Laboratoire de l'Accélérateur Linéaire

CKM fits as a function of luminosity (TIME)

A. Höcker^(a), H. Lacker^(a), S. Laplace^(a) and F. Le Diberder^(b)

^(a) Laboratoire de l'Accélérateur Linéaire
IN2P3-CNRS et Université de Paris-Sud, BP 34, F-91898 Orsay Cedex

^(b) Laboratoire de Physique Nucléaire et des Hautes Énergies
4, place Jussieu, Tour 33 r.d.c., F-75005 Paris, Cedex 05

CERN LIBRARIES, GENEVA

CM-P00047950

*Talk given at the 4th International Conference on B Physics and CP Violation
BPC4 and at the Workshop Physics beyond 10E34 e⁺e⁻
19-23 February 2001, Ago Town, Mie Prefecture, Japan*

U.E.R
de
l'Université Paris-Sud

Institut National
de Physique Nucléaire
et de Physique des Particules

CKM FITS AS A FUNCTION OF LUMINOSITY (TIME)

A. HÖCKER, H. LACKER*, S. LAPLACE

Laboratoire de l'Accélérateur Linéaire,
IN2P3-CNRS et Université de Paris-Sud, BP 34, F-91898 Orsay Cedex, FRANCE
E-mail: lacker@lal.in2p3.fr

F. LE DIBERDER

Laboratoire de Physique Nucléaire et des Hautes Energies
4, place Jussieu, Tour 33 r.d.c., F-75005 Paris, Cedex 05, FRANCE

Possible scenarios for CKM fits in the years 2005 and 2010 are presented using B - and K -physics results from extrapolated luminosities for B -factories at the $\Upsilon(4S)$, for the hadron machines at Tevatron and LHC and experiments for rare kaon decays. The study provides an estimate of what precision for the CKM matrix elements can be achieved if all relevant experiments and accelerators, including upgrades for the existing e^+e^- machines, reach their design goals. It is intended to give information used to explore which type of future experiments are needed to cover all relevant physics topics related to the CKM matrix and the search of physics beyond the Standard Model.

1 Introduction

The first goal addressed by global CKM fits is *Metrol-ogy*, that is to find allowed ranges for CKM matrix elements and related quantities, assuming the Standard Model (SM) to be correct. Furthermore, in a second step one intends to *probe the validity of the Standard Model*, that is to quantify the agreement between the SM predictions and the experimental information. Finally, within an extended theoretical framework, *e.g.*, Supersymmetry, one may search for specific signals of New Physics by pinning down the additional theoretical parameters. Every appropriate statistical approach may be used, though for our purpose the non-Bayesian method *Rfit*¹ is most convenient.

It is assumed in this study that accelerators and experiments, including the foreseen upgrades for the B -factories at the $\Upsilon(4S)$, are reaching the design luminosities. We attempt to understand what parts of relevant physics are eventually missing or not well covered. It is clear that these extrapolations are highly hypothetical, in particular, in those cases where the experiments are still to come! For observables with large statistics the systematic errors, eventually to be determined from data, are taken from educated guess-work here. Rather than showing CKM fits as a function of luminosity, three eras are considered: the present situation, and possible scenarios for the years 2005 and 2010. The outlook into 2005 shows possible achievements from the B -factories and from the Tevatron (TEV II $a+b$) experiments before the LHC era. The second scenario takes place after several years of data taking by BTeV and the LHC experiments. This is the time range in which also results for the rare kaon decays, $K_L^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$ and $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$, can be expected.

Figure 1: Present constraints in the $\bar{\rho} - \bar{\eta}$ plane where $\bar{\rho}$ and $\bar{\eta}$ are defined by $\bar{\rho} = \rho(1 - \lambda^2/2)$, $\bar{\eta} = \eta(1 - \lambda^2/2)$.

2 Inventory

The Wolfenstein parameters² λ and A are presently measured with uncertainties of about 1% and 5%, respectively, whereas ρ and η are known with much less precision. This is because the information on the latter is obtained via the measurements/constraints from $|V_{ub}/V_{cb}|$, Δm_d , Δm_s and $|\epsilon_K|$ which suffer from dominant theoretical uncertainties: the inclusive and exclusive $|V_{ub}|$ measurements due to large systematic and model dependent errors; Δm_d , $\Delta m_s/\Delta m_d$ and ϵ_K due to uncertainties in the hadronic parameters $f_{B_d}\sqrt{B_d}$, $\xi = f_{B_s}\sqrt{B_s}/f_{B_d}\sqrt{B_d}$ and B_K . The power of the $\Delta m_s/\Delta m_d$ constraint is not fully exploited since experiments were not able so far to significantly resolve the fast $B_s^0 - \bar{B}_s^0$ oscillations. Regardless of these uncertainties, it is a non-trivial fact that these constraints lead to a consistent picture in the $\bar{\rho} - \bar{\eta}$ plane (Fig. 1).

Figure 2: χ^2 distributions from the toy Monte Carlo simulation and corresponding CLs for the fit with and without $\sin 2\beta_{WA}$.

The measurement of $\sin 2\beta$ from neutral B -decays to CP-eigenstates containing charmonium gives an additional constraint. In striking contrast to the above mentioned measurements, the current uncertainty on $\sin 2\beta$ is mainly of statistical nature. The most competitive results are coming from the B -factories; the world average reads $\sin 2\beta_{WA} = 0.48 \pm 0.16$.

Drawn in Fig. 1 are the 5% confidence level contours^{1a} for the constraints from $\Delta m_s/\Delta m_d$, Δm_d , $|V_{ub}/V_{cb}|$ and $|\epsilon_K|$ and the 90%, 32% and 5% CL contours for the fit without using $\sin 2\beta_{WA}$. The 32% and 5% CL contours for $\sin 2\beta_{WA}$ indicate that the measurement is consistent with the allowed range obtained by the fit.

The agreement between data and the SM are gauged by means of a test statistics which is interpreted using a toy Monte Carlo simulation described in Ref.¹. The resulting χ^2 distribution from the simulation for the fit with and without $\sin 2\beta_{WA}$ and the corresponding CLs are shown in Fig. 2. The position of the minimum χ^2 indicates that no deviation from the SM is presently observed.

3 Extrapolation to the future

Extrapolations were performed using mainly Refs.³. Updated prospects can be found in these proceedings⁴. The hypothetical constraints on $\bar{\rho} - \bar{\eta}$ for 2005 and 2010 are shown in Figs. 3 and 4.

For 2005, it is assumed that BaBar and Belle are able to collect an integrated luminosity of 1000 fb^{-1} due to accelerator and detector upgrades and that a considerable part of the expected luminosity of 15 fb^{-1} at TEV II has

^aThe statistical interpretation of *confidence level* (CL) within Rfit is described in more detail in Refs.¹. For the fit output it is understood to be an upper bound for a confidence level, i.e., it corresponds to the best set of theoretical parameters at a given parameter space point, e.g., in $\bar{\rho} - \bar{\eta}$.

Table 1: Possible accuracies of quantities related to the CKM matrix as a function of time. If two errors are given the first accounts for statistical and accountable systematic uncertainties whereas the second error stands for theoretical uncertainties obtained from educated guess-work and is considered as a range in Rfit.

Element	2001	2005	2010
Belle, BaBar	$\approx 30 \text{ fb}^{-1}$	1000 fb^{-1}	4000 fb^{-1}
CLEO	$\approx 10 \text{ fb}^{-1}$		
TEV II		15 fb^{-1}	
$ V_{ub} $	$\pm 20\%$	$\pm 10\%$	$\pm 10\%$
$ V_{cb} $	$\pm 5\%$	$\pm 5\%$	$\pm 3\%$
Δm_d (ps^{-1})	± 0.014		
Δm_s (ps^{-1})	> 15.0	$\pm 0.2\%$	
m_t (MS) (GeV)	± 5.0	± 3.0	± 1.0
m_c (GeV)	± 0.1		
B_K	$\pm 0.06 \pm 0.13$	$\pm 0.03 \pm 0.07$	
$f_{B_d} \sqrt{B_d}$ (MeV)	$\pm 28 \pm 28$	$\pm 10 \pm 10$	
ξ	$\pm 0.03 \pm 0.05$	$\pm 0.015 \pm 0.025$	
$\sin 2\beta$ from	± 0.16	$\pm 0.01 \pm 0.01$	$\pm 0.005 \pm 0.005$
$B \rightarrow J/\psi K_s$	$\Upsilon(4S)$	$\Upsilon(4S)$	+BTeV/LHCb
and others	+TEV II	+TEV II	+CMS/ATLAS
α from	-	$\pm 5^\circ$	$\pm 2^\circ$
$B \rightarrow \rho\pi(\pi\pi)$	-	$\Upsilon(4S)$	+BTeV/LHCb
γ from	-	$\pm 10^\circ$	$\pm 6^\circ$
$B_{d(s)} \rightarrow D_{(s)} K$	-	$\Upsilon(4S)$	+BTeV/LHCb
		+TEV II	
$K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$	Limit	KOPIO/KAMI	BR $\cdot$ ($\pm 7\%$)
$K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$	1 ev (E787)	E949, CKM	BR $\cdot$ ($\pm 5\% \pm 4\%$)

been collected at that time. This would allow to measure $\sin 2\beta$ to better than 0.02. The precision on Δm_d will be improved at the B -factories resulting in a small improvement of the Δm_d constraint. If the frequency for $B_s^0 - \bar{B}_s^0$ oscillations is not considerably larger than the range of values predicted by the CKM constraints¹, Δm_s will be measured by CDF and D0 at TEV II to a very good precision and the uncertainty from the $\Delta m_s/\Delta m_d$ constraint will be dominated by the QCD parameter ξ . The top mass is expected to be measured to a precision of 3 GeV at TEV II. The theoretical uncertainty on $|V_{ub}|$ may be reduced to the 10% level⁴. Some theoretical improvement from lattice QCD on B_K , $f_{B_d} \sqrt{B_d}$ and ξ

Figure 3: Hypothetical picture of the $\bar{\rho} - \bar{\eta}$ plane in 2005.

Figure 4: Hypothetical picture of the $\bar{\rho} - \bar{\eta}$ plane in 2010.

can be expected. We assume a reduction of the uncertainties on these parameters by a factor of two. Measurements of α are possible if a Dalitz plot analysis in $B \rightarrow 3\pi$ and/or the penguin pollution in $B \rightarrow \pi\pi$ can be managed. A measurement of γ , though less precise and without resolving all ambiguities, can be achieved using $B_{d(s)} \rightarrow D_{(s)}K$ decays. Under these assumptions the allowed range in the $\bar{\rho} - \bar{\eta}$ plane is impressively reduced, to the point that it can not be seen anymore in Fig. 3. In 2010, an enormous amount of data will be collected by BTeV, LHCb, ATLAS and CMS, which will lead to a further improvement of $\sin 2\beta$. Nevertheless, the B -factories can still be competitive if they achieve their luminosity goals. In particular, the dedicated B -hadron experiments will provide significant improvements on the angles α and γ . At this stage, systematic and theoretical errors on these quantities will most likely dominate. The error on the top mass can be reduced at the top factory LHC. Theoretical developments are hard to predict. One may hope that, *e.g.*, $|V_{cb}|$ can be further improved to the 3% level. Without new theoretical techniques the uncertainty on $|V_{ub}|$ will most likely remain at the 10% level. Additional constraints of high quality will be introduced if experiments at FNAL and BNL will succeed in measuring the theoretically quite clean rare kaon decays $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$ and $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$. The metrological knowledge may reach a remarkable precision: the allowed range in $\bar{\rho} - \bar{\eta}$ being almost point-like (Fig. 4).

These considerations are not complete as several channels, *e.g.*, rare B -decays, or bounds on γ from charmless two-body B -decays, have not been taken into account, yet. The impact of LHCb and BTeV is clearly underestimated since many measurements as, *e.g.*, the rich potential of the channel $B_s \rightarrow \psi\phi$, were not included here. With an improvement of the theoretical understanding, the direct CP-violating observable ϵ'/ϵ could provide additional information. Prospects for experiments running on the $\Upsilon(5S)$ resonance were also not considered.

Figure 5: Comparison between CLs for hypothetical measurements (solid line) in 2005 and the fit output (dashed line). Also shown is the CL for the parameter f_{SUSY} (see text).

4 Deviation from the SM

In this section we consider a scenario in which inconsistencies between several measurements occur. For the hypothetical measurements of the unitarity triangle angles, $\sin 2\beta$ is fixed at the current world average, and values of $\gamma = 32^\circ$ and $\sin 2\alpha = 0.1$ were chosen.

Supersymmetric models are attractive candidates for physics beyond the SM. However, even the minimal supersymmetric extension of the SM (MSSM) already contains a large number of parameters. In a simple model given by Ali and London⁵ only one parameter, here denoted by f_{SUSY} , is introduced which modifies the top-exchange box-diagrams in ϵ_K and $B^0 - \bar{B}^0$ -mixing. As a consequence, the model is mainly sensitive to the angle γ . For the example chosen, the CLs of the hypothetical measurements are compared to the (upper bounds of) CLs of the fit (Fig. 5). Due to its precision, $\sin 2\beta$ would pull the fit result towards the measurement. A disagreement would be observed for α . The parameter f_{SUSY} would be found to be consistent with zero (Fig. 5), whereas the CLs for the fit (Fig. 6) would be very small, meaning that the simple model could not accommodate such measurements. The inconsistency would be pronounced even more for the extrapolated precisions in 2010 (Fig. 6).

The example illustrates that a disagreement between data and the SM does not necessarily imply an understanding of the data. Although the CKM fit is a powerful tool to detect a failure of the SM it does not tell us what kind of New Physics rules the behaviour of the ob-

Figure 6: χ^2 toy Monte Carlo distributions and corresponding CL in case of the example chosen for 2005 and 2010.

servables. It is not known if an extension of the SM is as simple as the model described above. Hence, various toy models representing distinct “classes” of SM extensions are desirable. These models should contain a sufficient but not too large number of parameters to provide a rich CKM-phenomenology. This would help to study possible scenarios of SM failures beforehand.

5 Conclusion

It is the predominant goal of the ongoing B and K physics efforts to determine the CKM matrix elements as precisely as possible. A large number of sensitive observables can be measured during the next decade. The SM picture of CP violation can be tested with high sensitivity since the four independent CKM matrix elements have to describe all data on the same footing. For some parameters redundant information from different measurements will be obtained hence providing the potential to detect hints for New Physics. For example, a comparison between $\sin 2\beta$ measured in $B \rightarrow \phi K_S$ (if manageable) and $B \rightarrow J/\psi K_S$ could allow to pin down New Physics contributions in $b \rightarrow s$ penguins. However, it is hard to predict what precision is needed for such a comparison is since the SM extension, *e.g.*, a SUSY model, has to be specified.

Many measurements not affected by large theoretical or systematic uncertainties need to be accumulated. This is certainly the case for $\sin 2\beta$, γ , rare kaon decays and also α if penguin contributions can be determined from data. Moreover, theoretical uncertainties ought to be reduced where possible. One might benefit from theoretical improvements, *e.g.*, unquenched lattice QCD calculations although it is hard to predict what precision eventually can be achieved. Experimental results could help in this respect. A measurement of the ratio f_{D_s}/f_{D_d}

at a τ /charm factory is useful to gauge the calculation of ξ . The decay $B^+ \rightarrow \tau^+ \nu_\tau$ would measure the product $f_{B_d} \cdot |V_{ub}|$ and thus strengthen the constraint on $\bar{\rho} - \bar{\eta}$ from Δm_d . Measurements of $|V_{ub}|$ with a theoretical uncertainty on the order 10% seem to be possible. It is an important issue for the inclusive measurements of $|V_{ub}|$ and $|V_{cb}|$ to reliably quantify the size of possible violations of quark-hadron duality, that is to explore the validity of the Heavy Quark Expansion.

In 2005, the constraints in the $\bar{\rho} - \bar{\eta}$ plane could be already strong if the B -factories succeeded their upgrades and the TEV II program proceeds as expected. Due to the additional impact from hadron machines and rare kaon decays, the metrological knowledge will be remarkable in 2010. If on this time scale the CKM matrix is still consistent with the SM the metrological phase might reach an end. However, if a deviation from the SM is observed or a direct signal for New Physics is detected during the next ten years, *e.g.*, at the LHC, the question of required precision for particular observables would find a more quantitative answer. Clearly, the situation has to be regularly addressed, in particular in light of a “Beyond 10^{34} B -factory”. Very challenging measurements like $B \rightarrow X_{d,s} \nu \bar{\nu}$ should be re-considered according to these evaluations.

Acknowledgements

We are indebted to all people who have provided the input numbers without which these extrapolations would not have been possible. Some names but by far not all can be found in the references. It was a pleasure to contribute to this workshop. In particular, we would like to thank Ian Shipsey for providing us the opportunity to present these results.

References

1. A. Höcker, H. Lacker, S. Laplace, F. Le Diberder, LAL 01-06, (2001); see also these proceedings.
2. L. Wolfenstein, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **51** (1983) 1945
3. BaBar collaboration, “The BaBar Physics Book, SLAC-R-504, 1998.
Z. Ligeti, Prospects for V_{cb} and V_{ub} ; D. Bortoletto, B Physics Reach in Run IIa/b; M. Smizanska, B Physics Reach of ATLAS/CMS; S. Stone, B Physics Reach of BTeV; T. Nakada, B physics reach of LHCb, A. El Khadra, Prospects for Lattice QCD, Talks given at the workshop “Beyond 10^{34} e^+e^- ”, Michigan, 2000.
4. J. T. Seeman, S. Kurokawa, W.J. Taylor, W. Johns, T. Nakada, J. Alexander, K. Abe, Y. Kwon, S. Petrak, A. Falk, J. Lee, G. Eigen, these proceedings.
5. A. Ali, D. London, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **9** (1999) 687