

University of Massachusetts Amherst

ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst

Civil and Environmental Engineering Faculty
Publication Series

Civil and Environmental Engineering

2004

Study of the decay $B^0((\bar{B})^0) \rightarrow \rho^+ \rho^-$, and constraints on the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-maskawa angle α

BABAR Collaboration

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umass.edu/cee_faculty_pubs

Recommended Citation

BABAR Collaboration, "Study of the decay $B^0((\bar{B})^0) \rightarrow \rho^+ \rho^-$, and constraints on the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-maskawa angle α " (2004). *Physical Review Letters*. 195.
<https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.93.231801>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Civil and Environmental Engineering at ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Civil and Environmental Engineering Faculty Publication Series by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.

Study of the decay $B^0(\bar{B}^0) \rightarrow \rho^+ \rho^-$, and constraints on the CKM angle α .

B. Aubert,¹ R. Barate,¹ D. Boutigny,¹ F. Couderc,¹ J.-M. Gaillard,¹ A. Hicheur,¹ Y. Karyotakis,¹ J. P. Lees,¹
V. Tisserand,¹ A. Zghiche,¹ A. Palano,² A. Pompili,² J. C. Chen,³ N. D. Qi,³ G. Rong,³ P. Wang,³ Y. S. Zhu,³
G. Eigen,⁴ I. Ofte,⁴ B. Stugu,⁴ G. S. Abrams,⁵ A. W. Borgland,⁵ A. B. Breon,⁵ D. N. Brown,⁵ J. Button-Shafer,⁵
R. N. Cahn,⁵ E. Charles,⁵ C. T. Day,⁵ M. S. Gill,⁵ A. V. Gritsan,⁵ Y. Groysman,⁵ R. G. Jacobsen,⁵ R. W. Kadel,⁵
J. Kadyk,⁵ L. T. Kerth,⁵ Yu. G. Kolomensky,⁵ G. Kukartsev,⁵ C. LeClerc,⁵ G. Lynch,⁵ A. M. Merchant,⁵
L. M. Mir,⁵ P. J. Oddone,⁵ T. J. Orimoto,⁵ M. Pripstein,⁵ N. A. Roe,⁵ M. T. Ronan,⁵ V. G. Shelkov,⁵
W. A. Wenzel,⁵ K. Ford,⁶ T. J. Harrison,⁶ C. M. Hawkes,⁶ S. E. Morgan,⁶ A. T. Watson,⁶ M. Fritsch,⁷ K. Goetzen,⁷
T. Held,⁷ H. Koch,⁷ B. Lewandowski,⁷ M. Pelizaeus,⁷ M. Steinke,⁷ J. T. Boyd,⁸ N. Chevalier,⁸ W. N. Cottingham,⁸
M. P. Kelly,⁸ T. E. Latham,⁸ F. F. Wilson,⁸ T. Cuhadar-Donszelmann,⁹ C. Hearty,⁹ N. S. Knecht,⁹ T. S. Mattison,⁹
J. A. McKenna,⁹ D. Thiessen,⁹ A. Khan,¹⁰ P. Kyberd,¹⁰ L. Teodorescu,¹⁰ V. E. Blinov,¹¹ A. D. Bukin,¹¹
V. P. Druzhinin,¹¹ V. B. Golubev,¹¹ V. N. Ivanchenko,¹¹ E. A. Kravchenko,¹¹ A. P. Onuchin,¹¹ S. I. Serednyakov,¹¹
Yu. I. Skovpen,¹¹ E. P. Solodov,¹¹ A. N. Yushkov,¹¹ D. Best,¹² M. Bruinsma,¹² M. Chao,¹² I. Eschrich,¹²
D. Kirkby,¹² A. J. Lankford,¹² M. Mandelkern,¹² R. K. Mommsen,¹² W. Roethel,¹² D. P. Stoker,¹² C. Buchanan,¹³
B. L. Hartfiel,¹³ J. W. Gary,¹⁴ B. C. Shen,¹⁴ K. Wang,¹⁴ D. del Re,¹⁵ H. K. Hadavand,¹⁵ E. J. Hill,¹⁵
D. B. MacFarlane,¹⁵ H. P. Paar,¹⁵ Sh. Rahatlou,¹⁵ V. Sharma,¹⁵ J. W. Berryhill,¹⁶ C. Campagnari,¹⁶ B. Dahmes,¹⁶
S. L. Levy,¹⁶ O. Long,¹⁶ A. Lu,¹⁶ M. A. Mazur,¹⁶ J. D. Richman,¹⁶ W. Verkerke,¹⁶ T. W. Beck,¹⁷ A. M. Eisner,¹⁷
C. A. Heusch,¹⁷ W. S. Lockman,¹⁷ T. Schalk,¹⁷ R. E. Schmitz,¹⁷ B. A. Schumm,¹⁷ A. Seiden,¹⁷ P. Spradlin,¹⁷
D. C. Williams,¹⁷ M. G. Wilson,¹⁷ J. Albert,¹⁸ E. Chen,¹⁸ G. P. Dubois-Felsmann,¹⁸ A. Dvoretiskii,¹⁸ D. G. Hitlin,¹⁸
I. Narsky,¹⁸ T. Piatenko,¹⁸ F. C. Porter,¹⁸ A. Ryd,¹⁸ A. Samuel,¹⁸ S. Yang,¹⁸ S. Jayatilleke,¹⁹ G. Mancinelli,¹⁹
B. T. Meadows,¹⁹ M. D. Sokoloff,¹⁹ T. Abe,²⁰ F. Blanc,²⁰ P. Bloom,²⁰ S. Chen,²⁰ W. T. Ford,²⁰ U. Nauenberg,²⁰
A. Olivas,²⁰ P. Rankin,²⁰ J. G. Smith,²⁰ J. Zhang,²⁰ L. Zhang,²⁰ A. Chen,²¹ J. L. Harton,²¹ A. Soffer,²¹
W. H. Toki,²¹ R. J. Wilson,²¹ Q. L. Zeng,²¹ D. Altenburg,²² T. Brandt,²² J. Brose,²² T. Colberg,²² M. Dickopp,²²
E. Feltresi,²² A. Hauke,²² H. M. Lacker,²² E. Maly,²² R. Müller-Pfefferkorn,²² R. Nogowski,²² S. Otto,²²
A. Petzold,²² J. Schubert,²² K. R. Schubert,²² R. Schwierz,²² B. Spaan,²² J. E. Sundermann,²² D. Bernard,²³
G. R. Bonneaud,²³ F. Brochard,²³ P. Grenier,²³ S. Schrenk,²³ Ch. Thiebaux,²³ G. Vasileiadis,²³ M. Verderi,²³
D. J. Bard,²⁴ P. J. Clark,²⁴ D. Lavin,²⁴ F. Muheim,²⁴ S. Playfer,²⁴ Y. Xie,²⁴ M. Andreotti,²⁵ V. Azzolini,²⁵
D. Bettoni,²⁵ C. Bozzi,²⁵ R. Calabrese,²⁵ G. Cibinetto,²⁵ E. Luppi,²⁵ M. Negrini,²⁵ L. Piemontese,²⁵ A. Sarti,²⁵
E. Treadwell,²⁶ R. Baldini-Ferrolì,²⁷ A. Calcaterra,²⁷ R. de Sangro,²⁷ G. Finocchiaro,²⁷ P. Patteri,²⁷ M. Piccolo,²⁷
A. Zallo,²⁷ A. Buzzo,²⁸ R. Capra,²⁸ R. Contri,²⁸ G. Crosetti,²⁸ M. Lo Vetere,²⁸ M. Macri,²⁸ M. R. Monge,²⁸
S. Passaggio,²⁸ C. Patrignani,²⁸ E. Robutti,²⁸ A. Santroni,²⁸ S. Tosi,²⁸ S. Bailey,²⁹ G. Brandenburg,²⁹ M. Morii,²⁹
E. Won,²⁹ R. S. Dubitzky,³⁰ U. Langenegger,³⁰ W. Bhimji,³¹ D. A. Bowerman,³¹ P. D. Dauncey,³¹ U. Egede,³¹
J. R. Gaillard,³¹ G. W. Morton,³¹ J. A. Nash,³¹ G. P. Taylor,³¹ G. J. Grenier,³² U. Mallik,³² J. Cochran,³³
H. B. Crawley,³³ J. Lamsa,³³ W. T. Meyer,³³ S. Prell,³³ E. I. Rosenberg,³³ J. Yi,³³ M. Davier,³⁴ G. Grosdidier,³⁴
A. Höcker,³⁴ S. Laplace,³⁴ F. Le Diberder,³⁴ V. Lepeltier,³⁴ A. M. Lutz,³⁴ T. C. Petersen,³⁴ S. Plaszczynski,³⁴
M. H. Schune,³⁴ L. Tantot,³⁴ G. Wormser,³⁴ C. H. Cheng,³⁵ D. J. Lange,³⁵ M. C. Simani,³⁵ D. M. Wright,³⁵
A. J. Bevan,³⁶ J. P. Coleman,³⁶ J. R. Fry,³⁶ E. Gabathuler,³⁶ R. Gamet,³⁶ R. J. Parry,³⁶ D. J. Payne,³⁶
R. J. Sloane,³⁶ C. Touramanis,³⁶ J. J. Back,³⁷ C. M. Cormack,³⁷ P. F. Harrison,³⁷ * G. B. Mohanty,³⁷
C. L. Brown,³⁸ G. Cowan,³⁸ R. L. Flack,³⁸ H. U. Flaecher,³⁸ M. G. Green,³⁸ C. E. Marker,³⁸ T. R. McMahon,³⁸
S. Ricciardi,³⁸ F. Salvatore,³⁸ G. Vaitsas,³⁸ M. A. Winter,³⁸ D. Brown,³⁹ C. L. Davis,³⁹ J. Allison,⁴⁰ N. R. Barlow,⁴⁰
R. J. Barlow,⁴⁰ P. A. Hart,⁴⁰ M. C. Hodgkinson,⁴⁰ G. D. Lafferty,⁴⁰ A. J. Lyon,⁴⁰ J. C. Williams,⁴⁰ A. Farbin,⁴¹
W. D. Hulsbergen,⁴¹ A. Jawahery,⁴¹ D. Kovalskyi,⁴¹ C. K. Lae,⁴¹ V. Lillard,⁴¹ D. A. Roberts,⁴¹ G. Blaylock,⁴²
C. Dallapiccola,⁴² K. T. Flood,⁴² S. S. Hertzbach,⁴² R. Kofler,⁴² V. B. Koptchev,⁴² T. B. Moore,⁴² S. Saremi,⁴²
H. Staengle,⁴² S. Willocq,⁴² R. Cowan,⁴³ G. Sciolla,⁴³ F. Taylor,⁴³ R. K. Yamamoto,⁴³ D. J. J. Mangeol,⁴⁴
P. M. Patel,⁴⁴ S. H. Robertson,⁴⁴ A. Lazzaro,⁴⁵ F. Palombo,⁴⁵ J. M. Bauer,⁴⁶ L. Cremaldi,⁴⁶ V. Eschenburg,⁴⁶
R. Godang,⁴⁶ R. Kroeger,⁴⁶ J. Reidy,⁴⁶ D. A. Sanders,⁴⁶ D. J. Summers,⁴⁶ H. W. Zhao,⁴⁶ S. Brunet,⁴⁷ D. Côté,⁴⁷
P. Taras,⁴⁷ H. Nicholson,⁴⁸ N. Cavallo,⁴⁹ F. Fabozzi,⁴⁹ † C. Gatto,⁴⁹ L. Lista,⁴⁹ D. Monorchio,⁴⁹ P. Paolucci,⁴⁹

D. Piccolo,⁴⁹ C. Sciacca,⁴⁹ M. Baak,⁵⁰ H. Bulten,⁵⁰ G. Raven,⁵⁰ L. Wilden,⁵⁰ C. P. Jessop,⁵¹ J. M. LoSecco,⁵¹
 T. A. Gabriel,⁵² T. Allmendinger,⁵³ B. Brau,⁵³ K. K. Gan,⁵³ K. Honscheid,⁵³ D. Hufnagel,⁵³ H. Kagan,⁵³
 R. Kass,⁵³ T. Pulliam,⁵³ A. M. Rahimi,⁵³ R. Ter-Antonyan,⁵³ Q. K. Wong,⁵³ J. Brau,⁵⁴ R. Frey,⁵⁴ O. Igonkina,⁵⁴
 C. T. Potter,⁵⁴ N. B. Sinev,⁵⁴ D. Strom,⁵⁴ E. Torrence,⁵⁴ F. Colecchia,⁵⁵ A. Dorigo,⁵⁵ F. Galeazzi,⁵⁵ M. Margoni,⁵⁵
 M. Morandin,⁵⁵ M. Posocco,⁵⁵ M. Rotondo,⁵⁵ F. Simonetto,⁵⁵ R. Stroili,⁵⁵ G. Tiozzo,⁵⁵ C. Voci,⁵⁵ M. Benayoun,⁵⁶
 H. Briand,⁵⁶ J. Chauveau,⁵⁶ P. David,⁵⁶ Ch. de la Vaissière,⁵⁶ L. Del Buono,⁵⁶ O. Hamon,⁵⁶ M. J. J. John,⁵⁶
 Ph. Leruste,⁵⁶ J. Ocariz,⁵⁶ M. Pivk,⁵⁶ L. Roos,⁵⁶ S. T'Jampens,⁵⁶ G. Therin,⁵⁶ P. F. Manfredi,⁵⁷ V. Re,⁵⁷
 P. K. Behera,⁵⁸ L. Gladney,⁵⁸ Q. H. Guo,⁵⁸ J. Panetta,⁵⁸ F. Anulli,^{27,59} M. Biasini,⁵⁹ I. M. Peruzzi,^{27,59}
 M. Pioppi,⁵⁹ C. Angelini,⁶⁰ G. Batignani,⁶⁰ S. Bettarini,⁶⁰ M. Bondioli,⁶⁰ F. Bucci,⁶⁰ G. Calderini,⁶⁰
 M. Carpinelli,⁶⁰ V. Del Gamba,⁶⁰ F. Forti,⁶⁰ M. A. Giorgi,⁶⁰ A. Lusiani,⁶⁰ G. Marchiori,⁶⁰ F. Martinez-Vidal,^{60,†}
 M. Morganti,⁶⁰ N. Neri,⁶⁰ E. Paoloni,⁶⁰ M. Rama,⁶⁰ G. Rizzo,⁶⁰ F. Sandrelli,⁶⁰ J. Walsh,⁶⁰ M. Haire,⁶¹ D. Judd,⁶¹
 K. Paick,⁶¹ D. E. Wagoner,⁶¹ N. Danielson,⁶² P. Elmer,⁶² Y. P. Lau,⁶² C. Lu,⁶² V. Miftakov,⁶² J. Olsen,⁶²
 A. J. S. Smith,⁶² A. V. Telnov,⁶² F. Bellini,⁶³ G. Cavoto,^{62,63} R. Faccini,⁶³ F. Ferrarotto,⁶³ F. Ferroni,⁶³
 M. Gaspero,⁶³ L. Li Gioi,⁶³ M. A. Mazzoni,⁶³ S. Morganti,⁶³ M. Pierini,⁶³ G. Piredda,⁶³ F. Safai Tehrani,⁶³
 C. Voena,⁶³ S. Christ,⁶⁴ G. Wagner,⁶⁴ R. Waldi,⁶⁴ T. Adye,⁶⁵ N. De Groot,⁶⁵ B. Franek,⁶⁵ N. I. Geddes,⁶⁵
 G. P. Gopal,⁶⁵ E. O. Olaiya,⁶⁵ R. Aleksan,⁶⁶ S. Emery,⁶⁶ A. Gaidot,⁶⁶ S. F. Ganzhur,⁶⁶ P.-F. Giraud,⁶⁶ G. Hamel
 de Monchenault,⁶⁶ W. Kozanecki,⁶⁶ M. Langer,⁶⁶ M. Legendre,⁶⁶ G. W. London,⁶⁶ B. Mayer,⁶⁶ G. Schott,⁶⁶
 G. Vasseur,⁶⁶ Ch. Yèche,⁶⁶ M. Zito,⁶⁶ M. V. Purohit,⁶⁷ A. W. Weidemann,⁶⁷ F. X. Yumiceva,⁶⁷ D. Aston,⁶⁸
 R. Bartoldus,⁶⁸ N. Berger,⁶⁸ A. M. Boyarski,⁶⁸ O. L. Buchmueller,⁶⁸ M. R. Convery,⁶⁸ M. Cristinziani,⁶⁸ G. De
 Nardo,⁶⁸ D. Dong,⁶⁸ J. Dorfan,⁶⁸ D. Dujmic,⁶⁸ W. Dunwoodie,⁶⁸ E. E. Elsen,⁶⁸ S. Fan,⁶⁸ R. C. Field,⁶⁸
 T. Glanzman,⁶⁸ S. J. Gowdy,⁶⁸ T. Hadig,⁶⁸ V. Halyo,⁶⁸ C. Hast,⁶⁸ T. Hryn'ova,⁶⁸ W. R. Innes,⁶⁸ M. H. Kelsey,⁶⁸
 P. Kim,⁶⁸ M. L. Kocian,⁶⁸ D. W. G. S. Leith,⁶⁸ J. Libby,⁶⁸ S. Luitz,⁶⁸ V. Luth,⁶⁸ H. L. Lynch,⁶⁸ H. Marsiske,⁶⁸
 R. Messner,⁶⁸ D. R. Muller,⁶⁸ C. P. O'Grady,⁶⁸ V. E. Ozcan,⁶⁸ A. Perazzo,⁶⁸ M. Perl,⁶⁸ S. Petrak,⁶⁸
 B. N. Ratcliff,⁶⁸ A. Roodman,⁶⁸ A. A. Salnikov,⁶⁸ R. H. Schindler,⁶⁸ J. Schwiening,⁶⁸ G. Simi,⁶⁸ A. Snyder,⁶⁸
 A. Soha,⁶⁸ J. Stelzer,⁶⁸ D. Su,⁶⁸ M. K. Sullivan,⁶⁸ J. Va'vra,⁶⁸ S. R. Wagner,⁶⁸ M. Weaver,⁶⁸ A. J. R. Weinstein,⁶⁸
 W. J. Wisniewski,⁶⁸ M. Wittgen,⁶⁸ D. H. Wright,⁶⁸ A. K. Yarritu,⁶⁸ C. C. Young,⁶⁸ P. R. Burchat,⁶⁹
 A. J. Edwards,⁶⁹ T. I. Meyer,⁶⁹ B. A. Petersen,⁶⁹ C. Roat,⁶⁹ S. Ahmed,⁷⁰ M. S. Alam,⁷⁰ J. A. Ernst,⁷⁰
 M. A. Saeed,⁷⁰ M. Saleem,⁷⁰ F. R. Wappler,⁷⁰ W. Bugg,⁷¹ M. Krishnamurthy,⁷¹ S. M. Spanier,⁷¹ R. Eckmann,⁷²
 H. Kim,⁷² J. L. Ritchie,⁷² A. Satpathy,⁷² R. F. Schwitters,⁷² J. M. Izen,⁷³ I. Kitayama,⁷³ X. C. Lou,⁷³ S. Ye,⁷³
 F. Bianchi,⁷⁴ M. Bona,⁷⁴ F. Gallo,⁷⁴ D. Gamba,⁷⁴ C. Borean,⁷⁵ L. Bosisio,⁷⁵ C. Cartaro,⁷⁵ F. Cossutti,⁷⁵ G. Della
 Ricca,⁷⁵ S. Dittongo,⁷⁵ S. Grancagnolo,⁷⁵ L. Lanceri,⁷⁵ P. Poropat,^{75,§} L. Vitale,⁷⁵ G. Vuagnin,⁷⁵ R. S. Panvini,⁷⁶
 Sw. Banerjee,⁷⁷ C. M. Brown,⁷⁷ D. Fortin,⁷⁷ P. D. Jackson,⁷⁷ R. Kowalewski,⁷⁷ J. M. Roney,⁷⁷ H. R. Band,⁷⁸
 S. Dasu,⁷⁸ M. Datta,⁷⁸ A. M. Eichenbaum,⁷⁸ M. Graham,⁷⁸ J. J. Hollar,⁷⁸ J. R. Johnson,⁷⁸ P. E. Kutter,⁷⁸
 H. Li,⁷⁸ R. Liu,⁷⁸ F. Di Lodovico,⁷⁸ A. Mihalyi,⁷⁸ A. K. Mohapatra,⁷⁸ Y. Pan,⁷⁸ R. Prepost,⁷⁸ A. E. Rubin,⁷⁸
 S. J. Sekula,⁷⁸ P. Tan,⁷⁸ J. H. von Wimmersperg-Toeller,⁷⁸ J. Wu,⁷⁸ S. L. Wu,⁷⁸ Z. Yu,⁷⁸ and H. Neal⁷⁹

(The BABAR Collaboration)

¹Laboratoire de Physique des Particules, F-74941 Annecy-le-Vieux, France

²Università di Bari, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-70126 Bari, Italy

³Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing 100039, China

⁴University of Bergen, Inst. of Physics, N-5007 Bergen, Norway

⁵Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory and University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA

⁶University of Birmingham, Birmingham, B15 2TT, United Kingdom

⁷Ruhr Universität Bochum, Institut für Experimentalphysik 1, D-44780 Bochum, Germany

⁸University of Bristol, Bristol BS8 1TL, United Kingdom

⁹University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada V6T 1Z1

¹⁰Brunel University, Uxbridge, Middlesex UB8 3PH, United Kingdom

¹¹Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics, Novosibirsk 630090, Russia

¹²University of California at Irvine, Irvine, CA 92697, USA

¹³University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA 90024, USA

¹⁴University of California at Riverside, Riverside, CA 92521, USA

¹⁵University of California at San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093, USA

¹⁶University of California at Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, CA 93106, USA

¹⁷University of California at Santa Cruz, Institute for Particle Physics, Santa Cruz, CA 95064, USA

¹⁸California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91125, USA

¹⁹University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH 45221, USA

- ²⁰University of Colorado, Boulder, CO 80309, USA
- ²¹Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80523, USA
- ²²Technische Universität Dresden, Institut für Kern- und Teilchenphysik, D-01062 Dresden, Germany
- ²³Ecole Polytechnique, LLR, F-91128 Palaiseau, France
- ²⁴University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH9 3JZ, United Kingdom
- ²⁵Università di Ferrara, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-44100 Ferrara, Italy
- ²⁶Florida A&M University, Tallahassee, FL 32307, USA
- ²⁷Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati dell'INFN, I-00044 Frascati, Italy
- ²⁸Università di Genova, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-16146 Genova, Italy
- ²⁹Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA
- ³⁰Universität Heidelberg, Physikalisches Institut, Philosophenweg 12, D-69120 Heidelberg, Germany
- ³¹Imperial College London, London, SW7 2AZ, United Kingdom
- ³²University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA 52242, USA
- ³³Iowa State University, Ames, IA 50011-3160, USA
- ³⁴Laboratoire de l'Accélérateur Linéaire, F-91898 Orsay, France
- ³⁵Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA 94550, USA
- ³⁶University of Liverpool, Liverpool L69 7ZE, United Kingdom
- ³⁷Queen Mary, University of London, E1 4NS, United Kingdom
- ³⁸University of London, Royal Holloway and Bedford New College, Egham, Surrey TW20 0EX, United Kingdom
- ³⁹University of Louisville, Louisville, KY 40292, USA
- ⁴⁰University of Manchester, Manchester M13 9PL, United Kingdom
- ⁴¹University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742, USA
- ⁴²University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA 01003, USA
- ⁴³Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Laboratory for Nuclear Science, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA
- ⁴⁴McGill University, Montréal, QC, Canada H3A 2T8
- ⁴⁵Università di Milano, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-20133 Milano, Italy
- ⁴⁶University of Mississippi, University, MS 38677, USA
- ⁴⁷Université de Montréal, Laboratoire René J. A. Lévesque, Montréal, QC, Canada H3C 3J7
- ⁴⁸Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, MA 01075, USA
- ⁴⁹Università di Napoli Federico II, Dipartimento di Scienze Fisiche and INFN, I-80126, Napoli, Italy
- ⁵⁰NIKHEF, National Institute for Nuclear Physics and High Energy Physics, NL-1009 DB Amsterdam, The Netherlands
- ⁵¹University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN 46556, USA
- ⁵²Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN 37831, USA
- ⁵³Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210, USA
- ⁵⁴University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403, USA
- ⁵⁵Università di Padova, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-35131 Padova, Italy
- ⁵⁶Universités Paris VI et VII, Lab de Physique Nucléaire H. E., F-75252 Paris, France
- ⁵⁷Università di Pavia, Dipartimento di Elettronica and INFN, I-27100 Pavia, Italy
- ⁵⁸University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA
- ⁵⁹Università di Perugia, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-06100 Perugia, Italy
- ⁶⁰Università di Pisa, Dipartimento di Fisica, Scuola Normale Superiore and INFN, I-56127 Pisa, Italy
- ⁶¹Prairie View A&M University, Prairie View, TX 77446, USA
- ⁶²Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA
- ⁶³Università di Roma La Sapienza, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-00185 Roma, Italy
- ⁶⁴Universität Rostock, D-18051 Rostock, Germany
- ⁶⁵Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Chilton, Didcot, Oxon, OX11 0QX, United Kingdom
- ⁶⁶DSM/Dapnia, CEA/Saclay, F-91191 Gif-sur-Yvette, France
- ⁶⁷University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC 29208, USA
- ⁶⁸Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, Stanford, CA 94309, USA
- ⁶⁹Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305-4060, USA
- ⁷⁰State Univ. of New York, Albany, NY 12222, USA
- ⁷¹University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37996, USA
- ⁷²University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX 78712, USA
- ⁷³University of Texas at Dallas, Richardson, TX 75083, USA
- ⁷⁴Università di Torino, Dipartimento di Fisica Sperimentale and INFN, I-10125 Torino, Italy
- ⁷⁵Università di Trieste, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-34127 Trieste, Italy
- ⁷⁶Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN 37235, USA
- ⁷⁷University of Victoria, Victoria, BC, Canada V8W 3P6
- ⁷⁸University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI 53706, USA
- ⁷⁹Yale University, New Haven, CT 06511, USA

(Dated: August 24, 2019)

Using a data sample of 89 million $\Upsilon(4S) \rightarrow B\bar{B}$ decays collected with the BABAR detector at the PEP-II asymmetric B Factory at SLAC, we measure the $B^0(\bar{B}^0) \rightarrow \rho^+\rho^-$ branching fraction as $(30 \pm$

$4(\text{stat}) \pm 5(\text{syst}) \times 10^{-6}$ and a longitudinal polarization fraction of $f_L = 0.99 \pm 0.03(\text{stat})_{-0.03}^{+0.04}(\text{syst})$. We measure the time-dependent-asymmetry parameters of the longitudinally polarized component of this decay as $C_L = -0.17 \pm 0.27(\text{stat}) \pm 0.14(\text{syst})$ and $S_L = -0.42 \pm 0.42(\text{stat}) \pm 0.14(\text{syst})$. We exclude values of α between 19° and 71° (90% C.L.).

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

The recently observed [1] decay $B^0(\bar{B}^0) \rightarrow \rho^+\rho^-$ proceeds mainly through the $b \rightarrow u\bar{u}d$ tree diagram. Interference between direct decay and decay after B^0 - \bar{B}^0 mixing results in a time-dependent decay-rate asymmetry between B^0 and \bar{B}^0 that is sensitive to the CKM [2] angle $\alpha \equiv \arg[-V_{td}V_{tb}^*/V_{ud}V_{ub}^*]$. The presence of loop (penguin) contributions introduces additional phases that can shift the experimentally measurable parameter α_{eff} away from the value of α . In the presence of penguin contributions $\alpha_{\text{eff}} = \alpha + \delta\alpha_{\text{penguin}}$. A constraint on α tests the Standard Model description of CP violation. Recent measurements of the $B^+ \rightarrow \rho^+\rho^0$ branching fraction and upper limit for $B^0 \rightarrow \rho^0\rho^0$ [3] indicate small penguin contributions in $B \rightarrow \rho\rho$, as has been found in some calculations [4]. Here we present a time-dependent analysis of $B^0(\bar{B}^0) \rightarrow \rho^+\rho^-$.

The CP analysis of B decays to $\rho^+\rho^-$ is complicated by the presence of three helicity states ($h = 0, \pm 1$). The $h = 0$ state corresponds to longitudinal polarization and is CP-even, while neither the $h = +1$ nor the $h = -1$ state is an eigenstate of CP. The longitudinal polarization fraction f_L is defined as the fraction of the helicity zero state in the decay. The angular distribution is

$$\frac{d^2\Gamma}{\Gamma d\cos\theta_1 d\cos\theta_2} = \frac{9}{4} \left(f_L \cos^2\theta_1 \cos^2\theta_2 + \frac{1}{4}(1 - f_L) \sin^2\theta_1 \sin^2\theta_2 \right) \quad (1)$$

where $\theta_i, i = 1, 2$ is defined for each ρ meson as the angle between the π^0 momentum in the ρ rest frame and the flight direction of the B^0 in this frame. We have integrated over the angle between the ρ -decay planes. A full angular analysis of the decays is needed in order to separate the definite CP contributions; if however a single CP channel dominates the decay, this is not necessary [5]. The longitudinal polarization dominates this decay [1, 6].

This measurement is based on 89 million $\Upsilon(4S) \rightarrow B\bar{B}$ decays collected with the BABAR [7] detector at the PEP-II asymmetric B Factory at SLAC. We reconstruct $B^0(\bar{B}^0) \rightarrow \rho^+\rho^-$ candidates (B_{rec}) from combinations of two charged tracks and two π^0 candidates. We require that both tracks have particle identification information inconsistent with the electron, kaon, and proton hypotheses. The π^0 candidates are formed from pairs of photons that have measured energies greater than 50 MeV. The reconstructed π^0 mass must satisfy $0.10 < m_{\gamma\gamma} < 0.16 \text{ GeV}/c^2$. The mass of the ρ candidates, $m_{\pi^\pm\pi^0}$, must satisfy $|m_{\pi^\pm\pi^0} - 0.770 \text{ GeV}/c^2| < 0.375 \text{ GeV}/c^2$. When multiple B candidates can be formed we select

the one that minimizes the sum of the deviations of the reconstructed π^0 masses from the true π^0 mass. Combinatorial backgrounds dominate near $|\cos\theta_i| = 1$, while backgrounds from B decays, like $B^0 \rightarrow \rho^+\pi^-$, with an additional low energy π^0 from the rest of the event (ROE), tend to concentrate at negative values of $\cos\theta_i$. We reduce these backgrounds with the requirement $-0.8 < \cos\theta_i < 0.98$.

Continuum $e^+e^- \rightarrow q\bar{q}$ ($q = u, d, s, c$) events are the dominant background. To discriminate signal from continuum we use a neural network (\mathcal{N}) to combine six variables: the two event-shape variables used in the Fisher discriminant of Ref. [8]; the cosine of the angle between the direction of the B and the collision axis (z) in the center-of-mass (CM) frame; the cosine of the angle between the B thrust axis and the z axis; the cosine of the angle between the B thrust axis and the thrust axis of the ROE; the decay angle of the π^0 (defined in analogy to the ρ decay angle, θ_i); the sum of transverse momenta in the ROE relative to the z axis.

Signal events are identified kinematically using two variables, the difference ΔE between the CM energy of the B candidate and $\sqrt{s}/2$, and the beam-energy substituted mass $m_{\text{ES}} = \sqrt{(s/2 + \mathbf{p}_i \cdot \mathbf{p}_B)^2/E_i^2 - \mathbf{p}_B^2}$, where \sqrt{s} is the total CM energy. The B momentum \mathbf{p}_B and four-momentum of the initial state (E_i, \mathbf{p}_i) are defined in the laboratory frame. We accept candidates that satisfy $5.21 < m_{\text{ES}} < 5.29 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ and $-0.12 < \Delta E < 0.15 \text{ GeV}$. The asymmetric ΔE window suppresses background from higher-multiplicity B decays.

To study the time-dependent asymmetry one needs to measure the proper time difference, Δt , between the two B decays in the event, and to determine the flavor tag of the other B -meson. The time difference between the decays of the two neutral B mesons in the event ($B_{\text{rec}}, B_{\text{tag}}$) is calculated from the measured separation Δz between the B_{rec} and B_{tag} decay vertices [9, 10]. We determine the B_{rec} vertex from the two charged-pion tracks in its decay. The B_{tag} decay vertex is obtained by fitting the other tracks in the event, with constraints from the B_{rec} momentum and the beam-spot location. The RMS resolution on Δt is 1.1 ps. We only use events for which the proper time difference between the B_{rec} and B_{tag} decays satisfies $|\Delta t| < 20 \text{ ps}$ and the error on Δt , $\sigma(\Delta t)$, is less than 2.5 ps. The flavor of the B_{tag} meson is determined with a multivariate technique [8] that has a total effective tagging efficiency of $(28.4 \pm 0.7)\%$. The events are assigned to five mutually exclusive tagging categories Lepton, Kaon 1, Kaon 2, Inclusive, and Untagged,

listed in order of decreasing reliability of the tag.

Signal candidates may pass the selection even if one or more of the pions assigned to the $\rho^+\rho^-$ state is from the other B in the event. These self-cross-feed (SCF) candidates comprise 39% (16%) of the accepted signal for $f_L = 1$ ($f_L = 0$).

The efficiency of the selection is 7.7% (14.9%) for longitudinally (transversely) polarized signal as determined with Monte Carlo (MC) [11]. The signal efficiency taking into account the measured polarisation is 7.7%. We select 24288 events, which are dominated by combinatoric backgrounds: roughly 86% from $q\bar{q}$ and 13% from $B\bar{B}$. We distinguish the following candidate types: (i) correctly reconstructed signal, for $B^0(\bar{B}^0) \rightarrow \rho^+\rho^-$ decays where the correct particles are combined to form the B_{rec} candidate; (ii) SCF signal; (iii) charm B^\pm background ($b \rightarrow c$); (iv) charm B^0 background ($b \rightarrow c$); (v) charmless B backgrounds; (vi) continuum $e^+e^- \rightarrow q\bar{q}$ ($q = u, d, s, c$) background. We consider both types (i) and (ii) as signal. The charmless decays $B^\pm \rightarrow \rho^\pm\pi^0$, $B^\pm \rightarrow \rho^\pm\rho^0$, $B^\pm \rightarrow a_1^\pm\pi^0$, and $B^\pm \rightarrow a_1\rho$ are expected to contribute to the final sample. For these decays we assume the following branching fractions: 11.0 ± 2.7 [12], $26.4^{+6.1}_{-6.4}$ [13], 30 ± 15 , and 20 ± 20 , in units of 10^{-6} , corresponding to 17 ± 4 , 16 ± 4 , 30 ± 15 , and 26 ± 26 events in the data, respectively. The latter two are estimated from the measured branching fractions of related decays. We expect an additional 283 ± 283 candidates of charmless B decays with more than four mesons in the final state; since most branching fractions for such modes have not been measured yet, we generate them using the JETSET simulation [14]. We expect 1700 (1016) charged (neutral) B decays to final states containing charm mesons. The rest of the background is composed of continuum. Each of these backgrounds is included as an individual component in the fit, where the continuum yield is allowed to vary in the fit.

Each candidate is described with the eight B_{rec} kinematic variables m_{ES} and ΔE , the $m_{\pi^\pm\pi^0}$ and $\cos\theta_i$ values of the two ρ mesons, Δt , and \mathcal{N} . For each different candidate-type considered, we construct a probability density function (PDF) that is the product of PDFs in each of these variables, assuming that they are uncorrelated. The total PDF is used in the fit to data.

The parameters of the PDFs for continuum-background m_{ES} , ΔE , $\cos\theta_i$, and \mathcal{N} are allowed to vary in the final fit to the data. The distribution of the continuum as a function of $m_{\pi^\pm\pi^0}$ is described by a non-parametric PDF [15] derived from m_{ES} and ΔE data sidebands. For all other types these distributions are extracted from high-statistics MC samples. The $\cos\theta_i$ distributions for the background are described by a non-parametric PDF derived from the MC, as the detector acceptance and selection criteria modify the known vector-meson decay distribution. The signal distribution is given by Eq. (1) multiplied by an acceptance function

determined from signal MC. We take into account known differences between data and the MC.

The signal Δt distribution is described by an exponential (B lifetime) multiplied by a CP violating term, convoluted with three Gaussians ($\sim 90\%$ core, $\sim 9\%$ tail, $\sim 1\%$ outliers) and takes into account $\sigma(\Delta t)$ from the vertex fit. The resolution is parameterized using a large sample of fully reconstructed hadronic B decays [9]. The nominal Δt distribution for the B backgrounds is a non-parametric representation of the MC; in the study of systematic errors we replace this model with the one used for signal. The continuum background is described by the sum of three Gaussian distributions whose parameters are determined by fitting the data.

The signal decay-rate distribution $f_+(f_-)$ for $B_{\text{tag}} = B^0(\bar{B}^0)$ is given by:

$$f_\pm(\Delta t) = \frac{e^{-|\Delta t|/\tau}}{4\tau} [1 \pm S \sin(\Delta m_d \Delta t) \mp C \cos(\Delta m_d \Delta t)],$$

where τ is the mean B^0 lifetime, Δm_d is the B^0 - \bar{B}^0 mixing frequency, and $S = S_L$ or S_T and $C = C_L$ or C_T are the CP asymmetry parameters for the longitudinal and transversely polarized signal. The fitting function takes into account mistag dilution and is convoluted with the Δt resolution function described above. We set S_T and C_T to zero since the transverse polarisation in the fit is small.

We perform an unbinned extended maximum likelihood (ML) fit that assumes the event types mentioned previously. The results of the fit are 246 ± 29 signal events with $f_L = 0.99 \pm 0.03$, $S_L = -0.42 \pm 0.42$ and $C_L = -0.17 \pm 0.27$. There is a bias on the yield coming from the neglect of correlations in the fit (six events) and B -background modeling (16 events). The former is estimated using MC simulations and the latter is dominated by the change in signal yield when the $a_1\rho$ component is to allowed to vary in a fit to the data. The signal yield remains stable when allowing the yield of other background types to vary. The corrected signal yield is 224 ± 29 events. Figure 1 shows distributions of m_{ES} , $\cos\theta_i$ and $m_{\pi^\pm\pi^0}$ for **Lepton** and **Kaon** 1 tagged events, enhanced in signal content by cuts on the signal-to-background likelihood ratios of the discriminating variables not projected. The additional cuts retain $\mathcal{O}(15\%)$ of the signal events in the analysis sample. For m_{ES} and ΔE we show a projection of the data for all tag categories; in these plots we retain $\mathcal{O}(60\%)$ of the signal events in the analysis sample. Figure 2 shows the raw Δt distribution for B^0 and \bar{B}^0 tagged events. The time-dependent decay-rate asymmetry $A = (R(\Delta t) - \bar{R}(\Delta t)) / (R(\Delta t) + \bar{R}(\Delta t))$ is also shown, where $R(\bar{R})$ is the decay-rate for B^0 (\bar{B}^0) tagged events.

The nominal fit does not account for non-resonant background. If we add a non-resonant component of $B \rightarrow \rho\pi\pi^0$ events to the likelihood, the fitted signal yield changes by less than 11% (90% C.L.). Any possible $B \rightarrow 4\pi$ component would be significantly smaller.




FIG. 1: The distributions for a sample of events enriched in signal for the variables (a) m_{ES} , (b) ΔE , (c) cosine of the ρ helicity angle and (d) $m_{\pi^+\pi^0}$. The dotted line is the projection of the sum of backgrounds and the solid line is the projection of the full likelihood. For m_{ES} we show the projections for (top line) all and (bottom line) **L**epton and **K**aon 1 tagged events.

The dominant systematic uncertainties in the yield arise from the assumed B -background branching fractions (20 events) and the uncertainty on the fraction of SCF events (14 events). The uncertainty on the estimated fraction of misreconstructed events is extrapolated from a control sample of fully reconstructed $B^0 \rightarrow D^-\rho^+$ decays. A 10% systematic error on the branching fraction comes from π^0 reconstruction. The dominant systematic error on f_L is from the uncertainty in PDF parameterization (± 0.03). We vary CP -violation in the B background




FIG. 2: The Δt distribution for a sample of events enriched in signal for (a) B^0 and (b) \bar{B}^0 tagged events. The dashed line represents the sum of backgrounds and the solid line represents the sum of signal and backgrounds. The time-dependent CP asymmetry A (see text) is shown in (c), where the curve represents the asymmetry.

within reasonable limits. This is the main systematic uncertainty on the CP results: 0.08 (0.11) on S_L (C_L). The systematic uncertainty on S_L (C_L) from B -background branching fractions is 0.02 (0.03). Uncertainty in the vertex-detector alignment contributes an error of 0.06 (0.04) on S_L (C_L). In half of the SCF events the misreconstructed signal contains at least one wrong track; the difference in resolution function for these events corresponds to an uncertainty of 0.03 (0.01) on S_L (C_L). The uncertainty in the parametrization of the likelihood contributes an error of 0.05 (0.02) on S_L (C_L). We estimate the systematic error from ignoring interference with non-resonant modes and $a_1\pi$ to be 0.02 on S_L and C_L , and 2.4% on the signal yield. The uncertainty from possible CP -violation in the doubly-Cabibbo-suppressed decays on the tag side of the event [16] is assumed to be the same as for $B^0(\bar{B}^0) \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$: 0.012 (0.037) for S_L (C_L). We also apply a correction to account for possible dilution from B -background (5%) and SCF (3%) events.

Our results are

$$\begin{aligned} BR(B^0 \rightarrow \rho^+\rho^-) &= (33 \pm 4(\text{stat}) \pm 5(\text{syst})) \times 10^{-6} \\ f_L &= 0.99 \pm 0.03(\text{stat}) \pm 0.04(\text{syst}) \\ C_L &= -0.17 \pm 0.27(\text{stat}) \pm 0.14(\text{syst}) \\ S_L &= -0.42 \pm 0.42(\text{stat}) \pm 0.14(\text{syst}) \end{aligned}$$

The correlation coefficient between S_L and C_L is -0.016 . We average this branching fraction with the less precise result from Ref. [1], taking into account correlations where appropriate [13], to obtain the final value of $(30 \pm 4 \pm 5) \times 10^{-6}$. This measurement supersedes the previous BABAR result presented in Ref. [1].

Using the Grossman-Quinn bound [1, 17] with the recent results on $B \rightarrow \rho^+\rho^0, \rho^0\rho^0$ from [3] we limit $|\alpha_{\text{eff}} - \alpha| < 13^\circ$ (68% C.L.). Ignoring possible non-resonant contributions, and $I = 1$ amplitudes [18] one can relate the CP parameters S_L and C_L to α , up to a four-fold ambiguity. If we select the solution closest to the CKM best fit central value of $\alpha = 95 - 98^\circ$ [19], the measured CP parameters of the longitudinal polarization correspond to $\alpha = 102_{-12}^{+16}(\text{stat})_{-4}^{+5}(\text{syst}) \pm 13(\text{penguin})^\circ$. Figure 3 shows the confidence level as a function of $\alpha_{\text{eff}} = \arcsin(S_L/\sqrt{1-C_L^2})/2$ for this result, (dotted) taking into account systematic uncertainties and (solid) also including the penguin contribution. We exclude values of α between 19° and 71° (90% C.L.).

We are grateful for the excellent luminosity and machine conditions provided by our PEP-II colleagues, and for the substantial dedicated effort from the computing organizations that support BABAR. The collaborating institutions wish to thank SLAC for its support and kind hospitality. This work is supported by DOE and NSF (USA), NSERC (Canada), IHEP (China), CEA and CNRS-IN2P3 (France), BMBF and DFG (Germany), INFN (Italy), FOM (The Netherlands), NFR (Norway), MIST (Russia), and PPARC (United Kingdom). Indi-




FIG. 3: A plot of (dotted) α_{eff} and (solid) α as a function of confidence level for this result.

viduals have received support from CONACyT (Mexico), A. P. Sloan Foundation, Research Corporation, and Alexander von Humboldt Foundation.

* Now at Department of Physics, University of Warwick, Coventry, United Kingdom

† Also with Università della Basilicata, Potenza, Italy

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

§ Deceased

- [1] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 031102 (2004).
- [2] N. Cabibbo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **10**, 531 (1963); M. Kobayashi and T. Maskawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. **49**, 652 (1973).
- [3] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett.

- 91**, 171802 (2003). Belle Collaboration, J. Zhang *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 221801 (2003);
- [4] R. Aleksan *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **356**, 95 (1995).
- [5] I. Dunietz *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **43**, 2193 (1991).
- [6] G. Kramer and W. Palmer, Phys. Rev. D **45**, 193 (1992); D. Ebert *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **56**, 312 (1997); A. Ali *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **58**, 094009 (1998); Y.-H. Chen *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 094014 (1999); H.-Y. Cheng and K.-C. Yang, Phys. Lett. B **511**, 40 (2001); M. Suzuki, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 054018 (2002).
- [7] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Nucl. Instr. Meth. A **479**, 1 (2002).
- [8] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 281802 (2002).
- [9] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 032003 (2002).
- [10] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 201802 (2002).
- [11] S. Agostinelli *et al.* [GEANT4 Collaboration], Nucl. Instr. Meth. A **506**, 250 (2003).
- [12] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, hep-ex/0311049.
- [13] The Heavy Flavor Averaging Group, <http://www.slac.stanford.edu/xorg/hfag/>.
- [14] T. Sjöstrand *et al.*, Comput. Phys. Commun. **135**, 238 (2001).
- [15] Cranmer, K. S., Comput. Phys. Commun. **136**, 198 (2001).
- [16] O. Long *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 034010 (2003).
- [17] M. Gronau, D. London, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 3381 (1990); Y. Grossman and H. Quinn, Phys. Rev. D **58**, 017504 (1998).
- [18] A. Falk *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 011502 (2004).
- [19] J. Charles *et al.*, hep-ph/0406184; M. Bona *et al.*, hep-ph/0408079.