B^0–$\overline{B}^0$ MIXING

Written March 2000 and revised March 2002 by O. Schneider (University of Lausanne).

Formalism in quantum mechanics

There are two neutral B^0–$\overline{B}^0$ meson systems, B_d^0–$\overline{B}_d^0$ and B_s^0–$\overline{B}_s^0$ (generically denoted B_q^0–$\overline{B}_q^0$, $q = s, d$), which exhibit the phenomenon of particle-antiparticle mixing [1]. Such a system is produced in one of its two possible states of well-defined flavor: $|B^0\rangle$ ($\bar{b}q$) or $|\overline{B}^0\rangle$ ($b\bar{q}$). Due to flavor-changing interactions, this initial state evolves into a time-dependent quantum superposition of the two flavor states, $a(t)|B^0\rangle + b(t)|\overline{B}^0\rangle$, satisfying the equation

$$i\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\begin{pmatrix} a(t) \\ b(t) \end{pmatrix} = \left(\mathbf{M} - \tfrac{i}{2}\mathbf{\Gamma}\right)\begin{pmatrix} a(t) \\ b(t) \end{pmatrix}, \qquad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{M}$ and $\mathbf{\Gamma}$, known as the mass and decay matrices, describe the dispersive and absorptive parts of B^0–$\overline{B}^0$ mixing. These matrices are hermitian, and CPT invariance requires $M_{11} = M_{22} \equiv M$ and $\Gamma_{11} = \Gamma_{22} \equiv \Gamma$

The two eigenstates of the effective Hamiltonian matrix $(\mathbf{M} - \tfrac{i}{2}\mathbf{\Gamma})$ are given by

$$|B_\pm\rangle = p|B^0\rangle \pm q|\overline{B}^0\rangle, \qquad (2)$$

and correspond to the eigenvalues

$$\lambda_\pm = \left(M - \tfrac{i}{2}\Gamma\right) \pm \frac{q}{p}\left(M_{12} - \tfrac{i}{2}\Gamma_{12}\right), \qquad (3)$$

where

$$\frac{q}{p} = \sqrt{\frac{M_{12}^* - \tfrac{i}{2}\Gamma_{12}^*}{M_{12} - \tfrac{i}{2}\Gamma_{12}}}. \qquad (4)$$

We choose a convention where $\mathrm{Re}(q/p) > 0$ and $CP|B^0\rangle = |\overline{B}^0\rangle$.

An alternative notation is

$$|B_\pm\rangle = \frac{(1+\epsilon)|B^0\rangle \pm (1-\epsilon)|\overline{B}^0\rangle}{\sqrt{2(1+|\epsilon|^2)}} \quad \text{with} \quad \frac{1-\epsilon}{1+\epsilon} = \frac{q}{p}. \quad (5)$$

The time dependence of these eigenstates of well-defined masses $M_\pm = \mathrm{Re}(\lambda_\pm)$ and decay widths $\Gamma_\pm = -2\,\mathrm{Im}(\lambda_\pm)$ is

given by the phases $e^{-i\lambda_\pm t} = e^{-iM_\pm t} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\Gamma_\pm t}$: the evolution of a pure $|B^0\rangle$ or $|\overline{B}^0\rangle$ state at $t = 0$ is thus given by

$$|B^0(t)\rangle = g_+(t)\,|B^0\rangle + \frac{q}{p}\,g_-(t)\,|\overline{B}^0\rangle\,, \tag{6}$$

$$|\overline{B}^0(t)\rangle = g_+(t)\,|\overline{B}^0\rangle + \frac{p}{q}g_-(t)\,|B^0\rangle\,, \tag{7}$$

where

$$g_\pm(t) = \frac{1}{2}\left(e^{-i\lambda_+ t} \pm e^{-i\lambda_- t}\right)\,. \tag{8}$$

This means that the flavor states remain unchanged $(+)$ or oscillate into each other $(-)$ with time-dependent probabilities proportional to

$$|g_\pm(t)|^2 = \frac{e^{-\Gamma t}}{2}\left[\cosh\left(\frac{\Delta\Gamma}{2}\,t\right) \pm \cos(\Delta m\,t)\right]\,, \tag{9}$$

where

$$\Delta m = |M_+ - M_-|\,, \qquad \Delta\Gamma = |\Gamma_+ - \Gamma_-|\,. \tag{10}$$

Time-integrated mixing probabilities are only well defined when considering decays to flavor-specific final states, *i.e.* final states f such that the instantaneous decay amplitudes $A_{\overline{f}} = \langle\overline{f}|H|B^0\rangle$ and $\overline{A}_f = \langle f|H|\overline{B}^0\rangle$, where H is the weak interaction Hamiltonian, are both zero. Due to mixing, a produced B^0 can decay to the final state $\overline{f}$ (mixed event) in addition to the final state f (unmixed event). Restricting the sample to these two decay channels, the time-integrated mixing probability is given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
\chi_f^{B^0 \to \overline{B}^0} &= \frac{\int_0^\infty |\langle\overline{f}|H|B^0(t)\rangle|^2 dt}{\int_0^\infty |\langle\overline{f}|H|B^0(t)\rangle|^2 dt + \int_0^\infty |\langle f|H|B^0(t)\rangle|^2 dt} \\
&= \frac{|\xi_f|^2(x^2 + y^2)}{|\xi_f|^2(x^2 + y^2) + 2 + x^2 - y^2}\,,
\end{aligned} \tag{11}
$$

where we have defined $\xi_f = \dfrac{q}{p}\dfrac{\overline{A}_{\overline{f}}}{A_f}$ and

$$x = \frac{\Delta m}{\Gamma}\,, \qquad y = \frac{\Delta\Gamma}{2\Gamma}\,. \tag{12}$$

The mixing probability $\chi_f^{\overline{B}^0 \to B^0}$ for the case of a produced $\overline{B}^0$ is obtained by replacing ξ_f with $1/\xi_f$ in Eq. (11). It

is different from $\chi_f^{B^0 \to \overline{B}^0}$ if $|\xi_f|^2 \neq 1$, a condition reflecting non-invariance under the CP transformation. CP violation in decay amplitudes is discussed elsewhere [2] and we assume $|\overline{A}_{\overline{f}}| = |A_f|$ from now on. The deviation of $|q/p|^2$ from 1, namely the quantity

$$1 - \left|\frac{q}{p}\right|^2 = \frac{4\,\mathrm{Re}(\epsilon)}{1 + |\epsilon|^2} + \mathcal{O}\left(\left(\frac{\mathrm{Re}(\epsilon)}{1 + |\epsilon|^2}\right)^2\right), \qquad (13)$$

describes CP violation in B^0–$\overline{B}^0$ mixing. As can be seen from Eq. (4), this can occur only if $M_{12} \neq 0$, $\Gamma_{12} \neq 0$ and if the phase difference between M_{12} and Γ_{12} is different from 0 or π.

In the absence of CP violation, $|q/p|^2 = 1$, $\mathrm{Re}(\epsilon) = 0$, the mass eigenstates are also CP eigenstates,

$$CP\,|B_\pm\rangle = \pm|B_\pm\rangle, \qquad (14)$$

the phases $\varphi_{M_{12}} = \arg(M_{12})$ and $\varphi_{\Gamma_{12}} = \arg(\Gamma_{12})$ satisfy

$$\sin(\varphi_{M_{12}} - \varphi_{\Gamma_{12}}) = 0, \qquad (15)$$

the mass and decay width differences reduce to

$$\Delta m = 2\,|M_{12}|, \qquad \Delta\Gamma = 2\,|\Gamma_{12}|, \qquad (16)$$

and the time-integrated mixing probabilities $\chi_f^{B^0 \to \overline{B}^0}$ and $\chi_f^{\overline{B}^0 \to B^0}$ become both equal to

$$\chi = \frac{x^2 + y^2}{2(x^2 + 1)}. \qquad (17)$$

Standard Model predictions and phenomenology

In the Standard Model, the transitions $B_q^0 \to \overline{B}_q^0$ and $\overline{B}_q^0 \to B_q^0$ are due to the weak interaction. They are described, at the lowest order, by box diagrams involving two W bosons and two up-type quarks (see Fig. 1), as is the case for K^0–$\overline{K}^0$ mixing. However, the long range interactions arising from intermediate virtual states are negligible for the neutral B meson systems, because the large B mass is off the region of hadronic resonances. The calculation of the dispersive and absorptive parts of the box diagrams yields the following predictions for the off-diagonal element of the mass and decay matrices [3],

Figure 1: Dominant box diagrams for the $B_q^0 \to \overline{B}_q^0$ transitions ($q = d$ or s). Similar diagrams exist where one or both t quarks are replaced with c or u quarks.

$$M_{12} = -\frac{G_F^2 m_W^2 \eta_B m_{B_q} B_{B_q} f_{B_q}^2}{12\pi^2} S_0(m_t^2/m_W^2) \left(V_{tq}^* V_{tb}\right)^2 \qquad (18)$$

$$\Gamma_{12} = \frac{G_F^2 m_b^2 \eta_B' m_{B_q} B_{B_q} f_{B_q}^2}{8\pi}$$

$$\times \left[(V_{tq}^* V_{tb})^2 + V_{tq}^* V_{tb} V_{cq}^* V_{cb} \; \mathcal{O}\!\left(\frac{m_c^2}{m_b^2}\right) \right.$$

$$\left. + (V_{cq}^* V_{cb})^2 \; \mathcal{O}\!\left(\frac{m_c^4}{m_b^4}\right) \right] \qquad (19)$$

where G_F is the Fermi constant, m_W the W boson mass, m_i the mass of quark i, and $m_{B_q} = M$, f_{B_q} and B_{B_q} are the B_q^0 mass, weak decay constant and bag parameter, respectively. The known function $S_0(x_t)$ can be approximated very well with $0.784\, x_t^{0.76}$ [4] and V_{ij} are the elements of the CKM matrix [5]. The QCD corrections η_B and η_B' are of order unity. The only non negligible contributions to M_{12} are from box diagrams involving two top quarks. The phases of M_{12} and Γ_{12} satisfy

$$\varphi_{M_{12}} - \varphi_{\Gamma_{12}} = \pi + \mathcal{O}\!\left(\frac{m_c^2}{m_b^2}\right) \qquad (20)$$

implying that the mass eigenstates have mass and width differences of opposite signs. This means that, like in the K^0–$\overline{K}^0$ system, the "heavy" state with mass $M_{\text{heavy}} = \max(M_+, M_-)$ has a smaller decay width than that of the "light" state with mass $M_{\text{light}} = \min(M_+, M_-)$. We thus redefine

$$\Delta m = M_{\text{heavy}} - M_{\text{light}}, \qquad \Delta\Gamma = \Gamma_{\text{light}} - \Gamma_{\text{heavy}}, \qquad (21)$$

where Δm is positive by definition and $\Delta\Gamma$ is expected to be positive in the Standard Model.

Furthermore, the quantity

$$\left| \frac{\Gamma_{12}}{M_{12}} \right| \simeq \frac{3\pi}{2} \frac{m_b^2}{m_W^2} \frac{1}{S_0(m_t^2/m_W^2)} \sim \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{m_b^2}{m_t^2} \right) \qquad (22)$$

is small, and a power expansion of $|q/p|^2$ yields

$$\left| \frac{q}{p} \right|^2 = 1 + \left| \frac{\Gamma_{12}}{M_{12}} \right| \sin(\varphi_{M_{12}} - \varphi_{\Gamma_{12}}) + \mathcal{O}\left(\left| \frac{\Gamma_{12}}{M_{12}} \right|^2 \right) . \qquad (23)$$

Therefore, considering both Eqs. (20) and (22), the CP-violating parameter

$$1 - \left| \frac{q}{p} \right|^2 \simeq \mathrm{Im}\left(\frac{\Gamma_{12}}{M_{12}} \right) \qquad (24)$$

is expected to be very small: $\sim \mathcal{O}(10^{-3})$ for the B_d^0–$\overline{B}_d^0$ system and $\lesssim \mathcal{O}(10^{-4})$ for the B_s^0–$\overline{B}_s^0$ system [6].

In the approximation of negligible CP violation in mixing, the ratio $\Delta\Gamma/\Delta m$ is equal to the small quantity $|\Gamma_{12}/M_{12}|$ of Eq. (22); it is hence independent of CKM matrix elements, *i.e.* the same for the B_d^0–$\overline{B}_d^0$ and B_s^0–$\overline{B}_s^0$ systems. It can be calculated with lattice QCD techniques; typical results are $\sim 5 \times 10^{-3}$ with quoted uncertainties of $\sim 30\%$. Given the current experimental knowledge (discussed below) on the mixing parameter x,

$$\begin{cases} x_d = 0.755 \pm 0.015 & (B_d^0\text{–}\overline{B}_d^0 \text{ system}) \\ x_s > 19.0 \text{ at } 95\% \text{ CL} & (B_s^0\text{–}\overline{B}_s^0 \text{ system}) \end{cases} , \qquad (25)$$

the Standard Model thus predicts that $\Delta\Gamma/\Gamma$ is very small for the B_d^0–$\overline{B}_d^0$ system (below 1%), but considerably larger for the B_s^0–$\overline{B}_s^0$ system ($\sim 10\%$). This width difference is caused by the existence of final states to which both the B_q^0 and $\overline{B}_q^0$ mesons can decay. Such decays involve $b \rightarrow c\overline{c}q$ quark-level transitions, which are Cabibbo-suppressed if $q = d$ and Cabibbo-allowed if $q = s$. If the final states common to B_s^0 and $\overline{B}_s^0$ are predominantly CP-even as discussed in Ref. 7, then the B_s^0–$\overline{B}_s^0$ mass eigenstate with the largest decay width corresponds to the CP-even eigenstate. Taking Eq. (21) into account, one thus expects $\Gamma_{\mathrm{light}} = \Gamma_+$ and

$$\Delta m_s = M_- - M_+ > 0 , \qquad \Delta\Gamma_s = \Gamma_+ - \Gamma_- > 0 . \qquad (26)$$

Experimental issues and methods for oscillation analyses

Time-integrated measurements of B^0–$\overline{B}^0$ mixing were published for the first time in 1987 by UA1 [8] and ARGUS [9], and since then by many other experiments. These measurements are typically based on counting same-sign and opposite-sign lepton pairs from the semileptonic decay of the produced $b\bar{b}$ pairs. Such analyses cannot easily separate the contributions from the different b-hadron species, therefore the clean environment of $\Upsilon(4S)$ machines (where only B_d^0 and charged B_u mesons are produced) is in principle best suited to measure χ_d.

However, better sensitivity is obtained from time-dependent analyses aimed at the direct measurement of the oscillation frequencies Δm_d and Δm_s, from the proper time distributions of B_d^0 or B_s^0 candidates identified through their decay in (mostly) flavor-specific modes and suitably tagged as mixed or unmixed. (This is particularly true for the B_s^0–$\overline{B}_s^0$ system where the large value of x_s implies maximal mixing, *i.e.* $\chi_s \simeq 1/2$.) In such analyses the B_d^0 or B_s^0 mesons are either fully reconstructed, partially reconstructed from a charm meson, selected from a lepton with the characteristics of a $b \to \ell^-$ decay, or selected from a reconstructed displaced vertex. At high-energy colliders (LEP, SLC, Tevatron), the proper time $t = \dfrac{m_B}{p}L$ is measured from the distance L between the production vertex and the B decay vertex, and from an estimate of the B momentum p. At asymmetric B factories (KEKB, PEP-II), producing $e^+e^- \to \Upsilon(4S) \to B_d^0\overline{B}_d^0$ events with a boost $\beta\gamma$ (= 0.425, 0.55), the proper time difference between the two B candidates is estimated as $\Delta t \simeq \dfrac{\Delta z}{\beta\gamma c}$, where Δz is the spatial separation between the two B decay vertices along the boost direction. In all cases, the good resolution needed on the vertex positions is obtained with silicon detectors.

The statistical significance $\mathcal{S}$ of a B_d^0 or B_s^0 oscillation signal can be approximated as [10]

$$\mathcal{S} \approx \sqrt{N/2}\, f_{\text{sig}}\, (1 - 2\eta)\, e^{-(\Delta m\, \sigma_t)^2/2} , \qquad (27)$$

where N and f_{sig} are the number of candidates and the fraction of signal in the selected sample, η is the total mistag probability,

and σ_t is the resolution on proper time (or proper time difference). The quantity $\mathcal{S}$ decreases very quickly as Δm increases; this dependence is controlled by σ_t, which is therefore a critical parameter for Δm_s analyses. At high-energy colliders, the proper time resolution $\sigma_t \sim \dfrac{m_B}{\langle p \rangle} \sigma_L \oplus t \dfrac{\sigma_p}{p}$ includes a constant contribution due to the decay length resolution σ_L (typically 0.05–0.3 ps), and a term due to the relative momentum resolution σ_p/p (typically 10–20% for partially reconstructed decays) which increases with proper time. At B factories, the B momentum is reconstructed and/or estimated from the beam energy constraint, and the term due to the spatial resolution dominates (typically 1–1.5 ps because of the much smaller B boost).

In order to tag a B candidate as mixed or unmixed, it is necessary to determine its flavor both in the initial state and in the final state. The initial and final state mistag probabilities, η_i and η_f, degrade $\mathcal{S}$ by a total factor $(1-2\eta) = (1-2\eta_i)(1-2\eta_f)$. In lepton-based analyses, the final state is tagged by the charge of the lepton from $b \to \ell^-$ decays; the biggest contribution to η_f is then due to $\overline{b} \to \overline{c} \to \ell^-$ decays. Alternatively, the charge of a reconstructed charm meson (D^{*-} from B_d^0 or D_s^- from B_s^0), or that of a kaon thought to come from a $b \to c \to s$ decay [11], can be used. For fully inclusive analyses based on topological vertexing, final state tagging techniques include jet charge [12] and charge dipole [13,14] methods.

At high-energy colliders, the methods to tag the initial state (i.e. the state at production), can be divided in two groups: the ones that tag the initial charge of the $\overline{b}$ quark contained in the B candidate itself (same-side tag), and the ones that tag the initial charge of the other b quark produced in the event (opposite-side tag). On the same side, the charge of a track from the primary vertex is correlated with the production state of the B if that track is a decay product of a B^{**} state or the first particle in the fragmentation chain [15,16]. Jet- and vertex-charge techniques work on both sides and on the opposite side, respectively. Finally, the charge of a lepton from $b \to \ell^-$ or of a kaon from $b \to c \to s$ can be used as opposite side tags, keeping in mind that their performance is degraded due to integrated mixing. At SLC, the beam polarization produced

a sizeable forward-backward asymmetry in the $Z \to b\bar{b}$ decays and provided another very interesting and effective initial state tag based on the polar angle of the B candidate [11]. Initial state tags have also been combined to reach $\eta_i \sim 26\%$ at LEP [16,17], or even 22% at SLD [13] with full efficiency. The equivalent figure at CDF (Tevatron Run I) is $\sim 40\%$ [18].

At B factories, the flavor of a B_d^0 meson at production cannot be determined, since the two neutral B mesons produced in a $\Upsilon(4S)$ decay evolve in a coherent P-wave state where they keep opposite flavors at any time. However, as soon as one of them decays, the other follows a time-evolution given by Eqs. (6) or (7), where t is replaced with Δt. Hence, the "initial state" tag of a B can be taken as the final state tag of the other B. Effective mistag probabilities of $\eta_i \sim 24\%$ for full efficiency (corresponding to effective tagging efficiencies of $\sim 27\%$ for perfect tagging) are achieved by BABAR and Belle [19], using different techniques including $b \to \ell^-$ and $b \to c \to s$ tags. It is interesting to note that, in this case, mixing of this other B (i.e. the coherent mixing occurring before the first B decay) does not contribute to the mistag probability.

In the absence of experimental evidence for a width difference, oscillation analyses typically neglect $\Delta\Gamma$ and describe the data with the physics functions $\Gamma e^{-\Gamma t}(1 \pm \cos(\Delta m t))/2$ (high-energy colliders) or $\Gamma e^{-\Gamma |\Delta t|}(1 \pm \cos(\Delta m \Delta t))/4$ (asymmetric $\Upsilon(4S)$ machines). As can be seen from Eq. (9), a non-zero value of $\Delta\Gamma$ would effectively reduce the oscillation amplitude with a small time-dependent factor that would be very difficult to distinguish from time resolution effects. Whereas measurements of Δm_d are usually extracted from the data using a maximum likelihood fit, no significant B_s^0–$\overline{B}_s^0$ oscillations have been seen so far. To extract information useful to set lower limits on Δm_s, B_s^0 analyses follow a method [10] in which a B_s^0 oscillation amplitude $\mathcal{A}$ is measured as a function of a fixed test value of Δm_s, using a maximum likelihood fit based on the functions $\Gamma_s e^{-\Gamma_s t}(1 \pm \mathcal{A}\cos(\Delta m_s t))/2$. To a very good approximation, the statistical uncertainty on $\mathcal{A}$ is Gaussian and equal to $1/\mathcal{S}$ [10]. If $\Delta m_s = \Delta m_s^{\text{true}}$, one expects $\mathcal{A} = 1$ within the total uncertainty $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$; however, if Δm_s is (far) below its true

value, a measurement consistent with $\mathcal{A} = 0$ is expected. A value of Δm_s can be excluded at 95% CL if $\mathcal{A} + 1.645\,\sigma_{\mathcal{A}} \le 1$. If Δm_s^{true} is very large, one expects $\mathcal{A} = 0$, and all values of Δm_s such that $1.645\,\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(\Delta m_s) < 1$ are expected to be excluded at 95% CL. Because of the proper time resolution, the quantity $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(\Delta m_s)$ is an increasing function of Δm_s and one therefore expects to be able to exclude individual Δm_s values up to Δm_s^{sens}, where Δm_s^{sens}, called here the sensitivity of the analysis, is defined by $1.645\,\sigma_{\mathcal{A}}(\Delta m_s^{\text{sens}}) = 1$.

B_d^0 mixing studies

Many B_d^0–$\overline{B}_d^0$ oscillations analyses have been performed by the ALEPH [12,20], BABAR [21], Belle [22,23], CDF [15,24], DELPHI [14,25], L3 [26], OPAL [27] and SLD [11] collaborations. Although a variety of different techniques have been used, the individual Δm_d results obtained at high-energy colliders have remarkably similar precision. Their average is compatible with the recent and more precise measurements from asymmetric B factories. The systematic uncertainties are not negligible; they are often dominated by sample composition, mistag probability, or b-hadron lifetime contributions. Before being combined, the measurements are adjusted on the basis of a common set of input values, including the b-hadron lifetimes and fractions published in this *Review*. Some measurements are statistically correlated. Systematic correlations arise both from common physics sources (fragmentation fractions, lifetimes, branching ratios of b hadrons), and from purely experimental or algorithmic effects (efficiency, resolution, tagging, background description). Combining all published measurements [15,20–22,25–27] and accounting for all identified correlations as described in Ref. 28 yields $\Delta m_d = 0.489 \pm 0.005(\text{stat}) \pm 0.007(\text{syst})$ ps^{-1}.

On the other hand, ARGUS and CLEO have published time-integrated measurements [29–31], which average to $\chi_d = 0.182 \pm 0.015$. Following Ref. 31, the width difference $\Delta\Gamma_d$ could in principle be extracted from the measured value of Γ_d and the above averages for Δm_d and χ_d (see Eqs. (12) and (17)), provided that $\Delta\Gamma_d$ has a negligible impact on the Δm_d measurements. However, a stronger constraint, $\Delta\Gamma_d/\Gamma_d < 20\%$

at 90% CL, has been obtained by DELPHI from a direct time-dependent study [14]. Assuming $\Delta\Gamma_d = 0$ and no CP violation in mixing, and using the measured B_d^0 lifetime, the Δm_d and χ_d results are combined to yield the world average

$$\Delta m_d = 0.489 \pm 0.008 \ \text{ps}^{-1} \qquad (28)$$

or, equivalently,

$$\chi_d = 0.181 \pm 0.004 \,. \qquad (29)$$

Evidence for CP violation in B_d^0 mixing has been searched for, both with flavor-specific and inclusive B_d^0 decays, in samples where the initial flavor state is tagged. In the case of semileptonic (or other flavor-specific) decays, where the final state tag is also available, the following asymmetry

$$\frac{N(\overline{B}_d^0(t) \to \ell^+ \nu_\ell X) - N(B_d^0(t) \to \ell^- \overline{\nu}_\ell X)}{N(\overline{B}_d^0(t) \to \ell^+ \nu_\ell X) + N(B_d^0(t) \to \ell^- \overline{\nu}_\ell X)}$$

$$= a_{CP} \simeq 1 - |q/p|_d^2 \simeq \frac{4\text{Re}(\epsilon_d)}{1 + |\epsilon_d|^2} \qquad (30)$$

has been measured, either in time-integrated analyses at CLEO [30–32] and CDF [33], or in time-dependent analyses at LEP [34–36] and BABAR [37]. In the inclusive case, also investigated at LEP [35,36,38], no final state tag is used, and the asymmetry [39]

$$\frac{N(B_d^0(t) \to \text{all}) - N(\overline{B}_d^0(t) \to \text{all})}{N(B_d^0(t) \to \text{all}) + N(\overline{B}_d^0(t) \to \text{all})}$$

$$\simeq a_{CP} \left[\frac{x_d}{2} \sin(\Delta m_d\, t) - \sin^2\left(\frac{\Delta m_d\, t}{2}\right) \right] \qquad (31)$$

must be measured as a function of the proper time to extract information on CP violation. In all cases asymmetries compatible with zero have been found, with a precision limited by the available statistics. A simple average of all published and preliminary results [30–38] neglecting small possible statistical correlations and assuming half of the systematics to be correlated between measurements performed at the same energy, is $a_{CP} = -0.002 \pm 0.009(\text{stat}) \pm 0.008(\text{syst})$, a result which does not yet constrain the Standard Model.

The Δm_d result of Eq. (28) provides an estimate of $|M_{12}|$ and can be used, together with Eqs. (16) and (18), to extract the magnitude of the CKM matrix element V_{td} within the Standard Model [40]. The main experimental uncertainties on the resulting estimate of $|V_{td}|$ come from m_t and Δm_d; however, the extraction is at present completely dominated by the uncertainty on the hadronic matrix element $f_{B_d}\sqrt{B_{B_d}} = 230 \pm 40$ MeV obtained from lattice QCD calculations [41].

B_s^0 mixing studies

B_s^0–$\overline{B}_s^0$ oscillations have been the subject of many studies from ALEPH [16,42], CDF [43], DELPHI [14,17,44,45], OPAL [46] and SLD [13,47]. No oscillation signal has been found so far. The most sensitive analyses appear to be the ones based on inclusive lepton samples at LEP. Because of their better proper time resolution, the small data samples analyzed inclusively at SLD, as well as the few fully reconstructed B_s decays at LEP, turn out to be also very useful to explore the high Δm_s region.

All results are limited by the available statistics. They can easily be combined, since all experiments provide measurements of the B_s^0 oscillation amplitude. The latter are averaged using the procedure of Ref. 28 to yield the combined amplitudes $\mathcal{A}$ shown in Fig. 2 as a function of Δm_s. The individual results have been adjusted to common physics inputs, and all known correlations have been accounted for; the sensitivities of the inclusive analyses, which depend directly through Eq. (27) on the assumed fraction f_s of B_s^0 mesons in an unbiased sample of weakly-decaying b hadrons, have also been rescaled to a common preliminary average of $f_s = 0.097 \pm 0.011$. The combined sensitivity for 95% CL exclusion of Δm_s values is found to be 19.3 ps^{-1}. All values of Δm_s below 14.9 ps^{-1} are excluded at 95% CL. The values between 14.9 and 22.4 ps^{-1} cannot be excluded, because the data is compatible with a signal in this region. However, no deviation from $\mathcal{A} = 0$ is seen in Fig. 2 that would indicate the observation of a signal.

Some Δm_s analyses are still unpublished [13,14,42,45,47]. Using only published results, the combined Δm_s result is

$$\Delta m_s > 13.1 \text{ ps}^{-1} \qquad \text{at 95\% CL}, \qquad (32)$$

Figure 2: Combined measurements of the B_s^0 oscillation amplitude as a function of Δm_s, including all preliminary results available at the time of the winter 2002 conferences [48]. The measurements are dominated by statistical uncertainties. Neighboring points are statistically correlated.

with a sensitivity of 13.3 ps^{-1}.

The information on $|V_{ts}|$ obtained, in the framework of the Standard Model, from the combined amplitude spectrum is hampered by the hadronic uncertainty, as in the B_d^0 case. However, many uncertainties cancel in the frequency ratio

$$\frac{\Delta m_s}{\Delta m_d} = \frac{m_{B_s}}{m_{B_d}} \, \xi^2 \left| \frac{V_{ts}}{V_{td}} \right|^2 , \tag{33}$$

where $\xi = (f_{B_s}\sqrt{B_{B_s}})/(f_{B_d}\sqrt{B_{B_d}}) = 1.16 \pm 0.05$ is an SU(3) flavor-symmetry breaking factor obtained from lattice QCD calculations [41]. The CKM matrix can be constrained using the experimental results on Δm_d, Δm_s, $|V_{ub}/V_{cb}|$, ϵ_K and $\sin(2\beta)$ together with theoretical inputs and unitarity conditions [40,49]. Given all measurements other than Δm_d and Δm_s, the constraint from our knowledge on the ratio $\Delta m_d/\Delta m_s$ is presently more effective in limiting the position of the apex of the CKM

unitarity triangle than the one obtained from the Δm_d measurements alone, due to the reduced hadronic uncertainty in Eq. (33). We note also that it would be difficult for the Standard Model to accommodate values of Δm_s above ~ 25 ps^{-1} [49].

Information on $\Delta \Gamma_s$ can be obtained by studying the proper time distribution of untagged data samples enriched in B_s^0 mesons [50]. In the case of an inclusive B_s^0 selection [51] or a semileptonic B_s^0 decay selection [17,52], both the short- and long-lived components are present, and the proper time distribution is a superposition of two exponentials with decay constants $\Gamma_s \pm \Delta \Gamma_s/2$. In principle, this provides sensitivity to both Γ_s and $(\Delta \Gamma_s/\Gamma_s)^2$. Ignoring $\Delta \Gamma_s$ and fitting for a single exponential leads to an estimate of Γ_s with a relative bias proportional to $(\Delta \Gamma_s/\Gamma_s)^2$. An alternative approach, which is directly sensitive to first order in $\Delta \Gamma_s/\Gamma_s$, is to determine the lifetime of B_s^0 candidates decaying to CP eigenstates; measurements exist for $B_s^0 \rightarrow J/\psi\phi$ [53] and $B_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^{(*)+}D_s^{(*)-}$ [54], which are mostly CP-even states [7]. An estimate of $\Delta \Gamma_s/\Gamma_s$ has also been obtained directly from a measurement of the $B_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^{(*)+}D_s^{(*)-}$ branching ratio [54], under the assumption that these decays practically account for all the CP-even final states.

Present data is not precise enough to efficiently constrain both Γ_s and $\Delta \Gamma_s/\Gamma_s$; since the B_s^0 and B_d^0 lifetimes are predicted to be equal within less than a percent [55], an expectation compatible with the current experimental data [56], the constraint $\Gamma_s = \Gamma_d$ can also be used to improve the extraction of $\Delta \Gamma_s/\Gamma_s$. Applying the combination procedure of Ref. 28 on the published results [17,52–54,57] yields

$$\Delta \Gamma_s/\Gamma_s < 0.52 \quad \text{at } 95\% \text{ CL} \qquad (34)$$

without external constraint, or

$$\Delta \Gamma_s/\Gamma_s < 0.31 \quad \text{at } 95\% \text{ CL} \qquad (35)$$

when constraining $1/\Gamma_s$ to the measured B_d^0 lifetime. These results are not yet precise enough to test Standard Model predictions.

Average b-hadron mixing and b-hadron production fractions at high energy

Let f_u, f_d, f_s and f_{baryon} be the B_u, B_d^0, B_s^0 and b-baryon fractions composing an unbiased sample of weakly-decaying b hadrons produced in high-energy colliders. LEP experiments have measured $f_s \times \text{BR}(B_s^0 \to D_s^- \ell^+ \nu_\ell X)$ [58], $\text{BR}(b \to \Lambda_b^0) \times \text{BR}(\Lambda_b^0 \to \Lambda_c^+ \ell^- \overline{\nu}_\ell X)$ [59] and $\text{BR}(b \to \Xi_b^-) \times \text{BR}(\Xi_b^- \to \Xi^- \ell^- \overline{\nu}_\ell X)$ [60] from partially reconstructed final states including a lepton, f_{baryon} from protons identified in b events [61], and the production rate of charged b hadrons [62]. The various b-hadron fractions have also been measured at CDF from electron-charm final states [63]. All the published results have been combined following the procedure and assumptions described in Ref. 28, to yield $f_u = f_d = (37.3 \pm 2.0)\%$, $f_s = (13.9 \pm 3.8)\%$ and $f_{\text{baryon}} = (11.5 \pm 2.0)\%$ under the constraints

$$f_u = f_d \quad \text{and} \quad f_u + f_d + f_s + f_{\text{baryon}} = 1 \,. \qquad (36)$$

Time-integrated mixing analyses performed with lepton pairs from $b\overline{b}$ events produced at high-energy colliders measure the quantity

$$\overline{\chi} = f_d' \chi_d + f_s' \chi_s \,, \qquad (37)$$

where f_d' and f_s' are the fractions of B_d^0 and B_s^0 hadrons in a sample of semileptonic b-hadron decays. Assuming that all b hadrons have the same semileptonic decay width implies $f_q' = f_q/(\Gamma_q \tau_b)$ $(q = s, d)$, where τ_b is the average b-hadron lifetime. Hence $\overline{\chi}$ measurements can be used to improve our knowledge on the fractions f_u, f_d, f_s and f_{baryon}.

Combining the above estimates of these fractions with the average $\overline{\chi} = 0.1184 \pm 0.0045$ (published in this *Review*), χ_d from Eq. (29) and $\chi_s = 1/2$ yields, under the constraints of Eq. (36),

$$f_u = f_d = (38.8 \pm 1.3)\% \,, \qquad (38)$$

$$f_s = (10.6 \pm 1.3)\% \,, \qquad (39)$$

$$f_{\text{baryon}} = (11.8 \pm 2.0)\% \,, \qquad (40)$$

showing that mixing information substantially reduces the uncertainty on f_s. These results and the averages quoted in

Eqs. (28) and (29) for χ_d and Δm_d have been obtained in a consistent way by the B oscillations working group [28], taking into account the fact that many individual measurements of Δm_d depend on the assumed values for the b-hadron fractions.

Summary and prospects

B^0–$\overline{B}^0$ mixing has been and still is a field of intense study. The mass difference in the B_d^0–$\overline{B}_d^0$ system is very well measured (with an accuracy of 1.7%) but, despite an impressive theoretical effort, the hadronic uncertainty still limits the precision of the extracted estimate of $|V_{td}|$. The mass difference in the B_s^0–$\overline{B}_s^0$ system is much larger and still unmeasured. However, the current experimental lower limit on Δm_s already provides, together with Δm_d, a significant constraint on the CKM matrix within the Standard Model. No strong experimental evidence exists yet for the rather large decay width difference expected in the B_s^0–$\overline{B}_s^0$ system. It is interesting to recall that the ratio $\Delta \Gamma_s / \Delta m_s$ does not depend on CKM matrix elements in the Standard Model (see Eq. (22)), and that a measurement of either Δm_s or $\Delta \Gamma_s$ could be turned into a Standard Model prediction of the other one.

The LEP and SLD experiments have still not finalized all their B_s^0 oscillation analyses, but a first measurement of Δm_s from data collected at the Z pole is now very unlikely. In the near future, the most promising prospects for B_s^0 mixing are from Run II at the Tevatron, where both Δm_s and $\Delta \Gamma_s$ are expected to be measured with fully reconstructed B_s^0 decays; for example, with 2 fb^{-1} of data, CDF expects to observe B_s^0 oscillations for values of Δm_s up to $\sim 40 - 50$ ps^{-1} (depending on event yields and signal-to-background ratios) [64], well above the current Standard Model prediction.

CP violation in B mixing, which has not been seen yet, as well as the phases involved in B mixing, will be further investigated with the large statistics that will become available both at the B factories and at the Tevatron.

B mixing may not have delivered all its secrets yet, because it is one of the phenomena where new physics might very well reveal itself (for example new particles involved in the box

diagrams). Theoretical calculations in lattice QCD are becoming more reliable and further progress in reducing hadronic uncertainties is expected. In the long term, a stringent check of the consistency, within the Standard Model, of the B_d^0 and B_s^0 mixing measurements with all other measured observables in B physics (including CP asymmetries in B decays) will be possible, allowing to place limits on new physics or, better, discover new physics.

References

1. T.D. Lee and C.S. Wu, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Sci. **16**, 511 (1966); I.I. Bigi and A.I. Sanda, "CP violation," Cambridge, Cambridge Univ. Press, 2000; G.C. Branco, L. Lavoura, and J.P. Silva, "CP violation," Clarendon Press Oxford, 1999; see also the review on B^0–$\overline{B}^0$ mixing by H. Quinn in C. Caso *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. **C3**, 1 (1998).

2. See the review on CP violation in B decays by H. Quinn and A. Sanda in this publication.

3. A.J. Buras, W. Slominski, and H. Steger, Nucl. Phys. **B245**, 369 (1984).

4. A.J. Buras and R. Fleischer, in "Heavy Flavours II," ed. A.J. Buras and M. Lindner, Singapore World Scientific (1998).

5. M. Kobayashi and K. Maskawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. **49**, 652 (1973).

6. I.I. Bigi *et al.*, in "CP violation," ed. C. Jarlskog, Singapore World Scientific, 1989.

7. R. Aleksan *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B316**, 567 (1993).

8. C. Albajar *et al.* (**UA1**), Phys. Lett. **B186**, 247 (1987).

9. H. Albrecht *et al.* (**ARGUS**), Phys. Lett. **B192**, 245 (1987).

10. H.-G. Moser and A. Roussarie, Nucl. Instrum. Methods **384**, 491 (1997).

11. **SLD** collab., SLAC-PUB-7228, SLAC-PUB-7229 and SLAC-PUB-7230, contrib. to 28th Int. Conf. on High Energy Physics, Warsaw, 1996; J. Wittlin, PhD thesis, SLAC-R-582, 2001.

12. **ALEPH** collab., contrib. 596 to Int. Europhysics Conf. on High Energy Physics, Jerusalem, 1997.

13. J. Thom, PhD thesis, SLAC-R-585, 2002.

14. **DELPHI** collab., contrib. 303 to Int. Europhysics Conf. on High Energy Physics, Budapest, 2001.

15. F. Abe *et al.*(**CDF**), Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2057 (1998), Phys. Rev. **D59**, 032001 (1999); Phys. Rev. **D60**, 051101 (1999); Phys. Rev. **D60**, 072003 (1999); T. Affolder *et al.*(**CDF**), Phys. Rev. **D60**, 112004 (1999).

16. R. Barate *et al.*(**ALEPH**), Eur. Phys. J. **C4**, 367 (1998); Eur. Phys. J. **C7**, 553 (1999).

17. P. Abreu *et al.*(**DELPHI**), Eur. Phys. J. **C16**, 555 (2000); Eur. Phys. J. **C18**, 229 (2000).

18. M. Paulini, private communication.

19. B. Aubert *et al.*(**BABAR**), Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 091801 (2001); K. Abe *et al.* (**Belle**), Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 091802 (2001).

20. D. Buskulic *et al.*(**ALEPH**), Z. Phys. **C75**, 397 (1997).

21. B. Aubert *et al.*(**BABAR**), `hep-ex/0112044`, SLAC-PUB-9061, to appear in Phys. Rev. Lett.; `hep-ex/0112045`, SLAC-PUB-9096, to appear in Phys. Rev. Lett.

22. K. Abe *et al.*(**Belle**), Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 3228 (2001).

23. Y. Sakai, `hep-ex/0202010`, to appear in the proc. of the 5th KEK topical conference, 2001.

24. M. Paulini, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A14**, 2791 (1999).

25. P. Abreu *et al.*(**DELPHI**), Z. Phys. **C76**, 579 (1997).

26. M. Acciarri *et al.*(**L3**), Eur. Phys. J. **C5**, 195 (1998).

27. G. Alexander *et al.*(**OPAL**), Z. Phys. **C72**, 377 (1996); K. Ackerstaff *et al.*(**OPAL**), Z. Phys. **C76**, 401 (1997); Z. Phys. **C76**, 417 (1997); G. Abbiendi *et al.*(**OPAL**), Phys. Lett. **B493**, 266 (2000).

28. **ALEPH**, **CDF**, **DELPHI**, **L3**, **OPAL**, and **SLD** collab., "Combined results on *b*-hadron production rates and decay properties," CERN-EP/2001-050; the combined results on *B* mixing and *b*-hadron fractions included in the above paper or published in this *Review* have been obtained by the *B* oscillations working group; see `http://www.cern.ch/LEPBOSC/` for more information.

29. H. Albrecht *et al.*(**ARGUS**), Z. Phys. **C55**, 357 (1992); Phys. Lett. **B324**, 249 (1994).

30. J. Bartelt *et al.*(**CLEO**), Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 1680 (1993).

31. B.H. Behrens *et al.*(**CLEO**), Phys. Lett. **B490**, 36 (2000).

32. D.E. Jaffe *et al.*(**CLEO**), Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 5000 (2001).

33. F. Abe *et al.*(**CDF**), Phys. Rev. **D55**, 2546 (1997).

34. K. Ackerstaff *et al.*(**OPAL**), Z. Phys. **C76**, 401 (1997).

35. **DELPHI** collab., contrib. 449 to Int. Europhysics Conf. on High Energy Physics, Jerusalem, 1997.

36. R. Barate *et al.* (**ALEPH**), Eur. Phys. J. **C20**, 431 (2001).

37. B. Aubert *et al.* (**BABAR**), `hep-ex/0202041`, SLAC-PUB-9149, submitted to Phys. Rev. Lett.

38. G. Abbiendi *et al.* (**OPAL**), Eur. Phys. J. **C12**, 609 (2000).

39. M. Beneke, G. Buchalla, and I. Dunietz, Phys. Lett. **B393**, 132 (1997);
   I. Dunietz, Eur. Phys. J. **C7**, 197 (1999).

40. See the review on the CKM quark-mixing matrix by F.J. Gilman, K. Kleinknecht and B. Renk in this publication.

41. For a review of lattice QCD results with heavy quarks, see for example C. Bernard, Nucl. Phys. (Proc. Supp.) **B94**, 159 (2001).

42. A. Heister *et al.* (**ALEPH**), CERN/EP-2002-016, submitted to Eur. Phys. J. C.

43. F. Abe *et al.* (**CDF**), Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 3576 (1999).

44. W. Adam *et al.* (**DELPHI**), Phys. Lett. **B414**, 382 (1997).

45. **DELPHI** collab., contrib. 304 to Int. Europhysics Conf. on High Energy Physics, Budapest, 2001.

46. G. Abbiendi *et al.* (**OPAL**), Eur. Phys. J. **C11**, 587 (1999);
   Eur. Phys. J. **C19**, 241 (2001).

47. **SLD** collab., SLAC-PUB-8568 and SLAC-PUB-8598, contrib. to 30th Int. Conf. on High Energy Physics, Osaka, 2000;
   C.-J.S. Lin, PhD thesis, SLAC-R-584, 2001.

48. D. Abbaneo, "Review of B_s^0 oscillations," to appear in the proc. of the 16th Rencontres de la Vallée d'Aoste, La Thuile, 2002.

49. Workshop on the CKM unitarity triangle, CERN, February 2002, `http://www.cern.ch/ckm-workshop/`, CERN yellow report in preparation.

50. K. Hartkorn and H.-G. Moser, Eur. Phys. J. **C8**, 381 (1999).

51. M. Acciarri *et al.* (**L3**), Phys. Lett. **B438**, 417 (1998).

52. F. Abe *et al.* (**CDF**), Phys. Rev. **D59**, 032004 (1999).

53. F. Abe *et al.* (**CDF**), Phys. Rev. **D57**, 5382 (1998).

54. R. Barate *et al.* (**ALEPH**), Phys. Lett. **B486**, 286 (2000).

55. See for example M. Beneke, G. Buchalla, and I. Dunietz, Phys. Rev. **D54**, 4419 (1996).

56. See the review on production and decay of *b*-hadrons by L. Gibbons and K. Honscheid in this publication.

57. D. Buskulic *et al.* (**ALEPH**), Phys. Lett. **B377**, 205 (1996);
   K. Ackerstaff *et al.* (**OPAL**), Phys. Lett. **B426**, 161 (1998).

58. P. Abreu *et al.* (**DELPHI**), Phys. Lett. **B289**, 199 (1992);
   P.D. Acton *et al.* (**OPAL**), Phys. Lett. **B295**, 357 (1992);

D. Buskulic *et al.* (**ALEPH**), Phys. Lett. **B361**, 221 (1995).

59. P. Abreu *et al.* (**DELPHI**), Z. Phys. **C68**, 375 (1995);
    R. Barate *et al.* (**ALEPH**), Eur. Phys. J. **C2**, 197 (1998).

60. P. Abreu *et al.* (**DELPHI**), Z. Phys. **C68**, 541 (1995);
    D. Buskulic *et al.* (**ALEPH**), Phys. Lett. **B384**, 449 (1996).

61. R. Barate *et al.* (**ALEPH**), Eur. Phys. J. **C5**, 205 (1998).

62. **DELPHI** collab., contrib. 5_515 to Int. Europhysics Conf.
    on High Energy Physics, Tampere, 1999.

63. F. Abe *et al.* (**CDF**), Phys. Rev. **D60**, 092005 (1999);
    T. Affolder *et al.* (**CDF**), Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 1663 (2000).

64. K. Anikeev *et al.*, "B physics at the Tevatron: Run II and
    beyond," `hep-ph/0201071`, FERMILAB-PUB-01/97.