

Measurement of $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 \pi^- \nu_\tau)$ using the *BABAR* detector

The *BABAR* Collaboration

August 14, 2008

Abstract

A preliminary measurement of the branching fraction $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow K_S^0 \pi^- \nu_\tau)$ is made using 384.6 fb^{-1} of e^+e^- collision data provided by the PEP-II collider, operating primarily at $\sqrt{s} = 10.58 \text{ GeV}$, and recorded using the *BABAR* detector. From this we measure: $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 \pi^- \nu_\tau) = (0.840 \pm 0.004 \text{ (stat)} \pm 0.023 \text{ (syst)})\%$. This result is the most precise measurement to date and is consistent with the world average.

Submitted to the 34th International Conference on High-Energy Physics, ICHEP 08,
30 July—5 August 2008, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94309

Work supported in part by Department of Energy contract DE-AC02-76SF00515.

The BABAR Collaboration,

B. Aubert, M. Bona, Y. Karyotakis, J. P. Lees, V. Poireau, E. Prencipe, X. Prudent, V. Tisserand
*Laboratoire de Physique des Particules, IN2P3/CNRS et Université de Savoie, F-74941 Annecy-Le-Vieux,
France*

J. Garra Tico, E. Grauges
Universitat de Barcelona, Facultat de Física, Departament ECM, E-08028 Barcelona, Spain

L. Lopez^{ab}, A. Palano^{ab}, M. Pappagallo^{ab}
INFN Sezione di Bari^a; Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Bari^b, I-70126 Bari, Italy

G. Eigen, B. Stugu, L. Sun
University of Bergen, Institute of Physics, N-5007 Bergen, Norway

G. S. Abrams, M. Battaglia, D. N. Brown, R. N. Cahn, R. G. Jacobsen, L. T. Kerth, Yu. G. Kolomensky,
G. Lynch, I. L. Osipenkov, M. T. Ronan,¹ K. Tackmann, T. Tanabe
Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory and University of California, Berkeley, California 94720, USA

C. M. Hawkes, N. Soni, A. T. Watson
University of Birmingham, Birmingham, B15 2TT, United Kingdom

H. Koch, T. Schroeder
Ruhr Universität Bochum, Institut für Experimentalphysik 1, D-44780 Bochum, Germany

D. Walker
University of Bristol, Bristol BS8 1TL, United Kingdom

D. J. Asgeirsson, B. G. Fulsom, C. Hearty, T. S. Mattison, J. A. McKenna
University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada V6T 1Z1

M. Barrett, A. Khan
Brunel University, Uxbridge, Middlesex UB8 3PH, United Kingdom

V. E. Blinov, A. D. Bukin, A. R. Buzykaev, V. P. Druzhinin, V. B. Golubev, A. P. Onuchin,
S. I. Serednyakov, Yu. I. Skovpen, E. P. Solodov, K. Yu. Todyshev
Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics, Novosibirsk 630090, Russia

M. Bondioli, S. Curry, I. Eschrich, D. Kirkby, A. J. Lankford, P. Lund, M. Mandelkern, E. C. Martin,
D. P. Stoker
University of California at Irvine, Irvine, California 92697, USA

S. Abachi, C. Buchanan
University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California 90024, USA

J. W. Gary, F. Liu, O. Long, B. C. Shen,¹ G. M. Vitug, Z. Yasin, L. Zhang
University of California at Riverside, Riverside, California 92521, USA

¹Deceased

V. Sharma

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

C. Campagnari, T. M. Hong, D. Kovalskyi, M. A. Mazur, J. D. Richman

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

T. W. Beck, A. M. Eisner, C. J. Flacco, C. A. Heusch, J. Kroseberg, W. S. Lockman, A. J. Martinez,
T. Schalk, B. A. Schumm, A. Seiden, M. G. Wilson, L. O. Winstrom

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

C. H. Cheng, D. A. Doll, B. Echenard, F. Fang, D. G. Hitlin, I. Narsky, T. Piatenko, F. C. Porter
California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California 91125, USA

R. Andreassen, G. Mancinelli, B. T. Meadows, K. Mishra, M. D. Sokoloff

University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio 45221, USA

P. C. Bloom, W. T. Ford, A. Gaz, J. F. Hirschauer, M. Nagel, U. Nauenberg, J. G. Smith, K. A. Ulmer,
S. R. Wagner

University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80309, USA

R. Ayad,² A. Soffer,³ W. H. Toki, R. J. Wilson

Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado 80523, USA

D. D. Altenburg, E. Feltresi, A. Hauke, H. Jasper, M. Karbach, J. Merkel, A. Petzold, B. Spaan, K. Wacker
Technische Universität Dortmund, Fakultät Physik, D-44221 Dortmund, Germany

M. J. Kobel, W. F. Mader, R. Nogowski, K. R. Schubert, R. Schwierz, A. Volk

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

D. Bernard, G. R. Bonneaud, E. Latour, M. Verderi

Laboratoire Leprince-Ringuet, CNRS/IN2P3, Ecole Polytechnique, F-91128 Palaiseau, France

P. J. Clark, S. Playfer, J. E. Watson

University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH9 3JZ, United Kingdom

M. Andreotti^{ab}, D. Bettoni^a, C. Bozzi^a, R. Calabrese^{ab}, A. Cecchi^{ab}, G. Cibinetto^{ab}, P. Franchini^{ab},
E. Luppi^{ab}, M. Negrini^{ab}, A. Petrella^{ab}, L. Piemontese^a, V. Santoro^{ab}

INFN Sezione di Ferrara^a; Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Ferrara^b, I-44100 Ferrara, Italy

R. Baldini-Ferroli, A. Calcaterra, R. de Sangro, G. Finocchiaro, S. Pacetti, P. Patteri, I. M. Peruzzi,⁴
M. Piccolo, M. Rama, A. Zallo

INFN Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, I-00044 Frascati, Italy

A. Buzzo^a, R. Contri^{ab}, M. Lo Vetere^{ab}, M. M. Macri^a, M. R. Monge^{ab}, S. Passaggio^a, C. Patrignani^{ab},
E. Robutti^a, A. Santroni^{ab}, S. Tosi^{ab}

INFN Sezione di Genova^a; Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Genova^b, I-16146 Genova, Italy

²Now at Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122, USA

³Now at Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, 69978, Israel

⁴Also with Università di Perugia, Dipartimento di Fisica, Perugia, Italy

K. S. Chaisanguanthum, M. Morii
Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, USA

A. Adametz, J. Marks, S. Schenk, U. Uwer
Universität Heidelberg, Physikalisches Institut, Philosophenweg 12, D-69120 Heidelberg, Germany

V. Klose, H. M. Lacker
Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Institut für Physik, Newtonstr. 15, D-12489 Berlin, Germany

D. J. Bard, P. D. Dauncey, J. A. Nash, M. Tibbetts
Imperial College London, London, SW7 2AZ, United Kingdom

P. K. Behera, X. Chai, M. J. Charles, U. Mallik
University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa 52242, USA

J. Cochran, H. B. Crawley, L. Dong, W. T. Meyer, S. Prell, E. I. Rosenberg, A. E. Rubin
Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011-3160, USA

Y. Y. Gao, A. V. Gritsan, Z. J. Guo, C. K. Lae
Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland 21218, USA

N. Arnaud, J. Béquilleux, A. D’Orazio, M. Davier, J. Firmino da Costa, G. Grosdidier, A. Höcker,
V. Lepeltier, F. Le Diberder, A. M. Lutz, S. Pruvot, P. Roudeau, M. H. Schune, J. Serrano, V. Sordini,⁵
A. Stocchi, G. Wormser
*Laboratoire de l’Accélérateur Linéaire, IN2P3/CNRS et Université Paris-Sud 11, Centre Scientifique
d’Orsay, B. P. 34, F-91898 Orsay Cedex, France*

D. J. Lange, D. M. Wright
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California 94550, USA

I. Bingham, J. P. Burke, C. A. Chavez, J. R. Fry, E. Gabathuler, R. Gamet, D. E. Hutchcroft, D. J. Payne,
C. Touramanis
University of Liverpool, Liverpool L69 7ZE, United Kingdom

A. J. Bevan, C. K. Clarke, K. A. George, F. Di Lodovico, R. Sacco, M. Sigamani
Queen Mary, University of London, London, E1 4NS, United Kingdom

G. Cowan, H. U. Flaecher, D. A. Hopkins, S. Paramesvaran, F. Salvatore, A. C. Wren
*University of London, Royal Holloway and Bedford New College, Egham, Surrey TW20 0EX, United
Kingdom*

D. N. Brown, C. L. Davis
University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky 40292, USA

A. G. Denig M. Fritsch, W. Gradl, G. Schott
Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz, Institut für Kernphysik, D-55099 Mainz, Germany

⁵Also with Università di Roma La Sapienza, I-00185 Roma, Italy

K. E. Alwyn, D. Bailey, R. J. Barlow, Y. M. Chia, C. L. Edgar, G. Jackson, G. D. Lafferty, A. Lyon,
T. J. West, J. I. Yi

University of Manchester, Manchester M13 9PL, United Kingdom

J. Anderson, C. Chen, A. Jawahery, D. A. Roberts, G. Simi, J. M. Tuggle

University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742, USA

C. Dallapiccola, X. Li, E. Salvati, S. Saremi

University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts 01003, USA

R. Cowan, D. Dujmic, P. H. Fisher, G. Sciolla, M. Spitznagel, F. Taylor, R. K. Yamamoto, M. Zhao
*Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Laboratory for Nuclear Science, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139,
USA*

P. M. Patel, S. H. Robertson

McGill University, Montréal, Québec, Canada H3A 2T8

A. Lazzaro^{ab}, V. Lombardo^a, F. Palombo^{ab}

INFN Sezione di Milano^a; Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Milano^b, I-20133 Milano, Italy

J. M. Bauer, L. Cremaldi R. Godang,⁶ R. Kroeger, D. A. Sanders, D. J. Summers, H. W. Zhao

University of Mississippi, University, Mississippi 38677, USA

M. Simard, P. Taras, F. B. Viaud

Université de Montréal, Physique des Particules, Montréal, Québec, Canada H3C 3J7

H. Nicholson

Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Massachusetts 01075, USA

G. De Nardo^{ab}, L. Lista^a, D. Monorchio^{ab}, G. Onorato^{ab}, C. Sciacca^{ab}

*INFN Sezione di Napoli^a; Dipartimento di Scienze Fisiche, Università di Napoli Federico II^b, I-80126
Napoli, Italy*

G. Raven, H. L. Snoek

*NIKHEF, National Institute for Nuclear Physics and High Energy Physics, NL-1009 DB Amsterdam, The
Netherlands*

C. P. Jessop, K. J. Knoepfel, J. M. LoSecco, W. F. Wang

University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana 46556, USA

G. Benelli, L. A. Corwin, K. Honscheid, H. Kagan, R. Kass, J. P. Morris, A. M. Rahimi,

J. J. Regensburger, S. J. Sekula, Q. K. Wong

Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210, USA

N. L. Blount, J. Brau, R. Frey, O. Igonkina, J. A. Kolb, M. Lu, R. Rahmat, N. B. Sinev, D. Strom,
J. Strube, E. Torrence

University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403, USA

⁶Now at University of South Alabama, Mobile, Alabama 36688, USA

G. Castelli^{ab}, N. Gagliardi^{ab}, M. Margoni^{ab}, M. Morandin^a, M. Posocco^a, M. Rotondo^a, F. Simonetto^{ab},
R. Stroili^{ab}, C. Voci^{ab}

INFN Sezione di Padova^a; Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Padova^b, I-35131 Padova, Italy

P. del Amo Sanchez, E. Ben-Haim, H. Briand, G. Calderini, J. Chauveau, P. David, L. Del Buono,
O. Hamon, Ph. Leruste, J. Ocariz, A. Perez, J. Prendki, S. Sitt

*Laboratoire de Physique Nucléaire et de Hautes Energies, IN2P3/CNRS, Université Pierre et Marie
Curie-Paris6, Université Denis Diderot-Paris7, F-75252 Paris, France*

L. Gladney

University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104, USA

M. Biasini^{ab}, R. Covarelli^{ab}, E. Manoni^{ab},

INFN Sezione di Perugia^a; Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Perugia^b, I-06100 Perugia, Italy

C. Angelini^{ab}, G. Batignani^{ab}, S. Bettarini^{ab}, M. Carpinelli^{ab,7}, A. Cervelli^{ab}, F. Forti^{ab}, M. A. Giorgi^{ab},
A. Lusiani^{ac}, G. Marchiori^{ab}, M. Morganti^{ab}, N. Neri^{ab}, E. Paoloni^{ab}, G. Rizzo^{ab}, J. J. Walsh^a

*INFN Sezione di Pisa^a; Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Pisa^b; Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa^c,
I-56127 Pisa, Italy*

D. Lopes Pegna, C. Lu, J. Olsen, A. J. S. Smith, A. V. Telnov

Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey 08544, USA

F. Anulli^a, E. Baracchini^{ab}, G. Cavoto^a, D. del Re^{ab}, E. Di Marco^{ab}, R. Faccini^{ab}, F. Ferrarotto^a,
F. Ferroni^{ab}, M. Gaspero^{ab}, P. D. Jackson^a, L. Li Gioi^a, M. A. Mazzoni^a, S. Morganti^a, G. Piredda^a,
F. Polci^{ab}, F. Renga^{ab}, C. Voena^a

INFN Sezione di Roma^a; Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Roma La Sapienza^b, I-00185 Roma, Italy

M. Ebert, T. Hartmann, H. Schröder, R. Waldi

Universität Rostock, D-18051 Rostock, Germany

T. Adye, B. Franek, E. O. Olaiya, F. F. Wilson

Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Chilton, Didcot, Oxon, OX11 0QX, United Kingdom

S. Emery, M. Escalier, L. Esteve, S. F. Ganzhur, G. Hamel de Monchenault, W. Kozanecki, G. Vasseur,
Ch. Yèche, M. Zito

CEA, Irfu, SPP, Centre de Saclay, F-91191 Gif-sur-Yvette, France

X. R. Chen, H. Liu, W. Park, M. V. Purohit, R. M. White, J. R. Wilson

University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina 29208, USA

M. T. Allen, D. Aston, R. Bartoldus, P. Bechtel, J. F. Benitez, R. Cenci, J. P. Coleman, M. R. Convery,
J. C. Dingfelder, J. Dorfan, G. P. Dubois-Felsmann, W. Dunwoodie, R. C. Field, A. M. Gabareen,
S. J. Gowdy, M. T. Graham, P. Grenier, C. Hast, W. R. Innes, J. Kaminski, M. H. Kelsey, H. Kim, P. Kim,
M. L. Kocian, D. W. G. S. Leith, S. Li, B. Lindquist, S. Luitz, V. Luth, H. L. Lynch, D. B. MacFarlane,
H. Marsiske, R. Messner, D. R. Muller, H. Neal, S. Nelson, C. P. O'Grady, I. Ofte, A. Perazzo, M. Perl,
B. N. Ratcliff, A. Roodman, A. A. Salnikov, R. H. Schindler, J. Schwiening, A. Snyder, D. Su,
M. K. Sullivan, K. Suzuki, S. K. Swain, J. M. Thompson, J. Va'vra, A. P. Wagner, M. Weaver, C. A. West,
W. J. Wisniewski, M. Wittgen, D. H. Wright, H. W. Wulsin, A. K. Yarritu, K. Yi, C. C. Young, V. Ziegler

Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, Stanford, California 94309, USA

⁷Also with Università di Sassari, Sassari, Italy

P. R. Burchat, A. J. Edwards, S. A. Majewski, T. S. Miyashita, B. A. Petersen, L. Wilden
Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305-4060, USA

S. Ahmed, M. S. Alam, J. A. Ernst, B. Pan, M. A. Saeed, S. B. Zain
State University of New York, Albany, New York 12222, USA

S. M. Spanier, B. J. Wogslund
University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee 37996, USA

R. Eckmann, J. L. Ritchie, A. M. Ruland, C. J. Schilling, R. F. Schwitters
University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712, USA

B. W. Drummond, J. M. Izen, X. C. Lou
University of Texas at Dallas, Richardson, Texas 75083, USA

F. Bianchi^{ab}, D. Gamba^{ab}, M. Pelliccioni^{ab}
INFN Sezione di Torino^a; Dipartimento di Fisica Sperimentale, Università di Torino^b, I-10125 Torino, Italy

M. Bomben^{ab}, L. Bosisio^{ab}, C. Cartaro^{ab}, G. Della Ricca^{ab}, L. Lanceri^{ab}, L. Vitale^{ab}
INFN Sezione di Trieste^a; Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Trieste^b, I-34127 Trieste, Italy

V. Azzolini, N. Lopez-March, F. Martinez-Vidal, D. A. Milanes, A. Oyanguren
IFIC, Universitat de Valencia-CSIC, E-46071 Valencia, Spain

J. Albert, Sw. Banerjee, B. Bhuyan, H. H. F. Choi, K. Hamano, R. Kowalewski, M. J. Lewczuk,
 I. M. Nugent, J. M. Roney, R. J. Sobie
University of Victoria, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada V8W 3P6

T. J. Gershon, P. F. Harrison, J. Ilic, T. E. Latham, G. B. Mohanty
Department of Physics, University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL, United Kingdom

H. R. Band, X. Chen, S. Dasu, K. T. Flood, Y. Pan, M. Pierini, R. Prepost, C. O. Vuosalo, S. L. Wu
University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706, USA

1 INTRODUCTION

Hadronic τ decays provide a clean laboratory for studying the hadronic weak current. Hadronic products from τ decays give access to the light quark vector (V) and axial-vector (A) spectral functions, which give insight into the dynamics of QCD at intermediate scales as well as providing tests of the Standard Model itself [1].

For hadronic τ -decays, $SU(3)_f$ symmetry breaking can be used to determine the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) matrix element magnitude $|V_{us}|$ [2], the strong coupling constant, α_s , and the strange quark mass, m_s [3]. These are all tests of the Standard Model as deviations from values measured in other processes would indicate new physics.

Hadrons from τ decays are produced via W emission. Relative to non-strange (ud) currents, strange (us) currents of τ decays are suppressed by $(|V_{us}|/|V_{ud}|)^2 \simeq \tan^2 \theta_C$, where $|V_{ud}|$ and $|V_{us}|$ are the absolute values of the CKM matrix elements. Resonant decay dominates these currents: the strange vector current is dominated by a K^* resonance which decays to $K\pi$ and the strange axial-vector current by the K_1 which decays mostly via $K\rho$ and $K^*\pi$ to $K\pi\pi$.

The high luminosity provided by the PEP-II collider, coupled with a large $\tau^+\tau^-$ production cross-section near the operating energy of $\sqrt{s} = 10.58$ GeV, provides a large data sample with which to study the strange hadronic decay $\tau^- \rightarrow (K\pi)^-\nu_\tau$ using the *BABAR* detector. Measurements of τ decay branching fractions to strange hadronic final states and studies of the strange spectral functions have been conducted by ALEPH [4], CLEO [5] and OPAL [6], but have been limited by statistics. About a hundred times larger samples of τ -events have been provided by the B -factories *BABAR* and *BELLE*. The measurement of $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow K_S^0\pi^-\nu_\tau)$ was recently carried out by *BELLE* [7] with a significantly reduced uncertainty compared to that of previous measurements.

2 THE *BABAR* DETECTOR AND DATASET

The *BABAR* detector is described in detail in [8]. Charged particles are detected and their momenta measured with a 5-layer double sided silicon vertex tracker (SVT) and a 40-layer drift chamber (DCH) inside a 1.5 T superconducting solenoidal magnet. A ring-imaging Cherenkov detector (DIRC) is used for the identification of charged particles. Energies of neutral particles are measured by an electromagnetic calorimeter (EMC) composed of 6,580 CsI(Tl) crystals, and the instrumented magnetic flux return (IFR) is used to identify muons.

The analysis described in this paper is based on data taken using the *BABAR* detector at the PEP-II collider [9] located at SLAC in the data-taking periods between October 1999 and August 2006. During this period a total of 384.6 fb^{-1} of data was recorded with a cross-section for $\tau^+\tau^-$ pair production of $(0.919 \pm 0.003) \text{ nb}$ [15]. This data sample contains over 700 million τ decays. Monte Carlo (MC) studies of simulated signal and background events were carried out using various MC samples. The τ MC events studied were generated with *KK2f* [10] and decayed with *TAUOLA* [11] using τ branching fractions based on PDG 2006 [12]. In the MC, the τ^- decays to $K_S^0\pi^-$ via the $K^*(892)^-$ resonance with a branching fraction of 0.90%. Non- τ hadronic and dilepton MC samples are used for studying the non- τ backgrounds.

3 SELECTING $\tau^- \rightarrow K_S^0\pi^-\nu_\tau$ EVENTS

In this analysis events containing a pion and a K_S^0 in the final state are studied, where the K_S^0 is reconstructed in the $\pi^+\pi^-$ mode.

The event is divided into two hemispheres in the center-of-momentum system (CMS) using the plane perpendicular to the thrust axis, which is the direction which maximizes the sum of the longitudinal momenta of the neutrals and tracks in the event [16]. One hemisphere of the event is required to contain only one charged track; this is defined as the tag hemisphere. The other hemisphere is required to contain three charged tracks; this is defined as the signal hemisphere. The tag track and at least one of the signal hemisphere tracks are required to point towards the interaction point.

Approximately 35 % of τ decay to fully leptonic final states. Requiring the track in the tag hemisphere to be identified as an electron or muon while requiring the signal hemisphere to contain only hadrons strongly reduces backgrounds from $e^+e^- \rightarrow q\bar{q}$ events. Electrons are identified using the ratio of calorimeter energy to the track momentum (E/p), the ionisation loss in the tracking system (dE/dx) and the shape of the shower in the calorimeter. Muons are identified by hits in the IFR and small energy deposits in the calorimeter.

K_S^0 candidates are constructed from any two oppositely charged tracks with an invariant mass within $25 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ of the K_S^0 mass as given by the Particle Data Group (PDG) $497.672 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ [12]. Only events with exactly one K_S^0 candidate are retained. The track from the signal side not originating from the K_S^0 candidate is required to be identified as a pion and originate from the interaction point. Pions are identified by the ionisation loss in the tracking system (dE/dx), the shape of the shower in the calorimeter and their discrimination from kaons performed in the DIRC. All tracks on the signal side are required to lie within the geometrical acceptance region of the EMC and DIRC to ensure good particle identification.

Additional cuts are imposed to further reduce the backgrounds. The net charge of the event is required to be zero and a cut requiring the thrust of the event to be greater than 0.85 is imposed to reduce the non- τ background.

Backgrounds from Bhabha events are suppressed by requiring the momentum of the lepton-side track to be less than $4.9 \text{ GeV}/c$. Backgrounds from radiative Bhabha and μ -pair events with a converted photon are suppressed by requiring the modulus of the cosine of the decay angle to be less than 0.97. The decay angle is defined as the angle between the momentum of the π^+ originating from the K_S^0 in the K_S^0 's rest frame and the K_S^0 momentum in the laboratory frame. When this quantity is calculated on electrons misidentified as pions the effect of assigning an incorrect mass will push the value towards ± 1 . From studies of missing transverse event energy, backgrounds from two-photon events are determined to be negligible.

Along with signal events, $\tau^- \rightarrow \pi^- \pi^+ \pi^- \nu_\tau$ events also produce three pions in the final state, but all three come directly from the primary interaction point. To remove $\tau^- \rightarrow \pi^- \pi^+ \pi^- \nu_\tau$ events the K_S^0 flight length significance in the plane perpendicular to the collision axis is required to be greater than 5.0. The flight length significance is defined as the measured flight length divided by its estimated uncertainty. This cut removes approximately 90% of the remaining $\tau^- \rightarrow \pi^- \pi^+ \pi^- \nu_\tau$ events in the sample. Figure 1 shows the K_S^0 flight length significance distribution for events in this analysis with all other cuts applied.

To increase the likelihood that the pions from the K_S^0 candidate really come from a K_S^0 they are required to have a distance of closest approach to each other of less than 2 mm. The K_S^0 trajectory is reconstructed by performing a vertex fit on the K_S^0 daughter pions constraining them to originate from a single point and then summing their momenta. To increase the probability that the K_S^0 originated from the interaction point this trajectory is required to have a distance of closest approach from the collision axis of less than 1 mm.

Once these cuts have been applied, the largest two background channels are from $\tau^- \rightarrow$




Figure 1: The K_S^0 flight length significance in the xy -plane for the the combined (e -tag+ μ -tag) sample. The MC signal branching fraction is set to the measured value from this analysis.

$K_L^0 K_S^0 \pi^- \nu_\tau$ and $\tau^- \rightarrow K_S^0 \pi^- \pi^0 \nu_\tau$ events where the additional neutral particle to the K_S^0 is undetected. In order to reject such events maximum neutral energy cuts are applied. The total energy in the calorimeter not associated to any charged track must be less than 0.5 GeV. In the signal hemisphere this quantity is required to be below 0.25 GeV.

After selection about 80% of the retained MC events are $\tau \rightarrow K_S^0 \pi^- \nu_\tau$. About 98.5% of the background events come from τ -decays and about 1.5% from non- τ -events. The overall signal efficiency is estimated from the MC simulation as:

$$\epsilon_{\text{sig}} = \frac{N_{\text{sig}}^{\text{sel}}}{N_{\text{sig}}^{\text{gen}}}, \quad (1)$$

where $N_{\text{sig}}^{\text{gen}}$ is the number of generated signal events and $N_{\text{sig}}^{\text{sel}}$ is the number of selected signal events. A total of 5.872×10^6 $\tau \rightarrow K_S^0 \pi^- \nu_\tau$ signal events were generated.

The total selection efficiency, which includes the efficiency corrections that are described in Section 4, is $(0.620 \pm 0.003)\%$, $(0.482 \pm 0.003)\%$ and $(1.101 \pm 0.004)\%$ for the e -tag, μ -tag and combined samples respectively.

4 EFFICIENCY CORRECTIONS

Since imperfect detector simulation may mean that the reconstruction/selection efficiencies differ between data and Monte Carlo, some corrections are applied to Monte Carlo signal and background events.

A detailed study of the K_S^0 efficiency has been carried out. $B^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ D^- (D^- \rightarrow K_S^0 \pi^-)$ decays were used to study the K_S^0 efficiency for data and Monte Carlo. As a result of this study, a per K_S^0 average data/MC efficiency correction of 0.983 should be applied to the MC sample. Since only one K_S^0 is selected in this analysis the MC sample is weighted with 0.983 as a K_S^0 efficiency correction.

The efficiency of particle identification (PID) cuts are known to differ between data and Monte Carlo and so corrections to the Monte Carlo are applied. A set of efficiency tables, binned in p , θ and ϕ , are used in order to obtain the necessary weights to use to correct the Monte Carlo events. The efficiency correction (data/MC relative efficiency) and corresponding uncertainty is calculated for each track.

In this analysis charged PID selection is performed on the pion not originating from the K_S^0 and the lepton. The average values obtained for the corrections due to the electron, muon and pion are 1.015, 0.948 and 0.979 respectively.

The total data/MC efficiency correction, $\varepsilon_{\text{corr}}$, is made by combining the efficiency corrections described above. $\varepsilon_{\text{corr}}$ is used to weight the MC sample and the average values obtained are 0.977, 0.912 and 0.947 for the e -tag, μ -tag and combined samples. The systematic error coming from this procedure is described in Section 5.

5 SYSTEMATIC UNCERTAINTIES

A number of systematic uncertainties have been considered. These are described below.

An error of 1.10% is included due to the K_S^0 efficiency correction procedure described in Section 4. When propagated through to the branching fraction measurement this gives a 1.40% systematic uncertainty on the branching fraction.

The tracking efficiency is susceptible to bias caused by physics data and MC simulation discrepancies. An error of 0.23% per track not originating from the K_S^0 is assigned to account for this. Tracking uncertainties from the K_S^0 daughters are included in the K_S^0 selection systematic. Each event contains two reconstructed charged tracks with correlated uncertainties, leading to a total tracking efficiency uncertainty of 0.46%. This gives a 0.58% systematic uncertainty on the branching fraction.

The total particle identification uncertainty that arises from the efficiency correction procedure described in Section 4 for the e -tag, μ -tag and combined samples is estimated to be 1.05%, 1.33% and 1.18%, respectively. When propagated through to the branching fraction measurement this gives a systematic uncertainty of 1.45% for the e -tag, 1.68% for the μ -tag and 1.50% for the combined sample.

The relative uncertainty associated with the $\tau^+ \tau^-$ pair production cross-section and the *BABAR* luminosity determination is 0.65%, leading to a 0.83% systematic uncertainty on the branching fraction. A relative error is applied for uncertainty in the modelling of selection variables on which cuts are applied. The modelling efficiency uncertainty is estimated as 0.29%, leading to a 0.37% systematic uncertainty on the branching fraction.

The systematic uncertainty on the signal efficiency and branching fraction measurement due to signal Monte Carlo statistics is 0.51% for the e -tag, 0.66% for the μ -tag and 0.37% for the combined samples. The error on the number of background events due to limited Monte Carlo statistics is 1.02% for e -tag, 1.12% for μ -tag and 0.76% for the combined sample. This gives a systematic uncertainty on the branching fraction measurement of 0.28% for e -tag, 0.30% for μ -tag and 0.20% for the combined sample.

Since a number of τ decay modes have not yet been precisely measured, particularly those modes which contain Cabibbo suppression factors, the branching fractions used as input to the Monte Carlo simulation come with an uncertainty which feeds into the total systematic error. In order to evaluate this a weighted-sum of the τ backgrounds is constructed using the Monte Carlo truth for τ Monte Carlo events passing the analysis selection criteria.

The branching fraction for the background mode $\tau^- \rightarrow K^- K^+ \pi^- \nu_\tau$ is taken from a recent *BABAR* collaboration measurement $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow K^- K^+ \pi^- \nu_\tau) = (0.1346 \pm 0.0010 \pm 0.0036)\%$ [14]. We predict the ratio $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow \pi^- K_S^0 K_L^0 \nu_\tau) / \mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow K^- K^+ \pi^- \nu_\tau)$ to be 0.50 ± 0.05 using an isospin relation [17]. This gives $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow \pi^- K_S^0 K_L^0 \nu_\tau) = (0.0673 \pm 0.0070)\%$ which is consistent with the PDG 2006 value $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow \pi^- K_S^0 K_L^0 \nu_\tau) = (0.112 \pm 0.030)\%$. All other background mode uncertainties are taken from the PDG 2006 [12]. The overall estimated uncertainty due to the τ backgrounds is given by:

$$\Delta^{\tau\text{-bkg}} = \sqrt{\sum_i \left(w_i \frac{\sigma_i}{\mathcal{B}_i} \right)^2}, \quad (2)$$

where w_i is the fraction of selected background τ events of mode i , \mathcal{B}_i is the branching fraction of mode i and σ_i is the uncertainty of \mathcal{B}_i .

Table 1 shows the weights and uncertainties of the τ background modes remaining in the selected $\tau^- \rightarrow K_S^0 \pi^- \nu_\tau$ sample. The resulting uncertainty attributed to the τ background modes ($\Delta^{\tau\text{-bkg}}$) is estimated as 4.99% on the number of background events and is consistent between each of the tagged samples. This leads to a 1.37% systematic uncertainty on the branching fraction.

Table 1: τ background uncertainties and their weights in the selected $\tau^- \rightarrow K_S^0 \pi^- \nu_\tau$ sample.

Decay Channel	w [%]	$\frac{\sigma}{\mathcal{B}}$ [%]
$\tau^- \rightarrow \pi^- K_S^0 \pi^0 \nu_\tau$	24.24	10.53
$\tau^- \rightarrow K^- K_S^0 \pi^0 \nu_\tau$	0.57	17.54
$\tau^- \rightarrow \pi^- \bar{K}^0 K_L^0 \nu_\tau$	41.16	10.38
$\tau^- \rightarrow \pi^- \bar{K}^0 K_S^0 \nu_\tau$	0.18	20.83
$\tau^- \rightarrow K^- \bar{K}^0 \nu_\tau$	2.64	10.46
$\tau^- \rightarrow \pi^- \pi^0 \nu_\tau$	0.75	0.39
$\tau^- \rightarrow 2\pi^+ \pi^- \nu_\tau$	23.65	0.89
$\tau^- \rightarrow 2\pi^- \pi^+ \pi^0 \nu_\tau$	3.41	1.35
$\tau^- \rightarrow K^- K^+ \pi^- \nu_\tau$	0.61	2.78
$\tau^- \rightarrow K^- \pi^+ \pi^- \nu_\tau$	0.78	10.26

Table 2 summarises the main sources of systematic uncertainty in the analysis.

The relative systematic uncertainty on the branching fraction includes the individual sources described above when propagated through equation (3) taking into account correlations between the different components considered. The total systematic uncertainty on the branching fraction measurement is 2.73%, 2.87% and 2.72% for the e -tag, μ -tag and combined samples, respectively.

6 BRANCHING FRACTION MEASUREMENT: $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 \pi^- \nu_\tau)$

Figure 2 shows the invariant mass spectrum of the selected data and MC $K_S^0 \pi^-$ candidates in the combined (e -tag+ μ -tag) sample after all the analysis requirements, including efficiency corrections.

Table 2: Summary of the systematic uncertainties as they feed into the measurement of $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow K^0 \pi^- \nu_\tau)$.

Systematic	e -tag	μ -tag	Combined
Tracking	0.58%	0.58%	0.58%
K_S^0 Efficiency	1.40%	1.40%	1.40%
PID	1.45%	1.68%	1.50%
$\mathcal{L} \times \sigma_{\tau\tau}$	0.83%	0.83%	0.83%
Statistical efficiency error	0.51%	0.56%	0.38%
MC background statistics	0.28%	0.30%	0.20%
τ backgrounds	1.37%	1.37%	1.37%
Modelling efficiency	0.37%	0.37%	0.37%
Total	2.73%	2.87%	2.72%

In this plot, the signal MC sample is scaled using the branching fraction measured in this analysis: $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow K_S^0 \pi^- \nu_\tau) = 0.420\%$. The data and MC sample disagreements can be ascribed to inadequate modelling of the K^* resonances in the MC simulation. There is some evidence that the $K^*(892)$ mass has been underestimated in the MC simulation and of the existence of $K_0^*(800)$ and $K_0^*(1430)$ resonances which are not modelled [7]. However these discrepancies do not affect our result for the branching ratio.

The final result for $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 \pi^- \nu_\tau)$ is estimated using the combined e -tag + μ -tag sample, where the total number of events observed, estimated background level and efficiency are derived from the two tagged samples. As a cross-check, $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 \pi^- \nu_\tau)$ is calculated for each tagged sample separately and the results obtained are in excellent agreement with the combined result.

The branching fraction $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 \pi^- \nu_\tau)$ is estimated by

$$\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 \pi^- \nu_\tau) = \frac{1}{2N_{\tau\tau}} \frac{N_{\text{data}} - N_{\text{bkg}}}{\varepsilon_{\text{sig}}}, \quad (3)$$

where $N_{\tau\tau}$ is the total number of $\tau^+\tau^-$ pairs in the real data, N_{data} is the number of selected events in real data, N_{bkg} is the number of background events estimated from Monte Carlo sample and ε_{sig} is the signal efficiency as defined in equation (1). The total number of $\tau^+\tau^-$ pairs in the data is given by

$$N_{\tau\tau} = \sigma_\tau \mathcal{L}_{\text{data}} = (353.4 \pm 2.3) \times 10^6, \quad (4)$$

where σ_τ is the $\tau^+\tau^-$ production cross-section at *BABAR* (i.e. 0.919 ± 0.003 nb) and $\mathcal{L}_{\text{data}}$ is the (integrated) real data luminosity (i.e. 384.6 ± 2.2 fb $^{-1}$).

Table 3 gives the numbers of real and simulated data events passing the selection criteria that feed into the $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 \pi^- \nu_\tau)$ calculation. A result for the measurement of the branching fraction $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 \pi^- \nu_\tau)$ is given in Table 4.

Figure 3 shows previously published measurements of $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 \pi^- \nu_\tau)$. It can be seen that this *BABAR* preliminary result is the world's most precise measurement.





Figure 2: Reconstructed $\tau^- \rightarrow K_S^0 \pi^- \nu_\tau$ mass distribution for the combined (e -tag+ μ -tag) sample using (left) logarithmic scale and (right) linear scale. The MC signal branching fraction is set to the measured value from this analysis.




Figure 3: Previously published measurements of $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 \pi^- \nu_\tau)$. The Belle result and the result from this analysis do not contribute to the PDG 2006 average. The *BABAR* preliminary result provides the world's most precise measurement to date: $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 \pi^- \nu_\tau) = (0.840 \pm 0.004 \text{ (stat)} \pm 0.023 \text{ (syst)}) \%$.

Table 3: Numbers of data and Monte Carlo events remaining in the selected samples corresponding to the 384.6 fb^{-1} (integrated) real data luminosity. The signal Monte Carlo has been scaled with the PDG 2006 value [12].

Data	e -tag	μ -tag	Combined
Real	47092 ± 217	36641 ± 191	83733 ± 289
Signal MC	39445 ± 193	30749 ± 176	70194 ± 261
$\tau^+\tau^-$ background	9942 ± 92	7645 ± 88	17587 ± 131
uds	8.9 ± 3.4	65.2 ± 7.9	74.1 ± 8.5
$c\bar{c}$	45.5 ± 5.0	43.5 ± 4.8	89.1 ± 6.9
$B\bar{B}$	3.4 ± 1.1	3.7 ± 1.2	7.1 ± 1.6
$\mu^+\mu^-$	0 ± 0	14.2 ± 3.7	14.2 ± 3.7

Table 4: *BABAR* preliminary $\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow \bar{K}^0\pi^-\nu_\tau)$ measurements.

Sample	$\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow \bar{K}^0\pi^-\nu_\tau)$ [%]
e -tag	0.840 ± 0.005 (stat) ± 0.023 (syst)
μ -tag	0.840 ± 0.006 (stat) ± 0.024 (syst)
Combined	0.840 ± 0.004 (stat) ± 0.023 (syst)

7 SUMMARY

Using 384.6 fb^{-1} of e^+e^- collision data produced by the PEP-II collider and recorded by the *BABAR* detector, we obtain the preliminary result:

$$\mathcal{B}(\tau^- \rightarrow \bar{K}^0\pi^-\nu_\tau) = (0.840 \pm 0.004 \text{ (stat)} \pm 0.023 \text{ (syst)}) \%. \quad (5)$$

This result is the most precise measurement of this branching fraction to date and is consistent with the world average.

8 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

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), 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 Education and Science of the Russian Federation, Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia (Spain), and the Science and Technology Facilities Council (United Kingdom). Individuals have received support from the Marie-Curie IEF program (European Union) and the A. P. Sloan Foundation.

References

- [1] S. L. Glashow *et al.* Nucl. Phys 22 (1961) 579.
- [2] N. Cabibbo *et al.* Phys. Rev. Lett 10 (1963) 531.
- [3] E. Gamiz *et al.*, JHEP 0301 (2003) 060.
- [4] S. Chen *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. C22 (2001) 31.
- [5] R. Briere *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 90 (2003) 181802.
- [6] G. Abbiendi *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. C35 (2004) 437.
- [7] D. Epifanov *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B654 (2007) 65.
- [8] B. Aubert *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A479 (2002) 1.
- [9] PEP-II: An asymmetric B Factory. Conceptual Design Report, 1993, SLAC-R-418.
- [10] B.F.L. Ward, S. Jadach and Z. Was, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. (2003) 73.
- [11] S. Jadach, Z. Was R. Decker and J.H. Kühn, Comput. Phys. Commun. 76 (1993) 361.
- [12] W. M. Yao *et al.*, J. Phys. G 33 (2006) 1.
- [13] S. Eidelman *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B592 (2004) 1.
- [14] B. Aubert *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 100 (2008) 011801.
- [15] S. Banerjee *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. D **77** (2008) 054012.
- [16] S. Brandt *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **12** (1964) 57;
E. Farhi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **39** (1977) 1587.
- [17] M. Finkemeier and E. Mirkes, Z. Phys. C **69** (1996) 243.