Indirect Charged Higgs Constraints from BABAR

Steven Robertson

Institute of Particle Physics, Canada

Charged Higgs 2008 Uppsala University, Sweden Sept 16-19, 2008





Work supported in part by US Department of Energy contract DE-AC02-76SF00515.

SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory, Menlo Park, CA 94025

Indirect constraints

Indirect charged Higgs limits obtained from B decay measurements:

- Comparatively large coupling to charge Higgs due to mass of b quark Large-tan β region accessible via tree level processes:
 - Leptonic decays of heavy pseudoscalar mesons: $b \searrow f_{\rm B}V_{\rm ub} \neq V$

$$\mathcal{B}r(B^+ \to \ell^+ \nu_{\ell}) = \frac{G_f^2}{8\pi} V_{ub} |^2 f_B^2 n_B m_{\ell}^2 \tau_B \left(1 - \frac{m_{\ell}^2}{m_B^2}\right)^2 \stackrel{B^+}{u} \stackrel{I^+}{V_{ub}} V_{\ell}^+$$

 Charged Higgs (2HDM) modifies SM Br by a multiplicative factor which is independent of lepton flavor:

$$r_{H^+} = \left[\begin{array}{ccc} 1 - \tan^2\beta \ (m^2_B/m^2_{H^+}) \end{array}\right]^2 \qquad B^+_+ \qquad H^+ \qquad l^+ \qquad l^+$$

/ \]

FCNC SM processes can have sizable new physics contributions:



The **BABAR detector**



BABAR/PEP-II Operations

As of 2008/04/11 00:00

- Final BABAR Υ(4S) "onpeak" data sample of ~0.5x10⁹ BB pairs, corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 430 fb⁻¹
 - also substantial samples of continuum tau- and charm-pair events
 - also ~45 fb⁻¹ of Υ "narrow resonance" data (surprise!)...



Analysis technique

Inclusive final states, or those containing (one or more) neutrinos may lack kinematic constraints which can be exploited for background suppression

 Reconstruct the decay of the non-signal "tag" B⁻ in Υ(4S) → B⁺B⁻ in one of a large number of exclusive decay modes

 \Rightarrow attribute all other particles to the decay of the "signal" B^+ candidate

- $\mathbf{B}^{-} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}^{(*)0} \mathbf{X}^{-}$ Hadronic tags - yield ~2700/fb⁻¹
- B⁻ → D⁰ ŀ v X⁰ Semileptonic tags
 yield ~6000/fb⁻¹
 - similar method but lower yield for neutral B tags...



$$m_{\rm ES} \equiv \sqrt{E_{\rm beam}^{*2} - p_B^{*2}}$$

 $\Delta E^* \equiv E_B^* - E_{\rm beam}^*$

$$\begin{array}{c} B^{\text{-}} \to D^{(*)0} X^{\text{-}} \\ & \stackrel{}{\to} K^{\text{-}} \pi^{\text{+}} \\ & \stackrel{}{\to} K^{\text{-}} \pi^{\text{+}} \pi^{0} \\ & \stackrel{}{\to} K^{\text{-}} \pi^{\text{+}} \pi^{\text{-}} \pi^{\text{+}} \\ & \stackrel{}{\to} K^{\text{-}} \pi^{\text{+}} \pi^{\text{-}} \pi^{\text{+}} \end{array}$$

Event selection

Continuum

Background

MC

0.6

0.8

COSθT

BB MC

0.4

0.2

 Suppress continuum backgrounds by exploiting differences in event "shapes" resulting from low momentum of B mesons from Υ(4S) decays

 Calibrate tag yield and continuum background contributions directly from data



Signal candidate is defined from all remaining tracks/clusters in the event after excluding "tag B" daughters

Arbitrary Units

2500

2000

1500

1000

500

O





Experimentally challenging due to presence of multiple neutrinos:

- Search for 1-prong τ decays: $\tau \rightarrow evv$, $\tau \rightarrow \mu vv$, $\tau \rightarrow \pi v$ and $\tau \rightarrow \pi \pi^0 v$
- "Topological" signal candidate selection, then require residual calorimeter energy to be consistent with "noise"



BABAR searches based on 383 x 10⁶ B meson pairs

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{B}(B^+ \to \tau^+ \nu) &= (0.9 \pm 0.6 (\text{stat.}) \pm 0.1 (\text{syst.})) \times 10^{-4} \quad (\text{SL tag}) \\ \mathcal{B}(B^+ \to \tau^+ \nu) &= (1.8^{+0.9}_{-0.8} \pm 0.4 \pm 0.2) \times 10^{-4} \quad (\text{Had tag}) \\ \text{Combined result:} \quad (2.6\sigma \text{ significance}) \\ \mathcal{B}(B^+ \to \tau^+ \nu) &= (1.2 \pm 0.4_{\text{stat.}} \pm 0.3_{\text{bkg.}} \pm 0.2_{\text{syst.}}) \times 10^{-4}. \end{split}$$

$\mathbf{B}^+ \rightarrow \tau^+ \nu$ (Belle)





 $\mathcal{B}(B \to \tau \nu) = [1.79^{+0.56}_{-0.49}(stat)^{+0.46}_{-0.51}(syst)] \times 10^{-4}$

Phys. Rev. Lett. 97, 251802 (2006)

 \Rightarrow Consistent results, but high compared with SM expectation

Interpretation

BELLE

Assuming SM is given by CKMfitter expectation:

 $\mathcal{B}(B \to \tau \upsilon)_{SM} = (0.93^{+0.12}_{-0.11}) \times 10^{-4}$

 Alternate prescription would be to use f_B from lattice, V_{ub} from experimental world average:

$$|V_{ub}|$$
= (4.39 ± 0.54) x 10⁻³, f_B = 0.189 ± 0.027 GeV

 $B(B \rightarrow \tau \nu)_{SM} = (1.2 \pm 0.4) \times 10^{-4},$

Naïve combination of BABAR and Belle results yields

 $B(B \rightarrow \tau v) = (1.51 \pm 0.33) \times 10^{-4}$

...very close to 5σ from zero



[•] r_H ~ 1.6

Consistency with SM

Specific bound also depends on the scenario – e.g. MSSM

• EFT approach in MFV: (G. Isidori, arXiv:0710.5377)

$$\mathbf{r}_{\mathsf{H}} \stackrel{\text{SUSY}}{=} \left[1 - \left(\frac{m_B^2}{m_{H^{\pm}}^2} \right) \frac{\tan^2 \beta}{\left(1 + \epsilon_0 \tan \beta \right)} \right]^2$$

with $\epsilon_0 \tan\beta \sim O(1)$ for large $\tan\beta$

- A better way to think of this is that the combination of $B \rightarrow \tau v$ with other flavor observables can be used to verify the overall consistency of the CKM picture
 - If B→τv is incompatible, then evidence of NP, but interpretation is (obviously) model dependent
 - Tension in the overall CKM determination at the level of about ~1.5σ



Beyond Tree Level...

Tree-level charged Higgs (Type-II 2HDM or MSSM) contribution has the same effect on all leptonic modes:

 $B(B^{+} \rightarrow l^{+} \nu)^{2HDM} = B(B^{+} \rightarrow l^{+} \nu)^{SM} \times [1 - \tan^{2}\beta (m^{2}_{B}/m^{2}_{H^{+}})]^{2}$

- "Universality" preserved at tree level
- Equal sensitivity in all modes!

At one-loop level, potentially large Lepton Flavour Violation (LFV) effects entering from e.g. SUSY in grand unification scenarios:

i.e. $\mathbf{B}^+ \rightarrow l^+ \mathbf{v}_{l'}$ where $l' \neq l$ via effective $l \mathbf{H}^+ \mathbf{v}$ coupling

Observable effects in ratios, $R_b^{l/\tau}$, of B leptonic branching ratios:

$$\left(R_B^{\ell/\tau}\right)_{\rm LFV}^{\rm MSSM} = \left(R_B^{\ell/\tau}\right)^{\rm SM} \left[1 + \frac{1}{R_{B\tau\nu}} \left(\frac{m_B^4}{M_{H^{\pm}}^4}\right) \left(\frac{m_\tau^2}{m_\ell^2}\right) \left|\Delta_R^{\tau\ell}\right|^2 \frac{\tan^6\beta}{(1+\epsilon_0\tan\beta)^2}\right]$$

- Uncertainties from V_{ub} and f_B cancel in ratio of modes!

G. Isidori and P. Paradisi hep-ph/0605012

A. Masiero, P. Paradisi and R. Petronzio hep-ph/0511289 Steven Robertson, Institute of Particle Physics 11

"Inclusive" $\mathbf{B}^+ \rightarrow \boldsymbol{\mu}^+ \boldsymbol{\nu}$

Two body $B^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ \nu$ final state with a high momentum muon yields a distinctive signature

 Search can be performed either with* or without tag reconstruction

* Phys.Rev.D77:091104,2008.





Inclusive $B \rightarrow X_s \gamma$



 Inclusive calculation more reliable (assuming quark – hadron duality), but more difficult experimentally

Recent NNLO QCD correction substantially reduces the main theoretical uncertainties on inclusive $b \rightarrow s\gamma$ calculation

"Robust" experimental determination with <10% precision

Inclusive B \rightarrow X_s γ (with tag reco)



Recent BABAR measurement utilizing hadronic tag reconstruction (based on 210 fb⁻¹ i.e. about half of full data statistics)



 $B(B \to X_s \gamma, E_{\gamma} > 1.9 GeV) = 3.66 \pm 0.85(stat) \pm 0.60(sys) \times 10^{-4}$

Also obtain moments of photon energy distribution: PRD 77:03

PRD 77:051103 2008

$$\left\langle E_{\gamma} \right\rangle (E_{\gamma} > 1.9 GeV) = 2.289 \pm 0.058 \pm 0.027 GeV \left\langle (E_{\gamma} - \left\langle E_{\gamma} \right\rangle)^2 \right\rangle = 0.0334 \pm 0.0124 \pm 0.0062 GeV^2$$

determine heavy quark parameters as inputs for CKM element determinations

 Technique currently limited by data statistics (low efficiency due to tag selection), but would be method of choice for a "Super B factory"

$\mathbf{B} \rightarrow \mathbf{X}_{\mathbf{s}} \boldsymbol{\gamma}$

HFAG experimental average (April 2008) 600 $B(B \rightarrow X_s \gamma) = (3.52 \pm 0.23 \pm 0.09) \times 10^{-4}$ $B \rightarrow X_s \gamma$ R_b LEP $B \rightarrow \tau \nu \quad B \rightarrow D \tau \nu \quad K \rightarrow \mu \nu$ 500 2HDM Type II Improved theoretical prediction* 400 for inclusive branching fraction: M_H± [GeV] $B(B \rightarrow X_s \gamma) = (3.0 - 3.5) \times 10^{-4}$ 300 for E > 1.6 GeV with uncertainties that vary from 200 7% to 14% 100 SM prediction is ~1σ below current experimental average (previously good agreement 10 20 30 40 50 with NLO predictions)

> * M. Misiak et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 98, 022002 (2007). T. Becher and M. Neubert, Phys. Lett. B637, 251 (2006). J. R. Andersen and E. Gardi, JHEP 01, 029 (2007).

tanβ

15

70

60

presented at FPCP 2008

Haisch

arXiv:0805.2141 [hep-ph]

LHC vs Flavour Constraints



ATLAS 30fb⁻¹ sensitivity mapped onto current flavour bounds

- comparable to bound from B(B $\rightarrow \tau v$) if measured with ~15% precision (assuming SM rate)

Summary

Recent B Factory rare decay results significantly constrain m_H – tan β plane for type II 2HDM

- $B \rightarrow \tau v$ almost 5 σ signal and currently about 1.5 σ from SM
- B→µv limits approaching SM expectation; will potentially impose a substantial constraint in the future
- Experimentally robust determination of inclusive $b \rightarrow s\gamma$ branching fraction slightly high compared with recent theory predictions
 - "Weaker" m_H constraint than previously (or favours charged Higgs...)

Backup Slides



Belle inclusive $B \rightarrow Xs \gamma$

6000 For $E\gamma > 1.7$ GeV: 4000 Photons / 50 MeV 2000 -2000 -4000⊟____ 1.5 3.5 4 E^{c.m.s} [GeV] 2.5 2 3 $\mathcal{B}(B \to X_s \gamma) = (3.31 \pm 0.19 \pm 0.37 \pm 0.01) \times 10^{-4}$ (stat.) (syst.) (boost.) arXiv: 0804.1580 $\langle E_{\gamma} \rangle = 2.281 \pm 0.032 \pm 0.053 \pm 0.002 \,\mathrm{GeV}$ $\langle E_{\gamma}^2 \rangle - \langle E_{\gamma} \rangle^2 = 0.0396 \pm 0.0156 \pm 0.0214 \pm 0.0012 \,\mathrm{GeV}^2$

Belle $B^+ \rightarrow \tau^+ v$ interpretation



BELLI



Sep 17, 2008 cHarged Higgs Workshop

Steven Robertson, Institute of Particle Physics 21

Inclusive $\mathbf{B}^+ \rightarrow \mathbf{l}^+ \mathbf{v}$ ($\mathbf{l} = \mathbf{e}, \mu$)

- Efficiencies much higher than exclusive method, but also higher backgrounds: ϵ_{μ} =(2.18 ± 0.06)% ϵ_{e} =(2.39 ± 0.06)%
- Extract signal from fit to M_{bc} distribution in region: 5.1< $M_{bc} < 5.29$; -0.8 (-1.0) < ΔE <0.4 GeV for $\mu(e)$

$$\begin{array}{l} B(B^+ \to \mu^+ \nu \) < 1.7 \ x \ 10^{-6} \\ B(B^+ \to e^+ \nu \) < 0.98 \ x \ 10^{-6} \end{array}$$





Phys.Lett.B647:67-73,2007.







Leptonic B decays

 Leptonic B decays are helicity-suppressed EW tree processes in the SM:



$$\mathcal{B}r(B^+ \to \ell^+ \nu_\ell) = \frac{G^2}{8\pi} |V_{ub}|^2 f_B^2 m_B m_\ell^2 \tau_B \left(1 - \frac{m_\ell^2}{m_B^2}\right)^2$$

 New physics contributions can arise from diagrams with internal lines containing non-SM particles:



 Charged Higgs, R-parity violating SUSY scalar sparticles, Pati-Salam leptoquarks...



Run 7



- Data taken between
 December 16, 2007 and April
 7, 2008
- 30.2 fb⁻¹ at Υ(3S)
- 14.5 fb⁻¹ at Υ(2S)
- ~5 fb⁻¹ above Υ(4S) scan
- Several Υ(3S) analyses and above Υ(4S) scan targeting ICHEP 2008

Interesting times...

Run plan for Run 7 approved until Oct 2008 with luminosity target of $\sim 2x10^{34}$ with anticipation of an additional $\sim 50\%$ new data

- substantial upgrades to accelerator during 3-month shutdown in fall 2007
- BABAR IFR (barrel muon system) upgrade completed prior to 2007 run
- Dec 21st Congressional budget cuts (targetted at ILC) result in termination of BABAR run effective Jan 1st 2008
 - BABAR successfully argues that physics case for Υ(3S) & Υ(2S) justifies a 3-month extension of the run
 - PEP-II/BABAR retool accelerator, detector and trigger system within a 3-day period over the holiday break







σ (e⁺e

- The $\Upsilon(4S)$ is a bb resonance which lies just above the mass threshold for production of BB meson pairs.
- Cross section of ~1.1nb

B⁰B⁰ pair is produced in

a coherent L=1 state

e

~1.1 million BB pairs per fb⁻¹



-50

 E_{CM} -M $_{Y(4S)}$

50

(MeV)

 \Rightarrow Enables studies of time-dependence of decays of "flavour-tagged" neutral B mesons

anti B

Electroweak FCNCs

 \mathbf{X}



C7 (Photon penguin) only

Observables: branching fractions E_{γ} (or m_{had}) spectrum, A_{CP}

New physics could result in a distinctive pattern of deviations in observables across a variety of related FCNC modes



 C_7 , C_9 (Vector EW) and C_{10}

Observables: (partial) branching fractions, dilepton A_{FB} , A_{CP}

 $\mathbf{B}^{0}_{s/d} \rightarrow l^{+}l^{-}$



C₁₀ (Axial vector EW) only

Observables: branching fractions

Lepton Flavour Violation

- In Standard Model, lepton flavour conservation is not associated with any underlying symmetry principle
 - LFV generally permitted in New Physics models containing more than one Higgs doublet
 - In SUSY seesaw models, flavour changing insertions arise from Yukawa couplings in the slepton mass RGEs:



- \Rightarrow New Physics effects in $\tau \rightarrow l \gamma$ ($l = e, \mu$) can saturate experimental bounds in natural and well-motivated models
 - MSSM with heavy right-handed neutrinos and seesaw mechanism: Br~10⁻⁷
 - heavy Dirac neutrinos, RPV SUSY models, flavour changing Z' models...

Higgs mediated LFV

 Higgs mediated LFV present in MSSM at loop level given that there is a source of LFV among sleptons:



 Predicts LFV effects in a variety of τ and B decay modes (with preference for 3rd generation couplings):



