

## PDF hosted at the Radboud Repository of the Radboud University Nijmegen

The following full text is a publisher's version.

For additional information about this publication click this link.

<http://hdl.handle.net/2066/128771>

Please be advised that this information was generated on 2021-09-22 and may be subject to change.

**Time-integrated and time-dependent angular analyses of  $B \rightarrow J/\psi K\pi$ : A measurement of  $\cos 2\beta$  with no sign ambiguity from strong phases**

(The *BABAR* Collaboration)

B. Aubert, R. Barate, D. Boutigny, F. Couderc, J.-M. Gaillard, Y. Karyotakis, J. P. Lees, V. Poireau, V. Tisserand, and A. Zghiche  
*Laboratoire de Physique des Particules, F-74941 Annecy-le-Vieux, France*

A. Palano and A. Pompili  
*Università di Bari, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-70126 Bari, Italy*

J. C. Chen, N. D. Qi, G. Rong, P. Wang, and Y. S. Zhu  
*Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing 100039, China*

G. Eigen, I. Ofte, and B. Stugu  
*University of Bergen, Inst. of Physics, N-5007 Bergen, Norway*

G. S. Abrams, A. W. Borgland, A. B. Breon, D. N. Brown, J. Button-Shafer, R. N. Cahn, E. Charles, C. T. Day, M. S. Gill, A. V. Gritsan, Y. Groysman, R. G. Jacobsen, R. W. Kadel, J. Kadyk, L. T. Kerth, Yu. G. Kolomensky, G. Kukartsev, G. Lynch, L. M. Mir, P. J. Oddone, T. J. Orimoto, M. Pripstein, N. A. Roe, M. T. Ronan, V. G. Shelkov, and W. A. Wenzel  
*Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory and University of California, Berkeley, California 94720, USA*

M. Barrett, K. E. Ford, T. J. Harrison, A. J. Hart, C. M. Hawkes, S. E. Morgan, and A. T. Watson  
*University of Birmingham, Birmingham, B15 2TT, United Kingdom*

M. Fritsch, K. Goetzen, T. Held, H. Koch, B. Lewandowski, M. Pelizaeus, and M. Steinke  
*Ruhr Universität Bochum, Institut für Experimentalphysik I, D-44780 Bochum, Germany*

J. T. Boyd, N. Chevalier, W. N. Cottingham, M. P. Kelly, T. E. Latham, and F. F. Wilson  
*University of Bristol, Bristol BS8 1TL, United Kingdom*

T. Cuhadar-Donszelmann, C. Hearty, N. S. Knecht, T. S. Mattison, J. A. McKenna, and D. Thiessen  
*University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada V6T 1Z1*

A. Khan, P. Kyberd, and L. Teodorescu  
*Brunel University, Uxbridge, Middlesex UB8 3PH, United Kingdom*

A. E. Blinov, V. E. Blinov, V. P. Druzhinin, V. B. Golubev, V. N. Ivanchenko, E. A. Kravchenko, A. P. Onuchin, S. I. Serednyakov, Yu. I. Skovpen, E. P. Solodov, and A. N. Yushkov  
*Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics, Novosibirsk 630090, Russia*

D. Best, M. Bruinsma, M. Chao, I. Eschrich, D. Kirkby, A. J. Lankford, M. Mandelkern, R. K. Mommsen, W. Roethel, and D. P. Stoker  
*University of California at Irvine, Irvine, California 92697, USA*

C. Buchanan and B. L. Hartfiel  
*University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California 90024, USA*

S. D. Foulkes, J. W. Gary, B. C. Shen, and K. Wang  
*University of California at Riverside, Riverside, California 92521, USA*

D. del Re, H. K. Hadavand, E. J. Hill, D. B. MacFarlane, H. P. Paar, Sh. Rahatlou, and V. Sharma  
*University of California at San Diego, La Jolla, California 92093, USA*

J. Adam Cunha, J. W. Berryhill, C. Campagnari, B. Dahmes, T. M. Hong, O. Long, A. Lu, M. A. Mazur,  
J. D. Richman, and W. Verkerke

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

T. W. Beck, A. M. Eisner, C. A. Heusch, J. Kroseberg, W. S. Lockman, G. Nesom, T. Schalk, B. A. Schumm, A. Seiden,  
P. Spradlin, D. C. Williams, and M. G. Wilson

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

J. Albert, E. Chen, G. P. Dubois-Felsmann, A. Dvoretzkii, D. G. Hitlin, I. Narsky, T. Piatenko, F. C. Porter, A. Ryd,  
A. Samuel, and S. Yang

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

S. Jayatilke, G. Mancinelli, B. T. Meadows, and M. D. Sokoloff

*University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio 45221, USA*

F. Blanc, P. Bloom, S. Chen, W. T. Ford, U. Nauenberg, A. Olivas, P. Rankin, J. G. Smith, J. Zhang, and L. Zhang

*University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80309, USA*

A. Chen, J. L. Harton, A. Soffer, W. H. Toki, R. J. Wilson, and Q. Zeng

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

D. Altenburg, T. Brandt, J. Brose, M. Dickopp, E. Feltresi, A. Hauke, H. M. Lacker, R. Müller-Pfefferkorn, R. Nogowski,  
S. Otto, A. Petzold, J. Schubert, K. R. Schubert, R. Schwierz, B. Spaan, and J. E. Sundermann

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

D. Bernard, G. R. Bonneaud, F. Brochard, P. Grenier, S. Schrenk, Ch. Thiebaux, G. Vasileiadis, and M. Verderi

*Ecole Polytechnique, LLR, F-91128 Palaiseau, France*

D. J. Bard, P. J. Clark, D. Lavin, F. Muheim, S. Playfer, and Y. Xie

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

M. Andreotti, V. Azzolini, D. Bettoni, C. Bozzi, R. Calabrese, G. Cibinetto, E. Luppi, M. Negrini,  
L. Piemontese, and A. Sarti

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

E. Treadwell

*Florida A&M University, Tallahassee, Florida 32307, USA*

F. Anulli, R. Baldini-Ferroli, A. Calcaterra, R. de Sangro, G. Finocchiaro, P. Patteri, I. M. Peruzzi, M. Piccolo, and A. Zallo

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

A. Buzzo, R. Capra, R. Contri, G. Crosetti, M. Lo Vetere, M. Macri, M. R. Monge, S. Passaggio, C. Patrignani, E. Robutti,  
A. Santroni, and S. Tosi

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

S. Bailey, G. Brandenburg, K. S. Chaisanguanthum, M. Morii, and E. Won

*Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, USA*

R. S. Dubitzky, U. Langenegger, J. Marks, and U. Uwer

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

W. Bhimji, D. A. Bowerman, P. D. Dauncey, U. Egede, J. R. Gaillard, G. W. Morton, J. A. Nash,  
M. B. Nikolich, and G. P. Taylor

*Imperial College London, London, SW7 2AZ, United Kingdom*

M. J. Charles, G. J. Grenier, and U. Mallik

*University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa 52242, USA*

J. Cochran, H. B. Crawley, J. Lamsa, W. T. Meyer, S. Prell, E. I. Rosenberg, A. E. Rubin, and J. Yi  
*Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011-3160, USA*

M. Biasini, R. Covarelli, and M. Pioppi  
*Università di Perugia, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-06100 Perugia, Italy*

M. Davier, X. Giroux, G. Grosdidier, A. Höcker, S. Laplace, F. Le Diberder, V. Lepeltier, A. M. Lutz, T. C. Petersen,  
S. Plaszczynski, M. H. Schune, L. Tantot, and G. Wormser  
*Laboratoire de l'Accélérateur Linéaire, F-91898 Orsay, France*

C. H. Cheng, D. J. Lange, M. C. Simani, and D. M. Wright  
*Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California 94550, USA*

A. J. Bevan, C. A. Chavez, J. P. Coleman, I. J. Forster, J. R. Fry, E. Gabathuler, R. Gamet, D. E. Hutchcroft, R. J. Parry,  
D. J. Payne, R. J. Sloane, and C. Touramanis  
*University of Liverpool, Liverpool L69 7ZE, United Kingdom*

C. M. Cormack and F. Di Lodovico  
*Queen Mary, University of London, E1 4NS, United Kingdom*

C. L. Brown, G. Cowan, R. L. Flack, H. U. Flaecher, M. G. Green, P. S. Jackson, T. R. McMahon, S. Ricciardi,  
F. Salvatore, and M. A. Winter  
*University of London, Royal Holloway and Bedford New College, Egham, Surrey TW20 0EX, United Kingdom*

D. Brown and C. L. Davis  
*University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky 40292, USA*

J. Allison, N. R. Barlow, R. J. Barlow, M. C. Hodgkinson, G. D. Lafferty, A. J. Lyon, and J. C. Williams  
*University of Manchester, Manchester M13 9PL, United Kingdom*

A. Farbin, W. D. Hulsbergen, A. Jawahery, D. Kovalskyi, C. K. Lae, V. Lillard, and D. A. Roberts  
*University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742, USA*

G. Blaylock, C. Dallapiccola, S. S. Hertzbach, R. Kofler, V. B. Koptchev, T. B. Moore, S. Saremi,  
H. Staengle, and S. Willocq  
*University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts 01003, USA*

R. Cowan, G. Sciolla, S. J. Sekula, F. Taylor, and R. K. Yamamoto  
*Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Laboratory for Nuclear Science, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, USA*

D. J. J. Mangeol, P. M. Patel, and S. H. Robertson  
*McGill University, Montréal, QC, Canada H3A 2T8*

A. Lazzaro, V. Lombardo, and F. Palombo  
*Università di Milano, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-20133 Milano, Italy*

J. M. Bauer, L. Cremaldi, V. Eschenburg, R. Godang, R. Kroeger, J. Reidy, D. A. Sanders, D. J. Summers, and H. W. Zhao  
*University of Mississippi, University, Mississippi 38677, USA*

S. Brunet, D. Côté, and P. Taras  
*Université de Montréal, Laboratoire René J. A. Lévesque, Montréal, QC, Canada H3C 3J7*

H. Nicholson  
*Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Massachusetts 01075, USA*

N. Cavallo,\* F. Fabozzi,\* C. Gatto, L. Lista, D. Monorchio, P. Paolucci, D. Piccolo, and C. Sciacca  
*Università di Napoli Federico II, Dipartimento di Scienze Fisiche and INFN, I-80126, Napoli, Italy*

M. Baak, H. Bulten, G. Raven, H. L. Snoek, and L. Wilden

*NIKHEF, National Institute for Nuclear Physics and High Energy Physics, NL-1009 DB Amsterdam, The Netherlands*

C. P. Jessop and J. M. LoSecco

*University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana 46556, USA*

T. Allmendinger, K. K. Gan, K. Honscheid, D. Hufnagel, H. Kagan, R. Kass, T. Pulliam, A. M. Rahimi,  
R. Ter-Antonyan, and Q. K. Wong

*Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210, USA*

J. Brau, R. Frey, O. Igonkina, C. T. Potter, N. B. Sinev, D. Strom, and E. Torrence

*University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403, USA*

F. Colecchia, A. Dorigo, F. Galeazzi, M. Margoni, M. Morandin, M. Posocco, M. Rotondo, F. Simonetto, R. Stroili,  
G. Tiozzo, and C. Voci

*Università di Padova, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-35131 Padova, Italy*

M. Benayoun, H. Briand, J. Chauveau, P. David, Ch. de la Vaissière, L. Del Buono, O. Hamon, M. J. J. John, Ph. Leruste,  
J. Malcles, J. Ocariz, M. Pivk, L. Roos, S. T'Jampens, and G. Therin

*Universités Paris VI et VII, Laboratoire de Physique Nucléaire et de Hautes Energies, F-75252 Paris, France*

P. F. Manfredi and V. Re

*Università di Pavia, Dipartimento di Elettronica and INFN, I-27100 Pavia, Italy*

P. K. Behera, L. Gladney, Q. H. Guo, and J. Panetta

*University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104, USA*

C. Angelini, G. Batignani, S. Bettarini, M. Bondioli, F. Bucci, G. Calderini, M. Carpinelli, F. Forti,  
M. A. Giorgi, A. Lusiani, G. Marchiori, F. Martinez-Vidal,<sup>†</sup> M. Morganti, N. Neri, E. Paoloni, M. Rama, G. Rizzo,  
F. Sandrelli, and J. Walsh

*Università di Pisa, Dipartimento di Fisica, Scuola Normale Superiore and INFN, I-56127 Pisa, Italy*

M. Haire, D. Judd, K. Paick, and D. E. Wagoner

*Prairie View A&M University, Prairie View, Texas 77446, USA*

N. Danielson, P. Elmer, Y. P. Lau, C. Lu, V. Miftakov, J. Olsen, A. J. S. Smith, and A. V. Telnov

*Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey 08544, USA*

F. Bellini, R. Faccini, F. Ferrarotto, F. Ferroni, M. Gaspero, L. Li Gioi, M. A. Mazzone, S. Morganti, M. Pierini, G. Piredda,  
F. Safai Tehrani, and C. Voena

*Università di Roma La Sapienza, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-00185 Roma, Italy*

G. Cavoto

*Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey 08544, USA*

*and Università di Roma La Sapienza, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-00185 Roma, Italy*

S. Christ, G. Wagner, and R. Waldi

*Universität Rostock, D-18051 Rostock, Germany*

T. Adye, N. De Groot, B. Franek, N. I. Geddes, G. P. Gopal, and E. O. Olaiya

*Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Chilton, Didcot, Oxon, OX11 0QX, United Kingdom*

R. Aleksan, S. Emery, A. Gaidot, S. F. Ganzhur, P.-F. Giraud, G. Hamel de Monchenault, W. Kozanecki, M. Legendre,  
G. W. London, B. Mayer, G. Schott, G. Vasseur, Ch. Yèche, and M. Zito

*DSM/Dapnia, CEA/Saclay, F-91191 Gif-sur-Yvette, France*

M. V. Purohit, A. W. Weidemann, J. R. Wilson, and F. X. Yumiceva

*University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina 29208, USA*

T. Abe, D. Aston, R. Bartoldus, N. Berger, A. M. Boyarski, O. L. Buchmueller, R. Claus, M. R. Convery, M. Cristinziani, G. De Nardo, D. Dong, J. Dorfan, D. Dujmic, W. Dunwoodie, E. E. Elsen, S. Fan, R. C. Field, T. Glanzman, S. J. Gowdy, T. Hadig, V. Halyo, C. Hast, T. Hryn'ova, W. R. Innes, M. H. Kelsey, P. Kim, M. L. Kocian, D. W. G. S. Leith, J. Libby, S. Luitz, V. Luth, H. L. Lynch, H. Marsiske, R. Messner, D. R. Muller, C. P. O'Grady, V. E. Ozcan, A. Perazzo, M. Perl, S. Petrak, B. N. Ratcliff, A. Roodman, A. A. Salnikov, R. H. Schindler, J. Schwiening, G. Simi, A. Snyder, A. Soha, J. Stelzer, D. Su, M. K. Sullivan, J. Va'vra, S. R. Wagner, M. Weaver, A. J. R. Weinstein, W. J. Wisniewski, M. Wittgen, D. H. Wright, A. K. Yarritu, and C. C. Young

*Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, Stanford, California 94309, USA*

P. R. Burchat, A. J. Edwards, T. I. Meyer, B. A. Petersen, and C. Roat

*Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305-4060, USA*

M. Ahmed, S. Ahmed, M. S. Alam, J. A. Ernst, M. A. Saeed, M. Saleem, and F. R. Wappler

*State University of New York, Albany, New York 12222, USA*

W. Bugg, M. Krishnamurthy, and S. M. Spanier

*University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee 37996, USA*

R. Eckmann, H. Kim, J. L. Ritchie, A. Satpathy, and R. F. Schwitters

*University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712, USA*

J. M. Izen, I. Kitayama, X. C. Lou, and S. Ye

*University of Texas at Dallas, USA, Richardson, Texas 75083, USA*

F. Bianchi, M. Bona, F. Gallo, and D. Gamba

*Università di Torino, Dipartimento di Fisica Sperimentale and INFN, I-10125 Torino, Italy*

L. Bosisio, C. Cartaro, F. Cossutti, G. Della Ricca, S. Dittongo, S. Grancagnolo, L. Lanceri, P. Poropat,<sup>‡</sup>

L. Vitale, and G. Vuagnin

*Università di Trieste, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-34127 Trieste, Italy*

R. S. Panvini

*Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee 37235, USA*

Sw. Banerjee, C. M. Brown, D. Fortin, P. D. Jackson, R. Kowalewski, J. M. Roney, and R. J. Sobie

*University of Victoria, Victoria, BC, Canada V8W 3P6*

J. J. Back, P. F. Harrison, and G. B. Mohanty

*Department of Physics, University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL, United Kingdom*

H. R. Band, X. Chen, B. Cheng, S. Dasu, M. Datta, A. M. Eichenbaum, K. T. Flood, M. Graham, J. J. Hollar, J. R. Johnson, P. E. Kutter, H. Li, R. Liu, A. Mihalyi, Y. Pan, R. Prepost, P. Tan, J. H. von Wimmersperg-Toeller, J. Wu, S. L. Wu, and Z. Yu

*University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706, USA*

M. G. Greene and H. Neal

*Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut 06511, USA*

(Received 2 November 2004; published 22 February 2005)

We present results on  $B \rightarrow J/\psi K\pi$  decays using  $e^+e^-$  annihilation data collected with the *BABAR* detector at the  $\Upsilon(4S)$  resonance. The detector is located at the PEP-II asymmetric-energy storage ring facility at the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center. Using approximately  $88 \times 10^6$   $B\bar{B}$  pairs, we measure the decay amplitudes for the flavor eigenmodes and observe strong-phase differences indicative of final-

\*Also with Università della Basilicata, Potenza, Italy

†Also with IFIC, Instituto de Física Corpuscular, CSIC-Universidad de Valencia, Valencia, Spain

‡Deceased

state interactions with a significance of 7.6 standard deviations. We use the interference between the  $K\pi$   $S$ -wave and  $P$ -wave amplitudes in the region of the  $K^*(892)$  to resolve the ambiguity in the determination of these strong phases. We then perform an ambiguity-free measurement of  $\cos 2\beta$  using the angular and time-dependent asymmetry in  $B \rightarrow J/\psi K^{*0}(K_S^0 \pi^0)$  decays. With  $\sin 2\beta$  fixed at its measured value and  $\cos 2\beta$  treated as an independent parameter, we find  $\cos 2\beta = 2.72_{-0.79}^{+0.50}(\text{stat}) \pm 0.27(\text{sys})$ , determining the sign of  $\cos 2\beta$  to be positive at 86% C.L.

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevD.71.032005

PACS numbers: 13.25.Hw, 12.15.Hh, 14.40.Nd, 11.30.Er

The Standard Model of electroweak interactions describes  $CP$  violation in weak interactions of quarks by the presence of a nonzero phase in the three-generation Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) quark-mixing matrix [1]. In this framework, the  $CP$ -violation parameter  $\sin 2\beta$  can be measured by examining the proper-time distributions of neutral  $B$ -meson decays to final states containing a charmonium meson and a neutral kaon. The Belle [2] and BABAR [3] experiments have recently performed precise measurements of  $\sin 2\beta$ , leading to a world average of  $0.731 \pm 0.056$  [4]. These measurements determine  $\beta$  up to a four-fold ambiguity, corresponding to the two different signs of  $\cos 2\beta$  and the transformation  $\beta \rightarrow \pi + \beta$ .

One of the possible values of  $\beta$  is compatible with measurements of other quantities that constrain the Unitarity Triangle [4]. However, it is still possible that, because of contributions from new physics, the actual value of  $\beta$  is one of the three other values consistent with the measurement of  $\sin 2\beta$  [5–7]. A measurement of the sign of  $\cos 2\beta$  would either agree with the standard interpretation  $\beta \approx 0.41$  and with its indistinguishable non-standard alternative  $\beta \approx 0.41 + \pi$ , or would exclude these and instead imply the nonstandard solutions  $\beta \approx 1.16$  and  $\beta \approx 1.16 + \pi$ .

Several strategies to determine  $\cos 2\beta$  have been proposed [6,8–13]. In particular,  $\cos 2\beta$  appears as a factor in the interference between the  $CP$ -odd and the two  $CP$ -even amplitudes in the time- and angle-dependent distribution describing the decay  $B \rightarrow J/\psi K^{*0}(K^{*0} \rightarrow K_S^0 \pi^0, J/\psi \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^-)$  [14–17]. However, neither this distribution nor the time-integrated angular distributions of the companion channels  $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^{*0}(K^{*0} \rightarrow K^+ \pi^-)$  and  $B^+ \rightarrow J/\psi K^{*+}$  (and related charge-conjugate decays) can resolve a two-fold ambiguity in the relative strong phases among the three  $B \rightarrow J/\psi K^*$  decay amplitudes. This leaves an overall sign ambiguity in  $\cos 2\beta$  [18,19]. Resolving the ambiguity from these partial waves alone would require the measurement of the polarization of the leptons from the  $J/\psi$  decay [20]. This could be done in principle using  $J/\psi \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$  decays or with  $\psi(2S) \rightarrow \tau^+ \tau^-$  decays by measuring the lepton polarizations. Such measurements are not feasible today. Theoretical arguments, based on the analysis of  $s$ -quark helicity conservation, suggest a “preferred” set of strong phases [21], but cannot guarantee the validity of this set.

In this analysis, we use the known dependence on  $K\pi$  invariant mass of the relative phase between the  $S$ -wave

and  $P$ -wave  $K\pi$   $I = 1/2$  scattering amplitudes in the vicinity of the  $K^*(892)$  to resolve the two-fold ambiguity in the relative strong phases among the three amplitudes for  $B \rightarrow J/\psi K^*$ . The dominant  $P$ -wave has the canonical Breit-Wigner form with a phase  $\delta_P$  that increases rapidly with  $K\pi$  invariant mass  $m_{K\pi}$ , while the  $S$ -wave phase  $\delta_S$  increases slowly with  $m_{K\pi}$  [22]. Accordingly,  $\delta_S - \delta_P$ , where  $\delta_P$  is assumed to be common to the three  $B \rightarrow J/\psi K\pi$   $P$ -wave amplitudes, is expected to decrease rapidly as  $m_{K\pi}$  increases from below to above the  $K^*$  resonance. We find that one solution for  $\delta_S - \delta_P$  yields this expected behavior while the other has precisely the opposite behavior. In this way, the ambiguity is resolved, so that the subsequent time-dependent analysis yields a value of  $\cos 2\beta$  that is free of the associated sign ambiguity.

We perform an angular analysis of the  $B \rightarrow J/\psi K^*$  decay mode and measure  $\cos 2\beta$  on a sample of  $(88 \pm 1) \times 10^6$   $B\bar{B}$  pairs collected with the BABAR detector at the PEP-II asymmetric-energy  $B$  Factory. These data correspond to an integrated luminosity of  $81.9 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  recorded at the  $\Upsilon(4S)$  resonance. The analysis is performed in three distinct stages.

In the first stage the time-integrated angular distributions describing the decay channels  $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^{*0}, K^{*0} \rightarrow K^+ \pi^-$  and  $B^+ \rightarrow J/\psi K^{*+}, K^{*+} \rightarrow K_S^0 \pi^+$  and  $K^{*+} \rightarrow K^+ \pi^0$ , together with those of the related charge-conjugate modes, are analyzed assuming that the  $K\pi$  system may be described entirely in terms of  $P$ -wave amplitudes. The weak process  $b \rightarrow c\bar{c}s$  is a  $\Delta I = 0$  interaction, so the amplitudes for  $B^0$  and  $B^+$  decay should be equal, as should be those for  $\bar{B}^0$  and  $B^-$ . A convenient description of the decays is provided in the transversity basis [14] since the related amplitudes have well-defined  $CP$  parities, which is of particular relevance for the  $\cos 2\beta$  measurement. The formalism is described in Sec. IA and the results of its application to the data are presented in Sec. IV in the form of transversity-amplitude magnitudes and relative phases. There is an intrinsic mathematical ambiguity associated with the phases; the relevant transformation expressed in Eq. (3) below leaves the angular distribution unchanged.

This ambiguity can be resolved by extending the formalism to include a  $K\pi$   $S$ -wave amplitude and then measuring the  $K\pi$  mass-dependence of its phase difference with respect to the  $P$ -waves. We will show that including a  $K\pi$   $S$ -wave with a significant  $S$ - $P$  interference is required to describe the data (see Sec. VA). The extended angular distribution is presented in Sec. IB, and its use in resolving

the phase ambiguity is described in Sec. V. This is the second stage in the analysis procedure.

The  $P$ -wave parameters extracted in Sec. IV are only slightly affected by the presence of an  $S$ -wave amplitude since in performing the analysis the data are integrated over a broad ( $\pm 100$  MeV/ $c^2$ )  $K\pi$  mass interval centered on the  $K^*(892)$ . The  $S$ - $P$  interference contributions essentially average out over this region, and since the  $S$ -wave intensity proves to be only a few percent of that of the  $P$ -wave, the presence of the  $S$ -wave can be accounted for by a small additional source of systematic uncertainty (Table V, line 7).

The third stage of the analysis is the application of the time-dependent formalism to the  $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^{*0}(K_S^0 \pi^0)$  decay channel, as described in Sec. IC. There, the  $K\pi$   $S$ -wave is omitted and the  $P$ -wave parameters are fixed to those obtained during the first stage of the analysis. The phase ambiguity discussed in Sec. IA translates into a sign ambiguity for  $\cos 2\beta$ . The  $K\pi$   $S$ - $P$  interference analysis of Sec. IV resolves the ambiguity and results in the assignment of a unique sign to the term in the time-dependent angular distribution that is proportional to  $\cos 2\beta$ . The time-dependent analysis of the  $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^{*0}(K_S^0 \pi^0)$  data sample, which is statistically independent of that used for the measurement of the amplitudes, is presented in Sec. VI. We summarize the results of the paper in Sec. VII.

Several experiments have determined the decay amplitudes in  $B \rightarrow J/\psi K^*$  decay. These results are summarized in Table I. The measurements presented here supersede previous *BABAR* results [19], which are based on subsets of the data used for this analysis. The data reconstruction and Monte Carlo simulation procedures have undergone significant improvement since our previous analysis; the reconstruction of  $J/\psi K^*$  channels involving a  $\pi^0$  has been improved (Sec. III) leading to a better purity; a dedicated background subtraction method has been developed (Sec. IV B and Appendix A).

## I. ANGULAR- AND TIME-DEPENDENT DIFFERENTIAL DECAY RATES

The  $B$  decay amplitudes are measured from the time-integrated differential decay distribution, expressed in the transversity basis. The definitions of the transversity frame and the related transversity angles ( $\theta_{K^*}$ ,  $\theta_{lr}$ ,  $\phi_{lr}$ ) are shown in Fig. 1.




FIG. 1. Definition of the transversity angles ( $\theta_{K^*}$ ,  $\theta_{lr}$ ,  $\phi_{lr}$ ) and coordinate system ( $\hat{x}_{lr}$ ,  $\hat{y}_{lr}$ ,  $\hat{z}_{lr}$ ). The direction opposite to the  $B$  meson momentum in the  $J/\psi$  rest frame is  $\hat{x}_{lr}$ ;  $\hat{y}_{lr}$  is perpendicular to  $\hat{x}_{lr}$  in the plane that contains  $\hat{x}_{lr}$  and  $\vec{p}_K$ , chosen so  $\vec{p}_K \cdot \hat{y}_{lr} > 0$ ;  $\hat{z}_{lr} = \hat{x}_{lr} \times \hat{y}_{lr}$ . The helicity angle  $\theta_{K^*}$  of the  $K^*$  decay is the angle between the direction opposite to the  $B$  meson flight direction and the kaon momentum, in the  $K^*$  rest frame. Finally,  $\theta_{lr}$  and  $\phi_{lr}$  are the polar and azimuthal angle of the positive lepton defined in the  $J/\psi$  rest frame.

### A. The time-integrated $J/\psi K^*$ angular distribution

We first consider only the  $K^*(892)$   $K\pi$  mass region. The amplitude for longitudinal polarization of the two vector mesons is  $A_0$ . There are two amplitudes for polarizations of the vector mesons transverse to the decay axis:  $A_{\parallel}$  for parallel polarization of the two vector mesons and  $A_{\perp}$  for their perpendicular polarization. The three independent amplitudes are assumed to have a common dependence on  $m_{K\pi}$ . This common dependence is irrelevant to the angular distribution and each of the three amplitudes is thus represented by a complex constant.

In terms of the angular variables  $\omega \equiv (\theta_{K^*}, \theta_{lr}, \phi_{lr})$ , the time-integrated differential decay rate for the decay of the  $B$  meson to the  $J/\psi(K^+ \pi^-)_{P\text{-wave}}$ ,  $J/\psi(K^+ \pi^0)_{P\text{-wave}}$ , or  $J/\psi(K_S^0 \pi^+)_{P\text{-wave}}$  final state is

$$\begin{aligned}
 g(\omega; \mathbf{A}) &\equiv \frac{1}{\Gamma} \frac{d^3\Gamma}{d\cos\theta_{K^*} d\cos\theta_{lr} d\phi_{lr}} \\
 &= f_1(\omega) |A_0|^2 + f_2(\omega) |A_{\parallel}|^2 + f_3(\omega) |A_{\perp}|^2 \\
 &\quad + f_4(\omega) \Im m(A_{\parallel}^* A_{\perp}) + f_5(\omega) \Re e(A_{\parallel} A_0^*) \\
 &\quad + f_6(\omega) \Im m(A_{\perp} A_0^*), \tag{1}
 \end{aligned}$$

where the functions  $f_i(\omega)$  are

TABLE I. The  $B \rightarrow J/\psi K^*(892)$  amplitude parameters (described in Sec. I) as measured by several experiments. The results in Ref. [19] are superseded by this work. Note that the phases are subject to a two-fold ambiguity, as described by Eq. (4).

	$ A_0 ^2$	$ A_{\perp} ^2$	$\delta_{\parallel} - \delta_0$ (rad)	$\delta_{\perp} - \delta_0$ (rad)
CLEO [23]	$0.52 \pm 0.07 \pm 0.04$	$0.16 \pm 0.08 \pm 0.04$	$3.00 \pm 0.37 \pm 0.04$	$-0.11 \pm 0.46 \pm 0.03$
CDF [24]	$0.59 \pm 0.06 \pm 0.01$	$0.13^{+0.12}_{-0.09} \pm 0.06$	$2.2 \pm 0.5 \pm 0.1$	$-0.6 \pm 0.5 \pm 0.1$
<i>BABAR</i> [19]	$0.597 \pm 0.028 \pm 0.024$	$0.160 \pm 0.032 \pm 0.014$	$2.50 \pm 0.20 \pm 0.08$	$-0.17 \pm 0.16 \pm 0.07$
Belle [25]	$0.617 \pm 0.020 \pm 0.027$	$0.192 \pm 0.023 \pm 0.026$	$2.83 \pm 0.19 \pm 0.08$	$-0.09 \pm 0.13 \pm 0.06$

$$\begin{aligned}
f_1(\omega) &\equiv \frac{9}{32\pi} 2\cos^2\theta_{K^*} [1 - \sin^2\theta_{lr}\cos^2\phi_{lr}], & f_2(\omega) &\equiv \frac{9}{32\pi} \sin^2\theta_{K^*} [1 - \sin^2\theta_{lr}\sin^2\phi_{lr}], \\
f_3(\omega) &\equiv \frac{9}{32\pi} \sin^2\theta_{K^*} \sin^2\theta_{lr}, & f_4(\omega) &\equiv \frac{9}{32\pi} \sin^2\theta_{K^*} \sin 2\theta_{lr} \sin\phi_{lr}, \\
f_5(\omega) &\equiv -\frac{9}{32\pi} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sin 2\theta_{K^*} \sin^2\theta_{lr} \sin 2\phi_{lr}, & f_6(\omega) &\equiv \frac{9}{32\pi} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sin 2\theta_{K^*} \sin 2\theta_{lr} \cos\phi_{lr}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Eqs. (1) and (2) have been obtained by summing over the unobserved lepton polarizations [20,26,27].

The symbol  $\mathbf{A}$  denotes the transversity amplitudes for the decay of the  $B$  meson:  $\mathbf{A} \equiv (A_0, A_{\parallel}, A_{\perp})$ . We set  $|A_0|^2 + |A_{\parallel}|^2 + |A_{\perp}|^2 = 1$ , so that  $g(\omega; \mathbf{A})$  (Eq. (1)) is a probability density function (PDF). We denote by  $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$  the amplitudes for the  $\bar{B}$  meson decay. In the absence of direct  $CP$  violation, we can choose a phase convention so that these amplitudes are related by  $\bar{A}_0 = +A_0$ ,  $\bar{A}_{\parallel} = +A_{\parallel}$ ,  $\bar{A}_{\perp} = -A_{\perp}$ , so that  $A_{\perp}$  is  $CP$ -odd and  $A_0$  and  $A_{\parallel}$  are  $CP$ -even. Fixing this phase convention also fixes the phase of the amplitude for  $B^0$ - $\bar{B}^0$  mixing.

The phases  $\delta_i$  of the amplitudes, where  $i = 0, \parallel, \perp$ , are defined by  $A_i = |A_i|e^{i\delta_i}$ . Obviously, only differences of phases appear in the differential decay rate through the observables

$$\begin{aligned}
\Im m(A_{\parallel}^* A_{\perp}) &= |A_{\parallel}| |A_{\perp}| \sin(\delta_{\perp} - \delta_{\parallel}), \\
\Re e(A_{\parallel} A_0^*) &= |A_{\parallel}| |A_0| \cos(\delta_{\parallel} - \delta_0), \\
\Im m(A_{\perp} A_0^*) &= |A_{\perp}| |A_0| \sin(\delta_{\perp} - \delta_0),
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

so that the differential decay rate (Eq. (1)) is invariant under the transformation

$$(\delta_{\parallel} - \delta_0, \delta_{\perp} - \delta_0) \longleftrightarrow (\delta_0 - \delta_{\parallel}, \pi + \delta_0 - \delta_{\perp}). \tag{4}$$

This is the above-mentioned ambiguity.

The three terms that would allow to resolve the ambiguity ( $\Re e(A_{\parallel}^* A_{\perp})$ ,  $\Im m(A_{\parallel} A_0^*)$  and  $\Re e(A_{\perp} A_0^*)$ ) vanish after summation over the unobserved final lepton polarizations.

We ensure  $|A_0|^2 + |A_{\parallel}|^2 + |A_{\perp}|^2 = 1$  by parametrizing the magnitudes of the three  $B$ -decay amplitudes by

$$\cos\theta_A \equiv |A_0|, \quad \sin\theta_A \cos\phi_A \equiv |A_{\parallel}|, \quad \sin\theta_A \sin\phi_A \equiv |A_{\perp}|. \tag{5}$$

with  $0 \leq \theta_A \leq \pi/2$ ,  $0 \leq \phi_A \leq \pi/2$ .

### B. Angular distributions including a $K\pi$ $S$ -wave contribution

The  $K\pi$  system originating from  $B \rightarrow J/\psi(K\pi)$  can, in principle, have any integer spin. The experiment with the largest  $K\pi$  sample, LASS [22], showed however that below  $1.3 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ , the  $S$  and  $P$  waves dominate. We have previously observed a broad structure [19] in the  $1.1$ – $1.3 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  range of the  $m_{K\pi}$  spectrum and found it to be compatible with a significant  $S$ -wave amplitude contribution. When a  $K\pi$   $S$  wave in the  $B$  decay amplitude is

included in addition to the  $K\pi$   $P$  wave, the differential decay rate (Eq. (1)) becomes [27]

$$\begin{aligned}
G_{S+P}(\omega, m_{K\pi}; \mathbf{A}, A_P, A_S) &\equiv \frac{1}{\Gamma} \frac{d^4\Gamma}{dm_{K\pi} d\cos\theta_{K^*} d\cos\theta_{lr} d\phi_{lr}} \\
&\propto pq \times [A_P^2 g(\omega; \mathbf{A}) + |A_S|^2 f_7(\omega) \\
&\quad + A_P (f_8(\omega) \Re e(A_{\parallel} A_S^*) \\
&\quad + f_9(\omega) \Im m(A_{\perp} A_S^*) \\
&\quad + f_{10}(\omega) \Re e(A_0 A_S^*)],
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where we have kept the notation  $\theta_{K^*}$  for the  $(K\pi)$  helicity angle;  $p$  is the  $K\pi$ -system momentum in the  $B$  rest frame and  $q$  is the kaon momentum in the  $K\pi$  rest frame; we chose  $A_P$  to be a real and positive function of  $m_{K\pi}$ . Its square is indicative of the overall strength of the  $P$ -wave amplitudes. We represent the  $m_{K\pi}$ -dependent  $S$ -wave amplitude as  $A_S = |A_S|e^{i\delta_S}$ . The phases of the  $P$ -wave amplitudes reside in  $A_0$ ,  $A_{\parallel}$ , and  $A_{\perp}$ .

Using the same phase convention as for the  $P$ -wave amplitudes,  $\bar{A}_S = A_S$ . The angular functions  $f_{7\dots 10}$  are

$$\begin{aligned}
f_7(\omega) &\equiv \frac{3}{32\pi} 2[1 - \sin^2\theta_{lr}\cos^2\phi_{lr}], \\
f_8(\omega) &\equiv -\frac{3}{32\pi} \sqrt{6} \sin\theta_{K^*} \sin^2\theta_{lr} \sin 2\phi_{lr}, \\
f_9(\omega) &\equiv \frac{3}{32\pi} \sqrt{6} \sin\theta_{K^*} \sin 2\theta_{lr} \cos\phi_{lr}, \\
f_{10}(\omega) &\equiv \frac{3}{32\pi} 4\sqrt{3} \cos\theta_{K^*} [1 - \sin^2\theta_{lr}\cos^2\phi_{lr}].
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

At a given  $m_{K\pi}$ , the normalization is obtained by introducing the parametrization

$$\cos\lambda \equiv \frac{A_P}{\sqrt{A_P^2 + |A_S|^2}}, \quad \sin\lambda \equiv \frac{|A_S|}{\sqrt{A_P^2 + |A_S|^2}}, \tag{8}$$

where  $\lambda$  is in the range  $[0, \pi/2]$ . The term  $\cos^2\lambda$  ( $\sin^2\lambda$ ) represents the fraction of the  $P$ -wave ( $S$ -wave) intensity at that value of  $m_{K\pi}$ . The distribution (Eq. (6)), normalized so that at any fixed  $m_{K\pi}$  the integral over the angular variables yields unity, is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
g_{S+P}(\omega; m_{K\pi}, \mathbf{A}, \lambda) &\equiv \cos^2 \lambda g(\omega; \mathbf{A}) + \sin^2 \lambda f_7(\omega) \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} \sin 2\lambda [f_8(\omega) \cos(\delta_{\parallel} - \delta_S) |A_{\parallel}| \\
&+ f_9(\omega) \sin(\delta_{\perp} - \delta_S) |A_{\perp}| \\
&+ f_{10}(\omega) \cos(\delta_S - \delta_0) |A_0|].
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

In Eq. (9), the dependence of  $g_{S+P}$  on  $m_{K\pi}$  follows from that of  $\lambda$  and of the strong phases  $\delta_i$  ( $i = \perp, \parallel, 0, S$ ). We see that at a given value of  $m_{K\pi}$  the equations are invariant under the transformation

$$\begin{aligned}
(\delta_{\parallel} - \delta_0, \delta_{\perp} - \delta_0, \delta_S - \delta_0) &\longleftrightarrow \\
(\delta_0 - \delta_{\parallel}, \pi + \delta_0 - \delta_{\perp}, \delta_0 - \delta_S). & \tag{10}
\end{aligned}$$

We will use the change of the  $S$ - $P$  relative phase in the region of the  $K^*(892)$  to resolve this ambiguity.

The phase of a weak decay amplitude is determined by phases introduced through the weak interaction itself, that is from the CKM matrix, and by strong final-state interactions. If in the decay  $B \rightarrow J/\psi K\pi$  the  $J/\psi$  were known not to interact with the  $K\pi$  system, Watson's final-state interaction theorem [28] would guarantee that the phases for the  $P$ -wave and  $S$ -wave final states would be simply the corresponding phase shifts in  $P$ -wave and  $S$ -wave  $K\pi$  scattering at the appropriate invariant mass, taking  $K\pi$  scattering to be elastic in this range. However, we know this is not exactly the case, for if it were, the three individual  $P$ -wave amplitudes would be relatively real (relative

phases 0 or  $\pi$ ). This is not the experimental result, as we shall show. Nonetheless, we will provisionally adopt the assumption that the interactions with the  $J/\psi$  are small, and, in particular, that they do not change significantly with  $m_{K\pi}$ . We then anticipate that the difference  $\delta_S - \delta_0$  will behave much like the difference  $\delta[K\pi(L=0)] - \delta[K\pi(L=1)]$ , where we restrict ourselves to the  $I = 1/2$  channel, which is produced in the  $B \rightarrow J/\psi K\pi$  decay. According to Wigner's causality principle [29], the phase of a resonant amplitude increases with increasing invariant mass. Since the  $K\pi$ ,  $I = 1/2$   $P$ -wave phase shift increases rapidly in the vicinity of the  $K^*(892)$ , while the corresponding  $S$ -wave increases only very gradually, we expect  $\delta_S - \delta_0$ ,  $\delta_S - \delta_{\perp}$ , and  $\delta_S - \delta_{\parallel}$  to fall rapidly with increasing  $m_{K\pi}$  in this region.

### C. Time-dependent angular distribution

The time-dependent angular distribution for a  $B^0$  meson produced at time  $t = 0$  decaying as  $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^{*0}(K^{*0} \rightarrow K_S^0 \pi^0)$  at proper time  $t$  has the same form as in Eq. (1) but with time-dependent amplitudes  $\mathbf{A}(t)$ :

$$g[\omega; \mathbf{A}(t), \sin 2\beta, \cos 2\beta] \equiv \frac{1}{\Gamma} \frac{d^4 \Gamma}{dt d\cos\theta_{K^*} d\cos\theta_{\pi} d\phi_{\pi}}. \tag{11}$$

Under the hypothesis of no direct  $CP$  violation in the decay, i.e.  $|A_i(0)| = |\bar{A}_i(0)|$ ,  $i = 0, \parallel, \perp$ , the corresponding terms that enter Eq. (11) are [16,17,27]

$$\begin{aligned}
|A_0^{(-)}(t)|^2 &\equiv e^{-\Gamma_0 t} |A_0|^2 [1 + \sin 2\beta \sin \Delta m t], \\
|A_{\parallel}^{(-)}(t)|^2 &\equiv e^{-\Gamma_0 t} |A_{\parallel}|^2 [1 + \sin 2\beta \sin \Delta m t], \\
|A_{\perp}^{(-)}(t)|^2 &\equiv e^{-\Gamma_0 t} |A_{\perp}|^2 [1 - \sin 2\beta \sin \Delta m t], \\
\Im m[A_{\parallel}^{(-)*}(t) A_{\perp}^{(-)}(t)] &\equiv +e^{-\Gamma_0 t} |A_{\parallel}| |A_{\perp}| [\sin(\delta_{\perp} - \delta_{\parallel}) \cos \Delta m t - \cos(\delta_{\perp} - \delta_{\parallel}) \cos 2\beta \sin \Delta m t], \\
\Re e[A_{\parallel}^{(-)}(t) A_0^{(-)*}(t)] &\equiv e^{-\Gamma_0 t} |A_{\parallel}| |A_0| \cos(\delta_{\parallel} - \delta_0) [1 + \sin 2\beta \sin \Delta m t], \\
\Im m[A_{\perp}^{(-)}(t) A_0^{(-)*}(t)] &\equiv +e^{-\Gamma_0 t} |A_{\perp}| |A_0| [\sin(\delta_{\perp} - \delta_0) \cos \Delta m t - \cos(\delta_{\perp} - \delta_0) \cos 2\beta \sin \Delta m t],
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

for an initial  $B^0(\bar{B}^0)$  meson. The mass difference between the two neutral  $B$  mass eigenstates is  $\Delta m$ , and  $\Gamma_0$  is the common neutral  $B$ -meson decay rate, neglecting the lifetime difference between these mass eigenstates. The expression for the differential decay rate can be recast in the following form [27]:

$$\begin{aligned}
g_{\eta}(\omega, t; \mathbf{A}, \sin 2\beta, \cos 2\beta) &= \frac{\Gamma_0}{2} e^{-\Gamma_0 t} \mathcal{A}(\omega; \mathbf{A}) \times \left\{ 1 + \eta \left[ \cos \Delta m t \frac{\mathcal{P}(\omega; \mathbf{A})}{\mathcal{A}(\omega; \mathbf{A})} + \sin \Delta m t \left( \frac{S(\omega; \mathbf{A})}{\mathcal{A}(\omega; \mathbf{A})} \sin 2\beta \right. \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + \frac{C(\omega; \mathbf{A})}{\mathcal{A}(\omega; \mathbf{A})} \cos 2\beta \right) \right] \right\},
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

with  $\eta = +1$  ( $\eta = -1$ ) for an initial  $B^0(\bar{B}^0)$  meson. The angular terms  $\mathcal{A}$ ,  $\mathcal{P}$ ,  $S$ , and  $C$  are

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}(\omega; \mathbf{A}) &\equiv f_1(\omega)|A_0|^2 + f_2(\omega)|A_{\parallel}|^2 + f_3(\omega)|A_{\perp}|^2 + f_5(\omega)|A_0||A_{\parallel}| \cos(\delta_{\parallel} - \delta_0), \\
\mathcal{P}(\omega; \mathbf{A}) &\equiv f_4(\omega)|A_{\parallel}||A_{\perp}| \sin(\delta_{\perp} - \delta_{\parallel}) + f_6(\omega)|A_0||A_{\perp}| \sin(\delta_{\perp} - \delta_0), \\
\mathcal{S}(\omega; \mathbf{A}) &\equiv f_1(\omega)|A_0|^2 + f_2(\omega)|A_{\parallel}|^2 - f_3(\omega)|A_{\perp}|^2 + f_5(\omega)|A_0||A_{\parallel}| \cos(\delta_{\parallel} - \delta_0), \\
\mathcal{C}(\omega; \mathbf{A}) &\equiv -f_4(\omega)|A_{\parallel}||A_{\perp}| \cos(\delta_{\perp} - \delta_{\parallel}) - f_6(\omega)|A_0||A_{\perp}| \cos(\delta_{\perp} - \delta_0).
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

The time-dependent asymmetry in the decay then reads

$$\begin{aligned}
a(\omega, t; \mathbf{A}, \sin 2\beta, \cos 2\beta) &\equiv \frac{g_{+1}(\omega, t; \mathbf{A}, \sin 2\beta, \cos 2\beta) - g_{-1}(\omega, t; \mathbf{A}, \sin 2\beta, \cos 2\beta)}{g_{+1}(\omega, t; \mathbf{A}, \sin 2\beta, \cos 2\beta) + g_{-1}(\omega, t; \mathbf{A}, \sin 2\beta, \cos 2\beta)} \\
&= \cos \Delta mt \frac{\mathcal{P}(\omega; \mathbf{A})}{\mathcal{A}(\omega; \mathbf{A})} + \sin \Delta mt \left( \frac{\mathcal{S}(\omega; \mathbf{A})}{\mathcal{A}(\omega; \mathbf{A})} \sin 2\beta + \frac{\mathcal{C}(\omega; \mathbf{A})}{\mathcal{A}(\omega; \mathbf{A})} \cos 2\beta \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

This reduces to the usual expression for decays to  $CP$  eigenstates when only the  $CP$ -even ( $A_0, A_{\parallel}$ ) amplitudes are nonzero or when only the  $CP$ -odd ( $A_{\perp}$ ) amplitude is nonzero. We now examine the terms on the right-hand side of Eq. (15):

- (1) The  $\cos \Delta mt$  term makes the smallest contribution to  $g_{\eta}(\omega, t; \mathbf{A}, \sin 2\beta, \cos 2\beta)$  because the distribution of values taken by  $\mathcal{P}(\omega; \mathbf{A})/\mathcal{A}(\omega; \mathbf{A})$ , as shown in Fig. 2(a), peaks at zero.
- (2) The  $\sin \Delta mt$  term has explicit dependence on both  $\sin 2\beta$  and  $\cos 2\beta$ :
  - (a) The usual  $\sin(\Delta mt) \sin 2\beta$  factor is weighted by the angular term  $\mathcal{S}(\omega; \mathbf{A})/\mathcal{A}(\omega; \mathbf{A})$ , which can take values between  $-1$  and  $+1$ , and whose distribution is shown in Fig. 2(b). This distribution reduces to one peak at  $+1$  or  $-1$  for a pure  $CP$ -even ( $|A_{\perp}| = 0$ ) or  $CP$ -odd ( $|A_{\perp}| = 1$ ) decay, respectively.
  - (b) The  $\cos 2\beta$  contribution is characteristic of a vector-vector channel. This contribution appears only *via* the interference terms involving the  $CP$ -odd amplitude  $A_{\perp}$  and the  $CP$ -even amplitudes  $A_0$  and  $A_{\parallel}$  (Eq. (14)). The angular term  $\mathcal{C}(\omega; \mathbf{A})/\mathcal{A}(\omega; \mathbf{A})$  takes values in a range smaller than  $[-1, +1]$  [Fig. 2(c)], whose bounds depend on the am-

plitudes and phases. The distribution of this angular term tends to peak at zero [Fig. 2(c)], inducing some loss in sensitivity to  $\cos 2\beta$  compared to that to  $\sin 2\beta$ .

- (c) The  $\sin 2\beta$  and  $\cos 2\beta$  contributions are distinguished by the angular information only.
- (d) From the orthogonality of the angular functions  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{C}$  (Eq. (14)) and the angular symmetry of  $g_{\eta}$  (Eq. (13)), the  $\sin 2\beta$  and  $\cos 2\beta$  parameters, if regarded as independent quantities, are uncorrelated in a fit of the differential decay rate (Eq. (13)), in the limit of infinite statistics and in the absence of experimental effects.

Under the transformation  $(\delta_{\parallel} - \delta_0, \delta_{\perp} - \delta_0) \rightarrow (\delta_0 - \delta_{\parallel}, \pi + \delta_0 - \delta_{\perp})$ ,  $\mathcal{A}$ ,  $\mathcal{P}$ , and  $\mathcal{S}$  are unchanged, while  $\mathcal{C}$  changes sign, showing that the ambiguity in the strong phases translates into an ambiguity in the sign of  $\cos 2\beta$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
(\delta_{\parallel} - \delta_0, \delta_{\perp} - \delta_0, \cos 2\beta) &\longleftrightarrow \\
(\delta_0 - \delta_{\parallel}, \pi + \delta_0 - \delta_{\perp}, -\cos 2\beta).
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

## II. THE BABAR DETECTOR

A detailed description of the *BABAR* detector is presented in Ref. [30]. Charged particles are detected with a five-layer, double-sided silicon vertex tracker (SVT) and a 40-layer drift chamber (DCH) with a helium-isobutane gas mixture, placed in a 1.5-T solenoidal field produced by a superconducting magnet. The charged-particle momentum resolution is approximately  $(\delta p_T/p_T)^2 = (0.0013 p_T)^2 + (0.0045)^2$ , where  $p_T$  is the transverse momentum in GeV/c. The SVT, with a typical single-hit resolution of  $10 \mu\text{m}$ , measures the impact parameters of charged-particle tracks in both the plane transverse to the beam direction and along the beam. Charged-particle types are identified from the ionization energy loss ( $dE/dx$ ) measured in the DCH and SVT, and from the Cherenkov radiation detected in a ring-imaging Cherenkov device. Photons are detected by a CsI(Tl) electromagnetic calorimeter (EMC) with an energy resolution




FIG. 2. (a) The distribution of  $\mathcal{P}(\omega; \mathbf{A})/\mathcal{A}(\omega; \mathbf{A})$ , (b)  $\mathcal{S}(\omega; \mathbf{A})/\mathcal{A}(\omega; \mathbf{A})$  and (c)  $\mathcal{C}(\omega; \mathbf{A})/\mathcal{A}(\omega; \mathbf{A})$ , where  $\mathcal{A}$ ,  $\mathcal{P}$ ,  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{C}$  are defined by Eq. (14), for a set of events generated according to the amplitudes  $\mathbf{A}$  corresponding to the *BABAR* values in Table I.

$\sigma(E)/E = 0.023 \cdot (E/\text{GeV})^{-1/4} \oplus 0.019$ . The return yoke of the superconducting coil is instrumented with resistive plate chambers (IFR) for the identification and muons and the detection of neutral hadrons.

### III. EVENT RECONSTRUCTION AND SELECTION

The event selection is similar to that used in our previous analysis [19]. Multihadron events are selected by demanding a minimum of three reconstructed charged tracks in the polar angle range  $0.41 < \theta_{lab} < 2.54$  rad. A charged track must be reconstructed in the DCH, and, if it does not result from a  $K_S^0$  decay, it must originate at the nominal interaction point within 1.5 cm in the plane transverse to the beam and 10 cm along the beam. Events are required to have a primary vertex within 0.5 cm of the average position of the interaction point in the plane transverse to the beamline, and within 6 cm longitudinally. Electromagnetic depositions in the calorimeter in the polar angle range  $0.410 < \theta_{lab} < 2.409$  rad that are not associated with charged tracks, that have an energy greater than 30 MeV and that have a shower shape consistent with a photon interaction are taken as neutral clusters. We require the total energy for charged tracks and photon candidates in the fiducial region to be greater than 4.5 GeV. To reduce continuum background, we require the normalized second Fox-Wolfram moment  $R_2$  [31] of the event, calculated with both charged tracks and neutral clusters, to be less than 0.5.

Charged tracks are required to be in regions of polar angle for which the particle identification (PID) efficiency is well-measured. For electrons, muons, and kaons the acceptable ranges are 0.40 to 2.40 rad, 0.30 to 2.70 rad, and 0.45 to 2.50 rad, respectively.

Candidates for  $J/\psi$  mesons are reconstructed in the  $e^+e^-$  and  $\mu^+\mu^-$  decay modes, from a pair of identified leptons that form a good vertex. A *Loose* [32] identification condition is required for each muon. (The number of interaction lengths it traverses in the EMC and IFR must be consistent with the expectation, as must be the average number of hits in each layer of the IFR; the IFR hits and the track extrapolation must match; the energy deposition in the EMC must be small.) A *Tight* condition [32] is required for each electron. (The measured  $dE/dx$  must be consistent with expectations; the energy deposition in the calorimeter must be consistent with the momentum measured in the drift chamber, and the lateral shower shape must be consistent with an electromagnetic shower.) Electrons that have no EMC information are selected on the basis of  $dE/dx$  information alone. For  $J/\psi \rightarrow e^+e^-$  decays, where an electron may have radiated one or several Bremsstrahlung photons, the missing energy is recovered by identifying EMC clusters with energy greater than 30 MeV lying within 35 mrad in polar angle and 50 mrad in azimuth of the electron direction projected onto the EMC. The lepton-pair invariant mass must be between 3.06 GeV/ $c^2$  and 3.14 GeV/ $c^2$  for muons, and

between 2.95 GeV/ $c^2$  and 3.14 GeV/ $c^2$  for electrons. This corresponds to a  $\pm 3\sigma$  interval for muons, and accounts for the partially recovered radiative tail due to Bremsstrahlung for electrons.

A candidate  $K_S^0$  consists of a vertexed pair of oppositely-charged tracks with invariant mass between 489 MeV/ $c^2$  and 507 MeV/ $c^2$ , when interpreted as pions. The  $K_S^0$  flight length must be greater than 1 mm, and its direction must form an angle with the  $K_S^0$  momentum vector in the plane perpendicular to the beam line that is less than 0.2 rad.

Neutral clusters, as defined above, are used as photon candidates for the reconstruction of  $\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$  decays. A  $\pi^0$  candidate consists of a pair of photons with invariant mass in the interval 106 MeV/ $c^2$  to 153 MeV/ $c^2$ , and a total energy greater than 200 MeV.

The  $J/\psi$ ,  $K_S^0$ , and  $\pi^0$  candidates are constrained to their corresponding nominal masses. Except in the analysis that includes an  $S$ -wave contribution,  $K^*$  candidates must have a  $K\pi$  invariant mass within 100 MeV/ $c^2$  of the nominal  $K^*(892)$  mass.

The  $J/\psi$  and  $K^*$  candidates are combined to form  $B \rightarrow J/\psi K^*$  candidates. It may happen that a genuine  $J/\psi K^*$  event is reconstructed incorrectly, most often with the true  $J/\psi$ , but with a wrongly reconstructed  $K^*$ . This happens mainly for  $B$  candidates with a daughter  $\pi^0$ , with cross-feed (CF) from the companion channel with a  $\pi^\pm$ , or self cross-feed (SCF) when the genuine  $\pi^0$  is incorrectly reconstructed with at least one wrong photon candidate. The (S)CF is reduced by demanding, for channels with a  $\pi^0$  in the final state, that  $\cos\theta_{K^*} < 0.7$ , where  $\theta_{K^*}$  is the  $K^*$ -decay helicity angle (see Fig. 1). In addition, as was done in Ref. [27], if a single event can be reconstructed in two different  $K^*$  modes and if one reconstruction uses a  $\pi^0$  and the other does not, the reconstruction without a  $\pi^0$  is retained. This reduces the cross-feed by 75% for a 1% relative loss in signal efficiency. In modes with a  $\pi^\pm$ , no  $\cos\theta_{K^*}$  cut is applied.

Two kinematic variables are used to further discriminate against incorrect  $B$  candidates. The first is the difference  $\Delta E = E_B^* - E_{\text{beam}}^*$  between the candidate- $B$  energy and the beam-energy in the  $Y(4S)$  rest frame. In the absence of experimental effects, reconstructed signal candidates have  $\Delta E = 0$ . The second is the beam-energy-substituted mass  $m_{\text{ES}} = (E_{\text{exp}}^2 - \vec{p}_B^2)^{1/2}$  where, in the laboratory frame  $E_{\text{exp}} = (s/2 + \vec{p}_B \cdot \vec{p}_i)/E_i$  is the  $B$ -candidate expected energy,  $\vec{p}_B$ , its measured momentum,  $(E_i, \vec{p}_i)$ , the  $e^+e^-$  initial-state four-momentum, and  $\sqrt{s}$  is the center-of-mass energy. For the signal region,  $\Delta E$  is required to be between  $-70$  MeV and  $+50$  MeV for channels involving a  $\pi^0$ , and within 30 MeV of zero otherwise. If several  $B$  candidates are found in an event, the one with the smallest  $|\Delta E|$  is retained.

The  $m_{\text{ES}}$  distributions for the  $B \rightarrow J/\psi K\pi$  candidates are shown in Fig. 3. Corresponding signal yields and purities are given in Table II. These results are obtained




FIG. 3. The  $m_{ES}$  distributions for the  $\Delta E$  intervals described in the text with overlaid Gaussian and ARGUS fit functions, for  $J/\psi K\pi$  candidates in data.

from fits to the  $m_{ES}$  distributions using a Gaussian distribution for the signal and an ARGUS shape [33] for the combinatorial background of the form

$$a(m_{ES}) = a_0 m_{ES} \sqrt{1 - (m_{ES}/m_0)^2} \times e^{\xi[1 - (m_{ES}/m_0)^2]}, \quad (17)$$

for  $m_{ES} < m_0$ , where  $m_0$  represents the kinematic upper limit and is fixed at the center-of-mass beam energy  $E_{beam}^* = 5.291$  GeV. The parameter  $\xi$  determines the shape of the spectrum.

With the signal region defined by  $m_{ES} > 5.27$  GeV/ $c^2$  and the above  $\Delta E$  ranges, the  $B$  reconstruction efficiencies, summed over  $J/\psi \rightarrow e^- e^-$  and  $J/\psi \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ , are  $(9.6 \pm 0.1)\%$ ,  $(24.5 \pm 0.1)\%$ ,  $(19.7 \pm 0.2)\%$ , and  $(12.5 \pm 0.2)\%$  for the modes  $K_S^0 \pi^0$ ,  $K^\pm \pi^\mp$ ,  $K_S^0 \pi^\pm$ , and  $K^\pm \pi^0$ , respectively. The composition of the remaining background events is given in Table III. The contribution of  $B$  candidates with a fake  $J/\psi$  candidate is less than 2%.

TABLE II. Event yield and purity, estimated from a fit to the  $m_{ES}$  distribution (Fig. 3), with a Gaussian signal distribution and an ARGUS threshold function [33] describing the combinatorial background. The spectra are integrated over the range  $m_{ES} > 5.27$  GeV/ $c^2$ . No correction for cross-feed is made since these numbers are not used in the actual analysis; rather they provide an indication of the purity of the data sample.

Channel	Yield	Purity (%)
$J/\psi(K_S^0 \pi^0)$	$131 \pm 14$	81.6
$J/\psi(K^\pm \pi^\mp)$	$2376 \pm 51$	95.8
$J/\psi(K_S^0 \pi^\pm)$	$670 \pm 27$	95.7
$J/\psi(K^\pm \pi^0)$	$791 \pm 33$	85.0

#### IV. ANGULAR ANALYSIS

The parameters  $\theta_A$ ,  $\phi_A$  (Eq. (5)),  $\delta_{\parallel} - \delta_0$  and  $\delta_{\perp} - \delta_0$  of the angular-dependent time-integrated decay rates are determined using a simultaneous unbinned likelihood fit to the three flavor-eigenstate  $B \rightarrow J/\psi K^*$  channels:  $J/\psi(K^\pm \pi^\mp)$ ,  $J/\psi(K_S^0 \pi^\pm)$ , and  $J/\psi(K^\pm \pi^0)$ . The PDF, before accounting for the experimental effects described below, is given by Eq. (1). We first consider only the  $P$ -wave amplitudes; the effect of the  $S$ -wave amplitude is discussed in Sec. IV D. The  $B$  flavor is taken into account in the fit through the relations ( $\bar{A}_0 = A_0$ ,  $\bar{A}_{\parallel} = A_{\parallel}$ ,  $\bar{A}_{\perp} = -A_{\perp}$ ) as explained in Sec. I.

##### A. Acceptance correction

The acceptance correction is applied as in our previous measurement [19]. We perform an unbinned likelihood fit of the PDF  $g^{obs}$  to the observed events, where

$$g^{obs}(\omega; \mathbf{A}) \equiv \frac{g(\omega; \mathbf{A})\varepsilon(\omega)}{\int g(\omega'; \mathbf{A})\varepsilon(\omega')d\omega'}, \quad (18)$$

where  $g(\omega; \mathbf{A})$  is given by Eq. (1), and  $\varepsilon(\omega)$  is the angle-dependent acceptance (probability to detect an event generated with angles  $\omega$ ). As defined by Eq. (18),  $g^{obs}$  is normalized by construction. The denominator of  $g^{obs}$

$$\langle \varepsilon \rangle(\mathbf{A}) \equiv \int g(\omega; \mathbf{A})\varepsilon(\omega)d\omega \quad (19)$$

is the average acceptance over the event-weighted phase space, which depends on the amplitudes  $\mathbf{A}$ .

In the case of the  $J/\psi K^*$  channels studied here, the presence of cross-feed from the companion channels, which have, as a consequence of isospin symmetry, the same  $\mathbf{A}$  dependence as that of the signal, must be taken into account. The observed PDF for channel  $b$  ( $b = K^\pm \pi^\mp, K_S^0 \pi^\pm, K^\pm \pi^0$ ) is then

$$g^{b,obs}(\omega; \mathbf{A}) = g(\omega; \mathbf{A}) \frac{\varepsilon^b(\omega)}{\sum_k \mathcal{A}_k(\mathbf{A})\Phi_k^b}, \quad (20)$$

with

TABLE III. The expected number of background events for each decay mode in the signal region, in an on-peak  $81.9 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  sample. The contribution from continuum is estimated using a  $9.6 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  off-peak data sample. The  $B\bar{B}$  contribution is estimated using a fully-simulated sample of generic  $B\bar{B}$  decays equivalent to  $72 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  (with the inclusive  $J/\psi$  events removed from the sample). The inclusive  $J/\psi$  contribution is estimated using a fully-simulated sample equivalent to  $91 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  ( $B \rightarrow J/\psi K^*$  (892) events removed).

Background Source	$B$ Decay Mode			
	$J/\psi(K_S^0\pi^0)$	$J/\psi(K^\pm\pi^\mp)$	$J/\psi(K_S^0\pi^\pm)$	$J/\psi(K^\pm\pi^0)$
Continuum	$0.2 \pm 0.1$	$1.2 \pm 0.4$	$0.1 \pm 0.1$	$0.7 \pm 0.4$
Generic $B\bar{B}$	$0.2 \pm 0.1$	$1.2 \pm 0.2$	$0.3 \pm 0.1$	$1.2 \pm 0.3$
Inclusive $J/\psi$	$22 \pm 5$	$126 \pm 12$	$38 \pm 7$	$135 \pm 12$

$$\varepsilon^b(\omega) \equiv \sum_a F_a \varepsilon^{a \rightarrow b}(\omega), \quad (21)$$

$$\Phi_k^b \equiv \sum_a F_a \int f_k(\omega) \varepsilon^{a \rightarrow b}(\omega) d\omega \quad (22)$$

and  $a = K_S^0\pi^0, K^\pm\pi^\mp, K_S^0\pi^\pm, K^\pm\pi^0$ . In the above expressions, the  $\mathcal{A}_{1..6}$  terms are (see Eq. (1))

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_1 &= |A_0|^2, & \mathcal{A}_2 &= |A_\parallel|^2, & \mathcal{A}_3 &= |A_\perp|^2, \\ \mathcal{A}_4 &= \Im m(A_\parallel^* A_\perp), & \mathcal{A}_5 &= \Re e(A_0^* A_\parallel), & \\ \mathcal{A}_6 &= \Im m(A_0^* A_\perp), \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

and  $F_a$  is the fraction of mode  $a$  in  $B \rightarrow J/\psi K^*$  decays (with  $\sum_a F_a = 1$ ). We assume that  $\mathcal{B}[Y(4S) \rightarrow B^0\bar{B}^0] = \mathcal{B}[Y(4S) \rightarrow B^+B^-]$ ,  $\Gamma(K^{*0} \rightarrow K^+\pi^-) = 2 \times \Gamma(K^{*0} \rightarrow K^0\pi^0)$ , and  $\Gamma(K^{*+} \rightarrow K^0\pi^+) = 2 \times \Gamma(K^{*+} \rightarrow K^+\pi^0)$ . The measured values [34] of the branching fractions for the decays  $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^{*0}$  and  $B^+ \rightarrow J/\psi K^{*+}$  are used. The angular functions  $f_k(\omega)$  ( $k = 1 \dots 6$ ) have been defined in Eq. (2) and  $\varepsilon^{a \rightarrow b}(\omega)$  is the probability for an event generated in channel  $a$  and with angles  $\omega$  to be detected as an event in channel  $b$ . Finally,  $\varepsilon^b(\omega)$  is the efficiency for reconstructed channel  $b$  considering  $B \rightarrow J/\psi K^*$  channels as a whole, that is counting cross-feed events as signal. The  $\Phi_k^b$  are the  $f_k(\omega)$  moments of the “whole” efficiency  $\varepsilon^b$ .

The angular resolution has been neglected, even for (self)cross-feed events. Also the possibility of doubly misidentifying the daughters of the  $K^{*0} \rightarrow K^+\pi^-$  candidate ( $K$ - $\pi$  swap) is not taken into account. The induced biases have been estimated with Monte Carlo (MC) based studies, and found to be negligible. Under these two approximations, the acceptance  $\varepsilon^b(\omega)$  can be factorized as in Eq. (20), and only the coefficients  $\Phi_k^b$  are needed.

The coefficients  $\Phi_k^b$  are computed with exclusive signal MC samples obtained using a full simulation of the experiment [35–37]. Particle identification efficiencies measured with data control samples are used to adjust the MC simulation to represent the actual behavior of the detector. Separate coefficients are used for different charges of the final-state mesons, in particular, to take into account the charge dependence of the interaction of charged kaons with matter, and any other possible charge asymmetry of the

detector. Writing the log-likelihood function for a pure signal sample we have, for each channel  $b$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} L^b(\mathbf{A}) &\equiv \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\text{evt}}} \ln[g^{b,\text{obs}}(\omega_i; \mathbf{A})] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\text{evt}}} \ln[g(\omega_i; \mathbf{A})] - N_{\text{evt}} \ln \left[ \sum_k \mathcal{A}_k(\mathbf{A}) \Phi_k^b \right] \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\text{evt}}} \ln[\varepsilon^b(\omega_i)]. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where  $\omega_i$  represents the measured angular variables for event  $i$ , and  $N_{\text{evt}}$  is the total number of signal candidates. When maximizing  $L^b(\mathbf{A})$ , the third term, which does not depend on the amplitudes, can be ignored [19].

## B. Background subtraction

In our previous measurement [19] of the decay amplitudes, it was assumed that the combinatorial background could be taken into account with an expansion in the same basis functions as the signal. The systematic bias due to neglecting the missing components of the background angular distribution was checked with MC-based studies.

Here, we use an improved background correction method in which events from the  $m_{\text{ES}}$  sideband are added to the log-likelihood that is maximized, but with a negative weight.

The sample of  $N_{\text{evt}}$  events selected in the signal region contains  $n_S$  signal events and  $n_B$  background events, so that  $N_{\text{evt}} = n_S + n_B$ . The values of  $n_S$  and  $n_B$  are unknown *a priori*. The quantity we would like to maximize is  $\sum_{i=1}^{n_S} \ln[g^{b,\text{obs}}(\omega_i; \mathbf{A})]$ , while we have

$$\begin{aligned} L^b(\mathbf{A}) &\equiv \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\text{evt}}} \ln[g^{b,\text{obs}}(\omega_i; \mathbf{A})] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n_S} \ln[g^{b,\text{obs}}(\omega_i; \mathbf{A})] + \sum_{j=1}^{n_B} \ln[g^{b,\text{obs}}(\omega_j; \mathbf{A})]. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Note that the same PDF appears for both the signal events and the background events: the PDF  $g^{b,\text{obs}}$  of the signal. We use a pure sample of background events to obtain an estimate of the second term. This sample is from the  $m_{\text{ES}}$

sideband region  $5.20 < m_{\text{ES}} < 5.27 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ , which contains  $N_B$  events. It can be shown that maximizing the modified expression  $L^{bl}$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} L^{bl}(\mathbf{A}) &\equiv \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\text{evt}}} \ln[g^{b,obs}(\omega_i; \mathbf{A})] - \frac{\tilde{n}_B}{N_B} \sum_{k=1}^{N_B} \ln[g^{b,obs}(\omega_k; \mathbf{A})] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n_S} \ln[g^{b,obs}(\omega_i; \mathbf{A})] + \sum_{j=1}^{n_B} \ln[g^{b,obs}(\omega_j; \mathbf{A})] \\ &\quad - \frac{\tilde{n}_B}{N_B} \sum_{k=1}^{N_B} \ln[g^{b,obs}(\omega_k; \mathbf{A})], \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

yields an unbiased estimator of the true parameters if  $\tilde{n}_B$  is an unbiased estimator of  $n_B$ . The quantity  $\tilde{n}_B$  is obtained by fitting the data from the  $m_{\text{ES}}$  sideband and signal regions with a combination of an ARGUS and a Gaussian function. Since there is no peaking background contribution in the signal region, we take for  $\tilde{n}_B$  the portion of the ARGUS fit that falls in the signal region.

As  $L^{bl}$  is not a log-likelihood, the uncertainties yielded by the minimization program MINUIT [38] are biased estimates of the actual uncertainties. An unbiased estimation of the uncertainties is described and validated in Appendix A.

With this pseudo-log-likelihood technique, we avoid parametrizing the acceptance as well as the background angular distributions. This technique and the combined ( $m_{\text{ES}}$ , angular) likelihood fit used in Ref. [19] rely on the assumption that the angular behavior of the combinatorial background is the same in the  $m_{\text{ES}}$  signal region and sideband. The possible bias related to this assumption is discussed in the next section.

### C. Validation

The complete fit scheme, including acceptance and background corrections as described above, has been validated with a  $B\bar{B}$  Monte Carlo sample equivalent to an integrated luminosity of  $590 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ , produced with a full

simulation of the *BABAR* detector (based on GEANT4 [35–37]). In this sample only events with a true  $J/\psi \rightarrow \ell\ell$  decay with center-of-mass momentum  $p_{J/\psi}^*$  greater than  $1.3 \text{ GeV}/c$  are simulated. This momentum cut is not applied in the analysis. It does not affect the signal region ( $m_{\text{ES}} > 5.27 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ ), but means that only a subset of the events in the  $m_{\text{ES}}$  sideband region is included.

An additional study has been performed with a larger sample generated with a parametrized simulation from the same event generator [35] with resolution effects and efficiencies incorporated. The equivalent integrated luminosity of this sample is  $16 \text{ ab}^{-1}$ .

The results of the two simulations are found to be compatible with each other. No statistically significant bias is observed with the full simulation. However, the high-statistics fast simulation shows small biases in the fitted parameters (Table IV). A contribution to the systematic uncertainty is derived from these biases in Sec. IV D.

### D. Systematic uncertainties

Table V summarizes the systematic uncertainties for the measurement of the amplitudes. The sources of uncertainty we have considered are described here.

- (1) “c.m. energy”: The center-of-mass energy, which defines the  $m_{\text{ES}}$  endpoint spectrum, enters as the parameter  $m_0$  of the ARGUS function (Eq. (17)). The value ( $5.291 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ ) is changed by  $\pm 2 \text{ MeV}/c^2$  (uncertainty on the beam-energy in the c.m. frame) and the largest deviation from the nominal fit result is taken as the estimate of the systematic uncertainty.
- (2) “Background shape”: The ARGUS function shape parameter  $\xi$  (Eq. (17)), fitted to the  $m_{\text{ES}}$  spectrum (fitted values are  $-53 \pm 7$ ,  $-43 \pm 12$ ,  $-54 \pm 6$  and  $-53 \pm 4$  for the  $K^\pm \pi^\mp$ ,  $K_S^0 \pi^\pm$ ,  $K^\pm \pi^0$ , and the combined channels, respectively), is changed by  $\pm 1$  standard deviation and the largest deviation

TABLE IV. Bias (in units of  $10^{-3}$ ) observed in fits for the individual  $K^*$  channels and the combined channel, based on parametrized Monte Carlo, taking as input the values of the amplitudes from Ref. [19]. The four first lines of the table present results for the fitted quantities  $\theta_A$ ,  $\phi_A$ ,  $\delta_{\parallel} - \delta_0$ , and  $\delta_{\perp} - \delta_0$ , all expressed in radians. The three last lines present results for the amplitude moduli squared, which are computed from  $\theta_A$  and  $\phi_A$ .

	Bias ( $10^{-3}$ )			
	$K^\pm \pi^\mp$	$K_S^0 \pi^\pm$	$K^\pm \pi^0$	all $K^*$
$\theta_A$	$2.9 \pm 1.0$	$-1.3 \pm 1.9$	$-8.7 \pm 1.9$	$-0.2 \pm 0.8$
$\phi_A$	$3.3 \pm 3.5$	$13.0 \pm 6.6$	$5.5 \pm 6.4$	$5.5 \pm 2.8$
$\delta_{\parallel} - \delta_0$	$-34.9 \pm 7.8$	$-19.2 \pm 14.7$	$-54.5 \pm 13.9$	$-36.2 \pm 6.2$
$\delta_{\perp} - \delta_0$	$-29.3 \pm 6.4$	$-7.8 \pm 11.8$	$-29.0 \pm 11.4$	$-25.2 \pm 5.0$
$ A_0 ^2$	$-2.9 \pm 1.0$	$1.3 \pm 1.9$	$8.5 \pm 1.9$	$0.2 \pm 0.8$
$ A_{\parallel} ^2$	$0.4 \pm 1.5$	$-5.9 \pm 2.8$	$-7.2 \pm 2.7$	$-2.2 \pm 1.2$
$ A_{\perp} ^2$	$2.5 \pm 1.4$	$4.6 \pm 2.7$	$-1.3 \pm 2.6$	$2.1 \pm 1.1$

TABLE V. Systematic uncertainties (in units of  $10^{-3}$ ) in the relative phases (rad) and in the amplitude moduli squared, for the three  $K^*$  channels combined.

Source	Systematic uncertainties ( $10^{-3}$ )				
	$\delta_{\parallel} - \delta_0$	$\delta_{\perp} - \delta_0$	$ A_0 ^2$	$ A_{\parallel} ^2$	$ A_{\perp} ^2$
1. c.m. energy	2.5	4.6	1.8	0.2	1.6
2. Bkg. shape	1.8	3.2	1.2	0.1	1.1
3. BR	0.3	0.9	0.1	0.1	0.1
4. MC stat.	14.2	7.9	2.7	2.3	2.4
5. Fit bias	36.2	25.2	0.2	2.2	2.1
6. PID	5.2	3.5	1.3	2.3	1.9
7. $S$ wave	33.4	37.1	2.9	2.5	0.5
Total	51.6	46.0	4.8	4.6	4.2

from the nominal fit result is taken as the estimate of the systematic uncertainty.

- (3) “BR”: The relative branching fractions of neutral and charged  $B$  mesons to  $J/\psi K^*$  affects the amount of cross-feed. The branching ratios are changed independently by  $\pm 1$  standard deviation [34] and the largest difference is taken as the systematic uncertainty.
- (4) “MC stat.”: The finite Monte Carlo sample size induces a limited knowledge of the coefficients  $\Phi_k^b$ . This effect is evaluated by splitting the original Monte Carlo sample into ten equal-sized subsamples, each of which is used to compute the  $\Phi_k^b$  coefficients. These coefficients are then used for ten angular fits on the data, all differences being thus due to differences of the  $\Phi_k^b$  coefficients. For each fitted parameter, the standard deviation is computed, and divided by  $\sqrt{10}$  to estimate the “MC stat.” effect due to the original Monte Carlo finite size.
- (5) “Fit bias”: Biases are observed in validation studies (Table IV). The observed bias is used as an estimate of the systematic uncertainty.
- (6) “PID”: The efficiency of the particle-identification has angular dependence. The induced effect on the fitted parameters is corrected by the acceptance-correction scheme. Imperfect knowledge of the particle-identification efficiency will result in a bias. A conservative estimate of the systematic uncertainty is obtained by using acceptance-correction

factors for different beam conditions, corresponding to the years 2000, 2001, and 2002, and using the largest differences as estimates of the systematic uncertainties.

- (7) “ $S$  wave”: An additional fit is performed with the  $g_{S+P}$  PDF (see next Section). The full  $g_{S+P}$ -to- $g_P$  shift is used as a conservative estimate of the contribution to the systematic uncertainty, as was done in Ref. [19].

### E. Results of the angular analysis

Table VI summarizes the results of the fit to the angular distribution. Keeping in mind the two-fold phase ambiguity (Eq. (4)), the results we report for the amplitude moduli and phases are those of the line “Total” of Table VI. The correlation matrix of the fitted parameters ( $\theta_A, \phi_A, \delta_{\parallel} - \delta_0, \delta_{\perp} - \delta_0$ ) (Eq. (5)) is

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1.00 & 0.00 & -0.04 & +0.04 \\ & 1.00 & -0.23 & -0.09 \\ & & 1.00 & +0.65 \\ & & & 1.00 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Angular distributions for the three channels are shown in Fig. 4. A forward-backward asymmetry is clearly visible in the comparison of the distributions of  $\cos\theta_{K^*}$  for (pure  $P$ -wave) MC, generated with the amplitudes found in the data, and for the data samples themselves. This is due to  $S$ - $P$  interference.

In a series of 168 simulated experiments of the same size as the data sample, we find that the probabilities for obtaining a larger likelihood than that observed for the data are 11%, 47%, 58%, and 25% for the  $K^{\pm}\pi^{\mp}$ ,  $K_S^0\pi^{\pm}$ ,  $K^{\pm}\pi^0$ , and combined samples, respectively.

The results for  $J/\psi K^{*0}$  and  $J/\psi K^{*\pm}$  decays are found to be compatible with each other (Table VI); this confirms the expectation of isospin symmetry.

From Table VI line Total, we note that  $\delta_{\parallel} - \delta_0$  differs from  $\pi$  by 3.6 standard deviations and that  $\delta_{\perp} - \delta_0$  differs from 0 by 2.0 standard deviations. In order to determine the uncertainty in  $\delta_{\parallel} - \delta_{\perp}$ , the combined data sample is refit using  $\delta_{\parallel} - \delta_{\perp}$  and  $\delta_0 - \delta_{\perp}$  as phase parameters. The resulting amplitudes and the value of  $\delta_0 - \delta_{\perp}$  were as before, and this refit yields

TABLE VI. Values of  $|A_0|^2$ ,  $|A_{\parallel}|^2$ ,  $|A_{\perp}|^2$ ,  $\delta_{\parallel} - \delta_0$ , and  $\delta_{\perp} - \delta_0$ , for subsamples of the data divided according to decay channel. The first uncertainty is statistical; the second systematic. Note that the phases are subject to a two-fold ambiguity (Eq. (4)).

Sample	$ A_0 ^2$	$ A_{\parallel} ^2$	$ A_{\perp} ^2$	$\delta_{\parallel} - \delta_0$ (rad)	$\delta_{\perp} - \delta_0$ (rad)
$K^{\pm}\pi^{\mp}$	$0.560 \pm 0.015 \pm 0.005$	$0.208 \pm 0.019 \pm 0.004$	$0.232 \pm 0.020 \pm 0.005$	$2.67 \pm 0.12 \pm 0.05$	$0.16 \pm 0.08 \pm 0.05$
$K_S^0\pi^{\pm}$	$0.560 \pm 0.028 \pm 0.006$	$0.232 \pm 0.034 \pm 0.010$	$0.208 \pm 0.034 \pm 0.007$	$2.75 \pm 0.22 \pm 0.05$	$0.12 \pm 0.17 \pm 0.05$
$K^{\pm}\pi^0$	$0.592 \pm 0.028 \pm 0.013$	$0.165 \pm 0.032 \pm 0.011$	$0.243 \pm 0.036 \pm 0.009$	$2.90 \pm 0.29 \pm 0.09$	$0.33 \pm 0.18 \pm 0.07$
Total	$0.566 \pm 0.012 \pm 0.005$	$0.204 \pm 0.015 \pm 0.005$	$0.230 \pm 0.015 \pm 0.004$	$2.73 \pm 0.10 \pm 0.05$	$0.18 \pm 0.07 \pm 0.05$




FIG. 4. Angular distributions. Histogram: Inclusive  $J/\psi$  MC sample ( $p_{J/\psi}^* > 1.3$  GeV/ $c$ ). Points: Data. The spectra are acceptance-corrected, background-subtracted, and normalized to the estimated yields (Table II). The visible forward-backward discrepancy in the  $\cos\theta_{K^*}$  distribution is due to the  $K\pi$   $S$ -wave amplitude present in the data, and absent in the MC sample. The related systematic uncertainties in the measurements of the decay amplitudes are listed in line seven of Table V.

$$\delta_{\parallel} - \delta_{\perp} = [\pi - (0.60 \pm 0.08 \pm 0.02)]\text{rad}, \quad (27)$$

where the systematic uncertainties have been estimated as in Sec. IV D. The  $\delta_{\parallel} - \delta_{\perp}$  statistical uncertainty agrees with that expected from Table VI line Total, taking into account the +65% correlation between the  $\delta_{\parallel} - \delta_0$  and  $\delta_{\perp} - \delta_0$  parameters. The departure from  $\pi$  is 7.6 standard deviations, and this demonstrates quite clearly the presence of final-state interactions between the  $J/\psi$  and the  $K^*$ .

## V. RESOLVING THE STRONG-PHASE AMBIGUITY

In our earlier publication [19] we presented evidence for the presence of a  $K\pi$   $S$ -wave amplitude in the  $1.1 < m_{K\pi} < 1.3$  GeV/ $c^2$  range. We study this  $S$  wave in more detail here, in particular, its interference with the  $P$  wave in the vicinity of the  $K^*(892)$  resonance. We then use this interference to resolve the strong-phase ambiguity for the  $B \rightarrow J/\psi K^*(892)$  decay amplitudes, using the observations of Sec. I B.

In the following we will denote the two strong-phase solutions obtained in the analysis of Sec. IV based on a purely  $P$ -wave angular distribution, by:

$$\text{Solution I: } (\delta_{\parallel} - \delta_0, \delta_{\perp} - \delta_0) \simeq (2.7, 0.2), \quad (28)$$

$$\text{Solution II: } (\delta_{\parallel} - \delta_0, \delta_{\perp} - \delta_0) \simeq (-2.7, \pi - 0.2). \quad (29)$$

The  $K\pi$  mass requirement mentioned in Sec. III ( $m_{K\pi}$  within 100 MeV/ $c^2$  of the nominal  $K^*(892)$  mass) is now relaxed, and the whole kinematical domain for the  $K\pi$  system from  $B \rightarrow J/\psi K\pi$  decay is used. The  $m_{K\pi}$  spectra are shown in Fig. 5.

### A. Probing the $S$ - $P$ interference

We use the  $K^{\pm}\pi^{\mp}$  sample since it is the largest sample and has the lowest background level. We split this sample




FIG. 5. The background-subtracted  $K\pi$  invariant mass distributions for  $J/\psi K\pi$  candidates in data.

into  $K\pi$  mass intervals so that each interval has approximately the same number of candidates. Equation (9) shows that the presence of both  $K\pi$   $P$ -wave and  $K\pi$   $S$ -wave amplitudes (i.e.  $\lambda \neq 0$  and  $\lambda \neq \pi/2$ ) implies the presence of  $S$ - $P$  interference. Before fitting the data to the distribution of Eq. (9), we check for the presence of such interference effects by evaluating the moments of the angular functions  $f_{8,9,10}$ . The orthogonality of these functions is expressed by

$$\int f_i(\omega)f_j(\omega)d\omega = \delta_{ij}\kappa_i \quad (i = 8, 9, 10; j = 1, \dots, 10), \quad (30)$$

with  $\kappa_8 = \kappa_9 = 3/40\pi$  and  $\kappa_{10} = 3/4\pi$ . The moments are defined by

$$\langle f_i \rangle \equiv \int g_{S+P}(\omega; m_{K\pi}, \mathbf{A}, \lambda) f_i(\omega) d\omega, \quad (31)$$

and are functions of  $m_{K\pi}$ . Using Eq. (31), we obtain for  $i = 8, 9, 10$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2}{\kappa_8} \langle f_8 \rangle &= \sin 2\lambda \cos(\delta_{\parallel} - \delta_S) |A_{\parallel}|, \\ \frac{2}{\kappa_9} \langle f_9 \rangle &= \sin 2\lambda \sin(\delta_{\perp} - \delta_S) |A_{\perp}|, \\ \frac{2}{\kappa_{10}} \langle f_{10} \rangle &= \sin 2\lambda \cos(\delta_S - \delta_0) |A_0|. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

The behavior with  $m_{K\pi}$  of the right side of Eq. (32) terms in data can be displayed by evaluating, in each  $K\pi$  mass interval, the related moments. Their background-subtracted, acceptance-corrected distributions are shown in Fig. 6 for data. They show rapid variation near the position of the  $K^*(892)$ , where the phase of the  $P$ -wave changes most rapidly. Similar distributions obtained from inclusive  $J/\psi$  MC samples, in which no interference between  $S$  and  $P$  waves is simulated, show values of the moments compatible with zero in the corresponding mass range. In addition, the fact that the moments  $\langle f_8 \rangle$ ,  $\langle f_9 \rangle$ ,  $\langle f_{10} \rangle$  show significant deviation from zero in the  $K\pi$  mass region above  $0.8 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  is a clear indication of the presence of an  $S$ -wave  $K\pi$  amplitude in this region, interfering with the  $P$ -wave amplitudes.

We also note that the  $\cos\theta_{K^*}$  forward-backward asymmetry

$$\begin{aligned} A_{FB} &\equiv \frac{N(\cos\theta_{K^*} > 0) - N(\cos\theta_{K^*} < 0)}{N(\cos\theta_{K^*} > 0) + N(\cos\theta_{K^*} < 0)} \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \sin 2\lambda \cos(\delta_S - \delta_0) |A_0| \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

is proportional to  $\langle f_{10} \rangle$  (Eq. (32)). The distribution of  $\langle f_{10} \rangle$  [Fig. 6(c)] has a mean value of  $-0.14 \pm 0.03$  in the  $0.8$ – $1.0 \text{ GeV}/c^2$   $K\pi$  mass range, thus indicating a global  $\cos\theta_{K^*}$  backward trend in the  $K^*(892)$  region, as observed in Fig. 4.




FIG. 6. Measured values of (a)  $\langle f_8 \rangle \cdot 2/\kappa_8$ , (b)  $\langle f_9 \rangle \cdot 2/\kappa_9$  and (c)  $\langle f_{10} \rangle \cdot 2/\kappa_{10}$ , defined in Eq. (32), as a function of  $m_{K\pi}$ , for the  $J/\psi K^\pm \pi^\mp$  candidates in data. The three distributions show a clear variation near the  $K^*(892)$  region.

### B. Fitting for $\delta_S - \delta_0$

The  $S + P$  angular distribution (Eq. (9)) is fit to the data in each  $K\pi$  mass interval of Fig. 6 in order to obtain the values of  $\lambda$  and  $\gamma = \delta_S - \delta_0$ . Separate fits are performed for the two possible strong-phase solutions (Eqs. (28) and (29)). We fix the  $P$ -wave amplitudes to the values obtained previously (Table VI, line Total). The methods for acceptance correction and background subtraction described in Sec. IV are also applied here. Any variation of the acceptance with  $m_{K\pi}$  is neglected.

The fit results for the  $K^\pm \pi^\mp$  channel are shown in Fig. 7. Figure 7(a) shows the  $P$ -wave intensity, namely  $\cos^2 \lambda \cdot n_S$ , and Fig. 7(b) shows the  $S$ -wave intensity. The quantity  $n_S$  is the estimated number of signal events in the given  $m_{K\pi}$  mass interval and is obtained from a fit similar to that in Fig. 3, but with the Gaussian parameters fixed to the values obtained there.

Figure 7(c) shows the phase  $\gamma$  as a function of  $m_{K\pi}$  for the two solutions for the strong phases (Eqs. (28) and (29)). We see that the two solutions show opposite behavior in each mass interval, as they must (see Eq. (10)). The large excursion in the relative phase in passing through the  $K^*(892)$  region supports our assumption that the phases




FIG. 7. (a) The  $P$ -wave intensity times number of events, i.e.,  $n_s \cos^2\lambda$ ; (b) the  $S$ -wave intensity times number of events, i.e.,  $n_s \sin^2\lambda$ . These are the numbers of events that would be observed in each interval for the amplitude under consideration, if it were the only amplitude. The fraction of  $S$ -wave intensity integrated over the range  $0.8 < m_{K\pi} < 1.0 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  is found to be  $(7.3 \pm 1.8)\%$ . (c) The evolution of  $\gamma/\pi$  with  $m_{K\pi}$ , for the two sets of strong phases. The mirror symmetry described by Eq. (10) is clearly visible as  $\gamma \leftrightarrow 2\pi - \gamma$ . The error bars represent the statistical uncertainty in the fit of  $(\lambda, \gamma)$  in the  $m_{K\pi}$  interval considered. All distributions are from fits to  $J/\psi K^\pm \pi^\mp$  candidates in data.

of the decay amplitudes reflect the phases of the simple  $K\pi$  system.

The full points of Fig. 7(c) are obtained with strong phases of ‘‘Solution II’’, for which  $\gamma$  is decreasing in the  $K^*(892)$  region, as required for the physical solution. A conservative estimate of the discrimination between the two solutions is made by fitting for the slope  $d\gamma/dm_{K\pi}$  in the range  $0.8 < m_{K\pi} < 1.0 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ ; we find

$$\text{Solution I: } +16.2 \pm 2.7 \text{ rad}/\text{GeV}/c^2$$

$$\text{Solution II: } -16.2 \pm 2.7 \text{ rad}/\text{GeV}/c^2$$

As they must, these two slopes have opposite values. The two fits have a  $\chi^2$  per degree of freedom of 1.6. Finally, interpreting Solution II as the physical solution, we obtain

the unique result

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\parallel} - \delta_0 &= (-2.73 \pm 0.10 \pm 0.05) \text{ rad}, \\ \delta_{\perp} - \delta_0 &= (+2.96 \pm 0.07 \pm 0.05) \text{ rad}, \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

i.e., the two relative phase values are approximately equal in magnitude but with opposite sign.

It should be noted that this phase solution is not that selected in previous papers, nor in Table VI.

### C. Examining the moments

The values of the moments  $\langle f_8 \rangle$ ,  $\langle f_9 \rangle$ , and  $\langle f_{10} \rangle$  (Eq. (32)) are unchanged under the strong-phase transformation Eq. (10), and, as such, do not allow us to distinguish between Solution I and II; but we show here that their variation, in particular, that of  $\langle f_9 \rangle$ , with  $m_{K\pi}$ , together with the physical requirement that  $d\gamma/dm_{K\pi} < 0$ , allows us to resolve the ambiguity, without relying on the explicit solutions displayed in Fig. 7(c).

Since  $\lambda$  is small and positive,  $\sin 2\lambda > 0$  and from Eq. (32) we can write

$$\frac{d\langle f_8 \rangle}{dm_{K\pi}} \sim +\sin(\delta_{\parallel} - \delta_0 - \gamma) \frac{d\gamma}{dm_{K\pi}}, \quad (35)$$

$$\frac{d\langle f_9 \rangle}{dm_{K\pi}} \sim -\cos(\delta_{\perp} - \delta_0 - \gamma) \frac{d\gamma}{dm_{K\pi}}, \quad (36)$$

$$\frac{d\langle f_{10} \rangle}{dm_{K\pi}} \sim -\sin\gamma \frac{d\gamma}{dm_{K\pi}}. \quad (37)$$

Given that the values for  $\delta_{\parallel}$  and  $\delta_{\perp}$  are close to 0 or  $\pi$  (Eqs. (28) and (29)), we can approximate Eqs. (35) and (36) by

$$\frac{d\langle f_8 \rangle}{dm_{K\pi}} \sim -\cos(\delta_{\parallel} - \delta_0) \sin\gamma \frac{d\gamma}{dm_{K\pi}}, \quad (38)$$

$$\frac{d\langle f_9 \rangle}{dm_{K\pi}} \sim -\cos(\delta_{\perp} - \delta_0) \cos\gamma \frac{d\gamma}{dm_{K\pi}}. \quad (39)$$

On Fig. 6(c) we observe, in the  $K^*(892)$  region, that

$$\langle f_{10} \rangle \sim +\cos\gamma < 0, \quad (40)$$

$$\frac{d\langle f_{10} \rangle}{dm_{K\pi}} \sim -\sin\gamma \frac{d\gamma}{dm_{K\pi}} > 0, \quad (41)$$

meaning that

$$\frac{d\langle f_8 \rangle}{dm_{K\pi}} \text{ has the sign of } \cos(\delta_{\parallel} - \delta_0), \quad (42)$$

$$\frac{d\langle f_9 \rangle}{dm_{K\pi}} \text{ has the sign of } \cos(\delta_{\perp} - \delta_0) \frac{d\gamma}{dm_{K\pi}}. \quad (43)$$

The variation of  $\langle f_8 \rangle$  observed on Fig. 6(a) is compatible

with Eq. (42), whichever strong-phase solution is considered (Eqs. (28) and (29),) and thus cannot distinguish between the physical solution and the nonphysical one. Figure 6(b) shows that  $d\langle f_9 \rangle / dm_{K\pi} > 0$ , meaning that either

$$\cos(\delta_{\perp} - \delta_0) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{d\gamma}{dm_{K\pi}} > 0, \quad (44)$$

$$\cos(\delta_{\perp} - \delta_0) < 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{d\gamma}{dm_{K\pi}} < 0. \quad (45)$$

We note that  $\cos(\delta_{\perp} - \delta_0) > 0$  for Solution I (Eq. (28)), and  $\cos(\delta_{\perp} - \delta_0) < 0$  for Solution II (Eq. (29)). The variation of  $\langle f_9 \rangle$  with  $m_{K\pi}$  provides thus the association of Solution II with the physical requirement  $d\gamma/dm_{K\pi} < 0$ , and of Solution I with the nonphysical case  $d\gamma/dm_{K\pi} > 0$ . This leads to select Solution II as the physical solution, consistently with the previous section.

#### D. Checking the $(K\pi)_{P\text{-wave}}$ lineshape

Figure 8 compares the  $P$ -wave intensity (as already shown in Fig. 7(a)) with a Breit-Wigner lineshape, including a centrifugal barrier factor, using the world average [34] parameter values for  $K^*(892)$ . (The mass resolution is




FIG. 8. (a) Comparison of the  $K^{\pm}\pi^{\mp}$   $P$ -wave intensity with a Breit-Wigner lineshape, including a centrifugal barrier factor, with world average parameters for  $K^*(892)$  [34]. The lineshape is integrated in each mass interval (star markers) and compared with the measured intensity in that interval, after a minimum  $\chi^2$  fit of the overall normalization to the data in the  $0.8 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ – $1.3 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  mass range. The  $\chi^2$  per degree of freedom is 0.86. (b) Pull (i.e. difference of measured and expected intensities, normalized to the uncertainty) in each mass interval.

about  $3 \text{ MeV}/c^2$  and is negligible in its effect.) The overall normalization is fit in the  $0.8$ – $1.3 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  mass range. The  $\chi^2$  per degree of freedom is 0.86. The good agreement observed between the data and the Breit-Wigner lineshape suggests that the final-state interactions observed at the end of Sec. IV E, though statistically significant, are not so great as to distort the lineshape. This is consistent with our hypothesis of small interaction between the  $J/\psi$  meson and the  $K\pi$  system, made at the end of Sec. I B.

#### E. Comparison with $K^- p \rightarrow K^- \pi^+(n)$ scattering results

In Fig. 9 we compare the evolution of  $\gamma$  observed in Fig. 7(c) with that obtained from the LASS measurement of  $K^- p \rightarrow K^- \pi^+(n)$  scattering. The LASS points [39] (based on data from Refs. [22,40]), represented as diamonds, show the phase difference

$$\delta_{S(I=1/2)} - \delta_{P(I=1/2)}$$

as a function of  $m_{K\pi}$ . Only the  $I = 1/2$  amplitude is retained since this is the only one produced by the  $B \rightarrow J/\psi K\pi$  process. The LASS analysis takes into account the  $D$  wave, while the present analysis does not, but the  $D$  wave [ $K_2^*(1430)$ ,  $\Gamma \sim 100 \text{ MeV}$ ] has an effect only at high  $m_{K\pi}$ . An overall shift of  $\pi$  radian is added to the LASS phase difference measurements in order to match the sign




FIG. 9. Comparison of the variation of  $\gamma = \delta_s - \delta_0$  with  $m_{K\pi}$  for the  $J/\psi K^{\pm}\pi^{\mp}$  events, for “Solution I” (open points, Eq. (28)) and “Solution II” (full points, Eq. (29)), with that measured by the LASS experiment [22,39,40] (diamond markers).

of the forward-backward asymmetry observed with the  $B \rightarrow J/\psi K \pi$  events. This shift does not modify the slope and general shape that are of interest here. The shift corresponds merely to changing the relative sign between the  $S$  and  $P$  wave amplitudes. The need for such a global shift is not surprising since the production processes are unrelated. We can see that the agreement between ‘‘Solution II’’ and LASS is striking (Fig. 9).

## VI. MEASUREMENT OF $\cos 2\beta$

To measure  $\cos 2\beta$ , we perform an unbinned maximum likelihood fit to the differential decay rate as a function of proper-time and the three angular variables (Eqs. (11) and (12),) for the  $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^{*0}(K_S^0 \pi^0)$  sample. The amplitude parameters  $|A_0|$ ,  $|A_\perp|$ ,  $|A_\parallel|$ ,  $\delta_\parallel - \delta_0$ , and  $\delta_\perp - \delta_0$  in Eq. (12) are fixed to those obtained by the angular analysis of the three high-statistics flavor-specific  $B \rightarrow J/\psi K^*$  channels, presented in Secs. IV and V. In particular, the strong phases  $\delta_\parallel - \delta_0$  and  $\delta_\perp - \delta_0$  are fixed to ‘‘Solution II’’ (Eq. (29) and (34),), described in Sec. V.

We examine each event with a  $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^{*0}(K_S^0 \pi^0)$  candidate, indicated by  $B_{CP}$ , for evidence that the other neutral  $B$  meson,  $B_{tag}$ , decayed as a  $B^0$  or a  $\bar{B}^0$  (flavor tag, as described below). We also determine the decay proper-time difference  $\Delta t \equiv t_{CP} - t_{tag}$ , which corresponds to the variable  $t$  in Eqs. (11)–(15). To a good approximation  $c \cdot \Delta t = \Delta z / (\gamma_B \cdot \beta \cdot \gamma)$  where  $\Delta z$  is the separation between the  $B_{CP}$  and  $B_{tag}$  vertices along the  $e^+e^-$  collision axis and  $\gamma_B \cdot \beta \cdot \gamma = (p_{e^-} - p_{e^+}) / (2 \cdot m_B)$ .

The background level in the  $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K_S^0 \pi^0$  sample is higher than in the other  $B \rightarrow J/\psi K \pi$  channels. In particular, some  $CP$ -violating backgrounds tend to peak in the signal region ( $m_{ES} > 5.27 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ ), making the  $m_{ES} < 5.27 \text{ GeV}/c^2$  region a poorer representation of the background behavior than in the other  $B \rightarrow J/\psi K \pi$  channels. In contrast with the method used for the angular analysis described above, the  $CP$  analysis is performed by maximizing a likelihood function that contains the PDFs of both the signal and the background. Only events from the signal region are used. Monte Carlo samples are used to determine the angular acceptance, and the background composition and angular dependence, as described in the following Sections.

### A. Background contributions

The inclusive  $J/\psi$  Monte Carlo sample is used to determine the composition of the  $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^{*0}(K_S^0 \pi^0)$  candidate sample. The results are shown in Table VII. Aside from the signal and cross-feed contributions, the dominant contributions are from  $B^0 \rightarrow \chi_{c1} K_S^0$  and  $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^{**}$  decays, where  $K^{**}$  denotes higher-mass  $K^*$  resonances. The angle- and  $\Delta t$ -dependent PDF for each of these backgrounds is described in the next Section.

TABLE VII. Composition of the reconstructed  $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^{*0}(K_S^0 \pi^0)$  candidate sample in the region  $m_{ES} > 5.27 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ . The background fractions are estimated from an inclusive  $J/\psi$  Monte Carlo sample with an equivalent integrated luminosity of  $590 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  with the requirement  $p_{J/\psi}^* > 1.3 \text{ GeV}/c$ . The first uncertainty is statistical; the second is systematic and is based on the uncertainty in the corresponding branching fraction [34] if it is known, and otherwise is based on a 50% uncertainty on the branching fraction used in the Monte Carlo generator.

	Fraction (%)	Effective $CP$
Signal	$83.0 \pm 1.2 \pm 5.7$	
Cross-feed	$3.2 \pm 0.5 \pm 0.3$	0
$B^0 \rightarrow \chi_{c1} K_S^0$	$4.0 \pm 0.6 \pm 1.1$	-1
Higher-mass $K^*$ resonances	$3.5 \pm 0.6 \pm 1.8$	$0 \pm 1$
Nonresonant $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K_S^0 \pi^0$	$2.8 \pm 0.5 \pm 1.4$	$0 \pm 1$
Other $B \rightarrow J/\psi X$	$3.5 \pm 0.6 \pm 1.8$	$0 \pm 1$

### B. Acceptance description

The acceptance and the combinatorial background PDF are described by expansions in terms of products of spherical harmonics. The orthonormal basis functions used are

$$\mathcal{Y}_{LRM}(\omega) \equiv \sqrt{2\pi} Y_{LM}(\theta_\psi, \chi) Y_{RM}(\theta_{K^*}, 0), \quad (46)$$

where  $\theta_\psi, \chi$  are the helicity angles corresponding to the transversity angles  $\theta_{lr}, \phi_{lr}$  [27] and the  $Y_{lm}$  are spherical harmonic functions. These  $\mathcal{Y}_{LRM}$  functions describe the partial waves involved in a ‘‘Scalar  $\rightarrow$  Vector  $X$ ’’ decay, where  $X$  can be of arbitrary spin [14]. A function of  $\omega$ , say  $\epsilon(\omega)$ , is expanded as:

$$\epsilon(\omega) = \sum_{LRM} T_{LRM}^\epsilon \mathcal{Y}_{LRM}(\omega), \quad (47)$$

where the sums over  $L$  and  $R$  run, in principle, from 0 to infinity, and the sum over  $M$  from  $-\min(L, R)$  to  $+\min(L, R)$ .

The moments of the acceptance are estimated from Monte Carlo simulation, with  $N_{gen}$  events generated with PDF  $g$ ,  $N_{obs}$  events being finally selected:

$$\begin{aligned} T_{LRM}^\epsilon &\equiv \int \epsilon(\omega) \mathcal{Y}_{LRM}^*(\omega) d\omega \\ &\approx \frac{1}{N_{gen}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{obs}} \frac{1}{g(\omega_i)} \mathcal{Y}_{LRM}^*(\omega_i). \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

The moments for the background PDFs are computed using the reconstructed events of the MC background sample distributed as  $b(\omega)$ :

$$T_{LRM}^b = \int b(\omega) \mathcal{Y}_{LRM}^*(\omega) d\omega \approx \frac{1}{N_b} \sum_{i=1}^{N_b} \mathcal{Y}_{LRM}^*(\omega_i). \quad (49)$$

We note that the analytical expressions for the background PDF and for the efficiency are not needed to

compute these moments. The expansion is done up to rank  $L = R = 4$  for the acceptance (signal distribution is of rank 2) and up to rank  $L = R = 6$  for the background. These ranks are chosen to be large enough so that no significant deviation of the fitted parameters  $\sin 2\beta$  and  $\cos 2\beta$  is observed in high-statistics Monte Carlo samples when compared to the generated values.

### C. The $B_{flav}$ sample

The fit is additionally performed on a large sample of fully-reconstructed  $B^0$  decays to flavor eigenstates ( $B_{flav}$ ) with decays  $B^0 \rightarrow D^{(*)\pm} h^\mp$ , where  $h = \pi, \rho, a_1$  and  $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^{*0} (K^{*0} \rightarrow K^\pm \pi^\mp)$ . These events are used to measure the parameters of the flavor-tagging algorithm and of the  $\Delta t$ -resolution functions. Flavor tagging performance is shown to be independent of the fully-reconstructed  $B$  meson and the  $\Delta t$  resolution is dominated by the vertex resolution of the incompletely reconstructed tagging  $B$  meson. Thus both tagging and  $\Delta t$  resolution can be studied with these large, well understood samples and the results applied to the channels of interest.

The fully-reconstructed  $B$  meson, i.e.,  $B_{flav}$  or  $B_{CP}$ , is denoted by  $B_{rec}$ .

### D. Flavor tag determination

We use a multivariate technique [3] to determine the flavor of the  $B_{tag}$  meson. Separate neural networks are trained to identify primary leptons, kaons, soft pions from  $D^*$  decays, and high-momentum charged particles from  $B$  decays. Events are assigned to one of five mutually exclusive tagging categories based on the estimated mistag probability and the source of the tagging information: *Lepton*, *Kaon I*, *Kaon II*, *Inclusive* and *Untagged*. The *Untagged* events are not used in this analysis.

We determine the average dilution  $\langle D \rangle$  and dilution difference  $\Delta D$ , defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{D} &\equiv 1 - 2\bar{w}, & D &\equiv 1 - 2w, \\ \langle D \rangle &\equiv \frac{D + \bar{D}}{2}, & \Delta D &\equiv D - \bar{D}, \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

for each tagging category, where  $w(\bar{w})$  is the probability that a flavor tag determination is incorrect when the true tag is a  $B^0(\bar{B}^0)$ . The quality of the tagging is expressed in terms of the effective efficiency  $Q \equiv \sum_k \epsilon_k (1 - 2w_k)^2$ , where  $\epsilon_k$  and  $w_k$  are the efficiencies and mistag probabilities, respectively, for events tagged in category  $k$ . The tagging performance is measured in a large data sample of fully-reconstructed  $B$  decays. The effective tagging efficiency is  $(28.1 \pm 0.7)\%$  [3]. The tagging efficiency asymmetry between  $B^0$  and  $\bar{B}^0$  has been studied [27,41] using the full simulation of the experiment and has been found to be negligible for this analysis.

### E. Determination of $\Delta t$ and $\Delta t$ resolution

The proper-time difference  $\Delta t$  between the decays of the two  $B$  mesons in the event ( $B_{rec}, B_{tag}$ ) is determined from the measured separation along the collision axis,  $\Delta z$ , between the  $B_{rec}$  and the  $B_{tag}$  vertices (Eq. (22) of Ref. [32]). The  $B_{tag}$  decay vertex is obtained by fitting tracks that do not belong to the  $B_{rec}$  candidate, imposing constraints from the  $B_{rec}$  momentum and the beam spot location. The average  $\Delta t$  resolution is approximately 1.1 ps. We require that the measured proper-time difference between the  $B_{rec}$  and the  $B_{tag}$  decays satisfies  $|\Delta t| < 20$  ps and that the estimated uncertainty in  $\Delta t$ ,  $\sigma_{\Delta t}$ , which is derived from the vertex fit for the event, be less than 2.5 ps.

The  $\Delta t$ -resolution function  $\mathcal{R}$  is represented by a sum of three Gaussian distributions (called the core, tail, and outlier components):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(\delta(\Delta t)) &\equiv f_{core} G(\delta(\Delta t); \mu_{core}, \sigma_{core}) \\ &+ f_{tail} G(\delta(\Delta t); \mu_{tail}, \sigma_{tail}) \\ &+ f_{outlier} G(\delta(\Delta t); \mu_{outlier}, \sigma_{outlier}), \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

where  $G$  is the Gaussian function,  $\delta(\Delta t) \equiv \Delta t - \Delta t_{true}$ ,  $\Delta t_{true}$  is the actual decay time difference, and  $f_{core}$ ,  $f_{tail}$ , and  $f_{outlier}$  the fractions of each component.

For the width of the core and tail Gaussians ( $\sigma_{core}$ ,  $\sigma_{tail}$ ), we use the measurement uncertainty  $\sigma_{\Delta t}$  and allow separate scale factors  $S_{core}$  and  $S_{tail}$  to accommodate an overall underestimate ( $S_k > 1$ ) or overestimate ( $S_k < 1$ ) of the uncertainties for all events, so that  $\sigma_{core} = S_{core} \sigma_{\Delta t}$  and  $\sigma_{tail} = S_{tail} \sigma_{\Delta t}$ .

The core and tail Gaussian distributions are allowed to have a nonzero mean ( $\mu_{core}$ ,  $\mu_{tail}$ ) to account for charm decay products possibly included in the  $B_{tag}$  vertex. In the resolution function, these mean offsets are scaled by the event-by-event measurement uncertainty  $\sigma_{\Delta t}$  to account for an observed correlation [32] between the mean of the  $\delta(\Delta t)$  distribution and the measurement uncertainty  $\sigma_{\Delta t}$  in Monte Carlo simulation. For the core we allow different means for each flavor-tagging category. One common mean is used for the tail components. The third Gaussian has a fixed width  $\sigma_{outlier} = 8$ ps and no offset ( $\mu_{outlier} = 0$ ); it accounts for fewer than 1% of events, typically due to incorrectly reconstructed vertices.

### F. Likelihood function

We maximize the log-likelihood given by

$$L_{total} = L_{CP} + L_{flav}, \quad (52)$$

$$\begin{aligned} L_{CP} &= \sum_{tag,c} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{obs}} \ln \{ f_0 b_0 + f_\pm b_\pm \\ &+ [1 - (f_0 + f_\pm)] g_s^{K_s^0 \pi^0, obs} \}, \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

where  $f_0$  and  $f_\pm$  are the fractions of ‘‘neutral’’ and

“charged” background in the  $CP$  sample, and  $b_0$  and  $b_{\pm}$  are the corresponding background PDFs, described below. The signal PDF  $g^{K_S^0\pi^0,obs}$  is

$$\begin{aligned} & g_{\zeta}^{K_S^0\pi^0,obs}(\omega, \Delta t; \mathbf{A}, \sin 2\beta, \cos 2\beta) \\ &= \epsilon(\omega) \frac{\Gamma_0}{2} \mathcal{A}(\omega; \mathbf{A}) \times \left\{ \left[ 1 + \zeta \left( \frac{\Delta D}{2} \right) \right] e_{\mathcal{R}}(\Delta t) \right. \\ &\quad - \zeta \langle D \rangle \left[ c_{\mathcal{R}}(\Delta t) \frac{\mathcal{P}(\omega; \mathbf{A})}{\mathcal{A}(\omega; \mathbf{A})} + s_{\mathcal{R}}(\Delta t) \left( \frac{\mathcal{S}(\omega; \mathbf{A})}{\mathcal{A}(\omega; \mathbf{A})} \sin 2\beta \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \frac{\mathcal{C}(\omega; \mathbf{A})}{\mathcal{A}(\omega; \mathbf{A})} \cos 2\beta \right) \right] \Bigg\} / \left\{ \left[ 1 + \zeta \frac{\Delta D}{2} \right] \sum_{k=1,2,3,5} \mathcal{A}_k \Phi_k \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \zeta \langle D \rangle \frac{1}{1 + x_d^2} \sum_{k=4,6} \mathcal{A}_k \Phi_k \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

where  $\zeta$  labels the flavor of the tagging  $B$  meson ( $\zeta = 1$ ) or  $\bar{B}^0$  meson ( $\zeta = -1$ ), and  $x_d = \Delta m / \Gamma_0$ .  $\mathcal{A}_k$  is defined by Eq. (23), and  $\Phi_k$  is the diagonal part of  $\Phi^b = K_S^0 \pi_k^0$  defined in Eq. (22). Only  $\varepsilon^{b \rightarrow b}$ ,  $b = K_S^0 \pi^0$  (Eq. (22)) is considered because the cross-feed is treated separately here, in the background contribution, as it does not contribute to  $CP$  violation. The  $\Delta t$ -resolution function  $\mathcal{R}$  (Eq. (51)) appears in the following convolutions:

$$\begin{aligned} e_{\mathcal{R}}(\Delta t) &\equiv e^{-\Gamma_0 |\Delta t_{true}|} \otimes \mathcal{R}[\delta(\Delta t)], \\ s_{\mathcal{R}}(\Delta t) &\equiv e^{-\Gamma_0 |\Delta t_{true}|} \sin(\Delta m \Delta t_{true}) \otimes \mathcal{R}[\delta(\Delta t)], \\ c_{\mathcal{R}}(\Delta t) &\equiv e^{-\Gamma_0 |\Delta t_{true}|} \cos(\Delta m \Delta t_{true}) \otimes \mathcal{R}[\delta(\Delta t)]. \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

Most of the background is due to inclusive decays of  $B$  mesons to  $J/\psi$  (see Table III). We account for backgrounds with the following PDFs:

- (i) Backgrounds from neutral- $B$  decays (see Table VII) are parametrized with a form analogous to the one that describes  $J/\psi K_S^0$ , but with an effective  $CP$  eigenvalue,  $\eta_{CP}$ , and angle dependence  $b(\omega)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} b_{0,\zeta}(\Delta t, \omega; \sin 2\beta, \eta_{CP}) &\equiv \frac{\Gamma_0}{2} e^{-\Gamma_0 |\Delta t|} \times \left[ \left( 1 + \zeta \frac{\Delta D}{2} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \zeta \langle D \rangle \eta_{CP} \sin 2\beta \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times \sin(\Delta m \Delta t) \right] b(\omega). \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

For  $B^0 \rightarrow \chi_{c1} K_S^0$  the angular dependence  $b(\omega)$  is estimated with the Monte Carlo, and parametrized using an expansion in  $\mathcal{Y}_{LRM}^*$ . For higher-mass  $K^*$  resonances, nonresonant  $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K_S^0 \pi^0$ , and other  $B \rightarrow J/\psi X$  sources, a flat angular dependence is used.

- (ii) Backgrounds from charged  $B$  decays (see Table VII) are dominantly due to cross-feed from  $B^{\pm} \rightarrow J/\psi K^{*\pm}$ . They have a  $\Delta t$  distribution characterized by the decay rate  $\Gamma_+$ . They are represented by

$$b_{\pm,\zeta}(\Delta t, \omega) \equiv \frac{\Gamma_+}{2} e^{-\Gamma_+ |\Delta t|} \left( 1 + \zeta \frac{\Delta D}{2} \right) b_{\pm}(\omega). \quad (57)$$

The  $B_{flav}$  sample, which is used to determine the tagging features, enters the log-likelihood through the  $L_{flav}$  term (Eq. (52)), which is based on PDFs for “mixed” and “unmixed” events as is appropriate for these neutral  $B$  decays. The background PDFs include a zero-lifetime contribution, a contribution with an effective lifetime, and a contribution with an effective lifetime and an oscillating factor. The signal PDFs are

$$h_{u,\zeta}(\Delta t) \propto \left[ \left( 1 + \zeta \frac{\Delta D}{2} \right) + u \langle D \rangle \cos(\Delta m \Delta t) \right], \quad (58)$$

where  $u = 1$  and  $u = -1$  for unmixed and mixed events, respectively. A complete description of the log-likelihood  $L_{flav}$  term is provided in Ref. [32] (In  $\mathcal{L}_{mix}$  term in Eq. (6) of Ref. [32]).

Finally the free parameters in the fit are (see Table XI)

- (i)  $\sin 2\beta$  and  $\cos 2\beta$  (2 param.),
- (ii) the parameters for the signal  $\Delta t$ -resolution function (8 param.),
- (iii) the tagging parameters for signal (8 param.),
- (iv) the parameters for the background  $B_{flav}$   $\Delta t$  resolution function (3 param.),
- (v) the parameters describing the composition of the background PDF for the  $B_{flav}$  sample (13 param.).

In total there are 34 parameters. We fix  $\Gamma_0$  and  $\Delta m$  to their world average values [34].

## G. Validation

The fitting scheme has been validated using the full simulation and the large parametrized MC samples mentioned above. No statistically significant bias is observed (Table VIII).

As a further cross-check, the data samples for the  $B^{\pm} \rightarrow J/\psi K^{*\pm}$ , channels, which are not expected to show any sizeable  $CP$  violation in the SM, are examined. For these channels, the differential decay rate does not have a  $\sin \Delta m \Delta t$  contribution, so that the coefficients analogous to  $\sin 2\beta$  and  $\cos 2\beta$  should vanish. No significant deviation this expectation is observed (Table IX).

TABLE VIII. Validation on full MC simulation [inclusive  $J/\psi$  MC sample ( $p_{J/\psi}^* > 1.3$  GeV/ $c$ ) and  $B_{flav}$  samples] and large parametrized MC samples. The generated values of  $\sin 2\beta$  and  $\cos 2\beta$  are 0.700 and 0.714, respectively.

$CP$ Sample		$\sin 2\beta$	$\cos 2\beta$
Full MC	(0.6 ab $^{-1}$ )	$0.61 \pm 0.16$	$0.20 \pm 0.32$
Parametrized MC	(16 ab $^{-1}$ )	$0.709 \pm 0.017$	$0.705 \pm 0.036$

TABLE IX. Fit results for the  $B^\pm \rightarrow J/\psi K^{*\pm}$  data control samples.

Sample	$\sin 2\beta$	$\cos 2\beta$
$B^\pm \rightarrow J/\psi(K_S^0 \pi^\pm)$	$0.21 \pm 0.20$	$-0.21 \pm 0.47$
$B^\pm \rightarrow J/\psi(K^\pm \pi^0)$	$0.20 \pm 0.20$	$-0.26 \pm 0.46$

### H. Systematic uncertainties

The contributions to the systematic uncertainty are summarized in Table X. Systematic uncertainties (a)–(j) and (q)–(t) are in common with the  $\sin 2\beta$  analysis [32] and are estimated in the same way. Systematic uncertainties (k)–(p) are specific to this  $J/\psi(K_S^0 \pi^0)$  analysis and are elaborated in the following:

(k) The systematic uncertainty due to imperfect knowledge of the fractions and  $CP$  values of the background sources is obtained by varying the fractions (see Table VII) by 1 standard deviation, if the background

TABLE X. Summary of systematic and statistical uncertainties on  $\sin 2\beta$  and  $\cos 2\beta$ .

Source	$\sin 2\beta$	$\cos 2\beta$
Signal Properties		
(a) $\Delta t$ -resolution function	$\pm 0.002$	$\pm 0.002$
(b) signal dilution $B_{CP}$ vs $B_{flav}$	$\pm 0.012$	$\pm 0.013$
(c) Gaussian model for <i>outliers</i>	$\pm 0.001$	$\pm 0.000$
(d) $f_{tail}$ parameter	$\pm 0.002$	$\pm 0.003$
(e) resolution/tagging correlation	$\pm 0.001$	$\pm 0.001$
(f) SVT alignment	$\pm 0.010$	$\pm 0.030$
Background properties: $B_{flav}$		
(g) signal probability	$\pm 0.001$	$\pm 0.001$
(h) ARGUS $m_0$ parameter	$\pm 0.002$	$\pm 0.010$
(i) oscillating contribution	$\pm 0.001$	$\pm 0.022$
(j) $\delta_{peak}$ contribution	$\pm 0.001$	$\pm 0.003$
$J/\psi(K_S^0 \pi^0)$ specific		
(k) background fraction and $CP$ parity	$\pm 0.032$	$\pm 0.142$
(m) background dilutions	$\pm 0.002$	$\pm 0.006$
(n) amplitude uncertainties	$\pm 0.016$	$\pm 0.154$
(o) statistics used for moments	$\pm 0.030$	$\pm 0.030$
(p) angular background distribution	$\pm 0.024$	$\pm 0.064$
External parameters		
(q) $z$ scale and “ <i>boost</i> ”	$\pm 0.001$	$\pm 0.001$
(r) beam spot	$\pm 0.010$	$\pm 0.040$
(s) $B^0$ lifetime	$\pm 0.014$	$\pm 0.040$
(t) $\Delta m$	$\pm 0.018$	$\pm 0.032$
Monte Carlo		
(u) Monte Carlo statistics	$\pm 0.130$	$\pm 0.140$
Total systematic uncertainty	$\pm 0.14$	$\pm 0.27$
Statistical uncertainty	$\pm 0.57$	$^{+0.76}_{-0.96}$

is measured, or by 50% of the branching fraction used in the Monte Carlo otherwise. The effective  $CP$  values (see Table VII) of unmeasured background is set to  $-1$  and then to  $+1$  to evaluate the effect on the measured parameters.

- (m) Backgrounds are assumed to have the same dilutions as the signal. To evaluate the related uncertainty, the dilutions obtained from the  $B^\pm$  sample are used and the difference in the results is taken as the systematic uncertainty.
- (n) Random sets of amplitude moduli and strong phases are generated, according to a multi-Gaussian distribution, based on the covariance matrix obtained in the fit for the amplitudes and on the systematic uncertainties in the amplitudes. These amplitudes are used in place of the nominal amplitudes to evaluate the variation in the  $CP$  parameters. This procedure incorporates the uncertainties in the  $S$ -wave amplitude as well. The systematic uncertainty obtained in  $\cos 2\beta$  is among the leading ones. To first order, this uncertainty is given by the product of the uncertainty in  $C(\omega, A)$  ( $\sim 5\%$ ) due to the uncertainty in the amplitudes, and the  $\cos 2\beta$  fitted value ( $\sim 3$ ), because of the multiplicative contribution  $C(\omega, A) \cos 2\beta$  in Eq. (54).
- (o) The limited size of the Monte Carlo sample induces an uncertainty in the moments used to determine the acceptance and the background distribution. This is evaluated by splitting the Monte Carlo into ten samples, leading to ten  $CP$  measurements, and taking as an estimate of the uncertainty the RMS divided by  $\sqrt{10}$ .
- (p) A flat angular distribution has been assumed for some of the background components (Sec. VIF). We estimate the magnitude of the related bias by computing the background moments from low- $m_{ES}$  events.

### I. Results

The results of the fit are given in Table XI. Figure 10 shows the contour plots in the  $\cos 2\beta$ ,  $\sin 2\beta$  plane. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \cos 2\beta &= +3.32^{+0.76}_{-0.96}(\text{stat}) \pm 0.27(\text{syst}), \\ \sin 2\beta &= -0.10 \pm 0.57(\text{stat}) \pm 0.14(\text{syst}). \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

The quality of the fit is estimated by generating 2000 experiments using the parametrized MC, and with the same sample size that is observed for the data. The probability to obtain a likelihood lower than that obtained from the data is found to be  $(22 \pm 1)\%$ .

When  $\sin 2\beta$  is fixed to the value measured in  $B$  decays to  $J/\psi K_S^0$  and related modes (this is justified in Sec. VIK),

TABLE XI. Global  $CP$  fit of the  $J/\psi K^{*0}(K_S^0\pi^0)$  events together with the  $B_{flav}$  sample. The transversity amplitudes used are those measured in the angular analysis. The  $\cos 2\beta$  value shown is the one corresponding to ‘‘Solution II’’ for the strong phases. The  $b$ ’s are the coefficients of the linear dependence of the  $\Delta t$  offset on  $\Delta t$  uncertainty:  $\langle \Delta t \rangle = b \times \sigma_{\Delta t}$ . Correlations smaller than 1% are not reported.

Parameter	Value	Correlation with $\sin 2\beta$	Correlation with $\cos 2\beta$
$\sin 2\beta$	$-0.10 \pm 0.57$	+1.00	-0.37
$\cos 2\beta$	$3.32^{+0.76}_{-0.96}$	-0.37	+1.00
Signal resolution function			
$S_{core}$	$-1.093 \pm 0.048$	-0.02	+0.03
$S_{tail}$	3.0 (fixed)		
$b_{core}$ Lepton	$-0.012 \pm 0.063$	+0.02	-0.01
$b_{core}$ Kaon I	$-0.226 \pm 0.052$	+0.01	-0.05
$b_{core}$ Kaon II	$-0.248 \pm 0.046$	+0.01	-0.02
$b_{core}$ Inclusive	$-0.212 \pm 0.047$	+0.02	-0.02
$b_{tail}$	$-1.010 \pm 0.290$	-0.02	+0.03
$f_{tail}$	$-0.109 \pm 0.020$	+0.02	-0.03
$f_{out}$	$-0.002 \pm 0.001$	...	+0.01
Signal dilutions			
$\langle D \rangle$ , Lepton	$-0.933 \pm 0.013$	...	...
$\langle D \rangle$ , Kaon I	$-0.799 \pm 0.014$	-0.01	+0.05
$\langle D \rangle$ , Kaon II	$-0.582 \pm 0.016$	...	-0.01
$\langle D \rangle$ , Inclusive	$-0.368 \pm 0.017$	+0.01	+0.02
$\Delta D$ , Lepton	$-0.031 \pm 0.022$	...	...
$\Delta D$ , Kaon I	$-0.023 \pm 0.022$	-0.01	+0.04
$\Delta D$ , Kaon II	$-0.090 \pm 0.024$	-0.01	...
$\Delta D$ , Inclusive	$-0.050 \pm 0.026$	...	...
Background properties ( $B_{flav}$ )			
$\tau$ [ps]	$-1.335 \pm 0.064$	...	...
$f(\tau = 0)$ Lepton	$-0.290 \pm 0.170$	...	...
$f(\tau = 0)$ Kaon I	$-0.631 \pm 0.027$	...	...
$f(\tau = 0)$ Kaon II	$-0.659 \pm 0.024$	...	...
$f(\tau = 0)$ Inclusive	$-0.684 \pm 0.023$	...	...
$S_{core}$	$-1.398 \pm 0.019$	...	...
$b_{core}$	$-0.043 \pm 0.013$	...	...
$f_{out}$	$-0.015 \pm 0.002$	...	...
Background dilutions			
$\langle D \rangle$ , Lepton, $\tau = 0$	$-1.360 \pm 0.690$	...	...
$\langle D \rangle$ , Kaon I, $\tau = 0$	$-0.648 \pm 0.030$	...	...
$\langle D \rangle$ , Kaon II, $\tau = 0$	$-0.393 \pm 0.023$	...	...
$\langle D \rangle$ , Inclusive, $\tau = 0$	$-0.158 \pm 0.024$	...	...
$\langle D \rangle$ , Lepton, $\tau > 0$	$-0.170 \pm 0.110$	...	...
$\langle D \rangle$ , Kaon I, $\tau > 0$	$-0.251 \pm 0.048$	...	...
$\langle D \rangle$ , Kaon II, $\tau > 0$	$-0.278 \pm 0.042$	...	...
$\langle D \rangle$ , Inclusive, $\tau > 0$	$-0.031 \pm 0.046$	...	...

$\sin 2\beta = \sin 2\beta_0 \equiv 0.731$  [4], we find

$$\cos 2\beta = +2.72^{+0.50}_{-0.79}(\text{stat}) \pm 0.27(\text{syst}). \quad (60)$$

### J. Graphical representation

The distribution of the time difference  $\Delta t$  is shown in Figs. 11(a) and 11(b), and the time-dependent asymme-

try is shown in Fig. 11(c). Note that in the case of perfect acceptance this asymmetry is not sensitive to  $\cos 2\beta$  [27].

A graphical representation of the sensitivity of the data to  $\cos 2\beta$  is obtained from the time dependence of the moment of  $C$ . Since  $C$  is orthogonal to both  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $S$ , we obtain, using Eq. (13)




FIG. 10 (color online). Contour plots in the  $\cos 2\beta$ ,  $\sin 2\beta$  plane. The triangle denotes the result of the fit. The error bars show the statistical uncertainty and the quadratic sum of the statistical and systematic uncertainties. The star denotes the result of the fit with  $\sin 2\beta$  fixed at  $\sin 2\beta = 0.731$  [4]. The value of  $\sin 2\beta$  of Ref. [4] and its uncertainties are represented as dashed horizontal lines. The  $n\sigma$  ( $n = 1, 2, 3$ ) contour corresponds to a decrease of  $0.5n^2$  in the log-likelihood with respect to the maximum value. The unit circle ( $\cos^2 2\beta + \sin^2 2\beta = 1$ ) on which the true values must lie is also shown.




FIG. 11. The distribution of  $\Delta t$  for events in the signal region, for (a)  $B^0$  and (b)  $\bar{B}^0$  tags with the fit result (full curve) overlaid. In (c) we show the raw asymmetry in the number of  $B^0$  and  $\bar{B}^0$  tags in the signal region,  $(N_{B^0} - N_{\bar{B}^0}) / (N_{B^0} + N_{\bar{B}^0})$ , for data, with the fit result (full curve) overlaid. Note that above distributions are not sensitive to  $\cos 2\beta$  since this dependence vanishes when integrated over the angular variables.

$$\begin{aligned} \langle C \rangle_{\pm}(\Delta t) &\equiv \int g_{\pm}(\omega, \Delta t; A, \sin 2\beta, \cos 2\beta) C(\omega; A) d\omega \\ &= \pm \frac{\Gamma_0}{2} e^{-\Gamma_0 |\Delta t|} \\ &\quad \times \left\{ \cos(\Delta m \Delta t) \int \mathcal{P}(\omega; A) C(\omega; A) d\omega \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sin(\Delta m \Delta t) \cos 2\beta \int C^2(\omega; A) d\omega \right\}. \quad (61) \end{aligned}$$

We see that the magnitude of the  $\sin(\Delta m \Delta t)$  oscillation is proportional to  $\cos 2\beta$ . The introduction of the angular acceptance  $\epsilon(\omega)$  in principle breaks the above orthogonality, causing  $\int \mathcal{A} C \epsilon d\omega$  and  $\int S C \epsilon d\omega$  terms to appear in the  $\langle C \rangle_{\pm}(\Delta t)$  expression, in addition to the  $\int \mathcal{P} C \epsilon d\omega$  and  $\int C^2 \epsilon d\omega$  terms. These quantities are estimated using Monte Carlo and are found to be at the percent level of  $\int C^2 \epsilon d\omega$  for  $\int \mathcal{A} C \epsilon d\omega$  and  $\int S C \epsilon d\omega$ , and 14% of  $\int C^2 \epsilon d\omega$  for  $\int \mathcal{P} C \epsilon d\omega$ .

Figure 12 shows the moment of  $C$  as a function of  $\Delta t$ , overlaid with a function obtained from Eq. (61) that takes the acceptance into account.

### K. Confidence level for positive $\cos 2\beta$ solution

The value  $\sin 2\beta = 0.731 \pm 0.056$  [4] measured in the charmonium- $K^0$  channel is in good agreement with expectations from the measurements of the sides of the Unitarity Triangle if the choice  $\beta \approx 0.41 \equiv \beta_0$  is made. However, the alternative solutions  $\beta \approx \pi/2 - 0.41, 0.41 + \pi$ , and  $3\pi/2 - 0.41$  could turn out to be correct if there is a significant contribution from outside the Standard-Model. The  $B$  decays to charmonium- $K^{0(*)}$  share the same quark-level diagram. The  $\sin 2\beta$  value that would be inferred from




FIG. 12. The moment of  $C$  as a function of  $\Delta t$ . The overlaid curve corresponds to the fit results (Table XI). The dashed curve corresponds to  $\cos 2\beta = +\sqrt{1 - \sin^2 2\beta_0} = +0.68$  [4], the dotted one to the nonstandard solution  $\cos 2\beta = -0.68$ .

a high-statistics measurement of the  $J/\psi K^*$  channel would thus conform to the measurement of Ref. [4]. We therefore constrain  $\sin 2\beta$  to  $\sin 2\beta_0$ . The systematic uncertainty on  $\beta$ , induced by the uncertainty in  $\sin 2\beta$ , ( $\pm 0.056$ ) [4] is  $\pm 0.043$ , which is negligible here.

We define  $\cos 2\beta_0 \equiv +\sqrt{1 - \sin^2 2\beta_0} \approx +0.68$ . In the following, we estimate the confidence level at which the  $-\cos 2\beta_0$  hypothesis (this corresponds to the possibilities  $\beta \approx \pi/2 - 0.41, 3\pi/2 - 0.41$ ) can be excluded against the  $+\cos 2\beta_0$  solution ( $\beta \approx 0.41, 0.41 + \pi$ ).

### 1. Assuming Gaussian statistics

Figure 13 shows the variation of the likelihood as a function of  $\cos 2\beta$ . In the case of fixed  $\sin 2\beta$ , the optimum is obtained at  $\cos 2\beta = +2.72$ ,  $2.2\sigma$  from  $+\cos 2\beta_0$  and  $3.5\sigma$  from  $-\cos 2\beta_0$ . For a Gaussian distribution, the probabilities to observe values  $2.2$  and  $3.5\sigma$  from the mean value are, respectively,  $3.25\%$  and  $0.08\%$ . In a Bayesian approach, assuming equal *a priori* probabilities for the  $\pm \cos 2\beta_0$  hypotheses, the probability that the




FIG. 13 (color online). The negative logarithm of the likelihood as a function of  $\cos 2\beta$ . Continuous line:  $\sin 2\beta$  is a free parameter. Dashed line:  $\sin 2\beta$  is fixed at  $\sin 2\beta_0 = 0.731$  [4].

$+\cos 2\beta_0$  choice is wrong would be  $0.08/(3.25 + 0.08) = 2.4\%$ .

### 2. Using the distribution of $\cos 2\beta$ values obtained from simulated experiments

To take into account the nonparabolic shape of the log-likelihood as a function of  $\cos 2\beta$ ,  $\cos 2\beta$  values are measured with 2000 simulated samples, each the same size as the data sample (104 events) (Fig. 14). For the  $+\cos 2\beta_0$  hypothesis, the distribution  $dN^+/d\cos 2\beta$  of  $\cos 2\beta$  values is that shown in Fig. 14(c). An unbinned likelihood fit is performed to the sample of the 2000  $\cos 2\beta$  values, with a sum of two Gaussian functions,  $h(\cos 2\beta)$ . The fit result is shown in Fig. 15(a) (where  $h(\cos 2\beta)$  is scaled by 100, i.e., 2000 times the bin size).

The distribution  $dN^-/d\cos 2\beta$  is obtained by the transformation  $\cos 2\beta \rightarrow -\cos 2\beta$ ; i.e., we have

$$\frac{dN^+}{d\cos 2\beta}(\cos 2\beta) = \frac{dN^-}{d\cos 2\beta}(-\cos 2\beta).$$

In a frequentist approach, we consider the probability that a result would disfavor, by at least as much as ours, the  $-\cos 2\beta_0$  hypothesis against the  $+\cos 2\beta_0$  one, by computing the probability to observe a ratio  $r(\cos 2\beta) \equiv \frac{dN^-}{d\cos 2\beta}(\cos 2\beta) / \frac{dN^+}{d\cos 2\beta}(\cos 2\beta)$  smaller than or equal to the one we obtain,  $r(+2.72)$  [42]. Because this ratio  $r(\cos 2\beta)$  has a monotonic decreasing behavior with  $\cos 2\beta$ , the probability to obtain  $r(\cos 2\beta) \leq r(+2.72)$ , if the true




FIG. 14. The distribution of the values of  $\cos 2\beta$  ((a) and (c)), and of the statistical uncertainties ((b) and (d)), obtained in 2000 simulated experiments, each based on a sample of the same size as the data; i.e., 104 events. These are taken from the parameterized MC sample mentioned above, with the generated  $\cos 2\beta$  value  $+0.68$ . In (a) and (b)  $\sin 2\beta$  is also free in the fit. In (c) and (d)  $\sin 2\beta$  is fixed to the world average. The vertical arrows show the positions of the values obtained from the data.




FIG. 15. (a) The  $\cos 2\beta$  distribution for 2000 simulated experiments of the same size as the data sample, where the generated values for  $\sin 2\beta$  and  $\cos 2\beta$  are  $+0.731$  and  $+0.68$ , respectively, [same as Fig. 14(c)]. An unbinned likelihood fit is performed to this distribution, using the sum of two Gaussian functions. The fit result is shown on the plot (full line) with the individual Gaussian contributions (dashed lines). The long vertical arrows show the  $\cos 2\beta$  values  $\pm 2.72$ . The small arrows indicate the extent of systematic uncertainties. (b) and (c) zoom on the  $\cos 2\beta = \pm 2.72$  regions of Fig. 15(a). The densities of points at  $+2.72$  and  $-2.72$  are used to discriminate between the  $\cos 2\beta = \pm \sqrt{1 - \sin^2 2\beta_0} = \pm 0.68$  hypotheses, as explained in the text.

$\cos 2\beta$  value is indeed  $-\cos 2\beta_0$ , is

$$\alpha \equiv \int_{+2.72}^{+\infty} \frac{dN^-}{d\cos 2\beta}(\cos 2\beta) d\cos 2\beta = 0.6\%, \quad (62)$$

leading to the confidence level at which the  $-\cos 2\beta_0$  hypothesis is excluded:

$$CL^{\text{Freq.}}(-\cos 2\beta_0 \text{ excluded}) \equiv 1 - \alpha = 99.4\%. \quad (63)$$

If we ask how likely it is to obtain a result in the above  $(+2.72, +\infty)$  range, if the true value of  $\cos 2\beta$  is  $+\cos 2\beta_0$ , we find:

$$\int_{+2.72}^{+\infty} \frac{dN^+}{d\cos 2\beta}(\cos 2\beta) d\cos 2\beta = 5.7\%. \quad (64)$$

In a frequentist interpretation, a high value for this last quantity would have indicated, together with the high  $CL^{\text{Freq.}}(-\cos 2\beta_0 \text{ excluded})$  value obtained, that the  $(+2.72, +\infty)$  domain would have allowed a sharp distinction between the two  $\pm \cos 2\beta_0$  hypotheses. The rather low value observed here (5.7%) expresses that, at the present

level of statistics, the discrimination between the  $\pm \cos 2\beta_0$  hypotheses is rather modest. We can conclude however that our result would be somewhat more improbable (0.6%) if the true value of  $\cos 2\beta$  were  $-\cos 2\beta_0$  than it would be (5.7%) if the true value were  $+\cos 2\beta_0$ .

In a Bayesian approach, assuming that the two  $\pm \cos 2\beta_0$  hypotheses have *a priori* equal probabilities, the confidence level at which the  $-\cos 2\beta_0$  solution is excluded,  $CL(-\cos 2\beta_0 \text{ excluded})$ , is obtained from  $\frac{dN^+}{d\cos 2\beta}(+2.72)$  and  $\frac{dN^-}{d\cos 2\beta}(+2.72)$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} CL(-\cos 2\beta_0 \text{ excluded}) &= \frac{h(+2.72)}{h(+2.72) + h(-2.72)} \\ &= \frac{6.64 \pm 0.38}{(6.64 \pm 0.38) + (0.86 \pm 0.15)} \\ &= (88.6 \pm 2.0)\%. \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

The probability to select incorrectly the  $+\cos 2\beta_0$  solution is significantly larger than for the previous Bayesian estimate based on Gaussian statistics (Sec. VI K1). The uncertainty in Eq. (65) comes from the statistical uncertainties on  $h(+2.72)$ ,  $h(-2.72)$  (limited by the 2000 simulated experiments used), and their correlation ( $-6\%$ ). The systematic effects on the  $\cos 2\beta$  measurement contribute to a  $\pm 0.4\%$  variation of  $CL(-\cos 2\beta_0 \text{ excluded})$  and are included in quadrature in the above uncertainty. We include a  $-1\sigma$  safety margin on  $CL(-\cos 2\beta_0 \text{ excluded})$ , and thus report

$$CL(-\cos 2\beta_0 \text{ excluded}) = 86.6\%. \quad (66)$$

## VII. CONCLUSION

We measure the transversity amplitudes of the decay to flavor eigenstates,  $B \rightarrow J/\psi K^{*0}(K^\pm \pi^\mp)$  and  $B \rightarrow J/\psi K^{*\pm}(K^\pm \pi^0 \text{ and } K_S^0 \pi^\pm)$ , with improved precision with respect to existing measurements. We determine

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\parallel} - \delta_0 &= (-2.73 \pm 0.10 \pm 0.05) \text{ rad}, \\ \delta_{\perp} - \delta_0 &= (+2.96 \pm 0.07 \pm 0.05) \text{ rad}, \\ |A_0|^2 &= 0.566 \pm 0.012 \pm 0.005, \\ |A_{\parallel}|^2 &= 0.204 \pm 0.015 \pm 0.005, \\ |A_{\perp}|^2 &= 0.230 \pm 0.015 \pm 0.004, \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

and

$$\delta_{\parallel} - \delta_{\perp} = (0.60 \pm 0.08 \pm 0.02) \text{ rad}. \quad (68)$$

We observe the presence of a significant *S*-wave amplitude interfering with the *P*-wave amplitude in the region of the  $K^*(892)$ . Using a novel method based on the dependence on the  $K\pi$  invariant mass of the interference between the *S*- and *P*-waves, we resolve the ambiguity in the

TABLE XII. Helicity-amplitude moduli and phases for  $H_+$  and  $H_-$  obtained from the measured transversity amplitudes (Eq. (67)) using Eq. (69). The corresponding configuration is shown in Fig. 16. The uncertainties are statistical only.

$ H_+ ^2$	$ H_- ^2$	$\delta_+$ (rad)	$\delta_-$ (rad)
$0.396 \pm 0.015$	$0.0379 \pm 0.009$	$-3.04 \pm 0.08$	$-1.36 \pm 0.12$

determination of the strong phases involved in  $B$  decays to  $J/\psi K^*$  (892).

The values obtained for  $|A_{\parallel}|^2$  and  $|A_{\perp}|^2$  are consistent with being equal. The additional unambiguous determination of the phases relative to that of  $A_0$  indicates that they have similar size but opposite sign, with a difference,  $\delta_{\parallel} - \delta_{\perp}$ , of  $34 \pm 5$  degrees. Using the relations between the helicity amplitudes and the transversity amplitudes,

$$\begin{aligned} H_{+1} &\equiv (A_{\parallel} + A_{\perp})/\sqrt{2} \equiv |H_+|e^{i\delta_+}, \\ H_{-1} &\equiv (A_{\parallel} - A_{\perp})/\sqrt{2} \equiv |H_-|e^{i\delta_-}, \quad H_0 \equiv A_0, \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

we obtain the moduli and phases given in Table XII. This determines the hierarchy of the helicity amplitudes in the decay to be  $|H_0|:|H_{+1}|:|H_{-1}| \sim 0.75:0.63:0.19$ . The corresponding configurations of the helicity and transversity amplitudes in the complex plane are illustrated in Fig. 16.

We confirm the presence of nonzero relative strong phases, with the difference between the phases of  $A_0$  and  $A_{\parallel}$  deviating from  $\pi$  with a significance of  $3.6\sigma$ , and the phase difference between the two transverse amplitudes being  $7.6\sigma$  from zero.

Treating  $\sin 2\beta$  and  $\cos 2\beta$  as independent quantities in the fit to the data, we obtain  $\cos 2\beta = +3.32^{+0.76}_{-0.96}(\text{stat}) \pm$




FIG. 16. Representation in the complex plane of the measured transversity amplitudes ( $A_0, A_{\parallel}, A_{\perp}$ ) (Eq. (67)) and the equivalent helicity amplitudes ( $H_0, H_{-1}, H_{+1}$ ) obtained using Eq. (69). The values for  $H_+$  and  $H_-$  are quoted in Table XII.

$0.27(\text{syst})$ . When  $\sin 2\beta$  is fixed to the value measured in the charmonium- $K^0$  modes,  $\sin 2\beta = 0.731$  [4], we find

$$\cos 2\beta = +2.72^{+0.50}_{-0.79} \pm 0.27. \quad (70)$$

The sign of  $\cos 2\beta$  is found to be positive at the 86% C.L. This is compatible with the sign inferred from the Standard-Model-based fits of the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa triangle, thus limiting the possible presence of unknown physics beyond the Standard Model.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful for the extraordinary contributions of our PEP-II colleagues in achieving the excellent luminosity and machine conditions that have made this work possible. The success of this project also relies critically on the expertise and dedication of the computing organizations that support *BABAR*. The collaborating institutions wish to thank SLAC for its support and the kind hospitality extended to them. This work is supported by the U.S. Department of Energy and National Science Foundation, the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (Canada), Institute of High Energy Physics (China), the Commissariat à l'Énergie Atomique and Institut National de Physique Nucléaire et de Physique des Particules (France), the Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung and Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (Germany), the Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare (Italy), the Foundation for Fundamental Research on Matter (The Netherlands), the Research Council of Norway, the Ministry of Science and Technology of the Russian Federation, and the Particle Physics and Astronomy Research Council (United Kingdom). Individuals have received support from CONACyT (Mexico), the A.P. Sloan Foundation, the Research Corporation, and the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation.

## APPENDIX A: UNCERTAINTIES WITH A PSEUDO-LOG-LIKELIHOOD, AND VALIDATIONS

In the angular analysis, the background correction is performed using a pseudo-log-likelihood  $L'$ , defined in Eq. (26). As  $L'$  is not a log-likelihood, the uncertainties yielded by the minimization program (MINUIT) [38] that is used are incorrect estimates of the actual uncertainties. The correct estimate is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}[A] &= \text{Cov}^H[A] \left( 1 + \left\{ n_B (1+k) \int b(\omega) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \times \left( \frac{\vec{\nabla} g^{b,obs}(\omega)}{g^{b,obs}(\omega)} \right)^2 d\omega + N_B^2 \sigma_k^2 \left[ \int b(\omega) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \times \frac{\vec{\nabla} g^{b,obs}(\omega)}{g^{b,obs}(\omega)} d\omega \right]^2 \right\} \text{Cov}^H[A] \right), \end{aligned} \quad (A1)$$

where

- (i)  $\mathbf{Cov}^H[A]$  is the covariance matrix of  $A$  at the maximum of  $L'$ , estimated by the HESSE routine of MINUIT[38] after the fit has converged.
- (ii) In the expressions for the bilinear forms  $\int b(\omega)[\vec{\nabla}g^{b,obs}(\omega)/g^{b,obs}(\omega)]^2 d\omega$  and  $[\int b(\omega)\vec{\nabla}g^{b,obs}(\omega)/g^{b,obs}(\omega)d\omega]^2$ ,  $\vec{\nabla}$  denotes the gradient, i.e., differentiation with respect to the fit parameters  $A$ . The “square” is not to be understood as a “scalar product”, but as a “direct product”, i.e.  $\vec{v}^2 = \vec{v}^\dagger \vec{v}$ , so that the resulting quantity is a square matrix.
- (iii)  $g^{b,obs}(\omega)$  and  $b(\omega)$  are the PDFs for the signal and the background. Note that in practice the knowledge of the PDF of the background is not needed for the computation of Eq. (A1) because for any function  $h(\omega)$ ,  $\int b(\omega)h(\omega)d\omega$  is estimated by the average of  $h$  over the  $m_{ES}$  sideband background sample:

$$\int b(\omega)h(\omega)d\omega \approx \frac{1}{N_B} \sum_{i=1}^{N_B} h(\omega_i). \quad (\text{A2})$$

- (iv)  $k$  is the scaling parameter  $k = \tilde{n}_B/N_B$ , and  $\sigma_k$  is its uncertainty.

The estimated number of background events in the signal region  $\tilde{n}_B$  is obtained from an ARGUS plus Gaussian fit to the  $m_{ES}$  spectrum.

The validation of the pseudo-log-likelihood method (i.e., the unbiased nature of the fit parameters, which is not shown here, and of their uncertainties) comes from MC-based studies. We have simulated  $10^3$  experiments with  $10^4$  events each [35], using a signal PDF with  $\theta_A = \phi_A = \delta_{\parallel} = \delta_{\perp} = 1$  rad (as defined in Eq. (5)).

We study the behavior of the fit for various values of the purity, adding the appropriate number of background events. A variety of background shapes have been used. Figure 17 presents results using an ARGUS




FIG. 17. Root mean square (RMS) of the pull distributions as a function of signal purity (defined in the  $5.2 \text{ GeV}/c^2 - 5.3 \text{ GeV}/c^2 m_{ES}$  range), for the fitted parameters  $\theta_A$ ,  $\phi_A$ ,  $\delta_{\parallel}$ , and  $\delta_{\perp}$ . Open symbols denote the RMS of the pulls computed with the uncertainties taken directly from MINUIT. Closed symbols denote the uncertainties computed according to Eq. (A1).

$m_{ES}$  distribution with an angular distribution of  $a + b\cos^2(\theta_{K^*}) + c\cos^4(\theta_{K^*})$ <sup>4</sup>.

Figure 17 shows the results from the Monte Carlo study. As the purity decreases, the MINUIT-reported uncertainties diverge more and more from the actual spread in the results. The uncertainties calculated from Eq. (A1) correctly predict the behavior of the spread, even at low purity.

<sup>4</sup>More precisely:  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{8\pi}} \mathcal{Y}_{000} + \frac{1}{15} \mathcal{Y}_{040}$ .

- [1] M. Kobayashi and T. Maskawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. **49**, 652 (1973).
- [2] Belle Collaboration, K. Abe *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 071102 (2002).
- [3] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 201802 (2002).
- [4] Particle Data Group, S. Eidelman *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **592**, 1 (2004).
- [5] M. Gronau and D. London, Phys. Rev. D **55**, 2845 (1997).
- [6] B. Kayser and D. London, Phys. Rev. D **61**, 116012 (2000).
- [7] R. Fleischer, G. Isidori, and J. Matias, J. High Energy Phys. 05 (2003) 053.
- [8] Y.I. Azimov, Phys. Rev. D **42**, 3705 (1990).
- [9] Y. Grossman and H.R. Quinn, Phys. Rev. D **56**, 7259 (1997).
- [10] J. Charles, A. Le Yaouanc, L. Oliver, O. Pene, and J.C. Raynal, Phys. Lett. B **425**, 375 (1998); **433**, 441E (1998).
- [11] T.E. Browder, A. Datta, P.J. O'Donnell, and S. Pakvasa, Phys. Rev. D **61**, 054009 (2000).
- [12] H.R. Quinn, T. Schietinger, J.P. Silva, and A.E. Snyder, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 5284 (2000).
- [13] I. Dunietz, R. Fleischer, and U. Nierste, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 114015 (2001).
- [14] I. Dunietz, H.R. Quinn, A. Snyder, W. Toki, and H.J. Lipkin, Phys. Rev. D **43**, 2193 (1991).

- [15] J. Charles, A. Le Yaouanc, L. Oliver, O. Pene, and J.C. Raynal, Phys. Rev. D **58**, 114021 (1998).
- [16] A. S. Dighe, I. Dunietz, and R. Fleischer, Eur. Phys. J. C **6**, 647 (1999).
- [17] C. W. Chiang, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 014017 (2000).
- [18] A. S. Dighe, I. Dunietz, and R. Fleischer, Phys. Lett. B **433**, 147 (1998).
- [19] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 241801 (2001).
- [20] C. W. Chiang and L. Wolfenstein, Phys. Rev. D **61**, 074031 (2000).
- [21] M. Suzuki, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 117503 (2001).
- [22] E-135 Collaboration, (LASS), D. Aston *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **B296**, 493 (1988).
- [23] CLEO Collaboration, C. P. Jessop *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 4533 (1997).
- [24] CDF Collaboration, T. Affolder *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 4668 (2000).
- [25] Belle Collaboration, K. Abe *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **538**, 11 (2002).
- [26] A. S. Dighe, I. Dunietz, H.J. Lipkin, and J.L. Rosner, Phys. Lett. B **369**, 144 (1996)
- [27] Stéphane T'Jampens, Ph.D. thesis, Université Paris XI, 2002 (unpublished, in French) <http://www-public.slac.stanford.edu/babar/BaBarPublications.htm>.
- [28] K. M. Watson, Phys. Rev. **88**, 1163 (1952).
- [29] E. P. Wigner, Phys. Rev. **98**, 145 (1955).
- [30] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A **479**, 1 (2002).
- [31] G.C. Fox and S. Wolfram, Phys. Rev. Lett. **41**, 1581 (1978).
- [32] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 032003 (2002).
- [33] ARGUS Collaboration, H. Albrecht *et al.*, Z. Phys. C **48**, 543 (1990).
- [34] Particle Data Group, K. Hagiwara *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 010001 (2002).
- [35] D.J. Lange, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A **462**, 152 (2001).
- [36] BABAR Computing Group Collaboration, D.H. Wright *et al.*, hep-ph/0305240.
- [37] GEANT4 Collaboration, S. Agostinelli *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A **506**, 250 (2003).
- [38] F. James and M. Roos, Comput. Phys. Commun. **10**, 343 (1975).
- [39] W. Dunwoodie (private communication).
- [40] Naoki Awaji, Ph.D. thesis, Nagoya Univ., 1986.
- [41] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 012007 (2004).
- [42] A. Stuart and J.K. Ord, *Kendall's Advanced Theory of Statistics*, Classical Inference and Relationship Vol. 2, 5th edition (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1991).