

# CP Violation and New Physics in $B_s$ Decays

Robert Fleischer

*Theory Division, CERN, CH-1211 Geneva 23, Switzerland*

## Abstract

The  $B_s$ -meson system is a key element in the  $B$ -physics programme of hadron colliders, offering various avenues to explore CP violation and to search for new physics. One of the most prominent decays is  $B_s \rightarrow J/\psi\phi$ , the counterpart of  $B_d \rightarrow J/\psi K_S$ , providing a powerful tool to search for new-physics contributions to  $B_s^0-\bar{B}_s^0$  mixing. Another benchmark mode is  $B_s \rightarrow K^+K^-$ , which complements  $B_d \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ , thereby allowing an extraction of the angle  $\gamma$  of the unitarity triangle that is sensitive to new-physics effects in the QCD penguin sector. Finally, we discuss new methods to constrain and determine  $\gamma$  with the help of  $B_s \rightarrow D_s^{(*)\pm}K^\mp$  decays, which complement  $B_d \rightarrow D^{(*)\pm}\pi^\mp$  modes. Since these strategies involve “tree” decays, the values of  $\gamma$  thus extracted exhibit a small sensitivity on new physics.

*Invited talk at FPCP 2003 – Flavour Physics & CP Violation  
Ecole Polytechnique, Paris, France, 3–6 June 2003  
To appear in the Proceedings*



# CP Violation and New Physics in $B_s$ Decays

*Robert Fleischer*

Theory Division, CERN  
CH-1211 Geneva 23, Switzerland

The  $B_s$ -meson system is a key element in the  $B$ -physics programme of hadron colliders, offering various avenues to explore CP violation and to search for new physics. One of the most prominent decays is  $B_s \rightarrow J/\psi\phi$ , the counterpart of  $B_d \rightarrow J/\psi K_S$ , providing a powerful tool to search for new-physics contributions to  $B_s^0\text{--}\overline{B}_s^0$  mixing. Another benchmark mode is  $B_s \rightarrow K^+K^-$ , which complements  $B_d \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ , thereby allowing an extraction of the angle  $\gamma$  of the unitarity triangle that is sensitive to new-physics effects in the QCD penguin sector. Finally, we discuss new methods to constrain and determine  $\gamma$  with the help of  $B_s \rightarrow D_s^{(*)\pm}K^\mp$  decays, which complement  $B_d \rightarrow D^{(*)\pm}\pi^\mp$  modes. Since these strategies involve “tree” decays, the values of  $\gamma$  thus extracted exhibit a small sensitivity on new physics.

## 1 Setting the Stage

At the  $e^+e^-$   $B$  factories operating at the  $\Upsilon(4S)$  resonance,  $B_s$  mesons are not accessible, i.e. their decays cannot be explored by the BaBar, Belle and CLEO collaborations. On the other hand, plenty of  $B_s$  mesons will be produced at hadron colliders. Consequently, these particles are the “El Dorado” for  $B$ -decay studies at run II of the Tevatron [1], and later on at the LHC [2]. A detailed overview of the physics potential of  $B_s$  mesons can be found in [3].

An important aspect of  $B_s$  physics is the mass difference  $\Delta M_s$ , which can be complemented with  $\Delta M_d$  to determine the side  $R_t \propto |V_{td}/V_{cb}|$  of the unitarity triangle (UT). To this end, we use that  $|V_{cb}| = |V_{ts}|$  to a good accuracy in the Standard Model (SM), and require an  $SU(3)$ -breaking parameter, which can be determined, e.g. on the lattice. At the moment, only experimental lower bounds on  $\Delta M_s$  are available, which can be converted into upper bounds on  $R_t$ , implying  $\gamma \lesssim 90^\circ$  [4]. Once  $\Delta M_s$  is measured, more stringent constraints on  $\gamma$  will emerge.

Another interesting quantity is the width difference  $\Delta\Gamma_s$ . While  $\Delta\Gamma_d/\Gamma_d$  is negligibly small, where  $\Gamma_d$  is the average decay width of the  $B_d$  mass eigenstates,  $\Delta\Gamma_s/\Gamma_s$  may well be as large as  $\mathcal{O}(10\%)$  [5], thereby allowing interesting studies with “untagged”  $B_s$  decay rates of the kind

$$\langle \Gamma(B_s(t) \rightarrow f) \rangle \equiv \Gamma(B_s^0(t) \rightarrow f) + \Gamma(\overline{B}_s^0(t) \rightarrow f), \quad (1)$$

where we do not distinguish between initially present  $B_s^0$  or  $\overline{B}_s^0$  mesons [6].

The focus of the following discussion will be CP violation. If we consider the decay of a neutral  $B_q$  meson ( $q \in \{d, s\}$ ) into a final state  $|f\rangle$ , which is an eigenstate of the CP operator satisfying  $(\mathcal{CP})|f\rangle = \pm|f\rangle$ , we obtain the following time-dependent CP asymmetry [3]:

$$\frac{\Gamma(B_q^0(t) \rightarrow f) - \Gamma(\overline{B}_q^0(t) \rightarrow f)}{\Gamma(B_q^0(t) \rightarrow f) + \Gamma(\overline{B}_q^0(t) \rightarrow f)} = \left[ \frac{\mathcal{A}_{\text{CP}}^{\text{dir}} \cos(\Delta M_q t) + \mathcal{A}_{\text{CP}}^{\text{mix}} \sin(\Delta M_q t)}{\cosh(\Delta\Gamma_q t/2) - \mathcal{A}_{\Delta\Gamma} \sinh(\Delta\Gamma_q t/2)} \right], \quad (2)$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{CP}}^{\text{dir}} \equiv \frac{1 - |\xi_f^{(q)}|^2}{1 + |\xi_f^{(q)}|^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{A}_{\text{CP}}^{\text{mix}} \equiv \frac{2 \text{Im} \xi_f^{(q)}}{1 + |\xi_f^{(q)}|^2}, \quad (3)$$

with

$$\xi_f^{(q)} = -e^{-i\phi_q} \left[ \frac{A(\overline{B}_q^0 \rightarrow f)}{A(B_q^0 \rightarrow f)} \right], \quad (4)$$

describe the “direct” and “mixing-induced” CP-violating observables, respectively. In the SM, the CP-violating weak  $B_q^0\text{-}\overline{B}_q^0$  mixing phase  $\phi_q$  is associated with the well-known box diagrams, and is given by

$$\phi_q = 2 \arg(V_{tq}^* V_{tb}) = \begin{cases} +2\beta & (q = d) \\ -2\lambda^2 \eta & (q = s), \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

where  $\beta$  is the usual angle of the UT. Looking at (2), we observe that  $\Delta\Gamma_q$  provides another observable  $\mathcal{A}_{\Delta\Gamma}$ , which is, however, not independent from those in (3).

The preferred mechanism for new physics (NP) to manifest itself in (2) is through contributions to  $B_q^0\text{-}\overline{B}_q^0$  mixing, which is a CKM-suppressed, loop-induced, fourth-order weak-interaction process within the SM. Simple dimensional arguments suggest that NP in the TeV regime may well affect the  $\Delta M_q$ , as well as the  $\phi_q$ . If NP enters differently in  $\Delta M_d$  and  $\Delta M_s$ , the determination of  $R_t$  from  $\Delta M_d/\Delta M_s$  would be affected. On the other hand, NP contributions to  $\phi_q$  would affect the mixing-induced CP asymmetries  $\mathcal{A}_{\text{CP}}^{\text{mix}}$ . Scenarios of this kind were considered in several papers; for a selection, see [7]–[11]. Thanks to the “golden” mode  $B_d \rightarrow J/\psi K_S$ , direct measurements of  $\sin \phi_d$  are already available. The current world average is given by  $\sin \phi_d \sim 0.734$ , which is in accordance with the indirect range following from the “CKM fits” [4]. Despite this remarkable feature, NP may still hide in the experimental value for  $\sin \phi_d$ , since it implies  $\phi_d \sim 47^\circ \vee 133^\circ$ , where the former solution would be consistent with the SM, while the second would require NP contributions to  $B_d^0\text{-}\overline{B}_d^0$  mixing. In order to explore these two solutions further, we may complement them with CP violation in  $B_d \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$  [12]. Following these lines [11], we obtain an allowed region in the  $\overline{\rho}\text{-}\overline{\eta}$  plane that is consistent with the SM for  $\phi_d \sim 47^\circ$ . In the case of  $\phi_d \sim 133^\circ$ , we arrive at a range in the second quadrant, which corresponds to  $\gamma > 90$  and is consistent with the  $\varepsilon_K$  hyperbola. Interestingly, also this exciting possibility cannot be discarded. The current  $B_d \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$  data do not yet allow us to draw definite conclusions, but the situation will significantly improve in the future. As far as  $B_s$  decays are concerned, the burning question in this context is whether  $\phi_s$ , which is tiny in the SM, as can be seen in (5), is made sizeable through NP effects. In order to address this issue, the  $B_s \rightarrow J/\psi\phi$  channel plays the key rôle.

## 2 $B_s \rightarrow J/\psi\phi$

This decay is the counterpart of  $B_d \rightarrow J/\psi K_S$ , and exhibits an analogous amplitude structure:

$$A(B_s \rightarrow J/\psi\phi) \propto [1 + \lambda^2 a e^{i\vartheta} e^{i\gamma}]. \quad (6)$$

Here  $\gamma$  is the usual angle of the UT, and the hadronic parameter  $a e^{i\vartheta}$  measures the ratio of penguin to tree contributions, which is naïvely expected to be of  $\mathcal{O}(\overline{\lambda})$ , where  $\overline{\lambda} = \mathcal{O}(\lambda) =$

$\mathcal{O}(0.2)$  is a “generic” expansion parameter [10]. In contrast to  $B_d \rightarrow J/\psi K_S$ , the final state of  $B_s \rightarrow J/\psi\phi$  is an admixture of different CP eigenstates, which can be disentangled through an angular analysis of the  $J/\psi[\rightarrow \ell^+\ell^-]\phi[\rightarrow K^+K^-]$  decay products [13]. Their angular distribution exhibits tiny direct CP violation, whereas mixing-induced CP-violating effects allow the extraction of

$$\sin\phi_s + \mathcal{O}(\bar{\lambda}^3) = \sin\phi_s + \mathcal{O}(10^{-3}). \quad (7)$$

Since we have  $\phi_s = -2\lambda^2\eta = \mathcal{O}(10^{-2})$  in the SM, the determination of this phase from (7) is affected by generic hadronic uncertainties of  $\mathcal{O}(10\%)$ , which may become important for the LHC era. These uncertainties can be controlled with the help of  $B_d \rightarrow J/\psi\rho^0$  [14].

Another interesting aspect of the  $B_s \rightarrow J/\psi\phi$  angular distribution is that it allows also the determination of  $\cos\delta_f \cos\phi_s$ , where  $\delta_f$  is a CP-conserving strong phase. If we fix the *sign* of  $\cos\delta_f$  through factorization, we may fix the sign of  $\cos\phi_s$ , which allows an *unambiguous* determination of  $\phi_s$  [15]. In this context,  $B_s \rightarrow D_\pm\eta^{(\prime)}, D_\pm\phi, \dots$  decays are also interesting [16].

The big hope is that experiments will find a *sizeable* value of  $\sin\phi_s$ , which would immediately signal NP. There are recent NP analyses where such a feature actually emerges, for example, within SUSY [17], or specific left–right-symmetric models [18].

### 3 $B_s \rightarrow K^+K^-$

The decay  $B_s \rightarrow K^+K^-$  is dominated by QCD penguins and complements  $B_d \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$  nicely, thereby allowing a determination of  $\gamma$  with the help of  $U$ -spin flavour-symmetry arguments [19]. Within the SM, we may write the corresponding decay amplitudes as follows:

$$A(B_d^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-) \propto [e^{i\gamma} - de^{i\theta}], \quad A(B_s^0 \rightarrow K^+K^-) \propto \left[ e^{i\gamma} + \left( \frac{1-\lambda^2}{\lambda^2} \right) d'e^{i\theta'} \right], \quad (8)$$

where the hadronic parameters  $de^{i\theta}$  and  $d'e^{i\theta'}$  measure the ratios of penguin to tree contributions to  $B_d^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$  and  $B_s^0 \rightarrow K^+K^-$ , respectively. Consequently, we obtain

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{CP}}^{\text{dir}}(B_d \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-) = \text{function}(d, \theta, \gamma), \quad \mathcal{A}_{\text{CP}}^{\text{mix}}(B_d \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-) = \text{function}(d, \theta, \gamma, \phi_d) \quad (9)$$

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{CP}}^{\text{dir}}(B_s \rightarrow K^+K^-) = \text{function}(d', \theta', \gamma), \quad \mathcal{A}_{\text{CP}}^{\text{mix}}(B_s \rightarrow K^+K^-) = \text{function}(d', \theta', \gamma, \phi_s). \quad (10)$$

As we saw above,  $\phi_d$  and  $\phi_s$  can “straightforwardly” be fixed, also if NP should contribute to  $B_q^0\text{--}\bar{B}_q^0$  mixing. Consequently,  $\mathcal{A}_{\text{CP}}^{\text{dir}}(B_d \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-)$  and  $\mathcal{A}_{\text{CP}}^{\text{mix}}(B_d \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-)$  allow us to eliminate  $\theta$ , thereby yielding  $d$  as a function of  $\gamma$  in a *theoretically clean* way. Analogously, we may fix  $d'$  as a function of  $\gamma$  with the help of  $\mathcal{A}_{\text{CP}}^{\text{dir}}(B_s \rightarrow K^+K^-)$  and  $\mathcal{A}_{\text{CP}}^{\text{mix}}(B_s \rightarrow K^+K^-)$ .

If we look at the corresponding Feynman diagrams, we observe that  $B_d \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$  and  $B_s \rightarrow K^+K^-$  are related to each other through an interchange of all down and strange quarks. Because of this feature, the  $U$ -spin flavour symmetry of strong interactions implies

$$d = d', \quad \theta = \theta'. \quad (11)$$

Applying the former relation, we may extract  $\gamma$  and  $d$  from the clean  $\gamma$ - $d$  and  $\gamma$ - $d'$  contours. Moreover, we may also determine  $\theta$  and  $\theta'$ , allowing an interesting check of the second relation.

This strategy is very promising from an experimental point of view: at CDF-II and LHCb, experimental accuracies for  $\gamma$  of  $\mathcal{O}(10^\circ)$  and  $\mathcal{O}(1^\circ)$ , respectively, are expected [1, 2, 20]. As far as  $U$ -spin-breaking corrections are concerned, they enter the determination of  $\gamma$  through a relative shift of the  $\gamma$ - $d$  and  $\gamma$ - $d'$  contours; their impact on the extracted value of  $\gamma$  depends on the form of these curves, which is fixed through the measured observables. In the examples discussed in [3, 19], the result for  $\gamma$  would be very robust under such corrections.

As we have already noted,  $B_s \rightarrow K^+K^-$  is not accessible at the BaBar and Belle detectors. However, since we obtain  $B_s \rightarrow K^+K^-$  from  $B_d \rightarrow \pi^\mp K^\pm$  through a replacement of the down spectator quark through a strange quark, we have  $\text{BR}(B_s \rightarrow K^+K^-) \approx \text{BR}(B_d \rightarrow \pi^\mp K^\pm)$ . In order to play with the  $B$ -factory data, we may then consider

$$H = \left( \frac{1 - \lambda^2}{\lambda^2} \right) \left( \frac{f_K}{f_\pi} \right)^2 \left[ \frac{\text{BR}(B_d \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-)}{\text{BR}(B_d \rightarrow \pi^\mp K^\pm)} \right] \sim 7.5. \quad (12)$$

If we use (8) and (11), we may write

$$H = \text{function}(d, \theta, \gamma), \quad (13)$$

which complements (9) and provides sufficient information to extract  $\gamma$ ,  $d$  and  $\theta$  [19, 21]. This approach was applied in the UT analysis sketched at the end of Section 1, following [11]. Interestingly,  $H$  implies also a very narrow SM “target range” in the  $\mathcal{A}_{\text{CP}}^{\text{mix}}(B_s \rightarrow K^+K^-)$ - $\mathcal{A}_{\text{CP}}^{\text{dir}}(B_s \rightarrow K^+K^-)$  plane [12]. The measurement of  $\text{BR}(B_s \rightarrow K^+K^-)$ , which is expected to be soon available from CDF-II [22], will already be an important achievement, allowing a better determination of  $H$ . Once also the CP asymmetries of this channel have been measured, we may fully exploit the physics potential of the  $B_s \rightarrow K^+K^-$ ,  $B_d \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$  system [19].

## 4 $B_s \rightarrow D_s^{(*)\pm} K^\mp$

Let us finally turn to colour-allowed “tree” decays of the kind  $B_s \rightarrow D_s^{(*)\pm} K^\mp$ , which complement  $B_d \rightarrow D^{(*)\pm} \pi^\mp$  transitions: these modes can be treated on the same theoretical basis, and provide new strategies to determine  $\gamma$  [23]. Following this paper, we may write these modes generically as  $B_q \rightarrow D_q \bar{u}_q$ . Their characteristic feature is that both a  $B_q^0$  and a  $\bar{B}_q^0$  may decay into  $D_q \bar{u}_q$ , thereby leading to interference between  $B_q^0$ - $\bar{B}_q^0$  mixing and decay processes, involving the weak phase  $\phi_q + \gamma$ . In the case of  $q = s$ , i.e.  $D_s \in \{D_s^+, D_s^{*+}, \dots\}$  and  $u_s \in \{K^+, K^{*+}, \dots\}$ , these interference effects are governed by a hadronic parameter  $x_s e^{i\delta_s} \propto R_b \approx 0.4$ , where  $R_b \propto |V_{ub}/V_{cb}|$  is the usual UT side, and hence are large. On the other hand, for  $q = d$ , i.e.  $D_d \in \{D^+, D^{*+}, \dots\}$  and  $u_d \in \{\pi^+, \rho^+, \dots\}$ , the interference effects are described by  $x_d e^{i\delta_d} \propto -\lambda^2 R_b \approx -0.02$ , and hence are tiny. In the following, we shall only consider  $B_q \rightarrow D_q \bar{u}_q$  modes, where at least one of the  $D_q, \bar{u}_q$  states is a pseudoscalar meson; otherwise a complicated angular analysis has to be performed.

The time-dependent rate asymmetries of these decays take the same form as (2). It is well known that they allow a determination of  $\phi_q + \gamma$ , where the “conventional” approach works as follows [24, 25]: if we measure the observables  $C(B_q \rightarrow D_q \bar{u}_q) \equiv C_q$  and  $C(B_q \rightarrow \bar{D}_q u_q) \equiv \bar{C}_q$  provided by the  $\cos(\Delta M_q t)$  pieces, we may determine the following quantities:

$$\langle C_q \rangle_+ \equiv (\bar{C}_q + C_q)/2 = 0, \quad \langle C_q \rangle_- \equiv (\bar{C}_q - C_q)/2 = (1 - x_q^2)/(1 + x_q^2), \quad (14)$$

where  $\langle C_q \rangle_-$  allows us to extract  $x_q$ . However, to this end we have to resolve terms entering at the  $x_q^2$  level. In the case of  $q = s$ , we have  $x_s = \mathcal{O}(R_b)$ , implying  $x_s^2 = \mathcal{O}(0.16)$ , so that this may actually be possible, though challenging. On the other hand,  $x_d = \mathcal{O}(-\lambda^2 R_b)$  is doubly Cabibbo-suppressed. Although it should be possible to resolve terms of  $\mathcal{O}(x_d)$ , this will be impossible for the vanishingly small  $x_d^2 = \mathcal{O}(0.0004)$  terms, so that other approaches to fix  $x_d$  are required [25]. In order to extract  $\phi_q + \gamma$ , the mixing-induced observables  $S(B_q \rightarrow D_q \bar{u}_q) \equiv S_q$  and  $S(B_q \rightarrow \bar{D}_q u_q) \equiv \bar{S}_q$  associated with the  $\sin(\Delta M_q t)$  terms of the time-dependent rate asymmetry must be measured. In analogy to (14), it is convenient to introduce observable combinations  $\langle S_q \rangle_{\pm}$ . If we assume that  $x_q$  is known, we may consider the quantities

$$s_+ \equiv (-1)^L \left[ \frac{1 + x_q^2}{2x_q} \right] \langle S_q \rangle_+ = + \cos \delta_q \sin(\phi_q + \gamma) \quad (15)$$

$$s_- \equiv (-1)^L \left[ \frac{1 + x_q^2}{2x_q} \right] \langle S_q \rangle_- = - \sin \delta_q \cos(\phi_q + \gamma), \quad (16)$$

which yield

$$\sin^2(\phi_q + \gamma) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ (1 + s_+^2 - s_-^2) \pm \sqrt{(1 + s_+^2 - s_-^2)^2 - 4s_+^2} \right]. \quad (17)$$

This expression implies an eightfold solution for  $\phi_q + \gamma$ . If we assume that  $\text{sgn}(\cos \delta_q) > 0$ , as suggested by factorization, a fourfold discrete ambiguity emerges. Note that this assumption allows us also to fix the sign of  $\sin(\phi_q + \gamma)$  through  $\langle S_q \rangle_+$ . To this end, the factor  $(-1)^L$ , where  $L$  is the  $D_q \bar{u}_q$  angular momentum, has to be properly taken into account [23]. This is a crucial issue for the extraction of the sign of  $\sin(\phi_d + \gamma)$  from  $B_d \rightarrow D^{*\pm} \pi^\mp$  decays.

Let us now discuss new strategies to explore CP violation through  $B_q \rightarrow D_q \bar{u}_q$  modes, following [23]. If the width difference  $\Delta\Gamma_s$  is sizeable, the ‘‘untagged’’ rates (see (1))

$$\langle \Gamma(B_q(t) \rightarrow D_q \bar{u}_q) \rangle = \langle \Gamma(B_q \rightarrow D_q \bar{u}_q) \rangle [\cosh(\Delta\Gamma_q t/2) - \mathcal{A}_{\Delta\Gamma}(B_q \rightarrow D_q \bar{u}_q) \sinh(\Delta\Gamma_q t/2)] e^{-\Gamma_q t} \quad (18)$$

and their CP conjugates provide  $\mathcal{A}_{\Delta\Gamma}(B_s \rightarrow D_s \bar{u}_s) \equiv \mathcal{A}_{\Delta\Gamma_s}$  and  $\mathcal{A}_{\Delta\Gamma}(B_s \rightarrow \bar{D}_s u_s) \equiv \bar{\mathcal{A}}_{\Delta\Gamma_s}$ . Introducing, in analogy to (14), observable combinations  $\langle \mathcal{A}_{\Delta\Gamma_s} \rangle_{\pm}$ , we may derive the relations

$$\tan(\phi_s + \gamma) = - \left[ \frac{\langle S_s \rangle_+}{\langle \mathcal{A}_{\Delta\Gamma_s} \rangle_+} \right] = + \left[ \frac{\langle \bar{\mathcal{A}}_{\Delta\Gamma_s} \rangle_-}{\langle S_s \rangle_-} \right], \quad (19)$$

which allow an *unambiguous* extraction of  $\phi_s + \gamma$  if we assume, in addition, that  $\text{sgn}(\cos \delta_q) > 0$ . Another important advantage of (19) is that we do *not* have to rely on  $\mathcal{O}(x_s^2)$  terms, as  $\langle S_s \rangle_{\pm}$  and  $\langle \mathcal{A}_{\Delta\Gamma_s} \rangle_{\pm}$  are proportional to  $x_s$ . On the other hand, we need a sizeable value of  $\Delta\Gamma_s$ . Measurements of untagged rates are also very useful in the case of vanishingly small  $\Delta\Gamma_q$ , since the ‘‘unevolved’’ untagged rates in (18) offer various interesting strategies to determine  $x_q$  from the ratio of  $\langle \Gamma(B_q \rightarrow D_q \bar{u}_q) \rangle + \langle \Gamma(B_q \rightarrow \bar{D}_q u_q) \rangle$  and CP-averaged rates of appropriate  $B^\pm$  or flavour-specific  $B_q$  decays.

If we keep the hadronic parameter  $x_q$  and the associated strong phase  $\delta_q$  as ‘‘unknown’’, free parameters in the expressions for the  $\langle S_q \rangle_{\pm}$ , we may obtain bounds on  $\phi_q + \gamma$  from

$$|\sin(\phi_q + \gamma)| \geq |\langle S_q \rangle_+|, \quad |\cos(\phi_q + \gamma)| \geq |\langle S_q \rangle_-|. \quad (20)$$

If  $x_q$  is known, stronger constraints are implied by

$$|\sin(\phi_q + \gamma)| \geq |s_+|, \quad |\cos(\phi_q + \gamma)| \geq |s_-|. \quad (21)$$

Once  $s_+$  and  $s_-$  are known, we may of course determine  $\phi_q + \gamma$  through the ‘‘conventional’’ approach, using (17). However, the bounds following from (21) provide essentially the same information and are much simpler to implement. Moreover, as discussed in detail in [23] for several examples within the SM, the bounds following from  $B_s$  and  $B_d$  modes may be highly complementary, thereby providing particularly narrow, theoretically clean ranges for  $\gamma$ .

Let us now further exploit the complementarity between the processes  $B_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^{(*)+} K^-$  and  $B_d^0 \rightarrow D^{(*)+} \pi^-$ . If we look at the corresponding decay topologies, we observe that these channels are related to each other through an interchange of all down and strange quarks. Consequently, the  $U$ -spin symmetry implies  $a_s = a_d$  and  $\delta_s = \delta_d$ , where  $a_s = x_s/R_b$  and  $a_d = -x_d/(\lambda^2 R_b)$  are the ratios of hadronic matrix elements entering  $x_s$  and  $x_d$ , respectively. There are various possibilities to implement these relations [23]. A particularly simple picture emerges if we assume that  $a_s = a_d$  and  $\delta_s = \delta_d$ , which yields

$$\tan \gamma = - \left[ \frac{\sin \phi_d - S \sin \phi_s}{\cos \phi_d - S \cos \phi_s} \right]_{\phi_s=0^\circ} - \left[ \frac{\sin \phi_d}{\cos \phi_d - S} \right]. \quad (22)$$

Here we have introduced

$$S = -R \left[ \frac{\langle S_d \rangle_+}{\langle S_s \rangle_+} \right] \quad (23)$$

with

$$R = \left( \frac{1 - \lambda^2}{\lambda^2} \right) \left[ \frac{1}{1 + x_s^2} \right], \quad (24)$$

where  $R$  can be fixed with the help of untagged  $B_s$  rates through

$$R = \left( \frac{f_K}{f_\pi} \right)^2 \left[ \frac{\Gamma(\overline{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^{(*)+} \pi^-) + \Gamma(B_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^{(*)-} \pi^+)}{\langle \Gamma(B_s \rightarrow D_s^{(*)+} K^-) \rangle + \langle \Gamma(B_s \rightarrow D_s^{(*)-} K^+) \rangle} \right]. \quad (25)$$

Alternatively, we may *only* assume that  $\delta_s = \delta_d$  or that  $a_s = a_d$ , as discussed in detail in [23]. Apart from features related to multiple discrete ambiguities, the most important advantage with respect to the ‘‘conventional’’ approach is that the experimental resolution of the  $x_q^2$  terms is not required. In particular,  $x_d$  does *not* have to be fixed, and  $x_s$  may only enter through a  $1 + x_s^2$  correction, which can straightforwardly be determined through untagged  $B_s$  rate measurements. In the most refined implementation of this strategy, the measurement of  $x_d/x_s$  would *only* be interesting for the inclusion of  $U$ -spin-breaking effects in  $a_d/a_s$ . Moreover, we may obtain interesting insights into hadron dynamics and  $U$ -spin-breaking effects.

In order to explore CP violation, the colour-suppressed counterparts of the  $B_q \rightarrow D_q \overline{u}_q$  modes are also very interesting. In the case of the  $B_d \rightarrow DK_{S(L)}$ ,  $B_s \rightarrow D\eta^{(\prime)}$ ,  $D\phi$ , ... modes, the interference effects between  $B_q^0 - \overline{B}_q^0$  mixing and decay processes are governed by  $x_{f_s} e^{i\delta_{f_s}} \propto R_b$ . If we consider the CP eigenstates  $D_\pm$ , we obtain additional interference effects at the amplitude level, which involve  $\gamma$ , and may introduce the following ‘‘untagged’’ rate asymmetry [16]:

$$\Gamma_{+-}^{f_s} \equiv \frac{\langle \Gamma(B_q \rightarrow D_+ f_s) \rangle - \langle \Gamma(B_q \rightarrow D_- f_s) \rangle}{\langle \Gamma(B_q \rightarrow D_+ f_s) \rangle + \langle \Gamma(B_q \rightarrow D_- f_s) \rangle}, \quad (26)$$



which allows us to constrain  $\gamma$  through  $|\cos \gamma| \geq |\Gamma_{+-}^{f_s}|$ . Moreover, if we complement  $\Gamma_{+-}^{f_s}$  with

$$\langle S_{f_s} \rangle_{\pm} \equiv (S_{+}^{f_s} \pm S_{-}^{f_s})/2, \quad (27)$$

where  $S_{\pm}^{f_s} \equiv \mathcal{A}_{\text{CP}}^{\text{mix}}(B_q \rightarrow D_{\pm} f_s)$ , we may derive the following simple but *exact* relation:

$$\tan \gamma \cos \phi_q = \left[ \frac{\eta_{f_s} \langle S_{f_s} \rangle_{+}}{\Gamma_{+-}^{f_s}} \right] + [\eta_{f_s} \langle S_{f_s} \rangle_{-} - \sin \phi_q], \quad (28)$$

where  $\eta_{f_s} \equiv (-1)^L \eta_{\text{CP}}^{f_s}$ . This expression allows a conceptually simple, theoretically clean and essentially unambiguous determination of  $\gamma$  [16]; further applications, employing also  $D$ -meson decays into CP non-eigenstates, can be found in [26]. Since the interference effects are governed by the tiny parameter  $x_{f_d} e^{i\delta_{f_d}} \propto -\lambda^2 R_b$  in the case of  $B_s \rightarrow D_{\pm} K_{\text{S(L)}}$ ,  $B_d \rightarrow D_{\pm} \pi^0, D_{\pm} \rho^0, \dots$ , these modes are not as promising for the extraction of  $\gamma$ . However, they provide the relation

$$\eta_{f_d} \langle S_{f_d} \rangle_{-} = \sin \phi_q + \mathcal{O}(x_{f_d}^2) = \sin \phi_q + \mathcal{O}(4 \times 10^{-4}), \quad (29)$$

allowing very interesting determinations of  $\phi_q$  with theoretical accuracies one order of magnitude higher than those of the conventional  $B_d \rightarrow J/\psi K_{\text{S}}$ ,  $B_s \rightarrow J/\psi \phi$  approaches (see Section 2). In particular,  $\phi_s^{\text{SM}} = -2\lambda^2 \eta$  could be determined with only  $\mathcal{O}(1\%)$  uncertainty [16].

## 5 Conclusions and Outlook

The most exciting question concerning  $B_s \rightarrow J/\psi \phi$  is whether this mode will exhibit sizeable mixing-induced CP-violating effects, thereby indicating NP contributions to  $B_s^0 \overline{B}_s^0$  mixing. As we have seen, the  $B_s$ -meson system offers interesting avenues to extract  $\gamma$ . For example, we may employ  $B_s \rightarrow K^+ K^-$ , which is governed by QCD penguin processes, to complement  $B_d \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-$ , or may complement pure “tree” decays of the kind  $B_s \rightarrow D_s^{(*)\pm} K^{\mp}$  with their  $B_d \rightarrow D^{(*)\pm} \pi^{\mp}$  counterparts. Here the burning question is whether the corresponding results for  $\gamma$  will show discrepancies, which could indicate NP effects in the penguin sector. The exploration of  $B_s$  decays is the “El Dorado” for  $B$ -physics studies at hadron colliders. Important first steps are already expected in the near future at run II of the Tevatron, whereas the rich physics potential of the  $B_s$ -meson system can be fully exploited by LHCb and BTeV.

## References

- [1] K. Anikeev *et al.*, hep-ph/0201071.
- [2] P. Ball *et al.*, CERN-TH/2000-101 [hep-ph/0003238], in CERN Report on *Standard Model physics (and more) at the LHC* (CERN, Geneva, 2000), p. 305.
- [3] R. Fleischer, Phys. Rep. **370** (2002) 537 [hep-ph/0207108].
- [4] M. Battaglia, A. J. Buras, P. Gambino and A. Stocchi, eds., Proceedings of the *First Workshop on the CKM Unitarity Triangle*, CERN, February 2002, hep-ph/0304132.

- [5] For an overview, see M. Beneke and A. Lenz, J. Phys. G **27** (2001) 1219 [hep-ph/0012222].
- [6] I. Dunietz, Phys. Rev. D **52** (1995) 3048 [hep-ph/9501287];  
R. Fleischer and I. Dunietz, Phys. Rev. D **55** (1997) 259 [hep-ph/9605220], Phys. Lett. B **387** (1996) 361 [hep-ph/9605221].
- [7] Y. Nir and D. J. Silverman, Nucl. Phys. B **345** (1990) 301.
- [8] Y. Grossman, Y. Nir and M. P. Worah, Phys. Lett. B **407** (1997) 307 [hep-ph/9704287].
- [9] J. P. Silva and L. Wolfenstein, Phys. Rev. D **62** (2000) 014018 [hep-ph/0002122].
- [10] R. Fleischer and T. Mannel, Phys. Lett. B **506** (2001) 311 [hep-ph/0101276].
- [11] R. Fleischer, G. Isidori and J. Matias, JHEP **0305** (2003) 053 [hep-ph/0302229].
- [12] R. Fleischer and J. Matias, Phys. Rev. D **66** (2002) 054009 [hep-ph/0204101].
- [13] A. S. Dighe *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **369** (1996) 144 [hep-ph/9511363];  
A. S. Dighe, I. Dunietz and R. Fleischer, Eur. Phys. J. C **6** (1999) 647 [hep-ph/9804253].
- [14] R. Fleischer, Phys. Rev. D **60** (1999) 073008 [hep-ph/9903540].
- [15] I. Dunietz, R. Fleischer and U. Nierste, Phys. Rev. D **63** (2001) 114015 [hep-ph/0012219].
- [16] R. Fleischer, Phys. Lett. B **562** (2003) 234 [hep-ph/0301255].
- [17] M. Ciuchini *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **67** (2003) 075016 [hep-ph/0212397].
- [18] K. Kiers, J. Kolb, J. Lee, A. Soni and G. H. Wu, Phys. Rev. D **66** (2002) 095002 [hep-ph/0205082]; D. Silverman, W. K. Sze and H. Yao, UCI-TR-2003-15 [hep-ph/0305013].
- [19] R. Fleischer, Phys. Lett. B **459** (1999) 306 [hep-ph/9903456].
- [20] A. Golutvin, “Reaching for  $\gamma$  (present and future)”, *these proceedings*.
- [21] R. Fleischer, Eur. Phys. J. C **16** (2000) 87 [hep-ph/0001253].
- [22] M. Martin, “Branching ratios from  $B_s$  and  $\Lambda_b$ ”, *these proceedings*.
- [23] R. Fleischer, CERN-TH/2003-084 [hep-ph/0304027].
- [24] R. Aleksan, I. Dunietz and B. Kayser, Z. Phys. C **54** (1992) 653.
- [25] I. Dunietz and R. G. Sachs, Phys. Rev. D **37** (1988) 3186 [E: D **39** (1989) 3515];  
I. Dunietz, Phys. Lett. B **427** (1998) 179 [hep-ph/9712401];  
M. Diehl and G. Hiller, Phys. Lett. B **517** (2001) 125 [hep-ph/0105213];  
D. A. Suprun *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **65** (2002) 054025 [hep-ph/0110159].
- [26] R. Fleischer, Nucl. Phys. B **659** (2003) 321 [hep-ph/0301256].