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## 1．Introduction

Additional heavy neutral $Z^{\prime}$ gauge bosons have been extensively studied in the literature． They arise naturally in grand unified models，superstring－inspired models［］］and in models with large extra dimensions［2］．There are stringent limits on the mass of an extra $Z^{\prime}$ from collider search experiments at the Tevatron［3］．Precision data put limits on the $Z-Z^{\prime}$ mixing angle $\theta$［目］．Although these limits are model－dependent，the typical constraints are $M_{Z^{\prime}}>O(500 \mathrm{GeV})$ and $\theta<O\left(10^{-3}\right)$ ．Most studies have assumed flavor universal $Z^{\prime}$ couplings．However，in intersecting D－brane constructions，it is possible to have family nonuniversal $Z^{\prime}$ couplings．In extensions of the Standard Model（SM）with gauged family symmetry，nonuniversal $Z^{\prime}$ couplings also arise naturally ${ }^{[5]}$ ．These couplings generally lead to flavor－changing and $C P$－violating $Z^{\prime}$ vertices，when quark and lepton mixing is taken into account．Flavor violating $Z$ couplings can be induced through $Z-Z^{\prime}$ mixing． Experimental observables in the flavor changing and $C P$ violating processes may be used to put constraints on $Z^{\prime}$ couplings．One of the important searches that the Large Hadron Collider（LHC）will undertake is to look for $Z^{\prime}$ bosons．It is therefore crucial to explore the parameter space of the allowed couplings of such $Z^{\prime}$ bosons．

In a recent paper［6］，Langacker and Plümacher have investigated the consequences of family nonuniversal $Z^{\prime}$ gauge boson．They have considered several processes including $Z \rightarrow \bar{q}_{i} q_{j}, l_{i} \rightarrow l_{j} l_{k} \bar{l}_{m}$ ，$\mu$－e conversion，radiative decays of $\mu \rightarrow e \gamma$ and $b \rightarrow s \gamma$ ，and meson decays，etc．In this paper we extend their analysis to include constraints from electric dipole moments（EDMs）of electron and neutron and muon $g-2$ ．We re－analyze mass difference and $C P$ violation in $K-\bar{K}$ mixing to emphasize the enhanced contributions from left－right mixing terms．For $B_{d}$ mixing，we find that it is important to include an independent observable，that is not affected by the $Z^{\prime}$ effects，to improved the constraints．

In the Standard Model, the fermion EDMs are generated at three-loop or higher orders. The predicted value of less than $10^{-33} \mathrm{e} \cdot \mathrm{cm}$ is several orders of magnitude lower than the most stringent bounds coming from electron and neutron EDM measurements. However, in extensions of the SM, such as $Z^{\prime}$ models with family nonuniversal couplings, additional weak phases will allow fermion EDMs to be generated at the one-loop level, and thus they can be dominant. Therefore, we can use EDM measurements to constrain $Z^{\prime}$ flavorchanging couplings.

By exchanging a $Z^{\prime}$ boson, oscillations of $K, B_{d}$ and $B_{s}$ mesons can occur via tree-level diagrams, as compared to one-loop box diagrams in the SM. Some of the operators that occur in the $K-\bar{K}$ mixing are enhanced so that very strong limits can be obtained from $\Delta M_{K}$ and $\epsilon_{K}$ measurements. In the $B_{d}$ system, the limit on $\left|V_{u b}\right|$, the measurements of $\Delta M_{B_{d}}$ and $\sin 2 \beta$ and the recent limit on $\left|V_{t d} / V_{t s}\right|$ obtained from $b \rightarrow d \gamma$ and $b \rightarrow s \gamma$ [7] can be combined to provide strong constraints on the $Z^{\prime}$ flavor-changing couplings. The recent measurements of $\Delta M_{B_{s}}$ at both DO [8] and CDF [9] have generated much interest in flavor mixing in $B$ mesons [10]. Several papers have studied $B_{s}$ mixing in the context of $Z^{\prime}$ models [11- [4]. Although the ratio $\left|\Delta M_{B_{d}} / \Delta M_{B_{s}}\right|$ provides the best determination of $\left|V_{t d} / V_{t s}\right|$ in the SM, when new physics effects enter both mass differences, the ratio does not have an advantage over the individual mass difference in constraining new physics variables. We will discuss this point in more detail.

The paper is organized as the following: after the introduction, we briefly describe our notations in section 2. We discuss fermion EDMs in section $3, K-\bar{K}$ mixing in section 4 , and $B-\bar{B}$ mixing in section ${ }^{\circ}$. We conclude in section 6 .

## 2. Formalism

We follow closely the formalism in ref. [6]. In the gauge eigenstate basis, the neutral current Lagrangian can be written as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{NC}}=-e J_{\mathrm{em}}^{\mu} A_{\mu}-g_{1} J^{(1) \mu} Z_{1, \mu}^{0}-g_{2} J^{(2) \mu} Z_{2, \mu}^{0}, \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $Z_{1}^{0}$ is the $\mathrm{SU}(2) \times \mathrm{U}(1)$ neutral gauge boson, $Z_{2}^{0}$ the new gauge boson associated with an additional Abelian gauge symmetry and $g_{1}$ and $g_{2}$ are the corresponding gauge couplings. The current associated with the additional $\mathrm{U}(1)^{\prime}$ gauge symmetry can be generally written as

$$
\begin{equation*}
J_{\mu}^{(2)}=\sum_{i, j} \bar{\psi}_{i} \gamma_{\mu}\left[\epsilon_{\psi_{L_{i j}}}^{(2)} P_{L}+\epsilon_{\psi_{R_{i j}}}^{(2)} P_{R}\right] \psi_{j}, \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\epsilon_{\psi_{L, R_{i j}}}^{(2)}$ is the chiral coupling of $Z_{2}^{0}$ with fermions, with $i$ and $j$ run over quark flavors, and similarly for leptons. Flavor changing effects arise if $\epsilon^{(2)}$ are nondiagonal matrices. If the $Z_{2}^{0}$ couplings are diagonal but family-nonuniversal, flavor changing couplings are induced by fermion mixings. When fermion Yukawa matrices $h_{\psi}$ are diagonalized by unitary matrices $V_{R, L}^{\psi}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
h_{\psi, \text { diag }}=V_{R}^{\psi} h_{\psi} V_{L}^{\psi^{\dagger}} \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$



Figure 1: Feynman diagram of fermion EDMs at one-loop level through flavor changing complex $Z^{\prime} f f^{\prime}$ coupling.
the current associated with $Z_{2}^{0}$ is rewritten in the fermion mass eigenstate basis

$$
\begin{equation*}
J_{\mu}^{(2)}=\sum_{i, j} \bar{\chi}_{i} \gamma_{\mu}\left[B_{i j}^{\psi_{L}} P_{L}+B_{i j}^{\psi_{R}} P_{R}\right] \chi_{j} \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

with

$$
\begin{equation*}
B_{i j}^{\psi_{L}} \equiv\left(V_{L}^{\psi} \epsilon_{\psi_{L}}^{(2)} V_{L}^{\psi^{\dagger}}\right)_{i j}, \quad \text { and } \quad B_{i j}^{\psi_{R}} \equiv\left(V_{R}^{\psi} \epsilon_{\psi_{R}}^{(2)} V_{R}^{\psi^{\dagger}}\right)_{i j} \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

In the following sections we simplify $B_{i j}^{\psi_{L, R}}$ as $B_{f f^{\prime}}^{L, R}$, with $f$ and $f^{\prime}$ specifying the flavors of quarks and leptons explicitly and the $L, R$ superscripts indicating left-handed or righthanded couplings. For example, $B_{13}^{d_{L}}$ will be written as $B_{d b}^{L}$. In general, $B_{f f^{\prime}}^{L}$ and $B_{f f^{\prime}}^{R}$ can be complex and have independent phases.

## 3. Electric dipole moments

In the SM, for a dipole operator, the weak phase exactly cancels out in the one-loop diagrams. Hence there is no contribution to fermion EDMs at the one-loop level. In comparison, there can be independent phases involving the left-handed and the righthanded $Z^{\prime}$ couplings. These complex phases can contribute to fermion EDMs through the one-loop diagram shown in figure 1, where $f$ and $f^{\prime}$ indicate fermions of different flavors.

For fermion $f$, the contribution to its EDM from figure 1 is evaluated to be,

$$
\begin{equation*}
d_{f}=-\frac{1}{16 \pi^{2}} g_{2}^{2} Q_{f} e \frac{m_{f^{\prime}}}{m_{Z^{\prime}}^{2}} \operatorname{Im}\left(B_{f f^{\prime}}^{L} B_{f f^{\prime}}^{R}\right) \int_{0}^{1} d x \frac{a x^{4}+4 x(1-x)}{a x^{2}+b x+1} \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where, $Q_{f}$ is the charge and $m_{f}$ is the mass of the external fermion, $m_{f^{\prime}}$ is the mass of the internal fermion, $m_{Z^{\prime}}$ is $Z^{\prime}$ boson mass, and $a=m_{f}^{2} / m_{Z^{\prime}}^{2}$ and $b=\left(m_{f^{\prime}}^{2}-m_{f}^{2}\right) / m_{Z^{\prime}}^{2}-1$. Note the contribution is non-zero only if both $B_{f f^{\prime}}^{L}$ and $B_{f f^{\prime}}^{R}$ are non-zero, at least one of them is complex, and their phases do not cancel. In the approximation of external quark mass being much less than the $Z^{\prime}$ mass, i.e., $m_{f} \ll m_{Z^{\prime}}$, the above equation can be simplified to be

$$
\begin{equation*}
d_{f}=-\frac{1}{8 \pi^{2}} g_{2}^{2} Q_{f} e \frac{m_{f^{\prime}}}{m_{Z^{\prime}}^{2}} \operatorname{Im}\left(B_{f f^{\prime}}^{L}{ }^{*} B_{f f^{\prime}}^{R}\right) \frac{1-c^{2}+2 c \log c}{(1-c)^{3}} \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

in which, $c=m_{f^{\prime}}^{2} / m_{Z^{\prime}}^{2}$. If the internal quark mass is again much less than $m_{Z^{\prime}}$, i.e. , $m_{f^{\prime}} \ll m_{Z^{\prime}}$, then the equation can be further simplified into

$$
\begin{align*}
d_{f} & =-\frac{1}{8 \pi^{2}} g_{2}^{2} Q_{f} e \frac{m_{f^{\prime}}}{m_{Z^{\prime}}^{2}} \operatorname{Im}\left(B_{f f^{\prime}}^{L} B_{f f^{\prime}}^{R}\right) \\
& =-\frac{g_{1}^{2}}{8 \pi^{2}} Q_{f} e \frac{m_{f^{\prime}}}{m_{Z}^{2}} y \operatorname{Im}\left(B_{f f^{\prime}}^{L}{ }^{*} B_{f f^{\prime}}^{R}\right) \tag{3.3}
\end{align*}
$$

where parameter $y$ is defined as

$$
\begin{equation*}
y \equiv\left(\frac{g_{2}}{g_{1}}\right)^{2} \frac{M_{Z}^{2}}{M_{Z^{\prime}}^{2}} \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now we can apply this result to electron and $u$ and $d$ quark EDMs. For electrons, both the diagrams with internal $\mu$ and internal $\tau$ contribute. By requiring both contributions to be less than electron EDM constraint $d_{e}<1.4 \times 10^{-27} \mathrm{e} \cdot \mathrm{cm}$ 15, we get

$$
\begin{align*}
& y \operatorname{Im}\left(B_{e \mu}^{L^{*}} B_{e \mu}^{R}\right)<1 \times 10^{-6}  \tag{3.5}\\
& y \operatorname{Im}\left(B_{e \tau}^{L^{*}} B_{e \tau}^{R}\right)<7 \times 10^{-8} \tag{3.6}
\end{align*}
$$

The constraint on $B_{e \tau}$ is stronger simply because the contributions to the EDMs are proportional to the internal fermion masses.

The strongest bounds on $B_{e \mu}^{L}$ and $B_{e \mu}^{R}$ come from the non-observation of coherent $\mu-e$ conversion [6] by the Sindrum-II Collaboration [17], as the small mixing between $Z$ and $Z^{\prime}$ can induce such conversion process,

$$
\begin{equation*}
w^{2}\left(\left|B_{e \mu}^{L}\right|^{2}+\left|B_{e \mu}^{R}\right|^{2}\right)<4 \times 10^{-14} \tag{3.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $w=g_{2} / g_{1} \sin \theta \cos \theta\left(1-m_{Z}^{2} / m_{Z^{\prime}}^{2}\right)$ and $\theta$ is the $Z-Z^{\prime}$ mixing angle. In the most interesting case of a TeV -scale $Z^{\prime}$ with small mixing, $\theta \lesssim 10^{-3}, y$ and $w$ are of the same order, and $y \approx w \approx 10^{-3}$. This is the case we assume in comparing the constraints from different processes. It is difficult to directly compare the constraints in eq. (3.5) and eq. (3.7), since the former depends on the phase difference between $B_{e \mu}^{L}$ and $B_{e \mu}^{R}$ and the later on the absolute values. As $\left|B_{e \mu}^{L, R}\right|$ become as small as in eq. (3.7), the constraint in eq. (3.5) becomes unimportant. In this sense, we say the coherent $\mu-e$ conversion provides a stronger constraint on $B_{e \mu}^{L, R}$ than the electron EDM. The decay $\tau \rightarrow 3 e$ provides the best constraint on flavor violating $Z^{\prime} e \tau$ coupling

$$
\begin{equation*}
w^{2}\left(\left|B_{e \tau}^{L}\right|^{2}+\left|B_{e \tau}^{R}\right|^{2}\right)<2 \times 10^{-5} \tag{3.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

In this case, the constraint from electron EDM, eq. (3.6), is more stringent, although it depends on the phases.

We can also apply the same constraint on quark EDMs inferred from the neutron EDM. Barring possible cancellations, we require each diagram contributes less than the
experimental limit $d_{n}<3.0 \times 10^{-26} \mathrm{e} \cdot \mathrm{cm}$ [16], we get the following constraints

$$
\begin{align*}
& y \operatorname{Im}\left(B_{u c}^{L *} B_{u c}^{R}\right)<3 \times 10^{-6},  \tag{3.9}\\
& y \operatorname{Im}\left(B_{d s}^{L *} B_{d s}^{R}\right)<5 \times 10^{-5},  \tag{3.10}\\
& y \operatorname{Im}\left(B_{u t}^{L *} B_{u t}^{R}\right)<2 \times 10^{-8},  \tag{3.11}\\
& y \operatorname{Im}\left(B_{d b}^{L *} B_{d b}^{R}\right)<2 \times 10^{-6} . \tag{3.12}
\end{align*}
$$

eq. (3.10) gives a weaker bound on $B_{d s}^{L, R}$ than those from $K_{L} \rightarrow \mu^{+} \mu^{-}$[18] and $K_{L} \rightarrow$ $\pi^{0} \mu^{+} \mu^{-}$(19] decays

$$
\begin{gather*}
w^{2}\left|\operatorname{Re} B_{d s}^{R}-\operatorname{Re} B_{d s}^{L}\right|^{2}<3 \times 10^{-11}, \\
w^{2}\left|\operatorname{Im} B_{d s}^{R}+\operatorname{Im} B_{d s}^{L}\right|^{2}<5 \times 10^{-11} . \tag{3.13}
\end{gather*}
$$

At the same time, the constraint in eq. (3.12) are relevant, compared to bounds that come from $B^{0}$ decay into a $\mu^{+} \mu^{-}$pair (20],

$$
\begin{equation*}
w^{2}\left|B_{d b}^{L, R}\right|^{2}<10^{-5} \tag{3.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

The same diagram in figure 11, with the external fermion being $\mu$, will contribute to muon $g-2$. The general expression for the contributions from the $Z^{\prime}$ diagram is given in ref. [21]. As the external and internal leptons masses are far smaller than the $Z^{\prime}$ mass, the dominant contribution becomes

$$
\begin{equation*}
a_{\mu}^{Z^{\prime}}=-\frac{y}{4 \pi^{2}} \frac{g_{1}^{2}}{m_{Z}^{2}} m_{\mu} m_{\tau} \operatorname{Re}\left(B_{\mu \tau}^{L}{ }^{*} B_{\mu \tau}^{R}\right) . \tag{3.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

If we demand this contribution to be less the the difference between the experimentally measured value and the Standard Model prediction [22], $\Delta a_{\mu}<250 \times 10^{-11}$, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
y \operatorname{Re}\left(B_{\mu \tau}^{L *} B_{\mu \tau}^{R}\right)<1 \times 10^{-2} . \tag{3.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

In the aforementioned small mixing and TeV -scale $Z^{\prime}$ case, this constraint on $B_{\mu \tau}$ is as strong as the one derived from $\tau \rightarrow 3 \mu$ decay [6],

$$
\begin{equation*}
w^{2}\left(\left|B_{\mu \tau}^{L}\right|^{2}+\left|B_{\mu \tau}^{R}\right|^{2}\right)<10^{-5} . \tag{3.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

The contribution from the diagram with electron in the loop are suppressed by the much lighter electron mass, thus it does not provide a useful constraint.

## 4. $K-\bar{K}$ mixing

The off-diagonal element $M_{12}$ in the neutral $K-\bar{K}$ mixing mass matrix is related to the $|\Delta S|=2$ effective Hamiltonian by

$$
\begin{equation*}
2 m_{K} M_{12}^{*}=\left\langle\bar{K}^{0}\right| \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{eff}}^{|\Delta S|=2}\left|K^{0}\right\rangle \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

With the definition

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\langle\bar{K}^{0}\right|\left[\bar{s} \gamma_{\mu}\left(1-\gamma_{5}\right) d\right]\left[\bar{s} \gamma^{\mu}\left(1-\gamma_{5}\right) d\right]\left|K^{0}\right\rangle \equiv \frac{8}{3} B_{K} f_{K}^{2} m_{K}^{2}, \tag{4.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

one obtains within the SM (23]

$$
\begin{align*}
M_{12}^{\mathrm{SM}}= & \frac{G_{F}^{2}}{16 \pi^{2}} M_{W}^{2}\left[\left(V_{c d}^{*} V_{c s}\right)^{2} \eta_{1} S_{0}\left(x_{c}\right)+\left(V_{t d}^{*} V_{t s}\right)^{2} \eta_{2} S_{0}\left(x_{t}\right)+2\left(V_{c d}^{*} V_{c s}\right)\left(V_{t d}^{*} V_{t s}\right) \eta_{3} S_{0}\left(x_{c}, x_{t}\right)\right] \\
& \times \frac{4}{3} B_{K}^{L L} f_{K}^{2} m_{K} \tag{4.3}
\end{align*}
$$

where the QCD factors $\eta_{1} \simeq 1.38, \eta_{2} \simeq 0.57$, and $\eta_{3} \simeq 0.47$, and the Inami-Lim functions 25] $S_{0}(x)$ and $S_{0}(x, y)$ can be found, for example, in ref. 23. The renormalization scale and scheme invariant bag parameter is

$$
\begin{equation*}
B_{K}^{L L}=\alpha_{s}^{(4)}(\mu)^{-2 / 9}\left[1+1.895 \frac{\alpha_{s}^{(4)}(\mu)}{4 \pi}\right] B_{K}^{L L}(\mu) \tag{4.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

with the same factor for left-right mixing bag parameters $B_{K 1}^{L R}$ and $B_{K 2}^{L R}$. We will take the following numerical values: $B_{K}^{L L}(2 \mathrm{GeV})=0.69 \pm 0.21, B_{K 1}^{L R}(2 \mathrm{GeV})=1.03 \pm 0.06$, and $B_{K 2}^{L R}(2 \mathrm{GeV})=0.73 \pm 0.10$ [26], $f_{K}=159.8 \pm 1.5 \mathrm{MeV}$, and $m_{K}=497.648 \pm 0.022 \mathrm{MeV}$ 18]. The short-distance contribution to the mass difference between the two mass eigenstates of kaons, $\Delta M_{K}$, is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta M_{K}^{\mathrm{SD}}=2 \operatorname{Re} M_{12} \tag{4.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

The $C P$ violation is measured by the parameter

$$
\begin{equation*}
\epsilon_{K}=\frac{e^{i \pi / 4}}{\sqrt{2} \Delta M_{K}} \operatorname{Im} M_{12} \tag{4.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Their experimental values are given in 18 as $\Delta M_{K}=0.5292 \times 10^{10} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$ and $\left|\epsilon_{K}\right|=$ $2.284 \times 10^{-3}$.

The general set of $|\Delta S|=2$ operators relevant for our discussions is:

$$
\begin{align*}
& O^{L L}=\left[\bar{s} \gamma_{\mu}\left(1-\gamma_{5}\right) d\right]\left[\bar{s} \gamma^{\mu}\left(1-\gamma_{5}\right) d\right] \\
& O_{1}^{L R}=\left[\bar{s} \gamma_{\mu}\left(1-\gamma_{5}\right) d\right]\left[\bar{s} \gamma^{\mu}\left(1+\gamma_{5}\right) d\right] \\
& O_{2}^{L R}=\left[\bar{s}\left(1-\gamma_{5}\right) d\right]\left[\bar{s}\left(1+\gamma_{5}\right) d\right] \\
& O^{R R}=\left[\bar{s} \gamma_{\mu}\left(1+\gamma_{5}\right) d\right]\left[\bar{s} \gamma^{\mu}\left(1+\gamma_{5}\right) d\right] . \tag{4.7}
\end{align*}
$$

As seen previously, only the operator $O^{L L}$ contributes to $K-\bar{K}$ mixing in the SM due to its chiral structure. The other three operators appear in the $Z^{\prime}$ models because the left- and right-handed couplings and operators mix through renormalization group (RG) evolution. The RG running of the Wilson coefficients $C(\mu)$ from the $M_{W}$ scale down to the lattice scale $\mu_{L}$, where we match with the lattice results of the associated hadronic matrix elements, can be schematically written as

$$
\begin{equation*}
C\left(\mu_{L}\right)=\mathrm{U}\left(\mu_{L}, M_{W}\right) C\left(M_{W}\right) \tag{4.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Details of computing the evolution matrix $\mathrm{U}\left(\mu_{L}, M_{W}\right)$ are given in ref. 24. Here we only provide the numerical values of the relevant evolution matrices:

$$
\begin{align*}
U_{L L}^{K} & =U_{R R}^{K} \simeq 0.788  \tag{4.9}\\
U_{L R}^{K} & =U_{R L}^{K} \simeq\left(\begin{array}{cc}
0.906 & -0.087 \\
-1.531 & 3.203
\end{array}\right) \tag{4.10}
\end{align*}
$$

In determining these results, we have used only the central value of $\alpha_{s}\left(M_{Z}\right)=0.118$ for a 5quark effective theory and chose the lattice scale $\mu_{L}=2 \mathrm{GeV}$. The additional contribution from the $Z^{\prime}$ model with only the left-handed couplings is

$$
\begin{equation*}
M_{12}^{L L}=\frac{G_{F}}{\sqrt{2}} y U_{L L}^{K}\left(B_{d s}^{L}\right)^{2} \frac{4}{3} B_{K}^{L L} f_{K}^{2} m_{K} \tag{4.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

and the expression that also includes the right-handed coupling is

$$
\begin{align*}
M_{12}^{L R}= & \frac{G_{F}}{\sqrt{2}} y f_{K}^{2} m_{K}\left\{\frac{4}{3} U_{L L}^{K}\left(B_{d s}^{L}\right)^{2} B_{K}^{L L}+\frac{4}{3} U_{R R}^{K}\left(B_{d s}^{R}\right)^{2} B_{K}^{R R}\right. \\
& \left.+\left(\frac{m_{K}}{m_{s}+m_{d}}\right)^{2} B_{d s}^{L} B_{d s}^{R}\left[-\frac{4}{3} U_{L R}^{K}(1,1) B_{K 1}^{L R}+2 U_{L R}^{K}(2,1) B_{K 2}^{L R}\right]\right\} \tag{4.12}
\end{align*}
$$

If we constrain the contribution to $\Delta M_{K}$ from $M_{12}^{L L}$ to be less than the currently measure experimental value, we get the bound,

$$
\begin{equation*}
y\left|\operatorname{Re}\left(B_{d s}^{L}\right)^{2}\right|<2 \times 10^{-8} \tag{4.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

After including the $R R$ and the $L R$ mixing terms, the constraint becomes

$$
\begin{equation*}
y\left|0.01 \operatorname{Re}\left[\left(B_{d s}^{L}\right)^{2}+\left(B_{d s}^{R}\right)^{2}\right]-\operatorname{Re}\left(B_{d s}^{L} B_{d s}^{R}\right)\right|<2 \times 10^{-10} \tag{4.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Keeping the dominant term, we can simplify the equation into

$$
\begin{equation*}
y\left|\operatorname{Re}\left(B_{d s}^{L} B_{d s}^{R}\right)\right|<2 \times 10^{-10} \tag{4.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

The theoretical uncertainty on $\epsilon_{K}$ within the Standard Model is mainly due to the uncertainty of the bag parameter $B_{K}$ and it is estimated to be about $30 \%$ 26. If we require that the contribution from $Z^{\prime}$ is less than the theoretical error associated with the SM prediction, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{\left|\epsilon_{K}^{Z^{\prime}}\right|}{\left|\epsilon_{K}^{\exp }\right|} & =\frac{\left|\operatorname{Im} M_{12}^{Z^{\prime}}\right|}{\sqrt{2} \Delta M_{K}^{\exp } \epsilon_{K}^{\exp }} \\
& \approx 1 \times 10^{12} y\left|0.01 \operatorname{Im}\left[\left(B_{d s}^{L}\right)^{2}+\left(B_{d s}^{R}\right)^{2}\right]-\operatorname{Im}\left(B_{d s}^{L} B_{d s}^{R}\right)\right|<0.3 \tag{4.16}
\end{align*}
$$

Assuming that only the $L L$ coupling exists, the constraint becomes

$$
\begin{equation*}
y \operatorname{Im}\left(B_{d s}^{L}\right)^{2}<3 \times 10^{-11} \tag{4.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

When both left-handed and right-handed couplings contribute, we can ignore the $L L$ and $R R$ terms, and obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
y \operatorname{Im}\left(B_{d s}^{L} B_{d s}^{R}\right)<3 \times 10^{-13} \tag{4.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

In comparison with ref. 28], the stronger bound here is due to the chiral and renormalization enhancement in the left-right mixing terms.

## 5. $B_{d}-\bar{B}_{d}$ mixing

Similar to $K-\bar{K}$ mixing, chiral couplings of $Z^{\prime}$ with $b$ and $d$ quarks can induce $B_{d}-\bar{B}_{d}$ mixing. In the SM , the off-diagonal element in the $B_{d}$ meson mass matrix is given by [23]

$$
\begin{equation*}
M_{12}^{\mathrm{SM}}=\frac{G_{F}^{2}}{16 \pi^{2}} M_{W}^{2}\left(V_{t b}^{*} V_{t d}\right)^{2} \eta_{B} \frac{4}{3} B_{B}^{L L} f_{B}^{2} m_{B} S_{0}\left(x_{t}\right), \tag{5.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the QCD factor $\eta_{B} \simeq 0.55, S_{0}\left(x_{t}\right)=2.463$ [23], and $m_{B}=5.2794 \pm 0.0005 \mathrm{GeV}$ 18]. The renormalization scale invariant bag parameter is

$$
\begin{equation*}
B_{B}^{L L}=\alpha_{s}^{(5)}(\mu)^{-6 / 23}\left[1+1.627 \frac{\alpha_{s}^{(5)}(\mu)}{4 \pi}\right] B_{B}^{L L}(\mu) \tag{5.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

with similar expressions for $B_{B 1}^{L R}$ and $B_{B 2}^{L R}$, which are bag parameters for left-right mixing operators. The bag parameters in the $\overline{\mathrm{MS}}$ scheme are evaluated on the lattice with quenched approximation [29] and they are: $B_{B}^{L L}(4.6 \mathrm{GeV})=0.87 \pm 0.06, B_{B 1}^{L R}(4.6 \mathrm{GeV})=1.72 \pm 0.12$, and $B_{B 2}^{L R}(4.6 \mathrm{GeV})=1.15 \pm 0.6$. The decay constant is $f_{B}=173 \pm 23 \mathrm{MeV}$.

It is a common practice to determine $\sin 2 \beta$ from the time-dependent $C P$ asymmetry of the $b \rightarrow c \bar{c} s$ processes because the decay amplitudes are dominated by tree-level processes and therefore least affected by new physics contributions 30]. Within the Standard Model, $\sin 2 \beta$ is related to the CKM matrix elements

$$
\begin{equation*}
\beta=\arg \left(-\frac{V_{c d} V_{c b}^{*}}{V_{t d} V_{t b}^{*}}\right) . \tag{5.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Both $\Delta M_{B}$ and $\sin 2 \beta$, determined from all charmonium modes, are measured at Belle 31] and BaBar [32] and the world average [33] are

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Delta M_{B}=0.507 \pm 0.005 \mathrm{ps}^{-1}  \tag{5.4}\\
& \sin 2 \beta=0.687 \pm 0.032 \tag{5.5}
\end{align*}
$$

A set of $|\Delta B|=2$ operators can be obtained by simply replacing $\bar{s}$ with $\bar{b}$ in eq. (4.7). Following ref. [24], we calculate the evolution matrices,

$$
\begin{align*}
U_{L L}^{B} & =U_{R R}^{B} \simeq 0.842  \tag{5.6}\\
U_{L R}^{B} & =U_{R L}^{B} \simeq\left(\begin{array}{cc}
0.921 & -0.041 \\
-0.882 & 2.081
\end{array}\right) \tag{5.7}
\end{align*}
$$

The contributions from $Z^{\prime}$ with purely left-handed couplings and with both left-handed and right-handed couplings to the off-diagonal $M_{12}^{B}$ are similar to eq. (4.11) and eq. (4.12) with simple replacements of parameters

$$
\begin{align*}
M_{12}^{L L}= & \frac{G_{F}}{\sqrt{2}} y U_{L L}^{B}\left(B_{d b}^{L}\right)^{2} \frac{4}{3} B_{B}^{L L} f_{B}^{2} m_{B}  \tag{5.8}\\
M_{12}^{L R}= & \frac{G_{F}}{\sqrt{2}} y f_{B}^{2} m_{B}\left\{\frac{4}{3} U_{L L}^{B}\left(B_{d b}^{L}\right)^{2} B_{B}^{L L}+\frac{4}{3} U_{R R}^{B}\left(B_{d b}^{R}\right)^{2} B_{B}^{R R}\right. \\
& \left.+\left(\frac{m_{B}}{m_{d}+m_{b}}\right)^{2}\left(B_{d b}^{L} B_{d b}^{R}\right)\left[-\frac{4}{3} U_{L R}^{B}(1,1) B_{B 1}^{L R}+2 U_{L R}^{B}(2,1) B_{B 2}^{L R}\right]\right\} \tag{5.9}
\end{align*}
$$

In the presence of $Z^{\prime}$ contributions, the weak phase thus measured should be an effective one, with

$$
\begin{equation*}
\beta_{\mathrm{eff}}=-\frac{1}{2} \arg \left(M_{12}^{\mathrm{SM}}+M_{12}^{Z^{\prime}}\right) . \tag{5.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

The measured $\Delta M_{B}$ and $\sin 2 \beta_{\text {eff }}$ may both contain contributions from $Z^{\prime}$. Therefore, assuming the existence of new physics, they cannot be used to determine the SM $V_{t d}$. Without the accurate determination from $B_{d}$ mixing and decay, information on the Wolfenstein parameters $\rho$ and $\eta$ (34] can only be derived from two sources. On the one hand, we can deduce constraints on $\sqrt{\rho^{2}+\eta^{2}}$ from $\left|V_{u b}\right|=(4.05 \pm 0.52) \times 10^{-3},\left|V_{c b}\right|=(41.4 \pm 2.1) \times 10^{-3}$ and $\left|V_{c d}\right|=0.224 \pm 0.014$ [35] and allow $\rho$ and $\eta$ values to vary within this constraint. $\left|V_{u b}\right|$ and $\left|V_{c b}\right|$ are determined from semileptonic decays of $B$ mesons. $\left|V_{c d}\right|$ can be deduced from neutrino and antineutrino production of charm off valence $d$ quarks. From $\left|V_{c d}\right|,\left|V_{c b}\right|$ and $\left|V_{u b}\right|$ we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\frac{V_{u b}}{V_{c d} V_{c b}}\right|=|\rho-i \eta|=0.437 \pm 0.066 \tag{5.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

On the other hand, the ratio $\left|V_{t d} / V_{t s}\right|$ has recently been determined at BELLE [7] through $b \rightarrow d \gamma$ decays. Its value is found to be within the interval of $0.142<\left|V_{t d} / V_{t s}\right|<0.259$ at a $95 \%$ confidence level. More importantly, diagrams involving $Z^{\prime}$ that contribute to the $b \rightarrow d \gamma$ or $b \rightarrow s \gamma$ process are not only loop suppressed but also mass suppressed. Therefore, the bound on $\left|V_{t d} / V_{t s}\right|$ provides an additional constraint on the SM $\rho$ and $\eta$ parameter space. The constraint derived from $\left|V_{t d} / V_{t s}\right|$, combined with $\left|V_{c d}\right|$, gives the ratio and its $1 \sigma$ range

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\frac{V_{t d}}{V_{c d} V_{t s}}\right|=|1-\rho-i \eta|=0.888 \pm 0.163 . \tag{5.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note we have used the $95 \%$ confidence level bound to derive the $1 \sigma$ error and turned asymmetric errors to symmetric ones assuming they are Gaussian.

In $\Delta M_{d}^{\exp } / \Delta M_{s}^{\text {exp }}$, the ratio of the hadronic parameters $\left(f_{B_{d}}^{2} B_{B_{d}}\right) /\left(f_{B_{s}}^{2} B_{B_{s}}\right)$ is more accurately known than individual hadronic parameters. It may seem that the ratio would provide a better determination of the related $Z^{\prime}$ couplings. This is not so when $Z^{\prime}$ effects enter both $\Delta M_{d}$ and $\Delta M_{s}$. While trying to constrain $B_{d b}$ from the ratio, we need to know $B_{s b}$. The hadronic uncertainties re-enter in the form of uncertainty on $B_{s b}$ [12]. Hence, we use $\Delta M_{d b}$ and $\sin 2 \beta_{e f f}$ to constrain $B_{d b}$, together with the bounds on $\rho$ and $\eta$ discussed above. Note that, in the $B_{s}$ system, the $C P$-violating parameter $\sin 2 \phi_{s}$ can be combined with $\Delta M_{B_{s}}$ to determine new physics parameters [1], 13].

To be specific, we consider only the $L L$ couplings in the following discussions. We now rewrite $M_{12}$ in simple forms of $\rho, \eta$ and $B_{d b}$,

$$
\begin{align*}
M_{12}^{\mathrm{SM}} & =\frac{G_{F}^{2}}{12 \pi^{2}} M_{W}^{2} \eta_{B} B_{B_{d}}^{L L} f_{B_{d}}^{2} m_{B_{d}} S_{0}\left(x_{t}\right)\left(V_{t b}^{*} V_{t d}\right)^{2} \\
& =C_{1}[1-(\rho+i \eta)]^{2},  \tag{5.13}\\
M_{12}^{L L} & =\frac{G_{F}}{\sqrt{2}} y U_{L L}^{B}\left(B_{d b}^{L}\right)^{2} \frac{4}{3} B_{B_{d}}^{L L} f_{B_{d}}^{2} m_{B_{d}} \\
& =C_{2} y\left(B_{d b}^{L}\right)^{2}, \tag{5.14}
\end{align*}
$$



Figure 2: The allowed $\rho$ and $\eta$ values (left) when both SM and $Z^{\prime}$ contribute to $B_{d}$ mixing, and the allowed ranges for $y \operatorname{Im}\left(B_{d b}^{L}\right)^{2}$ and $y \operatorname{Re}\left(B_{d b}^{L}\right)^{2}$ (right). For the dashed ( $1 \sigma$ ) and dotted (1.64 $)$ contours on the left and the scattered points $(1 \sigma)$ on the right, the constraint on $\left|V_{t d} / V_{t s}\right|$ is not imposed. For the solid contours, black for $1 \sigma$ and red for $1.64 \sigma$, the constraint on $\left|V_{t d} / V_{t s}\right|$ is imposed.
with

$$
\begin{align*}
C_{1} & \equiv \frac{G_{F}^{2}}{12 \pi^{2}} M_{W}^{2} \eta_{B} B_{B_{d}}^{L L} f_{B_{d}}^{2} m_{B_{d}} S_{0}\left(x_{t}\right) A^{2} \lambda^{6}=(1.823 \pm 0.52) \times 10^{-13} \mathrm{GeV}  \tag{5.15}\\
C_{2} & \equiv \frac{4}{3} \frac{G_{F}}{\sqrt{2}} U_{L L}^{B} B_{B_{d}}^{L L} f_{B_{d}}^{2} m_{B_{d}}=(1.947 \pm 0.53) \times 10^{-6} \mathrm{GeV} \tag{5.16}
\end{align*}
$$

and the ratio $C_{2} / C_{1}=(1.068 \pm 0.085) \times 10^{7}$. Here we take $A=0.801 \pm 0.024$ and $\lambda=0.2262 \pm 0.0020$ [35]. The observed $\Delta M_{B}$ and $\sin 2 \beta$ render

$$
\begin{gather*}
2 C_{1}\left|[1-(\rho+i \eta)]^{2}+\frac{C_{2}}{C_{1}} y\left(B_{d b}^{L}\right)^{2}\right|=(3.337 \pm 0.033) \times 10^{-13} \mathrm{GeV}  \tag{5.17}\\
-\arg \left\{[1-(\rho+i \eta)]^{2}+\frac{C_{2}}{C_{1}} y\left(B_{d b}^{L}\right)^{2}\right\}=0.757_{-0.043}^{+0.045} \tag{5.18}
\end{gather*}
$$

We try to get limits on $y\left(B_{d b}\right)^{2}$ based on the four conditions in eqs. (5.11), (5.12), (5.17) and (5.18).

In figure 2, we show the allowed ranges in the $\rho-\eta$ plane and in the plane of the $Z^{\prime}$ parameters $y \operatorname{Re}\left(B_{d b}^{L}\right)^{2}$ and $y \operatorname{Im}\left(B_{d b}^{L}\right)^{2}$. We show the results before imposing the $\left|V_{t d} / V_{t s}\right|$ constraint, i.e., eq. (5.12), with the dashed $(1 \sigma)$ and dotted $(1.64 \sigma)$ contours in the left plot, and with the scattered points in the right plot. Because of the additional $Z^{\prime}$ contributions, $\rho$ and $\eta$ are allowed to take all possible values allowed by the $\left|V_{u b}\right|,\left|V_{c d}\right|$ and $\left|V_{c b}\right|$ measurements, and the corresponding allowed range for $Z^{\prime}$ parameters are approximately $-2 \times 10^{-7}<y \operatorname{Re}\left(B_{d b}^{L}\right)^{2}<1 \times 10^{-7}$ and $-2 \times 10^{-7}<y \operatorname{Im}\left(B_{d b}^{L}\right)^{2}<1 \times 10^{-7}$. However, after imposing the $\left|V_{t d} / V_{t s}\right|$ constraint, the allowed region of $\rho$ and $\eta$ as well as those of $y \operatorname{Re}\left(B_{d b}^{L}\right)^{2}$ and $y \operatorname{Im}\left(B_{d b}^{L}\right)^{2}$ improve significantly, as shown by the solid black $(1 \sigma)$ and red
$(1.64 \sigma)$ contours in both plots of figure 2. Just from the four conditions listed above, the $\eta<0$ region is allowed, leaving a two-fold ambiguity on the allowed regions. Under the assumption that $Z^{\prime}$ is not the dominant contribution in $\epsilon_{K}$, we can use the $\epsilon_{K}$ measurement to exclude the $\eta<0$ region. From another point of view, for the lower regions in both plots, the large $Z^{\prime}$ contributions have to be canceled by the SM contributions to reproduce $\Delta M_{B}$ and $\sin 2 \beta$ measurements. The lower regions are thus less natural, and we limit ourself to the upper regions. Hence, when only left-handed couplings are present, the bounds can be estimated from the right plot of figure 2 to be

$$
\begin{align*}
& y\left|\operatorname{Re}\left(B_{d b}^{L}\right)^{2}\right|<5 \times 10^{-8},  \tag{5.19}\\
& y\left|\operatorname{Im}\left(B_{s d}^{L}\right)^{2}\right|<5 \times 10^{-8} . \tag{5.20}
\end{align*}
$$

When both left-handed and right handed couplings are included, the constraints are

$$
\begin{align*}
& y\left|\operatorname{Re}\left[\left(B_{b b}^{L}\right)^{2}+\left(B_{d b}^{R}\right)^{2}\right]-3.8 \operatorname{Re}\left(B_{d b}^{L} B_{d b}^{R}\right)\right|<5 \times 10^{-8},  \tag{5.21}\\
& y\left|\operatorname{Im}\left[\left(B_{d b}^{L}\right)^{2}+\left(B_{d b}^{R}\right)^{2}\right]-3.8 \operatorname{Im}\left(B_{d b}^{L} B_{d b}^{R}\right)\right|<5 \times 10^{-8}, \tag{5.22}
\end{align*}
$$

which are less illuminating because of the possible cancellation among different terms.

## 6. Conclusions

Flavor-changing and $C P$-violating processes are natural consequences of family-nonuniversal $Z^{\prime}$ models, and they can manifest in observables such as EDMs, muon $g-2$ and meson mixings. We have studied constraints on $Z^{\prime}$ couplings from electron and neutron EDMs, muon $g-2, K$ and $B$ meson mixing and $C P$ violation.

We presented the general expression for the fermion EDM generated by a one-loop diagram induced by the $Z^{\prime}$ boson. In the approximation that both internal and external fermion masses are much smaller than the $Z^{\prime}$ mass, the EDM is a simple quantity proportional to $Z^{\prime}$ couplings and the internal fermion mass. We obtained the constraints on the chiral couplings to $Z^{\prime}$ by requiring each individual contribution to be within the experimental limits of electron and neutron EDMs. Derived from the electron EDM, the constraint on $B_{e \mu}^{L, R}$ is weaker than that from the $\mu$-e conversion, while the constraint on $B_{e \tau}^{L, R}$ is stronger than that from the $\tau \rightarrow 3 e$ decay. From the neutron EDM, bounds on $B_{d s}^{L, R}$ are not as strong as those imposed by the $K_{L} \rightarrow \mu^{+} \mu^{-}$and $K_{L} \rightarrow \pi^{0} \mu^{+} \mu^{-}$decays. However, bounds on $B_{d b}^{L, R}$ are stronger than bounds from the $B^{0}$ to $\mu^{+} \mu^{-}$decay. Because the EDMs are proportional to the internal fermion masses, they provide better constraints on couplings involving heavier leptons and quarks. Requiring the $Z^{\prime}$ contribution to muon $g-2$ to be less than the discrepancy between theoretical and experimental values, we obtained comparable limits on $B_{\mu \tau}^{L, R}$ to that from the $\tau \rightarrow 3 \mu$ decay.

We calculated the $K$ - $\bar{K}$ mixing mass difference and the $C P$-violating parameter $\epsilon_{K}$. Due to the enhancement in the left-right mixing terms, their coefficients are two orders of magnitude bigger than those of purely left-handed and right-handed terms. Therefore, the constraint on the product $B_{d s}^{L} B_{d s}^{R}$ is much stronger than those on $\left(B_{d s}^{L}\right)^{2}$ and $\left(B_{d s}^{R}\right)^{2}$. The
mass difference provides a limit on the real part of $B_{d s}^{L} B_{d s}^{R}$, while the $\epsilon_{K}$ provides a limit on its imaginary part.

We also evaluated the $B_{d}-\bar{B}_{d}$ mixing in the context of the flavor-changing $Z^{\prime}$ couplings. Because the measured mass difference and $C P$ asymmetry may partially involve new physics at present, we can no longer use the $V_{t d}$ determined from the $B_{d}-\bar{B}_{d}$ system assuming only the SM physics. Instead, $V_{t d}$ is relaxed to all possible values allowed by the unitarity triangle, with $\left|V_{u b}\right|,\left|V_{c b}\right|$ and $\left|V_{c d}\right|$ fixed by the semileptonic $B$ decays and the neutrino and anti-neutrino production of charm. Furthermore, because $Z^{\prime}$ contributions to $b \rightarrow s \gamma$ and $b \rightarrow d \gamma$ decays are both loop and mass suppressed, these processes can be used to constrain the SM $\left|V_{t d} / V_{t s}\right|$. We used such limits to improve the analysis on $B_{d}$ mixing. We found that there was only a small window for the $Z^{\prime}$ physics in the $B_{d}$ system when one took into account all the constraints on $\Delta M_{B}, \sin 2 \beta,\left|V_{u b}\right|$, and $\left|V_{t d} / V_{t s}\right|$ given by the different experiments.
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