

Exclusive branching fraction measurements of semileptonic tau decays into three charged hadrons, $\tau^- \rightarrow \phi\pi^-\nu_\tau$ and $\tau^- \rightarrow \phi K^-\nu_\tau$

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 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 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 D. S. Best,¹³ 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 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. Kovalskiy,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 C. H. Cheng,¹⁹ A. Dvoretzskii,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 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 C. L. Lee,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 V. Lepeltier,³⁷ F. Le Diberder,³⁷ A. M. Lutz,³⁷ A. Oyanguren,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 C. K. Clarke,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 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. McLaughlin,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 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 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 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 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. Bechtel,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 A. J. R. Weinstein,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 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. Mihalyi,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

(Dated: January 28, 2008)

Using a data sample corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 342fb^{-1} collected with the BABAR detector at the SLAC PEP-II electron-positron storage ring operating at a center-of-mass energy near 10.58 GeV, we measure $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow \pi^- \pi^- \pi^+ \nu_\tau) = (8.83 \pm 0.01 \pm 0.13)\%$, $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow K^- \pi^- \pi^+ \nu_\tau) = (0.273 \pm 0.002 \pm 0.009)\%$, $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow K^- \pi^- K^+ \nu_\tau) = (0.1346 \pm 0.0010 \pm 0.0036)\%$ and $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow K^- K^- K^+ \nu_\tau) = (1.58 \pm 0.13 \pm 0.12) \times 10^{-5}$, where the uncertainties are statistical and systematic, respectively. Events where the $\pi^+ \pi^-$ pair is consistent with coming from a K_S^0 are excluded. These include significant improvements over previous measurements and a first measurement of $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow K^- K^- K^+ \nu_\tau)$ in which no resonance structure is assumed. We also report a first measurement of $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow \phi \pi^- \nu_\tau) = (3.42 \pm 0.55 \pm 0.25) \times 10^{-5}$, a new measurement of $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow \phi K^- \nu_\tau) = (3.39 \pm 0.20 \pm 0.28) \times 10^{-5}$ and a first upper limit on $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow K^- K^- K^+ \nu_\tau [\text{ex.}\phi])$.

PACS numbers: 13.35.Dx, 14.60.Fg, 14.40.Cs, 14.40.Ev, 12.15.Hh.

The weak interaction coupling strength between the first and second quark generations [1] can be probed with unprecedented precision in hadronic τ decays having net strangeness of unity in the final state using $e^+e^- \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$ data collected at the e^+e^- B-factories. Inclusive measurements of the strange spectral function, obtained from τ lepton decays to final states containing kaons, provide a direct determination of the strange quark mass and Cabbibo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) mixing element $|V_{us}|$ [2]. A significant improvement on the precision of $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow K^- \pi^- \pi^+ \nu_\tau)$ in particular, where one measurement [3] disagrees by more than two standard deviations from the others [4, 5], will have the most immediate impact on the determination of these two fundamental Standard Model (SM) parameters using τ decays [6]. Measurements of $\tau^- \rightarrow \phi \pi^- \nu_\tau$ and $\tau^- \rightarrow \phi K^- \nu_\tau$ provide an interesting laboratory for studying Okubo-Zweig-Iizuka (OZI) suppression [7].

Significant improvements on measurements of $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow \pi^- \pi^- \pi^+ \nu_\tau)$, $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow K^- \pi^- \pi^+ \nu_\tau)$ and $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow K^- \pi^- K^+ \nu_\tau)$ are reported together with a first measurement of $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow K^- K^- K^+ \nu_\tau)$ without resonance assumptions (charge conjugate decays are implied). The data sample corresponds to an integrated luminosity of $\mathcal{L} = 342\text{fb}^{-1}$ recorded at a center-of-mass (c.m.) energy (\sqrt{s}) near 10.58 GeV using the BABAR detector at the SLAC PEP-II asymmetric-energy e^+e^- storage ring. With a luminosity-weighted average cross-section of $\sigma_{e^+e^- \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-} = (0.919 \pm 0.003)\text{nb}$ [8, 9], this corresponds to the production of 3.16×10^8 τ -pair events.

The BABAR detector [10] has a silicon vertex tracker (SVT), drift chamber (DCH), ring-imaging Cherenkov detector (DIRC) and electromagnetic calorimeter (EMC) all contained in a 1.5-T solenoid. The iron flux return of the solenoid is instrumented to identify muons.

τ -pair events are simulated with higher-order radiative corrections using the KK2f Monte Carlo (MC) generator [8] with τ decays simulated with Tauola [11, 12] using measured rates [13]. The detector response is simulated

with GEANT4 [14]. Simulated events for signal as well as SM background processes [8, 11, 12, 15, 16] are reconstructed in the same manner as data. The MC samples are used for selection optimization and systematic error studies. The number of simulated non-signal events is comparable to the number expected in the data, with the exception of Bhabha and two-photon events, which are not simulated. Data studies demonstrate that these backgrounds are negligible.

The basic analysis strategy is to select a pure sample of $\tau^- \rightarrow h^- h^- h^+ \nu_\tau$ decays from $e^+e^- \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$ events by requiring the partner τ^+ to decay leptonically. Within this sample, each of the h^\pm mesons is uniquely identified as a charged pion or kaon and the decay categorized as $\tau^- \rightarrow \pi^- \pi^- \pi^+ \nu_\tau$, $\tau^- \rightarrow K^- \pi^- \pi^+ \nu_\tau$, $\tau^- \rightarrow K^- \pi^- K^+ \nu_\tau$ or $\tau^- \rightarrow K^- K^- K^+ \nu_\tau$. An efficiency migration matrix, \mathcal{E}_{ij} , initially obtained from MC simulations, is used to correct for efficiency losses from all stages of event selection and includes cross-feed between the four signal channels where i (j) is the selected (true) decay mode index. The \mathcal{E}_{ij} matrix is modified using data control samples of kaons and pions from $D^{*+} \rightarrow \pi^+ D^0$, $D^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ K^-$ decays to account for small differences between MC and data. The number of decay mode j signal events measured in the sample, $\mathbf{N}_j^{\text{Sig}}$, is then:

$$\mathbf{N}_j^{\text{Sig}} = \sum_i (\mathcal{E}^{-1})_{ji} \left(\mathbf{N}_i^{\text{Data}} - \mathbf{N}_i^{\text{Bkg}} \right) \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{N}_i^{\text{Data}}$ is the number of data events selected in decay channel i and $\mathbf{N}_i^{\text{Bkg}}$ is the estimated number of background events in decay channel i arising from sources other than $\tau^- \rightarrow h^- h^- h^+ \nu_\tau$. The branching fraction for decay mode j is then $\mathcal{B}_j = \frac{\mathbf{N}_j^{\text{Sig}}}{2\mathcal{L}\sigma_{e^+e^- \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-}}$.

The $\tau^- \rightarrow h^- h^- h^+ \nu_\tau$ sample is obtained by selecting events with four well reconstructed tracks having zero total charge, where none of the tracks originate from the conversion of photons in the material of the detector. All

four tracks are required to lie within the geometrical acceptance of the EMC and DIRC and, to ensure the tracks can reach the DIRC, are required to have a transverse momentum of at least $250 \text{ MeV}/c$. If any two photons in the event are identified as coming from $\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$, the event is removed from the sample. The event is divided into hemispheres in the c.m. by a plane perpendicular to the thrust axis [17]. One of the hemispheres, the ‘lepton-side’, is required to contain a $\tau \rightarrow e\nu\bar{\nu}$ or $\tau \rightarrow \mu\nu\bar{\nu}$ decay. If the hemisphere with an electron (muon) has any neutral particles with more than 1.0 (0.5) GeV the event is not selected. The $e^+e^- \rightarrow q\bar{q}$ backgrounds are further reduced to $\sim 0.1\%$ of the $\tau^- \rightarrow h^-h^-h^+\nu_\tau$ sample by requiring a thrust magnitude > 0.85 .

Backgrounds from Bhabha and $e^+e^- \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ events with photon conversions are suppressed by requiring the momentum of the lepton-side track to be less than 80% of $\sqrt{s}/2$ and a requirement that none of the three signal-side tracks pass an electron identification algorithm. Remaining non- τ background events, including those from two-photon processes, are reduced by requiring the event missing c.m. transverse momentum to be $> 0.009\sqrt{s}$.

The remaining background in the sample is predominantly from other τ decays containing π^0 and K_S^0 mesons. Events containing a K_S^0 are identified and removed. Residual backgrounds from decays having a π^0 are reduced by requiring the total energy in the signal-side hemisphere deposited in the EMC which is unassociated with the three charged hadron tracks to be $< 200 \text{ MeV}$. With these requirements, contributions from $\tau^- \rightarrow h^-n\pi^0\nu$ and $\tau^- \rightarrow h^-h^-h^+2\pi^0\nu$ are negligible.

A track in the $\tau^- \rightarrow h^-h^-h^+\nu_\tau$ sample is classified as a kaon using a likelihood approach to combine information from the DIRC, DCH and SVT with a characteristic kaon identification efficiency of $\sim 80\%$ and pion misidentification rate of $\sim 1\%$. If the track fails to be identified as a kaon, it is classified as a pion. Events are selected if the signal-side decays are identified as $\tau^- \rightarrow \pi^-\pi^-\pi^+\nu_\tau$, $\tau^- \rightarrow K^-\pi^-\pi^+\nu_\tau$, $\tau^- \rightarrow K^-\pi^-K^+\nu_\tau$ or $\tau^- \rightarrow K^-K^-K^+\nu_\tau$ with decays having a wrong charge combination removed.

The diagonal elements of \mathcal{E}_{ij} excluding particle identification (ϵ), numbers of selected, background and signal events determined using Eq. 1 are shown in Table I for all modes. The increase in ϵ with number of kaons in the decay is associated primarily with the transverse momentum requirement and the K_S^0 veto. The background fraction from τ decays to $\pi^-\pi^-\pi^+\pi^0\nu$ ($K^-\pi^-\pi^+\pi^0\nu$, $K^-\pi^-K^+\pi^0\nu$, $K^-K^-K^+\pi^0\nu$) in the $\pi^-\pi^-\pi^+$ ($K^-\pi^-\pi^+$, $K^-\pi^-K^+$, $K^-K^-K^+$) candidate sample is estimated to be $(3.6 \pm 0.3)\%$ ($(2.3 \pm 0.4)\%$, $(0.4 \pm 0.1)\%$, $< 5.0\%$). Non- τ backgrounds comprise less than 0.5% of each channel’s final event sample.

The component of \mathcal{E}_{ij} associated with the particle identification, M_{ij} , is shown in the first four rows of Table II. Note that this matrix includes efficiency losses associated

with cross-feed of the wrong charge combinations and small factors associated with data control sample corrections to the MC cross-feed efficiencies, therefore the columns of the table are not expected to sum to 100% .

Systematic uncertainties are assigned for: luminosity; cross-section; migration matrix elements, which includes MC statistical and systematic errors associated with the efficiency and particle identification; signal-mode modeling; modeling of the EMC and tracking response including scale and resolution uncertainties, the sensitivities of the measurements to the modeling of hadronic and electromagnetic showers in the EMC, and tracking efficiency; modeling of the trigger; and modeling of the backgrounds, including uncertainties on cross-sections and branching fractions. These are summarized in Table III along with the total error correlation matrix. The absolute normalization is a significant source of the correlations.

The branching fraction results of this analysis are presented in Table I together with the world average values/limit published by the Particle Data Group (PDG) [13], with which they are consistent and significantly more precise. In all four channels, the results where the lepton-side has an electron are consistent with those where it has a muon. Our measurement of $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow \pi^-\pi^-\pi^+\nu_\tau)$ is also consistent with a precision $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow \pi^-\pi^-\pi^+[\text{ex.}\omega])$ measurement [18] after accounting for the ω . Our measurement of $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow K^-\pi^-\pi^+\nu_\tau)$ is in agreement with [3] and disagrees by more than two standard deviations from [4] and [5]. We report a first measurement of $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow K^-K^-K^+\nu_\tau)$ in which no resonance structure is assumed and which has a significance in excess of 8σ .

A $\phi(1020)$ contribution is seen in both the $\tau^- \rightarrow K^-\pi^-K^+\nu_\tau$ and $\tau^- \rightarrow K^-K^-K^+\nu_\tau$ decay modes. The use of a kaon selection algorithm with higher efficiency, but less purity, provides significantly higher signal-to-background for $\tau^- \rightarrow \phi K^-\nu_\tau$. The $\tau^- \rightarrow \phi\pi^-\nu_\tau$ ($\tau^- \rightarrow \phi K^-\nu_\tau$) signal has a 5.7σ (9.8σ) level of significance. The last two rows of Table II lists the M_{ij} matrix for this higher efficiency selection. The K^+K^- invariant mass distributions for the $\tau^- \rightarrow K^-\pi^-K^+\nu_\tau$ ($\tau^- \rightarrow K^-K^-K^+\nu_\tau$) mode using this sample is shown in Fig. 1 (2). Below 1.09 GeV (1.15 GeV), after background subtraction of the non- K^+K^- events, the K^+K^- invariant mass distribution from the $\tau^- \rightarrow \phi\pi^-\nu_\tau$ ($\tau^- \rightarrow \phi K^-\nu_\tau$) decay is well described by a Breit-Wigner function convoluted with a Gaussian resolution function for the signal and a third-order polynomial (function in [19]) for the background and is used to fit for the number of events. A binned maximum likelihood fit yields 344 ± 42 (274 ± 16) $\tau^- \rightarrow \phi\pi^-\nu_\tau$ ($\tau^- \rightarrow \phi K^-\nu_\tau$) candidates. MC estimates of the subtracted $q\bar{q}$ background events with a ϕ contribute a 5.2% (0.7%) uncertainty. The $\phi\pi^-$ candidate sample has an additional 4.3% uncertainty arising from potentially peaking $\tau^- \rightarrow \phi\pi^-n\pi^0\nu_\tau$ background. The

TABLE I: Diagonal elements of \mathcal{E}_{ij} excluding particle identification, numbers of selected, background and signal events determined using Eq. 1. The branching fraction results for this work are presented in the fifth line where the first error is statistical and the second systematic. The PDG average branching fractions/limit [13] are presented in the sixth line.

	$\tau^- \rightarrow \pi^- \pi^- \pi^+ \nu_\tau$	$\tau^- \rightarrow K^- \pi^- \pi^+ \nu_\tau$	$\tau^- \rightarrow K^- \pi^- K^+ \nu_\tau$	$\tau^- \rightarrow K^- K^- K^+ \nu_\tau$
ϵ	0.028	0.031	0.035	0.039
N^{Data}	$(1.5953 \pm 0.0013) \times 10^6$	$(6.956 \pm 0.0026) \times 10^4$	$(1.819 \pm 0.013) \times 10^4$	275 ± 17
N^{Bkg}	$(0.0642 \pm 0.0002) \times 10^6$	$(0.2263 \pm 0.0064) \times 10^4$	$(0.0145 \pm 0.0008) \times 10^4$	2.5 ± 1.5
N^{Sig}	$(55.59 \pm 0.05) \times 10^6$	$(171.5 \pm 1.2) \times 10^4$	$(84.71 \pm 0.66) \times 10^4$	$(9.93 \pm 0.84) \times 10^3$
\mathcal{B} (this work)	$(8.83 \pm 0.01 \pm 0.13)\%$	$(0.273 \pm 0.002 \pm 0.009)\%$	$(0.1346 \pm 0.0010 \pm 0.0036)\%$	$(1.58 \pm 0.13 \pm 0.12) \times 10^{-5}$
\mathcal{B} (PDG average)	$(9.13 \pm 0.05 \pm 0.46)\%$ [4]	$(0.33 \pm 0.05)\%$	$(0.154 \pm 0.009)\%$	$< 3.7 \times 10^{-5} @ 90\% CL$

TABLE II: Component of the efficiency migration matrix associated with pion-kaon particle identification, M_{ij} , in percent. The $\tau^- \rightarrow \phi \pi^- \nu_\tau$ and $\tau^- \rightarrow \phi K^- \nu_\tau$ study employs a higher efficiency/lower purity kaon selection algorithm.

Candidates	Decay modes			
	$\pi\pi\pi$	$K\pi\pi$	$K\pi K$	KKK
$\pi\pi\pi$	97.40	22.49	4.73	1.02
$K\pi\pi$	1.42	74.87	16.43	6.38
$K\pi K$	0.01	0.49	59.63	25.54
KKK	—	—	0.26	50.87
$\phi\pi$			72.54	19.20
ϕK			0.83	66.06

TABLE III: Upper: Systematic uncertainties (%). Lower: Correlation matrix from stat. \oplus syst. covariance matrix.

	$\pi\pi\pi$	$K\pi\pi$	$K\pi K$	KKK
\mathcal{L}	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9
$\sigma_{e^+e^- \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-}$	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
M_{ij} and particle ID	0.4	3.0	1.9	4.9
signal modeling	0.2	0.2	1.3	2.0
EMC and DCH response	0.8	0.9	0.8	1.2
trigger	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
backgrounds	0.4	0.7	0.4	5.5
Total	1.4	3.4	2.7	7.8
$\pi\pi\pi$		0.544	0.390	0.031
$K\pi\pi$			0.177	0.093
$K\pi K$				0.087

fit parameterization contributes a 1.0% (2.0%) error. Accounting for $\mathcal{B}(\phi \rightarrow K^+K^-)$ [13], $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow \phi \pi^- \nu_\tau) = (3.42 \pm 0.55 \pm 0.25) \times 10^{-5}$ and $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow \phi K^- \nu_\tau) = (3.39 \pm 0.20 \pm 0.28) \times 10^{-5}$ with a correlation of -0.07. From the fit we find no evidence for $\tau^- \rightarrow K^- K^- K^+ \nu_\tau$ without a ϕ and set a first upper limit on $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow K^- K^- K^+ \nu_\tau [\text{ex.}\phi]) < 2.5 \times 10^{-6}$ at 90% CL.

This is the first measurement of $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow \phi \pi^- \nu_\tau)$. It is consistent with a CLEO limit [20] and larger than the $(1.20 \pm 0.28) \times 10^{-5}$ value predicted by a vector meson dominance model [7]. Our $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow \phi K^- \nu_\tau)$ measure-




FIG. 1: K^+K^- invariant mass in $\tau^- \rightarrow K^- \pi^- K^+ \nu_\tau$ decays. Data are represented by points with error bars, MC of $\tau^- \rightarrow K^- \pi^- K^+ \nu_\tau$ by the open histogram, cross-feed from other $\tau^- \rightarrow h^- h^- h^+ \nu_\tau$ channels by the light shaded histogram, and non- τ backgrounds by the dark shaded histogram. The inset shows the background-subtracted data with the fit (solid line) and non-resonant component (dashed line).

ment is consistent with a recent Belle result [21]. Recent calculations using a meson dominance model [22] agree with our $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow \phi \pi^- \nu_\tau)$ and $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow \phi K^- \nu_\tau)$ measurements and with the ratio $\frac{\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow \phi \pi^- \nu_\tau)}{\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow \phi K^- \nu_\tau)} = 0.99 \pm 0.21$. Our measurements of $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow K^- \pi^- \pi^+ \nu_\tau)$ and $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow K^- K^- K^+ \nu_\tau)$, when combined with improved measurements of the other strange decays, will constrain the CKM element $|V_{us}|$ better than unitarity bounds [6, 23].

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), MEC (Spain), and PPARC




FIG. 2: K^+K^- invariant mass in $\tau^- \rightarrow K^-K^-K^+\nu_\tau$ decays with two entries per event. Data are represented by points with error bars, the open histogram is the MC of $\tau^- \rightarrow \phi K^- \nu_\tau$, the light shaded histogram is the cross-feed from the other $\tau^- \rightarrow h^- h^- h^+ \nu_\tau$ channels, primarily from $\tau^- \rightarrow K^- \pi^- K^+ \nu_\tau$, and non- τ backgrounds by the dark shaded histogram. The inset shows the background-subtracted data with the fit (solid line) and non-resonant component (dashed line).

(United Kingdom). Individuals have received support from the Marie Curie EIF (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

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

[1] N. Cabibbo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **10**, 531 (1963).

[2] E. Gamiz, M. Jamin, A. Pich, J. Prades and F. Schwab, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 011803 (2005); S. Chen, M. Davier, E. Gamiz, A. Hocker, A. Pich and J. Prades, Eur. Phys.

J. C **22**, 31 (2001); J. Kambor and K. Maltman, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 093023 (2000) A. Pich and J. Prades, JHEP **9910**, 004 (1999); S. Narison, Phys. Lett. B **466**, 345 (1999). K. Maltman, Phys. Rev. D **58**, 093015 (1998).

[3] R. Barate *et al.* (ALEPH Collaboration), Eur. Phys. J. C **1**, 65 (1998).

[4] R. A. Briere *et al.* (CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 181802 (2003).

[5] G. Abbiendi *et al.* (OPAL Collaboration), Eur. Phys. J. C **35**, 437 (2004).

[6] K. Maltman and C. E. Wolfe, Phys. Lett. B **639**, 283 (2006).

[7] G. Lopez Castro and D. A. Lopez Falcon, Phys. Rev. D **54**, 4400 (1996).

[8] B. F. Ward, S. Jadach, and Z. Was, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **116**, 73 (2003).

[9] S. Banerjee, B. Pietrzyk, J. M. Roney and Z. Was, arXiv:0706.3235 [hep-ph].

[10] B. Aubert *et al.* (BABAR Collaboration), Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A **479**, 1 (2002).

[11] S. Jadach, Z. Was, R. Decker, and J. H. Kühn, Comp. Phys. Comm. **76**, 361 (1993).

[12] E. Barberio and Z. Was, Comp. Phys. Comm. **79**, 291 (1994).

[13] Particle Data Group, W.-M. Yao *et al.*, J. Phys. G **33**, 1 (2006).

[14] S. Agostinelli *et al.* (GEANT4 Collaboration), Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A **506**, 250 (2003).

[15] D. J. Lange, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A **462**, 152 (2001).

[16] T. Sjöstrand, Comp. Phys. Comm. **82**, 74 (1994).

[17] S. Brandt *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **12** (1964) 57; E. Farhi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **39** (1977) 1587.

[18] S. Schael *et al.* (ALEPH Collaboration), Phys. Rept. **421**, 191 (2005).

[19] H. Albrecht *et al.* (ARGUS Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **241**, 278 (1990). $f(m) = [m - (2m_K)] \times e^{b[m^2 - (2m_K)^2]} \times [m^2 - (2m_K)^2]^a$, $m > 2m_K$; $= 0$, $m < 2m_K$.

[20] P. Avery *et al.* (CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D **55**, R1119 (1997).

[21] K. Abe *et al.* (Belle Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **643**, 5 (2006).

[22] A. Flores-Tlalpa and G. Lopez-Castro, arXiv:0709.4039 [hep-ph].

[23] R. J. Hill, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 096006 (2006).