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Abstract

We report results on the studies of the $e^+e^- \rightarrow B_s^{(*)}\bar{B}_s^{(*)}$ processes. The results are based on a 121.4 fb$^{-1}$ data sample collected with the Belle detector at the center-of-mass energy near the $\Upsilon(10860)$ peak and 16.4 fb$^{-1}$ of data collected at 19 energy points in the range from 10.77 to 11.02 GeV. We observe a clear $e^+e^- \rightarrow \Upsilon(10860) \rightarrow B_s^{(*)}\bar{B}_s^{(*)}$ signal, with no statistically significant signal of $e^+e^- \rightarrow \Upsilon(11020) \rightarrow B_s^{(*)}\bar{B}_s^{(*)}$. The relative production ratio of $B_s^*\bar{B}_s^*$, $B_s\bar{B}_s^*$, and $B_s\bar{B}_s$ final states at $\sqrt{s} = 10.866$ GeV is measured to be $7 : 0.856 \pm 0.106(stat.) \pm 0.053(syst.) : 0.645 \pm 0.094(stat.) ^{+0.030}_{-0.033}(syst.)$. An angular analysis of the $B_s^*\bar{B}_s^*$ final state produced at the $\Upsilon(10860)$ peak is also performed.

PACS numbers: 14.40.Pq, 13.25.Gv, 12.39.Pu
INTRODUCTION

The Belle experiment has recently measured the ratio \( R_b = \frac{\sigma_{e^+e^- \rightarrow b\bar{b}}}{\sigma_{e^+e^- \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-}} \) in the energy range from 10.60 to 11.02 GeV utilizing an inclusive technique \[1\]. In addition, the energy dependence of the production cross section has been studied for several exclusive channels such as \( e^+e^- \rightarrow \Upsilon(nS)\pi^+\pi^- \) (\( n = 1, 2, 3 \)) \[1\] and \( e^+e^- \rightarrow h_b(mP)\pi^+\pi^- \) (\( m = 1, 2 \)) \[2\]. The measured energy dependence for the aforementioned exclusive cross sections exhibits substantially different behaviour compared to that for \( R_b \). Measurements of the cross sections for other exclusive final states, such as two-body \( B^{(*)}\bar{B}^{(*)} \), \( B_s^{(*)}\bar{B}_s^{(*)} \), and three-body \( B^{(*)}\bar{B}^{(*)}\pi \), might shed light on the mechanisms of the \( b\bar{b} \) hadronization and on the nature of the \( \Upsilon(10860) \) and \( \Upsilon(11020) \) resonances.

In this paper, we present preliminary results on the analysis of the \( e^+e^- \rightarrow B_s^{(*)}\bar{B}_s^{(*)} \) processes in the energy range from 10.77 to 11.02 GeV in the center-of-mass (c.m.) frame using data accumulated with the Belle detector \[3\] operating at the asymmetric-energy \( e^+e^- \) collider KEKB \[4\].

THE BELLE DETECTOR

The Belle detector is a large-solid-angle magnetic spectrometer based on a 1.5 T superconducting solenoid magnet. Charged particle tracking is provided by a four-layer silicon vertex detector and a 50-layer central drift chamber (CDC) that surround the interaction point. The charged particle acceptance covers laboratory polar angle \( \theta \) between 17\(^{\circ}\) and 150\(^{\circ}\), corresponding to about 92% of the total solid angle in the c.m. frame.

Charged hadron identification is provided by \( dE/dx \) measurements in the CDC, an array of 1188 aerogel Cherenkov counters (ACC), and a barrel-like array of 128 time-of-flight scintillation counters (TOF); information from the three subdetectors is combined to form a single likelihood ratio, which is then used in kaon and pion selection. Electromagnetic showering particles are detected in an array of 8736 CsI(Tl) crystals (ECL) that covers nearly the same solid angle as the charged particle tracking system.

Electron identification in Belle is based on a combination of \( dE/dx \) measurements in the CDC, the response of the ACC, and the position, shape and total energy deposition of the shower detected in the ECL. The electron identification efficiency is greater than 92% for tracks with \( p_{lab} > 1.0 \) GeV/c and the hadron misidentification probability is below 0.3%. The magnetic field is returned via an iron yoke that is instrumented to detect muons and \( K_L^0 \) mesons. Muons are identified based on their penetration range and transverse scattering in this KLM detector. In the momentum region relevant to this analysis, the identification efficiency is about 90% while the probability to misidentify a pion as a muon is below 2%. 
We use the EvtGen event generator [5] with PHOTOS [6] for radiative corrections and a GEANT-based Monte Carlo (MC) simulation [7] to model the response of the detector and determine the acceptance. The MC simulation includes run-dependent detector performance variations and background conditions.

**EVENT RECONSTRUCTION**

Charged tracks are selected with a set of track quality requirements based on the number of CDC hits and on the distances of closest approach to the interaction point (IP) along (perpendicular to) the beam axis of $|dz| < 5$ cm ($|dr| < 2.5$ cm). Tracks originating from a $B_s$ candidate are required to have momenta transverse to the beam greater than 0.05 GeV/$c$. For charged kaon identification, we impose a particle-identification requirement that has an 86% efficiency and a 7% fake rate from misidentified pions. Charged hadron candidates that are positively identified as electrons are excluded.

**$B_s$ Reconstruction**

Candidate $B_s$ decays are reconstructed in the following channels: $B_s \rightarrow D_s^{(*)-}\pi^+$, $B_s \rightarrow J/\psi K^+K^-$, $B_s \rightarrow J/\psi\pi^+\pi^-$, and $B_s \rightarrow \psi(2S)K^+K^-$. Candidate $D_s^{(*)}$ decays are reconstructed in the $D_s\gamma$ channel, where $D_s \rightarrow K^+K^−\pi^−$ or $K^0_SK^−$. $D_s$ candidates from the $B_s \rightarrow D_s^{-}\pi^+$ decay mode are reconstructed in the $K^+K^−\pi^−$, $K^0_SK^−$, and $K^0_SK^+\pi^−\pi^−$ final states. Neutral kaon ($K^0_S$) candidates are reconstructed using pairs of oppositely-charged tracks, both treated as pions, with an invariant mass within 15 MeV/$c^2$ of the nominal $K^0_S$ mass; the IP constraint is not imposed here. The direction of the $K^0_S$ candidate momentum vector is required to be consistent with the direction of its vertex displacement relative to the IP. To identify signal $D_s$ [$D_s^{(*)}$] candidates, we require $|M(D_s) − m_{D_s}| < 2.5\sigma$, $|[(M(D_s\gamma) − M(D_s)) − (m_{D_s} − m_{D_s})]| < 2.5\sigma$, where $m_{D_s}$ [$m_{D_s^{(*)}}$] is the $D_s$ [$D_s^{(*)}$] nominal mass [8], and $\sigma$ is the Gaussian width for the relevant final state. The invariant mass of the $J/\psi \rightarrow \ell^+\ell^−$ candidates, with $\ell$ being electron (muon), is required to satisfy $3.01$ ($3.05$) GeV/$c^2 < M(\ell^+\ell^-) < 3.13$ GeV/$c^2$. The $\psi(2S)$ candidates are reconstructed in the $\psi(2S) \rightarrow J/\psi\pi^+\pi^−$ decay mode. We require $|(M(J/\psi\pi^+\pi^-) − M(J/\psi)) − (m_{\psi(2S)} − m_{J/\psi})| < 8$ MeV/$c^2$, where $m_{J/\psi}$ and $m_{\psi(2S)}$ are the $J/\psi$ and $\psi(2S)$ nominal masses [8], respectively.

We identify $B_s$ candidates by their reconstructed invariant mass $M(B_s)$ and momentum $P(B_s)$. We do not reconstruct the photon from the $B_s^{*} \rightarrow B_s\gamma$ decay; instead, the individual two-body final states are discriminated based on the reconstructed $B_s$ momentum.
Signal $\Upsilon(10860) \rightarrow B_s^*\bar{B}_s^*$ events produce a narrow peak in the $P(B_s)$ spectrum around 0.442 GeV/$c$, the $\Upsilon(10860) \rightarrow B_s\bar{B}_s^*$ signal events produce a peak at 0.678 GeV/$c$, and $\Upsilon(10860) \rightarrow B_s\bar{B}_s$ signal peaks at 0.844 GeV/$c$. It is important to note here that, due to the very low momentum of the photon from the $B_s^* \rightarrow B_s\gamma$ decays, the $B_s\bar{B}_s^*$ events (where the reconstructed $B_s$ is the one from $B_s^*$) produce a peak in the $P(B_s)$ distribution at about the same position as $B_s\bar{B}_s^*$ events, where the reconstructed $B_s$ is the prompt one. This is confirmed with the signal MC simulation. Momentum smearing for $B_s$ daughters from $B_s^*$ decays becomes more significant for higher $E_{cm}$ values.

**Background Suppression**

The dominant source of background arises from $e^+e^- \rightarrow c\bar{c}$ continuum events, where real $D$ mesons produced in $e^+e^-$ annihilation are combined with random particles to form a $B$ candidate. This type of background is suppressed using variables that characterize the event topology. Since the momenta of the $B_s^{(*)}$ and $\bar{B}_s^{(*)}$ mesons produced from the $\Upsilon(10860)$ decay are low in the c.m. frame, their decay products are essentially uncorrelated and the event tends to be spherical. In contrast, hadrons from continuum events tend to exhibit a two-jet structure. We use $\theta_{\text{thr}}$, the angle between the thrust axis of the $B_s$ candidate and that of the rest of the event, to discriminate between the two cases. The distribution is strongly peaked near $|\cos \theta_{\text{thr}}| = 1.0$ for $q\bar{q}$ events and is nearly flat in $\cos \theta_{\text{thr}}$ for $B_s^{(*)}\bar{B}_s^{(*)}$ events. We require $|\cos \theta_{\text{thr}}| < 0.80$ for the $B_s \rightarrow D_s^{(*)}\pi$ final states; this eliminates about 83% of the continuum background and retains 79% of the signal events.

**ANALYSIS OF THE $\Upsilon(10860)$ DATA**

Figures 1(a), (b), and (c) show the combined $M(B_s)$ distribution for the generic $\Upsilon(10860) \rightarrow B^{(*)}\bar{B}^{(*)}$ MC, generic $\Upsilon(10860) \rightarrow B_s^{(*)}\bar{B}_s^{(*)}$ MC (with signal modes removed), and continuum $\Upsilon(10860) \rightarrow q\bar{q}$ ($q = u, d, s, c$) MC, respectively, with a requirement on the $B_s$ candidate momentum of $P(B_s) < 0.95$ GeV/$c$.

The combined $M(B_s)$ distribution for the selected $B_s$ candidates in data is shown in Fig. 1(d). To determine the $B_s$ signal yield, we perform a binned maximum likelihood fit of the $M(B_s)$ distribution to the non-coherent sum of signal and background components. The signal is parametrized by the sum of two Gaussian functions with a common mean, a ratio of widths fixed from the signal MC at $\sigma_2 = 2.1\sigma_1$, and a relative area of $N_2 = 0.36N_1$. The background component is comprised of the continuum background and the $B$- and $B_s$-related background. As evident from Figs. 1(a) and (c), the $B$-related and continuum backgrounds
FIG. 1: Mass distribution for the selected $B_s$ candidates (all modes combined) in the (a) $B_u$ and $B_d$ generic MC, (b) $B_s$ generic MC except for signal modes, (c) continuum $e^+e^- \rightarrow q\bar{q}$ generic MC, and (d) $\Upsilon(10860)$ data. The black histogram in (d) represents result of the fit with the signal component shown by the open histogram, $B$- and $B_s$-related background by the hatched histogram, and the continuum background by the cross-hatched histogram.

are featureless, so we parametrize these by linear functions. The shape of the $B_s$-related background, shown in Fig. 1(b), is fixed from the generic MC, while the normalization is fixed to be a fraction of the observed $B_s$ signal. The ratio of the number of the background events due to other $B_s$ decays to the number of events in the $B_s$ peak is determined to be $1.87$ for the $P(B_s)$ requirement used to select a combination of $B_s^{(*)}\bar{B}_s^{(*)}$ final states and $1.12$ for the $B_s^*\bar{B}_s^*$ final state. If the normalization is allowed to float while fitting the data, the fits yield $1.82 \pm 0.22$ and $1.06 \pm 0.13$, respectively. The result of the fit to the $M(B_s)$ distribution is shown in Fig. 1(d). The fit yields $2283 \pm 63$ signal $B_s$ decays.

To distinguish between individual two-body $e^+e^- \rightarrow B_s^{(*)}\bar{B}_s^{(*)}$ processes, we impose a requirement on the invariant mass of the $B_s$ candidate equivalent to a Gaussian $2.5\sigma$ efficiency, where $\sigma$ is a $B_s$ decay mode-dependent parameter. Figures 2(a), (b), and (c) show the
FIG. 2: Momentum distribution for the selected $B_s$ candidates (all modes combined) in the (a) $B_u$ and $B_d$ generic MC, (b) $B_s$ generic MC with signal modes removed, (c) continuum $e^+e^- \rightarrow q\bar{q}$ generic MC, and (d) $\Upsilon(10860)$ data. The black histogram in (d) represents a result of the fit with the signal component shown by the open histogram, $B$- and $B_s$-related background by the hatched histogram, and the continuum background by the cross-hatched histogram.

The $P(B_s)$ distribution for the generic $\Upsilon(10860) \rightarrow B^{(*)}B^{(*)}$ MC, generic $\Upsilon(10860) \rightarrow B_s^{(*)}B_s^{(*)}$ MC (with signal modes removed), and continuum $\Upsilon(10860) \rightarrow q\bar{q}$ MC, respectively, with a $B_s$ decay mode-dependent requirement on the $M(B_s)$ that corresponds to a Gaussian $2.5\sigma$ efficiency. A peaking structure observed in Fig. 2(b) around $P(B_s) \sim 0.5$ GeV/c is due to misreconstructed $B_s$ candidates, such as $B_s^0 \rightarrow D_s^-\pi^+$, $D_s^- \rightarrow K^+K^-\pi^-$ with double $\pi/K$ misidentification. Such events produce no peak in the $M(B_s)$ distribution but do peak in $P(B_s)$. The momentum distribution for the selected $B_s$ candidates in data is shown in Fig. 2(d). Three distinct peaks, corresponding to the $B_s\bar{B}_s$, $B_s\bar{B}_s^* + \bar{B}_sB_s^*$, and $B_s^*\bar{B}_s^*$ final states, are apparent.

We perform a binned maximum likelihood fit of the $P(B_s)$ distribution to the non-
coherent sum of three signal components and a background component. The shape of each signal component is determined from MC simulation with the initial state radiation (ISR) effect taken into account. The background component is comprised of the continuum background, the $B$-related background, and the $B_s$-related background. The shape of the continuum $P(B_s)$ background is parametrized as

$$B_{qq}(x) \sim x^\alpha e^{-(x/x_0)\beta},$$

(1)

where $x = P(B_s)$; $x_0$, $\alpha$, and $\beta$ are fit parameters. The normalization of the continuum background component is allowed to float. For the $B$- and $B_s$-related background components, we use the corresponding MC driven histograms (see Fig. 2) as PDFs. The ratios of the $B$- and $B_s$-related backgrounds to the $B_s^{(*)}$ signal yield are fixed from the MC simulation.

Results of the fit to the $P(B_s)$ distribution are shown in Fig. 2(d). The fit yields $1854 \pm 51$ $B_s^* \bar{B}_s^*$ signal events, $226 \pm 27$ $B_s \bar{B}_s^*$ + $\bar{B}_s B_s^*$ signal events, and $169 \pm 24$ $B_s \bar{B}_s$ signal events. Assuming a uniform reconstruction efficiency over the relevant $B_s$ momentum range, this corresponds to relative fractions of $7 : 0.853 \pm 0.106(stat.) \pm 0.053(syst.) : 0.638 \pm 0.094(stat.) \pm 0.033(syst.)$. These can be compared with the current world average results of $7 : 0.537 \pm 0.152 : 0.199 \pm 0.199$ and an expectation of $7 : 4 : 1$ in the heavy-quark spin symmetry (HQSS) approximation [10, 11].

The dominant sources of the systematic uncertainties for the relative fractions of the two-body signals are:

- the fraction of the $B$- and $B_s$-related background estimating by repeating the fit to the $B_s$ momentum distribution with the normalization of this background allowed to float;

- the $M(B_s)$ signal region, estimated by repeating the fit to the data with the $M(B_s)$ signal region set to $\pm 3\sigma$ and $\pm 2\sigma$ around the $B_s$ nominal mass;

- the momentum distribution fitting range, estimated by varying the upper boundary of the momentum range from 2.0 to 3.0 GeV/$c$ with a 0.25 GeV/$c$ step;

- the width of the momentum resolution function, estimated by varying the width of the $P(B_s)$ resolution within $\pm 10\%$ of the nominal value and repeating the fit to the data.

These uncertainties are summarized in Table I. The overall systematic uncertainty is estimated to be $\pm 0.053$ for the $B_s \bar{B}_s^* + \bar{B}_s B_s^*$ fraction and $\pm 0.033$ for the $B_s \bar{B}_s$ fraction.
TABLE I: Summary of the systematic studies for the relative $B_s^* \bar{B}_s^* : B_s \bar{B}_s^* + \bar{B}_s B_s^*$ : $B_s \bar{B}_s$ yields.

| Source                     | Signal yield, events | Ratio   | Uncertainty |
|----------------------------|----------------------|---------|-------------|
|                           | $B_s^* \bar{B}_s^*$ | $B_s \bar{B}_s^*$ | $B_s \bar{B}_s$ |
| $B & B_s$ background       |                      |         |             |
| floating                   | 1865 219 168         | 7 : 0.822 : 0.637 |
| ×1.50                      | 1844 227 164         | 7 : 0.862 : 0.623 |
| ×0.75                      | 1863 221 172         | 7 : 0.830 : 0.646 |
| $M(B_s)$ signal region     |                      |         |             |
| ±2σ                        | 1780 212 162         | 7 : 0.834 : 0.637 |
| ±3σ                        | 1897 235 174         | 7 : 0.867 : 0.642 |
| $P(B_s)$ range             |                      |         |             |
| $< 2.00$ GeV/c             | 1864 226 165         | 7 : 0.851 : 0.626 |
| $< 2.25$ GeV/c             | 1857 225 167         | 7 : 0.851 : 0.636 |
| $< 2.75$ GeV/c             | 1859 222 165         | 7 : 0.838 : 0.628 |
| $< 3.00$ GeV/c             | 1871 231 173         | 7 : 0.871 : 0.647 |
| Momentum resolution        |                      |         |             |
| $B_s^* \bar{B}_s^*$ : −10% | 1842 213 162         | 7 : 0.811 : 0.622 |
| $B_s^* \bar{B}_s^*$ : +10% | 1865 239 177         | 7 : 0.900 : 0.671 |
| $B_s \bar{B}_s^*$ : −10%  | 1855 226 169         | 7 : 0.855 : 0.644 |
| $B_s \bar{B}_s^*$ : +10%  | 1856 218 162         | 7 : 0.824 : 0.617 |
| $B_s \bar{B}_s$ : −10%    | 1854 227 171         | 7 : 0.860 : 0.652 |
| $B_s \bar{B}_s$ : +10%    | 1854 224 166         | 7 : 0.848 : 0.633 |
| Nominal fit                | 1854 ± 51 226 ± 27 169 ± 24 | 7 : 0.853 ± 0.106 : 0.638 ± 0.094 |

$B_s$ reconstruction efficiency

To account for the possible dependence of the $B_s$ reconstruction efficiency on the c.m. energy ($P(B_s)$ momentum), we generate 20K $e^+e^- \rightarrow B_s^{(*)} \bar{B}_s^{(*)}$ signal MC events at seven $E_{cm}$ points. Applying the same reconstruction and analysis algorithm, we determine the $B_s$ signal yield. The results are summarized in Fig. 5. No significant variations in the reconstruction efficiency are observed within the relevant $B_s$ momentum range, including the case where the $\cos(\theta_{thr})$ requirement is applied.
FIG. 3: $B_s$ reconstruction efficiency (no intermediate branching fractions included). (a) Momentum dependence of the $B_s$ reconstruction efficiency for the $B_s \to D_s [K^+ K^- \pi] \pi$ decay mode with no $\cos(\theta_{thr})$ cut (red points), with the $|\cos(\theta_{thr})| < 0.8$ cut applied (blue points), and for the $B_s \to J/\psi [\ell^+ \ell^-] K^+ K^-$ decay mode (black points). (b) Correction for the $B_s$ reconstruction efficiency as a function of the $B_s$ polar angle in the c.m. frame. Red points are for the $B_s \to D_s [K^+ K^- \pi] \pi$ decay mode, blue points are for the $B_s \to J/\psi [\mu^+ \mu^-] K^+ K^-$ decay mode. The solid line represents the result of the fit to a linear function.

Angular analysis

The $\cos(\theta_{B_s^*})$ distribution, where $\theta_{B_s^*}$ is the angle between the $B_s^*$ momentum and the z axis in the c.m. frame, provides information on the relative fractions of the $S = 0$ and $S = 2$ states, with $S$ being the total spin of the $B_s^* \bar{B}_s^*$ pair, produced in the $e^+ e^- \to B_s^* \bar{B}_s^*$ process. The angular distribution of the $S = 0$ component is proportional to $1 - \cos^2(\theta_{B_s^*})$ while that for the $S = 2$ component to $(7 - \cos^2(\theta_{B_s^*}))/10$. The differential cross section then reads as

$$\frac{d\sigma}{d\cos(\theta_{B_s^*})} \sim \mathcal{A}_0^2 + \mathcal{A}_2^2,$$

(2)

where $\mathcal{A}_0^2 = a_0^2(1 - \cos^2 \theta_{B_s^*})$ and $\mathcal{A}_2^2 = a_2^2(7 - \cos^2 \theta_{B_s^*})/10$ are the squared amplitudes for the $B_s^* \bar{B}_s^*$ production in a $P$ wave with the total spin of $S = 0$ and $S = 2$, respectively. In the heavy quark spin symmetry, the ratio $a_0^2 : a_2^2$ is expected to be 1:20. However, the proximity of the $B_s^* \bar{B}_s^*$ production threshold might distort this ratio significantly [12].

For the analysis of the $B_s^*$ polar angular distribution in data, we select $B_s^*$ candidates by applying a requirement on the $B_s$ momentum of $0.25 \text{ GeV}/c < P(B_s) < 0.55 \text{ GeV}/c$ and then determine the $B_s$ yield in $\cos(\theta_{B_s^*})$ bins. (In fact, we measure the polar angle of the $B_s$ meson, not $B_s^*$. The associated absolute uncertainty in $\cos \theta_{B_s^*}$ is below 0.01, which is much smaller than the bin width.) We perform a binned maximum likelihood fit to the $M(B_s)$
FIG. 4: $\cos(\theta_{B_s})$ distribution for the $e^+e^- \to B_s^*\bar{B}_s^*$ events. (a) Test with generic MC events. The solid line – a fit with combinations of the $S = 0$ and $S = 2$ components; the dashed line – a fit with the $S = 0$ component only. (b) $\Upsilon(10860)$ data. Th solid line – a fit with combinations of the $S = 0$ and $S = 2$ components; the dashed line – fit with the $S = 2$ component only. (c) measured $r$ value versus the input one as determined with signal MC; the solid line shows the exact proportionality.

distribution for each $\cos \theta_{B_s}$ bin. The $B_s$ yield as a function of $\cos \theta_{B_s}$ is fit to the following function:

$$
\frac{d\sigma}{d \cos(\theta_{B_s})} \sim r(1 - \cos^2 \theta_{B_s}) + (1 - r)\frac{7 - \cos^2 \theta_{B_s}}{10},
$$

where $r = a_0^2/(a_2^2 + a_0^2)$. We also apply the efficiency corrections described earlier.

As a cross-check of the analysis procedure, we apply it to the generic MC events. Results of this analysis are shown in Fig. 4(a). The fit result of $r = 0.952 \pm 0.029$ is consistent with a pure $S = 0$ component. This agrees with the MC input, where the fraction of the $S = 2$ component is (wrongly) set to zero.

Results of the same analysis applied to the data are shown in Fig. 4(b). The fit yields a fraction of the $S = 0$ component of $r = 0.175 \pm 0.057^{+0.022}_{-0.018}$. We also fit the data with a pure $S = 2$ form, the results are also shown in Fig. 4(b). The statistical significance of the $S = 0$ component, determined as $\sqrt{-2(\ln L_{S=2} - \ln L_{\text{mix}})}$ is 3.1 standard deviations (statistical only).

The dominant sources of the systematic uncertainties for the angular analysis are

- correction for the reconstruction efficiency $-0.004$: to estimate this uncertainty, we vary the slope of the correction function within its statistical uncertainty;

- binning $\pm0.010$: to estimate this uncertainty, we repeat the fit with bin widths of 0.040, 0.050, 0.080, 0.125, and 0.200, then take the largest positive and negative deviations as the estimation of the systematic uncertainty;

- determination of the $B_s$ signal yield $-0.015$: here, we vary the fraction of the $B_s$ related component within $\pm25\%$ and fraction of the second Gaussian in the signal PDF within.
±10% (the typical variation of these quantities for various $B_s$ decay chains) and repeat the fit to the angular distribution;

- momentum cuts to select the $B_s^*\bar{B}_s^*$ signal – ±0.012: here, we vary the lower and the higher boundary of the momentum range by ±0.05 GeV/c and repeat the fit to the angular distribution.

We also check for a possible systematic shift in the determination of the $r$ value (linearity check) using signal MC events generated with various inputs for the $S = 0$ fraction. The results of this study are shown in Fig. 4(c).

The overall systematic uncertainty is calculated as the quadratic sum of all contributions and is $\pm 0.022$. This reduces the significance of the $S = 0$ component to $2.6\sigma$.

ANALYSIS OF THE ENERGY SCAN DATA

For this analysis, we use 19 energy points above the $B_sB_s$ production threshold with about one inverse femtobarn of integrated luminosity accumulated at each point. We also split the 121.4 fb$^{-1}$ of data taken near the $\Upsilon(10860)$ peak into three samples with close $E_{cm}$ values according to the KEKB data; see Table III.

At each energy point, we use the same analysis strategy as applied in the analysis of the $\Upsilon(10860)$ data, described in the previous Section. The $M(B_s)$ distributions for selected $B_s$ candidates at each energy point are shown in Fig 5. The relevant information is summarized in Table III.

The visible cross section $\sigma^{vis}$ shown in Fig. 6(a) is calculated as

$$\sigma_i^{vis} = 0.0585 \frac{N_i}{N_{5S}} \frac{L_{5S}}{L_i};$$

where $N_i$ and $N_{5S} = 2270 \pm 60$ are the $B_s$ yields measured at the $i$-th energy point and for the full $\Upsilon(10860)$ sample, respectively; $L_i$ and $L_{5S} = 121.4$ fb$^{-1}$ are the corresponding luminosities. The factor $(0.0585 \pm 0.0106)$ nb is the product of the total $e^+e^- \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ cross section of $0.340 \pm 0.016$ nb [13] and the fraction of $e^+e^- \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ events hadronized to a pair of $B_s^{(*)}$ mesons, measured to be $f_s = 0.172 \pm 0.030$ [13]. Both these quantities have been measured by Belle at the $\Upsilon(10860)$.

In addition to the total $e^+e^- \rightarrow B_s^{(*)}\bar{B}_s^{(*)}$ cross section, we also perform a separate measurement of the exclusive $e^+e^- \rightarrow B_s^{*}\bar{B}_s^{*}$ cross section. We select $B_s^{*}\bar{B}_s^{*}$ events by applying a tighter requirement on the momentum of the reconstructed $B_s$, as summarized in Table III. Results are presented in Fig. 6(b) and in Table III. As a cross check, we apply the same procedure to events selected in a 0.25 GeV/c-wide momentum window above the two-body
TABLE II: Summary of the energy scan results.

| #  | Energy (GeV) | Lumi. (fb⁻¹) | Total $B_s^{(*)} \bar{B}_s^{(*)}$ $P(B_s)$ | $B_s$ Yield (GeV/c) | $\sigma_{\text{vis}}$ (Events) | Only $B_s^{(*)} \bar{B}_s^{(*)}$ $P(B_s)$ | $B_s$ Yield (GeV/c) | $\sigma_{\text{vis}}$ (Events) |
|----|-------------|--------------|--------------------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| 1  | 10.7711     | 0.955        | < 0.605                        | 3.0 ± 2.3        | 9.8 ± 7.5       | < 0.461                        | 12.3 ± 3.3       | 38.7 ± 10.4      |
| 2  | 10.8205     | 1.697        | < 0.793                        | 4.8 ± 4.1        | 8.8 ± 7.5       | < 0.520                        | 15.8 ± 3.4       | 49.8 ± 10.7      |
| 3  | 10.8497     | 0.989        | < 0.888                        | 14.3 ± 6.2       | 45.0 ± 19.5     | < 0.578                        | 20.6 ± 3.9       | 65.6 ± 12.4      |
| 4  | 10.8589     | 0.988        | < 0.916                        | 28.6 ± 6.3       | 84.4 ± 19.9     | < 0.622                        | 12.3 ± 3.9       | 39.2 ± 12.4      |
| 5  | 10.8695     | 0.978        | < 0.947                        | 28.6 ± 6.2       | 91.0 ± 19.7     | < 0.708                        | 3.3 ± 2.8        | 10.5 ± 8.9       |
| 6  | 10.8785     | 0.978        | < 0.973                        | 13.5 ± 5.4       | 43.0 ± 17.2     | < 0.718                        | 9.8 ± 4.0        | 21.4 ± 8.7       |
| 7  | 10.8836     | 1.848        | < 0.987                        | 24.5 ± 7.1       | 41.3 ± 12.0     | < 0.644                        | 20.5 ± 5.8       | 34.5 ± 9.8       |
| 8  | 10.8889     | 0.990        | < 1.003                        | 10.1 ± 5.1       | 31.8 ± 16.0     | < 0.668                        | 4.3 ± 2.8        | 13.5 ± 8.8       |
| 9  | 10.8985     | 0.983        | < 1.029                        | 11.2 ± 4.7       | 35.5 ± 14.9     | < 0.708                        | 3.3 ± 2.8        | 10.5 ± 8.9       |
| 10 | 10.9011     | 1.425        | < 1.036                        | 13.7 ± 4.9       | 30.0 ± 10.7     | < 0.718                        | 9.8 ± 4.0        | 21.4 ± 8.7       |
| 11 | 10.9077     | 0.980        | < 1.053                        | −2.8 ± 3.8       | −8.9 ± 12.1     | < 0.744                        | −1.1 ± 3.5       | −3.5 ± 11.1      |
| 12 | 10.9275     | 1.149        | < 1.105                        | 5.6 ± 4.8        | 12.1 ± 13.0     | < 0.815                        | 4.4 ± 3.4        | 11.9 ± 9.2       |
| 13 | 10.9575     | 0.969        | < 1.178                        | −0.2 ± 3.6       | −0.6 ± 11.6     | < 0.912                        | 2.3 ± 3.3        | 7.4 ± 10.1       |
| 14 | 10.9775     | 0.999        | < 1.224                        | 2.9 ± 4.7        | 9.0 ± 14.6      | < 0.971                        | 2.8 ± 3.2        | 8.7 ± 10.0       |
| 15 | 10.9919     | 0.985        | < 1.258                        | −4.5 ± 3.3       | −14.2 ± 10.4    | < 1.012                        | −1.0 ± 2.6       | −3.1 ± 8.2       |
| 16 | 11.0068     | 0.976        | < 1.290                        | −2.9 ± 4.2       | −9.3 ± 13.4     | < 1.052                        | −3.5 ± 2.7       | −11.2 ± 8.6      |
| 17 | 11.0164     | 0.771        | < 1.311                        | 10.4 ± 6.1       | 42.0 ± 24.6     | < 1.077                        | 7.7 ± 4.4        | 31.1 ± 17.8      |
| 18 | 11.0175     | 0.859        | < 1.314                        | 8.2 ± 5.2        | 29.7 ± 18.8     | < 1.080                        | 1.4 ± 3.4        | 5.1 ± 12.3       |
| 19 | 11.0220     | 0.982        | < 1.323                        | 0.8 ± 4.2        | 2.5 ± 13.3      | < 1.091                        | 0.4 ± 3.9        | 1.3 ± 12.4       |
| 20 | 10.8686     | 22.938       | < 0.945                        | 457.5 ± 29.0     | 62.1 ± 3.9      | < 0.573                        | 378 ± 42         | 51.3 ± 5.7       |
| 21 | 10.8633     | 47.647       | < 0.930                        | 817.7 ± 32.3     | 53.3 ± 2.1      | < 0.545                        | 732 ± 50         | 47.8 ± 3.3       |
| 22 | 10.8667     | 50.475       | < 0.940                        | 999.0 ± 33.0     | 61.6 ± 2.0      | < 0.563                        | 820 ± 53         | 50.6 ± 3.3       |

kinematic limit. The fit returns a $B_s$ yield consistent with zero at each energy point; the measured visible cross section for this sideband region is shown in Fig. (c).

The systematic uncertainty for the measured visible cross sections quoted in Table II is dominated by the common multiplicative part due to the uncertainties in the total $e^+e^- \to b\bar{b}$ cross section and the hadronization fraction $f_s$. The systematic uncertainty due to the $B_s$ signal yield extraction is determined for each energy point and varies from 6% to 20%.
FIG. 5: $M(B_s)$ distributions for $e^+e^- \rightarrow B_s^{(*)}\bar{B}_s^{(*)}$ candidates for each energy point.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the ratio of production cross sections for the two-body $B_s^* \bar{B}_s^* : B_s \bar{B}_s + c.c. : B_s \bar{B}_s$ in $e^+e^-$ annihilation at $\sqrt{s} = 10.866$ GeV is measured to be $7 : 0.853 \pm 0.106 \pm 0.053 : 0.638 \pm 0.094 \pm 0.033$. The fraction of the $S = 0$ component determined from the analysis of
FIG. 6: Cross section for the (a) total $e^+e^- \rightarrow B_s^{(*)}\bar{B}_s^{(*)}$; (b) $e^+e^- \rightarrow B_s^*\bar{B}_s^*$ only; (c) momentum sideband region. Vertical lines show the $B_s\bar{B}_s$, $B_s^*\bar{B}_s^*$, and $B_s^*\bar{B}_s^*$ thresholds, respectively.

The polar angular distribution of $B_s^*$ produced in the $\Upsilon(10860) \rightarrow B_s^*\bar{B}_s^*$ process is $r = 0.175 \pm 0.057^{+0.022}_{-0.018}$. The measured values of the ratio of the production cross sections and fraction of the $S = 0$ component are in strong contradiction with the HQSS prediction. Some possible reasons for such a difference are discussed in Ref. [12]. Analysis of the $\Upsilon(10860) \rightarrow B_s^*\bar{B}_s^*$ cross section in the energy range from 10.77 to 11.02 GeV reveals a strong signal of the $\Upsilon(10860)$ resonance with no statistically significant signal of the $\Upsilon(11020)$ resonance.
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