# Quantum-correlated $D^0\overline{D}^0$ systems in LHCb run 3

#### Ho Sang Lee Supervisors: Paras Naik, David Hutchcroft, Tara Shears

22nd May 2025





1/15

# Quantum-correlated $D^0\overline{D}^0$ systems - Motivation

- Produced in decays of quarkonia-like states, e.g  $\chi_{c1}(3872) \rightarrow D^0 \overline{D}^0 \pi^0 / \gamma$  produces *C*-even/odd  $D^0 \overline{D}^0$  systems respectively
- Initial aim is to separate C-even/odd D<sup>0</sup>D<sup>0</sup> systems and extract their respective yields without reconstructing neutrals
- Opens up a number of measurements — in-house strong phase input to CKM gamma, *T/CPT* violation measurements in neutral charm, near-threshold spectroscopy...







### DoubleCharm selections - Selective persistence

- In 2024, our trigger lines had full-event persistency i.e. when fired, the entire event would be saved to disk
- BW to disk over budget towards end of 2024 Quarkonia WG contributed over  $0.284 \text{ GB s}^{-1}$ , with a LHCb-wide target of  $0.68 \text{ GB s}^{-1}$  large reduction was needed!
- Held responsibility for re-optimising a number of trigger lines used by the Quarkonia WG





#### DoubleCharm selections - Selective persistence

- Only save certain parts of the event that we need, e.g. tracks from same PV as  $D^0\overline{D}^0$ , some detached tracks, neutrals...
- Validated using a  $T_{cc}^+ \rightarrow D^0 D^0 \pi^+$  MC by combining triggered *DD* candidates with additional pions to form  $T_{cc}^+$  candidates
- Large reduction in bandwidth for little cost Event size reduced by  $\sim$  40% while losing around  ${\cal O}(1\%)$  signal
- Work is ongoing to validate feature using  $D^{*+}(2010) o D^0 \pi^+$  decays in 2025 data



# DoubleCharm selections - Charm hadron builders

- Reconstruction of charm hadrons in 2024 data used tight kinematic cuts  $\implies$  clean  $D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$  mass spectrum at expense of efficiency for near-threshold signals (i.e.  $T_{cc}^+, \chi_{c1}(3872))$
- Looked at loosening kinematic cuts; focus more on decay topology
- Tested using  $\chi_{c1}(3872) \rightarrow D^0 \overline{D}^0 \pi^0$  MC sample; ~ 80% increase in near-threshold signal efficiency without increasing trigger bandwidth



#### First look at 2024 data

- Started work on analysing 2024  $D^0 \to HH$ ,  $\overline{D}^0 \to HH$  data by looking at selections to reduce background
- As a first step, tighten topological cuts on  $D^0$  and daughter hadrons:
  - Require  $D^0$  to be consistent with originating from associated PV
  - Require daughter hadron tracks to be be detached from closest PV
- Aim to reject random HH combinations as well as  $D^0$  originating from B decays
- Effect of selections on signal readily seen in  $D^0 \to K^- \pi^+$ ,  $\overline{D}^0 \to K^+ \pi^-$  channels



#### First look at 2024 data

- Large peak at D<sup>0</sup> mass in subsample rejected by cuts explained by D<sup>0</sup> originating from decay of B mesons
- Need for cut is more readily demonstrated by channel with a  $D^0 \rightarrow \pi^- \pi^+$  decay, e.g.  $D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$ ,  $\overline{D}^0 \rightarrow \pi^- \pi^+$



## First look at 2025 data

- Implemented monitoring for charm hadron mass distributions in the trigger before combination into *DD* candidates
  - Useful for checking performance of charm hadron builders due to higher statistics
  - Enables real-time monitoring of trigger performance
- Data taken over a single run corresponding to 1.34 pb<sup>-1</sup> of *pp* collisions during commissioning



# Summary of work done so far

- Implemented and tested selection persistency for Quarkonia WG spectroscopy lines Around  $100 \text{ MB s}^{-1}$  reduction in BW to disk for tiny cost in efficiency
- Reoptimised DoubleCharm trigger lines to improve efficiency for near-threshold exotic hadrons, namely the X3872 and  $T_{cc}^+$
- Started working on selections for quantum-correlated  $D^0\overline{D}^0$  analysis using Run 3 LHCb data
- Ongoing efforts to validate changes to trigger using 2025 data
- Any questions?

Backup Slides



### LHCb dataflow - A brief overview



### LHCb dataflow - A brief overview



< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □

# Selective persistence - Signal loss

- MC sample was truth-matched by imposing requirements on the true origin vertex of the D mesons and extra  $\pi^+$ , PID and parent/daughter IDs and keys
- Single event lost when moving to selective persistence corresponds to an event where the *DD* candidate and additional  $\pi^+$  have been reconstructed to originate from different PVs (i.e. PV mis-association)
- Seen in distribution of difference in PV z-position between DD candidate and  $\pi^+$



# First look at 2024 data - Background studies

- $\bullet\,$  Studied events rejected by tightening topological cuts by looking at  $\chi^2_{\rm PV}$
- $\chi^2_{\rm PV}$  refers to the  $\chi^2$  obtained when refitting the decay tree of a *DD* candidate under the constraint that both *D* mesons originate from the same PV
- Serves as a measure of how consistent a *DD* candidate is with the hypothesis that both *D* mesons originate from the same PV
- Wide tail in distribution of  $\chi^2_{\rm PV}$  indicates that a large number of rejected events originate from B decays



### First look at 2024 data - Background studies

- Applying  $\chi^2_{PV} < 16$  cut beforehand shows that the  $D^0$  and daughter selection cuts have a drastically different effect on the mass distribution of rejected events lose around  $\mathcal{O}(10\%)$  events in the  $D^0$  mass peak
- Signal loss consistent with a  $\mathcal{O}(1\%)$  signal loss seen from a 2024  $D^{*+}(2010) \rightarrow D^0 \pi^+$  sample using the same  $D^0$  selections but without the requirement to form a DD candidate.



イロト イボト イヨト イヨト 二日