

MIT Open Access Articles

Measurement of D-D-bar mixing using the ratio of lifetimes for the decays $D \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$ and $K^+ K^-$

The MIT Faculty has made this article openly available. **Please share** how this access benefits you. Your story matters.

Citation: BABAR Collaboration et al. "Measurement of D-D-bar mixing using the ratio of lifetimes for the decays $D \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$ and $K^+ K^-$." Physical Review D 80.7 (2009): 071103. © 2009 The American Physical Society.

As Published: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.80.071103>

Persistent URL: <http://hdl.handle.net/1721.1/57458>

Version: Final published version: final published article, as it appeared in a journal, conference proceedings, or other formally published context

Terms of Use: Article is made available in accordance with the publisher's policy and may be subject to US copyright law. Please refer to the publisher's site for terms of use.



Measurement of $D^0\text{-}\bar{D}^0$ mixing using the ratio of lifetimes for the decays $D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$ and $K^+ K^-$

B. Aubert,¹ Y. Karyotakis,¹ J. P. Lees,¹ V. Poireau,¹ E. Prencipe,¹ X. Prudent,¹ V. Tisserand,¹ J. Garra Tico,² E. Grauges,² M. Martinelli,^{3a,3b} A. Palano,^{3a,3b} M. Pappagallo,^{3a,3b} G. Eigen,⁴ B. Stugu,⁴ L. Sun,⁴ M. Battaglia,⁵ D. N. Brown,⁵ B. Hooberman,⁵ L. T. Kerth,⁵ Yu. G. Kolomensky,⁵ G. Lynch,⁵ I. L. Osipenkov,⁵ K. Tackmann,⁵ T. Tanabe,⁵ C. M. Hawkes,⁶ N. Soni,⁶ A. T. Watson,⁶ H. Koch,⁷ T. Schroeder,⁷ D. J. Asgeirsson,⁸ C. Hearty,⁸ T. S. Mattison,⁸ J. A. McKenna,⁸ M. Barrett,⁹ A. Khan,⁹ A. Randle-Conde,⁹ V. E. Blinov,¹⁰ A. D. Bukin,^{10,*} A. R. Buzykaev,¹⁰ V. P. Druzhinin,¹⁰ V. B. Golubev,¹⁰ A. P. Onuchin,¹⁰ S. I. Serednyakov,¹⁰ Yu. I. Skovpen,¹⁰ E. P. Solodov,¹⁰ K. Yu. Todyshev,¹⁰ M. Bondioli,¹¹ S. Curry,¹¹ I. Eschrich,¹¹ D. Kirkby,¹¹ A. J. Lankford,¹¹ P. Lund,¹¹ M. Mandelkern,¹¹ E. C. Martin,¹¹ D. P. Stoker,¹¹ H. Atmacan,¹² J. W. Gary,¹² F. Liu,¹² O. Long,¹² G. M. Vitug,¹² Z. Yasin,¹² V. Sharma,¹³ C. Campagnari,¹⁴ T. M. Hong,¹⁴ D. Kovalskyi,¹⁴ M. A. Mazur,¹⁴ J. D. Richman,¹⁴ T. W. Beck,¹⁵ A. M. Eisner,¹⁵ C. A. Heusch,¹⁵ J. Kroseberg,¹⁵ W. S. Lockman,¹⁵ A. J. Martinez,¹⁵ T. Schalk,¹⁵ B. A. Schumm,¹⁵ A. Seiden,¹⁵ L. Wang,¹⁵ L. O. Winstrom,¹⁵ C. H. Cheng,¹⁶ D. A. Doll,¹⁶ B. Echenard,¹⁶ F. Fang,¹⁶ D. G. Hitlin,¹⁶ I. Narsky,¹⁶ P. Ongmongkolkul,¹⁶ T. Piatenko,¹⁶ F. C. Porter,¹⁶ R. Andreassen,¹⁷ G. Mancinelli,¹⁷ B. T. Meadows,¹⁷ K. Mishra,¹⁷ M. D. Sokoloff,¹⁷ P. C. Bloom,¹⁸ W. T. Ford,¹⁸ A. Gaz,¹⁸ J. F. Hirschauer,¹⁸ M. Nagel,¹⁸ U. Nauenberg,¹⁸ J. G. Smith,¹⁸ S. R. Wagner,¹⁸ R. Ayad,^{19,†} W. H. Toki,¹⁹ R. J. Wilson,¹⁹ E. Feltresi,²⁰ A. Hauke,²⁰ H. Jasper,²⁰ T. M. Karbach,²⁰ J. Merkel,²⁰ A. Petzold,²⁰ B. Spaan,²⁰ K. Wacker,²⁰ M. J. Kobel,²¹ R. Nogowski,²¹ K. R. Schubert,²¹ R. Schwierz,²¹ D. Bernard,²² E. Latour,²² M. Verderi,²² P. J. Clark,²³ S. Playfer,²³ J. E. Watson,²³ M. Andreotti,^{24a,24b} D. Bettoni,^{24a} C. Bozzi,^{24a} R. Calabrese,^{24a,24b} A. Cecchi,^{24a,24b} G. Cibinetto,^{24a,24b} E. Fioravanti,^{24a,24b} P. Franchini,^{24a,24b} E. Luppi,^{24a,24b} M. Menerato,^{24a,24b} M. Negrini,^{24a,24b} A. Petrella,^{24a,24b} L. Piemontese,^{24a} V. Santoro,^{24a,24b} R. Baldini-Ferrolì,²⁵ A. Calcaterra,²⁵ R. de Sangro,²⁵ G. Finocchiaro,²⁵ S. Pacetti,²⁵ P. Patteri,²⁵ I. M. Peruzzi,^{25,‡} M. Piccolo,²⁵ M. Rama,²⁵ A. Zallo,²⁵ R. Contri,^{26a,26b} E. Guido,^{26a} M. Lo Vetere,^{26a,26b} M. R. Monge,^{26a,26b} S. Passaggio,^{26a} C. Patrignani,^{26a,26b} E. Robutti,^{26a} S. Tosi,^{26a,26b} K. S. Chaisanguanthum,²⁷ M. Morii,²⁷ A. Adametz,²⁸ J. Marks,²⁸ S. Schenk,²⁸ U. Uwer,²⁸ F. U. Bernlochner,²⁹ V. Klose,²⁹ H. M. Lacker,²⁹ T. Lueck,²⁹ A. Volk,²⁹ D. J. Bard,³⁰ P. D. Dauncey,³⁰ M. Tibbetts,³⁰ P. K. Behera,³¹ M. J. Charles,³¹ U. Mallik,³¹ J. Cochran,³² H. B. Crawley,³² L. Dong,³² V. Eyges,³² W. T. Meyer,³² S. Prell,³² E. I. Rosenberg,³² A. E. Rubin,³² Y. Y. Gao,³³ A. V. Gritsan,³³ Z. J. Guo,³³ N. Arnaud,³⁴ J. Béquilleux,³⁴ A. D'Orazio,³⁴ M. Davier,³⁴ D. Derkach,³⁴ J. Firmino da Costa,³⁴ G. Grosdidier,³⁴ F. Le Diberder,³⁴ V. Lepeltier,³⁴ A. M. Lutz,³⁴ B. Malaescu,³⁴ S. Pruvot,³⁴ P. Roudeau,³⁴ M. H. Schune,³⁴ J. Serrano,³⁴ V. Sordini,^{34,§} A. Stocchi,³⁴ G. Wormser,³⁴ D. J. Lange,³⁵ D. M. Wright,³⁵ I. Bingham,³⁶ J. P. Burke,³⁶ C. A. Chavez,³⁶ J. R. Fry,³⁶ E. Gabathuler,³⁶ R. Gamet,³⁶ D. E. Hutchcroft,³⁶ D. J. Payne,³⁶ C. Touramanis,³⁶ A. J. Bevan,³⁷ C. K. Clarke,³⁷ F. Di Lodovico,³⁷ R. Sacco,³⁷ M. Sigamani,³⁷ G. Cowan,³⁸ S. Paramesvaran,³⁸ A. C. Wren,³⁸ D. N. Brown,³⁹ C. L. Davis,³⁹ A. G. Denig,⁴⁰ M. Fritsch,⁴⁰ W. Gradl,⁴⁰ A. Hafner,⁴⁰ K. E. Alwyn,⁴¹ D. Bailey,⁴¹ R. J. Barlow,⁴¹ G. Jackson,⁴¹ G. D. Lafferty,⁴¹ T. J. West,⁴¹ J. I. Yi,⁴¹ J. Anderson,⁴² C. Chen,⁴² A. Jawahery,⁴² D. A. Roberts,⁴² G. Simi,⁴² J. M. Tuggle,⁴² C. Dallapiccola,⁴³ E. Salvati,⁴³ R. Cowan,⁴⁴ D. Dujmic,⁴⁴ P. H. Fisher,⁴⁴ S. W. Henderson,⁴⁴ G. Sciolla,⁴⁴ M. Spitznagel,⁴⁴ R. K. Yamamoto,^{44,*} M. Zhao,⁴⁴ P. M. Patel,⁴⁵ S. H. Robertson,⁴⁵ M. Schram,⁴⁵ P. Biassoni,^{46a,46b} A. Lazzaro,^{46a,46b} V. Lombardo,^{46a} F. Palombo,^{46a,46b} S. Stracka,^{46a,46b} L. Cremaldi,⁴⁷ R. Godang,^{47,||} R. Kroeger,⁴⁷ P. Sonnek,⁴⁷ D. J. Summers,⁴⁷ H. W. Zhao,⁴⁷ M. Simard,⁴⁸ P. Taras,⁴⁸ H. Nicholson,⁴⁹ G. De Nardo,^{50a,50b} L. Lista,^{50a} D. Monorchio,^{50a,50b} G. Onorato,^{50a,50b} C. Sciacca,^{50a,50b} G. Raven,⁵¹ H. L. Snoek,⁵¹ C. P. Jessop,⁵² K. J. Knoepfel,⁵² J. M. LoSecco,⁵² W. F. Wang,⁵² L. A. Corwin,⁵³ K. Honscheid,⁵³ H. Kagan,⁵³ R. Kass,⁵³ J. P. Morris,⁵³ A. M. Rahimi,⁵³ S. J. Sekula,⁵³ Q. K. Wong,⁵³ N. L. Blount,⁵⁴ J. Brau,⁵⁴ R. Frey,⁵⁴ O. Igonkina,⁵⁴ J. A. Kolb,⁵⁴ M. Lu,⁵⁴ R. Rahmat,⁵⁴ N. B. Sinev,⁵⁴ D. Strom,⁵⁴ J. Strube,⁵⁴ E. Torrence,⁵⁴ G. Castelli,^{55a,55b} N. Gagliardi,^{55a,55b} M. Margoni,^{55a,55b} M. Morandin,^{55a} M. Posocco,^{55a} M. Rotondo,^{55a} F. Simonetto,^{55a,55b} R. Stroili,^{55a,55b} C. Voci,^{55a,55b} P. del Amo Sanchez,⁵⁶ E. Ben-Haim,⁵⁶ G. R. Bonneaud,⁵⁶ H. Briand,⁵⁶ J. Chauveau,⁵⁶ O. Hamon,⁵⁶ Ph. Leruste,⁵⁶ G. Marchiori,⁵⁶ J. Ocariz,⁵⁶ A. Perez,⁵⁶ J. Prendki,⁵⁶ S. Sitt,⁵⁶ L. Gladney,⁵⁷ M. Biasini,^{58a,58b} E. Manoni,^{58a,58b} C. Angelini,^{59a,59b} G. Batignani,^{59a,59b} S. Bettarini,^{59a,59b} G. Calderini,^{59a,59b,¶} M. Carpinelli,^{59a,59b,**} A. Cervelli,^{59a,59b} F. Forti,^{59a,59b} M. A. Giorgi,^{59a,59b} A. Lusiani,^{59a,59c} M. Morganti,^{59a,59b} N. Neri,^{59a,59b} E. Paoloni,^{59a,59b} G. Rizzo,^{59a,59b} J. J. Walsh,^{59a} D. Lopes Pegna,⁶⁰ C. Lu,⁶⁰ J. Olsen,⁶⁰ A. J. S. Smith,⁶⁰ A. V. Telnov,⁶⁰ F. Anulli,^{61a} E. Baracchini,^{61a,61b} G. Cavoto,^{61a} R. Faccini,^{61a,61b} F. Ferrarotto,^{61a} F. Ferroni,^{61a,61b} M. Gaspero,^{61a,61b} P. D. Jackson,^{61a} L. Li Gioi,^{61a} M. A. Mazzoni,^{61a} S. Morganti,^{61a} G. Piredda,^{61a} F. Renga,^{61a,61b} C. Voena,^{61a} M. Ebert,⁶² T. Hartmann,⁶² H. Schröder,⁶² R. Waldi,⁶² T. Adye,⁶³ B. Franek,⁶³ E. O. Olaiya,⁶³ F. F. Wilson,⁶³ S. Emery,⁶⁴ L. Esteve,⁶⁴ G. Hamel de Monchenault,⁶⁴ W. Kozanecki,⁶⁴ G. Vasseur,⁶⁴ Ch. Yèche,⁶⁴ M. Zito,⁶⁴ M. T. Allen,⁶⁵ D. Aston,⁶⁵ R. Bartoldus,⁶⁵ J. F. Benitez,⁶⁵ R. Cenci,⁶⁵ J. P. Coleman,⁶⁵

M. R. Convery,⁶⁵ J. C. Dingfelder,⁶⁵ J. Dorfan,⁶⁵ G. P. Dubois-Felsmann,⁶⁵ W. Dunwoodie,⁶⁵ R. C. Field,⁶⁵ M. Franco Sevilla,⁶⁵ B. G. Fulsom,⁶⁵ A. M. Gabareen,⁶⁵ M. T. Graham,⁶⁵ P. Grenier,⁶⁵ C. Hast,⁶⁵ W. R. Innes,⁶⁵ J. Kaminski,⁶⁵ M. H. Kelsey,⁶⁵ H. Kim,⁶⁵ P. Kim,⁶⁵ M. L. Kocian,⁶⁵ D. W. G. S. Leith,⁶⁵ S. Li,⁶⁵ B. Lindquist,⁶⁵ S. Luitz,⁶⁵ V. Luth,⁶⁵ H. L. Lynch,⁶⁵ D. B. MacFarlane,⁶⁵ H. Marsiske,⁶⁵ R. Messner,^{65,*} D. R. Muller,⁶⁵ H. Neal,⁶⁵ S. Nelson,⁶⁵ C. P. O'Grady,⁶⁵ I. Ofte,⁶⁵ M. Perl,⁶⁵ B. N. Ratcliff,⁶⁵ A. Roodman,⁶⁵ A. A. Salnikov,⁶⁵ R. H. Schindler,⁶⁵ J. Schwiening,⁶⁵ A. Snyder,⁶⁵ D. Su,⁶⁵ M. K. Sullivan,⁶⁵ K. Suzuki,⁶⁵ S. K. Swain,⁶⁵ J. M. Thompson,⁶⁵ J. Va'vra,⁶⁵ A. P. Wagner,⁶⁵ M. Weaver,⁶⁵ C. A. West,⁶⁵ W. J. Wisniewski,⁶⁵ M. Wittgen,⁶⁵ D. H. Wright,⁶⁵ H. W. Wulsin,⁶⁵ A. K. Yarritu,⁶⁵ C. C. Young,⁶⁵ V. Ziegler,⁶⁵ X. R. Chen,⁶⁶ H. Liu,⁶⁶ W. Park,⁶⁶ M. V. Purohit,⁶⁶ R. M. White,⁶⁶ J. R. Wilson,⁶⁶ M. Bellis,⁶⁷ P. R. Burchat,⁶⁷ A. J. Edwards,⁶⁷ T. S. Miyashita,⁶⁷ S. Ahmed,⁶⁸ M. S. Alam,⁶⁸ J. A. Ernst,⁶⁸ B. Pan,⁶⁸ M. A. Saeed,⁶⁸ S. B. Zain,⁶⁸ A. Soffer,⁶⁹ S. M. Spanier,⁷⁰ B. J. Wogslund,⁷⁰ R. Eckmann,⁷¹ J. L. Ritchie,⁷¹ A. M. Ruland,⁷¹ C. J. Schilling,⁷¹ R. F. Schwitters,⁷¹ B. C. Wray,⁷¹ B. W. Drummond,⁷² J. M. Izen,⁷² X. C. Lou,⁷² F. Bianchi,^{73a,73b} D. Gamba,^{73a,73b} M. Pelliccioni,^{73a,73b} M. Bomben,^{74a,74b} L. Bosisio,^{74a,74b} C. Cartaro,^{74a,74b} G. Della Ricca,^{74a,74b} L. Lanceri,^{74a,74b} L. Vitale,^{74a,74b} V. Azzolini,⁷⁵ N. Lopez-March,⁷⁵ F. Martinez-Vidal,⁷⁵ D. A. Milanes,⁷⁵ A. Oyanguren,⁷⁵ J. Albert,⁷⁶ Sw. Banerjee,⁷⁶ B. Bhuyan,⁷⁶ H. H. F. Choi,⁷⁶ K. Hamano,⁷⁶ G. J. King,⁷⁶ R. Kowalewski,⁷⁶ M. J. Lewczuk,⁷⁶ I. M. Nugent,⁷⁶ J. M. Roney,⁷⁶ R. J. Sobie,⁷⁶ T. J. Gershon,⁷⁷ P. F. Harrison,⁷⁷ J. Ilic,⁷⁷ T. E. Latham,⁷⁷ G. B. Mohanty,⁷⁷ E. M. T. Puccio,⁷⁷ H. R. Band,⁷⁸ X. Chen,⁷⁸ S. Dasu,⁷⁸ K. T. Flood,⁷⁸ Y. Pan,⁷⁸ R. Prepost,⁷⁸ C. O. Vuosalo,⁷⁸ and S. L. Wu⁷⁸

(BABAR Collaboration)

¹Laboratoire d'Annecy-le-Vieux de Physique des Particules (LAPP), Université de Savoie, CNRS/IN2P3, F-74941 Annecy-Le-Vieux, France

²Universitat de Barcelona, Facultat de Física, Departament ECM, E-08028 Barcelona, Spain

^{3a}INFN Sezione di Bari, I-70126 Bari, Italy

^{3b}Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Bari, I-70126 Bari, Italy

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 British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada V6T 1Z1

⁹Brunel University, Uxbridge, Middlesex UB8 3PH, United Kingdom

¹⁰Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics, Novosibirsk 630090, Russia

¹¹University of California at Irvine, Irvine, California 92697, USA

¹²University of California at Riverside, Riverside, California 92521, USA

¹³University of California at San Diego, La Jolla, California 92093, USA

¹⁴University of California at Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, California 93106, USA

¹⁵University of California at Santa Cruz, Institute for Particle Physics, Santa Cruz, California 95064, USA

¹⁶California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California 91125, USA

¹⁷University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio 45221, USA

¹⁸University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80309, USA

¹⁹Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado 80523, USA

²⁰Technische Universität Dortmund, Fakultät Physik, D-44221 Dortmund, Germany

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

²²Laboratoire Leprince-Ringuet, CNRS/IN2P3, Ecole Polytechnique, F-91128 Palaiseau, France

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

^{24a}INFN Sezione di Ferrara, I-44100 Ferrara, Italy

^{24b}Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Ferrara, I-44100 Ferrara, Italy

²⁵INFN Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, I-00044 Frascati, Italy

^{26a}INFN Sezione di Genova, I-16146 Genova, Italy

^{26b}Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Genova, I-16146 Genova, Italy

²⁷Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, USA

²⁸Universität Heidelberg, Physikalisches Institut, Philosophenweg 12, D-69120 Heidelberg, Germany

²⁹Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Institut für Physik, Newtonstr. 15, D-12489 Berlin, Germany

³⁰Imperial College London, London, SW7 2AZ, United Kingdom

³¹University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa 52242, USA

³²Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011-3160, USA

³³Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland 21218, USA

- ³⁴Laboratoire de l'Accélérateur Linéaire, IN2P3/CNRS et Université Paris-Sud 11, Centre Scientifique d'Orsay, B. P. 34, F-91898 Orsay Cedex, 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
- ⁴⁰Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz, Institut für Kernphysik, D-55099 Mainz, Germany
- ⁴¹University of Manchester, Manchester M13 9PL, United Kingdom
- ⁴²University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742, USA
- ⁴³University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts 01003, USA
- ⁴⁴Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Laboratory for Nuclear Science, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, USA
- ⁴⁵McGill University, Montréal, Québec, Canada H3A 2T8
- ^{46a}INFN Sezione di Milano, I-20133 Milano, Italy
- ^{46b}Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Milano, I-20133 Milano, Italy
- ⁴⁷University of Mississippi, University, Mississippi 38677, USA
- ⁴⁸Université de Montréal, Physique des Particules, Montréal, Québec, Canada H3C 3J7
- ⁴⁹Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Massachusetts 01075, USA
- ^{50a}INFN Sezione di Napoli, I-80126 Napoli, Italy
- ^{50b}Dipartimento di Scienze Fisiche, Università di Napoli Federico II, I-80126 Napoli, Italy
- ⁵¹NIKHEF, National Institute for Nuclear Physics and High Energy Physics, NL-1009 DB Amsterdam, The Netherlands
- ⁵²University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana 46556, USA
- ⁵³Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210, USA
- ⁵⁴University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403, USA
- ^{55a}INFN Sezione di Padova, I-35131 Padova, Italy
- ^{55b}Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Padova, I-35131 Padova, Italy
- ⁵⁶Laboratoire de Physique Nucléaire et de Hautes Energies, IN2P3/CNRS, Université Pierre et Marie Curie-Paris6, Université Denis Diderot-Paris7, F-75252 Paris, France
- ⁵⁷University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104, USA
- ^{58a}INFN Sezione di Perugia, I-06100 Perugia, Italy
- ^{58b}Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Perugia, I-06100 Perugia, Italy
- ^{59a}INFN Sezione di Pisa, I-56127 Pisa, Italy
- ^{59b}Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Pisa, I-56127 Pisa, Italy
- ^{59c}Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, I-56127 Pisa, Italy
- ⁶⁰Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey 08544, USA
- ^{61a}INFN Sezione di Roma, I-00185 Roma, Italy
- ^{61b}Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Roma La Sapienza, I-00185 Roma, Italy
- ⁶²Universität Rostock, D-18051 Rostock, Germany
- ⁶³Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Chilton, Didcot, Oxon, OX11 0QX, United Kingdom
- ⁶⁴CEA, Irfu, SPP, Centre de Saclay, F-91191 Gif-sur-Yvette, France
- ⁶⁵SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory, Stanford, California 94309 USA
- ⁶⁶University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina 29208, USA
- ⁶⁷Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305-4060, USA
- ⁶⁸State University of New York, Albany, New York 12222, USA
- ⁶⁹Tel Aviv University, School of Physics and Astronomy, Tel Aviv, 69978, Israel
- ⁷⁰University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee 37996, USA
- ⁷¹University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712, USA
- ⁷²University of Texas at Dallas, Richardson, Texas 75083, USA
- ^{73a}INFN Sezione di Torino, I-10125 Torino, Italy
- ^{73b}Dipartimento di Fisica Sperimentale, Università di Torino, I-10125 Torino, Italy
- ^{74a}INFN Sezione di Trieste, I-34127 Trieste, Italy
- ^{74b}Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Trieste, I-34127 Trieste, Italy
- ⁷⁵IFIC, Universitat de Valencia-CSIC, E-46071 Valencia, Spain

*Deceased

†Now at Temple University, Philadelphia, PA 19122, USA

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

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

||Now at University of South Alabama, Mobile, AL 36688, USA

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

**Also with Università di Sassari, Sassari, Italy

⁷⁶*University of Victoria, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada V8W 3P6*⁷⁷*Department of Physics, University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL, United Kingdom*⁷⁸*University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706, USA*

(Received 7 August 2009; published 29 October 2009)

We measure the rate of D^0 - \bar{D}^0 mixing with the observable $y_{CP} = (\tau_{K\pi}/\tau_{KK}) - 1$, where τ_{KK} and $\tau_{K\pi}$ are, respectively, the mean lifetimes of CP -even $D^0 \rightarrow K^+K^-$ and CP -mixed $D^0 \rightarrow K^-\pi^+$ decays, using a data sample of 384 fb^{-1} collected by the *BABAR* detector at the SLAC PEP-II asymmetric-energy *B* Factory. From a sample of D^0 and \bar{D}^0 decays where the initial flavor of the decaying meson is not determined, we obtain $y_{CP} = [1.12 \pm 0.26(\text{stat}) \pm 0.22(\text{syst})]\%$, which excludes the no-mixing hypothesis at 3.3σ , including both statistical and systematic uncertainties. This result is in good agreement with a previous *BABAR* measurement of y_{CP} obtained from a sample of $D^{*+} \rightarrow D^0\pi^+$ events, where the D^0 decays to $K^-\pi^+$, K^+K^- , and $\pi^+\pi^-$, which is disjoint with the untagged D^0 events used here. Combining the two results taking into account statistical and systematic uncertainties, where the systematic uncertainties are assumed to be 100% correlated, we find $y_{CP} = [1.16 \pm 0.22(\text{stat}) \pm 0.18(\text{syst})]\%$, which excludes the no-mixing hypothesis at 4.1σ .

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevD.80.071103

PACS numbers: 13.25.Ft, 11.30.Er, 12.15.Ff

Several recent results [1–4] show evidence for mixing in the D^0 - \bar{D}^0 system consistent with predictions of possible standard model contributions [5–9]. These results also constrain many new physics models [10–14], and increasingly precise D^0 - \bar{D}^0 mixing measurements will provide even stronger constraints. One manifestation of D^0 - \bar{D}^0 mixing is differing D^0 decay time distributions for decays to different CP eigenstates [15]. We present here a measurement of this lifetime difference using a sample of D^0 and \bar{D}^0 decays in which the initial flavor of the decaying meson is unknown.

Assuming CP conservation in mixing, the two neutral D mass eigenstates $|D_1\rangle$ and $|D_2\rangle$ can be represented as

$$|D_1\rangle = p|D^0\rangle + q|\bar{D}^0\rangle \quad |D_2\rangle = p|D^0\rangle - q|\bar{D}^0\rangle, \quad (1)$$

where $|p|^2 + |q|^2 = 1$. The rate of D^0 - \bar{D}^0 mixing can be characterized by the parameters $x \equiv \Delta m/\Gamma$ and $y \equiv \Delta\Gamma/2\Gamma$, where $\Delta m = m_1 - m_2$ and $\Delta\Gamma = \Gamma_1 - \Gamma_2$ are, respectively, the differences between the mass and width eigenvalues of the states in Eq. (1), and $\Gamma = (\Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2)/2$ is the average width. If either x or y is nonzero, mixing will occur, altering the decay time distribution of D^0 and \bar{D}^0 mesons decaying into final states of specific CP [16].

In the limit of small mixing, and no CP violation in mixing or in the interference between mixing and decay (assumptions which are consistent with current experimental results), the mean lifetimes of decays to a CP eigenstate of a sample of D^0 ($\tau_{hh}^{D^0}$) and \bar{D}^0 ($\tau_{hh}^{\bar{D}^0}$), along with the mean lifetime of decays to a state of indefinite CP ($\tau_{K\pi}$), can be combined into the quantity

$$y_{CP} = \frac{\langle\tau_{K\pi}\rangle}{\langle\tau_{hh}\rangle} - 1, \quad (2)$$

where $\langle\tau_{hh}\rangle = (\tau_{hh}^{D^0} + \tau_{hh}^{\bar{D}^0})/2$. Noting that the untagged $K^-\pi^+$ [17] final state is a mixture of Cabbibo-favored and doubly Cabbibo-suppressed D^0 and \bar{D}^0 decays with a purely exponential lifetime distribution, along with a very

small admixture of mixed D^0 decays, an analogous expression also holds for $\langle\tau_{K\pi}\rangle$. Given the current experimental evidence indicating a small mixing rate, the lifetime distribution for all hh and $K\pi$ final states is exponential to a good approximation. If y_{CP} is zero, there is no D^0 - \bar{D}^0 mixing attributable to a width difference, although mixing caused by a mass difference may be present. In the limit of no direct CP violation, $y_{CP} = y$.

We measure the D^0 mean lifetime in the D^0 decay modes $K^-\pi^+$ and K^+K^- , where the initial flavor of the decaying D^0 is not identified (the *untagged* sample). This sample excludes D^0 mesons, which can be reconstructed as part of $D^{*+} \rightarrow D^0\pi^+$ decays, as these decays (the *tagged* sample) are the subject of an earlier *BABAR* analysis [18] whose results are combined with those of the current analysis. To avoid potential bias, we finalized our data selection criteria, fitting methodology, sources of possible systematic uncertainties to be examined, and method of calculating statistical limits for the current untagged analysis alone and in combination with the tagged analysis, prior to examining the mixing results from the untagged data. In general, systematic uncertainties related to the reconstruction of signal events cancel in the lifetime ratio. However, uncertainties related to the somewhat differing backgrounds present in the $K^-\pi^+$ and K^+K^- final states lead to larger systematic uncertainties in the untagged analysis compared to those of the tagged analysis, which has much higher signal purity.

We use 384 fb^{-1} of e^+e^- colliding-beam data recorded at, and slightly below, the $Y(4S)$ resonance (center-of-mass [CM] energy $\sqrt{s} \sim 10.6 \text{ GeV}$) with the *BABAR* detector [19] at the SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory PEP-II asymmetric-energy *B* Factory. Candidate D^0 signal decays are reconstructed in the final states $K^-\pi^+$ and K^+K^- . The selection of events and reconstruction of D^0 signal candidates closely follows that of our previous tagged analysis [18]. We require K^+ and π^+ candidates to satisfy particle

MEASUREMENT OF D^0 - \bar{D}^0 MIXING USING THE ...

identification criteria based on dF/dx ionization energy loss and Cherenkov angle measurements. We fit oppositely charged pairs of these candidates with appropriate mass hypotheses to a common vertex to form a D^0 candidate. The decay time t of each D^0 candidate with invariant mass within the range 1.80–1.93 GeV/c^2 , along with its estimated uncertainty σ_t , is determined from a combined fit to the D^0 production and decay vertices. The production point is taken to be the e^+e^- interaction region as determined using bhabha and di-muon events obtained from triggers surrounding any given signal candidate event. We retain only candidates with a χ^2 -based probability for the fit $P(\chi^2) > 0.1\%$, and with $-2 < t < 4$ ps and $\sigma_t < 0.5$ ps.

We further require the helicity angle θ_H , defined as the angle between the positively charged track in the D^0 rest frame and the D^0 direction in the laboratory frame, to satisfy $|\cos\theta_H| < 0.7$, which aids in the rejection of purely combinatorial background events. Contributions from true D^0 mesons produced in B meson decay are reduced to a negligible amount by rejecting D^0 candidates with momentum in the e^+e^- CM frame less than 2.5 GeV/c . For events with multiple candidates sharing one or more tracks, we retain only the candidate with the highest $P(\chi^2)$. The fraction of events with multiple signal candidates is $\sim 0.05\%$ for the K^+K^- final state, and $\sim 0.3\%$ for $K^-\pi^+$.

The invariant mass distributions for the final $D^0 \rightarrow K^-\pi^+$ and $D^0 \rightarrow K^+K^-$ samples are shown in Fig. 1. For the lifetime fits, we use only events within ± 10 MeV/c^2 of the D^0 signal peak $1.8545 < M_{D^0} < 1.8745$ GeV/c^2 (the *lifetime fit mass region*). The $K^-\pi^+$ and K^+K^- signal yields within this region and their purity are given in Table I. Events within the mass sideband regions $1.81 < M_{D^0} < 1.83$ GeV/c^2 and $1.90 < M_{D^0} < 1.92$ GeV/c^2 are used to determine the combinatorial background decay time distribution within the lifetime fit mass region. In addition to purely combinatorial backgrounds, there are small background contributions from




FIG. 1. (a) $D^0 \rightarrow K^-\pi^+$ and (b) $D^0 \rightarrow K^+K^-$ invariant mass distribution with the data (points), total fit (line) and background contribution (solid) overlaid. The innermost dashed lines on either side of the signal peaks delimit the lifetime fit mass region, with lower and upper mass sidebands shown on either side.

TABLE I. $D^0 \rightarrow K^-\pi^+$ and $D^0 \rightarrow K^+K^-$ signal yield and purity in the lifetime fit mass region.

Sample	Signal yield ($\times 10^3$)	Purity (%)
$K^-\pi^+$	2710.2 ± 3.4	94.2
K^+K^-	263.6 ± 1.0	80.9

decays of nonsignal charm parents where two of the decay products are selected as the daughters of a signal decay and subsequently pass the final event selection. These misreconstructed charm backgrounds are accounted for using simulated events. Their contribution is $\sim 0.7\%$ ($\sim 3.8\%$) of the total number of background events in the $K^-\pi^+$ (K^+K^-) signal region.

The mean D^0 lifetime is determined from a fit essentially identical to the one performed in the previous tagged analysis [18], using the reconstructed decay time t and the decay time uncertainty σ_t for events within the lifetime fit mass region. Three categories of events are accounted for in the lifetime fit: signal decays, combinatorial background, and misreconstructed charm events.

The decay time distribution of signal events is described by an exponential convolved with a resolution function which is taken as the sum of three Gaussian functions with widths proportional to σ_t . The functional form of this probability density function (PDF) for signal events is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_X(t, \sigma_t; \tau_X) = & f_{i3} \mathcal{D}(t, \sigma_t; S_X s_3, t_0, \tau_X) + (1 - f_{i3}) \\ & \times [f_{i2} \mathcal{D}(t, \sigma_t; S_X s_2, t_0, \tau_X) \\ & + (1 - f_{i2}) \mathcal{D}(t, \sigma_t; S_X s_1, t_0, \tau_X)], \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where f_{ii} (with $i = 1 \dots 3$) parameterizes the contribution of each individual resolution function, s_i is a scaling factor associated with each Gaussian, τ_X (where $X = K\pi, KK$) is the lifetime parameter determined by the fit, t_0 is an offset to the mean of the resolution function, and where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}(t, \sigma_t; s, t_0, \tau) = & C_{\sigma_t} \int \exp(-t_{\text{true}}/\tau) \\ & \times \exp\left(-\frac{(t - t_{\text{true}} + t_0)^2}{2(s \cdot \sigma_t)^2}\right) dt_{\text{true}} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

with normalization coefficient C_{σ_t} . Up to an overall scale factor in the width, the resolution function is identical for both final states. We account for a small ($\sim 1\%$) difference in the $K^-\pi^+$ and K^+K^- resolution function width using an additional fixed scale factor S_X . The value of S_{KK} is determined from the data, with $S_{K\pi}$ fixed to 1.0. Possible biases resulting from this assumption are included as part of the study of systematic uncertainties. All other resolution function parameters are shared among the two modes, and all parameters are allowed to vary in a simultaneous extended unbinned maximum likelihood fit to both final states.

B. AUBERT *et al.*

The decay time distribution of the combinatorial background is described by a sum of two Gaussians and a modified Gaussian with a power-law tail to account for a small number of events with large reconstructed lifetimes. The widths of these Gaussians are not scaled using event-by-event uncertainties. Events in the lower and upper $K^- \pi^+$ ($K^+ K^-$) mass sidebands are fit separately, and a weighted average of the results of these fits is used to parameterize the PDF for $K^- \pi^+$ ($K^+ K^-$) combinatorial events in the lifetime fit mass region.

Misreconstructed charm background events have one or more of the charm decay products either not reconstructed or reconstructed with the wrong particle hypothesis. In the $K^- \pi^+$ ($K^+ K^-$) final state, $\sim 60\%$ ($\sim 95\%$) of these events are from true D^0 decays, with the balance coming from charged D and charm baryon decays. The charm background is long lived and is described using an exponential convolved with a resolution function consisting of two Gaussians with a shared mean and widths that depend on σ_t . Because the number of these events in the $K^- \pi^+$ ($K^+ K^-$) sample is small relative to the total background, an effective lifetime distribution taken from simulated events and summed over all $K^- \pi^+$ ($K^+ K^-$) charm backgrounds is used in the $K^- \pi^+$ ($K^+ K^-$) lifetime fit.

Since the lifetime fit PDFs depend on the event-by-event decay time uncertainty, PDFs describing the distribution of decay time uncertainties for each of the event classes are required to avoid bias in the likelihood estimator used in the data fit [20]. We extract these distributions directly from the data. For combinatorial events, the distribution of decay time uncertainties is taken from a weighted average of the distributions extracted from the lower and upper mass sidebands. The decay time uncertainty distribution for signal events is obtained by subtracting the combinatorial background uncertainty distribution from the uncertainty distribution of all (i.e., background plus signal) candidates present in the lifetime fit mass region. The signal distribution is also used for the relatively small number of misreconstructed charm background events.

The results of the lifetime fits are shown in Figs. 2 and 3, along with a plot of the point-by-point residuals for each fit normalized by the statistical uncertainty associated with a data point. We find the $D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$ mean lifetime $\tau_{K\pi} = 410.39 \pm 0.38(\text{stat})$ fs and the $D^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-$ mean lifetime $\tau_{KK} = 405.85 \pm 1.00(\text{stat})$ fs, yielding $y_{CP} = [1.12 \pm 0.26(\text{stat})]\%$. The statistical significance of this mixing result without taking into account systematic uncertainties is 4.3σ . This untagged result is in good agreement with our previous tagged analysis [18]. When the two results are combined, we find $y_{CP} = [1.16 \pm 0.22(\text{stat})]\%$, a result with a statistical significance of 5.3σ , excluding any systematic uncertainties.

Numerous cross-checks have been performed to assure the unbiased nature of the fit model and to validate the assumptions used in its construction. We have performed

PHYSICAL REVIEW D **80**, 071103(R) (2009)




FIG. 2 (color online). $D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$ decay time distribution with the data (points), total lifetime fit (line), signal (white), combinatorial background (gray) and charm background (black) contributions overlaid.

fits to datasets composed of fully simulated signal and background events in the proportions seen in the actual data, and find no bias in the measurement of individual $\tau_{K\pi}$ and τ_{KK} lifetimes for simulated signal events generated at 411.6 fs (very near the nominal $D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$ lifetime value [16]), or for a lifetime value $\sim 10\%$ greater than this for $D^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-$. We additionally find no significant




FIG. 3 (color online). $D^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-$ decay time distribution with the data (points), total lifetime fit (line), signal (white), combinatorial background (gray) and charm background (black) contributions overlaid.

variations in the reconstruction efficiency for signal decays as a function of the true decay time.

Many of the systematic uncertainties associated with the individual lifetime measurements cancel to a great extent in the ratio of lifetimes. We consider as possible sources of systematic uncertainty: variations in the signal and background fit models, changes to the event selection, and detector effects that might introduce biases in the lifetime measurements.

We test the assumption of a shared signal resolution model by separately fitting each mode using completely independent resolution functions, and assign as a systematic uncertainty the magnitude of the change $|\Delta y_{CP}|$ in y_{CP} relative to the result of the nominal fit. We additionally perform the nominal fit using a double Gaussian signal resolution model, and similarly assign a systematic uncertainty. The total uncertainty associated with the choice of signal resolution model is 0.016%.

To estimate possible biases correlated with the extent and position of the lifetime fit mass region, the size of the mass window is varied by ± 2 and ± 5 MeV/ c^2 without changing the mass region center, and the center is shifted by ± 0.5 MeV/ c^2 while retaining the nominal 20 MeV/ c^2 width. The total systematic uncertainty obtained from variations in the lifetime fit mass window is 0.110%.

The modeling of the misreconstructed charm background is taken from simulated events, and we vary the expected contribution from these events by $\pm 15\%$ ($\pm 5\%$) for the $K^-\pi^+$ (K^+K^-) final state. These bounds are conservatively assigned based on the results of other *BABAR* charm analyses in which the background modes here are fully reconstructed, and in which data and simulated event yields are found to agree within a few percent. We additionally vary the effective lifetime used in the charm background lifetime fit PDFs by the same percentages, which corresponds to $> \pm 2\sigma$ in the statistical uncertainty given the number of simulated events used. The largest $|\Delta y_{CP}|$ value within each of these two classes of variations is assigned as a systematic uncertainty, 0.0585% for the normalization variations and 0.0624% for the effective lifetime variations, which are then added in quadrature.

We account for a possible bias associated with obtaining the combinatorial lifetime PDF in the lifetime fit mass region from data in the lower and upper mass sidebands by fluctuating the PDF parameters taking into account the correlations and statistical errors resulting from the sideband fits. We construct 100 PDF variations for each of the lower and upper sidebands for each of the final states, and then perform the nominal lifetime fit using each variation. We separately compute the root-mean-square deviation (RMS) of the 100 Δy_{CP} values associated with each of the four sets of variations, and assign the largest RMS, 0.115%, as a systematic uncertainty.

We evaluate systematic uncertainties associated with the selection of the final dataset by individually varying the selection criteria. We change the maximum allowed decay

time uncertainty by ± 0.1 ps, and assign the largest $|\Delta y_{CP}|$ value, 0.069%, as a systematic uncertainty. We vary the way in which signal candidates that share tracks with other signal candidates are selected by removing all overlapping candidates, and separately by also retaining all such candidates, and again take the larger of the resulting two $|\Delta y_{CP}|$ values, 0.017%, as a systematic uncertainty.

We account for possible detector effects which might bias the lifetime ratio by using several different detector configurations to rereconstruct simulated event samples with statistics greater than the actual data for each configuration. These configurations include vertex detector misalignments, along with boost and beamspot variations, whose extent is based on residual uncertainties in studies of mu-pair and cosmic events. The misalignment configurations introduce changes of up to 4 fs in both KK and $K\pi$ lifetimes, as well as changes in the offset parameter t_o of up to 5 fs. Since the same simulated event sample is reconstructed for each set of detector configuration, the variations are dominated by systematic effects. The total systematic uncertainty arising from this source is 0.093%.

Table II shows the contribution from each source of systematic uncertainty given above. The total is calculated as the sum in quadrature of each of the individual items. In addition to the contributions quantified in the table, we also look for possible biases by fitting the data separated in: several different data-taking periods; several different azimuthal and polar angle bins in the laboratory frame for the D^0 candidate; several bins of the opening angle in the laboratory frame between the two D^0 daughters; several bins of the D^0 helicity angle; and several bins of the D^0 momentum in the CM frame. We observed no significant biases in any of these cases.

In our previously published tagged analysis [18], we combined the tagged result with the result of an untagged *BABAR* analysis done using a much smaller dataset [21], and this previous untagged result is superseded by the result here, which is $y_{CP}(\text{untagged}) = [1.12 \pm 0.26(\text{stat}) \pm 0.22(\text{syst})]\%$, which excludes the no-mixing hypothesis at 3.3σ , including both statistical and systematic uncertainties. Our previous tagged result [18] is $y_{CP}(\text{tagged}) = [1.24 \pm 0.39(\text{stat}) \pm 0.13(\text{syst})]\%$. These results contain no events in common, and are thus statisti-

TABLE II. Systematic uncertainties.

Uncertainty source	$ \Delta y_{CP} $ (%)
Signal resolution model	0.016
Mass window	0.110
Misreconstructed charm model	0.086
Combinatorial PDF	0.115
σ_t selection	0.069
Overlap candidate selection	0.017
Detector effects	0.093
Total	0.216

cally uncorrelated by construction. However, the degree of correlation in the systematic uncertainties is substantial, and we conservatively assume a 100% correlation in the systematics shared between the two analyses. Combining the tagged and untagged results taking into account both statistical and systematic uncertainties [22], we find $y_{CP}(\text{correlated}) = [1.16 \pm 0.22(\text{stat}) \pm 0.18(\text{syst})]\%$. Summing statistical and systematic uncertainties in quadrature, the significance of this measurement is 4.1σ

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 U.S. 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.

-
- [1] B. Aubert *et al.* (*BABAR* Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 211802 (2007).
- [2] M. Staric *et al.* (Belle Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 211803 (2007).
- [3] L. M. Zhang *et al.* (Belle Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 131803 (2007).
- [4] T. Aaltonen *et al.* (CDF Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 121802 (2008).
- [5] L. Wolfenstein, Phys. Lett. **164B**, 170 (1985).
- [6] J. F. Donoghue, E. Golowich, B. R. Holstein, and J. Trampetic, Phys. Rev. D **33**, 179 (1986).
- [7] I. I. Bigi and N. G. Uraltsev, Nucl. Phys. **B592**, 92 (2001).
- [8] A. F. Falk, Y. Grossman, Z. Ligeti, and A. A. Petrov, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 054034 (2002).
- [9] A. F. Falk, Y. Grossman, Z. Ligeti, Y. Nir, and A. A. Petrov, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 114021 (2004).
- [10] G. Burdman and I. Shipsey, Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **53**, 431 (2003).
- [11] A. A. Petrov, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **21**, 5686 (2006).
- [12] E. Golowich, S. Pakvasa, and A. A. Petrov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 181801 (2007).
- [13] E. Golowich, J. Hewett, S. Pakvasa, and A. A. Petrov, Phys. Rev. D **76**, 095009 (2007).
- [14] E. Golowich, J. Hewett, S. Pakvasa, and A. A. Petrov, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 114030 (2009).
- [15] T. Liu, in *Workshop on the Future of High Sensitivity Charm Experiments: CHARM2000, Batavia, IL, 7-9 June 1994*, ariv:hep-ph/9408330.
- [16] C. Amsler *et al.* (Particle Data Group), Phys. Lett. B **667**, 1 (2008).
- [17] Charge conjugation is implied throughout.
- [18] B. Aubert *et al.* (*BABAR* Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D **78**, 011105 (2008).
- [19] B. Aubert *et al.* (*BABAR* Collaboration), Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A **479**, 1 (2002).
- [20] G. Punzi, in *Proceedings of the Conference on Statistical Problems in Particle Physics, Astrophysics, and Cosmology*, edited by L. Lyons, R. Mount, and R. Reitmeyer, eConf number C030908 (2003).
- [21] B. Aubert *et al.* (*BABAR* Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 121801 (2003).
- [22] L. Lyons *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A **270**, 110 (1988).