UC Berkeley

UC Berkeley Previously Published Works

Title

Measurement of the electron energy spectrum and its moments in inclusive $B \rightarrow X_{\text{ev}}$ decays

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4ws294k1>

Journal

Physical Review D, 69(11)

ISSN

0556-2821

Authors

Aubert, B
Barate, R
Boutigny, D
et al.

Publication Date

2004

DOI

10.1103/PhysRevD.69.111104

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 electron energy spectrum and its moments in inclusive $B \rightarrow X e \nu$ decays

- B. Aubert,¹ R. Barate,¹ D. Boutigny,¹ F. Couderc,¹ J.-M. Gaillard,¹ A. Hicheur,¹ Y. Karyotakis,¹ J. P. Lees,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. Groysman,⁵ R. G. Jacobsen,⁵ R. W. Kadel,⁵ J. Kadyk,⁵ L. T. Kerth,⁵ Yu. G. Kolomensky,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 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 S. E. Morgan,⁶ A. T. Watson,⁶ N. K. Watson,⁶ M. Fritsch,⁷ K. Goetzen,⁷ T. Held,⁷ H. Koch,⁷ B. Lewandowski,⁷ M. Pelizaeus,⁷ M. Steinke,⁷ J. T. Boyd,⁸ N. Chevalier,⁸ W. N. Cottingham,⁸ M. P. Kelly,⁸ T. E. Latham,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 L. Teodorescu,¹⁰ V. E. Blinov,¹¹ A. D. Bukin,¹¹ V. P. Druzhinin,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. Bruinsma,¹² M. Chao,¹² I. Eschrich,¹² D. Kirkby,¹² A. J. Lankford,¹² M. Mandelkern,¹² R. K. Mommsen,¹² W. Roethel,¹² D. P. Stoker,¹² C. Buchanan,¹³ B. L. Hartfiel,¹³ J. W. Gary,¹⁴ B. C. Shen,¹⁴ K. Wang,¹⁴ D. del Re,¹⁵ H. K. Hadavand,¹⁵ E. J. Hill,¹⁵ D. B. MacFarlane,¹⁵ H. P. Paar,¹⁵ Sh. Rahatlou,¹⁵ V. Sharma,¹⁵ J. W. Berryhill,¹⁶ C. Campagnari,¹⁶ B. Dahmes,¹⁶ S. L. Levy,¹⁶ O. Long,¹⁶ A. Lu,¹⁶ M. A. Mazur,¹⁶ J. D. Richman,¹⁶ W. Verkerke,¹⁶ T. W. Beck,¹⁷ A. M. Eisner,¹⁷ C. A. Heusch,¹⁷ W. S. Lockman,¹⁷ T. Schalk,¹⁷ R. E. Schmitz,¹⁷ B. A. Schumm,¹⁷ A. Seiden,¹⁷ P. Spradlin,¹⁷ D. C. Williams,¹⁷ M. G. Wilson,¹⁷ J. Albert,¹⁸ E. Chen,¹⁸ G. P. Dubois-Felsmann,¹⁸ A. Dvoretzki,¹⁸ D. G. Hitlin,¹⁸ I. Narsky,¹⁸ T. Piatenko,¹⁸ F. C. Porter,¹⁸ A. Ryd,¹⁸ A. Samuel,¹⁸ S. Yang,¹⁸ S. Jayatilke,¹⁹ G. Mancinelli,¹⁹ B. T. Meadows,¹⁹ M. D. Sokoloff,¹⁹ T. Abe,²⁰ F. Blanc,²⁰ P. Bloom,²⁰ S. Chen,²⁰ P. J. Clark,²⁰ W. T. Ford,²⁰ U. Nauenberg,²⁰ A. Olivas,²⁰ P. Rankin,²⁰ J. G. Smith,²⁰ W. C. van Hoek,²⁰ L. Zhang,²⁰ J. L. Harton,²¹ T. Hu,²¹ A. Soffer,²¹ W. H. Toki,²¹ R. J. Wilson,²¹ D. Altenburg,²² T. Brandt,²² J. Brose,²² T. Colberg,²² M. Dickopp,²² E. Feltresi,²² A. Hauke,²² H. M. Lacker,²² E. Maly,²² R. Müller-Pfefferkorn,²² R. Nogowski,²² S. Otto,²² J. Schubert,²² K. R. Schubert,²² R. Schwierz,²² B. Spaan,²² D. Bernard,²³ G. R. Bonneaud,²³ F. Brochard,²³ P. Grenier,²³ Ch. Thiebaux,²³ G. Vasileiadis,²³ M. Verderi,²³ D. J. Bard,²⁴ A. Khan,²⁴ D. Lavin,²⁴ F. Muheim,²⁴ S. Playfer,²⁴ M. Andreotti,²⁵ V. Azzolini,²⁵ D. Bettoni,²⁵ C. Bozzi,²⁵ R. Calabrese,²⁵ G. Cibinetto,²⁵ E. Lippi,²⁵ M. Negrini,²⁵ A. Sarti,²⁵ E. Treadwell,²⁶ R. Baldini-Ferroli,²⁷ A. Calcaterra,²⁷ R. de Sangro,²⁷ G. Finocchiaro,²⁷ P. Patteri,²⁷ M. Piccolo,²⁷ A. Zallo,²⁷ A. Buzzo,²⁸ R. Capra,²⁸ R. Contri,²⁸ G. Crosetti,²⁸ M. Lo Vetere,²⁸ M. Macri,²⁸ M. R. Monge,²⁸ S. Passaggio,²⁸ C. Patrignani,²⁸ E. Robutti,²⁸ A. Santroni,²⁸ S. Tosi,²⁸ S. Bailey,²⁹ G. Brandenburg,²⁹ M. Morii,²⁹ E. Won,²⁹ R. S. Dubitzky,³⁰ U. Langenegger,³⁰ W. Bhimji,³¹ D. A. Bowerman,³¹ P. D. Dauncey,³¹ U. Egede,³¹ J. R. Gaillard,³¹ G. W. Morton,³¹ J. A. Nash,³¹ G. P. Taylor,³¹ G. J. Grenier,³² S.-J. Lee,³² U. Mallik,³² J. Cochran,³³ H. B. Crawley,³³ J. Lamsa,³³ W. T. Meyer,³³ S. Prell,³³ E. I. Rosenberg,³³ J. Yi,³³ M. Davier,³⁴ G. Grosdidier,³⁴ A. Höcker,³⁴ S. Laplace,³⁴ F. Le Diberder,³⁴ V. Lepeltier,³⁴ A. M. Lutz,³⁴ T. C. Petersen,³⁴ S. Plaszczyński,³⁴ M. H. Schune,³⁴ L. Tantot,³⁴ G. Wormser,³⁴ C. H. Cheng,³⁵ D. J. Lange,³⁵ M. C. Simani,³⁵ D. M. Wright,³⁵ A. J. Bevan,³⁶ J. P. Coleman,³⁶ J. R. Fry,³⁶ E. Gabathuler,³⁶ R. Gamet,³⁶ M. Kay,³⁶ R. J. Parry,³⁶ D. J. Payne,³⁶ R. J. Sloane,³⁶ C. Touramanis,³⁶ J. J. Back,³⁷ P. F. Harrison,³⁷ G. B. Mohanty,³⁷ C. L. Brown,³⁸ G. Cowan,³⁸ R. L. Flack,³⁸ H. U. Flaecher,³⁸ S. George,³⁸ M. G. Green,³⁸ A. Kurup,³⁸ C. E. Marker,³⁸ T. R. McMahon,³⁸ S. Ricciardi,³⁸ F. Salvatore,³⁸ G. Vaitsas,³⁸ M. A. Winter,³⁸ D. Brown,³⁹ C. L. Davis,³⁹ J. Allison,⁴⁰ N. R. Barlow,⁴⁰ R. J. Barlow,⁴⁰ P. A. Hart,⁴⁰ M. C. Hodgkinson,⁴⁰ G. D. Lafferty,⁴⁰ A. J. Lyon,⁴⁰ J. C. Williams,⁴⁰ A. Farbin,⁴¹ W. D. Hulsbergen,⁴¹ A. Jawahery,⁴¹ D. Kovalskyi,⁴¹ C. K. Lae,⁴¹ V. Lillard,⁴¹ D. A. Roberts,⁴¹ G. Blaylock,⁴² C. Dallapiccola,⁴² K. T. Flood,⁴² S. S. Hertzbach,⁴² R. Kofler,⁴² V. B. Koptchev,⁴² T. B. Moore,⁴² S. Saremi,⁴² H. Staengle,⁴² S. Willocq,⁴² R. Cowan,⁴³ G. Sciolla,⁴³ F. Taylor,⁴³ R. K. Yamamoto,⁴³ D. J. J. Mangeol,⁴⁴ P. M. Patel,⁴⁴ S. H. Robertson,⁴⁴ A. Lazzaro,⁴⁵ F. Palombo,⁴⁵ J. M. Bauer,⁴⁶ L. Cremaldi,⁴⁶ V. Eschenburg,⁴⁶ R. Godang,⁴⁶ R. Kroeger,⁴⁶ J. Reidy,⁴⁶ D. A. Sanders,⁴⁶ D. J. Summers,⁴⁶ H. W. Zhao,⁴⁶ S. Brunet,⁴⁷ D. Côté,⁴⁷ P. Taras,⁴⁷ H. Nicholson,⁴⁸ C. Cartaro,⁴⁹ N. Cavallo,⁴⁹ F. Fabozzi,^{49,*} C. Gatto,⁴⁹ L. Lista,⁴⁹ D. Monorchio,⁴⁹ P. Paolucci,⁴⁹ D. Piccolo,⁴⁹ C. Sciacca,⁴⁹ M. Baak,⁵⁰ G. Raven,⁵⁰ L. Wilden,⁵⁰ C. P. Jessop,⁵¹ J. M. LoSecco,⁵¹ T. A. Gabriel,⁵² T. Allmendinger,⁵³ B. Brau,⁵³ K. K. Gan,⁵³ K. Honscheid,⁵³ D. Hufnagel,⁵³ H. Kagan,⁵³ R. Kass,⁵³ T. Pulliam,⁵³ R. Ter-Antonyan,⁵³ Q. K. Wong,⁵³ J. Brau,⁵⁴ R. Frey,⁵⁴ O. Igonkina,⁵⁴ C. T. Potter,⁵⁴ N. B. Sinev,⁵⁴ D. Strom,⁵⁴ E. Torrence,⁵⁴ F. Colecchia,⁵⁵ A. Dorigo,⁵⁵ F. Galeazzi,⁵⁵ M. Margoni,⁵⁵ M. Morandin,⁵⁵ M. Posocco,⁵⁵ M. Rotondo,⁵⁵ F. Simonetto,⁵⁵ R. Stroili,⁵⁵ G. Tiozzo,⁵⁵ C. Voci,⁵⁵ M. Benayoun,⁵⁶ H. Briand,⁵⁶ J. Chauveau,⁵⁶ P. David,⁵⁶ Ch. de la Vaissière,⁵⁶ L. Del Buono,⁵⁶ O. Hamon,⁵⁶ M. J. J. John,⁵⁶ Ph. Leruste,⁵⁶ J. Ocariz,⁵⁶ M. Pivk,⁵⁶ L. Roos,⁵⁶ S. T'Jampens,⁵⁶ G. Therin,⁵⁶ P. F. Manfredi,⁵⁷ V. Re,⁵⁷ P. K. Behera,⁵⁸ L. Gladney,⁵⁸ Q. H. Guo,⁵⁸ J. Panetta,⁵⁸ F. Anulli,^{57,59} M. Biasini,⁵⁹ I. M. Peruzzi,^{57,59} M. Pippi,⁵⁹ C. Angelini,⁶⁰ G. Batignani,⁶⁰ S. Bettarini,⁶⁰ M. Bondioli,⁶⁰ F. Bucci,⁶⁰ G. Calderini,⁶⁰ M. Carpinelli,⁶⁰ V. Del Gamba,⁶⁰ F. Forti,⁶⁰ M. A. Giorgi,⁶⁰ A. Lusiani,⁶⁰ G. Marchiori,⁶⁰ F. Martinez-Vidal,^{60,†} M. Morganti,⁶⁰ N. Neri,⁶⁰ E. Paoloni,⁶⁰ M. Rama,⁶⁰ G. Rizzo,⁶⁰ F. Sandrelli,⁶⁰ J. Walsh,⁶¹ M. Haire,⁶¹ D. Judd,⁶¹ K. Paick,⁶¹ D. E. Wagoner,⁶¹ N. Danielson,⁶² P. Elmer,⁶² C. Lu,⁶² V. Miftakov,⁶² J. Olsen,⁶² A. J. S. Smith,⁶² E. W. Varnes,⁶² F. Bellini,⁶³ G. Cavoto,^{62,63} R. Faccini,⁶³ F. Ferrarotto,⁶³ F. Ferroni,⁶³ M. Gaspero,⁶³ L. Li Gioi,⁶³ M. A. Mazzoni,⁶³ S. Morganti,⁶³ M. Pierini,⁶³ G. Piredda,⁶³ F. Safai Tehrani,⁶³ C. Voena,⁶³ S. Christ,⁶⁴ G. Wagner,⁶⁴ R. Waldi,⁶⁴ T. Adye,⁶⁵ N. De Groot,⁶⁵ B. Franek,⁶⁵ N. I. Geddes,⁶⁵ G. P. Gopal,⁶⁵ E. O. Olaiya,⁶⁵ S. M. Xella,⁶⁵ R. Aleksan,⁶⁶ S. Emery,⁶⁶ A. Gaidot,⁶⁶

S. F. Ganzhur,⁶⁶ P.-F. Giraud,⁶⁶ G. Hamel de Monchenault,⁶⁶ W. Kozanecki,⁶⁶ M. Langer,⁶⁶ M. Legendre,⁶⁶ G. W. London,⁶⁶ B. Mayer,⁶⁶ G. Schott,⁶⁶ G. Vasseur,⁶⁶ Ch. Yèche,⁶⁶ M. Zito,⁶⁶ M. V. Purohit,⁶⁷ A. W. Weidemann,⁶⁷ F. X. Yumiceva,⁶⁷ D. Aston,⁶⁸ R. Bartoldus,⁶⁸ N. Berger,⁶⁸ A. M. Boyarski,⁶⁸ O. L. Buchmueller,⁶⁸ M. R. Convery,⁶⁸ M. Cristinziani,⁶⁸ G. De Nardo,⁶⁸ D. Dong,⁶⁸ J. Dorfan,⁶⁸ D. Dujmic,⁶⁸ W. Dunwoodie,⁶⁸ E. E. Elsen,⁶⁸ R. C. Field,⁶⁸ T. Glanzman,⁶⁸ S. J. Gowdy,⁶⁸ T. Hadig,⁶⁸ V. Halyo,⁶⁸ T. Hryn'ova,⁶⁸ W. R. Innes,⁶⁸ M. H. Kelsey,⁶⁸ P. Kim,⁶⁸ M. L. Kocian,⁶⁸ D. W. G. S. Leith,⁶⁸ J. Libby,⁶⁸ S. Luitz,⁶⁸ V. Luth,⁶⁸ H. L. Lynch,⁶⁸ H. Marsiske,⁶⁸ R. Messner,⁶⁸ D. R. Muller,⁶⁸ C. P. O'Grady,⁶⁸ V. E. Ozcan,⁶⁸ A. Perazzo,⁶⁸ M. Perl,⁶⁸ S. Petrak,⁶⁸ B. N. Ratcliff,⁶⁸ A. Roodman,⁶⁸ A. A. Salnikov,⁶⁸ R. H. Schindler,⁶⁸ J. Schwiening,⁶⁸ G. Simi,⁶⁸ A. Snyder,⁶⁸ A. Soha,⁶⁸ J. Stelzer,⁶⁸ D. Su,⁶⁸ M. K. Sullivan,⁶⁸ J. Va'vra,⁶⁸ S. R. Wagner,⁶⁸ M. Weaver,⁶⁸ A. J. R. Weinstein,⁶⁸ W. J. Wisniewski,⁶⁸ M. Wittgen,⁶⁸ D. H. Wright,⁶⁸ C. C. Young,⁶⁸ P. R. Burchat,⁶⁹ A. J. Edwards,⁶⁹ T. I. Meyer,⁶⁹ B. A. Petersen,⁶⁹ C. Roat,⁶⁹ S. Ahmed,⁷⁰ M. S. Alam,⁷⁰ J. A. Ernst,⁷⁰ M. A. Saeed,⁷⁰ M. Saleem,⁷⁰ F. R. Wappler,⁷⁰ W. Bugg,⁷¹ M. Krishnamurthy,⁷¹ S. M. Spanier,⁷¹ R. Eckmann,⁷² H. Kim,⁷² J. L. Ritchie,⁷² A. Satpathy,⁷² R. F. Schwitters,⁷² J. M. Izen,⁷³ I. Kitayama,⁷³ X. C. Lou,⁷³ S. Ye,⁷³ F. Bianchi,⁷⁴ M. Bona,⁷⁴ F. Gallo,⁷⁴ D. Gamba,⁷⁴ C. Borean,⁷⁵ L. Bosio,⁷⁵ F. Cossutti,⁷⁵ G. Della Ricca,⁷⁵ S. Dittongo,⁷⁵ S. Grancagnolo,⁷⁵ L. Lanceri,⁷⁵ P. Poropat,^{75,†} L. Vitale,⁷⁵ G. Vuagnin,⁷⁵ R. S. Panvini,⁷⁶ Sw. Banerjee,⁷⁷ C. M. Brown,⁷⁷ D. Fortin,⁷⁷ P. D. Jackson,⁷⁷ R. Kowalewski,⁷⁷ J. M. Roney,⁷⁷ H. R. Band,⁷⁸ S. Dasu,⁷⁸ M. Datta,⁷⁸ A. M. Eichenbaum,⁷⁸ J. J. Hollar,⁷⁸ J. R. Johnson,⁷⁸ P. E. Kutter,⁷⁸ H. Li,⁷⁸ R. Liu,⁷⁸ F. Di Lodovico,⁷⁸ A. Mihalysi,⁷⁸ A. K. Mohapatra,⁷⁸ Y. Pan,⁷⁸ R. Prepost,⁷⁸ S. J. Sekula,⁷⁸ P. Tan,⁷⁸ J. H. von Wimmersperg-Toeller,⁷⁸ J. Wu,⁷⁸ S. L. Wu,⁷⁸ Z. Yu,⁷⁸ and H. Neal⁷⁹

(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 Riverside, Riverside, California 92521, USA

¹⁵University of California at San Diego, La Jolla, California 92093, USA

¹⁶University of California at Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, California 93106, USA

¹⁷University of California at Santa Cruz, Institute for Particle Physics, Santa Cruz, California 95064, USA

¹⁸California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California 91125, USA

¹⁹University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio 45221, USA

²⁰University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80309, USA

²¹Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado 80523, USA

²²Technische Universität Dresden, Institut für Kern- und Teilchenphysik, D-01062 Dresden, Germany

²³Ecole Polytechnique, LLR, F-91128 Palaiseau, France

²⁴University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH9 3JZ, United Kingdom

²⁵Università di Ferrara, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-44100 Ferrara, Italy

²⁶Florida A&M University, Tallahassee, Florida 32307, USA

²⁷Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati dell'INFN, I-00044 Frascati, Italy

²⁸Università di Genova, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-16146 Genova, Italy

²⁹Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, USA

³⁰Universität Heidelberg, Physikalisches Institut, Philosophenweg 12, D-69120 Heidelberg, Germany

³¹Imperial College London, London SW7 2AZ, United Kingdom

³²University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa 52242, USA

³³Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011-3160, USA

³⁴Laboratoire de l'Accélérateur Linéaire, F-91898 Orsay, France

³⁵Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California 94550, USA

³⁶University of Liverpool, Liverpool L69 7ZE, United Kingdom

³⁷Queen Mary, University of London, London E1 4NS, United Kingdom

³⁸University of London, Royal Holloway and Bedford New College, Egham, Surrey TW20 0EX, United Kingdom

³⁹University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky 40292, USA

⁴⁰University of Manchester, Manchester M13 9PL, United Kingdom

- ⁴¹University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742, USA
⁴²University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts 01003, USA
⁴³Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Laboratory for Nuclear Science, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, USA
⁴⁴McGill University, Montréal, Quebec, Canada H3A 2T8
⁴⁵Università di Milano, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-20133 Milano, Italy
⁴⁶University of Mississippi, University, Mississippi 38677, USA
⁴⁷Université de Montréal, Laboratoire René J. A. Lévesque, Montréal, Quebec, Canada H3C 3J7
⁴⁸Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Massachusetts 01075, USA
⁴⁹Università di Napoli Federico II, Dipartimento di Scienze Fisiche and INFN, I-80126, Napoli, Italy
⁵⁰NIKHEF, National Institute for Nuclear Physics and High Energy Physics, NL-1009 DB Amsterdam, The Netherlands
⁵¹University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana 46556, USA
⁵²Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37831, USA
⁵³Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210, USA
⁵⁴University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403, USA
⁵⁵Università di Padova, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-35131 Padova, Italy
⁵⁶Universités Paris VI et VII, Laboratoire de Physique Nucléaire H. E., F-75252 Paris, France
⁵⁷Università di Pavia, Dipartimento di Elettronica and INFN, I-27100 Pavia, Italy
⁵⁸University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104, USA
⁵⁹Università di Perugia, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-06100 Perugia, Italy
⁶⁰Università di Pisa, Dipartimento di Fisica, Scuola Normale Superiore and INFN, I-56127 Pisa, Italy
⁶¹Prairie View A&M University, Prairie View, Texas 77446, USA
⁶²Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey 08544, USA
⁶³Università di Roma La Sapienza, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-00185 Roma, Italy
⁶⁴Universität Rostock, D-18051 Rostock, Germany
⁶⁵Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Chilton, Didcot, Oxon OX11 0QX, United Kingdom
⁶⁶DSM/Dapnia, CEA/Saclay, F-91191 Gif-sur-Yvette, France
⁶⁷University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina 29208, USA
⁶⁸Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, Stanford, California 94309, USA
⁶⁹Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305-4060, USA
⁷⁰State University of New York, Albany, New York 12222, USA
⁷¹University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee 37996, USA
⁷²University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712, USA
⁷³University of Texas at Dallas, Richardson, Texas 75083, USA
⁷⁴Università di Torino, Dipartimento di Fisica Sperimentale and INFN, I-10125 Torino, Italy
⁷⁵Università di Trieste, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-34127 Trieste, Italy
⁷⁶Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee 37235, USA
⁷⁷University of Victoria, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada V8W 3P6
⁷⁸University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706, USA
⁷⁹Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut 06511, USA
- (Received 23 January 2004; published 29 June 2004)

We report a measurement of the inclusive electron energy spectrum for semileptonic decays of B mesons in a data sample of 52 million $Y(4S) \rightarrow B\bar{B}$ decays collected with the BABAR detector at the PEP-II asymmetric-energy B -meson factory at SLAC. We determine the branching fraction, first, second, and third moments of the spectrum for lower cutoffs on the electron energy between 0.6 and 1.5 GeV. We measure the partial branching fraction to be $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow Xe\nu, E_e > 0.6 \text{ GeV}) = [10.36 \pm 0.06(\text{stat.}) \pm 0.23(\text{sys.})]\%$.

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevD.69.111104

PACS number(s): 12.15.Hh, 11.30.Er, 13.25.Hw

The operator product expansion provides corrections to the relation between the semileptonic B decay rate and the magnitude of the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) [1] matrix element V_{cb} in the free-quark model [2]. The correc-

tions are expressed in terms of nonperturbative quantities that can be extracted from moments of inclusive distributions. We plan to use the precision measurements of moments of the lepton energy spectra presented here and of hadron mass distributions [3] to determine those parameters and thereby to improve the determination of $|V_{cb}|$ [4].

In this paper, we present a new measurement of the inclusive electron energy spectrum from semileptonic B decays, averaged over charged and neutral B mesons produced at the $Y(4S)$ resonance. After correcting for charmless semilep-

*Also with Università della Basilicata, Potenza, Italy.

†Also with IFIC, Instituto de Física Corpuscular, CSIC-Universidad de Valencia, Valencia, Spain.

‡Deceased.

tonic decays, we derive from this spectrum several moments as a function of the minimum electron energy ranging from 0.6 to 1.5 GeV, where the lower endpoint is set by the limits of electron identification and prevalence of background. In the B meson rest frame, we define $R_i(E_0, \mu)$ as $\int_{E_0}^{\infty} (E_e - \mu)^i (d\Gamma/dE_e) dE_e$, and measure the first moment $M_1(E_0) = R_1(E_0, 0)/R_0(E_0, 0)$, the central moments $M_n(E_0) = R_n[E_0, M_1(E_0)]/R_0(E_0, 0)$ for $n=2$ and 3 and the partial branching fraction $\mathcal{B}(E_0) = \tau_B R_0(E_0, 0)$, where τ_B is the average lifetime of charged and neutral B mesons.

The measurements presented here are based on data collected by the BABAR detector [5] at the PEP-II asymmetric e^+e^- storage ring; they correspond to an integrated luminosity of 47.4 fb^{-1} on the $\Upsilon(4S)$ resonance and 9.1 fb^{-1} at an energy 40 MeV below the resonance (off-resonance), measured in the electron-positron center of mass frame. Where background and efficiency corrections cannot be measured directly from data, we use a full simulation of the detector based on GEANT4 [6]. In the following, all kinematic variables defined in the $\Upsilon(4S)$ rest frame will be annotated with an asterisk.

This analysis is similar to the BABAR measurement of the semileptonic branching fraction [7], including use of the same electron identification criteria, but supersedes it by an order of magnitude in integrated luminosity. We identify $B\bar{B}$ events by observing an electron, e_{tag} , with charge $Q(e_{\text{tag}})$ and a momentum of $1.4 < p^* < 2.3 \text{ GeV}/c$ in the $\Upsilon(4S)$ rest frame. These electrons make up the tagged sample that is used as normalization for the branching fraction. Each electron e_{sig} with charge $Q(e_{\text{sig}})$ for which we require $p^* > 0.5 \text{ GeV}/c$ is assigned to the unlike-sign sample if the tagged sample contains an electron with $Q(e_{\text{tag}}) = -Q(e_{\text{sig}})$, and to the like-sign sample if $Q(e_{\text{tag}}) = Q(e_{\text{sig}})$. In events without $B^0\bar{B}^0$ mixing, primary electrons from semileptonic B decays belong to the unlike-sign sample while secondary electrons contribute to the like-sign sample.

Multi-hadron events are selected by either requiring a track multiplicity $N_{ch} \geq 5$, or $N_{ch} = 4$ plus at least two photon candidates with $E_\gamma > 80 \text{ MeV}$. Track pairs from converted photons are not included in N_{ch} , but count as one photon. For further suppression of non- $B\bar{B}$ events we require the ratio of the Fox-Wolfram moments H_2^*/H_0^* [8] to be less than 0.8.

Electrons originating from the same B meson as the tagged electron typically have opposite charge and direction. To reject them we require

$$\cos \alpha^* > 1.0 - p_e^* (\text{GeV}/c) \text{ and } \cos \alpha^* > -0.2, \quad (1)$$

where α^* is the angle between the two electrons. This requirement also excludes electron pairs from $J/\psi \rightarrow e^+e^-$ decays. To suppress background contributions from $J/\psi \rightarrow e^+e^-$ decays to the tagged sample, we require the invariant mass M_{ee} of the tag electron, paired with any electron of opposite charge and $\cos \alpha^* < -0.2$, to be outside the interval $2.9 < M_{ee} < 3.15 \text{ GeV}/c^2$. Here the requirement on $\cos \alpha^*$ does not reduce the efficiency of this veto, but ensures that no signal electron satisfying Eq. (1) is excluded from the

FIG. 1. Measured momentum spectrum (points) and estimated backgrounds (histograms) for electron candidates in (a) the unlike-sign sample, and (b) the like-sign sample.

unlike-sign sample. The efficiencies of these selection criteria are estimated by Monte Carlo (MC) simulation.

Continuum background is subtracted from the tagged, like-, and unlike-sign samples by scaling the off-resonance yields by the ratio of on- to off-resonance integrated luminosities, corrected for the energy dependence of the continuum cross section. In the off-resonance sample, the momenta are scaled by the ratio of the on- and off-resonance energies.

Electron spectra from photon conversions and Dalitz decays are extracted from data, taking into account the pair-reconstruction efficiencies from MC simulation. The relative uncertainty in these efficiencies is estimated to be 13% and 19% for conversion and Dalitz pairs, respectively.

The misidentification rates for pions, kaons, and protons are extracted from data control samples. They rise from 0.05% to 0.12% for pions and fall from 0.4% to 0.1% for kaons as p^* increases from 0.5 to 2.5 GeV/c. The systematic errors are estimated from the control sample purities and from the uncertainties in the π , K , and p abundances. The resulting relative uncertainties are less than 40%.

There is a small residual background in the sample of unlike-sign pairs originating from the same B meson and fulfilling the requirement on the opening angle α^* from Eq. (1). It is estimated from a fit to the $\cos \alpha^*$ distribution, separately for each 50-MeV/c-wide bin in p^* . The distribution is flat for signal pairs, while for background pairs it is taken from MC simulation, with a maximum at $\cos \alpha^* = -1$ and gradually decreasing to 0 at $\cos \alpha^* = 1$.

Figure 1 shows the electron momentum spectra and the background contributions discussed so far. Further backgrounds arise from decays of τ leptons, charmed mesons produced in $b \rightarrow c\bar{c}s$ decays and J/ψ or $\psi(2S) \rightarrow e^+e^-$ de-

TABLE I. Unlike-sign and like-sign pair yields for $0.6 < 9^* < 2.5$ GeV/c and their corrections with statistical and systematic errors. Numbers are quoted after all selection criteria.

	e^+e^- sample	$e^\pm e^\pm$ sample
All candidates	$183\,493 \pm 434$	$133\,842 \pm 371$
continuum bkgd.	$22\,922 \pm 349$	$15\,758 \pm 290$
conversion, Dalitz	$2978 \pm 286 \pm 327$	$10\,730 \pm 502 \pm 1177$
fake e	$885 \pm 63 \pm 423$	$2229 \pm 182 \pm 966$
e from same B	$3200 \pm 34 \pm 160$	
e yield	$153\,508 \pm 630 \pm 558$	$105\,126 \pm 712 \pm 1523$
eff. corr. e yield	$169\,654 \pm 732 \pm 2235$	$117\,192 \pm 803 \pm 2510$
irreducible bkgd.	$13\,912 \pm 92 \pm 1341$	$14\,512 \pm 97 \pm 2513$
corr. e yield	$155\,742 \pm 738 \pm 2606$	$102\,680 \pm 809 \pm 3551$

cays with only one detected e . We also need to correct for cases where the tagged electron does not originate from a semileptonic B decay. These backgrounds are irreducible, and their contributions to the three electron samples are estimated from MC simulations, using the ISGW2 model [9] to describe semileptonic D and D_s meson decays. Assuming $\Gamma(D_s \rightarrow Xe\nu) = \Gamma(D \rightarrow Xe\nu)$, we obtain $\mathcal{B}(D_s \rightarrow Xe\nu) = (8.05 \pm 0.66)\%$. Using 0.84 ± 0.09 [10] for the measured fraction of $B \rightarrow D_s X$ decays where the D_s originates from fragmentation of the W Boson, and $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow D_s X) = (10.5 \pm 2.6)\%$ [11] yields $\mathcal{B}(B^{0,+} \rightarrow D_s^+ \rightarrow e^+) = (0.71 \pm 0.20)\%$. Assuming equal production rates of D and D^* and using $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow \bar{D}D^*(*)X) = (8.2 \pm 1.3)\%$ [10], we arrive at $\mathcal{B}(B^{0,+} \rightarrow D^{0,+} \rightarrow e^+) = (0.84 \pm 0.21)\%$. To estimate the contribution of electrons from τ decays, we consider the cascades $B \rightarrow \tau \rightarrow e$ and $B \rightarrow D_s \rightarrow \tau \rightarrow e$, with branching fractions taken from [11]. The rates for the decays $B \rightarrow J/\psi \rightarrow e^+e^-$ and $B \rightarrow \psi(2S) \rightarrow e^+e^-$ are also adjusted to [11].

These irreducible background spectra are subtracted from the like-sign and unlike-sign spectra after correction for electron identification efficiency. We determine this efficiency as a function of p^* and the polar angle θ^* using $e^+e^- \rightarrow e^+e^- \gamma$ events and then use MC simulation to estimate losses in hadronic events with higher multiplicities. For $p^* > 0.6$ GeV/c, the average efficiency is 91% with an uncertainty of 1.5% estimated from the size of the MC correction. A summary of the yields is given in Table I.

To account for $B^0\bar{B}^0$ mixing, we determine the number of primary electrons in the i th p^* bin from the like-sign and unlike-sign pairs as

FIG. 2. Electron momentum spectrum from $B \rightarrow Xe\nu(\gamma)$ decays in the $Y(4S)$ frame after correction for efficiencies and bremsstrahlung, with combined statistical and systematic errors.

$$N_{b \rightarrow c, u}^i = \frac{1 - f_0 \chi_0}{1 - 2f_0 \chi_0} \frac{N_{e^+e^-}^i}{\epsilon_{\alpha^*}^i} - \frac{f_0 \chi_0}{1 - 2f_0 \chi_0} N_{e^\pm e^\pm}^i, \quad (2)$$

where $\chi_0 = 0.186 \pm 0.004$ [11] is the $B^0\bar{B}^0$ mixing parameter and $f_0 = \mathcal{B}[Y(4S) \rightarrow B^0\bar{B}^0] = 0.490 \pm 0.018$ [11]. The parameter $\epsilon_{\alpha^*}^i$ is the efficiency of the additional requirement for the unlike-sign sample as defined in Eq. (1).

The spectrum obtained from Eq. (2) is corrected for the effects of bremsstrahlung in the detector material using MC simulation. Since this correction significantly impacts the first moments, 3% for $E_0 = 0.6$ GeV and 0.5% for $E_0 = 1.5$ GeV, we have verified that the detector material is simulated to better than 3%. Figure 2 shows the resulting spectrum of primary electrons.

Charmless semileptonic $B \rightarrow X_u e \nu$ decays are modeled as in Ref. [12] by a combination of semileptonic decays with resonant and non-resonant hadronic systems. Using $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow X_u e \nu) = (2.2 \pm 0.5) \times 10^{-3}$ [12] to correct for this background, we determine the moments $\tilde{M}_n = \sum_k p_b^n N_{b \rightarrow c}^k / \sum_k N_{b \rightarrow c}^k$ where k runs over all bins above the energy E_0 and p_k are the bin centers for $n=1$ and the bin centers shifted by $\tilde{M}_1$ for $n=2$ and 3. These moments are then transformed into E_e moments M_n by correcting for the movement of the B mesons in the center-of-mass frame. Further biases due to the event selection criteria and binning are estimated from MC simulation. The spectra and moments presented are those of $B \rightarrow X_c e \nu(\gamma)$ decays with any number of photons. The moments as a function of E_0 are shown in Fig. 3 and Table II lists the principal systematic errors for $E_0 = 0.6$ and 1.5 GeV. Without subtraction of $B \rightarrow X_u e \nu$ decays, we measure $M_1^{b \rightarrow c}(1.5 \text{ GeV}) = (1779.0 \pm 1.9 \pm 0.7) \text{ MeV}$, which is consistent with a recent measurement by CLEO [13]. Measurements with $E_0 = 0$ GeV have been performed by DELPHI [14].

FIG. 3. Measured moments of the inclusive electron energy spectrum of $B \rightarrow X_c e \nu(\gamma)$ decays as a function of the cutoff energy, (a) $\mathcal{B}$, (b) M_1 , (c) M_2 , and (d) M_3 .

TABLE II. Results and breakdown of the systematic errors for $\mathcal{B} = \tau_B \int_{E_0}^{\infty} (d\Gamma/dE_e) dE_e$, and the moments M_1 , M_2 , and M_3 for $B \rightarrow X_c e \nu$ in the B -meson rest frame for two values of E_0 .

E_0 (GeV)	$\mathcal{B}(10^{-2})$		$M_1(\text{MeV})$		$M_2(10^{-3} \text{ GeV}^2)$		$M_3(10^{-3} \text{ GeV}^3)$	
	0.6	1.5	0.6	1.5	0.6	1.5	0.6	1.5
conversion and Dalitz pairs	0.029	0.001	1.6	0.02	0.6	0.00	0.06	0.00
e identification efficiency	0.151	0.044	2.5	0.30	0.6	0.07	0.29	0.08
e from same $\mathcal{B}$	0.019	0.000	1.3	0.00	0.6	0.00	0.03	0.00
$B \rightarrow D_s \rightarrow e$	0.074	0.001	4.1	0.04	1.6	0.00	0.14	0.00
$B \rightarrow D \rightarrow e$	0.060	0.000	3.8	0.00	1.6	0.00	0.01	0.00
$B \rightarrow \tau \rightarrow e$	0.032	0.002	1.4	0.05	0.4	0.00	0.13	0.00
e from J/ψ or $\psi(2S)$	0.002	0.001	0.0	0.01	0.0	0.01	0.00	0.00
secondary tags	0.053	0.011	1.5	0.06	0.5	0.00	0.06	0.00
χ	0.034	0.021	0.8	0.01	0.3	0.00	0.03	0.00
tracking efficiency	0.084	0.033	1.0	0.06	0.3	0.02	0.07	0.00
bremsstrahlung correction	0.011	0.028	1.9	0.43	0.0	0.05	0.19	0.00
event selection	0.052	0.024	0.6	0.14	0.0	0.03	0.07	0.01
$b \rightarrow u$ subtraction	0.047	0.030	1.2	1.24	0.6	0.48	0.20	0.17
B momentum correction	0.000	0.005	0.0	0.19	0.1	0.10	0.04	0.02
N_{tag} normalization	0.068	0.030						
moments	10.17	4.54	1414.3	1769.2	148.5	29.8	-9.97	2.11
$\pm(\text{stat.})$	0.06	0.03	3.7	1.8	2.0	0.8	0.79	0.44
$\pm(\text{syst.})$	0.23	0.08	7.4	1.4	2.7	0.5	0.48	0.20
moments with rad. correction	10.30	4.79	1432.8	1774.3	148.0	30.3	-12.05	2.12
$\pm(\text{stat.})$	0.06	0.03	3.9	1.9	2.2	0.9	0.88	0.47
$\pm(\text{syst.})$	0.24	0.09	7.8	1.4	3.1	0.5	0.46	0.20

We determine the partial branching fraction as $(\sum_k N_{b \rightarrow c,u}^k)/(N_{\text{tag}} \epsilon_{\text{evt}} \epsilon_{\text{cuts}})$, where k runs over all bins with $E_e > E_0$, $N_{\text{tag}} = [3616.8 \pm 3.5(\text{stat.}) \pm 21.8(\text{syst.})] \times 10^3$ is the background-corrected number of tag electrons, $\epsilon_{\text{evt}} = (98.9 \pm 0.5)\%$ refers to the relative efficiency for selecting two-electron events compared to events with a single e_{tag} , and $\epsilon_{\text{cuts}} = (82.8 \pm 0.3)\%$ is the acceptance for the signal electron for $E_0 = 0.6$ GeV. The result,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}[B \rightarrow X e \nu(\gamma), E_e > 0.6 \text{ GeV}] \\ = [10.36 \pm 0.06(\text{stat.}) \pm 0.23(\text{syst.})]\%, \end{aligned}$$

is consistent with our previous measurement [7], with the overall error improved by 25%. The partial branching fraction can be extrapolated to $E_0 = 0$ as part of a combined fit of the Heavy Quark Effective Theory (HQET) parameters to the full set of moments [4].

Current theoretical predictions on the lepton energy moments do not incorporate photon emission. Therefore we use PHOTOS [15] to simulate QED radiation and correct the moments for its impact. We verify that radiation that is not included in PHOTOS, e.g., additional hard photons, have no significant effect on the moments. The radiatively corrected moments and the estimated PHOTOS uncertainty [16] are

given in Table II. The complete listing of all moments and the full correlation matrix, with and without PHOTOS corrections can be found in Ref. [17].

In summary, we report a measurement of the electron energy spectrum of the inclusive decay $B \rightarrow X e \nu$ and its branching fraction for electron energies above 0.6 GeV, which supersedes our previous result [7]. We have also derived branching fractions, first, second, and third moments of electron energy spectrum from $B \rightarrow X_c e \nu$ decays for cutoff energies from 0.6 to 1.5 GeV. This set of moments combined with hadron mass moments [3] will be used for a significantly improved determination of HQET parameters and of $|V_{cb}|$ [4].

The authors 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.

- [1] N. Cabibbo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **10**, 531 (1963); M. Kobayashi and T. Maskawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. **49**, 652 (1973).
- [2] A. V. Manohar and M. B. Wise, Phys. Rev. D **49**, 1310 (1994).
- [3] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, preceding paper, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 111103(R) (2004).
- [4] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. (to be published), hep-ex/0404017.
- [5] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res. A **479**, 1 (2003).
- [6] GEANT4 Collaboration, S. Agostinelli *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res. A **506**, 250 (2003).
- [7] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 031101(R) (2003).
- [8] G. C. Fox and S. Wolfram, Phys. Rev. Lett. **41**, 1581 (1978).
- [9] D. Scora and N. Isgur, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 2783 (1995).
- [10] The LEP Electroweak Working Group, hep-ex/0112028.
- [11] Particle Data Group, K. Hagiwara *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 010001 (2002) and 2003 off-year partial update for the 2004 edition (URL: <http://pdg.lbl.gov/>).
- [12] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 071802 (2004).
- [13] CLEO Collaboration, A. H. Mahmood *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 072001 (2003).
- [14] M. Battaglia *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **556**, 41 (2003).
- [15] E. Barberio and Z. Was, Comput. Phys. Commun. **79**, 291 (1994).
- [16] E. Richter-Was, Phys. Lett. B **303**, 163 (1993).
- [17] EPAPS Document No. E-PRVDAQ-69-R03411. A direct link to this document may be found in the online article's HTML reference section. The document may also be reached via the EPAPS homepage (<http://www.aip.org/pubservs/epaps.html>) or [ftp.aip.org](ftp://ftp.aip.org) in the directory /epaps/. See the EPAPS homepage for more information.