



CP Violation




The asymmetry between Matter and AntiMatter

Outline

1. Antimatter & Big Bang
2. Symmetries and the weak interactions
3. Discovery of CP violation
4. Describing CP violation and the weak interactions
5. CP violation and the Standard Model
6. Testing the Standard Model predictions of CP violation
7. Outlook for future measurements
8. Summary

Antiparticles: Dirac's prediction




- Combining quantum mechanics with special relativity, and the wish to *linearize* $\partial/\partial t$, leads Dirac to the equation

$$(i\gamma^\mu \partial_\mu - m) \psi(\vec{x}, t) = 0$$

- Solutions describe particles with spin = 1/2
- But half of the solutions have *negative energy*

$$E = \pm \sqrt{\vec{p}^2 + m^2}$$

Antiparticles: Dirac's prediction




- Combining quantum mechanics with special relativity, and the wish to *linearize* $\partial/\partial t$, leads Dirac to the equation

$$(i\gamma^\mu \partial_\mu - m) \psi(\vec{x}, t) = 0$$

- Solutions describe particles with spin = 1/2
- But half of the solutions have *negative energy*


$$E = \pm \sqrt{\vec{p}^2 + m^2}$$



This picture fails for bosons !

- Vacuum represents a “sea” of such negative-energy particles (fully filled according to Pauli’s principle)
- Dirac identified holes in this sea as “antiparticles” with opposite charge to particles ... (however, he conjectured that these holes were protons, despite their large difference in mass, because he thought “positrons” would have been discovered already)
- An electron with energy E can fill this hole, emitting an energy $2E$ and leaving the vacuum (hence, the hole has effectively the charge $+e$ and positive energy).


Antiparticles: Stueckelberg/Feynman




- An electron with energy E can fill this hole, emitting an energy $2E$ and leaving the vacuum (hence, the hole has effectively the charge $+e$ and positive energy).

Stueckelberg/Feynman interpretation:

- consider the negative energy solution as *running backwards in time*




Antiparticles: Stueckelberg/Feynman




- An electron with energy E can fill this hole, emitting an energy $2E$ and leaving the vacuum (hence, the hole has effectively the charge $+e$ and positive energy).

Stueckelberg/Feynman interpretation:

- consider the negative energy solution as *running backwards in time*
- and re-label it as *antiparticle*, with *positive energy*, going forward in time
- emission of $E > 0$ antiparticle = absorption of particle $E < 0$
- Naturally describes **creation** and **annihilation**...
- ... and that particles and antiparticles must have the same mass, spin, ... and opposite charges




Antiparticles: CPT



Stueckelberg/Feynman interpretation:

- consider the negative energy solution as *running backwards in time*
- and re-label it as *antiparticle*, with *positive energy*, going forward in time
- emission of $E > 0$ antiparticle = absorption of particle $E < 0$

Antiparticles: CPT



Stueckelberg/Feynman interpretation:

- consider the negative energy solution as *running backwards in time*
- and re-label it as *antiparticle*, with *positive energy*, going forward in time
- emission of $E > 0$ antiparticle = absorption of particle $E < 0$

This involves a *CPT* transformation:

- we have flipped Charge (C),
- flipped time (T),
- *and to prevent momentum from being flipped, must also flip the space coordinates (P)*

Quantity		C	T	P
Time	t	t	$-t$	t
Space vector	x	x	x	$-x$
Momentum	p	p	$-p$	$-p$

CPT theorem

“Any Lorentz-invariant local quantum field theory is invariant under the combined application of **C**, **P** and **T**”

G. Lüders, W. Pauli (1954); J. Schwinger (1951)

Assumptions:

1. Lorentz invariance
2. “principle of locality”
3. Causality
4. Vacuum lowest energy
5. Flat space-time
6. Point-like particles

Consequences:

1. Relation between spin and statistics: fields with integer spin commute and fields with half-numbered spin anticommute; Pauli exclusion principle
2. Particles and antiparticles have **equal mass and lifetime**, equal magnetic moments with opposite sign, and **opposite quantum numbers**

CPT theorem

“Any Lorentz-invariant local quantum field theory is invariant under the combined application of C, P and T ”


G. Lüders, W. Pauli (1954); J. Schwinger (1951)

Assumptions:

1. Lorentz invariance
2. “principle of locality”
3. Causality
4. Vacuum lowest energy
5. Flat space-time
6. Point-like particles

Consequences:

1. Relation between spin and statistics: fields with integer spin commute and fields with half-numbered spin anticommute; Pauli exclusion principle
2. Particles and antiparticles have **equal mass** and **lifetime**, equal magnetic moments with opposite sign, and **opposite quantum numbers**



$$\frac{M(K^0) - M(\bar{K}^0)}{(M(K^0) + M(\bar{K}^0)) / 2} < 10^{-17} (95\% CL)$$

Discovery of Antiparticles

Back to experiment: does antimatter exist, and, if so, where is it?

Carl Anderson studies at cosmic rays on Pikes peak, using a Cloud chamber




Particles will show (temporarily) as condensation trail in gas volume (just like condensation trails of airplanes)



Antiparticles: Anderson's discovery

- Result: discovery of a positively charged, electron-like particle dubbed the 'positron'




Antiparticles: Anderson's discovery

CARL D. ANDERSON

The production and properties of positrons


Nobel Lecture, December 12, 1936

- Confirmed with $\gamma \rightarrow e^+e^-$



Big Bang

equal amounts of matter
& antimatter produced (?)




Where is the antimatter?




Cosmic Antimatter..

- Antiparticles appear in cosmic ray showers
- But what about the original incoming (anti?)particle
- Must measure before the shower starts, eg. above the atmosphere..



AntiMatter Searches:AMS



AntiMatter Searches:AMS






Photo taken from Mir (1998)



AntiMatter Searches:AMS

Look for anti-Helium: very unlikely to have been created as secondary product in collisions...



AMS-2 currently scheduled for STS-134
(either the last or last but one shuttle flight!)
for delivery to the ISS..

$$\frac{N_{\bar{\text{He}}}}{N_{\text{He}}} < 1.1 \cdot 10^{-6} @ 95\%CL$$

Antimatter Searches: Summary

No evidence for the original, “primordial” cosmic antimatter:


- Absence of anti-nuclei amongst cosmic rays in our galaxy
- Absence of intense γ -ray emission due to annihilation of distant galaxies in collision with antimatter



Antimatter & the Big Bang

Big Bang:

- Create equal amounts of matter & antimatter




Early universe

Antimatter & the Big Bang

Big Bang:

- Create equal amounts of matter & antimatter
- Somewhere along the way, one (matter) is favored
- Final result : a bit of matter and *lots* of photons
- $N_{\text{baryons}}/N_{\text{photons}} \cong 6 \cdot 10^{-10}$



Current universe

Sakharov's conditions on the Big Bang

VIOLATION OF CP INVARIANCE, C ASYMMETRY, AND BARYON ASYMMETRY OF THE UNIVERSE

A. D. Sakharov

Submitted 23 September 1966

ZhETF Pis'ma 5, No. 1, 32-35, 1 January 1967

The theory of the expanding Universe, which presupposes a superdense initial state of matter, apparently excludes the possibility of macroscopic separation of matter from anti-matter; it must therefore be assumed that there are no antimatter bodies in nature, i.e., the Universe is asymmetrical with respect to the number of particles and antiparticles (C asymmetry). In particular, the absence of antibaryons and the proposed absence of baryonic neutrinos implies a non-zero baryon charge (baryonic asymmetry). We wish to point out a possible explanation of C asymmetry in the hot model of the expanding Universe (see [1]) by making use of effects of CP invariance violation (see [2]). To explain baryon asymmetry, we propose in addition an approximate character for the baryon conservation law.



Andrei Sakharov
“Father” of Soviet
hydrogen bomb
& Nobel Peace Prize
Winner

Sakharov's conditions on the Big Bang

VIOLATION OF CP INVARIANCE, C ASYMMETRY, AND BARYON ASYMMETRY OF THE UNIVERSE

A. D. Sakharov

Submitted 23 September 1966

ZhETF Pis'ma 5, No. 1, 32-35, 1 January 1967

The theory of the expanding Universe, which presupposes a superdense initial state of matter, apparently excludes the possibility of macroscopic separation of matter from anti-matter; it must therefore be assumed that there are no antimatter bodies in nature, i.e., the Universe is asymmetrical with respect to the number of particles and antiparticles (C asymmetry). In particular, the absence of antibaryons and the proposed absence of baryonic neutrinos implies a non-zero baryon charge (baryonic asymmetry). We wish to point out a possible explanation of C asymmetry in the hot model of the expanding Universe (see [1]) by making use of effects of CP invariance violation (see [2]). To explain baryon asymmetry, we propose in addition an approximate character for the baryon conservation law.

Three requirements for a universe with a baryon asymmetry:

1. A process that violates baryon number
2. C and CP violation, i.e. breaking of the C and CP *symmetries*
3. 1 & 2 should occur during a phase which is NOT in thermal equilibrium

These lectures will focus on 2.



Andrei Sakharov
“Father” of Soviet
hydrogen bomb
& Nobel Peace Prize
Winner

Symmetries

Instructions by the VOC (Dutch East India Company) in Aug 1642:

*“Since many rich mines and other treasures have been found in countries north of the equator between 15° and 40° latitude, **there is no doubt that countries alike exist south** of the equator. The provinces in Peru and Chili rich of gold and silver, all positioned south of the equator, are revealing **proofs** hereof.”*

Abel Tasman discovered Tasmania (Nov. 1642), New Zealand (Dec. 1642), Fiji (Jan 1643), ...

From the point of view of the VOC, this was a disappointment..



Abel Tasman

Symmetries & “Hidden Observables”

“The root to all symmetry principles lies in the assumption that it is impossible to observe certain basic quantities; the non-observables”

1.Space translation symmetry:

Hidden observable: **Absolute position**

Conserved quantity: momentum

2.Time shift symmetry:

Hidden observable: **Absolute time**

Conserved quantity: Energy

3.Rotation symmetry:

Hidden observable: **Absolute orientation**

Conserved quantity: Angular momentum



T.D. Lee

[See Noether's theorem for more details](#)

Discrete Symmetries

- Space, time translation & orientation symmetries are all *continuous* symmetries
 - Each symmetry operation associated with one or more continuous parameter
- There are also *discrete* symmetries
 - Spatial sign flip ($x,y,z \rightarrow -x,-y,-z$) : **P**
 - Charge sign flip ($Q \rightarrow -Q$) : **C**
 - Time sign flip ($t \rightarrow -t$) : **T**
- Are these discrete symmetries exact symmetries that are observed in nature?
 - Is the assignment of the label (anti) particle a convention or not?
 - Is there a fundamental difference between left-handed and right-handed?

Quantity		P	C	T
Space vector	x	-x	x	x
Time	t	t	t	-t
Momentum	p	-p	p	-p
Spin	s	s	s	-s
Electrical field	E	-E	-E	E
Magnetic field	B	B	-B	-B

Discrete Symmetries

- Space, time translation & orientation symmetries are all *continuous* symmetries
 - Each symmetry operation associated with one or more continuous parameter
- There are also *discrete* symmetries
 - Spatial sign flip ($x,y,z \rightarrow -x,-y,-z$) : **P**
 - Charge sign flip ($Q \rightarrow -Q$) : **C**
 - Time sign flip ($t \rightarrow -t$) : **T**
- Are these discrete symmetries exact symmetries that are observed in nature?
 - Is the assignment of the label (anti) particle a convention or not?
 - Is there a fundamental difference between left-handed and right-handed?

In particle physics:

$$P |e_L^- \rangle = |e_R^- \rangle$$

$$P |\pi^0 \rangle = -|\pi^0 \rangle$$

$$P |n \rangle = +|n \rangle$$

$$C |e_L^- \rangle = |e_L^+ \rangle$$

$$C |u \rangle = |\bar{u} \rangle$$

$$C |d \rangle = |\bar{d} \rangle$$

$$C |\pi^0 \rangle = +|\pi^0 \rangle$$

note: the definition of a 'left handed' particle will follow in 'a few slides' time

Discrete Symmetries


- No evidence that electromagnetic & strong forces break C, P or T
- Example: π^0 decay into photons

$$\pi^0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} [u\bar{u} - d\bar{d}]_{L=0,S=0} \Rightarrow C |\pi^0\rangle = + |\pi^0\rangle$$
$$C \cdot \vec{B} = -\vec{B}; C \cdot \vec{E} = -\vec{E} \Rightarrow C |\gamma\rangle = - |\gamma\rangle$$

- π^0 decays to two photons, but not three!
- Initial *and* final states are C even, thus C is conserved!
- Experimental test of P and C conservation in EM interaction:
 - C invariance: $\text{Br}(\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma\gamma) < 3.1 \cdot 10^{-5}$
 - P invariance: $\text{Br}(\eta \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0 \pi^0 \pi^0) < 6.9 \cdot 10^{-7}$
- Experimental test of C invariance in strong interaction:
 - compare rates of positive and negative particles in eg. $p\bar{p} \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- X, K^+ K^- X, \dots$


Parity

- Before 1956 physicists were *convinced* that the laws of nature were left-right symmetric. Strange?
- A “gedanken” experiment:
Consider two perfectly mirror symmetric cars:




Parity

- Before 1956 physicists were *convinced* that the laws of nature were left-right symmetric. Strange?
- A “gedanken” experiment:
Consider two perfectly mirror symmetric cars:



Parity

- Before 1956 physicists were *convinced* that the laws of nature were left-right symmetric. Strange?
- A “gedanken” experiment:
Consider two perfectly mirror symmetric cars:



What would happen if the engine is powered by, say, ^{60}Co β decay?

The θ - τ puzzle

Observation of something(s) which decay to two pions and three pions, but whatever decays (now known as K^+), has, in both decays, the same lifetime, mass, spin=0...

In 1953, Dalitz argued that since the pion has parity of -1,

- **two pions** (*) would combine to produce a net parity of $(-1)(-1) = +1$,
- and **three pions** (*) would combine to have total parity of $(-1)(-1)(-1) = -1$.

Hence, if conservation of parity holds, there are two *distinct* particles with parity +1 (the ' θ ') and parity -1 (the ' τ ')(**).

But how to explain the fact that the mass and lifetime are the same?



$$I(J^P) = \frac{1}{2}(0^-)$$

K^+ DECAY MODES

K^- modes are charge conjugates of the modes below.

Mode	Fraction (Γ_i/Γ)	Scale factor/ Confidence level
Hadronic modes		
Γ_9 $\pi^+ \pi^0$	(21.13 \pm 0.14) %	S=1.1
Γ_{10} $\pi^+ \pi^0 \pi^0$	(1.73 \pm 0.04) %	S=1.2
Γ_{11} $\pi^+ \pi^+ \pi^-$	(5.576 \pm 0.031) %	S=1.1

Citation: S. Eidelman et al. (Particle Data Group), Phys. Lett. B 592, 1 (2004) (URL: <http://pdg.lbl.gov>)

(*) produced in the decay of a spin=0 mother

(**) Warning: do not confuse this ' τ ' with what is now known as the τ lepton...

Question of Parity Conservation in Weak Interactions*

T. D. LEE, *Columbia University, New York, New York*

AND


C. N. YANG,† *Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York*

(Received June 22, 1956)

The question of parity conservation in β decays and in hyperon and meson decays is examined. Possible experiments are suggested which might test parity conservation in these interactions.

RECENT experimental data indicate closely identical masses¹ and lifetimes² of the θ^+ ($\equiv K_{\tau 2}^+$) and the τ^+ ($\equiv K_{\tau 3}^+$) mesons. On the other hand, analyses³ of the decay products of τ^+ strongly suggest on the grounds of angular momentum and parity conservation that the τ^+ and θ^+ are not the same particle. This poses a rather puzzling situation that has been extensively discussed.⁴

One way out of the difficulty is to assume that parity is not strictly conserved, so that θ^+ and τ^+ are two different decay modes of the same particle, which necessarily has a single mass value and a single lifetime. We wish to analyze this possibility in the present paper against the background of the existing experimental evidence of parity conservation. It will become clear that existing experiments do indicate parity conservation in strong and electromagnetic interactions to a high degree of accuracy, but that for the weak interactions (i.e., decay interactions for the mesons and hyperons, and various Fermi interactions) parity conservation is so far only an extrapolated hypothesis unsupported by experimental evidence. (One might even say that the present θ - τ puzzle may be taken as an indication that parity conservation is violated in weak interactions. This argument is, however, not to be taken seriously because of the paucity of our present knowledge concerning the nature of the strange particles. It supplies rather an incentive for an examination of the question of parity conservation.) To decide



Question of Parity Conservation in Weak Interactions*

T. D. LEE, *Columbia University, New York, New York*

AND


C. N. YANG,† *Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York*

(Received June 22, 1956)

The question of parity conservation in β decays and in hyperon and meson decays is examined. Possible experiments are suggested which might test parity conservation in these interactions.

RECENT experimental data indicate closely identical masses¹ and lifetimes² of the θ^+ ($\equiv K_{\tau 2}^+$) and the τ^+ ($\equiv K_{\tau 3}^+$) mesons. On the other hand, analyses³ of the decay products of τ^+ strongly suggest on the grounds of angular momentum and parity conservation that the τ^+ and θ^+ are not the same particle. This poses a rather puzzling situation that has been extensively discussed.⁴

One way out of the difficulty is to assume that parity is not strictly conserved, so that θ^+ and τ^+ are two different decay modes of the same particle, which necessarily has a single mass value and a single lifetime. We wish to analyze this possibility in the present paper against the background of the existing experimental evidence of parity conservation. It will become clear that existing experiments do indicate parity conservation in strong and electromagnetic interactions to a high degree of accuracy, but that for the weak interactions (i.e., decay interactions for the mesons and hyperons, and various Fermi interactions) parity conservation is so far only an extrapolated hypothesis unsupported by experimental evidence. (One might even say that the present θ - τ puzzle may be taken as an indication that parity conservation is violated in weak interactions. This argument is, however, not to be taken seriously because of the paucity of our present knowledge concerning the nature of the strange particles. It supplies rather an incentive for an examination of the question of parity conservation.) To decide



The Nobel Prize in Physics 1957

"for their penetrating investigation of the so-called parity laws which has led to important discoveries regarding the elementary particles"

The Experimental (Re)Solution...

Experimental Test of Parity Conservation in Beta Decay*

C. S. WU, *Columbia University, New York, New York*

AND

E. AMBLER, R. W. HAYWARD, D. D. HOPPES, AND R. P. HUDSON,
National Bureau of Standards, Washington, D. C.

(Received January 15, 1957)

Idea for experiment in
collaboration with Lee and
Yang: *Look at spin of decay
products of polarized
radioactive nucleus*

- Production mechanism involves
exclusively weak interaction




Mme. Chien-Shiung Wu

Parity & Spin


How does the decay of a particle with spin tell you something about parity?

Gedanken-experiment: decay of a spin-1 particle to two spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ particles




- Spin: $|1, 1\rangle \rightarrow |\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\rangle + |\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\rangle$
- It is important that initial state is *maximally polarized*: only then there is a single solution for the spin of the decay products. If not, e.g.
 - $|1, 0\rangle \rightarrow |\frac{1}{2}, +\frac{1}{2}\rangle + |\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}\rangle$
 - $|1, 0\rangle \rightarrow |\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}\rangle + |\frac{1}{2}, +\frac{1}{2}\rangle$

Parity & Spin




Parity & Spin

- A possible orientation




Parity & Spin

- A possible orientation
- And another...




Parity & Spin

- A possible orientation
- And another...
- And another...



Parity & Spin

- A possible orientation
- And another...
- And another...




Parity & Spin: Helicity

- A possible orientation
- And another...
- And another...
- Introduce projection of spin on momentum, the helicity, to distinguish:

$$H = \frac{\vec{S} \cdot \vec{P}}{|\vec{S} \cdot \vec{P}|}$$

- Under parity transform $H \rightarrow -H$
- If parity conserved, no reason to favour one value of H over another

$H = +1$ "Right Handed"





$H = -1$ "Left Handed"

warning:
helicity assignment is not Lorentz invariant for massive particles: an observer can boost 'past' such that p changes direction.

For more details, please check on the difference between 'chirality' and 'helicity'


Mme Wu's Experiment : setup




- How do you obtain a sample of ^{60}Co with spins aligned in one direction, and compare to non-aligned case?
- Adiabatic demagnetization of ^{60}Co in a magnetic field at very low temperatures (~ 0.01 K!). Extremely challenging in 1956!

Mme Wu's Experiment : setup


- How do you obtain a sample of ^{60}Co with spins aligned in one direction, and compare to non-aligned case?
- Adiabatic demagnetization of ^{60}Co in a magnetic field at very low temperatures (~ 0.01 K!). Extremely challenging in 1956!





Mme Wu's Experiment : setup



- How do you obtain a sample of ^{60}Co with spins aligned in one direction, and compare to non-aligned case?
- Adiabatic demagnetization of ^{60}Co in a magnetic field at very low temperatures (~ 0.01 K!). Extremely challenging in 1956!





Mme Wu's Experiment : setup



- How do you obtain a sample of ^{60}Co with spins aligned in one direction, and compare to non-aligned case?
- Adiabatic demagnetization of ^{60}Co in a magnetic field at very low temperatures (~ 0.01 K!). Extremely challenging in 1956!



Mme Wu's Experiment : result



^{60}Co polarization decreases as a function of time as the temperature increases

- The counting rate in the polarized case is different from the unpolarized case
- Changing the direction of the B-field changes the counting rate!
- Electrons are preferentially emitted in the direction opposite the ^{60}Co spin!

Mme Wu's Experiment : conclusion



^{60}Co polarization decreases as a function of time as the temperature increases

- The counting rate in the polarized case is different from the unpolarized case
- Changing the direction of the B-field changes the counting rate!
- Electrons are preferentially emitted in the direction opposite the ^{60}Co spin!
- Analysis of the results shows that data consistent with the emission of only left-handed (i.e. $H = -1$) electrons
- ... and thus only *right-handed anti-neutrinos*

From P to C,P and CP

Observations of the Failure of Conservation of Parity and Charge Conjugation in Meson Decays: the Magnetic Moment of the Free Muon*

RICHARD L. GARWIN,† LEON M. LEDERMAN,
AND MARCEL WEINRICH

*Physics Department, Nevis Cyclotron Laboratories,
Columbia University, Irvington-on-Hudson,
New York, New York*


(Received January 15, 1957)



Leon M. Lederman




From P to C,P and CP

- Lederman et al.: Look at decay $\pi^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ \nu_\mu$



From P to C,P and CP





- Lederman et al.: Look at decay $\pi^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ \nu_\mu$



- Pion has spin 0; μ, ν_μ both have spin $1/2$
 - spin of decay products must be *oppositely* aligned
 - Helicity of muon is the *same* as that of neutrino.



From P to C,P and CP

- Lederman et al.: Look at decay $\pi^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ \nu_\mu$







- Pion has spin 0; μ, ν_μ both have spin $1/2$
 - spin of decay products must be *oppositely* aligned
 - Helicity of muon is the *same* as that of neutrino.


- Nice bonus: can also measure polarization of both neutrino (π^+ decay) and anti-neutrino (π^- decay)




C,P and CP



C,P and CP



C,P and CP



C broken, P broken, but CP appears to be preserved in weak interaction!

Summary

- Existence of antimatter is a consequence of the combination of special relativity and quantum mechanics
- No 'primordial' antimatter observed
- Need something called 'CP' symmetry breaking to explain the absence of antimatter
- CPT is a very good symmetry
- C,P and CP are conserved in strong & EM interactions
- C,P completely broken by weak interactions, CP looks healthy...

Kaons...

$$m_K \sim 494 \text{ MeV}/c^2$$

No strange particles lighter than kaons exist

⇒ Decay must violate “strangeness”

Strong force conserves “strangeness”

⇒ Decay is a pure weak interaction


Isospin				
+1	\bar{K}^0	$(s\bar{d})$	K^+	$(\bar{s}u)$
-1	K^-	$(s\bar{u})$	K^0	$(\bar{s}d)$
	-1		+1	“Strangeness”

Kaons...

$$m_K \sim 494 \text{ MeV}/c^2$$

No strange particles lighter than kaons exist
 \Rightarrow Decay must violate “strangeness”

Strong force conserves “strangeness”
 \Rightarrow Decay is a pure weak interaction



hadronic decays:

$$K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0, \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+, \pi^+ \pi^0 \pi^0$$

$$K^- \rightarrow \pi^- \pi^0, \pi^- \pi^+ \pi^-, \pi^- \pi^0 \pi^0$$

$$K^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0, \pi^0 \pi^0 \pi^0, \pi^+ \pi^-, \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0$$

$$\bar{K}^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0, \pi^0 \pi^0 \pi^0, \pi^+ \pi^-, \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0$$

Isospin

+1	\bar{K}^0	$(s\bar{d})$	K^+	$(\bar{s}u)$
-1	K^-	$(s\bar{u})$	K^0	$(\bar{s}d)$
	-1		+1	“Strangeness”

Kaons...

$$m_K \sim 494 \text{ MeV}/c^2$$

No strange particles lighter than kaons exist

⇒ Decay must violate “strangeness”

Strong force conserves “strangeness”

⇒ Decay is a pure weak interaction


Isospin

+1	$\overline{K^0} \ (s\bar{d})$	$K^+ \ (\bar{s}u)$
-1	$K^- \ (s\bar{u})$	$K^0 \ (\bar{s}d)$

-1

+1

“Strangeness”




hadronic decays:

$$K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^0, \pi^+\pi^-\pi^+, \pi^+\pi^0\pi^0$$

$$K^- \rightarrow \pi^-\pi^0, \pi^-\pi^+\pi^-, \pi^-\pi^0\pi^0$$

$$K^0 \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0, \pi^0\pi^0\pi^0, \pi^+\pi^-, \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$$

$$\overline{K^0} \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0, \pi^0\pi^0\pi^0, \pi^+\pi^-, \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$$




semi-leptonic decays:

$$K^+ \rightarrow \pi^0\mu^+\nu_\mu, \pi^0e^+\nu_e$$

$$K^- \rightarrow \pi^0\mu^-\bar{\nu}_\mu, \pi^0e^-\bar{\nu}_e$$

$$K^0 \rightarrow \pi^-\mu^+\nu_\mu, \pi^-e^+\nu_e$$

$$\overline{K^0} \rightarrow \pi^+\mu^-\bar{\nu}_\mu, \pi^+e^-\bar{\nu}_e$$



leptonic decays:

$$K^+ \rightarrow \mu^+\nu_\mu, e^+\nu_e$$

$$K^- \rightarrow \mu^-\bar{\nu}_\mu, e^-\bar{\nu}_e$$

$$K^0 \rightarrow \mu^-\mu^+, e^-e^+$$

$$\overline{K^0} \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-, e^+e^-$$

Kaons...

$$m_K \sim 494 \text{ MeV}/c^2$$

No strange particles lighter than kaons exist

⇒ Decay must violate “strangeness”

Strong force conserves “strangeness”

⇒ Decay is a pure weak interaction


Isospin

+1	$\overline{K^0} (s\bar{d})$	$K^+ (\bar{s}u)$
-1	$K^- (s\bar{u})$	$K^0 (\bar{s}d)$

-1

+1

“Strangeness”




hadronic decays:

$$K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^0, \pi^+\pi^-\pi^+, \pi^+\pi^0\pi^0$$

$$K^- \rightarrow \pi^-\pi^0, \pi^-\pi^+\pi^-, \pi^-\pi^0\pi^0$$

$$K^0 \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0, \pi^0\pi^0\pi^0, \pi^+\pi^-, \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$$

$$\overline{K^0} \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0, \pi^0\pi^0\pi^0, \pi^+\pi^-, \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$$




semi-leptonic decays:

$$K^+ \rightarrow \pi^0\mu^+\nu_\mu, \pi^0e^+\nu_e$$

$$K^- \rightarrow \pi^0\mu^-\bar{\nu}_\mu, \pi^0e^-\bar{\nu}_e$$

$$K^0 \rightarrow \pi^-\mu^+\nu_\mu, \pi^-e^+\nu_e$$

$$\overline{K^0} \rightarrow \pi^+\mu^-\bar{\nu}_\mu, \pi^+e^-\bar{\nu}_e$$



leptonic decays:

$$K^+ \rightarrow \mu^+\nu_\mu, e^+\nu_e$$

$$K^- \rightarrow \mu^-\bar{\nu}_\mu, e^-\bar{\nu}_e$$

$$K^0 \rightarrow \mu^-\mu^+, e^-e^+$$

$$\overline{K^0} \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-, e^+e^-$$

Hadronic and leptonic decays:
particle and anti-particle behave the same




Kaons...

$m_K \sim 494 \text{ MeV}/c^2$

No strange particles lighter than kaons exist
 \Rightarrow Decay must violate “strangeness”

Strong force conserves “strangeness”
 \Rightarrow Decay is a pure weak interaction

Isospin		+1	$\overline{K^0} \ (s\bar{d})$	$K^+ \ (\bar{s}u)$
		-1	$K^- \ (s\bar{u})$	$K^0 \ (\bar{s}d)$
		-1	+1	“Strangeness”



hadronic decays:

$$K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^0, \pi^+\pi^-\pi^+, \pi^+\pi^0\pi^0$$

$$K^- \rightarrow \pi^-\pi^0, \pi^-\pi^+\pi^-, \pi^-\pi^0\pi^0$$

$$K^0 \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0, \pi^0\pi^0\pi^0, \pi^+\pi^-, \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$$

$$\overline{K^0} \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0, \pi^0\pi^0\pi^0, \pi^+\pi^-, \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$$

semi-leptonic decays:

$$K^+ \rightarrow \pi^0\mu^+\nu_\mu, \pi^0e^+\nu_e$$

$$K^- \rightarrow \pi^0\mu^-\bar{\nu}_\mu, \pi^0e^-\bar{\nu}_e$$

$$K^0 \rightarrow \pi^-\mu^+\nu_\mu, \pi^-e^+\nu_e$$

$$\overline{K^0} \rightarrow \pi^+\mu^-\bar{\nu}_\mu, \pi^+e^-\bar{\nu}_e$$

leptonic decays:

$$K^+ \rightarrow \mu^+\nu_\mu, e^+\nu_e$$

$$K^- \rightarrow \mu^-\bar{\nu}_\mu, e^-\bar{\nu}_e$$

$$K^0 \rightarrow \mu^-\mu^+, e^-e^+$$

$$\overline{K^0} \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-, e^+e^-$$

Hadronic and leptonic decays:
 particle and anti-particle behave the same

Semi-leptonic decays:
 particle and anti-particle are distinct!
 “ $\Delta Q = \Delta S$ rule”



Behavior of Neutral Particles under Charge Conjugation

M. GELL-MANN,* *Department of Physics, Columbia University, New York, New York*

AND

A. PAIS, *Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, New Jersey*

(Received November 1, 1954)



Some properties are discussed of the θ^0 , a heavy boson that is known to decay by the process $\theta^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ + \pi^-$. According to certain schemes proposed for the interpretation of hyperons and K particles, the θ^0 possesses an antiparticle $\bar{\theta}^0$ distinct from itself. Some theoretical implications of this situation are discussed with special reference to charge conjugation invariance. The application of such invariance in familiar instances is surveyed in Sec. I. It is then shown in Sec. II that, within the framework of the tentative schemes under consideration, the θ^0 must be considered as a "particle mixture" exhibiting two distinct lifetimes, that each lifetime is associated with a different set of decay modes, and that no more than half of all θ^0 's undergo the familiar decay into two pions. Some experimental consequences of this picture are mentioned.



Behavior of Neutral Particles under Charge Conjugation

M. GELL-MANN,* *Department of Physics, Columbia University, New York, New York*

AND

A. PAIS, *Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, New Jersey*

(Received November 1, 1954)



Some properties are discussed of the K^0 , a heavy boson that is known to decay by the process $K^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ + \pi^-$. According to certain schemes proposed for the interpretation of hyperons and K particles, the K^0 possesses an antiparticle \bar{K}^0 distinct from itself. Some theoretical implications of this situation are discussed with special reference to charge conjugation invariance. The application of such invariance in familiar instances is surveyed in Sec. I. It is then shown in Sec. II that, within the framework of the tentative schemes under consideration, the K^0 must be considered as a "particle mixture" exhibiting two distinct lifetimes, that each lifetime is associated with a different set of decay modes, and that no more than half of all K^0 's undergo the familiar decay into two pions. Some experimental consequences of this picture are mentioned.



Behavior of Neutral Particles under Charge Conjugation

M. GELL-MANN,* *Department of Physics, Columbia University, New York, New York*

AND


A. PAIS, *Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, New Jersey*

(Received November 1, 1954)



Some properties are discussed of the K^0 , a heavy boson that is known to decay by the process $K^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ + \pi^-$. According to certain schemes proposed for the interpretation of hyperons and K particles, the K^0 possesses an antiparticle \bar{K}^0 distinct from itself. Some theoretical implications of this situation are discussed with special reference to charge conjugation invariance. The application of such invariance in familiar instances is surveyed in Sec. I. It is then shown in Sec. II that, within the framework of the tentative schemes under consideration, the K^0 must be considered as a "particle mixture" exhibiting two distinct lifetimes, that each lifetime is associated with a different set of decay modes, and that no more than half of all K^0 's undergo the familiar decay into two pions. Some experimental consequences of this picture are mentioned.

Known:





Behavior of Neutral Particles under Charge Conjugation

M. GELL-MANN,* *Department of Physics, Columbia University, New York, New York*

AND


A. PAIS, *Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, New Jersey*

(Received November 1, 1954)



Some properties are discussed of the K^0 , a heavy boson that is known to decay by the process $K^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ + \pi^-$. According to certain schemes proposed for the interpretation of hyperons and K particles, the K^0 possesses an antiparticle \bar{K}^0 distinct from itself. Some theoretical implications of this situation are discussed with special reference to charge conjugation invariance. The application of such invariance in familiar instances is surveyed in Sec. I. It is then shown in Sec. II that, within the framework of the tentative schemes under consideration, the K^0 must be considered as a "particle mixture" exhibiting two distinct lifetimes, that each lifetime is associated with a different set of decay modes, and that no more than half of all K^0 's undergo the familiar decay into two pions. Some experimental consequences of this picture are mentioned.

Known:



Hypothesis:





Behavior of Neutral Particles under Charge Conjugation

M. GELL-MANN,* *Department of Physics, Columbia University, New York, New York*

AND


A. PAIS, *Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, New Jersey*

(Received November 1, 1954)



Some properties are discussed of the K^0 , a heavy boson that is known to decay by the process $K^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ + \pi^-$. According to certain schemes proposed for the interpretation of hyperons and K particles, the K^0 possesses an antiparticle \bar{K}^0 distinct from itself. Some theoretical implications of this situation are discussed with special reference to charge conjugation invariance. The application of such invariance in familiar instances is surveyed in Sec. I. It is then shown in Sec. II that, within the framework of the tentative schemes under consideration, the K^0 must be considered as a "particle mixture" exhibiting two distinct lifetimes, that each lifetime is associated with a different set of decay modes, and that no more than half of all K^0 's undergo the familiar decay into two pions. Some experimental consequences of this picture are mentioned.

Known:



Hypothesis:

\bar{K}^0 is not equal to K^0

Use C (actually, CP) to deduce:


1. K^0 (\bar{K}^0) is an 'admixture' with two distinct lifetimes
2. Each lifetime associated to a distinct set of decay modes
3. No more than 50% of K^0 will decay to two pions...

Neutral Meson Mixing

$$\Psi(t) = a(t) |K^0\rangle + b(t) |\overline{K^0}\rangle \equiv \begin{pmatrix} a(t) \\ b(t) \end{pmatrix}$$

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Psi = \hat{H} \Psi$$

$$\hat{H} = \begin{pmatrix} M_K & 0 \\ 0 & M_K \end{pmatrix}$$




Neutral Meson Mixing

$$\Psi(t) = a(t) |K^0\rangle + b(t) |\overline{K}^0\rangle \equiv \begin{pmatrix} a(t) \\ b(t) \end{pmatrix}$$

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Psi = \hat{H} \Psi$$

$$\hat{H} = \begin{pmatrix} M_K & 0 \\ 0 & M_K \end{pmatrix}$$



As (eventually) K^0 and \overline{K}^0 decay, add an *antihermitic* part to the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H} = \begin{pmatrix} M_K - \frac{i}{2}\Gamma_K & 0 \\ 0 & M_K - \frac{i}{2}\Gamma_K \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} (|a|^2 + |b|^2) = - \begin{pmatrix} a^* & b^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_K & 0 \\ 0 & \Gamma_K \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix}$$


Can identify Γ_K as the decay width ($=1/\tau_K$)

Neutral Meson Mixing

$$\Psi(t) = a(t) |K^0\rangle + b(t) |\overline{K^0}\rangle \equiv \begin{pmatrix} a(t) \\ b(t) \end{pmatrix}$$

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Psi = \hat{H} \Psi$$

$$\hat{H} = \begin{pmatrix} M_K - \frac{i}{2}\Gamma_K & 0 \\ 0 & M_K - \frac{i}{2}\Gamma_K \end{pmatrix}$$




Neutral Meson Mixing

$$\Psi(t) = a(t) |K^0\rangle + b(t) |\overline{K^0}\rangle \equiv \begin{pmatrix} a(t) \\ b(t) \end{pmatrix}$$

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Psi = \hat{H} \Psi$$

$$\hat{H} = \begin{pmatrix} M_K - \frac{i}{2}\Gamma_K & 0 \\ 0 & M_K - \frac{i}{2}\Gamma_K \end{pmatrix}$$



Now consider the effect of CP symmetry:

$$\text{CP} \begin{cases} K^0 \\ \overline{K^0} \end{cases} \leftrightarrow \begin{cases} \pi^+ \pi^- \\ \pi^+ \pi^- \end{cases} \iff K^0 \leftrightarrow \overline{K^0}$$


$$\hat{H} = \begin{pmatrix} M_K - \frac{i}{2}\Gamma_K & \Delta \\ \Delta & M_K - \frac{i}{2}\Gamma_K \end{pmatrix}$$

Neutral Meson Mixing


$$\Psi(t) = a(t) |K^0\rangle + b(t) |\overline{K^0}\rangle \equiv \begin{pmatrix} a(t) \\ b(t) \end{pmatrix}$$

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Psi = \hat{H} \Psi$$


$$\hat{H} = \begin{pmatrix} M_K - \frac{i}{2}\Gamma_K & 0 \\ 0 & M_K - \frac{i}{2}\Gamma_K \end{pmatrix}$$



Now consider the effect of CP symmetry:



$$\hat{H} = \begin{pmatrix} M_K - \frac{i}{2}\Gamma_K & \Delta \\ \Delta & M_K - \frac{i}{2}\Gamma_K \end{pmatrix}$$




K^0 and $\overline{K^0}$ are *no longer* eigenstates of H
 their *sum* (K_1) & *difference* (K_2) are eigenstates...
 and K_1 and K_2 have *different* masses and lifetimes

Neutral Kaon Mixing

- K_1 and K_2 are their *own* antiparticle, but one is CP even, the other CP odd
- *Only* the CP even state can decay into 2 pions
 - $|K_1\rangle$ (CP=+1) \rightarrow $\pi\pi$ (CP = -1 * -1 = +1)
- The CP odd state will decay into 3 pions instead
 - $|K_2\rangle$ (CP=-1) \rightarrow $\pi\pi\pi$ (CP = -1*-1*-1 = -1)
- There is a huge difference in available phase space between the two (~600x!) \rightarrow the CP even state will decay much faster
 - Difference due to $M(K^0) \cong 3M(\pi)$
 - Δ has a large imaginary component!

$$|K_1\rangle = \frac{|K^0\rangle + |\overline{K^0}\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$$

$$|K_2\rangle = \frac{|K^0\rangle - |\overline{K^0}\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$$



Experimental confirmation...

Observation of Long-Lived Neutral V Particles*

K. LANDE, E. T. BOOTH, J. IMPEDUGLIA, AND L. M. LEDERMAN,
Columbia University, New York, New York

AND

W. CHINOWSKY, *Brookhaven National Laboratory,
Upton, New York*


(Received July 30, 1956)

At the present stage of the investigation one may only conclude that Table I, Fig. 2, and Q^* plots are consistent with a K^0 -type particle undergoing three-body decay. In this case the mode $\pi e \nu$ is probably prominent,⁹ the mode $\pi \mu \nu$ and perhaps other combinations may exist but are more difficult to establish, and $\pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0$ is relatively rare. Although the Gell-Mann-Pais predictions (I) and (II) have been confirmed, long lifetime and “anomalous” decay mode are not sufficient to identify the observed particle with θ_2^0 . In particular,



Designing a CP violation experiment


- How do you obtain a pure ‘beam’ of (CP-odd!) K_2 particles?
- Exploit that decay of K_1 into two pions is *much* faster than decay of K_2 into three pions
 - $\tau_1 = 0.89 \times 10^{-10}$ sec
 - $\tau_2 = 5.2 \times 10^{-8}$ sec (~ 600 times larger!)
- Beam of neutral Kaons automatically becomes beam of $|K_2\rangle$ as all $|K_1\rangle$ decay very early on...



The Cronin & Fitch Experiment




James Cronin



Val Fitch

Essential idea: Look for (CP violating)
 $K_2 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ decays 20 meters away from
 K^0 production point

Decay of K_2 into 3 pions




If you detect two out of the three pions of a $K_2 \rightarrow \pi\pi\pi$ decay their combined momentum will generally not point along the beam line

The Cronin & Fitch Experiment




James Cronin



Val Fitch

Essential idea: Look for (CP violating)
 $K_2 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-$ decays 20 meters away from
 K^0 production point

Decay of K_2 into 2 pions




Plot the angle between the momentum direction of two pions and the beamline

The Cronin & Fitch Experiment



James Cronin



Val Fitch

Essential idea: Look for (CP violating)
 $K_2 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ decays 20 meters away from
 K^0 production point


EVIDENCE FOR THE 2π DECAY OF THE K_2^0 MESON*†

J. H. Christenson, J. W. Cronin,‡ V. L. Fitch,‡ and R. Turley§

Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey


(Received 10 July 1964)

Decay of K_2 into 2 pions



Incoming K_2 beam

Plot the angle between the momentum direction of two pions and the beamline



CP is 'a bit' broken by weak interaction

Nobel prize 1980:

“The discovery emphasizes, once again, that even almost self evident principles in science cannot be regarded fully valid until they have been critically examined in precise experiments.”




How to construct a physics law that violates a symmetry just a tiny bit?

- Only 0.2% of K_2 decays violate CP...
- Maximal (100%) violation of P symmetry “easily” interpretable/explained as absence of a right-handed neutrino...

Summary

- Existence of antimatter is a consequence of the combination of special relativity and quantum mechanics
- No 'primordial' antimatter observed
- Need something called 'CP' symmetry breaking to explain the absence of antimatter
- CPT is a very good symmetry
- C,P and CP are conserved in strong & EM interactions
- C,P completely broken by weak interactions, CP looks healthy...
- neutral kaons can 'mix' (oscillate) into their antiparticles
- and this can causes lifetime & mass differences of the CP eigenstates of the Hamiltonian
- CP is (a bit) broken in the neutral kaon system!

How to describe this?



EVIDENCE FOR THE 2π DECAY OF THE K_2^0 MESON*†


J. H. Christenson, J. W. Cronin,‡ V. L. Fitch,‡ and R. Turlay§

Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey

(Received 10 July 1964)

three-body decays of the K_2^0 . The presence of a two-pion decay mode implies that the K_2^0 meson is not a pure eigenstate of CP . Expressed as $K_2^0 = 2^{-1/2}[(K_0 - \overline{K}_0) + \epsilon(K_0 + \overline{K}_0)]$ then $|\epsilon|^2 \cong R_T \tau_1 \tau_2$ where τ_1 and τ_2 are the K_1^0 and K_2^0 mean lives and R_T is the branching ratio including decay to two π^0 . Using $R_T = \frac{3}{2}R$ and the branching ratio quoted above, $|\epsilon| \cong 2.3 \times 10^{-3}$.

How to describe this?



EVIDENCE FOR THE 2π DECAY OF THE K_2^0 MESON*†

J. H. Christenson, J. W. Cronin,‡ V. L. Fitch,‡ and R. Turlay§

Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey


(Received 10 July 1964)

three-body decays of the K_2^0 . The presence of a two-pion decay mode implies that the K_2^0 meson is not a pure eigenstate of CP . Expressed as $K_2^0 = 2^{-1/2}[(K_0 - \bar{K}_0) + \epsilon(K_0 + \bar{K}_0)]$ then $|\epsilon|^2 \cong R_T \tau_1 \tau_2$ where τ_1 and τ_2 are the K_1^0 and K_2^0 mean lives and R_T is the branching ratio including decay to two π^0 . Using $R_T = \frac{3}{2}R$ and the branching ratio quoted above, $|\epsilon| \cong 2.3 \times 10^{-3}$.

$$|K_L\rangle = |K_2\rangle + \epsilon |K_1\rangle$$

with $|\epsilon| \ll 1$

How to describe this?



EVIDENCE FOR THE 2π DECAY OF THE K_2^0 MESON*†

J. H. Christenson, J. W. Cronin,‡ V. L. Fitch,‡ and R. Turlay§

Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey

(Received 10 July 1964)


three-body decays of the K_2^0 . The presence of a two-pion decay mode implies that the K_2^0 meson is not a pure eigenstate of CP . Expressed as $K_2^0 = 2^{-1/2}[(K_0 - \bar{K}_0) + \epsilon(K_0 + \bar{K}_0)]$ then $|\epsilon|^2 \cong R_T \tau_1 \tau_2$ where τ_1 and τ_2 are the K_1^0 and K_2^0 mean lives and R_T is the branching ratio including decay to two π^0 . Using $R_T = \frac{3}{2}R$ and the branching ratio quoted above, $|\epsilon| \cong 2.3 \times 10^{-3}$.

$$|K_L\rangle = |K_2\rangle + \epsilon |K_1\rangle$$

$$|K_S\rangle = |K_1\rangle + \epsilon |K_2\rangle$$

with $|\epsilon| \ll 1$

How to describe this?



EVIDENCE FOR THE 2π DECAY OF THE K_2^0 MESON*†

J. H. Christenson, J. W. Cronin,‡ V. L. Fitch,‡ and R. Turlay§

Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey

(Received 10 July 1964)

three-body decays of the K_2^0 . The presence of a two-pion decay mode implies that the K_2^0 meson is not a pure eigenstate of CP . Expressed as $K_2^0 = 2^{-1/2}[(K_0 - \bar{K}_0) + \epsilon(K_0 + \bar{K}_0)]$ then $|\epsilon|^2 \cong R_T \tau_1 \tau_2$ where τ_1 and τ_2 are the K_1^0 and K_2^0 mean lives and R_T is the branching ratio including decay to two π^0 . Using $R_T = \frac{3}{2}R$ and the branching ratio quoted above, $|\epsilon| \cong 2.3 \times 10^{-3}$.

$$|K_L\rangle = |K_2\rangle + \epsilon |K_1\rangle$$

$$|K_S\rangle = |K_1\rangle + \epsilon |K_2\rangle$$

$$\text{with } |\epsilon| \ll 1$$


Have a *choice* when ‘parameterizing’ K_S and K_L :

1. in terms of K^0 and \bar{K}^0
2. in terms of K_1 and K_2

Historically, ‘kaon physics’ has chosen 2, but in in ‘B physics’ (next lectures!), the equivalent of 1 is very much dominant (as $\epsilon_B=0$, but still $q \neq 1$ & $p \neq 1$...)

This tends to be very confusing...

How to describe this?



EVIDENCE FOR THE 2π DECAY OF THE K_2^0 MESON*†

J. H. Christenson, J. W. Cronin,‡ V. L. Fitch,‡ and R. Turlay§
 Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey
 (Received 10 July 1964)

three-body decays of the K_2^0 . The presence of a two-pion decay mode implies that the K_2^0 meson is not a pure eigenstate of CP . Expressed as $K_2^0 = 2^{-1/2}[(K_0 - \bar{K}_0) + \epsilon(K_0 + \bar{K}_0)]$ then $|\epsilon|^2 \cong R_T \tau_1 \tau_2$ where τ_1 and τ_2 are the K_1^0 and K_2^0 mean lives and R_T is the branching ratio including decay to two π^0 . Using $R_T = \frac{3}{2}R$ and the branching ratio quoted above, $|\epsilon| \cong 2.3 \times 10^{-3}$.

$$|K_L\rangle = p |K^0\rangle - q |\bar{K}^0\rangle$$

$$|K_S\rangle = p |K^0\rangle + q |\bar{K}^0\rangle$$

Have a *choice* when ‘parameterizing’ K_S and K_L :

1. in terms of K^0 and \bar{K}^0
2. in terms of K_1 and K_2

Historically, ‘kaon physics’ has chosen 2, but in in ‘B physics’ (next lectures!), the equivalent of 1 is very much dominant (as $\epsilon_B=0$, but still $q \neq 1$ & $p \neq 1$...)

This tends to be very confusing...

$$\langle K_L | K_L \rangle \equiv 1 \Rightarrow |q|^2 + |p|^2 = 1$$


eg.
$$p = 1 + \epsilon$$

$$q = 1 - \epsilon$$
 with $|\epsilon| \ll 1$

Time Evolution of K^0 and $\overline{K^0}$...

$$\begin{pmatrix} K_S(0) \\ K_L(0) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} +q & +p \\ +q & -p \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} K^0(0) \\ \overline{K^0}(0) \end{pmatrix}$$


$$\begin{pmatrix} K_S(t) \\ K_L(t) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-i\omega_S t} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-i\omega_L t} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} K_S(0) \\ K_L(0) \end{pmatrix}$$



$$\begin{pmatrix} K^0(t) \\ \overline{K^0}(t) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} +1/2q & +1/2q \\ +1/2p & -1/2p \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} K_S(t) \\ K_L(t) \end{pmatrix}$$




Time Evolution of K^0 and $\overline{K^0}$...

$$\begin{pmatrix} K^0(t) \\ \overline{K^0}(t) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} g_+(t) & \frac{p}{q}g_-(t) \\ \frac{q}{p}g_-(t) & g_+(t) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} K^0(0) \\ \overline{K^0}(0) \end{pmatrix} \quad g_{\pm}(t) = \frac{e^{-i\omega_S t} \pm e^{-i\omega_L t}}{2}$$




Time Evolution of K^0 and \overline{K}^0 ...


$$\begin{pmatrix} K^0(t) \\ \overline{K}^0(t) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} g_+(t) & \frac{p}{q}g_-(t) \\ \frac{q}{p}g_-(t) & g_+(t) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} K^0(0) \\ \overline{K}^0(0) \end{pmatrix} \quad g_{\pm}(t) = \frac{e^{-i\omega_S t} \pm e^{-i\omega_L t}}{2}$$



Time Evolution of K^0 and \bar{K}^0 ...




$$\begin{aligned}
 A_T(t) &= \frac{\bar{I}_{\pi^- e^+ \nu}(t) - I_{\pi^+ e^- \bar{\nu}}(t)}{\bar{I}_{\pi^- e^+ \nu}(t) + I_{\pi^+ e^- \bar{\nu}}(t)} \\
 &= \frac{1 - |q/p|^4}{1 + |q/p|^4} = 4\mathcal{R}\epsilon
 \end{aligned}$$



Time Evolution of K^0 and \bar{K}^0 ...


This measurement allows one to make an *ABSOLUTE* distinction between matter and anti-matter

- *Positive charge is the charged carried by the lepton preferentially produced in the decay of the neutral K meson*



$$A_T(t) = \frac{\bar{I}_{\pi^- e^+ \nu}(t) - I_{\pi^+ e^- \bar{\nu}}(t)}{\bar{I}_{\pi^- e^+ \nu}(t) + I_{\pi^+ e^- \bar{\nu}}(t)}$$


$$= \frac{1 - |q/p|^4}{1 + |q/p|^4} = 4\mathcal{R}\epsilon$$



Summary


- Existence of antimatter is a consequence of the combination of special relativity and quantum mechanics
- No 'primordial' antimatter observed
- Need something called 'CP' symmetry breaking to explain the absence of antimatter
- CPT is a very good symmetry
- C,P and CP are conserved in strong & EM interactions
- C,P completely broken by weak interactions, CP looks healthy...
- neutral kaons can 'mix' (oscillate) into their antiparticles
- and this can causes lifetime & mass differences of the CP eigenstates of the Hamiltonian
- CP is (a bit) broken in the neutral kaon system!
- And we can use this to unambiguously distinguish matter and antimatter

CLEAR@CERN






CLEAR@CERN

Use the strangeness conservation of the strong interactions to perform tagged K^0 and \bar{K}^0 production:



At $t=0$, events with a

- K^+ 'tag' are a pure \bar{K}^0 sample
- K^- 'tag' are a pure K^0 sample



Interference!

$$g_{\pm}(t) = \frac{e^{-i\omega_S t} \pm e^{-i\omega_L t}}{2}$$


$$A_{+-} \equiv \langle \pi^+ \pi^- | K^0 \rangle$$

$$\bar{A}_{+-} \equiv \langle \pi^+ \pi^- | \bar{K}^0 \rangle$$


$t = 0$

t

Amplitude



$$g_+(t)A_{+-} + \frac{q}{p}g_-(t)\bar{A}_{+-}$$



$$g_+(t)\bar{A}_{+-} + \frac{p}{q}g_-(t)A_{+-}$$

Interference!

$$g_{\pm}(t) = \frac{e^{-i\omega_S t} \pm e^{-i\omega_L t}}{2}$$

$$A_{+-} \equiv \langle \pi^+ \pi^- | K^0 \rangle$$


$$\bar{A}_{+-} \equiv \langle \pi^+ \pi^- | \bar{K}^0 \rangle$$

$$\lambda_{+-} \equiv \frac{q}{p} \frac{\bar{A}_{+-}}{A_{+-}}$$

$t = 0$

t

Amplitude



Interference!

$$g_{\pm}(t) = \frac{e^{-i\omega_S t} \pm e^{-i\omega_L t}}{2}$$

$$A_{+-} \equiv \langle \pi^+ \pi^- | K^0 \rangle$$


$$\bar{A}_{+-} \equiv \langle \pi^+ \pi^- | \bar{K}^0 \rangle$$

$$\lambda_{+-} \equiv \frac{q}{p} \frac{\bar{A}_{+-}}{A_{+-}}$$

$t = 0$

t

Rate



Three ways to break CP...

$$g_{\pm}(t) = \frac{e^{-i\omega_S t} \pm e^{-i\omega_L t}}{2}$$

$$A_{+-} \equiv \langle \pi^+ \pi^- | K^0 \rangle$$

$$\bar{A}_{+-} \equiv \langle \pi^+ \pi^- | \bar{K}^0 \rangle$$

$$\lambda_{+-} \equiv \frac{q}{p} \frac{\bar{A}_{+-}}{A_{+-}}$$

$$\Gamma(K^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-) \propto |A_{+-}|^2 \left[|g_+(t)|^2 + |\lambda_{+-}|^2 |g_-(t)|^2 + 2\mathcal{R}(\lambda_{+-} g_+^*(t) g_-(t)) \right]$$

$$\Gamma(\bar{K}^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-) \propto |\bar{A}_{+-}|^2 \left[|g_+(t)|^2 + \frac{1}{|\lambda_{+-}|^2} |g_-(t)|^2 + \frac{2}{|\lambda_{+-}|^2} \mathcal{R}(\lambda_{+-}^* g_+^*(t) g_-(t)) \right]$$

1. CP violation in decay $\left| \frac{\bar{A}_f}{A_f} \right| \neq 1$

2. CP violation in mixing: $\left| \frac{q}{p} \right| \neq 1$


3. CP violation in interference mixing/decay: $\mathcal{I}(\lambda_f) = \mathcal{I}\left(\frac{q}{p} \frac{\bar{A}_f}{A_f}\right) \neq 0$

Write in terms of observables...


$$\eta_{+-} = \frac{1-\lambda}{1+\lambda} = \frac{pA - q\bar{A}}{pA + q\bar{A}} = \frac{\langle \pi^+ \pi^- | K_L \rangle}{\langle \pi^+ \pi^- | K_S \rangle} \quad \eta_{+-} = |\eta_{+-}| e^{i\phi_{+-}} \quad \lambda_{+-} \equiv \frac{q}{p} \frac{\bar{A}_{+-}}{A_{+-}}$$

$$\Gamma(K^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-) = N \left[e^{-\Gamma_S t} + |\eta_{+-}|^2 e^{-\Gamma_L t} + 2e^{-\Gamma t} |\eta_{+-}| \cos(\Delta m t - \phi_{+-}) \right]$$


$$\Gamma(\bar{K}^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-) = \bar{N} \left[e^{-\Gamma_S t} + |\eta_{+-}|^2 e^{-\Gamma_L t} - 2e^{-\Gamma t} |\eta_{+-}| \cos(\Delta m t - \phi_{+-}) \right]$$



K_S



K_L



K_S - K_L interference

Write in terms of observables...

$$\eta_{+-} = \frac{1-\lambda}{1+\lambda} = \frac{pA - q\bar{A}}{pA + q\bar{A}} = \frac{\langle \pi^+\pi^- | K_L \rangle}{\langle \pi^+\pi^- | K_S \rangle} \quad \eta_{+-} = |\eta_{+-}| e^{i\phi_{+-}} \quad \lambda_{+-} \equiv \frac{q}{p} \frac{\bar{A}_{+-}}{A_{+-}}$$

$$\Gamma(K^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-) = N \left[e^{-\Gamma_S t} + |\eta_{+-}|^2 e^{-\Gamma_L t} + 2e^{-\Gamma t} |\eta_{+-}| \cos(\Delta m t - \phi_{+-}) \right]$$


$$\Gamma(\bar{K}^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-) = \bar{N} \left[e^{-\Gamma_S t} + |\eta_{+-}|^2 e^{-\Gamma_L t} - 2e^{-\Gamma t} |\eta_{+-}| \cos(\Delta m t - \phi_{+-}) \right]$$

K_S
 K_L
 K_S - K_L interference

Interference term has a *sign difference* because:

$$|K^0\rangle = \frac{1}{2p} (|K_L\rangle + |K_S\rangle)$$

$$|\bar{K}^0\rangle = \frac{1}{2q} (|K_L\rangle - |K_S\rangle)$$




A determination of the CP violation parameter η_{+-} from the decay of strangeness-tagged neutral kaons

CPLEAR Collaboration

A. Apostolakis ^a, E. Aslanides ^k, G. Backenstoss ^b, P. Bargassa ^m, O. Behnke ^q,
A. Benelli ⁱ, V. Bertin ^k, F. Blanc ^{g,m}, P. Bloch ^d, P. Carlson ^o, M. Carroll ⁱ,
E. Cawley ⁱ, M.B. Chertok ^c, M. Danielsson ^o, M. Dejardin ⁿ, J. Derre ⁿ, A. Ealet ^k,
C. Eleftheriadis ^p, W. Fetscher ^q, M. Fidecaro ^d, A. Filipčič ^j, D. Francis ^c, J. Fry ⁱ,
E. Gabathuler ⁱ, R. Gamet ⁱ, H.-J. Gerber ^q, A. Go ^o, A. Haselden ⁱ, P.J. Hayman ⁱ,
F. Henry-Couannier ^k, R.W. Hollander ^f, K. Jon-And ^o, P.-R. Kettle ^m, P. Kokkas ^d,
R. Kreuger ^f, R. Le Gac ^k, F. Leimgruber ^b, I. Mandić ^j, N. Manthos ^h, G. Marel ⁿ,
M. Mikuž ^j, J. Miller ^c, F. Montanet ^k, A. Muller ⁿ, T. Nakada ^m, B. Pagels ^q,
I. Papadopoulos ^p, P. Pavlopoulos ^b, G. Polivka ^b, R. Rickenbach ^b, B.L. Roberts ^c,
T. Ruf ^d, L. Sakeliou ^a, M. Schäfer ^q, L.A. Schaller ^g, T. Schietinger ^b,
A. Schopper ^d, L. Tauscher ^b, C. Thibault ^l, F. Touchard ^k, C. Touramanis ⁱ,
C.W.E. Van Eijk ^f, S. Vlachos ^b, P. Weber ^q, O. Wigger ^m, M. Wolter ^q, C. Yeche ⁿ,
D. Zavrtanik ^j, D. Zimmerman ^c

$$\mathcal{A} = \frac{\Gamma(K^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-) - \Gamma(\overline{K}^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-)}{\Gamma(K^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-) + \Gamma(\overline{K}^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-)}$$

Asymmetry A_{+-}



CP and the Standard Model

Sofar:

- seen that Weak Interaction breaks both C and P ‘completely’ and CP ‘a bit’
- described what happens in very generic terms...

Next:

1. towards the Standard Model description of the Weak Interaction
2. how CP violation is integrated into the Standard Model
3. how can we test the Standard Model description of CP violation?

Leptons & Quarks

In the sixties, it seemed that there were

- 4 types of lepton: e, ν_e, μ, ν_μ
- 3 types of quark: u, d, s
- but many (most!) considered quarks a mathematical trick to explain the zoo of observed particles...

Let's sort them by their electrical charge:


0:	ν_e, ν_μ	$+2/3$:	u
-1:	e, μ	$-1/3$:	d, s

Leptons & Quarks

In the sixties, it seemed that there were


- 4 types of lepton: e, ν_e, μ, ν_μ
- 3 types of quark: u, d, s
- but many (most!) considered quarks a mathematical trick to explain the zoo of observed particles...

Let's sort them by their electrical charge:



Weak Interaction: Leptons vs Quarks

- Problem: using the measured muon lifetime, the *predicted* neutron lifetime is a bit too short -- and the *predicted* lifetime of strange particles way too short...




- Conclusion: measured strength (coupling constant) of weak interaction is systematically (!) different when measured in different types of processes???
- Or maybe we just overlooked something?




UNITARY SYMMETRY AND LEPTONIC DECAYS


Nicola Cabibbo
CERN, Geneva, Switzerland
(Received 29 April 1963)



$>$




$>>$





UNITARY SYMMETRY AND LEPTONIC DECAYS

Nicola Cabibbo
 CERN, Geneva, Switzerland
 (Received 29 April 1963)



To determine θ , let us compare the rates for $K^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ + \nu$ and $\pi^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ + \nu$; we find

$$\frac{\Gamma(K^+ \rightarrow \mu\nu)}{\Gamma(\pi^+ \rightarrow \mu\nu)} = \tan^2\theta \frac{M_K (1 - M_\mu^2/M_K^2)^2}{M_\pi (1 - M_\mu^2/M_\pi^2)^2}. \quad (3)$$

From the experimental data, we then get^{5,6}


$$\theta = 0.257. \quad (4)$$

$$\frac{\left| \begin{array}{c} s \rightarrow \text{W}^- \\ \quad \quad \quad \searrow \\ \quad \quad \quad u \end{array} \right|^2}{\left| \begin{array}{c} d \rightarrow \text{W}^- \\ \quad \quad \quad \searrow \\ \quad \quad \quad u \end{array} \right|^2} = \tan^2\theta_C$$



UNITARY SYMMETRY AND LEPTONIC DECAYS


Nicola Cabibbo
CERN, Geneva, Switzerland
(Received 29 April 1963)






UNITARY SYMMETRY AND LEPTONIC DECAYS

Nicola Cabibbo
CERN, Geneva, Switzerland
(Received 29 April 1963)




Weak Interaction: Universality



The d quark as 'seen' by the W, the *weak* eigenstate d' ,
is *not* same as the *mass* eigenstate (the d)...


$$\begin{pmatrix} \nu_e \\ e \end{pmatrix}_L, \begin{pmatrix} \nu_\mu \\ \mu \end{pmatrix}_L, \begin{pmatrix} u \\ d' \end{pmatrix}_L = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ d \cos \theta_C + s \sin \theta_C \end{pmatrix}_L$$

Weak Interaction: Universality



The d' seen by the W is a *superposition* of the d and s ...

Weak Interaction: Universality



The d' seen by the W is a *superposition* of the d and s ...


- If d' is a superposition of the d and s , shouldn't there be an s' as well? (*)

$$\begin{pmatrix} d' \\ s' \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta_C & \sin \theta_C \\ -\sin \theta_C & \cos \theta_C \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} d \\ s \end{pmatrix}$$

- If so, we can write d' and s' as *rotated* versions of d and s

(*) yes: coupling of Z to d' *without* matching s' causes a tree-level flavour changing neutral current, which is incompatible with eg. observed $\text{Br}(K_L \rightarrow \mu\mu)$

Weak Interaction: Universality



The d' seen by the W is a *superposition* of the d and s ...

- If d' is a superposition of the d and s , shouldn't there be an s' as well? (*)

$$\begin{pmatrix} d' \\ s' \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta_C & \sin \theta_C \\ -\sin \theta_C & \cos \theta_C \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} d \\ s \end{pmatrix}$$

- If so, we can write d' and s' as *rotated* versions of d and s


$$\begin{pmatrix} u \\ d' \end{pmatrix}_L, \begin{pmatrix} c \\ s' \end{pmatrix}_L$$

- And if there is an s' , why no u -like partner for it?

(*) yes: coupling of Z to d' *without* matching s' causes a tree-level flavour changing neutral current, which is incompatible with eg. observed $\text{Br}(K_L \rightarrow \mu\mu)$


Cabibbo and the charm quark

- There was however one major exception which Cabibbo could not describe: $K^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$
- Observed rate much lower than expected from Cabibbos rate correlations (expected rate $\propto g^8 \sin^2 \theta_c \cos^2 \theta_c$)



GIM and the charm quark

- How does it solve the $K^0 \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ problem?
- Second decay amplitude added that is almost identical to original one, but has relative minus sign \Rightarrow (Almost) fully destructive interference



- Cancellation not perfect because u, c mass not quite the same...

Weak Interactions with Lepton-Hadron Symmetry*

S. L. GLASHOW, J. ILIOPOULOS, AND L. MAIANI†

Lyman Laboratory of Physics, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139


(Received 5 March 1970)

We propose a model of weak interactions in which the currents are constructed out of four basic quark fields and interact with a charged massive vector boson. We show, to all orders in perturbation theory, that the leading divergences do not violate any strong-interaction symmetry and the next to the leading divergences respect all observed weak-interaction selection rules. The model features a remarkable symmetry between leptons and quarks. The extension of our model to a complete Yang-Mills theory is discussed.

$$\begin{pmatrix} \nu_e \\ e \end{pmatrix}_L, \begin{pmatrix} \nu_\mu \\ \mu \end{pmatrix}_L$$
$$\begin{pmatrix} u \\ d' \end{pmatrix}_L, \begin{pmatrix} c \\ s' \end{pmatrix}_L$$

One 'tiny' problem: no experimental evidence for a fourth quark...

...until 1974: Ting, Richter (Nobel prize 1976)



Cartoon shown by N. Cabibbo in 1966...
since then, there was tremendous progress in the
understanding (better: describing) *CP* violation
⇒ **next topic!**

Summary

- Existence of antimatter is a consequence of the combination of special relativity and quantum mechanics
- No 'primordial' antimatter observed
- Need something called 'CP' symmetry breaking to explain the absence of antimatter
- CPT is a very good symmetry
- C,P and CP are conserved in strong & EM interactions
- C,P completely broken by weak interactions, CP looks healthy...
- neutral kaons can 'mix' (oscillate) into their antiparticles
- and this can causes lifetime & mass differences of the CP eigenstates of the Hamiltonian
- CP is (a bit) broken in the neutral kaon system!
- And we can use this to unambiguously distinguish matter and antimatter
- There are actually three ways in which CP can be broken!
- the weak and mass eigenstates of quarks are not the same...

Progress of Theoretical Physics, Vol. 49, No. 2, February 1973



***CP*-Violation in the Renormalizable Theory of Weak Interaction**

Makoto KOBAYASHI and Toshihide MASKAWA

Department of Physics, Kyoto University, Kyoto

(Received September 1, 1972)

In a framework of the renormalizable theory of weak interaction, problems of *CP*-violation are studied. It is concluded that no realistic models of *CP*-violation exist in the quartet scheme without introducing any other new fields. Some possible models of *CP*-violation are also discussed.



The Nobel Prize winning part

Next we consider a 6-plet model, another interesting model of CP -violation. Suppose that 6-plet with charges $(Q, Q, Q, Q-1, Q-1, Q-1)$ is decomposed into $SU_{\text{weak}}(2)$ multiplets as $2+2+2$ and $1+1+1+1+1+1$ for left and right components, respectively. Just as the case of (A, C) , we have a similar expression for the charged weak current with a 3×3 instead of 2×2 unitary matrix in Eq. (5). As was pointed out, in this case we cannot absorb all phases of matrix elements into the phase convention and can take, for example, the following expression:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta_1 & -\sin \theta_1 \cos \theta_3 & -\sin \theta_1 \sin \theta_3 \\ \sin \theta_1 \cos \theta_2 & \cos \theta_1 \cos \theta_2 \cos \theta_3 - \sin \theta_2 \sin \theta_3 e^{i\delta} & \cos \theta_1 \cos \theta_2 \sin \theta_3 + \sin \theta_2 \cos \theta_3 e^{i\delta} \\ \sin \theta_1 \sin \theta_2 & \cos \theta_1 \sin \theta_2 \cos \theta_3 + \cos \theta_2 \sin \theta_3 e^{i\delta} & \cos \theta_1 \sin \theta_2 \sin \theta_3 - \cos \theta_2 \sin \theta_3 e^{i\delta} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (13)$$

Then, we have CP -violating effects through the interference among these different current components. An interesting feature of this model is that the CP -violating effects of lowest order appear only in $\Delta S \neq 0$ non-leptonic processes and in the semi-leptonic decay of neutral strange mesons (we are not concerned with higher states with the new quantum number) and not in the other semi-leptonic, $\Delta S = 0$ non-leptonic and pure-leptonic processes.

$$\begin{pmatrix} u \\ d' \end{pmatrix}_L, \begin{pmatrix} c \\ s' \end{pmatrix}_L, \begin{pmatrix} t \\ b' \end{pmatrix}_L \quad \text{with} \quad \begin{pmatrix} d' \\ s' \\ b' \end{pmatrix} = V_{CKM} \begin{pmatrix} d \\ s \\ b \end{pmatrix}$$

How many 'physical' parameters in V_{CKM} ?

- complex $N \times N$ matrix: $2N^2$ parameters
- must be unitary:
 - eg. t must decay to either b, s or d, so $|V_{td}|^2 + |V_{ts}|^2 + |V_{tb}|^2 = 1$
 - in general: $V^{*T}V = I \rightarrow N^2$ constraints
- freedom to change phase of quark fields $|q_j\rangle \rightarrow e^{i\phi_j} |q_j\rangle$
 - $2N-1$ phases are irrelevant:
$$\langle q_i | V_{ij} | q_j \rangle \rightarrow \langle q_i | e^{-i\phi_i} V_{ij} e^{i\phi_j} | q_j \rangle$$
$$V_{ij} \rightarrow e^{i(\phi_j - \phi_i)} V_{ij}$$
- number of 'physical' parameters = $N^2 - 2N + 1$

How many 'physical' parameters in V_{CKM} ?

- complex $N \times N$ matrix: $2N^2$ parameters
- must be unitary:
 - eg. t must decay to either b, s or d, so $|V_{td}|^2 + |V_{ts}|^2 + |V_{tb}|^2 = 1$
 - in general: $V^{*T}V = I \rightarrow N^2$ constraints
- freedom to change phase of quark fields $|q_j\rangle \rightarrow e^{i\phi_j} |q_j\rangle$
- $2N-1$ phases are irrelevant:
$$\langle q_i | V_{ij} | q_j \rangle \rightarrow \langle q_i | e^{-i\phi_i} V_{ij} e^{i\phi_j} | q_j \rangle$$
$$V_{ij} \rightarrow e^{i(\phi_j - \phi_i)} V_{ij}$$
- number of 'physical' parameters = $N^2 - 2N + 1$
- how many can be rotation angles? $N(N-1)/2$
- For $N=2$: 1 parameter, with 1 rotation angle (Cabbibo!)
- For $N=3$: 4 parameters = 3 rotations + 1 *irreducible* complex phase!

Complex phases & CP

What does CP (or, equivalently T) conjugation do with the Hamiltonian H ?

$$\begin{aligned} [\hat{x}, \hat{p}] &= i\hbar \\ T [\hat{x}, \hat{p}] T^{-1} &= T i T^{-1} \hbar \end{aligned} \quad \begin{array}{l} T\hat{x} = \hat{x} \\ T\hat{p} = -\hat{p} \end{array} \quad \longrightarrow \quad T i T^{-1} = -i$$

Complex phases & CP

What does CP (or, equivalently T) conjugation do with the Hamiltonian H ?


$$[\hat{x}, \hat{p}] = i\hbar$$

$$T \hat{x} T^{-1} = \hat{x}$$

$$T \hat{p} T^{-1} = -\hat{p}$$

$$T [\hat{x}, \hat{p}] T^{-1} = T i T^{-1} \hbar \xrightarrow{\hspace{2cm}} T i T^{-1} = -i$$

The T (and CP) operations must be **anti-unitary**, which implies **complex conjugation** !



*With 3 (or more) generations V_{CKM} can be complex
 → **CP violation possible***

Are there really 3 generations?

- Discovery of 5th quark in 1977
 - Named 'b' for beauty/bottom
 - Mass around 4.5 GeV
 - Start of the 3rd generation of quarks!



Observation of a Dimuon Resonance at 9.5 GeV in 400-GeV Proton-Nucleus Collisions

S. W. Herb, D. C. Hom, L. M. Lederman, J. C. Sens,^(a) H. D. Snyder, and J. K. Yoh
Columbia University, New York, New York 10027

and



J. A. Appel, B. C. Brown, C. N. Brown, W. R. Innes, K. Ueno, and T. Yamanouchi
Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, Illinois 60510

and

A. S. Ito, H. Jöstlein, D. M. Kaplan, and R. D. Kephart
State University of New York at Stony Brook, Stony Brook, New York 11974
 (Received 1 July 1977)

Accepted without review at the request of Edwin L. Goldwasser under policy announced 26 April 1976

Dimuon production is studied in 400-GeV proton-nucleus collisions. A strong enhancement is observed at 9.5 GeV mass in a sample of 9000 dimuon events with a mass $m_{\mu^+\mu^-} > 5$ GeV.



Discovery of the 6th quark

Evidence for Top Quark Production in $\bar{p}p$ Collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 1.8$ TeV

- Discovery of top quark complete 3-generation picture
- Took a long time (1994) because t quark is very heavy: ~ 175 GeV/c²!




We summarize a search for the top quark with the Collider Detector at Fermilab (CDF) in a sample of $\bar{p}p$ collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 1.8$ TeV with an integrated luminosity of 19.3 pb^{-1} . We find 12 events consistent with either two W bosons, or a W boson and at least one b jet. The probability that the measured yield is consistent with the background is 0.26%. Though the statistics are too limited to establish firmly the existence of the top quark, a natural interpretation of the excess is that it is due to $t\bar{t}$ production. Under this assumption, constrained fits to individual events yield a top quark mass of $174 \pm 10^{+13}_{-12}$ GeV/c². The $t\bar{t}$ production cross section is measured to be $13.9^{+6.8}_{-4.8}$ pb.

PACS numbers: 14.65.Ha, 13.85.Ni, 13.85.Qk

Are there *more* than three generations?

- Surprisingly, you can actually say something about that...
 - Measure decay rate of Z boson into all quarks, compare to total Z boson decay rate
 - Because Z can decay into $\nu\bar{\nu}$ each additional generation with a light neutrino increases the *fraction* of Z decaying to $\nu\bar{\nu}$, and thus decreases the *fraction* of hadronic decays....
 - Shows conclusively that there are only 3 generations (of neutrinos, of the type we know, with mass $< M_Z/2$)



Summary

- Existence of antimatter is a consequence of the combination of special relativity and quantum mechanics
- No 'primordial' antimatter observed
- Need something called 'CP' symmetry breaking to explain the absence of antimatter
- CPT is a very good symmetry
- C,P and CP are conserved in strong & EM interactions
- C,P completely broken by weak interactions, CP looks healthy...
- neutral kaons can 'mix' (oscillate) into their antiparticles
- and this can causes lifetime & mass differences of the CP eigenstates of the Hamiltonian
- CP is (a bit) broken in the neutral kaon system!
- And we can use this to unambiguously distinguish matter and antimatter
- There are actually three ways in which CP can be broken!
- the weak and mass eigenstates of quarks are not the same... related by V_{CKM}
- with 3 or more families, one *can* have a complex phase(s) in V_{CKM} and thus CP violation is possible!

Three generations, four parameters...

$$\begin{pmatrix} d' \\ s' \\ b' \end{pmatrix} = V_{CKM} \begin{pmatrix} d \\ s \\ b \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} V_{ud} & V_{us} & V_{ub} \\ V_{cd} & V_{cs} & V_{cb} \\ V_{td} & V_{ts} & V_{tb} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} d \\ s \\ b \end{pmatrix}$$

$$V_{CKM} = \begin{pmatrix} c_{12}c_{13} & s_{12}c_{13} & s_{13}e^{-i\delta} \\ -s_{12}c_{23} - c_{12}s_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta} & c_{12}c_{23} - s_{12}s_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta} & s_{23}c_{13} \\ s_{12}s_{23} - c_{12}c_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta} & -c_{12}s_{23} - s_{12}c_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta} & c_{23}c_{13} \end{pmatrix}$$

with $s_{ij} = \sin \theta_{ij}$, $c_{ij} = \cos \theta_{ij}$
 so with four parameters $\theta_{12}, \theta_{23}, \theta_{13}, \delta$

... and many more observables!

How do you measure those numbers?

- Magnitudes are typically determined from *ratio* of decay rates

- Example 1 – Measurement of $|V_{ud}|$



- Compare decay rates of neutron decay and muon decay

- Ratio proportional to $|V_{ud}|^2$

- $|V_{ud}| = 0.9735 \pm 0.0008$

- V_{ud} of order 1

$$\begin{pmatrix} V_{ud} & V_{us} & V_{ub} \\ V_{cd} & V_{cs} & V_{cb} \\ V_{td} & V_{ts} & V_{tb} \end{pmatrix}$$



How do you measure those numbers?



- Example 2 – Measurement of $|V_{us}|$

- Compare decay rates of semileptonic K^- decay and muon decay

- Ratio proportional to $|V_{us}|^2$

- $|V_{us}| = 0.2196 \pm 0.0023$

$$\begin{pmatrix} V_{ud} & V_{us} & V_{ub} \\ V_{cd} & V_{cs} & V_{cb} \\ V_{td} & V_{ts} & V_{tb} \end{pmatrix}$$



How do you measure those numbers?

- Example 3 – Measurement of V_{cb}



- Compare decay rates of $B^0 \rightarrow D^{*-} l^+ \nu$ and muon decay

- Ratio proportional to V_{cb}^2

- $|V_{cb}| = 0.0402 \pm 0.0019$

- $|V_{cb}|$ is almost (but not quite) equal to $\sin(\theta_c)^2 [= 0.0484]$

$$\begin{pmatrix} V_{ud} & V_{us} & V_{ub} \\ V_{cd} & V_{cs} & V_{cb} \\ V_{td} & V_{ts} & V_{tb} \end{pmatrix}$$





How do you measure those numbers?

- Example 4 – Measurement of V_{ub}

- Compare decay rates of $B^0 \rightarrow D^{*-} l^+ \nu$ and $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^- l^+ \nu$
- Ratio proportional to $(V_{ub}/V_{cb})^2$
- $|V_{ub}/V_{cb}| = 0.090 \pm 0.025$
- V_{ub} is of order $\sin(\theta_c)^3 [= 0.01]$

$$\begin{pmatrix} V_{ud} & V_{us} & V_{ub} \\ V_{cd} & V_{cs} & V_{cb} \\ V_{td} & V_{ts} & V_{tb} \end{pmatrix}$$




How do you measure those numbers?

- Example 5 – Another Measurement of V_{ub}

- Measure $\text{Br}(B^- \rightarrow \tau^- \bar{\nu}_\tau)$

- proportional to $f_B^2 |V_{ub}|^2$

$$\begin{pmatrix} V_{ud} & V_{us} & V_{ub} \\ V_{cd} & V_{cs} & V_{cb} \\ V_{td} & V_{ts} & V_{tb} \end{pmatrix}$$



$$\mathcal{B}(B^- \rightarrow \tau^- \bar{\nu}_\tau) = \frac{G_F^2 m_B m_\tau^2}{8\pi} \left(1 - \frac{m_\tau^2}{m_B^2}\right)^2 f_B^2 |V_{ub}|^2 \tau_B,$$

- [9] B. Aubert *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D 77**, 011107(R) (2008); arXiv:0708.2260 [hep-ex]
 B. Aubert *et al.*, arXiv:0809.4027 [hep-ex]
 K. Ikado *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 251802 (2006), hep-ex/0604018.
 I. Adachi *et al.*, arXiv:0809.3834 [hep-ex].

Hierarchy...

$$\begin{pmatrix} |V_{ud}| & |V_{us}| & |V_{ub}| \\ |V_{cd}| & |V_{cs}| & |V_{cb}| \\ |V_{td}| & |V_{ts}| & |V_{tb}| \end{pmatrix} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0.97419 \pm 0.00022 & 0.2257 \pm 0.0010 & 0.00359 \pm 0.00016 \\ 0.2256 \pm 0.0010 & 0.97334 \pm 0.00023 & 0.0415^{+0.0010}_{-0.0011} \\ 0.00874^{+0.00026}_{-0.00037} & 0.0407 \pm 0.0010 & 0.999133^{+0.000044}_{-0.000043} \end{pmatrix}$$

Parametrization of the Kobayashi-Maskawa Matrix

Lincoln Wolfenstein

Department of Physics, Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213
(Received 22 August 1983)

The quark mixing matrix (Kobayashi-Maskawa matrix) is expanded in powers of a small parameter λ equal to $\sin\theta_c = 0.22$. The term of order λ^2 is determined from the recently measured B lifetime. Two remaining parameters, including the CP -nonconservation effects, enter only the term of order λ^3 and are poorly constrained. A significant reduction in the limit on ϵ'/ϵ possible in an ongoing experiment would tightly constrain the CP -nonconservation parameter and could rule out the hypothesis that the only source of CP nonconservation is the Kobayashi-Maskawa mechanism.

PACS numbers: 11.30.Er, 12.10.Ck, 13.25.+m



Hierarchy...

$$\begin{pmatrix} |V_{ud}| & |V_{us}| & |V_{ub}| \\ |V_{cd}| & |V_{cs}| & |V_{cb}| \\ |V_{td}| & |V_{ts}| & |V_{tb}| \end{pmatrix} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0.97419 \pm 0.00022 & 0.2257 \pm 0.0010 & 0.00359 \pm 0.00016 \\ 0.2256 \pm 0.0010 & 0.97334 \pm 0.00023 & 0.0415^{+0.0010}_{-0.0011} \\ 0.00874^{+0.00026}_{-0.00037} & 0.0407 \pm 0.0010 & 0.999133^{+0.000044}_{-0.000043} \end{pmatrix}$$

Parametrization of the Kobayashi-Maskawa Matrix

Lincoln Wolfenstein

Department of Physics, Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213
(Received 22 August 1983)

The quark mixing matrix (Kobayashi-Maskawa matrix) is expanded in powers of a small parameter λ equal to $\sin\theta_c = 0.22$. The term of order λ^2 is determined from the recently measured B lifetime. Two remaining parameters, including the CP -nonconservation effects, enter only the term of order λ^3 and are poorly constrained. A significant reduction in the limit on ϵ'/ϵ possible in an ongoing experiment would tightly constrain the CP -nonconservation parameter and could rule out the hypothesis that the only source of CP nonconservation is the Kobayashi-Maskawa mechanism.

PACS numbers: 11.30.Er, 12.10.Ck, 13.25.+m



$$\begin{pmatrix} V_{ud} & V_{us} & V_{ub} \\ V_{cd} & V_{cs} & V_{cb} \\ V_{td} & V_{ts} & V_{tb} \end{pmatrix} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda)$$

Hierarchy...

$$\begin{pmatrix} |V_{ud}| & |V_{us}| & |V_{ub}| \\ |V_{cd}| & |V_{cs}| & |V_{cb}| \\ |V_{td}| & |V_{ts}| & |V_{tb}| \end{pmatrix} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0.97419 \pm 0.00022 & 0.2257 \pm 0.0010 & 0.00359 \pm 0.00016 \\ 0.2256 \pm 0.0010 & 0.97334 \pm 0.00023 & 0.0415^{+0.0010}_{-0.0011} \\ 0.00874^{+0.00026}_{-0.00037} & 0.0407 \pm 0.0010 & 0.999133^{+0.000044}_{-0.000043} \end{pmatrix}$$

Parametrization of the Kobayashi-Maskawa Matrix

Lincoln Wolfenstein

Department of Physics, Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213
(Received 22 August 1983)

The quark mixing matrix (Kobayashi-Maskawa matrix) is expanded in powers of a small parameter λ equal to $\sin\theta_c = 0.22$. The term of order λ^2 is determined from the recently measured B lifetime. Two remaining parameters, including the CP -nonconservation effects, enter only the term of order λ^3 and are poorly constrained. A significant reduction in the limit on ϵ'/ϵ possible in an ongoing experiment would tightly constrain the CP -nonconservation parameter and could rule out the hypothesis that the only source of CP nonconservation is the Kobayashi-Maskawa mechanism.

PACS numbers: 11.30.Er, 12.10.Ck, 13.25.+m



$$\begin{pmatrix} V_{ud} & V_{us} & V_{ub} \\ V_{cd} & V_{cs} & V_{cb} \\ V_{td} & V_{ts} & V_{tb} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \lambda & 0 \\ -\lambda & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2)$$

Hierarchy...

$$\begin{pmatrix} |V_{ud}| & |V_{us}| & |V_{ub}| \\ |V_{cd}| & |V_{cs}| & |V_{cb}| \\ |V_{td}| & |V_{ts}| & |V_{tb}| \end{pmatrix} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0.97419 \pm 0.00022 & 0.2257 \pm 0.0010 & 0.00359 \pm 0.00016 \\ 0.2256 \pm 0.0010 & 0.97334 \pm 0.00023 & 0.0415^{+0.0010}_{-0.0011} \\ 0.00874^{+0.00026}_{-0.00037} & 0.0407 \pm 0.0010 & 0.999133^{+0.000044}_{-0.000043} \end{pmatrix}$$

Parametrization of the Kobayashi-Maskawa Matrix

Lincoln Wolfenstein

Department of Physics, Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213
(Received 22 August 1983)

The quark mixing matrix (Kobayashi-Maskawa matrix) is expanded in powers of a small parameter λ equal to $\sin\theta_c = 0.22$. The term of order λ^2 is determined from the recently measured B lifetime. Two remaining parameters, including the CP -nonconservation effects, enter only the term of order λ^3 and are poorly constrained. A significant reduction in the limit on ϵ'/ϵ possible in an ongoing experiment would tightly constrain the CP -nonconservation parameter and could rule out the hypothesis that the only source of CP nonconservation is the Kobayashi-Maskawa mechanism.

PACS numbers: 11.30.Er, 12.10.Ck, 13.25.+m



$$\begin{pmatrix} V_{ud} & V_{us} & V_{ub} \\ V_{cd} & V_{cs} & V_{cb} \\ V_{td} & V_{ts} & V_{tb} \end{pmatrix} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \lambda^2/2 & \lambda & 0 \\ -\lambda & 1 - \lambda^2/2 & A\lambda^2 \\ 0 & -A\lambda^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^3)$$

Hierarchy...

$$\begin{pmatrix} |V_{ud}| & |V_{us}| & |V_{ub}| \\ |V_{cd}| & |V_{cs}| & |V_{cb}| \\ |V_{td}| & |V_{ts}| & |V_{tb}| \end{pmatrix} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0.97419 \pm 0.00022 & 0.2257 \pm 0.0010 & 0.00359 \pm 0.00016 \\ 0.2256 \pm 0.0010 & 0.97334 \pm 0.00023 & 0.0415^{+0.0010}_{-0.0011} \\ 0.00874^{+0.00026}_{-0.00037} & 0.0407 \pm 0.0010 & 0.999133^{+0.000044}_{-0.000043} \end{pmatrix}$$

Parametrization of the Kobayashi-Maskawa Matrix

Lincoln Wolfenstein

Department of Physics, Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213
(Received 22 August 1983)


The quark mixing matrix (Kobayashi-Maskawa matrix) is expanded in powers of a small parameter λ equal to $\sin\theta_c = 0.22$. The term of order λ^2 is determined from the recently measured B lifetime. Two remaining parameters, including the CP -nonconservation effects, enter only the term of order λ^3 and are poorly constrained. A significant reduction in the limit on ϵ'/ϵ possible in an ongoing experiment would tightly constrain the CP -nonconservation parameter and could rule out the hypothesis that the only source of CP nonconservation is the Kobayashi-Maskawa mechanism.



PACS numbers: 11.30.Er, 12.10.Ck, 13.25.+m

$$\begin{pmatrix} V_{ud} & V_{us} & V_{ub} \\ V_{cd} & V_{cs} & V_{cb} \\ V_{td} & V_{ts} & V_{tb} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \lambda^2/2 & \lambda & A\lambda^3(\rho - i\eta) \\ -\lambda & 1 - \lambda^2/2 & A\lambda^2 \\ A\lambda^3(1 - \rho - i\eta) & -A\lambda^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^4)$$

Hierarchy...



*What is the explanation for this structure?
We don't know!*

- Transition within generation favored
- Transition from 1st to 2nd generation suppressed by $\lambda = \sin(\theta_c)$
- Transition from 2nd to 3rd generation suppressed by $\lambda^2 = \sin^2(\theta_c)$
- Transition from 1st to 3rd generation suppressed by $\lambda^3 = \sin^3(\theta_c)$

Summary

- Existence of antimatter is a consequence of the combination of special relativity and quantum mechanics
- No 'primordial' antimatter observed
- Need something called 'CP' symmetry breaking to explain the absence of antimatter
- CPT is a very good symmetry
- C,P and CP are conserved in strong & EM interactions
- C,P completely broken by weak interactions, CP looks healthy...
- neutral kaons can 'mix' (oscillate) into their antiparticles
- and this can causes lifetime & mass differences of the CP eigenstates of the Hamiltonian
- CP is (a bit) broken in the neutral kaon system!
- And we can use this to unambiguously distinguish matter and antimatter
- There are actually three ways in which CP can be broken!
- the weak and mass eigenstates of quarks are not the same...
- with 3 (or more) families, one can have a complex phase in the CKM matrix that defines the weak eigenstates, and this allows for CP violation!
- There is a clear (and unexplained!) hierarchy in the CKM

How to measure $|V_{td}|$ and $|V_{ts}|$?

$$\begin{pmatrix} V_{ud} & V_{us} & V_{ub} \\ V_{cd} & V_{cs} & V_{cb} \\ V_{td} & V_{ts} & V_{tb} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \lambda^2/2 & \lambda & A\lambda^3(\rho - i\eta) \\ -\lambda & 1 - \lambda^2/2 & A\lambda^2 \\ A\lambda^3(1 - \rho - i\eta) & -A\lambda^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^4)$$

Intermezzo: Neutral Meson Mixing

	u	c	t		d	s	b
\bar{u}	\times	D^0	\diamond	\bar{d}	\times	K^0	B^0
\bar{c}	$\overline{D^0}$	\times	\diamond	\bar{s}	$\overline{K^0}$	\times	B_s
\bar{t}	\diamond	\diamond	\times	\bar{b}	$\overline{B^0}$	$\overline{B_s}$	\times

- Need to be neutral and have distinct anti-particle (\times)
- Needs to have a non-zero lifetime
 - top is so heavy, it decays long before it can even form a meson (\diamond)
- That leaves four distinct cases...

Note: for (much!) more detail, see eg. [arXiv:hep-ex/0103016v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ex/0103016v1)

Intermezzo: Describing Mixing...

Time evolution of B^0 and \overline{B}^0 can be described by an effective Hamiltonian:

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Psi = H \Psi \quad \Psi(t) = a(t) |B^0\rangle + b(t) |\overline{B}^0\rangle \equiv \begin{pmatrix} a(t) \\ b(t) \end{pmatrix}$$

$$H = \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} M & M_{12} \\ M_{12}^* & M \end{pmatrix}}_{\text{hermitian}} - \frac{i}{2} \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} \Gamma & \Gamma_{12} \\ \Gamma_{12}^* & \Gamma \end{pmatrix}}_{\text{hermitian}}$$

what is the
difference between
 M_{12} and Γ_{12} ?

Intermezzo: Describing Mixing...

Time evolution of B^0 and \bar{B}^0 can be described by an effective Hamiltonian:


$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Psi = H \Psi \quad \Psi(t) = a(t) |B^0\rangle + b(t) |\bar{B}^0\rangle \equiv \begin{pmatrix} a(t) \\ b(t) \end{pmatrix}$$

$$H = \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} M & M_{12} \\ M_{12}^* & M \end{pmatrix}}_{\text{hermitian}} - \frac{i}{2} \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} \Gamma & \Gamma_{12} \\ \Gamma_{12}^* & \Gamma \end{pmatrix}}_{\text{hermitian}}$$

what is the difference between M_{12} and Γ_{12} ?

Remember: anti-hermitian part describes the 'leaking' out of (and into!) the (sub)space spanned by B^0 and \bar{B}^0


$$\frac{d}{dt} (|a|^2 + |b|^2) = - \begin{pmatrix} a^* & b^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma & \Gamma_{12} \\ \Gamma_{12}^* & \Gamma \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix}$$



For details, look up "Wigner-Weisskopf" approximation...

Mixing: Kaons vs. B mesons

- The difference between K mixing and ‘the rest’: Γ_{12}
- A large fraction of Kaon decays produce CP eigenstates:
 - all decays *without* leptons are CP eigenstates..
 - the CP even ones have more phase-space
 - Hence the lifetime difference (large Γ_{12} !)
- For B^0 , (and, to a somewhat lesser extent, B_s), the dominant decays are *not* CP eigenstates
 - hence $\Delta\Gamma=0$ (smallish), and Γ_{12} does *not* contribute to B^0 mixing
 - note: as a result labeling eigenstates as ‘S’hort and ‘L’ong doesn’t make sense -- hence the ‘H’eavy and ‘L’ight



Dominant decay amplitudes

Solving the Schrödinger Equation

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \psi(t) = \begin{pmatrix} M - \frac{i}{2} \Gamma & M_{12} - \frac{i}{2} \Gamma_{12} \\ M_{12}^* - \frac{i}{2} \Gamma_{12}^* & M - \frac{i}{2} \Gamma \end{pmatrix} \psi(t)$$

Solution (in terms of eigenvectors):

$$\psi(t) = a |B_H(t)\rangle + b |B_L(t)\rangle$$

(a and b determined by initial conditions)

Eigenvectors:

$$|B_H\rangle = p |B\rangle + q |\bar{B}\rangle$$

$$|B_L\rangle = p |B\rangle - q |\bar{B}\rangle$$

Evolution of eigenvectors:

$$|B_H(t)\rangle = |B_H\rangle e^{-i \left(M + \frac{1}{2} \Delta m - \frac{i}{2} (\Gamma - \Delta \Gamma) \right) t}$$

$$|B_L(t)\rangle = |B_L\rangle e^{-i \left(M - \frac{1}{2} \Delta m + \frac{i}{2} (\Gamma + \Delta \Gamma) \right) t}$$

From the eigenvector calculation:

$$\frac{q}{p} = \sqrt{\frac{M_{12}^* - \frac{i}{2} \Gamma_{12}^*}{M_{12} - \frac{i}{2} \Gamma_{12}}}$$

Δm and $\Delta \Gamma$ follow from the eigenvalues:

$$\Delta m + \frac{i}{2} \Delta \Gamma = 2 \sqrt{\left(M_{12} - \frac{i}{2} \Gamma_{12} \right) \left(M_{12}^* - \frac{i}{2} \Gamma_{12}^* \right)}$$

Solving the Schrödinger Equation

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \psi(t) = \begin{pmatrix} M - \frac{i}{2} \Gamma & M_{12} - \frac{i}{2} \Gamma_{12} \\ M_{12}^* - \frac{i}{2} \Gamma_{12}^* & M - \frac{i}{2} \Gamma \end{pmatrix} \psi(t)$$

Solution (in terms of eigenvectors):

$$\psi(t) = a |B_H(t)\rangle + b |B_L(t)\rangle$$

(a and b determined by initial conditions)

Eigenvectors:

$$|B_H\rangle = p |B\rangle + q |\bar{B}\rangle$$

$$|B_L\rangle = p |B\rangle - q |\bar{B}\rangle$$

Evolution of eigenvectors:

$$|B_H(t)\rangle = |B_H\rangle e^{-i(M + \frac{1}{2} \Delta m - \frac{i}{2}(\Gamma - \Delta\Gamma))t}$$

$$|B_L(t)\rangle = |B_L\rangle e^{-i(M - \frac{1}{2} \Delta m + \frac{i}{2}(\Gamma + \Delta\Gamma))t}$$

From the eigenvector calculation:



$$\frac{q}{p} = \sqrt{\frac{M_{12}^* - \frac{i}{2} \Gamma_{12}^*}{M_{12} - \frac{i}{2} \Gamma_{12}}}$$

Δm and $\Delta\Gamma$ follow from the eigenvalues:



$$\Delta m + \frac{i}{2} \Delta\Gamma = 2 \sqrt{\left(M_{12} - \frac{i}{2} \Gamma_{12}\right) \left(M_{12}^* - \frac{i}{2} \Gamma_{12}^*\right)}$$

if: $\Gamma_{12} = 0 \Rightarrow \Delta\Gamma = 0, \left|\frac{q}{p}\right| = 1$

Mixing: Box Diagrams





Mixing: Box Diagrams



GIM(V_{CKM} unitarity):
 if u, c, t same mass, everything
 cancels *by construction!*

Mixing: Box Diagrams



$$\begin{aligned}
 t - \bar{t} : & \quad \propto m_t^2 |V_{tb} V_{td}^*|^2 & \propto m_t^2 \lambda^6 \\
 c - \bar{c} : & \quad \propto m_c^2 |V_{cb} V_{cd}^*|^2 & \propto m_c^2 \lambda^6 \\
 c - \bar{t}, \bar{c} - t : & \quad \propto m_c m_t V_{tb} V_{td}^* V_{cb} V_{cd}^* & \propto m_c m_t \lambda^6
 \end{aligned}$$

GIM (V_{CKM} unitarity):
if u,c,t same mass, everything
cancels by construction!

$$\Delta m_d = \frac{G_F^2}{6\pi^2} m_w^2 \eta_B S_0(m_t^2 / m_W^2) m_{B_d} |V_{td}|^2 B_{B_d} f_{B_d}^2$$

Dominated by top quark mass:

$$\Delta m_B \approx 0.00002 \cdot \left(\frac{m_t}{\text{GeV}/c^2} \right)^2 \text{ps}^{-1}$$

reference: $\tau_B \sim 1.5 \text{ ps}$

Before you decay, you've gotta ask yourself one question:

“do I feel like oscillating?”

well, do ya?



Dominated by top quark mass:

$$\Delta m_B \approx 0.000002 \cdot \left(\frac{m_t}{\text{GeV}/c^2} \right)^2 \text{ps}^{-1}$$

reference:

$$\tau_B \sim 1.5 \text{ ps}$$

B⁰ Mixing: ARGUS, 1987

Integrated luminosity 1983-87: 103 pb⁻¹

- Produce an $b\bar{b}$ bound state, $\Upsilon(4S)$, in e^+e^- collisions:

- $e^+e^- \rightarrow \Upsilon(4S) \rightarrow B^0\bar{B}^0$


- and then observe:

$$\begin{array}{l}
 B_1^0 \rightarrow D_1^{*-} \mu_1^+ \nu_1 \\
 D_1^{*-} \rightarrow \bar{D}^0 \pi_{1s}^- \\
 \bar{D}^0 \rightarrow K_1^+ \pi_1^-
 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{l}
 B_2^0 \rightarrow D_2^{*-} \mu_2^+ \nu_2 \\
 D_2^{*-} \rightarrow D^- \pi^0 \\
 D^- \rightarrow K_2^+ \pi_2^- \pi_2^- \\
 \pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma
 \end{array}$$



- measure that $\sim 17\%$ of B^0 and \bar{B}^0 mesons oscillate before they decay

- $\tau_B \sim 1.5 \text{ ps} \Rightarrow \Delta m_d \sim 0.5/\text{ps}$,



First evidence of a really large top mass!

B_s mixing:




most important difference with B^0 :
replace $V_{td} \rightarrow V_{ts}$

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \frac{\Delta m_d}{\Delta m_s} &\approx \frac{|V_{td}|^2}{|V_{ts}|^2} \approx \frac{\lambda^6}{\lambda^4} = \lambda^2 \approx 0.04 \\ \Delta m_d &= 0.502 \pm 0.006 \text{ ps}^{-1} \end{aligned} \right\} \Rightarrow \Delta m_s \approx 12 \text{ ps}^{-1}$$

A more complete calculation leads to the
SM expectation of $\sim 18/\text{ps}$

B_s mixing: CDF, 2006




most important difference with B^0 :
replace $V_{td} \rightarrow V_{ts}$

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \frac{\Delta m_d}{\Delta m_s} &\approx \frac{|V_{td}|^2}{|V_{ts}|^2} \approx \frac{\lambda^6}{\lambda^4} = \lambda^2 \approx 0.04 \\ \Delta m_d &= 0.502 \pm 0.006 \text{ ps}^{-1} \end{aligned} \right\} \Rightarrow \Delta m_s \approx 12 \text{ ps}^{-1}$$

A more complete calculation leads to the SM expectation of $\sim 18/\text{ps}$

Observation of $B_s^0 - \bar{B}_s^0$ Oscillations



We report the observation of $B_s^0 - \bar{B}_s^0$ oscillations from a time-dependent measurement of the $B_s^0 - \bar{B}_s^0$ oscillation frequency Δm_s . Using a data sample of 1 fb^{-1} of $p\bar{p}$ collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 1.96 \text{ TeV}$ collected with the CDF II detector at the Fermilab Tevatron, we find signals of 5600 fully reconstructed hadronic B_s decays, 3100 partially reconstructed hadronic B_s decays, and 61 500 partially reconstructed semileptonic B_s decays. We measure the probability as a function of proper decay time that the B_s decays with the same, or opposite, flavor as the flavor at production, and we find a signal for $B_s^0 - \bar{B}_s^0$ oscillations. The probability that random fluctuations could produce a comparable signal is 8×10^{-8} , which exceeds 5σ significance. We measure $\Delta m_s = 17.77 \pm 0.10(\text{stat}) \pm 0.07(\text{syst}) \text{ ps}^{-1}$ and extract $|V_{td}/V_{ts}| = 0.2060 \pm 0.0007(\Delta m_s)^{+0.0081}_{-0.0060}(\Delta m_d + \text{theor})$.

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.97.242003](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.97.242003)



PACS numbers: 14.40.Nd, 12.15.Ff, 12.15.Hh, 13.20.He

D^0 mixing



Look for 'wrong
sign' D^0 decays



D⁰ mixing



Look for 'wrong sign' D⁰ decays



D^0 mixing: BaBar, 2007

PRL 98, 211802 (2007)

PHYSICAL REVIEW LETTERS

week ending
25 MAY 2007

Evidence for D^0 - \bar{D}^0 Mixing



We present evidence for D^0 - \bar{D}^0 mixing in $D^0 \rightarrow K^+ \pi^-$ decays from 384 fb^{-1} of e^+e^- colliding-beam data recorded near $\sqrt{s} = 10.6 \text{ GeV}$ with the *BABAR* detector at the PEP-II storage rings at the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center. We find the mixing parameters $x'^2 = [-0.22 \pm 0.30(\text{stat}) \pm 0.21(\text{syst})] \times 10^{-3}$ and $y' = [9.7 \pm 4.4(\text{stat}) \pm 3.1(\text{syst})] \times 10^{-3}$ and a correlation between them of -0.95 . This result is inconsistent with the no-mixing hypothesis with a significance of 3.9 standard deviations. We measure R_D , the ratio of doubly Cabibbo-suppressed to Cabibbo-favored decay rates, to be $[0.303 \pm 0.016(\text{stat}) \pm 0.010(\text{syst})]\%$. We find no evidence for CP violation.

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.98.211802](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.98.211802)

PACS numbers: 13.25.Ft, 11.30.Er, 12.15.Ff, 14.40.Lb








FIG. 2. (a) Projections of the proper-time distribution of combined D^0 and \bar{D}^0 WS candidates and fit result integrated over the signal region $1.843 < m_{K\pi} < 1.883 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ and $0.1445 < \Delta m < 0.1465 \text{ GeV}/c^2$. The result of the fit allowing (not allowing) mixing but not CP violation is overlaid as a solid (dashed) curve. (b) The points represent the difference between the data and the no-mixing fit. The solid curve shows the difference between fits with and without mixing.

Summary of Neutral Meson Mixing



	<i>d</i>	<i>s</i>	<i>b</i>
\bar{d}	×	K^0	B^0
\bar{s}	$\overline{K^0}$	×	B_s
\bar{b}	$\overline{B^0}$	$\overline{B_s}$	×
	<i>u</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>t</i>
\bar{u}	×	D^0	◇
\bar{c}	$\overline{D^0}$	×	◇
\bar{t}	◇	◇	×


Blue:
given a P^0 , at $t=0$,
the probability of
finding a P^0 at t .

Red:
given a P^0 , at $t=0$,
the probability of
finding a P^0 bar at t .

Time Evolution of K^0 and \bar{K}^0 ...


This measurement allows one to make an *ABSOLUTE* distinction between matter and anti-matter

- *Positive charge is the charged carried by the lepton preferentially produced in the decay of the neutral K meson*



$$A_T(t) = \frac{\bar{I}_{\pi^- e^+ \nu}(t) - I_{\pi^+ e^- \bar{\nu}}(t)}{\bar{I}_{\pi^- e^+ \nu}(t) + I_{\pi^+ e^- \bar{\nu}}(t)}$$

$$= \frac{1 - |q/p|^4}{1 + |q/p|^4} = 4\mathcal{R}\epsilon$$




CP mixing

(in it on) CP violation in B_d mixing

Search for T and CP Violation in $B^0-\bar{B}^0$ Mixing with Inclusive Dilepton Events

B. Aubert¹, D. Bortone¹, J.-M. Gaillard¹, A. Hicheur¹, Y. Karyotakis¹, J. P. Lees¹, P. Rolke¹, V. Tisserand¹, A. Zaluski¹, A. Palano², A. Poma³, G. P. Chen⁴, J. C. Chen⁵, S. D. Qiu⁶, G. Roca⁷, P. Wang⁸, Y. S. Zhu⁹, G. Eigen¹⁰, H. Stenzel¹¹, G. Abbiendi¹², A. W. Becklund¹³, A. B. Bondi¹⁴, X. Brown¹⁵, J. Bortone¹⁶, R. N. Cahn¹⁷, M. S. Gill¹⁸, A. V. Gritsan¹⁹, V. Gvozdenko²⁰, R. G. Jacobsen²¹, R. W. Kadel²², J. Kadyk²³, L. T. Kerth²⁴, Yu. G. Kolosovskiy²⁵, J. F. Kral²⁶, C. LeClair²⁷, M. E. Levi²⁸, G. Lynch²⁹, P. J. Oakham³⁰, M. Papoulias³¹, N. A. Roe³², A. Roussos³³, M. T. Ross³⁴, V. G. Skolovod³⁵, V. Tisserand³⁶, W. A. Wood³⁷, J. Harrison³⁸, C. M. Harker³⁹, D. J. Kwan⁴⁰, S. W. O'Neil⁴¹, R. C. Penny⁴², A. T. Watson⁴³, N. K. Watson⁴⁴, T. Deppenmann⁴⁵, K. Goetzen⁴⁶, H. Koch⁴⁷, M. Kuznetsov⁴⁸, K. Peters⁴⁹, H. Schaefer⁵⁰, M. Svirin⁵¹, N. R. Barlow⁵², W. Blum⁵³, N. Chondros⁵⁴, F. J. Chalk⁵⁵, W. S. Cottingham⁵⁶, B. Foster⁵⁷, C. M. Hester⁵⁸, F. F. Wilson⁵⁹, K. Abe⁶⁰, C. Bozzi⁶¹, T. S. Mattison⁶², J. A. McKenna⁶³, D. Thoburn⁶⁴, S. Jolly⁶⁵, A. K. McKemmer⁶⁶, V. E. Blinov⁶⁷, A. D. Bukin⁶⁸, D. A. Bala⁶⁹, A. R. Barbey⁷⁰, V. B. Golubev⁷¹, V. N. Ivanchenko⁷², A. A. Kozlov⁷³, E. A. Kravchenko⁷⁴, A. P. Davletov⁷⁵, S. I. Sedukhin⁷⁶, Yu. I. Skovpanov⁷⁷, I. Titov⁷⁸, A. N. Yashin⁷⁹, D. Danz⁸⁰, M. Chan⁸¹, D. Kirkby⁸², A. J. Lusk⁸³, M. Manktelow⁸⁴, S. McAdams⁸⁵, D. P. Stoker⁸⁶, K. Arisaka⁸⁷, C. Barbanza⁸⁸, S. Charalambous⁸⁹, D. B. MacFarlane⁹⁰, S. Pfeil⁹¹, Sh. Babalola⁹², G. Raven⁹³, V. Sharma⁹⁴, C. Caragnoli⁹⁵, B. Dabrowski⁹⁶, P. A. Hart⁹⁷, N. Kuznetsov⁹⁸, S. L. Levy⁹⁹, D. Long¹⁰⁰, L. Lu¹⁰¹, A. Mazar¹⁰², J. D. Balthasar¹⁰³, W. Verkerke¹⁰⁴, J. Bortone¹⁰⁵, A. M. Eisner¹⁰⁶, M. Grottel¹⁰⁷, C. A. Hays¹⁰⁸, W. S. Lockman¹⁰⁹, T. Pulliam¹¹⁰, T. Schalk¹¹¹, R. E. Schmitz¹¹², B. A. Schumm¹¹³, A. Seiden¹¹⁴, M. Turi¹¹⁵, W. Walkowiak¹¹⁶, D. C. Williams¹¹⁷, M. G. Wilson¹¹⁸, E. Chen¹¹⁹, G. P. Dubois-Falange¹²⁰, A. Dvornika¹²¹, D. G. Hill¹²², S. Metzger¹²³, J. Ormazabal¹²⁴, F. C. Porter¹²⁵, A. Ryal¹²⁶, S. Yang¹²⁷, B. Y. Zhu¹²⁸, S. Durr¹²⁹, S. Korolukha¹³⁰, G. Mazzanti¹³¹, B. T. Meadows¹³², M. D. Sokoloff¹³³, T. Barillari¹³⁴, W. T. Foell¹³⁵, U. Nauenberg¹³⁶, A. Olini¹³⁷, P. Rankin¹³⁸, J. Roy¹³⁹, G. C. Smith¹⁴⁰, W. C. van Hook¹⁴¹, J. Zhang¹⁴², J. Blouw¹⁴³, J. L. Harton¹⁴⁴, M. Krishnamoorthy¹⁴⁵, A. Seifert¹⁴⁶, W. H. Toki¹⁴⁷, R. J. Wilson¹⁴⁸, J. Zhang¹⁴⁹, T. Brand¹⁵⁰, T. Colfer¹⁵¹, M. Binkley¹⁵², S. D. Drell¹⁵³, A. Hankin¹⁵⁴, E. Maly¹⁵⁵, R. Miller-Pfeiffer¹⁵⁶, S. Ozon¹⁵⁷, K. R. Schubert¹⁵⁸, R. Schwierz¹⁵⁹, B. Spaas¹⁶⁰, L. Walden¹⁶¹, D. Bernstein¹⁶², G. R. Bonomi¹⁶³, F. Brodbeck¹⁶⁴, J. Cohen-Tanugi¹⁶⁵, S. Ferrara¹⁶⁶, S. T. Jeyaraj¹⁶⁷, Ch. Thakur¹⁶⁸, G. Vasilakou¹⁶⁹, A. Ajmal¹⁷⁰, R. Barone¹⁷¹, A. Khan¹⁷², D. Lutz¹⁷³, F. Maltoni¹⁷⁴, S. Playfer¹⁷⁵, J. E. Swain¹⁷⁶, J. Tinsley¹⁷⁷, M. Fiala¹⁷⁸, C. Davin¹⁷⁹, C. Bozzi¹⁸⁰, L. Pennington¹⁸¹, E. Dreesler¹⁸², F. Anulli¹⁸³, R. Baldini-Ferroli¹⁸⁴, A. Cakirer¹⁸⁵, R. de Saeger¹⁸⁶, F. Fabiani¹⁸⁷, G. Finocchiaro¹⁸⁸, P. Fattori¹⁸⁹, M. Paganoni¹⁹⁰, M. Pavesi¹⁹¹, X. Qian¹⁹², A. Zaluski¹⁹³, S. Bagdasarian¹⁹⁴, A. Banaś¹⁹⁵, G. Casati¹⁹⁶, G. Ciampi¹⁹⁷, M. Lo Vetere¹⁹⁸, M. Rong¹⁹⁹, M. R. M. Sanchez²⁰⁰, F. C. Porter²⁰¹, C. Patrignani²⁰², E. Bobutti²⁰³, A. Santoni²⁰⁴, S. Tosi²⁰⁵, M. Morik²⁰⁶, B. Bartalok²⁰⁷, B. Hanke²⁰⁸, U. Mallik²⁰⁹, J. Cochran²¹⁰, H. B. Crawley²¹¹, P. A. Fisher²¹², J. Lauer²¹³, W. T. Meyer²¹⁴, E. L. Rosowicz²¹⁵, J. Yi²¹⁶, G. G. Woodhead²¹⁷, A. Hicheur²¹⁸, M. M. Luchessa²¹⁹, S. Laporte²²⁰, F. La Barbera²²¹, V. Lepore²²², A. M. Lutz²²³, S. Passaroti²²⁴, M. H. Schraa²²⁵, S. Tinoou-David²²⁶, G. Wormser²²⁷, R. M. Bonta²²⁸, V. Brüggen²²⁹, D. J. Lange²³⁰, M. Mugga²³¹, K. von Bibber²³², D. M. Wright²³³, A. J. Bona²³⁴, R. E. Fry²³⁵, E. Gabathuler²³⁶, B. Gamm²³⁷, M. Gouze²³⁸, M. Kay²³⁹, D. J. Francis²⁴⁰, R. J. Stone²⁴¹, C. Torrioni²⁴², L. Ajakaiye²⁴³, D. A. Bowerman²⁴⁴, P. D. Dineen²⁴⁵, U. Egede²⁴⁶, I. Escherich²⁴⁷, G. W. Morton²⁴⁸, J. A. Nash²⁴⁹, P. Sankar²⁵⁰, D. Smith²⁵¹, J. J. Back²⁵², G. Bellodi²⁵³, P. Dixon²⁵⁴, P. F. Harrison²⁵⁵, R. J. L. Potter²⁵⁶, H. W. Shortchorn²⁵⁷, P. Strecher²⁵⁸, F. B. Vidal²⁵⁹, G. Cosma²⁶⁰, S. Gupta²⁶¹, M. G. Green²⁶², A. Kureth²⁶³, C. E. Mankin²⁶⁴, R. Melikhin²⁶⁵, B. Ristic²⁶⁶, F. Salomene²⁶⁷, G. Vaia²⁶⁸, D. Brown²⁶⁹, C. L. Davis²⁷⁰, J. Allison²⁷¹, R. J. Barlow²⁷², J. T. Boyd²⁷³, A. C. Forti²⁷⁴, F. Jackson²⁷⁵, G. D. Laflamme²⁷⁶, N. Savva²⁷⁷, J. H. Wetherill²⁷⁸, J. C. Williams²⁷⁹, A. Farin²⁸⁰, A. Jawahary²⁸¹, V. Lillard²⁸², J. Olson²⁸³, D. A. Roberts²⁸⁴, R. Schalk²⁸⁵, G. Billorey²⁸⁶, C. Dallagiacca²⁸⁷, K. T. Flood²⁸⁸, S. Bhattarai²⁸⁹, R. Kofler²⁹⁰, V. B. Kozlov²⁹¹, T. B. Moore²⁹², H. Stangor²⁹³, S. Willmetts²⁹⁴, B. Banaś²⁹⁵, R. Cora²⁹⁶, G. Scialò²⁹⁷, F. Taylor²⁹⁸, R. K. Yamamoto²⁹⁹, M. Mikolajczyk³⁰⁰, P. M. Patel³⁰¹, F. Palombo³⁰², M. J. Baver³⁰³, L. Cremaldi³⁰⁴, V. Eckhard³⁰⁵, R. Kowarski³⁰⁶, J. Boly³⁰⁷, D. A. Sanders³⁰⁸, D. J. Summers³⁰⁹, C. Hest³¹⁰, J. Y. Yeh³¹¹, P. Tanas³¹², H. Nicholson³¹³, C. Cartaro³¹⁴, N. Corbelli³¹⁵, G. De Santis³¹⁶, F. Fabozzi³¹⁷, C. Gatto³¹⁸, L. Lian³¹⁹, P. Padellaro³²⁰, D. Piccolo³²¹, C. Sciacca³²², J. M. L. Soares³²³, J. R. G. Abadillo³²⁴, T. A. Gabriel³²⁵, J. Brau³²⁶, R. Frey³²⁷, E. Grangeas³²⁸, M. Iwasaki³²⁹, N. B. Sinev³³⁰, D. Stora³³¹, F. Ceballos³³², F. Dal Corso³³³, A. Dorigo³³⁴, F. Gakkar³³⁵, M. Masarik³³⁶, G. Micheli³³⁷, M. Morandi³³⁸, M. Pavesi³³⁹, B. Rotondo³⁴⁰, F. Simonetto³⁴¹, S. Strolli³⁴², E. Terasma³⁴³, G. Vasi³⁴⁴, M. De Santis³⁴⁵, P. Davini³⁴⁶, Ch. de la Vigniere³⁴⁷, L. Del Buono³⁴⁸, O. Hazzon³⁴⁹, Ph. Lenzi³⁵⁰, J. Ocariz³⁵¹, M. Pivk³⁵², L. Roos³⁵³, J. Stark³⁵⁴, P. F. Manfredi³⁵⁵, V. Re³⁵⁶, V. Spisak³⁵⁷, E. D. Frank³⁵⁸, L. Ghisla³⁵⁹, Q. H. Guo³⁶⁰, J. Puerthaler³⁶¹, C. Angelini³⁶², G. Battaglia³⁶³, S. Betsworth³⁶⁴, M. Bondioli³⁶⁵, F. Bucci³⁶⁶, M. Capriotti³⁶⁷, F. Crotti³⁶⁸, M. A. G. Geilker³⁶⁹, A. Lanza³⁷⁰, G. M. Longo³⁷¹, F. Martinez-Vidal³⁷², M. Morganti³⁷³, N. Neri³⁷⁴, E. Paoloni³⁷⁵, M. Bona³⁷⁶, G. Rizzo³⁷⁷, F. Suardini³⁷⁸, G. Sun³⁷⁹, G. Tagliapietra³⁸⁰, J. Walsh³⁸¹, M. Haire³⁸², D. Jukić³⁸³, K. Paik³⁸⁴, L. Turbelli³⁸⁵, D. E. Wagner³⁸⁶, J. Albert³⁸⁷, C. Lu³⁸⁸, V. Mikhaylov³⁸⁹, F. Schilli³⁹⁰, A. J. S. Smith³⁹¹, A. Tamaso³⁹², S. W. Van Wazer³⁹³, G. Casati³⁹⁴, D. de Re³⁹⁵, B. Facchini³⁹⁶, F. Ferrarini³⁹⁷, F. Ferri³⁹⁸, M. A. Maszoni³⁹⁹, S. Morganti⁴⁰⁰, C. Poole⁴⁰¹, M. Serra⁴⁰², C. Voena⁴⁰³, S. Chiri⁴⁰⁴, R. W. Klähn⁴⁰⁵, T. Alys⁴⁰⁶, N. De Groot⁴⁰⁷, B. Franek⁴⁰⁸, N. I. Gokhale⁴⁰⁹, G. P. Gopal⁴¹⁰, S. M. Yellin⁴¹¹, R. Akhmetov⁴¹², S. Emery⁴¹³, A. Gashin⁴¹⁴, S. Gushkin⁴¹⁵, P. F. Girard⁴¹⁶, G. Hamed⁴¹⁷, M. Mochizuki⁴¹⁸, W. Kozłowski⁴¹⁹, M. Langer⁴²⁰, G. W. London⁴²¹, B. Mayer⁴²², B. Sefusyan⁴²³, G. Vasnetsov⁴²⁴, Ch. Yelton⁴²⁵, M. Zuo⁴²⁶, M. V. Purohit⁴²⁷, H. Singh⁴²⁸, A. W. Weikemann⁴²⁹, F. X. Yu⁴³⁰, I. Adami⁴³¹, D. Aston⁴³², N. Berger⁴³³, A. M. Boyarskiy⁴³⁴, G. Calderini⁴³⁵, M. R. Cozzani⁴³⁶, D. P. Coughlin⁴³⁷, D. Dang⁴³⁸, J. Datta⁴³⁹, W. Duppasubrahani⁴⁴⁰, S. J. Elliott⁴⁴¹, T. Ghisla⁴⁴², S. J. Gowdy⁴⁴³, T. Hara⁴⁴⁴, V. Halyo⁴⁴⁵, T. Harada⁴⁴⁶, T. Hirayama⁴⁴⁷, M. E. Hoffer⁴⁴⁸, W. R. Innes⁴⁴⁹, C. P. Jessop⁴⁵⁰, M. H. Kobayashi⁴⁵¹, P. Kim⁴⁵², M. L. Kocian⁴⁵³, U. Langenegger⁴⁵⁴, D. W. G. S. Leith⁴⁵⁵, S. Luitz⁴⁵⁶, V. Luth⁴⁵⁷, H. L. Lynch⁴⁵⁸, H. Mavrikis⁴⁵⁹, S. Meake⁴⁶⁰, R. Messner⁴⁶¹, D. R. Miller⁴⁶², C. P. O'Grady⁴⁶³, V. E. Ozcan⁴⁶⁴, A. Perazzo⁴⁶⁵, M. Perl⁴⁶⁶, S. Pratik⁴⁶⁷, H. Quinn⁴⁶⁸, B. N. Ratoff⁴⁶⁹, S. H. Robertson⁴⁷⁰, A. Bondioli⁴⁷¹, A. A. Schekel⁴⁷², P. Schattner⁴⁷³, R. H. Schindler⁴⁷⁴, J. Schwesinger⁴⁷⁵, A. Strydom⁴⁷⁶, A. Saba⁴⁷⁷, S. M. Spanier⁴⁷⁸, J. Seidler⁴⁷⁹, D. Su⁴⁸⁰, M. K. Sullivan⁴⁸¹, H. A. Tanaka⁴⁸², J. Vijaya⁴⁸³, S. R. Wagner⁴⁸⁴, M. Weaver⁴⁸⁵, A. J. R. Winstein⁴⁸⁶, W. J. Wisniewski⁴⁸⁷, D. H. Wright⁴⁸⁸, C. C. Young⁴⁸⁹, P. R. Becher⁴⁹⁰, C. H. Chen⁴⁹¹, T. J. Meehan⁴⁹², C. Bozzi⁴⁹³, J. M. Brown⁴⁹⁴, H. Gohar⁴⁹⁵, J. M. Ivarsen⁴⁹⁶, K. Kitayama⁴⁹⁷, X. C. Lou⁴⁹⁸, F. Brixler⁴⁹⁹, M. Bona⁵⁰⁰, D. Guala⁵⁰¹, L. Bossini⁵⁰², G. Daloz⁵⁰³, S. Dittongo⁵⁰⁴, L. Lanceri⁵⁰⁵, P. Puyot⁵⁰⁶, G. Vignani⁵⁰⁷, R. S. Pavlin⁵⁰⁸, C. M. Brown⁵⁰⁹, P. D. Jackson⁵¹⁰, R. Kowarski⁵¹¹, J. M. Roney⁵¹², H. R. Bha⁵¹³, E. Charles⁵¹⁴, S. Datta⁵¹⁵, M. Datta⁵¹⁶, A. M. Edwards⁵¹⁷, H. He⁵¹⁸, J. B. Johnson⁵¹⁹, F. Liu⁵²⁰, F. B. Lebedev⁵²¹, V. Pao⁵²², B. Popov⁵²³, J. J. Scott⁵²⁴, S. J. Sekula⁵²⁵, J. H. von Winterfeldt⁵²⁶, S. L. Wu⁵²⁷, Z. Ye⁵²⁸, T. M. B. Kordich⁵²⁹ and H. Neal⁵³⁰

Search for T and CP Violation in $B^0-\bar{B}^0$ Mixing with Inclusive Dilepton Events



Same as for kaons earlier:
Look for a like-sign asymmetry:

$$A_T(\Delta t) = \frac{N_{++}(\Delta t) - N_{--}(\Delta t)}{N_{++}(\Delta t) + N_{--}(\Delta t)} = \frac{1 - |q/p|^4}{1 + |q/p|^4}$$

Except, as expected, no asymmetry is observed...


FIG. 3: Corrected same-sign dilepton asymmetry as a function of Δt . The line shows the result of the fit for the dileptons with $\Delta z > 200 \mu\text{m}$.

We report the results of a search for T and CP violation in $B^0-\bar{B}^0$ mixing using an inclusive dilepton sample collected by the *BABAR* experiment at the PEP-II B Factory. The asymmetry between $\ell^+\ell^+$ and $\ell^-\ell^-$ events allows us to compare the probabilities for $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow B^0$ and $B^0 \rightarrow \bar{B}^0$ oscillations and thus probe T and CP invariance. Using a sample of 23 million $B\bar{B}$ pairs, we measure a same-sign dilepton asymmetry of $A_{T/CP} = (0.5 \pm 1.2(\text{stat}) \pm 1.4(\text{syst}))\%$. For the modulus of the ratio of complex mixing parameters p and q , we obtain $|q/p| = 0.998 \pm 0.006(\text{stat}) \pm 0.007(\text{syst})$.

CP in mixing? From ICHEP2010:



Dimuon charge asymmetry



$$A_{sl}^b \equiv \frac{N_b^{++} - N_b^{--}}{N_b^{++} + N_b^{--}}$$

N_b^{++} (N_b^{--}) – number of same-sign $\mu^+\mu^+$ ($\mu^-\mu^-$) events from $B \rightarrow \mu X$ decay

- Both B_d and B_s contribute in A_{sl}^b at Tevatron :

$$A_{sl}^b = (0.506 \pm 0.043)a_{sl}^d + (0.494 \pm 0.043)a_{sl}^s$$

B_d contribution

B_s contribution

- a_{sl}^q is the charge asymmetry of "wrong sign" semileptonic B_q^0 ($q = d, s$) decays:

$$a_{sl}^q \equiv \frac{\Gamma(\bar{B}_q^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ X) - \Gamma(B_q^0 \rightarrow \mu^- X)}{\Gamma(\bar{B}_q^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ X) + \Gamma(B_q^0 \rightarrow \mu^- X)}; \quad q = d, s$$

CP in mixing? From ICHEP2010:



Evidence for an anomalous like-sign


$$A_{sl}^b = (-0.957 \pm 0.251 (\text{stat}) \pm 0.146 (\text{syst}))\%$$

- This result differs from the SM prediction by $\sim 3.2 \sigma$
- A_{sl}^b produces a band in a_{sl}^d v.s. a_{sl}^s plane:

$$A_{sl}^b = (0.506 \pm 0.043)a_{sl}^d + (0.494 \pm 0.043)a_{sl}^s$$

- Obtained result agrees well with other measurements of a_{sl}^d and a_{sl}^s

B. Hoeneisen, ICHEP-2010,
DØ Collab., arXiv:1005.2757 accepted by PRD
DØ Collab., arXiv:1007.0395 accepted by PRL



2010/07/27

BSM searches through B

Summary

- Existence of antimatter is a consequence of the combination of special relativity and quantum mechanics
- No 'primordial' antimatter observed
- Need something called 'CP' symmetry breaking to explain the absence of antimatter
- CPT is a very good symmetry
- C,P and CP are conserved in strong & EM interactions
- C,P completely broken by weak interactions, CP looks healthy...
- neutral kaons can 'mix' (oscillate) into their antiparticles
- and this can causes lifetime & mass differences of the CP eigenstates of the Hamiltonian
- CP is (a bit) broken in the neutral kaon system!
- And we can use this to unambiguously distinguish matter and antimatter
- There are actually three ways in which CP can be broken!
- the weak and mass eigenstates of quarks are not the same...
- with 3 (or more) families, one can have a complex phase in the CKM matrix that defines the weak eigenstates, and this allows for CP violation!
- There is a clear (and unexplained!) hierarchy in the CKM
- All four neutral mesons can mix -- and do, but some faster(slower) than others...
- Heavy top quark needed for B mixing

How to put these measurements together?

- Many measurements, but in the end, V_{CKM} has only four parameters
- ...and only *one* of them is actually responsible for CP violation
- How to make a coherent/powerful/... test of the model?
- How to integrate CP measurements in this?

- V_{CKM} has *many* relations amongst its elements....

Use the unitarity constraint(s)!


The 9 unitarity conditions of the 3×3 generations CKM matrix:

$$\begin{pmatrix} V_{ud} & V_{us} & V_{ub} \\ V_{cd} & V_{cs} & V_{cb} \\ V_{td} & V_{ts} & V_{tb} \end{pmatrix}$$

Use the unitarity constraint(s)!

The 9 unitarity conditions of the 3×3 generations CKM matrix:

$$|V_{ud}|^2 + |V_{cd}|^2 + |V_{td}|^2 = 1$$



The diagram shows a 3x3 CKM matrix with elements V_{ud} , V_{us} , V_{ub} in the first row; V_{cd} , V_{cs} , V_{cb} in the second row; and V_{td} , V_{ts} , V_{tb} in the third row. The first column is highlighted with a light red background, and a curved arrow with an asterisk points from the top of this column to the top-right element V_{ub} , indicating the unitarity condition $|V_{ud}|^2 + |V_{cd}|^2 + |V_{td}|^2 = 1$.


$$\begin{pmatrix} V_{ud} & V_{us} & V_{ub} \\ V_{cd} & V_{cs} & V_{cb} \\ V_{td} & V_{ts} & V_{tb} \end{pmatrix}$$

Use the unitarity constraint(s)!

The 9 unitarity conditions of the 3×3 generations CKM matrix:

$$|V_{ud}|^2 + |V_{cd}|^2 + |V_{td}|^2 = 1$$

$$|V_{us}|^2 + |V_{cs}|^2 + |V_{ts}|^2 = 1$$


$$\begin{pmatrix} V_{ud} & V_{us} & V_{ub} \\ V_{cd} & V_{cs} & V_{cb} \\ V_{td} & V_{ts} & V_{tb} \end{pmatrix}$$


Use the unitarity constraint(s)!

The 9 unitarity conditions of the 3×3 generations CKM matrix:

$$|V_{ud}|^2 + |V_{cd}|^2 + |V_{td}|^2 = 1$$

$$|V_{us}|^2 + |V_{cs}|^2 + |V_{ts}|^2 = 1$$

$$|V_{ub}|^2 + |V_{cb}|^2 + |V_{tb}|^2 = 1$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} V_{ud} & V_{us} & V_{ub} \\ V_{cd} & V_{cs} & V_{cb} \\ V_{td} & V_{ts} & V_{tb} \end{pmatrix}$$


Use the unitarity constraint(s)!

The 9 unitarity conditions of the 3×3 generations CKM matrix:

$$\begin{aligned} |V_{ud}|^2 + |V_{cd}|^2 + |V_{td}|^2 &= 1 \\ |V_{us}|^2 + |V_{cs}|^2 + |V_{ts}|^2 &= 1 \\ |V_{ub}|^2 + |V_{cb}|^2 + |V_{tb}|^2 &= 1 \end{aligned} \quad \begin{pmatrix} V_{ud} & V_{us} & V_{ub} \\ V_{cd} & V_{cs} & V_{cb} \\ V_{td} & V_{ts} & V_{tb} \end{pmatrix}$$

Use the unitarity constraint(s)!


The 9 unitarity conditions of the 3×3 generations CKM matrix:

$$\begin{aligned} |V_{ud}|^2 + |V_{cd}|^2 + |V_{td}|^2 &= 1 \\ |V_{us}|^2 + |V_{cs}|^2 + |V_{ts}|^2 &= 1 \\ |V_{ub}|^2 + |V_{cb}|^2 + |V_{tb}|^2 &= 1 \end{aligned} \quad \begin{pmatrix} V_{ud} & V_{us} & V_{ub} \\ V_{cd} & V_{cs} & V_{cb} \\ V_{td} & V_{ts} & V_{tb} \end{pmatrix}$$

The 6 complex “**Unitarity Triangles**” involve different physics processes

Use the unitarity constraint(s)!

The 9 unitarity conditions of the 3×3 generations CKM matrix:



$$|V_{ud}|^2 + |V_{cd}|^2 + |V_{td}|^2 = 1$$

$$|V_{us}|^2 + |V_{cs}|^2 + |V_{ts}|^2 = 1$$

$$|V_{ub}|^2 + |V_{cb}|^2 + |V_{tb}|^2 = 1$$

The 6 complex “**Unitarity Triangles**” involve different physics processes

‘sd’ triangle: K^0

$$V_{us}^* V_{ud} + V_{cs}^* V_{cd} + V_{ts}^* V_{td} = 0 \quad \mathcal{O}(\lambda) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^5) = 0$$




Use the unitarity constraint(s)!

The 9 unitarity conditions of the 3×3 generations CKM matrix:

$$|V_{ud}|^2 + |V_{cd}|^2 + |V_{td}|^2 = 1$$

$$|V_{us}|^2 + |V_{cs}|^2 + |V_{ts}|^2 = 1$$

$$|V_{ub}|^2 + |V_{cb}|^2 + |V_{tb}|^2 = 1$$



The 6 complex “**Unitarity Triangles**” involve different physics processes

$$V_{us}^* V_{ud} + V_{cs}^* V_{cd} + V_{ts}^* V_{td} = 0$$

$$\mathcal{O}(\lambda) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^5) = 0$$




‘sd’ triangle: K^0

$$V_{ub}^* V_{ud} + V_{cb}^* V_{cd} + V_{tb}^* V_{td} = 0$$

$$\mathcal{O}(\lambda^3) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^3) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^3) = 0$$



‘bd’ triangle: B^0




Use the unitarity constraint(s)!

The 9 unitarity conditions of the 3×3 generations CKM matrix:

$$|V_{ud}|^2 + |V_{cd}|^2 + |V_{td}|^2 = 1$$

$$|V_{us}|^2 + |V_{cs}|^2 + |V_{ts}|^2 = 1$$


$$|V_{ub}|^2 + |V_{cb}|^2 + |V_{tb}|^2 = 1$$



The 6 complex “**Unitarity Triangles**” involve different physics processes

$$V_{us}^* V_{ud} + V_{cs}^* V_{cd} + V_{ts}^* V_{td} = 0$$

$$\mathcal{O}(\lambda) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^5) = 0$$




‘sd’ triangle: K^0

$$V_{ub}^* V_{ud} + V_{cb}^* V_{cd} + V_{tb}^* V_{td} = 0$$

$$\mathcal{O}(\lambda^3) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^3) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^3) = 0$$



‘bd’ triangle: B^0



$$V_{ub}^* V_{us} + V_{cb}^* V_{cs} + V_{tb}^* V_{ts} = 0$$

$$\mathcal{O}(\lambda^4) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2) = 0$$



‘bs’ triangle: B_s



Use the unitarity constraint(s)!

The 9 unitarity conditions of the 3×3 generations CKM matrix:

$$|V_{ud}|^2 + |V_{cd}|^2 + |V_{td}|^2 = 1$$

$$|V_{us}|^2 + |V_{cs}|^2 + |V_{ts}|^2 = 1$$

$$|V_{ub}|^2 + |V_{cb}|^2 + |V_{tb}|^2 = 1$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} V_{ud} & V_{us} & V_{ub} \\ V_{cd} & V_{cs} & V_{cb} \\ V_{td} & V_{ts} & V_{tb} \end{pmatrix}$$

The 6 complex “**Unitarity Triangles**” involve different physics processes

$$V_{us}^* V_{ud} + V_{cs}^* V_{cd} + V_{ts}^* V_{td} = 0$$

$$\mathcal{O}(\lambda) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^5) = 0$$




‘sd’ triangle: K^0

$$V_{ub}^* V_{ud} + V_{cb}^* V_{cd} + V_{tb}^* V_{td} = 0$$

$$\mathcal{O}(\lambda^3) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^3) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^3) = 0$$



‘bd’ triangle: B^0



$$V_{ub}^* V_{us} + V_{cb}^* V_{cs} + V_{tb}^* V_{ts} = 0$$

$$\mathcal{O}(\lambda^4) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2) = 0$$



‘bs’ triangle: B_s



Use the unitarity constraint(s)!

The 9 unitarity conditions of the 3×3 generations CKM matrix:

$$|V_{ud}|^2 + |V_{cd}|^2 + |V_{td}|^2 = 1$$

$$|V_{us}|^2 + |V_{cs}|^2 + |V_{ts}|^2 = 1$$

$$|V_{ub}|^2 + |V_{cb}|^2 + |V_{tb}|^2 = 1$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} V_{ud} & V_{us} & V_{ub} \\ V_{cd} & V_{cs} & V_{cb} \\ V_{td} & V_{ts} & V_{tb} \end{pmatrix}$$

The 6 complex “**Unitarity Triangles**” involve different physics processes

‘sd’ triangle: K^0

$$V_{us}^* V_{ud} + V_{cs}^* V_{cd} + V_{ts}^* V_{td} = 0$$

$$\mathcal{O}(\lambda) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^5) = 0$$



‘bd’ triangle: B^0

$$V_{ub}^* V_{ud} + V_{cb}^* V_{cd} + V_{tb}^* V_{td} = 0$$

$$\mathcal{O}(\lambda^3) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^3) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^3) = 0$$



$$V_{ub}^* V_{us} + V_{cb}^* V_{cs} + V_{tb}^* V_{ts} = 0$$

$$\mathcal{O}(\lambda^4) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2) = 0$$



‘bs’ triangle: B_s

$$V_{ud} V_{cd}^* + V_{us} V_{cs}^* + V_{ub} V_{cb}^* = 0$$

$$V_{ud} V_{td}^* + V_{us} V_{ts}^* + V_{ub} V_{tb}^* = 0$$

$$V_{cd} V_{td}^* + V_{cs} V_{ts}^* + V_{cb} V_{tb}^* = 0$$

Use the unitarity constraint(s)!

The 9 unitarity conditions of the 3×3 generations CKM matrix:

$$|V_{ud}|^2 + |V_{cd}|^2 + |V_{td}|^2 = 1$$

$$|V_{us}|^2 + |V_{cs}|^2 + |V_{ts}|^2 = 1$$

$$|V_{ub}|^2 + |V_{cb}|^2 + |V_{tb}|^2 = 1$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} V_{ud} & V_{us} & V_{ub} \\ V_{cd} & V_{cs} & V_{cb} \\ V_{td} & V_{ts} & V_{tb} \end{pmatrix}$$

The 6 complex “**Unitarity Triangles**” involve different physics processes

$$V_{us}^* V_{ud} + V_{cs}^* V_{cd} + V_{ts}^* V_{td} = 0$$

$$\mathcal{O}(\lambda) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^5) = 0$$

$$V_{ub}^* V_{ud} + V_{cb}^* V_{cd} + V_{tb}^* V_{td} = 0$$

$$\mathcal{O}(\lambda^3) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^3) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^3) = 0$$

$$V_{ub}^* V_{us} + V_{cb}^* V_{cs} + V_{tb}^* V_{ts} = 0$$

$$\mathcal{O}(\lambda^4) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2) = 0$$

$$V_{ud} V_{cd}^* + V_{us} V_{cs}^* + V_{ub} V_{cb}^* = 0$$


$$V_{ud} V_{td}^* + V_{us} V_{ts}^* + V_{ub} V_{tb}^* = 0$$

$$V_{cd} V_{td}^* + V_{cs} V_{ts}^* + V_{cb} V_{tb}^* = 0$$


‘sd’ triangle: K^0



‘bd’ triangle: B^0




‘bs’ triangle: B_s



relative size of CP -violating effects

“The” Unitarity Triangle...

$$V_{ub}^* V_{ud} + V_{cb}^* V_{cd} + V_{tb}^* V_{td} = 0$$



“The” Unitarity Triangle...


$$V_{ub}^* V_{ud} + V_{cb}^* V_{cd} + V_{tb}^* V_{td} = 0$$

- The internal angles are quark rephasing *independent* and *observable*

$$\alpha = \arg \left(-\frac{V_{tb}^* V_{td}}{V_{ub}^* V_{ud}} \right)$$

$$\gamma = \arg \left(-\frac{V_{ub}^* V_{ud}}{V_{cb}^* V_{cd}} \right)$$

$$\beta = \arg \left(-\frac{V_{cb}^* V_{cd}}{V_{tb}^* V_{td}} \right)$$



“The” Unitarity Triangle...


$$V_{ub}^* V_{ud} + V_{cb}^* V_{cd} + V_{tb}^* V_{td} = 0$$

- pick a quark phase convention such that $V_{cb}^* V_{cd}$ is real

$$\alpha = \arg \left(-\frac{V_{tb}^* V_{td}}{V_{ub}^* V_{ud}} \right)$$

$$\gamma = \arg \left(-\frac{V_{ub}^* V_{ud}}{V_{cb}^* V_{cd}} \right)$$

$$\beta = \arg \left(-\frac{V_{cb}^* V_{cd}}{V_{tb}^* V_{td}} \right)$$



“The” Unitarity Triangle...


$$V_{ub}^* V_{ud} + V_{cb}^* V_{cd} + V_{tb}^* V_{td} = 0$$

- Normalize all sides by $-V_{cb}^* V_{cd}$

$$\alpha = \arg \left(-\frac{V_{tb}^* V_{td}}{V_{ub}^* V_{ud}} \right)$$

$$\gamma = \arg \left(-\frac{V_{ub}^* V_{ud}}{V_{cb}^* V_{cd}} \right)$$

$$\beta = \arg \left(-\frac{V_{cb}^* V_{cd}}{V_{tb}^* V_{td}} \right)$$



“The” Unitarity Triangle...


$$V_{ub}^* V_{ud} + V_{cb}^* V_{cd} + V_{tb}^* V_{td} = 0$$

- Put in the Wolfenstein parameterization of the V_{CKM} elements

$$\alpha = \arg \left(-\frac{V_{tb}^* V_{td}}{V_{ub}^* V_{ud}} \right)$$

$$\gamma = \arg \left(-\frac{V_{ub}^* V_{ud}}{V_{cb}^* V_{cd}} \right)$$

$$\beta = \arg \left(-\frac{V_{cb}^* V_{cd}}{V_{tb}^* V_{td}} \right)$$



“The” Unitarity Triangle...


$$V_{ub}^* V_{ud} + V_{cb}^* V_{cd} + V_{tb}^* V_{td} = 0$$

- And simplify...


$$\alpha = \arg \left(-\frac{V_{tb}^* V_{td}}{V_{ub}^* V_{ud}} \right)$$

$$\gamma = \arg \left(-\frac{V_{ub}^* V_{ud}}{V_{cb}^* V_{cd}} \right)$$


$$\beta = \arg \left(-\frac{V_{cb}^* V_{cd}}{V_{tb}^* V_{td}} \right)$$



$(\bar{\rho}, \bar{\eta})$: the magnitudes only...




$(\bar{\rho}, \bar{\eta})$: the magnitudes and ϵ_K ...




Summary

- Existence of antimatter is a consequence of the combination of special relativity and quantum mechanics
- No 'primordial' antimatter observed
- Need something called 'CP' symmetry breaking to explain the absence of antimatter
- CPT is a very good symmetry
- C,P and CP are conserved in strong & EM interactions
- C,P completely broken by weak interactions, CP looks healthy...
- neutral kaons can 'mix' (oscillate) into their antiparticles
- and this can cause lifetime & mass differences of the CP eigenstates of the Hamiltonian
- CP is (a bit) broken in the neutral kaon system!
- And we can use this to unambiguously distinguish matter and antimatter
- There are actually three ways in which CP can be broken!
- the weak and mass eigenstates of quarks are not the same...
- with 3 (or more) families, one can have a complex phase in the CKM matrix that defines the weak eigenstates, and this allows for CP violation!
- There is a clear (and unexplained!) hierarchy in the CKM
- All four neutral mesons can mix -- and do, but some faster(slower) than others...
- Heavy top quark needed for B mixing
- Using the measured magnitudes of V_{CKM} elements, we can predict the weak phases!

Measuring the angles (phases!)..




- We've measured the sides, and have predictions for the angles,
- But how to measure the angles, i.e. phases?
- Interference!



Amplitudes and Observables

$$A_j = \langle \text{final} | H_j | \text{initial} \rangle$$
$$= |A_j| e^{+i\phi_j^{\text{weak}}}$$



$$P(i \rightarrow f) = |A_1 + A_2|^2$$



Amplitudes and Observables

$$A_j = \langle \text{final} | H_j | \text{initial} \rangle$$

$$= |A_j| e^{+i\phi_j^{\text{weak}}}$$

$$\bar{A}_j = A_j^*$$

$$= |A_j| e^{-i\phi_j^{\text{weak}}}$$



$$P(i \rightarrow f) = |A_1 + A_2|^2$$

$$P(\bar{i} \rightarrow \bar{f}) = |\bar{A}_1 + \bar{A}_2|^2$$



Amplitudes and Observables

$$A_j = \langle \text{final} | H_j | \text{initial} \rangle$$

$$= |A_j| e^{+i\phi_j^{\text{weak}}}$$

$$\bar{A}_j = A_j^*$$

$$= |A_j| e^{-i\phi_j^{\text{weak}}}$$




$$P(i \rightarrow f) = |A_1 + A_2|^2$$

$$P(\bar{i} \rightarrow \bar{f}) = |\bar{A}_1 + \bar{A}_2|^2$$

$$= |A_1|^2 + 2|A_1||A_2| \cos \phi_2 + |A_2|^2$$

Amplitudes and Observables

$$A_j = |A_j| e^{i(\phi_j^{\text{weak}} + \kappa_j)}$$




$$P(i \rightarrow f) = |A_1 + A_2|^2$$

Amplitudes and Observables


$$A_j = |A_j| e^{i(\phi_j^{\text{weak}} + \kappa_j)}$$



$$\bar{A}_j = |A_j| e^{i(-\phi_j^{\text{weak}} + \kappa_j)}$$




$$P(i \rightarrow f) = |A_1 + A_2|^2$$





$$P(\bar{i} \rightarrow \bar{f}) = |\bar{A}_1 + \bar{A}_2|^2$$

Amplitudes and Observables

$$A_j = |A_j| e^{i(\phi_j^{\text{weak}} + \kappa_j)}$$



$$\bar{A}_j = |A_j| e^{i(-\phi_j^{\text{weak}} + \kappa_j)}$$



$$P(i \rightarrow f) = |A_1 + A_2|^2$$


$$P(\bar{i} \rightarrow \bar{f}) = |\bar{A}_1 + \bar{A}_2|^2$$

$$= |A_1|^2 + 2|A_1||A_2| \cos(\phi_2 \pm \kappa_2) + |A_2|^2$$

$$P(i \rightarrow f) - P(\bar{i} \rightarrow \bar{f}) = -4|A_1||A_2| \sin(\phi_2) \sin(\kappa_2)$$

(large) weak phases necessary but *not* sufficient for (large) CP violation...

What to interfere with what?



- for β : $b \rightarrow c$ (V_{cb}) with B^0 mixing (V_{td})
- for α : $b \rightarrow u$ (V_{ub}) with B^0 mixing (V_{td})
- for γ : $b \rightarrow u$ (V_{ub}) with $b \rightarrow c$ (V_{cb})


Interference!

$$g_{\pm}(t) = \frac{e^{-i\omega_S t} \pm e^{-i\omega_L t}}{2}$$

$t = 0$

t

Amplitude



Interference!

$$g_{\pm}(t) = \frac{e^{-i\omega_S t} \pm e^{-i\omega_L t}}{2}$$

For neutral B mesons, g_- has a 90° phase difference wrt. g_+

$$g_+(t) = e^{-imt} e^{-\Gamma t/2} \cos \frac{\Delta m t}{2}$$


$$g_-(t) = e^{-imt} e^{-\Gamma t/2} i \sin \frac{\Delta m t}{2}$$

$$\lambda_{f_{CP}} = \frac{q}{p} \frac{\bar{A}_{f_{CP}}}{A_{f_{CP}}}$$


$t = 0$

t

Amplitude



$$A_{f_{CP}} e^{-imt} e^{-\Gamma t/2} \left(\cos \frac{\Delta m t}{2} + \lambda_{f_{CP}} i \sin \frac{\Delta m t}{2} \right)$$



$$\bar{A}_{f_{CP}} e^{-imt} e^{-\Gamma t/2} \left(\cos \frac{\Delta m t}{2} + \frac{1}{\lambda_{f_{CP}}} i \sin \frac{\Delta m t}{2} \right)$$

Interference!

Assume $\lambda_{f_{CP}} = \frac{q}{p} \frac{\bar{A}_{f_{CP}}}{A_{f_{CP}}} = e^{-i\phi_{weak}}$

$t = 0$

t

Amplitude

$$B^0 \rightarrow f_{CP} \quad A_{f_{CP}} e^{-imt} e^{-\Gamma t/2} \left(\cos \frac{\Delta mt}{2} + \lambda_{f_{CP}} i \sin \frac{\Delta mt}{2} \right)$$

$$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow f_{CP} \quad \bar{A}_{f_{CP}} e^{-imt} e^{-\Gamma t/2} \left(\cos \frac{\Delta mt}{2} + \frac{1}{\lambda_{f_{CP}}} i \sin \frac{\Delta mt}{2} \right)$$

Interference!

Assume $\lambda_{f_{CP}} = \frac{q}{p} \frac{\bar{A}_{f_{CP}}}{A_{f_{CP}}} = e^{-i\phi_{weak}}$

$t = 0$ t Amplitude


$$B^0 \rightarrow f_{CP} \quad A_{f_{CP}} e^{-imt} e^{-\Gamma t/2} \left(\cos \frac{\Delta mt}{2} + \lambda_{f_{CP}} i \sin \frac{\Delta mt}{2} \right)$$

$$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow f_{CP} \quad \bar{A}_{f_{CP}} e^{-imt} e^{-\Gamma t/2} \left(\cos \frac{\Delta mt}{2} + \frac{1}{\lambda_{f_{CP}}} i \sin \frac{\Delta mt}{2} \right)$$

$$\underline{B^0 \rightarrow f_{CP}}$$

$$\underline{\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow f_{CP}}$$

$$\Delta mt/2 = 0$$



Interference!


Assume $\lambda_{f_{CP}} = \frac{q \bar{A}_{f_{CP}}}{p A_{f_{CP}}} = e^{-i\phi_{weak}}$

$t = 0$ t Amplitude


$$B^0 \rightarrow f_{CP} \quad A_{f_{CP}} e^{-imt} e^{-\Gamma t/2} \left(\cos \frac{\Delta mt}{2} + \lambda_{f_{CP}} i \sin \frac{\Delta mt}{2} \right)$$

$$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow f_{CP} \quad \bar{A}_{f_{CP}} e^{-imt} e^{-\Gamma t/2} \left(\cos \frac{\Delta mt}{2} + \frac{1}{\lambda_{f_{CP}}} i \sin \frac{\Delta mt}{2} \right)$$



$B^0 \rightarrow f_{CP}$



$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow f_{CP}$




$\Delta mt/2 = 0$



$\Delta mt/2 = \pi/4$

\mathcal{I}



\mathcal{R}

Interference!


Assume $\lambda_{f_{CP}} = \frac{q \bar{A}_{f_{CP}}}{p A_{f_{CP}}} = e^{-i\phi_{weak}}$

$t = 0$ t Amplitude


$$B^0 \rightarrow f_{CP} \quad A_{f_{CP}} e^{-imt} e^{-\Gamma t/2} \left(\cos \frac{\Delta mt}{2} + \lambda_{f_{CP}} i \sin \frac{\Delta mt}{2} \right)$$

$$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow f_{CP} \quad \bar{A}_{f_{CP}} e^{-imt} e^{-\Gamma t/2} \left(\cos \frac{\Delta mt}{2} + \frac{1}{\lambda_{f_{CP}}} i \sin \frac{\Delta mt}{2} \right)$$


$B^0 \rightarrow f_{CP}$



$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow f_{CP}$



$\Delta mt/2 = 0$



$\Delta mt/2 = \pi/4$

$\Delta mt/2 = \pi/2$

\mathcal{I}

\mathcal{R}


Interference!

Assume $\lambda_{f_{CP}} = \frac{q \bar{A}_{f_{CP}}}{p A_{f_{CP}}} = e^{-i\phi_{weak}}$

$t = 0$ t Amplitude

$$B^0 \rightarrow f_{CP} \quad A_{f_{CP}} e^{-imt} e^{-\Gamma t/2} \left(\cos \frac{\Delta mt}{2} + \lambda_{f_{CP}} i \sin \frac{\Delta mt}{2} \right)$$

$$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow f_{CP} \quad \bar{A}_{f_{CP}} e^{-imt} e^{-\Gamma t/2} \left(\cos \frac{\Delta mt}{2} + \frac{1}{\lambda_{f_{CP}}} i \sin \frac{\Delta mt}{2} \right)$$



\mathcal{I}

\mathcal{R}


Interference!

Assume $\lambda_{f_{CP}} = \frac{q \bar{A}_{f_{CP}}}{p A_{f_{CP}}} = e^{-i\phi_{weak}}$

$t = 0$ t Amplitude

$$B^0 \rightarrow f_{CP} \quad A_{f_{CP}} e^{-imt} e^{-\Gamma t/2} \left(\cos \frac{\Delta mt}{2} + \lambda_{f_{CP}} i \sin \frac{\Delta mt}{2} \right)$$

$$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow f_{CP} \quad \bar{A}_{f_{CP}} e^{-imt} e^{-\Gamma t/2} \left(\cos \frac{\Delta mt}{2} + \frac{1}{\lambda_{f_{CP}}} i \sin \frac{\Delta mt}{2} \right)$$



\mathcal{I}
 \mathcal{R}

→ Time Dependent CP Asymmetry!!!


Interference!

$$\lambda_{f_{CP}} = \frac{q}{p} \frac{\bar{A}_{f_{CP}}}{A_{f_{CP}}}$$

$t = 0$ t Rate

$$B^0 \rightarrow f_{CP} \quad \frac{1}{2} e^{-\Gamma t} \left[1 + \left(\frac{1 - |\lambda|^2}{1 + |\lambda|^2} \right) \cos(\Delta m t) - \left(\frac{2\mathcal{I}(\lambda)}{1 + |\lambda|^2} \right) \sin(\Delta m t) \right]$$

$$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow f_{CP} \quad \frac{1}{2} e^{-\Gamma t} \left[1 - \left(\frac{1 - |\lambda|^2}{1 + |\lambda|^2} \right) \cos(\Delta m t) + \left(\frac{2\mathcal{I}(\lambda)}{1 + |\lambda|^2} \right) \sin(\Delta m t) \right]$$



$$A_{CP} \equiv \frac{\Gamma(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow f_{CP}) - \Gamma(B^0 \rightarrow f_{CP})}{\Gamma(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow f_{CP}) + \Gamma(B^0 \rightarrow f_{CP})}$$

$$= -C_{f_{CP}} \cos(\Delta m t) + S_{f_{CP}} \sin(\Delta m t)$$

↑ CP in decay ↑ CP in interference between decay and mixing


Next: find the right f_{CP} ...

$B \rightarrow J/\psi K_S$

$$\lambda_{J/\psi K_S} \equiv \frac{q}{p} \frac{\bar{A}_{J/\psi K_S}}{A_{J/\psi K_S}}$$

$B \rightarrow J/\psi K_S$

$$\lambda_{J/\psi K_S} \equiv \frac{q}{p} \frac{\bar{A}_{J/\psi K_S}}{A_{J/\psi K_S}}$$




$B \rightarrow J/\psi K_S$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \lambda_{J/\psi K_S} &\equiv \frac{q \bar{A}_{J/\psi K_S}}{p A_{J/\psi K_S}} \\
 &= -\frac{q \bar{A}_{J/\psi \bar{K}^0, \bar{K}^0 \rightarrow K_S}}{p A_{J/\psi K^0, K^0 \rightarrow K_S}}
 \end{aligned}$$

The diagram illustrates the decay of a \bar{B}^0 meson into J/ψ and \bar{K}^0 . The \bar{B}^0 meson consists of a b quark and a \bar{d} antiquark. The b quark transitions to a c quark via a W^- boson, with a CKM element V_{cb} . The W^- boson then decays into a c quark and a \bar{s} antiquark, with a CKM element V_{cs}^* . The \bar{d} antiquark remains a \bar{d} antiquark. The final state consists of a J/ψ meson ($c\bar{c}$) and a \bar{K}^0 meson ($s\bar{d}$). The transition is labeled with $\bar{K}^0 \times \langle K_S | \bar{K}^0 \rangle$.

$B \rightarrow J/\psi K_S$

$$\lambda_{J/\psi K_S} \equiv \frac{q \bar{A}_{J/\psi K_S}}{p A_{J/\psi K_S}}$$

$$= \frac{q \bar{A}_{J/\psi \bar{K}^0, \bar{K}^0 \rightarrow K_S}}{p A_{J/\psi \bar{K}^0, \bar{K}^0 \rightarrow K_S}}$$


The diagram shows the decay of a \bar{B}^0 meson into J/ψ and \bar{K}^0 . The \bar{B}^0 consists of a b quark and a \bar{d} quark. The J/ψ consists of a c quark and a \bar{c} quark. The \bar{K}^0 consists of a s quark and a \bar{d} quark. The decay is mediated by a W^- boson. The b quark transitions to a c quark via a W^- boson with CKM element V_{cb} . The W^- boson then transitions to a s quark and a \bar{c} quark via CKM elements V_{cs}^* and V_{cb} respectively. The \bar{d} quark remains a \bar{d} quark. The final state is J/ψ and \bar{K}^0 , which is then projected onto the K_S state: $\bar{K}^0 \times \langle K_S | \bar{K}^0 \rangle$.



$$\bar{A}_f = \eta_{CP} \bar{A}_{\bar{f}}$$

$$\begin{aligned} CP |J/\psi K_S\rangle &= (-1^1) [CP |J/\psi\rangle] [CP |K_S\rangle] \\ &= (-1^1) [(-1^1)(-) |J/\psi\rangle] [(+) |K_S\rangle] \\ &= - |J/\psi K_S\rangle \end{aligned}$$

$B \rightarrow J/\psi K_S$

$$\lambda_{J/\psi K_S} \equiv \frac{q \bar{A}_{J/\psi K_S}}{p A_{J/\psi K_S}}$$


$$= -\frac{q \bar{A}_{J/\psi \bar{K}^0, \bar{K}^0 \rightarrow K_S}}{p A_{J/\psi K^0, K^0 \rightarrow K_S}}$$



$$|K_S\rangle = p_K |K^0\rangle + q_K |\bar{K}^0\rangle$$



B → J/ψ K_S

$$\frac{q_K}{p_K} \approx \frac{V_{cs}^* V_{cd}}{V_{cs} V_{cd}^*}$$



$$\lambda_{J/\psi K_S} \equiv \frac{q}{p} \frac{\bar{A}_{J/\psi K_S}}{A_{J/\psi K_S}}$$

$$= -\frac{q}{p} \frac{\bar{A}_{J/\psi \bar{K}^0, \bar{K}^0 \rightarrow K_S}}{A_{J/\psi K^0, K^0 \rightarrow K_S}}$$





$$|K_S\rangle = p_K |K^0\rangle + q_K |\bar{K}^0\rangle$$

B → J/ψ K_S

$$\lambda_{J/\psi K_S} \equiv \frac{q \bar{A}_{J/\psi K_S}}{p A_{J/\psi K_S}}$$

$$= -\frac{q \bar{A}_{J/\psi \bar{K}^0, \bar{K}^0 \rightarrow K_S}}{p A_{J/\psi K^0, K^0 \rightarrow K_S}}$$

$$\frac{q_K}{p_K} \approx \frac{V_{cs}^* V_{cd}}{V_{cs} V_{cd}^*}$$




$$|K_S\rangle = p_K |K^0\rangle + q_K |\bar{K}^0\rangle$$

B → J/ψ K_S

$$\lambda_{J/\psi K_S} \equiv \frac{q \bar{A}_{J/\psi K_S}}{p A_{J/\psi K_S}}$$

$$= -\frac{q \bar{A}_{J/\psi \bar{K}^0, \bar{K}^0 \rightarrow K_S}}{p A_{J/\psi K^0, K^0 \rightarrow K_S}}$$





B → J/ψ K_S

$$\lambda_{J/\psi K_S} \equiv \frac{q \bar{A}_{J/\psi K_S}}{p A_{J/\psi K_S}}$$

$$= -\frac{q \bar{A}_{J/\psi \bar{K}^0, \bar{K}^0 \rightarrow K_S}}{p A_{J/\psi K^0, K^0 \rightarrow K_S}}$$

$$\frac{V_{tb}^* V_{td}}{V_{tb} V_{td}^*}$$




$B \rightarrow J/\psi K_S$

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_{J/\psi K_S} &\equiv \frac{q}{p} \frac{\bar{A}_{J/\psi K_S}}{A_{J/\psi K_S}} \\ &= -\frac{q}{p} \frac{\bar{A}_{J/\psi \bar{K}^0, \bar{K}^0 \rightarrow K_S}}{A_{J/\psi K^0, K^0 \rightarrow K_S}} \\ &= -\frac{V_{tb}^* V_{td} V_{cb} V_{cd}}{V_{tb} V_{td}^* V_{cb}^* V_{cd}}\end{aligned}$$


B → J/ψK_S

$$\begin{aligned}
 \lambda_{J/\psi K_S} &\equiv \frac{q \bar{A}_{J/\psi K_S}}{p A_{J/\psi K_S}} \\
 &= -\frac{q \bar{A}_{J/\psi \bar{K}^0, \bar{K}^0 \rightarrow K_S}}{p A_{J/\psi K^0, K^0 \rightarrow K_S}} \\
 &= -\frac{V_{tb}^* V_{td} V_{cb} V_{cd}}{V_{tb} V_{td}^* V_{cb}^* V_{cd}}
 \end{aligned}$$




$B \rightarrow J/\psi K_S$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \lambda_{J/\psi K_S} &\equiv \frac{q}{p} \frac{\bar{A}_{J/\psi K_S}}{A_{J/\psi K_S}} \\
 &= -\frac{q}{p} \frac{\bar{A}_{J/\psi \bar{K}^0, \bar{K}^0 \rightarrow K_S}}{A_{J/\psi K^0, K^0 \rightarrow K_S}} \\
 &= -\frac{V_{tb}^* V_{td}}{V_{tb} V_{td}^*} \frac{V_{cb} V_{cd}}{V_{cb}^* V_{cd}^*} \\
 &= -e^{-2i\beta}
 \end{aligned}$$




$B \rightarrow J/\psi K_S$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \lambda_{J/\psi K_S} &\equiv \frac{q \bar{A}_{J/\psi K_S}}{p A_{J/\psi K_S}} \\
 &= -\frac{q \bar{A}_{J/\psi \bar{K}^0, \bar{K}^0 \rightarrow K_S}}{p A_{J/\psi K^0, K^0 \rightarrow K_S}} \\
 &= -\frac{V_{tb}^* V_{td} V_{cb} V_{cd}}{V_{tb} V_{td}^* V_{cb}^* V_{cd}} \\
 &= -e^{-2i\beta}
 \end{aligned}$$





$$\mathcal{A}_{CP} = \frac{\Gamma(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K_S) - \Gamma(B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K_S)}{\Gamma(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K_S) + \Gamma(B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K_S)} = \sin(2\beta) \sin(\Delta m t)$$



KTeV
Kaons at the Tevatron



E787/949




CLEO-c



Currently running or recently ended programs

CKM Physics and CP Violation

Worldwide Experimental Facilities




Approved experiments (mostly in construction)

Currently running or recently ended programs

CKM Physics and CP Violation

Worldwide Experimental Facilities




Planned experiments that were not ratified

Approved experiments (mostly in construction)

Currently running or recently ended programs

CKM Physics and CP Violation

Worldwide Experimental Facilities



Planned experiments that were not ratified

Approved experiments (mostly in construction)


New proposals

Currently running or recently ended programs

CKM Physics and CP Violation

Worldwide Experimental Facilities

B factories: $e^+e^- \rightarrow Y(4S) \rightarrow B\bar{B}$



Very clean environment!

Measuring $A_{CP}(t)$ in $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K_S$

- Times evolution of $\Upsilon(4s)$ decay

- $t=0$: Decay of $\Upsilon(4s)$ into 2 B mesons


Neither B is in a specific eigenstate, but $B_1 B_2$ system evolves *coherently*, i.e. flavor anti-correlation preserved in evolution

- $t=t_1$ One of the two mesons (B_1) decays.

If it decays into a flavor eigenstate, flavor conservation in the coherent $B_1 B_2$ requires that also B_2 goes into a flavor eigenstate, even though it has not decayed yet!

- $t=t_2$ The other B meson decays

This meson can decay into any kind of state, eg. a \bar{B}^0 or B^0 flavor eigenstate. The latter means that mixing took place between t_1 and t_2 . It can also decay into a CP eigenstate (either directly or after a mixing)



Measuring $A_{CP}(t)$ in $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K_s$

- We can use this process to measure $A_{CP}(t)$


$$A_{CP}(t) = \frac{N(\overline{B}^0(t) \rightarrow J/\psi K_s) - N(B^0(t) \rightarrow J/\psi K_s)}{N(\overline{B}^0(t) \rightarrow J/\psi K_s) + N(B^0(t) \rightarrow J/\psi K_s)} = \sin 2\beta \sin \Delta mt$$

- More precise reading of A_{CP} :

- We don't necessarily need to produce B^0 mesons in a flavor eigenstate, we just need to measure the decay into CP eigenstate after a known time t since it was (through whatever means) in a flavor eigenstate


- Bottom line

- Look for $Y(4s) \rightarrow B^0 \overline{B}^0$ where '1st' B^0 decays in to flavor eigenstate and '2nd' B^0 decays into CP eigenstate and interpret $t_2 - t_1$ as the correct time for the $A_{CP}(t)$ formula
- Note: formalism also works when $\Delta t < 0$!



Measuring $A_{CP}(t)$ in $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K_S$

- The last little catch: How do you measure a decay time *difference*?
 - Naïve solution: measure both decay times
 - Impossible in practice because you measure decay times from flight distances, but nothing marks the decay point of the $Y(4s)$
 - And even if you knew the decay point, the produced B are almost at rest in the $Y(4S)$ frame...




- $m(Y(4s)) = 10.58 \text{ GeV}$
- $m(B^0) = 5.28 \text{ GeV} \rightarrow p_B^* = 340 \text{ MeV}/c \rightarrow (\beta\gamma)^* = 0.064 \rightarrow 30 \text{ um for } \tau = 1.5 \text{ ps}$

Measuring $A_{CP}(t)$ in $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K_S$



Pier Oddone, LBL
(now: FNAL)

- Solution: Make the $\Upsilon(4s)$ fly!
- Both B^0 mesons practically at rest in $\Upsilon(4s)$ rest frame
 - If $\Upsilon(4s)$ moves in lab frame at modest speed no B^0 's will be emitted 'backwards' as speed of $\Upsilon(4s)$ in lab is always larger than maximum backward speed of B^0 w.r.t the $\Upsilon(4s)$



- Result: spacing between vertices \propto difference in decay time!

The B Factories: PEP-2 (SLAC, USA) and KEK-B (KEK, Japan)



Linac

Fixed Target Experiments

BABAR

SLD (& MARK II)

The B Factories: PEP-2 (SLAC, USA) and KEK-B (KEK, Japan)



Linac

Fixed Target Experiments


BABAR

SLD (& MARK II)


**KEKB delivered $\int L = 950 \text{ fb}^{-1}$
Peak record: $2.1 \cdot 10^{34} \text{ cm}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$**

**PEP-II delivered $\int L = 557 \text{ fb}^{-1}$
Peak record: $1.2 \cdot 10^{34} \text{ cm}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$
switched off: april 7th, 2008**

The BABAR Detector




The BABAR Detector



e^-


The BABAR Detector



[Redacted]

e^-

The BABAR Detector



e^-

Ingredients of the measurements


Ingredients of the measurements

PEP-2 (SLAC)

$$E_{e^-} = 9 \text{ GeV} \quad E_{e^+} = 3.1 \text{ GeV}$$

$$\sqrt{s} = 10.58 \text{ GeV}$$

$$\langle \beta\gamma \rangle_{\Upsilon(4S)} = 0.56$$




Ingredients of the measurements

PEP-2 (SLAC)

$$E_{e^-} = 9 \text{ GeV} \quad E_{e^+} = 3.1 \text{ GeV}$$

$$\sqrt{s} = 10.58 \text{ GeV}$$

$$\langle \beta\gamma \rangle_{\Upsilon(4S)} = 0.56$$




Ingredients of the measurements

PEP-2 (SLAC)

$$E_{e^-} = 9 \text{ GeV} \quad E_{e^+} = 3.1 \text{ GeV}$$

$$\sqrt{s} = 10.58 \text{ GeV}$$

$$\langle \beta\gamma \rangle_{\Upsilon(4S)} = 0.56$$



$$\text{rec} = \text{flav}, \overline{\text{flav}}, CP$$

$$f_{\text{flav}} = D^{*-} \pi^+, \dots$$

$$f_{CP} = J/\psi K_S^0, J/\psi K_L^0, \dots$$

**Exclusive
B Meson
Reconstruction**


Ingredients of the measurements

PEP-2 (SLAC)

$$E_{e^-} = 9 \text{ GeV} \quad E_{e^+} = 3.1 \text{ GeV}$$

$$\sqrt{s} = 10.58 \text{ GeV}$$

$$\langle \beta\gamma \rangle_{\Upsilon(4S)} = 0.56$$



$$\text{rec} = \text{flav}, \overline{\text{flav}}, CP$$

$$f_{\text{flav}} = D^{*-} \pi^+, \dots$$

$$f_{CP} = J/\psi K_S^0, J/\psi K_L^0, \dots$$

**Exclusive
B Meson
Reconstruction**


Ingredients of the measurements

PEP-2 (SLAC)

$$E_{e^-} = 9 \text{ GeV} \quad E_{e^+} = 3.1 \text{ GeV}$$

$$\sqrt{s} = 10.58 \text{ GeV}$$

$$\langle \beta\gamma \rangle_{\Upsilon(4S)} = 0.56$$



$$\text{rec} = \text{flav}, \overline{\text{flav}}, CP$$

$$f_{\text{flav}} = D^{*-} \pi^+, \dots$$

$$f_{CP} = J/\psi K_S^0, J/\psi K_L^0, \dots$$

**Exclusive
B Meson
Reconstruction**


Ingredients of the measurements

PEP-2 (SLAC)

$$E_{e^-} = 9 \text{ GeV} \quad E_{e^+} = 3.1 \text{ GeV}$$

$$\sqrt{s} = 10.58 \text{ GeV}$$

$$\langle \beta\gamma \rangle_{\Upsilon(4S)} = 0.56$$



B-Flavor Tagging

Exclusive B Meson Reconstruction

rec = flav, $\overline{\text{flav}}$, CP

$$f_{\text{flav}} = D^{*-} \pi^+, \dots$$

$$f_{\text{CP}} = J/\psi K_S^0, J/\psi K_L^0, \dots$$

tag = B^0, \overline{B}^0

$$f_{B^0} = X \ell^+ \nu, X K^+, X \pi_s^-, \dots$$


Ingredients of the measurements

PEP-2 (SLAC)

$$E_{e^-} = 9 \text{ GeV} \quad E_{e^+} = 3.1 \text{ GeV}$$

$$\sqrt{s} = 10.58 \text{ GeV}$$

$$\langle \beta\gamma \rangle_{\Upsilon(4S)} = 0.56$$



B-Flavor Tagging

$$\text{rec} = \text{flav}, \overline{\text{flav}}, CP$$

$$f_{\text{flav}} = D^{*-} \pi^+, \dots$$

$$f_{CP} = J/\psi K_S^0, J/\psi K_L^0, \dots$$

$$\text{tag} = B^0, \bar{B}^0$$

$$f_{B^0} = X \ell^+ \nu, XK^+, X\pi_s^-, \dots$$

**Exclusive
B Meson
Reconstruction**


Ingredients of the measurements

PEP-2 (SLAC)

$$E_{e^-} = 9 \text{ GeV} \quad E_{e^+} = 3.1 \text{ GeV}$$

$$\sqrt{s} = 10.58 \text{ GeV}$$

$$\langle \beta\gamma \rangle_{\Upsilon(4S)} = 0.56$$



B-Flavor Tagging

$$\text{rec} = \text{flav}, \overline{\text{flav}}, CP$$

$$f_{\text{flav}} = D^{*-} \pi^+, \dots$$

$$f_{CP} = J/\psi K_S^0, J/\psi K_L^0, \dots$$

$$\text{tag} = B^0, \overline{B}^0$$

$$f_{B^0} = X \ell^+ \nu, X K^+, X \pi_s^-, \dots$$

Vertexing & Time Difference Determination


Exclusive B Meson Reconstruction

$$\Delta t \approx \Delta z / c \langle \beta\gamma \rangle_{\Upsilon(4S)}$$

$$\langle \Delta z \rangle_{B\overline{B}} \approx 260 \mu\text{m}$$



Example of fully reco'd BaBar event

“fish eye”
view






Example of fully reco'd BaBar event

“fish eye”
view





Example of fully reco'd BaBar event

“fish eye”
view



Example of fully reco'd BaBar event

"fish eye"
view





At $\Delta t=0$ (i.e. when the $D^*\pi$ decay happened), the 'CP' B was/would have been a B^0



Putting it all together:

$$B^0(\Delta t) \quad \overline{B^0}(\Delta t)$$



$$A_{CP}(\Delta t) = (1-2w) \cdot \sin(\Delta m_d \Delta t)$$



Imperfect flavor tagging




Finite Δt resolution




CP violation in B system!

$$e^+e^- \rightarrow \Upsilon(4S) \rightarrow B_{\text{rec}}B_{\text{tag}} \quad \begin{array}{l} B_{\text{rec}} \rightarrow J/\psi K_S \\ B_{\text{tag}} \rightarrow \ell^\pm X, K^\pm X, \pi_{\text{soft}}^\mp, \pi_{\text{fast}}^\pm X, \dots \end{array}$$




CP violation in B system!

$$e^+e^- \rightarrow \Upsilon(4S) \rightarrow B_{\text{rec}}B_{\text{tag}} \quad \begin{array}{l} B_{\text{rec}} \rightarrow J/\psi K_S \\ B_{\text{tag}} \rightarrow \ell^\pm X, K^\pm X, \pi_{\text{soft}}^\mp, \pi_{\text{fast}}^\pm X, \dots \end{array}$$



CP violation in B system!

$$e^+e^- \rightarrow \Upsilon(4S) \rightarrow B_{\text{rec}}B_{\text{tag}} \quad \begin{array}{l} B_{\text{rec}} \rightarrow J/\psi K_S \\ B_{\text{tag}} \rightarrow \ell^\pm X \end{array}$$



220 events

98% signal purity!


3.3% mistag rate!

20% better Δt resolution!


caveat: these plots made on a dataset of 100 million $\Upsilon(4S)$ decays...

Δt (ps)


Putting it all together..



Putting it all together..




Putting it all together..



Precise measurement of $\sin(2\beta)$ agrees perfectly with other measurements and CKM assumptions

There is a solution of ρ, η consistent with all measurements


Putting it all together..



Precise measurement of $\sin(2\beta)$ agrees perfectly with other measurements and CKM assumptions

There is a solution of ρ, η consistent with all measurements

Putting it all together..



Precise measurement of $\sin(2\beta)$ agrees perfectly with other measurements and CKM assumptions

There is a solution of ρ, η consistent with all measurements

☺ The CKM model of CP violation has successfully been confirmed!

At the scale of electroweak interaction, CKM is dominates CP violation

☹ No need (at current level of precision!) for physics beyond the Standard Model to explain observed CP violation

Summary

- Existence of antimatter is a consequence of the combination of special relativity and quantum mechanics
- No 'primordial' antimatter observed
- Need something called 'CP' symmetry breaking to explain the absence of antimatter
- CPT is a very good symmetry
- C,P and CP are conserved in strong & EM interactions
- C,P completely broken by weak interactions, CP looks healthy...
- neutral kaons can 'mix' (oscillate) into their antiparticles
- and this can causes lifetime & mass differences of the CP eigenstates of the Hamiltonian
- CP is (a bit) broken in the neutral kaon system!
- And we can use this to unambiguously distinguish matter and antimatter
- There are actually three ways in which CP can be broken!
- the weak and mass eigenstates of quarks are not the same...
- with 3 (or more) families, one can have a complex phase in the CKM matrix that defines the weak eigenstates, and this allows for CP violation!
- There is a clear (and unexplained!) hierarchy in the CKM
- All four neutral mesons can mix -- and do, but some faster(slower) than others...
- Heavy top quark needed for B mixing
- Using the measured magnitudes of V_{CKM} elements, we can predict the weak phases!
- And the measurements agree with the predictions...

Penguins on the horizon...



© Dr David Thomas, School of Ocean Sciences, UWB


Left-handed quarks, penguins and darts...

THE PHENOMENOLOGY OF THE NEXT LEFT-HANDED QUARKS

J. ELLIS, M.K. GAILLARD *, D.V. NANOPOULOS ** and S. RUDAZ ***

CERN, Geneva

Received 14 July 1977



We now turn to the "penguin" diagrams of figs. 2e and 2f.

Nucl. Phys. B131:285 1977


Left-handed quarks, penguins and darts...

THE PHENOMENOLOGY OF THE NEXT LEFT-HANDED QUARKS


J. ELLIS, M.K. GAILLARD *, D.V. NANOPOULOS ** and S. RUDAZ ***

CERN, Geneva


Received 14 July 1977




(a)




(b)




(c)



(d)



(e)



(f)

We now turn to the "penguin" diagrams of figs. 2e and 2f.

Nucl. Phys. B131:285 1977


Left-handed quarks, penguins and darts...

THE PHENOMENOLOGY OF THE NEXT LEFT-HANDED QUARKS

J. ELLIS, M.K. GAILLARD *, D.V. NANOPOULOS ** and S. RUDAZ ***


CERN, Geneva

Received 14 July 1977




(a)


(b)




(c)



(d)



(e)



(f)

In the spring of 1977, Mike Chanowitz, Mary K. and I wrote a paper on GUTs [Grand Unified Theories] predicting the b quark mass before it was found. When it was found a few weeks later, Mary K., Dimitri, Serge Rudaz and I immediately started working on its phenomenology.

That summer, there was a student at CERN, Melissa Franklin, who is now an experimentalist at Harvard. One evening, she, I, and Serge went to a pub, and she and I started a game of darts. We made a bet that if I lost I had to put the word penguin into my next paper. She actually left the darts game before the end, and was replaced by Serge, who beat me. Nevertheless, I felt obligated to carry out the conditions of the bet.


For some time, it was not clear to me how to get the word into this b quark paper that we were writing at the time.... Later... I had a sudden flash that the famous diagrams look like penguins. So we put the name into our paper, and the rest, as they say, is history."

We now turn to the "penguin" diagrams of figs. 2e and 2f.

Nucl. Phys. B131:285 1977


John Ellis in Mikhail Shifman's "ITEP Lectures in Particle Physics and Field Theory", hep-ph/9510397

Are we sure that $A_{CP}(J/\psi K_S) = \sin(2\beta)$?




$$A_{\overline{B}^0 \rightarrow J/\psi \overline{K}^0} = V_{cb} V_{cs}^* T$$

Are we sure that $A_{CP}(J/\psi K_S) = \sin(2\beta)$?



$$A_{\overline{B}^0 \rightarrow J/\psi \overline{K}^0} = V_{cb} V_{cs}^* T + V_{tb} V_{ts}^* P_t + V_{cb} V_{cs}^* P_c + V_{ub} V_{us}^* P_u$$


Are we sure that $A_{CP}(J/\psi K_S) = \sin(2\beta)$?



$$A_{\overline{B}^0 \rightarrow J/\psi \overline{K}^0} = V_{cb} V_{cs}^* T + V_{tb} V_{ts}^* P_t + V_{cb} V_{cs}^* P_c + V_{ub} V_{us}^* P_u$$

Use the 'bs' unitarity triangle relation: $V_{ub} V_{us}^* + V_{cb} V_{cs}^* + V_{tb} V_{ts}^* = 0$

Are we sure that $A_{CP}(J/\psi K_S) = \sin(2\beta)$?




$$A_{\overline{B}^0 \rightarrow J/\psi \overline{K}^0} = V_{cb} V_{cs}^* T + V_{tb} V_{ts}^* P_t + V_{cb} V_{cs}^* P_c + V_{ub} V_{us}^* P_u$$

Use the 'bs' unitarity triangle relation: $V_{ub} V_{us}^* + V_{cb} V_{cs}^* + V_{tb} V_{ts}^* = 0$

$$A_{\overline{B}^0 \rightarrow J/\psi \overline{K}^0} = V_{cb} V_{cs}^* (T + P_c - P_t) + V_{ub} V_{us}^* (P_u - P_t)$$

relative phase: γ

Are we sure that $A_{CP}(J/\psi K_S) = \sin(2\beta)$?



$$A_{\overline{B}^0 \rightarrow J/\psi \overline{K}^0} = V_{cb} V_{cs}^* T + V_{tb} V_{ts}^* P_t + V_{cb} V_{cs}^* P_c + V_{ub} V_{us}^* P_u$$

Use the 'bs' unitarity triangle relation: $V_{ub} V_{us}^* + V_{cb} V_{cs}^* + V_{tb} V_{ts}^* = 0$

$$A_{\overline{B}^0 \rightarrow J/\psi \overline{K}^0} = V_{cb} V_{cs}^* (T + P_c - P_t) + V_{ub} V_{us}^* (P_u - P_t)$$


$$= \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2) \quad \xrightarrow{\text{relative phase: } \gamma} \quad = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^4)$$

Penguin contribution with different weak phase suppressed by an extra factor λ^2 :
Extraction of $\sin(2\beta)$ from $J/\psi K_S$ is "theoretically clean"

Direct CP violation: $\Gamma(B^0 \rightarrow f) \neq \Gamma(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \bar{f})$

needs (at least!) 2 interfering amplitudes

Amplitude I




+

$$A_{\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+} = V_{ub} V_{us}^* T + \dots$$


Direct CP violation: $\Gamma(B^0 \rightarrow f) \neq \Gamma(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \bar{f})$

needs (at least!) 2 interfering amplitudes

Amplitude 1



Amplitudes 2,3 and 4...




$$A_{\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+} = V_{ub} V_{us}^* (T + P_u - P_t) + V_{cb} V_{cs}^* (P_c - P_t)$$


Direct CP violation: $\Gamma(B^0 \rightarrow f) \neq \Gamma(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \bar{f})$

needs (at least!) 2 interfering amplitudes

Amplitude 1



Amplitudes 2,3 and 4...




$$A_{\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+} = V_{ub} V_{us}^* (T + P_u - P_t) + V_{cb} V_{cs}^* (P_c - P_t)$$

$$= \mathcal{O}(\lambda^4) \quad \xrightarrow{\text{relative phase: } \gamma} \quad = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2)$$


Direct CP violation: $\Gamma(B^0 \rightarrow f) \neq \Gamma(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \bar{f})$

needs (at least!) 2 interfering amplitudes

Amplitude 1



Amplitudes 2,3 and 4...



$$A_{\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+} = V_{ub} V_{us}^* (T + P_u - P_t) + V_{cb} V_{cs}^* (P_c - P_t)$$

$$= \mathcal{O}(\lambda^4) \quad \text{relative phase: } \gamma \quad = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2)$$

Now the otherwise dominant tree diagram is suppressed by λ^2 !


potentially \sim equal amplitudes with *both* different strong and weak phases !

$$\rightarrow \Gamma(B^0 \rightarrow f) \neq \Gamma(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \bar{f})$$

Direct CP Asymmetry in $B^0 \rightarrow K^+ \pi^-$ Decays

We present a measurement of the direct CP asymmetry in the decay $B^0 \rightarrow K^+ \pi^-$ using a data sample of 227 million $\Upsilon(4S) \rightarrow B\bar{B}$ decays collected with the *BABAR* detector at the PEP-II asymmetric-energy e^+e^- collider at SLAC. We observe a total signal yield of $n_{K^-\pi^+} + n_{K^+\pi^-} = 1606 \pm 51$ decays and measure the asymmetry $(n_{K^-\pi^+} - n_{K^+\pi^-}) / (n_{K^-\pi^+} + n_{K^+\pi^-}) = -0.133 \pm 0.030$ (stat) ± 0.009 (syst). The probability of observing such an asymmetry in the absence of direct CP violation is 1.3×10^{-5} , corresponding to 4.2 standard deviations.


hep-ex/0407057
*Phys.Rev.Lett.*93:131801,2004



Peaking around the corner

Why are loop dominated decay processes very perceptible to ‘new’ particles?

- You can simply replace an ‘internal quark line’ (the circle) with ‘new’ particles without affecting the initial and final state of the decay




- Momentum flowing through loop should be integrated to “infinity”
→ Potential high masses of virtual particles don’t kill their contribution...
- No tree-level diagrams: less ‘competition’ from (boring) Standard Model amplitudes..

Summary


- Existence of antimatter is a consequence of the combination of special relativity and quantum mechanics
- No 'primordial' antimatter observed
- Need something called 'CP' symmetry breaking to explain the absence of antimatter
- CPT is a very good symmetry
- C,P and CP are conserved in strong & EM interactions
- C,P completely broken by weak interactions, CP looks healthy...
- neutral kaons can 'mix' (oscillate) into their antiparticles
- and this can cause lifetime & mass differences of the CP eigenstates of the Hamiltonian
- CP is (a bit) broken in the neutral kaon system!
- And we can use this to unambiguously distinguish matter and antimatter
- There are actually three ways in which CP can be broken!
- the weak and mass eigenstates of quarks are not the same...
- with 3 (or more) families, one can have a complex phase in the CKM matrix that defines the weak eigenstates, and this allows for CP violation!
- There is a clear (and unexplained!) hierarchy in the CKM
- All four neutral mesons can mix -- and do, but some faster (slower) than others...
- Heavy top quark needed for B mixing
- Using the measured magnitudes of V_{CKM} elements, we can predict the weak phases!
- And the measurements agree with the predictions...
- Penguins and rare decays *could* provide hints of physics beyond the Standard Model

The Future of B physics & CP violation at the LHC

ATLAS



CMS




ATLAS and CMS concentrate on “high- p_T ” discovery physics. Their B -physics potential relies on the low- p_T performance of the Trigger systems.

LHCb is **not** a fixed-target experiment (but does look like one). It concentrates on B physics.

Virtues over ATLAS & CMS: Low- p_T track trigger, particle ID & better mass resolution

LHCb




B Physics at Tevatron and LHC



B physics at hadron colliders is complementary to the e^+e^- *B* factories.

Strengths: High statistics: LHC will produce 10^{12} bb/year at 2×10^{32} cm⁻²s⁻¹; accesses the B_s ; sensitive to very rare modes, if clean signature; production of *b* baryons and B_c mesons



Weaknesses: Worse tagging (no quantum coherence) and background; no rare modes with neutrinos can be reconstructed; less efficient for π^0 ;




B physics at the Tevatron & LHC

Prime Measurements: (many, many more interesting measurements to be done!)

- B_s mixing phase: very small in SM, excellent probe for new physics: $2\beta_s \approx -2\arg V_{ts} V_{tb}^*$




new result
shown at EPS 16-22 July
2009 →



- $B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$: FCNC (box & EW-penguin-mediated) rare decay
- SM BR $\sim 3 \cdot 10^{-9}$; current limit (CDF, ICHEP2010) $< 4.3 \cdot 10^{-8}$ at 95% CL
- in MSSM, BR enhanced by $\tan(\beta)^6$ (note: β = ratio of VEVs, not 'sin(2 β)')

$B_s \rightarrow J/\psi \varphi$



Note: this is the projection in the *transverse* plane,
Vertex separation is *much* larger in 3D.

CKM phase and the universe

See, e.g.,
 W. Bernreuther,
 Lect. Notes Phys. 591 (2002) 237-293

- could the CKM phase generate the observed baryon asymmetry ?
- KM CP -violating asymmetries, d_{CP} , must be proportional to the Jarlskog invariant J

$$d_{CP} = J \times \tilde{F}_U \times \tilde{F}_D$$

where: $J = \text{Im}(V_{ud}V_{cs}V_{us}^*V_{cd}^*) \approx A^2\lambda^6\eta$ and: $\tilde{F}_U = (m_t^2 - m_c^2) \cdot (m_t^2 - m_u^2) \cdot (m_c^2 - m_u^2)$
 $= (3.1 \pm 0.2) \times 10^{-5}$ $\tilde{F}_D = (m_b^2 - m_s^2) \cdot (m_b^2 - m_d^2) \cdot (m_s^2 - m_d^2)$

Area of every
 unitarity triangle!

- If any two up- or down- type masses equal, can *redefine* mass eigenstates, 'effectively' reducing the CKM from 3x3 to 2x2
- Since non-zero quark masses are required, CP symmetry can only be broken where the Higgs field has acquired a vacuum expectation value $\rightarrow T_{EW}$
- (But with $M(\text{Higgs}) > 70$ GeV, insufficient deviation from thermal equilibrium...)
- To make d_{CP} dimensionless, we divide by dimensioned parameter $D = T_c$ at the EW scale ($T_c = T_{EW} \sim 100$ GeV), with $[D] = \text{GeV}^{12}$

$$\hat{d}_{CP} = \frac{d_{CP}}{D^{12}} \approx 10^{-19} \ll \eta \approx O(10^{-10})$$

KM CP violation seems irrelevant for baryogenesis !

What about neutrinos?

- However, we now know that neutrinos also have flavour oscillations
 - thus they must have a (very small) mass...
 - ... and thus there is the equivalent of a CKM matrix for them:
 - *the Pontecorvo-Maki-Nakagawa-Sakata matrix*

$$\begin{pmatrix} |U_{e1}|^2 & |U_{e2}|^2 & |U_{e3}|^2 \\ |U_{\mu 1}|^2 & |U_{\mu 2}|^2 & |U_{\mu 3}|^2 \\ |U_{\tau 1}|^2 & |U_{\tau 2}|^2 & |U_{\tau 3}|^2 \end{pmatrix} \approx \begin{pmatrix} \frac{2}{3} & \frac{1}{3} & 0 \\ \frac{1}{6} & \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{6} & \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix}$$

- which has a completely different hierarchy!
- and, because neutrinos have no electric charge, you can do things you cannot do with quarks...
- there are scenarios (leptogenesis) where CP violation in the neutrino sector would generate (eventually) baryogenesis...

Summary

- Existence of antimatter is a consequence of the combination of special relativity and quantum mechanics
 - No ‘primordial’ antimatter observed, need CP violation (amongst others!)
 - CP broken by the charged weak interaction
 - The weak and mass eigenstates of quarks are *different*, and this difference is *described* by the CKM matrix (but not explained!)
 - There is a clear (and unexplained!) hierarchical structure to the CKM matrix...
 - With 3 (or more) families, one can have a complex phase(s) in the CKM matrix, and this *allows* for CP violation!
 - Measurements show that CKM describes the dominant (only?) source of CP violation (at the EW scale).
 - But it doesn’t explain the matter -- antimatter asymmetry of the universe..
- ➡ *There is plenty left to be explored!*

Symmetries

Instructions by the VOC (Dutch East India Company) in Aug 1642:

*“Since many rich mines and other treasures have been found in countries north of the equator between 15° and 40° latitude, **there is no doubt that countries alike exist south** of the equator. The provinces in Peru and Chili rich of gold and silver, all positioned south of the equator, are revealing **proofs** hereof.”*

Abel Tasman discovered Tasmania (Nov. 1642), New Zealand (Dec. 1642), Fiji (Jan 1643), ...

From the point of view of the VOC, this was a disappointment..



Abel Tasman



I'd be happy to discover Fiji instead!






Figure 2.4: The constraints from measurements on the Unitarity Triangles relevant for the B_d^0 system (left) and the B_s^0 system (right) in the Standard Model. The constraints on UT_s are the constraints on UT , multiplied by $V_{us}V_{cd}/V_{ud}V_{cs}$. Since this (small) number is negative, the constraints are point mirrored in $(0,0)$. Since the factor has a small imaginary component there are small differences in the plots as the distance from the origin increases.




Figure 2.9: An example of a diagram where supersymmetry particles contribute to $B_s - \bar{B}_s$ oscillation [21].




Figure 2.10: Constraints on $\Delta\Gamma$ and ϕ_s from the combination of $B_s^0 \rightarrow J/\psi\phi$ measurements of CDF and DØ at the time of writing. In the right plot also the information from measurements of lifetimes and semi-leptonic asymmetries in B_s^0 decays is used.

2.6.1 New Physics contributions

In the case that supersymmetry particles exist, these are expected to contribute to the box diagram, as shown by the Feynman diagram example shown in figure 2.6.1 [21]. As an alternative example, contributions from Z' bosons are discussed in [22].

In general, new particles are expected not to contribute to on-shell processes, due to their larger masses. Therefore, any non-SM contribution to $\Delta B = 2$ mixing transitions is expected to only affect M_{12} , and not Γ_{12} . Such a contribution can be parameterized by introducing a parameter Δ_s . With the inclusion of new physics, the off-diagonal term in the Hamiltonian can be written as

$$M_{12} \rightarrow M_{12}^{SM} \Delta_s \equiv M_{12}^{SM} |\Delta_s| e^{i\phi_s^\Delta}. \quad (2.60)$$

Since this changes the overall phase as

$$\arg M_{12} \rightarrow \arg M_{12}^{SM} + \arg \Delta_s, \quad (2.61)$$

(2.57) becomes

$$\lambda_{J/\psi\phi} \rightarrow \eta e^{+2i\beta_s - i\phi_s^\Delta}. \quad (2.62)$$

This implies that the NP phase augments the SM CP violating phase in the following way

$$-2\beta_s \rightarrow -2\beta_s + \phi_s^\Delta. \quad (2.63)$$

Now the CP-violating observable $\phi_s \equiv -2\beta_s + \phi_s^\Delta$ can be introduced⁷, such that, finally

$$\lambda_{J/\psi\phi} = \eta e^{-i\phi_s}. \quad (2.64)$$

Then the observables given in (2.35) and (2.43) are influenced in the following manner:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta m_s &\rightarrow 2|M_{12}^{SM}| |\Delta_s| \\ \Delta\Gamma_s &\rightarrow 2\Gamma_{12} \cos(\phi_{M/\Gamma} + \phi_s^\Delta) \\ a_{SL} &\rightarrow \left| \frac{\Gamma_{12}}{M_{12}^{SM}} \right| \frac{\sin(\phi_{M/\Gamma} + \phi_s^\Delta)}{|\Delta_s|} \end{aligned} \quad (2.65)$$




Figure 2.11: Current constraints on New Physics from the measurements of ϕ_s , widths and width differences, mass differences and semi-leptonic asymmetries. Deviations from the SM values according to (2.63) and (2.65) are assumed. Due to the large uncertainties, only the 68% CL are shown for the individual constraints. Both 68% and 95% contours are shown for the global constraint. The SM point ($\Delta_s = (1, 0)$) is excluded at 2σ [10].