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Measurement of the $B^0 \to D^{*-} \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+$ branching fraction
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Using a sample of \((470.9 \pm 2.8) \times 10^6 \, B \bar{B} \) pairs, we measure the decay branching fraction
\[
B(B^0 \to D^{*+} \pi^- \pi^-) = (7.26 \pm 0.11 \pm 0.31) \times 10^{-3},
\]
where the first uncertainty is statistical and the second is systematic. Our measurement will be helpful in studies of lepton universality by measuring
\[
B(B^0 \to D^{*+} \tau^- \nu_\tau) \text{ using } \tau^- \to \pi^- \pi^- \pi^- \nu_\tau \text{, } \text{decays, normalized to } B(B^0 \to D^{*+} \pi^- \pi^- \pi^-) .
\]

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevD.94.091101

The BABAR Collaboration measured the branching fraction ratios for \( B \) semleptonic decays to \( D \) and \( D^* \)
\[
\mathcal{R}^{(*)} = \frac{B(B \to D^{(*)} \ell^- \nu_\ell)}{B(B \to D^{(*)} \ell^- \nu_\ell)} ,
\]
where \( \ell^- \) is an electron or a muon, to be in excess of standard model (SM) predictions [1]. The use of charge conjugate reactions is implied throughout this article. After combining the results for \( \mathcal{R} \) and \( \mathcal{R}^* \), the excess is consistent with lepton universality at the 3.4\( \sigma \) level. The Belle Collaboration [2] and the LHCb Collaboration [3] conducted similar measurements with comparable results. A measurement of \( B(B^0 \to D^{*+} \pi^- \nu_\tau) \) using \( \tau^- \to \pi^- \pi^- \pi^- \nu_\tau \), may yield the observation of a further deviation from the SM. Such a measurement has not been done before and may make use of a clean kinematic signature. This possibility relies in part on a measurement of \( B(B^0 \to D^{*+} \pi^- \pi^- \pi^-) \), for which the current world average value is \((7.0 \pm 0.8) \times 10^{-3} [4] \). The LHCb Collaboration measured this value to be \((7.27 \pm 0.11(\text{stat}) \pm 0.36(\text{syst}) \pm 0.34(\text{norm})) \times 10^{-3} [5], \) where the final uncertainty is due to using \( B^0 \to D^{*+} \pi^- \) for normalization purposes. This measurement has not been included in the world average value as yet. In this article, we report on a measurement of \( B(B^0 \to D^{*+} \pi^- \pi^- \pi^-) \).

We use data recorded with the BABAR detector at the PEP-II asymmetric-energy \( e^+ e^- \) collider at SLAC. The BABAR detector is described in detail elsewhere [6,7]. The data sample corresponds to an integrated luminosity of \( 424.2 \pm 1.8 \, fb^{-1} \) collected at the \( Y(4S) \) resonance [8], which corresponds to the production of \((470.9 \pm 2.8) \times 10^6 \, B \bar{B} \) pairs. We use Monte Carlo (MC) simulations to understand background processes and signal reconstruction efficiencies. The EvtGen event generator [9] is used to simulate particle decays. This includes a sample of \( e^+ e^- \to q\bar{q}(\gamma) \) events, where \( q \) is a \( u, d, s, \) or \( c \) quark, with an equivalent luminosity of \( 2.589 \, fb^{-1} \) and a sample of \( 1.427 \times 10^6 \, B \bar{B} \) pairs. The detector response is simulated with the Geant4 [10] suite of programs.

We fully reconstruct the \( B^0 \to D^{*+} \pi^- \pi^- \pi^- \) decay chain by adding the four-momenta of particle candidates. The \( D^{*+} \) mesons are reconstructed in the \( D^{*+} \to D^0 \pi^- \) and \( \bar{D}^0 \to K^- \pi^- \) final states. A \( \bar{D}^0 \) candidate is reconstructed from two charged-particle tracks, of which one is identified as a \( K^+ \) meson based on information obtained using the tracking and Cherenkov detectors. We require \( \bar{D}^0 \) candidates to have an invariant-mass value within \( \pm 20 \, MeV/c^2 \) of the nominal \( \bar{D}^0 \) mass [4], which corresponds to 3 standard deviations in its mass resolution. Each \( \bar{D}^0 \) candidate is combined with a charged-particle track with momentum less than \( 0.45 \, GeV/c \) in the \( e^+ e^- \) center-of-mass (CM) frame to form a \( D^{*+} \) candidate. We require the difference between the reconstructed mass of the \( D^{*+} \) candidate and the reconstructed mass of the \( D^0 \) candidate to lie between \( 0.1435 \) and \( 0.1475 \, GeV/c^2 \). The \( D^{*+} \) candidate is combined with three other charged-particle tracks to form a \( B^0 \) candidate. We do not explicitly apply particle identification to select charged pions, but assign the pion mass hypothesis to all tracks other than the \( K^+ \) daughter of the \( \bar{D}^0 \). All other reconstructed tracks and neutral clusters in the event are collectively referred to as the rest of the event (ROE). We use a neural network classifier [11] to suppress non-\( B \bar{B} \) backgrounds. The classifier makes use of nine variables, each of which is calculated in the CM frame:

(i) the cosine of the angle between the \( B^0 \) candidate’s thrust axis [12] and the beam axis;
(ii) the sphericity [13] of the \( B^0 \) candidate;
(iii) the thrust of the ROE;
(iv) the sum over the ROE of \( p \), where \( p \) is the magnitude of a particle’s momentum;
(v) the sum over the ROE of \( \frac{1}{2} (3 \cos^2 \theta - 1) p \), where \( \theta \) is the polar angle of a particle’s momentum;
(vi) the cosine of the angle between the thrust axis of the \( B^0 \) candidate and the thrust axis of the ROE;
(vii) the cosine of the angle between the sphericity axis of the $B^0$ candidate and the thrust axis of the ROE;
(viii) the ratio of the second-order to zeroth-order Fox-Wolfram moment using all reconstructed particles [14];
(ix) the cosine of the angle between the thrust axis calculated using all reconstructed particles and the beam axis.

Each of these nine variables contributes to separating $B^0$ decays from non-$B\bar{B}$ decays. We apply a selection on the output of the neural network classifier that rejects 69% of reconstructed signal candidates from non-$B\bar{B}$ decays, and retains 80% of correctly reconstructed $B^0$ candidates. Finally, we require the $B^0$ candidate to have a CM-frame energy within $\pm 90$ MeV of $\sqrt{s}/2$, where $\sqrt{s}$ is the nominal invariant mass of the initial state. This corresponds to 4 standard deviations in the energy resolution. We retain all $B^0$ candidates that pass our selection criteria instead of selecting a best candidate for each event. In MC-simulated signal and background events that have at least one $B^0$ candidate passing all selection criteria, there are on average 1.57 and 1.37 $B^0$ candidates per event, respectively. We do not apply corrections to the number of $B^0$ candidates per event, as the $B^0$ candidate multiplicity in data is consistent with the weighted average of those in the signal and background simulation.

After applying all selection criteria, we determine the energy-substituted mass $m_{ES} = \sqrt{s}/4 - p^2_B$ for the selected $B^0$ candidates, where $p_B$ is the CM-frame momentum of a $B^0$. Figure 1 shows the $m_{ES}$ distribution for the data and for MC-simulated events. The $m_{ES}$ distribution of correctly reconstructed signal candidates has a peak near the $B^0$ mass.

The $m_{ES}$ distribution of signal events is modeled using a Crystal Ball [15] probability density function (PDF), with cutoff and power-law parameters determined using MC-simulated events. We consider only $B^0$ candidates that are correctly reconstructed. We model the background $m_{ES}$ distribution as follows. The nonpeaking backgrounds from $e^+e^- \rightarrow q\bar{q}(\gamma)$ events and from $B\bar{B}$ pairs are modeled using an ARGUS function [16]. Each of the peaking backgrounds from $B^+B^-$ and $B^0\bar{B}^0$ is modeled by a Gaussian distribution for which the normalization, mean, and width, are determined by a fit to the corresponding simulated event sample. We perform a one-dimensional unbinned extended-maximum-likelihood fit in order to estimate the number of signal candidates. We allow the mean and width parameters of the Crystal Ball function, the curvature parameter of the ARGUS function, and the normalization of the nonpeaking background, to vary in the fit. The cutoff parameter for the ARGUS function is fixed to $\sqrt{s}/2$, and the peaking background PDF shapes and normalizations are fixed to their MC-estimated values. The peaking background contributions are estimated to be $590 \pm 120$ and $1450 \pm 130$ candidates from $B^+B^-$ and $B^0\bar{B}^0$ decays, respectively; some originate from signal decays where one or more pion is misreconstructed even when there is a correctly reconstructed $B^0$ candidate. There is also a contribution from $B^+ \rightarrow D^+X$ and $B^0 \rightarrow D^0X$ decays, where $X$ denotes any combination of $\pi$ and $\rho$ mesons other than $\rho^0\pi^+$ or $\pi^+\pi^-\pi^+$. The fit to the $m_{ES}$ distribution shown in Fig. 1 results in a signal yield of $17800 \pm 300$.

The distribution for the MC signal peaks 0.2 MeV/c$^2$ higher in $m_{ES}$ value than the data. This arises from a value of the simulated $B^0$ mass that is different from that found in Ref. [4]. We weight the simulated events in order to match the data mass peak and we repeat the measurement of the simulated efficiencies for the signal and the peaking background. The change is negligible and produces a negligible correction on the branching fraction measurement.

We define the signal region to be $5.273 < m_{ES} < 5.285$ GeV/c$^2$, and a sideband region to be $5.240 < m_{ES} < 5.270$ GeV/c$^2$. About 97.6% of signal events are contained within the signal region. To obtain the $3\sigma$ invariant-mass distribution for the signal events in Fig. 2, we subtract the events in the sideband region of the $m_{ES}$ in Fig. 1, normalized to the fitted background component in the signal region, from the total $3\sigma$ mass distribution. By integrating the dashed line in Fig. 1, we obtain 68883 events in the sideband region and 24427 background events in the signal region. These values make use of the peaking background estimates described in the previous paragraph.

As expected from the branching fractions in Ref. [4], the main contribution comes from $a_1^-(1260)$ decays, and a contribution from the decay $D^+_s \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^+$ is also
The analysis of the ground, the total number of produced efficiency of the decay channel order to determine the branching fraction correctly. The signal yield in our study of the reconstruction efficiency in $B_\alpha$ for the $B_\alpha$ assumes a mass of $233$ events is estimated to be $84400 \pm 1200$. The two components are added in quadrature. The pion from the $D^{*-} \rightarrow D^0 \pi^-$ decay has momentum less than $0.18$ GeV/c, a region dominated by tracks from the decay $D_s^{*-} \rightarrow D_s^0 \pi^-$, and $0.26\%$ for greater than this value [17]. The two components are added in quadrature. The pion from the $D^{*-} \rightarrow D^0 \pi^-$ decay has momentum less than $0.18$ GeV/c $62\%$ of the time. The corresponding fraction

Table I summarizes the systematic uncertainties. The uncertainties are assumed to be uncorrelated, and so are added in quadrature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Uncertainty (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fit algorithm and peaking backgrounds</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track finding</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\pi^\pm \pi^\mp$ invariant-mass modeling</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D^{*-}$ and $D^0$ decay branching fractions</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Upsilon(4S) \rightarrow B^0\bar{B}^0$ decay branching fraction</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K^+$ identification</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal efficiency MC statistics</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sideband subtraction</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B\bar{B}$ counting</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIG. 2. The background-subtracted invariant-mass spectrum of the $3\pi$ system. The indicated mass value of the $a_1^+$ is obtained from Ref. [4]. The $B^0 \rightarrow D^{*-}a_1^+$, $D_1^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^+$ decay, which is removed in the final result, is visible in the spectrum. The spectrum is obtained prior to the efficiency correction. The inset shows the distribution around the $D_1^+$ region.

FIG. 3. The reconstruction efficiency as a function of $3\pi$ invariant mass using MC-simulated events. The uncertainties are statistical.
for other pions in the signal $B^0$ decay is 5%. The $3\pi$ invariant mass of the $D_{1+}^*$ contamination has the same mass location and width in the data and MC-simulated events. However, there are differences between the full reconstructed $3\pi$ invariant-mass spectrum for the data and that obtained from MC-simulated events. We studied the signal yield before and after reweighting the $3\pi$ invariant-mass spectrum in the MC-simulated events to match the data. The observed change due to the reweighting of the $3\pi$ mass distribution is 1.7%, which we assign as the associated systematic uncertainty. This also accounts for uncertainties in the relative contributions of the different decay modes and the mass and width of the $a_{1+}^0$ resonance. We use the $D_{0+}$ and $\bar{D}^0$ decay branching fraction uncertainties from Ref. [4]. We use the value of $B( Y(4S) \to B^0\bar{B}^0) = 0.486 \pm 0.006$ from Ref. [4] for the branching fraction of the decay $Y(4S) \to B^0\bar{B}^0$, which has a relative uncertainty of 1.2%. The kaon identification uncertainty is estimated by comparing the number of $D_{0+}$ events in data and MC simulations with and without implementing identification requirements. According to dedicated studies using BABAR data control samples, we correct for kaon-identification efficiency differences between data and MC simulation by a factor of $0.978 \pm 0.011$, where the uncertainty is chosen to be half the difference from unity. The signal efficiency MC statistical uncertainty is 0.9%. Nominally, we subtract the $3\pi$ mass distribution in the sideband from that of the signal region. However, the $3\pi$ mass distribution of both peaking and nonpeaking backgrounds in the signal region may not necessarily be the same as that in the sideband. To estimate the associated systematic uncertainty, we test the sideband subtraction procedure using only MC-simulated background events. After applying efficiency corrections to the resulting distribution, we obtain an integral of 571. Dividing this by the number of efficiency-corrected signal in the data, this translates to a 0.7% difference, which we assign as the associated systematic uncertainty. The number of $B$ mesons produced is uncertain to 0.6% [8]. We studied the MC modeling of decay angle correlations, and found the associated systematic uncertainty to be negligible. As described earlier in the text, there is a peaking background contribution in the $m_{ES}$ distribution due to signal events that are misreconstructed. The rate of this background depends on the branching fraction of signal events. Using our measured branching fraction value, we apply corrections to the expected number of $B^0\bar{B}^0$ peaking background and repeat the signal extraction procedure on the data. There is a small bias on the branching fraction value but it is negligible compared to the systematic uncertainty due to the other peaking backgrounds.

From the number of fitted signal events, corrected for efficiency and normalized to the total number of produced $B^0$ mesons in the data sample, and taking into account the $D_{0+}$ and $\bar{D}^0$ branching fractions we derive $B(B^0 \to D_{0+}\pi^+\pi^-) = (7.26 \pm 0.11 \pm 0.31) \times 10^{-3}$, where the first uncertainty is statistical and the second systematic. The result is consistent with the current world average and is 2.4 times more precise. This result can be used as input for measurements of $R^{(*)}$ using hadronic $\tau$ decays in the search for deviations from the SM. The inclusive branching fraction value without removing the $D_{1+}^*$ contamination is $\left(7.37 \pm 0.11 \pm 0.31\right) \times 10^{-3}$.
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