## Evidence for an Anomalous Like-Sign Dimuon Charge Asymmetry
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We measure the charge asymmetry $A \equiv\left(N^{++}-N^{--}\right) /\left(N^{++}+N^{--}\right)$of like-sign dimuon events in $6.1 \mathrm{fb}^{-1}$ of $p \bar{p}$ collisions recorded with the D 0 detector at a center-of-mass energy $\sqrt{s}=1.96 \mathrm{TeV}$ at the Fermilab Tevatron collider. From $A$ we extract the like-sign dimuon charge asymmetry in semileptonic $b$-hadron decays: $A_{\mathrm{sl}}^{b}=-0.00957 \pm 0.00251$ (stat) $\pm 0.00146$ (sys). It differs by 3.2 standard deviations from the standard model prediction $A_{\mathrm{sl}}^{b}(\mathrm{SM})=\left(-2.3_{-0.6}^{+0.5}\right) \times 10^{-4}$, and provides first evidence of anomalous $C P$ violation in the mixing of neutral $B$ mesons.
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Studies of particle production and decay under the reversal of discrete symmetries [charge conjugation ( $C$ ), parity $(P)$ and time reversal] have yielded considerable insight into the structure of theories that describe high energy phenomena. The violation of these discrete symmetries has only been observed in the weak interaction. Of particular interest is the observation of $C P$ violation [1], a phenomenon well established in the $K^{0}$ and $B_{d}^{0}$ systems, but not in the $B_{s}^{0}$ system where the effects of $C P$ violation are expected to be small in the standard model (SM) [2]. A review of the experimental results and of the theoretical framework for describing $C P$ violation in the mixing of $B_{q}^{0} \leftrightarrow \bar{B}_{q}^{0}(q=d, s)$ mesons [3] can be found in Ref. [4]. At the Fermilab Tevatron collider, $b$ quarks are produced mainly in $b \bar{b}$ pairs. In like-sign dimuon events, one muon can arise from direct semileptonic decay, e.g., $b \rightarrow \mu^{-} X$, of a $\bar{B}_{q}^{0}$ or $B^{-}$meson, and the other from a $B_{q}^{0} \leftrightarrow \bar{B}_{q}^{0}$ oscillation followed, in this example, by a semileptonic
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decay of the $\bar{B}_{q}^{0}$ meson, $B_{q}^{0} \rightarrow \bar{B}_{q}^{0} \rightarrow \mu^{-} X$. Extensions of the SM containing additional contributions to the Feynman "box" diagrams responsible for $B_{q}^{0}$ mixing may enhance $C P$ violation in mixing [5-9]. The violation of $C P$ symmetry is a necessary condition for baryogenesis, the process thought to be responsible for the matter-antimatter asymmetry of the Universe [10]. However, the observed level of $C P$ violation in the $K^{0}$ and $B_{d}^{0}$ systems is not sufficient to accommodate this asymmetry, suggesting the presence of additional sources of $C P$ violation beyond the SM [11].

This Letter and a more detailed article [12] present a measurement of the charge asymmetry for like-sign muon pairs. The data, corresponding to an integrated luminosity of $6.1 \mathrm{fb}^{-1}$, were recorded with the D0 detector [13] at the Fermilab Tevatron proton-antiproton ( $p \bar{p}$ ) collider, operating at a center-of-mass energy of 1.96 TeV . The D0 experiment is well suited to the investigation of the small
effects of $C P$ violation because the periodic reversal of the D0 solenoid and toroid magnetic field polarities results in a cancellation of most detector-related charge asymmetries. In addition, the $p \bar{p}$ initial state is $C P$ invariant, and the high center-of-mass energy provides access to mass states beyond the reach of the $B$ factories running at $\sqrt{s}=$ $M[\Upsilon(4 S)]<2 M\left(B_{s}\right)$.

The like-sign dimuon charge asymmetry $A$ is defined as

$$
\begin{equation*}
A \equiv \frac{N^{++}-N^{--}}{N^{++}+N^{--}} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $N^{++}$and $N^{--}$represent the number of events in which the two muons with the highest $p_{T}$, defined as the momentum component transverse to the beam axis, satisfying the kinematic selections described below, have the same positive or negative charges. After removing contributions from background and from remaining detector effects, any residual asymmetry is assumed to arise solely from the mixing of $B_{q}^{0}(q=d, s)$ mesons (via $B_{q}^{0} \leftrightarrow \bar{B}_{q}^{0}$ oscillations) that later decay semileptonically. This corrected asymmetry $A_{\mathrm{sl}}^{b}$ is defined as

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{\mathrm{sl}}^{b} \equiv \frac{N_{b}^{++}-N_{b}^{--}}{N_{b}^{++}+N_{b}^{--}} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $N_{b}^{++}$and $N_{b}^{--}$represent the number of events containing two $b$-quark hadrons decaying semileptonically into two positive or two negative muons, respectively. Assuming $C P T$ invariance, each neutral $B_{q}^{0}$ meson contributes a term to this asymmetry

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{\mathrm{sl}}^{b}=\beta_{d} a_{\mathrm{sl}}^{d}+\beta_{s} a_{\mathrm{sl}}^{s} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

with

$$
\begin{equation*}
a_{\mathrm{sl}}^{q}=\frac{\Delta \Gamma_{q}}{\Delta M_{q}} \tan \phi_{q} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\phi_{q}$ is the $C P$-violating phase, and $\Delta M_{q}$ and $\Delta \Gamma_{q}$ are the mass and width differences between the eigenstates of the propagation matrices of the neutral $B_{q}^{0}$ mesons. The values of $\beta_{d}=0.506 \pm 0.043$ and $\beta_{s}=0.494 \pm 0.043$ are taken from previous measurements [4]. The SM predicts [2,12]:

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{\mathrm{sl}}^{b}(\mathrm{SM})=\left(-2.3_{-0.6}^{+0.5}\right) \times 10^{-4} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

and an experimental result significantly different from this expectation would therefore be indicative of the presence of physics beyond the SM.

The main background for these measurements arises from events with at least one muon from kaon or pion decay or from the sequential decay of $b$ quarks, $\bar{b} \rightarrow \bar{c} \rightarrow$ $\mu^{-} X$. The most important background asymmetry arises from the fact that $K^{+}$and $K^{-}$mesons interact differently with the material of the detector, and thus their decay rates into positive and negative muons are not identical.

The asymmetry $A_{\mathrm{sl}}^{b}$ can also be obtained from the measurement of the charge asymmetry $a_{\mathrm{sl}}^{b}$ in semileptonic decays of $b$ quarks to muons of "wrong" charge, i.e., a muon of charge opposite to the sign of the charge of
the original $b$ quark, induced through $B_{q}^{0} \leftrightarrow \bar{B}_{q}^{0}$ oscillations [3]:

$$
\begin{equation*}
a_{\mathrm{sl}}^{b} \equiv \frac{\Gamma\left(\bar{B} \rightarrow B \rightarrow \mu^{+} X\right)-\Gamma\left(B \rightarrow \bar{B} \rightarrow \mu^{-} X\right)}{\Gamma\left(\bar{B} \rightarrow B \rightarrow \mu^{+} X\right)+\Gamma\left(B \rightarrow \bar{B} \rightarrow \mu^{-} X\right)}=A_{\mathrm{sl}}^{b} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

The asymmetry $a_{\mathrm{sl}}^{b}$ can be measured from the inclusive muon charge asymmetry

$$
\begin{equation*}
a \equiv \frac{n^{+}-n^{-}}{n^{+}+n^{-}} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $n^{+}$and $n^{-}$correspond to the number of positive and negative muons satisfying the kinematic selections. For the asymmetry $a$, the signal comes from $B_{q}^{0}$ mixing, followed by the semileptonic decay. In addition to the background already considered for $A$, the direct production of $c$ quark pairs followed by their semileptonic decays constitutes an additional source of muons contributing to $a$.

We define all muons from weak decays of $b$ and $c$ quarks as signal, and use the branching fractions and momentum spectra of particles in the decay chains that produce such muons to determine the dilution of the $A_{\mathrm{sl}}^{b}$ asymmetry in the observed asymmetry of the signal component. The dilutions, defined as the coefficients which relate the signal asymmetries to $A_{\mathrm{sl}}^{b}$, are $0.070 \pm 0.006$ and $0.486 \pm 0.032$ for the inclusive muon and for the like-sign dimuon signal asymmetries, respectively. The difference in the dilution coefficients arises because the presence of the second muon with the same charge preferentially selects those events that contain a $B_{s}^{0}$ or $B_{d}^{0}$ that has oscillated. Therefore, the asymmetry $A$ is far more sensitive to $A_{\mathrm{sl}}^{b}$ than $a$.

We measure the asymmetries $A$ and $a$ in the like-sign dimuon and inclusive muon data, respectively. These have different contributions from background processes and from detector asymmetries, which are measured directly in data as a function of the muon transverse momenta, and are used to correct the measured asymmetries. After applying all corrections, the only expected source of residual asymmetry in both the inclusive muon and dimuon samples is the asymmetry $A_{\mathrm{sl}}^{b}$. Given the difference in sensitivity between $A$ and $a$ and the fact that the asymmetry $a$ is dominated by detector effects, we do not take a weighted average of the two determinations of $A_{\mathrm{sl}}^{b}$. Instead, we use the measurement of $a$ to constrain the background contributions to $A$, thereby achieving a further reduction of the total uncertainty on $A_{\mathrm{sl}}^{b}$. This is possible because the detector effects and their related systematic uncertainties largely cancel in an appropriately-chosen linear combination of $A$ and $a$.

The inclusive muon and like-sign dimuon samples are obtained from data collected with single and dimuon triggers, respectively. Charged particles with transverse momentum in the range $1.5<p_{T}<25 \mathrm{GeV}$ and with pseudorapidity $|\eta|<2.2$ [14] are considered as muon candidates. The upper limit on $p_{T}$ is applied to suppress the contribution of muons from $W$ and $Z$ boson decays. To
ensure that the muon candidate passes through the detector, including all three layers of the muon system, we require either $p_{T}>4.2 \mathrm{GeV}$ or a longitudinal momentum component $\left|p_{z}\right|>6.4 \mathrm{GeV}$. Muon candidates are selected by matching central tracks with a segment reconstructed in the muon system and by applying tight quality requirements aimed at reducing false matching and background from cosmic rays and beam halo. The transverse impact parameter of the muon track relative to the reconstructed $p \bar{p}$ interaction vertex must be smaller than 0.3 cm , with the longitudinal distance from the point of closest approach to this vertex smaller than 0.5 cm . Strict quality requirements are also applied to the tracks and to the reconstructed $p \bar{p}$ interaction vertex. The inclusive muon sample contains all muons passing the selection requirements. The two muons in the like-sign dimuon sample are required to have an invariant mass greater than 2.8 GeV to minimize the number of events in which both muon candidates originate from the same $b$ quark.

Muon candidates from decays of charged kaons and pions and from incomplete absorption of hadrons that penetrate the calorimeter and reach the muon detectors ("punch-through"), as well as false matches of central tracks to segments reconstructed in the outer muon detector, are considered as detector backgrounds. We use data to measure the fraction of each source of background in both the dimuon and inclusive muon samples, and the corresponding asymmetries. Data are also used to determine the intrinsic charge-detection asymmetry of the D0 detector. Since the interaction length of the $K^{+}$meson is greater than that of the $K^{-}$meson [4], kaons provide a positive contribution to the asymmetries $A$ and $a$. The asymmetries for other background sources (pions, protons, and falsely reconstructed tracks) are at least a factor of 10 smaller.

The asymmetry for kaon tracks that are eventually misidentified as muons ( $K \rightarrow \mu$ tracks) is measured in data using $K^{* 0} \rightarrow K^{+} \pi^{-}, \bar{K}^{* 0} \rightarrow K^{-} \pi^{+}$, and $\phi \rightarrow K^{+} K^{-}$decays. For both channels we select muon candidates from the entire inclusive muon sample and examine mass distributions separately for events with $K^{+} \rightarrow \mu^{+}$and $K^{-} \rightarrow$ $\mu^{-}$tracks, extracting the sum and the difference in the number of $K^{* 0}$ or $\phi$ meson decays containing positive or negative $K \rightarrow \mu$ tracks. The distribution of this difference as a function of the invariant mass of the $K^{* 0}$ candidates is shown in Fig. 1. The resulting asymmetry is corrected using simulations [12] for the fraction of kaons ( $\approx 6 \%$ ) that decay prior to being reconstructed. Similarly, the asymmetries for pion or proton tracks misidentified as muons are measured using samples of $K_{S} \rightarrow \pi^{+} \pi^{-}$and $\Lambda \rightarrow p \pi^{-}$decays, respectively.

The fraction of muons from kaons is also determined from the $K^{* 0} \rightarrow K^{+} \pi^{-}$sample. The fraction of all kaons arising from $K^{* 0}$ decay is taken from the observed $K^{* \pm} \rightarrow$ $K_{S} \pi^{ \pm}$decays using the assumption of isospin invariance, which is validated in data [4]. The probability of identifying the associated $\pi^{ \pm}$in the $K^{* 0}$ decay is taken to be the same as in $K^{* \pm}$, as is confirmed by simulation. The frac-
$\times 10{ }^{2}$


FIG. 1 (color online). The difference in the number of events for the $K^{+} \pi^{-}$and $K^{-} \pi^{+}$mass distributions of $K^{* 0}$ candidates in the inclusive muon sample. The solid line represents the result of the fit, while the dashed line shows the background contribution.
tions of pions and protons associated with identified muons, relative to the fraction of muons from kaons, are estimated using the decays $K_{S} \rightarrow \pi^{+} \pi^{-}, \phi \rightarrow K^{+} K^{-}$, and $\Lambda \rightarrow p \pi^{-}$, and the spectra and multiplicities of pions, kaons, and protons from simulation.

After subtracting the muons originating from kaons, pions, and protons, we find the fraction of muons in the inclusive muon sample from prompt sources constituting the signal sample (heavy flavor) to be $0.581 \pm$ 0.014 (stat) $\pm 0.039$ (syst). The signal fraction arising from prompt sources for the like-sign dimuon sample, after subtracting the contribution from events where one or both muons are background, is $0.665 \pm 0.016$ (stat) $\pm$ 0.033 (syst).

The reversal of both solenoid and toroid magnet polarities suppresses many detector effects, reducing thereby any charge asymmetry introduced by track reconstruction and muon identification considerably [15]. The small residual reconstruction asymmetry is measured using a sample of $J / \psi \rightarrow \mu^{+} \mu^{-}$decays reconstructed from two central detector tracks, with at least one matching a track segment in the muon detector. This measurement is performed as a function of the muon $p_{T}$ and indicates a residual detector asymmetry of order $10^{-3}$.

The uncorrected asymmetries $a$ and $A$ are obtained by counting the number of events of each charge in the inclusive muon and like-sign dimuon samples, respectively. There are $1.495 \times 10^{9}$ muons in the inclusive muon sample and $3.731 \times 10^{6}$ events in the like-sign dimuon sample. The uncorrected asymmetries are

$$
\begin{align*}
& a=+0.00955 \pm 0.00003 \text { (stat), }  \tag{8}\\
& A=+0.00564 \pm 0.00053 \text { (stat). } \tag{9}
\end{align*}
$$

In comparison, the dominant contribution to $A$ from background is due to kaon decay and has the value $0.00828 \pm$ 0.00035 (stat). After correcting for background and for the dilutions of the $A_{\mathrm{sl}}^{b}$ asymmetry in the observed asymmetries of the signal component, we obtain

TABLE I. Sources of uncertainty on $A_{\mathrm{sl}}^{b}$ in Eqs. (10), (11), and (13). The first eight rows correspond to statistical uncertainties and the next three rows to systematic uncertainties.

| Source | $\delta\left(A_{\mathrm{sl}}^{b}\right)(10)$ | $\delta\left(A_{\mathrm{sl}}^{b}\right)(11)$ | $\delta\left(A_{\mathrm{sl}}^{b}\right)(13)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $A$ or $a$ (stat) | 0.00066 | 0.00159 | 0.00179 |
| $K$ fraction (stat) | 0.00222 | 0.00123 | 0.00140 |
| $\pi$ fraction | 0.00234 | 0.00038 | 0.00010 |
| $p$ fraction | 0.00301 | 0.00044 | 0.00011 |
| $K$ asymmetry | 0.00410 | 0.00076 | 0.00061 |
| $\pi$ asymmetry | 0.00699 | 0.00086 | 0.00035 |
| $p$ asymmetry | 0.00478 | 0.00054 | 0.00001 |
| Detector asymmetry | 0.00405 | 0.00105 | 0.00077 |
| $K$ fraction (syst) | 0.02137 | 0.00300 | 0.00128 |
| $\pi, K, p$ multiplicity | 0.00098 | 0.00025 | 0.00018 |
| $A_{\mathrm{sl}}^{b}$ dilution | 0.00080 | 0.00046 | 0.00068 |
| Total statistical | 0.01118 | 0.00266 | 0.00251 |
| Total systematic | 0.02140 | 0.00305 | 0.00146 |
| Total | 0.02415 | 0.00405 | 0.00290 |

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{\mathrm{sl}}^{b}=+0.0094 \pm 0.0112(\mathrm{stat}) \pm 0.0214(\mathrm{syst}) \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

from the inclusive muon sample and

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{\mathrm{sl}}^{b}=-0.00736 \pm 0.00266(\text { stat }) \pm 0.00305(\text { syst }) \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

from the like-sign dimuon sample. Since the same background processes contribute to the uncorrected asymmetries $a$ and $A$, their uncertainties are strongly correlated. We take advantage of this correlation to obtain a single optimized value of $A_{\mathrm{sl}}^{b}$ with higher precision, by using a linear combination of the uncorrected asymmetries

$$
\begin{equation*}
A^{\prime} \equiv A-\alpha a \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

We scan the coefficient $\alpha$ in order to minimize the total uncertainty on the value of $A_{\mathrm{sl}}^{b}$, which occurs when $\alpha=$ 0.959 . The corresponding final result for the asymmetry $A_{\mathrm{sl}}^{b}$ is

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{\mathrm{sl}}^{b}=-0.00957 \pm 0.00251(\text { stat }) \pm 0.00146(\text { syst }) \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

It differs by 3.2 standard deviations from the SM prediction for $A_{\mathrm{sl}}^{b}$ of Eq. (5). The contributions to the total uncertainty of $A_{\mathrm{sl}}^{b}$ in Eqs. (10), (11), and (13) are listed in Table I, and the result in Eq. (13) is dominated by statistical uncertainties.

Several consistency checks are performed by dividing the data into smaller samples using additional selections based on data taking periods, muon and track quality requirements, and changing the requirements on impact parameter, transverse momentum, polar angle, and rapidity of the muons. The resulting variations of $A_{\mathrm{sl}}^{b}$ are statistically consistent with the result of Eq. (13), even if the individual values of the uncorrected asymmetries $A$ and $a$ vary widely between the different samples due to changes in the background contributions. Both the size and the dependence on the muon momentum of the asymmetry $a$, which is dominated by background, are reproduced correctly through measurements of the background frac-


FIG. 2 (color online). The observed and expected like-sign dimuon charge asymmetry $A$ as a function of dimuon invariant mass. The expected asymmetry is shown for $A_{\mathrm{sl}}^{b}=0$ and $A_{\mathrm{sl}}^{b}=$ -0.00957 .
tions and asymmetries. Similarly, the dependence of the like-sign dimuon asymmetry on the dimuon invariant mass observed in data, as shown in Fig. 2, is reproduced by expectations when $A_{\mathrm{sl}}^{b}$ is fixed to its measured value, while there are significant discrepancies if $A_{\mathrm{sl}}^{b}=0$ is assumed.

The measured value of $A_{\mathrm{sl}}^{b}$ places a constraint on the charge asymmetries in semileptonic decays of $B_{d}^{0}$ and $B_{s}^{0}$ mesons and on the $C P$-violating phases of the $B_{d}^{0}$ and $B_{s}^{0}$ mixing matrices, as given by Eqs. (3) and (4). Figure 3 presents our measurement of $A_{\mathrm{sl}}^{b}$ in the $a_{\mathrm{sl}}^{d}-a_{\mathrm{sl}}^{s}$ plane, together with direct measurements of $a_{\mathrm{sl}}^{d}$ from the $B$-factories [16-18] and of our independent measurement of $a_{\mathrm{sl}}^{s}$ in


FIG. 3 (color online). Comparison of $A_{\mathrm{sl}}^{b}$ in data with the SM prediction for $a_{\mathrm{sl}}^{d}$ and $a_{\mathrm{sl}}^{s}$. Also shown are other measurements of $a_{\mathrm{sl}}^{d}=-0.0047 \pm 0.0046[16-18]$ and $a_{\mathrm{sl}}^{s}=-0.0017 \pm 0.0091$ [19]. The bands represent the $\pm 1$ standard deviation uncertainties on each measurement.
$B_{s}^{0} \rightarrow D_{s} \mu X$ decays [19]. Additional comparisons and combinations of these results with previous measurements sensitive to the same physics effect are given in Ref. [12].

In conclusion, we have measured the like-sign dimuon charge asymmetry $A_{\mathrm{sl}}^{b}$ of semileptonic $b$-hadron decays:

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{\mathrm{sl}}^{b}=-0.00957 \pm 0.00251(\text { stat }) \pm 0.00146(\text { syst }) \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

This result is consistent with our previous measurement [15] obtained with $1 \mathrm{fb}^{-1}$ and supersedes it. The asymmetry disagrees with the prediction of the SM by 3.2 standard deviations. This is the first evidence for anomalous $C P$ violation in the mixing of neutral $B$ mesons.
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