### The physics case for a DA $\Phi$ NE upgrade

Gino Isidori [*INFN–Frascati & University of Bern*]

- Introduction
  - General considerations about future low-energy experiments
  - Dreams & realistic possibilities for DAΦNE [*the Alghero heritage*]
- The unique features of a super  $\Phi$ -factory for <u>kaon physics</u>
  - General considerations
  - A few selected examples:
- 1. CPT tests
- <u>2.</u> Interferometry
- <u>3.</u> The  $V_{us}$  saga
- <u>4.</u> Rare (but not impossible...) decays
- <u>5.</u> Charge asymmetries,  $\pi\pi$  phases *et al*.

My conclusions

### Introduction

<u>General considerations about future low-energy experiments</u>

Within a few years we shall enter in the LHC era

Possible scenarios ~ 2010:

- LHC has started and has clearly seen signals of NP
- LHC has started but has not seen any clear NP signal
- [LHC has not started yet...]

Within all these scenarios still important & interesting to perform high-precision low-energy experiments

Some of the main arguments why it is still important to perform high–precision low–energy experiments in the LHC era:

→ No competition with LHC as far as the NP search is concerned [with some remarkable exception], but <u>full complementarity</u> for the identification of the symmetries of the NP model

I. Study of <u>rare & forbidden processes</u>:  $(g-2)_{\mu}$ ,  $K \rightarrow \pi \nu \nu$ , CPT, ...

Several SM parameters[Yukawa sector], which are likely to play a fundamental role in the identification of the underlying theory, can only be measured at low energies

II. <u>Precision measurements</u> of  $V_{\text{CKM}}$ ,  $m_{\text{q}}$ ,  $\alpha_{\text{i}}$ 

→ There are still interesting aspects of non-perturbative QCD which are not fully understood and need to be investigated

III. <u>CHPT</u> studies for K &  $\pi$  decays, <u>exotic bound states</u> [hadr. atoms, hypernuclei],  $e^+e^- \& \gamma \gamma \rightarrow hadr$ . <u>form factors</u>, ...

#### Dreams & realistic possibilities for $DA\Phi NE$

In principle an  $e^+e^-$  machine with <u>flexible</u> c.o.m. energy up to  $\sqrt{s} \sim 2.5$ GeV and <u>very high luminosity</u> at the  $\Phi$  peak would be an ideal machine for this type of physics:



The Alghero Conference [www.lnf.infn.it/conference/d2] Highlights of the kaon-physics program @  $\Phi$ -factory vs. luminosity:



$$K_L o \pi^0 
u ar{
u}$$
 cannot be measured

It has been said so often:

$$\Im V_{td} V_{ts}^* = A^2 \lambda^5 \eta = 25.6 \sqrt{\mathsf{BR}(K_L \to \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu})}$$
$$\mathsf{BR}(K_L \to \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}) = 3 \times 10^{-11}$$

10 eV/3 × 10<sup>-11</sup>=3.3 × 10<sup>11</sup> K's. @1% dec/ $\phi$ , need 100×3.3 × 10<sup>11</sup>=3.3 × 10<sup>13</sup>  $\phi$ 's or 1.1 × 10<sup>13</sup>  $\mu$ b<sup>-1</sup>. In one year, need  $\mathcal{L}$ =10<sup>6</sup>  $\mu$ b<sup>-1</sup>/s or  $\mathcal{L}$ =1 × 10<sup>36</sup> cm<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>. For one hundred events,  $\mathcal{L}$ =1 × 10<sup>37</sup> cm<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> or 10 year running.

$$J_{12} \qquad h = A^2 \lambda^5 \eta (\times 10) \longrightarrow \lambda(1 - \lambda^2/2)$$

To get  $\eta$  need  $\lambda$  and A!

 $\delta(A^2\lambda^5)/(A^2\lambda^5) \sim 5.6\%$ , K. Schubert, LP03. Optimistic?

Alghero 13 September 2003 Paolo Franzini - DAONE2? 30



#### Dreams & realistic possibilities for $DA\Phi NE$



<u>In practice</u> we need to take into account that:

- •If  $L < 10^{35} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1} \implies$  No chance for the rare golden modes [even if enhanced over SM expectations]
- •Strong <u>external</u> competition on almost all the remaining items from other machines/experiments
- •Serious internal (time) competition between the  $\Phi$  & non- $\Phi$  options [extrapolate from the present DA $\Phi$ NE situation...]

• The unique features of a (super)  $\Phi$ -factory for kaon physics

General considerations:

 $\Phi \rightarrow \mathbf{K}^{+}\mathbf{K}^{-}$  (50%),  $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{L}}\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{S}}$  (34%), ...

- Pure  $K_S$  beam  $[K_L tag] \Rightarrow Rare K_S decays$  [so far, the most used feature by KLOE]
- $K_L K_S$  in a pure quatum state [L=1]  $\Rightarrow$  Neutral kaon interferometry
- Kaon beams of known momentum  $\Rightarrow$  Great advantage for any K<sup>±</sup> & K<sub>L</sub> decay with missing energy
- $K^+K^- \& K_LK_S$  in the same detector  $\Rightarrow$  Useful for CHPT &  $K^{\pm}CPV$  studies

• The unique features of a (super)  $\Phi$ -factory for kaon physics

General considerations:

 $\Phi \rightarrow \mathbf{K}^{+}\mathbf{K}^{-}$  (50%),  $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{L}}\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{S}}$  (34%), ...

- Pure  $K_S$  beam  $[K_L tag] \Rightarrow Rare K_S$  decays [so far, the most used feature by KLOE]
- $K_L K_S$  in a pure quatum state [L=1]  $\Rightarrow$  Neutral kaon interferometry
- Kaon beams of known momentum  $\Rightarrow$  Great advantage for any K<sup>±</sup> & K<sub>L</sub> decay with missing energy
- $K^+K^- \& K_LK_S$  in the same detector  $\Rightarrow$  Useful for CHPT &  $K^{\pm}CPV$  studies
- N.B.: Kaon physics has also a unique *theoretical advantage* : several systematic theoretical tools [CHPT, Lattice, OPE, ...] able to mach [not always, but in most cases...] the challenge of high–precision experiments

### A few selected examples:

### 1. CPT tests

CPT symmetry is linked to the basic mathematical tools that we use in particle physics:

QFT + Lorentz invariance + Locality  $\Rightarrow$  CPT

These tools have intrinsic limitations [we are not able to include gravity in consistent way]  $\Rightarrow$  we should expect CPT at some level

But we do not have a consistent & predictive theory if we abandon these tools  $\Rightarrow$  hard to define a reference scale/size for CPT



Main message: Kaon physics offer an ideal framework to test CPT reference scale set by the most significant experimental bounds

<u>1.1</u> The charge asymmetry in  $K_S \rightarrow \pi^{\pm} l^{\mp} \nu$ 

#### <u>1.2</u> Bell–Steinberger relation

Even if **CPT** is violated, we can assume that unitarity [=the conservation of prbability] holds:

#### A marvelous tool !

- Exact relation in the CPT limit
- Non-vanishing Im(D) could only be due to
  - violations of CPT
  - violations of unitarity
  - new exotic invisible final states

$$\Delta = \frac{M_{\overline{K}} - M_{K}}{M_{L} - M_{S}} e^{i\phi_{SW}} + \dots$$

They should as in aide in

$$\phi_{SW} = \arctan[2(M_L - M_S)/(\Gamma_S - \Gamma_L)]$$

#### <u>1.2</u> Bell–Steinberger relation

Even if **CPT** is violated, we can assume that unitarity [=the conservation of prbability] holds:

$$\Gamma_{\rm K} = \sum_{f} A({\rm K} \to f) A({\rm K} \to f)^{*} \qquad \text{They should coincide in the limit of exact CPT}$$

$$\Gamma_{\rm \overline{K}} = \sum_{f} A({\rm \overline{K}} \to f) A({\rm \overline{K}} \to f)^{*} \qquad \text{the limit of exact CPT}$$

$$\phi_{\rm SW} = \arctan[2(M_{\rm L} - M_{\rm S})/(\Gamma_{\rm S} - \Gamma_{\rm L})] \qquad \qquad \Delta = \frac{M_{\rm \overline{K}} - M_{\rm K}}{M_{\rm L} - M_{\rm S}} e^{i\phi_{\rm SW}} + \dots$$

$$\left[\frac{\Gamma_{\rm L} + \Gamma_{\rm S}}{\Gamma_{\rm S} - \Gamma_{\rm L}} + i \tan(\phi_{\rm SW})\right] \left[\frac{Re(\varepsilon_{\rm M})}{1 + |\varepsilon_{\rm M}|^{2}} + i \operatorname{Im}(\Delta)\right] = \frac{1}{\Gamma_{\rm S} - \Gamma_{\rm L}} \sum_{f} A_{\rm L}(f) A_{\rm S}(f)^{*}$$

#### A marvelous tool !

- Exact relation in the CPT limit
- Non-vanishing Im(D) could only be due to
  - violations of CPT
  - violations of unitarity
  - new exotic invisible final states

no better place to measure this combination than a  $\Phi$  factory !

771

 $|\text{Im}(\Delta)|_{000} < 6.4 \times 10^{-6} [\text{KLOE '04}]$ 

...but still a lot of work to improve the bounds on the full contribution <u>2.</u> Neutral kaon interferometry

Probably the most characteristic type of measurements for a  $\Phi$  factory:

- $(\pi^+\pi^-) (\pi^+\pi^-)$  :  $\Delta m \& \Gamma_{L,S} + \eta_{\pm} + \text{tests of QM}$
- $(\pi^+\pi^-) (\pi^0\pi^0)$  : Re( $\epsilon'/\epsilon$ ) & Im( $\epsilon'/\epsilon$ ) +  $\pi\pi$  phases + tests of CPT & QM
- $(\pi l \nu) (\pi l \nu)$  : tests of CPT
- $(\pi l v) (3\pi)$  :  $\eta_{3\pi} + \pi \pi$  phases

- $(3\pi)-(3\pi)$  :  $\eta_{3\pi} + \pi\pi$  phases [different combinations]
- : η<sub>ππγ</sub>

Several interesting channels with  $L \sim O(100 \text{ fb}^{-1})$ 



The first example of interference observed in KLOE.  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \phi \rightarrow K_S K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^- + \pi^+\pi^ \Rightarrow \Gamma_S, \ \Gamma_L, \ \Delta m, \ [\Re, \Im(\eta_i, \ \delta \dots)]$  $I(f_1, f_2, \Delta t) = ..2 |\eta_1| |\eta_2| e^{-\Gamma \Delta t/2} \cos(\Delta m \Delta t + \phi_1 - \phi_2)$ 



<u>3.</u> The  $V_{us}$  saga





#### But this is not the end of the story...



• SU(2) breaking not yet tested at the th. level (~ 0.3%)

- Exp. studies of the f.f. beyond the linear approximation are a key ingredient to reduce the th. error on  $f_+(0)$  [ similar to the hadronic moments in  $B \rightarrow Xlv$  ]

$$f_{0}(x, y) = 1 + \lambda_{0} x + \delta y^{2} + \lambda_{2} x^{2} + \dots \qquad \begin{aligned} x = (p_{K} - p_{\pi})^{2} / m_{\pi}^{2} &\Rightarrow V. \text{ Lubicz \& M. Knecht} \\ y = (m_{K}^{2} - m_{\pi}^{2}) / m_{K}^{2} \\ F_{K} / F_{\pi}, \lambda_{0}, \dots \qquad CHPT \text{ [Bijnens \& Talavera, et al.]} \\ \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Natural goal} &\text{for a high- or} \\ \text{medium/high-} L \\ \Phi \text{ factory} \end{aligned}$$

4. Rare (but not impossible...) decays

An interesting example:

The  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 l^+ l^- \oplus K_S \rightarrow \pi^0 l^+ l^- \oplus K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \gamma \gamma$  system

 $\Rightarrow$  L. Sehgal & C. Smith

#### 4. Rare (but not impossible...) decays

An interesting example:

The 
$$K_L \to \pi^0 l^+ l^- \oplus K_S \to \pi^0 l^+ l^- \oplus K_L \to \pi^0 \gamma \gamma$$
 system  
 $\Rightarrow$  L. Sehgal & C. Smith

with sizable (35%–45%) contr. from the th. clean & interesting

 $B_{\rm L}(ee)_{\rm SM} = 3.7 \pm 1.0 \times 10^{-11}$  $B_{\rm L}(\mu\mu)_{\rm SM} = 1.5 \pm 0.3 \times 10^{-11}$ 

direct–CPV amplitude

$$W = \underbrace{u, c, t}_{Z} + box$$

similar to  $K_{\rm L} \rightarrow \pi^0 \nu \nu$ , with different NP sensitivity

G.D'Ambrosio, G. Buchalla & G.I. '03 G.I., C. Smith & R. Unterdorfer, '04 4. Rare (but not impossible...) decays





Irreducible error  $\sim 10\%$ 

[not as clean as  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 vv$ , but still extremely interesting + different NP sensitivity] provided we can measure at a comparable level of accuracy the corresponding  $K_S$  transitions  $\Rightarrow$  possible at a super  $\Phi$  factory with O(100 fb<sup>-1</sup>)

### 5.1 Charge asymmetries

$$\Delta_{f} = \frac{d\Gamma(K^{+} \rightarrow f^{+}) - d\Gamma(K^{-} \rightarrow f^{-})}{d\Gamma(K^{+} \rightarrow f^{+}) + \delta\Gamma(K^{-} \rightarrow f^{-})} \neq 0 \qquad \Leftrightarrow \quad \text{direct } \mathbb{CP}$$

Strong competition from NA48/2 and small chances to observe non–zero signals within the SM, but still worth to try...

A particularly interesting case:  $K^{\pm} \rightarrow \pi^{\pm} \pi^{0} \gamma$ [Th. cleaner + more sensitive to New Physics effects than  $K \rightarrow 3\pi$ ]

$$Dalitz-Plot \ variables:$$

$$T_{c} = charged kaon kin. energy$$

$$W^{2} = \frac{qp_{+} q p_{K}}{M_{\pi}^{2} M_{K}^{2}}$$

$$\mathcal{CP} \Rightarrow \frac{\partial^{2} \Gamma}{\partial^{2} \Gamma \partial T_{c} \partial W^{2}} = \frac{\partial^{2} \Gamma}{R} \left[ 1 + \Re \left( \frac{E_{DE}}{A_{2\pi}} \right) W^{2} + O(W^{4}) \right]$$

$$W^{2} = \frac{qp_{+} q p_{K}}{M_{\pi}^{2} M_{K}^{2}}$$

$$\mathcal{CP} \Rightarrow \frac{\partial^{2} \Gamma \partial T_{c} \partial W^{2} - \partial^{2} \overline{\Gamma} \partial T_{c} \partial W^{2}}{\partial^{2} \Gamma \partial T_{c} \partial W^{2} + \partial^{2} \overline{\Gamma} \partial T_{c} \partial W^{2}} = \Omega W^{2} + \dots$$

$$\mathcal{CP} \Rightarrow \frac{\partial^{2} \Gamma}{\partial^{2} \Gamma \partial T_{c} \partial W^{2} + \partial^{2} \overline{\Gamma} \partial T_{c} \partial W^{2}} = \Omega W^{2} + \dots$$

 $\frac{d_R^{i}}{\epsilon} = \frac{d_L^{j}}{\epsilon} \qquad \frac{d_L^{j}}{\Omega_{SUSY}} \sim 10^{-4} \text{ [chromag. op. saturates } \epsilon'/\epsilon \Leftrightarrow \text{ realisitc models]} \\ \Omega_{SUSY} \sim 10^{-3} \text{ [large cancellations in } \epsilon'/\epsilon \Leftrightarrow \text{ possible, not natural]}$ 

#### 5.2 $\pi\pi$ phases *et al*.

There are many interesting aspects of QCD at low energies which can still be studied in the kaon sector [most notable example: the precise determination of  $\pi\pi$  phases from  $K^{\pm}_{14}$ ]

Many of them are described in the 2<sup>nd</sup> DA $\Phi$ NE Handbook, others strategies have recently been inspired by the new precise NA48/2 data [e.g. the extraction of  $\pi\pi$  phases from  $K_{3\pi} \Rightarrow$  Cabibbo's talks], probably even more are still to come...

Not easy to anticipate the potential impact of a future DAΦNE upgrade in this context

but there are good chances for substantial contributions

# • My conclusions

The physics case of a high–intensity  $\Phi$  factory with  $10^{33} < L \ [cm^{-2}s^{-1}] < 10^{34}$  is certainly interesting and worth to be explored

Not a unique outstanding goal, but a series of interesting meas. in the K sector:

- <u>clear targets</u> [V<sub>us</sub> & K<sub>13</sub> f.f., rare (K<sub>S</sub>) decays, CPT tests]
- <u>less clear targets</u> [  $K^{\pm}$ -asym., interferometry,  $K_{14}$ ,... ]  $\Rightarrow$  more work on real data needed to better quantify the potential impact
- + the usual non-K program at the  $\Phi$  [worth to think about  $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi\pi$ ]

This of course does not mean that the high-energy option is not interesting

# • My conclusions

The physics case of a high–intensity  $\Phi$  factory with  $10^{33} < L \ [cm^{-2}s^{-1}] < 10^{34}$  is certainly interesting and worth to be explored

Not a unique outstanding goal, but a series of interesting meas. in the K sector:

- <u>clear targets</u> [V<sub>us</sub> & K<sub>13</sub> f.f., rare (K<sub>S</sub>) decays, CPT tests]
- <u>less clear targets</u> [  $K^{\pm}$ -asym., interferometry,  $K_{14}$ ,... ]  $\Rightarrow$  more work on real data needed to better quantify the potential impact
- + the usual non–K program at the  $\Phi$  [worth to think about  $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi\pi$ ]

This of course does not mean that the high-energy option is not interesting

However... \* The most clear goals in the high–L option will be less interesting if the time scale is too long [strong competition within the field of flavour physics]

★ The high-L option is extremely challenging from the exp. point of view
 [huge statistics & high precision] ⇒ a too long interruption of the kaon program could be dangerous

# • My conclusions

The physics case of a high–intensity  $\Phi$  factory with  $10^{33} < L \ [cm^{-2}s^{-1}] < 10^{34}$  is certainly interesting and worth to be explored

Not a unique outstanding goal, but a series of interesting meas. in the K sector:

- <u>clear targets</u> [V<sub>us</sub> & K<sub>13</sub> f.f., rare (K<sub>S</sub>) decays, CPT tests]
- <u>less clear targets</u> [  $K^{\pm}$ -asym., interferometry,  $K_{14}$ ,... ]  $\Rightarrow$  more work on real data needed to better quantify the potential impact
- + the usual non–K program at the  $\Phi$  [worth to think about  $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi\pi$ ]

# In addition to the natural machine and experimental considerations the time schedule of this program represents a key point

# Rare Kaon decays – The Good, The Bad, The Ugly – George Redlinger



The physics case for DA $\Phi$ NE upgrade – For a few picobarns<sup>-1</sup> more –



Rare Kaon decays – The Good, The Bad, The Ugly –

