

## Evidence for $B_s^{(*)}\bar{B}_s^{(*)}$ Production at the $\Upsilon(5S)$ Resonance

M. Artuso,<sup>1</sup> C. Boulahouache,<sup>1</sup> S. Blusk,<sup>1</sup> J. Butt,<sup>1</sup> O. Dorjkhaidav,<sup>1</sup> J. Li,<sup>1</sup> N. Mena,<sup>1</sup> R. Mountain,<sup>1</sup> R. Nandakumar,<sup>1</sup> K. Randrianarivony,<sup>1</sup> R. Redjimi,<sup>1</sup> R. Sia,<sup>1</sup> T. Skwarnicki,<sup>1</sup> S. Stone,<sup>1</sup> J. C. Wang,<sup>1</sup> K. Zhang,<sup>1</sup> S. E. Csorna,<sup>2</sup> G. Bonvicini,<sup>3</sup> D. Cinabro,<sup>3</sup> M. Dubrovin,<sup>3</sup> A. Bornheim,<sup>4</sup> S. P. Pappas,<sup>4</sup> A. J. Weinstein,<sup>4</sup> R. A. Briere,<sup>5</sup> G. P. Chen,<sup>5</sup> J. Chen,<sup>5</sup> T. Ferguson,<sup>5</sup> G. Tatishvili,<sup>5</sup> H. Vogel,<sup>5</sup> M. E. Watkins,<sup>5</sup> J. L. Rosner,<sup>6</sup> N. E. Adam,<sup>7</sup> J. P. Alexander,<sup>7</sup> K. Berkelman,<sup>7</sup> D. G. Cassel,<sup>7</sup> V. Crede,<sup>7</sup> J. E. Duboscq,<sup>7</sup> K. M. Ecklund,<sup>7</sup> R. Ehrlich,<sup>7</sup> L. Fields,<sup>7</sup> R. S. Galik,<sup>7</sup> L. Gibbons,<sup>7</sup> B. Gittelman,<sup>7</sup> R. Gray,<sup>7</sup> S. W. Gray,<sup>7</sup> D. L. Hartill,<sup>7</sup> B. K. Heltsley,<sup>7</sup> D. Hertz,<sup>7</sup> C. D. Jones,<sup>7</sup> J. Kandaswamy,<sup>7</sup> D. L. Kreinick,<sup>7</sup> V. E. Kuznetsov,<sup>7</sup> H. Mahlke-Krüger,<sup>7</sup> T. O. Meyer,<sup>7</sup> P. U. E. Onyisi,<sup>7</sup> J. R. Patterson,<sup>7</sup> D. Peterson,<sup>7</sup> E. A. Phillips,<sup>7</sup> J. Pivarski,<sup>7</sup> D. Riley,<sup>7</sup> A. Ryd,<sup>7</sup> A. J. Sadoff,<sup>7</sup> H. Schwarthoff,<sup>7</sup> X. Shi,<sup>7</sup> M. R. Shepherd,<sup>7</sup> S. Stroiney,<sup>7</sup> W. M. Sun,<sup>7</sup> D. Urner,<sup>7</sup> T. Wilksen,<sup>7</sup> K. M. Weaver,<sup>7</sup> M. Weinberger,<sup>7</sup> S. B. Athar,<sup>8</sup> P. Avery,<sup>8</sup> L. Bрева-Newell,<sup>8</sup> R. Patel,<sup>8</sup> V. Potlia,<sup>8</sup> H. Stoeck,<sup>8</sup> J. Yelton,<sup>8</sup> P. Rubin,<sup>9</sup> C. Cawfield,<sup>10</sup> B. I. Eisenstein,<sup>10</sup> G. D. Gollin,<sup>10</sup> I. Karliner,<sup>10</sup> D. Kim,<sup>10</sup> N. Lowrey,<sup>10</sup> P. Naik,<sup>10</sup> C. Sedlack,<sup>10</sup> M. Selen,<sup>10</sup> E. J. White,<sup>10</sup> J. Williams,<sup>10</sup> J. Wiss,<sup>10</sup> D. M. Asner,<sup>11</sup> K. W. Edwards,<sup>11</sup> D. Besson,<sup>12</sup> T. K. Pedlar,<sup>13</sup> D. Cronin-Hennessy,<sup>14</sup> K. Y. Gao,<sup>14</sup> D. T. Gong,<sup>14</sup> J. Hietala,<sup>14</sup> Y. Kubota,<sup>14</sup> T. Klein,<sup>14</sup> B. W. Lang,<sup>14</sup> S. Z. Li,<sup>14</sup> R. Poling,<sup>14</sup> A. W. Scott,<sup>14</sup> A. Smith,<sup>14</sup> S. Dobbs,<sup>15</sup> Z. Metreveli,<sup>15</sup> K. K. Seth,<sup>15</sup> A. Tomaradze,<sup>15</sup> P. Zweber,<sup>15</sup> J. Ernst,<sup>16</sup> K. Arms,<sup>17</sup> H. Severini,<sup>18</sup> S. A. Dytman,<sup>19</sup> W. Love,<sup>19</sup> S. Mehrabyan,<sup>19</sup> J. A. Mueller,<sup>19</sup> V. Savinov,<sup>19</sup> Z. Li,<sup>20</sup> A. Lopez,<sup>20</sup> H. Mendez,<sup>20</sup> J. Ramirez,<sup>20</sup> G. S. Huang,<sup>21</sup> D. H. Miller,<sup>21</sup> V. Pavlunin,<sup>21</sup> B. Sanghi,<sup>21</sup> I. P. J. Shipsey,<sup>21</sup> G. S. Adams,<sup>22</sup> M. Cravey,<sup>22</sup> J. P. Cummings,<sup>22</sup> I. Danko,<sup>22</sup> J. Napolitano,<sup>22</sup> Q. He,<sup>23</sup> H. Muramatsu,<sup>23</sup> C. S. Park,<sup>23</sup> E. H. Thorndike,<sup>23</sup> T. E. Coan,<sup>24</sup> Y. S. Gao,<sup>24</sup> F. Liu,<sup>24</sup> and R. Stroynowski<sup>24</sup>

(CLEO Collaboration)

<sup>1</sup>Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York 13244, USA

<sup>2</sup>Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee 37235, USA

<sup>3</sup>Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan 48202, USA

<sup>4</sup>California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California 91125, USA

<sup>5</sup>Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213, USA

<sup>6</sup>Enrico Fermi Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois 60637, USA

<sup>7</sup>Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853, USA

<sup>8</sup>University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32611, USA

<sup>9</sup>George Mason University, Fairfax, Virginia 22030, USA

<sup>10</sup>University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, Illinois 61801, USA

<sup>11</sup>Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1S 5B6

<sup>12</sup>University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66045, USA

<sup>13</sup>Luther College, Decorah, Iowa 52101, USA

<sup>14</sup>University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455, USA

<sup>15</sup>Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois 60208, USA

<sup>16</sup>State University of New York at Albany, Albany, New York 12222, USA

<sup>17</sup>Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210, USA

<sup>18</sup>University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma 73019, USA

<sup>19</sup>University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260, USA

<sup>20</sup>University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez, Puerto Rico 00681

<sup>21</sup>Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana 47907, USA

<sup>22</sup>Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, New York 12180, USA

<sup>23</sup>University of Rochester, Rochester, New York 14627, USA

<sup>24</sup>Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas 75275, USA

(Received 22 August 2005; published 19 December 2005)

We use data collected by the CLEO III detector at the Cornell Electron Storage Ring to measure the inclusive yields of  $D_s$  mesons as  $\mathcal{B}(\Upsilon(5S) \rightarrow D_s X) = (44.7 \pm 4.2 \pm 9.9)\%$  and  $\mathcal{B}(\Upsilon(4S) \rightarrow D_s X) = (18.1 \pm 0.5 \pm 2.8)\%$ . From these measurements, we make a model dependent estimate of the ratio of  $B_s^{(*)}\bar{B}_s^{(*)}$  to the total  $b\bar{b}$  quark pair production of  $(16.0 \pm 2.6 \pm 5.8)\%$  at the  $\Upsilon(5S)$  energy.

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.95.261801

PACS numbers: 13.25.Hw, 13.66.Bc

An enhancement in the total  $e^+e^-$  annihilation cross section into hadrons was discovered at the Cornell Electron Storage Ring (CESR) long ago [1,2] and its mass measured as  $10.865 \pm 0.008$  GeV. This effect was named the  $Y(5S)$  resonance. Theoretical models [3–5] predict the different relative decay rates of  $Y(5S)$  into combinations of  $B^{(*)}\bar{B}^{(*)}$  and  $B_s^{(*)}\bar{B}_s^{(*)}$ , where (\*) indicates the possible presence of a  $B^*$  meson. This original  $\sim 116$  pb $^{-1}$  of data failed to reveal if  $B_s$  mesons were produced. It is important to check the predictions of these and other models; furthermore,  $e^+e^-$  “ $B$  factories” could exploit a possible  $B_s$  yield here as they have done for  $B$  mesons on  $Y(4S)$ .

In this Letter, we examine  $D_s$  yields, because, in a simple spectator model,  $B_s$  decays into  $D_s$  nearly all the time. Since the  $B \rightarrow D_s X$  branching ratio has already been measured to be  $(10.5 \pm 2.6 \pm 2.5)\%$  [6], we expect a large difference between the  $D_s$  yields at  $Y(5S)$  and  $Y(4S)$  that can lead to an estimate of the size of the  $B_s^{(*)}\bar{B}_s^{(*)}$  component at  $Y(5S)$ . When we discuss  $Y(5S)$  here, we mean any production above what is expected from continuum production of quarks lighter than  $b$  at an  $e^+e^-$  center-of-mass energy of 10.865 GeV. The CLEO III detector is equipped to measure the momenta and directions of charged particles, identify charged hadrons, detect photons, and determine with good precision their directions and energies. It has been described in detail previously in Refs. [7,8].

In this analysis, we use  $0.42$  fb $^{-1}$  of integrated luminosity taken at the  $Y(5S)$  peak in February 2003. We also use  $6.34$  fb $^{-1}$  of integrated luminosity collected on  $Y(4S)$  and  $2.32$  fb $^{-1}$  of data taken in the continuum 40 MeV in the center-of-mass energy below  $Y(4S)$ . These data were accumulated between August 2000 and June 2001. The detector hardware was not changed over the entire time period. Efficiencies are carefully monitored and did not change measurably between data sets.

We look for  $D_s$  candidates through the reconstruction of three charged tracks in hadronic events via the  $D_s^+ \rightarrow \phi\pi^+$  decay mode. Here and elsewhere in this Letter, mention of one charge implies the same consideration for the charge-conjugate mode. Requiring the Fox-Wolfram shape parameter  $R_2$  [9] to be less than 0.25 suppresses continuum background events which are less isotropic than  $b$ -quark events.

Pairs of oppositely charged tracks were considered candidate decay products of a  $\phi$  if at least one of the tracks is identified as a kaon and if the invariant mass of the  $K^+K^-$  system is within  $\pm 10$  MeV/ $c^2$  of the nominal  $\phi$  mass. A third track was combined with the  $K^+K^-$  system to form a  $D_s$  candidate without using particle identification.

The Ring Imaging Cherenkov (RICH) of the CLEO III detector is used for track momenta larger than 0.62 GeV/ $c$ . Information on the angle of the detected Cherenkov photons is translated into a likelihood of a given photon being due to a particular particle analyzed with a specific mass hypothesis. Contributions from all photons

associated with a particular track with one mass hypothesis are then summed to form an overall likelihood denoted as  $\mathcal{L}_i$  for each “ $i$ ” particle hypothesis.

To utilize the information on the ionization loss in the drift chamber of the CLEO III detector,  $dE/dx$ , we calculate the differences between the expected and the observed ionization losses divided by the error for the pion and kaon hypotheses, called  $\sigma_\pi$  and  $\sigma_K$ .

Particle identification (PID) information arises from both RICH and  $dE/dx$  in the following manner: (a) If neither RICH nor  $dE/dx$  information is available, then the track is accepted. (b) If  $dE/dx$  is available and RICH is not, then we insist that kaon candidates have  $\text{PID}_{dE} = \sigma_\pi^2 - \sigma_K^2 > 0$ . (c) If RICH information is available and  $dE/dx$  is not available, then we require that  $\text{PID}_{\text{RICH}} = -2 \log(\mathcal{L}_\pi) + 2 \log(\mathcal{L}_K) > 0$  for kaons. (d) If both  $dE/dx$  and RICH information are available, we require that  $(\text{PID}_{dE} + \text{PID}_{\text{RICH}}) > 0$  for kaons.

To suppress combinatoric backgrounds, we take advantage of the polarization of the  $\phi$ , as it is a vector particle while the other particles in this decay are spinless. The expected distribution from real  $\phi$  decays varies as  $\cos^2\theta_h$ , where  $\theta_h$  is the angle between the  $D_s$  and the  $K^+$  momenta measured in the  $\phi$  rest frame while combinatoric backgrounds tend to be flat. Thus, we require  $|\cos\theta_h|$  to be larger than 0.3.

For  $\phi\pi^+$  combinations satisfying the previous requirements, we look for  $D_s$  candidates having a momentum less than half of the beam energy. Instead of momentum, we choose to work with the variable  $x$ , which is the  $D_s$  momentum divided by the beam energy, to remove differences caused by the change of the beam energies between continuum data taken just below  $Y(4S)$ , at  $Y(4S)$ , and at  $Y(5S)$ . The  $\phi\pi$  invariant mass distributions for  $x < 0.5$  are shown in Fig. 1.

We fit the invariant mass of the  $\phi\pi^\pm$  candidates in 10 different  $x$  intervals (from 0 to 0.5) for data taken at the  $Y(4S)$  peak, at the continuum below  $Y(4S)$ , and at the  $Y(5S)$  peak.

The invariant mass distribution in each  $x$  interval of the  $Y(4S)$  data set was fitted to a Gaussian signal shape and a linear background. The width of each Gaussian was allowed to float. The corresponding distributions at the other energies were similarly fitted but with the corresponding Gaussian widths fixed to those determined at  $Y(4S)$ . The raw  $D_s$  yields are listed in the second, third, and fourth columns in Table I.

The number of  $D_s$  candidates is determined by subtracting the scaled four-flavor ( $u, d, s,$  and  $c$  quarks) continuum data below  $Y(4S)$  from the  $Y(4S)$  and the  $Y(5S)$  data. To determine the scale factors,  $S_{nS}$ , we account for both the ratio of luminosities and the  $s$  dependence of the continuum cross section using

$$S_{nS} = \frac{L_{nS}}{L_{\text{cont}}} \left( \frac{E_{\text{cont}}}{E_{nS}} \right)^2, \quad (1)$$




FIG. 1. The invariant mass distributions of the  $D_s$  candidates with  $x < 0.5$  from: (a) the  $Y(4S)$  on-resonance data, (b) the continuum below the  $Y(4S)$  resonance data, and (c) the  $Y(5S)$  on-resonance data.

where  $L_{nS}$ ,  $L_{\text{cont}}$ ,  $E_{nS}$ , and  $E_{\text{cont}}$  are the collected luminosities and the center-of-mass energies at  $Y(nS)$  and at the continuum below  $Y(4S)$ . We find:  $S_{4S} = 2.712 \pm 0.001 \pm 0.043$  and  $S_{5S} = (17.15 \pm 0.01 \pm 0.24) \times 10^{-2}$ .

The second (systematic) error on these scale factors is determined by using the number of charged tracks in the  $0.6 < x < 0.8$  interval. The lower limit is determined by the maximum value tracks from  $B\bar{B}$  events can have, including smearing due to the measuring resolution, and the upper limit is chosen to eliminate radiative electromagnetic processes. Because tracks should be produced only from continuum events, we suppress beam-gas and beam-wall interactions and photon pair and  $\tau$  pair events using strict cuts on track multiplicities, event energies, and event shapes. [Since particle production may be larger at the higher  $Y(5S)$  energy than the continuum below  $Y(4S)$ , we apply a small multiplicative correction of  $(0.6 \pm$

1.1)%, as determined by Monte Carlo simulation to the relative track yields.] We find that the scale factors using this track counting method are  $2.668 \pm 0.007$  and  $(17.085 \pm 0.207) \times 10^2$ , for  $S_{4S}$  and  $S_{5S}$ , respectively, and use the difference as the systematic error.

The total number of hadronic events above the four-flavor continuum are  $N_{Y(4S)}^{\text{Res}}$  equals  $(6.43 \pm 0.01 \pm 0.41) \times 10^6$  and  $N_{Y(5S)}^{\text{Res}}$  equals  $(0.130 \pm 0.001 \pm 0.022) \times 10^6$ . The 6.4% and 17.5% systematic errors here are due to the 1.6% and 1.4% systematic errors on  $S_{4S}$  and  $S_{5S}$  scale factors, respectively.

The branching ratio of  $Y(nS) \rightarrow D_s X$  in each  $i$ th  $x$  interval is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}^i(Y(nS) \rightarrow D_s X) &= \frac{1}{N_{Y(nS)}^{\text{Res}} \mathcal{B}(D_s \rightarrow \phi \pi) \mathcal{B}(\phi \rightarrow K^+ K^-)} \\ &\times \left( \frac{N_{Y(nS)}^i}{\epsilon^i} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where  $N_{Y(nS)}^i$  are the continuum subtracted on resonance  $D_s$  yields.  $\mathcal{B}(\phi \rightarrow K^+ K^-)$  is taken as 49.1% [6]. The reconstruction efficiency  $\epsilon^i$  is taken to be the same at both resonances. This is reasonable because our tracking and particle identification efficiencies are carefully monitored and did not change significantly between data sets. Specifically, our Monte Carlo simulations of the  $D_s$  reconstruction efficiencies include time dependent effects of dead channels and individual hit efficiencies in both the tracking and RICH systems. A comparison of the simulations at both energies shows changes in the reconstruction efficiency between the two energies of  $< 2\%$ .

The results are listed in Table I. We show in Fig. 2 the  $x$  distribution of the inclusive  $D_s$  yields from  $Y(4S)$  and  $Y(5S)$  decays, continuum subtracted and efficiency corrected.

TABLE I. The  $x$  dependent  $D_s$  yields from the  $Y(nS)$  data, the continuum below  $Y(4S)$ , the  $Y(nS)$  continuum subtracted data,  $N_{Y(nS)}^i$ , the efficiency  $\epsilon^i$ , and the partial branching ratios  $B_{nS}^i = Y(nS) \rightarrow D_s X$ , for  $ns$  equal to 4S and 5S. The errors are statistical only.

| $x^i( p /E \text{ beam})$ | ON $Y(4S)$        | ON $Y(5S)$       | Continuum       | $N_{Y(4S)}^i$     | $N_{Y(5S)}^i$   | $\epsilon^i(\%)$ | $B_{4S}^i(\%)$  | $B_{5S}^i(\%)$ |
|---------------------------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| 0.00–0.05                 | $44.4 \pm 15.7$   | $1.0 \pm 3.2$    | $0.0 \pm 0.0$   | $44.4 \pm 15.7$   | $1.0 \pm 3.1$   | 28.9             | $0.11 \pm 0.04$ | $0.1 \pm 0.4$  |
| 0.05–0.10                 | $317.6 \pm 39.6$  | $13.3 \pm 8.1$   | $20.7 \pm 12.0$ | $261.4 \pm 51.2$  | $9.7 \pm 8.3$   | 23.9             | $0.8 \pm 0.2$   | $1.4 \pm 1.2$  |
| 0.10–0.15                 | $583.6 \pm 53.9$  | $30.4 \pm 10.4$  | $21.6 \pm 15.3$ | $524.9 \pm 68.1$  | $26.7 \pm 10.7$ | 24.7             | $1.5 \pm 0.2$   | $3.8 \pm 1.5$  |
| 0.15–0.20                 | $845.5 \pm 59.0$  | $54.4 \pm 13.0$  | $41.7 \pm 18.5$ | $732.3 \pm 77.5$  | $47.2 \pm 13.3$ | 25.4             | $2.1 \pm 0.2$   | $6.5 \pm 1.8$  |
| 0.20–0.25                 | $1206.4 \pm 60.6$ | $57.6 \pm 12.7$  | $40.2 \pm 18.3$ | $1097.4 \pm 78.2$ | $50.7 \pm 13.0$ | 27.7             | $2.8 \pm 0.2$   | $6.4 \pm 1.7$  |
| 0.25–0.30                 | $2028.6 \pm 63.8$ | $104.1 \pm 14.0$ | $70.3 \pm 18.0$ | $1838.0 \pm 80.3$ | $92.0 \pm 14.3$ | 28.6             | $4.6 \pm 0.2$   | $11.3 \pm 1.8$ |
| 0.30–0.35                 | $2233.7 \pm 60.7$ | $86.7 \pm 12.1$  | $57.0 \pm 16.2$ | $2079.2 \pm 74.9$ | $76.9 \pm 12.4$ | 29.4             | $5.0 \pm 0.2$   | $9.2 \pm 1.5$  |
| 0.35–0.40                 | $660.8 \pm 37.9$  | $53.8 \pm 9.4$   | $75.0 \pm 14.5$ | $457.4 \pm 54.6$  | $41.0 \pm 9.7$  | 30.4             | $1.1 \pm 0.1$   | $4.7 \pm 1.1$  |
| 0.40–0.45                 | $233.5 \pm 25.9$  | $22.6 \pm 6.7$   | $73.4 \pm 12.9$ | $34.3 \pm 43.3$   | $10.1 \pm 7.0$  | 31.4             | $0.1 \pm 0.1$   | $1.1 \pm 0.8$  |
| 0.45–0.50                 | $245.8 \pm 22.2$  | $14.8 \pm 5.6$   | $86.0 \pm 12.1$ | $12.6 \pm 39.5$   | $0.1 \pm 6.0$   | 32.4             | $0.03 \pm 0.09$ | $0.0 \pm 0.6$  |




FIG. 2. Branching rate as a function of  $x$  from  $Y(5S)$  decays (solid circles) and from  $Y(4S)$  decays (open circles).

The total production rate is found by summing the partial production rates. The product of the  $D_s$  production rate at  $Y(4S)$  and  $\mathcal{B}(D_s \rightarrow \phi\pi)$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}(Y(4S) \rightarrow D_s X) \times \mathcal{B}(D_s \rightarrow \phi\pi) \\ = (8.0 \pm 0.2 \pm 0.9) \times 10^{-3}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

which is in a good agreement with previous measurements [6], while at  $Y(5S)$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}(Y(5S) \rightarrow D_s X) \times \mathcal{B}(D_s \rightarrow \phi\pi) \\ = (19.8 \pm 1.9 \pm 3.8) \times 10^{-3}. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Many systematic errors cancel in the ratio of decay rates. Thus,

$$\frac{\mathcal{B}(Y(5S) \rightarrow D_s X)}{\mathcal{B}(Y(4S) \rightarrow D_s X)} = 2.4 \pm 0.3^{+0.6}_{-0.3}, \quad (5)$$

directly demonstrates, at 5.6 standard deviation significance, a much larger yield of  $D_s$  at  $Y(5S)$  than at  $Y(4S)$ .

We use  $\mathcal{B}(D_s \rightarrow \phi\pi^+) = (4.4 \pm 0.5)\%$ , which is the weighted average of the  $(3.6 \pm 0.9)\%$  Particle Data Group value [6] and the recent measured value of  $(4.8 \pm 0.6)\%$  [10], although the latter value is at the 90% C.L. upper limit found previously [11]. We find

$$\mathcal{B}(Y(4S) \rightarrow D_s X) = (18.1 \pm 0.5 \pm 2.8)\%, \quad (6)$$

and, consequently,

$$\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow D_s X) = (9.0 \pm 0.3 \pm 1.4)\%. \quad (7)$$




FIG. 3. Dominant decay diagrams for a  $B$  meson into  $D_s$  mesons ( $q$  is either a  $u$  or  $d$  quark).

In addition, we find

$$\mathcal{B}(Y(5S) \rightarrow D_s X) = (44.7 \pm 4.2 \pm 9.9)\%. \quad (8)$$

From these results, we estimate the size of the  $B_s^{(*)}\bar{B}_s^{(*)}$  component at  $Y(5S)$  in a model dependent manner. Here we start with the knowledge that an equal admixture of  $B^0$  and  $B^+$  mesons decay into the sum of  $D^0$  and  $D^+$  mesons roughly 100% of the time [6]. Thus, we expect  $B_s$  mesons to decay into  $D_s$  mesons also about 100% of the time. In what follows, we estimate our own theoretical corrections to this number.

We know that the branching fraction  $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow D_s X) = (9.0 \pm 0.3 \pm 1.4)\%$  comes either from the  $W^- \rightarrow \bar{c}s$  process, shown in Fig. 3(a), or from the  $b \rightarrow c$  piece if it manages to create an  $s\bar{s}$  pair through fragmentation; see Fig. 3(b).

Similarly, the production of  $D_s$  mesons from  $B_s$  decay arises from two dominant processes. Figure 4(a) shows the simple spectator process that is expected to produce  $D_s$  mesons nearly all the time; here the primary  $b \rightarrow c$  transition has the charm quark pairing with the spectator anti-strange quark. Figure 4(b) shows the subset of process (a) where  $W^- \rightarrow \bar{c}s$  and these two quarks form a color singlet pair. The chances of this occurring should be similar to the chance of getting an upper vertex  $D_s$  in  $B$  decay [Fig. 3(a)], i.e., a  $D_s$  along with a  $D$ .

We can use data to help estimate the size of these processes. First let us consider the diagram shown in Fig. 4(a). The nearly 100% probability that this process will produce  $D_s$  mesons is reduced if the  $c\bar{s}$  pair fragments




FIG. 4. Dominant decay diagrams for a  $B_s$  meson into  $D_s$  mesons.

into a kaon plus a  $D$  instead of a  $D_s$  by producing an additional  $u\bar{u}$  or  $d\bar{d}$  pair. We do not actually know the size of this fragmentation, though it is clear that producing a light quark-antiquark pair ( $d\bar{d}$  or  $u\bar{u}$ ) is easier than  $s\bar{s}$ . We estimate that the reduction in  $D_s$  yield due to this fragmentation is a  $(-15 \pm 10)\%$  effect. Next we estimate the size of the process depicted in Fig. 4(b). The  $B \rightarrow DD_s$  modes have branching fractions that sum to about 5%. There are some additional decays due to  $B \rightarrow D^{**}D_s$  and  $B \rightarrow DD_{sI}^{(*)}$  decays that also contribute  $D_s$  mesons. We add these and

estimate an extra  $(7 \pm 3)\%$  of  $D_s$  mesons in  $B_s$  decays produced by the diagram in Fig. 4(b). Taking into account all these contributions, we derive a model dependent estimate of  $(100 + 7 - 15)\% = 92\%$ . Therefore, we use  $\mathcal{B}(B_s \rightarrow D_s X) = (92 \pm 11)\%$ .

We can estimate now the fraction of  $Y(5S)$  that decays into  $B_s^{(*)}\bar{B}_s^{(*)}$ , which we denote as  $f_s$ . The  $D_s$  yields at  $Y(5S)$  come from two sources,  $B$  and  $B_s$  mesons. The equation linking them is

$$\mathcal{B}(Y(5S) \rightarrow D_s X)\mathcal{B}(D_s \rightarrow \phi\pi^+)/2 = f_s\mathcal{B}(B_s \rightarrow D_s X)\mathcal{B}(D_s \rightarrow \phi\pi^+) + \frac{(1-f_s)}{2}\mathcal{B}(Y(4S) \rightarrow D_s X)\mathcal{B}(D_s \rightarrow \phi\pi^+), \quad (9)$$

where the product branching fractions  $\mathcal{B}(Y(5S) \rightarrow D_s X)\mathcal{B}(D_s \rightarrow \phi\pi^+)$  and  $\mathcal{B}(Y(4S) \rightarrow D_s X)\mathcal{B}(D_s \rightarrow \phi\pi^+)$  are given by Eqs. (4) and (3), respectively. Therefore, at the  $Y(5S)$  energy, we obtain the  $B_s^{(*)}\bar{B}_s^{(*)}$  ratio to the total  $b\bar{b}$  quark pair production above the four-flavor ( $u, d, s,$  and  $c$  quarks) continuum of

$$f_s = \mathcal{B}(Y(5S) \rightarrow B_s^{(*)}\bar{B}_s^{(*)}) = (16.0 \pm 2.6 \pm 5.8)\%. \quad (10)$$

The systematic errors in this analysis are dominated by the 1.6% relative error on  $S_{4S}$  and 1.4% on  $S_{5S}$  scale factors which contribute large components (6.4% and 17.5%) to the error on the number of hadronic events above continuum at  $Y(4S)$  and  $Y(5S)$ . There is also a contribution from the 11.3% error on the  $B_s \rightarrow D_s X$  branching fraction estimate and a contribution from the 11% error on the absolute  $D_s \rightarrow \phi\pi$  branching fraction. An additional component comes from a 6.4% error on the  $D_s$  detection efficiency, which includes a 2% error on the tracking efficiency and a 2% error on the particle identification, both per track. We also have a 5% error on the yields due to the fitting method. The total systematic error is obtained by summing all entries in quadrature.

In conclusion, we have measured the inclusive yields of  $D_s$  mesons as  $\mathcal{B}(Y(5S) \rightarrow D_s X) = (44.7 \pm 4.2 \pm 9.9)\%$  and  $\mathcal{B}(Y(4S) \rightarrow D_s X) = (18.1 \pm 0.5 \pm 2.8)\%$ . The ratio

$$\frac{\mathcal{B}(Y(5S) \rightarrow D_s X)}{\mathcal{B}(Y(4S) \rightarrow D_s X)} = 2.4 \pm 0.3^{+0.6}_{-0.3} \quad (11)$$

provides the first statistically significant evidence ( $5.6\sigma$ ) of substantial production of  $B_s$  mesons at the  $Y(5S)$  resonance. Using a model dependent estimate of  $\mathcal{B}(B_s \rightarrow D_s X)$ , we find that the  $B_s^{(*)}\bar{B}_s^{(*)}$  ratio to the total  $b\bar{b}$  quark pair production above the four-flavor ( $u, d, s,$  and  $c$ )

continuum at the  $Y(5S)$  energy is

$$f_s = \mathcal{B}(Y(5S) \rightarrow B_s^{(*)}\bar{B}_s^{(*)}) = (16.0 \pm 2.6 \pm 5.8)\%. \quad (12)$$

Several phenomenological models predict the decay rates of  $Y(5S)$  into combinations of  $B^{(*)}\bar{B}^{(*)}$  and  $B_s^{(*)}\bar{B}_s^{(*)}$ , though here we are concerned only with the relative  $B_s$  fraction  $f_s$ . The unitarized quark model estimates [3] and the predictions of Martin and Ng [4] are about 30%, both somewhat larger than our measurement. Byers and Eichten [5] present two models, both giving  $f_s < 20\%$ , in good agreement with our finding.

We gratefully acknowledge the effort of the CESR staff in providing us with excellent luminosity and running conditions. This work was supported by the National Science Foundation and the U.S. Department of Energy.

- 
- [1] D. Besson *et al.* (CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **54**, 381 (1985).
  - [2] D. M. Lovelock *et al.* (CUSB Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **54**, 377 (1985).
  - [3] S. Ono *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **55**, 2938 (1985); S. Ono, A. I. Sanda, and N. A. Törnqvist, Phys. Rev. D **34**, 186 (1986); N. A. Törnqvist, Phys. Rev. Lett. **53**, 878 (1984).
  - [4] A. D. Martin and C.-K. Ng, Z. Phys. C **40**, 133 (1988).
  - [5] N. Byers and E. Eichten, Nucl. Phys. B, Proc. Suppl. **16**, 281 (1990); N. Byers, hep-ph/9412292.
  - [6] S. Eidelman *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **592**, 1 (2004).
  - [7] D. Peterson *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A **478**, 142 (2002); Y. Kubota *et al.* (CLEO Collaboration), Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A **320**, 66 (1992).
  - [8] M. Artuso *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A **554**, 147 (2005); **502**, 91 (2003).
  - [9] G. Fox and S. Wolfram, Phys. Rev. Lett. **41**, 1581 (1978).
  - [10] B. Aubert *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 091104(R) (2005).
  - [11] F. Muheim and S. Stone, Phys. Rev. D **49**, 3767 (1994).