### CP Violation in B Decays and Search for New Physics

#### Leo Piilonen, Virginia Tech on behalf of the Belle Collaboration





XXVIème Rencontres de Blois May 2014

#### Acknowledgements:

Kay Kinoshita, Hiroshi Nakano, Martin Ritter, Veronika Chobanova, Luis Pesántez, Gagan Mohanty, Zbynek Drásal, Minakshi Nayak, Simone Donati, Rose Koopman, Tadeusz Lesiak, Dan Johnson, Antonio Romero Vidal, Anton Poluektov, D. Vieira, Marta Calvi, Angelo Di Canto, Laurence Carson, Francesca Dordei, Julian Wishahi, Adam Davis, Mirco Dorigo ... and probably many others

See parallel-session talks (LHCb):

- Matthew Reid: time-dependent  $\mathcal{CP}$  in  $B \to J/\psi \, h \, h$
- Jeremy Dalseno: direct CP in  $B \to D K$
- Elvina Gersabeck: CP in D decays

#### CP symmetry is broken in the Standard Model. 3x3 quark-mixing matrix has one CP-violating phase.

Prog. Theo. Phys. 49, 2 (1973)

3



¶ Overconstrain by measuring angles and sides.

#### All measurements agree with the CKM mechanism.



 $\phi_1 \leftrightarrow \beta$  $\phi_2 \leftrightarrow \alpha$  $\phi_3 \leftrightarrow \gamma$ 

#### Is there some room for New Physics here?



including  $\sin 2\phi_1$  in the fit

#### Is there some room for New Physics here?



<u>excluding</u>  $\sin 2\phi_1$  from the fit

#### Is there some room for New Physics here? ¶ Scale $M_{12}^d$ by complex factor $\Delta_d$ in $B_d^0 - \overline{B}_d^0$ mixing:



#### Is there some room for New Physics here? ¶ Scale $M_{12}^s$ by complex factor $\Delta_s$ in $B_s^0 - \bar{B}_s^0$ mixing:



There are three distinct ways to measure  $\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{P}$ :

- direct QP in decay (charged & neutral)  $\Gamma(B \to f) \neq \Gamma(\bar{B} \to \bar{f}) \qquad |\bar{\mathcal{A}}_{\bar{f}}/\mathcal{A}_{f}| \neq 1$
- $\mathcal{CP}$  in mixing (neutral)  $\Gamma(B \to \overline{B}) \neq \Gamma(\overline{B} \to B)$

$$|B_{H,L}\rangle = p|B^0\rangle \pm q|\bar{B}^0\rangle |q/p| \neq 1$$

•  $\mathcal{QP}$  in interference between mixing & decay (neutral)  $\Gamma(B \to f_{CP}) \neq \Gamma(\bar{B} \to f_{CP}) \quad \arg \left| \frac{q}{p} \frac{\bar{\mathcal{A}}_{\bar{f}}}{\mathcal{A}_{f}} \right| \neq 0$ 

Notes: *B* could be replaced by *D*.  $f_{CP}$  is a CP eigenstate.

### Direct CP Violation

### Direct CPV in B<sup>+</sup> $\rightarrow J/\psi K^+$ , B<sup>+</sup> $\rightarrow J/\psi \pi^+$

No effect expected in b  $\rightarrow$  scc (J/ $\psi K$ ), possible in b  $\rightarrow$  dcc (J/ $\psi \pi$ )



- Regular reversal of magnetic field minimizes  $A(\pi)$ 

- A(K) measured in  $K^{*0} \rightarrow K^{+}\pi^{-}$ 

Event selection chosen to minimize statistical uncertainty on  $A(J/\psi K)_{RAW}$ 



PRL 110, 241801 (2013)

### Direct CPV in B<sup>+</sup> $\rightarrow J/\psi K^+$ , B<sup>+</sup> $\rightarrow J/\psi \pi^+$



Type of uncertainty	$A^{J/\psi K}$ (%)	$A^{J/\psi\pi}$ (%)
Statistical	0.36	4.4
Mass range	0.022	0.55
Fit function	0.011	0.69
$\Delta A_{\text{tracking}}$	0.05	0.05
$\Delta A_{\kappa}$	0.043	n/a
Total systematic uncertainty	0.07	0.9
Total uncertainty	0.37	4.5



A(J/ψK) = [0.59 ±0.36(stat) ±0.07(syst)] % with a 1 % correction due to K<sup>+</sup>/K<sup>-</sup> asymmetry

 $A(J/\psi\pi) = [-4.2 \pm 4.4(stat) \pm 0.9(syst)]$  %

PRL **110, 241801** (2013)



 $B_d^0 \to \eta' K^*(892)$ preliminary



$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{CP}} = -0.22 \pm {}^{0.18}_{0.17} \pm {}^{0.02}_{0.03}$$



## Polarization amplitudes and CP asymmetries in $B^0 o \varphi K^* (892)^0$ - $\mathcal{L} = 1 \, \mathrm{fb}^{-1}$

#### $B^0 \rightarrow \Phi K^* (892)^0$

- $b \rightarrow ss\overline{s}$  FCNC decay, penguin in SM  $\implies$  sensitive to NP contributions in the loop.
- $B^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^- K^+ \pi^-$  final state studied.









- Angular analysis of time-integrated decay rates to disentangle helicity structure of the P → VV decay (L= 0, 1, 2):
  - **P-wave**: longitudinal  $\mathcal{A}_0$  and transverse, parallel  $\mathcal{A}_{\parallel}$  and perpendicular  $\mathcal{A}_{\perp}$ ;
  - S-wave:  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{S}}(K\pi)$  ( $B^0 \to \Phi K^+ \pi^-$ ) and  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{S}}(KK)$  ( $B^0 \to K^* (892)^0 K^- K^+$ ).



## Polarization amplitudes and CP asymmetries in $B^0 o \varphi K^* (892)^0$ - $\mathcal{L} = 1 \, \mathrm{fb}^{-1}$





#### Direct $\mathcal{CP}$ in $B^0 \to \phi K^* (892)^0 - \mathcal{L} = 1 \, \mathrm{fb}^{-1}$

[arXiv:1403.2888]

- Final state tagged by  $K^{*0} \rightarrow K^+ \pi^-$  decay.
- Raw asymmetry measured from integrated rates:

$$A = \frac{N(\overline{B}^0 \to \overline{\phi}\overline{K}^*(892)^0) - N(B^0 \to \overline{\phi}\overline{K}^*(892)^0)}{N(\overline{B}^0 \to \overline{\phi}\overline{K}^*(892)^0) + N(B^0 \to \overline{\phi}\overline{K}^*(892)^0)}$$

• Correcting for production and detection asymmetries (determined using the control channel  $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^* (892)^0$ ):

$$A^{CP}(\phi K^{*0}) = (+1.5 \pm 3.2 \,(\text{stat}) \,\pm 0.5 \,(\text{syst}))\%$$

- Systematic uncertainty from the difference in kinematic and trigger used to select  $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^* (892)^0$  events.
- No direct *CP* in agreement with (and a factor of 2 more precise than):

 $A^{CP}(\phi K^{*0}) = (+1 \pm 6 \text{ (stat)} \pm 3 \text{ (syst)})\%$ Babar [Phys.Rev.D 78, 092008(2008)]  $A^{CP}(\phi K^{*0}) = (-0.7 \pm 4.8 \text{ (stat)} \pm 2.1 \text{ (syst)})\%$ Belle [Phys.Rev.D 88, 072004(2013)] The weak phase  $\phi_3$  is measured in  $B^- \to D^{(*)} K^{(*)-}$ decays by the interference between two amplitudes if both  $D^{(*)0}$  and  $\overline{D}^{(*)0}$  decay to a common final state



Then  $B^- \to \overline{\widetilde{D}} K^-$  with  $|\overline{\widetilde{D}}\rangle \propto |D^0\rangle + r_B e^{i(\delta_B - \phi_3)} |\overline{D}^0\rangle$ and  $B^+ \to \widetilde{D}K^+$  with  $|\widetilde{D}\rangle \propto |D^0\rangle + r_B e^{i(\delta_B + \phi_3)} |\overline{D}^0\rangle$ where  $r_B = \left| \frac{\mathcal{A}(B^- \to D^0 K^-)}{\mathcal{A}(B^- \to D^0 K^-)} \right| \approx \mathcal{O}(0.1)$  including colour suppression

19

Three techniques to measure  $\phi_3$  use rare decays of the form  $B^- \to \widetilde{D}^0 K^-$ 

✓ GLW: use CP eigenstates  $|D\rangle_{1,2} \propto |D^0\rangle \pm \overline{D}^0\rangle$ Gronau and London, PLB 253, 483 (1991) Gronau and Wyler, PLB 265, 172 (1991) Gronau, PRD 58, 037301 (1998) Gronau, PLB 557, 198 (2003)

- ✓ ADS: use  $|K^+\pi^-\rangle$  state (CF for  $\overline{D}^0$ ; DCS for  $D^0$ ) Atwood, Dunietz and Soni, PRL 78, 3257 (1997)
- ✓ GGSZ: use Dalitz analysis of  $|K_S \pi^+ \pi^-\rangle$  state Giri, Grossman, Soffer and Zupan, PRD 68, 054018 (2003) Bondar, Proc BINP Dalitz Analysis Meeting (2002) (unpublished)



By 2018, expect  $\sigma_{v} \sim 4^{\circ}$ 

#### $B \to X_{s+d} \gamma$



- Inclusive method: reduce model uncertainty but has high background.
- High energy photon (1.7 2.8 GeV) and lepton (e,  $\mu$ ) for tagging
- Mass veto for  $\pi^0(\eta) \to \gamma \gamma$

$$B \to X_{s+d} \gamma$$



$$\omega = \omega_{\rm osc} + \omega_{2nd} + \omega_{\rm misID}$$
$$= 0.1413 \pm 0.0052$$
$$A_{\rm CP} = \frac{1}{1 - 2\omega} A_{\rm CP}^{\rm meas}$$

• Asymmetry in lepton ID, study in  $B \rightarrow X J/\Psi(l^+l^-)$ , tag-and-probe  $\varepsilon^{\pm} = \frac{N_{\text{pass}}}{N_{\text{pass}} + N_{\text{fail}}}$  $A_{\text{det}} = \frac{\varepsilon^+ - \varepsilon^-}{\varepsilon^+ + \varepsilon^-}$   $A_{\text{det}} = (0.10 \pm 0.22)\%$ 

- Asymmetry in BB bkg: measured in data ( $E_{\gamma}^{*} < 1.7 \text{ GeV}$ )  $A_{bkg} = \frac{N^{+} - N^{-}}{N^{+} + N^{-}}$   $A_{bkg} = (-0.14 \pm 0.78)\%$
- These asymmetries are bias!, must correct them



 $B \to X_{s+d} \gamma$ preliminary

#### 

Raw asymmetry is corrected for mis-tagging and asymmetry bias (see previous page)



# CP Violation in $B^0 \bar{B}^0$ Mixing



#### $\mathcal{CP}$ in mixing, time-integrated: $a_{sl}^s$ PLB 728, 607 (2014)

Analyse  $B_s^{o} \rightarrow D_s X \mu v$  decays (2011 data).

$$A_{\text{meas}} \equiv \frac{\Gamma[D_s^- \mu^+] - \Gamma[D_s^+ \mu^-]}{\Gamma[D_s^- \mu^+] + \Gamma[D_s^+ \mu^-]}$$
$$= \frac{a_{\text{sl}}^s}{2} + \left[a_{\text{P}} - \frac{a_{\text{sl}}^s}{2}\right] \frac{\int_{t=0}^{\infty} e^{-\Gamma_s t} \cos(\Delta M_s t) \epsilon(t) dt}{\int_{t=0}^{\infty} e^{-\Gamma_s t} \cosh(\frac{\Delta \Gamma_s t}{2}) \epsilon(t) dt}$$

B<sub>s</sub><sup>o</sup> production asymmetry negligible: highly suppressed (10<sup>-4</sup>) due to fast oscillations.

Opposite magnet polarities: cancel most of detection asymmetries of charged particles.

Using large control samples: correct for tracking (0.13%) and background asymmetries (0.05%); account for difference in trigger and PID efficiencies for  $\mu^+$  and  $\mu^-$ .



 $a_{sl}^{s} = (-0.06 \pm 0.50 \pm 0.36)\%$ 

World's best measurement, consistent with SM expectation

D0 3σ deviation from SM neither ruled out nor confirmed

### Kills of a mixing with time-dependence:



- □ Mixing due to  $2^{nd}$  order weak transition, M<sub>12</sub>,  $\Gamma_{12}$  <sup>1</sup> 0
- □ NP could contribute to  $M_{12}$  (m >>  $m_B$ )
- $\square Imperative to measure amplitude and phase of M<sub>12</sub> precisely!$ 
  - Theoretical input (lattice) CRUCIAL here to shrink this band



 $\Box$  V<sub>td</sub> and sin(2 $\beta$ ) also measure apex using NP-sensitive processes!

### Amplitude of $B^0_{(s)}\bar{B}^0_{(s)}$ time-dependent mixing





## CP Violation in Mixing & Decay Interference

Time-dependent CP asymmetry in mixing & decay interference:  $\begin{array}{c}
\overline{B}_{d}^{0} & \xrightarrow{f_{CP}} \\
\overline{B}_{$ 

 $\begin{array}{ll} \text{Mixing \& decay interference: } \mathcal{S}_{\mathsf{CP}} = + \frac{2 \text{Im} \lambda_{\mathsf{CP}}}{1 + |\lambda_{\mathsf{CP}}|^2} &= -\xi_{f_{\mathsf{CP}}} \sin(2\phi_1) \\ \text{Decay via multiple paths: } \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{CP}} = - \frac{1 - |\lambda_{\mathsf{CP}}|^2}{1 + |\lambda_{\mathsf{CP}}|^2} &= 0 \end{array} \begin{array}{l} \text{for single} \\ \text{Feynman diagram to } f_{\mathsf{CP}} \\ \text{where } \lambda_{\mathsf{CP}} = \xi_{f_{\mathsf{CP}}} \frac{q}{p} \frac{\bar{A}_{f_{\mathsf{CP}}}}{A_{f_{\mathsf{CP}}}} \end{array} \end{array}$ 



 $B^0_d \to \omega K^0_S$ 

#### preliminary

#### arXiv: 1311.6666 submitted to PRD



First evidence  $(3.1\sigma)$  for  $\mathcal{QP}$  in this mode. No sign of New Physics.



#### penguin-dominated (tree is color- and Cabibbo-suppressed)



and distributions of candidates reconstructed with (data points). es show the corresponding one dimensional projections of the fitted model (sig-

 $B_d^0 \to \eta' K^0$ 

#### No sign of New Physics



$$B^0_d \to K_S \eta \gamma$$



For 100% photon polarization, there is no common  $s\vec{\gamma}$ final state  $\Rightarrow$  no time-dependent QP. In reality, for  $B^0 \rightarrow K_S \eta \gamma$ , SM expectation is  $S_{CP} \approx 2(m_s/m_b) \sin(2\phi_1)$ .

New Physics with alternate helicity structure can give time-dependent  $\ensuremath{\mathcal{CP}}$  without affecting  $\Gamma(b \to s\gamma)$ .

Atwood, Soni, Gronau: PRL 79, 185 (1997) Atwood, Gershon, Hazumi, Soni: PRD 71, 076003 (2005)



#### penguin mode

3-dimensional extended maximum-likelihood fit

 $B_d^0 \to K_S \eta \gamma$ 

#### preliminary



## $\mathcal{A}_{CP} = -0.48 \pm 0.41 \pm 0.07$ $\mathcal{S}_{CP} = -1.32 \pm 0.77 \pm 0.36$

#### ... both consistent with 0



#### Time dependent $\mathcal{CP}$ in $B_s^0 \to K^+K^- - \mathcal{L} = 1 \text{ fb}^{-1}$

[ J. High Energy Phys. 10 (2013) 183]

Time-dependent CP asymmetry:

$$\mathcal{A}^{CP}(t) = \frac{\Gamma_{\overline{B}{}^0_{s} \to KK}(t) - \Gamma_{B{}^0_{s} \to KK}(t)}{\Gamma_{\overline{B}{}^0_{s} \to KK}(t) + \Gamma_{B{}^0_{s} \to KK}(t)} = \frac{-C_{KK}\cos(\Delta m_{s}t) + S_{KK}\sin(\Delta m_{s}t)}{\cosh\left(\frac{\Delta\Gamma_{s}}{2}t\right) - \mathcal{A}_{KK}^{\Delta\Gamma_{s}}\sinh\left(\frac{\Delta\Gamma_{s}}{2}t\right)}$$

where  $C_{KK}$  = direct  $\mathcal{AP}$ ,  $S_{KK}$  = mixing-induced  $\mathcal{AP}$  and  $\mathcal{A}_{KK}^{\Delta\Gamma_s} = \mathcal{AP}$  in interference.

Time-dependent analysis, flavour-tagging to identify initial  $B_s^0$  flavour: calibrated using flavour-specific  $B^0 \rightarrow K^+ \pi^-$  events.





#### Time dependent $\mathcal{CP}$ in $B^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-$ - $\mathcal{L} = 1 \, \mathrm{fb}^{-1}$

[ J. High Energy Phys. 10 (2013) 183]

Time-dependent CP asymmetry:

$$\mathcal{A}^{CP}(t) = \frac{\Gamma_{\overline{B}^0 \to \pi\pi}(t) - \Gamma_{B^0 \to \pi\pi}(t)}{\Gamma_{\overline{B}^0 \to \pi\pi}(t) + \Gamma_{B^0 \to \pi\pi}(t)} = \frac{-C_{\pi\pi}\cos(\Delta m_d t) + S_{\pi\pi}\sin(\Delta m_d t)}{\cosh\left(\frac{\Delta\Gamma_d}{2}t\right) - \mathcal{A}_{\pi\pi}^{\Delta\Gamma_d}\sinh\left(\frac{\Delta\Gamma_d}{2}t\right)}$$

where  $C_{\pi\pi}$  = direct  $\mathcal{P}$ ,  $S_{\pi\pi}$  = mixing-induced  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{A}_{KK}^{\Delta\Gamma_s} = \mathcal{P}$  in interference.

Time-dependent analysis, flavour-tagging to identify initial  $B^0$  flavour: calibrated using flavour-specific  $B^0 \rightarrow K^+ \pi^-$  events.





7-dimensional unbinned extended maximum-likelihood fit



 $B_d^0 \to \pi^+ \pi^-$ 



## $\mathcal{S}_{\mathsf{CP}} = -0.64 \pm 0.08 \pm 0.03$ $\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{CP}} = +0.33 \pm 0.06 \pm 0.03$



$$B_d^0 \to \rho^0 \rho^0$$

penguin-dominated mode with color-suppressed tree



not a pure CP eigenstate; needs angular analysis to extract the longitudinal component and isospin analysis to extract  $\phi_2$ 

6-dimensional unbinned extended maximum-likelihood fit



$$B^0_d \to \rho^0 \rho^0$$
 and  $B^0_d \to \pi^+ \pi^-$  : extract  $\phi_2$ 



PRD 88, 092003 (2013)

#### TCPV summary for $b \to c\bar{c}s$



#### TCPV summary for $b \rightarrow sq\bar{q}$ penguins

		sin(2	$2\beta^{\text{eff}}$	É) ≡	sin(	$(2\phi_1^{ef})$	<b>HFAG</b> Moriond 2014 PRELIMINARY
b→c	cs	World Avera	ge	÷	:	:	0.68 ± 0.02
		BaBar			H	50	0.66 ± 0.17 ± 0.07
	X	Belle				<mark>문 ★</mark>	<b>0.90</b> <sup>+0.09</sup> <sub>-0.19</sub>
	Φ	Average				★ <mark>은</mark>	0.74 +0.11
0		BaBar			-	••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	0.57 ± 0.08 ± 0.02
Ň		Belle				-	$0.68 \pm 0.07 \pm 0.03$
Ľ		Average					0.63 ± 0.06
	Х N	BaBar			<u>_</u>	8	$0.94^{+0.21}_{-0.24} \pm 0.06$
	$\mathbf{x}_{\mathrm{s}}$	Belle 🕨		*		g	$0.30 \pm 0.32 \pm 0.08$
	Š	Average				. <u>9</u>	0.72 ± 0.19
0		BaBar			<b>5★</b> }	-	0.55 ± 0.20 ± 0.03
Š		Belle		-			0.67 ± 0.31 ± 0.08
_н		Average				-	0.57 ± 0.17
- · - · -	s S	BaBar	•	+ 🖯		0.	$35_{-0.31}^{+0.26} \pm 0.06 \pm 0.03$
	×	Belle			2	<b>0</b> .	$64^{+0.19}_{-0.25} \pm 0.09 \pm 0.10$
	Ū.	Average			* .9		0.54 +0.18
- · - · -	)	BaBar			*0	R	$0.55 \begin{array}{c} +0.26 \\ -0.29 \end{array} \pm 0.02$
Ž		Belle				2 *	<del>0.91 ±</del> 0.32 ± 0.05
З		Average				<u><u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u></u></u>	0.71 ± 0.21
	·····	BaBar				₹	0.74 <sup>+0.12</sup> -0.15
	Ъ	Belle		+			0.63 +0.16
	Ļ	Average					0.69 +0.10
Ŷ		BaBar					$0.65 \pm 0.12 \pm 0.03$
$\succeq$		Belle				<b>*</b>	0.76 +0.14 -0.18
$\stackrel{\scriptscriptstyle +}{\succeq}$	:	Average					0.68 +0.09 -0.10

					C <sub>f</sub>	= -,	A <sub>f</sub>		н М РГ	IFA oriond 2 RELIMIN	<b>G</b> 014 ARY
	~	:	BaBar	:	· •	<del>ত ম</del> ি			0.05	± 0.18 ±	0.05
	Y		Belle		-	A P		-0.04	4 ± 0.20 :	± 0.10 ±	0.02
	÷		Average		-	<del>, k</del> i	-			0.01 ±	0.14
		0	BaBar		H				-0.08	± 0.06 ±	0.02
		Ň	Belle						-0.03	± 0.05 ±	0.03
		Ľ	Average							-0.05 ±	0.04
	Ч С		BaBar	1	₹				-0.17	± 0.18 ±	0.04
	Ч		Belle 🛏		P P				-0.31	± 0.20 ±	0.07
	Х °		Average	_	* :2					-0.24 ±	0.14
		Q ,	BaBar			50 C	★•		0.13	± 0.13 ±	0.03
		N N	Belle		• \star	A P			-0.14	± 0.13 ±	0.06
		В	Average			T to S				0.01 ±	0.10
	ုတ္		BaBar		Ű	★ <mark>0</mark>		-0.0	5 ± 0.26 :	± 0.10 ±	0.03
	° ℃		Belle	H	A L	* 2		-0	.03 +0.24 -0.23 :	± 0.11 ±	0.10
	Q		Average			* 5	•			-0.06 ±	0.20
		S	<del>BaBar★</del>		U	50-			-0.5	2 +0.22 -0.20 ±	0.03
		Х,	Belle		E A	puq	<b>P</b>	*	<b></b> •0.36 :	± 0.19 ±	0.05
		5	Average			* 5				-0.04 ±	0.14
	S		BaBar			10	* <mark>2</mark>	I		0.15 ±	0.16
Ľ	Š		Belle							0.13 ±	0.17
	ч- <sup>-</sup>		Average			Ę	★ <del>ĕ</del>			0.14 ±	0.12
		Š	BaBar			• 🔁 સે			0.02	± 0.09 ±	0.03
		$\mathbf{\dot{\mathbf{z}}}$	Belle				<b>*</b>	0.14	4 ± 0.11	± 0.08 ±	0.03
		⁺∠;	Average			<b>T</b> ★ S	i			0.06 ±	0.08
_	1	-0.8	-0.6	-0.4	-0.2	0	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.8	1

TCPV summary for  $b \rightarrow sq\bar{q}$  penguins



#### Summary

- Many new CP-asymmetry results emerging from Belle, LHCb, ...
- I did not have time to talk about D decays here
- No significant deviations from Standard Model expectations – no New Physics yet
- Many results are still statistics-limited
- Many LHCb analyses have used only 1/3 of existing data set; more data will arrive in 2015
- Belle II will take up where Belle left off physics running starts in 2016

## Backup



#### KEK B Factory and Belle: 1999–2010



#### Integrated luminosity at the B factories



# of  $B\overline{B} @ \Upsilon(4S)$  : 772M (Belle) and 475M (BABAR)

### LHCb Detector





Highlights from LHCb – CP Violation in the B Sector | Julian Wishahi



### LHCb Data Taking 2011 & 2012

Instantaneo



data taking ef
 >99% of detec

- working
- >99% of collec analysis



integrated luminosity

• 1 fb<sup>-1</sup> @ 7 TeV (2011)

2 fb<sup>-1</sup> @ 8 TeV (2012)



Leveling is ob beam displac

The a

2011 integrat 10<sup>15</sup> x 75.3 № 1

A moving centre of mass is required to measure the time-dependent  $\mathcal{CP}$  in  $B^0 \to J/\psi K^0$  etc **CP-sensitive decay** J/w t<sub>CP</sub> t<sub>tag</sub> Ks  $\overline{\mathbf{B}}{}^{0}$ В electron Y(4S) (8GeV positron  $\mathbf{B}_2$ (3.5 GeV) $\Delta z^{\text{lab}} \sim 200 \mu \text{m}$  $\beta \gamma = \begin{cases} 0.56 & \text{BaBar} \\ 0.425 & \text{Belle} \\ \approx 25 & \text{LHCb} \end{cases}$  $\Delta z^{\mathsf{lab}} \simeq c \,\beta \,\gamma \,\Delta t^{\mathsf{cm}}$ tag the flavour as B by decay product(s)

Time-dependent CP asymmetry in  $b \to c\bar{c}s$  is typically dominated by one tree diagram  $B_a^0 \longrightarrow J/\psi K_S \qquad \frac{b}{d} \longrightarrow V_{cs}^*$ 

• limited opportunity for New Physics in tree; more likely (?) to appear in  $B\bar{B}$  mixing

... but in  $b \to s\bar{u}u$ ,  $s\bar{d}d$ ,  $s\bar{s}s$  is dominated by (or has only one) penguin diagram



## ADS method measures $\phi_3$ via the interference in rare $B^- \rightarrow [K^+\pi^-]_D K^-$ decays





Cabibbo favoured D decay

doubly Cabibbo suppressed Ø decay ADS rate and asymmetry (relative to the common decay):



where 
$$r_D = \left| \frac{\mathcal{A}(D^0 \to K^+ \pi^-)}{\mathcal{A}(\overline{D}^0 \to K^+ \pi^-)} \right| = 0.0613 \pm 0.0010$$
  
and  $r_B$  was defined earlier

59



### Observables for $B^+ \rightarrow D^0 (\rightarrow K_S K \pi) h^+ \sqrt{k_F}$

- This is the first ADS-like analysis to use Singly-Cabibbo-Suppressed (SCS) modes.
   Label final states as OS or SS comparing K<sup>±</sup> with B<sup>±</sup>
- Analysing three-body *D* final state requires knowledge of how the average interference amplitude ( $\kappa_{K_SK\pi}$ ) and strong phase difference ( $\delta_{K_SK\pi}$ ) vary across the *D* Dalitz plot
  - This is taken from a CLEO-c measurement, Phys. Rev. D 85 (2012) 092016
- Decay rates for  $B^+ \rightarrow D^0 K^+$  are:

 $\Gamma_{\mathrm{SS,}\ DK}^{\pm} = z \begin{bmatrix} 1 + r_B^2 r_D^2 + 2r_B r_D \kappa_{K_{\mathrm{S}}^0 K \pi} \cos(\delta_B \pm \gamma - \delta_{K_{\mathrm{S}}^0 K \pi}) \\ \Gamma_{\mathrm{OS,}\ DK}^{\pm} = z \begin{bmatrix} r_B^2 + r_D^2 + 2r_B r_D \kappa_{K_{\mathrm{S}}^0 K \pi} \cos(\delta_B \pm \gamma + \delta_{K_{\mathrm{S}}^0 K \pi}) \end{bmatrix}$ 

- Measure yield ratios (e.g.  $\mathcal{R}_{DK/D\pi, SS}$ ) and charge asymmetries (e.g.  $\mathcal{A}_{SS,DK}$ ) between the OS and SS samples, and between DK and  $D\pi$  final states.
- Analysis is done across whole Dalitz plane, and a restricted region around the K<sup>\*±</sup> resonance, whe the coherence factor κ<sub>KsKπ</sub> is higher (≈1.0 vs ≈0.7).





Results for  $B^+ \rightarrow D^0 (\rightarrow K_{\varsigma} K \pi) h^+$ 

Entries / (15 MeV/c<sup>2</sup>)

- Measure 8 yields, with  $B^+ \rightarrow D^0 K^+$  and  $B^+ \rightarrow D^0 \pi^+$ separated by OS/SS and charge of  $B^\pm$
- Charge-summed yields for OS and SS D<sup>0</sup>K<sup>+</sup> are 71 and 145 respectively.
- Sensitivity to γ appears to be improved by taking K<sup>\*±</sup> region, due to higher coherence factor.
- Good prospects for future analysis of K<sup>\*±</sup> region with more statistics.



