

Study of $J/\psi\pi^+\pi^-$ states produced in $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi\pi^+\pi^-K^0$ and $B^- \rightarrow J/\psi\pi^+\pi^-K^-$

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 M. Battaglia,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. Kolomensky,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 T. Cuhadar-Donszelmann,¹⁰ B. G. Fulsom,¹⁰ C. Hearty,¹⁰
 N. S. Knecht,¹⁰ T. S. Mattison,¹⁰ J. A. McKenna,¹⁰ A. Khan,¹¹ P. Kyberd,¹¹ M. Saleem,¹¹ L. Teodorescu,¹¹
 A. E. Blinov,¹² V. E. Blinov,¹² A. D. Bukin,¹² V. P. Druzhinin,¹² V. B. Golubev,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 S. Curry,¹³ I. Eschrich,¹³ D. Kirkby,¹³ A. J. Lankford,¹³ P. Lund,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 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 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 J. F. Hirschauer,²¹ A. Kreisel,²¹ U. Nauenberg,²¹ A. Olivas,²¹ P. Rankin,²¹
 W. O. Ruddick,²¹ J. G. Smith,²¹ K. A. Ulmer,²¹ S. R. Wagner,²¹ J. Zhang,²¹ A. Chen,²² E. A. Eckhart,²²
 A. Soffer,²² W. H. Toki,²² R. J. Wilson,²² F. Winklmeier,²² Q. Zeng,²² D. Altenburg,²³ E. Feltresi,²³ A. Hauke,²³
 B. Spaan,²³ T. Brandt,²⁴ J. Brose,²⁴ M. Dickopp,²⁴ V. Klose,²⁴ H. M. Lacker,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. Negrini,²⁷ L. Piemontese,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 G. Brandenburg,³⁰ K. S. Chaisanguanthum,³⁰ M. Morii,³⁰
 E. Won,³⁰ J. Wu,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 R. L. Flack,³² J. R. Gaillard,³² G. W. Morton,³² J. A. Nash,³²
 M. B. Nikolich,³² G. P. Taylor,³² W. P. Vazquez,³² M. J. Charles,³³ W. F. Mader,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 A. Oyanguren,³⁵ T. C. Petersen,³⁵ M. Pierini,³⁵ S. Plaszczyński,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 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 K. C. Schofield,³⁷ C. Touramanis,³⁷ C. M. Cormack,³⁸
 F. Di Lodovico,³⁸ W. Menges,³⁸ R. Sacco,³⁸ C. L. Brown,³⁹ G. Cowan,³⁹ H. U. Flaecher,³⁹ M. G. Green,³⁹
 D. A. Hopkins,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 C. L. Edgar,⁴¹ M. C. Hodgkinson,⁴¹ M. P. Kelly,⁴¹ G. D. Lafferty,⁴¹

Submitted to *Physical Review Letters*

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

M. T. Naisbit,⁴¹ J. C. Williams,⁴¹ C. Chen,⁴² W. D. Hulsbergen,⁴² A. Jawahery,⁴² D. Kovalskyi,⁴² C. K. Lae,⁴² D. A. Roberts,⁴² G. Simi,⁴² G. Blaylock,⁴³ C. Dallapiccola,⁴³ S. S. Hertzbach,⁴³ R. Kofler,⁴³ V. B. Koptchev,⁴³ X. Li,⁴³ T. B. Moore,⁴³ S. Saremi,⁴³ H. Staengle,⁴³ S. Willocq,⁴³ R. Cowan,⁴⁴ K. Koenke,⁴⁴ G. Sciolla,⁴⁴ S. J. Sekula,⁴⁴ M. Spitznagel,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 J. Strube,⁵⁴ E. Torrence,⁵⁴ 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 S. Pacetti,⁵⁸ M. Pioppi,⁵⁸ C. Angelini,⁵⁹ G. Batignani,⁵⁹ S. Bettarini,⁵⁹ F. Bucci,⁵⁹ G. Calderini,⁵⁹ M. Carpinelli,⁵⁹ R. Cenci,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 J. Walsh,⁵⁹ M. Haire,⁶⁰ D. Judd,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 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 N. van Bakel,⁶⁷ R. Bartoldus,⁶⁷ N. Berger,⁶⁷ A. M. Boyarski,⁶⁷ O. L. Buchmueller,⁶⁷ R. Claus,⁶⁷ J. P. Coleman,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 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 J. Stelzer,⁶⁷ D. Su,⁶⁷ M. K. Sullivan,⁶⁷ K. Suzuki,⁶⁷ S. Swain,⁶⁷ J. M. Thompson,⁶⁷ J. Va'vra,⁶⁷ M. Weaver,⁶⁷ W. J. Wisniewski,⁶⁷ M. Wittgen,⁶⁷ D. H. Wright,⁶⁷ A. K. Yarritu,⁶⁷ K. Yi,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 F. R. Wappler,⁶⁹ S. B. Zain,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 G. Williams,⁷² S. Ye,⁷² F. Bianchi,⁷³ M. Bona,⁷³ F. Gallo,⁷³ D. Gamba,⁷³ M. Bomben,⁷⁴ L. Bosio,⁷⁴ C. Cartaro,⁷⁴ F. Cossutti,⁷⁴ G. Della Ricca,⁷⁴ S. Dittongo,⁷⁴ S. Grancagnolo,⁷⁴ L. Lanceri,⁷⁴ L. Vitale,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. Mihalys,⁷⁹ Y. Pan,⁷⁹ R. Prepost,⁷⁹ P. Tan,⁷⁹ J. H. von Wimmersperg-Toeller,⁷⁹ S. L. Wu,⁷⁹ Z. Yu,⁷⁹ and H. Neal⁸⁰

(The 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, Inst. 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 1, 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, 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, Quebec, 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, Quebec, 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
- 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 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, Italy⁷⁵IFIC, Universitat de Valencia-CSIC, E-46071 Valencia, Spain⁷⁶Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee 37235, USA⁷⁷University of Victoria, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada V8W 3P6⁷⁸Department of Physics, University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL, United Kingdom⁷⁹University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706, USA⁸⁰Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut 06511, USA

(Dated: July 21, 2005)

We present results of a search for the $X(3872)$ in $B^0 \rightarrow X(3872)K_S^0$, $X(3872) \rightarrow J/\psi\pi^+\pi^-$, improved measurements of $B^- \rightarrow X(3872)K^-$, and a study of the $J/\psi\pi^+\pi^-$ mass region above the $X(3872)$. We use 232 million $B\bar{B}$ pairs collected at the $\Upsilon(4S)$ resonance with the BABAR detector at the PEP-II e^+e^- asymmetric-energy storage rings. The results include the 90% confidence interval $1.34 \times 10^{-6} < \mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow X(3872)K^0, X \rightarrow J/\psi\pi^+\pi^-) < 10.3 \times 10^{-6}$ and the branching fraction $\mathcal{B}(B^- \rightarrow X(3872)K^-, X \rightarrow J/\psi\pi^+\pi^-) = (10.1 \pm 2.5 \pm 1.0) \times 10^{-6}$. We observe a $(2.7 \pm 1.3 \pm 0.2)$ MeV/ c^2 mass difference of the $X(3872)$ produced in the two decay modes. Furthermore, we find an excess of $J/\psi\pi^+\pi^-$ events with an invariant mass just above 4.2 GeV/ c^2 that is consistent with recent observations in initial state radiation events.

PACS numbers: 13.25.Hw, 14.40.Gx, 12.39.Mk

The $X(3872)$ was first observed in the charged B -meson decay [1] $B^- \rightarrow X(3872)K^-$, $X(3872) \rightarrow J/\psi\pi^+\pi^-$ by the Belle Collaboration [2]. It has been confirmed by the BABAR Collaboration [3] and observed inclusively in the same final state by the CDF and D0 collaborations [4]. This narrow-width particle has a mass very near the $D^0\bar{D}^{*0}$ threshold and decays into final states containing charmonium (J/ψ). The most plausible interpretation [5] was a 1^3D_2 or 1^1D_2 $c\bar{c}$ state which would be narrow since it would be forbidden to decay into open charm $D\bar{D}$ states. However, these candidates should have large radiative transitions into χ_c states that have not been observed [2]. Recent studies from Belle that combine angular and kinematic properties of the $\pi^+\pi^-$ mass, strongly favor a $J^{PC} = 1^{++}$ state [7]. Other explanations include 2^1P_1 $c\bar{c}$ (1^{+-}) or 2^3P_1 1^{++} states that should be narrow, but are predicted to be about 100 MeV/ c^2 higher than the $X(3872)$ mass and are not expected to have a large decay rate into $J/\psi\pi\pi$ final states [6]. Hence, the $X(3872)$ appears not to be a simple quark model $q\bar{q}$ meson state.

Many explanations have been proposed for the nature of the $X(3872)$. Recent interpretations include the diquark-antidiquark model [8] and the S-wave $D^0\bar{D}^{*0}$ molecule model [9]. The diquark-antidiquark model predicts a spectrum of $J = 0, 1, 2$ particles and identifies the $X(3872)$ as its 1^{++} member state with the two quark combinations $X_u = [cu][\bar{c}\bar{u}]$ and $X_d = [cd][\bar{c}\bar{d}]$ with a mass difference $m(X_d) - m(X_u) \approx (7 \pm 2)$ MeV/ c^2 . In addition, these two states could form mixed states that are produced in both charged and neutral B -meson decays with different masses and rates depending on the mixing angle. A search for the predicted charged partner of the $X(3872)$ has been addressed in a previous analysis with an upper limit that is still consistent with the model [10]. The $D^0\bar{D}^{*0}$ molecule model interprets the $X(3872)$ as a loosely bound $D^0\bar{D}^{*0}$ S-wave state that is

produced in weak decays of the B -meson into $D^0\bar{D}^{*0}K$. In this picture, the S-wave molecule must form a $J^P = 1^+$ state. From factorization, heavy-quark symmetry, and isospin symmetry, the decay $B^0 \rightarrow X(3872)K^0$ is predicted to be suppressed by an order of magnitude relative to $B^- \rightarrow X(3872)K^-$ [9]. To investigate these predictions, we present in this letter a study of the neutral mode $B^0 \rightarrow X(3872)K^0$, $X(3872) \rightarrow J/\psi\pi^+\pi^-$ and we analyze $B^- \rightarrow J/\psi\pi^+\pi^-K^-$ decays with increased statistics to obtain improved measurements of $X(3872) \rightarrow J/\psi\pi^+\pi^-$. In addition, we examine the higher $J/\psi\pi^+\pi^-$ invariant mass region to search for a structure recently observed in initial state radiation (ISR) events [11].

The data were collected with the BABAR detector at the PEP-II asymmetric-energy e^+e^- storage rings on the $\Upsilon(4S)$ resonance. The integrated luminosity of the data used in this analysis is 211 fb $^{-1}$; this corresponds to the production of $(232 \pm 3) \times 10^6$ $B\bar{B}$ pairs.

The BABAR detector is described in detail elsewhere [12]. Charged-particle trajectories are measured by a combination of a five-layer silicon vertex tracker (SVT) and a 40-layer drift chamber (DCH) in a 1.5-T solenoidal magnetic field. For charged-particle identification, we combine information from a ring-imaging Cherenkov detector (DIRC) and energy-loss measurements provided by the SVT and the DCH. Photons and electrons are detected in a CsI(Tl) electromagnetic calorimeter (EMC). Penetrating muons are identified by resistive-plate chambers in the instrumented magnetic flux return (IFR).

Charged pion candidates are required to be detected in at least 12 DCH layers and have a transverse momentum greater than 100 MeV/ c . Kaons, electrons, and muons are separated from pions based on information from the IFR and DIRC, energy loss in the SVT and DCH (dE/dx), or the ratio of the candidate EMC energy deposition to its momentum (E/p). Photon candidates are identified

with clusters in the EMC with total energy > 30 MeV and a shower shape consistent with that expected from a photon.

The $B^0 \rightarrow J/\psi \pi^+ \pi^- K_s^0$ and $B^- \rightarrow J/\psi \pi^+ \pi^- K^-$ decays are reconstructed in the following way. Electron candidates and bremsstrahlung photons satisfying $2.95 < m(e^+ e^- (\gamma)) < 3.14$ GeV/ c^2 are used to form $J/\psi \rightarrow e^+ e^-$ candidates. A pair of muon candidates within the mass interval $3.06 < m(\mu^+ \mu^-) < 3.14$ GeV/ c^2 is required for a $J/\psi \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ candidate. A mass constraint to the nominal J/ψ mass [13] is imposed in the fit of the lepton pairs. We reconstruct $K_s^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-$ candidates from pairs of oppositely charged tracks forming a vertex with a χ^2 probability larger than 0.1%, a flight-length significance $l/\sigma(l) > 3$ and an invariant mass within 15 MeV/ c^2 of the nominal K_s^0 mass [13]. $X(3872)$ candidates are formed by combining J/ψ candidates with two oppositely charged pion candidates fitted to a common vertex. Finally, we form $B^0(B^-)$ candidates by combining $X(3872)$ candidates with $K_s^0(K^-)$ candidates. To suppress continuum background, we select only events with a ratio of the second to the zeroth Fox-Wolfram moment [14] less than 0.5.

We use two kinematic variables to identify signal events from B decays: the difference between the energy of the B candidate and the beam energy, $\Delta E \equiv E_B^* - \sqrt{s}/2$, and the energy-substituted mass $m_{ES} \equiv \sqrt{(s/2 + \mathbf{p}_i \cdot \mathbf{p}_B)^2/E_i^2 - \mathbf{p}_B^2}$. Here $(E_i, \mathbf{p}_i)$ is the four-vector (in the laboratory frame) and $\sqrt{s}$ is the center-of-mass (CM) energy of the $e^+ e^-$ system. E_B^* is the energy of the B candidate in the CM system and $\mathbf{p}_B$ the momentum in the laboratory frame. The signature of signal events is $\Delta E \approx 0$, and $m_{ES} \approx m_B$ where m_B is the mass of the B -meson [13].

We optimize the signal selection criteria by maximizing the ratio $n_s^{mc}/(3/2 + \sqrt{n_b^{mc}})$ [15] where n_s^{mc} (n_b^{mc}) are the number of reconstructed MC signal (background) events. The optimization was performed by varying the selection criteria on ΔE , m_{ES} , the candidate masses of the $X(3872)$ and K_s^0 , and the particle identification (PID) requirements of leptons, pions, and charged kaons. The criteria $|\Delta E| < 15$ MeV, $|m_{ES} - m_B| < 6$ MeV/ c^2 and $|m(J/\psi \pi^+ \pi^-) - 3872 \text{ MeV}/c^2| < 6$ MeV/ c^2 (signal region) were found to be optimal for selecting signal events. In case of multiple candidates in an event, we select the candidate with the smallest value of $|\Delta E|$. Applying our optimized selection criteria, we compute the $J/\psi \pi^+ \pi^-$ invariant mass in the range $3.8 - 3.95$ GeV/ c^2 shown in Figs. 1(a) and 1(b) for the B^- and B^0 mode, respectively. The shaded area shows events in the sideband region $|m_{ES} - 5260| < 6$ MeV/ c^2 .

We extract the number of signal events with an extended unbinned maximum-likelihood fit to the two-dimensional distribution $y(m_{ES}, m_X)$ where m_X is the $J/\psi \pi^+ \pi^-$ invariant mass. The probability density function (PDF) (normalized to the total number of events)

is $\mathcal{P}(y) = \sum_t n_t \mathcal{P}_t(y)$ where n_t is the number of events of category t . We consider three different event categories: signal, B decays with the same final-state particles as the signal and that accumulate near $m_{ES} \approx m_B$ (peaking background), and combinatorial background. The individual PDFs $\mathcal{P}_t$ are assumed to be uncorrelated in m_{ES} and m_X and can therefore be factorized as $\mathcal{P}_t(y) = g_t(m_{ES})h_t(m_X)$, where g_t and h_t represent the m_{ES} and m_X probability distributions, respectively. The $B \rightarrow X(3872)K$ signal events are modeled by a Gaussian distribution in m_{ES} . The resolution function in m_X for those events is best described by a Cauchy function [16]. The PDF for peaking background events is parameterized by a Gaussian distribution in m_{ES} and a linear function in m_X . We model combinatorial background events by an ARGUS function [17] in m_{ES} and a linear function in m_X . The fit performance was validated with MC experiments. The mean and width of the m_{ES} Gaussian distribution for signal and peaking background and the width of the m_X Cauchy distribution for the B^0 mode were fixed to values obtained from MC samples. Other parameters are allowed to vary in the fit.

The fit is performed in the region $5.2 < m_{ES} < 5.3$ GeV/ c^2 and $3.80 < m_X < 3.95$ GeV/ c^2 without applying the optimized selection criteria on those two variables. The signal region projections of the two-dimensional fit are shown in Fig. 1 for the B^- (a,c) and B^0 (b,d) modes. We obtain 61.2 ± 15.3 signal events for the B^- mode (n_s^-) and 8.3 ± 4.5 signal events for the B^0 mode (n_s^0), respectively.

The efficiency is determined from MC samples with an $X(3872)$ signal of zero width at 3.872 GeV/ c^2 . The decay model consists of the sequential isotropic decays $B \rightarrow X(3872)K$, $X(3872) \rightarrow J/\psi \rho^0$, and $\rho^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-$. Compared to a three-body decay, this gives a more accurate description of the observed $\pi^+ \pi^-$ invariant mass distribution [3]. Efficiencies are corrected for the small differences in PID and tracking efficiencies that are found by comparing data and MC control samples. The final efficiencies are $(17.4 \pm 0.2)\%$ for the B^0/K_s^0 mode and $(22.2 \pm 0.2)\%$ for the B^-/K^- mode.

The branching fraction systematic errors (B^- , B^0 mode in %) include uncertainties in the number of $B\bar{B}$ events (1.1, 1.1), secondary branching fractions (5.0, 5.0) [13], efficiency calculation due to limited MC statistics (0.7, 1.9), MC decay model of the $X(3872)$ (1.0, 1.6), differences between data and MC (1.8, 8.9), PID (5.0, 5.0), charged particle tracking (6.0, 4.8), and K_s^0 reconstruction (-, 1.6). The production ratio of B^0 and B^- mesons in $\Upsilon(4S)$ decays is 1.006 ± 0.048 [18]. The total fractional error obtained by adding the uncertainties in quadrature is 9.6% and 12.8% for the B^- and B^0 mode, respectively.

Assuming Gaussian systematic errors, the negative log-likelihood (NLL) function including systematic errors is $L_{sys} = ([1/L(n)] + 2\sigma_{sys}^2/(n - n_S)^2)^{-1}$ where




FIG. 1: Signal region projections of $m(J/\psi \pi^+ \pi^-)$ and m_{ES} for $B^- \rightarrow X(3872)K^-$ (a,c) and $B^0 \rightarrow X(3872)K_s^0$ (b,d). The dashed line represents the combinatorial background PDF, the dotted line represents the sum of the combinatorial and peaking background PDF, and the solid line the sum of all background plus the signal PDF. The shaded area shows events in the m_{ES} sideband region $|m_{ES} - 5260 \text{ MeV}/c^2| < 6 \text{ MeV}/c^2$.

$L(n) = -\ln(\mathcal{L}(n)/\mathcal{L}_{max})$ is the NLL projection of the parameter estimate n of the number of signal events and σ_{sys} is the systematic error on the number of signal events. The significance including systematic errors obtained from $\sqrt{2L_{sys}(n=0)}$ is 2.5σ for the B^0 mode and 6.1σ for the B^- mode.

Using n_s^0 and n_s^- , the efficiencies, the secondary branching fractions and the number of $B\bar{B}$ events, we obtain the branching fractions $\mathcal{B}^0 \equiv \mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow X(3872)K^0, X \rightarrow J/\psi \pi^+ \pi^-) = (5.1 \pm 2.8 \pm 0.7) \times 10^{-6}$ and $\mathcal{B}^- \equiv \mathcal{B}(B^- \rightarrow X(3872)K^-, X \rightarrow J/\psi \pi^+ \pi^-) = (10.1 \pm 2.5 \pm 1.0) \times 10^{-6}$. For the ratio of branching fractions, $R \equiv \mathcal{B}^0/\mathcal{B}^-$, where most of the systematic errors cancel, we obtain $R = 0.50 \pm 0.30 \pm 0.05$. We calculate a 90% confidence level (C.L.) likelihood interval [19] $[n_l, n_h]$ for the number of signal events in the B^0 mode by solving the equation $2L_{sys}(n_{l,h}) = [\text{erf}^{-1}(0.95)]^2$. With $n_l = 2.2$ and $n_h = 16.9$ the 90% C.L. interval on $\mathcal{B}^0$ is $1.34 \times 10^{-6} < \mathcal{B}^0 < 10.3 \times 10^{-6}$. Using the same strategy, the confidence interval on the ratio of branching fractions becomes $0.13 < R < 1.10$ at 90% C.L.

We measure the mass of the $X(3872)$ in both modes in reference to the precisely measured $\psi(2S)$ mass [13]. We fit the $J/\psi \pi^+ \pi^-$ invariant mass in the $\psi(2S)$ and $X(3872)$ region and calculate $m_X = m_{X,\text{fit}} - m_{\psi(2S),\text{fit}} + m_{\psi(2S)}$. The result for the B^0 mode is $(3868.6 \pm 1.2 \pm$

$0.2) \text{ MeV}/c^2$ and $(3871.3 \pm 0.6 \pm 0.1) \text{ MeV}/c^2$ for the B^- mode, where the first error is the statistical uncertainty on $m_{X,\text{fit}}$ and the second is the uncertainty on $m_{\psi(2S),\text{fit}}$ and $m_{\psi(2S)}$ [13]. The mass difference of the $X(3872)$ produced in B^0 and B^- decays is $\Delta m = (2.7 \pm 1.3 \pm 0.2) \text{ MeV}/c^2$. The full width at half maximum of the X -mass distribution from the fit on data is $(6.7 \pm 2.7) \text{ MeV}/c^2$, which is consistent with the MC-determined value of $(5.4 \pm 0.1) \text{ MeV}/c^2$. From this we calculate the 90% C.L. upper limit on the natural width as $\Gamma < 4.1 \text{ MeV}/c^2$.

Recent observations by *BABAR* [11] in ISR events provide evidence for at least one broad resonance in the invariant mass spectrum of $J/\psi \pi^+ \pi^-$ at $4.259 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ that can be characterized by a single resonance with a full width of $88 \text{ MeV}/c^2$. This structure is referred to as $Y(4260)$. We search in B^- decays for states decaying into $J/\psi \pi^+ \pi^-$ above $4 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ and impose the additional selection criterion $|m(K^- \pi^+ \pi^-) - 1273 \text{ MeV}/c^2| > 250 \text{ MeV}/c^2$, which removes backgrounds from $K_1(1270)$ decays. In the resulting mass distribution, Fig. 2, we observe large combinatoric backgrounds and cannot reliably determine the parameters of one or more resonances. We use a two-dimensional PDF identical to the previous model, but fix the central value and width of the signal component to the ISR results [11]. The natural width of $88 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ has been enlarged by the detector resolution, which is found to be the same as for the mass region around $3.87 \text{ GeV}/c^2$. The m_X projection of the two-dimensional fit is overlaid in Fig. 2 and yields 128 ± 42 signal events. The statistical significance calculated from $\sqrt{-2 \ln \mathcal{L}_0/\mathcal{L}}$ is 3.1σ where $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{L}_0$ are the maximum likelihood of the fit and the null hypothesis fit, respectively. Using a phase-space MC simulation of a state at $4.26 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ decaying into $J/\psi \pi^+ \pi^-$ and assuming the same systematic uncertainties and efficiency corrections as for the $X(3872)$, we obtain a branching fraction of $\mathcal{B}_Y = \mathcal{B}(B^- \rightarrow Y(4260)K^-, Y(4260) \rightarrow J/\psi \pi^+ \pi^-) = (2.0 \pm 0.7 \pm 0.2) \times 10^{-5}$. The 90% C.L. likelihood interval on this branching ratio is $1.2 \times 10^{-5} < \mathcal{B}_Y < 2.9 \times 10^{-5}$ which also corresponds to a 95% C.L. upper limit of 2.9×10^{-5} .

In conclusion, our studies of the neutral mode in the mass region below $4 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ yield a signal of 2.5σ significance and a ratio of branching fractions of $R = 0.50 \pm 0.30 \pm 0.05$. Since one narrow state is observed in the mode $B^- \rightarrow X(3872)K^-$, $X \rightarrow J/\psi \pi^+ \pi^-$, the diquark-antidiquark model [8] predicts one amplitude (from X_d or X_u) to be dominant in the charged mode and the other amplitude to be dominant in the neutral mode. In this case, the model predicts the relative rates to be equal ($R = 1$) and the mass difference to be $(7 \pm 2) \text{ MeV}/c^2$. The ratio of branching fractions is consistent with our measurement, $0.13 < R < 1.10$ at 90% C.L., and the observed mass difference of $(2.7 \pm 1.3 \pm 0.2) \text{ MeV}/c^2$ is both consistent with zero and the model prediction within two




FIG. 2: Projection of the two-dimensional fit for the mass region above $4 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ for events within the m_{ES} signal region in $B^- \rightarrow J/\psi \pi^+ \pi^- K^-$. The lines represent the same event types as in Fig. 1.

standard deviations. In the S-wave molecule model [9], the neutral mode branching fraction is predicted to be at least 10 times smaller ($R < 0.1$) than the charged mode. However, we obtain a ratio of neutral to charged branching fractions which is slightly more consistent with isospin-conserving decays.

Finally, we observe an excess of events above background in the $J/\psi \pi^+ \pi^-$ invariant mass between 4.2 and $4.4 \text{ GeV}/c^2$ at a 3.1σ significance level. These events are consistent with the broad structure observed in ISR events [11].

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.

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

† Also with Università della Basilicata, Potenza, Italy

‡ Deceased

- [1] Charge conjugate reactions are included implicitly throughout.
- [2] Belle Collaboration, S. K. Choi *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 262001 (2003).
- [3] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D71**, 071103 (2005).
- [4] CDF Collaboration, D. Acosta *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 072001 (2004). D0 Collaboration, V. M. Abazov *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 162002 (2004).
- [5] E. J. Eichten, K. Lane, and C. Quigg, Phys. Rev. **D69**, 094019 (2004);
- [6] T. Barnes and S. Godfrey, Phys. Rev. **D69**, 054008, (2004); T. Barnes, S. Godfrey, and E.S. Swanson, hep-ph/0505002 (2005).
- [7] Belle Collaboration, K. Abe *et al.*, hep-ex/0505038 (2005).
- [8] L. Maiani, F. Piccinini, A. D. Polosa, and V. Riquer, Phys. Rev. **D71**, 014028 (2005).
- [9] E. Braaten and M. Kusunoki, Phys. Rev. **D71**, 074005 (2005).
- [10] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D71**, 031501 (2005).
- [11] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, hep-ex/0506081 (2005)
- [12] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Meth. **A479**, 1 (2002).
- [13] Particle Data Group, K. Eidelman *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B592**, 1 (2004).
- [14] S. Wolfram and G.C. Fox, Nucl. Phys. **B149**, 413 (1979).
- [15] G. Punzi, physics/0308063 (2003).
- [16] A non-relativistic Breit-Wigner shape.
- [17] ARGUS Collaboration, H. Albrecht *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **185**, 218(1987); Phys. Lett. B **241**, 278 (1990).
- [18] BABAR Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D69**, 071101 (2004).
- [19] G. Cowan, *Statistical Data Analysis* (Oxford Science Publications, 1998).