



University of
Massachusetts
Amherst

Measurement of branching fractions and charge asymmetries in $B^{+/-} \rightarrow \rho^{+/-} \pi^0$ and $B^{+/-} \rightarrow \rho^0 \pi^{+/-}$ decays, and search for $B^0 \rightarrow \rho^0 \pi^0$

Item Type	article
DOI	10.1103/PhysRevLett.93.051802
Download date	2026-03-14 20:13:44
Link to Item	https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14394/4908

Measurement of Branching Fractions and Charge Asymmetries in $B^\pm \rightarrow \rho^\pm \pi^0$ and $B^\pm \rightarrow \rho^0 \pi^\pm$ Decays, and Search for $B^0 \rightarrow \rho^0 \pi^0$

B. Aubert,¹ R. Barate,¹ D. Boutigny,¹ F. Couderc,¹ J.-M. Gaillard,¹ A. Hicheur,¹ Y. Karyotakis,¹ J. P. Lees,¹ P. Robbe,¹ V. Tisserand,¹ A. Zghiche,¹ A. Palano,² A. Pompili,² J. C. Chen,³ N. D. Qi,³ G. Rong,³ P. Wang,³ Y. S. Zhu,³ G. Eigen,⁴ I. Ofte,⁴ B. Stugu,⁴ G. S. Abrams,⁵ A. W. Borgland,⁵ A. B. Breon,⁵ D. N. Brown,⁵ J. Button-Shafer,⁵ R. N. Cahn,⁵ E. Charles,⁵ C. T. Day,⁵ M. S. Gill,⁵ A. V. Gritsan,⁵ Y. Groysman,⁵ R. G. Jacobsen,⁵ R. W. Kadel,⁵ J. Kadyk,⁵ L. T. Kerth,⁵ Yu. G. Kolomensky,⁵ G. Kukartsev,⁵ C. LeClerc,⁵ M. E. Levi,⁵ G. Lynch,⁵ L. M. Mir,⁵ P. J. Oddone,⁵ T. J. Orimoto,⁵ M. Pripstein,⁵ N. A. Roe,⁵ A. Romosan,⁵ M. T. Ronan,⁵ V. G. Shelkov,⁵ A. V. Telnov,⁵ W. A. Wenzel,⁵ K. Ford,⁶ T. J. Harrison,⁶ C. M. Hawkes,⁶ D. J. Knowles,⁶ S. E. Morgan,⁶ R. C. Penny,⁶ A. T. Watson,⁶ N. K. Watson,⁶ K. Goetzen,⁷ T. Held,⁷ H. Koch,⁷ B. Lewandowski,⁷ M. Pelizaeus,⁷ K. Peters,⁷ H. Schmuecker,⁷ M. Steinke,⁷ J. T. Boyd,⁸ N. Chevalier,⁸ W. N. Cottingham,⁸ M. P. Kelly,⁸ T. E. Latham,⁸ C. Mackay,⁸ F. F. Wilson,⁸ K. Abe,⁹ T. Cuhadar-Donszelmann,⁹ C. Hearty,⁹ T. S. Mattison,⁹ J. A. McKenna,⁹ D. Thiessen,⁹ P. Kyberd,¹⁰ A. K. McKemey,¹⁰ L. Teodorescu,¹⁰ V. E. Blinov,¹¹ A. D. Bukin,¹¹ V. B. Golubev,¹¹ V. N. Ivanchenko,¹¹ E. A. Kravchenko,¹¹ A. P. Onuchin,¹¹ S. I. Serednyakov,¹¹ Yu. I. Skovpen,¹¹ E. P. Solodov,¹¹ A. N. Yushkov,¹¹ D. Best,¹² M. Bruinsma,¹² M. Chao,¹² D. Kirkby,¹² A. J. Lankford,¹² M. Mandelkern,¹² R. K. Mommsen,¹² W. Roethel,¹² D. P. Stoker,¹² C. Buchanan,¹³ B. L. Hartfiel,¹³ J. W. Gary,¹⁴ J. Layter,¹⁴ B. C. Shen,¹⁴ K. Wang,¹⁴ D. del Re,¹⁵ H. K. Hadavand,¹⁵ E. J. Hill,¹⁵ D. B. MacFarlane,¹⁵ H. P. Paar,¹⁵ Sh. Rahatlou,¹⁵ V. Sharma,¹⁵ J. W. Berryhill,¹⁶ C. Campagnari,¹⁶ B. Dahmes,¹⁶ S. L. Levy,¹⁶ O. Long,¹⁶ A. Lu,¹⁶ M. A. Mazur,¹⁶ J. D. Richman,¹⁶ W. Verkerke,¹⁶ T. W. Beck,¹⁷ J. Beringer,¹⁷ A. M. Eisner,¹⁷ C. A. Heusch,¹⁷ W. S. Lockman,¹⁷ T. Schalk,¹⁷ R. E. Schmitz,¹⁷ B. A. Schumm,¹⁷ A. Seiden,¹⁷ P. Spradlin,¹⁷ M. Turri,¹⁷ W. Walkowiak,¹⁷ D. C. Williams,¹⁷ M. G. Wilson,¹⁷ J. Albert,¹⁸ E. Chen,¹⁸ G. P. Dubois-Felsmann,¹⁸ A. Dvoretzki,¹⁸ R. J. Erwin,¹⁸ D. G. Hitlin,¹⁸ I. Narsky,¹⁸ T. Piatenko,¹⁸ F. C. Porter,¹⁸ A. Ryd,¹⁸ A. Samuel,¹⁸ S. Yang,¹⁸ S. Jayatilake,¹⁹ G. Mancinelli,¹⁹ B. T. Meadows,¹⁹ M. D. Sokoloff,¹⁹ T. Abe,²⁰ F. Blanc,²⁰ P. Bloom,²⁰ S. Chen,²⁰ P. J. Clark,²⁰ W. T. Ford,²⁰ U. Nauenberg,²⁰ A. Olivas,²⁰ P. Rankin,²⁰ J. Roy,²⁰ J. G. Smith,²⁰ W. C. van Hoek,²⁰ L. Zhang,²⁰ J. L. Harton,²¹ T. Hu,²¹ A. Soffer,²¹ W. H. Toki,²¹ R. J. Wilson,²¹ J. Zhang,²¹ D. Altenburg,²² T. Brandt,²² J. Brose,²² T. Colberg,²² M. Dickopp,²² R. S. Dubitzky,²² A. Hauke,²² H. M. Lacker,²² E. Maly,²² R. Müller-Pfefferkorn,²² R. Nogowski,²² S. Otto,²² J. Schubert,²² K. R. Schubert,²² R. Schwierz,²² B. Spaan,²² L. Wilden,²² D. Bernard,²³ G. R. Bonneaud,²³ F. Brochard,²³ J. Cohen-Tanugi,²³ P. Grenier,²³ Ch. Thiebaux,²³ G. Vasileiadis,²³ M. Verderi,²³ A. Khan,²⁴ D. Lavin,²⁴ F. Muheim,²⁴ S. Playfer,²⁴ J. E. Swain,²⁴ M. Andreotti,²⁵ V. Azzolini,²⁵ D. Bettoni,²⁵ C. Bozzi,²⁵ R. Calabrese,²⁵ G. Cibinetto,²⁵ E. Luppi,²⁵ M. Negrini,²⁵ L. Piemontese,²⁵ A. Sarti,²⁵ E. Treadwell,²⁶ R. Baldini-Ferrolli,²⁷ A. Calcaterra,²⁷ R. de Sangro,²⁷ D. Falciari,²⁷ G. Finocchiaro,²⁷ P. Patteri,²⁷ M. Piccolo,²⁷ A. Zallo,²⁷ A. Buzzo,²⁸ R. Capra,²⁸ R. Contri,²⁸ G. Crosetti,²⁸ M. Lo Vetere,²⁸ M. Macri,²⁸ M. R. Monge,²⁸ S. Passaggio,²⁸ C. Patrignani,²⁸ E. Robutti,²⁸ A. Santroni,²⁸ S. Tosi,²⁸ S. Bailey,²⁹ M. Morii,²⁹ E. Won,²⁹ W. Bhimji,³⁰ D. A. Bowerman,³⁰ P. D. Dauncey,³⁰ U. Egede,³⁰ I. Eschrich,³⁰ J. R. Gaillard,³⁰ G. W. Morton,³⁰ J. A. Nash,³⁰ G. P. Taylor,³⁰ G. J. Grenier,³¹ S.-J. Lee,³¹ U. Mallik,³¹ J. Cochran,³² H. B. Crawley,³² J. Lamsa,³² W. T. Meyer,³² S. Prell,³² E. I. Rosenberg,³² J. Yi,³² M. Davier,³³ G. Grosdidier,³³ A. Höcker,³³ S. Laplace,³³ F. Le Diberder,³³ V. Lepeltier,³³ A. M. Lutz,³³ T. C. Petersen,³³ S. Plaszczynski,³³ M. H. Schune,³³ L. Tantot,³³ G. Wormser,³³ V. Brigljević,³⁴ C. H. Cheng,³⁴ D. J. Lange,³⁴ M. C. Simani,³⁴ D. M. Wright,³⁴ A. J. Bevan,³⁵ J. P. Coleman,³⁵ J. R. Fry,³⁵ E. Gabathuler,³⁵ R. Gamet,³⁵ M. Kay,³⁵ R. J. Parry,³⁵ D. J. Payne,³⁵ R. J. Sloane,³⁵ C. Touramanis,³⁵ J. J. Back,³⁶ P. F. Harrison,³⁶ H. W. Shorthouse,³⁶ P. B. Vidal,³⁶ C. L. Brown,³⁷ G. Cowan,³⁷ R. L. Flack,³⁷ H. U. Flaecher,³⁷ S. George,³⁷ M. G. Green,³⁷ A. Kurup,³⁷ C. E. Marker,³⁷ T. R. McMahon,³⁷ S. Ricciardi,³⁷ F. Salvatore,³⁷ G. Vaitsas,³⁷ M. A. Winter,³⁷ D. Brown,³⁸ C. L. Davis,³⁸ J. Allison,³⁹ N. R. Barlow,³⁹ R. J. Barlow,³⁹ P. A. Hart,³⁹ M. C. Hodgkinson,³⁹ F. Jackson,³⁹ G. D. Lafferty,³⁹ A. J. Lyon,³⁹ J. H. Weatherall,³⁹ J. C. Williams,³⁹ A. Farbin,⁴⁰ A. Jawahery,⁴⁰ D. Kovalskyi,⁴⁰ C. K. Lae,⁴⁰ V. Lillard,⁴⁰ D. A. Roberts,⁴⁰ G. Blaylock,⁴¹ C. Dallapiccola,⁴¹ K. T. Flood,⁴¹ S. S. Hertzbach,⁴¹ R. Kofler,⁴¹ V. B. Koptchev,⁴¹ T. B. Moore,⁴¹

S. Saremi,⁴¹ H. Staengle,⁴¹ S. Willocq,⁴¹ R. Cowan,⁴² G. Sciolla,⁴² F. Taylor,⁴² R. K. Yamamoto,⁴² D. J. J. Mangeol,⁴³ P. M. Patel,⁴³ S. H. Robertson,⁴³ A. Lazzaro,⁴⁴ F. Palombo,⁴⁴ J. M. Bauer,⁴⁵ L. Cremaldi,⁴⁵ V. Eschenburg,⁴⁵ R. Godang,⁴⁵ R. Kroeger,⁴⁵ J. Reidy,⁴⁵ D. A. Sanders,⁴⁵ D. J. Summers,⁴⁵ H. W. Zhao,⁴⁵ S. Brunet,⁴⁶ D. Cote-Ahern,⁴⁶ P. Taras,⁴⁶ H. Nicholson,⁴⁷ C. Cartaro,⁴⁸ N. Cavallo,⁴⁸ G. De Nardo,⁴⁸ F. Fabozzi,^{48,*} C. Gatto,⁴⁸ L. Lista,⁴⁸ P. Paolucci,⁴⁸ D. Piccolo,⁴⁸ C. Sciacca,⁴⁸ M. A. Baak,⁴⁹ G. Raven,⁴⁹ J. M. LoSecco,⁵⁰ T. A. Gabriel,⁵¹ B. Brau,⁵² K. K. Gan,⁵² K. Honscheid,⁵² D. Hufnagel,⁵² H. Kagan,⁵² R. Kass,⁵² T. Pulliam,⁵² Q. K. Wong,⁵² J. Brau,⁵³ R. Frey,⁵³ O. Igonkina,⁵³ C. T. Potter,⁵³ N. B. Sinev,⁵³ D. Strom,⁵³ E. Torrence,⁵³ F. Colechia,⁵⁴ A. Dorigo,⁵⁴ F. Galeazzi,⁵⁴ M. Margoni,⁵⁴ M. Morandin,⁵⁴ M. Posocco,⁵⁴ M. Rotondo,⁵⁴ F. Simonetto,⁵⁴ R. Stroili,⁵⁴ G. Tiozzo,⁵⁴ C. Voci,⁵⁴ M. Benayoun,⁵⁵ H. Briand,⁵⁵ J. Chauveau,⁵⁵ P. David,⁵⁵ Ch. de la Vaissière,⁵⁵ L. Del Buono,⁵⁵ O. Hamon,⁵⁵ M. J. J. John,⁵⁵ Ph. Leruste,⁵⁵ J. Ocariz,⁵⁵ M. Pivk,⁵⁵ L. Roos,⁵⁵ J. Stark,⁵⁵ S. T'Jampens,⁵⁵ G. Therin,⁵⁵ P. F. Manfredi,⁵⁶ V. Re,⁵⁶ P. K. Behera,⁵⁷ L. Gladney,⁵⁷ Q. H. Guo,⁵⁷ J. Panetta,⁵⁷ F. Anulli,^{27,58} M. Biasini,⁵⁸ I. M. Peruzzi,^{27,58} M. Pioppi,⁵⁸ C. Angelini,⁵⁹ G. Batignani,⁵⁹ S. Bettarini,⁵⁹ M. Bondioli,⁵⁹ F. Bucci,⁵⁹ G. Calderini,⁵⁹ M. Carpinelli,⁵⁹ V. Del Gamba,⁵⁹ F. Forti,⁵⁹ M. A. Giorgi,⁵⁹ A. Lusiani,⁵⁹ G. Marchiori,⁵⁹ F. Martinez-Vidal,^{59,†} M. Morganti,⁵⁹ N. Neri,⁵⁹ E. Paoloni,⁵⁹ M. Rama,⁵⁹ G. Rizzo,⁵⁹ F. Sandrelli,⁵⁹ J. Walsh,⁵⁹ M. Haire,⁶⁰ D. Judd,⁶⁰ K. Paick,⁶⁰ D. E. Wagoner,⁶⁰ N. Danielson,⁶¹ P. Elmer,⁶¹ C. Lu,⁶¹ V. Miftakov,⁶¹ J. Olsen,⁶¹ A. J. S. Smith,⁶¹ H. A. Tanaka,⁶¹ E. W. Varnes,⁶¹ F. Bellini,⁶² G. Cavoto,^{61,62} R. Faccini,⁶² F. Ferrarotto,⁶² F. Ferroni,⁶² M. Gaspero,⁶² M. A. Mazzoni,⁶² S. Morganti,⁶² M. Pierini,⁶² G. Piredda,⁶² F. Safai Tehrani,⁶² C. Voena,⁶² S. Christ,⁶³ G. Wagner,⁶³ R. Waldi,⁶³ T. Adye,⁶⁴ N. De Groot,⁶⁴ B. Franek,⁶⁴ N. I. Geddes,⁶⁴ G. P. Gopal,⁶⁴ E. O. Olaiya,⁶⁴ S. M. Xella,⁶⁴ R. Aleksan,⁶⁵ S. Emery,⁶⁵ A. Gaidot,⁶⁵ S. F. Ganzhur,⁶⁵ P.-F. Giraud,⁶⁵ G. Hamel de Monchenault,⁶⁵ W. Kozanecki,⁶⁵ M. Langer,⁶⁵ M. Legendre,⁶⁵ G. W. London,⁶⁵ B. Mayer,⁶⁵ G. Schott,⁶⁵ G. Vasseur,⁶⁵ Ch. Yeche,⁶⁵ M. Zito,⁶⁵ M. V. Purohit,⁶⁶ A. W. Weidemann,⁶⁶ F. X. Yumiceva,⁶⁶ D. Aston,⁶⁷ R. Bartoldus,⁶⁷ N. Berger,⁶⁷ A. M. Boyarski,⁶⁷ O. L. Buchmueller,⁶⁷ M. R. Convery,⁶⁷ M. Cristinziani,⁶⁷ D. Dong,⁶⁷ J. Dorfan,⁶⁷ D. Dujmic,⁶⁷ W. Dunwoodie,⁶⁷ E. E. Elsen,⁶⁷ R. C. Field,⁶⁷ T. Glanzman,⁶⁷ S. J. Gowdy,⁶⁷ E. Grauges-Pous,⁶⁷ T. Hadig,⁶⁷ V. Halyo,⁶⁷ T. Hryn'ova,⁶⁷ W. R. Innes,⁶⁷ C. P. Jessop,⁶⁷ M. H. Kelsey,⁶⁷ P. Kim,⁶⁷ M. L. Kocian,⁶⁷ U. Langenegger,⁶⁷ D. W. G. S. Leith,⁶⁷ J. Libby,⁶⁷ S. Luitz,⁶⁷ V. Luth,⁶⁷ H. L. Lynch,⁶⁷ H. Marsiske,⁶⁷ R. Messner,⁶⁷ D. R. Muller,⁶⁷ C. P. O'Grady,⁶⁷ V. E. Ozcan,⁶⁷ A. Perazzo,⁶⁷ M. Perl,⁶⁷ S. Petrak,⁶⁷ B. N. Ratcliff,⁶⁷ A. Roodman,⁶⁷ A. A. Salnikov,⁶⁷ R. H. Schindler,⁶⁷ J. Schwiening,⁶⁷ G. Simi,⁶⁷ A. Snyder,⁶⁷ A. Soha,⁶⁷ J. Stelzer,⁶⁷ D. Su,⁶⁷ M. K. Sullivan,⁶⁷ J. Va'vra,⁶⁷ S. R. Wagner,⁶⁷ M. Weaver,⁶⁷ A. J. R. Weinstein,⁶⁷ W. J. Wisniewski,⁶⁷ D. H. Wright,⁶⁷ C. C. Young,⁶⁷ P. R. Burchat,⁶⁸ A. J. Edwards,⁶⁸ T. I. Meyer,⁶⁸ B. A. Petersen,⁶⁸ C. Roat,⁶⁸ M. Ahmed,⁶⁹ S. Ahmed,⁶⁹ M. S. Alam,⁶⁹ J. A. Ernst,⁶⁹ M. A. Saeed,⁶⁹ M. Saleem,⁶⁹ F. R. Wappler,⁶⁹ W. Bugg,⁷⁰ M. Krishnamurthy,⁷⁰ S. M. Spanier,⁷⁰ R. Eckmann,⁷¹ H. Kim,⁷¹ J. L. Ritchie,⁷¹ R. F. Schwitters,⁷¹ J. M. Izen,⁷² I. Kitayama,⁷² X. C. Lou,⁷² S. Ye,⁷² F. Bianchi,⁷³ M. Bona,⁷³ F. Gallo,⁷³ D. Gamba,⁷³ C. Borean,⁷⁴ L. Bosisio,⁷⁴ G. Della Ricca,⁷⁴ S. Dittongo,⁷⁴ S. Grancagnolo,⁷⁴ L. Lanceri,⁷⁴ P. Poropat,^{74,‡} L. Vitale,⁷⁴ G. Vuagnin,⁷⁴ R. S. Panvini,⁷⁵ Sw. Banerjee,⁷⁶ C. M. Brown,⁷⁶ D. Fortin,⁷⁶ P. D. Jackson,⁷⁶ R. Kowalewski,⁷⁶ J. M. Roney,⁷⁶ H. R. Band,⁷⁷ S. Dasu,⁷⁷ M. Datta,⁷⁷ A. M. Eichenbaum,⁷⁷ J. R. Johnson,⁷⁷ P. E. Kutter,⁷⁷ H. Li,⁷⁷ R. Liu,⁷⁷ F. Di Lodovico,⁷⁷ A. Mihalyi,⁷⁷ A. K. Mohapatra,⁷⁷ Y. Pan,⁷⁷ R. Prepost,⁷⁷ S. J. Sekula,⁷⁷ J. H. von Wimmersperg-Toeller,⁷⁷ J. Wu,⁷⁷ S. L. Wu,⁷⁷ Z. Yu,⁷⁷ and H. Neal⁷⁸

(The BABAR Collaboration)

¹Laboratoire de Physique des Particules, F-74941 Annecy-le-Vieux, France

²Università di Bari, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-70126 Bari, Italy

³Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing 100039, China

⁴University of Bergen, Inst. of Physics, N-5007 Bergen, Norway

⁵Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory and University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA

⁶University of Birmingham, Birmingham, B15 2TT, United Kingdom

⁷Ruhr Universität Bochum, Institut für Experimentalphysik 1, D-44780 Bochum, Germany

⁸University of Bristol, Bristol BS8 1TL, United Kingdom

⁹University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada V6T 1Z1

¹⁰Brunel University, Uxbridge, Middlesex UB8 3PH, United Kingdom

¹¹Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics, Novosibirsk 630090, Russia

¹²University of California at Irvine, Irvine, CA 92697, USA

¹³University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA 90024, USA

¹⁴University of California at Riverside, Riverside, CA 92521, USA

¹⁵University of California at San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093, USA

- ¹⁶University of California at Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, CA 93106, USA
- ¹⁷University of California at Santa Cruz, Institute for Particle Physics, Santa Cruz, CA 95064, USA
- ¹⁸California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91125, USA
- ¹⁹University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH 45221, USA
- ²⁰University of Colorado, Boulder, CO 80309, USA
- ²¹Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80523, USA
- ²²Technische Universität Dresden, Institut für Kern- und Teilchenphysik, D-01062 Dresden, Germany
- ²³Ecole Polytechnique, LLR, F-91128 Palaiseau, France
- ²⁴University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH9 3JZ, United Kingdom
- ²⁵Università di Ferrara, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-44100 Ferrara, Italy
- ²⁶Florida A&M University, Tallahassee, FL 32307, USA
- ²⁷Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati dell'INFN, I-00044 Frascati, Italy
- ²⁸Università di Genova, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-16146 Genova, Italy
- ²⁹Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA
- ³⁰Imperial College London, London, SW7 2BW, United Kingdom
- ³¹University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA 52242, USA
- ³²Iowa State University, Ames, IA 50011-3160, USA
- ³³Laboratoire de l'Accélérateur Linéaire, F-91898 Orsay, France
- ³⁴Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA 94550, USA
- ³⁵University of Liverpool, Liverpool L69 3BX, United Kingdom
- ³⁶Queen Mary, University of London, E1 4NS, United Kingdom
- ³⁷University of London, Royal Holloway and Bedford New College, Egham, Surrey TW20 0EX, United Kingdom
- ³⁸University of Louisville, Louisville, KY 40292, USA
- ³⁹University of Manchester, Manchester M13 9PL, United Kingdom
- ⁴⁰University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742, USA
- ⁴¹University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA 01003, USA
- ⁴²Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Laboratory for Nuclear Science, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA
- ⁴³McGill University, Montréal, QC, Canada H3A 2T8
- ⁴⁴Università di Milano, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-20133 Milano, Italy
- ⁴⁵University of Mississippi, University, MS 38677, USA
- ⁴⁶Université de Montréal, Laboratoire René J. A. Lévesque, Montréal, QC, Canada H3C 3J7
- ⁴⁷Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, MA 01075, USA
- ⁴⁸Università di Napoli Federico II, Dipartimento di Scienze Fisiche and INFN, I-80126, Napoli, Italy
- ⁴⁹NIKHEF, National Institute for Nuclear Physics and High Energy Physics, NL-1009 DB Amsterdam, The Netherlands
- ⁵⁰University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN 46556, USA
- ⁵¹Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN 37831, USA
- ⁵²Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210, USA
- ⁵³University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403, USA
- ⁵⁴Università di Padova, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-35131 Padova, Italy
- ⁵⁵Universités Paris VI et VII, Lab de Physique Nucléaire H. E., F-75252 Paris, France
- ⁵⁶Università di Pavia, Dipartimento di Eletttronica and INFN, I-27100 Pavia, Italy
- ⁵⁷University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA
- ⁵⁸Università di Perugia and INFN, I-06100 Perugia, Italy
- ⁵⁹Università di Pisa, Dipartimento di Fisica, Scuola Normale Superiore and INFN, I-56127 Pisa, Italy
- ⁶⁰Prairie View A&M University, Prairie View, TX 77446, USA
- ⁶¹Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA
- ⁶²Università di Roma La Sapienza, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-00185 Roma, Italy
- ⁶³Universität Rostock, D-18051 Rostock, Germany
- ⁶⁴Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Chilton, Didcot, Oxon, OX11 0QX, United Kingdom
- ⁶⁵DSM/Dapnia, CEA/Saclay, F-91191 Gif-sur-Yvette, France
- ⁶⁶University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC 29208, USA
- ⁶⁷Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, Stanford, CA 94309, USA
- ⁶⁸Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305-4060, USA
- ⁶⁹State Univ. of New York, Albany, NY 12222, USA
- ⁷⁰University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37996, USA
- ⁷¹University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX 78712, USA
- ⁷²University of Texas at Dallas, Richardson, TX 75083, USA
- ⁷³Università di Torino, Dipartimento di Fisica Sperimentale and INFN, I-10125 Torino, Italy
- ⁷⁴Università di Trieste, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-34127 Trieste, Italy
- ⁷⁵Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN 37235, USA
- ⁷⁶University of Victoria, Victoria, BC, Canada V8W 3P6
- ⁷⁷University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI 53706, USA
- ⁷⁸Yale University, New Haven, CT 06511, USA

(Dated: October 25, 2018)

We present measurements of branching fractions and charge asymmetries in B -meson decays to $\rho^+\pi^0$, $\rho^0\pi^+$ and $\rho^0\pi^0$. The data sample comprises 89×10^6 $\Upsilon(4S) \rightarrow B\bar{B}$ decays collected with the BABAR detector at the PEP-II asymmetric-energy B Factory at SLAC. We find the charge-averaged branching fractions $\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow \rho^+\pi^0) = (10.9 \pm 1.9(\text{stat}) \pm 1.9(\text{syst})) \times 10^{-6}$ and $\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow \rho^0\pi^+) = (9.5 \pm 1.1 \pm 0.8) \times 10^{-6}$, and we set a 90% confidence-level upper limit $\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow \rho^0\pi^0) < 2.9 \times 10^{-6}$. We measure the charge asymmetries $A_{CP}^{\rho^+\pi^0} = 0.24 \pm 0.16 \pm 0.06$ and $A_{CP}^{\rho^0\pi^+} = -0.19 \pm 0.11 \pm 0.02$.

PACS numbers: 13.25.Hw, 11.30.Er, 12.15.Hh

The study of B -meson decays into charmless hadronic final states plays an important role in the understanding of CP violation in the B system. Recently, the BABAR experiment performed a search for CP -violating asymmetries in neutral B decays to $\rho^\pm\pi^\mp$ final states [1], where the mixing-induced CP asymmetry is related to the angle $\alpha \equiv \arg[-V_{td}V_{tb}^*/V_{ud}V_{ub}^*]$ of the Unitarity Triangle [2]. The extraction of α from $\rho^\pm\pi^\mp$ is complicated by the interference of decay amplitudes with differing weak and strong phases. One strategy to overcome this problem is to perform an SU(2) analysis that uses all $\rho\pi$ final states [3]. Assuming isospin symmetry, the angle α can be determined free of hadronic uncertainties from a pentagon relation formed in the complex plane by the five decay amplitudes $B^0 \rightarrow \rho^+\pi^-$, $B^0 \rightarrow \rho^-\pi^+$, $B^0 \rightarrow \rho^0\pi^0$, $B^+ \rightarrow \rho^+\pi^0$ and $B^+ \rightarrow \rho^0\pi^+$ [4]. These amplitudes can be determined from measurements of the corresponding decay rates and CP -asymmetries. The branching fractions have been measured for $B^0 \rightarrow \rho^+\pi^-$ and $B^+ \rightarrow \rho^0\pi^+$, and an upper limit has been set for $B^0 \rightarrow \rho^0\pi^0$ [1, 5].

In this letter we present measurements of the branching fractions of the decay modes $B^+ \rightarrow \rho^+\pi^0$ and $B^+ \rightarrow \rho^0\pi^+$, and a search for the decay $B^0 \rightarrow \rho^0\pi^0$. All three analyses follow a quasi-two-body approach [1, 6]. For the charged modes we also measure the charge asymmetry, defined as

$$A_{CP} \equiv \frac{\Gamma(B^- \rightarrow f) - \Gamma(B^+ \rightarrow \bar{f})}{\Gamma(B^- \rightarrow f) + \Gamma(B^+ \rightarrow \bar{f})}, \quad (1)$$

where f and \bar{f} are the final state and its charge-conjugate, respectively.

The data used in this analysis were collected with the BABAR detector [7] at the PEP-II asymmetric-energy e^+e^- storage ring at SLAC. The sample consists of $(88.9 \pm 1.0) \times 10^6$ $B\bar{B}$ pairs collected at the $\Upsilon(4S)$ resonance (“on-resonance”), and an integrated luminosity of 9.6 fb^{-1} collected about 40 MeV below the $\Upsilon(4S)$ (“off-resonance”).

Each signal B candidate is reconstructed from three-pion final states that must be $\pi^+\pi^0\pi^0$, $\pi^+\pi^-\pi^+$, or $\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$. Charged tracks must have ionization-energy loss and Cherenkov-angle signatures inconsistent with those expected for electrons, kaons, protons, or muons [7]. The π^0 candidate must have a mass that satisfies $0.11 < m(\gamma\gamma) < 0.16 \text{ GeV}/c^2$, where each photon is required to have an energy greater than 50 MeV in the laboratory

frame and to exhibit a lateral profile of energy deposition in the electromagnetic calorimeter consistent with an electromagnetic shower [7]. The mass of the reconstructed ρ candidate must satisfy $0.4 < m(\pi^+\pi^0) < 1.3 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ for ρ^+ and $0.53 < m(\pi^+\pi^-) < 0.9 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ for ρ^0 . The tight upper $m(\pi^+\pi^-)$ cut at $0.9 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ is to remove contributions from the scalar $f_0(980)$ resonance, and the tight lower cut is to reduce the contamination from K_S^0 decays. To reduce contributions from $B^0 \rightarrow \rho^+\pi^-$ decays, a $B^0 \rightarrow \rho^0\pi^0$ candidate is rejected if $0.4 < m(\pi^\pm\pi^0) < 1.3 \text{ GeV}/c^2$. For the $B^+ \rightarrow \rho^+\pi^0$ and $B^0 \rightarrow \rho^0\pi^0$ modes, the invariant mass of any charged track in the event and the π^0 must be less than $5.14 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ to reject $B^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^0$ background. For the $B^+ \rightarrow \rho^0\pi^+$ mode, we remove background from charmed decays $B \rightarrow \bar{D}^0 X$, $\bar{D}^0 \rightarrow K^+\pi^-$ or $\pi^+\pi^-$, by requiring the masses $m(\pi^+\pi^-)$ and $m(K^+\pi^-)$ to be less than $1.844 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ or greater than $1.884 \text{ GeV}/c^2$. We take advantage of the helicity structure of $B \rightarrow \rho\pi$ decays by requiring that $|\cos\theta_\rho| > 0.25$, where θ_ρ is the angle between the π^0 (π^+) momentum from the ρ^+ (ρ^0) decay and the B momentum in the ρ rest frame.

Two kinematic variables, ΔE and m_{ES} , allow the discrimination of signal B decays from random combinations of tracks and π^0 candidates. The energy difference, ΔE , is the difference between the e^+e^- center-of-mass (CM) energy of the B candidate and $\sqrt{s}/2$, where \sqrt{s} is the total CM energy. The beam-energy-substituted mass, m_{ES} , is defined by $\sqrt{(s/2 + \mathbf{p}_i \cdot \mathbf{p}_B)^2/E_i^2 - \mathbf{p}_B^2}$, where the B momentum, \mathbf{p}_B , and the four-momentum of the initial state (E_i , \mathbf{p}_i) are measured in the laboratory frame. For $B^+ \rightarrow \rho^0\pi^+$ we require that $-0.05 < \Delta E < 0.05 \text{ GeV}$ while for both modes containing a π^0 we relax this requirement to $-0.15 < \Delta E < 0.10 \text{ GeV}$. For both $B^+ \rightarrow \rho^0\pi^+$ and $B^0 \rightarrow \rho^0\pi^0$ we require that $5.23 < m_{ES} < 5.29 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ while for $B^+ \rightarrow \rho^+\pi^0$ it is relaxed to $5.20 < m_{ES} < 5.29 \text{ GeV}/c^2$.

Continuum $e^+e^- \rightarrow q\bar{q}$ ($q = u, d, s, c$) events are the dominant background. To enhance discrimination between signal and continuum, we use neural networks (NN) to combine six discriminating variables: the reconstructed ρ mass, $|\cos\theta_\rho|$, the cosine of the angle between the B momentum and the beam direction in the CM frame, the cosine of the angle between the B thrust axis and the beam direction in the CM frame, and the two event-shape variables that are used in the Fisher discriminant of Ref. [8]. The event shape variables are sums

TABLE I: Numbers of selected events from on-resonance data, signal efficiencies, relative fraction of misreconstructed and wrong charge events from MC.

	$B^+ \rightarrow \rho^+\pi^0$	$B^+ \rightarrow \rho^0\pi^+$	$B^0 \rightarrow \rho^0\pi^0$
Selected events	13177	8551	7048
Signal efficiency	$17.5 \pm 0.1\%$	$28.3 \pm 0.1\%$	$20.0 \pm 0.1\%$
Misreconstructed	$38.6 \pm 0.2\%$	$7.1 \pm 0.1\%$	$9.1 \pm 0.2\%$
Wrong charge	$8.1 \pm 0.1\%$	$1.6 \pm 0.1\%$	-

over all particles i of $p_i \times |\cos\theta_i|^n$, where $n = 0$ or 2 and θ_i is the angle between momentum i and the B thrust axis. The NN for each analysis weighs the discriminating variables differently, according to training on off-resonance data and the relevant Monte Carlo (MC) simulated signal events. The final $\rho\pi$ candidate samples are selected with cuts on the corresponding NN outputs.

To further discriminate further between signal and continuum background, for the $B^0 \rightarrow \rho^0\pi^0$ mode, we use the separation between the vertex of the reconstructed B and the vertex reconstructed for the remaining tracks. This separation is related to Δt , the difference between the two decay times, by $\Delta z = c\beta\gamma\Delta t$, where for PEP-II the boost is $\beta\gamma = 0.56$.

Approximately 33%, 7%, and 8% of the events have more than one candidate satisfying the selection in the $B^+ \rightarrow \rho^+\pi^0$, $B^+ \rightarrow \rho^0\pi^+$, and $B^0 \rightarrow \rho^0\pi^0$ decay mode, respectively. In such cases we choose the candidate with the reconstructed ρ mass closest to the nominal value of $0.77 \text{ GeV}/c^2$. Table I summarizes the numbers of events selected from the data sample and the signal efficiencies estimated from MC simulation. Some of the actual signal events are misreconstructed; this is primarily due to the presence of random combinations involving low momentum pions. For the charged B modes we distinguish misreconstructed signal events with correct charge assignment from those with incorrect charge assignment. These numbers, estimated from MC, are also listed in Table I.

We use MC-simulated events to study the background from other B decays, (B -background), which include both charmed ($b \rightarrow c$) and charmless decays. In the selected $\rho^+\pi^0$ ($\rho^0\pi^+$, $\rho^0\pi^0$) sample we expect 205 ± 46 (73 ± 19 , 59 ± 18) $b \rightarrow c$ and 228 ± 77 (92 ± 11 , 74 ± 22) charmless background events. All the three analyses share the major B -background modes: $B^0 \rightarrow \rho^+\pi^-$, longitudinally polarized $B^0 \rightarrow \rho^+\rho^-$, and $B^+ \rightarrow \rho^+\rho^0$. Other important modes include $B^+ \rightarrow \rho^+\pi^0$ (for $B^0 \rightarrow \rho^0\pi^0$), $B^+ \rightarrow (a_1\pi)^+$ (for $B^+ \rightarrow \rho^+\pi^0$), $B^+ \rightarrow K^*(892)^0\pi^+$ (for $B^+ \rightarrow \rho^0\pi^+$), and background modes containing higher kaon resonances.

An unbinned maximum likelihood fit is used for each analysis to determine event yields and charge asymmetries. To enhance discrimination between signal and

background events, we use the B -flavor-tagging algorithm developed for the $BABAR$ measurement of the CP -violating amplitude $\sin 2\beta$ [8], where events are separated into categories based on the topology of the event and the probability of misassigning the B -meson flavor. The likelihood for the N_k candidates tagged in category k is

$$\mathcal{L}_k = e^{-N'_k} \prod_{i=1}^{N_k} \left\{ N^{\rho\pi} \epsilon_k \mathcal{P}_{i,k}^{\rho\pi} + N_k^{q\bar{q}} \mathcal{P}_{i,k}^{q\bar{q}} + \sum_{j=1}^{N_B} \mathcal{L}_{ij,k}^B \right\}, \quad (2)$$

where $N^{\rho\pi}$ is the number of signal events in the entire sample, ϵ_k is the fraction of signal events tagged in category k , $N_k^{q\bar{q}}$ is the number of continuum background events that are tagged in category k , and N_B is the number of B -background modes. N'_k is the sum of the expected event yields for signal ($\epsilon_k N^{\rho\pi}$), continuum ($N_k^{q\bar{q}}$) and fixed B background. For the charged modes the asymmetries are introduced by multiplying the signal yields by $\frac{1}{2}(1 - Q_i A_{CP})$, where Q_i is the charge of B -candidate i . The likelihood term $\mathcal{L}_{ij,k}^B$ corresponds to the j th B -background contribution of the N_B B -background classes. The total likelihood is the product of likelihoods for each tagging category.

The probability density functions (PDF) for signal and continuum, $\mathcal{P}_k^{\rho\pi}$ and $\mathcal{P}_k^{q\bar{q}}$, are the products of the PDFs of the discriminating variables. The signal PDFs are given by $\mathcal{P}_k^{(\rho\pi)^+} \equiv \mathcal{P}^{(\rho\pi)^+}(m_{ES}) \cdot \mathcal{P}^{(\rho\pi)^+}(\Delta E) \cdot \mathcal{P}_k^{(\rho\pi)^+}(\text{NN})$ for the charged B decay modes, and by $\mathcal{P}_k^{\rho^0\pi^0} \equiv \mathcal{P}^{\rho^0\pi^0}(m_{ES}) \cdot \mathcal{P}^{\rho^0\pi^0}(\Delta E) \cdot \mathcal{P}_k^{\rho^0\pi^0}(\text{NN}) \cdot \mathcal{P}_k^{\rho^0\pi^0}(\Delta t)$ for $B^0 \rightarrow \rho^0\pi^0$. Each signal PDF is decomposed into two parts with distinct distributions: signal events that are correctly reconstructed and signal events that are misreconstructed. For the charged B modes, each PDF for the misreconstructed events is further divided into a right-charge and wrong-charge part. The m_{ES} , ΔE , and NN PDFs for signal and for B background are taken from MC simulation. For continuum, the yields and PDF parameters are determined simultaneously in the fit to on-resonance data.

In the $B^0 \rightarrow \rho^0\pi^0$ decay the Δt distributions for signal and B background are modeled from fully reconstructed B^0 decays from data control samples [8]. The continuum Δt parameters are free in the fit to on-resonance data.

To validate the fit procedure, we perform fits on large MC samples that contain the measured number of signal and continuum events and the expected B -background. Biases observed in these tests are largely due to correlations between the discriminating variables, which are not accounted for in the PDFs. For $\rho^+\pi^0$ and $\rho^0\pi^+$ they are not negligible and are used to correct the fitted signal yields. In addition, the full fit biases are assigned as systematic uncertainties on all three signal yields.

Contributions to the systematic errors are summarized in Table II. Uncertainties in the signal MC simulation

TABLE II: Summary of the systematic uncertainties.

Error source	$\rho^+\pi^0$	$\rho^0\pi^+$	$\rho^0\pi^0$	$A_{CP}^{\rho^+\pi^0}$	$A_{CP}^{\rho^0\pi^+}$
	(events)			(10^{-2})	
Signal model	10.7	3.8	3.3	3.4	0.3
Fit procedure bias	14.4	8.2	2.0	-	-
B background	11.2	2.3	3.3	5.0	2.2
Detector charge bias	-	-	-	1.0	0.9
Total fit error	21.1	9.3	5.1	6.1	2.4
Relative efficiency error	11.6%	7.2%	7.0%	-	-

are obtained from a topologically similar control sample of fully reconstructed $B^0 \rightarrow D^- \rho^+$ decays. For the $B^+ \rightarrow \rho^+ \pi^0$ channel we also use $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \pi^0$ decays to estimate the uncertainty in the ΔE model. We vary the signal parameters, that are fixed in the fit, within their estimated errors and assign the effects on the signal yields and charge asymmetries as systematic errors. The expected yields from the B -background modes are varied according to the uncertainties in the measured or estimated branching fractions. Since B -background modes may exhibit direct CP violation, the corresponding charge asymmetries are varied within their physical ranges. For $B^0 \rightarrow \rho^0 \pi^0$, the systematic uncertainty due to interference with $B^0 \rightarrow \rho^+ \pi^-$ is found to be 1.5 events. This is obtained by repeating the fit to data, after removing the cut on $m(\pi^\pm \pi^0)$. Systematic errors due to possible nonresonant $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0$ decays are derived from experimental limits [5]. Contributions from nonresonant $B^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0 \pi^0$ for the $\rho^+ \pi^0$ mode and $B^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+$ for the $\rho^0 \pi^+$ mode are estimated to be negligible. For the $B^+ \rightarrow \rho^0 \pi^+$ and $B^0 \rightarrow \rho^0 \pi^0$ decay modes, systematic uncertainties due to interference between ρ^0 and $f_0(980)$ or a possible broad scalar $\sigma(400 - 1200)$ were also studied and found to be negligible. Repeating the selection and fit for all three modes, without using the ρ -candidate mass and helicity angle, gives results that are compatible with those reported here. In the $B^+ \rightarrow \rho^0 \pi^+$ case, the analysis was repeated in the region $|\cos \theta_\rho| < 0.25$, and the resulting signal yield was consistent with zero.

After correcting for the fit biases we find from the maximum likelihood fits the event yields, $N(\rho^+ \pi^0) = 169.0 \pm 28.7$, $N(\rho^0 \pi^+) = 237.9 \pm 26.5$, and $N(\rho^0 \pi^0) = 24.9 \pm 11.5$, where the errors are statistical only. Figure 1 shows distributions of m_{ES} and ΔE , enhanced in signal content by cuts on the signal-to-continuum likelihood ratios of the other discriminating variables. The statistical significance of the previously unobserved $B^+ \rightarrow \rho^+ \pi^0$ signal amounts to 7.3σ , computed as $\sqrt{2\Delta \log \mathcal{L}}$, where $\Delta \log \mathcal{L}$ is the log-likelihood difference between a signal hypothesis corresponding to the bias-corrected yield and a signal hypothesis corresponding to a yield that equals one standard deviation of the systematic error. We find the




FIG. 1: Distributions of m_{ES} and ΔE for samples enhanced in $\rho^0 \pi^\pm$ signal (a,b), $\rho^\pm \pi^0$ signal (c,d) and $\rho^0 \pi^0$ signal (e,f). The solid curve represents a projection of the maximum likelihood fit result. The dashed curve represents the contribution from continuum events, and the dotted line indicates the combined contributions from continuum events and B -related backgrounds.

branching fractions to be

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow \rho^+ \pi^0) &= (10.9 \pm 1.9 \pm 1.9) \times 10^{-6}, \\
 \mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow \rho^0 \pi^+) &= (9.5 \pm 1.1 \pm 0.8) \times 10^{-6}, \\
 \mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow \rho^0 \pi^0) &= (1.4 \pm 0.6 \pm 0.3) \times 10^{-6},
 \end{aligned}$$

where the first errors are statistical and the second systematic. The systematic errors include the uncertainties in the efficiencies, which are dominated by the uncertainty in the π^0 reconstruction efficiency and in the case of $\rho^0 \pi^+$, by the uncertainty due to particle identification.

Here we define the $B^0 \rightarrow \rho^0 \pi^0$ branching ratio by including those events that pass our selection and are fitted as signal but excluding those events that can be interpreted as $B^0 \rightarrow \rho^+ \pi^-$ with a ρ^+ , whose mass is closer to $0.77 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ than the mass of the reconstructed ρ^0 . The signal significance for $\rho^0 \pi^0$, including statistical and systematic errors, is 2.1σ , and we use a limit setting procedure similar to Ref. [11] to obtain a 90% Confidence-Level upper limit on its branching fraction. Fits on MC samples are used to find the signal hypothesis for which the ratio of the probability that the fitted signal yield is less than that observed in data, and the probability that the fitted yield is less than that in data under the null signal hypothesis, is 0.1. This signal hypothesis is shifted up by one sigma of the systematic error and the efficiency

is shifted down also by one sigma. This method gives an upper limit of $\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow \rho^0\pi^0) < 2.9 \times 10^{-6}$.

Theoretical predictions of the ratio of branching fractions $R \equiv \mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow \rho^\pm\pi^\mp)/\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow \rho^0\pi^+)$, vary over a wide range. Tree level estimates suggest $R \simeq 6$ [12], while the inclusion of penguin contributions, off-shell B^* excited states and scalar $\pi^+\pi^-$ resonances leads to lower values, $R \simeq 2 - 3$ [13]. Using the measured $B^+ \rightarrow \rho^0\pi^+$ branching fraction and the $B^0 \rightarrow \rho^\pm\pi^\mp$ branching fraction from Ref. [1] we find $R = 2.38_{-0.31}^{+0.37}(\text{stat})_{-0.20}^{+0.24}(\text{syst})$, which is in agreement with previous experimental results [5].

For the charged B decays we find the charge asymmetries, $A_{CP}^{\rho^+\pi^0} = 0.24 \pm 0.16 \pm 0.06$, $A_{CP}^{\rho^0\pi^+} = -0.19 \pm 0.11 \pm 0.02$, with contributions to the systematic errors listed in Table II.

In summary, we have presented measurements of branching fractions and CP -violating charge asymmetries in $B^+ \rightarrow \rho^+\pi^0$ and $B^+ \rightarrow \rho^0\pi^+$ decays, and a search for the decay $B^0 \rightarrow \rho^0\pi^0$. We observe the decay $B^+ \rightarrow \rho^+\pi^0$ with a statistical significance of 7.3σ . We also find a branching fraction for $B^+ \rightarrow \rho^0\pi^+$ that is consistent with previous measurements [5], and set an upper limit for $B^0 \rightarrow \rho^0\pi^0$. We do not observe evidence for direct CP violation.

We are grateful for the excellent luminosity and machine conditions provided by our PEP-II colleagues, and for the substantial dedicated effort from the computing organizations that support BABAR. The collaborating institutions wish to thank SLAC for its support and kind hospitality. This work is supported by DOE and NSF (USA), NSERC (Canada), IHEP (China), CEA and CNRS-IN2P3 (France), BMBF and DFG (Germany), INFN (Italy), FOM (The Netherlands), NFR (Norway), MIST (Russia), and PPARC (United Kingdom). Individuals have received support from the A. P. Sloan Foundation, Research Corporation, and Alexander von Hum-

boldt Foundation.

* Also with Università della Basilicata, Potenza, Italy

† Also with IFIC, Instituto de Física Corpuscular, CSIC-Universidad de Valencia, Valencia, Spain

‡ Deceased

- [1] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, hep-ex/0306030, submitted to Phys. Rev. Lett. (2003).
- [2] N. Cabibbo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **10**, 531 (1963); M. Kobayashi, T. Maskawa, Prog. Th. Phys. **49**, 652 (1973).
- [3] H.J. Lipkin, Y. Nir, H.R. Quinn and A. Snyder, Phys. Rev. **D44**, 1454 (1991).
- [4] If not otherwise stated, charge conjugate modes are implied throughout this document.
- [5] CLEO Collaboration, C.P. Jessop *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 2881 (2000); Belle Collaboration, A. Gordon *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B542**, 183 (2002).
- [6] R. Aleksan, I. Dunietz, B. Kayser and F. Le Diberder, Nucl. Phys. **B361**, 141 (1991).
- [7] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods **A479**, 1 (2002).
- [8] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D66**, 032003 (2002).
- [9] Particle Data Group, K. Hagiwara *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D66**, 010001 (2002).
- [10] ARGUS Collaboration, H. Albrecht *et al.*, Z. Phys. **C48**, 543 (1990).
- [11] ALEPH, DELPHI, L3 and OPAL Collaborations, the LEP working group for Higgs boson searches, CERN-EP/98-046 (1998).
- [12] M. Bauer, B. Stech and M. Wirbel, Z. Phys. **C34**, 103 (1987).
- [13] A. Deandrea and A. D. Polosa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 216(2001); J. Tandean and S. Gardner Phys. Rev. **D66**, 034019(2002); S. Gardner and U.-G. Meißner Phys. Rev. **D65**, 094004(2002).