

PDF hosted at the Radboud Repository of the Radboud University Nijmegen

The following full text is a publisher's version.

For additional information about this publication click this link.

<http://hdl.handle.net/2066/128766>

Please be advised that this information was generated on 2021-09-26 and may be subject to change.

Search for the rare decay $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*0} \gamma$

B. Aubert,¹ R. Barate,¹ D. Boutigny,¹ F. Couderc,¹ Y. Karyotakis,¹ J. P. Lees,¹ V. Poireau,¹ V. Tisserand,¹ A. Zghiche,¹ E. Grauges,² A. Palano,³ M. Pappagallo,³ A. Pompili,³ J. C. Chen,⁴ N. D. Qi,⁴ G. Rong,⁴ P. Wang,⁴ Y. S. Zhu,⁴ G. Eigen,⁵ I. Ofte,⁵ B. Stugu,⁵ G. S. Abrams,⁶ A. W. Borgland,⁶ A. B. Breon,⁶ D. N. Brown,⁶ J. Button-Shafer,⁶ R. N. Cahn,⁶ E. Charles,⁶ C. T. Day,⁶ M. S. Gill,⁶ A. V. Gritsan,⁶ Y. Groysman,⁶ R. G. Jacobsen,⁶ R. W. Kadel,⁶ J. Kadyk,⁶ L. T. Kerth,⁶ Yu. G. Kolomoisky,⁶ G. Kukartsev,⁶ G. Lynch,⁶ L. M. Mir,⁶ P. J. Oddone,⁶ T. J. Orimoto,⁶ M. Pripstein,⁶ N. A. Roe,⁶ M. T. Ronan,⁶ W. A. Wenzel,⁶ M. Barrett,⁷ K. E. Ford,⁷ T. J. Harrison,⁷ A. J. Hart,⁷ C. M. Hawkes,⁷ S. E. Morgan,⁷ A. T. Watson,⁷ M. Fritsch,⁸ K. Goetzen,⁸ T. Held,⁸ H. Koch,⁸ B. Lewandowski,⁸ M. Pelizaeus,⁸ K. Peters,⁸ T. Schroeder,⁸ M. Steinke,⁸ J. T. Boyd,⁹ J. P. Burke,⁹ N. Chevalier,⁹ W. N. Cottingham,⁹ M. P. Kelly,⁹ T. Cuhadar-Donszelmann,¹⁰ C. Hearty,¹⁰ N. S. Knecht,¹⁰ T. S. Mattison,¹⁰ J. A. McKenna,¹⁰ D. Thiessen,¹⁰ A. Khan,¹¹ P. Kyberd,¹¹ L. Teodorescu,¹¹ A. E. Blinov,¹² V. E. Blinov,¹² A. D. Bukin,¹² V. P. Druzhinin,¹² V. B. Golubev,¹² V. N. Ivanchenko,¹² E. A. Kravchenko,¹² A. P. Onuchin,¹² S. I. Serednyakov,¹² Yu. I. Skovpen,¹² E. P. Solodov,¹² A. N. Yushkov,¹² D. Best,¹³ M. Bondioli,¹³ M. Bruinsma,¹³ M. Chao,¹³ I. Eschrich,¹³ D. Kirkby,¹³ A. J. Lankford,¹³ M. Mandelkern,¹³ R. K. Mommsen,¹³ W. Roethel,¹³ D. P. Stoker,¹³ C. Buchanan,¹⁴ B. L. Hartfiel,¹⁴ A. J. R. Weinstein,¹⁴ S. D. Foulkes,¹⁵ J. W. Gary,¹⁵ O. Long,¹⁵ B. C. Shen,¹⁵ K. Wang,¹⁵ L. Zhang,¹⁵ D. del Re,¹⁶ H. K. Hadavand,¹⁶ E. J. Hill,¹⁶ D. B. MacFarlane,¹⁶ H. P. Paar,¹⁶ S. Rahatlou,¹⁶ V. Sharma,¹⁶ J. W. Berryhill,¹⁷ C. Campagnari,¹⁷ A. Cunha,¹⁷ B. Dahmes,¹⁷ T. M. Hong,¹⁷ A. Lu,¹⁷ M. A. Mazur,¹⁷ J. D. Richman,¹⁷ W. Verkerke,¹⁷ T. W. Beck,¹⁸ A. M. Eisner,¹⁸ C. J. Flacco,¹⁸ C. A. Heusch,¹⁸ J. Kroseberg,¹⁸ W. S. Lockman,¹⁸ G. Nesom,¹⁸ T. Schalk,¹⁸ B. A. Schumm,¹⁸ A. Seiden,¹⁸ P. Spradlin,¹⁸ D. C. Williams,¹⁸ M. G. Wilson,¹⁸ J. Albert,¹⁹ E. Chen,¹⁹ G. P. Dubois-Felsmann,¹⁹ A. Dvoretzskii,¹⁹ D. G. Hitlin,¹⁹ I. Narsky,¹⁹ T. Piatenko,¹⁹ F. C. Porter,¹⁹ A. Ryd,¹⁹ A. Samuel,¹⁹ S. Yang,¹⁹ R. Andreassen,²⁰ S. Jayatilleke,²⁰ G. Mancinelli,²⁰ B. T. Meadows,²⁰ M. D. Sokoloff,²⁰ F. Blanc,²¹ P. Bloom,²¹ S. Chen,²¹ W. T. Ford,²¹ U. Nauenberg,²¹ A. Olivas,²¹ P. Rankin,²¹ W. O. Ruddick,²¹ J. G. Smith,²¹ K. A. Ulmer,²¹ J. Zhang,²¹ A. Chen,²² E. A. Eckhart,²² J. L. Harton,²² A. Soffer,²² W. H. Toki,²² R. J. Wilson,²² Q. Zeng,²² B. Spaan,²³ D. Altenburg,²⁴ T. Brandt,²⁴ J. Brose,²⁴ M. Dickopp,²⁴ E. Feltresi,²⁴ A. Hauke,²⁴ V. Klose,²⁴ H. M. Lacker,²⁴ E. Maly,²⁴ R. Nogowski,²⁴ S. Otto,²⁴ A. Petzold,²⁴ G. Schott,²⁴ J. Schubert,²⁴ K. R. Schubert,²⁴ R. Schwierz,²⁴ J. E. Sundermann,²⁴ D. Bernard,²⁵ G. R. Bonneaud,²⁵ P. Grenier,²⁵ S. Schrenk,²⁵ Ch. Thiebaux,²⁵ G. Vasileiadis,²⁵ M. Verderi,²⁵ D. J. Bard,²⁶ P. J. Clark,²⁶ W. Gradl,²⁶ F. Muheim,²⁶ S. Playfer,²⁶ Y. Xie,²⁶ M. Andreotti,²⁷ V. Azzolini,²⁷ D. Bettoni,²⁷ C. Bozzi,²⁷ R. Calabrese,²⁷ G. Cibinetto,²⁷ E. Luppi,²⁷ M. Negri,²⁷ L. Piemontese,²⁷ A. Sarti,²⁷ F. Anulli,²⁸ R. Baldini-Ferroli,²⁸ A. Calcaterra,²⁸ R. de Sangro,²⁸ G. Finocchiaro,²⁸ P. Patteri,²⁸ I. M. Peruzzi,²⁸ M. Piccolo,²⁸ A. Zallo,²⁸ A. Buzzo,²⁹ R. Capra,²⁹ R. Contri,²⁹ M. Lo Vetere,²⁹ M. Macri,²⁹ M. R. Monge,²⁹ S. Passaggio,²⁹ C. Patrignani,²⁹ E. Robutti,²⁹ A. Santroni,²⁹ S. Tosi,²⁹ S. Bailey,³⁰ G. Brandenburg,³⁰ K. S. Chaisanguanthum,³⁰ M. Morii,³⁰ E. Won,³⁰ R. S. Dubitzky,³¹ U. Langenegger,³¹ J. Marks,³¹ S. Schenk,³¹ U. Uwer,³¹ W. Bhimji,³² D. A. Bowerman,³² P. D. Dauncey,³² U. Egede,³² J. R. Gaillard,³² G. W. Morton,³² J. A. Nash,³² M. B. Nikolich,³² G. P. Taylor,³² M. J. Charles,³³ G. J. Grenier,³³ U. Mallik,³³ A. K. Mohapatra,³³ J. Cochran,³⁴ H. B. Crawley,³⁴ V. Eyges,³⁴ W. T. Meyer,³⁴ S. Prell,³⁴ E. I. Rosenberg,³⁴ A. E. Rubin,³⁴ J. Yi,³⁴ N. Arnaud,³⁵ M. Davier,³⁵ X. Giroux,³⁵ G. Grosdidier,³⁵ A. Höcker,³⁵ F. Le Diberder,³⁵ V. Lepeltier,³⁵ A. M. Lutz,³⁵ T. C. Petersen,³⁵ M. Pierini,³⁵ S. Plaszczynski,³⁵ S. Rodier,³⁵ P. Roudeau,³⁵ M. H. Schune,³⁵ A. Stocchi,³⁵ G. Wormser,³⁵ C. H. Cheng,³⁶ D. J. Lange,³⁶ M. C. Simani,³⁶ D. M. Wright,³⁶ A. J. Bevan,³⁷ C. A. Chavez,³⁷ J. P. Coleman,³⁷ I. J. Forster,³⁷ J. R. Fry,³⁷ E. Gabathuler,³⁷ R. Gamet,³⁷ K. A. George,³⁷ D. E. Hutchcroft,³⁷ R. J. Parry,³⁷ D. J. Payne,³⁷ C. Touramanis,³⁷ C. M. Cormack,³⁸ F. Di Lodovico,³⁸ C. L. Brown,³⁹ G. Cowan,³⁹ R. L. Flack,³⁹ H. U. Flaecher,³⁹ M. G. Green,³⁹ P. S. Jackson,³⁹ T. R. McMahon,³⁹ S. Ricciardi,³⁹ F. Salvatore,³⁹ D. Brown,⁴⁰ C. L. Davis,⁴⁰ J. Allison,⁴¹ N. R. Barlow,⁴¹ R. J. Barlow,⁴¹ M. C. Hodgkinson,⁴¹ G. D. Lafferty,⁴¹ M. T. Naisbit,⁴¹ J. C. Williams,⁴¹ C. Chen,⁴² A. Farbin,⁴² W. D. Hulsbergen,⁴² A. Jawahery,⁴² D. Kovalskyi,⁴² C. K. Lae,⁴² V. Lillard,⁴² D. A. Roberts,⁴² G. Blaylock,⁴³ C. Dallapiccola,⁴³ S. S. Hertzbach,⁴³ R. Kofler,⁴³ V. B. Koptchev,⁴³ T. B. Moore,⁴³ S. Saremi,⁴³ H. Staengle,⁴³ S. Willocq,⁴³ R. Cowan,⁴⁴ K. Koeneke,⁴⁴ G. Sciolla,⁴⁴ S. J. Sekula,⁴⁴ F. Taylor,⁴⁴ R. K. Yamamoto,⁴⁴ H. Kim,⁴⁵ P. M. Patel,⁴⁵ S. H. Robertson,⁴⁵ A. Lazzaro,⁴⁶ V. Lombardo,⁴⁶ F. Palombo,⁴⁶ J. M. Bauer,⁴⁷ L. Cremaldi,⁴⁷ V. Eschenburg,⁴⁷ R. Godang,⁴⁷ R. Kroeger,⁴⁷ J. Reidy,⁴⁷ D. A. Sanders,⁴⁷ D. J. Summers,⁴⁷ H. W. Zhao,⁴⁷ S. Brunet,⁴⁸ D. Côté,⁴⁸ P. Taras,⁴⁸ B. Viaud,⁴⁸ H. Nicholson,⁴⁹ N. Cavallo,^{50,*} G. De Nardo,⁵⁰ F. Fabozzi,^{50,*} C. Gatto,⁵⁰ L. Lista,⁵⁰ D. Monorchio,⁵⁰ P. Paolucci,⁵⁰ D. Piccolo,⁵⁰ C. Sciacca,⁵⁰ M. Baak,⁵¹ H. Bulten,⁵¹ G. Raven,⁵¹ H. L. Snoek,⁵¹ L. Wilden,⁵¹ C. P. Jessop,⁵² J. M. LoSecco,⁵² T. Allmendinger,⁵³ G. Benelli,⁵³ K. K. Gan,⁵³ K. Honscheid,⁵³ D. Hufnagel,⁵³ P. D. Jackson,⁵³ H. Kagan,⁵³ R. Kass,⁵³ T. Pulliam,⁵³ A. M. Rahimi,⁵³ R. Ter-Antonyan,⁵³ Q. K. Wong,⁵³ J. Brau,⁵⁴ R. Frey,⁵⁴ O. Igonkina,⁵⁴ M. Lu,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 C. Voci,⁵⁵ M. Benayoun,⁵⁶ H. Briand,⁵⁶ J. Chauveau,⁵⁶ P. David,⁵⁶ L. Del Buono,⁵⁶ Ch. de la Vaissière,⁵⁶ O. Hamon,⁵⁶ M. J. J. John,⁵⁶ Ph. Leruste,⁵⁶ J. Malclès,⁵⁶ J. Ocariz,⁵⁶ L. Roos,⁵⁶ G. Therin,⁵⁶ P. K. Behera,⁵⁷ L. Gladney,⁵⁷ Q. H. Guo,⁵⁷ J. Panetta,⁵⁷ M. Biasini,⁵⁸ R. Covarelli,⁵⁸ M. Pioppi,⁵⁸ C. Angelini,⁵⁹ G. Batignani,⁵⁹ S. Bettarini,⁵⁹ F. Bucci,⁵⁹ G. Calderini,⁵⁹ M. Carpinelli,⁵⁹ F. Forti,⁵⁹ M. A. Giorgi,⁵⁹ A. Lusiani,⁵⁹ G. Marchiori,⁵⁹ M. Morganti,⁵⁹ N. Neri,⁵⁹ E. Paoloni,⁵⁹ M. Rama,⁵⁹ G. Rizzo,⁵⁹ G. Simi,⁵⁹ J. Walsh,⁵⁹ M. Haire,⁶⁰ D. Judd,⁶⁰ K. Paick,⁶⁰ D. E. Wagoner,⁶⁰ J. Biesiada,⁶¹ N. Danielson,⁶¹ P. Elmer,⁶¹ Y. P. Lau,⁶¹ C. Lu,⁶¹ J. Olsen,⁶¹ A. J. S. Smith,⁶¹ A. V. Telnov,⁶¹ F. Bellini,⁶² G. Cavoto,⁶² A. D’Orazio,⁶² E. Di Marco,⁶² R. Faccini,⁶² F. Ferrarotto,⁶² F. Ferroni,⁶² M. Gaspero,⁶² L. Li Gioi,⁶² M. A. Mazzoni,⁶² S. Morganti,⁶² G. Piredda,⁶² F. Polci,⁶² F. Safai Tehrani,⁶² C. Voena,⁶² S. Christ,⁶³ H. Schröder,⁶³ G. Wagner,⁶³ R. Waldi,⁶³ T. Adye,⁶⁴ N. De Groot,⁶⁴ B. Franek,⁶⁴ G. P. Gopal,⁶⁴ E. O. Olaiya,⁶⁴ F. F. Wilson,⁶⁴ R. Aleksan,⁶⁵ S. Emery,⁶⁵ A. Gaidot,⁶⁵ S. F. Ganzhur,⁶⁵ P.-F. Giraud,⁶⁵ G. Graziani,⁶⁵ G. Hamel de Monchenault,⁶⁵ W. Kozanecki,⁶⁵ M. Legendre,⁶⁵ G. W. London,⁶⁵ B. Mayer,⁶⁵ G. Vasseur,⁶⁵ Ch. Yèche,⁶⁵ M. Zito,⁶⁵ M. V. Purohit,⁶⁶ A. W. Weidemann,⁶⁶ J. R. Wilson,⁶⁶ F. X. Yumiceva,⁶⁶ T. Abe,⁶⁷ M. T. Allen,⁶⁷ D. Aston,⁶⁷ R. Bartoldus,⁶⁷ N. Berger,⁶⁷ A. M. Boyarski,⁶⁷ O. L. Buchmueller,⁶⁷ R. Claus,⁶⁷ M. R. Convery,⁶⁷ M. Cristinziani,⁶⁷ J. C. Dingfelder,⁶⁷ D. Dong,⁶⁷ J. Dorfan,⁶⁷ D. Dujmic,⁶⁷ W. Dunwoodie,⁶⁷ S. Fan,⁶⁷ R. C. Field,⁶⁷ T. Glanzman,⁶⁷ S. J. Gowdy,⁶⁷ T. Hadig,⁶⁷ V. Halyo,⁶⁷ C. Hast,⁶⁷ T. Hryn’ova,⁶⁷ W. R. Innes,⁶⁷ S. Kazuhito,⁶⁷ M. H. Kelsey,⁶⁷ P. Kim,⁶⁷ M. L. Kocian,⁶⁷ D. W. G. S. Leith,⁶⁷ J. Libby,⁶⁷ S. Luitz,⁶⁷ V. Luth,⁶⁷ H. L. Lynch,⁶⁷ H. Marsiske,⁶⁷ R. Messner,⁶⁷ D. R. Muller,⁶⁷ C. P. O’Grady,⁶⁷ V. E. Ozcan,⁶⁷ A. Perazzo,⁶⁷ M. Perl,⁶⁷ B. N. Ratcliff,⁶⁷ A. Roodman,⁶⁷ A. A. Salnikov,⁶⁷ R. H. Schindler,⁶⁷ J. Schwiening,⁶⁷ A. Snyder,⁶⁷ A. Soha,⁶⁷ J. Stelzer,⁶⁷ J. Strube,^{54,67} D. Su,⁶⁷ M. K. Sullivan,⁶⁷ J. M. Thompson,⁶⁷ J. Va’vra,⁶⁷ S. R. Wagner,⁶⁷ M. Weaver,⁶⁷ W. J. Wisniewski,⁶⁷ M. Wittgen,⁶⁷ D. H. Wright,⁶⁷ A. K. Yarritu,⁶⁷ C. C. Young,⁶⁷ P. R. Burchat,⁶⁸ A. J. Edwards,⁶⁸ S. A. Majewski,⁶⁸ B. A. Petersen,⁶⁸ C. Roat,⁶⁸ M. Ahmed,⁶⁹ S. Ahmed,⁶⁹ M. S. Alam,⁶⁹ J. A. Ernst,⁶⁹ M. A. Saeed,⁶⁹ M. Saleem,⁶⁹ F. R. Wappler,⁶⁹ W. Bugg,⁷⁰ M. Krishnamurthy,⁷⁰ S. M. Spanier,⁷⁰ R. Eckmann,⁷¹ J. L. Ritchie,⁷¹ A. Satpathy,⁷¹ R. F. Schwitters,⁷¹ J. M. Izen,⁷² I. Kitayama,⁷² X. C. Lou,⁷² S. Ye,⁷² F. Bianchi,⁷³ M. Bona,⁷³ F. Gallo,⁷³ D. Gamba,⁷³ M. Bomben,⁷⁴ L. Bosisio,⁷⁴ C. Cartaro,⁷⁴ F. Cossutti,⁷⁴ G. Della Ricca,⁷⁴ S. Dittongo,⁷⁴ S. Grancagnolo,⁷⁴ L. Lanceri,⁷⁴ P. Poropat,^{74,†} L. Vitale,⁷⁴ G. Vuagnin,⁷⁴ F. Martinez-Vidal,⁷⁵ R. S. Panvini,^{76,†} Sw. Banerjee,⁷⁷ B. Bhuyan,⁷⁷ C. M. Brown,⁷⁷ D. Fortin,⁷⁷ K. Hamano,⁷⁷ R. Kowalewski,⁷⁷ J. M. Roney,⁷⁷ R. J. Sobie,⁷⁷ J. J. Back,⁷⁸ P. F. Harrison,⁷⁸ T. E. Latham,⁷⁸ G. B. Mohanty,⁷⁸ H. R. Band,⁷⁹ X. Chen,⁷⁹ B. Cheng,⁷⁹ S. Dasu,⁷⁹ M. Datta,⁷⁹ A. M. Eichenbaum,⁷⁹ K. T. Flood,⁷⁹ M. Graham,⁷⁹ J. J. Hollar,⁷⁹ J. R. Johnson,⁷⁹ P. E. Kutter,⁷⁹ H. Li,⁷⁹ R. Liu,⁷⁹ B. Mellado,⁷⁹ A. Mihalyi,⁷⁹ Y. Pan,⁷⁹ R. Prepost,⁷⁹ P. Tan,⁷⁹ J. H. von Wimmersperg-Toeller,⁷⁹ J. Wu,⁷⁹ S. L. Wu,⁷⁹ Z. Yu,⁷⁹ M. G. Greene,⁸⁰ and H. Neal⁸⁰

(BABAR Collaboration)

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

²IFAE, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, E-08193 Bellaterra, Barcelona, Spain

³Università di Bari, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-70126 Bari, Italy

⁴Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing 100039, China

⁵University of Bergen, Institute of Physics, N-5007 Bergen, Norway

⁶Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory and University of California, Berkeley, California 94720, USA

⁷University of Birmingham, Birmingham, B15 2TT, United Kingdom

⁸Ruhr Universität Bochum, Institut für Experimentalphysik I, D-44780 Bochum, Germany

⁹University of Bristol, Bristol BS8 1TL, United Kingdom

¹⁰University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada V6T 1Z1

¹¹Brunel University, Uxbridge, Middlesex UB8 3PH, United Kingdom

¹²Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics, Novosibirsk 630090, Russia

¹³University of California at Irvine, Irvine, California 92697, USA

¹⁴University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California 90024, USA

¹⁵University of California at Riverside, Riverside, California 92521, USA

¹⁶University of California at San Diego, La Jolla, California 92093, USA

¹⁷University of California at Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, California 93106, USA

¹⁸University of California at Santa Cruz, Institute for Particle Physics, Santa Cruz, California 95064, USA

¹⁹California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California 91125, USA

²⁰University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio 45221, USA

²¹University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80309, USA

²²Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado 80523, USA

- ²³Universität Dortmund, Institut für Physik, D-44221 Dortmund, Germany
- ²⁴Technische Universität Dresden, Institut für Kern- und Teilchenphysik, D-01062 Dresden, Germany
- ²⁵Ecole Polytechnique, LLR, F-91128 Palaiseau, France
- ²⁶University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH9 3JZ, United Kingdom
- ²⁷Università di Ferrara, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-44100 Ferrara, Italy
- ²⁸Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati dell'INFN, I-00044 Frascati, Italy
- ²⁹Università di Genova, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-16146 Genova, Italy
- ³⁰Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, USA
- ³¹Universität Heidelberg, Physikalisches Institut, Philosophenweg 12, D-69120 Heidelberg, Germany
- ³²Imperial College London, London SW7 2AZ, United Kingdom
- ³³University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa 52242, USA
- ³⁴Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011-3160, USA
- ³⁵Laboratoire de l'Accélérateur Linéaire, F-91898 Orsay, France
- ³⁶Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California 94550, USA
- ³⁷University of Liverpool, Liverpool L69 7ZE, United Kingdom
- ³⁸Queen Mary, University of London, London E1 4NS, United Kingdom
- ³⁹University of London, Royal Holloway and Bedford New College, Egham, Surrey TW20 0EX, United Kingdom
- ⁴⁰University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky 40292, USA
- 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
- ⁴⁶Università di Milano, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-20133 Milano, Italy
- ⁴⁷University of Mississippi, University, Mississippi 38677, USA
- ⁴⁸Université de Montréal, Laboratoire René J. A. Lévesque, Montréal, Québec, Canada H3C 3J7
- ⁴⁹Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Massachusetts 01075, USA
- ⁵⁰Università di Napoli Federico II, Dipartimento di Scienze Fisiche and INFN, 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
- ⁵³The Ohio 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 et de Hautes Energies, F-75252 Paris, France
- ⁵⁷University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104, USA
- ⁵⁸Università di Perugia, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-06100 Perugia, Italy
- ⁵⁹Università di Pisa, Dipartimento di Fisica, Scuola Normale Superiore and INFN, I-56127 Pisa, Italy
- ⁶⁰Prairie View A&M University, Prairie View, Texas 77446, USA
- ⁶¹Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey 08544, USA
- ⁶²Università di Roma La Sapienza, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-00185 Roma, Italy
- ⁶³Universität Rostock, D-18051 Rostock, Germany
- ⁶⁴Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Chilton, Didcot, Oxon, OX11 0QX, United Kingdom
- ⁶⁵DSM/Dapnia, CEA/Saclay, F-91191 Gif-sur-Yvette, France
- ⁶⁶University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina 29208, USA
- ⁶⁷Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, Stanford, California 94309, USA
- ⁶⁸Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305-4060, USA
- ⁶⁹State University of New York, Albany, New York 12222, USA
- 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
- ⁷³Università di Torino, Dipartimento di Fisica Sperimentale and INFN, I-10125 Torino, Italy
- ⁷⁴Università di Trieste, Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, I-34127 Trieste, Italy
- ⁷⁵IFIC, Universitat de Valencia-CSIC, E-46071 Valencia, Spain
- ⁷⁶Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee 37235, USA
- ⁷⁷University of Victoria, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada V8W 3P6
- ⁷⁸Department of Physics, University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL, United Kingdom
- ⁷⁹University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706, USA

* Also with Università della Basilicata, Potenza, Italy.

† Deceased.

⁸⁰*Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut 06511, USA*
(Received 27 June 2005; published 29 September 2005)

We report on a search for the rare decay $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*0}\gamma$, which in the standard model is dominated by W -exchange. The analysis is based on a data sample comprising 87.8×10^6 $B\bar{B}$ pairs collected with the *BABAR* detector at the PEP-II asymmetric-energy B Factory at SLAC. No significant signal is observed, and an upper limit on the branching fraction of 2.5×10^{-5} at the 90% confidence level is obtained.

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.72.051106](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.72.051106)

PACS numbers: 12.39.St, 13.20.He

Within the standard model (SM), the rare decay $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*0}\gamma$ [1] is dominated by the W -boson exchange process. One of the leading SM contributions to the decay is illustrated in Fig. 1. Similar W -exchange transitions are present in other decays. For example, they contribute to the decay $B^0 \rightarrow \rho^0\gamma$ along with the leading electromagnetic-penguin process [2]. The branching fraction $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*0}\gamma)$ is estimated to be of order 10^{-6} [2–4], but the presence of a large $q\bar{q}g$ (color octet) component in the wave function of the B meson may reduce the color-suppression enough to raise the branching fraction by a factor of about 10 [4]. A search for $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*0}\gamma$, published by the CLEO collaboration [5], resulted in a limit of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*0}\gamma) < 5.0 \times 10^{-5}$ at the 90% confidence level (C.L.).

We search for the decay $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*0}\gamma$ in data collected using the *BABAR* detector operating at the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center (SLAC) PEP-II asymmetric-energy e^+e^- collider. The collider runs with a center-of-mass (CM) energy of 10.58 GeV at the peak of the $Y(4S)$ resonance, which decays into B^+B^- and $B^0\bar{B}^0$ pairs. The analysis is based on 87.8×10^6 $B\bar{B}$ pairs, corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 79.9 fb^{-1} . The *BABAR* detector is described in detail in Ref. [6]; here we introduce briefly the detector systems important for the present analysis. Tracks of charged particles and their momenta are measured in a vertex tracker, consisting of five layers of double-sided silicon microstrip detectors, and a 40-layer drift chamber. Both systems are located within a 1.5-T solenoidal magnetic field and provide dE/dx measurements for particle identification (PID). A Cherenkov ring imaging detector adds measurements for PID by recording Cherenkov light emitted from charged particles traversing transparent quartz bars. Photons are identified by an elec-

tromagnetic calorimeter consisting of 6580 CsI(Tl) crystals.

Event samples from Monte Carlo (MC) simulations are used to optimize the event selection criteria and to estimate the signal efficiency and background. The detector response is simulated using GEANT4 [7]. The MC sample for the signal $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*0}\gamma$ contains 328 000 events. We use MC samples of similar size for several exclusive B -decay background modes. The color-suppressed hadronic decay $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*0}\pi^0$, with branching fraction $(2.7 \pm 0.5) \times 10^{-4}$ [8], is the largest contributor among them. Other backgrounds originate from $B\bar{B}$ modes with incompletely or incorrectly reconstructed particles, and from random combinations of particles from two different B mesons or from $q\bar{q}$ pairs. For these, we use MC samples of generic $B\bar{B}$ events and continuum $q\bar{q}$ ($q = u, d, s, c$) events corresponding to about 200 fb^{-1} and 110 fb^{-1} , respectively.

The D^{*0} candidates are reconstructed in six submodes, with $D^{*0} \rightarrow D^0(\pi^0, \gamma)$ and $D^0 \rightarrow (K^-\pi^+, K^-\pi^+\pi^0, K^-\pi^+\pi^+\pi^-)$. The event selection criteria are optimized by using the MC samples to maximize $S^2/(S+B)$, where S (B) is the number of signal (background) events. A signal branching fraction of 10^{-6} is assumed during the optimization. The most important selection requirements are described below.

The photon from the decay $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*0}\gamma$ is emitted with an energy of about 2.3 GeV in the CM frame (“hard photon”). Although this high energy leads to a relatively clear signal, care must be taken that remnants of π^0 decays are not mistaken as the signal photon. The “ π^0 veto” rejects a hard photon candidate if its combination with any other photon with laboratory energy larger than 30 MeV yields an invariant mass in the range $[110, 155] \text{ MeV}/c^2$. A similar veto for η decays rejects a photon candidate if its combination with any other photon of laboratory energy larger than 250 MeV yields an invariant mass within $[508, 588] \text{ MeV}/c^2$. Hard photon candidates must also pass a calorimeter shower-shape requirement designed to exclude irregularly shaped showers caused, for example, by overlapping photons from π^0 decay. Background is further suppressed by requiring a hard photon candidate to be isolated from all other showers and tracks by at least 50 cm in the calorimeter.

A photon candidate from the decay $D^{*0} \rightarrow D^0\gamma$ (“soft photon”) must satisfy the same shower-shape requirement




FIG. 1. W -exchange is the leading contribution to the $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*0}\gamma$ decay in the standard model. The photon may be emitted from any quark line or the W .

and η veto that are applied to hard photons. In the π^0 veto the minimum energy for the other photon is raised to 80 MeV and the invariant mass range is restricted to $[115, 150] \text{ MeV}/c^2$. In addition, the CM energy of the soft photon candidate has to be at least 110 MeV.

The mass of the π^0 in the decay $D^{*0} \rightarrow D^0\pi^0$ and of the π^0 in the decay $D^0 \rightarrow K^-\pi^+\pi^0$ is required to be within $11 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ of the true π^0 mass (which corresponds to a cut at about 1.7σ , where σ is the π^0 mass resolution). Photons from π^0 decay need a minimum energy of 30 MeV and have to pass a similar, but slightly less stringent, shower-shape requirement as the hard and soft photons.

The charged K and π tracks are required to originate from the interaction point and have to pass likelihood-based particle identification selections using dE/dx and Cherenkov light measurements. The K track in the $D^0 \rightarrow K^-\pi^+\pi^+\pi^-$ decay is in addition required to have a transverse momentum larger than $0.1 \text{ GeV}/c$ and at least 12 hits in the drift chamber. A vertex fit is applied to the D^0 candidates. They are required to have masses close to the known D^0 mass: within $12 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ ($\sim 1.8\sigma$) for $D^0 \rightarrow K^-\pi^+$, within $23 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ ($\sim 1.9\sigma$) for $D^0 \rightarrow K^-\pi^+\pi^0$, and within $12 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ ($\sim 2.3\sigma$) for $D^0 \rightarrow K^-\pi^+\pi^+\pi^-$. Additional selection requirements are applied to D^0 candidates decaying into $K^-\pi^+\pi^0$. The laboratory energy of the π^0 must be at least 250 MeV, and only $D^0 \rightarrow K^-\pi^+\pi^0$ candidates that appear in the Dalitz plot close to known resonances [9] are accepted. The difference between the D^{*0} and D^0 mass has to be within $2 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ ($\sim 2\sigma$) for $D^{*0} \rightarrow D^0\pi^0$ and within $9 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ ($\sim 1.8\sigma$) for $D^{*0} \rightarrow D^0\gamma$ of the known value of Ref. [8].

The D^{*0} helicity angle θ_H^* is defined in the D^{*0} CM frame as the angle between the direction of the D^0 and the direction opposite to the B momentum. For the $D^{*0} \rightarrow D^0\pi^0$ modes, $\cos\theta_H^*$ is distributed as $\sin^2\theta_H^*$ for signal, but as $\cos^2\theta_H^*$ for background from $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*0}\pi^0$. Optimization leads to the requirement $|\cos\theta_H^*| < 0.75$. No such condition is imposed for $D^{*0} \rightarrow D^0\gamma$ modes.

Several selection requirements reduce the number of fake decays from $q\bar{q}$ continuum background. The angle θ_B^* is defined as the angle between the B candidate momentum in the $Y(4S)$ CM frame and the beam axis. In $q\bar{q}$ background events the distribution is uniform in $\cos\theta_B^*$, while for real B mesons it follows a $\sin^2\theta_B^*$ distribution. We require that $|\cos\theta_B^*| < 0.8$. The angle θ_T^* is the angle between the thrust direction of the B candidate and the thrust direction computed from the other photons and tracks in the event. For signal events the distribution of $|\cos\theta_T^*|$ is flat, while for continuum events the distribution has a maximum at $|\cos\theta_T^*| = 1$ due to their jetlike nature. We require that $|\cos\theta_T^*| < 0.75$.

The candidates are subsequently characterized with two kinematic quantities, m_{ES} and ΔE . For the “energy-substituted mass” m_{ES} , the energy of the B candidate is substituted by precisely known beam parameters:

$$m_{ES} = \sqrt{(s/2 + c^2\mathbf{p}_0 \cdot \mathbf{p}_B)^2/E_0^2 - c^2\mathbf{p}_B^2}, \quad (1)$$

where s is the square of the total CM energy, E_0 and \mathbf{p}_0 are the energy and momentum of the initial $Y(4S)$ in the laboratory frame, and $\mathbf{p}_B = \mathbf{p}_{D^{*0}} + \mathbf{p}_\gamma$ is the momentum of the B candidate, also taken in the laboratory frame. The quantity ΔE is defined as the difference between the energy of the B candidate E^* and the beam energy, both taken in the CM system:

$$\Delta E = E^* - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{s}. \quad (2)$$

Requirements of $|\Delta E| < 0.34 \text{ GeV}$ and $5.2 < m_{ES} < 5.29 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ are applied at this point.

If an event contains more than one $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*0}\gamma$ candidate passing all selection criteria, the selection is made based on a χ^2 function that uses the measured D^0 mass and D^{*0} - D^0 mass difference, the measured resolutions, and known mass and mass-difference values from Ref. [8]. This selection is sufficient, as the ambiguity is never due to the presence of two hard photon candidates.

The distribution of m_{ES} versus ΔE is shown in Fig. 2 for the data taken at the $Y(4S)$ resonance. While the combinatorial $q\bar{q}$ background is smoothly distributed over this plane, the signal should peak around $\Delta E = 0$ and $m_{ES} = 5.28 \text{ GeV}/c^2$. The borders of the signal box are given by $5.275 < m_{ES} < 5.285 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ and $-0.1 < \Delta E < 0.08 \text{ GeV}$, extending to about 1.7 (1.9) times the resolution of m_{ES} (ΔE) of signal events. The ΔE constraint is asymmetric to account for the energy leakage from the calorimeter for the hard photon candidates. The area with m_{ES} ranging from $5.2 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ to $5.27 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ is called the “grand sideband.”

The contributions to the systematic uncertainties in the signal reconstruction efficiencies are listed in Table I. The overall relative uncertainties range from 16.5% to 19.8%, depending on the reconstruction mode (see Table II). The




FIG. 2. Distribution of data events in the ΔE - m_{ES} plane. The lines indicate the regions of the signal box and of the grand sideband.

TABLE I. Maximal and minimal relative systematic uncertainties in the efficiency for the individual reconstruction modes.

	Systematic uncertainty in % of the efficiency
γ and π^0 reconstruction	5.0 to 12.5
Hard γ separation	2.0
Shower shape	1.0 to 2.5
π^0 , η veto	1.5 to 3.0
Track finding efficiency	2.6 to 5.9
Kaon PID	3.0
D^0 mass	2.3 to 4.4
D^{*0} - D^0 mass difference	2.5 to 6.7
Dalitz structure	0.0 to 5.0
Helicity angle θ_H^*	0.0 to 3.8
Thrust angle θ_T^*	5.5 to 7.3
B^0 angle θ_B^*	3.0 to 3.8
ΔE	8.6 to 12.0
m_{ES}	2.3 to 4.0
Simulation statistics	2.0 to 4.7
Sum	16.5 to 19.8

major contributors are described here in more detail. The uncertainties in the photon reconstruction due to efficiency, energy scale, and energy resolution uncertainties are studied with control samples and result in an uncertainty of 2.5% per photon (5% per π^0). Studies of the track finding efficiency using control samples result in uncertainties of 2.6% to 5.9% depending on the mode. The size of the uncertainty in the ΔE and m_{ES} selection is obtained by varying the selection according to observed differences between data and MC simulation. For the thrust angle θ_T^* , the B^0 angle θ_B^* , and the helicity angle θ_H^* , the size of the uncertainties is obtained by shifting the selection requirement by ± 0.05 in the cosine of each angle. The uncertainty due to possible discrepancies between data and MC simulation in the D^0 mass and the D^{*0} - D^0 mass difference is estimated by comparing these distributions for events in

the grand sideband. Data and Monte Carlo simulation agree sufficiently well, and the size of the systematic uncertainty in the efficiency is obtained from the uncertainty on the fits to the mass and mass-difference plots.

Several correction factors are applied to the signal efficiency based on comparison studies on data and Monte Carlo simulations: a tracking efficiency factor of 0.992 for the kaon in the decay $D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+ \pi^+ \pi^-$, a factor 0.95 for the decay $D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+ \pi^0$ due to the selection requirement involving the Dalitz structure, and factors from 0.89 to 0.95 depending on the reconstructed mode due to photon reconstruction. The overall selection efficiencies for the six signal modes are listed in Table II. The uncertainties on the efficiencies include all contributions from systematic effects on the efficiencies. The combined efficiency (weighted by the branching fractions of the individual modes and taking correlations in the uncertainties between the six submodes into account) is $(1.8 \pm 0.3)\%$. In the determination of the $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*0} \gamma$ branching fraction results, a 1.1% uncertainty on the number of $B\bar{B}$ pairs in the data sample is included as well as the contribution by the D^0 (D^{*0}) branching fraction uncertainties [8].

The number of events expected in the signal box due to background is not estimated from data, but from MC simulation, since the ΔE - m_{ES} distributions of several categories of $B\bar{B}$ background peak inside the signal box. After counting the MC events and scaling the number to 79.9 fb^{-1} , a total of 9.4 ± 1.7 background events is expected for all six modes combined. Of those, 2.9 events originate from $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*0} \pi^0$, 5.1 events from other $B\bar{B}$ decays, and 1.4 events from $q\bar{q}$ events. The breakdown for each channel is given in Table II.

The estimate of the number of background events is cross-checked by two studies, one based on events in the grand sideband, and the other based on events in the signal box using a control sample of $D^{*0} \pi^0$ events. The first study results in ratios of data-to-MC events ranging from 1.0 ± 0.3 to 1.5 ± 0.2 for the various D^{*0} decay modes, and a ratio of 1.2 ± 0.1 for all modes combined. Taking the

TABLE II. Results for individual modes and all modes combined. The upper limit is given for 90% C.L.

Mode	Branching fraction of mode [8] (in %)	Relative systematic uncertainty (in %)	Signal efficiency (in %)	Expected background (events)	Range of data-to-MC ratios	Observed in signal box (events)	Branching fraction upper limit ($\times 10^{-5}$)
$D^{*0} \rightarrow D^0 \pi^0$							
$D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$	2.3	16.5	4.2 ± 0.7	1.5 ± 0.7	0.0 to 1.6	1	3.4
$D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+ \pi^0$	7.9	19.8	1.2 ± 0.2	2.0 ± 0.8	0.0 to 1.3	1	3.5
$D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+ \pi^+ \pi^-$	4.6	17.3	2.0 ± 0.3	0.7 ± 0.1	0.5 to 2.0	1	3.9
$D^{*0} \rightarrow D^0 \gamma$							
$D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$	1.4	17.3	3.8 ± 0.7	1.6 ± 0.4	0.4 to 1.6	2	8.0
$D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+ \pi^0$	4.9	19.6	0.9 ± 0.2	2.4 ± 1.2	0.1 to 1.2	3	14.8
$D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+ \pi^+ \pi^-$	2.8	17.7	1.7 ± 0.3	1.2 ± 0.2	0.2 to 1.7	5	20.3
All modes combined	23.9	16.8	1.8 ± 0.3	9.4 ± 1.7	0.4 to 1.3	13	2.5


SEARCH FOR THE RARE DECAY $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*0}\gamma$ 

FIG. 3. ΔE (left) and m_{ES} (right) distributions for data (points) and MC simulation (shaded histograms). All selection requirements are applied including the m_{ES} signal box requirement for the left plot and the ΔE signal box requirement for the right plot.

uncertainties into account, data and MC simulation do not disagree significantly. For the second study, $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*0}\pi^0$ events are selected by loosening some selection requirements and by inverting the π^0 veto: we now keep events in which a photon combined with the hard photon forms a reasonable π^0 candidate. The number of events seen in the signal box is usually found to be lower in data than in MC simulation with data-to-MC ratios from 0.3 ± 0.3 to 1.2 ± 0.7 for the various D^{*0} decay modes and 0.6 ± 0.2 for all modes combined.

We observe 13 events in the signal box. Figure 3 presents the ΔE and m_{ES} distributions with all selection requirements applied. The Monte Carlo simulation is shown with separate contributions from $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*0}\pi^0$, other $B\bar{B}$, and $q\bar{q}$ events.

The branching fractions are determined in a frequentist-model approach, modified based on Ref. [10]. Besides taking the systematic uncertainty in the efficiency and the statistical uncertainty in the background estimate into account, the background expectation value is also shifted by a factor selected from a flat distribution of the range determined by the data-to-Monte Carlo ratios (see Table II). When combining all six modes, this shift comes from the range 0.4 to 1.3 (derived from 0.6 ± 0.2 and 1.2 ± 0.1) and is applied coherently for each of the modes.




FIG. 4. $1 - \text{confidence level}$ versus the assumed branching fraction. The shaded areas are the 68% and 95% probability regions. The 90% C.L. is marked with an arrow.

We assume that 50% of the $Y(4S)$ mesons decay into neutral $B\bar{B}$ pairs. Figure 4 displays $1 - \text{C.L.}$ versus the assumed branching fraction. The significance of this measurement, i.e., $1 - \text{C.L.}$ at branching fraction zero, is 0.86. The central value of the branching fraction of $\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*0}\gamma$ is $(1.0^{+1.1}_{-0.9}) \times 10^{-5}$, which is consistent with zero. The upper limit on the branching fraction is $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \rightarrow D^{*0}\gamma) < 2.5 \times 10^{-5}$ at 90% confidence level and is in agreement with the theoretical expectations.

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 CONACyT (Mexico), A. P. Sloan Foundation, Research Corporation, and Alexander von Humboldt Foundation.

[1] Charge-conjugates are implied throughout this paper.
 [2] H. Y. Cheng, Phys. Rev. D **51**, 6228 (1995).
 [3] H. Y. Cheng *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **51**, 1199 (1995).
 [4] R. R. Mendel and P. Sitarski, Phys. Rev. D **36**, 953 (1987); **38**, 1632(E) (1988).
 [5] M. Artuso *et al.* (CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 4292 (2000).
 [6] B. Aubert *et al.* (*BABAR* Collaboration), Nucl. Instrum.

Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A **479**, 1 (2002).
 [7] S. Agostinelli *et al.* (GEANT4 Collaboration), Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A **506**, 250 (2003).
 [8] S. Eidelman *et al.* (Particle Data Group), Phys. Lett. B **592**, 1 (2004).
 [9] P. L. Frabetti *et al.* (E687 Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **331**, 217 (1994).
 [10] R. Barlow, Comput. Phys. Commun. **149**, 97 (2002).