Measurement of the decay
$$K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \overline{\nu}$$

Douglas Bryman University of British Columbia



JSPS Fellow



Standard Model (Buras et al., Mescia and Smith, Brod and Gorbahn):

$$\mathbf{B}(K_{L}^{0} \to \pi^{0} \nu \overline{\nu}) = 1.8 \times 10^{-10} \left(\frac{\mathrm{Im} \lambda_{t}}{\lambda^{5}} X(x_{t}) \right)^{2} = 2.76 \pm 0.40 \times 10^{-11}$$
$$\mathbf{B}(K^{+} \to \pi^{+} \nu \overline{\nu}) \sim 1.0 \times 10^{-10} A^{4} \left[\eta^{2} + (\rho_{0} - \rho)^{2} \right] = 8.5 \pm 0.7 \times 10^{-11}$$
$$\mathrm{Im} \lambda_{t} = \mathrm{Im} V_{u}^{*} V_{u} = \eta A^{2} \lambda^{5}$$
$$\mathrm{Golden Relation:} \sin(2\beta)_{\nu K_{s}} = \sin(2\beta)_{K \to \pi \nu \overline{\nu}}$$



New Physics: Model-Independent Description (Buras, Isidori, et al.)

 $L_{SM} \sim \text{Renormalizable part of an effective field theory}$:

$$L_{EFT} = L_{SM} + \Sigma \frac{\lambda}{\Lambda^2}$$

Main Issues: Cutoff scale Λ [TeV], Symmetries

Rare K Decays can probe the flavor structure of the new physics at very high mass scales.

For measurement precision
$$P = \frac{\sigma(B)}{B_{SM}(K_L^0 \to \pi^0 v \overline{v})} = 10\%$$
:
 $\frac{\Lambda}{\sqrt{\operatorname{Im} \lambda_{sd}}} > \frac{405}{\sqrt{P}} \text{ TeV (90\% C.L.)} \longrightarrow \Lambda \ge 1280 \text{ TeV!}$

$K \rightarrow \pi v \bar{v}$: Great Discovery Potential

Two Examples

SUSY: Rare meson decays into light neutralinos



Minimal Flavor Violation e.g. Littlest Higgs Model with T-parity $B(K_L^0 \to \pi^0 v \overline{v}) vs. B(K^+ \to \pi^+ v \overline{v})$



H. K. Dreiner et al. Bonn-TH-2009-04

M. Blanke, et al.,arXiv:hep-ph/0610298.

Experiments

E949: $B(K^+ \to \pi^+ \nu \overline{\nu}) = 1.73^{+1.15}_{-1.05} \times 10^{-10}$















CANADA-CHINA-JAPAN-RUSSIA-USA Collaboration:

Institute for Nuclear Research (Moscow), Institute for High Energy Physics (Protvino), University of New Mexico, Princeton University, Brookhaven National Laboratory, TRIUMF, University of British Columbia, Tsinghua University (Beijing), Stony Brook University, Fermilab, Kyoto University, KEK, University of Alberta, Fukui University, Osaka University, National Defense Academy (Japan)

Advanced Technologies:

- Highest Efficiency Detection
- Low mass central tracking chamber - inflated cathodes
- 500 MHz digitizers

BNL E787/949

- Scintillating fiber target
- Pure Csl calorimeter
- •"Blind Analysis"



Measurement of $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \nu$



 \bullet Determine everything possible about the K^+ and π^+

* $\pi^{\scriptscriptstyle +}\!/\mu^{\scriptscriptstyle +}$ particle ID better than 10⁶ ($\pi^{\scriptscriptstyle +}\!\!\cdot\!\mu^{\scriptscriptstyle +}\!\!\cdot\!e^{\scriptscriptstyle +}$)

- Eliminate events with extra charged particles or *photons* $* \pi^0$ inefficiency < 10⁻⁶
- Suppress backgrounds well below the expected signal (S/N~10)
 - * Predict backgrounds from data: dual independent cuts
 - * Use "Blind analysis" techniques
 - * Test predictions with "outside-the-box" measurements
- Evaluate candidate events with S/N function

Previous measurements E787/E949

PNN1:Above $K_{\pi 2}$ peak: 3 events B(K⁺ $\rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \nu$)=1.47 $^{+1.30}_{-0.89} \times 10^{-10}$



PNN2: Below $K_{\pi 2}$ peak: *limit*

B(K⁺ $\rightarrow \pi^+\nu\nu$)<2.2 ×10⁻⁹ 1 event observed Bkg=1.22±0.24 events

PNN2 Primary Background:

$$K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0 (K_{\pi 2})$$







Before cuts



Estimating Backgrounds **Dual-Cut BLIND Analysis Method**

Cut 1 vs Cut 2



If Cuts 1 and 2 are uncorrelated: A/B=C/D Background in A: A=B C/D

Example: Estimating the $K_{\pi 2}$ Background from Data

Range vs. Energy with Momentum with Photon Veto Reversed Photon Veto Applied (H) 44 42 24 10 Photon Veto Cut 38 10 36 34 10 32 30 1 28 200 205210 215 220 100 105 110 115 120 125 130 135 140 190 195 P (MeV/c) E (MeV)

Left: Kinematically selected $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0$ with photon veto applied. Photon veto: Typically 2-5 ns wide time windows and 0.2 - 3 MeV energy thresholds

Right: Select photons. Phase space cuts in momentum(P), range(R), energy(E)

Blind Analysis Strategy for PNN2

Mask the signal region.

- Develop the cuts and estimate the background (1/3 data); use data as much as possible in the background estimates.
- Bifurcated background analysis with (2/3) of data.
- Study correlations: Outside the box study
- Open the "box".

Cut-2; PV threshold' signal

Cut-1; 'Target Cuts

 $K_{\pi 2}$: 1=Target scat.2=Photon veto K_{e4} : 1= T_{π} + Te2=MC $K_{\mu 2}$: 1=Kinematics $2=\pi \rightarrow \mu \rightarrow e$

E949 scintillating fiber target



Each fiber is $0.5 \times 0.5 \times 300.0 \ \mathrm{cm}$

$K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0$ Background from Scattering



 $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- e^+ \nu$ (Ke4) Background

Ke4 candidate (data)

Ke4 MC Events





Relax photon veto or target pulse shape cut

Compare predicted and observed events

in the extended region.

Region	$N_{ m exp}$	$N_{ m obs}$
Pulse shape CCD_L	$0.79\substack{+0.46 \\ -0.51}$	0
Photon Veto PV_L	$9.09^{+1.53}_{-1.32}$	3
PV_{looser}	$32.4^{+12.3}_{-8.1}$	34

18

PNN2 Background summary

Process	Bkgd events (E949)	Bkgd events (E787)
$K_{\pi 2}$ -scatter	$0.649 \pm 0.150^{+0.067}_{-0.100}$	1.030 ± 0.230
$K_{\pi 2 \gamma}$	$0.076 \pm 0.007 \pm 0.006$	0.033 ± 0.004
K_{e4}	$0.176 \pm 0.072^{+0.233}_{-0.124}$	0.052 ± 0.041
CEX	$0.013 \pm 0.013 ^{+0.010}_{-0.003}$	0.024 ± 0.017
Muon	0.011 ± 0.011	0.016 ± 0.011
Beam	0.001 ± 0.001	0.066 ± 0.045
Total bkgd	$0.93 \pm 0.17^{+0.32}_{-0.24}$	1.22 ± 0.24
	Sensitivity	
	E949 pnn2	E787 pnn2
Total Kaons	$1.70 imes10^{12}$	$1.73 imes 10^{12}$
Total Acceptance	$1.37 imes10^{-3}$	$0.84 imes10^{-3}$
SES	$4.3 imes 10^{-10}$	$6.9 imes 10^{-10}$



Division of the signal region

- The background is not uniformly distributed in the signal region.
- Use the remaining rejection power of photon veto, delayed coincidence, π → μ → e and kinematic cuts to divide the signal region into 9 cells with differing levels of signal acceptance (S_i) and background (B_i).
- Calculate $\mathcal{B}(K^+ \to \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu})$ using S_i/B_i of any cells containing events using the likelihood ratio method.

Final results from E787/E949

7 events observed



$$B(K^+ \to \pi^+ \nu \overline{\nu}) = 1.73^{+1.15}_{-1.05} x 10^{-10}$$

Probability that All 7 events are due to background: 0.001



Search for $K^+ \to \pi^+ X$



90% CL limits on $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ X$ where X is a massive non-interacting particle for $\tau(X) \ge 100$ ps, assuming 100% detection efficiency if X decays within the outer radius of the barrel photon veto.

Also: $\mathcal{B}(K^+ \to \pi^+ X) < 5.6 \times 10^{-8}$ (90%CL) for $M(X) = M(\pi^0)$ from limit on $\mathcal{B}(\pi^0 \to \nu \bar{\nu}) < 2.7 \times 10^{-7}$ (E949, PRD**72** 091102 (2005)).

 $\mathcal{B}(K^+ \to \pi^+ X) \mathcal{B}(X \to \nu \bar{\nu}) < 3 \times 10^{-9}.$

Search for $K^+ \to \pi^+ XX$



Interpretation assuming a scalar or tensor interaction:

$$egin{split} \mathcal{B}_{
m scalar} &= (9.9^{+8.5}_{-4.2}) imes 10^{-10} \ \mathcal{B}_{
m tensor} &= (4.9^{+3.9}_{-2.4}) imes 10^{-10} \end{split}$$

Figure:

Top is simulated π^+ energy spectra Bottom are events passing the trigger

BNL E787/E949 Results

Discoveries

 $K^{+} \to \pi^{+} \nu \overline{\nu}$ $K^{+} \to \pi^{+} \gamma \gamma$ $K^{+} \to \pi^{+} \mu \mu$ $K^{+} \to \mu \nu \gamma (SD)$ $K^{+} \to \pi^{+} \pi^{0} \gamma (DE)$

Searches $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ a$ $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \gamma$ $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ H$ $\pi^0 \rightarrow \nu \nu$ $\pi^0 \to \gamma X$ $K^+ \rightarrow e \nu \mu \mu$ $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^+ \nu \overline{\nu}$

Still to come: $K^+ \to \pi^0 \mu^+ \nu \gamma$, $K^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^0 \gamma$, $K^+ \to \mu \nu_H_{26}$

New opportunity:

$K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ v \overline{v}$ at JPARC or Fermilab: Stopped K technique: 1000 events! 100 x E949 Same technique.





- Improved acceptance
- Higher stop efficiency at low momentum
- Reduced randoms and accidental spoiling of events (photon veto) due to low momentum.

Summary

BNL E787/E949: $B(K^+ \to \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}) = 1.73^{+1.15}_{-1.05} x 10^{-10}$ $K \to \pi \nu \bar{\nu}$ experiments have come a long way and the prospects are bright for future advancements.

