B_d and B_s Oscillations at the TeVatron

Guillelmo Gómez-Ceballos

Instituto de Física de Cantabria

On behalf of the DØ and CDF Collaborations

B-Physics at Hadron Colliders

+ Large production rates

$\sigma(p\bar{p} \to bX, |y| < 0.6) \approx 18\mu b$

10^3 higher than at $\Upsilon(4S)$

+ Heavy and excited B states currently uniquely at Tevatron:

$B_s, B_c, \Lambda_b, \Xi_b, B^{**}, B_s^{**}, ...$

+ But QCD background is 10^3 higher than signal

Triggers are critical

+ Event signature polluted by many fragmentation tracks;

High precision vertex tracker + dedicated reconstruction algorithms needed



B Triggers

+ B decays to $J/\psi \to \mu^+\mu^- \to$ Di-muon trigger (CDF/DØ)
  + easy trigger
  + clean signature
+ Semileptonic B decays $\to$ Single lepton trigger (DØ) + displaced track (CDF)
  + large branching ratio
  + missing momentum (neutrino & neutrals)





+ Fully hadronic B decays $\to$ Two Track trigger (CDF)
  + requires displaced track trigger
  + requires fast online tracking

Theoretical Predictions for Δm

B^0/B_s^0 mix through box diagram:

$$\Delta m_q \propto m_{B_q} \hat{B}_{B_q} f_{B_q}^2 \left| V_{tb} V_{tq}^* \right|^2$$
$$q = s, d$$



Uncertainties cancel in ratio:

$$\frac{\Delta m_s}{\Delta m_d} = \frac{m_{B_s}}{m_{B_d}} \xi^2 \frac{|V_{ts}|^2}{|V_{td}|^2}$$

with $\xi^2 = 1.21 \pm 0.02 \,^{+0.035}_{-0.014}$



- + measure $\frac{\Delta m_s}{\Delta m_d} \Rightarrow$ find $\frac{|V_{ts}|^2}{|V_{td}|^2}$ to 2.5%
- + Δm_d measured to high precision
- + Δm_s not measured yet!
- + Standard Model CKM fit:

$$\Delta m_s = 18.3 \,^{+6.5}_{-1.5} \text{ ps}^{-1}$$

- + potential new physics discovery

Δm_s Measurement



Why is this measurement so difficult?:

B_s Mesons Mix much faster than B_d Mesons!

In order to measure:

$$\mathcal{A}_{mix}(t) = \frac{N_{unmix}(t) - N_{mix}(t)}{N_{unmix}(t) + N_{mix}(t)} = \mathcal{D} * \cos(\Delta m_s t)$$

Significance $\propto \sqrt{\varepsilon \mathcal{D}^2} \frac{S}{\sqrt{S+B}} e^{-\Delta m_s^2 \sigma_t^2 / 2}$

We need to:

+ Reconstruct B_s signal in:
  + hadronic modes
  + semileptonic modes
+ Proper decay length resolution: fully reconstructed modes provide better accuracy
+ Tag the production flavor (the -key- problem in a hadron collider!): tagging power $\varepsilon \mathcal{D}^2$

  Efficiency: $\varepsilon = \frac{N_{wrong}+N_{right}}{N}$; Dilution: $\mathcal{D} = 1 - 2\frac{N_{wrong}}{N_{wrong}+N_{right}}$

Reconstructed $B \to lDX$ Candidates (DØ)

DØ exploits high statistics μ trigger semileptonic decays: worse proper time resolution, but high statistics

$$ct = \frac{L_{xy}}{\gamma\beta};\ \gamma\beta = \frac{p_T(B)}{M(B)} = \frac{p_T(\ell D)}{M(B)} * K \text{ (}K\text{ from MC)};\ \sigma_{ct} = \left(\frac{\sigma_{L_{xy}}}{\gamma\beta}\right) \oplus \left(\frac{\sigma_{\gamma\beta}}{\gamma\beta}\right) * ct$$



$D_s \to \phi\pi, \phi \to K^+K^-$



$D_s \to K^*K, K^* \to K\pi$

Reconstructed $B \to lDX$ Candidates (CDF)

The most recent analysis uses semileptonic modes collected by the Two Track Trigger, new analysis in progress with $\sim 765\ \text{pb}^{-1}$





$B^+ \to \mu^+ \overline{D}^0 (K\pi) X$

$B_s \to \mu^+ D_s^- (\phi\pi) X$

Fully Hadronic Decays (CDF)

More than 2300 B_s signal candidates with ~ 765 pb^{-1}



$B^+ \to \overline{D}^0(K\pi)\pi^+$



$B_s \to D_s^-(\phi\pi)\pi^+$

Proper Decay Time Reconstruction

Algorithm:

- \+ measure transverse momenta p_T of all decay products
- \+ measure the decay length L_{xy} from the P.V. to decay vertex
- \+ boost meson back to its rest frame

Fully reconstructed decays $B_s \to D_s(3)\pi$

- \+ all daughters reconstructed
- \+ formula for proper decay time: $ct = L_{xy}\frac{m_B}{p_T}$

Inclusively reconstructed decays $B_s \to \ell\nu D_s X$

- \+ some decay products escape detection (ν, neutrals, etc)
- \+ missing momentum $\Rightarrow$ increased ct error (σ_{ct})
- \+ formula for proper decay time:

$$ct = L_{xy}\frac{m_B}{p_T} \cdot K, \quad \text{where } K = \left\langle \frac{p_T^{\ell D}}{p_T^B} \right\rangle \text{ from MC}$$

B Flavor Tagging

Opposite Side Tagging:

- Jet-Charge-Tagging: (used at CDF/DØ)
  sign of the weighted average charge of opposite B-Jet

- Soft-Lepton-Tagging: (used at CDF/DØ)
  identify soft lepton (e, μ) from semileptonic decay of opposite B: $b \to l^- X$ (BR $\approx$ 20%),

  Dilution due to $\bar{b} \to \bar{c} \to l^- X$ and oscillation

Same (Kaon) Side Tagging : (just NEW at CDF!!!)

- $B_{s/d}$ is likely to be accompanied close by a K^+/π^+ (particle ID is mandatory)



Opposite Side Taggers

Combined Tagger:

- + Soft Muon Tagger
- + Soft Electron Tagger
- + Jet Charge Tagger



	εD^2 (%)	
Tagger	DØ	CDF
Muon	1.48±0.17	0.55±0.05
Electron	0.21±0.07	0.30±0.03
JQT	0.50±0.11	0.70±0.06
Combined	2.48±0.22(*)	1.55±0.08

Tagging performance measured in $B^{0/+}$ candidates

Individual DØ results come from a cut on $|d| > 0.3$ on each Tagger, while the combined result is made by a sum of several bins on $|d|$

Same Side Kaon Tagger at CDF (I)

Have to rely on Monte Carlo for prediction of SS(K)T performance for B_s decays!

- \+ Extensive data/MC comparisons on all tagging related quantities
- \+ Different tagging algorithms probe different aspects of the fragmentation

Very good agreement in high statistics B^+ and B^0 modes in all checks!



Same Side Kaon Tagger at CDF (II)

Small discrepancies covered by systematics



Systematic studies cover:

- + Fragmentation Model
- + $b\bar{b}$ Production Mechanisms
- + B^{**} content
- + Detector/PID resolution
- + Multiple interactions
- + PID content around B
- + Data/MC agreement

Select the most likely kaon track (PID *) as tagging track

SS(K)T performance estimated from MC:

$$\varepsilon D^2(B_s \to D_s(\phi\pi)\pi) = 4.0^{+0.8}_{-1.2}\%$$

*) TOF & dE/dx are used for particle identification

Crucial Test of the Whole "Machinery": B_d Mixing

+ For setting limit on Δm_s, knowledge of tagger performance is crucial → measure tagging dilution in kinematically similar B^0/B^+ samples (for OST)
+ Δm_d and Δm_s fit is very complex
  + combining several B flavor and several decay modes
  + combining several taggers
  + mass and lifetime templates for various backgrounds

Δm_d measurement is very important to test the fitter



$B^0 \to \mu D^* X$



$B^{0/+} \to \mu D^0 X$

Δm_d Measurement

Combined taggers (semileptonic channels) DØ:

$\Delta m_d = 0.506 \pm 0.020(syst) \pm 0.016(stat) ps^{-1}$ (New, just last Monday!)

Combined opposite side taggers (semileptonic channels) CDF:

$$\Delta m_d = 0.511 \pm 0.020(syst) \pm 0.014(stat) ps^{-1}$$

Combined opposite side taggers (hadronic channels) CDF:

$$\Delta m_d = 0.536 \pm 0.028(syst) \pm 0.006(stat) ps^{-1}$$

Results consistent with world average ($\Delta m_d = 0.508 \pm 0.004$)

The whole framework ready to fit for B_s Oscillations...

Fourier analysis



Frequency domain approach:

+ introduce amplitude:

  $P(t) \sim (1 \pm \mathcal{A} D \cos \Delta m_s t)$

+ fit for $\mathcal{A}$ at different Δm_s

$\Rightarrow$ obtain frequency spectrum

+ method is called amplitude scan

+ traditionally used for B_s mixing search

$\Rightarrow$ easy to combine experiments

+ true $\Delta m_s \Rightarrow \mathcal{A} = 1$, else $\mathcal{A} = 0$

Amplitude scan notations

Example of B^0 mixing:

- amplitude error bars: come from unbinned likelihood fit
- yellow: 1.645σ around data points defines 95% CL region
- Δm values where $\mathcal{A} + 1.645\sigma < 1$ are excluded at 95% CL
- dashed line: 1.645σ as a function of Δm
- sensitivity: the Δm where $1.645\sigma = 1$
- on average, we expect to observe mixing within sensitivity



narrow range $\mathcal{A}$ scan



same analysis, wider $\mathcal{A}$ range

B_s Mixing Limits in Run II





DØ:
Observed Limit at 95% C.L.: 7.3 ps^{-1}
(Sensitivity: 9.5 ps^{-1})

CDF:
Observed Limit at 95% C.L.: 8.6 ps^{-1}
(Sensitivity: 13.0 ps^{-1})

World Average:
Observed Limit at 95% C.L.: 16.6 ps^{-1} (Sensitivity: 20.0 ps^{-1})

Coming Improvements

DØ:

- Addition of other taggers
- Use of other semileptonic decay modes
- Use of hadronic decay modes
- Improve vertex resolution (inclusion Layer0)
- Unbinned fitting procedure (!!)

CDF:

- Improved selection in hadronic modes using Neural Networks
- Use partially reconstructed hadronic modes
- Use semileptonic events from other triggers
- Improve vertex resolution
- Use Same-Side Kaon tagger (!!!)

Use all the data in our hands!!!

Summary

- + Tevatron experiments are in unique position to exploit B_s system
- + Δm_d results are quite robust and consistent with world average
- + Δm_s results:
  - + limit at 7.3 (8.6) ps^{-1} at DØ(CDF)
  - + sensitivity at 9.5 (13.0) ps^{-1} at DØ(CDF)
- + Significant potential for improvements!!!



Back Up Slides

Neutral B Meson Mixing





Two-state mixing system

- "heavy" and "light" weak eigenstates
- B and $\overline{B}$ mass eigenstates

$$|B_s\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|B_{s,H}\rangle + |B_{s,L}\rangle)$$
$$|\overline{B}_s\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|B_{s,H}\rangle - |B_{s,L}\rangle)$$



Solution in proper time

$$P(t)_{B^0\to B^0} = \frac{1}{2\tau}e^{-t/\tau}(1+\cos\Delta m t)$$
$$P(t)_{B^0\to\overline{B^0}} = \frac{1}{2\tau}e^{-t/\tau}(1-\cos\Delta m t)$$

- mixing par. $\Delta m = m_H - m_L$

CKM Matrix

What is the origin of flavor symmetry breaking?
$\rightarrow$ quark mixing, CKM matrix

quark mass eigenstates
$\neq$ weak interaction eigenstates

$$\begin{pmatrix} d' \\ s' \\ b' \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} V_{ud} & V_{us} & V_{ub} \\ V_{cd} & V_{cs} & V_{cb} \\ V_{td} & V_{ts} & V_{tb} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} d \\ s \\ b \end{pmatrix}$$

$V * V^{\dagger} = 1$

CKM elements not predicted by SM



Goal: Measure sides/angles of CKM triangle sides in all possible ways

σ_{ct} Resolution Studies

The proper decay length resolution is the limiting factor at high Δm_s
Studies on this topic play a very important role!





σ_{ct}: signal/background (CDF)

σ_{ct}: before/after tuning (DØ)

Opposite Side Taggers at CDF

tagger	εD^2 hadronic (%)	εD^2 semileptonic (%)
muon	0.56±0.09±0.03	0.55±0.05±0.02
electron	0.26±0.05±0.02	0.31±0.03±0.01
JQ/vertex	0.23±0.07±0.01	0.25±0.03±0.01
JQ/displaced	0.35±0.08±0.02	0.37±0.05±0.02
JQ/high-p_T	0.15±0.06±0.02	0.08±0.02±0.01
combined	1.55±0.16±0.05	1.55±0.08±0.03

+ Taggers are mutually exclusive
+ 3 different jet types in Jet Charge (JQ) tagger
+ Performance on hadronics and semileptonics consistent within errors

Same Side Kaon Tagger at CDF

Very good agreement in all kinematical variables as well!