Improved Measurement of the CP-Violating Asymmetry Amplitude sin2beta

The BABAR Collaboration

Presented at the 16th Les Rencontres de Physique de la Vallee D'Aoste, 3/3/2002—3/9/2002, La Thuile, Aosta Valley, Italy

Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94309

Work supported by Department of Energy contract DE-AC03-76SF00515.

Improved Measurement of the CP-violating Asymmetry Amplitude $\sin 2\beta$

The BABAR Collaboration

B. Aubert, D. Boutigny, J.-M. Gaillard, A. Hicheur, Y. Karyotakis, J. P. Lees, P. Robbe, 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

G. P. Chen, 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, M. S. Gill, A. V. Gritsan, Y. Groysman, R. G. Jacobsen, R. W. Kadel, J. Kadyk, L. T. Kerth, Yu. G. Kolomensky, J. F. Kral, C. LeClerc, M. E. Levi, G. Lynch, L. M. Mir, P. J. Oddone,
- M. Pripstein, N. A. Roe, A. Romosan, M. T. Ronan, V. G. Shelkov, A. V. Telnov, and W. A. Wenzel Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory and University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA
- T. J. Harrison, C. M. Hawkes, D. J. Knowles, S. W. O'Neale, R. C. Penny, A. T. Watson, and N. K. Watson University of Birmingham, Birmingham, B15 2TT, United Kingdom
 - T. Deppermann, K. Goetzen, H. Koch, B. Lewandowski, K. Peters, H. Schmuecker, and M. Steinke Ruhr Universität Bochum, Institut für Experimentalphysik 1, D-44780 Bochum, Germany
- N. R. Barlow, W. Bhimji, N. Chevalier, P. J. Clark, W. N. Cottingham, B. Foster, C. Mackay, and F. F. Wilson University of Bristol, Bristol BS8 1TL, United Kingdom
 - K. Abe, C. Hearty, T. S. Mattison, J. A. McKenna, and D. Thiessen University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada V6T 1Z1

S. Jolly and A. K. McKemey Brunel University, Uxbridge, Middlesex UB8 3PH, United Kingdom

V. E. Blinov, A. D. Bukin, D. A. Bukin, A. R. Buzykaev, V. B. Golubev, V. N. Ivanchenko,

A. A. Korol, E. A. Kravchenko, A. P. Onuchin, S. I. Serednyakov, Yu. I. Skovpen, and A. N. Yushkov Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics, Novosibirsk 630090, Russia

D. Best, M. Chao, D. Kirkby, A. J. Lankford, M. Mandelkern, S. McMahon, and D. P. Stoker University of California at Irvine, Irvine, CA 92697, USA

> K. Arisaka, C. Buchanan, and S. Chun University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA 90024, USA

D. B. MacFarlane, S. Prell, Sh. Rahatlou, G. Raven, and V. Sharma

C. Campagnari, B. Dahmes, P. A. Hart, N. Kuznetsova, S. L. Levy, O. Long, A. Lu, M. A. Mazur, J. D. Richman, and W. Verkerke University of California at Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, CA 93106, USA

J. Beringer, A. M. Eisner, M. Grothe, C. A. Heusch, W. S. Lockman, T. Pulliam, T. Schalk,

R. E. Schmitz, B. A. Schumm, A. Seiden, M. Turri, W. Walkowiak, D. C. Williams, and M. G. Wilson University of California at Santa Cruz, Institute for Particle Physics, Santa Cruz, CA 95064, USA

> E. Chen, G. P. Dubois-Felsmann, A. Dvoretskii, D. G. Hitlin, S. Metzler, J. Ovang, F. C. Porter, A. Rvd, A. Samuel, S. Yang, and R. Y. Zhu

California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91125, USA

S. Jayatilleke, G. Mancinelli, B. T. Meadows, and M. D. Sokoloff University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH 45221, USA

T. Barillari, P. Bloom, W. T. Ford, U. Nauenberg, A. Olivas,
P. Rankin, J. Roy, J. G. Smith, W. C. van Hoek, and L. Zhang University of Colorado, Boulder, CO 80309, USA

J. Blouw, J. L. Harton, M. Krishnamurthy, A. Soffer, W. H. Toki, R. J. Wilson, and J. Zhang Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80523, USA

T. Brandt, J. Brose, T. Colberg, M. Dickopp, R. S. Dubitzky, A. Hauke, E. Maly, R. Müller-Pfefferkorn, S. Otto, K. R. Schubert, R. Schwierz, B. Spaan, and L. Wilden Technische Universität Dresden, Institut für Kern- und Teilchenphysik, D-01062 Dresden, Germany

> D. Bernard, G. R. Bonneaud, F. Brochard, J. Cohen-Tanugi,
> S. Ferrag, S. T'Jampens, Ch. Thiebaux, G. Vasileiadis, and M. Verderi Ecole Polytechnique, LLR, F-91128 Palaiseau, France

A. Anjomshoaa, R. Bernet, A. Khan, D. Lavin, F. Muheim, S. Playfer, J. E. Swain, and J. Tinslay University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH9 3JZ, United Kingdom

M. Falbo

Elon University, Elon University, NC 27244-2010, USA

C. Borean, C. Bozzi, and L. Piemontese Università di Ferrara, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-44100 Ferrara, Italy

E. Treadwell

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

F. Anulli,^{*} R. Baldini-Ferroli, A. Calcaterra, R. de Sangro, D. Falciai,

G. Finocchiaro, P. Patteri, I. M. Peruzzi,^{*} M. Piccolo, Y. Xie, and A. Zallo Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati dell'INFN, I-00044 Frascati, Italy

S. Bagnasco, A. Buzzo, R. Contri, G. Crosetti, M. Lo Vetere, M. Macri, M. R. Monge, S. Passaggio, F. C. Pastore, C. Patrignani, E. Robutti, A. Santroni, and S. Tosi Università di Genova, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-16146 Genova, Italy

M. Morii

Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA

R. Bartoldus, R. Hamilton, and U. Mallik University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA 52242, USA R. M. Bionta, V. Brigljević, D. J. Lange, M. Mugge, K. van Bibber, and D. M. Wright Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA 94550, USA

A. J. Bevan, J. R. Fry, E. Gabathuler, R. Gamet, M. George, M. Kay, D. J. Payne, R. J. Sloane, and C. Touramanis University of Liverpool, Liverpool L69 3BX, United Kingdom

> M. L. Aspinwall, D. A. Bowerman, P. D. Dauncey, U. Egede, I. Eschrich, G. W. Morton, J. A. Nash, P. Sanders, and D. Smith University of London, Imperial College, London, SW7 2BW, United Kingdom

J. J. Back, G. Bellodi, P. Dixon, P. F. Harrison, R. J. L. Potter, H. W. Shorthouse, P. Strother, and P. B. Vidal Queen Mary, University of London, E1 4NS, United Kingdom

G. Cowan, S. George, M. G. Green, A. Kurup, C. E. Marker, T. R. McMahon, S. Ricciardi, F. Salvatore, and G. Vaitsas 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, KY 40292, USA

J. Allison, R. J. Barlow, J. T. Boyd, A. C. Forti, F. Jackson, G. D. Lafferty, N. Savvas, J. H. Weatherall, and J. C. Williams University of Manchester, Manchester M13 9PL, United Kingdom

A. Farbin, A. Jawahery, V. Lillard, J. Olsen, D. A. Roberts, and J. R. Schieck University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742, USA

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

B. Brau, R. Cowan, G. Sciolla, F. Taylor, and R. K. Yamamoto Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Laboratory for Nuclear Science, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA

> M. Milek and P. M. Patel McGill University, Montréal, QC, Canada H3A 2T8

F. Palombo and C. Vite Università di Milano, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-20133 Milano, Italy

J. M. Bauer, L. Cremaldi, V. Eschenburg, R. Kroeger, J. Reidy, D. A. Sanders, and D. J. Summers University of Mississippi, University, MS 38677, USA

C. Hast, J. Y. Nief, and P. Taras Université de Montréal, Laboratoire René J. A. Lévesque, Montréal, QC, Canada H3C 3J7

> H. Nicholson Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, MA 01075, USA

C. Cartaro, N. Cavallo,[†] G. De Nardo, F. Fabozzi, C. Gatto, L. Lista, P. Paolucci, D. Piccolo, and C. Sciacca Università di Napoli Federico II, Dipartimento di Scienze Fisiche and INFN, I-80126, Napoli, Italy

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

G. Grosdidier, A. Höcker, H. M. Lacker, S. Laplace, F. Le Diberder, V. Lepeltier,

A. M. Lutz, S. Plaszczynski, M. H. Schune, S. Trincaz-Duvoid, and G. Wormser Laboratoire de l'Accélérateur Linéaire, F-91898 Orsay, France

J. M. LoSecco University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN 46556, USA

J. R. G. Alsmiller and T. A. Gabriel Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN 37831, USA

J. Brau, R. Frey, E. Grauges, M. Iwasaki, C. T. Potter, N. B. Sinev, and D. Strom University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403, USA

F. Colecchia, F. Dal Corso, A. Dorigo, F. Galeazzi, M. Margoni, M. Morandin, M. Posocco, M. Rotondo, F. Simonetto, R. Stroili, E. Torassa, 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, Ph. Leruste, J. Ocariz, M. Pivk, L. Roos, and J. Stark Universités Paris VI et VII, Lab de Physique Nucléaire H. E., F-75252 Paris, France

P. F. Manfredi, V. Re, and V. Speziali Università di Pavia, Dipartimento di Elettronica and INFN, I-27100 Pavia, Italy

> E. D. Frank, L. Gladney, Q. H. Guo, and J. Panetta University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA

C. Angelini, G. Batignani, S. Bettarini, M. Bondioli, F. Bucci, E. Campagna, M. Carpinelli,

F. Forti, M. A. Giorgi, A. Lusiani, G. Marchiori, F. Martinez-Vidal, M. Morganti, N. Neri, E. Paoloni, M. Rama, G. Rizzo, F. Sandrelli, G. Simi, G. Triggiani, and J. Walsh Università di Pisa, Scuola Normale Superiore and INFN, I-56010 Pisa, Italy

> M. Haire, D. Judd, K. Paick, L. Turnbull, and D. E. Wagoner Prairie View A&M University, Prairie View, TX 77446, USA

J. Albert, P. Elmer, C. Lu, V. Miftakov, S. F. Schaffner, A. J. S. Smith, A. Tumanov, and E. W. Varnes Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA

F. Bellini, G. Cavoto, D. del Re, F. Ferrarotto, F. Ferroni, M. A. Mazzoni, S. Morganti, G. Piredda, M. Serra, and C. Voena Università di Roma La Sapienza, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-00185 Roma, Italy

R. Faccini

University of California at San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093, USA and Università di Roma La Sapienza, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-00185 Roma, Italy

S. Christ and R. Waldi

Universität Rostock, D-18051 Rostock, Germany

T. Adye, N. De Groot, B. Franek, N. I. Geddes, G. P. Gopal, and S. M. Xella 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. Langer, G. W. London, B. Mayer, B. Serfass, G. Vasseur, Ch. Yèche, and M. Zito DAPNIA, Commissariat à l'Energie Atomique/Saclay, F-91191 Gif-sur-Yvette, France

> M. V. Purohit, A. W. Weidemann, and F. X. Yumiceva University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC 29208, USA

I. Adam, D. Aston, N. Berger, A. M. Boyarski, G. Calderini, M. R. Convery, D. P. Coupal, D. Dong, J. Dorfan, W. Dunwoodie, R. C. Field, T. Glanzman, S. J. Gowdy, T. Haas, T. Hadig, V. Halyo, T. Himel, T. Hryn'ova, M. E. Huffer, W. R. Innes, C. P. Jessop, M. H. Kelsey, P. Kim,

M. L. Kocian, U. Langenegger, D. W. G. S. Leith, S. Luitz, V. Luth, H. L. Lynch, H. Marsiske,

S. Menke, R. Messner, D. R. Muller, C. P. O'Grady, V. E. Ozcan, A. Perazzo, M. Perl, S. Petrak,

H. Quinn, B. N. Ratcliff, S. H. Robertson, A. Roodman, A. A. Salnikov, T. Schietinger, R. H. Schindler,

J. Schwiening, A. Snyder, A. Soha, S. M. Spanier, J. Stelzer, D. Su, M. K. Sullivan, H. A. Tanaka,

J. Va'vra, S. R. Wagner, M. Weaver, A. J. R. Weinstein, W. J. Wisniewski, D. H. Wright, and C. C. Young Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, Stanford, CA 94309, USA

> P. R. Burchat, C. H. Cheng, T. I. Meyer, and C. Roat Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305-4060, USA

> > R. Henderson TRIUMF, Vancouver, BC, Canada V6T 2A3

W. Bugg and H. Cohn University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37996, USA

J. M. Izen, I. Kitayama, and X. C. Lou University of Texas at Dallas, Richardson, TX 75083, USA

F. Bianchi, M. Bona, and D. Gamba Università di Torino, Dipartimento di Fisica Sperimentale and INFN, I-10125 Torino, Italy

L. Bosisio, G. Della Ricca, S. Dittongo, L. Lanceri, P. Poropat, L. Vitale, and G. Vuagnin Università di Trieste, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-34127 Trieste, Italy

> R. S. Panvini Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN 37235, USA

C. M. Brown, P. D. Jackson, R. Kowalewski, and J. M. Roney University of Victoria, Victoria, BC, Canada V8W 3P6

H. R. Band, S. Dasu, M. Datta, A. M. Eichenbaum, H. Hu, J. R. Johnson, R. Liu, F. Di Lodovico, Y. Pan, R. Prepost, I. J. Scott, S. J. Sekula, J. H. von Wimmersperg-Toeller, S. L. Wu, and Z. Yu University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI 53706, USA

> T. M. B. Kordich and H. Neal Yale University, New Haven, CT 06511, USA (Dated: September 24, 2002)

We present updated results on time-dependent CP-violating asymmetries in neutral B decays to several CP eigenstates. The measurements use a data sample of about 62 million $\Upsilon(4S) \rightarrow B\overline{B}$ decays collected between 1999 and 2001 by the BABAR detector at the PEP-II asymmetric-energy BFactory at SLAC. In this sample we study events in which one neutral B meson is fully reconstructed in a final state containing a charmonium meson and the flavor of the other neutral B meson is determined from its decay products. The amplitude of the CP-violating asymmetry, which in the Standard Model is proportional to $\sin 2\beta$, is derived from the decay time distributions in such events. We measure $\sin 2\beta = 0.75 \pm 0.09$ (stat) ± 0.04 (syst) and $|\lambda| = 0.92 \pm 0.06$ (stat) ± 0.02 (syst). The latter is consistent with the Standard Model expectation of no direct CP violation. These results are preliminary.

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

The Standard Model of electroweak interactions describes CP violation in weak decays as a consequence of a

^{*}Also with Università di Perugia, I-06100 Perugia, Italy

 $^{^\}dagger \mathrm{Also}$ with Università della Basilicata, I-85100 Potenza, Italy

Measurements of the CP-violating asymmetry parameter $\sin 2\beta$ have recently been published by the BABAR [3] and Belle [4] collaborations from data taken between 1999 and summer 2001 at the PEP-II and KEKB asymmetric-energy e^+e^- colliders. These results, which followed less precise measurements [5], established CP violation in the B^0 system. In this paper, we report an updated measurement of $\sin 2\beta$, using a sample of 62 million B^0 decays collected with the BABAR detector. Since our previous measurement, we have added a sample of 30 million B^0 decays collected in the latter half of 2001, and have improved data reconstruction and analysis techniques. The measurement technique is described in detail in Ref. [6]. The discussion here is limited to the changes in the analysis with respect to the published results [3, 6].

Since the BABAR detector is described in detail elsewhere [7], only a brief description is given here. Surrounding the beam-pipe is a silicon vertex tracker (SVT), which provides precise measurements of the trajectories of charged particles as they leave the e^+e^- interaction point. Outside of the SVT, a 40-layer drift chamber (DCH) allows measurements of track momenta in a 1.5 T magnetic field as well as energy-loss measurements, which contribute to charged particle identification. Surrounding the DCH is a detector of internally reflected Cherenkov radiation (DIRC), which provides charged hadron identification. Outside of the DIRC is a CsI(Tl) electromagnetic calorimeter (EMC) that is used to detect photons, provide electron identification and reconstruct neutral hadrons. The EMC is surrounded by a superconducting coil, which creates the magnetic field for momentum measurements. Outside of the coil, the flux return is instrumented with resistive plate chambers interspersed with iron (IFR) for the identification of muons and long-lived neutral hadrons. We use the GEANT4 [8] software to simulate interactions of particles traversing the BABAR detector.

From approximately 56 fb⁻¹ of data recorded at the $\Upsilon(4S)$ resonance, corresponding to 62 million produced $B\overline{B}$ pairs, we reconstruct a sample of neutral *B* mesons, B_{CP} , decaying to the final states $J/\psi K_s^0$ ($K_s^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-$, $\pi^0\pi^0$), $\psi(2S)K_s^0$ ($K_s^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-$), $\chi_{c1}K_s^0$ ($K_s^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-$), $J/\psi K^{*0}$ ($K^{*0} \to K_s^0\pi^0$, $K_s^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-$), and $J/\psi K_L^0$. The J/ψ and $\psi(2S)$ mesons are reconstructed through their decays to e^+e^- and $\mu^+\mu^-$; the $\psi(2S)$ is also reconstructed through its decay to $J/\psi \pi^+\pi^-$. The χ_{c1} meson is reconstructed in the decay mode $J/\psi \gamma$. We examine each of the events in the B_{CP} sample for evidence that the recoiling neutral B meson decayed as a B^0 or \overline{B}^0 (flavor tag).

The decay-time distribution of B decays to a CP eigenstate with a B^0 or \overline{B}^0 tag can be expressed in terms of a complex parameter λ that depends on both the $B^0-\overline{B}^0$ oscillation amplitude and the amplitudes describing \overline{B}^0 and B^0 decays to this final state [9]. The decay rate $f_+(f_-)$ when the tagging meson is a $B^0(\overline{B}^0)$ is given by

$$f_{\pm}(\Delta t) = \frac{e^{-|\Delta t|/\tau_{B^0}}}{4\tau_{B^0}} \times \left[1 \pm \frac{2\mathcal{I}m\lambda}{1+|\lambda|^2} \sin\left(\Delta m_d\Delta t\right) \mp \frac{1-|\lambda|^2}{1+|\lambda|^2} \cos\left(\Delta m_d\Delta t\right) \right],\tag{1}$$

where $\Delta t = t_{\rm rec} - t_{\rm tag}$ is the difference between the proper decay time of the reconstructed *B* meson (*B*_{rec}) and the proper decay time of the tagging *B* meson (*B*_{tag}), τ_{B^0} is the *B*⁰ lifetime, Δm_d is the mass difference determined from B^0 - \overline{B}^0 oscillations, and the lifetime difference between the neutral B mass eigenstates is assumed to be negligible. The sine term in Eq. 1 is due to the interference between direct decay and decay after flavor change, and the cosine term is due to the interference between two or more decay amplitudes with different weak phases. Evidence for CP violation can be observed as a difference between the Δt distributions of B^0 - and \overline{B}^0 -tagged events or as an asymmetry with respect to $\Delta t = 0$ for either flavor tag.

In the Standard Model, $\lambda = \eta_f e^{-2i\beta}$ for charmonium-containing $b \to c\overline{c}s$ decays where η_f is the CP eigenvalue of the final state f. Thus, the time-dependent CP-violating asymmetry is

$$A_{CP}(\Delta t) \equiv \frac{f_{+}(\Delta t) - f_{-}(\Delta t)}{f_{+}(\Delta t) + f_{-}(\Delta t)} = -\eta_{f} \sin 2\beta \sin (\Delta m_{d} \Delta t), \qquad (2)$$

with $\eta_f = -1$ for $J/\psi K_s^0$, $\psi(2S)K_s^0$, and $\chi_{c1}K_s^0$, and +1 for $J/\psi K_L^0$. The measurement of $\sin 2\beta$ with the decay mode $B \to J/\psi K^{*0}(K^{*0} \to K_s^0 \pi^0)$ is experimentally complicated by the presence of both even (L=0, 2) and odd (L=1) orbital angular momenta in the final state. With the measured CP-even and CP-odd contributions to the decay rate [10], the experimental sensitivity to $\sin 2\beta$ is reduced by 24% compared to pure CP eigenstates. The interference between CP-even and CP-odd amplitudes in this mode allows a measurement of $\cos 2\beta$ up to a sign ambiguity. The time- and angle-dependent decay rate $f_+(f_-)$ when the tagging meson is a $B^0(\overline{B}^0)$ is given by

$$f_{\pm}(\Delta t, \vec{\omega}) = \frac{e^{-|\Delta t|/\tau_{B^0}}}{4\tau_{B^0}} \bigg[I(\vec{\omega}; \vec{\mathcal{A}}) \mp \left\{ C(\vec{\omega}; \vec{\mathcal{A}}) \cos(\Delta m_d \Delta t) + \left[S_{\sin 2\beta}(\vec{\omega}; \vec{\mathcal{A}}) \sin 2\beta + S_{\cos 2\beta}(\vec{\omega}; \vec{\mathcal{A}}) \cos 2\beta \right] \sin(\Delta m_d \Delta t) \bigg\} \bigg]$$
(3)

where the coefficients $I, C, S_{\sin 2\beta}$, and $S_{\cos 2\beta}$ are functions of three transversity angles $\vec{\omega}$ and the previously measured transversity amplitudes $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ [10] (see appendix A).

The event selection, lepton and charged kaon identification, and J/ψ and $\psi(2S)$ reconstruction used in this analysis are similar to those described in Ref. [3, 6]. Since these earlier publications, significant improvements have been made in the analysis. Charged kaon identification has improved due to a better alignment of the Cherenkov detector and better Cherenkov angle reconstruction. For the $B^0 \to J/\psi K_L^0$ selection, we have loosened the muon selection requirements for $J/\psi \to \mu^+\mu^-$ and the π^0 veto for K_L^0 candidates. In the $K_S^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-$ selection for $B^0 \to J/\psi K_S^0$ candidates, the requirement on the $\pi^+\pi^-$ mass has been relaxed to $472 < m(\pi^+\pi^-) < 522 \text{ MeV}/c^2$. We have increased the sensitivity to $\sin 2\beta$ for the mode $J/\psi K^{*0}(K^{*0} \to K_S^0\pi^0)$ by taking into account the transversity angles for each event instead of integrating out the angle dependence. Events reconstructed in this mode that have a candidate in the mode $J/\psi K^{*+}(K^{*+} \to K_S^0\pi^+)$ are rejected. In addition, the whole dataset has been processed with a uniform reconstruction algorithm and detector calibration. This provides, in particular, better alignment of the tracking system and improved track reconstruction efficiency for the 20 fb⁻¹ of data collected in 1999–2000. For example, the event yield increased by 11% (37%) for the $\eta_f = -1 (J/\psi K_L^0)$ sample while the purity only decreased by 4% (3%). The effect of all improvements decreases the error on $\sin 2\beta$ scaled to the same integrated luminosity by 13%.

Candidates in the B_{CP} sample are selected by requiring that the difference ΔE between their energy and the beam energy in the center-of-mass frame be less than three standard deviations from zero. For modes involving K_s^0 , the beam-energy substituted mass $m_{\rm ES} = \sqrt{(E_{\rm beam}^{\rm cm})^2 - (p_B^{\rm cm})^2}$ must be greater than 5.2 GeV/ c^2 . The resolution for ΔE is about 10 MeV, except for the $K_s^0 \to \pi^0 \pi^0$ (33 MeV), the $J/\psi K^{*0}$ (20 MeV) and the $J/\psi K_L^0$ (3.5 MeV after *B* mass constraint) modes. For the purpose of determining numbers of events and purities, a signal region 5.270 (5.273) $< m_{\rm ES} < 5.290$ (5.288) GeV/ c^2 is used for modes containing $K_s^0 (K^{*0})$. The signal region for the mode $J/\psi K_L^0$ is defined by $|\Delta E| < 10$ MeV.

A measurement of A_{CP} requires a determination of the experimental Δt resolution and the fraction of events in which the tag assignment is incorrect. A mistag fraction w reduces the observed CP asymmetry by a factor (1-2w). Mistag fractions and Δt resolution functions are determined from a sample B_{flav} of neutral B decays to flavor eigenstates consisting of the channels $D^{(*)-}h^+(h^+ = \pi^+, \rho^+, \text{ and } a_1^+)$ and $J/\psi K^{*0}(K^{*0} \to K^+\pi^-)$. Validation studies are performed with a control sample of charged B mesons decaying to the final states $J/\psi K^{(*)+}$, $\psi(2S)K^+$, $\chi_{c1}K^+$, and $D^{(*)0}\pi^+$.

The methods for flavor tagging and vertex reconstruction, and the determination of Δt , are described in Ref. [6]. For flavor tagging, we exploit information from the recoil *B* decay in the event. The charges of energetic electrons and muons from semileptonic *B* decays, kaons, soft pions from D^* decays, and high momentum particles are correlated with the flavor of the decaying *b* quark. For example, a positive lepton indicates a B^0 tag. About 68% of the events can be assigned to one of four hierarchical, mutually exclusive tagging categories. The remaining untagged events are excluded from further analysis.

For a lepton tag we require an electron or muon candidate with a center-of-mass momentum $p_{\rm cm} > 1.0$ or $1.1 \,{\rm GeV}/c$, respectively. This efficiently selects primary leptons from semileptonic *B* decays and reduces contamination due to oppositely-charged leptons from charm decays. Events satisfying these criteria are assigned to the Lepton category unless the lepton charge and the net charge of all kaon candidates indicate opposite flavor tags. Events without a lepton tag but with a non-zero net kaon charge are assigned to the Kaon category. All remaining events are passed to a neural network algorithm whose main inputs are the momentum and charge of the track with the highest center-of-mass momentum, and the outputs of secondary networks, trained with Monte Carlo samples to identify primary leptons, kaons, and soft pions. Based on the output of the neural network algorithm, events are tagged as B^0 or \overline{B}^0 and assigned to the NT1 (more certain tags) or NT2 (less certain tags) category, or not tagged at all. The tagging power of the NT1 and NT2 categories arises primarily from soft pions and from recovering unidentified isolated primary electrons and muons.

The time interval Δt between the two *B* decays is calculated from the measured separation Δz between the decay vertex of the reconstructed *B* meson ($B_{\rm rec}$) and the vertex of the flavor-tagging *B* meson ($B_{\rm tag}$) along the *z* axis. The calculation of Δt includes an event-by-event correction for the direction of the $B_{\rm rec}$ with respect to the *z* direction in the $\Upsilon(4S)$ frame. We determine the *z* position of the $B_{\rm rec}$ vertex from the charged tracks that constitute the $B_{\rm rec}$ candidate. The decay vertex of the $B_{\rm tag}$ is determined by fitting the tracks not belonging to the $B_{\rm rec}$ candidate to a

common vertex. An additional constraint on the tagging vertex comes from a pseudotrack computed from the $B_{\rm rec}$ vertex and three-momentum, the beam-spot (with a vertical size of 10 μ m), and the $\Upsilon(4S)$ momentum. For 99.5% of the reconstructed events the r.m.s. Δz resolution is 180 μ m. An accepted candidate must have converged fits for the $B_{\rm rec}$ and $B_{\rm tag}$ vertices, a Δt error less than 2.5 ps, and a measured $|\Delta t| < 20$ ps. The fraction of events in data satisfying these requirements is 93%.



FIG. 1: Distribution of $m_{\rm ES}$ for flavor tagged B_{CP} candidates selected in the final states a) $J/\psi K_S^0$ $(K_S^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-)$, b) $J/\psi K_S^0$ $(K_S^0 \to \pi^0\pi^0)$, c) $\psi(2S)K_S^0$, d) $\chi_{c1}K_S^0$, e) $J/\psi K^{*0}(K^{*0} \to K_S^0\pi^0)$, and f) distribution of ΔE for flavor tagged $J/\psi K_L^0$ candidates.

In Table I we list the numbers of events and the signal purities for the tagged B_{CP} candidates. The purities are determined from fits to the $m_{\rm ES}$ (all K_s^0 modes except $J/\psi K^{*0}$) or ΔE (K_L^0 mode) distributions in data, or from Monte Carlo simulation ($J/\psi K^{*0}$ mode). Figure 1 shows the $m_{\rm ES}$ distributions for modes containing a K_s^0 , and ΔE for the $J/\psi K_L^0$ candidates. For modes containing a K_s^0 , we use a Monte Carlo simulation to estimate the fractions of events in the signal peaks that are due to cross-feed from other decay modes. The fractions of peaking background range between $(0.8 \pm 0.2)\%$ for $J/\psi K_s^0 (K_s^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-)$ and $(6.0 \pm 1.8)\%$ for $\psi(2S)K_s^0$. For the $J/\psi K_L^0$ decay mode, the composition, effective η_f , and ΔE distributions of the individual background sources are determined either from Monte Carlo simulation (for B decays to J/ψ) or from the $m_{\ell^+\ell^-}$ sidebands in data (for fake $J/\psi \to \ell^+\ell^-$). The tagging efficiencies for the four tagging categories are measured from data and summarized in Table II.

TABLE I: Number of tagged events, signal purity, and result of fitting for CP asymmetries in the full CP sample and in various subsamples, as well as in the B_{flav} and charged B control samples. Purity is the fitted number of signal events divided by the total number of events in the ΔE and m_{ES} signal region defined in the text. Errors are statistical only.

Sample	$N_{ m tag}$	Purity (%)	$\sin 2eta$
Full <i>CP</i> sample	1850	79	0.75 ± 0.09
$J/\psi K^0_S \ (K^0_S o \pi^+\pi^-)$	693	96	0.79 ± 0.11
$J\!/\psi K^0_S \left(K^0_S ightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0 ight)$	123	89	0.42 ± 0.33
$\psi(2S)K^0_S$	119	89	0.84 ± 0.32
$\chi_{c1}K^0_S$	60	94	0.84 ± 0.49
$J/\psi K_L^0$	742	57	0.73 ± 0.19
$J/\psi K^{*0} \ (K^{*0} \to K^0_S \pi^0)$	113	83	0.62 ± 0.56
$J/\psi K_{S}^{0}, \psi(2S)K_{S}^{0}, \chi_{c1}K_{S}^{0} \text{ only } (\eta_{f}=-1)$	995	94	0.76 ± 0.10
Lepton tags	176	97	0.73 ± 0.16
Kaon tags	504	95	0.75 ± 0.14
NT1 tags	117	95	0.86 ± 0.33
NT2 tags	198	94	0.84 ± 0.61
B^0 tags	471	94	0.79 ± 0.14
\overline{B}^0 tags	524	95	0.73 ± 0.14
$B_{\rm flav}$ sample	17546	85	0.00 ± 0.03
Charged B sample	14768	89	-0.02 ± 0.03

TABLE II: Average mistag fractions w_i and mistag differences $\Delta w_i = w_i(B^0) - w_i(\overline{B}^0)$, extracted for each tagging category *i* from the maximum-likelihood fit to the time distribution for the fully-reconstructed B^0 sample (B_{flav} and B_{CP}). The figure of merit for tagging is the effective tagging efficiency $Q_i = \varepsilon_i (1 - 2w_i)^2$, where ε_i is the fraction of events with a reconstructed tag vertex that is assigned to the i^{th} category. Uncertainties are statistical only. The statistical error on $\sin 2\beta$ is proportional to $1/\sqrt{Q}$, where $Q = \sum Q_i$.

Category	ε (%)	w~(%)	$\Delta w~(\%)$	Q~(%)
Lepton	11.1 ± 0.2	8.6 ± 0.9	0.6 ± 1.5	7.6 ± 0.4
Kaon	34.7 ± 0.4	18.1 ± 0.7	-0.9 ± 1.1	14.1 ± 0.6
NT1	7.7 ± 0.2	22.0 ± 1.5	1.4 ± 2.3	2.4 ± 0.3
NT2	14.0 ± 0.3	37.3 ± 1.3	-4.7 ± 1.9	0.9 ± 0.2
All	67.5 ± 0.5			25.1 ± 0.8

We determine $\sin 2\beta$ with a simultaneous unbinned maximum likelihood fit to the Δt distributions of the B_{CP} and B_{flav} tagged samples. Equations 1 (with $|\lambda| = 1$) and 3 describe the Δt distribution of the $\eta_f = -1$ and $J/\psi K_L^0$ samples, and the $J/\psi K^{*0}$ sample, respectively. The Δt distributions of the B_{flav} sample evolve according to the known frequency for flavor oscillation in neutral B mesons. The observed amplitudes for the CP asymmetry in the B_{CP} sample and for flavor oscillation in the B_{flav} sample are reduced by the same factor (1 - 2w) due to mistags. The Δt distributions for the B_{CP} and B_{flav} samples are both convolved with a common Δt resolution function. Events are assigned signal and background probabilities based on the m_{ES} (all modes except $J/\psi K_L^0$) or $\Delta E (J/\psi K_L^0)$ distributions. Backgrounds are incorporated with an empirical description of their Δt evolution, containing prompt and non-prompt components convolved with a separate resolution function [6].

The Δt resolution function \mathcal{R} for the signal is represented in terms of $\delta_t \equiv \Delta t - \Delta t_{\text{true}}$ by a sum of three Gaussian distributions with different means and widths:

$$\mathcal{R}(\delta_{\rm t}) = \sum_{k=\rm core, tail} \frac{f_k}{S_k \sigma_{\Delta t} \sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{(\delta_{\rm t} - b_k \sigma_{\Delta t})^2}{2(S_k \sigma_{\Delta t})^2}\right) + \frac{f_{\rm outlier}}{\sigma_{\rm outlier} \sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{\delta_{\rm t}^2}{2\sigma_{\rm outlier}^2}\right). \tag{4}$$

For the core and tail Gaussians, we use two separate scale factors S_{core} and S_{tail} to multiply the measurement uncertainty $\sigma_{\Delta t}$ that is derived from the vertex fit for each event. The scale factor for the tail component S_{tail} is fixed to the value found in Monte Carlo simulation since it is strongly correlated with the other resolution function parameters. The core and tail Gaussian distributions are allowed to have nonzero means to account for any daughters of long-lived charm particles included in the B_{tag} vertex. In the resolution function, mean offsets b_k are multiplied by the event-by-event measurement uncertainty $\sigma_{\Delta t}$ to account for an observed correlation between the mean of the δ_t distribution and the measurement uncertainty $\sigma_{\Delta t}$ in Monte Carlo simulation. The mean of the core Gaussian is allowed to be different for each tagging category. One common mean is used for the tail component. The outlier Gaussian has a fixed width and no offset; it accounts for the fewer than 0.5% of events with incorrectly reconstructed vertices. In simulated events, we find no significant difference between the Δt resolution function of the B_{CP} sample and of the B_{flav} sample. This is expected, since the B_{tag} vertex precision dominates the Δt resolution. Hence, the same resolution function is used for all modes.

TABLE III: Δt resolution function parameters for B_{flav} and B_{CP} candidates extracted from the simultaneous maximumlikelihood fit to the Δt distributions for the B_{flav} and B_{CP} samples.

$S_{\rm core}$	1.19 ± 0.07	$S_{ m tail}$	3.0 (fixed)
$b_{\rm core}$ (lepton)	0.01 ± 0.07	b_{tail}	-2.5 ± 1.7
$b_{ m core}$ (kaon)	-0.24 ± 0.04	$\sigma_{ m outlier}$	8 ps (fixed)
$b_{\rm core}$ (NT1)	-0.20 ± 0.08	$f_{ m tail}$	0.05 ± 0.04
$b_{\rm core}$ (NT2)	-0.21 ± 0.06	$f_{ m outlier}$	0.004 ± 0.002

A total of 35 parameters are varied in the final fit, including the values of $\sin 2\beta$ (1), the average mistag fraction w and the difference Δw between B^0 and \overline{B}^0 mistags for each tagging category (8), parameters for the signal Δt resolution (8), and parameters for background time dependence (6), Δt resolution (3), and mistag fractions (8). In addition, we allow $\cos 2\beta$ (1), which is determined from the $J/\psi K^{*0}$ events, to vary in the fit. The sign of $\cos 2\beta$ cannot be determined due to a twofold ambiguity in the relative strong phases of the angular amplitudes [11]. We use the convention for the strong phases given in Appendix A.

The determination of the mistag fractions and Δt resolution function for the signal is dominated by the highstatistics B_{flav} sample. The measured mistag fractions and the parameters of the signal resolution function are listed in Tables II and III. Background parameters are determined from events with $m_{\text{ES}} < 5.27 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ (except $J/\psi K_L^0$ and $J/\psi K^{*0}$). We fix $\tau_{B^0} = 1.548 \text{ ps}$ and $\Delta m_d = 0.472 \text{ ps}^{-1}$ [12]. The largest correlation between $\sin 2\beta$ and any linear combination of the other free parameters is 0.14.

The simultaneous fit to all CP decay modes and the flavor decay modes yields

$$\sin 2\beta = 0.75 \pm 0.09 \text{ (stat)} \pm 0.04 \text{ (syst)}.$$

Figure 2 shows the Δt distributions and asymmetries in yields between B^0 tags and \overline{B}^0 tags for the $\eta_f = -1$ and $\eta_f = +1$ samples as a function of Δt , overlaid with the projection of the global likelihood fit result.

Repeating the fit with all parameters except $\sin 2\beta$ fixed to their values at the global maximum likelihood, we attribute a total contribution in quadrature of 0.01 to the error on $\sin 2\beta$ due to the combined statistical uncertainties in mistag rates, Δt resolution, and background parameters. The dominant sources of systematic error are due to uncertainties in the level, composition, and *CP* asymmetry of the background in the selected *CP* events (0.022), limited Monte Carlo simulation statistics (0.014), and the assumed parameterization of the Δt resolution function (0.013), due in part to residual uncertainties in the SVT alignment. Uncertainties in Δm_d and τ_{B^0} each contribute 0.010 to the systematic error. We have performed fits with Δm_d and τ_{B^0} fixed to a series of values around the corresponding world averages in order to determine the dependence of $\sin 2\beta$ on these two parameters and find that $\sin 2\beta = [0.75 - 0.31(\Delta m_d - 0.472 \text{ ps}^{-1}) - 0.62(\tau_{B^0} - 1.548 \text{ ps})].$

The large sample of reconstructed events allows a number of consistency checks, including separation of the data by decay mode, tagging category, and B_{tag} flavor. The results of fits to these subsamples for the $\eta_f = -1$ sample are shown in Table I and found to be statistically consistent. The fit results to the samples of non-*CP* decay modes indicate no statistically significant asymmetry. The distributions and asymmetry in yields for B^0 and \overline{B}^0 tags as a function of Δt for the B_{flav} sample are shown in Fig. 3. In addition, we have made a number of detailed analyses of the



FIG. 2: Number of $\eta_f = -1$ candidates $(J/\psi K_S^0, \psi(2S)K_S^0, \chi_{c1}K_S^0)$ in the signal region a) with a B^0 tag N_{B^0} and b) with a \overline{B}^0 tag $N_{\overline{B}^0}$, and c) the raw asymmetry $(N_{B^0} - N_{\overline{B}^0})/(N_{B^0} + N_{\overline{B}^0})$, as functions of Δt . The solid curves represent the result of the combined fit to the full $B_{\rm CP}$ sample. The shaded regions represent the background contributions. Figures d) – f) contain the corresponding information for the $\eta_f = +1 \mod J/\psi K_L^0$. The likelihood is normalized to the total number of B^0 and \overline{B}^0 tags. The value of $\sin 2\beta$ is independent of the individual normalizations and therefore of the difference between the number of B^0 and \overline{B}^0 tags. This difference is responsible for the small vertical shift between the data points and the solid curves.

expected distribution of changes in $\sin 2\beta$ that might result from reprocessing, in order to account for the correlations between the two results from the same sample. From these studies, we conclude that the observed difference in the 1999–2000 result, before and after reprocessing, is equivalent to about two standard deviations of the distribution of predicted changes due to reprocessing for events that appear in common. The change in the overall result in the 1999–2000 dataset, from $\sin 2\beta = 0.45 \pm 0.20$ to 0.60 ± 0.15 , is consistent with the effects of both reprocessing and event selection modifications.

With the theoretically preferred choice of the strong phases, consistent with the hypothesis of the *s*-quark helicity conservation in the decay [13], the parameter $\cos 2\beta$ is measured to be $+3.3^{+0.6}_{-1.0}$ (stat) $^{+0.6}_{-0.7}$ (syst). This value is 2.2 σ away from the one obtained using the relation $\sqrt{1-\sin^2 2\beta} = 0.66$. The dominant contributions to the systematic error on $\cos 2\beta$ are due to uncertainties in the transversity amplitudes for the signal $\binom{-0.4}{+0.2}$ and the background (± 0.5). If we fix $\cos 2\beta$ to 0.66, the measured value of $\sin 2\beta$ does not change. For the alternative set of strong phases, $(\phi_{\perp}, \phi_{\parallel}) \rightarrow (\pi - \phi_{\perp}, -\phi_{\parallel})$, the sign of $\cos 2\beta$ flips, yielding $\cos 2\beta = -3.3^{+1.0}_{-0.6}$ (stat) $^{+0.7}_{-0.6}$ (syst). If the parameter $|\lambda|$ in Eq. 1 is allowed to float in the fit to the $\eta_f = -1$ sample, which has high purity and

If the parameter $|\lambda|$ in Eq. 1 is allowed to float in the fit to the $\eta_f = -1$ sample, which has high purity and requires minimal assumptions on the effect of backgrounds, the value obtained is $|\lambda| = 0.92 \pm 0.06$ (stat) ± 0.02 (syst). The sources of the systematic error are the same as for the $\sin 2\beta$ measurement with an additional contribution in quadrature of 0.012 from the uncertainty on the difference in the tagging efficiencies for B^0 and \overline{B}^0 tagged events. In this fit, the coefficient of the $\sin(\Delta m_d \Delta t)$ term in Eq. 1 is measured to be 0.76 ± 0.10 (stat) in agreement with Table I.

This analysis supersedes our previous result [3]. It provides the single most precise measurement of $\sin 2\beta$ currently available and is consistent with the range implied by measurements and theoretical estimates of the magnitudes of CKM matrix elements in the context of the Standard Model [14].



FIG. 3: Number of B_{flav} candidates in the signal region a) with a B^0 tag, N_{B^0} , and b) with a \overline{B}^0 tag, $N_{\overline{B}^0}$, and c) the raw asymmetry $(N_{B^0} - N_{\overline{B}^0})/(N_{B^0} + N_{\overline{B}^0})$, as functions of Δt . The solid curves represent the result of the combined fit to all selected B_{flav} events. The shaded regions represent the background contributions.

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 US 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'Energie Atomique and Institut National de Physique Nucléaire et de Physique des Particules (France), the Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung (Germany), the Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare (Italy), 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 the A. P. Sloan Foundation, the Research Corporation, and the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation.

APPENDIX A: TIME-DEPENDENT *CP* ASYMMETRY IN $B \rightarrow J/\psi K^{*0}(K^{*0} \rightarrow K_S^0 \pi^0)$

The decay $B \to J/\psi K^*$ is described by three amplitudes. In the transversity basis [15, 16], the amplitudes A_0 , A_{\parallel} and A_{\perp} have CP eigenvalues +1, +1 and -1, respectively. A_0 corresponds to longitudinal polarization of the vector mesons, and A_{\parallel} and A_{\perp} correspond to parallel and perpendicular transverse polarizations, respectively. The relative phase between the parallel (perpendicular) transverse amplitude and the longitudinal amplitude is given by $\phi_{\parallel} \equiv \arg(A_{\parallel}/A_0)$ ($\phi_{\perp} \equiv \arg(A_{\perp}/A_0)$). The transversity frame is defined as the J/ψ rest frame (see Fig. 4). The K^* direction defines the negative x axis. The $K\pi$ decay plane defines the (x, y) plane, with y oriented such that $p_y(K) > 0$. The z axis is the normal to this plane, and the coordinate system is right-handed. The transversity angles θ_{tr} and φ_{tr} are defined as the polar and azimuthal angles of the positive lepton from the J/ψ decay; θ_{K^*} is the K^* helicity angle defined in the K^* rest frame as the angle between the K direction and the direction opposite to the J/ψ .



FIG. 4: Definitions of transversity angles θ_{tr} , φ_{tr} , and θ_{K^*} . The angles θ_{tr} and φ_{tr} are determined in the J/ψ rest frame. The angle θ_{K^*} is determined in the K^* rest frame.

The time- and transversity-angle-dependent decay rate distributions $f_+(f_-)$ when the tagging meson is a $B^0(\overline{B}{}^0)$ are given by

$$f_{\pm}(\Delta t, \vec{\omega}) = \frac{e^{-|\Delta t|/\tau_{B^0}}}{4\tau_{B^0}} \bigg[I(\vec{\omega}; \vec{\mathcal{A}}) \mp \Big\{ C(\vec{\omega}; \vec{\mathcal{A}}) \cos(\Delta m_d \Delta t) \\ + \Big[S_{\sin 2\beta}(\vec{\omega}; \vec{\mathcal{A}}) \sin 2\beta + S_{\cos 2\beta}(\vec{\omega}; \vec{\mathcal{A}}) \cos 2\beta \Big] \sin(\Delta m_d \Delta t) \Big\} \bigg].$$
(A1)

The coefficients $I, C, S_{\sin 2\beta}$, and $S_{\cos 2\beta}$, which depend on the transversity angles $\vec{\omega} = (\theta_{K^*}, \theta_{tr}, \varphi_{tr})$ and the transversity amplitudes $\vec{\mathcal{A}} = (A_0, A_{\parallel}, A_{\perp})$, are given by

$$I(\vec{\omega}; \vec{\mathcal{A}}) = f_{1}(\vec{\omega})|A_{0}|^{2} + f_{2}(\vec{\omega})|A_{\parallel}|^{2} + f_{3}(\vec{\omega})|A_{\perp}|^{2} + f_{5}(\vec{\omega})|A_{\parallel}||A_{0}|\cos(\phi_{\parallel} - \phi_{0})$$

$$C(\vec{\omega}; \vec{\mathcal{A}}) = f_{4}(\vec{\omega})|A_{\parallel}||A_{\perp}|\sin(\phi_{\perp} - \phi_{\parallel}) + f_{6}(\vec{\omega})|A_{\perp}||A_{0}|\sin(\phi_{\perp} - \phi_{0})$$

$$S_{\sin 2\beta}(\vec{\omega}; \vec{\mathcal{A}}) = f_{1}(\vec{\omega})|A_{0}|^{2} + f_{2}(\vec{\omega})|A_{\parallel}|^{2} - f_{3}(\vec{\omega})|A_{\perp}|^{2} + f_{5}(\vec{\omega})|A_{\parallel}||A_{0}|\cos(\phi_{\parallel} - \phi_{0})$$

$$S_{\cos 2\beta}(\vec{\omega}; \vec{\mathcal{A}}) = -f_{4}(\vec{\omega})|A_{\parallel}||A_{\perp}|\cos(\phi_{\perp} - \phi_{\parallel}) - f_{6}(\vec{\omega})|A_{\perp}||A_{0}|\cos(\phi_{\perp} - \phi_{0})$$
(A2)

with

$$f_{1}(\vec{\omega}) = \frac{9}{32\pi} 2\cos^{2}(\theta_{K^{*}}) \left[1 - \sin^{2}(\theta_{tr})\cos^{2}(\varphi_{tr})\right]$$

$$f_{2}(\vec{\omega}) = \frac{9}{32\pi} \sin^{2}(\theta_{K^{*}}) \left[1 - \sin^{2}(\theta_{tr})\sin^{2}(\varphi_{tr})\right]$$

$$f_{3}(\vec{\omega}) = \frac{9}{32\pi} \sin^{2}(\theta_{K^{*}})\sin^{2}(\theta_{tr})$$

$$f_{4}(\vec{\omega}) = \frac{9}{32\pi} \sin^{2}(\theta_{K^{*}})\sin(2\theta_{tr})\sin(\varphi_{tr})$$

$$f_{5}(\vec{\omega}) = -\frac{9}{32\pi} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sin(2\theta_{K^{*}})\sin^{2}(\theta_{tr})\sin(2\varphi_{tr})$$

$$f_{6}(\vec{\omega}) = \frac{9}{32\pi} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sin(2\theta_{K^{*}})\sin(2\theta_{tr})\cos(\varphi_{tr}).$$
(A3)

- [1] N. Cabibbo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **10**, 531 (1963);
- M. Kobayashi and T. Maskawa, Prog. Th. Phys. 49, 652 (1973).
- [2] A.B. Carter and A.I. Sanda, Phys. Rev. D23, 1567 (1981);
 I.I. Bigi and A.I. Sanda, Nucl. Phys. B193, 85 (1981).
- [3] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 091801 (2001).
- [4] BELLE Collaboration, K. Abe *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 091802 (2001).
- [5] OPAL Collaboration, K. Ackerstaff *et al.*, Eur. Phys. Jour. C 5, 379 (1998);
 CDF Collaboration, T. Affolder *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D61, 072005 (2000);
 ALEPH Collaboration, R. Barate *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B492, 259 (2000);
 BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86, 2515 (2001);
 BELLE Collaboration, A. Abashian *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86, 2509 (2001).
- [6] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert et al., BABAR-PUB-01/03, SLAC-PUB-9060, hep-ex/0201020, submitted to Phys. Rev. D .
- [7] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert et al., Nucl. Instr. and Methods A479, 117 (2002).
- [8] http://wwwinfo.cern.ch/asd/geant4/geant4.html
- [9] See, for example, L. Wolfenstein, Eur. Phys. Jour. C 15, 115 (2000).
- [10] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 241801 (2001).
- [11] A.S. Dighe, I. Dunietz and R. Fleischer, Phys. Lett. **B433**, 147 (1998).
- [12] Particle Data Group, D.E. Groom et al., Eur. Phys. Jour. C 15, 1 (2000).
- [13] M. Suzuki, Phys. Rev. **D64**, 117503 (2001).
- [14] See, for example, F.J. Gilman, K. Kleinknecht and B. Renk, Eur. Phys. Jour. C 15, 110 (2000).
- [15] I. Dunietz, H.R. Quinn, A. Snyder, W. Toki and H. J. Lipkin, Phys. Rev. D 43, 2193 (1991).
- [16] A.S. Dighe, I. Dunietz, H.J. Lipkin and J.L. Rosner, Phys. Lett. B369, 144 (1996).