We present preliminary measurements of the \( CP \) asymmetry parameters and \( CP \) content in \( B^0 \to K^+K^-K^0_L \) decays, with \( B^0 \to \phi K^0_L \) events excluded. In a sample of 227 \( M_B \bar{B} \) pairs collected by the \( BABAR \) detector at the \( PEP-II \) \( B \) Factory at SLAC, we find the \( CP \) parameters to be

\[
S = 0.07 \pm 0.28 \text{(stat)}^{+0.11}_{-0.12} \text{(syst)}
\]

\[
C = 0.54 \pm 0.22 \text{(stat)}^{+0.08}_{-0.09} \text{(syst)}
\]

where the first error is statistical and the second is systematic. Estimating the fraction of \( CP \)-odd final states from angular moments analysis in the \( K^+K^-K^0_S \) \( CP \)-conjugate final state, \( f_{odd}(K^+K^-K^0_L) = 0.92 \pm 0.07 \text{ (stat)} \pm 0.06 \text{ (syst)} \), we determine

\[
\sin 2\beta_{\text{eff}} = 0.09 \pm 0.33 \text{ (stat)}^{+0.13}_{-0.14} \text{(syst)} \pm 0.10 \text{(syst CP-cont)}
\]
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We present preliminary measurements of the $CP$ asymmetry parameters and $CP$ content in $B^0 \rightarrow K^+K^0_L$ decays, with $B^0 \rightarrow \phi K^0_L$ events excluded. In a sample of 227 $M\bar{M}$ pairs collected by the BABAR detector at the PEP-II $B$ Factory at SLAC, we find the $CP$ parameters to be

$$S = 0.07 \pm 0.28 (\text{stat}) ^{+0.11}_{-0.12} (\text{syst})$$

$$C = 0.54 \pm 0.22 (\text{stat}) ^{+0.08}_{-0.09} (\text{syst})$$

where the first error is statistical and the second is systematic. Estimating the fraction of $CP$-odd final states from angular moments analysis in the $K^+K^-K^0_s$ $CP$-conjugate final state, $f_{\text{odd}}(K^+K^-K^0_s) = 0.92 \pm 0.07$ (stat) $\pm 0.06$ (syst), we determine

$$\sin 2\beta_{\text{eff}} = 0.09 \pm 0.33 (\text{stat}) ^{+0.13}_{-0.14} (\text{syst}) \pm 0.10 (\text{syst CP-cont})$$

where the last error is due to uncertainty on the $CP$ content.
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3 Deceased
1 INTRODUCTION

In the Standard Model (SM), CP violation arises from a single complex phase in the Cabibbo–Kobayashi–Maskawa (CKM) quark-mixing matrix [1]. Decays of B mesons into charmless hadronic final states with three kaons are dominated by $b \to sss$ gluonic penguin amplitudes, with smaller contributions from electroweak penguins, while other SM amplitudes are suppressed by CKM factors [2]. The time-dependent CP-asymmetry is obtained by measuring the proper time difference $\Delta t = t_{CP} - t_{tag}$ between a fully reconstructed neutral B meson ($B_{CP}$) in the final state $K^+K^-K_S^0$, and the partially reconstructed recoil B meson ($B_{tag}$). The decay products of $B_{tag}$ provide evidence that it decayed either as $B^0$ or $\bar{B}^0$ (flavor tag). The decay rate $f_+ (f_-)$ when the tagging meson is a $B^0 (\bar{B}^0)$ is given by

$$f_\pm (\Delta t) = \frac{e^{-|\Delta t|/\tau_{B^0}}}{4\tau_{B^0}} \left[ 1 \pm S \sin (\Delta m_d \Delta t) \mp C \cos (\Delta m_d \Delta t) \right],$$

where $\tau_{B^0}$ is the neutral B meson mean lifetime and $\Delta m_d$ is the $B^0 - \bar{B}^0$ oscillation frequency. The parameters $C$ and $S$ describe the magnitude of CP violation in the decay and in the interference between decay and mixing, respectively. The time-dependent CP-violating asymmetry is defined as $A_{CP} \equiv (f_+ - f_-)/(f_+ + f_-)$. In the SM, we expect $C = 0$ because there is only one decay mechanism and direct CP violation requires amplitudes with different phases. Neglecting CKM-suppressed contributions and assuming that $K^+K^-K_S^0$ decay proceeds through an S-wave, leading to a CP-odd final state, the time-dependent CP-violating parameter $S$ in this decay and $B^0 \to J/\psi K^0$ are both equal to the same parameter $\sin 2\beta$ [3], where the latter decay is dominated by tree diagrams. Since many scenarios of physics beyond the SM introduce additional diagrams with heavy particles in the penguin loops and corresponding new phases, comparison of CP-violating observables with SM expectations is a sensitive probe for new physics [4]. Measurements of $\sin 2\beta$ in $B$ decays to charmonium such as $B^0 \to J/\psi K_S^0$ have been reported by the BABAR [5] and Belle [6] collaborations, and the world average for $\sin 2\beta$ (0.736 $\pm$ 0.049 [7]) is in good agreement with SM expectations [8]. A deviation from this value in the case of loop-dominated channels might signal the presence of physics beyond the SM.

Measurements of the CP asymmetry in the decays $B^0 \to \phi K_S^0$ and $B^0 \to \phi K_L^0$ currently have large statistical uncertainties [9,10]. More accurate CP asymmetry measurements have been performed in the final state $K^+K^-K_S^0$, (excluding $B^0 \to \phi K_S^0$) [11], which has a branching fraction several times larger than the resonant modes. The CP content of the final state, which is $a_{pri}$or unknown, is estimated using an angular-moment analysis.

In this document we report preliminary measurements of the time dependent CP asymmetry in the CP conjugate state $B^0 \to K^+K^-K_L^0$.

2 THE BaBar DETECTOR AND DATASET

This measurement is based on a sample of approximately 227 million $B\bar{B}$ pairs collected at the $\Upsilon(4S)$ resonance with the BaBar detector [12] at the PEP-II asymmetric-energy $e^+e^-$ storage ring [13] located at the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center. The BaBar detector is fully described elsewhere [12]. The detector systems used in this analysis are a charged-particle tracking system consisting of a five-layer silicon vertex tracker (SVT) and a 40-layer drift chamber (DCH) surrounded by a 1.5-T solenoidal magnet with an instrumented flux return (IFR), an electromagnetic calorimeter (EMC) composed of 6580 CsI(Tl) crystals, and a detector of internally reflected
Cherenkov light (DIRC) providing excellent charged $K - \pi$ identification up to a momentum of 4.5 GeV/c, which is the relevant momentum range for this analysis.

3 EVENT RECONSTRUCTION

The $B^0 \rightarrow K^+K^-K^0_s$ candidate ($B_{CP}$) is reconstructed by combining a pair of oppositely charged tracks extrapolated from a common vertex and a $K^0_s$ candidate. For the charged tracks we require at least 12 measured drift-chamber coordinates and a minimum transverse momentum of 0.1 GeV/c. The tracks must also originate within $\pm 10$ cm along the beam axis and 1.5 cm in the transverse plane, with respect to the nominal beam spot. Charged kaons are distinguished from pion and proton tracks via a requirement on a likelihood ratio that combines $dE/dx$ information from the SVT and the DCH for tracks with momentum $p < 0.7$ GeV/c. For tracks with higher $p$, $dE/dx$ in the DCH and the Cherenkov angle and the number of photons as measured by the DIRC are used in the likelihood. These particle identification criteria limit the rate of pion misidentification as a kaon to less than 2%, with an efficiency of 70%.

We identify a $K^0_s$ candidate as in the BABAR analysis of the decay $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^0_s$ analysis [14] either as a cluster of energy deposited in the EMC or as a cluster of hits in two or more layers of the IFR that cannot be associated with any charged track in the event. The $K^0_s$ energy is not measured, therefore, we determine the $K^0_s$ laboratory momentum from its flight direction as measured from the EMC or IFR cluster, and the constraint that the invariant $K^+K^-K^0_s$ mass agree with the known $B^0$ mass. In those cases where the $K^0_s$ is detected in both the IFR and EMC we use the angular information from the EMC, because it has higher precision. In order to reduce background from $\pi^0$ decays, we reject an EMC $K^0_s$ candidate cluster if it forms an invariant mass between 100 and 150 MeV/$c^2$ with any other neutral cluster in the event under the $\gamma\gamma$ hypothesis, or if it has energy greater than 1 GeV and contains two shower maxima consistent with two photons from a $\pi^0$ decay. The remaining background of $K^0_s$ candidates due to photons and overlapping showers is further reduced with the use of a neural network $\mathcal{NN}_{EMC}$. The $\mathcal{NN}_{EMC}$ is constructed from cluster shape variables, trained using as signal measured $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^0_s$ events and as background measured $K^+K^-K^0_s$ events which lie outside the signal region, and tested on $e^+e^- \rightarrow \phi(\rightarrow K^0_s K^0_s)\gamma$ events.

The results are extracted using an extended unbinned maximum likelihood fit. We parameterize the distributions of kinematic and topological variables for signal and background events in terms of probability density functions (PDFs) [17]. The selection requirements for these variables is loose to include background dominated regions which can then be extrapolated into the signal region. The main source of background, estimated from data, comes from random combinations of tracks produced in events of the type $e^+e^- \rightarrow q\bar{q}$, where $q = u, d, s, c$ (continuum). Background from decays of $B$ mesons in other final states with and without charm is estimated using Monte Carlo simulation.

In the following we describe the event variables used in the maximum likelihood fit to characterize the signal and background: the energy difference $\Delta E = E_{B} - \frac{3}{2}\sqrt{s}$, where $E_{B}$ is the energy of the $B$ candidate and $\sqrt{s}$ is the total energy, both evaluated in the $T(4S)$ rest frame, a neural network $\mathcal{NN}$ built with topological quantities, and $\Delta t$, described in Section II. For signal events, $\Delta E$ is expected to peak at zero, with a broad tail for positive values of $\Delta E$. We require $\Delta E < 0.08$ GeV, in order to be able to fix the shape of background under the signal peak. The $\Delta E$ resolution is 3.0 MeV, which includes the different resolutions for EMC and IFR events. This resolution has been validated on data using reconstructed $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi K^0_s$ events.
Continuum events are characterized by a jet-like topology in the $\Upsilon(4S)$ rest frame, because of the large amount of phase space in the decay, while $B$ mesons are produced almost at rest, so particles produced in $B$ decays are distributed isotropically. One can then define a set of topological variables to quantify the sphericity of the event. One such quantity is the angle $\theta_{SPH}$ between the sphericity axis of the $B_{CP}$ candidate and the sphericity axis formed from the other charged and neutral particles in the event. We also use the cosine of the angle $\theta_B$ between the $B_{CP}$ momentum and the beam axis, and the sum of the momenta $p_i$ of the other charged and neutral particles in the event weighted by the Legendre polynomials $L_0(\theta_i)$ and $L_2(\theta_i)$ where $\theta_i$ is the angle between the momentum of particle $i$ and the thrust axis of the $B_{CP}$ candidate. We use other variables characterizing a final state with a $K^0_L$. One is the reconstructed energy difference $\Delta E_{mis}$, calculated in the laboratory frame as the difference between total reconstructed energy of the event, where the energy of the neutral particles is calibrated for an electromagnetic shower, and the two reconstructed kaon energies. The other is the cosine of the polar angle of the missing momentum, $\vec{p}_{miss}$, calculated as the difference between the sum of beam momenta and all tracks and EMC clusters, in the laboratory frame, excluding the $K^0_L$ candidate. We combine these variables in a neural network $\mathcal{N}\mathcal{N}$, which peaks at 0 for continuum events and at 1 for signal events. We apply a selection that retains 80% of signal events and rejects 84% of continuum background. The rest of the events are used for the maximum likelihood fit.

The remaining background originates from $B$ decays where a neutral or charged pion is missed during the reconstruction (peaking $B$ background). Since the branching fractions for these decay modes ($B^0 \rightarrow K^+K^-K^{*0}(K^0_L\pi^0)$, $B^0 \rightarrow K^{*+}(K^+\pi^0)K^-K^0_L$, $B^+ \rightarrow K^+K^-K^{*+}(K^0_L\pi^+)$, and $B^+ \rightarrow K^+K^0_LK^{*-}(K^0_\pi^-)$) are not known, we build a cocktail of exclusive Monte Carlo samples, weighted with the relative efficiency, and the yield is floated in the final fit. The rest of the background originating from $B$ decays comes from the combinations of particles originating from both $B$ mesons that have continuum-like values of $\Delta E$, so these events are included in the continuum component by the fit, without generating a bias in the fitted values of $S$ and $C$ parameters.

We suppress background from $B$ decays that proceed through a $b \rightarrow c$ transition leading to the $K^+K^-K^0_L$ final state by applying invariant mass cuts to remove $D^0$, $J/\psi$, $\chi_{c0}$, and $\psi(2S)$ decaying into $K^+K^-$, and $D^+$ and $D^{*+}$ decays into $K^+K^0_L$.

All the other tracks and clusters that are not associated with the reconstructed $B^0 \rightarrow K^+K^-K^0_L$ decay are used to form the $B_{tag}$; its flavor is determined with a multivariate tagging algorithm [15]. The tagging efficiency $\varepsilon$ and mistag probability $w$ in five hierarchical and mutually exclusive categories are measured using fully reconstructed $B^0$ decays into the $D^{(*)-}X^+(X^+ = \pi^+, \rho^+, a^+_1)$ and $J/\psi K^{*0}$ ($K^{*0} \rightarrow K^+\pi^-$) flavor eigenstates ($B_{flav}$ sample). The analyzing power $\varepsilon(1-2w)^2$ is $(30.3 \pm 0.4)\%$.

A detailed description of the $\Delta t$ reconstruction algorithm is given in Ref. [14].

4  MAXIMUM LIKELIHOOD FIT

The CP asymmetry parameters are extracted from a $K^+K^-K^0_L$ sample which excludes $B^0 \rightarrow \phi K^0_L$ with an invariant mass veto: $|m(K^+K^-) - m(\phi)| > 15$ MeV/c$^2$. This excludes $B^0 \rightarrow \phi K^0_L$ events by three standard deviations. The average $\Delta z$ resolution is 190$\mu$m, dominated by the tagging vertex in the event. Thus, we can characterize the resolution using the much larger $B_{flav}$ sample, which we use for signal parameterization. The amplitudes for the $B_{CP}$ asymmetries and for the $B_{flav}$ flavor
oscillations are reduced by the same factor due to wrong tags. Both distributions are convolved with a common $\Delta t$ resolution function. Backgrounds are accounted for by adding terms to the likelihood, incorporated with different assumptions about their $\Delta t$ evolution and resolution function [14]. The $\Delta t$ resolution function is parameterized as a sum of two Gaussian distributions with different mean values whose widths are given by a scale factor times the event-by-event uncertainty $\sigma_{\Delta t}$. A third Gaussian distribution, with a fixed large width, accounts for a small fraction of outlying events [5].

For the time-dependent fit we retain events that have $|\Delta t| < 20$ ps and whose estimated uncertainty $\sigma_{\Delta t}$ is less than 2.5 ps.

Since we measure the correlation among the observables to be small in the data sample used in the fit (the largest is 2.9 % between $\Delta E$ and $N_1N_2$) we take the probability density function $P_{i,c}^j$ for each event $j$ to be a product of the PDFs for the separate observables. For each event hypothesis $i$ (signal, backgrounds) and tagging category $c$, we define $P_{i,c}^j = P_i(\Delta E) \cdot P_i(N_1N_2) \cdot P_i(\Delta t; \sigma_{\Delta t}, c)$.

The likelihood function for each decay chain is then

$$L = \prod_c \exp \left( -\sum_i N_{i,c} \prod_j \left[ \sum_i N_{i,c} P_{i,c}^j \right] \right),$$

(2)

where $N_{i,c}$ is the yield of events of hypothesis $i$ obtained from the fit in category $c$, and $N_c$ is the number of category $c$ events in the sample. The total sample consists of 77577 $K^+K^-K^0_L$ candidates. The total reconstruction efficiency is $\langle \varepsilon \rangle = (23.1 \pm 0.6)\%$. We fixed in the fit $S_{B\rightarrow bkg} = 0.42$ (as estimated from full Monte Carlo simulation of generic neutral and charged $B$-decays) and $C_{B\rightarrow bkg} = 0$ (as the SM expectations). From the fit we find $777 \pm 80 K^+K^-K^0_L$ signal events ($B^0 \rightarrow \phi K^0_L$ excluded). The signal yield agrees with the branching fraction determined in the $K^+K^-K^0_S$ final state within one standard deviation, but the uncertainty in $K^0_L$ efficiency is large. Figure 1 shows the $\Delta E$ distribution together with the result from the fit after a cut to enhance signal, where $\theta_H$ is the angle between the $K^+$ candidate and the parent $B_{CP}$ flight direction in the $K^+K^-$ rest frame. The neural network output distribution together with the result from the fit after a requirement on the likelihood to enhance the sensitivity. The fit was tested with both a parameterized simulation of a large number of data-sized experiments and a full detector simulation. The likelihood of our data fit agrees with the likelihoods from fits to the simulated data. Figure 2 shows the comparison between data and Monte Carlo simulated events of the signal to background likelihood ratio $L_{signal}/(L_{signal} + L_{bkg})$ distribution. It shows the goodness of the agreement between data and Monte Carlo parameterization event-by-event. The fit was also verified with our $J/\psi K^0_L$ data sample to check the fitted central value of $\sin2\beta$ and the sign of the CP eigenstate definition.

5 ESTIMATION OF CP CONTENT

The measurement of the CP content has been done in the $K^+K^-K^0_S$ final state from an angular moments analysis [11]. Since the $K^+K^-K^0_S$ final state has higher purity than can be obtained in the $K^0_L$ final state, the angular analysis has not been repeated with our sample, but the results on the CP-conjugate state have been used. In order to take into account differences in the efficiency across the Dalitz plot between the $K^+K^-K^0_S$ and $K^+K^-K^0_L$ samples, which can change the relative amount of CP-even(odd) fraction in different $m(K^+K^-)$ regions, we use the $f_{even}$ fraction measured in seven $m(K^+K^-)$ bins (excluding the $\phi$ region) in $B^0 \rightarrow K^+K^-K^0_S$ and compute a re-weighted average using $K^+K^-K^0_S$ yields in the same mass bins. Table 1 shows the $K^+K^-K^0_L$ efficiencies, yields and the measured $K^+K^-K^0_S f_{even}$. Variations of the signal yield are shown also in the upper plot of Fig. 4.
Figure 1: Distribution of the event variable \( \Delta E \) after a \( \cos \theta_H \) cut (left) and neural network output after a requirement on the likelihood, calculated without the plotted variable. The signal efficiency for the selection and likelihood requirements is 31\% for \( \Delta E \) and 8\% for the neural network output. The solid line represents the fit result for the total event yield and the dashed line for the total background. The dotted line represents the continuum background, only.

Table 1: Average efficiencies, yields for \( B^0 \to K^+K^-K^0_L \), and \( f_{\text{even}} \), calculated in the \( K^+K^-K^0_S \) final state, for seven \( K^+K^- \) mass bins (excluding \( \phi \) region).

| \( m(K^+K^-) \) GeV/c\(^2 \) | \( \langle \varepsilon \rangle \) | Signal yield | \( f_{\text{even}} \) (\( K^+K^-K^0_S \)) |
|-----------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------|
| [1.1 ; 1.3]     | 0.153       | 67.6 ± 20.8  | 1.10 ± 0.18     |
| [1.3 ; 1.5]     | 0.172       | 44.0 ± 21.3  | 0.99 ± 0.14     |
| [1.5 ; 1.9]     | 0.188       | 93.9 ± 28.0  | 0.93 ± 0.21     |
| [1.9 ; 2.3]     | 0.223       | 146.4 ± 28.1 | 0.95 ± 0.16     |
| [2.3 ; 2.7]     | 0.258       | 117.4 ± 24.0 | 0.79 ± 0.24     |
| [2.7 ; 3.1]     | 0.271       | 93.7 ± 21.8  | 0.74 ± 0.25     |
| [3.1 ; 4.9]     | 0.242       | 141.9 ± 37.2 | 0.96 ± 0.43     |

Out of the \( \phi \) region the sample consists mainly of S-wave decays, giving an \( f_{\text{odd}} \) fraction close to 1. We find the total fraction of \( CP \)-odd final states:

\[
f_{\text{odd}} = 0.92 \pm 0.07 \text{ (stat)} \pm 0.06 \text{ (syst)},
\]

where the systematic uncertainty is evaluated in the \( \text{BABAR} \ B^0 \to K^+K^-K^0_S \) analysis [11].

6 SYSTEMATIC STUDIES

We consider systematic uncertainties in the \( CP \) coefficients \( S \) and \( C \) due to the parameterization of PDFs for the event yields in signal and background by varying the parameters within one standard deviation (evaluated from a fit to Monte Carlo simulated events). Since the real \( CP \) content of the \( B \) background is not known, we vary \( S_{B-bkg} \) and \( C_{B-bkg} \) in a conservative interval. About 50\% of these
events come from charged $B$ decays, which show only direct $CP$-violation, while neutral $B$ decays can violate $CP$ both in mixing and decay. We therefore vary the $B$ background $CP$ parameters in the interval $-0.5 < S_{B\rightarrow bkg}(C_{B\rightarrow bkg}) < 0.5$, which corresponds to a uniform variation of the parameters for neutral $B$ background in the whole physically allowed interval $-1 < S_{B\rightarrow bkg}(C_{B\rightarrow bkg}) < 1$. We evaluate the uncertainty associated with the assumed parameterization of the $\Delta t$ resolution function for signal and $B$ background, a possible difference in the efficiency between reconstructed $B^0$ and $\bar{B}^0$ decays, and the fixed values for $\Delta m_d$ and $\tau_{B^0}$, by varying the parameters within one standard deviation (extracted from a fit to the $B_{flav}$ sample). We also estimate uncertainties coming from possible SVT layer misalignments. The bias in the coefficients due to the fit procedure is included in the uncertainty without making corrections to the final results. Finally, we estimate the errors due to the effect of doubly CKM-suppressed decays [16]. We add these contributions in quadrature to obtain the total systematic uncertainty. The summary is reported in Table 2.

7 RESULTS

The coefficients of the time-dependent $CP$ asymmetry in $B^0 \rightarrow K^+K^-K^0_L$ decays (excluding the $B^0 \rightarrow \phi K^0_L$ final state) determined by the fit are:

\[
S = 0.07 \pm 0.28 \text{ (stat)} \pm 0.11 \text{ (syst)},
\]
\[
C = 0.54 \pm 0.22 \text{ (stat)} \pm 0.08 \text{ (syst)}.
\]

Figure 3 shows the $\Delta t$ distributions of the $B^0$- and the $\bar{B}^0$-tagged subsets together with the raw asymmetry, with the result of the combined time-dependent $CP$-asymmetry fit superimposed. We also fit the $CP$ parameters in the same $m(K^+K^-)$ regions used to estimate the $CP$-odd fraction. The results are shown in Figure 4. The presence of both P- and S-wave decays in our $CP$ sample dilutes the measurement of the sine coefficient. If we account for the measured $CP$-odd fraction, we can extract the SM parameter $\sin 2\beta$. Using the estimate of the $CP$ content based on the angular moments, and setting $C = 0$ in the fit, we get

\[
\sin 2\beta_{\text{eff}} = \frac{S}{2f_{\text{odd}} - 1} = 0.09 \pm 0.33 \text{ (stat)} \pm 0.13 \text{ (syst)} \pm 0.10 \text{ (syst CP-cont)}
\]
Figure 3: Distributions of $\Delta t$ for $B^0 \rightarrow K^+K^-K^0_L$ candidates with (top) $B^0$- and (middle) $\bar{B}^0$-tags. The solid lines refer to the fit for all events; the dashed lines correspond to the background. The bottom plot shows the asymmetry. A requirement on signal-to-background ratio to enhance the signal is applied.
Figure 4: Distribution of signal yield (top), $C$ (middle) and $S$ (bottom) parameters in 7 different $m(K^+K^-)$ intervals.
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Table 2: Summary of systematic uncertainties on the parameters $S$ and $C$. The total systematic errors are obtained by adding in quadrature all individual sources.

| Source                        | $\Delta S(\text{+})$ | $\Delta S(\text{-})$ | $\Delta C(\text{+})$ | $\Delta C(\text{-})$ |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| $\Delta m_d$                  | 0.004                 | -0.001                | 0.000                 | -0.001                |
| $\tau_{B^0}$                  | 0.01                  | 0.01                  | 0.00                  | -0.00                 |
| $\Delta t$ model              | 0.02                  | 0.02                  | 0.02                  | 0.01                  |
| Tagging                       | 0.04                  | 0.04                  | 0.03                  | 0.03                  |
| $B$ background $CP$            | 0.10                  | 0.10                  | 0.06                  | 0.07                  |
| Signal and background PDFs    | 0.03                  | 0.03                  | 0.02                  | 0.02                  |
| fit biases                    | 0.00                  | 0.00                  | 0.02                  | 0.02                  |
| SVT local alignment           | 0.01                  | 0.01                  | 0.00                  | 0.00                  |
| doubly-CKM-suppressed decays  | 0.00                  | 0.00                  | 0.01                  | 0.01                  |
| Total                         | 0.11                  | 0.12                  | 0.08                  | 0.09                  |

where the last error is due to uncertainty on the $CP$ content. Since this uncertainty is multiplicative and the fitted value of $S$ is close to 0, we conservatively computed this uncertainty shifting the measured value of $S$ within 1 standard deviation.

8 SUMMARY

In a sample of 227 million $B\bar{B}$ mesons, we have obtained preliminary measurements of the $CP$ content and $CP$ parameters in the $K^+K^-K^0_L$ final state that excludes $B^0 \rightarrow \phi K^0_L$ decays. We estimated the fraction of $S$-wave events ($CP$-odd fraction) from measured value in the $K^+K^-K^0_L$ final state, which has higher purity than $K^+K^-K^0_L$. The result shows the dominance of $CP$-odd final states. We compute the average of $\sin^2\beta_{\text{eff}}$ and $C$ parameter in $K^+K^-K^0_L$ and $K^+K^-K^0_L$ final states treating the systematic errors and the uncertainty on the $CP$ content as completely correlated. This gives the most conservative estimation of the combined uncertainty. We obtain:

$$[\sin^2\beta_{\text{eff}}]_{\text{av}} = 0.41 \pm 0.18 \text{ (stat)} \pm 0.07 \text{ (syst)} \pm 0.11 \text{ (CP content)}$$

$$[C]_{\text{av}} = 0.23 \pm 0.12 \text{ (stat)} \pm 0.07 \text{ (syst)}$$

The result agrees within one standard deviation with the value of $\sin^2\beta$ in the $B^0 \rightarrow (\bar{c}c)K^0$ decays [15].
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