

Waiting for Precise Measurements of β and γ

Andrzej J. Buras

TUM Institute for Advanced Study, Lichtenbergstr. 2a, D-85748 Garching, Germany

Physik Department, TUM School of Natural Sciences, TU München,
James-Franck-Straße, D-85748 Garching, Germany

Abstract

During the last three decades the determination of the Unitarity Triangle (UT) was dominated by the measurements of its sides R_b and R_t through tree-level B decays and the $\Delta M_d/\Delta M_s$ ratio, respectively, with some participation of the measurements of the angle β through the mixing induced CP-asymmetries like $S_{\psi K_S}$ and ε_K . However, as pointed out already in 2002 by Fabrizio Parodi, Achille Stocchi and the present author, the most efficient strategy for a precise determination of the apex of the UT, that is $(\bar{\varrho}, \bar{\eta})$, is to use the measurements of the angles β and γ . The second best strategy would be the measurements of R_b and γ . However, in view of the tensions between different determinations of $|V_{ub}|$ and $|V_{cb}|$, that enter R_b , the (β, γ) strategy should be a clear winner once LHCb and Belle II will improve the measurements of these two angles. In this note we recall our finding of 2002 which should be finally realized in this decade through precise measurements of both angles by these collaborations. In this context we present two very simple formulae for $\bar{\varrho}$ and $\bar{\eta}$ in terms of β and γ which could be derived by high-school students, but to my knowledge never appeared in the literature on the UT, not even in our 2002 paper. We also emphasize the importance of precise measurements of both angles that would allow to perform powerful tests of the SM through numerous $|V_{cb}|$ -independent correlations between K and B decay branching ratios $R_i(\beta, \gamma)$ recently derived by Elena Venturini and the present author. The simple findings presented here will appear in a subsection of a much longer contribution to the proceedings of KM50 later this year. I exhibited them here so that they are not lost in the latter.

1 Introduction

This year we celebrate the 60th anniversary of the Cabibbo angle [1] and the 50th anniversary of the Kobayashi-Maskawa paper [2] in which they predicted the existence of the third generation of quarks, required for the explanation of the observed CP-violation within the Standard Model (SM). In this seminal paper they also presented a parametrization of a unitary 3×3 matrix that guaranteed the absence of FCNC processes at the tree-level in the SM through Glashow, Iliopoulos and Maiani (GIM) mechanism [3]. There are different parametrizations of this matrix, in particular the standard parametrization of the CKM matrix of Chau and Keung [4], the approximate Wolfenstein parametrization [5] and much more precise Wolfenstein-like parametrization introduced in Munich in 1994 [6] in which in particular the apex of the unitarity triangle (UT) in Fig. 1 is described by $(\bar{\varrho}, \bar{\eta})$. The latter parametrization dominates present CKM phenomenology.

All these parametrizations involve three real parameters and one complex phase. In particular in 1986 Harari and Leurer [7] recommended the standard parametrization because of the relations¹

$$s_{12} = |V_{us}|, \quad s_{13} = |V_{ub}|, \quad s_{23} = |V_{cb}|, \quad \gamma, \quad (1)$$

that allows the determination of these four parameters separately in tree-level decays. Consequently, basically all flavour phenomenology in the last three decades used such sets of parameters. In particular the determination of the UT was dominated by the measurements of its sides R_b and R_t through tree-level B decays and the $\Delta M_d/\Delta M_s$ ratio, respectively, with some participation of the measurements of the angle β through the mixing induced CP-asymmetries like $S_{\psi K_S}$, the parameter ε_K and much less precise angle γ . This is the case not only of global analyses by UTfitter [8], CKMfitter [9] and PDG [10] but also of less sophisticated determinations of the CKM matrix and of the UT.

However, as pointed out in [11–14], the most powerful strategy appears eventually to be the one which uses as basic CKM parameters

$$|V_{us}| = \lambda, \quad |V_{cb}|, \quad \beta, \quad \gamma, \quad (2)$$

that is two mixing angles and two phases with β replacing $|V_{ub}|$ in (1). In my view this choice is superior to the one in (1) for several reasons:

- The known tensions between exclusive and inclusive determinations of $|V_{cb}|$ and $|V_{ub}|$ [15,16] are represented only by $|V_{cb}|$ which can be eliminated efficiently by constructing suitable ratios of flavour observables $R_i(\beta, \gamma)$ which are free of the tensions in question. These ratios are often independent of these two phases or dependent only on one of them [12–14]. See Table 4 in [13].
- As pointed out already in 2002 [17], the most efficient strategy for a precise determination of the apex of the UT, that is $(\bar{\varrho}, \bar{\eta})$, is to use the measurements of the angles β and γ . Indeed, among any pairs of two variables representing the sides and the angles of the UT that are assumed for this exercise to be known with the same precision, the measurement of (β, γ) results in the most accurate values of $(\bar{\varrho}, \bar{\eta})$. The second best strategy would be the measurements of R_b and γ . However, in view of the tensions between different determinations of $|V_{ub}|$ and $|V_{cb}|$, that enter R_b , the (β, γ)

¹ $c_{13} = 1$ to an excellent accuracy.

strategy will be a clear winner once LHCb and Belle II collaborations will improve the measurements of these two angles.

- The $|V_{cb}| - \gamma$ plots for fixed β proposed in [12, 13] are, as emphasized in [18], useful companions to common UT fits because they exhibit better possible inconsistencies between $|V_{cb}|$ and (β, γ) determinations than the latter fits.

In this note we would like to emphasize the importance of the (β, γ) strategy and present new formulae for $\bar{\varrho}$ and $\bar{\eta}$ in terms of these two UT parameters that are accompanied by a simple numerics. Finally we recall briefly the prospects for precise measurements of β and γ in the near future.

2 New Formulae for $\bar{\varrho}$ and $\bar{\eta}$

We begin with two simple formulae that are central in the (β, γ) strategy but to my knowledge have not been presented in the literature before, not even in our 2002 paper [17]. They read

$$\boxed{\bar{\varrho} = \frac{\sin \beta \cos \gamma}{\sin(\beta + \gamma)}, \quad \bar{\eta} = \frac{\sin \beta \sin \gamma}{\sin(\beta + \gamma)}} \quad (3)$$

so that $(\bar{\varrho}, \bar{\eta})$ can be found in no time once β and γ are known. They follow simply from

$$\bar{\varrho} = R_b \cos \gamma, \quad \bar{\eta} = R_b \sin \gamma, \quad R_b = \frac{\sin \beta}{\sin(\beta + \gamma)} \quad (4)$$


with the first two relations representing (R_b, γ) strategy [17]. Evidently these formulae can be derived by high-school students², but the UT is unknown to them and somehow to my knowledge no flavour physicist got the idea to present them in print so far.

While precise measurements of β and γ are important for the determination of the UT, they will also be very important for the tests of strategies developed in [12–14]. Indeed as demonstrated recently in these papers for K decays and in the case of B decays already in 2003 [19] one can construct a multitude of $|V_{cb}|$ -independent ratios $R_i(\beta, \gamma)$ not only of decay branching ratios to quark mixing observables but also of branching ratios themselves. Those which involve branching ratios from different meson systems depend generally on β and γ . Once β and γ will be precisely measured, this multitude of the ratios $R_i(\beta, \gamma)$ will provide very good tests of the SM independently of the uncertain values of $|V_{cb}|$ and $|V_{ub}|$ from tree-level decays. Judging from the development in the last ten years, it could still take some time before they are reduced to a satisfactory level.

The explicit expressions for $R_i(\beta, \gamma)$ can be found in in [12–14] together with plots for them as functions of β and γ . Moreover, determining CKM parameters from $\Delta F = 2$ process only, thereby avoiding the $|V_{cb}|$ tensions, all ratios $R_i(\beta, \gamma)$ can be predicted in the SM rather precisely already today. We quote here only [14]

$$\boxed{\frac{\mathcal{B}(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu})}{[\mathcal{B}(B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)]^{1.4}} = 53.69 \pm 2.75,} \quad (5)$$

²In fact I recall that I had to solve such a triangle problem in 1962.

Figure 1: *The Unitarity Triangle.*

$$\frac{\mathcal{B}(K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu})}{[\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu \bar{\nu})]^{1.4}} = (1.90 \pm 0.13) \times 10^{-3} \quad (6)$$

that could be of particular interest when the measurements of $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$, $B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ and $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ will be improved by NA62, CMS, LHCb and ATLAS at CERN and Belle II experiment at KEK. Results for 26 K and B decay branching ratios using this strategy are listed in [12, 14].

The corresponding CKM parameters are found to be [12]

$$|V_{cb}| = 42.6(4) \times 10^{-3}, \quad \gamma = 64.6(16)^\circ, \quad \beta = 22.2(7)^\circ, \quad (7)$$

and consequently

$$\bar{\varrho} = 0.164(12), \quad \bar{\eta} = 0.341(11). \quad (8)$$

In Tables 1 and 2 we show $\bar{\varrho}$ and $\bar{\eta}$ as functions on γ for different values of β in the expected ranges for the latter parameters. The present experimental determinations of β and γ read

$$\beta = (22.2 \pm 0.7)^\circ, \quad \gamma = (63.8_{-3.7}^{+3.5})^\circ, \quad (9)$$

with the first one used in (8). Here the value for γ is the most recent one from the LHCb which updates the one in [20] $(65.4_{-4.2}^{+3.8})^\circ$. It is not as precise as the one in (7) but fully consistent with it. In the coming years LHCb and Belle II should reduce the error in γ in the ballpark of 1° and also the error on β will be reduced. In fact for the strategies of [12–14] the reduction of the error on β is even more important than the one on γ because β is an input but γ an output.

It is interesting to compare these tables with the most recent “angle-only fit” of UTfitter [21]

$$\bar{\varrho} = 0.156(17), \quad \bar{\eta} = 0.341(12). \quad (10)$$

The significant error on $\bar{\varrho}$ will be reduced by much with the improved measurement of γ . Let us then anticipate a future measurements with

$$\gamma = 64.0(10)^\circ, \quad \beta = 22.2(4)^\circ, \quad (2026). \quad (11)$$

Using (3) and adding the errors in quadrature we find

$$\bar{\varrho} = 0.166(7), \quad \bar{\eta} = 0.340(6), \quad (2026). \quad (12)$$

Once the tensions in the determination of $|V_{cb}|$ and $|V_{ub}|$ will be resolved the full fit will of course result in even more precise values.

γ/β	21.6°	21.8°	22.0°	22.2°	22.4°	22.6°	22.8°	23.0°
60°	0.186	0.188	0.189	0.191	0.192	0.194	0.195	0.197
61°	0.180	0.181	0.183	0.184	0.186	0.187	0.189	0.190
62°	0.174	0.175	0.177	0.178	0.180	0.181	0.183	0.184
63°	0.168	0.169	0.171	0.172	0.174	0.175	0.176	0.178
64°	0.162	0.163	0.165	0.166	0.167	0.169	0.170	0.172
65°	0.156	0.157	0.159	0.160	0.161	0.163	0.164	0.165
66°	0.150	0.151	0.152	0.154	0.155	0.156	0.158	0.159
67°	0.144	0.145	0.146	0.148	0.149	0.150	0.151	0.153
68°	0.138	0.139	0.140	0.142	0.143	0.144	0.145	0.146

Table 1: Values of $\bar{\rho}$ for different values of β and γ .

γ/β	21.6°	21.8°	22.0°	22.2°	22.4°	22.6°	22.8°	23.0°
60°	0.322	0.325	0.328	0.330	0.333	0.336	0.338	0.340
61°	0.325	0.327	0.330	0.333	0.336	0.338	0.341	0.344
62°	0.327	0.330	0.333	0.335	0.338	0.341	0.344	0.346
63°	0.329	0.332	0.335	0.338	0.341	0.343	0.346	0.349
64°	0.332	0.335	0.338	0.340	0.343	0.346	0.349	0.352
65°	0.334	0.337	0.340	0.343	0.346	0.349	0.351	0.354
66°	0.337	0.340	0.342	0.345	0.348	0.351	0.354	0.357
67°	0.339	0.342	0.345	0.348	0.351	0.354	0.357	0.360
68°	0.341	0.344	0.347	0.350	0.353	0.356	0.359	0.362

Table 2: Values of $\bar{\eta}$ for different values of β and γ .

3 Outlook

During this decade significant progress in the measurements of β and in particular of γ is expected. A measurement of γ with an accuracy of 1° should be possible. Various strategies for achieving this goal, in particular using $B \rightarrow DK$ decays, are reviewed in the Belle II book [22], in chapter 8 of my book [23] and in particular in the classic paper by Robert Fleischer [24]. According to the analysis in [25] the ultimate theoretical error in the determination of γ should be far below experimental sensitivity in the near future. See also [26, 27]. As far as β is concerned see detailed discussion in the Belle II book [22]. The reduction of the error down to the one anticipated in (11) should be possible, although here some NP infection could be present. The rapid tests proposed in [12–14] can help in clarifying it.

Acknowledgements I would like to thank Mohamed Zied Jaber for checking Tables 1 and 2. Financial support from the Excellence Cluster ORIGINS, funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation), Excellence Strategy, EXC-2094, 390783311 is acknowledged.

References

- [1] N. Cabibbo, *Unitary Symmetry and Leptonic Decays*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **10** (1963) 531–533. [648(1963)].
- [2] M. Kobayashi and T. Maskawa, *CP Violation in the Renormalizable Theory of Weak Interaction*, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **49** (1973) 652–657.
- [3] S. L. Glashow, J. Iliopoulos, and L. Maiani, *Weak Interactions with Lepton-Hadron Symmetry*, *Phys. Rev.* **D2** (1970) 1285–1292.
- [4] L.-L. Chau and W.-Y. Keung, *Comments on the Parametrization of the Kobayashi-Maskawa Matrix*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **53** (1984) 1802.
- [5] L. Wolfenstein, *Parametrization of the Kobayashi-Maskawa Matrix*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **51** (1983) 1945.
- [6] A. J. Buras, M. E. Lautenbacher, and G. Ostermaier, *Waiting for the top quark mass, $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$, $B_s^0 - \bar{B}_s^0$ mixing and CP asymmetries in B decays*, *Phys. Rev.* **D50** (1994) 3433–3446, [hep-ph/9403384].
- [7] H. Harari and M. Leurer, *Recommending a Standard Choice of Cabibbo Angles and KM Phases for Any Number of Generations*, *Phys. Lett. B* **181** (1986) 123–128.
- [8] **UTfit** Collaboration, M. Bona et al., *Model-independent constraints on $\Delta F=2$ operators and the scale of new physics*, *JHEP* **0803** (2008) 049, [arXiv:0707.0636].
- [9] **CKMfitter Group** Collaboration, J. Charles et al., *CP violation and the CKM matrix: Assessing the impact of the asymmetric B factories*, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C41** (2005) 1–131, [hep-ph/0406184].
- [10] **Particle Data Group** Collaboration, R. L. Workman, *Review of Particle Physics*, *PTEP* **2022** (2022) 083C01.
- [11] M. Blanke and A. J. Buras, *Emerging ΔM_d -anomaly from tree-level determinations of $|V_{cb}|$ and the angle γ* , *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79** (2019), no. 2 159, [arXiv:1812.06963].
- [12] A. J. Buras and E. Venturini, *The exclusive vision of rare K and B decays and of the quark mixing in the standard model*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82** (2022), no. 7 615, [arXiv:2203.11960].
- [13] A. J. Buras and E. Venturini, *Searching for New Physics in Rare K and B Decays without $|V_{cb}|$ and $|V_{ub}|$ Uncertainties*, *Acta Phys. Polon. B* **53** (9, 2021) A1, [arXiv:2109.11032].
- [14] A. J. Buras, *Standard Model predictions for rare K and B decays without new physics infection*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83** (2023), no. 1 66, [arXiv:2209.03968].
- [15] M. Bordone, B. Capdevila, and P. Gambino, *Three loop calculations and inclusive $|V_{cb}|$* , *Phys. Lett. B* **822** (2021) 136679, [arXiv:2107.00604].
- [16] **Flavour Lattice Averaging Group (FLAG)** Collaboration, Y. Aoki et al., *FLAG Review 2021*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82** (2022), no. 10 869, [arXiv:2111.09849].
- [17] A. J. Buras, F. Parodi, and A. Stocchi, *The CKM matrix and the unitarity triangle: Another look*, *JHEP* **0301** (2003) 029, [hep-ph/0207101].
- [18] A. J. Buras, *On the superiority of the $|V_{cb}| - \gamma$ plots over the unitarity triangle plots in the 2020s*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82** (2022), no. 7 612, [arXiv:2204.10337].

-
- [19] A. J. Buras, *Relations between $\Delta M_{s,d}$ and $B_{s,d} \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ in models with minimal flavour violation*, *Phys. Lett.* **B566** (2003) 115–119, [[hep-ph/0303060](#)].
- [20] **LHCb** Collaboration, R. Aaij et al., *Simultaneous determination of CKM angle γ and charm mixing parameters*, *JHEP* **12** (2021) 141, [[arXiv:2110.02350](#)].
- [21] **UTfit** Collaboration, M. Bona et al., *New UTfit Analysis of the Unitarity Triangle in the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa scheme*, [arXiv:2212.03894](#).
- [22] **Belle-II** Collaboration, W. Altmannshofer et al., *The Belle II Physics Book*, *PTEP* **2019** (2019), no. 12 123C01, [[arXiv:1808.10567](#)]. [Erratum: *PTEP* 2020, 029201 (2020)].
- [23] A. J. Buras, *Gauge Theory of Weak Decays*. Cambridge University Press, 6, 2020.
- [24] R. Fleischer, *New strategies to extract β and γ from $B_d \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-$ and $B_s \rightarrow K^+ K^-$* , *Phys. Lett.* **B459** (1999) 306–320, [[hep-ph/9903456](#)].
- [25] J. Brod and J. Zupan, *The ultimate theoretical error on γ from $B \rightarrow DK$ decays*, *JHEP* **1401** (2014) 051, [[arXiv:1308.5663](#)].
- [26] N. Rout, *Measurement of CKM angle ϕ_3 at Belle II*, [arXiv:1906.11792](#).
- [27] K. De Bruyn, R. Fleischer, E. Malami, and P. van Vliet, *New physics in B_q^0 mixing: present challenges, prospects, and implications for*, *J. Phys. G* **50** (2023), no. 4 045003, [[arXiv:2208.14910](#)].