






Lecture on

heavy flavor physics & rare decay searches

Nuno Leonardo (LIP)

B & Quarkonia Physics, CMS Group Convener







LABORATÓRIO DE INSTRUMENTAÇÃO E FÍSICA EXPERIMENTAL DE PARTICULAS



LHC Run I: flagships




a 4-decade search effort... ended 3 summers ago:
Higgs by ATLAS & CMS

a 3-decade search effort... ended this summer:
 $B_s \rightarrow \mu\mu$ by CMS & LHCb





LHC: stuff that fits (in SM)

Impressive amount of sophisticated measurements exploring fantastic and unique data






Summary of CMS SUSY Results* in SMS framework



*Observed limits, theory uncertainties not included
Only a selection of available mass limits
Probe "up to" the quoted mass limit

LHC Run I: something unexpected?

- SM makes precise predictions
- any deviation from SM observed in LHC so far -- in flavor sector?





3.7 σ deviation

2.3 σ deviation





plus a few other hints...

\rightarrow more **data** needed!

LHC Run II has just re-started




- something absolutely unexpected and exotic yet?



The “ridge”

flavor physics & rare decays



and a new, exciting bump?

Too early to tell, need more data!
Just getting ready for Run2 surprises...!

Tetraquarks,
pentaquarks, ... and
other exotic beasts

N. Leonardo

“flavor” ?

Three Generations of Matter (Fermions)

	I	II	III		
mass →	3 MeV	1.24 GeV	172.5 GeV	0	125.7 GeV
charge →	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	0	0
spin →	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	1	0
name →	u up	c charm	t top	γ photon	H Higgs
	6 MeV	95 MeV	4.2 GeV	0	0
	$-\frac{1}{3}$	$-\frac{1}{3}$	$-\frac{1}{3}$	0	0
	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	1	2
	d down	s strange	b bottom	g gluon	G Graviton
	<2 eV	<0.19 MeV	<18.2 MeV	90.2 GeV	
	0	0	0	0	
	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	1	
	ν_e electron neutrino	ν_μ muon neutrino	ν_τ tau neutrino	Z⁰ weak force	
	0.511 MeV	106 MeV	1.78 GeV	80.4 GeV	
	-1	-1	-1	±1	
	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	1	
	e electron	μ muon	τ tau	W[±] weak force	

Leptons

Bosons (Forces)

Contents

1.LHC:status&highlights

Run I selected highlights.
Run II starting now!

2.motivation

NP scale, puzzles, CKM, unitarity, global fits

3.detection

displaced topology, LHC as a HF factory

4.production

cross section, polarization, spectroscopy

5.suppression

melting and energy loss in QGP

6.lifetime

proper time bias and resolution

7.tagging & mixing

flavor tagging techniques, dilution factors,
oscillation frequency

8.CP violation

in decay, mixing, and interference

9.rare decays

as New Physics probes, FCNC, LFV

the role of flavor physics

- in searching for **New Physics**
 - discovery potential beyond energy frontier e.g. via searches for rare processes
- in understanding why the **SM** appears so fundamental
 - in that no phenomena beyond the SM has (yet) been detected at LHC Run I
- in learning about standing mysteries of the **flavor structure** of SM (and BSM)
- in connecting **CP violation** to the matter-antimatter asymmetry in the observable universe
- in probing the properties of **deconfined QCD** matter at high temperature and density
- extra: as an experimental tool & probe
 - serve as probe or a **dominant background** in SM measurements and BSM searches
 - used for **detector calibration** (e.g. material budget, magnetic field, detector performance)

probing beyond (the SM)

- central goal of LHC physics program:

- discover new physics (NP) aka BSM


- **complementary** approaches

- **direct** searches for new heavy particles produced (on-shell) in LHC collisions

- indirect searches via virtual NP contributions via high-**precision** measurements of SM processes

- search for **rare decays**, highly suppressed (or forbidden) in SM and sensitive to NP

- virtual contributions provide sensitivity to higher mass scales, well beyond the TeV scale



R. Sundrum-CKM 2012

indirect discovery via precision


- new physics can show up at precision frontier before energy frontier

- kaon (1947), Λ^0 (1950) led to discovery of **strangeness**
- GIM mechanism (1970) before discovery of **charm** (1974)
- CP violation (1964) before discovery of **bottom** (1977) & **top** (1995)
- neutral current (1973) before discovery of **Z** (1983)
- precision W and t mass meas. constrained **Higgs** mass, etc!

(note: quarks postulated 1964 [Gellman&Zweig], based on hadron classification ['eightfold way'], directly confirmed experimentally 1968 [DIS])


1970

GIM mechanism
(Glashow-Iliopoulos-Maiani)
required the fourth quark: **C**charm
e.g. $K^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ \nu_\mu$ so why not $K^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$?



1973


3rd quark generation predicted
bottom and **top**
by Kobayashi and Maskawa
to explain observed CP violation
(discovered in **1964** in the kaon system)




precision m_W and m_t
 $\Rightarrow m_H < 145 \text{ GeV}$




$\nu_\mu e^- \rightarrow \nu_\mu e^-$ **1973**
neutral currents observed




1974
J/ψ meson
discovery
(SPEAR+AGS)




1977
Y meson
discovery
(E288)



1995
top quark
discovery
(CDF+D0)



2012
Higgs boson
discovery
(ATLAS+CMS)




1983
Z boson
discovery
(UA1+UA2)

bottom line: historically, precision measurements at lower energies predicted the existence of new, heavier states

a path to new physics

- the effects of NP can be searched for and revealed indirectly through the virtual exchange of NP particles
 - general quantum effects in flavor loops
 - eg: SUSY particles can contribute in addition to SM; Z' could affect effective couplings
- if NP hides behind SM interactions
 - either NP mass scale is very LARGE
 - or NP couplings mimic Yukawa couplings (minimal flavor violation scenario, MFV)
- in all cases study of flavor observables expected to enlighten or constrain theory



note: flavor-sector constraints at the LHC comparable (or stronger) than direct search limits, e.g. for large regions of the parameter space of minimal supersymmetry models

«flavor» physics?

- the SM flavor sector arises from interplay of fermion-weak-gauge and fermion-Higgs couplings

Electroweak symmetry breaking:
 Masses for gauge bosons and fermions [Higgs mechanism]

Three generations of quarks and leptons

Left-handed doublets: $\begin{pmatrix} \nu_e \\ e \end{pmatrix}_L, \begin{pmatrix} \nu_\mu \\ \mu \end{pmatrix}_L, \begin{pmatrix} \nu_\tau \\ \tau \end{pmatrix}_L, \begin{pmatrix} u \\ d \end{pmatrix}_L, \begin{pmatrix} c \\ s \end{pmatrix}_L, \begin{pmatrix} t \\ b \end{pmatrix}_L$

Right-handed singlets: $e_R, \mu_R, \tau_R, u_R, d_R, c_R, s_R, t_R, b_R$

Rich **flavor** phenomenology ...

T = 1/2

T = 0

The parameters of the SM

- 3 gauge couplings
- 2 Higgs parameters
- strong CPV parameter, $\bar{\theta}$
- 6 quark masses
- 3 quark mixing angles + 1 phase (CKM)
- 3 (+3) lepton masses
- (3 lepton mixing angles + 1 phase (PMNS))

Out of the 19 parameters of the SM (excluding neutrino masses/mixing), 14 arise from the flavor sector.

flavor parameters


flavor «puzzle»

- there are standing mysteries intrinsic to the SM flavor sector
 - why are there so many free parameters
 - why do these parameters exhibit strong hierarchical structure spanning several orders of magnitude
 - why are there so many fermions
 - what is responsible for their organization into generations
 - and why are there 3 such generations each of leptons and quarks
 - why wide range of fermion couplings and masses
 - for example: $O(10^{-5}) \cdot m_t \sim m_u \sim m_\nu \cdot O(10^{+6})$, $|V_{ub}| \sim O(10^{-3}) \cdot |V_{td}|$
 - why are there flavor symmetries
 - and what breaks them
 - why is $\theta_{\text{QCD}} < 10^{-9}$
 - what is the origin of CP violation
- various solutions to this puzzle have been proposed (but not established), inevitably leading to beyond-the-SM scenarios
 - for within the SM these parameters can only be accommodated, not explained

another, related «puzzle»: BAU

(*baryon asymmetry in the universe*) ←

- Sakharov conditions (1967), necessary for dynamical evolution of matter dominated universe from symmetric initial state
 1. baryon number violation
 2. C & CP violation
 3. thermal inequilibrium
- no significant amounts of antimatter observed
 - $\Delta N_B / N_Y \equiv [N(\text{baryon}) - N(\text{antibaryon})] / N_Y \sim 10^{-10}$
- amount of CP violation in SM not sufficient to explain BAU
 - CPV in quark sector (CKM) would yield an asymmetry of $O(10^{-17}) \ll 10^{-10}$
- **more CPV is needed!**
 - to create a larger asymmetry, require: new sources of CP violation ... that occur at higher energies
- where might it be found?
 - lepton sector: CPV in neutrino oscillations
 - quark sector: discrepancies with KM predictions
 - gauge/higgs sector; extra dimensions or other new physics?
 - *precision measurements of flavor observables sensitive to additions to SM*



«heavy» flavor?

light quarks: $m \lesssim \Lambda_{\text{QCD}}$

u, d: realm of nuclear physics
s: rare kaon decays test SM

$$\begin{aligned} m_u &\approx 3 \text{ MeV} \\ m_d &\approx 5 \text{ MeV} \\ m_s &\approx 100 \text{ MeV} \end{aligned}$$

$$m_c \approx 1300 \text{ MeV}$$

$$m_b \approx 4200 \text{ MeV}$$

$$m_t \approx 170000 \text{ MeV}$$

top (not that heavy!)
the top quark has its own
phenomenology (since it
does not hadronize)

$$\begin{aligned} m_{\nu_1} &\leq 10^{-6} \text{ MeV} \\ m_{\nu_2} &\leq 10^{-6} \text{ MeV} \\ m_{\nu_3} &\leq 10^{-6} \text{ MeV} \end{aligned}$$

$$m_e \approx 0.5 \text{ MeV}$$

$$m_\mu \approx 100 \text{ MeV}$$

$$m_\tau \approx 1800 \text{ MeV}$$

neutrinos
have their own
phenomenology, not
detected (directly) at LHC

light charged leptons
e.g. electric and
magnetic dipole
moments test SM

tau
e.g. searches for lepton
flavor violation, $\tau \rightarrow \mu\mu\mu$

Study Beauty and Charm quarks

- hidden flavor aka quarkonia: ψ ($c\bar{c}$), Υ ($b\bar{b}$), $X_{c,b}$; plus exotic X,Y,Z states
- open charm: D mesons
- open beauty, B mesons (B_u, B_d, B_s, B_c) and b-baryons ($\Lambda_b, \Xi_b, \Omega_b, \dots$)

note:

- «B physics» refers to study of flavor-changing interactions of b-quark mesons
- some extra focus placed today on Υ and $B_{(s)}$ – particularly interesting at LHC

quark masses [higgs]

Exercise:
show this

- a Lagrangian mass term $m\bar{\psi}\psi$ would break chiral gauge symmetry \implies not allowed
- introducing Yukawa interactions with a scalar field, fermion mass terms get generated

the Higgs $\leftarrow -Y\bar{\psi}\psi\phi \xrightarrow{\text{spontaneous symmetry breaking}} -Y\bar{\psi}\psi(v + \phi')$

- the mass terms for up- and down-type quarks have the form

$$\mathcal{L}_M = -\bar{\mathbf{u}}_R^{\circ T} \mathbf{m}_u \mathbf{u}_L^{\circ} - \bar{\mathbf{d}}_R^{\circ T} \mathbf{m}_d \mathbf{d}_L^{\circ} + \text{h.c.}$$

- the mass matrices - m_u, m_d - are not diagonal; may be diagonalized (w/ unitary matrices L,R)

$$\begin{aligned} L_u \mathbf{m}_u R_u^\dagger &= \hat{\mathbf{m}}_u \\ L_d \mathbf{m}_d R_d^\dagger &= \hat{\mathbf{m}}_d \end{aligned} \implies \hat{\mathbf{m}}_{u(d)} = \text{diag}(m_{u(d)}, m_{c(s)}, m_{t(b)})$$

- flavor changing interactions in the SM (charged currents) through couplings to W^\pm bosons

$$\mathcal{L}_W = \frac{g}{\sqrt{2}} \bar{\mathbf{u}}_L^{\circ T} \gamma^\mu \bar{\mathbf{d}}_L^{\circ} W_\mu^+ + \text{h.c.} = \frac{g}{2\sqrt{2}} \bar{\mathbf{u}}^T \gamma^\mu (1 - \gamma^5) \mathbf{V} \mathbf{d} W_\mu^+ + \text{h.c.}$$


the CKM matrix

- the unitary quark-mixing matrix V is the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa matrix

$$\mathbf{V} \equiv L_u L_d^\dagger$$

- describing quark-flavor mixing

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



quark mixing [CKM]

$$\mathbf{V}_{\text{CKM}} = \begin{pmatrix} V_{ud} & V_{us} & V_{ub} \\ V_{cd} & V_{cs} & V_{cb} \\ V_{td} & V_{ts} & V_{tb} \end{pmatrix} \sim \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \lambda^2/2 & \lambda & A\lambda^3(\rho - i\eta) \\ -\lambda & 1 - \lambda^2/2 & A\lambda^2 \\ A\lambda^3(1 - \rho - i\eta) & -A\lambda^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^4)$$

- CKM: a unitary 3x3 matrix
 - has 9 parameters: 3 rotation (Euler angles) + 6 phases
 - 5 of these phases can be absorbed by making phase rotations of quark fields
 - we are left with 4 independent parameters: 3 angles & 1 (complex) phase
 - in a standard parameterization (Wolfenstein) these are: A , λ , ρ & η
- one irreducible phase \Rightarrow the source of CP violation in the SM

Exercise:

- * show that in case of N generations, unitarity implies $(N-1)^2$ independent parameters, with $N(N-1)/2$ rotation angles and $(N-1)(N-2)/2$ complex phases
- * show that at least three quark generations are required for CP violation

unitarity

- unitarity of the CKM matrix



$$\sum_i V_{ij} V_{ik}^* = \delta_{jk} = \sum_i V_{ji} V_{ki}^*$$

- e.g. multiplying 1st & 3rd columns

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

- may be represented as a triangle in the (ρ, η) plane
- CPV is proportional to triangles' area


the unitarity triangle




Exercise: show that CKM unitarity yields six triangles (note: the bs triangle is much squeezed wrt to the bd one, with small area; a large $\beta_{(bs)}$ angle would indicate BSM contributions)

constraining the unitarity triangle

- is the CKM matrix unitary (as expected in the SM)?
 - 4th generation of quarks? New forces? E.g. SUSY?
- over-constrain the UT: measure each side and each angle
 - do all measurements cross at one single point?




example: B meson mixing



→ neutral B mesons undergo spontaneous flavor oscillations between particle and antiparticle!

example: B meson mixing




- the mixing process (and oscillation frequency, Δm_q) is proportional to the involved CKM matrix elements

$$\Delta m_q = C_q |V_{tb}^* V_{tq}|^2, \quad (q = d, s)$$

$$\frac{\Delta m_d}{\Delta m_s} = \frac{C_d |V_{td}|^2}{C_s |V_{ts}|^2} = \frac{m_{B^0}}{m_{B_s}} \xi_\Delta^{-2} \frac{|V_{td}|^2}{|V_{ts}|^2}$$

$$\frac{\Delta m_s}{\Delta m_d} = \xi_\Delta^2 \frac{m_{B_s}}{m_{B^0}} \left(\frac{1 - \frac{1}{2}\lambda^2}{\lambda} \right)^2 \frac{1}{(1 - \bar{\rho})^2 + \bar{\eta}^2}$$

$$(1 - \bar{\rho})^2 + \bar{\eta}^2 = c$$



- i.e., the ratio of B_d and B_s oscillation frequencies yields a **circle** centered at the point $(\rho=1, \eta=0)$

→ a measured value of Δm_s away from $\sim 17.5 \text{ ps}^{-1}$ would have been incompatible with the SM

UT fit

$$(1 - \bar{\rho})^2 + \bar{\eta}^2 = c$$

$$c = \frac{\Delta m_d}{\Delta m_s} \xi_\Delta^2 \frac{m_{B_s}}{m_{B^0}} \left(\frac{1 - \frac{1}{2}\lambda^2}{\lambda} \right)^2$$

$$\lambda = 0.224 \pm 0.012$$

$$\xi = 1.210^{+0.047}_{-0.035} \text{ from lattice QCD (hep-lat-0510113)}$$

$$\Delta m_d = (51.0 \pm 0.4) \times 10^{10} \text{ } \hbar \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ (PDG'14)}$$

$$\Delta m_s = (17.69 \pm 0.08) \times 10^{12} \text{ } \hbar \text{ s}^{-1}$$

- if c would be exactly known, the constraint would indeed be a circle

$$f(\bar{\rho}, \bar{\eta} | c) = \delta((1 - \bar{\rho})^2 + \bar{\eta}^2 - c)$$

- but... there are uncertainties, both theoretical and experimental

- thus c is described by a probability density function (PDF): $f(c)$

- upon employing Bayes' theorem

$$\mathcal{L}(\bar{\rho}, \bar{\eta}, c, \mathbf{x} | \hat{c}) \propto f(\hat{c} | \bar{\rho}, \bar{\eta}, c, \mathbf{x}) \cdot f(c, \mathbf{x}, \bar{\rho}, \bar{\eta})$$

- we obtain the PDF for ρ, η as

$$\mathcal{L}(\bar{\rho}, \bar{\eta}, \mathbf{x}) \propto \prod_{j=1, M} f(\hat{c}_j | c_j(\bar{\rho}, \bar{\eta}, \mathbf{x})) \times \prod_{i=1, N} f_i(x_i)$$


posterior PDF

constraints

prior PDF



- integration requires use of numerical and statistical sampling techniques, e.g. Monte Carlo

Exercise: which factor limits the CKM-constraining power of B mixing; may it be constrained experimentally




UT fit


- as seen, experimental and theoretical inputs with corresponding uncertainties are combined in global inference frameworks
 - imposing SM relations -- or testing alternative BSM flavor scenarios
 - using frequentist or Bayesian statistical fit approaches, e.g.:




UT fit evolution over 20 years




1995




2001




2004



2006





2009



2013

constraining NP





- allowing for New Physics contributions, via generic parameterizations
- e.g. NP contribution to off-diagonal B mass mixing matrix M_{12} [see mixing section]
 - $M_{12}^{SM,q} = M_{12}^{SM,q} \cdot \Delta_q$, with $\Delta_q = |\Delta_q| \cdot \exp(i\Phi^{\Delta q})$ and $q=s,d$
 - SM point corresponds to: $\Delta_s = 1 = \Delta_d$
 - NP phases, Φ^{Δ} , shift CP phases from mixing-induced CP asymmetries
 - $2\beta_s \mapsto 2\beta_s - \Phi^{\Delta_s}$ ($B_s \rightarrow J/\psi\varphi$) and $2\beta_d \mapsto 2\beta_d + \Phi^{\Delta_d}$ ($B_d \rightarrow J/\psi K$)



detection

a distinctive experimental signature

- bottom and charm hadrons live longer than the other unstable particles
 - $\tau(D) \sim 0.5\text{-}1\text{ ps}$, $\tau(B) \sim 1.5\text{ ps}$
 - they travel macroscopic (i.e. measurable) distances in the detector before decaying, producing a displaced vertex topology
- extensively explored
 - in heavy-flavor analyses themselves
 - **b-jet tagging**: discriminate b-jets from the lighter quark jets
 - in SM measurements and BSM searches: to detect signal HF components (e.g. $t \rightarrow Wb$, $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$,...) or control HF backgrounds (e.g. $b\bar{b}$ dijets,...)




Exercise: determine how far a B^0 meson with typical momentum $P_{B^0} = 100\text{ GeV}$ is expected to fly at the center of a LHC detector

N. Leonardo

flavor physics & rare decays


heavy flavor “factories”

PEP II AT SLAC (US)
9 GEV e^- ON 3.1 GEV e^+




Asymmetric e^+e^- colliders
at $Y(4S)$ resonance (10.58 GeV)
aka “B factories”

KEKB AT KEK (JAPAN)
8 GEV e^- ON 3.5 GEV e^+




TEVATRON AT FNAL (US)
PP AT 2 TEV



General purpose
hadron colliders

LHC AT CERN
PP AT 14 TEV



note: currently only
LHC is operational

flavor physics & rare decays

colliders (comparison)


	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \Upsilon(4s) \rightarrow B\bar{B}$ PEP-II, KEK-B	$p\bar{p} \rightarrow b\bar{b}X$ ($\sqrt{s} = 2$ TeV) TeVatron	$pp \rightarrow b\bar{b}X$ ($\sqrt{s} = 14$ TeV) LHC
prod	1 nb	$\sim 100 \mu\text{b}$	$\sim 500 \mu\text{b}$
typ. $b\bar{b}$ rate	10 Hz	~ 100 kHz	~ 500 kHz
purity	$\sim 1/4$	$\sigma_{b\bar{b}}/\sigma_{incl} \approx 0.2\%$	$\sigma_{b\bar{b}}/\sigma_{incl} \approx 0.6\%$
pile-up	0	1.7	0.5-20
B content	B^+B^- (50%), $B^0\bar{B}^0$ (50%)	B^+ (40%), B^0 (40%), B_s (10%), B_c (<1%), b-baryons (10%)	
B boost	small, $\beta\gamma \sim 0.56$	large, decay vertices are displaced	
event structure	BB pair alone	many particles non-associated to $b\bar{b}$	
prod. vertex	Not reconstructed	reconstructed with many tracks	
$B^0\bar{B}^0$ mixing	coherent	incoherent \rightarrow flavour tagging dilution	

- lepton collider (at Υ resonance)
 - pros: clean events, high purity
 - cons: produces only B_u and B_d mesons
- hadron collider
 - pros: high cross sections ($O(10^3)$ larger), all b-hadron species produced
 - contra: trigger, bandwidth, dilution, pileup, ...

Specialized


detectors

LHCb (LHC)




General purpose


ATLAS (LHC)




CMS (LHC)




Belle (KEK)




D0 (Tevatron)



CDF (Tevatron)



BaBar (PEPII)







D0 Detector


detector capability

- main requirements
 - ▶ ability to detect secondary, displaced decay vertices
 - ▮▮▮▮▮ precise silicon tracker
 - ▶ ability to select displaced topologies online, in real time
 - ▮▮▮▮▮ flexible trigger system
 - ▶ robust and precise event and particle reconstruction
 - ▮▮▮▮▮ momentum resolution
 - ▶ particle identification: leptons (distinguish muons from kaons, with low fake rates), hadrons (separate protons from kaons from pions)

Acceptances @ LHC




the ideal heavy flavor detector?



Disclaimer: this (combined detector layout) doesn't actually exist

production


HF production




- high HF production rates at the LHC
 - very large production **cross section** (σ)
 - large accumulated **luminosity** (L)
- LHC: HF 'factory' ($N=L\cdot\sigma$)
 - allow to perform precision measurements, as well as to search for very rare processes
- HF production is ubiquitous
 - forming backgrounds for many physics processes explored at the LHC
 - need to be thoroughly understood

hadron production

- different mechanisms contribute to HF production













- produced quarks evolve into hadrons: known as fragmentation
 - involving short-distance/perturbative vs long-distance processes
- heavy **quarkonia** $Q\bar{Q}=(b\bar{b}, c\bar{c})$ are an ideal laboratory in which to study the strong force and the mechanisms of hadron formation
 - non-perturbative evolution of $Q\bar{Q}$ pair into a quarkonium state
 - employ effective theories: e.g. non-relativistic QCD (NRQCD; CSM, CEM...)



need to carry out detailed of HF production, including **cross sections, polarizations**, etc


the 'rediscovery' of the SM plot






s-wave quarkonia

charmonia ($c\bar{c}$) \Rightarrow



bottomonia ($b\bar{b}$) \Rightarrow





cross section

“ $N=L\cdot\sigma$ ”

$$\frac{d^2\sigma(Q\bar{Q})}{dp_T dy} \mathcal{B}(Q\bar{Q} \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-) = \frac{N_{fit}(Q\bar{Q})}{\mathcal{L} \cdot \mathcal{A} \cdot \epsilon \cdot \Delta p_T \cdot \Delta y}$$






- **N**: fitted signal yield
- **A**: detector acceptance from simulation
 - dependent on unknown production polarization
- **ϵ** : track, muon reconstruction and trigger efficiencies, from **data-driven** (T&P) methods
- **L**: integrated sample luminosity
 - Acceptance and efficiency corrections applied event-per-event or as bin averages $\langle \mathcal{A}, \epsilon \rangle$



cross section



" $N=L \cdot \sigma$ "

$$\frac{d^2\sigma(Q\bar{Q})}{dp_T dy} \mathcal{B}(Q\bar{Q} \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-) = \frac{N_{fit}(Q\bar{Q})}{\mathcal{L} \cdot \mathcal{A} \cdot \epsilon \cdot \Delta p_T \cdot \Delta y}$$




quarkonia production *[in pp]*

cross sections






polarizations



- precision measurements of quarkonium production
- LHC allows to probe higher p_T region for the first time

☞ (note: see polarization details in lecture: 'polarization in LHC physics')


b-hadron production



- integrated cross sections and NLO predictions in agreement
- baryon spectrum falls faster than meson spectra
- analysis of larger datasets will much improve precision of differential measurements

B_c

- meson with different heavy flavors -- unique in SM
 - sometimes also referred to as ‘quarkonium’: similar non-relativist potential techniques used to predict properties
 - formed of $\bar{b}+c$ quarks: the heaviest quark flavors expected to form mesons
 - b and c may both decay weakly
 - much shorter lifetime than other B mesons
- state by now observed in several modes
 - no excited states observed yet (many expected)



$\bar{b} \rightarrow \bar{c}$ transition

$$B_c^+ \rightarrow J/\psi \ell^+ \nu_\ell$$

$$B_c^+ \rightarrow J/\psi \pi^+$$

$c \rightarrow s$ transition




$$B_c^+ \rightarrow B_s^0 \pi^+$$

$$B_c^+ \rightarrow B_s^0 \ell^+ \nu_\ell$$

$c\bar{b} \rightarrow W^+$ transition


$$B_c^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^{*0} K^+$$

$$B_c^+ \rightarrow \phi K^+$$

$$B_c^+ \rightarrow \tau^+ \nu_\tau$$


beauty spectroscopy

mesons



Before 2006, only one b baryon had been seen: Λ_b

CDF and D0 contributed several such discoveries:



- ▶ Σ_b^- (2006)
- ▶ Ξ_b^- (2007)
- ▶ Ω_b (2008)

LHC:

- ▶ $\chi_b(3P)$ (ATLAS' 2011)
- ▶ Ξ_b^{*0} (CMS'2012)
- ▶ $B_c(2S)$ (ATLAS'2014)
- ▶ Ξ_b^{*-} $\Xi_b'^-$ (LHCb'2014)


Several other composite particles awaiting to be discovered!...

baryons




the first new particles found at the LHC

$\chi_b(3P)$ meson




- first new particle discovered by ATLAS
- reconstruct the radiative bottomonium decay by exploring photon conversions in tracker material




➔ note: these (orthogonal capabilities) further illustrate the ability of general purpose detectors to make flavor discoveries

Ξ_b^* baryon





- first new particle discovered by CMS
- first new b baryon observed at LHC
- complex cascade decay topology
 - 4 displaced vertices
 - 6 final state tracks



and couple more recent discoveries

[ATLAS'2014]
 $B_c(2S) \rightarrow \mu\mu\pi\pi$

[LHCb'2014]
 $\Xi_b'^-, \Xi_b^{*-} \rightarrow p\bar{k}\pi\pi$




exotic spectroscopy

- while not all of the predicted states have been observed yet... many unexpected ones already have
- referred to as XYZ states
- all started with the discovery of the X(3872) state by Belle in 2003
 - quickly confirmed by Babar, CDF, D0
 - other unconventional states popped up

State	m (MeV)	Γ (MeV)	J^{PC}	Process (mode)
X(3872)	3871.52 ± 0.20	1.3 ± 0.6 (< 2.2)	$1^{++}/2^{-+}$	$B \rightarrow K(\pi^+ \pi^- J/\psi)$ $p\bar{p} \rightarrow (\pi^+ \pi^- J/\psi) + \dots$ $B \rightarrow K(\omega J/\psi)$ $B \rightarrow K(D^{*0} \bar{D}^0)$ $B \rightarrow K(\gamma J/\psi)$ $B \rightarrow K(\gamma \psi(2S))$
X(3915)	3915.6 ± 3.1	28 ± 10	$0/2^{7+}$	$B \rightarrow K(\omega J/\psi)$ $e^+ e^- \rightarrow e^+ e^- (\omega J/\psi)$
X(3940)	3942_{-8}^{+9}	37_{-17}^{+27}	$?^{7+}$	$e^+ e^- \rightarrow J/\psi(D\bar{D}^*)$ $e^+ e^- \rightarrow J/\psi(\dots)$
G(3900)	3943 ± 21	52 ± 11	1^{--}	$e^+ e^- \rightarrow \gamma(D\bar{D})$
Y(4008)	4008_{-49}^{+121}	226 ± 97	1^{--}	$e^+ e^- \rightarrow \gamma(\pi^+ \pi^- J/\psi)$
$Z_1(4050)^+$	4051_{-43}^{+24}	82_{-55}^{+51}	$?$	$B \rightarrow K(\pi^+ \chi_{c1}(1P))$
Y(4140)	4143.4 ± 3.0	15_{-7}^{+11}	$?^{7+}$	$B \rightarrow K(\phi J/\psi)$
X(4160)	4156_{-25}^{+29}	139_{-65}^{+113}	$?^{7+}$	$e^+ e^- \rightarrow J/\psi(D\bar{D}^*)$
$Z_2(4250)^+$	4248_{-45}^{+185}	177_{-72}^{+321}	$?$	$B \rightarrow K(\pi^+ \chi_{c1}(1P))$
Y(4260)	4263 ± 5	108 ± 14	1^{--}	$e^+ e^- \rightarrow \gamma(\pi^+ \pi^- J/\psi)$
				$e^+ e^- \rightarrow (\pi^+ \pi^- J/\psi)$ $e^+ e^- \rightarrow (\pi^0 \pi^0 J/\psi)$
Y(4274)	$4274.4_{-6.7}^{+8.4}$	32_{-15}^{+22}	$?^{7+}$	$B \rightarrow K(\phi J/\psi)$
X(4350)	$4350.6_{-5.1}^{+4.6}$	$13.3_{-10.0}^{+18.4}$	$0,2^{++}$	$e^+ e^- \rightarrow e^+ e^- (\phi J/\psi)$
Y(4360)	4353 ± 11	96 ± 42	1^{--}	$e^+ e^- \rightarrow \gamma(\pi^+ \pi^- \psi(2S))$
$Z(4430)^+$	4443_{-18}^{+24}	107_{-71}^{+113}	$?$	$B \rightarrow K(\pi^+ \psi(2S))$
X(4630)	4634_{-11}^{+9}	92_{-32}^{+41}	1^{--}	$e^+ e^- \rightarrow \gamma(\Lambda_c^+ \Lambda_c^-)$
Y(4660)	4664 ± 12	48 ± 15	1^{--}	$e^+ e^- \rightarrow \gamma(\pi^+ \pi^- \psi(2S))$
$Y_b(10888)$	10888.4 ± 3.0	$30.7_{-7.7}^{+8.9}$	1^{--}	$e^+ e^- \rightarrow (\pi^+ \pi^- \Upsilon(nS))$

Many theoretical interpretations in discussion:



- conventional quarkonia;
- tetra-quarks states;
- meson-molecules;
- hybrid mesons;
- threshold effects;




➔ properties do **not** well fit the quarkonia picture

[Eur.Phys.J.C71:1534,2011]

XYZ states

X(3872) \rightarrow J/ ψ $\pi\pi$


Y(4140) in $B_u \rightarrow X[J/\psi\phi]K$ decays



heavy flavor (suppression)
in
heavy ion collisions


➔ at large energy densities, QCD predicts the existence of a deconfined state of quarks and gluons -- the **quark gluon plasma (QGP)**

- ▶ studied in heavy ion collisions
- ▶ the goal is to characterize and quantify the properties of the dense and hot medium produced at the unprecedented LHC energies




- heavy-flavor states are ideal “hard probes” for studying the properties of the created medium

note: topic presented in dedicated lecture: ‘matter at high density and temperature’




quarkonium suppression [Pb-Pb]




- first (quantitative) measurements of the $Y(nS)$ states in HI collisions
- unprecedented resolutions, allowing to separate the three states
 - experimentally and theoretically robust
- excited states **observed** ($>5\sigma$) to be more suppressed than ground state
- spectacular indication of formation of **Quark Gluon Plasma** in heavy ion coll.

“the LHC heavy-ion **text book** result”

Exercise: the excited states being suppressed, what may be expected also of the observed ground state (hint: $nS \rightarrow 1S$ feed-down)




quarkonium sequential suppression



quarkonia suppression pattern experimentally established:
 less tightly bound states are more suppressed in the medium





in medium hadron suppression



- measure of suppression, R_{AA} (nuclear modification factor)
 - cross section ration in PbPb vs pp, scaled by number of binary collisions
- different particle species undergo different energy loss in the medium
 - colorless probes (W,Z, γ) are not suppressed ($R_{AA} \sim 1$)
- ➔ study **flavor dependence** of energy loss


b-hadron detection

- prior to LHC, b-hadron detection was pursued mostly through inclusive-lepton ($B \rightarrow lX$) and inclusive-charmonia ($B \rightarrow J/\psi X$) studies
- with LHC, moved to a new class of more reliable and precise new measurements
 - through non-prompt charmonia: remove prompt contribution through lifetime analysis [see next section]
 - through exclusive state reconstruction [see next slide]
- both **achieved for the first time** at the LHC




B_u, B_d, B_s [in p - Pb]

- ▶ first B meson peaks reconstructed in collisions involving heavy ions (2014/5)



these systems constitute precise handles that will facilitate a much improved understanding of the mechanisms of energy loss of hadrons in the deconfined ('hot') and nuclear ('cold') media -- and of its flavor dependence

- heavy flavor studies at the LHC are opening up new research lines in nuclear physics, benefitting from the exquisite capability of the detectors and unprecedented collision energies at the LHC
- several ground-breaking results already delivered, many more to come



- large HF production cross section + precision HF detection capability

lifetime

quantum mechanics (i)

- an unstable particle may be described by an effective hamiltonian
- through the non-relativistic Schrodinger equation
- the solution reproduces the law of radioactive decay

$$\mathcal{P}(t) \sim \frac{1}{\tau} e^{-t/\tau} \quad \tau \text{ is the lifetime}$$

- t is the proper decay time, experimentally it is measured from the decay length L and momentum p (or their projections on the transverse plane)

$$t = \frac{L}{\beta\gamma} = L \frac{M}{p} = L_{xy} \frac{M}{p_T}$$



↳ Lorentz boost factor

$$\mathcal{H} = m - \frac{i}{2}\Gamma$$

$$i\partial_t\psi = \mathcal{H}\psi$$

$$|\psi\rangle_t = e^{-imt} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\Gamma t} |\psi_0\rangle$$

$$|\langle\psi_0|\psi\rangle_t|^2 = e^{-\Gamma t};$$



lifetime modeling

signal model $\rightarrow L(t|\sigma_t, \tau) = \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}} \cdot \left[\frac{1}{\tau} e^{-\frac{t}{\tau}} \theta(t) \otimes G(t; \sigma_t) \right] \cdot \mathcal{E}(t)$

\uparrow PDF normalization \uparrow theory model \uparrow t-resolution function \uparrow t-acceptance function

- **t-resolution**

- use per-event uncertainties σ_t (more precisely reco'd B's get larger weight)
- calibrate using data (high stat. modes)



$$\sigma_t \mapsto S_t \cdot \sigma_t.$$

- **trigger/selection bias**

- vertex detachment requirements used in selection bias t-distribution, requires acceptance correction, $\mathcal{E}(t)$


- **backgrounds**

- prompt, $\delta(t)$ (\rightarrow resolution)
- long-lived (from decay products of other b-hadrons)



[t-resolution, σ_t]


- σ_t may be taken per-event from the vertex kinematic fit
- should be calibrated, using data
- a possible strategy (CDF, also used for example by LHCb)
 - if dataset is t-unbiased: fit prompt peak with scale factor, $e^{-\Gamma \cdot t} \otimes R(t, S_t, \sigma_t)$; else:
 - construct a **prompt sample of B-like vertices**, closely mimicking kinematics and topology of the signal; fit this sample as above, allowing for scale factor
 - to further facilitate transfer to signal sample, parameterize $S_t(\Delta R, l, \eta, z, X^2)$



CDF

signals:
 $B \rightarrow D\pi, DIX$
 triggered by SVT

calibration sample:
 SVT-displaced D +
 prompt tracks



LHCb




signal:
 $B \rightarrow J/\psi \pi \pi \pi$
 displaced

calibration sample:
 prompt J/ψ +
 prompt pion pair

(PLB 713 (2012) 378)

[t-acceptance, $\epsilon(t)$]


- if dataset is not biased, $\epsilon(t)=1$
- if bias corresponds to a threshold (global or per-event) on L_{xy} or t , then the efficiency is given by a threshold function $\epsilon(t)=\theta(t-t_0)$
- if a more general bias, $\epsilon(t)$ can be estimated from MC or data




MC driven:

$$\mathcal{E}(t) = \frac{t\text{-distribution after selection}}{\sum_{\{\sigma_t\}} \frac{1}{\tau} e^{-t/\tau} \otimes G(t; \sigma_t)}$$

Data driven: [PRD 83 \(2011\) 032008](#)




b-hadron lifetimes



PRD 85 (2012) 112003

$$\tau(B^0) = 1.508 \pm 0.025 \pm 0.043 \text{ ps}$$

$$\tau(\Lambda_b) = 1.303 \pm 0.075 \pm 0.035 \text{ ps}$$



PRL 106 (2011) 121804


$$\tau(B^+) = 1.639 \pm 0.009 \pm 0.009 \text{ ps}$$

$$\tau(B^0) = 1.507 \pm 0.010 \pm 0.008 \text{ ps}$$

$$\tau(\Lambda_b) = 1.537 \pm 0.045 \pm 0.014 \text{ ps}$$

$$\tau(B^+)/\tau(B^0) = 1.088 \pm 0.009 \pm 0.004$$

$$\tau(\Lambda_b)/\tau(B^0) = 1.020 \pm 0.030 \pm 0.008$$



arXiv:1402.2554


$$\tau_{B^+ \rightarrow J/\psi K^+} = 1.637 \pm 0.004 \pm 0.003 \text{ ps}$$

$$\tau_{B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^{*0}} = 1.524 \pm 0.006 \pm 0.004 \text{ ps}$$

$$\tau_{B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K_S^0} = 1.499 \pm 0.013 \pm 0.005 \text{ ps}$$

$$\tau_{\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow J/\psi \Lambda} = 1.415 \pm 0.027 \pm 0.006 \text{ ps}$$

$$\tau_{B_s^0 \rightarrow J/\psi \phi} = 1.480 \pm 0.011 \pm 0.005 \text{ ps}$$




JHEP 07 (2013) 163

$$\tau(\Lambda_b) = 1.503 \pm 0.052 \pm 0.031 \text{ ps}$$

PRD 87 (2013) 032002

$$\tau(\Lambda_b) = 1.449 \pm 0.036 \pm 0.017 \text{ ps}$$



PDG 2013	
B ⁰	1.519 ± 0.007 ps
B ⁺	1.641 ± 0.008 ps
B _s	1.516 ± 0.011 ps
B _c	0.452 ± 0.033 ps
Λ _b	1.429 ± 0.024 ps

flavor oscillations
&
flavor tagging

quantum mechanics (ii)

- allowing for a flavor-changing perturbation (ΔF) in the hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_0 + \mathcal{H}_{\Delta F} \quad i \frac{d}{dt} \psi = \mathcal{H} \psi \quad i \frac{d}{dt} \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} m - \frac{i}{2}\Gamma & M_{12} - \frac{i}{2}\Gamma_{12} \\ M_{12}^* - \frac{i}{2}\Gamma_{12}^* & m - \frac{i}{2}\Gamma \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix}$$

$$|\psi\rangle = a |P^0\rangle + b |\bar{P}^0\rangle$$

- a pure flavor eigenstate at $t=0$ will evolve to an admixture
 - non-diagonal elements in $H \Rightarrow$ flavor eigenstates differ from mass eigenstates

$$\begin{aligned} |P_L\rangle &= p |P^0\rangle + q |\bar{P}^0\rangle \\ |P_H\rangle &= p |P^0\rangle - q |\bar{P}^0\rangle \end{aligned} \quad \text{with } |p|^2 + |q|^2 = 1$$

- time evolution of flavor eigenstates (after finding H eigenvalues $\lambda_{H,L}$)

$$|P_{L,H}\rangle_t = e^{-i\lambda_{L,H}t} |P_{L,H}\rangle = e^{-im_{L,H}t - \frac{1}{2}\Gamma_{L,H}t} |P_{L,H}\rangle$$

- probability for particle-antiparticle transition

$$|\langle P^0 | \mathcal{H} | \bar{P}^0 \rangle|^2 = \left| \frac{p}{q} \right|^4 |\langle \bar{P}^0 | \mathcal{H} | P^0 \rangle|^2 = \left| \frac{p}{q} \right|^2 \frac{1}{2} e^{-\Gamma t} \left[\cosh \left(\frac{\Delta\Gamma}{2} t \right) - \cos(\Delta m t) \right]$$

with $\Delta\Gamma \equiv \Gamma_L - \Gamma_H$ and $\Delta m \equiv m_H - m_L$

- neglecting CPV in mixing (i.e. $p/q=1$) and $\Delta\Gamma$, the mixing probability is:




$$\mathcal{P}_{B_q^0 \rightarrow \bar{B}_q^0}(t) = \mathcal{P}_{\bar{B}_q^0 \rightarrow B_q^0}(t) = \frac{\Gamma}{2} e^{-\Gamma t} [1 - \cos(\Delta m t)]$$

flavor oscillations

$$p(B \rightarrow B) = \frac{e^{-t/\tau}}{2\tau} (1 + \cos \Delta mt)$$

$$p(B \rightarrow \bar{B}) = \frac{e^{-t/\tau}}{2\tau} (1 - \cos \Delta mt)$$

oscillation frequency given by mass difference between heavy and light H eigenstates



t-resolution, t-bias, dilution

Fourier transform

Exercise: show that a proper time cut $t > t_0$ induces undershootings besides the peak in the Fourier transform of the oscillation signal

- but... one critical ingredient still missing: need to know whether or not a given B candidate in the data has mixed \Rightarrow flavor tagging

particle or antiparticle




- (let 'flavor' here refer to the particle and antiparticle state)
- flavor at **decay time**:
 - trivially given by the charge of the decay products, if using flavor specific final states
 - (e.g. final flavor given by pion charge in $B_s \rightarrow D_s^- \pi^+$ vs $\underline{B}_s \rightarrow D_s^+ \pi^-$)
- flavor at **production time**: ...

how may it be determined ??


Exercise: think about it before resuming discussion in next 2 slides

how to tag?

- **attempt #1**: use B_s mesons from the decay of heavier particles




$t \rightarrow Wb$




- ▶ the initial B flavor (b or \bar{b}) could be inferred from the decay products of the heavier, parent state, eg from the charge of the pion in the examples
- **attempt #2**: make use of the other b quark (from the originally produced $b\bar{b}$ pair), by reconstructing the other b-hadron in the event, say $B^\pm \rightarrow J/\psi K^\pm$ (flavor given by the kaon charge)

- ▶ these possibilities are quite interesting! but given reconstruction inefficiencies (of parent or other B), very high signal statistics would/will be required...

➔ **catch**: infer flavor without full decay reconstruction



flavor tagging methods




opposite-side tagging

- ▶ lepton (e, μ)
- ▶ jet-charge
- ▶ kaon

Exercise:
 1. explain how B flavor oscillations cause an intrinsic dilution of the OST methods performance
 2. show how the lepton tagger, based on semileptonic B decays ($B \rightarrow l$) is affected by sequential decays such as $B \rightarrow D \rightarrow l$

same-side tagging



Exercise: explain why the performance of SST (OST) should (not) depend on the species of B meson being tagged

dilution factors

- various effects decrease the amplitude of an oscillation signal

$$\left(\text{mixing significance} \right)^2 \sim \frac{\epsilon D^2 S}{2} \cdot \frac{S}{S+B} \cdot e^{-\sigma_t^2 w^2}$$

flavor tagging
signal yield
signal purity
proper time resolution


oscillation frequency w
Exercise: explain why the t-resolution is even more determining for B_s than B_d mixing

- tagging power ϵD^2 is given by the algorithm efficiency ϵ and dilution $D=(1-2w)^2$ where w is the wrong-tag fraction (i.e. probability algorithm gives wrong decision)
- it determines the effective statistical reduction of the sample size: $S \rightsquigarrow S \cdot \epsilon_{\text{tag}} D^2$

tagger \ ϵD^2	CDF	D0	ATLAS	CMS	LHCb
for decay $B_s \rightarrow J/\psi \Phi$	$1.39 \pm 0.05\%$ [OST] $3.5 \pm 1.4\%$ [SST] $\sim 4.9\%$	[OST+SST] $4.68 \pm 0.54\%$ $\sim 4.7\%$	[OST] $1.45 \pm 0.05\%$ $\sim 1.5\%$	[OST] $\sim 1\%$	$2.43 \pm 0.08 \pm 0.26\%$ [OST] $0.89 \pm 0.06\%$ [SST] $\sim 3.3\%$

mixing model

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{mass} \cdot \mathcal{L}_t \cdot \mathcal{L}_{\sigma_t} \cdot \mathcal{L}_D \quad \text{[for each sample component \& event]}$$









$$\mathcal{L}_t = \frac{1}{N} \kappa \frac{e^{-\frac{\kappa t'}{\tau}}}{\tau} \frac{1 \pm A S_D D \cos(\Delta m_s \kappa t')}{2} \otimes R(t - t'; S_{\sigma_t} \sigma_t) \cdot \mathcal{E}(t) \otimes F(\kappa)$$

analytical computation
(if need be)

Frequency Δm_s
or
Amplitude (A, σ_A) for fixed Δm_s



- ingredients: mass, proper time, proper time resolution, t-acceptance function, kinematic factor (for partially reco'd decays), and... flavor tagging

B_d mixing



$$\Delta m_d = 0.5156 \pm 0.0051 \text{ (stat.)} \pm 0.0033 \text{ (syst.) ps}^{-1} \quad \text{(most precise measurement)}$$

B_s mixing



frequency space \Leftrightarrow time space

observation by CDF (2006)

$p\text{-value} = 8 \times 10^{-8}$ corresponding to 5.4σ
 $\Delta m_s = 17.77 \pm 0.10(\text{stat}) \pm 0.07(\text{syst}) \text{ ps}^{-1}$

LHCb confirmed (improved precision)

$\Delta m_s = 17.768 \pm 0.023 (\text{stat}) \pm 0.006 (\text{syst}) \text{ ps}^{-1}$

In agreement with SM expectation $\Delta m_s = 17.3 \pm 2.6 \text{ ps}^{-1}$ [arXiv:1102.4274]

note: experimental precision $O(10^2)$ times better than theory calculation

CP violation

quantum mechanics (iii)

- discrete symmetries
 - Charge conjugation: particle \rightarrow antiparticle
 - Parity: $\mathbf{x} \rightarrow -\mathbf{x}$
 - Time reversal: $t \rightarrow -t$
- C and P are maximally violated in weak interactions
 - no right handed neutrinos, no left-handed antineutrinos)
- CPT is conserved in any Lorentz invariant gauge field theory; thus, $CP \Leftrightarrow T$

- under CP, an operator $O(\mathbf{x}, t)$ transforms as $O(\mathbf{x}, t) \rightarrow O^\dagger(-\mathbf{x}, t)$
- the effective Lagrangian ($L=L^\dagger$) has the structure $\mathcal{L} = aO + a^*O^\dagger \xrightarrow{CP} aO^\dagger + a^*O = \mathcal{L}$
 - CP violation thus requires $a^* \neq a$, i.e. a complex phase

• Yuakawa term

$$-\mathcal{L}_{Yukawa} = Y_{ij} \bar{\psi}_{Li} \phi \psi_{Rj} + Y_{ij}^* \bar{\psi}_{Rj} \phi^\dagger \psi_{Li}$$

• Charged current term

$$\mathcal{L}_W = \frac{g}{\sqrt{2}} \bar{u}_{iL} V_{ij} \gamma_\mu W^{-\mu} d_{jL} + \frac{g}{\sqrt{2}} \bar{d}_{iL} V_{ij}^* \gamma_\mu W^{+\mu} u_{iL}$$

Exercise: verify that CP invariance applied to Yukawa and W currents would imply $Y_{ij} = Y_{ij}^$ and $V_{ij} = V_{ij}^*$ using CP transformations recalled in tables below*

Field		P	C
Scalar field	$\phi(\vec{x}, t)$	$\phi(-\vec{x}, t)$	$\phi^\dagger(\vec{x}, t)$
Dirac spinor	$\psi(\vec{x}, t)$	$\gamma^0 \psi(-\vec{x}, t)$	$i\gamma^2 \gamma^0 \bar{\psi}^T(\vec{x}, t)$
	$\bar{\psi}(\vec{x}, t)$	$\bar{\psi}(-\vec{x}, t) \gamma^0$	$-\psi^T(\vec{x}, t) C^{-1}$
Axial vector field	$A_\mu(\vec{x}, t)$	$-A^\mu(-\vec{x}, t)$	$A_\mu^\dagger(\vec{x}, t)$

	Bilinear	P	C	T	CP	CPT
scalar	$\bar{\psi}_1 \psi_2$	$\bar{\psi}_1 \psi_2$	$\bar{\psi}_2 \psi_1$	$\bar{\psi}_1 \psi_2$	$\bar{\psi}_2 \psi_1$	$\bar{\psi}_2 \psi_1$
pseudo scalar	$\bar{\psi}_1 \gamma_5 \psi_2$	$-\bar{\psi}_1 \gamma_5 \psi_2$	$\bar{\psi}_2 \gamma_5 \psi_1$	$-\bar{\psi}_1 \gamma_5 \psi_2$	$-\bar{\psi}_2 \gamma_5 \psi_1$	$\bar{\psi}_2 \gamma_5 \psi_1$
vector	$\bar{\psi}_1 \gamma_\mu \psi_2$	$\bar{\psi}_1 \gamma^\mu \psi_2$	$-\bar{\psi}_2 \gamma_\mu \psi_1$	$\bar{\psi}_1 \gamma^\mu \psi_2$	$-\bar{\psi}_2 \gamma^\mu \psi_1$	$-\bar{\psi}_2 \gamma_\mu \psi_1$
axial vector	$\bar{\psi}_1 \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 \psi_2$	$-\bar{\psi}_1 \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 \psi_2$	$\bar{\psi}_2 \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 \psi_1$	$\bar{\psi}_1 \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 \psi_2$	$-\bar{\psi}_2 \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 \psi_1$	$-\bar{\psi}_2 \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 \psi_1$
tensor	$\bar{\psi}_1 \sigma_{\mu\nu} \psi_2$	$\bar{\psi}_1 \sigma^{\mu\nu} \psi_2$	$-\bar{\psi}_2 \sigma_{\mu\nu} \psi_1$	$-\bar{\psi}_1 \sigma^{\mu\nu} \psi_2$	$-\bar{\psi}_2 \sigma^{\mu\nu} \psi_1$	$\bar{\psi}_2 \sigma_{\mu\nu} \psi_1$

quantum mechanics (iv)

- consider neutral meson P^0 decays to a final state f $\bar{A}(f) = \langle f|T|\bar{P}^0\rangle$
- the time dependent decay rates may be expressed as $A(f) = \langle f|T|P^0\rangle$

$$\Gamma_{P^0 \rightarrow f}(t) = |A_f|^2 (1 + |\lambda_f|^2) \frac{e^{-\Gamma t}}{2} \left(\cosh \frac{1}{2} \Delta\Gamma t + D_f \sinh \frac{1}{2} \Delta\Gamma t + C_f \cos \Delta m t - S_f \sin \Delta m t \right)$$

$$\Gamma_{\bar{P}^0 \rightarrow f}(t) = |A_f|^2 \left| \frac{p}{q} \right|^2 (1 + |\lambda_f|^2) \frac{e^{-\Gamma t}}{2} \left(\cosh \frac{1}{2} \Delta\Gamma t + D_f \sinh \frac{1}{2} \Delta\Gamma t - C_f \cos \Delta m t + S_f \sin \Delta m t \right)$$

- with $\lambda_f = \frac{q \bar{A}_f}{p A_f}$ $D_f = \frac{2\Re\lambda_f}{1 + |\lambda_f|^2}$ $C_f = \frac{1 - |\lambda_f|^2}{1 + |\lambda_f|^2}$ $S_f = \frac{2\Im\lambda_f}{1 + |\lambda_f|^2}$

▶ sin and sinh terms are associated to interference of decays with and without oscillation

• CP violation classification

▶ CPV in decay

$$\Gamma(P^0 \rightarrow f) \neq \Gamma(\bar{P}^0 \rightarrow \bar{f})$$

▶ CPV in mixing

$$\text{Prob}(P^0 \rightarrow \bar{P}^0) \neq \text{Prob}(\bar{P}^0 \rightarrow P^0)$$

▶ CPV in interference between decay with and without mixing

$$\Gamma(P^0(\rightsquigarrow \bar{P}^0) \rightarrow f)(t) \neq \Gamma(\bar{P}^0(\rightsquigarrow P^0) \rightarrow f)(t)$$

$$\left| \frac{\bar{A}_f}{A_f} \right| \neq 1$$


$$\left| \frac{q}{p} \right| \neq 1$$

$$\Im \left(\frac{q \bar{A}_f}{p A_f} \right) \neq 0$$

$$A_{CP}(t) = \frac{\Gamma_{P^0(t) \rightarrow f} - \Gamma_{\bar{P}^0(t) \rightarrow f}}{\Gamma_{P^0(t) \rightarrow f} + \Gamma_{\bar{P}^0(t) \rightarrow f}} = \frac{2C_f \cos \Delta m t - 2S_f \sin \Delta m t}{2 \cosh \frac{1}{2} \Delta\Gamma t + 2D_f \sinh \frac{1}{2} \Delta\Gamma t}$$

CPV in interference w/or w/o mixing

- defined by $\text{Im } \lambda_f \neq 0$
- available to modes in which both B and \bar{B} decay to a same final state f
- example: $B_s \rightarrow J/\psi K K, J/\psi \pi \pi$





$$\beta_s = \arg(-V_{ts}V_{tb}^*/V_{cs}V_{cb}^*) = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2)$$

$$2\beta_s \approx -\phi$$


$$\phi_s = \phi_s^{\text{SM}} + \phi_s^{\text{NP}}$$

$$\phi_{\text{SM}} \sim -0.04$$

NP can add large phases




$B_s \rightarrow J/\psi \phi$



PRL 109 (2012) 171802, CDF full Run II

$$\beta_s \in [-\pi/2, -1.51] \cup [-0.06, 0.30] \cup [1.26, \pi/2]$$


$$\Delta\Gamma_s = 0.068 \pm 0.026(\text{stat}) \pm 0.009(\text{syst}) \text{ ps}^{-1}$$



PRD 85 (2012) 032006, D0 8/fb

$$\phi_s^{J/\psi\phi} = -0.55^{+0.38}_{-0.36}$$

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




JHEP 1212 (2012) 072

(see also ATLAS-CONF-2013-039)

$$\phi_s = 0.22 \pm 0.41 \text{ (stat.)} \pm 0.10 \text{ (syst.) rad}$$

$$\Delta\Gamma_s = 0.053 \pm 0.021 \text{ (stat.)} \pm 0.010 \text{ (syst.) ps}^{-1}$$




PRL 108 (2012) 101803

$$\phi_s = 0.15 \pm 0.18 \text{ (stat)} \pm 0.06 \text{ (syst) rad}$$

$$\Delta\Gamma_s = 0.123 \pm 0.029 \text{ (stat)} \pm 0.011 \text{ (syst) ps}^{-1}$$


N. Leonardo



PRL 108 (2012) 241801

Removal of sign ambiguity:
physical solution $\Delta\Gamma_s > 0$

flavor physics & rare decays




PRD 87 (2013) 112010

$$\phi_s = 0.07 \pm 0.09(\text{stat}) \pm 0.01(\text{syst}) \text{ rad,}$$

$$\Delta\Gamma_s = 0.100 \pm 0.016(\text{stat}) \pm 0.003(\text{syst}) \text{ ps}^{-1}$$

ϕ_s & $\Delta\Gamma_s$ [world summary]



Experiment	$\Delta\Gamma_s$ (ps^{-1})	ϕ_s (rad)
ATLAS (4.9/fb)	$0.053 \pm 0.021 \pm 0.010$	$0.12 \pm 0.25 \pm 0.05$
CMS (20/fb)	$0.096 \pm 0.014 \pm 0.007$	$-0.03 \pm 0.11 \pm 0.03$
LHCb (3/fb)	$0.0805 \pm 0.0091 \pm 0.0032$	$-0.058 \pm 0.049 \pm 0.006$

$\leftarrow B_s \rightarrow J/\psi\phi$
 $\leftarrow B_s \rightarrow J/\psi KK, J/\psi\pi\pi, \phi\phi$

rare decays

rare NP probes

- search for virtual contributions of new heavy particles in loops
- most interesting processes are those highly suppressed in SM
 - flavor-changing neutral current (FCNC), forbidden at tree level in SM
 - lepton flavor violation (LFV)
 - CKM suppressed
 - helicity suppressed
 - dominance of short distance effects, SM uncertainties under control
- experimental probes with precise theory prediction
 - uncertainty typically dominated by QCD; e.g. prefer leptonic to hadronic final states
- processes that may be modified (enhanced or suppressed) by orders of magnitude by NP
 - SUSY, 2HDM, LHT, Z', RS models

$$A(b \rightarrow \underset{s}{d})_{\text{FCNC}} \sim c_{\text{SM}} \frac{y_t^2 V_{td}^* V_{tb}}{16\pi^2 M_W^2} + c_{\text{NP}} \frac{\delta_{3d}}{16\pi^2 \Lambda_{\text{NP}}^2}$$

quantum mechanics (v)


- **Effective Hamiltonian** (describing weak decay of hadron M into final state F)
 - expressed by means of an operator product expansion (OPE)

$$A(M \rightarrow F) = \langle F | \mathcal{H}_{eff} | M \rangle = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_i V_{CKM}^i C_i(\mu) \langle F | Q_i(\mu) | M \rangle$$


Fermi constant
CKM matrix element

Wilson coefficient
short distance coupling (perturbative)
hadronic matrix element
long distance/non-perturbative

- new physics can modify C_i couplings and/or add new operators Q_i
- EFT for $b \rightarrow s |^+ |^-$ FCNC transitions





operator Q_i	$B \rightarrow K \mu \mu$	$B \rightarrow \mu \mu$
$\mathcal{O}_7 \sim m_b (\bar{s}_L \sigma_{\mu\nu} b_R) F_{\mu\nu}$	✓	
$\mathcal{O}_9 \sim (\bar{s} b)_{V-A} (\bar{\ell} \ell)_V$	✓	
$\mathcal{O}_{10} \sim (\bar{s} b)_{V-A} (\bar{\ell} \ell)_A$	✓	✓
$\mathcal{O}_{S,P} \sim (\bar{s} b)_{S+P} (\bar{\ell} \ell)_{S,P}$		✓







$B^0 \rightarrow K^{*0} \mu \mu$


- $b \rightarrow sll$ transitions, governed by FCNCs
- experimentally clean signature \Rightarrow superb laboratory for NP tests
- with clean theoretical predictions (at least at low $q^2 := m_{\mu\mu}^2$)
- and not so rare \Rightarrow allow measurements of many sensitive kinematic variables and asymmetries
- measure differential decay distributions
 - multivariate analysis in mass, proper time
 - and angular distributions



$B^0 \rightarrow K^{*0} \mu\mu$



First measurement of zero-crossing point of A_{FB}
 $q^2_0 = (4.9 \pm 0.9) \text{ GeV}^2/c^4$
 Consistent with SM expectation




iv. *ccurruu*




flavor physics & rai

3


$B \rightarrow K \mu \mu$



- new set of variables proposed \implies less sensitive to hadronic form factors
- P'_5 : LHCb measures 4 new observables in 6 bins of q^2 ; one of the 24 measurements deviates from SM by $\sim 3.7\sigma$
- possible interpretation as a NP contribution to Wilson coefficient C_9
- interesting (correlated?) tensions with SM prediction
- \implies to be explored with priority with more data and additional decays




$B_s \rightarrow \mu\mu$
the 'golden' rare decay



motivation

- in the Standard Model $B_{d/s} \rightarrow \mu\mu$ decays are highly suppressed

- helicity suppressed, by factor of $(m_\mu/m_B)^2$




- in the limit of massless muons, the process would be forbidden by spin conservation
- FCNC, forbidden at tree level, in SM, can only proceed through higher-order loop diagrams
- Cabibbo suppressed $|V_{ts(td)}|^2$

- Possible new particles in the loops!



- may enhance or suppress the decay rates

Standard Model






New Physics

(extended scalar sector, eg SUSY)






analysis steps

- collect the data
 - dedicated algorithm deployed online for selection in real time
- optimize selection criteria
 - while keeping signal-region data blind
 - use multivariate discriminators to reject backgrounds from signals
- likelihood fit to the dimuon mass
 - fit simultaneously $B_s \rightarrow \mu\mu$ and $B_d \rightarrow \mu\mu$
- evaluate statistical significance
 - if excess is observed: is it a fluctuation?
 - if no excess: place exclusion limit
- measure branching fraction




physics backgrounds

- B_d and B_s signals
 - Crystal Ball, fixed shape,
 - normalization floating
- combinatorial background
 - first-degree polynomial
- rare semileptonic background ($b \rightarrow q\mu\nu$)
 - fixed shape, constrained normalization
- rare peaking background
 - constrained to expectation





- rare physics backgrounds normalized to B^+ yields in data, for each analysis channel

opening the box



- CMS observes an excess!
- but is it statistical significant?
 - $B_s \rightarrow \mu\mu$: 4.3σ [yes...]
 - $B_d \rightarrow \mu\mu$: 2.0σ [no...]


opening the box



- CMS observes an excess!
- but is it statistical significant?
 - $B_s \rightarrow \mu\mu$: 4.3σ [yes...]
 - $B_d \rightarrow \mu\mu$: 2.0σ [no...]

- LHCb observes an excess, too!
 - $B_s \rightarrow \mu\mu$: 4.0σ
 - $B_d \rightarrow \mu\mu$: 2.0σ

CMS + LHCb




- CMS and LHCb have performed a combined analysis of their full Run I datasets, and delivered a definitive observation of $B_s \rightarrow \mu\mu$

$$\mathcal{B}(B_s^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-) = (2.8_{-0.6}^{+0.7}) \times 10^{-9} \quad (6.2\sigma)$$

$$\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-) = (3.9_{-1.4}^{+1.6}) \times 10^{-10} \quad (3.0\sigma)$$

comparison to SM expectation




SM compatibility:

B_s : 1.2σ


B_d : 2.2σ

B_s/B_d : 2.3σ



new-physics constraints

➡ Measurement results in strong constraints to the parameter space of certain classes of NP models; some specific examples:




D. Straub et al, arXiv:1012.3893

Constraints on MSSM (incl. models with abelian/non-abelian flavor symmetries), 4th generation, RS, and MFV models

JHEP 0903 (2009) 108, JHEP 1009 (2010) 106
JHEP 06 (2008) 068, Nucl.Phys.B831 (2010) 26

new-physics constraints

➡ Measurement results in strong constraints to the parameter space of certain classes of NP models; some specific examples:




[D. Straub et al, arXiv:1012.3893](#)

Constraints on MSSM (incl. models with abelian/non-abelian flavor symmetries), 4th generation, RS, and MFV models

JHEP 0903 (2009) 108, JHEP 1009 (2010) 106
JHEP 06 (2008) 068, Nucl.Phys.B831 (2010) 26

new-physics constraints


➡ Measurement results in strong constraints to the parameter space of certain classes of NP models; some specific examples:



D. Straub et al, arXiv:1012.3893

Constraints on MSSM (incl. models with abelian/non-abelian flavor symmetries), 4th generation, RS, and MFV models


JHEP 0903 (2009) 108, JHEP 1009 (2010) 106
JHEP 06 (2008) 068, Nucl.Phys.B831 (2010) 26






A. Akeroyd et al, JHEP 1112 (2011) 088

Constraints on CMSSM, in the case of a SM-like $B_s \rightarrow \mu\mu$

a long journey ends, and new one starts



- following observation of $B_s \rightarrow \mu\mu$ in Run, will focus on:
- $B_d \rightarrow \mu\mu$: optimize search for B_d , for which the B_s will now be a background!
- explore observables with additional sensitivity to New Physics, e.g. effective lifetimes and CP asymmetries



summary

- broad and successful flavor physics programme at the LHC
- advancements and breakthroughs in the different areas during Run I
 - rare decays, CP violation, production, spectroscopy, QGP hard probes
- no large discrepancies wrt the Standard Model found, yet
 - several $\sim 3\sigma$ level tensions will be pursued and clarified in next LHC runs
- exploring highly sensitive phenomena, including
 - fast: B_s oscillations occur at 3 trillion times a second
 - rare: B_s decays to muon pairs 3 times in a billion
 - hot: created medium in ion collisions 5 trillion $^\circ\text{C}$
- continuing flavor physics program complementary to high- p_T searches into the high luminosity LHC runs
 - in the quest of finding evidence of New Physics and setting its scale
 - to differentiate amongst NP models and characterize their flavor structure

References

- ▶ **experiment:** Matter antimatter fluctuations, N.Leonardo, LAP (2011)
IST lib. 11.10.L.1754, Contents: http://home.fnal.gov/~leonardo/oscillations_book.htm
- ▶ **theory:** CP violation, G.C.Branco, L.Lavoura, J.P.Silva, OUP (1999)

note: references available from LIP/IST/CERN libraries

multiple excellent reviews exist on each of the core topics presented

extra material

CPV in decay: $B \rightarrow K\pi$

$$A_{dir}^{CP} = \frac{\Gamma(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow f) - \Gamma(B^0 \rightarrow f)}{\Gamma(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \bar{f}) + \Gamma(B^0 \rightarrow f)}$$

- B factories: BABAR, BELLE (2004)

- Babar Collaboration [Phys. Rev. Lett. 97, 171805 \(2006\)](#)
 - Belle Collaboration [Phys. Rev. D87, 031103 \(2013\)](#)

- Tevatron: CDF (2012)

$$A_{CP}(B^0 \rightarrow K^+ \pi^-) = -0.083 \pm 0.013 \pm 0.003$$



$$A_{CP}(B_s^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+) = +0.22 \pm 0.07 \pm 0.02$$

- LHC: LHCb (2013)

$$A_{CP}(B^0 \rightarrow K^+ \pi^-) = -0.080 \pm 0.007 \text{ (stat)} \pm 0.003 \text{ (syst)}$$

$$A_{CP}(B_s^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+) = 0.27 \pm 0.04 \text{ (stat)} \pm 0.01 \text{ (syst)}$$

- first observation ($>5\sigma$) of CPV in B_s



$B_s \rightarrow KK$

- time-dependent asymmetry

$$A(t) = \frac{\Gamma_{\bar{B}_{(s)}^0 \rightarrow f}(t) - \Gamma_{B_{(s)}^0 \rightarrow f}(t)}{\Gamma_{\bar{B}_{(s)}^0 \rightarrow f}(t) + \Gamma_{B_{(s)}^0 \rightarrow f}(t)} = \frac{-C_f \cos(\Delta m_{d(s)} t) + S_f \sin(\Delta m_{d(s)} t)}{\cosh\left(\frac{\Delta\Gamma_{d(s)}}{2} t\right) - A_f^{\Delta\Gamma} \sinh\left(\frac{\Delta\Gamma_{d(s)}}{2} t\right)}$$



direct CPV
CPV in decay-mixing interference

$$C_{KK} = 0.14 \pm 0.11 \text{ (stat)} \pm 0.03 \text{ (syst)}$$

$$S_{KK} = 0.30 \pm 0.12 \text{ (stat)} \pm 0.04 \text{ (syst)}$$


- first time-dependent CPV measurement in $B_s \rightarrow KK$ decays

JHEP 10 (2013) 183





A_{CP}


- extensive set of measurements of CPV in charmless B decays
- example, $B \rightarrow hhh(h)$ from LHCb



PRL 112 (2014) 011801



PRL 111 (2013) 101801



$B_u \rightarrow \psi h, Dh$

- direct CPV is *only* type possible for charged B
- **hidden charm**
 - no direct CPV expected for the Cabbibo-favored decay $B \rightarrow J/\psi K$
 - Cabbibo-suppressed decays $B^+ \rightarrow J/\psi \pi^+, \psi' \pi^+, \psi' K^+$, with $\psi \rightarrow \mu\mu$:
 - tree and penguin contribute different phases \Rightarrow possible CPV
- **open charm**
 - $B \rightarrow DK$ with $D \rightarrow KK, \pi\pi, \pi K$, w/ first observation of $B^\pm \rightarrow [\pi^\pm K]_D K^\pm$
 - interference through D final state accessible to both D^0 and \underline{D}^0

time-integrated asymmetry:

$$A^{\psi\pi} = \frac{\mathcal{B}(B^- \rightarrow \psi\pi^-) - \mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow \psi\pi^+)}{\mathcal{B}(B^- \rightarrow \psi\pi^-) + \mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow \psi\pi^+)}$$



$$A_{CP}^{J/\psi\pi} = 0.005 \pm 0.027 \pm 0.011$$

$$A_{CP}^{\psi(2S)\pi} = 0.048 \pm 0.090 \pm 0.011$$

$$A_{CP}^{\psi(2S)K} = 0.024 \pm 0.014 \pm 0.008$$

$$A^{J/\psi K} = [0.59 \pm 0.36 \text{ (stat)} \pm 0.07 \text{ (syst)}] \%$$

$$A^{J/\psi\pi} = [-4.2 \pm 4.4 \text{ (stat)} \pm 0.9 \text{ (syst)}] \%$$



No evidence of direct CPV in $B^+ \rightarrow \psi h$

D0

[PRL 110 \(2012\) 241801](#)

LHCb:

[PRD 85 \(2012\) 091105](#)

Measurement (5.8σ) of direct CPV in $B^+ \rightarrow DK$

[PLB 712 \(2012\)](#)

also study decay $B^+ \rightarrow [K_S K \pi]_D h$

[arXiv:1402.2982](#)

CPV in mixing


- defined by condition $|q/p| \neq 1$
- induces charge asymmetry in semileptonic B decays
 - eg, $B_s \rightarrow \mu^+ D_s \nu X$
- dilepton asymmetry

$$A_{SL}(t) = \frac{\Gamma[\bar{B}^0(t) \rightarrow \ell^+ X] - \Gamma[B^0(t) \rightarrow \ell^- X]}{\Gamma[\bar{B}^0(t) \rightarrow \ell^+ X] + \Gamma[B^0(t) \rightarrow \ell^- X]}$$

$$= \frac{1 - |q/p|^4}{1 + |q/p|^4} \approx 2(1 - |q/p|),$$


- A_{SL} is, actually, time-independent
- sensitive to deviations of $|q/p|$ from 1

D0, PRD 82, 032001 (2010)



D0 reported **3.9σ discrepancy** with SM
 both B_s and B_d contribute to the asymmetry
 ⇨ evidence for anomalous CPV in the mixing of B mesons

a_{sl} asymmetry



inclusive measurements:

single and like-sign dimuon charge asymmetries

[PRD 89 \(2014\) 012002](#)

$$a_{sl}^d = (-0.62 \pm 0.43) \times 10^{-2}$$

$$a_{sl}^s = (-0.82 \pm 0.99) \times 10^{-2}$$


assuming $\Delta\Gamma_d/\Gamma_d$ SM value:

$$a_{sl}^d = (-0.62 \pm 0.42) \times 10^{-2}$$

$$a_{sl}^s = (-0.86 \pm 0.74) \times 10^{-2}$$

D0 final Run II results yield 3σ discrepancy with SM

N. Leonardo



semileptonic decays:

[PRD 86 \(2012\) 072009](#): $a_{sl,d}$ from $B_d \rightarrow \mu D_s^{(*)} X$

$$a_{sl}^d = (0.51 \pm 0.86)\% \text{ } (\mu D \text{ channel}),$$

$$a_{sl}^d = (1.25 \pm 0.87)\% \text{ } (\mu D^* \text{ channel})$$


[PRL 110 \(2013\) 011801](#): $a_{sl,s}$ from $B_s \rightarrow \mu D_s X$

$$a_{sl}^s = [-1.12 \pm 0.74 \text{ (stat)} \pm 0.17 \text{ (syst)}] \%$$

$$a_{sl}^d(\text{comb.}) = (0.07 \pm 0.27)\%$$

$$a_{sl}^s(\text{comb.}) = (-1.67 \pm 0.54)\%$$

flavor physics & rare decays



semileptonic decays:

[PLB 728 \(2014\) 607](#)


$a_{sl,s}$ from $B_s \rightarrow \mu D_s X$

most precise measurement


$$a_{sl}^s = (-0.06 \pm 0.50 \pm 0.36)\%$$

LHCb + Y(4S) results appear consistent with SM expectation


$B_s \rightarrow J/\psi f_0$



PRD 85 (2012) 011103



PRD 84 (2011) 052012



PLB 698 (2011) 11, first observation

PLB 713 (2012) 378, ϕ_s measurement:

$$\phi_s = -0.019^{+0.173+0.004}_{-0.174-0.003}$$

👉 lifetime-like measurement!

👉 mixing-like measurement!

👉 CP-odd final state: no need for angular analysis!

untagged:

$$\begin{aligned} & \Gamma(B_s^0 \rightarrow f_-) + \Gamma(\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow f_-) \\ &= \mathcal{N} e^{-\Gamma_s t} \left\{ e^{\Delta\Gamma_{st}/2} (1 + \cos\phi_s) + e^{-\Delta\Gamma_{st}/2} (1 - \cos\phi_s) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

tagged:

$$\begin{aligned} & \Gamma(B_s^{(-)} \rightarrow f_-) \\ &= \mathcal{N} e^{-\Gamma_s t} \left\{ \frac{e^{\Delta\Gamma_{st}/2}}{2} (1 + \cos\phi_s) + \frac{e^{-\Delta\Gamma_{st}/2}}{2} (1 - \cos\phi_s) \pm \sin\phi_s \sin(\Delta m_{st}) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

$D^0 \rightarrow \mu\mu$

- FCNC search in **up-type quark sector**

- complement B and K searches

- decay $D^0 \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ highly suppressed in SM ($\sim 10^{-13}$), but enhanced by NP scenarios

- use normalization channel; e.g. at CMS

$$D^{*+} \rightarrow D^0(K^-\mu^+\nu)\pi^+$$

- no excess observed, place upper limit (@90% CL)

➔ **exclusion limits**

- CDF $< 2.1 \times 10^{-7}$ PRD 82 (2010) 091195
 - BABAR: $[0.6, 8.1] \times 10^{-7}$ PRD 86 (2012)032001
 - BELLE $< 1.4 \times 10^{-7}$ PRD 81 (2010) 091102
 - LHCb $< 1.3 \times 10^{-8}$ LHCb-CONF-2012-005
 - CMS $< 5.4 \times 10^{-7}$ CMS-PAS-BPH-11-017

