The CP-violating asymmetry in ! + e+e

D ao-N eng G ao^y

Department of Astronomy and Applied Physics, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230026, China

A bstract

We study the CP-violating asymmetry $A_{\rm CP}$, which arises, in ! $^+$ e⁺e , from the angular correlation of the e⁺e and $^+$ planes due to the interference between the magnetic and electric decay amplitudes. With the phenomenologically determined magnetic amplitude and branching ratio as input, the asymmetry, induced by the electric bremsstrahlung amplitude through the CP-violating decay! $^+$, and by an unconventional tensor type operator, has been estimated respectively. The upper bound of $A_{\rm CP}$ from the former is about 10 3 , and the asymmetry from the latter might be up to 0 (10 2). One can therefore expect that this CP asymmetry would be an interesting CP-violating observable for the future precise measurements in the factories.

y E-m ail: gaodn@ ustc.edu.cn

CP violation has been observed experimentally in the avor-changing weak decays of the neutral K-m esons [1, 2, 3] and B-m esons [4, 5]. However, the origin of the violation remains unclear in the modern particle physics. The standard model predicts that the only way that CP is violated is through the Cabbibo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) mechanism [6]. Specifically, the source of CP violation is a single phase in the CKM mixing matrix that describes the avor-changing weak interaction couplings of quarks. Although the predictions based on CKM mechanism are consistent with the observations in K and B systems, it would be interesting to look for the other sources of CP violation beyond the CKM phase and outside avor-changing processes, in order both to increase our understanding in the CP violation itself and to look for new physics e ects beyond the standard model [7].

Rare decays provide a good laboratory for the above motivations, and CP violation in some rare decays has been explored by experimentalists [8]. Theorectally, P violation and CP violation in the decay of ! have been discussed by Herczeg and Singer [9] nearly thirty years before; very recently, Geng, Ng, and Wu [10] studied the CP-violating e ects in this decay by considering the photon polarizations, and they predicted that a sizable linear photon polarization could be expected in some unconventional new physics scenarios. In the neutral K system, a large CP asymmetry, which arises from the interference between the parity-conserving magnetic amplitudes and the parity-violating electric amplitudes of K $_{\rm L}$! $^{+}$ e $^{+}$ e , has been predicted theoretically by many authors [11, 12, 13] and con med experimentally [14, 2]. The purpose of this paper is to extend the above analyses to the decay of ! $^{+}$ e $^{+}$ e , thus to probe possible new CP-violating e ects in factories. It will be shown below that an interesting CP-violating observable could be constructed if a relevant parity-violating electric transition exists.

The invariant decay amplitude of (p)! $^+$ (p,) (p) e^+ (k,)e (k) can be expressed as follows

A (!
$$^{+}$$
 $e^{+}e$) = $\frac{e}{q^{2}}u(k)$ $v(k_{+})$ M " p_{+} p $q + E_{+}p_{+} + E_{-}p$; (1)

where $q=k_++k_-$. The Lorentz invariant form factors M and E stand for parity-conserving m agnetic and parity-violating electric transitions respectively, which depend on scalar products of q, p_+ and p_- . In order to discuss CP violation in p_+ e⁺ e , it is convenient to use the same kinematic variables as those in K_L p_+ e⁺ e , which have been used by Pais and Trieman for semileptonic p_+ decays [15, 16]. They are: p_+ s = p_+ p p_+ invariant m assignared of p_+ sq² = p_+ the angle between the p_+ three-momentum and the three-momentum in the p_+ rest frame; p_+ the angle between the e⁺ three-momentum and the three-momentum in the e⁺ e rest frame; p_+ the angle between the e⁺ e and p_+ planes in the rest frame. U sing these kinematic variables, a CP-violating observable could be found by analyzing the distribution of the

decay width (! + e+e), which reads

$$A_{CP} = hsign (sin cos) i = \frac{\frac{Z_{2}}{0}}{\frac{d(! + e^{+}e)}{d}} d sign (sin cos)} c (2)$$

Now in terms of the invariant form factors de ned in eq. (1), and integrating over $\cos_{\rm e}$ and , we obtain

$$A_{CP} = \frac{e^{2}}{3 \cdot 2^{3} \cdot 6m^{3} \cdot (! + e^{+}e)}$$

$$Z = d \cos ds dq^{2} \sin^{2} \frac{s^{3} \cdot (s; m^{2}; q^{2})}{q^{2}} Re[(E_{+} E)M]; \qquad (3)$$

w here

$$= 1 \frac{4m^2}{s}; (4)$$

$$(a;b;c) = a^2 + b^2 + c^2 + 2(ab + ac + bc)$$
: (5)

The decay rate of ! has been measured [17] and is dominated by the magnetic transition [18, 19]. However, the prediction to the decay rate from the lowest order chiral perturbation theory are somewhat lower than the experimental value [18]. Phenomenologically, one can adopt the following magnetic form factor [20], constructed using chiralmodels, for the magnetic transition of !

$$M = \frac{e}{8^{2}f^{2}} e^{\frac{1}{9}} \frac{1}{3f_{8}} cos \qquad \frac{s}{3} \frac{1}{f_{0}} sin^{\frac{1}{A}} \qquad 1 \qquad \frac{3m_{V}^{2}}{m_{V}^{2}} \frac{!}{s};$$
 (6)

which yields the decay width very close to the experimental value of (! +). Note that, in eq. (6), $m_V = 770$ MeV is the vector-meson mass; f = 93 MeV, $f_8 = 1.3f$, and $f_0 = 1.1f$; = 20° is the angle of the $f_0 = 1.1f$ mixing.

Since the CP asymmetry in eq. (3) arises from the interference between the M and E terms, in order to get nonzero A_{CP} , we have to look for the possible interaction which could yield the electric transitions of ! + e⁺ e . As pointed out in Ref. [10], it is easy to see that brem sstrahlung electric amplitudes can be induced through the interm ediate state which violates CP symmetry. Thus it is straightforward to get

$$E_{+} = \frac{2eg_{+}}{q^{2} + 2q_{p}};$$
 (7)

and

$$E = \frac{2eg}{q^2 + 2q};$$
 (8)

where g + is the e ective coupling of ! + [21, 10]. From the experimental upper bound Br(! +) < 3:3 10 4 [17], one can get

$$\dot{q} + \dot{q} < 0:12 \text{ M eV}:$$
 (9)

Now using eqs. (3) (8) together with the following scalar products of four-vectors

$$q p = \frac{1}{4} (m^2 s q^2) \frac{1}{2} {}^{1=2} (s; m^2; q^2) \infty s ; (10)$$

$$q p = \frac{1}{4} (m^2 s q^2) + \frac{1}{2} {}^{1=2} (s; m^2; q^2) \infty s ; (11)$$

$$q p = \frac{1}{4} (m^2 s q^2) + \frac{1}{2} {}^{1=2} (s; m^2; q^2) \infty s;$$
 (11)

we can obtain

The branching ratio of ! + e + e has been measured. Its value listed in the present Particle Data Book [17] is

Br(!
$$^{+}$$
 $e^{+}e$) = $13^{+1.2}_{0.8}$ 10 3 ; (13)

which is from a very old measurement [22]. The very recent measurement is from CMD-2 Collaboration [23]:

Br(! + e⁺ e) =
$$3.7^{+2.5}_{1.8}$$
 0.3 10 4: (14)

Obviously, the situation for the observed Br(! e e e) is not very good due to the existing large uncertainty, which of course needs to be further in proved. As a phenomenological analysis in the present paper, we use the central value in eq. (14) instead of the theoretical prediction from eq. (1) to illustrate the numerical value for the CP-violating asym m etry A_{CP} .

The experimental constraint on g + has been obtained in eq. (9) by the limit of Br(!), which makes the upper bound of A_{CP} be about 10 3 . Theoretically, in ! + together with the e ective coupling g + Ref. [21], the CP-violating decay has been studied both in the standard model based on CKM mechanism [6] and/or strong term lagrangian [24] and in the spontaneous CP violation model based on the Weinberg mechanism [25]. Unfortunately, the values of g + given by the above mechanisms are much less than the upper bound in eq. (9), which implies that CP asymmetry in eq. (12) is very small and fully negligible. As explained in Ref. [10], this is not surprising at all because the CP-violating quantities such as and 0 in the K 0 system, and the neutron electric dipole m om ents d, have im posed very strong constraints on the coupling of! + good choices to evade these constraints is that, we should search for some unconventional sources of CP violation which do not contribute directly to $\,$, 0 , and d_{n} and yet has a contribution to the decay! + (). A type of such operators, avor-conserving CP

violating four-quark operators involving two strange quarks together with combinations of other light quarks, have been proposed in [10], which can be explicitly written as follows

$$O = \frac{1}{m^3} G \sin_{5} (p \ q) s$$
 ; (15)

where denotes up or down quarks, G is a dimensionless parameter originating from short-distance physics and it can be taken real due to the CPT invariance. In order to evaluate the contribution from eq. (15) to $\cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot$, the authors of Ref. [10] used a factorization approximation that the $\cdot \cdot \cdot$ part is from and the transition involves only part containing strangeness. Following the same procedure, it is easy to get the electric form factors of $\cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot$ e⁺ e as

$$E_{+} = \frac{eF (s)G}{m^3} (q^2 + 2q p);$$
 (16)

and

E
$$\frac{\text{eF (s)G}}{\text{m}^3} (q^2 + 2q \quad p);$$
 (17)

where F (s) parameterizes the form factor of the ! transition. It has been estimated as F (s) F (0) 0:19 by the authors of Ref. [10] using the light front quark model [26]. From eqs. (3), (6), (16), and (17), we obtain

$$\vec{A}_{CP} j = \frac{3:7 \cdot 10^{-4}}{Br(! + e^{+}e)} = 2:0 \cdot 10^{2} \ js j;$$
(18)

If G is O (1), A_{CP} could be about 2:0 10 2 , which is one order larger than the upper bound in eq. (12). Note that, for G 1, we still have M j is much large than E j which does not essentially change the prediction from eq. (6) for the decay rate of P . On the other hand, as mentioned in Ref. [10], since the operator in eq. (15) cannot directly generate the decay P and also cannot induce P either, the P violating contributions from the operator in eq. (15) are free of the strong constraints from P, and P and P which is a principle, P of P could be expected.

In this paper, we are concerned about the general aspects of the CP-violating asym metry in ! e^+ e^+ e^- , and our study seems to indicate that there exists the possibility of observing such e ects. One might suspect that G O(1) is over-estimated. This is not very surprising because generally the CP asym metry of this decay is strongly suppressed in many conventional mechanisms. We should further explore how to realize the uncoventional operators of eq. (15) in some explicit theoretical models, in which G could be enhanced up to O(1) or not much smaller than 1. This is not the task of the present paper, and it will be considered in the future study. On the other hand, the measurement of the CP asymmetry

 A_{CP} in ! e^+e^- would provide an interesting \lim it on G, thus further impose the constraints on the theoretical models.

The CP-violating e ects in ! + , which is generated from the interference between the magnetic and electric amplitudes of the decay with explicit photon polarization, has been studied in Ref. [10], and a sizable CP-violating e ect could be induced when the contributions from an unconventional CP-violating interaction in terms of a tensor type operator in eq. (15) are considered. Note that such CP-violating e ects will be invisible as long as the polarization of the photon is not observed. As an alternative to measuring the photon polarization, we consider in the present paper the decay! + from the internal conversion of the photon into an e⁺e pair, and the CP-violating e ects hidden in the polarization of the photon now can be translated into the CP asymmetry A CP in the angular correlation of the e⁺ e plane relative to the ⁺ plane. The upper bound of A_{CP} is about 10³ by using the experimental limit of Br(! +); more interestingly, the value of A CP m ight be enhanced up to O (1%) in some unconventional scenarios. Hopefully, for the future high statistics experiments in the factories, this asymmetry could be a useful CP-violating observable both to increase our knowledge on CP violation and to search for new physics e ects beyond the standard model.

A cknow ledgm ents

The author wishes to thank Chao-Qiang Geng and Paul Singer for very helpful communications. This work is supported in part by the NSF of China under Grant No. 19905008.

R eferences

- [1] J.H. Christenson, J.W. Cronin, V.L. Fitch, and R. Turlay, Phys. Rev. Lett. 13, 138 (1964).
- [2] L. Iconom idou-Fayard, NA 48 Collaboration, hep-ex/0110028.
- [3] R.Kessler, KTeV Collaboration, hep-ex/0110020.
- [4] B. Aubert et al., BaBar Collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 091801 (2001).
- [5] K. Abe et al., Belle Collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 091802 (2001).
- [6] N. Cabibbo, Phys. Rev. Lett. 10, 531 (1963); M. Kobayashi and T. Maskawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. 49, 652 (1973).

- [7] For a recent review: Y.Nir, hep-ph/0109090.
- [8] S.Kullander et al., Invited talk at the XXV Mazurian Lakes School of Physics, August 27-September 6, Piaski, Poland, Acta. Phys. Polan. B 29, 97 (1998).
- [9] P. Herczeg and P. Singer, Phys. Rev. D 8, 4107 (1973).
- [10] C.Q.Geng, J.N.Ng, and T.H.Wu, hep-ph/0201191.
- [11] L M . Sehgaland M . W anninger, Phys. Rev. D 46, 1035 (1992); Erratum, Phys. Rev. D 46, 5209 (1992); P. Heiliger and L M . Sehgal, Phys. Rev. D 48, 4146 (1993); Erratum, Phys. Rev. D 60, 079902 (1999).
- [12] JK. Elwood, M. J. Savage, and M. B. W. ise, Phys. Rev. D. 52, 5095 (1995); Erratum, Phys. Rev. D. 53, 2855 (1996); JK. Elwood, M. J. Savage, JW. W. alden, and M. B. W. ise, Phys. Rev. D. 53, 4078 (1996).
- [13] G. Ecker and H. Pichl, Phys. Lett. B 507, 193 (2001).
- [14] A.A laviH aratietal, KTeV Collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 408 (2000).
- [15] A. Pais and S.B. Triem an, Phys. Rev. 168, 1858 (1968).
- [16] J. Bijnens, G. Colangelo, G. Ecker, and J. Gasser, Semileptonic kaon decays, in The second DA NE physics handbook, L. Maiani, G. Pancheri, and N. Paver (eds.), LNF 1995.
- [17] D E.Groom et al, Eur. Phys. J. C 15, 1 (2000).
- [18] L.Am etller, hep-ph/0111278.
- [19] B.R. Holstein, hep-ph/0112150.
- [20] C. Picciotto, Phys. Rev. D 45, 1569 (1992).
- [21] C. Jarlskog and E. Shabalin, Phys. Rev. D 52, 248 (1995); Phys. Rev. D 52, 6327 (1995).
- [22] R.A. Grossman, L.R. Price, and F.S. Craw ford, Phys. Rev. 146, 993 (1966).
- [23] R.R. Akhmetshin et al., CMD-2 Collaboration, Phys. Lett. B 501, 191 (2001).
- [24] G. 't Hooft, Phys. Rev. Lett. 37, 8 (1976).
- [25] S.W einberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. 37, 657 (1976).
- [26] C.Q. Geng, C.C. Lih, and W. M. Zhang, Phys. Rev. D 57, 5697 (1998); Phys. Rev. D 62, 074017 (2000).