1434 [hep-ph].
- [39] A. Lenz, (2013), arXiv:1311.6447 [hep-ph].
- [40] M. Gronau, Phys. Rev. **D91**, 076007 (2015), arXiv:1501.03272 [hep-ph].
- [41] S. Müller, U. Nierste, and S. Schacht, Phys. Rev. **D92**, 014004 (2015), arXiv:1503.06759 [hep-ph].
- [42] D. Zeppenfeld, Z.Phys. **C8**, 77 (1981).
- [43] M. Gronau, O. F. Hernandez, D. London, and J. L. Rosner, Phys.Rev. **D52**, 6356 (1995), arXiv:hep-ph/9504326 [hep-ph].
- [44] Y. Grossman, Z. Ligeti, and D. J. Robinson, JHEP **1401**, 066 (2014), arXiv:1308.4143 [hep-ph].
- [45] Y. Grossman and Y. Nir, JHEP **1204**, 002 (2012), arXiv:1110.3790 [hep-ph].
- [46] Y. Amhis *et al.* (Heavy Flavor Averaging Group), (2012), arXiv:1207.1158, and online update 30 June 2014 [hep-ex].
- [47] B. Aubert *et al.* (BaBar Collaboration), Phys.Rev.Lett. **100**, 061803 (2008), arXiv:0709.2715 [hep-ex].
- [48] M. Staric *et al.* (Belle Collaboration), Phys.Lett. **B670**, 190 (2008), arXiv:0807.0148 [hep-ex].
- [49] B. Ko (Belle), PoS **ICHEP2012**, 353 (2013), arXiv:1212.1975.
- [50] LHCb Collaboration, “A search for time-integrated CP violation in $D^0 \rightarrow K^- K^+$ and $D^0 \rightarrow \pi^- \pi^+$ decays,” (2013), LHCb-CONF-2013-003.
- [51] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb collaboration), Phys.Lett. **B723**, 33 (2013), arXiv:1303.2614 [hep-ex].
- [52] T. Aaltonen *et al.* (CDF Collaboration), Phys.Rev. **D85**, 012009 (2012), arXiv:1111.5023 [hep-ex].
- [53] G. Bonvicini *et al.* (CLEO Collaboration), Phys.Rev. **D63**, 071101 (2001), arXiv:hep-ex/0012054 [hep-ex].
- [54] H. Mendez *et al.* (CLEO Collaboration), Phys.Rev. **D81**, 052013 (2010), arXiv:0906.3198 [hep-ex].
- [55] B. Ko *et al.* (Belle Collaboration), JHEP **1302**, 098 (2013), arXiv:1212.6112 [hep-ex].
- [56] J. Lees *et al.* (BaBar Collaboration), Phys.Rev. **D87**, 052012 (2013), arXiv:1212.3003 [hep-ex].
- [57] J. Link *et al.* (FOCUS Collaboration), Phys.Rev.Lett. **88**, 041602 (2002), arXiv:hep-ex/0109022 [hep-ex].
- [58] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb Collaboration), JHEP **1410**, 25 (2014), arXiv:1406.2624 [hep-ex].
- [59] B. Ko *et al.* (Belle collaboration), Phys.Rev.Lett. **104**, 181602 (2010), arXiv:1001.3202 [hep-ex].
- [60] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb collaboration), JHEP **1306**, 112 (2013), arXiv:1303.4906 [hep-ex].
- [61] R. Cenci (BaBar), (2012), arXiv:1209.0138 [hep-ex].

- [62] G. Hiller, M. Jung and S. Schacht, In preparation, DO-TH 13/25, QFET-2013/12, TTP13-037.
- [63] Grossman, Yuval and Kagan, Alexander L. and Zupan, Jure, Phys.Rev. **D85**, 114036 (2012), arXiv:1204.3557 [hep-ph].
- [64] M. Wiebusch, Comput.Phys.Commun. **184**, 2438 (2013), arXiv:1207.1446 [hep-ph].