## **Discussion session: CP violation in the B System**

1) CPV in B mixing

$$\begin{split} a_{\mathrm{fs}}^s &= \frac{\Gamma\left(\bar{B}_s^0(t) \to f\right) - \Gamma\left(B_s^0(t) \to \bar{f}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\bar{B}_s^0(t) \to f\right) + \Gamma\left(B_s^0(t) \to \bar{f}\right)} \equiv a_{\mathrm{sl}}^s \; . \\ &= \Im\left(\frac{\Gamma_{12}^s}{M_{12}^s}\right) = \left|\frac{\Gamma_{12}^s}{M_{12}^s}\right| \sin \phi_{12}^s \; . \\ \end{split}$$
with  $\phi_{12}^s \coloneqq \arg\left(-\frac{M_{12}^s}{\Gamma_{12}^s}\right) = \pi + \phi_M - \phi_{\Gamma}. \end{split}$ 

Is there an indirect bound on the semi-leptonic CP asymmetry a\_sl^s, that is considerably stronger than the direct experimental bound? This was claimed by Fleischer, Vos in 1606.06042v1 and to a lesser extent in v2

$$a_{sl}^{s} = \begin{cases} (2.22 \pm 0.27) \cdot 10^{-5} & \text{SM} \\ (170 \pm 300) \cdot 10^{-5} & \text{Exp} \\ (14 \pm 18) \cdot 10^{-5} & 1606.06042 \text{v1} \\ (4 \pm 75) \cdot 10^{-5} & 1606.06042 \text{v2} \end{cases}$$

FV consider only the cc contribution. Possible failures:

- Bs to J/Psi Phi, Ds+ Ds-,... do not saturate Delta Gamma s.
- uc and uu are missing, this is important for a\_sl^s!
- Are there any experimental bounds on Bs to invisible, which might contribute to Delta Gamma\_s? Similar to Bs to tau tau.

## 2) CPV in interference

$$\mathcal{A}_{\rm CP}^{\rm mix} = -\frac{2|\lambda_f|}{1+|\lambda_f|^2} \sin\left[\arg(\lambda_f)\right] = +\frac{2|\lambda_f|}{1+|\lambda_f|^2} \sin\left[\phi_s\right] , \tag{143}$$
$$\mathcal{A}_{\Delta\Gamma} = -\frac{2|\lambda_f|}{1+|\lambda_f|^2} \cos\left[\arg(\lambda_f)\right] = -\frac{2|\lambda_f|}{1+|\lambda_f|^2} \cos\left[\phi_s\right] , \tag{144}$$

With

$$\mathcal{A}_f = \langle f | \mathcal{H}_{eff} | B_s^0 \rangle , \qquad \bar{\mathcal{A}}_f = \langle f | \mathcal{H}_{eff} | \bar{B}_s^0 \rangle .$$
  
 $\lambda_f = \frac{q}{p} \frac{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_f}{\mathcal{A}_f}$ 

In the case of only one CKM structure

$$\begin{split} A_{CP,f}(t) &\approx \frac{\sin \phi_s \sin(\Delta M_s t)}{\cos \phi_s \sinh(\frac{\Delta \Gamma_s t}{2}) - \cosh(\frac{\Delta \Gamma_s t}{2})} \ . \end{split}$$
$$\phi_s &= -2\beta_s \ , \\\beta_s &= -\arg \left[ -\frac{V_{ts}^* V_{tb}}{V_{cs}^* V_{cb}} \right] \\ &= 0.0183 \pm 0.0010 = (1.05 \pm 0.05)^\circ \end{split}$$

Be aware of any assumptions, that might not be justified anymore due to the high experimental precisions. Penguin pollution?

## 3) direct CPV

$$A_{\text{dir.CP},f}(t) = \frac{\Gamma\left(\bar{B}_s^0(t) \to \bar{f}\right) - \Gamma\left(B_s^0(t) \to f\right)}{\Gamma\left(\bar{B}_s^0(t) \to \bar{f}\right) + \Gamma\left(B_s^0(t) \to f\right)},$$

Status of the B to K pi puzzle: Tobias Huber, Christoph Bobeth, Martin Beneke

- Rough pattern of size of CP violating effects reproduced by QCD factorisation.
- Create combinations, where unknown 1/mb corrections might cancel to a large extent: delta, Delta
- But B to K pi puzzle still present, despite NNLO-QCD corrections

Not discussed:

- multi-body decays are discussed on Thursday
- CPasym in all kinds of "b to Xgamma" afternoon talk

Comments added by B. Golob: Few experimental questions were raised during the discussion: - are there results on  $B_{(s)}$  -> invisible decays? There are few, the ones from Belle (that I'm aware of) are a)  $B^+ -> e^+ (\mu^+) X^0$ ,  $X^0$  is invisible; arXiv:1605.04430 by Belle; UL on the Br depends on the mass of  $X^0$ , typically below (3-4)x10<sup>-6</sup> for  $M_{X0} < 1.4 \text{ GeV/c}^2$ . b) B -> invisible, arXiv:1206.5948 by Belle; UL on Br(B -> invisible) is  $1.3x10^{-4}$  @ 90% C.L. c) there's an ongoing study on  $D^0$  -> invisible, expected UL on Br is in the range  $10^{-4}$ .

- what is the situation with Belle new result on  $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0$ ? The preliminary results has been shown long ago (CKM 2014); it was realized that the selection of events needs to be revised and the central value will change to some extent. The final result is close to publication.

- comment received: in various modes where TCPV is measured it would be appreciated by the theory community if individual S and C terms are quoted for each mode individually; moreover, even if there are strong indications that for example C=0 in particular mode it would be appreciated if fits with C as a free parameter are also performed.