

Observation of $B^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 K^+$ and $B^0 \rightarrow K^0 \bar{K}^0$

B. Aubert,¹ M. Bona,¹ D. Boutigny,¹ F. Couderc,¹ Y. Karyotakis,¹ J. P. Lees,¹ V. Poireau,¹ V. Tisserand,¹
A. Zghiche,¹ E. Grauges,² A. Palano,³ J. C. Chen,⁴ N. D. Qi,⁴ G. Rong,⁴ P. Wang,⁴ Y. S. Zhu,⁴ G. Eigen,⁵
I. Ofte,⁵ B. Stugu,⁵ G. S. Abrams,⁶ M. Battaglia,⁶ D. N. Brown,⁶ J. Button-Shafer,⁶ R. N. Cahn,⁶ E. Charles,⁶
M. S. Gill,⁶ Y. Groyzman,⁶ R. G. Jacobsen,⁶ J. A. Kadyk,⁶ L. T. Kerth,⁶ Yu. G. Kolomensky,⁶ G. Kukartsev,⁶
G. Lynch,⁶ L. M. Mir,⁶ T. J. Orimoto,⁶ M. Pripstein,⁶ N. A. Roe,⁶ M. T. Ronan,⁶ W. A. Wenzel,⁶ P. del
Amo Sanchez,⁷ M. Barrett,⁷ K. E. Ford,⁷ T. J. Harrison,⁷ A. J. Hart,⁷ C. M. Hawkes,⁷ A. T. Watson,⁷
T. Held,⁸ H. Koch,⁸ B. Lewandowski,⁸ M. Pelizaeus,⁸ K. Peters,⁸ T. Schroeder,⁸ M. Steinke,⁸ J. T. Boyd,⁹
J. P. Burke,⁹ W. N. Cottingham,⁹ D. Walker,⁹ D. J. Asgeirsson,¹⁰ T. Cuhadar-Donszelmann,¹⁰ B. G. Fulsom,¹⁰
C. Hearty,¹⁰ N. S. Knecht,¹⁰ T. S. Mattison,¹⁰ J. A. McKenna,¹⁰ A. Khan,¹¹ P. Kyberd,¹¹ M. Saleem,¹¹
D. J. Sherwood,¹¹ L. Teodorescu,¹¹ V. E. Blinov,¹² A. D. Bukin,¹² V. P. Druzhinin,¹² V. B. Golubev,¹²
A. P. Onuchin,¹² S. I. Serednyakov,¹² Yu. I. Skovpen,¹² E. P. Solodov,¹² K. Yu Todyshev,¹² M. Bondioli,¹³
M. Bruinsma,¹³ M. Chao,¹³ S. Curry,¹³ I. Eschrich,¹³ D. Kirkby,¹³ A. J. Lankford,¹³ P. Lund,¹³ M. Mandelkern,¹³
R. K. Mommsen,¹³ W. Roethel,¹³ D. P. Stoker,¹³ S. Abachi,¹⁴ C. Buchanan,¹⁴ S. D. Foulkes,¹⁵ J. W. Gary,¹⁵
O. Long,¹⁵ B. C. Shen,¹⁵ K. Wang,¹⁵ L. Zhang,¹⁵ H. K. Hadavand,¹⁶ E. J. Hill,¹⁶ H. P. Paar,¹⁶ S. Rahatlou,¹⁶
V. Sharma,¹⁶ J. W. Berryhill,¹⁷ C. Campagnari,¹⁷ A. Cunha,¹⁷ B. Dahmes,¹⁷ T. M. Hong,¹⁷ D. Kovalskyi,¹⁷
J. D. Richman,¹⁷ T. W. Beck,¹⁸ A. M. Eisner,¹⁸ C. J. Flacco,¹⁸ C. A. Heusch,¹⁸ J. Kroseberg,¹⁸ W. S. Lockman,¹⁸
G. Nesom,¹⁸ T. Schalk,¹⁸ B. A. Schumm,¹⁸ A. Seiden,¹⁸ P. Spradlin,¹⁸ D. C. Williams,¹⁸ M. G. Wilson,¹⁸
J. Albert,¹⁹ E. Chen,¹⁹ A. Dvoretzkii,¹⁹ F. Fang,¹⁹ D. G. Hitlin,¹⁹ I. Narsky,¹⁹ T. Piatenko,¹⁹ F. C. Porter,¹⁹
A. Ryd,¹⁹ G. Mancinelli,²⁰ B. T. Meadows,²⁰ K. Mishra,²⁰ M. D. Sokoloff,²⁰ F. Blanc,²¹ P. C. Bloom,²¹ S. Chen,²¹
W. T. Ford,²¹ J. F. Hirschauer,²¹ A. Kreisel,²¹ M. Nagel,²¹ U. Nauenberg,²¹ A. Olivas,²¹ W. O. Ruddick,²¹
J. G. Smith,²¹ K. A. Ulmer,²¹ S. R. Wagner,²¹ J. Zhang,²¹ A. Chen,²² E. A. Eckhart,²² A. Soffer,²² W. H. Toki,²²
R. J. Wilson,²² F. Winklmeier,²² Q. Zeng,²² D. D. Altenburg,²³ E. Feltresi,²³ A. Hauke,²³ H. Jasper,²³ J. Merkel,²³
A. Petzold,²³ B. Spaan,²³ T. Brandt,²⁴ V. Klose,²⁴ H. M. Lacker,²⁴ W. F. Mader,²⁴ R. Nogowski,²⁴ J. Schubert,²⁴
K. R. Schubert,²⁴ R. Schwierz,²⁴ J. E. Sundermann,²⁴ A. Volk,²⁴ D. Bernard,²⁵ G. R. Bonneaud,²⁵ E. Latour,²⁵
Ch. Thiebaux,²⁵ M. Verderi,²⁵ P. J. Clark,²⁶ W. Gradl,²⁶ F. Muheim,²⁶ S. Playfer,²⁶ A. I. Robertson,²⁶ Y. Xie,²⁶
M. Andreotti,²⁷ D. Bettoni,²⁷ C. Bozzi,²⁷ R. Calabrese,²⁷ G. Cibinetto,²⁷ E. Luppi,²⁷ M. Negrini,²⁷ A. Petrella,²⁷
L. Piemontese,²⁷ E. Prencipe,²⁷ F. Anulli,²⁸ R. Baldini-Ferrolli,²⁸ A. Calcaterra,²⁸ R. de Sangro,²⁸ G. Finocchiaro,²⁸
S. Pacetti,²⁸ P. Patteri,²⁸ I. M. Peruzzi,²⁸ * M. Piccolo,²⁸ M. Rama,²⁸ A. Zallo,²⁸ A. Buzzo,²⁹ R. Contri,²⁹ M. Lo
Vetere,²⁹ M. M. Macri,²⁹ M. R. Monge,²⁹ S. Passaggio,²⁹ C. Patrignani,²⁹ E. Robutti,²⁹ A. Santroni,²⁹ S. Tosi,²⁹
G. Brandenburg,³⁰ K. S. Chaisanguanthum,³⁰ M. Morii,³⁰ J. Wu,³⁰ R. S. Dubitzky,³¹ J. Marks,³¹ S. Schenk,³¹
U. Uwer,³¹ D. J. Bard,³² W. Bhimji,³² D. A. Bowerman,³² P. D. Dauncey,³² U. Egede,³² R. L. Flack,³²
J. A. Nash,³² M. B. Nikolich,³² W. Panduro Vazquez,³² P. K. Behera,³³ X. Chai,³³ M. J. Charles,³³ U. Mallik,³³
N. T. Meyer,³³ V. Ziegler,³³ J. Cochran,³⁴ H. B. Crawley,³⁴ L. Dong,³⁴ V. Eyges,³⁴ W. T. Meyer,³⁴ S. Prell,³⁴
E. I. Rosenberg,³⁴ A. E. Rubin,³⁴ A. V. Gritsan,³⁵ A. G. Denig,³⁶ M. Fritsch,³⁶ G. Schott,³⁶ N. Arnaud,³⁷
M. Davier,³⁷ G. Grosdidier,³⁷ A. Höcker,³⁷ F. Le Diberder,³⁷ V. Lepeltier,³⁷ A. M. Lutz,³⁷ A. Oyanguren,³⁷
S. Pruvot,³⁷ S. Rodier,³⁷ P. Roudeau,³⁷ M. H. Schune,³⁷ A. Stocchi,³⁷ W. F. Wang,³⁷ G. Wormser,³⁷ C. H. Cheng,³⁸
D. J. Lange,³⁸ D. M. Wright,³⁸ C. A. Chavez,³⁹ I. J. Forster,³⁹ J. R. Fry,³⁹ E. Gabathuler,³⁹ R. Gamet,³⁹
K. A. George,³⁹ D. E. Hutchcroft,³⁹ D. J. Payne,³⁹ K. C. Schofield,³⁹ C. Touramanis,³⁹ A. J. Bevan,⁴⁰
F. Di Lodovico,⁴⁰ W. Menges,⁴⁰ R. Sacco,⁴⁰ G. Cowan,⁴¹ H. U. Flaecher,⁴¹ D. A. Hopkins,⁴¹ P. S. Jackson,⁴¹
T. R. McMahan,⁴¹ S. Ricciardi,⁴¹ F. Salvatore,⁴¹ A. C. Wren,⁴¹ D. N. Brown,⁴² C. L. Davis,⁴² J. Allison,⁴³
N. R. Barlow,⁴³ R. J. Barlow,⁴³ Y. M. Chia,⁴³ C. L. Edgar,⁴³ G. D. Lafferty,⁴³ M. T. Naisbit,⁴³ J. C. Williams,⁴³
J. I. Yi,⁴³ C. Chen,⁴⁴ W. D. Hulsbergen,⁴⁴ A. Jawahery,⁴⁴ C. K. Lae,⁴⁴ D. A. Roberts,⁴⁴ G. Simi,⁴⁴ G. Blaylock,⁴⁵
C. Dallapiccola,⁴⁵ S. S. Hertzbach,⁴⁵ X. Li,⁴⁵ T. B. Moore,⁴⁵ S. Saremi,⁴⁵ H. Staengle,⁴⁵ R. Cowan,⁴⁶ G. Sciolla,⁴⁶
S. J. Sekula,⁴⁶ M. Spitznagel,⁴⁶ F. Taylor,⁴⁶ R. K. Yamamoto,⁴⁶ H. Kim,⁴⁷ S. E. Mclachlin,⁴⁷ P. M. Patel,⁴⁷
S. H. Robertson,⁴⁷ A. Lazzaro,⁴⁸ V. Lombardo,⁴⁸ F. Palombo,⁴⁸ J. M. Bauer,⁴⁸ L. Cremaldi,⁴⁹ V. Eschenburg,⁴⁹

R. Godang,⁴⁹ R. Kroeger,⁴⁹ D. A. Sanders,⁴⁹ D. J. Summers,⁴⁹ H. W. Zhao,⁴⁹ S. Brunet,⁵⁰ D. Côté,⁵⁰ M. Simard,⁵⁰ P. Taras,⁵⁰ F. B. Viaud,⁵⁰ H. Nicholson,⁵¹ N. Cavallo,⁵²,† G. De Nardo,⁵² F. Fabozzi,⁵²,† C. Gatto,⁵² L. Lista,⁵² D. Monorchio,⁵² P. Paolucci,⁵² D. Piccolo,⁵² C. Sciacca,⁵² M. A. Baak,⁵³ G. Raven,⁵³ H. L. Snoek,⁵³ C. P. Jessop,⁵⁴ J. M. LoSecco,⁵⁴ T. Allmendinger,⁵⁵ G. Benelli,⁵⁵ L. A. Corwin,⁵⁵ K. K. Gan,⁵⁵ K. Honscheid,⁵⁵ D. Hufnagel,⁵⁵ P. D. Jackson,⁵⁵ H. Kagan,⁵⁵ R. Kass,⁵⁵ A. M. Rahimi,⁵⁵ J. J. Regensburger,⁵⁵ R. Ter-Antonyan,⁵⁵ Q. K. Wong,⁵⁵ N. L. Blount,⁵⁶ J. Brau,⁵⁶ R. Frey,⁵⁶ O. Igonkina,⁵⁶ J. A. Kolb,⁵⁶ M. Lu,⁵⁶ R. Rahmat,⁵⁶ N. B. Sinev,⁵⁶ D. Strom,⁵⁶ J. Strube,⁵⁶ E. Torrence,⁵⁶ A. Gaz,⁵⁷ M. Margoni,⁵⁷ M. Morandin,⁵⁷ A. Pompili,⁵⁷ M. Posocco,⁵⁷ M. Rotondo,⁵⁷ F. Simonetto,⁵⁷ R. Stroili,⁵⁷ C. Voci,⁵⁷ M. Benayoun,⁵⁸ H. Briand,⁵⁸ J. Chauveau,⁵⁸ P. David,⁵⁸ L. Del Buono,⁵⁸ Ch. de la Vaissière,⁵⁸ O. Hamon,⁵⁸ B. L. Hartfiel,⁵⁸ Ph. Leruste,⁵⁸ J. Malcès,⁵⁸ J. Ocariz,⁵⁸ L. Roos,⁵⁸ G. Therin,⁵⁸ L. Gladney,⁵⁹ M. Biasini,⁶⁰ R. Covarelli,⁶⁰ C. Angelini,⁶¹ G. Batignani,⁶¹ S. Bettarini,⁶¹ F. Bucci,⁶¹ G. Calderini,⁶¹ M. Carpinelli,⁶¹ R. Cenci,⁶¹ F. Forti,⁶¹ M. A. Giorgi,⁶¹ A. Lusiani,⁶¹ G. Marchiori,⁶¹ M. A. Mazur,⁶¹ M. Morganti,⁶¹ N. Neri,⁶¹ E. Paoloni,⁶¹ G. Rizzo,⁶¹ J. J. Walsh,⁶¹ M. Haire,⁶² D. Judd,⁶² D. E. Wagoner,⁶² J. Biesiada,⁶³ N. Danielson,⁶³ P. Elmer,⁶³ Y. P. Lau,⁶³ C. Lu,⁶³ J. Olsen,⁶³ A. J. S. Smith,⁶³ A. V. Telnov,⁶³ F. Bellini,⁶⁴ G. Cavoto,⁶⁴ A. D’Orazio,⁶⁴ D. del Re,⁶⁴ E. Di Marco,⁶⁴ R. Faccini,⁶⁴ F. Ferrarotto,⁶⁴ F. Ferroni,⁶⁴ M. Gaspero,⁶⁴ L. Li Gioi,⁶⁴ M. A. Mazzoni,⁶⁴ S. Morganti,⁶⁴ G. Piredda,⁶⁴ F. Polci,⁶⁴ F. Safai Tehrani,⁶⁴ C. Voena,⁶⁴ M. Ebert,⁶⁵ H. Schröder,⁶⁵ R. Waldi,⁶⁵ T. Adye,⁶⁶ N. De Groot,⁶⁶ B. Franek,⁶⁶ E. O. Olaiya,⁶⁶ F. F. Wilson,⁶⁶ R. Aleksan,⁶⁷ S. Emery,⁶⁷ A. Gaidot,⁶⁷ S. F. Ganzhur,⁶⁷ G. Hamel de Monchenault,⁶⁷ W. Kozanecki,⁶⁷ M. Legendre,⁶⁷ G. Vasseur,⁶⁷ Ch. Yèche,⁶⁷ M. Zito,⁶⁷ X. R. Chen,⁶⁸ H. Liu,⁶⁸ W. Park,⁶⁸ M. V. Purohit,⁶⁸ J. R. Wilson,⁶⁸ M. T. Allen,⁶⁹ D. Aston,⁶⁹ R. Bartoldus,⁶⁹ P. Bechtel,⁶⁹ N. Berger,⁶⁹ R. Claus,⁶⁹ J. P. Coleman,⁶⁹ M. R. Convery,⁶⁹ M. Cristinziani,⁶⁹ J. C. Dingfelder,⁶⁹ J. Dorfan,⁶⁹ G. P. Dubois-Felsmann,⁶⁹ D. Dujmic,⁶⁹ W. Dunwoodie,⁶⁹ R. C. Field,⁶⁹ T. Glanzman,⁶⁹ S. J. Gowdy,⁶⁹ M. T. Graham,⁶⁹ P. Grenier,⁶⁹ V. Halyo,⁶⁹ C. Hast,⁶⁹ T. Hryn’ova,⁶⁹ W. R. Innes,⁶⁹ M. H. Kelsey,⁶⁹ P. Kim,⁶⁹ D. W. G. S. Leith,⁶⁹ S. Li,⁶⁹ S. Luitz,⁶⁹ V. Luth,⁶⁹ H. L. Lynch,⁶⁹ D. B. MacFarlane,⁶⁹ H. Marsiske,⁶⁹ R. Messner,⁶⁹ D. R. Muller,⁶⁹ C. P. O’Grady,⁶⁹ V. E. Ozcan,⁶⁹ A. Perazzo,⁶⁹ M. Perl,⁶⁹ T. Pulliam,⁶⁹ B. N. Ratcliff,⁶⁹ A. Roodman,⁶⁹ A. A. Salnikov,⁶⁹ R. H. Schindler,⁶⁹ J. Schwiening,⁶⁹ A. Snyder,⁶⁹ J. Stelzer,⁶⁹ D. Su,⁶⁹ M. K. Sullivan,⁶⁹ K. Suzuki,⁶⁹ S. K. Swain,⁶⁹ J. M. Thompson,⁶⁹ J. Va’vra,⁶⁹ N. van Bakel,⁶⁹ M. Weaver,⁶⁹ A. J. R. Weinstein,⁶⁹ W. J. Wisniewski,⁶⁹ M. Wittgen,⁶⁹ D. H. Wright,⁶⁹ A. K. Yarritu,⁶⁹ K. Yi,⁶⁹ C. C. Young,⁶⁹ P. R. Burchat,⁷⁰ A. J. Edwards,⁷⁰ S. A. Majewski,⁷⁰ B. A. Petersen,⁷⁰ C. Roat,⁷⁰ L. Wilden,⁷⁰ S. Ahmed,⁷¹ M. S. Alam,⁷¹ R. Bula,⁷¹ J. A. Ernst,⁷¹ V. Jain,⁷¹ B. Pan,⁷¹ M. A. Saeed,⁷¹ F. R. Wappler,⁷¹ S. B. Zain,⁷¹ W. Bugg,⁷² M. Krishnamurthy,⁷² S. M. Spanier,⁷² R. Eckmann,⁷³ J. L. Ritchie,⁷³ A. Satpathy,⁷³ C. J. Schilling,⁷³ R. F. Schwitters,⁷³ J. M. Izen,⁷⁴ X. C. Lou,⁷⁴ S. Ye,⁷⁴ F. Bianchi,⁷⁵ F. Gallo,⁷⁵ D. Gamba,⁷⁵ M. Bomben,⁷⁶ L. Bosisio,⁷⁶ C. Cartaro,⁷⁶ F. Cossutti,⁷⁶ G. Della Ricca,⁷⁶ S. Dittongo,⁷⁶ L. Lanceri,⁷⁶ L. Vitale,⁷⁶ V. Azzolini,⁷⁷ N. Lopez-March,⁷⁷ F. Martinez-Vidal,⁷⁷ Sw. Banerjee,⁷⁸ B. Bhuyan,⁷⁸ C. M. Brown,⁷⁸ D. Fortin,⁷⁸ K. Hamano,⁷⁸ R. Kowalewski,⁷⁸ I. M. Nugent,⁷⁸ J. M. Roney,⁷⁸ R. J. Sobie,⁷⁸ J. J. Back,⁷⁹ P. F. Harrison,⁷⁹ T. E. Latham,⁷⁹ G. B. Mohanty,⁷⁹ M. Pappagallo,⁷⁹ H. R. Band,⁸⁰ X. Chen,⁸⁰ B. Cheng,⁸⁰ S. Dasu,⁸⁰ M. Datta,⁸⁰ K. T. Flood,⁸⁰ J. J. Hollar,⁸⁰ P. E. Kutter,⁸⁰ B. Mellado,⁸⁰ A. Mihalysi,⁸⁰ Y. Pan,⁸⁰ M. Pierini,⁸⁰ R. Prepost,⁸⁰ S. L. Wu,⁸⁰ Z. Yu,⁸⁰ and H. Neal⁸¹

(The BABAR Collaboration)

¹Laboratoire de Physique des Particules, IN2P3/CNRS et Université de Savoie, F-74941 Annecy-Le-Vieux, France

²Universitat de Barcelona, Facultat de Física, Departament ECM, E-08028 Barcelona, Spain

³Università di Bari, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-70126 Bari, Italy

⁴Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing 100039, China

⁵University of Bergen, Institute of Physics, N-5007 Bergen, Norway

⁶Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory and University of California, Berkeley, California 94720, USA

⁷University of Birmingham, Birmingham, B15 2TT, United Kingdom

⁸Ruhr Universität Bochum, Institut für Experimentalphysik 1, D-44780 Bochum, Germany

⁹University of Bristol, Bristol BS8 1TL, United Kingdom

¹⁰University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada V6T 1Z1

¹¹Brunel University, Uxbridge, Middlesex UB8 3PH, United Kingdom

¹²Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics, Novosibirsk 630090, Russia

¹³University of California at Irvine, Irvine, California 92697, USA

¹⁴University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California 90024, USA

¹⁵University of California at Riverside, Riverside, California 92521, USA

¹⁶University of California at San Diego, La Jolla, California 92093, USA

¹⁷University of California at Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, California 93106, USA

¹⁸University of California at Santa Cruz, Institute for Particle Physics, Santa Cruz, California 95064, USA

- ¹⁹California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California 91125, USA
²⁰University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio 45221, USA
²¹University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80309, USA
²²Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado 80523, USA
²³Universität Dortmund, Institut für Physik, D-44221 Dortmund, Germany
²⁴Technische Universität Dresden, Institut für Kern- und Teilchenphysik, D-01062 Dresden, Germany
²⁵Laboratoire Leprince-Ringuet, CNRS/IN2P3, Ecole Polytechnique, F-91128 Palaiseau, France
²⁶University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH9 3JZ, United Kingdom
²⁷Università di Ferrara, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-44100 Ferrara, Italy
²⁸Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati dell'INFN, I-00044 Frascati, Italy
²⁹Università di Genova, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-16146 Genova, Italy
³⁰Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, USA
³¹Universität Heidelberg, Physikalisches Institut, Philosophenweg 12, D-69120 Heidelberg, Germany
³²Imperial College London, London, SW7 2AZ, United Kingdom
³³University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa 52242, USA
³⁴Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011-3160, USA
³⁵Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland 21218, USA
³⁶Universität Karlsruhe, Institut für Experimentelle Kernphysik, D-76021 Karlsruhe, Germany
³⁷Laboratoire de l'Accélérateur Linéaire, IN2P3/CNRS et Université Paris-Sud 11, Centre Scientifique d'Orsay, B.P. 34, F-91898 ORSAY Cedex, France
³⁸Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California 94550, USA
³⁹University of Liverpool, Liverpool L69 7ZE, United Kingdom
⁴⁰Queen Mary, University of London, E1 4NS, United Kingdom
⁴¹University of London, Royal Holloway and Bedford New College, Egham, Surrey TW20 0EX, United Kingdom
⁴²University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky 40292, USA
⁴³University of Manchester, Manchester M13 9PL, United Kingdom
⁴⁴University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742, USA
⁴⁵University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts 01003, USA
⁴⁶Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Laboratory for Nuclear Science, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, USA
⁴⁷McGill University, Montréal, Québec, Canada H3A 2T8
⁴⁸Università di Milano, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-20133 Milano, Italy
⁴⁹University of Mississippi, University, Mississippi 38677, USA
⁵⁰Université de Montréal, Physique des Particules, Montréal, Québec, Canada H3C 3J7
⁵¹Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Massachusetts 01075, USA
⁵²Università di Napoli Federico II, Dipartimento di Scienze Fisiche and INFN, I-80126, Napoli, Italy
⁵³NIKHEF, National Institute for Nuclear Physics and High Energy Physics, NL-1009 DB Amsterdam, The Netherlands
⁵⁴University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana 46556, USA
⁵⁵Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210, USA
⁵⁶University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403, USA
⁵⁷Università di Padova, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-35131 Padova, Italy
⁵⁸Laboratoire de Physique Nucléaire et de Hautes Energies, IN2P3/CNRS, Université Pierre et Marie Curie-Paris6, Université Denis Diderot-Paris7, F-75252 Paris, France
⁵⁹University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104, USA
⁶⁰Università di Perugia, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-06100 Perugia, Italy
⁶¹Università di Pisa, Dipartimento di Fisica, Scuola Normale Superiore and INFN, I-56127 Pisa, Italy
⁶²Prairie View A&M University, Prairie View, Texas 77446, USA
⁶³Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey 08544, USA
⁶⁴Università di Roma La Sapienza, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-00185 Roma, Italy
⁶⁵Universität Rostock, D-18051 Rostock, Germany
⁶⁶Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Chilton, Didcot, Oxon, OX11 0QX, United Kingdom
⁶⁷DSM/Dapnia, CEA/Saclay, F-91191 Gif-sur-Yvette, France
⁶⁸University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina 29208, USA
⁶⁹Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, Stanford, California 94309, USA
⁷⁰Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305-4060, USA
⁷¹State University of New York, Albany, New York 12222, USA
⁷²University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee 37996, USA
⁷³University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712, USA
⁷⁴University of Texas at Dallas, Richardson, Texas 75083, USA
⁷⁵Università di Torino, Dipartimento di Fisica Sperimentale and INFN, I-10125 Torino, Italy
⁷⁶Università di Trieste, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-34127 Trieste, Italy
⁷⁷IFIC, Universitat de Valencia-CSIC, E-46071 Valencia, Spain
⁷⁸University of Victoria, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada V8W 3P6
⁷⁹Department of Physics, University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL, United Kingdom

⁸⁰University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706, USA
⁸¹Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut 06511, USA

We report observations of the $b \rightarrow d$ penguin-dominated decays $B^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 K^+$ and $B^0 \rightarrow K^0 \bar{K}^0$ in 316 fb^{-1} of e^+e^- collision data collected with the BABAR detector. We measure the branching fractions $\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 K^+) = (1.61 \pm 0.44 \pm 0.09) \times 10^{-6}$ and $\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow K^0 \bar{K}^0) = (1.08 \pm 0.28 \pm 0.11) \times 10^{-6}$, and the CP -violating charge asymmetry $\mathcal{A}_{CP}(\bar{K}^0 K^+) = 0.10 \pm 0.26 \pm 0.03$. Using a vertexing technique previously employed in several analyses of all-neutral final states containing kaons, we report the first measurement of time-dependent CP -violating asymmetries in $B^0 \rightarrow K_s^0 K_s^0$, obtaining $S = -1.28_{-0.73}^{+0.80} {}_{-0.16}^{+0.11}$ and $C = -0.40 \pm 0.41 \pm 0.06$. We also report improved measurements of the branching fraction $\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow K^0 \pi^+) = (23.9 \pm 1.1 \pm 1.0) \times 10^{-6}$ and CP -violating charge asymmetry $\mathcal{A}_{CP}(K^0 \pi^+) = -0.029 \pm 0.039 \pm 0.010$.

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

The decays $B^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 K^+$ and $B^0 \rightarrow K^0 \bar{K}^0$ are expected to be dominated by the flavor-changing neutral-current process $b \rightarrow d \bar{s} s$, which is highly suppressed in the standard model and potentially sensitive to the presence of new particles in a way analogous to $b \rightarrow s \bar{s} s$ decays such as $B \rightarrow \phi K$ [1, 2]. Assuming top-quark dominance in the virtual loop mediating the $b \rightarrow d$ transition [3], the charge asymmetry in $B^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 K^+$ and the time-dependent CP -violating asymmetry parameters in $B^0 \rightarrow K_s^0 K_s^0$ are expected to vanish, while contributions from lighter quarks or supersymmetric particles could induce observable asymmetries [4]. It has been noted [5] that the branching fraction and CP asymmetries in $B^0 \rightarrow K^0 \bar{K}^0$ are related in a nearly model-independent way, providing a sensitive test of the standard model description of CP violation.

In this Letter, we report observations of $B^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 K^+$ and $B^0 \rightarrow K^0 \bar{K}^0$ using a data sample approximately 50% larger than the one used in our previous search [6]. (The use of charge-conjugate modes is implied throughout this paper unless otherwise stated.) In addition to establishing these decay modes, we present measurements of the time-dependent CP -violating asymmetries in $B^0 \rightarrow K^0 \bar{K}^0$ for the first time. We also report updated measurements of the branching fraction and charge asymmetry in the $SU(3)$ -related decay $B^+ \rightarrow K^0 \pi^+$.

The CP asymmetry in $B^0 \rightarrow K^0 \bar{K}^0$ (observed in the $K_s^0 K_s^0$ final state) is determined from the difference in the time-dependent decay rates for B^0 and \bar{B}^0 . In the process $e^+e^- \rightarrow \Upsilon(4S) \rightarrow B^0 \bar{B}^0$, the decay rate f_+ (f_-) is given by [7]

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

when the second B meson in the event (denoted B_{tag}) is identified as B^0 (\bar{B}^0). Here Δt is the time difference between the decays of the signal and B_{tag} mesons, τ is the average B^0 lifetime, and Δm_d is the $B^0 - \bar{B}^0$ mixing frequency. The amplitude S describes CP violation in the interference between mixed and unmixed decays into the same final state, while C describes direct CP violation in

decay.

The data sample used in this analysis contains $(347.5 \pm 3.8) \times 10^6 \Upsilon(4S) \rightarrow B\bar{B}$ decays collected by the BABAR detector [8] at the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center's (SLAC) PEP-II asymmetric-energy e^+e^- collider. The primary detector elements used in this analysis are a charged-particle tracking system consisting of a five-layer silicon vertex tracker and a 40-layer drift chamber surrounded by a 1.5-T solenoidal magnet, and a dedicated particle-identification system consisting of a detector of internally reflected Cherenkov light.

We identify two separate event samples corresponding to the decays $B^+ \rightarrow K_s^0 h^+$ and $B^0 \rightarrow K_s^0 K_s^0$, where h^+ is either a pion or a kaon. Neutral kaons are reconstructed in the mode $K_s^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-$ by combining pairs of oppositely charged tracks originating from a common decay point and satisfying selection requirements on their invariant mass and proper decay time. Candidate h^+ tracks are assigned the pion mass and are required to originate from the interaction region and to have a well-measured Cherenkov angle (θ_c) consistent with either the pion or kaon particle hypothesis.

For each B^0 candidate, we require the absolute value of the difference ΔE between its reconstructed energy in the center-of-mass (CM) frame and the beam energy ($\sqrt{s}/2$) to be less than 100 MeV. For B^+ candidates, we require $-115 < \Delta E < 75$ MeV, where the lower limit accounts for an average shift in ΔE of -45 MeV in the $\bar{K}^0 K^+$ mode due to the assignment of the pion mass to the K^+ candidate. We also define a beam-energy substituted mass $m_{\text{ES}} \equiv \sqrt{(s/2 + \mathbf{p}_i \cdot \mathbf{p}_B)^2 / E_i^2 - \mathbf{p}_B^2}$, where the B -candidate momentum \mathbf{p}_B and the four-momentum of the initial e^+e^- state (E_i, \mathbf{p}_i) are calculated in the laboratory frame. We require $5.20 < m_{\text{ES}} < 5.29 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ for B candidates in both samples. To suppress the dominant background arising from the process $e^+e^- \rightarrow q\bar{q}$ ($q = u, d, s, c$), we calculate the CM angle θ_S^* between the sphericity axis [9] of the B candidate and the sphericity axis of the remaining charged and neutral particles in the event, and require $|\cos \theta_S^*| < 0.8$.

After applying all of the above requirements, we find 2321 (30159) candidates in the B^0 (B^+) sample. The to-

TABLE I: Summary of results for the total detection efficiencies ε , fitted signal yields n , signal-yield significances s (including systematic uncertainty), charge-averaged branching fractions \mathcal{B} , and charge asymmetries \mathcal{A}_{CP} (including 90% confidence intervals). The efficiencies include the branching fraction for $K_s^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ and the probability of 50% for $K^0\bar{K}^0 \rightarrow K_s^0K_s^0$. Branching fractions are calculated assuming equal rates for $\Upsilon(4S) \rightarrow B^0\bar{B}^0$ and B^+B^- [10].

Mode	ε (%)	n	s (σ)	\mathcal{B} (10^{-6})	\mathcal{A}_{CP}	\mathcal{A}_{CP} (90%CL)
$B^+ \rightarrow K^0\pi^+$	12.9 ± 0.4	$1072 \pm 46^{+32}_{-37}$		$23.9 \pm 1.1 \pm 1.0$	$-0.029 \pm 0.039 \pm 0.010$	$[-0.092, 0.036]$
$B^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0K^+$	12.6 ± 0.4	$71 \pm 19 \pm 4$	5.3	$1.61 \pm 0.44 \pm 0.09$	$0.10 \pm 0.26 \pm 0.03$	$[-0.31, 0.54]$
$B^0 \rightarrow K^0\bar{K}^0$	8.5 ± 0.3	$32 \pm 8 \pm 3$	7.3	$1.08 \pm 0.28 \pm 0.11$		

tal detection efficiencies are given in Table I and include the branching fraction for $K_s^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ [11] and a probability of 50% for $K^0\bar{K}^0 \rightarrow K_s^0K_s^0$ [12]. We use data and simulated Monte Carlo samples [13] to verify that backgrounds from other B decays are negligible.

A multivariate technique [14] is employed to determine the flavor of the B_{tag} meson in the B^0 sample. Separate neural networks are trained to identify primary leptons, kaons, low-momentum pions from D^* decays, and high-momentum charged particles from B decays. Events are assigned to one of six mutually exclusive ‘‘tagging’’ categories. 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 . We measure the tagging performance in a data sample of fully reconstructed neutral B decays (B_{flav}) to $D^{(*)-}(\pi^+, \rho^+, a_1^+)$, where the flavor of the decaying B meson is known, and find a total effective efficiency of $Q = (30.4 \pm 0.3)\%$.

The time difference $\Delta t \equiv \Delta z/\beta\gamma c$ is obtained from the known boost of the e^+e^- system ($\beta\gamma = 0.56$) and the measured distance Δz along the beam (z) axis between the $B^0 \rightarrow K_s^0K_s^0$ and B_{tag} decay vertices. The position of the B_{tag} vertex is determined from the remaining charged particles in the event after removing the four tracks composing the signal candidate. Despite the relatively long lifetime of the K_s^0 mesons, the z position of the B -candidate decay point is obtained reliably by exploiting the precise knowledge of the interaction point using the technique described in Ref. [15]. We compute Δt and its error from a combined fit to the $\Upsilon(4S) \rightarrow B^0\bar{B}^0$ decay, including the constraint from the known average lifetime of the B^0 meson. Approximately 82% of signal events contain a K_s^0 reconstructed from pions that each have at least two hits in the silicon vertex tracker, providing sufficiently small Δt uncertainty (0.9 ps) to perform the measurement. We require $|\Delta t| < 20$ ps and $\sigma_{\Delta t} < 2.5$ ps, where $\sigma_{\Delta t}$ is the uncertainty on Δt determined separately for each event. The resolution function for signal candidates is a sum of three gaussian distributions with parameters determined from the B_{flav} sample [14]. The background Δt distribution has the same functional form as the signal resolution function, with parameters

determined directly from data.

To obtain the yields and CP violating asymmetry parameters in each sample, we apply separate unbinned maximum-likelihood fits incorporating discriminating variables that account for differences between $B\bar{B}$ and $q\bar{q}$ events. In addition to the kinematic variables m_{ES} and ΔE , we include a Fisher discriminant \mathcal{F} [16] defined as an optimized linear combination of the event-shape variables $\sum_i p_i^*$ and $\sum_i p_i^* \cos^2 \theta_i^*$, where p_i^* is the CM momentum of particle i , θ_i^* is the CM angle between the momentum of particle i and the B -candidate thrust axis, and the sum is over all particles in the event excluding the B daughters. For the fit to the B^+ sample we include the Cherenkov angle measurement to separate $K_s^0\pi^+$ and $K_s^0K^+$ decays. For the B^0 sample we include Δt to determine the CP -violating asymmetry parameters S and C simultaneously with the signal yield.

The likelihood function to be maximized is defined as $\mathcal{L} = \exp(-\sum_i n_i) \prod_{j=1}^N [\sum_i n_i \mathcal{P}_i]$, where n_i and \mathcal{P}_i are the yield and probability density function (PDF) for each component i in the fit, and N is the total number of events in the sample. For the B^0 sample there are two components (signal and background), and the total PDF is calculated as the product of the individual PDFs for m_{ES} , ΔE , \mathcal{F} , and Δt . The signal Δt PDF is derived from Eq. 1, modified to take into account the mistag probability and convolved with the resolution function. We combine B^+ and B^- candidates in a single fit and include the PDF for θ_c to determine separate yields and charge asymmetries for the two signal components, $K_s^0\pi$ and K_s^0K , and two corresponding background components. For both signal and background, the $K_s^0h^\pm$ yields are parameterized as $n_\pm = n(1 \mp \mathcal{A}_{CP})/2$; we fit directly for the total yield n and the charge asymmetry \mathcal{A}_{CP} . We have found correlations among the PDF variables in the fit to be negligible in both the B^0 and B^+ samples.

The parameterizations of the PDFs are determined from data wherever possible. In both samples, we exploit the large sideband regions in m_{ES} and ΔE to determine all background PDF parameters simultaneously with the yields and CP asymmetries in the fits. For the B^+ sample, the large signal $K_s^0\pi^+$ component allows for an accurate determination of the peak positions for m_{ES}

and ΔE , as well as the parameters describing the shape of the PDF for \mathcal{F} . The remaining shape parameters describing m_{ES} and ΔE are determined from simulated Monte Carlo samples and are fixed in the fit. We use the $K_S^0\pi^+$ parameters to describe signal $K_S^0K^+$ PDFs in m_{ES} , ΔE , and \mathcal{F} , taking into account the known shift in the mean of ΔE due to the pion-mass hypothesis. For both signal and background, the θ_c PDFs are obtained from a sample of $D^{*+} \rightarrow D^0\pi^+$ ($D^0 \rightarrow K^-\pi^+$) decays reconstructed in data, as described in Ref. [17]. For the B^0 sample, all shape parameters describing the m_{ES} , ΔE , and \mathcal{F} signal PDFs are fixed to the values determined from Monte Carlo simulation except the peak position for ΔE , which is derived from the results of the fit to the B^+ sample.

Several cross-checks were performed to validate the fitting technique before data in the signal region were examined. We checked for biases by performing pseudo-experiments where simulated Monte Carlo signal events were mixed with background events generated directly from the PDFs according to the expected yields in the data. The resulting small biases on the yields include effects of incorrect particle identification and are accounted for in the systematic uncertainties.

The fit results supersede our previous measurements of these quantities and are summarized in Table I. The signal yields for $B^+ \rightarrow K_S^0K^+$ and $B^0 \rightarrow K_S^0K_S^0$ correspond to significances of 5.3σ and 7.3σ (including systematic uncertainties), respectively, and are consistent with our previous measurements [6], as well as with recent results by the Belle Collaboration [18]. The significances are computed by taking the square root of the change in $2\ln\mathcal{L}$ when the appropriate yield is fixed to zero. The fit to the B^0 sample yields $S = -1.28^{+0.80}_{-0.73} +0.11_{-0.16}$ and $C = -0.40 \pm 0.41 \pm 0.06$, where the first errors are statistical and the second are systematic. The linear correlation coefficient between S and C is -32% .

In Fig. 1 we compare data and PDFs using the event-weighting technique described in Ref. [19]. We perform fits excluding the variable being shown; the covariance matrix and remaining PDFs are used to determine a weight that each event is either signal (main plot) or background (inset). The resulting distributions (points with errors) are normalized to the appropriate yield and can be directly compared with the PDFs (solid curves) used in the fits. We find good agreement between data and the assumed shapes in both m_{ES} and ΔE . In Fig. 2 we display the Δt distributions for $K_S^0K_S^0$ events tagged as B^0 or \bar{B}^0 , and the asymmetry $\mathcal{A} = (N_{B^0} - N_{\bar{B}^0}) / (N_{B^0} + N_{\bar{B}^0})$. The projections are enhanced in signal decays by selecting on probability ratios calculated from the signal and background PDFs (excluding Δt). The likelihood function in the $B^0 \rightarrow K_S^0K_S^0$ fit is used to derive Bayesian confidence-level contours in the C vs. S plane by fixing (S, C) to specific values, refitting the data, and recording the change in $-2\log\mathcal{L}$. Figure 2 shows the resulting $n\sigma$ contours in the physical




FIG. 1: Distributions of (left) m_{ES} and (right) ΔE for signal (main plot) and background (inset) (a),(b) $K_S^0\pi^+$, (c),(d) $K_S^0K^+$, and (e),(f) $K_S^0K_S^0$ candidates (points with error bars) in data obtained with the weighting technique described in the text. The solid curves represent the assumed shapes used in the fits.




FIG. 2: Left: distributions of Δt for $B^0 \rightarrow K_S^0K_S^0$ decays in data tagged as B^0 (top) or \bar{B}^0 (middle), and the asymmetry (bottom). The data is enhanced in signal decays using requirements on probability ratios. The solid curve represents the PDF projection for the sum of signal and background, while the dotted curve shows the contribution from background only. Right: Likelihood contours in the S vs. C plane, where $n\sigma$ corresponds to a change in $-2\log\mathcal{L}$ of 2.3 for $n = 1$, 6.2 for $n = 2$, and 11.8 for $n = 3$. The circle indicates the physically allowed region, while the point with error bars denotes the result of the fit to data.

region defined by $S^2 + C^2 < 1$.

Systematic uncertainties on the signal yields are primarily due to the imperfect knowledge of the PDF shapes. We evaluate this uncertainty by varying the PDF parameters that are fixed in the fit within their statistical errors, and by substituting different functional forms for the PDF shapes. For the charged modes, the

largest contribution is due to the signal parameterization of m_{ES} and ΔE (3% for $K_s^0\pi^+$, 4% for $K_s^0K^+$), while for the neutral mode it is due to the potential fit bias (8.6%) determined from the pseudo-experiments. We use the larger of the value or uncertainty on the background asymmetries to set the systematic uncertainty on \mathcal{A}_{CP} due to potential charge bias [17]. We measure background asymmetries $\mathcal{A}_{CP}(K_s^0\pi^+) = -0.010 \pm 0.008$ and $\mathcal{A}_{CP}(K_s^0K^+) = -0.005 \pm 0.009$, which are consistent with no bias and lead to a systematic uncertainty of 0.010. The dominant sources of systematic uncertainty on S and C are due to the positions of the means in m_{ES} and ΔE . The statistical uncertainties of the measured values of the CP parameters are in good agreement with the expected error values (0.8 ± 0.3 for S and 0.6 ± 0.2 for C), while Monte Carlo studies confirm that the fit technique is unbiased for large values of the CP parameters.

In summary, we have observed the decays $B^+ \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 K^+$ and $B^0 \rightarrow K^0 \bar{K}^0$ with significances of 5.3σ and 7.3σ , respectively. The observed branching fractions are consistent with recent theoretical estimates [5, 20]. The measured values of the time-dependent CP -violating asymmetry parameters in the $B^0 \rightarrow K_s^0 K_s^0$ mode reported here indicate that large positive values of S are disfavored, although more data will be needed to confirm this result. We have also improved our measurements of the branching fraction and CP -violating charge asymmetry in $B^+ \rightarrow K_s^0 \pi^+$; both are consistent with previous measurements by other experiments [21].

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 CONACyT (Mexico), A. P. Sloan Foundation, Research Corporation, and Alexander von Humboldt Foundation.

- [†] Also with Università della Basilicata, Potenza, Italy
- [1] D. London and R. D. Peccei, Phys. Lett. B **223**, 257 (1989); H. R. Quinn, Nucl. Phys. B Proc. Suppl. **37A**, 21 (1994).
 - [2] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 091102 (2005); Belle Collaboration, K. Abe *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 261602 (2003).
 - [3] R. Fleischer, Phys. Lett. B **341**, 205 (1994).
 - [4] A. K. Giri and R. Mohanta, JHEP **11**, 084 (2004).
 - [5] R. Fleischer and S. Recksiegel, Eur. Phys. Jour. C **38**, 251 (2004).
 - [6] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 221801 (2005).
 - [7] For a review, see D. Kirkby and Y. Nir in Ref. [11].
 - [8] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A **479**, 1 (2002).
 - [9] G. Hanson *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **35**, 1609 (1975).
 - [10] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 071101 (2004).
 - [11] Particle Data Group, S. Eidelman *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **592**, 1 (2004).
 - [12] The decay $B^0 \rightarrow K^0 \bar{K}^0$ proceeds in an S -wave, which produces equal fractions of $K_S^0 K_S^0$ and $K_L^0 K_L^0$, but no $K_S^0 K_L^0$, neglecting CP violation in the kaon system.
 - [13] The BABAR detector simulation is based on GEANT 4, S. Agostini *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A **506**, 250 (2003).
 - [14] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 032003 (2002).
 - [15] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 111102 (2005).
 - [16] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 281802 (2002).
 - [17] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 131801 (2004).
 - [18] Belle Collaboration, Y. Chao *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 231802 (2005).
 - [19] M. Pivk and F. R. Le Diberder, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A **555**, 356 (2005).
 - [20] M. Beneke and M. Neubert, Nucl. Phys. B **675**, 333 (2003); Y.-Y. Keum, Pramana **63**, 1151 (2004); R. Fleischer and S. Recksiegel, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 051501 (2005).
 - [21] Belle Collaboration, Y. Chao *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 031502 (2005); CLEO Collaboration, S. Chen *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 525 (2000).

* Also with Università di Perugia, Dipartimento di Fisica, Perugia, Italy