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A first flavor-tagged measurement of the time-dependent $CP$-violating asymmetry in $B_s^0 \to \phi \phi$ decays is presented. In this decay channel, the $CP$-violating weak phase arises due to $CP$ violation in the interference between $B_s^0 \to \phi \phi$ mixing and the $b \to s \bar{s} s$ gluonic penguin decay amplitude. Using a sample of $pp$ collision data corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 1.0 fb$^{-1}$ and collected at a center-of-mass energy of 7 TeV with the LHCb detector, 880 $B_s^0 \to \phi \phi$ signal decays are obtained. The $CP$-violating phase is measured to be in the interval $[-2.46, -0.76]$ rad at a 68% confidence level. The $p$ value of the standard model prediction is 16%.
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The $B_s^0 \to \phi \phi$ decay is forbidden at the tree level in the standard model (SM) and proceeds via a gluonic $b \to s \bar{s} s$ penguin process. Hence, this channel provides an excellent probe of new heavy particles entering the penguin quantum loops. Generally, $CP$ violation in the SM is governed by a single phase in the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa quark mixing matrix. The interference between the $B_s^0$-$\bar{B}_s^0$ oscillation and decay amplitudes leads to a $CP$ asymmetry in the decay time distributions of $B_s^0$ and $\bar{B}_s^0$ mesons, which is characterized by a $CP$-violating weak phase. The SM predicts this phase to be small. Due to different decay amplitudes the actual value is dependent on the $B_s^0$ decay channel. For $B_s^0 \to J/\psi \phi$, which proceeds via a $b \to c \bar{c} s$ transition, the SM prediction of the weak phase is given by $-2 \arg(-V_{ts}V_{tb}^*/V_{cs}V_{cb}^*) = -0.036 \pm 0.002$ rad [5]. The LHCb Collaboration recently measured the weak phase in this decay to be $0.068 \pm 0.091$ (stat) $\pm 0.011$ (syst) rad [6], which is consistent with the SM and places stringent constraints on $CP$ violation in $B_s^0$-$\bar{B}_s^0$ oscillations [7]. In the SM, the phase in the $B_s^0 \to \phi \phi$ decay $\phi_s$ is expected to be close to zero due to a cancellation of the phases arising from $B_s^0$-$\bar{B}_s^0$ oscillations and decay [8]. Calculations using QCD factorization provide an upper limit of 0.02 rad for $|\phi_s|$ [1–3].

In this Letter, we present the first measurement of the $CP$-violating phase in $B_s^0 \to \phi \phi$ decays. Charge conjugate states are implied. The result is based on $pp$ collision data corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 1.0 fb$^{-1}$ and collected by the LHCb experiment in 2011 at a center-of-mass energy of 7 TeV. This data sample was previously used for a time-integrated measurement of the polarization amplitudes and triple product asymmetries in the same decay mode [9]. The analysis reported here improves the selection efficiency, measures the $B_s^0$ decay time, and identifies the flavor of the $B_s^0$ meson at production. This allows a study of $CP$ violation in the interference between mixing and decay to be performed. It is necessary to disentangle the $CP$-even longitudinal ($A_0$), $CP$-even transverse ($A_0$), and $CP$-odd transverse ($A_1$) polarizations of the $\phi \phi$ final state by measuring the distributions of the helicity angles [9].

The LHCb detector is a forward spectrometer at the Large Hadron Collider covering the pseudorapidity range $2 < \eta < 5$ and is described in detail in Ref. [10]. Events are selected by a hardware trigger, which selects hadron or muon candidates with high transverse energy or momentum ($p_T$), followed by a two stage software trigger [11]. In the software trigger, $B_s^0 \to \phi \phi$ candidates are selected either by identifying events containing a pair of oppositely charged kaons with an invariant mass close to that of the $\phi$ meson or by using a topological $b$-hadron trigger. In the simulation, $pp$ collisions are generated using PYTHIA 6.4 [12], with a specific LHCb configuration [13]. Decays of hadronic particles are described by EVTGEN [14] and the detector response is implemented using the GEANT4 toolkit [15] as described in Ref. [16].

The $B_s^0 \to \phi \phi$ decays are reconstructed by combining two $\phi$ meson candidates that decay into the $K^+ K^-$ final state. Kaon candidates are required to have $p_T > 0.5$ GeV/c, and an impact parameter $\chi^2$ larger than 16 with respect to the primary vertex (PV), where the impact parameter $\chi^2$ is defined as the difference between the $\chi^2$ of the PV reconstructed with and without the considered track. Candidates must also be identified as kaons using the ring-imaging Cherenkov detectors [17], by requiring that the difference in the global likelihood between the kaon and pion mass hypotheses ($\Delta \ln \mathcal{L}_{K} = \ln \mathcal{L}_{K} - \ln \mathcal{L}_{\pi}$) be larger than $-5$. Both $\phi$ meson candidates must have a reconstructed mass $m_{KK}$ of the kaon pair within 20 MeV/$c^2$ of the known mass of the $\phi$ meson, a transverse momentum ($p_T^{\phi}$) larger than
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0.9 GeV/c, and a product $p_T^{\phi 1} p_T^{\phi 2} > 2$ GeV$^2$/c$^2$. The $\chi^2$ per degree of freedom (ndf) of the vertex fit for both $\phi$ meson candidates and the $B^0_s$ candidate is required to be smaller than 25. Using the above criteria, 17,575 candidates are selected in the invariant four-kaon mass range $5100 < m_{KKKK} < 5600$ MeV/c$^2$.

A boosted decision tree (BDT) [18] is used to separate signal from background. The six observables used as input to the BDT are $p_T$, $\eta$, and $\chi^2$/ndf of the vertex fit for the $B^0_s$ candidate and the cosine of the angle between the $B^0_s$ momentum and the direction of flight from the closest primary vertex to the decay vertex, in addition to the smallest $p_T$ and the largest track $\chi^2$/ndf of the kaon tracks. The BDT is trained using simulated $B^0_s \rightarrow \phi \phi$ signal events and background from the data where at least one of the $\phi$ candidates has invariant mass in the range $20 < |m_{KK} - m_{\phi}| < 25$ MeV/c$^2$.

The $s$Plot technique [19,20] is used to assign a signal weight to each $B^0_s \rightarrow \phi \phi$ candidate. Using the four-kaon mass as the discriminating variable, the distributions of the signal components for the $B^0_s$ decay time and helicity angles can be determined in the data sample. The sensitivity to $\phi_s$ is optimized taking into account the signal purity and the flavor tagging performance. The final selection of $B^0_s \rightarrow \phi \phi$ candidates based on this optimization is required to have a BDT output larger than 0.1, $\Delta \ln \mathcal{L}_{Ks} > -3$ for each kaon, and $|m_{KK} - m_{\phi}| < 15$ MeV/c$^2$ for each $\phi$ candidate.

In total, 1182 $B^0_s \rightarrow \phi \phi$ candidates are selected. Figure 1 shows the four-kaon invariant mass distribution for the selected events. Using an unbinned extended maximum likelihood fit, a signal yield of 880 $\pm$ 31 events is obtained. In this fit, the $B^0_s \rightarrow \phi \phi$ signal component is modeled by two Gaussian functions with a common mean. The width of the first Gaussian component is measured to be $12.9 \pm 0.5$ MeV/c$^2$, in agreement with the expectation from simulation. The relative fraction and width of the second Gaussian component is fixed from simulation to values of 0.785 and 29.5 MeV/c$^2$, respectively, in order to ensure a good quality fit. Combinatorial background is modeled using an exponential function which is allowed to vary in the fit. Contributions from specific backgrounds such as $B^0_s \rightarrow \phi K^{\ast 0}$, where $K^{\ast 0} \rightarrow K^+ \pi^-$, are found to be negligible.

An unbinned maximum likelihood fit is performed to the decay time $t$ and the three helicity angles $\Omega = \{\theta_1, \theta_2, \Phi\}$ of the selected $B^0_s \rightarrow \phi \phi$ candidates, each of which is reassigned a signal $s$Plot weight based on the four-kaon invariant mass $m_{KKKK}$ [19,20]. The probability density function (PDF) consists of signal components, which include detector resolution and acceptance effects, and are factorized into separate terms for the decay time and the angular observables.

The $B^0_s$ decay into the $K^+K^-K^+K^-$ final state can proceed via combinations of intermediate vector ($\phi$) and scalar ($f_0(980)$) resonances and scalar nonresonant $K^+K^-$ pairs. Thus the total decay amplitude is a coherent sum of $P$-wave (vector-vector), $S$-wave (vector-scalar) and $SS$-wave (scalar-scalar) contributions. The differential decay rate of the decay time and helicity angles is described by a sum of 15 terms, corresponding to five polarization amplitudes and their interference terms

$$
\frac{d^4\Gamma}{d\cos\theta_1 d\cos\theta_2 d\Phi dt} \propto \sum_{i=1}^{15} K_i(t)f_i(\Omega).
$$

The angular functions $f_i(\Omega)$ for the $P$-wave terms are derived in Ref. [21] and the helicity angles of the two $\phi$ mesons are randomly assigned to $\theta_1$ and $\theta_2$. The time-dependent functions $K_i(t)$ can be written as [21]

\begin{equation}
K_i(t) = N_i e^{-\Gamma_i t} \left[ c_i \cos(\Delta m_i t) + d_i \sin(\Delta m_i t) + a_i \cos(\frac{1}{2} \Delta \Gamma_i t) + b_i \sin(\frac{1}{2} \Delta \Gamma_i t) \right],
\end{equation}

where $\Delta \Gamma_i = \Gamma_L - \Gamma_H$ is the decay width difference between the light (L) and heavy (H) $B^0_s$ mass eigenstates, $\Gamma_i$ is the average decay width, $\Delta m_i = (\Gamma_L + \Gamma_H)/2$, and $\Delta m_i$ is the $B^0_s$-$B^0_s$ oscillation frequency. The coefficients $N_i, a_i, b_i, c_i,$ and $d_i$ can be expressed in terms of $\phi$ and the magnitudes $|A_i|$ and phases $\delta_i$ of the five polarization amplitudes at $t = 0$. The three $P$-wave amplitudes, denoted by $A_{0i}, A_{1i}, A_{2i}$, are normalized such that $|A_{0i}|^2 + |A_{1i}|^2 + |A_{2i}|^2 = 1$, with the strong phases $\delta_1$ and $\delta_2$ defined as $\delta_1 = \delta_+ - \delta_0$ and $\delta_2 = \delta_+ - \delta_0$. The $S$- and $SS$-wave amplitudes and their corresponding phases are denoted by $A_{3S}, A_{4S},$ and $\delta_S, \delta_{SS}$, respectively. For a $B^0_s$ meson produced at $t = 0$, the coefficients in Eq. (2) and the angular functions $f_i(\theta_1, \theta_2, \Phi)$ are given in Table I, where $\delta_{1S} = \delta_2 - \delta_0$. Assuming that CP violation in mixing and direct CP violation are negligible, the differential distribution for a $B^0_s$ meson is obtained by changing the sign of the coefficients $c_i$ and $d_i$. The PDF is invariant under the transformation $(\phi_s, \Delta \Gamma_s, \delta_{0S}, \delta_+, \delta_S, \delta_{SS}) \rightarrow (\pi - \phi_s, \Delta \Gamma_s, \delta_{0S}, \delta_+, \delta_S, \delta_{SS})$.

---

**FIG. 1** (color online). Invariant $K^+K^-K^+K^-$ mass distribution for selected $B^0_s \rightarrow \phi \phi$ candidates. The total fit (solid line) consists of a double Gaussian signal component together with an exponential background (dotted line).
Similarly, the $B_0^0$ model the decay time resolution are determined from multiplying the signal PDF with a binned acceptance histogram. Determined using simulation and incorporated by multi-trigger, which requires tracks with significant displacement for short decay times, the acceptance vanishes due to the phase space. The validity of the fit model has been extensively validated in simulation studies. A single Gaussian function with a resolution of 40 fs is found to have a similar effect on physics parameters and is applied to the data fit.

The $\phi_s$ measurement requires that the meson flavor be tagged as either a $B_0^0$ or $B_0^\ast$ meson at production. To achieve this, both the opposite side (OS) and same side kaon (SSK) flavor tagging methods are used [23,24]. In OS tagging the $b$-quark hadron produced in association with the signal $b$-quark is exploited through the charge of a muon or electron produced in semileptonic decays, the charge of a kaon from a subsequent charmed hadron decay, and the momentum-weighted charge of all tracks in an inclusively reconstructed decay vertex. The SSK tagging makes use of kaons formed from the signal $m_{KK}$ mass window considered in the amplitude interpretation. This factor is calculated from the interference between the different $m_{KK}$ line shapes of the vector and scalar contributions. The validity of the fit model has been extensively tested using simulated data samples.

The acceptance as a function of the helicity angles is not completely uniform due to the forward geometry of the detector and the momentum cuts placed to the final state particles. A three-dimensional acceptance function is determined using simulation. The acceptance factors are included in the fit as a normalization of the PDF for each of the angular terms. The acceptance function varies by less than 20% across the phase space.

The event reconstruction, trigger, and offline selections introduce a decay time dependent acceptance. In particular for short decay times, the acceptance vanishes due to the trigger, which requires tracks with significant displacement from any PV. Therefore, the decay time acceptance is determined using simulation and incorporated by multiplying the signal PDF with a binned acceptance histogram. The fractions of different triggers are found to be in agreement between data and simulation.

The parameters of a double Gaussian function used to model the decay time resolution are determined from $-\Delta\Gamma_{\pi_\pi}, -\delta_{\pi}, \pi - \delta_{\pi}, -\delta_{\phi}, -\delta_{\phi}$). This twofold ambiguity is resolved in the fit as Gaussian constraints are applied for the $B_0^0$ average decay width and decay width difference to the values measured in $B_0^0 \rightarrow J/\psi \phi$ decays, $\Gamma_{\pi} = 0.663 \pm 0.008$ ps$^{-1}$ and $\Delta\Gamma_{\pi} = 0.100 \pm 0.017$ ps$^{-1}$, with a correlation coefficient $\rho(\Delta\Gamma_{\pi}, \Gamma_{\pi}) = -0.39$ [6]. Similarly, the $B_0^\ast$ oscillation frequency $\Delta m_1$ is constrained to the value $\Delta m_1 = 17.73 \pm 0.05$ ps$^{-1}$ [22].

A correction factor is multiplied to the interference terms in Table I between the $P$- and $S$-wave (and the $P$- and $SS$-wave) contributions to account for the finite $m_{KK}$ mass window considered in the amplitude interpretation. This factor is calculated from the interference between the different $m_{KK}$ line shapes of the vector and scalar contributions. The validity of the fit model has been extensively tested using simulated data samples.

The acceptance as a function of the helicity angles is not completely uniform due to the forward geometry of the detector and the momentum cuts placed to the final state particles. A three-dimensional acceptance function is determined using simulation. The acceptance factors are included in the fit as a normalization of the PDF for each of the angular terms. The acceptance function varies by less than 20% across the phase space.

The event reconstruction, trigger, and offline selections introduce a decay time dependent acceptance. In particular for short decay times, the acceptance vanishes due to the trigger, which requires tracks with significant displacement from any PV. Therefore, the decay time acceptance is determined using simulation and incorporated by multiplying the signal PDF with a binned acceptance histogram. The fractions of different triggers are found to be in agreement between data and simulation.

The parameters of a double Gaussian function used to model the decay time resolution are determined from

TABLE I. Coefficients of the time-dependent terms and angular functions defined in Eqs. (1) and (2). Amplitudes are defined at $t = 0$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$i$</th>
<th>$N_i$</th>
<th>$a_i$</th>
<th>$b_i$</th>
<th>$c_i$</th>
<th>$d_i$</th>
<th>$f_i$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>A_0</td>
<td>^2$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$-\cos\phi_s$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>A_1</td>
<td>^2$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$-\cos\phi_s$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>A_2</td>
<td>^2$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$-\cos\phi_s$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>A_3</td>
<td></td>
<td>A_{\phi_s}</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>A_4</td>
<td></td>
<td>A_{\phi_s}</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>A_5</td>
<td></td>
<td>A_{\phi_s}</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>A_6</td>
<td></td>
<td>A_{\phi_s}</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>A_7</td>
<td></td>
<td>A_{\phi_s}</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>A_8</td>
<td></td>
<td>A_{\phi_s}</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>A_9</td>
<td></td>
<td>A_{\phi_s}</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>A_{10}</td>
<td></td>
<td>A_{\phi_s}</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>A_{11}</td>
<td></td>
<td>A_{\phi_s}</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>A_{12}</td>
<td></td>
<td>A_{\phi_s}</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>A_{13}</td>
<td></td>
<td>A_{\phi_s}</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>A_{14}</td>
<td></td>
<td>A_{\phi_s}</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$|A_0|^2$, $|A_1|^2$, $|A_2|^2$ are the coefficients of the time-independent terms defined in Eqs. (1) and (2). $A_{\phi_s}$ is the amplitude of the angular dependence defined in Eq. (1). $\phi_s$ is the phase of the angular dependence defined in Eq. (2). $\delta_{s\phi}$ is the phase of the angular dependence defined in Eq. (2).

TABLE II. Fit results with statistical and systematic uncertainties. A 68% statistical confidence interval is quoted for $\phi_s$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>$\sigma_{\text{stat}}$</th>
<th>$\sigma_{\text{syst}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\phi_s$ [rad] (68% C.L.)</td>
<td>$[-2.37, -0.92]$</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>A_0</td>
<td>^2$</td>
<td>0.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>A_1</td>
<td>^2$</td>
<td>0.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>A_2</td>
<td>^2$</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\delta_1$ [rad]</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\delta_2$ [rad]</td>
<td>-1.47</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\delta_3$ [rad]</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
propagated to the statistical uncertainties of the physics parameters, following the procedure described in Ref. [6]. For events tagged by both the OS and SSK methods, a combined tagging decision is made. The total tagging power is \( P_{\text{tag}} \), with a tagging efficiency of \( \epsilon_{\text{tag}} = (49.7 \pm 5.0)\% \) and a dilution \( D = (1 - 2\omega) \) where \( \omega \) is the average mistag probability. Untagged events are included in the analysis as they increase the sensitivity to \( \phi_s \) through the \( b_t \) terms in Eq. (2).

The total \( S \)-wave fraction is determined to be \((1.6^{+2.4}_{-1.2})\%\) where the double \( S \)-wave contribution \( A_{SS} \) is set to zero, since the fit shows little sensitivity to \( A_{SS} \). A fit to the twodimensional mass \( m_{KK} \) for both kaon pairs where background is subtracted using sidebands is performed and yields a consistent \( S \)-wave fraction of \((2.1 \pm 1.2)\%\).

The results of the fit for the main observables are shown in Table II. Figure 2 shows the distributions for the decay time and helicity angles with the projections for the best fit. The \( CP \)-even \( P \)-wave, the \( CP \)-odd \( P \)-wave and \( S \)-wave components are shown by the long dashed, short dashed, and dotted lines, respectively.

![FIG. 2 (color online). One-dimensional projections of the \( B^0 \to \phi\phi \) fit for (a) decay time, (b) helicity angle \( \Phi \), and (c) \( \theta_1 \) and (d) \( \theta_2 \). The data are marked as points, while the solid lines represent the projections of the best fit. The \( CP \)-even \( P \)-wave, the \( CP \)-odd \( P \)-wave and \( S \)-wave components are shown by the long dashed, short dashed, and dotted lines, respectively.](image)

All uncertainties related to the calibration of the tagging and the assumed values of \( \Gamma_s \), \( \Delta\Gamma_s \), and \( \Delta m_s \) are absorbed into the statistical uncertainty, described above. Systematic uncertainties are determined and the sum in quadrature of all sources is reported in Table II for each observable. To check that the background is properly accounted for, an additional fit is performed where the angular and time distributions are parametrized using the \( B_s^0 \) mass sidebands. This gives results in agreement with those presented here and no further systematic uncertainty is assigned. The uncertainty due to the modeling of the \( S \)-wave component is evaluated by allowing the \( SS \)-wave component to vary in the fit. The difference between the two fits leads to the dominant uncertainty on \( \phi_s \) of 0.20 rad. The systematic uncertainty due to the decay time acceptance is found by taking the difference in the values of fitted parameters between the nominal fit, using a binned time acceptance, and a fit in which the time acceptance is explicitly parametrized. This is found to be 0.09 rad for \( \phi_s \). Possible differences in the simulated decay time resolution compared to the data are studied by varying the resolution according to the discrepancies observed in the \( B_s^0 \to J/\psi\phi \) analysis [6]. This leads to a systematic uncertainty of 0.01 rad for \( \phi_s \).

![FIG. 3. Negative \( \Delta \ln \) likelihood scan of \( \phi_s \). Only the statistical uncertainty is included.](image)
The distributions of maximum $p_T$ and $\chi^2$/ndf of the final state tracks and the $p_T$ and $\eta$ of the $B^{0}_s$ candidate are reweighted to better match the data. From this, the angular acceptance is recalculated, leading to small changes in the results (0.02 rad for $\phi_s$), which are assigned as systematic uncertainty. Biases in the fit method are studied using simulated pseudoexperiments that lead to an uncertainty of 0.02 rad for $\phi_s$. Further small systematic uncertainties (0.02 rad for $\phi_3$) are due to the limited number of events in the simulation sample used for the determination of the angular acceptance and to the choice of a single versus a double Gaussian function for the mass PDF, which is used to assign the signal weights. The total systematic uncertainty on $\phi_s$ is 0.22 rad, significantly smaller than the statistical uncertainty.

In summary, we present the first study of $CP$ violation in the decay time distribution of hadronic $B^{0}_s \to \phi \phi$ decays. The $CP$-violating phase $\phi_s$ is restricted to the interval of $[-2.46, -0.76]$ rad at 68% C.L. The $p$ value of the standard model prediction [8] is 16%, taking the values of the strong phases and polarization amplitudes observed in data and assuming that systematic uncertainties are negligible. The precision of the $\phi_s$ measurement is dominated by the statistical uncertainty and is expected to improve with larger LHCb data sets.
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