

## Search for the decay $B \rightarrow D_{s1}^+(2536)X$

M. Bishai, J. Fast, J. W. Hinson, N. Menon, D. H. Miller, E. I. Shibata, I. P. J. Shipsey, and M. Yurko  
*Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana 47907*

S. Glenn, S. D. Johnson, Y. Kwon,\* S. Roberts, and E. H. Thorndike  
*University of Rochester, Rochester, New York 14627*

C. P. Jessop, K. Lingel, H. Marsiske, M. L. Perl, V. Savinov, D. Ugolini, R. Wang, and X. Zhou  
*Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94309*

T. E. Coan, V. Fadeyev, I. Korolkov, Y. Maravin, I. Narsky, V. Shelkov, J. Staeck, R. Stroynowski, I. Volobouev,  
 and J. Ye  
*Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas 75275*

M. Artuso, F. Azfar, A. Efimov, M. Goldberg, D. He, S. Kopp, G. C. Moneti, R. Mountain, S. Schuh, T. Skwarnicki,  
 S. Stone, G. Viehhauser, and X. Xing  
*Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York 13244*

J. Bartelt, S. E. Csorna, V. Jain,† K. W. McLean, and S. Marka  
*Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee 37235*

R. Godang, K. Kinoshita, I. C. Lai, P. Pomianowski, and S. Schrenk  
*Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia 24061*

G. Bonvicini, D. Cinabro, R. Greene, L. P. Perera, and G. J. Zhou  
*Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan 48202*

B. Barish, M. Chadha, S. Chan, G. Eigen, J. S. Miller, C. O'Grady, M. Schmidtler, J. Urheim, A. J. Weinstein,  
 and F. Würthwein  
*California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California 91125*

D. W. Bliss, G. Masek, H. P. Paar, S. Prell, and V. Sharma  
*University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, California 92093*

D. M. Asner, J. Gronberg, T. S. Hill, D. J. Lange, R. J. Morrison, H. N. Nelson, T. K. Nelson, J. D. Richman, D. Roberts,  
 A. Ryd, and M. S. Witherell  
*University of California, Santa Barbara, California 93106*

R. Balest, B. H. Behrens, W. T. Ford, A. Gritsan, H. Park, J. Roy, and J. G. Smith  
*University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80309-0390*

J. P. Alexander, C. Bebek, B. E. Berger, K. Berkelman, K. Bloom, V. Boisvert,  
 D. G. Cassel, H. A. Cho, D. S. Crowcroft, M. Dickson, S. von Dombrowski, P. S. Drell, K. M. Ecklund, R. Ehrlich,  
 A. D. Foland, P. Gaidarev, L. Gibbons, B. Gittelmann, S. W. Gray, D. L. Hartill, B. K. Heltsley, P. I. Hopman,  
 J. Kandaswamy, P. C. Kim, D. L. Kreinick, T. Lee, Y. Liu, N. B. Mistry, C. R. Ng, E. Nordberg, M. Ogg,‡  
 J. R. Patterson, D. Peterson, D. Riley, A. Soffer, B. Valant-Spaight, and C. Ward  
*Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853*

M. Athanas, P. Avery, C. D. Jones, M. Lohner, C. Prescott, J. Yelton, and J. Zheng  
*University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32611*

G. Brandenburg, R. A. Briere, A. Ershov, Y. S. Gao, D. Y.-J. Kim, R. Wilson, and H. Yamamoto  
*Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138*

T. E. Browder, Y. Li, and J. L. Rodriguez  
*University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, Hawaii 96822*

T. Bergfeld, B. I. Eisenstein, J. Ernst, G. E. Gladding, G. D. Gollin, R. M. Hans, E. Johnson, I. Karliner, M. A. Marsh, M. Palmer, M. Selen, and J. J. Thaler  
*University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, Illinois 61801*

K. W. Edwards  
*Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1S 5B6*  
*and the Institute of Particle Physics, Canada*

A. Bellerive, R. Janicek, D. B. MacFarlane, and P. M. Patel  
*McGill University, Montréal, Québec, Canada H3A 2T8*  
*and the Institute of Particle Physics, Canada*

A. J. Sadoff  
*Ithaca College, Ithaca, New York 14850*

R. Ammar, P. Baringer, A. Bean, D. Besson, D. Coppage, C. Darling, R. Davis, S. Kotov, I. Kravchenko, N. Kwak, and L. Zhou  
*University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66045*

S. Anderson, Y. Kubota, S. J. Lee, J. J. O'Neill, S. Patton, R. Poling, T. Riehle, and A. Smith  
*University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455*

M. S. Alam, S. B. Athar, Z. Ling, A. H. Mahmood, H. Severini, S. Timm, and F. Wappler  
*State University of New York at Albany, Albany, New York 12222*

A. Anastassov, J. E. Duboscq, D. Fujino, § K. K. Gan, T. Hart, K. Honscheid, H. Kagan, R. Kass, J. Lee, M. B. Spencer, M. Sung, A. Undrus, || R. Wanke, A. Wolf, and M. M. Zoeller  
*Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210*

B. Nemati, S. J. Richichi, W. R. Ross, and P. Skubic  
*University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma 73019*

(CLEO Collaboration)

(Received 23 October 1997; published 10 March 1998)

We have searched for the decay  $B \rightarrow D_{s1}^+(2536)X$  and measured an upper limit for the inclusive branching fraction of  $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow D_{s1}^+ X) < 0.96\%$  at the 90% confidence level. This limit is small compared with the total expected  $B \rightarrow \bar{D}^{(*)} D^{(*)} K X$  rate. Assuming factorization, the  $D_{s1}^+$  decay constant is constrained to be  $f_{D_{s1}^+} < 114$  MeV at the 90% confidence level, at least 2.5 times smaller than that of  $D_s^+$ . [S0556-2821(98)01809-8]

PACS number(s): 13.25.Hw, 14.40.Nd

## I. INTRODUCTION

One of the outstanding issues in  $B$  meson physics is the semileptonic branching fraction puzzle. Experimentally  $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow X l \nu)$  is measured to be  $(10.43 \pm 0.24\%)$  [1], whereas theoretical calculations have difficulties accommodating a branching fraction below  $\sim 12.5\%$  [2]. One way to reduce the theoretical expectations is through a twofold enhancement in the assumed  $\bar{b} \rightarrow \bar{c} c \bar{s}$  rate [3], which is estimated to

be  $\sim 15\%$  from the measured inclusive rates for  $B \rightarrow D_s^+ X$  and  $B \rightarrow \psi X$ .

Recently, Buchalla *et al.* [4] and Blok *et al.* [5] have suggested that a significant fraction of the  $\bar{b} \rightarrow \bar{c} c \bar{s}$  transition hadronizes into  $B \rightarrow \bar{D} D K X$ . This is supported by CLEO's [6] observation of "wrong-sign"  $D$  mesons from  $B$  decays,  $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow D X) = (7.9 \pm 2.2)\%$ , where the  $D$  comes from the virtual  $W^+ \rightarrow c \bar{s}$ . The ALEPH [7] and DELPHI [8] Collaborations have also observed sizeable  $B \rightarrow D^{(*)} \bar{D}^{(*)} X$  decay rates. Exclusive  $B$  decays involving wrong-sign  $D$  mesons can result from (1) resonant  $B \rightarrow \bar{D}^{(*)} D_s^{*} X$  decays, where the  $W^+ \rightarrow c \bar{s}$  hadronizes to an excited  $D_s^+$  meson that decays into  $D K X$ , and (2) non-resonant  $B \rightarrow \bar{D}^{(*)} D^{(*)} K$  decays. This paper explores one possibility in the first case, namely, the decays  $B \rightarrow D_{s1}^+(2536)X$  where  $D_{s1}^+$  is the narrow P-wave  $D_s^+$  meson with  $J^P = 1^+$ . The "upper-vertex" production of  $D_{s1}^+$  from  $W^+ \rightarrow c \bar{s}$  hadronization is shown in Fig. 1(a). In

\*Permanent address: Yonsei University, Seoul 120-749, Korea.

†Permanent address: Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, NY 11973.

‡Permanent address: University of Texas, Austin, TX 78712

§Permanent address: Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA 94551.

||Permanent address: BINP, RU-630090 Novosibirsk, Russia.




FIG. 1. Feynman diagrams for (a)  $B \rightarrow D_{s1}^+ X$  decays producing  $D_{s1}^+$  at the upper vertex and (b)  $B \rightarrow D_{s1}^- X$  decays producing  $D_{s1}^-$  at the lower vertex.

addition,  $D_{s1}^+$  mesons can be produced from ‘‘lower-vertex’’ decays  $b \rightarrow c\bar{u}d$  with the creation of an  $s\bar{s}$  quark pair, as shown in Fig. 1(b). This produces right-sign  $D$  mesons; however, the decay rate is expected to be small. Throughout this paper charge conjugate states are implied.

Continuum  $D_{s1}^+$  production has been thoroughly studied [1]. The  $D_{s1}^+$  is just above the  $D^*K$  mass threshold and decays dominantly into  $D^{*0}K^+$  and  $D^{*+}K^0$ . Other possible decay channels are negligible:  $D_s^{(*)+}\pi^0$  due to isospin conservation,  $D_s^{(*)+}(n\pi)$  due to Okubo-Zweig-Iizuka (OZI) rule suppression [9],  $DK$  or  $D_s^+\pi^0$  due to angular momentum and parity conservation, and  $D_s^{(*)+}\gamma$  due to the small radiative decay rate.

## II. DATA SAMPLE AND EVENT SELECTION

The data used in this analysis were selected from hadronic events collected by the CLEO II detector at the Cornell Electron Storage Ring (CESR). The CLEO II detector [10] is a large solenoidal detector with 67 tracking layers and a CsI electromagnetic calorimeter that provides efficient  $\pi^0$  reconstruction. The data consist of an integrated luminosity of  $3.11 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  at the  $Y(4S)$  resonance, corresponding to  $3.3 \times 10^6$   $B\bar{B}$  events. To evaluate non- $B\bar{B}$  backgrounds we also collected  $1.61 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  of ‘‘continuum’’ data 60 MeV below the  $Y(4S)$  resonance.

The inclusive  $B \rightarrow D_{s1}^+ X$  decay is studied by reconstructing the decay channels  $D_{s1}^+ \rightarrow D^{*0}K^+$  and  $D^{*+}K_S^0$  using the decay modes  $D^{*0} \rightarrow D^0\pi^0$  and  $D^{*+} \rightarrow D^0\pi^+$ . The  $D^0$  is reconstructed using the decay modes  $D^0 \rightarrow K^-\pi^+$  and  $K^-\pi^+\pi^0$ . Hadronic events are required to satisfy the ratio of Fox-Wolfram moments [11]  $R_2 = H_2/H_0 < 0.3$  to reduce the background from continuum events.

Charged tracks, except pions from  $K_S^0$  decays, are required to be consistent with coming from the primary interaction point. Charged kaon and pion candidates are identified using specific ionization ( $dE/dx$ ) and, when available, time-of-flight (TOF) information. For kaon identification, we consider the relative probability for a charged track to be a kaon,  $\mathcal{R}_K = \mathcal{P}_K / (\mathcal{P}_\pi + \mathcal{P}_K + \mathcal{P}_p)$ , where  $\mathcal{P}$  is the  $\chi^2$  probability for a given particle hypothesis. The requirement on  $\mathcal{R}_K$  depends on the decay mode of interest. Pion candidates are identified by requiring the  $dE/dx$  and, when available, TOF information to be within 3 standard deviations ( $\sigma$ ) of that expected for pions. We select  $K_S^0$  candidates through the decay to  $\pi^+\pi^-$  by requiring a decay vertex displaced from the primary interaction point and a  $K_S^0$  invariant mass within  $10 \text{ MeV}/c^2$  of its nominal value. We reconstruct  $\pi^0$  candi-

dates through the decay to  $\gamma\gamma$  by requiring candidates to have an invariant mass within 2.5 standard deviations ( $\sigma \approx 5 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ ) of the nominal  $\pi^0$  mass.

The  $K^-\pi^+$  and  $K^-\pi^+\pi^0$  combinations are required to have a kaon identification of  $\mathcal{R}_K > 0.5$  and  $0.7$ , respectively, and an invariant mass within 15 and 25  $\text{MeV}/c^2$  ( $\sim 2\sigma$ ) of the nominal  $D^0$  mass, respectively. In addition, we select regions of the  $D^0 \rightarrow K^-\pi^+\pi^0$  Dalitz plot to take advantage of the known resonant substructure [12]. For the  $D_{s1}^+ \rightarrow D^{*0}K^+$  mode, the Dalitz cut reduces the signal efficiency by 40% and the background by 80%. We relax the Dalitz cut for the  $D^{*+}K_S^0$  mode since the combinatoric background is substantially lower.

The  $D^{*+} \rightarrow D^0\pi^+$  candidates are required to have a mass difference  $M(D^0\pi^+) - M(D^0)$  within  $1.5 \text{ MeV}/c^2$  ( $\sim 2\sigma$ ) of the nominal value of  $145.4 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ , where  $M(X)$  is the reconstructed invariant mass of  $X$ . Similarly, the  $D^{*0} \rightarrow D^0\pi^0$  candidates are required to have a mass difference  $M(D^0\pi^0) - M(D^0)$  within  $1.5 \text{ MeV}/c^2$  ( $\sim 2\sigma$ ) of the nominal value of  $142.1 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ . To form  $D_{s1}^+$  candidates charged kaons are combined with  $D^{*0}$  candidates and  $K_S^0$ 's are combined with  $D^{*+}$  candidates. Since the primary kaons from  $D_{s1}^+ \rightarrow D^{*0}K^+$  decays have low momentum, we can impose a stringent  $\mathcal{R}_K > 0.9$  requirement on the  $K^+$  with negligible loss of efficiency. The  $D_{s1}^+$  candidates are required to have a scaled momentum  $x_p = p_{D_{s1}^+} / \sqrt{E_{beam}^2 - M_{D_{s1}^+}^2} < 0.45$ , which is the kinematic limit for  $B \rightarrow D_{s1}^+ X$  decays. (We ignore the negligible contributions from  $b \rightarrow u$  decays.) Upper-vertex  $D_{s1}^+$  production results in a maximum  $x_p$  of 0.35, and this requirement is imposed when determining the  $D_{s1}^+$  decay constant. The  $D_{s1}^+$  decay channels with  $\pi^0$ 's in the final state often have multiple  $D_{s1}^+$  candidates per event. We select the candidate with the highest  $\chi^2$  probability of being a  $D_{s1}^+$ , which is derived from the invariant masses of the reconstructed  $\pi^0$ ,  $D^0$ , and  $D^*$  mesons.

## III. RAW YIELDS

The  $D_{s1}^+$  signal is identified using the  $D^*K$  mass difference,  $\Delta M_1 = M(D^{*0}K^+) - M(D^{*0}) - M_{K^+}$  and  $\Delta M_2 = M(D^{*+}K_S^0) - M(D^{*+}) - M_{K_S^0}$ , where  $M_{K^+}$  and  $M_{K_S^0}$  are the known masses [1]. The  $D^*K$  mass difference signal has a resolution that is two to four times smaller than the corresponding signal in the reconstructed  $D^*K$  invariant mass distribution. The  $\Delta M_1$  and  $\Delta M_2$  distributions are shown in Fig. 2, where the  $D^0 \rightarrow K^-\pi^+$  and  $K^-\pi^+\pi^0$  modes have been added together. The data are fit with a Gaussian signal and a threshold background function. The Gaussian width is fixed to that expected from a GEANT-based Monte Carlo simulation [13] ( $\sigma = 2.4 - 3.6 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ , depending on the mode) and the mean is fixed to the measured  $D_{s1}^+$  mass difference from continuum data ( $\Delta M_1 \approx 35 \text{ MeV}/c^2$  and  $\Delta M_2 \approx 27 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ .) We observe  $42 \pm 14$  signal events in the  $D^{*0}K^+$  mode and  $9 \pm 6$  events in the  $D^{*+}K_S^0$  mode.

However, when the  $D^{*0}K^+$  candidates are further subdivided into the  $D^0 \rightarrow K^-\pi^+$  and  $K^-\pi^+\pi^0$  decay channels there is a discrepancy in the  $D_{s1}^+$  yields. As shown in Fig. 3, we observe  $10 \pm 8$  signal events in the  $\Delta M_1$  distribution for




FIG. 2. The mass difference distribution for (a)  $D^{*0}K^+$  and (b)  $D^{*+}K_S^0$  candidates from  $B$  meson decays.

the  $D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$  channel and  $33 \pm 12$   $D_{s1}^+$  signal events for the  $D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+ \pi^0$  channel. After accounting for branching fractions and efficiencies, discussed below, this results in a  $2.2\sigma$  discrepancy in the  $D^{*0}K^+$  rates between the two  $D^0$  modes. We cannot rule out the fact that background sources may be contributing a false  $D_{s1}^+$  signal in the  $D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+ \pi^0$  channel, but not in the  $D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$  channel. However, no such mechanism has been uncovered. To be conservative, we choose to quote only an upper limit for the decay  $B \rightarrow D_{s1}^+ X$ .

Since the  $D_{s1}^+$  reconstruction efficiency increases rapidly




FIG. 3. The  $\Delta M_1$  mass difference distribution for  $D^{*0}K^+$  candidates from the (a)  $D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$  and (b)  $D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+ \pi^0$  decay channels.




FIG. 4. The efficiency corrected yield for our  $B \rightarrow D_{s1}^+ X$  candidates as a function of the  $D_{s1}^+$  scaled momentum  $x_p$ . The kinematic limit from upper-vertex and lower-vertex  $B \rightarrow D_{s1}^+ X$  decays is  $x_p < 0.35$  and  $x_p < 0.45$ , respectively.

with  $x_p$  and the  $D_{s1}^+$  momentum distribution from  $B$  decays is not known, we compute the inclusive  $B \rightarrow D_{s1}^+ X$  branching fraction by dividing the data into four equal regions of  $x_p$  from 0.05 to 0.45 and summing the efficiency corrected yields. The  $D_{s1}^+ \rightarrow D^{*0}K^+$  and  $D^{*+}K^0$  branching fractions are equal according to isospin, and their ratio has been measured to be within 30% of unity [14]. We measure the branching fraction  $B \rightarrow D_{s1}^+ X$  to be  $(0.77 \pm 0.22)\%$  from the  $D^{*0}K^+$  mode and  $(0.28 \pm 0.37)\%$  from the  $D^{*+}K_S^0$  mode, where the error is statistical only. The two measurements are statistically consistent. The  $x_p$  distribution for our  $D_{s1}^+$  candidates is shown in Fig. 4.

#### IV. CROSS CHECKS

Several cross checks, shown in Fig. 5, were performed to corroborate the validity of the  $D_{s1}^+$  signal. The scaled continuum background from data after satisfying all selection cuts is negligible, and there is no excess in the  $\Delta M_1$  signal region ( $3 \pm 5$  events). The uncertainty in the continuum  $D_{s1}^+$  contribution is included in the systematic error. There is also no evidence of peaking in the  $\Delta M_1$  signal region for wrong-sign  $D^{*0}K^-$  combinations ( $0 \pm 9$  events),  $D^0$  mass sidebands ( $5 \pm 5$  events), and  $D^{*0}$  mass sidebands ( $-4 \pm 6$  events).

We have also searched for the  $D^0$  signal from  $D_{s1}^+ \rightarrow D^{*0}K^+$  candidates in the  $\Delta M_1$  signal region,  $|\Delta M_1 - 35 \text{ MeV}/c^2| < 10 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ , by relaxing the  $D^0$  mass cut and histogramming the invariant mass of all  $K^- \pi^+$  and  $K^- \pi^+ \pi^0$  combinations that satisfy the remaining selection criteria. In events with multiple candidates per  $D^0$  decay mode we select the candidate with the highest  $\chi^2$  probability, which is derived from the reconstructed  $\pi^0$  and  $D_{s1}^+$  masses. We observe  $100 \pm 15$   $D^0$  events. However, there are also real  $D^0$ 's in the random  $D^{*0}K^+$  combinations under the  $D_{s1}^+$




FIG. 5. The normalized  $D^{*0}K^+$  mass difference distributions from (a) continuum events, (b)  $D^{*0}K^-$  ‘‘wrong-sign’’ combinations, (c)  $D^0$  mass sidebands, and (d)  $D^{*0}$  mass sidebands.

peak; after a  $\Delta M_1$  sideband subtraction the  $D^0$  invariant mass spectrum yields  $44 \pm 18$  events [see Fig. 6(a)]. This is consistent with our  $D_{s1}^+ \rightarrow D^{*0}K^+$  yield in Fig. 2.

Similarly, we have studied the  $D^{*0}$  signal from  $D_{s1}^+ \rightarrow D^{*0}K^+$  candidates in the  $\Delta M_1$  signal region. We observe  $59 \pm 15$   $D^0$  events. As in the  $D^0$  case there are also real  $D^{*0}$ 's in the random  $D^{*0}K^+$  combinations under the  $D_{s1}^+$  peak. After a  $\Delta M_1$  sideband subtraction the  $D^{*0}$  mass difference spectrum yields  $25 \pm 18$  events [see Fig. 6(b)], consistent with our  $D_{s1}^+ \rightarrow D^{*0}K^+$  yield.

Finally, we have studied the  $D_{s1}^+$  production from continuum  $e^+e^- \rightarrow c\bar{c}$  events. The selection criteria is similar to that used to find  $D_{s1}^+$  from  $B$  decays, but since continuum charm production has a hard fragmentation, we require  $x_p > 0.5$ . In addition, we remove the  $R_2 < 0.3$  cut, relax the charged kaon identification to  $\mathcal{R}_K > 0.1$ , and remove the Dalitz cut for  $D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+ \pi^0$ . The mass difference distribution for  $D^{*0}K^+$  and  $D^{*+}K_S^0$  combinations are shown in Fig. 7, where the  $D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$  and  $K^- \pi^+ \pi^0$  modes have been




FIG. 6. (a) The invariant mass distribution for  $K^- \pi^+$  and  $K^- \pi^+ \pi^0$  combinations from  $D^{*0}K^+$  candidates in the  $\Delta M_1$  signal region, after sideband subtraction. (b) The  $D^{*0}$  mass difference distribution from  $D^{*0}K^+$  candidates in the  $\Delta M_1$  signal region, after sideband subtraction.




FIG. 7. The mass difference distribution for (a)  $D^{*0}K^+$  and (b)  $D^{*+}K_S^0$  candidates from continuum  $e^+e^- \rightarrow c\bar{c}$  events.

added together. We extract the  $D_{s1}^+$  signal by fitting the data with a Gaussian signal and a threshold background function. The Gaussian width is fixed to the value predicted by Monte Carlo ( $2.1 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ ), and the mean is allowed to float. We observe  $222 \pm 19$  events in the  $D_{s1}^+ \rightarrow D^{*0}K^+$  mode with a mass difference of  $35.0 \pm 0.2 \text{ MeV}/c^2$  (statistical error only), and  $101 \pm 11$  events in the  $D_{s1}^+ \rightarrow D^{*+}K_S^0$  mode with a mass difference of  $27.5 \pm 0.3 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ . The results are consistent with the previous CLEO analysis [14].

## V. SYSTEMATIC ERRORS AND FINAL RESULTS

There are several sources of systematic error. We assign a systematic error of 16% to account for the  $2.2\sigma$  discrepancy between the  $D^{*0}K^+$  rates for the  $D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$  and  $K^- \pi^+ \pi^0$  modes. This accommodates different methods of computing the weighted average of the  $B \rightarrow D_{s1}^+ X$  branching fraction from the four separate decay chains. Uncertainties in the  $\Delta M$  value of  $\pm 0.3 \text{ MeV}/c^2$  from fits to the continuum  $D_{s1}^+$  production were used to set a systematic error of 1% and 16% in the  $D^{*0}K^+$  and  $D^{*+}K_S^0$  yields from  $B$  decays, respectively. Uncertainties due to reconstruction efficiencies include 1.5% per charged track, 5% per  $\pi^0$ , 5% for slow pions from  $D^{*+}$ , and 5% for  $K_S^0$ . We also include systematic errors of 7% for Monte Carlo statistics, 5% for kaon identification and the Dalitz decay cut efficiency, 4% for uncertainties in the yield for  $x_p < 0.05$ , and 8% for uncertainties in the continuum  $D_{s1}^+$  contribution that passes our selection criteria. The total systematic error is 25%.

Averaging the  $D^{*0}K^+$  and  $D^{*+}K_S^0$  modes together, we obtain  $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow D_{s1}^+ X) = (0.64 \pm 0.19 \pm 0.16)\%$ . Since the  $D_{s1}^+$  signal is observed largely in only one decay mode  $D_{s1}^+ \rightarrow D^{*0}K^+$  with  $D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+ \pi^0$ , and since there is a discrepancy between this mode and the corresponding mode involving  $D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$ , we instead prefer to quote an upper limit on

the branching fraction to be  $\mathcal{B} < 0.96\%$  at the 90% C.L. [15] This decay rate limit is small relative to the total rate expected for  $B \rightarrow \bar{D}^{(*)} D^{(*)} K X$  of about  $(7.9 \pm 2.2)\%$  from the wrong-sign  $D$  meson yield in  $B$  decays [6]. This is not surprising considering the  $c\bar{s}$  system has appreciable phase space beyond the  $D_{s1}^+$  mass [4]. Also, CLEO's [16] recent observation of exclusive  $B \rightarrow \bar{D}^{(*)} D^{(*)} K$  decays shows that the  $D^{(*)} K$  invariant mass distribution lies mostly above the  $D_{s1}^+$  mass.

## VI. $D_{s1}^+$ DECAY CONSTANT

Measurement of the  $B \rightarrow D_{s1}^+ X$  decay rate also provides an estimate of the  $D_{s1}^+$  decay constant,  $f_{D_{s1}^+}$ , assuming that the  $D_{s1}^+$  comes dominantly from upper-vertex decays. The inclusive decay rate for  $B$  mesons into ground state or excited  $D_s^+$  mesons can be calculated assuming factorization [17]:

$$\Gamma(B \rightarrow D_s X) = \frac{G_F^2 |V_{cb} V_{cs}|^2}{16\pi} M_b^3 a_1^2 f_{D_s}^2 I(x, y)$$

where  $a_1$  is the Bauer-Stech-Wirbel (BSW) [18] parameter for the effective charged current, and  $I(x, y)$  is a kinematic factor with  $x = M_D^2/M_b^2$  and  $y = M_c^2/M_b^2$ . For scalar or pseudoscalar  $D_s$  mesons,  $I(x, y) = \sqrt{(1-x-y)^2 - 4xy}(1-x-2y-xy+y^2)$ , and for vector or axial-vector  $D_s$  mesons,  $I(x, y) = \sqrt{(1-x-y)^2 - 4xy}(1+x-2x^2-2y+xy+y^2)$ .

We have tightened the  $x_p$  requirement to  $x_p < 0.35$  since this is the kinematic limit for upper-vertex  $B \rightarrow D_{s1}^+ \bar{D} X$  decays. The production of ground state and excited  $D_s^+$  mesons from lower-vertex decays such as  $\bar{B} \rightarrow D_{s1}^+ \bar{K} X$  is expected to be suppressed. This is certainly true for  $B \rightarrow D_s^+ X$  decays where the fraction of  $D_s^+$  produced at the lower-vertex is measured to be  $0.172 \pm 0.079 \pm 0.026$  [19]. Moreover, there is no evidence of  $D_{s1}^+$  production in the region  $x_p = 0.35 - 0.45$  where lower-vertex production is likely to occur (see Fig. 4). However, there is an excess of  $B \rightarrow D_{s1}^+ X$  candidates observed at low  $x_p < 0.15$  (as seen in Fig. 4) which cannot arise from factorizable upper-vertex contributions, and hence should not be included in computing  $f_{D_{s1}^+}$  from the above equation. We use  $(75 \pm 25)\%$  of the measured  $B \rightarrow D_{s1}^+ X$  branching fraction to account for these uncertainties in the lower-vertex and non-factorizable contributions to  $D_{s1}^+$ .

With the assumption  $f_{D_s^+} = f_{D_s^{*+}}$  we can extract  $f_{D_{s1}^+}$  from the ratio of inclusive rates:

$$\frac{\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow D_{s1}^+ X)}{\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow D_s^+ X)} = \frac{\Gamma(B \rightarrow D_{s1}^+ X)}{\Gamma(B \rightarrow D_s^+ X) + \Gamma(B \rightarrow D_s^{*+} X)} \\ \approx 0.49 \left( \frac{f_{D_{s1}^+}}{f_{D_s^+}} \right)^2.$$

Many systematic errors cancel in the ratio. From our upper limit on  $B \rightarrow D_{s1}^+ X$  and CLEO's [20] measurement of  $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow D_s^+ X) = (12.11 \pm 0.39 \pm 0.88 \pm 1.38)\%$ , we derive  $f_{D_{s1}^+}/f_{D_s^+} < 0.40$  at the 90% C.L. The central value is  $f_{D_{s1}^+}/f_{D_s^+} = 0.29 \pm 0.06 \pm 0.06$ , where the first error is due to the total error in the inclusive  $B \rightarrow D_s^+ X$  and  $B \rightarrow D_{s1}^+ X$  branching fractions, and the second is the uncertainty in the non-factorizable and lower-vertex contributions to the  $B \rightarrow D_{s1}^+ X$  decay rate. Using the measured value of  $f_{D_s^+} = 280 \pm 40$  MeV [20] gives  $f_{D_{s1}^+} = 81 \pm 26$  MeV which corresponds to an upper limit of  $f_{D_{s1}^+} < 114$  MeV. This limit accommodates the prediction of  $f_{D_{s1}^+} = 87 \pm 19$  MeV by Veseli and Dunietz [21].

## VII. CONCLUSIONS

In summary, we have searched for  $B$  mesons decaying into the P-wave  $D_{s1}^+$  (2536) meson. The upper limit of  $\mathcal{B}(B \rightarrow D_{s1}^+ X) < 0.96\%$  at the 90% C.L. accounts for at most only a fraction of the total wrong-sign  $B \rightarrow DX$  rate. Assuming factorization, the decay constant  $f_{D_{s1}^+}$  is at least a factor of 2.5 times smaller than the decay constant for the pseudo-scalar  $D_s^+$ .

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We gratefully acknowledge the effort of the CESR staff in providing us with excellent luminosity and running conditions. J.P.A., J.R.P., and I.P.J.S. thank the NYI program of the NSF, M.S. thanks the PFF program of the NSF, G.E. thanks the Heisenberg Foundation, K.K.G., M.S., H.N.N., T.S., and H.Y. thank the OJI program of DOE, J.R.P., K.H., M.S. and V.S. thank the A.P. Sloan Foundation, R.W. thanks the Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung, M.S. thanks Research Corporation, and S.D. thanks the Swiss National Science Foundation for support. This work was supported by the National Science Foundation, the U.S. Department of Energy, and the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

- 
- [1] Particle Data Group, R. M. Barnett *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **54**, 1 (1996).  
 [2] I. Bigi, B. Blok, M. Shifman, and A. Vainshtein, Phys. Lett. B **323**, 408 (1994).  
 [3] A. F. Falk, M. B. Wise, and I. Dunietz, Phys. Rev. D **51**, 1183 (1995); E. Bagan, P. Ball, V. M. Braun, and P. Gosdzinsky,

- Phys. Lett. B **324**, 362 (1995); M. B. Voloshin, Phys. Rev. D **51**, 3948 (1995).  
 [4] G. Buchalla, I. Dunietz, and H. Yamamoto, Phys. Lett. B **364**, 188 (1995).  
 [5] B. Blok, M. Shifman, and N. Uraltsev, Nucl. Phys. **B494**, 237 (1997).

- [6] CLEO Collaboration, T. E. Coan *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 1150 (1998).
- [7] ALEPH Collaboration, A. M. Stacey, in *ICHEP'96*, Proceedings of the 1996 International Conference on High Energy Physics, Warsaw, Poland, edited by Z. Ajduk and A. Wroblewski (World Scientific, Singapore, 1997).
- [8] DELPHI Collaboration, M. L. Andrieux, in *ICHEP'96* [7].
- [9] S. Okubo, Phys. Lett. **5B**, 165 (1963); G. Zweig, CERN Report 8419/TH412 (1964); I. Iizuka, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **37**, 21 (1966).
- [10] CLEO Collaboration, Y. Kubota *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res. A **320**, 66 (1992).
- [11] G. Fox and S. Wolfram, Phys. Rev. Lett. **41**, 1581 (1978).
- [12] E691 Collaboration, J. C. Anjos *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **48**, 56 (1993).
- [13] R. Brun *et al.*, GEANT 3.15, CERN DD/EE/84-1.
- [14] CLEO Collaboration, J. Alexander *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **303**, 377 (1993).
- [15] The 90% upper limit is derived, assuming Gaussian statistics, by adding 1.28 times the total error to the central value.
- [16] CLEO Collaboration, M. Bishai *et al.*, contributed to the 1997 International Europhysics Conference on High Energy Physics, Jerusalem, Israel.
- [17] J. H. Kuhn, S. Nussinov, and R. Ruckl, Z. Phys. C **5**, 117 (1980).
- [18] M. Bauer, B. Stech, and M. Wirbel, Z. Phys. C **29**, 637 (1985).
- [19] CLEO Collaboration, X. Fu *et al.*, contributed to the 1995 International Europhysics Conference on High Energy Physics, Brussels, Belgium.
- [20] CLEO Collaboration, D. Gibaut *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **53**, 4734 (1996).
- [21] S. Veseli and I. Dunietz, Phys. Rev. D **54**, 6803 (1996).