

Search for CPT and Lorentz Violation in $B^0-\bar{B}^0$ Oscillations with Dilepton Events

B. Aubert,¹ M. Bona,¹ D. Boutigny,¹ Y. Karyotakis,¹ J. P. Lees,¹ V. Poireau,¹ X. Prudent,¹ V. Tisserand,¹ A. Zghiche,¹ J. Garra Tico,² E. Grauges,² L. Lopez,³ A. Palano,³ M. Pappagallo,³ G. Eigen,⁴ B. Stugu,⁴ L. Sun,⁴ G. S. Abrams,⁵ M. Battaglia,⁵ D. N. Brown,⁵ J. Button-Shafer,⁵ R. N. Cahn,⁵ Y. Groysman,⁵ R. G. Jacobsen,⁵ J. A. Kadyk,⁵ L. T. Kerth,⁵ Yu. G. Kolomensky,⁵ G. Kukartsev,⁵ D. Lopes Pegna,⁵ G. Lynch,⁵ L. M. Mir,⁵ T. J. Orimoto,⁵ I. L. Osipenko,⁵ M. T. Ronan,^{5,*} K. Tackmann,⁵ T. Tanabe,⁵ W. A. Wenzel,⁵ P. del Amo Sanchez,⁶ C. M. Hawkes,⁶ A. T. Watson,⁶ H. Koch,⁷ T. Schroeder,⁷ D. Walker,⁸ D. J. Asgeirsson,⁹ T. Cuhadar-Donszelmann,⁹ B. G. Fulsom,⁹ C. Hearty,⁹ T. S. Mattison,⁹ J. A. McKenna,⁹ M. Barrett,¹⁰ A. Khan,¹⁰ M. Saleem,¹⁰ L. Teodorescu,¹⁰ V. E. Blinov,¹¹ A. D. Bukin,¹¹ V. P. Druzhinin,¹¹ V. B. Golubev,¹¹ A. P. Onuchin,¹¹ S. I. Serednyakov,¹¹ Yu. I. Skovpen,¹¹ E. P. Solodov,¹¹ K. Yu. Todyshev,¹¹ M. Bondioli,¹² S. Curry,¹² I. Eschrich,¹² D. Kirkby,¹² A. J. Lankford,¹² P. Lund,¹² M. Mandelkern,¹² E. C. Martin,¹² D. P. Stoker,¹² S. Abachi,¹³ C. Buchanan,¹³ J. W. Gary,¹⁴ F. Liu,¹⁴ O. Long,¹⁴ B. C. Shen,^{14,*} G. M. Vitug,¹⁴ L. Zhang,¹⁴ H. P. Paar,¹⁵ S. Rahatlou,¹⁵ V. Sharma,¹⁵ J. W. Berryhill,¹⁶ C. Campagnari,¹⁶ A. Cunha,¹⁶ B. Dahmes,¹⁶ T. M. Hong,¹⁶ D. Kovalskyi,¹⁶ J. D. Richman,¹⁶ T. W. Beck,¹⁷ A. M. Eisner,¹⁷ C. J. Flacco,¹⁷ C. A. Heusch,¹⁷ J. Kroseberg,¹⁷ W. S. Lockman,¹⁷ T. Schalk,¹⁷ B. A. Schumm,¹⁷ A. Seiden,¹⁷ M. G. Wilson,¹⁷ L. O. Winstrom,¹⁷ E. Chen,¹⁸ C. H. Cheng,¹⁸ F. Fang,¹⁸ D. G. Hitlin,¹⁸ I. Narsky,¹⁸ T. Piatenko,¹⁸ F. C. Porter,¹⁸ R. Andreassen,¹⁹ G. Mancinelli,¹⁹ B. T. Meadows,¹⁹ K. Mishra,¹⁹ M. D. Sokoloff,¹⁹ F. Blanc,²⁰ P. C. Bloom,²⁰ S. Chen,²⁰ W. T. Ford,²⁰ J. F. Hirschauer,²⁰ A. Kreisel,²⁰ M. Nagel,²⁰ U. Nauenberg,²⁰ A. Olivas,²⁰ J. G. Smith,²⁰ K. A. Ulmer,²⁰ S. R. Wagner,²⁰ J. Zhang,²⁰ A. M. Gabareen,²¹ A. Soffer,^{21,†} W. H. Toki,²¹ R. J. Wilson,²¹ F. Winklmeier,²¹ D. D. Altenburg,²² E. Feltresi,²² A. Hauke,²² H. Jasper,²² J. Merkel,²² A. Petzold,²² B. Spaan,²² K. Wacker,²² V. Klose,²³ M. J. Kobel,²³ H. M. Lacker,²³ W. F. Mader,²³ R. Nogowski,²³ J. Schubert,²³ K. R. Schubert,²³ R. Schwierz,²³ J. E. Sundermann,²³ A. Volk,²³ D. Bernard,²⁴ G. R. Bonneaud,²⁴ E. Latour,²⁴ V. Lombardo,²⁴ Ch. Thiebaux,²⁴ M. Verderi,²⁴ P. J. Clark,²⁵ W. Gradl,²⁵ F. Muheim,²⁵ S. Playfer,²⁵ A. I. Robertson,²⁵ J. E. Watson,²⁵ Y. Xie,²⁵ M. Andreotti,²⁶ D. Bettoni,²⁶ C. Bozzi,²⁶ R. Calabrese,²⁶ A. Cecchi,²⁶ G. Cibinetto,²⁶ P. Franchini,²⁶ E. Luppi,²⁶ M. Negrini,²⁶ A. Petrella,²⁶ L. Piemontese,²⁶ E. Prencipe,²⁶ V. Santoro,²⁶ F. Anulli,²⁷ R. Baldini-Feroli,²⁷ A. Calcaterra,²⁷ R. de Sangro,²⁷ G. Finocchiaro,²⁷ S. Pacetti,²⁷ P. Patteri,²⁷ I. M. Peruzzi,^{27,‡} M. Piccolo,²⁷ M. Rama,²⁷ A. Zallo,²⁷ A. Buzzo,²⁸ R. Contri,²⁸ M. Lo Vetere,²⁸ M. M. Macri,²⁸ M. R. Monge,²⁸ S. Passaggio,²⁸ C. Patrignani,²⁸ E. Robutti,²⁸ A. Santroni,²⁸ S. Tosi,²⁸ K. S. Chaisanguanthum,²⁹ M. Morii,²⁹ J. Wu,²⁹ R. S. Dubitzky,³⁰ J. Marks,³⁰ S. Schenk,³⁰ U. Uwer,³⁰ D. J. Bard,³¹ P. D. Dauncey,³¹ R. L. Flack,³¹ J. A. Nash,³¹ W. Panduro Vazquez,³¹ M. Tibbetts,³¹ P. K. Behera,³² X. Chai,³² M. J. Charles,³² U. Mallik,³² J. Cochran,³³ H. B. Crawley,³³ L. Dong,³³ V. Eyges,³³ W. T. Meyer,³³ S. Prell,³³ E. I. Rosenberg,³³ A. E. Rubin,³³ Y. Y. Gao,³⁴ A. V. Gritsan,³⁴ Z. J. Guo,³⁴ C. K. Lae,³⁴ A. G. Denig,³⁵ M. Fritsch,³⁵ G. Schott,³⁵ N. Arnaud,³⁶ J. Béguilleux,³⁶ A. D'Orazio,³⁶ M. Davier,³⁶ G. Grosdidier,³⁶ A. Höcker,³⁶ V. Lepeltier,³⁶ F. Le Diberder,³⁶ A. M. Lutz,³⁶ S. Pruvot,³⁶ S. Rodier,³⁶ P. Roudeau,³⁶ M. H. Schune,³⁶ J. Serrano,³⁶ V. Sordini,³⁶ A. Stocchi,³⁶ L. Wang,³⁶ W. F. Wang,³⁶ G. Wormser,³⁶ D. J. Lange,³⁷ D. M. Wright,³⁷ I. Bingham,³⁸ J. P. Burke,³⁸ C. A. Chavez,³⁸ J. R. Fry,³⁸ E. Gabathuler,³⁸ R. Gamet,³⁸ D. E. Hutchcroft,³⁸ D. J. Payne,³⁸ K. C. Schofield,³⁸ C. Touramanis,³⁸ A. J. Bevan,³⁹ K. A. George,³⁹ F. Di Lodovico,³⁹ R. Sacco,³⁹ G. Cowan,⁴⁰ H. U. Flaecher,⁴⁰ D. A. Hopkins,⁴⁰ S. Paramesvaran,⁴⁰ F. Salvatore,⁴⁰ A. C. Wren,⁴⁰ D. N. Brown,⁴¹ C. L. Davis,⁴¹ J. Allison,⁴² N. R. Barlow,⁴² R. J. Barlow,⁴² Y. M. Chia,⁴² C. L. Edgar,⁴² G. D. Lafferty,⁴² T. J. West,⁴² J. I. Yi,⁴² J. Anderson,⁴³ C. Chen,⁴³ A. Jawahery,⁴³ D. A. Roberts,⁴³ G. Simi,⁴³ J. M. Tuggle,⁴³ C. Dallapiccola,⁴⁴ S. S. Hertzbach,⁴⁴ X. Li,⁴⁴ T. B. Moore,⁴⁴ E. Salvati,⁴⁴ S. Saremi,⁴⁴ R. Cowan,⁴⁵ D. Dujmic,⁴⁵ P. H. Fisher,⁴⁵ K. Koeneke,⁴⁵ G. Sciolla,⁴⁵ M. Spitznagel,⁴⁵ F. Taylor,⁴⁵ R. K. Yamamoto,⁴⁵ M. Zhao,⁴⁵ Y. Zheng,⁴⁵ S. E. Mclachlin,^{46,*} P. M. Patel,⁴⁶ S. H. Robertson,⁴⁶ A. Lazzaro,⁴⁷ F. Palombo,⁴⁷ J. M. Bauer,⁴⁸ L. Cremaldi,⁴⁸ V. Eschenburg,⁴⁸ R. Godang,⁴⁸ R. Kroeger,⁴⁸ D. A. Sanders,⁴⁸ D. J. Summers,⁴⁸ H. W. Zhao,⁴⁸ S. Brunet,⁴⁹ D. Côté,⁴⁹ M. Simard,⁴⁹ P. Taras,⁴⁹ F. B. Viaud,⁴⁹ H. Nicholson,⁵⁰ G. De Nardo,⁵¹ F. Fabozzi,^{51,§} L. Lista,⁵¹ D. Monorchio,⁵¹ C. Sciacca,⁵¹ M. A. Baak,⁵² G. Raven,⁵² H. L. Snoek,⁵² C. P. Jessop,⁵³ K. J. Knoepfel,⁵³ J. M. LoSecco,⁵³ G. Benelli,⁵⁴ L. A. Corwin,⁵⁴ K. Honscheid,⁵⁴ H. Kagan,⁵⁴ R. Kass,⁵⁴ J. P. Morris,⁵⁴ A. M. Rahimi,⁵⁴ J. J. Regensburger,⁵⁴ S. J. Sekula,⁵⁴ Q. K. Wong,⁵⁴ N. L. Blount,⁵⁵ J. Brau,⁵⁵ R. Frey,⁵⁵ O. Igonkina,⁵⁵ J. A. Kolb,⁵⁵ M. Lu,⁵⁵ R. Rahmat,⁵⁵ N. B. Sinev,⁵⁵ D. Strom,⁵⁵ J. Strube,⁵⁵ E. Torrence,⁵⁵ N. Gagliardi,⁵⁶ A. Gaz,⁵⁶ M. Margoni,⁵⁶ M. Morandin,⁵⁶ A. Pompili,⁵⁶ M. Posocco,⁵⁶ M. Rotondo,⁵⁶ F. Simonetto,⁵⁶ R. Stroili,⁵⁶ C. Voci,⁵⁶ E. Ben-Haim,⁵⁷ H. Briand,⁵⁷ G. Calderini,⁵⁷ J. Chauveau,⁵⁷ P. David,⁵⁷ L. Del Buono,⁵⁷ Ch. de la Vaissière,⁵⁷ O. Hamon,⁵⁷ Ph. Leruste,⁵⁷ J. Malcès,⁵⁷ J. Ocariz,⁵⁷ A. Perez,⁵⁷ J. Prendki,⁵⁷ L. Gladney,⁵⁸ M. Biasini,⁵⁹ R. Covarelli,⁵⁹ E. Manoni,⁵⁹ C. Angelini,⁶⁰ G. Batignani,⁶⁰

S. Bettarini,⁶⁰ M. Carpinelli,^{60,||} R. Cenci,⁶⁰ A. Cervelli,⁶⁰ F. Forti,⁶⁰ M. A. Giorgi,⁶⁰ A. Lusiani,⁶⁰ G. Marchiori,⁶⁰ M. A. Mazur,⁶⁰ M. Morganti,⁶⁰ N. Neri,⁶⁰ E. Paoloni,⁶⁰ G. Rizzo,⁶⁰ J. J. Walsh,⁶⁰ J. Biesiada,⁶¹ P. Elmer,⁶¹ Y. P. Lau,⁶¹ C. Lu,⁶¹ J. Olsen,⁶¹ A. J. S. Smith,⁶¹ A. V. Telnov,⁶¹ E. Baracchini,⁶² F. Bellini,⁶² G. Cavoto,⁶² D. del Re,⁶² E. Di Marco,⁶² R. Faccini,⁶² F. Ferrarotto,⁶² F. Ferroni,⁶² M. Gaspero,⁶² P. D. Jackson,⁶² M. A. Mazzoni,⁶² S. Morganti,⁶² G. Piredda,⁶² F. Polci,⁶² F. Renga,⁶² C. Voena,⁶² M. Ebert,⁶³ T. Hartmann,⁶³ H. Schröder,⁶³ R. Waldi,⁶³ T. Adye,⁶⁴ G. Castelli,⁶⁴ B. Franek,⁶⁴ E. O. Olaiya,⁶⁴ W. Roethel,⁶⁴ F. F. Wilson,⁶⁴ S. Emery,⁶⁵ M. Escalier,⁶⁵ A. Gaidot,⁶⁵ S. F. Ganzhur,⁶⁵ G. Hamel de Monchenault,⁶⁵ W. Kozanecki,⁶⁵ G. Vasseur,⁶⁵ Ch. Yèche,⁶⁵ M. Zito,⁶⁵ X. R. Chen,⁶⁶ H. Liu,⁶⁶ W. Park,⁶⁶ M. V. Purohit,⁶⁶ R. M. White,⁶⁶ J. R. Wilson,⁶⁶ M. T. Allen,⁶⁷ D. Aston,⁶⁷ R. Bartoldus,⁶⁷ P. Bechtle,⁶⁷ R. Claus,⁶⁷ J. P. Coleman,⁶⁷ M. R. Convery,⁶⁷ J. C. Dingfelder,⁶⁷ J. Dorfan,⁶⁷ G. P. Dubois-Felsmann,⁶⁷ W. Dunwoodie,⁶⁷ R. C. Field,⁶⁷ T. Glanzman,⁶⁷ S. J. Gowdy,⁶⁷ M. T. Graham,⁶⁷ P. Grenier,⁶⁷ C. Hast,⁶⁷ W. R. Innes,⁶⁷ J. Kaminski,⁶⁷ M. H. Kelsey,⁶⁷ H. Kim,⁶⁷ P. Kim,⁶⁷ M. L. Kocian,⁶⁷ D. W. G. S. Leith,⁶⁷ S. Li,⁶⁷ S. Luitz,⁶⁷ V. Luth,⁶⁷ H. L. Lynch,⁶⁷ D. B. MacFarlane,⁶⁷ H. Marsiske,⁶⁷ R. Messner,⁶⁷ D. R. Muller,⁶⁷ S. Nelson,⁶⁷ C. P. O'Grady,⁶⁷ I. Ofte,⁶⁷ A. Perazzo,⁶⁷ M. Perl,⁶⁷ T. Pulliam,⁶⁷ B. N. Ratcliff,⁶⁷ A. Roodman,⁶⁷ A. A. Salnikov,⁶⁷ R. H. Schindler,⁶⁷ J. Schwiening,⁶⁷ A. Snyder,⁶⁷ D. Su,⁶⁷ M. K. Sullivan,⁶⁷ K. Suzuki,⁶⁷ S. K. Swain,⁶⁷ J. M. Thompson,⁶⁷ J. Va'vra,⁶⁷ A. P. Wagner,⁶⁷ M. Weaver,⁶⁷ W. J. Wisniewski,⁶⁷ M. Wittgen,⁶⁷ D. H. Wright,⁶⁷ A. K. Yarritu,⁶⁷ K. Yi,⁶⁷ C. C. Young,⁶⁷ V. Ziegler,⁶⁷ P. R. Burchat,⁶⁸ A. J. Edwards,⁶⁸ S. A. Majewski,⁶⁸ T. S. Miyashita,⁶⁸ B. A. Petersen,⁶⁸ L. Wilden,⁶⁸ S. Ahmed,⁶⁹ M. S. Alam,⁶⁹ R. Bula,⁶⁹ J. A. Ernst,⁶⁹ B. Pan,⁶⁹ M. A. Saeed,⁶⁹ F. R. Wappler,⁶⁹ S. B. Zain,⁶⁹ S. M. Spanier,⁷⁰ B. J. Wogland,⁷⁰ R. Eckmann,⁷¹ J. L. Ritchie,⁷¹ A. M. Ruland,⁷¹ C. J. Schilling,⁷¹ R. F. Schwitters,⁷¹ J. M. Izen,⁷² X. C. Lou,⁷² S. Ye,⁷² F. Bianchi,⁷³ F. Gallo,⁷³ D. Gamba,⁷³ M. Pelliccioni,⁷³ M. Bomben,⁷⁴ L. Bosisio,⁷⁴ C. Cartaro,⁷⁴ F. Cossutti,⁷⁴ G. Della Ricca,⁷⁴ L. Lanceri,⁷⁴ L. Vitale,⁷⁴ V. Azzolini,⁷⁵ N. Lopez-March,⁷⁵ F. Martinez-Vidal,^{75,||} D. A. Milanes,⁷⁵ A. Oyanguren,⁷⁵ J. Albert,⁷⁶ Sw. Banerjee,⁷⁶ B. Bhuyan,⁷⁶ K. Hamano,⁷⁶ R. Kowalewski,⁷⁶ I. M. Nugent,⁷⁶ J. M. Roney,⁷⁶ R. J. Sobie,⁷⁶ P. F. Harrison,⁷⁷ J. Ilic,⁷⁷ T. E. Latham,⁷⁷ G. B. Mohanty,⁷⁷ H. R. Band,⁷⁸ X. Chen,⁷⁸ S. Dasu,⁷⁸ K. T. Flood,⁷⁸ J. J. Hollar,⁷⁸ P. E. Kutter,⁷⁸ Y. Pan,⁷⁸ M. Pierini,⁷⁸ R. Prepost,⁷⁸ S. L. Wu,⁷⁸ and H. Neal⁷⁹

(BABAR Collaboration)

¹Laboratoire de Physique des Particules, IN2P3/CNRS et Université de Savoie, F-74941 Annecy-Le-Vieux, France

²Universitat de Barcelona, Facultat de Física, Departament ECM, E-08028 Barcelona, Spain

³Università di Bari, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, 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

⁶University of Birmingham, Birmingham, B15 2TT, United Kingdom

⁷Ruhr Universität Bochum, Institut für Experimentalphysik 1, D-44780 Bochum, Germany

⁸University of Bristol, Bristol BS8 1TL, United Kingdom

⁹University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada V6T 1Z1

¹⁰Brunel University, Uxbridge, Middlesex UB8 3PH, United Kingdom

¹¹Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics, Novosibirsk 630090, Russia

¹²University of California at Irvine, Irvine, California 92697, USA

¹³University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California 90024, USA

¹⁴University of California at Riverside, Riverside, California 92521, USA

¹⁵University of California at San Diego, La Jolla, California 92093, USA

¹⁶University of California at Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, California 93106, USA

¹⁷University of California at Santa Cruz, Institute for Particle Physics, Santa Cruz, California 95064, USA

¹⁸California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California 91125, USA

¹⁹University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio 45221, USA

²⁰University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80309, USA

²¹Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado 80523, USA

²²Universität Dortmund, Institut für Physik, D-44221 Dortmund, Germany

²³Technische Universität Dresden, Institut für Kern- und Teilchenphysik, D-01062 Dresden, Germany

²⁴Laboratoire Leprince-Ringuet, CNRS/IN2P3, Ecole Polytechnique, F-91128 Palaiseau, France

²⁵University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH9 3JZ, United Kingdom

²⁶Università di Ferrara, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-44100 Ferrara, Italy

²⁷Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati dell'INFN, I-00044 Frascati, Italy

²⁸Università di Genova, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-16146 Genova, Italy

²⁹Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, USA

³⁰Universität Heidelberg, Physikalisches Institut, Philosophenweg 12, D-69120 Heidelberg, Germany

- ³¹Imperial College London, London, SW7 2AZ, United Kingdom
³²University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa 52242, USA
³³Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011-3160, USA
³⁴Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland 21218, USA
³⁵Universität Karlsruhe, Institut für Experimentelle Kernphysik, D-76021 Karlsruhe, Germany
³⁶Laboratoire de l'Accélérateur Linéaire, IN2P3/CNRS et Université Paris-Sud 11, Centre Scientifique d'Orsay, B. P. 34, F-91898 ORSAY Cedex, France
³⁷Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California 94550, USA
³⁸University of Liverpool, Liverpool L69 7ZE, United Kingdom
³⁹Queen Mary, University of London, E1 4NS, United Kingdom
⁴⁰University of London, Royal Holloway and Bedford New College, Egham, Surrey TW20 0EX, United Kingdom
⁴¹University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky 40292, USA
⁴²University of Manchester, Manchester M13 9PL, United Kingdom
⁴³University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742, USA
⁴⁴University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts 01003, USA
⁴⁵Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Laboratory for Nuclear Science, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, USA
⁴⁶McGill University, Montréal, Québec, Canada H3A 2T8
⁴⁷Università di Milano, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-20133 Milano, Italy
⁴⁸University of Mississippi, University, Mississippi 38677, USA
⁴⁹Université de Montréal, Physique des Particules, Montréal, Québec, Canada H3C 3J7
⁵⁰Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Massachusetts 01075, USA
⁵¹Università di Napoli Federico II, Dipartimento di Scienze Fisiche and INFN, I-80126, Napoli, Italy
⁵²NIKHEF, National Institute for Nuclear Physics and High Energy Physics, NL-1009 DB Amsterdam, The Netherlands
⁵³University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana 46556, USA
⁵⁴Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210, USA
⁵⁵University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403, USA
⁵⁶Università di Padova, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-35131 Padova, Italy
⁵⁷Laboratoire de Physique Nucléaire et de Hautes Energies, IN2P3/CNRS, Université Pierre et Marie Curie-Paris6, Université Denis Diderot-Paris7, F-75252 Paris, France
⁵⁸University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104, USA
⁵⁹Università di Perugia, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-06100 Perugia, Italy
⁶⁰Università di Pisa, Dipartimento di Fisica, Scuola Normale Superiore and INFN, I-56127 Pisa, Italy
⁶¹Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey 08544, USA
⁶²Università di Roma La Sapienza, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-00185 Roma, Italy
⁶³Universität Rostock, D-18051 Rostock, Germany
⁶⁴Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Chilton, Didcot, Oxon, OX11 0QX, United Kingdom
⁶⁵DSM/Dapnia, CEA/Saclay, F-91191 Gif-sur-Yvette, France
⁶⁶University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina 29208, USA
⁶⁷Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, Stanford, California 94309, USA
⁶⁸Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305-4060, USA
⁶⁹State University of New York, Albany, New York 12222, USA
⁷⁰University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee 37996, USA
⁷¹University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712, USA
⁷²University of Texas at Dallas, Richardson, Texas 75083, USA
⁷³Università di Torino, Dipartimento di Fisica Sperimentale and INFN, I-10125 Torino, Italy
⁷⁴Università di Trieste, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-34127 Trieste, Italy
⁷⁵IFIC, Universitat de Valencia-CSIC, E-46071 Valencia, Spain
⁷⁶University of Victoria, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada V8W 3P6
⁷⁷Department of Physics, University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL, United Kingdom
⁷⁸University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706, USA
⁷⁹Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut 06511, USA

(Received 19 November 2007; published 4 April 2008)

We report results of a search for CPT and Lorentz violation in $B^0-\bar{B}^0$ oscillations using inclusive dilepton events from $232 \times 10^6 \Upsilon(4S) \rightarrow B\bar{B}$ decays recorded by the BABAR detector at the PEP-II B Factory at SLAC. We find 2.8σ significance, compatible with no signal, for variations in the complex CPT violation parameter z at the Earth's sidereal frequency and extract values for the quantities Δa_μ in the general Lorentz-violating standard-model extension. The spectral powers for variations in z over the frequency range 0.26 yr^{-1} to $2.1 \text{ solar day}^{-1}$ are also compatible with no signal.

It was shown recently [1] that an interacting quantum field theory need not be local for CPT violation to imply violation of Lorentz invariance. In the general Lorentz-violating standard-model extension (SME) [2], the parameter for CPT violation in neutral meson oscillations depends on the four-velocity of the meson [3].

We report a search for this effect using $Y(4S) \rightarrow B\bar{B}$ decays recorded by the *BABAR* detector at the PEP-II asymmetric-energy e^+e^- collider. Any observed CPT violation should vary with a period of one sidereal day (≈ 0.99727 solar days) as the $Y(4S)$ boost direction follows the Earth's rotation with respect to the distant stars [4].

The physical states of the B^0 - \bar{B}^0 system are

$$|B_{L,H}\rangle = p\sqrt{1 \mp z}|B^0\rangle \pm q\sqrt{1 \pm z}|\bar{B}^0\rangle, \quad (1)$$

where L (H) labels the ‘‘light’’ (‘‘heavy’’) eigenstate of the effective Hamiltonian. The complex parameter z vanishes if CPT is conserved; T invariance implies $|q/p| = 1$.

In the SME, CPT - and Lorentz-violating coupling coefficients $a_\mu^{q_i}$ for the two valence quarks in the B^0 meson are contained in quantities $\Delta a_\mu = r_{q_1} a_\mu^{q_1} - r_{q_2} a_\mu^{q_2}$, where the r_{q_i} are due to quark-binding and normalization effects. The CPT parameter z depends on the meson four-velocity $\beta^\mu = \gamma(1, \vec{\beta})$ in each experiment's observer frame as [3]

$$z \approx \beta^\mu \Delta a_\mu / (\Delta m - i\Delta\Gamma/2), \quad (2)$$

where $\beta^\mu \Delta a_\mu$ is real and varies with sidereal time due to the rotation of $\vec{\beta}$ relative to the constant vector $\Delta\vec{a}$. The magnitude of the decay rate difference $\Delta\Gamma \equiv \Gamma_H - \Gamma_L$ is known to be small compared to the B^0 - \bar{B}^0 oscillation frequency $\Delta m \equiv m_H - m_L$; hence Eq. (2) constrains

$$\Delta m \text{Re}z \approx 2\Delta m(\Delta m/\Delta\Gamma) \text{Im}z \approx \beta^\mu \Delta a_\mu. \quad (3)$$

Limits on analogous flavor-dependent Δa_μ specific to $K^0\bar{K}^0$ oscillations [5] and to $D^0\bar{D}^0$ oscillations [6] have been reported by the KTeV and FOCUS collaborations.

We adopt the basis $(\hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{z})$ for the rotating laboratory frame and the basis $(\hat{X}, \hat{Y}, \hat{Z})$ for the Sun-centered non-rotating frame containing $\Delta\vec{a}$ [7]. \hat{Z} is parallel to the Earth's rotation axis, $\hat{X}(\hat{Y})$ is at right ascension $0^\circ(90^\circ)$, and \hat{y} is at declination 0° . We take β^μ for each B meson to be the $Y(4S)$ four-velocity, and choose \hat{z} to lie along $-\vec{\beta}$. The event sidereal time \hat{t} is given by the right ascension of \hat{z} as it precesses around \hat{Z} at the sidereal frequency $\Omega = 2\pi$ rad/sidereal day. We find $\hat{t} = 14.0$ sidereal hours at the Unix epoch (00:00:00 UTC, 1 Jan. 1970) from the latitude (37.4° N) and longitude (122.2° W) of *BABAR* and the $Y(4S)$ boost ($\langle\beta\gamma\rangle \approx 0.55$ toward 37.8° east of south), which also yield $\cos\chi = \hat{z} \cdot \hat{Z} = 0.628$ in Eq. (4):

$$\begin{aligned} \beta^\mu \Delta a_\mu &= \gamma[\Delta a_0 - \beta\Delta a_z \cos\chi \\ &\quad - \beta \sin\chi(\Delta a_Y \sin\Omega\hat{t} + \Delta a_X \cos\Omega\hat{t})]. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Neutral B mesons from $Y(4S)$ decay evolve in orthogonal flavor states until one decays, after which the flavor of the other continues to oscillate. We use *direct* semileptonic decays ($b \rightarrow X\ell\nu$, where $\ell = e$ or μ) to tag the flavor of each $B^0(\bar{B}^0)$ by the charge of the lepton $\ell^+(\ell^-)$. The decay rate for opposite-sign dilepton ($\ell^+\ell^-$) events is

$$\begin{aligned} N^{+-} &\propto e^{-|\Delta t|/\tau_{B^0}} \{(1 + |z|^2) \cosh(\Delta\Gamma\Delta t/2) \\ &\quad + (1 - |z|^2) \cos(\Delta m\Delta t) - 2\text{Re}z \sinh(\Delta\Gamma\Delta t/2) \\ &\quad + 2\text{Im}z \sin(\Delta m\Delta t)\}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

We define $1/\tau_{B^0}$ to be the average neutral B decay rate, and $\Delta t \equiv t^+ - t^-$, where $t^+(t^-)$ is the proper time for one of a pair of B mesons to decay to $\ell^+(\ell^-)$. We make the approximation $\sinh(\Delta\Gamma\Delta t/2) \approx \Delta\Gamma\Delta t/2$, which is valid for the range $|\Delta t| < 15$ ps used in this analysis. We use $|\Delta\Gamma| = 6 \times 10^{-3}$ ps $^{-1}$ [8] in the $\cosh(\Delta\Gamma\Delta t/2)$ term.

The asymmetry between the decay rates at $\Delta t > 0$ and $\Delta t < 0$ compares the probabilities $P(B^0 \rightarrow B^0)$ and $P(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow \bar{B}^0)$. Omitting second-order terms in z gives

$$A_{CPT}(\Delta t) \approx \frac{-\text{Re}z\Delta\Gamma\Delta t + 2\text{Im}z \sin(\Delta m\Delta t)}{\cosh(\Delta\Gamma\Delta t/2) + \cos(\Delta m\Delta t)}. \quad (6)$$

The *BABAR* detector is described elsewhere [9]. We use about 232×10^6 $Y(4S) \rightarrow B\bar{B}$ decays, and 16 fb^{-1} of data 40 MeV below the $Y(4S)$ resonance, collected in 1999–2004 to search for variations in z of the form

$$z = z_0 + z_1 \cos(\Omega\hat{t} + \phi). \quad (7)$$

For long data-taking periods, any day/night variations in detector response tend to cancel over sidereal time.

We have previously measured [10] time-integrated values of $\text{Im}z$ and $\text{Re}z\Delta\Gamma$ from the Δt distribution of the same events. Here, we measure $\text{Im}z_0$, $\text{Re}z_0\Delta\Gamma$, $\text{Im}z_1$, and $\text{Re}z_1\Delta\Gamma$ by extending the likelihood fit to include the event sidereal time \hat{t} , and extract values for the SME quantities Δa_μ . In a complementary approach, we measure the spectral power of variations in z over a wide frequency band using the periodogram method [11].

The event selection is the same as in Ref. [10]. Briefly, we suppress non- $B\bar{B}$ background by event-shape and event-topology requirements, and select events having at least two well-identified lepton candidates with momenta 0.8 – 2.3 GeV/ c in the $Y(4S)$ rest frame that are not part of reconstructed J/ψ , $\psi(2S) \rightarrow e^+e^-$, $\mu^+\mu^-$ decays or photon conversions. Lepton candidates must have at least one z -coordinate measurement in the silicon vertex tracker to allow Δt to be well measured. We reject events in which either of the two highest-momentum lepton candidates (the *dilepton*) is classified as a *cascade* lepton from a $b \rightarrow (c, \tau) \rightarrow \ell$ transition by a neural-network algorithm that uses as input variables the momenta and opening angle of the two leptons together with the event's visible energy and missing momentum. The selected dilepton sample com-

prises 1.18×10^6 opposite-sign events and 0.22×10^6 same-sign events.

We estimate the $Y(4S)$ decay point in the transverse plane with a χ^2 -fit using the transverse distances to the two lepton tracks and the beam spot. To measure Δt , we assume each lepton originates from a direct B meson decay at the point on the lepton track with the least transverse distance to the $Y(4S)$. The component Δz , along the Lorentz boost, of the distance between these two points yields $\Delta t = \Delta z / \langle \beta \gamma \rangle c$. For opposite-sign events $\Delta z = z^+ - z^-$; for same-sign events we use $|\Delta z|$.

We model the Δt distribution of the dilepton sample with the probability density functions (PDFs) used in Ref. [10] to represent contributions from $B^0\bar{B}^0$ and B^+B^- decays and non- $B\bar{B}$ events. The latter are estimated, using off-resonance data, to be 3.1% of the sample. The fit to data determines that 59% of the $B\bar{B}$ events are B^+B^- decays. With minor $B\bar{B}$ background contributions fixed to values from Monte Carlo (MC) simulation, the fit to data also determines the fractions of $B^0\bar{B}^0$ and B^+B^- decays that are *signal* events ($\approx 80\%$) with two direct leptons, and the fractions ($\approx 10\%$) that are events with one direct lepton and a $b \rightarrow c \rightarrow \ell$ cascade decay of the other B meson. Same-sign dilepton events are retained primarily to improve the determination of these fractions.

Each PDF is a convolution of a decay rate in Δt with a resolution function that is a sum of Gaussians or, for events with a cascade lepton, its convolution with one or two double-sided exponentials accounting for the lifetimes of intermediate τ or $D_{(s)}$ meson states, respectively. We use a sum of three Gaussians for signal events. The fit to data determines their fractions and also their widths except that of the widest, which is fixed to 8 ps. For leptons from different B mesons, our $B^0\bar{B}^0$ decay rate contains \mathbf{z} to first-order [cf. Equation (5)] for opposite-sign events and is $\propto e^{-|\Delta t|/\tau_{B^0}} \{\cosh(\Delta\Gamma\Delta t/2) - \cos(\Delta m\Delta t)\}$ for same-sign events; for B^+B^- decays, it is $\propto e^{-|\Delta t|/\tau_{B^\pm}}$. For leptons from the same B meson, the decay rates are exponentials with effective lifetimes determined from MC simulation.

Dilution factors are included to account for wrong flavor tags in cascade decays.

Each event's timestamp yields the time elapsed since the Unix epoch. We use this time, folded over one sidereal day and shifted in phase by 14.0 sidereal hours, for \hat{t} .

We extract \mathbf{z} from a two-dimensional maximum likelihood fit to the opposite-sign and same-sign data events binned separately in Δt and \hat{t} . The likelihood function in Δt for each of the 24 sidereal-time slices contains a common sum of the PDFs, and \mathbf{z} varies with \hat{t} as in Eq. (7). The likelihood fit corresponds to A_{CPT} in Eq. (6). We obtain the values for \mathbf{z} and ϕ reported in Table I (upper left). The statistical correlation between $\text{Im}z_0$ and $\text{Re}z_0\Delta\Gamma$ is 76%; between $\text{Im}z_1$ and $\text{Re}z_1\Delta\Gamma$ it is 79%.

Table I shows the sources of systematic uncertainties in the asymmetry parameters. We vary separately τ_{B^0} , τ_{B^\pm} , and Δm by 1σ from their known values [12], and vary $|\Delta\Gamma|$ over the range 0–0.1 ps^{-1} to allow 3σ deviations from its reported value [8]. Fixed parameters in the PDF resolution functions for nonsignal events are varied separately by 10%, motivated by a comparison of resolution parameters fitted to signal events in data and MC simulation. The fractions of the $D_{(s)}$ meson components in background cascade decays are also varied by 10%. We evaluate effects of possible silicon vertex tracker (SVT) internal misalignments and absolute z -scale uncertainty using $B^0\bar{B}^0$ MC samples. The clock that sets the event timestamps is governed by the highly stable PEP-II master oscillator and is resynchronized with U.S. time standards often enough to keep relative sidereal phase errors $< 0.2\%$. Another small uncertainty in sidereal phase arises in calculating the $Y(4S)$ boost's right ascension. We use $e^+e^- \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-(\gamma)$ data events, with true $\Delta z = 0$, to check for sidereal variations in measured Δz that could mimic a Lorentz-violation signal. The measured amplitude (0.022 ± 0.025) μm and mean (0.030 ± 0.018) μm are sources of negligible uncertainties. At the solar-day frequency the amplitude is (0.028 ± 0.025) μm , consistent with no effect from diurnal detector response variations.

TABLE I. Asymmetry parameter values from fits, with systematic errors below. Equation (7) implies $\mathbf{z}_1 \rightarrow -\mathbf{z}_1$ for $\phi \rightarrow \phi + \pi$.

A_{CPT} parameter	Without SME constraint [see Eq. (6)]					With SME constraint [see Eq. (8)]		
	$\text{Im}z_0$ $\times 10^{-3}$	$\text{Re}z_0\Delta\Gamma$ $\times 10^{-3} \text{ ps}^{-1}$	$\text{Im}z_1$ $\times 10^{-3}$	$\text{Re}z_1\Delta\Gamma$ $\times 10^{-3} \text{ ps}^{-1}$	ϕ (rad)	$\text{Im}z_0$ $\times 10^{-3}$	$\text{Im}z_1$ $\times 10^{-3}$	ϕ (rad)
Value from fit	-14.2 ± 7.3	-7.3 ± 4.1	-24 ± 11	-18.5 ± 5.6	2.63 ± 0.31	-5.2 ± 3.6	-17.0 ± 5.8	2.56 ± 0.36
Systematic effects								
τ_{B^0} , τ_{B^\pm} , Δm , $\Delta\Gamma$	± 0.7	± 0.4	± 0.6	± 0.5	± 0.05	± 0.4	± 0.7	± 0.01
SVT alignment, z scale	± 0.6	± 1.5	± 2.0	± 1.1	± 0.20	± 1.7	± 1.4	± 0.15
PDF resolution models	± 2.0	± 1.0	± 2.5	± 1.2	± 0.02	± 0.8	± 1.0	± 0.01
Background fractions	± 0.1	± 0.1	± 0.2	± 0.2	± 0.01	± 0.2	± 0.3	± 0.01
Sidereal phase	± 0.0	± 0.0	± 0.0	± 0.0	± 0.03	± 0.0	± 0.0	± 0.03
Total systematic error	± 2.2	± 1.8	± 3.3	± 1.7	± 0.21	± 1.9	± 1.9	± 0.15




FIG. 1 (color online). A_{CPT}^{meas} versus sidereal time for opposite-sign dilepton events with $|\Delta t| > 3$ ps. Some event types, e.g., B^+B^- decays, have $A_{CPT} = 0$. The curve is a projection, for $|\Delta t| > 3$ ps, using two-dimensional likelihood fit results for $|\Delta t| < 15$ ps.

In Fig. 1 we plot the sidereal-time dependence of the measured asymmetry A_{CPT}^{meas} for the opposite-sign dilepton events with $|\Delta t| > 3$ ps, thereby omitting highly-populated bins where any asymmetry is predicted to be small. Figure 2 shows confidence level contours for $\text{Im}z_1$ and $\text{Re}z_1\Delta\Gamma$. The significance for sidereal variations in \mathbf{z} , characteristic of CPT and Lorentz violation, is 2.8σ .

The results of the fit described above are compatible with the SME constraint $\text{Re}z_1\Delta\Gamma \approx 2\Delta m\text{Im}z_1$ [Eq. (3)] for $\Delta m = 0.507 \text{ ps}^{-1}$ [12]. We repeat the likelihood fit subject to this constraint. The asymmetry in Eq. (6) becomes

$$A_{CPT}(\Delta t) \approx \frac{2\text{Im}z_1\{-\Delta m\Delta t + \sin(\Delta m\Delta t)\}}{\cosh(\Delta\Gamma\Delta t/2) + \cos(\Delta m\Delta t)}. \quad (8)$$

We obtain the results reported in Table I (right). The statistical correlation between $\text{Im}z_1$ and ϕ is 48%. The significance for sidereal variations in \mathbf{z} is again 2.8σ . We ob-




FIG. 2. Contours indicating 1σ , 2σ , and 3σ significance, around the central values of $\text{Im}z_1$ and $\text{Re}z_1\Delta\Gamma$ (solid circle).

tain consistent results for $\text{Im}z_0$, $\text{Im}z_1$, and ϕ when second-order terms [Eq. (5)] of form $|z|^2 = \rho^2 \cos^2(\Omega\hat{t} + \phi)$, motivated by finding $|\text{Im}z_1| > |\text{Im}z_0|$, are included in the likelihood fit to data with ρ^2 as a free parameter.

We use Eqs. (3), (4), and (7) to extract the SME quantities

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta a_0 - 0.30\Delta a_Z &\approx (-3.0 \pm 2.4)(\Delta m/\Delta\Gamma) \times 10^{-15} \text{ GeV}, \\ \Delta a_X &\approx (-22 \pm 7)(\Delta m/\Delta\Gamma) \times 10^{-15} \text{ GeV}, \\ \Delta a_Y &\approx (-14_{-13}^{+10})(\Delta m/\Delta\Gamma) \times 10^{-15} \text{ GeV}. \end{aligned}$$

We now use the periodogram method [11] to examine the spectral power for variations in \mathbf{z} over a wide band of frequencies. The spectral power at a test frequency ν is

$$P(\nu) \equiv \left| \sum_{j=1}^N w_j e^{2i\pi\nu T_j} \right|^2 / N\sigma_w^2, \quad (9)$$

where the data, comprising N measurements w_j made at times T_j , have variance σ_w^2 . Here, T_j is the time elapsed since the Unix epoch for opposite-sign dilepton event j , and the weights $w_j = \Delta m\Delta t_j - \sin(\Delta m\Delta t_j)$ are suited to the study of periodic variations in \mathbf{z} according to Eq. (8).

In the absence of an oscillatory signal, the probability that $P(\nu)$ exceeds a value S at a given frequency is $\exp(-S)$; if M independent frequencies are tested, the largest $P(\nu)$ value exceeds S with probability

$$\Pr\{P_{\max}(\nu) > S; M\} = 1 - [1 - \exp(-S)]^M. \quad (10)$$

We use 20 994 test frequencies from 0.26 yr^{-1} to $2.1 \text{ solar day}^{-1}$, spaced by $10^{-4} \text{ solar day}^{-1}$. This oversamples the frequency range by a factor of about 2.2 and avoids underestimating the spectral power of a signal. The number of independent frequencies is about 9500.




FIG. 3. Periodogram for opposite-sign dilepton events. The solar-day and sidereal-day frequencies, indicated by the left and right triangles (inset), are well resolved in our data.

Figure 3 shows the periodogram we obtain. The largest spectral power is $P_{\max}(\nu) = 8.78$, for the test frequency $\nu = 0.463\,12$ solar day $^{-1}$. With no signal, the probability of finding a larger spectral power in our periodogram is 76%. Interpolation to the sidereal frequency ($\approx 1.002\,74$ solar day $^{-1}$) yields $P(\nu) = 5.28$, a value that is exceeded at 78 test frequencies. At the solar-day frequency, where any effects due to day/night variations in detector response should appear, $P(\nu) = 1.47$.

In conclusion, we report results of a search for sidereal variations in the *CPT* violation parameter \mathbf{z} that complement our previous time-integrated measurements [10]. Neither the likelihood fits nor the periodogram method detect asymmetries that provide evidence for *CPT* and Lorentz violation. We constrain the quantities Δa_μ of the SME that govern *CPT* violation in B^0 - \bar{B}^0 oscillations.

The authors are indebted to Alain Milsztajn (deceased) for his help with the periodogram analysis. 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), MIST (Russia), MEC (Spain), and STFC (United Kingdom). Individuals have received support from the Marie Curie EIF (European Union) and the A. P. Sloan Foundation.

*Deceased.

†Present address: Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, 69978, Israel.

‡Also with Università di Perugia, Dipartimento di Fisica, Perugia, Italy.

§Also with Università della Basilicata, Potenza, Italy.

||Also with Università di Sassari, Sassari, Italy.

¶Also with Universitat de Barcelona, Facultat de Fisica, Departament ECM, E-08028 Barcelona, Spain.

- [1] O. W. Greenberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 231602 (2002).
- [2] D. Colladay and V. A. Kostelecký, Phys. Rev. D **55**, 6760 (1997); Phys. Rev. D **58**, 116002 (1998); V. A. Kostelecký, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 105009 (2004).
- [3] V. A. Kostelecký, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 1818 (1998).
- [4] V. A. Kostelecký, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 076001 (2001).
- [5] H. Nguyen (KTeV Collaboration), in *CPT and Lorentz Symmetry II*, edited by V. A. Kostelecký (World Scientific, Singapore, 2002).
- [6] J. M. Link *et al.* (FOCUS Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **556**, 7 (2003).
- [7] V. A. Kostelecký and C. D. Lane, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 116010 (1999); V. A. Kostelecký and M. Mewes, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 056005 (2002).
- [8] B. Aubert *et al.* (*BABAR* Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D **70**, 012007 (2004).
- [9] B. Aubert *et al.* (*BABAR* Collaboration), Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A **479**, 1 (2002).
- [10] B. Aubert *et al.* (*BABAR* Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 251802 (2006).
- [11] N. R. Lomb, Astrophys. Space Sci. **39**, 447 (1976); J. D. Scargle, Astrophys. J. **263**, 835 (1982).
- [12] W.-M. Yao *et al.* (Particle Data Group), J. Phys. G **33**, 1 (2006) and 2007 partial update for edition 2008.