

Rephase-Invariant CP -Violating Observables and Mixings in the B^0 -, D^0 - and K^0 -Systems

W. F. Palmer and Y. L. Wu

Department of Physics, Ohio State University

Columbus, Ohio 43210, U.S.A.

(Dec. 1994)

Abstract

We present a general model-independent and rephase-invariant formalism that cleanly relates observables to the fundamental parameters and explicitly separates different types of CP violation in the B^0 -, D^0 - and K^0 -systems. We emphasize its importance when interpreting experimental measurement of CP violation, the unitarity triangle, and probes of new physics.

PACS numbers: 11.30.Er, 13.25.+m

Typeset using REVTeX

CP violation in neutral meson decays arises from CP violating phases in the mixing matrix (indirect CP violation) or in the weak decay amplitudes (direct CP violation). In the Cabibbo, Kobayashi and Maskawa (CKM) [1] model of CP violation, both direct and indirect CP violation occur. They can be measured by studying time evolution of neutral meson decays [2-6]. Recently there has been much activity connected with tests of this model, particularly on measuring the unitarity triangle through the time evolution measurements [7-9] and time-independent measurements of decay rates by using SU(3) relations for B-meson decay amplitudes [10,11]. Other models for CP violation, like the superweak theory [12], or the most general two Higgs doublet models [13], may have different predictions for the direct and indirect phases. In the K-system, several experiments are underway to probe direct CP violation and time evolution of kaon decays. In the D-system, mixing and CP violation are expected to be small in the standard model (SM) and thus experimental tests are interesting as a probe of new physics. In the B-system, CP violation could be large in the CKM scheme of the SM, prompting much experimental activity.

Recently, it has been pointed out [14,15] that there are some limitations in extracting the angles of the unitarity triangle by using SU(3) relations for B-meson decay amplitudes as suggested by [11]. Thus it is still necessary to investigate carefully the time-evolution measurements. Basic formula for time-dependent decay rates have been extensively studied [2-9] and applied to various processes. In this note we develop and refine these studies into a general model-independent and rephase-invariant formalism that cleanly relates observables to the fundamental parameters and explicitly separates different forms of CP violation for the neutral meson systems. A meaningful classification of different forms of CP violation must be invariant against phases [16] that can be arbitrarily assigned. In this note we will show that in the neutral meson system there exist in general seven rephase-invariant observables which in principle can be detected by studying the time-evolution of the neutral meson and rate asymmetry. We then conclude that CP-violating observables are in general classified into three types of CP violation and any CP-violating observable can be expressed in terms of seven rephase-invariant quantities. Especially, we emphasize the importance of the rephase-

invariant and model-independent observables when interpreting experimental measurements in the K^0 -, D^0 - and B^0 -systems. Applying this analysis to the decays $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-$, $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0$ and $B^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0$, we find there are eight physical observables to determine nine input parameters when including the electroweak penguin. Therefore, to extract the angle of the unitarity triangle, one needs in principle an additional theoretical input. We also examine an interesting decay mode to extract the angle β .

Let M^0 be the neutral meson (which can be K^0 or D^0 or B^0) and $\bar{M}^0$ its antiparticle. M^0 and $\bar{M}^0$ can mix with each other and form two physical mass eigenstates

$$M_1 = p|M^0\rangle + q|\bar{M}^0\rangle; \quad M_2 = p|M^0\rangle - q|\bar{M}^0\rangle \quad (1)$$

The CP-violating parameter M is introduced via

$$M = \frac{1 - \frac{q}{p}}{1 + \frac{q}{p}}; \quad \frac{q}{p} = \sqrt{\frac{H_{21}}{H_{12}}} \quad (2)$$

where $H_{12} = M_{12} - \frac{i}{2}\Gamma_{12} = \langle M^0 | \mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}} | \bar{M}^0 \rangle$.

Let f denote the final decay state of the neutral meson and $\bar{f}$ its charge conjugate state. The decay amplitudes of M^0 and $\bar{M}^0$ are denoted by

$$g = \langle f | \mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}} | M^0 \rangle; \quad h = \langle f | \mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}} | \bar{M}^0 \rangle; \quad \bar{g} = \langle \bar{f} | \mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}} | M^0 \rangle; \quad \bar{h} = \langle \bar{f} | \mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}} | \bar{M}^0 \rangle \quad (3)$$

Parameters containing direct CP violation are defined by

$$\frac{0}{M} = \frac{1 - \frac{h}{g}}{1 + \frac{h}{g}}; \quad \frac{0}{\bar{M}} = \frac{1 - \frac{\bar{h}}{\bar{g}}}{1 + \frac{\bar{h}}{\bar{g}}}; \quad \frac{\infty}{M} = \frac{1 - \frac{g}{\bar{g}}}{1 + \frac{g}{\bar{g}}}; \quad \frac{\infty}{\bar{M}} = \frac{1 - \frac{\bar{g}}{h}}{1 + \frac{\bar{g}}{h}} \quad (4)$$

Note that the above parameters are not physical observables since they are not rephase-invariant. Let us introduce CP-violating observables by considering the ratio, $r_f = \frac{\langle f | \mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}} | M_2 \rangle}{\langle f | \mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}} | M_1 \rangle} = \frac{(1 - r_f)}{(1 + r_f)}$, with $r_f = \frac{(q/p)(h/g)}$ being rephase-invariant. Using a simple algebra relation $1 - ab = [(1+a)(1-b) + (1-a)(1+b)]/2$ and $1 + ab = [(1+a)(1+b) + (1-a)(1-b)]/2$, it is not difficult to show that r_f can be rewritten as

$$r_f = \frac{a + a_0 + ia_+}{2 + a a_0 + a_0} \quad (5)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
a &= \frac{1 - \bar{p}p}{1 + \bar{p}p} = \frac{2\text{Re}_M}{1 + j_M^2}; & a_0 &= \frac{1 - \bar{h}g}{1 + \bar{h}g} = \frac{2\text{Re}_M^0}{1 + j_M^0{}^2}; \\
a_{+0} &= \frac{4\text{Im}(q\bar{h}=p\bar{g})}{(1 + \bar{p}p)(1 + \bar{h}g)} = \frac{2\text{Im}_M(1 - j_M^0{}^2) + 2\text{Im}_M^0(1 - j_M^2)}{(1 + j_M^2)(1 + j_M^0{}^2)} \\
a_{-0} &= \frac{4\text{Re}(q\bar{h}=p\bar{g})}{(1 + \bar{p}p)(1 + \bar{h}g)} & 1 &= \frac{4\text{Im}_M \text{Im}_M^0 - 2(j_M^2 + j_M^0{}^2)}{(1 + j_M^2)(1 + j_M^0{}^2)}
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Obviously, a , a_0 , a_{+0} and a_{-0} are all rephase-invariant. But only three of them are independent as $(1 - a^2)(1 - a_0^2) = a_{+0}^2 + (1 + a_{-0})^2$. Analogously, one has

$$\frac{\langle f | \mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}} | M_2 \rangle}{\langle f | \mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}} | M_1 \rangle} = \frac{a + a_0 + ia_{+0}}{2 + a a_0 + a_{-0}} \tag{7}$$

where a_0 , a_{+0} and a_{-0} are similar to a_0 , a_{+0} and a_{-0} but with j_M^0 being replaced by j_M^0 .

In most phase conventions of the CKM matrix in the literature [1,17], one has, $j_K j_{-1} = 1$, for the K-system. In the phase convention of Wu and Yang [18], one has, further, $j_K^0 j_{-1} = 1$. With the fact that $! = \bar{A}_2 = A_0 j_{-1} = 1$, one obtains from eq.(6) that $a' = 2\text{Re}_K$, $a_0' = 2\text{Re}_K^0$, $a_{+0}' = 2\text{Im}_K + 2\text{Im}_K^0$ and $a_{-0}' = 0$, and thus

$$+ = \text{Re}_K + \text{Re}_K^0 + i(\text{Im}_K + \text{Im}_K^0) = \text{Re}_K + \text{Re}_K^0 \tag{8}$$

which reproduces the form often used in the literature for $K^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-$ decay.

Two additional rephase-invariant quantities complete the set of observables,

$$a_{\infty} = \frac{1 - \bar{g}g}{1 + \bar{g}g} = \frac{2\text{Re}_M^0}{1 + j_M^0{}^2}; \quad a_M^{\infty} = \frac{1 - \bar{h}h}{1 + \bar{h}h} = \frac{2\text{Re}_M}{1 + j_M^2} \tag{9}$$

So far we have introduced five parameters from which seven independent rephase-invariant observables are constructed to describe CP violation: Re_M is an indirect CP-violating parameter; Re_M^0 and Im_M^0 define direct CP-violating parameters; Re_M^0 and Im_M^0 contain the ratio of the two decay amplitudes and can be associated with direct CP violation as well as the interference between indirect and direct CP violation. All the CP violations can be well defined and in general classified into the following three types: i) purely indirect CP violation which is given by the rephase-invariant CP-violating observable a ; ii) purely direct CP violation

which is characterized by the rephase-invariant CP-violating observables a_{∞} and a_{∞} ; and iii) indirect-direct mixed CP violation which is described by the rephase-invariant CP-violating observables a_{+0} and a_{+0} . For the case that the final states are CP eigenstates, one has $a_0 = a_{\infty} = a_0 = a_{\infty}$. Thus, in this case a_0 and a_0 also indicate purely direct CP violation. When the final states are not CP eigenstates, a_0 and a_0 do not, in general, provide a clear signal of direct CP violation although they contain direct CP violation. Their deviation from $a_0 = 1; 0$ and $a_0 = 1; 0$ can arise from different CKM angles, final state interactions, or different hadronic form factors, but not necessarily from CP violation.

In order to measure these rephase-invariant observables, we consider the proper time evolution of the neutral mesons

$$|M^0(t)\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^2 C_i e^{-i(m_i - i\Gamma_i/2)t} |M_i\rangle; \quad |\bar{M}^0(t)\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^2 \bar{C}_i e^{-i(m_i - i\Gamma_i/2)t} |\bar{M}_i\rangle \quad (10)$$

with $C_1 = C_2 = 1/2p$ and $\bar{C}_1 = \bar{C}_2 = 1/2q$ for purely M^0 and $\bar{M}^0$ at $t = 0$. The time-dependent decay rates are found to be

$$\Gamma(M^0(t) \rightarrow f) / \Gamma(M^0(t) \rightarrow f) = \frac{1}{1+a} \frac{(\mathcal{P}^2 + \mathcal{H}^2)}{2} e^{-\Gamma t} \quad (11)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & [(1+a_0) \cosh(\Gamma t) + (1+a_0) \sinh(\Gamma t) + (a_{+0} + a_{+0}) \cos(m t) + a_{+0} \sin(m t)] \\ \Gamma(M^0(t) \rightarrow f) / \Gamma(M^0(t) \rightarrow f) &= \frac{1}{1-a} \frac{(\mathcal{P}^2 + \mathcal{H}^2)}{2} e^{-\Gamma t} \quad (12) \\ & [(1+a_0) \cosh(\Gamma t) + (1+a_0) \sinh(\Gamma t) - (a_{+0} + a_{+0}) \cos(m t) - a_{+0} \sin(m t)] \end{aligned}$$

One can easily write down the decay rates $\Gamma(M^0(t) \rightarrow f)$ and $\Gamma(\bar{M}^0(t) \rightarrow f)$, where $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2$ and $m = m_2 - m_1$. Here we have omitted the integral of the phase space.

From studying the time-dependent spectrum of the decay rates of M^0 and $\bar{M}^0$, one can, in principle, find the coefficients of the four functions $\sinh(\Gamma t)$, $\cosh(\Gamma t)$, $\cos(m t)$ and $\sin(m t)$ and extract the quantities a_{-0} , a_0 , a_{+0} , $\mathcal{P}^2 + \mathcal{H}^2$, a_{-0} , a_0 , a_{+0} and $\mathcal{P}^2 + \mathcal{H}^2$ as well as m , Γ_1 and Γ_2 . Thus, one can determine the amplitudes p , q , $\mathcal{P}^2$, $\mathcal{H}^2$, $\mathcal{P}^2$, $\mathcal{H}^2$ and combinations of the phases $(\phi_M + \phi_A)$ as well as $(\phi_M + \phi_A)$ via

Note that only the combination of the two phases is rephase-invariant.

$$\frac{q_p}{j_p} = \frac{1}{1+a} \frac{a}{j_p}; \quad \frac{h_g}{j_g} = \frac{1}{1+a_0} \frac{a_0}{j_g}; \quad \sin(2(\phi_M + \phi_A)) = \frac{a + a_0}{(1-a^2)(1-a_0^2)} \quad (13)$$

where $q_p = \frac{j_p}{j_p} e^{2i\phi_M}$, $h_g = \frac{j_g}{j_g} e^{2i\phi_A}$ and $g_h = \frac{j_h}{j_h} e^{2i\phi_A}$. For $f^{CP} = f$, one has $\phi_A = \phi_A$. For $f \notin f^{CP}$, $\phi_A = \phi_A$ holds only when final state interactions are absent, so that $\phi_A \neq \phi_A$ implies an existence of final state interactions when f is not a CP eigenstate.

The time-dependent CP asymmetry is the difference between the two decay rates of eqs. (11) and (12). In terms of the rephase-invariant quantities, we have

$$\begin{aligned} A_{CP}(t) &= \frac{\Gamma(M^0(t) \rightarrow f)}{\Gamma(\bar{M}^0(t) \rightarrow f)} - \frac{\Gamma(\bar{M}^0(t) \rightarrow f)}{\Gamma(M^0(t) \rightarrow f)} = \frac{1}{1-a^2} \frac{1}{2} e^{-\Gamma t} \frac{(\frac{j_p^2}{j_p^2} + \frac{j_g^2}{j_g^2})}{2} \\ &\quad + [(1+a_\infty)(1-a)(a+a_0) + (1-a_\infty)(1+a)(a+a_0)] \cos(\phi_M t) \\ &\quad + [(1+a_\infty)(1-a)a_{+0} + (1-a_\infty)(1+a)a_{+0}] \sin(\phi_M t) \\ &\quad + [(a-a_\infty)(2+(a_0+a_0)a) + (1-aa_\infty)(a_0-a_0)a] \cosh(\Gamma t) \\ &\quad + [(a-a_\infty)(2+a_0+a_0) + (1-aa_\infty)(a_0-a_0)] \sinh(\Gamma t) g \\ &\quad + (g \sin \phi_h; g \sin \phi_h; a_\infty \sin \phi_\infty) \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

One can in general deduce several asymmetries from the four time-dependent decay rates $\Gamma(M^0(t) \rightarrow f)$, $\Gamma(\bar{M}^0(t) \rightarrow f)$, $\Gamma(M^0(t) \rightarrow \bar{f})$ and $\Gamma(\bar{M}^0(t) \rightarrow \bar{f})$.

To apply the above general analyses to specific processes, we may classify the processes into the following scenarios

i) $M^0 \rightarrow f$ ($M^0 \notin f$), $\bar{M}^0 \rightarrow f$ ($\bar{M}^0 \notin f$), i.e., f or $\bar{f}$ is not a common final state of M^0 and $\bar{M}^0$. Examples are: $M^0 \rightarrow M^0 1$, $M^0 \rightarrow M^{0*} 1$; $B^0 \rightarrow D^- D_s^+$; $B^0 \rightarrow D^+ D_s^-$. This scenario also applies to charged meson decays [19].

ii) $M^0 \rightarrow (f = \bar{f}; f^{CP} = \bar{f})$, $\bar{M}^0 \rightarrow \bar{f}$, i.e., final states are CP eigenstates. Such as $B^0(B^0)$, $D^0(D^0)$, $K^0(K^0) \rightarrow \pi^+$, π^0 . For the final states such as π^+ and π^0 , although each of them is not a CP eigenstate of $B^0(B^0)$ or $D^0(D^0)$, one can always reconstruct them into CP eigenstates as $(\pi^+) = (\pi^+ + \pi^0)$ with $CP(\pi^+) = (\pi^+)$. This reconstruction is meaningful since π^+ and π^0 have the same weak phase as they contain the same quark content.

iii) $M^0 \rightarrow (f; f \notin f^{CP}) \rightarrow \bar{M}^0$, i.e., $\bar{M}^0$ and M^0 are common final states but they are not charge conjugate states. For example, $B^0(B^0) \rightarrow K_S J/\psi, B_S^0(B_S^0) \rightarrow K_S$.

iv) $M^0 \rightarrow (f \& \bar{f}; f^{CP} \notin f) \rightarrow \bar{M}^0$, i.e., both f and $\bar{f}$ are the common final states of M^0 and $\bar{M}^0$, but they are not CP eigenstates. This is the most general case. For example, $B^0(B^0) \rightarrow D^+ D^-, D^+ D^0; B_S^0(B_S^0) \rightarrow D_S^+ K^-, K^- D_S^+$.

In the scenario i), one has: $a_0 = \bar{a}_0 = 1, a_{+0} = 0 = \bar{a}_{+0}$ and $a_{-0} = -1 = \bar{a}_{-0}$. The time-dependent rates of eqs. (11) and (12) then become much simpler. Thus, m, Γ, a and a_∞ can be easily extracted via

$$A_{CP}(t) = \frac{\Gamma(M^0(t) \rightarrow f) + \Gamma(\bar{M}^0(t) \rightarrow f)}{\Gamma(M^0(t) \rightarrow f) - \Gamma(\bar{M}^0(t) \rightarrow f)} = a_\infty \quad (15)$$

$$A_{CP}^0(t) = \frac{\Gamma(M^0(t) \rightarrow f) - \Gamma(\bar{M}^0(t) \rightarrow f)}{\Gamma(M^0(t) \rightarrow f) + \Gamma(\bar{M}^0(t) \rightarrow f)} = (a_\infty + \frac{2a}{1+a^2}) = (1 + \frac{2a}{1+a^2} a_\infty) \quad (16)$$

$$\frac{\cos(m t)}{\cosh(\Gamma t)} = \frac{A^\pm(t) + a}{1 + A^\pm(t)a}; \quad A^\pm(t) = \frac{\Gamma(M^0(t) \rightarrow f) - \Gamma(\bar{M}^0(t) \rightarrow f)}{\Gamma(M^0(t) \rightarrow f) + \Gamma(\bar{M}^0(t) \rightarrow f)}: \quad (17)$$

It is interesting to note that the CP asymmetries A_{CP} and A_{CP}^0 are actually time-independent since the time-dependent parts cancel in the ratio. Indirect CP violation a in the B^0 - and B_S^0 -system may be directly obtained by measuring the decay channels in the scenario i), such as $B^0 \rightarrow D^+ K^-, D_S^+$ and $B_S^0 \rightarrow D_S^+ K^-, K^- D^+$, respectively, or from their semileptonic decays, since in these decays one has $a_\infty = 0$. Purely direct CP violation a_∞ in the B^0 - and B_S^0 -system may be detected by studying decay modes such as $B^0 \rightarrow D^+ D_S^-, K^+,$ and $B_S^0 \rightarrow D_S^+ D^-, K^+$. These decay modes receive contributions from both tree and penguin diagrams so that the final state interactions may become significant.

We now discuss the scenario ii) in which $a_0 = \bar{a}_0 = a_{+0} = \bar{a}_{+0}$ and $a_{-0} = -\bar{a}_{-0}$. Thus, the time-dependent CP asymmetry simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned} A_{CP}(t) &= (\Gamma_m(t) - a_\infty \Gamma(t)) / (\Gamma_m(t) + a_\infty \Gamma(t)) \\ \Gamma_m(t) &= (a + a_\infty) \cos(m t) + a_{+0} \sin(m t) \\ \Gamma(t) &= (1 + a a_\infty) \cosh(\Gamma t) + (1 + a_{-0}) \sinh(\Gamma t) \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Suppose that m, Γ and a are known from studying the processes in the scenario

i); one then can extract the direct CP-violating observable a_0 and CP-violating observable a_{+0} from the coefficients of $\cos(\Delta t)$ and $\sin(\Delta t)$ respectively from type (ii) processes.

Let us consider the following special but realistic cases:

1) $a_0 = 1$, then, to the first order of a_0 and a_{+0} , one has

$$A_{CP}(t) \approx a + \frac{(a + a_0) \cos(\Delta t) + a_{+0} \sin(\Delta t)}{\cosh(\Delta t) + (1 + a_0) \sinh(\Delta t)} \quad (19)$$

This case actually holds for all the neutral meson systems. In the $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ system, one also has $a_0 = 1$ and $\Delta m = 2$.

2) $a_0 = 1$, $j = j_1$ and $j = j_2$ and $j = j_3$. Then, $A_{CP}(t)$ further simplifies

$$A_{CP}(t) \approx a + (a + a_0) \cos(\Delta t) + a_{+0} \sin(\Delta t) \quad (20)$$

which may be applied, in a good approximation, to the $B^0 - \bar{B}^0$ system.

As an interesting example, let us reanalyze the B^0 processes in the context of our formalism and show how eight observables may be extracted from the data.

The decay amplitudes of $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-$, $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0$ and $B^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0$ can be expanded, in terms of the isospin ($I = 0; 2$) and the tree- and penguin-diagrams, into

$$g_+ = \frac{1}{2} (A_{0T} e^{i\Delta_T + i\Delta_{0T}} + A_{0P} e^{i\Delta_P + i\Delta_{0P}} - A_{2T} e^{i\Delta_T + i\Delta_{2T}} - A_{2P} e^{i\Delta_P + i\Delta_{2P}}) \quad (21)$$

$$g_{00} = A_{0T} e^{i\Delta_T + i\Delta_{0T}} + A_{0P} e^{i\Delta_P + i\Delta_{0P}} + 2 (A_{2T} e^{i\Delta_T + i\Delta_{2T}} + A_{2P} e^{i\Delta_P + i\Delta_{2P}}) \quad (22)$$

$$g_{+0} = 3 (A_{2T} e^{i\Delta_T + i\Delta_{2T}} + A_{2P} e^{i\Delta_P + i\Delta_{2P}}) \quad (23)$$

where A_{0i} and A_{2i} are the isospin $I = 0$ and 2 amplitudes of the tree diagram ($i = T$) and penguin diagrams ($i = P$), Δ_{0i} and Δ_{2i} ($i = T, P$) are the corresponding strong phases. Where A_{2P} arises from the electroweak penguin. Δ_T and Δ_P are the weak phases of the tree- and penguin-diagrams respectively. Thus, we have nine physical quantities. They consist of five phases and four amplitudes:

$$\begin{aligned} & \Delta_T, \Delta_P; (\Delta_M + \Delta_T) \text{ or } (\Delta_M + \Delta_P); \Delta_T = \Delta_{0T} - \Delta_{2T}; \\ & \Delta_P = \Delta_{0P} - \Delta_{2P}; \frac{0}{P} = \Delta_{2P} - \Delta_{2T}; A_{0T}; A_{2T}; A_{0P}; A_{2P} \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

while we have in general eight independent observables, they are:

$$a_0^{(+)}; a_0^{(00)}; a_{\pi\pi}^{(+0)}; a_{\pi^+\pi^0}^{(+)}; a_{\pi^+\pi^0}^{(00)}; \langle \pi^+ \pi^- \rangle; \langle \pi^0 \pi^0 \rangle; \langle \pi^+\pi^0 \rangle \quad (25)$$

which implies that without using a theoretical input one cannot in principle unambiguously extract the angle α from $B \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$. A model calculation however shows that $A_{2P} = A_{2T} \pm 1.6\%$ ($\mathcal{V}_{td} \mp \mathcal{V}_{ub}$) [14]. If the contribution of the electroweak penguin is negligible, it is remarkable that there are only seven quantities (omitting $A_P^{(0)}$ and A_{2P} in eq. (24)) which can be extracted from seven observables (omitting $a_{\pi\pi}^{(+0)}$ in eq. (25)), where $a_0^{(+)}$ and $a_0^{(00)}$ are proportional to $\sin(\alpha_P)\sin(\alpha)$ and $\sin(\alpha_T - \alpha_P)\sin(\alpha)$; $a_{\pi^+\pi^0}^{(+)}$ and $a_{\pi^+\pi^0}^{(00)}$ are related to combinations of $\sin(\alpha_M + \alpha_T)$, $\cos(\alpha_P)$, $\cos(\alpha_T)$ and the relative amplitude of the tree and penguin diagrams. Together with the decay rates $\Gamma_{\pi^+\pi^-}$, $\Gamma_{\pi^0\pi^0}$ and $\Gamma_{\pi^+\pi^0}$, one can in principle extract the seven quantities in eq. (24) as also noted by [7]. In the CKM scheme, one has $\alpha_M = \alpha$, $\alpha_T = \alpha$ and $\alpha_P = \alpha$, thus

$$(\alpha_M + \alpha_T) = \alpha + \alpha = 2\alpha; \quad \alpha_T - \alpha_P = \alpha - \alpha = 0 \quad (26)$$

A model for the strong phase of the strong penguin diagram has recently been studied by [19,20]. As an illustration of the effect of strong phase and amplitude of the strong penguin diagram, we present in the table 1 the values of $a_0^{(+)}$, $a_0^{(00)}$, $a_{\pi^+\pi^0}^{(+)}$, and $a_{\pi^+\pi^0}^{(00)}$ with $\alpha = 0$ in the decays $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$, $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0$ as functions of representative Wolfenstein parameters λ and ρ of the CKM matrix in a BSW model [21] using the methods and parameters of refs. [19,22]. As we see from table 1, the influence of the amplitude and strong phase of the penguin diagram is sizable even in the $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ channel but is quite drastic in the $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0$ channel, where color suppression occurs for the tree amplitude. It should also be noted how sensitive $a_{\pi^+\pi^0}^{(00)}$ is to the CKM parameters, changing sign between the two preferred Ali and London [22] solutions due to the cancellation between tree and strong penguin contributions. For certain values of λ and ρ , $a_{\pi^+\pi^0}^{(00)} \neq 0$. In this case the electroweak penguin could be a complication in the $\pi^0\pi^0$ channel when extracting the angle α . The effect of the electroweak penguin diagram may be seen by studying the CP asymmetry $a_{\pi\pi}^{(+0)}$ in the charged B-meson decay.

A similar analysis can be applied to the K - and D -systems. It is of interest that for the K -system it becomes simpler, i.e. $\Gamma_T = \Gamma_P = \Gamma$ ($I = 0, 2$). This is because in the K -system scattering is assumed to be purely elastic (in the good approximation of neglecting the final state), while in the B -system scattering can be inelastic. Thus in the K -system there are only seven parameters in eq. (24) instead of nine, but there are also only six independent observables in eq. (25) because $\Gamma = [(\Gamma^+ - \Gamma^-) + (\Gamma^0 - \Gamma^{\bar{0}})] + [(\Gamma^{00} - \Gamma^{\bar{0}\bar{0}})] = 0$ as required by CPT in the absence of other channels. In the B -system there are two more parameters as well as two more observables as shown above and $\Gamma \neq 0$. Therefore the measurement of Γ distinguishes CP violation in the K -system from that of B -system^y.

We now present another interesting decay mode to extract the angle β , i.e., $B_s^0 \rightarrow (\mathcal{D}_s K^+; K^- D_s^+)$ B_s^0 . Since these decay modes only receive contributions from tree diagram, the phase α of the amplitude is almost a purely weak phase and given by $2\alpha = 2\beta$ in the CKM scheme. The phase β from the $B_s^0 - \bar{B}_s^0$ mixing is expected to be small in the CKM scheme, $\beta \approx 1$. By measuring the rephase-invariant quantities a_{+0} and a_{00} in the above decay modes, one then extracts the angle β (see equation (13))

$$\sin(2(\beta_M + \alpha_A))' \sin \beta = \frac{a_{+0}}{(1 - \alpha^2)(1 - \alpha_0^2)}' \frac{a_{00}}{(1 - \alpha_0^2)} \quad (27)$$

In general, such a triangle is not necessarily closed as long as either the mass mixing matrices or the amplitudes receive contributions from new sources of CP violation or new interactions beyond the standard model, such as the most general two-Higgs doublet model [13].

We hope that the general model-independent and rephase-invariant formalism developed in this note will be useful in the analysis of the neutral meson systems to test the SM and probe new physics.

The authors would like to thank G. Kramer and L. Wolfenstein for carefully reading the manuscript and for helpful advice. They also wish to thank H. Simma for useful discussions.

^y We would like to thank L. Wolfenstein for pointing this out to us

REFERENCES

- [1] N. Cabibbo, Phys. Rev. Lett. 10, 531 (1963); M. Kobayashi and T. Maskawa, Prog. Theor. Phys., 49, (652) (1973).
- [2] I.I. Bigi and A. J. Sanda, Nucl. Phys. B 193, 85 (1981); B 281, 41 (1987).
- [3] L. Wolfenstein, Nucl. Phys. B 246, 45 (1984).
- [4] E. A. Paschos and R. A. Zacher, Z. Phys. C 28, 521 (1985).
- [5] I. Dunietz and J. Rosner, Phys. Rev. D 34, 1404 (1986).
- [6] For a review see also: CP Violation by C. Jarlskog (World Scientific, Singapore, 1989); CP Violation by L. Wolfenstein (Elsevier Science Publishers B.V. Current Physics-Sources and Comments'), 1989; E. A. Paschos and U. Türke, Phys. Rep. 178, 147 (1989); B Decays, edited by S. Stone, World Scientific, 1994.
- [7] M. Gronau and D. London, Phys. Rev. Lett. 65, 3381 (1990).
- [8] H. Lipkin, Y. Nir, H. Quinn, and A. Snyder, Phys. Rev. D 44, 1454 (1991).
- [9] H. Fritzsch, D. D. Wu and Z. Z. Xing, Phys. Lett. B 328, 477 (1994).
- [10] J.P. Silva and L. Wolfenstein, Phys. Rev. D 49, R1151 (1994).
- [11] M. Gronau, J.L. Rosner and D. London, Phys. Rev. Lett. 73, 21 (1994); O.F. Hernandez, et al., Phys. Lett. B 333, 500 (1994).
- [12] L. Wolfenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. 13, 562 (1964); J.M. Soares and L. Wolfenstein, Phys. Rev. D 47, 1021 (1993).
- [13] Y.L. Wu and L. Wolfenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. 73, 1762 (1994); L. Wolfenstein and Y.L. Wu, Phys. Rev. Lett. 73, 2809 (1994).
- [14] N.G. Deshpande and X.G. He, Univ. of Oregon preprint OIT S-553, 1994.
- [15] A. Buras and R. Fleischer, MPI PhT /94-56, TUM -T 31-69/94.

- [16] C . Jarlskog, Phys. Rev. Lett. 55, 1039 (1985); D D Wu, Phys. Rev. D 33, 860 (1986);
O W . Greenberg, Phys. Rev. D 32 , 1841 (1985).
- [17] L. Wolfenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. 51, 1945 (1983).
- [18] T . T . Wu and C N . Yang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 13, 380 (1964).
- [19] G . Kramer, W F . Palmer and H . Simma, DESY Report 94-170, Z. Phys. C (in press).
- [20] H . Simma and D . W yler, Phys. Lett. B 272, 395 (1991); A . Buras et al., Nucl. Phys.
B 370, 69 (1992);
- [21] M . Bauer, B . Stech and M . W irbel, Z. Phys. C 34, 103 (1987); *ibid* C 29, 637 (1985).
- [22] A . Ali and D . London, CERN-TH 7248/94, Z. Phys. C (in press).

Table 1. $B \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0$ CP-violating observables in a standard model calculation using the BSW model [21], absorptive parts of the penguins in NLL formalism [20], and the CKM parameters of a recent fit [22].

CP Violation in $B \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0$					
Tree (T) and Penguins with (P) or without (P') Absorptive Parts					
NLL QCD Coefficients, BSW model					
	Assumptions		Decay Parameters		
Channel	CKM (λ ; ρ)	Amplitude	a_0	a_{+0}	$\langle BR \rangle$
$0^+ 0^+$	(-0.12, 0.34)	T + P	0.316	0.201	$4.25 \cdot 10^{-7}$
	"	T + P'	0.0	0.216	$4.14 \cdot 10^{-7}$
	"	T	0.0	-0.951	$5.66 \cdot 10^{-7}$
$0^- 0^-$	(-0.28, 0.24)	T + P	0.496	-0.465	$1.91 \cdot 10^{-7}$
	"	T + P'	0.0	-0.487	$1.77 \cdot 10^{-7}$
	"	T	0.	-0.869	$5.93 \cdot 10^{-7}$
$+$	(-0.12, 0.34)	T + P	0.0708	-0.766	$1.19 \cdot 10^{-5}$
	"	T + P'	0.	-0.777	$1.18 \cdot 10^{-5}$
	"	T	0.0	-0.951	$1.43 \cdot 10^{-5}$
$-$	(-0.28, 0.24)	T + P	0.0573	-0.967	$1.03 \cdot 10^{-5}$
	"	T + P'	0.0	-0.97	$1.03 \cdot 10^{-5}$
	"	T	0.0	-0.869	$1.50 \cdot 10^{-5}$