Measurements of $B \to DK$ decays to constrain the CKM Unitarity Triangle angle $\gamma$ and related results at LHCb
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Constraints on the CKM angle $\gamma$ are presented from GLW, ADS, and GGSZ analyses of $B^\pm \to DK^{\pm}$ at the LHCb experiment. The branching fractions of $B^0 \to D^0 K^+\pi^-$ and $B^0_s \to D^0 K^-\pi^+$ are also reported, measured relative to the related mode $B^0 \to \bar{D}^0 \pi^+\pi^-$. 
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1 Measurements of $\gamma$ from $B^{\pm} \to DK^{\pm}$

The CKM angle $\gamma = \arg(-V_{ud}V_{ub}^*/V_{cd}V_{cb}^*)$ is currently the least well-constrained angle in the Unitarity Triangle. So far, the most-sensitive measurements of $\gamma$ from a single experiment have been performed by Belle [1] and BaBar [2]. These measurements yield values of $(68^{+15}_{-14})^\circ$ and $(69^{+17}_{-16})^\circ$, respectively.

Tree-level processes such as $B^{\pm} \to DK^{\pm}$ provide a theoretically clean measurement of $\gamma$ with no contributions from new physics processes. This measurement can be compared with measurements from loop-mediated processes, which are sensitive to new physics, to provide a test of the Standard Model. The current limits on the CKM Unitarity Triangle due to tree-level and loop processes, as calculated by the CKMFitter group [3], are shown in Fig. 1.

Figure 1: Constraints on the CKM Unitarity Triangle due to (left) tree-level processes and (right) loop-mediated processes.

1.1 GLW/ADS analysis of $B^{\pm} \to DK^{\pm}$ and $B^{\pm} \to D\pi^{\pm}$

The GLW method [4] uses $D$ decays to $CP$ eigenstates such as $K^+K^-$ and $\pi^+\pi^-$. Decays can proceed either via a $D^0$ or a $\bar{D}^0$ with a phase difference of $\delta_{B^{\pm}} + \gamma$. Suppression in the decay via $D^0$ with respect to the $\bar{D}^0$ decay limits interference to $O(10\%)$ in $B^{\pm} \to DK^{\pm}$ and $O(1\%)$ in $B^{\pm} \to D\pi^{\pm}$.

The ADS method [5] uses $D$ decays to quasi-flavour-specific states such as $\pi^+K^-$ and $\pi^-K^+\pi^+\pi^-$. Here the suppression of one of the $B$ decays is partially balanced by the suppression of one of the $D$ decays, giving larger interference terms while also introducing an additional phase shift of $\delta_D$.

Analyses have been performed on $B^{\pm} \to DK^{\pm}$ and $B^{\pm} \to D\pi^{\pm}$ with the $D$ meson reconstructed from the final states $K^+K^-$, $\pi^+\pi^-$, $K^+\pi^-$, $\pi^+K^-$, $\pi^-K^+\pi^+\pi^-$ and $\pi^-K^+\pi^+\pi^-$ using LHCb data corresponding to 1 fb$^{-1}$ of $pp$ collisions at a centre of mass energy of 7 TeV [6,7]. The invariant mass distributions of the two- and four-body suppressed ADS modes are shown in Fig. 2 and Fig. 3, respectively. The
Figure 2: Fits to the invariant mass distributions of the two-body suppressed ADS mode $\pi^\pm K^\pm$ in (top) $B^+ \rightarrow DK^+$ and (bottom) $B^- \rightarrow D\pi^+$. The $B^+ \rightarrow DK^+$ and $B^- \rightarrow D\pi^+$ components are shown in red and green, respectively. The shaded component indicates partially reconstructed background, the dashed magenta line corresponds to partially reconstructed $\Lambda^0_b \rightarrow \Lambda^+_c h^-$ and the total shape also includes a combinatoric background.

The values obtained for each of these observables can be found in Refs. [6, 7]. These variables serve as inputs for the combined $\gamma$ measurements in Section 1.3 and Section 1.4.

1.2 GGSZ analysis of $B^\pm \rightarrow DK^\pm$

The GGSZ method [8] exploits the variation of the strong phase $\delta_D$ across the Dalitz plot in $D$ decays to three-body self-conjugate states such as $K_S^0\pi^+\pi^-$ and $K_S^0K^+K^-$. The Dalitz plot is divided into bins, as shown in Fig. 4, chosen to maximise statistical sensitivity. The populations of $B^+$ and $B^-$ decays in each bin are given by
Figure 3: Fits to the invariant mass distributions of the four-body suppressed ADS mode $\pi^{\mp}K^{\pm}\pi^{\mp}\pi^{\pm}$ in (top) $B^{\mp} \rightarrow DK^{\mp}$ and (bottom) $B^{\mp} \rightarrow D\pi^{\mp}$. The $B^{\mp} \rightarrow DK^{\mp}$ and $B^{\mp} \rightarrow D\pi^{\mp}$ components are shown in red and green, respectively. The shaded component indicates partially reconstructed background, the dashed magenta line corresponds to partially reconstructed $B^{0}_{s} \rightarrow DK^{-}\pi^{+}$ and the total shape also includes a combinatoric background.

\[ N^{+}_{\pm i} = h_{B^{+}} \left( K^{+}_{\pm i} + (x_{+}^2 + y_{+}^2)K_{\pm i} + 2\sqrt{K^{+}_{\pm i}}(x_{+}c_{\pm i} + y_{+}s_{\pm i}) \right), \]
\[ N^{-}_{\pm i} = h_{B^{-}} \left( K^{-}_{\pm i} + (x_{-}^2 + y_{-}^2)K_{\mp i} + 2\sqrt{K^{-}_{\pm i}}(x_{-}c_{\pm i} + y_{-}s_{\pm i}) \right), \]

where $K_{\pm i}$ is the efficiency corrected yield in bin $\pm i$ due to $D^{0}$ flavour tagged events from BaBar [9,10] and $c_{\pm i}$ and $s_{\pm i}$ are the cosine and sine of the strong phase $\delta_{D}$ in bin $\pm i$ from CLEO-c [11].

The remaining parameters are left free in the fit to the data: $h_{B^{\pm}}$ are normalisation factors for $B^{\pm}$, and $x_{\pm} = r_{B}\cos(\delta_{B} \pm \gamma)$ and $y_{\pm} = r_{B}\sin(\delta_{B} \pm \gamma)$ are the Cartesian parameters, which are sensitive to $\gamma$.

Analyses have been performed on $B^{\pm} \rightarrow DK^{\pm}$ with the $D$ meson reconstructed in the final states $K^{0}_{s}\pi^{+}\pi^{-}$ and $K^{0}_{s}K^{+}K^{-}$ using LHCb data corresponding to 1 fb$^{-1}$ of pp collisions at a centre of mass energy of 7 TeV [12] and 2 fb$^{-1}$ of pp collisions at a centre of mass energy of 8 TeV [13]. The values obtained for the Cartesian parameters in the 8 TeV analysis are

\[ x_{+} = (-8.7 \pm 3.1\text{(stat.)} \pm 1.6\text{(syst.)} \pm 0.6\text{(ext.)}) \times 10^{-2}, \]
\[ x_{-} = (5.3 \pm 3.2\text{(stat.)} \pm 0.9\text{(syst.)} \pm 0.9\text{(ext.)}) \times 10^{-2}, \]
\[ y_{+} = (0.1 \pm 3.6\text{(stat.)} \pm 1.4\text{(syst.)} \pm 1.9\text{(ext.)}) \times 10^{-2}, \]
\[ y_{-} = (9.9 \pm 3.6\text{(stat.)} \pm 2.2\text{(syst.)} \pm 1.6\text{(ext.)}) \times 10^{-2}, \]
Figure 4: Binning schemes used for the Dalitz plots of (left) \( D \to K_S^0 \pi^+ \pi^- \) and (right) \( D \to K_S^0 K^+ K^- \). Bins in the top-left half of the plots \( m_{K^0 h^-}^2 > m_{K^0 h^+}^2 \) are identified as \(+i\) and bins in the bottom-right half are labeled \(-i\).

where the third uncertainty is due to the CLEO-c strong phase measurements used in the fit.

Combining these values with the results from the 7 TeV analysis and fitting for \( \gamma, r_B \) and \( \delta_B \) yields values of \((57 \pm 16)^\circ, (8.8^{+2.3}_{-2.4}) \times 10^{-2} \) and \((124^{+15}_{-17})^\circ\), respectively, where the values for \( \gamma \) and \( \delta_B \) are modulo \(180^\circ\). Two-dimensional projections of the confidence regions for these parameters are shown in Fig. 5.

Figure 5: Two-dimensional projections of the confidence regions onto the (left) \((\gamma, r_B)\) and (right) \((\gamma, \delta_B)\) planes. Contours indicate the 1, 2 and 3\(\sigma\) boundaries and diamonds mark the central values.

1.3 Combination of results from 1 fb\(^{-1}\) measurements

The results in Section 1.1 and Section 1.2 are combined using a frequentist approach to obtain a more constraining measurement of \( \gamma \) [14]. In addition to these results
Table 1: Best-fit values and confidence intervals for $\gamma$ from the combination of $D_K$ and $D_\pi$ measurements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>combination</th>
<th>$\gamma$</th>
<th>68% CL</th>
<th>95% CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$D_K$</td>
<td>72.0°</td>
<td>[56.4, 86.7]°</td>
<td>[42.6, 99.6]°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_\pi$</td>
<td>18.9°</td>
<td>[7.4, 99.2]° $\cup$ [167.9, 176.4]°</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_K$ and $D_\pi$</td>
<td>72.6°</td>
<td>[55.4, 82.3]°</td>
<td>[40.2, 92.7]°</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further measurements are included to improve the fit: measurements of the strong phases and coherence factors for $D \to \bar{K}\pi$ and $D \to K\pi\pi\pi$ decays from CLEO-c [15], $CP$ asymmetry measurements of the neutral $D$ mesons from the Heavy Flavour Averaging Group [16] and charm mixing parameters from LHCb [17]. A likelihood is constructed from the measured observables as

$$\mathcal{L}(\tilde{\alpha}) = \prod_i \xi_i(A_{obs}^i|\tilde{\alpha}),$$

where the sum is over the different measurements, $\tilde{\alpha}$ is the set of parameters and $\xi_i$ denotes the likelihood probability density functions (PDFs) of the observables $A_{obs}^i$. For most observables a Gaussian PDF is assumed, however, where highly non-Gaussian behaviour is observed, the experimental likelihood is used.

A combined $\gamma$ measurement has been performed including the results from Section 1.1 and a subset of the results from Section 1.2 corresponding to 1 fb$^{-1}$ of $pp$ collisions at a centre of mass energy of 7 TeV [12]. The best-fit values and confidence intervals (modulo 180°) of $\gamma$ are given in Table 1 and the $1-\text{CL}$ curves for $\gamma$ are shown in Fig. 6.

Figure 6: $1-\text{CL}$ curves for $\gamma$ from the combined 1 fb$^{-1}$ GLW/ADS and 1 fb$^{-1}$ GGSZ measurements using (left) only $D_K$, (centre) only $D_\pi$ and (right) both decay modes.

1.4 Combination including 3 fb$^{-1}$ GGSZ measurement

Another combination [18] has been performed that incorporates all of the results reported in Section 1.2 but only those observables from Section 1.1 corresponding
Table 2: Best-fit values and confidence intervals for $\gamma$, $r_B$ and $\delta_B$ from the combination of $DK$ measurements including GGSZ measurements from 3 fb$^{-1}$ of data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>quantity</th>
<th>value</th>
<th>68% CL</th>
<th>95% CL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma$</td>
<td>67.2°</td>
<td>[55.1, 79.1]°</td>
<td>[43.9, 89.5]°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_B$</td>
<td>0.0923</td>
<td>[0.0843, 0.1001]</td>
<td>[0.0762, 0.1075]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\delta_B$</td>
<td>114.3°</td>
<td>[101.3, 126.3]°</td>
<td>[88.7, 136.3]°</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

to $B^\pm \to DK^\pm$ decays. Mixing in the neutral $D$ mesons is also neglected in the equations used for the observables in this combination.

The best-fit values and confidence intervals (all modulo 180°) for $\gamma$, $r_B$ and $\delta_B$ are given in Table 2. Figure 7 and Figure 8 show the 1 − CL curve for $\gamma$, and the 2D projection of the likelihood in $\gamma$ and $r_B$, respectively.

Figure 7: 1 − CL curve for $\gamma$ from the combined 1 fb$^{-1}$ GLW/ADS and 3 fb$^{-1}$ GGSZ measurements.

2 Measurement of $B^{0}_{(s)} \to DK\pi$ branching fractions

The decay mode $B^{0} \to DK^{+}\pi^{-}$ has potential for a significant future measurement of $\gamma$ [10][21]. Sensitivity to $\gamma$ comes from the interference of $b \to c$ and $b \to u$ amplitudes of a similar magnitude. $B^{0}_{s} \to DK^{-}\pi^{+}$ and the related mode $B^{0}_{s} \to D^{*}K^{-}\pi^{+}$ form important backgrounds to this mode, therefore, an understanding of these modes is necessary.

Branching fraction measurements of $B^{0} \to DK^{+}\pi^{-}$ and $B^{0}_{s} \to DK^{-}\pi^{+}$, relative to the normalisation mode $B^{0} \to D^{\pi^{+}\pi^{-}}$, have been made using LHCb data corresponding to 1 fb$^{-1}$ of $pp$ collisions at a centre of mass energy of 7 TeV [22].
The invariant mass distributions of $D\pi\pi$ and $DK\pi$ candidates where the $D$ is reconstructed from $\bar{D}^0 \to K^+\pi^-$ are shown in Fig. 9. The measured relative branching fractions are

$$\frac{B\left(B^0 \to \bar{D}^0 K^+\pi^-\right)}{B\left(B^0 \to \bar{D}^0 \pi^+\pi^-\right)} = 0.106 \pm 0.007 \text{ (stat.)} \pm 0.008 \text{ (syst.)},$$

$$\frac{B\left(B^0_{s} \to \bar{D}^0 K^-\pi^+\right)}{B\left(B^0 \to \bar{D}^0 \pi^+\pi^-\right)} = 1.18 \pm 0.05 \text{ (stat.)} \pm 0.12 \text{ (syst.)}.$$

Figure 9: Fits to the $B^0_{(s)}$ candidate invariant mass distributions for the (a) $D\pi\pi$ and (b) $DK\pi$ samples. Data points are shown in black, the full fitted PDFs as solid blue lines and the components as detailed in the legends.
These relative measurements yield absolute branching fractions of

\[
\mathcal{B}\left(B^0 \to D^0 K^+\pi^-\right) = (9.0 \pm 0.6 \text{ (stat.)} \pm 0.7 \text{ (syst.)} \pm 0.9(\mathcal{B})) \times 10^{-5},
\]

\[
\mathcal{B}\left(B^0_s \to D^0 K^-\pi^+\right) = (1.00 \pm 0.04 \text{ (stat.)} \pm 0.10 \text{ (syst.)} \pm 0.10(\mathcal{B})) \times 10^{-3},
\]

where the third uncertainty arises from the uncertainties on \(\mathcal{B}(B^0 \to D^0 \pi^+\pi^-)\). This is the most precise measurement of \(\mathcal{B}(B^0 \to D^0 K^+\pi^-)\) to date and the first measurement of \(\mathcal{B}(B^0_s \to D^0 K^-\pi^+)\).

Although no quantitative analysis of the Dalitz plots has yet been attempted, the Dalitz plot distributions obtained (corrected for efficiency) are presented in Fig. 10.

**Figure 10:** Efficiency corrected Dalitz plot distributions for (a) \(B^0 \to D^0 \pi^+\pi^-\), (b) \(B^0 \to D^0 K^+\pi^-\) and (c) \(B^0_s \to D^0 K^-\pi^+\) candidates obtained from the signal weights.

### 3 Conclusions and prospects

The \(B^\pm \to D K^\pm\) decay mode offers an excellent opportunity to measure the CKM angle \(\gamma\) from Standard Model processes. The combination in Section 1.4 gives the most sensitive measurement of \(\gamma\) from a single experiment so far, yielding a value of \((67 \pm 12)^\circ\). This measurement is expected to improve further with the completion of a GLW/ADS analysis on the remaining 2 fb\(^{-1}\) of LHCb data currently available. In addition, other modes such as \(B^0 \to D K^+\pi^-\) offer great prospects for future \(\gamma\) measurements.
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