



# Experimental results on $B \rightarrow D^{(*)}\pi\pi$

**Thomas Latham** 

Workshop on *B* decay into *D*\*\* 27<sup>th</sup> November 2012

THE UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK

# Overview

- Quick recap of motivations
- Outline the experimental methods and associated challenges
- Present the experimental results from BaBar on  $B \rightarrow D\pi\pi$  decays
  - Emphasis on D\*\* intermediate states
  - Include comparisons with Belle results but details of Belle analyses given by D. Matvienko tomorrow
- Show some recent results and future prospects from LHCb

- The  $B \rightarrow D^{(*)}\pi\pi$  Dalitz plots can contain:
  - $D^{**\pi}$  contributions
  - Colour-suppressed D<sup>0</sup>h<sup>0</sup> decays
- As we've heard already in this workshop, there is some discrepancy between theory and experiment in  $B \rightarrow D^{**}/v$  decays
- The BFs of  $B \rightarrow D^{**}\pi$  transitions are of interest to provide more input into this issue (see earlier talk by Alain Le Yaouanc)
- Isospin symmetry relates the BFs of the various  $B \rightarrow D\rho$  decays
  - Combining such measurements can give insight into strong interaction phases
- In the neutral B decays can perform a time-dependent analysis to measure sin(2β) and cos(2β) if D is reconstructed in decay to a CP eigenstate
  - See, for example, TL and T. Gershon, J. Phys. G 36, 025006 (2009)
- Can also measure  $sin(2\beta+\gamma)$  from the time-dependent  $B^0 \rightarrow D^{**}\pi$  decay rate if the *D* is reconstructed in a non-*CP* eigenstate

- In charged *B* decays there are two tree level diagrams, colour allowed (top) and colour suppressed (bottom)
- Slightly complicates the comparison with the semi-leptonic decays since only the first contributes in that case



- In neutral *B* decays there are again two tree level diagrams (both colour allowed)
- But one is heavily CKM suppressed and gives opposite sign D\*\*
  - (and sensitivity to CKM angle γ)
- Simpler comparison with the semi-leptonic decays



# Analysis Overview

- Reconstruct  $D^0$  and  $D^+$  candidates in their decays to  $K^-\pi^+(\pi^+\pi^-)$  and  $K^-\pi^+\pi^+$
- Optionally reconstruct  $D^*$  candidates in decay to  $D\pi$
- Form *B* candidates from *D*/*D*\* and two additional pions
- Apply particle ID to pions and D daughters
- Suppress continuum background with event-shape variables
- Fit to kinematic and Dalitz-plot variables determines signal and background yields plus complex amplitude coefficients

### Analysis Variables – Topological

- Light quark continuum cross section  $\sim 3x \ b\overline{b}$
- *B* mesons produced almost at rest since just above threshold
- Use event topology to discriminate
- Combine variables in a Multi-Variate Analyser (MVA) such as a Neural Network (NN)



## Analysis Variables – Kinematic

Make use of precision kinematic information from the beams.



# Dalitz-plot Analysis

- Dalitz plot is a representation of the  $B \rightarrow PPP$  phase space
- Structure in the DP gives information on resonance masses, widths and spins, relative phases, interference etc.
- Model each contribution to the DP as a separate amplitude with a complex coefficient (isobar model)
- Amplitude model must be symmetrised if identical particles are present in the final state



# **Dalitz-plot Analysis**

- Also need to account for the following effects and their possible Dalitz-plot dependence:
  - signal reconstruction efficiency
  - fraction of misreconstructed signal events
  - experimental resolution on the Dalitz-plot position of each of those categories
  - background event yields



#### $B^- \rightarrow D^+ \pi^- \pi^-$

- Both Belle and BaBar have studied this mode
  - Belle: 65M BB pairs,
     PRD 69, 112002 (2004)
  - BaBar: 383M BB pairs,
     PRD 79, 112004 (2009)
- Contributions found from
  - two D\*\* states:
    - D<sub>2</sub>\*0 (~30%) and D<sub>0</sub>\*0 (~60%)
  - off-shell  $B \rightarrow D^*(2007)\pi$  and  $B \rightarrow B^*\pi$  decays
    - $D_v^*$  (~10%) and  $B_v^*$  (~5%)
  - P-wave non-resonant Dππ
     (BaBar only) (~5%)



#### 27/11/2012

۲

 $B^- \rightarrow D^+ \pi^- \pi^-$ 





#### $B^- \rightarrow D^+ \pi^- \pi^-$

Measured quantity	Belle - PRD 69, 112002 (2004)	BaBar - PRD 79, 112004 (2009)
$BF(B^- \rightarrow D^+ \pi^- \pi^-)$	$(1.02 \pm 0.04 \pm 0.15) \times 10^{-3}$	$(1.08 \pm 0.03 \pm 0.05) \times 10^{-3}$
$D_2^*$ Mass	$(2461.6 \pm 2.1 \pm 0.5 \pm 3.3) \text{ MeV/c}^2$	(2460.4 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.9) MeV/c <sup>2</sup>
$D_2^*$ Width	(45.6 ± 4.4 ± 6.5 ± 1.6) MeV	(41.8 ± 2.5 ± 2.1 ± 2.0) MeV
$D_2^*$ Product BF	$(3.4 \pm 0.3 \pm 0.6 \pm 0.4) \times 10^{-4}$	$(3.5 \pm 0.2 \pm 0.2 \pm 0.4) \times 10^{-4}$
$D_0^*$ Mass	(2308 ± 17 ± 15 ± 28) MeV/c <sup>2</sup>	(2297 ± 8 ± 5 ± 19) MeV/c <sup>2</sup>
D <sub>0</sub> * Width	(276 ± 21 ± 18 ± 60) MeV	(273 ± 12 ± 17 ± 45) MeV
$D_0^*$ Product BF	$(6.1 \pm 0.6 \pm 0.9 \pm 1.6) \times 10^{-3}$	$(6.8 \pm 0.3 \pm 0.4 \pm 2.0) \times 10^{-3}$
$D_2^*$ and $D_0^* \Delta \phi$	$(-2.37 \pm 0.11 \pm 0.08 \pm 0.10)$ rad	(–2.07 ± 0.06 ± 0.09 ± 0.18) rad

The two experiments give very compatible results for all  $D^{**}$  quantities

#### $B^- \rightarrow D^+ \pi^- \pi^-$

- Systematic uncertainties mostly dominated by the background parameterisation
- Event selection and fit bias also significant for some parameters, particularly the width of the D<sub>0</sub>\*
- Model uncertainties estimated by varying the Blatt-Weisskopf barrier radii and trying alternative models, removing the less significant components and adding other NR components

### $B^0 \rightarrow D^0 \pi^+ \pi^-$

- Both Belle and BaBar have studied this mode
  - Belle: 388M BB pairs,
     PRD 76, 012006 (2007)
  - BaBar: preliminary results, from 471M BB pairs, arXiv:1007.4464 [hep-ex]
- Analysis is more complicated due to presence of π<sup>+</sup>π<sup>-</sup> resonances and physical D\*(2010)<sup>+</sup> near threshold
- Contributions found from
  - two  $D^{**}$  states:  $D_2^{*+}$  and  $D_0^{*+}$
  - virtual D<sub>v</sub>\* (~10%)
  - $-\rho$ (770) and f<sub>2</sub>(1270)
  - various S-wave components



 The description of the S-wave is the main difference between the BaBar and Belle analyses

 $B^0 \rightarrow D^0 \pi^+ \pi^-$ 

- BaBar uses a K-matrix approach to model the  $\pi^+\pi^-$  S-wave
- Belle uses a sum of Breit-Wigners:  $f_0(600)$ ,  $f_0(980)$  and  $f_0(1370)$
- BaBar includes a  $D\pi$  NR in addition to the  $D_0^*$  to model enhancement at low invariant mass
  - Find strong destructive interference between these  $D\pi$  S-wave contributions

#### $B^0 \rightarrow D^0 \pi^+ \pi^-$

- Projections of the BaBar data with the fit model superimposed
- ➤ Total fit
- Continuum background
- Total background (continuum + B decays)
- Signal component



#### $B^0 \rightarrow D^0 \pi^+ \pi^-$

Branching Fraction	BABAR Value $(10^{-4})$	Belle Value $(10^{-4})$
Inclusive $B^0 \to \overline{D}{}^0 \pi^+ \pi^-$	$8.81 \pm 0.18 \pm 0.76 \pm 0.78 \pm 0.11$	$8.4\pm0.4\pm0.8$
$B^0 \to D_2^*(2460)^- \pi^+ \times D_2^*(2460)^- \to \overline{D}{}^0 \pi^-$	$1.80 \pm 0.09 \pm 0.19 \pm 0.37 \pm 0.02$	$2.15 \pm 0.17 \pm 0.29 \pm 0.12$
$B^0 \to D_0^*(2400)^- \pi^+ \times D_0^*(2400)^- \to \overline{D}{}^0 \pi^-$	$2.18 \pm 0.23 \pm 0.33 \pm 1.15 \pm 0.03$	$0.60 \pm 0.13 \pm 0.15 \pm 0.22$
$B^0 \to  ho(770)^0 \overline{D}{}^0$	$2.98 \pm 0.19 \pm 0.53 \pm 0.93 \pm 0.04$	$3.19 \pm 0.20 \pm 0.24 \pm 0.38$
$B^0 \to f_2(1270)\overline{D}^0$	$1.02 \pm 0.12 \pm 0.18 \pm 0.36 \pm 0.03$	$1.20 \pm 0.18 \pm 0.21 \pm 0.32$
$B^0 \to D_v^*(2010)^- \pi^+ \times D_v^*(2010)^- \to \overline{D}{}^0 \pi^-$	$1.39 \pm 0.08 \pm 0.16 \pm 0.35 \pm 0.02$	$0.88\pm0.13$
$D\pi$ nonresonant	$1.62 \pm 0.21 \pm 0.41 \pm 1.21 \pm 0.02$	
K matrix total	$2.26 \pm 0.22 \pm 0.34 \pm 0.58 \pm 0.03$	

- Inclusive and sub-mode BF measurements in good agreement except for D\*<sub>v</sub>(2010)<sup>-</sup>π<sup>+</sup> and D\*<sub>0</sub>(2400)<sup>-</sup>π<sup>+</sup>, where BaBar see larger values than Belle
- Direct comparison complicated due to different S-wave parameterisations

# Recent **LHC**



#### results

- LHCb recently published observation of  $B^0 \rightarrow D^0 K^+ K^-$  and evidence for the  $B_s$  decay to the same final state
  - PRL 109, 131801 (2012)
- Both of these BFs were relative measurements, with the decay  $B^0 \rightarrow D^0 \pi^+ \pi^-$  acting as the normalisation channel
- Approximately 8000 D<sup>0</sup>π<sup>+</sup>π<sup>-</sup> signal events were found c.f.
   5000 in the full BaBar dataset
- The signal is also very clean see upper right plot





- Programme of  $B \rightarrow Dhh$  measurements underway
- Hope for Dalitz-plot analyses of several modes on combined 2011-2012 dataset = 3 fb<sup>-1</sup>
- Should have, e.g. ~40k  $B^0 \rightarrow D^0 \pi^+ \pi^-$  signal events and similar numbers in the  $B^+$  decays
- With these very large statistics, other modes such as  $B^- \rightarrow D^+ K^- \pi^-$  (which may be experimentally very clean) could also be studied
- Studies of  $D_s^{**}$  resonances also underway, see recent observation of  $B_s \rightarrow D_{s1}(2536)^+\pi^-$

- arXiv:1211.1541 [hep-ex]

# Summary

- B factories have established signals for  $B \rightarrow D^{**}\pi$ decays in both charged and neutral *B* decays to  $D^{(*)}\pi\pi$  final states
- The charged B decays are experimentally cleaner and BaBar and Belle results are in excellent agreement
- The neutral *B* decays require greater statistics to fully disentangle the numerous contributions to the Dalitz plot
- Future prospects at LHCb look very promising!

#### BACKUP

# **PEP-II and BaBar**





## LHCb data acquisition



- Need precise

   measurements of CKM
   matrix elements using
   different quark level
   transitions to test the
   Standard Model
- To maximise precision and remove ambiguities measure cos(2β) as well as sin(2β)



• Idea to measure sin(2 $\beta$ ) and cos(2 $\beta$ ) in timedependent DP analysis of  $B^0 \rightarrow D_{CP} \pi^+ \pi^$ discussed in outline in

J. Charles et al. Phys. Lett. B 425, 375 (1998)
 [Erratum-ibid. B 433, 441 (1998)]

- Idea developed and feasibility studies presented in
  - T. Latham and T. Gershon, J. Phys. G 36, 025006 (2009)

# Extended DP Analysis

- The  $B \rightarrow D^* \pi \pi$  modes have extra degrees of freedom due to the spin of the  $D^*$
- Can consider, for example
  - the angle between the pions from the D\*\* and D\* decays in the D\* rest frame
  - the azimuthal angle of the pion from the  $D^*$  wrt the B  $\rightarrow D^*\pi\pi$  decay plane
- The different polarisation states of any  $\pi^+\pi^-$  resonances must also be accounted for

# $B \rightarrow D^* \pi \pi$

- Only measurements from Belle so far
- Both charged and neutral *B* decays studied:
   PRD 69, 112002 (2004)
   BELLE-CONF-0460 (2004)
- Here the 1<sup>+</sup> states D<sub>1</sub> and D<sub>1</sub>' contribute instead of the 0<sup>+</sup> D<sub>0</sub>\*
- Will hear more on this tomorrow morning from D. Matvienko

 $B^- \rightarrow D^+ \pi^- \pi^-$ 

#### Systematics and Model Errors

Systematic Source	$\frac{\Delta \mathcal{B}(B^- \to D^+ \pi^- \pi^-)}{\mathcal{B}(B^- \to D^+ \pi^- \pi^-)} \ (\%)$			
Number of $B^+B^-$ events	1.6			
Tracking efficiencies	2.5			
PID	1.5			
$\Delta E$ background shape	1.3			
$D^+$ branching fraction	2.3			
Fit models	0.7			
Fit bias	1.0			
Total Systematics	4.4			

TABLE IV: Summary of systematic uncertainties (relative errors in %) in the measurement of the total branching fraction.

TABLE V: Summary of systematic uncertainties in the masses, widths and fit fractions of the  $D_2^{*0}$  and  $D_0^{*0}$  and the phase of  $D_0^{*0}$ .

Systematic Source	$\Delta m_{D_2^{*0}}$	$\Delta \Gamma_{D_2^{*0}}$	$\Delta m_{D_0^{*0}}$	$\Delta \Gamma_{D_0^{*0}}$	$\Delta f_{D_2^{*0}}$	$\Delta f_{D_0^{*0}}$	$\Delta \phi_{D_0^{*0}}$
	$(\text{MeV}/c^2)$	(MeV)	$(\text{MeV}/c^2)$	(MeV)	(%)	(%)	(rad)
Background parameterization	1.0	1.1	3	<b>5</b>	1.2	0.0	0.04
Background fraction	0.1	0.4	2	1	0.4	0.4	0.00
Event selection	0.6	1.6	1	14	0.3	0.8	0.08
Fit bias	0.3	0.7	4	8	0.7	1.4	0.02
PID efficiency	0.0	0.1	0	0	0.0	0.1	0.01
Total systematic error	1.2	2.1	5	17	1.5	1.7	0.09
Fit models	1.3	0.7	15	40	1.5	17.2	0.07
$r  \operatorname{constant}$	1.4	1.9	12	21	3.8	7.8	0.17
Total model-dependent error	1.9	2.0	19	45	4.1	18.9	0.18