Measurement of sin(2β) in the decay $B_d^0 \longrightarrow J/\Psi K_s^0$

Johannes Mayer, Patrick Fahner

LHCb, Physikalisches Institut
Heidelberg University

29/07/2013

Decay $B_d^0 \longrightarrow J/\Psi K_s^0$



$B_d^0 - \bar{B}_d^0$-Mixing



Time-dependent asymmetry

$$\mathcal{A}_{J/\Psi K_s^0}(t) = \frac{\Gamma(\bar{B}_d^0 \to J/\Psi K_s^0) - \Gamma(B_d^0 \to J/\Psi K_s^0)}{\Gamma(\bar{B}_d^0 \to J/\Psi K_s^0) + \Gamma(B_d^0 \to J/\Psi K_s^0)} \quad (1)$$

$$= S_{J/\Psi K_s^0} \sin(\Delta m_d t) - C_{J/\Psi K_s^0} \cos(\Delta m_d t) \quad (2)$$

sine - term

- interference between direct decay and decay after mixing
- $S_{J/\Psi K_s^0} = \sin(2\beta)$

cosine - term

- interference between decay amplitudes or CPV in mixing
- here: $C_{J/\Psi K_s^0} \approx 0$

Basis of our work

Basis: 2011 LHCb analysis (LHCb-ANA-2012-016)

- data collected 2011
- $\sqrt{s} = 7\mathrm{TeV}$
- $1.025\mathrm{fb}^{-1}$
- result: $S_{J/\Psi K_s^0} = 0.72 \pm 0.06(\text{stat.}) \pm 0.04(\text{syst.})$

Our data:

- only 2012 data
- $\sqrt{s} = 8\mathrm{TeV}$
- $\approx 2\mathrm{fb}^{-1}$
- separation into long and downstream tracks

LHCb-detector



Tracks

- Long Tracks: VELO + T Stations (Johannes)
- Downstream Tracks: TT + T Stations (Patrick)

Cuts

- in general took from 2011 analysis
- analysis on detached and biased trigger line
- New in 2012: Ghost probability. We choose ghost prob < 0.5 for π and μ tracks.

Fit strategy

- Unbinned Maximum Likelihood Fit
- sFit: Maximise modified likelihood function

$$\mathcal{L}_W(\vec{\lambda}) = \prod_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{P}(\vec{x_e}; \vec{\lambda})^{W_s(y_e)} \tag{3}$$

- sWeigths $W_s(y_e)$ calculated with sPlot-technique
- total decay time p.d.f.

$$\mathcal{P}_{meas} = \underbrace{\epsilon(t)}_{=1,\text{ later more}} \mathcal{P}_{sig}(t') \otimes \mathcal{R}(t - t') \tag{4}$$

Mean dacay time resolution

- hardly any effect on $S_{J/\Psi K_s^0}$ expected
- Resolution model

$$\mathcal{R}(t) = \sum_{i=0}^{3} \frac{f_i}{2\pi\sigma_i} e^{-\frac{t^2}{2\sigma^2}} \tag{5}$$

- Use prescaled trigger line
- apply all cuts except lifetime cut
- Perform sFit with reonstructed J/Ψ mass as discriminating variable
- fit only negative decay times (unphysical, explainable only with resolution effects)

Mean dacay time resolution

Long Tracks

Downstream Tracks



Mean decay time resolution

Fit results

Parameter		long tracks	downstream tracks
σ_1	(ps)	0.117±0.016	0.480±0.070
σ_2	(ps)	0.061±0.037	0.04396±0.00094
σ_3	(ps)	0.037±0.003	0.0932±0.0034
f_1		0.054±0.032	0.00329±0.00099
f_2		0.294±0.138	0.739±0.027

nominal fit

mass fit - parameterisation

Signal

$$\mathcal{P}_{m;S}(m;\vec{\lambda}_{m;S}) = f_{S,m}\mathcal{G}(m;m_{B_d^0},\sigma_{m,1}) + (1-f_{S,m})\mathcal{G}(m;m_{B_d^0},\sigma_{m,2}) \quad (6)$$

Background

$$\mathcal{P}_{m;B}(m;\vec{\lambda}_{m;B}) = e^{-\alpha_m m}/\mathcal{N}_{m;B} \quad (7)$$

Total mass p.d.f.

$$\mathcal{P}_m(m;\vec{\lambda}_m) = f_{sig}\mathcal{P}_{m;S}(m;\vec{\lambda}_{m;S}) + (1-f_{sig})\mathcal{P}_{m;B}(m;\vec{\lambda}_{m;B}) \quad (8)$$

nominal fit

mass fit

Long Tracks

Downstream Tracks



nominal fit

decay time distribution - probability density function

$$\mathcal{P}_{\text{meas}}(t, d, \omega) \propto e^{-t/\tau} \{1 - d\mu(1-2\omega) - d\Delta p_0 \\ - [d(1-2\omega) - \mu(1 - d\Delta p_0)]\, S_{J/\Psi K^0_s} \sin(\Delta m_d t)\} \tag{9}$$

- d: tagging decision
- $\mu = A_P = \frac{R_{\bar{B}^0_d} - R_{B^0_d}}{R_{\bar{B}^0_d} + R_{B^0_d}}$ production asymmetry
- ω: calibrated mistag probability

$$\omega(\eta^{OS}) = p_1(\eta^{OS} - \left\langle \eta^{OS} \right\rangle) + p_0 \tag{10}$$

  p_0, p_1: calibration parameters
  η^{OS}: predicted mistag probability
- Δp_0: tagging calibration asymmetry
- Δm_d: mixing frequency

Fit results

- floating parameters: $S_{J/\Psi K^0_s}$, τ, Δm_d
- constrained parameters: $\mu = -0.015 \pm 0.013$, $p_0 = 0.382 \pm 0.003$, $p_1 = 0.981 \pm 0.024$, $\Delta p_0 = 0.0045 \pm 0.0053$
- fixed parameters: $\left\langle \eta^{OS} \right\rangle = 0.382$, resolution parameters
- total events: ??? (long) // 12689 (downstream)
- signal events: ??? (long) // 8585 (downstream) [2011: 8600 total]

Fit results

Long Tracks

Downstream Tracks



fit results

Note: Both results of $S_{J/\Psi K_s^0}$ are blinded with the same string.

Parameter	long	downstream
$S_{J/\Psi K_s^0}$(blinded)	$\pm$	0.565$\pm$0.069
τ	$\pm$	1.516$\pm$0.039
Δm_d	$\pm$	0.521$\pm$0.039

Systematic errors

- Fit Bias due to fit method
- Tagging calibration
- Time acceptance
- Correlation mass $\leftrightarrow$ decay time
- Time resolution

Generate Toy MC with

- ??? (long) resp. 13000 events (downstream)
- $S_{J/\Psi K_s^0} = 0.75$
- all other parameters derived from nominal fit
- $S_{J/\Psi K_s^0}$, τ, Δm_d floating

Systematic errors
Fit Bias

Long Tracks

Downstream Tracks



Systematic errors
Fit Bias

Results of the toys:

Long Tracks

Downstream Tracks

$$\mu_{S_{J/\Psi K_s^0}} = 0.7548 \pm 0.0005$$
$$\sigma_{S_{J/\Psi K_s^0}} = 0.0672 \pm 0.0003$$
$$\mu_{\text{pull}} = 0.068 \pm 0.007$$
$$\sigma_{\text{pull}} = 0.946 \pm 0.005$$

Multiply mean μ of pull distribution with statistical uncertainty of nominal fit.

Long Tracks

$$\delta S^{\text{Fit}}_{J/\Psi K_s^0} = xxx$$

Downstream Tracks

$$\delta S^{\text{Fit}}_{J/\Psi K_s^0} = 0.0047$$

Systematic errors

Fit Bias - origins

- too small pull width: background
- major contribution to bias: statistics



Vary Tagging calibration parameters $p_0, p_1 \pm$ their systematic uncertainties

1. in the nominal fit
2. in the generation of Toy MC, but fit with original values

Note: Systematic studies on used tagging calibration hasn't finished yet $\longrightarrow$ no official value. We use largest differences in channels so far:

$$\delta p_0^{stat.} = 0.019, \qquad \delta p_1^{stat.} = 0.07$$

Choose highest difference from nominal fit / toy as estimate for the systematic uncertainty

- Long tracks:
- Downstream tracks: $\delta S^{\text{TagCalib}}_{J/\Psi K^0_s} = 0.095$

Note: Estimates very large due to large $\delta p_0^{stat.}$, $\delta p_1^{stat.}$ compared to other calibrations (systematic studies of calibration need to be finished)

Note: just a cross-check, no in-depth analysis

Determination of an acceptance function

- no separation between B_d^0 and $\overline{B_d^0}$
  $\Rightarrow$ simple exponential decay
- neglect lifetime cut ($t > 0.3\text{ps}$)
- contributions to acceptance:
  - turn-on-effect
  - decreasing acceptance for higher lifetimes due to VELO geometry

Systematic errors

Time acceptance

Fit p.d.f

$$\mathcal{P}_{acc}(t) \propto \underbrace{e^{-t/\tau}}_{\text{exp. decay}} \cdot \underbrace{\frac{2}{\pi}\arctan[t \cdot \exp(at+b)]}_{\text{turn-on-effect}} \cdot \underbrace{(1+\beta t)}_{\substack{\text{higher lifetimes} \\ (\beta<0)}}$$

Note: τ will be constrained to the PDG value $\tau = 1,519 \pm 0,007\mathrm{ps}$.

Systematic errors

Time acceptance

Long Tracks

Systematic errors

Time acceptance

Downstream Tracks



Table : Fit results for exponential decay fit with acceptance function. τ was constrained to the PDG value $\tau = 1,519 \pm 0,007\mathrm{ps}$

parameter	long	long
τ	$\pm$	1.519$\pm$0.007
a	$\pm$	52.8$\pm$8.6
b	$\pm$	-9.2$\pm$1.6
β	$\pm$	-0.0053$\pm$0.0089

Systematic errors

Time acceptance

Toy MC Study

- generate with acceptance function
- use parameters mentioned above
- fit without acceptance function
- compare mean of $S_{J/\Psi K_s^0}$ distribution with cooresponding mean of fit bias toy

Assignment of systematic error due to neglect of any time acceptance:

Long Tracks

$$\delta S^{\mathrm{Acc}}_{J/\Psi K_s^0} = xxx$$

Downstream Tracks

$$\delta S^{\mathrm{Acc}}_{J/\Psi K_s^0} = 0.0013$$

Systematic errors

Correlation mass $\leftrightarrow$ decay time

Fit reconstructed B_d^0-mass in different time bins. Subsequently, fix mass values to the values obtained in the 4 bins and fit the whole sample. Choose highest difference of $S_{J/\Psi K_s^0}$ as estimate.

Bin	time range of mass fit	long	down
1	$t \in [0.3, 0.7]\mathrm{ps}$	$\pm$	0.559$\pm$0.069
2	$t \in [0.7, 1.5]\mathrm{ps}$	$\pm$	0.567$\pm$0.068
3	$t \in [1.5, 3]\mathrm{ps}$	$\pm$	0.566$\pm$0.069
4	$t \in [3, 14]\mathrm{ps}$	$\pm$	0.566$\pm$0.069
weighted average		$\pm$	0.565$\pm$0.034
nominal fit		$\pm$	0.565$\pm$0.069
$\delta S_{J/\Psi K_s^0}^{\text{mass/t}}$		xxx	???

Systematic errors

Resolution

Vary σ_i of resolution $\pm 20\%$, fit with these parameters and compare $S_{J/\Psi K_s^0}$

	long	down
$+20\%$	$\pm$	0.565 ± 0.069
-20%	$\pm$	0.564 ± 0.069
nominal fit	$\pm$	0.565 ± 0.069
$\delta S_{J/\Psi K_s^0}^{\text{resolution}}$	xxx	0.001

Systematic errors
Summary

effect	long	downstream
fit method		0.0047
tagging calibration		0.0952
time acceptance		0.0013
mass $\leftrightarrow$ decay time		???
resolution		0.001
total		xxx

Conclusion

Long Tracks

$S_{J/\psi K_s^0} =$
$xxx \pm xxx(\text{stat.}) \pm xxx(\text{syst.})$

Downstream Tracks



$S_{J/\psi K_s^0} =$
$0.565 \pm 0.069(\text{stat.}) \pm xxx(\text{syst.})$

Both results are blinded with the same string

Conclusion

Comparison with other results

	$S_{J/\Psi K_s^0}$
long tracks (blinded)	$\pm$
downstream tracks (blinded)	0.565 ± 0.069
2011 analysis	0.72 ± 0.06
world average	0.679 ± 0.020
BaBar (most precise)	0.687 ± 0.028