



Anomalies in B decays

University of Geneva, April 25, 2018

Michel De Cian, EPFL



- B physics is the study of bound states containing one *b* quark and their decays / dynamics.
- They decay in a multitude of final states, allowing the study of a wide range of physics.
- They are copiously produced at the LHC.

LHC physics (toy version)





- Take a bunch of protons
- Smash them together and create a mess.
- Spend some millions to build a device to understand it.



- b hadrons are moderately heavy (\sim 5 GeV, $> \Lambda_{QCD}$) and are mainly produced in the forward or backward direction at the LHC \rightarrow build a forward detector.
- B hadrons have "soft" decay products and travel \sim 1 cm before decaying \rightarrow build a detector with low- p_T capability and good momentum / vertex resolution.
- B hadrons have a large variety of decay channels with different particle species in the final states
 - ightarrow need a particle ID.

B physics at the LHC

LHCb

*



LHCb: Comparison with CMS

*



LHCb: Vertex Locator



• Velo sensors 8mm from the beam position.

• Allows for very good Impact Parameter and Primary / Secondary Vertex resolution.

[Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 30, 1530022 (2015)] [Eur. Phys. J. C 73 (2013) 2431]

LHCb: Performance numbers



• Excellent momentum / mass resolution:

- $\frac{\delta p}{n} = 0.5\% (10 \text{ GeV}/c) 1.0\% (200 \text{ GeV}/c)$
- $\sigma_m(B^0_s \to \mu^+\mu^-) \approx 20 \, {\rm MeV}/c^2$
- Impact parameter resolution:
 - 15 +29/ $p_{
 m T}$ [GeV/c]) $\mu{
 m m}$
- High particle identification efficiency.
 - $\varepsilon_{\mu} \approx$ 97% with 1-3% $\pi \rightarrow \mu$ misidentification
 - $\varepsilon_K pprox$ 95% with pprox 5% $\pi \to K$ misidentification



LHCb: Event display

•



Rare B Decays

B decays as a laboratory





- B hadrons are a perfect laboratory to perform measurements of many fundamental physics quantities.
- Decays governed by (electro)weak interaction, but hadronic state itself by strong interaction.
- B physics is by definition flavour physics and strongly linked to the CKM matrix.



- Will (mostly) take about flavour-changing neutral current decays of b quarks today.
- And only consider electroweak interactions (no gluonic penguins).
- Decays are strongly suppressed, but heavy new particles (beyond the SM) can appear in the loop and alter the final state distributions.

• "Rare B decays":
$$\mathcal{B} \sim 10^{-6}$$

46



46



- $\mathcal{B}(B^0 \to \mu^+ \mu^-) < 3.4 \cdot 10^{-10}$
- All compatible with standard model predictions.

 $b \rightarrow s \ell^+ \ell^-$





$$m^2(\gamma,Z)=q^2=m^2(B^0_s)$$

 $m^2(\gamma,Z) = q^2 > 4m_\ell^2$ i.e. physics depends on q^2



All results with 3 fb $^{-1}$ (Run I)



$b \rightarrow s \ell^+ \ell^-$ differential branching fractions



- Measure branching fractions as a function of q^2 .
 - Normalize $B \to K \mu^+ \mu^-$ to $B \to K J \! / \psi$
- For $B^0
 ightarrow K^0 \mu^+ \mu^-$ use decay $K^0_{
 m S}
 ightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-$
- Measured values significantly below prediction for low q^2 .

$b \rightarrow s \ell^+ \ell^-$ differential branching fractions



- Measure branching fractions as a function of q^2
 - Normalize $B \to K^* \mu^+ \mu^-$ to $B \to K^* J/\psi$
- For $B^+\!\to K^{*+}\mu^+\mu^-$ use decay $K^{*+}\!\to K^0_{\rm S}\pi^+$
- Measured values below prediction for low q^2 .

$b \! \rightarrow s \ell^+ \ell^-$ differential branching fractions



- Measure branching fractions as a function of q^2
 - Normalize $B^0_s \to \phi \mu^+ \mu^-$ to $B^0_s \to \phi J\!/\!\psi$
 - Normalize $\Lambda^0_b
 ightarrow \Lambda \mu^+ \mu^-$ to $\Lambda^0_b
 ightarrow \Lambda J/\psi$
- Basically all differential branching fractions are lower than their prediction for low values of q^2 .

46



All results with 3 fb $^{-1}$ (Run I)



- Differential decay rate of P → VV decays depends on 3 decay angles and an observable, depending on q².
- $\frac{1}{\Gamma} \frac{d\Gamma}{d\cos\theta_\ell d\cos\theta_K d\phi} = \frac{9}{32\pi} \sum_i J_i(q^2) f(\cos\theta_\ell, \cos\theta_K, \phi)$
- Best studied case in LHCb: $B^0\!\to K^{*0}\mu^+\mu^-$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathrm{d}^4(\Gamma+\bar{\Gamma})}{\mathrm{d}\cos\theta_\ell\,\mathrm{d}\cos\theta_K\,\mathrm{d}\phi\,\mathrm{d}q^2} &= \frac{9}{32\pi} \left[\frac{3}{4} (1-F_L) \sin^2\theta_K + F_L \cos^2\theta_K + \right. \\ &\left. \frac{1}{4} (1-F_L) \sin^2\theta_K \cos 2\theta_\ell - F_L \cos^2\theta_K \cos 2\theta_\ell + \right. \\ &\left. S_3 \sin^2\theta_K \sin^2\theta_\ell \cos 2\phi + S_4 \sin 2\theta_K \sin 2\theta_\ell \cos \phi + \right. \\ &\left. S_5 \sin 2\theta_K \sin \theta_\ell \cos \phi + S_6 \sin^2\theta_K \cos \theta_\ell + \right. \\ &\left. S_7 \sin 2\theta_K \sin \theta_\ell \sin \phi + \right. \\ &\left. S_8 \sin 2\theta_K \sin 2\theta_\ell \sin \phi + S_9 \sin^2\theta_K \sin^2\theta_\ell \sin 2\phi \right] \end{aligned}$$

- Call the coefficient in front of the angular expressions "observable".
- Angular terms are (almost all) orthogonal.
- $S_6 = \frac{4}{3}A_{FB} = \frac{4}{3}\frac{\#\cos\theta_\ell > 0 \#\cos\theta_\ell < 0}{\#\cos\theta_\ell > 0 + \#\cos\theta_\ell < 0}$: Forward-backward asymmetry of the leptons.
- F_L : Longitudinal polarization of the K^{*0}



- Use a BDT to select the events, in total pprox 2400 signal candidates.
- Use simulated sample of phase-space generated events to determine the effect of the acceptance and selection.



•



••



[JHEP 02 (2016) 104] [PRL 118.111801 (2017)] [arXiv:1710.02846] [ATLAS-CONF-2017-023]

Angular analysis of $B^0 \rightarrow K^{*0} \mu^+ \mu^-$



- $P'_5 = \frac{S_5}{\sqrt{1 F_L}}$
- The P'_i observables are less prone to hadronic form-factor uncertainties than the S_i ones (when using so-called "soft form-factors").
- Measurement also by Belle, CMS, ATLAS (but with less statistical power)
- Global significance is about 3.4 σ from the SM (LHCb measurement alone).

Wilson coefficients (I)



- Need a framework to describe all these different types of processes, with as little assumptions as possible.
- Fermi solved this problem already 85 years ago for the β decay by introducting a point interaction.
- G_F is a coupling constant that gives the strength of the interaction, as long as $E \ll m_W$.

Wilson coefficients (II)



$$\mathcal{H}_{eff} = -4 \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{tb} V_{ts}^* \sum_i \mathcal{C}_i \mathcal{O}_i$$

- Do the same thing for the 3 possible interactions in $b o s \ell^+ \ell^-$ processes.
- G_F is Fermi constant, V_{tb}, V_{ts}^* CKM elements.
- \mathcal{C}_i are called Wilson coefficients, they are (complex) numbers.
- Derive \mathcal{C}_i from all measurements and combine them in global fits.

30

Global fits (part I)



- Only consider C_9 and C_{10} .
- 0.0 / 0.0 is the Standard Model.
- Does not include lepton universality measurements (see later).
- $> 3\sigma$ away from Standard Model. Is it new physics?

The villain

•





The villain



- This could mimic a new physics effect in C₉, and is not included in the uncertainties of the hadronic form-factors.
- One could measure effect of charm-loops by a precise analysis of the $\mu\mu$ invariant mass (\rightarrow backup).

LFU

All results with 3 fb $^{-1}$ (Run I)

46

Lepton Flavour universality in loop decays



- Measure $R_K = rac{\mathcal{B}(B^+ o K^+ \mu^+ \mu^-)}{\mathcal{B}(B^+ o K^+ e^+ e^-)}$ in $q^2 \in [1,6]\,\mathrm{GeV}^2\!/c^4$
- Use $B^+ \to J/\psi \, K^+$, $J/\psi \to \ell \ell$ as normalization and control channel.
- Electrons are more challenging than muons, due to lower reconstruction efficiency and energy loss due to bremsstrahlung.
- Hadronic uncertainties cancel in the ratio.
- 2.6σ deviation from the SM, $\mathcal{B}(B^+ \to K^+ e^+ e^-) \text{ compatible with SM predictions.}$

Lepton Flavour universality in loop decays



- 2.6 σ from the standard model prediction in $1\,{\rm GeV^2}/c^4 < q^2 < 6\,{\rm GeV^2}/c^4$
- $\mathcal{B}(B^+ \to K^+ e^+ e^-)$ alone is measured to be compatible with the SM.
- Hm...

46

Lepton Flavour universality in loop decays



• Consider
$$R_{K^*} = rac{\mathcal{B}(B^0 \to K^{*0} \mu^+ \mu^-)}{\mathcal{B}(B^0 \to K^{*0} e^+ e^-)}$$

- Similar strategy as for $R_K.$ Use $B^0\to J/\psi\,K^*, J/\psi\to\ell\ell$ as normalization and control channel.
- Compatible at 2.2 and 2.4 σ with SM prediction for low and intermediate q^2 region.

Global fits (part II)



- Can introduce a different Wilson coefficient C_9 for muons and electrons and redo global fits.
- Compatible with only deviations in the muon channels and not in the electron channels.

LFU in $\overline B{}^0\!\to D^{*+}\ell\nu$



• Measure lepton flavour universality in charged-current (tree) decays.

• Measure
$$R_{D^*} = \frac{\mathcal{B}(\overline{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+} \tau^- \nu)}{\mathcal{B}(\overline{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+} \mu^- \nu)}$$

LFU in $\overline{B}{}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+} \ell \nu$, muonic mode



- Measure lepton flavour universality in charged-current (tree) decays.
- Measure $R_{D^*} = rac{\mathcal{B}(\overline{B}^0 o D^{*+} \tau^- \nu)}{\mathcal{B}(\overline{B}^0 o D^{*+} \mu^- \nu)}$
- Use $\tau^- \rightarrow \mu^- \nu \nu$, *i.e.* τ and μ modes have the same final state.
 - Distinguish with kinematical distributions
- $R_{D^*, \exp, \mu} = 0.336 \pm 0.027 (\text{stat}) \pm 0.030 (\text{syst})$
- $R_{D^*,\rm{SM}} = 0.252 \pm 0.003$
- + $\,\approx 2\sigma$ from the SM prediction.

LFU in $\overline{B}{}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+} \ell \nu$, 3-prong mode



- Use $\tau^- \rightarrow \pi^- \pi^+ \pi^- \nu$
- Use $\overline{B}{}^0 \to D^{*+}3\pi$ as normalisation channel, and known ratio $\mathcal{B}(\overline{B}{}^0 \to D^{*+}3\pi)/\mathcal{B}(\overline{B}{}^0 \to D^{*+}\mu\nu)$ to calculate R_{D^*}
- $R_{D^*, \exp, 3\pi} = 0.286 \pm 0.019 (\text{stat}) \pm 0.025 (\text{sys}) \pm 0.021 (\text{BR})$

LFU in $B_c^+ \to J/\psi \,\ell \nu$



- $R_{J/\psi,\text{theo}} = 0.25 0.28$
- + $R_{J\!/\!\psi\,,{
 m LHCb}} = 0.71 \pm 0.17 ({
 m stat}) \pm 0.18 ({
 m syst})$ (compatible within 2 σ)
- Systematic uncertainties dominated by limited size of simulation and knowledge of $B_c^+\to J\!/\!\psi$ form factors.

Models

- There are a plethora of models that try to explain all anomalies simultaneously.
- Have to explain: Difference in branching fractions, angular distributions, lepton flavour on tree and loop level.
- Possible masses of BSM particles:

tree level, unsupressed	loop level, unsupressed
$\sim 30{\rm TeV}$	$\sim 2.5{\rm TeV}$
tree level, MFV	loop level, MFV
$\sim 6{\rm TeV}$	$\sim 0.5{\rm TeV}$

Z^\prime and Leptoquarks



- Can introduce a Z^\prime that causes a flavour-changing neutral current on tree level or loop level.
- Leptoquarks can simultaneously explain $R_{D^{*0}}$ (tree-level leptoquarks), R_K (loop-level leptoquarks) and muon g-2 (PRL116, 141802 (2016))

Optimist's point of view



- Many measurements show a deviation, and when combined, it is significant.
- The pattern is somewhat consistent, as shown by global fits.
- The effects are observed by several (independent) measurements and experiments.
- No large uncertainty in the theoretical prediction has been discovered.

Pessimist's point of view



- "The effect is of a magnitude that remains close to the limit of detectability, or many measurements are necessary because of the very low statistical significance of the results."
 - I. Langmuir on pathological science.



Conclusion



- B decays are an exciting field of research.
- Several intriguing deviations from the SM have shown up in flavour-changing neutral and charged currents.
- The combination could hint to a deviation from the Standard Model.
- Nature of these anomalies will hopefully soon be resolved.

Backup

Short- and long-distance effects in $B \rightarrow K \mu^+ \mu^-$



• Need to perform same analysis for $B^0 \to K^{*0} \mu^+ \mu^-$ to understand effect of charm-loops.

46

46

Zero-crossing point in $B^0 \rightarrow K^{*0} \mu^+ \mu^-$



- Zero-crossing point of A_{FB} theoretically clean.
- For example: $S_6 = \frac{4}{3}A_{FB} = \frac{4}{3}\frac{\#\cos\theta_\ell > 0 \#\cos\theta_\ell < 0}{\#\cos\theta_\ell > 0 + \#\cos\theta_\ell < 0}$: Forward-backward asymmetry of the leptons.

Angular analysis of $B_s^0 \rightarrow \phi \mu^+ \mu^-$

••



q^2 dependence of C_9



- Check shift of C_9 as a function of q^2 . Should be constant (assuming the new physics is heavy enough).
- That's a hint, but not a confirmation for non-hadronic BSM effects.

Analyses of $b \rightarrow d\ell\ell$ transitions



- First evidence of $B^0_s o K^* \mu^+ \mu^-$ (3.4 σ)
- Using 3 fb^{-1} of Run I and 1.6 fb⁻¹ of Run II.
- $\mathcal{B}(B^0_s \to K^* \mu^+ \mu^-) = (3.0 \pm 1.0 (\text{stat}) \pm 0.2 (\text{syst}) \pm 0.3 (\text{ext})) \cdot 10^{-8}$
- With the upgrade of LHCb from 2021, differential decay rates can be measured.

Luminosity levelling



46

- LHCb does not run at the maximum instantaneous luminosity, as the occupancy in the forward region would be too high.
 - $\mu \approx$ 1.1 for 25ns running.
- Luminosity for LHCb is leveled such that it is constant within a fill.
- Achieved by displacing the beams.

Trigger (Run II)



- Have the same reconstruction (charged and neutral particles) in the software trigger and offline.
- Perform a alignment & calibration after first stage of software trigger, *i.e.* automatically.

A toy angular analysis

- A particle decays into two particles, with angle α .
- Suppose we can formulate the angular distribution as:

$$\frac{d\Gamma}{d\alpha} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \left[A \cos \alpha + B \sin \alpha + C \right] \quad \alpha \in [-\pi, \pi]$$

- The angular terms are given by kinematics / spin only.
- Remember: $\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega}(e^+e^- \to \mu^+\mu^-) = \frac{\alpha^2}{4s} \left(1 + \cos^2\theta\right)$

A toy angular analysis



- The coefficients contain the physics-information we are interested in.
- Do: Run an experiment, collect data, select your decay, plot number of events as a function of α.
- Fit the angular distribution in collision data with the pdf and extract the coefficients.