







Rare B decays at Belle

Nadiia Maslova HEPHY Vienna nadiia.maslova@oeaw.ac.at

ALPS 2023 – Anomalies in Particle Physics 26-31 March 2023, Obergugl University Centre, Tyrol, Austria

Rare B decays

- In SM the coupling of gauge bosons to leptons is independent of lepton flavor *Lepton Flavor Universality (LFU)*
- LFU is a good probe for New Physics (NP) some models predict larger couplings for heavier leptons
- LFU can be also accompanied by Lepton Flavor Violation (LFV) ⇒ any signal observation could be an indication of NP contribution

This talk: recent Belle efforts to search for LFU in $b \rightarrow s$ transition and LFV

The Belle experiment



- KEKB asymmetric e⁺ e⁻ collider
- Operated from 1999 to 2010, followed by Belle II
- Collected data: Υ(4S) 711 fb⁻¹, Υ(5S) -121 fb⁻¹



LFU: $R(K^{(*)})$

- $R_{K^{(*)}} \equiv \frac{Br (B \to K^{(*)} \mu^+ \mu^-)}{Br (B \to K^{(*)} e^+ e^-)}$
- Multivariate analysis is used to suppress continuum background and select signal. Signal yields obtained from fit of M_{bc} in different q^2 bins
- Results consistent with SM
- The dominant systematic uncertainty coming from lepton identification -5(10)%
- The same analysis R(K) also searched for LFV $B \rightarrow K\mu e$. Upper limits at 90% CL obtained:

Channel	Babar $(\times 10^{-7})$	LHCb $(\times 10^{-9})$	$\begin{array}{c} \text{Belle} \\ (\times \ 10^{-8}) \end{array}$
$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \to K^+ \mu^+ e^-)$		6.4	8.5
$\mathcal{B}(B^+\to K^+\mu^-e^+)$		7.0	3.0
$\mathcal{B}\bigl(B^+\to K^0\mu^\pm e^\mp\bigr)$	2.7		3.8



$LFV: B^+ \to K^+ \tau^{\pm} l^{\mp}$

- Hadronic tagging with Full Event Interpretation
- FEI reconstructs hierarchically exclusive B-meson channels ($\mathcal{O}(10^3)$ decays available)
- Signal B: 3 charged tracks originating from IP, not associated to B tag
- Consider τ decays $\tau \to e \nu \overline{\nu}, \tau \to \mu \nu \overline{\nu}, \tau \to \pi \nu$
- 2 BDTs trained for background suppression $-B\overline{B}$ and $q\overline{q}$. Systematic uncertainties are evaluated using the control samples: $B^+ \to \overline{D}^{**0} (\to D^- \pi^+)\pi^+$ (similar topology, D treated as τ); $B \to J/\psi K$ (for $q\overline{q}$ suppression evaluation $-B_{sig}$ topology is not used)



BDT output distribution for signal MC, data, and control samples

Full data sample: $711 f b^{-1}$



Nadiia Maslova, HEPHY

$|\mathsf{LFV}:B^+ \to K^+ \tau^\pm l^\mp|$

• Leading systematic uncertainties $(B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \tau^+ \mu^-)$:

BDT selection $B\overline{B}$ - 10.6%, and $q\overline{q}$ - 10.8%, tag calibration - 5.9%

• The most stringent limits up-to-date:

Channel	Babar	LHCb $(\times 10^{-5})$	$\begin{array}{c} \text{Belle} \\ (\times \ 10^{-5}) \end{array}$
$\mathcal{B}(B^+\to K^+\tau^+\mu^-)$	2.8	3.9	0.59
$\mathcal{B}(B^+\to K^+\tau^+e^-)$	1.5		1.51
$\mathcal{B}(B^+\to K^+\tau^-\mu^+)$	4.5	3.9	2.45
$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \to K^+ \tau^- e^+)$	4.3		1.53



Recoil mass – used for fitting, should peak at mass of au lepton

$$M_{\rm recoil}^2 = m_{\tau}^2 = m_B^2 + m_{K\ell}^2 - 2(E_{\rm beam}^* E_{K\ell}^*/c^4 + p_{B_{\rm tag}}^* p_{K\ell}^* \cos \theta/c^2)$$

LFV: $B_s^0 \rightarrow l\tau$

- $e^+e^- \rightarrow \Upsilon(5S) \rightarrow B_s^{(*)0} \overline{B}_s^{(*)0}, B_s^{*0} \rightarrow B_s^0 \gamma$, 100% mixing $B_s^0 \leftrightarrow \overline{B}_s^0$
- Semi-leptonic tag: $\overline{B}_{s}^{0} \rightarrow D_{s}^{+}l^{-}(X)\overline{\nu}_{l}$, select lepton from tag side with an opposite charge of primary lepton of signal-side
- FastBDT classifier to suppress continuum background (kinematics variables + Fox-Wolfram moments), optimized with Punzi FOM. Best candidate selection – based on FastBDT output



Schematic view of the process, signal and tag sides

Full data sample: $121 f b^{-1}$

arXiv:2301.10989

LFV: $B_s^0 \rightarrow l\tau$

• Leading systematic uncertainties:

SL tagging uncertainty – 15%, number of B_s – 16.1%, FBDT selection - 3.3(3.7)%

• Set up upper limits at 90% CL:

Channel	LHCb	Belle
$\mathcal{B}(B^0_s \to e^{\mp}\tau^{\pm})$	-	14.1 $\times 10^{-4}$
$\mathcal{B}(B^0_s \to \mu^\mp \tau^\pm)$	3.4×10^{-5}	7.3×10^{-4}

• Limit on electron channel is the first such limit reported!



FBDT output distribution for signal MC, generic MC and data



Final fit is performed on p_1^st

$B^+ \to K^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$

- Has never been observed yet, the SM prediction is $\mathcal{B}(B^+ \to K^+ \nu \bar{\nu}) = (5.04 \pm 0.38) \times 10^{-6}$ [substracting long-distance contribution]
- FCNC, clean theoretical prediction exact factorization
- Sensitive to contributions of non-SM particles
- Possible scenarios: Z' (light/heavy), leptoquarks



Contributing Feynman diagrams: penguin and box



Experimental results from Belle (SL, had), BaBar (Had+SL), Belle II (inclusive)

 Challenging to detect: small branching fraction and large missing energy
→ inclusive tagging method, used first in Belle II – intriguing result with relatively small dataset

$B^+ \to K^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$

Multivariate classification is used to suppress background and select signal:

- BDT1: to reduce largely $B\overline{B}$ and $q\overline{q}$ background
- BDT2 or NN: to select signal. NN trained with decorrelation on q^2 variable to avoid biases
- Control sample: $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ J/\psi \rightarrow K^+ \mu^+ \mu^-$, muons discarded



FOM over signal efficiency dependence for BDT1 and BDT2 Nadiia Maslova, HEPHY Rare B Decays f



Distribution in $q^2 \times \sigma$ bins

Summary

- New Physics could manifest itself in LFU and LFV
- $R(K^{(*)})$ consistent with the SM
- $B_s^0 \rightarrow l\tau$ the first upper limit estimation for the electron channel
- $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \tau^{\pm} l^{\mp}$ the most stringent upper limits to-date
- $B^+ \to K^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ inclusive tag analysis ongoing

Thank you for attention!

Backup $R(K^{(*)})$





Backup $R(K^{(*)})$

TABLE II. Results for R_{K^*} , $R_{K^{*0}}$, and $R_{K^{*+}}$. The first uncertainty is statistical and the second is systematic	TABLE II.	Results for R_{K^*} , $R_{K^{*0}}$, and	$R_{K^{*+}}$. The	first uncertainty is statistical a	and the second is systematic
---	-----------	--	--------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------

$q^2 ({\rm GeV}^2/c^4)$	All modes	B^0 modes	B^+ modes
[0.045, 1.1]	$0.52^{+0.36}_{-0.26}\pm 0.05$	$0.46^{+0.55}_{-0.27} \pm 0.13$	$0.62^{+0.60}_{-0.36} \pm 0.07$
[1.1, 6]	$0.96^{+0.45}_{-0.29} \pm 0.11$	$1.06^{+0.63}_{-0.38} \pm 0.13$	$0.72^{+0.99}_{-0.44} \pm 0.14$
[0.1, 8]	$0.90^{+0.27}_{-0.21} \pm 0.10$	$0.86^{+0.33}_{-0.24} \pm 0.09$	$0.96^{+0.56}_{-0.35} \pm 0.13$
[15, 19]	$1.18^{+0.52}_{-0.32} \pm 0.10$	$1.12^{+0.61}_{-0.36} \pm 0.10$	$1.40^{+1.99}_{-0.68} \pm 0.11$
[0.045, 19]	$0.94^{+0.17}_{-0.14}\pm0.08$	$1.12^{+0.27}_{-0.21}\pm0.09$	$0.70^{+0.24}_{-0.19} \pm 0.06$

TABLE III. Results for the branching fractions in $[10^{-7}]$ in the corresponding q^2 range in GeV^2/c^4 . The first uncertainty is statistical and the second is systematic.

Mode	$q^2 \in [1.1,6]$	$q^2 \in [0.1, 8]$	$q^2 \in [15, 19]$	$q^2 > 0.045$
$\mathcal{B}(B^0 \to K^{*0} e^+ e^-)$	$1.8^{+0.6}_{-0.6}\pm0.2$	$3.7^{+0.9}_{-0.9} \pm 0.4$	$2.0^{+0.6}_{-0.5}\pm0.2$	$9.2^{+1.6}_{-1.6} \pm 0.8$
$\mathcal{B}(B^0\to K^{*0}\mu^+\mu^-)$	$1.9^{+0.6}_{-0.5}\pm0.3$	$3.2^{+0.8}_{-0.8}\pm0.4$	$2.2^{+0.5}_{-0.4} \pm 0.2$	$10.3^{+1.3}_{-1.3} \pm 1.1$
$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \to K^{*+}e^+e^-)$	$1.7^{+1.0}_{-1.0}\pm0.2$	$4.6^{+1.6}_{-1.5}\pm0.7$	$2.1^{+1.2}_{-1.0}\pm 0.2$	$14.1^{+3.1}_{-2.8} \pm 1.8$
$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \to K^{*+} \mu^+ \mu^-)$	$1.2^{+0.9}_{-0.7}\pm0.2$	$4.4^{+1.6}_{-1.4}\pm0.5$	$2.9^{+1.0}_{-0.8}\pm0.3$	$9.9^{+2.4}_{-2.3}\pm1.1$

Backup $B^+ \to K^+ \tau^{\pm} l^{\mp}$

Source	$K^+\tau^+\mu^-$	$K^+\tau^+e^-$	$K^+ \tau^- \mu^+$	$K^+ \tau^- e^+$
Additive (events)				
PDF shape (mean)	0.09	0.01	0.08	0.08
PDF shape (width)	0.02	0.08	0.04	0.07
PDF shape (f_{sig})	0.28	0.16	0.11	0.16
Linearity	0.03	0.04	0.02	0.04
Total	0.30	0.18	0.14	0.20
Multiplicative (%)				
$B_{\rm tag}$ calibration	5.9	5.9	5.9	5.9
Track reconstruction	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1
Kaon id.	1.3	1.4	1.3	1.3
Lepton id.	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.4
τ daughter id.	0.7	0.7	0.6	0.6
MC statistics	1.0	1.5	1.2	1.0
Number of $B\overline{B}$ pairs	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4
BDT $B\overline{B}$ selection	10.6	10.0	12.7	12.6
BDT $q\overline{q}$ selection	8.8	8.6	9.2	6.6
<i>f</i> ⁺⁻	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2
Total	15.3	14.8	17.0	15.7

TABLE II: Contributions to the systematic uncertainties of the measurements.

Nadiia Maslova, HEPHY



Figure 3: The p_1^* distribution of signal MC, generic MC and data in $B_s \to e^- \tau^+$ (a) and $B_s \to \mu^- \tau^+$ (b) modes. The different background components in generic MC are indicated by different colours as shown in the legend. The MC samples are normalized with respect to the data luminosity. The signal components correspond to $\mathcal{B} = 1 \times 10^{-3}$.

Decay	Fraction, %
$B^{\pm} \to \overline{D}^* (2007)^0 \mu^{\pm} \nu_{\mu}$	7.880327
$B^{\pm} \rightarrow \overline{D}^* (2007)^0 e^{\pm} \nu_e$	6.58383
$B^{\pm} \to \overline{D}^0 \mu^{\pm} \nu_{\mu}$	6.08433
$B^{\pm} \to \overline{D}^0 e^{\pm} \nu_e$	5.811197
$B^{\pm} \to \overline{D}^0 \tau^{\pm} \nu_{\tau}$	1.048505
$B^{\pm} \to \overline{D}^* (2007)^0 \tau^{\pm} \nu_{\tau}$	0.968968
$B^{\pm} \rightarrow D^0 D_s^{\pm}$	0.757687
$B^{\pm} \rightarrow \overline{D}_0^* (2300)^0 \mu^{\pm} \nu_{\mu}$	0.673378
$B^{\pm} \rightarrow \rho(770)^{\pm} D^{0}$	0.638757
$B^{\pm} \rightarrow \overline{D}_0^* (2300)^0 e^{\pm} \nu_e$	0.640273
$B^{\pm} \rightarrow D_s^{*\pm} \overline{D}^* (2007)^0$	0.628755
$B^{\pm} \to \overline{D}^* (2007)^0 e^{\pm} \nu_e \gamma$	0.603814
$B^{\pm} \to D^*(2007)^0 \rho(770)^{\pm}$	0.5300025
$B^{\pm} \rightarrow D_1(2420)^0 \mu^{\pm} \overline{\nu}_{\mu}$	0.518129
$B^{\pm} \to \overline{D}^0 e^{\pm} \nu_e \gamma$	0.512394
$B^{\pm} \to \overline{D}_1(2430)^0 \mu^{\pm} \nu_{\mu}$	0.51266
$B^{\pm} \rightarrow D^0 \pi^{\pm}$	0.483492
$B^{\pm} \to \overline{D}^* (2007)^0 K^{\pm} \overline{K}^0$	0.47301
$B^{\pm} \rightarrow \overline{D}_1(2420)^0 e^{\pm} \nu_e$	0.465642
$B^{\pm} \rightarrow \overline{D}_1(2430)^0 e^{\pm} \nu_e$	0.458707

Decay	Fraction, %
$B^0 \to D^*(2010)^{\mp} \mu^{\pm} \nu_{\mu}$	7.181017
$B^0 \to D^*(2010)^{\mp} e^{\pm} \nu_e$	5.938356
$B^0 \to D^{\mp} \mu^{\pm} \nu_{\mu}$	3.108249
$B^0 \to D^{\mp} e^{\pm} \nu_e$	2.915231
$B^0 \to D^- \overline{n} p$	0.788527
$B^0 \rightarrow D^*(2010)^{\mp} \tau^{\pm} \nu_{\tau}$	0.99131
$B^0 \rightarrow D_0^*(2300)^{\mp} \mu^{\pm} \overline{\nu}_{\mu}$	0.993152
$B^0 \to D_0^*(2300)^{\mp} e^{\pm} \nu_e$	0.93435
$B^0 \to D^*(2010)^{\mp} D_s^{*\pm}$	0.81219
$B^0 \to D^*(2010)^{\mp} K^{\pm} \overline{K}^0$	0.758093
$B^0 \to D_1(2420)^{\mp} \mu^{\pm} \nu_{\mu}$	0.66667
$B^0 \to D_1(H)^{\mp} \mu^{\pm} \nu_{\mu}$	0.646855
$B^0 \to D^*(2010)^{\mp} \overline{n} p$	0.483966
$B^0 \to D_1(2420)^{\mp} e^{\pm} \nu_e$	0.6095
$B^0 \to D_1(H)^{\mp} e^{\pm} \overline{\nu}_e$	0.588462
$B^0 \to D^{\mp} \tau^{\pm} \nu_{\tau}$	0.578569
$B^0 \rightarrow D^*(2010)^{\mp} e^{\pm} \nu_e \gamma$	0.56437
$B^0 \to D^*(2010)^{\mp} D_s^{\pm}$	0.503903
$B^0 \rightarrow D^{\mp} D_s^{\pm}$	0.492259
$B^0 \rightarrow D_s^{*\pm} D^{\mp}$	0.40087

Nadiia Maslova, HEPHY