

CP Violating Phase Difference between $B \rightarrow J/\psi K_S$ and $J/\psi K_S \pi^0$ from New Physics

^{1,2}Xiao-Gang He and ²Wei-Shu Hou

¹ School of Physics, University of Melbourne, Parkville, Vic. 3052, Australia

²Department of Physics, National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan 10764, R.O.C.

Abstract

The small P wave component of $B \rightarrow J/\psi K^*$ measured by CLEO makes it practical to measure $\sin 2\beta$ using $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^{*0} \rightarrow J/\psi K_S \pi^0$, independent from $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K_S$. Because these modes are color suppressed, new physics enhanced color dipole bsg coupling, as hinted from the persistent $\mathcal{B}_{s.l.}$ and n_C problems as well as the newly observed large semi-inclusive $B \rightarrow \eta' + X_s$ decay, may have significant impact. We show that it may lead to a difference in the $\sin 2\beta$ measurements between $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K_S$ and $J/\psi K_S \pi^0$ measurable at the B Factories in the near future.

PACS numbers: 13.25.Hw, 11.30.Er, 12.60-i

The CLEO Collaboration has recently reported [1] the first full angular analysis of the color-suppressed decays $B \rightarrow J/\psi K^{*0}$ and $J/\psi K^{*+}$. They find that the P wave component is small, $|P|^2 = 0.16 \pm 0.04$, which means that $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^{*0} \rightarrow J/\psi K_S \pi^0$ decay is dominated by CP -even final states. The mode can therefore be used to measure the CP violating angle $\sin 2\beta$ without the complication of an angular analysis [2]. Compared to the gold-plated (CP -odd) $J/\psi K_S$ mode, one has a dilution factor $\sim 30\%$ but this is now already measured, hence both modes can be profitably studied as the B Factories turn on in 1999. An interesting question can now be raised: What if $\sin 2\beta_{J/\psi K_S} \neq \sin 2\beta_{J/\psi K_S \pi^0}$? Naively it is hard to conceive how $\sin 2\beta_{J/\psi K_S}$ and $\sin 2\beta_{J/\psi K_S \pi^0}$ could differ, since the decays are from the *tree level* CKM dominant $b \rightarrow c\bar{c}s$ process, while any change in CP violating phase due to new physics in $B^0-\bar{B}^0$ mixing is just a common factor. One needs new contribution to the decay amplitudes. In this paper we elucidate some new physics mechanisms whereby the $\sin 2\beta$ measurements could differ between $B \rightarrow J/\psi K_S$ and $B \rightarrow J/\psi K_S \pi^0$ decays, hence illustrating the importance of making and refining these separate measurements.

Let us first illustrate how $\sin 2\beta_{J/\psi K_S}$ and $\sin 2\beta_{J/\psi K_S \pi^0}$ could in principle differ. The mixing-dependent CP violation measurable is $\text{Im } \xi = \text{Im } \{(q/p)(A^* \bar{A}/|A|^2)\}$, where $q/p = e^{-2i\phi_B}$ is from $B^0-\bar{B}^0$ mixing, $A = |A|e^{i\phi_w}$ and $\bar{A} = |\bar{A}|e^{-i\phi_w}$ are decay amplitudes for B and $\bar{B}$ decays into the same CP eigenstates, respectively. For $B \rightarrow J/\psi K_S$, the final state is purely CP odd. Taking the weak phase of the decay amplitude to be ϕ_0 , one has

$$\text{Im } \xi(B \rightarrow J/\psi K_S) = -\sin 2\beta_{J/\psi K_S} = -\sin(2\phi_B + 2\phi_0). \quad (1)$$

For $B \rightarrow J/\psi K^{*0} \rightarrow J/\psi K_S \pi^0$, the final state is a mixture of CP odd and even states. Taking ϕ_w for these decay amplitudes to be ϕ_1 and $\tilde{\phi}_1$, respectively, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Im } \xi(B \rightarrow J/\psi K_S \pi^0) &= \text{Im } \{e^{-2i\phi_B} [e^{-2i\phi_1} |P|^2 - e^{-2i\tilde{\phi}_1} (1 - |P|^2)]\} \\ &\equiv (1 - 2|P|^2) \sin 2\beta_{J/\psi K_S \pi^0}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $|P|^2$ is the CP odd fraction. We have defined $\sin 2\beta_{J/\psi K_S \pi^0}$ in such a way that in the Standard Model (SM) it is equal to $\sin 2\beta$, that is

$$\sin 2\beta_{J/\psi K_S} = \sin 2\beta_{J/\psi K_S \pi^0} = \sin 2\beta, \quad (\text{Standard Model}) \quad (3)$$

since one has $\phi_0 = \phi_1 = \tilde{\phi}_1$ and $\phi_B + \phi_0 = \beta$. In the Wolfenstein parametrization, which we adopt, one has $\phi_0 = 0$ and $\phi_B = \beta$. Clearly, both measurements provide true information about $\sin 2\beta$ within SM. However, this is no longer true if one goes beyond SM. The two phases ϕ_1 and $\tilde{\phi}_1$ may differ, and they may also be different from ϕ_0 . If such is the case, then $\sin 2\beta_{J/\psi K_S} \neq \sin 2\beta_{J/\psi K_S \pi^0}$ follows.

There are many ways where new physics may change the phases $\phi_{0,1}$ and $\tilde{\phi}_1$. To lowest order they are through dimension 6 four quark operators, or else the dimension 5 color dipole operator $\bar{s}i\sigma_{\mu\nu}G^{\mu\nu}(1 \pm \gamma_5)b$, where $G^{\mu\nu}$ is the gluon field strength. New physics contributions of the form $\bar{c}\gamma^\mu(1 \pm \gamma_5)c\bar{s}\gamma_\mu(1 - \gamma_5)b$ may generate a common phase shift for $\phi_{0,1}$ and $\tilde{\phi}_1$, whereas operators of the form $\bar{c}\gamma^\mu(1 \pm \gamma_5)c\bar{s}\gamma_\mu(1 + \gamma_5)b$ may shift ϕ_0 and ϕ_1 by a common factor and $\tilde{\phi}_1$ by the same amount but with opposite sign. Our primary example, however, would be the dimension 5 color dipole operator, since there are experimental hints that it may be large in Nature.

We parametrize the color dipole interaction as

$$\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}}V_{tb}V_{ts}^*\frac{g_s}{16\pi^2}F_2m_b\bar{s}\sigma_{\mu\nu}G^{\mu\nu}(1 + \gamma_5)b. \quad (4)$$

In SM $F_2 \simeq 0.286$ is small, and the process $b \rightarrow sg$ (where g is “on-shell”, or jet-like) is only of order 0.2%, and is very hard to measure experimentally. However, the persistent low semileptonic B branching ratio ($\mathcal{B}_{s,l.}$) and charm counting (n_C) problems suggest that $b \rightarrow sg$ decay could be enhanced to the 10% level [3,4], which implies $|F_2| \sim 2$. A bound on $b \rightarrow sg$ from the recent $B \rightarrow D\bar{D}K + X$ study [5] does not yet rule this out, while the discovery of a surprisingly large semi-inclusive $B \rightarrow \eta' + X_s$ decay [6] may call for an interplay of [7] the SM bsg charge radius coupling $|F_1^{\text{SM}}| \sim 5$ and the new physics dipole coupling $|F_2| \sim 2$. Furthermore, this new physics enhanced dipole coupling brings in naturally a CKM-independent CP violating phase, and could lead to rate asymmetries at the 10% level [7] in the m_{X_s} recoil mass spectrum of the $B \rightarrow \eta' + X_s$ mode.

Still, how can $\phi_{0,1}$ and $\tilde{\phi}_1$ be significantly changed by the color dipole interaction? Note that $B \rightarrow J/\psi K_S(K^*)$ decays are color suppressed. Assuming factorization, the decay rate is proportional to $|c_1 + c_2/N|^2$, which suffer from accidental cancellation for $N = 3$. A phenomenological fit suggests $N_{\text{eff}} \simeq 2$ [8,9], or, alternatively, if one takes $N = 3$ from QCD, then there must be sizable color-octet and other nonfactorizable contributions. The former amplitude is found to be $\sim 1/N$, similar to the color-singlet term, while the other nonfactorizable contributions are $\sim 1/N^2$ [9] in the large N expansion. Thus, the weak phases $\phi_{0,1}$ and $\tilde{\phi}_1$ should be sensitive to color octet operators such as the color dipole.

Even for $b \rightarrow sg \sim 10\%$, by itself its contribution to $B \rightarrow J/\psi K^*$ is only a small fraction of the measured $\sim 10^{-3}$ rate. However, the shift in 2β for $J/\psi K_S \pi^0$ mode could be at $-0.15 \sin \phi$ level, where ϕ is the new CP violating phase. In contrast, because of the dipole nature of the F_2 coupling, the corresponding shift in the $B \rightarrow J/\psi K_S$ mode is suppressed by a factor m_ψ^2/m_B^2 . The phase difference is clearly measurable in the near future.

We now turn to some details. In the factorization approximation but including color octet contributions, the leading order decay amplitudes for $B \rightarrow J/\psi K_S(K^*)$ can be written as

$$A(B \rightarrow J/\psi K_S(K^*)) = i \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cb} V_{cs}^* f_\psi m_\psi \varepsilon_\psi^\mu \left\{ (B_1 + 2B_8 r_8) \langle K_S(K^*) | \bar{s} \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) b | B \rangle \right. \\ \left. + \frac{\alpha_s}{2\pi} \frac{m_b}{q^2} r'_8 \langle K_S(K^*) | \bar{s} i \sigma_{\mu\nu} q^\nu (c_8(1 + \gamma_5) + \tilde{c}_8(1 - \gamma_5)) b | B \rangle \right\}, \quad (5)$$

where we have adopted $c_8 = -F_2$ in the operator language, and

$$B_1 = c_1 + \frac{c_2}{N} - \sum_{i=u,c,t} \frac{V_{ib} V_{is}^*}{V_{cb} V_{cs}^*} \left(c_3^i + \frac{c_4^i}{N} + c_5^i + \frac{c_6^i}{N} \right), \\ B_8 = c_2 - \sum_{i=u,c,t} \frac{V_{ib} V_{is}^*}{V_{cb} V_{cs}^*} (c_4^i + c_6^i), \quad (6)$$

where the Wilson coefficients c_j^i for tree and strong penguin operators evaluated in Ref. [10] will be used. The index i indicates the quark in the penguin loop. The electroweak penguin contributions have been neglected. The decay constant f_ψ is defined by $\langle J/\psi | \bar{c} \gamma^\mu c | 0 \rangle = i f_\psi m_\psi \varepsilon_\psi^\mu$, and is determined from leptonic decays of J/ψ to be $f_\psi \simeq 410$ MeV. The parameters r_8 and r'_8 are ratios of color octet and singlet matrix elements

$$\begin{aligned}
r_8 &= \frac{\langle J/\psi K_S(K^*) | [\bar{c}\gamma_\mu T^a c] [\bar{s}\gamma^\mu (1 - \gamma_5) T^a b] | B \rangle}{\langle J/\psi | \bar{c}\gamma^\mu c | 0 \rangle \langle K_S(K^*) | \bar{s}\gamma^\mu (1 - \gamma_5) b | B \rangle}, \\
r'_8 &= \frac{\langle J/\psi K_S(K^*) | [\bar{c}\gamma^\mu T^a c] [\bar{s}i\sigma_{\mu\nu} q^\nu (1 \pm \gamma_5) T^a b] | B \rangle}{\langle J/\psi | \bar{c}\gamma^\mu c | 0 \rangle \langle K_S(K^*) | \bar{s}i\sigma_{\mu\nu} q^\nu (1 \pm \gamma_5) b | B \rangle}.
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

These two parameters can in principle be different, but at the moment it is not possible to calculate them from first principles. We will determine r_8 by fitting experimental data, and take $r'_8 = r_8$ to be equal. This will give an indication of the size of the effect. We also include a possible color dipole $(1 - \gamma_5)$ term with strength $\tilde{c}_8$ for completeness.

Following the notation of Ref. [11], we parametrize

$$\langle \bar{K}^0 | \bar{s}\gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) b | B \rangle = F_1(q^2) (p_\mu^B + p_\mu^K) + \frac{m_B^2 - m_K^2}{q^2} (F_0(q^2) - F_1(q^2)) q_\mu, \tag{8}$$

where we take $F_1(0) = F_0(0) = 0.379$. For the q^2 dependence of these form factors, we assume the pole form $F_i(q^2) = F_i(0)/(1 - q^2/m_i^2)^n$, with $m_0 = 5.98$ GeV and $m_1 = 5.43$ GeV. Heavy quark effective theory suggests that at maximum recoil, $F_1(q_{\text{max}}^2)/F_0(q_{\text{max}}^2)$ scales as m_b [12], which implies that if the pole power for $F_1(q^2)$ is n , then $F_0(q^2)$ is $n - 1$. We take dipole behavior for F_1 and monopole for F_0 .

At maximum recoil $\langle \bar{K}^0 | \bar{s}i\sigma_{\mu\nu} q^\nu (1 \pm \gamma_5) b | B \rangle$ can be related to the form factors defined in Eq. (8) by heavy quark effective theory [12]. With $m_b \simeq m_B$, $p_b \simeq p_B$ and extrapolating to $q^2 \simeq m_{J/\psi}^2$, we find

$$\varepsilon_\psi^\mu \langle \bar{K}^0 | \bar{s}i\sigma_{\mu\nu} q^\nu (1 \pm \gamma_5) b | B \rangle \simeq 2\varepsilon_\psi \cdot p_B m_B F_1(q^2) s(q^2), \tag{9}$$

where $s(q^2) = [(F_0(q^2)/F_1(q^2) - 1)(1 - m_K^2/m_B^2) - q^2/m_B^2]/2 \approx -m_\psi^2/m_B^2$ is a suppression factor due to the helicity structure of $\sigma_{\mu\nu}$ at the quark level. Note that in the photon case one has $q^2 = 0$ and this factor vanishes, as it should. The full decay amplitude is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
A(B \rightarrow J/\psi K_S) &\simeq iG_F V_{cb} V_{cs}^* f_\psi m_\psi F_1(m_\psi^2) \varepsilon_\psi \cdot p_B \\
&\times \left\{ [B_1 + 2B_8 r_8] + \frac{\alpha_s}{2\pi} \frac{m_B^2}{m_\psi^2} [c_8 + \tilde{c}_8] r_8 s(m_\psi^2) \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

To fit experimental data, one needs $1/N_{eff} = 1/N + 2r_8 \approx 1/2$ [8,9], giving $r_8 \approx 1/12$.

For $B \rightarrow J/\psi K^*$, we continue to use the form factor parametrization of [11],

$$\begin{aligned}\langle K^* | \bar{s} \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) b | B \rangle &= \frac{2V(q^2)}{m_B + m_{K^*}} \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \varepsilon_{K^*}^\nu q^\alpha p_{K^*}^\beta + i \frac{A_2(q^2)}{m_B + m_{K^*}} \varepsilon_{K^*} \cdot q (p_B^\mu + p_{K^*}^\mu) \\ &\quad - i(m_B + m_{K^*}) A_1(q^2) \varepsilon_{K^*}^\mu + 2im_{K^*} \frac{A_3(q^2) - A_0(q^2)}{q^2} \varepsilon_{K^*} \cdot q q_\mu, \quad (11)\end{aligned}$$

where $2m_{K^*}A_3(q^2) = (m_B + m_{K^*})A_1(q^2) - (m_B - m_{K^*})A_2(q^2)$, and $V(0)$, $A_1(0)$, $A_2(0) = 0.369$, 0.328 , 0.331 with pole masses 5.43 , 5.98 and 5.82 GeV, respectively, while $A_0(0) = A_3(0)$ with pole mass 5.38 GeV. We assume dipole behavior for $V(q^2)$, $A_2(q^2)$ and monopole for $A_1(q^2)$, $A_0(q^2)$. For $\langle K^* | \bar{s} i \sigma_{\mu\nu} b | B \rangle$, we parametrize

$$\begin{aligned}\langle K^* | \bar{s} i \sigma_{\mu\nu} b | B \rangle &= \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \left(g_+(q^2) \varepsilon_{K^*}^\alpha (p_B + p_{K^*})^\beta + g_-(q^2) \varepsilon_{K^*}^\alpha (p_B - p_{K^*})^\beta \right. \\ &\quad \left. + h(q^2) (p_B + p_{K^*})^\alpha (p_B - p_{K^*})^\beta \varepsilon_{K^*} \cdot p_B \right). \quad (12)\end{aligned}$$

The matrix element $\langle K^* | \bar{s} i \sigma_{\mu\nu} \gamma_5 b | B \rangle$ is related to the above by the identity $i\sigma^{\mu\nu} = (1/2)\epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}\sigma_{\alpha\beta}\gamma_5$ where $\epsilon^{0123} = 1$. Using heavy quark effective theory at maximum recoil and extrapolating down to the desired q^2 , we have

$$\begin{aligned}g_+(q^2) &= \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{m_B + m_{K^*}}{m_B} A_1(q^2) + \frac{m_B^2 - m_{K^*}^2 + q^2}{m_B(m_B + m_{K^*})} V(q^2) \right], \\ g_-(q^2) &= \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{m_B + m_{K^*}}{m_B} A_1(q^2) - \frac{3m_B^2 + m_{K^*}^2 - q^2}{m_B(m_B + m_{K^*})} V(q^2) \right], \\ h(q^2) &= \left[\frac{V(q^2)}{m_B(m_B + m_{K^*})} - \frac{A_2(q^2)}{2m_B(m_B + m_{K^*})} - \frac{m_{K^*}A_0(q^2)}{m_B q^2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2m_B q^2} \left((m_B + m_{K^*})A_1(q^2) - (m_B - m_{K^*})A_2(q^2) \right) \right]. \quad (13)\end{aligned}$$

The full decay amplitude is given by

$$\begin{aligned}A(B \rightarrow J/\psi K^*) &= i\sqrt{2}G_F V_{cb} V_{cs}^* f_\psi m_\psi \left\{ [B_1 + 2B_8 r_8] \left(\frac{V(m_\psi^2)}{m_B + m_{K^*}} \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \varepsilon_\psi^\mu \varepsilon_{K^*}^\nu p_B^\alpha p_{K^*}^\beta \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{i}{2} (m_B + m_{K^*}) A_1(m_\psi^2) \varepsilon_\psi \cdot \varepsilon_{K^*} + i \frac{A_2(m_\psi^2)}{m_B + m_{K^*}} \varepsilon_\psi \cdot p_B \varepsilon_{K^*} \cdot p_B \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{\alpha_s}{2\pi} \frac{m_B}{m_\psi^2} [c_8 + \tilde{c}_8] r_8 g_+(m_\psi^2) \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \varepsilon_\psi^\mu \varepsilon_{K^*}^\nu p_B^\alpha p_{K^*}^\beta \\ &\quad + i \frac{\alpha_s}{2\pi} \frac{m_B}{m_\psi^2} [c_8 - \tilde{c}_8] r_8 \left(\frac{1}{2} \left(g_+(m_\psi^2) (m_B^2 - m_{K^*}^2) + g_-(m_\psi^2) m_\psi^2 \right) \varepsilon_\psi \cdot \varepsilon_{K^*} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - \left(g_+(m_\psi^2) - h(m_\psi^2) m_\psi^2 \right) \varepsilon_\psi \cdot p_B \varepsilon_{K^*} \cdot p_B \right) \right\}. \quad (14)\end{aligned}$$

Unlike the $s(m_\psi^2)$ factor in Eq. (10), the form factors $g_+(m_\psi^2)$ and $h(m_\psi^2)m_\psi^2$ in Eq. (14) are not suppressed by m_ψ^2/m_B^2 . Thus, the color dipole contribution to $B \rightarrow J/\psi K_S$ is suppressed by a factor of m_ψ^2/m_B^2 compared to $B \rightarrow J/\psi K^*$. This suppression factor can be traced to the helicity structure of the $\sigma_{\mu\nu}$ interaction at the quark level. Although we have worked with color singlet operators, we note that QCD is helicity conserving. Soft gluon emissions would not change the helicity structure, and hence the color octet dipole contribution to $B \rightarrow J/\psi K_S$ should still be suppressed compared to $B \rightarrow J/\psi K^*$. If the color dipole operator coefficients c_8 or $\tilde{c}_8$ contain CP violating phases, the measurements of $\sin 2\beta_{J/\psi K_S}$ and $\sin 2\beta_{J/\psi K_S \pi^0}$ could differ.

The source of CP violation must come from physics beyond SM. We consider one possibility here. It has been shown that in supersymmetric models, it is possible to have large c_8 in the desired range ($|c_8| \approx 2$) necessary for solving the n_c and $\mathcal{B}_{s,L}$ problems, from exchange of gluino and squarks in the loop [4,13]. The SUSY contribution to c_8 is given by

$$c_8 = \frac{\sqrt{2}\pi\alpha_s}{V_{tb}V_{ts}^*G_F} \left\{ (U_{LL}^\dagger \tilde{M}_L^2 U_{LL})_{sb} \frac{g_3(m_g^2/\tilde{m}_L^2)}{\tilde{m}_L^4} + (U_{RL}^\dagger \tilde{M}_R^2 U_{RL})_{sb} \frac{g_3(m_g^2/\tilde{m}_R^2)}{\tilde{m}_R^4} \right. \\ \left. + (U_{RL}^\dagger \tilde{M}_R^2 U_{RR})_{sb} \frac{g_4(m_g^2/\tilde{m}_R^2)}{m_b \tilde{m}_R^3} + (U_{LL}^\dagger \tilde{M}_L^2 U_{LR})_{sb} \frac{g_4(m_g^2/\tilde{m}_L^2)}{m_b \tilde{m}_L^3} \right\}, \quad (15)$$

where m_g^2 is the gluino mass, $\tilde{M}_{L,R}^2$ are the diagonal down squark mass matrices, and we have used the average squark masses $\tilde{m}_{L,R}^2$ in the functions $g_{3,4}$, which are given in Ref. [13]. The U matrices transform weak basis $(\tilde{D}_R^0, \tilde{D}_L^0)$ to mass basis $(\tilde{D}_R, \tilde{D}_L)$ squarks,

$$\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{D}_R \\ \tilde{D}_L \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} U_{RR} & U_{RL} \\ U_{LR} & U_{LL} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{D}_R^0 \\ \tilde{D}_L^0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (16)$$

One obtains $\tilde{c}_8$ by exchanging L and R in Eq. (15). There will also be corrections to F_1 (or c_{3-6}), but these are subleading compared to the large log already contained in the SM contribution, since SUSY corrections are from heavy internal particles with masses at same order of magnitude [14]. In any case, inclusion of F_1 corrections will not change our conclusion, and in principle one can find some parameter space in which the corrections are much smaller than the SM one.

It is evident that c_8 of Eq. (15) contains in general many phases. For illustration let us consider the special case where only the second and third generation squarks mix and there are no mixings between $\tilde{D}_R$ and $\tilde{D}_L$. Then

$$c_8(\tilde{c}_8) = \frac{\sqrt{2}\pi\alpha_s}{V_{tb}V_{ts}^*G_F}\tilde{m}_{23}^2e^{i\phi}g_3(m_g^2/\tilde{m}_{L(R)}^2). \quad (17)$$

where $\tilde{m}_{23}^2e^{-i\phi}$ is the 2-3 entry in the squark mass matrices. This scenario is least constrained by experiment. In particular, the phase ϕ is not constrained by low energy phenomena involving the first generation, and the $B^0 - \bar{B}^0$ mixing phase ϕ_B is also unaffected. In the following we use this model to illustrate the shift in $\sin 2\beta$.

As has been discussed earlier, the unique feature of color dipole coupling is that its effect on $B \rightarrow J/\psi K_S$ is small, whereas the impact on $B \rightarrow J/\psi K^*$ is enhanced by $m_B^2/m_\psi^2 \approx 3$. The numerical value depends on $\alpha_s(m_b)$, which we will vary from 0.2 to 0.25. For $|c_8| = 2$ and $\tilde{c}_8 = 0$, we find that the color dipole contribution to the decay amplitude can be as large as 8%. If $\phi \neq 0$, it would generate phases for the CP even and odd amplitudes

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_0 &\approx (0.02 - 0.03) \sin \phi, \\ \tilde{\phi}_1 &\approx \phi_1 \approx (0.06 - 0.08) \sin \phi, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

becoming larger as α_s increases. One would measure $\sin 2\beta_{J/\psi K_S \pi^0} \approx \sin(2\beta + 0.12 \sin \phi)$ and $\sin(2\beta + 0.16 \sin \phi)$ for $\alpha_s(m_b)$ equal to 0.20 and 0.25 respectively. Taking the present best fit value of 0.68 for $\sin 2\beta$ [15], the enhanced color dipole interaction could shift $\sin 2\beta_{J/\psi K_S \pi^0}$ by as much as 17%. The shift in $\sin 2\beta_{J/\psi K_S}$ is three times smaller. Deviations between $\sin 2\beta_{J/\psi K_S}$ and $\sin 2\beta_{J/\psi K_S \pi^0}$ as large as discussed here will be probed soon at asymmetric B factories, and in the future at the LHC, where $\sin 2\beta_{J/\psi K_S(\pi^0)}$ can be measured to 1% accuracy. We note that, if $b \rightarrow sg \sim 10\%$ (hence $|c_8| \approx 2$) sounds extreme, $b \rightarrow sg$ at 3% and 1% level cannot be easily ruled out by experimental methods given in Ref. [5]. Although one would then be decoupled from the n_c and $\mathcal{B}_{s.l.}$ problems, the difference in $\sin 2\beta_{J/\psi K_S}$ and $\sin 2\beta_{J/\psi K_S \pi^0}$ would still be at $\sim 60\%$ and 30% of those discussed here, and still measurable.

If it turns out that c_8 is small but $|\tilde{c}_8| \sim 2$, $\phi_{0,1}$ remains the same, but $\tilde{\phi}_1$ changes sign. We now have $\sin 2\beta_{J/\psi K_S \pi^0} \approx \sin(2\beta - 2\tilde{\phi}_1/(1 - 2|P|^2))$ and the shift is larger by a factor

of $1/(1 - 2|P|^2)$ compared with the previous case. The relative sign of ϕ_1 and $\tilde{\phi}_1$ can be probed by performing an angular analysis [2].

The effects discussed here is really some form of “penguin pollution” due to new physics. As such, the estimates are not fully precise. We have relied on the color octet mechanism to estimate the color dipole contribution. This point needs further clarification. However, we find support from inclusive $B \rightarrow J/\psi X_s$ using the formalism of Ref. [16]. The tree level color octet contribution improves agreement with inclusive rate for $N = 3$. Through interference, the color dipole operator contributes about 20% to the decay rate, which is consistent with the level found in exclusive decays. Hence, we feel that the numerical values obtained here are of the right order of magnitude.

The difference between $\sin 2\beta_{J/\psi K_S}$ and $\sin 2\beta_{J/\psi K_S \pi^0}$ is sensitive also to other forms of new physics. Let us give an example of possible contributions from dimension 6 operators. In R-parity violating supersymmetric models, exchange of charged sleptons and down type squarks can generate currents involving the right handed quark b_R with a new CP violating phase ϕ_R , and therefore phase shifts of the type $\delta\phi_0 = \delta\phi_1 = -\delta\tilde{\phi}$ as mentioned earlier. The couplings involved are constrained by $b \rightarrow s\gamma$, but contributions at 10% level to the amplitude is still allowed [17]. The difference between $\sin 2\beta_{J/\psi K_S}$ and $\sin 2\beta_{J/\psi K_S \pi^0}$ can be of order $0.1 \sin \phi_R \cos \phi_B$, where we have used ϕ_B instead of β because new physics may also contribute to ϕ_B , which is in general different from β . The effect is again measurable.

Before closing we would like to point out that the color dipole effect on CP violation can be further studied in $B \rightarrow \phi K_S$ decay, where $\text{Im} \xi(B \rightarrow \phi K_S)$ is also a measure of $\sin 2\beta$ in SM. At leading order this is a pure penguin process and already at loop level, hence the enhanced color dipole interaction will have larger effect than in $B \rightarrow J/\psi K^*$. The shift in $\sin 2\beta_{\phi K_S}$ will be much larger than the case for $B \rightarrow J/\psi K_S \pi^0$. A large color dipole interaction can also induce large rate asymmetries in penguin dominated B decays such as $B^- \rightarrow \phi K^-$ and $K^- \pi^0$ as well as $B^0 \rightarrow K^+ \pi^-$. These modes are self-tagging hence easier to measure. Details will be discussed elsewhere.

In conclusion, we have demonstrated that physics beyond the Standard Model can change the prediction for $\sin 2\beta_{J/\psi K_S}$ and $\sin 2\beta_{J/\psi K_S \pi^0}$. The shift due to large color dipole interaction is small for $\sin 2\beta_{J/\psi K_S}$, but can be as large as 17% for $\sin 2\beta_{J/\psi K_S \pi^0}$. This will be tested at B factories. The shift can be much larger for $\sin 2\beta_{\phi K_S}$.

This work is supported in part by grant NSC 87-2112-M-002-037 and NSC 87-2811-M-002-046 of the Republic of China and by Australian Research Council.

REFERENCES

- [1] C.P. Jessop et al. (CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 4533 (1997).
- [2] I. Dunietz et al., Phys. Rev. D**43**, 2193 (1991); A.S. Dighe et al., Phys. Lett. B**369**, 144 (1996).
- [3] B.G. Grzadkowski and W.S. Hou, Phys. Lett. B**272**, 383 (1991).
- [4] A.L. Kagan, Phys. Rev. D**51**, 6196 (1995).
- [5] T. Coan et al. (CLEO Collaboration), preprint CLNS 97/1516.
- [6] T. Browder et al. (CLEO Collaboration), preprint CLNS 98/1544.
- [7] W.S. Hou and B. Tseng, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 434 (1998).
- [8] H.Y. Cheng and B. Tseng, Phys. Rev. D**51**, 6259 (1995).
- [9] M. Neubert and B. Stech, hep-ph/9705292.
- [10] N.G. Deshpande and X.G. He, Phys. Lett. B**336**, 471 (1994).
- [11] M. Bauer, B. Stech and M. Wirbel, Z. Phys. C**34**, 103 (1987).
- [12] N. Isgur and M. Wise, Phys. Rev. D**42**, 2388 (1990).
- [13] M. Ciuchini, E. Gabrielli and G. Giudice, Phys. Lett. B**388**, 353 (1996).
- [14] S. Abel, N. Cottingham and I. Whittingham, hep-ph/9803401.
- [15] F. Parodi, P. Roudeau and A. Stocchi, hep-ph/9802289.
- [16] P. Ko, J. Lee and H.S. Song, Phys. Rev. D**53**, 1409 (1996); X.G. He and A. Soni, Phys. Lett. B**391**, 456 (1997).
- [17] Y. Grossman and M. Worah, Phys. Lett. B**395**, 241 (1997).