Status of the Analysis bias comprehension in the D*1 q/p Analysis

•Old Problem: bias in the B⁰ BKG sector:

Martino 12/9/08



...Which results in a ~average bias in the B^0 SIGNAL+BKG Fit:



|q/p| comes from a binomial constraint on the mixed positive vs mixed negative events.

- •Tried to avoid the BKG influence in the global fit by using two alternative strategies:
- Remove the BKG sample from the binomal constraint;
 Use an additional effective |q/p| parameter for the BKG.

Strategy 1: Remove BKG events from the binomial constraint and use just signal events in the determination of |q/p|:



Result worst than before... Why?

In the global Signal+BKG fit the not perfect separation between the two components (see later) reflects in the necessity to use both the signal & BKG yields in the constraint.

Strategy 2: use 2 different |q/p| parameters Signal vs BKG



Two |q/p|-1 parameters are strongly correlated... Strategy does not work

4

Is the Bias just a B⁰ BKG feature?

Exercise: Use B⁰ Signal+B⁺ BKG samples:



NO BIAS! ONLY B⁰ BKG IS AFFECTED!

Crucial point: determination of the detector asymmetry in the BKG sector

Recostruction Asymmetry determination improved by using in addition also the untagged event sample.

Statistical correlation between the tagged & untagged samples to be taken into account... (to be done).



Signal: No bias

BKG: bias almost removed!

Global fit: still some problem in the SIG+BKG combination... 2nd Hint of wrong relative fractions?

6

Check the Signal Fraction in the global sample by comparing the predicted Signal VS BKG yields in the global fit with the true ones (predicted/true ratio)

	e ⁺ K ⁺	SIGNAL e⁻K⁻	$\Box^{+}K^{+}$	⁻ K ⁻
Btag	0.851	0.855	0.940	0.945
Dtag	0.946	0.947	0.955	0.955
		BKG		
Btag	1.117	1.113	1.013	1.039
Dtag	1.066	1.066	1.064	1.047

HUGE Discrepancy!

Bug in the Signal Fraction (m \square^2)? To be investigated soon

7

Avoid the Signal Fraction problem by using the true Signal & BKG yields in the constraint for the |q/p| determination:



One half of the effect removed!

Compatibility between the SIG vs BKG detector asymmetries to be checked. Small discrepancy could be at the origin of the residual bias in the SIG+BKG combination

Signal vs BKG Detector Asymmetries

Reconstruction Asymmetry for electron sample



Signal vs BKG Detector Asymmetries

Reconstruction Asymmetry for muon sample



Signal vs BKG Detector Asymmetries

Tagging Asymmetry



 \Box (sig/bkg)=(3.4±8)*10⁻³

Signal

BKG

ALL

BAD AGREEMENT: ANY PROBLEM?

Reconstruction Asymmetry Check

Signal Sample Electrons Mass Band -0.0006±0.0003

- Side Band
- Δ(SB/MB) -0.00
- Δ (SIG/BKG)

BKG Sample

 0.0015 ± 0.0005

-0.0018±0.0005

-0.0033±0.0007

-0.0003±0.0005

Muons Mass Band 0.0074±0.0004

Side Band -

Δ -

 $\Delta(SIG/BKG)$

 0.0108 ± 0.0006

0.0125±0.0006

-0.0017±0.0008

Conclusion & Next Steps

B^o BKG bias reduced by a factor 2 (~0.0020):

•Reconstruction asymmetry obtained using in addition the untagged event sample (statistical correlation with the tagged event sample to be taken into account);

•Found a Bug in the Signal fraction to be fixed;

 Is the discrepancy between Signal & BKG detector asymmetries at the origin of the residual |q/p| bias? Check in the next few days;

NEXT STEPS

IDEA: Statistical correlation between tagged and untagged samples can be removed by a two steps procedure:

1) Determine the detector asymmetries from the Mv^2 SIDE BAND (very low dependence on |q/p|) and fix them in the fit.

2) Fit just the MASS BAND for the |q/p| determination.