# The flavor intensity frontier: Belle II and LHCb and some of their recent results

Daniel Greenwald

Institute for Hadronic Structure & Fundamental Symmetries Technische Universität München

> DPG Frühjahrstagung 2025 Göttingen, April 4, 2025

We know of the following elementary fermions

We know of the following elementary fermions

( d )  $\left( e \right) \left( \nu_{e} \right)$ ( u )

We know of the following elementary fermions

 $\begin{array}{c|c} u & d & e & \nu_e \\ \hline c & s & \mu & \nu_\mu \end{array}$ 

We know of the following elementary fermions

d  $\nu_{\mathsf{e}}$ u е  $u_{\mu}$ С s  $\mu$ b t au $\nu_{\tau}$ 

We know of the following elementary fermions



these **flavors** are distinguishable only by their masses

We know of the following elementary fermions



these **flavors** are distinguishable only by their masses and couplings to the  $W^{\pm}$  (for the quarks)

We know of the following elementary fermions



these **flavors** are distinguishable only by their masses and couplings to the  $W^{\pm}$  (for the quarks)

flavor physics  $\equiv$  study of differences and dynamics between flavors

We know of the following elementary fermions



these **flavors** are distinguishable only by their masses and couplings to the  $W^{\pm}$  (for the quarks)

flavor physics  $\equiv$  study of differences and dynamics between flavors

**Grand scheme:** find origin of mass and interaction hierarchies

We know of the following elementary fermions



these **flavors** are distinguishable only by their masses and couplings to the  $W^{\pm}$  (for the quarks)

flavor physics  $\equiv$  study of differences and dynamics between flavors

- **Grand scheme:** find origin of mass and interaction hierarchies
- ▶ Nearer goals: measure standard-model parameters and search for new forces and particles





#### The LHC symmetrically collides protons with protons



The LHC symmetrically collides protons with protons at center-of-mass energies of 7-14 TeV



The LHC symmetrically collides protons with protons at center-of-mass energies of 7-14 TeV

$$pp \rightarrow q\bar{q} + X$$
,  $pp \rightarrow W + X$ ,  $pp \rightarrow Z + X$ 



The LHC symmetrically collides protons with protons at center-of-mass energies of 7-14 TeV

$$pp \rightarrow q\bar{q} + X$$
,  $pp \rightarrow W + X$ ,  $pp \rightarrow Z + X$ 

q = u, d, s, c, b, t



The LHC symmetrically collides protons with protons at center-of-mass energies of 7-14 TeV

$$pp \rightarrow q\bar{q} + X$$
,  $pp \rightarrow W + X$ ,  $pp \rightarrow Z + X$ 

q = u, d, s, c, b, t X = hadrons, charged leptons, neutrinos



The LHC symmetrically collides protons with protons at center-of-mass energies of 7-14 TeV

$$pp \rightarrow q\bar{q} + X$$
,  $pp \rightarrow W + X$ ,  $pp \rightarrow Z + X$ 

q = u, d, s, c, b, t X = hadrons, charged leptons, neutrinos

Only parts of protons interact with each other,



The LHC symmetrically collides protons with protons at center-of-mass energies of 7-14 TeV

$$pp \rightarrow q\bar{q} + X$$
,  $pp \rightarrow W + X$ ,  $pp \rightarrow Z + X$ 

q = u, d, s, c, b, t X = hadrons, charged leptons, neutrinos

Only parts of protons interact with each other, at an energy much less than collision energy.



The LHC symmetrically collides protons with protons at center-of-mass energies of 7-14 TeV

$$pp \rightarrow q\bar{q} + X$$
,  $pp \rightarrow W + X$ ,  $pp \rightarrow Z + X$ 

q = u, d, s, c, b, t X = hadrons, charged leptons, neutrinos

Only parts of protons interact with each other, at an energy much less than collision energy.

Particles of interest have high momenta in the beam directions.





#### It's a forward detector





It's a **forward detector** consisting of

vertex & tracking detectors



It's a **forward detector** consisting of

#### vertex & tracking detectors measure charged-particle trajectories,



It's a **forward detector** consisting of

#### vertex & tracking detectors measure charged-particle trajectories, determine p from bending in B field



- vertex & tracking detectors measure charged-particle trajectories, determine p from bending in B field
- ring-imaging Cherenkov det's



- vertex & tracking detectors measure charged-particle trajectories, determine p from bending in B field
- ring-imaging Cherenkov det's identify charged-particle types (π<sup>±</sup>, K<sup>±</sup>, ...)



- vertex & tracking detectors measure charged-particle trajectories, determine p from bending in B field
- ring-imaging Cherenkov det's identify charged-particle types (π<sup>±</sup>, K<sup>±</sup>, ...)
- calorimeters



It's a **forward detector** consisting of

- vertex & tracking detectors measure charged-particle trajectories, determine p from bending in B field
- ring-imaging Cherenkov det's identify charged-particle types (π<sup>±</sup>, K<sup>±</sup>, ...)

 calorimeters measure particle energies



- vertex & tracking detectors measure charged-particle trajectories, determine p from bending in B field
- ring-imaging Cherenkov det's identify charged-particle types (π<sup>±</sup>, K<sup>±</sup>, ...)
- calorimeters measure particle energies
- muon detectors



It's a **forward detector** consisting of

- vertex & tracking detectors measure charged-particle trajectories, determine p from bending in B field
- ring-imaging Cherenkov det's identify charged-particle types (π<sup>±</sup>, K<sup>±</sup>, ...)
- calorimeters measure particle energies
- muon detectors

detect muons



Detects and identifies e<sup>±</sup>,  $\mu^{\pm}$ ,  $\pi^{\pm}$ , K<sup>±</sup>,  $p^{\pm}$ ;  $\gamma$ 

- vertex & tracking detectors measure charged-particle trajectories, determine p from bending in B field
- ring-imaging Cherenkov det's identify charged-particle types (π<sup>±</sup>, K<sup>±</sup>, ...)
- calorimeters measure particle energies
- muon detectors detect muons



Detects and identifies  $e^{\pm}$ ,  $\mu^{\pm}$ ,  $\pi^{\pm}$ ,  $K^{\pm}$ ,  $p^{\pm}$ ;  $\gamma$ Reconstructs  $K_{S}^{0} \rightarrow \pi^{+}\pi^{-}$ ,  $\Lambda^{0} \rightarrow p \pi^{-}$ ,  $\pi^{0} \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$ , ...

- vertex & tracking detectors measure charged-particle trajectories, determine p from bending in B field
- ring-imaging Cherenkov det's identify charged-particle types (π<sup>±</sup>, K<sup>±</sup>, ...)
- calorimeters measure particle energies
- muon detectors detect muons




SuperKEKB asymmetrically collides electrons with positrons



SuperKEKB asymmetrically collides electrons with positrons at c.m. energies near 10.6 GeV



SuperKEKB asymmetrically collides electrons with positrons at c.m. energies near 10.6 GeV

$$e^+e^- 
ightarrow f ar{f}$$



SuperKEKB asymmetrically collides electrons with positrons at c.m. energies near 10.6 GeV

$$e^+e^- \rightarrow f\bar{f}$$
  
 $f = e, \mu, \tau, u, d, s, c, b$ 



SuperKEKB asymmetrically collides electrons with positrons at c.m. energies near 10.6 GeV

$$\mathrm{e^+e^-} 
ightarrow far{f}$$
  
 $f=\mathrm{e},\mu,oldsymbol{ au},\mathrm{u},\mathrm{d},\mathrm{s},\mathrm{c},\mathrm{b}$ 

incoming  $E(e^-) > E(e^+)$ 



SuperKEKB asymmetrically collides electrons with positrons at c.m. energies near 10.6 GeV

$$e^+e^- \rightarrow f\bar{f}$$

$$f = e, \mu, \boldsymbol{\tau}, u, d, s, c, b$$

incoming  $E(e^-) > E(e^+) \longrightarrow$  outgoing system moves in electron direction in lab frame





#### It's a $4\pi$ detector





It's a  $4\pi$  detector consisting of

vertex det's & drift chamber



It's a  $4\pi$  detector consisting of

 vertex det's & drift chamber measure charged-particle trajectories,



It's a  $4\pi$  detector consisting of

vertex det's & drift chamber measure charged-particle trajectories, determine p from bending in B field



- vertex det's & drift chamber measure charged-particle trajectories, determine p from bending in B field
- Particle ID (Cherenkov) det's



- vertex det's & drift chamber measure charged-particle trajectories, determine p from bending in B field
- Particle ID (Cherenkov) det's identify charged-particle types (π<sup>±</sup>, K<sup>±</sup>, ...)



It's a  $4\pi$  detector consisting of

- vertex det's & drift chamber measure charged-particle trajectories, determine p from bending in B field
- Particle ID (Cherenkov) det's identify charged-particle types (π<sup>±</sup>, K<sup>±</sup>, ...)

calorimeter



- vertex det's & drift chamber measure charged-particle trajectories, determine p from bending in B field
- Particle ID (Cherenkov) det's identify charged-particle types (π<sup>±</sup>, K<sup>±</sup>, ...)
- calorimeter measure particle energies



- vertex det's & drift chamber measure charged-particle trajectories, determine p from bending in B field
- Particle ID (Cherenkov) det's identify charged-particle types (π<sup>±</sup>, K<sup>±</sup>, ...)
- calorimeter measure particle energies
- K<sub>L</sub> & muon detector



- vertex det's & drift chamber measure charged-particle trajectories, determine p from bending in B field
- Particle ID (Cherenkov) det's identify charged-particle types (π<sup>±</sup>, K<sup>±</sup>, ...)
- calorimeter measure particle energies
- K<sub>L</sub> & muon detector detect K<sub>L</sub> & muons



It's a  $4\pi$  detector consisting of

- vertex det's & drift chamber measure charged-particle trajectories, determine p from bending in B field
- Particle ID (Cherenkov) det's identify charged-particle types (π<sup>±</sup>, K<sup>±</sup>, ...)
- calorimeter measure particle energies
- K<sub>L</sub> & muon detector detect K<sub>L</sub> & muons

Detects and identifies  $e^{\pm}$ ,  $\mu^{\pm}$ ,  $\pi^{\pm}$ ,  $K^{\pm}$ ,  $p^{\pm}$ ;  $\gamma$ ,  $K_{L}$ 



Detects and identifies  $e^{\pm}$ ,  $\mu^{\pm}$ ,  $\pi^{\pm}$ ,  $K^{\pm}$ ,  $p^{\pm}$ ;  $\gamma$ ,  $K_{L}$ Reconstructs  $K_{S}^{0} \rightarrow \pi^{+}\pi^{-}$ ,  $\Lambda^{0} \rightarrow p \pi^{-}$ ,  $\pi^{0} \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$ , ...

- vertex det's & drift chamber measure charged-particle trajectories, determine p from bending in B field
- Particle ID (Cherenkov) det's identify charged-particle types (π<sup>±</sup>, K<sup>±</sup>, ...)
- calorimeter measure particle energies
- K<sub>L</sub> & muon detector detect K<sub>L</sub> & muons









► Taking data since 2010.





► Taking data since 2010.

► Taking data since 2019.





#### Taking data since 2019.











- ► Taking data since 2010.
- Collected several  $fb^{-1}$  of data.

Taking data since 2019.
 collected 100s of fb<sup>-1</sup> of data



Belle II

- ► Taking data since 2010.
- Collected several  $fb^{-1}$  of data.
- Millibarn cross sections for  $pp \rightarrow q\bar{q} + X$ .

Taking data since 2019.
 collected 100s of fb<sup>-1</sup> of data



- ► Taking data since 2010.
- $\blacktriangleright$  Collected several fb<sup>-1</sup> of data.
- Millibarn cross sections for  $pp \rightarrow q\bar{q} + X$ .



- Taking data since 2019.
- **•** collected 100s of  $fb^{-1}$  of data
- nanobarn cross sections for  $e^+e^- \rightarrow f \bar{f}$ .



- ► Taking data since 2010.
- $\blacktriangleright$  Collected several fb<sup>-1</sup> of data.
- Millibarn cross sections for  $pp \rightarrow q\bar{q} + X$ .
- trillions of events



- Taking data since 2019.
- **•** collected 100s of  $fb^{-1}$  of data
- nanobarn cross sections for  $e^+e^- \rightarrow f \bar{f}$ .



- Taking data since 2010.
- $\blacktriangleright$  Collected several fb<sup>-1</sup> of data.
- Millibarn cross sections for  $pp \rightarrow q\bar{q} + X$ .
- trillions of events



- ► Taking data since 2019.
- **>** collected 100s of  $fb^{-1}$  of data
- nanobarn cross sections for  $e^+e^- \rightarrow f \bar{f}$ .
- 100s of millions of events



- ► Taking data since 2010.
- $\blacktriangleright$  Collected several fb<sup>-1</sup> of data.
- Millibarn cross sections for  $pp \rightarrow q\bar{q} + X$ .
- trillions of events
- high cross sections



- ► Taking data since 2019.
- $\blacktriangleright$  collected 100s of  ${\rm fb}^{-1}$  of data
- nanobarn cross sections for  $e^+e^- \rightarrow f \bar{f}$ .
- 100s of millions of events



- Taking data since 2010.
- Collected several  $fb^{-1}$  of data.
- Millibarn cross sections for  $pp \rightarrow q\bar{q} + X$ .
- trillions of events
- high cross sections



- ► Taking data since 2019.
- $\blacktriangleright$  collected 100s of  ${\rm fb}^{-1}$  of data
- nanobarn cross sections for  $e^+e^- \rightarrow f \bar{f}$ .
- 100s of millions of events
- high luminosity



- Taking data since 2010.
- Collected several  $fb^{-1}$  of data.
- Millibarn cross sections for  $pp \rightarrow q\bar{q} + X$ .
- trillions of events
- high cross sections



- ► Taking data since 2019.
- $\blacktriangleright$  collected 100s of  ${\rm fb}^{-1}$  of data
- nanobarn cross sections for  $e^+e^- \rightarrow f\bar{f}$ .
- 100s of millions of events
- high luminosity (world's highest)



- Taking data since 2010.
- Collected several  $fb^{-1}$  of data.
- Millibarn cross sections for  $pp \rightarrow q\bar{q} + X$ .
- trillions of events
- high cross sections



- Taking data since 2019.
- $\blacktriangleright$  collected 100s of  ${\rm fb}^{-1}$  of data
- nanobarn cross sections for  $e^+e^- \rightarrow f \bar{f}$ .
- 100s of millions of events
- high luminosity (world's highest)

lots of data = high intensity  $\rightarrow$  precise measurements


- Taking data since 2010.
- Collected several  $fb^{-1}$  of data.
- Millibarn cross sections for  $pp \rightarrow q\bar{q} + X$ .
- trillions of events
- high cross sections



- Taking data since 2019.
   collected 100s of fb<sup>-1</sup> of data
   nanobarn cross sections for e<sup>+</sup>e<sup>-</sup> → f f̄.
  - 100s of millions of events
  - high luminosity (world's highest)

can study particles heavier than B, 5.3 GeV



- Taking data since 2010.
- Collected several  $fb^{-1}$  of data.
- Millibarn cross sections for  $pp \rightarrow q\bar{q} + X$ .
- trillions of events
- high cross sections



- Taking data since 2019.
   collected 100s of fb<sup>-1</sup> of data
   nanobarn cross sections for e<sup>+</sup>e<sup>-</sup> → f f.
  - 100s of millions of events
  - high luminosity (world's highest)

- can study particles heavier than B, 5.3 GeV
- larger lab-frame momenta



- Taking data since 2010.
- Collected several fb<sup>-1</sup> of data.
- Millibarn cross sections for  $pp \rightarrow q\bar{q} + X$ .
- trillions of events
- high cross sections



- ► Taking data since 2019.
   ► collected 100s of fb<sup>-1</sup> of data
   ► nanobarn cross sections for e<sup>+</sup>e<sup>-</sup> → f f.
- 100s of millions of events
- high luminosity (world's highest)

- can study particles heavier than B, 5.3 GeV
- larger lab-frame momenta
- more data



- Taking data since 2010.
- Collected several  $fb^{-1}$  of data.
- Millibarn cross sections for  $pp \rightarrow q\bar{q} + X$ .
- trillions of events
- high cross sections



- Taking data since 2019.
   collected 100s of fb<sup>-1</sup> of data
   nanobarn cross sections for e<sup>+</sup>e<sup>-</sup> → f f̄.
   100s of millions of events
  - high luminosity (world's highest)

- can study particles heavier than B, 5.3 GeV
- can (better) detect  $\gamma$ 's and reconstruct  $\pi^0$ 's

- larger lab-frame momenta
- more data



- Taking data since 2010.
- Collected several  $fb^{-1}$  of data.
- Millibarn cross sections for  $pp \rightarrow q\bar{q} + X$ .
- trillions of events
- high cross sections



Taking data since 2019.
collected 100s of fb<sup>-1</sup> of data
nanobarn cross sections for e<sup>+</sup>e<sup>-</sup> → f f̄.
100s of millions of events
high luminosity (world's highest)

- can study particles heavier than B, 5.3 GeV
- larger lab-frame momenta
- more data

- can (better) detect  $\gamma$ 's and reconstruct  $\pi^0$ 's
- can study decays to invisible particles



- Taking data since 2010.
- Collected several  $fb^{-1}$  of data.
- Millibarn cross sections for  $pp \rightarrow q\bar{q} + X$ .
- trillions of events
- high cross sections



Taking data since 2019.
 collected 100s of fb<sup>-1</sup> of data
 nanobarn cross sections for e<sup>+</sup>e<sup>-</sup> → f f̄.
 100s of millions of events
 high luminosity (world's highest)

- can study particles heavier than B, 5.3 GeV
- larger lab-frame momenta
- more data

- ▶ can (better) detect  $\gamma$ 's and reconstruct  $\pi^0$ 's
- can study decays to invisible particles
- $\blacktriangleright$  can study  $\tau$  decay



- ▶ 1700 members
- 100 institutes
- 22 countries



- 1200 members
   124 in the second s
- 124 institutes
- 28 countries





Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung



- 1700 members
- 100 institutes
- 22 countries

- 1200 members124 institutes
- 28 countries

#### **German Contributions**





Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung



- 1700 members
- 100 institutes
- 22 countries

1200 members
124 institutes
28 countries

#### **German Contributions**

- Aachen
- Bonn
- Bochum
- Freiburg

- Dortmund
- Heidelberg Uni, MPK

- Bonn
- Giessen
- Göttingen
- DESY

- Heidelberg
- Karlsruhe
- Mainz
- München LMU, MPP, TUM

Let's look at some of the most recent measurements.

#### Let's look at some of the most recent measurements.

Focusing on

**what** we measure,

**why** we measure it, and

**how** we measure it.

#### Let's look at some of the most recent measurements.

Focusing on

what we measure, limited to my personal selection, given the time constraints,

**why** we measure it, and

**how** we measure it.

 $\textbf{CP} \equiv \textbf{swaps}$  left-handed particles and right-handed antiparticles

 $\label{eq:CP} CP \equiv swaps \mbox{ left-handed particles and right-handed antiparticles} \\ CP \mbox{ violation} \equiv CP \mbox{ conjugated states behaving differently} \\$ 

 $\label{eq:CP} CP \equiv swaps \mbox{ left-handed particles and right-handed antiparticles} \\ CP \mbox{ violation} \equiv CP \mbox{ conjugated states behaving differently} \\$ 

Why do we care?

 $\label{eq:CP} CP \equiv swaps \mbox{ left-handed particles and right-handed antiparticles} \\ CP \mbox{ violation} \equiv CP \mbox{ conjugated states behaving differently} \\$ 

Why do we care?

Universe is CP asymmetric—made of matter, not antimatter.

 $\label{eq:CP} CP \equiv swaps \mbox{ left-handed particles and right-handed antiparticles} \\ CP \mbox{ violation} \equiv CP \mbox{ conjugated states behaving differently} \\$ 

Why do we care?

Universe is CP asymmetric—made of matter, not antimatter.
 ⇒ better understand where and how CP is violated.

 $\label{eq:CP} CP \equiv swaps \mbox{ left-handed particles and right-handed antiparticles} \\ CP \mbox{ violation} \equiv CP \mbox{ conjugated states behaving differently} \\$ 

Why do we care?

- Universe is CP asymmetric—made of matter, not antimatter.
   ⇒ better understand where and how CP is violated.
- Standard model predicts particular processes are CP symmetric.

 $\label{eq:CP} CP \equiv swaps \mbox{ left-handed particles and right-handed antiparticles} \\ CP \mbox{ violation} \equiv CP \mbox{ conjugated states behaving differently} \\$ 

Why do we care?

- Universe is CP asymmetric—made of matter, not antimatter.
   ⇒ better understand where and how CP is violated.
- Standard model predicts particular processes are CP symmetric. ⇒ search for new forces and particles beyond the standard model.

 $\label{eq:CP} CP \equiv swaps \mbox{ left-handed particles and right-handed antiparticles} \\ CP \mbox{ violation} \equiv CP \mbox{ conjugated states behaving differently} \\$ 

Why do we care?

- Universe is CP asymmetric—made of matter, not antimatter.
   ⇒ better understand where and how CP is violated.
- Standard model predicts particular processes are CP symmetric. ⇒ search for new forces and particles beyond the standard model.

 $\label{eq:CP} CP \equiv \text{swaps left-handed particles and right-handed antiparticles} \\ CP \mbox{ violation} \equiv CP \mbox{ conjugated states behaving differently}$ 

Why do we care?

- Universe is CP asymmetric—made of matter, not antimatter.
   ⇒ better understand where and how CP is violated.
- Standard model predicts particular processes are CP symmetric. ⇒ search for new forces and particles beyond the standard model.

$$A_{\rm CP} \equiv \frac{\Gamma(X \to abc) - \overline{\Gamma(X \to abc)}}{\Gamma(X \to abc) + \overline{\Gamma(X \to abc)}}$$

 $\label{eq:CP} CP \equiv swaps \mbox{ left-handed particles and right-handed antiparticles} \\ CP \mbox{ violation} \equiv CP \mbox{ conjugated states behaving differently} \\$ 

Why do we care?

- Universe is CP asymmetric—made of matter, not antimatter.
   ⇒ better understand where and how CP is violated.
- Standard model predicts particular processes are CP symmetric. ⇒ search for new forces and particles beyond the standard model.

$$A_{\rm CP} \equiv \frac{\Gamma(X \to abc) - \overline{\Gamma(X \to abc)}}{\Gamma(X \to abc) + \overline{\Gamma(X \to abc)}} \in [-1, 1]$$

 $\label{eq:CP} CP \equiv \text{swaps left-handed particles and right-handed antiparticles} \\ CP \mbox{ violation} \equiv CP \mbox{ conjugated states behaving differently}$ 

Why do we care?

- Universe is CP asymmetric—made of matter, not antimatter.
   ⇒ better understand where and how CP is violated.
- Standard model predicts particular processes are CP symmetric. ⇒ search for new forces and particles beyond the standard model.

$$A_{\rm CP} \equiv \frac{\Gamma(X \to abc) - \overline{\Gamma(X \to abc)}}{\Gamma(X \to abc) + \overline{\Gamma(X \to abc)}} \ \in \ [-1, 1] \ = \ \begin{cases} {\sf zero} & \to \ {\sf CP} \ {\sf conserving} \\ \\ \end{array}$$

 $\label{eq:CP} CP \equiv \text{swaps left-handed particles and right-handed antiparticles} \\ CP \mbox{ violation} \equiv CP \mbox{ conjugated states behaving differently}$ 

Why do we care?

- Universe is CP asymmetric—made of matter, not antimatter.
   ⇒ better understand where and how CP is violated.
- Standard model predicts particular processes are CP symmetric. ⇒ search for new forces and particles beyond the standard model.

$$A_{\rm CP} \equiv \frac{\Gamma(X \to abc) - \overline{\Gamma(X \to abc)}}{\Gamma(X \to abc) + \overline{\Gamma(X \to abc)}} ~\in~ [-1, 1] ~=~ \begin{cases} {\sf zero} & \to \ {\sf CP} \ {\sf conserving} \\ {\sf nonzero} & \to \ {\sf CP} \ {\sf violating} \end{cases}$$

Why?

Why? CP violation is not a widely-scene phenomenon:

**1964** CP violation in K<sup>0</sup> mixing

strange meson

| 1964 | CP violation in K <sup>0</sup> mixing | strange meson |
|------|---------------------------------------|---------------|
| 1999 | CP violation in K <sup>0</sup> decay  | strange meson |

| 1964 | CP violation in K <sup>0</sup> mixing               | strange meson |
|------|---|---------------|
| 1999 | CP violation in $K^0$ decay                         | strange meson |
| 2001 | <b>CP violation in B<sup>0</sup></b> mixing & decay | bottom meson  |

| 1964 | CP violation in K <sup>0</sup> mixing               | strange meson |
|------|---|---------------|
| 1999 | CP violation in $K^0$ decay                         | strange meson |
| 2001 | <b>CP violation in B<sup>0</sup></b> mixing & decay | bottom meson  |
|      |   |               |

| 1964 | CP violation in K <sup>0</sup> mixing               | strange meson |
|------|---|---------------|
| 1999 | CP violation in $K^0$ decay                         | strange meson |
| 2001 | <b>CP violation in B<sup>0</sup></b> mixing & decay | bottom meson  |
| 2004 | CP violation in $B^0$ decay                         | bottom meson  |
| 2012 | ${\sf CP}$ violation in ${\sf B}^+$ decay           | bottom meson  |

| 1964 | <b>CP violation in K<sup>0</sup></b> mixing         | strange meson        |
|------|---|----------------------|
| 1999 | CP violation in $K^0$ decay                         | strange meson        |
| 2001 | <b>CP violation in B<sup>0</sup></b> mixing & decay | bottom meson         |
| 2004 | CP violation in B <sup>0</sup> decay                | bottom meson         |
| 2012 | CP violation in $B^+$ decay                         | bottom meson         |
| 2013 | CP violation in $B_s^0$ decay                       | bottom-strange meson |

| 1964 | CP violation in K <sup>0</sup> mixing               | strange meson        |
|------|---|----------------------|
| 1999 | CP violation in $K^0$ decay                         | strange meson        |
| 2001 | <b>CP violation in B<sup>0</sup></b> mixing & decay | bottom meson         |
| 2004 | CP violation in $B^0$ decay                         | bottom meson         |
| 2012 | ${\sf CP}$ violation in ${\sf B}^+$ decay           | bottom meson         |
| 2013 | CP violation in $B_s^0$ decay                       | bottom-strange meson |
| 2019 | <b>CP violation in D<sup>0</sup></b> decay          | charm meson          |

Why? CP violation is not a widely-scene phenomenon:

| 1964 | CP violation in K <sup>0</sup> mixing               | strange meson        |
|------|---|----------------------|
| 1999 | CP violation in $K^0$ decay                         | strange meson        |
| 2001 | <b>CP violation in B<sup>0</sup></b> mixing & decay | bottom meson         |
| 2004 | CP violation in $B^0$ decay                         | bottom meson         |
| 2012 | CP violation in $B^+$ decay                         | bottom meson         |
| 2013 | CP violation in $B_s^0$ decay                       | bottom-strange meson |
| 2019 | <b>CP violation in D<sup>0</sup></b> decay          | charm meson          |

CP violation was not seen in process involving baryons.
Why? CP violation is not a widely-scene phenomenon:

| 1964 | CP violation in K <sup>0</sup> mixing               | strange meson        |
|------|---|----------------------|
| 1999 | CP violation in $K^0$ decay                         | strange meson        |
| 2001 | <b>CP violation in B<sup>0</sup></b> mixing & decay | bottom meson         |
| 2004 | CP violation in $B^0$ decay                         | bottom meson         |
| 2012 | CP violation in $B^+$ decay                         | bottom meson         |
| 2013 | CP violation in $B_s^0$ decay                       | bottom-strange meson |
| 2019 | <b>CP violation in D<sup>0</sup></b> decay          | charm meson          |

CP violation was not seen in process involving baryons.

Yet the CP asymmetry of the universe is a baryon-antibaryon asymmetry

Why? CP violation is not a widely-scene phenomenon:

| 1964 | CP violation in K <sup>0</sup> mixing               | strange meson        |
|------|---|----------------------|
| 1999 | CP violation in $K^0$ decay                         | strange meson        |
| 2001 | <b>CP violation in B<sup>0</sup></b> mixing & decay | bottom meson         |
| 2004 | CP violation in $B^0$ decay                         | bottom meson         |
| 2012 | CP violation in $B^+$ decay                         | bottom meson         |
| 2013 | CP violation in $B_s^0$ decay                       | bottom-strange meson |
| 2019 | <b>CP violation in D<sup>0</sup></b> decay          | charm meson          |

CP violation was not seen in process involving baryons.

Yet the CP asymmetry of the universe is a baryon-antibaryon asymmetry

LHCb measured the decay-rate CP asymmetries of some decays of the  $\Lambda^0_b$  baryon

Why? CP violation is not a widely-scene phenomenon:

| 1964 | CP violation in K <sup>0</sup> mixing               | strange meson        |
|------|---|----------------------|
| 1999 | CP violation in $K^0$ decay                         | strange meson        |
| 2001 | <b>CP violation in B<sup>0</sup></b> mixing & decay | bottom meson         |
| 2004 | CP violation in $B^0$ decay                         | bottom meson         |
| 2012 | CP violation in $B^+$ decay                         | bottom meson         |
| 2013 | CP violation in $B_s^0$ decay                       | bottom-strange meson |
| 2019 | <b>CP violation in D<sup>0</sup></b> decay          | charm meson          |

CP violation was not seen in process involving baryons.

Yet the CP asymmetry of the universe is a **baryon-antibaryon asymmetry** 

LHCb measured the decay-rate CP asymmetries of some decays of the  $\Lambda^0_b$  baryon



Why? CP violation is not a widely-scene phenomenon:

| 1964 | CP violation in K <sup>0</sup> mixing               | strange meson        |
|------|---|----------------------|
| 1999 | CP violation in $K^0$ decay                         | strange meson        |
| 2001 | <b>CP violation in B<sup>0</sup></b> mixing & decay | bottom meson         |
| 2004 | CP violation in $B^0$ decay                         | bottom meson         |
| 2012 | CP violation in $B^+$ decay                         | bottom meson         |
| 2013 | CP violation in $B_s^0$ decay                       | bottom-strange meson |
| 2019 | <b>CP violation in D<sup>0</sup></b> decay          | charm meson          |

h

CP violation was not seen in process involving baryons.

Yet the CP asymmetry of the universe is a **baryon-antibaryon asymmetry** 

LHCb measured the decay-rate CP asymmetries of some decays of the  $\Lambda^0_b$  baryon

• for 
$$\Lambda_b^0 \to \Lambda^0 \pi^+ \pi^-$$
,  $\Lambda^0 K^+ \pi^-$ ,  $\Lambda^0 \pi^+ K^-$ ,

[LHCb: PRL134.101802, 2025]

Why? CP violation is not a widely-scene phenomenon:

| 1964 | CP violation in K <sup>0</sup> mixing               | strange meson        |
|------|---|----------------------|
| 1999 | CP violation in $K^0$ decay                         | strange meson        |
| 2001 | <b>CP violation in B<sup>0</sup></b> mixing & decay | bottom meson         |
| 2004 | CP violation in $B^0$ decay                         | bottom meson         |
| 2012 | CP violation in $B^+$ decay                         | bottom meson         |
| 2013 | CP violation in $B_s^0$ decay                       | bottom-strange meson |
| 2019 | <b>CP violation in D<sup>0</sup></b> decay          | charm meson          |

h

CP violation was not seen in process involving baryons.

Yet the CP asymmetry of the universe is a **baryon-antibaryon asymmetry** 

LHCb measured the decay-rate CP asymmetries of some decays of the  $\Lambda^0_b$  baryon

for 
$$\Lambda_b^0 \to \Lambda^0 \pi^+ \pi^-$$
,  $\Lambda^0 K^+ \pi^-$ ,  $\Lambda^0 \pi^+ K^-$ ,  
for  $\Lambda_b^0 \to p K^- \pi^+ \pi^-$ 

[LHCb: PRL134.101802, 2025]

[LHCb: Moriond EW, 2025]



Find final-state particles

$$p \pi^{-} \pi^{+} K^{-}, \Lambda^{0} \pi^{+} \pi^{-}, \Lambda^{0} K^{+} \pi^{-}, \Lambda^{0} \pi^{+} K^{-},$$
 ( $\Lambda^{0} \rightarrow p \pi^{-}$ )  
LHCb detector

Find final-state particles

$$p \pi^{-} \pi^{+} K^{-}, \Lambda^{0} \pi^{+} \pi^{-}, \Lambda^{0} K^{+} \pi^{-}, \Lambda^{0} \pi^{+} K^{-},$$

$$(\Lambda^0 \to p\pi^-)$$

Require

LHCb detector

• they come from common point far from pp collision since  $\Lambda_b^0$  flies before decaying.

Find final-state particles

$$p \pi^{-} \pi^{+} K^{-}, \Lambda^{0} \pi^{+} \pi^{-}, \Lambda^{0} K^{+} \pi^{-}, \Lambda^{0} \pi^{+} K^{-},$$

$$(\Lambda^0 \to p\pi^-)$$

#### Require

- they come from common point far from pp collision since Λ<sup>0</sup><sub>b</sub> flies before decaying.
- their momentum sum point back to pp collision since A<sup>0</sup><sub>b</sub> comes from pp interaction.

Find final-state particles

$$p \pi^{-} \pi^{+} K^{-}, \Lambda^{0} \pi^{+} \pi^{-}, \Lambda^{0} K^{+} \pi^{-}, \Lambda^{0} \pi^{+} K^{-},$$

$$(\Lambda^0 \to p\pi^-)$$

#### Require

- they come from common point far from pp collision since Λ<sup>0</sup><sub>b</sub> flies before decaying.
- their momentum sum point back to pp collision since  $\Lambda_b^0$  comes from pp interaction.
- Veto weakly-decaying intermediate states:

Find final-state particles

$$p \pi^{-} \pi^{+} K^{-}, \Lambda^{0} \pi^{+} \pi^{-}, \Lambda^{0} K^{+} \pi^{-}, \Lambda^{0} \pi^{+} K^{-},$$

$$(\Lambda^0 \to p\pi^-)$$

#### ► Require

- they come from common point far from pp collision since Λ<sup>0</sup><sub>b</sub> flies before decaying.
- their momentum sum point back to pp collision since  $\Lambda_b^0$  comes from pp interaction.
- Veto weakly-decaying intermediate states: when final-state subset has mass near such a state.

#### **HCb** detector

Find final-state particles

$$p \pi^{-} \pi^{+} K^{-}, \Lambda^{0} \pi^{+} \pi^{-}, \Lambda^{0} K^{+} \pi^{-}, \Lambda^{0} \pi^{+} K^{-},$$

$$(\Lambda^0 \to p\pi^-)$$

#### Require

- they come from common point far from pp collision since Λ<sup>0</sup><sub>b</sub> flies before decaying.
- their momentum sum point back to pp collision since A<sup>0</sup><sub>b</sub> comes from pp interaction.
- Veto weakly-decaying intermediate states: when final-state subset has mass near such a state.
- Use machine-learning algorithm to remove random background

### Selected candidates are predominantly correct $\Lambda^0_b,$





Fit to the mass spectrum to get signal yield,  $N(\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \cdots)$ 



Fit to the mass spectra to get signal yields,  $N(\Lambda_b^0 \to \cdots)$  and  $N(\overline{\Lambda}_b^0 \to \overline{\cdots})$ .



Fit to the mass spectra to get signal yields,  $N(\Lambda_b^0 \to \cdots)$  and  $N(\overline{\Lambda}_b^0 \to \overline{\cdots})$ .

likewise for  $\Lambda^0 \pi^+ \pi^-$ , ...

$$A_{\rm raw}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{\rm 0}\to{\rm fsp's})\equiv \frac{N(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{\rm 0}\to\cdots)-N(\overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^{\rm 0}\to\overline{\rm fsp's})}{N(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{\rm 0}\to\cdots)+N(\overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^{\rm 0}\to\overline{\rm fsp's})}$$

$$\begin{split} A_{\rm raw}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{\rm 0}\to{\sf fsp's}) &\equiv \frac{N(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{\rm 0}\to\cdots)-N(\overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^{\rm 0}\to\overline{{\sf fsp's}})}{N(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{\rm 0}\to\cdots)+N(\overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^{\rm 0}\to\overline{{\sf fsp's}})} \\ &= A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{\rm 0}\to{\sf fsp's})+A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{\rm 0})+A_{\rm det}({\sf fsp's}) \end{split}$$

$$\begin{split} A_{\rm raw}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to{\sf fsp's}) &\equiv \frac{N(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to\cdots)-N(\overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0\to\overline{\sf fsp's})}{N(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to\cdots)+N(\overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0\to\overline{\sf fsp's})} \\ &= A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to{\sf fsp's}) + A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0) + A_{\rm det}({\sf fsp's}) \end{split}$$

 $A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_b^0)\equiv$  asymmetry of production of  $\Lambda_b^0$  and  $\overline{\Lambda}_b^0$  from pp collision

$$\begin{split} A_{\rm raw}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to{\sf fsp's}) &\equiv \frac{N(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to\cdots)-N(\overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0\to\overline{\sf fsp's})}{N(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to\cdots)+N(\overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0\to\overline{\sf fsp's})} \\ &= A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to{\sf fsp's}) + A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0) + A_{\rm det}({\sf fsp's}) \end{split}$$

 $A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_b^0) \equiv asymmetry of production of \Lambda_b^0 and \overline{\Lambda}_b^0$  from pp collision  $A_{\rm det}(fsp's) \equiv asymmetry of detection of \Lambda_b^0 and \overline{\Lambda}_b^0$  decay products

$$\begin{split} A_{\rm raw}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to{\sf fsp's}) &\equiv \frac{N(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to\cdots)-N(\overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0\to\overline{\sf fsp's})}{N(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to\cdots)+N(\overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0\to\overline{\sf fsp's})} \\ &= A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to{\sf fsp's}) + A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0) + A_{\rm det}({\sf fsp's}) \end{split}$$

 $A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_b^0) \equiv$  asymmetry of production of  $\Lambda_b^0$  and  $\overline{\Lambda}_b^0$  from pp collision  $A_{\rm det}(fsp's) \equiv$  asymmetry of detection of  $\Lambda_b^0$  and  $\overline{\Lambda}_b^0$  decay products

Use raw asymmetry in  $\Lambda_b^0 \to \Lambda_c^+ \pi^-$  to remove these:

$$\begin{split} A_{\rm raw}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to{\sf fsp's}) &\equiv \frac{N(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to\cdots)-N(\overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0\to\overline{\sf fsp's})}{N(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to\cdots)+N(\overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0\to\overline{\sf fsp's})} \\ &= A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to{\sf fsp's}) + A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0) + A_{\rm det}({\sf fsp's}) \end{split}$$

 $A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0) \equiv a$ symmetry of production of  $\Lambda_{\rm b}^0$  and  $\overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0$  from pp collision  $A_{\rm det}(fsp's) \equiv a$ symmetry of detection of  $\Lambda_{\rm b}^0$  and  $\overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0$  decay products

Use raw asymmetry in  $\Lambda^0_b \to \Lambda^+_c \pi^-$  to remove these:

$$A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{\rm 0} \to {\rm fsp's}) = A_{\rm raw}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{\rm 0} \to {\rm fsp's}) - A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{\rm 0}) - A_{\rm det}({\rm fsp's})$$

$$\begin{split} A_{\rm raw}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to{\sf fsp's}) &\equiv \frac{N(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to\cdots)-N(\overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0\to\overline{{\sf fsp's}})}{N(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to\cdots)+N(\overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0\to\overline{{\sf fsp's}})} \\ &= A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to{\sf fsp's})+A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0)+A_{\rm det}({\sf fsp's}) \end{split}$$

 $A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0) \equiv a$ symmetry of production of  $\Lambda_{\rm b}^0$  and  $\overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0$  from pp collision  $A_{\rm det}(fsp's) \equiv a$ symmetry of detection of  $\Lambda_{\rm b}^0$  and  $\overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0$  decay products

Use raw asymmetry in  $\Lambda^0_b \to \Lambda^+_c \pi^-$  to remove these:

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{0}\to{\sf fsp's}) &= A_{\rm raw}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{0}\to{\sf fsp's}) &- A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{0}) &- A_{\rm det}({\sf fsp's}) \\ A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{0}\to\Lambda_{\rm c}^{+}\pi^{-}) &= A_{\rm raw}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{0}\to\Lambda_{\rm c}^{+}\pi^{-}) &- A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{0}) &- A_{\rm det}(\Lambda_{\rm c}^{+}\pi^{-}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{split} A_{\rm raw}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to{\sf fsp's}) &\equiv \frac{N(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to\cdots)-N(\overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0\to\overline{{\sf fsp's}})}{N(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to\cdots)+N(\overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0\to\overline{{\sf fsp's}})} \\ &= A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to{\sf fsp's})+A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0)+A_{\rm det}({\sf fsp's}) \end{split}$$

 $A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0) \equiv asymmetry of production of \Lambda_{\rm b}^0 and \overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0$  from pp collision  $A_{\rm det}(fsp's) \equiv asymmetry of detection of \Lambda_{\rm b}^0 and \overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0$  decay products

Use raw asymmetry in  $\Lambda^0_b \to \Lambda^+_c \pi^-$  to remove these:

$$\begin{split} &A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{0}\to{\sf fsp's}) = A_{\rm raw}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{0}\to{\sf fsp's}) - A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{0}) - A_{\rm det}({\sf fsp's}) \\ &A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{0}\to\Lambda_{\rm c}^{+}\pi^{-}) = A_{\rm raw}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{0}\to\Lambda_{\rm c}^{+}\pi^{-}) - A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{0}) - A_{\rm det}(\Lambda_{\rm c}^{+}\pi^{-}) \end{split}$$

 $\Lambda_c^+$  final state chosen to match  $\Lambda_b^0\,\mbox{'s.}$ 

$$\begin{split} A_{\rm raw}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to{\sf fsp's}) &\equiv \frac{N(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to\cdots)-N(\overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0\to\overline{{\sf fsp's}})}{N(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to\cdots)+N(\overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0\to\overline{{\sf fsp's}})} \\ &= A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to{\sf fsp's})+A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0)+A_{\rm det}({\sf fsp's}) \end{split}$$

 $A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0) \equiv asymmetry of production of \Lambda_{\rm b}^0 and \overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0$  from pp collision  $A_{\rm det}(fsp's) \equiv asymmetry of detection of \Lambda_{\rm b}^0 and \overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0$  decay products

Use raw asymmetry in  $\Lambda^0_b o \Lambda^+_c \pi^-$  to remove these:

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to{\sf fsp's}) &= A_{\rm raw}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to{\sf fsp's}) &- A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0) &- A_{\rm det}({\sf fsp's}) \\ 0 &= A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to\Lambda_{\rm c}^+\pi^-) = A_{\rm raw}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to\Lambda_{\rm c}^+\pi^-) &- A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0) &- A_{\rm det}(\Lambda_{\rm c}^+\pi^-) \end{aligned}$$

 $\Lambda_c^+$  final state chosen to match  $\Lambda_b^0 \, \mbox{'s.}$ 

$$\begin{split} A_{\rm raw}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to{\sf fsp's}) &\equiv \frac{N(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to\cdots)-N(\overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0\to\overline{{\sf fsp's}})}{N(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to\cdots)+N(\overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0\to\overline{{\sf fsp's}})} \\ &= A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to{\sf fsp's})+A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0)+A_{\rm det}({\sf fsp's}) \end{split}$$

 $A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0) \equiv asymmetry of production of \Lambda_{\rm b}^0 and \overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0$  from pp collision  $A_{\rm det}(fsp's) \equiv asymmetry of detection of \Lambda_{\rm b}^0 and \overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0$  decay products

Use raw asymmetry in  $\Lambda^0_b o \Lambda^+_c \pi^-$  to remove these:

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{0}\to{\sf fsp's}) &= A_{\rm raw}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{0}\to{\sf fsp's}) &- A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{0}) &- A_{\rm det}({\sf fsp's}) \\ 0 &= A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{0}\to\Lambda_{\rm c}^{+}\pi^{-}) = A_{\rm raw}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{0}\to\Lambda_{\rm c}^{+}\pi^{-}) &- A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{0}) &- A_{\rm det}(\Lambda_{\rm c}^{+}\pi^{-}) \end{aligned}$$

 $\Lambda_c^+$  final state chosen to match  $\Lambda_b^0 \, \mbox{'s.}$ 

$$\begin{split} A_{\rm raw}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to{\sf fsp's}) &\equiv \frac{N(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to\cdots)-N(\overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0\to\overline{{\sf fsp's}})}{N(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to\cdots)+N(\overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0\to\overline{{\sf fsp's}})} \\ &= A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to{\sf fsp's})+A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0)+A_{\rm det}({\sf fsp's}) \end{split}$$

 $A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0) \equiv asymmetry of production of \Lambda_{\rm b}^0 and \overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0$  from pp collision  $A_{\rm det}(fsp's) \equiv asymmetry of detection of \Lambda_{\rm b}^0 and \overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0$  decay products

Use raw asymmetry in  $\Lambda^0_b o \Lambda^+_c \pi^-$  to remove these:

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to{\sf fsp's}) &= A_{\rm raw}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to{\sf fsp's}) &- A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0) &- A_{\rm det}({\sf fsp's}) \\ 0 &= A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to\Lambda_{\rm c}^+\pi^-) = A_{\rm raw}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to\Lambda_{\rm c}^+\pi^-) &- A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0) &- A_{\rm det}(\Lambda_{\rm c}^+\pi^-) \end{aligned}$$

 $\Lambda_c^+$  final state chosen to match  $\Lambda_b^0 \, \mbox{'s.}$ 

$$A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{\rm 0}\to\Lambda^{\rm 0}{\rm K}^{+}{\rm K}^{-}) = (8.3\pm2.3\pm1.6)\%$$
 [LHCb: PRL134.101802 2025]

$$\begin{split} A_{\rm raw}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to{\sf fsp's}) &\equiv \frac{N(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to\cdots)-N(\overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0\to\overline{\sf fsp's})}{N(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to\cdots)+N(\overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0\to\overline{\sf fsp's})} \\ &= A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to{\sf fsp's}) + A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0) + A_{\rm det}({\sf fsp's}) \end{split}$$

 $A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0) \equiv asymmetry of production of \Lambda_{\rm b}^0 and \overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0$  from pp collision  $A_{\rm det}(fsp's) \equiv asymmetry of detection of \Lambda_{\rm b}^0 and \overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0$  decay products

Use raw asymmetry in  $\Lambda^0_b o \Lambda^+_c \pi^-$  to remove these:

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to{\sf fsp's}) &= A_{\rm raw}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to{\sf fsp's}) &- A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0) &- A_{\rm det}({\sf fsp's}) \\ 0 &= A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to\Lambda_{\rm c}^+\pi^-) = A_{\rm raw}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to\Lambda_{\rm c}^+\pi^-) &- A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0) &- A_{\rm det}(\Lambda_{\rm c}^+\pi^-) \end{aligned}$$

 $\Lambda_c^+$  final state chosen to match  $\Lambda_b^0 \, \mbox{'s.}$ 

$$\begin{split} A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{0} \to \Lambda^{0}{\rm K}^{+}{\rm K}^{-}) &= (8.3 \pm 2.3 \pm 1.6)\% & [{\rm LHCb:} \ {\rm PRL134.101802} \ {\rm 2025}] \\ A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{0} \to {\rm p} \ {\rm K}^{-}\pi^{+}\pi^{-}) &= (2.45 \pm 0.46 \pm 0.10)\% & [{\rm LHCb:} \ {\rm Moriond} \ {\rm EW}, \ {\rm 2025}] \end{split}$$

$$\begin{split} A_{\rm raw}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to{\sf fsp's}) &\equiv \frac{N(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to\cdots)-N(\overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0\to\overline{\sf fsp's})}{N(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to\cdots)+N(\overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0\to\overline{\sf fsp's})} \\ &= A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to{\sf fsp's}) + A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0) + A_{\rm det}({\sf fsp's}) \end{split}$$

 $A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0) \equiv asymmetry of production of \Lambda_{\rm b}^0 and \overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0$  from pp collision  $A_{\rm det}(fsp's) \equiv asymmetry of detection of \Lambda_{\rm b}^0 and \overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0$  decay products

Use raw asymmetry in  $\Lambda^0_b o \Lambda^+_c \pi^-$  to remove these:

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to{\sf fsp's}) &= A_{\rm raw}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to{\sf fsp's}) &- A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0) &- A_{\rm det}({\sf fsp's}) \\ 0 &= A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to\Lambda_{\rm c}^+\pi^-) = A_{\rm raw}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to\Lambda_{\rm c}^+\pi^-) &- A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0) &- A_{\rm det}(\Lambda_{\rm c}^+\pi^-) \end{aligned}$$

 $\Lambda_c^+$  final state chosen to match  $\Lambda_b^0 \, \mbox{'s.}$ 

$$\begin{split} A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{0}\to\Lambda^{0}{\rm K}^{+}{\rm K}^{-}) &= (8.3\pm2.3\pm1.6)\% \to 3.1\sigma \quad [{\rm LHCb:} \ {\rm PRL134.101802} \ {\rm 2025}] \\ A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{0}\to{\rm p}\ {\rm K}^{-}\pi^{+}\pi^{-}) &= (2.45\pm0.46\pm0.10)\% \qquad \qquad [{\rm LHCb:} \ {\rm Moriond} \ {\rm EW,} \ {\rm 2025}] \end{split}$$

$$\begin{split} A_{\rm raw}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to{\sf fsp's}) &\equiv \frac{N(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to\cdots)-N(\overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0\to\overline{{\sf fsp's}})}{N(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to\cdots)+N(\overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0\to\overline{{\sf fsp's}})} \\ &= A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to{\sf fsp's})+A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0)+A_{\rm det}({\sf fsp's}) \end{split}$$

 $A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0) \equiv asymmetry of production of \Lambda_{\rm b}^0 and \overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0$  from pp collision  $A_{\rm det}(fsp's) \equiv asymmetry of detection of \Lambda_{\rm b}^0 and \overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0$  decay products

Use raw asymmetry in  $\Lambda^0_b o \Lambda^+_c \pi^-$  to remove these:

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to{\sf fsp's}) &= A_{\rm raw}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to{\sf fsp's}) &- A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0) &- A_{\rm det}({\sf fsp's}) \\ 0 &= A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to\Lambda_{\rm c}^+\pi^-) = A_{\rm raw}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to\Lambda_{\rm c}^+\pi^-) &- A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0) &- A_{\rm det}(\Lambda_{\rm c}^+\pi^-) \end{aligned}$$

 $\Lambda_c^+$  final state chosen to match  $\Lambda_b^0\,\mbox{'s.}$ 

$$\begin{split} A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{0}\to\Lambda^{0}{\rm K}^{+}{\rm K}^{-}) &= (8.3\pm2.3\pm1.6)\% \to 3.1\sigma \quad [{\rm LHCb:} \ {\rm PRL134.101802} \ {\rm 2025}] \\ A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{0}\to{\rm p}\ {\rm K}^{-}\pi^{+}\pi^{-}) &= (2.45\pm0.46\pm0.10)\% \to 5.2\sigma \quad [{\rm LHCb:} \ {\rm Moriond}\ {\rm EW}, \ {\rm 2025}] \end{split}$$

$$A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{\rm 0}\to{\rm p}\,{\rm K}^-\pi^+\pi^-)=(2.45\pm0.46\pm0.10)\%\quad\to\quad 5.2\sigma$$

[LHCb: Moriond EW, 2025]

$$A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{\rm 0}\to{\rm p}\,{\rm K}^-\pi^+\pi^-)=(2.45\pm0.46\pm0.10)\%\quad\to\quad 5.2\sigma$$

[LHCb: Moriond EW, 2025]

LHCb observed CP violation in baryon decay.

$$A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{\rm 0}\to{\rm p}\,{\rm K}^-\pi^+\pi^-)=(2.45\pm0.46\pm0.10)\%\quad\to\quad 5.2\sigma$$

[LHCb: Moriond EW, 2025]

#### LHCb observed CP violation in baryon decay.

| 1964 | CP violation in K <sup>0</sup> mixing         | strange meson        |
|------|---|----------------------|
| 1999 | CP violation in $K^0$ decay                   | strange meson        |
| 2001 | CP violation in B <sup>0</sup> mixing & decay | bottom meson         |
| 2004 | CP violation in B <sup>0</sup> decay          | bottom meson         |
| 2012 | CP violation in $B^+$ decay                   | bottom meson         |
| 2013 | CP violation in $B_s^0$ decay                 | bottom-strange meson |
| 2019 | CP violation in D decay                       | charm meson          |
LHCb:  $\Lambda_b^0$  decay-rate CP asymmetries

$$A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{\rm 0}\to{\rm p}\,{\rm K}^-\pi^+\pi^-)=(2.45\pm0.46\pm0.10)\%\quad\to\quad 5.2\sigma$$

[LHCb: Moriond EW, 2025]

#### LHCb observed CP violation in baryon decay.

| 1964 | CP violation in K <sup>0</sup> mixing | strange meson        |
|------|---------------------------------------|----------------------|
| 1999 | CP violation in $K^0$ decay           | strange meson        |
| 2001 | CP violation in $B^0$ mixing & decay  | bottom meson         |
| 2004 | CP violation in $B^0$ decay           | bottom meson         |
| 2012 | CP violation in $B^+$ decay           | bottom meson         |
| 2013 | CP violation in $B_s^0$ decay         | bottom-strange meson |
| 2019 | CP violation in D decay               | charm meson          |

#### **2025** CP violation in $\Lambda_b^0$ decay bottom baryon

Let's look at charm

Let's look at charm—at decays of D mesons

Let's look at charm—at decays of D mesons



Let's look at charm—at decays of D mesons



to pion pairs

Let's look at charm—at decays of D mesons

$$\begin{array}{c|c} \hline d \\ \hline c \\ D^+ \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \hline u \\ \hline D^0 \\ \hline D^0 \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} u \\ \hline D^0 \\ \hline D^0 \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{c} d \\ \hline c \\ D^- \\ \end{array}$$

to pion pairs

$$\pi^{+}\pi^{0}$$
  $\pi^{+}\pi^{-}$   $\pi^{0}\pi^{0}$ 

Let's look at charm—at decays of D mesons

to pion pairs

$$\pi^{+}\pi^{0}$$
  $\pi^{+}\pi^{-}$   $\pi^{0}\pi^{0}$ 

Let's look at charm—at decays of D mesons

to pion pairs

$$\pi^{+}\pi^{0}$$
  $\pi^{+}\pi^{-}$   $\pi^{0}\pi^{0}$ 

isospin superpositions: 0+1+2, 0+2, 2

Let's look at charm—at decays of D mesons



to pion pairs

 $\pi^{+}\pi^{0}$   $\pi^{+}\pi^{-}$   $\pi^{0}\pi^{0}$ 

isospin superpositions: 0+1+2, 0+2, 2

Standard model:

Let's look at charm—at decays of D mesons

to pion pairs

 $\pi^{+}\pi^{0}$   $\pi^{+}\pi^{-}$   $\pi^{0}\pi^{0}$ 

Standard model:

 $A_{\rm CP}^{\rm SM}(|\Delta I| = \frac{3}{2} \mathsf{D} \to \pi\pi) = 0$ 

isospin superpositions: 0+1+2, 0+2, 2

Let's look at charm—at decays of D mesons

to pion pairs

 $\pi^{+}\pi^{0}$   $\pi^{+}\pi^{-}$   $\pi^{0}\pi^{0}$ 

isospin superpositions: 0+1+2, 0+2, 2

Standard model:

 $A_{\rm CP}^{\rm SM}(|\Delta I|{=}\frac{3}{2}\ \mathsf{D}\rightarrow\pi\pi)=0 \quad \text{and} \quad A_{\rm CP}^{\rm SM}(|\Delta I|{=}\frac{1}{2}\ \mathsf{D}\rightarrow\pi\pi)\ll 1$ 

Let's look at charm—at decays of D mesons

to pion pairs

 $\pi^{+}\pi^{0}$   $\pi^{+}\pi^{-}$   $\pi^{0}\pi^{0}$ 

isospin superpositions: 0+1+2, 0+2, 2

Standard model:

 $A_{\mathrm{CP}}^{\mathrm{SM}}(|\Delta I| = \frac{3}{2} \mathsf{D} \to \pi\pi) = 0 \text{ and } A_{\mathrm{CP}}^{\mathrm{SM}}(|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2} \mathsf{D} \to \pi\pi) \ll 1$ 

•  $\mathsf{D}^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^0$  only has  $|\Delta I| = \frac{3}{2}$ ,

Let's look at charm—at decays of D mesons

to pion pairs

 $\pi^{+}\pi^{0}$   $\pi^{+}\pi^{-}$   $\pi^{0}\pi^{0}$ 

isospin superpositions: 0+1+2, 0+2, 2

Standard model:

 $A_{\mathrm{CP}}^{\mathrm{SM}}(|\Delta I| = \frac{3}{2} \mathsf{D} \to \pi\pi) = 0 \text{ and } A_{\mathrm{CP}}^{\mathrm{SM}}(|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2} \mathsf{D} \to \pi\pi) \ll 1$ 

•  $\mathsf{D}^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^0$  only has  $|\Delta I| = \frac{3}{2}$ , so  $A_{\mathrm{CP}}^{\mathrm{SM}}(\mathsf{D}^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^-) = 0$ 

Let's look at charm—at decays of D mesons

$$\begin{array}{c|cccc} \hline d & c & u & c & d & c \\ \hline D^+ & D^0 & \overline{D}^0 & D^- & isospin \frac{1}{2} \end{array}$$

to pion pairs

 $\pi^{+}\pi^{0}$   $\pi^{+}\pi^{-}$   $\pi^{0}\pi^{0}$ 

isospin superpositions: 0+1+2, 0+2, 2

Standard model:

 $A_{\mathrm{CP}}^{\mathrm{SM}}(|\Delta I| = \frac{3}{2} \mathsf{D} \to \pi\pi) = 0 \text{ and } A_{\mathrm{CP}}^{\mathrm{SM}}(|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2} \mathsf{D} \to \pi\pi) \ll 1$ 

•  $D^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^0$  only has  $|\Delta I| = \frac{3}{2}$ , so  $A_{\rm CP}^{\rm SM}(D^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^-) = 0$ 

• 
$$D^0 \to \pi\pi$$
 has both  $|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2}$  and  $\frac{3}{2}$ ,

Let's look at charm—at decays of D mesons

to pion pairs

 $\pi^{+}\pi^{0}$   $\pi^{+}\pi^{-}$   $\pi^{0}\pi^{0}$ 

isospin superpositions: 0+1+2, 0+2, 2

Standard model:

 $A_{\mathrm{CP}}^{\mathrm{SM}}(|\Delta I| = \frac{3}{2} \mathsf{D} \to \pi\pi) = 0 \text{ and } A_{\mathrm{CP}}^{\mathrm{SM}}(|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2} \mathsf{D} \to \pi\pi) \ll 1$ 

•  $D^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^0$  only has  $|\Delta I| = \frac{3}{2}$ , so  $A_{\rm CP}^{\rm SM}(D^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^-) = 0$ 

▶  $D^0 \rightarrow \pi \pi$  has both  $|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2}$  and  $\frac{3}{2}$ , but nonzero  $A_{CP}^{SM}$  only from  $|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2}$  part.

- $\blacktriangleright A_{\rm CP}^{\rm SM}(\mathsf{D}^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^0) = 0$
- ►  $A_{CP}^{SM}(D^0 \to \pi\pi)$  only from  $A_{CP}^{SM}(|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2} D \to \pi\pi)$  and small

- $\blacktriangleright A_{\rm CP}^{\rm SM}(\mathsf{D}^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^0) = 0$
- ►  $A_{CP}^{SM}(D^0 \to \pi\pi)$  only from  $A_{CP}^{SM}(|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2} D \to \pi\pi)$  and small

So, if we measure

- $\blacktriangleright A_{\rm CP}^{\rm SM}(\mathsf{D}^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^0) = 0$
- ►  $A_{CP}^{SM}(D^0 \to \pi\pi)$  only from  $A_{CP}^{SM}(|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2} D \to \pi\pi)$  and small
- So, if we measure
- $\blacktriangleright A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^0) \neq 0$

- $\blacktriangleright A_{\rm CP}^{\rm SM}(\mathsf{D}^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^0) = 0$
- ►  $A_{CP}^{SM}(D^0 \to \pi\pi)$  only from  $A_{CP}^{SM}(|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2} D \to \pi\pi)$  and small

So, if we measure

►  $A_{\rm CP}({\sf D}^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^0) \neq 0$  $\longrightarrow$  something beyond the standard model

- $\blacktriangleright A_{\rm CP}^{\rm SM}(\mathsf{D}^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^0) = 0$
- ►  $A_{CP}^{SM}(D^0 \to \pi\pi)$  only from  $A_{CP}^{SM}(|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2} D \to \pi\pi)$  and small

#### So, if we measure

- ►  $A_{\rm CP}({\sf D}^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^0) \neq 0$  $\longrightarrow$  something beyond the standard model
- $A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-)$  and  $A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \pi^0\pi^0)$  inconsistent with  $A_{\rm CP}(|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2} |\mathsf{D} \to \pi\pi)$

- $\blacktriangleright A_{\rm CP}^{\rm SM}(\mathsf{D}^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^0) = 0$
- ►  $A_{CP}^{SM}(D^0 \to \pi\pi)$  only from  $A_{CP}^{SM}(|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2} D \to \pi\pi)$  and small

#### So, if we measure

- ►  $A_{\rm CP}({\sf D}^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^0) \neq 0$  $\longrightarrow$  something beyond the standard model
- ►  $A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-)$  and  $A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \pi^0\pi^0)$  inconsistent with  $A_{\rm CP}(|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2} \ \mathsf{D} \to \pi\pi)$  $\longrightarrow$  something beyond the standard model

- $\blacktriangleright A_{\rm CP}^{\rm SM}(\mathsf{D}^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^0) = 0$
- ►  $A_{CP}^{SM}(D^0 \to \pi\pi)$  only from  $A_{CP}^{SM}(|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2} D \to \pi\pi)$  and small

#### So, if we measure

- ►  $A_{\rm CP}({\sf D}^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^0) \neq 0$  $\longrightarrow$  something beyond the standard model
- ►  $A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-)$  and  $A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \pi^0\pi^0)$  inconsistent with  $A_{\rm CP}(|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2} \mathsf{D} \to \pi\pi)$  $\longrightarrow$  something beyond the standard model

- $\blacktriangleright A_{\rm CP}^{\rm SM}(\mathsf{D}^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^0) = 0$
- ►  $A_{CP}^{SM}(D^0 \to \pi\pi)$  only from  $A_{CP}^{SM}(|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2} D \to \pi\pi)$  and small

#### So, if we measure

- ►  $A_{\rm CP}({\sf D}^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^0) \neq 0$  $\longrightarrow$  something beyond the standard model
- ►  $A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-)$  and  $A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \pi^0\pi^0)$  inconsistent with  $A_{\rm CP}(|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2} \mathsf{D} \to \pi\pi)$  $\longrightarrow$  something beyond the standard model

Can't directly measure  $A_{\rm CP}(|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2} \ {\sf D} \to \pi\pi)$ , but can calculate it

- $\blacktriangleright A_{\rm CP}^{\rm SM}(\mathsf{D}^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^0) = 0$
- ►  $A_{CP}^{SM}(D^0 \to \pi\pi)$  only from  $A_{CP}^{SM}(|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2} D \to \pi\pi)$  and small

#### So, if we measure

- ►  $A_{\rm CP}({\sf D}^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^0) \neq 0$  $\longrightarrow$  something beyond the standard model
- ►  $A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-)$  and  $A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \pi^0\pi^0)$  inconsistent with  $A_{\rm CP}(|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2} \mathsf{D} \to \pi\pi)$  $\longrightarrow$  something beyond the standard model
- Can't directly measure  $A_{\mathrm{CP}}(|\Delta I|{=}rac{1}{2}\ \mathsf{D} 
  ightarrow \pi\pi)$ ,

but can calculate it from asymmetries, branching fractions, and  $D^0\mathchar`-D^+$  lifetime ratio

$$A_{\rm CP}(|\Delta I|{=}\frac{1}{2} \ {\rm D} \to \pi\pi) = \frac{B_{+-}A_{+-} \ + \ B_{00}A_{00} \ - \ \frac{2}{3}\frac{\tau_0}{\tau_+}B_{+0}A_{+0}}{B_{+-} \ + \ B_{00} \ - \ \frac{2}{3}\frac{\tau_0}{\tau_+}B_{+0}}$$

- $\blacktriangleright A_{\rm CP}^{\rm SM}(\mathsf{D}^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^0) = 0$
- ►  $A_{CP}^{SM}(D^0 \to \pi\pi)$  only from  $A_{CP}^{SM}(|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2} D \to \pi\pi)$  and small

So, if we measure

- ►  $A_{\rm CP}({\rm D}^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^0) \neq 0$ → something beyond the standard model
- ►  $A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-)$  and  $A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \pi^0\pi^0)$  inconsistent with  $A_{\rm CP}(|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2} \mathsf{D} \to \pi\pi)$  $\longrightarrow$  something beyond the standard model

Can't directly measure  $A_{\mathrm{CP}}(|\Delta I|{=}rac{1}{2}\ \mathsf{D} 
ightarrow \pi\pi)$ ,

but can calculate it from asymmetries, branching fractions, and  $D^0\mathchar`-D^+$  lifetime ratio

$$A_{\rm CP}(|\Delta I|{=}\frac{1}{2} \ {\rm D} \to \pi\pi) = \frac{B_{+-}A_{+-} \ + \ B_{00}A_{00} \ - \ \frac{2}{3}\frac{\tau_0}{\tau_+}B_{+0}A_{+0}}{B_{+-} \ + \ B_{00} \ - \ \frac{2}{3}\frac{\tau_0}{\tau_+}B_{+0}}$$

Asymmetries are limiting inputs,

- $\blacktriangleright A_{\rm CP}^{\rm SM}(\mathsf{D}^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^0) = 0$
- ►  $A_{CP}^{SM}(D^0 \to \pi\pi)$  only from  $A_{CP}^{SM}(|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2} D \to \pi\pi)$  and small

#### So, if we measure

- ►  $A_{\rm CP}({\sf D}^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^0) \neq 0$  $\longrightarrow$  something beyond the standard model
- ►  $A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-)$  and  $A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \pi^0\pi^0)$  inconsistent with  $A_{\rm CP}(|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2} \mathsf{D} \to \pi\pi)$  $\longrightarrow$  something beyond the standard model
- Can't directly measure  $A_{\rm CP}(|\Delta I|{=}\frac{1}{2}~{\sf D}\rightarrow\pi\pi)$  ,

but can calculate it from asymmetries, branching fractions, and  $D^0\mathchar`-D^+$  lifetime ratio

$$A_{\rm CP}(|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2} \ \mathsf{D} \to \pi\pi) = \frac{B_{+-}A_{+-} + B_{00}A_{00} - \frac{2}{3}\frac{\tau_0}{\tau_+}B_{+0}A_{+0}}{B_{+-} + B_{00} - \frac{2}{3}\frac{\tau_0}{\tau_+}B_{+0}}$$

Asymmetries are limiting inputs,  $A_{\rm CP}(D^0 \to \pi^0 \pi^0)$  most limiting.

$$A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}}) = \frac{\Gamma(\mathsf{D}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}}) - \Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}})}{\Gamma(\mathsf{D}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}}) + \Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}})}$$

$$A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}}) = \frac{\Gamma(\mathsf{D}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}}) - \Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}})}{\Gamma(\mathsf{D}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}}) + \Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}})}$$

Distinguish  $D^0 \to \pi^0 \pi^0$  and  $\overline{D}^0 \to \pi^0 \pi^0$ 

$$A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}}) = \frac{\Gamma(\mathsf{D}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}}) - \Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}})}{\Gamma(\mathsf{D}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}}) + \Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}})}$$

Distinguish  $D^0 \to \pi^0 \pi^0$  and  $\overline{D}^0 \to \pi^0 \pi^0$  by requiring they come from  $D^{*\pm}$  decay:

$$A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}}) = \frac{\Gamma(\mathsf{D}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}}) - \Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}})}{\Gamma(\mathsf{D}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}}) + \Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}})}$$

$$A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}}) = \frac{\Gamma(\mathsf{D}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}}) - \Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}})}{\Gamma(\mathsf{D}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}}) + \Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}})}$$

Distinguish  $D^0 \to \pi^0 \pi^0$  and  $\overline{D}^0 \to \pi^0 \pi^0$  by requiring they come from  $D^{*\pm}$  decay:  $D^{*+} \to D^0 \pi^+$   $D^{*-} \to \overline{D}^0 \pi^-$ 

Find final state particles:  $\pi^{\pm}\pi^{0}\pi^{0}$ 

$$A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}}) = \frac{\Gamma(\mathsf{D}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}}) - \Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}})}{\Gamma(\mathsf{D}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}}) + \Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}})}$$

- Find final state particles:  $\pi^{\pm}\pi^{0}\pi^{0}$
- Require

$$A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}}) = \frac{\Gamma(\mathsf{D}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}}) - \Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}})}{\Gamma(\mathsf{D}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}}) + \Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}})}$$

- Find final state particles:  $\pi^{\pm}\pi^{0}\pi^{0}$
- Require
  - $\pi^0 \pi^0$  mass be consistent with D<sup>0</sup> mass

$$A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}}) = \frac{\Gamma(\mathsf{D}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}}) - \Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}})}{\Gamma(\mathsf{D}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}}) + \Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}})}$$

- Find final state particles:  $\pi^{\pm}\pi^{0}\pi^{0}$
- Require
  - $\blacktriangleright \pi^0 \pi^0$  mass be consistent with D<sup>0</sup> mass
  - ▶  $\pi^{\pm}\pi^{0}\pi^{0}$  mass consistent with  $D^{*\pm}-D^{0}$  mass difference

$$A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}}) = \frac{\Gamma(\mathsf{D}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}}) - \Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}})}{\Gamma(\mathsf{D}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}}) + \Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}})}$$

- Find final state particles:  $\pi^{\pm}\pi^{0}\pi^{0}$
- Require
  - $\pi^0 \pi^0$  mass be consistent with D<sup>0</sup> mass
  - ▶  $\pi^{\pm}\pi^{0}\pi^{0}$  mass consistent with  $D^{*\pm}-D^{0}$  mass difference
  - $\blacktriangleright\ D^{*\pm}$  have enough momentum to not come from B decay
$$A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}}) = \frac{\Gamma(\mathsf{D}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}}) - \Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}})}{\Gamma(\mathsf{D}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}}) + \Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}})}$$

Distinguish  $D^0 \to \pi^0 \pi^0$  and  $\overline{D}^0 \to \pi^0 \pi^0$  by requiring they come from  $D^{*\pm}$  decay:

 $D^{*+} \rightarrow D^0 \pi^+$   $D^{*-} \rightarrow \overline{D}^0 \pi^-$ 

- Find final state particles:  $\pi^{\pm}\pi^{0}\pi^{0}$
- Require
  - $\pi^0 \pi^0$  mass be consistent with D<sup>0</sup> mass
  - $\pi^{\pm}\pi^{0}\pi^{0}$  mass consistent with  $D^{*\pm}-D^{0}$  mass difference
  - ▶  $D^{*\pm}$  have enough momentum to not come from B decay  $\longrightarrow$  don't inherit  $A_{\rm CP}$  from B decay

$$A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}}) = \frac{\Gamma(\mathsf{D}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}}) - \Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}})}{\Gamma(\mathsf{D}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}}) + \Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}})}$$

Distinguish  $D^0 \to \pi^0 \pi^0$  and  $\overline{D}^0 \to \pi^0 \pi^0$  by requiring they come from  $D^{*\pm}$  decay:

 $D^{*+} \rightarrow D^0 \pi^+$   $D^{*-} \rightarrow \overline{D}^0 \pi^-$ 

- Find final state particles:  $\pi^{\pm}\pi^{0}\pi^{0}$
- Require
  - $\pi^0 \pi^0$  mass be consistent with D<sup>0</sup> mass
  - $\pi^{\pm}\pi^{0}\pi^{0}$  mass consistent with  $D^{*\pm}-D^{0}$  mass difference
  - ▶  $D^{*\pm}$  have enough momentum to not come from B decay  $\longrightarrow$  don't inherit  $A_{\rm CP}$  from B decay
- Use machine-learning algorithm to remove background.





Fit to the mass and  $\Delta m$  spectra to get signal yields,  $N(D^0 \to \pi^0 \pi^0)$  and  $N(\overline{D}^0 \to \pi^0 \pi^0)$ .

Again this the **raw** asymmetry is not the CP one

Again this the **raw** asymmetry is not the CP one

$$A_N(\mathsf{D}^{*+} \to \mathsf{D}^0\pi^+, \mathsf{D}^0 \to \pi^0\pi^0) = A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \pi^0\pi^0) + A_{\rm prod}(\mathsf{D}^{*+}) + A_{\rm det}(\pi^+)$$

Again this the raw asymmetry is not the CP one

$$A_N(\mathsf{D}^{*+}\to\mathsf{D}^0\pi^+,\mathsf{D}^0\to\pi^0\pi^0) = A_{\mathrm{CP}}(\mathsf{D}^0\to\pi^0\pi^0) + A_{\mathrm{prod}}(\mathsf{D}^{*+}) + A_{\mathrm{det}}(\pi^+)$$

►  $A_{\rm prod}(D^0) \equiv$  from  $e^+e^- \rightarrow c\overline{c}$  forward-backward asymmetry

Again this the **raw** asymmetry is not the CP one

$$A_N(\mathsf{D}^{*+}\to\mathsf{D}^0\pi^+,\mathsf{D}^0\to\pi^0\pi^0) = A_{\mathrm{CP}}(\mathsf{D}^0\to\pi^0\pi^0) + A_{\mathrm{prod}}(\mathsf{D}^{*+}) + A_{\mathrm{det}}(\pi^+)$$

 A<sub>prod</sub>(D<sup>0</sup>) ≡ from e<sup>+</sup>e<sup>-</sup> → cc̄ forward-backward asymmetry cancel by averaging over forward and backward D\*

Again this the **raw** asymmetry is not the CP one

$$A_N(\mathsf{D}^{*+}\to\mathsf{D}^0\pi^+,\mathsf{D}^0\to\pi^0\pi^0) = A_{\mathrm{CP}}(\mathsf{D}^0\to\pi^0\pi^0) + A_{\mathrm{prod}}(\mathsf{D}^{*+}) + A_{\mathrm{det}}(\pi^+)$$

 A<sub>prod</sub>(D<sup>0</sup>) ≡ from e<sup>+</sup>e<sup>-</sup> → cc̄ forward-backward asymmetry cancel by averaging over forward and backward D\*

$$\overline{A}_N \equiv \frac{1}{2} \Big[ A_N^{\rm F} + A_N^{\rm B} \Big]$$

Again this the **raw** asymmetry is not the CP one

$$A_N(\mathsf{D}^{*+}\to\mathsf{D}^0\pi^+,\mathsf{D}^0\to\pi^0\pi^0) = A_{\mathrm{CP}}(\mathsf{D}^0\to\pi^0\pi^0) + A_{\mathrm{prod}}(\mathsf{D}^{*+}) + A_{\mathrm{det}}(\pi^+)$$

 A<sub>prod</sub>(D<sup>0</sup>) ≡ from e<sup>+</sup>e<sup>-</sup> → cc̄ forward-backward asymmetry cancel by averaging over forward and backward D\*

$$\overline{A}_N \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[ A_N^{\rm F} + A_N^{\rm B} \right] = A_{\rm CP} (\mathsf{D}^0 \to \pi^0 \pi^0) + A_{\rm det} (\pi^+)$$

Again this the **raw** asymmetry is not the CP one

$$A_N(\mathsf{D}^{*+}\to\mathsf{D}^0\pi^+,\mathsf{D}^0\to\pi^0\pi^0) = A_{\mathrm{CP}}(\mathsf{D}^0\to\pi^0\pi^0) + A_{\mathrm{prod}}(\mathsf{D}^{*+}) + A_{\mathrm{det}}(\pi^+)$$

 A<sub>prod</sub>(D<sup>0</sup>) ≡ from e<sup>+</sup>e<sup>-</sup> → cc̄ forward-backward asymmetry cancel by averaging over forward and backward D\*

$$\overline{A}_N \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[ A_N^{\mathrm{F}} + A_N^{\mathrm{B}} \right] = A_{\mathrm{CP}}(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \pi^0 \pi^0) + A_{\mathrm{det}}(\pi^+)$$

► calculate  $A_{det}(\pi^+)$  from  $D^{*+} \rightarrow D^0 \pi^+, D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$ 

Again this the **raw** asymmetry is not the CP one

$$A_N(\mathsf{D}^{*+}\to\mathsf{D}^0\pi^+,\mathsf{D}^0\to\pi^0\pi^0) = A_{\mathrm{CP}}(\mathsf{D}^0\to\pi^0\pi^0) + A_{\mathrm{prod}}(\mathsf{D}^{*+}) + A_{\mathrm{det}}(\pi^+)$$

 A<sub>prod</sub>(D<sup>0</sup>) ≡ from e<sup>+</sup>e<sup>-</sup> → cc̄ forward-backward asymmetry cancel by averaging over forward and backward D\*

$$\overline{A}_N \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[ A_N^{\rm F} + A_N^{\rm B} \right] = A_{\rm CP} (\mathsf{D}^0 \to \pi^0 \pi^0) + A_{\rm det} (\pi^+)$$

▶ calculate  $A_{det}(\pi^+)$  from  $D^{*+} \rightarrow D^0 \pi^+, D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$ 

 $\overline{A}_N(\mathsf{D}^0\to\mathsf{K}^-\pi^+,\mathbf{w/}\ \mathsf{D}^* \text{ req.}) = A_{\mathrm{CP}}(\mathsf{D}^0\to\mathsf{K}^-\pi^+) + A_{\mathrm{det}}(\pi^+) + A_{\mathrm{det}}(\mathsf{K}^-\pi^+)$ 

Again this the **raw** asymmetry is not the CP one

$$A_N(\mathsf{D}^{*+}\to\mathsf{D}^0\pi^+,\mathsf{D}^0\to\pi^0\pi^0) = A_{\mathrm{CP}}(\mathsf{D}^0\to\pi^0\pi^0) + A_{\mathrm{prod}}(\mathsf{D}^{*+}) + A_{\mathrm{det}}(\pi^+)$$

 A<sub>prod</sub>(D<sup>0</sup>) ≡ from e<sup>+</sup>e<sup>-</sup> → cc̄ forward-backward asymmetry cancel by averaging over forward and backward D\*

$$\overline{A}_N \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[ A_N^{\mathrm{F}} + A_N^{\mathrm{B}} \right] = A_{\mathrm{CP}}(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \pi^0 \pi^0) + A_{\mathrm{det}}(\pi^+)$$

► calculate  $A_{det}(\pi^+)$  from  $D^{*+} \rightarrow D^0 \pi^+, D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$ 

$$\begin{split} \overline{A}_N(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \mathsf{K}^-\pi^+, \mathbf{w}/ \ \ \mathsf{D}^* \ \operatorname{req.}) &= A_{\operatorname{CP}}(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \mathsf{K}^-\pi^+) + A_{\operatorname{det}}(\pi^+) + A_{\operatorname{det}}(\mathsf{K}^-\pi^+) \\ \overline{A}_N(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \mathsf{K}^-\pi^+, \mathbf{w}/\mathbf{o} \ \ \mathsf{D}^* \ \operatorname{req.}) &= A_{\operatorname{CP}}(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \mathsf{K}^-\pi^+) \\ &+ A_{\operatorname{det}}(\mathsf{K}^-\pi^+) \end{split}$$

Again this the **raw** asymmetry is not the CP one

$$A_N(\mathsf{D}^{*+}\to\mathsf{D}^0\pi^+,\mathsf{D}^0\to\pi^0\pi^0) = A_{\mathrm{CP}}(\mathsf{D}^0\to\pi^0\pi^0) + A_{\mathrm{prod}}(\mathsf{D}^{*+}) + A_{\mathrm{det}}(\pi^+)$$

 A<sub>prod</sub>(D<sup>0</sup>) ≡ from e<sup>+</sup>e<sup>-</sup> → cc̄ forward-backward asymmetry cancel by averaging over forward and backward D\*

$$\overline{A}_N \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[ A_N^{\rm F} + A_N^{\rm B} \right] = A_{\rm CP} (\mathsf{D}^0 \to \pi^0 \pi^0) + A_{\rm det} (\pi^+)$$

► calculate  $A_{det}(\pi^+)$  from  $D^{*+} \rightarrow D^0 \pi^+, D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$ 

$$\begin{split} \overline{A}_N(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \mathsf{K}^-\pi^+, \mathbf{w}/ \ \ \mathsf{D}^* \ \operatorname{req.}) &= A_{\operatorname{CP}}(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \mathsf{K}^-\pi^+) + A_{\operatorname{det}}(\pi^+) + A_{\operatorname{det}}(\mathsf{K}^-\pi^+) \\ \overline{A}_N(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \mathsf{K}^-\pi^+, \mathbf{w}/\mathbf{o} \ \ \mathsf{D}^* \ \operatorname{req.}) &= A_{\operatorname{CP}}(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \mathsf{K}^-\pi^+) \\ &+ A_{\operatorname{det}}(\mathsf{K}^-\pi^+) \end{split}$$

So

$$A_{\det}(\pi^+) = \overline{A}_N(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \mathsf{K}^-\pi^+, \mathbf{w/ D^* req.}) - \overline{A}_N(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \mathsf{K}^-\pi^+, \mathbf{w/o D^* req.})$$

$$A_{\rm CP}({\sf D^0} \to \pi^0\pi^0) = (3.0\pm7.2\pm2.0)\times10^{-3}$$

[Belle & Belle II: Moriond EW, 2025]

$$A_{\rm CP}({\sf D}^{\sf 0}\to\pi^{\sf 0}\pi^{\sf 0})=(3.0\pm7.2\pm2.0)\times10^{-3}$$

[Belle & Belle II: Moriond EW, 2025]

Let's calculate  $A_{\rm CP}(|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2} \mathsf{D} \to \pi\pi)$ .

$$A_{\rm CP}({\sf D^0} \to \pi^0\pi^0) = (3.0\pm7.2\pm2.0)\times10^{-3}$$

[Belle & Belle II: Moriond EW, 2025]

Let's calculate  $A_{\rm CP}(|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2} \ {\sf D} o \pi \pi).$ 

Using

$$A_{\rm CP}({\sf D}^0 o \pi^0 \pi^0) = (3.0 \pm 7.2 \pm 2.0) \times 10^{-3}$$

[Belle & Belle II: Moriond EW, 2025]

Let's calculate  $A_{\rm CP}(|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2} \ {\sf D} \to \pi\pi).$ 

Using

•  $A_{\rm CP}(D^0 \to \pi^0 \pi^0) = (1.1 \pm 4.9) \times 10^{-3}$ 

from Belle II (2025) and Belle (2014)

$$A_{\rm CP}({\sf D}^0 o \pi^0 \pi^0) = (3.0 \pm 7.2 \pm 2.0) \times 10^{-3}$$

[Belle & Belle II: Moriond EW, 2025]

Let's calculate  $A_{\rm CP}(|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2} \mathsf{D} \to \pi \pi)$ .

Using

- $A_{\rm CP}(D^0 \to \pi^0 \pi^0) = (1.1 \pm 4.9) \times 10^{-3}$
- $A_{\rm CP}(D^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-) = (2.3 \pm 0.6) \times 10^{-3}$

from Belle II (2025) and Belle (2014) from LHCb (2022)

$$A_{\rm CP}({\sf D}^0 o \pi^0 \pi^0) = (3.0 \pm 7.2 \pm 2.0) \times 10^{-3}$$

[Belle & Belle II: Moriond EW, 2025]

Let's calculate  $A_{\rm CP}(|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2} \ {\sf D} \to \pi\pi).$ 

Using

•  $A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \pi^0 \pi^0) = (1.1 \pm 4.9) \times 10^{-3}$ •  $A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \pi^+ \pi^-) = (2.3 \pm 0.6) \times 10^{-3}$ 

from Belle II (2025) and Belle (2014) from LHCb (2022)

•  $A_{\rm CP}(D^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^0) = (4.2 \pm 7.9) \times 10^{-3}$  from LHCb (2021), Belle (2018), and CLEO (2010)

$$A_{\rm CP}({\sf D^0} \to \pi^0\pi^0) = (3.0\pm7.2\pm2.0)\times10^{-3}$$

[Belle & Belle II: Moriond EW, 2025]

Let's calculate  $A_{\rm CP}(|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2} \ {\sf D} \to \pi\pi).$ 

Using

•  $A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \pi^0 \pi^0) = (1.1 \pm 4.9) \times 10^{-3}$ •  $A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \pi^+ \pi^-) = (2.3 \pm 0.6) \times 10^{-3}$ 

from Belle II (2025) and Belle (2014) from LHCb (2022)

•  $A_{\rm CP}(D^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^0) = (4.2 \pm 7.9) \times 10^{-3}$  from LHCb (2021), Belle (2018), and CLEO (2010)

 $A_{\rm CP}(|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2} \ \mathsf{D} \to \pi\pi) = (1.5 \pm 0.4 \pm 2.1 \pm 1.4) \times 10^{-3} = (1.5 \pm 2.5) \times 10^{-3}$ 

$$A_{\rm CP}({\sf D}^0 o \pi^0 \pi^0) = (3.0 \pm 7.2 \pm 2.0) \times 10^{-3}$$

[Belle & Belle II: Moriond EW, 2025]

Let's calculate  $A_{\rm CP}(|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2} \ \mathsf{D} \to \pi\pi)$ .

Using

• 
$$A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \pi^0 \pi^0) = (1.1 \pm 4.9) \times 10^{-3}$$
  
•  $A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \pi^+ \pi^-) = (2.3 \pm 0.6) \times 10^{-3}$ 

from Belle II (2025) and Belle (2014) from LHCb (2022)

•  $A_{\rm CP}(D^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^0) = (4.2 \pm 7.9) \times 10^{-3}$  from LHCb (2021), Belle (2018), and CLEO (2010)

 $A_{\rm CP}(|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2} \ \mathsf{D} \to \pi\pi) = (1.5 \pm 0.4 \pm 2.1 \pm 1.4) \times 10^{-3} = (1.5 \pm 2.5) \times 10^{-3}$ 

uncertainty from  $\mathsf{D}^0 o \pi^0 \pi^0$  drops by 25%,

$$A_{\rm CP}({\sf D}^0 o \pi^0 \pi^0) = (3.0 \pm 7.2 \pm 2.0) \times 10^{-3}$$

[Belle & Belle II: Moriond EW, 2025]

Let's calculate  $A_{\rm CP}(|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2} \ \mathsf{D} \to \pi\pi)$ .

Using

• 
$$A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \pi^0 \pi^0) = (1.1 \pm 4.9) \times 10^{-3}$$
  
•  $A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \pi^+ \pi^-) = (2.3 \pm 0.6) \times 10^{-3}$ 

from Belle II (2025) and Belle (2014) from LHCb (2022)

•  $A_{\rm CP}(D^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^0) = (4.2 \pm 7.9) \times 10^{-3}$  from LHCb (2021), Belle (2018), and CLEO (2010)

 $A_{\rm CP}(|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2} \ \mathsf{D} \to \pi\pi) = (1.5 \pm 0.4 \pm 2.1 \pm 1.4) \times 10^{-3} = (1.5 \pm 2.5) \times 10^{-3}$ 

uncertainty from  $D^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0$  drops by 25%, total uncertainty drops by 19%.

Status in  $\mathsf{D}\to\pi\pi$ 



Belle II: new measurements of  $A_{\rm CP}({\sf D}^0 \to {\sf K}^0_{\sf S}{\sf K}^0_{\sf S})$ 

## Belle II: new measurements of $A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \mathsf{K}^0_\mathsf{S}\mathsf{K}^0_\mathsf{S})$

In standard model  $A_{\rm CP}(D^0 \rightarrow K^0_S K^0_S)$  could be as large as %.

In standard model  $A_{\rm CP}(D^0 \rightarrow {\sf K}^0_{\sf S}{\sf K}^0_{\sf S})$  could be as large as %.

Belle II measured it (using Belle data, too),

In standard model  $A_{\rm CP}(D^0 \to K^0_{\rm S} K^0_{\rm S})$  could be as large as %.

Belle II measured it (using Belle data, too), learning  $D^0$  flavor from

#### Belle II: new measurements of $A_{\rm CP}({\sf D}^0 \to {\sf K}^0_{\sf S}{\sf K}^0_{\sf S})$

In standard model  $A_{\rm CP}(D^0 \rightarrow {\sf K}^0_{\sf S}{\sf K}^0_{\sf S})$  could be as large as %.

Belle II measured it (using Belle data, too), learning  $D^0$  flavor from

 $\blacktriangleright$  D<sup>\*+</sup>  $\rightarrow$  D<sup>0</sup> $\pi^+$ 

In standard model  $A_{\rm CP}(D^0 \to K^0_{\rm S} K^0_{\rm S})$  could be as large as %.

Belle II measured it (using Belle data, too), learning  $D^0$  flavor from

 $\blacktriangleright$  D<sup>\*+</sup>  $\rightarrow$  D<sup>0</sup> $\pi^+$ 

charm flavor tagger

In standard model  $A_{\rm CP}(D^0 \to K^0_{\rm S} K^0_{\rm S})$  could be as large as %.

Belle II measured it (using Belle data, too), learning  $D^0$  flavor from

 $\blacktriangleright$  D<sup>\*+</sup>  $\rightarrow$  D<sup>0</sup> $\pi^+$ 

 charm flavor tagger new algorithm that looks at rest of event,

> $e^+e^- \rightarrow c\overline{c} \rightarrow D^0 + X_{\overline{c}}$ [Belle II: PRD107.112010, 2023]

In standard model  $A_{\rm CP}(D^0 \to K^0_{\rm S} K^0_{\rm S})$  could be as large as %.

Belle II measured it (using Belle data, too), learning  $D^0$  flavor from

 $\blacktriangleright$  D<sup>\*+</sup>  $\rightarrow$  D<sup>0</sup> $\pi^+$ 

 charm flavor tagger new algorithm that looks at rest of event,

$$e^+e^- \rightarrow c\overline{c} \rightarrow D^0 + X_{\overline{c}}$$

[Belle II: PRD107.112010, 2023]

first used for this analysis.

In standard model  $A_{\rm CP}(D^0 \to K^0_{\rm S} K^0_{\rm S})$  could be as large as %.

Belle II measured it (using Belle data, too), learning  $D^0$  flavor from

►  $D^{*+} \rightarrow D^0 \pi^+$ 

 $A_{\rm CP}({\sf D}^0 \to {\sf K}^0_{\sf S}{\sf K}^0_{\sf S}) = (-1.4 \pm 1.3 \pm 0.1)\%$ [Belle II: PRD111.012015, 2025]

 charm flavor tagger new algorithm that looks at rest of event,

 $e^+e^- \rightarrow c\overline{c} \rightarrow D^0 + X_{\overline{c}}$ 

[Belle II: PRD107.112010, 2023]

first used for this analysis.

In standard model  $A_{\rm CP}(D^0 \to K^0_{\rm S} K^0_{\rm S})$  could be as large as %.

Belle II measured it (using Belle data, too), learning  $D^0$  flavor from

 $\blacktriangleright$  D<sup>\*+</sup>  $\rightarrow$  D<sup>0</sup> $\pi^+$ 

 $A_{\rm CP}({\sf D}^0 \to {\sf K}^0_{\sf S}{\sf K}^0_{\sf S}) = (-1.4 \pm 1.3 \pm 0.1)\%$ [Belle II: PRD111.012015, 2025]

 charm flavor tagger new algorithm that looks at rest of event,

$$e^+e^- \rightarrow c\overline{c} \rightarrow D^0 + X_{\overline{c}}$$

[Belle II: PRD107.112010, 2023]

first used for this analysis.

$$\begin{split} A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^0\to\mathsf{K}^0_\mathsf{S}\mathsf{K}^0_\mathsf{S}) &= (1.3\pm2.0\pm0.3)\%\\ & [\text{Belle II: Moriond EW, 2025}] \end{split}$$

In standard model  $A_{\rm CP}(D^0 \to K^0_{\rm S} K^0_{\rm S})$  could be as large as %.

Belle II measured it (using Belle data, too), learning  $D^0$  flavor from

 $\blacktriangleright$  D<sup>\*+</sup>  $\rightarrow$  D<sup>0</sup> $\pi^+$ 

 $A_{\rm CP}({\sf D}^0 \to {\sf K}^0_{\sf S}{\sf K}^0_{\sf S}) = (-1.4 \pm 1.3 \pm 0.1)\%$ [Belle II: PRD111.012015, 2025]

 charm flavor tagger new algorithm that looks at rest of event,

$$e^+e^- 
ightarrow c\overline{c} 
ightarrow D^0 + X_{\overline{c}}$$

[Belle II: PRD107.112010, 2023]

first used for this analysis.

$$A_{\rm CP}({\sf D}^0 o {\sf K}^0_{\sf S}{\sf K}^0_{\sf S}) = (1.3 \pm 2.0 \pm 0.3)\%$$
  
[Belle II: Moriond EW, 2025]

combined:

$$A_{\rm CP}({\sf D}^0 \to {\sf K}^0_{\sf S}{\sf K}^0_{\sf S}) = (-0.6 \pm 1.1 \pm 0.1)\%$$
  
[Belle II: Moriond EW, 2025]
Belle II: new measurements of  $A_{\rm CP}(D^0 \to K^0_{\rm S} K^0_{\rm S})$ 

In standard model  $A_{\rm CP}(D^0 \to K^0_{\rm S} K^0_{\rm S})$  could be as large as %.

Belle II measured it (using Belle data, too), learning  $D^0$  flavor from

 $\blacktriangleright$  D<sup>\*+</sup>  $\rightarrow$  D<sup>0</sup> $\pi^+$ 

 $A_{\rm CP}({\sf D}^0\to{\sf K}^0_{\sf S}{\sf K}^0_{\sf S})=(-1.4\pm1.3\pm0.1)\%$ [Belle II: PRD111.012015, 2025]

 charm flavor tagger new algorithm that looks at rest of event,

$$e^+e^- 
ightarrow c\overline{c} 
ightarrow D^0 + X_{\overline{c}}$$

[Belle II: PRD107.112010, 2023] first used for this analysis.

first used for this analysis.

$$A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \mathsf{K}^0_\mathsf{S}\mathsf{K}^0_\mathsf{S}) = (1.3 \pm 2.0 \pm 0.3)\%$$
[Belle II: Moriond EW, 2025]

combined:

$$A_{\rm CP}({\sf D}^0 \to {\sf K}^0_{\sf S}{\sf K}^0_{\sf S}) = (-0.6 \pm 1.1 \pm 0.1)\%$$
  
[Belle II: Moriond EW, 2025]

▶ and with LHCb (2021, 2015) & Belle (2017)

$$A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D^0}\to\mathsf{K^0_SK^0_S})=(-1.3\pm0.8)\%$$

Belle II: new measurements of  $A_{\rm CP}(D^0 \rightarrow K^0_{\rm S} K^0_{\rm S})$ 

In standard model  $A_{\rm CP}(D^0 \to K^0_{\rm S} K^0_{\rm S})$  could be as large as %.

Belle II measured it (using Belle data, too), learning  $D^0$  flavor from

 $\blacktriangleright$  D<sup>\*+</sup>  $\rightarrow$  D<sup>0</sup> $\pi^+$ 

 $A_{\rm CP}({\sf D}^0\to{\sf K}^0_{\sf S}{\sf K}^0_{\sf S})=(-1.4\pm1.3\pm0.1)\%$ [Belle II: PRD111.012015, 2025]

 charm flavor tagger new algorithm that looks at rest of event,

$$e^+e^- 
ightarrow c\overline{c} 
ightarrow D^0 + X_{\overline{c}}$$

[Belle II: PRD107.112010, 2023] first used for this analysis.

$$\begin{split} A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D^0}\to\mathsf{K}^0_\mathsf{S}\mathsf{K}^0_\mathsf{S}) &= (1.3\pm2.0\pm0.3)\%\\ & [\text{Belle II: Moriond EW, 2025}] \end{split}$$

combined:

$$A_{\rm CP}({\sf D}^0 \to {\sf K}^0_{\sf S}{\sf K}^0_{\sf S}) = (-0.6 \pm 1.1 \pm 0.1)\%$$
  
[Belle II: Moriond EW, 2025]

▶ and with LHCb (2021, 2015) & Belle (2017)

$$A_{\rm CP}({\sf D^0}\to{\sf K^0_S}{\sf K^0_S})=(-1.3\pm0.8)\%$$

LHCb recently measured decay-time dependence of decay-rate ratios

$$\frac{\Gamma(\mathsf{D}^{0}\to\mathsf{K}^{+}\pi^{-})}{\Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^{0}\to\mathsf{K}^{+}\pi^{-})}$$

LHCb recently measured decay-time dependence of decay-rate ratios

$$\frac{\Gamma(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \mathsf{K}^+ \pi^-)}{\Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^0 \to \mathsf{K}^+ \pi^-)} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^0 \to \mathsf{K}^- \pi^+)}{\Gamma(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \mathsf{K}^- \pi^+)}$$

LHCb recently measured decay-time dependence of decay-rate ratios

$$\frac{\Gamma(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \mathsf{K}^+ \pi^-)}{\Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^0 \to \mathsf{K}^+ \pi^-)} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^0 \to \mathsf{K}^- \pi^+)}{\Gamma(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \mathsf{K}^- \pi^+)}$$

where  $D^0$  and  $\overline{D}^0$  are the produced states—they oscillate before decaying.

LHCb recently measured decay-time dependence of decay-rate ratios

$$\frac{\Gamma(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \mathsf{K}^+ \pi^-)}{\Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^0 \to \mathsf{K}^+ \pi^-)} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^0 \to \mathsf{K}^- \pi^+)}{\Gamma(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \mathsf{K}^- \pi^+)}$$

where  $D^0$  and  $\overline{D}^0$  are the produced states—they oscillate before decaying.

From this, we learn about  $D^0-\overline{D}^0$  mixing

LHCb recently measured decay-time dependence of decay-rate ratios

$$\frac{\Gamma(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \mathsf{K}^+ \pi^-)}{\Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^0 \to \mathsf{K}^+ \pi^-)} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^0 \to \mathsf{K}^- \pi^+)}{\Gamma(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \mathsf{K}^- \pi^+)}$$

where  $D^0$  and  $\overline{D}^0$  are the produced states—they oscillate before decaying.

From this, we learn about  $D^0-\overline{D}^0$  mixing and  $A_{\rm CP}(D^0 \to {\rm K}^+\pi^-)$ ,

LHCb recently measured decay-time dependence of decay-rate ratios

$$\frac{\Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^0 \to \mathsf{K}^+ \pi^-)}{\Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^0 \to \mathsf{K}^+ \pi^-)} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^0 \to \mathsf{K}^- \pi^+)}{\Gamma(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \mathsf{K}^- \pi^+)}$$

where  $D^0$  and  $\overline{D}^0$  are the produced states—they oscillate before decaying.

From this, we learn about  $D^0-\overline{D}^0$  mixing and  $A_{\rm CP}(D^0 \to K^+\pi^-)$ , which the standard-model expects to be zero (less than  $10^{-5}$ ).

LHCb recently measured decay-time dependence of decay-rate ratios

$$\frac{\Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^0\to\mathsf{K}^+\pi^-)}{\Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^0\to\mathsf{K}^+\pi^-)} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^0\to\mathsf{K}^-\pi^+)}{\Gamma(\mathsf{D}^0\to\mathsf{K}^-\pi^+)}$$

where  $D^0$  and  $\overline{D}^0$  are the produced states—they oscillate before decaying.

From this, we learn about  $D^0-\overline{D}^0$  mixing

and  $A_{\rm CP}(D^0 \to K^+\pi^-)$ , which the standard-model expects to be zero (less than  $10^{-5}$ ).

 $A_{\rm CP}({\rm D^0} \to {\rm K^+}\pi^-) = (-6.6\pm5.7)\times10^{-3}$ 

[LHCb: PRD111.012001, 2025]

Inching towards testing the standard model.

Lepton-flavor universality  $\equiv$  e,  $\mu,$  and  $\tau$  have the same electroweak couplings.

Lepton-flavor universality  $\equiv$  e,  $\mu$ , and  $\tau$  have the same electroweak couplings.

Lepton-flavor universality  $\equiv$  e,  $\mu,$  and  $\tau\,$  have the same electroweak couplings.



Lepton-flavor universality  $\equiv$  e,  $\mu,$  and  $\tau\,$  have the same electroweak couplings.





Lepton-flavor universality  $\equiv$  e,  $\mu,$  and  $\tau\,$  have the same electroweak couplings.

We can test that with leptonic  $\tau$  decay:



 $\Gamma(\tau^- \to \mathrm{e}^- \nu_\tau \overline{\nu}_\mathrm{e})$ 



Lepton-flavor universality  $\equiv$  e,  $\mu,$  and  $\tau\,$  have the same electroweak couplings.



Lepton-flavor universality  $\equiv$  e,  $\mu,$  and  $\tau\,$  have the same electroweak couplings.

We can test that with leptonic  $\tau$  decay:



$$\Gamma(\tau^- \to e^- \nu_\tau \overline{\nu_e})$$



 $\Gamma(\tau^- \to \mu^- \nu_\tau \overline{\nu}_\mu)$ 

Lepton-flavor universality  $\equiv$  e,  $\mu,$  and  $\tau\,$  have the same electroweak couplings.





Lepton-flavor universality  $\equiv$  e,  $\mu,$  and  $\tau\,$  have the same electroweak couplings.





Lepton-flavor universality  $\equiv$  e,  $\mu$ , and  $\tau$  have the same electroweak couplings.





Lepton-flavor universality  $\equiv$  e,  $\mu,$  and  $\tau\,$  have the same electroweak couplings.

We can test that with leptonic  $\tau$  decay:





 $\Gamma(\tau^- \to \mathbf{e}^- \nu_\tau \overline{\nu}_{\mathbf{e}}) \propto |g_\tau|^2 |g_{\mathbf{e}}|^2 \qquad \qquad \Gamma(\tau^- \to \mu^- \nu_\tau \overline{\nu}_{\mu}) \propto |g_\tau|^2 |g_{\mu}|^2$ 

$$\left|\frac{g_{\mu}}{g_{\rm e}}\right| \propto \sqrt{\frac{B(\tau^- \to \mu^- \nu_\tau \overline{\nu}_\mu)}{B(\tau^- \to {\rm e}^- \nu_\tau \overline{\nu}_{\rm e})}}$$

clean data set from  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$ .

clean data set from  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$ .

require one  $\tau$  decay leptonically

clean data set from  ${\rm e^+e^-} \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-.$ 







require one  $\tau$  decay leptonically and the other decay hadronically (to  $\pi^+\pi^0$ ).



require one  $\tau$  decay leptonically and the other decay hadronically (to  $\pi^+\pi^0$ ).



require one  $\tau$  decay leptonically and the other decay hadronically (to  $\pi^+\pi^0$ ).



Find only two charged particles, opp'ly charged, and one or more  $\pi^0$  (in one hemisphere)

require one  $\tau$  decay leptonically and the other decay hadronically (to  $\pi^+\pi^0$ ).



- Find only two charged particles, opp'ly charged, and one or more  $\pi^0$  (in one hemisphere)
- Require

require one  $\tau$  decay leptonically and the other decay hadronically (to  $\pi^+\pi^0$ ).



Find only two charged particles, opp'ly charged, and one or more  $\pi^0$  (in one hemisphere)

Require

large thrust, high missing mass, low missing  $p_t$ , to isolate  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$ .

require one  $\tau$  decay leptonically and the other decay hadronically (to  $\pi^+\pi^0$ ).



thrust axis  $\equiv$  axis most along momenta

Find only two charged particles, opp'ly charged, and one or more  $\pi^0$  (in one hemisphere)

Require

- large thrust, high missing mass, low missing  $p_t$ , to isolate  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$ .
- ▶ charged particle in  $\pi^0$  hemisph. not look like  $e^{\pm}$ , to veto  $e^+e^- \rightarrow e^+e^-$ .

require one  $\tau$  decay leptonically and the other decay hadronically (to  $\pi^+\pi^0$ ).



thrust axis  $\equiv$  axis most along momenta

Find only two charged particles, opp'ly charged, and one or more  $\pi^0$  (in one hemisphere)

Require

- large thrust, high missing mass, low missing  $p_{\rm t}$ , to isolate  ${\rm e^+e^-} \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$ .
- ► charged particle in  $\pi^0$  hemisph. not look like  $e^{\pm}$ , to veto  $e^+e^- \rightarrow e^+e^-$ .
- other charged particle look like  $e^{\pm}$  or  $\mu^{\pm}$ .
# Belle II: Testing lepton universality with leptonic $\tau$ decay clean data set from ${\rm e^+e^-} \to \tau^+\tau^-.$

require one  $\tau$  decay leptonically and the other decay hadronically (to  $\pi^+\pi^0$ ).



thrust axis  $\equiv$  axis most along momenta

Find only two charged particles, opp'ly charged, and one or more  $\pi^0$  (in one hemisphere)

- large thrust, high missing mass, low missing  $p_{\rm t}$ , to isolate  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$ .
- ► charged particle in  $\pi^0$  hemisph. not look like  $e^{\pm}$ , to veto  $e^+e^- \rightarrow e^+e^-$ .
- other charged particle look like  $e^{\pm}$  or  $\mu^{\pm}$ .
- Use neural network to remove background.

# Belle II: Testing lepton universality with leptonic $\tau$ decay clean data set from ${\rm e^+e^-} \to \tau^+\tau^-.$

require one  $\tau$  decay leptonically and the other decay hadronically (to  $\pi^+\pi^0$ ).



thrust axis  $\equiv$  axis most along momenta

Find only two charged particles, opp'ly charged, and one or more  $\pi^0$  (in one hemisphere)

- large thrust, high missing mass, low missing  $p_{\rm t}$ , to isolate  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$ .
- ► charged particle in  $\pi^0$  hemisph. not look like  $e^{\pm}$ , to veto  $e^+e^- \rightarrow e^+e^-$ .
- other charged particle look like  $e^{\pm}$  or  $\mu^{\pm}$ .
- Use neural network to remove background.
- Fit to  $p_{\ell}$  spectra to get branching-fraction ratio.

# Belle II: Testing lepton universality with leptonic $\tau$ decay clean data set from ${\rm e^+e^-} \to \tau^+\tau^-.$

require one  $\tau$  decay leptonically and the other decay hadronically (to  $\pi^+\pi^0$ ).



thrust axis  $\equiv$  axis most along momenta

Find only two charged particles, opp'ly charged, and one or more  $\pi^0$  (in one hemisphere)

- large thrust, high missing mass, low missing  $p_{\rm t}$ , to isolate  ${\rm e^+e^-} \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$ .
- Charged particle in π<sup>0</sup> hemisph. not look like e<sup>±</sup>, to veto e<sup>+</sup>e<sup>−</sup> → e<sup>+</sup>e<sup>−</sup>.
- other charged particle look like  $e^{\pm}$  or  $\mu^{\pm}$ .
- Use neural network to remove background.
- Fit to  $p_{\ell}$  spectra to get branching-fraction ratio.
- Study lepton-ID efficiencies and correlations.

### Belle II: Testing lepton universality with leptonic $\tau$ decay



[Belle II: JHEP08.205, 2024]

### Belle II: Other recent $\tau$ measurements

Limits on lepton-flavor violation:

$$\begin{split} B(\tau^- \to \Lambda^0 \pi^-) < 4.7 \times 10^{-8} @~90\% \text{ credibility} \\ B(\tau^- \to \overline{\Lambda}^0 \pi^-) < 4.3 \times 10^{-8} @~90\% \text{ credibility} \\ B(\tau^- \to \mu^- \mu^+ \mu^-) < 1.9 \times 10^{-8} @~90\% \text{ credibility} \end{split}$$

[Belle II: PRD110.112003, 2024] [Belle II: PRD110.112003, 2024] [Belle II: JHEP09.062, 2024]

### Belle II: Other recent $\tau$ measurements

Limits on lepton-flavor violation:

$$\begin{split} B(\tau^- \to \Lambda^0 \pi^-) < 4.7 \times 10^{-8} @~90\% \text{ credibility} \\ B(\tau^- \to \overline{\Lambda}^0 \pi^-) < 4.3 \times 10^{-8} @~90\% \text{ credibility} \\ B(\tau^- \to \mu^- \mu^+ \mu^-) < 1.9 \times 10^{-8} @~90\% \text{ credibility} \end{split}$$

[Belle II: PRD110.112003, 2024] [Belle II: PRD110.112003, 2024] [Belle II: JHEP09.062, 2024]

• Measurement of  $\tau$  mass:



Belle II & LHCb are very active.

### Belle II & LHCb are very active.

I have highlighted only a few recent results.

### Belle II & LHCb are very active.

I have highlighted only a few recent results.

Give me another 25 minutes and I'm happy to talk about more.

### Belle II & LHCb are very active.

I have highlighted only a few recent results. Give me another 25 minutes and I'm happy to talk about more.

**Discovery of CP violation in baryons:** 

 $\Lambda^0_{
m b} 
ightarrow {
m p} \, {
m K}^- \pi^+ \pi^-, \; \Lambda^0 {
m K}^+ {
m K}^-$ 

### Belle II & LHCb are very active.

I have highlighted only a few recent results. Give me another 25 minutes and I'm happy to talk about more.

**Discovery of CP violation in baryons:** 

$$\Lambda^0_{
m b} 
ightarrow {
m p} \, {
m K}^- \pi^+ \pi^-, \; \Lambda^0 {
m K}^+ {
m K}^-$$

Search for physics beyond standard model via  $A_{CP}(D \text{ decay})$ :  $D^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0, \ K_S^0 K_S^0, \ K^{\pm} K^{\mp}$ 

### Belle II & LHCb are very active.

I have highlighted only a few recent results. Give me another 25 minutes and I'm happy to talk about more.

**Discovery of CP violation in baryons:** 

$$\Lambda^0_{
m b} 
ightarrow {
m p} \, {
m K}^- \pi^+ \pi^-, \; \Lambda^0 {
m K}^+ {
m K}^-$$

- ► Search for physics beyond standard model via  $A_{CP}$ (D decay):  $D^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0, \ K_S^0 K_S^0, \ K^{\pm} K^{\mp}$
- Testing testing lepton universality in  $\tau$  decay:

 $\tau^- 
ightarrow \mathrm{e}^- \nu_{ au} \, \overline{\nu}_{\mathrm{e}}, \ \mu^- \nu_{ au} \, \overline{\nu}_{\mu}$ 

### Belle II & LHCb are very active.

I have highlighted only a few recent results. Give me another 25 minutes and I'm happy to talk about more.

**Discovery of CP violation in baryons:** 

$$\Lambda^0_{
m b} 
ightarrow {
m p} \, {
m K}^- \pi^+ \pi^-, \; \Lambda^0 {
m K}^+ {
m K}^-$$

- Search for physics beyond standard model via  $A_{CP}$  (D decay):  $D^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0, \ K_s^0 K_s^0, \ K^{\pm} K^{\mp}$
- Testing testing lepton universality in  $\tau$  decay:

 $\tau^- \to \mathrm{e}^- \nu_\tau \, \overline{\nu}_\mathrm{e}, \ \mu^- \nu_\tau \, \overline{\nu}_\mu$ 

Both experiments are active in many other areas, including

- study of quarkonia, tetraquarks, pentaquarks
- dark-matter searches
- measuring quark-mixing-matrix parameters

- hadron spectroscopy
- measuring electroweak parameters
- study of B mesons

### Some event counts

►  $A_{CP}(\Lambda_{b}^{0} \rightarrow \cdots)$  @ LHCb  $\Lambda_{\rm b}^0 \pi^+ \pi^-$  636 ± 42  $\Lambda_{\rm h}^{\tilde{0}}{\rm K}^{+}\pi^{-}$  618 ± 32  $\Lambda_{\rm b}^{0}{\rm K}^{+}{\rm K}^{-}$  1920 ± 50 p K<sup>+</sup> $\pi^{+}\pi^{-}$  80 690 ± 340 ►  $A_{CP}(D^0 \rightarrow \cdots)$  @ Belle II  $\pi^0\pi^0 \quad \mathcal{O}(10^4)$  $K_c^0 K_c^0 = 2214 \pm 51$  Belle II  $4864 \pm 78$ Belle  $\blacktriangleright$  D<sup>0</sup>  $\rightarrow$  K<sup>±</sup> $\pi^{\mp}$  @ I HCb  $K^{+}\pi^{-}$  412 × 10<sup>6</sup>  $K^{-}\pi^{+}$  1.6 × 10<sup>6</sup>  $\blacktriangleright \tau^- \rightarrow \ell^- \nu_\tau \bar{\nu}_\ell$  @ Belle II  $e 4.4 \times 10^{6}$  $\mu 4.4 \times 10^{6}$ 

thrust

$$ert ec t ert \equiv rac{\sum_i ec p_i \cdot \hat{t}}{\sum_i ert ec p_i ert}$$

## The flavor intensity frontier: Belle II and LHCb and some of their recent results

Daniel Greenwald

Institute for Hadronic Structure & Fundamental Symmetries Technische Universität München

> DPG Frühjahrstagung 2025 Göttingen, April 4, 2025

## What is flavor physics?

We know of the following elementary fermions



these **flavors** are distinguishable only by their masses and couplings to the  $W^{\pm}$  (for the quarks)

flavor physics  $\equiv$  study of differences and dynamics between flavors

- **Grand scheme:** find origin of mass and interaction hierarchies
- ▶ Nearer goals: measure standard-model parameters and search for new forces and particles

## The LHCb experiment at CERN's Large Hadron Collider



The LHC symmetrically collides protons with protons at center-of-mass energies of 7-14 TeV

$$pp \rightarrow q\bar{q} + X$$
,  $pp \rightarrow W + X$ ,  $pp \rightarrow Z + X$ 

q = u, d, s, c, b, t X = hadrons, charged leptons, neutrinos

Only parts of protons interact with each other, at an energy much less than collision energy.

Particles of interest have high momenta in the beam directions.

## The LHCb detector



Detects and identifies  $e^{\pm}$ ,  $\mu^{\pm}$ ,  $\pi^{\pm}$ ,  $K^{\pm}$ ,  $p^{\pm}$ ;  $\gamma$ Reconstructs  $K_{S}^{0} \rightarrow \pi^{+}\pi^{-}$ ,  $\Lambda^{0} \rightarrow p \pi^{-}$ ,  $\pi^{0} \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$ , ... It's a **forward detector** consisting of

- vertex & tracking detectors measure charged-particle trajectories, determine p from bending in B field
- ring-imaging Cherenkov det's identify charged-particle types (π<sup>±</sup>, K<sup>±</sup>, ...)
- calorimeters measure particle energies
- muon detectors detect muons

### The Belle II experiment at KEK's SuperKEKB collider



SuperKEKB asymmetrically collides electrons with positrons at c.m. energies near 10.6 GeV

$$e^+e^- \rightarrow f\bar{f}$$

$$f = e, \mu, \boldsymbol{\tau}, u, d, s, c, b$$

incoming  $E(e^-) > E(e^+) \longrightarrow$  outgoing system moves in electron direction in lab frame

### The Belle II detector



Detects and identifies  $e^{\pm}$ ,  $\mu^{\pm}$ ,  $\pi^{\pm}$ ,  $K^{\pm}$ ,  $p^{\pm}$ ;  $\gamma$ ,  $K_{L}$ Reconstructs  $K_{S}^{0} \rightarrow \pi^{+}\pi^{-}$ ,  $\Lambda^{0} \rightarrow p \pi^{-}$ ,  $\pi^{0} \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$ , ...

It's a  $4\pi$  detector consisting of

- vertex det's & drift chamber measure charged-particle trajectories, determine p from bending in B field
- Particle ID (Cherenkov) det's identify charged-particle types (π<sup>±</sup>, K<sup>±</sup>, ...)
- calorimeter measure particle energies
- K<sub>L</sub> & muon detector detect K<sub>L</sub> & muons





### Taking data since 2019.









- Taking data since 2010.
- Collected several  $fb^{-1}$  of data.
- Millibarn cross sections for  $pp \rightarrow q\bar{q} + X$ .
- trillions of events
- high cross sections



Taking data since 2019.
 collected 100s of fb<sup>-1</sup> of data
 nanobarn cross sections for e<sup>+</sup>e<sup>-</sup> → f f̄.
 100s of millions of events
 high luminosity (world's highest)

lots of data = high intensity  $\rightarrow$  precise measurements

- can study particles heavier than B, 5.3 GeV
- larger lab-frame momenta
- more data

- ▶ can (better) detect  $\gamma$ 's and reconstruct  $\pi^0$ 's
- can study decays to invisible particles
- $\blacktriangleright$  can study  $\tau$  decay





Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung



- 1700 members
- 100 institutes
- 22 countries

1200 members
124 institutes
28 countries

### **German Contributions**

- Aachen
- Bonn
- Bochum
- Freiburg

- Dortmund
- Heidelberg Uni, MPK

- Bonn
- Giessen
- Göttingen
- DESY

- Heidelberg
- Karlsruhe
- Mainz
- München LMU, MPP, TUM

#### Let's look at some of the most recent measurements.

Focusing on

what we measure, limited to my personal selection, given the time constraints,

**why** we measure it, and

**how** we measure it.

### Let's start with CP violation

 $\label{eq:CP} CP \equiv \text{swaps left-handed particles and right-handed antiparticles} \\ CP \mbox{ violation} \equiv CP \mbox{ conjugated states behaving differently}$ 

Why do we care?

- Universe is CP asymmetric—made of matter, not antimatter.
   ⇒ better understand where and how CP is violated.
- Standard model predicts particular processes are CP symmetric. ⇒ search for new forces and particles beyond the standard model.

One method: measure decay-rate CP asymmetries

$$A_{\rm CP} \equiv \frac{\Gamma(X \to abc) - \overline{\Gamma(X \to abc)}}{\Gamma(X \to abc) + \overline{\Gamma(X \to abc)}} ~\in~ [-1, 1] ~=~ \begin{cases} {\sf zero} & \to \ {\sf CP} \ {\sf conserving} \\ {\sf nonzero} & \to \ {\sf CP} \ {\sf violating} \end{cases}$$

## LHCb: search for CP violation in baryon decay

Why? CP violation is not a widely-scene phenomenon:

| 1964 | CP violation in K <sup>0</sup> mixing               | strange meson        |
|------|---|----------------------|
| 1999 | CP violation in $K^0$ decay                         | strange meson        |
| 2001 | <b>CP violation in B<sup>0</sup></b> mixing & decay | bottom meson         |
| 2004 | CP violation in $B^0$ decay                         | bottom meson         |
| 2012 | CP violation in $B^+$ decay                         | bottom meson         |
| 2013 | CP violation in $B_s^0$ decay                       | bottom-strange meson |
| 2019 | <b>CP violation in D<sup>0</sup></b> decay          | charm meson          |

h

CP violation was not seen in process involving baryons.

Yet the CP asymmetry of the universe is a **baryon-antibaryon asymmetry** 

LHCb measured the decay-rate CP asymmetries of some decays of the  $\Lambda^0_b$  baryon

for 
$$\Lambda_b^0 \to \Lambda^0 \pi^+ \pi^-$$
,  $\Lambda^0 K^+ \pi^-$ ,  $\Lambda^0 \pi^+ K^-$ ,  
for  $\Lambda_b^0 \to p K^- \pi^+ \pi^-$ 

[LHCb: PRL134.101802, 2025]

[LHCb: Moriond EW, 2025]

## LHCb: $\Lambda_b^0$ decay-rate CP asymmetries



## LHCb: $\Lambda_b^0$ decay-rate CP asymmetries

Find final-state particles

$$p \pi^{-} \pi^{+} K^{-}, \Lambda^{0} \pi^{+} \pi^{-}, \Lambda^{0} K^{+} \pi^{-}, \Lambda^{0} \pi^{+} K^{-},$$

$$(\Lambda^0 \to p\pi^-)$$

- they come from common point far from pp collision since Λ<sup>0</sup><sub>b</sub> flies before decaying.
- their momentum sum point back to pp collision since A<sup>0</sup><sub>b</sub> comes from pp interaction.
- Veto weakly-decaying intermediate states: when final-state subset has mass near such a state.
- Use machine-learning algorithm to remove random background

Selected candidates are predominantly correct  $\Lambda_b^0$ , but also incorrect ones.



Fit to the mass spectra to get signal yields,  $N(\Lambda_b^0 \to \cdots)$  and  $N(\overline{\Lambda}_b^0 \to \overline{\cdots})$ .

likewise for  $\Lambda^0 \pi^+ \pi^-$ , ...

From fit results, calculate raw asymmetry

$$\begin{split} A_{\rm raw}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to{\sf fsp's}) &\equiv \frac{N(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to\cdots)-N(\overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0\to\overline{{\sf fsp's}})}{N(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to\cdots)+N(\overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0\to\overline{{\sf fsp's}})} \\ &= A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to{\sf fsp's})+A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0)+A_{\rm det}({\sf fsp's}) \end{split}$$

 $A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0) \equiv asymmetry of production of \Lambda_{\rm b}^0 and \overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0$  from pp collision  $A_{\rm det}(fsp's) \equiv asymmetry of detection of \Lambda_{\rm b}^0 and \overline{\Lambda}_{\rm b}^0$  decay products

Use raw asymmetry in  $\Lambda^0_b o \Lambda^+_c \pi^-$  to remove these:

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to{\sf fsp's}) &= A_{\rm raw}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to{\sf fsp's}) &- A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0) &- A_{\rm det}({\sf fsp's}) \\ 0 &= A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to\Lambda_{\rm c}^+\pi^-) = A_{\rm raw}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0\to\Lambda_{\rm c}^+\pi^-) &- A_{\rm prod}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^0) &- A_{\rm det}(\Lambda_{\rm c}^+\pi^-) \end{aligned}$$

 $\Lambda_c^+$  final state chosen to match  $\Lambda_b^0\,\mbox{'s.}$ 

LHCb reported two significant asymmetries

$$\begin{split} A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{0}\to\Lambda^{0}{\rm K}^{+}{\rm K}^{-}) &= (8.3\pm2.3\pm1.6)\% \to 3.1\sigma \quad [{\rm LHCb:} \ {\rm PRL134.101802} \ {\rm 2025}] \\ A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{0}\to{\rm p}\ {\rm K}^{-}\pi^{+}\pi^{-}) &= (2.45\pm0.46\pm0.10)\% \to 5.2\sigma \quad [{\rm LHCb:} \ {\rm Moriond}\ {\rm EW}, \ {\rm 2025}] \end{split}$$

LHCb:  $\Lambda_b^0$  decay-rate CP asymmetries

$$A_{\rm CP}(\Lambda_{\rm b}^{\rm 0}\to{\rm p}\,{\rm K}^-\pi^+\pi^-)=(2.45\pm0.46\pm0.10)\%\quad\to\quad 5.2\sigma$$

[LHCb: Moriond EW, 2025]

### LHCb observed CP violation in baryon decay.

| 1964 | CP violation in K <sup>0</sup> mixing | strange meson        |
|------|---------------------------------------|----------------------|
| 1999 | CP violation in $K^0$ decay           | strange meson        |
| 2001 | CP violation in $B^0$ mixing & decay  | bottom meson         |
| 2004 | CP violation in $B^0$ decay           | bottom meson         |
| 2012 | CP violation in $B^+$ decay           | bottom meson         |
| 2013 | CP violation in $B_s^0$ decay         | bottom-strange meson |
| 2019 | CP violation in D decay               | charm meson          |

### **2025** CP violation in $\Lambda_b^0$ decay bottom baryon

### Belle II & LHCb: $D \rightarrow \pi\pi$ decay-rate CP asymmetries

Let's look at charm—at decays of D mesons

to pion pairs

 $\pi^{+}\pi^{0}$   $\pi^{+}\pi^{-}$   $\pi^{0}\pi^{0}$ 

isospin superpositions: 0+1+2, 0+2, 2

Standard model:

 $A_{\mathrm{CP}}^{\mathrm{SM}}(|\Delta I| = \frac{3}{2} \mathsf{D} \to \pi\pi) = 0 \text{ and } A_{\mathrm{CP}}^{\mathrm{SM}}(|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2} \mathsf{D} \to \pi\pi) \ll 1$ 

•  $D^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^0$  only has  $|\Delta I| = \frac{3}{2}$ , so  $A_{\rm CP}^{\rm SM}(D^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^-) = 0$ 

▶  $D^0 \rightarrow \pi \pi$  has both  $|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2}$  and  $\frac{3}{2}$ , but nonzero  $A_{CP}^{SM}$  only from  $|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2}$  part.

## Belle II & LHCb: $D \rightarrow \pi\pi$ decay-rate CP asymmetries

- $\blacktriangleright A_{\rm CP}^{\rm SM}(\mathsf{D}^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^0) = 0$
- ►  $A_{CP}^{SM}(D^0 \to \pi\pi)$  only from  $A_{CP}^{SM}(|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2} D \to \pi\pi)$  and small

### So, if we measure

- ►  $A_{\rm CP}({\sf D}^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^0) \neq 0$  $\longrightarrow$  something beyond the standard model
- ►  $A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-)$  and  $A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \pi^0\pi^0)$  inconsistent with  $A_{\rm CP}(|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2} \mathsf{D} \to \pi\pi)$  $\longrightarrow$  something beyond the standard model
- Can't directly measure  $A_{\rm CP}(|\Delta I|{=}\frac{1}{2}~{\sf D}\rightarrow\pi\pi)$  ,

but can calculate it from asymmetries, branching fractions, and  $D^0\mathchar`-D^+$  lifetime ratio

$$A_{\rm CP}(|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2} \ \mathsf{D} \to \pi\pi) = \frac{B_{+-}A_{+-} + B_{00}A_{00} - \frac{2}{3}\frac{\tau_0}{\tau_+}B_{+0}A_{+0}}{B_{+-} + B_{00} - \frac{2}{3}\frac{\tau_0}{\tau_+}B_{+0}}$$

Asymmetries are limiting inputs,  $A_{\rm CP}(D^0 \to \pi^0 \pi^0)$  most limiting.

Belle II:  $D^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0$  decay-rate CP asymmetry

$$A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}}) = \frac{\Gamma(\mathsf{D}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}}) - \Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}})}{\Gamma(\mathsf{D}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}}) + \Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^{\mathsf{0}} \to \pi^{\mathsf{0}}\pi^{\mathsf{0}})}$$

Distinguish  $D^0 \to \pi^0 \pi^0$  and  $\overline{D}^0 \to \pi^0 \pi^0$  by requiring they come from  $D^{*\pm}$  decay:

 $D^{*+} \rightarrow D^0 \pi^+$   $D^{*-} \rightarrow \overline{D}^0 \pi^-$ 

- Find final state particles:  $\pi^{\pm}\pi^{0}\pi^{0}$
- Require
  - $\pi^0 \pi^0$  mass be consistent with D<sup>0</sup> mass
  - $\pi^{\pm}\pi^{0}\pi^{0}$  mass consistent with  $D^{*\pm}-D^{0}$  mass difference
  - ▶  $D^{*\pm}$  have enough momentum to not come from B decay  $\longrightarrow$  don't inherit  $A_{\rm CP}$  from B decay
- Use machine-learning algorithm to remove background.
## Belle II: $D^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0$ decay-rate CP asymmetry



Fit to the mass and  $\Delta m$  spectra to get signal yields,  $N(D^0 \to \pi^0 \pi^0)$  and  $N(\overline{D}^0 \to \pi^0 \pi^0)$ .

## Belle II: $D^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0$ decay-rate CP asymmetry

Again this the **raw** asymmetry is not the CP one

$$A_N(\mathsf{D}^{*+}\to\mathsf{D}^0\pi^+,\mathsf{D}^0\to\pi^0\pi^0) = A_{\mathrm{CP}}(\mathsf{D}^0\to\pi^0\pi^0) + A_{\mathrm{prod}}(\mathsf{D}^{*+}) + A_{\mathrm{det}}(\pi^+)$$

 A<sub>prod</sub>(D<sup>0</sup>) ≡ from e<sup>+</sup>e<sup>-</sup> → cc̄ forward-backward asymmetry cancel by averaging over forward and backward D\*

$$\overline{A}_N \equiv \frac{1}{2} \left[ A_N^{\rm F} + A_N^{\rm B} \right] = A_{\rm CP} (\mathsf{D}^0 \to \pi^0 \pi^0) + A_{\rm det} (\pi^+)$$

► calculate  $A_{det}(\pi^+)$  from  $D^{*+} \rightarrow D^0 \pi^+, D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$ 

$$\begin{split} \overline{A}_N(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \mathsf{K}^-\pi^+, \mathbf{w}/ \ \ \mathsf{D}^* \ \operatorname{req.}) &= A_{\operatorname{CP}}(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \mathsf{K}^-\pi^+) + A_{\operatorname{det}}(\pi^+) + A_{\operatorname{det}}(\mathsf{K}^-\pi^+) \\ \overline{A}_N(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \mathsf{K}^-\pi^+, \mathbf{w}/\mathbf{o} \ \ \mathsf{D}^* \ \operatorname{req.}) &= A_{\operatorname{CP}}(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \mathsf{K}^-\pi^+) \\ &+ A_{\operatorname{det}}(\mathsf{K}^-\pi^+) \end{split}$$

So

$$A_{\det}(\pi^+) = \overline{A}_N(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \mathsf{K}^-\pi^+, \mathbf{w/ D^* req.}) - \overline{A}_N(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \mathsf{K}^-\pi^+, \mathbf{w/o D^* req.})$$

Belle II:  $D^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0$  decay-rate CP asymmetry

$$A_{\rm CP}({\sf D}^0 o \pi^0 \pi^0) = (3.0 \pm 7.2 \pm 2.0) \times 10^{-3}$$

[Belle & Belle II: Moriond EW, 2025]

Let's calculate  $A_{\rm CP}(|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2} \ \mathsf{D} \to \pi\pi)$ .

Using

• 
$$A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \pi^0 \pi^0) = (1.1 \pm 4.9) \times 10^{-3}$$
  
•  $A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D}^0 \to \pi^+ \pi^-) = (2.3 \pm 0.6) \times 10^{-3}$ 

from Belle II (2025) and Belle (2014) from LHCb (2022)

•  $A_{\rm CP}(D^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^0) = (4.2 \pm 7.9) \times 10^{-3}$  from LHCb (2021), Belle (2018), and CLEO (2010)

 $A_{\rm CP}(|\Delta I| = \frac{1}{2} \ \mathsf{D} \to \pi\pi) = (1.5 \pm 0.4 \pm 2.1 \pm 1.4) \times 10^{-3} = (1.5 \pm 2.5) \times 10^{-3}$ 

uncertainty from  $D^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0$  drops by 25%, total uncertainty drops by 19%.

Status in  $\mathsf{D}\to\pi\pi$ 



Belle II: new measurements of  $A_{\rm CP}(D^0 \rightarrow K^0_{\rm S} K^0_{\rm S})$ 

In standard model  $A_{\rm CP}(D^0 \to K^0_{\rm S} K^0_{\rm S})$  could be as large as %.

Belle II measured it (using Belle data, too), learning  $D^0$  flavor from

 $\blacktriangleright$  D<sup>\*+</sup>  $\rightarrow$  D<sup>0</sup> $\pi^+$ 

 $A_{\rm CP}({\sf D}^0\to{\sf K}^0_{\sf S}{\sf K}^0_{\sf S})=(-1.4\pm1.3\pm0.1)\%$ [Belle II: PRD111.012015, 2025]

 charm flavor tagger new algorithm that looks at rest of event,

$$e^+e^- 
ightarrow c\overline{c} 
ightarrow D^0 + X_{\overline{c}}$$

[Belle II: PRD107.112010, 2023] first used for this analysis.

$$\begin{split} A_{\rm CP}(\mathsf{D^0}\to\mathsf{K}^0_\mathsf{S}\mathsf{K}^0_\mathsf{S}) &= (1.3\pm2.0\pm0.3)\%\\ & [\text{Belle II: Moriond EW, 2025}] \end{split}$$

combined:

$$A_{\rm CP}({\sf D}^0 \to {\sf K}^0_{\sf S}{\sf K}^0_{\sf S}) = (-0.6 \pm 1.1 \pm 0.1)\%$$
  
[Belle II: Moriond EW, 2025]

▶ and with LHCb (2021, 2015) & Belle (2017)

$$A_{\rm CP}({\sf D^0}\to{\sf K^0_S}{\sf K^0_S})=(-1.3\pm0.8)\%$$

### LHCb: new search for CP violation in $D^0 \rightarrow K^{\pm} \pi^{\mp}$

LHCb recently measured decay-time dependence of decay-rate ratios

$$\frac{\Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^0\to\mathsf{K}^+\pi^-)}{\Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^0\to\mathsf{K}^+\pi^-)} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\Gamma(\overline{\mathsf{D}}^0\to\mathsf{K}^-\pi^+)}{\Gamma(\mathsf{D}^0\to\mathsf{K}^-\pi^+)}$$

where  $D^0$  and  $\overline{D}^0$  are the produced states—they oscillate before decaying.

From this, we learn about  $D^0-\overline{D}^0$  mixing

and  $A_{\rm CP}(D^0 \to K^+\pi^-)$ , which the standard-model expects to be zero (less than  $10^{-5}$ ).

 $A_{\rm CP}({\rm D^0} \to {\rm K^+}\pi^-) = (-6.6\pm5.7)\times10^{-3}$ 

[LHCb: PRD111.012001, 2025]

Inching towards testing the standard model.

### Belle II: Testing lepton universality with leptonic $\tau$ decay

Lepton-flavor universality  $\equiv$  e,  $\mu,$  and  $\tau\,$  have the same electroweak couplings.

We can test that with leptonic  $\tau$  decay:





 $\Gamma(\tau^- \to \mathbf{e}^- \nu_\tau \overline{\nu}_{\mathbf{e}}) \propto |g_\tau|^2 |g_{\mathbf{e}}|^2 \qquad \qquad \Gamma(\tau^- \to \mu^- \nu_\tau \overline{\nu}_{\mu}) \propto |g_\tau|^2 |g_{\mu}|^2$ 

$$\left|\frac{g_{\mu}}{g_{\rm e}}\right| \propto \sqrt{\frac{B(\tau^- \to \mu^- \nu_\tau \overline{\nu}_\mu)}{B(\tau^- \to {\rm e}^- \nu_\tau \overline{\nu}_{\rm e})}}$$

require one  $\tau$  decay leptonically and the other decay hadronically (to  $\pi^+\pi^0$ ).



Find only two charged particles, opp'ly charged, and one or more  $\pi^0$  (in one hemisphere)

- large thrust, high missing mass, low missing  $p_{\rm t}$ , to isolate  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$ .
- charged particle in π<sup>0</sup> hemisph. not look like e<sup>±</sup>, to veto e<sup>+</sup>e<sup>−</sup> → e<sup>+</sup>e<sup>−</sup>.
- other charged particle look like  $e^{\pm}$  or  $\mu^{\pm}$ .
- Use neural network to remove background.
- ▶ Fit to p<sub>ℓ</sub> spectra to get branching-fraction ratio.
- Study lepton-ID efficiencies and correlations.

require one  $\tau$  decay leptonically and the other decay hadronically (to  $\pi^+\pi^0$ ).



Find only two charged particles, opp'ly charged, and one or more  $\pi^0$  (in one hemisphere)

- large thrust, high missing mass, low missing  $p_t$ , to isolate  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$ .
- charged particle in π<sup>0</sup> hemisph. not look like e<sup>±</sup>, to veto e<sup>+</sup>e<sup>−</sup> → e<sup>+</sup>e<sup>−</sup>.
- other charged particle look like  $e^{\pm}$  or  $\mu^{\pm}$ .
- Use neural network to remove background.
- ► Fit to p<sub>ℓ</sub> spectra to get branching-fraction ratio.
- Study lepton-ID efficiencies and correlations.

require one  $\tau$  decay leptonically and the other decay hadronically (to  $\pi^+\pi^0$ ).



thrust axis  $\equiv$  axis most along momenta

Find only two charged particles, opp'ly charged, and one or more  $\pi^0$  (in one hemisphere)

- large thrust, high missing mass, low missing  $p_{\rm t}$ , to isolate  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$ .
- charged particle in π<sup>0</sup> hemisph. not look like e<sup>±</sup>, to veto e<sup>+</sup>e<sup>−</sup> → e<sup>+</sup>e<sup>−</sup>.
- other charged particle look like  $e^{\pm}$  or  $\mu^{\pm}$ .
- Use neural network to remove background.
- Fit to  $p_{\ell}$  spectra to get branching-fraction ratio.
- Study lepton-ID efficiencies and correlations.

require one  $\tau$  decay leptonically and the other decay hadronically (to  $\pi^+\pi^0$ ).



thrust axis  $\equiv$  axis most along momenta

Find only two charged particles, opp'ly charged, and one or more  $\pi^0$  (in one hemisphere)

- large thrust, high missing mass, low missing  $p_t$ , to isolate  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$ .
- charged particle in π<sup>0</sup> hemisph. not look like e<sup>±</sup>, to veto e<sup>+</sup>e<sup>−</sup> → e<sup>+</sup>e<sup>−</sup>.
- other charged particle look like  $e^{\pm}$  or  $\mu^{\pm}$ .
- Use neural network to remove background.
- ► Fit to p<sub>ℓ</sub> spectra to get branching-fraction ratio.
- Study lepton-ID efficiencies and correlations.

### Belle II: Testing lepton universality with leptonic $\tau$ decay



[Belle II: JHEP08.205, 2024]

#### Belle II: Other recent $\tau$ measurements

Limits on lepton-flavor violation:

$$\begin{split} B(\tau^- \to \Lambda^0 \pi^-) < 4.7 \times 10^{-8} @~90\% \text{ credibility} \\ B(\tau^- \to \overline{\Lambda}^0 \pi^-) < 4.3 \times 10^{-8} @~90\% \text{ credibility} \\ B(\tau^- \to \mu^- \mu^+ \mu^-) < 1.9 \times 10^{-8} @~90\% \text{ credibility} \end{split}$$

[Belle II: PRD110.112003, 2024] [Belle II: PRD110.112003, 2024] [Belle II: JHEP09.062, 2024]

• Measurement of  $\tau$  mass:



### Summary

#### Belle II & LHCb are very active.

I have highlighted only a few recent results. Give me another 25 minutes and I'm happy to talk about more.

**Discovery of CP violation in baryons:** 

$$\Lambda^0_{
m b} 
ightarrow {
m p} \, {
m K}^- \pi^+ \pi^-, \; \Lambda^0 {
m K}^+ {
m K}^-$$

- Search for physics beyond standard model via  $A_{CP}(D \text{ decay})$ :  $D^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0, \ K^0_S K^0_S, \ K^{\pm} K^{\mp}$
- Testing testing lepton universality in  $\tau$  decay:

 $\tau^- 
ightarrow \mathrm{e}^- \nu_{ au} \, \overline{\nu}_{\mathrm{e}}, \ \mu^- \nu_{ au} \, \overline{\nu}_{\mu}$ 

Both experiments are active in many other areas, including

- study of quarkonia, tetraquarks, pentaquarks
- dark-matter searches
- measuring quark-mixing-matrix parameters

- hadron spectroscopy
- measuring electroweak parameters
- study of B mesons

#### Some event counts

►  $A_{CP}(\Lambda_{b}^{0} \rightarrow \cdots)$  @ LHCb  $\Lambda_{\rm b}^0 \pi^+ \pi^-$  636 ± 42  $\Lambda_{\rm h}^{\tilde{0}}{\rm K}^{+}\pi^{-}$  618 ± 32  $\Lambda_{\rm b}^{0}{\rm K}^{+}{\rm K}^{-}$  1920 ± 50 p K<sup>+</sup> $\pi^{+}\pi^{-}$  80 690 ± 340 ►  $A_{CP}(D^0 \rightarrow \cdots)$  @ Belle II  $\pi^0\pi^0 \quad \mathcal{O}(10^4)$  $K_c^0 K_c^0 = 2214 \pm 51$  Belle II  $4864 \pm 78$ Belle  $\blacktriangleright$  D<sup>0</sup>  $\rightarrow$  K<sup>±</sup> $\pi^{\mp}$  @ I HCb  $K^{+}\pi^{-}$  412 × 10<sup>6</sup>  $K^{-}\pi^{+}$  1.6 × 10<sup>6</sup>  $\blacktriangleright \tau^- \rightarrow \ell^- \nu_\tau \bar{\nu}_\ell$  @ Belle II  $e 4.4 \times 10^{6}$  $\mu 4.4 \times 10^{6}$ 

thrust

$$ert ec t ert \equiv rac{\sum_i ec p_i \cdot \hat{t}}{\sum_i ert ec p_i ert}$$