Review of the last week



The artificial sample (projection on the M_1)

- Discussion about prompt + non-prompt combination
 - Using square of the single dimension fraction
 - Using greater lifetime variable out of two
 - Doing 4D fit
- Discussion about whether the parameters should be fixed
 - Mass: width will be fixed/float in different conditions
 - Lifetime: non-prompt shall be fixed, prompt shall be float between SPS/DPS
- An artificial combinatorial background sample has been made

-square of 1D fraction?



- $p+p/_{All} = f^2$
- A fatal assumption: J/ψ_1 and J/ψ_2 are not related to each other



- True value: ${}^{p+p}/_{All} = {}^{1000}/_{(1000+2+2+200)} = 83\%$
- f acquired from 1D: $f = \frac{1002}{(1002+202)} = 83\%$ • $f^2 = 0.83^2 = 69\%$

2

–using the greater lifetime variable?

- Advantage: we can keep the 3D fit and no additional com will be added (P+NP, NP+P, NP+NP will all be non-prompt)
- Issues need to be solved:
 - We have reached an agreement on the Sig_{Lxy} , but there may be no significant rank between prompt and non-prompt J/ψ
 - We may need to change the distinguishment variable
 - Non-prompt lifetime variable (e.g. $L_{xy}PV$) is not certainly larger than the prompt one
 - May regard it as an error
 - 4D fit may help
 - The sorting may change the shape of the distribution
 - We need to redo all the 1D fit
 - We have no idea what will be the shape of the prompt + nonprompt components after the sorting
 - We can not validate this method





Prompt + non-prompt components ----4D fit?

- May be the only available method as for now
- Issue need to be considered:
 - The shape of the prompt and non-prompt is similar after the vertex cut, which may cause big uncertainty in the fitting
- We may need to take a step back and do the fit without the vertex cut



Distribution of the combinatorial background on the lifetime dimension(s)

• Using the sub-range dataset to determine the distribution



Float the prompt sample shape parameters

- The parameters for the prompt component used to be fixed (by a 8K SPS:4K DPS mixing sample) in the final fitting
- Since slight discrepancies were noticed between SPS and DPS shape, we tried to float the shape parameters between SPS and DPS
- Only tried Sig_{Lxy}
- 1D fit to SPS and DPS:



Float the prompt sample shape parameters

• Relative error [%]



~	Prompt	Non- prompt		
1	6K	2K		
2	8K	2K		
3	10K	2K		
4	12K	2K		
5	14K	2K		
6	16K	2K		
7	20K	2K		

- Floating the parameters cause a much worse estimation
- A much larger uncertainty can also be noticed in some cases
- Propose to keep it fixed

Fitting to the artificial sample

• The side band can be noticed in the "narrow" mass windows: directly fit in the narrow windows $J/\psi_1\mu^+\mu^-$



- The shape parameters of mass dimensions are left to float
- The distributions of lifetime dimensions of the combinatorial background are determined by the sub-range dataset

Fitting to the artificial sample







- Fitting quality is still not satisfying
- Estimation:
 - prompt: 12000 ± 200 (compare to 12K)
 - Non-prompt: 1630 ± 140 (compare to 2K)
- Prompt estimation is much better, but the nonprompt one is worse



- Prompt + non-prompt component
 - Square of the 1D fraction is not suitable
 - Too many issues need to be solved if we want to use greater $c\tau$
 - 4D fit (without the vertex cut) may be available
- Lifetime shape of combinatorial background
 - Propose to determine from by the sub range datasets
- Test the distinguishment with the float prompt parameters
 - Result is worse than fixed parameters
- Continue to fit to the artificial sample
 - Result is better than the last week, but still unsatisfying



-An interesting proposal?



- By using the $c\tau_1 + c\tau_2$ (or $c\tau_1 + c\tau_2$) we can finish the distinguishment in 1D
- The most significant problem is that we have less idea about how the $c\tau_1 \pm c\tau_2$ distributes for the prompt non-prompt components

—4D fit using the greater(smaller) $c\tau$?



- With sorted *cτ*, most of the prompt non-prompt combination candidates become non-prompt + prompt
- Although some candidates are still prompt + non-prompt. Thus we may need 4D fit to solve this issue

Compare between different distinguishment variables

• Average relative error [%] between samples

				w/ ve	4		
	$L_{xy}PV$	CT	Sig _{Lxy}	$d^{J/\psi}$	$c\tau \& d^{J/\psi}$	Sig_{Lxy} & $d^{J/\psi}$	$L_{xy}PV$
Prompt	1.15	1.27	0.15	3.71	3.71	7.37	0.41
Non-prompt	6.82	6.54	2.07	19.6	19.6	42.6	4.85

		сτ	Sig _{Lxy}	$d^{J/\psi}$	cτ & d ^{J/ψ}
Prompt	1.04	0.13	0.35	0.60	0.42
Non-prompt	0.85	3.41	1.44	0.52	1.37

Wide mass windows

1

About the fitting parameters

• Thesis

• Our current strategy

	JJ (prompt)	JJ (non- prompt)	Combi			JJ (prompt)	JJ (non- prompt)	Combi
$M_{J/\psi}$	Mean float Sigma fixed from MC		Fixed from side band	$M_{J/\psi}$		Mean float Sigma float		Fixed from side band
Lifetime	Fixed from MC	Float	Fixed from side band		Lifetime	Fixed from MC	Fixed from MC	Fixed from side band
• 1:				I			2	

- Will be float in the overall fitting, but fixed in the binned fitting
- 2:
 - May solve the uncertainty in the MC
 - May cover the prompt + non-prompt component
 - Our previous study was carried out with the fixed parameters
 - With the vertex cut, the shape of prompt and non-prompt components are similar, free the parameters may cause some issues

Representative fitting plot in the distinguishment test



- Prompt: 16000 (12KSPS+4KDPS)
- Non-prompt: 2000
- **Estimation**:
 - prompt: 16200 ± 400
 - Non-prompt: 1800 ± 400

Artificial sample







• 5K *J*μμ+5K μμJ+2K μμμμ (generated dataset)

3.4 3.5 m(J/Ψ₂) [GeV]

Data

 $M_{J/\Psi 2}$

ţţ.

+ +

3.1

3

3.2

3.3

Combinatorial background determination in the thesis



 The distributions of lifetime dimensions of the combinatorial background are determined by the sub-range dataset The PDF used in this fitting is a combination of a double gaussian and a 3rd order Chebyshev, where the gaussian is fixed by the MC and the Chebyshev is float