

Measurement of the Absolute Branching Fractions $B \rightarrow D\pi, D^*\pi, D^{**}\pi$ with a Missing Mass Method

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-Ferrolì,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,⁴⁹ 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. Malclès,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. Bechtle,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. Sahnikov,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. Mihalys,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

⁷⁷*IFIC, Universitat de Valencia-CSIC, E-46071 Valencia, Spain*
⁷⁸*University of Victoria, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada V8W 3P6*
⁷⁹*Department of Physics, University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL, United Kingdom*
⁸⁰*University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706, USA*
⁸¹*Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut 06511, USA*
(Dated: September 20, 2006)

We present branching fraction measurements of charged and neutral B decays to $D\pi^-$, $D^*\pi^-$ and $D^{**}\pi^-$ with a missing mass method, based on a sample of 231 million $\Upsilon(4S) \rightarrow B\bar{B}$ pairs collected by the *BABAR* detector at the PEP-II e^+e^- collider. One of the B mesons is fully reconstructed and the other one decays to a reconstructed charged π and a companion charmed meson identified by its recoil mass, inferred by kinematics. Here D^{**} refers to the sum of all the non-strange charm meson states with masses in the range $2.2 - 2.8$ GeV/ c^2 . We measure the branching fractions:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{B}(B^- \rightarrow D^0\pi^-) &= (4.49 \pm 0.21 \pm 0.23) \times 10^{-3} \\ \mathcal{B}(B^- \rightarrow D^{*0}\pi^-) &= (5.13 \pm 0.22 \pm 0.28) \times 10^{-3} \\ \mathcal{B}(B^- \rightarrow D^{**0}\pi^-) &= (5.50 \pm 0.52 \pm 1.04) \times 10^{-3} \\ \mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^+\pi^-) &= (3.03 \pm 0.23 \pm 0.23) \times 10^{-3} \\ \mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}\pi^-) &= (2.99 \pm 0.23 \pm 0.24) \times 10^{-3} \\ \mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{**+}\pi^-) &= (2.34 \pm 0.65 \pm 0.88) \times 10^{-3}\end{aligned}$$

and the ratios:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{B}(B^- \rightarrow D^{*0}\pi^-)/\mathcal{B}(B^- \rightarrow D^0\pi^-) &= 1.14 \pm 0.07 \pm 0.04 \\ \mathcal{B}(B^- \rightarrow D^{**0}\pi^-)/\mathcal{B}(B^- \rightarrow D^0\pi^-) &= 1.22 \pm 0.13 \pm 0.23 \\ \mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}\pi^-)/\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^+\pi^-) &= 0.99 \pm 0.11 \pm 0.08 \\ \mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{**+}\pi^-)/\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^+\pi^-) &= 0.77 \pm 0.22 \pm 0.29\end{aligned}$$

The first uncertainty is statistical and the second is systematic.

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

Our understanding of hadronic B -meson decays has improved considerably during the past few years with the development of the Heavy Quark Effective Theory (HQET) [1, 2] and the Soft Collinear Effective Theory (SCET) [3, 4]. In these models, and in the framework of the factorization hypothesis [4, 5], the amplitude of the $B \rightarrow D^{(*)}\pi$ two-body decay carries information about the difference δ between the strong-interaction phases of the two isospin amplitudes $A_{1/2}$ and $A_{3/2}$ that contribute [6, 7]. A non-zero value of δ provides a measure of the departure from the heavy-quark limit and the importance of the final-state interactions in the $D^{(*)}\pi$ system. With the measurements by the *BABAR* [8] and *BELLE* [9] experiments of the color-suppressed B decay $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{(*)0}\pi^0$ providing evidence for a sizeable value of δ , an improved measurement of the color-favored decay amplitudes ($B^- \rightarrow D^{(*)0}\pi^-$ and $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{(*)+}\pi^-$) is of renewed interest. In addition, the study of B decays into D , D^* , and D^{**} mesons will allow tests of the spin symmetry [10–13] imbedded in HQET and of non-factorizable corrections [14] that have been assumed to be negligible in the case of the excited states D^{**} [15].

In this paper we present new measurements of the branching fractions for the decays $B^- \rightarrow D^0\pi^-$, $D^{*0}\pi^-$, $D^{**0}\pi^-$, and $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^+\pi^-$, $D^{*+}\pi^-$, $D^{**+}\pi^-$ [16], based on a missing mass method previously used by *BABAR* [17].

Here D^{**} refers to the sum of all the non-strange charm meson states with masses in the range $2.2 - 2.8$ GeV/ c^2 . This analysis uses $\Upsilon(4S) \rightarrow B\bar{B}$ events in which a B^+ or a B^0 meson, denoted B_{reco} , decays into a hadronic final state and is fully reconstructed. The decays of the recoiling \bar{B} into a charged pion and a charmed meson, *i.e.* $\bar{B} \rightarrow \pi^-X$, are studied. The charged pion is reconstructed and the mass of the $X = D, D^*, D^{**}$ is inferred from the kinematics of the two body B decay. This method, unlike the previous exclusive measurements [18, 19], does not assume that the $\Upsilon(4S)$ decays into B^+ and B^0 with equal rates, nor does it rely on the D , D^* , or D^{**} decay branching fractions.

The measurements presented here are based on a sample of 231 million $B\bar{B}$ pairs (210 fb^{-1}) recorded at the $\Upsilon(4S)$ resonance with the *BABAR* detector at the PEP-II asymmetric-energy B factory at SLAC. The *BABAR* detector is described in detail elsewhere [20]. Charged-particle trajectories are measured by a 5-layer double-sided silicon vertex tracker (SVT) and a 40-layer drift chamber (DCH), both operating in a 1.5-T solenoidal magnetic field. Charged-particle identification is provided by the average energy loss (dE/dx) in the tracking devices and by an internally reflecting ring-imaging Cherenkov detector. Photons are detected by a CsI(Tl) electromagnetic calorimeter. Muons are identified by the

instrumented magnetic-flux return (IFR). We use Monte Carlo (MC) simulations of the BABAR detector based on GEANT4 [21] to optimize selection criteria and determine selection efficiencies.

We reconstruct B^+ and B^0 decays (B_{reco}) in the modes $B^+ \rightarrow \bar{D}^{(*)0}\pi^+$, $\bar{D}^{(*)0}\rho^+$, $\bar{D}^{(*)0}a_1^+$, and $B^0 \rightarrow D^{(*)-}\pi^+$, $D^{(*)-}\rho^+$, $D^{(*)-}a_1^+$. \bar{D}^0 candidates are reconstructed in the $K^+\pi^-$, $K^+\pi^-\pi^0$, $K^+\pi^-\pi^+\pi^-$, and $K_S^0\pi^+\pi^-$ decay channels, while D^- candidates are reconstructed in the $K^+\pi^-\pi^-$ and $K_S^0\pi^-\pi^-$ modes, and K_S^0 mesons are reconstructed to $\pi^+\pi^-$. D^* candidates are reconstructed in the $D^{*-} \rightarrow \bar{D}^0\pi^-$ and $\bar{D}^{*0} \rightarrow \bar{D}^0\pi^0$ decay modes. A 3σ cut is applied on the D meson mass m_D (and on the D^*-D mass difference Δm_{D^*}) where $\sigma = \sigma_{m_D}(\sigma_{\Delta m_{D^*}})$ is the resolution on m_D (Δm_{D^*}) and is determined from data. A vertex fit is performed on D (D^*) with the mass constrained to the nominal value [22]. Two nearly independent variables are defined to identify the fully reconstructed B candidates kinematically. The first one is 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 \mathbf{p}_B is the B_{reco} momentum and (E_i, \mathbf{p}_i) is the four-momentum of the initial e^+e^- system, both measured in the laboratory frame. The invariant mass of the initial e^+e^- system is \sqrt{s} . The second variable is $\Delta E = E_B^* - \sqrt{s}/2$, where E_B^* is the B_{reco} candidate energy in the center-of-mass frame. To define the B_{reco} sample (Fig. 1), we require $|\Delta E| < n\sigma_{\Delta E}$, where the measured resolutions $\sigma_{\Delta E}$ range from 12 to 35 MeV and $n = 2$ or 3, both depending on the B_{reco} mode. The B_{reco} candidate multiplicity is 1.4 for data as well as for the MC simulation sample. For events with more than one candidate, we select the B_{reco} with the best χ^2 defined with the variables m_D , Δm_{D^*} , and ΔE . The MC simulation shows that the recoil variables are reconstructed well within their experimental resolution when using this selection.

The number of B_{reco} is extracted from the m_{ES} spectra (Fig. 1) in the 5.27 – 5.29 GeV/c^2 signal region. The m_{ES} distribution is fit to the sum of a broad combinatorial background and a narrow signal in the mass interval 5.21 – 5.29 GeV/c^2 . The combinatorial background is described by an empirical phase-space threshold function [23] and the signal with a Crystal Ball function [24] which is a Gaussian function centered at the B meson mass modified to account for photon radiation energy-loss. All parameters for the functions describing the B_{reco} signal and background distributions are determined from data. The measured yields of reconstructed B^+ and B^0 candidates, $N_{B^+} = 189474 \pm 7487$ and $N_{B^0} = 103169 \pm 3303$, are obtained by subtracting the fitted and the peaking (described below) backgrounds from the total number of events found in the signal region. These B_{reco} numbers serve as the normalization of all branching fraction measurements reported in this paper. The error is dominated by the systematic uncertainties due to the fit of the combinatorial background




FIG. 1: m_{ES} spectra of reconstructed (a) B^+ and (b) B^0 candidates. The solid curve is the sum of the fitted signal and background whereas the dashed curve is the background component only.

and to the determination of the peaking background. We assign 2.3% uncertainty to N_{B^+} and 1.8% to N_{B^0} as a fit uncertainty, obtained by varying the lower boundary of the fit interval from 5.20 to 5.23 GeV/c^2 . The contamination of misreconstructed B^0 events in the B^+ signal (and vice-versa) induces a peaking background near the B mass. From the MC simulation, the fraction of B^0 events in the reconstructed B^+ signal sample is found to be $(3.2 \pm 3.2_{\text{sys}})\%$ and the fraction of B^+ events in the reconstructed B^0 signal sample $(2.8 \pm 2.8_{\text{sys}})\%$. A 100% systematic uncertainty is conservatively assigned to these numbers taking into account the possible differences in the reconstruction efficiency in data and MC, as well as the branching fraction uncertainties for those B decay modes contributing to the peaking background. The total systematic uncertainties on N_{B^+} and N_{B^0} are 3.9% and 3.2%, respectively.

In the decay $\Upsilon(4S) \rightarrow B_{\text{reco}}\bar{B}_X\pi$ where $\bar{B}_X\pi$ is the recoiling \bar{B} which decays into π^-X , the invariant mass of the X system is derived from the missing 4-momentum p_X applying energy-momentum conservation:

$$p_X = p_{\Upsilon(4S)} - p_{B_{\text{reco}}} - p_{\pi^-}.$$

The 4-momentum of the $\Upsilon(4S)$, $p_{\Upsilon(4S)}$, is computed from the beam energies and p_{π^-} and $p_{B_{\text{reco}}}$ are the measured 4-momenta of the pion and of the reconstructed B_{reco} ,

respectively. The B_{reco} energy is constrained by the beam energies. The $\bar{B} \rightarrow D\pi^-$, $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^*\pi^-$, or $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{**}\pi^-$ signal yields peak at the D , D^* , and D^{**} masses in the missing mass spectrum, respectively.

The pion candidates, chosen among the tracks that do not belong to the B_{reco} , are required to have produced at least 12 DCH hits. For the charged B_{reco} , the pion candidate has the opposite sign to the B_{reco} . For neutral B_{reco} , because of the $B^0 - \bar{B}^0$ mixing, the corresponding requirement is not applied. Muon tracks are rejected using the IFR information, electrons tracks using the energy loss in the SVT and the DCH, or the ratio of the candidate's EMC energy deposition to its momentum (E/p). Protons and kaons are rejected based on informations from the DIRC and energy loss in the SVT and the DCH. The rejection efficiency is 97% and there is no peaking trend in the missing mass distribution from remaining kaons, protons, muons, or electrons. The pion reconstruction efficiency is determined from the MC simulation and reported in Table I.

The signal yields for the different decay modes are extracted from the missing mass spectra. The data distributions and the $b\bar{b}$ and the $q\bar{q}$ ($q = c, u, d, s$) background expectations are shown in Figs. 2(a) and 2(b). The shape of the background is taken from MC and the normalization is scaled to match the data in the sideband region $2.8 - 3.2 \text{ GeV}/c^2$. The error on the background normalization is 2%. This is determined using the statistical errors of MC and data samples. The background subtracted missing mass distributions are shown in Figs. 2(c) and 2(d).

The $D\pi$ and $D^*\pi$ signal yields are extracted by a χ^2 fit to the background subtracted missing mass distribution in the range $1.65 - 2.20 \text{ GeV}/c^2$. The $D\pi$ and $D^*\pi$ components are each modeled by a sum of two Gaussian functions, to account for tails in the mass distributions. The parameters are $m_i^{D^{(*)}}$ and $\sigma_i^{D^{(*)}}$ for the D and D^* resonances, where the index $i = 1, 2$ corresponds to the first and second Gaussian. In the fit, the central values m_i^D and the σ_i^D are free parameters, while for the D^* the variances are constrained by the ratios $\sigma_i^{D^*}/\sigma_i^D = 0.900 \pm 0.015$, as determined from MC simulation, while the central values differences $m_i^{D^*} - m_i^D$ are fixed to $0.1421 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ and to $0.1406 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ for B^+ and B^0 , respectively, corresponding to the world average D and D^* mass differences [22].

The D^{**} yields are defined as the excess of candidates in the missing mass range $2.2 - 2.8 \text{ GeV}/c^2$, and the $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{**}\pi^-$ branching fractions refer to the contributions of all non-strange charm meson states in the same region. The range is chosen in order to maximize the acceptance to the four P-wave D^{**} states predicted by the theory given the $34 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ mass resolution, determined from MC simulation, in the same region. The well-known narrow D_1 and D_2^* states [22] are fully contained in this range, and more than 90% of the broad

D_0 and D_1' , are covered if measured masses and widths [25, 26] are used. The event yields, the efficiencies, and the resulting branching fractions are reported in Table I.

TABLE I: Signal yields, efficiencies and branching fractions for $\bar{B} \rightarrow D\pi^-$, $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^*\pi^-$ and $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{**}\pi^-$. The first error is statistical except for the efficiencies for which it is mainly systematic. The second error on the branching fractions is systematic. The $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^{**}\pi^-$ branching fractions are given for the $2.2 - 2.8 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ mass range which in addition to the P-wave states may include some yet unknown charm meson states.

Decay mode	Yield	Efficiency	$\mathcal{B}(10^{-3})$
$B^- \rightarrow D^0\pi^-$	677 ± 32		$4.49 \pm 0.21 \pm 0.23$
$B^- \rightarrow D^{*0}\pi^-$	774 ± 33	0.796 ± 0.007	$5.13 \pm 0.22 \pm 0.28$
$B^- \rightarrow D^{**0}\pi^-$	829 ± 78		$5.50 \pm 0.52 \pm 1.04$
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^+\pi^-$	248 ± 19		$3.03 \pm 0.23 \pm 0.23$
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}\pi^-$	245 ± 19	0.793 ± 0.007	$2.99 \pm 0.23 \pm 0.24$
$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{**+}\pi^-$	192 ± 54		$2.34 \pm 0.65 \pm 0.88$

The uncertainty related to π reconstruction efficiency is due to the MC sample statistics and the systematic uncertainty on track reconstruction and particle identification algorithms. The uncertainty due to the yield extraction is estimated by fitting the MC sample. The difference between the MC and the data fitted yields is found to be consistent with zero and the statistical errors are taken as a systematic error. We evaluate the uncertainty on the missing mass resolution in the $D\pi$ and $D^*\pi$ yield extraction by varying by one standard deviation the ratio $\sigma_i^{D^*}/\sigma_i^D$ while $\sigma_2^{D^*}$ and $m_2^{D^*}$ are let free. The difference in the yield is taken as systematic uncertainty. The uncertainty related to the subtraction of the background is determined by varying the branching fraction of the different background components within the uncertainties of the most recent measurements [22] and taking into account the error on the background normalization. Due to the threshold shape of some of the background components and the fast varying combinatorial background, $B \rightarrow D^{**}\pi$ branching fractions have larger systematic errors than $B \rightarrow D\pi$ and $B \rightarrow D^*\pi$ branching fractions. The summary of these systematic uncertainties is reported in Table II.

Using the measured branching fractions we compute the following ratios:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}(B^- \rightarrow D^{*0}\pi^-)/\mathcal{B}(B^- \rightarrow D^0\pi^-) &= 1.14 \pm 0.07 \pm 0.04, \\ \mathcal{B}(B^- \rightarrow D^{**0}\pi^-)/\mathcal{B}(B^- \rightarrow D^0\pi^-) &= 1.22 \pm 0.13 \pm 0.23, \\ \mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}\pi^-)/\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^+\pi^-) &= 0.99 \pm 0.11 \pm 0.08, \\ \mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{**+}\pi^-)/\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^+\pi^-) &= 0.77 \pm 0.22 \pm 0.29. \end{aligned}$$

The first uncertainty is statistical and the second is systematic. In addition to the cancellation of many of the




FIG. 2: Top: missing mass distributions obtained in the recoil of B^+ (a) and B^0 (b). The points with error bars show the data and the histograms show the background contributions ($b\bar{b}$ and $q\bar{q}$ ($q = c, u, d, s$)) predicted by the MC simulation. Bottom: background-subtracted missing mass spectra for B^+ (c) and B^0 (d). The curves show the result of the fits to the $D\pi$ and $D^*\pi$ components.

TABLE II: Total relative systematic uncertainties for the branching fractions $\mathcal{B}(B^- \rightarrow (D^0, D^{*0}, D^{**0})\pi^-)$ and $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow (D^+, D^{*+}, D^{**+})\pi^-)$.

Syst. Source	$B^- \rightarrow D^0\pi^-$	$B^- \rightarrow D^{*0}\pi^-$	$B^- \rightarrow D^{**0}\pi^-$	$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^+\pi^-$	$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}\pi^-$	$\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{**+}\pi^-$
N_B	3.9%	3.9%	3.9%	3.2%	3.2%	3.2%
Efficiency	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%
Yield extraction	2.7%	2.7%	5.1%	5.4%	5.1%	5.9%
Missing mass resolution	0.9%	0.8%	-	1.9%	1.1%	-
Background subtraction	1.6%	2.3%	17.7%	3.7%	5.4%	37.1%
Total	5.2%	5.4%	18.9%	7.6%	8.2%	37.7%

systematic errors, the ratios are insensitive to the absolute normalization scale.

In summary, we have measured the branching fractions for the decays $B^- \rightarrow D^0\pi^-$, $B^- \rightarrow D^{*0}\pi^-$, $B^- \rightarrow D^{**0}\pi^-$, $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^+\pi^-$, $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}\pi^-$, and $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{**+}\pi^-$, using a missing mass method. This measurement does not assume that the $\Upsilon(4S)$ decays into B^+ and B^0 with equal rates, nor does it rely on the D ,

D^* , or D^{**} intermediate branching fractions. The results for $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow D\pi^-)$ and $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow D^*\pi^-)$ are compatible with previous world averages [22]. We have extracted a new result for $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow D^{**}\pi^-)$ branching fractions where D^{**} excited states correspond to the yield measured in the mass range 2.2 – 2.8 GeV/c^2 . The isospin study [6, 7] will become competitive with the exclusive measurements [19] if the statistical error is reduced by a fac-

tor of 2. With regard to spin symmetry, the values measured for the ratios $\mathcal{B}(B^- \rightarrow D^{*0}\pi^-)/\mathcal{B}(B^- \rightarrow D^0\pi^-)$ and $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}\pi^-)/\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^+\pi^-)$ are close to 1, as predicted by different theoretical models [10–14], and their precision is comparable or better than the current world averages [22].

We are grateful for the extraordinary contributions of our PEP-II colleagues in achieving the excellent luminosity and machine conditions that have made this work possible. The success of this project also relies critically on the expertise and dedication of the computing organizations that support *BABAR*. The collaborating institutions wish to thank SLAC for its support and the kind hospitality extended to them. This work is supported by the US Department of Energy and National Science Foundation, the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (Canada), Institute of High Energy Physics (China), the Commissariat à l’Energie Atomique and Institut National de Physique Nucléaire et de Physique des Particules (France), the Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung and Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (Germany), the Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare (Italy), the Foundation for Fundamental Research on Matter (The Netherlands), the Research Council of Norway, the Ministry of Science and Technology of the Russian Federation, Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia (Spain), and the Particle Physics and Astronomy Research Council (United Kingdom). Individuals have received support from the Marie-Curie IEF program (European Union) and the A. P. Sloan Foundation.

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

† Also with Università della Basilicata, Potenza, Italy

- [1] M. Beneke *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **B591**, 313 (2000).
 [2] M. Neubert and B. Stech in *Heavy Flavours* edited by A.J. Buras and M. Lindner, 2nd ed. (World scientific, Singapore, 1998).
 [3] C.W. Bauer, D. Pirjol, and I. W. Stewart, Phys. Rev.

- D **65**, 054022 (2002).
 [4] C.W. Bauer, D. Pirjol, and I. W. Stewart, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 201806 (2001).
 [5] M. Bauer, B. Stech, M. Wirbel, Z. Phys. C **34**, 103 (1987).
 [6] J.L. Rosner, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 074029 (1999).
 [7] C. W. Chiang and J.L. Rosner, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 074013 (2003).
 [8] *BABAR* Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **6**, 032004 (2004).
 [9] Belle Collaboration, K. Abe *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 052002 (2002).
 [10] T. Mannel *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **259**, 359 (1991).
 [11] M. Neubert, W. Rieckert, B. Stech, and Q. P. Xu, in *Heavy Flavours* edited by A.J. Buras and M. Lindner, (World scientific, Singapore, 1992).
 [12] S. Mantry, D. Pirjol, and I. W. Stewart, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 114009 (2003).
 [13] F. Jugeau, A. Le Yaouanc, L. Oliver, and J.-C Raynal, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 094010(2005).
 [14] B. Blok, and M. Shifman, Nucl. Phys. **B389**, 534 (1993).
 [15] M. Neubert, Phys. Lett. B **418**, 173 (1998).
 [16] Charge conjugate relations are assumed throughout this paper.
 [17] *BABAR* Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 052002 (2006).
 [18] S. Ahmed *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 031101(R) (2002) and M.S. Alam *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **50**, 43(1994).
 [19] G. Calderini, *BABAR* Collaboration, XXXIII International Conference on High Energy Physics (ICHEP’06), Moscow, 26 July - 2 August, 2006.
 [20] *BABAR* Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Nucl. Instr. Meth. A **479**,1 (2002).
 [21] GEANT4 Collaboration, S. Agostinelli *et al.* Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys Res. Sect. A **506**, 250 (2003).
 [22] W.-M. Yao *et al.* (Particle Data Group Collaboration), J. Phys. **G33**, 1, (2006).
 [23] ARGUS Collaboration, H. Albrecht *et al.*, Z. Phys. C **48**, 543 (1990).
 [24] CRYSTAL BALL collaboration, T. Skwarnicki, DESY F31-86-02, J. E. Gaiser *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **34**, 711 (1986).
 [25] Belle Collaboration, K.Abe *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 112002 (2004).
 [26] FOCUS Collaboration, J. M. Link *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **586**, 11 (2004).