



# First evidence for the two-body charmless baryonic decay $B^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$

The LHCb collaboration<sup>†</sup>

## Abstract

The results of a search for the rare two-body charmless baryonic decays  $B^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  and  $B_s^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  are reported. The analysis uses a data sample, corresponding to an integrated luminosity of  $0.9 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ , of  $pp$  collision data collected by the LHCb experiment at a centre-of-mass energy of 7 TeV. An excess of  $B^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  candidates with respect to background expectations is seen with a statistical significance of 3.3 standard deviations. This is the first evidence for a two-body charmless baryonic  $B^0$  decay. No significant  $B_s^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  signal is observed, leading to an improvement of three orders of magnitude over previous bounds. If the excess events are interpreted as signal, the 68.3% confidence level intervals on the branching fractions are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}) &= (1.47_{-0.51}^{+0.62} {}_{-0.14}^{+0.35}) \times 10^{-8}, \\ \mathcal{B}(B_s^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}) &= (2.84_{-1.68}^{+2.03} {}_{-0.18}^{+0.85}) \times 10^{-8}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first uncertainty is statistical and the second is systematic.

Submitted to JHEP

© CERN on behalf of the LHCb collaboration, license CC-BY-3.0.

---

<sup>†</sup>Authors are listed on the following pages.



## LHCb collaboration

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

D. Hynds<sup>50</sup>, V. Iakovenko<sup>43</sup>, M. Idzik<sup>26</sup>, P. Ilten<sup>12</sup>, R. Jacobsson<sup>37</sup>, A. Jaeger<sup>11</sup>, E. Jans<sup>40</sup>,  
 P. Jatton<sup>38</sup>, A. Jawahery<sup>57</sup>, F. Jing<sup>3</sup>, M. John<sup>54</sup>, D. Johnson<sup>54</sup>, C.R. Jones<sup>46</sup>, C. Joram<sup>37</sup>,  
 B. Jost<sup>37</sup>, M. Kaballo<sup>9</sup>, S. Kandybei<sup>42</sup>, W. Kanso<sup>6</sup>, M. Karacson<sup>37</sup>, T.M. Karbach<sup>37</sup>,  
 I.R. Kenyon<sup>44</sup>, T. Ketel<sup>41</sup>, A. Keune<sup>38</sup>, B. Khanji<sup>20</sup>, O. Kochebina<sup>7</sup>, I. Komarov<sup>38</sup>,  
 R.F. Koopman<sup>41</sup>, P. Koppenburg<sup>40</sup>, M. Korolev<sup>31</sup>, A. Kozlinskiy<sup>40</sup>, L. Kravchuk<sup>32</sup>, K. Kreplin<sup>11</sup>,  
 M. Kreps<sup>47</sup>, G. Krocker<sup>11</sup>, P. Krokovny<sup>33</sup>, F. Kruse<sup>9</sup>, M. Kucharczyk<sup>20,25,j</sup>, V. Kudryavtsev<sup>33</sup>,  
 K. Kurek<sup>27</sup>, T. Kvaratskheliya<sup>30,37</sup>, V.N. La Thi<sup>38</sup>, D. Lacarrere<sup>37</sup>, G. Lafferty<sup>53</sup>, A. Lai<sup>15</sup>,  
 D. Lambert<sup>49</sup>, R.W. Lambert<sup>41</sup>, E. Lanciotti<sup>37</sup>, G. Lanfranchi<sup>18</sup>, C. Langenbruch<sup>37</sup>,  
 T. Latham<sup>47</sup>, C. Lazzeroni<sup>44</sup>, R. Le Gac<sup>6</sup>, J. van Leerdam<sup>40</sup>, J.-P. Lees<sup>4</sup>, R. Lefèvre<sup>5</sup>,  
 A. Leflat<sup>31</sup>, J. Lefrançois<sup>7</sup>, S. Leo<sup>22</sup>, O. Leroy<sup>6</sup>, T. Lesiak<sup>25</sup>, B. Leverington<sup>11</sup>, Y. Li<sup>3</sup>,  
 L. Li Gioi<sup>5</sup>, M. Liles<sup>51</sup>, R. Lindner<sup>37</sup>, C. Linn<sup>11</sup>, B. Liu<sup>3</sup>, G. Liu<sup>37</sup>, S. Lohn<sup>37</sup>, I. Longstaff<sup>50</sup>,  
 J.H. Lopes<sup>2</sup>, N. Lopez-March<sup>38</sup>, H. Lu<sup>3</sup>, D. Lucchesi<sup>21,q</sup>, J. Luisier<sup>38</sup>, H. Luo<sup>49</sup>, F. Machefert<sup>7</sup>,  
 I.V. Machikhiliyan<sup>4,30</sup>, F. Maciuc<sup>28</sup>, O. Maev<sup>29,37</sup>, S. Malde<sup>54</sup>, G. Manca<sup>15,d</sup>, G. Mancinelli<sup>6</sup>,  
 J. Maratas<sup>5</sup>, U. Marconi<sup>14</sup>, P. Marino<sup>22,s</sup>, R. Märki<sup>38</sup>, J. Marks<sup>11</sup>, G. Martellotti<sup>24</sup>, A. Martens<sup>8</sup>,  
 A. Martín Sánchez<sup>7</sup>, M. Martinelli<sup>40</sup>, D. Martinez Santos<sup>41</sup>, D. Martins Tostes<sup>2</sup>, A. Martynov<sup>31</sup>,  
 A. Massafferri<sup>1</sup>, R. Matev<sup>37</sup>, Z. Mathe<sup>37</sup>, C. Matteuzzi<sup>20</sup>, E. Maurice<sup>6</sup>, A. Mazurov<sup>16,32,37,e</sup>,  
 J. McCarthy<sup>44</sup>, A. McNab<sup>53</sup>, R. McNulty<sup>12</sup>, B. McSkelly<sup>51</sup>, B. Meadows<sup>56,54</sup>, F. Meier<sup>9</sup>,  
 M. Meissner<sup>11</sup>, M. Merk<sup>40</sup>, D.A. Milanese<sup>8</sup>, M.-N. Minard<sup>4</sup>, J. Molina Rodriguez<sup>59</sup>, S. Monteil<sup>5</sup>,  
 D. Moran<sup>53</sup>, P. Morawski<sup>25</sup>, A. Mordà<sup>6</sup>, M.J. Morello<sup>22,s</sup>, R. Mountain<sup>58</sup>, I. Mous<sup>40</sup>,  
 F. Muheim<sup>49</sup>, K. Müller<sup>39</sup>, R. Muresan<sup>28</sup>, B. Muryn<sup>26</sup>, B. Muster<sup>38</sup>, P. Naik<sup>45</sup>, T. Nakada<sup>38</sup>,  
 R. Nandakumar<sup>48</sup>, I. Nasteva<sup>1</sup>, M. Needham<sup>49</sup>, S. Neubert<sup>37</sup>, N. Neufeld<sup>37</sup>, A.D. Nguyen<sup>38</sup>,  
 T.D. Nguyen<sup>38</sup>, C. Nguyen-Mau<sup>38,o</sup>, M. Nicol<sup>7</sup>, V. Niess<sup>5</sup>, R. Niet<sup>9</sup>, N. Nikitin<sup>31</sup>, T. Nikodem<sup>11</sup>,  
 A. Nomerotski<sup>54</sup>, A. Novoselov<sup>34</sup>, A. Oblakowska-Mucha<sup>26</sup>, V. Obraztsov<sup>34</sup>, S. Oggero<sup>40</sup>,  
 S. Ogilvy<sup>50</sup>, O. Okhrimenko<sup>43</sup>, R. Oldeman<sup>15,d</sup>, M. Orlandea<sup>28</sup>, J.M. Otalora Goicochea<sup>2</sup>,  
 P. Owen<sup>52</sup>, A. Oyanguren<sup>35</sup>, B.K. Pal<sup>58</sup>, A. Palano<sup>13,b</sup>, T. Palczewski<sup>27</sup>, M. Palutan<sup>18</sup>,  
 J. Panman<sup>37</sup>, A. Papanestis<sup>48</sup>, M. Pappagallo<sup>50</sup>, C. Parkes<sup>53</sup>, C.J. Parkinson<sup>52</sup>, G. Passaleva<sup>17</sup>,  
 G.D. Patel<sup>51</sup>, M. Patel<sup>52</sup>, G.N. Patrick<sup>48</sup>, C. Patrignani<sup>19,i</sup>, C. Pavel-Nicorescu<sup>28</sup>,  
 A. Pazos Alvarez<sup>36</sup>, A. Pellegrino<sup>40</sup>, G. Penso<sup>24,l</sup>, M. Pepe Altarelli<sup>37</sup>, S. Perazzini<sup>14,c</sup>,  
 E. Perez Trigo<sup>36</sup>, A. Pérez-Calero Yzquierdo<sup>35</sup>, P. Perret<sup>5</sup>, M. Perrin-Terrin<sup>6</sup>, L. Pescatore<sup>44</sup>,  
 E. Pesen<sup>61</sup>, K. Petridis<sup>52</sup>, A. Petrolini<sup>19,i</sup>, A. Phan<sup>58</sup>, E. Picatoste Olloqui<sup>35</sup>, B. Pietrzyk<sup>4</sup>,  
 T. Pilar<sup>47</sup>, D. Pinci<sup>24</sup>, S. Playfer<sup>49</sup>, M. Plo Casasus<sup>36</sup>, F. Polci<sup>8</sup>, G. Polok<sup>25</sup>, A. Poluektov<sup>47,33</sup>,  
 E. Polcarpo<sup>2</sup>, A. Popov<sup>34</sup>, D. Popov<sup>10</sup>, B. Popovici<sup>28</sup>, C. Potterat<sup>35</sup>, A. Powell<sup>54</sup>,  
 J. Prisciandaro<sup>38</sup>, A. Pritchard<sup>51</sup>, C. Prouve<sup>7</sup>, V. Pugatch<sup>43</sup>, A. Puig Navarro<sup>38</sup>, G. Punzi<sup>22,r</sup>,  
 W. Qian<sup>4</sup>, J.H. Rademacker<sup>45</sup>, B. Rakotomiamanana<sup>38</sup>, M.S. Rangel<sup>2</sup>, I. Raniuk<sup>42</sup>,  
 N. Rauschmayr<sup>37</sup>, G. Raven<sup>41</sup>, S. Redford<sup>54</sup>, M.M. Reid<sup>47</sup>, A.C. dos Reis<sup>1</sup>, S. Ricciardi<sup>48</sup>,  
 A. Richards<sup>52</sup>, K. Rinnert<sup>51</sup>, V. Rives Molina<sup>35</sup>, D.A. Roa Romero<sup>5</sup>, P. Robbe<sup>7</sup>, D.A. Roberts<sup>57</sup>,  
 E. Rodrigues<sup>53</sup>, P. Rodriguez Perez<sup>36</sup>, S. Roiser<sup>37</sup>, V. Romanovsky<sup>34</sup>, A. Romero Vidal<sup>36</sup>,  
 J. Rouvinet<sup>38</sup>, T. Ruf<sup>37</sup>, F. Ruffini<sup>22</sup>, H. Ruiz<sup>35</sup>, P. Ruiz Valls<sup>35</sup>, G. Sabatino<sup>24,k</sup>,  
 J.J. Saborido Silva<sup>36</sup>, N. Sagidova<sup>29</sup>, P. Sail<sup>50</sup>, B. Saitta<sup>15,d</sup>, V. Salustino Guimaraes<sup>2</sup>,  
 B. Sanmartin Sedes<sup>36</sup>, M. Sannino<sup>19,i</sup>, R. Santacesaria<sup>24</sup>, C. Santamarina Rios<sup>36</sup>,  
 E. Santovetti<sup>23,k</sup>, M. Sapunov<sup>6</sup>, A. Sarti<sup>18,l</sup>, C. Satriano<sup>24,m</sup>, A. Satta<sup>23</sup>, M. Savrie<sup>16,e</sup>,  
 D. Savrina<sup>30,31</sup>, P. Schaack<sup>52</sup>, M. Schiller<sup>41</sup>, H. Schindler<sup>37</sup>, M. Schlupp<sup>9</sup>, M. Schmelling<sup>10</sup>,  
 B. Schmidt<sup>37</sup>, O. Schneider<sup>38</sup>, A. Schopper<sup>37</sup>, M.-H. Schune<sup>7</sup>, R. Schwemmer<sup>37</sup>, B. Sciascia<sup>18</sup>,  
 A. Sciubba<sup>24</sup>, M. Seco<sup>36</sup>, A. Semennikov<sup>30</sup>, K. Senderowska<sup>26</sup>, I. Sepp<sup>52</sup>, N. Serra<sup>39</sup>, J. Serrano<sup>6</sup>,  
 P. Seyfert<sup>11</sup>, M. Shapkin<sup>34</sup>, I. Shapoval<sup>16,42</sup>, P. Shatalov<sup>30</sup>, Y. Shcheglov<sup>29</sup>, T. Shears<sup>51,37</sup>,  
 L. Shekhtman<sup>33</sup>, O. Shevchenko<sup>42</sup>, V. Shevchenko<sup>30</sup>, A. Shires<sup>9</sup>, R. Silva Coutinho<sup>47</sup>,

M. Sirendi<sup>46</sup>, N. Skidmore<sup>45</sup>, T. Skwarnicki<sup>58</sup>, N.A. Smith<sup>51</sup>, E. Smith<sup>54,48</sup>, J. Smith<sup>46</sup>, M. Smith<sup>53</sup>, M.D. Sokoloff<sup>56</sup>, F.J.P. Soler<sup>50</sup>, F. Soomro<sup>38</sup>, D. Souza<sup>45</sup>, B. Souza De Paula<sup>2</sup>, B. Spaan<sup>9</sup>, A. Sparkes<sup>49</sup>, P. Spradlin<sup>50</sup>, F. Stagni<sup>37</sup>, S. Stahl<sup>11</sup>, O. Steinkamp<sup>39</sup>, S. Stevenson<sup>54</sup>, S. Stoica<sup>28</sup>, S. Stone<sup>58</sup>, B. Storaci<sup>39</sup>, M. Straticiuc<sup>28</sup>, U. Straumann<sup>39</sup>, V.K. Subbiah<sup>37</sup>, L. Sun<sup>56</sup>, S. Swientek<sup>9</sup>, V. Syropoulos<sup>41</sup>, M. Szczekowski<sup>27</sup>, P. Szczypka<sup>38,37</sup>, T. Szumlak<sup>26</sup>, S. T'Jampens<sup>4</sup>, M. Teklishyn<sup>7</sup>, E. Teodorescu<sup>28</sup>, F. Teubert<sup>37</sup>, C. Thomas<sup>54</sup>, E. Thomas<sup>37</sup>, J. van Tilburg<sup>11</sup>, V. Tisserand<sup>4</sup>, M. Tobin<sup>38</sup>, S. Tolk<sup>41</sup>, D. Tonelli<sup>37</sup>, S. Topp-Joergensen<sup>54</sup>, N. Torr<sup>54</sup>, E. Tournefier<sup>4,52</sup>, S. Tourneur<sup>38</sup>, M.T. Tran<sup>38</sup>, M. Tresch<sup>39</sup>, A. Tsaregorodtsev<sup>6</sup>, P. Tsopelas<sup>40</sup>, N. Tuning<sup>40</sup>, M. Ubeda Garcia<sup>37</sup>, A. Ukleja<sup>27</sup>, D. Urner<sup>53</sup>, A. Ustyuzhanin<sup>52,p</sup>, U. Uwer<sup>11</sup>, V. Vagnoni<sup>14</sup>, G. Valentini<sup>14</sup>, A. Vallier<sup>7</sup>, M. Van Dijk<sup>45</sup>, R. Vazquez Gomez<sup>18</sup>, P. Vazquez Regueiro<sup>36</sup>, C. Vázquez Sierra<sup>36</sup>, S. Vecchi<sup>16</sup>, J.J. Velthuis<sup>45</sup>, M. Veltri<sup>17,g</sup>, G. Veneziano<sup>38</sup>, M. Vesterinen<sup>37</sup>, B. Viaud<sup>7</sup>, D. Vieira<sup>2</sup>, X. Vilasis-Cardona<sup>35,n</sup>, A. Vollhardt<sup>39</sup>, D. Volyanskyy<sup>10</sup>, D. Voong<sup>45</sup>, A. Vorobyev<sup>29</sup>, V. Vorobyev<sup>33</sup>, C. Voß<sup>60</sup>, H. Voss<sup>10</sup>, R. Waldi<sup>60</sup>, C. Wallace<sup>47</sup>, R. Wallace<sup>12</sup>, S. Wandernoth<sup>11</sup>, J. Wang<sup>58</sup>, D.R. Ward<sup>46</sup>, N.K. Watson<sup>44</sup>, A.D. Webber<sup>53</sup>, D. Websdale<sup>52</sup>, M. Whitehead<sup>47</sup>, J. Wicht<sup>37</sup>, J. Wiechczynski<sup>25</sup>, D. Wiedner<sup>11</sup>, L. Wiggers<sup>40</sup>, G. Wilkinson<sup>54</sup>, M.P. Williams<sup>47,48</sup>, M. Williams<sup>55</sup>, F.F. Wilson<sup>48</sup>, J. Wimberley<sup>57</sup>, J. Wishahi<sup>9</sup>, W. Wislicki<sup>27</sup>, M. Witek<sup>25</sup>, S.A. Wotton<sup>46</sup>, S. Wright<sup>46</sup>, S. Wu<sup>3</sup>, K. Wyllie<sup>37</sup>, Y. Xie<sup>49,37</sup>, Z. Xing<sup>58</sup>, Z. Yang<sup>3</sup>, R. Young<sup>49</sup>, X. Yuan<sup>3</sup>, O. Yushchenko<sup>34</sup>, M. Zangoli<sup>14</sup>, M. Zavertyaev<sup>10,a</sup>, F. Zhang<sup>3</sup>, L. Zhang<sup>58</sup>, W.C. Zhang<sup>12</sup>, Y. Zhang<sup>3</sup>, A. Zhelezov<sup>11</sup>, A. Zhokhov<sup>30</sup>, L. Zhong<sup>3</sup>, A. Zvyagin<sup>37</sup>.

<sup>1</sup>Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Físicas (CBPF), Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

<sup>2</sup>Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ), Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

<sup>3</sup>Center for High Energy Physics, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China

<sup>4</sup>LAPP, Université de Savoie, CNRS/IN2P3, Annecy-Le-Vieux, France

<sup>5</sup>Clermont Université, Université Blaise Pascal, CNRS/IN2P3, LPC, Clermont-Ferrand, France

<sup>6</sup>CPPM, Aix-Marseille Université, CNRS/IN2P3, Marseille, France

<sup>7</sup>LAL, Université Paris-Sud, CNRS/IN2P3, Orsay, France

<sup>8</sup>LPNHE, Université Pierre et Marie Curie, Université Paris Diderot, CNRS/IN2P3, Paris, France

<sup>9</sup>Fakultät Physik, Technische Universität Dortmund, Dortmund, Germany

<sup>10</sup>Max-Planck-Institut für Kernphysik (MPIK), Heidelberg, Germany

<sup>11</sup>Physikalisches Institut, Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg, Heidelberg, Germany

<sup>12</sup>School of Physics, University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland

<sup>13</sup>Sezione INFN di Bari, Bari, Italy

<sup>14</sup>Sezione INFN di Bologna, Bologna, Italy

<sup>15</sup>Sezione INFN di Cagliari, Cagliari, Italy

<sup>16</sup>Sezione INFN di Ferrara, Ferrara, Italy

<sup>17</sup>Sezione INFN di Firenze, Firenze, Italy

<sup>18</sup>Laboratori Nazionali dell'INFN di Frascati, Frascati, Italy

<sup>19</sup>Sezione INFN di Genova, Genova, Italy

<sup>20</sup>Sezione INFN di Milano Bicocca, Milano, Italy

<sup>21</sup>Sezione INFN di Padova, Padova, Italy

<sup>22</sup>Sezione INFN di Pisa, Pisa, Italy

<sup>23</sup>Sezione INFN di Roma Tor Vergata, Roma, Italy

<sup>24</sup>Sezione INFN di Roma La Sapienza, Roma, Italy

<sup>25</sup>Henryk Niewodniczanski Institute of Nuclear Physics Polish Academy of Sciences, Kraków, Poland

<sup>26</sup>AGH - University of Science and Technology, Faculty of Physics and Applied Computer Science, Kraków, Poland

<sup>27</sup>National Center for Nuclear Research (NCBJ), Warsaw, Poland

- <sup>28</sup> *Horia Hulubei National Institute of Physics and Nuclear Engineering, Bucharest-Magurele, Romania*
- <sup>29</sup> *Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute (PNPI), Gatchina, Russia*
- <sup>30</sup> *Institute of Theoretical and Experimental Physics (ITEP), Moscow, Russia*
- <sup>31</sup> *Institute of Nuclear Physics, Moscow State University (SINP MSU), Moscow, Russia*
- <sup>32</sup> *Institute for Nuclear Research of the Russian Academy of Sciences (INR RAN), Moscow, Russia*
- <sup>33</sup> *Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics (SB RAS) and Novosibirsk State University, Novosibirsk, Russia*
- <sup>34</sup> *Institute for High Energy Physics (IHEP), Protvino, Russia*
- <sup>35</sup> *Universitat de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain*
- <sup>36</sup> *Universidad de Santiago de Compostela, Santiago de Compostela, Spain*
- <sup>37</sup> *European Organization for Nuclear Research (CERN), Geneva, Switzerland*
- <sup>38</sup> *Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), Lausanne, Switzerland*
- <sup>39</sup> *Physik-Institut, Universität Zürich, Zürich, Switzerland*
- <sup>40</sup> *Nikhef National Institute for Subatomic Physics, Amsterdam, The Netherlands*
- <sup>41</sup> *Nikhef National Institute for Subatomic Physics and VU University Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands*
- <sup>42</sup> *NSC Kharkiv Institute of Physics and Technology (NSC KIPT), Kharkiv, Ukraine*
- <sup>43</sup> *Institute for Nuclear Research of the National Academy of Sciences (KINR), Kyiv, Ukraine*
- <sup>44</sup> *University of Birmingham, Birmingham, United Kingdom*
- <sup>45</sup> *H.H. Wills Physics Laboratory, University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom*
- <sup>46</sup> *Cavendish Laboratory, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom*
- <sup>47</sup> *Department of Physics, University of Warwick, Coventry, United Kingdom*
- <sup>48</sup> *STFC Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom*
- <sup>49</sup> *School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, United Kingdom*
- <sup>50</sup> *School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, United Kingdom*
- <sup>51</sup> *Oliver Lodge Laboratory, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, United Kingdom*
- <sup>52</sup> *Imperial College London, London, United Kingdom*
- <sup>53</sup> *School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Manchester, Manchester, United Kingdom*
- <sup>54</sup> *Department of Physics, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom*
- <sup>55</sup> *Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, United States*
- <sup>56</sup> *University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH, United States*
- <sup>57</sup> *University of Maryland, College Park, MD, United States*
- <sup>58</sup> *Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY, United States*
- <sup>59</sup> *Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro (PUC-Rio), Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, associated to <sup>2</sup>*
- <sup>60</sup> *Institut für Physik, Universität Rostock, Rostock, Germany, associated to <sup>11</sup>*
- <sup>61</sup> *Celal Bayar University, Manisa, Turkey, associated to <sup>37</sup>*

<sup>a</sup> *P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Russian Academy of Science (LPI RAS), Moscow, Russia*

<sup>b</sup> *Università di Bari, Bari, Italy*

<sup>c</sup> *Università di Bologna, Bologna, Italy*

<sup>d</sup> *Università di Cagliari, Cagliari, Italy*

<sup>e</sup> *Università di Ferrara, Ferrara, Italy*

<sup>f</sup> *Università di Firenze, Firenze, Italy*

<sup>g</sup> *Università di Urbino, Urbino, Italy*

<sup>h</sup> *Università di Modena e Reggio Emilia, Modena, Italy*

<sup>i</sup> *Università di Genova, Genova, Italy*

<sup>j</sup> *Università di Milano Bicocca, Milano, Italy*

<sup>k</sup> *Università di Roma Tor Vergata, Roma, Italy*

<sup>l</sup> *Università di Roma La Sapienza, Roma, Italy*

<sup>m</sup> *Università della Basilicata, Potenza, Italy*

<sup>n</sup> *LIFAEELS, La Salle, Universitat Ramon Llull, Barcelona, Spain*

<sup>o</sup> *Hanoi University of Science, Hanoi, Viet Nam*

<sup>p</sup> *Institute of Physics and Technology, Moscow, Russia*

<sup>q</sup>*Università di Padova, Padova, Italy*

<sup>r</sup>*Università di Pisa, Pisa, Italy*

<sup>s</sup>*Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa, Italy*

# 1 Introduction

The observation of  $B$  meson decays into two charmless mesons has been reported in several decay modes [1]. Despite various searches at  $e^+e^-$  colliders [2–5], it is only recently that the LHCb collaboration reported the first observation of a two-body charmless baryonic  $B$  decay, the  $B^+ \rightarrow p\bar{\Lambda}(1520)$  mode [6]. This situation is in contrast with the observation of a multitude of three-body charmless baryonic  $B$  decays whose branching fractions are known to be larger than those of the two-body modes; the former exhibit a so-called threshold enhancement, with the baryon-antibaryon pair being preferentially produced at low invariant mass, while the suppression of the latter may be related to the same effect [7].

In this paper, a search for the  $B^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  and  $B_s^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  rare decay modes at LHCb is presented. Both branching fractions are measured with respect to that of the  $B^0 \rightarrow K^+\pi^-$  decay mode. The inclusion of charge-conjugate processes is implied throughout this paper.

In the Standard Model (SM), the  $B^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  mode decays via the  $b \rightarrow u$  tree-level process whereas the penguin-dominated decay  $B_s^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  is expected to be further suppressed. Theoretical predictions of the branching fractions for two-body charmless baryonic  $B^0$  decays within the SM vary depending on the method of calculation used, *e.g.* quantum chromodynamics sum rules, diquark model and pole model. The predicted branching fractions are typically of order  $10^{-7} - 10^{-6}$  [8–12]. No theoretical predictions have been published for the branching fraction of two-body charmless baryonic decays of the  $B_s^0$  meson.

The experimental 90% confidence level (CL) upper limit on the  $B^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  branching fraction,  $\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}) < 1.1 \times 10^{-7}$ , is dominated by the latest search by the Belle experiment [5] and has already ruled out most theoretical predictions. A single experimental search exists for the corresponding  $B_s^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  mode, performed by ALEPH, yielding the upper limit  $\mathcal{B}(B_s^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}) < 5.9 \times 10^{-5}$  at 90% CL [2].

## 2 Detector and trigger

The LHCb detector [13] 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 placed downstream. The combined tracking system provides momentum measurement with relative uncertainty that varies from 0.4% at 5 GeV/ $c$  to 0.6% at 100 GeV/ $c$ , and impact parameter (IP) resolution of 20  $\mu\text{m}$  for tracks with high transverse momentum ( $p_T$ ). Charged hadrons are identified using two ring-imaging Cherenkov detectors [14]. 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 by a system composed of alternating layers of iron and multiwire proportional chambers [15].



41 The trigger [16] consists of a hardware stage, based on information from the calorimeter  
42 and muon systems, followed by a software stage, which applies a full event reconstruction.

43 Events are triggered and subsequently selected in a similar way for both  $B_{(s)}^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$   
44 signal modes and the normalisation channel  $B^0 \rightarrow K^+\pi^-$ . The software trigger requires a  
45 two-track secondary vertex with a large sum of track  $p_T$  and significant displacement from  
46 the primary  $pp$  interaction vertices (PVs). At least one track should have  $p_T > 1.7 \text{ GeV}/c$   
47 and  $\chi_{\text{IP}}^2$  with respect to any primary interaction greater than 16, where  $\chi_{\text{IP}}^2$  is defined  
48 as the difference in  $\chi^2$  from the fit of a given PV reconstructed with and without the  
49 considered track. A multivariate algorithm [17] is used for the identification of secondary  
50 vertices consistent with the decay of a  $b$  hadron.

51 Simulated data samples are used for determining the relative detector and selection  
52 efficiencies between the signal and the normalisation modes:  $pp$  collisions are generated  
53 using PYTHIA 6.4 [18] with a specific LHCb configuration [19]; decays of hadronic par-  
54 ticles are described by EVTGEN [20], in which final state radiation is generated using  
55 PHOTOS [21]; and the interaction of the generated particles with the detector and its  
56 response are implemented using the GEANT4 toolkit [22] as described in Ref. [23].

### 57 3 Candidate selection

58 The selection requirements of both signal modes and the normalisation channel exploit the  
59 characteristic topology of two-body decays and their kinematics. All daughter tracks tend  
60 to have larger  $p_T$  compared to generic tracks from light-quark background owing to the  
61 high  $B$  mass, therefore a minimum  $p_T$  requirement is imposed for all daughter candidates.  
62 Furthermore, the two daughters form a secondary vertex (SV) displaced from the PV due  
63 to the relatively long  $B$  lifetime. The reconstructed  $B$  momentum vector points to its  
64 production vertex, the PV, which results in the  $B$  meson having a small IP with respect  
65 to the PV. This is in contrast with the daughters, which tend to have a large IP with  
66 respect to the PV as they originate from the SV, therefore a minimum  $\chi_{\text{IP}}^2$  with respect to  
67 the PVs is imposed on the daughters. The condition that the  $B$  candidate comes from the  
68 PV is further reinforced by requiring that the angle between the  $B$  candidate momentum  
69 vector and the line joining the associated PV and the  $B$  decay vertex ( $B$  direction angle)  
70 is close to zero.

71 To avoid potential biases,  $p\bar{p}$  candidates with invariant mass within  $\pm 50 \text{ MeV}/c^2$  ( $\approx 3\sigma$ )  
72 around the known  $B^0$  and  $B_s^0$  masses, specifically the region  $[5230, 5417] \text{ MeV}/c^2$ , are not  
73 examined until all analysis choices are finalised. The final selection of  $p\bar{p}$  candidates relies  
74 on a boosted decision tree (BDT) algorithm [24] as a multivariate classifier to separate  
75 signal from background. Additional preselection criteria are applied prior to the BDT  
76 training.

77 The BDT is trained with simulated signal samples and data from the sidebands of  
78 the  $p\bar{p}$  mass distribution as background. Of the  $1.0 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  of data recorded in 2011, 10% of  
79 the sample is exploited for the training of the  $B_{(s)}^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  selection, and 90% for the actual  
80 search. The BDT training relies on an accurate description of the distributions of the

81 selection variables in simulated events. The agreement between simulation and data is  
 82 checked on the  $B^0 \rightarrow K^+\pi^-$  proxy decay with distributions obtained from data using the  
 83 *sPlot* technique [25]. No significant deviations are found, giving confidence that the inputs  
 84 to the BDT yield a nearly optimal selection. The variables used in the BDT classifier are  
 85 properties of the  $B$  candidate and of the  $B$  daughters, *i.e.* the proton and the antiproton.  
 86 The  $B$  candidate variables are: the vertex  $\chi^2$  per number of degrees of freedom; the vertex  
 87  $\chi_{\text{IP}}^2$ ; the direction angle; the distance in  $z$  (the direction of the interacting proton beams)  
 88 between its decay vertex and the related PV; and the  $p_{\text{T}}$  asymmetry within a cone around  
 89 the  $B$  direction defined by  $A_{p_{\text{T}}} = (p_{\text{T}}^B - p_{\text{T}}^{\text{cone}})/(p_{\text{T}}^B + p_{\text{T}}^{\text{cone}})$ , with  $p_{\text{T}}^{\text{cone}}$  being the  $p_{\text{T}}$   
 90 of the vector sum of the momenta of all tracks measured within the cone radius  $R = 0.6$   
 91 around the  $B$  direction, except for the  $B$ -daughter particles. The cone radius is defined in  
 92 pseudorapidity and azimuthal angle  $(\eta, \phi)$  as  $R = \sqrt{(\Delta\eta)^2 + (\Delta\phi)^2}$ . The BDT selection  
 93 variables on the daughters are: their distance of closest approach; the minimum of their  
 94  $p_{\text{T}}$ ; the sum of their  $p_{\text{T}}$ ; the minimum of their  $\chi_{\text{IP}}^2$ ; the maximum of their  $\chi_{\text{IP}}^2$ ; and the  
 95 minimum of their cone multiplicities within the cone of radius  $R = 0.6$  around them, the  
 96 daughter cone multiplicity being calculated as the number of charged particles within the  
 97 cone around each  $B$  daughter.

98 The cone-related discriminators are motivated as isolation variables. The cone multi-  
 99 plicity requirement ensures that the  $B$  daughters are reasonably isolated in space. The  
 100  $A_{p_{\text{T}}}$  requirement further exploits the isolation of signal daughters in comparison to random  
 101 combinations of particles.

102 The figure of merit suggested in Ref. [26] is used to determine the optimal selection  
 103 point of the BDT classifier

$$\text{FoM} = \frac{\epsilon^{\text{BDT}}}{a/2 + \sqrt{B_{\text{BDT}}}}, \quad (1)$$

104 where  $\epsilon^{\text{BDT}}$  is the efficiency of the BDT selection on the  $B_{(s)}^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  signal candidates, which  
 105 is determined from simulation,  $B_{\text{BDT}}$  is the expected number of background events within  
 106 the (initially excluded) signal region, estimated from the data sidebands, and the term  
 107  $a = 3$  quantifies the target level of significance in units of standard deviation. With this  
 108 optimisation the BDT classifier is found to retain 44% of the  $B_{(s)}^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  signals while  
 109 reducing the combinatorial background level by 99.6%.

110 The kinematic selection of the  $B^0 \rightarrow K^+\pi^-$  decay is performed using individual  
 111 requirements on a set of variables similar to that used for the BDT selection of the  
 112  $B_{(s)}^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  decays, except that the cone variables are not used. This selection differs from  
 113 the selection used for signal modes and follows from the synergy with ongoing LHCb  
 114 analyses on two-body charmless  $B$  decays, *e.g.* Ref. [27].

115 The particle identification (PID) criteria applied in addition to the  $B_{(s)}^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  BDT  
 116 classifier are also optimised via Eq. 1. In this instance, the signal efficiencies are determined  
 117 from data control samples owing to known discrepancies between data and simulation for  
 118 the PID variables. Proton PID efficiencies are tabulated in bins of  $p$ ,  $p_{\text{T}}$  and the number  
 119 of tracks in the event from data control samples of  $\Lambda \rightarrow p\pi^-$  decays that are selected  
 120 solely using kinematic criteria. Pion and kaon efficiencies are likewise tabulated from data

121 control samples of  $D^{*+} \rightarrow D^0(\rightarrow K^-\pi^+)\pi^+$  decays. The kinematic distributions of the  
 122 simulated decay modes are then used to determine an average PID efficiency.

123 Specific PID criteria are separately defined for the two signal modes and the normali-  
 124 sation channel. The PID efficiencies are found to be approximately 56% for the  $B_{(s)}^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$   
 125 signals and 42% for  $B^0 \rightarrow K^+\pi^-$  decays.

126 The ratio of efficiencies of  $B_{(s)}^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  with respect to  $B^0 \rightarrow K^+\pi^-$ ,  $\epsilon_{B_{(s)}^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}}/\epsilon_{B^0 \rightarrow K^+\pi^-}$ ,  
 127 including contributions from the detector acceptance, trigger, selection and PID, is 0.60  
 128 (0.61). After all selection criteria are applied, 45 and 58009 candidates remain in the  
 129 invariant mass ranges [5080, 5480] MeV/ $c^2$  and [5000, 5800] MeV/ $c^2$  of the  $p\bar{p}$  and  $K^+\pi^-$   
 130 spectra, respectively.

131 Possible sources of background to the  $p\bar{p}$  and  $K^+\pi^-$  spectra are investigated using  
 132 simulation samples. These include partially reconstructed backgrounds with one or more  
 133 particles from the decay of the  $b$  hadron escaping detection, and two-body  $b$ -hadron decays  
 134 where one or both daughters are misidentified.

## 135 4 Signal yield determination

136 The signal and background candidates, in both the signal and normalisation channels, are  
 137 separated, after full selection, using unbinned maximum likelihood fits to the invariant  
 138 mass spectra.

139 The  $K^+\pi^-$  mass spectrum of the normalisation mode is described with a series of  
 140 probability density functions (PDFs) for the various components, similarly to Ref. [28]: the  
 141  $B^0 \rightarrow K^+\pi^-$  signal, the  $B_s^0 \rightarrow \pi^+K^-$  signal, the  $B_s^0 \rightarrow K^+K^-$ ,  $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$  and the  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow$   
 142  $p\pi^-$  misidentified backgrounds, partially reconstructed backgrounds, and combinatorial  
 143 background. Any contamination from other decays is treated as a source of systematic  
 144 uncertainty.

145 Both signal distributions are modelled by the sum of two Crystal Ball (CB) functions [29]  
 146 describing the high and low-mass asymmetric tails. The peak values and the widths of  
 147 the two CB components are constrained to be the same. All CB tail parameters and  
 148 the relative normalisation of the two CB functions are fixed to the values obtained from  
 149 simulation whereas the signal peak value and width are free to vary in the fit to the  $K^+\pi^-$   
 150 spectrum. The  $B_s^0 \rightarrow \pi^+K^-$  signal width is constrained to the fitted  $B^0 \rightarrow K^+\pi^-$  width  
 151 such that the ratio of the widths is identical to that obtained in simulation.

152 The invariant mass distributions of the misidentified  $B_s^0 \rightarrow K^+K^-$ ,  $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$   
 153 and  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow p\pi^-$  backgrounds are determined from simulation and modelled with non-  
 154 parametric PDFs. The fractions of these misidentified backgrounds are related to the  
 155 fraction of the  $B^0 \rightarrow K^+\pi^-$  signal in the data via scaling factors that take into account the  
 156 relative branching fractions [1, 30],  $b$ -hadron production fractions  $f_q$  [31, 32], and relevant  
 157 misidentification rates. The latter are determined from calibration data samples.

158 Partially reconstructed backgrounds represent decay modes that can populate the  
 159 spectrum when misreconstructed as signal with one or more undetected final-state particles,  
 160 possibly in conjunction with misidentifications. The shape of this distribution is determined

161 from simulation, where each contributing mode is assigned a weight dependent on its  
 162 relative branching fraction,  $f_q$  and selection efficiency. The weighted sum of these partially-  
 163 reconstructed backgrounds is shown to be well modelled with the sum of two exponentially-  
 164 modified Gaussian (EMG) functions

$$\text{EMG}(x; \mu, \sigma, \lambda) = \frac{\lambda}{2} e^{\frac{\lambda}{2}(2x + \lambda\sigma^2 - 2\mu)} \cdot \text{erfc}\left(\frac{x + \lambda\sigma^2 - \mu}{\sqrt{2}\sigma}\right), \quad (2)$$

165 where  $\text{erfc}(x) = 1 - \text{erf}(x)$  is the complementary error function. The signs of the variable  
 166  $x$  and parameter  $\mu$  are reversed compared to the standard definition of an EMG function.  
 167 The parameters defining the shape of the two EMG functions and their relative weight  
 168 are determined from simulation. The component fraction of the partially-reconstructed  
 169 backgrounds is obtained from the fit to the data, all other parameters being fixed from  
 170 simulation. The mass distribution of the combinatorial background is found to be well  
 171 described by a linear function whose gradient is determined by the fit.

172 The fit to the  $K^+\pi^-$  spectrum, presented in Fig. 1, determines seven parameters, and  
 173 yields  $N(B^0 \rightarrow K^+\pi^-) = 24\,968 \pm 198$  signal events, where the uncertainty is statistical  
 174 only.

175 The  $p\bar{p}$  spectrum is described by PDFs for the three components: the  $B^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  and  
 176  $B_s^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  signals, and the combinatorial background. In particular, any contamination from  
 177 partially reconstructed backgrounds, with or without misidentified particles, is treated as  
 178 a source of systematic uncertainty.

179 Potential sources of non-combinatorial background to the  $p\bar{p}$  spectrum are two- and  
 180 three-body decays of  $b$  hadrons into protons, pions and kaons, and many-body  $b$ -baryon  
 181 modes partially reconstructed, with one or multiple misidentifications. It is verified from  
 182 extensive simulation studies that the ensemble of specific backgrounds do not peak in the  
 183 signal region but rather contribute to a smooth mass spectrum, which can be accommodated  
 184 by the dominant combinatorial background contribution. The most relevant backgrounds  
 185 are found to be  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+(\rightarrow p\bar{K}^0)\pi^-$ ,  $\Lambda_b^0 \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 p\pi^-$ ,  $B^0 \rightarrow K^+K^-\pi^0$  and  $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$   
 186 decays. Calibration data samples are exploited to determine the PID efficiencies of  
 187 these decay modes, thereby confirming the suppression with respect to the combinatorial  
 188 background by typically one or two orders of magnitude. Henceforth physics-specific  
 189 backgrounds are neglected in the fit to the  $p\bar{p}$  mass spectrum.

190 The  $B_{(s)}^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  signal mass shapes are verified in simulation to be well described by a  
 191 single Gaussian function. The widths of both Gaussian functions are assumed to be the  
 192 same for  $B^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  and  $B_s^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$ ; a systematic uncertainty associated to this assumption  
 193 is evaluated. They are determined from simulation with a scaling factor to account for  
 194 differences in the resolution between data and simulation; the scaling factor is determined  
 195 from the  $B^0 \rightarrow K^+\pi^-$  data and simulation samples. The mean of the  $B_s^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  Gaussian  
 196 function is constrained according to the  $B_s^0 - B^0$  mass difference [1]. The mass distribution  
 197 of the combinatorial background is described by a linear function.

198 The fit to the  $p\bar{p}$  mass spectrum is presented in Fig. 2. The yields for the  $B_{(s)}^0 \rightarrow$   
 199  $p\bar{p}$  signals in the full mass range are  $N(B^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}) = 11.4_{-4.1}^{+4.3}$  and  $N(B_s^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}) = 5.7_{-3.2}^{+3.5}$ ,  
 200 where the uncertainties are statistical only.




Figure 1: Invariant mass distribution of  $K^+\pi^-$  candidates after full selection. The fit result (blue, solid) is superposed together with each fit model component as described in the legend. The normalised fit residual distribution is shown at the bottom.

201 The statistical significances of the  $B_{(s)}^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  signals are computed, using Wilks'  
 202 theorem [33], from the change in the mass fit likelihood profiles when omitting the signal  
 203 under scrutiny, namely  $\sqrt{2\ln(L_{S+B}/L_B)}$ , where  $L_{S+B}$  and  $L_B$  are the likelihoods from the  
 204 baseline fit and from the fit without the signal component, respectively. The statistical  
 205 significances are  $3.5\sigma$  and  $1.9\sigma$  for the  $B^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  and  $B_s^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  decay modes, respectively.  
 206 Each statistical-only likelihood curve is convolved with a Gaussian resolution function  
 207 of width equal to the systematic uncertainty (discussed below) on the signal yield. The  
 208 resulting likelihood profiles are presented in Fig. 3. The total signal significances are  $3.3\sigma$   
 209 and  $1.9\sigma$  for the  $B^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  and  $B_s^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  modes, respectively. We observe an excess of  
 210  $B^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  candidates with respect to background expectations; the  $B_s^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  signal is not  
 211 considered to be statistically significant.




Figure 2: Invariant mass distribution of  $p\bar{p}$  candidates after full selection. The fit result (blue, solid) is superposed with each fit model component: the  $B^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  signal (red, dashed), the  $B_s^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  signal (grey, dotted) and the combinatorial background (green, dot-dashed).




Figure 3: Negative logarithm of the profile likelihoods as a function of (left) the  $B^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  signal yield and (right) the  $B_s^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  signal yield. The orange solid curves correspond to the statistical-only profiles whereas the blue dashed curves include systematic uncertainties.

## 212 5 Systematic uncertainties

213 The sources of systematic uncertainty are minimised by performing the branching fraction  
 214 measurement relative to a decay mode topologically identical to the decays of interest.  
 215 They are summarised in Table 1.

216 The branching fraction of the normalisation channel  $B^0 \rightarrow K^+\pi^-$ ,  $\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow K^+\pi^-) =$   
 217  $(19.55 \pm 0.54) \times 10^{-6}$  [30], is known to a precision of 2.8%, which is taken as a system-  
 218 atic uncertainty. For the measurement of the  $B_s^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  branching fraction, an extra

Table 1: Relative systematic uncertainties contributing to the  $B_{(s)}^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  branching fractions. The total corresponds to the sum of all contributions added in quadrature.

Source	Value (%)		
	$B^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$	$B_s^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$	$B^0 \rightarrow K^+\pi^-$
$B^0 \rightarrow K^+\pi^-$ branching fraction	–	–	2.8
Trigger efficiency relative to $B^0 \rightarrow K^+\pi^-$	2.0	2.0	–
Selection efficiency relative to $B^0 \rightarrow K^+\pi^-$	8.0	8.0	–
PID efficiency	10.6	10.7	1.0
Yield from mass fit	6.8	4.6	1.6
$f_s/f_d$	–	7.8	–
Total	15.1	16.3	3.4

219 uncertainty arises from the 7.8% uncertainty on the ratio of fragmentation fractions  
 220  $f_s/f_d = 0.256 \pm 0.020$  [32].

221 The trigger efficiencies are assessed from simulation for all decay modes. The simulation  
 222 describes well the ratio of efficiencies of the relevant modes that comprise the same number  
 223 of tracks in the final state. Neglecting small  $p$  and  $p_T$  differences between the  $B^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$   
 224 and  $B_s^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  modes, the ratios of  $B^0 \rightarrow K^+\pi^-/B_{(s)}^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  trigger efficiencies should be  
 225 consistent within uncertainties. The difference of about 2% observed in simulation is taken  
 226 as systematic uncertainty.

227 The  $B^0 \rightarrow K^+\pi^-$  mode is used as a proxy for the assessment of the systematic  
 228 uncertainties related to the selection;  $B^0 \rightarrow K^+\pi^-$  signal distributions are obtained from  
 229 data, using the *sPlot* technique, for a variety of selection variables. From the level of  
 230 agreement between simulation and data, a systematic uncertainty of 8% is derived for the  
 231  $B_{(s)}^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  selection efficiencies relative to  $B^0 \rightarrow K^+\pi^-$ .

232 The PID efficiencies are determined from data control samples. The associated sys-  
 233 tematic uncertainties are estimated by repeating the procedure with simulated control  
 234 samples, the uncertainties being equal to the differences observed between data and  
 235 simulation, scaled by the PID efficiencies estimated with the data control samples. The  
 236 systematic uncertainties on the PID efficiencies are found to be 10.6%, 10.7% and 1.0% for  
 237 the  $B^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$ ,  $B_s^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  and  $B^0 \rightarrow K^+\pi^-$  decay modes, respectively. The large uncertainties  
 238 on the proton PID efficiencies arise from limited coverage of the proton control samples in  
 239 the kinematic region of interest for the signal.

240 Systematic uncertainties on the fit yields arise from the limited knowledge or the  
 241 choice of the mass fit models, and from the uncertainties on the values of the parameters  
 242 fixed in the fits. They are investigated by studying a large number of simulated datasets,  
 243 with parameters varying within their estimated uncertainties. Combining all sources of  
 244 uncertainty in quadrature, the uncertainties on the  $B^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$ ,  $B_s^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  and  $B^0 \rightarrow K^+\pi^-$

245 yields are 6.8%, 4.6% and 1.6%, respectively.

## 246 6 Results and conclusion

247 The branching fractions are determined relative to the  $B^0 \rightarrow K^+\pi^-$  normalisation channel  
248 according to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}(B_{(s)}^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}) &= \frac{N(B_{(s)}^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p})}{N(B^0 \rightarrow K^+\pi^-)} \cdot \frac{\epsilon_{B^0 \rightarrow K^+\pi^-}}{\epsilon_{B_{(s)}^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}}} \cdot f_d/f_{d(s)} \cdot \mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow K^+\pi^-) \\ &= \alpha_{d(s)} \cdot N(B_{(s)}^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}), \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

249 where  $\alpha_{d(s)}$  are the single-event sensitivities equal to  $(1.31 \pm 0.18) \times 10^{-9}$  and  $(5.04 \pm$   
250  $0.81) \times 10^{-9}$  for the  $B^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  and  $B_s^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  decay modes, respectively; their uncertainties  
251 amount to 14% and 16%, respectively.

252 The Feldman-Cousins (FC) frequentist method [34] is chosen for the calculation of the  
253 branching fractions. The determination of the 68.3% and 90% CL bands is performed  
254 with simulation studies relating the measured signal yields to branching fractions, and  
255 accounting for systematic uncertainties. The 68.3% and 90% CL intervals are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}) &= (1.47_{-0.51}^{+0.62} {}_{-0.14}^{+0.35}) \times 10^{-8} \quad \text{at } 68.3\% \text{ CL}, \\ \mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}) &= (1.47_{-0.81}^{+1.09} {}_{-0.18}^{+0.69}) \times 10^{-8} \quad \text{at } 90\% \text{ CL}, \\ \mathcal{B}(B_s^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}) &= (2.84_{-1.68}^{+2.03} {}_{-0.18}^{+0.85}) \times 10^{-8} \quad \text{at } 68.3\% \text{ CL}, \\ \mathcal{B}(B_s^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}) &= (2.84_{-2.12}^{+3.57} {}_{-0.21}^{+2.00}) \times 10^{-8} \quad \text{at } 90\% \text{ CL}, \end{aligned}$$

256 where the first uncertainties are statistical and the second are systematic.

257 In summary, a search has been performed for the rare two-body charmless baryonic  
258 decays  $B^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  and  $B_s^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  using a data sample, corresponding to an integrated  
259 luminosity of  $0.9 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ , of  $pp$  collisions collected at a centre-of-mass energy of 7 TeV by  
260 the LHCb experiment. The results allow two-sided confidence limits to be placed on the  
261 branching fractions of both  $B^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  and  $B_s^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  for the first time. We observe an  
262 excess of  $B^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  candidates with respect to background expectations with a statistical  
263 significance of  $3.3\sigma$ . This is the first evidence for a two-body charmless baryonic  $B^0$  decay.  
264 No significant  $B_s^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  signal is observed and the present result improves the previous  
265 bound by three orders of magnitude.

266 The measured  $B^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  branching fraction is incompatible with all published theoretical  
267 predictions by one to two orders of magnitude and motivates new and more precise theo-  
268 retical calculations of two-body charmless baryonic  $B$  decays. An improved experimental  
269 search for these decay modes at LHCb with the full 2011 and 2012 dataset will help to  
270 clarify the situation, in particular for the  $B_s^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$  mode.



## Acknowledgements

We express our gratitude to our colleagues in the CERN accelerator departments for the excellent performance of the LHC. We thank the technical and administrative staff at the LHCb institutes. We acknowledge support from CERN and from the national agencies: CAPES, CNPq, FAPERJ and FINEP (Brazil); NSFC (China); CNRS/IN2P3 and Region Auvergne (France); BMBF, DFG, HGF and MPG (Germany); SFI (Ireland); INFN (Italy); FOM and NWO (The Netherlands); SCSR (Poland); MEN/IFA (Romania); MinES, Rosatom, RFBR and NRC “Kurchatov Institute” (Russia); MinECo, XuntaGal and GENCAT (Spain); SNSF and SER (Switzerland); NAS Ukraine (Ukraine); STFC (United Kingdom); NSF (USA). We also acknowledge the support received from the ERC under FP7. The Tier1 computing centres are supported by IN2P3 (France), KIT and BMBF (Germany), INFN (Italy), NWO and SURF (The Netherlands), PIC (Spain), GridPP (United Kingdom). We are thankful for the computing resources put at our disposal by Yandex LLC (Russia), as well as to the communities behind the multiple open source software packages that we depend on.

## References

- [1] Particle Data Group, J. Beringer *et al.*, *Review of particle physics*, Phys. Rev. **D86** (2012) 010001.
- [2] ALEPH collaboration, D. Buskulic *et al.*, *Observation of charmless hadronic B decays*, Phys. Lett. **B384** (1996) 471.
- [3] CLEO collaboration, T. Coan *et al.*, *Search for exclusive rare baryonic decays of B mesons*, Phys. Rev. **D59** (1999) 111101, [arXiv:hep-ex/9810043](#).
- [4] BaBar collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, *Search for the decay  $B^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}$* , Phys. Rev. **D69** (2004) 091503, [arXiv:hep-ex/0403003](#).
- [5] Belle collaboration, Y.-T. Tsai *et al.*, *Search for  $B^0 \rightarrow p\bar{p}, \Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$  and  $B^+ \rightarrow p\bar{\Lambda}$  at Belle*, Phys. Rev. **D75** (2007) 111101, [arXiv:hep-ex/0703048](#).
- [6] LHCb collaboration, R. Aaij *et al.*, *Studies of the decays  $B^+ \rightarrow p\bar{p}h^+$  and observation of  $B^+ \rightarrow \bar{\Lambda}(1520)p$* , [arXiv:1307.6165](#), submitted to Phys. Rev. D.
- [7] H.-Y. Cheng and J. G. Smith, *Charmless hadronic B meson decays*, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **59** (2009) 215, [arXiv:0901.4396](#).
- [8] V. Chernyak and I. Zhitnitsky, *B-meson exclusive decays into baryons*, Nucl. Phys. **B345** (1990) 137.
- [9] P. Ball and H. G. Dosch, *Branching ratios of exclusive decays of bottom mesons into baryon-antibaryon pairs*, Z. Phys. **C - Particles and Fields** **51** (1991) 445.

- 305 [10] M. Jarfi *et al.*, *Pole model of B-meson decays into baryon-antibaryon pairs*, Phys. Rev.  
306 **D43** (1991) 1599.
- 307 [11] M. Jarfi *et al.*, *Relevance of baryon-antibaryon decays of  $B_d^0$ ,  $\bar{B}_d^0$  in tests of CP*  
308 *violation*, Phys. Lett. **B237** (1990) 513.
- 309 [12] H.-Y. Cheng and K.-C. Yang, *Charmless exclusive baryonic B decays*, Phys. Rev.  
310 **D66** (2002) 014020.
- 311 [13] LHCb collaboration, A. A. Alves Jr. *et al.*, *The LHCb detector at the LHC*, JINST **3**  
312 (2008) S08005.
- 313 [14] M. Adinolfi *et al.*, *Performance of the LHCb RICH detector at the LHC*, Eur. Phys.  
314 J. **C73** (2013) 2431, [arXiv:1211.6759](#).
- 315 [15] A. A. Alves Jr *et al.*, *Performance of the LHCb muon system*, JINST **8** (2013) P02022,  
316 [arXiv:1211.1346](#).
- 317 [16] R. Aaij *et al.*, *The LHCb trigger and its performance in 2011*, JINST **8** (2013) P04022,  
318 [arXiv:1211.3055](#).
- 319 [17] V. V. Gligorov and M. Williams, *Efficient, reliable and fast high-level triggering using*  
320 *a bonsai boosted decision tree*, JINST **8** (2013) P02013, [arXiv:1210.6861](#).
- 321 [18] T. Sjöstrand, S. Mrenna, and P. Skands, *PYTHIA 6.4 physics and manual*, JHEP **05**  
322 (2006) 026, [arXiv:hep-ph/0603175](#).
- 323 [19] I. Belyaev *et al.*, *Handling of the generation of primary events in GAUSS, the LHCb*  
324 *simulation framework*, Nuclear Science Symposium Conference Record (NSS/MIC)  
325 **IEEE** (2010) 1155.
- 326 [20] D. J. Lange, *The EvtGen particle decay simulation package*, Nucl. Instrum. Meth.  
327 **A462** (2001) 152.
- 328 [21] P. Golonka and Z. Was, *PHOTOS Monte Carlo: a precision tool for QED corrections*  
329 *in Z and W decays*, Eur. Phys. J. **C45** (2006) 97, [arXiv:hep-ph/0506026](#).
- 330 [22] Geant4 collaboration, J. Allison *et al.*, *Geant4 developments and applications*, IEEE  
331 Trans. Nucl. Sci. **53** (2006) 270; Geant4 collaboration, S. Agostinelli *et al.*, *Geant4: a*  
332 *simulation toolkit*, Nucl. Instrum. Meth. **A506** (2003) 250.
- 333 [23] M. Clemencic *et al.*, *The LHCb simulation application, GAUSS: design, evolution and*  
334 *experience*, J. Phys. Conf. Ser. **331** (2011) 032023.
- 335 [24] L. Breiman, J. H. Friedman, R. A. Olshen, and C. J. Stone, *Classification and*  
336 *regression trees*, Wadsworth international group, Belmont, California, USA, 1984.

- 337 [25] M. Pivk and F. R. Le Diberder, *sPlot: a statistical tool to unfold data distributions*,  
338 Nucl. Instrum. Meth. **A555** (2005) 356, [arXiv:physics/0402083](#).
- 339 [26] G. Punzi, *Sensitivity of searches for new signals and its optimization*, in *Statistical*  
340 *problems in particle physics, astrophysics, and cosmology* (L. Lyons, R. Mount, and  
341 R. Reitmeyer, eds.), p. 79, 2003. [arXiv:physics/0308063](#).
- 342 [27] LHCb collaboration, R. Aaij *et al.*, *Measurement of the effective  $B_s^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-$  lifetime*,  
343 Phys. Lett. **B716** (2012) 393, [arXiv:1207.5993](#).
- 344 [28] LHCb collaboration, R. Aaij *et al.*, *First observation of CP violation in the decays of*  
345  *$B_s^0$  mesons*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110** (2013) 221601, [arXiv:1304.6173](#).
- 346 [29] T. Skwarnicki, *A study of the radiative cascade transitions between the Upsilon-prime*  
347 *and Upsilon resonances*, PhD thesis, Institute of Nuclear Physics, Krakow, 1986,  
348 DESY-F31-86-02.
- 349 [30] Heavy Flavor Averaging Group, Y. Amhis *et al.*, *Averages of b-hadron, c-hadron, and*  
350  *$\tau$ -lepton properties as of early 2012*, [arXiv:1207.1158](#), updated results and plots  
351 available at: <http://www.slac.stanford.edu/xorg/hfag/>.
- 352 [31] LHCb collaboration, R. Aaij *et al.*, *Measurement of b hadron production fractions in*  
353 *7 TeV pp collisions*, Phys. Rev. **D85** (2012) 032008, [arXiv:1111.2357](#).
- 354 [32] LHCb collaboration, R. Aaij *et al.*, *Measurement of the fragmentation fraction*  
355 *ratio  $f_s/f_d$  and its dependence on B meson kinematics*, JHEP **1304** (2013) 001,  
356 [arXiv:1301.5286](#).
- 357 [33] S. S. Wilks, *The large-sample distribution of the likelihood ratio for testing composite*  
358 *hypotheses*, The Annals of Mathematical Statistics (1938) 60.
- 359 [34] G. J. Feldman and R. D. Cousins, *Unified approach to the classical statistical analysis*  
360 *of small signals*, Phys. Rev. **D57** (1998) 3873.