

## Determining $\gamma$ using $B \rightarrow DK$ with multibody $D$ decays

Anjan Giri,<sup>1</sup> Yuval Grossman,<sup>1</sup> Abner Soffer,<sup>2</sup> and Jure Zupan<sup>1,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Physics, Technion (Israel Institute of Technology,  
Technion City, 32000 Haifa, Israel

<sup>2</sup>Department of Physics, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80523

<sup>3</sup>J. Stefan Institute, Jamova 39, P.O. Box 3000, 1001 Ljubljana, Slovenia

### Abstract

We propose a method for determining  $\gamma$  using  $B \rightarrow DK$  decays followed by a multibody  $D$  decay, such as  $D \rightarrow K_S^+ \pi^+$ ,  $D \rightarrow K_S^+ K^- K^+$  and  $D \rightarrow K_S^+ \pi^+ \pi^0$ . The main advantages of the method is that it uses only Cabibbo allowed  $D$  decays, and that large strong phases are expected due to the presence of resonances. Since no knowledge about the resonance structure is needed,  $\gamma$  can be extracted without any hadronic uncertainty.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The theoretically cleanest way of determining the angle

$$\gamma = \arg(-V_{ud}V_{ub}^* = V_{cd}V_{cb}^*); \quad (1)$$

is to utilize the interference between the  $b \rightarrow c$  and  $b \rightarrow u$  decay amplitudes [12]. Because these transitions involve only distinct quark flavors, there are no penguin contributions to these decays. In the original idea by Gronau and Wyler (GW) [3] the  $B \rightarrow D_{CP} K$  decay modes are used, where  $D_{CP}$  represents a  $D$  meson which decays into a  $CP$  eigenstate. The dependence on  $\gamma$  arises from the interference between the  $B \rightarrow D^0 K$  and  $B \rightarrow \bar{D}^0 K$  decay amplitudes. The main advantage of the GW method is that, in principle, the hadronic parameters can be cleanly extracted from data, by measuring the  $B \rightarrow D^0 K$  and  $B \rightarrow \bar{D}^0 K$  decay rates.

In practice, however, measuring  $\gamma$  in this way is not an easy task. Due to the values of the CKM coefficients and color suppression, the ratio between the two interfering amplitudes,  $r_B$  [see Eq. (4)], is expected to be small, of order 10%–20%. This reduces the sensitivity to  $\gamma$ , which is roughly proportional to the magnitude of the smaller amplitude. In addition, if the strong phases vanish, measuring  $\gamma$  makes use of terms of order  $r_B^2$ . In contrast, if a large strong phase is involved in the interference, there is a sensitivity to  $\gamma$  at order  $r_B$  with most methods. Thus, in general, having large interfering amplitudes with large relative strong phases is a favorable situation.

Since the hadronic parameters are not yet known, it is still not clear which of the proposed methods is more sensitive. In addition, all the methods are expected to be statistically limited. It is therefore important to make use of all modes and methods, as well as to try to find new methods. Any new method that is based on "unused" decay channels increases the total statistics. Moreover, many of the analyses are sensitive to common hadronic parameters, for example,  $r_B$ . Combining them will increase the sensitivity of the measurement by more than just the increase in statistics.

Here we study the possibility to use  $B \rightarrow D K$ , followed by a multibody  $D$  decay, in order to cleanly determine  $\gamma$ . While this idea was already discussed in [5], most of our results and applications are new. For the sake of concreteness, we concentrate on the  $D \rightarrow K_S^+ \pi^+$  decay mode. The advantage of using such decay chains is threefold. First, one expects large strong phases due to the presence of resonances. Second, only Cabibbo allowed  $D$  decay modes are needed. Third, the final state involves only charged particles, which have a higher reconstruction efficiency and lower background than neutrals. The price one has to pay is that a Dalitz plot analysis of the data is needed. We describe how to do the Dalitz plot analysis in a model-independent way, and explore the advantages gained by introducing

variable model-dependence. The final balance between the advantages and disadvantages depends on yet-to-be-determined hadronic parameters and experimental considerations.

## II. MODEL INDEPENDENT DETERMINATION OF

As we shall show in this section, to perform a model independent determination of the angle one needs to measure the two CP-conjugate decay modes,  $B \rightarrow DK \rightarrow (K_S^+)_D K^-$  and to perform a Dalitz plot analysis of the  $K_S^+$  final state originating from the intermediate D meson. (In the following discussion we neglect  $D^0 \rightarrow D^0$  mixing, which is a good approximation in the context of the Standard Model. See appendix A for details.)

Let us first focus on the following cascade decay

$$B \rightarrow DK \rightarrow (K_S^+)_D K^-; \quad (2)$$

and define the amplitudes

$$A(B \rightarrow D^0 K^-) = A_B; \quad (3)$$

$$A(B \rightarrow \bar{D}^0 K^-) = A_B r_B e^{i(\beta_B)}; \quad (4)$$

The same definitions apply to the amplitudes for the CP conjugate cascade  $B^+ \rightarrow DK^+ \rightarrow (K_S^+)_D K^+$ , with the change of weak phase sign  $\rightarrow$  in (4). Since we have set the strong phase of  $A_B$  to zero by convention,  $\beta_B$  is the difference of strong phases between the two amplitudes. For the CKM elements, the usual convention of the weak phases has been used. (The deviation of the weak phase from  $\beta_B$  has been neglected, as it is suppressed by the factor  $\lambda^4 \approx 2 \cdot 10^{-3}$ , with  $\lambda$  being the sine of the Cabibbo angle.) The value of  $|A_B|$  is known from the measurement of the  $B \rightarrow D^0 K^-$  decay width using flavor specific decays of  $D^0$  and the precision of its determination is expected to further improve [13]. The amplitude  $A(B \rightarrow \bar{D}^0 K^-)$  is color suppressed and cannot be determined from experiment in this way [4]. The color suppression together with the experimental values of the ratio of the relevant CKM elements leads to the theoretical expectation  $r_B \approx 0.1 - 0.2$  (see recent discussion in [11]).

For the three-body D meson decay we define

$$\begin{aligned} A_D(s_{12}; s_{13}) &= A_{12;13} e^{i\phi_{12;13}} A(D^0 \rightarrow K_S(p_1) (p_2)^+ (p_3)) \\ &= A(\bar{D}^0 \rightarrow K_S(p_1)^+ (p_2) (p_3)); \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where  $s_{ij} = (p_i + p_j)^2$ , and  $p_1; p_2; p_3$  are the momenta of the  $K_S; ; ^+$  respectively. We also set the magnitude  $A_{12;13} \geq 0$ , such that  $\phi_{12;13}$  can vary between 0 and  $2\pi$ . In the last

equality the CP symmetry of the strong interaction together with the fact that the final state is a spin zero state has been used. With the above definitions, the amplitude for the cascade decay is

$$A(B \rightarrow (K_S^+)_D K^-) = A_B P_D A_D(s_{12}; s_{13}) + r_B e^{i(\phi_B)} A_D(s_{13}; s_{12}); \quad (6)$$

where  $P_D$  is the D meson propagator. Next, we write down the expression for the reduced partial decay width

$$\begin{aligned} d^{\wedge}(B \rightarrow (K_S^+)_D K^-) = & A_{12;13}^2 + r_B^2 A_{13;12}^2 \\ & + 2r_B \text{Re} [A_D(s_{12}; s_{13}) A_D(s_{13}; s_{12}) e^{i(\phi_B)}] dp; \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where  $dp$  denotes the phase space variables, and we used the extremely accurate narrow width approximation for the D meson propagator.

In general, there is no symmetry between the two arguments of  $A_D$  in Eq. (6), and thus in the rates over the Dalitz plot. A symmetry would be present if, for instance, the three-body D decay proceeded only through  $\rho$ -like resonances. We emphasize, however, that the product  $A_D(s_{12}; s_{13}) A_D(s_{13}; s_{12})$  in the interference term in Eq. (7) is symmetric under the exchange  $s_{12} \leftrightarrow s_{13}$  followed by complex conjugation. This fact is used to simplify the analysis.

The moduli of the D decay amplitude  $A_{12;13}$  can be measured from the Dalitz plot of the  $D^0 \rightarrow K_S^+ K^-$  decay. To perform this measurement the flavor of the decaying neutral D meson has to be tagged. This can be best achieved by using the charge of the soft pion in the decay  $D^+ \rightarrow D^0 \pi^+$ . However, the phase  $\phi_{12;13}$  of the D meson decay amplitude is not measurable without further model dependent assumptions. The cosine of the relevant phase difference may be measured at a charm factory (see section III). If the three-body decay  $D^0 \rightarrow K_S^+ K^-$  is assumed to be resonance dominated, the Dalitz plot can be fit to a sum of Breit-Wigner functions, determining also the relative phases of the resonant amplitudes. This is further discussed in section IV. Here we assume that no charm factory data is available and develop the formalism without any model dependent assumptions.

Using the trigonometric relation  $\cos(a+b) = \cos a \cos b - \sin a \sin b$ , the last term of (7) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Re} [A_D(s_{12}; s_{13}) A_D(s_{13}; s_{12}) e^{i(\phi_B)}] = & \\ A_{12;13} A_{13;12} [\cos(\phi_{12;13} - \phi_{13;12}) \cos(\phi_B) + \sin(\phi_{12;13} - \phi_{13;12}) \sin(\phi_B)]: & \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Obviously, to compare with the data, an integration over at least some part of the Dalitz




FIG. 1: The partitions of Dalitz plot as discussed in text. The symmetry axis is the dashed line. On the axes we have  $s_{12} = m_{K_s^+}^2$  and  $s_{13} = m_{K_s^+}^2$  in  $\text{GeV}^2$ .

plot has to be performed. We therefore partition the Dalitz plot into  $n$  bins and define

$$c_i = \int_{Z^i} dp A_{12;13} A_{13;12} \cos(\delta_{12;13} - \delta_{13;12}); \quad (9a)$$

$$s_i = \int_{Z^i} dp A_{12;13} A_{13;12} \sin(\delta_{12;13} - \delta_{13;12}); \quad (9b)$$

$$T_i = \int_i dp A_{12;13}^2; \quad (9c)$$

where the integrals are done over the phase space of the  $i$ -th bin. The variables  $c_i$  and  $s_i$  contain differences of strong phases and are therefore unknowns in the analysis. The variables  $T_i$ , on the other hand, can be measured from flavor tagged  $D$  decays as discussed above, and are assumed to be known inputs into the analysis.

Due to the symmetry of the interference term, it is convenient to use pairs of bins that are placed symmetrically about the  $12 \leftrightarrow 13$  line, as shown in Fig. 1. Consider an even,  $n = 2k$ , number of bins. The  $k$  bins lying below the symmetry axis are denoted by index  $i$ , while the remaining bins are indexed with  $\bar{i}$ . The  $\bar{i}$ -th bin is obtained by mirroring the  $i$ -th bin over the axis of symmetry. The variables  $c_i; s_i$  of the  $i$ -th bin are related to the variables of the  $\bar{i}$ -th bin by

$$c_i = c_{\bar{i}}; \quad s_i = -s_{\bar{i}}; \quad (10)$$

while there is no relation between  $T_i$  and  $T_{\bar{i}}$ . Note that had one used  $12 \leftrightarrow 13$  symmetric bins centered on the symmetry axis, one would have had  $s_i = 0$ .

Together with the information available from the  $B^+$  decay, we arrive at a set of  $4k$

equations

$$\hat{d}_i^-(B) = (K_S^+)_D(K^-) = T_i + r_B^2 T_i + 2r_B [\cos(\beta) c_i + \sin(\beta) s_i]; \quad (11a)$$

$$\hat{d}_i^-(B) = (K_S^+)_D(K^-) = T_i + r_B^2 T_i + 2r_B [\cos(\beta) c_i - \sin(\beta) s_i]; \quad (11b)$$

$$\hat{d}_i^+(B) = (K_S^+)_D(K^+) = T_i + r_B^2 T_i + 2r_B [\cos(\beta + \alpha) c_i + \sin(\beta + \alpha) s_i]; \quad (11c)$$

$$\hat{d}_i^+(B) = (K_S^+)_D(K^+) = T_i + r_B^2 T_i + 2r_B [\cos(\beta + \alpha) c_i - \sin(\beta + \alpha) s_i]; \quad (11d)$$

These equations are related to each other through  $c_i \leftrightarrow s_i$  and/or  $c_i \leftrightarrow -c_i$  exchanges. All in all, there are  $2k + 3$  unknowns in (11),

$$c_i; s_i; r_B; \beta; \alpha; \quad (12)$$

so that the  $4k$  relations (11) are solvable for  $k \geq 2$ . In other words, a partition of the Dalitz plot to four or more bins allows for the determination of  $\alpha$  without hadronic uncertainties. This is our main result.

Alternatively to this binning, one can use a partition of the Dalitz plot into  $k$  bins which are symmetric under  $c_i \leftrightarrow s_i$ . For that case,  $s_i = 0$  and the set of the  $4k$  equations (11) reduces to  $2k$  relations (the first two and the last two equations in (11) are the same in this case). Then, there are just  $k + 3$  unknowns to be solved for, which is possible for  $k \geq 3$ . While such binning may be needed due to low statistics, it has several disadvantages, which are further discussed below.

When  $c_i = 0$  or  $s_i = 0$  for all  $i$ , some equations become degenerate and  $\alpha$  cannot be extracted. However, due to resonances, we do not expect this to be the case. Degeneracy also occurs if  $\beta = 0$ . In this case,  $\alpha$  can still be extracted if some of the  $c_i$  and/or  $s_i$  are independently measured, as discussed in the following sections.

The optimal partition of the Dalitz plot as well as the number of bins is to be determined once the analysis will be done. Some of the considerations that enter this choice are as follows. First, one would like to have as many small bins as possible, in order that  $c_i$  and  $s_i$  do not average out to small numbers. Second, the bins have to be large enough that there are significantly more events than bins. Otherwise there will be more unknowns than observables. There are also experimental considerations, such as optimal parameterization of backgrounds and reconstruction efficiency.

### III. IMPROVED MEASUREMENT OF $c_i$ AND $s_i$

So far, we have used the B decay sample to obtain all the unknowns, including  $c_i$  and  $s_i$ , which are parameters of the charm system. We now discuss ways to make use of high-statistics charm decays to improve the measurement of these parameters, or obtain them independently. Doing so will reduce the number of unknowns that need to be determined from the relatively low-statistics B sample, thereby reducing the error in the measurement of  $\phi$ .

The first improvement in the measurement is obtained by making use of the large sample of tagged D decays, identified in the decay  $D^+ \rightarrow D^0 + \dots$ , at the B factories. So far we only assumed that we use this data to determine  $T_i$ . In fact, it can also be used to bound the unknowns  $c_i$  and  $s_i$  defined in (9):

$$\sum_i |c_i|^2 + |s_i|^2 \leq \sum_i \frac{1}{2} (A_{12;13}^2 + A_{13;12}^2) \cos(\phi_{12;13} - \phi_{13;12}) : \quad (13)$$

This bound will help decrease the error in the determination of  $\phi$ , with an especially significant effect when, due to low statistics in each bin,  $c_i$  and  $s_i$  will be determined with large errors.

Next, we show that the  $c_i$  can be independently measured at a charm factory [14]{16}. This is done by running the machine at the  $(3770)$  resonance, which decays into a  $D\bar{D}$  pair. If one D meson is detected in a CP eigenstate decay mode, it tags the other D as an eigenstate of the opposite CP eigenvalue. The amplitude and partial decay width for this state to decay into the final state of interest are

$$A(D^0 \rightarrow K_S(p_1)(p_2)^+(p_3)) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (A_D(s_{12};s_{13}) - A_{\bar{D}}(s_{13};s_{12})); \quad (14)$$

$$\Gamma(D^0 \rightarrow K_S(p_1)(p_2)^+(p_3)) = \frac{1}{2} (A_{12;13}^2 + A_{13;12}^2 - 2A_{12;13}A_{13;12} \cos(\phi_{12;13} - \phi_{13;12})) \Gamma_D :$$

where we defined  $D^0 = (D^0 - \bar{D}^0)/\sqrt{2}$ . With these relations, one readily obtains

$$c_i = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\sum_i \Gamma(D_+^0 \rightarrow K_S(p_1)(p_2)^+(p_3))}{\sum_i \Gamma(D^0 \rightarrow K_S(p_1)(p_2)^+(p_3))} : \quad (15)$$

As stated above, obtaining this independent measurement reduces the error in the measurement of  $\phi$  by removing  $k$  of the  $2k + 3$  unknowns.

We can further improve the measurement if we take each bin  $i$  and further divide it into  $n_i$  sub-bins, such that the quantities  $A_{12;13}$ ,  $\cos(\phi_{12;13} - \phi_{13;12})$ , and  $\sin(\phi_{12;13} - \phi_{13;12})$  do not change significantly within each sub-bin  $i^0$ . Naively, this statement appears to introduce model dependence. In practice, however, the high statistics in the tagged D sample and the charm factory  $(3770)$  sample allow its verification up to a statistical error, which can be measured and propagated to the final measurement of  $\phi$ .

Given this condition, Eq. (9a) may be written as

$$c_i = \sum_{i^0} A_{i^0} A_{\bar{i}^0} \cos(\delta_{i^0} - \delta_{\bar{i}^0}) p_{i^0} = \sum_{i^0} p_{i^0} \frac{A_{i^0} A_{\bar{i}^0}}{T_{i^0} T_{\bar{i}^0}} \cos(\delta_{i^0} - \delta_{\bar{i}^0}); \quad (16)$$

where the  $\bar{i}^0$ -th sub-bin is the  $12 \pm 13$  m error in age of the  $i^0$ -th sub-bin,  $A_{i^0}$  and  $A_{\bar{i}^0}$  are the values of  $A_{12;13}$  and  $A_{\bar{12};\bar{13}}$  on sub-bin  $i^0$ , taken to be constant throughout the sub-bin, and  $p_{i^0}$  is the area of sub-bin  $i^0$ . Analogously to Eq. (9c), we have defined the quantities  $T_{i^0} = A_{12;13}^2 p_{i^0}$ , which are measured using the tagged  $D$  sample. The  $c_{i^0}$ 's are assumed to be measured at the charm factory, applying (15) to the sub-bin  $i^0$ . Similarly, Eq. (9b) becomes

$$s_i = \sum_{i^0} p_{i^0} \frac{A_{i^0} A_{\bar{i}^0}}{T_{i^0} T_{\bar{i}^0}} \sin(\delta_{i^0} - \delta_{\bar{i}^0}) = \sum_{i^0} q_{i^0} \frac{A_{i^0} A_{\bar{i}^0}}{T_{i^0} T_{\bar{i}^0}} \frac{\phi_i}{\phi_0}; \quad (17)$$

Eq. (17) removes the  $k$  unknowns  $s_i$ , and replaces them with the two-fold ambiguity associated with the sign of the square root. Thus, the best approach is to have the signs of  $s_i$  determined by the fit, while constraining their absolute values to satisfy Eq. (17). Doing so will reduce the "strain" on the  $B$  decay sample, reducing the error on  $\phi$ .

Another option for removing the dependence on  $s_i$  is to use bins centered symmetrically about the  $12 \pm 13$  line, making  $s_i$  vanish, as discussed after Eq. (10). In this case, both the number of unknowns and the number of observables (bins) is reduced by  $k$ . By contrast, using Eq. (17) introduces new information from the independent tagged  $D$  sample, and is therefore preferred. Doing so also preserves the  $\sin(\delta_B)$  terms in Eq. (11), which helps resolve discrete ambiguities (see [7] and section V).

#### IV. ASSUMING BREIT-WIGNER DEPENDENCE

If the functional dependence of both the moduli and the phases of the  $D^0$  meson decay amplitudes  $A_D(s_{12}; s_{13})$  were known, then the analysis would be simplified. There would be only three variables,  $r_B$ ;  $\delta_B$ , and  $\phi$ , that need to be fit to the reduced partial decay widths in Eq. (7). A plausible assumption about their forms, which is also supported by experimental data [17-19], is that a significant part of the three-body  $D^0 \rightarrow K_S^+ K_S^-$  decay proceeds via resonances. These include decay transitions of the form  $D^0 \rightarrow K_S^0 \rightarrow K_S^+ K_S^-$  or  $D^0 \rightarrow K(892)^+ \rightarrow K_S^+ K_S^-$ , as well as decays through higher resonances, e.g.,  $f_0(980)$ ,  $f_2(1270)$ , or  $f_0(1370)$ , inducing  $\rho$ -like transitions, or  $K_0(1430)$ , which induces a  $K(892)$ -like transition.

It is important to stress that these assumptions can be tested. By making use of the high statistics tagged  $D$  sample, one can test that the assumed shapes of the resonances are consistent with the data. While the error introduced by using the Breit-Wigner shapes is

theoretical, it is expected to be much smaller than the statistical error in the measurement of  $\Gamma$ . It will become a problem only when the B sample is large enough to provide a precision measurement of  $\Gamma$ . By then the tagged D sample will have increased as well, allowing even more precise tests of these assumptions, as well as improving the precision of the methods presented in section III.

The decay amplitude can then be fit to a sum of Breit-Wigner functions and a constant term. Following the notations of Ref. [20] we write

$$A_D(s_{12};s_{13}) = A(D^0 \rightarrow K_S(p_1)(p_2) + (p_3)) = a_0 e^{i\phi_0} + \sum_r a_r e^{i\phi_r} A_r(s_{12};s_{13}); \quad (18)$$

where the first term corresponds to the non-resonant term and the second to the resonant contributions. The Breit-Wigner function is defined as

$$A_r(s_{12};s_{13}) = \tilde{M}_r BW^r; \quad (19)$$

where  $r$  represent a specific resonance in either the  $K_S(p_1)(p_2)$ ,  $K_S(p_1) + (p_3)$  or  $(p_2) + (p_3)$  channel.  $\tilde{M}_r$  is the term which accounts for the angular dependence. It depends on the spin  $J$  of the resonance. For example,  $\tilde{M}_r = 1$  and  $\tilde{M}_r = \mathcal{K}_1 \mathcal{K}_3$ . Here  $\mathcal{K}_1; \mathcal{K}_3$  are, respectively, the three momenta of one of the particles originating from the resonance and of the remaining particle, as measured in the rest frame of the two resonating particles [20].  $BW^r$  corresponds to the relativistic Breit-Wigner function and is given by

$$BW^r(s) = \frac{1}{s - M_r^2 + iM_r \Gamma_r \left(\frac{p}{s}\right)}; \quad (20)$$

where  $M_r$  is the mass of the  $r$ -th resonance and  $\Gamma_r \left(\frac{p}{s}\right)$  denotes the mass-dependent width. The argument of  $BW^r$  is  $s_{12}$  [ $s_{13}, s_{23}$ ] for a  $K_S(p_1)(p_2)$  [ $K_S(p_1) + (p_3)$ ,  $(p_2) + (p_3)$ ] resonance. One can find detailed expressions for all the functions mentioned above in Ref. [20].

One of the strong phases  $\phi_i$  in the ansatz (18) can be put to zero, while others are fit to the experimental data together with the amplitudes  $a_i$ . The best option is to fit the Dalitz plot of tagged D decays, as was done a decade ago by the ARGUS and E687 collaborations [17, 18] and recently by the CLEO collaboration [19]. The obtained functional form of  $A_D(s_{12};s_{13})$  can then be fed to Eq. (7), which is then fit to the Dalitz plot of the  $B \rightarrow (K_S + )_D K$  decay with  $r_B, \Gamma_B$  and  $\phi_B$  left as free parameters. In appendix B we provide a formula for the latter case, where only three resonance are included in the analysis.

## V. DISCUSSIONS

The observables  $\hat{a}_i$  defined in (11) can be used to experimentally look for direct CP violation. Explicitly,

$$\begin{aligned} a_{CP}^i \hat{a}_i^+ &= 4r_B \sin [\zeta_i \sin \delta_B - s_i \cos \delta_B]; \\ a_{CP}^i \hat{a}_i^- &= 4r_B \sin [\zeta_i \sin \delta_B + s_i \cos \delta_B]: \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

It is manifest that finite  $a_{CP}$  requires non vanishing strong and weak phases. The first terms in the parenthesis in (21) depends on  $\sin \delta_B$ . This is the same dependence as for a two-body  $D$  decays into CP eigenstates. In the second terms, which depend on  $\cos \delta_B$ , the required strong phase arises from the  $D$  decay amplitudes. Due to the resonances, we expect this strong phase to be large. Therefore, it may be that direct CP violation can be established in this mode even before the full analysis to measure  $\hat{a}_i$  is conducted. With more data,  $\hat{a}_i$  can be extracted assuming Breit-Wigner resonances (cf. section IV). Eventually, a model independent extraction of  $\hat{a}_i$  can be done (cf. section II and III).

The above proposed method for the model independent measurement of  $\hat{a}_i$  involves a four-fold ambiguity in the extracted value. The set of equations (11) are invariant under each of the two discrete transformations

$$P: \delta_B \rightarrow \delta_B + \pi; \zeta_i \rightarrow -\zeta_i; \quad P': \delta_B \rightarrow \delta_B; \zeta_i \rightarrow -\zeta_i; s_i \rightarrow -s_i: \quad (22)$$

We note that if all the bins used are symmetric under  $12 \leftrightarrow 13$ , the absence of the  $\sin(\delta_B)$  terms in Eq. (11) introduces a new ambiguity transformation,  $P_{ex}: \delta_B \rightarrow \delta_B; \zeta_i \rightarrow -\zeta_i$ . The discrete transformation  $P$  is a symmetry of the amplitude (6) and is thus an irreducible uncertainty of the method. It can be lifted if the sign of either  $\cos \delta_B$  or  $\sin \delta_B$  is known. The ambiguity due to  $P'$  can be resolved if the sign of  $\sin \delta_B$  is known or if the sign of  $s_i$  can be determined in at least some part of the Dalitz plot. The latter can be done by fitting a part of the Dalitz plot to Breit-Wigner functions. We emphasize that only the sign of the phase of the resonance amplitude is required, and thus we can safely use a Breit-Wigner form for this purpose.

The  $r_B$  suppression present in the scheme outlined above can be somewhat lifted if the cascade decay  $B \rightarrow D X_S \rightarrow (K_S^+)^- X_S$  is used [6, 11]. Here  $X_S$  is a multibody hadronic state with an odd number of kaons (examples of such modes are  $K^+ K^0$  and  $K_S^0$ ). Unlike the  $B \rightarrow \bar{D}^0 K^0$  decay, these modes have color-allowed contributions. This lifts the color suppression in  $r_B$ , while the mild suppression due to the CKM matrix elements remains. The major difference compared with the case of the two-body  $B$  decay is that now  $r_B$  and  $\delta_B$  are functions of the  $B \rightarrow D X_S$  decay phase space. Therefore, the experimental analysis has to deal with two Dalitz plots, one describing  $B \rightarrow D X_S$  and the

other describing the  $D \rightarrow K_S^+ \pi^0$  decay. In appendix C the necessary formalism that applies to this case is outlined. Note that the above mentioned treatment for multibody B decays also applies to quasi two-body B decays involving a resonance, such as  $B \rightarrow DK^*$ .

In addition to using different B modes, statistics may be increased by employing various D decay modes as well. An interesting possibility is the Cabibbo allowed  $D \rightarrow K_S^+ \pi^0$  decay. It comes with an even larger branching ratio than the  $D \rightarrow K_S^+ \pi^0$  decay. In addition, it has many intermediate resonances contributing to the greatly varying decay amplitude, which is what is needed for the extraction of  $\phi$ . The disadvantages of this mode are the low reconstruction efficiency of the  $\pi^0$ , as well as the binning difficulties introduced by the higher dimensionality of the four-body phase space. The formalism of section II applies to this mode as well, but now the partition of the four-body phase space is meant in Eq. (11). In the equivalent of (5), this mode has an extra minus sign, since we have introduced a new CP-odd state, the  $\pi^0$ . The final set of equations is then obtained from (11) by replacing  $r_B \rightarrow -r_B$ . The Cabibbo allowed mode  $D \rightarrow K^+ K^+ K_S^-$  may also be used for the extraction of  $\phi$ , as can the Cabibbo suppressed decays to  $K^+ K^+ \pi^0$ ,  $K^+ \pi^+ \pi^0$ , and  $K_S^+ K^+$ . One can also use (almost) flavor eigenstate decay modes, such as  $D \rightarrow K^+ \pi^+ \pi^0$  and  $D \rightarrow K^+ \pi^+ \pi^+$  [5]. Here, the important interference is between the Cabibbo allowed  $\overline{D}$  decay and the doubly Cabibbo suppressed D decay.

While we concentrated on charged B decays, the Dalitz plot analysis presented here can also be applied to self-tagging decays of neutral B mesons [8]. It is also straightforward to apply it to cases where time dependent CP asymmetries are measured [2].

The sensitivity to  $\phi$  is roughly proportional to the smaller of the two interfering amplitudes. Assuming that the only two small parameters are  $r_B$  and  $\phi$ , our method is sensitive to  $\phi$  at  $O(r_B)$ . However, the method is sensitive to  $\phi$  only in parts of the Dalitz plot. The highest sensitivity is in regions with two or more overlapping resonances. The sensitivity of the proposed method is therefore of order  $O(r_B^2)$ , where  $r_B^2$  is the fraction of events which are in the interesting region of the Dalitz plot.

A crucial point of our method is that it uses interference between two Cabibbo allowed D decay amplitudes. This is against the common intuition, which suggests that we must have a  $r_B^2$  suppression for such interference to take place, as we need a final state that is common to both  $D$  and  $\overline{D}$ . Specifically, one typically requires one Cabibbo allowed decay and another that is doubly Cabibbo suppressed, or two decays that are singly Cabibbo suppressed. To overcome this preconception, our method makes use of  $K^0 \overline{K}^0$  mixing (which is also the case for the two-body  $D \rightarrow K_S^0 \pi^0$  decay), plus the existence of overlapping resonances, which are obtained by Cabibbo-allowed  $D^0$  and  $\overline{D}^0$  decays. In addition, it is important that the hadronic three-body D meson decays have a widely changing amplitude over the Dalitz plot, which is ensured by the presence of resonances in this energy region. If the strong phases

$A_{12;13}$  and the moduli  $|A_{12;13}|$  in Eq. (9) were (almost) constant across the available phase space, the extraction of  $\delta$  from Eqs. (11) would not be possible.

Before concluding, we mention that quasi two-body  $D$  decays where one of the particles is a resonance, such as  $D \rightarrow K^+ \rho^0$  and  $D \rightarrow K^+ \omega$  [4], were proposed for use in measuring  $\delta$ . But in fact, using such decays requires a Dalitz plot analysis (see e.g. [10, 12]). What we showed here is that one can actually use the whole Dalitz plot to carry out the analysis and does not need to single out contributions of one particular resonance. Moreover, we showed that the assumption about the shapes of the resonances can be avoided, essentially with currently available data-sets.

In conclusion, we have shown that the angle  $\delta$  can be determined from the cascade decays  $B \rightarrow K (K_S^* \rightarrow \rho^0) D$ . The reason for the applicability of the proposed method lies in the presence of resonances in the three-body  $D$  meson decays that provide a necessary variation of both the phase and the magnitude of the decay amplitude across the phase space. The fact that no Cabibbo suppressed  $D$  decay amplitudes are used in the analysis is another advantage of the method. However, it does involve a Dalitz plot analysis with possibly only parts of the Dalitz plot being practically useful for the extraction of  $\delta$ . In reality, many methods have to be combined in order to achieve the required statistics for a precise determination of  $\delta$  [7].

Acknowledgments

We thank Michael Gronau, Zoltan Ligeti and Marie-Helene Schune for helpful discussions. Y.G. is supported in part by the Israel Science Foundation (ISF) under Grant No. 237/01, by the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation (BSF) through Grant No. 2000133 and by the German-Israeli Foundation for Scientific Research (GIF) through Grant No. G-698-22.7/01. The work of A.S. was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy under contract DE-FG 03-93ER 40788. J.Z. is supported in part by the Ministry of Education, Science and Sport of the Republic of Slovenia.

## APPENDIX A: THE EFFECT OF $D$ - $\bar{D}$ MIXING

In this section we focus on the contributions introduced by the fact that the flavor states  $D^0$ ,  $\bar{D}^0$  and the mass eigenstates  $D_{H,L} = p_D D^0 + q_D \bar{D}^0$  do not coincide. This effect was studied in the general case in Ref. [21]. Here we apply their formalism to our case.

Following Ref. [21] we introduce the rephasing-invariant parameter  $r_1$

$$r_1 = \frac{|A_{D \rightarrow f^+ B \rightarrow D}|}{1 + |A_{D \rightarrow f^- B \rightarrow D}|}; \quad (\text{A } 1)$$

where

$$\frac{q_D}{p_D} \frac{A_{D^0 \rightarrow f}}{A_{D^+ \rightarrow f}}; \quad r_B = \frac{A_{B \rightarrow D^0 K} P_D}{A_{B \rightarrow D^+ K} Q_D} = r_B e^{i(2\phi_D - \phi_B)}; \quad (\text{A } 2)$$

and we use the definitions of Eqs. (3) and (4) and allow for new physics effects in  $q_D/p_D = e^{i2\phi_D}$ . (In the phase convention where the  $D$  decay amplitudes are real, the phase  $\phi_D$  is negligible in the Standard Model). In our case, the final state  $f$  equals  $K_S^+$ , which leads to

$$\frac{A_{D \rightarrow K_S^+ (p_1) (p_2) + (p_3)}}{A_{D \rightarrow K_S^+ (s_{12}; s_{13})}} = e^{i2\phi_D} \frac{A_D(s_{13}; s_{12})}{A_D(s_{12}; s_{13})} = R_D(s_{12}; s_{13}) e^{i(2\phi_D + \phi_{13;12} - \phi_{12;13})}; \quad (\text{A } 3)$$

Once  $D^0$ – $D^+$  mixing is taken into account in the analysis, the expression for the partial decay width (7) is multiplied by the correction term [21]

$$1 - \text{Re}(x_D) + \text{Im}(y_D); \quad (\text{A } 4)$$

where we have expanded the correction term to first order in the small parameters

$$x_D = \frac{m}{\Gamma}; \quad y_D = \frac{\Delta\Gamma}{2\Gamma}; \quad (\text{A } 5)$$

where  $m$  and  $\Delta\Gamma$  are the mass and decay width differences in the  $D^0$ – $D^+$  system, and  $\Gamma$  is the  $D^0$  decay width. The values of  $x_D$  and  $y_D$  are constrained by present measurements to be in the percent range,  $y_D = (1.0 \pm 0.7)\%$  [22] and  $|x_D| < 2.8\%$  [23] (assuming small strong phases).

The ratio of magnitudes,  $R_D(s_{12}; s_{13})$ , depends on the position in the Dalitz plot, and can vary widely. Our method is useful for the model independent extraction of  $\phi$  only in the region where  $R_D$  is of order one. We therefore distinguish three limiting cases

$R_D \ll 1$ , for which  $\text{Re}(x_D); \text{Im}(y_D) \ll 1$  and therefore the corrections in (A 4) can be of order 10%. However, this is the region of Dalitz plot where our method is mostly not sensitive to  $\phi$  and therefore the induced corrections due to  $D^0$ – $D^+$  mixing do not translate into an error on the extracted  $\phi$ .

$R_D \approx 1$ , for which  $\text{Re}(x_D); \text{Im}(y_D) \approx 1$  and therefore the corrections in (A 4) are at the percent level. This is the value of  $R_D$  for which our method is most sensitive to  $\phi$ .

$R_D \gg 1$ , for which  $\text{Re}(x_D); \text{Im}(y_D) \approx R_D$  and therefore the corrections in (A 4) are very small.

In conclusion, we expect errors of at most a few percent due to neglecting  $D^0$ – $D^+$  mixing in our method. In principle, even these errors can be taken into account [16, 21, 24].

APPENDIX B: A FIT TO BREIT-WIGNER FUNCTIONS: AN ILLUSTRATION FOR THREE RESONANCES

In this appendix we provide the formulae for the fit of  $D$  meson decay amplitude to a sum of three Breit-Wigner functions describing  $K^*(892)$  and  $D^0$  resonances. We write Eq. (18) explicitly as

$$\begin{aligned} A_D(s_{12}; s_{13}) &= A(D^0 \rightarrow K_S^0(p_1)(p_2)^+(p_3)) = \\ &= a A_0(s_{23}) + a_K e^{i\phi_F} A_K(s_{12}) + a_K r_D e^{i\phi_D} A_K(s_{13}); \end{aligned} \quad (B1)$$

where  $\phi_F$  ( $\phi_D$ ) is the strong phase of the Cabibbo favored (doubly Cabibbo suppressed)  $D^0 \rightarrow K^+(p_1)^+(p_2)^+(p_3)$  decay with respect to the decay  $D^0 \rightarrow K_S^0$ . We further introduced

$$\begin{aligned} a / A(D^0 \rightarrow K_S^0) &= A(\bar{D}^0 \rightarrow K_S^0); \\ a_K e^{i\phi_F} / A(D^0 \rightarrow K^+) &= A(\bar{D}^0 \rightarrow K^+); \\ a_K r_D e^{i\phi_D} / A(D^0 \rightarrow K^+) &= A(\bar{D}^0 \rightarrow K^+); \end{aligned} \quad (B2)$$

The Breit-Wigner functions  $A_r$  are defined in (19), where we write in (B1) only the  $s_{ab}$  dependence of the BW  $r$  part, given in (20). The first index of  $s_{ab}$  is understood to denote also the particle appearing in the expression for  $M_r$  (19). Exchanging  $a \leftrightarrow b$  corresponds to  $M_r \leftrightarrow \bar{M}_r$ , in particular  $A_0(s_{23}) = A_0(s_{32})$ . In the above we assumed that there is no CP violation in the  $D$  decays amplitudes. Note that there are two small parameters

$$r_B \approx 0.1 \text{--} 0.2; \quad \phi^2 \approx 0.05; \quad (B3)$$

We then obtain (cf. (6))

$$\begin{aligned} A(B^+ \rightarrow (K_S^0(p_1)(p_2)^+(p_3))_D K^+) &= \\ A_B P_D &= a A_0(s_{23}) + a_K e^{i\phi_F} A_K(s_{12}) + r_D e^{i\phi_D} A_K(s_{13}) + \\ &+ r_B e^{i(\phi_B - \phi_D)} [a A_0(s_{32}) + a_K e^{i\phi_F} A_K(s_{13}) + r_D e^{i\phi_D} A_K(s_{12})]; \end{aligned} \quad (B4)$$

The corresponding expressions for  $B^+$  decays are obtained by changing  $D \rightarrow K^+$  and  $(p_2)^+(p_3) \rightarrow (p_2)(p_3)$ .

We further define

$$\phi_{12} = \arg[A_K(s_{12})]; \quad \phi_{13} = \arg[A_K(s_{13})]; \quad \phi_0 = \arg[A_0(s_{23})]; \quad (B5)$$

where the dependence of  $\phi_0$  on the position in the Dalitz plot is implicitly assumed. The

reduced differential decay rate is then

$$\begin{aligned}
& d^{\wedge}(\mathbb{B} \rightarrow (K_S^+)_D K^+) / \\
& a^2 \mathcal{A}_0(s_{23})^2 [1 - 2r_B \cos(\delta_B) + r_B^2] + \\
& a_K^2 \mathcal{A}_K(s_{12})^2 [1 + 2r_B r_D \cos(\delta_{BD}^F) + (r_B r_D)^2] + \\
& a_K^2 \mathcal{A}_K(s_{13})^2 [r_D^2 + 2r_B r_D \cos(\delta_{BF}^D) + r_B^2] + \\
& 2a_n a_K \mathcal{A}_0(s_{23}) \mathcal{A}_K(s_{13}) j \\
& \quad r_D \cos \delta_0^{D^+} + r_B^2 \cos \delta_0^{F^+} - r_B r_D \cos(\delta_{B0}^{D^+}) + r_B \cos(\delta_0^{BF^+}) + \\
& 2a_n a_K \mathcal{A}_0(s_{23}) \mathcal{A}_K(s_{12}) j \\
& \quad \cos \delta_0^F - r_B \cos(\delta_{B0}^F) + r_B r_D \cos(\delta_0^{BD}) + r_B^2 r_D \cos \delta_0^D + \\
& 2a_n^2 \mathcal{A}_K(s_{12}) \mathcal{A}_K(s_{13}) j \\
& \quad r_D \cos \delta_F^{D^+} + r_B \cos(\delta^{B^+}) + r_B r_D^2 \cos(\delta_B^+) + r_B^2 r_D \cos \delta_D^{F^+}; \quad (B6)
\end{aligned}$$

where the notation of the strong phases is such that the lower (upper) indices indicate phases appearing with a plus (minus) sign. For example,

$$\delta_D^{F^+} = \delta_D^+ - \delta_F^+; \quad (B7)$$

$a$ ,  $a_K$  and  $r_D$  are assumed to be known and thus there are five unknowns to fit, namely

$$r_B; \delta_D; \delta_F; \delta_B; \delta; \quad (B8)$$

Using both  $B^-$  and  $B^+$  decays, there is enough information to determine them all. This is true even if one neglects terms that scale as  $r_B^2$  and even if  $r_D = 0$ . This indicates that the method does not rely on doubly Cabibbo suppressed decays of the  $D$ , and that it is sensitive to  $\delta$  in terms of order  $r_B$ , rather than  $r_B^2$  (See discussion in [10]). Moreover, even if some or all of the strong phases that arise from two-body decays, namely,  $\delta_B$ ,  $\delta_D$ ; and  $\delta_F$ , vanish, there is still enough information to determine  $\delta$ .

#### APPENDIX C: MULTIBODY B DECAY

We consider the cascade decay  $B^- \rightarrow D X_S \rightarrow (K_S^+)_D X_S$ . Let us assume that the phase space of the first decay,  $B^- \rightarrow D X_S$ , is partitioned into  $m$  bins that we label by the index  $j$ , and the phase space of the  $D$  meson decay is partitioned into  $n = 2k$  bins labeled

by  $i$  and  $j$  as in section II. Instead of Eqs. (11) we now have the set of  $4k + m$  equations

$$\int_{i,j}^Z d(B \rightarrow (K_S^+)_D X_S) = T_i + R_j^B T_{\bar{i}} + \cos(\varphi_i^B + s_i s_j^B) + \sin(\varphi_i^B - s_i c_j^B); \quad (C1a)$$

$$\int_{i,j}^Z d(B \rightarrow (K_S^0)_D X_S) = T_{\bar{i}} + R_j^B T_i + \cos(\varphi_i^B - s_i s_j^B) + \sin(\varphi_i^B + s_i c_j^B); \quad (C1b)$$

$$\int_{i,j}^Z d(B^+ \rightarrow (K_S^+)_D X_S^+) = T_{\bar{i}} + R_j^B T_i + \cos(\varphi_i^B - s_i s_j^B) - \sin(\varphi_i^B + s_i c_j^B); \quad (C1c)$$

$$\int_{i,j}^Z d(B^+ \rightarrow (K_S^0)_D X_S^+) = T_i + R_j^B T_{\bar{i}} + \cos(\varphi_i^B + s_i s_j^B) - \sin(\varphi_i^B - s_i c_j^B); \quad (C1d)$$

where the integration is over the phase space of the  $j$ -th bin in the  $B$  decay and the phase space of the  $i$ -th bin in the  $D$  decay. The  $j$ -th bin of the  $B^+$  decay phase space is obtained from the  $j$ -th bin of the  $B$  decay by CP conjugation. We also used

$$\begin{aligned} s_j^B &= \frac{2r_B \sin \theta_B}{Z^j}; \\ c_j^B &= \frac{2r_B \cos \theta_B}{Z^j}; \\ R_j^B &= \frac{r_B^2}{j}; \end{aligned} \quad (C2)$$

where  $r_B$  and  $\theta_B$  are functions of the position in the  $B$  decay phase space. From the set of  $4k + m$  equations (C1), one has to determine  $2k + 3m + 1$  unknowns  $\varphi_i$ ,  $s_i$ ,  $c_j^B$ ,  $s_j^B$ ,  $R_j^B$ , and  $\theta_B$ . With a partition of the  $D$  decay phase space into  $2k + 4$  bins and with a partition of the  $B$  decay phase space into  $m + 1$  bins, one has enough relations to determine all the unknowns, including the angle  $\theta_B$ . This is true even for constant  $\theta_B$  and  $r_B$ , in which case the above equations fall into  $4k$  sets of  $m$  equivalent relations, i.e. the set of  $4k + m$  equations is reduced to the set of  $4k$  independent relations (11).

Finally, we note that the above equations can be used to determine  $\theta_B$  also for two-body  $D$  decays [6].

---

[1] For a review see, for example, G. C. Branco, L. Lavoura and J. P. Silva, "CP violation", Clarendon Press (1999).

[2] M. Gronau and D. London, Phys. Lett. B 253, 483 (1991).

- [3] M . G ronau and D . W yler, Phys. Lett. B 265, 172 (1991).
- [4] D . A twood, I. D unietz and A . Soni, Phys. Rev. Lett. 78, 3257 (1997) [[hep-ph/9612433](#)];
- [5] D . A twood, I. D unietz and A . Soni, Phys. Rev. D 63, 036005 (2001) [[arXiv:hep-ph/0008090](#)].
- [6] R . A leksan, T . C . Petersen and A . So er, [hep-ph/0209194](#);
- [7] A . So er, Phys. Rev. D 60, 054032 (1999) [[hep-ph/9902313](#)].
- [8] I. D unietz, Phys. Lett. B 270, 75 (1991).
- [9] R . A leksan, I. D unietz and B . K ayser, Z . P hys. C 54, 653 (1992); M . G ronau and J. L . Rosner, Phys. Lett. B 439, 171 (1998) [[hep-ph/9807447](#)]; M . G ronau, Phys. Rev. D 58, 037301 (1998) [[hep-ph/9802315](#)]; J. H . Jang and P . K o, Phys. Rev. D 58, 111302 (1998) [[hep-ph/9807496](#)]; Z. z. X ing, Phys. Rev. D 58, 093005 (1998) [[hep-ph/9804434](#)]; B . K ayser and D . London, Phys. Rev. D 61, 116013 (2000) [[hep-ph/9909561](#)]; R . F leischer, [hep-ph/0301255](#); [hep-ph/0301256](#).
- [10] Y . G rossm an, Z . L igeti and A . So er, [hep-ph/0210433](#);
- [11] M . G ronau, [hep-ph/0211282](#).
- [12] D . A . Suprun, J. L . Rosner, [hep-ph/0303117](#);
- [13] M . A thanas et al. [CLEO Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 5493 (1998) [[hep-ex/9802023](#)]. K . Abe et al. [BELLE Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 111801 (2001) [[hep-ex/0104051](#)]. R . M ahapatra et al. [CLEO Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 101803 (2002) [[hep-ex/0112033](#)]. K . Abe et al. [Belle collaboration], [hep-ex/0207012](#); B . A ubert et al. [BABAR Collaboration], [hep-ex/0207087](#);
- [14] A . So er, [arXiv:hep-ex/9801018](#).
- [15] M . G ronau, Y . G rossm an and J. L . Rosner, Phys. Lett. B 508, 37 (2001) [[arXiv:hep-ph/0103110](#)].
- [16] J. P . Silva and A . So er, Phys. Rev. D 61, 112001 (2000) [[arXiv:hep-ph/9912242](#)].
- [17] P . L . Frabetti et al. [E687 Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B 331, 217 (1994).
- [18] H . A lbrecht et al. [ARGUS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B 308, 435 (1993).
- [19] H . M uramatsu et al. [CLEO Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 251802 (2002) [[hep-ex/0207067](#)].
- [20] E . M . A itala et al. [E791 Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. 86, 770 (2001).
- [21] A . A morin , M . G . Santos and J. P . Silva, Phys. Rev. D 59, 056001 (1999) [[hep-ph/9807364](#)].
- [22] M . G rothe, M od. Phys. Lett. A 18, 1 (2003) [[hep-ex/0301011](#)].
- [23] R . G odang et al. [CLEO Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 5038 (2000) [[hep-ex/0001060](#)].
- [24] C . C . M eca and J. P . Silva, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 1377 (1998) [[hep-ph/9807320](#)].