An Updated Measurement of the B_s Mixing Phase sin2β_s at CDF

Elisa Pueschel Carnegie Mellon University on behalf of the CDF Collaboration

Physics at the LHC, Hamburg, Germany June 11, 2010

The Tevatron

- p anti-p collisions at a center of mass energy of 1.96 TeV
- ~5 fb⁻¹ data used for this analysis





Possible New Physics in $B_s^0 \rightarrow J/\Psi \varphi$

- $B_s^0 \rightarrow J/\Psi \phi$ decays can occur directly, or via mixing
- Mixing box diagram makes this system a prime place to seach for new physics



• CP violation can occur in interference between direct decays and decays via mixing



• New physics contributions could affect size of CP violation

CP Violation in B_s⁰ Mixing

Time evolution of states is given by the time-dependent Schrodinger equation:





Diagonalizing M (mass matrix) and Γ (decay matrix) translates flavor eigenstates to heavy and light mass eigenstates

$$|B_s^H\rangle = p |B_s^0\rangle - q |\bar{B_s^0}\rangle \qquad |B_s^L\rangle = p |B_s^0\rangle + q |\bar{B_s^0}\rangle \quad \text{where} \quad \frac{q}{p} = \frac{V_{tb}^* V_{ts}}{V_{tb} V_{ts}^*}$$

Observables are:

$$\Delta m_s = m_H - m_L \approx 2 \mid M_{12} \mid$$
$$\Delta \Gamma_s = \Gamma_H - \Gamma_L \approx 2 \mid \Gamma_{12} \mid \cos(\phi_s)$$
$$\phi_s = \arg\left(\frac{-M_{12}}{\Gamma_{12}}\right)$$

Mass difference/oscillation frequency Lifetime/decay width difference CP Phase

β_s in the Standard Model

$$\begin{pmatrix} d'\\s'\\b' \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} V_{ud} & V_{us} & V_{ub}\\V_{cd} & V_{cs} & V_{cb}\\V_{td} & V_{ts} & V_{tb} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} d\\s\\b \end{pmatrix}$$

Use unitary property of CKM matrix to derive unitary relations:



Accessible through B₅⁰→J/Ψφ decays

$$\beta_s^{SM} = \arg\left(-\frac{V_{ts}V_{tb}^*}{V_{cs}V_{cb}^*}\right) \sim \lambda^2 \approx 0.02 \qquad (\lambda = \sin(\theta_{\text{Cabibbo}}))$$

If a new phase, ϕ_s^{NP} exists, $\phi_s = \phi_s^{SM} + \phi_s^{NP} \sim \phi_s^{NP}$, $2\beta_s = 2\beta_s^{SM} - \phi_s^{NP} \sim -\phi_s^{NP}$ For large new physics phase, $2\beta_s = -\phi_s^{NP} = -\phi_s$

$B_s^0 \rightarrow J/\Psi \phi$ Phenomenology

- Final state includes L=0 (S-wave), L=1 (P-wave), L=2 (D-wave) contributions
- Spin states can be mapped to CP states
 - L=0 and L=2 \rightarrow CP even, L=1 \rightarrow CP odd



- Final state amplitudes identified by linear polarizations of J/Ψ and φ
 - A_⊥(t) (transversely polarized, CP odd), A₁₁(t) (transversely polarized, CP even), A₀(t) (longitudinally polarized, CP even)
 - Define angles: $\vec{\rho} = (\theta, \phi, \psi)$

Strong phases:

 $\delta_{||} = \arg(A_{||}(0)A_0^*(0))$ $\delta_{||} = \arg(A_{||}(0)A_0^*(0))$

Analysis Strategy

- Reconstruct $B_s^0 \rightarrow J/\Psi(\rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-) \phi(\rightarrow K^+ K^-)$ events
- Determine relative proportion of CP-odd to CP-even using angular analysis



- Increase sensitivity to β_s by separately tracking time evolution of B_s⁰ and anti-B_s⁰ with flavor tagging algorithms
- Combine angular analysis with time-dependent, flavor-tagged analysis in unbinned maximum likelihood fit
 - Extract parameters of interest: β_s, ΔΓ (decay width difference), τ(B_s⁰) (B_s⁰ average lifetime), transversity amplitudes, strong phases

Non-resonant KK/f₀ Contamination

- B_s⁰→J/Ψ K⁺K⁻ and B_s⁰→J/Ψ f₀ could contaminate B_s⁰→J/Ψφ signal and bias measurement of β_s
 - Include possibility of nonresonant KK/f₀ in likelihood
 - Model both states as flat in φ mass region
 - Perform mass integration over φ mass window



A fit to KK invariant mass does not show large S-wave contamination

Symmetries of Likelihood

 The likelihood (before adding S-wave) reveals an exact symmetry

 $(\beta_s, \Delta\Gamma, \delta_{\perp}, \delta_{||}) \Leftrightarrow (\pi/2 - \beta_s, -\Delta\Gamma, \pi - \delta_{\perp}, 2\pi - \delta_{||})$

- Creates an ambiguity in measurement of βs
- Addition of (substantial) S-wave breaks the symmetry
 - S-P interference term is not invariant under the old transformation
 - Removes ambiguity, leaving one solution for β_s

Previous results







CDF: 2.8 fb⁻¹ + D \emptyset : 2.8 fb⁻¹ P-value for SM point = 3.4%

CDF

- Data collected at CDF using dimuon trigger
- This analysis relies on:
 - tracking subsystems for mass and spatial resolution
 - decay time resolution
 ~0.1ps (B lifetime is
 ~1.5ps)
 - particle identification (dE/dx and time of flight) for selection and tagging



Signal Selection

- Suppress background using artificial neural network
 - Training variables include p_T of tracks and decay particles, vertex probability for decay particles
 - Cut on neural network output is chosen by minimizing β_s errors on pseudoexperiments



OST Calibration

- Calibrate opposite side tagger using B⁺→J/Ψ K⁺ events, which have same opposite side fragmentation behavior as B_s⁰
- $B^+ \rightarrow J/\Psi K^+$ decays are self-tagging
 - Compare measured to predicted dilution



SSKT Calibration

- Remeasured B_s⁰ mixing on 5.2 fb⁻¹ of data
 - $B_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- \pi^+$ and $B_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- (3\pi)^+$ channels
- For amplitude scan of Δm_s, probability normalized such that A=1 at true value of Δm_s
 - Measured amplitude relates measured to predicted dilution
 - A = 0.94 ± 0.15 (stat) ± 0.13 (syst)
 - $\Delta m_s = 17.79 \pm 0.07 \text{ ps}^{-1}$



Fit Projections

Check performance of fit with fit projections of proper time and transversity angles



Results: Lifetime and Width Difference

- Likelihood shows biases (particularly for β_s) and non-Gaussian behaviors
 - Likelihood with CP violation fixed to zero is well-behaved, use to make point estimates

 $c\tau_s = 458.7 \pm 7.5(stat) \pm 3.6(syst)\mu m$ $\Delta\Gamma_s = 0.075 \pm 0.035(stat) \pm 0.01(syst)ps^{-1}$ $|A_{||}(0)|^2 = 0.231 \pm 0.014(stat) \pm 0.015(syst)$ $|A_0(0)|^2 = 0.524 \pm 0.013(stat) \pm 0.015(syst)$ $\phi_{\perp} = 2.95 \pm 0.64(stat) \pm 0.07(syst)$

Systematics include modeling of angular efficiency, mass distributions, resolution function, background lifetime, background angular distributions, tracking alignment

Results: Final contour

- Profile likelihood ordering technique used to guarantee coverage at 68% and 95% confidence levels
- P-value at SM point is 44%
- Two solutions are still of nearly identical depth, cannot choose one solution over the other



Results: β_s Scan



P-value at SM point is 31%

 $\beta_s \in [0.02, \, 0.52] \; U \; [1.08, \, 1.55] \; \text{at} \; 68\% \; CL$ $\beta_s \in [-0.13, \, 0.68] \; U \; [0.89, \, \pi/2] \; U \; [-\pi/2, \, -1.44] \; \text{at} \; 95\% \; CL$

Results: S-wave Fraction

 Likelihood scan of S-wave fraction finds non-resonant KK/f₀ fraction <6.7 at 95% CL



Conclusions

- Latest measurement of β_s using $B_s^0 \rightarrow J/\Psi \varphi$ decays
- Errors on β_s have decreased significantly from previous measurements
- Consistency with Standard Model expection has improved from previous measurements
- CDF will double data sample by end of Run II, allowing even more precise measurement



Backup

Some Equations

Time dependence of transversity amplitudes is given by

$$A_{i} = \frac{e^{-imt}e^{-\Gamma t/2}}{\sqrt{\tau_{H} + \tau_{L} \pm \cos 2\beta_{s} (\tau_{L} - \tau_{H})}} \begin{bmatrix} E_{+}(t) \pm e^{2i\beta_{s}}E_{-}(t) \end{bmatrix} A_{i}(0)$$

$$\bar{A}_{i} = \frac{e^{-imt}e^{-\Gamma t/2}}{\sqrt{\tau_{H} + \tau_{L} \pm \cos 2\beta_{s} (\tau_{L} - \tau_{H})}} \begin{bmatrix} \pm E_{+}(t) + e^{-2i\beta_{s}}E_{-}(t) \end{bmatrix} A_{i}(0)$$
where $E_{\pm}(t) \equiv \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} e^{+\left(-\Delta\Gamma + i\Delta m_{s}\right)t} \pm e^{-\left(-\Delta\Gamma + i\Delta m_{s}\right)t} \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$
If we form the vectors A and \bar{A}
we can express the B or anti-B probability as a function of time and angle
$$A(t) = (A_{0}(t)\cos\psi, -\frac{A_{\parallel}(t)\sin\psi}{\sqrt{2}}, i\frac{A_{\perp}(t)\sin\psi}{\sqrt{2}})$$

$$\bar{A}(t) = (\bar{A}_{0}(t)\cos\psi, -\frac{\bar{A}_{\parallel}(t)\sin\psi}{\sqrt{2}}, i\frac{\bar{A}_{\perp}(t)\sin\psi}{\sqrt{2}})$$
where $\hat{n} = (\sin\theta\cos\phi, \sin\theta\sin\phi, \cos\theta)$

$$P_{\bar{B}}(\theta, \phi, \psi, t) = \frac{9}{16\pi} |\bar{A}(t) \times \hat{n}|^{2}$$

$$22$$

Likelihood

Likelihood is given by:

$$\mathcal{L} = (f_{s} \cdot P_{s}(\underline{m}) \cdot P_{s}(\underline{\xi}) \cdot T(t, \psi, \theta, \phi, \mathcal{D}, \xi) \cdot P_{s}(\sigma_{t}) \cdot P_{s}(\mathcal{D}) + (1 - f_{s}) \cdot P_{b}(\underline{m}) \cdot P_{b}(\underline{\xi}) \cdot P_{b}(t, \sigma_{t}) \cdot P_{b}(\psi) \cdot P_{b}(\theta) \cdot P_{b}(\phi) \cdot P_{b}(\sigma_{t}) \cdot P_{b}(\mathcal{D})$$
Signal fraction Mass Tag Decision Proper time error Dilution
Dilution scale factor Proper time Angles Angular Efficiency
$$T(t, \psi, \theta, \phi, \mathcal{D}_{1}, \mathcal{D}_{2}, \xi_{1}, \xi_{2}) = \frac{1 + \xi_{1}(s)\mathcal{D}_{1}}{1 + |\xi_{1}|} \frac{1 + \xi_{2}s_{2}\mathcal{D}_{2}}{1 + |\xi_{2}|} P(t, \psi, \theta, \phi) \underbrace{\epsilon(\psi, \theta, \phi)}_{N} \otimes G_{1}(\sigma_{t})G_{2}(\sigma_{t}) + \frac{1 - \xi_{1}s_{1}\mathcal{D}_{1}}{1 + |\xi_{1}|} \frac{1 - \xi_{2}s_{2}\mathcal{D}_{2}}{1 + |\xi_{2}|} P(t, \psi, \theta, \phi) \underbrace{\epsilon(\psi, \theta, \phi)}_{N} \otimes G_{1}(\sigma_{t})G_{2}(\sigma_{t}) + \frac{1 - \xi_{1}s_{1}\mathcal{D}_{1}}{1 + |\xi_{2}|} \frac{1 - \xi_{2}s_{2}\mathcal{D}_{2}}{1 + |\xi_{2}|} P(t, \psi, \theta, \phi) \underbrace{\epsilon(\psi, \theta, \phi)}_{N} \otimes G_{1}(\sigma_{t})G_{2}(\sigma_{t}) + \frac{1 - \xi_{1}s_{1}\mathcal{D}_{1}}{1 + |\xi_{2}|} \frac{1 - \xi_{2}s_{2}\mathcal{D}_{2}}{1 + |\xi_{2}|} P(t, \psi, \theta, \phi) \underbrace{\epsilon(\psi, \theta, \phi)}_{N} \otimes G_{1}(\sigma_{t})G_{2}(\sigma_{t}) + \frac{1 - \xi_{1}s_{1}\mathcal{D}_{1}}{1 + |\xi_{2}|} \frac{1 - \xi_{2}s_{2}\mathcal{D}_{2}}{1 + |\xi_{2}|} P(t, \psi, \theta, \phi) \underbrace{\epsilon(\psi, \theta, \phi)}_{N} \otimes G_{1}(\sigma_{t})G_{2}(\sigma_{t}) + \frac{1 - \xi_{1}s_{1}\mathcal{D}_{1}}{1 + |\xi_{2}|} \frac{1 - \xi_{2}s_{2}\mathcal{D}_{2}}{1 + |\xi_{2}|} P(t, \psi, \theta, \phi) \underbrace{\epsilon(\psi, \theta, \phi)}_{N} \otimes G_{1}(\sigma_{t})G_{2}(\sigma_{t})} + \frac{1 - \xi_{1}s_{1}\mathcal{D}_{1}}{1 + |\xi_{2}|} P(t, \psi, \theta, \phi) \underbrace{\epsilon(\psi, \theta, \phi)}_{N} \otimes G_{1}(\sigma_{t})G_{2}(\sigma_{t})} + \frac{1 - \xi_{1}s_{1}\mathcal{D}_{1}}{1 + |\xi_{2}|} P(t, \psi, \theta, \phi) \underbrace{\epsilon(\psi, \theta, \phi)}_{N} \otimes G_{1}(\sigma_{t})G_{2}(\sigma_{t})} + \frac{1 - \xi_{1}s_{1}\mathcal{D}_{1}}{1 + |\xi_{2}|} P(t, \psi, \theta, \phi) \underbrace{\epsilon(\psi, \theta, \phi)}_{N} \otimes G_{1}(\sigma_{t})G_{2}(\sigma_{t})} + \frac{1 - \xi_{1}s_{1}\mathcal{D}_{1}}{1 + |\xi_{2}|} P(t, \psi, \theta, \phi) \underbrace{\epsilon(\psi, \theta, \phi)}_{N} \otimes G_{1}(\sigma_{t})G_{2}(\sigma_{t})} + \frac{1 - \xi_{1}s_{1}\mathcal{D}_{1}}{1 + |\xi_{2}|} P(t, \psi, \theta, \phi) \underbrace{\epsilon(\psi, \theta, \phi)}_{N} \otimes G_{1}(\sigma_{t})G_{2}(\sigma_{t})} + \frac{1 - \xi_{1}s_{1}\mathcal{D}_{1}} + \frac{1 - \xi$$

Flavor Tagging

- Most b quarks at Tevatron produced in b anti-b pairs
- Same side tagger uses charge of kaon produced in association with B_s⁰ meson
- Opposite side tagger uses charge of decay products from event's other B hadron

 Tagging algorithms return a tag decision and a predicted dilution (related to probability of correct tag: P_{Correct} = (1+D)/2)



Detector Sculpting • Account for detector sculpting of transversity angles Calculate angular efficiencies on realistic $B_s^0 \rightarrow J/\Psi \phi$ Monte Carlo Efficiency in $cos(\theta)$ Efficiency in $cos(\psi)$ Efficiency in ϕ 80.05 0.045 80^{0.05} 0^{0.045} 0.05 0.05 0.045 Ja 0.04 per 0.04 0.04 candidates 0.03 0.03 0.02 Candidates 0.03-0.02-0.02-0.035 0.03-0.025 0.02-0.015 50.015 0.015 10.0 UI Ltaction 0 0.01-0.005-0+ -1 0_† ი0 -0.8 -0.6 -0.4 -0.2 0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 -0.8 -0.6 -0.4 -0.2 0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 5 6 $\cos(\theta)$ φ [rad] $\cos(\psi)$

Modeling Background Angles

 Background angles are described empirically using B_s⁰ mass sidebands

