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#### Abstract

Flavour $S U(3)$ symmetry of strong interactions and certain dynamical assumptions have been used in a series of recent publications to extract weak CKM phases from $B$-decays into $\{\pi \pi, \pi K, K \bar{K}\}$ final states. We point out that irrespectively of $S U(3)$-breaking effects the presence of QCD-penguin contributions with internal $u$ - and $c$-quarks precludes a clean determination of the angle $\beta$ in the unitarity triangle by using the branching ratios only. This difficulty can be overcome by measuring in addition the ratio $x_{d} / x_{s}$ of $B_{d}^{0}-\bar{B}_{d}^{0}$ to $B_{s}^{0}-\bar{B}_{s}^{0}$ mixings. The measurement of the angle $\gamma$ is unaffected by these new contributions. Some specific uncertainties related to $S U(3)$-breaking effects and electroweak penguin contributions are briefly discussed.


[^0]Recently in a series of interesting publications [1]-[5], $S U(3)$ flavour symmetry of strong interactions [6]-10] has been combined with certain dynamical assumptions (neglect of annihilation diagrams, etc.) to derive simple relations among $B$-decay amplitudes into $\pi \pi, \pi K$ and $K \bar{K}$ final states. These $S U(3)$ relations should allow to determine in a clean manner both weak phases of the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa-matrix (CKM-matrix) [11 and strong final state interaction phases by measuring only branching ratios of the relevant $B$-decays. Neither tagging nor time-dependent measurements are needed!

In this note we would like to point out certain limitations of this approach. Irrespectively of the uncertainties related to $S U(3)$-breaking effects, which have been partially addressed in [1]-5], the success of this approach depends on whether the penguin amplitudes are fully dominated by the diagrams with internal top-quark exchanges. As we will show below, sizable contributions may also arise from QCD-penguins with internal up- and charm-quarks. The main purpose of our letter is to analyze the impact of these new contributions on the analyses of refs. [1]- [5].

Interestingly enough the determination of the angle $\gamma$ in the unitarity triangle as outlined in [1], 4, 5] is not affected by the presence of QCD-penguins with internal $u$ - and $c$-quarks. Unfortunately these new contributions preclude a clean determination of the angle $\beta$ by using the branching ratios only. We show however that the additional knowledge of the ratio $x_{d} / x_{s}$ of $B_{d}^{0}-\bar{B}_{d}^{0}$ to $B_{s}^{0}-\bar{B}_{s}^{0}$ mixings would allow a clean determination of $\beta$ except for $S U(3)$-breaking uncertainties.

In order to discuss these effects, let us denote, as in [1]-5], the amplitudes corresponding to $b \rightarrow d$ and $b \rightarrow s$ QCD-penguins by $\bar{P}$ and $\bar{P}^{\prime}$, respectively, and those representing the CP-conjugate processes by $P$ and $P^{\prime}$ (these amplitudes can be obtained easily from $\bar{P}$ and $\bar{P}^{\prime}$ by changing the signs of the weak CKMphases). Then, taking into account QCD-penguin diagrams with internal $u$-, $c$ and $t$-quarks, we get

$$
\begin{align*}
\bar{P} & =\sum_{q=u, c, t} V_{q d}^{*} V_{q b} P_{q}=v_{c}^{(d)}\left(P_{c}-P_{u}\right)+v_{t}^{(d)}\left(P_{t}-P_{u}\right)  \tag{1}\\
\bar{P}^{\prime} & =\sum_{q=u, c, t} V_{q s}^{*} V_{q b} P_{q}=v_{c}^{(s)}\left(P_{c}^{\prime}-P_{u}^{\prime}\right)+v_{t}^{(s)}\left(P_{t}^{\prime}-P_{u}^{\prime}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

where we have employed unitarity of the CKM-Matrix and have defined the CKM-factors as

$$
\begin{align*}
v_{c}^{(q)} & =V_{c q}^{*} V_{c b} \\
v_{t}^{(q)} & =V_{t q}^{*} V_{t b} . \tag{2}
\end{align*}
$$

Applying the Wolfenstein parametrization [12] gives

$$
\begin{align*}
v_{c}^{(d)} & =-\lambda\left|V_{c b}\right|\left(1+\mathcal{O}\left(\lambda^{4}\right)\right) \\
v_{t}^{(d)} & =\left|V_{t d}\right| \exp (i \beta) \tag{3}
\end{align*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{align*}
v_{c}^{(s)} & =\left|V_{c b}\right|\left(1+\mathcal{O}\left(\lambda^{2}\right)\right) \\
v_{t}^{(s)} & =-\left|V_{c b}\right|\left(1+\mathcal{O}\left(\lambda^{2}\right)\right), \tag{4}
\end{align*}
$$

where the estimate of non-leading terms follows ref. [13]. In order to simplify the presentation we will omitt these non-leading terms in $\lambda$ in our analysis.

Introducing the notation

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{q_{1} q_{2}} \equiv\left|P_{q_{1} q_{2}}\right| \exp \left(i \delta_{q_{1} q_{2}}\right) \equiv P_{q_{1}}-P_{q_{2}} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $q_{1}, q_{2} \in\{u, c, t\}$ and combining eqs. (3) and (4) with (11) yields

$$
\begin{align*}
\bar{P} & =\left[-\frac{1}{R_{t}} \frac{\left|P_{c u}\right| e^{i \delta_{c u}}}{\left|P_{t u}\right| e^{i \delta_{t u}}}+e^{i \beta}\right]\left|V_{t d}\right|\left|P_{t u}\right| e^{i \delta_{t u}}  \tag{6}\\
\bar{P}^{\prime} & =\left[-\frac{\left|P_{c u}^{\prime}\right| e^{i \delta_{c u}^{\prime}}}{\left|P_{t u}^{\prime}\right| e^{i \delta_{t u}^{\prime}}}+1\right] e^{i \pi}\left|V_{c b}\right|\left|P_{t u}^{\prime}\right| e^{i \delta_{t u}^{\prime}} . \tag{7}
\end{align*}
$$

$R_{t}$ is given by the CKM-combination

$$
\begin{equation*}
R_{t} \equiv \frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{\left|V_{t d}\right|}{\left|V_{c b}\right|} \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

and represents the side of the so-called unitarity triangle that is related to $B_{d}^{0}-\bar{B}_{d}^{0}$ mixing. From present experimental data, we expect $R_{t}$ being of $\mathcal{O}(1)$ 13].

Assuming $S U(3)$ flavour symmetry of strong interactions, the "primed" amplitudes $\left|P_{q_{1} q_{2}}^{\prime}\right|$ and strong phase shifts $\delta_{q_{1} q_{2}}^{\prime}$ are equal to the "unprimed" ones [3]-5]. Consequently, the penguin-amplitudes (6) and (7) can be expressed in the form

$$
\begin{align*}
\bar{P} & =\left[-\frac{1}{R_{t}} \Delta P+e^{i \beta}\right]\left|V_{t d}\right|\left|P_{t u}\right| e^{i \delta_{t u}}  \tag{9}\\
\bar{P}^{\prime} & =[-\Delta P+1] e^{i \pi}\left|V_{c b}\right|\left|P_{t u}\right| e^{i \delta_{t u}}, \tag{10}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\Delta P$ is defined by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta P \equiv|\Delta P| e^{i \delta_{\Delta P}} \equiv \frac{\left|P_{c u}\right| e^{i \delta_{c u}}}{\left|P_{t u}\right| e^{i \delta_{t u}}} \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

and describes the contributions of the QCD-penguins with internal $u$ - and $c$ quarks. Notice that $\Delta P$ suffers from large hadronic uncertainties, in particular
from strong final state interaction phases parametrized by $\delta_{c u}$ and $\delta_{t u}$. In the limit of degenerate $u$ - and $c$-quark masses, $\Delta P$ would vanish due to the GIM mechanism. However, since $m_{u} \approx 4.5 \mathrm{MeV}$, whereas $m_{c} \approx 1.3 \mathrm{GeV}$, this GIM cancellation is incomplete and in principle sizable effects arising from $\Delta P$ could be expected.

In order to investigate this issue quantitatively, let us estimate $\Delta P$ by using the perturbative approach of Bander, Silverman and Soni [14]. To simplify the following discussion, we neglect the influence of the renormalization group evolution from $\mu=\mathcal{O}\left(M_{W}\right)$ down to $\mu=\mathcal{O}\left(m_{b}\right)$ and take into account QCD renormalization effects only approximately through the replacement $\alpha_{s} \rightarrow \alpha_{s}(\mu)$. Then, the low-energy effective penguin Hamiltonian is given by (see, e.g., refs. [15]-18])

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{eff}}^{\text {pen }}(\Delta B=-1)= & -\frac{G_{\mathrm{F}}}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\alpha_{s}(\mu)}{8 \pi} \sum_{q=d, s}\left[v_{c}^{(q)}\left\{G\left(m_{c}, k, \mu\right)-G\left(m_{u}, k, \mu\right)\right\}\right.  \tag{12}\\
& \left.+v_{t}^{(q)}\left\{E\left(x_{t}\right)+\frac{2}{3} \ln \left(\frac{\mu^{2}}{M_{W}^{2}}\right)-G\left(m_{u}, k, \mu\right)\right\}\right] P^{(q)},
\end{align*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
P^{(q)}=-\frac{1}{3} Q_{3}^{(q)}+Q_{4}^{(q)}-\frac{1}{3} Q_{5}^{(q)}+Q_{6}^{(q)} \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

is a linear combination of the usual QCD-penguin operators

$$
\begin{align*}
Q_{3}^{(q)} & =(\bar{q} b)_{\mathrm{V}-\mathrm{A}} \sum_{q^{\prime}}\left(\bar{q}^{\prime} q^{\prime}\right)_{\mathrm{V}-\mathrm{A}} \\
Q_{4}^{(q)} & =\left(\bar{q}_{\alpha} b_{\beta}\right)_{\mathrm{V}-\mathrm{A}} \sum_{q^{\prime}}\left(\bar{q}_{\beta}^{\prime} q_{\alpha}^{\prime}\right)_{\mathrm{V}-\mathrm{A}}  \tag{14}\\
Q_{5}^{(q)} & =(\bar{q} b)_{\mathrm{V}-\mathrm{A}} \sum_{q^{\prime}}\left(\bar{q}^{\prime} q^{\prime}\right)_{\mathrm{V}+\mathrm{A}} \\
Q_{6}^{(q)} & =\left(\bar{q}_{\alpha} b_{\beta}\right)_{\mathrm{V}-\mathrm{A}} \sum_{q^{\prime}}\left(\bar{q}_{\beta}^{\prime} q_{\alpha}^{\prime}\right)_{\mathrm{V}+\mathrm{A}}
\end{align*}
$$

and the function $G(m, k, M)$ is defined by 18

$$
\begin{equation*}
G(m, k, M) \equiv-4 \int_{0}^{1} d x x(1-x) \ln \left[\frac{m^{2}-k^{2} x(1-x)}{M^{2}}\right] \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

The four-vector $k$ denotes the momentum of the virtual gluon appearing in the QCD-penguin diagrams, $x_{t}=m_{t}^{2} / M_{W}^{2}$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
E(x)=-\frac{2}{3} \ln x+\frac{x^{2}\left(15-16 x+4 x^{2}\right)}{6(1-x)^{4}} \ln x+\frac{\left(18-11 x-x^{2}\right) x}{12(1-x)^{3}} \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

is one of the so-called Inami-Lim functions (19. In eq. (14), $q^{\prime}$ runs over the quark flavours being active at the scale $\mu=\mathcal{O}\left(m_{b}\right)\left(q^{\prime} \in\{u, d, c, s, b\}\right)$ and $\alpha, \beta$ are $S U(3)_{\mathrm{C}}$ colour indices.

Evaluating hadronic matrix elements of $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{eff}}^{\mathrm{pen}}(\Delta B=-1)$ and comparing them with eq. (1), we find

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta P \approx \frac{G\left(m_{c}, k, \mu\right)-G\left(m_{u}, k, \mu\right)}{E\left(x_{t}\right)+\frac{2}{3} \ln \left(\frac{\mu^{2}}{M_{W}^{2}}\right)-G\left(m_{u}, k, \mu\right)} . \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

In this perturbative approximation, the strong phase shift of $\Delta P$ is generated exclusively through absorptive parts of the penguin amplitudes with internal $u$ - and $c$-quarks ("Bander-Silverman-Soni mechanism" [14]). Whereas the $\mu$ dependence cancels exactly in (17), $\Delta P$ depends strongly on the value of $k^{2}$, as can be seen from Figs. 1 and 2. Simple kinematical considerations at the quark-level imply that $k^{2}$ should lie within the "physical" range [17, 18]

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{4} \lesssim \frac{k^{2}}{m_{b}^{2}} \lesssim \frac{1}{2} . \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

For such values of $k^{2}$, we read off from Figs. 1 and 2 that

$$
\begin{equation*}
0.2 \lesssim|\Delta P| \lesssim 0.5 \quad \text { and } \quad 70^{\circ} \lesssim \delta_{\Delta P} \lesssim 130^{\circ}, \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

respectively. Consequently, $\Delta P$ may lead to sizable effects in the $S U(3)$ triangle relations discussed below. We are aware of the fact that the estimate of $\Delta P$ given here is very rough. It illustrates however a potential hadronic uncertainty which cannot be ignored.

In refs. [1]-[5], only QCD-penguins with internal top-quarks have been taken into account. This approximation corresponds to $\Delta P=0$ and gives

$$
\begin{align*}
\bar{P}_{\Delta P=0} & =a_{P} e^{i \beta} e^{i \delta_{P}}  \tag{20}\\
\bar{P}_{\Delta P=0}^{\prime} & =a_{P^{\prime}} e^{i \pi} e^{i \delta_{P}} \tag{21}
\end{align*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
a_{P}=\left|V_{t d}\right|\left|P_{t u}\right|, \quad a_{P^{\prime}}=a_{P} /\left(\lambda R_{t}\right) \quad \text { and } \quad \delta_{P}=\delta_{t u} \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

Notice that the weak- and strong phase structure of (21) is similar to (10) which can be re-written in the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{P}^{\prime}=\rho_{P^{\prime}} a_{P^{\prime}} e^{i \pi} e^{i\left(\delta_{P}-\psi^{\prime}\right)} \tag{23}
\end{equation*}
$$

with

$$
\begin{equation*}
\rho_{P^{\prime}}=\sqrt{1-2|\Delta P| \cos \delta_{\Delta P}+|\Delta P|^{2}} \tag{24}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tan \psi^{\prime}=\frac{|\Delta P| \sin \delta_{\Delta P}}{1-|\Delta P| \cos \delta_{\Delta P}} \tag{25}
\end{equation*}
$$

In eq. (23), $\pi$ represents the CP-violating weak phase, while $\delta_{P}-\psi^{\prime}$ denotes the CP-conserving strong phase shift.

Therefore, the determination of the weak CKM-angle $\gamma$ through $S U(3)$ triangle relations involving the charged $B$-meson decays $B^{+} \rightarrow\left\{\pi^{0} K^{+}, \pi^{+} K^{0}, \pi^{+} \pi^{0}\right\}$ (and the corresponding CP-conjugate modes) as outlined in refs. [1] , [5] is not affected by $\Delta P$ at all, since no non-trivial weak phases appear in $P^{\prime}\left(\bar{P}^{\prime}\right)$ even in the presence of QCD penguins with internal $u$ - and $c$-quarks. However, the strong phase differences $\delta_{P}-\delta_{T, C}$ are shifted by the angle $\psi^{\prime}$. Here $\delta_{T}$ and $\delta_{C}$ denote the strong phases of the "tree" and "colour-suppressed" amplitudes

$$
\begin{equation*}
T=a_{T} e^{i \gamma} e^{i \delta_{T}} \quad \text { and } \quad C=a_{C} e^{i \gamma} e^{i \delta_{C}} \tag{26}
\end{equation*}
$$

contributing to $B^{ \pm} \rightarrow \pi^{ \pm} \pi^{0}$, respectively.
On the other hand, the QCD-penguin contributions with internal $u$ - and $c$ quarks affect the extraction of the phase $\beta$ by using the triangle relations [3]-[5]

$$
\begin{align*}
A\left(B_{d}^{0} \rightarrow \pi^{+} \pi^{-}\right)+\sqrt{2} A\left(B_{d}^{0} \rightarrow \pi^{0} \pi^{0}\right) & =\sqrt{2} A\left(B^{+} \rightarrow \pi^{+} \pi^{0}\right) \\
(T+P)+(C-P) & =(T+C) \tag{27}
\end{align*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{align*}
A\left(B_{d}^{0} \rightarrow \pi^{-} K^{+}\right) / r_{u}+\sqrt{2} A\left(B_{d}^{0} \rightarrow \pi^{0} K^{0}\right) / r_{u} & =\sqrt{2} A\left(B^{+} \rightarrow \pi^{+} \pi^{0}\right) \\
\left(T+P^{\prime} / r_{u}\right)+\quad\left(C-P^{\prime} / r_{u}\right) & =(T+C), \tag{28}
\end{align*}
$$

where $r_{u}=V_{u s} / V_{u d}$.
Following the approach outlined in ref. [5], the complex amplitudes $P^{\prime}$ and $P$ can be determined up to a common strong phase shift (and some discrete ambiguities) through a two-triangle construction involving the rates of the five modes appearing in (27) and (28) and two additional rates that determine $|P|$ and $\left|P^{\prime}\right|$ (e.g., $B^{+} \rightarrow K^{+} \bar{K}^{0}$ and $B^{+} \rightarrow \pi^{+} K^{0}$, respectively). Therefore, the relative angle $\vartheta$ between $P$ and $P^{\prime}$ can be measured. Expressing $P$ in the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
P=\rho_{P} a_{P} e^{-i \beta} e^{i\left(\delta_{P}-\psi\right)} \tag{29}
\end{equation*}
$$

with

$$
\begin{equation*}
\rho_{P}=\frac{1}{R_{t}} \sqrt{R_{t}^{2}-2 R_{t}|\Delta P| \cos \left(\beta+\delta_{\Delta P}\right)+|\Delta P|^{2}} \tag{30}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tan \psi=\frac{|\Delta P| \sin \left(\beta+\delta_{\Delta P}\right)}{R_{t}-|\Delta P| \cos \left(\beta+\delta_{\Delta P}\right)} \tag{31}
\end{equation*}
$$

we find using (22), (23) and (29)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{r_{t}} \frac{P^{\prime}}{P}=\frac{\rho_{P^{\prime}}}{\rho_{P}} e^{i\left(\psi-\psi^{\prime}\right)} \equiv \frac{\rho_{P^{\prime}}}{\rho_{P}} e^{i(\vartheta-\beta)} \tag{32}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $r_{t} \equiv V_{t s} / V_{t d}$. Note that the deviation of the rhs. of eq. (32) from one represents corrections to the relation between $P^{\prime}$ and $P$ presented in refs. [2]- [5]. Consequently, $\vartheta$ is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\vartheta=\beta+\psi-\psi^{\prime} . \tag{33}
\end{equation*}
$$

In contrast to $\psi^{\prime}$, which is a pure strong phase, $\psi$ is a combination of both CP-conserving strong phases $\left(\delta_{\Delta P}\right)$ and the CP-violating weak phase $\beta$.

If we neglect the QCD-penguins with internal $u$ - and $c$-quarks, as the authors of refs. [3]-5], we have $\Delta P=0$ and, thus, $\vartheta$ is equal to the CKM-angle $\beta$ in this approximation. However, as can be seen from Figs. 1 and 2, the perturbative estimates of $\Delta P$ indicate that sizable contributions may arise from this amplitude which show up in eq. (33) as the phase difference $\psi-\psi^{\prime}$. Since both $\psi$ and $\psi^{\prime}$ contain strong phases, $\vartheta$ is not a theoretical clean quantity in general (even if the $S U(3)$ triangle relations were valid exactly!) and this determination of the angle $\beta$ suffers from hadronic uncertainties in contrast to the assertions made in [3]- [5].

In order to illustrate this point quantitatively, we have plotted the dependence of $\psi-\psi^{\prime}$ on $k^{2} / m_{b}^{2}$ arising from (17) for $R_{t}=1$ and various angles $\beta$ in Fig. 3. The corresponding curves for $\rho_{P^{\prime}} / \rho_{P}$ (see eq. (32)) are shown in Fig. 4. In drawing these figures, we have taken into account that the angle $\beta$ is smaller than $45^{\circ}$ for the present range of $\left|V_{u b} / V_{c b}\right|$ [13]. Notice that the hadronic uncertainties in (32) and (33) cancel each other, i.e., $P^{\prime}=r_{t} P$ and $\psi^{\prime}=\psi$, if we choose $R_{t}=1$ and $\beta=0$. This cancellation is, however, incomplete in the general case.

As an illustration consider a measurement of $\vartheta=15^{\circ}$. Setting $\Delta P=0$ one would conclude that $\beta=15^{\circ}$ and $\sin 2 \beta=0.50$. With $\Delta P \neq 0$, as calculated here, the true $\beta$ could be as high as $20^{\circ}\left(\psi-\psi^{\prime}=-5^{\circ}\right)$ giving $\sin 2 \beta=0.64$. We observe that this uncertainty (in addition to possible $S U(3)$-breaking effects) could spoil the comparison of $\beta$, measured this way, with the clean determination of $\sin 2 \beta$ in $B_{d} \rightarrow \psi K_{\mathrm{S}}$.

We now want to demonstrate that the hadronic uncertainties affecting the determination of $\beta$ through (33) can be eliminated provided $R_{t}$ is known. To this end, we consider the "normalized" penguin amplitudes

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{1}{\lambda\left|V_{c b}\right|} P & =\left[-\Delta P+R_{t} e^{-i \beta}\right]\left|P_{t u}\right| e^{i \delta_{t u}}  \tag{34}\\
\frac{1}{\left|V_{c b}\right|} P^{\prime} & =[\Delta P-1]\left|P_{t u}\right| e^{i \delta_{t u}} \tag{35}
\end{align*}
$$

and those of the corresponding CP-conjugate processes (see (9) and (10)) which are related to (34) and (35) through the substitution $\beta \rightarrow-\beta$. Combining these complex amplitudes in the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
z \equiv \frac{P+\lambda P^{\prime}}{\bar{P}+\lambda \bar{P}^{\prime}}=\frac{1-R_{t} e^{-i \beta}}{1-R_{t} e^{i \beta}}=e^{i 2 \gamma} \tag{36}
\end{equation*}
$$

we observe that both $\Delta P$ and $\left|P_{t u}\right| \exp \left(i \delta_{t u}\right)$, which are unknown, nonperturbative quantities, cancel in the ratio $z$. The appearance of $\gamma$ in this ratio can be understood by noting that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{P}+\lambda \bar{P}^{\prime}=-v_{u}^{(d)} P_{t u}=-\left|V_{u b}\right| e^{-i \gamma}\left(1+\mathcal{O}\left(\lambda^{2}\right)\right)\left|P_{t u}\right| e^{i \delta_{t u}} \tag{37}
\end{equation*}
$$

Consequently, in the limit of exact $S U(3)$ triangle relations (27) and (28), the angle $2 \gamma$, which is related to $\beta$ through

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tan 2 \gamma=\frac{2 R_{t}\left(1-R_{t} \cos \beta\right) \sin \beta}{1-2 R_{t} \cos \beta+R_{t}^{2} \cos 2 \beta} \tag{38}
\end{equation*}
$$

can be also here extracted without theoretical uncertainties. If, in addition, $R_{t}$ is also known, the CKM-phase $\beta$ can be determined as well. In Fig. 5, we have illustrated the dependence of $2 \gamma$ on $\beta$ for various values of $R_{t}$. Note that $2 \gamma=\pi-\beta$, if $R_{t}=1$.

The theoretically cleanest way of measuring $R_{t}$ without using CP-violating quantities is obtained through

$$
\begin{equation*}
R_{t}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{R_{d s}}} \sqrt{\frac{x_{d}}{x_{s}}} \frac{1}{\left|V_{u s}\right|} \tag{39}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $x_{d}$ and $x_{s}$ give the sizes of $B_{d}^{0}-\bar{B}_{d}^{0}$ and $B_{s}^{0}-\bar{B}_{s}^{0}$ mixings, respectively, and

$$
\begin{equation*}
R_{d s}=\frac{\tau_{B_{d}}}{\tau_{B_{s}}} \cdot \frac{m_{B_{d}}}{m_{B_{s}}}\left[\frac{F_{B_{d}} \sqrt{B_{B_{d}}}}{F_{B_{s}} \sqrt{B_{B_{s}}}}\right]^{2} \tag{40}
\end{equation*}
$$

summarizes the $S U(3)$ flavour-breaking effects. In the strict $S U(3)$ limit, we have $R_{d s}=1$. The main theoretical uncertainty resides in the values of the $B$ meson decay constants $F_{B_{d, s}}$ and in the non-perturbative parameters $B_{B_{d, s}}$ which parametrize the hadronic matrix elements of the relevant operators. We believe however that $R_{d s}$ can be more reliably estimated than $\Delta P$.

At this point, it should be stressed that the elimination of the hadronic uncertainties arising from $\Delta P$, i.e., the QCD-penguins with internal $u$ - and $c$-quarks, requires to consider also the CP-conjugate modes to extract "clean" values of
$\beta$. Furthermore, $R_{t}$ has to be known. These complications are very different from the situation in refs. [3]- [5], where it has been emphasized that it was not necessary to measure the charge-conjugate rates in order to determine $\beta$.

Assuming factorization, $S U(3)$-breaking corrections can be taken into account approximately through the substitutions $r_{u} \rightarrow r_{u} f_{K} / f_{\pi}$ (5) and $r_{t} \rightarrow r_{t} f_{K} / f_{\pi}$ in eqs. (28) and (32), respectively, where $P^{\prime}$ and $P$ in eq. (32) are the same as in the triangle relations (27) and (28). Moreover, we have to replace $\lambda$ in our result (36) by $\lambda f_{\pi} / f_{K}$. $S U(3)$-breaking effects must also be taken into account in the determination of $|P|$ and $\left|P^{\prime}\right|$ from the decay amplitudes $\left|A\left(B^{+} \rightarrow K^{+} \bar{K}^{0}\right)\right|$ and $\left|A\left(B^{+} \rightarrow \pi^{+} K^{0}\right)\right|$, respectively. Within the framework of factorization we find

$$
\begin{align*}
|P| & =\frac{f_{\pi}}{f_{K}} \frac{F_{B \pi}\left(0 ; 0^{+}\right)}{F_{B K}\left(0 ; 0^{+}\right)}\left|A\left(B^{+} \rightarrow K^{+} \bar{K}^{0}\right)\right|  \tag{41}\\
\left|P^{\prime}\right| & =\left|A\left(B^{+} \rightarrow \pi^{+} K^{0}\right)\right| \tag{42}
\end{align*}
$$

where $F_{B \pi}\left(0 ; 0^{+}\right)$and $F_{B K}\left(0 ; 0^{+}\right)$are form factors parametrizing the hadronic quark-current matrix elements $\left\langle\pi^{+}\right|(\bar{b} d)_{\mathrm{V}-\mathrm{A}}\left|B^{+}\right\rangle$and $\left\langle K^{+}\right|(\bar{b} s)_{\mathrm{V}-\mathrm{A}}\left|B^{+}\right\rangle$, respectively [20]. Unfortunately, hadronic form factors appear in eq. (41) which are model dependent. Using, for example, the model of Bauer, Stech and Wirbel [21], we estimate that the $S U(3)$-breaking factor in (41) should be of $\mathcal{O}(0.7)$.

At present, there is no reliable theoretical technique available to evaluate nonfactorizable $S U(3)$-breaking corrections to the relevant $B$-decays. Since already the factorizable corrections are quite large $((20-30) \%)$, we expect that nonfactorizable $S U(3)$-breaking may also lead to sizable effects. In particular, such corrections could spoil the elimination of the QCD-penguins with internal $u$ - and $c$-quarks through eq. (36). Furthermore, in the presence of a heavy top-quark, electroweak-penguin contributions may also lead to sizable corrections ( $(10-30) \%$ at the amplitude level) to the penguin sectors of $B$-decays into final states that contain mesons with a CP-self-conjugate quark content [22]-24]. Possible impact of electroweak penguins on the approach of refs. [1]- [5] has been recently also emphasized in ref. (25].

In summary, we have shown that QCD-penguins with internal $u$ - and $c$-quarks may lead to sizable systematic errors in the extraction of the CKM-phase $\beta$ by using the approach presented in refs. [3]-[5]. However, $\beta$ can still be determined in a theoretical clean way (up to corrections arising from non-factorizable $S U(3)$ breaking and certain neglected contributions which are expected to be small on dynamical grounds [1]-[5]), if $R_{t}$ and the rates of the CP-conjugate processes appearing in the corresponding triangle relations are measured. On the other
hand, the determination of $\gamma$ along the lines suggested in (1)- (5) and in (36) in the present paper is not affected by these new QCD-penguin contributions. Its fate depends then only on the ability of estimating $S U(3)$-breaking effects and on the precision with which the relevant branching ratios can be measured one day.
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## Figure Captions

Fig. 1: The dependence of $|\Delta P|$ on $k^{2} / m_{b}^{2}$.
Fig. 2: The dependence of $\delta_{\Delta P}$ on $k^{2} / m_{b}^{2}$.

Fig. 3: The dependence of $\psi-\psi^{\prime}$ on $k^{2} / m_{b}^{2}$ for $R_{t}=1$ and various values of the CKM-angle $\beta$.

Fig. 4: The dependence of $\rho_{P^{\prime}} / \rho_{P}$ on $k^{2} / m_{b}^{2}$ for $R_{t}=1$ and various values of the CKM-angle $\beta$.

Fig. 5: The dependence of angle $2 \gamma$ on the CKM-angle $\beta$ for various values of $R_{t}$.
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