

Direct CP , Lepton Flavor, and Isospin Asymmetries in the Decays $B \rightarrow K^{(*)}l^+l^-$

B. Aubert,¹ M. Bona,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 L. Lopez,^{3a,3b} A. Palano,^{3a,3b} M. Pappagallo,^{3a,3b} G. Eigen,⁴ B. Stugu,⁴ L. Sun,⁴ G. S. Abrams,⁵ M. Battaglia,⁵ D. N. Brown,⁵ R. N. Cahn,⁵ R. G. Jacobsen,⁵ L. T. Kerth,⁵ Yu. G. Kolomensky,⁵ G. Lynch,⁵ I. L. Osipenkov,⁵ M. T. Ronan,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. Walker,⁸ D. J. Asgeirsson,⁹ B. G. Fulsom,⁹ C. Hearty,⁹ T. S. Mattison,⁹ J. A. McKenna,⁹ M. Barrett,¹⁰ A. Khan,¹⁰ V. E. Blinov,¹¹ A. D. Bukin,¹¹ A. R. Buzykaev,¹¹ V. P. Druzhinin,¹¹ V. B. Golubev,¹¹ A. P. Onuchin,¹¹ S. I. Serednyakov,¹¹ Yu. I. Skovpen,¹¹ E. P. Solodov,¹¹ K. Yu. Todyshev,¹¹ M. Bondioli,¹² S. Curry,¹² I. Eschrich,¹² D. Kirkby,¹² A. J. Lankford,¹² P. Lund,¹² M. Mandelkern,¹² E. C. Martin,¹² D. P. Stoker,¹² S. Abachi,¹³ C. Buchanan,¹³ J. W. Gary,¹⁴ F. Liu,¹⁴ O. Long,¹⁴ B. C. Shen,^{14,*} G. M. Vitug,¹⁴ Z. Yasin,¹⁴ L. Zhang,¹⁴ V. Sharma,¹⁵ C. Campagnari,¹⁶ T. M. Hong,¹⁶ D. Kovalskyi,¹⁶ M. A. Mazur,¹⁶ J. D. Richman,¹⁶ T. W. Beck,¹⁷ A. M. Eisner,¹⁷ C. J. Flacco,¹⁷ C. A. Heusch,¹⁷ J. Kroseberg,¹⁷ W. S. Lockman,¹⁷ T. Schalk,¹⁷ B. A. Schumm,¹⁷ A. Seiden,¹⁷ L. Wang,¹⁷ M. G. Wilson,¹⁷ L. O. Winstrom,¹⁷ C. H. Cheng,¹⁸ D. A. Doll,¹⁸ B. Echenard,¹⁸ F. Fang,¹⁸ D. G. Hitlin,¹⁸ I. Narsky,¹⁸ T. Piatenko,¹⁸ F. C. Porter,¹⁸ R. Andreassen,¹⁹ G. Mancinelli,¹⁹ B. T. Meadows,¹⁹ K. Mishra,¹⁹ M. D. Sokoloff,¹⁹ P. C. Bloom,²⁰ W. T. Ford,²⁰ A. Gaz,²⁰ J. F. Hirschauer,²⁰ M. Nagel,²⁰ U. Nauenberg,²⁰ J. G. Smith,²⁰ K. A. Ulmer,²⁰ S. R. Wagner,²⁰ R. Ayad,^{21,†} A. Soffer,^{21,†} W. H. Toki,²¹ R. J. Wilson,²¹ D. D. Altenburg,²² E. Feltresi,²² A. Hauke,²² H. Jasper,²² M. Karbach,²² J. Merkel,²² A. Petzold,²² B. Spaan,²² K. Wacker,²² M. J. Kobel,²³ W. F. Mader,²³ R. Nogowski,²³ K. R. Schubert,²³ R. Schwierz,²³ J. E. Sundermann,²³ A. Volk,²³ D. Bernard,²⁴ G. R. Bonneaud,²⁴ E. Latour,²⁴ Ch. Thiebaux,²⁴ M. Verderi,²⁴ P. J. Clark,²⁵ W. Gradl,²⁵ S. Playfer,²⁵ J. E. Watson,²⁵ M. Andreotti,^{26a,26b} D. Bettoni,^{26a} C. Bozzi,^{26a} R. Calabrese,^{26a,26b} A. Cecchi,^{26a,26b} G. Cibinetto,^{26a,26b} P. Franchini,^{26a,26b} E. Luppi,^{26a,26b} M. Negrini,^{26a,26b} A. Petrella,^{26a,26b} L. Piemontese,^{26a} V. Santoro,^{26a,26b} R. Baldini-Ferrolì,²⁷ A. Calcaterra,²⁷ R. de Sangro,²⁷ G. Finocchiaro,²⁷ S. Pacetti,²⁷ P. Patteri,²⁷ I. M. Peruzzi,^{27,§} M. Piccolo,²⁷ M. Rama,²⁷ A. Zallo,²⁷ A. Buzzo,^{28a} R. Contri,^{28a,28b} M. Lo Vetere,^{28a,28b} M. M. Macri,^{28a} M. R. Monge,^{28a,28b} S. Passaggio,^{28a} C. Patrignani,^{28a,28b} E. Robutti,^{28a} A. Santroni,^{28a,28b} S. Tosi,^{28a,28b} K. S. Chaisanguanthum,²⁹ M. Morii,²⁹ J. Marks,³⁰ S. Schenk,³⁰ U. Uwer,³⁰ V. Klose,³¹ H. M. Lacker,³¹ D. J. Bard,³² P. D. Dauncey,³² J. A. Nash,³² W. Panduro Vazquez,³² M. Tibbetts,³² P. K. Behera,³³ X. Chai,³³ M. J. Charles,³³ U. Mallik,³³ J. Cochran,³⁴ H. B. Crawley,³⁴ L. Dong,³⁴ W. T. Meyer,³⁴ S. Prell,³⁴ E. I. Rosenberg,³⁴ A. E. Rubin,³⁴ Y. Y. Gao,³⁵ A. V. Gritsan,³⁵ Z. J. Guo,³⁵ C. K. Lae,³⁵ A. G. Denig,³⁶ M. Fritsch,³⁶ G. Schott,³⁶ N. Arnaud,³⁷ J. Béquilleux,³⁷ A. D'Orazio,³⁷ M. Davier,³⁷ J. Firmino da Costa,³⁷ G. Grosdidier,³⁷ A. Höcker,³⁷ V. Lepeltier,³⁷ F. Le Diberder,³⁷ A. M. Lutz,³⁷ S. Pruvot,³⁷ P. Roudeau,³⁷ M. H. Schune,³⁷ J. Serrano,³⁷ V. Sordini,^{37,||} A. Stocchi,³⁷ G. Wormser,³⁷ D. J. Lange,³⁸ D. M. Wright,³⁸ I. Bingham,³⁹ J. P. Burke,³⁹ C. A. Chavez,³⁹ J. R. Fry,³⁹ E. Gabathuler,³⁹ R. Gamet,³⁹ D. E. Hutchcroft,³⁹ D. J. Payne,³⁹ C. Touramanis,³⁹ A. J. Bevan,⁴⁰ C. K. Clarke,⁴⁰ K. A. George,⁴⁰ F. Di Lodovico,⁴⁰ R. Sacco,⁴⁰ M. Sigamani,⁴⁰ G. Cowan,⁴¹ H. U. Flaecher,⁴¹ D. A. Hopkins,⁴¹ S. Paramesvaran,⁴¹ F. Salvatore,⁴¹ A. C. Wren,⁴¹ D. N. Brown,⁴² C. L. Davis,⁴² K. E. Alwyn,⁴³ D. Bailey,⁴³ R. J. Barlow,⁴³ Y. M. Chia,⁴³ C. L. Edgar,⁴³ G. Jackson,⁴³ G. D. Lafferty,⁴³ T. J. West,⁴³ J. I. Yi,⁴³ J. Anderson,⁴⁴ C. Chen,⁴⁴ A. Jawahery,⁴⁴ D. A. Roberts,⁴⁴ G. Simi,⁴⁴ J. M. Tuggle,⁴⁴ C. Dallapiccola,⁴⁵ X. Li,⁴⁵ E. Salvati,⁴⁵ S. Saremi,⁴⁵ R. Cowan,⁴⁶ D. Dujmic,⁴⁶ P. H. Fisher,⁴⁶ K. Koeneke,⁴⁶ G. Sciolla,⁴⁶ M. Spitznagel,⁴⁶ F. Taylor,⁴⁶ R. K. Yamamoto,⁴⁶ M. Zhao,⁴⁶ P. M. Patel,⁴⁷ S. H. Robertson,⁴⁷ A. Lazzaro,^{48a,48b} V. Lombardo,^{48a} F. Palombo,^{48a,48b} J. M. Bauer,⁴⁹ L. Cremaldi,⁴⁹ V. Eschenburg,⁴⁹ R. Godang,^{49,¶} R. Kroeger,⁴⁹ D. A. Sanders,⁴⁹ D. J. Summers,⁴⁹ H. W. Zhao,⁴⁹ M. Simard,⁵⁰ P. Taras,⁵⁰ F. B. Viaud,⁵⁰ H. Nicholson,⁵¹ G. De Nardo,^{52a,52b} L. Lista,^{52a} D. Monorchio,^{52a,52b} G. Onorato,^{52a,52b} C. Sciacca,^{52a,52b} G. Raven,⁵³ H. L. Snoek,⁵³ C. P. Jessop,⁵⁴ K. J. Knoepfel,⁵⁴ J. M. LoSecco,⁵⁴ W. F. Wang,⁵⁴ G. Benelli,⁵⁴ L. A. Corwin,⁵⁵ K. Honscheid,⁵⁵ H. Kagan,⁵⁵ R. Kass,⁵⁵ J. P. Morris,⁵⁵ A. M. Rahimi,⁵⁵ J. J. Regensburger,⁵⁵ S. J. Sekula,⁵⁵ Q. K. Wong,⁵⁵ N. L. Blount,⁵⁶ J. Brau,⁵⁶ R. Frey,⁵⁶ O. Igonkina,⁵⁶ J. A. Kolb,⁵⁶ M. Lu,⁵⁶ R. Rahmat,⁵⁶ N. B. Sinev,⁵⁶ D. Strom,⁵⁶ J. Strube,⁵⁶ E. Torrence,⁵⁶ G. Castelli,^{57a,57b} N. Gagliardi,^{57a,57b} M. Margoni,^{57a,57b} M. Morandin,^{57a} M. Posocco,^{57a} M. Rotondo,^{57a} F. Simonetto,^{57a,57b} R. Stroili,^{57a,57b} C. Voci,^{57a,57b} P. del Amo Sanchez,⁵⁸ E. Ben-Haim,⁵⁸ H. Briand,⁵⁸ G. Calderini,⁵⁸ J. Chauveau,⁵⁸ P. David,⁵⁸ L. Del Buono,⁵⁸ O. Hamon,⁵⁸ Ph. Leruste,⁵⁸ J. Ocariz,⁵⁸ A. Perez,⁵⁸ J. Prendki,⁵⁸ S. Sitt,⁵⁸ L. Gladney,⁵⁹ M. Biasini,^{60a,60b} R. Covarelli,^{61a,61b} E. Manoni,^{60a,60b} C. Angelini,^{61a,61b} G. Batignani,^{61a,61b} S. Bettarini,^{61a,61b} M. Carpinelli,^{61a,61b,‡} A. Cervelli,^{61a,61b} F. Forti,^{61a,61b} M. A. Giorgi,^{61a,61b} A. Lusiani,^{61a,61c} G. Marchiori,^{61a,61b} M. Morganti,^{61a,61b} N. Neri,^{61a,61b} E. Paoloni,^{61a,61b} G. Rizzo,^{61a,61b} J. J. Walsh,^{61a} D. Lopes Pegna,⁶² C. Lu,⁶² J. Olsen,⁶² A. J. S. Smith,⁶² A. V. Telnov,⁶² F. Anulli,^{63a} E. Baracchini,^{63a,63b} G. Cavoto,^{63a} D. del Re,^{63a,63b}

E. Di Marco,^{63a,63b} R. Faccini,^{63a,63b} F. Ferrarotto,^{63a} F. Ferroni,^{63a,63b} M. Gaspero,^{63a,63b} P.D. Jackson,^{63a} L. Li Gioi,^{63a} M. A. Mazzoni,^{63a} S. Morganti,^{63a} G. Piredda,^{63a} F. Polci,^{63a,63b} F. Renga,^{63a,63b} C. Voena,^{63a} M. Ebert,⁶⁴ T. Hartmann,⁶⁴ H. Schröder,⁶⁴ R. Waldi,⁶⁴ T. Adye,⁶⁵ B. Franek,⁶⁵ E. O. Olaiya,⁶⁵ F. F. Wilson,⁶⁵ S. Emery,⁶⁶ M. Escalier,⁶⁶ L. Esteve,⁶⁶ S. F. Ganzhur,⁶⁶ G. Hamel de Monchenault,⁶⁶ W. Kozanecki,⁶⁶ G. Vasseur,⁶⁶ Ch. Yèche,⁶⁶ M. Zito,⁶⁶ X. R. Chen,⁶⁷ H. Liu,⁶⁷ W. Park,⁶⁷ M. V. Purohit,⁶⁷ R. M. White,⁶⁷ J. R. Wilson,⁶⁷ M. T. Allen,⁶⁸ D. Aston,⁶⁸ R. Bartoldus,⁶⁸ P. Bechtel,⁶⁸ J. F. Benitez,⁶⁸ R. Cenci,⁶⁸ J. P. Coleman,⁶⁸ M. R. Convery,⁶⁸ J. C. Dingfelder,⁶⁸ J. Dorfan,⁶⁸ G. P. Dubois-Felsmann,⁶⁸ W. Dunwoodie,⁶⁸ R. C. Field,⁶⁸ A. M. Gabareen,⁶⁸ S. J. Gowdy,⁶⁸ M. T. Graham,⁶⁸ P. Grenier,⁶⁸ C. Hast,⁶⁸ W. R. Innes,⁶⁸ J. Kaminski,⁶⁸ M. H. Kelsey,⁶⁸ H. Kim,⁶⁸ P. Kim,⁶⁸ M. L. Kocian,⁶⁸ D. W. G. S. Leith,⁶⁸ S. Li,⁶⁸ B. Lindquist,⁶⁸ S. Luitz,⁶⁸ V. Luth,⁶⁸ H. L. Lynch,⁶⁸ D. B. MacFarlane,⁶⁸ H. Marsiske,⁶⁸ R. Messner,⁶⁸ D. R. Muller,⁶⁸ H. Neal,⁶⁸ S. Nelson,⁶⁸ C. P. O'Grady,⁶⁸ I. Ofte,⁶⁸ A. Perazzo,⁶⁸ M. Perl,⁶⁸ B. N. Ratcliff,⁶⁸ A. Roodman,⁶⁸ A. A. Salnikov,⁶⁸ R. H. Schindler,⁶⁸ J. Schwiening,⁶⁸ A. Snyder,⁶⁸ D. Su,⁶⁸ M. K. Sullivan,⁶⁸ K. Suzuki,⁶⁸ S. K. Swain,⁶⁸ J. M. Thompson,⁶⁸ J. Va'vra,⁶⁸ A. P. Wagner,⁶⁸ M. Weaver,⁶⁸ C. A. West,⁶⁸ W. J. Wisniewski,⁶⁸ M. Wittgen,⁶⁸ D. H. Wright,⁶⁸ H. W. Wulsin,⁶⁸ A. K. Yarritu,⁶⁸ K. Yi,⁶⁸ C. C. Young,⁶⁸ V. Ziegler,⁶⁸ P. R. Burchat,⁶⁹ A. J. Edwards,⁶⁹ S. A. Majewski,⁶⁹ T. S. Miyashita,⁶⁹ B. A. Petersen,⁶⁹ L. Wilden,⁶⁹ S. Ahmed,⁷⁰ M. S. Alam,⁷⁰ J. A. Ernst,⁷⁰ B. Pan,⁷⁰ M. A. Saeed,⁷⁰ S. B. Zain,⁷⁰ S. M. Spanier,⁷¹ B. J. Wogslund,⁷¹ R. Eckmann,⁷² J. L. Ritchie,⁷² A. M. Ruland,⁷² C. J. Schilling,⁷² R. F. Schwitters,⁷² B. W. Drummond,⁷³ J. M. Izen,⁷³ X. C. Lou,⁷³ F. Bianchi,^{74a,74b} D. Gamba,^{74a,74b} M. Pelliccioni,^{74a,74b} M. Bomben,^{75a,75b} L. Bosisio,^{75a,75b} C. Cartaro,^{75a,75b} G. Della Ricca,^{75a,75b} L. Lanceri,^{75a,75b} L. Vitale,^{75a,75b} V. Azzolini,⁷⁶ N. Lopez-March,⁷⁶ F. Martinez-Vidal,⁷⁶ D. A. Milanese,⁷⁶ A. Oyanguren,⁷⁶ J. Albert,⁷⁷ Sw. Banerjee,⁷⁷ B. Bhuyan,⁷⁷ H. H. F. Choi,⁷⁷ K. Hamano,⁷⁷ R. Kowalewski,⁷⁷ M. J. Lewczuk,⁷⁷ I. M. Nugent,⁷⁷ J. M. Roney,⁷⁷ R. J. Sobie,⁷⁷ T. J. Gershon,⁷⁸ P. F. Harrison,⁷⁸ J. Ilic,⁷⁸ T. E. Latham,⁷⁸ G. B. Mohanty,⁷⁸ H. R. Band,⁷⁹ X. Chen,⁷⁹ S. Dasu,⁷⁹ K. T. Flood,⁷⁹ Y. Pan,⁷⁹ M. Pierini,⁷⁹ R. Prepost,⁷⁹ C. O. Vuosalo,⁷⁹ and S. L. Wu⁷⁹

(BABAR Collaboration)

¹Laboratoire de Physique des Particules, IN2P3/CNRS et Université de Savoie, 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 I, D-44780 Bochum, Germany

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

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

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

¹¹Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics, Novosibirsk 630090, Russia

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

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

¹⁴University of California at Riverside, Riverside, California 92521, USA

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

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

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

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

¹⁹University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio 45221, USA

²⁰University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80309, USA

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

²²Technische Universität Dortmund, Fakultät Physik, D-44221 Dortmund, Germany

²³Technische Universität Dresden, Institut für Kern- und Teilchenphysik, D-01062 Dresden, Germany

²⁴Laboratoire Leprince-Ringuet, CNRS/IN2P3, Ecole Polytechnique, F-91128 Palaiseau, France

²⁵University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH9 3JZ, United Kingdom

^{26a}INFN Sezione di Ferrara, I-44100 Ferrara, Italy

^{26b}Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Ferrara, I-44100 Ferrara, Italy

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

^{28a}INFN Sezione di Genova, I-16146 Genova, Italy

^{28b}Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Genova, I-16146 Genova, Italy

²⁹Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, USA

- ³⁰Universität Heidelberg, Physikalisches Institut, Philosophenweg 12, D-69120 Heidelberg, Germany
- ³¹Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Institut für Physik, Newtonstrasse 15, D-12489 Berlin, 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
- ³⁵Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland 21218, USA
- ³⁶Universität Karlsruhe, Institut für Experimentelle Kernphysik, D-76021 Karlsruhe, Germany
- ³⁷Laboratoire de l'Accélérateur Linéaire, IN2P3/CNRS et Université Paris-Sud 11, Centre Scientifique d'Orsay, B. P. 34, F-91898 Orsay Cedex, France
- ³⁸Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California 94550, USA
- ³⁹University of Liverpool, Liverpool L69 7ZE, United Kingdom
- ⁴⁰Queen Mary, University of London, London, E1 4NS, United Kingdom
- ⁴¹University of London, Royal Holloway and Bedford New College, Egham, Surrey TW20 0EX, United Kingdom
- ⁴²University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky 40292, USA
- ⁴³University of Manchester, Manchester M13 9PL, United Kingdom
- ⁴⁴University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742, USA
- ⁴⁵University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts 01003, USA
- ⁴⁶Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Laboratory for Nuclear Science, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, USA
- ⁴⁷McGill University, Montréal, Québec, Canada H3A 2T8
- ^{48a}INFN Sezione di Milano, I-20133 Milano, Italy
- ^{48b}Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Milano, I-20133 Milano, Italy
- ⁴⁹University of Mississippi, University, Mississippi 38677, USA
- ⁵⁰Université de Montréal, Physique des Particules, Montréal, Québec, Canada H3C 3J7
- ⁵¹Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Massachusetts 01075, USA
- ^{52a}INFN Sezione di Napoli, I-80126 Napoli, Italy
- ^{52b}Dipartimento di Scienze Fisiche, Università di Napoli Federico II, I-80126 Napoli, Italy
- ⁵³NIKHEF, National Institute for Nuclear Physics and High Energy Physics, NL-1009 DB Amsterdam, The Netherlands
- ⁵⁴University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana 46556, USA
- ⁵⁵Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210, USA
- ⁵⁶University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403, USA
- ^{57a}INFN Sezione di Padova, I-35131 Padova, Italy
- ^{57b}Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Padova, I-35131 Padova, Italy
- ⁵⁸Laboratoire de Physique Nucléaire et de Hautes Energies, IN2P3/CNRS, Université Pierre et Marie Curie-Paris6, Université Denis Diderot-Paris7, F-75252 Paris, France
- ⁵⁹University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104, USA
- ^{60a}INFN Sezione di Perugia, I-06100 Perugia, Italy
- ^{60b}Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Perugia, I-06100 Perugia, Italy
- ^{61a}INFN Sezione di Pisa, I-56127 Pisa, Italy
- ^{61b}Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Pisa, I-56127 Pisa, Italy
- ^{61c}Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, I-56127 Pisa, Italy
- ⁶²Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey 08544, USA
- ^{63a}INFN Sezione di Roma, I-00185 Roma, Italy
- ^{63b}Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Roma La Sapienza, I-00185 Roma, Italy
- ⁶⁴Universität Rostock, D-18051 Rostock, Germany
- ⁶⁵Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Chilton, Didcot, Oxon, OX11 0QX, United Kingdom
- ⁶⁶DSM/Irfu, CEA/Saclay, F-91191 Gif-sur-Yvette Cedex, France
- ⁶⁷University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina 29208, USA
- ⁶⁸Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, Stanford, California 94309, USA
- ⁶⁹Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305-4060, USA
- ⁷⁰State University of New York, Albany, New York 12222, USA
- ⁷¹University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee 37996, USA
- ⁷²University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712, USA
- ⁷³University of Texas at Dallas, Richardson, Texas 75083, USA
- ^{74a}INFN Sezione di Torino, I-10125 Torino, Italy
- ^{74b}Dipartimento di Fisica Sperimentale, Università di Torino, I-10125 Torino, Italy
- ^{75a}INFN Sezione di Trieste, I-34127 Trieste, Italy
- ^{75b}Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Trieste, I-34127 Trieste, Italy
- ⁷⁶IFIC, Universitat de Valencia-CSIC, E-46071 Valencia, Spain
- 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

(Received 25 July 2008; published 4 March 2009)

We measure branching fractions and integrated rate asymmetries for the rare decays $B \rightarrow K^{(*)}l^+l^-$, where l^+l^- is either e^+e^- or $\mu^+\mu^-$, using a sample of $384 \times 10^6 B\bar{B}$ events collected with the BABAR detector at the PEP-II e^+e^- collider. We find no evidence for direct CP or lepton-flavor asymmetries. However, for dilepton masses below the J/ψ resonance, we find evidence for unexpectedly large isospin asymmetries in both $B \rightarrow Kl^+l^-$ and $B \rightarrow K^*l^+l^-$ which differ, respectively, by 3.2σ and 2.7σ , including systematic uncertainties, from the standard model expectations.

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.102.091803

PACS numbers: 13.20.He, 11.30.Er, 11.30.Hv

The decays $B \rightarrow K^{(*)}l^+l^-$, where l^+l^- is either e^+e^- or $\mu^+\mu^-$, arise from flavor-changing neutral current processes that are forbidden at the tree level in the standard model (SM). The lowest-order SM processes contributing to these decays are a W^+W^- box diagram, and the radiative photon and electroweak Z penguin diagrams [1]. Their amplitudes are expressed in terms of hadronic form factors and effective Wilson coefficients C_7^{eff} , C_9^{eff} , and C_{10}^{eff} , representing the electromagnetic penguin diagram, and the vector part and the axial-vector part of the Z penguin and W^+W^- box diagrams, respectively [2]. New physics contributions may enter the penguin and box diagrams at the same order as the SM diagrams, modifying the Wilson coefficients from their SM expectations [3].

We report results herein on exclusive branching fractions, direct CP asymmetries, the ratio of rates to dimuon and dielectron final states, and isospin asymmetries, measured in two regions of dilepton mass squared chosen to exclude the region of the J/ψ resonance: a low q^2 region $0.1 < q^2 \equiv m_{ll}^2 < 7.02 \text{ GeV}^2/c^4$ and a high q^2 region $q^2 > 10.24 \text{ GeV}^2/c^4$. We also present results for the two regions combined. The $\psi(2S)$ resonance is removed from the high q^2 region by vetoing events with $12.96 < q^2 < 14.06 \text{ GeV}^2/c^4$. For $K^*e^+e^-$ final states, we also report results in extended low and extended combined q^2 regions including events $q^2 < 0.1 \text{ GeV}^2/c^4$, where there is an enhanced coupling to the photonic penguin amplitude unique to this mode. Recent BABAR results on angular observables using the same data set and similar event selection as is used here are reported in [1].

The $B \rightarrow Kl^+l^-$ branching fraction is predicted to be $(0.35 \pm 0.12) \times 10^{-6}$, while $B \rightarrow K^*l^+l^-$ for $q^2 > 0.1 \text{ GeV}^2/c^4$ is expected to be roughly 3 times larger at $(1.19 \pm 0.39) \times 10^{-6}$ [3]. The $\sim 30\%$ uncertainties are due to lack of knowledge about the form factors that model the hadronic effects in the $B \rightarrow K$ and $B \rightarrow K^*$ transitions. Thus, measurements of decay rates to exclusive final states are less suited to searches for new physics than rate asymmetries, where many theory uncertainties cancel [4].

The direct CP asymmetry

$$A_{CP}^{K^{(*)}} \equiv \frac{\mathcal{B}(\bar{B} \rightarrow \bar{K}^{(*)}l^+l^-) - \mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow K^{(*)}l^+l^-)}{\mathcal{B}(\bar{B} \rightarrow \bar{K}^{(*)}l^+l^-) + \mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow K^{(*)}l^+l^-)} \quad (1)$$

is expected to be $O(10^{-3})$ in the SM, but new physics at the

electroweak scale could produce a significant enhancement [5].

The ratio of rates to dimuon and dielectron final states

$$R_{K^{(*)}} \equiv \frac{\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow K^{(*)}\mu^+\mu^-)}{\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow K^{(*)}e^+e^-)} \quad (2)$$

is unity in the SM to within a few percent [6]. In two-Higgs-doublet models, including supersymmetry, these ratios are sensitive to the presence of a neutral Higgs boson, which might, at large $\tan\beta$, increase $R_{K^{(*)}}$ by $\sim 10\%$ [7]. In the region $q^2 < (2m_\mu)^2$, where only the e^+e^- modes are allowed, there is a large enhancement of $B \rightarrow K^*e^+e^-$ due to a $1/q^2$ scaling of the photon penguin contribution. The expected SM value of R_{K^*} including this region is 0.75 [6], and we fit the K^* data set over the extended combined and extended low q^2 regions in order to test this prediction.

The CP -averaged isospin asymmetry

$$A_I^{K^{(*)}} \equiv \frac{\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow K^{(*)0}l^+l^-) - r\mathcal{B}(B^\pm \rightarrow K^{(*)\pm}l^+l^-)}{\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow K^{(*)0}l^+l^-) + r\mathcal{B}(B^\pm \rightarrow K^{(*)\pm}l^+l^-)}, \quad (3)$$

where $r = \tau_0/\tau_+ = 1/(1.07 \pm 0.01)$ is the ratio of the B^0 and B^+ lifetimes [8], has a SM expectation of $+6\% - 13\%$ as $q^2 \rightarrow 0 \text{ GeV}^2/c^4$ [9]. This is consistent with the measured asymmetry of $3\% \pm 3\%$ in $B \rightarrow K^*\gamma$ [8]. A calculation of the predicted $K^{*+}l^+l^-$ and $K^{*0}l^+l^-$ rates integrated over the low q^2 region gives $A_I^{K^*} = -0.005 \pm 0.020$ [10,11]. In the high q^2 region, contributions from charmonium states may provide an additional source of isospin asymmetry, although the measured asymmetry in $J/\psi K^{(*)}$ is at most a few percent [8].

We use a data sample of $384 \times 10^6 B\bar{B}$ pairs collected at the $Y(4S)$ resonance with the BABAR detector [12] at the PEP-II asymmetric-energy e^+e^- collider at SLAC. Our selection of charged and neutral particle candidates, as well as reconstruction of π^0 , K_S^0 , and K^* candidates, are described at [1]. We reconstruct signal events in ten separate final states containing an e^+e^- or $\mu^+\mu^-$ pair, and a $K_S^0(\rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-)$, K^+ , or $K^*(892)$ candidate with an invariant mass $0.82 < M(K\pi) < 0.97 \text{ GeV}/c^2$. We reconstruct K^{*0} candidates in the final state $K^+\pi^-$, and K^{*+} candidates in the final states $K^+\pi^0$ and $K_S^0\pi^+$ (charge conjugation is implied throughout except as explicitly noted). We also

TABLE I. $A_{CP}^{K^{(*)}}$ results in each relevant q^2 region. The uncertainties are statistical and systematic, respectively.

Mode	Combined q^2	Low q^2	High q^2
$K^+ l^+ l^-$	$-0.18^{+0.18}_{-0.18} \pm 0.01$	$-0.18^{+0.19}_{-0.19} \pm 0.01$	$-0.09^{+0.36}_{-0.39} \pm 0.02$
$K^{*0} l^+ l^-$	$0.02^{+0.20}_{-0.20} \pm 0.02$	$-0.23^{+0.38}_{-0.38} \pm 0.02$	$0.17^{+0.24}_{-0.24} \pm 0.02$
$K^{*+} l^+ l^-$	$0.01^{+0.26}_{-0.24} \pm 0.02$	$0.10^{+0.25}_{-0.24} \pm 0.02$	$-0.18^{+0.45}_{-0.55} \pm 0.04$
$K^{*+} l^+ l^-$	$0.01^{+0.16}_{-0.15} \pm 0.01$	$0.01^{+0.21}_{-0.20} \pm 0.01$	$0.09^{+0.21}_{-0.21} \pm 0.02$

study final states $K^{(*)} h^\pm \mu^\mp$, where h is a track with no particle identification requirement applied, to characterize backgrounds from hadrons misidentified as muons.

$B \rightarrow K^{(*)} l^+ l^-$ decays are reconstructed using the kinematic variables $m_{ES} = \sqrt{s/4 - p_B^{*2}}$ and $\Delta E = E_B^* - \sqrt{s}/2$, where p_B^* and E_B^* are the B momentum and energy in the $\Upsilon(4S)$ center-of-mass (c.m.) frame, and \sqrt{s} is the total c.m. energy. We define a fit region $m_{ES} > 5.2 \text{ GeV}/c^2$, with $-0.07 < \Delta E < 0.04$ ($-0.04 < \Delta E < 0.04$) GeV for $e^+ e^-$ ($\mu^+ \mu^-$) final states in the low and extended low q^2 region, and $-0.08 < \Delta E < 0.05$ ($-0.05 < \Delta E < 0.05$) GeV for high q^2 .

The main backgrounds arise from random combinations of leptons from semileptonic B and D decays, which are suppressed through the use of neural networks (NN) whose construction is described in detail in [1]. For each of the ten final states we use separate NN optimized to suppress either continuum or $B\bar{B}$ backgrounds in the low, extended low or high q^2 regions. We use simulated samples of signal and background events in the construction of the NN, and assume rates consistent with accepted values [8].

There is a further background contribution from $B \rightarrow D(\rightarrow K^{(*)} \pi) \pi$ decays, where both pions are misidentified as leptons. The pion misidentification rates are 2%–3% for muons and <0.1% for electrons, so this background is only significant in the $\mu^+ \mu^-$ final states. We veto these events by assigning the pion mass to a muon candidate, and requiring the invariant mass of the hypothetical $K^{(*)} \pi$ system to be outside the range 1.84–1.90 GeV/ c^2 . After all the above selections have been applied, the final reconstruction efficiency for signal events varies from 3.5% for $K^+ \pi^0 \mu^+ \mu^-$ for the combined q^2 region, to 22% for $K^+ \pi^- e^+ e^-$ in the high q^2 region.

We perform unbinned maximum likelihood fits to m_{ES} distributions to obtain signal and background yields. We use an ARGUS shape [13] to describe the combinatorial background, allowing the shape parameter to float in the fits. For the signal, we use a fixed Gaussian shape unique to each final state, with mean and width determined from fits to the analogous final states in the vetoed $J/\psi K^{(*)}$ events. We account for a small residual contribution from misidentified hadrons by constructing a probability density function (PDF) using $K^{(*)} h^\pm \mu^\mp$ events weighted by the probability for the h^\pm to be misidentified as a muon. We

also account for background events that peak in the m_{ES} signal region, arising from charmonium events that escape the veto, and for contributions from misreconstructed signal events. We test our fits in each final state using the large samples of vetoed $J/\psi K^{(*)}$ and $\psi(2S) K^{(*)}$ events, and find that all the branching fractions are in good agreement with accepted values [14]. We perform simultaneous fits for $A_{CP}^{K^{(*)}}$, $R_{K^{(*)}}$ and $A_I^{K^{(*)}}$ summed over all the signal modes that contribute to the particular measurement.

We estimate the statistical significance of our fits by generating ensembles of 1000 data sets for each of the ten final states in each q^2 region of interest, and fitting each data set with the full fit model described above. These tests also confirm the unbiased nature and proper error scaling of our fit methodology.

For the total $B \rightarrow K l^+ l^-$ and $B \rightarrow K^* l^+ l^-$ branching fractions averaged assuming isospin and lepton-flavor symmetry, we measure $(0.394^{+0.073}_{-0.069} \pm 0.020) \times 10^{-6}$ and $(1.11^{+0.19}_{-0.18} \pm 0.07) \times 10^{-6}$, respectively, where the first uncertainty is statistical and the second is systematic. Complete branching fraction results in all final states and q^2 regions, along with the statistical significance of each measurement and frequentist upper limits for measurements with $<4\sigma$ statistical significance, are available online [15]. All results are in good agreement with previous measurements [8].

Table I summarizes the results for $A_{CP}^{K^{(*)}}$. In the fits to the separate B and \bar{B} data sets in charge-conjugate final states, we assume a common background ARGUS shape parameter. Our final results are consistent with the SM expectation of negligible direct CP asymmetry. Table II shows the

TABLE II. $R_{K^{(*)}}$ results in each q^2 region. The extended (“ext.”) regions are relevant only for R_{K^*} . The uncertainties are statistical and systematic, respectively.

q^2 Region	R_{K^*}	R_K
Combined	$1.37^{+0.53}_{-0.40} \pm 0.09$	$0.96^{+0.44}_{-0.34} \pm 0.05$
Ext. combined	$1.10^{+0.42}_{-0.32} \pm 0.07$...
Low	$1.01^{+0.58}_{-0.44} \pm 0.08$	$0.40^{+0.30}_{-0.23} \pm 0.02$
Ext. low	$0.56^{+0.29}_{-0.23} \pm 0.04$...
High	$2.15^{+1.42}_{-0.78} \pm 0.15$	$1.06^{+0.81}_{-0.51} \pm 0.06$

TABLE III. $A_I^{K^{(*)}}$ results in each q^2 region. The uncertainties are statistical and systematic, respectively. The last table row shows $K^*e^+e^-$ results for the extended regions.

Mode	Combined q^2	Low q^2	High q^2
$K\mu^+\mu^-$	$0.13_{-0.37}^{+0.29} \pm 0.04$	$-0.91_{-\infty}^{+1.2} \pm 0.18$	$0.39_{-0.46}^{+0.35} \pm 0.04$
Ke^+e^-	$-0.73_{-0.50}^{+0.39} \pm 0.04$	$-1.41_{-0.69}^{+0.49} \pm 0.04$	$0.21_{-0.41}^{+0.32} \pm 0.03$
Kl^+l^-	$-0.37_{-0.34}^{+0.27} \pm 0.04$	$-1.43_{-0.85}^{+0.56} \pm 0.05$	$0.28_{-0.30}^{+0.24} \pm 0.03$
$K^*\mu^+\mu^-$	$-0.00_{-0.26}^{+0.36} \pm 0.05$	$-0.26_{-0.34}^{+0.50} \pm 0.05$	$-0.08_{-0.27}^{+0.37} \pm 0.05$
$K^*e^+e^-$	$-0.20_{-0.20}^{+0.22} \pm 0.03$	$-0.66_{-0.17}^{+0.19} \pm 0.02$	$0.32_{-0.45}^{+0.75} \pm 0.03$
$K^*l^+l^-$	$-0.12_{-0.16}^{+0.18} \pm 0.04$	$-0.56_{-0.15}^{+0.17} \pm 0.03$	$0.18_{-0.28}^{+0.36} \pm 0.04$
$K^*e^+e^-$ (ext.)	$-0.27_{-0.18}^{+0.21} \pm 0.03$	$-0.25_{-0.18}^{+0.20} \pm 0.03$...

results for R_K and R_{K^*} , which are also consistent with the SM expectations.

Table III shows the results for the isospin asymmetry $A_I^{K^{(*)}}$. We directly fit the data for $A_I^{K^{(*)}}$ taking into account the differing lifetimes of B^0 and B^+ . Figure 1 shows the charged and neutral low q^2 data sets with overlaid fit projections. We find no significant isospin asymmetries in the high and combined q^2 regions, or for $K^*e^+e^-$ fits in the extended regions. However, we find evidence for large negative asymmetries in the low q^2 region.

We calculate the statistical significance with which a null isospin asymmetry hypothesis is rejected using the change in log likelihood $\sqrt{2\Delta \ln \mathcal{L}}$ between the nominal fit to the data and a fit with $A_I^{K^{(*)}} = 0$ fixed. Figure 2 shows the likelihood curves obtained from the Kl^+l^- and $K^*l^+l^-$ fits. The parabolic nature of the curves in the $A_I^{K^{(*)}} > -1$ region demonstrates the essentially Gaussian nature of our

fit results in the physical region, and the right-side axis of Fig. 2 shows purely statistical significances based on Gaussian coverage. Incorporating the relatively small systematic uncertainties as a scaling factor on the change in log likelihood, the significance in the low q^2 region that $A_I^{K^{(*)}}$ is different from zero is 3.2σ for Kl^+l^- and 2.7σ for $K^*l^+l^-$. We have verified these confidence intervals by performing fits to ensembles of simulated data sets generated with $A_I^{K^{(*)}} = 0$ fixed, and we find frequentist coverage consistent with the $\Delta \ln \mathcal{L}$ calculations. The highly negative $A_I^{K^{(*)}}$ values for both Kl^+l^- and $K^*l^+l^-$ at low q^2 suggest that this asymmetry may be insensitive to the hadronic final state, and so we sum the likelihood curves as shown in Fig. 2 and obtain $A_I^{K^{(*)}} = -0.64_{-0.14}^{+0.15} \pm 0.03$. Including systematics, this is a 3.9σ difference from a null $A_I^{K^{(*)}}$ hypothesis.

We consider systematic uncertainties associated with reconstruction efficiencies; hadronic background parametrization in dimuon final states; peaking background contributions obtained from simulated events; and possible CP , lepton flavor, and isospin asymmetries in the background PDFs. We quantify the efficiency systematics using the vetoed $J/\psi K^{(*)}$ samples. These include charged track, π^0 , and K_S^0 reconstruction, particle identification, NN selection, and the ΔE and K^* mass selections. The largest contributions to the systematic uncertainties on the rates are particle identification, the characterization of the had-




FIG. 1 (color online). Charged and neutral fit projections in the low q^2 region. Total fit (solid), combinatoric background (long dash), signal (medium dash), hadronic background (short dash), peaking background (dots).




FIG. 2. Low q^2 region $A_I^{K^{(*)}}$ fit likelihood curves. Kl^+l^- (long dash), $K^*l^+l^-$ (short dash), $(K, K^*)l^+l^-$ (solid).

ronic background and the signal m_{ES} PDF shape. All of these cancel at least partially in the rate asymmetries, and the final systematic uncertainties are small compared to the statistical ones.

We perform several additional checks of effects that might cause a bias in our final results. We vary the parametrization of the hadronic background PDFs, and of the random combinatorial background ARGUS shapes in the low q^2 region, to test the robustness of the large $A_I^{K^{(*)}}$ asymmetries. We remove all the NN selections, and perform separate fits to the two K^{*+} final states, and observe no significant variation in the $A_I^{K^{(*)}}$ results. To understand if an isospin asymmetry might be induced by the combinatorial background, we compare data and simulated background events within a larger region $|\Delta E| < 0.25$ GeV outside our ΔE selection window and in the $5.2 < m_{ES} < 5.27$ GeV/ c^2 region. We find that the numbers of simulated and data events in this larger region agree well. No signal isospin asymmetry is found using simulated events within the fit region.

In summary, we have measured branching fractions, and studied direct CP violation, ratios of rates to dimuon and dielectron final states, and isospin asymmetries in the rare decays $B \rightarrow K^{(*)}l^+l^-$. Our branching fraction results agree with both SM predictions and previous measurements. Our results for the direct CP asymmetries and lepton-flavor rate ratios are in good agreement with their respective SM predictions of zero and one. The isospin asymmetries in the high and combined q^2 regions are consistent with zero, but in the low q^2 region in both $B \rightarrow Kl^+l^-$ and $B \rightarrow K^*l^+l^-$ we measure large negative asymmetries that are each about 3σ different from zero, including systematic uncertainties. Combining these results, we obtain $A_I^{K^{(*)}} = -0.64_{-0.14}^{+0.15} \pm 0.03$, with a 3.9σ difference (including systematics) from $A_I^{K^{(*)}} = 0$. Such large negative asymmetries are unexpected in the SM, which predicts essentially no isospin asymmetry integrated over our low q^2 region and, as $q^2 \rightarrow 0$, an asymmetry of $\sim +10\%$, opposite in sign to our observation in the low q^2 region.

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 (U.S.), NSERC (Canada), CEA and CNRS-IN2P3 (France), BMBF and

DFG (Germany), INFN (Italy), FOM (The Netherlands), NFR (Norway), MES (Russia), MEC (Spain), and STFC (U.K.). Individuals have received support from the Marie Curie EIF (European Union) and the A.P. Sloan Foundation.

*Deceased.

[†]Now at Temple University, Philadelphia, PA 19122, USA.

[‡]Now at Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, 69978, Israel.

[§]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 Università di Sassari, Sassari, Italy.

- [1] B. Aubert *et al.* (*BABAR* Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D **79**, 031102(R) (2009).
- [2] G. Buchalla, A. J. Buras, and M. E. Lautenbacher, Rev. Mod. Phys. **68**, 1125 (1996).
- [3] A. Ali, E. Lunghi, C. Greub, and G. Hiller, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 034002 (2002).
- [4] F. Kruger, L. M. Sehgal, N. Sinha, and R. Sinha, Phys. Rev. D **61**, 114028 (2000); **63**, 019901(E) (2000).
- [5] C. Bobeth, G. Hiller, and G. Piranishvili, J. High Energy Phys. 07 (2008) 106.
- [6] G. Hiller and F. Kruger, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 074020 (2004).
- [7] Q. S. Yan, C. S. Huang, W. Liao, and S. H. Zhu, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 094023 (2000).
- [8] E. Barberio *et al.* (Heavy Flavor Averaging Group), arXiv:0704.3575.
- [9] T. Feldmann and J. Matias, J. High Energy Phys. 01 (2003) 074.
- [10] M. Beneke, T. Feldmann, and D. Seidel, Eur. Phys. J. C **41**, 173 (2005).
- [11] T. Feldmann, in Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on the CKM Unitary Triangle, Rome (unpublished).
- [12] B. Aubert *et al.* (*BABAR* Collaboration), Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A **479**, 1 (2002).
- [13] H. Albrecht *et al.* (*ARGUS* Collaboration), Z. Phys. C **48**, 543 (1990).
- [14] W. M. Yao *et al.* (Particle Data Group), J. Phys. G **33**, 1 (2006).
- [15] See EPAPS Document No. E-PRLTAO-102-060910 for branching fraction results to accompany this article. For more information on EPAPS, see <http://www.aip.org/pubservs/epaps.html>.