CP Violation in Non-leptonic Charmed Meson Decays

Pietro Santorelli

Dipartimento di Fisica Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II

Physics of Heavy Quarks and Hadrons Dubna, 18 July 2013

Pietro Santorelli (Università di Napoli)

D decays & CP Violation

Physics of Heavy Quarks & Hadrons 1 / 37

Recent Experimental results on Direct CPV in D Decays

$$\Delta a_{\rm CP} = a_{CP}(K^+K^-) - a_{\rm CP}(\pi^+\pi^-)$$

 $\Delta a_{\rm CP} = (-0.82 \pm 0.21 \pm 0.11)\% \qquad (\rm LHCb\,(2012)),$

Recent Experimental results on Direct CPV in D Decays

$$\Delta a_{\rm CP} = a_{CP}(\kappa^+\kappa^-) - a_{\rm CP}(\pi^+\pi^-)$$

$$\Delta a_{\rm CP} = (-0.82 \pm 0.21 \pm 0.11)\%$$

- $= (-0.62 \pm 0.21 \pm 0.10)\%$
- $= (-0.87 \pm 0.41 \pm 0.06)\%$
- = (+0.24 ± 0.62 ± 0.26)%
- $= (-0.34 \pm 0.15 \pm 0.10)\%$
- $= (+0.49 \pm 0.30 \pm 0.14)\%$

- (LHCb(2012)),
- (CDF(2012)),
- (Belle (2012)),
- (BaBaR(2008)),
- (LHCb(2013)),
- (LHCb(2013)).

Recent Experimental results on Direct CPV in D Decays

$$\Delta a_{\rm CP} = a_{CP}(\kappa^+\kappa^-) - a_{\rm CP}(\pi^+\pi^-)$$

$$\Delta a_{\rm CP} = (-0.82 \pm 0.21 \pm 0.11)\%$$

- $= (-0.62 \pm 0.21 \pm 0.10)\%$
- $= (-0.87 \pm 0.41 \pm 0.06)\%$
- $= (+0.24 \pm 0.62 \pm 0.26)\%$
- $= (-0.34 \pm 0.15 \pm 0.10)\%$
- $= (+0.49 \pm 0.30 \pm 0.14)\%$

- (LHCb(2012)), (CDF(2012)),
- $(CDI^{*}(2012)),$
- (Belle (2012)),
- (BaBaR(2008)),
- (LHCb(2013)),
- (LHCb(2013)).

A naive weighted average

 $\Delta a_{\rm CP} = (-0.33 \pm 0.12)\%$

The description of the CP Violation

- The description of the CP Violation
- Provide the second s

- The description of the CP Violation
- Provide the second s
- A Simple Model

- The description of the CP Violation
- Provide the second s
- A Simple Model
- Are the experimental data compatible with the Standard Model?

- The description of the CP Violation
- Provide the second s
- A Simple Model
- Are the experimental data compatible with the Standard Model?

Conclusions

In the SM CP Violation can emerge in the interaction involving charged currents.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \overline{\psi}_1 \gamma_\mu \psi_2 & \stackrel{\operatorname{CP}}{\longrightarrow} & -\overline{\psi}_2 \gamma^\mu \psi_1 \\ \\ \overline{\psi}_1 \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 \psi_2 & \stackrel{\operatorname{CP}}{\longrightarrow} & -\overline{\psi}_2 \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 \psi_1 \\ \\ W_\mu & \stackrel{\operatorname{CP}}{\longrightarrow} & -W^{\dagger\mu} \end{array}$$

In the SM CP Violation can emerge in the interaction involving charged currents.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \overline{\psi}_{1} \gamma_{\mu} \psi_{2} & \stackrel{\mathrm{CP}}{\longrightarrow} & -\overline{\psi}_{2} \gamma^{\mu} \psi_{1} \\ \\ \overline{\psi}_{1} \gamma_{\mu} \gamma_{5} \psi_{2} & \stackrel{\mathrm{CP}}{\longrightarrow} & -\overline{\psi}_{2} \gamma^{\mu} \gamma_{5} \psi_{1} \\ \\ W_{\mu} & \stackrel{\mathrm{CP}}{\longrightarrow} & -W^{\dagger \mu} \end{array}$$

 $\mathscr{L} = gV_{12} \,\overline{\psi}_1 \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) \psi_2 W^\mu + gV_{12}^* \,\overline{\psi}_2 \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) \psi_1 W^{\dagger \mu}$

In the SM CP Violation can emerge in the interaction involving charged currents.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \overline{\psi}_{1} \gamma_{\mu} \psi_{2} & \stackrel{\mathrm{CP}}{\longrightarrow} & -\overline{\psi}_{2} \gamma^{\mu} \psi_{1} \\ \\ \overline{\psi}_{1} \gamma_{\mu} \gamma_{5} \psi_{2} & \stackrel{\mathrm{CP}}{\longrightarrow} & -\overline{\psi}_{2} \gamma^{\mu} \gamma_{5} \psi_{1} \\ \\ W_{\mu} & \stackrel{\mathrm{CP}}{\longrightarrow} & -W^{\dagger \mu} \end{array}$$

In the SM CP Violation can emerge in the interaction involving charged currents.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \overline{\psi}_{1} \gamma_{\mu} \psi_{2} & \stackrel{\mathrm{CP}}{\longrightarrow} & -\overline{\psi}_{2} \gamma^{\mu} \psi_{1} \\ \\ \overline{\psi}_{1} \gamma_{\mu} \gamma_{5} \psi_{2} & \stackrel{\mathrm{CP}}{\longrightarrow} & -\overline{\psi}_{2} \gamma^{\mu} \gamma_{5} \psi_{1} \\ \\ W_{\mu} & \stackrel{\mathrm{CP}}{\longrightarrow} & -W^{\dagger \mu} \end{array}$$

 W^{-}

 W^+

A generic flavoured neutral meson M^0 (K^0 , D^0 , B^0_d and B^0_s) with non-zero eigenvalue of flavor F and its antiparticle \overline{M}^0 are defined by

$$F \left| M^{0} \right\rangle = + \left| M^{0} \right\rangle \qquad F \left| \bar{M}^{0} \right\rangle = - \left| \bar{M}^{0} \right\rangle$$

A generic flavoured neutral meson M^0 (K^0 , D^0 , B^0_d and B^0_s) with non-zero eigenvalue of flavor F and its antiparticle \overline{M}^0 are defined by

$$F \left| M^{0} \right\rangle = + \left| M^{0} \right\rangle \qquad F \left| \bar{M}^{0} \right\rangle = - \left| \bar{M}^{0} \right\rangle$$

Moreover,

$$CP \left| M^{0} \right\rangle = \left| ar{M}^{0} \right\rangle \qquad CP \left| ar{M}^{0} \right\rangle = \left| M^{0} \right\rangle$$

A generic flavoured neutral meson M^0 (K^0 , D^0 , B^0_d and B^0_s) with non-zero eigenvalue of flavor F and its antiparticle \overline{M}^0 are defined by

$$F \left| M^{0} \right\rangle = + \left| M^{0} \right\rangle \qquad F \left| \bar{M}^{0} \right\rangle = - \left| \bar{M}^{0} \right\rangle$$

Moreover,

$$CP \left| M^{0} \right\rangle = \left| ar{M}^{0} \right\rangle \qquad CP \left| ar{M}^{0} \right\rangle = \left| M^{0} \right\rangle$$

Weak interactions don't conserve flavour quantum numbers and so M^0 and \overline{M}^0 cannot be physical states.

A generic flavoured neutral meson M^0 (K^0 , D^0 , B^0_d and B^0_s) with non-zero eigenvalue of flavor F and its antiparticle \overline{M}^0 are defined by

$$F \left| M^{0} \right\rangle = + \left| M^{0} \right\rangle \qquad F \left| \bar{M}^{0} \right\rangle = - \left| \bar{M}^{0} \right\rangle$$

Moreover,

$$CP \left| M^{0} \right\rangle = \left| ar{M}^{0} \right\rangle \qquad CP \left| ar{M}^{0} \right\rangle = \left| M^{0} \right\rangle$$

Weak interactions don't conserve flavour quantum numbers and so M^0 and \overline{M}^0 cannot be physical states.

But, if CP is conserved, the physical states are

$$M_{\pm} = rac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[\left| M^0
ight
angle \pm \left| ar{M}^0
ight
angle
ight] \qquad ext{ } CP \left| M_{\pm}
ight
angle = \pm \left| M_{\pm}
ight
angle$$

The exact time evolution of \overline{M}^0 and M^0 is prohibitively complicated: M^0 and \overline{M}^0 couple together and can decay into other states.

Starting from initial states which are linear combinations of \overline{M}^0 and M^0 , we can study the time evolution of the coefficients by considering the weak interactions as perturbation to the strong ones. At the second order in the weak interactions and in the subspace $M^0 - \overline{M}^0$, the effective hamiltonian can be written as

$$\iota \hbar \frac{d}{dt} |\psi\rangle = \boldsymbol{H} |\psi\rangle$$

The exact time evolution of \overline{M}^0 and M^0 is prohibitively complicated: M^0 and \overline{M}^0 couple together and can decay into other states.

Starting from initial states which are linear combinations of \overline{M}^0 and M^0 , we can study the time evolution of the coefficients by considering the weak interactions as perturbation to the strong ones. At the second order in the weak interactions and in the subspace $M^0 - \overline{M}^0$, the effective hamiltonian can be written as

$$i\hbar \frac{d}{dt}|\psi\rangle = H|\psi\rangle \qquad H = M - \frac{i}{2}\Gamma$$

The exact time evolution of \overline{M}^0 and M^0 is prohibitively complicated: M^0 and \overline{M}^0 couple together and can decay into other states.

Starting from initial states which are linear combinations of \overline{M}^0 and M^0 , we can study the time evolution of the coefficients by considering the weak interactions as perturbation to the strong ones. At the second order in the weak interactions and in the subspace $M^0 - \overline{M}^0$, the effective hamiltonian can be written as

$$i\hbar \frac{d}{dt}|\psi\rangle = H|\psi\rangle$$
 $H = M - \frac{i}{2}\Gamma$ $M = M^{\dagger}$
 $\Gamma = \Gamma^{\dagger}$

The exact time evolution of \overline{M}^0 and M^0 is prohibitively complicated: M^0 and \overline{M}^0 couple together and can decay into other states.

Starting from initial states which are linear combinations of \overline{M}^0 and M^0 , we can study the time evolution of the coefficients by considering the weak interactions as perturbation to the strong ones. At the second order in the weak interactions and in the subspace $M^0 - \overline{M}^0$, the effective hamiltonian can be written as

$$i \hbar \frac{d}{dt} |\psi\rangle = H |\psi\rangle$$
 $H = M - \frac{i}{2} \Gamma$ $M = M^{\dagger}$
 $\Gamma = \Gamma^{\dagger}$

Note that

$$rac{d}{dt}raket{\psi}{\psi}=-rac{1}{\hbar}raket{\psi}{\Gamma}{\psi}$$

The exact time evolution of \overline{M}^0 and M^0 is prohibitively complicated: M^0 and \overline{M}^0 couple together and can decay into other states.

Starting from initial states which are linear combinations of \overline{M}^0 and M^0 , we can study the time evolution of the coefficients by considering the weak interactions as perturbation to the strong ones. At the second order in the weak interactions and in the subspace $M^0 - \overline{M}^0$, the effective hamiltonian can be written as

$$i\hbar \frac{d}{dt}|\psi\rangle = H|\psi\rangle$$
 $H = M - \frac{i}{2}\Gamma$ $M = M^{\dagger}$
 $\Gamma = \Gamma^{\dagger}$

Note that

$$rac{d}{dt}raket{\psi}{\psi}=-rac{1}{\hbar}raket{\psi}{\Gamma}{\psi}$$

Moreover,

$$\mathbf{H} = H_{strong} + H_{e.m.} + H_{weak}$$

The exact time evolution of \overline{M}^0 and M^0 is prohibitively complicated: M^0 and \overline{M}^0 couple together and can decay into other states.

Starting from initial states which are linear combinations of \overline{M}^0 and M^0 , we can study the time evolution of the coefficients by considering the weak interactions as perturbation to the strong ones. At the second order in the weak interactions and in the subspace $M^0 - \overline{M}^0$, the effective hamiltonian can be written as

$$i\hbar \frac{d}{dt}|\psi\rangle = H|\psi\rangle$$
 $H = M - \frac{i}{2}\Gamma$ $M = M^{\dagger}$
 $\Gamma = \Gamma^{\dagger}$

Note that

$$rac{d}{dt}raket{\psi} \psi
angle = -rac{1}{\hbar}raket{\psi} \Gamma \ket{\psi}$$

Moreover,

$$H = H_{strong} + H_{e.m.} + H_{weak} = H_{\Delta F=0} + H_{\Delta F=1}$$

A generic state $\ket{\psi}=a(t)\ket{M^{0}}+b(t)\ket{ar{M}^{0}}$ satisfy the equation

$$\imath \bar{n} rac{d}{dt} \ket{\psi} = oldsymbol{H} \ket{\psi}$$

A generic state $\ket{\psi}=a(t)\ket{M^0}+b(t)\ket{ar{M}^0}$ satisfy the equation

$$\iota \bar{n} \frac{d}{dt} |\psi\rangle = H |\psi\rangle$$

$$\imath \hbar \frac{d}{dt} \begin{pmatrix} a(t) \\ b(t) \end{pmatrix} = \left(\mathbf{M} - \frac{\imath}{2} \mathbf{\Gamma} \right) \begin{pmatrix} a(t) \\ b(t) \end{pmatrix}$$

A generic state $\ket{\psi}=a(t)\ket{M^0}+b(t)\ket{ar{M}^0}$ satisfy the equation

$$i\hbar\frac{d}{dt}|\psi\rangle = \mathbf{H}|\psi\rangle$$

$$\mathbf{h}\frac{d}{dt}\left(\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{a}(t)\\ \mathbf{b}(t)\end{array}\right) = \left(\mathbf{M} - \frac{i}{2}\mathbf{\Gamma}\right)\left(\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{a}(t)\\ \mathbf{b}(t)\end{array}\right)$$

$$\left(\mathbf{M} - \frac{i}{2}\mathbf{\Gamma}\right) = \begin{pmatrix} M_{11} - (i/2)\Gamma_{11} & M_{12} - (i/2)\Gamma_{12} \\ \\ M_{21} - (i/2)\Gamma_{21} & M_{22} - (i/2)\Gamma_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$

wher

A generic state $\ket{\psi} = a(t) \ket{M^0} + b(t) \ket{ar{M}^0}$ satisfy the equation

 $\left(\mathbf{M} - \frac{\iota}{2}\mathbf{\Gamma}\right) = \begin{pmatrix} M_{11} - (\iota/2)\Gamma_{11} & M_{12} - (\iota/2)\Gamma_{12} \\ M_{21} - (\iota/2)\Gamma_{21} & M_{22} - (\iota/2)\Gamma_{22} \end{pmatrix}$

with

where

Mass matrix elements $M_{11} = M_{11}^* = m_0 + \langle M^0 | H_w | M^0 \rangle + \sum_n \mathscr{P} \frac{|\langle n | H_w | M^0 \rangle|^2}{m_0 - E_n}$ $M_{22} = M_{22}^* = m_0 + \langle \bar{M}^0 | H_w | \bar{M}^0 \rangle + \sum_n \mathscr{P} \frac{|\langle n | H_w | \bar{M}^0 \rangle|^2}{m_0 - E_n}$ $M_{12} = M_{21}^* = \underline{\langle M^0 | H_w | \bar{M}^0 \rangle}_{=0} + \sum_n \mathscr{P} \frac{\langle M^0 | H_w | n \rangle \langle n | H_w | \bar{M}^0 \rangle}{m_0 - E_n}$

Pietro Santorelli (Università di Napoli)

A generic state $\ket{\psi} = a(t) \ket{M^0} + b(t) \ket{ar{M}^0}$ satisfy the equation

where

$$\left(\mathbf{M} - \frac{i}{2}\mathbf{\Gamma}\right) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{M}_{11} - (i/2)\mathbf{\Gamma}_{11} & \mathbf{M}_{12} - (i/2)\mathbf{\Gamma}_{12} \\ \mathbf{M}_{21} - (i/2)\mathbf{\Gamma}_{21} & \mathbf{M}_{22} - (i/2)\mathbf{\Gamma}_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$

with

Mass matrix elementsDecay matrix elements $M_{11} = M_{11}^* = m_0 + \langle M^0 | H_w | M^0 \rangle + \sum_n \mathscr{P} \frac{|\langle n | H_w | M^0 \rangle|^2}{m_0 - E_n}$ $\Gamma_{11} = \Gamma_{11}^* = 2\pi \sum_n \delta(m_0 - E_n) |\langle n | H_w | M^0 \rangle|^2$ $M_{22} = M_{22}^* = m_0 + \langle \bar{M}^0 | H_w | \bar{M}^0 \rangle + \sum_n \mathscr{P} \frac{|\langle n | H_w | \bar{M}^0 \rangle|^2}{m_0 - E_n}$ $\Gamma_{12} = \Gamma_{22}^* = 2\pi \sum_n \delta(m_0 - E_n) |\langle n | H_w | \bar{M}^0 \rangle|^2$ $M_{12} = M_{21}^* = \langle M^0 | H_w | \bar{M}^0 \rangle + \sum_n \mathscr{P} \frac{\langle M^0 | H_w | n \rangle \langle n | H_w | \bar{M}^0 \rangle}{m_0 - E_n}$ $\Gamma_{12} = \Gamma_{21}^* = 2\pi \sum_n \delta(m_0 - E_n) |\langle n | H_w | \bar{M}^0 \rangle|^2$ $M_{12} = M_{21}^* = \langle M^0 | H_w | \bar{M}^0 \rangle + \sum_n \mathscr{P} \frac{\langle M^0 | H_w | n \rangle \langle n | H_w | \bar{M}^0 \rangle}{m_0 - E_n}$ $\langle M^0 | H_w | n \rangle \langle n | H_w | \bar{M}^0 \rangle$

Pietro Santorelli (Università di Napoli)

CPT symmetry

$$M_{11} = M_{22}$$

 $\Gamma_{11} = \Gamma_{22}$





CPT symmetry

$$M_{11} = M_{22}$$

 $\Gamma_{11} = \Gamma_{22}$

$$\begin{array}{ll} |M_a\rangle &=& p \left| M^0 \right\rangle + q \left| \bar{M}^0 \right\rangle \\ |M_b\rangle &=& p \left| M^0 \right\rangle - q \left| \bar{M}^0 \right\rangle \end{array}$$

Pietro Santorelli (Università di Napoli)



$$\frac{q}{p} = \pm \sqrt{\frac{H_{21}}{H_{12}}} = \pm \sqrt{\frac{M_{12}^{*} - (i/2)\Gamma_{12}}{M_{12} - (i/2)\Gamma_{12}}}$$





Pietro Santorelli (Università di Napoli)




Pietro Santorelli (Università di Napoli)

Widths and Mass Differences



M.Gersabeck, arXiv:1207.2195 [hep-ex]

Pietro Santorelli (Università di Napoli)

It is very simple to evaluate the time evolution of the flavour eigenstates:

$$\begin{split} \left| M^{0}(t) \right\rangle &= f_{+}(t) \left| M^{0} \right\rangle + \frac{q}{p} f_{-}(t) \left| \bar{M}^{0} \right\rangle \\ \left| \bar{M}^{0}(t) \right\rangle &= f_{+}(t) \left| \bar{M}^{0} \right\rangle + \frac{p}{q} f_{-}(t) \left| M^{0} \right\rangle \end{split}$$

It is very simple to evaluate the time evolution of the flavour eigenstates:

$$\begin{split} \left| M^{0}(t) \right\rangle &= f_{+}(t) \left| M^{0} \right\rangle + \frac{q}{p} f_{-}(t) \left| \bar{M}^{0} \right\rangle \\ \left| \bar{M}^{0}(t) \right\rangle &= f_{+}(t) \left| \bar{M}^{0} \right\rangle + \frac{p}{q} f_{-}(t) \left| M^{0} \right\rangle \end{split}$$

where

$$f_{\pm}(t) = \frac{1}{2} e^{-\iota m_a t} e^{-\Gamma_a t/2} \left[1 \pm e^{-\iota \Delta m t} e^{-\Delta \Gamma t/2} \right]$$

It is very simple to evaluate the time evolution of the flavour eigenstates:

where

$$f_{\pm}(t) = \frac{1}{2} e^{-\iota m_a t} e^{-\Gamma_a t/2} \left[1 \pm e^{-\iota \Delta m t} e^{-\Delta \Gamma t/2} \right]$$

Probability to find at time t the same flavour eigenstate which it had at time t = 0

$$P[M^{0}(t) \rightarrow M^{0}] = P[\bar{M}^{0}(t) \rightarrow \bar{M}^{0}] = |f_{+}(t)|^{2}$$

It is very simple to evaluate the time evolution of the flavour eigenstates:

$$\begin{aligned} \left| M^{0}(t) \right\rangle &= f_{+}(t) \left| M^{0} \right\rangle + \frac{q}{p} f_{-}(t) \left| \bar{M}^{0} \right\rangle \\ \left| \bar{M}^{0}(t) \right\rangle &= f_{+}(t) \left| \bar{M}^{0} \right\rangle + \frac{p}{q} f_{-}(t) \left| M^{0} \right\rangle \end{aligned}$$

where

$$f_{\pm}(t) = \frac{1}{2}e^{-\iota m_a t}e^{-\Gamma_a t/2} \left[1 \pm e^{-\iota \Delta m t}e^{-\Delta \Gamma t/2}\right]$$

Probability to find at time t the same flavour eigenstate which it had at time t = 0

Probability that an initial M^0 becomes \overline{M}^0 and *viceversa*

$$P[M^{0}(t) \rightarrow M^{0}] = P[\bar{M}^{0}(t) \rightarrow \bar{M}^{0}] = |f_{+}(t)|^{2}$$

$$P[M^{0}(t) \rightarrow \bar{M}^{0}] = \left|\frac{q}{p}\right|^{2} |f_{-}(t)|^{2}$$
$$P[\bar{M}^{0}(t) \rightarrow M^{0}] = \left|\frac{p}{q}\right|^{2} |f_{-}(t)|^{2}$$

Pietro Santorelli (Università di Napoli)

10/37

$$P[M^{0}(t) \to M^{0}] = \frac{1}{2}e^{-\Gamma t}\left(\cosh(\mathbf{y}\Gamma t) + \cos(\mathbf{x}\Gamma t)\right)$$
$$P[M^{0}(t) \to \overline{M}^{0}] = \frac{1}{2}\left|\frac{q}{p}\right|^{2}e^{-\Gamma t}\left(\cosh(\mathbf{y}\Gamma t) - \cos(\mathbf{x}\Gamma t)\right)$$

$$P[M^{0}(t) \to M^{0}] = \frac{1}{2}e^{-\Gamma t}(\cosh(\mathbf{y}\Gamma t) + \cos(\mathbf{x}\Gamma t))$$
$$P[M^{0}(t) \to \overline{M}^{0}] = \frac{1}{2}\left|\frac{q}{\rho}\right|^{2}e^{-\Gamma t}(\cosh(\mathbf{y}\Gamma t) - \cos(\mathbf{x}\Gamma t))$$

$$x \equiv \frac{m_b - m_a}{\Gamma} = \frac{\Delta m}{\Gamma}$$
$$y \equiv \frac{\Gamma_b - \Gamma_a}{2\Gamma} = \frac{\Delta \Gamma}{2\Gamma}$$
$$\Gamma \equiv \frac{\Gamma_b + \Gamma_a}{2}$$

$$P[M^{0}(t) \to M^{0}] = \frac{1}{2}e^{-\Gamma t}\left(\cosh(y\Gamma t) + \cos(x\Gamma t)\right)$$
$$P[M^{0}(t) \to \overline{M}^{0}] = \frac{1}{2}\left|\frac{q}{\rho}\right|^{2}e^{-\Gamma t}\left(\cosh(y\Gamma t) - \cos(x\Gamma t)\right)$$



$$x \equiv \frac{m_b - m_a}{\Gamma} = \frac{\Delta m}{\Gamma}$$
$$y \equiv \frac{\Gamma_b - \Gamma_a}{2\Gamma} = \frac{\Delta \Gamma}{2\Gamma}$$
$$\Gamma \equiv \frac{\Gamma_b + \Gamma_a}{2}$$

Pietro Santorelli (Università di Napoli)

$$P[M^{0}(t) \to M^{0}] = \frac{1}{2}e^{-\Gamma t}(\cosh(\mathbf{y}\Gamma t) + \cos(\mathbf{x}\Gamma t))$$
$$P[M^{0}(t) \to \overline{M}^{0}] = \frac{1}{2}\left|\frac{q}{p}\right|^{2}e^{-\Gamma t}(\cosh(\mathbf{y}\Gamma t) - \cos(\mathbf{x}\Gamma t))$$





Pietro Santorelli (Università di Napoli)

D decays & CP Violation

Physics of Heavy Quarks & Hadrons 11 / 37

CP Violation in the Mixing

This occurs when the physical states do not coincide with CP eigenstates,

|q|
eq |p|

CP Violation in the Mixing

This occurs when the physical states do not coincide with CP eigenstates,

|q|
eq |p|

For example if $M^0 \rightarrow f \not\leftarrow \overline{M}^0$ or $M^0 \not\rightarrow f \leftarrow \overline{M}^0$

CP Violation in the Mixing

This occurs when the physical states do not coincide with CP eigenstates,

 $|q| \neq |p|$

For example if

As in the case of semileptonic decay modes $M^0 \to f \not\leftarrow \bar{M}^0$ or $M^0 \not\rightarrow f \leftarrow \bar{M}^0$ $M^0 \to \ell^+ X \not\leftarrow \bar{M}^0$ and $M^0 \not\rightarrow \ell^- X \leftarrow \bar{M}^0$

CP Violation in the Mixing

This occurs when the physical states do not coincide with CP eigenstates,

|q|
eq |p|

For example if $M^0 \to f \not\leftarrow \bar{M}^0$ or $M^0 \not\rightarrow f \leftarrow \bar{M}^0$ As in the case of semileptonic decay modes $M^0 \to \ell^+ X \not\leftarrow \bar{M}^0$ and $M^0 \not\rightarrow \ell^- X \leftarrow \bar{M}^0$ $\frac{\Gamma(M^0(t) \to \ell^- X) - \Gamma(\bar{M}^0(t) \to \ell^+ X)}{\Gamma(M^0(t) \to \ell^- X) + \Gamma(\bar{M}^0(t) \to \ell^+ X)} = \frac{1 - |p/q|^4}{1 + |p/q|^4}$

CP Violation in the Mixing

This occurs when the physical states do not coincide with CP eigenstates,

|q|
eq |p|



CP Violation in the Mixing

This occurs when the physical states do not coincide with CP eigenstates,

|q|
eq |p|

For example if As in the case of semileptonic decay modes $M^0 \to f \not\leftarrow \bar{M}^0$ or $M^0 \not\rightarrow f \leftarrow \bar{M}^0$ $M^0 \to \ell^+ X \not\leftarrow \bar{M}^0$ and $M^0 \not\rightarrow \ell^- X \leftarrow \bar{M}^0$ $\frac{\Gamma(M^{0}(t) \to \ell^{-} X) - \Gamma(\bar{M}^{0}(t) \to \ell^{+} X)}{\Gamma(M^{0}(t) \to \ell^{-} X) + \Gamma(\bar{M}^{0}(t) \to \ell^{+} X)} = \frac{1 - |p/q|^{4}}{1 + |p/q|^{4}}$ \overline{M}^{0} \overline{f} \neq \overline{M}^{0} M^{0}

This kind of CPV is of the indirect type

CP Violation in the Decays (Direct)

This occurs when the decay amplitudes for CP conjugate processes into final states *f* and \overline{f} are different in modulus

 $|A(i \rightarrow f)| \neq |A(\overline{i} \rightarrow \overline{f})|$

CP Violation in the Decays (Direct)

This occurs when the decay amplitudes for CP conjugate processes into final states *f* and \overline{f} are different in modulus

$$|A(i \to f)| \neq |A(\overline{i} \to \overline{f})|$$

In this case $\Delta m \approx \Delta \Gamma \approx 0$ and

$$\mathbf{a}_{\mathrm{CP}}^{\mathrm{dir}} = \frac{\Gamma(M^0 \to f) - \Gamma(\bar{M}^0 \to \bar{f})}{\Gamma(M^0 \to f) + \Gamma(\bar{M}^0 \to \bar{f})}$$



CP Violation in the Decays (Direct)

This occurs when the decay amplitudes for CP conjugate processes into final states *f* and \overline{f} are different in modulus

$$|A(i \to f)| \neq |A(\overline{i} \to \overline{f})|$$

In this case $\Delta m \approx \Delta \Gamma \approx 0$ and

$$\mathbf{a}_{\mathrm{CP}}^{\mathrm{dir}} = \frac{\Gamma(M^0 \to f) - \Gamma(\bar{M}^0 \to \bar{f})}{\Gamma(M^0 \to f) + \Gamma(\bar{M}^0 \to \bar{f})}$$



This kind of CPV is the only one is also possible for charged particles, which are forbidden to mix by charge

conservation.

Pietro Santorelli (Università di Napoli)

D decays & CP Violation

CPV in the interference of mixing and decays

This occurs when both, M^0 and \overline{M}^0 , decay into the same final state

CPV in the interference of mixing and decays

This occurs when both, M^0 and \overline{M}^0 , decay into the same final state

 $M^0 \to f \leftarrow \bar{M}^0$

CPV in the interference of mixing and decays

This occurs when both, M^0 and \overline{M}^0 , decay into the same final state

 $M^0 \to f \leftarrow \overline{M}^0$ • This is the case of $CPf = \pm f: D^0 \to KK, \pi\pi \leftarrow \overline{D}^0$

CPV in the interference of mixing and decays

This occurs when both, M^0 and \overline{M}^0 , decay into the same final state

 $M^0 \to f \leftarrow \bar{M}^0$

- This is the case of $CPf = \pm f: D^0 \to KK, \pi\pi \leftarrow \overline{D}^0$
- but not only: for example $D^0(\overline{D}^0) \to K^- \pi^+$

CPV in the interference of mixing and decays

This occurs when both, M^0 and \overline{M}^0 , decay into the same final state

 $M^0 \to f \leftarrow \bar{M}^0$

- This is the case of $CPf = \pm f: D^0 \to KK, \pi\pi \leftarrow \overline{D}^0$
- but not only: for example $D^0(\overline{D}^0) \to K^- \pi^+$

$$A(M^0 \rightarrow f) + A(M^0 \rightarrow \bar{M}^0)A(\bar{M}^0 \rightarrow f)$$

CPV in the interference of mixing and decays

This occurs when both, M^0 and \overline{M}^0 , decay into the same final state

 $M^{0} \rightarrow f \leftarrow \overline{M}^{0}$ • This is the case of $CPf = \pm f: D^{0} \rightarrow KK, \pi\pi \leftarrow \overline{D}^{0}$ • but not only: for example $D^{0}(\overline{D}^{0}) \rightarrow K^{-}\pi^{+}$ $A(M^{0} \rightarrow f) + A(M^{0} \rightarrow \overline{M}^{0})A(\overline{M}^{0} \rightarrow f)$ $M^{0} \rightarrow \overline{M}^{0} \rightarrow f$

CPV in the interference of mixing and decays

This occurs when both, M^0 and \overline{M}^0 , decay into the same final state

 $M^0 \rightarrow f \leftarrow \overline{M}^0$ • This is the case of $CPf = \pm f: D^0 \to KK, \pi\pi \leftarrow \overline{D}^0$ • but not only: for example $D^0(\overline{D}^0) \to K^-\pi^+$ $A(M^0 \rightarrow f) + A(M^0 \rightarrow \overline{M}^0) A(\overline{M}^0 \rightarrow f)$ Useful definition $\lambda_f = \frac{\langle M^0 | M_a \rangle}{\langle M^0 | M_a \rangle} \frac{A(M^0 \to f)}{A(M^0 \to f)} = \frac{q}{p} \frac{A_f}{A_f}$

CPV in the interference of mixing and decays

This occurs when both, M^0 and \overline{M}^0 , decay into the same final state

• This is the case of $CPf = \pm f: D^0 \to KK, \pi\pi \leftarrow \overline{D}^0$ $M^0 \rightarrow f \leftarrow \overline{M}^0$ • but not only: for example $D^0(\overline{D}^0) \to K^-\pi^+$ $A(M^0 \rightarrow f) + A(M^0 \rightarrow \overline{M}^0) A(\overline{M}^0 \rightarrow f)$ Useful definition $\lambda_f = \frac{\langle M^0 | M_a \rangle}{\langle M^0 | M_a \rangle} \frac{A(M^0 \to f)}{A(M^0 \to f)} = \frac{q}{n} \frac{A_f}{A_f}$ **CP** Symmetry implies $\lambda_f = \frac{1}{\lambda_f} \Rightarrow \lambda_f = 1$

Pietro Santorelli (Università di Napoli)

CPV in the interference of mixing and decays

This occurs when both, M^0 and \overline{M}^0 , decay into the same final state

• This is the case of $CPf = \pm f: D^0 \to KK, \pi\pi \leftarrow \overline{D}^0$ $M^0 \rightarrow f \leftarrow \overline{M}^0$ • but not only: for example $D^0(\overline{D}^0) \to K^-\pi^+$ f $A(M^0 \rightarrow f) + A(M^0 \rightarrow \overline{M}^0) A(\overline{M}^0 \rightarrow f)$ Useful definition $\lambda_f = \frac{\langle M^0 | M_a \rangle}{\langle M^0 | M_a \rangle} \frac{A(\bar{M}^0 \to f)}{A(M^0 \to f)} = \frac{q}{p} \frac{\bar{A}_f}{\bar{A}_f}$ **CP** Symmetry implies $\lambda_f = \frac{1}{\lambda_f} \Rightarrow \lambda_f = 1$

Pietro Santorelli (Università di Napoli)

CPV in the interference of mixing and decays

This occurs when both, M^0 and \overline{M}^0 , decay into the same final state

• This is the case of $CPf = \pm f: D^0 \to KK, \pi\pi \leftarrow \overline{D}^0$ $M^0 \rightarrow f \leftarrow \overline{M}^0$ • but not only: for example $D^0(\overline{D}^0) \to K^-\pi^+$ f _____ $A(M^0 \rightarrow f) + A(M^0 \rightarrow \overline{M}^0)A(\overline{M}^0 \rightarrow f)$ Useful definition $\lambda_f = \frac{\langle M^0 | M_a \rangle}{\langle M^0 | M_a \rangle} \frac{A(\bar{M}^0 \to f)}{A(M^0 \to f)} = \frac{q}{p} \frac{\bar{A}_f}{\bar{A}_f}$ **CP** Symmetry implies • $|\lambda_f| \neq 1$ CPV in mixing or decay $\lambda_f = \frac{1}{\lambda_f} \Rightarrow \lambda_f = 1$ • $\Im(\lambda_f) \neq 0$ CPV in interf. mixing and decay Pietro Santorelli (Università di Napoli) D decays & CP Violation Physics of Heavy Quarks & Hadrons 14/37 $\Delta a_{\rm CP} = a_{\rm CP}(K^+K^-) - a_{\rm CP}(\pi^+\pi^-)$

$$a_{CP}(h^+h^-,t) = \frac{\Gamma(D^0(t) \to h^+h^-) - \Gamma(\bar{D}^0(t) \to h^+h^-)}{\Gamma(D^0(t) \to h^+h^-) + \Gamma(\bar{D}^0(t) \to h^+h^-)} \approx 1$$

$$\frac{\Gamma(D^0 \to h^+h^-) - \Gamma(\bar{D}^0 \to h^+h^-)}{\Gamma(D^0 \to h^+h^-) + \Gamma(\bar{D}^0 \to h^+h^-)} + \frac{t}{\tau_D} a_{CP}^{ind}$$

$$= a_{CP}^{dir}(h^+h^-) + \frac{t}{\tau_D} a_{CP}^{ind}$$

where t is the proper decay time. The integrated asymmetry

$$a_{CP}(h^+h^-) \approx a_{CP}^{dir}(h^+h^-) + a_{CP}^{ind} \int dt \frac{t}{\tau_D} D(t)$$
$$= a_{CP}^{dir}(h^+h^-) + a_{CP}^{ind} \frac{\langle t \rangle}{\tau_D}$$

where D(t) is the observed distribution of proper decay time

 $\Delta a_{\rm CP} = a_{\rm CP}(K^+K^-) - a_{\rm CP}(\pi^+\pi^-)$

$$a_{CP}(h^+h^-,t) = \frac{\Gamma(D^0(t) \to h^+h^-) - \Gamma(\bar{D}^0(t) \to h^+h^-)}{\Gamma(D^0(t) \to h^+h^-) + \Gamma(\bar{D}^0(t) \to h^+h^-)} \approx 1$$

$$\frac{\Gamma(D^0 \to h^+h^-) - \Gamma(\bar{D}^0 \to h^+h^-)}{\Gamma(D^0 \to h^+h^-) + \Gamma(\bar{D}^0 \to h^+h^-)} + \frac{t}{\tau_D} a_{CP}^{ind}$$

$$= a_{CP}^{dir}(h^+h^-) + \frac{t}{\tau_D} a_{CP}^{ind}$$

where t is the proper decay time. The integrated asymmetry

$$a_{CP}(h^+h^-) \approx a_{CP}^{dir}(h^+h^-) + a_{CP}^{ind} \int dt \frac{t}{\tau_D} D(t)$$
$$= a_{CP}^{dir}(h^+h^-) + a_{CP}^{ind} \frac{\langle t \rangle}{\tau_D}$$

where D(t) is the observed distribution of proper decay time

$$\Delta a_{\rm CP} = a_{CP}(\kappa^+\kappa^-) - a_{CP}(\pi^+\pi^-) \approx a_{CP}^{\rm dir}(\kappa^+\kappa^-) - a_{CP}^{\rm dir}(\pi^+\pi^-)$$



• CKM hierarchy leads to two-generation dominance ($\lambda \simeq 0.23$)

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



• CKM hierarchy leads to two-generation dominance ($\lambda \simeq 0.23$)

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

We classify the decay processes into three classes



• CKM hierarchy leads to two-generation dominance ($\lambda \simeq 0.23$)

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

We classify the decay processes into three classes

• Cabibbo Favoured (CF): $|V_{cs}V_{ud}^*| \approx 1$ as, for example, $D^0 \to K^- \pi^+$



CKM hierarchy leads to two-generation dominance ($\lambda \simeq 0.23$) •

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

We classify the decay processes into three classes

- Cabibbo Favoured (CF): |V_{cs} V^{*}_{ud}| ≈ 1 as, for example, D⁰ → K⁻π⁺
 Singly Cabibbo Suppressed (SCS): |V_{cd} V^{*}_{ud}| ≈ λ (D⁰ → π⁺π⁻),



CKM hierarchy leads to two-generation dominance ($\lambda \simeq 0.23$) •

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

• We classify the decay processes into three classes

 Cabibbo Favoured (CF): |V_{cs} V^{*}_{ud}| ≈ 1 as, for example, D⁰ → K⁻π⁺
 Singly Cabibbo Suppressed (SCS): |V_{cd} V^{*}_{ud}| ≈ λ (D⁰ → π⁺π⁻), |V_{cs} V^{*}_{us}| ≈ λ $(D^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-, D^0 \rightarrow K^0 \overline{K}^0)$
Hadronic two-body Decays of D Meson



• CKM hierarchy leads to two-generation dominance ($\lambda \simeq 0.23$)

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

We classify the decay processes into three classes

- Cabibbo Favoured (CF): $|V_{cs}V_{ud}^*| \approx 1$ as, for example, $D^0 \to K^- \pi^+$
- Singly Cabibbo Suppressed (SCS): $|V_{cd}V_{ud}^*| \approx \lambda$ ($D^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$), $|V_{cs}V_{us}^*| \approx \lambda$ ($D^0 \rightarrow K^+K^-$, $D^0 \rightarrow K^0\bar{K}^0$)
- Double Cabibbo Suppressed (DCS): $|V_{cd}V_{us}^*| \approx \lambda^2 (D^0 \to K^+\pi^-)$

The Effective Field Theory approach allows to build an effective hamiltonian in which short and long distance contributions are separate.



The Effective Field Theory approach allows to build an effective hamiltonian in which short and long distance contributions are separate.



We have the tree operators $q,q' \in \{d,s\}$

$$O_2 = \left[\bar{q}^{\alpha}\gamma^{\mu}(1-\gamma_5)c_{\alpha}\right]\left[\bar{u}^{\beta}\gamma_{\mu}(1-\gamma_5)q_{\beta}'\right]$$

The Effective Field Theory approach allows to build an effective hamiltonian in which short and long distance contributions are separate.



We have the tree operators $q,q' \in \{d,s\}$

$$O_2 = \left[\bar{q}^{\alpha} \gamma^{\mu} (1 - \gamma_5) c_{\alpha} \right] \left[\bar{u}^{\beta} \gamma_{\mu} (1 - \gamma_5) q'_{\beta} \right]$$
$$O_1 = \left[\bar{u}^{\alpha} \gamma^{\mu} (1 - \gamma_5) c_{\beta} \right] \left[\bar{q}^{\beta} \gamma_{\mu} (1 - \gamma_5) q'_{\alpha} \right]$$

The Effective Field Theory approach allows to build an effective hamiltonian in which short and long distance contributions are separate.



We have the tree operators $q,q' \in \{d,s\}$

$$O_2 = \left[\bar{q}^{\alpha} \gamma^{\mu} (1 - \gamma_5) c_{\alpha} \right] \left[\bar{u}^{\beta} \gamma_{\mu} (1 - \gamma_5) q'_{\beta} \right]$$
$$O_1 = \left[\bar{u}^{\alpha} \gamma^{\mu} (1 - \gamma_5) c_{\beta} \right] \left[\bar{q}^{\beta} \gamma_{\mu} (1 - \gamma_5) q'_{\alpha} \right]$$



The Effective Field Theory approach allows to build an effective hamiltonian in which short and long distance contributions are separate.



We have the tree operators $q,q' \in \{d,s\}$

$$O_{2} = \left[\bar{q}^{\alpha} \gamma^{\mu} (1 - \gamma_{5}) c_{\alpha} \right] \left[\bar{u}^{\beta} \gamma_{\mu} (1 - \gamma_{5}) q_{\beta}^{\prime} \right]$$
$$O_{1} = \left[\bar{u}^{\alpha} \gamma^{\mu} (1 - \gamma_{5}) c_{\beta} \right] \left[\bar{q}^{\beta} \gamma_{\mu} (1 - \gamma_{5}) q_{\alpha}^{\prime} \right]$$





Pietro Santorelli (Università di Napoli)

D decays & CP Violation





$$O_{3} = \left[\bar{u}^{\alpha}\gamma^{\mu}(1-\gamma_{5})c_{\alpha}\right]\sum_{p=u,d,s}\left[\bar{p}^{\beta}\gamma_{\mu}(1-\gamma_{5})p_{\beta}\right]$$

$$O_{4} = \left[\bar{u}^{\alpha}\gamma^{\mu}(1-\gamma_{5})c_{\beta}\right]\sum_{p=u,d,s}\left[\bar{p}^{\beta}\gamma_{\mu}(1-\gamma_{5})p_{\alpha}\right]$$

$$O_{5} = \left[\bar{u}^{\alpha}\gamma^{\mu}(1-\gamma_{5})c_{\alpha}\right]\sum_{p=u,d,s}\left[\bar{p}^{\beta}\gamma_{\mu}(1+\gamma_{5})p_{\beta}\right]$$

$$O_{6} = \left[\bar{u}^{\alpha}\gamma^{\mu}(1-\gamma_{5})c_{\beta}\right]\sum_{p=u,d,s}\left[\bar{p}^{\beta}\gamma^{\mu}(1+\gamma_{5})p_{\alpha}\right]$$



$$O_{3} = \left[\bar{u}^{\alpha}\gamma^{\mu}(1-\gamma_{5})c_{\alpha}\right]\sum_{p=u,d,s}\left[\bar{p}^{\beta}\gamma_{\mu}(1-\gamma_{5})p_{\beta}\right]$$

$$O_{4} = \left[\bar{u}^{\alpha}\gamma^{\mu}(1-\gamma_{5})c_{\beta}\right]\sum_{p=u,d,s}\left[\bar{p}^{\beta}\gamma_{\mu}(1-\gamma_{5})p_{\alpha}\right]$$

$$O_{5} = \left[\bar{u}^{\alpha}\gamma^{\mu}(1-\gamma_{5})c_{\alpha}\right]\sum_{p=u,d,s}\left[\bar{p}^{\beta}\gamma_{\mu}(1+\gamma_{5})p_{\beta}\right]$$

$$O_{6} = \left[\bar{u}^{\alpha}\gamma^{\mu}(1-\gamma_{5})c_{\beta}\right]\sum_{p=u,d,s}\left[\bar{p}^{\beta}\gamma^{\mu}(1+\gamma_{5})p_{\alpha}\right]$$

$$H_{\rm w}^{\rm SCS} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{ud} V_{cd}^* \left[C_1 O_1^d + C_2 O_2^d \right] \qquad (q = q' = d)$$





$$O_{3} = \left[\bar{u}^{\alpha}\gamma^{\mu}(1-\gamma_{5})c_{\alpha}\right]\sum_{p=u,d,s}\left[\bar{p}^{\beta}\gamma_{\mu}(1-\gamma_{5})p_{\beta}\right]$$

$$O_{4} = \left[\bar{u}^{\alpha}\gamma^{\mu}(1-\gamma_{5})c_{\beta}\right]\sum_{p=u,d,s}\left[\bar{p}^{\beta}\gamma_{\mu}(1-\gamma_{5})p_{\alpha}\right]$$

$$O_{5} = \left[\bar{u}^{\alpha}\gamma^{\mu}(1-\gamma_{5})c_{\alpha}\right]\sum_{p=u,d,s}\left[\bar{p}^{\beta}\gamma_{\mu}(1+\gamma_{5})p_{\beta}\right]$$

$$O_{6} = \left[\bar{u}^{\alpha}\gamma^{\mu}(1-\gamma_{5})c_{\beta}\right]\sum_{p=u,d,s}\left[\bar{p}^{\beta}\gamma^{\mu}(1+\gamma_{5})p_{\alpha}\right]$$

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\rm w}^{\rm SCS} &= \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \, V_{ud} \, V_{cd}^* \left[{}^{C}_{1} \, O_1^d + {}^{C}_{2} \, O_2^d \right] & (q = q' = d) \\ &+ \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \, V_{us} \, V_{cs}^* \left[{}^{C}_{1} \, O_1^s + {}^{C}_{2} \, O_2^s \right] & (q = q' = s) \end{aligned}$$



000000

p

d.s.b

 \vec{p}

$$O_{3} = \left[\bar{u}^{\alpha}\gamma^{\mu}(1-\gamma_{5})c_{\alpha}\right]\sum_{p=u,d,s}\left[\bar{p}^{\beta}\gamma_{\mu}(1-\gamma_{5})p_{\beta}\right]$$

$$O_{4} = \left[\bar{u}^{\alpha}\gamma^{\mu}(1-\gamma_{5})c_{\beta}\right]\sum_{p=u,d,s}\left[\bar{p}^{\beta}\gamma_{\mu}(1-\gamma_{5})p_{\alpha}\right]$$

$$O_{5} = \left[\bar{u}^{\alpha}\gamma^{\mu}(1-\gamma_{5})c_{\alpha}\right]\sum_{p=u,d,s}\left[\bar{p}^{\beta}\gamma_{\mu}(1+\gamma_{5})p_{\beta}\right]$$

$$O_{6} = \left[\bar{u}^{\alpha}\gamma^{\mu}(1-\gamma_{5})c_{\beta}\right]\sum_{p=u,d,s}\left[\bar{p}^{\beta}\gamma^{\mu}(1+\gamma_{5})p_{\alpha}\right]$$

$$H_{w}^{SCS} = \frac{G_{F}}{\sqrt{2}} V_{ud} V_{cd}^{*} [C_{1} O_{1}^{d} + C_{2} O_{2}^{d}] \qquad (q = q' = d)$$

+ $\frac{G_{F}}{\sqrt{2}} V_{us} V_{cs}^{*} [C_{1} O_{1}^{s} + C_{2} O_{2}^{s}] \qquad (q = q' = s)$
- $\frac{G_{F}}{\sqrt{2}} V_{ub} V_{cb}^{*} \sum_{i=3}^{6} C_{i} O_{i} + h.c.$

We have to evaluate

$$\langle f | H_{\rm w} | D \rangle = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V V^* \frac{C_j}{\sqrt{2}} \langle f | O_j | D \rangle + \dots$$

We have to evaluate

$$\left\langle f\right|H_{\mathrm{w}}\left|D\right\rangle = \frac{G_{F}}{\sqrt{2}}VV^{*}\frac{C_{j}}{\left\langle f\right|O_{j}\left|D\right\rangle} + \dots$$

• The Wilson coefficient can be evaluated perturbatively

We have to evaluate

$$\left\langle f\right|H_{\mathrm{w}}\left|D\right\rangle = \frac{G_{F}}{\sqrt{2}}VV^{*}\frac{C_{j}}{\left\langle f\right|O_{j}\left|D\right\rangle} + \dots$$

- The Wilson coefficient can be evaluated perturbatively
- The hadronic matrix elements are dominated by non-perturbative QCD
 - from first principle: Lattice QCD (in the not so near future)
 - QCD factorization is expected don't work well, due to the large $\Lambda_{\rm QCD}/m_{\rm c}$ corrections

We have to evaluate

$$\langle f | H_{\rm w} | D \rangle = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V V^* \frac{C_j}{\langle f | O_j | D \rangle} + \dots$$

- The Wilson coefficient can be evaluated perturbatively
- The hadronic matrix elements are dominated by non-perturbative QCD
 - from first principle: Lattice QCD (in the not so near future)
 - QCD factorization is expected don't work well, due to the large $\Lambda_{\rm QCD}/m_{\rm c}$ corrections
- Models of calculations can be useful to estimates order of magnitudes
 - Factorization & Final state Interactions
 - Flavour symmetries (SU(3)_F, isospin, U-spin, etc.)

The idea (due to Feynman) is

 $\left< \textit{M}_{1} \textit{M}_{2} \right| \textit{J}^{\mu}\textit{J}_{\mu}' \left| \textit{D} \right> \approx \left< \textit{M}_{1} \right| \textit{J}^{\mu} \left| \textit{D} \right> \left< \textit{M}_{2} \right| \textit{J}_{\mu}' \left| \textit{0} \right>$

The idea (due to Feynman) is

 $\left< M_1 M_2 \right| J^{\mu} J^{\prime}_{\mu} \left| D \right> \approx \left< M_1 \right| J^{\mu} \left| D \right> \left< M_2 \right| J^{\prime}_{\mu} \left| 0 \right>$

Color allowed external *W* emission tree amplitude: $T \rightarrow$



The idea (due to Feynman) is

 $\left< M_1 M_2 \right| J^{\mu} J^{\prime}_{\mu} \left| D \right> \approx \left< M_1 \right| J^{\mu} \left| D \right> \left< M_2 \right| J^{\prime}_{\mu} \left| 0 \right>$



The idea (due to Feynman) is

 $\left< M_1 M_2 \right| J^{\mu} J^{\prime}_{\mu} \left| D \right> \approx \left< M_1 \right| J^{\mu} \left| D \right> \left< M_2 \right| J^{\prime}_{\mu} \left| 0 \right>$



Pietro Santorelli (Università di Napoli)

$\left< M_1 \, M_2 \right| J^{\mu} J'_{\mu} \left| D \right> \approx ... + \left< 0 \right| J^{\mu} \left| D \right> \left< M_1 \, M_2 \right| J'_{\mu} \left| 0 \right>$

$\langle M_1 M_2 | J^{\mu} J'_{\mu} | D \rangle \approx \ldots + \langle 0 | J^{\mu} | D \rangle \langle M_1 M_2 | J'_{\mu} | 0 \rangle$

W-Exchange amplitude





W-Exchange amplitude



Annihilation amplitude



$$\langle P_i(p) | A^{\mu} | 0 \rangle = -i f_{P_i} p^{\mu} \langle V_i(p, \lambda) | V^{\mu} | 0 \rangle = m_i f_{V_i} \varepsilon^{*\mu}(\lambda)$$

$$\begin{array}{lll} \langle P_{i}(p) | A^{\mu} | 0 \rangle &=& -i f_{P_{i}} p^{\mu} \\ \langle V_{i}(p,\lambda) | V^{\mu} | 0 \rangle &=& m_{i} f_{V_{i}} \varepsilon^{*\mu}(\lambda) \\ \langle P_{i}(p_{i}) | V^{\mu} | P_{j}(p_{j}) \rangle &=& \left(p_{i}^{\mu} + p_{j}^{\mu} - \frac{m_{j}^{2} - m_{i}^{2}}{q^{2}} q^{\mu} \right) f_{+}(q^{2}) + \frac{m_{j}^{2} - m_{i}^{2}}{q^{2}} q^{\mu} f_{0}(q^{2}) \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{lll} \langle P_{i}(p) | \, A^{\mu} | 0 \rangle &= & -i \, f_{P_{i}} \, p^{\mu} \\ \langle V_{i}(p,\lambda) | \, V^{\mu} | 0 \rangle &= & m_{i} \, f_{V_{i}} \, \varepsilon^{*\mu}(\lambda) \\ \langle P_{i}(p_{i}) | \, V^{\mu} | P_{j}(p_{j}) \rangle &= & \left(p_{i}^{\mu} + p_{j}^{\mu} - \frac{m_{j}^{2} - m_{i}^{2}}{q^{2}} \, q^{\mu} \right) \, f_{+}(q^{2}) + \frac{m_{j}^{2} - m_{i}^{2}}{q^{2}} \, q^{\mu} \, f_{0}(q^{2}) \\ \langle V_{i}(p_{i}) | \, A^{\mu} | P_{j}(p_{j}) \rangle &= & i (m_{j} + m_{i}) \, A_{1}(q^{2}) \left(\varepsilon^{*\mu} - \frac{\varepsilon^{*} \cdot q}{q^{2}} \, q^{\mu} \right) - \\ & & - i \, A_{2}(q^{2}) \frac{\varepsilon^{*} \cdot q}{m_{j} + m_{i}} \left(p_{i}^{\mu} + p_{j}^{\mu} - \frac{m_{j}^{2} - m_{i}^{2}}{q^{2}} \, q^{\mu} \right) + \\ & & + i 2 \, m_{i} \, A_{0}(q^{2}) \, \frac{\varepsilon^{*} \cdot q}{q^{2}} \, q^{\mu} \end{array}$$

Pietro Santorelli (Università di Napoli)

Factorization: The ${\it D}^0
ightarrow \pi^-\pi^+$ Amplitude

$$\begin{split} \mathscr{A}_{w}(D^{0} \to \pi^{-}\pi^{+}) &= \\ &-\frac{G_{F}}{\sqrt{2}} V_{ud} V_{cd}^{*} \quad \times \quad \left[(C_{2} + \xi C_{1}) \langle \pi^{-} | \bar{a} \gamma_{\mu} c | D^{0} \rangle \langle \pi^{+} | \bar{u} \gamma^{\mu} \gamma_{5} d | 0 \rangle \right] \\ &+ \frac{G_{F}}{\sqrt{2}} V_{ub} V_{cb}^{*} \quad \times \quad \left[(C_{4} + \xi C_{3}) \langle \pi^{-} | \bar{a} \gamma_{\mu} c | D^{0} \rangle \langle \pi^{+} | \bar{u} \gamma^{\mu} \gamma_{5} d | 0 \rangle \right. \\ &\left. - 2 (C_{6} + \xi C_{5}) \langle \pi^{-} \pi^{+} | \bar{u} u | 0 \rangle \langle 0 | \bar{u} \gamma_{5} c | D^{0} \rangle \right. \\ &\left. + 2 (C_{6} + \xi C_{5}) \langle \pi^{-} | \bar{d} c | D^{0} \rangle \langle \pi^{+} | \bar{u} \gamma_{5} d | 0 \rangle \right] \end{split}$$

$$\begin{array}{lll} \langle 0 | \, \bar{u} \gamma_5 c \, \big| D^0 \rangle &=& -\iota \frac{f_D \, m_D^2}{m_u + m_c} \\ \langle \pi^+ \big| \, \bar{u} \gamma_5 d \, | 0 \rangle &=& \frac{f_\pi \, m_\pi^2}{m_u + m_d} \\ \\ \xi &=& \frac{1}{N_c} \to 0 \end{array}$$

Final State Interaction Effects

These long-distance effects are dominated by resonances with the correct quantum numbers and masses very near the one of charmed mesons.



Final State Interaction Effects

These long-distance effects are dominated by resonances with the correct quantum numbers and masses very near the one of charmed mesons.



Final State Interaction Effects

These long-distance effects are dominated by resonances with the correct quantum numbers and masses very near the one of charmed mesons.



for the PP final state a scalar octet, S_c with $J^P = 0^+$

g₈₈₈ d_{abc} P_a P_b S_c

for a PV final state $0^- \tilde{P}$ resonance

$$f_{abc} \left(\partial_{\mu} \, \tilde{P}_{a} \right) V_{b}^{\mu} \, P_{c}$$

$$\sin \delta_8 \exp(i\delta_8) = \frac{\Gamma(\tilde{P})}{2(m_{\tilde{P}} - m_D) - i\Gamma(\tilde{P})}$$

Results

This kind of approach gives:

- a quite good agreement with the experimental data (at that time) on the branching ratios;
- Direct CP violation effects of the order of 10⁻³.

In particular

$$\Delta a_{\rm CP} = a_{\rm CP}^{\rm dir}(\kappa^+\kappa^-) - a_{\rm CP}^{\rm dir}(\pi^+\pi^-) \simeq 0.11 \times 10^{-3}$$

Buccella, Lusignoli, Miele, Pugliese, P.S., Phys. Rev. D51 (1995) 3478

Now the question is:

Is a CP violation as large as the first experimental results a sign of new physics or not?

Pietro Santorelli (Università di Napoli)

In the limit of SU(3) flavour symmetry

$$A(D^0
ightarrow K^+ K^-) = -A(D^0
ightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-) \quad \Rightarrow$$

In the limit of SU(3) flavour symmetry

 $A(D^0 o K^+ K^-) = -A(D^0 o \pi^+ \pi^-) \quad \Rightarrow \quad a^{dir}_{CP}(K^+ K^-) = -a^{dir}_{CP}(\pi^+ \pi^-)$

In the limit of SU(3) flavour symmetry

$$m{A}(D^0 o m{K}^+\,m{K}^-) = -m{A}(D^0 o \pi^+\,\pi^-) \quad \Rightarrow \quad a^{dir}_{CP}(m{K}^+\,m{K}^-) = -a^{dir}_{CP}(\pi^+\,\pi^-)$$

Thus $Br(D^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-)$ should be larger than $Br(D^0 \to K^+K^-)$ (Phase space differences) Experimentally

$$Br(D^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-) = (1.401 \pm 0.027) \times 10^{-3}$$
$$Br(D^0 \to K^+K^-) = (3.96 \pm 0.08) \times 10^{-3}$$

In the limit of SU(3) flavour symmetry

$$m{A}(D^0 o m{K}^+\,m{K}^-) = -m{A}(D^0 o \pi^+\,\pi^-) \quad \Rightarrow \quad a^{dir}_{CP}(m{K}^+\,m{K}^-) = -a^{dir}_{CP}(\pi^+\,\pi^-)$$

Thus $Br(D^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-)$ should be larger than $Br(D^0 \to K^+K^-)$ (Phase space differences) Experimentally

$$Br(D^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-) = (1.401 \pm 0.027) \times 10^{-3}$$

 $Br(D^0 \to K^+K^-) = (3.96 \pm 0.08) \times 10^{-3}$

Combining data from Babar, Belle and LHCb Franco, Mishima and Silvestrini (JHEP 1205 (2012) 140) found

$$egin{array}{rll} a_{CP}^{dir}(\pi^+\,\pi^-) &=& (0.45\pm 0.26)\% \ a_{CP}^{dir}(\kappa^+\,\kappa^-) &=& (-0.21\pm 0.24)\% \end{array}$$
Singly Cabibbo Suppressed D Decays

In the limit of SU(3) flavour symmetry

$$m{A}(D^0 o m{K}^+\,m{K}^-) = -m{A}(D^0 o \pi^+\,\pi^-) \quad \Rightarrow \quad a^{dir}_{CP}(m{K}^+\,m{K}^-) = -a^{dir}_{CP}(\pi^+\,\pi^-)$$

Thus $Br(D^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-)$ should be larger than $Br(D^0 \to K^+K^-)$ (Phase space differences) Experimentally

$$Br(D^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-) = (1.401 \pm 0.027) \times 10^{-3}$$

 $Br(D^0 \to K^+K^-) = (3.96 \pm 0.08) \times 10^{-3}$

Combining data from Babar, Belle and LHCb Franco, Mishima and Silvestrini (JHEP 1205 (2012) 140) found

$$a^{dir}_{CP}(\pi^+ \pi^-) = (0.45 \pm 0.26)\%$$

 $a^{dir}_{CP}(K^+ K^-) = (-0.21 \pm 0.24)\%$

Large SU(3) Violation

D decays & CP Violation

• We assume that SU(3)_F breaking effects are due to FSI

- We assume that SU(3)_F breaking effects are due to FSI
- We evaluate *bare* amplitudes using SU(3)_F symmetry (less model dependence than in factorization)

Buccella, Lusignoli, Pugliese, P.S., arXiv:1305.7343 [hep-ph]

- We assume that SU(3)_F breaking effects are due to FSI
- We evaluate *bare* amplitudes using SU(3)_F symmetry (less model dependence than in factorization)

Buccella, Lusignoli, Pugliese, P.S., arXiv:1305.7343 [hep-ph]

• The D⁰ is a U-spin singlet

- We assume that SU(3)_F breaking effects are due to FSI
- We evaluate *bare* amplitudes using SU(3)_F symmetry (less model dependence than in factorization)

Buccella, Lusignoli, Pugliese, P.S., arXiv:1305.7343 [hep-ph]

- The D⁰ is a U-spin singlet
- The effective Hamiltonian

 $H_w = H_{\Delta U=1} + H_{\Delta U=0} =$

- We assume that SU(3)_F breaking effects are due to FSI
- We evaluate *bare* amplitudes using SU(3)_F symmetry (less model dependence than in factorization)

Buccella, Lusignoli, Pugliese, P.S., arXiv:1305.7343 [hep-ph]

- The D⁰ is a U-spin singlet
- The effective Hamiltonian

$$H_{w} = H_{\Delta U=1} + H_{\Delta U=0} = \underbrace{\sin \theta_{C} \cos \theta_{C}}_{\sim \lambda} \tilde{H}_{\Delta U=1} + \underbrace{V_{ub} V_{cb}^{*}}_{\sim \lambda^{3} \cdot \lambda^{2}} \tilde{H}_{\Delta U=0}$$

- We assume that SU(3)_F breaking effects are due to FSI
- We evaluate *bare* amplitudes using SU(3)_F symmetry (less model dependence than in factorization)

Buccella, Lusignoli, Pugliese, P.S., arXiv:1305.7343 [hep-ph]

- The D⁰ is a U-spin singlet
- The effective Hamiltonian

$$H_{w} = H_{\Delta U=1} + H_{\Delta U=0} = \underbrace{\sin \theta_{C} \cos \theta_{C}}_{\sim \lambda} \tilde{H}_{\Delta U=1} + \underbrace{V_{ub} V_{cb}^{*}}_{\sim \lambda^{3} \cdot \lambda^{2}} \tilde{H}_{\Delta U=0}$$

$$H_{\Delta U=1} = \frac{G_F}{2\sqrt{2}} (V_{us} V_{cs}^* - V_{ud} V_{cd}^*) [C_1 (O_1^s - O_1^d) + C_2 (O_2^s - O_2^d)]$$

$$\simeq \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \sin \theta_C \cos \theta_C [C_1 (O_1^s - O_1^d) + C_2 (O_2^s - O_2^d)].$$

Pietro Santorelli (Università di Napoli)

There are only two independent combinations of S-wave states having U=1

$$H_{\Delta U=1} \left| D^0 \right\rangle = \frac{a}{|v_1\rangle} + \frac{b}{|v_2\rangle}$$

There are only two independent combinations of S-wave states having U=1

$$H_{\Delta U=1}\left|D^{0}
ight
angle=rac{a}{|v_{1}
angle}+rac{b}{b}|v_{2}
angle$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} |v_1\rangle &= \frac{1}{2} \Big\{ |\mathcal{K}^+ \, \mathcal{K}^- > + |\mathcal{K}^- \, \mathcal{K}^+ > - |\pi^+ \, \pi^- > - |\pi^- \, \pi^+ > \Big\} \\ |v_2\rangle &= \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2\sqrt{2}} \Big\{ |\pi^0 \, \pi^0 > - |\eta_8 \, \eta_8 > - \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \left(|\pi^0 \, \eta_8 > + |\eta_8 \, \pi^0 > \right) \Big\} \end{aligned}$$

There are only two independent combinations of S-wave states having U=1

$$H_{\Delta U=1}\left|D^{0}
ight
angle=rac{a}{|v_{1}
angle}+rac{b}{b}|v_{2}
angle$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} |v_1\rangle &= \frac{1}{2} \Big\{ |\mathcal{K}^+ \, \mathcal{K}^- > + |\mathcal{K}^- \, \mathcal{K}^+ > - |\pi^+ \, \pi^- > - |\pi^- \, \pi^+ > \Big\} \\ |v_2\rangle &= \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2\sqrt{2}} \Big\{ |\pi^0 \, \pi^0 > - |\eta_8 \, \eta_8 > - \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \left(|\pi^0 \, \eta_8 > + |\eta_8 \, \pi^0 > \right) \Big\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\mathcal{A}(D^{0} \to \mathcal{K}^{+}\mathcal{K}^{-}) = \left\langle \mathcal{K}^{+}\mathcal{K}^{-} \middle| \mathcal{H}_{\Delta U=1} \middle| D^{0} \right\rangle = \frac{a}{\langle \mathcal{K}^{+}\mathcal{K}^{-} \middle| v_{1} \rangle + \frac{b}{\langle \mathcal{K}^{+}\mathcal{K}^{-} \middle| v_{2} \rangle}$$

There are only two independent combinations of S-wave states having U=1

$$H_{\Delta U=1}\left|D^{0}
ight
angle=rac{a}{|v_{1}
angle}+rac{b}{b}|v_{2}
angle$$

where

$$\begin{split} |v_1\rangle &= & \frac{1}{2}\Big\{|\mathcal{K}^+ \, \mathcal{K}^- > + |\mathcal{K}^- \, \mathcal{K}^+ > - |\pi^+ \, \pi^- > - |\pi^- \, \pi^+ > \Big\} \\ |v_2\rangle &= & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2\sqrt{2}}\Big\{|\pi^0 \, \pi^0 > - |\eta_8 \, \eta_8 > - \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \left(|\pi^0 \, \eta_8 > + |\eta_8 \, \pi^0 > \right)\Big\} \end{split}$$

$$\mathcal{A}(D^{0} \to \mathcal{K}^{+}\mathcal{K}^{-}) = \left\langle \mathcal{K}^{+}\mathcal{K}^{-} \middle| \mathcal{H}_{\Delta U=1} \middle| D^{0} \right\rangle = \frac{a}{\langle \mathcal{K}^{+}\mathcal{K}^{-} \middle| v_{1} \rangle + \frac{b}{\langle \mathcal{K}^{+}\mathcal{K}^{-} \middle| v_{2} \rangle}$$

$$\mathcal{A}(D^{0} \to \pi^{+}\pi^{-}) = \left\langle \pi^{+}\pi^{-} \right| \mathcal{H}_{\Delta U=1} \left| D^{0} \right\rangle = \frac{a}{\langle} \pi^{+}\pi^{-} \left| \right. \mathbf{v}_{1} \right\rangle + \frac{b}{\langle} \pi^{+}\pi^{-} \left| \right. \mathbf{v}_{2} \right\rangle$$

Pietro Santorelli (Università di Napoli)

More interestingly the two independent combinations of *S*-wave states having U=1 can be written in terms of two representations of SU(3)

$$\begin{split} |8, U = 1\rangle &= \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2\sqrt{5}} \quad \Big\{ \quad |K^{+}K^{-} > + |K^{-}K^{+} > -|\pi^{+}\pi^{-} > -|\pi^{-}\pi^{+} > \\ &- \quad \left[|\pi^{0}\pi^{0} > -|\eta_{8}\eta_{8} > -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|\pi^{0}\eta_{8} > +|\eta_{8}\pi^{0} >) \right] \Big\}, \\ |27, U = 1\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{10}} \quad \Big\{ \quad |K^{+}K^{-} > + |K^{-}K^{+} > -|\pi^{+}\pi^{-} > -|\pi^{-}\pi^{+} > \\ &+ \quad \frac{3}{2} \left[|\pi^{0}\pi^{0} > -|\eta_{8}\eta_{8} > -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|\pi^{0}\eta_{8} > +|\eta_{8}\pi^{0} >) \right] \Big\}. \end{split}$$

More interestingly the two independent combinations of *S*-wave states having U=1 can be written in terms of two representations of SU(3)

$$\begin{split} |8, U = 1\rangle &= \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2\sqrt{5}} \quad \Big\{ \quad |K^{+}K^{-} > + |K^{-}K^{+} > -|\pi^{+}\pi^{-} > -|\pi^{-}\pi^{+} > \\ &- \left[|\pi^{0}\pi^{0} > -|\eta_{8}\eta_{8} > -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|\pi^{0}\eta_{8} > +|\eta_{8}\pi^{0} >) \right] \Big\}, \\ |27, U = 1\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{10}} \quad \Big\{ \quad |K^{+}K^{-} > + |K^{-}K^{+} > -|\pi^{+}\pi^{-} > -|\pi^{-}\pi^{+} > \\ &+ \quad \frac{3}{2} \left[|\pi^{0}\pi^{0} > -|\eta_{8}\eta_{8} > -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|\pi^{0}\eta_{8} > +|\eta_{8}\pi^{0} >) \right] \Big\}. \end{split}$$

$$\langle 8, U = 1 | H_{\Delta U = 1} | D^0 \rangle \propto T - \frac{2}{3}C$$
$$\langle 27, U = 1 | H_{\Delta U = 1} | D^0 \rangle \propto T + C$$

More interestingly the two independent combinations of *S*-wave states having U=1 can be written in terms of two representations of SU(3)

$$\begin{split} |8, U = 1\rangle &= \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2\sqrt{5}} \quad \Big\{ \quad |\mathcal{K}^{+}\mathcal{K}^{-} > + |\mathcal{K}^{-}\mathcal{K}^{+} > -|\pi^{+}\pi^{-} > -|\pi^{-}\pi^{+} > \\ &- \quad \left[|\pi^{0}\pi^{0} > -|\eta_{8}\eta_{8} > -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|\pi^{0}\eta_{8} > +|\eta_{8}\pi^{0} >) \right] \Big\}, \\ |27, U = 1\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{10}} \quad \Big\{ \quad |\mathcal{K}^{+}\mathcal{K}^{-} > + |\mathcal{K}^{-}\mathcal{K}^{+} > -|\pi^{+}\pi^{-} > -|\pi^{-}\pi^{+} > \\ &+ \quad \frac{3}{2} \left[|\pi^{0}\pi^{0} > -|\eta_{8}\eta_{8} > -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|\pi^{0}\eta_{8} > +|\eta_{8}\pi^{0} >) \right] \Big\}. \end{split}$$

$$\langle 8, U = 1 | H_{\Delta U = 1} | D^0 \rangle \propto T - \frac{2}{3}C$$

$$\langle 27, U = 1 | H_{\Delta U = 1} | D^0 \rangle \propto T + C$$

$$A(D^0 \to K^+ K^-) = \alpha \left(T - \frac{2}{3}C\right) + \beta (T + C)$$

$$A(D^0 \to \pi^+ \pi^-) = \gamma \left(T - \frac{2}{3}C\right) + \delta (T + C)$$

Final State Interactions in SCS D Decays

The necessary SU(3) breaking is determined by the final state interactions, described as the effect of resonances in the scattering of the final particles.

Final State Interactions in SCS D Decays

The necessary SU(3) breaking is determined by the final state interactions, described as the effect of resonances in the scattering of the final particles.

In other words, strong phases are generated by the resonances responsible for rescattering of final states.

Final State Interactions in SCS D Decays

The necessary SU(3) breaking is determined by the final state interactions, described as the effect of resonances in the scattering of the final particles.

In other words, strong phases are generated by the resonances responsible for rescattering of final states.

Assuming no exotic resonances belonging to the 27 representation, the possible resonances have SU(3) and isospin quantum numbers (8, I = 1), (8, I = 0) and (1, I = 0). Moreover, the two states with I = 0 can be mixed, yielding two resonances:

$$|f_0 > = \sin \phi | 8, I = 0 > + \cos \phi | 1, I = 0 > |f'_0 > = -\cos \phi | 8, I = 0 > + \sin \phi | 1, I = 0 >$$

The mixing angle ϕ and the strong phases δ_0 , δ'_0 and δ_1 are our model parameters, together with the two independent weak decay amplitudes

Final State Interactions in SCS D Decays (1)

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{A}(D^{0} \to \pi^{+}\pi^{-}) &= \left(T - \frac{2}{3}C\right) \left\{ -\frac{3}{10} \left(e^{i\delta_{0}} + e^{i\delta_{0}'}\right) + \left(-\frac{3}{10}\cos(2\phi) + \frac{3}{4\sqrt{10}}\sin(2\phi)\right) \left(e^{i\delta_{0}'} - e^{i\delta_{0}}\right) \right\} \\ &- \left(T + C\right) \frac{2}{5} , \\ \mathcal{A}(D^{0} \to K^{+}K^{-}) &= \left(T - \frac{2}{3}C\right) \left\{ \frac{3}{20} \left(e^{i\delta_{0}} + e^{i\delta_{0}'}\right) + \left(\frac{3}{20}\cos(2\phi) + \frac{3}{4\sqrt{10}}\sin(2\phi)\right) \left(e^{i\delta_{0}'} - e^{i\delta_{0}}\right) \right. \\ &+ \left. \frac{3}{10} e^{i\delta_{1}} \right\} \\ &+ \left(T + C\right) \frac{2}{5} . \end{split}$$

Final State Interactions in SCS D Decays (1)

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{A}(D^{0} \to \pi^{+}\pi^{-}) &= \left(T - \frac{2}{3}C\right) \left\{ -\frac{3}{10} \left(e^{i\delta_{0}} + e^{i\delta_{0}'}\right) + \left(-\frac{3}{10}\cos(2\phi) + \frac{3}{4\sqrt{10}}\sin(2\phi)\right) \left(e^{i\delta_{0}'} - e^{i\delta_{0}}\right) \right\} \\ &- \left(T + C\right) \frac{2}{5} , \\ \mathcal{A}(D^{0} \to K^{+}K^{-}) &= \left(T - \frac{2}{3}C\right) \left\{ \frac{3}{20} \left(e^{i\delta_{0}} + e^{i\delta_{0}'}\right) + \left(\frac{3}{20}\cos(2\phi) + \frac{3}{4\sqrt{10}}\sin(2\phi)\right) \left(e^{i\delta_{0}'} - e^{i\delta_{0}}\right) \right. \\ &+ \left. \frac{3}{10} e^{i\delta_{1}} \right\} \\ &+ \left(T + C\right) \frac{2}{5} . \end{split}$$

SU(3) limit

$$\begin{split} \sin\phi &= 1 \quad \delta_0 = \delta_1 \\ \left< 1, I = 0 \right| H_{\Delta U = 1} \left| D^0 \right> = 0 \Rightarrow \delta_0' \end{split}$$

Final State Interactions in SCS D Decays (1)

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{A}(D^{0} \to \pi^{+}\pi^{-}) &= \left(T - \frac{2}{3}C\right) \left\{ -\frac{3}{10} \left(e^{i\delta_{0}} + e^{i\delta_{0}'}\right) + \left(-\frac{3}{10}\cos(2\phi) + \frac{3}{4\sqrt{10}}\sin(2\phi)\right) \left(e^{i\delta_{0}'} - e^{i\delta_{0}}\right) \right\} \\ &- \left(T + C\right) \frac{2}{5} , \\ \mathcal{A}(D^{0} \to K^{+}K^{-}) &= \left(T - \frac{2}{3}C\right) \left\{ \frac{3}{20} \left(e^{i\delta_{0}} + e^{i\delta_{0}'}\right) + \left(\frac{3}{20}\cos(2\phi) + \frac{3}{4\sqrt{10}}\sin(2\phi)\right) \left(e^{i\delta_{0}'} - e^{i\delta_{0}}\right) \right. \\ &+ \left. \frac{3}{10}e^{i\delta_{1}} \right\} \\ &+ \left(T + C\right) \frac{2}{5} . \end{split}$$

	Parameters	Results
SU(3) limit		
$\sin \phi = 1$ $\delta_0 = \delta_1$	C/T = -0.53 $\phi = 22^{\circ}$	$\frac{\Gamma(D^0 \to K_{\rm S} K_{\rm S})}{\Gamma(D^0 \to K^+ K^-)} = 0.0429 (0.043 \pm 0.010)$
$\langle 1, I = 0 H_{\Delta U = 1} D^0 \rangle = 0 \Rightarrow \beta_0'$	$\delta_0 = 148^\circ$	$\frac{\Gamma(D^0 \to \pi^+ \pi^-)}{\Gamma(D^0 \to K^+ K^-)} = 0.354 (0.354 \pm 0.010)$
	$\delta_0 = 53^\circ$ $\delta_1 = 83^\circ$	$\frac{\Gamma(D^0 \to \pi^0 \pi^0)}{\Gamma(D^0 \to K^+ K^-)} = 0.202 (0.202 \pm 0.013)$

Pietro Santorelli (Università di Napoli)

D decays & CP Violation

A nonzero direct CP asymmetry is present only when the decay amplitude is

 $\mathscr{A} = A e^{\iota \delta_A} + B e^{\iota \delta_B}$

A nonzero direct CP asymmetry is present only when the decay amplitude is

 $\mathscr{A} = A e^{\iota \delta_A} + B e^{\iota \delta_B}$

the CP conjugate amplitude is

 $\bar{\mathscr{A}} = A^* e^{i\delta_A} + B^* e^{i\delta_B}$

A nonzero direct CP asymmetry is present only when the decay amplitude is

 $\mathscr{A} = A e^{\iota \delta_A} + B e^{\iota \delta_B}$

the CP conjugate amplitude is

$$\bar{\mathscr{A}} = \mathsf{A}^* \; \mathsf{e}^{\imath \delta_{\mathsf{A}}} + \mathsf{B}^* \; \mathsf{e}^{\imath \delta_{\mathsf{B}}}$$

and the CP asymmetry is:

$$a_{\mathrm{CP}}^{\mathrm{dir}} = rac{|\mathscr{A}|^2 - |\bar{\mathscr{A}}|^2}{|\mathscr{A}|^2 + |\bar{\mathscr{A}}|^2}$$

A nonzero direct CP asymmetry is present only when the decay amplitude is

 $\mathscr{A} = A e^{\iota \delta_A} + B e^{\iota \delta_B}$

the CP conjugate amplitude is

$$\bar{\mathscr{A}} = \mathsf{A}^* \; \mathsf{e}^{\imath \delta_{\mathsf{A}}} + \mathsf{B}^* \; \mathsf{e}^{\imath \delta_{\mathsf{B}}}$$

and the CP asymmetry is:

$$a_{\rm CP}^{\rm dir} = \frac{|\mathscr{A}|^2 - |\mathscr{\bar{A}}|^2}{|\mathscr{A}|^2 + |\mathscr{\bar{A}}|^2} = \frac{2\,\Im(A^*\,B)\,\sin(\delta_A - \delta_B)}{|A|^2 + |B|^2 + 2\,\Re(A^*\,B)\,\cos(\delta_A - \delta_B)}$$

A nonzero direct CP asymmetry is present only when the decay amplitude is

 $\mathscr{A} = A e^{\iota \delta_A} + B e^{\iota \delta_B}$

the CP conjugate amplitude is

$$\bar{\mathscr{A}} = \mathsf{A}^* \; \mathsf{e}^{\imath \delta_{\mathsf{A}}} + \mathsf{B}^* \; \mathsf{e}^{\imath \delta_{\mathsf{B}}}$$

and the CP asymmetry is:

$$a_{\rm CP}^{\rm dir} = \frac{|\mathscr{A}|^2 - |\bar{\mathscr{A}}|^2}{|\mathscr{A}|^2 + |\bar{\mathscr{A}}|^2} = \frac{2\,\Im(A^*\,B)\,\sin(\delta_A - \delta_B)}{|A|^2 + |B|^2 + 2\,\Re(A^*\,B)\,\cos(\delta_A - \delta_B)}$$

What about the amplitude *B*?

Pietro Santorelli (Università di Napoli)

D decays & CP Violation

The amplitude *B* is provided by

 $\langle f | H_{\Delta U=0} | D^0 \rangle$

where

$$H_{\Delta U=0} = -\frac{G_{F}}{\sqrt{2}} V_{ub} V_{cb}^{*} \left\{ \underbrace{\sum_{i=3}^{6} C_{i} O_{i}}_{\text{Penguins}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \left[C_{1} (O_{1}^{s} + O_{1}^{d}) + C_{2} (O_{2}^{s} + O_{2}^{d}) \right]}_{\text{Tree } (T', C')} \right\}$$

But

$$|T'/T| = |C'/C| = \left|\frac{V_{ub} V_{cb}^*}{\sin \theta_C \cos \theta_C}\right| \simeq 10^{-4}$$

The amplitude *B* is provided by

 $\langle f | H_{\Delta U=0} | D^0 \rangle$

where

$$H_{\Delta U=0} = -\frac{G_{F}}{\sqrt{2}} V_{ub} V_{cb}^{*} \left\{ \sum_{i=3}^{6} C_{i}O_{i} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \left[C_{1}(O_{1}^{s} + O_{1}^{d}) + C_{2}(O_{2}^{s} + O_{2}^{d}) \right]}_{\text{Penguins}} \right\}$$
But

$$|T'/T| = |C'/C| = \left|\frac{V_{ub} V_{cb}^*}{\sin \theta_C \cos \theta_C}\right| \simeq 10^{-4}$$

Large CPV can be due only to the Penguin terms

Pietro Santorelli (Università di Napoli)

Neglecting the contribution of the terms containing T' and C'

$$\mathscr{A}(\mathsf{K}^+\mathsf{K}^-)\simeq\mathsf{T}\mathsf{f}_{\mathsf{T}}(\delta_i,\phi,\mathsf{C}/\mathsf{T})\,+\,\mathsf{P}\,\mathsf{f}_{\mathsf{P}}(\delta_i,\phi)$$

Neglecting the contribution of the terms containing T' and C'

$$\mathscr{A}(\mathsf{K}^+\mathsf{K}^-)\simeq\mathsf{T}\mathsf{f}_{\mathsf{T}}(\delta_i,\phi,\mathsf{C}/\mathsf{T})+\mathsf{P}\mathsf{f}_{\mathsf{P}}(\delta_i,\phi)$$

and so

$$a_{CP}^{dir}(K^+K^-) \simeq rac{2 T \Im(P) \Im(f_T f_P^*)}{T^2 |f_T|^2} + \dots = +1.5 rac{\Im(P)}{T} \ a_{CP}^{dir}(\pi^+\pi^-) = -3.4 rac{\Im(P)}{T}$$

Neglecting the contribution of the terms containing T' and C'

$$\mathscr{A}(\mathsf{K}^+\mathsf{K}^-)\simeq\mathsf{T}\mathsf{f}_{\mathsf{T}}(\delta_i,\phi,\mathsf{C}/\mathsf{T})+\mathsf{P}\mathsf{f}_{\mathsf{P}}(\delta_i,\phi)$$

and so

$$a_{CP}^{dir}(K^+K^-) \simeq rac{2 T \Im(P) \Im(f_T f_P^*)}{T^2 |f_T|^2} + ... = +1.5 rac{\Im(P)}{T}$$

 $a_{CP}^{dir}(\pi^+\pi^-) = -3.4 rac{\Im(P)}{T}$

 $\frac{\Im(P)}{T} = \frac{|V_{ub} V_{cb}|}{\sin \theta_C \cos \theta_C} \sin \gamma \frac{\langle \kappa^+ \kappa^- | \sum_{i=3}^6 C_i Q_i + \frac{1}{2} [C_1 \{Q_1^s + Q_1^d\} + C_2 \{Q_2^s + Q_2^d\}] | D^0 \rangle}{\langle \kappa^+ \kappa^- | C_1 (Q_1^s - Q_1^d) + C_2 (Q_2^s - Q_2^d) | D^0 \rangle} = 6.3 \, 10^{-4} \, \kappa$

Neglecting the contribution of the terms containing T' and C'

$$\mathscr{A}(\mathsf{K}^+\mathsf{K}^-)\simeq\mathsf{T}\mathsf{f}_{\mathsf{T}}(\delta_i,\phi,\mathsf{C}/\mathsf{T})+\mathsf{P}\mathsf{f}_{\mathsf{P}}(\delta_i,\phi)$$

and so

$$a_{CP}^{dir}(\kappa^{+}\kappa^{-}) \simeq rac{2 T \Im(P) \Im(f_{T} f_{P}^{*})}{T^{2} |f_{T}|^{2}} + ... = +1.5 rac{\Im(P)}{T}$$

 $a_{CP}^{dir}(\pi^{+}\pi^{-}) = -3.4 rac{\Im(P)}{T}$

 $\frac{\Im(P)}{T} = \frac{|V_{ub} V_{cb}|}{\sin \theta_C \cos \theta_C} \sin \gamma \frac{\langle \kappa^+ \kappa^- | \sum_{i=3}^6 C_i Q_i + \frac{1}{2} [C_1 \{Q_1^s + Q_1^d\} + C_2 \{Q_2^s + Q_2^d\}] | D^0 \rangle}{\langle \kappa^+ \kappa^- | C_1 (Q_1^s - Q_1^d) + C_2 (Q_2^s - Q_2^d) | D^0 \rangle} = 6.3 \, 10^{-4} \, \kappa$

$$\Delta a_{
m CP} = 3.03 \ 10^{-3} \ \kappa$$

Pietro Santorelli (Università di Napoli)

D decays & CP Violation

Conclusions

We analyzed the Singly-Cabibbo-Suppressed decays of the neutral D mesons in the framework of a model that ascribes all of the large SU(3) violations to final state interactions.

The values of the strong phases are in principle suitable to predict consistent CP violations in the decay amplitudes.

We were able to give an accurate description of decay branching ratios

The experimental situation regarding the CP violating asymmetries is at present rather confused, but we think anyhow of interest to have shown that large asymmetries can be obtained, considering the uncertainties of long distance contributions and even without invoking New Physics.

Bibliography: New Physics

- 9 Y. Grossman, A. L. Kagan and Y. Nir, Phys. Rev. D 75 (2007) 036008 [hep-ph/0609178];
- G. Isidori, J. F. Kamenik, Z. Ligeti and G. Perez, Phys. Lett. B 711 (2012) 46 [arXiv:1111.4987 [hep-ph]];
- K. Wang and G. Zhu, Phys. Lett. B 709 (2012) 362 [arXiv:1111.5196 [hep-ph]];
- G. Hiller, Y. Hochberg and Y. Nir, Phys. Rev. D 85 (2012) 116008 [arXiv:1204.1046 [hep-ph]];
- 6 G. F. Giudice, G. Isidori and P. Paradisi, JHEP 1204 (2012) 060 [arXiv:1201.6204 [hep-ph]];
- W. Altmannshofer, R. Primulando, C. -T. Yu and F. Yu, JHEP **1204** (2012) 049 [arXiv:1202.2866 [hep-ph]];
- 🖉 C. -H. Chen, C. -Q. Geng and W. Wang, Phys. Rev. D **85** (2012) 077702 [arXiv:1202.3300 [hep-ph]];
- O. Gedalia, J. F. Kamenik, Z. Ligeti and G. Perez, Phys. Lett. B 714 (2012) 55 [arXiv:1202.5038 [hep-ph]];
- T. Mannel and N. Uraltsev, JHEP 1303 (2013) 064 [arXiv:1205.0233 [hep-ph]];
- B. Keren-Zur, P. Lodone, M. Nardecchia, D. Pappadopulo, R. Rattazzi and L. Vecchi, Nucl. Phys. B 867 (2013) 429 [arXiv:1205.5803 [hep-ph]];
- 🔟 R. Barbieri, D. Buttazzo, F. Sala and D. M. Straub, JHEP **1210** (2012) 040 [arXiv:1206.1327 [hep-ph]];
- A. D. Dolgov, S. I. Godunov, A. N. Rozanov and M. I. Vysotsky, JETP Lett. 96 (2012) 290 [arXiv:1206.6652 [hep-ph]];
- C. Delaunay, J. F. Kamenik, G. Perez and L. Randall, JHEP 1301 (2013) 027 [arXiv:1207.0474 [hep-ph]].

Bibliography: Standard Model

- M. Golden and B. Grinstein, Phys. Lett. B 222 (1989) 501,
- 2 D. Pirtskhalava and P. Uttayarat, Phys. Lett. B 712 (2012) 81 [arXiv:1112.5451 [hep-ph]];
- B. Bhattacharya, M. Gronau and J. L. Rosner, Phys. Rev. D 85 (2012) 054014 [arXiv:1201.2351 [hep-ph]];
- 4 T. Feldmann, S. Nandi and A. Soni, JHEP 1206 (2012) 007 [arXiv:1202.3795 [hep-ph]];
- 🧕 J. Brod, Y. Grossman, A. L. Kagan and J. Zupan, JHEP **1210** (2012) 161 [arXiv:1203.6659 [hep-ph]].
- E. Franco, S. Mishima and L. Silvestrini, JHEP 1205 (2012) 140 [arXiv:1203.3131 [hep-ph]].