Search for the suppressed $\Lambda_c^+ \to p\mu^+\mu^-$ decay and observation of the $\Lambda_c^+ \to p\omega$ decay

Marcin Chrzaszcz
mchrzasz@cern.ch

With M. Jezabek, T. Lesiak, B. Nowak, M. Witek (IFJ PAN)

Tuesday meeting, CERN
September 26, 2017

Yellow pages

- ⇛ Reviewers: Tom Blake(chair), Harry Cliff, Simon Eydelman(EB)
- ⇛ Twiki:

`https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/viewauth/LHCbPhysics/Lc2PMuMu`

- ⇛ Review start: 01.04.2017
- ⇛ Three interactions with the review committee.
- ⇛ Unbinding: 18.07.2017
- ⇛ Minor changes to the analysis during the review.

We would like to take this occasion and than Tom, Harry and Simon for fruitful, constructive and smooth review!

Motivation

⇛ SM predictions:
$\mathcal{O}(10^{-8})$

⇛ Long distance effects:
$\mathcal{O}(10^{-6})$

⇛ Previous measurement done by Babar:
$Br(\Lambda_c^+ \to p\mu^+\mu^-) < 4.4 \cdot 10^{-5}$ at 90% CL







Should be able to improve by a factor of 100!

Analysis strategy

⇛ Normalization to $\Lambda_c^+ \to p\phi(\mu\mu)$.

⇛ Typical steps rare decays:

- Loose stripping selection.
- BDT1 used for first preselection.
- BDT2 used to further suppress the background.
- PID used to fight the peaking background.

⇛ Search performed in several dimuon mass windows.

⇛ Selection optimized on $\mathrm{CL_s}$.

⇛ Unblinding and calculate the UL of BR using $\mathrm{CL_s}$.

Analysis strategy

⇛ Normalization to $\Lambda_c^+ \to p\phi(\mu\mu)$.

⇛ Typical steps rare decays:

- Loose stripping selection.
- BDT1 used for first preselection.
- BDT2 used to further suppress the background.
- PID used to fight the peaking background.

⇛ Search performed in several dimuon mass windows.

⇛ Selection optimized on $\mathrm{CL_s}$.

⇛ Unblinding and calculate the UL of BR using $\mathrm{CL_s}$.



Normalization channel

Use the $\Lambda_c^+ \to p\phi(\mu\mu)$.

$\Rightarrow$ Same final state, same selection, a lot of systematics cancel.

$\Rightarrow$ The Branching fraction of $\Lambda_c^+ \to p\phi$ is know with $22\ \%$.

Use the $\Lambda_c^+ \to pK\pi$.

$\Rightarrow$ Precisely known branching fraction (precision: $6.4\ \%$).

$\Rightarrow$ A lot of additional systematics due to different final states, different selections

We choose the $\Lambda_c^+ \to p\phi(\mu\mu)$ option

$\Rightarrow$ In the most optimistic scenario where you assume the $22\ \%$ systematic to go town to $6.4\ \%$ the UL.

$\Rightarrow$ In this case the UL gets worse $7.8\ \%$.

Normalization channel

Use the $\Lambda_c^+ \to p\phi(\mu\mu)$.

$\Rightarrow$ Same final state, same selection, a lot of systematics cancel.
$\Rightarrow$ The Branching fraction of $\Lambda_c^+ \to p\phi$ is know with 22 %.

Use the $\Lambda_c^+ \to pK\pi$.

$\Rightarrow$ Precisely known branching fraction (precision: 6.4 %).
$\Rightarrow$ A lot of additional systematics due to different final states, different selections

We choose the $\Lambda_c^+ \to p\phi(\mu\mu)$ option

$\Rightarrow$ In the most optimistic scenario where you assume the 22 % systematic to go town to 6.4 % the UL.
$\Rightarrow$ In this case the UL gets worse 7.8 %.

Data sets and Stripping

⇒ 2011+2012 (aka Run1) Stripping 20.

Condition	$\Lambda_c^+ \to p\mu^+\mu^-$
$\mu^{\pm}$ and p	
p_T	$> 300 MeV/c$
Track χ^2/ndf	< 3
IP χ^2/ndf	> 9
PID $\mu^{\pm}$	PIDmu> -5 and (PIDmu - PIDK) > 0
PID p	PIDp>10
Λ_c^+	
Δm	$< 150 MeV/c^2$
Vertex χ^2	< 15
IP χ^2	< 225
$c\tau$	$> 100\mu$m
Lifetime fit χ^2	< 225

Preselection

⇛ Additional cuts:

Common cuts
$m_{\mu\mu} < 1400\ MeV/c^2$
proton $ProbNNp > 0.1$
$\mu^+, \mu^-\ ProbNNmu > 0.1$
$10\ GeV/c < p_{proton} < 100\ GeV/c$

⇛ We define couple of dimuom mass regions:

$m(\mu\mu)$ region	$\left[MeV/c^2\right]$
ϕ region	$[985, 1055]$
ω region	$[759, 805]$
non resonant	$[210, 747] \cup [817, 980] \cup [1060, 1400]$

Trigger

⇛ We require the following triggers (all are TOS):

- L0
  - L0MuonDecision
- HLT1
  - Hlt1TrackMuonDecision
  - Hlt1DiMuonLowMassDecision
  - Hlt1TrackAllL0Decision
- HLT2
  - Hlt2DiMuonDetachedDecision
  - Hlt2CharmSemilep3bodyD2KMuMuDecision
  - Hlt2CharmSemilepD2HMuMuDecision

⇛ The TIS increase the signal yield by $< 10\ \%$ and were asked to be removed at the WG review stage.

BDT1 training

⇛ The normalization channel is also a rather "rare decay":
$\mathrm{Br}(\Lambda_c^+ \to p\phi) \cdot \mathrm{Br}(\phi \to \mu\mu) = 3.1 \cdot 10^{-7}$
⇛ After the previous preselection a simple BDT is trained using variables that are well simulated in the MC. k-folding used ($k = 10$)
⇛ The BDT1 (not surprisingly) likes the prompt Λ_c rather the secondary ones.







BDT1 selection

- ⇛ The selection based on BDT1 is not optimised.
- ⇛ A loose cut:

$$\mathrm{BDT1} > -0.1$$





- ⇛ The normalization channel peak is observed.

BDT2 selection

⇛ Variables used:

- flight distance - the one between the production and decay points.
- χ^2 of flight distance,
- transformed decay time - $T = \exp\left(-1000 \cdot \tau/\mathrm{ns}\right)$,
- IP - impact parameter with respect to primary vertex,
- χ^2 of IP of Λ_c^+
- $\log(\chi^2_{DTF})$,
- p_T - transverse momentum of Λ_c^+,
- minimum of χ^2 of p, μ^+, μ^- w.r.t. primary vertex,
- transverse momenta





BDT2

⇛ After correcting the DATA/MC differences the BDT distribution shows a a good DATA/MC agreement.

⇛ No mass correlation observed.







PID

⇛ MC re sampling is choose to correct the PID distributions:
For MC samples the ProbNNp and ProbNNmu are drawn from the PIDCalib distributions.

⇛ The PIDCalib doesn't cover to low p_T muons (10%).
⇛ Decided to use for them the $D_s \to \phi(\mu\mu)$ sample.







Selection optimization

- ⇛ The final selection of the analysis is optimized!
- ⇛ CL_s method used.
- ⇛ KDE used to sample toy experiments.



Variable	Condition
BDT	> 0.0
$ProbNNp(p)$	> 0.68
minimum $ProbNNmu(\mu^{\pm})$	> 0.38









Peaking backgrounds

$\Rrightarrow$ The tight PID cuts essentially kill the peaking bkg!
$\Rrightarrow$ The only bkg left is the $\Lambda_c^+ \to p\pi\pi$.





$\Rrightarrow$ Estimated contamination:
1.96 ± 1.13 $\Rrightarrow$ assigned as systematic

Normalization

⇛ The gold equation:

$$\frac{\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \to p\mu^+\mu^-)}{\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \to p\phi(\mu\mu))} = \frac{\epsilon_{\rm norm}{}^{\rm TOT}}{\epsilon_{\rm sig}{}^{\rm TOT}} \times \frac{N_{\rm sig}}{N_{\rm norm}},$$

⇛ We take advantage of the cancellation that:

$$\frac{\epsilon_{\rm norm}{}^{\rm TOT}}{\epsilon_{\rm sig}{}^{\rm TOT}} = \frac{\epsilon_{\rm norm}{}^{\rm STRIP}}{\epsilon_{\rm sig}{}^{\rm STRIP}} \times \frac{\epsilon_{\rm norm}{}^{\rm COMM}}{\epsilon_{\rm sig}{}^{\rm COMM}} \times \frac{\epsilon_{\rm norm}{}^{\rm SPEC}}{\epsilon_{\rm sig}{}^{\rm SPEC}}, \quad \frac{\epsilon_{\rm norm}{}^{\rm i}}{\epsilon_{\rm sig}{}^{\rm i}} \simeq 1$$

⇛ In addition we have added 6 mass bins to increase the sensitivity.

⇛ Signal is modelled by a double Gaussian.



Expected background

⇛ Background modelled with a linear function.



bin	no events
bin1	8.56136 ± 0.540302
bin2	8.60318 ± 0.536917
bin3	8.64582 ± 0.536561
bin4	8.6887 ± 0.539208
bin5	8.7304 ± 0.544752
bin6	8.77226 ± 0.553162





⇛ Expected upper limits: $\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \to p\mu^+\mu^-) < 5.91 \times 10^{-8}$ at 90 % CL

Observed Upper limits

⇛ After the green light from RC we have unblinded we did not observed a significant access of events.
⇛ We have set an UL:

$$\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \to p\mu^+\mu^-) < 7.68\times10^{-8} \text{at} 90\,\%\,\text{CL}$$







By product :)

$\Rrightarrow$ We also looked at the ω dimuon region.

We observed an access

Using Wilks theorem we have calculated the singificance to be $5.0\ \sigma$!

$\Rrightarrow$ This is the first observation of this decay!!!

$\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \to p\omega) = (7.6 \pm 2.6\ (stat) \pm 0.9\ (syst1) \pm 3.1\ (syst2))\ \times 10^{-4}$





Conclusion

- Improved the UL for $\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \to p\mu^+\mu^-)$ by two orders of magnitude!

Conclusion

- Improved the UL for $\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \to p\mu^+\mu^-)$ by two orders of magnitude!



- First time observed the decay $\Lambda_c^+ \to p\omega$!!
- Paper is beeing prepared, aiming PRL
- We would like to ask the collaboration for approving this analysis.

Backup