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1. Introduction

The heavy quark expansion (HQE) is a powerful theoretical technique in the description of decays of hadrons containing heavy quarks. This model describes inclusive decays and has been used extensively in the analysis of beauty and charm hadron decays, for example in the extraction of Cabibbo–Kobayashi–Maskawa matrix elements, such as $|V_{cb}|$ and $|V_{ub}|$ [1]. The basics of the theory were derived in the late 1980s [2]. For b-flavored hadrons, the expansion of the total decay width in terms of powers of $1/m_b$ where $m_b$ is the b quark mass, was derived a few years later [3]. These developments are summarized in Ref. [4]. It was found that there were no terms of $O(1/m_b)$, that the $O(1/m_b^2)$ terms were tiny, and initial estimates of $O(1/m_b^3)$ [5,6] effects were small. Thus differences of only a few percent were expected between the $\Lambda_b^0$ and $B^0$ total decay widths, and hence their lifetimes [5,7,8].

In the early part of the past decade, measurements of the ratio of $\Lambda_b^0$ to $B^0$ lifetimes, $\tau_{\Lambda_b^0}/\tau_{B^0}$, gave results considerably smaller than this expectation. In 2003 one experimental average gave $0.798 \pm 0.052$ [9], while another was $0.786 \pm 0.034$ [10]. Some authors sought to explain the small value of the ratio by including additional operators or other modifications [11], while others thought that the HQE could be pushed to provide a ratio of about 0.9 [12], but not so low as the measured value. Recent measurements have obtained higher values [13]. In fact, the most precise previous measurement from LHCb, $0.976 \pm 0.012 \pm 0.006$ [14], based on 1.0 fb$^{-1}$ of data, agreed with the early HQE expectations.

In this paper we present an updated result for $\tau_{\Lambda_b^0}/\tau_{B^0}$ using data from 3.0 fb$^{-1}$ of integrated luminosity collected with the LHCb detector from $pp$ collisions at the LHC. Here we add the 2.0 fb$^{-1}$ data sample from the 8 TeV data to our previous 1.0 fb$^{-1}$ 7 TeV sample [14]. The data are combined and analyzed together. Larger simulation samples are used than in our previous publication, and uncertainties are significantly reduced.

The $\Lambda_b^0$ baryon is detected in the $J/\psi pK^-$ decay mode, discovered by LHCb [14], while the $B^0$ meson is reconstructed in $J/\psi \Lambda^0(982)$ decays, with $\Lambda^0(982) \rightarrow \pi^+ K^-$. These modes have the same topology into four charged tracks, thus facilitating cancellation of systematic uncertainties in the lifetime ratio.

The LHCb detector [15] is a single-arm forward spectrometer covering the pseudorapidity range $2 < \eta < 5$, designed for the study of particles containing $b$ or $c$ quarks. The detector includes a high-precision tracking system consisting of a silicon-strip vertex detector surrounding the $pp$ interaction region, a large-area silicon-strip detector located upstream of a dipole magnet with a bending power of about 4 Tm, and three stations of silicon-strip detectors and straw drift tubes [16] placed downstream. The combined tracking system provides a momentum measurement with relative uncertainty that varies from 0.4% at 5 GeV to 0.6% at 100 GeV, and impact parameter resolution of 20 μm for tracks with large transverse momentum, $p_T$. Different types of charged hadrons are distinguished using information from two ring-imaging Cherenkov (RICH) detectors [17]. Photon, electron and hadron candidates are identified by a calorimeter system consisting of scintillating-pad and preshower detectors, an electromagnetic calorimeter and a hadronic calorimeter. Muons are identified with specific criteria.

Charge-conjugate modes are implicitly included throughout this Letter.
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ABSTRACT

The LHCb measurement of the lifetime ratio of the $\Lambda_b^0$ baryon to the $B^0$ meson is updated using data corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 3.0 fb$^{-1}$ collected using 7 and 8 TeV centre-of-mass energy $pp$ collisions at the LHC. The decay modes used are $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow J/\psi pK^-$ and $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi \pi^+ K^-$, where the $\pi^+ K^-$ mass is consistent with that of the $K^{*0}(892)$ meson. The lifetime ratio is determined with unprecedented precision to be $0.974 \pm 0.006 \pm 0.004$, where the first uncertainty is statistical and the second systematic. This result is in agreement with original theoretical predictions based on the heavy quark expansion. Using the current world average of the $B^0$ lifetime, the $\Lambda_b^0$ lifetime is found to be $1.479 \pm 0.005 \pm 0.010$ ps.
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identified by a system composed of alternating layers of iron and multiwire proportional chambers [18]. The trigger [19] 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.

2. Event selection and b hadron reconstruction

Events selected for this analysis are triggered by a $J/\psi \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ decay, where the $J/\psi$ is required at the software level to be consistent with coming from the decay of a $b$ hadron by use of either impact parameter (IP) requirements or detachment of the reconstructed $J/\psi$ decay position from the associated primary vertex.

Events are required to pass a cut-based preselection and then are further filtered using a multivariate discriminator based on the boosted decision tree (BDT) technique [20]. To satisfy the preselection requirements the muon candidates must have $p_T > 550$ MeV, while the hadron candidates are required to have $p_T > 250$ MeV. Each muon is required to have $X_{BC}^2 > 4$, where $X_{BC}^2$ is defined as the difference in $X^2$ of the primary vertex reconstructed with and without the considered track. Events must have a $\mu^+\mu^-$ pair that forms a common vertex with $X^2 < 16$ and that has an invariant mass between $(-48$ and $+43)$ MeV of the known $J/\psi$ mass [1]. Candidate $\mu^+\mu^-$ pairs are then constrained to the $J/\psi$ mass to improve the determination of the $J/\psi$ momentum. The two charged final state hadrons must have a vector summed $p_T$ of more than 1 GeV, and form a vertex with $X^2/ndf < 10$, where $ndf$ is the number of degrees of freedom, and a common vertex with the $J/\psi$ candidate with $X^2/ndf < 16$. Particle identification requirements are different for the two modes. Using information from the RICH detectors, a likelihood is formed for each hadron hypothesis. The difference in the logarithms of the likelihoods, DLL($h_1 - h_2$), is used to distinguish between the two hypotheses, $h_1$ and $h_2$ [17]. In the $A_0^b$ decay the kaon candidate must have DLL($K - \pi$) > 4 and DLL($K - p$) > 3, while the proton candidate must have DLL($p - \pi$) > 10 and DLL($p - K$) > 3. For the $B^0$ decay, the requirements on the pion candidate are DLL($\pi - \mu$) > 10 and DLL($\pi - K$) > 10, while DLL($K - \pi$) > 0 is required for the kaon.

The BDT selection uses the smaller value of the DLL($\mu - \pi$) of the $\mu^+\mu^-$ and $\mu^+\mu^-$ candidates, the $p_T$ of each of the two charged hadrons, and their sum, the $A_0^b$ pt, the $A_0^b$ vertex $X^2$, and the $X_{BC}^2$ of the $A_0^b$ candidate with respect to the primary vertex. The choice of these variables is motivated by minimizing the dependence of the selection efficiency on decay time; for example, we do not use the $X_{BC}^2$ of the proton, the kaon, the flight distance, or the pointing angle of $A_0^b$ to the primary vertex. To train and test the BDT we use a simulated sample of $A_0^b \rightarrow J/\psi pK^-$ events for signal and a background data sample from the mass sidebands in the region 100–200 MeV below the $A_0^b$ signal peak. Half of these events are used for training, while the other half are used for testing. The BDT selection is chosen to maximize $S^2/(S + B)$, where $S$ and $B$ are the signal and background yields, respectively. This optimization includes the requirement that the $A_0^b$ candidate decay time be greater than 0.4 ps. The same BDT selection is used for $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi \pi^+K^-$ decays. The distributions of the BDT classifier output for signal and background are shown in Fig. 1. The final selection requires that the BDT output variable be greater than 0.04.

The resulting $A_0^b$ and $B^0$ candidate invariant mass distributions are shown in Fig. 2. For $B^0$ candidates we also require that the invariant $\pi^+K^-$ mass be within $\pm 100$ MeV of the $R^0(892)$ mass. In order to measure the number of signal events we need to ascertain the backgrounds. The background is dominated by random track combinations at masses around the signal peaks, and their shape is assumed to be exponential in invariant mass. Specific backgrounds arising from incorrect particle identification, called "reflections", are also considered. In the case of the $A_0^b$ decay, these are $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^+K^-$ decays where a kaon is misidentified as a proton and $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^0_s(892)$ decays with $K^0_s(892) \rightarrow \pi^+K^-$ where the pion is misidentified as a proton. There is also a double misidentification background caused by swapping the kaon and proton identifications.

To study these backgrounds, we examine the mass combinations in the sideband regions from 60–200 MeV on either side of the $A_0^b$ mass peak. Specifically for each candidate in the $J/\psi pK^-$ sideband regions we reassign to the proton track the kaon or pion mass hypothesis respectively, and plot them separately. The resulting distributions are shown in Fig. 3. The $m(J/\psi K^+K^-)$ invariant mass distribution shows a large peak at the $B^0_s$ mass. There is also a small contribution from the $B^0$ final state where the $\pi^+$ is misidentified as a $p$. The $m(J/\psi \pi^+K^0_s)$ distribution, on the other hand, shows a peak at the $B^0$ mass with a large contribution from $B^0_s$ decays where the $K^+$ is misidentified as a $p$. For both distributions the shapes of the different contributions are determined using simulation. Fitting both distributions we find $19327 \pm 309 B^0_s$, and $5613 \pm 285 B^0$ events in the $A_0^b$ sideband.

Samples of simulated $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^+K^-$ and $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^-\pi^+$ events are used to find the shapes of these reflected backgrounds in the $J/\psi pK^-$ mass spectrum. Using the event yields found in data and the simulation shapes, we estimate $5603 \pm 90 B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^+K^-$ and $1150 \pm 59 B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi \pi^+K^-$ reflection candidates within $\pm 20$ MeV of the $A_0^b$ peak. These numbers are used as Gaussian constraints in the mass fit described below with the central values as the Gaussian means and the uncertainties as the widths. Following a similar procedure we find $1138 \pm 48$ doubly-misidentified $A_0^b$ decays under the $A_0^b$ peak. This number is also used as a Gaussian constraint in the mass fit.

To determine the number of $A_0^b$ signal candidates we perform an unbinned maximum likelihood fit to the candidate $J/\psi pK^-$ invariant mass spectrum shown in Fig. 2(a). The fit function is the sum of the $A_0^b$ signal component, combinatorial background, the contributions from the $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^+K^-$ and $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi \pi^+K^-$ reflections and the doubly-misidentified $A_0^b \rightarrow J/\psi K^+\mu$ decays. The signal is modeled by a triple-Gaussian function with common means. The fraction and the width ratio for the second and third Gaussians are fixed to the values obtained in the fit to $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^0_s(892)$ decays, shown in Fig. 2(b). The effective r.m.s.
width is 4.7 MeV. The combinatorial background is described by an exponential function. The shapes of reflections and doubly-misidentified contributions are described by histograms imported from the simulations. The mass fit gives 50233 ± 331 signal and 15842 ± 104 combinatorial background candidates, 5642 ± 88 $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^- K^+$ and 1167 ± 58 $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi \pi^+ K^-$ reflection candidates, and 1140 ± 48 doubly-misidentified $A^0_s$ candidates within ±20 MeV of the $A^0_s$ mass peak. The $pK^-$ mass spectrum is consistent with that found previously [14], with a distinct peak near 1520 MeV, together with the other broad resonant and non-resonant structures that cover the entire kinematic region.

The $B^0$ candidate mass distribution can be polluted by the reflection from $A^0_s \rightarrow J/\psi pK^-$ and $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi \pi^+ K^-$ decays. Following a similar procedure as for the analysis of the $A^0_s$ mass spectra, we take into account the reflection under the $B^0$ peak. Fig. 2(b) shows the fit to the $J/\psi \pi^+ K^-$ mass distribution. There are signal peaks at both $B^0$ and $B^0$ masses on top of the background. A triple-Gaussian function with common means is used to fit each signal. The shape of the $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi \pi^+ K^-$ mass distribution is taken to be the same as that of the signal $B^0$ decay. The effective r.m.s. width is 6.5 MeV. An exponential function is used to fit the combinatorial background. The shape of the $A^0_s \rightarrow J/\psi pK^-$ reflection is taken from simulation, the yield being Gaussian constrained in the global fit to the expected value. The mass fit gives 340256 ± 893 signal and 11978 ± 153 background candidates along with a negligible 573 ± 27 contribution of $A^0_s \rightarrow J/\psi pK^-$ reflection candidates within ±20 MeV of the $B^0$ mass peak. All other reflection contributions are found to be negligible.

### 3. Measurement of the $A^0_s$ to $B^0$ lifetime ratio

The decay time, $t$, is calculated as

$$t = \frac{\vec{d} \cdot \vec{p}}{|p|^2},$$

where $m$ is the reconstructed invariant mass, $\vec{p}$ the momentum and $\vec{d}$ the flight distance vector of the particle between the production and decay vertices. The $b$ hadron is constrained to come from the primary vertex. To avoid systematic biases due to shifts in the measured decay time, we do not constrain the two muons to the $J/\psi$ mass.

The decay time distribution of the $A^0_s \rightarrow J/\psi pK^-$ signal can be described by an exponential function convolved with a resolution function, $G(t - t', \sigma_{t',\sigma})$, where $t'$ is the true decay time, multiplied by an acceptance function, $A_{t',\sigma}(t)$:

$$F_{A^0_s}(t) = A_{t',\sigma}(t) \times \left[ e^{-t'/\tau_{t',\sigma}} \otimes G(t - t', \sigma_{t', \sigma}) \right].$$

The ratio of the decay time distributions of $A^0_s \rightarrow J/\psi pK^-$ and $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi R^{\psi}(892)$ is given by

$$R(t) = A_{A^0_s}(t) \times \left[ e^{-t'/\tau_{t',\sigma}} \otimes G(t - t', \sigma_{A^0_s}) \right] / A_{B^0}(t) \times \left[ e^{-t'/\tau_{t',\sigma}} \otimes G(t - t', \sigma_{B^0}) \right].$$

The advantage of measuring the lifetime through the ratio is that the decay time acceptances introduced by the trigger requirements, selection and reconstruction almost cancel in the ratio of
the decay time distributions. The decay time resolutions are 40 fs for the $A_b^0$ decay and 37 fs for the $B^0$ decay [14]. They are both small enough in absolute scale, and similar enough for differences in resolutions between the two modes not to affect the final result.

Thus, \[
R(t) = R(0)e^{-t/(\tau_{B^0} - 1/\tau_{A_b^0})} = R(0)e^{-t\Delta_{AB}},
\]
where $\Delta_{AB} \equiv 1/\tau_{B^0} - 1/\tau_{A_b^0}$ is the width difference and $R(0)$ is the normalization. Since the acceptances are not quite equal, a correction is implemented to first order by modifying Eq. (4) with a linear function

\[
R(t) = R(0)[1 + at]e^{-t\Delta_{AB}},
\]
where $a$ represents the slope of the acceptance ratio as a function of decay time.

The decay time acceptance is the ratio between the reconstructed decay time distribution for selected events and the generated decay time distribution convolved with the triple-Gaussian decay time resolutions obtained from the simulations. In order to ensure that the $p$ and $p_T$ distributions of the generated $b$ hadrons are correct, we weight the simulated samples to match the data distributions. The simulations do not model the hadron identification efficiencies with sufficient accuracy for our purposes. Therefore we further weight the samples according to the hadron identification efficiencies obtained from $D^{\pm+} \rightarrow \pi^+ D^0, D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$ events for pions and kaons, and $A \rightarrow p\pi^-$ for protons. The $A_b^0 \rightarrow J/\psi pK^-$ sample is also weighted using signal yields in bins of $m(pK^-)$.

The decay time acceptances obtained from the weighted simulations are shown in Fig. 4(a). The individual acceptances in both cases exhibit the same behaviour. The ratio of the decay time acceptances is shown in Fig. 4(b). For decay times greater than 7 ps, the acceptance is poorly determined, while below 0.4 ps the individual acceptances decrease quickly. Thus, we consider decay times between 0.4 and 7 ps. We use the parameters found from the time integrated fits fixed in each time bin, with the signal and background yields allowed to vary, except for the double misidentification background fraction that is fixed.

The resulting signal yields as a function of decay time are shown as (blue) circles, and the fit for $\Delta_{AB}$ used to measure the $A_b^0$ lifetime.

For the decay time distributions, the acceptance is poorly determined, while below 0.4 ps the individual acceptances decrease quickly. Thus, we consider decay times between 0.4 and 7 ps. We use the parameters found from the time integrated fits fixed in each time bin, with the signal and background yields allowed to vary, except for the double misidentification background fraction that is fixed.

The resulting signal yields as a function of decay time are shown as (blue) circles, and the fit for $\Delta_{AB}$ used to measure the $A_b^0$ lifetime.

The decay time acceptances obtained from the weighted simulations are shown in Fig. 4(a). The individual acceptances in both cases exhibit the same behaviour. The ratio of the decay time acceptances is shown in Fig. 4(b). For decay times greater than 7 ps, the acceptance is poorly determined, while below 0.4 ps the individual acceptances decrease quickly. Thus, we consider decay times between 0.4 and 7 ps. We use the parameters found from the time integrated fits fixed in each time bin, with the signal and background yields allowed to vary, except for the double misidentification background fraction that is fixed.

The resulting signal yields as a function of decay time are shown as (blue) circles, and the fit for $\Delta_{AB}$ used to measure the $A_b^0$ lifetime.
and a fit with a double-Gaussian function. We find a change of
tematic uncertainty on the signal shape.
parametrize the acceptance ratio between
certainty from the simulation. An alternative choice of the ac-
imation background is evaluated by allowing the fraction to change in
each time bin. The resulting difference is smaller than the assigned un-
also replace the exponential background function with a linear
paring the default result to that obtained when we allow the
DeltaLambda = 1.5 0.0010 0.0015
Signal shape 1.5 0.0021 0.0032
Background model 2.2 0.0032 0.0049
Acceptance function 0.2 0.0003 0.0004
Background model 1.3 0.0019 0.0029
Acceptance slope 0.3 0.0004 0.0006
pK helicity – 0.0001 0.0008
B0 lifetime – 0.0044 0.0096

Whenever two uncertainties are quoted, the first is statistical and
Decay time fit range 0.3 0.0004 0.0006
pK helicity 0.3 0.0004 0.0006
B0 lifetime – 0.0001 0.0008
Total 3.1 0.0044 0.0096

Table 1
Systematic uncertainties on the \( \Delta_{AB} \), the lifetimes ratio \( \tau_{A_0^0}/\tau_{B_0^0} \) and the \( \Lambda_b^0 \) lifetime. The systematic uncertainty associated with \( \Delta_{AB} \) is independent of the \( B^0 \) lifetime.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>( \Delta_{AB} ) (ns(^{-1}))</th>
<th>( \tau_{A_0^0}/\tau_{B_0^0} )</th>
<th>( \tau_{A_0^0} ) (ps)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signal shape</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0021</td>
<td>0.0032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background model</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.0010</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double misidentification</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.0019</td>
<td>0.0029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance slope</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.0032</td>
<td>0.0049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance function</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decay time fit range</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>0.0006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pK helicity</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>0.0006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B0 lifetime</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.0044</td>
<td>0.0096</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Systematic uncertainties

The uncertainties due to the background are estimated by com-
paring the default result to that obtained when we allow the
exponential background parameter to float in each time bin. We
also replace the exponential background function with a linear
function; the resulting difference is smaller than the assigned un-
certainty due to floating the background parameter. The systematic un-
certainty due to the normalization of the double misidentifica-
tion background is evaluated by allowing the fraction to change in
each time bin.

The systematic uncertainties due to the acceptance slope are esti-
ated by varying the slope, \( a \), according to its statistical un-
certainty from the simulation. An alternative choice of the ac-
centration function, where a second-order polynomial is used to
parametrize the acceptance ratio between \( \Lambda_b^0 \to J/\psi pK^- \) and
\( B^0 \to J/\psi K^0 \) (892), results in a smaller uncertainty. There is also
an uncertainty due to the decay time range used because of the
possible change of the acceptance ratio at short decay times.
This uncertainty is ascertained by changing the fit range to be
0.7–7.0 ps and using the difference with the baseline fit. This
uncertainty is greatly reduced with respect to our previous pub-
llication [14] due to the larger fit range, finer decay time bins, and
larger signal sample.

In order to correctly model the acceptance, which can depend on
the kinematics of the decay, the \( \Lambda_b^0 \to J/\psi pK^- \) simulation is
weighted according to the \( m(pK^-) \) distribution observed in data.
As a cross-check, we weight the simulation according to the two-
dimensional distribution of \( m(pK^-) \) and \( pK^- \) helicity angle and
assign the difference as a systematic uncertainty. In addition, the
PDG value for the \( B^0 \) lifetime, \( \tau_{B_0^0} = 1.519 \pm 0.007 \) ps [1], is used
to calculate the \( \Lambda_b^0 \) lifetime; the errors contribute to the systematic
uncertainty. The total systematic uncertainty is obtained by adding
all of the contributions in quadrature.

5. Conclusions

We determine the ratio of lifetimes of the \( \Lambda_b^0 \) baryon and \( B^0 \)
meson to be

\[
\frac{\tau_{\Lambda_b^0}}{\tau_{B^0}} = 0.974 \pm 0.006 \pm 0.004.
\]

This is the most precise measurement to date and supersedes our
previously published result [14]. It demonstrates that the \( \Lambda_b^0 \) lif-
time is shorter than the \( B^0 \) lifetime by \( -2.6 \pm 0.7 \)% consistent
with the original predictions of the HQE [2,4,5,21,22], thus provid-
ning validation for the theory. Using the world average measured
value for the \( B^0 \) lifetime [1], we determine

\[
\tau_{\Lambda_b^0} = 1.479 \pm 0.009 \pm 0.010 \text{ ps},
\]

which is the most precise measurement to date.

LHCb has also made a measurement of \( \tau_{A_0^0} \) using the \( J/\psi \Lambda \)
fine state obtaining 1.415 \pm 0.027 \pm 0.006 ps [23]. The two LHCb
measurements have systematic uncertainties that are only weakly
correlated, and we quote an average of the two measurements
of 1.468 \pm 0.009 \pm 0.008 ps.
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