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Abstract:
We search for $CP$ violation in the decay $D^+ \rightarrow K_S^0 K^+$ using a data sample with an integrated luminosity of 977 fb$^{-1}$ collected with the Belle detector at the KEKB $e^+ e^-$ asymmetric-energy collider. No $CP$ violation has been observed and the $CP$ asymmetry in $D^+ \rightarrow K_S^0 K^+$ decay is measured to be $(-0.25 \pm 0.28 \pm 0.14)\%$, which is the most sensitive measurement to date. After subtracting $CP$ violation due to $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ mixing, the $CP$ asymmetry in $D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}_S^0 K^+$ decay is found to be $(+0.08 \pm 0.28 \pm 0.14)\%$. 
1 Introduction

Studies of $CP$ violation in charmed meson decays provide a promising opportunity to search for new physics beyond the standard model (SM) [1] in the absence of disagreement between experimental measurements and the SM interpretation of $CP$ violation in $K$ and $B$ meson decays [2–4]. Recently, the LHCb collaboration has reported $\Delta A_{CP} = (-0.82 \pm 0.21 \pm 0.11)\%$ [5] where $\Delta A_{CP}$ is the $CP$ asymmetry difference between $D^0 \rightarrow K^0_S K^+$ and $D^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-$ decays. Thereafter, the CDF collaboration has also announced $\Delta A_{CP} = (-0.62 \pm 0.21 \pm 0.10)\%$ [6], which strongly supports the non-zero $\Delta A_{CP}$ measured from the LHCb collaboration. Together with results from the BaBar and Belle collaborations, the value of $\Delta A_{CP}$ is significantly different from zero [7]. Taking into account that the indirect $CP$ asymmetries in the two decays are approximately equal [8], $\Delta A_{CP}$ can be expressed as

$$\Delta A_{CP} = \Delta a_{CP}^{\text{dir}} + a_{CP}^{\text{ind}} \Delta \langle t \rangle / \tau,$$

(1.1)

where $a_{CP}^{\text{dir}}$ and $a_{CP}^{\text{ind}}$ denote direct and indirect $CP$ violation, respectively, and $\langle t \rangle / \tau$ is the mean proper decay time of the selected signal sample in units of the $D^0$ lifetime [9]. The factor $\Delta \langle t \rangle / \tau$ in eq. (1.1) depends on the experimental conditions and the largest value reported to date is $0.26 \pm 0.01$ from the CDF measurement [6]. Therefore, $\Delta A_{CP}$ reveals a significant direct $CP$ violation difference between the two decays. Within the SM, direct $CP$ violation in the charm sector is expected to be present only in singly Cabibbo-suppressed (SCS) decays, and even there is expected to be small, $O(0.1\%)$ [10]. Hence, the current $\Delta A_{CP}$ measurements engender questions of whether the origin of the asymmetry lies within [11–14] or beyond [15–18] the SM. The origin of $\Delta A_{CP}$ calls for the precise
measurements of $A_{CP}$ in $D^0 \rightarrow K^+K^-$ and $D^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$. A complementary test is a precise measurement of $A_{CP}$ in another SCS charmed hadron decay, $D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0K^+$, as suggested in ref. [13]. As shown in figures 1(a) and 1(b), the decay $D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0K^+$ shares the same
decay diagrams with $D^0 \rightarrow K^+K^-$ by exchanging the spectator quarks, $d \leftrightarrow u$. Although there are additional contributions to the two decays as shown in figures 1(c) and 1(d), these are expected to be small due to helicity- and color-suppression considerations \(^2\). Therefore, neglecting the latter contributions in $D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0K^+$ and $D^0 \rightarrow K^+K^-$ decays, the direct $CP$ asymmetries in the two decays are expected to be the same.

In this paper, we report results from a search for $CP$ violation in the decay $D^+ \rightarrow K_S^0K^+$ that originates from $D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0K^+$ decay, where $K_S^0$ decays to $\pi^+\pi^-$. The $CP$ asymmetry in the decay, $A_{CP}$, is then defined as

$$A_{CP}^{D^+\rightarrow K^0K^+} \equiv \frac{\Gamma(D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0K^+)\Gamma(\bar{K}^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-) - \Gamma(D^- \rightarrow K^0K^-)\Gamma(K^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-)}{\Gamma(D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0K^+)\Gamma(\bar{K}^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-) + \Gamma(D^- \rightarrow K^0K^-)\Gamma(K^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-)} = \frac{A_{CP}^{D^+\rightarrow K^0K^+} + A_{CP}^{K^0}}{1 + A_{CP}^{D^+\rightarrow K^0K^+}A_{CP}^{K^0}} \simeq A_{CP}^{D^+\rightarrow \bar{K}^0K^+} + A_{CP}^{K^0}, \quad (1.2)$$

where $\Gamma$ is the partial decay width. In eq. (1.2), $A_{CP}^{D^+\rightarrow K^0K^+}$ is the $CP$ asymmetry in the decay $D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0K^+$ and $A_{CP}^{K^0}$ is that in $\bar{K}^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ decay induced by $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ mixing in the SM [19–21] in which the decay $\bar{K}^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ arises from $K_S^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ together with a small contribution from $K_L^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$, where the latter is known precisely from $K_L^0$ semileptonic decays, $A_{CP}^{K^0} = (-0.332 \pm 0.006)\%$ [2]. As shown in eq. (1.2), the product of the two small asymmetries is neglected. The $D^+$ decaying to the final state $K_S^0K^+$ proceeds from $D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0K^+$ decay, which is SCS. In the SM, direct $CP$ violation in SCS charmed meson decays is predicted to occur with a non-vanishing phase that enters the diagram

\(^2\)In helicity suppression, a spinless meson decaying to a back-to-back quark-antiquark pair is suppressed by the conservation of angular momentum. In color suppression, the final state quarks are required to carry the correct color charge in order for the final state to be colorless.
shown in figure 1(b) in the Kobayashi-Maskawa ansatz [22]. The current average of $\Delta A_{\text{CP}}$ favors a negative value of direct $CP$ violation in $D^0 \rightarrow K^+K^-$ decay. Correspondingly, the $CP$ asymmetry in $D^+ \rightarrow K^0_S K^+$ decays is more likely to have a negative value since the two $CP$ asymmetry terms shown in eq. (1.2) are negative.

2 Methodology

We determine $A_{CP}^{D^+ \rightarrow K^0_S K^+}$ by measuring the asymmetry in the signal yield

$$A_{\text{rec}}^{D^+ \rightarrow K^0_S K^+} = \frac{N_{\text{rec}}^{D^+ \rightarrow K^0_S K^+} - N_{\text{rec}}^{D^+ \rightarrow K^0_S K^-}}{N_{\text{rec}}^{D^+ \rightarrow K^0_S K^+} + N_{\text{rec}}^{D^+ \rightarrow K^0_S K^-}},$$

(2.1)

where $N_{\text{rec}}$ is the number of reconstructed decays. The asymmetry in eq. (2.1) includes the forward-backward asymmetry ($A_{FB}$) due to $\gamma^*Z^0$ interference and higher order QED effects in $e^+e^- \rightarrow c\bar{c}$ [23-25], and the detection efficiency asymmetry between $K^+$ and $K^-$ ($A_\epsilon^K$) as well as $A_{CP}$. In addition, ref. [26] calculates another asymmetry source, denoted $A_D$, due to the differences in interactions of $\bar{K}^0$ and $K^0$ mesons with the material of the detector. Since we reconstruct the $K^0_S$ with $\pi^+\pi^-$ combinations, the $\pi^+\pi^-$ detection asymmetry cancels out for $K^0_S$. The asymmetry of eq. (2.1) can be written as

$$A_{\text{rec}}^{D^+ \rightarrow K^0_S K^+} = A_{\text{CP}}^{D^+ \rightarrow K^0_S K^+} + A_{FB}^{D^+}(\cos \theta_{D^+}^{\text{c.m.s.}}) + A_\epsilon^{K^+}(p_{TK^+}^{\text{lab}}, \cos \theta_{K^+}^{\text{lab}}),$$

(2.2)

by neglecting the terms involving the product of asymmetries. In eq. (2.2), $A_{\text{CP}}^{D^+ \rightarrow K^0_S K^+}$ is the sum of $A_{\text{CP}}^{D^+ \rightarrow K^0_K K^+}$ and $A_{\text{CP}}^{D^+ \rightarrow K^0_K K^-}$ as stated in eq. (1.2), where the former is independent of all kinematic variables while the latter is known to depend on the $K^0_S$ decay time according to ref. [27], and $A_{FB}^{D^+}$ is an odd function of the cosine of the polar angle $\theta_{D^+}^{\text{c.m.s.}}$ of the $D^+$ momentum in the center-of-mass system (c.m.s.). $A_{\epsilon}^{K^+}$ depends on the transverse momentum $p_{TK^+}^{\text{lab}}$ and the polar angle $\theta_{K^+}^{\text{lab}}$ of the $K^+$ in the laboratory frame (lab). Here, $A_D$ is a function of the lab momentum $p_{K^+}^{\text{lab}}$ of the $K^0_S$. To correct for $A_{\epsilon}^{K^+}$ in eq. (2.2), we use the technique developed in our previous publication [28]. We use $D^0 \rightarrow K^-\pi^+$ and $D_s^+ \rightarrow \phi\pi^+$ decays where the $\phi$ is reconstructed with $K^+K^-$ combinations and hence the $K^+K^-$ detection asymmetry near cancels out [29] (the residual small effect is included in the systematic error). Since these are Cabibbo-favored decays for which the direct $CP$ asymmetry is expected to be negligible, in analogy to eq. (2.2), $A_{\text{rec}}^{D^0 \rightarrow K^-\pi^+}$ and $A_{\text{rec}}^{D_s^+ \rightarrow \phi\pi^+}$ can be written as

$$A_{\text{rec}}^{D^0 \rightarrow K^-\pi^+} = A_{\text{FB}}^{D^0}(\cos \theta_{D^0}^{\text{c.m.s.}}) + A_\epsilon^{K^-}(p_{TK^-}^{\text{lab}}, \cos \theta_{K^-}^{\text{lab}}) + A_\epsilon^{\pi^+}(p_{T\pi^+}^{\text{lab}}, \cos \theta_{\pi^+}^{\text{lab}}),$$

(2.3)

$$A_{\text{rec}}^{D_s^+ \rightarrow \phi\pi^+} = A_{\text{FB}}^{D_s^+}(\cos \theta_{D_s^+}^{\text{c.m.s.}}) + A_\epsilon^{\phi}(p_{T\phi}^{\text{lab}}, \cos \theta_{\phi}^{\text{lab}}) + A_\epsilon^{\pi^+}(p_{T\pi^+}^{\text{lab}}, \cos \theta_{\pi^+}^{\text{lab}}).$$

(2.4)
Thus, with the additional $A^K_\epsilon$ term in $A^{D^0 \to K^- \pi^+}_{\text{rec}}$, one can measure $A^K_\epsilon$ by subtracting $A^{D^+_s \to \pi^+}_{\text{rec}}$ from $A^{D^0 \to K^- \pi^+}_{\text{rec}}$, assuming the same $A_{FB}$ for $D^0$ and $D^+_s$ mesons. We also obtain $A_D$ according to ref. [26]. After these $A^K_\epsilon$ and $A_D$ corrections \footnote{We define $A^{h^-} = [N^{h^-} - N^{h^-}_{\text{corr}}]/[N^{h^-} + N^{h^-}_{\text{corr}}]$. Hence $A^{h^-} = -A^{h^+}$.}, we obtain

\[
A^{D^+ \to K^+_S K^{0}_{S}}_{\text{rec}}(\cos \theta^\text{c.m.s.}_{D^+}) = A^{D^+ \to K^0_{S} K^+_S}_{CP} + A^{D^+ \to K^0_{S} K^+_S}_{FB}(\cos \theta^\text{c.m.s.}_{D^+}). \tag{2.5}
\]

We subsequently extract $A_{CP}$ and $A_{FB}$ as a function of $\cos \theta^\text{c.m.s.}_{D^+}$ by taking sums and differences:

\[
A^{D^+ \to K^+_S K^{0}_{S}}_{CP}(\cos \theta^\text{c.m.s.}_{D^+}) = \frac{A^{D^+ \to K^+_S K^{0}_{S}}_{\text{rec}}(\cos \theta^\text{c.m.s.}_{D^+}) - A^{D^+ \to K^+_S K^{0}_{S}}_{\text{rec}}(\cos \theta^\text{c.m.s.}_{D^+})}{2}, \tag{2.6a}
\]

\[
A^{D^+ \to K^+_S K^{0}_{S}}_{FB}(\cos \theta^\text{c.m.s.}_{D^+}) = \frac{A^{D^+ \to K^+_S K^{0}_{S}}_{\text{rec}}(\cos \theta^\text{c.m.s.}_{D^+}) + A^{D^+ \to K^+_S K^{0}_{S}}_{\text{rec}}(\cos \theta^\text{c.m.s.}_{D^+})}{2}. \tag{2.6b}
\]

Note that extracting $A_{CP}$ in eq. (2.5) using eq. (2.6a) is crucial here to cancel out the Belle detector’s asymmetric acceptance in $\cos \theta^\text{c.m.s.}_{D^+}$.

3 Data and event selections

The data used in this analysis were recorded at the $\Upsilon(nS)$ resonances ($n = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$) or near the $\Upsilon(4S)$ resonance with the Belle detector at the $e^+e^-$ asymmetric-energy collider KEKB \footnote{We define $A^{h^-} = [N^{h^-} - N^{h^-}_{\text{corr}}]/[N^{h^-} + N^{h^-}_{\text{corr}}]$. Hence $A^{h^-} = -A^{h^+}$.}. The data sample corresponds to an integrated luminosity of 977 fb$^{-1}$. The Belle detector is a large solid angle magnetic spectrometer that consists of a silicon vertex detector (SVD), a 50-layer central drift chamber (CDC), an array of aerogel threshold Cherenkov counters (ACC), a barrel-like arrangement of time-of-flight scintillation counters (TOF), and an electromagnetic calorimeter comprising CsI(Tl) crystals located inside a superconducting solenoid coil that provides a 1.5 T magnetic field. An iron flux return located outside the coil is instrumented to detect $K^0_L$ mesons and to identify muons. A detailed description of the Belle detector can be found in ref. [31].

Except for the tracks from $K^0_S$ decays we require charged tracks to originate from the vicinity of the interaction point (IP) by limiting the impact parameters along the beam direction (z-axis) and perpendicular to it to less than 4 cm and 2 cm, respectively. All charged tracks other than those from $K^0_S$ decays are identified as pions or kaons by requiring the ratio of particle identification likelihoods, $L_K/(L_K + L_{\pi})$, constructed using information from the CDC, TOF, and ACC, to be larger or smaller than 0.6, respectively \footnote{We define $A^{h^-} = [N^{h^-} - N^{h^-}_{\text{corr}}]/[N^{h^-} + N^{h^-}_{\text{corr}}]$. Hence $A^{h^-} = -A^{h^+}$.}. For both kaons and pions, the efficiencies and misidentification probabilities are about 90% and 5%, respectively.

We form $K^0_S$ candidates adopting the standard Belle $K^0_S$ criteria \footnote{We define $A^{h^-} = [N^{h^-} - N^{h^-}_{\text{corr}}]/[N^{h^-} + N^{h^-}_{\text{corr}}]$. Hence $A^{h^-} = -A^{h^+}$.}, requiring the invariant mass of the charged track pair to be within [0.4826, 0.5126] GeV/$c^2$. The “loose” $K^0_S$ candidates not satisfying these standard selections are also used in this analysis with additional requirements described later.

The $K^0_S$ and $K^+$ candidates are combined to form a $D^+$ candidate by fitting their tracks to a common vertex; the $D^+$ candidate is fitted to the independently measured IP...
profile to give the production vertex. To remove combinatorial background as well as $D^+$ mesons that are produced in possibly $CP$-violating $B$ meson decays, we require the $D^+$ meson momentum calculated in the c.m.s. ($p_{D^+}^\text{lab}$) to be greater than 2.5 and 3.0 GeV/c for the data taken at the $\Upsilon(4S)$ and $\Upsilon(5S)$ resonances, respectively. For the data taken below $\Upsilon(4S)$, we apply the requirement $p_{D^+}^\text{lab}>2.0$ GeV/c. In addition to the selections described above, we further optimize the signal sensitivity with four variables: the goodness-of-fit values of the $D^+$ decay- and production-vertex fits $\chi^2_D$ and $\chi^2_T$, the transverse momentum of the $K^+$ in the lab $p_{T_K^+}^\text{lab}$, and the angle $\xi$ between the $D^+$ momentum vector (as reconstructed from its daughters) and the vector joining the $D^+$ production and decay vertices. We optimize the requirement on these four variables with the standard and loose $K_S^0$ selections by maximizing $N_S/\sqrt{N_S+N_B}$, where $N_S+N_B$ and $N_B$ are the yields in the $K_S^0K^+$ invariant mass signal ([1.860, 1.884] GeV/c$^2$) and sideband ([1.843, 1.855] and [1.889, 1.901] GeV/c$^2$) regions, respectively. The optimal set of ($\chi^2_D$, $\chi^2_T$, $p_{T_K^+}^\text{lab}$, $\xi$) requirements are found to be ($<100$, $<10$, $>0.30$ GeV/c, $<40^\circ$), ($<100$, $<10$, $>0.25$ GeV/c, $<115^\circ$), and ($<100$, $<10$, $>0.20$ GeV/c, $<125^\circ$) for the data taken below the $\Upsilon(4S)$, at the $\Upsilon(4S)$, and at the $\Upsilon(5S)$, respectively. Note that $p_{D^+}^\text{lab}$ is highly correlated with $p_{T_K^+}^\text{lab}$ and $\xi$; hence, a tighter $p_{D^+}^\text{lab}$ requirement on the $\Upsilon(5S)$ sample results in looser $p_{T_K^+}^\text{lab}$ and $\xi$ requirements and vice versa for the data taken below the $\Upsilon(4S)$. The $D^+$ candidates with the loose $K_S^0$ requirement are further optimized with two additional variables: the $\chi^2$ of the fit of tracks from the $K_S^0$ decay and the kaon from the $D^+$ meson decay to a single vertex ($\chi^2_{Khh}^\text{lab}$) and the angle $\zeta$ between the $K_S^0$ momentum vector (as reconstructed from its daughters) and the vector joining the $D^+$ and $K_S^0$ decay vertices. The two variables are again varied simultaneously and the optimum is found to be $\chi^2_{Khh}^\text{lab}>6$ and $\zeta<3^\circ$ for all data. The inclusion of $D^+$ candidates with the loose $K_S^0$ requirement improves the statistical sensitivity by approximately 5%. After the final selections described above, we find no significant peaking backgrounds—for example, $D^+ \to \pi^+\pi^-K^+$ decays—in the Monte Carlo (MC) simulated events [34]. Figure 2 shows the distributions of $M(K_S^0K^+)$ and $M(K_S^0K^-)$ together with the results of the fits described below.

Each $D^\pm \to K_S^0K^\pm$ signal is parameterized as two Gaussian distributions with a common mean. The combinatorial background is parameterized with the unnormalized form $e^{\alpha+\beta M(K_S^0K^\pm)}$, where $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are fit parameters. The asymmetry and the sum of the $D^+$ and $D^-$ yields are directly obtained from a simultaneous fit to the $D^+$ and $D^-$ candidate distributions. Besides the asymmetry and the sum of the $D^+$ and $D^-$ yields, the common parameters in the simultaneous fit are the widths of the two Gaussians and the ratio of their amplitudes. The asymmetry and the sum of the $D^+ \to K_S^0K^+$ and $D^- \to K_S^0K^-$ yields from the fit are ($+0.048\pm0.275$)% and 276812 ± 1156, respectively, where the errors are statistical.

In order to measure the $CP$ asymmetry in $D^+ \to K_S^0K^+$ decays, we must also reconstruct $D^0 \to K^+\pi^-$ and $D^+_s \to \phi\pi^+$ decays: see eqs. (2.2), (2.3), and (2.4). For the reconstruction of the $D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$ and $D^+_s \to \phi\pi^+$ decays, we require the same track quality, particle identification, vertex fit quality, and $p_{D^+_s}^\text{lab}$ requirements as used for the reconstruction of the $D^+ \to K_S^0K^+$ decays, where the mass window for the $\phi$ is ±16 MeV/c$^2$ [29] of the nominal $\phi$ mass [2].
4 Extraction of $A_{CP}$ in the decay $D^+ \to K_S^0 K^+$

To obtain $A_{K^+}^{D_s}$, we first extract $A_{rec}^{D_s^+ \to \phi \pi^+}$ from a simultaneous fit to the mass distributions of $D_s^+$ and $D_s^−$ candidates with similar parameterizations as for $D^\pm \to K_S^0 K^\pm$ decays except that, for the $D_s^\pm \to \phi \pi^\pm$ signal description, a single Gaussian is used. The values of $A_{rec}^{D_s^+ \to \phi \pi^+}$ are evaluated in $10 \times 10 \times 10$ bins of the three-dimensional (3D) phase space ($p_{T\pi^+}^{lab}$, $\cos \theta_{\pi^+}^{lab}$, $\cos \theta_{\phi}^{c.m.s}$). Each $D^0 \to K^- \pi^+$ and $D^0 \to K^+ \pi^−$ candidate is then weighted with a factor of $1 − A_{rec}^{D_s^+ \to \phi \pi^+}$ and $1 + A_{rec}^{D_s^+ \to \phi \pi^+}$, respectively, in the corresponding bin of this space. After this weighting, the asymmetry in the $D^0 \to K^- \pi^+$ decay sample becomes $A_{K^-}^{D_s}$. The detector asymmetry, $A_{K^-}^{D_s}$, is measured from simultaneous fits to the weighted $M(K^- \pi^\pm)$ distributions in $10 \times 10$ bins of the 2D phase space ($p_{T\pi^-}^{lab}$, $\cos \theta_{\pi^-}^{lab}$) with similar parameterizations as used for $D^+ \to K_S^0 K^+$ decays except that, for the $D^0 \to K^- \pi^+$ signal description, a sum of a Gaussian and bifurcated Gaussian is used. Figure 3 shows the measured $A_{K^-}^{D_s}$ in bins of $p_{T\pi^-}^{lab}$ and $\cos \theta_{\pi^-}^{lab}$ together with $A_{rec}^{D^0 \to K^- \pi^+}$ for comparison; we observe that $A_{rec}^{D^0 \to K^- \pi^+}$ shows a $\cos \theta_{\pi^-}^{D_s}$ dependency that is inherited from $A_{D_s}^{D^0}$ while $A_{K^-}^{D_s}$ does not. The average of $A_{K^-}^{D_s}$ over the phase space is $(−0.150 \pm 0.029)\%$, where the error is due to the limited statistics of the $D^0 \to K^- \pi^+$ sample.

Based on a recent study of $A_D$ [26], we obtain the dilution asymmetry in bins of $K_S^0$ lab momentum. For the present analysis, $A_D$ is approximately 0.1% after integrating over the phase space of the two-body decay.

The data samples shown in figure 2 are divided into $10 \times 10 \times 16$ bins of the 3D phase space ($p_{TK^+}^{lab}$, $\cos \theta_{K^+}^{lab}$, $p_{K^0_S}^{lab}$). Each $D^\pm \to K_S^0 K^\pm$ candidate is then weighted with a factor of $(1 + A_{K^+}^{D_s})(1 + A_D)$ in this space. The weighted $M(K_S^0 K^\pm)$ distributions in bins of $\cos \theta_{D_s}^{c.m.s}$ are fitted simultaneously to obtain the corrected asymmetry. We fit the linear component in $\cos \theta_{D_s}^{c.m.s}$ to determine $A_{FB}$; the $A_{CP}$ component is uniform in $\cos \theta_{D_s}^{c.m.s}$. Figure 4 shows $A_{CP}^{D^+ \to K_S^0 K^+}$ and $A_{FB}^{D^+}$ as a function of $|\cos \theta_{D_s}^{c.m.s}|$. From a weighted average
Figure 3. The $A_{K^-}^K$ map in bins of $p_T^{lab}$ and $\cos^\theta_{lab}$ of the $K^-$ obtained with the $D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$ and $D_s^+ \to \phi\pi^+$ samples (triangles). The $A_{rec}^{D^0\to K^-\pi^+}$ map is also shown (rectangles).

over the $|\cos^\theta_{D^0}|$ bins, we obtain $A_{CP}^{D^0\to K_S^0K^+} = (-0.246 \pm 0.275)\%$, where the error is statistical.

5 Systematic uncertainty

The entire analysis procedure is validated with fully simulated MC events [34] and the result is consistent with null input asymmetry. We also consider other sources of systematic uncertainty. The dominant one in the $A_{CP}$ measurement is the $A_{K^+}$ determination, the uncertainty of which is mainly due to the statistical uncertainties in the $D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$ and $D_s^+ \to \phi\pi^+$ samples. These are found to be 0.029% and 0.119%, respectively, from a simplified simulation study. A possible $A_{CP}$ in the $D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$ final state is estimated using $A_{CP} = -y\sin\delta\sin\phi\sqrt{R}$ [35]. A calculation with 95% upper and lower limits on $D^0 - \bar{D}^0$ mixing and $CP$ violation parameters $y$, $\phi$, and strong phase difference $\delta$ and Cabibbo suppression factor $R$ from ref. [3], $A_{CP}$ in the $D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$ final state is estimated to be less than 0.005% and this is included as one of systematic uncertainties in the $A_{K^+}$ determination. As reported in our previous publication [29], the magnitude of $A_{K^+}^{KK}$ for
Figure 4. Measured $A_{CP}$ (top) and $A_{FB}$ (bottom) values as a function of $|\cos \theta_{c.m.s.}^D|$. In the top plot, the dashed line is the mean value of $A_{CP}$ while the hatched band is the $\pm 1\sigma_{total}$ interval, where $\sigma_{total}$ is the total uncertainty.

the $\phi$ reconstruction in $D^+ \rightarrow \phi \pi^+$ decays is 0.051%, which is also added to the systematic uncertainty in the $A_{CP}$ measurement. By adding the contributions in quadrature, the systematic uncertainty in the $A_{CP}$ determination is estimated to be 0.133%. We estimate 0.008% and 0.021% systematic uncertainties due to the choice of the fitting method and that of the $\cos \theta_{c.m.s.}^D$ binning, respectively. Finally, we add the systematic uncertainty in the $A_D$ correction, which is 0.010% based on ref. [26]. The quadratic sum of the above uncertainties, 0.135%, is taken as the total systematic uncertainty.

6 Results

We find $A_{CP}^{D^+ \rightarrow K_S^0 K^+} = (-0.246 \pm 0.275 \pm 0.135)\%$. This measurement supersedes our previous determination of $A_{CP}^{D^+ \rightarrow K_S^0 K^+}$ [28]. In Table 1, we compare all the available measurements and give their weighted average.

According to Grossman and Nir [27], we can estimate the experimentally measured $CP$ asymmetry induced by SM $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ mixing, $A_{CP}^{K_S^0}$. The efficiency as a function of $K_S^0$ decay time in our detector is obtained from MC simulated events. The efficiency is then used in eq. (2.10) of ref. [27] to obtain the correction factor that takes into account, for $A_{CP}^{K_S^0}$, the dependence on the kaon decay time. The result is $0.987 \pm 0.007$. By multiplying the correction factor $0.987 \pm 0.007$ and the asymmetry due to the neutral kaons [2], we find the experimentally measured $A_{CP}^{K_S^0}$ to be $(-0.328 \pm 0.006)\%$. 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiment</th>
<th>$A_{CP}^{D^+ \rightarrow K^0_S K^+}$ (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOCUS [36]</td>
<td>$+7.1 \pm 6.1 \pm 1.2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEO [37]</td>
<td>$-0.2 \pm 1.5 \pm 0.9$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belle (this measurement)</td>
<td>$-0.246 \pm 0.275 \pm 0.135$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New world average</td>
<td>$-0.23 \pm 0.30$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Summary of $A_{CP}^{D^+ \rightarrow K^0_S K^+}$ measurements (where the first uncertainties are statistical and the second systematic), together with their average (assuming the uncertainties to be uncorrelated, the error on the average represents the total uncertainty).

7 Conclusion

We report the most sensitive $CP$ asymmetry measurement to date for the decay $D^+ \rightarrow K^0_S K^+$ using a data sample corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 977 fb$^{-1}$ collected with the Belle detector. The $CP$ asymmetry in the decay is measured to be $(-0.25 \pm 0.28 \pm 0.14)\%$. After subtracting the contribution due to $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ mixing ($A_{CP}^{K^0}$), the $CP$ asymmetry in the charm decay ($A_{CP}^{D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 K^+}$) is measured to be $(+0.08 \pm 0.28 \pm 0.14)\%$, which can be compared with direct $CP$ violation in $D^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-$. For the latter the current averages of $\Delta A_{CP}$ and $CP$ asymmetry in $D^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-$ favor a negative value [3]. Our result, on the other hand, does not show this tendency for $D^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 K^+$ decays, albeit with a significant statistical uncertainty.
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