

Evidence for the Rare Decay $B^+ \rightarrow D_s^+ \pi^0$

B. Aubert,¹ M. Bona,¹ D. Boutigny,¹ Y. Karyotakis,¹ J. P. Lees,¹ V. Poireau,¹ X. Prudent,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 Y. Groysman,⁶
R. G. Jacobsen,⁶ J. A. Kadyk,⁶ L. T. Kerth,⁶ Yu. G. Kolomensky,⁶ G. Kukartsev,⁶ D. Lopes Pegna,⁶ G. Lynch,⁶
L. M. Mir,⁶ T. J. Orimoto,⁶ M. Pripstein,⁶ N. A. Roe,⁶ M. T. Ronan,^{6,*} K. Tackmann,⁶ W. A. Wenzel,⁶
P. del Amo Sanchez,⁷ M. Barrett,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
E. C. Martin,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 L. Zhang,¹⁵ 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 D. C. Williams,¹⁸ M. G. Wilson,¹⁸ L. O. Winstrom,¹⁸ J. Albert,¹⁹ E. Chen,¹⁹
C. H. Cheng,¹⁹ A. Dvoretzki,¹⁹ F. Fang,¹⁹ D. G. Hitlin,¹⁹ I. Narsky,¹⁹ T. Piatenko,¹⁹ F. C. Porter,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 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 S. Kaiser,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 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 P. D. Dauncey,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 V. Lepeltier,³⁷ F. Le Diberder,³⁷
A. M. Lutz,³⁷ S. Pruvot,³⁷ S. Rodier,³⁷ P. Roudeau,³⁷ M. H. Schune,³⁷ J. Serrano,³⁷ A. Stocchi,³⁷ W. F. Wang,³⁷
G. Wormser,³⁷ 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. McMahon,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 T. J. West,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 E. Salvati,⁴⁵ S. Saremi,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

Submitted to Physical Review Letters

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 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 J. P. Morris,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 C. T. Potter,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 E. Ben-Haim,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. Gladney,⁵⁹ M. Biasini,⁶⁰ R. Covarelli,⁶⁰ C. Angelini,⁶¹ G. Batignani,⁶¹ S. Bettarini,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 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 B. Franek,⁶⁶ E. O. Olaiya,⁶⁶ S. Ricciardi,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 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 A. P. Wagner,⁶⁹ M. Weaver,⁶⁹ W. J. Wisniewski,⁶⁹ M. Wittgen,⁶⁹ D. H. Wright,⁶⁹ H. W. Wulsin,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 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 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. Pelliccioni,⁷⁵ M. Bomben,⁷⁶ L. Bosisio,⁷⁶ C. Cartaro,⁷⁶ F. Cossutti,⁷⁶ G. Della Ricca,⁷⁶ L. Lanceri,⁷⁶ L. Vitale,⁷⁶ V. Azzolini,⁷⁷ N. Lopez-March,⁷⁷ F. Martinez-Vidal,⁷⁷ A. Oyanguren,⁷⁷ Sw. Banerjee,⁷⁸ B. Bhuyan,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 S. Dasu,⁸⁰ K. T. Flood,⁸⁰ J. J. Hollar,⁸⁰ P. E. Kutter,⁸⁰ B. Mellado,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/Daphnia, 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 have searched for the rare decay $B^+ \rightarrow D_s^+ \pi^0$. The analysis is based on a sample of 232 million $\Upsilon(4S) \rightarrow B\bar{B}$ decays collected with the *BABAR* detector at the PEP-II e^+e^- storage ring. We find 19.6 signal events, corresponding to a significance of 4.7σ . The extracted signal yield including statistical and systematic uncertainties is $20.1_{-6.0-1.5}^{+6.8+0.4}$, and we measure $\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow D_s^+ \pi^0) = (1.5_{-0.4}^{+0.5} \pm 0.1 \pm 0.2) \times 10^{-5}$, where the first uncertainty is statistical, the second is systematic, and the last is due to the uncertainty on the D_s^+ decay and its daughter decay branching fractions.

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

Significant CP violation in the standard model (SM) of particle physics is induced by the 3×3 unitary Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) quark flavor mixing matrix V [1] but is considered too small to produce the observed matter-antimatter asymmetry in the universe. Hence, New Physics contributions are searched for by testing unitarity conditions for V in a variety of processes. In these tests the parameter $\gamma = \arctan(\bar{\eta}/\bar{\rho})$, where $\bar{\rho} + i \cdot \bar{\eta} \equiv -V_{ud}V_{ub}^*/V_{cd}V_{cb}^*$, plays a crucial role as it is extracted from processes dominated by SM tree-amplitudes and can be compared with γ obtained from constraints dominated by loop amplitudes which are mutually sensitive to New Physics. Constraints on $\sin(2\beta + \gamma)$ ($\beta = \arctan(\bar{\eta}/(1 - \bar{\rho}))$) can be obtained from the measurement of time-dependent decay rates in $B^0, \bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^- \pi^+$ or $D^{*-} \pi^+$ [2], where CKM-favored ($\propto V_{cb}^*V_{ud}$) and CKM-suppressed ($\propto V_{ub}^*V_{cd}$) processes interfere [3]. First measurements have been recently published [4].

The ratio $r = |A(B^0 \rightarrow D^+ \pi^-)/A(B^0 \rightarrow D^- \pi^+)|$ of decay amplitudes is required in order to constrain $\sin(2\beta + \gamma)$ from $B^0 \rightarrow D^\mp \pi^\pm$. The amplitude $A(B^0 \rightarrow D^- \pi^+)$ is well known from the precisely measured branching fraction $\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow D^- \pi^+)$ [5]. With the currently available data samples the measurement of the CKM-suppressed decay $B^0 \rightarrow D^+ \pi^-$ is not feasible due to the presence of a very large background from the CKM-favored decay $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^+ \pi^-$. This problem could be avoided with the measurement of the isospin related decay $B^+ \rightarrow D^+ \pi^0$ which is currently out of reach due to its small branching fraction ($< 10^{-6}$). However, r can be related to $\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow D_s^+ \pi^-)$ [3] as well as to $\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow D_s^+ \pi^0)$ with the use of SU(3) flavor symmetry. Tree and W -exchange amplitudes contribute to $B^0 \rightarrow D^+ \pi^-$, whereas only a tree amplitude contributes to $B^{0(+)} \rightarrow D_s^+ \pi^{-(0)}$. The exchange amplitude is expected to be small and has been estimated at 10–15% of the total decay amplitude [6]. This estimate uses $\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow D_s^- K^+)$ [7] and neglects final-state rescattering interactions. Non-factorizable SU(3)-breaking effects are hard to quantify and often assumed to not exceed the 30% level [4] consistent with the spread of theoretical estimates of r [8].

The branching fraction $\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow D_s^+ \pi^-)$ has been measured by the Belle and *BABAR* collaborations [7]. The decay $B^+ \rightarrow D_s^+ \pi^0$ provides an independent estimate of r , though not as precise as the one from $B^0 \rightarrow D_s^+ \pi^-$ due to the smaller branching fraction and reconstruction efficiency. It also represents a significant background source

for analyses of other decays related to the extraction of $\sin(2\beta + \gamma)$, such as $B^+ \rightarrow D^+ \pi^0$, $D_s^{*+} \pi^0$ or $B^0 \rightarrow D_s^+ \rho^-$. For $\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow D_s^+ \pi^0)$ only an upper limit of 2×10^{-4} at 90% confidence level [9] has been established so far. Here, we present evidence for the decay $B^+ \rightarrow D_s^+ \pi^0$ and a measurement of its branching fraction.

The analysis uses a sample of 232 million $\Upsilon(4S)$ decays into $B\bar{B}$ pairs collected with the *BABAR* detector at the PEP-II asymmetric-energy B -factory. The *BABAR* detector is described in detail elsewhere [10]. We use the GEANT4 [11] Monte Carlo (MC) software to simulate interactions of particles traversing the *BABAR* detector.

We select events with a minimum of three reconstructed tracks. To reject $e^+e^- \rightarrow q\bar{q}$ ($q = u, d, s, c$) continuum events, the ratio of the second and zeroth order Fox-Wolfram moments [12], determined from all clusters in the electromagnetic calorimeter with an energy above 30 MeV and all tracks, must be less than 0.5.

We reconstruct D_s^+ -meson candidates in the decay modes $D_s^+ \rightarrow \phi\pi^+$, $K_s^0 K^+$, and $\bar{K}^{*0} K^+$, with $\phi \rightarrow K^+ K^-$, $K_s^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-$, and $\bar{K}^{*0} \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$. Charged kaon (pion) candidates are required to fulfill kaon (pion) selection criteria with high efficiency (80–95%) and small misidentification probability (1–10%) depending on the selector used [10, 13]. K_s^0 candidates, reconstructed from two oppositely-charged tracks, are required to have a measured flight distance from the primary interaction point that is at least three times the measurement error and an invariant $\pi^+ \pi^-$ mass of ± 15 MeV/ c^2 around the PDG mass [5]. ϕ (\bar{K}^{*0}) candidates are required to have an invariant $K^+ K^-$ ($K^- \pi^+$) mass of ± 30 (± 75) MeV/ c^2 around the PDG mass [5]. D_s^+ candidates are required to have invariant masses $m_{D_s^+}$ within 60 MeV/ c^2 around $m_{D_s^+}^{\text{PDG}} = 1968.3$ MeV/ c^2 [5]. We further define a signal region by requiring $|m_{D_s^+} - m_{D_s^+}^{\text{PDG}}| \lesssim 2\sigma$ where σ has been determined from the MC simulation and found to be 4.7 (5.0) MeV/ c^2 for $D_s^+ \rightarrow \phi\pi^+$ ($\bar{K}^{*0} K^+$) and 6.0 MeV/ c^2 for $K_s^0 K^+$. For background studies sidebands are defined by $|m_{D_s^+} - m_{D_s^+}^{\text{PDG}}| \gtrsim 3\sigma$. To suppress background from $B^+ \rightarrow D_s^{*+} \pi^0$ events we restrict the D_s^+ momentum in the $\Upsilon(4S)$ system to lie within [2.073, 2.550] GeV/ c . Decay daughters from \bar{K}^{*0} , K_s^0 , D_s^+ , and B^+ candidates are constrained to a geometric vertex.

Neutral pions are reconstructed in $\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ requiring a π^0 laboratory energy above 200 MeV and an invariant

mass $m_{\gamma\gamma} \in [115, 150]$ MeV/ c^2 . To improve the momentum resolution a kinematic fit is applied to the daughter photons constraining $m_{\gamma\gamma}$ to the PDG π^0 mass [5].

Charged B -meson candidates are obtained by combining D_s^+ and π^0 candidates and are identified by two kinematic variables. The first is the beam-energy-substituted mass $m_{\text{ES}} = \sqrt{(s/2 + \mathbf{p}_0 \cdot \mathbf{p}_B / E_0)^2 - \mathbf{p}_B^2}$, where E_0 and \mathbf{p}_0 are the energy, respectively, the momentum of the e^+e^- system, \mathbf{p}_B the B^+ candidates momentum, and \sqrt{s} the e^+e^- center-of-momentum (c.m.) energy. The second variable is $\Delta E = E_B^* - \sqrt{s}/2$, where E_B^* is the B^+ candidate's c.m. energy. For signal events the m_{ES} distribution is centered at the B -meson mass with a resolution of about 2.5 MeV/ c^2 , and the ΔE distribution has a maximum close to zero with a resolution of about 50 MeV. The m_{ES} and ΔE signal distributions are both asymmetric with a tail towards smaller values due to energy leakage in the electromagnetic calorimeter when reconstructing $\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$. The signal region is defined by $m_{\text{ES}} \in [5.2, 5.3]$ GeV/ c^2 and $|\Delta E| < 0.2$ GeV. In a small fraction of events ($< 5\%$) multiple signal candidates are found. In this case, the candidate with the smallest deviation of $m_{\gamma\gamma}$ from the PDG π^0 mass [5] is retained. If multiple candidates still remain, the final candidate is selected randomly.

A neural network (NN) [14] built from event topology and invariant mass variables is used to suppress continuum background, mainly coming from $e^+e^- \rightarrow c\bar{c}$. The NN variables are: (1) thrust [15] and (2) sphericity [16], both calculated from all tracks and neutral candidates in the event; (3) the cosine of the angle between the thrust axis of the B^+ candidate and the thrust axis calculated from all tracks and neutral candidates not belonging to the B^+ candidate; (4) the energy flow moments L_0 and L_2 [17]; (5) the cosine of the angle between the thrust axis of the B^+ candidate in the $\Upsilon(4S)$ system and the beam axis; (6) the cosine of the angle between the B^+ momentum vector in the $\Upsilon(4S)$ system and the beam axis; (7) the invariant mass of the corresponding ϕ , K_s^0 and \bar{K}^{*0} candidate, and (8) the cosine of the helicity angle between the ϕ (\bar{K}^{*0}) momentum in the D_s^+ rest frame and the momentum vector of the ϕ (\bar{K}^{*0}) decay daughter in the ϕ (\bar{K}^{*0}) rest system. The NN has been trained on simulated $B^+ \rightarrow D_s^+ \pi^0$ and simulated continuum events. With an optimized NN cut, signal events are retained with an efficiency of order 60%, while about 96% (70%) of continuum events (non-signal B decays) are rejected.

We extract the signal yield with a two-dimensional extended unbinned maximum likelihood fit in the variables m_{ES} and ΔE where we combine the three D_s^+ modes. The extended log-likelihood function used is given by

$$\ln \mathcal{L} = - \sum_{j=1}^3 n_j + \sum_{i=1}^N \ln \sum_{j=1}^3 n_j P_j(\mathbf{x}_i)$$

where the sum is over $i = 1, \dots, N = 154$ selected

events inside the signal region and the n_j represent the three yields after the aforementioned selection: (1) signal (SIG), (2) combinatorial background (CBG) that comes from random combinations of tracks and π^0 candidates, mainly from continuum events, and (3) B background peaking at m_{ES} values close to the nominal B -meson mass and at negative ΔE values (PBG) mostly due to $B^+ \rightarrow D_s^{*+} \pi^0$. $P_j(\mathbf{x}_i)$ is the product of probability density functions (PDF's) of candidate i in the variables $\mathbf{x}_i = (m_{\text{ES}}, \Delta E)_i$: $P_j(\mathbf{x}_i) = P_{j,1}(m_{\text{ES}_i}) \cdot P_{j,2}(\Delta E_i)$. To take into account correlations observed in the simulation we allow in some cases for a functional dependence of the PDF parameters of $P_{j,1}(m_{\text{ES}})$ on ΔE , or of $P_{j,2}(\Delta E)$ on m_{ES} .

The signal PDF has been determined from the MC simulation. The m_{ES} PDF is described by an asymmetric Gaussian $G(m_{\text{ES}}, \mu, \sigma)$ with $\sigma = \sigma_L(\sigma_R)$ for $x - \mu < 0$ (≥ 0). The parameters μ , σ_L and σ_R are given by second order polynomials in ΔE in order to take into account a non-linear correlation between ΔE and m_{ES} observed in the MC simulation. The ΔE signal PDF is described by a Crystal Ball function [18].

The CBG PDF in m_{ES} is parameterized by $f(m_{\text{ES}}) = m_{\text{ES}} \sqrt{1 - (\frac{m_{\text{ES}}}{m_{\text{ES}}^{\text{max}}})^2} \exp(\xi \cdot (1 - (\frac{m_{\text{ES}}}{m_{\text{ES}}^{\text{max}}})^2))$ [19], where $m_{\text{ES}}^{\text{max}}$ is the kinematic limit $\sqrt{s}/2$ fixed at 5.2895 GeV/ c^2 . The CBG PDF in ΔE is described by a second order polynomial $\text{Pol}(\Delta E) = 1 + p_1 \cdot \Delta E + p_2(m_{\text{ES}}) \cdot \Delta E^2$. To take into account a possible correlation between ΔE and m_{ES} of order 5%, the parameter p_2 depends linearly on m_{ES} . The parameters ξ , p_1 , and p_2 are determined from the likelihood fit on data.

The PBG component is modeled by simulated $B^+ \rightarrow D_s^{*+} \pi^0$ MC events. The ΔE PDF is described by a Gaussian. As in the case for the signal, the m_{ES} PDF is described by an asymmetric Gaussian, and its parameters μ , σ_L and σ_R are given by second order polynomials in ΔE . Additional backgrounds that peak at negative ΔE values are due to B -meson decays such as $B^0 \rightarrow D^{(*)-} \rho^+$ with a similar decay topology and kinematics as the signal decay. This kind of background is found to be well described by the $B^+ \rightarrow D_s^{*+} \pi^0$ PDF. Another sizeable background source from the decay $B^0 \rightarrow D_s^+ \rho^-$ is not well described by the $B^+ \rightarrow D_s^{*+} \pi^0$ PDF. However, the expected number of $B^0 \rightarrow D_s^+ \rho^-$ events estimated from Ref. [20] is small compared to the other peaking background sources. As a consequence, we do not introduce an additional PDF and estimate the fit bias introduced in this way from a dedicated MC simulation study.

The fit has been validated on samples using signal and peaking background events from the full MC simulation. From the likelihood fit we find the yield estimators $\hat{n}_{\text{SIG}} = 19.6_{-6.0}^{+6.8}$, $\hat{n}_{\text{CBG}} = 116.7 \pm 12.5$ and $\hat{n}_{\text{PBG}} = 17.7 \pm 6.9$, the latter being consistent with the expectation from the MC simulation. The signal significance is determined from a MC simulation containing no




FIG. 1: Likelihood projections on m_{ES} and ΔE after a cut on the signal-to-background likelihood ratio. Points with error bars: data; black solid line: result of the full fit; grey dashed curve: signal; grey dash-dotted curve: peaking background; grey solid curve: combinatorial background.

signal events, where we use the background yields and the CBG parameters as measured by the fit on data. We include the statistical uncertainties on the CBG PDF parameters and the uncertainties on the background yields and find a probability to observe at least \hat{n}_{SIG} events of 1.5×10^{-6} corresponding to a 4.7σ significance. Fit projections for ΔE and m_{ES} are shown in Fig. 1 where background contributions are suppressed by a cut on the signal-to-background likelihood ratio where the cut values are determined from MC by maximizing the ratio $\hat{n}_{\text{SIG}}/\sqrt{\hat{n}_{\text{SIG}} + \hat{n}_{\text{CBG}} + \hat{n}_{\text{PBG}}}$.

We assume $\mathcal{B}(\Upsilon(4S) \rightarrow B^+B^-) = \mathcal{B}(\Upsilon(4S) \rightarrow B^0\bar{B}^0)$ and calculate the branching fraction from $\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow D_s^+\pi^0) = \hat{n}_{\text{SIG}}/(N_{B\bar{B}} \sum_k \varepsilon_k \mathcal{B}_k)$, where $N_{B\bar{B}}$ is the number of charged and neutral B -meson pairs, ε_k is the signal efficiency, and \mathcal{B}_k is the branching fraction of D_s^+ decay mode k ($k = \phi\pi^+, K_s^0 K^+, \bar{K}^{*0} K^+$) including their daughter decay modes taken from Ref. [5] and scaled to the recent result [21] for $D_s^+ \rightarrow \phi\pi^+$ ($\mathcal{B}_{\phi\pi^+} = 2.3\%$, $\mathcal{B}_{K_s^0 K^+} = 1.7\%$, $\mathcal{B}_{\bar{K}^{*0} K^+} = 2.9\%$). Signal efficiencies ($\varepsilon_{\phi\pi^+} = 9.7\%$, $\varepsilon_{K_s^0 K^+} = 9.1\%$, $\varepsilon_{\bar{K}^{*0} K^+} = 7.1\%$) are estimated from the MC simulation and are corrected for differences between data and simulation using high statis-

tics control samples of high purity. The result is

$$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow D_s^+\pi^0) = (1.5_{-0.4}^{+0.5} \pm 0.1 \pm 0.2) \times 10^{-5},$$

where the first uncertainty is statistical, the second systematic (Table I) and the third due to the branching fraction uncertainties of the D_s^+ [21] and its daughter decays (Table I and Ref. [5]). We also quote the product $\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow D_s^+\pi^0)\mathcal{B}(D_s^+ \rightarrow \phi\pi^+) = (7.0_{-2.1-0.7}^{+2.4+0.5} \pm 0.4) \times 10^{-7}$.

Several systematic uncertainties on the signal yield have been considered. Background from B decays into charmless final states (CPBG, *e.g.* $B^+ \rightarrow \phi\rho^+$) peaking in the same region in m_{ES} and ΔE as $B^+ \rightarrow D_s^+\pi^0$ has been estimated from a fit in the D_s^+ mass sidebands. Scaled to the D_s^+ mass signal region we find $\hat{n}_{\text{CPBG}}^{\text{scaled}} = -1.4 \pm 1.4$ and assign the statistical error as a one-sided systematic error. The background peaking at negative ΔE values found in this fit is consistent with the MC expectation. MC studies with many samples of the same size as the data sample indicate a small negative fit bias. We correct for this bias ($+0.5$ events) and assign the statistical uncertainty as a systematic error (± 0.3 events). The PDF parameters for signal and peaking background have been varied within their errors as found in the fit on MC resulting in a variation of ± 0.20 events in the signal yield. The change in the signal yield when m_{ES}^{max} is free to vary is $+0.16$ events and is assigned as a systematic error. The possible bias in \hat{n}_{SIG} due to the presence of $B^0 \rightarrow D_s^+\rho^-$ events is estimated to be -0.18 events where the upper limit at 90% confidence level [20], $\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow D_s^+\rho^-) < 1.9 \times 10^{-5}$, has been assumed, and is assigned as a systematic uncertainty. We obtain a total systematic uncertainty on the signal yield of $_{-1.5}^{+0.4}$ events.

Other systematic uncertainties on the branching fraction are due to the uncertainty on $N_{B\bar{B}}$, the statistical uncertainty on the MC samples used, and possible differences in detection and reconstruction efficiencies between data and MC simulation for: NN and $m_{D_s^+}$ selection requirements estimated with a high-purity control sample of $B^+ \rightarrow D_s^+\bar{D}^0$ ($\bar{D}^0 \rightarrow K^+\pi^-, K^+\pi^-\pi^+\pi^-$) events; charged particle tracking; K_s^0 and π^0 reconstruction; and charged particle identification (PID).

In summary, we measure $\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow D_s^+\pi^0) = (1.5_{-0.4}^{+0.5} \pm 0.1 \pm 0.2) \times 10^{-5}$ and translate the result into a $\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow D_s^+\pi^-)$ value with the use of isospin symmetry and B -meson lifetime values from Ref. [5]. The result, $\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow D_s^+\pi^-) = (2.7_{-0.8-0.3}^{+0.9+0.2} \pm 0.4) \times 10^{-5}$, is consistent with the ones given in Refs. [7] but is less precise.

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),

TABLE I: Contributions to the relative systematic uncertainty (in %) on the branching fraction $\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow D_s^+ \pi^0)$ coming from the signal efficiency subdivided in the reconstructed D_s^+ modes, the signal yield, and the number of $B\bar{B}$ pairs. Also shown is the total relative systematic uncertainty and the uncertainty due to the individual \mathcal{B}_k (both in %).

Uncertainty in $D_s^+ \rightarrow$	$\phi\pi^+$	$K_s^0 K^+$	$\bar{K}^{*0} K^+$
NN cut efficiency	+4.5, -5.2	+6.1, -7.0	+4.1, -4.7
m_{D_s} cut efficiency	+1.6, -2.0	+2.2, -3.1	+4.6, -6.6
Tracking efficiency	± 3.9	± 1.3	± 3.9
K_s^0 efficiency	-	± 3.1	-
π^0 efficiency		± 3.2	
PID	± 2.5	± 1.6	± 2.5
MC statistics	± 1.1	± 1.1	± 1.4
Total efficiency error	+7.5, -8.0	+8.2, -9.2	+8.5, -10.0
Signal Yield		+2.3, -7.5	
$N_{B\bar{B}}$		± 1.1	
Total systematic error		+6.9, -9.6	
\mathcal{B}_k	± 13	± 18	± 17

INFN (Italy), FOM (The Netherlands), NFR (Norway), MIST (Russia), MEC (Spain), and PPARC (United Kingdom). Individuals have received support from the Marie Curie EIF (European Union) and the A. P. Sloan Foundation.

* Deceased

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

‡ Also with Università della Basilicata, Potenza, Italy

§ Also with IPPP, Physics Department, Durham University, Durham DH1 3LE, United Kingdom

- [1] M. Kobayashi and T. Maskawa, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **49**, 652 (1973).
[2] Charge conjugated states are implied unless explicitly stated.
[3] I. Dunietz, *Phys. Lett.* **B427**, 179 (1998).
[4] *BABAR* Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 251801 (2004); *Phys. Rev.* **D71**, 112003

- (2005). Belle Collaboration, T. Sarangi *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 031802 (2004).
[5] Particle Data Group, S. Eidelman *et al.*, *Phys. Lett.* **B592**, 1 (2004).
[6] C.W. Chiang and J.L. Rosner, *Phys. Rev.* **D67**, 074013 (2003); C.S. Kim, S. Oh, and C. Yu, *Phys. Lett.* **B621**, 259 (2005).
[7] Belle Collaboration, P. Krokovny *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 231804 (2002); *BABAR* Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 181803 (2003); *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 081801 (2007).
[8] D.A. Suprun, C.W. Chiang, and J.L. Rosner, *Phys. Rev.* **D65**, 054025 (2002).
[9] CLEO Collaboration, J. Alexander *et al.*, *Phys. Lett.* **B319**, 365 (1993).
[10] *BABAR* Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, *Nucl. Instrum. Methods* **A479**, 1 (2002).
[11] GEANT4 Collaboration, S. Agostinelli *et al.*, *Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A* **506**, 250 (2003).
[12] G.C. Fox and S. Wolfram, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **41**, 1581 (1978).
[13] *BABAR*-DIRC Collaboration, I. Adam *et al.*, *Nucl. Instrum. Methods* **A538**, 281 (2005).
[14] Artificial Intelligence International Workshop on Software Engineering, in “New Computing Techniques in Physics Research IV: Proceedings of the Fourth International Workshop on Software Engineering, Artificial Intelligence and Expert Systems for High Energy,” edited by B. Denby and Denis Perret-Gallix, <http://hal.in2p3.fr/in2p3-00002142/en/>, p. 725.
[15] S. Brandt *et al.*, *Phys. Lett.* **12**, 57 (1964); E. Farhi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **39**, 1587 (1977).
[16] J.D. Bjorken and S.J. Brodsky, *Phys. Rev.* **D1**, 1416 (1970).
[17] *BABAR* Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 281802 (2002); *Phys. Rev.* **D70**, 032006 (2004).
[18] M.J. Oreglia, Ph.D Thesis, Stanford University [Report No. SLAC-236, 1980], Appendix D; J.E. Gaiser, Ph.D Thesis, Stanford University [Report No. SLAC-255, 1982], Appendix F; T. Skwarnicki, Ph.D Thesis, Institute for Nuclear Physics, Krakow, [Report No. DESY F31-86-02, 1986], Appendix E.
[19] ARGUS Collaboration, H. Albrecht *et al.*, *Z. Phys.* **C48**, 543 (1990).
[20] *BABAR* Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, “A search for the rare decay $B^0 \rightarrow D_s^+ \rho^-$,” hep-ex/0408029 (2004).
[21] *BABAR* Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **D71**, 091104 (2005).