$B \rightarrow KKK AmAn$

Ignacio Bediaga, Jeremy Dalseno, Juan Otalora, Jussara Miranda

Starting point: Measurements of CP violation in the three-body phase space of charmless B[±] decays (LHCb-PAPER-2014-044, LHCb-ANA-2014-050, TWiki, BnoC WG database, August 2014) arXiv:1408.5373 Phys.Rev.D90, 112004 (2014), DOI:10.1103/PhysRevD.90.112004

Report on the Run1 B^[] kkk amplitude analisys effort: **a work in progress**

- Will assume an audience familiar with the Isobar approach to Dalitz plot fitting and also the QMI for the s-wave
- Use Laura++ for the Isobar and Jeremy's (and Juan) fitter for QMI





Figure 6: Projections in bins of the $m(K^+K^-)_{\text{low}}$ variable of (a, b) the number of B^- and B^+ signal events and (c, d) their difference for $B^{\pm} \to K^{\pm}K^+K^-$ decays. The inset plots show the ϕ resonance region of $m(K^+K^-)_{\text{low}}$ between 1.00 and 1.05 GeV/ c^2 , which is excluded from the main plots. The plots are restricted to events with (a, c) $\cos \theta < 0$ and (b, d) $\cos \theta > 0$. The yields are acceptance-corrected and background-subtracted. A guide line for zero (horizontal red line) was included on plots (c, d).

Dalitz oveview



Dalitz isobar

From the Isobar model the total signal amplitude for B^+ and B^- is defined as:

$$\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{m}_{K\pi}^2,\mathbf{m}_{KK}^2) = \sum_j \mathbf{c}_j \mathcal{M}_{Rj}(\mathbf{m}_{K\pi}^2,\mathbf{m}_{KK}^2),$$

where $c_j = (x + \Delta x) + i(y + \Delta y)$ and $\bar{c}_j = (x - \Delta x) + i(y - \Delta y)$ is the complex coefficient for a given resonance decay mode j. Δx_j and Δy_j parametrize the CPV in the decay.

Caveats:

- Need to be particularly careful on adding scalar contributions- no angular signature long list of poorly stablished states enhance the possibility of destabilizing the fit producing large interfering solutions
- Sum of fit fractions >> or << than 100% signs large destructive or constructive inteference terms</p>
- Relative phases and amplitudes are measured. Phases are determined through the interference. Need to chose one contributions to have the parameters fixed: \$\Phi(1020)\$ and Xc are too narrow and the NR is too unknown.

on the possible contributions

 $\begin{array}{c} \textbf{BaBar:} \text{Study of } CP \text{ violation in Dalitz-plot analyses of } B^0 \rightarrow K^+K^-K^0_s, B^+ \rightarrow K^+K^-K^+, \\ \text{ and } B^+ \rightarrow K^0_s K^0_s K^+ & \text{Physical Review D 85, 112010 (2012)} \end{array}$

$$F_{NR}(s_{12}, s_{23}) = e^{\alpha s_{12}} + e^{\alpha s_{23}}, \qquad F_{NR}(s_{12}, s_{23}) = (a_{S0} + a_{S1}x + a_{S2}x^2) + (a_{P0} + a_{P1}x + a_{P2}x^2)P_1(\cos\theta_3),$$

TABLE VIII: Branching fractions (neglecting interference), CP asymmetries, and CP-violating phases (see Eq. (III)) for $B^+ \to K^+ K^- K^+$. The $\mathcal{B}(B^+ \to RK^+)$ column gives the branching fractions to intermediate resonant states, corrected for secondary branching fractions obtained from Ref. [15]. Central values and uncertainties are obtained from Solution I. In addition to quoting the overall NR branching fraction, we quote the S-wave and P-wave NR branching fractions separately.

	Decay mode	$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \to K^+ K^- K^+) \times FF_j \ (10^{-6})$	$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \to RK^+) \ (10^{-6})$	A_{CP} (%)	$\Delta \phi_j$ (deg)
	$\phi(1020)K^{+}$	$4.48 \pm 0.22^{+0.33}_{-0.24}$	$9.2 \pm 0.4^{+0.7}_{-0.5}$	$12.8\pm4.4\pm1.3$	$23 \pm 13^{+4}_{-5}$
	$f_0(980)K^+$	$9.4 \pm 1.6 \pm 2.8$		$-8\pm8\pm4$	$9\pm7\pm6$
≁	$f_0(1500)K^+$	$0.74 \pm 0.18 \pm 0.52$	$17\pm4\pm12$		
	$f'_2(1525)K^+$	$0.69 \pm 0.16 \pm 0.13$	$1.56 \pm 0.36 \pm 0.30$	$14\pm10\pm4$	$-2\pm 6\pm 3$
->	$f_0(1710)K^+$	$1.12 \pm 0.25 \pm 0.50$			
	$\chi_{c0}K^+$	$1.12 \pm 0.15 \pm 0.06$	$184 \pm 25 \pm 14$		$-4\pm13\pm2$
->	NR	$22.8 \pm 2.7 \pm 7.6$		$6.0\pm4.4\pm1.9$	0 (fixed)
≁	NR (S-wave)	$52^{+23}_{-14} \pm 27$			
->	NR (P-wave)	$24^{+22}_{-12} \pm 27$			

We want to include explicitly the rescattering amplitude but its parametrization is still under study. as a start (see Melissa's taslk) because we believe that it can be the carrier of CPV

We have "interpreted" the exponential NR form ... (obs: since this is a symmetrical state this amplitude automatically Interferes construtively with is self)



• Tobias non-resonant function [Phys.Rev.D92.054010,2015] instead of κ

$$T_{nr}(m_{\pi^+K^-}^2) = (1 + \frac{m_{\pi^+K^-}^2}{\Lambda^2})^{-1},$$

contribuitions





contribuitions

Strategy and fit results

- We tried many, many, many combinations. I will show one fit... which is the "best" and yet pretty bad... and than we make a change in the strategy
- We never include wide scalars that populate the same phase space region, i.e, either TobiasNR or a low mass free MW pole or f0(980)
- > We had to "create" the rhoVETO object to accommodate the B-(and B+) structure at high mass
- The interference of f0(1700) with the NR +- solve empty region at m2KK~3
- To evaluate the model we compare plot s_high for the regions defined by the re lines and s_low for costheta13> and <0 for the blue and green regions</p>



reson = negSigModel->addResonance("rho0(1450)", 2, LauAbsResonance::RelBWVeto); reson->changeResonance(1.48, 0.08,-1);

fit10050



1.8

1.2

1.4

1.6

m_{KK} [GeV]

1.2

1.4

 m_{KK} [GeV]

1.6

1.8

1.0

partial conclusions

With the known (or even created) objects it is very hard to ha a reasonable fit
Notice the large interference and the fact that the rescattering ACP>0 where we'd expect <0</p>

▶ We did not yet tried a generic NR ~ BaBar... Rather we are trying the QMI

Inspired in:

Nuclear Physics B 899 (2015) 247–264 Three-body non-leptonic *B* decays and QCD factorization

Susanne Kränkl, Thomas Mannel, Javier Virto*



But for now just the siple split:



³ig. 1. Left: The physical kinematical region in the plane of two independent momentum invariants s_{+-}^{low} , s_{+-}^{high} (Dalitz lot), divided into the different regions with special kinematical configurations: I – Mercedes Star configuration, IIa, IIb - Two collinear pions, IIIa, IIIb – One soft pion. Right: Dalitz plot distribution for $B^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^+$ from Ref. [5].





Setup

Non-S -wave: $\phi(1020),\,f_2'(1525)$ and χ_{c0}

S-wave: 20 bins below charm threshold, 10 bins above, spread evenly in the mass

Bose symmetric binning in orthogonal direction implied



Jeremy fits the whole phase space but also splits ... I will show only those to compare w isobar





$$B^+ \to K^+ K^+ K^- \mathrm{QM}$$

~comaparable non Swave

Very different Swave: amplitude shape; phase motion and CPV

shigh > 14

FF(phiKp) = 15.3876 +/- 0.328246 FF+(phiKp) = 15.3885 +/- 0.414427 FF-(phiKp) = 15.3867 +/- 0.389577

FF(f2Kp) = 1.73203 +/- 0.232363 FF+(f2Kp) = 1.30891 +/- 0.324183 FF-(f2Kp) = 2.15516 +/- 0.311331

FF(chic0Kp) = 0.96111 +/- 0.1203 FF+(chic0Kp) = 0.937932 +/- 0.148136 FF-(chic0Kp) = 0.984288 +/- 0.149289

FF(SwaveKp) = 70.8911 +/- 0.619718 FF+(SwaveKp) = 71.7097 +/- 1.68053 FF-(SwaveKp) = 70.0725 +/- 1.01145

FF(Sum) = 88.9718 +/- 0.505555 FF+(Sum) = 89.345 +/- 1.5163 FF-(Sum) = 88.5986 +/- 1.12189

Acp(phiKp) = -5.81554e-05 +/- 0.0174326 Acp(f2Kp) = 0.244292 +/- 0.131327 Acp(chic0Kp) = 0.0241157 +/- 0.0864499 Acp(SwaveKp) = -0.0115474 +/- 0.0138049

FF(phiKp) = 12,4058 +/- 0,184568 FF+(phiKp) = 12.1633 +/- 0.282241 FF-(phiKp) = 12.6483 +/- 0.289112 FF(f2Kp) = 2.55233 +/- 0.195227 FF+(f2Kp) = 2.62721 +/- 0.313784 FF-(f2Kp) = 2.47746 +/- 0.239317 FF(chic0Kp) = 5.90076 +/- 0.188311 FF+(chic0Kp) = 3.89043 +/- 0.261576 FF-(chic0Kp) = 7.91109 +/- 0.274622 FF(SwaveKp) = 79.9672 +/- 0.709158 FF+(SwaveKp) = 88.6826 +/- 1.02964 FF-(SwaveKp) = 71.2518 +/- 0.971649 FF(Sum) = 100.826 +/- 0.667746 FF+(Sum) = 107.364 +/- 1.03655 FF-(Sum) = 94.2886 +/- 0.94534 Acp(phiKp) = 0.0195457 +/- 0.0170584 Acp(f2Kp) = -0.0293366 +/- 0.0760898 Acp(chic0Kp) = 0.34069 +/- 0.0283046

Fit2403GT (-@(1680) - f2(1270))



(h) (Top: 5.93; 3e-24) (Mid.: 6.65; 1e-27) (Cut: m13Sq>6)



This have the same nonSWave as the QMI (unfortunately I do no have the phase and amplitude for the SWave)

13

fit2300LT (same as 10050)

mt. [GeV/c]

Marc [GeV4/c4]

10 12

1.8

 B^{-}

 B^+ ____





fit2304LT(-@(1680) - f2(1270))



The isobar M_highLT region reproduce the CPV via destructive interference of TobiasNR and Rescatt!



 J/Ψ

χœ

Very interesting, large statistics and low background... should be the first to be done, but...NO too hard!

Special features:

Large NR - need better model

Large localized CPV not clearly associated to standard possible contributions – need better model Apparently the quasi-2body approximation fail in several regions, really? Nevetheless some stable isobar outcomes: NR>~80% CPV~-13%

Very recently we started the QMI approach - very promising

- sensitive to non Swave model
- difficult to interpret, but it is a guide to isobar -win win
- start working on 2D QMI (Juan Otalora) if indeed quasi-2body fails ...

even more sensitive to noSwave model

