CPT Violation in $\phi \to K^0\overline{K}^0$

Can we study it in LHCb?

Sonja Bartkowski
Supervisors: Giulio Dujany & George Lafferty
In collaboration with Lorenzo Capriotti, Jonathan Harrison, Wojciech Krzemien, Jeroen Van Tilburg, & Wojciech Wislicki

September 1, 2015

Who I am

- Master student at the TU Dortmund, Germany
- Last summer:
  - Bachelor thesis with ATLAS (top physics)
  - Quantum information processing summer school
- This fall:
  - Start of my master thesis (ATLAS exotics)
- This summer:



- And of course the project I am about to show you!

CPT Violation in neutral kaon systems

$$|\phi\rangle \rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\left|K^0\right\rangle\left|\overline{K}^0\right\rangle - \left|\overline{K}^0\right\rangle\left|K^0\right\rangle\right) = \frac{N}{\sqrt{2}}\left(|K_S\rangle\,|K_L\rangle - |K_L\rangle\,|K_S\rangle\right)$$

- K_S and K_L are not CP eigenstates
- $K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ as well as $K_S \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$, $\mathcal{BR}(K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-) \sim 2 \cdot 10^{-3}$
- Interference in decay intensity:

$$I(t_1, t_2) \propto e^{-\Gamma_L t_1 - \Gamma_S t_2} + e^{-\Gamma_S t_1 - \Gamma_L t_2} - 2e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\Gamma_S + \Gamma_L)(t_1 + t_2)} \cos\left(\Delta m \left(t_1 - t_2\right)\right)$$

CPT Violation in neutral kaon systems

$$|\phi\rangle \rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\left|K^0\right\rangle\left|\overline{K}^0\right\rangle - \left|\overline{K}^0\right\rangle\left|K^0\right\rangle\right) = \frac{N}{\sqrt{2}}\left(|K_S\rangle\,|K_L\rangle - |K_L\rangle\,|K_S\rangle\right)$$

- K_S and K_L are not CP eigenstates
- $K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ as well as $K_S \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$, $\mathcal{BR}(K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-) \sim 2 \cdot 10^{-3}$
- Interference in decay intensity:

$$I(t_1, t_2) \propto e^{-\Gamma_L t_1 - \Gamma_S t_2} + e^{-\Gamma_S t_1 - \Gamma_L t_2} - 2e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\Gamma_S + \Gamma_L)(t_1 + t_2)} \cos\left(\Delta m\left(t_1 - t_2\right)\right)$$

CPT Violation in neutral kaon systems

$$|\phi\rangle \rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\left|K^0\right\rangle\left|\overline{K}^0\right\rangle - \left|\overline{K}^0\right\rangle\left|K^0\right\rangle\right) = \frac{N}{\sqrt{2}}\left(|K_S\rangle|K_L\rangle - |K_L\rangle|K_S\rangle\right)$$

- K_S and K_L are not CP eigenstates
- $K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ as well as $K_S \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$, $\mathcal{BR}(K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-) \sim 2 \cdot 10^{-3}$
- Interference in decay intensity:

$$I(t_1, t_2) \propto e^{-\Gamma_L t_1 - \Gamma_S t_2} + e^{-\Gamma_S t_1 - \Gamma_L t_2} - 2(1 - \zeta_{SL})e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\Gamma_S + \Gamma_L)(t_1 + t_2)}\cos\left(\Delta m\left(t_1 - t_2\right)\right)$$

Intrinsical violation of CPT introduces decoherence term.

CPT Violation in neutral kaon systems

Intrinsical violation of CPT introduces decoherence term.[1]

$$I(t_1, t_2) \propto e^{-\Gamma_L t_1 - \Gamma_S t_2} + e^{-\Gamma_S t_1 - \Gamma_L t_2}$$
$$- 2(1 - \zeta_{SL}) e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\Gamma_S + \Gamma_L)(t_1 + t_2)} \cos\left(\Delta m\left(t_1 - t_2\right)\right)$$



[CPT and Quantum Mechanics Tests with Kaons, J. Bernabeu et al., arXiv:hep-ph/0607322]

$\Rightarrow$ Excess of 4π decays for small Δt

[1] There are different decoherence models, but we will stick with this one for now for the sake of simplicity.

Comparison of two approaches

Prompt ϕ

- high production cross section



$D_S^\pm \to \phi\pi^\pm$

- lower rate ($\sim$1%)
- possibly better handle on background rejection



- First study on the prompt ϕ approach
- Compare with D_S approach

Terminology

Signal:	Excess of $\phi \to$ 2 neutral kaons $\to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^+\pi^-$ for Δt small due to CPT violation
SM background:	Resulting from CPV, $\phi \to K_L K_S \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^+\pi^-$
Regeneration background:	Regeneration $K_L \to K_S$ in material
Combinatoric background:	Prompt kaons and pions

Selection

- Stripping for the prompt ϕ approach already existed



Selection

- Developed selection for $D_S \to \phi\pi$
  - Cuts on the mass regions of ϕ and D_S
  - Cuts on the χ^2 of the impact parameter of ϕ to exclude prompt ϕ





Efficiencies

	Prompt ϕ	$D_s \to \phi\pi$
Cross section (14 TeV), LHCb acceptance	3516 µb	388 µb
Branching fractions	34.2%	4.5% · 34.2%
Fiducial cuts efficiency	2.5%	7.0%
Prob. $K_s K_s \to 4\pi$, exactly 1 (2) decays inside bp	15.1% (2.8%)	
Prob. $K_s K_L \to 4\pi$ (CPV), exactly 1 (2) decays inside bp	$3.98 \cdot 10^{-7}$ ($4.99 \cdot 10^{-10}$)	
Upper limit KLOE prob. $K_s K_L \to 4\pi$ (CPV + CPTV), exactly 1 (2) decays inside bp	$5.13 \cdot 10^{-7}$ ($1.64 \cdot 10^{-8}$)	
Reconstruction & selection efficiency	7.9% (7.6%)	1.4% (3.9%)
L0 efficiency	16.1% (18.6%)	23.0% (19.5%)
HLT1 efficiency	13.7% (16.7%)	35.6% (25.0%)
HLT2 efficiency	65.6% (100.0%)	68.8% (100.0%)
Total efficiency SM background	$4.39 \cdot 10^{-5}$ ($5.85 \cdot 10^{-5}$)	$8.18 \cdot 10^{-5}$ ($1.32 \cdot 10^{-4}$)
Expected events SM background / fb^{-1}	21 ($3.51 \cdot 10^{-2}$)	$1.94 \cdot 10^{-1}$ ($3.94 \cdot 10^{-4}$)
Upper limit for signal (KLOE)	27 (1.15)	$2.5 \cdot 10^{-1}$ ($1.29 \cdot 10^{-2}$)
Background (data 2012) / fb^{-1}	163110 (29120)	450 (2030)

Efficiencies

Conclusion:

- Background dominates over signal for both approaches
- For the D_S approach, both signal and background rate go down by two orders of magnitude compared to the prompt ϕ approach
  - There is no big improvement in the signal to background ratio

Feasibility study for prompt ϕ

Studies of minimum bias Monte Carlo suggest that 80% background is prompt K_S

- this background is irreducible
- $I(t_1, t_2) \propto e^{-\Gamma_S t_1}\, e^{-\Gamma_S t_2}$

Toy study with RooFit!

- decay intensity
- momentum distribution
- 1 kaon decaying inside beampipe
- regeneration not taken into account

But first: Studying resolution for toy study

Time resolution



Resolution of the core of the distribution is a few ps

$\Rightarrow$ 5 ps binning in toy study

Feasibility study for prompt ϕ





Feasibility study for prompt ϕ

- Using optimistic signal to background ratio of $4 \cdot 10^{-4}$
- RooStats profile likelihood calculator
- Fitted with square root of luminosity



For KLOE limit

$$\zeta_{SL} = 0.098$$

$$\Downarrow$$

$$\int L\, dt \approx 275\ \text{fb}^{-1},$$

extrapolated from fit

Summary

- Selection for $D_S \to \phi\pi$ implemented
- Compared the prompt ϕ and the D_S approach
  - For both strategies, the background dominates.
- The time resolution is a few ps
- Performed a toy study for the prompt ϕ approach to estimate limits we can set on CPTV

After my studies, the prospects for this analysis look bleak.

Summary

- Selection for $D_S \to \phi\pi$ implemented
- Compared the prompt ϕ and the D_S approach
  - For both strategies, the background dominates.
- The time resolution is a few ps
- Performed a toy study for the prompt ϕ approach to estimate limits we can set on CPTV

After my studies, the prospects for this analysis look bleak.

Thank you for your attention!

BACKUP


Ks1_TAU-Ks1_TRUETAU:Ks2_TAU-Ks2_TRUETAU {Ds_DTF_CHI2_PV>=0 && phi_BKGCAT==0 && abs(Ks1_TAU-Ks1_TRUETAU) <.02 && abs(Ks2_TAU-Ks2_TRUETAU) < .02}
Ks1_TAU-Ks1_TRUETAU
Ks2_TAU-Ks2_TRUETAU
0.02
0.015
0.01
0.005
0
−0.005
−0.01
−0.015
−0.02


Ds_DTF_TAU_Ks1/299.792458-Ks1_TRUETAU:Ds_DTF_TAU_Ks2/299.792458-Ks2_TRUETAU {Ds_DTF_CHI2_PV>=0 && phi_BKGCAT==0 && abs(Ds_DTF_TAU_Ks1/299.792458-Ks1_TRUETAU) <.02 && abs(Ds_DTF_TAU_Ks2/299.792458-Ks2_TRUETAU) < .02}
Ds_DTF_TAU_Ks1/299.792458-Ks1_TRUETAU
0.02
0.015
0.01
0.005
0
−0.005
−0.01
−0.015
−0.02
−0.02 −0.015 −0.01 −0.005 0 0.005 0.01 0.015 0.02
Ds_DTF_TAU_Ks2/299.792458-Ks2_TRUETAU


Ds_DTF_TAU_Ks1:Ds_DTF_TAU_Ks1/299.792458-Ks1_TRUETAU {Ds_DTF_CHI2_PV>=0 && phi_BKGCAT==0}
Ds_DTF_TAU_Ks1
120
100
80
60
40
20
–0.2
–0.1
0
0.1
0.2
0.3
0.4
Ds_DTF_TAU_Ks1/299.792458-Ks1_TRUETAU

Toy study

- Generated toy data as the weighted sum of two distributions in decay times:
  1. Combinatoric background of prompt K_S with decay intensity
  $$I(t_1, t_2) \propto e^{-\Gamma_S t_1} e^{-\Gamma_S t_2}$$
  2. SM background with decay intensity
  $$\begin{aligned} I(t_1, t_2) \propto & e^{-\Gamma_L t_1 - \Gamma_S t_2} + e^{-\Gamma_S t_1 - \Gamma_L t_2} \\ & - 2e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\Gamma_S + \Gamma_L)(t_1 + t_2)} \cos\left(\Delta m \left(t_1 - t_2\right)\right) \end{aligned}$$
- Ratio of SM background to combinatoric background from efficiency study
- Fitted to
$$\begin{aligned} I(t_1, t_2) \propto & e^{-\Gamma_L t_1 - \Gamma_S t_2} + e^{-\Gamma_S t_1 - \Gamma_L t_2} \\ & - 2(1 - \zeta_{SL}) e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\Gamma_S + \Gamma_L)(t_1 + t_2)} \cos\left(\Delta m \left(t_1 - t_2\right)\right) \end{aligned}$$
- Derived limit on ζ_{SL} from fit result

Selection - prompt ϕ

Prompt ϕ production

- Stripping PhiToKSKS_PhiToKsKsLine

  π TRGHOSTPROB < 0.35
  P $>$ 2.GeV
  MIPCHI2DV(PRIMARY) $>$ 9.
  K_S ADMASS('KS0') < 35.MeV
  VFASPF(VCHI2) < 25.
  ϕ LL or LD combinations $^{*)}$
  APT > 400 MeV
  VFASPF(VCHI2/VDOF) < 6
  MIPCHI2DV(PRIMARY) < 9
  M < 1100 MeV

- 1010 MeV $<$phi_M$<$ 1030 MeV

$^{*)}$ because of regeneration, KLOE follows the same approach

Selection - $D_s \to \phi\pi$

- Selection (inspired by PhiToKSKS_PhiToKsKsLine and other charm lines) on CHARMCOMPLETEEVENT.DST

$\pi(K_S)$
PT $>$ 150 MeV
BPVIPCHI2() $>$ 1.0
TRCHI2DOF $<$ 5
TRGHOSTPROB $<$ 0.3

K_S
ADMASS('KS0') $<$ 35 MeV
VFASPF(VCHI2) $<$ 2.
PT $>$ 200 MeV
BPVVD $>$ 10.0 mm
BPVVDCHI2 $>$ 100
VFASPF(VCHI2PDOF) $<$ 10
BPVDIRA $>$ 0.999

ϕ
LL or LD combinations
ADMASS('phi(1020)')$<$70 MeV
VFASPF(VCHI2/VDOF) $<$ 6
APT $>$ 400 MeV

$\pi(D_S)$
TRGHOSTPROB $<$ 0.35
P $>$ 2 GeV
MIPCHI2DV(PRIMARY) $>$ 9

D_S
ADMASS('D_s+') $<$ 150MeV
(BPVVDCHI2 $>$ 16.0) or
(BPVLTIME() $>$ 0.150 ps)
VFASPF(VCHI2/VDOF) $<$ 25.0

- 1010 MeV$<$phi_M$<$1030 MeV & 1955 MeV$<$Ds_M$<$1985 MeV
- IPCHI2 $\geq$ 15, (possible to tighten cut if more MC statistics available)

Backgrounds

Estimates from minimum bias MC (42 M events). The number in brackets is the number of background events with physical K_s.

Background category	prompt ϕ	$D_s \to \phi\pi$
light flavour	17(17)	0
$b\overline{b}$	1(1)	0
different PV	3(2)	0
physical bkg, partl. reconstructed	1(1)	1(1)
ghosts	0	1(0)
total	21(20)	2(1)

Remaining background for prompt ϕ is mostly irreducible.

Terminology



Time resolution