

UC Berkeley

UC Berkeley Previously Published Works

Title

Measurement of the Inclusive Charmless Semileptonic Branching Ratio of B Mesons and Determination of

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1wp702d3>

Journal

Physical Review Letters, 92(7)

ISSN

0031-9007

Authors

Aubert, B
Barate, R
Boutigny, D
[et al.](#)

Publication Date

2004-02-20

DOI

10.1103/PhysRevLett.92.071802

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

Measurement of the Inclusive Charmless Semileptonic Branching Ratio of B Mesons and Determination of $|V_{ub}|$

B. Aubert,¹ R. Barate,¹ D. Boutigny,¹ J.-M. Gaillard,¹ A. Hicheur,¹ Y. Karyotakis,¹ J. P. Lees,¹ P. Robbe,¹ V. Tisserand,¹ A. Zghiche,¹ A. Palano,² A. Pompili,² J. C. Chen,³ N. D. Qi,³ G. Rong,³ P. Wang,³ Y. S. Zhu,³ G. Eigen,⁴ I. Ofte,⁴ B. Stugu,⁴ G. S. Abrams,⁵ A. W. Borgland,⁵ A. B. Breon,⁵ D. N. Brown,⁵ J. Button-Shafer,⁵ R. N. Cahn,⁵ E. Charles,⁵ C. T. Day,⁵ M. S. Gill,⁵ A. V. Gritsan,⁵ Y. Groyzman,⁵ R. G. Jacobsen,⁵ R. W. Kadel,⁵ J. Kadyk,⁵ L. T. Kerth,⁵ Yu. G. Kolomensky,⁵ J. F. Kral,⁵ G. Kukartsev,⁵ C. LeClerc,⁵ M. E. Levi,⁵ G. Lynch,⁵ L. M. Mir,⁵ P. J. Oddone,⁵ T. J. Orimoto,⁵ M. Pripstein,⁵ N. A. Roe,⁵ A. Romosan,⁵ M. T. Ronan,⁵ V. G. Shelkov,⁵ A. V. Telnov,⁵ W. A. Wenzel,⁵ K. Ford,⁶ T. J. Harrison,⁶ C. M. Hawkes,⁶ D. J. Knowles,⁶ S. E. Morgan,⁶ R. C. Penny,⁶ A. T. Watson,⁶ N. K. Watson,⁶ T. Deppermann,⁷ K. Goetzen,⁷ H. Koch,⁷ B. Lewandowski,⁷ M. Pelizaeus,⁷ K. Peters,⁷ H. Schmucker,⁷ M. Steinke,⁷ N. R. Barlow,⁸ J. T. Boyd,⁸ N. Chevalier,⁸ W. N. Cottingham,⁸ M. P. Kelly,⁸ T. E. Latham,⁸ C. Mackay,⁸ F. F. Wilson,⁸ K. Abe,⁹ T. Cuhadar-Donszelmann,⁹ C. Hearty,⁹ T. S. Mattison,⁹ J. A. McKenna,⁹ D. Thiessen,⁹ P. Kyberd,¹⁰ A. K. McKemey,¹⁰ V. E. Blinov,¹¹ A. D. Bukin,¹¹ V. B. Golubev,¹¹ V. N. Ivanchenko,¹¹ E. A. Kravchenko,¹¹ A. P. Onuchin,¹¹ S. I. Serednyakov,¹¹ Yu. I. Skovpen,¹¹ E. P. Solodov,¹¹ A. N. Yushkov,¹¹ D. Best,¹² M. Chao,¹² D. Kirkby,¹² A. J. Lankford,¹² M. Mandelkern,¹² S. McMahon,¹² R. K. Mommsen,¹² W. Roethel,¹² D. P. Stoker,¹² C. Buchanan,¹³ D. del Re,¹⁴ H. K. Hadavand,¹⁴ E. J. Hill,¹⁴ D. B. MacFarlane,¹⁴ H. P. Paar,¹⁴ Sh. Rahatlou,¹⁴ U. Schwanke,¹⁴ V. Sharma,¹⁴ J. W. Berryhill,¹⁵ C. Campagnari,¹⁵ B. Dahmes,¹⁵ N. Kuznetsova,¹⁵ S. L. Levy,¹⁵ O. Long,¹⁵ A. Lu,¹⁵ M. A. Mazur,¹⁵ J. D. Richman,¹⁵ W. Verkerke,¹⁵ T. W. Beck,¹⁶ J. Beringer,¹⁶ A. M. Eisner,¹⁶ C. A. Heusch,¹⁶ W. S. Lockman,¹⁶ T. Schalk,¹⁶ R. E. Schmitz,¹⁶ B. A. Schumm,¹⁶ A. Seiden,¹⁶ M. Turri,¹⁶ W. Walkowiak,¹⁶ D. C. Williams,¹⁶ M. G. Wilson,¹⁶ J. Albert,¹⁷ E. Chen,¹⁷ G. P. Dubois-Felsmann,¹⁷ A. Dvoretzkii,¹⁷ D. G. Hitlin,¹⁷ I. Narsky,¹⁷ F. C. Porter,¹⁷ A. Ryd,¹⁷ A. Samuel,¹⁷ S. Yang,¹⁷ S. Jayatilke,¹⁸ G. Mancinelli,¹⁸ B. T. Meadows,¹⁸ M. D. Sokoloff,¹⁸ T. Abe,¹⁹ T. Barillari,¹⁹ F. Blanc,¹⁹ P. Bloom,¹⁹ S. Chen,¹⁹ P. J. Clark,¹⁹ W. T. Ford,¹⁹ U. Nauenberg,¹⁹ A. Olivas,¹⁹ P. Rankin,¹⁹ J. Roy,¹⁹ J. G. Smith,¹⁹ W. C. van Hoek,¹⁹ L. Zhang,¹⁹ J. L. Harton,²⁰ T. Hu,²⁰ A. Soffer,²⁰ W. H. Toki,²⁰ R. J. Wilson,²⁰ J. Zhang,²⁰ D. Altenburg,²¹ T. Brandt,²¹ J. Brose,²¹ T. Colberg,²¹ M. Dickopp,²¹ R. S. Dubitzky,²¹ A. Hauke,²¹ H. M. Lacker,²¹ E. Maly,²¹ R. Müller-Pfefferkorn,²¹ R. Nogowski,²¹ S. Otto,²¹ K. R. Schubert,²¹ R. Schwierz,²¹ B. Spaan,²¹ L. Wilden,²¹ D. Bernard,²² G. R. Bonneaud,²² F. Brochard,²² J. Cohen-Tanugi,²² Ch. Thiebaux,²² G. Vasileiadis,²² M. Verderi,²² A. Khan,²³ D. Lavin,²³ F. Muheim,²³ S. Playfer,²³ J. E. Swain,²³ J. Tinslay,²³ M. Andreotti,²⁴ D. Bettoni,²⁴ C. Bozzi,²⁴ R. Calabrese,²⁴ G. Cibinetto,²⁴ E. Luppi,²⁴ M. Negrini,²⁴ L. Piemontese,²⁴ A. Sarti,²⁴ E. Treadwell,²⁵ F. Anulli,^{26,*} R. Baldini-Ferrolli,²⁶ A. Calcaterra,²⁶ R. de Sangro,²⁶ D. Falciari,²⁶ G. Finocchiaro,²⁶ P. Patteri,²⁶ I. M. Peruzzi,^{26,*} M. Piccolo,²⁶ A. Zallo,²⁶ A. Buzzo,²⁷ R. Contri,²⁷ G. Crosetti,²⁷ M. Lo Vetere,²⁷ M. Macri,²⁷ M. R. Monge,²⁷ S. Passaggio,²⁷ F. C. Pastore,²⁷ C. Patrignani,²⁷ E. Robutti,²⁷ A. Santroni,²⁷ S. Tosi,²⁷ S. Bailey,²⁸ M. Morii,²⁸ M. L. Aspinwall,²⁹ W. Bhimji,²⁹ D. A. Bowerman,²⁹ P. D. Dauncey,²⁹ U. Egede,²⁹ I. Eschrich,²⁹ G. W. Morton,²⁹ J. A. Nash,²⁹ P. Sanders,²⁹ G. P. Taylor,²⁹ G. J. Grenier,³⁰ S.-J. Lee,³⁰ U. Mallik,³⁰ J. Cochran,³¹ H. B. Crawley,³¹ J. Lamsa,³¹ W. T. Meyer,³¹ S. Prell,³¹ E. I. Rosenberg,³¹ J. Yi,³¹ M. Davier,³² G. Grosdidier,³² A. Höcker,³² S. Laplace,³² F. Le Diberder,³² V. Lepeltier,³² A. M. Lutz,³² T. C. Petersen,³² S. Plaszczynski,³² M. H. Schune,³² L. Tantot,³² G. Wormser,³² V. Brigljević,³³ C. H. Cheng,³³ D. J. Lange,³³ D. M. Wright,³³ A. J. Bevan,³⁴ J. P. Coleman,³⁴ J. R. Fry,³⁴ E. Gabathuler,³⁴ R. Gamet,³⁴ M. Kay,³⁴ R. J. Parry,³⁴ D. J. Payne,³⁴ R. J. Sloane,³⁴ C. Touramanis,³⁴ J. J. Back,³⁵ P. F. Harrison,³⁵ H. W. Shorthouse,³⁵ P. Strother,³⁵ P. B. Vidal,³⁵ C. L. Brown,³⁶ G. Cowan,³⁶ R. L. Flack,³⁶ H. U. Flaecher,³⁶ S. George,³⁶ M. G. Green,³⁶ A. Kurup,³⁶ C. E. Marker,³⁶ T. R. McMahon,³⁶ S. Ricciardi,³⁶ F. Salvatore,³⁶ G. Vaitsas,³⁶ M. A. Winter,³⁶ D. Brown,³⁷ C. L. Davis,³⁷ J. Allison,³⁸ R. J. Barlow,³⁸ A. C. Forti,³⁸ P. A. Hart,³⁸ F. Jackson,³⁸ G. D. Lafferty,³⁸ A. J. Lyon,³⁸ J. H. Weatherall,³⁸ J. C. Williams,³⁸ A. Farbin,³⁹ A. Jawahery,³⁹ D. Kovalskyi,³⁹ C. K. Lae,³⁹ V. Lillard,³⁹ D. A. Roberts,³⁹ G. Blaylock,⁴⁰ C. Dallapiccola,⁴⁰ K. T. Flood,⁴⁰ S. S. Hertzbach,⁴⁰ R. Kofler,⁴⁰ V. B. Koptchev,⁴⁰ T. B. Moore,⁴⁰ S. Saremi,⁴⁰ H. Staengle,⁴⁰ S. Willocq,⁴⁰ R. Cowan,⁴¹ G. Sciolla,⁴¹ F. Taylor,⁴¹ R. K. Yamamoto,⁴¹ D. J. J. Mangeol,⁴² M. Milek,⁴² P. M. Patel,⁴² A. Lazzaro,⁴³ F. Palombo,⁴³ J. M. Bauer,⁴⁴ L. Cremaldi,⁴⁴ V. Eschenburg,⁴⁴ R. Godang,⁴⁴ R. Kroeger,⁴⁴ J. Reidy,⁴⁴ D. A. Sanders,⁴⁴ D. J. Summers,⁴⁴ H. W. Zhao,⁴⁴ C. Hast,⁴⁵ P. Taras,⁴⁵ H. Nicholson,⁴⁶ C. Cartaro,⁴⁷ N. Cavallo,^{47,†} G. De Nardo,⁴⁷ F. Fabozzi,^{47,†} C. Gatto,⁴⁷ L. Lista,⁴⁷ P. Paolucci,⁴⁷ D. Piccolo,⁴⁷ C. Sciacca,⁴⁷ M. A. Baak,⁴⁸ G. Raven,⁴⁸ J. M. LoSecco,⁴⁹ T. A. Gabriel,⁵⁰ B. Brau,⁵¹ T. Pulliam,⁵¹ J. Brau,⁵² R. Frey,⁵² C. T. Potter,⁵² N. B. Sinev,⁵² D. Strom,⁵² E. Torrence,⁵² F. Colecchia,⁵³ A. Dorigo,⁵³ F. Galeazzi,⁵³ M. Margoni,⁵³ M. Morandin,⁵³ M. Posocco,⁵³ M. Rotondo,⁵³ F. Simonetto,⁵³

R. Stroili,⁵³ G. Tiozzo,⁵³ C. Voci,⁵³ M. Benayoun,⁵⁴ H. Briand,⁵⁴ J. Chauveau,⁵⁴ P. David,⁵⁴ Ch. de la Vaissière,⁵⁴ L. Del Buono,⁵⁴ O. Hamon,⁵⁴ M. J. J. John,⁵⁴ Ph. Leruste,⁵⁴ J. Ocariz,⁵⁴ M. Pivk,⁵⁴ L. Roos,⁵⁴ J. Stark,⁵⁴ S. T'Jampens,⁵⁴ P. F. Manfredi,⁵⁵ V. Re,⁵⁵ L. Gladney,⁵⁶ Q. H. Guo,⁵⁶ J. Panetta,⁵⁶ C. Angelini,⁵⁷ G. Batignani,⁵⁷ S. Bettarini,⁵⁷ M. Bondioli,⁵⁷ F. Bucci,⁵⁷ G. Calderini,⁵⁷ M. Carpinelli,⁵⁷ F. Forti,⁵⁷ M. A. Giorgi,⁵⁷ A. Lusiani,⁵⁷ G. Marchiori,⁵⁷ F. Martinez-Vidal,^{57,‡} M. Morganti,⁵⁷ N. Neri,⁵⁷ E. Paoloni,⁵⁷ M. Rama,⁵⁷ G. Rizzo,⁵⁷ F. Sandrelli,⁵⁷ J. Walsh,⁵⁷ M. Haire,⁵⁸ D. Judd,⁵⁸ K. Paick,⁵⁸ D. E. Wagoner,⁵⁸ N. Danielson,⁵⁹ P. Elmer,⁵⁹ C. Lu,⁵⁹ V. Miftakov,⁵⁹ J. Olsen,⁵⁹ A. J. S. Smith,⁵⁹ E. W. Varnes,⁵⁹ F. Bellini,⁶⁰ G. Cavoto,^{59,60} R. Faccini,^{14,60} F. Ferrarotto,⁶⁰ F. Ferroni,⁶⁰ M. Gaspero,⁶⁰ M. A. Mazzoni,⁶⁰ S. Morganti,⁶⁰ M. Pierini,⁶⁰ G. Piredda,⁶⁰ F. Safai Tehrani,⁶⁰ C. Voena,⁶⁰ S. Christ,⁶¹ G. Wagner,⁶¹ R. Waldi,⁶¹ T. Adye,⁶² N. De Groot,⁶² B. Franek,⁶² N. I. Geddes,⁶² G. P. Gopal,⁶² E. O. Olaiya,⁶² S. M. Xella,⁶² R. Aleksan,⁶³ S. Emery,⁶³ A. Gaidot,⁶³ S. F. Ganzhur,⁶³ P.-F. Giraud,⁶³ G. Hamel de Monchenault,⁶³ W. Kozanecki,⁶³ M. Langer,⁶³ G. W. London,⁶³ B. Mayer,⁶³ G. Schott,⁶³ G. Vasseur,⁶³ Ch. Yeche,⁶³ M. Zito,⁶³ M. V. Purohit,⁶⁴ A. W. Weidemann,⁶⁴ F. X. Yumiceva,⁶⁴ D. Aston,⁶⁵ R. Bartoldus,⁶⁵ N. Berger,⁶⁵ A. M. Boyarski,⁶⁵ O. L. Buchmueller,⁶⁵ M. R. Convery,⁶⁵ D. P. Coupal,⁶⁵ D. Dong,⁶⁵ J. Dorfan,⁶⁵ D. Dujmic,⁶⁵ W. Dunwoodie,⁶⁵ R. C. Field,⁶⁵ T. Glanzman,⁶⁵ S. J. Gowdy,⁶⁵ E. Grauges-Pous,⁶⁵ T. Hadig,⁶⁵ V. Halyo,⁶⁵ T. Hryn'ova,⁶⁵ W. R. Innes,⁶⁵ C. P. Jessop,⁶⁵ M. H. Kelsey,⁶⁵ P. Kim,⁶⁵ M. L. Kocian,⁶⁵ U. Langenegger,⁶⁵ D. W. G. S. Leith,⁶⁵ S. Luitz,⁶⁵ V. Luth,⁶⁵ H. L. Lynch,⁶⁵ H. Marsiske,⁶⁵ S. Menke,⁶⁵ R. Messner,⁶⁵ D. R. Muller,⁶⁵ C. P. O'Grady,⁶⁵ V. E. Ozcan,⁶⁵ A. Perazzo,⁶⁵ M. Perl,⁶⁵ S. Petrak,⁶⁵ B. N. Ratcliff,⁶⁵ S. H. Robertson,⁶⁵ A. Roodman,⁶⁵ A. A. Salnikov,⁶⁵ R. H. Schindler,⁶⁵ J. Schwiening,⁶⁵ G. Simi,⁶⁵ A. Snyder,⁶⁵ A. Soha,⁶⁵ J. Stelzer,⁶⁵ D. Su,⁶⁵ M. K. Sullivan,⁶⁵ H. A. Tanaka,⁶⁵ J. Va'vra,⁶⁵ S. R. Wagner,⁶⁵ M. Weaver,⁶⁵ A. J. R. Weinstein,⁶⁵ W. J. Wisniewski,⁶⁵ D. H. Wright,⁶⁵ C. C. Young,⁶⁵ P. R. Burchat,⁶⁶ A. J. Edwards,⁶⁶ T. I. Meyer,⁶⁶ C. Roat,⁶⁶ S. Ahmed,⁶⁷ M. S. Alam,⁶⁷ J. A. Ernst,⁶⁷ M. Saleem,⁶⁷ F. R. Wappler,⁶⁷ W. Bugg,⁶⁸ M. Krishnamurthy,⁶⁸ S. M. Spanier,⁶⁸ R. Eckmann,⁶⁹ H. Kim,⁶⁹ J. L. Ritchie,⁶⁹ R. F. Schwitters,⁶⁹ J. M. Izen,⁷⁰ I. Kitayama,⁷⁰ X. C. Lou,⁷⁰ S. Ye,⁷⁰ F. Bianchi,⁷¹ M. Bona,⁷¹ F. Gallo,⁷¹ D. Gamba,⁷¹ C. Borean,⁷² L. Bosisio,⁷² G. Della Ricca,⁷² S. Dittongo,⁷² S. Grancagnolo,⁷² L. Lanceri,⁷² P. Poropat,^{72,§} L. Vitale,⁷² G. Vuagnin,⁷² R. S. Panvini,⁷³ Sw. Banerjee,⁷⁴ C. M. Brown,⁷⁴ D. Fortin,⁷⁴ P. D. Jackson,⁷⁴ R. Kowalewski,⁷⁴ J. M. Roney,⁷⁴ H. R. Band,⁷⁵ S. Dasu,⁷⁵ M. Datta,⁷⁵ A. M. Eichenbaum,⁷⁵ H. Hu,⁷⁵ J. R. Johnson,⁷⁵ P. E. Kutter,⁷⁵ H. Li,⁷⁵ R. Liu,⁷⁵ F. Di Lodovico,⁷⁵ A. Mihalyi,⁷⁵ A. K. Mohapatra,⁷⁵ Y. Pan,⁷⁵ R. Prepost,⁷⁵ S. J. Sekula,⁷⁵ J. H. von Wimmersperg-Toeller,⁷⁵ J. Wu,⁷⁵ S. L. Wu,⁷⁵ Z. Yu,⁷⁵ and H. Neal⁷⁶

(BABAR Collaboration)

¹Laboratoire de Physique des Particules, F-74941 Annecy-le-Vieux, France

²Università di Bari, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-70126 Bari, Italy

³Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing 100039, China

⁴University of Bergen, Institute of Physics, N-5007 Bergen, Norway

⁵Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory and University of California, Berkeley, California 94720, USA

⁶University of Birmingham, Birmingham, B15 2TT, United Kingdom

⁷Ruhr Universität Bochum, Institut für Experimentalphysik 1, D-44780 Bochum, Germany

⁸University of Bristol, Bristol BS8 1TL, United Kingdom

⁹University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada V6T 1Z1

¹⁰Brunel University, Uxbridge, Middlesex UB8 3PH, United Kingdom

¹¹Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics, Novosibirsk 630090, Russia

¹²University of California at Irvine, Irvine, California 92697, USA

¹³University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California 90024, USA

¹⁴University of California at San Diego, La Jolla, California 92093, USA

¹⁵University of California at Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, California 93106, USA

¹⁶University of California at Santa Cruz, Institute for Particle Physics, Santa Cruz, California 95064, USA

¹⁷California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California 91125, USA

¹⁸University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio 45221, USA

¹⁹University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80309, USA

²⁰Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado 80523, USA

²¹Technische Universität Dresden, Institut für Kern- und Teilchenphysik, D-01062 Dresden, Germany

²²Ecole Polytechnique, LLR, F-91128 Palaiseau, France

²³University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH9 3JZ, United Kingdom

²⁴Università di Ferrara, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-44100 Ferrara, Italy

²⁵Florida A&M University, Tallahassee, Florida 32307, USA

²⁶Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati dell'INFN, I-00044 Frascati, Italy

²⁷Università di Genova, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-16146 Genova, Italy

²⁸Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, USA

- ²⁹Imperial College London, London, SW7 2BZ, United Kingdom
³⁰University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa 52242, USA
³¹Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011-3160, USA
³²Laboratoire de l'Accélérateur Linéaire, F-91898 Orsay, France
³³Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California 94550, USA
³⁴University of Liverpool, Liverpool L69 3BX, United Kingdom
³⁵Queen Mary, University of London, E1 4NS, United Kingdom
³⁶University of London, Royal Holloway and Bedford New College, Egham, Surrey TW20 0EX, United Kingdom
³⁷University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky 40292, USA
³⁸University of Manchester, Manchester M13 9PL, United Kingdom
³⁹University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742, USA
⁴⁰University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts 01003, USA
⁴¹Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Laboratory for Nuclear Science, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, USA
⁴²McGill University, Montréal, Québec, Canada H3A 2T8
⁴³Università di Milano, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-20133 Milano, Italy
⁴⁴University of Mississippi, University, Mississippi 38677, USA
⁴⁵Université de Montréal, Laboratoire René J. A. Lévesque, Montréal, Québec, Canada H3C 3J7
⁴⁶Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Massachusetts 01075, USA
⁴⁷Università di Napoli Federico II, Dipartimento di Scienze Fisiche and INFN, I-80126, Napoli, Italy
⁴⁸NIKHEF, National Institute for Nuclear Physics and High Energy Physics, NL-1009 DB Amsterdam, The Netherlands
⁴⁹University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana 46556, USA
⁵⁰Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37831, USA
⁵¹Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210, USA
⁵²University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403, USA
⁵³Università di Padova, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-35131 Padova, Italy
⁵⁴Universités Paris VI et VII, Lab de Physique Nucléaire H. E., F-75252 Paris, France
⁵⁵Università di Pavia, Dipartimento di Elettronica and INFN, I-27100 Pavia, Italy
⁵⁶University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104, USA
⁵⁷Università di Pisa, Dipartimento di Fisica, Scuola Normale Superiore and INFN, I-56127 Pisa, Italy
⁵⁸Prairie View A&M University, Prairie View, Texas 77446, USA
⁵⁹Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey 08544, USA
⁶⁰Università di Roma La Sapienza, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-00185 Roma, Italy
⁶¹Universität Rostock, D-18051 Rostock, Germany
⁶²Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Chilton, Didcot, Oxon, OX11 0QX, United Kingdom
⁶³DSM/Dapnia, CEA/Saclay, F-91191 Gif-sur-Yvette, France
⁶⁴University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina 29208, USA
⁶⁵Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, Stanford, California 94309, USA
⁶⁶Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305-4060, USA
⁶⁷State University of New York, Albany, New York 12222, USA
⁶⁸University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee 37996, USA
⁶⁹University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712, USA
⁷⁰University of Texas at Dallas, Richardson, Texas 75083, USA
⁷¹Università di Torino, Dipartimento di Fisica Sperimentale and INFN, I-10125 Torino, Italy
⁷²Università di Trieste, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-34127 Trieste, Italy
⁷³Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee 37235, USA
⁷⁴University of Victoria, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada V8W 3P6
⁷⁵University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706, USA
⁷⁶Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut 06511, USA

(Received 25 July 2003; published 18 February 2004)

We report a measurement of the inclusive charmless semileptonic branching fraction of B mesons in a sample of 89×10^6 $B\bar{B}$ events recorded with the $BABAR$ detector at the $Y(4S)$ resonance. Events are selected by fully reconstructing the decay of one B meson and identifying a charged lepton from the decay of the other B meson. The number of signal events is extracted from the mass distribution of the hadronic system accompanying the lepton and is used to determine the ratio of branching fractions $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B} \rightarrow X_u \ell \bar{\nu})/\mathcal{B}(\bar{B} \rightarrow X \ell \bar{\nu}) = [2.06 \pm 0.25(\text{stat}) \pm 0.23(\text{syst}) \pm 0.36(\text{theo})] \times 10^{-2}$. Using the measured branching fraction for inclusive semileptonic B decays, we find $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B} \rightarrow X_u \ell \bar{\nu}) = [2.24 \pm 0.27(\text{stat}) \pm 0.26(\text{syst}) \pm 0.39(\text{theo})] \times 10^{-3}$ and derive the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa matrix element $|V_{ub}| = [4.62 \pm 0.28(\text{stat}) \pm 0.27(\text{syst}) \pm 0.48(\text{theo})] \times 10^{-3}$.

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.92.071802

PACS numbers: 13.20.He, 12.15.Hh

The element $|V_{ub}|$ of the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa quark-mixing matrix [1] plays a critical role in testing the consistency of the standard model description of CP violation. In this Letter, we present a determination of $|V_{ub}|$ from a measurement of inclusive charmless semileptonic decays $\bar{B} \rightarrow X_u \ell \bar{\nu}$ [2]. The analysis uses $Y(4S) \rightarrow B\bar{B}$ events in which one of the B meson decays hadronically and is fully reconstructed (B_{reco}) and the semileptonic decay of the recoiling \bar{B} meson is identified by the presence of an electron or muon. While this approach results in a low overall event selection efficiency, it allows for the determination of the momentum, charge, and flavor of the B mesons. We use the invariant mass m_X of the hadronic system to separate $\bar{B} \rightarrow X_u \ell \bar{\nu}$ decays from the dominant $\bar{B} \rightarrow X_c \ell \bar{\nu}$ background, which clusters above the D meson mass [3]. We achieve a higher signal purity and acceptance than previous analyses [4] and obtain smaller theoretical uncertainties. By measuring the fraction of charmless semileptonic decays $R_u = \mathcal{B}(\bar{B} \rightarrow X_u \ell \bar{\nu})/\mathcal{B}(\bar{B} \rightarrow X \ell \bar{\nu})$, we minimize experimental uncertainties.

The measurement presented here is based on a sample of $89 \times 10^6 B\bar{B}$ pairs collected near the $Y(4S)$ resonance by the $BABAR$ detector [5] at the PEP-II asymmetric-energy e^+e^- storage ring operating at SLAC.

We use Monte Carlo (MC) simulations of the $BABAR$ detector based on GEANT [6] to optimize selection criteria and to determine signal efficiencies and background distributions. Charmless semileptonic $\bar{B} \rightarrow X_u \ell \bar{\nu}$ decays are simulated as a combination [see Fig. 1(a)] of resonant three-body decays ($X_u = \pi, \eta, \rho, \omega, \dots$) [7] and decays to nonresonant hadronic final states X_u [8], for which the hadronization is performed by string fragmentation as implemented in the program JETSET [9]. The motion of the b quark inside the B meson is implemented with the shape function parametrization given in Ref. [8]. The simulation of the $\bar{B} \rightarrow X_c \ell \bar{\nu}$ background uses an HQET parametrization of form factors for $\bar{B} \rightarrow D^* \ell \bar{\nu}$ [10], and models for $\bar{B} \rightarrow D \pi \ell \bar{\nu}$, $D^* \pi \ell \bar{\nu}$ [11], and $\bar{B} \rightarrow D \ell \bar{\nu}$, $D^{**} \ell \bar{\nu}$ [7].

To reconstruct a large sample of B mesons, hadronic decays $B_{\text{reco}} \rightarrow \bar{D}Y^+, \bar{D}^*Y^+$ are selected. Here, the system




FIG. 1 (color online). m_X distributions for MC simulated $\bar{B} \rightarrow X_u \ell \bar{\nu}$ events with a lepton of $p^* > 1 \text{ GeV}/c$: (a) generated m_X for the two components of the signal model, and (b) reconstructed m_X before and after all other requirements.

Y^+ consists of hadrons with a total charge of $+1$, composed of $n_1 \pi^+ n_2 K^+ n_3 K_S^0 n_4 \pi^0$, where $n_1 + n_2 \leq 5$, $n_3 \leq 2$, and $n_4 \leq 2$. We reconstruct $D^{*+} \rightarrow \bar{D}^0 \pi^+$; $\bar{D}^{*0} \rightarrow \bar{D}^0 \pi^0$, $\bar{D}^0 \gamma$; $D^- \rightarrow K^+ \pi^- \pi^-$, $K^+ \pi^- \pi^- \pi^0$, $K_S^0 \pi^-$, $K_S^0 \pi^- \pi^0$, $K_S^0 \pi^- \pi^- \pi^+$; and $\bar{D}^0 \rightarrow K^+ \pi^-$, $K^+ \pi^- \pi^0$, $K^+ \pi^- \pi^- \pi^+$, $K_S^0 \pi^+ \pi^-$. The kinematic consistency of B_{reco} candidates is checked with two variables, the beam energy-substituted mass $m_{\text{ES}} = \sqrt{s/4 - \vec{p}_B^2}$ and the energy difference $\Delta E = E_B - \sqrt{s}/2$. Here \sqrt{s} is the total energy in the $Y(4S)$ center of mass frame, and \vec{p}_B and E_B denote the momentum and energy of the B_{reco} candidate in the same frame. We require $\Delta E = 0$ within 3 standard deviations as measured for each mode.

For each of the reconstructed B decay modes, the purity \mathcal{P} is estimated as the signal fraction in events with $m_{\text{ES}} > 5.27 \text{ GeV}/c^2$. The number of signal events is derived from a fit to the m_{ES} distribution that uses an empirical description [12] of the combinatorial background, together with a signal [13] peaked at the B meson mass [Fig. 2(a)]. We use 311 modes for which \mathcal{P} exceeds a decay mode dependent threshold in the range of 8% to 24%. In events with more than one reconstructed B decay, we select the decay mode with the highest purity. We reconstruct one B candidate in 0.3% (0.5%) of the $B^0 \bar{B}^0$ ($B^+ B^-$) events.

Semileptonic decays $\bar{B} \rightarrow X \ell \bar{\nu}$ of the \bar{B} recoiling against the B_{reco} candidate are identified by an electron or muon with a minimum momentum of $p^* > 1 \text{ GeV}/c$ in the \bar{B} rest frame. After this requirement, the purity of the event sample is 67%. For charged B_{reco} candidates, we require the charge of the lepton to be consistent with a primary semileptonic \bar{B} decay. For neutral B_{reco} candidates, both charge-flavor combinations are retained and the known average $B^0 \bar{B}^0$ mixing rate is used to determine the primary lepton yield. Electrons are identified [14] with 92% average efficiency and a hadron misidentification rate ranging between 0.05% and 0.1%. Muons are identified [5] with an efficiency ranging between 60% ($p^* > 1 \text{ GeV}/c$) and 75% ($p^* > 2 \text{ GeV}/c$) and hadron misidentification rate between 1% and 3%.




FIG. 2 (color online). Fit to the m_{ES} distributions for (a) the sample with $p^* > 1 \text{ GeV}/c$ lepton and (b) the sample after all requirements and with $m_X < 1.55 \text{ GeV}/c^2$. The arrow indicates the lower limit of the signal region.

The hadronic system X in the decay $\bar{B} \rightarrow X\ell\bar{\nu}$ is reconstructed from charged tracks and energy depositions in the calorimeter that are not associated with the B_{reco} candidate or the identified lepton. Care is taken to eliminate fake charged tracks, as well as low-energy beam-generated photons and energy depositions in the calorimeter from charged and neutral hadrons. The neutrino four-momentum p_ν is estimated from the missing momentum four-vector $p_{\text{miss}} = p_{Y(4S)} - p_{B_{\text{reco}}} - p_X - p_\ell$, where all momenta are measured in the laboratory frame and $p_{Y(4S)}$ refers to the $Y(4S)$ meson momentum.

To select $\bar{B} \rightarrow X_u\ell\bar{\nu}$ candidates we require exactly one charged lepton with $p^* > 1 \text{ GeV}/c$, charge conservation ($Q_X + Q_\ell + Q_{B_{\text{reco}}} = 0$), and a missing mass consistent with zero ($m_{\text{miss}}^2 < 0.5 \text{ GeV}^2/c^4$). These criteria suppress the dominant $\bar{B} \rightarrow X_c\ell\bar{\nu}$ decays, many of which contain additional neutrinos or an undetected K_L^0 meson. The determination of the mass of the hadronic system is improved by a kinematic fit that imposes four-momentum conservation, the equality of the masses of the two B mesons, and forces $p_\nu^2 = 0$. The resulting m_X resolution is $350 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ on average. We suppress the $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*+}\ell^-\bar{\nu}$ background by reconstructing only the π_s^+ (from the $D^{*+} \rightarrow D^0\pi_s^+$ decay) and the lepton: since the momentum of the π_s^+ is almost collinear with the D^{*+} momentum in the laboratory frame, we can approximate the energy of the D^{*+} as $E_{D^{*+}} \simeq m_{D^{*+}} + E_{\pi_s^+}/145 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ and eliminate events with $(p_B - p_{D^{*+}} - p_\ell)^2 > -3 \text{ GeV}^2/c^4$. We veto events with charged or neutral kaons (reconstructed as $K_S^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$) in the recoil \bar{B} to reduce the background from $\bar{B} \rightarrow X_c\ell\bar{\nu}$ decays. The impact of the event selection on the m_X distribution is illustrated in Fig. 1(b). If all charged particles of the X system are reconstructed, the selection efficiency is $> 50\%$, but lost particles lower the efficiency significantly. Therefore, resonant states (e.g., the ρ meson) decaying into few particles are selected with higher efficiency.

We determine R_u from N_u , the observed number of $\bar{B} \rightarrow X_u\ell\bar{\nu}$ candidates with $m_X < 1.55 \text{ GeV}/c^2$, and N_{sl} , the number of events with at least one charged lepton:

$$R_u = \frac{\mathcal{B}(\bar{B} \rightarrow X_u\ell\bar{\nu})}{\mathcal{B}(\bar{B} \rightarrow X\ell\bar{\nu})} = \frac{N_u / (\varepsilon_{\text{sel}}^u \varepsilon_{m_X}^u)}{N_{\text{sl}}} \times \frac{\varepsilon_\ell^{\text{sl}} \varepsilon_{\text{reco}}^{\text{sl}}}{\varepsilon_\ell^u \varepsilon_{\text{reco}}^u}.$$

Here $\varepsilon_{\text{sel}}^u = (34.2 \pm 0.6_{\text{stat}})\%$ is the efficiency for selecting $\bar{B} \rightarrow X_u\ell\bar{\nu}$ decays once a $\bar{B} \rightarrow X\ell\bar{\nu}$ candidate has been identified, $\varepsilon_{m_X}^u = (73.3 \pm 0.9_{\text{stat}})\%$ is the fraction of signal events with $m_X < 1.55 \text{ GeV}/c^2$, $\varepsilon_\ell^{\text{sl}}/\varepsilon_\ell^u = 0.887 \pm 0.008_{\text{stat}}$ corrects for the difference in the efficiency of the lepton momentum cut for $\bar{B} \rightarrow X\ell\bar{\nu}$ and $\bar{B} \rightarrow X_u\ell\bar{\nu}$ decays, and $\varepsilon_{\text{reco}}^{\text{sl}}/\varepsilon_{\text{reco}}^u = 1.00 \pm 0.03_{\text{stat}}$ accounts for a possible efficiency difference in the B_{reco} reconstruction in events with $\bar{B} \rightarrow X\ell\bar{\nu}$ and $\bar{B} \rightarrow X_u\ell\bar{\nu}$ decays.

We derive N_{sl} from a fit to the m_{ES} distribution shown in Fig. 2(a). The residual background in N_{sl} from misidentified leptons and semileptonic charm decays

amounts to $(6.8 \pm 0.1_{\text{stat}})\%$ and is subtracted. We extract N_u from the m_X distribution by a minimum χ^2 fit to the sum of three contributions: the signal, the background N_c from $\bar{B} \rightarrow X_c\ell\bar{\nu}$, and a background of $< 1\%$ from other sources (misidentified leptons, secondary τ , and charm decays). In each bin of the m_X distribution, the combinatorial B_{reco} background for $m_{\text{ES}} > 5.27$ is subtracted on the basis of a fit to the m_{ES} distribution [Fig. 2(b)]. Figure 3(a) shows the fitted m_X distribution. To minimize the model dependence, the first bin covers the region up to $m_X^{\text{cut}} = 1.55 \text{ GeV}/c^2$. The fit reproduces the data well with $\chi^2/\text{dof} = 7.6/6$. Figure 3(b) shows the m_X distribution after background subtraction with finer binning. Table I summarizes the results of fits with different sizes of the first m_X bin, for electrons and muons, for neutral and charged B_{reco} candidates, and for different ranges of the B_{reco} purity \mathcal{P} . The results are all consistent within the uncorrelated errors of signal and background samples.

We have performed extensive studies to determine the systematic uncertainties on R_u . To establish that the background from $\bar{B} \rightarrow X_c\ell\bar{\nu}$ events is adequately simulated we use previously excluded events with charged or neutral kaons as a control sample. The fraction of events removed by the application of selection criteria is very well described by the MC simulation for both the signal and the control samples. The relative systematic error due to uncertainties in the detection of photons is estimated to be 4.7% by varying the corrections applied to the MC simulation to match the data control samples. An error of 1.0% due to the simulation of showers generated by K_L^0 interactions is estimated by removing the K_L^0 energy depositions in the MC simulation. An error of 1.0% is due to the uncertainty in the track-finding efficiency. The errors due to identification of electrons, muons, and kaons are estimated to be 1.0%, 1.0%, and 2.3%, respectively, by varying identification efficiencies by $\pm 2\%$, $\pm 3\%$, and $\pm 2\%$ for e^\pm , μ^\pm , and K^\pm , and the misidentification rates by $\pm 15\%$ for all particle types (see Ref. [14]). The uncertainty due to the B_{reco} combinatorial background subtraction is 3.8%. It is estimated by changing the empirical m_{ES} signal function to a Gaussian distribution and by




FIG. 3 (color online). The m_X distribution for $\bar{B} \rightarrow X\ell\bar{\nu}$ candidates: (a) data (points) and fit components, and (b) data and signal MC after subtraction of the $b \rightarrow c\ell\nu$ and the “other” backgrounds.

TABLE I. Fit results for data subsamples.

Sample	N_{sl}	N_u	N_c	$R_u(\%)$
$m_X^{\text{cut}} = 1.55 \text{ GeV}/c^2$	29982 ± 233	175 ± 21	90 ± 5	2.06 ± 0.25
$m_X^{\text{cut}} = 1.40 \text{ GeV}/c^2$	29982 ± 233	143 ± 18	54 ± 3	1.89 ± 0.24
$m_X^{\text{cut}} = 1.70 \text{ GeV}/c^2$	29982 ± 233	214 ± 26	145 ± 9	2.35 ± 0.28
neutral B_{reco}	10862 ± 133	76 ± 15	22 ± 3	2.53 ± 0.50
charged B_{reco}	19080 ± 191	100 ± 16	67 ± 4	1.82 ± 0.30
Electrons	17320 ± 173	101 ± 15	46 ± 3	2.27 ± 0.34
Muons	12622 ± 157	73 ± 15	41 ± 4	1.83 ± 0.37
$\mathcal{P} > 80\%$	4187 ± 68	20 ± 7	12 ± 1	1.68 ± 0.57
$50\% < \mathcal{P} < 80\%$	12373 ± 141	68 ± 13	41 ± 3	1.94 ± 0.37
$\mathcal{P} < 50\%$	13144 ± 170	86 ± 15	34 ± 3	2.31 ± 0.41

varying the parameters within 1 standard deviation of the default values. The limited statistics of the simulated event samples adds an uncertainty of 4.5%. The choice of bins for $m_X > 1.55 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ impacts the fit result at a level of 1.2%.

The uncertainties in the background modeling due to branching fraction measurements for $\bar{B} \rightarrow D\ell\bar{\nu}, D^*\ell\bar{\nu}, \dots$ and for inclusive and exclusive D meson decays [15] contribute 4.4%. The error due to the hadronization in the $\bar{B} \rightarrow X_u\ell\bar{\nu}$ final state is estimated to be 3.0% by measuring R_u as a function of the charged and neutral particle multiplicities and performing the fit with only the nonresonant part of the signal model. We assign an additional 2.8% error to account for the uncertainties in the inclusive and exclusive branching fractions for charmless semileptonic B decays [15], plus 3.7% for the veto on strange particles. Here, we assume a 100% uncertainty in the $s\bar{s}$ contents for the resonant and 30% for the non-resonant component [16].

The efficiencies ϵ_{sel}^u and $\epsilon_{m_X}^u$ are sensitive to the choice of the shape function parameters [8], which we assume to be directly related to the HQET parameters $\bar{\Lambda}$ and λ_1 . We assess the uncertainties by varying within their errors $\bar{\Lambda} = 0.48 \pm 0.12 \text{ GeV}$ and $\lambda_1 = -0.30 \pm 0.11 \text{ GeV}^2$, values obtained from the results in Ref. [17] by removing terms proportional to $1/m_b^3$ and α_s^2 from the relation between the measured observables and $\bar{\Lambda}$ and λ_1 . We have verified that significantly larger variations of these parameters are inconsistent with our measured m_X distribution. Taking into account the correlation of -0.8 between $\bar{\Lambda}$ and λ_1 , we arrive at a theoretical error of 17.5%.

In summary, we have $R_u = (2.06 \pm 0.25 \pm 0.23 \pm 0.36) \times 10^{-2}$, where the errors are statistical, systematic (experimental plus signal and background modeling), and theoretical, respectively. Taking into account common errors we compute the double ratio $[\mathcal{B}(B^- \rightarrow X_u\ell\bar{\nu})/\mathcal{B}(B^- \rightarrow X\ell\bar{\nu})][\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow X\ell\bar{\nu})/\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow X_u\ell\bar{\nu})] = 0.72 \pm 0.18_{\text{stat}} \pm 0.19_{\text{syst}}$, consistent with theoretical expectation. Combining R_u with the measured inclusive semileptonic branching fraction $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B} \rightarrow X\ell\bar{\nu}) = (10.87 \pm 0.18_{\text{stat}} \pm 0.30_{\text{syst}})\%$ [14], we obtain

$$\mathcal{B}(\bar{B} \rightarrow X_u\ell\bar{\nu}) = (2.24 \pm 0.27 \pm 0.26 \pm 0.39) \times 10^{-3}.$$

We combine this result with the average B lifetime of $\tau_B = 1.608 \pm 0.012 \text{ ps}$ [15,18] and obtain [19]

$$|V_{ub}| = (4.62 \pm 0.28 \pm 0.27 \pm 0.40 \pm 0.26) \times 10^{-3}.$$

The first error is statistical, the second systematic, the third gives the theoretical uncertainty in the signal efficiency and the extrapolation of R_u to the full m_X range, and the fourth is the uncertainty in the extraction of $|V_{ub}|$ from the total decay rate. No error is assigned to the assumption of parton-hadron duality.

This result is consistent with previous inclusive measurements [4], but is based on a sample with larger phase-space acceptance and higher purity. The results of exclusive measurements [20] tend to have a lower central value, but with a slightly larger error due to model-dependent form factor calculations. In the future, improved understanding of the signal composition and charm background will reduce the experimental errors, and this, together with independent measurements of $b \rightarrow s$ transitions and semileptonic B decays, is expected to constrain the theoretical uncertainties.

We are grateful for the excellent luminosity and machine conditions provided by our PEP-II colleagues, and for the substantial dedicated effort from the computing organizations that support *BABAR*. The collaborating institutions wish to thank SLAC for its support and kind hospitality. This work is supported by DOE and NSF (USA), NSERC (Canada), IHEP (China), CEA and CNRS-IN2P3 (France), BMBF and DFG (Germany), INFN (Italy), FOM (The Netherlands), NFR (Norway), MIST (Russia), and PPARC (United Kingdom). Individuals have received support from the A. P. Sloan Foundation, Research Corporation, and Alexander von Humboldt Foundation.

*Also with Università di Perugia, Perugia, Italy.

†Also with Università della Basilicata, Potenza, Italy.

- [‡]Also with IFIC, Instituto de Física Corpuscular, CSIC-Universidad de Valencia, Valencia, Spain.
- [§]Deceased.
- [1] N. Cabibbo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **10**, 531 (1963); M. Kobayashi and T. Maskawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. **49**, 652 (1973).
- [2] Charge conjugation is implied throughout the Letter.
- [3] V. D. Barger, C. S. Kim, and R. J. N. Phillips, Phys. Lett. B **251**, 629 (1990); A. F. Falk, Z. Ligeti, and M. B. Wise, Phys. Lett. B **406**, 225 (1997); I. I. Bigi, R. D. Dikeman, and N. Uraltsev, Eur. Phys. J. C **4**, 453 (1998).
- [4] ALEPH Collaboration, R. Barate *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. C **6**, 555 (1999); L3 Collaboration, M. Acciarri *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **436**, 174 (1998); DELPHI Collaboration, P. Abreu *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **478**, 14 (2000); OPAL Collaboration, G. Abbiendi *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. C **21**, 399 (2001); CLEO Collaboration, A. Bornheim *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 231803 (2002).
- [5] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res. Sect. A **479**, 1 (2002).
- [6] GEANT4 Collaboration, S. Agostinelli *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res. Sect. A **506**, 250 (2003).
- [7] D. Scora and N. Isgur, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 2783 (1995).
- [8] F. De Fazio and M. Neubert, J. High Energy Phys. **06** (1999) 017.
- [9] T. Sjöstrand, Comput. Phys. Commun. **82**, 74 (1994).
- [10] CLEO Collaboration, J. E. Duboscq *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 3898 (1996).
- [11] J. L. Goity and W. Roberts, Phys. Rev. D **51**, 3459 (1995).
- [12] ARGUS Collaboration, H. Albrecht *et al.*, Z. Phys. C **48**, 543 (1990).
- [13] Crystal Ball Collaboration, T. Skwarnicki, DESY F31-86-02.
- [14] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 031101 (2003).
- [15] Particle Data Group Collaboration, K. Hagiwara *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 010001 (2002).
- [16] TASSO Collaboration, M. Althoff *et al.*, Z. Phys. C **27**, 27 (1985).
- [17] CLEO Collaboration, D. Cronin-Hennessy *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 251808 (2001).
- [18] The impact of the uncertainty of the fraction of neutral and charged B mesons is negligible.
- [19] We follow the prescription of [15], p. 708, based on N. Uraltsev, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **14**, 4641 (1999); A. H. Hoang, Z. Ligeti, and A. V. Manohar, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 074017 (1999).
- [20] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 181801 (2003); CLEO Collaboration, S. B. Athar *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 072003 (2003).