

Measurement of timedependent CP violation in $B^0 \rightarrow K_S^0 K_S^0 K_S^0$ decays at Belle

Kookhyun Kang

Kavli IPMU 2021.11.05



AVLI INSTITUTE FOR THE PHYSICS AND MATHEMATICS OF THE UNIVERSE

Outline

- Introduction
- Study with Monte Carlo (MC)
 - Signal selection
 - Background suppression
- Results
- Summary

Introduction – motivation (1)

- Time-dependent CP violation (TDCPV) parameters are S and A
 - *S* = mixing induced CP violation
 - A = direct CP violation
- Standard Model expectation in $B^0 \rightarrow K^0_S K^0_S K^0_S$ decays,

•
$$S = \sin(2\phi_1) = 0.688$$
, $A = 0$, $\phi_1 \equiv \arg(\frac{V_{cd}V_{cb}^*}{V_{td}V_{tb}^*})$

- From the results
 - Deviations from the SM expectation provide sensitivity to new physics.
 - Difference of S at previous Belle and BaBar

 \checkmark We measure S and A in the $B^0 \rightarrow K_S^0 K_S^0 K_S^0$ decays with the final Belle data set of $772 \times 10^6 B\overline{B}$

B $f \neq B$ I_{CP} ¥ - Direct CPV Mixing-induced CPV K_s K_s K_s S_{CP} BaBar $0.94 + 0.21 \pm 0.06$ PRD 85 (2012) 054023 31802 difference $3.30 \pm 0.32 \pm 0.08$ 1.60 difference 520468M $B\overline{B}$ Belle

0.6

0.4

0.8

1

1.2

 0.72 ± 0.19

1.8

1.4 1.6

3

PRL 98 (2007) 031802

HFLAV correlated average

0.2

Averade

-0.2

Introduction – motivation (2)



• Pure $b \rightarrow s$ penguin transition by loop diagram



Significant deviation of $sin 2\phi_1^{eff}$ from $sin 2\phi_1$ indicates evidence of NP.

Introduction - Belle experiment

- KEKB is B-meson factory in Tsukuba at Japan.
 - Asymmetric e^+e^- collider
 - LER(e⁺) = 3.5 GeV
 - HER(*e*⁻) = 8 GeV
 - Center of Mass energy = 10.58 GeV





✓ Verification of the Kobayashi-Maskawa theory of CP-violation in B-meson decay



Introduction - Belle detector

Particle Identification (PID)



Introduction – time-dependent CP violation

- The time-dependent *CP* violation (*TDCPV*) can be caused by
 - interference between B^0 decay to CP eigenstate (f_{cp}) and $B^0 \overline{B}^0$ mixing.



• $\Upsilon(4S) \rightarrow B^0 \overline{B}{}^0$ in to *CP* eigenstate, the decay rate is given by

 $P = \frac{e^{-\frac{|\Delta t|}{\tau_{B^0}}}}{4\tau_{B^0}} \times (1 + q[Ssin(\Delta m_d \Delta t) + A\cos(\Delta m_d \Delta t))) \qquad \qquad \Delta m_d = \text{mass of } q = \text{flavor info} \\ \Delta t = \text{distance}$

 Δm_d = mass difference between q = flavor information of tag side Δt = distance between B-meson pairs

$$\mathcal{A}_{CP} = \frac{P(\bar{B}^{0}(\Delta t) \to f_{CP}) - P(B^{0}(\Delta t) \to f_{CP})}{P(\bar{B}^{0}(\Delta t) \to f_{CP}) + P(B^{0}(\Delta t) \to f_{CP})} = Ssin(\Delta m_{d}\Delta t) + Acos(\Delta m_{d}\Delta t)$$



•
$$M_{bc} = \sqrt{E_{beam}^2 - p_B^2}$$

• p_B = momentum of B in CM frame



Continuum background



Vertex reconstruction & flavor tagging

 $P = \frac{e^{-\frac{|\Delta t|}{\tau_{B^0}}}}{4\tau_{B^0}} \times (1 + q[Ssin(\Delta m_d \Delta t) + A\cos(\Delta m_d \Delta t)])$

- To identify B meson flavor,
 - flavor tagging for B_{tag} is performed by using inclusive properties of particles not associated with the signal B^0
 - *B_{signal}* is *CP* eigenstate
- Flavor-specific decay modes
 - r = tagging quality value (0-1)
 - r = 0 for no tagging
 - r = 1 for perfectly tagging



Vertex reconstruction

- In $B^0 \rightarrow K_S^0 K_S^0 K_S^0$, there is no primary charged track
 - to find vertex position we make Ks trajectory using pion hit
- Resolution function of Δt
 - Detector resolution
 - Non-primary track effect for B_{tag}
 - Kinematical approximation due to the difference in the p_{lab} of $B^0\bar{B}^0$



Results - signal extraction

Transformed NN output: used for continuum suppression



- An unbinned maximum likelihood (ML) fit with 3D PDF (ΔE , M_{bc} , Transformed NN).
- Signal $B^0 \& \overline{B}{}^0$ is obtained to be 258 ± 17 and the purity in the signal region is 74%.

PDF	ΔΕ	M _{bc}	Transformed NN
Signal	Double Gaussian	Gaussian	Asymmetry Gaussian
Background	1 st Polynomial	ARGUS	Asymmetry Gaussian

List of resonance modes

Several resonance mode can be included to signal event because we require three K_S^0 from B^0

	Decay mode	$B(B^0 \rightarrow X K_S^0)$	$B(X \to K^0_S K^0_S)$	Expected events
-	$\square B^0 \to D^0 K^0_S$	$(2.6 \pm 0.35) \times 10^{-5}$	$(1.7 \pm 0.12) \times 10^{-4}$	0.3±0.0
Background	$B^0 \rightarrow \eta_c K_S^{\tilde{0}}$	$(3.45 \pm 0.6) \times 10^{-4}$	$< 3.1 \times 10^{-4} 90\%$	<7.6±1.2
	$B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K_S^0$	$(4.35 \pm 0.16) \times 10^{-4}$	$<1.4\times10^{-8}$	<0.0±0.0
$h \rightarrow c$	\neg $B^0 \rightarrow \psi(2S) K_S^0$	$(2.9 \pm 0.25) \times 10^{-4}$	$<4.6\times10^{-6}$	<0.1±0.0
CP odd	$B^0 \rightarrow \chi_{c0} K_S^0$	$(0.73 \pm 0.13) \times 10^{-4}$	$(3.16 \pm 0.17) \times 10^{-3}$	16.3 ± 3.1
	$B^0 \rightarrow \chi_{c1} K_S^0$	$(1.96 \pm 0.13) \times 10^{-4}$	$<6\times10^{-5}$ CL=90%	<0.8±0.1
	$ B^0 \to \chi_{c2} K_S^0 $	$(0.75) \times 10^{-5} CL = 90\%$	$(2.6 \pm 0.2) \times 10^{-4}$	0.3 ± 0.0
	$B^0 \rightarrow f_2(1270) K_S^0$	$(1.35^{+0.65}_{-0.6}) \times 10^{-6}$	$(1.15^{+0.12}_{-0.1}) \times 10^{-2}$	$1.1^{+0.5}_{-0.5}$
	$B^0 \to f_0(1500) K_S^0$	$(0.65^{+0.35}_{-0.25}) \times 10^{-5}$	$(2.15 \pm 0.25) \times 10^{-2}$	$9.9^{+5.5}_{-4.0}$
Signal _	$B^0 \to f_2'(1525)K_S^0$	$(1.5^{+2.5}_{-2.0}) \times 10^{-7}$	$(22.17 \pm 0.55) \times 10^{-2}$	$2.4^{+3.9}_{-3.1}$
$b \rightarrow s$	$B^0 \to f_0(980)(K^0_S K^0_S) K^0_S$	(2.7 ± 1.8)	$(5) \times 10^{-6}$	191.3 ± 127.6
	$B^0 \to f_0(1710)(K^0_S K^0_S) K^0_S$	$(5.0^{+5.0}_{-2.6})$	10^{-7}	$35.4^{+35.4}_{-18.4}$
	$B^0 \to f_2(2010)(K^0_S K^0_S) K^0_S$	$(5 \pm 6) \times 10^{-7}$		35.4 ± 42.5

Results - Dalitz plot



✓ Compare the dalitz plot for MC and data, our evtgen model for MC generation by PHSP well describes data.

CP fitting – linearity check using signal MC

- Input *S* : 0.1, 0.3, 0.5, 0.7, 0.9 with A = 0
- Input *A* : 0.1, 0.3, 0.5, 0.7, 0.9 with S = 0



Measurement of TDCPV parameters

• Fitting results

- $S = -0.71 \pm 0.23$ (stat) ± 0.05 (syst)
 - $-\sin 2\phi_1$ in $b \to c\bar{c}s = -0.699$
- $A = 0.12 \pm 0.16 \text{ (stat)} \pm 0.05 \text{ (syst)}$



Systematic error

Source	S	A
Vertex reconstruction	0.031	0.038
Flavor tagging	0.002	0.004
Resolution function	0.016	0.014
Physics parameters	0.004	0.001
Fit bias	0.012	0.009
Signal fraction	0.024	0.021
Background Δt shape	0.016	0.001
SVD misalignment	0.004	0.005
∆z bias	0.002	0.004
Tag-side interference	0.001	0.008
Total	0.05	0.05

Main source of systematic error comes from non-primary charged track.

Significance of CP violation

- The significance is calculated using the Feldman-Cousins approach.
 - Frequentist approach
 - ↔ Bayesian approach (PDF based on hypothesis)
- The significance of *CP* violation is determined to be 2.5σ away from (0,0)





Consistent with previous measurements and $b \rightarrow c \bar{c} s$

Summary

- The measurements of time-dependent *CP* violation in $B^0 \rightarrow K_S^0 K_S^0 K_S^0$ decays using the final data sample (772 × 10⁶ $B\overline{B}$):
 - $S = -0.72 \pm 0.23$ (stat) ± 0.05 (syst)
 - $A = 0.11 \pm 0.16 \text{ (stat)} \pm 0.05 \text{ (syst)}$
- The results are
 - The results are consistent with SM expectation (-0.70)
 - Previous Belle & BaBar result
- PHYSICAL REVIEW D 103, 032003 (2021)
 - https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.103.032003

Backup

Signal reconstruction – selection criteria and best candidate selection

- We use K_S^0 only from charged decay to avoid background.

	$B^0 \to K^0_S K^0_S K^0_S$
$K_S^0(\pi^+\pi^-)$ selection in mdst_vee2	$ \Delta M_{\pi\pi} < 10 \sigma$, nisKsfinder cut (nb_vlike>0.2)
$\Delta E [GeV]$	$-0.2 < \Delta E < 0.2$
M_{bc} [GeV/ c^2]	5.2 < M_{bc}
Best candidate selection	smallest of $\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^3 \left(\frac{M_{\pi\pi}^i - M_{K_S^0}}{\sigma_{\pi\pi}} \right)^2$
Continuum BKG suppression	KSFW LR, cosθ _B , cosθ _T NeuroBayes output>0.08

Classical and FC frequentist



By ordering principle

Dalitz plot



• Compare the dalitz plot for MC and data, our evtgen model for MC generation, PHSP_CP, well describes data.

CP fitting – lifetime measurement



- Using 1M signal MC with input τ_B is 1.5367
 - Fitting result: 1.5461 ± 0.0072 ps
 - Difference (fitting result input) : 0.0106 ps
- Data result
 - Fitting result: 1.4271 ± 0.1129 ps
 - PDG value $(1.520 \pm 0.004 \text{ ps})$

✓ The result of lifetime fitting is consistent with PDG value