VOLUME 93, NUMBER 3

Search for $B_s^0 \to \mu^+ \mu^-$ and $B_d^0 \to \mu^+ \mu^-$ Decays in $p\bar{p}$ Collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 1.96$ TeV

D. Acousta,¹⁵ T. Affolder,⁸ T. Akimoto,⁵³ M.G. Albrow,¹⁴ D. Ambrose,⁴² S. Amerio,⁴¹ D. Amidei,³² A. Anastassov,⁴⁹ K. Anikeev,³⁰ A. Annovi,⁴³ J. Antos,¹ M. Aoki,⁵³ G. Apollinari,¹⁴ T. Arisawa,⁵⁵ J.-F. Arguin,³¹ A. Artikov,¹² W. Ashmanskas,² A. Attal,⁶ F. Azfar,⁴⁰ P. Azzi-Bacchetta,⁴¹ N. Bacchetta,⁴¹ H. Bachacou,²⁷ W. Badgett,¹⁴ A. Barbaro-Galtieri,²⁷ G. J. Barker,²⁴ V. E. Barnes,⁴⁵ B. A. Barnett,²³ S. Baroiant,⁵ M. Barone,¹⁶ G. Bauer,³⁰ F. Bedeschi,⁴³ S. Behari,²³ S. Belforte,⁵² G. Bellettini,⁴³ J. Bellinger,⁵⁷ D. Benjamin,¹³ A. Beretvas,¹⁴ A. Bhatti,⁴⁷ M. Binkley,¹⁴ D. Bisello,⁴¹ M. Bishai,¹⁴ R. E. Blair,² C. Blocker,⁴ K. Bloom,³² B. Blumenfeld,²³ A. Bocci,⁴⁷ A. Bodek,⁴⁶ G. Bolla,⁴⁵ A. Bolshov,³⁰ P.S. L. Booth,²⁸ D. Bortoletto,⁴⁵ J. Boudreau,⁴⁴ S. Bourov,¹⁴ C. Bromberg,³³ E. Brubaker,²⁷ J. Budagov,¹² H. S. Budd,⁴⁶ K. Burkett,¹⁴ G. Busetto,⁴¹ P. Bussey,¹⁸ K. L. Byrum,² S. Cabrera,¹³ P. Calafiura,²⁷ M. Campanelli,¹⁷ M. Campbell,³² A. Canepa,⁴⁵ M. Casarsa,⁵² D. Carlsmith,⁵⁷ S. Carron,¹³ R. Carosi,⁴³ A. Castro,³ P. Catastini,⁴³ D. Cauz,⁵² A. Cerri,²⁷ C. Cerri,⁴³ L. Cerrito,²² J. Chapman,³² C. Chen,⁴² Y.C. Chen,¹ M. Chertok,⁵ G. Chiarelli, ⁴³ G. Chlachidze, ¹² F. Chlebana, ¹⁴ I. Cho, ²⁶ K. Cho, ²⁶ D. Chokheli, ¹² M. L. Chu, ¹ S. Chuang, ⁵⁷ J. Y. Chung, ³⁷
W.-H. Chung, ⁵⁷ Y. S. Chung, ⁴⁶ C. I. Ciobanu, ²² M. A. Ciocci, ⁴³ A. G. Clark, ¹⁷ D. Clark, ⁴ M. Coca, ⁴⁶ A. Connolly, ²⁷
M. Convery, ⁴⁷ J. Conway, ⁴⁹ M. Cordelli, ¹⁶ G. Cortiana, ⁴¹ J. Cranshaw, ⁵¹ J. Cuevas, ⁹ R. Culbertson, ¹⁴ C. Currat, ²⁷
D. Cyr, ⁵⁷ D. Dagenhart, ⁴ S. Da Ronco, ⁴¹ S. D'Auria, ¹⁸ P. de Barbaro, ⁴⁶ S. De Cecco, ⁴⁸ G. De Lentdecker, ⁴⁶ S. Dell'Agnello, ¹⁶ M. Dell'Orso, ⁴³ S. Demers, ⁴⁶ L. Demortier, ⁴⁷ M. Dininno, ³ D. De Pedis, ⁴⁸ P. F. Derwent, ¹⁴ T. Devlin,⁴⁹ C. Dionisi,⁴⁸ J. R. Dittmann,¹⁴ P. Doksus,²² A. Dominguez,²⁷ S. Donati,⁴³ M. Donega,¹⁷ M. D'Onnofrio,¹⁷ T. Dorigo,⁴¹ V. Drollinger,³⁵ K. Ebina,⁵⁵ N. Eddy,²² R. Ely,²⁷ R. Erbacher,¹⁴ M. Erdmann,²⁴ D. Errede,²² S. Errede,²² R. Eusebi,⁴⁶ H.-C. Fang,²⁷ S. Farrington,²⁸ I. Fedorko,⁴³ R. G. Feild,⁵⁸ M. Feindt,²⁴ J. P. Fernandez,⁴⁵ C. Ferretti,³² R. D. Field,¹⁵ I. Fiori,⁴³ G. Flanagan,³³ B. Flaugher,¹⁴ L. R. Flores-Castillo,⁴⁴ A. Foland,¹⁹ S. Forrester,⁵ G.W. Foster,¹⁴ M. Franklin,¹⁹ H. Frisch,¹¹ Y. Fujii,²⁵ I. Furic,³⁰ A. Gajjar,²⁸ A. Gallas,³⁶ J. Galyardt,¹⁰ M. Gallinaro,⁴⁷ M. Garcia-Sciveres,²⁷ A. F. Garfinkel,⁴⁵ C. Gay,⁵⁸ H. Gerberich,¹³ D.W. Gerdes,³² E. Gerchtein,¹⁰ S. Giagu,⁴⁸ P. Giannetti,⁴³ A. Gibson,²⁷ K. Gibson,¹⁰ C. Ginsburg,⁵⁷ K. Giolo,⁴⁵ M. Giordani,⁵² G. Giurgiu,¹⁰ V. Glagolev,¹² D. Glenzinski,¹⁴ M. Gold,³⁵ N. Goldschmidt,³² D. Goldstein,⁶ J. Goldstein,⁴⁰ G. Gomez,⁹ G. Gomez-Ceballos,³⁰ M. Gondcharov,⁵⁰ O. González,⁴⁵ I. Gorelov,³⁵ A.T. Goshaw,¹³ Y. Gotra,⁴⁴ K. Goulianos,⁴⁷ A. Gresele,³ C. Grosso-Pilcher,¹¹ M. Guenther,⁴⁵ J. Guimaraes da Costa,¹⁹ C. Haber,²⁷ K. Hahn,⁴² S. R. Hahn,¹⁴ E. Halkiadakis,⁴⁶ R. Handler,⁵⁷ F. Happacher,¹⁶ K. Hara,⁵³ M. Hare,⁵⁴ R. F. Harr,⁵⁶ R. M. Harris,¹⁴ F. Hartmann,²⁴ K. Hatakeyama,⁴⁷ J. Hauser,⁶ C. Hays,¹³ H. Hayward,²⁸ E. Heider,⁵⁴ B. Heinemann,²⁸ J. Heinrich,⁴² M. Hennecke,²⁴ M. Herndon,²³ C. Hill,⁸ D. Hirschbuehl,²⁴ A. Hocker,⁴⁶ K. D. Hoffman,¹¹ A. Holloway,¹⁹ S. Hou,¹ M. A. Houlden,²⁸ B. T. Huffman,⁴⁰ Y. Huang,¹³ R. E. Hughes,³⁷ J. Huston,³³ K. Ikado,⁵⁵ J. Incandela,⁸ G. Introzzi,⁴³ M. Iori,⁴⁸ Y. Ishizawa,⁵³ C. Issever,⁸ A. Ivanov,⁴⁶ Y. Iwata,²¹ B. Iyutin,³⁰ E. James,¹⁴ D. Jang,⁴⁹ J. Jarrell,³⁵ D. Jeans,⁴⁸ H. Jensen,¹⁴ E. J. Jeon,²⁶ M. Jones,⁴⁵ K. K. Joo,²⁶ S. Jun,¹⁰ T. Junk,²² T. Kamon,⁵⁰ J. Kang,³² M. Karagoz Unel,³⁶ P. E. Karchin,⁵⁶ S. Kartal,¹⁴ Y. Kato,³⁹ Y. Kemp,²⁴ R. Kephart,¹⁴ U. Kerzel,²⁴ V. Khotilovich,⁵⁰ B. Kilminster,³⁷ D. H. Kim,²⁶ H. S. Kim,²² J. E. Kim,²⁶ M. J. Kim,¹⁰ M. S. Kim,²⁶ S. B. Kim,²⁶ S. H. Kim,⁵³ T. H. Kim,³⁰ Y. K. Kim,¹¹ B. T. King,²⁸ M. Kirby,¹³ L. Kirsch,⁴ S. Klimenko,¹⁵ B. Knuteson,³⁰ B. R. Ko,¹³ H. Kobayashi,⁵³ P. Koehn,³⁷ D. J. Kong,²⁶ K. Kondo,⁵⁵ J. Kongisberg,¹⁵ K. Kordas,³¹ A. Korn,³⁰ A. Korytov,¹⁵ K. Kotelnikov,³⁴ A.V. Kotwal,¹³ A. Kovalev,⁴² J. Kraus,²² I. Kravchenko,³⁰ A. Kreymer,¹⁴ J. Kroll,⁴² M. Kruse,¹³ V. Krutelyov,⁵⁰ S. E. Kuhlmann,² N. Kuznetsova,¹⁴ A. T. Laasanen,⁴⁵ S. Lai,³¹ S. Lami,⁴⁷ S. Lammel,¹⁴ J. Lancaster,¹³ M. Lancaster,²⁹ R. Lander,⁵ K. Lannon,³⁷ A. Lath,⁴⁹ G. Latino,³⁵ R. Lauhakangas,²⁰ I. Lazzizzera,⁴¹ Y. Le,²³ C. Lecci,²⁴ T. LeCompte,² J. Lee,²⁶ J. Lee,⁴⁶ S.W. Lee,⁵⁰ N. Leonardo,³⁰ S. Leone,⁴³ J. D. Lewis,¹⁴ K. Li,⁵⁸ C. Lin,⁵⁸ C. S. Lin,¹⁴ M. Lindgren,⁶ T. M. Liss,²² D. O. Litvintsev,¹⁴ T. Liu,¹⁴ Y. Liu,¹⁷ N. S. Lockyer,⁴² A. Loginov,³⁴ M. Loreti,⁴¹ P. Loverre,⁴⁸ R.-S. Lu,¹ D. Lucchesi,⁴¹ P. Lukens,¹⁴ L. Lyons,⁴⁰ J. Lys,²⁷ R. Lysak,¹ D. MacQueen,³¹ R. Madrak,¹⁹ K. Maeshima,¹⁴ P. Maksimovic,²³ L. Malferrari,³ G. Manca,²⁸ R. Marginean,³⁷ M. Martin,²³ A. Martin,⁵⁸ V. Martin,³⁶ M. Martiínez,¹⁴ T. Maruyama,¹¹ H. Matsunaga,⁵³ M. Mattson,⁵⁶ P. Mazzanti,³ K. S. McFarland,⁴⁶ D. McGivern,²⁹ P. M. McIntyre,⁵⁰ P. McNamara,⁴⁹ R. McNulty,²⁸ S. Menzemer,³⁰ A. Menzione,⁴³ P. Merkel,¹⁴ C. Mesropian,⁴⁷ A. Messina,⁴⁸ T. Miao,¹⁴ N. Miladinovic,⁴ L. Miller,¹⁹ R. Miller,³³ J. S. Miller,³² R. Miquel,²⁷ S. Miscetti,¹⁶ G. Mitselmakher,¹⁵ A. Miyamoto,²⁵ Y. Miyazaki,³⁹ N. Moggi,³ B. Mohr,⁶ R. Moore,¹⁴ M. Morello,⁴³ T. Moulik,⁴⁵ A. Mukherjee,¹⁴ M. Mulhearn,³⁰ T. Muller,²⁴ R. Mumford,²³
A. Munar,⁴² P. Murat,¹⁴ J. Nachtman,¹⁴ S. Nahn,⁵⁸ I. Nakamura,⁴² I. Nakano,³⁸ A. Napier,⁵⁴ R. Napora,²³ D. Naumov,³⁵ V. Necula,¹⁵ F. Niell,³² J. Nielsen,²⁷ C. Nelson,¹⁴ T. Nelson,¹⁴ C. Neu,⁴² M. S Neubauer,⁷ C. Newman-Holmes,¹⁴

A.-S. Nicollerat,¹⁷ T. Nigmanov,⁴³ L. Nodulman,² K. Oesterberg,²⁰ T. Ogawa,⁵⁵ S. Oh,¹³ Y. D. Oh,²⁶ T. Ohsugi,²¹ T. Okusawa,³⁹ R. Oldeman,⁴⁸ R. Orava,²⁰ W. Orejudos,²⁷ C. Pagliarone,⁴³ F. Palmonari,⁴³ R. Paoletti,⁴³ V. Papadimitriou,⁵¹ S. Pashapour,³¹ J. Patrick,¹⁴ G. Pauletta,⁵² M. Paulini,¹⁰ T. Pauly,⁴⁰ C. Paus,⁶⁰ D. Pellett, ⁵ A. Penzo,⁵² T. J. Phillips,¹³ G. Piacentino,⁴³ J. Piedra,⁹ K. T. Pitts,²² C. Plager,⁶ A. Ponkov,¹⁶ G. Punzi,⁴³ J. Rademacker,⁴⁰ O. Poukhov,¹² E. Prakoshyn,¹² T. Pratt,²⁸ A. Pronko,¹⁵ J. Proudfoot,² F. Ptohos,¹⁶ G. Punzi,⁴³ J. Rademacker,⁴⁰ A. Rakitine,³⁰ S. Rappoccio,¹⁸ F. Ratnikov,⁴⁰ H. Ray,³² A. Reichold,⁴⁰ V. Rekovic,³⁵ P. Renton,⁴⁰ M. Rescigno,⁴⁸ F. Rimondi,³ K. Rinnert,²⁴ L. Ristori,⁴³ W. J. Robertson,¹³ A. Robson,⁴⁰ T. Rodrigo,⁹ S. Rolli,⁵⁴ L. Rosenson,³⁰ R. Roser,¹⁴ R. Rossin,⁴¹ C. Rutt,⁴⁵ J. Russ,¹⁰ A. Ruiz,⁹ D. Ryan,⁵⁴ H. Saarikko,²⁰ A. Safonov,⁵ R. St. Denis,¹⁸ W. K. Sakumoto,⁴⁶ G. Salamanna,⁴⁸ D. Saltzberg,⁶ C. Sanchez,³⁷ A. Sansoni,¹⁶ L. Santi,⁵² S. Sarkar,⁴⁸ K. Sato,⁵³ P. Savard,³¹ P. Schemitz,²⁴ P. Schlabach,¹⁴ E. E. Schmidt,¹⁴ M. P. Schmidt,⁵⁶ M. Schmitt,³⁵ L. Scodellaro,⁴¹ I. Sfligoi,¹⁶ T. Shears,²⁸ A. Scribano,⁴³ F. Scuri,⁴³ A. Sefov,⁴⁵ S. Seidel,³⁵ Y. Seiya,³⁹ F. Semeria,³ L. Sexton-Kennedy,¹⁴ M. D. Shapiro,²⁷ P. F. Shepard,⁴⁴ M. Shimojima,⁵⁵ M. Shochet,¹¹ Y. Shon,⁵⁷ I. Shreyber,³⁴ A. Sidoti,⁴³ M. Siket,¹ A. Sill,⁵¹ P. Sinervo,³¹ A. Sisakyan,¹² A. Skiba,²⁴ A. J. Slaughter,¹⁴ K. Sliwa,⁵⁴ J. R. Smith,⁵ F. D. Snider,¹⁴ R. Snihur,³¹ S. V. Somalwar,⁴⁹ J. Spalding,¹⁴ M. Spezziga,⁵¹ L. Spinella,⁴³ M. Spiropulu,⁸ P. Squillacioti,⁴³ H. Stadie,²⁴ A. Stefani,⁴³ M. Stetzer,³¹ O. Stelzer-Chilton,³¹ J. Strologa,⁵⁵ D. Stuart,⁸ A. Sukhanov,¹⁵ K. Sumorok,³⁰ H. Sun,⁴ T. Suzuki,³³ A. Taffard,²² R. Tafaka,⁸¹ S. Tapprogge,²⁰ M. Tecchio

(CDF Collaboration)

¹Institute of Physics, Academia Sinica, Taipei, Taiwan 11529, Republic of China

²Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, Illinois 60439, USA

³Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, University of Bologna, I-40127 Bologna, Italy

⁴Brandeis University, Waltham, Massachusetts 02254, USA

⁵University of California at Davis, Davis, California 95616, USA

⁶University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California 90024, USA

⁷University of California at San Diego, La Jolla, California 92093, USA

⁸University of California at Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, California 93106, USA

⁹Instituto de Fisica de Cantabria, CSIC-University of Cantabria, 39005 Santander, Spain

¹⁰Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213, USA

¹¹Enrico Fermi Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois 60637, USA

¹² Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, RU-141980 Dubna, Russia

¹³Duke University, Durham, North Carolina 27708, USA

¹⁴Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, Illinois 60510, USA

¹⁵University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32611, USA

¹⁶Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, I-00044 Frascati, Italy

¹⁷University of Geneva, CH-1211 Geneva 4, Switzerland

¹⁸Glasgow University, Glasgow G12 8QQ, United Kingdom

¹⁹Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, USA

²⁰The Helsinki Group, Helsinki Institute of Physics; and Division of High Energy Physics, Department of Physical Sciences,

University of Helsinki, FIN-00044, Helsinki, Finland

²¹Hiroshima University, Higashi-Hiroshima 724, Japan

²²University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61801, USA

²³The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland 21218, USA

²⁴Institut für Experimentelle Kernphysik, Universität Karlsruhe, 76128 Karlsruhe, Germany

²⁵High Energy Accelerator Research Organization (KEK), Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305, Japan

²⁶Center for High Energy Physics, Kyungpook National University, Taegu 7020701, Korea; Seoul National University, Seoul 151-

742, Korea; and SungKyunKwan University, Suwon 440-746, Korea

²⁷Ernest Orlando Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, California 94720, USA

²⁸University of Liverpool, Liverpool L69 7ZE, United Kingdom

²⁹University College London, London WC1E 6BT, United Kingdom

³⁰Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, USA

³¹Institute of Particle Physics, McGill University, Montréal, Canada H3A 2T8 and University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada M5S 1A7

³²University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109, USA

³³Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824, USA

³⁴Institution for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, ITEP, Moscow 117259, Russia

³⁵University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131, USA

³⁶Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois 60208, USA

³⁷The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210, USA

³⁸Okayama University, Okayama 700-8530, Japan

³⁹Osaka City University, Osaka 588, Japan

⁴⁰University of Oxford, Oxford OX1 3RH, United Kingdom

⁴¹Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Sezione di Padova-Trento, University of Padova, I-35131 Padova, Italy

⁴²University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104, USA

⁴³Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, University and Scuola Normale Superiore of Pisa, I-56100 Pisa, Italy

⁴⁴University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260, USA

⁴⁵Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana 47907, USA

⁴⁶University of Rochester, Rochester, New York 14627, USA

⁴⁷The Rockefeller University, New York, New York 10021, USA

⁴⁸Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Sezione di Roma 1, University di Roma "La Sapienza," I-00185 Roma, Italy

⁴⁹Rutgers University, Piscataway, New Jersey 08855, USA

⁵⁰Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas 77843, USA

⁵¹Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas 79409, USA

⁵²Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, University of Trieste, Udine, Italy

⁵³University of Tsukuba, Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305, Japan

⁵⁴Tufts University, Medford, Massachusetts 02155, USA

⁵⁵Waseda University, Tokyo 169, Japan

⁵⁶Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan 48210, USA

⁵⁷University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706, USA

⁵⁸Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut 06520, USA

(Received 19 March 2004; published 13 July 2004)

We report on a search for $B_s^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ and $B_d^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ decays in $p\bar{p}$ collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 1.96$ TeV using 171 pb⁻¹ of data collected by the CDF II experiment at the Fermilab Tevatron Collider. The decay rates of these rare processes are sensitive to contributions from physics beyond the standard model. One event survives all our selection requirements, consistent with the background expectation. We derive branching ratio limits of $\mathcal{B}(B_s^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-) < 5.8 \times 10^{-7}$ and $\mathcal{B}(B_d^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-) < 1.5 \times 10^{-7}$ at 90% confidence level.

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.93.032001

PACS numbers: 14.40.Nd, 13.20.He

The rare flavor-changing neutral current decay $B_s^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ [1] is one of the most sensitive probes to physics beyond the standard model (SM) [2–6]. The decay has not been observed and is currently limited to $\mathcal{B}(B_s^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-) < 2.0 \times 10^{-6}$ at 90% confidence level (C.L.) [7], while the SM prediction is $(3.5 \pm 0.9) \times 10^{-9}$ [8]. The limit on the related branching ratio, $\mathcal{B}(B_s^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-) < 1.6 \times 10^{-7}$ [9], is approximately 1000 times larger than its SM expectation. The $\mathcal{B}(B_s^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)$ can be significantly enhanced in various supersymmetric (SUSY) extensions of the SM. Minimal supergravity models at large $\tan\beta$ [3–5] predict $\mathcal{B}(B_s^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-) < \mathcal{O}(10^{-7})$ in regions of parameter space consistent with the observed

muon g - 2 [10] and also with the observed relic density of cold dark matter [11]. SO(10) models [6], which naturally accommodate neutrino masses, predict a branching ratio as large as 10^{-6} in regions of parameter space consistent with these same experimental constraints. *R*-parity violating SUSY models can also accommodate $\mathcal{B}(B_s^0 \to \mu^+ \mu^-)$ up to 10^{-6} [4]. Correspondingly, the $\mathcal{B}(B_d^0 \to \mu^+ \mu^-)$ can be enhanced by the same models. Even modest improvements to the experimental limits can significantly restrict the available parameter space of these models.

We report on a search for $B_s^0 \to \mu^+ \mu^-$ and $B_d^0 \to \mu^+ \mu^-$ decays using the upgraded Collider Detector at

Fermilab (CDF II) at the Tevatron $p\bar{p}$ collider. The CDF II detector consists of a magnetic spectrometer surrounded by calorimeters and muon chambers and is described in detail in Ref. [12]. A cylindrical drift chamber (COT) provides 96 measurement layers, organized into alternating axial and $\pm 2^{\circ}$ stereo superlayers [13], and a five-layer silicon microstrip detector (SVX II) provides precise tracking information near the beam line [14]. These are immersed in a 1.4 T magnetic field and measure charged particle momenta in the plane transverse to the beam line, p_T . Four layers of planar drift chambers (CMU) detect muons which penetrate the five absorption lengths of calorimeter steel [15]. Another four layers of planar drift chambers (CMP) instrument 0.6 m of steel outside the magnet return yoke [16]. The CMU and CMP chambers each provide coverage in the pseudorapidity range $|\eta| <$ 0.6, where $\eta = -\ln(\tan\frac{\theta}{2})$ and θ is the angle of the track with respect to the beam line. The data set reported here corresponds to an integrated luminosity of $\mathcal{L} = 171 \pm$ 10 pb⁻¹ [17].

The data used in this analysis are selected by dimuon triggers. Muons are reconstructed as track stubs in the CMU chambers. Two well-separated stubs are required and each is matched to a track reconstructed online using COT axial information [18]. The matched tracks must have $p_T > 1.5 \text{ GeV}/c$. A complete event reconstruction performed online confirms the p_T and track-stub matching requirements. If the overlapping CMP chambers contain a confirming muon stub, the track is required to have $p_T > 3 \text{ GeV}/c$. The two tracks must originate from the same vertex, be oppositely charged, and have an opening angle inconsistent with a cosmic ray event. The invariant mass of the muon pair must satisfy $M_{\mu^+\mu^-} < 6 \text{ GeV}/c^2$. Events in which neither muon is reconstructed with a CMP stub must additionally satisfy $p_T^{\mu^+} + p_T^{\mu^-} > 5 \text{ GeV}/c$ and $M_{\mu^+\mu^-} > 2.7 \text{ GeV}/c^2$. This set of triggers is used for all the data included here and events passing these requirements are recorded for further analysis.

Our offline analysis begins by identifying the muon candidates and matching them to the trigger tracks using COT hit information. To avoid regions of rapidly changing trigger efficiency, we omit muons with $p_T <$ 2 GeV/c. To reduce backgrounds from fake muons, stricter track-stub matching requirements are made and the vector sum of the muon momenta must satisfy $|\vec{p}_T^{\mu^+\mu^-}| > 6 \text{ GeV}/c$. To ensure good vertex resolution, stringent requirements are made on the number of SVX II hits associated with each track. Surviving events have the two muon tracks constrained to a common 3D vertex satisfying vertex quality requirements. The two-dimensional decay length, $|L_T|$, is calculated as the transverse distance from the beam line to the dimuon vertex and is signed relative to $\vec{p}_T^{\mu^+\mu^-}$. For each *B* candidate we estimate the proper decay length using $\lambda = cM_{\mu^+\mu^-}|\vec{L}_T|/|\vec{p}_T^{\mu^+\mu^-}|$. In the data, 2981 events survive all the above trigger and offline reconstruction requirements. This forms a background-dominated sample with contributions from two principal sources: combinatoric background events with a fake muon and events from generic *B*-hadron decays (e.g., sequential semileptonic decays $b \rightarrow c\mu^- X \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^- X$ or double semileptonic decay in gluon splitting events $g \rightarrow b\bar{b} \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^- X$).

We model the signal decays using the PYTHIA Monte Carlo (MC) program [19] tuned to inclusive *B*-hadron data [20]. The PYTHIA events are passed through a full detector simulation and satisfy the same requirements as the data. To normalize to experimentally determined cross sections, we require $p_T(B_{s(d)}^0) > 6 \text{ GeV}/c$ and rapidity |y| < 1.

To discriminate $B^0_{s(d)} \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ decays from background events we use these four variables: the invariant mass of the muon pair $(M_{\mu^+\mu^-})$, the *B*-candidate proper decay length (λ), the opening angle ($\Delta\Phi$) between the *B*-hadron flight direction (estimated as the vector $\vec{p}_T^{\mu^+\mu^-}$) and the vector \vec{L}_T , and the *B*-candidate track isolation (*I*) [21]. Figure 1 shows the distributions of these variables for background-dominated data and MC signal events.

A "blind" analysis technique is used to determine the optimal selection criteria for these four variables. The data in the search window $5.169 < M_{\mu^+\mu^-} < 5.469 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ are hidden, and the optimization is performed using only data in the sideband regions, $4.669 < M_{\mu^+\mu^-} < 5.169 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ and $5.469 < M_{\mu^+\mu^-} < 5.969 \text{ GeV}/c^2$. The search region corresponds to approximately ± 4 times the two-track invariant mass resolution centered on the B_s^0 and B_d^0 masses [22]. We use the set of $(M_{\mu^+\mu^-}, \lambda, \Delta\Phi, I)$ criteria which minimizes the *a priori*



FIG. 1. Arbitrarily normalized distributions of the discriminating variables for events in our background-dominated data sample (solid line) compared to Monte Carlo $B_s^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^$ events (dashed line).

expected 90% C.L. upper limit on the branching ratio. For a given number of observed events n and an expected background of n_{bg} , the branching ratio is determined using

$$\mathcal{B}(B_s^0 \to \mu^+ \mu^-) \leq \frac{N(n, n_{\rm bg})}{2\sigma_{B_r^0} \mathcal{L} \alpha \epsilon_{\rm total}},$$

where $N(n, n_{bg})$ is the number of candidate $B_s^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^$ decays at 90% C.L., estimated using the Bayesian approach of Ref. [23] and incorporating the uncertainties into the limit. The *a priori* expected limit is given by the sum over all possible observations, *n*, weighted by the corresponding Poisson probability when expecting n_{bg} . The B_s^0 production cross section is estimated as $\sigma_{B_s^0} = \frac{f_s}{f_u} = \frac{0.100}{0.391}$ [24] and σ_{B^+} is taken from Ref. [25]. For the $B_d^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ limit we substitute $\sigma_{B_d^0}$ for $\sigma_{B_s^0}$, f_d for f_s , and assume $f_d = f_u$. The factor of 2 in the denominator accounts for the charge-conjugate *B*-hadron final states. The expected background n_{bg} and the total acceptance times efficiency $\alpha \epsilon_{\text{total}}$ are estimated separately for each combination of requirements.

For both signal and background, the variables λ and $\Delta \Phi$ are the only correlated variables with a linear correlation of -0.3. Thus we estimate the number of background events as $n_{\rm bg} = n_{\rm sb}(\lambda, \Delta \Phi) f_I f_M$, where $n_{\rm sb}(\lambda, \Delta \Phi)$ is the number of sideband events passing a particular set of λ and $\Delta \Phi$ cuts, f_I is the fraction of background events that survive a given I requirement, and f_M is the ratio of the number of events in the search window to the number of events in the sideband regions. Since $M_{\mu^+\mu^-}$ and I are uncorrelated with the rest of the variables, we evaluate f_M and f_I on samples with no λ or $\Delta \Phi$ requirement, thus reducing their associated uncertainty.

We estimate f_I from the background-dominated sample for a variety of thresholds. We investigate sources of systematic bias by calculating f_I in bins of $M_{\mu^+\mu^-}$ and λ and conservatively assign a relative systematic uncertainty of $\pm 5\%$. Since the $M_{\mu^+\mu^-}$ distribution of the background-dominated sample is well described by a firstorder polynomial, f_M is given by the ratio of widths of the search to sideband regions.

MC studies demonstrate that our estimate of n_{bg} accurately accounts for generic $b\bar{b}$ contributions, while two-body decays of *B* mesons $(B^0_{s(d)} \rightarrow h^+h^-)$, where $h^{\pm} = \pi^{\pm}$ or K^{\pm}) are estimated to contribute to the search region at levels at least 100 times smaller than our expected sensitivity.

Using these background-dominated control samples, $\mu^{\pm}\mu^{\pm}$ events and $\mu^{+}\mu^{-}$ events with $\lambda < 0$, we compare our background predictions to the number of events in the search window for a wide range of $(\lambda, \Delta \Phi, I)$ requirements. No statistically significant discrepancies are observed. For example, using the optimized set of selection criteria described below and summing over these control

samples, we get a total prediction of 3 ± 1 events and observe five. Another cross-check is performed using a fake muon enhanced $\mu^+\mu^-$ sample. By requiring at least one of the muon legs to fail the muon identification requirements, we reduce the signal efficiency by a factor of 50 while increasing the background acceptance by a factor of 3. In this sample, using the optimized requirements, we predict 6 ± 1 and observe seven events.

We estimate the total acceptance times efficiency as $\alpha \epsilon_{\text{total}} = \alpha \epsilon_{\text{trig}} \epsilon_{\text{reco}} \epsilon_{\text{final}}$, where α is the geometric and kinematic acceptance of the trigger, ϵ_{trig} is the trigger efficiency for events in the acceptance, ϵ_{reco} is the offline reconstruction efficiency for events passing the trigger, and ϵ_{final} is the efficiency for events satisfying the trigger and reconstruction requirements. For the optimization, only ϵ_{final} changes as we vary the requirements on $M_{\mu^+\mu^-}$, λ , $\Delta\Phi$, and *I*.

The acceptance is estimated as the fraction of $B_{s(d)}^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ MC events which fall within the geometric acceptance and satisfy the kinematic requirements of at least one of the analysis triggers. We find $\alpha = (6.6 \pm 0.5)\%$. The uncertainty includes roughly equal contributions from systematic variations of the modeling of the *B*-hadron p_T spectrum and longitudinal beam profile, and from the statistics of the sample. It also includes negligible contributions from variations of the beam line offsets and of the detector material description used in the simulation.

The trigger efficiency, including the effects of the offline-to-trigger track matching, is estimated from samples of $J/\psi \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ decays selected with a trigger requiring only one identified muon. The data are used to parametrize the trigger efficiency as a function of p_T and η for the unbiased muon. The efficiency for $B_{s(d)}^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^$ decays is determined by the convolution of this parametrization with the $(p_T^{\mu^+}, \eta^{\mu^+}, p_T^{\mu^-}, \eta^{\mu^-})$ spectra of signal MC events within the acceptance. Including the online reconstruction requirements, the trigger efficiency is $\epsilon_{\text{trig}} = (85 \pm 3)\%$. The uncertainty is dominated by the systematic uncertainty accounting for kinematic differences between $J/\psi \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ and $B_{s(d)}^0 \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ decays and also includes contributions from variations in the functional form used in the parametrization, the effects of two-track correlations, and sample statistics.

The offline reconstruction efficiency is given by the product $\epsilon_{\text{reco}} = \epsilon_{\text{COT}} \epsilon_{\mu} \epsilon_{\text{SVX}}$, where ϵ_{COT} is the absolute reconstruction efficiency of the COT, ϵ_{μ} is the muon reconstruction efficiency given a COT track, and ϵ_{SVX} is the fraction of reconstructed muons which satisfy the SVX II requirements. Each term is a two-track efficiency. A hybrid data-MC method is used to determine ϵ_{COT} . Occupancy effects are accounted for by embedding COT hits from MC tracks in data events. The MC simulation is tuned at the hit level to reproduce residuals, hit width, and hit usage in the data. For embedded muons

with $p_T > 2 \text{ GeV}/c$, we measure $\epsilon_{\text{COT}} = 99\%$. Using the unbiased $J/\psi \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ samples, we estimate the muon reconstruction efficiency, including the track-stub matching requirements, to be 96%. A sample of $J/\psi \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ events satisfying our COT and muon reconstruction requirements is used to determine $\epsilon_{\text{SVX}} = 75\%$. The total reconstruction efficiency is given by the above product, $\epsilon_{\text{reco}} = (71 \pm 3)\%$. The uncertainty is dominated by the systematic uncertainty accounting for kinematic differences between $J/\psi \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ and $B_{s(d)}^0 \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ decays and also includes contributions from the variation of the COT simulation parameters and sample statistics.

The efficiency ϵ_{final} is determined from the $B^0_{s(d)} \rightarrow$ $\mu^+\mu^-$ MC sample and varies from 28%–78% over the range $(M_{\mu^+\mu^-}, \lambda, \Delta\Phi, I)$ requirements considered in the optimization. The MC modeling is checked by comparing the mass resolution and λ , $\Delta \Phi$, and I efficiency as a function of selection threshold for $B^+ \rightarrow J/\psi K^+ (J/\psi \rightarrow$ $\mu^+\mu^-$) events. The $B^+ \rightarrow J/\psi K^+$ MC sample is produced in the same manner as the $B_s^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ sample. The $B^+ \rightarrow J/\psi K^+$ data sample is collected using dimuon triggers very similar to those used in the analysis, but with a larger acceptance for $B^+ \rightarrow J/\psi K^+$ decays. We make the same requirements on the dimuon tracks and vertex as employed in the analysis. The MC efficiency is consistent with the sideband-subtracted data efficiency for a range of cut thresholds within 5% (relative), which is assigned as a systematic uncertainty on ϵ_{final} . In both the data and the MC sample, the mean of the three-track invariant mass distribution is within 3 MeV/ c^2 of the world average B^+ mass. The two-track invariant mass resolution is well described by the MC sample.

The optimal set of selection criteria uses a $\pm 80 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ search window around the B_s^0 mass, $\lambda > 200 \ \mu\text{m}$, $\Delta \Phi < 0.10$ rad, and I > 0.65. The mass resolution, estimated from the MC for the events surviving all requirements, is 27 MeV/ c^2 so that the B_d^0 and B_s^0 masses are resolved. We define a separate search window centered on the world average B_d^0 mass and use the same set of selection criteria for the $B_d^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ search. The total acceptance times efficiency is $\alpha \epsilon_{\text{total}} = (2.0 \pm 0.2)\%$ for both decays.

Using these criteria one event survives all requirements and has an invariant mass of $M_{\mu^+\mu^-} = 5.295 \text{ GeV}/c^2$, thus falling into both the B_s^0 and B_d^0 search windows as shown in Fig. 2. This is consistent with the 1.1 ± 0.3 background events expected in each of the B_s^0 and B_d^0 mass windows. We derive 90% (95%) C.L. limits of $\mathcal{B}(B_s^0 \to \mu^+\mu^-) < 5.8 \times 10^{-7} (7.5 \times 10^{-7})$ and $\mathcal{B}(B_d^0 \to \mu^+\mu^-) < 1.5 \times 10^{-7}$ (1.9×10^{-7}). The new $B_s^0 \to \mu^+\mu^-$ limit improves the previous limit [7] by a factor of 3 and significantly reduces the allowed parameter space of *R*-parity violating and SO(10) SUSY models [4,6]. The $B_d^0 \to \mu^+\mu^-$ limit is slightly better than the recent limit from the Belle Collaboration [9].



FIG. 2. The $\mu^+\mu^-$ invariant mass distribution of the events in the sideband and search regions satisfying all requirements.

We thank the Fermilab staff and the technical staffs of the participating institutions for their vital contributions. This work was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy and National Science Foundation; by the Italian Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare; by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Tecnology of Japan; by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada; by the National Science Council of the Republic of China; by the Swiss National Science Foundation; by the A.P. Sloan Foundation; by the Bundesministerium fuer Bildung und Forschung, Germany; by the Korean Science and Engineering Foundation and the Korean Research Foundation; by the Particle Physics and Astronomy Research Council and the Royal Society, U.K.; by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research; by the Comision Interministerial de Ciencia y Tecnologia, Spain; and in part by the European Community's Potential Programme Human under Contract No. HPRN-CT-20002, Probe for New Physics.

- [1] Throughout this Letter inclusion of charge-conjugate modes is implicit.
- [2] S. R. Choudhury and N. Gaur, Phys. Lett. B 451, 86 (1999); K. S. Babu and C. Kolda, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 228 (2000); P. H. Chankowski and L. Slawianowska, Phys. Rev. D 63, 054012 (2001); C. Bobeth *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D 64, 074014 (2001); A. J. Buras *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B 546, 96 (2002); S. Baek, P. Ko, and W. Y. Song, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 271801 (2002); A. Dedes and A. Pilaftsis, Phys. Rev. D 67, 015012 (2003); G. L. Kane, C. Kolda, and J. E. Lennon, hep-ph/0310042.

- [3] A. Dedes, H. K. Dreiner, and U. Nierste, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 251804 (2001).
- [4] R. Arnowitt et al., Phys. Lett. B 538, 121 (2002).
- [5] H. Baer et al., J. High Energy Phys. 07 (2002) 050.
- [6] R. Dermisek *et al.*, J. High Energy Phys. 04 (2003) 037;
 D. Auto *et al.*, J. High Energy Phys. 06 (2003) 023.
- [7] CDF Collaboration, F. Abe *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D 57, R3811 (1998).
- [8] G. Buchalla and A. J. Buras, Nucl. Phys. B398, 285 (1993); B400, 225 (1993); B548, 309 (1999);
 M. Misiak and J. Urban, Phys. Lett. B 451, 161 (1999).
- [9] Belle Collaboration, M. C. Chang *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D 68, 111101(R) (2003).
- [10] Muon g-2 Collaboration, G.W. Bennett *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 161802 (2004).
- [11] D. N. Spergel *et al.*, Astrophys. J. Suppl. Ser. **148**, 175 (2003).
- [12] CDF II Collaboration, R. Blair *et al.*, Fermilab Report No. FERMILAB-PUB-96/390-E, 1996.
- [13] T. Affolder *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A **526**, 249 (2004).
- [14] A. Sill *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A 447, 1 (2000).
- [15] G. Ascoli *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A 268, 33 (1988).
- [16] T. Dorigo *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A **461**, 560 (2001).
- [17] D. Acosta *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A **494**, 57 (2002); S. Klimenko, J. Konigsberg, and

T. M. Liss, Fermilab Report No. FERMILAB-FN-0741, 2003.

- [18] E. J. Thomson *et al.*, IEEE Trans. Nucl. Sci. **49**, 1063 (2002).
- [19] T. Sjöstrand *et al.*, Comput. Phys. Commun. **135**, 238 (2001).
- [20] K. Lannon, Ph.D. thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2003, http://www-lib.fnal.gov/archive/ thesis/fermilab-thesis-2003-21.shtml.
- [21] The *B*-candidate isolation is defined as $I = |\vec{p}_T^{\mu^+\mu^-}|/(\sum_i p_T^i + |\vec{p}_T^{\mu^+\mu^-}|)$, where the sum is over all tracks within an η - ϕ cone radius of 1, centered on $\vec{p}_T^{\mu^+\mu^-}$, and satisfying standard track quality requirements; ϕ is an azimuthal angle defined in the plane transverse to the beam line.
- [22] The mass windows are centered on 5.369 GeV/ c^2 and 5.279 GeV/ c^2 for the B_s^0 and B_d^0 searches, respectively.
- [23] Particle Data Group, K. Hagiwara *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 010001 (2002).
- [24] f_x is the probability that a *b* quark fragments to produce a B_x hadron. We use the updated 2003 values from the Particle Data Group, K. Hagiwara *et al.*, http:// pdg.lbl.gov/.
- [25] CDF Collaboration, D. Acosta *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 052005 (2002). This corresponds to a measurement at $\sqrt{s} = 1.8$ TeV. No correction is made to account for the increased \sqrt{s} since it is small compared to the uncertainties on the measured σ_{B^+} .