

Optimal transport and CP violation: The Dalitz Mover's Distance


4D Seminar

Tony Menzo

PhD candidate, University of Cincinnati

In collaboration with Adam Davis, Ahmed Youssef, and Jure Zupan

Based on 2301.13211



Standard lore

Given a field X

- The charge operator conjugates all internal quantum numbers e.g.

$$C[X^\pm] = X^\mp$$

- The parity operator inverts 'handedness' ($\vec{x} \rightarrow -\vec{x}$), for fermionic X^\pm

$$P[X_L^\pm] = X_R^\pm$$

* Chiral couplings tend to cause CP violation

CP in weak meson decays

$$-\mathcal{L}_W = \frac{g}{\sqrt{2}} \overline{u_{L,i}} \gamma^\mu (V_{\text{CKM}})_{ij} d_{L,j} W_\mu^+ + h.c.$$



Contains a single CP-violating phase

CP violation has been observed (at $5\sigma+$) in **~30** different hadron decay modes involving s, c, and b quarks.

Direct CP violation

Requires at least two interfering amplitudes:

$$A(X \rightarrow \dots) = a_1 e^{i\phi_1} e^{i\delta_1} + a_2 e^{i\phi_2} e^{i\delta_2}$$

$$A(\bar{X} \rightarrow \overline{\dots}) = a_1 e^{-i\phi_1} e^{i\delta_1} + a_2 e^{-i\phi_2} e^{i\delta_2}$$



$$\frac{\Gamma(X) - \Gamma(\bar{X})}{\Gamma(X) + \Gamma(\bar{X})} = \frac{-a_1 a_2 \sin(\phi_1 - \phi_2) \sin(\delta_1 - \delta_2)}{|a_1|^2 + |a_2|^2 + 2a_1 a_2 \cos(\phi_1 - \phi_2) \cos(\delta_1 - \delta_2)}$$

Necessary condition for direct CPV: $\frac{\mathcal{A}(X \rightarrow \dots)}{\mathcal{A}(\bar{X} \rightarrow \overline{\dots})} \neq 1$


3-body kinematics

12 degrees of freedom
- 10 constraints

2 independent variables





Phase space-dependent CPV



**** Generically for N-body decays
there are $3N - 7$ degrees of freedom**



Dalitz analysis



What to remember:

$$d\Gamma \propto |\mathcal{M}|^2 dm_{12}^2 dm_{23}^2$$

Dalitz analysis



What to remember:

$$d\Gamma \propto |\mathcal{M}|^2 dm_{12}^2 dm_{23}^2$$

Direct CPV manifests as local density asymmetries between conjugate Dalitz plots

Is there CPV?

1. Binned test statistic $\longrightarrow A_{\text{CP}} = \frac{N - \bar{N}}{N + \bar{N}}$

2. Model the conjugate amplitudes

3. Unbinned test statistic

$$T = \sum_{i,j>i}^N \frac{\psi_{ij}}{N(N-1)} + \sum_{i,j>i}^{\bar{N}} \frac{\psi_{ij}}{\bar{N}(\bar{N}-1)} - \sum_{i,j}^{N,\bar{N}} \frac{\psi_{ij}}{N\bar{N}}, \quad \psi_{ij} \equiv \psi(d_{ij}; \sigma) = e^{-d_{ij}^2/2\sigma^2}$$

Is there CPV?

1. Binned test statistic $\longrightarrow A_{\text{CP}} = \frac{N - \bar{N}}{N + \bar{N}}$

- Binning washes out asymmetry

2. Model the conjugate amplitudes

3. Unbinned test statistic

$$T = \sum_{i,j>i}^N \frac{\psi_{ij}}{N(N-1)} + \sum_{i,j>i}^{\bar{N}} \frac{\psi_{ij}}{\bar{N}(\bar{N}-1)} - \sum_{i,j}^{N,\bar{N}} \frac{\psi_{ij}}{N\bar{N}}, \quad \psi_{ij} \equiv \psi(d_{ij}; \sigma) = e^{-d_{ij}^2/2\sigma^2}$$

Is there CPV?

1. Binned test statistic $\longrightarrow A_{\text{CP}} = \frac{N - \bar{N}}{N + \bar{N}}$

- Binning washes out asymmetry

2. Model the conjugate amplitudes

- Complex + many fit parameters, model dependent

3. Unbinned test statistic

$$T = \sum_{i,j>i}^N \frac{\psi_{ij}}{N(N-1)} + \sum_{i,j>i}^{\bar{N}} \frac{\psi_{ij}}{\bar{N}(\bar{N}-1)} - \sum_{i,j}^{N,\bar{N}} \frac{\psi_{ij}}{N\bar{N}}, \quad \psi_{ij} \equiv \psi(d_{ij}; \sigma) = e^{-d_{ij}^2/2\sigma^2}$$

Is there CPV?

1. Binned test statistic $\longrightarrow A_{\text{CP}} = \frac{N - \bar{N}}{N + \bar{N}}$

- Binning washes out asymmetry

2. Model the conjugate amplitudes

- Complex + many fit parameters, model dependent

3. Unbinned test statistic \nearrow Widely used in experimental searches

$$T = \sum_{i,j>i}^N \frac{\psi_{ij}}{N(N-1)} + \sum_{i,j>i}^{\bar{N}} \frac{\psi_{ij}}{\bar{N}(\bar{N}-1)} - \sum_{i,j}^{N,\bar{N}} \frac{\psi_{ij}}{N\bar{N}}, \quad \psi_{ij} \equiv \psi(d_{ij}; \sigma) = e^{-d_{ij}^2/2\sigma^2}$$

What do we need?

- Discrete, 2D test statistic
- Sensitive to density asymmetries

What do we need?

- Discrete, 2D test statistic
- Sensitive to density asymmetries

→ Statistical distances

Statistical distance

Input two statistical samples and output scalar value.

Larger values = dissimilar distributions

Smaller values = similar distributions

Given samples x , y and z from distribution X :

$$d(x, y) \geq 0$$

$$d(x, y) = 0 \text{ if and only if } x = y$$

$$d(x, y) = d(y, x)$$

$$d(x, y) \leq d(x, y) + d(y, z)$$

Examples:

Total variation distance

Wasserstein or Earth Mover's distance (EMD)

Hellinger's distance

Statistical distance

Input two statistical samples and output scalar value.

Larger values = dissimilar distributions

Smaller values = similar distributions

Given samples x , y and z from distribution X :

Divergence $d(x, y) \geq 0$ $d(x, y) = 0$ if and only if $x = y$

Metric $d(x, y) = d(y, x)$ $d(x, y) \leq d(x, z) + d(z, y)$


Examples:

Total variation distance


Wasserstein or Earth Mover's distance (EMD)

Hellinger's distance

Wasserstein or Earth mover's distance



Wasserstein or Earth mover's distance




Each pile has some associated “work” required to transport from a given pile to a hole.

Given distance and transport matrices, the total cost of a particular “plan” is given by

$$\text{Total cost} = \sum_i \sum_j f_{ij} d_{ij}$$

Minimize!

Wasserstein or Earth mover's distance



The optimal transport plan is given by the following optimization problem:

$$\min_f \sum_i \sum_j f_{ij} d_{ij}$$


Subject to the following constraints:

$$\sum_j f_{ij} = a_i$$

$$\sum_i f_{ij} = b_j$$

$$f_{ij} \geq 0 \quad \forall (i, j)$$

Wasserstein or Earth mover's distance



The optimal transport plan is given by the following optimization problem:

$$\min_f \sum_i \sum_j f_{ij} d_{ij}$$

Subject to the following constraints:

$$\sum_j f_{ij} = a_i$$

$$\sum_i f_{ij} = b_j$$


$$f_{ij} \geq 0 \quad \forall (i, j)$$

Linear programming optimization problem, many numerically efficient algorithms exist e.g. simplex, etc


Earth mover's distance in practice

Compute the transport matrix and sum up all distances

$$W_q(\mathcal{E}, \bar{\mathcal{E}}) = \left[\min_{\{f_{ij} \geq 0\}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^{\bar{N}} f_{ij} (\hat{d}_{ij})^q \right]^{1/q}$$



EMD intuition




Construction of the test statistic

- 1) Model the CP conserving distribution of the statistic e.g. permutation method
- 2) Compute the statistic between conjugate amplitudes
- 3) Read off p-value based on CP conserving model



EMD and CPV

An exaggerated example:




EMD and CPV

Direct CPV manifests as local density asymmetries between conjugate Dalitz plots.




Data





Two analyses: Low statistics (1000 event datasets) and large statistics (10^5 event datasets)

CP conserving model

Comparison between permutation and “master” models of CPV



Performance as a statistic







Visualization






$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{CP}}(s_{12}, s_{13}) = \frac{d\bar{\Gamma}(\bar{s}_{12}, \bar{s}_{13}) - d\Gamma(s_{12}, s_{13})}{d\bar{\Gamma}(\bar{s}_{12}, \bar{s}_{13}) + d\Gamma(s_{12}, s_{13})}$$

$$W_q = \sum_i \delta W_q(i)$$

$$\mathcal{W}_{\text{CP}}^q(s_{12}, s_{13}) = \frac{\sum_i \delta \bar{W}_i - \sum_i \delta W_i}{\sum_i \delta \bar{W}_i + \sum_i \delta W_i}$$




Visualization



Visualization

Binned variation for large dataset:




How can we increase sensitivity?

Important: Density asymmetries signify CP violation


The only feature that is relevant for determining CPV are the frequency of relative distances (not the magnitude).

Can we get rid of the polluting CP conserving distances?


Windowed-Wasserstein statistic



$$w(x) = \begin{cases} +1 & x \in [\delta W_{\min}^{\text{window}}, \delta W_{\max}^{\text{window}}] \\ -1 & x \in [\delta W_{\min}^{\text{window}}, \delta W_{\max}^{\text{window}}] \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$




Windowed-Wasserstein statistic




Dalitz mover's distance variants

Naively the EMD algorithm scales like $O(N^3)$

Two ways to improve: (1) Binned-EMD




Dalitz mover's distance variants






Dalitz mover's distance variants

(2) Sliced EMD - scales like $O(n \log_2 n)$




Dalitz mover's distance variants



In practice

- In practice the Dailtz mover's distance is complementary to the direct CP asymmetry



What about other types of CPV?

Neutral meson oscillations introduce a richness and complexity into the phenomenology of CP violation.

$$\Gamma(X^0 \rightarrow f) \neq \Gamma(\bar{X}^0 \rightarrow f)$$

$$\text{Prob}(X^0 \rightarrow \bar{X}^0) \neq \text{Prob}(\bar{X}^0 \rightarrow X^0)$$

$$\text{Prob}(X^0_{\rightsquigarrow \bar{X}^0} \rightarrow f)(t) \neq \text{Prob}(\bar{X}^0_{\rightsquigarrow X^0} \rightarrow f)(t)$$


What about $N > 3$?

The complexity of amplitude models increase significantly with N – it is still interesting to know if these modes exhibit CP violation.

Conclusion

The Wasserstein distance can be used as a robust, model independent, unbinned test of CP violation.

- Future directions:
 - Time dependent CPV
 - Flavor violation
 - Is there a better test?
 - Model independent way of classifying CPV resonances



BACK-UP

Unbinned tests for CPV

Energy Test: $O(n^2)$, tuned on σ

$$T = \sum_{i,j>i}^N \frac{\psi_{ij}}{N(N-1)} + \sum_{i,j>i}^{\bar{N}} \frac{\psi_{ij}}{\bar{N}(\bar{N}-1)} - \sum_{i,j}^{N,\bar{N}} \frac{\psi_{ij}}{N\bar{N}}, \quad \psi_{ij} \equiv \psi(d_{ij}; \sigma) = e^{-d_{ij}^2/2\sigma^2}$$

CPC

CPV

