Measurement of the Branching Fraction and Photon Energy Moments of $B \rightarrow X_s \gamma$ and $A_{CP}(B \rightarrow X_{s+d} \gamma)$
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The photon spectrum in $B \to X_s \gamma$ decay, where $X_s$ is any strange hadronic state, is studied using a data sample of $88.5 \times 10^6 e^+ e^- \to Y(4S) \to B \bar{B}$ decays collected by the BABAR experiment at the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center. The partial branching fraction, $\Delta B(B \to X_s \gamma) = (3.67 \pm 0.29 \text{(stat)} \pm 0.34 \text{(sys)}) \times 10^{-4}$, the first moment $\langle E_\gamma \rangle = 2.28 \pm 0.025 \pm 0.017 \pm 0.015 \text{ GeV}$, and the second moment $\langle E_\gamma^2 \rangle = 0.0328 \pm 0.0040 \pm 0.0023 \pm 0.0036 \text{ GeV}^2$ are measured for the photon energy range $1.9 \text{ GeV} < E_\gamma < 2.7 \text{ GeV}$. They are also measured for narrower $E_\gamma$ ranges. The moments are then fit to recent theoretical calculations to extract the heavy quark expansion parameters $m_b$ and $\mu_w^2$ and to extrapolate the partial branching fraction to $E_\gamma > 1.6 \text{ GeV}$. In addition, the direct $CP$ asymmetry $A_{CP}(B \to X_s(4S)\gamma)$ is measured to be $-0.110 \pm 0.115\text{(stat)} \pm 0.017\text{(sys)}$.

The results presented are based on data collected with the BABAR detector [13] at the PEP-II asymmetric-energy $e^+ e^-$ collider located at the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center. The on-resonance integrated luminosity is $81.5 \text{ fb}^{-1}$, corresponding to $88.5 \times 10^6 B \bar{B}$ events. Additionally, $9.6 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ of off-resonance data are used in the continuum background subtraction. The BABAR Monte Carlo simulation program, based on GEANT4 [14], EVTGEN [15], and JETSET [16], is used to generate samples of $B^+ \to B^- \to B^0 \bar{B}^0$ (excluding signal channels), $q\bar{q}$, $\tau^+ \tau^-$, and signal events. The signal models used to calculate efficiencies are based on Refs. [5] (“kinetic scheme”) and [6] (“shape function scheme”) and on an earlier calculation [4] by Kagan and Neubert. These predictions approximate the $X_s$ resonance structure with a smooth distribution in $m_{X_s}$. This is reasonable except at the lowest masses where the $K^*(892)$ dominates the spectrum. Hence, the portion of the $m_{X_s}$ spectrum below 1.1 GeV/c$^2$ is replaced by a Breit-Wigner $K^*(892)$ distribution. The analysis was done “blind” in the range of reconstructed photon energy $E_\gamma$ from 1.9 to 2.9 GeV [the asterisk denotes the $Y(4S)$ rest frame]; that is, the on-resonance data were not looked at until all selection requirements were set and the corrected backgrounds determined. The signal range is limited by high $B \bar{B}$ backgrounds at low $E_\gamma$. The event selection begins by finding at least one photon candidate with $1.6 < E_\gamma < 3.4 \text{ GeV}$ in the event. A photon candidate is a localized electromagnetic calorimeter energy deposit with a lateral profile consistent with that of a single photon. It is required to be isolated by 25 cm from any other energy deposit and to be well contained in the calorimeter ($-0.74 < \cos \theta_\gamma < 0.93$), where $\theta_\gamma$ is the polar angle with respect to the beam axis. Photons that are consistent with originating from an identifiable $\pi^0$ or $\eta \to \gamma \gamma$ decay are vetoed. Hadronic events are selected by requiring at least three reconstructed charged particles and the normalized second Fox-Wolfram moment $R_2$ to be less than 0.55. To reduce radiative Bhabha and two-photon backgrounds, the number of charged particles plus half the number of photons with energy above 0.08 GeV is required to be $\equiv 4.5$.

Event shape variables are used to exploit the difference in topology of isotropic $B \bar{B}$ events and jetlike continuum events. This is accomplished by the $R_2^2$ requirement as well as a single linear discriminant formed from 19 different

In the standard model (SM), the radiative decay of the $b$ quark, $b \to s \gamma$, proceeds via a loop diagram and is sensitive to possible new physics, with new heavy particles participating in the loop [1]. Next-to-leading-order SM calculations for the branching fraction give $\mathcal{B}(B \to X_s \gamma) = (3.61^{+0.37}_{-0.49}) \times 10^{-4}$ ($E_\gamma > 0.6 \text{ GeV}$) [2], and calculations to higher order, which are expected to considerably decrease the uncertainty, are currently underway [3]. The shape of the photon energy spectrum, which is insensitive to non-SM physics [4], can be used to determine the heavy quark expansion parameters $m_b$ and $\mu_w^2$ [5,6], related to the mass and momentum of the $b$ quark within the $B$ meson. These parameters can be used to reduce the error in the extraction of the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa matrix elements $|V_{cb}|$ and $|V_{ub}|$ from semileptonic $B$-meson decays [7]. New physics can also significantly enhance the direct $CP$ asymmetry for $b \to s \gamma$ and $b \to d \gamma$ decay [2]. We define $A_{CP} = \frac{\Gamma(b \to s \gamma + b \to d \gamma)}{\Gamma(b \to s \gamma + b \to d \gamma)}$, which is $\sim 10^{-9}$ in the SM [8]. Measurements of this joint asymmetry complement those of $A_{CP}$ in $b \to s \gamma$ [9] to constrain new physics models.

This Letter reports on a fully inclusive analysis of $B \to X_s \gamma$ decays collected from $e^+ e^- \to Y(4S) \to B \bar{B}$, where the photon from the decay of one $B$ meson is measured, but the $X_s$ is not reconstructed. This avoids incurring large uncertainties from the modeling of the $X_s$ fragmentation but at the cost of high backgrounds which need to be strongly suppressed. The principal backgrounds are from other $B \bar{B}$ decays containing a high-energy photon and from continuum $q\bar{q}(q = u d s c)$ and $\tau^+ \tau^-$ events. The continuum background, including a contribution from initial state radiation (ISR), is suppressed principally by requiring a high-momentum lepton from the nonsignal $B$ decay and also by discriminating against its more jetlike topology. The $B \bar{B}$ background to high-energy photons, dominated by $\pi^0$ and $\eta$ decays, is reduced by vetoing on reconstructed $\pi^0$ or $\eta$. The residual continuum background is subtracted using off-resonance data taken at a center-of-mass energy 40 MeV below that of the $Y(4S)$, while the remaining $B \bar{B}$ background is estimated using a Monte Carlo simulation which has been checked and corrected using data control samples. Previous inclusive measurements of $B \to X_s \gamma$ have been presented by the CLEO [10], BELLE [11], and BABAR [12] Collaborations using alternative techniques which incur different systematic uncertainties.
variables. Eighteen of the quantities are the sum of charged and neutral energy found in 10-degree cones (from 0 to 180 degrees) centered on the photon candidate direction; the photon energy is not included. Additionally, the discriminant includes $R_{ij}/R_{ii}$, where $R_{ij}$ is the normalized second Fox-Wolfram moment calculated in the frame recoiling against the photon, which for ISR events is the $q\bar{q}$ rest frame. The discriminant coefficients were determined by maximizing the separation power between simulated signal and continuum events.

Lepton tagging further reduces the backgrounds from continuum events. About 20% of $B$ mesons decay semileptonically to either $e$ or $\mu$. Leptons from hadron decays in continuum events tend to be at lower momentum. Since the tag lepton comes from the recoiling $B$ meson, it does not compromise the inclusiveness of the $B \to X_{s} \gamma$ selection. The tag lepton is required to have momentum $p_{\gamma}^\ast > 1.25$ GeV/$c$ for electrons and $p_{\mu}^\ast > 1.5$ GeV/$c$ for muons. Additionally, requiring the photon-lepton angle $\cos \phi_{\gamma\ell} > -0.7$ removes more continuum background, in which the lepton and photon candidates tend to be back-to-back. Finally, the presence of a relatively high-energy neutrino in semileptonic $B$ decays is exploited by requiring the missing energy of the event $E_{\text{miss}} > 0.8$ GeV/$c$. Virtually all of the tagging leptons arise from the decay $B \to X_{s} \ell \nu$. The rate of such events in the simulation is corrected as a function of lepton momentum [17].

The event selection is chosen to maximize the statistical significance of the expected signal using simulated signal (Kagan and Neubert with $m_{b} = 4.80$ GeV/$c^{2}$ and $\mu_{z}^2 = 0.30$ GeV$^2$) and background events, allowing for the low statistics of the off-resonance data used for the subtraction of continuum background. After selection, the low-energy range $1.6 < E_{\gamma} < 1.9$ GeV is dominated by the $\bar{B}B$ background, while the high-energy range $2.9 < E_{\gamma} < 3.4$ GeV is dominated by the continuum background; they provide control regions for the $\bar{B}B$ subtraction and continuum subtraction, respectively. The signal region lies between 1.9 and 2.7 GeV. The signal efficiency (=1.6% for this $E_{\gamma}$ range) depends on $E_{\gamma}$ and the signal model but has negligible dependence on the details of the fragmentation of the $X_{s}$.

The $\bar{B}B$ background is estimated with the simulated $B\bar{B}$ data set. It consists predominantly of photons originating from $\pi^{0}$ or $\eta$ decays ($\approx 80\%$). Other significant sources are $\pi^{\pm}$ which fake photons by annihilating in the calorimeter and electrons that are misreconstructed or lost or that undergo hard bremsstrahlung. The $\pi^{0}(\eta)$ background simulation is compared to data by using the same selection criteria as for $B \to X_{s} \gamma$ but removing the $\pi^{0}(\eta)$ vetos. The photon energy and lepton momentum thresholds are relaxed to $E_{\gamma} > 1.0$ GeV, $p_{e}^\ast > 1.0$ GeV/$c$, and $p_{\mu}^\ast > 1.1$ GeV/$c$ to gain statistics. The yields of $\pi^{0}(\eta)$ are measured in bins of $E_{\pi^{0}(\eta)}$ by fitting the $\gamma\gamma$ mass distributions in on-resonance data, off-resonance data, and simulated $B\bar{B}$ background. Correction factors to the $\pi^{0}(\eta)$ components of the $B\bar{B}$ simulation are derived from these yields, including a small adjustment for the different efficiencies of the $\pi^{0}(\eta)$ vetoes between data and simulation. As no $\bar{c}$ control sample could be isolated, this source of $B\bar{B}$ background is corrected by comparing in data and simulation the inclusive $p$ yields in $B$ decay and the calorimeter response to $p$’s, using a $\Lambda \to p\pi^{+}$ sample. The electron component of the $B\bar{B}$ simulation is corrected with electrons from a Bhabha data sample, taking into account the lower track multiplicity of these events compared to the signal events. Finally, the small contributions from $\omega$ and $\eta'$ decays are corrected using inclusive $B$ decay data. After including all corrections and systematic errors, the expected background yield from the simulation in the $B\bar{B}$ control region ($1.6 < E_{\gamma} < 1.9$ GeV) is $1667 \pm 54$ events, compared to $1790 \pm 64$ events observed in data after continuum subtraction. Note that a small contribution in this region from the expected signal ($=20-40$ events) has been neglected in this comparison. In the high-energy control region $2.9 < E_{\gamma} < 3.4$ GeV, the expected background is $390 \pm 20$ events, compared to $393 \pm 58$ events observed in data.

Figure 1 shows the measured spectrum for signal and control regions after the $B\bar{B}$ and continuum backgrounds have been subtracted. To extract partial branching fractions (PBFs) and first and second moments from this spectrum, it is necessary to first correct for efficiency. Theoretical predictions are made for the true $E_{\gamma}$ in the $B$ meson rest frame, whereas the experimental measurements are made with reconstructed $E_{\gamma}$ in the $Y(4S)$ frame. Hence, it is also necessary to correct for smearing due to the asymmetric calorimeter resolution and the Doppler shift between the
contribution from measurement of the spectrum is from the uncertainty in the $0.0025$ determined from a efficiency of the event shape variable selection (3%), de-

The parameters $m_{1}$ and $\mu^{\pi}_{2}$, which are defined differently in the kinetic ($K$) and shape function (SF) schemes, can be extracted by fitting theoretical predictions to the measured moments. The first moments for $E_{y} > 1.9$ and $2.0 \text{ GeV}$ and the second moment for $E_{y} > 2.0 \text{ GeV}$ are fitted, taking into account the correlations between the measured moments. As the moments are dependent on the assumed signal model due to the efficiency and resolution smearing corrections, the signal model and the model-dependence errors are adjusted based on the results of the fit, and the moments are recomputed and refit. Only a few iterations are required until the result is stable. In the kinetic scheme, $m_{1}{(K)} = 4.44^{+0.08}_{-0.12} \text{ GeV}/c^{2}$ and $\mu^{\pi}_{2}{(K)} = 0.64^{+0.13}_{-0.12} \text{ GeV}^{2}$, with a correlation of $-0.93$.

The first error is due to the uncertainty in the measured moments, and the second error is due to uncertainty in the theoretical calculations [5]. In the shape function scheme, using the exponential shape function form [6], $m_{1}{(SF)} = 4.43^{+0.07}_{-0.08} \text{ GeV}/c^{2}$ and $\mu^{\pi}_{2}{(SF)} = 0.44^{+0.06}_{-0.07} \text{ GeV}^{2}$, with a correlation of $-0.63$. If the Gaussian shape function form were used, $m_{1}{(SF)}$ and $\mu^{\pi}_{2}{(SF)}$ would increase by $0.13 \text{ GeV}/c^{2}$ and $0.01 \text{ GeV}^{2}$, respectively. The spectra with the fitted parameters are compared to data in Fig. 1.

These results (without theory error) are then used to extrapolate the measured partial branching fraction from $E_{y} > 1.9$ to $1.6 \text{ GeV}$ to allow comparisons to theoretical predictions. In the kinetic scheme $B(B \to X_{y} \gamma, E_{y} > 1.6 \text{ GeV}) = (3.94 \pm 0.31 \pm 0.36 \pm 0.21) \times 10^{-4}$, and in the shape function scheme $B(B \to X_{y} \gamma, E_{y} > 1.6 \text{ GeV}) = (4.79 \pm 0.38 \pm 0.44^{+0.73}_{-0.73}) \times 10^{-4}$, where the errors are statistical, systematic, and model dependence. The model dependence is derived from the 1$\sigma$ error ellipse for the $m_{1} - \mu^{\pi}_{2}$ fit. The central value in the shape function scheme is reduced to $4.55 \times 10^{-4}$ if the Gaussian form is used.

Finally, the sample is divided into $b$ and $\bar{b}$ decays using the charge of the lepton tag to measure $A_{C|}(B \to X_{y} \gamma) = N^{+} - N^{-} / N^{+} + N^{-}$, where $N^{+(-)}$ are the positively (negatively) tagged signal yields and $1/(1 - 2\omega)$ is the dilution factor due to the mistag fraction $\omega$. A requirement $2.2 < E_{y} < 2.7 \text{ GeV}$ maximizes the statistical precision of

TABLE I. The measured partial branching fraction and first and second moments ($\pm$ stat $\pm$ syst $\pm$ model) for different ranges of $E_{y}$ in the $B$ rest frame.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$E_{y}$ (GeV)</th>
<th>$\Delta B(B \to X_{y} \gamma)$ (10$^{-4}$)</th>
<th>$\langle E_{y} \rangle$ (GeV)</th>
<th>$\langle E_{y}^{2} \rangle - \langle E_{y} \rangle^{2}$ (GeV$^{2}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.9 to 2.7</td>
<td>3.67 $\pm$ 0.29 $\pm$ 0.34 $\pm$ 0.29</td>
<td>2.288 $\pm$ 0.025 $\pm$ 0.017 $\pm$ 0.015</td>
<td>0.0328 $\pm$ 0.0040 $\pm$ 0.0023 $\pm$ 0.0036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 to 2.7</td>
<td>3.41 $\pm$ 0.27 $\pm$ 0.29 $\pm$ 0.23</td>
<td>2.316 $\pm$ 0.016 $\pm$ 0.010 $\pm$ 0.013</td>
<td>0.0266 $\pm$ 0.0026 $\pm$ 0.0010 $\pm$ 0.0020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 to 2.7</td>
<td>2.97 $\pm$ 0.24 $\pm$ 0.25 $\pm$ 0.17</td>
<td>2.355 $\pm$ 0.014 $\pm$ 0.007 $\pm$ 0.011</td>
<td>0.0191 $\pm$ 0.0019 $\pm$ 0.0006 $\pm$ 0.0015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 to 2.7</td>
<td>2.42 $\pm$ 0.21 $\pm$ 0.20 $\pm$ 0.13</td>
<td>2.407 $\pm$ 0.012 $\pm$ 0.005 $\pm$ 0.008</td>
<td>0.0116 $\pm$ 0.0014 $\pm$ 0.0004 $\pm$ 0.0005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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the measurement as determined from simulated data. The yields are \( N^+ = 349 \pm 48 \) and \( N^- = 409 \pm 45 \). The bias on \( A_{CP} \) due to any charge asymmetry in the detector or \( B\bar{B} \) background is measured to be \(-0.005 \pm 0.013 \) using control samples of \( e^+ e^- \rightarrow X\gamma \) and \( B \rightarrow X\pi^0, \eta \). The mistag fraction due to mixing is 9.3 \( \pm 0.2\% \) [20]. An additional 2.6 \( \pm 0.3\% \) mistag fraction arises from leptons from \( D \) decay, \( \pi^\pm \) faking \( \mu^\pm \), \( \gamma \) conversions, \( \pi^0 \) Dalitz decay, and charmonium decay. After correcting for charge bias and dilution, \( A_{CP} = -0.110 \pm 0.115(\text{stat}) \pm 0.017(\text{syst}) \), including multiplicative systematic uncertainties from the \( B\bar{B} \) background subtraction (5.4\%) and the dilution factor (1.0\%). The model-dependence uncertainty due to differences in the \( B \rightarrow X_s \gamma \) and \( B \rightarrow X_d \gamma \) spectra is estimated to be negligible.

In conclusion, the branching fraction and the energy moments of the photon spectrum in \( B \rightarrow X_s \gamma \) are measured for \( E_\gamma > 1.9 \) GeV. The moments are consistent with previous measurements [10–12] and are used to extract values of \( m_s \) and \( \mu^\pm \) which are consistent with those extracted from semileptonic \( B \) decays [21]. These measurements have been used to reduce the systematic error in the estimation of \( |V_{ts}| \) and \( |V_{ub}| \) [7]. The measured branching fractions are in agreement with the SM expectation and previous measurements. The measured \( A_{CP} \) is also consistent with the SM expectation.
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