## $B^{0}-\bar{B}^{0}$ MIXING
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There are two neutral $B$ meson systems which are like the neutral kaon system, in that two $C P$-conjugate states exist: the states $B^{0}=\bar{b} d$, and $\bar{B}^{0}=\bar{d} b$, which we will call the $B_{d}$ system; and the states $B_{s}^{0}=\bar{b} s$, and $\bar{B}_{s}^{0}=\bar{s} b$, which we call the $B_{s}$ system. For early work on $C P$ violation in the $B$ systems, chiefly the $B_{d}$ system, see Ref. 1. In both these systems the mass eigenstates are not $C P$ eigenstates, but are mixtures of the two $C P$-conjugate quark states. The fact that the mixing, due to box diagrams, shown in Fig. 1, produces non- $C P$ eigenstates means that there is a $C P$-violating phase that enters in the amplitude for these diagrams. The two mass eigenstates can be written, for example for the $B_{d}$ system,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left|B_{L}\right\rangle=p\left|B^{0}\right\rangle+q\left|\bar{B}^{0}\right\rangle \\
& \left|B_{H}\right\rangle=p\left|B^{0}\right\rangle-q\left|\bar{B}^{0}\right\rangle \tag{1}
\end{align*}
$$

Here $H$ and $L$ stand for Heavy and Light, respectively.


Figure 1: Mixing Diagrams.

The complex coefficients $p$ and $q$ obey the normalization condition

$$
\begin{equation*}
|q|^{2}+|p|^{2}=1 \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

We define the mass difference $\Delta M$ and width difference $\Delta \Gamma$ between the neutral $B$ mesons:

$$
\begin{align*}
\Delta M & \equiv M_{H}-M_{L} \\
\Delta \Gamma & \equiv \Gamma_{H}-\Gamma_{L} \tag{3}
\end{align*}
$$

so that $\Delta M$ is positive by definition. Finding the eigenvalues of the mass-mixing matrix, one gets

$$
\begin{equation*}
(\Delta M)^{2}-\frac{1}{4}(\Delta \Gamma)^{2}=4\left(\left|M_{12}\right|^{2}-\frac{1}{4}\left|\Gamma_{12}\right|^{2}\right) \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta M \Delta \Gamma=4 \operatorname{Re}\left(M_{12} \Gamma_{12}^{*}\right) \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the off-diagonal term of the mixing matrix is written as $M_{12}+i \Gamma_{12}$. Note that both $M_{12}$ and $\Gamma_{12}$ may be complex quantities; the separation is defined by the fact that $\Gamma_{12}$ is given by the absorbtive part of the diagrams (cut contributions). The ratio $q / p$ is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{q}{p}=-\frac{\Delta M-\frac{i}{2} \Delta \Gamma}{2\left(M_{12}-\frac{i}{2} \Gamma_{12}\right)}=-\frac{2\left(M_{12}^{*}-\frac{i}{2} \Gamma_{12}^{*}\right)}{\Delta M-\frac{i}{2} \Delta \Gamma} . \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Whereas in the kaon case the lifetimes of the two eigenstates are significantly different and the difference in masses between them is small, in the $B_{d}$ system it is the mass differences that dominate the physics, and the two states have nearly equal predicted widths (and thus lifetimes). We define, for $q=d, s$

$$
\begin{equation*}
x_{q}=\frac{\Delta M_{q}}{\Gamma_{q}}, \quad y_{q}=\frac{\Delta \Gamma_{q}}{\Gamma_{q}} . \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

The value of $x_{d}$ is about 0.7 , not very different from the similar quantity for the $K^{0}$ which is 0.48 . The difference between the widths of the two $B_{d}$ eigenstates is produced by the contributions from channels to which both $B^{0}$ and $\bar{B}^{0}$ can decay. These have branching ratios of $\mathcal{O}\left(10^{-3}\right)$ [2]. Furthermore there are contributions of both signs to the difference, so there is no reason that the net effect should be much larger than
the individual terms. Conservatively, one expects $y_{d} \leq 10^{-2}$ and thus also $|q / p|_{d}$ equal to 1 to a very good approximation. Experimentally no effect of a difference in lifetimes has been observed.

For $B_{s}$ there is currently only a lower bound on the value of $x_{s}$. Theoretical expectation is that it may be as large as 20 or more, which makes it quite difficult to measure. A significant difference in widths is possible, due to the fact that a number of the simplest two-body channels contribute only to a single $C P$ (like the two-pion state which dominates $K$-decays and is the source of the large width difference in that system). The difference in widths could be as much as $20 \%$ of the total width in the $B_{s}$ system [3]. Note that this still gives a small ratio, of order a few percent, for $\Delta \Gamma / \Delta M$.

The proper time evolution of an initially $(t=0)$ pure $B^{0}$ or $\bar{B}^{0}$ is given by

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left|B_{\mathrm{phys}}^{0}(t)\right\rangle=g_{+}(t)\left|B^{0}\right\rangle+(q / p) g_{-}(t)\left|\bar{B}^{0}\right\rangle, \\
& \left|\bar{B}_{\mathrm{phys}}^{0}(t)\right\rangle=(p / q) g_{-}(t)\left|B^{0}\right\rangle+g_{+}(t)\left|\bar{B}^{0}\right\rangle . \tag{8}
\end{align*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{align*}
& g_{ \pm}=\frac{1}{2} \exp (-\Gamma t / 2) \exp (-i M t) \\
& \times\left\{e^{-(\Delta \Gamma / 2-\Delta M) t} \pm e^{+(\Delta \Gamma / 2-\Delta M) t}\right\} \tag{9}
\end{align*}
$$

The rate at which an initial $B_{q}^{0}\left(\bar{B}_{q}^{0}\right)$ decays as a $\bar{B}_{q}^{0}\left(B_{q}^{0}\right)$ is thus

$$
\begin{equation*}
R_{q}(t)=q / p(\text { or } p / q) \Gamma\left|g_{-}(t)\right|^{2} . \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

The quantity $\chi_{q}$ measures the total probability that a created $B^{0}$ decays as a $\bar{B}^{0}$; it is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\chi_{q}=\int_{0}^{\infty} R_{q}(t) d t=\frac{1}{2}|q / p|^{2} \frac{x_{q}^{2}-y_{q}^{2} / 4}{\left(1+x_{q}^{2}\right)\left(1-y_{q}^{2} / 4\right)} \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Time-dependent mixing measurements are now being done for the $B_{d}$ system; earlier experiments measured only the timeintegrated mixing, which is parameterized by a parameter $\chi_{d}$. In this case to a good approximation we can set $|q / p|=1$ and
$\left|y_{d}\right| \ll x_{d}<1$ so that the simpler form $\chi_{d}=\frac{1}{2} \frac{x_{d}^{2}}{1+x_{d}^{2}}$ applies, and a measurement of $\chi_{d}$ implies a value of $x_{d}$.

In the $B^{0}-\bar{B}^{0}$ mixing section of the $B^{0}$ Particle Listings, we list the $\chi_{d}$ measurements, most of which come from $\Upsilon(4 S)$ data, and the $\Delta m_{B^{0}}$ measurements, which come from $Z$ data. We average these sections separately, but then include the results from both sections in "OUR EVALUATION" of $\chi_{s}$ and $\Delta M_{B_{s}^{0}}$. We convert both of these sets of measurements and list them in the $x_{d}$ section. The $x_{d}$ values obtained from $\Delta m_{B^{0}}$ measurements have a common systematic error due to the error on $\tau_{B^{0}}$. The averaging takes this common systematic error into account.

Because of the large value of $x_{s}$ the quantity $\chi_{s}$ will be close to its upper limit of 0.5 . This means that one cannot determine $x_{s}$ accurately by measuring $\chi_{s}$. It will require excellent time resolution to resolve the time-dependent mixing of the $B_{s}^{0}$ system, and thereby determine $\Delta M_{B_{s}^{0}}$.

In the $B_{s}^{0}-\bar{B}_{s}^{0}$ mixing section of the $B_{s}^{0}$ Particle Listings, we give measurements of $\chi_{B}$, the mixing parameter for a high-energy admixture of $b$-hadrons

$$
\begin{equation*}
\chi_{B}=f_{d} \frac{\mathcal{B}_{d}}{\langle\mathcal{B}\rangle} \chi_{d}+f_{s} \frac{\mathcal{B}_{s}}{\langle\mathcal{B}\rangle} \chi_{s} . \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here $f_{d}$ and $f_{s}$ are the fractions of $b$ hadrons that are produced as $B^{0}$ and $B_{s}^{0}$ mesons respectively, and $\mathcal{B}_{d}, \mathcal{B}_{s}$, and $\langle\mathcal{B}\rangle$ are branching fractions for $B_{d}, B_{s}$, and the $b$-hadron admixture respectively decaying to the observed mode. If we assume that $\chi_{s}=0.5$ and $\mathcal{B}_{d} /\langle\mathcal{B}\rangle=\mathcal{B}_{s} /\langle\mathcal{B}\rangle=1$, Eq. (12) can be used to determine $f_{s}$ as discussed in the note on "Production and Decay of $b$-Flavored Hadrons."
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