

12-15-2006

Measurement of the B_s^0 Lifetime Using Semileptonic Decays

V.M. Abazov

Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia

Kenneth A. Bloom

University of Nebraska - Lincoln, kbloom2@unl.edu

Gregory R. Snow

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, gsnow1@unl.edu

D0 Collaboration

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/physicsbloom>

 Part of the [Physics Commons](#)

Abazov, V.M.; Bloom, Kenneth A.; Snow, Gregory R.; and Collaboration, D0, "Measurement of the B_s^0 Lifetime Using Semileptonic Decays" (2006). *Kenneth Bloom Publications*. 195.

<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/physicsbloom/195>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Research Papers in Physics and Astronomy at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Kenneth Bloom Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

Measurement of the B_s^0 Lifetime Using Semileptonic Decays

V. M. Abazov,³⁶ B. Abbott,⁷⁶ M. Abolins,⁶⁶ B. S. Acharya,²⁹ M. Adams,⁵² T. Adams,⁵⁰ M. Agelou,¹⁸ J.-L. Agram,¹⁹ S. H. Ahn,³¹ M. Ahsan,⁶⁰ G. D. Alexeev,³⁶ G. Alkhalaf,⁴⁰ A. Alton,⁶⁵ G. Alverson,⁶⁴ G. A. Alves,² M. Anastasoiaie,³⁵ T. Andeen,⁵⁴ S. Anderson,⁴⁶ B. Andrieu,¹⁷ M. S. Anzels,⁵⁴ Y. Arnaud,¹⁴ M. Arov,⁵³ A. Askew,⁵⁰ B. Åsman,⁴¹ A. C. S. Assis Jesus,³ O. Atramentov,⁵⁸ C. Autermann,²¹ C. Avila,⁸ C. Ay,²⁴ F. Badaud,¹³ A. Baden,⁶² L. Bagby,⁵³ B. Baldin,⁵¹ D. V. Bandurin,³⁶ P. Banerjee,²⁹ S. Banerjee,²⁹ E. Barberis,⁶⁴ P. Bargassa,⁸¹ P. Baringer,⁵⁹ C. Barnes,⁴⁴ J. Barreto,² J. F. Bartlett,⁵¹ U. Bassler,¹⁷ D. Bauer,⁴⁴ A. Bean,⁵⁹ M. Begalli,³ M. Begel,⁷² C. Belanger-Champagne,⁵ A. Bellavance,⁶⁸ J. A. Benitez,⁶⁶ S. B. Beri,²⁷ G. Bernardi,¹⁷ R. Bernhard,⁴² L. Berntzon,¹⁵ I. Bertram,⁴³ M. Besançon,¹⁸ R. Beuselinck,⁴⁴ V. A. Bezzubov,³⁹ P. C. Bhat,⁵¹ V. Bhatnagar,²⁷ M. Binder,²⁵ C. Biscarat,⁴³ K. M. Black,⁶³ I. Blackler,⁴⁴ G. Blazey,⁵³ F. Blekman,⁴⁴ S. Blessing,⁵⁰ D. Bloch,¹⁹ K. Bloom,⁶⁸ U. Blumenschein,²³ A. Boehnlein,⁵¹ O. Boeriu,⁵⁶ T. A. Bolton,⁶⁰ F. Borcherding,⁵¹ G. Borissov,⁴³ K. Bos,³⁴ T. Bose,⁷⁸ A. Brandt,⁷⁹ R. Brock,⁶⁶ G. Brooijmans,⁷¹ A. Bross,⁵¹ D. Brown,⁷⁹ N. J. Buchanan,⁵⁰ D. Buchholz,⁵⁴ M. Buehler,⁸² V. Buescher,²³ S. Burdin,⁵¹ S. Burke,⁴⁶ T. H. Burnett,⁸³ E. Busato,¹⁷ C. P. Buszello,⁴⁴ J. M. Butler,⁶³ S. Calvet,¹⁵ J. Cammin,⁷² S. Caron,³⁴ M. A. Carrasco-Lizarraga,³³ W. Carvalho,³ B. C. K. Casey,⁷⁸ N. M. Cason,⁵⁶ H. Castilla-Valdez,³³ S. Chakrabarti,²⁹ D. Chakraborty,⁵³ K. M. Chan,⁷² A. Chandra,⁴⁹ D. Chapin,⁷⁸ F. Charles,¹⁹ E. Cheu,⁴⁶ F. Chevallier,¹⁴ D. K. Cho,⁶³ S. Choi,³² B. Choudhary,²⁸ L. Christofek,⁵⁹ D. Claes,⁶⁸ B. Clément,¹⁹ C. Clément,⁴¹ Y. Coadou,⁵ M. Cooke,⁸¹ W. E. Cooper,⁵¹ D. Coppage,⁵⁹ M. Corcoran,⁸¹ M.-C. Cousinou,¹⁵ B. Cox,⁴⁵ S. Crépe-Renaudin,¹⁴ D. Cutts,⁷⁸ M. Cwiok,³⁰ H. da Motta,² A. Das,⁶³ M. Das,⁶¹ B. Davies,⁴³ G. Davies,⁴⁴ G. A. Davis,⁵⁴ K. De,⁷⁹ P. de Jong,³⁴ S. J. de Jong,³⁵ E. De La Cruz-Burelo,⁶⁵ C. De Oliveira Martins,³ J. D. Degenhardt,⁶⁵ F. Déliot,¹⁸ M. Demarteau,⁵¹ R. Demina,⁷² P. Demine,¹⁸ D. Denisov,⁵¹ S. P. Denisov,³⁹ S. Desai,⁷³ H. T. Diehl,⁵¹ M. Diesburg,⁵¹ M. Doidge,⁴³ A. Dominguez,⁶⁸ H. Dong,⁷³ L. V. Dudko,³⁸ L. Duflot,¹⁶ S. R. Dugad,²⁹ A. Duperrin,¹⁵ J. Dyer,⁶⁶ A. Dyshkant,⁵³ M. Eads,⁶⁸ D. Edmunds,⁶⁶ T. Edwards,⁴⁵ J. Ellison,⁴⁹ J. Elmsheuser,²⁵ V. D. Elvira,⁵¹ S. Eno,⁶² P. Ermolov,³⁸ J. Estrada,⁵¹ H. Evans,⁵⁵ A. Evdokimov,³⁷ V. N. Evdokimov,³⁹ S. N. Fatakia,⁶³ L. Felgioni,⁶³ A. V. Ferapontov,⁶⁰ T. Ferbel,⁷² F. Fiedler,²⁵ F. Filthaut,³⁵ W. Fisher,⁵¹ H. E. Fisk,⁵¹ I. Fleck,²³ M. Ford,⁴⁵ M. Fortner,⁵³ H. Fox,²³ S. Fu,⁵¹ S. Fuess,⁵¹ T. Gadfort,⁸³ C. F. Galea,³⁵ E. Gallas,⁵¹ E. Galyaev,⁵⁶ C. Garcia,⁷² A. Garcia-Bellido,⁸³ J. Gardner,⁵⁹ V. Gavrilov,³⁷ A. Gay,¹⁹ P. Gay,¹³ D. Gelé,¹⁹ R. Gelhaus,⁴⁹ C. E. Gerber,⁵² Y. Gershtein,⁵⁰ D. Gillberg,⁵ G. Ginther,⁷² N. Gollub,⁴¹ B. Gómez,⁸ K. Gounder,⁵¹ A. Goussiou,⁵⁶ P. D. Grannis,⁷³ H. Greenlee,⁵¹ Z. D. Greenwood,⁶¹ E. M. Gregores,⁴ G. Grenier,²⁰ Ph. Gris,¹³ J.-F. Grivaz,¹⁶ S. Grünendahl,⁵¹ M. W. Grünewald,³⁰ F. Guo,⁷³ J. Guo,⁷³ G. Gutierrez,⁵¹ P. Gutierrez,⁷⁶ A. Haas,⁷¹ N. J. Hadley,⁶² P. Haefner,²⁵ S. Hagopian,⁵⁰ J. Haley,⁶⁹ I. Hall,⁷⁶ R. E. Hall,⁴⁸ L. Han,⁷ K. Hanagaki,⁵¹ K. Harder,⁶⁰ A. Harel,⁷² R. Harrington,⁶⁴ J. M. Hauptman,⁵⁸ R. Hauser,⁶⁶ J. Hays,⁵⁴ T. Hebbeker,²¹ D. Hedin,⁵³ J. G. Hegeman,³⁴ J. M. Heinmiller,⁵² A. P. Heinson,⁴⁹ U. Heintz,⁶³ C. Hensel,⁵⁹ G. Hesketh,⁶⁴ M. D. Hildreth,⁵⁶ R. Hirosky,⁸² J. D. Hobbs,⁷³ B. Hoeneisen,¹² M. Hohlfeld,¹⁶ S. J. Hong,³¹ R. Hooper,⁷⁸ P. Houben,³⁴ Y. Hu,⁷³ V. Hynek,⁹ I. Iashvili,⁷⁰ R. Illingworth,⁵¹ A. S. Ito,⁵¹ S. Jabeen,⁶³ M. Jaffré,¹⁶ S. Jain,⁷⁶ K. Jakobs,²³ C. Jarvis,⁶² A. Jenkins,⁴⁴ R. Jesik,⁴⁴ K. Johns,⁴⁶ C. Johnson,⁷¹ M. Johnson,⁵¹ A. Jonckheere,⁵¹ P. Jonsson,⁴⁴ A. Juste,⁵¹ D. Käfer,²¹ S. Kahn,⁷⁴ E. Kajfasz,¹⁵ A. M. Kalinin,³⁶ J. M. Kalk,⁶¹ J. R. Kalk,⁶¹ S. Kappler,²¹ D. Karmanov,³⁸ J. Kasper,⁶³ I. Katsanos,⁷¹ D. Kau,⁵⁰ R. Kaur,²⁷ R. Kehoe,⁸⁰ S. Kermiche,¹⁵ S. Kesiosoglou,⁷⁸ A. Khanov,⁷⁷ A. Kharchilava,⁷⁰ Y. M. Kharzhev,³⁶ D. Khatidze,⁷¹ H. Kim,⁷⁹ T. J. Kim,³¹ M. H. Kirby,³⁵ B. Klima,⁵¹ J. M. Kohli,²⁷ J.-P. Konrath,²³ M. Kopal,⁷⁶ V. M. Korablev,³⁹ J. Kotcher,⁷⁴ B. Kothari,⁷¹ A. Koubarovsky,³⁸ A. V. Kozelov,³⁹ J. Kozminski,⁶⁶ A. Kryemadhi,⁸² S. Krzywdzinski,⁵¹ T. Kuhl,²⁴ A. Kumar,⁷⁰ S. Kunori,⁶² A. Kupco,¹¹ T. Kurča,^{20,*} J. Kvita,⁹ S. Lager,⁴¹ S. Lammers,⁷¹ G. Landsberg,⁷⁸ J. Lazoflores,⁵⁰ A.-C. Le Bihan,¹⁹ P. Lebrun,²⁰ W. M. Lee,⁵³ A. Leflat,³⁸ F. Lehner,⁴² C. Leonidopoulos,⁷¹ V. Lesne,¹³ J. Leveque,⁴⁶ P. Lewis,⁴⁴ J. Li,⁷⁹ Q. Z. Li,⁵¹ J. G. R. Lima,⁵³ D. Lincoln,⁵¹ J. Linnemann,⁶⁶ V. V. Lipaev,³⁹ R. Lipton,⁵¹ Z. Liu,⁵ L. Lobo,⁴⁴ A. Lobodenko,⁴⁰ M. Lokajicek,¹¹ A. Lounis,¹⁹ P. Love,⁴³ H. J. Lubatti,⁸³ M. Lynker,⁵⁶ A. L. Lyon,⁵¹ A. K. A. Maciel,² R. J. Madaras,⁴⁷ P. Mättig,²⁶ C. Magass,²¹ A. Magerkurth,⁶⁵ A.-M. Magnan,¹⁴ N. Makovec,¹⁶ P. K. Mal,⁵⁶ H. B. Malbouisson,³ S. Malik,⁶⁸ V. L. Malyshev,³⁶ H. S. Mao,⁶ Y. Maravin,⁶⁰ M. Martens,⁵¹ S. E. K. Mattingly,⁷⁸ R. McCarthy,⁷³ R. McCroskey,⁴⁶ D. Meder,²⁴ A. Melnitchouk,⁶⁷ A. Mendes,¹⁵ L. Mendoza,⁸ M. Merkin,³⁸ K. W. Merritt,⁵¹ A. Meyer,²¹ J. Meyer,²² M. Michaut,¹⁸ H. Miettinen,⁸¹ T. Millet,²⁰ J. Mitrevski,⁷¹ J. Molina,³ N. K. Mondal,²⁹ J. Monk,⁴⁵ R. W. Moore,⁵ T. Moulík,⁵⁹ G. S. Muanza,¹⁶ M. Mulders,⁵¹ M. Mulhearn,⁷¹ L. Mundim,³ Y. D. Mutaf,⁷³ E. Nagy,¹⁵ M. Naimuddin,²⁸ M. Narain,⁶³ N. A. Naumann,³⁵ H. A. Neal,⁶⁵ J. P. Negret,⁸ S. Nelson,⁵⁰ P. Neustroev,⁴⁰ C. Noeding,²³ A. Nomerotski,⁵¹ S. F. Novaes,⁴ T. Nunnemann,²⁵ V. O'Dell,⁵¹ D. C. O'Neil,⁵ G. Obrant,⁴⁰ V. Oguri,³ N. Oliveira,³ N. Oshima,⁵¹ R. Otec,¹⁰

G. J. Otero y Garzón,⁵² M. Owen,⁴⁵ P. Padley,⁸¹ N. Parashar,⁵⁷ S.-J. Park,⁷² S. K. Park,³¹ J. Parsons,⁷¹ R. Partridge,⁷⁸ N. Parua,⁷³ A. Patwa,⁷⁴ G. Pawloski,⁸¹ P. M. Perea,⁴⁹ E. Perez,¹⁸ K. Peters,⁴⁵ P. Pétrouff,¹⁶ M. Petteni,⁴⁴ R. Piegaia,¹ M.-A. Pleier,²² P. L. M. Podesta-Lerma,³³ V. M. Podstavkov,⁵¹ Y. Pogorelov,⁵⁶ M.-E. Pol,² A. Pompoš,⁷⁶ B. G. Pope,⁶⁶ A. V. Popov,³⁹ W. L. Prado da Silva,³ H. B. Prosper,⁵⁰ S. Protopopescu,⁷⁴ J. Qian,⁶⁵ A. Quadt,²² B. Quinn,⁶⁷ K. J. Rani,²⁹ K. Ranjan,²⁸ P. A. Rapidis,⁵¹ P. N. Ratoff,⁴³ P. Renkel,⁸⁰ S. Reucroft,⁶⁴ M. Rijssenbeek,⁷³ I. Ripp-Baudot,¹⁹ F. Rizatdinova,⁷⁷ S. Robinson,⁴⁴ R. F. Rodrigues,³ C. Royon,¹⁸ P. Rubinov,⁵¹ R. Ruchti,⁵⁶ V. I. Rud,³⁸ G. Sajot,¹⁴ A. Sánchez-Hernández,³³ M. P. Sanders,⁶² A. Santoro,³ G. Savage,⁵¹ L. Sawyer,⁶¹ T. Scanlon,⁴⁴ D. Schaile,²⁵ R. D. Schamberger,⁷³ Y. Scheglov,⁴⁰ H. Schellman,⁵⁴ P. Schieferdecker,²⁵ C. Schmitt,²⁶ C. Schwanenberger,⁴⁵ A. Schwartzman,⁶⁹ R. Schwienhorst,⁶⁶ S. Sengupta,⁵⁰ H. Severini,⁷⁶ E. Shabalina,⁵² M. Shamim,⁶⁰ V. Shary,¹⁸ A. A. Shchukin,³⁹ W. D. Shephard,⁵⁶ R. K. Shivpuri,²⁸ D. Shpakov,⁶⁴ V. Siccaldi,¹⁹ R. A. Sidwell,⁶⁰ V. Simak,¹⁰ V. Sirotenko,⁵¹ P. Skubic,⁷⁶ P. Slattery,⁷² R. P. Smith,⁵¹ G. R. Snow,⁶⁸ J. Snow,⁷⁵ S. Snyder,⁷⁴ S. Söldner-Rembold,⁴⁵ X. Song,⁵³ L. Sonnenschein,¹⁷ A. Sopczak,⁴³ M. Sosebee,⁷⁹ K. Soustruznik,⁹ M. Souza,² B. Spurlock,⁷⁹ J. Stark,¹⁴ J. Steele,⁶¹ K. Stevenson,⁵⁵ V. Stolin,³⁷ A. Stone,⁵² D. A. Stoyanova,³⁹ J. Strandberg,⁴¹ M. A. Strang,⁷⁰ M. Strauss,⁷⁶ R. Ströhmer,²⁵ D. Strom,⁵⁴ M. Strovink,⁴⁷ L. Stutte,⁵¹ S. Sumowidagdo,⁵⁰ A. Sznajder,³ M. Talby,¹⁵ P. Tamburello,⁴⁶ W. Taylor,⁵ P. Telford,⁴⁵ J. Temple,⁴⁶ B. Tiller,²⁵ M. Titov,²³ V. V. Tokmenin,³⁶ M. Tomoto,⁵¹ T. Toole,⁶² I. Torchiani,²³ S. Towers,⁴³ T. Trefzger,²⁴ S. Trincas-Duvoid,¹⁷ D. Tsybychev,⁷³ B. Tuchming,¹⁸ C. Tully,⁶⁹ A. S. Turcot,⁴⁵ P. M. Tuts,⁷¹ R. Unalan,⁶⁶ L. Uvarov,⁴⁰ S. Uvarov,⁴⁰ S. Uzunyan,⁵³ B. Vachon,⁵ P. J. van den Berg,³⁴ R. Van Kooten,⁵⁵ W. M. van Leeuwen,³⁴ N. Varelas,⁵² E. W. Varnes,⁴⁶ A. Vartapetian,⁷⁹ I. A. Vasilyev,³⁹ M. Vaupel,²⁶ P. Verdier,²⁰ L. S. Vertogradov,³⁶ M. Verzocchi,⁵¹ F. Villeneuve-Seguié,⁴⁴ P. Vint,⁴⁴ J.-R. Vlimant,¹⁷ E. Von Toerne,⁶⁰ M. Voutilainen,^{68,†} M. Vreeswijk,³⁴ H. D. Wahl,⁵⁰ L. Wang,⁶² J. Warchol,⁵⁶ G. Watts,⁸³ M. Wayne,⁵⁶ M. Weber,⁵¹ H. Weerts,⁶⁶ N. Wermes,²² M. Wetstein,⁶² A. White,⁷⁹ D. Wicke,²⁶ G. W. Wilson,⁵⁹ S. J. Wimpenny,⁴⁹ M. Wobisch,⁵¹ J. Womersley,⁵¹ D. R. Wood,⁶⁴ T. R. Wyatt,⁴⁵ Y. Xie,⁷⁸ N. Xuan,⁵⁶ S. Yacoob,⁵⁴ R. Yamada,⁵¹ M. Yan,⁶² T. Yasuda,⁵¹ Y. A. Yatsunenko,³⁶ K. Yip,⁷⁴ H. D. Yoo,⁷⁸ S. W. Youn,⁵⁴ C. Yu,¹⁴ J. Yu,⁷⁹ A. Yurkewicz,⁷³ A. Zatserklyaniy,⁵³ C. Zeitnitz,²⁶ D. Zhang,⁵¹ T. Zhao,⁸³ Z. Zhao,⁶⁵ B. Zhou,⁶⁵ J. Zhu,⁷³ M. Zielinski,⁷² D. Zieminska,⁵⁵ A. Zieminski,⁵⁵ V. Zutshi,⁵³ and E. G. Zverev³⁸

(D0 Collaboration)

¹Universidad de Buenos Aires, Buenos Aires, Argentina²LAFEX, Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Físicas, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil³Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil⁴Instituto de Física Teórica, Universidade Estadual Paulista, São Paulo, Brazil⁵University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada, York University, Toronto, Ontario, Canada,

and McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

⁶Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing, People's Republic of China⁷University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, People's Republic of China⁸Universidad de los Andes, Bogotá, Colombia⁹Center for Particle Physics, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic¹⁰Czech Technical University, Prague, Czech Republic¹¹Center for Particle Physics, Institute of Physics, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Prague, Czech Republic¹²Universidad San Francisco de Quito, Quito, Ecuador¹³Laboratoire de Physique Corpusculaire, IN2P3-CNRS, Université Blaise Pascal, Clermont-Ferrand, France¹⁴Laboratoire de Physique Subatomique et de Cosmologie, IN2P3-CNRS, Université de Grenoble 1, Grenoble, France¹⁵CPPM, IN2P3-CNRS, Université de la Méditerranée, Marseille, France¹⁶IN2P3-CNRS, Laboratoire de l'Accélérateur Linéaire, Orsay, France¹⁷LPNHE, IN2P3-CNRS, Universités Paris VI and VII, Paris, France¹⁸DAPNIA/Service de Physique des Particules, CEA, Saclay, France¹⁹IREs, IN2P3-CNRS, Université Louis Pasteur, Strasbourg, France,

and Université de Haute Alsace, Mulhouse, France

²⁰Institut de Physique Nucléaire de Lyon, IN2P3-CNRS, Université Claude Bernard, Villeurbanne, France²¹III. Physikalisches Institut A, RWTH Aachen, Aachen, Germany²²Physikalisches Institut, Universität Bonn, Bonn, Germany²³Physikalisches Institut, Universität Freiburg, Freiburg, Germany²⁴Institut für Physik, Universität Mainz, Mainz, Germany

- ²⁵Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, München, Germany
²⁶Fachbereich Physik, University of Wuppertal, Wuppertal, Germany
²⁷Panjab University, Chandigarh, India
²⁸Delhi University, Delhi, India
²⁹Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Mumbai, India
³⁰University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland
³¹Korea Detector Laboratory, Korea University, Seoul, Korea
³²SungKyunKwan University, Suwon, Korea
³³CINVESTAV, Mexico City, Mexico
³⁴FOM-Institute NIKHEF and University of Amsterdam/NIKHEF, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
³⁵Radboud University Nijmegen/NIKHEF, Nijmegen, The Netherlands
³⁶Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia
³⁷Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, Moscow, Russia
³⁸Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia
³⁹Institute for High Energy Physics, Protvino, Russia
⁴⁰Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute, St. Petersburg, Russia
⁴¹Lund University, Lund, Sweden, Royal Institute of Technology and Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden, and Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden
⁴²Physik Institut der Universität Zürich, Zürich, Switzerland
⁴³Lancaster University, Lancaster, United Kingdom
⁴⁴Imperial College, London, United Kingdom
⁴⁵University of Manchester, Manchester, United Kingdom
⁴⁶University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona 85721, USA
⁴⁷Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory and University of California, Berkeley, California 94720, USA
⁴⁸California State University, Fresno, California 93740, USA
⁴⁹University of California, Riverside, California 92521, USA
⁵⁰Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida 32306, USA
⁵¹Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, Illinois 60510, USA
⁵²University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, Illinois 60607, USA
⁵³Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, Illinois 60115, USA
⁵⁴Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois 60208, USA
⁵⁵Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47405, USA
⁵⁶University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana 46556, USA
⁵⁷Purdue University Calumet, Hammond, Indiana 46323, USA
⁵⁸Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011, USA
⁵⁹University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66045, USA
⁶⁰Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas 66506, USA
⁶¹Louisiana Tech University, Ruston, Louisiana 71272, USA
⁶²University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742, USA
⁶³Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, USA
⁶⁴Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts 02115, USA
⁶⁵University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109, USA
⁶⁶Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824, USA
⁶⁷University of Mississippi, University, Mississippi 38677, USA
⁶⁸University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska 68588, USA
⁶⁹Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey 08544, USA
⁷⁰State University of New York, Buffalo, New York 14260, USA
⁷¹Columbia University, New York, New York 10027, USA
⁷²University of Rochester, Rochester, New York 14627, USA
⁷³State University of New York, Stony Brook, New York 11794, USA
⁷⁴Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York 11973, USA
⁷⁵Langston University, Langston, Oklahoma 73050, USA
⁷⁶University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma 73019, USA
⁷⁷Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma 74078, USA
⁷⁸Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island 02912, USA
⁷⁹University of Texas, Arlington, Texas 76019, USA
⁸⁰Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas 75275, USA
⁸¹Rice University, Houston, Texas 77005, USA
⁸²University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22901, USA
⁸³University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98195, USA

(Received 24 April 2006; published 12 December 2006)

We report a measurement of the B_s^0 lifetime in the semileptonic decay channel $B_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- \mu^+ \nu X$ (and its charge conjugate), using approximately 0.4 fb^{-1} of data collected with the D0 detector during 2002–2004. Using 5176 reconstructed $D_s^- \mu^+$ signal events, we have measured the B_s^0 lifetime to be $\tau(B_s^0) = 1.398 \pm 0.044(\text{stat})_{-0.025}^{+0.028}(\text{syst})$ ps. This is the most precise measurement of the B_s^0 lifetime to date.

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.97.241801

PACS numbers: 13.25.Hw, 14.40.Nd

Measurements of the lifetimes of different b hadrons allow tests of the mechanism of heavy hadron decay. The spectator model predicts that all hadrons with the same heavy flavor content have identical lifetimes. However, observed charm and bottom hadron lifetimes suggest that nonspectator effects, such as interference between contributing amplitudes, are not negligible in heavy hadron decays. This implies that a mechanism beyond the simple spectator model is required. An effective theory called the heavy quark expansion (HQE) [1] includes such effects and predicts lifetime differences among the different bottom hadrons. In particular, a difference of the order of 1% is predicted between B^0 and B_s^0 mesons. The measurement of the flavor-specific B_s^0 lifetime using semileptonic decays is also useful in determining the decay width difference between the light and heavy mass eigenstates of the B_s^0 meson, which is an equal mixture of CP eigenstates that correspond to mass eigenstates in the absence of CP violation in the B_s^0 system.

In this Letter, we present a high-statistics measurement of the B_s^0 lifetime, using a large sample of semileptonic B_s^0 decays collected in $p\bar{p}$ collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 1.96 \text{ TeV}$ with the D0 detector at the Fermilab Tevatron Collider in 2002–2004. The data correspond to approximately 0.4 fb^{-1} of integrated luminosity. B_s^0 mesons were identified through their semileptonic decay $B_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- \mu^+ \nu X$ [2], where the D_s^- meson decays via $D_s^- \rightarrow \phi \pi^-$, followed by $\phi \rightarrow K^+ K^-$.

The D0 detector is described in detail elsewhere [3]. The detector components most important to this analysis are the central-tracking and muon systems. The D0 central-tracking system consists of a silicon microstrip tracker (SMT) and a central fiber tracker (CFT), both located within a 2 T superconducting solenoidal magnet, with designs optimized for tracking and vertexing at pseudorapidities $|\eta| < 3$ and $|\eta| < 2.5$, respectively, (where $\eta = -\ln[\tan(\theta/2)]$). A liquid-argon and uranium calorimeter has a central section covering pseudorapidities up to ≈ 1.1 , and two end calorimeters that extend the coverage to $|\eta| \approx 4.2$ [4]. The muon system is located outside the calorimeters and has pseudorapidity coverage $|\eta| < 2$. It consists of a layer of tracking detectors and scintillation trigger counters in front of 1.8 T toroids, followed by two similar layers after the toroids [5].

Events with semileptonic B -meson decays were selected using inclusive single-muon triggers in a three-level trigger system. The triggers used did not impose any impact parameter criterion and were shown to not bias the lifetime measurement. Off-line, muons were identified by extrapolation of the muon track segments, formed by the hits in the

muon system, to the tracks found in the central tracking system. Each muon was required to have a momentum $p > 3 \text{ GeV}/c$ and a transverse momentum $p_T > 2 \text{ GeV}/c$.

The primary vertex of each $p\bar{p}$ interaction was defined by all available well-reconstructed tracks [6] and constrained by the mean beam-spot position. The latter was updated every few hours. The resolution of the reconstructed primary vertex was typically $20 \mu\text{m}$ in the transverse plane and $40 \mu\text{m}$ in the beam direction.

To reconstruct $D_s^- \rightarrow \phi \pi^-$ decays, tracks with $p_T > 1.0 \text{ GeV}/c$ were assigned the kaon mass and oppositely charged pairs were combined to form a ϕ candidate. Each ϕ candidate was required to have a mass in the range $1.008\text{--}1.032 \text{ GeV}/c^2$, compatible with the reconstructed ϕ mass at D0. The ϕ candidate was then combined with another track of $p_T > 0.7 \text{ GeV}/c$. For the “right-sign” combinations, we required the charge of the track to be opposite to that of the muon and assigned the pion mass to this track. All selected tracks were required to have at least one SMT hit and one CFT hit. The three tracks selected were combined to form a common vertex (the D_s^- vertex) with a confidence level greater than 0.1%. The D_s^- candidate was required to have $p_T > 3.5 \text{ GeV}/c$.

The secondary vertex, where the B_s^0 decays to a muon and a D_s^- meson, was obtained by finding the intersection of the trajectory of the muon track and the flight path of the D_s^- candidate. The confidence level of that vertex had to be greater than 0.01%. The reconstructed D_s^- decay vertex was required to be displaced from the primary vertex in the direction of the D_s^- momentum.

The helicity angle Φ , defined as the angle between the directions of the K^- and D_s^- in the ϕ rest frame, has a distribution proportional to $\cos^2 \Phi$. A cut of $|\cos \Phi| > 0.4$ was applied to further reduce combinatorial background, which was found to have a flat distribution. In order to suppress the physics background originating from $D^{(*)}D^{(*)}$ processes [7], we required that the transverse momentum of the muon with respect to the D_s^- meson, $p_{T\text{rel}}$, exceed $2 \text{ GeV}/c$. The $D_s^- \mu^+$ invariant mass was also restricted to $3.4\text{--}5.0 \text{ GeV}/c^2$, to be consistent with a B -meson candidate. Because the number of tracks near the B_s^0 candidate tends to be small, we required the isolation $I = p^{\text{tot}}(\mu^+ D_s^-)/(p^{\text{tot}}(\mu^+ D_s^-) + \sum p_i^{\text{tot}}) > 0.65$, where the sum $\sum p_i^{\text{tot}}$ was taken over all charged particles in the cone $\sqrt{(\Delta\phi)^2 + (\Delta\eta)^2} < 0.5$, with $\Delta\phi$ and $\Delta\eta$ being the azimuthal angle and the pseudorapidity with respect to the $(\mu^+ D_s^-)$ direction. The muon, kaon, and pion tracks were not included in the sum.

The lifetime of the B_s^0 , τ , is related to the decay length in the transverse plane L_{xy} by $L_{xy} = c\tau p_T/m$, where p_T is

the transverse momentum of the B_s^0 and m is its invariant mass. L_{xy} is defined as the displacement of the B_s^0 vertex from the primary vertex projected onto the transverse momentum of the $D_s^- \mu^+$ system. Because the B_s^0 meson is not fully reconstructed, $p_T(B_s^0)$ is estimated by $p_T(D_s^- \mu^+)/K$, where the correction factor $K = p_T(D_s^- \mu^+)/p_T(B_s^0)$ is determined using Monte Carlo (MC) methods. The quantity used to extract the B_s^0 lifetime is called the pseudoproper decay length (PPDL). The correction factor K was applied statistically when extracting $c\tau(B_s^0)$ from the PPDL in the lifetime fit.

In the cases with more than one B_s^0 candidate per event, we chose the one with the highest vertex confidence level. We also required the PPDL uncertainty to be less than $500 \mu\text{m}$. The resulting invariant mass distribution of the D_s^- candidates is shown in Fig. 1. The distribution for “right-sign” $D_s^- \mu^+$ candidates was fitted using a Gaussian, to describe the signal, and a second-order polynomial, to describe the combinatorial background. A second Gaussian was included for the Cabibbo-suppressed $D^- \rightarrow \phi \pi^-$ decay. The best fit result is shown in the same figure. The fit yields a signal of $5176 \pm 242(\text{stat}) \pm 314(\text{syst}) D_s^-$ candidates and a mass of $1958.8 \pm 0.9 \text{ MeV}/c^2$. The width of the D_s^- Gaussian is $22.6 \pm 1.0 \text{ MeV}/c^2$. The systematic uncertainty comes from the fit. For the D^- meson, the fit yields 1551 events. Figure 1 also shows the invariant mass distribution of the “wrong-sign” candidates. The observed shift in the D_s^- mass is consistent with known issues associated with the calibration of the D0 track momenta. The contribution to the mass region from reflected states was found to be negligible. Studies confirmed that this mass shift introduces no significant residual bias in the lifetime determination.




FIG. 1. The mass distribution of $\phi \pi^-$ candidates. Points with errors bars show the “right-sign” $D_s^- \mu^+$ combinations, and the open squares show the corresponding “wrong-sign” distribution. The dashed curve represents the result of the fit to the “right-sign” combinations. The two peaks are associated with the D^- and D_s^- mesons, respectively.

MC samples were generated using PYTHIA [8] for the production and hadronization phase, and EVTGEN [9] for decaying the b and c hadrons. Branching ratios from the Particle Data Group have been used when available. Detector acceptance and smearing were taken into account using the full D0 detector simulation based on GEANT [10]. Generated MC signal samples include contributions from $D_s^- \mu^+ \nu$, $D_s^{*-} \mu^+ \nu$, $D_{s0}^{*-} \mu^+ \nu$, $D_{s1}^{*-} \mu^+ \nu$, and $D_s^{(*)-} \tau^+ \nu$.

Apart from the background due to combinatorial processes such as a prompt muon and an identified D_s^- meson, there are several real physics processes that produce a muon and a D_s^- meson, where neither comes from the semileptonic decay of the B_s^0 meson. These “right-sign” $D_s^- \mu^+$ combinations are included in the signal sample and are defined as “physics backgrounds.” Prompt D_s^- mesons from $c\bar{c}$ production at the interaction point can combine with high- p_T muons generated either via direct production or in charm decays. These $c\bar{c}$ background events are expected to have very short lifetimes and thus could introduce a significant bias in the B_s^0 lifetime measurement. Backgrounds that originate from \bar{B} mesons and provide the $D_s^- \mu^+$ final state, but not via the semileptonic decay $B_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- \mu^+ \nu X$, are called non- B_s^0 backgrounds. This kind of background is expected to have a relatively long lifetime, thus its effect on the B_s^0 lifetime fit is smaller than that of the charm background. There are three sources of such events: $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D_s^{(*)-} D^{(*)+} X$, $B^- \rightarrow D_s^{(*)-} \bar{D}^{(*)0} X$, and $\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^{(*)-} D^{(*)} X$, where the charm meson accompanying the $D_s^{(*)-}$, which decays to $\phi \pi^-$, decays semileptonically. The momentum of the muon coming from the decay of the $D^{(*)}$ is softer than that for the signal, because it comes from the decay of a secondary charm hadron. This implies that the contribution of these modes to the signal sample is reduced by the kinematic cuts. We found the fractional contribution of the backgrounds to the signal region to be $(10.0 \pm 7.0)\%$ for $c\bar{c}$ background and $(11.3^{+5.3}_{-3.6})\%$ for non- B_s^0 backgrounds.

The lifetime of the B_s^0 was found using a fit to the PPDL distribution. We defined a signal sample using the D_s^- mass distribution in the region from $1913.6 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ to $2004.0 \text{ MeV}/c^2$, corresponding to $\pm 2\sigma$ from the fitted mean mass. The PPDL distribution of the combinatorial background events contained in the signal sample was defined using “right-sign” events from the D_s^- sidebands ($1755.3\text{--}1800.5 \text{ MeV}/c^2$, and $2117.1\text{--}2162.3 \text{ MeV}/c^2$) and “wrong-sign” events between 1755.3 and $2162.3 \text{ MeV}/c^2$. The combinatorial background due to random track combinations was modeled by the sideband sample events. This assumption is supported by the mass distribution of the “wrong-sign” combinations where no enhancement is visible in the D_s^- mass region.

The PPDL distribution obtained from the signal sample was fitted using an unbinned maximum log-likelihood method. Both the B_s^0 lifetime and the background shape were determined in a simultaneous fit to the signal and

background samples. The likelihood function \mathcal{L} is given by

$$\mathcal{L} = C_{\text{sig}} \prod_i^{N_S} [f_{\text{sig}} \mathcal{F}_{\text{sig}}^i + (1 - f_{\text{sig}}) \mathcal{F}_{\text{bck}}^i] \prod_j^{N_B} \mathcal{F}_{\text{bck}}^j, \quad (1)$$

where N_S , N_B are the number of events in the signal and background samples and f_{sig} is the ratio of D_s^- signal events obtained from the D_s^- mass distribution fit to the total number of events in the signal sample. To constrain f_{sig} , we factored in an additional likelihood term using the number of D_s^- signal events observed from the invariant mass distribution, and its uncertainty C_{sig} .

Because the current world-average width difference between the light and heavy mass eigenstates ($\Delta\Gamma_s$) of the B_s^0 system is small [11] compared with the current precision of the data, we used for the signal probability distribution function (PDF) $\mathcal{F}_{\text{sig}}^i$, a normalized single exponential decay function convoluted with a Gaussian resolution function. The K -factor correction was also convoluted with the exponential decay function. Since *a priori*, we do not know the decay length uncertainty, which we estimated on an event-by-event basis, an overall global scale factor s was introduced as a free parameter in the B_s^0 lifetime fit. The events from non- B_s^0 background were taken into account in the fit by including similar PDFs to those in the signal but using fixed parameters according to the world-average values [12]. A different K -factor distribution was also used for each process. To take into account the $c\bar{c}$ background, we used a Gaussian distribution with fixed parameters. These contributions were evaluated and parametrized using MC methods following a similar procedure as for the signal evaluation.

The combinatorial background sample $\mathcal{F}_{\text{bck}}^i$ was parametrized using a Gaussian distribution function for the resolution plus several exponential decays: two for the negative values in the PDDL distribution (one short and one long component) and two for the positive values of the distribution.

Figure 2 shows the PDDL distribution of the $D_s^- \mu^+$ signal sample with the fit result superimposed (dashed curve). The dotted curve represents the sum of the background probability function over the events in the signal sample. The B_s^0 signal is represented by the filled area.

To test the resolutions, pulls, fitting, and selection criteria, we performed detailed studies using MC samples and found no significant bias in our analysis procedure. In order to study the stability of the B_s^0 lifetime measurement, we split the data sample into two parts according to different kinematic and geometric parameters, compared the fitted results, and found the lifetimes consistent within their uncertainties. We also varied the selection criteria and mass fit ranges, and did not observe any significant shifts. We performed an extensive study of our fitting procedure, looking for any possible bias using MC ensembles with statistics of the size of our data set and distributions as




FIG. 2 (color online). Pseudoproper decay length distribution for $D_s^- \mu^+$ candidates with the result of the fit superimposed as the dashed curve. The dotted curve represents the combinatorial background and the filled area represents the B_s^0 signal.

those in data. These samples were fitted, and the mean and width of the distributions of extracted parameters were found to be consistent with the fits to data. One final check of the procedure involved performing a similar lifetime fit to a control sample defined by the Cabibbo-suppressed decay $D^- \rightarrow \phi \pi^-$ (see Fig. 1). We found that 89.1% of the sample comes from $B^0 \rightarrow D^- \mu^+ X$, and the B^0 lifetime to be 1.541 ± 0.093 ps, where the uncertainty is statistical only. This result is in good agreement with the world-average B^0 lifetime [11,12].

We considered and evaluated various sources of systematic uncertainties. The major contributions come from the determination of the combinatorial background, the model for the resolution, and the physics background. To determine the systematics due to the uncertainty on the combinatorial background, we tested other assumptions on the background samples: we used just the events in the sidebands, just the events in the wrong-sign combinations, and removed either the right sideband or the left sideband samples. We also modified the definitions of those samples, changing the mass window sizes and positions. The largest difference in $c\tau$ observed in these variations of background modeling was $4.3 \mu\text{m}$, which was taken to be the systematic uncertainty due to this source. The effect of uncertainty in the resolution of the decay length was studied using an alternative global scale factor s . We repeated the lifetime fit with fixed values of s obtained from MC samples and from a different lifetime analysis [13]. Using a variation of the resolution scale by a factor of 2 beyond these bounds, we found a $3.7 \mu\text{m}$ variation in $c\tau$. The uncertainty from the physics background was evaluated by varying the branching fractions of the different processes as well as the shapes of the lifetime templates, as given by their known lifetime values [12]. The variations were within 1 standard deviation in each case. Assuming no correlation between them, we added the effects of all the variations in quadrature and found a total contribution of

$^{+2.9}_{-4.2}$ μm . Using a similar procedure, we evaluated the uncertainty coming from the determination of the $c\bar{c}$ background and found a difference of $^{+2.3}_{-0.8}$ μm .

To evaluate the uncertainty associated with the K factor determination, we modified the kinematics of the event using a different decay model, a different p_T spectrum for the b quark, and a different p_T spectrum for the muon. We also varied the amount of each component, according to their uncertainty, of the $B_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- \mu^+ X$ signal. In each case, the K factor was reevaluated and the fit repeated. We added all K factor variation effects in quadrature and found a total uncertainty of $^{+3.6}_{-2.1}$ μm .

There are two requirements in our selection method that could potentially change the final result by altering the shape of the PDDL distribution: $p_{T\text{rel}} > 2$ GeV/ c and the positive displacement from the primary vertex of the reconstructed D_s^- decay vertex. Using MC methods, we evaluated their effects by removing them one at a time. The largest variation observed was $^{+3.0}_{-0.3}$ μm , and the selection efficiency is flat as a function of proper decay time. The effect of a possible misalignment of the SMT system was tested in Ref. [13]. We repeated the study using MC signal samples and observed the same shift of $c\tau = 2$ μm , which was taken as a systematic uncertainty due to possible misalignment. The total systematic uncertainty from all of these sources added in quadrature is $^{+8.4}_{-7.6}$ μm .

In summary, using an integrated luminosity of approximately 0.4 fb^{-1} , we have measured the B_s^0 lifetime in the decay channel $D_s^- \mu^+ \nu X$ to be $\tau(B_s^0) = 1.398 \pm 0.044(\text{stat})^{+0.028}_{-0.025}(\text{syst})$ ps. Note that this measurement takes $\Delta\Gamma_s$ equal to zero. The extraction of the average lifetime $\bar{\tau}_s$ for $\Delta\Gamma_s \neq 0$ is straightforward [11]. The result is in good agreement with previous experiments as well as the current world-average value for all flavor-specific decays, $\tau(B_s^0) = 1.442 \pm 0.066$ ps [11,14]. Our B_s^0 lifetime measurement is the most precise to date and exceeds the precision of the current world-average measurement $\tau(B_s^0)_{\text{PDG}} = 1.461 \pm 0.057$ ps [12], where semileptonic and hadronic decays were combined. This measurement is approximately 2.5σ away from the B^0 lifetime, more than the 1% predicted by HQE.

We thank the staffs at Fermilab and collaborating institutions, and acknowledge support from the DOE and NSF (USA); CEA and CNRS/IN2P3 (France); FASI, Rosatom and RFBR (Russia); CAPES, CNPq, FAPERJ, FAPESP and FUNDUNESP (Brazil); DAE and DST (India); Colciencias (Colombia); CONACyT (Mexico); KRF and KOSEF (Korea); CONICET and UBACyT (Argentina); FOM (The Netherlands); PPARC (United Kingdom); MSMT (Czech Republic); CRC Program, CFI, NSERC and WestGrid Project (Canada); BMBF and DFG (Germany); SFI (Ireland); The Swedish Research Council (Sweden); Research Corporation; Alexander von Humboldt Foundation; and the Marie Curie Program.

*On leave from IEP SAS Kosice, Slovakia.

†Visiting scientist from Helsinki Institute of Physics, Helsinki, Finland.

- [1] I. I. Bigi *et al.*, in *B Decays*, edited by S. Stone (World Scientific, Singapore, 1994), 2nd ed..
- [2] Unless otherwise stated, charge-conjugate states are implied.
- [3] V. M. Abazov *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A **565**, 463 (2006).
- [4] S. Abachi *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A **338**, 185 (1994).
- [5] V. M. Abazov *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A **552**, 372 (2005).
- [6] J. Abdallah *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. C **32**, 185 (2004).
- [7] $D^{(*)}$ denotes either D , D^* , or D^{**} .
- [8] T. Sjöstrand *et al.*, Comput. Phys. Commun. **135**, 238 (2001).
- [9] D. J. Lange, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A **462**, 152 (2001).
- [10] R. Brun *et al.*, CERN Report No. DD/EE/84-1, 1984.
- [11] K. Anikeev *et al.* (Heavy Flavor Averaging Group), hep-ex/0505100.
- [12] S. Eidelman *et al.* (Particle Data Group), Phys. Lett. B **592**, 1 (2004).
- [13] V. M. Abazov *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 042001 (2005).
- [14] D. Buskulic *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **377**, 205 (1996); K. Ackerstaff *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **426**, 161 (1998); F. Abe *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 032004 (1999); P. Abreu *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. C **16**, 555 (2000).