

# MODEL AGNOSTIC MEASUREMENT OF $B^0 \rightarrow D^{*-} \tau^+ \nu_{\tau}$ ANGULAR COEFFICIENTS

IoP HEPP & APP Annual Conference - 04/04/22

Luke Scantlebury-Smead on behalf of the LHCb Collaboration

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD





### INTRODUCTION - LEPTON FLAVOUR UNIVERSALITY

- Lepton Flavour Universality (LFU)
- Measurements of ratios of branching fractions with final states differing by lepton flavour:

$$\mathscr{R}(X_c) \equiv \frac{\mathscr{B}\left(X_b \to X_c \ \tau^+ \nu_{\tau}\right)}{\mathscr{B}\left(X_b \to X_c \ \mu^+ \nu_{\mu}\right)} \quad X_b : b\text{-hadron}, X_c : c\text{-hadron}$$

- LFUV would be a clear sign of New Physics (NP)





Standard Model assumes electroweak coupling to each of the three charged leptons is identical

Current measurements from B-factories and LHCb show discrepancy with SM, but not  $> 5\sigma$ 

LUKE SCANTLEBURY-SMEAD - UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD





OXFORD

### INTRODUCTION - ANGULAR ANALYSIS

• Measure the 12  $B^0 \to D^{*-} \tau^+ \nu_{\tau}$  angular coefficients and  $\mathscr{R}(D^*)$ 

- Multidimensional fit strategy with three decay angles and other discriminating variables ▶ Based on proof-of-concept paper using RapidSim samples - <u>JHEP 11, (2019) 133</u>
- ▶ NP can be detected in angular coefficients even if  $\mathscr{R}(D^*)$  is compatible with SM
- Full Run 1 + 2 LHCb data set and simulation samples:  $9 \text{fb}^{-1}$





$$\frac{d^{4}\Gamma}{dq^{2}d\cos\theta_{D}d\cos\theta_{L}d\chi} = \frac{9}{32\pi} \left\{ I_{1c}\cos^{2}\theta_{D} + I_{1s}\sin^{2}\theta_{D} + \left[ I_{2c}\cos^{2}\theta_{D} + I_{2s}\sin^{2}\theta_{D} \right]\cos 2\theta_{L} + \left[ I_{6c}\cos^{2}\theta_{D} + I_{6s}\sin^{2}\theta_{D} \right]\cos\theta_{L} + \left[ I_{3}\cos 2\chi + I_{9}\sin 2\chi \right]\sin^{2}\theta_{L}\sin^{2}\theta_{$$





UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

# SELECTION OPTIMISATION AND NORMALISATION FITS





### USING MVA TO REDUCE BACKGROUND Combinatorial BDT Tau BDT

- Signal MC vs WS data
- Variables: Track and vertex quality, particle PT, etc.



- Signal MC vs  $B \to D^*D_{s}(X) \mathrm{MC}$ • Variables:  $\tau \to \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+$
- information,  $B^0$ information





- Isolation BDT
  - Signal MC vs  $B \to D^*D_{\mathfrak{s}}(X) \operatorname{MC}$
  - Variables: charged and neutral isolation variables



### LUKE SCANTLEBURY-SMEAD - UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD



# 1.0



### MVA SELECTION OPTIMISATION

- In order to obtain control and signal samples, need to have a selection in place
- ► Selection involved several rectangular cuts, as well as 3 BDT cuts
- ► BDT cuts are optimised simultaneously using numerical method
- Cuts are optimised to maximise signal purity while maintaining a particular signal yield
- Signal yield is approximated using normalisation fits:  $B^0 \rightarrow D^{*-}\pi^+\pi^-\pi^+$

$$N_{sig} = N_{norm} * \frac{\epsilon_{sig}}{\epsilon_{norm}} * \frac{\mathscr{B}(B^0 \to D^{*-}\tau^+\nu_{\tau})}{\varepsilon_{norm}}$$

►  $\mathscr{B}(B^0 \to D^{*-}\tau^+\nu_{\tau})$  multiplied by a random number  $\in [0.75, 1.25]$  to blind optimisation to SM value



 $\cdot \left( \mathscr{B}(\tau^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+ \overline{\nu}_{\tau}) + \mathscr{B}(\tau^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+ \pi^0 \overline{\nu}_{\tau}) \right)$  $\mathscr{B}(B^0 \to D^{*-} \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+)$ 





### NORMALISATION FITS



- Three normalisation fits
  - $m(\pi^+\pi^-\pi^+)$  measure  $D_s^+ \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^+$  peak calculate <sub>s</sub>Weights
  - $m(D^{*-}\pi^{+}\pi^{-}\pi^{+})$  with *s*Weights measure  $B^{0} \rightarrow D^{*-}D_{s}$  yield
  - $m(D^{*-}\pi^{+}\pi^{-}\pi^{+})$  measure  $B^{0} \rightarrow D^{*-}\pi^{+}\pi^{-}\pi^{+}$  yield
  - Calculate estimate of optimised signal yield





ealculate <sub>s</sub>Weights  $\rightarrow D^{*-}D_{s}$  yield yield



# REMOVING FAKE D\*







### MEASURING FAKE D\* RATE - DATA FIT

- ▶ True *D*<sup>\*</sup> peaks in both
- Fake  $D^*$  peaks in  $m(D^0)$ , not in  $m(D^* D^0)$
- Fake  $D^0$  does not peak in either
- Use floating yields for each of these components
- Can remove combinatorial background that rectangular  $m(D^0)$ , and  $m(D^* - D^0)$  cuts wouldn't
- Increase in purity from this step
- Still other sources of combinatorial background
  - True  $D^*$  + fake  $3\pi$  combinatorial modelled with inclusive MC
  - ▶ B1B2 background modelled with WS data after sWeight fit is performed on WS data













# CONTROL STUDIES







# LHCD

- Control studies used to measure data/simulation agreement
- Obtain sets of weights to correct simulation
- Improve data/simulation agreement
- Correct decay fractions in simulation
- Methodology aligned with the Run 1  $\mathcal{R}(D^*)$  measurement <u>PRL 120 (2018) 171802</u>, PRD 97 (2018) 072013













# SIGNAL FIT







### SIGNAL FIT - SIGNAL PDF

- Simultaneous multidimensional template fit
  - ▶ 3D fit in the decay angles
  - 3D fit in BDT,  $q^2$ ,  $\tau z$  flight distance significance
- - Assumes SM and a form factor model
- In this analysis, background templates are still SM shapes taken from simulation
- The signal simulation is divided into 12 model independent angular templates,  $h_{I_x}$ 
  - Signal template is the sum of these angular templates
    - Each  $h_{I_x}$  is normalised by their  $I_x$  coefficient which floats in the fit:

$$P_{D^*\tau\nu} = \left(\frac{1}{3}\left(4 - 6I_{1s} + I_{2c} + 2I_{2s}\right)\right) h_{I_{1c}} + \sum_{x} I_x h_{I_x}$$



• In traditional  $\mathscr{R}(D^*)$  analyses, the signal and background PDFs use SM simulation as the templates









- Take angular function for a particular  $I_x$ ,  $f_{I_x}$ :  $I_{1s} \sin^2 \theta_D$
- Divide by the total model *M* to obtain weight function,  $W_{I_x}$  $dq^2 d\cos\theta_D d\cos\theta_I d\chi$
- Calculate the value of the weight function for signal simulation (using truth variables)





$$\frac{d^{4}\Gamma}{dq^{2}d\cos\theta_{D}d\cos\theta_{L}d\chi} = \frac{9}{32\pi} \left\{ I_{1c}\cos^{2}\theta_{D} + I_{1s}\sin^{2}\theta_{D} + \left[ I_{2c}\cos^{2}\theta_{D} + I_{2s}\sin^{2}\theta_{D} \right]\cos 2\theta_{L} + \left[ I_{6c}\cos^{2}\theta_{D} + I_{6s}\sin^{2}\theta_{D} \right]\cos \theta_{L} + \left[ I_{3}\cos 2\chi + I_{9}\sin 2\chi \right]\sin^{2}\theta_{L}\sin^{2}\theta_$$















- Take angular function for a particular  $I_x$ ,  $f_{I_r}: I_{1s} \sin^2 \theta_D$
- Divide by the total model *M* to obtain weight function,  $W_{I_r}$
- Calculate the value of the weight function for signal simulation (using truth variables)



- Apply weights to signal simulation to create  $I_x$  template,  $h_{I_x}$  (in reconstructed space)
- $h_{I_r}$  and  $f_{I_r}$  deviate due
  - Selection effects
  - Missing  $\nu$
  - Angular resolution







### ANGULAR FIT - TOY

- Toy fit based on expected statistics in data
- Signal toy generated with  $I_{y}$  according to <u>https://</u> arxiv.org/abs/1912.09335
- Expected precision of 7-8% on  $\mathcal{R}(D^*)$ (no systematics included)
  - Similar precision to Run 1 result <u>PRL 120 (2018) 171802, PRD 97 (2018) 072013</u>
  - BDT has less separation due to model independent restrictions on input variables
  - Additional freedom in signal PDF due to 12 angular templates
- $I_x$  measured in fit with signal template









• Expected performance of angular coefficient measurements for different dataset sizes:

- ▶ 9fb<sup>-1</sup>: Run 1 + 2 (blue)
- ▶  $23 \text{fb}^{-1}$ : Run 1 + 2 + 3 (red)
- ▶  $50 \text{fb}^{-1}$ : Run 1 + 2 + 3 + 4 (green)





### ANGULAR ANALYSIS: ANGULAR COEFFICIENTS

Parametric fit to true angles  $23 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  template fit 9 fb<sup>-1</sup> template fit to reco. angles & BDT ------ $50 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  template fit



### LUKE SCANTLEBURY-SMEAD - UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD



UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

17

### SUMMARY

- Measuring the 12  $B^0 \to D^{*-} \tau^+ \nu_{\tau}$  angular coefficients and  $\mathscr{R}(D^*)$ 
  - Expected precision of 7-8% on  $\mathscr{R}(D^*)$  (no systematics included)
  - First measurement of angular coefficients for  $B^0 \to D^{*-} \tau^+ \nu_{\tau}$
- Selection involves three BDTs
  - BDT cuts optimised simultaneously using normalisation fits to estimate signal yield
- Control studies to correct simulation for the largest backgrounds in the signal fit
  - $\bullet \ B \to D^{*-}D^0(X)$
  - $\bullet \ B \to D^{*-}D^+(X)$
  - $\bullet \ B \to D^{*-}D_{s}^{+}(X)$
  - $D_{s}^{+} \to \pi^{+}\pi^{-}\pi^{+}(X)$
- Signal fit requires 12 angular templates for signal PDF
  - ► 3D + 3D fit in decay angles + discriminating variables







# BACK UP SLIDES







# BDT TRAINING







### USING BDTS TO REDUCE BACKGROUND

- Use three BDTs to suppress different backgrounds or focus on different properties
- Train a BDT using these three BDTs as input variables for potential use in signal fit
- Trained with xGBoost in scikit learn package
- Combinatorial BDT
  - Signal MC truth matched + preselection
  - ► WS data preselection
  - ► Variables: Track and vertex quality, particle PT, etc.
- ► Tau BDT
  - ► Signal MC truth matched + preselection
  - ►  $B \rightarrow D^*D_s(X)$  MC truth matched + preselection
  - Variables:  $\tau \to \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+$  information,  $B^0$  information
- Isolation BDT
  - Signal MC truth matched + preselection
  - $B \to D^*D_s(X)$  MC truth matched + preselection
  - Variables: charged and neutral isolation variables







### SIGNAL SELECTION

### Variable

Trigge  $PV(\tau^{+}) = V_{z}(PV)/error$   $m(\pi^{+}\pi^{-}\pi^{+})$   $m(D^{*-}\pi^{+}\pi^{-}\pi^{+})$   $m(D^{*} - D)$  $m(D^{0})$ 

 $\tau$  flight distance significanc



	Condition
er	(B0_L0HadronDecision_TOS or B0_L0Global_TIS) and (B0_Hlt1TrackMVADecision_TOS or B0_Hlt1TwoTrackMVADecision_TOS) and (B0_Hlt2Topo2BodyDecision_TOS or B0_Hlt2Topo3BodyDecision_TOS or B0_Hlt2Topo4BodyDecision_TOS)
+)	$= \mathrm{PV}(D^0)$
or	> 10.0
+)	$< 1600  { m MeV}/c^2$
+)	$< 4700.0  { m MeV}/c^2$
))	$\in$ [140.0, 160.0] MeV/ $c^2$
))	$\in m(D^0)_{\text{PDG}} \pm 40.0 \text{ MeV}/c^2$
e	∈ [3.0, 25.0]





### COMBINATORIAL BDT - TRAINING











### TAU BDT - TRAINING













### ISOLATION BDT - TRAINING











# SELECTION OPTIMISATION AND NORMALISATION FITS







- Three normalisation fits
  - $m(\pi^+\pi^-\pi^+)$  measure  $D_s^+ \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^+$  peak calculate Weights

  - $m(D^{*-}\pi^+\pi^-\pi^+)$  measure  $B^0 \to D^{*-}\pi^+\pi^-\pi^+$  yield
  - Calculate estimate of optimised signal yield



•  $m(D^{*}\pi^{+}\pi^{-}\pi^{+})$  with with weights - measure  $B^{0} \rightarrow D^{*}D_{s}$  yield - can compare Weighted data and MC



- Fit  $m(\pi^+\pi^-\pi^+)$  around mass of  $D_s$ 
  - Measure  $D_s^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+$  peak
  - Calculate sWeights





![](_page_27_Picture_8.jpeg)

- Fit  $m(D^{*-}\pi^+\pi^-\pi^+)$  with  $m(\pi^+\pi^-\pi^+)$ around mass of  $D_s$
- Use sWeights so we only have  $B^0 \rightarrow D^{*-}D^+_{s}(X)$
- Measure pure  $B^0 \to D^{*-}D_s^+$  yield

![](_page_28_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Figure_7.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Picture_9.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Picture_10.jpeg)

- Fit  $m(D^{*-}\pi^+\pi^-\pi^+)$  with  $B^0 \to D^{*-}D_{c}^+$ yield fixed
- No  $m(\pi^+\pi^-\pi^+)$  constraints
- No sWeights
- Measure  $B^0 \to D^{*-}\pi^+\pi^-\pi^+$  yield
- Optimisation loop then runs

![](_page_29_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Figure_8.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Picture_10.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Picture_11.jpeg)

# REMOVING FAKE D\*

![](_page_30_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Picture_5.jpeg)

### SIGNAL SELECTION

### Variable

Trigge  $\mathrm{PV}(\tau)$  $V_z(\tau^+) - V_z(PV)/error$  $m(D^{(}$  $\tau$  flight distance significance Combinatorial BD

- $au \operatorname{BD}$
- Isolation BD

![](_page_31_Picture_6.jpeg)

	Condition
er	(B0_L0HadronDecision_TOS or B0_L0Global_TIS) and (B0_Hlt1TrackMVADecision_TOS or B0_Hlt1TwoTrackMVADecision_TOS) and (B0_Hlt2Topo2BodyDecision_TOS or B0_Hlt2Topo3BodyDecision_TOS or B0_Hlt2Topo4BodyDecision_TOS)
+)	$= PV(D^0)$
or	> 10.0
+)	$< 1600  {\rm MeV}/c^2$
+)	$< 4700.0  {\rm MeV}/c^2$
))	$\in$ [140.0, 160.0] MeV/ $c^2$
))	$\in m(D^0)_{\text{PDG}} \pm 40.0 \text{ MeV}/c^2$
e	> 3.0
T	> 0.6690
T	> 0.4816
T	> 0.8296

![](_page_31_Picture_9.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Picture_10.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Picture_2.jpeg)

	Condition
ζ	< 4
p	$\in$ [3000, 100,000] MeV/ <i>c</i>
$\mathcal{P}_T$	$\in$ [300, 10,000] MeV/ <i>c</i>
K	< 1
p	$\in$ [3000, 100,000] MeV/ <i>c</i>
$\mathcal{P}_T$	∈ [300, 10,000] MeV/c

![](_page_32_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Picture_7.jpeg)

### MEASURING FAKE D\* RATE - SIGNAL PDF

- After full selection the  $B^0 \to D^{*-} \tau^+ \nu_{\tau}$  dataset still contains some fake  $D^*$  and  $D^0$ combinatorial background
- Measure this rate with 2D fit to  $m(D^0)$  and  $m(D^* - D^0)$  and use Weights to subtract it
- ▶ Fit signal MC to measure PDF parameters for the true  $D^*$  component
  - Gaussian constrain tail parameters and internal PDF fractions
  - Means and widths vary freely
  - Signal true  $D^*$  PDF used to model all sources of true  $D^*$  in data

![](_page_33_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_33_Figure_9.jpeg)

![](_page_33_Picture_11.jpeg)

![](_page_33_Picture_12.jpeg)

### MEASURING FAKE D\* RATE - DATA FIT

- True  $D^*$  peaks in both
- Fake  $D^*$  peaks in  $m(D^0)$ , not in  $m(D^* D^0)$
- Fake  $D^0$  does not peak in either
- Use floating yields for each of these components
- Can remove combinatorial background that rectangular  $m(D^0)$ , and  $m(D^* - D^0)$  cuts wouldn't
- Still other sources of combinatorial background
  - True  $D^*$  + fake  $3\pi$  combinatorial modelled with inclusive MC
  - ▶ B1B2 background modelled with WS data after sWeight fit is performed on WS data

![](_page_34_Picture_9.jpeg)

![](_page_34_Figure_11.jpeg)

![](_page_34_Picture_13.jpeg)

![](_page_34_Picture_14.jpeg)

# CONTROL STUDIES

![](_page_35_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Figure_3.jpeg)

### CONTROL STUDIES

- Several control studies
  - ►  $B \to D^{*-}D^{0}(X)$  : Weights for data/MC agreement
    - ► Isolate  $B \to D^{*-}D^{0}(X)$  via  $D^{0} \to K^{-}\pi^{+}\pi^{-}\pi^{+}$  using Weights
  - ▶  $B \rightarrow D^{*-}D^{+}(X)$  : Weights for data/MC agreement
    - ► Isolate  $B \to D^{*-}D^{+}(X)$  via  $D^{+} \to K^{-}\pi^{+}\pi^{+}$  using Weights
  - ►  $B \to D^{*-}D_{c}(X)$ : Weights for data/MC agreement and for relative decay fractions
    - Isolate  $D_s \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+$  using Weights
    - Fit  $m(D^{*-}D_{s})$  to measure decay fractions
  - ►  $D_s \to \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+ (X)$ : Weights for relative decay fractions
    - Simultaneous fit in four variables to measure decay fractions

![](_page_36_Picture_12.jpeg)

• Methodology aligned with the Run 1  $\mathscr{R}(D^*)$  measurement <u>PRL 120 (2018) 171802</u>, <u>PRD 97 (2018) 072013</u>

![](_page_36_Picture_21.jpeg)

![](_page_36_Picture_22.jpeg)

- $B \to D^*D^0(X) \ C O N T R O L \ S T U D Y$ • Isolate  $B \to D^*D^0(X)$  via  $D^0 \to K^-\pi^+\pi^-\pi^+$ •  $m(K^-\pi^+\pi^-\pi^+) \in m(D^0)_{\text{PDG}} \pm 200.0 \text{ MeV}/c^2$
- Fit  $m(K^-\pi^+\pi^-\pi^+)$  in MC for shape
- Fit  $m(K^-\pi^+\pi^-\pi^+)$  in data to measure peak
- sWeight  $m(K^-\pi^+\pi^-\pi^+)$  peak to obtain pure  $B \to D^*D^0(X)$
- Perform data/MC reweighting to correct  $B \to D^*D^0(X) \text{ MC}$

![](_page_37_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_37_Figure_8.jpeg)

![](_page_37_Picture_10.jpeg)

### $B \rightarrow D^*D^0(X)$ REWEIGHTING

- Sequential reweighting using several variables
- ► Take data/MC ratio and fit using a cubic spline
  - Spline fit accounts for errors on each point
  - Smoothed to avoid features due to fluctuations
  - More robust than just using the ratio histograms
- Use spline to calculate weight for each MC event
  - ► Value of the spline at the variable value is used
  - Apply weight and move to next variable
    - ▶ Fit data/MC ratio with spline and update the weight
- Obtain single weight that corrects MC
  - Derived from  $B \to D^*(D^0 \to K^- \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+)(X)$ , but applied to all  $B \to D^* D^0(X)$

![](_page_38_Picture_12.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Figure_14.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Figure_15.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Figure_16.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Figure_17.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Picture_19.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Picture_20.jpeg)

## $B \rightarrow D^*D^0(X) D ATA/MC R ATIO FITS$

![](_page_39_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_39_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_39_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_39_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_39_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_39_Picture_7.jpeg)

### $B \rightarrow D^*D^0(X)$ VARIABLES AFTER REWEIGHTING

![](_page_40_Figure_1.jpeg)

LHCD THCD

![](_page_40_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_40_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_40_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_40_Picture_7.jpeg)

### CONTROL STUDIES

- Several control studies
  - ▶  $B \to D^{*-}D^{0}(X)$  : Weights for data/MC agreement
    - ► Isolate  $B \to D^{*-}D^{0}(X)$  via  $D^{0} \to K^{-}\pi^{+}\pi^{-}\pi^{+}$  using Weights
  - $B \to D^{*-}D^{+}(X)$ : Weights for data/MC agreement
    - Isolate  $B \to D^{*-}D^{+}(X)$  via  $D^{+} \to K^{-}\pi^{+}\pi^{+}$  using Weights
  - ►  $B \to D^{*-}D_{c}(X)$ : Weights for data/MC agreement and for relative decay fractions
    - Isolate  $D_s \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+$  using Weights
    - Fit  $m(D^{*-}D_{s})$  to measure decay fractions
  - ►  $D_s \to \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+ (X)$ : Weights for relative decay fractions
    - Simultaneous fit in four variables to measure decay fractions

![](_page_41_Picture_12.jpeg)

• Methodology aligned with the Run 1  $\mathscr{R}(D^*)$  measurement <u>PRL 120 (2018) 171802</u>, <u>PRD 97 (2018) 072013</u>

![](_page_41_Picture_21.jpeg)

![](_page_41_Picture_22.jpeg)

 $B \to D^*D^+(X) \ C O N T R O L \ S T U D Y$ • Isolate  $B \to D^*D^+(X)$  via  $D^+ \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+$ •  $m(K^-\pi^+\pi^+) \in m(D^+)_{\text{PDG}} \pm 200.0 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ 

- Fit  $m(K^-\pi^+\pi^+)$  in MC for shape
- Fit  $m(K^-\pi^+\pi^+)$  in data to measure peak
- sWeight  $m(K^-\pi^+\pi^+)$  peak to obtain pure  $B \to D^*D^+(X)$
- Perform data/MC reweighting to correct  $B \to D^*D^+(X) \operatorname{MC}$

![](_page_42_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_42_Figure_8.jpeg)

![](_page_42_Picture_10.jpeg)

### $B \rightarrow D^*D^+(X)$ R E W E I G H T I N G

- Sequential reweighting using several variables
- ► Take data/MC ratio and fit using a cubic spline
  - Spline fit accounts for errors on each point
  - Smoothed to avoid features due to fluctuations
  - More robust than just using the ratio histograms
- Use spline to calculate weight for each MC event
  - ► Value of the spline at the variable value is used
  - Apply weight and move to next variable
    - ▶ Fit data/MC ratio with spline and update the weight
- Obtain single weight that corrects MC
  - Derived from  $B \to D^*(D^+ \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+)(X)$ , but applied to all  $B \to D^*D^+(X)$

![](_page_43_Picture_12.jpeg)

![](_page_43_Figure_14.jpeg)

![](_page_43_Figure_15.jpeg)

![](_page_43_Picture_17.jpeg)

![](_page_43_Picture_18.jpeg)

### $B \rightarrow D^*D^+(X) DATA/MC RATIO FITS$

![](_page_44_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_44_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_44_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_44_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_44_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_44_Picture_8.jpeg)

### $B \rightarrow D^*D^+(X)$ VARIABLES AFTER REWEIGHTING

![](_page_45_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_45_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_45_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_45_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_45_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_45_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_45_Picture_8.jpeg)

### CONTROL STUDIES

- Several control studies
  - ▶  $B \to D^{*-}D^{0}(X)$  : Weights for data/MC agreement
    - ► Isolate  $B \to D^{*-}D^{0}(X)$  via  $D^{0} \to K^{-}\pi^{+}\pi^{-}\pi^{+}$  using Weights
  - ▶  $B \rightarrow D^{*-}D^{+}(X)$  : Weights for data/MC agreement
    - ► Isolate  $B \to D^{*-}D^{+}(X)$  via  $D^{+} \to K^{-}\pi^{+}\pi^{+}$  using Weights
  - $B \to D^{*-}D_{s}(X)$ : Weights for data/MC agreement and for relative decay fractions
    - Isolate  $D_s \to \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+$  using Weights
    - Fit  $m(D^{*-}D_{s})$  to measure decay fractions
  - ►  $D_s \to \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+ (X)$ : Weights for relative decay fractions
    - Simultaneous fit in four variables to measure decay fractions

![](_page_46_Picture_12.jpeg)

• Methodology aligned with the Run 1  $\mathscr{R}(D^*)$  measurement <u>PRL 120 (2018) 171802</u>, <u>PRD 97 (2018) 072013</u>

![](_page_46_Picture_21.jpeg)

![](_page_46_Picture_22.jpeg)

 $B \rightarrow D^*D_{\mathcal{S}}(X) \ \mathcal{C} O \mathcal{N} \mathcal{T} \mathcal{R} O \mathcal{L} \ \mathcal{S} \mathcal{T} \mathcal{U} \mathcal{D} \mathcal{Y}$ 

- Isolate  $D_s \to \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+$  with  $m(\pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+)$  fit and sWeights
  - $m(\pi^+\pi^-\pi^+) \in m(D_s)_{\text{PDG}} \pm 200.0 \text{ MeV}/c^2$
- Fit  $m(D^*\pi^+\pi^-\pi^+)$  with control selection applied
- Measure fractions of different  $B \to D^*D_s(X)$ decays
- Compare to fractions of  $B \to D^*D_s(X)$  decays generated in MC
- Calculate weights to correct these fractions

![](_page_47_Picture_8.jpeg)

![](_page_47_Figure_11.jpeg)

### LUKE SCANTLEBURY-SMEAD - UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

![](_page_47_Picture_13.jpeg)

OXFORD

- Fit  $B^0 \to D^*D_s^*$  RooHORNSdini and RooHILLdini PDFs from the published  $B^0 \rightarrow D^*D^*_s$  analysis: <u>https://arxiv.org/</u> <u>abs/2105.02596</u>
  - Also use  $f_L = 0.578$  from that analysis
- Fit  $B^0 \to D^*D_s$  using a sum of Crystal Balls
- Lower mass components are templates taken from MC

![](_page_48_Picture_5.jpeg)

siduals

res

![](_page_48_Figure_8.jpeg)

### LUKE SCANTLEBURY-SMEAD - UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

![](_page_48_Picture_10.jpeg)

OXFORD

# $B \rightarrow D^* D_s(X) \ C \ O \ N \ T \ R \ O \ L \ S \ T \ U \ D \ Y \ - \ B \ D \ T \ S$ ► $B \to D^*(D_s \to \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+)(X)$ data

# ► $B \to D^*(D_s \to \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+)(X)$ MC summed using the fractions measured in $m(D^* \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+)$ fit

![](_page_49_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_49_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_49_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_49_Figure_7.jpeg)

![](_page_49_Picture_8.jpeg)

### $B \rightarrow D^*D_s(X) \ C \ O \ N \ T \ R \ O \ L \ S \ T \ U \ D \ Y \ - \ D \ E \ C \ A \ Y \ A \ N \ G \ L \ E \ S$

![](_page_50_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_50_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_50_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_50_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_50_Picture_7.jpeg)

### $B \rightarrow D^*D_s(X) \text{ CONTROL STUDY} - \text{OTHER VARIABLES}$

![](_page_51_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_51_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_51_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_51_Figure_6.jpeg)

![](_page_51_Picture_7.jpeg)

### $B \rightarrow D^*D_s(X)$ VARIABLES AFTER REWEIGHTING

![](_page_52_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_52_Figure_2.jpeg)

Use spline reweighting to correct residual discrepancies Imperfect knowledge of  $B \to D^{**}D_{s}(X)$ modes and their relative proportions

![](_page_52_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_52_Figure_7.jpeg)

![](_page_52_Picture_8.jpeg)

![](_page_52_Picture_9.jpeg)

### CONTROL STUDIES

- Several control studies
  - ▶  $B \to D^{*-}D^{0}(X)$  : Weights for data/MC agreement
    - ► Isolate  $B \to D^{*-}D^{0}(X)$  via  $D^{0} \to K^{-}\pi^{+}\pi^{-}\pi^{+}$  using Weights
  - ▶  $B \rightarrow D^{*-}D^{+}(X)$  : Weights for data/MC agreement
    - ► Isolate  $B \to D^{*-}D^{+}(X)$  via  $D^{+} \to K^{-}\pi^{+}\pi^{+}$  using Weights
  - $B \to D^{*-}D_{s}(X)$ : Weights for data/MC agreement and for relative decay fractions
    - ► Isolate  $D_s \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+$  using Weights
    - Fit  $m(D^{*-}D_{s})$  to measure decay fractions
  - $D_s \to \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+ (X)$ : Weights for relative decay fractions
    - Simultaneous fit in four variables to measure decay fractions
- Methodology aligned with the Run 1  $\mathscr{R}(D^*)$  measurement <u>PRL 120 (2018) 171802</u>, <u>PRD 97 (2018) 072013</u>

![](_page_53_Picture_12.jpeg)

![](_page_53_Picture_21.jpeg)

![](_page_53_Picture_22.jpeg)

 $D_s \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+ (X) \text{ CONTROL STUDY}$ 

- MC contains certain fractions of  $D_s \to \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+ (X)$  decays
- Not necessarily aligned with data
- Need to perform a fit to measure these fractions in data and correct the MC
- Simultaneous fit in four variables
  - $\blacktriangleright m(\pi^+\pi^+)$
  - $\blacktriangleright \min[m(\pi^+\pi^-)]$
  - $\blacktriangleright \max[m(\pi^+\pi^-)]$
  - $m(\pi^{+}\pi^{-}\pi^{+})$

![](_page_54_Picture_9.jpeg)

![](_page_54_Picture_13.jpeg)

![](_page_54_Picture_14.jpeg)

### $D_s \to \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+ (X) \text{ S E L E C T I O N}$

### Variable

Trigge  $PV(\tau)$  $V_z(\tau^+) - V_z(PV)/error$  $m(D^{*-}\pi^{+}\pi^{-}\pi^{+}\pi^{-}\pi^{+}m(D^{*}-D$  $m(D^{0})$  $\tau$  flight distance significance Combinatorial BD  $au \operatorname{BD}$ Isolation BD  $\min[m(\pi^+\pi^ \max[m(\pi^+\pi^$  $m(\pi^+\pi^-)$  $m(\pi^+\pi^-\pi^-)$ 

![](_page_55_Picture_4.jpeg)

	Condition
er	(B0_L0HadronDecision_TOS or B0_L0Global_TIS) and (B0_Hlt1TrackMVADecision_TOS or B0_Hlt1TwoTrackMVADecision_TOS) and (B0_Hlt2Topo2BodyDecision_TOS or B0_Hlt2Topo3BodyDecision_TOS or B0_Hlt2Topo4BodyDecision_TOS)
+)	$= PV(D^0)$
or	> 10.0
+)	$< 5000.0  {\rm MeV}/c^2$
0)	$\in$ [140.0, 160.0] MeV/ $c^2$
))	$\in m(D^0)_{\text{PDG}} \pm 40.0 \text{ MeV}/c^2$
e	∈ [4.0, 25.0]
Т	> 0.5407
Т	< 0.4388
T	> 0.8017
)]	$\in [2m(\pi^{\pm}), 1000] \text{ MeV}/c^2$
)]	$\in$ [300, 1500] MeV/ $c^2$
+)	$\in [2m(\pi^{\pm}), 1500] \text{ MeV}/c^2$
+)	$\in$ [500, 1600] MeV/ $c^2$

![](_page_55_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_55_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_56_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_56_Picture_2.jpeg)

	Condition
ζ	< 4
p	$\in$ [3000, 100,000] MeV/ <i>c</i>
$\mathcal{P}_T$	$\in$ [300, 10,000] MeV/ <i>c</i>
K	< 1
p	$\in$ [3000, 100,000] MeV/ <i>c</i>
$\mathcal{P}_T$	∈ [300, 10,000] MeV/c

![](_page_56_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_56_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_57_Figure_0.jpeg)

 $\blacktriangleright m(\pi^+\pi^+)$  $\blacktriangleright \min[m(\pi^+\pi^-)]$  $\blacktriangleright \max[m(\pi^+\pi^-)]$ 

### $D_s \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+ (X) R E S U L T S - F I T V A R I A B L E S$

Simultaneous fit in four variables

![](_page_57_Figure_7.jpeg)

![](_page_57_Figure_8.jpeg)

![](_page_57_Picture_9.jpeg)

# SIGNAL FIT

![](_page_58_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_58_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_58_Picture_5.jpeg)

### SIGNAL FIT - SIGNAL PDF

- Simultaneous multidimensional template fit
  - ▶ 3D fit in the decay angles
  - 3D fit in BDT,  $q^2$ ,  $\tau z$  flight distance significance
- - Assumes SM and a form factor model
- In this analysis, background templates are still SM shapes taken from simulation
- The signal simulation is divided into 12 model independent angular templates,  $h_{I_x}$ 
  - Signal template is the sum of these angular templates
    - Each  $h_{I_x}$  is normalised by their  $I_x$  coefficient which floats in the fit:

$$P_{D^*\tau\nu} = \left(\frac{1}{3}\left(4 - 6I_{1s} + I_{2c} + 2I_{2s}\right)\right) h_{I_{1c}} + \sum_{x} I_x h_{I_x}$$

![](_page_59_Picture_11.jpeg)

• In traditional  $\mathscr{R}(D^*)$  analyses, the signal and background PDFs use SM simulation as the templates

![](_page_59_Picture_19.jpeg)

![](_page_59_Picture_20.jpeg)

![](_page_59_Picture_21.jpeg)

![](_page_60_Figure_0.jpeg)

- Take angular function for a particular  $I_x$ ,  $f_{I_x}$ :  $I_{1s} \sin^2 \theta_D$
- Divide by the total model *M* to obtain weight function,  $W_{I_x}$  $dq^2 d\cos\theta_D d\cos\theta_I d\chi$
- Calculate the value of the weight function for signal simulation (using truth variables)

![](_page_60_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_60_Figure_6.jpeg)

$$\frac{d^{4}\Gamma}{dq^{2}d\cos\theta_{D}d\cos\theta_{L}d\chi} = \frac{9}{32\pi} \left\{ I_{1c}\cos^{2}\theta_{D} + I_{1s}\sin^{2}\theta_{D} + \left[ I_{2c}\cos^{2}\theta_{D} + I_{2s}\sin^{2}\theta_{D} \right]\cos 2\theta_{L} + \left[ I_{6c}\cos^{2}\theta_{D} + I_{6s}\sin^{2}\theta_{D} \right]\cos \theta_{L} + \left[ I_{3}\cos 2\chi + I_{9}\sin 2\chi \right]\sin^{2}\theta_{L}\sin^{2}\theta_$$

![](_page_60_Picture_9.jpeg)

![](_page_60_Picture_10.jpeg)

![](_page_60_Picture_11.jpeg)

![](_page_60_Picture_12.jpeg)

![](_page_60_Picture_13.jpeg)

![](_page_60_Picture_14.jpeg)

![](_page_61_Figure_0.jpeg)

- Take angular function for a particular  $I_x$ ,  $f_{I_r}: I_{1s} \sin^2 \theta_D$
- Divide by the total model *M* to obtain weight function,  $W_{I_r}$
- Calculate the value of the weight function for signal simulation (using truth variables)

![](_page_61_Picture_4.jpeg)

- Apply weights to signal simulation to create  $I_x$  template,  $h_{I_x}$  (in reconstructed space)
- $h_{I_r}$  and  $f_{I_r}$  deviate due
  - Selection effects
  - Missing  $\nu$
  - Angular resolution

![](_page_61_Picture_11.jpeg)

![](_page_61_Picture_12.jpeg)

![](_page_61_Picture_13.jpeg)

### ANGULAR FIT - TOY

- Toy fit based on expected statistics in data
- Signal toy generated with  $I_{y}$  according to <u>https://</u> arxiv.org/abs/1912.09335
- Expected precision of 7-8% on  $\mathscr{R}(D^*)$ (no systematics included)
  - Similar precision to Run 1 result <u>PRL 120 (2018) 171802</u>, <u>PRD 97 (2018) 072013</u>
  - BDT has less separation due to model independent restrictions on input variables
  - Additional freedom in signal PDF due to 12 angular templates
- $I_x$  measured in fit with signal template

![](_page_62_Picture_8.jpeg)

![](_page_62_Picture_9.jpeg)

![](_page_62_Picture_12.jpeg)

![](_page_62_Picture_13.jpeg)

### ANGULAR FIT - TOY COMPONENTS

![](_page_63_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_63_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_63_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_63_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_63_Picture_6.jpeg)

### ANGULAR FIT - TOY

![](_page_64_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_64_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_64_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_64_Picture_6.jpeg)

• Expected performance of angular coefficient measurements for different dataset sizes:

- ▶ 9fb<sup>-1</sup>: Run 1 + 2 (blue)
- ▶  $23 \text{fb}^{-1}$ : Run 1 + 2 + 3 (red)
- ▶  $50 \text{fb}^{-1}$ : Run 1 + 2 + 3 + 4 (green)

![](_page_65_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_65_Picture_5.jpeg)

### ANGULAR ANALYSIS: ANGULAR COEFFICIENTS

Parametric fit to true angles  $23 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  template fit 9 fb<sup>-1</sup> template fit to reco. angles & BDT ------ $50 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  template fit

![](_page_65_Figure_9.jpeg)

### LUKE SCANTLEBURY-SMEAD - UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

![](_page_65_Picture_11.jpeg)

![](_page_65_Figure_12.jpeg)

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD