# CKM and CP violation results from the Tevatron

#### RICK JESIK IMPERIAL COLLEGE LONDON REPRESENTING THE CDF AND DØ COLLABORATIONS

#### HADRONCOLLIDERPHYSICS SYMPOSIUM 2011 NOVEMBER 14 - 18, 2011 PARIS, FRANCE

#### The Tevatron was a B-factory

- The Tevatron has a long legacy of significant B-physics measurements.
  - Pioneered usage of vertex detectors in hadron colliders (used in trigger!)
  - We have shown one can do B-physics alongside a high-pT program.
  - Probes higher mass states not available to e<sup>+</sup>e<sup>-</sup> machines, but has also been able to compete with them in B<sub>d</sub> channels.
- B<sub>s</sub> physics has been the forte of the Tevatron B-program
  - $\Delta m_s$  measurement has been the highlight so far.
  - This measurement placed severe constraints on the CKM unitary triangle – The Standard Model (unfortunately) passed this test with flying colors.



• CP violation in the B<sub>s</sub> system is at the forefront of our current program

# **CP** Violation Matters

- Matter and anti-matter were produced in equal amounts from the energy of the Big Bang, but the universe as we know it consists almost entirely of matter. Where did the anti-matter go?
- Some peculiar properties of particles and their interactions produced a small preference for matter (CP violation) which evolved into the present matter dominance.
- We have actually measured CP violation in weak quark decays in both the kaon and B<sub>d</sub> meson systems, but at levels far too small to explain this.
- The CKM formalism of the SM predicts no other significant sources of CPV.
- But we exist! So we continue to search for chinks in the CKM armor and for other sources of CP violation.



R. Jesik – HCP2011

#### CP Violation in Interference $B_s^{\ 0} \rightarrow J/\psi \phi$

•  $B_s$  equivalent to the classic sin2 $\beta$  measurement.

$$\varphi_s^{J/\psi\phi} = -2 \arg \frac{-V_{ts}V_{tb}^*}{V_{cs}V_{cb}^*} = -2\beta_s \approx -0.04 \text{ (SM)}$$



• Sensitive to new physics in the box diagram.



#### CP Violation in $B_s^{\ 0} \rightarrow J/\psi \phi$



R. Jesik – HCP2011

#### DØ Update

 DØ has updated their measurement using a boosted decision tree selection on 8 fb<sup>-1</sup> of data.

$$\overline{\tau}_{s} = 1.443^{+0.038}_{-0.035} \text{ ps},$$

$$\Delta\Gamma_{s} = 0.163^{+0.065}_{-0.064} \text{ ps}^{-1},$$

$$\phi_{s}^{J/\psi\phi} = -0.55^{+0.38}_{-0.019},$$

$$|A_{0}|^{2} = 0.558^{+0.017}_{-0.030},$$

$$|A_{\parallel}|^{2} = 0.231^{+0.024}_{-0.030},$$

$$\delta_{\parallel} = 3.15 \pm 0.22,$$

$$\cos(\delta_{\perp} - \delta_{s}) = -0.11^{+0.27}_{-0.25}.$$

$$F_{S} = 0.173 \pm 0.036,$$





### CP Violation in $B_s^{\ 0} \rightarrow J/\psi \phi$



- DØ has updated their measurement using a boosted decision tree selection and has ~ 2 fb<sup>-1</sup> of data to add.
- CDF will double statistics soon.
- Final Tevatron combination will be done.
- Discrepancy has shrunk, but both experiments show the same trend away from the SM value.

# **CP** Violation in $B_s^{\ 0} \rightarrow J/\psi f^{\ 0}$

- Very interesting decay mode much smaller BR, but no need for angular analysis.
- Can help resolve two-fold ambiguity
- DØ and CDF have measured BR
- CDF has measured lifetime a direct measurement of the CP odd lifetime!







#### CP Violation in $B_s^{0} \rightarrow \phi \phi$

• Not enough statistics to do a mixing induced CPV analysis, but CDF has looked at triple product asymmetries which can be non-zero if there is new physics.



#### CP violation in B meson mixing $A^b{}_{sl}$



• We search for CP violation in mixing in the like-sign dimuon charge asymmetry of semileptonic B decays.

$$A_{sl}^{b} \equiv \frac{N_{b}^{++} - N_{b}^{--}}{N_{b}^{++} + N_{b}^{--}} \qquad \qquad A_{sl}^{q} = \frac{\Delta \Gamma_{q}}{\Delta M_{q}} \tan(\varphi_{q})$$

- $\circ~$  The SM predicts small values and the  $B_{\rm d}$  contribution has been measured to be small at the B factories.
- As with  $B_s^{0} \rightarrow J/\psi \phi$ , new physics can enhance the value of the CPV phase. The NP contributions are in fact the same in these two cases.
- In summer of 2010, DØ measured a value  $3.2\sigma$  away from the SM

#### Semileptonic Charge Asymmetry

•  $A^{b}_{sl}$  is also equal to the charge asymmetry of "wrong sign" semileptonic B decays Y. Grossman, Y. Nir, G. Raz, PRL 97, 151801 (2006)



- "Right sign" decay is  $B \rightarrow \mu^+ X$
- "Wrong sign" decays can happen only due to flavor oscillation in *B*<sub>d</sub> and *B*<sub>s</sub> mesons

$$a_{sl}^{b} = \frac{\Gamma(\overline{B} \to \mu^{+}X) - \Gamma(B \to \mu^{-}X)}{\Gamma(\overline{B} \to \mu^{+}X) + \Gamma(B \to \mu^{-}X)} = A_{sl}^{b}$$

R. Jesik – HCP2011

# $A^{b}_{sl}$ Measurement Strategy

• Measure raw single and like-sign dimuon asymmetries:

$$a = \frac{n^{+} - n^{-}}{n^{+} + n^{-}} \qquad A = \frac{N^{++} - N^{--}}{N^{++} + N^{--}}$$

- Determine detector and reconstruction related backgrounds, the remaining mixing contributions are equivalent.
- The single muon asymmetry is dominated, however, by background so we do NOT take a weighted average. We use it instead to effectively subtract the background from the purer dimuon measurement by taking a linear combination of the two.
- DØ's frequent switching of both magnet's polarities is crucial to reduce detector acceptance effects very small systematic uncertainties.
- Improvements since the first measurement
  - Dominant background is now measured by data completely.
  - More data, better trigger efficiency.
  - Cleaner muon selection less background.
  - Impact parameter studies.

#### New Dimuon Asymmetry Result

$$A_{sl}^{b} = (-0.787 \pm 0.172 \text{ (stat)} \pm 0.093 \text{ (syst)})\%$$

• To be compared with the SM prediction:

 $A_{sl}^{b}(SM) = (-0.023_{-0.006}^{+0.005})\%$ 

- This result is two orders of magnitude larger than the SM prediction; ~ 3.9σ away from it.
- Consistent with previous result.
- In the correct direction to explain matter dominance.

#### Dimuon Asymmetry Closure Test

- The raw inclusive muon asymmetry *a* is dominated by background.
- We determine  $a_{bkg}$ independently from data and compare it to the raw asymmetry.
- We see that the background determination matches the asymmetry data quite well even describing the pT dependence correctly.



# $A^{b}{}_{\rm sl}$ at the Tevatron

#### $A_{sl}^{b} = (0.594 \pm 0.022)a_{sl}^{d} + (0.406 \pm 0.022)a_{sl}^{s}$

- Both  $B_d$  and  $B_s$  are produced at the Tevatron,  $A^b{}_{sl}$  is a linear combination of  $a^d{}_{sl}$  and  $a^s{}_{sl}$ 
  - Relies on mixing probability and production fractions measurements of  $B_d$  and  $B_s$ mesons.
  - LEP HFAG values used, consistent with LHCb and CDF update
- Only a ~ 12%  $B_s$  production fraction, but large mixing probability leads to a large  $B_s$  contribution.



### Impact Parameter Dependence of $A^b{}_{sl}$

• In order to further pin down the contributions to  $A^b{}_{sl}$ , we study the impact parameter distribution



- IP > 120 μm
  - b enriched, with larger B<sub>d</sub> contribution due to longer oscillation frequency
- IP < 120 μm
  - $\circ~$  more background, but larger  $B_{\rm s}$  contribution



#### Impact Parameter dependence of $A^{b}_{sl}$



#### Putting it (almost) all together

- The value of  $a_{sl}^s$  can be translated into the measurement of the CP violating phase  $\phi_s$  and  $\Delta\Gamma_s$  which is in excellent agreement with an independent measurement of  $\phi_s$  and  $\Delta\Gamma_s$  in  $B_s \rightarrow J/\psi\phi$  decays.
- This result is also consistent with the CDF measurement.
- LHCb already has considerable weight here as well, they are also planning an orthogonal measurement of  $A^b_{sl}$ .



R. Jesik – HCP2011

# Conclusion

- The Tevatron remains a wonderful place to do B-physics (even though we have stopped running)
- We are at the peak of our analyses with one more round of major updates soon to come.
  - Updated and combined Tev meaurement of  $\phi_s$  in  $B_s \rightarrow J/\psi \phi$
  - Update of dimuon charge asymmetry with more sophisticated IP analysis
     with a likely 5 sigma reach
- There are dozens of CKM and CPV analyses that I have not covered, and there are tons of data available for new ideas
- Remember Chris Quiggs's advice this morning:
  - o "Stay Hungry, Stay Foolish"
  - We are pretty full, but there is always room for desert.
  - Staying foolish has never been a problem for us....



R. Jesik – HCP2011

# **S-wave Contribution**

Fraction ( $F_S$ ) and phase ( $\delta_S$ ) of non-resonant S-wave  $K^+K^-$  contribution are free parameters in the fit.

Alternative method based on mass fit gives cross-check of  $\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{S}}$  measurement.

- Divide data into slices in M(K<sup>+</sup>K<sup>-</sup>);
- Fit the M(µ<sup>+</sup>µ<sup>-</sup>K<sup>+</sup>K<sup>-</sup>) distribution in each slice, to extract B<sub>s</sub><sup>0</sup> signal;



#### S-wave Contribution

Fraction (F<sub>S</sub>) and phase ( $\delta_S$ ) of non-resonant S-wave  $K^+K^-$  contribution are free parameters in the fit.

Alternative method based on mass fit gives cross-check of  $F_s$  measurement.

- Divide data into slices in M(K<sup>+</sup>K<sup>-</sup>);
- Fit the M(μ<sup>+</sup>μ<sup>-</sup>K<sup>+</sup>K<sup>-</sup>) distribution in each slice, to extract B<sub>s</sub><sup>0</sup> signal;

**B**<sup>0</sup><sub>s</sub> signal has two components:

- 1) Clear resonance at  $\varphi(1020)$  'P-wave'
- 2) Uniform non-resonant contribution 'S-wave'.

Fitting to a number of different models yields:

$$F_{s} = (12 \pm 3) \%$$
  
R. Jesik – HCP2011

