B[±]→D⁰(K_s $\pi^+\pi^-$)K[±] Dalitz analysis at LHCb

Susan Haines University of Cambridge

IoP HEPP/APP 2010, March 30th 2010





Overview

- CKM angle γ
- B⁻→DK⁻ measurements
- Dalitz analysis of $B^- \rightarrow D(K_s \pi \pi)K^-$
- MC studies
- First look at 2009 collision data
- 2010/2011 what can we expect?



CKM angle γ "from trees"

 Tightest experimental constraints on γ from loop processes, which are sensitive to new physics



• Current value of γ from direct measurement $\gamma = (73^{+22}_{-25})^{\circ}$ (CKMfitter)



Tree-level processes are expected to be dominated by Standard Model

- Differences between tree-level and loop
 Unitarity Triangles ⇒ new physics
- Also test SM unitarity and 3 generation model by overconstraining tree Unitarity Triangle
- Aim to measure γ from trees to much higher precision: sensitivity from expected total LHCb data set (10 fb⁻¹) 1.9-2.7°, including systematics⁽¹⁾



(1) K. Akiba et al., LHCb-2008-031 (2008)

Time integrated $B^- \rightarrow DK^-$ measurements

 Sensitive to γ at tree level when D⁰ or D
⁰ decays to same final state, due to interference effects



Diagram b) CKM and colour suppressed

 No penguin loop contributions – largest correction is from D^{0-D̄0} mixing, giving bias <<1° on γ⁽²⁾

LHCb

(2) Yu. Grossman, A. Soffer and J. Zupan, Phys. Rev. D 72, 031501 (2005)



- Possible D decay modes include⁽³⁾
 - ππ, KK, Kπ (GLW⁽⁴⁾/ADS⁽⁵⁾ analysis combined)
 - Kπππ (ADS-type analysis with resonances)
 - $K_s \pi \pi$ (Dalitz analysis)



(3) LHCb collaboration, LHCb-PUB-2009-029 (2009)

(4) M. Gronau and D. London, Phys. Lett. B 253, 483 (1991); M. Gronau and D. Wyler, Phys. Lett. B 265, 172 (1991)

(5) D. Atwood, I. Dunietz and A. Soni, Phys. Rev. Lett. 78, 3257 (1997); D. Atwood, I. Dunietz and A. Soni, Phys. Rev. D 63, 036005 (2001) Susan Haines

Dalitz analysis: $B^{-} \rightarrow D(K_{s} \pi \pi)K^{-}$

Analysis of 3 body self-conjugate D decay^(6,7) with rich resonance structure

Bands centred on invariant mass of 2body intermediate states



 Sensitivity to γ from differences in Dalitz plot of D decay from B⁻→DK⁻ and B⁺→DK⁺



(6) A. Giri, Yu. Grossman, A. Soffer and J. Zupan, Phys. Rev. D 68, 054018 (2003)
 (7) A. Bondar, Proceedings of BINP Special Analysis Meeting on Dalitz Analysis, 24-26 Sep. 2002, unpublished Susan Haines

- Two methods to determine γ :
 - Model-dependent likelihood fit; model assumptions give systematic error (8,9)
 - Model-independent binned method; uses strong phase difference from CLEO-c, has lower statistical precision



(8) B. Aubert et al. (BaBar collaboration), Phys. Rev. D 78(3), 034023 (2008)

(9) A. Poluektov on behalf of the Belle collaboration, 'CPV measurements in B decays at Belle', presented at The 2009 Europhysics Conference on High Energy Physics, July 16th–22nd 2009, Krakow



Study on 14 TeV MC

Cut-based event selection on MC simulation at

CoM energy 14 TeV

- 2 fb⁻¹ yield of **14376±397** events⁽¹⁰⁾ (no trigger)
- Study identified several categories of background, including combinatoric and specific B→DK/B→Dπ decays⁽¹⁰⁾
- Largest background real D plus random K



LHCb

(10) V. Gibson, C. Lazzeroni, Y. Y. Li, LHCb-2008-028 (2008)

 Sensitivity to γ found using toy MC with Belle and BaBar resonance models^(11,8)



Latest Belle result⁽¹⁴⁾ (605 fb⁻¹):

$\gamma = 78.4^{\circ + 10.8^{\circ}}_{-11.6^{\circ}} \pm 3.6^{\circ} \text{ (syst)} \pm 8.9^{\circ} \text{ (model)}$

(11) K. Abe et al. (Belle collaboration), arXiv:0803.3375v1 (2008)
(8) B. Aubert et al. (BaBar collaboration), Phys. Rev. D, 78(3):034023 (2008)
(12) Y. Y. Li, Thesis, (2009)
(13) Y. Y. Li, B+/- ->D(Kspipi) K+/- at LHCb, presented at LHCb-UK Dalitz plot workshop, Warwick, 2nd October 2009
(14) A. Poluektov et al. (Belle collaboration), arXiv: 1003.3360v1 (2010)



Study on 10 TeV MC – preparation for first data

- Simulation at 10 TeV CoM energy
- New cut-based event selection optimising # Signal/\(# Signal + # Background) and associated preselection
- 2 fb⁻¹ yield of 12655±310 signal events (no trigger)
- Non-peaking background < 6262 events at 90% conf.



Example cuts:



Selection efficiency (2.838±0.049)x10⁻³



K_s mass peaks from B⁻→D($K_s \pi \pi$)K⁻ optimised selection (2009 collisions)



Promising results!

See backup for peaks from dedicated 2009 LHCb Ks selection

What is expected in 2010/2011?

- MC at 7 TeV CoM energy currently in production...
- 1 fb⁻¹ of data, assume σ_{bb̄} = 454 μb (Pythia); efficiency from 10 TeV MC with optimised selection:

Yield ~ 8000 events (no trigger)

Trigger eff ~50% depending on running conditions

- Sensitivity estimate ~ same as 2 fb⁻¹ at 14 TeV,
 i.e. σ(γ) = 12°
- Close to latest Belle result errors (slide 10)



Conclusions

- γ from trees is a key measurement at LHCb
- Differences between tree-level and loop Unitarity Triangles would point to new physics
- B⁻→D(K_sππ)K⁻ analysis ready for 2010/2011 data – could provide competitive measurement



Backup – yield calculations

- $N_{year} = L_{year} \times \sigma_{b\overline{b}} \times 2 \times Br(b \rightarrow B^{\pm}) \times Br(B^{\pm} \rightarrow DK^{\pm}) \times Br(D \rightarrow K_{s} \pi \pi) \times Br(K_{s} \rightarrow \pi \pi) \times \varepsilon_{selection}$
- For 14 TeV CoM energy MC study, assume 2 fb⁻¹ integrated luminosity, σ_{bb̄} taken as 500µb
- For 10 TeV CoM energy MC study, assume 2 fb⁻¹ integrated luminosity, $\sigma_{b\overline{b}}$ taken as 336µb



Backup – K_s mass peaks

 K_s mass peaks from LHCb 2009 collision data, using dedicated K_s selection optimised for this data – official results



M. Schiller