



University of
Massachusetts
Amherst

Measurements of branching fractions and CP-violating asymmetries in $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$, $K^+\pi^-$, K^+K^- decays

Item Type	article
DOI	10.1103/PhysRevLett.89.281802
Download date	2026-05-17 17:45:36
Link to Item	https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14394/4925

Measurements of Branching Fractions and CP -violating Asymmetries in $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-, K^+\pi^-, K^+K^-$ Decays

B. Aubert,¹ D. Boutigny,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 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 J. F. Kral,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 T. J. Harrison,⁶ C. M. Hawkes,⁶ D. J. Knowles,⁶ S. W. O'Neale,⁶ R. C. Penny,⁶ A. T. Watson,⁶
N. K. Watson,⁶ T. Deppermann,⁷ K. Goetzen,⁷ H. Koch,⁷ B. Lewandowski,⁷ K. Peters,⁷ H. Schmuecker,⁷
M. Steinke,⁷ N. R. Barlow,⁸ W. Bhimji,⁸ J. T. Boyd,⁸ N. Chevalier,⁸ P. J. Clark,⁸ W. N. Cottingham,⁸ C. Mackay,⁸
F. F. Wilson,⁸ K. Abe,⁹ C. Hearty,⁹ T. S. Mattison,⁹ J. A. McKenna,⁹ D. Thiessen,⁹ S. Jolly,¹⁰ A. K. McKemey,¹⁰
V. E. Blinov,¹¹ A. D. Bukin,¹¹ A. R. Buzykaev,¹¹ V. B. Golubev,¹¹ V. N. Ivanchenko,¹¹ A. A. Korol,¹¹
E. A. Kravchenko,¹¹ A. P. Onuchin,¹¹ S. I. Serebnyakov,¹¹ Yu. I. Skovpen,¹¹ A. N. Yushkov,¹¹ D. Best,¹²
M. Chao,¹² D. Kirkby,¹² A. J. Lankford,¹² M. Mandelkern,¹² S. McMahon,¹² D. P. Stoker,¹² C. Buchanan,¹³
S. Chun,¹³ H. K. Hadavand,¹⁴ E. J. Hill,¹⁴ D. B. MacFarlane,¹⁴ H. Paar,¹⁴ S. Prell,¹⁴ Sh. Rahatlou,¹⁴ G. Raven,¹⁴
U. Schwanke,¹⁴ V. Sharma,¹⁴ J. W. Berryhill,¹⁵ C. Campagnari,¹⁵ B. Dahmes,¹⁵ P. A. Hart,¹⁵ N. Kuznetsova,¹⁵
S. L. Levy,¹⁵ O. Long,¹⁵ A. Lu,¹⁵ M. A. Mazur,¹⁵ J. D. Richman,¹⁵ W. Verkerke,¹⁵ J. Beringer,¹⁶ A. M. Eisner,¹⁶
M. Grothe,¹⁶ C. A. Heusch,¹⁶ W. S. Lockman,¹⁶ T. Pulliam,¹⁶ T. Schalk,¹⁶ R. E. Schmitz,¹⁶ B. A. Schumm,¹⁶
A. Seiden,¹⁶ M. Turri,¹⁶ W. Walkowiak,¹⁶ D. C. Williams,¹⁶ M. G. Wilson,¹⁶ E. Chen,¹⁷ G. P. Dubois-Felsmann,¹⁷
A. Dvoretzkii,¹⁷ D. G. Hitlin,¹⁷ F. C. Porter,¹⁷ A. Ryd,¹⁷ A. Samuel,¹⁷ S. Yang,¹⁷ S. Jayatilake,¹⁸ G. Mancinelli,¹⁸
B. T. Meadows,¹⁸ M. D. Sokoloff,¹⁸ T. Barillari,¹⁹ P. Bloom,¹⁹ W. T. Ford,¹⁹ U. Nauenberg,¹⁹ A. Olivas,¹⁹
P. Rankin,¹⁹ J. Roy,¹⁹ J. G. Smith,¹⁹ W. C. van Hoek,¹⁹ L. Zhang,¹⁹ J. L. Harton,²⁰ T. Hu,²⁰ M. Krishnamurthy,²⁰
A. Soffer,²⁰ W. H. Toki,²⁰ R. J. Wilson,²⁰ J. Zhang,²⁰ D. Altenburg,²¹ T. Brandt,²¹ J. Brose,²¹ T. Colberg,²¹
M. Dickopp,²¹ R. S. Dubitzky,²¹ A. Hauke,²¹ E. Maly,²¹ R. Müller-Pfefferkorn,²¹ S. Otto,²¹ K. R. Schubert,²¹
R. Schwierz,²¹ B. Spaan,²¹ L. Wilden,²¹ D. Bernard,²² G. R. Bonneaud,²² F. Brochard,²² J. Cohen-Tanugi,²²
S. Ferrag,²² S. T'Jampens,²² Ch. Thiebaux,²² G. Vasileiadis,²² M. Verderi,²² A. Anjomshoaa,²³ R. Bernet,²³
A. Khan,²³ D. Lavin,²³ F. Muheim,²³ S. Playfer,²³ J. E. Swain,²³ J. Tinslay,²³ M. Falbo,²⁴ C. Borean,²⁵ C. Bozzi,²⁵
L. Piemontese,²⁵ A. Sarti,²⁵ E. Treadwell,²⁶ F. Anulli,^{27,*} R. Baldini-Ferrolì,²⁷ A. Calcaterra,²⁷ R. de Sangro,²⁷
D. Falciari,²⁷ G. Finocchiaro,²⁷ P. Patteri,²⁷ I. M. Peruzzi,^{27,*} M. Piccolo,²⁷ A. Zallo,²⁷ S. Bagnasco,²⁸ A. Buzzo,²⁸
R. Contri,²⁸ G. Crosetti,²⁸ M. Lo Vetere,²⁸ M. Macri,²⁸ M. R. Monge,²⁸ S. Passaggio,²⁸ F. C. Pastore,²⁸
C. Patrignani,²⁸ E. Robutti,²⁸ A. Santroni,²⁸ S. Tosi,²⁸ S. Bailey,²⁹ M. Morii,²⁹ R. Bartoldus,³⁰ G. J. Grenier,³⁰
U. Mallik,³⁰ J. Cochran,³¹ H. B. Crawley,³¹ J. Lamsa,³¹ W. T. Meyer,³¹ E. I. Rosenberg,³¹ J. Yi,³¹ M. Davier,³²
G. Grosdidier,³² A. Höcker,³² H. M. Lacker,³² S. Laplace,³² F. Le Diberder,³² V. Lepeltier,³² A. M. Lutz,³²
T. C. Petersen,³² S. Plaszczynski,³² M. H. Schune,³² L. Tantot,³² S. Trincaz-Duvoid,³² G. Wormser,³²
R. M. Bionta,³³ V. Brigljević,³³ D. J. Lange,³³ K. van Bibber,³³ D. M. Wright,³³ A. J. Bevan,³⁴ J. R. Fry,³⁴
E. Gabathuler,³⁴ R. Gamet,³⁴ M. George,³⁴ M. Kay,³⁴ D. J. Payne,³⁴ R. J. Sloane,³⁴ C. Touramanis,³⁴
M. L. Aspinwall,³⁵ D. A. Bowerman,³⁵ P. D. Dauncey,³⁵ U. Egede,³⁵ I. Eschrich,³⁵ G. W. Morton,³⁵ J. A. Nash,³⁵
P. Sanders,³⁵ D. Smith,³⁵ G. P. Taylor,³⁵ J. J. Back,³⁶ G. Bellodi,³⁶ P. Dixon,³⁶ P. F. Harrison,³⁶ R. J. L. Potter,³⁶
H. W. Shorthouse,³⁶ P. Strother,³⁶ P. B. Vidal,³⁶ G. Cowan,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 R. J. Barlow,³⁹ A. C. Forti,³⁹ F. Jackson,³⁹ G. D. Lafferty,³⁹ A. J. Lyon,³⁹
N. Savvas,³⁹ J. H. Weatherall,³⁹ J. C. Williams,³⁹ A. Farbin,⁴⁰ A. Jawahery,⁴⁰ V. Lillard,⁴⁰ D. A. Roberts,⁴⁰
J. R. Schieck,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 H. Staengle,⁴¹ S. Willcoq,⁴¹ B. Brau,⁴² R. Cowan,⁴² G. Sciolla,⁴² F. Taylor,⁴² R. K. Yamamoto,⁴²

M. Milek,⁴³ P. M. Patel,⁴³ F. Palombo,⁴⁴ J. M. Bauer,⁴⁵ L. Cremaldi,⁴⁵ V. Eschenburg,⁴⁵ R. Kroeger,⁴⁵ J. Reidy,⁴⁵ D. A. Sanders,⁴⁵ D. J. Summers,⁴⁵ C. Hast,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 J. M. LoSecco,⁴⁹ J. R. G. Alsmiller,⁵⁰ T. A. Gabriel,⁵⁰ J. Brau,⁵¹ R. Frey,⁵¹ M. Iwasaki,⁵¹ C. T. Potter,⁵¹ N. B. Sinev,⁵¹ D. Strom,⁵¹ E. Torrence,⁵¹ F. Colecchia,⁵² A. Dorigo,⁵² F. Galeazzi,⁵² M. Margoni,⁵² M. Morandin,⁵² M. Posocco,⁵² M. Rotondo,⁵² F. Simonetto,⁵² R. Stroili,⁵² C. Voci,⁵² M. Benayoun,⁵³ H. Briand,⁵³ J. Chauveau,⁵³ P. David,⁵³ Ch. de la Vaissière,⁵³ L. Del Buono,⁵³ O. Hamon,⁵³ Ph. Leruste,⁵³ J. Ocariz,⁵³ M. Pivk,⁵³ L. Roos,⁵³ J. Stark,⁵³ P. F. Manfredi,⁵⁴ V. Re,⁵⁴ V. Speziali,⁵⁴ L. Gladney,⁵⁵ Q. H. Guo,⁵⁵ J. Panetta,⁵⁵ C. Angelini,⁵⁶ G. Batignani,⁵⁶ S. Bettarini,⁵⁶ M. Bondioli,⁵⁶ F. Bucci,⁵⁶ G. Calderini,⁵⁶ E. Campagna,⁵⁶ M. Carpinelli,⁵⁶ F. Forti,⁵⁶ M. A. Giorgi,⁵⁶ A. Lusiani,⁵⁶ G. Marchiori,⁵⁶ F. Martinez-Vidal,⁵⁶ M. Morganti,⁵⁶ N. Neri,⁵⁶ E. Paoloni,⁵⁶ M. Rama,⁵⁶ G. Rizzo,⁵⁶ F. Sandrelli,⁵⁶ G. Triggiani,⁵⁶ J. Walsh,⁵⁶ M. Haire,⁵⁷ D. Judd,⁵⁷ K. Paick,⁵⁷ L. Turnbull,⁵⁷ D. E. Wagoner,⁵⁷ J. Albert,⁵⁸ N. Danielson,⁵⁸ P. Elmer,⁵⁸ C. Lu,⁵⁸ V. Miftakov,⁵⁸ J. Olsen,⁵⁸ S. F. Schaffner,⁵⁸ A. J. S. Smith,⁵⁸ A. Tumanov,⁵⁸ E. W. Varnes,⁵⁸ F. Bellini,⁵⁹ G. Cavoto,^{58,59} D. del Re,⁵⁹ R. Faccini,^{14,59} F. Ferrarotto,⁵⁹ F. Ferroni,⁵⁹ E. Leonardi,⁵⁹ M. A. Mazzoni,⁵⁹ S. Morganti,⁵⁹ G. Piredda,⁵⁹ F. Safai Tehrani,⁵⁹ M. Serra,⁵⁹ C. Voena,⁵⁹ S. Christ,⁶⁰ G. Wagner,⁶⁰ R. Waldi,⁶⁰ T. Adye,⁶¹ N. De Groot,⁶¹ B. Franek,⁶¹ N. I. Geddes,⁶¹ G. P. Gopal,⁶¹ S. M. Xella,⁶¹ R. Aleksan,⁶² S. Emery,⁶² A. Gaidot,⁶² P.-F. Giraud,⁶² G. Hamel de Monchenault,⁶² W. Kozanecki,⁶² M. Langer,⁶² G. W. London,⁶² B. Mayer,⁶² G. Schott,⁶² B. Serfass,⁶² G. Vasseur,⁶² Ch. Yeche,⁶² M. Zito,⁶² M. V. Purohit,⁶³ A. W. Weidemann,⁶³ F. X. Yumiceva,⁶³ I. Adam,⁶⁴ D. Aston,⁶⁴ N. Berger,⁶⁴ A. M. Boyarski,⁶⁴ M. R. Convery,⁶⁴ D. P. Coupal,⁶⁴ D. Dong,⁶⁴ J. Dorfan,⁶⁴ W. Dunwoodie,⁶⁴ R. C. Field,⁶⁴ T. Glanzman,⁶⁴ S. J. Gowdy,⁶⁴ E. Grauges,⁶⁴ T. Haas,⁶⁴ T. Hadig,⁶⁴ V. Halyo,⁶⁴ T. Himel,⁶⁴ T. Hryn'ova,⁶⁴ M. E. Huffer,⁶⁴ W. R. Innes,⁶⁴ C. P. Jessop,⁶⁴ M. H. Kelsey,⁶⁴ P. Kim,⁶⁴ M. L. Kocian,⁶⁴ U. Langenegger,⁶⁴ D. W. G. S. Leith,⁶⁴ S. Luitz,⁶⁴ V. Luth,⁶⁴ H. L. Lynch,⁶⁴ H. Marsiske,⁶⁴ S. Menke,⁶⁴ R. Messner,⁶⁴ D. R. Muller,⁶⁴ C. P. O'Grady,⁶⁴ V. E. Ozcan,⁶⁴ A. Perazzo,⁶⁴ M. Perl,⁶⁴ S. Petrak,⁶⁴ H. Quinn,⁶⁴ B. N. Ratcliff,⁶⁴ S. H. Robertson,⁶⁴ A. Roodman,⁶⁴ A. A. Salnikov,⁶⁴ T. Schietinger,⁶⁴ R. H. Schindler,⁶⁴ J. Schwiening,⁶⁴ G. Simi,⁶⁴ A. Snyder,⁶⁴ A. Soha,⁶⁴ S. M. Spanier,⁶⁴ J. Stelzer,⁶⁴ D. Su,⁶⁴ M. K. Sullivan,⁶⁴ H. A. Tanaka,⁶⁴ J. Va'vra,⁶⁴ S. R. Wagner,⁶⁴ M. Weaver,⁶⁴ A. J. R. Weinstein,⁶⁴ W. J. Wisniewski,⁶⁴ D. H. Wright,⁶⁴ C. C. Young,⁶⁴ P. R. Burchat,⁶⁵ C. H. Cheng,⁶⁵ T. I. Meyer,⁶⁵ C. Roat,⁶⁵ R. Henderson,⁶⁶ W. Bugg,⁶⁷ H. Cohn,⁶⁷ J. M. Izen,⁶⁸ I. Kitayama,⁶⁸ X. C. Lou,⁶⁸ F. Bianchi,⁶⁹ M. Bona,⁶⁹ D. Gamba,⁶⁹ L. Bosisio,⁷⁰ G. Della Ricca,⁷⁰ S. Dittongo,⁷⁰ L. Lanceri,⁷⁰ P. Poropat,⁷⁰ L. Vitale,⁷⁰ G. Vuagnin,⁷⁰ R. S. Panvini,⁷¹ S. W. Banerjee,⁷² C. M. Brown,⁷² D. Fortin,⁷² P. D. Jackson,⁷² R. Kowalewski,⁷² J. M. Roney,⁷² H. R. Band,⁷³ S. Dasu,⁷³ M. Datta,⁷³ A. M. Eichenbaum,⁷³ H. Hu,⁷³ J. R. Johnson,⁷³ R. Liu,⁷³ F. Di Lodovico,⁷³ A. Mohapatra,⁷³ Y. Pan,⁷³ R. Prepost,⁷³ I. J. Scott,⁷³ S. J. Sekula,⁷³ J. H. von Wimmersperg-Toeller,⁷³ J. Wu,⁷³ S. L. Wu,⁷³ Z. Yu,⁷³ and H. Neal⁷⁴

(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 San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093, USA

¹⁵University of California at Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, CA 93106, USA

¹⁶University of California at Santa Cruz, Institute for Particle Physics, Santa Cruz, CA 95064, USA

¹⁷California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91125, USA

¹⁸University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH 45221, USA

¹⁹University of Colorado, Boulder, CO 80309, USA

²⁰Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80523, USA

²¹Technische Universität Dresden, Institut für Kern- und Teilchenphysik, D-01062 Dresden, Germany

²²Ecole Polytechnique, LLR, F-91128 Palaiseau, France

- ²³University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH9 3JZ, United Kingdom
²⁴Elon University, Elon University, NC 27244-2010, USA
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
³⁰University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA 52242, USA
³¹Iowa State University, Ames, IA 50011-3160, USA
³²Laboratoire de l'Accélérateur Linéaire, F-91898 Orsay, France
³³Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA 94550, USA
³⁴University of Liverpool, Liverpool L69 3BX, United Kingdom
³⁵University of London, Imperial College, London, SW7 2BW, 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
⁴⁹University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN 46556, USA
⁵⁰Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN 37831, USA
⁵¹University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403, USA
⁵²Università di Padova, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-35131 Padova, Italy
⁵³Universités Paris VI et VII, Lab de Physique Nucléaire H. E., F-75252 Paris, France
⁵⁴Università di Pavia, Dipartimento di Elettronica and INFN, I-27100 Pavia, Italy
⁵⁵University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA
⁵⁶Università di Pisa, Scuola Normale Superiore and INFN, I-56010 Pisa, Italy
⁵⁷Prairie View A&M University, Prairie View, TX 77446, USA
⁵⁸Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA
⁵⁹Università di Roma La Sapienza, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-00185 Roma, Italy
⁶⁰Universität Rostock, D-18051 Rostock, Germany
⁶¹Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Chilton, Didcot, Oxon, OX11 0QX, United Kingdom
⁶²DAPNIA, Commissariat à l'Energie Atomique/Saclay, F-91191 Gif-sur-Yvette, France
⁶³University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC 29208, USA
⁶⁴Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, Stanford, CA 94309, USA
⁶⁵Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305-4060, USA
⁶⁶TRIUMF, Vancouver, BC, Canada V6T 2A3
⁶⁷University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37996, USA
⁶⁸University of Texas at Dallas, Richardson, TX 75083, USA
⁶⁹Università di Torino, Dipartimento di Fisica Sperimentale and INFN, I-10125 Torino, Italy
⁷⁰Università di Trieste, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-34127 Trieste, Italy
⁷¹Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN 37235, USA
⁷²University of Victoria, Victoria, BC, Canada V8W 3P6
⁷³University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI 53706, USA
⁷⁴Yale University, New Haven, CT 06511, USA

(Dated: November 9, 2018)

We present measurements of branching fractions and CP -violating asymmetries for neutral B meson decays to two-body final states of charged pions and kaons based on a sample of about 88 million $\Upsilon(4S) \rightarrow B\bar{B}$ decays. From a time-independent fit we measure the charge-averaged branching fractions $\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-) = (4.7 \pm 0.6 \pm 0.2) \times 10^{-6}$, $\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow K^+\pi^-) = (17.9 \pm 0.9 \pm 0.7) \times 10^{-6}$, and the direct CP -violating charge asymmetry $\mathcal{A}_{K\pi} = -0.102 \pm 0.050 \pm 0.016$ $[-0.188, -0.016]$, where the ranges in square brackets indicate the 90% confidence intervals. From a time-dependent fit we measure the $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ CP -violating parameters $S_{\pi\pi} = 0.02 \pm 0.34 \pm 0.05$ $[-0.54, +0.58]$ and $C_{\pi\pi} = -0.30 \pm 0.25 \pm 0.04$ $[-0.72, +0.12]$.

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

Recent measurements of the CP -violating asymmetry parameter $\sin 2\beta$ reported by the *BABAR* [1] and Belle [2] Collaborations established CP violation in neutral B decays. These results are consistent with the Standard Model (SM) expectation based on indirect constraints on the magnitudes of the elements of the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa [3] quark-mixing matrix. However, a full test of the CP violation mechanism in the SM, through a single complex phase in the CKM matrix, will require additional direct constraints on the angles (α , β , and γ) of the Unitarity Triangle [4].

The time-dependent CP -violating asymmetry in the decay $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ is related to the angle α , and ratios of branching fractions for various $\pi\pi$ and $K\pi$ decay modes are sensitive to the angle γ . In this Letter we present results for branching fractions and CP -violating asymmetries in $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$, $K^+\pi^-$, and K^+K^- decays [5] using a sample of 87.9 ± 1.0 million $B\bar{B}$ pairs. A detailed description of the *BABAR* detector is presented in Ref. [6], and more details on the analysis technique are given in Refs. [7], which describe our previous measurements of these quantities. Other measurements of the branching fractions and the charge asymmetry in $B^0 \rightarrow K^+\pi^-$ have been performed by the CLEO and Belle Collaborations [8]. More recently, the Belle Collaboration reported a measurement of the time-dependent CP asymmetry in $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ [9].

We reconstruct a sample of neutral B mesons (B_{rec}) decaying to the $h^+h'^-$ final state, where h and h' refer to π or K . Signal yields are determined with a maximum likelihood fit including kinematic, topological, and particle identification information. For the $K^\mp\pi^\pm$ components, the yield is parameterized as $N_{K^\mp\pi^\pm} = N_{K\pi}(1 \pm \mathcal{A}_{K\pi})/2$, where $N_{K\pi}$ is the total yield and $\mathcal{A}_{K\pi} \equiv (N_{K^-\pi^+} - N_{K^+\pi^-})/(N_{K^-\pi^+} + N_{K^+\pi^-})$ is the CP -violating charge asymmetry. The asymmetry arises from interference between the $b \rightarrow s$ penguin and $b \rightarrow u$ tree amplitudes, and is predicted [10, 11] to be less than 20% in the Standard Model. However, a larger asymmetry could be induced by new particles, such as charged Higgs bosons or supersymmetric particles, contributing to the penguin amplitude.

In order to extract the CP asymmetry parameters in $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ decay, we examine each event in the B_{rec} sample to determine whether the second B meson (B_{tag}) decayed as a B^0 or \bar{B}^0 (flavor tag) and reconstruct the difference Δt between the proper decay times of the B_{rec} and B_{tag} decays. The decay rate distribution f_+ (f_-) when $h^+h'^- = \pi^+\pi^-$ and $B_{\text{tag}} = B^0$ (\bar{B}^0) is given by

$$f_{\pm}(\Delta t) = \frac{e^{-|\Delta t|/\tau}}{4\tau} [1 \pm S_{\pi\pi} \sin(\Delta m_d \Delta t) \mp C_{\pi\pi} \cos(\Delta m_d \Delta t)], \quad (1)$$

where τ is the mean B^0 lifetime and Δm_d is the mixing frequency due to the eigenstate mass difference. The

parameters $S_{\pi\pi}$ and $C_{\pi\pi}$ are defined as

$$S_{\pi\pi} \equiv \frac{2\text{Im}\lambda}{1 + |\lambda|^2} \quad \text{and} \quad C_{\pi\pi} \equiv \frac{1 - |\lambda|^2}{1 + |\lambda|^2}, \quad (2)$$

and vanish in the absence of CP violation. If the decay proceeds purely through the $b \rightarrow u$ tree amplitude, the complex parameter λ is given by

$$\lambda(B \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-) = \left(\frac{V_{tb}^* V_{td}}{V_{tb} V_{td}^*} \right) \left(\frac{V_{ud}^* V_{ub}}{V_{ud} V_{ub}^*} \right). \quad (3)$$

In this case $C_{\pi\pi} = 0$ and $S_{\pi\pi} = \sin 2\alpha$, where $\alpha \equiv \arg[-V_{td}V_{tb}^*/V_{ud}V_{ub}^*]$. In general, the $b \rightarrow d$ penguin amplitude modifies both the magnitude and phase of λ , so that $C_{\pi\pi} \neq 0$ and $S_{\pi\pi} = \sqrt{1 - C_{\pi\pi}^2} \sin 2\alpha_{\text{eff}}$, where α_{eff} depends on the magnitudes and relative strong and weak phases of the tree and penguin amplitudes. Several approaches have been proposed to obtain information on α in the presence of penguins [10, 12].

The event selection and B_{rec} reconstruction used in this analysis are similar to those used in Ref. [7]. Hadronic events are selected based on charged particle multiplicity and event topology. Candidate B_{rec} decays are reconstructed from pairs of oppositely-charged tracks forming a good quality vertex, where the B_{rec} four-momentum is calculated with the pion mass assumed for both tracks.

Signal decays are identified kinematically using two variables, the difference ΔE between the center-of-mass (CM) energy of the B_{rec} candidate and $\sqrt{s}/2$, and the beam-energy substituted mass $m_{\text{ES}} = \sqrt{(s/2 + \mathbf{p}_i \cdot \mathbf{p}_B)^2/E_i^2 - \mathbf{p}_B^2}$, where \sqrt{s} is the total CM energy, and the B_{rec} momentum \mathbf{p}_B and the four-momentum of the initial state (E_i, \mathbf{p}_i) are defined in the laboratory frame. For signal decays ΔE and m_{ES} are Gaussian distributed with resolutions of 26 MeV and 2.6 MeV/ c^2 , respectively. For $\pi^+\pi^-$ decays ΔE peaks near zero, while for decays with one or two kaons the ΔE peak position is parameterized as a function of the kaon momenta in the laboratory frame, with an average shift of -45 MeV and -91 MeV, respectively. The distribution of m_{ES} peaks near the B mass. We require $5.20 < m_{\text{ES}} < 5.29$ GeV/ c^2 and $|\Delta E| < 0.15$ GeV.

Identification of $h^+h'^-$ tracks as pions or kaons is accomplished with the Cherenkov angle measurement θ_c from a detector of internally reflected Cherenkov light. We construct charge-dependent double-Gaussian probability density functions (PDFs) from the difference between measured and expected values of θ_c for the pion or kaon hypothesis, normalized by the error σ_{θ_c} . The PDF parameters are measured in a sample of $D^{*+} \rightarrow D^0\pi^+$, $D^0 \rightarrow K^-\pi^+$ decays, reconstructed in data. The typical separation between pions and kaons varies from $8\sigma_{\theta_c}$ at 2 GeV/ c to $2.5\sigma_{\theta_c}$ at 4 GeV/ c .

We have studied potential backgrounds from other B decays and find them to be negligible. Backgrounds from

TABLE I: Average tagging efficiency ϵ , average mistag fraction w , mistag fraction difference $\Delta w = w(B^0) - w(\bar{B}^0)$, and effective tagging efficiency Q for signal events in each tagging category. The quantities are measured in the B_{flav} sample.

Category	ϵ (%)	w (%)	Δw (%)	Q (%)
Lepton	9.1 ± 0.2	3.3 ± 0.7	-1.6 ± 1.3	8.0 ± 0.3
Kaon I	16.6 ± 0.2	9.5 ± 0.7	-2.8 ± 1.3	10.7 ± 0.4
Kaon II	19.8 ± 0.3	20.6 ± 0.8	-5.3 ± 1.3	6.7 ± 0.4
Inclusive	20.1 ± 0.3	31.7 ± 0.9	-2.6 ± 1.4	2.7 ± 0.3
Untagged	34.4 ± 0.5			
Total Q				28.4 ± 0.7

the process $e^+e^- \rightarrow q\bar{q}$ ($q = u, d, s, c$) are suppressed by their topology. In the CM frame we define the angle θ_S between the sphericity axis of the B candidate and the sphericity axis of the remaining particles in the event, and require $|\cos\theta_S| < 0.8$, which removes 83% of this background. For these particles we also define a Fisher discriminant $\mathcal{F} = 0.53 - 0.60 \times \sum_i p_i^* + 1.27 \times \sum_i p_i^* |\cos(\theta_i^*)|^2$ where p_i^* is the momentum of particle i and θ_i^* is the angle between its momentum and the B_{rec} thrust axis in the CM frame. The shapes of \mathcal{F} for signal and background events are included as PDFs in the maximum likelihood fit.

We use a multivariate technique [13] to determine the flavor of the B_{tag} meson. Separate neural networks are trained to identify primary leptons, kaons, soft pions from D^* decays, and high-momentum charged particles from B decays. Events are assigned to one of five mutually exclusive tagging categories based on the estimated mistag probability and the source of the tagging information (Table I). The quality of tagging is expressed in terms of the effective efficiency $Q = \sum_k \epsilon_k (1 - 2w_k)^2$, where ϵ_k and w_k are the efficiencies and mistag probabilities, respectively, for events tagged in category k . Table I summarizes the tagging performance measured in a data sample B_{flav} of fully reconstructed neutral B decays to $D^{(*)-}(\pi^+, \rho^+, a_1^+)$. The assumption of equal tagging efficiencies and mistag probabilities for signal $\pi^+\pi^-$, $K^+\pi^-$, and K^+K^- decays is validated in a detailed Monte Carlo simulation. The background hypothesis have separate tagging efficiencies.

The time difference Δt is obtained from the known boost of the e^+e^- system and the measured distance between the z positions of the B_{rec} and B_{tag} decay vertices. A detailed description of the algorithm is given in Ref. [14]. We require $|\Delta t| < 20$ ps and $\sigma_{\Delta t} < 2.5$ ps, where $\sigma_{\Delta t}$ is the error on Δt . The resolution function for signal candidates is a sum of three Gaussians, identical to the one described in Ref. [13], with parameters determined from a fit to the B_{flav} sample (including events in all five tagging categories). The background Δt distribu-

tion is modeled as the sum of an exponential convolved with a Gaussian, with two additional Gaussians to account for tails. Common parameters are used to describe the background shape for all tagging categories. We find that 96% of background events are described by an effective lifetime of approximately 0.7 ps.

We use an unbinned extended maximum likelihood fit to extract yields and CP parameters from the B_{rec} sample. The likelihood for candidate j tagged in category k is obtained by summing the product of event yield N_i , tagging efficiency $\epsilon_{i,k}$, and probability $\mathcal{P}_{i,k}$ over the eight possible signal and background hypotheses i (referring to $\pi^+\pi^-$, $K^+\pi^-$, $K^-\pi^+$, and K^+K^- decays). The extended likelihood function for category k is

$$\mathcal{L}_k = \exp\left(-\sum_i N_i \epsilon_{i,k}\right) \prod_j \left[\sum_i N_i \epsilon_{i,k} \mathcal{P}_{i,k}(\vec{x}_j; \vec{\alpha}_i)\right]. \quad (4)$$

The probabilities $\mathcal{P}_{i,k}$ are evaluated as the product of PDFs for each of the independent variables $\vec{x}_j = \{m_{\text{ES}}, \Delta E, \mathcal{F}, \theta_c^+, \theta_c^-, \Delta t\}$, where θ_c^+ and θ_c^- are the Cherenkov angles for the positively and negatively charged tracks. We use separate PDF parameters for θ_c^+ and θ_c^- to account for possible systematic differences. The total likelihood \mathcal{L} is the product of likelihoods for each tagging category, and the free parameters are determined by maximizing the quantity $\ln \mathcal{L}$. The fitted sample contains 26070 events.

Signal yields are determined from a fit excluding tagging or Δt information. There are 16 free parameters, including signal and background yields (6 parameters); $K\pi$ asymmetries (2); and parameters for the background shapes in m_{ES} (1), ΔE (2), and \mathcal{F} (5). Table II summarizes signal yields, total efficiencies, charge-averaged branching fractions, and $\mathcal{A}_{K\pi}$. In the efficiency calculation we neglect possible effects due to final state radiation from the B_{rec} decay products. The significance of $\mathcal{A}_{K\pi}$ is 2.0, where significance is defined as the square root of the change in $-2 \log \mathcal{L}$ when $\mathcal{A}_{K\pi}$ is fixed to zero. These results are consistent with our previous measurements [7], and with measurements from other experiments [8]. For the decay $B^0 \rightarrow K^+K^-$ we measure a yield of only 1 ± 8 events and so compute a Bayesian 90% confidence level (C.L.) upper limit on the branching fraction. Ref. [7] gives a detailed description of the method used.

The dominant sources of systematic error on the branching fraction measurements are from possible fit bias (determined in large samples of Monte Carlo simulated events), uncertainty in track and θ_c reconstruction efficiencies, and imperfect knowledge of the PDF shapes. The calculation of selection efficiencies using Monte Carlo simulated decays has been checked against control samples in data and residual uncertainties are included in the systematic error on branching fractions. For $\mathcal{A}_{K\pi}$ the systematic error is dominated by the θ_c PDF shape and possible charge bias in track reconstruction. The total




FIG. 1: Distributions of m_{ES} and ΔE for events enhanced in signal (a), (b) $\pi^+\pi^-$ and (c), (d) $K^\mp\pi^\pm$ decays. Solid curves represent projections of the maximum likelihood fit, dashed curves represent $q\bar{q}$ and $\pi\pi \leftrightarrow K\pi$ cross-feed background.

systematic error is computed as the sum in quadrature of the individual uncertainties.

Figure 1 shows distributions of m_{ES} and ΔE after selecting on probability ratios to enhance the signal purity. The solid curve in each plot represents the fit projection after correcting for the efficiency of the additional selection (52% for $\pi\pi$, 79% for $K\pi$).

The parameters $S_{\pi\pi}$ and $C_{\pi\pi}$ are determined from a second fit including tagging and Δt information, where the B_{flav} sample is included to determine the signal parameters describing tagging information and the Δt resolution function. The Δt PDF for signal $\pi^+\pi^-$ decays is given by Eq. 1, modified to include w_k and Δw_k for each tagging category and convolved with the signal resolution function. We also take into account possible differences in reconstruction and tagging efficiencies between B^0 and \bar{B}^0 mesons. The Δt PDF for signal $K^+\pi^-$ events takes into account $B^0-\bar{B}^0$ mixing based on the charge of the kaon and the flavor of B_{tag} .

A total of 76 parameters are varied in the fit, including the values of $S_{\pi\pi}$ and $C_{\pi\pi}$ (2); signal and background yields (5); $K\pi$ charge asymmetries (2); signal and background tagging efficiencies (16) and efficiency asymmetries (16); signal mistag fraction and mistag fraction differences (8); signal resolution function (9); and parameters for the background shapes in m_{ES} (5), ΔE (2), \mathcal{F} (5), and Δt (6). We assume zero events from $B^0 \rightarrow K^+K^-$ decays and we fix τ_{B^0} and Δm_d to their world average values [15]. As a means of validating the analysis technique, we determine τ and Δm_d in the B_{rec} sample and




FIG. 2: Distributions of Δt for events enhanced in signal $\pi\pi$ decays with B_{tag} tagged as (a) B^0 (N_{B^0}) or (b) \bar{B}^0 ($N_{\bar{B}^0}$), and (c) the asymmetry $[N_{B^0} - N_{\bar{B}^0}] / [N_{B^0} + N_{\bar{B}^0}]$ as a function of Δt . Solid curves represent projections of the maximum likelihood fit, dashed curves represent the sum of $q\bar{q}$ and $K\pi$ background events.

find $\tau = (1.56 \pm 0.07)$ ps and $\Delta m_d = (0.52 \pm 0.05)$ ps $^{-1}$.

The combined fit to the B_{rec} and B_{flav} samples yields

$$S_{\pi\pi} = 0.02 \pm 0.34 \text{ (stat)} \pm 0.05 \text{ (syst)} [-0.54, +0.58],$$

$$C_{\pi\pi} = -0.30 \pm 0.25 \text{ (stat)} \pm 0.04 \text{ (syst)} [-0.72, +0.12],$$

where the range in square brackets indicates the 90% C.L. interval taking into account the systematic errors. The correlation between $S_{\pi\pi}$ and $C_{\pi\pi}$ is -10% . The signal yields determined in this fit are within 3% of the yields obtained from the time-independent fit. Systematic uncertainties on $S_{\pi\pi}$ and $C_{\pi\pi}$ are dominated by imperfect knowledge of the PDF shapes and possible fit bias. We also evaluate multiplicative systematic errors (0.015), which are calculated at one standard deviation and summed in quadrature with the additive systematic uncertainties. Figure 2 shows distributions of Δt for events with B_{tag} tagged as B^0 or \bar{B}^0 , and the asymmetry as a function of Δt for tagged events enhanced in signal $\pi\pi$ decays.

In summary, we have presented updated measurements of branching fractions and CP -violating asymmetries in $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$, $K^+\pi^-$, and K^+K^- decays. These results are consistent with, and supersede our previous measurements [7]. We do not observe large mixing-induced or direct CP violation in the time-dependent asymmetry of $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ decays, as reported in [9].

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),

TABLE II: Summary of results for total detection efficiencies, fitted signal yields N_S , charge-averaged branching fractions \mathcal{B} , and $\mathcal{A}_{K\pi}$. Branching fractions are calculated assuming equal rates for $\Upsilon(4S) \rightarrow B^0\bar{B}^0$ and B^+B^- . The upper limits for $N_{K^+K^-}$ and $\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow K^+K^-)$ correspond to the 90% C.L.

Mode	Efficiency (%)	N_S	$\mathcal{B}(10^{-6})$	$\mathcal{A}_{K\pi}$	$\mathcal{A}_{K\pi}$ 90% C.L.
$\pi^+\pi^-$	38.0 ± 0.8	$157 \pm 19 \pm 7$	$4.7 \pm 0.6 \pm 0.2$		
$K^+\pi^-$	37.5 ± 0.8	$589 \pm 30 \pm 17$	$17.9 \pm 0.9 \pm 0.7$	$-0.102 \pm 0.050 \pm 0.016$	$[-0.188, -0.016]$
K^+K^-	36.2 ± 0.8	$1 \pm 8 (< 16)$	< 0.6		

CEA and CNRS-IN2P3 (France), BMBF and DFG (Germany), INFN (Italy), NFR (Norway), MIST (Russia), and PPARC (United Kingdom). Individuals have received support from the A. P. Sloan Foundation, Research Corporation, and Alexander von Humboldt Foundation.

* Also with Università di Perugia, I-06100 Perugia, Italy

- [1] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 091801 (2001).
- [2] BELLE Collaboration, K. Abe *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 091802 (2001).
- [3] N. Cabibbo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **10**, 531 (1963); M. Kobayashi and T. Maskawa, Prog. Th. Phys. **49**, 652 (1973).
- [4] For a general review see Y. Nir and H. Quinn, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **42**, 211 (1992).
- [5] Unless explicitly stated, charge conjugate decay modes are assumed throughout this paper.
- [6] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Nucl. Instr. and Methods A **479**, 1 (2002).
- [7] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 151802 (2001); Phys. Rev. D **65**, 051502 (2002).
- [8] CLEO Collaboration, S. Chen *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 525 (2000); CLEO Collaboration, D. Cronin-Hennessy *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 515 (2002); Belle Collaboration, B.C.K. Casey *et al.*, hep-ex/0207090, submitted to Phys. Rev. D.
- [9] Belle Collaboration, K. Abe *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 071801 (2002).
- [10] M. Beneke, G. Buchalla, M. Neubert, and C.T. Sachrajda, Nucl. Phys. B **606**, 245 (2001);
- [11] A. Ali, G. Kramer, and C. Lü, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 0140054 (1999); Y.Y. Keum, H-n. Li, and A.I. Sanda, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 054008 (2001); M. Ciuchini *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **515**, 33 (2001).
- [12] M. Gronau and D. London, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 3381 (1990); Y. Grossman and H.R. Quinn, Phys. Rev. D **58**, 017504 (1998); J. Charles, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 054007 (1999); M. Gronau, D. London, N. Sinha, and R. Sinha, Phys. Lett. B **514**, 315 (2001); M. Gronau and J. Rosner, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 053003 (2002); R. Fleischer and J. Matias, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 054009 (2002).
- [13] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, SLAC-PUB-9293, hep-ex/0207042, to appear in Phys. Rev. Lett.
- [14] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 032003 (2002).
- [15] Particle Data Group, K. Hagiwara *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 010001 (2002).