Imperial College London

Rare decays at LHCb Ulrik Egede

Angular analysis of $B^0 \rightarrow K^{*0}\mu^+\mu^-$ Search for $B \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ Search for lepton number violation in $B^+ \rightarrow h^-\mu^+\mu^+$

PANIC, July 2011, MIT

Introduction

LHCb as a probe for Rare Decays

Results presented here are for data collected in about 300 pb⁻¹ of integrated luminosity

- Collected in just 3 months of 2011
- Already the best results in the world



What do we mean by Rare Decays?

Flavour Changing Neutral Current decays that are only allowed in the SM at loop level

SM and New Physics on equal footing opening up possibility for large NP effects

Exclusive decays are a good probe for New Physics High sensitivity, i.e. large changes to observables may occur

Few constraints from other measurements, so probes new "regions" of physics

Theoretical uncertainties are small

Systematics are not an issue for a long time.

An effective theory for New Physics

 $\mathscr{L}_{\text{eff}} = \mathscr{L}_{\text{gauge}}(A_i, \Psi_j; \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{C}) + \mathscr{L}_{\text{Higgs}}(A_i, \Psi_j, \varphi; \langle \varphi \rangle) + \sum_{d>4} \frac{\mathbf{C}^n}{\Lambda^{d-4}} O_n^d$

 O_d^n : All possible operators with heavy d.o.f c^n : Parameters arising from New Physics Λ : Energy scale of New Physics

- $B^0 \rightarrow K^{*0}\mu^+\mu^-$ sensitive to C⁷, C⁹ and C¹⁰ and in particular the right handed counterparts
- $B \to \mu^+ \mu^-$ sensitive to scalar operators, e.g SUSY Higgs sector

Analysis strategy for $B^0 \to K^{\star 0} \mu^+ \mu^-$

Select events with boosted decision tree

Trained on $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^{*0}$ control channel and signal side-band from 2010 data

Correct for efficiency

Use event-by-event correction

Verify analysis

Use known $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^{*0}$ angular distribution

Fit for observables

Perform simultaneous fit to mass and angular distribution



The signal from 309 pb⁻¹

After J/ ψ and ψ (2S) vetoes, we see 302±20 signal events

 $B^0 \rightarrow K^{*0} \mu^+ \mu^-$ signal is very clean!



Regions of squared di-muon mass, q²

In each of the bins we have signal significance of 5 or higher



25 July 2011

Efficiency correction

Events are individually efficiency corrected based on their kinematics in the B rest frame

Simulation calibrated with data driven input on PID and detector resolution

Method cross checked by fitting $B^0 \to J/\psi K^{*0}$

When including S-wave, result is in very good agreement with BaBar analysis





Fit for observables

An unbinned likelihood fit with event-by-event weights is performed for each q² bin

Simultaneous fit to mass, θ_{κ} and θ_{I} projections

Signal

 $\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{Crystal \ Ball \ in \ mass} \\ & \frac{1}{\Gamma} \frac{\mathrm{d}^2 \Gamma}{\mathrm{d} \cos \theta_K \, \mathrm{d} q^2} = \frac{3}{2} F_L \cos^2 \theta_K + \frac{3}{4} (1 - F_L) (1 - \cos^2 \theta_K) \\ & \frac{1}{\Gamma} \frac{\mathrm{d}^2 \Gamma}{\mathrm{d} \cos \theta_\ell \, \mathrm{d} q^2} = \frac{3}{4} F_L (1 - \cos^2 \theta_\ell) + \frac{3}{8} (1 - F_L) (1 + \cos^2 \theta_\ell) + A_{FB} \cos \theta_\ell \end{aligned}$

Background

Exponential in mass Polynomial in angles

Systematic evaluations

Issues related to efficiency correction

- Variation in PID and detector resolution corrections
- Trigger modelling
- Uncertainty in B momentum spectra
- Track reconstruction efficiency

Fitting

Signal shape uncertainty

Background shape uncertainty

The largest systematics are all dominated by statistics of data or simulation

Same analysis strategy can be used for much larger sample Total error is never more than 10% larger than statistics only error

Differential decay rate



Differential decay rate



CDF: Result presented at EPS BELLE: PRL103:171801,2009 BaBar: PRD73:092001,2006

K^{*0} longitudinal polarisation, F₁



Errors from Bayesian approach with flat prior for physical region of F_1 , A_{FB} plane. Systematics included.

25 July 2011

Ulrik Egede



K^{*0} longitudinal polarisation, F₁



Forward-backward asymmetry A_{FB}



Tabulated results, including $1 < q^2 < 6 \text{ GeV}^2/c^4$ results available in backup slides

25 July 2011

Forward-backward asymmetry A_{FB}



Analysis strategy for $B \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ search

- Use highly efficient muon trigger
- Perform loose selection based on di-muon secondary vertex
- Train boosted decision tree to separate signal from background with real muons
- Calibrate BDT from control channels
- Normalise event yield from control channels

Count events in BDT and invariant mass bins and extract limit

Calibration

BDT calibrated from sidebands (background) and $B \to h^+h^-$ (signal)

Use $B \rightarrow h^+h^-$ candidates that did not contribute to trigger decision to avoid trigger bias



Invariant mass resolution calibrated from interpolation between ψ and Y resonances

Ulrik Egede



$B \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$

Signal region in bins of BDT response



25	5 July 2011		Ulrik Egede		19/23
	observed	2872	26	3	2
	Exp. SM signal	1.26 ± 0.13	0.61 ± 0.06	0.67 ± 0.07	0.72 ± 0.07
	Exp.combinatorial	2968 ± 69	25 ± 2.5	2.99 ± 0.89	0.66 ± 0.40
		BDT<0.25	0.25 <bdt<0.5< td=""><td>0.5<bdt<0.75< td=""><td>0.75<bdt< td=""></bdt<></td></bdt<0.75<></td></bdt<0.5<>	0.5 <bdt<0.75< td=""><td>0.75<bdt< td=""></bdt<></td></bdt<0.75<>	0.75 <bdt< td=""></bdt<>

$B \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$

Normalisation

The event rate is normalised to 3 channels



For all need to correct for difference in selection and trigger efficiency

For $B^+ \rightarrow J/\psi K^+$ and $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^- K^+$ need to correct for production fractions

Use new LHCb average for this:

$$f_s/f_d = 0.267^{+0.021}_{-0.020}$$

$B \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$

Extracted limit for \mathbf{B} \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-



The limit is extracted using a modified frequentist approach (CL_s method) Systematics folded into limit

Limits @ 90% CL in full agreement with expectation

using toy MC approach

 $BF(B^{0}_{s} \rightarrow \mu^{+}\mu^{-}) < 1.30 \ 10^{-8}$ $BF(B^{0} \rightarrow \mu^{+}\mu^{-}) < 0.43 \ 10^{-8}$

SM prediction $BF(B_{s}^{0} \rightarrow \mu^{+}\mu^{-})=3.2\pm0.2\ 10^{-9}$ $BF(B^{0} \rightarrow \mu^{+}\mu^{-})=1.1\pm0.1\ 10^{-10}$ A.J.Buras: arXiv:1012.1447

 $B^+ \rightarrow h^- \mu^+ \mu^+$

Lepton number violation

A search has been conducted for the lepton number violating decays $B^+ \rightarrow K^- \mu^+ \mu^+$ and $B^+ \rightarrow \pi^- \mu^+ \mu^+$

These decays possible if there is a GeV range Majorana neutrino

Search conducted in 2010 data (36 pb⁻¹)

Nothing found and limits set at 90% CL

 $BF(B^+ \rightarrow K^- \mu^+ \mu^+) < 4.1 \ 10^{-8}$

 $BF(B^+ \rightarrow \pi^- \mu^+ \mu^+) < 4.4 \ 10^{-8}$





Conclusion

Results presented for Rare FCNC decays

- Just 3 months of data makes LHCb world competitive
- $B^0 \to K^{\star 0} \mu^+ \mu^-$

Angular analysis performed to measure width, $\rm F_{L}$ and $\rm A_{FB}$ in q^2 bins

First hint of (SM predicted) zero crossing in A_{FB} seen

$B \to \mu^+ \mu^-$

No excess observed for neither $B^0_{\ s} \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ nor $B^0 \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$

 $BF(B_{s}^{0} \rightarrow \mu^{+}\mu^{-}) < 1.30 \ 10^{-8} @ 90\% \ CL$

 $BF(B^0 \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-) < 0.43 \ 10^{-8} @ 90\% \ CL$

B⁺ → h⁻µ⁺µ⁺ with just 2010 data (36 pb⁻¹) Set limit at BF(B⁺ → K⁻(π^{-})µ⁺µ⁺) < 4.1 (4.4) 10⁻⁸

Tabulated $B^0 \rightarrow K^{*0}\mu^+\mu^-$ results

Yield and signal significance in q² bins

Significance obtained from difference in log likelihood between a signal+background and a background only hypothesis. Position of peak and width fixed from $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^{*0}$

$q^2(\mathrm{GeV}^2)$	n_{sig}	n_{bkg}	significance (σ)
$0 < q^2 < 2$	40.9 ± 7.5	14.4 ± 8.5	7.7
$2 < q^2 < 4.3$	23.3 ± 6.2	15.3 ± 8.6	4.9
$4.3 < q^2 < 8.68$	93.3 ± 11.3	30.0 ± 12.5	11.7
$10.09 < q^2 < 12.9$	57.3 ± 8.8	18.6 ± 9.7	9.3
$14.18 < q^2 < 16$	42.2 ± 6.8	3.6 ± 4.7	10.1
$16 < q^2 < 19$	48.1 ± 7.8	6.7 ± 6.4	9.2
$1 < q^2 < 6 { m GeV}^2$	70.0 ± 10.2	$32.\pm3.2$	9.4
Full	302.3 ± 20.1	91.0 ± 5.4	_

Tabulated $B^0 \rightarrow K^{*0}\mu^+\mu^-$ results

Results for A_{FB} , F_L and differential width in q^2 bins The width is the average width in the bin in units of 10^{-7} GeV/c⁴

$q^2 (\mathrm{GeV}^2)$	A_{FB}	F_L	$\mathrm{d}\Gamma/\mathrm{d}q^2$
$0 < q^2 < 2$	$-0.17^{+0.22}_{-0.23} \pm 0.06$	$0.03^{+0.15}_{-0.03} \pm 0.06$	$0.56 \pm 0.11 \pm 0.03$
$2 < q^2 < 4.3$	$-0.04^{+0.19}_{-0.15} \pm 0.06$	$0.84^{+0.15}_{-0.13} \pm 0.06$	$0.28 \pm 0.08 \pm 0.02$
$4.3 < q^2 < 8.68$	$0.28^{+0.06}_{-0.08} \pm 0.02$	$0.60^{+0.07}_{-0.07} \pm 0.01$	$0.55 \pm 0.07 \pm 0.03$
$10.09 < q^2 < 12.9$	$0.27^{+0.11}_{-0.13} \pm 0.03$	$0.44^{+0.12}_{-0.11} \pm 0.02$	$0.53 \pm 0.09 \pm 0.03$
$14.18 < q^2 < 16$	$0.50^{+0.06}_{-0.09} \pm 0.03$	$0.33^{+0.11}_{-0.08} \pm 0.04$	$0.59 \pm 0.10 \pm 0.03$
$16 < q^2 < 19$	$0.10^{-0.13}_{-0.13} \pm 0.06$	$0.28^{+0.10}_{-0.09} \pm 0.04$	$0.48 \pm 0.08 \pm 0.03$
$1 < q^2 < 6$	$-0.10^{+0.14}_{-0.14} \pm 0.05$	$0.57^{+0.11}_{-0.10} \pm 0.03$	$0.39 \pm 0.06 \pm 0.02$

Likelihoods in A_{FB} , F_{L} plane



Likelihoods in A_{FB} , F_{L} plane



25 July 2011

27/23

Tabulated $B^0_{s} \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ results

	BDT<0.25	0.25 <bdt<0.5< th=""><th>0.5<bdt<0.75< th=""><th>0.75<bdt< th=""></bdt<></th></bdt<0.75<></th></bdt<0.5<>	0.5 <bdt<0.75< th=""><th>0.75<bdt< th=""></bdt<></th></bdt<0.75<>	0.75 <bdt< th=""></bdt<>
Exp.combinatorial	2968 ± 69	25 ± 2.5	2.99 ± 0.89	0.66 ± 0.40
Exp. SM signal	1.26 ± 0.13	0.61 ± 0.06	0.67 ± 0.07	0.72 ± 0.07
observed	2872	26	3	2

$B^0_s ightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$	at 90% CL	at 95% CL	CL_b
expected limit			
(bkg only hypothesis)	$0.8 imes10^{-8}$	$1.0 imes10^{-8}$	
expected limit			
(bkg+SM hypothesis)	$1.2 imes 10^{-8}$	$1.5 imes10^{-8}$	
observed limit	$1.3 imes10^{-8}$	$1.6 imes10^{-8}$	0.86

Tabulated B⁰ \rightarrow $\mu^+\mu^-$ results

$B^0 o \mu^+ \mu^-$	at 90% CL	at $95\%~{\rm CL}$	CL_b
expected limit			
(bkg only hypothesis)	$2.4 imes 10^{-9}$	$3.1 imes10^{-9}$	
observed limit	4.2×10^{-9}	5.2×10^{-9}	0.90



Most signal like $B^0_{\ s} \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ candidate



LHCb layout



25 July 2011

Ulrik Egede



LHCb layout



33/23

LHCb layout



25 July 2011

Ulrik Egede

LHCb layout



25 July 2011

Ulrik Egede