

Comments on the review of CP Violation in the Particle Data Book

Dan-Di Wu¹

HEP, Prairie View A&M University, Prairie View, TX 77446-0355, USA

Rephasing invariant formalism for the $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ system is recommended for the Particle Data Group. This formalism is accurate and prevents possible errors in generalizing the formalism to other systems, as well as in using CKM matrices not included in the Particle Data Book.

The 1998 Particle Data Book (PDB) is already available on the Web site. In this brief note I will comment on an essential part of “CP Violation” (referred as CPVW) prepared by L. Wolfenstein. Compared with the old version[1] by Wolfenstein and Trippe, a crucial differentiation is made, for the study of the K^0 system, between the parameter $\tilde{\epsilon}$ in (12.3) (that is phase convention dependent) and ϵ in (12.5a) (that is phase convention independent). However a further improvement may help the CLEO group to avoid a mistake in assuming, for the B_d system, a counterpart of Eq (12.5d), $Re\epsilon_{B_d} \approx \frac{1}{4}a_{ll}[2]$, which is still in the new version of the PDB. All three recommended forms of the CKM matrix (RCKM)[3] in the Particle Data Book provide the same a_{ll} of order 10^{-4} . But they give large and different $Re\epsilon_{B_d}$. Indeed, $\epsilon_{B_d} = \frac{(1+\sigma)-(1-\sigma)e^{i\theta}}{(1+\sigma)+(1-\sigma)e^{i\theta}}$, where $\theta = \arg(V_{tb}V_{td}^*)^2$, and $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}\langle B_H|B_L\rangle \sim 10^{-4}$. The phase θ can be arbitrarily changed by changing the phase of the b-quark field, for example. Consequently, ϵ_{B_d} can be as large as $1/\sigma \sim 10^4$. This is an example of how generalizing a formalism for the K^0 system under specific phase conventions (to be discussed later) leads to mistakes because for the B_d system the same conventions (such as RCKM) do not lead to similar formulas.

I find Eqs (12.5b and 12.5c) for the K^0 system in CPVW misleading. For the reader’s convenience, I record these equations:

$$(12.5b) \quad \epsilon = \tilde{\epsilon} + i(ImA_0/ReA_0),$$

$$(12.5c) \quad \sqrt{2}\epsilon' = ie^{i\delta_2 - \delta_0}(ReA_2/ReA_0)(ImA_2/ReA_2 - ImA_0/ReA_0).$$

¹ E-mail: wu@hp75.pvamu.edu or danwu@physics.rice.edu

Yet they are numerically correct, if any one of the three CKM phase conventions recommended (the RCKM) in the PDB is used, because for these conventions $\tilde{\epsilon}$ for the Kaon is small. This precondition for the validity of these equations is missing in the CPVW. A CKM phase convention is just an example of phase convention of the coupling constants. If I choose $\text{Re}A_0 = 0$ by changing the phase of the s quark field, these equations get zero denominators. Note to keep $CP|K^0\rangle = |\bar{K}^0\rangle$, which is a requirement in CPVW, I can use the phase of the composite wave function. Now the effect of the phase of the s quark will only show in the form of the CKM matrix, which then affect the phases of the relevant decay amplitudes and mixing mass and width. Consequently, $\text{Re}\tilde{\epsilon}$ may not be small, depending on the CKM phase convention adopted. New CKM matrices are recommended by Chen and Wu[4] and by Fritzsche and Xing[5] with some of those matrices these formulas become wild. In addition the sentence after Eq (12.4) of CPVW, “ A_I would be real if CP invariance held” is misleading, because only relative phases between different quantities count in physics. Even if the phase difference between A_0 and A_2 did not exist, there could still be a phase difference between M_{12} and Γ_{12} in principle, which would contribute to CP noninvariance in the mixing[6]. In the following I list phase convention independent formulas, then discuss convention dependent formulas (two sets for two conventions that appeared in CPVW). Since ϵ is widely used as a phase convention dependent parameter for all the mixing systems (e.g. ϵ_{B_d} discussed above), I will replace $\tilde{\epsilon}$ by ϵ and ϵ by ϵ_0 in my following presentation.

1) The accurate formulas for (12.5b) and (12.5c) should read instead (assuming CPT invariance):

$$\epsilon_0 = (\epsilon \text{Re}A_0 + i \text{Im}A_0) / (\text{Re}A_0 + i \epsilon \text{Im}A_0) \quad (1)$$

$$\epsilon' = (i/\sqrt{2})e^{i(\delta_2 - \delta_0)} \text{Im}(A_2/A_0), \quad (2)$$

These equations are simple. Eq (1) is very easy to reproduce, given the definitions[9][10] of the relevant quantities

$$K_S = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2(1+|\epsilon|^2)}} [(1+\epsilon)K^0 + (1-\epsilon)\bar{K}^0],$$

$$K_L = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2(1+|\epsilon|^2)}} [(1+\epsilon)K^0 - (1-\epsilon)\bar{K}^0].$$

Note that ϵ thus defined is CKM phase convention dependent after assigning $CP|K^0\rangle = |\bar{K}^0\rangle$.

$$\epsilon_0 = \frac{A(K_L \rightarrow 2\pi, I=0)}{A(K_S \rightarrow 2\pi, I=0)} = (1/3)(2\eta_{+-} + \eta_{00}),$$

The reduction of Eq (2) can be found, for example, in Ref[7], given ϵ_0 small experimentally, where ϵ' is defined as

$$\epsilon' = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[\frac{\langle 2\pi, I=2|K_L \rangle}{\langle 2\pi, I=2|K_S \rangle} - \epsilon_0 \frac{\langle 2\pi, I=2|K_S \rangle}{\langle 2\pi, I=0|K_S \rangle} \right] = (1/3)(\eta_{+-} - \eta_{00}).$$

I-spin symmetry is assumed in formulas for ϵ_0, ϵ' .

2) Under the Wu-Yang phase convention,

$$\text{Im}A_0 = 0,$$

Eqs (1 and 2) become respectively:

$$\epsilon_0 = \epsilon. \quad (3)$$

$$\epsilon' = (i/\sqrt{2})e^{i(\delta_2 - \delta_0)}\text{Im}A_2/A_0, \quad (4)$$

3) However, under the conventions of the RCKM matrices, in particular, the Wolfenstein matrix[8],

$$\text{Im}A_2 = 0.$$

ϵ under this convention is also small because ϵ_0 and $\text{Im}A_0$ are both small. Indeed,

$$\epsilon = (\epsilon_0 \text{Re}A_0 - i\text{Im}A_0)/(\text{Re}A_0 - i\epsilon_0 \text{Im}A_0).$$

We therefore have

$$\epsilon_0 = \epsilon + i(\text{Im}A_0/\text{Re}A_0), \quad (5)$$

$$\epsilon' = -(i/\sqrt{2})e^{i(\delta_2 - \delta_0)}(A_2/|A_0|)(\text{Im}A_0/|A_0|), \quad (6)$$

At the moment, the Wu-Yang convention is not widely used because the specific CKM matrix to realize the Wu-Yang convention is difficult to present. The phase convention dependent parameter ϵ in both Wu-Yang conventions and the RCKM conventions are small, however, this is completely an effect of phase convention, that has nothing to do with the smallness of ϵ_0 and ϵ' . At the extreme, if one chooses $\text{Re}A_0 = 0$, one gets $\epsilon = 1/\epsilon_0 \sim 10^3$, which tells that the unphysical parameter ϵ can become very large by just changing the conventions. Therefore ϵ is not measurable. The arbitrariness of the ϵ parameter has been thoroughly discussed by Wu [7] and recently by Xing[11].

Finally, the formula

$$\text{Re}\epsilon_{B_d} \approx \frac{1}{4}a_{ll}$$

used by the CLEO group will make sense if ϵ_{B_d} is made very small (at the order of $\sigma = \langle B_H|B_L \rangle$) by choosing suitable CKM conventions. This is realized by the Chen-Wu matrix discussed in a preprint[12]². With this matrix, Eq (12.9) of CPVW is simplified because $(q_B/p_B) = \text{Real}$ is intended in this convention. It so happens that the matrix that realizes this convention also makes Eq (12.11) of CPVW for the asymmetry in the process $B_d \rightarrow \psi K_S$ [13] to become

$$a_{\psi K_S} = \sin 2\delta$$

²Also by the Fritzsch-Xing matrix[5].

where δ is the phase angle in the Chen-Wu matrix. I believe this result is very important to the BaBar and the Belle experiments, given the limited scope and accuracy of these experiments. It upgrades the measurement from getting one of many angles and sides of the unitarity triangles (many of these angles and sides are not measurable or poorly measurable) to getting one of a set of four parameters of the CKM matrix.

This work is in part supported by an NSF HRD grant and in part by the Center for Applied Radiation Research (CARR) at Prairie View A&M University.

References

- [1] L. Wolfenstein and T. Trippe, Particle Data Group, Phys. Rev. D **54**, 422 (1996).
- [2] CLEO Collaboration, Particle Data Group, Phys. Rev. D **54**, 514 (1996).
- [3] F.J. Gilman, K. Kleinecht and B. Renk, Particle Data Group, Phys. Rev. D **54**, 94 (1996).
- [4] W. Chen and D.D. Wu, Comm. Theor. Phys. **14**, 247 (1990).
- [5] Z.Z. Xing and H. Fritzsch, e-print hep-ph/9707215, Phys. Lett. B **413**, 396 (1997).
- [6] D.D. Wu, Phys. Lett. B **90** 452 (1980)
- [7] D.D. Wu, Phys. Rev. D **40**, 806 (1989).
- [8] L. Wolfenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **51**, 1945 (1983); J. P. Silva and L. Wolfenstein, Phys. Rev. D **55**, 5331 (1997).
- [9] T.T. Wu and C.N. Yang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **13**, 380 (1964).
- [10] L. Wolfenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **13**, 562 (1964).
- [11] Talk given at APCTP Workshop: Pacific Particle Physics Phenomenology (P4 97), Seoul, Korea, 31 Oct - 2 Nov 1997. e-Print Archive: hep-ph/9712324.
- [12] D.D. Wu, e-Print Archive! hep-ph/9710845.
- [13] A.B. Carter and A.I. Sanda, Phys. Rev. Lett. **45**, 952 (1980); Phys. Rev. D **23**, 1567 (1981), I.I. Bigi and A.I. Sanda, Nucl. Phys. B **193**, 85 (1981); **281**, 41 (1987); D.S. Du, I. Dunietz and D.D. Wu, Phys. Rev. D **34**, 3414 (1986); B. Kayser, NSF report, NSF-PT-92-01, 1991.