S. Stone

Heavy Flavor Highlights

BF11, Oct. 20, 2011

What is Heavy Flavor Physics ?

- Define Heavy Flavor Physics
  - Flavor Physics: Study of interactions that differ among flavors
  - Heavy: Not SM neutrino's or u or d quarks, maybe s quarks, concentrate here on c & b quarks, t too heavy



u, d, ν's	s, μ	c & b, τ; ν_M's ?	t
too light	maybe	just right	too heavy

Physics Beyond the Standard Model

- Baryogenesis: From current measurements can only generate $(n_B-\bar{n}_B)/n_\gamma$ =~10^{-20} but ~6×10^{-10} is needed. Thus New Physics must exist to generate needed CP Violation
- Dark Matter





Gravitational lensing

- Hierarchy Problem: We don't understand how we get from the Planck scale of Energy ~10^{19} GeV to the Electroweak Scale ~100 GeV without "fine tuning" quantum corrections

Seeking New Physics

- HFP as a tool for NP discovery
  - While measurements of fundamental constants are fun, the main purpose of HFP is to find and/or define the properties of physics beyond the SM
  - HFP probes large mass scales via virtual quantum loops. An example, of the importance of such loops is extracting the Higgs mass
  - M_w changes due to m_t $\quad \frac{dM_W}{dm_t} \alpha \frac{m_t}{M_w}$



  - M_w changes due to m_H $\quad \frac{dM_W}{dm_H} \alpha - \frac{dm_H}{M_H}$



Flavor as a High Mass Probe

- Already excluded ranges
  - $\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{SM}} + \frac{c_i}{\Lambda_i} O_i$, take $c_i = 1$



Ways out

1. New particles have large masses >>1 TeV
2. New particles have degenerate masses
3. Mixing angles in new sector are small, same as in SM (MFV)
4. The above already implies strong constrains on NP

See: Isidori, Nir & Perez arXiv:1002.0900; Neubert EPS 2011 talk

Ex. of Strong Constraints on NP

- Inclusive b→sγ, (Eγ > 1.6 GeV)
  - Measured $(3.55\pm0.26)\times10^{-4}$ (HFAG)
  - Theory $(3.15\pm0.23)\times10^{-4}$ (NNLL) Misiak arXiv:1010.4896
  - Ratio = 1.13±0.11, Limits most NP models
  - Example 2HDM
  - $m(H^+) < 316$ GeV











Misiak et. al hep-ph/0609232,
See also A. Buras et. al, arXiv:1105.5146

Limits on New Physics

- It is oft said that we have not seen New Physics, yet what we observe is the sum of Standard Model + New Physics. How to set limits on NP?
- One hypothesis: assume that tree level diagrams are dominated by SM and loop diagrams could contain NP



Tree diagram example



Loop diagram example

Quark Mixing & CKM Matrix

- In SM charge -1/3 quarks (d, s, b) are mixed
- Described by CKM matrix (also ν are mixed)

$$V_{\left(\frac{2}{3},-\frac{1}{3}\right)} = \begin{pmatrix} V_{ud} & V_{us} & V_{ub} \\ V_{cd} & V_{cs} & V_{cb} \\ V_{td} & V_{ts} & V_{tb} \end{pmatrix}$$



$$= \begin{pmatrix} 1-\lambda^2/2 & \lambda & A\lambda^3(\rho - i\eta) \\ -\lambda & 1-\lambda^2/2 & A\lambda^2 \\ A\lambda^3(1-\rho-i\eta) & -A\lambda^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} + O(\lambda^4)$$

- λ=0.225, A=0.8, constraints on ρ & η
- These are fundamental constants in SM

What are limits on NP from quark decays?

- Tree diagrams are unlikely to be affected by physics beyond the Standard Model



Note γ is a CP violating angle but is measured via Tree diagrams here – For NP both rare & CPV processes are important

CP Violation in B° & K° Only

- Absorptive (Imaginary) part of mixing diagram should be sensitive to New Physics. Lets compare





They are Consistent



- But consistency is only at the 5% level
- Limits on NP are not so strong

Limits on New Physics From B° Mixing

- Is there NP in B^o-$\bar{B}^o$ mixing?
- $\langle B^o | H^{SM+NP}_{\Delta B=2} | \bar{B}^o \rangle = \Delta_d^{NP} \langle B^o | H^{SM}_{\Delta B=2} | \bar{B}^o \rangle$

  $\Delta_d^{NP} = \mathrm{Re}\,\Delta_d + i\,\mathrm{Im}\Delta_d$
- Assume NP in tree decays is negligible, so no NP in $|V_{ij}|$, γ from $B^- \rightarrow D^o K^-$
- Allow NP in Δm, weak phases, A_{SL}, & $\Delta\Gamma$



- Room for new physics, in fact SM is only at 5% c.l.

One Clear Problem

- $B^- \to \tau^- \nu$, tree process:



Can be new particles instead of W^- but why not also in $D^+_{(s)} \to \ell^+ \nu$?

- $\sin 2\beta$, CPV in e.g. $B^o \to J/\psi\, K_s$: Box diagram
- Source of most of the CKM discrepancy
  - See: E. Lunghi & A. Soni, "Demise of CKM & its aftermath," [arXiv:1104.2117], they advocate a 4th generation



V_{ub}

- An irritating problem: Lingering difference between inclusive $b \to u\ell\nu$, & exclusive $B \to \pi\ell\nu$,
- Values $|V_{ub}| \times 10^{-3}$
  - Inclusive: 4.25±0.15±0.20
  - Exclusive: 3.25±0.12±0.28



Kowalewski Beauty 2011

New



See Urquijo EPS 2011

V_{ub} Consequences



Use of Exclusive would increase τν sin2β discrepancy, use of Inclusive would not solve the problem

A V_{ub} fix?

- Add new physics: right handed currents with coupling V_{ub}^R
  - B→πℓν rate goes as $\left|V_{ub}^L + V_{ub}^R\right|^2$
  - B→τν rate goes as $\left|V_{ub}^L - V_{ub}^R\right|^2$
  - B→X_uℓν rate goes as $\left|V_{ub}^L\right|^2 + \left|V_{ub}^R\right|^2$
- Agreement with ~15% rhc
  - Can arise in SUSY
  - Not in loops
  - See Crivellin

 [arXiv:0907.2461], also Buras et.al, [arXiv: 1007.1993]



Recent Results

- NP **must** affect every process; the amount tells us what the NP is ("DNA footprint")
- New data from CDF, D0, BaBar BES, BELLE, ATLAS, CMS & LHCb – Not nearly enough time to cover





$B^o \rightarrow K^{*o}\mu^+\mu^-$

- Similar to K*γ, but more decay paths



+ new particles in loops

- Several variables can be examined, e.g. muon forward-backward asymmetry, A_{FB} is well predicted
- Situation as of July 26



New $B^o \rightarrow K^{*o}\mu^+\mu^-$

- New results from CDF 6.8 fb^{-1} & LHCb 0.3 fb^{-1}



No evidence of deviation from SM so far

b Fractions (LHCb)

- Important to set normalization scale for B_s
- f_s/f_d using hadronic decays

$B_d \to D^- K^+ / B_s \to D_s^- \pi^+$, & $B_d \to D^- \pi^+ / B_s \to D_s^- \pi^+$



$$f_s / f_d = 0.253 \pm 0.017 \pm 0.017 \pm 0.020$$

Theory error

- Using Semileptonics: $b \to (D^o, D^+, D_s, \Lambda_b)\, X\mu\upsilon$



$$f_s / f_d = 0.268 \pm 0.008^{+0.022}_{-0.020}$$

- independent of η & p_t

$$f_s / f_d = 0.267^{+0.021}_{-0.020}$$

LHCb-CONF-2011-028



$B_s \to \mu^+\mu^-$

- SM branching ratio is $(3.2\pm0.2)\times10^{-9}$ [Buras arXiv: 1012.1447], NP can make large contributions.

Standard Model



MSSM



- Many NP models possible, not just Super-Sym

Discrimination

- Select same topology as $B \to h^+h^-$, add μ ID
- Lots of other variables to discriminate against bkgrd : B impact parameter, B lifetime, B p_t, B isolation, muon isolation, minimum impact parameter of muons, muon polarization…
- Can use $B \to h^+h^-$ to tune cuts or form a multivariate analysis, used by CDF & LHCb





CDF Result



Example:
Obs: 2
Bkg. exp:
0.16±0.12

$$B(B_s \to \mu^+\mu^-)$$
$$= (1.8^{+1.1}_{-0.9})x10^{-8}$$

5.6 x SM expectation

p value for bkgrnd + SM is 2.9%

Set a "two sided limit @ 90% CL" $4.6 \times 10^{-9} < \mathcal{B}(B_s^0 \to \mu^+\mu^-) < 3.9 \times 10^{-8}$

This means to me that there isn't a statistically significant result

LHCb



	BDT<1/4	1/4<BDT<1/2	½<BDT<3/4	¾<BDT<1
# expected bkgrd	2968±69	25.0±2.5	2.99±0.89	0.66±0.40
# expected signal	1.26±0.13	0.61±0.06	0.67±0.07	0.72±0.07
Sum expected	2969±69	25.6±2.5	3.66±0.89	1.38±0.41
Observed	2872	26	3	2

LHCb

- LHCb does not observe any excess
- In the two BDT signal bins expect 5.1 events if $\mathcal{B}$ is at SM level, see 5



- Expected limit @95% (90%) 1.5(1.2)x10^{-8}
- Observed limit @95% (90%) 1.6(1.3)x10^{-8}
- p-value of bkgrnd only hypothesis 14%
- Observed limit with 2010 data 1.5(1.2)x10^{-8}

CMS

- Cut based analysis

	Barrel	Endcap
# expected bkgrd	0.60±0.35	0.80±0.40
# bkgrd $B \to h^+h^-$	0.07±0.02	0.04±0.01
# expected signal	0.80±0.16	0.36±0.07
Sum expected	1.47±0.39	1.20±0.41
Observed	2	1

- Upper limits:
  - 1.9×10^{-8} @95% CL
  - 1.6×10^{-8} @90% CL



LHC Combined

- Observed limits
  - 1.1×10^{-8} @95% CL
  - 0.9×10^{-8} @90% CL,
  - This is 3.4(2.8) times SM value
- LHC consistent with CDF with a probability of 0.3%
- Set serious limits in NUHM1 SUSY model
- Still lots of room for NP





Neutral Meson Mixing

- Neutral mesons can transform into their anti-particles via 2nd order weak interactions
- Short distance transition rate depends on
  - mass of intermediate q_i, the heavier the better, favors s & b since t is allowed, while for c, b is the heaviest
  - CKM elements V_{ij}



New particles possible in loop

+ "long distance" for D^o

$D^o \Longrightarrow \pi\pi,.. \Longrightarrow \bar{D}^o$



from Van Kooten

Some Definitions

- Weak interaction eigenstates are different that strong interaction eigenstates
- $|M_L\rangle = p|M^o\rangle + q|\overline{M}^o\rangle$, $|M_H\rangle = p|M^o\rangle - q|\overline{M}^o\rangle$,
- Since we observe the mesons via their weak decays, $m = (M_H+M_L)/2$, $\Delta M = M_H - M_L$,

  $1/\tau = \Gamma = (\Gamma_H+\Gamma_L)/2$, $\Delta\Gamma = \Gamma_L - \Gamma_H$,
- Useful quantities are $x = \Delta M/\Gamma$, $y = \Delta\Gamma/2\Gamma$
- D^o mixing predictions (from Petrov 2006):





D^o Mixing

- Data from BaBar, Belle, CDF, CLEO
- Result 10.1σ from no mixing, though no single measurement is better than 5σ
- Non-zero value allows for indirect CPV, as well as direct CPV in decay, or a mixture of the two





CPV in Charm

- Expect largest effects in Cabibbo Suppressed Decays. COULD REVEAL NP (see Grossman Kagan & Nir)
- Nothing yet observed, limits at <1% level
- Experiments, in some cases, now measuring differences in CP asymmetries to cancel systematic effects
- Examples (define $A(D \to f) = \frac{\Gamma(D \to f) - \Gamma(\bar{D} \to \bar{f})}{\Gamma(D \to f) + \Gamma(\bar{D} \to \bar{f})}$) if $f = \bar{f}$, CP eigenst
  - Belle $A(D^+ \to \phi\pi^+) - A(D_s^+ \to \phi\pi^+) = (-0.51 \pm 0.28 \pm 0.05)\%$ [arXiv: 1110.0694]
  - CDF $A(D^o \to \pi^+\pi^-) = (-0.22 \pm 0.24 \pm 0.11)\%$ & $A(D^o \to K^+K^-) = (-0.24 \pm 0.22 \pm 0.10)\%$ [CDF Public Note 10269]
  - BaBar using T-odd triple products in $D^+ \to K^+ K_S \pi^+ \pi^-$ finds $A_T = (-1.21 \pm 1.00 \pm 0.46)\%$ [arXiv:1105.4410v2]
  -

CPV Time Evolution

- Consider $$a[f(t)] = \frac{\Gamma\left(\bar{M} \to f\right) - \Gamma\left(M \to f\right)}{\Gamma\left(\bar{M} \to f\right) + \Gamma\left(M \to f\right)}$$
- Define $$A_f \equiv A(M \to f),\, \bar{A}_f \equiv A(\bar{M} \to f), \quad \lambda_f = \frac{p}{q}\frac{\bar{A}_f}{A_f}$$
- Only 1 A_f & $\Delta\Gamma$=0 $\Gamma\left(M \to f\right) = N_f \left|A_f\right|^2 e^{-\Gamma t}\left(1 - \mathrm{Im}\,\lambda_f \sin\left(\Delta M t\right)\right)$
- Then $a[f(t)] = -\mathrm{Im}\,\lambda_f$, & λ_f is a function of V_{ij} in SM
- For B°, $\Delta\Gamma \approx 0$, but there can be multiple A_f
$$\Gamma\left(M \to f\right) = N_f \left|A_f\right|^2 e^{-\Gamma t}\left(\frac{1-\left|\lambda_f\right|^2}{2}\cos\left(\Delta M t\right) - \mathrm{Im}\,\lambda_f \sin\left(\Delta M t\right)\right)$$
- If in addition $\Delta\Gamma \neq 0$, eg. B_s

$$\Gamma\left(M \to f\right) = N_f \left|A_f\right|^2 e^{-\Gamma t}\left(\frac{1+\left|\lambda_f\right|^2}{2}\cosh\frac{\Delta\Gamma t}{2} + \frac{1-\left|\lambda_f\right|^2}{2}\cos\left(\Delta M t\right) - \mathrm{Re}\,\lambda_f \sinh\frac{\Delta\Gamma t}{2} - \mathrm{Im}\,\lambda_f \sin\left(\Delta M t\right)\right)$$

See Nierste
arXiv:0904.1869 [hep-ph]



CPV in $B_s \rightarrow J/\psi X$

- Interference between mixing & decay



- For *f* =$J/\psi\ \phi$ or $J/\psi\ f_0$



$$\varphi_s^{SM} \equiv -2\beta_s = -2\arg\left(-\frac{V_{ts}V^*_{tb}}{V_{cs}V^*_{cb}}\right) = -0.04 \text{ rad}$$

- Small CPV expected, good place for NP to appear
- $B_s \rightarrow J/\psi\phi$ is not a CP eigenstate, as it's a vector-vector final state, so must do an angular analysis to separate the CP+ and CP- components

Transversity

$$\frac{d^4\Gamma(B_s^0 \to J/\psi\phi)}{dt\, d\cos\theta\, d\varphi\, d\cos\psi} \equiv \frac{d^4\Gamma}{dt\, d\Omega} \propto \sum_{k=1}^{10} h_k(t) f_k(\Omega)$$



k	$h_k(t)$	$f_k(\theta,\psi,\varphi)$
1	$\|A_0\|^2(t)$	$2\cos^2\psi\,(1-\sin^2\theta\cos^2\phi)$
2	$\|A_\parallel(t)\|^2$	$\sin^2\psi\,(1-\sin^2\theta\sin^2\phi)$
3	$\|A_\perp(t)\|^2$	$\sin^2\psi\sin^2\theta$
4	$\Im(A_\parallel(t)\,A_\perp(t))$	$-\sin^2\psi\sin 2\theta\sin\phi$
5	$\Re(A_0(t)\,A_\parallel(t))$	$\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{2}\,\sin 2\psi\sin^2\theta\sin 2\phi$
6	$\Im(A_0(t)\,A_\perp(t))$	$\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{2}\,\sin 2\psi\sin 2\theta\cos\phi$
7	$\|A_s(t)\|^2$	$\frac{2}{3}(1-\sin^2\theta\cos^2\phi)$
8	$\Re(A_s^*(t)A_\parallel(t))$	$\frac{1}{3}\sqrt{6}\sin\psi\sin^2\theta\sin 2\phi$
9	$\Im(A_s^*(t)A_\perp(t))$	$\frac{1}{3}\sqrt{6}\sin\psi\sin 2\theta\cos\phi$
10	$\Re(A_s^*(t)A_0(t))$	$\frac{4}{3}\sqrt{3}\cos\psi(1-\sin^2\theta\cos^2\phi)$

} for S-wave under ϕ predicted by Stone & Zhang PRD 79, 074024 (2009) (rows 7–10)

Transversity II

$$|A_0|^2(t) = |A_0|^2 e^{-\Gamma_s t}\left[\cosh\left(\frac{\Delta\Gamma}{2}t\right) - \cos\phi_s \sinh\left(\frac{\Delta\Gamma}{2}t\right) + \sin\phi_s \sin(\Delta m t)\right],$$

$$|A_\parallel(t)|^2 = |A_\parallel|^2 e^{-\Gamma_s t}\left[\cosh\left(\frac{\Delta\Gamma}{2}t\right) - \cos\phi_s \sinh\left(\frac{\Delta\Gamma}{2}t\right) + \sin\phi_s \sin(\Delta m t)\right],$$

$$|A_\perp(t)|^2 = |A_\perp|^2 e^{-\Gamma_s t}\left[\cosh\left(\frac{\Delta\Gamma}{2}t\right) + \cos\phi_s \sinh\left(\frac{\Delta\Gamma}{2}t\right) - \sin\phi_s \sin(\Delta m t)\right],$$

$$\Im(A_\parallel^*(t)\,A_\perp(t)) = |A_\parallel||A_\perp| e^{-\Gamma_s t}\left[-\cos(\delta_\perp - \delta_\parallel)\sin\phi_s \sinh\left(\frac{\Delta\Gamma}{2}t\right) - \cos(\delta_\perp - \delta\_\|)\cos\phi_s \sin(\Delta m t) + \sin(\delta_\perp - \delta_\parallel)\cos(\Delta m t)\right],$$

$$\Re(A_0^*(t)\,A_\parallel(t)) = |A_0||A_\parallel| e^{-\Gamma_s t}\cos(\delta_\parallel - \delta_0)\left[\cosh\left(\frac{\Delta\Gamma}{2}t\right) - \cos\phi_s \sinh\left(\frac{\Delta\Gamma}{2}t\right) + \sin\phi_s \sin(\Delta m t)\right],$$

$$\Im(A_0^*(t)\,A_\perp(t)) = |A_0||A_\perp| e^{-\Gamma_s t}\left[-\cos(\delta_\perp - \delta_0)\sin\phi_s \sinh\left(\frac{\Delta\Gamma}{2}t\right) - \cos(\delta_\perp - \delta_0)\cos\phi_s \sin(\Delta m t) + \sin(\delta_\perp - \delta_0)\cos(\Delta m t)\right],$$

$$|A_s(t)|^2 = |A_s|^2 e^{-\Gamma_s t}\left[\cosh\left(\frac{\Delta\Gamma}{2}t\right) + \cos\phi_s \sinh\left(\frac{\Delta\Gamma}{2}t\right) - \sin\phi_s \sin(\Delta m t\right],$$

only term for $f=f_{cp}$

$$\Re(A_s^*(t)A_\parallel(t)) = |A_s||A_\parallel| e^{-\Gamma_s t}\left[-\sin(\delta_\parallel - \delta_s)\sin\phi_s \sinh\left(\frac{\Delta\Gamma}{2}t\right) - \sin(\delta_\parallel - \delta_s)\ \cos\phi_s \sin(\Delta m t) + \cos(\delta_\parallel - \delta_s)\cos(\Delta m t)\right],$$

$$\Im(A_s^*(t)A_\perp(t)) = |A_s||A_\perp| e^{-\Gamma_s t}\sin(\delta_\perp - \delta_s)\left[\cosh\left(\frac{\Delta\Gamma}{2}t\right) + \cos\phi_s \sinh\left(\frac{\Delta\Gamma}{2}t\right) - \sin\phi_s \sin(\Delta m t)\right],$$

$$\Re(A_s^*(t)A_0(t)) = |A_s||A_0| e^{-\Gamma_s t}\left[-\sin(\delta_0 - \delta_s)\sin\phi_s \sinh\left(\frac{\Delta\Gamma}{2}t\right) - \sin(\delta_0 - \delta_s)\cos\phi_s \sin(\Delta m t) + \cos(\delta_0 - \delta_s)\cos(\Delta m t)\right].$$



ΔM_s

CDF 1 fb^{-1} (2006)

17.77±0.10±0.07 ps^{-1}

LHCb 0.34 fb^{-1} (2011)

17.725±0.041±0.026 ps^{-1}





- Used to calibrate the flavor tagging

CPV in $B_s \rightarrow J/\psi\phi$

- Correlated constraints on $\Delta\Gamma_s$ versus CP violating phase ϕ_s
- Ambiguous solution for $\Delta\Gamma_s \rightarrow -\Delta\Gamma_s$, $\phi_s \rightarrow \pi - \phi_s$.





New LHCb ϕ_s result

$\Gamma = 0.656 \pm 0.009$
$\pm 0.008\ (ps^{-1})$
$\Delta\Gamma = 0.123$
± 0.029
$\pm 0.011\ (ps^{-1})$
$\phi_s = 0.13 \pm 0.18$
$\pm 0.07\ (rad)$



- All measurements consistent with SM value



1^{st} Observation of $B_s \rightarrow J/\psi\, f_0(980)$

- In $B_s \rightarrow J/\psi\,\phi$ the S-wave predicted (& now observed) under the ϕ could manifest itself as a 0^+ $\pi^+\pi^-$ system, the $f_0(980)$ [Stone & Zhang PRD 79, 074024 (2009)]. As a CP eigenstate can be used to measure ϕ_s without angular analysis



$$\frac{\Gamma\left(J/\psi f_0;\, f_0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\right)}{\Gamma\left(J/\psi\phi;\, \phi \rightarrow K^+K^-\right)} \approx 0.25$$

$m(J/\psi\,\pi^+\pi^-)$ within 90 MeV of 980 MeV



$m(\pi^+\pi^-)$ within 30 MeV of B_s mass



Confirmations

- Belle, CDF & D0
- CDF measures τ also, ignoring CP violation, in this CP odd eigenstate. $<\tau_{Bs}>=1.43\pm0.04$ ps (PDG)



$$\tau_{J/\psi f_0} = 1.70^{+0.12}_{-0.11} \pm 0.03\,\text{ps}$$



CPV in $B_s \to J/\psi f_0$

Log-likelihood profile



- ϕ_s=-0.44±0.44±0.02 rad
- Combined with $J/\psi\phi$, ϕ_s=0.03±0.16±0.07 rad

1^{st} Observation of $B_s \to J/\psi\, f'_2(1525)$

- $B_s \to J/\psi K^+K^-$





- $$R^{f'_2}_{\text{effective}} \equiv \frac{\mathcal{B}(B^0_s \to J/\psi f'_2(1525),\ f'_2(1525) \to K^+K^-)}{\mathcal{B}(B^0_s \to J/\psi\phi,\ \phi \to K^+K^-)} = (19.4 \pm 1.8 \pm 1.1)\%$$
$$\text{for } \left|m(K^+K^-) - 1525 \text{ MeV}\right| < 125 \text{ MeV}.$$

CKM B_s Fit

- Now even better consistency with SM than B_d
- However, much more room for NP than in B_d system due to less precise measurements



a_{sl}

- By definition $|q/p| = 1\text{-}a_{sl}$

$$a_{sl} = \frac{\Gamma\left(\bar{M} \to f\right) - \Gamma\left(M \to \bar{f}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\bar{M} \to f\right) + \Gamma\left(M \to \bar{f}\right)}$$

- Here *f* is by construction flavor specific, $f \neq \bar{f}$
- Can measure eg. $\bar{B}_s \to D_s^+ \mu^- \nu$, versus $B_s \to D_s^- \mu^+ \nu$,
- Or can consider that muons from two B decays can be like-sign when one mixes and the other decays, so look at $\mu^+\mu^+$ vs $\mu^-\mu^-$
- a_{sl} is expected to be very small in the SM, $a_{sl}=(\Delta\Gamma/\Delta M) \tan\phi$, for B^o -7.6×10^{-4} for B_s $+3.4\times10^{-5}$

arXiv:1008.1593 [hep-ph]

DØ result on a_{sl}

- Using dimuons

$$A_{sl}^{b} = (-0.787 \pm 0.172 \pm 0.093)\%$$

3.9σ from zero



a_{sl} vs ϕ_s

$a^s_{sl}=(\Delta\Gamma/\Delta M)\tan\phi_s$

Assume all asymmetry is due to B_s

$a^s_{sl}=(-0.787\pm0.196)\%$





Majorana ν's

- Several ways of looking for presence of heavy ν's (N) in heavy quark decays if they are Majorana (their own anti-particles) and couple to "ordinary" ν's





ℓ & ℓ′ can be e, μ or τ

Analogous to ν-less nuclear β decay

Current Searches

- Belle $B^- \to D^- \ell \ell'$
- Found upper limits,

ee mode not competitive with nuclear β decay, others unique

Mode	U.L. $[10^{-6}]$
$B^+ \to D^- e^+ e^+$	< 2.6
$B^+ \to D^- e^+ \mu^+$	< 1.8
$B^+ \to D^- \mu^+ \mu^+$	< 1.0

[arXiv:1107.064]

LHCb $B^- \to \pi^+ \mu^- \mu^-$,

u.l $< 4.5\text{x}10^{-8}$

See A. Atre, T. Han, S. Pascoli, & B. Zhang [arXiv:0901.3589]



Searches at higher masses

- CDF general search for like-sign dileptons [A. Abulencia et. al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 98, 221803 (2007)]
- CMS search for events with two isolated like-sign leptons, hadronic jets & missing E_T [arXiv:1104.3168]
- ATLAS [arXiv:1108.0366]
- If seen could also be interpreted in terms of other NP, ie. supersymmetery….



New Exotic States

- Belle discovery of $Z_b(10610)$ and $Z_b(10650)$
- $\Upsilon(5S)\to\Upsilon(nS)\pi^+\pi^-$ Dalitz plots. See $\Upsilon(nS)\pi^\pm$ states
- Also seen in $h_b(1P)\pi^\pm$ & $h_b(2P)\pi^\pm$ decays arXiv:1105.4583





Lepton Flavor Violation

- $\mu \to e\gamma$ MEG data 2009 results (Mori EPS2011)





Note 2-sided limit

- Data 2010 Results





Combined $\mathcal{B}<2.4\times10^{-12}$

- Many limits on $\tau \to \ell hh$, Λh, $\bar{\Lambda} h$, $\mu\gamma$, μh, 3μ, best limits near 10^{-8} (Belle, BaBar)

Future Acts

- LHCb Upgrade: run at 10^{33} cm^{-2}/s (x5), & double trigger efficiency on purely hadronic final states
- Super B factories
- Time scales are on the order of 6 years
- BES III, LHCb are happening now





Conclusions

- Heavy Flavor physics is now very sensitive to potential New Physics effects at high mass scales
- LHC experiments have shown their ability by already making world class 1st measurements of flavor physics. They are ready!
- Heavy Flavor experiments are ready to search for and limit New Physics, especially in rare and CP violating b & c decays at the LHC with the 2011 data and beyond
- Many other interesting flavor results have not been mentioned – apologies

The End

DØ a_{sl}

- Separate into B_d and B_s samples using impact parameter of muons
- Find

$$a_{\rm sl}^d = (-0.12 \pm 0.52)\%,$$
$$a_{\rm sl}^s = (-1.81 \pm 1.06)\%.$$





New b-Baryon Decays



CDF Ξ_b^o
1st observation
mass 5787.8±5.0 MeV



D⁰pπ⁻



D⁰pK⁻



$\Lambda_b\to D^0pK$

$\Lambda_b\to D^0pK$ observed for first time with significance of 6.3σ

$$\frac{\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_b^0\to D^0pK^-)}{\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_b^0\to D^0p\pi^-)}=0.112\pm0.019^{+0.011}_{-0.014}$$

X(4140)?

- In $B^- \to J/\psi\phi K^-$ decays, CDF reported a narrow structure in $m(J/\psi\phi)$ mass [arXiv:1101.6058]









No signal evident in LHCb data

Exp: $\mathcal{B}(B_s \to \mu^+\mu^-)$ in NUHM1





- CMS discovery contours for H, A $\to \tau^+\tau^- \to$jets (solid line), jet + μ (dashed), jet + e (dotted) using 30-60 fb^{-1}

- (From O. Buchmueller et al., arXiv:0907.5568)



$B^o \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$

- In fact correlation between B_d & B_s $\mu^+\mu^-$ could be crucial



- This can only be done with the LHCb Upgrade

ATLAS B σ's



ATLAS Preliminary
√s = 7 TeV
∫L dt = 40 pb⁻¹
m_Bs = 5364.0 ± 1.4(stat.) MeV
N_Bs = 358 ± 22(stat.)
σ = 26.6 ± 1.5(stat.) MeV
τ > 0.40 ps
m_J/ψ KK (MeV)



CMS Preliminary
√s=7 TeV, L=40pb⁻¹
ct > 0.01 cm
signal
non-prompt background
prompt background
Events / (0.018 GeV/c²)
J/ψφ invariant mass (GeV/c²)



CMS Preliminary,√s=7 TeV
Spring 2011
value ± stat. ± syst. ± lum. error
(integrated luminosity)
pp→ B⁺ X
P_T>5 GeV, |y|<2.4
28.3 ± 2.4 ± 2.0 ± 1.1 μb
(6 pb⁻¹)
pp→ B⁰ X
P_T>5 GeV, |y|<2.2
33.2 ± 2.5 ± 3.1 ± 1.3 μb
(40 pb⁻¹)
pp→ B_s X → J/ψ φ X
8<P_T<50 GeV, |y|<2.4 (x1000)
6.9 ± 0.6 ± 0.5 ± 0.3 nb
(40 pb⁻¹)
Theory: MC@NLO
CTEQ6M PDF, μ=(m_b²+p_T²)^1/2, m_b=4.75 GeV
B-Meson Production Cross Section [μb]



Also D^+, D_s, Λ_b





Dfb: 9406±110





Dfb: 2446±60

Extract B_s fractions

- Crucial to set absolute scale for B_s rates, since not given by e^+e^- machines.
- Must correct for $B_s \rightarrow D^o K^+ X \mu\nu$, also $\Lambda_b \rightarrow D^o p X \mu\nu$

$$f_s/(f_u+f_d) = 0.136 \pm 0.004^{+0.012}_{-0.011}$$







B_s fraction - hadronic

- Also can use hadronic decays + theory ~35 pb^{-1}

$\sqrt{s}$ = 7 TeV
LHCb Preliminary



$$\frac{f_s}{f_d} = 0.249 \pm 0.013^{\rm stat} \pm 0.020^{\rm syst} \pm 0.025^{\rm theor}$$

$$\frac{f_s}{f_d} = 0.242 \pm 0.024^{\rm stat} \pm 0.018^{\rm syst} \pm 0.016^{\rm theor},$$

Semileptonics: $f_s / f_d = 0.272 \pm 0.008^{+0.024}_{-0.022}$

Λ_b Fraction

- Significant p_t dependence





$$[f_{\Lambda_b}/(f_u + f_d)] = 0.401 \pm 0.019 \pm 0.106 - (0.012 \pm 0.0025 \pm 0.0012) \times p_t(\mathrm{GeV})$$

- In general agreement with CDF measured at <p_t>~10 GeV/c $f_{\Lambda_b}/(f_u + f_d) = 0.281 \pm 0.012^{+0.011}_{-0.056}{}^{+0.128}_{-0.086}$



$\sigma(pp\rightarrow b\bar{b}X)$ using 15 nb^{-1}

- $b\rightarrow D^0X\mu^-\nu$, $D^o\rightarrow K^-\pi^+$, ~280 events

Infancy



$$\sigma = \frac{\#\text{ of detected } D^0\mu^- \;\&\; \bar{D}^0\mu^+}{L \text{ x efficiency x } 2}$$



- In 2<η<6, (75.3±5.4±13.0) μb LEP frag ⇒ 284±20±49 μb
- In 2<η<6, 89.6 μb Tevatron frag ⇒ 338±24±58 μb
- Also measured charm cross-section, ~20x b



b xsect from b→J/ψX





$$t_z = \frac{(z_{J/\psi} - z_{\rm PV}) \times M_{J/\psi}}{p_z}$$



- Here use 5.2 pb^{-1}
- σ= 288±4±48 μb

ATLAS σ from b→J/ψX







- ATLAS also in agreement with FONLL for p_t>5 GeV/c





CMS σ from b→Xμν



$$\sigma = 1.32 \pm 0.01(\mathrm{stat}) \pm 0.30(\mathrm{syst}) \pm 0.15(\mathrm{lumi})\ \mu\mathrm{b}$$

$$\sigma_{MC@NLO} = 0.84^{+0.36}_{-0.19}(\mathrm{scale}) \pm 0.08(\mathrm{m_b}) \pm 0.04(\mathrm{pdf})\mu\mathrm{b} \qquad \sigma_{PYTHIA} = 1.8\mu\mathrm{b}$$





- In all cases generally good agreement with NLO calculations, within large errors

CPV Time Evolution

- In general with $A_f \equiv A(M \to f), \bar{A}_f \equiv A(\bar{M} \to f), \quad \lambda_f = \frac{p}{q}\frac{\bar{A}_f}{A_f}$

$$\Gamma(M(t) \to f) = \mathcal{N}_f |A_f|^2 e^{-\Gamma t} \left\{ \frac{1+|\lambda_f|^2}{2} \cosh\frac{\Delta\Gamma\, t}{2} + \frac{1-|\lambda_f|^2}{2} \cos(\Delta M\, t) - \mathrm{Re}\,\lambda_f \sinh\frac{\Delta\Gamma\, t}{2} - \mathrm{Im}\,\lambda_f \sin(\Delta M\, t) \right\},$$

See Nierste arXiv:0904.1869 [hep-ph]

- For B°, ΔΓ≈0

$$\Gamma(M \to f) = N_f |A_f|^2 e^{-\Gamma t} \left(\frac{1}{2}\left(1 - |\lambda_f|\right)\cos(\Delta M t) - \mathrm{Im}\,\lambda_f \sin(\Delta M t) \right)$$

- if only 1 A_f $\quad \Gamma(M \to f) = N_f |A_f|^2 e^{-\Gamma t} \left(1 - \mathrm{Im}\,\lambda_f \sin(\Delta M t)\right)$

- and a CP eigenstates

$$a[f_{CP}(t)] = \frac{\Gamma(\bar{M} \to f_{CP}) - \Gamma(M \to f_{CP})}{\Gamma(\bar{M} \to f_{CP}) + \Gamma(M \to f_{CP})} = -2\,\mathrm{Im}\,\lambda_f$$

λ_f a function of V_{ij} in SM & thus to α,β or γ