UPDATED RESULTS ON THE CKM MARTIX
AND THE UNITARITY TRIANGLE

Including results presented up to
Moriond 07, La Thuille, Italy
and FPCP 07, Bled, Slovania

P r e l i m i n a r y

June 3rd, 2007

The CKMfitter Group

Abstract

This document provides the collection of up-to-date inputs to the global CKM analysis, and numerical results obtained with the use of the fit package CKMfitter. The statistical method employed is the frequentist approach *R*fit. Detailed background information on the methodology and the treatment of experimental and theoretical uncertainties is provided in:

CP VIOLATION AND THE CKM MATRIX:
ASSESSING THE IMPACT OF THE ASYMMETRIC *B* FACTORIES
By CKMfitter Group
Eur. Phys. J. **C41**, 1-131, 2005 [hep-ph/0406184]

The CKMfitter Group

J. Charles[b], O. Deschamps[c], R. Itoh[h], A. Jantsch[e], H. Lacker[e], S. Monteil[c], S. T'Jampens[a], V. Tisserand[a], K. Trabelsi[h]

[a] *Laboratoire d'Annecy-Le-Vieux de Physique des Particules*
9 Chemin de Bellevue, BP 110, F-74941 Annecy-le-Vieux Cedex, France
(UMR 5814 du CNRS-IN2P3 associée à l'Université de Savoie)
e-mail: tisserav@lapp.in2p3.fr, tjamp@lapp.in2p3.fr

[b] *Centre de Physique Théorique,*
Campus de Luminy, Case 907, F-13288 Marseille Cedex 9, France
(UMR 6207 du CNRS associée aux Universités d'Aix-Marseille I et II
et Université du Sud Toulon-Var; laboratoire affilié à la FRUMAM-FR2291)
e-mail: charles@cpt.univ-mrs.fr

[c] *Laboratoire de Physique Corpusulaire de Clermont-Ferrand*
Université Blaise Pascal
24, avenue des Landais F-63177 Aubiere Cedex
(UMR 6533 du CNRS-IN2P3 associée à l'Université Blaise Pascal)
e-mail: odescham@in2p3.fr, monteil@clermont.in2p3.fr

[e] *Technische Universität Dresden,*
Institut für Kern- und Teilchenphysik, D-01062 Dresden, Germany
e-mail: h.lacker@physik.tu-dresden.de, A.Jantsch@physik.tu-dresden.de

[h] *High Energy Accelerator Research Organization, KEK*
1-1 Oho, Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305-0801 Japan
e-mail: ryosuke.itoh@kek.jp, karim.trabelsi@kek.jp

References

[1] Results presented at the San Diego CKM workshop, http://ckm2005.ucsd.edu/ hep-ph/0512039.

[2] M. Jamin, talk presented at Moriond EW 2007. The uncertainty is dominated by a preliminary LQCD calculation: UKQCD/RBC, hep-lat/0702026.

[3] The Heavy Flavor Averaging Group (HFAG), Winter 2007 averages, http://www.slac.stanford.edu/xorg/hfag/

[4] For the inclusive average we are taking the BLNP number. (The DGE result is very close to the BLNP result. The uncertainty of the DGE calculation does not include all sources evaluated by BLNP.) The theoretical error on the inclusive average is obtained by adding linearly the contributions from weak annihilation, subleading shape functions and the HQE uncertainty on m_b.
We use only branching fractions measured for $B \to \pi \ell \nu$. we average the results obtained from the two unquenched Lattice calculations and the LCSR calculation for the form factor quoted by HFAG [3] in such a way that the smallest theoretical error is kept.
Also for the average between the inclusive and exclusive result we keep the smallest theoretical error.

[5] Particle Data Group (W.-M. Yao *et al.*), Journal of Physics **G 33**, 1 (2006)

[6] O. Buchmüller and H. Flächer, Fit to Moment Measurements from $B \to X_c \ell \nu$ and $B \to X_s \gamma$ Decays using Heavy Quark Expansions in the Kinetic Scheme, Phys. Rev. **D 73**, 073008 (2006) (hep-ph/0507253 (2005))

[7] For this only the recent CDF measurement (hep-ex/0609040) has been used as it currently dominates the world average which still needs to be determined by HFAG.

[8] B. Aubert *et al.*, BABAR-PUB-07003, SLAC-PUB-12377, hep-ex/0703008 (2007).

[9] A. Kusaka *et al.*, Belle Preprint 2007-4, KEK Preprint 2006-65, hep-ex/0701015 (2007).

[10] U. Nierste, hep-ph/0612310.

[11] B. Aubert *et al.*, BABAR-CONF-06/028, hep-ex/0608019 (2006)
B. Aubert *et al.*, BABAR-PUB-07/007, 0705.1820 [hep-ex].
A. Gritsan, talk at FPCP07.
K. Ikado *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97** (2006) 251802, hep-ex/0604018

[12] S. Herrlich and U. Nierste, Nucl. Phys. **B419**, 292 (1994)

[13] U. Nierste, private communication (2003)

[14] G. Buchalla, A.J. Buras and M.E. Lautenbacher, Rev. Mod. Phys. **68**, 1125 (1996)

[15] N. Tantalo, hep-ph/0703241.

[16] D. Becirevic, hep-ph/0310072.

Parameter	Value $\pm$ Error(s)	Reference	Errors GS	Errors TH
$\|V_{ud}\|$ (nuclei)	0.97377 ± 0.00027	[1]	$\star$	-
$\|V_{us}\|$ ($K_{\ell 3}$)	0.2240 ± 0.0011	[2]	$\star$	-
$\|V_{ub}\|$	$(4.09 \pm 0.09 \pm 0.44) \times 10^{-3}$	[3, 4]	$\star$	$\star$
$\|V_{cb}\|$	$(41.60 \pm 0.70) \times 10^{-3}$	[5]	$\star$	-
$\|\varepsilon_K\|$	$(2.232 \pm 0.007) \times 10^{-3}$	[5]	$\star$	-
Δm_d	$(0.507 \pm 0.005)\ \mathrm{ps}^{-1}$	[3]	$\star$	-
Δm_s	CDF measurement	[7]	$\star$	-
$\sin(2\beta)_{[c\bar{c}]}$	0.678 ± 0.025	[3]	$\star$	-
$S_{\pi\pi}^{+-}$	-0.61 ± 0.08	[3]	$\star$	-
$C_{\pi\pi}^{+-}$	-0.38 ± 0.07	[3]	$\star$	-
$C_{\pi\pi}^{00}$	$-0.36^{+0.33}_{-0.31}$	[3]	$\star$	-
$\mathcal{B}_{\pi\pi}$ all charges	Inputs to isospin analysis	[3]	$\star$	-
$S_{\rho\rho,L}^{+-}$	-0.06 ± 0.18	[3]	$\star$	-
$C_{\rho\rho,L}^{+-}$	-0.11 ± 0.13	[3]	$\star$	-
$\mathcal{B}_{\rho\rho,L}$ all charges	Inputs to isospin analysis	[3]	$\star$	-
$B^0 \to (\rho\pi)^0 \to 3\pi$	Time-dependent Dalitz analysis	[8, 9]	$\star$	-
$B^- \to D^{(*)}K^{(*)-}$	Inputs to GLW analysis	[3]	$\star$	-
$B^- \to D^{(*)}K^{(*)-}$	Inputs to ADS analysis	[3]	$\star$	-
$B^- \to D^{(*)}K^{(*)-}$	GGSZ Dalitz analyses	[3]	$\star$	-
$\mathcal{B}(B^- \to \tau^-\overline{\nu}_\tau)$	Experimental likelihoods	[11]	$\star$	-
$\overline{m}_c(m_c)$	$(1.24 \pm 0.037 \pm 0.095)$ GeV	[6]	$\star$	$\star$
$\overline{m}_t(m_t)$	(163.8 ± 2.0) GeV	[10]	$\star$	-
m_{K^+}	(493.677 ± 0.016) MeV	[5]	-	-
Δm_K	$(3.4833 \pm 0.0066) \times 10^{-12}$ MeV	[5]	-	-
m_{B_d}	(5.2794 ± 0.0005) GeV	[5]	-	-
m_{B_s}	(5.3696 ± 0.0024) GeV	[5]	-	-
m_W	(80.423 ± 0.039) GeV	[5]	-	-
G_F	$1.16639 \times 10^{-5}\ \mathrm{GeV}^{-2}$	[5]	-	-
f_K	(159.8 ± 1.5) MeV	[5]	-	-
B_K	$0.79 \pm 0.02 \pm 0.09$	[15]	$\star$	$\star$
$\alpha_s(m_Z^2)$	0.1176 ± 0.0020	[5]	-	$\star$
η_{cc}	Calculated from $\overline{m}_c(m_c)$ and α_s	[13]	-	$\star$
η_{ct}	0.47 ± 0.04	[12]	-	$\star$
η_{tt}	0.5765 ± 0.0065	[12, 13]	-	$\star$
$\eta_B(\overline{\mathrm{MS}})$	0.551 ± 0.007	[14]	-	$\star$
f_{B_s}	$(268 \pm 17 \pm 20)$ MeV	[15]	$\star$	$\star$
B_s	$1.29 \pm 0.05 \pm 0.08$	[15]	$\star$	$\star$
f_{B_s}/f_{B_d}	$1.20 \pm 0.02 \pm 0.05$	[15]	$\star$	$\star$
B_s/B_d	1.00 ± 0.02	[16]	$\star$	$\star$

Table 1: *Inputs to the standard CKM fit. If not stated otherwise: for two errors given, the first is statistical and accountable systematic and the second stands for systematic theoretical uncertainties. The last two columns indicate* R*fit treatment of the input parameters: measurements or parameters that have statistical errors (we include here experimental systematics) are marked in the "GS" column by an asterisk; measurements or parameters that have systematic theoretical errors are marked in the "TH" column by an asterisk. Upper part: experimental determinations of the CKM matrix elements. Middle upper part: CP-violation and mixing observables. Middle lower part: parameters used in SM predictions that are obtained from experiment. Lower part: parameters of the SM predictions obtained from theory.*