



HAL
open science

A Measurement of the KL Charge Asymmetry

A. Alavi-Harati, T. Alexopoulos, M. Arenton, K. Arisaka, S. Averitte, R.F. Barbosa, A.R. Barker, M. Barrio, L. Bellantoni, A. Bellavance, et al.

► **To cite this version:**

A. Alavi-Harati, T. Alexopoulos, M. Arenton, K. Arisaka, S. Averitte, et al.. A Measurement of the KL Charge Asymmetry. *Physical Review Letters*, 2002, 88, pp.181601. in2p3-00012724

HAL Id: in2p3-00012724

<https://hal.in2p3.fr/in2p3-00012724>

Submitted on 8 Apr 2003

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

A Measurement of the K_L Charge Asymmetry

(Submitted to Physical Review Letters, December 31st, 2001)

A. Alavi-Harati¹², T. Alexopoulos¹², M. Arenton¹¹, K. Arisaka², S. Averitte¹⁰, R.F. Barbosa^{7,**}, A.R. Barker⁵, M. Barrio⁴, L. Bellantoni⁷, A. Bellavance⁹, J. Belz¹⁰, R. Ben-David⁷, D.R. Bergman¹⁰, E. Blucher⁴, G.J. Bock⁷, C. Bown⁴, S. Bright⁴, E. Cheu¹, S. Childress⁷, R. Coleman⁷, M.D. Corcoran⁹, G. Corti¹¹, B. Cox¹¹, M.B. Crisler⁷, A.R. Erwin¹², R. Ford⁷, A. Glazov⁴, A. Golossanov¹¹, G. Graham⁴, J. Graham⁴, K. Hagan¹¹, E. Halkiadakis¹⁰, J. Hamm¹, K. Hanagaki⁸, S. Hidaka⁸, Y.B. Hsiung⁷, V. Jejer¹¹, D.A. Jensen⁷, R. Kessler⁴, H.G.E. Kobrak³, J. LaDue⁵, A. Lath¹⁰, A. Ledovskoy¹¹, P.L. McBride⁷, P. Mikelsons⁵, E. Monnier^{4,*}, T. Nakaya⁷, K.S. Nelson¹¹, H. Nguyen^{7,i}, V. O'Dell⁷, M. Pang⁷, R. Pordes⁷, V. Prasad⁴, X.R. Qi⁷, B. Quinn^{4,8}, E.J. Ramberg⁷, R.E. Ray⁷, A. Roodman⁴, M. Sadamoto⁸, S. Schnetzer¹⁰, K. Senyo⁸, P. Shanahan⁷, P.S. Shawhan⁴, J. Shields¹¹, W. Slater², N. Solomey⁴, S.V. Somalwar¹⁰, R.L. Stone¹⁰, E.C. Swallow^{4,6}, S.A. Taegar¹, R.J. Tesarek¹⁰, G.B. Thomson¹⁰, P.A. Toale⁵, A. Tripathi², R. Tschirhart⁷, S.E. Turner², Y.W. Wah⁴, J. Wang¹, H.B. White⁷, J. Whitmore⁷, B. Winstein⁴, R. Winston⁴, T. Yamanaka⁸, E.D. Zimmerman⁴

The KTeV Collaboration

¹ University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona 85721

² University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California 90095

³ University of California at San Diego, La Jolla, California 92093

⁴ The Enrico Fermi Institute, The University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois 60637

⁵ University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80309

⁶ Elmhurst College, Elmhurst, Illinois 60126

⁷ Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, Illinois 60510

⁸ Osaka University, Toyonaka, Osaka 560-0043 Japan

⁹ Rice University, Houston, Texas 77005

¹⁰ Rutgers University, Piscataway, New Jersey 08854

¹¹ The Department of Physics and Institute of Nuclear and Particle Physics,

University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22901

¹² University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706

We present a measurement of the charge asymmetry δ_L in the mode $K_L \rightarrow \pi^\pm e^\mp \nu$ based on 298 million analyzed decays. We measure a value of $\delta_L = (3322 \pm 58(stat) \pm 47(sys)) \cdot 10^{-6}$, in good agreement with previous measurements and 2.4 times more precise than the current best published result. The result is used to place more stringent limits on CPT and $\Delta S = \Delta Q$ violation in the neutral kaon system.

PACS numbers: 11.30.Er, 11.30.-j, 13.25.Es, 13.20.-v

The charge asymmetry in K_L semileptonic decays is deeply related to CP violation through neutral kaon mixing. The K_L wavefunction is proportional to $(1 + \epsilon_L)K^0 - (1 - \epsilon_L)\bar{K}^0$, where ϵ_L parameterizes CP violation in mixing. This parameter can be determined in the decay modes $K_L \rightarrow \pi^\pm e^\mp \nu$ (Ke3) and $K_L \rightarrow \pi^\pm \mu^\mp \nu$ (K μ 3). The charge asymmetry (δ_L) is defined as

$$\delta_L = \frac{BR(e^+\pi^-) - BR(e^-\pi^+)}{BR(e^+\pi^-) + BR(e^-\pi^+)}.$$

Assuming $\Delta S = \Delta Q$ and no CPT violation in the decay $K^0(\bar{K}^0) \rightarrow e^+\pi^-\nu(e^-\pi^+\bar{\nu})$, δ_L is simply $2\text{Re } \epsilon_L$. To first order in the parameters that violate CP and CPT,

$$\delta_L = 2\text{Re } \epsilon_L - 2\text{Re } Y - \text{Re}(x - \bar{x}).$$

The terms Y and $\text{Re}(x - \bar{x})$ parameterize CPT violation in the $\Delta S = \Delta Q$ and $\Delta S = -\Delta Q$ transitions respectively[1, 2]:

$$\frac{\langle e^+\pi^-\nu|K^0 \rangle}{\langle e^-\pi^+\bar{\nu}|\bar{K}^0 \rangle} = \frac{1 - Y}{1 + Y}$$

$$x = \frac{\langle e^+\pi^-\nu|\bar{K}^0 \rangle}{\langle e^+\pi^-\nu|K^0 \rangle} \quad \bar{x} = \frac{\langle e^-\pi^+\bar{\nu}|K^0 \rangle^*}{\langle e^-\pi^+\bar{\nu}|\bar{K}^0 \rangle^*}.$$

In the Standard Model, the $\Delta S = \Delta Q$ violation is CPT-conserving and occurs in 2nd order weak decays. Estimates for $|x|$ are in the range 10^{-7} [3]. δ_L is modified to order $|x|^2$ and will not be considered in this letter.

The measurement of δ_L can be compared to expectations derived from the $K_L \rightarrow 2\pi$ (K π 2) amplitudes (η_{+-}, η_{00})[2, 4]:

$$\text{Re} \left(Y + \frac{x - \bar{x}}{2} + a \right) = \text{Re} \left(\frac{2}{3}\eta_{+-} + \frac{1}{3}\eta_{00} \right) - \frac{\delta_L}{2}. \quad (1)$$

This comparison is sensitive to CPT violation in Ke3 and K π 2 decays, where the latter is parameterized by $\text{Re } a$.

The current world average on δ_L comes mainly from a measurement by the CERN-Heidelberg collaboration in 1974. Using 34 million Ke3 decays, they found $\delta_L = (3409 \pm 171(stat) \pm 50(sys)) \cdot 10^{-6}$ [5]. We describe in this letter a measurement of δ_L in the Ke3 mode based on approximately 298 million Ke3 decays.




FIG. 1: The KTeV detector configured for measuring $\text{Re}(\epsilon'/\epsilon)$.

The KTeV beamline and detector at Fermilab is described elsewhere[6]. For this analysis, the detector is configured for the measurement of $\text{Re}(\epsilon'/\epsilon)$. As shown in Fig. 1, two approximately parallel neutral K_L beams enter a long vacuum tank, which defines the fiducial volume for accepted decays. One of the beams strikes an active absorber (regenerator), which serves to tag the coherent regeneration of K_S . The regenerator moves to the other beam in between Tevatron spill cycles. Following the vacuum tank, there are 4 planar drift chambers and an analysis magnet that imparts a 411 MeV/c horizontal transverse kick to the charged particles. A high precision 3100-element pure Cesium Iodide calorimeter (CsI) is used primarily to measure the energy of e^\pm and photons. Photon veto detectors surrounding the vacuum tank, drift chambers, and CsI serve to reject events with particles escaping the calorimeter.

Only $\text{Ke}3$ decays in the beam opposite the regenerator were used in this analysis. They were triggered by the presence of hits in the drift chambers and scintillators placed immediately upstream of the CsI, and by the lack of activity in the regenerator or photon vetoes. To keep the event rate manageable, the trigger rejected beam muons and $K\mu 3$ events by requiring no activity in the scintillation counters (muon veto) placed behind 4 meters of Fe absorbers downstream of the CsI.

Selecting $\text{Ke}3$ events is relatively straightforward, as they are the most copious K_L decay mode ($\text{BR}(\text{Ke}3) \approx 0.39$). We identify two-track vertices in the region between 90 and 160 meters from the target with kinematics inconsistent with $K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ ($K\pi 3$) and $\Lambda(\bar{\Lambda}) \rightarrow p\pi^-(\bar{p}\pi^+)$. The tracks are required to extrapolate to CsI energy deposits while maintaining sufficient clearance from the inner and outer edges. A track is identified as an electron if its momentum exceeds 5 GeV/c and its CsI energy deposit divided by its momentum (E/P) exceeded 0.925. Pions are identified as having momentum exceeding 8 GeV/c and E/P less than 0.925. The tighter pion momentum requirement rejects $K\mu 3$

background, since 8 GeV/c is the threshold for minimum-ionizing particles to penetrate through to the muon veto counters.

To minimize background from target K_S coherently interfering with the K_L , the event proper time (τ) had to exceed 10.5 K_S lifetimes (τ_S). The K_L momentum (P_K) reconstruction has ambiguities inherent to any 3-body decay with one unobserved particle. The longitudinal component of the neutrino momentum in the kaon rest frame can be either parallel or anti-parallel to the kaon flight direction in the lab frame. This introduces two possible solutions for P_K . We use the low P_K solution to calculate τ . Based on Monte Carlo (MC) simulations, this choice is at least 70% correct for $\tau < 22.5 \tau_S$. A small correction, derived from MC, was made for errors in the P_K solution and the residual target K_S interference.

The measurement of δ_L requires a careful control of systematics. The most important of these is to ensure an equal acceptance and efficiency for oppositely charged particles. We combine data sets of opposite analysis magnet polarities, which was reversed about once per day, to ensure that the detector is exposed to oppositely charged particles in the same manner. We also used data collected during rare decay running (E799), which included a transition radiation detector (TRD)[7, 8] used for the study of electron and pion identification.

There are eight possible configurations for $\text{Ke}3$ decays: $e^+\pi^-$ or $e^-\pi^+$, east (E) or west (W) K_L beams, and positive (+) or negative (-) magnet polarities. The number of $\text{Ke}3$ events in each configuration (N_i) depends on the branching ratio (BR), the acceptance and efficiency (A), and the flux $N(K_L)$. We define R as:

$$R^4 = \frac{\text{BR}(e^+\pi^-)A(e^+\pi^-, E, +)N(K_L, E, +)}{\text{BR}(e^-\pi^+)A(e^-\pi^+, E, -)N(K_L, E, -)} \quad (2)$$

$$\times \frac{\text{BR}(e^+\pi^-)A(e^+\pi^-, E, -)N(K_L, E, -)}{\text{BR}(e^-\pi^+)A(e^-\pi^+, E, +)N(K_L, E, +)}$$

$$\times \frac{\text{BR}(e^+\pi^-)A(e^+\pi^-, W, +)N(K_L, W, +)}{\text{BR}(e^-\pi^+)A(e^-\pi^+, W, -)N(K_L, W, -)}$$

$$\times \frac{\text{BR}(e^+\pi^-)A(e^+\pi^-, W, -)N(K_L, W, -)}{\text{BR}(e^-\pi^+)A(e^-\pi^+, W, +)N(K_L, W, +)},$$

where the four numerators and denominators represent N_i , $i = 1, 8$. Since the fluxes cancel and $A(e^\pm\pi^\mp) = A(e^\mp\pi^\pm)$ under magnetic field reversal, Eq. 2 reduces to:

$$\text{raw } \delta_L = \frac{R-1}{R+1} \quad \sigma(\text{raw } \delta_L) = \frac{1}{8} \cdot \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^8 \frac{1}{N_i}}. \quad (3)$$

Equation 3 defines the “raw” δ_L , and does not take into account several effects discussed below. Our data yields $\text{raw } \delta_L = (3417 \pm 58) \cdot 10^{-6}$ (ppm). Figure 2 shows its dependence on the decay vertex distance from the target.

In principle, the same flux and acceptance/efficiency cancellation occurs in the pairing of the first and second




FIG. 2: Raw δ_L and number of events versus vertex distance from target. A fit to a constant yields 3417 ± 58 ppm with a χ^2 of 81.53 for 81 degrees of freedom.

(third and fourth) factors of Eq. 2, such that δ_L can be measured within the east and west beams. Eq. 3 is the geometric mean of the two δ_L measurements.

Figure 3 shows the raw asymmetry in various data subsets. In particular, we see the importance of combining data from opposite polarity runs. The difference between measurements made with only one magnet setting, $\delta_L(+)$ - $\delta_L(-)$, is significant and on the order of δ_L itself. This difference is due to very small offsets of the inner apertures and is well-reproduced by our MC. The MC is not used to correct this large effect since Eq. 2 naturally accounts for such geometrical asymmetries. On the other hand, the values for δ_L agree between decays in the east and west beams. Other data divisions yield good agreement except for the sample with $8 \text{ GeV}/c < P_\pi < 15 \text{ GeV}/c$ (discussed below).




FIG. 3: Raw δ_L for all events and various data subsets. The line indicates the raw value of 3417 ppm.

We account for the different behavior of particles and

antiparticles in matter. For each cut that introduces a bias, we measure f^+ (f^-), the inefficiency in the $e^+\pi^-$ ($e^-\pi^+$) configuration. The correction to raw δ_L for the cut, summarized in table I, is simply $(f^+ - f^-)/2$.

Many biases due to π^\pm interaction differences were considered, and data were used to measure most of these corrections. These include the π^\pm energy deposition in the CsI, the loss of pions due to interactions in the trigger scintillators, and pion punchthrough past the Fe absorbers depositing energy in the muon veto. Events with E/P for pions exceeding 0.925 would be removed since the analysis requires exactly one identified electron. This effect, studied using pions in $K\pi 3$ events, removes $\approx 0.6\%$ of the pions, with the probability being slightly larger for π^+ than π^- . The asymmetry between π^+ and π^- has a strong momentum dependence and explains the trend seen for the $8 \text{ GeV}/c < P_\pi < 15 \text{ GeV}/c$ data sample (see Fig. 3). The correction to δ_L is -156 ± 10 ppm.

A correction was estimated for possible biases due to the trigger muon veto requirement, which removed approximately 3% of pions due to decay-in-flight and punchthrough. Good events can also be lost if accompanied by accidental muons. Only pion punchthrough would cause a bias due to the neutron excess in the Fe absorbers. The estimate used a Ke3 sample collected in E799, where the TRD gave additional electron purity. The sample is triggered by *requiring* muon counter hits, as these events are the ones that would be removed by the analysis trigger. This sample had a charge asymmetry of $(4.4 \pm 1.3) \cdot 10^{-3}$, consistent with no bias. Nevertheless, we use a correction of 34 ± 40 ppm, where the error is given by the sample statistics.

Pion interactions in the trigger scintillator can confuse the reconstruction so that the track fails to match to a CsI cluster. This effect, studied using Ke3 events with a relaxed track-cluster matching requirement, removes $\approx 0.42\%$ of all pions and was slightly more probable for the π^- than π^+ , leading to a correction of 54 ± 10 ppm.

Considering e^\pm interaction differences, one has primarily e^+ annihilation and δ -ray production. An e^+ annihilation occurring near the upstream surface of the trigger scintillator would fail the trigger requirement due to the reduced energy deposition. δ -rays more than 10 MeV and emitted from the vacuum window or tracking system can cause losses since the momentum transfer would drastically change the event kinematics. These losses cause a bias due to the small difference between the Bhabha (e^+e^-) and Moller (e^-e^-) scattering cross section. These corrections were derived by a Geant simulation of the detector material. They are of order ± 10 ppm, mitigated by the high momentum of the tracks and the minimal material ($2\% X_0$) upstream of the CsI.

Finally, a Ke3 sample was used to study potential biases of the E/P cut on electrons. This sample was selected by a relaxed E/P cut and by the tagging of a minimum-ionizing π in the CsI. The E/P removed re-

moved approximately 0.233% of e^+ and e^- . No bias is seen, and we assigned a correction of -19 ± 18 ppm. This result was confirmed with a similar Ke3 sample collected in E799, where the TRD gave additional electron purity.

We applied a small correction to account for pions absorbed in the vacuum window, drift chambers, and helium bags. This was estimated assuming isospin conservation in strong interactions, and so the π^+ and π^- absorption differences depended on the excess protons, which was predominantly in the form of hydrogen. We accounted for a small bias due to π^- charge exchange near the upstream surface of the trigger scintillator (analogous to the case of e^+ trigger loss). For this, we used the measurements of [9] and [10] and extrapolated them to our π^- momentum range.

Other small corrections, derived from MC, accounted for the inexact reversal of the analysis magnet polarity and the residual coherent K_S from the target, absorber, and K_L scatters with the final collimator and regenerator. Table I shows the summary of all systematic cor-

TABLE I: Corrections in ppm for this analysis.

$\pi^+\pi^-$ difference in CsI	-156 ± 10
π^\pm interaction in trigger scintillator	$+54 \pm 10$
π decay and punchthrough	$+34 \pm 40$
e^+e^- difference in CsI	-19 ± 18
target/absorber $K_S - K_L$ interference	-12 ± 1
e^+ annihilation in spectrometer	$+11 \pm 1$
Delta ray production	-8.5 ± 4.3
π absorption in spectrometer	$+5.0 \pm 3.2$
inexact analysis magnet polarity reversal	-3.1 ± 1.6
final collimator and regenerator scatters	-1.2 ± 2.3
$\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ background	$+0.5 \pm 0.7$
$K\mu 3$ background	0 ± 0
$\Lambda_{p\pi}$ and Λ_β background	0 ± 0
Total correction	-95.3 ± 46.5

rections. The uncertainties are uncorrelated since they are mainly statistical errors of the Ke3 and $K\pi 3$ control samples. Combining the corrections with raw δ_L , we find:

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_L &= 3322 \pm 58 \text{ (stat)} \pm 47 \text{ (syst)} \text{ ppm} \\ &= 3322 \pm 74 \text{ (combined)} \text{ ppm.}\end{aligned}$$

This result is in excellent agreement with previous measurements and 2.4 times more precise than the current best result (see Fig. 4). A combination of all results including ours yields:

$$\delta_L = 3307 \pm 63 \text{ ppm} \quad \chi^2 = 4.2/6 \text{ d.o.f..}$$

Substituting η_{+-} and η_{00} values from [11] and the combined δ_L into Eq. 1, we find:

$$\begin{aligned}Re(Y + \frac{x - \bar{x}}{2} + a) &= (1650 \pm 16) - (1653 \pm 32) \\ &= -3 \pm 35 \text{ ppm.}\end{aligned}$$

The result is consistent with no CPT violation and is limited by the charge asymmetry uncertainty. It limits $|Re(Y + (x - \bar{x})/2 + a)| < 61$ ppm at the 90% C.L.. Barring fortuitous cancellations, this is thus far the most stringent limit on Y , x , and a .




FIG. 4: Compilation of δ_L measurements including this result. Lines indicate the average and its uncertainty.

We gratefully acknowledge the support and effort of the Fermilab staff and the technical staffs of the participating institutions for their vital contributions. This work was supported in part by the DOE, the NSF and the Ministry of Education and Science of Japan. A.R.B., E.B. and S.V.S. acknowledge support from the NYI program of the NSF; A.R.B. and E.B. from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation; E.B. from the OJI program of the DOE; K.H., T.N. and M.S. from the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science; and R.F.B from the Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo. P.S.S. acknowledges receipt of a Grainger Fellowship.

† To whom correspondence should be addressed: hogann@fnal.gov.

* Perm. address C.P.P. Marseille/C.N.R.S., France

**Perm. address Univ. of São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil

-
- [1] C.D. Buchanan *et al*, *Phys. Rev. D* **45**, 4088 (1992).
 - [2] The Daphne Physics Handbook, Volume I, editors L. Miani, G. Pancheri, N. Paver, INFN, 1992.
 - [3] C. Dib and B. Guberina, *Phys. Lett. B* **25**, (1991).
 - [4] V. V. Barmin *et al*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **247**, (1984).
 - [5] Geweniger *et al*, *Phys. Lett. B* **48**, 483 (1974).
 - [6] P. Shawhan, Ph. D. Thesis, Univ. of Chicago (1999).
 - [7] G. Graham, Ph.D. Thesis, Univ. of Chicago (1999).
 - [8] N. Solomey *et al*, *Nucl. Inst. Meth.* **A419**, (1998).
 - [9] T. Inagaki *et al*, *Nucl. Inst. Meth.* **A359**, 478-484 (1995).
 - [10] V. Flaminio *et al*, CERN-HERA 83-01.
 - [11] Particle Data Group, Review of Particle Physics, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **15**, 1-878, (2000).