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I. INTRODUCTION

The measurement of the polarization content of the decay $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^*(892)^0$ and its charge-conjugate $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^*(892)^0$ is presented using data, corresponding to an integrated luminosity of $1.0 \text{ fb}^{-1}$, collected in $pp$ collisions at a center-of-mass energy of 7 TeV with the LHCb detector. The polarization amplitudes and the corresponding phases are measured to be $|A_0|^2 = 0.227 \pm 0.004 \text{ (stat)} \pm 0.011 \text{ (syst)}$, $|A_\perp|^2 = 0.201 \pm 0.004 \text{ (stat)} \pm 0.008 \text{ (syst)}$, $\delta_0 = -2.94 \pm 0.02 \text{ (stat)} \pm 0.03 \text{ (syst)}$, and $\delta_\perp = 2.94 \pm 0.02 \text{ (stat)} \pm 0.02 \text{ (syst)}$. Comparing $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^*(892)^0$ and $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^*(892)^0$ decays, no evidence for direct $CP$ violation is found.

II. ANGULAR ANALYSIS

To measure the individual polarization amplitudes $(A_0, A_\parallel, A_\perp, A_S)$, the decay is analyzed in terms of three angular variables, denoted as $\Omega = \{\cos \theta, \cos \varphi, \varphi\}$ in the transversity basis (Fig. 2). For a $B^0$ decay, the angle between the $\mu^+$ momentum direction and the $z$ axis in the $J/\psi$ rest frame is denoted $\theta$, and $\varphi$ is the azimuthal angle of the $\mu^+$ momentum direction in the same frame. $\psi$ is the angle between the momentum direction of the $K^*$ meson and the negative momentum direction of the $J/\psi$ meson in the $K^* \rightarrow K^+ \pi^-$ rest frame. For $\bar{B}^0$ decays, the angles are defined with respect to the $\mu^-$ and the $K^*$ meson.

In this analysis the flavor of the $B$ meson at production is not measured. Therefore, the observed $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^*$ decays arise from both initial $B^0$ or $\bar{B}^0$ mesons as a result of oscillations. Summing over both contributions, the differential decay rate can be written as [15,16]

$$d\Gamma(B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^*) \propto e^{-\Gamma_d} \sum_{k=1}^{10} h_k f_k(\Omega). \quad (1)$$
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from Eq. (1) by defining the angles using the charge conjugate final state particles and multiplying the interference terms \( f_4, f_6, \) and \( f_9 \) in Table I by \(-1\). To allow for possible direct \( CP \) violation, the amplitudes are changed from \( A_t \) to \( \tilde{A}_t \) \((i = 0, \|, \perp, S)\).

### III. LHCb Detector

The LHCb detector [17] is a single-arm forward spectrometer covering the pseudorapidity range \(2 < \eta < 5\), designed for the study of particles containing \( b \) or \( c \) quarks. The detector includes a high-precision tracking system consisting of a silicon-strip vertex detector surrounding the \( pp \) interaction region, a large-area silicon-strip detector located upstream of a dipole magnet with a bending power of about 4 Tm, and three stations of silicon-strip detectors and straw drift tubes placed downstream. The combined tracking system provides a momentum measurement with relative uncertainty that varies from 0.4\% at 5 GeV/c to 0.6\% at 100 GeV/c, and impact parameter resolution of 20 \( \mu \)m for tracks with high transverse momentum \(( p_T)\).

Different types of charged hadrons are distinguished by information from two ring-imaging Cherenkov detectors [18]. Photon, electron, and hadron candidates are identified by a calorimeter system consisting of scintillating-pad and preshower detectors, an electromagnetic calorimeter, and a hadronic calorimeter. Muons are identified by a system composed of alternating layers of iron and multiwire proportional chambers. The trigger consists of a hardware stage, based on information from the calorimeter and muon systems, followed by a software stage, which applies a full event reconstruction. In the simulation, \( pp \) collisions are generated using \textsc{pythia} 6.4 [19] with a specific LHCb
configuration [20]. Decays of hadronic particles are described by EVTGEN [21], in which final state radiation is generated using PHOTOS [22]. The interaction of the generated particles with the detector and its response are implemented using the GEANT4 toolkit [23] as described in Ref. [24].

IV. DATA SAMPLES AND CANDIDATE SELECTION

In the following $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^{*0}$ refers to both charge-conjugate decays unless otherwise stated. The selection of $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^{*0}$ candidates is based upon the decays of the $J/\psi \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ and the $K^{*0} \rightarrow K^+ \pi^-$ final states. Candidates must satisfy the hardware trigger [25], which selects events containing muon candidates that have high transverse momentum with respect to the beam direction. The subsequent software trigger [25] is composed of two stages. The first stage performs a partial event reconstruction and requires events to have two well-identified oppositely charged muons with invariant mass larger than $2.7 \text{ GeV}/c^2$. The second stage of the software trigger performs a full event reconstruction and only retains events containing a $\mu^+ \mu^-$ pair that has invariant mass within $120 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ of the known $J/\psi$ mass [26] and forms a vertex that is significantly displaced from the nearest primary $pp$ interaction vertex (PV).

The $J/\psi$ candidates are formed from two oppositely charged tracks, being identified as muons, having $p_T > 500 \text{ MeV}/c$ and originating from a common vertex. The invariant mass of this pair of muons must be in the range $3030–3150 \text{ MeV}/c^2$.

The $K^{*0}$ candidates are formed from two oppositely charged tracks, one identified as a kaon and one as a pion, which originate from the same vertex. It is required that the $K^{*0}$ candidate has $p_T > 2 \text{ GeV}/c$ and invariant mass in the range $826–966 \text{ MeV}/c^2$.

The $B^0$ candidates are reconstructed from the $J/\psi$ and $K^{*0}$ candidates, with the invariant mass of the $\mu^+ \mu^-$ pair constrained to the known $J/\psi$ mass. The resulting $B^0$ candidates are required to have an invariant mass $m(J/\psi K^+ \pi^-)$ in the range $5150–5400 \text{ MeV}/c^2$. The decay time of the $B^0$ candidate is calculated from a vertex and kinematic fit that constrains the $B^0$ candidate to originate from its associated PV [27]. The $\chi^2$ per degree of freedom of the fit is required to be less than 5. For events with multiple $B^0$ candidates, the candidate with the smallest fit $\chi^2$ per degree of freedom is chosen. Only $B^0$ candidates with a decay time in the range $0.3–14 \text{ ps}$ are retained. The lower bound on the decay time rejects a large fraction of the prompt combinatorial background.

In the data sample, corresponding to an integrated luminosity of $1.0 \text{ fb}^{-1}$, collected in $pp$ collisions at a center-of-mass energy of $7 \text{ TeV}$ with the LHCb detector, a total of 77 282 candidates are selected. The invariant mass distribution is shown in Fig. 3. From a fit the number of signal decays is found to be $61 244 \pm 132$. The uncertainties on the signal yields quoted here and in Sec. VII come from propagating the uncertainty on the signal fraction evaluated by the fit.

V. MAXIMUM LIKELIHOOD FIT

The parameters used in this analysis are $|A_0|^2$, $|A_\perp|^2$, $F_S$, $\delta_\parallel$, $\delta_\perp$, and $\delta_S$, where we introduce the parameter $F_S = |A_S|^2/(1 + |A_S|^2)$ to denote the fractional S-wave component. The parameter $|A_0|^2$ is determined by the constraint $|A_0|^2 + |A_\parallel|^2 + |A_\perp|^2 = 1$. The best fit values of these parameters are determined with an unbinned maximum log-likelihood fit to the decay time and angular distributions of the selected $B^0$ candidates. To subtract the background component, each event is given a signal weight, $W_i$, using the sPlot [28] method with $m(J/\psi K^+ \pi^-)$ as the discriminating variable. The invariant mass distribution of the signal is modeled as the sum of two Gaussian functions with a common mean. The mean and widths of both Gaussian functions, as well as the fraction of the first Gaussian are parameters determined by the fit. The effective resolution of the mass peak is determined to be $9.3 \pm 0.8 \text{ MeV}/c^2$. The invariant mass distribution of the background is described by an exponential function. The signal fraction in a $\pm 30 \text{ MeV}/c$ window around the known $B^0$ mass [26] is approximately 93%.

A maximum likelihood fit is then performed with each candidate weighted by $W_i$. The fit uses a signal-only probability density function (PDF), which is denoted $S$. It is a function of the decay time $t$ and angles $\Omega$, and is obtained from Eq. (1). The exponential decay time function is convolved with a Gaussian function to take into account the decay time resolution of $45 \text{ fs}$ [14]. The effect of the time and angular resolution on this analysis has been studied and found to be negligible [16].

The fit minimizes the negative log-likelihood summed over the selected candidates.
\[-\ln L = -\alpha \sum_i W_i \ln S_i (t_i, \Omega_i), \quad (2)\]

where \(\alpha = \sum_i W_i / \sum_i W_i^2\) is a normalization factor accounting for the effect of the weights in the determination of the uncertainties [29].

The selection applied to the data is almost unbiased with respect to the decay time. The measurements of amplitudes and phases are insensitive to the decay time acceptance since \(d\Gamma / dt \sim 0\) and the time dependence of the PDF factorizes out from the angular part. Nevertheless, the small deviation of the decay time acceptance from uniformity is determined from data using decay time unbiased triggers as a reference and is included in the fitting procedure.

The acceptance as a function of the decay angles is not uniform because of the forward geometry of the detector and the momentum selection requirements applied to the final state particles. A three-dimensional acceptance function, \(A(\Omega)\), is determined using simulated events subject to the same selection criteria as the data and is included in the fit. Figure 4 shows the acceptance as a function of each decay angle, integrated over the other two angles for (a) \(\cos \theta\), (b) \(\cos \psi\), and (c) \(\varphi\). The projections are normalized such that their average value over the histogram range is unity.

The phase of the P-wave amplitude increases rapidly as a function of the \(K^+\pi^-\) invariant mass, whereas the S-wave phase increases relatively slowly [30]. As a result the phase difference between the S- and P-wave amplitudes falls with increasing \(K^+\pi^-\) invariant mass. A fit that determines the phase difference in bins of \(m(K^+\pi^-)\) can therefore be used to select the physical solution and hence resolve the ambiguity described in Sec. II. This method has previously been used to measure the sign of \(\Delta \Gamma_\phi\) in the \(B^0\) system [31]. In the analysis the data are divided into four bins of \(m(K^+\pi^-)\), shown in Fig. 5 and defined in Table II. A simultaneous fit to all four bins is performed in which the
P-wave parameters are common, but \( F_S \) and \( \delta_S \) are independent parameters in each bin. Consistent results are obtained with the use of two or six bins.

To correct for the variation of the S-wave relative to the P-wave over the \( m(K^+ \pi^-) \) range of each bin, a correction factor is introduced in each of the three interference terms \( f_S, f_0, \) and \( f_Q \) in Eq. (1). The S-wave line shape is assumed to be uniform across the \( m(K^+ \pi^-) \) range, and the P-wave shape is described by a relativistic Breit-Wigner function. The correction factor is calculated by integrating the product \( p s^* \)

\[
\int m_{K^+\pi^-}^0 p^* d m(K^+ \pi^-) = C_{SP} e^{-i\theta_{SP}}.
\]

where \( p \) and \( s \) are the P- and S-wave line shapes normalized to unity in the range of integration, \( * \) is the complex conjugation operator, \( m_{K^+\pi^-}^0 \) and \( m_{K^+\pi^-}^0 \) denote the boundaries of the \( m(K^+ \pi^-) \) bin, \( C_{SP} \) is the correction factor, and \( \theta_{SP} \) is absorbed in the measurements of \( \delta_s - \delta_0 \). The \( C_{SP} \) factors tend to unity (i.e. no correction) as the bin width tends to zero. The \( C_{SP} \) factors calculated for this analysis are given in Table II. The factors are close to unity, and hence the analysis is largely insensitive to this correction.

### VI. SYSTEMATIC UNCERTAINTIES

To estimate the systematic uncertainties arising from the choice of the model for the \( B^0 \) invariant mass, the signal mass PDF is changed from a double Gaussian function to either a single Gaussian or a crystal ball function. The largest differences observed in the fitted values of the parameters are assigned as systematic uncertainties.

To account for uncertainties in the treatment of the combinatorial background, an alternative fit to the data is performed without using signal weights. An explicit background model, \( B \), is constructed, with the time distribution being described by two exponential functions, and the angular distribution by a three-dimensional histogram derived from the sidebands of the \( B^0 \) invariant mass distribution. A fit is then made to the unweighted data sample with the sum of \( S \) and \( B \). The results of this fit are consistent with those from the fit using signal weights, and the small differences are included as systematic uncertainties.

### TABLE II. Bins of \( m(K^+ \pi^-) \) and the corresponding \( C_{SP} \) correction factor for the S-wave interference terms, assuming a uniform distribution for the nonresonant \( K^+ \pi^- \) contribution and a relativistic Breit-Wigner shape for decays via the \( K^{*0} \) resonance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( m(K^+ \pi^-) ) [MeV/c(^2)]</th>
<th>( C_{SP} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>826–861</td>
<td>0.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>861–896</td>
<td>0.946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>896–931</td>
<td>0.948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>931–966</td>
<td>0.985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A very small contribution from the decay \( B^0 \to J/\psi K^{*0} \) [32] in the high-mass sideband of the \( B^0 \) invariant mass distribution of Fig. 3 has a negligible effect on the fit results. The only significant background that peaks in the \( B^0 \) mass region arises from candidates where one or more of the tracks are misreconstructed, in most of the

### TABLE III. Systematic uncertainties as described in the text. The contribution from omitting the \( C_{SP} \) factors is negligible for the P-wave parameters. The total systematic uncertainty is the sum in quadrature of the individual contributions.

| Source                  | \( |A_{\parallel}|^2 \) | \( |A_{\perp}|^2 \) | \( \delta_{\parallel} \) [rad] | \( \delta_{\perp} \) [rad] |
|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| (a) P-wave parameters   |                     |                     |                             |                             |
| Mass model              | 0.000               | 0.001               | 0.00                        | 0.00                        |
| Background treatment    | 0.002               | 0.001               | 0.00                        | 0.00                        |
| Misreconstructed        | 0.002               | 0.000               | 0.00                        | 0.00                        |
| background              | 0.009               | 0.007               | 0.03                        | 0.01                        |
| Angular acceptance      | 0.001               | 0.001               | 0.01                        | 0.01                        |
| Statistical uncertainty | 0.001               | 0.001               | 0.01                        | 0.01                        |
| on acceptance           | 0.001               | 0.001               | 0.01                        | 0.01                        |
| Other resonances        | 0.005               | 0.004               | 0.00                        | 0.00                        |
| Total systematic       | 0.011               | 0.008               | 0.03                        | 0.02                        |
| uncertainty            | 0.004               | 0.004               | 0.02                        | 0.02                        |
| Statistical uncertainty | 0.007               | 0.10                | 0.004                       | 0.006                       |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>( F_{S}^{(i)} )</th>
<th>( \delta_{S}^{(i)} ) [rad]</th>
<th>( F_{S}^{(ii)} )</th>
<th>( \delta_{S}^{(ii)} ) [rad]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b) S-wave parameters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of bins (1) and (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass model</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background treatment</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misreconstructed</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>background</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angular acceptance</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical uncertainty</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on acceptance</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other resonances</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total systematic</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uncertainty</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>( F_{S}^{(iii)} )</th>
<th>( \delta_{S}^{(iii)} ) [rad]</th>
<th>( F_{S}^{(iv)} )</th>
<th>( \delta_{S}^{(iv)} ) [rad]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(c) S-wave parameters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of bins (3) and (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass model</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background treatment</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misreconstructed</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>background</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angular acceptance</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical uncertainty</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on acceptance</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other resonances</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total systematic</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uncertainty</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
cases the pion track. From simulation studies we find that this corresponds to 3.5% of the signal yield and has a similar $B^0$ mass distribution to the signal but a significantly different angular distribution. The yield and shape of the background are taken from simulated events and are used to explicitly model this background in the data fit. The effect on the fit results is taken as a systematic uncertainty. Other background contributions are found to be insignificant.

The angular acceptance function is determined from simulated events, and a systematic uncertainty is included to take into account the limited size of the simulated event sample. An observed difference in the kinematic distributions of the final state particles between data and simulation is largely attributed to the S-wave component, which is not included in the simulation. To account for the S-wave, the simulated events are reweighted to match the signal distributions expected from the best estimate of the physics parameters from data (including the S-wave). After this procedure, small differences remain in the pion and kaon momentum distributions. The simulated events are further reweighted to remove these differences, and the change in the fit results is taken as the systematic uncertainty due to the modeling of the acceptance.

The $C_{SP}$ factors do not affect the P-wave amplitudes and have only a small effect on the S-wave amplitudes. The fit is performed with each $C_{SP}$ factor set to unity, and the differences in the S-wave parameters are taken as a systematic uncertainty.

This analysis assumes only P- and S-wave contributions to the $K^+ \pi^-$ system, but makes no assumption about the $m(K^+ \pi^-)$ mass model itself (except in the determination of the $C_{SP}$ factors). The S-wave fractions reported in Table V correspond to a shape that does not exhibit an approximately linear S-wave (as might be naively expected). A separate study of the $m(K^+ \pi^-)$ mass spectrum and angular distribution has been performed over a wider $m(K^+ \pi^-)$ mass range. This study indicates that there may be contributions from additional resonances, e.g. $\kappa(800)$, $K^*(1410)$, $K_L^*(1430)$, and $K^*(1680)$ states. Of particular interest is the $K_L^*(1430)$ contribution, which is a D-wave state and can interfere with the P-wave. Using simulated pseudoexperiments such interferences are observed to change the shape of the observed $m(K^+ \pi^-)$ spectrum distributions.
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FIG. 7 (color online). Variation of (a) \( F_S \) and (b) \( \delta_S - \delta_0 \) in the simultaneous fit in four bins of the \( K^+ \pi^- \) mass. There are two solutions of the relative phase, the falling trend (solid points) being the physical one.

from that corresponding to a simple linear S-wave, and that by ignoring such possible additional resonances the P- and S-wave parameters may be biased. These biases are estimated using simulated experiments containing these additional resonances, and they are assigned as systematic uncertainties. The systematic uncertainties are summarized in Table III.

VII. RESULTS

The values of the P-wave parameters obtained from the fit to the combined \( B^0 \to J/\psi K^{*0} \) and \( \bar{B}^0 \to J/\psi \bar{K}^{*0} \) samples, assuming no direct CP violation, are shown in Table IV with their statistical and systematic uncertainties. The projections of the decay time and the transversity angles are shown in Fig. 6. Although we have included the decay time distribution in the fit, we do not report a lifetime measurement here, which will instead be included in a forthcoming publication. Figure 7 shows the values for \( F_S \) and \( \delta_S - \delta_0 \) as a function of the \( K^+ \pi^- \) mass. The phase \( \delta_0 = 0 \) is inserted explicitly to emphasize that this is the phase difference between the S-wave and P-wave. The error bars include both the statistical and the systematic uncertainties. The solid points of Fig. 7(b) correspond to the physical solution with a decreasing phase difference. Table V presents the values of \( F_S \) and \( \delta_S - \delta_0 \) for the physical solution. The correlation matrix for the P- and S-wave parameters is shown in Table VI. Integrating the S-wave fraction over all four \( m(K^+ \pi^-) \) bins gives an average value of \( F_S = (6.4 \pm 0.3 \pm 1.0)\% \) in the full window of \( \pm 70 \text{ MeV}/c^2 \) around the known \( K^{*0} \) mass [26]. The BABAR Collaboration [1] measured an S-wave component of \( (7.3 \pm 1.8)\% \) in \( B^0 \to J/\psi K^+ \pi^- \) in a \( K^+ \pi^- \) mass range from 0.8 to 1.0 GeV/c^2.

The results of separate fits to 30896 \( B^0 \to J/\psi K^{*0} \) and 30442 \( B^0 \to J/\psi \bar{K}^{*0} \) background subtracted candidates are shown in Table VII, along with the direct CP asymmetries. Only the P-wave amplitudes are allowed to vary in the fit; the S-wave parameters in each \( m(K^+ \pi^-) \) bin are fixed to the values determined with the combined fit. The fit allows for a difference between the angular acceptance due to charge asymmetries in the detector. The systematic uncertainties are calculated similarly as described in Sec. VI; the uncertainty due to the angular acceptance partially cancels in the direct CP asymmetry calculation. The \( B^0 \) and \( \bar{B}^0 \) fit results are consistent within uncertainties, with the largest difference being approximately 2 standard deviations in \( |A_\ell|^2 \). There is no evidence for BSM contributions to direct CP violation at the current level of precision.

In previous analyses of the \( B^0 \to J/\psi K^{*0} \) polarization amplitudes and phases fits have been performed using a

---

TABLE V. Signal yield (\( N_{\text{sig}} \)) and results for the S-wave parameters in each bin of \( m(K^+ \pi^-) \) mass, showing statistical and systematic uncertainties. Only the physical solution is shown for \( \delta_S - \delta_0 \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( m(K^+ \pi^-) ) [MeV/c^2]</th>
<th>( N_{\text{sig}} )</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>826–861</td>
<td>6456 ± 69</td>
<td>( F_S )</td>
<td>0.115 ± 0.007 ± 0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( \delta_S - \delta_0 ) [rad]</td>
<td>3.09 ± 0.10 ± 0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>861–896</td>
<td>24418 ± 80</td>
<td>( F_S )</td>
<td>0.049 ± 0.004 ± 0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( \delta_S - \delta_0 ) [rad]</td>
<td>2.66 ± 0.06 ± 0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>896–931</td>
<td>23036 ± 77</td>
<td>( F_S )</td>
<td>0.052 ± 0.006 ± 0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( \delta_S - \delta_0 ) [rad]</td>
<td>1.94 ± 0.03 ± 0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>931–966</td>
<td>7383 ± 64</td>
<td>( F_S )</td>
<td>0.105 ± 0.014 ± 0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( \delta_S - \delta_0 ) [rad]</td>
<td>1.53 ± 0.03 ± 0.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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TABLE VI. Correlation matrix for the four-bin fit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value for $B^0$</th>
<th>Value for $\bar{B}^0$</th>
<th>$B^0 - \bar{B}^0$ asymmetry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>_1^2$</td>
<td>0.230 ± 0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>_2^2$</td>
<td>0.194 ± 0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\delta_1$ [rad]</td>
<td>-2.94 ± 0.03</td>
<td>-2.92 ± 0.03</td>
<td>0.003 ± 0.007 ± 0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\delta_2$ [rad]</td>
<td>2.94 ± 0.02</td>
<td>2.96 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.003 ± 0.005 ± 0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE VII. Results from fits to the $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^0$ and $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^{*0}$ background subtracted candidates and the direct $CP$ asymmetries $S:X$, where $X$ represents the parameter in question. The uncertainties are statistical for the amplitudes and phases and both statistical and systematic for the direct $CP$ measurements.

Parameter: Value for $B^0$: Value for $\bar{B}^0$: $B^0 - \bar{B}^0$ asymmetry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value for $B^0$:</th>
<th>Value for $\bar{B}^0$:</th>
<th>$B^0 - \bar{B}^0$ asymmetry:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>_1^2$:</td>
<td>0.220 ± 0.004 ± 0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>_2^2$:</td>
<td>0.210 ± 0.004 ± 0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\delta_1$ [rad]:</td>
<td>-2.98 ± 0.03 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-2.93 ± 0.08 ± 0.04</td>
<td>-2.887 ± 0.090 ± 0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\delta_2$ [rad]:</td>
<td>2.97 ± 0.02 ± 0.02</td>
<td>2.91 ± 0.05 ± 0.03</td>
<td>2.938 ± 0.064 ± 0.010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE VIII. Comparison of the LHCb results assuming no S-wave component with results from previous experiments. The uncertainties are statistical and systematic, respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value for $B^0$:</th>
<th>Value for $\bar{B}^0$:</th>
<th>$B^0 - \bar{B}^0$ asymmetry:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LHCb (no S-wave):</td>
<td>0.220 ± 0.004 ± 0.003</td>
<td>0.211 ± 0.010 ± 0.006</td>
<td>0.231 ± 0.012 ± 0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BABAR 2007 [1]:</td>
<td>0.210 ± 0.004 ± 0.004</td>
<td>0.233 ± 0.010 ± 0.005</td>
<td>0.195 ± 0.012 ± 0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belle 2005 [2]:</td>
<td>-2.98 ± 0.03 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-2.93 ± 0.08 ± 0.04</td>
<td>-2.887 ± 0.090 ± 0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDF 2005 [3]:</td>
<td>2.97 ± 0.02 ± 0.02</td>
<td>2.91 ± 0.05 ± 0.03</td>
<td>2.938 ± 0.064 ± 0.010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

single bin in $m(K^+ \pi^-)$, and no S-wave component has been included. To allow comparison with recent results, the fit is repeated in a single $m(K^+ \pi^-)$ bin with the S-wave component set to zero. The results are summarized in Table VIII and are consistent with the previous results, and they are more accurate by a factor of 2 to 3. BABAR has also resolved the twofold ambiguity in the strong phases [30,33] but has not reported S-wave fractions in separate bins.

VIII. CONCLUSION

A full angular analysis of the decay $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^{*0}$ has been performed. The polarization amplitudes and their strong phases are measured using data, corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 1.0 fb$^{-1}$, collected in $pp$ collisions at a center-of-mass energy of 7 TeV with the LHCb detector. The results are consistent with previous measurements and confirm the theoretical predictions mentioned in Sec. I. The ambiguity in the strong phases is resolved by measuring the relative S- and P-wave phases in bins of the $K^+ \pi^-$ invariant mass. No significant direct $CP$ asymmetry is observed.
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