## Chapter 13

The CKM Matrix and the Kobayashi-Maskawa Mechanism

> Section Editors: A. Bevan, S. Prell (BaBar) B. Golob, B. Yabsley (BELLE) T. Mannel (TH)

## Status

|     | 13            | The   | CKM matrix and the Kobayashi-Maskawa mech-          |
|-----|---------------|-------|---|
|     |               | anism | • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •               |
| Add | $\rightarrow$ | 13.1  | Historical Background                               |
| Add | $\rightarrow$ | 13.2  | CP Violation and Baryogenesis                       |
| New | $\rightarrow$ | 13.3  | CP Violation in a lagrangian field theory           |
|     |               | 13.4  | The CKM matrix and the Kobayashi-Maskawa            |
|     |               |       | $mechanism\ .\ .\ .\ .\ .\ .\ .\ .\ .\ .\ .\ .\ .\$ |
|     |               | 13.5  | The Unitarity Triangle                              |
| New | $\rightarrow$ |       | CP violation phenomenology                          |

- Three Iterations among the Sec. Eds. done
- Section is almost finalized

## Progress since last meeting

FCNCs are suppressed by this GIM mechanism. In fact, FCNC's in the kaon system involve a transition of an s quark into a d quark. This can be achieved by a two subsequent charged current processes involving (in the two family picture) the up and the charm quark as an intermediate state. Taking into account Cabibbo mixing these amplitudes are

$$\mathcal{A}(s \to d) = \mathcal{A}(s \to u \to d) + \mathcal{A}(s \to c \to d)$$
  
=  $\sin \theta_C \, \cos \theta_C [f(m_u) - f(m_c)]$  (1)

Hence, if the up and charm quark masses were degenerate, no kaon FCNC processes, including  $K - \overline{K}$  mixing could occur.

However, the up and charm masses are not degenerate and thus K -  $\overline{K}$  can occur. Neglecting the small up-quark mass, the amplitude for K - K mixing turns out to be

$$\mathcal{A}(K \to \overline{K}) \propto \sin^2 \theta_C \, \cos^2 \theta_C \frac{m_c^2}{M_W^2} \tag{2}$$

from which Gaillard and Lee (1974) could extract an estimate for the charm-quark mass of  $m_c \sim 1.5$  GeV by comparison with data. It was one of the great triumphs in particle physics when a few months later narrow resonances with masses of about 3 GeV were discovered which were identified as bound state of c and  $\bar{c}$ . This discovery completed the second particle family and introduced a  $2 \times 2$  quark mixing matrix into the phenomenology of

 Added an example for ,,the GIM mechanism at work" in the Kaon system

### Added an illustration of the Sacharov conditions

In order to illustrate the first two Saharov conditions, we employ a very simplistic example. Assume that in the early universe existed a particle X that can decay to only two final states  $|f_1\rangle$  and  $|f_2\rangle$ . These two state have the baryon numbers  $N_B^{(1)}$  and  $N_B^{(2)}$ , and the decay rates are

 $\Gamma(X \to f_1) = \Gamma_0 r \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma(X \to f_2) = \Gamma_0(1-r), \quad (4)$ 

where  $\Gamma_0$  is the total width of X Of course, there is also the CP conjugate situation in which the particle  $\overline{X}$  decays to the state  $\overline{f_1}$  with the baryon number  $-N_B^{(1)}$  and  $\overline{f_2}$  with the baryon number  $-N_B^{(2)}$ . The rates are

 $\Gamma(\overline{X} \to \overline{f}_1) = \Gamma_0 \overline{r} \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma(\overline{X} \to \overline{f}_2) = \Gamma_0(1 - \overline{r}) \quad (5)$ 

where  $\Gamma_0$  is the same as for X due to CP invariance. The overall change  $\Delta N_b$  in baryon number induced by the decay of an equal number of X and  $\overline{X}$  particles is

$$\Delta N_B = r N_B^{(1)} + (1 - r) N_B^{(2)} - \bar{r} N_B^{(1)} - (1 - \bar{r}) N_B^{(2)}$$
$$= (r - \bar{r}) \left( N_B^{(1)} - N_B^{(2)} \right)$$
(6)

Thus  $\Delta N_B$  non-zero means that we have to have CP violation  $(r \neq \bar{r})$  and a violation of baryon number  $(N_B^{(1)} \neq N_B^{(2)})$ , illustrating the first two conditions.

#### 13.3 CP Violation in a lagrangian field theory

The standard model is formulated as a quantum field theory based on a Lagrangian derived from symmetry principles. To this end, the (hermitean) Lagrangian of the SM is given in terms of scalar operators  $\mathcal{O}_i$  with couplings  $a_i$ 

$$\mathcal{L}(x) = \sum_{i} \left( a_i \mathcal{O}_i(x) + a_i^* \mathcal{O}_i^{\dagger}(x) \right) , \qquad (7)$$

where the  $\mathcal{O}_i$  are composed of the SM quark, lepton and gauge fields. It is straightforward to verify that CP conservation implies that all couplings  $a_i$  can be made real by suitable phase redefinitions of the fields composing the  $\mathcal{O}_i$ . In turn, CP is violated in a lagrangian field theory, if there is no choice of phases that renders all  $a_i$  real.

In the SM there are in principle two sources of CP violation. The so-called "strong CP violation" originates from special features of the QCD vacuum, resulting in a contribution of the form

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{strong CP}} = \theta \, \frac{\alpha_s}{8\pi} G^{\mu\nu,a} \tilde{G}^a_{\mu\nu} \tag{8}$$

where  $G_{\mu\nu}$  ( $\tilde{G}_{\mu\nu}$ ) is the (dual) field strength of the gluon field. This term is P and CP violating due to its pseu-

# Added a section on the basics of CP violation

 Added a section on CP Phenomenology, explaining the various kinds of CPV and introducing some basic notions

#### 13.6 CP violation phenomenology

Since CP violation is due to irreducible phases of coupling constants, it becomes observable through interference effects. The simplest example is an amplitude consisting of two distinct contributiuons

$$A(B \to f) = \lambda_1 \langle f | O_1 | B \rangle + \lambda_2 \langle f | O_2 | B \rangle$$
 (26)<sup>235</sup>

where  $\lambda_{1/2}$  are (complex) coupling constants (in our case combinations of CKM matrix elements) and  $\langle f|O_{1/2}|B\rangle$ are matrix elements of interaction operators between initial and final state.

The CP image is the process  $\overline{fB} \to \overline{f}$  yielding

$$A(\overline{B} \to \overline{f}) = \lambda_1^* \langle \overline{f} | O_1^{\dagger} | \overline{B} \rangle + \lambda_2^* \langle \overline{f} | O_2^{\dagger} | \overline{B} \rangle$$
(27)

The matrix elements of  $\mathcal{O}_{1/2}^{(\dagger)}$  involve only strong interactions which we assume to be CP invariant. Hence we have  $\langle \overline{f}|O_1^{\dagger}|\overline{B}\rangle = \langle f|O_1|B\rangle$  and  $\langle \overline{f}|O_2^{\dagger}|\overline{B}\rangle = \langle f|O_2|B\rangle$  (28)

Thus the CP Asymmetry becomes

$$\mathcal{A}_{\rm CP}(B \to f) = \frac{\Gamma(B \to f) - \Gamma(\overline{B} \to \overline{f})}{\Gamma(B \to f) + \Gamma(\overline{B} \to \overline{f})}$$
(29)  
$$\propto 2 \operatorname{Im}[\lambda_1 \lambda_2^*] \operatorname{Im}[\langle f | O_1 | B \rangle \langle f | O_2 | B \rangle^*]$$

230

# Remaining To Do's

- Few minor comment still need to be included
- References need to be checked and validated
- Interplay with Chapter 7 (Mixing and Time Dependence) needs to be checked
- Fix a few TeXnicalities.