Observation of CP violation in B decay - By the Belle Collaboration -

Hitoshi Yamamoto

Tohoku University

Sept 12, 2001

1. Highlights

- 2. Theoretical background
- 3. Experimental Detail
- 4. Conclusion

Belle Collaboration: \sim 250 physicists



International Collaboration: ~50 Institutions



BELLE Collaboration

Aomori University Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics Chiba University Chuo University University of Cincinnati Frankfurt University Gyeongsang National University University of Hawaii Hiroshima Institute of Technology Hiroshima College of Maritime Tech. IHEP, Beijing ITEP, Moscow Joint Crystal Collaboration Group Kanagawa University KEK Korea University Krakow Institute of Nuclear Physics Kyoto University University of Melbourne Mindanao State University Nagasaki Institute of Applied Science Nagoya University Nara Woman's University National Central University National Kaoshing University

National Lien-Ho Colles National Taiwan Univer Nihon Dental College Niigata University Osaka University Osaka City University Panjab University Princeton University Saga University Seoul National Universit University of Science an Sugiyama Woman's Col Sungkyunkwan Universi University of Sydney Toho University Tohoku University Tohoku-gakuin Universi University of Tokyo Tokyo Institute of Techr Tokyo Metropolitan Uni Tokyo University of Ag Toyama National Colleg University of Tsukuba Utkal Univesity Virginia Polytechnic Ins Yonsei University

KEK (High-Energy Physics Lab., Tsukuba, Japan)



KEK B-factory (KEK-B)



1. $\Upsilon(4S) \rightarrow B^0 \overline{B}{}^0$ (also B^+B^-)

 $M_{\Upsilon(4S)} = 10.59 \text{ GeV}, \ 2M_B = 10.56 \text{ GeV}.$ $\rightarrow B^0, \bar{B}^0$ nearly at rest in $\Upsilon(4S)$ c.m. ($P_B^* \sim 0.33$ GeV, or $\beta_B^* \sim 0.063$)

2. But $\Upsilon(4S)$ is moving.

$$\beta_{\Upsilon(4S)} = \frac{P_{\Upsilon(4S)}}{E_{\Upsilon(4S)}} = \frac{8.0 - 3.5}{8.0 + 3.5} = 0.39$$

3. $B^0 - \bar{B}^0$ mix.

Quantum-correlated coherent mixing.

4. Then, B^0, \overline{B}^0 decay.

 $au_B \sim$ 1.55 ps ightarrow average decay length \sim 200 μ m.

One *B* decays to a *CP* eigenstate $|f_{CP}\rangle$ ('CP' side; e.g. $|f_{CP}\rangle = J/\Psi K_S \dots$) The other to a channel that tells B^0 or \bar{B}^0 ('tag' side; e.g. $B^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ X$, $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \mu^- X$)

Measurement of Δt

$$\Delta t \equiv t_{CP} - t_{tag} = \frac{\Delta z}{\beta \gamma c}$$
 (t: decay time in rest frame)







Why is this a CP violation?

A, B: phenomena (or statements)

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{particle} \leftrightarrow \text{antiparticle}(C) \\ A \xleftarrow{} B \\ \text{mirror inversion}(P) \end{array}$$

If A and B occur at the same rate (or both true), then CP is conserved, otherwise, CP is violated.

For
$$CP(\xi_f) = -1$$
 (e.g. ΨK_S)

Observation: A: If tag side is $\bar{B}^0(q = -1)$, the *CP* side tends to decay earlier than the tag side.

 $\downarrow CP$

B: If tag side is \overline{B}^0 , the *CP* side tends to decay earlier than the tag side. (not true!)

 $\rightarrow CP$ violation

Similarly for CP = +1 or B^0 tag.

(CP+ and - having different distributions is not CP violation.)

Theoretical Background

Standard-Model quark-W Interaction

$$L_{\text{int}}(t) = \int d^3x \left(\mathcal{L}_{qW}(x) + \mathcal{L}_{qW}^{\dagger}(x) \right)$$
$$\mathcal{L}_{qW}(x) = \frac{g}{\sqrt{8}} \sum_{i,j=1,3} V_{ij} \, \bar{U}_i \, \gamma_{\mu} (1 - \gamma_5) D_j \, W^{\mu}$$
$$U_i \equiv \begin{pmatrix} u \\ c \\ t \end{pmatrix}, \quad D_j \equiv \begin{pmatrix} d \\ s \\ b \end{pmatrix}$$

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} V_{ud} & V_{us} & V_{ub} \\ V_{cd} & V_{cs} & V_{cb} \\ V_{td} & V_{ts} & V_{tb} \end{pmatrix}$$

Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Masukawa (CKM) matrix (Unitary)

One can show that,

If V_{ij} are all real (by adjusting quark phases), then

 $(CP)\mathcal{L}_{int}(CP)^{\dagger} = \mathcal{L}_{int}$

In general, a 3×3 quark mixing matrix cannot be made real $\rightarrow CP$ violation (Kobayashi, Masukawa, 1973)

Our phase convention:
$$\begin{pmatrix} V_{ud} & V_{us} & V_{ub} \\ V_{cd} & V_{cs} & V_{cb} \\ V_{td} & V_{ts} & V_{tb} \end{pmatrix}$$
black : \sim real
red : complex

If an interaction does not involve t - d or u - b transitions, then, $(CP)H_{eff}(CP)^{\dagger} = H_{eff}$.

Unitarity Triangle

e.g: orthogonality of *d*-column and *b*-column:

 $V_{ud}V_{ub}^* + V_{cd}V_{cb}^* + V_{td}V_{tb}^* = 0$



$$\phi_1(\equiv\beta) = -\arg(V_{td}),$$

If the CKM matrix is real, the triangle is a line.

How does the CKM unitarity triangle look?

Experimental inputs:

1.
$$|V_{ub}/V_{cb}|$$
 (by $b \rightarrow ue\nu$)
2. $B^0 - \overline{B}^0$ mixing $\rightarrow |V_{td}|$
3. ϵ_K (from Kaon system)

Many people have performed a fit. One recent example: Ciuchini et.al.:



Normalized to the bottom length of the triangle. (two bands for each are 68% and 95% c.l.)

CP Violation by Mixing-Decay Interference

$$\Gamma_{B^{0}(\bar{B}^{0})\to f_{CP}}(t) = e^{-\gamma t} |pA|^{2} \left[1 \pm \Im\left(\frac{q\overline{A}}{pA}\right) \sin \delta m t\right]$$

$$\begin{cases} B_a = pB^0 + q\bar{B}^0 \\ B_b = pB^0 - q\bar{B}^0 \\ \end{cases}, \quad \begin{cases} A \equiv Amp(B^0 \to f_{CP}) \\ \bar{A} \equiv Amp(\bar{B}^0 \to f_{CP}) \end{cases}$$

 $B_{a,b}$: eigenstates of mass and decay rate.

 γ : average decay rate, $\delta m \equiv m_a - m_b$

Time-dependent asymmetry:

$$A_{CP}(t) \equiv \frac{\Gamma_{\bar{B}^0} - \Gamma_{B^0}}{\Gamma_{\bar{B}^0} + \Gamma_{B^0}} = -\Im\left(\frac{q\bar{A}}{p\bar{A}}\right)\sin\delta m t$$

What is $\Im \frac{q\bar{A}}{pA}$ for $f_{CP} = \Psi K_S$ etc. ?



c : no V_{td} or V_{ub} in decay $\overline{s} \rightarrow (CP)H_{eff}(CP)^{\dagger} = H_{eff}.$ $K^{0} \rightarrow K_{s}$ (in our convention)

$$A = \underbrace{\langle f_{CP} |}_{(CP)^{\dagger}(CP)} \underbrace{H_{\text{eff}}}_{(CP)^{\dagger}(CP)} \underbrace{|B^{0}\rangle = \xi_{f} \langle f_{CP} | H_{\text{eff}} | \bar{B}^{0} \rangle = \xi_{f} \bar{A} \longrightarrow \frac{\bar{A}}{A} = \xi_{f}$$
$$(CP|f_{CP}\rangle = \xi_{f} | f_{CP} \rangle, \quad CP|B^{0}\rangle = |\bar{B}^{0}\rangle)$$

$$\overline{B}^{o} \xrightarrow[\overline{d}]{} \frac{V_{tb} \quad t \quad V_{td}^{*} \quad d}{W} \xrightarrow[\overline{d}]{} \frac{W}{V_{td}} \stackrel{*}{\overline{t}} V_{tb} \quad \overline{b}} \xrightarrow{B^{o}} \rightarrow \frac{q}{p} = -\frac{V_{td}V_{tb}^{*}}{V_{td}^{*}V_{tb}} = -e^{-2i\phi_{1}}$$

$$\Im \frac{q\overline{A}}{pA} = \xi_f \sin 2\phi_1$$
. (No CPV in decay)

Quantum correlation in $\Upsilon 4S \rightarrow B^0 \overline{B}^0$ (coherent L=1):

$$\Upsilon 4S \to (B^0 \overline{B}{}^0 - \overline{B}{}^0 B^0) \\\to e^{-\gamma t} (B^0 \overline{B}{}^0 - \overline{B}{}^0 B^0)$$

If one finds one side to be \overline{B}^0 at t, then the other side is pure B^0 at the same time t, then it will evolve as usual.

 $ightarrow \Gamma_{B^{0}(\bar{B}^{0})
ightarrow f}(t)$ applies to $\Upsilon 4S$ with $t \rightarrow \Delta t \equiv t_{CP} - t_{tag}$, (and $e^{-\gamma t} \rightarrow e^{-\gamma |\Delta t|}$)



CP-si	ide	Recon	st	truc	cti	on

CP mode	ξ_{CP}	N_{evt}	N_{bkg}
$\overline{\Psi K_S(\to\pi^+\pi^-)}$		457	11.9
$\Psi K_S (\to \pi^0 \pi^0)$	_	76	9.4
$\Psi'(\rightarrow \ell^+\ell^-)K_S$	_	39	1.2
$\Psi'(\rightarrow \Psi \pi^+\pi^-)K_S$	—	46	2.1
$\chi_{c1}K_S$	_	24	2.4
$\eta_c (\to K^+ K^- \pi^0) K_S$	—	23	11.3
$\eta_c (\to K_S K^- \pi^+) K_S$	_	41	13.6
$\Psi K^{*0} (\rightarrow K_S \pi^0)$	+/-	41	6.7
ΨK_L	+	569	223

┝
-





- 6. KLM Detector
- 7. Superconducting Solenoid
- 8. Superconducting Final Focussing System

Particle identifications

electrons: EM shower in the EM calorimeter (ECL).

muons: Penetration to KLM.

 π/K : Aerogel Cerenkov counters. Time of flight counter. Ionization in the drife chamber (dE/dx).

Dataset used for this analysis

Integrated luminosity = 29.1 fb⁻¹. 31.3 million $B\bar{B}$ pairs created.

$\Psi \to \ell^+ \ell^-$ reconstruction



Ψ' reconstruction



$\chi_{c1} \rightarrow \Psi \gamma$ reconstruction



 χ_{c1} : left peak, χ_{c2} : left peak (violation of factorization!)

Full B Reconstruction

 $B \to f_1 \cdots f_n$

Move to the $\Upsilon 4S$ c.m. and require that candidates satisfy

$$E_{\text{tot}} = E_B^* \equiv \frac{M_{\Upsilon(4S)}}{2}, \quad |\vec{P}_{\text{tot}}| = |\vec{P}_B^*| = 0.33 GeV$$

where

$$E_{\text{tot}} \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{n} E_i, \quad \vec{P}_{\text{tot}} \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{n} \vec{P}_i$$

Instead of E_{tot} and $|\vec{P}_{tot}|$, we often use

 $\Delta E \equiv E_{\text{tot}} - E_B^* \quad \text{(energy difference)}$ $M_{\text{bc}} \equiv \sqrt{E_B^{*2} - \vec{P}_{\text{tot}}^2} \quad \text{(beam-constrained mass)}$

 $\Psi K_S(\rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-)$



 $\Psi K_S(\rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-)$



 $\Psi'(\rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^-) K_S$

 $\Psi'(\rightarrow \Psi \pi^+ \pi^-) K_S$







 $\eta_c (\to K_S K^+ \pi^-) K_S$

$\eta_c (\to K^+ K^- \pi^0) K_S$



- K_L : Only the direction is measured by nuclear interaction in ECL (EM calorimeter) and/or KLM (KL-muon chamber).
- p_B^* : Cannot obtain both ΔE and M_{bc} Assume *B* mass, extract p_B^* ($\equiv M_{bc}$).



$$\Psi K^{*0}(\to K_S \pi^0)$$

B (spin-0)
$$\rightarrow \Psi$$
 (spin-1) K^{*0} (spin-1)
3 polarization states: helicities = (++, --, 00)

Extract *P* (*CP*) contents by full angular analysis of the isospin-related modes.



$$\frac{\xi_f = -1}{\text{all}} = 0.19 \pm 0.04(stat) \pm 0.04(sys)$$

Tagging of *B* **Flavor**

What distinguish B^0 and \overline{B}^0 ?

- 1. Leptons (e, μ)
 - $b \rightarrow \ell^-$: high-P lepton.
 - $b \rightarrow c \rightarrow \ell^+$: low-P lepton.
- 2. Charged kaons. $b \rightarrow c \rightarrow s(K^{-})$
- **3.** $\Lambda(\rightarrow p\pi^{-})$. $b \rightarrow c \rightarrow s(\Lambda)$
- 4. Charged pions.
 - $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{(*)}\pi^-$ etc.: high-P pion.
 - $b \rightarrow D^{*+} \rightarrow D^0 \pi^+$: low-P pion.

Multi-dimentional likelihood tagging







 $\epsilon_{\rm eff} = 0.270 \pm 0.008(stat)^{+0.006}_{-0.009}(sys)$

Measurement of Δz (Δt)

- Vertexing -

Use the two charged tracks of $\Psi \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^-$, or $\eta_c \rightarrow KK\pi$. K_S not used: decay mosly outside of the silicon device.



Verify vertexing by measuring B^0 lifetime

 $B^0 \to D^{*-} \ell^+ \nu$



 $\tau_{B^0} = 1.55 \pm 0.02$ ps (world average: 1.55 ± 0.03 ps)

Event-by-event likelihood fit

Fit the Δt distribution with

$$P_{i}(\Delta t) = \int \left[f_{sig} \mathcal{P}_{sig}(\Delta t', q, r_{i}, \xi_{f}) R_{sig}(\Delta t - \Delta t') + (1 - f_{sig}) \mathcal{P}_{bkg}(\Delta t') R_{bkg}(\Delta t - \Delta t') \right] d\Delta t'$$

 f_{sig} :(signal fraction) $\mathcal{P}_{sig} = e^{-\gamma |\Delta t|} (1 - \xi_f q r_i \sin 2\phi_1 \sin \delta m \Delta t)$ (signal before smearing) R_{sig} : 2 gaussians(signal resolution) $\mathcal{P}_{bkg} = e^{-\frac{\Delta t}{\tau_{bkg}}}$ and $\delta(\Delta t)$ (bkg before smearing) R_{bkg} : 2 gaussians(bkg resolution)

Use the world averages for γ (B^0 decay rate) and $\delta m \rightarrow$ only free parameter is $\sin 2\phi_1$.

Plot time-dependent asymmetry

Fit $\sin 2\phi_1$ in each Δt bin



 $\sin 2\phi_1 = 0.99 \pm 0.14(stat) \pm 0.06(sys)$

Systematic errors on $\sin 2\phi_1$

vertexing	0.04
tagging	0.03
Δt resolution	0.02
background shapes	0.01
Errors on $\delta m \ au_{B^0}$	0.01
total	0.06

Mode dependence of $\sin 2\phi_1$





B^0 control modes



'sin $2\phi_1$ ' = 0.05 ± 0.04

Comparison with other experiments



BaBar and Belle accounced this summer within 2 weeks of each other.

In terms of the unitarity triangle



Summary

- 1. We have clearly observed CP violation in B decay. The significance is more than 6 σ .
- 2. The dependence on Δt , CP eigenvalue, and flavor are as expected.
- 3. The value of $\sin 2\phi_1$ is consistent with the standard model with Koboyashi-Masukawa mechanism. (a bit largar than?)
- 4. Further inprovements in statistical/systematic errors are expected soon.
- * Upgrade 2002:
 - Smaller beampipe: $r = 2cm \rightarrow 1.5cm$. 25% improvement in vertex resolution.
 - New IR design for better background protection.
 - New vertex detector: more layers (3→4), more coverage.
 - New inner CDC (2-layer small-cell chamber)