## **Overlap for** $B^0 \rightarrow K^* \mu \mu$

Thomas Blake<sup>1</sup>, <u>Marcin Chrzaszcz</u><sup>2,3</sup>, Sam Cunliffe<sup>4</sup>, Christoph Langenbruch<sup>1</sup>, Konstantinos Petridis<sup>4</sup>, Nicola Serra<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Warwick
 <sup>2</sup> University of Zurich
 <sup>3</sup> Institute of Nuclear Physics, Krakow
 <sup>4</sup> Imperial College London

Physics Performance, Trigger and Stripping meeting



August 18, 2014

#### Outline









Previous presentations:

- $B^0 \rightarrow K^* \mu \mu$  meeting: https://indico.cern.ch/event/ 290864/contribution/0/material/slides/0.pdf.
- $B^0 \rightarrow K^* \mu \mu$  meeting: https://indico.cern.ch/event/ 290864/contribution/2/material/slides/1.pdf.
- PPTS meeting: https://indico.cern.ch/event/288654/ contribution/2/material/slides/0.pdf.



In July we freeze the selection for  ${\rm B^0} \to {\rm K^*}\mu\mu$ : LHCb-INT-2013-058

- New selection is based on simplified BDT:(less variables, larger dataset)
- Modified vetoes for exclusive backgrounds
- Moved from Stripping 17 RECO12  $\rightarrow$  Stripping 20 RECO14.
- A question raised by Tom:
  - "What is the overlap for the new and old selection on the 2011 data sample?"
- By product: check any potential bias of events not common in both RECOs, check how well we can model this things in MC(needed for acceptance corrections),



#### Method 1:

Take old ntuples and match events using a unique numbers: event-number and run-number. Study the missing events from one data sample.

#### Advantages

• Comparing directly samples that we do our analysis on.

#### Data samples used for studies:

- RECO12, Stripping 17, full selection, old BDT. Fixed sample.
- RECO14, Stripping 20, full selection.

#### Disadvantages

- Different stripping.
- Not easy to disentangle different contributions.
- Event alignment problems(recovered).



#### with BDT, signal region

$q^2$ [GeV <sup>2</sup> ]	$N_{ m old}$	$N_{\rm new}$	$N_{ m common}$	$N_{ m old}^{ m only}$	$N_{\rm new}^{ m only}$	$N_{ m common}/N_{ m old}$ [%]	$N_{ m common}/N_{ m old\cupnew}$ [%]
[0.1,2]	162	156	105	57	51	64.8	49.3
[2,4]	101	91	60	41	31	59.4	45.5
[4,6]	111	107	66	45	41	59.5	43.4
[6,8]	165	144	98	67	46	59.4	46.4
$(m_{{ m J}/\psi}\pm 0.05)^2$	102102	105000	77678	24424	27322	76.1	60.0
[11, 12.5]	88	110	63	25	47	71.6	46.7
[15, 17]	121	148	88	33	60	72.7	48.6
[17, 19]	79	109	59	20	50	74.7	45.7

Helicity angles in different RECO samples:



#### with BDT, background region

$q^2$ [GeV <sup>2</sup> ]	$N_{ m old}$	$N_{\rm new}$	$N_{ m common}$	$N_{ m old}^{ m only}$	$N_{ m new}^{ m only}$	$N_{ m common}/N_{ m old}$ [%]	$N_{ m common}/N_{ m old\cupnew}$ [%]
[0.1, 2]	33	11	2	31	9	6.1	4.8
[2, 4]	50	25	10	40	15	20.0	15.4
[4,6]	37	28	4	33	24	10.8	6.6
[6, 8]	32	32	7	25	25	21.9	12.3
$(m_{{ m J}/\psi}\pm 0.05)^2$	1751	1773	549	1202	1224	31.4	18.5
[11, 12.5]	35	25	9	26	16	25.7	17.6
[15, 17]	27	18	5	22	13	18.5	12.5
[17, 19]	27	15	1	26	14	3.7	2.4



#### without BDT, signal region

$q^2$ [GeV <sup>2</sup> ]	$N_{ m old}$	$N_{\rm new}$	$N_{ m common}$	$N_{ m old}^{ m only}$	$N_{\rm new}^{ m only}$	$N_{ m common}/N_{ m old}$ [%]	$N_{ m common}/N_{ m old\cupnew}$ [%]
[0.1, 2]	162	320	119	43	201	73.5	32.8
[2, 4]	101	416	75	26	341	74.3	17.0
[4, 6]	111	409	78	33	331	70.3	17.6
[6,8]	165	499	118	47	381	71.5	21.6
$(m_{\mathrm{J/\psi}}\pm0.05)^2$	102102	125084	83995	18107	41089	82.3	58.7
[11, 12.5]	88	359	69	19	290	78.4	18.3
[15, 17]	121	478	99	22	379	81.8	19.8
[17, 19]	79	377	65	14	312	82.3	16.6

Helicity angles in different RECO samples:



#### without BDT, background region

$q^2$ [GeV <sup>2</sup> ]	$N_{ m old}$	$N_{\rm new}$	$N_{ m common}$	$N_{ m old}^{ m only}$	$N_{ m new}^{ m only}$	$N_{ m common}/N_{ m old}$ [%]	$N_{ m common}/N_{ m old\cupnew}$ [%]
[0.1, 2]	33	457	18	15	439	54.5	3.8
[2, 4]	50	643	33	17	610	66.0	5.0
[4,6]	37	634	18	19	616	48.6	2.8
[6, 8]	32	650	21	11	629	65.6	3.2
$(m_{{ m J}/\psi}\pm 0.05)^2$	1751	7976	857	894	7119	48.9	9.7
[11, 12.5]	35	466	23	12	443	65.7	4.8
[15, 17]	27	603	16	11	587	59.3	2.6
[17, 19]	27	678	16	11	662	59.3	2.3



## with BDT, $p_T > 250$ MeV, signal region

•  $p_T$  was inherit from CommonParticles in S17, removed in S20.

$q^2$ [GeV <sup>2</sup> ]	$N_{ m old}$	$N_{\rm new}$	$N_{ m common}$	$N_{ m old}^{ m only}$	$N_{\rm new}^{ m only}$	$N_{ m common}/N_{ m old}$ [%]	$N_{ m common}/N_{ m old\cupnew}$ [%]
[0.1,2]	147	136	101	46	35	68.7	55.5
[2,4]	89	79	59	30	20	66.3	54.1
[4,6]	100	86	60	40	26	60.0	47.6
[6, 8]	143	117	92	51	25	64.3	54.8
$(m_{\mathrm{J/\psi}}\pm0.05)^2$	95946	95224	74711	21235	20513	77.9	64.2
[11, 12.5]	83	94	62	21	32	74.75	53.9
[15, 17]	112	121	83	29	38	74.1	55.3
[17, 19]	73	84	58	15	26	79.5	58.6

Helicity angles in different RECO samples:



## with BDT, $p_T > 250 \text{MeV}$ , background region

#### • $p_T$ was inherit from CommonParticles in S17, removed in S20.

$q^2$ [GeV <sup>2</sup> ]	$N_{ m old}$	$N_{\rm new}$	$N_{ m common}$	$N_{ m old}^{ m only}$	$N_{ m new}^{ m only}$	$N_{ m common}/N_{ m old}$ [%]	$N_{ m common}/N_{ m old\cupnew}$ [%]
[0.1, 2]	31	4	2	29	2	6.5	6.1
[2, 4]	46	16	8	38	8	17.4	14.8
[4,6]	34	15	4	30	11	11.82	8.9
[6, 8]	29	17	7	22	10	24.1	17.9
$(m_{\mathrm{J/\psi}}\pm0.05)^2$	1420	1138	522	898	616	36.8	25.6
[11, 12.5]	31	14	9	22	5	29.0	25.0
[15, 17]	25	12	5	20	7	20.0	15.6
[17, 19]	25	7	1	24	6	4.0	3.2



## without BDT, $p_T > 250$ MeV, signal region

•  $p_T$  was inherit from CommonParticles in S17, removed in S20.

$q^2$ [GeV <sup>2</sup> ]	$N_{ m old}$	$N_{\rm new}$	$N_{ m common}$	$N_{ m old}^{ m only}$	$N_{\rm new}^{ m only}$	$N_{ m common}/N_{ m old}$ [%]	$N_{ m common}/N_{ m old\cupnew}$ [%]
[0.1,2]	147	215	113	34	102	76.9	45.4
[2,4]	89	211	70	19	141	78.7	30.4
[4,6]	100	209	71	29	138	71.0	29.8
[6, 8]	143	284	109	34	175	76.2	34.3
$(m_{\mathrm{J/\psi}}\pm0.05)^2$	95946	110137	80481	15465	29656	83.9	64.1
[11, 12.5]	83	209	68	15	141	81.9	30.4
[15, 17]	112	268	92	20	176	82.1	31.9
[17, 19]	73	187	63	10	124	86.3	32.0

• q<sup>2</sup> trend is worrying. Can suggests kinematic dependence? Helicity angles in different RECO samples:



## without BDT, $p_T > 250$ MeV, background region

#### • $p_T$ was inherit from CommonParticles in S17, removed in S20.

$q^2$ [GeV <sup>2</sup> ]	$N_{ m old}$	$N_{\rm new}$	$N_{ m common}$	$N_{ m old}^{ m only}$	$N_{ m new}^{ m only}$	$N_{ m common}/N_{ m old}$ [%]	$N_{ m common}/N_{ m old\cupnew}$ [%]
[0.1, 2]	31	233	18	13	215	58.1	7.3
[2, 4]	46	295	31	15	264	67.4	10.0
[4,6]	34	294	17	17	277	50.0	5.5
[6, 8]	29	344	20	9	324	69.0	5.7
$(m_{\mathrm{J/\psi}}\pm0.05)^2$	1420	4037	802	618	3235	56.5	17.2
[11, 12.5]	31	258	20	11	238	64.5	7.4
[15, 17]	25	288	15	10	273	60.0	5.0
[17, 19]	25	301	12	13	289	48.0	3.8



#### **Kinematics comparison**



- Clear lack of high  $p_T$  tracks in RECO 14
- Still investigating.
- Check, effects are independent of polarity.



Marcin Chrząszcz (UZH, IFJ)

14 / 28

#### Method 2: MC comparison

- Simulate MC for:B  $\to$  K\* $\mu\mu$  PHSP, B  $\to$  K\* $\mu\mu$  SM and B  $\to$  K\*J/ $\!\psi$
- $\bullet~$  Using the same chain: Gauss  $\rightarrow~$  Boole  $\rightarrow~$  Moore
- The same files are run through two different Brunel versions (one for REC012 other for REC014).
- After this you have two sets of dsts that are easy to compare.

#### Advantages

- Clean way to compare(no backgrounds).
- Can check every step.
- No alignment of events problem.

#### Disadvantages

- Perfect detector alignment.
- DATA/MC difference.
- Need to repeat each step in 2011 analysis.

Luricn

## MC Results $\mathsf{B}^0 o \mathsf{K}^*\mathsf{J}/\psi$

MC



#### DATA



Marcin Chrząszcz (UZH, IFJ)

Overlap or  $B^0 \to K^* \mu \mu$ , PPTS meeting

## MC Results $B^0 \rightarrow K^* J/\psi$ RECO

#### Legend:

RY = RECO Y.No selection just truth matching.

Comparison(NEW vs OLD)	FOM	eff [%]
R14 vs R12	$(OLD\&\&NEW)/(OLD\ NEW)$	90.1
R14 vs R12	(OLD&&NEW)/(OLD)	95.0
R14 vs R12	(OLD&&NEW)/(NEW)	94.6



## MC Results $\mathsf{B}^0 \to \mathsf{K}^*\mathsf{J}/\psi$

#### Legend:

SXRY = Stripping X, RECO Y.

Comparison(NEW vs OLD)	FOM	eff [%]
S20R14 vs S17R12	$(OLD\&\&NEW)/(OLD\ NEW)$	81.1
S20R14 vs S17R12	(OLD&&NEW)/(OLD)	88.2
S20R14 vs S17R14	(OLD&&NEW)/(OLD  NEW)	94.7
S20R14 vs S17R14	(OLD&&NEW)/(OLD)	95.4
S17R14 vs S17R12	(OLD&&NEW)/(OLD  NEW)	84.5
S17R14 vs S17R12	(OLD&&NEW)/(OLD)	92.0
S20R12 vs S17R12	(OLD&&NEW)/(OLD  NEW)	90.0
S20R12 vs S17R12	(OLD&&NEW)/(OLD)	90.0





- The overlap in data is about 64% when we have the BDT applied and the cuts aligned.
- The BDTs contain different variables and do not select the same events. The overlap for the old sample increases from 78 to 84% when turning off the BDT in the new sample.
- Without any selection, the MC predicts an overlap of 95%.



## Mille viae ducunt homines per sacula solutio



- We are getting closer. We need to match 88% (MC) with 83% (DATA).
- To meet at common point we need to recover the old selection and BDT(work in progress).
- $p_T$  mystery remains to be solved.
- Applying an aligned selection (with no BDT), this comes down to 81%. We know that there is not a complete correlation in e.g. IP χ<sup>2</sup> between a track reconstructed in RECO 12 and 14, which explains this difference. University of Zurich<sup>men</sup>



# Backup



## Results/Plots B<sup>0</sup>





## Results/Plots B<sup>0</sup>





University of Zurich

# Results/Plots B<sup>0</sup>







Marcin Chrząszcz (UZH, IFJ)

Overlap or  $B^0 \to K^* \mu \mu$ , PPTS meeting

24 / 28

## Results/Plots K







#### Results/Plots $\pi$







## Results/Plots $\mu^-$







## Results/Plots $\mu^+$





