arXiv:2212.01828v2 [hep-ph] 18 Mar 2023

Study of CP Violation in $D^{\pm} \to K^*(892)^0\pi^{\pm} + \bar{K}^*(892)^0\pi^{\pm} \to K^0_{S,L}\pi^0\pi^{\pm}$ Decays

Ru-Min Wang[1]*, Xiao-Dong Cheng[2]†, Xing-Bo Yuan[3]‡

[1]College of Physics and Communication Electronics,
JiangXi Normal University, NanChang 330022, People's Republic of China

[2]College of Physics and Electronic Engineering,
Xinyang Normal University, Xinyang 464000, People's Republic of China

[3]Institute of Particle Physics and Key Laboratory of Quark and Lepton Physics (MOE),
Central China Normal University, Wuhan 430079, People's Republic of China

Abstract

Within the Standard Model, we investigate the CP violations and the $K^0_S - K^0_L$ asymmetries in $D^{\pm} \to K^*(892)^0\pi^{\pm} + \bar{K}^*(892)^0\pi^{\pm} \to K^0_{S,L}\pi^0\pi^{\pm}$ decays basing on the factorization-assisted topological-amplitude (FAT) approach and the topological amplitude approach of Ref. [40]. We find that the CP violations in these decays $A_{CP}^{K^0_{S,L}}$ can exceed the order of 10^{-3} in the two approaches and consist of three parts: the indirect CP violations in $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ mixing $A^{mix}_{CP,K^0_{S,L}}$, the direct CP violations in charm decays $A^{dir}_{CP,K^0_{S,L}}$ and the new CP violation effects $A^{int}_{CP,K^0_{S,L}}$, which are induced from the interference between two tree (Cabibbo-favored and doubly Cabibbo-suppressed) amplitudes with the neutral kaon mixing. The indirect CP violations in $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ mixing play a dominant role in $A_{CP}^{K^0_{S,L}}$, the new CP violation effects have a non-negligible contribution to $A_{CP}^{K^0_{S,L}}$. We estimate the numerical results of the $K^0_S - K^0_L$ asymmetries $R^{D^{\pm}}_{K_S-K_L}$ and find that there exist a large difference between the numerical results in the FAT approach and that of the topological amplitude approach of Ref. [40]. We present the numbers of $D^{\pm}$ events-times-efficiency

*ruminwang@sina.com
†chengxd@mails.ccnu.edu.cn
‡y@mail.ccnu.edu.cn

needed to observe the CP violations and the $K_S^0 - K_L^0$ asymmetries at three standard deviations (3σ) level. We also find that if ones adopt the values of the decay time parameters $t_0 = 3.0\tau_S$ and $t_1 = 10.0\tau_S$, the new CP violation effect $A_{CP,K_S^0}^{int}$ would dominate the CP violation in $D^{\pm} \to K^*(892)^0\pi^{\pm} + \bar{K}^*(892)^0\pi^{\pm} \to K_S^0\pi^0\pi^{\pm}$ decays and could be observed with 6.7×10^6 and 6.5×10^6 $D^{\pm}$ events-times-efficiency in the FAT approach and the topological amplitude approach of Ref. [40], respectively. Our results could be tested by the LHCb, Belle II and BESIII experiments.

1 Introduction

The exploration of CP violation is one of the main topics in particle physics and cosmology, heavy flavor meson decays provide an ideal place to study CP violation. In the Standard Model (SM), CP violation is due to a complex parameter in the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) matrix. However, the strength of CP violation predicted by the Standard Model is insufficient to explain the baryon asymmetry of the unverse [1, 2], so it is necessary to search for new sources of CP violation. It is important to investigate as many systems as possible, to see the correlation between different processes and understand the origin of CP violation.

CP violation in Kaon and B meson systems has been well established, but not yet in charmed meson decays. In 2019, the LHCb collaboration reported the first confirmed observation of the CP asymmetries in charm sector via measuring the difference of time-integrated CP asymmetries of $D^0 \to K^+K^-$ and $D^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-$ decays with a significance of more than 5σ [3]. Combining the LHCb results in 2014 [4], 2016 [5] and 2019 [3] leads to a result of a nonzero value of ΔA_{CP}

$$\Delta A_{CP} = A_{CP}(K^+K^-) - A_{CP}(\pi^+\pi^-) = (1.54 \pm 0.29) \times 10^{-3}. \tag{1}$$

In recent years, there are a number of theoretical works, which concentrate on studying the CP violations in the charm sector [6–44]. Charmed meson decays become one of the most important platforms for studying the CP violation and its origin.

The decays with final states including K_S^0 or K_L^0 can be used to study CP violation [45–73]. In these decays, the indirect CP violation induced by the $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ mixing has a non-negligible effect, even plays a dominant role. There exist 2.8σ discrepancy observed between the BaBar measurement and the SM prediction of the CP asymmetry in the $\tau^+ \to \pi^+ K_S \bar{\nu}_\tau$ decay [59–61], this may imply the existence of the physics beyond the SM because of the absence of the direct CP violation in this decay. However, no unambiguous conclusion can be drawn due to the large uncertainty [63], so more precise data and more reactions with final states including K_S^0 or K_L^0 are needed in both experiment and theory.

In Ref. [51], the authors study the CP asymmetries in the $D^\pm \to K_S^0\pi^\pm$ decays, they show that besides the indirect CP violation due to the $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ mixing, a new CP violation effect induced by the interference between the Cabibbo-favored (CF) and doubly Cabibbo-

suppressed (DCS) amplitudes with the $K^0-\bar{K}^0$ mixing may give a non-negligible contribution to the CP asymmetries in the $D^\pm\to K^0_S\pi^\pm$ decays. CP violations in the $D^\pm\to K^*(892)^0\pi^\pm$ and $D^\pm\to \bar{K}^*(892)^0\pi^\pm$ decays are rarely studied, especially CP violations in the $D^\pm\to K^*(892)^0\pi^\pm+\bar{K}^*(892)^0\pi^\pm\to K^0_{S,L}\pi^0\pi^\pm$ decays [74]. For example, the new CP violation effects induced by the interference between the CF and DCS amplitudes with the $K^0-\bar{K}^0$ mixing in the $D^\pm\to K^*(892)^0\pi^\pm+\bar{K}^*(892)^0\pi^\pm\to K^0_{S,L}\pi^0\pi^\pm$ decays have never been studied. For simplicity, we refer to $K^*(892)^0$ and $\bar{K}^*(892)^0$ as K^{*0} and $\bar{K}^{*0}$ hereinafter, respectively.

In this paper, we will study the CP violations in the $D^\pm\to K^{*0}\pi^\pm+\bar{K}^{*0}\pi^\pm\to K^0_{S,L}\pi^0\pi^\pm$ decays, which consist of the indirect CP violations in $K^0-\bar{K}^0$ mixing, the direct CP asymmetries in charm decays and the new CP violation effects induced by the interference between the CF and DCS amplitudes with the $K^0-\bar{K}^0$ mixing. We will present the formulas and the numerical results of the CP asymmetries, we will also investigate the possibility to observe the new CP violation effect in the $D^\pm\to K^{*0}\pi^\pm+\bar{K}^{*0}\pi^\pm\to K^0_S\pi^0\pi^\pm$ decays, which depends on the choice of the decay time of K^0_S. Additionally, we will study the $K^0_S-K^0_L$ asymmetries in the $D^\pm\to K^{*0}\pi^\pm+\bar{K}^{*0}\pi^\pm\to K^0_{S,L}\pi^0\pi^\pm$ decays and give the numerical results.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we derive the branching ratio of the $D^\pm\to K^{*0}\pi^\pm+\bar{K}^{*0}\pi^\pm\to K^0_{S,L}\pi^0\pi^\pm$ decays. In section 3, we calculate the CP violations and the $K^0_S-K^0_L$ asymmetries for the $D^\pm\to K^{*0}\pi^\pm+\bar{K}^{*0}\pi^\pm\to K^0_{S,L}\pi^0\pi^\pm$ decays. The numerical results and discussions are present in section 4. In section 5, we investigate the observation of the new CP violation effect in the $D^\pm\to K^{*0}\pi^\pm+\bar{K}^{*0}\pi^\pm\to K^0_S\pi^0\pi^\pm$ decays. And section 6 is the conclusion. In Appendix A, We collect the formulas for the evolutions of the Wilson coefficients in the scale $\mu<m_c$.

2 Branching fractions

2.1 the amplitudes for the decays $D^\pm\to K^{*0}(\bar{K}^{*0})\pi^\pm\to K^0(\bar{K}^0)\pi^0\pi^\pm$

The $D^\pm\to K^{*0}\pi^\pm+\bar{K}^{*0}\pi^\pm\to K^0_{S,L}\pi^0\pi^\pm$ decays can proceed via the $D^\pm\to K^{*0}(\bar{K}^{*0})\pi^\pm$ processes, the $K^{*0}\to K^0\pi^0(\bar{K}^{*0}\to\bar{K}^0\pi^0)$ decays and the $K^0-\bar{K}^0$ oscillation and decay. Within the SM, the CF decays $D^+\to\bar{K}^{*0}\pi^+$ and $D^-\to K^{*0}\pi^-$ can proceed via the color-allowed external W-emission tree diagram and the color-suppressed internal W-emission tree




Figure 1: Topological diagrams contributing to the Cabibbo-allowed $D^+ \to \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^+$ and $D^- \to K^{*0}\pi^-$ decays: (a,b) the color-allowed external W-emission tree diagram and (c,d) the color-suppressed internal W-emission tree diagram.

diagram, which are displayed in Fig 1, the DCS channels $D^+ \to K^{*0}\pi^+$ and $D^- \to \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^-$ can occur through the color-suppressed internal W-emission tree diagram and the W-annihilation diagram, which are displayed in Fig 2. Here, all diagrams meant to have all the strong interactions included, i.e., gluon lines are included implicitly in all possible ways [75]. The effective Hamiltonian relevant to the $D^\pm \to K^{*0}(\bar{K}^{*0})\pi^\pm$ decays is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}_{\rm eff} = &\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} C_1(\mu) \left[V_{cs}^* V_{ud} \left(\bar{s}_\alpha c_\beta\right)_{V-A} \left(\bar{u}_\beta d_\alpha\right)_{V-A} + V_{cd}^* V_{us} \left(\bar{d}_\alpha c_\beta\right)_{V-A} \left(\bar{u}_\beta s_\alpha\right)_{V-A} \right] \\ &+ \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} C_2(\mu) \left[V_{cs}^* V_{ud} \left(\bar{s}_\alpha c_\alpha\right)_{V-A} \left(\bar{u}_\beta d_\beta\right)_{V-A} + V_{cd}^* V_{us} \left(\bar{d}_\alpha c_\alpha\right)_{V-A} \left(\bar{u}_\beta s_\beta\right)_{V-A} \right] + \text{h.c.}, \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where G_F is the Fermi coupling constant, $V_{qq'}$ is the corresponding CKM matrix element, α and β are the color indices, $(\bar{q}q')_{V-A}$ represents $\bar{q}\gamma_\mu(1-\gamma_5)q'$. $C_1(\mu)$ and $C_2(\mu)$ are the Wilson coefficients, the evolutions of these Wilson coefficients in the scale μ are given in Ref. [14]. For convenience, we duplicate these explicit expressions in Appendix A. Based on the topological amplitude approach [76, 77], the decay amplitudes of the diagrams in Fig 1 and Fig 2 can be




Figure 2: Topological diagrams contributing to the DCS $D^+ \to K^{*0}\pi^+$ and $D^- \to \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^-$ decays: (a,b) the color-suppressed internal W-emission tree diagram and (c,d) the W-annihilation diagram.

parameterized as

$$\left\langle \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^+ \left| \mathcal{H}_{\rm eff} \right| D^+ \right\rangle_{T_V} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cs}^* V_{ud} T_V^0 \; \varepsilon^* \cdot p_{D^+}, \tag{3}$$

$$\left\langle K^{*0}\pi^- \left| \mathcal{H}_{\rm eff} \right| D^- \right\rangle_{T_V} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cs} V_{ud}^* T_V^0 \; \varepsilon^* \cdot p_{D^-}, \tag{4}$$

$$\left\langle \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^+ \left| \mathcal{H}_{\rm eff} \right| D^+ \right\rangle_{C_P} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cs}^* V_{ud} C_P^0 \; \varepsilon^* \cdot p_{D^+}, \tag{5}$$

$$\left\langle K^{*0}\pi^- \left| \mathcal{H}_{\rm eff} \right| D^- \right\rangle_{C_P} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cs} V_{ud}^* C_P^0 \; \varepsilon^* \cdot p_{D^-}, \tag{6}$$

$$\left\langle K^{*0}\pi^+ \left| \mathcal{H}_{\rm eff} \right| D^+ \right\rangle_{C_P} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cd}^* V_{us} C_P^0 \; \varepsilon^* \cdot p_{D^+}, \tag{7}$$

$$\left\langle \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^- \left| \mathcal{H}_{\rm eff} \right| D^- \right\rangle_{C_P} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cd} V_{us}^* C_P^0 \; \varepsilon^* \cdot p_{D^-}, \tag{8}$$

$$\left\langle K^{*0}\pi^+ \left| \mathcal{H}_{\rm eff} \right| D^+ \right\rangle_{A_V} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cd}^* V_{us} A_V^0 \; \varepsilon^* \cdot p_{D^+}, \tag{9}$$

$$\left\langle \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^- \left| \mathcal{H}_{\rm eff} \right| D^- \right\rangle_{A_V} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cd} V_{us}^* A_V^0 \; \varepsilon^* \cdot p_{D^-}, \tag{10}$$

where the subscript T_V in Eq.(3) and Eq.(4) denotes that the decay amplitude is the color-allowed external W-emission tree diagram amplitude with the $D^+ \to \bar{K}^{*0}$ and $D^- \to K^{*0}$ transitions, the subscript C_P in Eqs.(5)-(8) represents that the decay amplitude is the color-

suppressed internal W-emission tree diagram amplitude with the $D^{\pm} \to \pi^{\pm}$ transitions, the subscript A_V in Eq.(9) and Eq.(10) denotes that the decay amplitude is the W-annihilation diagram amplitude with the s (or $\bar{s}$) quark from the weak decay entering in the $\bar{K}^{*0}$ (or K^{*0}) meson. In our calculation, we based on the results of two topological amplitude approaches: the factorization-assisted topological-amplitude (FAT) approach and the topological amplitude approach of Ref. [40] (hereinafter for brevity referred to as the TA approach of Ref. [40]). In the FAT approach, the topological amplitudes can be expressed as [14, 23, 78]

$$T_V^0 = \alpha_1^V \, 2m_{K^*} \, f_{\pi^+} \, A_0(m_{\pi^+}^2), \tag{11}$$

$$C_P^0 = \alpha_2^P \, 2m_{K^*} \, f_{K^*} \, f_+(p_{K^*}^2), \tag{12}$$

$$A_V^0 = C_1(\mu_A) \, \chi_q^A \, e^{i\phi_q^A} \, f_{D^+} \, m_{D^+} \, \frac{f_{K^*}}{f_\rho} \, e^{iS_\pi}, \tag{13}$$

where m_{K^*}, m_{π^+} and m_{D^+} is the mass of the meson K^{*0}, π^+ and D^+, respectively. f_{π^+}, f_{K^*}, f_ρ and f_{D^+} is the decay constant of the meson π^+, K^{*0}, ρ and D^+, respectively. ε (we denote $\varepsilon \equiv \varepsilon(p_{K^*}, \lambda)$ for simplicity) is the polarization vector of the K^{*0} meson, it yields the following relations [40]

$$\varepsilon_\mu(p_{K^*}, \lambda) p_{K^*}^\mu = 0, \tag{14}$$

$$\sum_\lambda \varepsilon^{*\mu}(p_{K^*}, \lambda) \varepsilon^\nu(p_{K^*}, \lambda) = -g^{\mu\nu} + \frac{p_{K^*}^\mu p_{K^*}^\nu}{m_{K^*}^2}. \tag{15}$$

The effective Wilson coefficients α_1^V and α_2^P in Eq.(11) and Eq.(12)are

$$\alpha_1^V = C_2(\mu_T) + \frac{1}{3} C_1(\mu_T), \qquad \alpha_2^P = C_1(\mu_C) + C_2(\mu_C) \left[\frac{1}{3} + \chi_P^C \, e^{i\phi_P^C} \right], \tag{16}$$

χ_q^A, ϕ_q^A, χ_P^C and ϕ_P^C in Eq.(13) and Eq.(16) are the non-factorizable parameters, e^{iS_π} in Eq.(13) is a strong phase factor which is introduced for each pion involved in the non-factorizable contributions of the W-annihilation diagram amplitude. We note that the parameters χ_q^A, ϕ_q^A, χ_P^C, ϕ_P^C and S_π are free and universal, they can be determined by fitting the data. μ_A, μ_T and μ_C in Eq.(13) and Eq.(16) is, respectively, the scale for the W-annihilation diagram, the color-allowed external W-emission tree diagram and the color-suppressed internal W-emission tree diagram [23, 78]

$$\mu_A = \sqrt{\Lambda m_{D^+}(1 - r_P^2)(1 - r_V^2)}, \quad \mu_T = \sqrt{\Lambda m_{D^+}(1 - r_P^2)}, \quad \mu_C = \sqrt{\Lambda m_{D^+}(1 - r_V^2)}, \tag{17}$$

with

$$r_P = \frac{m_{\pi^+}}{m_{D^+}}, \qquad r_V = \frac{m_{K^*}}{m_{D^+}}, \tag{18}$$

Λ represents the momentum of the soft degree of freedom in the D decays, fixed to be $\Lambda = 0.5GeV$ in this work. $f_+(p^2_{K^*})$ in Eq.(12) is the $D^\pm \to \pi^\pm$ transition form factor, which can be written as

$$\left\langle \pi^+ \left| \bar{u}\gamma^\mu c \right| D^+ \right\rangle = f_0(q^2)\left(\frac{m^2_{D^+} - m^2_{\pi^+}}{q^2}q^\mu\right) + f_+(q^2)\left(p^\mu_{D^+} + p^\mu_{\pi^+} - \frac{m^2_{D^+} - m^2_{\pi^+}}{q^2}q^\mu\right), \tag{19}$$

with $q = p_{D^+} - p_{\pi^+}$. $A_0(m^2_{\pi^+})$ in Eq.(11) is the $D^\pm \to \bar{K}^{*0}$ transition form factor, which can be written as [79–81]

$$\begin{aligned}\left\langle \bar{K}^{*0} \left| \bar{s}\gamma^\mu\gamma_5 c \right| D^+ \right\rangle = i\Big[&\varepsilon^{*\mu}\left(m_{D^+} + m_{K^*}\right)A_1(q^2) \\ &- \frac{\varepsilon^*\cdot q}{m_{D^+} + m_{K^*}}\left(p^\mu_{D^+} + p^\mu_{K^*}\right)A_2(q^2) - \frac{\varepsilon^*\cdot q}{q^2}2m_{K^*}q^\mu A_3(q^2)\Big] + i\frac{\varepsilon^*\cdot q}{q^2}2m_{K^*}q^\mu A_0(q^2),\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

with $q = p_{D^+} - p_{K^*}$ and

$$A_3(q^2) = \frac{m_{D^+} + m_{K^*}}{2m_{K^*}}A_1(q^2) - \frac{m_{D^+} - m_{K^*}}{2m_{K^*}}A_2(q^2). \tag{21}$$

There exist many model and lattice calculations for $D^\pm$ to $\pi^\pm$, K^{*0} transition form factors. In this paper, we shall use the following parametrization for form-factor q^2 dependence [33, 75, 82, 83]

$$F(q^2) = \frac{F(0)}{\left(1 - \frac{q^2}{m^2_{pole}}\right)\left(1 - \alpha\frac{q^2}{m^2_{pole}}\right)}, \tag{22}$$

where for the form factor $f_+(q^2)$, $m_{pole} = m_{D^*(2010)^+}$, $F(0) = 0.666$ and $\alpha = 0.24$, while for the form factor $A_0(q^2)$, $m_{pole} = m_{D_s^+}$ $F(0) = 0.78$ and $\alpha = 0.24$.

In the TA approach of Ref. [40], basing on the solution (S3') of the fitting result in Table II of Ref. [40], we can obtain the following numerical results of the topological amplitudes

$$|T^0_V| = 0.266 \pm 0.004, \qquad \delta_{T^0_V} = 0^\circ \tag{23}$$

$$|C^0_P| = 0.245 \pm 0.002, \qquad \delta_{C^0_P} = (201 \pm 1)^\circ, \tag{24}$$

$$|A^0_V| = 0.028 \pm 0.002, \qquad \delta_{A^0_V} = (77 \pm 5)^\circ, \tag{25}$$




Figure 3: Resonant contribution to the amplitudes of $D^\pm \to \pi^\pm K^0\pi^0$ and $D^\pm \to \pi^\pm \bar{K}^0\pi^0$ through the intermediate states K^{*0} and $\bar{K}^{*0}$, where the blob stands for a transition due to weak interactions.

here, we note that the values of $|T_V^0|$, $|C_P^0|$ and $|A_V^0|$ are obtained by the products of the values of the corresponding topological amplitudes in Table II of Ref. [40] and $\sqrt{2}/G_F$, the values of $\delta_{T_V^0}$, $\delta_{C_P^0}$, and $\delta_{A_V^0}$ are obtained directly from Table II of Ref. [40].

In the overlapped region of the K^{*0} and $\bar{K}^{*0}$ resonances, the decay amplitudes of the cascade decays $D^\pm \to K^{*0}\pi^\pm \to K^0\pi^0\pi^\pm$ and $D^\pm \to \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^\pm \to \bar{K}^0\pi^0\pi^\pm$, which are depicted in Fig 3, can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
A(D^+ \to & K^{*0}\pi^+ \to K^0\pi^0\pi^+) = \\
& = \left\langle K^0\pi^0 \left|\mathcal{L}\right| K^{*0}\right\rangle T_{K^*}^{BW}(p_{K^*}^2)\left(\left\langle K^{*0}\pi^+ \left|\mathcal{H}_{\rm eff}\right| D^+\right\rangle_{C_P} + \left\langle K^{*0}\pi^+ \left|\mathcal{H}_{\rm eff}\right| D^+\right\rangle_{A_V}\right), \quad (26)\\
A(D^+ \to & \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^+ \to \bar{K}^0\pi^0\pi^+) = \\
& = \left\langle \bar{K}^0\pi^0 \left|\mathcal{L}\right| \bar{K}^{*0}\right\rangle T_{K^*}^{BW}(p_{K^*}^2)\left(\left\langle \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^+ \left|\mathcal{H}_{\rm eff}\right| D^+\right\rangle_{C_P} + \left\langle \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^+ \left|\mathcal{H}_{\rm eff}\right| D^+\right\rangle_{T_V}\right), \quad (27)\\
A(D^- \to & K^{*0}\pi^- \to K^0\pi^0\pi^-) = \\
& = \left\langle K^0\pi^0 \left|\mathcal{L}\right| K^{*0}\right\rangle T_{K^*}^{BW}(p_{K^*}^2)\left(\left\langle K^{*0}\pi^- \left|\mathcal{H}_{\rm eff}\right| D^-\right\rangle_{C_P} + \left\langle K^{*0}\pi^- \left|\mathcal{H}_{\rm eff}\right| D^-\right\rangle_{T_V}\right), \quad (28)\\
A(D^- \to & \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^- \to \bar{K}^0\pi^0\pi^-) = \\
& = \left\langle \bar{K}^0\pi^0 \left|\mathcal{L}\right| \bar{K}^{*0}\right\rangle T_{K^*}^{BW}(p_{K^*}^2)\left(\left\langle \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^- \left|\mathcal{H}_{\rm eff}\right| D^-\right\rangle_{C_P} + \left\langle \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^- \left|\mathcal{H}_{\rm eff}\right| D^-\right\rangle_{A_V}\right), \quad (29)
\end{aligned}$$

with the Lagrangian [40]

$$\mathcal{L} = ig^{K^{*0}\to K^0\pi^0}\left(\bar{K}^{*0\mu}\pi^0 \overset{\leftrightarrow}{\partial}_\mu K^0 + K^{*0\mu}\bar{K}^0 \overset{\leftrightarrow}{\partial}_\mu \pi^0\right), \quad (30)$$

and the relativistic Breit-Wigner line shape for K^{*0}

$$T_{K^*}^{BW}(s) = \frac{1}{s - m_{K^*}^2 + im_{K^*}\Gamma_{K^*}(s)}, \quad (31)$$

where $\Gamma_{K^*}(s)$ is the mass dependent width of K^{*0}

$$\Gamma_{K^*}(s) = \Gamma^0_{K^*} \left(\frac{q_{K^0}}{q^0_{K^0}}\right)^3 \frac{m_{K^*}}{\sqrt{s}} \frac{X_1^2(q_{K^0})}{X_1^2(q^0_{K^0})}, \tag{32}$$

with q_{K^0} denotes the c.m. momentum of K^0 in the rest frame of K^*, $q^0_{K^0}$ is the value of q_{K^0} when s is equal to $m^2_{K^*}$,

$$q_{K^0} = \frac{f(\sqrt{s}, m_{K^0}, m_{\pi^0})}{\sqrt{4s}}, \tag{33}$$

where the function f is

$$f(x,y,z) = \sqrt{x^4 + y^4 + z^4 - 2x^2y^2 - 2x^2z^2 - 2y^2z^2}. \tag{34}$$

In Eq.(32), $\Gamma^0_{K^*}$ is the nominal total width of K^* with $\Gamma^0_{K^*} = \Gamma_{K^*}(m^2_{K^*})$, X_1 is the Blatt-Weisskopf barrier factor

$$X_1(z) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{(zr_{BW})^2 + 1}}, \tag{35}$$

with $r_{BW} \approx 4.0\text{GeV}^{-1}$.

Using the Lagrangian in Eq.(30), one obtains

$$\left\langle K^0\pi^0 \left|\mathcal{L}\right| K^{*0}\right\rangle = g^{K^{*0}\to K^0\pi^0} \varepsilon \cdot (p_{K^0} - p_{\pi^0}), \tag{36}$$

$$\left\langle \bar{K}^0\pi^0 \left|\mathcal{L}\right| \bar{K}^{*0}\right\rangle = -g^{K^{*0}\to K^0\pi^0} \varepsilon \cdot (p_{\bar{K}^0} - p_{\pi^0}), \tag{37}$$

where $g^{K^{*0}\to K^0\pi^0}$ is the coupling of K^{*0} to $K^0\pi^0$, which can be extracted from

$$\mathcal{B}(K^{*0} \to K^0\pi^0) = \frac{1}{6\pi m^2_{K^*}\Gamma^0_{K^*}} \left(g^{K^{*0}\to K^0\pi^0}\right)^2 \left(\frac{f(m_{K^*}, m_{K^0}, m_{\pi^0})}{\sqrt{4m^2_{K^*}}}\right)^3. \tag{38}$$

Substituting Eq.(7), Eq.(9), Eq.(31) and Eq.(36) into Eq.(26), we can obtain the decay amplitude of the cascade decay $D^+ \to K^{*0}\pi^+ \to K^0\pi^0\pi^+$

$$\begin{aligned} A(D^+ \to K^{*0}\pi^+ \to K^0\pi^0\pi^+) = {} & \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V^*_{cd}V_{us}(C^0_P + A^0_V)\, \varepsilon^* \cdot p_{D^+} \\ & \times \frac{1}{p^2_{K^*} - m^2_{K^*} + im_{K^*}\Gamma_{K^*}(p^2_{K^*})} g^{K^{*0}\to K^0\pi^0} \varepsilon \cdot (p_{K^0} - p_{\pi^0})\, F(\sqrt{p^2_{K^*}}, m_{K^*}). \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

In order to account for the off-shell effect of K^*, we follow Ref. [40, 84] to add a form factor $F(\sqrt{s}, m_{K^*})$ into the above equation, the form factor $F(\sqrt{s}, m_{K^*})$ can be parameterized as

$$F(\sqrt{s}, m_{K^*}) = \frac{\Lambda^2 + m^2_{K^*}}{\Lambda^2 + s}, \tag{40}$$

with the cutoff Λ not far from the mass of the resonance K^*,

$$\Lambda = m_{K^*} + \beta\Lambda_{QCD}, \tag{41}$$

where $\beta = 1.0 \pm 0.2$ and $\Lambda_{QCD} = 0.25$GeV.

From Eq.(14) and Eq.(15), we obtain

$$\sum_{\lambda} \varepsilon^* \cdot p_{D^+}\, \varepsilon \cdot (p_{K^0} - p_{\pi^0}) = 2\vec{p}_{\pi^+} \cdot \vec{p}_{K^0}, \tag{42}$$

in the rest frame of K^0 and π^0. Substituting the above equation into Eq.(39), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} A(D^+ \to K^{*0}\pi^+ \to K^0\pi^0\pi^+) &= \sqrt{2}G_F V_{cd}^* V_{us}(C_P^0 + A_V^0) \\ &\times \frac{1}{p_{K^*}^2 - m_{K^*}^2 + im_{K^*}\Gamma_{K^*}(p_{K^*}^2)} g^{K^{*0}\to K^0\pi^0}\, F(\sqrt{p_{K^*}^2}, m_{K^*})\, \vec{p}_{\pi^+} \cdot \vec{p}_{K^0}. \end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

Similarly, we can obtain the following amplitudes

$$\begin{aligned} A(D^+ \to \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^+ \to \bar{K}^0\pi^0\pi^+) &= -\sqrt{2}G_F V_{cs}^* V_{ud}(C_P^0 + T_V^0) \\ &\times \frac{1}{p_{K^*}^2 - m_{K^*}^2 + im_{K^*}\Gamma_{K^*}(p_{K^*}^2)} g^{K^{*0}\to K^0\pi^0}\, F(\sqrt{p_{K^*}^2}, m_{K^*})\, \vec{p}_{\pi^+} \cdot \vec{p}_{\bar{K}^0}, \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

$$\begin{aligned} A(D^- \to \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^- \to \bar{K}^0\pi^0\pi^-) &= -\sqrt{2}G_F V_{cd} V_{us}^*(C_P^0 + A_V^0) \\ &\times \frac{1}{p_{K^*}^2 - m_{K^*}^2 + im_{K^*}\Gamma_{K^*}(p_{K^*}^2)} g^{K^{*0}\to K^0\pi^0}\, F(\sqrt{p_{K^*}^2}, m_{K^*})\, \vec{p}_{\pi^-} \cdot \vec{p}_{\bar{K}^0}, \end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

$$\begin{aligned} A(D^- \to K^{*0}\pi^- \to K^0\pi^0\pi^-) &= \sqrt{2}G_F V_{cs} V_{ud}^*(C_P^0 + T_V^0) \\ &\times \frac{1}{p_{K^*}^2 - m_{K^*}^2 + im_{K^*}\Gamma_{K^*}(p_{K^*}^2)} g^{K^{*0}\to K^0\pi^0}\, F(\sqrt{p_{K^*}^2}, m_{K^*})\, \vec{p}_{\pi^-} \cdot \vec{p}_{K^0}. \end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

2.2 the effect of the $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ mixing

Now, we proceed to study the time evolution of the initially-pure $K^0(\bar{K}^0)$ states. In the $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ system, the two mass eigenstates, K_S^0 of mass m_S and width Γ_S and K_L^0 of mass m_L and width Γ_L, are linear combinations of the flavor eigenstates K^0 and $\bar{K}^0$. Under the assumption of CPT invariance, these mass eigenstates can be expressed as [85]

$$\left|K_L^0\right\rangle = p\left|K^0\right\rangle - q\left|\bar{K}^0\right\rangle, \tag{47}$$

$$\left|K_S^0\right\rangle = p\left|K^0\right\rangle + q\left|\bar{K}^0\right\rangle, \tag{48}$$

where p and q are complex mixing parameters. CP conservation requires both $p = q = \sqrt{2}/2$. The mass and width eigenstates, $K_{S,L}^0$, may also be described with the popular notations

$$\left|K_L^0\right\rangle = \frac{1+\epsilon}{\sqrt{2(1+|\epsilon|^2)}}\left|K^0\right\rangle - \frac{1-\epsilon}{\sqrt{2(1+|\epsilon|^2)}}\left|\bar{K}^0\right\rangle, \tag{49}$$

$$\left|K_S^0\right\rangle = \frac{1+\epsilon}{\sqrt{2(1+|\epsilon|^2)}}\left|K^0\right\rangle + \frac{1-\epsilon}{\sqrt{2(1+|\epsilon|^2)}}\left|\bar{K}^0\right\rangle, \tag{50}$$

where the complex parameter ϵ signifies deviation of the mass eigenstates from the CP eigenstates. The parameters p and q can be expressed in terms of ϵ

$$p = \frac{1+\epsilon}{\sqrt{2(1+|\epsilon|^2)}}, \qquad q = \frac{1-\epsilon}{\sqrt{2(1+|\epsilon|^2)}}. \tag{51}$$

Combining Eq.(47), Eq.(48), Eq.(51) and neglecting the tiny direct CP asymmetry in the $K^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-$ and $K^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ decays, we can derive

$$\frac{A(K_L^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-)}{A(K_S^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-)} = \frac{p-q}{p+q} = \epsilon, \tag{52}$$

$$\frac{A(K_S^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0)}{A(K_L^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0)} = \frac{p-q}{p+q} = \epsilon, \tag{53}$$

The time-evolved states of the $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ system can be expressed by the mass eigenstates

$$\left|K_{phys}^0(t)\right\rangle = \frac{1}{2p}e^{-im_L t - \frac{1}{2}\Gamma_L t}\left|K_L^0\right\rangle + \frac{1}{2p}e^{-im_S t - \frac{1}{2}\Gamma_S t}\left|K_S^0\right\rangle, \tag{54}$$

$$\left|\bar{K}_{phys}^0(t)\right\rangle = -\frac{1}{2q}e^{-im_L t - \frac{1}{2}\Gamma_L t}\left|K_L^0\right\rangle + \frac{1}{2q}e^{-im_S t - \frac{1}{2}\Gamma_S t}\left|K_S^0\right\rangle. \tag{55}$$

Using Eq.(54) and Eq.(55), the time-dependent amplitudes of the cascade decays $D^\pm \to K^{*0}\pi^\pm + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^\pm \to K^0(t)\pi^0\pi^\pm + \bar{K}^0(t)\pi^0\pi^\pm \to f_{K^0}\pi^0\pi^\pm$ (hereinafter for brevity referred to as $D^\pm \to K^*\pi^\pm \to K(t)\pi^0\pi^\pm \to f_{K^0}\pi^0\pi^\pm$) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} &A\left(D^\pm \to K^*\pi^\pm \to K(t)\pi^0\pi^\pm \to f_{K^0}\pi^0\pi^\pm\right) \\ &\quad = A(D^\pm \to K^{*0}\pi^\pm \to K^0\pi^0\pi^\pm)\cdot A(K_{phys}^0(t) \to f_{K^0}) \\ &\quad + A(D^\pm \to \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^\pm \to \bar{K}^0\pi^0\pi^\pm)\cdot A(\bar{K}_{phys}^0(t) \to f_{K^0}), \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

where f_{K^0} denotes the final state from the decay of the K^0 or $\bar{K}^0$ meson. $A(K_{phys}^0(t) \to f_{K^0})$ and $A(\bar{K}_{phys}^0(t) \to f_{K^0})$ denotes the amplitude of the $K_{phys}^0(t) \to f_{K^0}$ and $\bar{K}_{phys}^0(t) \to f_{K^0}$ decays, respectively. They have the following forms

$$A(K_{phys}^0(t) \to f_{K^0}) = \frac{1}{2p}e^{-im_L t - \frac{1}{2}\Gamma_L t}A(K_L^0 \to f_{K^0}) + \frac{1}{2p}e^{-im_S t - \frac{1}{2}\Gamma_S t}A(K_S^0 \to f_{K^0}), \tag{57}$$

$$A(\bar{K}^0_{phys}(t)\to f_{K^0}) = -\frac{1}{2q}e^{-im_L t-\frac{1}{2}\Gamma_L t}A(K^0_L\to f_{K^0}) + \frac{1}{2q}e^{-im_S t-\frac{1}{2}\Gamma_S t}A(K^0_S\to f_{K^0}). \quad (58)$$

For convenience, we introduce the following substitutions

$$r_{sf}\,e^{i\delta} = \frac{C^0_P + A^0_V}{C^0_P + T^0_V}, \qquad r_{wf}\,e^{i\phi} = -\frac{V^*_{cd}V_{us}}{V^*_{cs}V_{ud}}, \qquad r_f = r_{sf}\,r_{wf}, \quad (59)$$

where r_{sf}, r_{wf} and r_f are positive numbers, r_f denotes the magnitude of the ratio of the DCS amplitude to the CF amplitude, δ and ϕ is the strong phase difference and the weak phase difference, respectively. Making use of Eqs.(40), (43), (44), (56) and (59) and performing integration over phase space, we can obtain

$$\Gamma(D^+\to K^*\pi^+\to K(t)\pi^0\pi^+\to f_{K^0}\pi^0\pi^+) = \frac{G_F^2|g^{K^{*0}\to K^0\pi^0}|^2}{6144\pi^3 m^3_{D^+}}|V_{cs}|^2|V_{ud}|^2$$
$$\cdot\int_{p_0^2}^{p_1^2} g_{in}(p^2_{K^*})|C^0_P + T^0_V|^2\left[r_f^2\,g_{K^0_{phys}} + r_f e^{i(\delta+\phi)}g_{K^0_{phys}\bar{K}^0_{phys}} + r_f e^{-i(\delta+\phi)}g^*_{K^0_{phys}\bar{K}^0_{phys}} + g_{\bar{K}^0_{phys}}\right]dp^2_{K^*}, \quad (60)$$

where we use the following substitutions

$$g_{K^0_{phys}} = |A(K^0_{phys}(t)\to f_{K^0})|^2, \qquad g_{\bar{K}^0_{phys}} = |A(\bar{K}^0_{phys}(t)\to f_{K^0})|^2, \quad (61)$$
$$g_{K^0_{phys}\bar{K}^0_{phys}} = A(K^0_{phys}(t)\to f_{K^0})A^*(\bar{K}^0_{phys}(t)\to f_{K^0}), \quad (62)$$
$$g_{in}(p^2_{K^*}) = \frac{(f(m_{D^+},\sqrt{p^2_{K^*}},m_{\pi^+}))^3\cdot(f(\sqrt{p^2_{K^*}},m_{K^0},m_{\pi^0}))^3}{[(p^2_{K^*}-m^2_{K^*})^2 + m^2_{K^*}\Gamma^2_{K^*}(p^2_{K^*})]\cdot p^6_{K^*}}\frac{(\Lambda^2+m^2_{K^*})^2}{(\Lambda^2+p^2_{K^*})^2}, \quad (63)$$

p_0^2 and p_1^2 in Eq.(60) is the lower bound and the upper bound of $p^2_{K^*}$, respectively. In order to select the K^* event and suppress the background, we adopt $p_0^2 = (m_{K^*} - 3\Gamma^0_{K^*})^2$ and $p_1^2 = (m_{K^*} + 3\Gamma^0_{K^*})^2$ in our calculation, where m_{K^*} and $\Gamma^0_{K^*}$ is the mass and decay width of the K^* resonance, respectively.

Similarly, we can derive the decay width for the $D^-\to K^{*0}\pi^- + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^-\to K^0(t)\pi^0\pi^- + \bar{K}^0(t))\pi^0\pi^-\to f_{K^0}\pi^0\pi^-$ decay

$$\Gamma(D^-\to K^*\pi^-\to K(t)\pi^0\pi^-\to f_{K^0}\pi^0\pi^-) = \frac{G_F^2|g^{K^{*0}\to K^0\pi^0}|^2}{6144\pi^3 m^3_{D^+}}|V_{cs}|^2|V_{ud}|^2$$
$$\cdot\int_{p_0^2}^{p_1^2} g_{in}(p^2_{K^*})|C^0_P + T^0_V|^2\left[r_f^2\,g_{\bar{K}^0_{phys}} + r_f e^{i(\phi-\delta)}g_{K^0_{phys}\bar{K}^0_{phys}} + r_f e^{-i(\phi-\delta)}g^*_{K^0_{phys}\bar{K}^0_{phys}} + g_{K^0_{phys}}\right]dp^2_{K^*}. \quad (64)$$

2.3 the decay widths for the $D^{\pm} \to K^{*0}\pi^{\pm} + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^{\pm} \to K^0_{S,L}\pi^0\pi^{\pm}$ decays

In experiment, the K^0_S state is defined via a final state $\pi^+\pi^-$ with $m_{\pi\pi} \approx m_S$ and a time difference between the $D^{\pm}$ decay and the K^0_S decay [59, 86, 87]. By taking into account these experimental features, the partial decay width for the $D^+ \to K^{*0}\pi^+ + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^+ \to K^0_S\pi^0\pi^+$ (hereinafter for brevity referred to as $D^+ \to K^*\pi^+ \to K^0_S\pi^0\pi^+$) decay can be defined as

$$\Gamma(D^+ \to K^*\pi^+ \to K^0_S\pi^0\pi^+) = \frac{\int_{t_0}^{t_1} \Gamma(D^+ \to K^*\pi^+ \to K(t)\pi^0\pi^+ \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0\pi^+)dt}{(e^{-\Gamma_S t_0} - e^{-\Gamma_S t_1}) \cdot \mathcal{B}(K^0_S \to \pi^+\pi^-)}, \tag{65}$$

where $t_0 = 0.1\tau_S$ and $t_1 = 2\tau_S \sim 20\tau_S$ with τ_S is the K^0_S lifetime, we adopt $t_1 = 10\tau_S$ in our calculation. Combining Eq.(52), Eq.(57), Eq.(58), Eq.(60) and Eq.(65), we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Gamma(D^+ \to K^*\pi^+ \to K^0_S\pi^0\pi^+) = \frac{G_F^2 |g^{K^{*0}\to K^0\pi^0}|^2}{6144\pi^3 m^3_{D^+}} |V_{cs}|^2 |V_{ud}|^2 \\
&\cdot \int_{p_0^2}^{p_1^2} g_{in}(p^2_{K^*}) |C_P^0 + T_V^0|^2 \left[r_f^2\, g^{K^0_S}_{K^0_{phys}} + r_f e^{i(\delta+\phi)} g^{K^0_S}_{K^0_{phys}\bar{K}^0_{phys}} + r_f e^{-i(\delta+\phi)} g^{K^{0*}_S}_{K^0_{phys}\bar{K}^0_{phys}} + g^{K^0_S}_{\bar{K}^0_{phys}} \right] dp^2_{K^*},
\end{aligned} \tag{66}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
g^{K^0_S}_{K^0_{phys}} &= \frac{\int_{t_0}^{t_1} |A(K^0_{phys}(t) \to \pi^+\pi^-)|^2 dt}{(e^{-\Gamma_S t_0} - e^{-\Gamma_S t_1}) \cdot \mathcal{B}(K^0_S \to \pi^+\pi^-)} = \\
&= \frac{1}{4|p|^2} \left[1 + \frac{e^{-\Gamma_L t_0} - e^{-\Gamma_L t_1}}{e^{-\Gamma_S t_0} - e^{-\Gamma_S t_1}} \cdot \frac{\mathcal{B}(K^0_L \to \pi^+\pi^-)}{\mathcal{B}(K^0_S \to \pi^+\pi^-)} + 2Re\left(\frac{p-q}{p+q} t_{K^0_S - K^0_L} \right) \right],
\end{aligned} \tag{67}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
g^{K^0_S}_{K^0_{phys}\bar{K}^0_{phys}} &= \frac{\int_{t_0}^{t_1} A(K^0_{phys}(t) \to \pi^+\pi^-) A^*(\bar{K}^0_{phys}(t) \to \pi^+\pi^-) dt}{(e^{-\Gamma_S t_0} - e^{-\Gamma_S t_1}) \cdot \mathcal{B}(K^0_S \to \pi^+\pi^-)} = \\
&= \frac{1}{4pq^*} \left[1 - \frac{e^{-\Gamma_L t_0} - e^{-\Gamma_L t_1}}{e^{-\Gamma_S t_0} - e^{-\Gamma_S t_1}} \cdot \frac{\mathcal{B}(K^0_L \to \pi^+\pi^-)}{\mathcal{B}(K^0_S \to \pi^+\pi^-)} + 2iIm\left(\frac{p-q}{p+q} t_{K^0_S - K^0_L} \right) \right],
\end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
g^{K^0_S}_{\bar{K}^0_{phys}} &= \frac{\int_{t_0}^{t_1} |A(\bar{K}^0_{phys}(t) \to \pi^+\pi^-)|^2 dt}{(e^{-\Gamma_S t_0} - e^{-\Gamma_S t_1}) \cdot \mathcal{B}(K^0_S \to \pi^+\pi^-)} = \\
&= \frac{1}{4|q|^2} \left[1 + \frac{e^{-\Gamma_L t_0} - e^{-\Gamma_L t_1}}{e^{-\Gamma_S t_0} - e^{-\Gamma_S t_1}} \cdot \frac{\mathcal{B}(K^0_L \to \pi^+\pi^-)}{\mathcal{B}(K^0_S \to \pi^+\pi^-)} - 2Re\left(\frac{p-q}{p+q} t_{K^0_S - K^0_L} \right) \right],
\end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

where

$$t_{K^0_S - K^0_L} = \frac{e^{-i(m_L - m_S)t_0 - \frac{\Gamma_S+\Gamma_L}{2}t_0} - e^{-i(m_L - m_S)t_1 - \frac{\Gamma_S+\Gamma_L}{2}t_1}}{e^{-\Gamma_S t_0} - e^{-\Gamma_S t_1}} \cdot \frac{\Gamma_S}{\frac{\Gamma_S+\Gamma_L}{2} + i(m_L - m_S)}. \tag{70}$$

The terms in the square brackets of Eq.(67)-(69) are related to the effect of the K^0_S decay, the effect of the K^0_L decay and their interference, respectively. From Particle Data Group [85],we

can obtain

$$\frac{e^{-\Gamma_L t_0}-e^{-\Gamma_L t_1}}{e^{-\Gamma_S t_0}-e^{-\Gamma_S t_1}}=0.019, \tag{71}$$

$$\frac{\mathcal{B}(K_L^0\to\pi^+\pi^-)}{\mathcal{B}(K_S^0\to\pi^+\pi^-)}=(2.84\pm0.01)\times10^{-3}, \tag{72}$$

with $t_0=0.1\tau_S=0.1/\Gamma_S$ and $t_1=10\tau_S=10/\Gamma_S$, so the second term in the square bracket of Eq.(67)-(69), which corresponds to the effect of the K_L^0 decay, can be neglected. Combining Eq.(51), Eq.(66), Eq.(67), Eq.(68), Eq.(69) and neglecting terms of $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$, we can derive

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma(D^+\to K^*\pi^+\to K_S^0\pi^0\pi^+)&=\frac{G_F^2\left|g^{K^{*0}\to K^0\pi^0}\right|^2}{6144\pi^3 m_{D^+}^3}|V_{cs}|^2|V_{ud}|^2\\&\cdot\int_{p_0^2}^{p_1^2}g_{in}(p_{K^*}^2)\,|C_P^0+T_V^0|^2\left\{\frac{r_f^2}{2}\left[1-2Re(\epsilon)+2Re(\epsilon\cdot t_{K_S^0-K_L^0})\right]+r_f\cos(\phi+\delta)\right.\\&\left.+2r_f\sin(\phi+\delta)\left[Im(\epsilon)-Im(\epsilon\cdot t_{K_S^0-K_L^0})\right]+\frac{1}{2}\left[1+2Re(\epsilon)-2Re(\epsilon\cdot t_{K_S^0-K_L^0})\right]\right\}dp_{K^*}^2.\end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

Similarly, we can derive the decay width for the $D^-\to K^{*0}\pi^-+\bar{K}^{*0}\pi^-\to K_S^0\pi^0\pi^-$ (hereinafter for brevity referred to as $D^-\to K^*\pi^-\to K_S^0\pi^0\pi^-$) decay

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma(D^-\to K^*\pi^-\to K_S^0\pi^0\pi^-)&=\frac{G_F^2\left|g^{K^{*0}\to K^0\pi^0}\right|^2}{6144\pi^3 m_{D^+}^3}|V_{cs}|^2|V_{ud}|^2\\&\cdot\int_{p_0^2}^{p_1^2}g_{in}(p_{K^*}^2)\,|C_P^0+T_V^0|^2\left\{\frac{r_f^2}{2}\left[1+2Re(\epsilon)-2Re(\epsilon\cdot t_{K_S^0-K_L^0})\right]+r_f\cos(\phi-\delta)\right.\\&\left.+2r_f\sin(\phi-\delta)\left[Im(\epsilon)-Im(\epsilon\cdot t_{K_S^0-K_L^0})\right]+\frac{1}{2}\left[1-2Re(\epsilon)+2Re(\epsilon\cdot t_{K_S^0-K_L^0})\right]\right\}dp_{K^*}^2.\end{aligned} \tag{74}$$

In experiment, the K_L^0 state is defined via a large time difference between the $D^\pm$ decay and the K_L^0 decay, so the K_L^0 states mostly decay outside the detector [88]. Basing on these experimental features, the partial decay width for the $D^+\to K^{*0}\pi^+ + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^+\to K_L^0\pi^0\pi^+$ (hereinafter for brevity referred to as $D^+\to K^*\pi^+\to K_L^0\pi^0\pi^+$) decay can be defined as

$$\Gamma(D^+\to K^*\pi^+\to K_L^0\pi^0\pi^+)=\frac{\int_{t_2}^{+\infty}\Gamma(D^+\to K^*\pi^+\to K(t)\pi^0\pi^+\to\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0\pi^0\pi^+)dt}{e^{-\Gamma_L t_2}\cdot\mathcal{B}(K_L^0\to\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0)}, \tag{75}$$

where $t_2\geq100\tau_S$. Using Eq.(53), Eq.(57), Eq.(58), Eq.(60) and Eq.(75), we can derive

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma(D^+\to K^*\pi^+\to K_L^0\pi^0\pi^+)&=\frac{G_F^2\left|g^{K^{*0}\to K^0\pi^0}\right|^2}{6144\pi^3 m_{D^+}^3}|V_{cs}|^2|V_{ud}|^2\\&\cdot\int_{p_0^2}^{p_1^2}g_{in}(p_{K^*}^2)|C_P^0+T_V^0|^2\left[r_f^2\,g^{K_L^0}_{K^0_{phys}}+r_f e^{i(\delta+\phi)}g^{K_L^0}_{K^0_{phys}\bar{K}^0_{phys}}+r_f e^{-i(\delta+\phi)}g^{K_L^{0*}}_{K^0_{phys}\bar{K}^0_{phys}}+g^{K_L^0}_{\bar{K}^0_{phys}}\right]dp_{K^*}^2,\end{aligned} \tag{76}$$

with

$$g^{K^0_L}_{K^0_{phys}} = \frac{\int_{t_2}^{+\infty} |A(K^0_{phys}(t) \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0)|^2 dt}{e^{-\Gamma_L t_2} \cdot \mathcal{B}(K^0_L \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0)} =$$
$$= \frac{1}{4|p|^2}\left[1 + e^{-(\Gamma_S-\Gamma_L)t_2} \cdot \frac{\mathcal{B}(K^0_S \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0)}{\mathcal{B}(K^0_L \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0)} + 2Re\left(\frac{p-q}{p+q} t_{K^0_L - K^0_S}\right)\right], \quad (77)$$

$$g^{K^0_L}_{K^0_{phys}\bar{K}^0_{phys}} = \frac{\int_{t_2}^{+\infty} A(K^0_{phys}(t) \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0) A^*(\bar{K}^0_{phys}(t) \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0) dt}{e^{-\Gamma_L t_2} \cdot \mathcal{B}(K^0_L \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0)} =$$
$$= \frac{1}{4pq^*}\left[-1 + e^{-(\Gamma_S-\Gamma_L)t_2} \cdot \frac{\mathcal{B}(K^0_S \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0)}{\mathcal{B}(K^0_L \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0)} - 2iIm\left(\frac{p-q}{p+q} t_{K^0_L - K^0_S}\right)\right], \quad (78)$$

$$g^{K^0_L}_{\bar{K}^0_{phys}} = \frac{\int_{t_2}^{+\infty} |A(\bar{K}^0_{phys}(t) \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0)|^2 dt}{e^{-\Gamma_L t_2} \cdot \mathcal{B}(K^0_L \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0)} =$$
$$= \frac{1}{4|q|^2}\left[1 + e^{-(\Gamma_S-\Gamma_L)t_2} \cdot \frac{\mathcal{B}(K^0_S \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0)}{\mathcal{B}(K^0_L \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0)} - 2Re\left(\frac{p-q}{p+q} t_{K^0_L - K^0_S}\right)\right], \quad (79)$$

where

$$t_{K^0_L - K^0_S} = \frac{\Gamma_L \cdot e^{i(m_L - m_S)t_2 - \frac{\Gamma_S - \Gamma_L}{2} t_2}}{\frac{\Gamma_S + \Gamma_L}{2} - i(m_L - m_S)}, \quad (80)$$

Using the result from Particle Data Group [85]: $\Gamma_L/\Gamma_S = (1.75 \pm 0.01) \times 10^{-3}$, we can obtain

$$e^{-(\Gamma_S-\Gamma_L)t_2} \leq 4.4 \times 10^{-44}, \qquad e^{-\frac{\Gamma_S-\Gamma_L}{2} t_2} \leq 2.1 \times 10^{-22}, \quad (81)$$

with $t_2 \geq 100/\Gamma_S$, so the last two terms in the square brackets of Eq.(77)-(79) can be neglected safely. Substituting Eq.(51), Eq.(77), Eq.(78) and Eq.(79) into Eq.(76) and neglecting terms of $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$, we can obtain

$$\Gamma(D^+ \to K^*\pi^+ \to K^0_L\pi^0\pi^+) = \frac{G_F^2 |g^{K^{*0}\to K^0\pi^0}|^2}{6144\pi^3 m^3_{D^+}} |V_{cs}|^2 |V_{ud}|^2 \int_{p_0^2}^{p_1^2} g_{in}(p^2_{K^*}) |C^0_P + T^0_V|^2$$
$$\cdot \left[\frac{r_f^2}{2}(1 - 2Re(\epsilon)) - r_f \cos(\phi + \delta) - 2r_f \sin(\phi + \delta) Im(\epsilon) + \frac{(1 + 2Re(\epsilon))}{2}\right] dp^2_{K^*}. \quad (82)$$

Similarly, we can derive the decay width for the $D^- \to K^{*0}\pi^- + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^- \to K^0_L\pi^0\pi^-$ (hereinafter for brevity referred to as $D^- \to K^*\pi^- \to K^0_L\pi^0\pi^-$) decay

$$\Gamma(D^- \to K^*\pi^- \to K^0_L\pi^0\pi^-) = \frac{G_F^2 |g^{K^{*0}\to K^0\pi^0}|^2}{6144\pi^3 m^3_{D^+}} |V_{cs}|^2 |V_{ud}|^2 \int_{p_0^2}^{p_1^2} g_{in}(p^2_{K^*}) |C^0_P + T^0_V|^2$$
$$\cdot \left[\frac{r_f^2}{2}(1 + 2Re(\epsilon)) - r_f \cos(\phi - \delta) - 2r_f \sin(\phi - \delta) Im(\epsilon) + \frac{(1 - 2Re(\epsilon))}{2}\right] dp^2_{K^*}. \quad (83)$$

The branching ratios of the $D^\pm \to K^{*0}\pi^\pm + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^\pm \to K^0_{S,L}\pi^0\pi^\pm$ decays can be obtained by multiplying the partial decay widths for these decays, which are given in Eqs.(73), (74), (82) and (83), and the mean life of $D^\pm$ meson.

3 CP violations and $K_S^0 - K_L^0$ asymmetries

3.1 CP violations in the $D^\pm \to K^{*0}\pi^\pm + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^\pm \to K^0_{S,L}\pi^0\pi^\pm$ decays

Basing on the partial decay widths for the $D^\pm \to K^{*0}\pi^\pm + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^\pm \to K^0_{S,L}\pi^0\pi^\pm$ decays derived in section 2, we can proceed to study the CP violations and $K_S^0 - K_L^0$ asymmetries in these decays.

In the $D^\pm \to K^{*0}\pi^\pm + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^\pm \to K^0_{S,L}\pi^0\pi^\pm$ decays, the time-independent CP violation observables are defined as

$$A_{CP}^{K^0_{S,L}} = \frac{\Gamma(D^+ \to K^*\pi^+ \to K^0_{S,L}\pi^0\pi^+) - \Gamma(D^- \to K^*\pi^- \to K^0_{S,L}\pi^0\pi^-)}{\Gamma(D^+ \to K^*\pi^+ \to K^0_{S,L}\pi^0\pi^+) + \Gamma(D^- \to K^*\pi^- \to K^0_{S,L}\pi^0\pi^-)}. \tag{84}$$

Substituting Eq.(73) and Eq.(74) into Eq.(84), we can derive

$$A_{CP}^{K^0_S} = A^{mix}_{CP,K^0_S} + A^{dir}_{CP,K^0_S} + A^{int}_{CP,K^0_S}, \tag{85}$$

$$A^{mix}_{CP,K^0_S} = \frac{\int_{p_0^2}^{p_1^2} g_{in}(p^2_{K^*}) \left|C_P^0 + T_V^0\right|^2 \left\{2(1-r_f^2)\left[Re(\epsilon) - Re(\epsilon \cdot t_{K^0_S - K^0_L})\right]\right\} dp^2_{K^*}}{\int_{p_0^2}^{p_1^2} g_{in}(p^2_{K^*}) \left|C_P^0 + T_V^0\right|^2 \left(1 + r_f^2 + 2r_f\cos\delta\cos\phi\right) dp^2_{K^*}}, \tag{86}$$

$$A^{dir}_{CP,K^0_S} = \frac{\int_{p_0^2}^{p_1^2} g_{in}(p^2_{K^*}) \left|C_P^0 + T_V^0\right|^2 \left(-2r_f\sin\delta\sin\phi\right) dp^2_{K^*}}{\int_{p_0^2}^{p_1^2} g_{in}(p^2_{K^*}) \left|C_P^0 + T_V^0\right|^2 \left(1 + r_f^2 + 2r_f\cos\delta\cos\phi\right) dp^2_{K^*}}, \tag{87}$$

$$A^{int}_{CP,K^0_S} = \frac{\int_{p_0^2}^{p_1^2} g_{in}(p^2_{K^*}) \left|C_P^0 + T_V^0\right|^2 \left\{4r_f\sin\delta\cos\phi\left[Im(\epsilon) - Im(\epsilon \cdot t_{K^0_S - K^0_L})\right]\right\} dp^2_{K^*}}{\int_{p_0^2}^{p_1^2} g_{in}(p^2_{K^*}) \left|C_P^0 + T_V^0\right|^2 \left(1 + r_f^2 + 2r_f\cos\delta\cos\phi\right) dp^2_{K^*}}, \tag{88}$$

where A^{mix}_{CP,K^0_S} denotes the CP violation in kaon mixing [51, 59], the two terms in the square bracket of Eq.(86) correspond to the pure K_S^0 term and the $K_L^0 - K_S^0$ interference term, respectively. The $K_L^0 - K_S^0$ interference term, which is a function of t_0 and t_1, is as important as the pure K_S^0 term [59]. A^{dir}_{CP,K^0_S} denotes the direct CP asymmetry induced by the interference between the tree level CF and DCS amplitudes. A^{int}_{CP,K^0_S} represents a new CP violating effect, which relates to the following expression

$$\begin{aligned} & 4r_f\sin\delta\cos\phi\left[Im(\epsilon) - Im(\epsilon \cdot t_{K^0_S - K^0_L})\right] \\ &= \frac{\left(C_P^0 + A_V^0\right)\left(C_P^{0*} + T_V^{0*}\right) - \left(C_P^{0*} + A_V^{0*}\right)\left(C_P^0 + T_V^0\right)}{\left|\left(C_P^0 + T_V^0\right)\right|^2} \\ & \qquad \cdot \frac{V_{cd}^* V_{us} V_{cs} V_{ud}^* + V_{cd} V_{us}^* V_{cs}^* V_{ud}}{2|V_{cs}|^2|V_{ud}|^2} \cdot \left(g^{K^0_S *}_{K^0_{phys}\bar{K}^0_{phys}} - g^{K^0_S}_{K^0_{phys}\bar{K}^0_{phys}}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{89}$$

i.e., this new CP violating effect arises from the interference between two tree (CF and DCS) amplitudes with the neutral kaon mixing [51, 89, 90]. Here, we also note that the $K_L^0 - K_S^0$ interference term $\epsilon \cdot t_{K_S^0 - K_L^0}$ has a large contribution to the new CP violating effect, as shown in Eq.(88). In our calculation, we adopt $t_0 = 0.1\tau_S$ and $t_1 = 10\tau_S$. In addition, we will discuss the impact of the choice of t_0 on A^{mix}_{CP,K_S^0}, A^{int}_{CP,K_S^0} and $A^{K_S^0}_{CP}$ in section 5.

Similarly, substituting Eq.(82) and Eq.(83) into Eq.(84), we can derive the expression for CP asymmetry in the $D^\pm \to K^{*0}\pi^\pm + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^\pm \to K_L^0\pi^0\pi^\pm$ decays

$$A^{K_L^0}_{CP} = A^{mix}_{CP,K_L^0} + A^{dir}_{CP,K_L^0} + A^{int}_{CP,K_L^0}, \tag{90}$$

$$A^{mix}_{CP,K_L^0} = \frac{\int_{p_0^2}^{p_1^2} g_{in}(p^2_{K^*}) \left|C_P^0 + T_V^0\right|^2 \left[2(1-r_f^2)Re(\epsilon)\right] dp^2_{K^*}}{\int_{p_0^2}^{p_1^2} g_{in}(p^2_{K^*}) \left|C_P^0 + T_V^0\right|^2 \left(1 + r_f^2 - 2r_f\cos\delta\cos\phi\right) dp^2_{K^*}}, \tag{91}$$

$$A^{dir}_{CP,K_L^0} = \frac{\int_{p_0^2}^{p_1^2} g_{in}(p^2_{K^*}) \left|C_P^0 + T_V^0\right|^2 (2r_f\sin\delta\sin\phi) \, dp^2_{K^*}}{\int_{p_0^2}^{p_1^2} g_{in}(p^2_{K^*}) \left|C_P^0 + T_V^0\right|^2 \left(1 + r_f^2 - 2r_f\cos\delta\cos\phi\right) dp^2_{K^*}}, \tag{92}$$

$$A^{int}_{CP,K_L^0} = \frac{\int_{p_0^2}^{p_1^2} g_{in}(p^2_{K^*}) \left|C_P^0 + T_V^0\right|^2 \left[-4r_f\sin\delta\cos\phi Im(\epsilon)\right] dp^2_{K^*}}{\int_{p_0^2}^{p_1^2} g_{in}(p^2_{K^*}) \left|C_P^0 + T_V^0\right|^2 \left(1 + r_f^2 - 2r_f\cos\delta\cos\phi\right) dp^2_{K^*}}, \tag{93}$$

where A^{mix}_{CP,K_L^0}, A^{dir}_{CP,K_L^0} and A^{int}_{CP,K_L^0} denotes the indirect CP violation in kaon mixing, the direct CP violation in charm decays and the new CP violation effect, respectively. From Eqs.(90)-(93), one can find that all CP violation effects in the $D^\pm \to K^{*0}\pi^\pm + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^\pm \to K_L^0\pi^0\pi^\pm$ decays receive no contribution from the $K_L^0 - K_S^0$ interference and are independent of the decay time t_2.

3.2 $K_S^0 - K_L^0$ asymmetries in the $D^\pm \to K^{*0}\pi^\pm + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^\pm \to K_{S,L}^0\pi^0\pi^\pm$ decays

The $K_S^0 - K_L^0$ asymmetries in the D meson decays are induced by the interference between the CF and DCS amplitudes, which was first pointed out by Bigi and Yamamoto [91]. The determination on the $K_S^0 - K_L^0$ asymmetries in the D meson decays can be useful to study the DCS processes and understand the dynamics of charm decay [78, 92]. In the $D^\pm \to K^{*0}\pi^\pm + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^\pm \to K_{S,L}^0\pi^0\pi^\pm$ decays, the $K_S^0 - K_L^0$ asymmetries are defined by

$$R^{D^+}_{K_S - K_L} = \frac{\Gamma\left(D^+ \to K^*\pi^+ \to K_S^0\pi^0\pi^+\right) - \Gamma\left(D^+ \to K^*\pi^+ \to K_L^0\pi^0\pi^+\right)}{\Gamma\left(D^+ \to K^*\pi^+ \to K_S^0\pi^0\pi^+\right) + \Gamma\left(D^+ \to K^*\pi^+ \to K_L^0\pi^0\pi^+\right)}, \tag{94}$$

$$R^{D^-}_{K_S-K_L}=\frac{\Gamma\left(D^-\to K^*\pi^-\to K^0_S\pi^0\pi^-\right)-\Gamma\left(D^-\to K^*\pi^-\to K^0_L\pi^0\pi^-\right)}{\Gamma\left(D^-\to K^*\pi^-\to K^0_S\pi^0\pi^-\right)+\Gamma\left(D^-\to K^*\pi^-\to K^0_L\pi^0\pi^-\right)}. \tag{95}$$

Using Eq.(73), Eq.(82) and Eq.(94), we can obtain

$$R^{D^+}_{K_S-K_L}=\frac{\int_{p_0^2}^{p_1^2} g_{in}(p^2_{K^*})\left|C^0_P+T^0_V\right|^2 A^{D^+}_{K_S-K_L}dp^2_{K^*}}{\int_{p_0^2}^{p_1^2} g_{in}(p^2_{K^*})\left|C^0_P+T^0_V\right|^2\left[1+r_f^2+2Re(\epsilon)-Re(\epsilon\cdot t_{K^0_S-K^0_L})\right]dp^2_{K^*}}, \tag{96}$$

with

$$A^{D^+}_{K_S-K_L}=2r_f\cos(\phi+\delta)+2r_f\sin(\phi+\delta)\left(2Im(\epsilon)-Im(\epsilon\cdot t_{K^0_S-K^0_L})\right)-Re(\epsilon\cdot t_{K^0_S-K^0_L}). \tag{97}$$

From the above equation, we can see that the main contribution to $R^{D^+}_{K_S-K_L}$ come from the pure K^0_S and K^0_L decay, the contribution from the $K^0_L-K^0_S$ interference terms $\epsilon\cdot t_{K^0_S-K^0_L}$ is small because of the suppression of the parameter ϵ. Similarly, combining Eq.(74), Eq.(83) and Eq.(95), we can derive the expression for $K^0_S-K^0_L$ asymmetry in $D^-\to K^{*0}\pi^-+\bar{K}^{*0}\pi^-\to K^0_{S,L}\pi^0\pi^-$ decays

$$R^{D^-}_{K_S-K_L}=\frac{\int_{p_0^2}^{p_1^2} g_{in}(p^2_{K^*})\left|C^0_P+T^0_V\right|^2 A^{D^-}_{K_S-K_L}dp^2_{K^*}}{\int_{p_0^2}^{p_1^2} g_{in}(p^2_{K^*})\left|C^0_P+T^0_V\right|^2\left[1+r_f^2-2Re(\epsilon)+Re(\epsilon\cdot t_{K^0_S-K^0_L})\right]dp^2_{K^*}}, \tag{98}$$

with

$$A^{D^-}_{K_S-K_L}=2r_f\cos(\phi-\delta)+2r_f\sin(\phi-\delta)\left(2Im(\epsilon)-Im(\epsilon\cdot t_{K^0_S-K^0_L})\right)+Re(\epsilon\cdot t_{K^0_S-K^0_L}). \tag{99}$$

According to the definition of the weak phase difference in Eq.(59), we have $\sin\phi=\mathcal{O}(10^{-3})$ and $\cos\phi\approx 1$. Hence as a good approximation, $\cos(\phi\pm\delta)\approx\cos\delta$ and $\sin(\phi\pm\delta)\approx\pm\sin\delta$. Therefore, the determinations of $R^{D^+}_{K_S-K_L}$ and $R^{D^-}_{K_S-K_L}$ are useful to understand the strong phase difference between the DCS and CF amplitudes [78].

4 Numerical results

4.1 Input parameters

Using the theoretical expressions for the branching ratios, the CP asymmetries and the $K^0_S-K^0_L$ asymmetries derived in section 2 and section 3, we are able to calculate these observables numerically. Firstly, we collect the input parameters used in this work as below [85, 93–98]

$$m_{D^+}=1.870\text{GeV}, \qquad \tau_{D^+}=(1033\pm5)\times10^{-15}\text{s},$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&m_S = 0.498\text{GeV}, && m_L = 0.498\text{GeV},\\
&m_L - m_S = 3.484 \times 10^{-15}\text{GeV}, && m_{K^0} = 0.498\text{GeV},\\
&\Gamma_S = (7.351 \pm 0.003) \times 10^{-15}\text{GeV}, && \Gamma_L = (1.287 \pm 0.005) \times 10^{-17}\text{GeV},\\
&m_{D^*(2010)^\pm} = 2.010\text{GeV}, && m_{D_S^\pm} = 1.968\text{GeV},\\
&m_{K^*} = 0.892\text{GeV}, && \Gamma^0_{K^*} = (5.14 \pm 0.08) \times 10^{-2}\text{GeV},\\
&m_{\pi^+} = 0.140\text{GeV}, && m_{\pi^0} = 0.135\text{GeV},\\
&f_{D^+} = (0.205 \pm 0.004)\text{GeV}, && f_{K^*} = (0.220 \pm 0.005)\text{GeV},\\
&f_{\pi^+} = (0.130 \pm 0.001)\text{GeV}, && f_{\rho^0} = (0.216 \pm 0.003)\text{GeV},\\
&Re(\epsilon) = (1.66 \pm 0.02) \times 10^{-3}, && Im(\epsilon) = (1.57 \pm 0.02) \times 10^{-3}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{100}
$$

The branching ratios used in this paper are taken from the Particle Data Group [85]

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{B}(K^{*0} \to K^0\pi^0) = (33.251 \pm 0.007) \times 10^{-2},\\
&\mathcal{B}(K^0_S \to \pi^+\pi^-) = (69.20 \pm 0.05) \times 10^{-2}, \qquad \mathcal{B}(K^0_L \to \pi^+\pi^-) = (1.967 \pm 0.010) \times 10^{-3},\\
&\mathcal{B}(K^0_S \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0) = (3.5^{-0.9}_{+1.1}) \times 10^{-7}, \qquad \mathcal{B}(K^0_L \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0) = (12.54 \pm 0.05) \times 10^{-2}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{101}
$$

As for the universal nonfactorizable parameters, we use the results fitted in Ref. [78], which are based on the factorization-assisted topological-amplitudes approach

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\chi^C_P = -0.443 \pm 0.007, \qquad \phi^C_P = 0.497 \pm 0.027,\\
&\chi^A_q = 0.147 \pm 0.021, \qquad \phi^A_q = -0.584 \pm 0.211, \qquad S_\pi = 1.28 \pm 0.14.
\end{aligned}
\tag{102}
$$

In order to see physics more transparently, we use the Wolfenstein parametrization of the CKM matrix elements, which imaginary part satisfy the unitarity relation to order λ^5 [85, 99–101]

$$
V_{ud} = 1 - \frac{\lambda^2}{2}, \qquad V_{us} = \lambda, \qquad V_{cd} = -\lambda, \qquad V_{cs} = 1 - \frac{\lambda^2}{2} - A^2\lambda^4(\rho + i\eta), \tag{103}
$$

with λ, A, ρ and η are the real parameters. The latest results fitted by the UTfit collaboration are presented as following [102]

$$
\lambda = 0.225 \pm 0.001, \qquad A = 0.826 \pm 0.012, \qquad \rho = 0.152 \pm 0.014, \qquad \eta = 0.357 \pm 0.010. \tag{104}
$$

Table 1: The values of the branching ratios for the $D^{\pm} \to K^{*}\pi^{\pm} \to K^{0}_{S,L}\pi^{0}\pi^{\pm}$ decays in the FAT approach and the TA approach of Ref. [40].

observables	the FAT approach	the TA approach of Ref. [40]
$\mathcal{B}(D^{+} \to K^{*}\pi^{+} \to K^{0}_{S}\pi^{0}\pi^{+})$	$(3.12^{-0.34}_{+0.36}) \times 10^{-3}$	$(2.25^{-0.21}_{+0.23}) \times 10^{-3}$
$\mathcal{B}(D^{-} \to K^{*}\pi^{-} \to K^{0}_{S}\pi^{0}\pi^{-})$	$(3.14^{-0.34}_{+0.36}) \times 10^{-3}$	$(2.28^{-0.22}_{+0.23}) \times 10^{-3}$
$\mathcal{B}(D^{+} \to K^{*}\pi^{+} \to K^{0}_{L}\pi^{0}\pi^{+})$	$(2.14^{-0.24}_{+0.25}) \times 10^{-3}$	$(2.43^{-0.21}_{+0.23}) \times 10^{-3}$
$\mathcal{B}(D^{-} \to K^{*}\pi^{-} \to K^{0}_{L}\pi^{0}\pi^{-})$	$(2.12^{-0.24}_{+0.25}) \times 10^{-3}$	$(2.41^{-0.21}_{+0.22}) \times 10^{-3}$
$\mathcal{B}(D^{\pm} \to K^{*}\pi^{\pm} \to K^{0}_{S}\pi^{0}\pi^{\pm})$	$(3.13^{-0.34}_{+0.36}) \times 10^{-3}$	$(2.27^{-0.22}_{+0.23}) \times 10^{-3}$
$\mathcal{B}(D^{\pm} \to K^{*}\pi^{\pm} \to K^{0}_{L}\pi^{0}\pi^{\pm})$	$(2.13^{-0.24}_{+0.25}) \times 10^{-3}$	$(2.42^{-0.21}_{+0.22}) \times 10^{-3}$

By substituting the values of the parameters listed above into Eqs.(73), (74), (82) and (83), we can obtain the numerical values of the branching ratios, which are shown in Table 1.

Here, the results in the last two lines of Table 1 are the averaged branching ratios of the decay and its charge conjugate. The results given in Table 1 are consistent with the experimental measurement of $\mathcal{B}(D^{+} \to K^{*}\pi^{+} \to K^{0}_{S}\pi^{0}\pi^{+}) = (2.64 \pm 0.32) \times 10^{-3}$ from BESIII [85, 103]. We also note that the reasons for the differences between the results of the FAT approach and that of the TA approach of Ref. [40] are the small values of $\cos\delta$ and $|\,(C^{0}_{P} + T^{0}_{V})\,|^{2}$ in the TA approach of Ref. [40].

4.2 The numerical results of the CP asymmetries

Now, we move on to calculate the numerical results of the CP asymmetries in $D^{\pm} \to K^{*0}\pi^{\pm} + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^{\pm} \to K^{0}_{S,L}\pi^{0}\pi^{\pm}$ decays. By substituting the values of the parameters in Eqs.(100), (102) and (104) into Eqs.(85)-(88) and Eqs.(90)-(93), we can obtain the numerical results of the CP asymmetries in $D^{\pm} \to K^{*0}\pi^{\pm} + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^{\pm} \to K^{0}_{S,L}\pi^{0}\pi^{\pm}$ decays, which are shown in Table 2. From these numerical values, we can obtain the following points:

1. The indirect CP violation in $K^{0} - \bar{K}^{0}$ mixing $A^{mix}_{CP,K^{0}_{S}}$ is dominant in the CP asymmetry in $D^{\pm} \to K^{*0}\pi^{\pm} + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^{\pm} \to K^{0}_{S}\pi^{0}\pi^{\pm}$ decays $A^{K^{0}_{S}}_{CP}$. The contributions from the $K^{0}_{L} - K^{0}_{S}$ interference term $Re(\epsilon \cdot t_{K^{0}_{S}-K^{0}_{L}})$ is more than twice of that from the pure K^{0}_{S} decay term $Re(\epsilon)$ in $A^{mix}_{CP,K^{0}_{S}}$, and they interfere destructively.

2. The direct CP asymmetry $A^{dir}_{CP,K^{0}_{S}}$ suffer from both the r_{wf} and $\sin\phi$ suppression, thus its numerical value is small.

Table 2: The values of the CP asymmetries in the $D^{\pm} \to K^{*}\pi^{\pm} \to K^{0}_{S,L}\pi^{0}\pi^{\pm}$ decays in the FAT approach and the TA approach of Ref. [40].

observables	the FAT approach	the TA approach of Ref. [40]
A^{mix}_{CP,K^0_S}	$(-2.92 \pm 0.06) \times 10^{-3}$	$(-3.64^{-0.07}_{+0.06}) \times 10^{-3}$
A^{dir}_{CP,K^0_S}	$(-1.18 \pm 0.11) \times 10^{-4}$	$(-1.67 \pm 0.12) \times 10^{-4}$
A^{int}_{CP,K^0_S}	$(-6.50^{-0.51}_{+0.52}) \times 10^{-4}$	$(-9.17^{-0.52}_{+0.48}) \times 10^{-4}$
$A^{K^0_S}_{CP} = A^{mix}_{CP,K^0_S} + A^{dir}_{CP,K^0_S} + A^{int}_{CP,K^0_S}$	$(-3.69 \pm 0.09) \times 10^{-3}$	$(-4.72 \pm 0.09) \times 10^{-3}$
A^{mix}_{CP,K^0_L}	$(3.92^{-0.09}_{+0.08}) \times 10^{-3}$	$(3.11^{-0.06}_{+0.05}) \times 10^{-3}$
A^{dir}_{CP,K^0_L}	$(1.74^{-0.14}_{+0.15}) \times 10^{-4}$	$(1.56 \pm 0.11) \times 10^{-4}$
A^{int}_{CP,K^0_L}	$(8.52^{-0.59}_{+0.61}) \times 10^{-4}$	$(7.65^{-0.41}_{+0.40}) \times 10^{-4}$
$A^{K^0_L}_{CP} = A^{mix}_{CP,K^0_L} + A^{dir}_{CP,K^0_L} + A^{int}_{CP,K^0_L}$	$(4.95 \pm 0.10) \times 10^{-3}$	$(4.03 \pm 0.07) \times 10^{-3}$

3. The value of r_{sf} and $\sin\delta$ vary from 2.49 to 2.97 and from -0.91 to -0.57 in the integral interval of $p^2_{K^*}$ in the FAT approach, respectively. In the TA approach of Ref. [40], the value of r_{sf} and $\sin\delta$ is 2.42 and -0.99, respectively, so the new CP violation effect A^{int}_{CP,K^0_S} only suffer from the r_{wf} suppression relative to the indirect CP violation in $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ mixing, as shown in Eq.(86) and Eq.(88). Moreover, the pure K^0_S decay term $Im(\epsilon)$ and the $K^0_L - K^0_S$ interference term $Im(\epsilon \cdot t_{K^0_S - K^0_L})$ interfere constructively in A^{int}_{CP,K^0_S}, all these reasons result in a non-negligible contribution of the new CP violation effect to the CP asymmetry in $D^{\pm} \to K^{*0}\pi^{\pm} + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^{\pm} \to K^0_S\pi^0\pi^{\pm}$ decays.

4. The value of r_f and $\cos\delta$ vary from 0.13 to 0.16 and from 0.42 to 0.82 in the integral interval of $p^2_{K^*}$ in the FAT approach, respectively, however, the value of r_f and $\cos\delta$ is 0.13 and -0.13 in the TA approach of Ref. [40], respectively.

5. Basing on the numerical values of $sin\delta$ and $\cos\delta$ in the FAT approach and the TA approach of Ref. [40] and according to the expressions for CP asymmetries in Eqs.(85)-(88) and Eqs.(90)-(93), we can derive that the large value of $|\sin\delta|$ and the negative value of $\cos\delta$ in the TA approach of Ref. [40] result in the differences between the numerical values of the CP asymmetries in the FAT approach and that in the TA approach of Ref. [40].

According to the numerical results of the CP asymmetries in $D^{\pm} \to K^{*0}\pi^{\pm} + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^{\pm} \to K^0_{S,L}\pi^0\pi^{\pm}$ decays, we can estimate that how many $D^{\pm}$ events-times-efficiency are needed to establish the CP asymmetries to three standard deviations (3σ). When the CP violations are

observed at three standard deviations (3σ) level, the numbers of $D^{\pm}$ events-times-efficiency needed read [104–106]

$$(\epsilon_f N)_{CP}^{K^0_{S,L}} = \frac{9}{2\cdot\mathcal{B}(D^{\pm}\to K^{*}\pi^{\pm}\to K^0_{S,L}\pi^0\pi^{\pm})\cdot\mathcal{B}(K^0_{S,L}\to f_{K^0_{S,L}})\cdot\left|A_{CP}^{K^0_{S,L}}\right|}, \tag{105}$$

where $f_{K^0_S}$ and $f_{K^0_L}$ denotes $\pi^+\pi^-$ and $\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$, respectively. Combining Eq.(101), Eq.(105) and the numerical results of the branching ratios and the CP asymmetries in Table 1 and Table 2, we can obtain

$$(\epsilon_f N)_{CP}^{K^0_S} = \begin{cases} (5.0\sim 6.3)\times 10^5, & \text{the FAT approach,} \\ (5.5\sim 6.7)\times 10^5, & \text{the TA approach of Ref. [40].} \end{cases} \tag{106}$$

Similarly, substituting Eq.(101) and the numerical results of the branching ratios and the CP asymmetries in Table 1 and Table 2 into Eq.(105), we have

$$(\epsilon_f N)_{CP}^{K^0_L} = \begin{cases} (3.0\sim 3.8)\times 10^6, & \text{the FAT approach,} \\ (3.4\sim 4.0)\times 10^6, & \text{the TA approach of Ref. [40].} \end{cases} \tag{107}$$

4.3 The numerical results of the $K^0_S - K^0_L$ asymmetries

Now, we turn to calculate the numerical results of the $K^0_S - K^0_L$ asymmetries $R^{D^{\pm}}_{K_S-K_L}$. The explicit expressions for $R^{D^{\pm}}_{K_S-K_L}$ have been given in Eqs.(96)-(99). With the values of the parameters in Eqs.(100), (102) and (104), we can obtain the numerical results of $R^{D^{\pm}}_{K_S-K_L}$

$$R^{D^+}_{K_S-K_L} = \begin{cases} 0.186^{-0.017}_{+0.015}, & \text{the FAT approach,} \\ -0.038^{-0.013}_{+0.012}, & \text{the TA approach of Ref. [40].} \end{cases} \tag{108}$$

and

$$R^{D^-}_{K_S-K_L} = \begin{cases} 0.194^{-0.016}_{+0.015}, & \text{the FAT approach,} \\ -0.029^{-0.013}_{+0.012}, & \text{the TA approach of Ref. [40].} \end{cases} \tag{109}$$

Basing on these numerical values, we can obtain the following points:

1. From the Eqs.(96)-(99), we can see that the $K^0_S - K^0_L$ asymmetries $R^{D^{\pm}}_{K_S-K_L}$ only suffer from the r_{wf} suppression, so they have a large value, which indicate that there exist a large difference between the branching ratios of $D^{\pm}\to K^{*0}\pi^{\pm} + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^{\pm}\to K^0_S\pi^0\pi^{\pm}$ and the branching ratios of $D^{\pm}\to K^{*0}\pi^{\pm} + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^{\pm}\to K^0_L\pi^0\pi^{\pm}$.

2. The numerical results of $R^{D^\pm}_{K_S-K_L}$ in the FAT approach are many times (about 5 times for $R^{D^+}_{K_S-K_L}$ and about 6 times for $R^{D^-}_{K_S-K_L}$) larger than that in the TA approach of Ref. [40], moreover, the signs of $R^{D^\pm}_{K_S-K_L}$ in these two approaches are opposite to each other, the reason is that the values of $\cos\delta$ are different in these two approaches. In addition, the $K^0_L - K^0_S$ interference term $Re(\epsilon \cdot t_{K^0_S-K^0_L})$ has a non-negligible contribution to $R^{D^\pm}_{K_S-K_L}$ in the TA approach of Ref. [40].

3. The measurement of $R^{D^\pm}_{K_S-K_L}$ can help to discriminate the FAT approach and the TA approach of Ref. [40].

In the same way as the CP asymmetries in $D^\pm \to K^{*0}\pi^\pm + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^\pm \to K^0_{S,L}\pi^0\pi^\pm$ decays, the numbers of $D^\pm$ events-times-efficiency needed for observing the $K^0_S - K^0_L$ asymmetries at three standard deviations (3σ) level are

$$(\epsilon_f N)^{D^\pm}_{K_S-K_L} = \frac{9}{[\mathcal{B}(D^\pm \to K^*\pi^\pm \to K^0_S\pi^0\pi^\pm) + \mathcal{B}(D^\pm \to K^*\pi^\pm \to K^0_L\pi^0\pi^\pm)] \cdot \left|R^{D^\pm}_{K_S-K_L}\right|}, \tag{110}$$

Using the numerical results of the branching ratios in Table 1, Eq.(108) and Eq.(110), we can obtain

$$(\epsilon_f N)^{D^+}_{K_S-K_L} = \begin{cases} (0.8 \sim 1.0) \times 10^4, & \text{the FAT approach,} \\ (3.8 \sim 7.8) \times 10^4, & \text{the TA approach of Ref. [40].} \end{cases} \tag{111}$$

Similarly, using the numerical results of the branching ratios in Table 1, Eq.(109) and Eq.(110), we have

$$(\epsilon_f N)^{D^-}_{K_S-K_L} = \begin{cases} (0.8 \sim 1.0) \times 10^4, & \text{the FAT approach,} \\ (0.5 \sim 1.2) \times 10^5. & \text{the TA approach of Ref. [40].} \end{cases} \tag{112}$$

5 the observation of the new CP violation effect

In this section, we will study to observe the new CP violation effect in the $D^\pm \to K^{*0}\pi^\pm + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^\pm \to K^0_S\pi^0\pi^\pm$ decays. As discussed in section 3.1, the CP violation in the $D^\pm \to K^{*0}\pi^\pm + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^\pm \to K^0_S\pi^0\pi^\pm$ decays $A^{K^0_S}_{CP}$ consists of three parts: the indirect CP violation in $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ mixing A^{mix}_{CP,K^0_S}, the direct CP violation in charm decays A^{dir}_{CP,K^0_S} and the new CP violation

effect from the interference between two tree (CF and DCS) amplitudes with the neutral kaon mixing A^{int}_{CP,K^0_S}. Moreover, the CP violation in the $D^\pm \to K^{*0}\pi^\pm + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^\pm \to K^0_S\pi^0\pi^\pm$ decays is dominated by the indirect CP violation in $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ mixing, which is shown in Table 2, all these make the observation of the new CP violation effect more difficulty.

Now, it is important to note the following features of the three parts of the CP violation in the $D^\pm \to K^{*0}\pi^\pm + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^\pm \to K^0_S\pi^0\pi^\pm$ decays:


1. The $K^0_L - K^0_S$ interference term $\epsilon \cdot t_{K^0_S - K^0_L}$ makes a large contribution to both the indirect CP violation in $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ mixing A^{mix}_{CP,K^0_S} and the new CP violation effect from the interference between two tree (CF and DCS) amplitudes with the neutral kaon mixing A^{int}_{CP,K^0_S}, which can be seen from Eq.(86) and Eq.(88).

2. The $K^0_L - K^0_S$ interference term is the function of the decay time parameters t_0 and t_1, we adopt $t_0 = 0.1\tau_S$ and $t_1 = 10\tau_S$ in our above calculation.

3. As discussed in section 4.2, the contributions from the $K^0_L - K^0_S$ interference term $Re(\epsilon \cdot t_{K^0_S - K^0_L})$ and that from the pure K^0_S decay term $Re(\epsilon)$ interfere destructively in A^{mix}_{CP,K^0_S}, however, the contributions from the $K^0_L - K^0_S$ interference term $Im(\epsilon \cdot t_{K^0_S - K^0_L})$ and that from the pure K^0_S decay term $Im(\epsilon)$ interfere constructively in A^{int}_{CP,K^0_S}.

So there is a possibility that the numerical value of the indirect CP violation in $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ mixing A^{mix}_{CP,K^0_S} become smaller and the numerical value of the new CP violation effect A^{int}_{CP,K^0_S} become larger if we adopt some specific values of t_0, as a result, the new CP violation effect A^{int}_{CP,K^0_S} would dominate the CP violation in the $D^\pm \to K^{*0}\pi^\pm + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^\pm \to K^0_S\pi^0\pi^\pm$ decays, the observation of the new CP violation effect become possible.

According the Eqs.(85)-(88), we calculate the dependence of A^{mix}_{CP,K^0_S}, A^{int}_{CP,K^0_S} and $A^{K^0_S}_{CP}$ on the selection of t_0 in the FAT approach and the TA approach of Ref. [40], which is shown in Fig. 4. Here, we note that we still adopt $t_1 = 10\tau_S$ in the calculations. It can be seen from Fig. 4 that the maximum value of $|A^{K^0_S}_{CP}|$ can reach up to 9.31×10^{-3} and 1.23×10^{-2} in the FAT approach and the TA approach of Ref. [40], respectively, when $|A^{K^0_S}_{CP}|$ adopt these values, the new CP violation effect A^{int}_{CP,K^0_S} is comparable with the indirect CP violation in $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ mixing A^{mix}_{CP,K^0_S}. In addition, it can be seen from Fig. 4 that the numerical value of the indirect CP violation in $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ mixing A^{mix}_{CP,K^0_S} become smaller and the new CP violation effect A^{int}_{CP,K^0_S}



(a) (b)

Figure 4: The dependence of the indirect CP violation in $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ mixing A^{mix}_{CP,K^0_S}, the direct CP violation in the charm decay A^{dir}_{CP,K^0_S}, the new CP violation effect A^{int}_{CP,K^0_S} and the CP violation in the $D^{\pm} \to K^{*0}\pi^{\pm} + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^{\pm} \to K^0_S\pi^0\pi^{\pm}$ decays $A^{K^0_S}_{CP}$ on the selection of t_0 with $t_1 = 10/\Gamma_S$: (a)in the FAT approach, (b)in the TA approach of Ref. [40].

plays a dominant pole in the CP violation in the $D^{\pm} \to K^{*0}\pi^{\pm} + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^{\pm} \to K^0_S\pi^0\pi^{\pm}$ decays $A^{K^0_S}_{CP}$ at some values of t_0. For example, when $t_0 = 3.0\tau_S$, we have

$$A^{mix}_{CP,K^0_S} = (-0.84 \pm 0.25) \times 10^{-3}, \tag{113}$$

$$A^{dir}_{CP,K^0_S} = (-1.18 \pm 0.11) \times 10^{-4}, \tag{114}$$

$$A^{int}_{CP,K^0_S} = (-6.15 \pm 0.48) \times 10^{-3}, \tag{115}$$

$$A^{K^0_S}_{CP} = A^{mix}_{CP,K^0_S} + A^{dir}_{CP,K^0_S} + A^{int}_{CP,K^0_S} = (-7.11 \pm 0.56) \times 10^{-3}, \tag{116}$$

in the the FAT approach and

$$A^{mix}_{CP,K^0_S} = (-1.05 \pm 0.31) \times 10^{-3}, \tag{117}$$

$$A^{dir}_{CP,K^0_S} = (-1.67 \pm 0.12) \times 10^{-4}, \tag{118}$$

$$A^{int}_{CP,K^0_S} = (-8.68^{-0.48}_{+0.45}) \times 10^{-3}, \tag{119}$$

$$A^{K^0_S}_{CP} = A^{mix}_{CP,K^0_S} + A^{dir}_{CP,K^0_S} + A^{int}_{CP,K^0_S} = (-9.90^{-0.59}_{+0.56}) \times 10^{-3}, \tag{120}$$

in the TA approach of Ref. [40]. Obviously, if we adopt $t_0 = 3.0\tau_S$ and $t_1 = 10.0\tau_S$, the new CP violation effect A^{int}_{CP,K^0_S} is possible to be observed.

However, the method mentioned above has a drawback: if we adopt $t_0 = 3.0\tau_S$ and $t_1 = 10.0\tau_S$, we would lost a lot of the $D^{\pm} \to K^{*0}\pi^{\pm} + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^{\pm} \to K^0_S\pi^0\pi^{\pm}$ event, The reason is that the decay of a K^0_S meson to final state $\pi^+\pi^-$ occurs mainly at time less than $5\tau_S$ and the

decay-rate of K_S^0 meson decrease rapidly with time. The event selection efficiency of $t_0 = 3.0\tau_S$ and $t_1 = 10.0\tau_S$ can be written as

$$\epsilon_{t_0} = \frac{\int_{3\tau_S}^{10\tau_S} \Gamma(D^\pm \to K^*\pi^\pm \to K(t)\pi^0\pi^\pm \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0\pi^\pm)dt}{\int_0^{+\infty} \Gamma(D^\pm \to K^*\pi^\pm \to K(t)\pi^0\pi^\pm \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0\pi^\pm)dt}, \tag{121}$$

substituting Eq.(60) and Eq.(64) into Eq.(121) and using the values of the parameters in Eqs.(100), (102) and (104), we can obtain the numerical result of ϵ_{t_0}

$$\epsilon_{t_0} = 5.0 \times 10^{-2}, \tag{122}$$

where the above result is the averaged efficiency of the decay and its charge conjugate. So, if the CP violations in Eq.(116) and Eq.(120) are observed at three standard deviations (3σ) level, the numbers of $D^\pm$ events-times-efficiency needed read

$$(\epsilon_f N)^{K_S^0}_{CP,t_0=3\tau_S} = \frac{9}{2 \cdot \mathcal{B}(D^\pm \to K^*\pi^\pm \to K_S^0\pi^0\pi^\pm) \cdot \mathcal{B}(K_S^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-) \cdot \left|A_{CP}^{K_S^0}\right| \cdot \epsilon_{t_0}}, \tag{123}$$

substituting Eq.(101), Eq.(116), Eq.(120), Eq.(122) and the numerical results of the branching ratios in Table 1 into Eq.(123), we can obtain

$$(\epsilon_f N)^{K_S^0}_{CP,t_0=3\tau_S} = \begin{cases} (5.1 \sim 6.7) \times 10^6, & \text{the FAT approach,} \\ (5.2 \sim 6.5) \times 10^6, & \text{the TA approach of Ref. [40].} \end{cases} \tag{124}$$

where ϵ_f is the selection efficiency in experiment, it don't contain ϵ_{t_0}. In a word, if ones adopt the scenario $t_0 = 3.0\tau_S$ and $t_1 = 10.0\tau_S$ and want to observe the new CP violation effect A^{int}_{CP,K_S^0} in $D^\pm \to K^{*0}\pi^\pm + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^\pm \to K_S^0\pi^0\pi^\pm$ decays, the number of $D^\pm$ events-times-efficiency needed is $(5.1 \sim 6.7) \times 10^6$ and $(5.2 \sim 6.5) \times 10^6$ in the FAT approach and the TA approach of Ref. [40], respectively.

6 Conclusions

In this work, we derive the expressions for the CP violations in $D^\pm \to K^{*0}\pi^\pm + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^\pm \to K_{S,L}^0\pi^0\pi^\pm$ decays $A_{CP}^{K_{S,L}^0}$, which consists of three parts: the indirect CP violations in $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ mixing $A^{mix}_{CP,K_{S,L}^0}$, the direct CP violations in charm decay $A^{dir}_{CP,K_{S,L}^0}$ and the new CP violation effects $A^{int}_{CP,K_{S,L}^0}$, which are induced from the interference between two tree (CF and DCS) amplitudes with the neutral kaon mixing. We calculate the numerical results of the CP violations

in $D^{\pm} \to K^{*0}\pi^{\pm} + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^{\pm} \to K^0_{S,L}\pi^0\pi^{\pm}$ decays based on the FAT approach and the TA approach of Ref. [40]

$$A^{K^0_S}_{CP} = \begin{cases} (-3.69 \pm 0.09) \times 10^{-3}, & \text{the FAT approach,} \\ (-4.72 \pm 0.09) \times 10^{-3}, & \text{the TA approach of Ref. [40],} \end{cases} \tag{125}$$

and

$$A^{K^0_L}_{CP} = \begin{cases} (4.95 \pm 0.10) \times 10^{-3}, & \text{the FAT approach,} \\ (4.03 \pm 0.07) \times 10^{-3}, & \text{the TA approach of Ref. [40],} \end{cases} \tag{126}$$

we find that the indirect CP violations in $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ mixing play a dominant role in the CP violations in $D^{\pm} \to K^{*0}\pi^{\pm} + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^{\pm} \to K^0_{S,L}\pi^0\pi^{\pm}$ decays, the new CP violation effect have a non-negligible contribution to the CP violations in $D^{\pm} \to K^{*0}\pi^{\pm} + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^{\pm} \to K^0_{S,L}\pi^0\pi^{\pm}$ decays. In order to observe the CP violations at three standard deviations (3σ) level, 6.3×10^5 and 3.8×10^6 $D^{\pm}$ events-times-efficiency are needed for the $D^{\pm} \to K^{*0}\pi^{\pm} + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^{\pm} \to K^0_S\pi^0\pi^{\pm}$ decays and $D^{\pm} \to K^{*0}\pi^{\pm} + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^{\pm} \to K^0_L\pi^0\pi^{\pm}$ decays in the FAT approach, respectively. In the TA approach of Ref. [40], 6.7×10^5 and 4.0×10^6 $D^{\pm}$ events-times-efficiency are needed to observe the CP violations at three standard deviations (3σ) level for the $D^{\pm} \to K^{*0}\pi^{\pm} + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^{\pm} \to K^0_S\pi^0\pi^{\pm}$ decays and $D^{\pm} \to K^{*0}\pi^{\pm} + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^{\pm} \to K^0_L\pi^0\pi^{\pm}$ decays, respectively.

We present the formulas of the $K^0_S - K^0_L$ asymmetries $R^{D^{\pm}}_{K_S-K_L}$ in the $D^{\pm} \to K^{*0}\pi^{\pm} + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^{\pm} \to K^0_{S,L}\pi^0\pi^{\pm}$ decays and predict the numerical values of them in the FAT approach and the TA approach of Ref. [40]

$$R^{D^+}_{K_S-K_L} = \begin{cases} 0.186^{-0.017}_{+0.015}, & \text{the FAT approach,} \\ -0.038^{-0.013}_{+0.012}, & \text{the TA approach of Ref. [40],} \end{cases} \tag{127}$$

and

$$R^{D^-}_{K_S-K_L} = \begin{cases} 0.194^{-0.016}_{+0.015}, & \text{the FAT approach,} \\ -0.029^{-0.013}_{+0.012}, & \text{the TA approach of Ref. [40],} \end{cases} \tag{128}$$

because the $K^0_S - K^0_L$ asymmetries $R^{D^{\pm}}_{K_S-K_L}$ only suffer from the r_{wf} suppression, so they have a large value, which indicate that there exist a large difference between the branching ratios of $D^{\pm} \to K^{*0}\pi^{\pm} + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^{\pm} \to K^0_S\pi^0\pi^{\pm}$ and the branching ratios of $D^{\pm} \to K^{*0}\pi^{\pm} + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^{\pm} \to K^0_L\pi^0\pi^{\pm}$. In addition, Because the values of $\cos\delta$ are different in the FAT approach and the TA

approach of Ref. [40], the numerical results of $R^{D^\pm}_{K_S-K_L}$ in the FAT approach are many times (about 5 times for $R^{D^+}_{K_S-K_L}$ and about 6 times for $R^{D^-}_{K_S-K_L}$) larger than that in the TA approach of Ref. [40], moreover, the signs of $R^{D^\pm}_{K_S-K_L}$ in these two approaches are opposite to each other. Basing on the FAT approach, we estimate that the range of the numbers of $D^\pm$ events-times-efficiency needed for observing the $K^0_S - K^0_L$ asymmetries at three standard deviations (3σ) level is from 0.8×10^4 to 1.0×10^4 both for the $D^+ \to K^{*0}\pi^+ + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^+ \to K^0_{S,L}\pi^0\pi^+$ decays and for the $D^- \to K^{*0}\pi^- + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^- \to K^0_{S,L}\pi^0\pi^-$ decays. In the the TA approach of Ref. [40], we derive that the range of the numbers of $D^\pm$ events-times-efficiency needed for observing the $K^0_S - K^0_L$ asymmetries at three standard deviations (3σ) level is $3.8\times 10^4 \sim 7.8\times 10^4$ for the $D^+ \to K^{*0}\pi^+ + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^+ \to K^0_{S,L}\pi^0\pi^+$ decays and $0.5\times 10^5 \sim 1.2\times 10^5$ for the $D^- \to K^{*0}\pi^- + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^- \to K^0_{S,L}\pi^0\pi^-$ decays.

We also investigate the possibility to observe the new CP violation effect A^{int}_{CP,K^0_S} in the $D^\pm \to K^{*0}\pi^\pm + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^\pm \to K^0_S\pi^0\pi^\pm$ decays in the FAT approach and the TA approach of Ref. [40]. We find that the new CP violation effect can dominate the CP violation in the $D^\pm \to K^{*0}\pi^\pm + \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^\pm \to K^0_S\pi^0\pi^\pm$ decays when the scenario with $t_0 = 3.0\tau_S$ and $t_1 = 10.0\tau_S$ is adopted. However, the observation of the new CP violation effect A^{int}_{CP,K^0_S} in the above mentioned scenario is at the expense of the loss of the event selection efficiency. If the clean signal of the new CP violation effect A^{int}_{CP,K^0_S} is established, the number of $D^\pm$ events-times-efficiency needed is 6.7×10^6 and 6.5×10^6 in the FAT approach and the TA approach of Ref. [40], respectively.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Professor Fu-Sheng Yu for his valuable suggestions. The work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Contract Nos. 12175088, 12135006).

A Wilson coefficients

Below we present the evolution of the Wilson coefficients in the scale $\mu < m_c$ [14, 107],

$$C_1(\mu) = 0.2334(\alpha_s)^{1.444} + 0.0459(\alpha_s)^{0.7778} - 1.313(\alpha_s)^{0.4444} + 0.3041(\alpha_s)^{-0.2222}, \qquad \text{(A.1)}$$

$$C_2(\mu) = -0.2334(\alpha_s)^{1.444} + 0.0459(\alpha_s)^{0.7778} + 1.313(\alpha_s)^{0.4444} + 0.3041(\alpha_s)^{-0.2222}, \qquad \text{(A.2)}$$

where α_s is the strong running coupling constant

$$\alpha_s = \alpha_s(\mu) = \frac{4\pi}{\beta_0 \ln(\mu^2/\Lambda^2_{\overline{MS}})} \left[1 - \frac{\beta_1}{\beta_0^2} \frac{\ln\ln(\mu^2/\Lambda^2_{\overline{MS}})}{\ln(\mu^2/\Lambda^2_{\overline{MS}})}\right], \qquad \text{(A.3)}$$

with

$$\beta_0 = \frac{33 - 2f}{3}, \qquad \beta_1 = 102 - \frac{38}{3}f, \qquad \text{(A.4)}$$

where $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}$ is the QCD scale characteristic for the $\overline{MS}$ scheme, f is the number of "effective" flavours, their values can be found

$$\Lambda_{\overline{MS}} = \Lambda^{(3)}_{\overline{MS}} = 375\text{MeV}, \qquad f = 3, \qquad \text{(A.5)}$$

for $\mu < m_c$.

References

[1] A. D. Sakharov, Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **5**, 32-35 (1967). doi:10.1070/PU1991v034n05ABEH002497.

[2] A. Riotto, [arXiv:hep-ph/9807454 [hep-ph]].

[3] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb], Phys. Rev. Lett. **122**, no.21, 211803 (2019) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.122.211803 [arXiv:1903.08726 [hep-ex]].

[4] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb], JHEP **07**, 041 (2014) doi:10.1007/JHEP07(2014)041 [arXiv:1405.2797 [hep-ex]].

[5] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb], Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, no.19, 191601 (2016) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.191601 [arXiv:1602.03160 [hep-ex]].

[6] M. Artuso, B. Meadows and A. A. Petrov, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **58**, 249-291 (2008) doi:10.1146/annurev.nucl.58.110707.171131 [arXiv:0802.2934 [hep-ph]].

[7] I. I. Bigi and A. Paul, JHEP **03**, 021 (2012) doi:10.1007/JHEP03(2012)021 [arXiv:1110.2862 [hep-ph]].

[8] Y. Hochberg and Y. Nir, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 261601 (2012) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.108.261601 [arXiv:1112.5268 [hep-ph]].

[9] D. Delepine, G. Faisel and C. A. Ramirez, J. Phys. Conf. Ser. **378**, 012015 (2012) doi:10.1088/1742-6596/378/1/012015.

[10] H. Y. Cheng and C. W. Chiang, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 034036 (2012) [erratum: Phys. Rev. D **85**, 079903 (2012)] doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.85.034036 [arXiv:1201.0785 [hep-ph]].

[11] C. H. Chen, C. Q. Geng and W. Wang, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 077702 (2012) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.85.077702 [arXiv:1202.3300 [hep-ph]].

[12] W. Altmannshofer, R. Primulando, C. T. Yu and F. Yu, JHEP **04**, 049 (2012) doi:10.1007/JHEP04(2012)049 [arXiv:1202.2866 [hep-ph]].

[13] E. Franco, S. Mishima and L. Silvestrini, JHEP **05**, 140 (2012) doi:10.1007/JHEP05(2012)140 [arXiv:1203.3131 [hep-ph]].

[14] H. n. Li, C. D. Lu and F. S. Yu, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 036012 (2012) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.86.036012 [arXiv:1203.3120 [hep-ph]].

[15] B. Keren-Zur, P. Lodone, M. Nardecchia, D. Pappadopulo, R. Rattazzi and L. Vecchi, Nucl. Phys. B **867**, 394-428 (2013) doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2012.10.012 [arXiv:1205.5803 [hep-ph]].

[16] G. Isidori and J. F. Kamenik, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 171801 (2012) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.171801 [arXiv:1205.3164 [hep-ph]].

[17] I. Bediaga, J. Miranda, A. C. dos Reis, I. I. Bigi, A. Gomes, J. M. Otalora Goicochea and A. Veiga, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 036005 (2012) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.86.036005 [arXiv:1205.3036 [hep-ph]].

[18] H. Y. Cheng and C. W. Chiang, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 014014 (2012) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.86.014014 [arXiv:1205.0580 [hep-ph]].

[19] C. H. Chen, C. Q. Geng and W. Wang, Phys. Lett. B **718**, 946-950 (2013) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2012.11.014 [arXiv:1206.5158 [hep-ph]].

[20] I. I. Bigi, [arXiv:1206.4554 [hep-ph]].

[21] S. Fajfer and N. Košnik, Phys. Rev. D **87**, no.5, 054026 (2013) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.87.054026 [arXiv:1208.0759 [hep-ph]].

[22] D. Delepine, G. Faisel and C. A. Ramirez, Phys. Rev. D **87**, no.7, 075017 (2013) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.87.075017 [arXiv:1212.6281 [hep-ph]].

[23] Q. Qin, H. n. Li, C. D. Lü and F. S. Yu, Phys. Rev. D **89**, no.5, 054006 (2014) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.89.054006 [arXiv:1305.7021 [hep-ph]].

[24] F. Buccella, M. Lusignoli, A. Pugliese and P. Santorelli, Phys. Rev. D **88**, no.7, 074011 (2013) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.88.074011 [arXiv:1305.7343 [hep-ph]].

[25] A. Dighe, D. Ghosh and B. P. Kodrani, Phys. Rev. D **89**, no.9, 096008 (2014) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.89.096008 [arXiv:1306.3861 [hep-ph]].

[26] A. J. Bevan and B. T. Meadows, Phys. Rev. D **90**, no.9, 094028 (2014) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.90.094028 [arXiv:1310.0050 [hep-ex]].

[27] C. S. Huang, T. Li, X. C. Wang and X. H. Wu, Phys. Rev. D **90**, no.5, 055003 (2014) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.90.055003 [arXiv:1311.3436 [hep-ph]].

[28] Q. Qin, H. N. Li, C. D. Lü and F. S. Yu, Int. J. Mod. Phys. Conf. Ser. **29**, 1460209 (2014) doi:10.1142/S2010194514602099.

[29] H. Zhou, B. Zheng and Z. H. Zhang, Adv. High Energy Phys. **2018**, 7627308 (2018) doi:10.1155/2018/7627308 [arXiv:1811.07556 [hep-ph]].

[30] H. N. Li, C. D. Lü and F. S. Yu, [arXiv:1903.10638 [hep-ph]].

[31] Y. Grossman and S. Schacht, JHEP **07**, 020 (2019) doi:10.1007/JHEP07(2019)020 [arXiv:1903.10952 [hep-ph]].

[32] A. Soni, [arXiv:1905.00907 [hep-ph]].

[33] H. Y. Cheng and C. W. Chiang, Phys. Rev. D **100**, no.9, 093002 (2019) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.100.093002 [arXiv:1909.03063 [hep-ph]].

[34] A. Dery and Y. Nir, JHEP **12**, 104 (2019) doi:10.1007/JHEP12(2019)104 [arXiv:1909.11242 [hep-ph]].

[35] S. Bianco and I. I. Bigi, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **35**, no.24, 2030013 (2020) doi:10.1142/S0217751X20300136 [arXiv:2001.06908 [hep-ph]].

[36] D. Wang, C. P. Jia and F. S. Yu, JHEP **21**, 126 (2020) doi:10.1007/JHEP09(2021)126 [arXiv:2001.09460 [hep-ph]].

[37] M. Saur and F. S. Yu, Sci. Bull. **65**, 1428-1431 (2020) doi:10.1016/j.scib.2020.04.020 [arXiv:2002.12088 [hep-ex]].

[38] I. Bediaga and C. Göbel, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **114**, 103808 (2020) doi:10.1016/j.ppnp.2020.103808 [arXiv:2009.07037 [hep-ex]].

[39] A. Dery, Y. Grossman, S. Schacht and A. Soffer, JHEP **05**, 179 (2021) doi:10.1007/JHEP05(2021)179 [arXiv:2101.02560 [hep-ph]].

[40] H. Y. Cheng and C. W. Chiang, Phys. Rev. D **104**, no.7, 073003 (2021) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.104.073003 [arXiv:2104.13548 [hep-ph]].

[41] H. Y. Cheng and C. W. Chiang, [arXiv:2112.14398 [hep-ph]].

[42] A. Karan and A. K. Nayak, Phys. Rev. D **101**, no.1, 015027 (2020) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.101.015027 [arXiv:2001.05282 [hep-ph]].

[43] A. Karan, Eur. Phys. J. C **80**, no.8, 782 (2020) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-020-8297-8 [arXiv:2007.06725 [hep-ph]].

[44] A. Dery, Y. Grossman, S. Schacht and D. Tonelli, [arXiv:2209.07429 [hep-ph]].

[45] A. Amorim, M. G. Santos and J. P. Silva, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 056001 (1999) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.59.056001 [arXiv:hep-ph/9807364 [hep-ph]].

[46] T. Aaltonen *et al.* [CDF], Phys. Rev. D **86**, 032007 (2012) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.86.032007 [arXiv:1207.0825 [hep-ex]].

[47] C. Thomas and G. Wilkinson, JHEP **10**, 185 (2012) doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2012)185 [arXiv:1209.0172 [hep-ex]].

[48] J. P. Lees *et al.* [BaBar], Phys. Rev. D **87**, no.5, 052012 (2013) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.87.052012 [arXiv:1212.3003 [hep-ex]].

[49] B. R. Ko *et al.* [Belle], JHEP **02**, 098 (2013) doi:10.1007/JHEP02(2013)098 [arXiv:1212.6112 [hep-ex]].

[50] D. Wang, P. F. Guo, W. H. Long and F. S. Yu, JHEP **03**, 066 (2018) doi:10.1007/JHEP03(2018)066 [arXiv:1709.09873 [hep-ph]].

[51] D. Wang, F. S. Yu and H. n. Li, Phys. Rev. Lett. **119**, no.18, 181802 (2017) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.119.181802 [arXiv:1707.09297 [hep-ph]].

[52] B. R. Ko *et al.* [Belle Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 021601 (2012) Erratum: [Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 119903 (2012)] doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.021601, 10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.119903 [arXiv:1203.6409 [hep-ex]].

[53] B. R. Ko *et al.* [Belle], Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 181602 (2010) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.104.181602 [arXiv:1001.3202 [hep-ex]].

[54] P. del Amo Sanchez *et al.* [BaBar], Phys. Rev. D **83**, 071103 (2011) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.83.071103 [arXiv:1011.5477 [hep-ex]].

[55] J. P. Lees *et al.* [BaBar], Phys. Rev. D **85**, 031102 (2012) [erratum: Phys. Rev. D **85**, 099904 (2012)] doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.85.031102 [arXiv:1109.1527 [hep-ex]].

[56] H. Mendez *et al.* [CLEO], Phys. Rev. D **81**, 052013 (2010) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.81.052013 [arXiv:0906.3198 [hep-ex]].

[57] S. Dobbs *et al.* [CLEO], Phys. Rev. D **76**, 112001 (2007) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.76.112001 [arXiv:0709.3783 [hep-ex]].

[58] J. M. Link *et al.* [FOCUS], Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 041602 (2002) [erratum: Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 159903 (2002)] doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.88.041602 [arXiv:hep-ex/0109022 [hep-ex]].

[59] Y. Grossman and Y. Nir, JHEP **04**, 002 (2012) doi:10.1007/JHEP04(2012)002 [arXiv:1110.3790 [hep-ph]].

[60] I. I. Bigi, [arXiv:1204.5817 [hep-ph]].

[61] V. Poireau [BaBar], [arXiv:1205.2201 [hep-ex]].

[62] F. Z. Chen, X. Q. Li, S. C. Peng, Y. D. Yang and H. H. Zhang, JHEP **01**, 108 (2022) doi:10.1007/JHEP01(2022)108 [arXiv:2107.12310 [hep-ph]].

[63] F. Z. Chen, X. Q. Li and Y. D. Yang, JHEP **05**, 151 (2020) doi:10.1007/JHEP05(2020)151 [arXiv:2003.05735 [hep-ph]].

[64] F. Z. Chen, X. Q. Li, Y. D. Yang and X. Zhang, Phys. Rev. D **100**, no.11, 113006 (2019) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.100.113006 [arXiv:1909.05543 [hep-ph]].

[65] A. Dighe, S. Ghosh, G. Kumar and T. S. Roy, [arXiv:1902.09561 [hep-ph]].

[66] J. Rendón, P. Roig and G. Toledo, Phys. Rev. D **99**, no.9, 093005 (2019) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.99.093005 [arXiv:1902.08143 [hep-ph]].

[67] V. Cirigliano, A. Crivellin and M. Hoferichter, SciPost Phys. Proc. **1**, 007 (2019) doi:10.21468/SciPostPhysProc.1.007.

[68] G. López Castro, SciPost Phys. Proc. **1**, 008 (2019) doi:10.21468/SciPostPhysProc.1.008 [arXiv:1812.05892 [hep-ph]].

[69] D. Delepine, G. Faisel and C. A. Ramirez, [arXiv:1806.05090 [hep-ph]].

[70] V. Cirigliano, A. Crivellin and M. Hoferichter, Phys. Rev. Lett. **120**, no.14, 141803 (2018) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.120.141803 [arXiv:1712.06595 [hep-ph]].

[71] L. Dhargyal, LHEP **1**, no.3, 9-14 (2018) doi:10.31526/LHEP.3.2018.03 [arXiv:1605.00629 [hep-ph]].

[72] H. Z. Devi, L. Dhargyal and N. Sinha, Phys. Rev. D **90**, no.1, 013016 (2014) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.90.013016 [arXiv:1308.4383 [hep-ph]].

[73] D. Kimura, K. Y. Lee and T. Morozumi, PTEP **2013**, 053B03 (2013) [erratum: PTEP **2013**, no.9, 099201 (2013); erratum: PTEP **2014**, no.8, 089202 (2014)] doi:10.1093/ptep/ptt013 [arXiv:1201.1794 [hep-ph]].

[74] T. Feldmann, S. Nandi and A. Soni, JHEP **06**, 007 (2012) doi:10.1007/JHEP06(2012)007 [arXiv:1202.3795 [hep-ph]].

[75] H. Y. Cheng and C. W. Chiang, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 074021 (2010) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.81.074021 [arXiv:1001.0987 [hep-ph]].

[76] T. G. Rizzo and L. L. C. Wang, BNL-27950.

[77] L. L. Chau and T. G. Rizzo, BNL-30237.

[78] D. Wang, F. S. Yu, P. F. Guo and H. Y. Jiang, Phys. Rev. D **95**, no.7, 073007 (2017) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.95.073007 [arXiv:1701.07173 [hep-ph]].

[79] M. Wirbel, B. Stech and M. Bauer, Z. Phys. C **29**, 637 (1985) doi:10.1007/BF01560299.

[80] D. Melikhov and B. Stech, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 014006 (2000) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.62.014006 [arXiv:hep-ph/0001113 [hep-ph]].

[81] L. J. Cooper *et al.* [HPQCD], Phys. Rev. D **102**, no.1, 014513 (2020) [erratum: Phys. Rev. D **103**, no.9, 099901 (2021)] doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.102.014513 [arXiv:2003.00914 [hep-lat]].

[82] Fu-Sheng Yu, X. X. Wang and C. D. Lu, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 074019 (2011) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.84.074019 [arXiv:1101.4714 [hep-ph]].

[83] H. Y. Cheng, C. W. Chiang and A. L. Kuo, Phys. Rev. D **93**, no.11, 114010 (2016) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.93.114010 [arXiv:1604.03761 [hep-ph]].

[84] H. Y. Cheng, C. W. Chiang and C. K. Chua, Phys. Rev. D **103**, no.3, 036017 (2021) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.103.036017 [arXiv:2011.07468 [hep-ph]].

[85] R. L. Workman *et al.* [Particle Data Group], PTEP **2022**, 083C01 (2022) doi:10.1093/ptep/ptac097.

[86] X. D. Cheng, R. M. Wang and X. B. Yuan, Phys. Rev. D **104**, no.9, 093005 (2021) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.104.093005 [arXiv:2107.10683 [hep-ph]].

[87] X. D. Cheng, R. M. Wang, X. B. Yuan and X. Zhang, Phys. Rev. D **104**, no.9, 093004 (2021) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.104.093004 [arXiv:2109.02223 [hep-ph]].

[88] A. Cerri, V. V. Gligorov, S. Malvezzi, J. Martin Camalich, J. Zupan, S. Akar, J. Alimena, B. C. Allanach, W. Altmannshofer and L. Anderlini, *et al.* CERN Yellow Rep. Monogr. **7**, 867-1158 (2019) doi:10.23731/CYRM-2019-007.867 [arXiv:1812.07638 [hep-ph]].

[89] C. P. Jia, D. Wang and F. S. Yu, Nucl. Phys. B **956**, 115048 (2020) doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2020.115048 [arXiv:1910.00876 [hep-ph]].

[90] D. Wang, [arXiv:2204.04116 [hep-ph]].

[91] I. I. Y. Bigi and H. Yamamoto, Phys. Lett. B **349**, 363-366 (1995) doi:10.1016/0370-2693(95)00285-S [arXiv:hep-ph/9502238 [hep-ph]].

[92] Q. He *et al.* [CLEO], Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 091801 (2008) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.100.091801 [arXiv:0711.1463 [hep-ex]].

[93] P. Ball, G. W. Jones and R. Zwicky, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 054004 (2007) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.75.054004 [arXiv:hep-ph/0612081 [hep-ph]].

[94] A. Bharucha, D. M. Straub and R. Zwicky, JHEP **08**, 098 (2016) doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2016)098 [arXiv:1503.05534 [hep-ph]].

[95] V. M. Braun, P. C. Bruns, S. Collins, J. A. Gracey, M. Gruber, M. Göckeler, F. Hutzler, P. Pérez-Rubio, A. Schäfer and W. Söldner, *et al.* JHEP **04**, 082 (2017) doi:10.1007/JHEP04(2017)082 [arXiv:1612.02955 [hep-lat]].

[96] Q. Chang, X. N. Li, X. Q. Li, F. Su and Y. D. Yang, Phys. Rev. D **98**, no.11, 114018 (2018) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.98.114018 [arXiv:1810.00296 [hep-ph]].

[97] Y. Aoki *et al.* [Flavour Lattice Averaging Group (FLAG)], Eur. Phys. J. C **82**, no.10, 869 (2022) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-022-10536-1 [arXiv:2111.09849 [hep-lat]].

[98] Y. Amhis *et al.* [HFLAV], [arXiv:2206.07501 [hep-ex]].

[99] L. Wolfenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **51**, 1945 (1983) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.51.1945

[100] Y. H. Ahn, H. Y. Cheng and S. Oh, Phys. Lett. B **703**, 571-575 (2011) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2011.08.047 [arXiv:1106.0935 [hep-ph]].

[101] A. J. Buras, [arXiv:hep-ph/9806471 [hep-ph]].

[102] [UTfit Collaboration], online update at: http://utfit.org/UTfit/ResultsSummer2018SM.

[103] M. Ablikim *et al.* [BESIII], Phys. Rev. D **89**, no.5, 052001 (2014) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.89.052001 [arXiv:1401.3083 [hep-ex]].

[104] T. Zhou, T. Wang, H. F. Fu, Z. H. Wang, L. Huo and G. L. Wang, Eur. Phys. J. C **81**, no.4, 339 (2021) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-021-09128-2 [arXiv:2012.06135 [hep-ph]].

[105] Y. S. Dai and D. S. Du, Eur. Phys. J. C **9**, 557-564 (1999) doi:10.1007/s100529900073 [arXiv:hep-ph/9809386 [hep-ph]].

[106] H. F. Fu, Y. Jiang, C. S. Kim and G. L. Wang, JHEP **06**, 015 (2011) doi:10.1007/JHEP06(2011)015 [arXiv:1102.5399 [hep-ph]].

[107] S. Fajfer, P. Singer and J. Zupan, Eur. Phys. J. C **27**, 201-218 (2003) doi:10.1140/epjc/s2002-01090-5 [arXiv:hep-ph/0209250 [hep-ph]].