

New physics effects in ϵ'/ϵ

Yue-Liang Wu*

Institute of Theoretical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences
Beijing 100080, China
e-mail: ylwu@itp.ac.cn

June 29, 2018

Abstract

After presenting an optimistic prediction for the CP-violating parameter ϵ'/ϵ in the standard model, we provide an analysis on new physics effects in ϵ'/ϵ .

*Supported in part by Outstanding Young Scientist Research Fund under grant No. of NSF # 19625514.

1 Optimistic Prediction for ϵ'/ϵ

The KTeV collaboration at Fermilab and NA48 collaboration at CERN have reported their more precise measurements on CP-violating ratio ϵ'/ϵ in $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$ decays

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Re}(\epsilon'/\epsilon) &= (28.0 \pm 4.1) \cdot 10^{-4} && \text{KTeV}[1], \\ \text{Re}(\epsilon'/\epsilon) &= (18.5 \pm 7.3) \cdot 10^{-3} && \text{NA48}[2]. \end{aligned}$$

The direct CP violation arises from the phase difference between the $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$ isospin amplitudes A_2 and A_0 and is defined as

$$\text{Re}(\epsilon'/\epsilon) \simeq \frac{\epsilon'}{\epsilon} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}|\epsilon|} \text{Im} \left(\frac{A_2}{A_0} \right) \quad (1)$$

Thus the ratio ϵ'/ϵ can be simply rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Re} \left(\frac{\epsilon'}{\epsilon} \right)_{SM} &\simeq 2.0 \cdot 10^{-3} \left(\frac{\text{Im}\lambda_t}{1.3 \cdot 10^{-4}} \right) \\ &\cdot \left(\frac{175 \text{MeV}}{m_s(1 \text{GeV})} \right)^2 \left(\frac{-y_6 B_6^{(1/2)}}{0.30} \right) \left(\frac{y_B}{1.5} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where y_B is defined as $y_B \equiv 2 - r_y r_B + r_0$ with $r_0 = (0.2 - \Omega_{\eta-\eta'} - \Omega')/0.8$. The parameters r_y and r_B are defined as the following ratios $r_y \equiv -2y_8/(\alpha_{em}3y_6)$ and $r_B = B_8^{(3/2)}/B_6^{(1/2)}$. Here the parameters y_6 , y_8 , $B_6^{(1/2)}$ and $B_8^{(3/2)}$ take values at the same energy scale ($\mu = 1$ GeV). For conservative, we take

$$0.8 \times 10^{-4} \leq \text{Im}\lambda_t \leq 1.8 \times 10^{-4} \quad (3)$$

It is easy to check that the ratio r_y only has a weak dependence on the scales μ and Λ_{QCD} [3] $r_y = 0.91 \pm 0.09$ (at Leading Order), $r_y = 0.98 \pm 0.08$ (in NDR scheme) and $r_y = 1.28 \pm 0.08$ (in HV scheme) when the energy scale μ ranges from 1 GeV to 2 GeV and the QCD scale Λ_{QCD} from about 200 MeV to 400 MeV with $m_t(m_t) = 170 \text{GeV}$. A large value for $B_6^{(1/2)}$ was emphasized in [4, 5]. A chiral relation for $\langle Q_6 \rangle$ at $O(p^2)$ order has been found to be useful[5]

$$\begin{aligned} \langle Q_6 \rangle &= (2m_K^2/m_s\Lambda_\chi)^2 f_\pi^4 \text{tr}(\lambda_6 \partial_\mu U \partial^\mu U^\dagger) \\ &= -(2m_K^2/m_s\Lambda_\chi)^2 \langle Q_2 - Q_1 \rangle \end{aligned}$$

which implies that chiral loop corrections to the $O(p^2)$ order terms will lead $\langle Q_6 \rangle$ to have the same enhancement as $\langle Q_2 - Q_1 \rangle$. Therefore, when the other corrections, such as the $O(p^4)$ terms at tree level and the nonfactorizable contributions from the terms $O(p^0/N_c)$, are neglected, one has

$$B_6^{(1/2)} \sim B_{12}^{(1/2)} \equiv \langle Q_2 - Q_1 \rangle / \langle Q_2 - Q_1 \rangle^{tree}$$

Recently, it has been shown [6] that the chiral relation between $\langle Q_6 \rangle$ and $\langle Q_2 - Q_1 \rangle$ is modified due to possible nonfactorizable chiral loop effects of the terms $O(p^0/N_c) \sim \text{Tr}(\lambda_6 U U^\dagger)$ which vanishes at tree level. At the chiral one-loop level, it has been found that $B_{12}^{(1/2)}(0.8\text{GeV}) = 3.5$ [7]. Numerically, by including about 30% reduction due to the nonfactorizable chiral loop effects of the terms $O(p^0/N_c)$ and about 30% corrections arising from possible higher order terms, we obtain the following range for $B_6^{(1/2)}$ at $\mu \simeq 0.8$ GeV

$$B_6^{(1/2)} = (1 - \Delta_B) B_{12}^{(1/2)} \simeq 2.4 \pm 0.7 \quad (4)$$

Note that the parameter $B_8^{(3/2)}$, unlike the parameter $B_6^{(1/2)}$, does not deviate significantly from the VSA value. Taking $r_B \simeq 0.5$, we arrive at the following constraint on y_B

$$\begin{aligned} y_B &= 1.55 \pm 0.14 && \text{(at Leading Order);} \\ y_B &= 1.51 \pm 0.13 && \text{(in NDR scheme);} \\ y_B &= 1.36 \pm 0.13 && \text{(in HV scheme)} \end{aligned}$$

For the coefficient function y_6 , there remains a big uncertainty due to scheme- and Λ_{QCD} -dependence

$$0.09 \leq y_6(0.8\text{GeV}) \leq 0.24 \quad (5)$$

With the above analyses, we arrive at the following prediction for $\text{Re}(\epsilon'/\epsilon)$ in the SM

$$\text{Re}(\epsilon'/\epsilon) = 2.0_{-1.3}^{+2.8} \times 10^{-3} \left(\frac{175\text{MeV}}{m_s(1\text{GeV})} \right)^2 \quad (6)$$

Here the central value is consistent with the current world averaged value

$$\text{Re}(\epsilon'/\epsilon) = (2.1 \pm 0.46) \times 10^{-3} \quad (7)$$

Several groups[4, 8] have investigated the contributions to ϵ'/ϵ . With the current status of the SM predictions for the ratio ϵ'/ϵ , it may be too early to call for new physics due to large uncertainties of the relevant parameters. The SM with three families accommodates CP violation in quark decays in an elegant and economical manner, there are little evidence, however, that this explanation is unique. In fact, there are hints from cosmological arguments that it is not. In present theories with baryon-number-violating processes, the universe at very early times contains equal (thermal) populations of particles and antiparticles. How and when the currently observed excess of matter over antimatter is one of the key puzzles of cosmology. Attempts to explain this with only standard KM CP violation phase have so far not been successful. At this time we do not yet know the origin of the CP violations. In such a situation it is useful to make consistent hypotheses which can be either disproved by experiments or guide us to the origin of the effect.

2 ϵ'/ϵ in Two Higgs Doublet Model

One of the most popular origins of the effect is spontaneous breaking of the symmetry as was first pointed out by T.D. Lee. A complete model and systematic analysis has been

worked out in ref.[9] by considering one of the simplest extensions of the standard model with an extra Higgs doublet (S2HDM). The model is based on two basic assumptions: (i) abandoning the *ad hoc* discrete symmetry and considering approximate flavor symmetry; (ii) CP violation originates solely from a single relative phase of the two vacuum expectation values (VEVs). As a consequence, there exists a variety of new sources of CP violation.

The original Yukawa interaction has the form

$$L_Y = \bar{\psi}_L(\Gamma_1^D \phi_1 + \Gamma_2^D \phi_2)D_R + \bar{\psi}_L(\Gamma_1^U \bar{\phi}_1 + \Gamma_2^U \bar{\phi}_2)U_R$$

plus a similar term for leptons.

Rewriting L_Y in terms of the Higgs basis and the quark mass basis, we have $L_Y = (\sqrt{2}G_F)^{1/2}(L_1 + L_2) + H.c.$ with

$$\begin{aligned} L_1 &= \sqrt{2}(H^+ \sum_{i,j}^3 \xi_{d_j} m_{d_j} V_{ij} \bar{u}_L^i d_R^j \\ &\quad - H^- \sum_{i,j}^3 \xi_{u_j} m_{u_j} V_{ij}^\dagger \bar{d}_L^i u_R^j) \\ &\quad + H^0 \sum_i^3 (m_{u_i} \bar{u}_L^i u_R^i + m_{d_i} \bar{d}_L^i d_R^i) \\ &\quad + \Phi \sum_i^3 \xi_{d_i} m_{d_i} \bar{d}_L^i d_R^i + \Phi^* \sum_i^3 \xi_{u_i} m_{u_i} \bar{u}_L^i u_R^i \\ \\ L_2 &= \sqrt{2}(H^+ \sum_{i,j' \neq j}^3 V_{ij'} \mu_{j'j}^d \bar{u}_L^i d_R^j \\ &\quad - H^- \sum_{i,j' \neq j}^3 V_{ij'}^\dagger \mu_{j'j}^u \bar{d}_L^i u_R^j) + \Phi \sum_{i \neq j}^3 \mu_{ij}^d \bar{d}_L^i d_R^j \\ &\quad + \Phi^* \sum_{i \neq j}^3 \mu_{ij}^u \bar{u}_L^i u_R^j \end{aligned}$$

Where H^0 is the “real” Higgs boson and the orthogonal state $\Phi \equiv (R + iI)$ forms a doublet with the charged Higgs H^\pm . The neutral mass eigenstates H_1^0, H_2^0, H_3^0 are related to (R, H^0, I) by an orthogonal matrix O^H .

The factors $\xi_{d_j} m_{d_j}$ ($\xi_{u_j} m_{u_j}$) arise primarily from diagonal elements of Γ_1^D (Γ_1^U) and Γ_2^D (Γ_2^U) whereas the factors $\mu_{j'j}^d$ ($\mu_{j'j}^u$) arise from the small off-diagonal elements. In the physical mass eigenstate basis for all particles, there are four major sources of CP violation induced from the single CP violation phase δ :

- (1) The KM phase in the CKM matrix in W^\pm -boson and charged-Higgs exchanges;

(2) The new milliweak CP violation phases in the factors ξ_q (q= u,d,c,s,t,b) in both charged and neutral Higgs exchange processes, which is independent of the KM phase;

(3) The superweak effects due to phases in the factors μ_{ij}^f . These yield CP violation in FCNE;

(4) From the Higgs potential one derives the matrix O^H that diagonalizes the 3×3 neutral Higgs mass matrix. Even in the absence of fermions this O^H may violate CP invariance.

From the above sources of CP violation, the dominant contributions to the ratio ϵ'/ϵ are

$$\begin{aligned}
Re(\epsilon'/\epsilon) &\equiv Re(\epsilon'/\epsilon)_{SM+H^+} + Re(\epsilon'/\epsilon)_{H^+-Tree} \\
&\quad + Re(\epsilon'/\epsilon)_{H^+-LD} + Re(\epsilon'/\epsilon)_{H^0-Tree} \\
&\simeq Re\left(\frac{\epsilon'}{\epsilon}\right)_{SM} \left(\frac{\tilde{y}_6}{y_6}\right) \left(\frac{\tilde{y}_B}{y_B}\right) \\
&\quad + 2.3 \cdot 10^{-3} \left(\frac{Im(\xi_s^* \tilde{\xi}_d)}{(11)^2}\right) \left(\frac{200 GeV}{m_{H^+}}\right)^2 \\
&\quad + (0.2 - 3.0) \times 10^{-3} Re(\epsilon_{H^+-LD}/\epsilon^{exp.}) \\
&\quad - 0.88 \cdot 10^{-4} \left(\frac{Im\tilde{\eta}_d^{(k)}}{10}\right) \left(\frac{125 GeV}{m_{H_k^0}}\right) \\
&\quad \cdot \left(\sqrt{\frac{\Delta m_K^{H^0}}{\Delta m_K^{exp.}}}\right) \left(\frac{Re X_{k,12}^{d*}}{\sqrt{Re(Y_{k,12}^{d*})^2}}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

with $\tilde{y}_B = 2 - \tilde{r}_y r_B$, $\tilde{r}_y = -2\tilde{y}_8/(3\tilde{y}_6\alpha_{em})$, $\tilde{\xi}_d = \xi_d + \xi_u^* m_u/m_d$, $\tilde{\eta}_d^{(k)} = \eta_d^{(k)} - \frac{m_u}{m_d} \eta_u^{(k)}$, $X_{k,12}^d = (\mu_{k,12}^d + \mu_{k,21}^{d*})/2$ and $Y_{k,12}^d = -i(\mu_{k,12}^d - \mu_{k,21}^{d*})/2$

In addition to the known features due to the induced KM source, one sees that the new sources through charged Higgs boson exchange can make a significant contribution to ϵ'/ϵ

$$\frac{\epsilon'}{\epsilon} \simeq 2 \times 10^{-3}, \quad \tan \beta \sim 8 \left(\frac{m_{H^+}}{(200 GeV)}\right)$$

without conflicting with other constraints. The indirect CP-violating parameter ϵ could be fitted by the new sources from box diagrams containing H^\pm . It may also receive significant contribution from superweak FCNE. The new sources could provide large CP violation in hyperon decays. CP asymmetry in the decay $b \rightarrow s\gamma$ may also be larger than in the standard model due to the new source. The resulting values for the electric dipole moments D_e and D_n of the electron and neutron from the new sources could be close to the present limits.

3 ϵ'/ϵ in Other Models

In the minimal supersymmetric standard model (MSSM), when abandoning flavor universality ansatz and considering approximate flavor symmetry as well as assuming CP violating trilinear Yukawa couplings, one has investigated the supersymmetric contributions to ϵ'/ϵ [10]. The relevant part of the effective hamiltonian is $H_{eff}^{\Delta S=1} = C_8 Q_{8G}$ with

$$C_8 = \frac{\alpha_s \pi}{m_{\tilde{q}}^2} [(\delta_{12}^d)_{LL} (-\frac{1}{3} M_3(x) - 3M_4(x)) + (\delta_{12}^d)_{LR} \frac{m_{\tilde{g}}}{m_s} (-\frac{1}{3} - 3M_2(x))] \quad (8)$$

where $x = m_{\tilde{g}}^2/m_{\tilde{q}}^2$. Consequently, for $|Im(\delta_{12}^d)_{LR}^2|^{1/2} \simeq 10^{-5}$ and $m_{\tilde{q}} \simeq 500 GeV$, one has

$$(\epsilon'/\epsilon)_{SUSY} \simeq 3 \times 10^{-3}$$

Recently, it was also shown[11] that the contributions to the ratio $Re(\epsilon'/\epsilon)$ from anomalous gauge couplings could also be significant.

References

- [1] H. Nguyen, in this proceedings;
A. Alavi-Harati *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83** (1999) 22.
- [2] S. Palestini, in this proceedings;
V. Fanti *et al.*, hep-ex/9909022.
- [3] A. Buras, M. Jamin and M. Lautenbacher, Nucl. Phys. **B408**, 209 (1993); M. Cuichini *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **B415**, 403 (1994).
- [4] J. Heinrich, E.A. Paschos, J.-M. Schwarz, and Y.L. Wu, Phys. Lett. **B279**, 140 (1992);
E.A. Paschos, Proceedings of the 27th Lepton-Photon Symposium, Beijing, China 1995, edited by Z.P. Zheng and H.S. Chen, (World Scientific, Singapore, 1996).
- [5] Y.L. Wu, Intern. J. of Mod. Phys. A7 (1992) 2863; Y.L. Wu in: Proceedings of 26TH Int. Conf. on High Energy Physics, Dallas, USA, 1992, PP 506, edited by James R. Sanford.
- [6] T. Hambye, G.O. Köhler, E.A. Paschos, P.H. Soldan, and W.A. Bardeen, Phys. Rev. **D58**, 014017 (1998).
- [7] T. Hambye, G.O. Köhler, and P.H. Soldan, hep-ph/9902334; J.P. Fatelo and J.-M. Gérard, Phys. Lett. **B257**, 191 (1991).

- [8] M.Ciuchini, Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl. 59 (1997) 149; A.J. Buras *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **B370** (1993) 209; S. Bertolini *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **B514** (1998) 93;
S. Bosch *et al.*, hep-ph/9904408;
T. Hambye *et al.*, hep-ph/9906434;
A.A. Bel'kov *et al.*, hep-ph/9907335.
- [9] Y.L. Wu and L. Wolfenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 1762 (1994); L. Wolfenstein and Y.L. Wu, Phys. Rev. Lett., **73**, 2809 (1994);
Y.L. Wu, hep-ph/9404241, hep-ph/9903363
- [10] A. Masiero and H. Murayama, hep-ph/9903363; K.S. Babu, B. Dutta and R.N. Mohapatra, hep-ph/9905464; S.Khalil and T. Kobayashi, hep-ph/9906374;
S. Baek, J.-H. Jang, P. Ko and J.H. Park, hep-ph/9907572; R. Barbieri, R. Contino and A. Strumia, hep-ph/9908255; G. Eyal, A. Masiero, Y. Nir and L. Silvestrini, hep-ph/9908382.
- [11] X.G. He, hep-ph/9903242.