Searches for direct CPV in charm at LHCb

Maxime Schubiger On behalf of the LHCb collaboration

CHARM 2018 - Novosibirsk, Russia 24 May 2018





Maxime Schubiger

24 May 2018

Searches for direct CPV in charm at LHCb

- In the Standard Model (SM), charge-parity violation (*CPV*) in the quark sector comes only from the phase in the CKM matrix
- Order of magnitudes too small to explain our matter dominated universe
- \rightarrow Look for New Physics (NP) processes that enhance CPV
 - Direct CPV (or CPV in the decay)
 - Difference of decay rate between two CP conjugated states

$$\left|A(D^0 \to f)\right|^2 \neq \left|A(\bar{D}^0 \to \bar{f})\right|^2$$

Introduction

Why look for CPV in charm ?

- Prediction of *CPV* in charm from the SM are small
 - \rightarrow Lots of room for NP enhancement
- Only way to probe for CPV in the up-type sector
 - \rightarrow Complementary to other searches in *B* or *K*

Why look for CPV in charm at LHCb ?

- Largest sample of charm decays
 - Large *cc* cross-section:



 $\sigma(\ensuremath{\textit{pp}}
ightarrow \ensuremath{\textit{ccX}}) = (2369\pm3\pm152\pm118)\,\mu b$,

at 13 TeV and for $p_{T} < 8$ GeV/ c, 2.0 < y < 4.5 [JHEP 03 (2016) 159]

- \rightarrow Large charm yields ($O(100 \text{ M}) D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$ tagged decays)
- Good momentum resolution (0.5 1%)
- Good tracking efficiency (over 95%)
- Excellent vertex resolution (IP resolution $(15 + 29/p_T) \ \mu m)$

The experimental observable is not directly A_{CP} , but A_{raw} :

$$A_{\rm raw} = A_{CP} + A_P + A_D + A_{\rm tag}$$

- The production asymmetry A_P: In pp collisions there is an initial anti-quark deficit
- The detection asymmetry *A_D* : Mesons and anti-mesons have different behaviours in matter
- The tagging asymmetry *A*_{tag} : The tagging particle also has different behaviour in matter according to its charge
- The *CP* asymmetry A_{CP} : What we want to measure

$$A_{CP} = \frac{\Gamma(D^0 \to f) - \Gamma(\overline{D}{}^0 \to \overline{f})}{\Gamma(D^0 \to f) + \Gamma(\overline{D}{}^0 \to \overline{f})}$$

Production and tagging asymmetries

At LHCb, we use 2 independent tagging methods :



Detection asymmetry

- Detection asymmetry reduced by flipping magnet polarity regularly
- Residual detection asymmetry due to intrinsic different cross-section between the two charges of a particle when interacting with the detector's material



Experimental trick

- Difficult to measure the detector asymmetries
- One solution is to analyse 2 similar decays
 - They need to have the same tagging channel
 - e.g. $D^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-$ and $D^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-$
 - Cancel the detector asymmetries by subtracting the two raw asymmetries

$$\begin{split} \Delta A_{C\!P} &= A_{\rm raw}(D^0 \to K^+ K^-) - A_{\rm raw}(D^0 \to \pi^+ \pi^-) \\ &= A_{C\!P}(D^0 \to K^+ K^-) + A_P(D^{*+}) + A_D(K^+ K^-) + A_{\rm tag}(\pi^+) \\ &- A_{C\!P}(D^0 \to \pi^+ \pi^-) - A_P(D^{*+}) - A_D(\pi^+ \pi^-) - A_{\rm tag}(\pi^+) \\ &= A_{C\!P}(D^0 \to K^+ K^-) - A_{C\!P}(D^0 \to \pi^+ \pi^-) \end{split}$$

Most precise measurements to date

- Based on Run 1 data
- Updated analyses with Run 2 data under way

$$\begin{split} A_{CP}(D^0 \to K^+ K^-) &= (0.4 \pm 1.2 \pm 1.0) \times 10^{-3} & \text{[Phys. Lett. B 767 (2017), 177-187]} \\ A_{CP}(D^0 \to \pi^+ \pi^-) &= (0.7 \pm 1.4 \pm 1.1) \times 10^{-3} & \text{[Phys. Lett. B 767 (2017), 177-187]} \\ \Delta A_{CP}(D^0 \to h^+ h^-) &= (1.0 \pm 0.8 \pm 0.3) \times 10^{-3} & \text{[Phys. Rev. Lett. 116, 191601 (2016)]} \end{split}$$

 \rightarrow In the following slides, I will present a highlight of the latest results

A measurement of the *CP* asymmetry difference between $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow pK^-K^+$ and $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p\pi^-\pi^+$

[JHEP 03 (2018) 182]

- Dataset : 3.0 fb⁻¹, Run 1
- Production mode : $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ \mu^- X$
- Raw asymmetry :

$$\begin{split} \textbf{A}_{\rm raw}(f) &= \textbf{A}_{C\!P}(f) + \textbf{A}_{P}(\Lambda_{b}^{0}) + \textbf{A}_{\rm tag}(\mu) + \textbf{A}_{D}(f) \\ & \text{where } \textbf{f} = \textbf{p} K^{+} K^{-}, \, \textbf{p} \pi^{+} \pi^{-} \end{split}$$

 Removing experimental asymmetries by taking the difference between the two final states

$$\Delta A_{CP} = A_{\text{raw}}(pK^+K^-) - A_{\text{raw}}(p\pi^+\pi^-)$$
$$= A_{CP}(pK^+K^-) - A_{CP}(p\pi^+\pi^-)$$

Assuming the kinematics is the same for the two final states

- The kinematics of the two final states are not the same
- ightarrow Reweight the kinematics of $p\pi^+\pi^-$ to pK^+K^-
 - Reweight with decision trees with gradient boosting (GBDT)
 - Reweight for Λ_c^+ transverse momentum and pseudorapidity and *p* transverse momentum
 - limited by statistics of pK^+K^- final state
 - Quote a weighted asymmetry:

$$\Delta \mathbf{A}_{C\!P}^{\mathrm{wgt}} = \mathbf{A}_{\mathrm{raw}}(\mathbf{p}\mathbf{K}^{+}\mathbf{K}^{-}) - \mathbf{A}_{\mathrm{raw}}^{\mathrm{wgt}}(\mathbf{p}\pi^{+}\pi^{-})$$

 Weight function published in order to compare with theoretical predictions

ΔA_{CP} in Λ_c^+ decays

Yields



Results

$$\Delta A_{C\!P}^{
m wgt} = (3.0 \pm 9.1 \pm 6.1) imes 10^{-3}$$

- First measurement of *CPV* parameters in 3-body Λ_c^+ decays.
- No CPV observed

Measurement of *CP* asymmetries in $D^{\pm} \rightarrow \eta' \pi^{\pm}$ and $D_s^{\pm} \rightarrow \eta' \pi^{\pm}$ decays

[Phys. Lett. B 771 (2017) 21-30]

- Dataset : $3.0 \, \text{fb}^{-1}$, Run 1
- Observable:

$$m{A}_{
m raw} = m{A}_{C\!P} + m{A}_{P}(m{D}^{\pm}_{(m{s})}) + m{A}_{D}(\eta'\pi^{\pm})$$

- Production and detection asymmetries estimated from control channels
- Since the charge of the *D* meson specifies the flavour, no tagging needed
- ightarrow No tagging asymmetry

$A_{C\!P} ext{ in } D^{\pm}_{(s)} o \eta' \pi^{\pm} ext{ decays}$

- First analysis of $D^{\pm}_{(s)}
 ightarrow \eta' \pi^{\pm}$ decays at a hadron collider
- Decay of the $\eta':\eta'\!\rightarrow\pi^+\pi^-\gamma$
- Challenging to reconstruct the η' because of the neutral photon



${\it A_{C\!P}}$ in ${\it D}^{\pm}_{(s)}$ ightarrow $\eta'\pi^{\pm}$ decays

- Control channels:
 - For D[±] → η'π[±] : D[±] → K_S⁰π[±], K_S⁰ → π⁺π⁻
 For D[±]_s → η'π[±] : D[±]_s → φπ[±], φ → K⁺K⁻

• Construct difference of *CP* asymmetries

$$\begin{split} \Delta A_{CP}(D^{\pm} \to \eta' \pi^{\pm}) &\equiv A_{CP}(D^{\pm} \to \eta' \pi^{\pm}) - A_{CP}(D^{\pm} \to K_{s}^{0} \pi^{\pm}) \\ &= A_{raw}(D^{\pm} \to \eta' \pi^{\pm}) - A_{raw}(D^{\pm} \to K_{s}^{0} \pi^{\pm}) + A(\overline{K}^{0} - K^{0}) \\ \Delta A_{CP}(D_{s}^{\pm} \to \eta' \pi^{\pm}) &\equiv A_{CP}(D_{s}^{\pm} \to \eta' \pi^{\pm}) - A_{CP}(D_{s}^{\pm} \to \phi \pi^{\pm}) \\ &= A_{raw}(D_{s}^{\pm} \to \eta' \pi^{\pm}) - A_{raw}(D_{s}^{\pm} \to \phi \pi^{\pm}) \end{split}$$

• Extract the CP asymmetries

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathsf{A}_{C\!P}(D^{\pm} \to \eta' \pi^{\pm}) \approx \Delta \mathsf{A}_{C\!P}(D^{\pm} \to \eta' \pi^{\pm}) + \mathsf{A}_{C\!P}(D^{\pm} \to \mathsf{K}_{\mathrm{S}}^{0} \pi^{\pm}) \\ & \mathsf{A}_{C\!P}(D^{\pm}_{s} \to \eta' \pi^{\pm}) \approx \Delta \mathsf{A}_{C\!P}(D^{\pm}_{s} \to \eta' \pi^{\pm}) + \mathsf{A}_{C\!P}(D^{\pm}_{s} \to \phi \pi^{\pm}) \end{aligned}$$

$\overline{{\it A_{C\!P}} ext{ in } {\it D}^{\pm}_{(s)} o \eta' \pi^{\pm} ext{ decays}}$

Results

• Measure the two ΔA_{CP}

$$\Delta A_{CP}(D^{\pm} \to \eta' \pi^{\pm}) = (-5.8 \pm 7.2 \pm 5.3) \times 10^{-3}$$

$$\Delta A_{CP}(D_s^{\pm} \to \eta' \pi^{\pm}) = (-4.4 \pm 3.6 \pm 2.2) \times 10^{-3}$$

• Extract the two *A_{CP}* with input from the control channels

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{CP}(D^{\pm} \to \eta' \pi^{\pm}) &= (-6.1 \pm 7.2 \pm 5.3 \pm 1.2) \times 10^{-3} \\ \mathcal{A}_{CP}(D^{\pm}_{s} \to \eta' \pi^{\pm}) &= (-8.4 \pm \underbrace{3.6}_{\text{stat}} \pm \underbrace{2.2}_{\text{syst}} \pm \underbrace{2.7}_{\text{control}}) \times 10^{-3} \end{aligned}$$

Compatible with no CPV

$$\begin{split} N_{\rm sig}(D^{\pm} &\to \eta' \pi^{\pm}) = (62.7 \pm 0.4) \times 10^3 \\ N_{\rm sig}(D^{\pm}_{s} &\to \eta' \pi^{\pm}) = (152.2 \pm 0.5) \times 10^3 \end{split}$$



Search for CP violation in the phase space of $D^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+ \pi^-$ decays

[Phys. Lett. B 769 (2017) 345-356]

CPV in $D^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+ \pi^-$

- Dataset : $3.0 \, \text{fb}^{-1}$, Run 1
- Production mode : $D^{*+} \rightarrow D^0 \pi^+$
- $N_{\rm sig} = (1008 \pm 1) \times 10^3$



Parametrisation of the phase space

- Ordering of the particles:
 - For the D^0 : $\pi_1 \pi_2 \pi_3 \pi_4 = \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+ \pi^-$, where largest $m(\pi^+ \pi^-) = m(\pi_3 \pi_4)$
 - For the \overline{D}^0 : *CP* is applied $\pi_1 \pi_2 \pi_3 \pi_4 = \pi^- \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+$
- 5D phase space:
 - $m(\pi_1\pi_2), m(\pi_1\pi_4), m(\pi_2\pi_3), m(\pi_1\pi_2\pi_3), m(\pi_1\pi_2\pi_4)$

The energy test [J. Stat. Comput. Simul. 75 (2005) 109]

- Sensitive to local CPV in the phase space
- Model independent unbinnned method
- Define a metric to compute the distance between 2 points in the phase space
- Define a test statistic, T

$$T = \sum_{i,j>i}^{n} \frac{\psi_{ij}}{n(n-1)} + \sum_{i,j>i}^{\overline{n}} \frac{\psi_{ij}}{\overline{n}(\overline{n}-1)} - \sum_{i,j}^{n,\overline{n}} \frac{\psi_{ij}}{n\overline{n}}$$

- Build the "no CPV" hypothesis as a set of random permutations of the data
- Compare the value in data to the "no CPV " hypothesis

This is the first application of the energy test to a 4-body decay

CPV in $D^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+ \pi^-$

[Phys. Lett. B 769 (2017) 345-356]

2 tests are performed

• P-even test: D^0 vs \overline{D}^0 (*i.e.* I+II vs III+IV)

Definition of the triple-product:

For the
$$D^0$$
: $C_T = \vec{p}_1 \cdot (\vec{p}_2 \times \vec{p}_3)$
For the \overline{D}^0 : $CP(C_T) = -C(C_T) = -\overline{C}_T$

P-odd test: C_T>0 vs C_T<0 (*i.e.* I+IV vs II+III)



[Phys. Lett. B 769 (2017) 345-356]



P-odd test corresponds to a significance of CPV of 2.7 σ .

Results

Local asymmetry exceeding 2σ seen in the region of the $\rho(770)^0$



Measurement of the time-integrated CP asymmetry in $D^0 \rightarrow K^0_{ m s} K^0_{ m s}$ decays

Preliminary

[LHCb-PAPER-2018-012]

$A_{C\!P}$ in $D^0 ightarrow K^0_{ m s} K^0_{ m s}$ decays

- Dataset : 2.0 fb⁻¹, 2015-2016
- Production mode : $D^{*+} \rightarrow D^0 \pi^+$
- Raw asymmetry :

$$\textit{A}_{raw}(\textit{K}^{0}_{s}\textit{K}^{0}_{s}) = \textit{A}_{\textit{CP}}(\textit{K}^{0}_{s}\textit{K}^{0}_{s}) + \textit{A}_{\textit{P}}(\textit{D}^{*+}) + \textit{A}_{tag}(\pi^{+})$$

- No detection asymmetries from the daughters of the D⁰ since they are symmetric
- Removing production and tagging asymmetries by using a control channel D⁰ → K⁺K⁻:

$$\Delta A_{CP} = A_{raw}(K_s^0 K_s^0) - A_{raw}(K^+ K^-)$$
$$= A_{CP}(K_s^0 K_s^0) - A_{CP}(K^+ K^-)$$

${\cal A}_{C\!P}$ in $D^0\! ightarrow {\cal K}^0_{ m s} {\cal K}^0_{ m s}$ decays

Various possible tracks in LHCb:



For this analysis:

- $\bullet\,$ LL: the two ${\cal K}^0_{\!\rm S}$ decay in the VELO and have long tracks
- LD: one K_s⁰ has a long track and one decays downstream of the VELO (downstream track)

A_{CP} in $D^0 \rightarrow K^0_{s} K^0_{s}$ decays [LHCb-PAPER-2018-012] $D^0 ightarrow K^0_{ m s} K^0_{ m s}$ $\overline{D}{}^0 \rightarrow K^0_{\rm s} K^0_{\rm s}$ Candidates / (0.3 MeV/c² $\overline{D^0} \rightarrow K^0_S K^0_S$ andidates / (0.3 MeV/c2 $D^0 \rightarrow K^0_s K^0_s$ 80Ē LHCb Preliminary LHCb Preliminary + Data + Data 70 - Total - Total 60 ----Bkg -Bkg 501 $N_{sig}^{LL} = 759 \pm 32$ LL 40 30 20 140 142 144 146 148 150 144 146 150 140 142 148 Am (MeV/c2) $\Delta m (MeV/c^2)$ andidates / (0.3 MeV/c2 Candidates / (0.3 MeV/c2 $\overline{D^0} \rightarrow K^0_s K^0_s$ $D^0 \rightarrow K^0_c K^0_c$ LHCb Preliminary LHCb Preliminary + Data + Data - Total - Total -Bkg

----Bkg

 $\Delta m (MeV/c^2)$

Results

 $N_{sig}^{LD} = 308 \pm 26$ LD

•
$$A_{CP} = (4.2 \pm 3.4 \pm 1.0)\%$$

Compatible with Run 1 result: $A_{CP} = (-2.9 \pm 5.2 \pm 2.2)\%$ •

144 146 148 150

Average : $A_{CP} = (2.0 \pm 2.9 \pm 1.0)\%$ ٥

25

10 140

Catching up with the Belle result

20

140 142 144 146 148 150 154

 $\Delta m (MeV/c^2)$

- This was a highlight of 4 recent analyses from LHCb
 - Angelo Carbone will also present a new result on direct CPV in $D^0 \to K^+\pi^-$ decays later today
- No CPV has been observed in charm yet
- Reaching the precision of the theory predictions $(10^{-3} 10^{-4})$
 - New estimate of direct CPV in charm : $\mathcal{O}(10^{-4})$ [Khodjamirian and Petrov, PLB 774 (2017), 235-242]
- More promising results with Run 2 are coming
 - Already collected 3.7 fb⁻¹ between 2015 and 2017
 - Expect to have a total dataset (Run 1 + Run 2) of \sim 9.0 fb $^{-1}$ at the end of this year
- Working hard towards the upgrade for even better results

BACKUP

The LHCb detector



Details on energy test

• The metric used to define the distance is:

$$d_{ij}^2 = (m_{12}^{2,j} - m_{12}^{2,i})^2 + (m_{14}^{2,j} - m_{14}^{2,i})^2 + (m_{23}^{2,j} - m_{23}^{2,i})^2 + (m_{123}^{2,j} - m_{123}^{2,i})^2 + (m_{124}^{2,j} - m_{124}^{2,i})^2$$

• The test statistic *T* is defined to compare the distances:

$$T = \sum_{i,j>i}^{n} \frac{\psi_{ij}}{n(n-1)} + \sum_{i,j>i}^{\overline{n}} \frac{\psi_{ij}}{\overline{n}(\overline{n}-1)} - \sum_{i,j}^{n,\overline{n}} \frac{\psi_{ij}}{n\overline{n}},$$

- first two terms : average weighted distance between events in 1 sample of n (n) events
- third term : average weighted distance between events in both samples
- ψ function : Gaussian with tuneable width

$$\psi(extsf{d}_{ extsf{ij}}) = extsf{e}^{- extsf{d}_{ extsf{ij}}^2/2\delta^2}$$

${\cal A}_{C\!P}$ in $D^0\! ightarrow {\cal K}^0_{ m s} {\cal K}^0_{ m s}$ decays

Removing specific backgrounds:



$A_{C\!P}$ in $D^0 ightarrow K^0_{ m s} K^0_{ m s}$ decays

Removing specific backgrounds:

