

$D^0 \rightarrow K^\pm \pi^\mp$ and CP Violation at a τ -charm Factory

Zhi-zhong Xing ¹

*Sektion Physik, Theoretische Physik, Universität München,
Theresienstrasse 37, D-80333 München, Germany*

Abstract

We calculate the time-dependent and time-integrated decay rates of $(D^0 \bar{D}^0) \rightarrow (K^\pm \pi^\mp)(l^\pm X^\mp)$ at the $\psi(3.77)$ and $\psi(4.14)$ resonances. The possibilities to distinguish between the effects of $D^0 - \bar{D}^0$ mixing and doubly Cabibbo suppressed decay (DCSD) are illustrated, and the signal of CP violation induced by the interplay of mixing and DCSD is discussed. Ratios of the decay rates of $(D^0 \bar{D}^0) \rightarrow (K^\pm \pi^\mp)(K^\pm \pi^\mp)$ to that of $(D^0 \bar{D}^0) \rightarrow (K^+ \pi^-)(K^- \pi^+)$ are also recalculated by accommodating CP violation and final-state interactions.

¹Electronic address: Xing@hep.physik.uni-muenchen.de

1. Introduction

Recently some attention has been paid to the potential of searching for large $D^0 - \bar{D}^0$ mixing that is out of reach of the standard-model limitation, and to the possibility of probing significant CP violation in the charm sector [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]. The main experimental scenarios include the fixed target facilities, the τ -charm factories and the B -meson factories [6, 7, 8, 9]. Among various decay channels of neutral D mesons, D^0 vs $\bar{D}^0 \rightarrow K^\pm \pi^\mp$ are of particular interest, in both theory and experiments, to study the effects of $D^0 - \bar{D}^0$ mixing and doubly Cabibbo suppressed decay (DCSD).

In the standard model, the transitions $D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$ and $\bar{D}^0 \rightarrow K^+ \pi^-$ are Cabibbo favored. In contrast, $D^0 \rightarrow K^+ \pi^-$ and $\bar{D}^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$ are DCSD's. If there exists detectable $D^0 - \bar{D}^0$ mixing due to new physics, then the processes $D^0 \rightarrow \bar{D}^0 \rightarrow K^+ \pi^-$ and $\bar{D}^0 \rightarrow D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$ may compete with or even dominate over the respective DCSD's. Since any new physics is not likely to affect the direct decays of c quark (via the tree-level W -mediated diagrams) in a significant way [5, 10], one can use D^0 vs $\bar{D}^0 \rightarrow K^\pm \pi^\mp$ to explore the magnitude of $D^0 - \bar{D}^0$ mixing as well as the effect of CP violation induced by the interplay of decay and mixing. Of course, this idea has been extensively considered in the literature (see, e.g., refs. [1, 5]). But most of the previous studies focused on the *incoherent* decays of D^0 and \bar{D}^0 mesons, a case applicable to the fixed target experiments (perhaps also applicable to the experiments at a B -meson factory) [6, 9].

In this work we calculate the time-dependent and time-integrated transition probabilities of *coherent* ($D^0 \bar{D}^0$) decays to $(K^\pm \pi^\mp)(l^\pm X^\mp)$, where the semileptonic final states serve to tag the flavors of the parent D mesons, for various possible measurements at a τ -charm factory. We illustrate how to distinguish between $D^0 - \bar{D}^0$ mixing and DCSD effects in the time distributions of decay rates, and how to isolate the signal of CP violation arising from the interplay of these two effects. Accommodating CP violation and nonvanishing strong phase shift in $D \rightarrow K \pi$, a recalculation of the coherent decays $(D^0 \bar{D}^0) \rightarrow (K^\pm \pi^\mp)(K^\pm \pi^\mp)$ is also given to probe $D^0 - \bar{D}^0$ mixing and to separate it from the DCSD effect. Similar analyses can be carried out for a variety of neutral D decays to non- CP eigenstates.

2. Master formulas

At a τ -charm factory, the coherent ($D^0 \bar{D}^0$) events can be produced through [7]

$$\begin{aligned} e^+ e^- &\rightarrow \psi(3.77) \rightarrow (D^0 \bar{D}^0)_{C=-}, \\ e^+ e^- &\rightarrow \psi(4.14) \rightarrow \gamma(D^0 \bar{D}^0)_{C=+} \text{ or } \pi^0(D^0 \bar{D}^0)_{C=-}, \end{aligned}$$

where C represents the charge-conjugation parity. Since D^0 and \bar{D}^0 mix coherently until one of them decays, one may use the semileptonic decay of one meson to tag the flavor of the other meson decaying to a flavor-nonspecific hadronic state. The time-dependent wave function for a $(D^0\bar{D}^0)_C$ pair at rest is written as

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[|D^0(\mathbf{k}, t)\rangle \otimes |\bar{D}^0(-\mathbf{k}, t)\rangle + C |D^0(-\mathbf{k}, t)\rangle \otimes |\bar{D}^0(\mathbf{k}, t)\rangle \right], \quad (1)$$

where \mathbf{k} is the three-momentum vector of D^0 and \bar{D}^0 mesons. The proper-time evolution of an initially ($t = 0$) pure D^0 or \bar{D}^0 is given by

$$\begin{aligned} |D^0(t)\rangle &= f_+(t)|D^0\rangle + e^{+i2\phi_m} f_-(t)|\bar{D}^0\rangle, \\ |\bar{D}^0(t)\rangle &= f_+(t)|\bar{D}^0\rangle + e^{-i2\phi_m} f_-(t)|D^0\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where ϕ_m is a complex parameter connecting the flavor eigenstates to the mass eigenstates through ²

$$\begin{aligned} |D_L\rangle &= e^{-i\phi_m}|D^0\rangle + e^{+i\phi_m}|\bar{D}^0\rangle, \\ |D_H\rangle &= e^{-i\phi_m}|D^0\rangle - e^{+i\phi_m}|\bar{D}^0\rangle; \end{aligned} \quad (3a)$$

and the evolution functions $f_{\pm}(t)$ read

$$f_{\pm}(t) = \frac{1}{2} e^{-(im+\Gamma/2)t} \left[e^{+(i\Delta m - \Delta\Gamma/2)t/2} \pm e^{-(i\Delta m - \Delta\Gamma/2)t/2} \right]. \quad (3b)$$

In the above equation, we have defined $m \equiv (m_L + m_H)/2$, $\Gamma \equiv (\Gamma_L + \Gamma_H)/2$, $\Delta m \equiv m_H - m_L$ and $\Delta\Gamma \equiv \Gamma_L - \Gamma_H$, where $m_{L(H)}$ and $\Gamma_{L(H)}$ are the mass and width of $D_{L(H)}$ respectively.

Now we consider the case that one D meson decays to a semileptonic state $|l^+X^- \rangle$ or $|l^-X^+ \rangle$ at (proper) time t_1 and the other to $|K^+\pi^- \rangle$ or $|K^-\pi^+ \rangle$ at t_2 . After a lengthy calculation, the joint decay rates for having such events are obtained as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{R}(l^+, t_1; K^+\pi^-, t_2)_C &\propto |A_l|^2 |A_{K\pi}|^2 e^{-\Gamma t_+} \left[(1 + |\lambda_{K\pi}|^2) \cosh\left(\frac{\Delta\Gamma}{2}t_C\right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - 2\text{Re}\lambda_{K\pi} \sinh\left(\frac{\Delta\Gamma}{2}t_C\right) + (1 - |\lambda_{K\pi}|^2) \cos(\Delta m t_C) - 2\text{Im}\lambda_{K\pi} \sin(\Delta m t_C) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (4a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{R}(l^-, t_1; K^-\pi^+, t_2)_C &\propto |A_l|^2 |A_{K\pi}|^2 e^{-\Gamma t_+} \left[(1 + |\tilde{\lambda}_{K\pi}|^2) \cosh\left(\frac{\Delta\Gamma}{2}t_C\right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - 2\text{Re}\tilde{\lambda}_{K\pi} \sinh\left(\frac{\Delta\Gamma}{2}t_C\right) + (1 - |\tilde{\lambda}_{K\pi}|^2) \cos(\Delta m t_C) - 2\text{Im}\tilde{\lambda}_{K\pi} \sin(\Delta m t_C) \right]; \end{aligned} \quad (4b)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{R}(l^-, t_1; K^+\pi^-, t_2)_C &\propto |A_l|^2 |A_{K\pi}|^2 e^{-4\text{Im}\phi_m} e^{-\Gamma t_+} \left[(1 + |\lambda_{K\pi}|^2) \cosh\left(\frac{\Delta\Gamma}{2}t_C\right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - 2\text{Re}\lambda_{K\pi} \sinh\left(\frac{\Delta\Gamma}{2}t_C\right) - (1 - |\lambda_{K\pi}|^2) \cos(\Delta m t_C) + 2\text{Im}\lambda_{K\pi} \sin(\Delta m t_C) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (5a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{R}(l^+, t_1; K^-\pi^+, t_2)_C &\propto |A_l|^2 |A_{K\pi}|^2 e^{+4\text{Im}\phi_m} e^{-\Gamma t_+} \left[(1 + |\tilde{\lambda}_{K\pi}|^2) \cosh\left(\frac{\Delta\Gamma}{2}t_C\right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - 2\text{Re}\tilde{\lambda}_{K\pi} \sinh\left(\frac{\Delta\Gamma}{2}t_C\right) - (1 - |\tilde{\lambda}_{K\pi}|^2) \cos(\Delta m t_C) + 2\text{Im}\tilde{\lambda}_{K\pi} \sin(\Delta m t_C) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5b)$$

²Here CPT symmetry in the $D^0 - \bar{D}^0$ mixing matrix has been assumed.

In deriving these formulas, we have used the $\Delta Q = \Delta C$ rule and CPT invariance as well as the reliable assumption that there is no direct CP violation in the decay amplitudes of $D^0 \rightarrow K^\pm \pi^\mp$. The relevant quantities appearing in eqs. (4) and (5) are defined as follows: $t_C \equiv t_2 + Ct_1$, $A_l \equiv \langle l^+ X^- | \mathcal{H} | D^0 \rangle$, $A_{K\pi} \equiv \langle K^- \pi^+ | \mathcal{H} | D^0 \rangle$, $\lambda_{K\pi} \equiv \exp(-2i\phi_m)$, $\xi_{K\pi}$ and $\tilde{\lambda}_{K\pi} \equiv \exp(+2i\phi_m)$, $\tilde{\xi}_{K\pi}$, where

$$\xi_{K\pi} \equiv \frac{\langle K^+ \pi^- | \mathcal{H} | D^0 \rangle}{\langle K^+ \pi^- | \mathcal{H} | \bar{D}^0 \rangle}, \quad \tilde{\xi}_{K\pi} \equiv \frac{\langle K^- \pi^+ | \mathcal{H} | \bar{D}^0 \rangle}{\langle K^- \pi^+ | \mathcal{H} | D^0 \rangle}. \quad (6)$$

Note that $|\tilde{\xi}_{K\pi}| = |\xi_{K\pi}|$ holds in the absence of direct CP violation. But in general $\tilde{\xi}_{K\pi} = \xi_{K\pi}^*$ is not true due to the existence of final-state interactions [5]. Moreover, one should keep in mind that $|\xi_{K\pi}|$ is doubly Cabibbo suppressed and its magnitude is of the order 10^{-2} [1].

It is known that $\text{Im}\phi_m \neq 0$ implies observable CP violation in $D^0 - \bar{D}^0$ mixing. This kind of CP -violating signal can manifest itself in the like-sign dilepton events of $(D^0 \bar{D}^0)_C$ pairs:

$$\begin{aligned} N_C^{--} &\equiv \text{R}(l^-, t_1; l^-, t_2)_C \propto e^{-4\text{Im}\phi_m} e^{-\Gamma t_+} \left[\cosh\left(\frac{\Delta\Gamma}{2} t_C\right) - \cos(\Delta m t_C) \right], \\ N_C^{++} &\equiv \text{R}(l^+, t_1; l^+, t_2)_C \propto e^{+4\text{Im}\phi_m} e^{-\Gamma t_+} \left[\cosh\left(\frac{\Delta\Gamma}{2} t_C\right) - \cos(\Delta m t_C) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

If $\text{Im}\phi_m$ is of the level $O(\geq 10^{-3})$, it should be first observed from the CP -violating asymmetry

$$\frac{N_C^{++} - N_C^{--}}{N_C^{++} + N_C^{--}} = \frac{e^{+4\text{Im}\phi_m} - e^{-4\text{Im}\phi_m}}{e^{+4\text{Im}\phi_m} + e^{-4\text{Im}\phi_m}} \approx 4\text{Im}\phi_m. \quad (8)$$

Note that this asymmetry is not only independent of the time distributions of $N_C^{\pm\pm}$ but also independent of the charge-conjugation parity C , thus it can be measured by using the time-integrated dilepton events at either $\psi(3.77)$ or $\psi(4.14)$ resonance.

In the following discussions about the decay modes $D^0 \rightarrow K^\pm \pi^\mp$ and their CP -conjugate processes, we shall neglect the contribution from $\text{Im}\phi$. We shall in turn use the assumption $|\Delta\Gamma| \ll |\Delta m|$ (i.e., neglecting the mixing effect induced by $\Delta\Gamma$), which is very likely to be a good approximation if $|\Delta m|$ is close to its current experimental bound [5]. As a consequence, $|\tilde{\lambda}_{K\pi}| = |\lambda_{K\pi}|$ holds.

3. Time dependence of the decay rates

By use of the approximations mentioned above, the formulas in eqs. (4) and (5) can be simplified. Here we assume that a reconstruction of the decay-time differences t_- between neutral D decays to $l^\pm X^\mp$ and $K^\pm \pi^\mp$ is possible in experiments. Usually it is difficult to detect the t_+ distribution of joint decay rates in either linacs or storage rings, since the creation point of the $\psi(3.77)$ or $\psi(4.14)$ resonance cannot be well resolved [11]. Hence we prefer to integrate $\text{R}(l^\pm, t_1; K^\pm \pi^\mp, t_2)_C$ over t_+ in order to obtain the t_- distributions. For simplicity, we define

a dimensionless parameter $T \equiv \Gamma t_-$ and choose $T > 0$ by convention. The relevant results are given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{R}(l^+, K^+\pi^-; T)_- &\propto e^{-T} (4 - x^2 T^2 - 4xT \text{Im} \lambda_{K\pi}), \\
\mathbf{R}(l^-, K^-\pi^+; T)_- &\propto e^{-T} (4 - x^2 T^2 - 4xT \text{Im} \tilde{\lambda}_{K\pi}), \\
\mathbf{R}(l^-, K^+\pi^-; T)_- &\propto e^{-T} (4|\lambda_{K\pi}|^2 + x^2 T^2 + 4xT \text{Im} \lambda_{K\pi}), \\
\mathbf{R}(l^+, K^-\pi^+; T)_- &\propto e^{-T} (4|\tilde{\lambda}_{K\pi}|^2 + x^2 T^2 + 4xT \text{Im} \tilde{\lambda}_{K\pi});
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{R}(l^+, K^+\pi^-; T)_+ &\propto e^{-T} [4 - x^2(2 + 2T + T^2) - 4x(1 + T) \text{Im} \lambda_{K\pi}], \\
\mathbf{R}(l^-, K^-\pi^+; T)_+ &\propto e^{-T} [4 - x^2(2 + 2T + T^2) - 4x(1 + T) \text{Im} \tilde{\lambda}_{K\pi}], \\
\mathbf{R}(l^-, K^+\pi^-; T)_+ &\propto e^{-T} [4|\lambda_{K\pi}|^2 + x^2(2 + 2T + T^2) + 4x(1 + T) \text{Im} \lambda_{K\pi}], \\
\mathbf{R}(l^+, K^-\pi^+; T)_+ &\propto e^{-T} [4|\tilde{\lambda}_{K\pi}|^2 + x^2(2 + 2T + T^2) + 4x(1 + T) \text{Im} \tilde{\lambda}_{K\pi}],
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where $x \equiv \Delta m/\Gamma$ is a $D^0 - \bar{D}^0$ mixing parameter. In obtaining eqs. (9) and (10), we have assumed x to be at the detectable level [12] (i.e., $|x| \sim 10^{-2}$) and made approximations up to the accuracy of $O(x^2)$, $O(|\lambda_{K\pi}|^2)$ or $O(x|\lambda_{K\pi}|)$.

One can observe that the $D^0 - \bar{D}^0$ mixing (x) and DCSD ($\lambda_{K\pi}$ or $\tilde{\lambda}_{K\pi}$) terms play insignificant roles in the decay rates $\mathbf{R}(l^+, K^+\pi^-; T)_C$ and $\mathbf{R}(l^-, K^-\pi^+; T)_C$. In contrast, $\mathbf{R}(l^-, K^+\pi^-; T)_C$ and $\mathbf{R}(l^+, K^-\pi^+; T)_C$ are remarkably suppressed due to the smallness of x and $|\lambda_{K\pi}|$. Let us parametrize $\xi_{K\pi}$ and $\tilde{\xi}_{K\pi}$ as follows: $\xi_{K\pi} = |\xi_{K\pi}| e^{i(\delta_{K\pi} + \phi_t)}$ and $\tilde{\xi}_{K\pi} = |\xi_{K\pi}| e^{i(\delta_{K\pi} - \phi_t)}$, where $\delta_{K\pi}$ and ϕ_t stand for the strong phase shift and the weak transition phase respectively. Then $\text{Im} \lambda_{K\pi}$ and $\text{Im} \tilde{\lambda}_{K\pi}$ are given as

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Im} \lambda_{K\pi} &= |\xi_{K\pi}| \sin(\delta_{K\pi} + \phi_t - 2\phi_m), \\
\text{Im} \tilde{\lambda}_{K\pi} &= |\xi_{K\pi}| \sin(\delta_{K\pi} - \phi_t + 2\phi_m).
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

In the standard model, we have $\phi_t = \arg[(V_{cd}V_{us}^*)/(V_{ud}V_{cs}^*)] \approx A^2\lambda^4\eta \leq 10^{-3}$ as well as $\phi_m = \arg[(V_{us}V_{cs}^*)/(V_{cs}V_{us}^*)]/2 \approx 0$, where A , λ and η are the Wolfenstein parameters. Since any new physics is unlikely to significantly affect the direct decays of c quark, $\phi_t \approx 0$ is always a good approximation and will be used later on. New physics might introduce additional non-trivial phases into ϕ_m [10, 13], leading to observable CP -violating effects through the interplay of decay and mixing.

To isolate the mixing and DCSD effects, the following two types of measurables can be analyzed in experiments:

- (a) The combined decay rate

$$\Omega_C^+(T) \equiv \mathbf{R}(l^-, K^+\pi^-; T)_C + \mathbf{R}(l^+, K^-\pi^+; T)_C.$$

Explicitly, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega_{-}^{\pm}(T) &\propto 2 e^{-T} [4|\xi_{K\pi}|^2 + x^2 T^2 + 4x|\xi_{K\pi}|T \sin \delta_{K\pi} \cos(2\phi_m)] , \\ \Omega_{+}^{\pm}(T) &\propto 2 e^{-T} [4|\xi_{K\pi}|^2 + x^2(2 + 2T + T^2) + 4x|\xi_{K\pi}|(1 + T) \sin \delta_{K\pi} \cos(2\phi_m)] .\end{aligned}\quad (12)$$

Note that the strong phase shift $\delta_{K\pi}$ vanishes only in the limit of SU(3) symmetry [14]. To fit the CLEO II result for $D^0 \rightarrow K^{\pm}\pi^{\mp}$, which gives $|\xi_{K\pi}|^2 = (0.77 \pm 0.25 \pm 0.25)\%$ [15], one finds $\delta_{K\pi} \sim 5^{\circ} - 13^{\circ}$ from a few phenomenological models [16]. For illustration, we show the time dependence of $\Omega_{C}^{\pm}(T)$ in Fig. 1 by taking $|\xi_{K\pi}| = 0.08$, $\delta_{K\pi} = 10^{\circ}$, $\phi_m = 30^{\circ}$ and $x = 0.06$ (the upper bound of $|x|$ is 0.086 [12]). One can observe that $\Omega_{-}^{\pm}(T)$ and $\Omega_{+}^{\pm}(T)$ are most sensitive to the presence of DCSD or $D^0 - \bar{D}^0$ mixing in the regions $T \sim 1 - 4$ and $T \sim 0 - 4$, respectively. For small values of T , the signal of mixing in $\Omega_{+}^{\pm}(T)$ is more significant than that in $\Omega_{-}^{\pm}(T)$. Thus it is in principle favourable to study $D^0 - \bar{D}^0$ mixing by use of $(D^0 \bar{D}^0)_{C=+}$ events at the $\psi(4.14)$ resonance.

(b) The CP -violating asymmetry

$$\mathcal{A}_C^{\pm}(T) \equiv \frac{\mathbf{R}(l^+, K^+ \pi^-; T)_C - \mathbf{R}(l^-, K^- \pi^+; T)_C}{\mathbf{R}(l^+, K^+ \pi^-; T)_C + \mathbf{R}(l^-, K^- \pi^+; T)_C}.$$

This signal arises from the interplay of DCSD and mixing. With the help of eqs. (9) and (10), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}_{-}^{\pm}(T) &\approx x|\xi_{K\pi}|T \cos \delta_{K\pi} \sin(2\phi_m) , \\ \mathcal{A}_{+}^{\pm}(T) &\approx x|\xi_{K\pi}|(1 + T) \cos \delta_{K\pi} \sin(2\phi_m) .\end{aligned}\quad (13)$$

It is clear that the above asymmetries are considerably suppressed due to the smallness of x and $|\xi_{K\pi}|$. In addition, nonvanishing ϕ_m is a necessary condition to have nonzero $\mathcal{A}_C^{\pm}(T)$. We illustrate the changes of $\mathcal{A}_C^{\pm}(T)$ with T in Fig. 2, where the inputs are the same as in case (a). Here it should be noted that large data samples for $(l^+, K^+ \pi^-)$ and $(l^-, K^- \pi^+)$ events are available at a τ -charm factory, since such joint decay rates are not suppressed by small mixing and DCSD effects (see eqs. (9) and (10)). Hence it is quite likely to measure $\mathcal{A}_C^{\pm}(T)$ in the near future, if the magnitudes of x and ϕ_m are large enough (e.g., $x \geq 0.05$ and $\sin(2\phi_m) \geq 0.5$).

A natural question to be asked is if the decay-time differences T (or t_-) between the semileptonic and nonleptonic D decays can really be measured on the $\psi(3.77)$ and $\psi(4.14)$ resonances. For symmetric e^+e^- collisions at the $\Upsilon(4S)$ resonance, the produced $B_d^0 \bar{B}_d^0$ pair is almost at rest so that their mean decay length is insufficient for identifying the decay vertices or measuring the decay-time difference [11]. Hence designing an asymmetric B factory is necessary to study the time distribution of joint $(B_d^0 \bar{B}_d^0)$ decays and CP violation. For the similar kinetic reasons, a symmetric τ -charm factory might also be unable to resolve the decay

vertices of $(D^0\bar{D}^0)$ events, and this would make the time-dependent measurements discussed above impossible in practice. Of course, an instructive analysis of this problem is desirable to give definite conclusions for the τ -charm factory designers. From our point of view it is suggestive to have an asymmetric τ -charm factory running at the $\psi(3.77)$ and $\psi(4.14)$ resonances, which can allow various possible measurements of $D^0 - \bar{D}^0$ mixing, DCSD and CP -violating effects in coherent $(D^0\bar{D}^0)_C$ decays.

4. Time integration of the decay rates

In this section we calculate the time-integrated probabilities of the joint decays $(D^0\bar{D}^0)_C \rightarrow (l^\pm X^\mp)(K^\pm \pi^\mp)$. Without loss of any generality, we start from eqs. (4) and (5), where no special approximation has been made. Integrating $R(l^\pm, t_1; K^\pm \pi^\mp, t_2)_C$ over $t_1 \in [0, +\infty)$ and $t_2 \in [0, +\infty)$, one obtains:

$$R(l^+, K^+ \pi^-)_C \propto |A_l|^2 |A_{K\pi}|^2 \left[\frac{1 + Cy^2}{(1 - y^2)^2} (1 + |\lambda_{K\pi}|^2) - \frac{2(1 + C)y}{(1 - y^2)^2} \text{Re}\lambda_{K\pi} + \frac{1 - Cx^2}{(1 + x^2)^2} (1 - |\lambda_{K\pi}|^2) - \frac{2(1 + C)x}{(1 + x^2)^2} \text{Im}\lambda_{K\pi} \right], \quad (14a)$$

$$R(l^-, K^- \pi^+)_C \propto |A_l|^2 |A_{K\pi}|^2 \left[\frac{1 + Cy^2}{(1 - y^2)^2} (1 + |\tilde{\lambda}_{K\pi}|^2) - \frac{2(1 + C)y}{(1 - y^2)^2} \text{Re}\tilde{\lambda}_{K\pi} + \frac{1 - Cx^2}{(1 + x^2)^2} (1 - |\tilde{\lambda}_{K\pi}|^2) - \frac{2(1 + C)x}{(1 + x^2)^2} \text{Im}\tilde{\lambda}_{K\pi} \right]; \quad (14b)$$

and

$$R(l^-, K^+ \pi^-)_C \propto |A_l|^2 |A_{K\pi}|^2 e^{-4\text{Im}\phi_m} \left[\frac{1 + Cy^2}{(1 - y^2)^2} (1 + |\lambda_{K\pi}|^2) - \frac{2(1 + C)y}{(1 - y^2)^2} \text{Re}\lambda_{K\pi} - \frac{1 - Cx^2}{(1 + x^2)^2} (1 - |\lambda_{K\pi}|^2) + \frac{2(1 + C)x}{(1 + x^2)^2} \text{Im}\lambda_{K\pi} \right], \quad (15a)$$

$$R(l^+, K^- \pi^+)_C \propto |A_l|^2 |A_{K\pi}|^2 e^{+4\text{Im}\phi_m} \left[\frac{1 + Cy^2}{(1 - y^2)^2} (1 + |\tilde{\lambda}_{K\pi}|^2) - \frac{2(1 + C)y}{(1 - y^2)^2} \text{Re}\tilde{\lambda}_{K\pi} - \frac{1 - Cx^2}{(1 + x^2)^2} (1 - |\tilde{\lambda}_{K\pi}|^2) + \frac{2(1 + C)x}{(1 + x^2)^2} \text{Im}\tilde{\lambda}_{K\pi} \right], \quad (15b)$$

where $y \equiv \Delta\Gamma/(2\Gamma)$ is another $D^0 - \bar{D}^0$ mixing parameter. From the above formulas one can observe that for $C = -$ case the interference terms $\text{Re}\lambda_{K\pi}$, $\text{Im}\lambda_{K\pi}$, $\text{Re}\tilde{\lambda}_{K\pi}$ and $\text{Im}\tilde{\lambda}_{K\pi}$ disappear in the joint decay rates. Indeed this is a generic feature of coherent $(D^0\bar{D}^0)_{C=-}$ decays, independent of the final products to be semileptonic or nonleptonic states [11].

In the assumption of $|\Delta\Gamma| \ll |\Delta m|$, one equivalently has $|y| \ll |x|$. Subsequently we neglect the contributions from $\text{Im}\phi$ and y as well as the $O(\leq x^3)$ terms, in order to simplify

eqs. (14) and (15). The relevant time-integrated decay rates turn out to be

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{R}(l^+, K^+\pi^-)_- &= \mathbf{R}(l^-, K^-\pi^+)_- \propto |A_l|^2 |A_{K\pi}|^2 \left[2 - x^2 (1 - |\lambda_{K\pi}|^2) \right], \\ \mathbf{R}(l^-, K^+\pi^-)_- &= \mathbf{R}(l^+, K^-\pi^+)_- \propto |A_l|^2 |A_{K\pi}|^2 \left[2|\lambda_{K\pi}|^2 + x^2 (1 - |\lambda_{K\pi}|^2) \right]; \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{R}(l^+, K^+\pi^-)_+ &\propto |A_l|^2 |A_{K\pi}|^2 \left[2 - 3x^2 (1 - |\lambda_{K\pi}|^2) - 4x \text{Im} \lambda_{K\pi} \right], \\ \mathbf{R}(l^-, K^-\pi^+)_+ &\propto |A_l|^2 |A_{K\pi}|^2 \left[2 - 3x^2 (1 - |\tilde{\lambda}_{K\pi}|^2) - 4x \text{Im} \tilde{\lambda}_{K\pi} \right], \\ \mathbf{R}(l^-, K^+\pi^-)_+ &\propto |A_l|^2 |A_{K\pi}|^2 \left[2|\lambda_{K\pi}|^2 + 3x^2 (1 - |\lambda_{K\pi}|^2) + 4x \text{Im} \lambda_{K\pi} \right], \\ \mathbf{R}(l^+, K^-\pi^+)_+ &\propto |A_l|^2 |A_{K\pi}|^2 \left[2|\tilde{\lambda}_{K\pi}|^2 + 3x^2 (1 - |\tilde{\lambda}_{K\pi}|^2) + 4x \text{Im} \tilde{\lambda}_{K\pi} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Here the $x^2|\lambda_{K\pi}|^2$ and $x^2|\tilde{\lambda}_{K\pi}|^2$ terms are further negligible. These formulas can be compared with those given in eqs. (9) and (10).

In practical experiments, the combined decay rates

$$\Omega_C^{+-} \equiv \mathbf{R}(l^-, K^+\pi^-)_C + \mathbf{R}(l^+, K^-\pi^+)_C$$

should be observable. Similar to eq. (12), we find

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_-^{+-} &\propto 2|A_l|^2 |A_{K\pi}|^2 \left[2|\xi_{K\pi}|^2 + x^2 (1 - |\xi_{K\pi}|^2) \right] \\ \Omega_+^{+-} &\propto 2|A_l|^2 |A_{K\pi}|^2 \left[2|\xi_{K\pi}|^2 + 3x^2 (1 - |\xi_{K\pi}|^2) + 4x|\xi_{K\pi}| \sin \delta_{K\pi} \cos(2\phi_m) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Clearly the effects of $D^0 - \bar{D}^0$ mixing and DCSD cannot be distinguished from each other, if the sizes of $|x|$ and $|\xi_{K\pi}|$ are comparable. In the case of $|x| \ll |\xi_{K\pi}|$, the relation $\Omega_-^{+-} = \Omega_+^{+-} \propto |\xi_{K\pi}|^2$ holds, as expected in the standard model. Here the time-integrated CP asymmetries can be defined as

$$\mathcal{A}_C^{+-} \equiv \frac{\mathbf{R}(l^+, K^+\pi^-)_C - \mathbf{R}(l^-, K^-\pi^+)_C}{\mathbf{R}(l^+, K^+\pi^-)_C + \mathbf{R}(l^-, K^-\pi^+)_C}.$$

Explicitly, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_-^{+-} &\approx 0, \\ \mathcal{A}_+^{+-} &\approx 2x|\xi_{K\pi}| \cos \delta_{K\pi} \sin(2\phi_m). \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

This result is quite similar to that obtained for B_d^0 vs $\bar{B}_d^0 \rightarrow D^\pm \pi^\mp$ at the $\Upsilon(4S)$ [11].

Now we roughly estimate the magnitudes of Ω_-^{+-} , Ω_+^{+-} and \mathcal{A}_+^{+-} , to give one a feeling of ballpark numbers to be expected. Assuming the semileptonic decay mode serving for flavor tagging to be $D^0 \rightarrow K^- e^+ \nu_e$, we have its branching ratio $\text{Br}(D^0 \rightarrow K^- e^+ \nu_e) \approx 3.8\%$ [12]. In addition, the current data give $\text{Br}(D^0 \rightarrow K^-\pi^+) \approx 4.01\%$ [12]. Then $\mathbf{R}(l^+, K^+\pi^-)_\pm$ and $\mathbf{R}(l^-, K^-\pi^+)_\pm$ are at the level 10^{-3} or so, while Ω_\pm^{+-} may be of the order 10^{-5} if we input $x \sim 0.06$. Within the experimental capabilities of a τ -charm factory, it is possible to measure Ω_\pm^{+-} as well as $\Omega_\pm^{+-}(T)$ to an acceptable degree of accuracy with about 10^7 ($D^0 \bar{D}^0$)

events. Furthermore, the upper bound of the CP asymmetry $\mathcal{A}_+^{\pm-}$ can be obtained by use of the experimental results $|x| < 0.086$ and $|\xi_{K\pi}| \approx 0.088$ [12, 15]. Taking $\cos\delta_{K\pi} = 1$ and $\sin(2\phi_m) = \pm 1$, we get $|\mathcal{A}_+^{\pm-}| < 0.015$. Similar constraints on the time-dependent CP asymmetries in eq. (13) are then obtainable through the relations $\mathcal{A}_-^{\pm-}(T) = 0.5A_+^{\pm-}T$ and $\mathcal{A}_+^{\pm-}(T) = 0.5A_+^{\pm-}(1+T)$. In the assumption of perfect detectors or 100% tagging efficiencies, one needs about 10^8 ($D^0\bar{D}^0$) events to uncover $|\mathcal{A}_+^{\pm-}| \sim 0.01$ at the level of three standard deviations or to measure $|\mathcal{A}_+^{\pm-}| \sim 0.005$ at the level of one standard deviation. Accumulation of so many events is of course a serious challenge to all types of facilities for charm physics, but it should be achieved in the second-round experiments of a τ -charm factory.

5. Further discussions

Taking into account the $D^0 - \bar{D}^0$ mixing and DCSD effects, we have calculated the time-dependent and time-integrated decay rates for neutral D decays to $K^\pm\pi^\mp$ at a τ -charm factory. The similarities and differences between the decay modes from $(D^0\bar{D}^0)_{C=+}$ and $(D^0\bar{D}^0)_{C=-}$ events are illustrated. We have also taken a look at the CP asymmetry of D^0 vs $\bar{D}^0 \rightarrow K^\pm\pi^\mp$, which is induced by the interplay of $D^0 - \bar{D}^0$ mixing and DCSD. A similar discussion can be given for other neutral D decays to two-body non- CP eigenstates with DCSD effects included, such as $D^0 \rightarrow K^\pm\rho^\mp, K^{*\pm}\pi^\mp$ and their CP -conjugate processes. These channels may occur through the same weak interactions, but their final-state strong interactions should be different from one another (e.g., $\delta_{K\pi} \neq \delta_{K\rho}$). If the $SU(3)$ breaking effects in $D^0 \rightarrow (K^\pm, K^{*\pm}) + (\pi^\mp, \rho^\mp, a_1^\mp, \text{etc})$ are not so significant that all the strong phase shifts lie in the same quadrant as $\delta_{K\pi}$, then a sum over these modes is possible to increase the number of decay events in statistics, with few dilution effect on the signal of CP violation.

It has been pointed out that the coherent decays $(D^0\bar{D}^0)_C \rightarrow (K^\pm\pi^\mp)(K^\pm\pi^\mp)$ can be used to search for $D^0 - \bar{D}^0$ mixing and to separate it from the DCSD effect [1, 17]. The relevant measurables may be

$$r_C^{+-} \equiv \frac{\text{R}(K^+\pi^-, K^+\pi^-)_C}{\text{R}(K^-\pi^+, K^+\pi^-)_C} \quad \text{or} \quad r_C^{-+} \equiv \frac{\text{R}(K^-\pi^+, K^-\pi^+)_C}{\text{R}(K^-\pi^+, K^+\pi^-)_C}.$$

Since in previous calculations the effects of CP violation and nonvanishing $\delta_{K\pi}$ on $r_C^{\pm\mp}$ were neglected, it is worth having a recalculation of these observables without special approximations. Explicitly, we find ³:

$$r_-^{+-} \approx r_-^{-+} \approx \frac{1}{2}(x^2 + y^2), \quad (20)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} r_+^{+-} &\approx \frac{3}{2}(x^2 + y^2) + 4(|\lambda_{K\pi}|^2 + x\text{Im}\lambda_{K\pi} - y\text{Re}\lambda_{K\pi}), \\ r_+^{-+} &\approx \frac{3}{2}(x^2 + y^2) + 4(|\tilde{\lambda}_{K\pi}|^2 + x\text{Im}\tilde{\lambda}_{K\pi} - y\text{Re}\tilde{\lambda}_{K\pi}). \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

³Here it is not necessary to assume $|x| \gg |y|$, but $\text{Im}\phi_m = 0$ has been used.

One can see that $r_+^{+-} \neq r_+^{-+}$ in general, and their difference implies the presence of CP violation:

$$r_+^{-+} - r_+^{+-} \approx 8|\xi_{K\pi}| \sin(2\phi_m) (x \cos \delta_{K\pi} + y \sin \delta_{K\pi}) . \quad (22)$$

In the approximation of $y = 0$, we get $r_+^{-+} - r_+^{+-} \approx 4\mathcal{A}_+^{+-}$. Of course, this CP asymmetry is very interesting and should be searched for in experiments.

Certainly there are other possibilities to explore CP violation in neutral D decays [1, 2]. In particular, direct CP violation in the decay amplitude is expected to give rise to observable effects in some decay modes to CP eigenstates (e.g., D^0 vs $\bar{D}^0 \rightarrow K^+K^-, \pi^+\pi^-$ and $K_S\rho$) [3, 18]. Following the same approaches outlined in this work, a detailed analysis of the time-dependent and time-integrated decay rates for $(D^0\bar{D}^0)_C \rightarrow (K^+K^-)(l^\pm X^\mp)$ etc is worth while. In practical experiments, however, a symmetric τ -charm factory seems difficult to implement the time-dependent measurements. Hence one is invited to speculate an asymmetric machine and its physics potential [19].

Our conclusion is that coherent $(D^0\bar{D}^0)$ decays to $(K^\pm\pi^\mp)(l^\pm X^\mp)$ and $(K^\pm\pi^\mp)(K^\pm\pi^\mp)$ contain clear signals of $D^0 - \bar{D}^0$ mixing, DCSD and CP violation. They can be measured through either time-dependent or time-integrated way (or both) at a τ -charm factory running at the $\psi(3.77)$ or $\psi(4.14)$ resonance. It is also interesting to study a variety of decay modes similar to $D^0 \rightarrow K^\pm\pi^\mp$ at the same experimental scenario.

I would like to thank Harald Fritzsch for his warm hospitality and constant encouragement. This work was stimulated from useful discussions with Dongsheng Du, Daniel M. Kaplan and Tiehui (Ted) Liu. I am greatly indebted to Ted for his reading the manuscript and giving many constructive comments on it. Finally I acknowledge the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation of Germany for its financial support.

References

- [1] I.I. Bigi and A.I. Sanda, Phys. Lett. B171 (1986) 320; I.I. Bigi, in the Proceedings of the Tau-Charm Factory Workshop, SLAC, May 1989 (edited by L.V. Beers), p. 169; I.I. Bigi, F. Gabbiani, and A. Masiero, Z. Phys. C48 (1990) 633.
- [2] D. Du, Phys. Rev. D34 (1986) 3428.
- [3] F. Buccella et al., Phys. Lett. B302 (1993) 319; A.L. Yaouanc, L. Oliver, and J.C. Raynal, Phys. Lett. B292 (1992) 353. I.I. Bigi and H. Yamamoto, Phys. Lett. B349 (1995) 363.

- [4] Z.Z. Xing, Phys. Lett. B353 (1995) 313.
- [5] G. Blaylock, A. Seiden, and Y. Nir, Phys. Lett. B355 (1995) 555; T.E. Browder and S. Pakvasa, preprint UH 511-828-95 (1995).
- [6] D.M. Kaplan, in the Proceedings of the Charm 2000 Workshop, Fermilab, June 1994 (edited by D.M. Kaplan and S. Kwan), p. 35; preprint IIT-HEP-95/3 (presented at the Tau-Charm Factory Workshop, Argonne, June 1995).
- [7] J.R. Fry and T. Ruf, in the Proceedings of the Third Workshop on the Tau-Charm Factory, Marbella, June 1993 (edited by J. Kirkby), p. 387.
- [8] J.L. Hewett, in the Proceedings of the Tau-Charm Factory in the Era of *B*-Factories and CESR, SLAC, August 1994 (edited by L.V. Beers and M.L. Perl), p. 5.
- [9] T. Liu, in the Proceedings of the Charm 2000 Workshop, Fermilab, June 1994 (edited by D.M. Kaplan and S. Kwan); preprint Princeton/HEP/95-6 (presented at the Tau-Charm Factory Workshop, Argonne, June 1995).
- [10] Z.Z. Xing, Phys. Lett. B371 (1996) 310.
- [11] Z.Z. Xing, Phys. Rev. D53 (1996) 204; and references therein.
- [12] Particle Data Group, L. Montanet et al., Phys. Rev. D50 (1994) 1173.
- [13] Z.Z. Xing, "On Testing Unitarity of the Quark Mixing Matrix", preprint LMU-13/95 (to appear in the Proceedings of the Conference on Production and Decay of Hyperons, Charm and Beauty Hadrons, Strasbourg, September 1995).
- [14] L. Wolfenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. 75 (1995) 2460.
- [15] CLEO Collaboration, D. Cinabro et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 72 (1994) 406.
- [16] L.L. Chau and H.Y. Cheng, Phys. Lett. B333 (1994) 514; F. Buccella et al., Phys. Rev. D51 (1995) 3478; T. Kaeding, preprint LBL-37224 (to appear in Phys. Lett. B).
- [17] H. Yamamoto, Ph.D. Thesis, preprint CALT-68-1318 (1985).
- [18] CLEO Collaboration, J. Bartelt et al., Phys. Rev. D52 (1995) 4860.
- [19] T. Liu, private communications.





Figure 1: Illustrative plots of the time dependence of $\Omega_{-}^{+-}(T)$ and $\Omega_{+}^{+-}(T)$ (in common but arbitrary units), where $\delta_{K\pi} = 10^0$ and $\phi_m = 30^0$ are taken.




Figure 2: Illustrative plot of the time dependence of $\mathcal{A}_C^{+-}(T)$, where $x = 0.06$, $|\xi_{K\pi}| = 0.08$, $\delta_{K\pi} = 10^0$ and $\phi_m = 30^0$ are taken.