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Search for the Decays $B^0_s \to \tau^+\tau^-$ and $B^0 \to \tau^+\tau^-$
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A search for the rare decays $B^0 \to \tau^+\tau^-$ and $B^0 \to \tau^+\tau^-$ is performed using proton–proton collision data collected with the LHCb detector. The data sample corresponds to an integrated luminosity of 3 fb$^{-1}$ collected in 2011 and 2012. The $\tau$ leptons are reconstructed through the decay $\tau \to \pi^\pm \pi^\mp \nu_{\tau}$. Assuming no contribution from $B^0 \to \tau^+\tau^-$ decays, an upper limit is set on the branching fraction $B(B^0_s \to \tau^+\tau^-) < 6.8 \times 10^{-3}$ at the 95% confidence level. If instead no contribution from $B^0_s \to \tau^+\tau^-$ decays is assumed, the limit is $B(B^0 \to \tau^+\tau^-) < 2.1 \times 10^{-3}$ at the 95% confidence level. These results correspond to the first direct limit on $B(B^0_s \to \tau^+\tau^-)$ and the world’s best limit on $B(B^0 \to \tau^+\tau^-)$.
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Processes where a $B$ meson decays into a pair of oppositely charged leptons are powerful probes in the search for physics beyond the Standard Model (SM). Recently, the first observation of the $B^0 \to \mu^+\mu^-$ decay was made [1,2] (the inclusion of charge-conjugate processes is implied throughout this Letter). Its measured branching fraction ($B$) is compatible with the SM prediction [3] and imposes stringent constraints on theories beyond the SM. Complementing this result with searches for the tauonic modes $B \to \tau^+\tau^-$, where $B$ can be either a $B^0$ or a $B^0_s$ meson, is of great interest in view of the recent hints of lepton flavor nonuniversality obtained by several experiments. In particular the measurements of $R(D^{(*)}) = [B(B^0 \to D^{(*)}\tau^+\nu_{\tau})]/[B(B^0 \to D^{(*)}\ell^+\nu_{\ell})]$, where $\ell^+$ represents either a muon, an electron or both, are found to be larger than the SM prediction by 3.9 standard deviations ($\sigma$) [4], and the measurement of $R_K = [B(B^0 \to K^+\mu^+\mu^-)]/[B(B^+ \to K^+\ell^+\ell^-)]$ is 2.6$\sigma$ lower than the SM prediction [5]. Possible explanations for these and other [6] deviations from their SM expectations include leptoquarks, $W'/Z'$ bosons, and two-Higgs-doublet models (see, e.g., Refs. [7,8]). In these models, the $B \to \tau^+\tau^-$ branching fractions could be enhanced with respect to the SM predictions, $B(B^0 \to \tau^+\tau^-) = (2.22 \pm 0.19) \times 10^{-8}$ and $B(B^0_s \to \tau^+\tau^-) = (7.73 \pm 0.49) \times 10^{-7}$ [3], by several orders of magnitude [8–12]. All minimal-flavor-violating models predict the same enhancement of $B(B^0_s \to \tau^+\tau^-)$ over $B(B^0 \to \tau^+\tau^-)$ as in the SM.

The experimental search for $B \to \tau^+\tau^-$ decays is complicated by the presence of at least two undetected neutrinos, originating from the decay of the $\tau$ leptons. The BABAR collaboration has searched for the $B^0 \to \tau^+\tau^-$ mode [13] and published an upper limit $B(B^0 \to \tau^+\tau^-) < 4.10 \times 10^{-3}$ at the 90% confidence level (C.L.). There are currently no experimental results for the $B^0 \to \tau^+\tau^-$ mode, though its branching fraction can be indirectly constrained to be less than 3% at the 90% C.L. [14–16].

In this Letter, the first search for the rare decay $B^0 \to \tau^+\tau^-$ is presented, along with a search for the $B^0_s \to \tau^+\tau^-$ decay. The analysis is performed with proton–proton collision data corresponding to integrated luminosities of 1.0 and 2.0 fb$^{-1}$ recorded with the LHCb detector at center-of-mass energies of 7 and 8 TeV, respectively. The $\tau$ leptons are reconstructed through the decay $\tau^+ \to \pi^\mp \pi^\pm \pi^0 \nu_{\tau}$, which proceeds predominantly through the decay chain $\tau \to a_1(1260)^-\nu_{\tau}$, $a_1(1260)^- \to \rho(770)^0\pi^-$ [17]. The branching fraction $B(\tau^+ \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0\nu_{\tau})$ is $(9.31 \pm 0.05)\%$ [18]. Because of the final-state neutrinos, the $\tau^+\tau^-$ mass provides only a weak discrimination between signal and background, and cannot be used as a way to distinguish $B^0_s$ from $B^0$ decays. The number of signal candidates is obtained from a fit to the output of a multivariate classifier that uses a range of kinematic and topological variables as input. Data-driven methods are used to determine signal and background models. The observed signal yield is converted into a branching fraction using as a normalization channel the decay $B^0 \to D^-\bar{D}^+ [19,20]$, with $D^+ \to K^+\pi^+\pi^-$ and $D^- \to K^-K^+\pi^0$.

The LHCb detector, described in detail in Refs. [21,22], is a single-arm forward spectrometer covering the pseudorapidity range $2 < \eta < 5$. The online event selection is performed by a trigger [23], which 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. The hardware trigger stage requires events to have a muon with high transverse momentum ($p_T$) with respect to the beam line or a hadron, photon, or electron...
with high transverse energy in the calorimeters. For hadrons, the transverse energy threshold is around 3.5 GeV, depending on the data-taking conditions. The software trigger requires a two-, three-, or four-track secondary vertex with a significant displacement from the primary \( pp \) interaction vertices (PVs). A multivariate classifier [24] is used for the identification of secondary vertices that are significantly displaced from the PVs, and are consistent with the decay of a \( b \) hadron. At least one charged particle must have \( p_T > 1.7 \text{ GeV}/c \) and be inconsistent with originating from any PV.

Simulated data are used to optimize the selection, obtain the signal model for the fit and determine the selection efficiencies. In the simulation, \( pp \) collisions are generated using PYTHIA [25] with a specific LHCb configuration [26]. Decays of hadrons are described by EVTGEN [27], in which final-state radiation is generated using PHOTOS [28]. The interaction of the generated particles with the detector, and its response, are implemented using the GEANT4 toolkit [29] as described in Ref. [30]. The \( \tau \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^-\nu_\tau \) decays are generated using the resonance chiral Lagrangian model [31] with a tuning based on the BABAR results for the \( \tau \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^-\nu_\tau \) decays [32], implemented in the TAUOLA generator [33].

In the off-line selection of the candidate signal and normalization decays, requirements on the particle identification (PID) [34], track quality, and the impact parameter with respect to any PV are imposed on all charged final-state particles. Three charged tracks, identified as pions for the \( B \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^- \) decays, and pions or kaons for the \( B^0 \rightarrow D^-D_s^+ \) decays, forming a good-quality vertex are combined to make intermediate \( \tau \), \( D^+ \), and \( D_s^+ \) candidates. The kinematic properties of these candidates, like momenta and masses, are calculated from the three-track combinations. The flight directions of the \( \tau \), \( D^+ \), and \( D_s^+ \) candidates are estimated from their calculated momentum vectors. For the \( \tau \) candidates this is a biased estimate due to the missing neutrinos. In turn, \( B \)-meson candidates are reconstructed from two oppositely charged \( \tau \) or from \( D^- \) and \( D_s^+ \) candidates with decay vertices well separated from the PVs. The \( B \)-meson candidates are required to have \( p_T > 2 \text{ GeV}/c \), at least one \( \tau \), \( D^+ \), and \( D_s^+ \) candidate with \( p_T > 4 \text{ GeV}/c \) and at least one pion or kaon with \( p_T > 2 \text{ GeV}/c \). No further selection requirements are imposed on the normalization mode.

For each \( \tau \) candidate, the two-dimensional distribution of the invariant masses \( m_{\pi^+\pi^-} \) of the two oppositely charged two-pion combinations in nine sectors, as illustrated in Fig. 1. Exploiting the intermediate \( \rho(770)^0 \) resonance of the \( \tau \) decays, these sectors are used to define three regions. The signal region consists of \( B \) candidates with both \( \tau \) candidates in sector 5, and is used to determine the signal yield. The signal-depleted region, composed of \( B \) candidates having at least one \( \tau \) candidate in sectors 1, 3, 7, or 9, provides a sample used when optimizing the selection.

The control region corresponds to \( B \) candidates with one \( \tau \) candidate in sectors 4, 5, or 8 and the other in sectors 4 or 8, and provides the background model.

For the \( B \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^- \) modes, further requirements are imposed on two types of isolation variables that are able to discriminate signal from background from partially reconstructed decays with additional charged or neutral particles. The first class of isolation variables, based on the decision of a multivariate classifier trained on simulated signal and other \( b \)-hadron decays, discriminates against processes containing additional charged tracks that either make a good-quality vertex with any selected pion or \( \tau \) candidate, or belong to the same \( b \)-hadron decay as the selected pion candidates. The second class of isolation variables is based on calorimeter activity due to neutral particles in a cone, defined in terms of the pseudorapidity and polar angle, centered on the \( B \) candidate momentum.

In addition to the isolation variables, a method to perform an analytic reconstruction of the \( B \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^- \) decay chain, described in detail in Refs. [35,36], has been developed. It combines geometrical information about the decay and mass constraints on the particles (\( B \), \( \tau \), and \( \nu \)) in the decay chain to calculate the \( \tau \) momenta analytically. The possible solutions for the two \( \tau \) momenta are found as solutions of a system of two coupled equations of second degree with two unknowns. The finite detector resolution and approximations made in the calculation prevent real solutions being found for a substantial fraction of the signal events. However, several intermediate quantities associated with the method are exploited to discriminate signal from background.

To make full use of the discrimination power present in the distributions of the selection variables, a requirement is
added on the output of a neural network [37], built using seven variables: the $\tau^+$ candidate masses and decay times, a charged track isolation variable for the pions, a neutral isolation variable for the $B$ candidate, and one variable from the analytic reconstruction method, introduced in Ref. [36]. The classifier is trained on simulated $B \rightarrow \tau^+ \tau^-$ decays, representing the signal, and data events from the signal-depleted region.

In order to determine the signal yield, a binned maximum likelihood fit is performed on the output of a second neural network (NN), built with 29 variables and using the same training samples. The NN inputs include the eight variables from the analytic reconstruction method listed in Ref. [36], further isolation variables, as well as kinematic and geometrical variables. The NN output is transformed to obtain a flat distribution for the signal over the range $[0.0, 1.0]$, while the background peaks towards zero.

Varying the two-pion invariant mass sector boundaries, the signal region is optimised for the $B^0 \rightarrow \tau^+ \tau^-$ branching fraction limit using pseudoexperiments. The boundaries are set to 615 and 935 MeV/$c^2$. The overall efficiency of the selection, determined using simulated $B^0 \rightarrow \tau^+ \tau^-$ decays, is approximately $2.2(2.4) \times 10^{-5}$, including the geometrical acceptance. Assuming the SM prediction, the number of $B^0 \rightarrow \tau^+ \tau^-$ decays expected in the signal region is 0.02.

After the selection, the signal, signal-depleted, and control regions contain, respectively, 16%, 13%, and 58% of the simulated signal decays. The corresponding fractions of selected candidates in data are 7%, 37%, and 47%. Most signal decays fall into the control region, but the signal region, which contains about 14 700 candidates in data after the full selection, is more sensitive due to its lower background contamination. For the fit, ten equally sized bins of NN output in the range $[0.0, 1.0]$ are considered, where the high NN region $[0.7, 1.0]$ was not investigated until the fit strategy was fixed. The signal model is taken from the $B^0 \rightarrow \tau^+ \tau^-$ simulation, while the background model is taken from the data control region, correcting for the presence of expected signal events in this region. The fit model is given by

$$\mathcal{N}_{data}^{SR} = s \mathcal{N}_{sim}^{SR} + f_b \left( \mathcal{N}_{data}^{CR} - s \mathcal{N}_{data}^{CR} \right),$$

where $\mathcal{N}_{sim}^{SR (data)} (\mathcal{N}_{sim}^{CR (data)})$ is the NN output distribution in the signal (control) region from simulation (data), $s$ is the signal yield in the signal region, $f_b$ is a scaling factor for the background template, and $\mathcal{N}_{data}^{CR}$ is the signal efficiency in the signal (control) region. The quantities $s$ and $f_b$ are left free in the fit. The corresponding normalized distributions $\hat{\mathcal{N}}_{sim}^{SR}$, $\hat{\mathcal{N}}_{sim}^{CR}$, and $\hat{\mathcal{N}}_{data}^{CR}$ are shown in Fig. 2.

The agreement between the background NN output distributions in the control and signal regions has been tested in different samples: in the data for the background-dominated NN output bins $[0.0, 0.7]$, in a generic $b\bar{b}$ simulated sample and in several specific simulated background modes (such as $B^0 \rightarrow D^- \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+$ with $D^- \rightarrow K^0 \pi^- \pi^- \pi^+$, or $B^0 \rightarrow D^-_s \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+$ with $D^- \rightarrow \nu \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+$). Within the statistical uncertainty, the distributions have been found to agree with each other in all cases. The background in the control region can therefore be used to characterize the background in the signal region.

Differences between the shapes of the background distribution in the signal and control regions of the data are the main sources of systematic uncertainties on the background model. These uncertainties are taken into account by allowing each bin in the $\mathcal{N}_{data}^{CR}$ distribution to vary according to a Gaussian constraint. The width of this Gaussian function is determined by splitting the control region into two approximately equally populated samples and taking, for each bin, the maximum difference between the NN outputs of the two subregions and the unsplit sample. The splitting is constructed to have one region more signal-like and one region more backgroundlike.

![FIG. 2. (Left) Normalized NN output distribution in the signal ($\hat{\mathcal{N}}_{sim}^{SR}$) and control ($\hat{\mathcal{N}}_{sim}^{CR}$) region for $B^0 \rightarrow \tau^+ \tau^-$ simulated events. (Right) Normalized NN output distribution in the data control region $\hat{\mathcal{N}}_{data}^{CR}$. The uncertainties reflect the statistics of the (simulated) data.](image-url)
The signal can be mismodeled in the simulation. The $B^0 \to D^- D_s^+$ decay is used to compare data and simulation for the variables used in the NN. Ten variables are found to be slightly mismodeled and their distributions are corrected by weighting. The difference in the shape of the NN output distribution compared to the original unweighted sample is used to derive the associated systematic uncertainty. The fit procedure is validated with pseudoexperiments and is found to be unbiased. Assuming no signal contribution, the expected statistical (systematic) uncertainty on the signal yield is $+6_{-5}^{+4}(_{-4}^{+0})$. The fit result on data is shown in Fig. 3 and gives a signal yield $s = 25.1802 \pm 0.259 \pm 0.015$ [38], which has four contributions: the $B^0 \to D^- D_s^+$ component, described by an exponential function, and two partially reconstructed backgrounds, $B^0 \to D^{*-} D_s^*$ and $B^0 \to D S^+$, modeled as in Ref. [40]. The resulting fit is shown in Fig. 4 and gives a yield of $N^{obs}_{D^- D_s^+} = 10629 \pm 114$, where the uncertainty is statistical.

Uncertainties on $\alpha^s$ arise from the $B^0 \to D^- D_s^+$ fit model, the finite size of the simulated samples, the uncertainty from the corrections to the simulation and external inputs. The latter contribution, which includes the branching fractions and hadronization fractions in Eq. (2), is dominant, giving a relative uncertainty of 17% on $\alpha^s$. The $B^0 \to D^- D_s^+$ fit model is varied using the sum of two Gaussian functions with a common mean and power-law tails instead of the Hypatia function for the signal, a second-order Chebyshev polynomial instead of an exponential function for the combinatorial background, and adding two other background components

$$\alpha^s \equiv \frac{e^{D^- D_s^+} B(B^0 \to D^- D_s^+) B(D^- \to K^+ \pi^- \pi^+) B(D_s^+ \to K^- K^+ \pi^+)}{N^{obs}_{D^- D_s^+} e^{\tau \pi^- \pi^+} \frac{f_d}{f_s},}$$

where $e^{\tau \pi^- \pi^+}$ and $e^{D^- D_s^+}$ are the combined efficiencies of trigger, reconstruction, and selection of the signal and normalization channels. The branching fractions used are $B(B^0 \to D^- D_s^+) = (7.5 \pm 1.1) \times 10^{-3}$ [19], $B(D^- \to K^+ \pi^- \pi^+) = (9.46 \pm 0.24)\%$ [18] and $B(D_s^+ \to K^- K^+ \pi^+) = (5.45 \pm 0.17)\%$ [18], and $f_s/f_d = 0.259 \pm 0.015$ [38] is the ratio of $B_s^0$ to $B^0$ production fractions. The efficiencies are determined using simulation, applying correction factors derived from data. The $B^0 \to D^- D_s^+$ yield, $N^{obs}_{D^- D_s^+}$, is obtained from a fit to the mass distribution, which has four contributions: the $B^0 \to D^- D_s^+$ component, modeled by a Hypatia function [39], a combinatorial background component, described by an exponential function, and two partially reconstructed backgrounds, $B^0 \to D^{*-} D_s^*$ and $B^0 \to D S^+$, modeled as in Ref. [40]. The resulting fit is shown in Fig. 4 and gives a yield of $N^{obs}_{D^- D_s^+} = 10629 \pm 114$, where the uncertainty is statistical.

Uncertainties on $\alpha^s$ arise from the $B^0 \to D^- D_s^+$ fit model, the finite size of the simulated samples, the uncertainty from the corrections to the simulation and external inputs. The latter contribution, which includes the branching fractions and hadronization fractions in Eq. (2), is dominant, giving a relative uncertainty of 17% on $\alpha^s$. The $B^0 \to D^- D_s^+$ fit model is varied using the sum of two Gaussian functions with a common mean and power-law tails instead of the Hypatia function for the signal, a second-order Chebyshev polynomial instead of an exponential function for the combinatorial background, and adding two other background components.
from $B^0 \to D^+D_s^{-}$ and $B^0 \to a_1(1260)^-D_s^{*-}$ decays. The change in signal yield compared to the nominal fit is taken as a systematic uncertainty, adding the contributions from the four variations in quadrature. The overall relative uncertainty on $\alpha^*$ due to $N_{D^0/D_s^{-}}^{\text{obs}}$ (including the fit uncertainty) is 1.7%. Corrections determined from $J/\psi \to \mu^+\mu^-$ and $D^0 \to K^{-}\pi^+$ data control samples are applied for the tracking, PID, and the hadronic hardware trigger efficiencies. The relative uncertainty on $\alpha^*$ due to selection efficiencies is 2.9%, taking into account both the limited size of the simulated samples and the systematic uncertainties. The normalization factor is found to be $\alpha^* = (4.07 \pm 0.70) \times 10^{-5}$.

The shapes of the NN output distributions and the selection efficiencies depend on the parametrization used in the simulation to model the $\tau \to \pi^-\pi^+\pi^-\nu_\tau$ decay. The result obtained with the TAUOLA BABAR-tune model is therefore compared to available alternatives [41], which are based on CLEO data for the $\tau \to \pi^-\pi^0\rho^0\nu_\tau$ decay [42]. The selection efficiency for these alternative models can be up to 20% higher, due to different structures in the two-pion invariant mass, resulting in lower limits. Dependence of the NN signal output distribution on the $\tau$-decay model is found to be negligible. Since the alternative models are based on a different $\tau$ decay, the BABAR-tune model is chosen as default and no systematic uncertainty is assigned.

The signal yield obtained from the likelihood fit is translated into an upper limit on the $B^0 \to \tau^+\tau^-$ branching fraction using the $C_\ell$ method [43,44]. Assuming no contribution from $B^0 \to \tau^+\tau^-$ decays, an upper limit is set on the $B^0 \to \tau^+\tau^-$ branching fraction of $5.2(6.8) \times 10^{-3}$ at 90% (95%) C.L. This is the first experimental limit on $B(B^0 \to \tau^+\tau^-)$. The analysis is repeated for the $B^0 \to \tau^+\tau^-$ decay. The fit is performed by replacing the signal model with that derived from simulated $B^0 \to \tau^+\tau^-$ decays, giving $s = -15^{+67}_{-56} \text{(stat)}^{+44}_{-42} \text{(syst)}$ [36]. The expected statistical (systematic) uncertainty on the signal yield is $\frac{s}{\sqrt{s}} = (58^\pm 33)$. The corresponding normalization factor is $\alpha^* = (1.16 \pm 0.19) \times 10^{-5}$. The limit obtained is $B(B^0 \to \tau^+\tau^-) < 1.6(2.1) \times 10^{-3}$ at 90% (95%) C.L., which constitutes a factor of 2.6 improvement with respect to the BABAR result [13] and is the current best limit on $B(B^0 \to \tau^+\tau^-)$.
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