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We have performed a search for the decay $B \rightarrow X_{s} \ell^{+} \ell^{-}$using a pseudo-inclusive reconstruction technique. Using a data sample of $657 \times 10^{6} B \bar{B}$ pairs, we observe a clear signal, including $238.3 \pm 26.4 \pm 2.3$ events in the mass region $M\left(X_{s}\right)<2.0 \mathrm{GeV} / c^{2}$. The measured branching fraction is $\mathscr{B}\left(B \rightarrow X_{s} \ell \ell\right)=\left(3.33 \pm 0.80(\text { stat })_{-0.24}^{+0.19}(\right.$ syst $\left.)\right) \times 10^{-6}$; this result is restricted to the region $M\left(\ell^{+} \ell^{-}\right)>0.2 \mathrm{GeV} / c^{2}$.
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## 1. Introduction

In the Standard Model (SM), the rare decay $B \rightarrow X_{s} \ell^{+} \ell^{-}(\ell=e, \mu)$ proceeds through a $b \rightarrow s \ell^{+} \ell^{-}$transition, which is forbidden at tree level. On the other hand, the flavor-changing neutral current (FCNC) process can occur at higher order via electroweak penguin and $W^{+} W^{-}$box diagrams. Since only Wilson coefficients $\mathscr{O}_{7}, \mathscr{O}_{9}$ and $\mathscr{O}_{10}$ appear in the effective Hamiltonian, we can constrain these coefficients by $b \rightarrow s \ell^{+} \ell^{-}$transition and thus probe New Physics [1, 2]. Recently, the Belle and BaBar collaborations have both observed exclusive $B \rightarrow K \ell^{+} \ell^{-}$and $B \rightarrow K^{*} \ell^{+} \ell^{-}$ decays [3, 4, 5, 6, 7], the inclusive $B \rightarrow X_{s} \ell^{+} \ell^{-}$decays are also measured [8, 9]. In this report, we improve the measurement of $B \rightarrow X_{s} \ell^{+} \ell^{-}$using a data sample of $657 \times 10^{6} \mathrm{BB}$ pairs.

## 2. Event selection and signal extraction

We reconstruct inclusive $B \rightarrow X_{s} \ell^{+} \ell^{-}$decays with a dilepton pair $\ell^{+} \ell^{-}\left(e^{+} e-\right.$ or $\left.\mu^{+} \mu^{-}\right)$, and one of eighteen reconstructed hadronic states $X_{s}$. The hadronic states $X_{s}$ consists of one $K^{ \pm}$or $K_{s}$ and up to four pions (at most one pion can be neutral): $K^{ \pm}, K^{ \pm} \pi^{0}, K^{ \pm} \pi^{\mp}, K^{ \pm} \pi^{\mp} \pi^{0}, K^{ \pm} \pi^{\mp} \pi^{ \pm}$, $K^{ \pm} \pi^{\mp} \pi^{ \pm} \pi^{0}, K^{ \pm} \pi^{\mp} \pi^{ \pm} \pi^{\mp}, K^{ \pm} \pi^{\mp} \pi^{ \pm} \pi^{\mp} \pi^{0}, K^{ \pm} \pi^{\mp} \pi^{ \pm} \pi^{\mp} \pi^{ \pm}, K_{s}^{0}, K_{s}^{0} \pi^{0}, K_{s}^{0} \pi^{ \pm}, K_{s}^{0} \pi^{ \pm} \pi^{0}, K_{s}^{0} \pi^{ \pm} \pi^{\mp}$, $K_{s}^{0} \pi^{ \pm} \pi^{\mp} \pi^{0}, K_{s}^{0} \pi^{ \pm} \pi^{\mp} \pi^{\mp}, K_{s}^{0} \pi^{ \pm} \pi^{\mp} \pi^{\mp} \pi^{0}$, and $K_{s}^{0} \pi^{ \pm} \pi^{\mp} \pi^{\mp} \pi^{ \pm}$. Signal event candidates are characterized by the kinematic variable: the beam-energy-constrained mass, $M_{\mathrm{cc}}=\sqrt{E_{\text {beam }}^{2}-P_{B}^{* 2}}$, where $E_{\text {beam }}$ is the run-dependent beam energy, and $P_{B}^{*}$ is the momentum of the $B$ candidate in the $\Upsilon(4 S)$ center-of-mass (CM) frame.

Since there are large peaking backgrounds from charmonium $B$ decays to $X_{s} J / \psi$ or $X_{s} \psi(2 S)$, we remove these candidates with a dilepton mass in the regions $M_{e e(\gamma)}-M_{J / \psi} \in[-0.4,0.15] \mathrm{GeV} / c^{2}$, $M_{e e(\gamma)}-M_{\psi(2 S)} \in[-0.25,0.1] \mathrm{GeV} / c^{2}, M_{\mu \mu}-M_{J / \psi} \in[-0.25,0.1] \mathrm{GeV} / c^{2}$ and $M_{\mu \mu}-M_{\psi(2 S)} \in$ $[-0.15,0.1] \mathrm{GeV} / c^{2}$. We also require $M_{e^{+} e^{-}}>0.2 \mathrm{GeV} / c^{2}$ to remove the possible background from the radiative $B \rightarrow X_{s} \gamma$ decays or $\pi^{0}$ Dalitz decays. Another background source is from random combinations with semileptonic $B$ decays $(b \rightarrow c \rightarrow s, d)$. In this case, at least one of the leptons in $X_{s} \ell^{+} \ell^{-}$reconstruction is misidentified from another conjugate $B$ decays. Since most of the semileptonic $B$ decays produce a neutrino, we reject this background using missing mass, missing energy information, and the distance of two leptons along the positron beam ( $z$ axis). For continuum background $e^{+} e^{-} \rightarrow q \bar{q}(q=u, d, s$ and $c$ ) events, we use modified Fox-Wolfram moments [10] that are combined into a Fisher discriminant. This discriminant is subsequently combined with the probabilities for the cosine of the $B$ flight direction in the CM frame, the energy difference $\Delta E=E_{B}^{*}-E_{\text {beam }}$ [ $E_{B}^{*}$ is the energy of the $B$ candidate in the $\Upsilon(4 S)$ CM frame] and $\chi^{2}$ value for the $B$ decay vertex to form a likelihood ratio $\mathscr{R}=\mathscr{L}_{s} /\left(\mathscr{L}_{s}+\mathscr{L}_{q \bar{q}}\right)$. Here, $\mathscr{L}_{s}\left(\mathscr{L}_{q \bar{q}}\right)$ is a likelihood function for signal (continuum) events that is obtained from the signal (continuum) MC simulation.

We perform an extended unbinned maximum likelihood fit to the $M_{\mathrm{bc}}$ distribution in the region $M_{\mathrm{bc}}>5.20 \mathrm{GeV} / c^{2}$ to extract the signal. Other interesting measurements are the branching fraction of $B \rightarrow X_{s} \ell^{+} \ell^{-}$versus $M_{X_{s}}$ and $q^{2}\left(M_{\ell^{+} \ell^{-}}^{2}\right)$ variables, we divide $M_{X_{s}}$ and $q^{2}$ into several regions and use $M_{\mathrm{bc}}$ fit to determine their branching fractions, these results are shown on Fig. 1.

## 3. Summary

We have measured the branching fraction of $B \rightarrow X_{s} \ell^{+} \ell^{-}$to be $\left(3.33 \pm 0.8_{-0.24}^{+0.19}\right) \times 10^{-6}$ with
$10.1 \sigma$ significance. The distributions of $\mathrm{d} \mathscr{B}\left(B \rightarrow X_{s} \ell^{+} \ell^{-}\right) v s . \mathrm{d} M_{X_{s}}$ and $\mathrm{d} \mathscr{B}\left(B \rightarrow X_{s} \ell^{+} \ell^{-}\right) v s . \mathrm{d} q^{2}$ are consistent with SM predictions. We have also measured the branching fractions of $B \rightarrow X_{8} e^{+} e^{-}$ and $B \rightarrow X_{s} \mu^{+} \mu^{-}$to be $\left(4.56 \pm 1.15_{-0.4}^{+0.33}\right) \times 10^{-6}$ and $\left(1.91 \pm 1.02_{-0.18}^{+0.16}\right) \times 10^{-6}$, respectively. The ratio of measured branching fraction $\mathscr{B}\left(B \rightarrow X_{s} e^{+} e^{-}\right) / \mathscr{B}\left(B \rightarrow X_{s} \mu^{+} \mu^{-}\right)$is $2.39 \pm 1.41$. This value with its error bar is within our MC assumption: $\mathscr{B}\left(B \rightarrow X_{s} e^{+} e^{-}\right) / \mathscr{B}\left(B \rightarrow X_{s} \mu^{+} \mu^{-}\right)=1$; although the difference, the systematic error for $B \rightarrow X_{s} \ell^{+} \ell^{-}$efficiency is considered to be small.

The systematic errors (in the unit of percentage) are summarized in Table 1. There are three major sources of systematic errors: peaking backgrounds [from $B \rightarrow X_{s} J / \psi, X_{s} \psi(2 S), X_{s} \psi(3770)$, $X_{s} \psi(4040)$ and $X_{s} \psi(4160)$ decays], detector systematics (tracking and particle identification efficiencies) and MC modeling systematics $\left[\mathscr{B}\left(B \rightarrow K^{(*)} \ell^{+} \ell^{-}\right)\right.$assumption, $K^{*}-X_{s}$ transition and $X_{s}$ decay fractions], etc.

Table 1: Systematic errors (in the unit of percentage) on the $B \rightarrow X_{s} e^{+} e^{-}$and $B \rightarrow X_{s} \mu^{+} \mu^{-}$branching fraction measurements.

| Source | $B \rightarrow X_{s} e^{+} e^{-}$ | $B \rightarrow X_{s} \mu^{+} \mu^{-}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Signal PDF | $\pm 0.3$ | $\pm 0.1$ |
| $B \rightarrow X_{s} J / \psi, X_{s} \psi(2 S)$ | $\pm 1.2$ | $\pm 0.9$ |
| $B \rightarrow X_{s} \psi(3770), X_{s} \psi(4040), X_{s} \psi(4160)$ | $\pm 0.9$ | $\pm 0.9$ |
| $B \rightarrow X_{s} \pi \pi, X_{s} \pi \ell v$ | ${ }_{-0.5}^{+0.4}$ | ${ }_{-0.3}^{+0.2}$ |
| Self-cross-feed | $\pm 0.1$ | $\pm 0.1$ |
| Tracking efficiency | $\pm 3.6$ | $\pm 3.6$ |
| $\ell^{ \pm}$efficiency | $\pm 2.1$ | $\pm 2.2$ |
| $K^{ \pm}$efficiency | $\pm 0.4$ | $\pm 1.0$ |
| $\pi^{ \pm}$efficiency | $\pm 3.4$ | $\pm 3.0$ |
| $K_{s}^{0}$ efficiency | $\pm 0.9$ | $\pm 0.9$ |
| $\pi^{0}$ efficiency | $\pm 0.5$ | $\pm 0.5$ |
| $\mathscr{R}$ requirement | $\pm 5.3$ | $\pm 2.6$ |
| Fermi motion model | ${ }^{+1.3}$ | ${ }^{+4.9}$ |
| $K^{*}-X_{s}$ transition | ${ }_{-6.0}^{+2.3}$ | ${ }_{-2.0}^{+2.7}$ |
| $X_{s}$ decay fractions | $\pm 5.8$ | $\pm 5.8$ |
| $X_{s}$ decay fractions with two or more kaons | $\pm 1.7$ | $\pm 1.7$ |
| MC statistics | $<0.1$ | $<0.1$ |
| $B \bar{B}$ number | $\pm 1.4$ | $\pm 1.4$ |
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Figure 1: Upper left: Projection of the $M_{\mathrm{bc}}$ fit with a data sample containing $657 \times 10^{6} B \bar{B}$ pairs. The signal component $B \rightarrow X_{s} \ell^{+} \ell^{-}$is shown in black line, the background ( $b \rightarrow c \rightarrow s, d$ and continuum), peaking background $\left[B \rightarrow X_{s} J / \psi, X_{s} \psi(2 S), X_{s} \psi(3770), X_{s} \psi(4040)\right.$ and $X_{s} \psi(4160)$ ], self-cross-feed components are shown in yellow, green, and blue solid shaded regions, respectively. Upper right: The $\mathrm{d} \mathscr{B}\left(B \rightarrow X_{s} \ell^{+} \ell^{-}\right) / \mathrm{d} M_{X_{s}}$ distribution, the dot with error bars are data, the yellow shaded region is MC simulation. Lower: The $\mathrm{d} \mathscr{B}\left(B \rightarrow X_{s} \ell^{+} \ell^{-}\right) / \mathrm{d} q^{2}\left(M_{\ell^{+} \ell^{-}}^{2}\right)$ distribution, the dot with error bars are data, the yellow shaded region is MC simulation.
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