

University of Groningen

Measurement of the $B\text{-}s(o) \rightarrow D\text{-}s\text{-}D\text{-}s^+$ and $B\text{-}s(o) \rightarrow D\text{-}s\text{-}D\text{-}s^+$ Effective Lifetimes

Aaij, R.; Adeva, B.; Adinolfi, M.; Affolder, A.; Ajaltouni, Z.; Albrecht, J.; Alessio, F.; Alexander, M.; Ali, S.; Alkhazov, G.

Published in:
Physical Review Letters

DOI:
[10.1103/PhysRevLett.112.111802](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.112.111802)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2014

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Aaij, R., Adeva, B., Adinolfi, M., Affolder, A., Ajaltouni, Z., Albrecht, J., Alessio, F., Alexander, M., Ali, S., Alkhazov, G., Cartelle, P. A., Alves, A. A., Amato, S., Amerio, S., Amhis, Y., Anderlini, L., Anderson, J., Andreassen, R., Andreotti, M., ... LHCb Collaboration (2014). Measurement of the $B\text{-}s(o) \rightarrow D\text{-}s\text{-}D\text{-}s^+$ and $B\text{-}s(o) \rightarrow D\text{-}s\text{-}D\text{-}s^+$ Effective Lifetimes. *Physical Review Letters*, 112(11), [111802].
<https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.112.111802>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Measurement of the $\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- D_s^+$ and $\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D^- D_s^+$ Effective Lifetimes

R. Aaij *et al.**

(LHCb Collaboration)

(Received 4 December 2013; published 19 March 2014)

The first measurement of the effective lifetime of the \bar{B}_s^0 meson in the decay $\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- D_s^+$ is reported using a proton-proton collision data set, corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 3 fb^{-1} , collected by the LHCb experiment. The measured value of the $\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- D_s^+$ effective lifetime is $1.379 \pm 0.026 \pm 0.017 \text{ ps}$, where the uncertainties are statistical and systematic, respectively. This lifetime translates into a measurement of the decay width of the light \bar{B}_s^0 mass eigenstate of $\Gamma_L = 0.725 \pm 0.014 \pm 0.009 \text{ ps}^{-1}$. The \bar{B}_s^0 lifetime is also measured using the flavor-specific $\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D^- D_s^+$ decay to be $1.52 \pm 0.15 \pm 0.01 \text{ ps}$.

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.112.111802

PACS numbers: 13.25.Hw, 14.40.Nd

A central goal in quark-flavor physics is to test whether the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa mechanism [1,2] can fully describe all relevant weak decay observables, or if physics beyond the standard model (SM) is needed. In the neutral B meson sector, the mass eigenstates do not coincide with the flavor eigenstates as a result of $B\bar{B}$ mixing. In addition to measurable mass splittings between the mass eigenstates [3], the B_s system also exhibits a sizeable difference in the decay widths Γ_L and Γ_H , where the subscripts L and H refer to the light and heavy mass eigenstates, respectively. This difference is due to the large decay width to final states accessible to both B_s^0 and \bar{B}_s^0 . In the absence of CP violation, the mass eigenstates are also eigenstates of CP . The summed decay rate of B_s^0 and \bar{B}_s^0 to the CP -even $D_s^+ D_s^-$ final state can be written as [4]

$$\Gamma_{\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- D_s^+}(t) + \Gamma_{B_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^+ D_s^-}(t) \propto (1 + \cos \phi_s) e^{-\Gamma_L t} + (1 - \cos \phi_s) e^{-\Gamma_H t}, \quad (1)$$

where ϕ_s is the (CP -violating) relative weak phase between the \bar{B}_s^0 mixing and $b \rightarrow c\bar{c}s$ decay amplitudes.

The untagged decay rate in Eq. (1) provides a probe of ϕ_s , Γ_L , and Γ_H in a way that is complementary to direct determinations using CP violating asymmetries [5]. Since ϕ_s is small, Eq. (1) is well approximated by a single exponential

$$\Gamma_{\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- D_s^+}(t) + \Gamma_{B_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^+ D_s^-}(t) \propto e^{-t/\tau_{\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- D_s^+}^{\text{eff}}}, \quad (2)$$

which defines the $\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- D_s^+$ effective lifetime, where $\tau_{\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- D_s^+}^{\text{eff}} = (1/\Gamma_s)[1 - y_s \cos \phi_s + \mathcal{O}(y_s^2)]$ [4,6].

* Full author list given at the end of the article.

Published by the American Physical Society under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 License. Further distribution of this work must maintain attribution to the author(s) and the published articles title, journal citation, and DOI.

Here, $y_s \equiv \Delta\Gamma_s/(2\Gamma_s)$, $\Delta\Gamma_s \equiv \Gamma_L - \Gamma_H$ and $\Gamma_s \equiv (\Gamma_H + \Gamma_L)/2$. In this formulation, we have assumed that direct CP violation is negligible in the $\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- D_s^+$ decay, in accord with SM expectations. Using the measured value of $\phi_s = 0.01 \pm 0.07 \pm 0.01 \text{ rad}$ [5], which is in good agreement with the SM expectation of $-0.0363_{-0.0015}^{+0.0016} \text{ rad}$ [7], it follows that $\tau_{\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- D_s^+}^{\text{eff}} \simeq \Gamma_L^{-1}$.

The most precise measurement to date of the effective lifetime in a CP -even final state used $\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-$ [8] decays, and yielded a value $\tau_{\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-}^{\text{eff}} = 1.455 \pm 0.046 \text{ (stat)} \pm 0.006 \text{ (syst)} \text{ ps}$. Loop contributions, both within, and possibly beyond the SM, are expected to be significantly larger in $\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-$ than in $\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- D_s^+$. These contributions give rise to direct CP violation in the $\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-$ decay [9], which lead to differences between τ^{eff} in these two CP final state decays, making a comparison of their effective lifetimes interesting. Measurements have also been made in CP -odd modes, such as $\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow J/\psi f_0(980)$ [10,11] and $\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K_S^0$ [12]. The most precise value is from the former, yielding $\tau_{\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow J/\psi f_0(980)}^{\text{eff}} = 1.700 \pm 0.040 \text{ (stat)} \pm 0.026 \text{ (syst)} \text{ ps}$ [10]. Constraints from these measurements on the $(\Delta\Gamma_s, \phi_s)$ parameter space are given in Refs. [4,13]. Improved precision on the effective lifetimes will enable more stringent tests of the consistency between the direct measurements of $\Delta\Gamma_s$ and ϕ_s , and those inferred using effective lifetimes.

In this Letter, the $\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- D_s^+$ time-dependent decay rate is normalized to the corresponding rate in the $B^- \rightarrow D^0 D_s^-$ decay, which has similar final state topology and kinematic properties, and a precisely measured lifetime of $\tau_{B^-} = 1.641 \pm 0.008 \text{ ps}$ [14]. As a result, many of the systematic uncertainties cancel in the measured ratio. The relative rate is then given by

$$\frac{\Gamma_{\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- D_s^+}(t) + \Gamma_{B_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^+ D_s^-}(t)}{\Gamma_{B^- \rightarrow D^0 D_s^-}(t) + \Gamma_{B^+ \rightarrow \bar{D}^0 D_s^+}(t)} \propto e^{-\alpha_{su} t}, \quad (3)$$

where $\alpha_{su} = 1/\tau_{\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- D_s^+}^{\text{eff}} - 1/\tau_{B^-}$. A measurement of α_{su} therefore determines $\tau_{\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- D_s^+}^{\text{eff}}$.

The \bar{B}_s^0 meson lifetime is also measured using the flavor-specific, Cabibbo-suppressed $\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D^- D_s^+$ decay. Its time-dependent rate is normalized to that of the $B^0 \rightarrow D^- D_s^+$ decay. In what follows, the symbol B without a flavor designation refers to either a B^- , \bar{B}^0 , or \bar{B}_s^0 meson, and D refers to either a D^0 , D^+ , or D_s^+ meson. Unless otherwise indicated, charge conjugate final states are included.

The measurements presented use a proton-proton (pp) collision data sample corresponding to 3 fb^{-1} of integrated luminosity, 1 fb^{-1} recorded at a center-of-mass energy of 7 TeV, and 2 fb^{-1} at 8 TeV, collected by the LHCb experiment. The LHCb detector [15] includes a high-precision tracking system that provides a momentum measurement with relative uncertainty of about 0.5% and impact parameter (IP) resolution of $20 \mu\text{m}$ for tracks with large transverse momentum (p_T). A pair of ring-imaging Cherenkov detectors [16] provide charged hadron identification. Photon, electron, and hadron candidates are discriminated using a calorimeter system consisting of scintillating-pad and preshower detectors, and electromagnetic and hadronic calorimeters. Muons are identified by a system composed of alternating layers of iron and multi-wire proportional chambers [17].

The trigger [18] consists of a hardware stage, based on information from the calorimeter and muon systems, followed by a software stage, which applies a full event reconstruction [18,19]. Of the B meson candidates considered in this analysis, about 60% are triggered at the hardware level by one or more of the final state particles in the signal B decay. The remaining 40% are triggered due to other activity in the event. The software trigger requires a two-, three- or four-track secondary vertex with a large p_T sum of the tracks and a significant displacement from the primary pp interaction vertices (PVs). At least one track should have $p_T > 1.7 \text{ GeV}/c$ and χ_{IP}^2 with respect to any PV greater than 16, where χ_{IP}^2 is defined as the difference in χ^2 of a given PV reconstructed with and without the considered particle included.

Proton-proton collisions are simulated using PYTHIA [20] with a specific LHCb configuration [21]. Decays of hadronic particles are described by EVTGEN [22], in which final state radiation is generated using PHOTOS [23]. The interaction of the generated particles with the detector and its response are implemented using the GEANT4 tool kit [24] as described in Ref. [25].

Signal $\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- D_s^+$ candidates are reconstructed using four final states: (i) $D_s^+ \rightarrow K^+ K^- \pi^+$, $D_s^- \rightarrow K^- K^+ \pi^-$, (ii) $D_s^+ \rightarrow K^+ K^- \pi^+$, $D_s^- \rightarrow \pi^- \pi^+ \pi^-$, (iii) $D_s^+ \rightarrow K^+ K^- \pi^+$, $D_s^- \rightarrow K^- \pi^+ \pi^-$, and (iv) $D_s^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+$, $D_s^- \rightarrow \pi^- \pi^+ \pi^-$. In the normalization mode, $B^- \rightarrow D^0 D_s^-$, only the final state $D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$, $D_s^- \rightarrow K^- K^+ \pi^-$ is used. For the $\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D^- D_s^+$ decay and the corresponding B^0 normalization mode, the $D^- \rightarrow K^+ \pi^- \pi^-$, $D_s^+ \rightarrow K^+ K^- \pi^+$ final state is

used. Loose particle identification (PID) requirements are imposed on kaon and pion candidates, with efficiencies typically in excess of 95%. The D candidates are required to have masses within $25 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ of their known values [14] and to have vertex separation from the B vertex satisfying $\chi_{\text{VS}}^2 > 2$. Here χ_{VS}^2 is the increase in χ^2 of the parent (B) vertex fit when the (D meson) decay products are constrained to come from the parent vertex, relative to the nominal fit. To suppress the large background from $\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^+ \pi^- \pi^+ \pi^-$ decays, $D_s^- \rightarrow \pi^- \pi^+ \pi^-$ candidates are required to have $\chi_{\text{VS}}^2 > 6$. As the signatures of b -hadron decays to double-charm final states are similar, vetoes are employed to suppress the cross-feed resulting from particle misidentification, following Ref. [26]. For the $D_s^+ \rightarrow K^+ \pi^- \pi^+$ decay, an additional veto to suppress cross feed from $D^+ \rightarrow K^- \pi^+ \pi^+$ with double misidentification is employed, which renders this background negligible. Potential background to D_s^+ decays from $D^{*+} \rightarrow D^0 \pi^+$ with $D^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-$, $\pi^+ \pi^-$ is also removed by requiring the mass difference, $M(D^0 \pi^+) - M(D^0) > 150 \text{ MeV}/c^2$. The production point of each B candidate is taken as the PV with the smallest χ_{IP}^2 value. All B candidates are refit taking both D mass and vertex constraints into account [27].

The efficiencies of the PID and veto requirements are evaluated using dedicated $D^{*+} \rightarrow D^0 \pi^+$, $D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$ calibration samples collected at the same time as the data. The kinematic distributions of kaons and pions from the calibration sample are reweighted using simulation to match those of the B decays under study. The combined PID and veto efficiencies are 91.4% for $B^- \rightarrow D^0 D_s^-$, 88.0% for $(\bar{B}_s^0, B^0) \rightarrow D^- D_s^+$, and 86.5%, 90.8%, 86.6%, and 95.9% for the $\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- D_s^+$ final states (i)–(iv), respectively.

To further improve the signal-to-background ratio, a boosted decision tree (BDT) [28,29] algorithm using seventeen input variables is employed. Five variables from the B candidate are used, including χ_{IP}^2 , the vertex fit χ_{VTX}^2 (with D mass, and vertex constraints), the PV χ_{VS}^2 , p_T , and a p_T imbalance variable [30]. For each D daughter, χ_{IP}^2 , the flight distance from the B vertex normalized by its uncertainty, and the maximum distance between the trajectories of any pair of particles in the D decay, are used. Last, for each D candidate, the minimum p_T , and both the smallest and largest χ_{IP}^2 , among the D daughter particles are used. The BDT uses simulated decays to emulate the signal and wrong-charge final states from data with masses larger than $5.2 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ for the background. Here, wrong charge refers to $D_s^\pm D_s^\pm$, $D^\pm D_s^\pm$, and $D^0 D_s^+$ combinations, where in the latter case we remove candidates within $30 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ of the B^+ mass [14], to remove the small doubly Cabibbo-suppressed decay contribution to this final state. The selection requirement on the BDT output is chosen to maximize the expected $\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- D_s^+$ signal significance, corresponding to signal and background efficiencies of about 97% and 33%, respectively. More than one candidate




FIG. 1. Ratio of selection efficiencies for $B^- \rightarrow D^0 D_s^-$ relative to $\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- D_s^+$ decays as a function of decay time. The uncertainties shown are due to finite simulated sample sizes.

per event is allowed, but after all selections the fraction of events with multiple candidates is below 0.25% for all modes.

For the lifetime analysis, we consider only B candidates with reconstructed decay time less than 9 ps. The decay time is computed after a kinematic fit that applies both D mass and all vertex constraints. Signal efficiencies as functions of decay time are determined using simulated decays after all selections, except those that involve PID, as described above. The resulting B^- to \bar{B}_s^0 relative efficiency as a function of decay time is shown in Fig. 1, where six decay time bins with widths ranging between 1 and 3 ps are used. For the $\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- D_s^+$ decay, the efficiency used in the ratio is the weighted average of the $D_s^+ D_s^-$ final states (i)–(iv), where the weights are obtained from the observed yields in data. The efficiency accounts for the migration between bins, which is small since the resolution on the reconstructed time of ~ 50 fs is much less than the bin width. Moreover, the time resolution is nearly identical for the signal and normalization modes, and is independent of the reconstructed lifetime. The relative efficiency is consistent with being independent of decay time; however, the computed bin-by-bin efficiencies are used to correct the data.

The mass distributions for the signal, summed over the four final states, and the normalization modes, are shown in Fig. 2, along with the results of binned maximum likelihood fits. The B signal shapes are each modeled using the sum of two Crystal Ball (CB) functions [31] with a common mean. The shape parameters are fixed from fits to simulated signal decays, with the exception of the resolution parameter, which is found to be about 15% larger in data than simulation. The shape of the low-mass background from partially reconstructed decays, where either a photon or pion is missing, is obtained from simulated decays, as are the cross-feed background shapes from $B^0 \rightarrow D^- D_s^+$ and $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ D_s^-$ decays ($\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- D_s^+$ channel only). An additional peaking background due to $B \rightarrow DK^- K^+ \pi^-$ decays is also included in the fit. Its shape is obtained from simulation and the yield is fixed to be 1% of the signal yield from a fit to the D mass sidebands. The combinatorial background shape is described by an exponential function with the shape parameter fixed to the value obtained from a fit to the mass spectrum of wrong-charge candidates. All yields, except that of the $B \rightarrow DK^- K^+ \pi^-$, are freely varied in the fit to the full data sample.

In total, we observe 3499 ± 65 $\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- D_s^+$ and 19432 ± 140 $B^- \rightarrow D^0 D_s^-$ decays. The data are split into the time bins shown in Fig. 1, and each mass distribution is fitted with the CB widths fixed to the values obtained from the full fit. The independence of the signal shape parameters on decay time is validated using simulated decays. The ratios of yields are then computed, and corrected by the relative efficiencies shown in Fig. 1. Figure 3 shows the efficiency-corrected yield ratios as a function of decay time. The data points are placed at the average time within each bin assuming an exponential form $e^{-t/(1.5 \text{ ps})}$. Fitting an exponential function to the data yields the result $\alpha_{su} = 0.1156 \pm 0.0139 \text{ ps}^{-1}$. The χ^2 of the fit is 6.2 for 4 degrees of freedom. The uncertainty in the fitted slope due to using the value of 1.5 ps to get the average time in each bin is negligible. Using the known B^- lifetime, $\tau_{\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- D_s^+}^{\text{eff}}$ is determined to be 1.379 ± 0.026 (stat) ps.




FIG. 2 (color online). Mass distributions and fits to the full data sample for (left) $\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- D_s^+$ and (right) $B^- \rightarrow D^0 D_s^-$ candidates. The points are the data and the curves and shaded regions show the fit components.




FIG. 3 (color online). Efficiency corrected yield ratio of $\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- D_s^+$ relative to $B^- \rightarrow D^0 D_s^-$ as a function of decay time, along with the exponential fit. The uncertainties are statistical only.

As a cross-check, the full analysis is applied to the $B^- \rightarrow D^0 D_s^-$ and $B^0 \rightarrow D^- D_s^+$ decays, treating the former as the signal mode and the latter as the normalization mode. The fitted value for $\alpha \equiv 1/\tau_{B^0} - 1/\tau_{B^-}$ is $0.0500 \pm 0.0076 \text{ ps}^{-1}$, in excellent agreement with the expected value of 0.0489 ± 0.0042 [14]. This check indicates that the relative lifetime measurements are insensitive to small differences in the number of charged particles or lifetimes of the D mesons in the final state. The $B^0 \rightarrow D^- D_s^+$ mode could have also been used as a normalization mode for the $\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- D_s^+$ time-dependent rate measurement, but due to limited simulated sample sizes it would have led to a larger systematic uncertainty.

As the method for determining $\tau_{\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- D_s^+}^{\text{eff}}$ relies on ratios of yields and efficiencies, many systematic uncertainties cancel. The robustness of the relative acceptance is tested by subdividing the sample into mutually exclusive subsamples based on (i) center of mass energy, (ii) $D_s^- D_s^+$ final states, and (iii) the hardware trigger decision, and searching for deviations larger than those expected from the finite sizes of the samples. The results from all checks were found to be within one standard deviation of the average. Based on the largest deviation, we assign a 0.010 ps systematic uncertainty due to the modeling of the relative acceptance. The statistical precision on the relative acceptance, as obtained from simulation, contributes an uncertainty of 0.011 ps. Using a different signal shape to fit the data leads to 0.003 ps uncertainty. If the combinatorial background shape parameter is allowed to freely vary in each time bin fit, we find a deviation of 0.001 ps from the nominal value of $\tau_{\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- D_s^+}^{\text{eff}}$, which is assigned as a systematic uncertainty. Because of the presence of a nontrivial acceptance function, the result of fitting a single exponential to the untagged B_s^0 decay time distribution does not coincide precisely with the formal definition of the effective lifetime [32]. The deviation between $\tau_{\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- D_s^+}^{\text{eff}}$ and the single exponential fit

is at most 0.001 ps [32], which is assigned as a systematic uncertainty. The precision on the B^- lifetime leads to 0.008 ps uncertainty on the value of $\tau_{\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- D_s^+}^{\text{eff}}$. Summing these deviations in quadrature, we obtain a total systematic uncertainty of 0.017 ps. In converting to a measurement of Γ_L , an additional uncertainty due to a small CP -odd component of expected size $1 - \cos \phi_s = (0.1 \pm 3.2) \times 10^{-3}$ [5] leads to a negative bias no larger than -0.001 ps^{-1} . This is included in the Γ_L systematic uncertainty.

The value of $\tau_{\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- D_s^+}^{\text{eff}}$ and the corresponding decay width of the light \bar{B}_s^0 mass eigenstate are determined to be

$$\tau_{\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- D_s^+}^{\text{eff}} = 1.379 \pm 0.026 \pm 0.017 \text{ ps},$$

$$\Gamma_L = 0.725 \pm 0.014 \pm 0.009 \text{ ps}^{-1},$$

where the first uncertainty is statistical and the second is systematic. These are the first such measurements using the $\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- D_s^+$ decay. The measured effective lifetime represents the most precise measurement of the width of the light \bar{B}_s^0 mass eigenstate, and is about 1 standard deviation lower than the value obtained using $\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-$ decays [8]. Compared to the $\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- D_s^+$ decay, which is dominated by tree-level processes, the $\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-$ decay is expected to have larger relative contributions from SM-loop amplitudes [4,33,34], and, therefore, one should not naively average the effective lifetimes from these two decays. Moreover, if non-SM particles contribute additional amplitudes, their effect is likely to be larger in $\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-$ than in $\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- D_s^+$ decays [35].

The value of Γ_L obtained in this analysis may be compared to the value inferred from the time-dependent analyses of $J/\psi K^+ K^-$ and $J/\psi \pi^+ \pi^-$ decays. Using the values $\Gamma_s = 0.661 \pm 0.004 \pm 0.006 \text{ ps}^{-1}$ and $\Delta\Gamma_s = 0.106 \pm 0.011 \pm 0.007 \text{ ps}^{-1}$ [5], we find $\Gamma_L = 0.714 \pm 0.010 \text{ ps}^{-1}$, in good agreement with the value obtained from $\tau_{\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^- D_s^+}^{\text{eff}}$.

The effective lifetime of the flavor-specific $\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D^- D_s^+$ decay is also measured, using the $B^0 \rightarrow D^- D_s^+$ decay for normalization. The technique is identical to that described above, with the simplification that the relative efficiency equals 1, since the final states are identical. Effects due to the mass difference between the \bar{B}_s^0 and B^0 mesons are negligible. A tighter BDT selection is imposed to optimize the expected signal-to-background ratio, which results in signal and background efficiencies of 87% and 11%, respectively. The mass spectrum and the corresponding fit are shown in Fig. 4, where the fitted components are analogous to those described previously. A total of $230 \pm 18 \bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D^- D_s^+$ and $21\,195 \pm 147 B^0 \rightarrow D^- D_s^+$ decays are obtained. The time bins are the same as above, except the 6–9 ps bin is dropped, since the yield in the signal mode beyond 6 ps is negligible. The relative decay rate is fitted to




FIG. 4 (color online). Mass distribution and fits to the full data sample for \bar{B}_s^0 and B^0 decays into the $D^- D_s^+$ final state. The points are the data and the curves and shaded regions show the fit components.

an exponential form $Ce^{-\beta t}$, where C is a normalization constant. The fitted value of β is $0.000 \pm 0.068 \text{ ps}^{-1}$. The systematic uncertainty due to the signal shape is 0.007 ps, obtained by using a different signal shape function. The exponential background shape is fixed in the nominal fit using $D^\pm D_s^\pm$ candidates, and a systematic uncertainty of 0.010 ps is determined by allowing its shape parameter to vary freely in the fit. In determining the effective lifetime, an uncertainty of 0.007 ps due to the limited precision of the B^0 lifetime [14] is also included. The resulting effective lifetime in the $\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D^- D_s^+$ mode is

$$\tau_{\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D^- D_s^+}^{\text{eff}} = 1.52 \pm 0.15 \pm 0.01 \text{ ps}.$$

This is the first measurement of the \bar{B}_s^0 lifetime using the $\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D^- D_s^+$ decay. Its value is consistent with previous direct and indirect measurements of the \bar{B}_s^0 lifetime in other flavor-specific decays.

In summary, we report the first measurement of the $\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D^- D_s^+$ effective lifetime and present the most precise direct measurement of the width of the light B_s mass eigenstate. Their values are $\tau_{\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D^- D_s^+}^{\text{eff}} = 1.379 \pm 0.026 \pm 0.017 \text{ ps}$ and $\Gamma_L = 0.725 \pm 0.014 \pm 0.009 \text{ ps}^{-1}$. The Γ_L result is consistent with the value obtained from previously measured values of $\Delta\Gamma_s$ and Γ_s [5]. We also determine the average \bar{B}_s^0 lifetime to be $1.52 \pm 0.15 \pm 0.01 \text{ ps}$ using the $\bar{B}_s^0 \rightarrow D^- D_s^+$ decay, which is consistent with other measurements.

We express our gratitude to our colleagues in the CERN accelerator departments for the excellent performance of the LHC. We thank the technical and administrative staff at the LHCb institutes. We acknowledge support from CERN and from the national agencies CAPES, CNPq, FAPERJ, and FINEP (Brazil); NSFC (China); CNRS/IN2P3 and Region Auvergne (France); BMBF, DFG, HGF, and MPG (Germany); SFI (Ireland); INFN (Italy); FOM and NWO

(Netherlands); SCSR (Poland); MEN/IFA (Romania); MinES, Rosatom, RFBR and NRC “Kurchatov Institute” (Russia); MinECo, XuntaGal, and GENCAT (Spain); SNSF and SER (Switzerland); NAS Ukraine (Ukraine); STFC (United Kingdom); NSF (USA). We also acknowledge the support received from the ERC under FP7. The Tier1 computing centres are supported by IN2P3 (France), KIT, and BMBF (Germany), INFN (Italy), NWO, and SURF (Netherlands), PIC (Spain), GridPP (United Kingdom). We are thankful for the computing resources put at our disposal by Yandex LLC (Russia), as well as to the communities behind the multiple open source software packages that we depend on.

- [1] N. Cabibbo, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **10**, 531 (1963).
- [2] M. Kobayashi and T. Maskawa, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **49**, 652 (1973).
- [3] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb Collaboration), *New J. Phys.* **15**, 053021 (2013).
- [4] R. Fleischer and R. Knegjens, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **71**, 1789 (2011).
- [5] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 112010 (2013).
- [6] K. Hartkorn and H. Moser, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **8**, 381 (1999).
- [7] J. Charles *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. D* **84**, 033005 (2011).
- [8] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb Collaboration), *Phys. Lett. B* **716**, 393 (2012).
- [9] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb Collaboration), *J. High Energy Phys.* **10** (2013) 183.
- [10] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 152002 (2012).
- [11] T. Aaltonen *et al.* (CDF Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. D* **84**, 052012 (2011).
- [12] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb Collaboration), *Nucl. Phys.* **B873**, 275 (2013).
- [13] R. Knegjens, *Nucl. Phys.* **B241**, 164 (2013).
- [14] J. Beringer *et al.* (Particle Data Group), *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 010001 (2012), and 2013 partial update for the 2014 edition.
- [15] A. A. Alves Jr. *et al.* (LHCb Collaboration), *JINST* **3**, S08005 (2008).
- [16] M. Adinolfi *et al.*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **73**, 2431 (2013).
- [17] A. A. Alves Jr. *et al.*, *JINST* **8**, P02022 (2013).
- [18] R. Aaij *et al.*, *JINST* **8**, P04022 (2013).
- [19] V. V. Gligorov and M. Williams, *JINST* **8**, P02013 (2013).
- [20] T. Sjöstrand, S. Mrenna, and P. Skands, *J. High Energy Phys.* **05** (2006) 026; T. Sjöstrand, S. Mrenna, and P. Skands, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **178**, 852 (2008).
- [21] I. Belyaev *et al.*, *Nuclear Science Symposium Conference Record (NSS/MIC)* (IEEE, Bellingham, WA, 2010), p. 1155.
- [22] D. J. Lange, *Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A* **462**, 152 (2001).
- [23] P. Golonka and Z. Was, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **45**, 97 (2006).
- [24] J. Allison *et al.* (GEANT4 Collaboration) *IEEE Trans. Nucl. Sci.* **53**, 270 (2006); S. Agostinelli *et al.* (GEANT4 Collaboration) *Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A* **506**, 250 (2003).

- [25] M. Clemencic, G. Corti, S. Easo, C. R. Jones, S. Miglioranza, M. Pappagallo, and P. Robbe, *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **331**, 032023 (2011).
- [26] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 092007 (2013).
- [27] W. D. Hulsbergen, *Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A* **552**, 566 (2005).
- [28] L. Breiman, J. H. Friedman, R. A. Olshen, and C. J. Stone, *Classification and Regression Trees* (Wadsworth Intl. Group, Belmont, CA, 1984).
- [29] R. E. Schapire and Y. Freund, *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.* **55**, 119 (1997).
- [30] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb Collaboration), *Phys. Lett. B* **723**, 44 (2013).
- [31] T. Skwarnicki, Ph.D. thesis, Institute of Nuclear Physics, Krakow, 1986, DESY-F31-86-02.
- [32] K. De Bruyn, R. Fleischer, R. Kneijens, P. Koppenburg, M. Merk, and N. Tuning, *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 014027 (2012).
- [33] R. Fleischer, *Phys. Lett. B* **459**, 306 (1999).
- [34] R. Fleischer, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **51**, 849 (2007).
- [35] R. Fleischer and R. Kneijens, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **71**, 1532 (2011).

R. Aaij,⁴⁰ B. Adeva,³⁶ M. Adinolfi,⁴⁵ A. Affolder,⁵¹ Z. Ajaltouni,⁵ J. Albrecht,⁹ F. Alessio,³⁷ M. Alexander,⁵⁰ S. Ali,⁴⁰ G. Alkhazov,²⁹ P. Alvarez Cartelle,³⁶ A. A. Alves Jr,²⁴ S. Amato,² S. Amerio,²¹ Y. Amhis,⁷ L. Anderlini,^{17,a} J. Anderson,³⁹ R. Andreassen,⁵⁶ M. Andreotti,^{16,b} J. E. Andrews,⁵⁷ R. B. Appleby,⁵³ O. Aquines Gutierrez,¹⁰ F. Archilli,³⁷ A. Artamonov,³⁴ M. Artuso,⁵⁸ E. Aslanides,⁶ G. Auriemma,^{24,c} M. Baalouch,⁵ S. Bachmann,¹¹ J. J. Back,⁴⁷ A. Badalov,³⁵ V. Balagura,³⁰ W. Baldini,¹⁶ R. J. Barlow,⁵³ C. Barschel,³⁸ S. Barsuk,⁷ W. Barter,⁴⁶ V. Batozskaya,²⁷ Th. Bauer,⁴⁰ A. Bay,³⁸ J. Beddow,⁵⁰ F. Bedeschi,²² I. Bediaga,¹ S. Belogurov,³⁰ K. Belous,³⁴ I. Belyaev,³⁰ E. Ben-Haim,⁸ G. Bencivenni,¹⁸ S. Benson,⁴⁹ J. Benton,⁴⁵ A. Berezhnoy,³¹ R. Bernet,³⁹ M.-O. Bettler,⁴⁶ M. van Beuzekom,⁴⁰ A. Bien,¹¹ S. Bifani,⁴⁴ T. Bird,⁵³ A. Bizzeti,^{17,d} P. M. Bjørnstad,⁵³ T. Blake,⁴⁷ F. Blanc,³⁸ J. Blouw,¹⁰ S. Blusk,⁵⁸ V. Bocci,²⁴ A. Bondar,³³ N. Bondar,²⁹ W. Bonivento,^{15,37} S. Borghi,⁵³ A. Borgia,⁵⁸ M. Borsato,⁷ T. J. V. Bowcock,⁵¹ E. Bowen,³⁹ C. Bozzi,¹⁶ T. Brambach,⁹ J. van den Brand,⁴¹ J. Bressieux,³⁸ D. Brett,⁵³ M. Britsch,¹⁰ T. Britton,⁵⁸ N. H. Brook,⁴⁵ H. Brown,⁵¹ A. Bursche,³⁹ G. Busetto,^{21,e} J. Buytaert,³⁷ S. Cadeddu,¹⁵ R. Calabrese,^{16,b} O. Callot,⁷ M. Calvi,^{20,f} M. Calvo Gomez,^{35,g} A. Camboni,³⁵ P. Campana,^{18,37} D. Campora Perez,³⁷ A. Carbone,^{14,h} G. Carbone,^{23,i} R. Cardinale,^{19,j} A. Cardini,¹⁵ H. Carranza-Mejia,⁴⁹ L. Carson,⁴⁹ K. Carvalho Akiba,² G. Casse,⁵¹ L. Castillo Garcia,³⁷ M. Cattaneo,³⁷ Ch. Cauet,⁹ R. Cenci,⁵⁷ M. Charles,⁸ Ph. Charpentier,³⁷ S.-F. Cheung,⁵⁴ N. Chiapolini,³⁹ M. Chrzaszcz,^{39,25} K. Ciba,³⁷ X. Cid Vidal,³⁷ G. Ciezarek,⁵² P. E. L. Clarke,⁴⁹ M. Clemencic,³⁷ H. V. Cliff,⁴⁶ J. Closier,³⁷ C. Coca,²⁸ V. Coco,³⁷ J. Cogan,⁶ E. Cogneras,⁵ P. Collins,³⁷ A. Comerma-Montells,³⁵ A. Contu,^{15,37} A. Cook,⁴⁵ M. Coombes,⁴⁵ S. Coquereau,⁸ G. Corti,³⁷ B. Couturier,³⁷ G. A. Cowan,⁴⁹ D. C. Craik,⁴⁷ M. Cruz Torres,⁵⁹ S. Cunliffe,⁵² R. Currie,⁴⁹ C. D'Ambrosio,³⁷ J. Dalseno,⁴⁵ P. David,⁸ P. N. Y. David,⁴⁰ A. Davis,⁵⁶ I. De Bonis,⁴ K. De Bruyn,⁴⁰ S. De Capua,⁵³ M. De Cian,¹¹ J. M. De Miranda,¹ L. De Paula,² W. De Silva,⁵⁶ P. De Simone,¹⁸ D. Decamp,⁴ M. Deckenhoff,⁹ L. Del Buono,⁸ N. Déléage,⁴ D. Derkach,⁵⁴ O. Deschamps,⁵ F. Dettori,⁴¹ A. Di Canto,¹¹ H. Dijkstra,³⁷ S. Donleavy,⁵¹ F. Dordei,¹¹ P. Dorosz,^{25,k} A. Dosil Suárez,³⁶ D. Dossett,⁴⁷ A. Dovbnya,⁴² F. Dupertuis,³⁸ P. Durante,³⁷ R. Dzhelyadin,³⁴ A. Dziurda,²⁵ A. Dzyuba,²⁹ S. Easo,⁴⁸ U. Egede,⁵² V. Egorychev,³⁰ S. Eidelman,³³ D. van Eijk,⁴⁰ S. Eisenhardt,⁴⁹ U. Eitschberger,⁹ R. Ekelhof,⁹ L. Eklund,^{50,37} I. El Rifai,⁵ Ch. Elsasser,³⁹ A. Falabella,^{16,b} C. Färber,¹¹ C. Farinelli,⁴⁰ S. Farry,⁵¹ D. Ferguson,⁴⁹ V. Fernandez Albor,³⁶ F. Ferreira Rodrigues,¹ M. Ferro-Luzzi,³⁷ S. Filippov,³² M. Fiore,^{16,b} M. Fiorini,^{16,b} C. Fitzpatrick,³⁷ M. Fontana,¹⁰ F. Fontanelli,^{19,j} R. Forty,³⁷ O. Francisco,² M. Frank,³⁷ C. Frei,³⁷ M. Frosini,^{17,37,a} E. Furfaro,^{23,i} A. Gallas Torreira,³⁶ D. Galli,^{14,h} M. Gandelman,² P. Gandini,⁵⁸ Y. Gao,³ J. Garofoli,⁵⁸ P. Garosi,⁵³ J. Garra Tico,⁴⁶ L. Garrido,³⁵ C. Gaspar,³⁷ R. Gauld,⁵⁴ E. Gersabeck,¹¹ M. Gersabeck,⁵³ T. Gershon,⁴⁷ Ph. Ghez,⁴ A. Gianelle,²¹ V. Gibson,⁴⁶ L. Giubega,²⁸ V. V. Gligorov,³⁷ C. Göbel,⁵⁹ D. Golubkov,³⁰ A. Golutvin,^{52,30,37} A. Gomes,^{1,l} H. Gordon,³⁷ M. Grabalosa Gándara,⁵ R. Graciani Diaz,³⁵ L. A. Granado Cardoso,³⁷ E. Graugés,³⁵ G. Graziani,¹⁷ A. Grecu,²⁸ E. Greening,⁵⁴ S. Gregson,⁴⁶ P. Griffith,⁴⁴ L. Grillo,¹¹ O. Grünberg,⁶⁰ B. Gui,⁵⁸ E. Gushchin,³² Yu. Guz,^{34,37} T. Gys,³⁷ C. Hadjivasiliou,⁵⁸ G. Haefeli,³⁸ C. Haen,³⁷ T. W. Hafkenscheid,⁶² S. C. Haines,⁴⁶ S. Hall,⁵² B. Hamilton,⁵⁷ T. Hampson,⁴⁵ S. Hansmann-Menzemer,¹¹ N. Harnew,⁵⁴ S. T. Harnew,⁴⁵ J. Harrison,⁵³ T. Hartmann,⁶⁰ J. He,³⁷ T. Head,³⁷ V. Heijne,⁴⁰ K. Hennessy,⁵¹ P. Henrard,⁵ J. A. Hernando Morata,³⁶ E. van Herwijnen,³⁷ M. Heß,⁶⁰ A. Hicheur,¹ D. Hill,⁵⁴ M. Hoballah,⁵ C. Hombach,⁵³ W. Hulsbergen,⁴⁰ P. Hunt,⁵⁴ T. Huse,⁵¹ N. Hussain,⁵⁴ D. Hutchcroft,⁵¹ D. Hynds,⁵⁰ V. Iakovenko,⁴³ M. Idzik,²⁶ P. Ilten,⁵⁵ R. Jacobsson,³⁷ A. Jaeger,¹¹ E. Jans,⁴⁰ P. Jaton,³⁸ A. Jawahery,⁵⁷ F. Jing,³ M. John,⁵⁴ D. Johnson,⁵⁴ C. R. Jones,⁴⁶ C. Joram,³⁷ B. Jost,³⁷ N. Jurik,⁵⁸ M. Kabbalo,⁹ S. Kandybei,⁴² W. Kanso,⁶ M. Karacson,³⁷ T. M. Karbach,³⁷ I. R. Kenyon,⁴⁴ T. Ketel,⁴¹

B. Khanji,²⁰ S. Klaver,⁵³ O. Kochebina,⁷ I. Komarov,³⁸ R. F. Koopman,⁴¹ P. Koppenburg,⁴⁰ M. Korolev,³¹ A. Kozlinskiy,⁴⁰ L. Kravchuk,³² K. Kreplin,¹¹ M. Kreps,⁴⁷ G. Krocker,¹¹ P. Krokovny,³³ F. Kruse,⁹ M. Kucharczyk,^{20,25,37,f} V. Kudryavtsev,³³ K. Kurek,²⁷ T. Kvaratskheliya,^{30,37} V. N. La Thi,³⁸ D. Lacarrere,³⁷ G. Lafferty,⁵³ A. Lai,¹⁵ D. Lambert,⁴⁹ R. W. Lambert,⁴¹ E. Lanciotti,³⁷ G. Lanfranchi,¹⁸ C. Langenbruch,³⁷ T. Latham,⁴⁷ C. Lazzeroni,⁴⁴ R. Le Gac,⁶ J. van Leerdam,⁴⁰ J.-P. Lees,⁴ R. Lefèvre,⁵ A. Leflat,³¹ J. Lefrançois,⁷ S. Leo,²² O. Leroy,⁶ T. Lesiak,²⁵ B. Leverington,¹¹ Y. Li,³ M. Liles,⁵¹ R. Lindner,³⁷ C. Linn,¹¹ F. Lionetto,³⁹ B. Liu,³ G. Liu,³⁷ S. Lohn,³⁷ I. Longstaff,⁵⁰ J. H. Lopes,² N. Lopez-March,³⁸ P. Lowdon,³⁹ H. Lu,³ D. Lucchesi,^{21,e} J. Luisier,³⁸ H. Luo,⁴⁹ E. Luppi,^{16,b} O. Lupton,⁵⁴ F. Machefert,⁷ I. V. Machikhiliyan,³⁰ F. Maciuc,²⁸ O. Maev,^{29,37} S. Malde,⁵⁴ G. Manca,^{15,m} G. Mancinelli,⁶ J. Maratas,⁵ U. Marconi,¹⁴ P. Marino,^{22,n} R. Märki,³⁸ J. Marks,¹¹ G. Martellotti,²⁴ A. Martens,⁸ A. Martín Sánchez,⁷ M. Martinelli,⁴⁰ D. Martinez Santos,⁴¹ D. Martins Tostes,² A. Martynov,³¹ A. Massafferri,¹ R. Matev,³⁷ Z. Mathe,³⁷ C. Matteuzzi,²⁰ A. Mazurov,^{16,37,b} M. McCann,⁵² J. McCarthy,⁴⁴ A. McNab,⁵³ R. McNulty,¹² B. McSkelly,⁵¹ B. Meadows,^{56,54} F. Meier,⁹ M. Meissner,¹¹ M. Merk,⁴⁰ D. A. Milanes,⁸ M.-N. Minard,⁴ J. Molina Rodriguez,⁵⁹ S. Monteil,⁵ D. Moran,⁵³ M. Morandin,²¹ P. Morawski,²⁵ A. Mordà,⁶ M. J. Morello,^{22,n} R. Mountain,⁵⁸ I. Mous,⁴⁰ F. Muheim,⁴⁹ K. Müller,³⁹ R. Muresan,²⁸ B. Muryn,²⁶ B. Muster,³⁸ P. Naik,⁴⁵ T. Nakada,³⁸ R. Nandakumar,⁴⁸ I. Nasteva,¹ M. Needham,⁴⁹ S. Neubert,³⁷ N. Neufeld,³⁷ A. D. Nguyen,³⁸ T. D. Nguyen,³⁸ C. Nguyen-Mau,^{38,o} M. Nicol,⁷ V. Niess,⁵ R. Niet,⁹ N. Nikitin,³¹ T. Nikodem,¹¹ A. Novoselov,³⁴ A. Oblakowska-Mucha,²⁶ V. Obraztsov,³⁴ S. Oggero,⁴⁰ S. Ogilvy,⁵⁰ O. Okhrimenko,⁴³ R. Oldeman,^{15,m} G. Onderwater,⁶² M. Orlandea,²⁸ J. M. Otalora Goicochea,² P. Owen,⁵² A. Oyanguren,³⁵ B. K. Pal,⁵⁸ A. Palano,^{13,p} M. Palutan,¹⁸ J. Panman,³⁷ A. Papanestis,^{48,37} M. Pappagallo,⁵⁰ L. Pappalardo,¹⁶ C. Parkes,⁵³ C. J. Parkinson,⁹ G. Passaleva,¹⁷ G. D. Patel,⁵¹ M. Patel,⁵² C. Patrignani,^{19,j} C. Pavel-Nicorescu,²⁸ A. Pazos Alvarez,³⁶ A. Pearce,⁵³ A. Pellegrino,⁴⁰ G. Penso,^{24,q} M. Pepe Altarelli,³⁷ S. Perazzini,^{14,h} E. Perez Trigo,³⁶ P. Perret,⁵ M. Perrin-Terrin,⁶ L. Pescatore,⁴⁴ E. Pesen,⁶³ G. Pessina,²⁰ K. Petridis,⁵² A. Petrolini,^{19,j} E. Picatoste Olloqui,³⁵ B. Pietrzyk,⁴ T. Pilař,⁴⁷ D. Pinci,²⁴ S. Playfer,⁴⁹ M. Plo Casasus,³⁶ F. Polci,⁸ G. Polok,²⁵ A. Poluektov,^{47,33} E. Polcarpo,² A. Popov,³⁴ D. Popov,¹⁰ B. Popovici,²⁸ C. Potterat,³⁵ A. Powell,⁵⁴ J. Prisciandaro,³⁸ A. Pritchard,⁵¹ C. Prouve,⁴⁵ V. Pugatch,⁴³ A. Puig Navarro,³⁸ G. Punzi,^{22,r} W. Qian,⁴ B. Rachwal,²⁵ J. H. Rademacker,⁴⁵ B. Rakotomiarmanana,³⁸ M. Rama,¹⁸ M. S. Rangel,² I. Raniuk,⁴² N. Rauschmayr,³⁷ G. Raven,⁴¹ S. Redford,⁵⁴ S. Reichert,⁵³ M. M. Reid,⁴⁷ A. C. dos Reis,¹ S. Ricciardi,⁴⁸ A. Richards,⁵² K. Rinnert,⁵¹ V. Rives Molina,³⁵ D. A. Roa Romero,⁵ P. Robbe,⁷ D. A. Roberts,⁵⁷ A. B. Rodrigues,¹ E. Rodrigues,⁵³ P. Rodriguez Perez,³⁶ S. Roiser,³⁷ V. Romanovsky,³⁴ A. Romero Vidal,³⁶ M. Rotondo,²¹ J. Rouvinet,³⁸ T. Ruf,³⁷ F. Ruffini,²² H. Ruiz,³⁵ P. Ruiz Valls,³⁵ G. Sabatino,^{24,i} J. J. Saborido Silva,³⁶ N. Sagidova,²⁹ P. Sail,⁵⁰ B. Saitta,^{15,m} V. Salustino Guimaraes,² B. Sanmartin Sedes,³⁶ R. Santacesaria,²⁴ C. Santamarina Rios,³⁶ E. Santovetti,^{23,i} M. Sapunov,⁶ A. Sarti,¹⁸ C. Satriano,^{24,c} A. Satta,²³ M. Savrie,^{16,b} D. Savrina,^{30,31} M. Schiller,⁴¹ H. Schindler,³⁷ M. Schlupp,⁹ M. Schmelling,¹⁰ B. Schmidt,³⁷ O. Schneider,³⁸ A. Schopper,³⁷ M.-H. Schune,⁷ R. Schwemmer,³⁷ B. Sciascia,¹⁸ A. Sciubba,²⁴ M. Seco,³⁶ A. Semennikov,³⁰ K. Senderowska,²⁶ I. Sepp,⁵² N. Serra,³⁹ J. Serrano,⁶ P. Seyfert,¹¹ M. Shapkin,³⁴ I. Shapoval,^{16,42,b} Y. Shcheglov,²⁹ T. Shears,⁵¹ L. Shekhtman,³³ O. Shevchenko,⁴² V. Shevchenko,⁶¹ A. Shires,⁹ R. Silva Coutinho,⁴⁷ G. Simi,²¹ M. Sirendi,⁴⁶ N. Skidmore,⁴⁵ T. Skwarnicki,⁵⁸ N. A. Smith,⁵¹ E. Smith,^{54,48} E. Smith,⁵² J. Smith,⁴⁶ M. Smith,⁵³ H. Snoek,⁴⁰ M. D. Sokoloff,⁵⁶ F. J. P. Soler,⁵⁰ F. Soomro,³⁸ D. Souza,⁴⁵ B. Souza De Paula,² B. Spaan,⁹ A. Sparkes,⁴⁹ P. Spradlin,⁵⁰ F. Stagni,³⁷ S. Stahl,¹¹ O. Steinkamp,³⁹ S. Stevenson,⁵⁴ S. Stoica,²⁸ S. Stone,⁵⁸ B. Storaci,³⁹ S. Stracka,^{22,37} M. Straticiu,²⁸ U. Straumann,³⁹ R. Stroili,²¹ V. K. Subbiah,³⁷ L. Sun,⁵⁶ W. Sutcliffe,⁵² S. Swientek,⁹ V. Syropoulos,⁴¹ M. Szczekowski,²⁷ P. Szczypka,^{38,37} D. Szilard,² T. Szumlak,²⁶ S. T'Jampens,⁴ M. Teklishyn,⁷ G. Tellarini,^{16,b} E. Teodorescu,²⁸ F. Teubert,³⁷ C. Thomas,⁵⁴ E. Thomas,³⁷ J. van Tilburg,¹¹ V. Tisserand,⁴ M. Tobin,³⁸ S. Tolk,⁴¹ L. Tomassetti,^{16,b} D. Tonelli,³⁷ S. Topp-Joergensen,⁵⁴ N. Torr,⁵⁴ E. Tournefier,^{4,52} S. Tourneur,³⁸ M. T. Tran,³⁸ M. Tresch,³⁹ A. Tsaregorodtsev,⁶ P. Tsoelas,⁴⁰ N. Tuning,⁴⁰ M. Ubeda Garcia,³⁷ A. Ukleja,²⁷ A. Ustyuzhanin,⁶¹ U. Uwer,¹¹ V. Vagnoni,¹⁴ G. Valenti,¹⁴ A. Vallier,⁷ R. Vazquez Gomez,¹⁸ P. Vazquez Regueiro,³⁶ C. Vázquez Sierra,³⁶ S. Vecchi,¹⁶ J. J. Velthuis,⁴⁵ M. Veltri,^{17,s} G. Veneziano,³⁸ M. Vesterinen,¹¹ B. Viaud,⁷ D. Vieira,² X. Vilasis-Cardona,^{35,g} A. Vollhardt,³⁹ D. Volyanskyy,¹⁰ D. Voong,⁴⁵ A. Vorobyev,²⁹ V. Vorobyev,³³ C. Voß,⁶⁰ H. Voss,¹⁰ J. A. de Vries,⁴⁰ R. Waldi,⁶⁰ C. Wallace,⁴⁷ R. Wallace,¹² S. Wandernoth,¹¹ J. Wang,⁵⁸ D. R. Ward,⁴⁶ N. Warrington,⁵⁸ N. K. Watson,⁴⁴ A. D. Webber,⁵³ D. Websdale,⁵² M. Whitehead,⁴⁷ J. Wicht,³⁷ J. Wiechczynski,²⁵ D. Wiedner,¹¹ L. Wiggers,⁴⁰ G. Wilkinson,⁵⁴ M. P. Williams,^{47,48} M. Williams,⁵⁵ F. F. Wilson,⁴⁸ J. Wimberley,⁵⁷ J. Wishahi,⁹ W. Wislicki,²⁷ M. Witek,²⁵ G. Wormser,⁷ S. A. Wotton,⁴⁶ S. Wright,⁴⁶ S. Wu,³ K. Wyllie,³⁷ Y. Xie,^{49,37} Z. Xing,⁵⁸ Z. Yang,³ X. Yuan,³ O. Yushchenko,³⁴ M. Zangoli,¹⁴ M. Zavertyaev,^{10,t} F. Zhang,³ L. Zhang,⁵⁸ W. C. Zhang,¹² Y. Zhang,³ A. Zhelezov,¹¹ A. Zhokhov,³⁰ L. Zhong,³ and A. Zvyagin³⁷

(LHCb Collaboration)

- ¹Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Físicas (CBPF), Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
²Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ), Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
³Center for High Energy Physics, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China
⁴LAPP, Université de Savoie, CNRS/IN2P3, Annecy-Le-Vieux, France
⁵Clermont Université, Université Blaise Pascal, CNRS/IN2P3, LPC, Clermont-Ferrand, France
⁶CPPM, Aix-Marseille Université, CNRS/IN2P3, Marseille, France
⁷LAL, Université Paris-Sud, CNRS/IN2P3, Orsay, France
⁸LPNHE, Université Pierre et Marie Curie, Université Paris Diderot, CNRS/IN2P3, Paris, France
⁹Fakultät Physik, Technische Universität Dortmund, Dortmund, Germany
¹⁰Max-Planck-Institut für Kernphysik (MPIK), Heidelberg, Germany
¹¹Physikalisches Institut,
 Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg, Heidelberg, Germany
¹²School of Physics, University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland
¹³Sezione INFN di Bari, Bari, Italy
¹⁴Sezione INFN di Bologna, Bologna, Italy
¹⁵Sezione INFN di Cagliari, Cagliari, Italy
¹⁶Sezione INFN di Ferrara, Ferrara, Italy
¹⁷Sezione INFN di Firenze, Firenze, Italy
¹⁸Laboratori Nazionali dell'INFN di Frascati, Frascati, Italy
¹⁹Sezione INFN di Genova, Genova, Italy
²⁰Sezione INFN di Milano Bicocca, Milano, Italy
²¹Sezione INFN di Padova, Padova, Italy
²²Sezione INFN di Pisa, Pisa, Italy
²³Sezione INFN di Roma Tor Vergata, Roma, Italy
²⁴Sezione INFN di Roma La Sapienza, Roma, Italy
²⁵Henryk Niewodniczanski Institute of Nuclear Physics Polish Academy of Sciences, Kraków, Poland
²⁶AGH - University of Science and Technology, Faculty of Physics and Applied Computer Science, Kraków, Poland
²⁷National Center for Nuclear Research (NCBJ), Warsaw, Poland
²⁸Horia Hulubei National Institute of Physics and Nuclear Engineering, Bucharest-Magurele, Romania
²⁹Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute (PNPI), Gatchina, Russia
³⁰Institute of Theoretical and Experimental Physics (ITEP), Moscow, Russia
³¹Institute of Nuclear Physics, Moscow State University (SINP MSU), Moscow, Russia
³²Institute for Nuclear Research of the Russian Academy of Sciences (INR RAN), Moscow, Russia
³³Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics (SB RAS) and Novosibirsk State University, Novosibirsk, Russia
³⁴Institute for High Energy Physics (IHEP), Protvino, Russia
³⁵Universitat de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain
³⁶Universidad de Santiago de Compostela, Santiago de Compostela, Spain
³⁷European Organization for Nuclear Research (CERN), Geneva, Switzerland
³⁸Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), Lausanne, Switzerland
³⁹Physik-Institut, Universität Zürich, Zürich, Switzerland
⁴⁰Nikhef National Institute for Subatomic Physics, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
⁴¹Nikhef National Institute for Subatomic Physics and VU University Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
⁴²NSC Kharkiv Institute of Physics and Technology (NSC KIPT), Kharkiv, Ukraine
⁴³Institute for Nuclear Research of the National Academy of Sciences (KINR), Kyiv, Ukraine
⁴⁴University of Birmingham, Birmingham, United Kingdom
⁴⁵H.H. Wills Physics Laboratory, University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom
⁴⁶Cavendish Laboratory, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom
⁴⁷Department of Physics, University of Warwick, Coventry, United Kingdom
⁴⁸STFC Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom
⁴⁹School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, United Kingdom
⁵⁰School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, United Kingdom
⁵¹Oliver Lodge Laboratory, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, United Kingdom
⁵²Imperial College London, London, United Kingdom
⁵³School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Manchester, Manchester, United Kingdom
⁵⁴Department of Physics, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom
⁵⁵Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA
⁵⁶University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH, USA
⁵⁷University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland, USA

⁵⁸*Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York, USA*

⁵⁹*Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro (PUC-Rio), Rio de Janeiro, Brazil*

⁶⁰*Institut für Physik, Universität Rostock, Rostock, Germany*

⁶¹*National Research Centre Kurchatov Institute, Moscow, Russia*

⁶²*KVI - University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands*

⁶³*Celal Bayar University, Manisa, Turkey*

^aAlso at Università di Firenze, Firenze, Italy.

^bAlso at Università di Ferrara, Ferrara, Italy.

^cAlso at Università della Basilicata, Potenza, Italy.

^dAlso at Università di Modena e Reggio Emilia, Modena, Italy.

^eAlso at Università di Padova, Padova, Italy.

^fAlso at Università di Milano Bicocca, Milano, Italy.

^gAlso at LIFAELS, La Salle, Universitat Ramon Llull, Barcelona, Spain.

^hAlso at Università di Bologna, Bologna, Italy.

ⁱAlso at Università di Roma Tor Vergata, Roma, Italy.

^jAlso at Università di Genova, Genova, Italy.

^kAlso at AGH - University of Science and Technology, Faculty of Computer Science, Electronics and Telecommunications, Kraków, Poland.

^lAlso at Universidade Federal do Triângulo Mineiro (UFMT), Uberaba-MG, Brazil.

^mAlso at Università di Cagliari, Cagliari, Italy.

ⁿAlso at Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa, Italy.

^oAlso at Hanoi University of Science, Hanoi, Viet Nam.

^pAlso at Università di Bari, Bari, Italy.

^qAlso at Università di Roma La Sapienza, Roma, Italy.

^rAlso at Università di Pisa, Pisa, Italy.

^sAlso at Università di Urbino, Urbino, Italy.

^tAlso at P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Russian Academy of Science (LPI RAS), Moscow, Russia.