Constraints on New Physics from and $\mathbf{\dot{y}}_{ub}\mathbf{j}$

Patricia Ball

IPPP, Departm ent of Physics, University of Durham, Durham DH1 3LE, UK

A bstract

The SM unitarity triangle (UT) is completely determined by the parameters and $\mathbf{j}_{ub}\mathbf{j}$ which can be extracted from tree-level processes and are assumed to be free of new physics. By comparison with other determinations of UT parameters one can impose constraints on new physics in loop processes, in particular B mixing.



Talk given at CKM 06, Nagoya (Japan), Dec 2006

Patricia Balle durham acuk

Independently of any new sources of avour violation induced by new physics (NP), there is always a Standard M odel (SM) unitarity triangle (UT). It is completely determined by two parameters, which one can choose as $j_{ub}=V_{cb}j$ and { the rationale being that these parameters can be determined from tree-level processes and hence are expected to be essentially free of new physics e ects. In this talk we discuss the impact of the presently available information on $j_{ub}=V_{cb}j$ and on possible new physics in B mixing, based on Ref. [1]; we include the most recent update on (sin d) or presented at ICHEP2006.

Let us not discuss the status of y_{ub} jand y_{cb} j. The latter quantity is presently known with 2% precision from sem ileptonic B decays; we shall use the value obtained in Ref. [2] from the analysis of leptonic and hadronic moments in inclusive b ! c', transitions [3]:

$$y_{cb}j = (42.0 \quad 0.7) \quad 10^3$$
; (1)

this value agrees with that from exclusive sem ileptonic decays.

The situation is less favourable with y_{ub} ; there is more than 1 discrepancy between the values from inclusive and exclusive b! u`, transitions [4]:

 $\mathbf{\dot{y}}_{ub}\mathbf{\dot{j}}_{ncl} = (4:4 \ 0:3) \ 10^3; \ \mathbf{\dot{y}}_{ub}\mathbf{\dot{j}}_{xcl} = (3:8 \ 0:6) \ 10^3:$ (2)

The error on $\mathbf{j}_{ub}\mathbf{j}_{xcl}$ is dominated by the theoretical uncertainty of lattice and lightcone sum rule calculations of B ! and B ! transition form factors [5, 6], whereas for $\mathbf{j}_{ub}\mathbf{j}_{ncl}$ experimental and theoretical errors are at part. A recent improvement of the method used to extract $\mathbf{j}_{ub}\mathbf{j}_{has}$ been suggested in Ref. [7]; it relies on xing the shape of the exclusive form factor from experimental data on the q²-spectrum in B ! e , which helps to reduce both the experimental and theoretical error of $\mathbf{j}_{ub}\mathbf{j}_{excl}$. The \low " value $\mathbf{j}_{ub}\mathbf{j}_{ub}\mathbf{j}_{excl}$ is in agreement with the determination of $\mathbf{j}_{ub}\mathbf{j}_{bb}\mathbf{j}_{bb}$ by the UT t collaboration, from only the angles of the UT [8]. In this report we shall present results for both values of $\mathbf{j}_{ub}\mathbf{j}_{bb}\mathbf{$

As for the UT angle , tree-level results can be obtained from the CP asymmetries in B! D⁽⁾K⁽⁾ decays. At present, the only results available come from the Dalitz-plot analysis of the CP asymmetry in B ! (K_{S}^{0+})K, with K_{S}^{0+} being a threebody nal state common to both D 0 and D 0 . This method to measure from a newphysics free tree-level process was suggested in Ref. [10] and has been in plan ented by both BaBar [11] and Belle [12], but the BaBar result currently su ers from huge errors: $B_{BaBar} = (92 \quad 41 \quad 11 \quad 12)$, $B_{elle} = (53^{+15}_{18})$ 3 9). O ther determ inations of from QCDF, $_{QCDF} = (62 \ 8) \ [13], SCET, _{SCET} = (73.9^{+7.4}_{10.7}) \ [14], SU(3) \ ts of non-leptonic$ B decays $_{SU(3)} = (70.0^{+3.8}_{4.3})$ [15], radiative penguin decays, $_{B!V} = (61.0^{+13.5+8.9}_{16.09.3})$ [16], and global UT ts [8, 17] all come with theoretical uncertainties and/or possible contam ination by unresolved new physics. In this report we shall use = (65) 20), which is a fair average over all these determ inations.

W ith and $jV_{ub}=V_{cb}j$ xed, let us not have a closer book at the $B_d^0 \{B_d^0 m \text{ ixing parameters.} In the presence of NP, the matrix element M <math>_{12}^d$ can be written, in a model-independent way, as

$$M_{12}^{d} = M_{12}^{d;SM} + de^{i_{d}};$$

where the real parameter $_d$ 0 m easures the \strength" of the NP contribution with respect to the SM, whereas $_d$ is a new CP-violating phase; analogous form ulae apply to the B_s system. The B_d m ixing parameters then read

$$M_{d} = M_{d}^{SM} 1 + _{d}e^{i_{d}}; \qquad (3)$$

$$_{d} = {}^{SM}_{d} + {}^{NP}_{d} = {}^{SM}_{d} + arg(1 + {}_{d}e^{i_{d}}):$$
(4)

Experimental constraints on $_d$ and $_d$ are provided by M $_d$ and $_d$, the mass dierence and mixing phase in the B_d system . While the interpretation of the very accurately known experimental value of M $_d$ depends crucially on hadronic matrix elements provided by lattice calculations, $_d$ can be measured directly as mixing-induced CP asymmetry in b! ccs transitions [4]:

$$(\sin_{\rm d})_{\rm cs} = 0.675 \quad 0.026;$$
 (5)

which yields the twofold solution

$$_{\rm d} = (42.5 \ 2.0) \ (137.5 \ 2.0) ; \tag{6}$$

where the latter result is in dram atic con ict with globalCKM ts and would require a large NP contribution to $B_d^0 \{B_d^0 \text{ m ixing. However, experimental information on the sign of cos d rules out a negative value of this quantity at greater than 95% C L. [18], so that we are left with d = (42.5 2.0).$

The SM prediction of the mixing phase, ${}_d^{SM}$ = 2 , can easily be obtained in terms of the tree-level quantities $R_{\rm b}$ and , as

$$\sin = \frac{R_{b} \sin}{1 - 2R_{b} \cos + R_{b}^{2}}; \quad \cos = \frac{1 - R_{b} \cos}{1 - 2R_{b} \cos + R_{b}^{2}}; \quad (7)$$

Here the quantity R_{b} is given by

$$R_{b} = 1 - \frac{2}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{V_{ub}}{V_{cb}}$$
 : (8)

U sing Eq. (4), the experim ental value of $_d$ can immediately be converted into a result for the NP phase $_d^{\rm NP}$, which depends on both and R_b . It turns out that the dependence of $_d^{\rm NP}$ on is very small and that R_b plays actually the key rôle for its determination. With our range of values for and y_{ub} jwe nd

$${}_{d \text{ incl}}^{\text{SM}} = (53.5 \ 3.8) ; {}_{d \text{ excl}}^{\text{SM}} = (45.9 \ 7.6) ; (9)$$

corresponding to

$${}^{\text{NP}}_{\text{d} \text{incl}} = (11:0 \ 4:3) ; {}^{\text{NP}}_{\text{d} \text{excl}} = (3:4 \ 7:9) ; (10)$$

results of ${}_{d}^{NP}$ 10 were also recently obtained in Refs. [19, 20, 9]. Note that the emergence of a non-zero value of ${}_{d}^{NP}$ is caused by the large value of y_{ub} from inclusive sem ileptonic decays, but that ${}_{d}^{NP}$ is compatible with zero for y_{ub} from exclusive decays.



Figure 1: Left panel: allowed region (yellow/grey) in the $_{d}$ { plane in a scenario with the JLQCD lattice results (11) and $_{d}^{NP}$. Dashed lines: central values of M_{d}^{latt} and $_{d}^{NP}$, solid lines: 1 . Right panel: ditto for the scenario with the (HP+JL)QCD lattice results (12) and $_{d}^{NP}$ incl.

We can now combine the constraints from both M $_{\rm d}$ and $_{\rm d}$ to constrain the allowed region in the $_{\rm d}$ { plane. These contraints depend on hadronic input for M $_{\rm d}$ in term s of the parameter $f_{\rm B_d} \hat{B}_{\rm B_d}^{1=2}$ for which there exist two independent unquenched lattice results, one by the JLQCD collaboration with N $_{\rm f}$ = 2 active avours [21], and one by the HPQCD collaboration with N $_{\rm f}$ = 2 + 1 active avours [22]. We also give the corresponding results for the B $_{\rm s}$ which we will need below :

$$f_{B_{d}} \hat{B}_{B_{d}}^{1=2} = (0.215 \quad 0.019^{+0}_{0.023}) \, \text{GeV};$$

$$f_{B_{s}} \hat{B}_{B_{s}}^{1=2} = (0.245 \quad 0.021^{+0.003}_{0.002}) \, \text{GeV}; \qquad (11)$$

$$f_{B_{d}} \hat{B}_{B_{d}}^{1=2} = (0.244 \quad 0.026) \, \text{GeV};$$

$$f_{B_{s}} \hat{B}_{B_{s}}^{1=2} = (0.281 \quad 0.021) \, \text{GeV}: \qquad (12)$$

The last but one entry is a combination of both HPQCD and JLQCD results, as the HPQCD collaboration is yet to provide results on B_{B_d} .

The corresponding constraints in the $_{d}-_{d}$ plane are shown in Fig. 1. We see that a non-vanishing value of $_{d}^{NP}$, even as small as $_{d}^{NP}$ 10, has a strong in pact on the allowed space in the $_{d}\{_{d}$ plane. In both scenarios with di erent lattice results and di erent values for y_{ub} ; the upper bounds of $_{d} < 2.5$ on the NP contributions following from the experimental value of M $_{d}$ are reduced to $_{d} < 0.5$. In order to determ ine $_{d}$ more precisely, it is mandatory to reduce the errors of M $_{d}^{latt}$, which come from both and lattice calculations. The value of $_{d}$ can be determined { with impressive accuracy { at the LHC, whereas progress on the lattice side is much harder to predict.

Let us now have a closer look at the B_s -m eson system . The big news in 2006 was the



Figure 2: The allowed regions (yellow/grey) in the $_{s}{s plane}$. Left panel: JLQCD lattice results (11). Right panel: HPQCD lattice results (12).

rst m easurem ent, by the CDF collaboration, of M $_{\rm s}$ [23]:

$$M_{s} = (17.77 \quad 0.10 \quad 0.07) \, \text{ps}^{1} :$$
 (13)

In order to describe NP e ects in B_s m ixing in a model-independent way, we param etrize them analogously to (3) and (4). The relevant CKM factor is $\mathbf{\dot{y}}_{ts}\mathbf{V}_{tb}\mathbf{j}$. Using the unitarity of the CKM matrix and including next-to-leading order terms in the W olfenstein expansion, we have

$$\frac{V_{ts}}{V_{cb}} = 1 \frac{1}{2} (1 - 2R_b \cos)^2 + O(^4):$$
(14)

Consequently, apart from the tiny correction in ², the CKM factor for M _s is independent of and R_b, which is an important advantage in comparison with the B_d-meson system. The accuracy of the SM prediction of M _s is hence limited by the hadronic mixing parameter $f_{B_s} \hat{B}_{B_s}^{1=2}$. In Fig. 2, we show the constraints in the _s{ _s plane. We see that upper bounds of _s < 2:5 arise from the measurement of M _s. Consequently, the CDF measurement of M _s leaves ample space for the NP parameters _s and _s. This situation will change significantly as soon as precise information about CP violation in the B_s-meson system becomes available.

To date, the CP-violating phase associated with $B_s^0 \{B_s^0 \text{ m ixing is not very well con-strained}$. In the SM, it is doubly Cabibbo-suppressed, and can be written as follows:

$$s_{\rm s}^{\rm SM} = 2^2 = 2^2 R_{\rm b} sin \qquad 2:$$
 (15)

Because of the small SM phase in (15), $B_s^0 \{B_s^0 \text{ m ixing is particularly well suited to search$ for NP e ects, which may well lead to a sizeable value of s. The presently availableinformation on stems from measurements of s and the semileptonic CP asymmetry $<math>a_{fs}^s$; they have been re-analysed very recently in Ref. [24] with the result

$$\sin_s = 0.77 \quad 0.04 \quad 0.34 \quad \text{or} \quad \sin_s = 0.67 \quad 0.05 \quad 0.29;$$
 (16)

depending on the value of M $_{s}^{latt}$; both results would imply a 2 deviation from the SM prediction sin $_{s}^{SM}$ 0:04, but are heavily theory dependent. In order to test the SM



Figure 3: C on bined constraints for the allowed region (yellow/grey) in the $_{s}$ { $_{s}$ plane through M $_{s}$ for the HPQCD results (12) and CP violation m easurements. Left panel: the SM scenario (sin $_{s})_{exp} = 0.04$ 0.02. Right panel: a NP scenario with (sin $_{s})_{exp} = 0.20$ 0.02. The solid lines correspond to cos $_{s} > 0$, the dotted lines to cos $_{s} < 0$.

and probe CP-violating NP contributions to $B_s^0 \{B_s^0 \text{ m ixing in a less theory-dependent way, the decay <math>B_s^0 ! J =$, which is very accessible at the LHC, plays a key rôle and allows the m easurement of

$$\sin_{s} = \sin\left(2^{2}R_{b}\sin + \frac{NP}{s}\right); \qquad (17)$$

in analogy to the determ ination of sin $_{\rm d}$ through $B_{\rm d}^0$! J= K $_{\rm S}$.

In order to illustrate the possible impact of NP e ects, let us assume that the NP parameters satisfy the simple relation

$$_{d} = _{s}; \quad _{d} = _{s}; \quad (18)$$

i.e. that in particular $d^{NP} = s^{NP}$. To illustrate the impact of CP violation m easurements on the allowed region in the s{ splane, let us consider two cases:

i) $(\sin_s)_{exp} = 0.04 \quad 0.02$, i.e. the SM prediction;

ii)
$$(\sin_s)_{exp} = 0.20$$
 0.02, i.e. the above NP scenario $d = s$ 11.

In Fig. 3, we show the situation in the ${}_{s}$ { ${}_{s}$ plane. The constraints on the NP parameters are rather strong, although ${}_{s}$ could still assume sizeable values, with the upper bound ${}_{s}$ 0.5. In the SM -like scenario (i), values of ${}_{s}$ around 180 would arise, i.e. a NP contribution with a sign opposite to the SM. However, due to the absence of new CP-violating e ects, the accuracy of lattice results would have to be considerably improved in order to allow the extraction of a value of ${}_{s}$ incompatible with 0.0 n the other hand, a measurement of (sin ${}_{s}$)_{exp} = 0.20 0.02 would give a NP signal at the 10 level, with ${}_{s} > 0.2$.

Let us conclude with a few remarks concerning the prospects for the search for NP through $B_s^0 \{B_s^0 \text{ m ixing at the LHC}.This task will be very challenging if essentially no CP - violating e ects will be found in <math>B_s^0$! J= (and sim ilar decays). On the other hand, as

we dem onstrated above, even a sm allphase $_{s}^{NP}$ 10 (inspired by the B_d data) would lead to CP asymmetries at the 20% level, which could be unambiguously detected after a couple of years of data taking, and would not be a ected by hadronic uncertainties. Conversely, the measurement of such an asymmetry would allow one to establish a lower bound on the strength of the NP contribution { even if hadronic uncertainties still preclude a direct extraction of this contribution from M_s { and to dram atically reduce the allowed region in the NP parameter space. In fact, the situation may be even more promising, as speci c scenarios of NP still allow large new phases in B_s⁰ {B_s⁰ mixing, also after the measurement of M_s, see, for instance, Refs. [25, 26].

In essence, the lesson to be learnt from the CDF m easurement of M $_{\rm s}$ is that NP m ay actually be hiding in B $_{\rm s}^{0}$ {B $_{\rm s}^{0}$ m ixing, but is still obscured by parameter uncertainties, some of which will be reduced by in proved statistics at the LHC, whereas others require dedicated work of, in particular, lattice theorists. The smoking gun for the presence of NP in B $_{\rm s}^{0}$ {B} $_{\rm s}^{0}$ m ixing will be the detection of a non-vanishing value of $_{\rm s}^{\rm NP}$ through CP violation in B $_{\rm s}^{0}$! J= . Let us nally emphasize that the current B-factory data m ay show { in addition to $_{\rm d}^{\rm NP}$ 10 { other rst indications of new sources of CP violation through m easurements of B $_{\rm d}^{0}$! K $_{\rm s}$ and B ! K decays, which m ay point towards a m odi ed electroweak penguin sector. All these examples are yet another demonstration that avour physics is not an optional extra, but an indispensable ingredient in the pursuit of NP, also and in particular in the era of the LHC.

References

- [1] P.Balland R.Fleischer, Eur. Phys. J.C 48 (2006) 413 [arX iv hep-ph/0604249].
- [2] O. Buchmuller and H. Flacher, Phys. Rev. D 73 (2006) 073008 [arXiv:hep-ph/0507253].
- [3] P.G ambino and N. Uraltsev, Eur. Phys. J.C 34 (2004) 181 [arX iv hep-ph/0401063].
- [4] E.Barberio et al. [HFAG], hep-ex/0603003; updated results available at http://www.slac.stanford.edu/xorg/hfag/.
- [5] M.Okam oto et al., Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. 140 (2005) 461 [arX iv hep-lat/0409116];
 E.Gulez et al., Phys. Rev. D 73 (2006) 074502 [arX iv hep-lat/0601021].
- [6] P.Ball, JHEP 9809 (1998) 005 [arX iv hep-ph/9802394];
 A.Khodjam irian et al., Phys. Rev. D 62 (2000) 114002 [arX iv hep-ph/0001297];
 P.Ball and R. Zwicky, JHEP 0110 (2001) 019 [arX iv hep-ph/0110115]; Phys. Rev. D 71 (2005) 014015 [arX iv hep-ph/0406232]; Phys. Rev. D 71 (2005) 014029 [arX iv hep-ph/0412079];
 A.Khodjam irian, T.M annel and N.O en, arX iv hep-ph/0611193.

- [7] P.Balland R.Zwicky, Phys. Lett. B 625 (2005) 225 [arX iv hep-ph/0507076];
 P.Ball, Phys. Lett. B 644 (2007) 38 [arX iv hep-ph/0611108] and talk at this conference [arX iv hep-ph/0612190].
- [8] M.Bona et al. [UT tCollaboration], JHEP 0610 (2006) 081 [arX iv hep-ph/0606167]; updated results available at http://www.utfit.org/.
- [9] M.Blanke, A.J.Buras, D.Guadagnoli and C.Tarantino, JHEP 0610 (2006) 003 [arX iv hep-ph/0604057].
- [10] A.Giri, Y.Grossman, A. So er and J. Zupan, Phys. Rev. D 68 (2003) 054018 [arX iv:hep-ph/0303187].
- B.Aubert et al. BABAR Collaboration], arX iv hep-ex/0507101;
 D.Marciano BaBar Collaboration], talk given at ICHEP 06, Moscow, August 2006.
- [12] A. Poluektov et al. [Belle Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D 73 (2006) 112009 [arXiv:hep-ex/0604054].
- [13] M . Neubert, talk at this conference.
- [14] I. Stewart, talk at this conference.
- [15] R.Fleischer, talk at this conference.
- [16] P.Balland R.Zwicky, JHEP 0604 (2006) 046 [arX iv hep-ph/0603232];
 P.Ball, G.W. Jones and R.Zwicky, arX iv hep-ph/0612081;
 P.Ball, talk at this conference [arX iv hep-ph/0612264].
- [17] J.Charles et al. [CKM tterG roup], Eur.Phys.J.~C 41 (2005) 1; for the m ost recent updates, see http://ckmfitter.in2p3.fr/.
- [18] G.Cavoto et al, hep-ph/0603019.
- [19] A.J.Buras, R.Fleischer, S.Recksiegel and F.Schwab, Eur. Phys. J.C 45 (2006) 701 [arX iv:hep-ph/0512032].
- [20] M. Bona et al. [UT tCollaboration], JHEP 0603 (2006) 080 [arX iv hep-ph/0509219].
- [21] S. Aoki et al. [JLQCD Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. 91 (2003) 212001 [arX iv:hep-ph/0307039].
- [22] A. Gray et al. [HPQCD Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. 95 (2005) 212001 [arX iv hep-lat/0507015];
 E.Dalgic et al. [HPQCD Collaboration], arX iv hep-lat/0610104.
- [23] A. Abulencia et al. [CDF Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. 97 (2006) 062003
 [arX iv:hep-ex/0606027];
 A. Abulencia et al. [CDF Collaboration], arX iv:hep-ex/0609040.

- [24] A. Lenz and U. Nierste, arX iv hep-ph/0612167.
- [25] P.Ball, S.Khaliland E.Kou, Phys. Rev. D 69 (2004) 115011 [arX iv hep-ph/0311361].
- [26] P. Ball, J. M. Frere and J. Matias, Nucl. Phys. B 572 (2000) 3
 [arX iv hep-ph/9910211];
 P.Balland R.Fleischer, Phys. Lett. B 475 (2000) 111 [arX iv hep-ph/9912319].