

Search for Long-Lived Particles in e^+e^- Collisions

J. P. Lees,¹ V. Poireau,¹ V. Tisserand,¹ E. Grauges,² A. Palano^{ab,3} G. Eigen,⁴ B. Stugu,⁴ D. N. Brown,⁵ L. T. Kerth,⁵ Yu. G. Kolomensky,⁵ M. J. Lee,⁵ G. Lynch,⁵ H. Koch,⁶ T. Schroeder,⁶ C. Hearty,⁷ T. S. Mattison,⁷ J. A. McKenna,⁷ R. Y. So,⁷ A. Khan,⁸ V. E. Blinov^{abc,9} A. R. Buzykaev^{a,9} V. P. Druzhinin^{ab,9} V. B. Golubev^{ab,9} E. A. Kravchenko^{ab,9} A. P. Onuchin^{abc,9} S. I. Serednyakov^{ab,9} Yu. I. Skovpen^{ab,9} E. P. Solodov^{ab,9} K. Yu. Todyshev^{ab,9} A. J. Lankford,¹⁰ B. Dey,¹¹ J. W. Gary,¹¹ O. Long,¹¹ C. Campagnari,¹² M. Franco Sevilla,¹² T. M. Hong,¹² D. Kovalskyi,¹² J. D. Richman,¹² C. A. West,¹² A. M. Eisner,¹³ W. S. Lockman,¹³ W. Panduro Vazquez,¹³ B. A. Schumm,¹³ A. Seiden,¹³ D. S. Chao,¹⁴ C. H. Cheng,¹⁴ B. Echenard,¹⁴ K. T. Flood,¹⁴ D. G. Hitlin,¹⁴ T. S. Miyashita,¹⁴ P. Ongmongkolkul,¹⁴ F. C. Porter,¹⁴ M. Röhrken,¹⁴ R. Andreassen,¹⁵ Z. Huard,¹⁵ B. T. Meadows,¹⁵ B. G. Pushpawela,¹⁵ M. D. Sokoloff,¹⁵ L. Sun,¹⁵ P. C. Bloom,¹⁶ W. T. Ford,¹⁶ A. Gaz,¹⁶ J. G. Smith,¹⁶ S. R. Wagner,¹⁶ R. Ayad,^{17,*} W. H. Toki,¹⁷ B. Spaan,¹⁸ D. Bernard,¹⁹ M. Verderi,¹⁹ S. Playfer,²⁰ D. Bettoni^{a,21} C. Bozzi^{a,21} R. Calabrese^{ab,21} G. Cibinetto^{ab,21} E. Fioravanti^{ab,21} I. Garzia^{ab,21} E. Luppi^{ab,21} L. Piemontese^{a,21} V. Santoro^{a,21} A. Calcaterra,²² R. de Sangro,²² G. Finocchiaro,²² S. Martellotti,²² P. Patteri,²² I. M. Peruzzi,^{22,†} M. Piccolo,²² M. Rama,²² A. Zallo,²² R. Contri^{ab,23} M. Lo Vetere^{ab,23} M. R. Monge^{ab,23} S. Passaggio^{a,23} C. Patrignani^{ab,23} E. Robutti^{a,23} B. Bhuyan,²⁴ V. Prasad,²⁴ A. Adametz,²⁵ U. Uwer,²⁵ H. M. Lacker,²⁶ U. Mallik,²⁷ C. Chen,²⁸ J. Cochran,²⁸ S. Prell,²⁸ H. Ahmed,²⁹ A. V. Gritsan,³⁰ N. Arnaud,³¹ M. Davier,³¹ D. Derkach,³¹ G. Grosdidier,³¹ F. Le Diberder,³¹ A. M. Lutz,³¹ B. Malaescu,^{31,‡} P. Roudeau,³¹ A. Stocchi,³¹ G. Wormser,³¹ D. J. Lange,³² D. M. Wright,³² J. P. Coleman,³³ J. R. Fry,³³ E. Gabathuler,³³ D. E. Hutchcroft,³³ D. J. Payne,³³ C. Touramanis,³³ A. J. Bevan,³⁴ F. Di Lodovico,³⁴ R. Sacco,³⁴ G. Cowan,³⁵ D. N. Brown,³⁶ C. L. Davis,³⁶ A. G. Denig,³⁷ M. Fritsch,³⁷ W. Gradl,³⁷ K. Griessinger,³⁷ A. Hafner,³⁷ K. R. Schubert,³⁷ R. J. Barlow,^{38,§} G. D. Lafferty,³⁸ R. Cenci,³⁹ B. Hamilton,³⁹ A. Jawahery,³⁹ D. A. Roberts,³⁹ R. Cowan,⁴⁰ G. Sciolla,⁴⁰ R. Cheaib,⁴¹ P. M. Patel,^{41,¶} S. H. Robertson,⁴¹ N. Neri^{a,42} F. Palombo^{ab,42} L. Cremaldi,⁴³ R. Godang,^{43,**} P. Sonnek,⁴³ D. J. Summers,⁴³ M. Simard,⁴⁴ P. Taras,⁴⁴ G. De Nardo^{ab,45} G. Onorato^{ab,45} C. Sciacca^{ab,45} M. Martinelli,⁴⁶ G. Raven,⁴⁶ C. P. Jessop,⁴⁷ J. M. LoSecco,⁴⁷ K. Honscheid,⁴⁸ R. Kass,⁴⁸ E. Feltres^{ab,49} M. Margoni^{ab,49} M. Morandin^{a,49} M. Posocco^{a,49} M. Rotondo^{a,49} G. Simi^{ab,49} F. Simonetto^{ab,49} R. Stroili^{ab,49} S. Akar,⁵⁰ E. Ben-Haim,⁵⁰ M. Bomben,⁵⁰ G. R. Bonneaud,⁵⁰ H. Briand,⁵⁰ G. Calderini,⁵⁰ J. Chauveau,⁵⁰ Ph. Leruste,⁵⁰ G. Marchiori,⁵⁰ J. Ocariz,⁵⁰ M. Biasini^{ab,51} E. Manoni^{a,51} S. Pacetti^{ab,51} A. Rossi^{a,51} C. Angelini^{ab,52} G. Batignani^{ab,52} S. Bettarini^{ab,52} M. Carpinelli^{ab,52,††} G. Casarosa^{ab,52} A. Cervelli^{ab,52} M. Chrzaszcz^{a,52} F. Forti^{ab,52} M. A. Giorgi^{ab,52} A. Lusiani^{ac,52} B. Oberhof^{ab,52} E. Paoloni^{ab,52} A. Perez^{a,52} G. Rizzo^{ab,52} J. J. Walsh^{a,52} D. Lopes Pegna,⁵³ J. Olsen,⁵³ A. J. S. Smith,⁵³ F. Anulli^{a,54} R. Faccini^{ab,54} F. Ferrarotto^{a,54} F. Ferroni^{ab,54} M. Gaspero^{ab,54} L. Li Gioi^{a,54} A. Pilloni^{ab,54} G. Piredda^{a,54} C. Büniger,⁵⁵ S. Dittrich,⁵⁵ O. Grünberg,⁵⁵ M. Hess,⁵⁵ T. Leddig,⁵⁵ C. Voß,⁵⁵ R. Waldi,⁵⁵ T. Auye, ⁵⁶ E. O. Olaiya,⁵⁶ F. F. Wilson,⁵⁶ S. Emery,⁵⁷ G. Vasseur,⁵⁷ D. Aston,⁵⁸ D. J. Bard,⁵⁸ C. Cartaro,⁵⁸ M. R. Convery,⁵⁸ J. Dorfan,⁵⁸ G. P. Dubois-Felsmann,⁵⁸ W. Dunwoodie,⁵⁸ M. Ebert,⁵⁸ R. C. Field,⁵⁸ B. G. Fulsom,⁵⁸ M. T. Graham,⁵⁸ C. Hast,⁵⁸ W. R. Innes,⁵⁸ P. Kim,⁵⁸ D. W. G. S. Leith,⁵⁸ D. Lindemann,⁵⁸ S. Luitz,⁵⁸ V. Luth,⁵⁸ H. L. Lynch,⁵⁸ D. B. MacFarlane,⁵⁸ D. R. Muller,⁵⁸ H. Neal,⁵⁸ M. Perl,^{58,¶} T. Pulliam,⁵⁸ B. N. Ratcliff,⁵⁸ A. Roodman,⁵⁸ A. A. Salnikov,⁵⁸ R. H. Schindler,⁵⁸ A. Snyder,⁵⁸ D. Su,⁵⁸ M. K. Sullivan,⁵⁸ J. Va'vra,⁵⁸ W. J. Wisniewski,⁵⁸ H. W. Wulsin,⁵⁸ M. V. Purohit,⁵⁹ R. M. White,^{59,‡‡} J. R. Wilson,⁵⁹ A. Randle-Conde,⁶⁰ S. J. Sekula,⁶⁰ M. Bellis,⁶¹ P. R. Burchat,⁶¹ E. M. T. Puccio,⁶¹ M. S. Alam,⁶² J. A. Ernst,⁶² R. Gorodeisky,⁶³ N. Guttman,⁶³ D. R. Peimer,⁶³ A. Soffer,⁶³ S. M. Spanier,⁶⁴ J. L. Ritchie,⁶⁵ R. F. Schwitters,⁶⁵ B. C. Wray,⁶⁵ J. M. Izen,⁶⁶ X. C. Lou,⁶⁶ F. Bianchi^{ab,67} F. De Mori^{ab,67} A. Filippi^{a,67} D. Gamba^{ab,67} L. Lanceri^{ab,68} L. Vitale^{ab,68} F. Martinez-Vidal,⁶⁹ A. Oyanguren,⁶⁹ P. Villanueva-Perez,⁶⁹ J. Albert,⁷⁰ Sw. Banerjee,⁷⁰ A. Beaulieu,⁷⁰ F. U. Bernlochner,⁷⁰ H. H. F. Choi,⁷⁰ G. J. King,⁷⁰ R. Kowalewski,⁷⁰ M. J. Lewczuk,⁷⁰ T. Lueck,⁷⁰ I. M. Nugent,⁷⁰ J. M. Roney,⁷⁰ R. J. Sobie,⁷⁰ N. Tasneem,⁷⁰ T. J. Gershon,⁷¹ P. F. Harrison,⁷¹ T. E. Latham,⁷¹ H. R. Band,⁷² S. Dasu,⁷² Y. Pan,⁷² R. Prepost,⁷² and S. L. Wu⁷²

(The BABAR Collaboration)

Submitted to Physical Review Letters.

This material is based upon work supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of Basic Energy Sciences, under Contract No. DE-AC02-76SF00515 and HEP.

- ¹Laboratoire d'Annecy-le-Vieux de Physique des Particules (LAPP),
Université de Savoie, CNRS/IN2P3, F-74941 Annecy-Le-Vieux, France
- ²Universitat de Barcelona, Facultat de Física, Departament ECM, E-08028 Barcelona, Spain
- ³INFN Sezione di Bari^a; Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Bari^b, I-70126 Bari, Italy
- ⁴University of Bergen, Institute of Physics, N-5007 Bergen, Norway
- ⁵Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory and University of California, Berkeley, California 94720, USA
- ⁶Ruhr Universität Bochum, Institut für Experimentalphysik 1, D-44780 Bochum, Germany
- ⁷University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada V6T 1Z1
- ⁸Brunel University, Uxbridge, Middlesex UB8 3PH, United Kingdom
- ⁹Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics SB RAS, Novosibirsk 630090^a,
Novosibirsk State University, Novosibirsk 630090^b,
Novosibirsk State Technical University, Novosibirsk 630092^c, Russia
- ¹⁰University of California at Irvine, Irvine, California 92697, USA
- ¹¹University of California at Riverside, Riverside, California 92521, USA
- ¹²University of California at Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, California 93106, USA
- ¹³University of California at Santa Cruz, Institute for Particle Physics, Santa Cruz, California 95064, USA
- ¹⁴California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California 91125, USA
- ¹⁵University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio 45221, USA
- ¹⁶University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80309, USA
- ¹⁷Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado 80523, USA
- ¹⁸Technische Universität Dortmund, Fakultät Physik, D-44221 Dortmund, Germany
- ¹⁹Laboratoire Leprince-Ringuet, Ecole Polytechnique, CNRS/IN2P3, F-91128 Palaiseau, France
- ²⁰University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH9 3JZ, United Kingdom
- ²¹INFN Sezione di Ferrara^a; Dipartimento di Fisica e Scienze della Terra, Università di Ferrara^b, I-44122 Ferrara, Italy
- ²²INFN Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, I-00044 Frascati, Italy
- ²³INFN Sezione di Genova^a; Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Genova^b, I-16146 Genova, Italy
- ²⁴Indian Institute of Technology Guwahati, Guwahati, Assam, 781 039, India
- ²⁵Universität Heidelberg, Physikalisches Institut, D-69120 Heidelberg, Germany
- ²⁶Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Institut für Physik, D-12489 Berlin, Germany
- ²⁷University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa 52242, USA
- ²⁸Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011-3160, USA
- ²⁹Physics Department, Jazan University, Jazan 22822, Kingdom of Saudia Arabia
- ³⁰Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland 21218, USA
- ³¹Laboratoire de l'Accélérateur Linéaire, IN2P3/CNRS et Université Paris-Sud 11,
Centre Scientifique d'Orsay, F-91898 Orsay Cedex, France
- ³²Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California 94550, USA
- ³³University of Liverpool, Liverpool L69 7ZE, United Kingdom
- ³⁴Queen Mary, University of London, London, E1 4NS, United Kingdom
- ³⁵University of London, Royal Holloway and Bedford New College, Egham, Surrey TW20 0EX, United Kingdom
- ³⁶University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky 40292, USA
- ³⁷Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz, Institut für Kernphysik, D-55099 Mainz, Germany
- ³⁸University of Manchester, Manchester M13 9PL, United Kingdom
- ³⁹University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742, USA
- ⁴⁰Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Laboratory for Nuclear Science, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, USA
- ⁴¹McGill University, Montréal, Québec, Canada H3A 2T8
- ⁴²INFN Sezione di Milano^a; Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Milano^b, I-20133 Milano, Italy
- ⁴³University of Mississippi, University, Mississippi 38677, USA
- ⁴⁴Université de Montréal, Physique des Particules, Montréal, Québec, Canada H3C 3J7
- ⁴⁵INFN Sezione di Napoli^a; Dipartimento di Scienze Fisiche,
Università di Napoli Federico II^b, I-80126 Napoli, Italy
- ⁴⁶NIKHEF, National Institute for Nuclear Physics and High Energy Physics, NL-1009 DB Amsterdam, The Netherlands
- ⁴⁷University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana 46556, USA
- ⁴⁸Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210, USA
- ⁴⁹INFN Sezione di Padova^a; Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Padova^b, I-35131 Padova, Italy
- ⁵⁰Laboratoire de Physique Nucléaire et de Hautes Energies,
IN2P3/CNRS, Université Pierre et Marie Curie-Paris6,
Université Denis Diderot-Paris7, F-75252 Paris, France
- ⁵¹INFN Sezione di Perugia^a; Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Perugia^b, I-06123 Perugia, Italy
- ⁵²INFN Sezione di Pisa^a; Dipartimento di Fisica,
Università di Pisa^b; Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa^c, I-56127 Pisa, Italy
- ⁵³Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey 08544, USA
- ⁵⁴INFN Sezione di Roma^a; Dipartimento di Fisica,
Università di Roma La Sapienza^b, I-00185 Roma, Italy
- ⁵⁵Universität Rostock, D-18051 Rostock, Germany

⁵⁶Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Chilton, Didcot, Oxon, OX11 0QX, United Kingdom

⁵⁷CEA, Irfu, SPP, Centre de Saclay, F-91191 Gif-sur-Yvette, France

⁵⁸SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory, Stanford, California 94309 USA

⁵⁹University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina 29208, USA

⁶⁰Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas 75275, USA

⁶¹Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305-4060, USA

⁶²State University of New York, Albany, New York 12222, USA

⁶³Tel Aviv University, School of Physics and Astronomy, Tel Aviv, 69978, Israel

⁶⁴University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee 37996, USA

⁶⁵University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712, USA

⁶⁶University of Texas at Dallas, Richardson, Texas 75083, USA

⁶⁷INFN Sezione di Torino^a; Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Torino^b, I-10125 Torino, Italy

⁶⁸INFN Sezione di Trieste^a; Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Trieste^b, I-34127 Trieste, Italy

⁶⁹IFIC, Universitat de Valencia-CSIC, E-46071 Valencia, Spain

⁷⁰University of Victoria, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada V8W 3P6

⁷¹Department of Physics, University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL, United Kingdom

⁷²University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706, USA

We present a search for a neutral, long-lived particle L that is produced in e^+e^- collisions and decays at a significant distance from the e^+e^- interaction point into various flavor combinations of two oppositely charged tracks. The analysis uses an e^+e^- data sample with a luminosity of 489.1 fb^{-1} collected by the BABAR detector at the $\Upsilon(4S)$, $\Upsilon(3S)$, and $\Upsilon(2S)$ resonances and just below the $\Upsilon(4S)$. Fitting the two-track mass distribution in search of a signal peak, we do not observe a significant signal, and set 90% confidence level upper limits on the product of the L production cross section, branching fraction, and reconstruction efficiency for six possible two-body L decay modes as a function of the L mass. The efficiency is given for each final state as a function of the mass, lifetime, and transverse momentum of the candidate, allowing application of the upper limits to any production model. In addition, upper limits are provided on the branching fraction $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow X_s L)$, where X_s is a strange hadronic system.

PACS numbers: 13.66.Hk, 14.80.-j, 14.80.Ec

Recent anomalous astrophysical observations [1–3] have generated interest in GeV-scale hidden-sector states that may be long-lived [4–12]. Searches for long-lived particles have been performed both in the sub-GeV [13–15] and multi-GeV [16–21] mass ranges. Dedicated experiments to search for such particles have been proposed [22] or are under construction [23]. However, the $O(1 \text{ GeV}/c^2)$ mass range has remained mostly unexplored, especially in a heavy-flavor environment. B factories offer an ideal laboratory to probe this regime.

We search herein for a neutral, long-lived particle L , which decays into any of the final states $f = e^+e^-, \mu^+\mu^-, e^\pm\mu^\mp, \pi^+\pi^-, K^+K^-,$ or $K^\pm\pi^\mp$. A displaced vertex and two-body decay kinematics constitute the main means for background suppression, and the search is performed by fitting the distribution of the L -candidate mass.

The results are presented in two ways. In the “model-independent” presentation, no assumption is made regarding the production mechanism of the L . Rather, we present limits on the product of the inclusive production cross section $\sigma(e^+e^- \rightarrow LX)$, branching fraction $\mathcal{B}(L \rightarrow f)$, and reconstruction efficiency $\epsilon(f)$ for each of the two-body final states f , where X is any set of particles. As supplementary material to this letter [24], we provide tables of the efficiency as a function of L mass m , transverse [35] momentum p_T in the center-of-mass (CM) frame, and proper decay distance $c\tau$, assuming

the L to be a spin-zero particle. The provided upper limits, efficiencies, and p_T distributions of the simulated events used to obtain the efficiencies facilitate the application of the model-independent presentation of the results to any specific model of L production. In the “model-dependent” presentation, we provide limits on the branching fraction for the decay $B \rightarrow X_s L$, where X_s is a hadronic system with strangeness -1 . This presentation is motivated by Higgs-portal models of dark matter [8–11].

The data were collected with the BABAR detector at the PEP-II asymmetric-energy e^+e^- collider at SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory. The sample consists of $404.0 \pm 1.7 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ collected at a CM energy corresponding to the $\Upsilon(4S)$ resonance, an “off-resonance” sample of $43.74 \pm 0.20 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ collected about 40 MeV below the $\Upsilon(4S)$ peak, $27.85 \pm 0.18 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ collected at the $\Upsilon(3S)$, and $13.56 \pm 0.09 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ taken at the $\Upsilon(2S)$ [25]. The $\Upsilon(4S)$ sample contains $(448.4 \pm 2.2) \times 10^6 B\bar{B}$ pairs, and the $\Upsilon(3S)$ and $\Upsilon(2S)$ samples have $(121.3 \pm 1.2) \times 10^6 \Upsilon(3S)$ and $(98.3 \pm 0.9) \times 10^6 \Upsilon(2S)$ mesons, respectively [26]. An additional $\Upsilon(4S)$ sample of $20.37 \pm 0.09 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ is used to validate the analysis procedure and is not included in the final analysis.

The BABAR detector and its operation are described in detail in Refs. [27] and [28]. Charged-particle momenta are measured in a tracking system consisting of

a five-layer, double-sided silicon vertex detector (SVT) and a 40-layer drift chamber (DCH), both located in a 1.5 T axial magnetic field. Electron and photon energies are measured in a CsI(Tl) electromagnetic calorimeter (EMC) inside the magnet coil. Charged-particle identification (PID) is performed using an internally reflecting, ring-imaging Cherenkov detector, as well as the energy loss measured by the SVT, DCH and EMC. Muons are identified mainly with the instrumented magnetic-flux return.

Using Monte Carlo (MC) simulations, we determine both the signal mass resolution and reconstruction efficiency. The events are produced with the `EvtGen` [30] event generator, taking the L spin to be zero. We generate two types of signal MC samples. In the first type, which is used to create the efficiency tables [24] for the model-independent presentation, the L is produced at 11 different masses, $m_0^{\text{MC}} = 0.5, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9,$ and $9.5 \text{ GeV}/c^2$. For $m_0^{\text{MC}} \leq 4 \text{ GeV}/c^2$, the L is created in the process $e^+e^- \rightarrow B\bar{B}$, with one B meson decaying to $L + N\pi$ ($N = 1, 2,$ or 3) and the other B decaying generically. At higher masses, the production process is $\Upsilon(4S) \rightarrow L + N\pi$. In both cases, the L is produced uniformly throughout the available phase space, with an average transverse decay distance of 20 cm. The events are subsequently reweighted to obtain efficiencies for other decay lengths. Note that these specific processes do not reflect preferred hypotheses about the production mechanism, nor do the results depend on these processes. Rather, they are a convenient method to populate the kinematic range for the efficiency tables.

The second type of signal MC, used for the model-dependent presentation of the results, contains $B \rightarrow X_s L$ decays, for the seven mass values $m_0^{\text{MC}} = 0.5, 1, 2, 3, 3.5, 4,$ and $4.5 \text{ GeV}/c^2$. The X_s is nominally taken to be 10% K , 25% $K^*(892)$, and 65% $K^*(1680)$ [29], with the high-mass tail of the X_s spectrum suppressed by phase-space limitations, especially for heavy L states. This choice of X_s composition results in an L -momentum spectrum as a function of m_0^{MC} that reproduces the dimuon spectrum for $B \rightarrow X_s \mu^+ \mu^-$ in events generated with `EvtGen` using the BTOXSLL model [30]. The other B meson in the event decays generically.

In addition to the signal MC samples, background MC samples are used for optimizing the event selection criteria and studying the signal extraction method. The background samples are $e^+e^- \rightarrow B\bar{B}$ (produced with `EvtGen` [30]), $\tau^+\tau^-$, $\mu^+\mu^-$ (KK2f [31]), e^+e^- (BHWISE [32]), and $q\bar{q}$ events (JETSET [33]), where q is a $u, d, s,$ or c quark. The detector response is simulated with `GEANT4` [34].

The L candidates are reconstructed from pairs of oppositely charged tracks, identified as either e^+e^- , $\mu^+\mu^-$, $e^\pm\mu^\mp$, $\pi^+\pi^-$, K^+K^- , or $K^\pm\pi^\mp$ using loose PID selection criteria that favor high selection efficiency over purity. A track may have different PID assignments and

may appear in multiple pairs. Each track must satisfy $d_0/\sigma_{d_0} > 3$, where d_0 is the transverse distance of closest approach of the track to the e^+e^- interaction point (IP), and σ_{d_0} is the d_0 uncertainty, calculated from the SVT and DCH hit position uncertainties during the track reconstruction. The two tracks are fit to a common vertex, and the χ^2 value of the fit is required to be smaller than 10 for one degree of freedom. The two-dimensional vector \vec{r} between the IP and the vertex in the transverse plane must have length $r \equiv |\vec{r}|$ in the range $1 < r < 50 \text{ cm}$, and the uncertainty on r is required to satisfy $\sigma_r < 0.2 \text{ cm}$. We require the angle α between \vec{r} and the L -candidate transverse-momentum vector to satisfy $\alpha < 0.01 \text{ rad}$. The uncertainty σ_m on the measured L -candidate mass m must be less than $0.2 \text{ GeV}/c^2$. The L candidate is discarded if either of the tracks has SVT or DCH hits located between the IP and the vertex, or if the vertex is within the material of the beampipe wall, the DCH support tube, or the DCH inner cylinder. Candidates must satisfy the following decay-mode-specific invariant-mass criteria: $m_{e^+e^-} > 0.44 \text{ GeV}/c^2$, $m_{\mu^+\mu^-} < 0.37 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ or $m_{\mu^+\mu^-} > 0.5 \text{ GeV}/c^2$, $m_{e^\pm\mu^\mp} > 0.48 \text{ GeV}/c^2$, $m_{\pi^+\pi^-} > 0.86 \text{ GeV}/c^2$, $m_{K^+K^-} > 1.35 \text{ GeV}/c^2$, and $m_{K^\pm\pi^\mp} > 1.05 \text{ GeV}/c^2$. These criteria reject background from $K_s^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ and $\Lambda \rightarrow p\pi^-$ decays. In addition, other than in the $\mu^+\mu^-$ mode, they exclude low-mass regions in which the mass distributions of background MC events are not smooth, and therefore incompatible with the background description method outlined below. We require at least one of the tracks of $L \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ candidates with $m \geq 8 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ to have an SVT hit. This rejects candidates that decay into $\mu^+\mu^-$ within the material of the final-focusing magnets, and thus have poor mass resolution. These selection criteria are found to yield near-optimal signal sensitivity given the broad range of m and r values of this search.

For each decay mode, we determine the full efficiency, including the impact of detector acceptance, trigger, reconstruction, and selection criteria, for different values of m_0^{MC} , $c\tau$, and p_T . We have tabulated these as supplementary material [24]. The efficiency varies from 47% for $m = 1 \text{ GeV}/c^2$, $2 < p_T < 3 \text{ GeV}/c$, and $c\tau = 3 \text{ cm}$ to nearly zero for large values of m_0^{MC} and $c\tau$. The efficiency has some dependence on the L polar-angle θ , measured with respect to the direction of the e^+e^- center of mass. For a $1 + \cos^2\theta$ distribution in the CM frame, the strongest dependence is observed for track momentum $p < 0.3 \text{ GeV}/c$, where the efficiency is decreased by 22% relative to that of a uniform $\cos\theta$ distribution. For $p > 2 \text{ GeV}/c$, the efficiency varies by no more than 8%.

The dominant source of background consists of hadronic events with high track multiplicity, where large- d_0 tracks originate mostly from K_s^0 , Λ , K^\pm , and π^\pm decays, as well as particle interactions with detector material. Random overlaps of such tracks comprise the majority of the background candidates.

We extract the signal yield for each final state as a function of L mass with unbinned extended maximum-likelihood fits of the m distribution. The procedure is based on the fact that signal MC events peak in m while the background distribution varies slowly. The fit probability density functions (PDFs) for signal and background are constructed separately for each mode and each data sample. The PDFs account for the signal mass resolution, which is evaluated separately in each of 11 mass regions, where each region straddles the m_0^{MC} value of one of the signal MC samples of the first type. In region i , the value of the signal PDF for a candidate with hypothesis mass m_0 , measured mass m , and mass resolution uncertainty σ_m is $P_S^i(m) = H_S^i((m - m_0)/\sigma_m)$, where $H_S^i(x)$ is the histogram of the mass pull $x = (m^{\text{MC}} - m_0^{\text{MC}})/\sigma_m^{\text{MC}}$ for signal MC events of true mass m_0^{MC} , measured mass m^{MC} , and m^{MC} uncertainty σ_m^{MC} . This PDF accounts correctly for the large variation in σ_m with r and m .

The background PDF $P_B(m)$ is obtained from the data, so as not to rely on the background simulation, with the following procedure. First, we create a variable-bin-width histogram $H_D(m)$ of the data m distribution. The width of a histogram bin, whose lower edge is in m region i , is $w_i = nR_i$, where $n = 15$, and R_i is the RMS width of the signal $m - m_0^{\text{MC}}$ distribution in that region. The value of R_i ranges from about $6 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ for $m_0^{\text{MC}} = 0.5 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ to $180 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ for $m_0^{\text{MC}} = 9.5 \text{ GeV}/c^2$. We obtain $P_B(m)$ by fitting $H_D(m)$ with a second-order polynomial spline, with knots located at the bin boundaries. Simulation studies of the background mass distribution show that the choice $n = 15$ is sufficiently large to prevent $P_B(m)$ from conforming to signal peaks and thus hiding statistically significant signals, yet sufficiently small to avoid high false-signal yields due to background fluctuations. Fig. 1 shows the m distributions of the data (with uniform mass bins) and the background PDFs.

We scan the data in search of an L signal, varying m_0 in steps of $2 \text{ MeV}/c^2$. At each scan point, we fit the data in the full mass range using the PDF $n_S P_S + n_B P_B$, where the signal and background yields n_S and n_B are determined in the fit. The statistical significance $S = \text{sign}(n_S) \sqrt{2 \log(\mathcal{L}_S/\mathcal{L}_B)}$, where \mathcal{L}_S is the maximum likelihood for n_S signal events over the background yield, and \mathcal{L}_B is the likelihood for $n_S = 0$, is calculated for each scan point. The distributions of S values for all the scan points are nearly normal.

Significance values greater than 3 are found in two scan points, both in the $\mu^+\mu^-$ mode in the $\Upsilon(4S)$ + off-resonance sample. The highest significance is $S = 4.7$, with a signal yield of 13 events at the low-mass threshold of $m_0 = 0.212 \text{ GeV}/c^2$. The second-highest significance of $S = 4.2$ occurs at $m_0 = 1.24 \text{ GeV}/c^2$, corresponding to a signal yield of 10 events. To obtain the p -values for these significances, we perform the scans on a large number of $m_{\mu^+\mu^-}$ spectra generated according to the background PDF, obtained from the data with a finer




FIG. 1: Mass distribution of the $\Upsilon(4S)$ + off-resonance data (red solid points) and $\Upsilon(3S)+\Upsilon(2S)$ data (blue open squares) for each mode, overlaid with the background PDF P_B in matching color. In the $\mu^+\mu^-$ mode, the bin width in the range $m < 370 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ is $10 \text{ MeV}/c^2$.

binning of $n = 5$. With this choice of n , the generated spectra are not sensitive to fluctuations of the order of the signal resolution (which correspond to $n = 1$), yet include features that are much smaller than the resolution of the PDF ($n = 15$). We find that the probability for $S \geq 4.7$ (4.2) anywhere in the $\mu^+\mu^-$ spectrum with $m_{\mu^+\mu^-} < 0.37 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ ($m_{\mu^+\mu^-} > 0.5 \text{ GeV}/c^2$) is 4×10^{-4} (8×10^{-3}). The p -values are consistent with the naive expectation $p(S)w/R$, where $p(S)$ is the p -value without the “look-elsewhere effect”, w is the width of the mass region under study, and R is the average value of R_i . We do not include the other modes in the calculation of the p -values. Doing so would naively multiply the p -values by about six. Further study provides strong indication for material-interaction background in the $0.212 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ region. Specifically, most of the 34 $\mu^+\mu^-$ vertices with $m_{\mu^+\mu^-} < 0.215 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ occur inside or at the edge of detector-material regions. Furthermore, these candidates have track momenta between $0.2 \text{ GeV}/c$ and $0.4 \text{ GeV}/c$, where muons are poorly separated from electrons and pions. Thus, the peak is consistent with misidentified photon conversions close to the mass threshold. We conclude

that a significant signal is not observed.

Systematic uncertainties on the signal yields are calculated for each scan fit separately. The dominant uncertainty is due to the background PDF, and is evaluated by repeating the scans with $n = 20$, which is the maximal plausible value for n that does not lead to a large probability for false-signal detection. This uncertainty is a few signal events on average, and generally decreases with mass. An additional uncertainty is evaluated by taking R_i from events with $p_T < 0.8 \text{ GeV}/c$ or $p_T > 0.8 \text{ GeV}/c$. To estimate uncertainties due to the weak signal PDF dependence on r and m , we repeat the scans after obtaining H_S^i from signal MC events with either $r < 4 \text{ cm}$ or $r > 4 \text{ cm}$, as well as from signal MC events from adjacent mass regions. The uncertainty due to the signal mass resolution is evaluated by comparing the mass pull distributions of K_S^0 mesons in data and MC, whose widths differ by 5%. A conservative uncertainty of 2% on the signal reconstruction efficiencies is estimated from the K_S^0 reconstruction efficiency in data and MC. Smaller uncertainties on the efficiency, of up to 1%, arise from particle identification, and signal MC statistics. The total uncertainties on the efficiency are reported in the efficiency tables [24].

Observing that the likelihood \mathcal{L}_S is a nearly normal function of the signal yield, it is analytically convolved with a Gaussian representing the systematic uncertainties in n_S . The resulting function is used to obtain 90% confidence level uniform prior Bayesian upper limits on the product $\sigma(e^+e^- \rightarrow LX) \mathcal{B}(L \rightarrow f) \epsilon(f)$. Fig. 2 shows these limits, which are also provided in the supplementary material [24].

Determining the efficiency from the $B \rightarrow X_s L$ signal MC sample, we obtain upper limits on the product of branching fractions $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow X_s L) \mathcal{B}(L \rightarrow f)$ for each of the final states f . These limits, shown in Fig. 3, exclude significant regions of the parameter space of Ref. [8].

In conclusion, we have performed a search for long-lived particles L produced in e^+e^- collisions. No signal is observed, and upper limits on $\sigma(e^+e^- \rightarrow LX) \mathcal{B}(L \rightarrow f) \epsilon(f)$ and on $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow X_s L) \mathcal{B}(L \rightarrow f)$ are set at 90% confidence level for six two-body final states f . We provide detailed efficiency tables to enable applying our results to any specific model [24].

We are grateful for the excellent luminosity and machine conditions provided by our PEP-II colleagues, and for the substantial dedicated effort from the computing organizations that support *BABAR*. The collaborating institutions wish to thank SLAC for its support and kind hospitality. This work is supported by DOE and NSF (USA), NSERC (Canada), CEA and CNRS-IN2P3 (France), BMBF and DFG (Germany), INFN (Italy), FOM (The Netherlands), NFR (Norway), MES (Russia), MINECO (Spain), STFC (United Kingdom), BSF (USA-Israel). Individuals have received support from the Marie Curie EIF (European Union) and the A. P. Sloan Foun-




FIG. 2: The 90% confidence level upper limits on $\sigma(e^+e^- \rightarrow LX) \mathcal{B}(L \rightarrow f) \epsilon(f)$ as a function of L mass for the $\Upsilon(4S) +$ off-resonance sample (red lower points) and for the $\Upsilon(3S) + \Upsilon(2S)$ sample (blue upper points). The limits include the systematic uncertainties on the signal yield.

dation (USA).

* Now at: University of Tabuk, Tabuk 71491, Saudi Arabia

† Also at: Università di Perugia, Dipartimento di Fisica, I-06123 Perugia, Italy

‡ Now at: Laboratoire de Physique Nucléaire et de Hautes Energies, IN2P3/CNRS, F-75252 Paris, France

§ Now at: University of Huddersfield, Huddersfield HD1 3DH, UK

¶ Deceased

** Now at: University of South Alabama, Mobile, Alabama 36688, USA

†† Also at: Università di Sassari, I-07100 Sassari, Italy

‡‡ Now at: Universidad Técnica Federico Santa María, 2390123 Valparaíso, Chile

[1] M. Aguilar *et al.* [AMS Collaboration], *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 141102 (2013).

[2] O. Adriani *et al.* [PAMELA Collaboration], *Nature* **458**, 607 (2009).

[3] M. Ackermann *et al.* [Fermi LAT Collaboration], *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 011103 (2012).

[4] B. Batell, M. Pospelov and A. Ritz, *Phys. Rev. D* **79**,




FIG. 3: The 90% confidence level upper limits as a function of L mass on the product branching fractions $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow X_s L)\mathcal{B}(L \rightarrow f)$ for each final state f and different values of $c\tau$. The limits include all systematic uncertainties.

115008 (2009).
 [5] R. Essig, P. Schuster and N. Toro, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 015003 (2009).
 [6] F. Bossi, Adv. High Energy Phys. **2014**, 891820 (2014).
 [7] P. Schuster, N. Toro and I. Yavin, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 016002 (2010).
 [8] F. Bezrukov and D. Gorbunov, JHEP **1307**, 140 (2013).
 [9] C. Cheung and Y. Nomura, JHEP **1011**, 103 (2010).
 [10] K. Schmidt-Hoberg, F. Staub and M. W. Winkler, Phys. Lett. B **727**, 506 (2013).
 [11] J. D. Clarke, R. Foot and R. R. Volkas, JHEP **1402**, 123

(2014).
 [12] A. E. Nelson and J. Scholtz, arXiv:1311.0040 [hep-ph].
 [13] S. Andreas, C. Niebuhr and A. Ringwald, Phys. Rev. D **86** (2012) 095019.
 [14] S. N. Gninenko, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 055027 (2012).
 [15] T. Adams *et al.* [NuTeV Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 041801 (2001).
 [16] V. M. Abazov *et al.* [D0 Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 161802 (2006).
 [17] V. M. Abazov *et al.* [D0 Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 071801 (2009).
 [18] F. Abe *et al.* [CDF Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **58**, 051102 (1998).
 [19] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **720**, 277 (2013).
 [20] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 251801 (2012).
 [21] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **719**, 280 (2013).
 [22] R. Essig, P. Schuster, N. Toro and B. Wojtsekhowski, JHEP **1102**, 009 (2011).
 [23] O. Moreno, arXiv:1310.2060 [physics.ins-det].
 [24] See Supplemental Material at [URL will be inserted by publisher] for the efficiency tables.
 [25] J. P. Lees *et al.* [BABAR Collaboration], Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A **726**, 203 (2013).
 [26] G. D. McGregor, SLAC-R-912, arXiv:0812.1954 [hep-ex].
 [27] B. Aubert *et al.* [BABAR Collaboration], Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A **479**, 1 (2002).
 [28] B. Aubert *et al.* [BABAR Collaboration], Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A **729**, 615 (2013).
 [29] Particle Data Group (J. Beringer *et al.*) Phys. Rev. D **86**, 010001 (2012) and 2013 partial update for the 2014 edition.
 [30] D. J. Lange, Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A **462**, 152 (2001); <http://evtgen.warwick.ac.uk>.
 [31] S. Jadach, B. F. L. Ward and Z. Was, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 113009 (2001).
 [32] S. Jadach, W. Placzek and B. F. L. Ward, Phys. Lett. B **390**, 298 (1997).
 [33] T. Sjostrand, Comput. Phys. Commun. **82**, 74 (1994).
 [34] S. Agostinelli *et al.* (GEANT4 Collaboration), Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A **506**, 250 (2003).
 [35] The term 'transverse' throughout this paper refers to projections of vectors onto the plane transverse to the direction of the e^+e^- center of mass system.