Improved measurement of time-dependent $CP$ asymmetries and the $CP$-odd fraction in the decay $B^0 \to D^{\ast\ast} D^{\ast}$
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We present an updated measurement of the CP-odd fraction and the time-dependent CP asymmetries in the decay $B^0 \rightarrow D^{*+} D^{*-}$ using $(383 \pm 4) \times 10^6 \bar{B}B$ pairs collected with the BABAR detector. We...
In the standard model (SM), CP violation is described by a single complex phase in the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) quark-mixing matrix, \( V \) [1]. Measurements of CP asymmetries by the BABAR [2] and Belle [3] collaborations have firmly established this effect in the \( b \to (c\bar{c})s \) charmonium decays [4] and precisely determined the parameter sin2\( \beta \), where \( \beta \) is \( \arg [ -V_{cd}V_{cb}^* / V_{ub}V_{ub}^* ] \). The amplitude of the decay \( B^0 \to D^{*-}\bar{D}^* \) is dominated by a tree-level, color-allowed \( c \bar{c} \bar{d}d \) transition. Within the framework of the SM, the CP asymmetry of \( B^0 \to D^{*-}\bar{D}^* \) is equal to sin2\( \beta \) when the correction due to penguin diagram contributions is neglected. The penguin-induced correction to the CP asymmetry, estimated in models based on the factorization approximation and heavy quark symmetry, is predicted to be about 2% [5], while contributions from non-SM processes may lead to a large correction [6]. Such a deviation in the sin2\( \beta \) measurement from that of the \( B^0 \to (c\bar{c})K^{(*)0} \) decays would be evidence of physics beyond the SM.

Studies of CP violation in \( B^0 \to D^{(*)-}\bar{D}^{(*)+} \) transitions have been carried out by both the BABAR and Belle collaborations. Most recently, the Belle collaboration reported evidence of large direct CP violation in \( B^0 \to D^+D^- \) where \( C_{D^+D^-} = -0.91 \pm 0.23 \pm 0.06 \) [7], in contradiction to the SM expectation. However, a large direct CP violation has not been observed in this channel by BABAR [8], nor in previous measurements with \( B^0 \to D^{(*)+}\bar{D}^{(*)-} \) decays that involve the same quark-level weak decay [9,10].

The \( B^0 \to D^{(*)+}\bar{D}^{(*)-} \) decay proceeds through the CP-even \( S \) and \( D \) waves and through the CP-odd \( P \) wave. In this paper, we present an improved measurement of the CP-odd fraction \( R_L \) based on a time-integrated one-dimensional angular analysis. We also present an improved measurement of the time-dependent CP asymmetry, obtained from a combined analysis of time-dependent flavor-tagged decays and the one-dimensional angular distribution of the decay products.

The data used in this analysis comprise \( (383 \pm 4) \times 10^6 \) \( Y(4S) \to BB \) decays collected with the BABAR detector [11] at the PEP-II asymmetric-energy \( e^+e^- \) storage rings. We use a Monte Carlo (MC) simulation based on GEANT4 [12] to validate the analysis procedure and to study the relevant backgrounds.

We select \( B^0 \to D^{(*)+}\bar{D}^{(*)-} \) candidates from oppositely charged pairs of \( D^* \) mesons. The \( D^{(*)} \) is reconstructed in its decays to \( D^0 \pi^+ \) and \( D^+\pi^0 \). We reconstruct candidates for \( D^0\) and \( D^+ \) mesons in the modes \( D^0 \to K^-\pi^+ \), \( K^-\pi^0 \), \( K^-\pi^-\pi^+\pi^- \), \( K_{S}^0\pi^+\pi^- \), and \( D^+ \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+ \). We reject the \( B^0 \) candidates for which both \( D^* \) mesons decay to \( D^0\) because of the smaller branching fraction and larger backgrounds. To suppress the \( e^+e^- \to q\bar{q} \) (\( q = u, d, s \), and \( c \)) continuum background, we require the ratio of the second and zeroth order Fox-Wolfram moments [13] to be less than 0.6.

For each \( B^0 \to D^{(*)+}\bar{D}^{(*)-} \) candidate, we construct a likelihood function \( L_{\text{mass}} \) from the masses and mass uncertainties of the \( D \) and \( D^* \) candidates [14]. In this likelihood, the mass resolution is modeled by a Gaussian function whose variance is determined candidate-by-candidate from the number of signal candidates to obtain the highest expected signal significance.

We include candidates with an energy-substituted mass, \( m_{ES} = \sqrt{E_{\text{beam}}^2 - p_B^2} \), greater than 5.23 GeV/c\(^2\), where \( p_B \) is the \( B^0 \) candidate momentum in the \( Y(4S) \) frame. On average, we have 1.8 \( B^0 \) candidates per event in data after all the selection requirements. In cases where more than one candidate is reconstructed in an event, the candidate with the smallest value of \( -\ln L_{\text{mass}} \) is chosen. Studies using MC samples show that this procedure results in the selection of the correct \( B^0 \) candidate more than 95% of the time.

The total probability density function (PDF) of the \( m_{ES} \) distribution is the sum of the signal and background components. The signal PDF is modeled by a Gaussian function and the combinatorial background is described by a threshold function [15]. Studies based on MC simulation show that there is a small peaking background from \( B^+ \to D^{(*)}D^* \) in which a \( D^0 \) originating from a \( D^{(*)0} \) decay is combined with a random soft \( \pi^- \) to form a \( D^{(*)+} \) candidate. This background is described by the same PDF as the signal, and its fraction with respect to the signal yield is fixed to (1.8 \pm 1.8)\%, as determined in MC simulation. An unbinned maximum likelihood (ML) fit to the \( m_{ES} \) distri-
and integrating over the decay time and the angles detector efficiency as a function of the transversity angles approximately 65%.

Within the transversity framework: the angle \( \theta_{tr} \) of the slow pion from the momentum, \( 0 \leq \theta_{tr} \leq \pi \), is measured in a simultaneous unbinned ML fit to the \( \cos \theta_{tr} \) and the \( m_{ES} \) distributions shown in Fig. 2. The background in the \( \cos \theta_{tr} \) distribution is modeled as an even, second-order polynomial, while the signal PDF is given by Eq. (1). The finite detector resolution of the \( \theta_{tr} \) measurement is modeled by the sum of three Gaussian functions plus a small tail component that accounts for misreconstructed events, where all the parameters are fixed to the values determined in the MC simulation. The resolution function is convolved with the signal PDF in the maximum likelihood fit. We categorize events into three types: \( D^+D^+ \to (D^0 \pi^+, \bar{D}^0 \pi^-) \), \( (D^+ \pi^0, \bar{D}^0 \pi^-) \), and \( (D^+ \pi^0, \bar{D}^0 \pi^-) \), each with different

\[
\frac{1}{\Gamma} \frac{d\Gamma}{d \cos \theta_{tr}} = \frac{9}{32\pi} \left[ (1 - R_\perp) \sin^2 \theta_{tr} \right. \\
\times \left[ \frac{1 + \alpha}{2} I_0(\cos \theta_{tr}) + \frac{1 - \alpha}{2} I_2(\cos \theta_{tr}) \right] \\
+ 2 R_\perp \cos^2 \theta_{tr} \times I_0(\cos \theta_{tr}) \right],
\]

where \( R_\perp = |A_\perp|^2/(|A_0|^2 + |A_\parallel|^2 + |A_\perp|^2) \), \( \alpha = (|A_\parallel|^2 - |A_\perp|^2)/(|A_0|^2 + |A_\parallel|^2) \), \( A_0 \) is the amplitude for longitudinally polarized \( D^* \) mesons, \( A_\parallel \) and \( A_\perp \) are the amplitudes for parallel and perpendicular transversely polarized \( D^* \) mesons. The three efficiency moments \( I_k(\cos \theta_{tr}) \), where \( k = 0, \parallel, \perp \), are defined as

\[
I_k(\cos \theta_{tr}) = \int d \cos \theta_{tr} d \phi_{tr} g_k(\theta_1, \phi_\parallel) e(\theta_1, \theta_{tr}, \phi_{tr}).
\]

where \( g_0 = 4 \cos^2 \theta_1 \cos^2 \phi_{tr} \), \( g_\parallel = 2 \sin^2 \theta_1 \sin^2 \phi_{tr} \), \( g_\perp = \sin^2 \theta_1 \), and \( \epsilon \) is the overall detector efficiency. The efficiency moments are parametrized as second-order even polynomials of \( \cos \theta_{tr} \) with parameter values determined from the MC simulation. In fact, the three \( I_k \) functions deviate only slightly from a constant, making the decay distribution [Eq. (1)] nearly independent of the amplitude asymmetry \( \alpha \).

The \( CP \)-odd fraction \( R_\perp \) is measured in a simultaneous unbinned ML fit to the \( \cos \theta_{tr} \) and the \( m_{ES} \) distributions shown in Fig. 2. The background in the \( \cos \theta_{tr} \) distribution is modeled as an even, second-order polynomial, while the signal PDF is given by Eq. (1). The finite detector resolution of the \( \theta_{tr} \) measurement is modeled by the sum of three Gaussian functions plus a small tail component that accounts for misreconstructed events, where all the parameters are fixed to the values determined in the MC simulation. The resolution function is convolved with the signal PDF in the maximum likelihood fit. We categorize events into three types: \( D^+D^+ \to (D^0 \pi^+, \bar{D}^0 \pi^-) \), \( (D^+ \pi^0, \bar{D}^0 \pi^-) \), and \( (D^+ \pi^0, \bar{D}^0 \pi^-) \), each with different

FIG. 2. Measured distribution of \( m_{ES} \) (a) and of \( \cos \theta_{tr} \) in the region \( m_{ES} > 5.27 \text{ GeV}/c^2 \) (b). The solid line is the projection of the fit result. The dotted line represents the background component.
signal-fraction parameters in the likelihood fit. Their efficiency moments and \(\cos \theta_{\ell} \) resolutions are separately determined from the MC simulation. The other parameters, determined in the likelihood fit, are the \(\cos \theta_{\ell} \) background-shape parameter, three \(m_{ES} \) parameters (width and mean of the signal Gaussian, and the threshold function shape parameter), as well as \(R_\perp \).

After fitting to data and taking into account possible systematic uncertainties, we find

\[
R_\perp = 0.143 \pm 0.034 \text{(stat)} \pm 0.008 \text{(syst)}. \tag{3}
\]

Figure 2 shows the projections of the data and the fit result onto \(m_{ES} \) and \(\cos \theta_{\ell} \).

In the fit described above, the value of \(\alpha \), the asymmetry between the two \(CP\)-even amplitudes in the transversity framework, is fixed to zero. We estimate the corresponding systematic uncertainty by varying its value from \(-1\) to \(+1\) and find negligible change (0.003) in the fitted value of \(R_\perp \). Other systematic uncertainties arise from varying fixed parameters within their errors: the parametrization of the angular resolution (0.006), the determination of the efficiency moments (0.004), and the background parametrization (0.004). The total systematic uncertainty on \(R_\perp \) is 0.008.

We perform a combined analysis of the \(\cos \theta_{\ell} \) distribution and its time dependence to extract the time-dependent \(CP\) asymmetry, using the event sample described previously. We use information from the other \(B \) meson (\(B_{\text{tag}} \)) in the event to tag the initial flavor of the fully reconstructed \(B^0 \to D^{*+}D^{-} \) (\(B_{\text{rec}} \)). The multivariate flavor tagging algorithm is described in detail elsewhere [18]. We define six mutually exclusive tagging categories in order of expected tag purity from lepton to hadron, which includes kaon and pion tags. The total effective tagging efficiency of this algorithm is (30.5 ± 0.4)\%.

The decay rate \(f_\pm (f_-) \) for a neutral \(B \) meson accompanied by a \(B^0 (\bar{B}^0) \) tag is given by

\[
f_\pm (\Delta t, \cos \theta_{\ell}) \propto e^{-\Delta t / \tau_{\ell}} \left[ G(1 \mp \Delta \omega) \pm (1 - 2\omega) \right] \times [F \sin(\Delta m_{\ell} \Delta t) - H \cos(\Delta m_{\ell} \Delta t)], \tag{4}
\]

where \(\Delta t = t_{\text{rec}} - t_{\text{tag}} \) is the difference between the proper decay time of the \(B_{\text{rec}} \) and \(B_{\text{tag}} \) mesons, \(\tau_{\ell} = (1.530 \pm 0.009) \text{ ps} \) is the \(B^0 \) lifetime, and \(\Delta m_{\ell} = (0.507 \pm 0.005) \text{ ps}^{-1} \) is the mass difference between the \(B^0 \) and \(\bar{B}^0 \) mass eigenstates [19]. The average mistag probability \(\omega \) describes the effect of incorrect tags, and \(\Delta \omega \) is the difference between the mistag rate for \(B^0 \) and \(\bar{B}^0 \) determined for each tagging category from a large sample of neutral \(B \) decays to flavor eigenstates, \(B_{\text{flav}} \). In the likelihood fit, the expression in Eq. (4) is convolved with an empirical \(\Delta t \) resolution function determined from the \(B_{\text{flav}} \) sample. The \(\theta_{\ell} \) resolution is accounted for in the same way as described previously.

Our increased statistics allows for better treatment of the background in this analysis. The background \(\Delta t \) distributions are parametrized by an empirical description that includes components that have zero lifetime, and that have an effective lifetime similar to the signal. The lifetime of the second component and its relative fraction are allowed to vary in the likelihood fit. We also allow the lifetime component to have free effective \(CP\) asymmetry parameters, \(C_{\text{eff}} \) and \(S_{\text{eff}} \), for each tagging category to take

\[
C_+ = C_{\parallel}[|A_2|^2 + C_0|A_0|^2] \left/ |A_0|^2 \right., \quad S_+ = S_{\parallel}[|A_2|^2 + S_0|A_0|^2] \left/ |A_0|^2 \right.,
\]

where we allow the three transversity amplitudes to have different \(\lambda_k \) due to possibly different penguin-to-tree amplitude ratios, and define the \(CP\) asymmetry parameters \(C_k = (1 - |A_k|^2) / (1 + |A_k|^2), \quad S_k = 2Im(A_k) / (1 + |A_k|^2) \). Here, we also define:
The correlations between $C_S$ as asymmetry are negligible. Figure 3 shows the integrated angular analysis.

In (a), the solid (dashed) curves represent the fit to the data for $B^0(B^0)$ tagged candidates (a) and the raw asymmetry ($N_{\ell^+} - N_{\ell^0}) / (N_{\ell^0} + N_{\ell^0})$, as functions of $\Delta t$ (b). In (a), the solid (dashed) curves represent the fit to the data for $B^0(B^0)$ tags.

To further test the consistency of the fitting procedure, the same analysis is applied to the $B^0 \rightarrow D_s^{*+}D_s^{-}$ control sample. The result is consistent with no $CP$ violation as expected.

The sources of systematic uncertainty on the $CP$ asymmetries and their estimated magnitudes are summarized in Table I. We vary the yield and $CP$ asymmetries of possible backgrounds that peak under the signal. We also vary fixed parameters in the fit for the assumed parameterization of the $\Delta t$ resolution function, the possible differences between the $R_{\text{Raw}}$ and $B_{CP}$ mistag fractions, and knowledge of the event-by-event beam-spot position. We evaluate the uncertainty due to possible interference between the suppressed $b \rightarrow u\bar{c}d$ amplitude and the favored $b \rightarrow c\bar{u}d$ amplitude for some tag side decays [21]. We also include systematic uncertainties incurred from the finite MC sample used to verify the fitting method. All of the systematic uncertainties are much smaller than the statistical uncertainties.

In summary, we have reported measurements of the $CP$-odd fraction, $R_\perp$, and time-dependent $CP$ asymmetries for the decay $B^0 \rightarrow D_s^{*+}D_s^{-}$. The measurement is consistent with and supersedes the previous BABAR result [9]. The time-dependent asymmetries are found to be consistent with the SM predictions. The nonzero value of the measured $S_+$ indicates the evidence of $CP$ violation at the $3.7\sigma$ confidence level.

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 organiza-

![FIG. 3. The distribution in $\Delta t$ of the yield in the region $m_{BS} > 5.27$ GeV/c$^2$ for $B^0(B^0)$ tagged candidates (a) and the raw asymmetry $(N_{\ell^+} - N_{\ell^0}) / (N_{\ell^0} + N_{\ell^0})$, as functions of $\Delta t$ (b). In (a), the solid (dashed) curves represent the fit to the data for $B^0(B^0)$ tags.]

### Table I. Systematic errors on time-dependent $CP$ asymmetry parameters for the decay $B^0 \rightarrow D_s^{*+}D_s^{-}$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>$C_+$</th>
<th>$S_+$</th>
<th>$C_-$</th>
<th>$S_-$</th>
<th>$C$</th>
<th>$S$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peaking backgrounds</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta t$ resolution parametrization</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mistag fraction differences</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beam-spot position</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta m_{d, t_B}$</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angular resolution</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tag-side interference and others</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC statistics</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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[4] We imply charge conjugate modes throughout the paper.