Hadronic Charm Decays

Jonas Rademacker on behalf of CLEO-c

June 2010, FCPC, Turino

Hadronic Charm Decays (without the coolest bits)

Jonas Rademacker on behalf of CLEO-c

June 2010, FCPC, Turino

Hadronic Charm Decays (without the coolest bits)

Jonas Rademacker on behalf of CLEO-c

Correlated charm for γ covered by Chris Thomas, yesterday

Mixing and CP violation in charm covered in dedicated session tomorrow

June 2010, FCPC, Turino

Hadronic Charm Decays (without the coolest bits)

Jonas Rademacker on behalf of CLEO-c

Plenty of good stuff left:
Very comprehensive sets of absolute and relative branching fractions (incl. results from CLEO-c's full D and Ds dataset), symmetries of the strong interaction, strong phases, Dalitz analyses.

Correlated charm for γ covered by Chris Thomas, yesterday

Mixing and CP violation in charm covered in dedicated session tomorrow

June 2010, FCPC, Turino

Facilities

- Most hadronic charm decays are found when looking for B mesons: By the B factories (ca 3 billion D mesons), by CDF's hadronic B trigger (even larger amounts, only a small fraction analysed). LHCb will reconstruct unprecedented amounts and has a dedicated charm programme.

- But: Quantity is not everything. FOCUS, a fixed-target charm experiment, is responsible for many world-leading charm results. CLEO-c has only ~0.3% of the amount of charm that the B factories have produced, but delivers unique and competitive results due to the special properties of threshold production. BES-III to continue the good work.

Threshold production:



- Use for normalisation in absolute BF measurements.
- Fixes quantum numbers of signal D

Absolute BF

- Important normalising modes: $D^0 \to K^- \pi^+$
  $D^+ \to K^- \pi^+ \pi^+$
  $D_s^+ \to K^- K^+ \pi^+$
  (historically "$\phi\pi^+$")



Belle 07: hep-ex/0701053 (Prel.) [552 fb^{-1}]
CLEO 07: PRD 76, 112001 [281 pb^{-1}]
BaBar 08: PRL 100, 051802 [210 fb^{-1}]
CLEO 08: PRL 100, 161804 [298 pb^{-1}]

- Methods - need to know there is a D before reconstructing it
  - BaBar: partial reconstruction of $D^* \to D\pi$, using only the π (and the rest of the event, but not the D)
  - BELLE: $e^+e^- \to D_s^{*+} D_{s1}^- (\to \overline{D}^{*0} K^-)$
  - CLEO-c: $e^+e^- \to \overline{D}^{(*)}{}_{(s)}\, D_{(s)}$

Branching Fractions of $D, D_{(S)} \rightarrow PP$

CLEO-c, full data set

818/pb at ψ(3770)

$3 \cdot 10^6$ $D^o D^o$

$2.4 \cdot 10^6$ $D^+ D^-$

586/pb at

$\sqrt{s}$=4170 MeV

$5.4 \cdot 10^5$ $D_S^+ D_S^-$

PhysRevD.81.052013 (2009)

TABLE II: Ratios of branching fractions to the corresponding normalization modes $D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$, $D^+ \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+$, anc $D_s \to K_S^0 K^+$, branching fractions results from this analysis, and charge asymmetries $\mathcal{A}_{CP}$. Uncertainties are statistical error systematic error, and the error from the input branching fractions of normalization modes.

Mode	$\mathcal{B}_{\text{mode}}/\mathcal{B}_{\text{Normalization}}$ (%)	This result $\mathcal{B}$ (%)	$\mathcal{A}_{CP}$ (%)
$D^0 \to K^+K^-$	10.4138 ± 0.1064 ± 0.1128	0.4052 ± 0.0041 ± 0.0044 ± 0.0080	
$D^0 \to K_S^0 K_S^0$	0.4095 ± 0.0432 ± 0.0214	0.0159 ± 0.0017 ± 0.0008 ± 0.0003	
$D^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-$	3.7023 ± 0.0561 ± 0.0893	0.1441 ± 0.0022 ± 0.0035 ± 0.0029	
$D^0 \to \pi^0\pi^0$	2.1491 ± 0.0740 ± 0.0758	0.0836 ± 0.0029 ± 0.0030 ± 0.0017	
$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$	100	3.8910 external input [2]	0.5 ± 0.4 ± 0.9
$D^0 \to K_S^0\pi^0$	31.0495 ± 0.2964 ± 0.7467	1.2081 ± 0.0115 ± 0.0291 ± 0.0239	
$D^0 \to K_S^0\eta$	12.2575 ± 0.2872 ± 0.6677	0.4769 ± 0.0112 ± 0.0260 ± 0.0094	
$D^0 \to \pi^0\eta$	1.7714 ± 0.1481 ± 0.1047	0.0689 ± 0.0058 ± 0.0041 ± 0.0014	
$D^0 \to K_S^0\eta'$	24.7307 ± 0.8154 ± 1.1433	0.9623 ± 0.0317 ± 0.0445 ± 0.0190	
$D^0 \to \pi^0\eta'$	2.4084 ± 0.2874 ± 0.1519	0.0937 ± 0.0112 ± 0.0059 ± 0.0019	
$D^0 \to \eta\eta$	4.2495 ± 0.2838 ± 0.3522	0.1653 ± 0.0110 ± 0.0137 ± 0.0033	
$D^0 \to \eta\eta'$	2.7318 ± 0.6235 ± 0.2500	0.1063 ± 0.0243 ± 0.0097 ± 0.0021	
$D^+ \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+$	100	9.1400 external input [2]	-0.1 ± 0.4 ± 0.9
$D^+ \to K_S^0 K^+$	3.3502 ± 0.0573 ± 0.0720	0.3062 ± 0.0052 ± 0.0066 ± 0.0066	-0.2 ± 1.5 ± 0.9
$D^+ \to \pi^+\pi^0$	1.3208 ± 0.0382 ± 0.0443	0.1207 ± 0.0035 ± 0.0041 ± 0.0026	2.9 ± 2.9 ± 0.3
$D^+ \to K_S^0\pi^+$	16.8160 ± 0.1239 ± 0.3679	1.5370 ± 0.0113 ± 0.0336 ± 0.0331	-1.3 ± 0.7 ± 0.3
$D^+ \to K^+\pi^0$	0.1923 ± 0.0206 ± 0.0063	0.0176 ± 0.0019 ± 0.0006 ± 0.0004	-3.5 ± 10.7 ± 0.9
$D^+ \to K^+\eta$	< 0.1442 (90% C.L.)	< 0.0132 (90% C.L.)	
$D^+ \to \pi^+\eta$	3.8538 ± 0.0895 ± 0.1916	0.3522 ± 0.0082 ± 0.0175 ± 0.0076	-2.0 ± 2.3 ± 0.3
$D^+ \to K^+\eta'$	< 0.2032 (90% C.L.)	< 0.0187 (90% C.L.)	
$D^+ \to \pi^+\eta'$	5.2061 ± 0.1762 ± 0.2565	0.4758 ± 0.0161 ± 0.0234 ± 0.0103	-4.0 ± 3.4 ± 0.6
$D_s^+ \to K_S^0 K^+$	100	1.4900 external input [3]	4.7 ± 1.8 ± 0.9
$D_s^+ \to \pi^+\pi^0$	< 2.3492 (90% C.L.)	< 0.0376 (90% C.L.)	
$D_s^+ \to K_S^0\pi^+$	8.4766 ± 0.7147 ± 0.1778	0.1263 ± 0.0106 ± 0.0026 ± 0.0073	16.3 ± 7.3 ± 0.3
$D_s^+ \to K^+\pi^0$	4.2383 ± 1.4756 ± 0.2304	0.0632 ± 0.0220 ± 0.0034 ± 0.0036	-26.6 ± 23.8 ± 0.9
$D_s^+ \to K^+\eta$	11.7933 ± 2.1753 ± 0.5888	0.1757 ± 0.0324 ± 0.0088 ± 0.0101	9.3 ± 15.2 ± 0.9
$D_s^+ \to \pi^+\eta$	123.1123 ± 4.2907 ± 6.2133	1.8344 ± 0.0639 ± 0.0926 ± 0.1059	-4.6 ± 2.9 ± 0.3
$D_s^+ \to K^+\eta'$	11.9866 ± 3.6840 ± 0.6158	0.1786 ± 0.0549 ± 0.0092 ± 0.0103	6.0 ± 18.9 ± 0.9
$D_s^+ \to \pi^+\eta'$	269.8080 ± 8.9375 ± 14.0957	4.0201 ± 0.1332 ± 0.2100 ± 0.2320	-6.1 ± 3.0 ± 0.6

Some results I'll show later use only part the data set.

Diagrammatic Approach

T=Colour-favoured Tree



C=Colour-suppressed tree



E=Exchange



A=Annihilation



Express CF decays in terms of SU(3)-invariant diagrams, fit to measured BFs

Meson	Decay mode	$\mathcal{B}$ [10] (%)	Rep.
D^0	$K^-\pi^+$	3.891±0.077	$T+E$
	$\overline{K}^0\pi^0$	2.380±0.092	$(C-E)/\sqrt{2}$
	$\overline{K}^0\eta$	0.962±0.060	$\frac{C}{\sqrt{2}}\sin(\theta_\eta+\phi_1)-\frac{\sqrt{3}E}{\sqrt{2}}\cos(\theta_\eta+2\phi_1)$
	$\overline{K}^0\eta'$	1.900±0.108	$-\frac{C}{\sqrt{2}}\cos(\theta_\eta+\phi_1)-\frac{\sqrt{3}E}{\sqrt{2}}\sin(\theta_\eta+2\phi_1)$
D^+	$\overline{K}^0\pi^+$	3.074±0.097	$C+T$
D_s^+	$\overline{K}^0K^+$	2.98±0.17	$C+A$
	$\pi^+\eta$	1.84±0.15	$T\cos(\theta_\eta+\phi_1)-\sqrt{2}A\sin(\theta_\eta+\phi_1)$
	$\pi^+\eta'$	3.95±0.34	$T\sin(\theta_\eta+\phi_1)+\sqrt{2}A\cos(\theta_\eta+\phi_1)$

$$\begin{aligned} T &= 3.003 \pm 0.023 \\ C &= (2.565 \pm 0.030)\ \exp\left[i(-152.11 \pm 0.57)^\circ\right] \\ E &= (1.372 \pm 0.036)\ \exp\left[i(123.62 \pm 1.25)^\circ\right] \\ A &= (0.452 \pm 0.058)\ \exp\left[i(19^{+15}_{-14})^\circ\right] \end{aligned}$$

These are not Feynman diagrams. All QCD effects to all orders are implied

Applying the diagrammatic approach to SCS

- Using the results from the CF analysis to predict SCS decay rates results in reasonable qualitative agreement with some notable exceptions.

Meson	Decay mode	$\mathcal{B}$[1] (10^{-3})	Predicted $\mathcal{B}$ (10^{-3}) $\lvert T\rvert < \lvert C\rvert$	$\lvert T\rvert > \lvert C\rvert$
D^0	$\pi^+\pi^-$	1.45 ± 0.05	2.24	2.24
	$\pi^0\pi^0$	0.81 ± 0.05	1.36	1.35
	K^+K^-	4.07 ± 0.10	1.92	1.93
	$K^0\overline{K}^0$	0.32 ± 0.02	0	0
D^+	$\pi^+\pi^0$	1.18 ± 0.06	0.88	0.89
	$K^+\overline{K}^0$	6.12 ± 0.22	0.73	6.15
D_s^+	π^+K^0	2.52 ± 0.27	0.37	3.08
	π^0K^+	0.62 ± 0.23	0.86	0.85

- For decays involving η or η', there is some indication of the presence of an additional contribution from the singlet-annihilation diagram:



PhysRevD.81.014026 2010

1st observation and SU(3) test

	Expect from SU(3)	get
$\frac{\Gamma\left(D^+ \to K^+K^+\pi^-\right)\,\Gamma\left(D^+ \to K^+\pi^+\pi^-\right)}{\Gamma\left(D^+ \to K^+K^-\pi^+\right)\,\Gamma\left(D^+ \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+\right)}$	$\tan^8\theta$ H. J. Lipkin, Nucl. Phys. B, Proc. Suppl. 115, 117 (2003).	$(1.57 \pm 0.21)\times\tan^8\theta$ BELLE: Phys. Rev. Lett. 102, 221802 (2009)

1st Observation of $D_s^+ \to K^+K^+\pi^-$ (BELLE 2009)



U-spin and $D^o \rightarrow K_{S,L}\pi^o$

*U-spin: swap d↔s quarks, important e.g. for extracting γ from $B_S \rightarrow KK$, $B_d \rightarrow \pi\pi$

- $\Gamma(D^o \rightarrow K_S\pi^o) \neq \Gamma(D^o \rightarrow K_L\pi^o)$

- $\sqrt{2}\,A(D^o \rightarrow K_{S,L}\pi^o) = \quad A(D \rightarrow K^o\pi^o) \quad \pm \quad A(D \rightarrow \overline{K^o}\pi^o)$

CF 

$\pm$ 

DCS

U-spin* prediction

$$\frac{\Gamma\left(D^0 \rightarrow K_S\pi^0\right) - \Gamma\left(D^0 \rightarrow K_L\pi^0\right)}{\Gamma\left(D^0 \rightarrow K_S\pi^0\right) + \Gamma\left(D^0 \rightarrow K_L\pi^0\right)} = -2\frac{A_{DCS}}{A_{CF}} = 2\tan^2\theta_C = 0.109$$

I. Bigi and H. Yamamoto, Physics Letters 349 (1995) 363-366

$D^o \to K_{L,S}\pi^0$ $D^+ \to K_{L,S}\pi^+$ experimentally

- Challenging: Invisible K_L, difficult π^o.
- CLEO-c:
  - e+ e– → ψ(3770)→DD

    100% of beam energy converted to DD pair ⇒ kinematic constraints.
  - Extremely clean environment, good calorimeter

CLEAN-c



$$\psi(3770) \to D^0(K_S\pi^+\pi^-)\bar{D}^0(K^+\pi^-)$$

$D^o \rightarrow K_{L,S}\pi^0$, at CLEO-c

- Clean missing mass-squared peak at $m^2_{K^o}$ = 0.28GeV^2
- Lines: MC simulation. Crosses: Data.
- Result



$$\frac{\Gamma\left(D^0 \rightarrow K_S\pi^0\right) - \Gamma\left(D^0 \rightarrow K_L\pi^0\right)}{\Gamma\left(D^0 \rightarrow K_S\pi^0\right) + \Gamma\left(D^0 \rightarrow K_L\pi^0\right)} = 0.108 \pm 0.025 \pm 0.024$$

In good agreement with U-spin prediction of $2\tan^2\theta$=0.109

281/pb at CLEO: PRL **100,** 091801 (2008)

First Observation of $D_s^+ \rightarrow pn$



CLEO-c: Phys. Rev. Lett. 100, 181802 (2008)

- Only baryonic state kinematically accessible to D^o D^+ D_s^+
- Virtually background-free reconstruction at CLEO-c
- First observation of meson → 2 baryons plus nothing else.

$$\mathcal{B}(D_s^+ \rightarrow p\bar{n}) = (1.30 \pm 0.36^{+0.12}_{-0.16}) \times 10^{-3}$$

Inclusive Ds BF

- $e^+e^- \to D_S^{+*} D_S^-$
- Fully reconstruct one Ds as tag
- Reconstruction of desired decay product on other side.



CLEO: PhysRevD.79.112008 (2009) (arXiv:0904.2417)

Tag:



reconstructed Ds mass minus PDG Ds mass

Inclusive reconstruction:



Inclusive Ds BF Results

Mode	Yield(%)	K_L^0 Mode	Yield(%)	$\mathcal{B}$(PDG)(%)	prediction based on excl. rates [1]
$D_s^+ \to \pi^+ X$	$119.3 \pm 1.2 \pm 0.7$				125.5 ±11.1
$D_s^+ \to \pi^- X$	$43.2 \pm 0.9 \pm 0.3$				46.6±6.8
$D_s^+ \to \pi^0 X$	$123.4 \pm 3.8 \pm 5.3$				112.5±8.0
$D_s^+ \to K^+ X$	$28.9 \pm 0.6 \pm 0.3$			$20 \begin{smallmatrix} + & 18 \\ - & 14 \end{smallmatrix}$	27.3 ± 1.4
$D_s^+ \to K^- X$	$18.7 \pm 0.5 \pm 0.2$			$13 \begin{smallmatrix} + & 14 \\ - & 12 \end{smallmatrix}$	18.4±0.7
$D_s^+ \to \eta X$	$29.9 \pm 2.2 \pm 1.7$				32.7 ± 2.9
$D_s^+ \to \eta' X$	$11.7 \pm 1.7 \pm 0.7$				18.2±2.1
$D_s^+ \to \phi X$	$15.7 \pm 0.8 \pm 0.6$				19.2±2.4
$D_s^+ \to \omega X$	$6.1 \pm 1.4 \pm 0.3$				0.8±0.1
$D_s^+ \to f_0(980)X, f_0(980) \to \pi^+\pi^-$	$< 1.3\%$ (90% CL)				
$D_s^+ \to K_S^0 X$	$19.0 \pm 1.0 \pm 0.4$	$D_s^+ \to K_L^0 X$	15.6 ± 2.0	20 ± 14	K^o: 18.4±2.0, $\bar{K}^o$ 22.7± 2.2
$D_s^+ \to K_S^0 K_S^0 X$	$1.7 \pm 0.3 \pm 0.1$	$D_s^+ \to K_L^0 K_S^0 X$	5.0 ± 1.0		
$D_s^+ \to K_S^0 K^+ X$	$5.8 \pm 0.5 \pm 0.1$	$D_s^+ \to K_L^0 K^+ X$	5.2 ± 0.7		
$D_s^+ \to K_S^0 K^- X$	$1.9 \pm 0.4 \pm 0.1$	$D_s^+ \to K_L^0 K^- X$	1.9 ± 0.3		
$D_s^+ \to K^+ K^- X$	$15.8 \pm 0.6 \pm 0.3$				
$D_s^+ \to K^+ K^+ X$	$< 0.26\%$ (90% CL)				
$D_s^+ \to K^- K^- X$	$< 0.06\%$ (90% CL)				

CLEO inclusive Ds result: PhysRevD.79.112008 (2009) (arXiv:0904.2417),
[1] Prediction: Gronau and Rosner: PhysRevD.79.074022 (2009)

Inclusive D_s BF Results

Mode	Yield(%)	K_L^0 Mode	Yield(%)	$\mathcal{B}$(PDG)(%)	prediction based on excl. rates [1]
$D_s^+ \to \pi^+ X$	$119.3 \pm 1.2 \pm 0.7$				125.5 ±11.1
$D_s^+ \to \pi^- X$	$43.2 \pm 0.9 \pm 0.3$				46.6±6.8
$D_s^+ \to \pi^0 X$	$123.4 \pm 3.8 \pm 5.3$				112.5±8.0
$D_s^+ \to K^+ X$	$28.9 \pm 0.6 \pm 0.3$			$20 \ ^{+\ 18}_{-\ 14}$	27.3 ± 1.4
$D_s^+ \to K^- X$	$18.7 \pm 0.5 \pm 0.2$			$13 \ ^{+\ 14}_{-\ 12}$	18.4±0.7
$D_s^+ \to \eta X$	$29.9 \pm 2.2 \pm 1.7$				32.7 ± 2.9
$D_s^+ \to \eta' X$	[illegible]				18.2±2.1
$D_s^+ \to \phi X$	$15.7 \pm 0.8 \pm 0.6$				[illegible]
$D_s^+ \to \omega X$	$6.1 \pm 1.4 \pm 0.3$				0.8±0.1
$D_s^+ \to f_0(980) X, f_0(980) \to \pi^+\pi^-$	$< 1.3\%$ (90% CL)				
$D_s^+ \to K_S^0 X$	[illegible]	$D_s^+ \to K_L^0 X$	[illegible]		[illegible] 18.4±2.0, K^0 22.7± 2.2
$D_s^+ \to K_S^0 K_S^0 X$	$1.7 \pm 0.3 \pm 0.1$	$D_s^+ \to K_L^0 K_S^0 X$	5.0 ± 1.0		
$D_s^+ \to K_S^0 K^+ X$	$5.8 \pm 0.5 \pm 0.1$	$D_s^+ \to K_L^0 K^+ X$	5.2 ± 0.7		
$D_s^+ \to K_S^0 K^- X$	$1.9 \pm 0.4 \pm 0.1$	$D_s^+ \to K_L^0 K^- X$	1.9 ± 0.3		
$D_s^+ \to K^+ K^- X$	$15.8 \pm 0.6 \pm 0.3$				
$D_s^+ \to K^+ K^+ X$	$< 0.26\%$ (90% CL)				
$D_s^+ \to K^- K^- X$	$< 0.06\%$ (90% CL)				

CLEO inclusive Ds result: PhysRevD.79.112008 (2009) (arXiv:0904.2417),
[1] Prediction: Gronau and Rosner: PhysRevD.79.074022 (2009)

Exclusive vs inclusive $D_S \to \omega X$

- Most incl. rates[1] accounted for by known excl. ones[2], except, at first: $\Sigma_i\ \Gamma_{excl}\ (D_S \to \omega X_i) \sim 0.13 \times \Gamma_{incl}\ (D_S \to \omega X)$

- A closer look at exclusive $D_S \to \omega X$ BR:

Mode	$\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{mode}}(\%)$
$D_s^+ \to \pi^+\omega$	$0.21 \pm 0.09 \pm 0.01$
$D_s^+ \to \pi^+\pi^0\omega$	$2.78 \pm 0.65 \pm 0.25$
$D_s^+ \to \pi^+\pi^+\pi^-\omega$	$1.58 \pm 0.45 \pm 0.09$
$D_s^+ \to \pi^+\eta\omega$	$0.85 \pm 0.54 \pm 0.06$
	< 2.13 (90% CL)
$D_s^+ \to K^+\omega$	< 0.24 (90% CL)
$D_s^+ \to K^+\pi^0\omega$	< 0.82 (90% CL)
$D_s^+ \to K^+\pi^+\pi^-\omega$	< 0.54 (90% CL)
$D_s^+ \to K^+\eta\omega$	< 0.79 (90% CL)

Exclusive vs inclusive Ds→ωX

- Most incl. rates[1] accounted for by known excl. ones[2], except, at first:
  $\Sigma_i\ \Gamma_{excl}\ (D_S \to \omega X_i) \sim 0.13 \times \Gamma_{incl}\ (D_S \to \omega X)$

- A closer look at exclusive Ds→ωX BR:

Mode	$\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{mode}}(\%)$
$D_s^+ \to \pi^+\omega$	$0.21 \pm 0.09 \pm 0.01$
$D_s^+ \to \pi^+\pi^0\omega$	$2.78 \pm 0.65 \pm 0.25$
$D_s^+ \to \pi^+\pi^+\pi^-\omega$	$1.58 \pm 0.45 \pm 0.09$
$D_s^+ \to \pi^+\eta\omega$	$0.85 \pm 0.54 \pm 0.06$
[illegible]	< 2.13 (90% CL)
$D_s^+ \to K^+\omega$	< 0.24 (90% CL)
$D_s^+ \to K^+\pi^0\omega$	< 0.82 (90% CL)
$D_s^+ \to K^+\pi^+\pi^-\omega$	< 0.54 (90% CL)
$D_s^+ \to K^+\eta\omega$	< 0.79 (90% CL)

$D_s^+ \to \pi^+\pi^0\omega$ $2.78 \pm 0.65 \pm 0.25$
$D_s^+ \to \pi^+\pi^+\pi^-\omega$ $1.58 \pm 0.45 \pm 0.09$

Exclusive vs inclusive $D_S \to \omega X$

- Most incl. rates[1] accounted for by known excl. ones[2], except, at first:
  $\Sigma_i \, \Gamma_{excl} \, (D_S \to \omega X_i) \sim 0.13 \times \Gamma_{incl} \, (D_S \to \omega X)$

- A closer look at exclusive $D_S \to \omega X$ BR:

Mode	$\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{mode}}(\%)$
$D_s^+ \to \pi^+\omega$	$0.21 \pm 0.09 \pm 0.01$
$D_s^+ \to \pi^+\pi^0\omega$	$2.78 \pm 0.65 \pm 0.25$
$D_s^+ \to \pi^+\pi^+\pi^-\omega$	$1.58 \pm 0.45 \pm 0.09$
$D_s^+ \to \pi^+\eta\omega$	$0.85 \pm 0.54 \pm 0.06$
[illegible]	< 2.13 (90% CL)
$D_s^+ \to K^+\omega$	< 0.24 (90% CL)
$D_s^+ \to K^+\pi^0\omega$	< 0.82 (90% CL)
$D_s^+ \to K^+\pi^+\pi^-\omega$	< 0.54 (90% CL)
$D_s^+ \to K^+\eta\omega$	< 0.79 (90% CL)

$$D_s^+ \to \pi^+\pi^0\omega \qquad 2.78 \pm 0.65 \pm 0.25$$
$$D_s^+ \to \pi^+\pi^+\pi^-\omega \qquad 1.58 \pm 0.45 \pm 0.09$$

The two $D_S \to \omega X$ decay modes with the largest B.R. were previously unknown

Exclusive vs inclusive Ds→ωX

- Most incl. rates[1] accounted for by known excl. ones[2], except, at first:
  $\Sigma_i\ \Gamma_{excl}\ (D_S \to \omega X_i) \sim 0.13 \times \Gamma_{incl}\ (D_S \to \omega X)$

- A closer look at exclusive Ds→ωX BR:

Mode	$\mathcal{B}_{\text{mode}}(\%)$
$D_s^+ \to \pi^+\omega$	$0.21 \pm 0.09 \pm 0.01$
$D_s^+ \to \pi^+\pi^0\omega$	$2.78 \pm 0.65 \pm 0.25$
$D_s^+ \to \pi^+\pi^+\pi^-\omega$	$1.58 \pm 0.45 \pm 0.09$
$D_s^+ \to \pi^+\eta\omega$	$0.85 \pm 0.54 \pm 0.06$
[illegible]	< 2.13 (90% CL)
$D_s^+ \to K^+\omega$	< 0.24 (90% CL)
$D_s^+ \to K^+\pi^0\omega$	< 0.82 (90% CL)
$D_s^+ \to K^+\pi^+\pi^-\omega$	< 0.54 (90% CL)
$D_s^+ \to K^+\eta\omega$	< 0.79 (90% CL)

$$D_s^+ \to \pi^+\pi^0\omega \qquad 2.78 \pm 0.65 \pm 0.25$$
$$D_s^+ \to \pi^+\pi^+\pi^-\omega \qquad 1.58 \pm 0.45 \pm 0.09$$

The two Ds→ωX decay modes with the largest B.R. were previously unknown

- Now, sum of known Ds→ωX modes = (5.4±1.0)%, accounts for most of inclusive BR(Ds→ωX) = (6.1±1.4)%

CLEO exclusive ω results: PhysRevD.80.051102 (2009)

Dalitz Analyses

- Kinematics of 3-body decay D→A,B,C fully described by

  $m^2_{AB} \equiv (p_A + p_B)^2$

  $m^2_{BC} \equiv (p_B + p_C)^2$.

- Phase-space is flat in m^2_{AB}, m^2_{BC}

$D^+ \to K^+K^-\pi^+$



- Decay rates:

$$\frac{d^2\Gamma}{dm^2_{ab}\, dm^2_{bc}} = \left| a_1 e^{i\delta_1} + a_2 e^{i\delta_2} + a_3 e^{i\delta_3} + \ldots \right|^2 \frac{d^2\Phi}{dm^2_{ab}\, dm^2_{bc}}$$

- Strength: Access to magnitudes AND phases of amplitudes.

Recent Results: $D_S^+ \to K^- K^+ \pi^+$ at CLEO

- Isobar fit. Good agreement with previous E687 (701 event) fit[1].
- Get much-improved fit to CLEO-c data with additional KK S-wave contribution.
- Best results by adding an $f_0(1370)$ resonance.

12k $D_S^+ \to K^- K^+ \pi^+$ events at CLEO-c

`CLEO: PRD 79, 072008 (2009), arXiv:0903.1301`



[1] E687: P.L. Frabetti et al. (E687 Collaboration), Phys. Lett., B351, 591 (1995)
see also unpublished FOCUS result: A.M. Rahimi, FERMILAB-THESIS-2000-13
and S. Malvezzi, AIP Conf. Proc. 549, 569 (2002)

“Isobar” Model

“Isobar” Model

- Each resonance = Breit Wigner lineshape (or similar) times factors accounting for spin.

“Isobar” Model

- Each resonance = Breit Wigner lineshape (or similar) times factors accounting for spin.

- Popular amongst experimentalists, less so amongst theorists: violates unitarity. OK as long as resonances are reasonably narrow, don’t overlap too much.

“Isobar” Model

- Each resonance = Breit Wigner lineshape (or similar) times factors accounting for spin.
- Popular amongst experimentalists, less so amongst theorists: violates unitarity. OK as long as resonances are reasonably narrow, don’t overlap too much.
- Alternatives exist, e.g. K-matrix formalism, which respects unitarity.

“Isobar” Model

- Each resonance = Breit Wigner lineshape (or similar) times factors accounting for spin.
- Popular amongst experimentalists, less so amongst theorists: violates unitarity. OK as long as resonances are reasonably narrow, don’t overlap too much.
- Alternatives exist, e.g. K-matrix formalism, which respects unitarity.
- General consensus: Isobar OK for (relatively narrow) P, D wave resonances, but problematic for (usually very broad) S-wave.

“Isobar” Model

- Each resonance = Breit Wigner lineshape (or similar) times factors accounting for spin.

- Popular amongst experimentalists, less so amongst theorists: violates unitarity. OK as long as resonances are reasonably narrow, don’t overlap too much.

- Alternatives exist, e.g. K-matrix formalism, which respects unitarity.

- General consensus: Isobar OK for (relatively narrow) P, D wave resonances, but problematic for (usually very broad) S-wave.

- Isobar S-wave usually modelled by a “non-resonant” component, plus, occasionally, $\sigma \to \pi\pi$ and $\kappa \to K\pi$ resonances (rather controversial).

$D^+ \to K^- \pi^+ \pi^+$ (ca 80% $K\pi$ S-wave)

colours added for illustration, not error bands

total Kπ S-wave

Kπ S-wave w/o K_0*(1430)

isobar S-wave w/o K_0*(1430)



CLEO: PhysRevD.78.052001 (2008)

E791 isobar analysis: Phys. Rev. Lett 89, 121801 (2002); *E791 model indep analysis:Phys. Rev. D73, 032004 (2006);

**CLEO: PhysRevD.78.052001 (2008) ; FOCUS K-matrix Phys Lett B. 653,1,11 (2007), model indep.: Phys.Lett.B681:14-21,2009

$D^+ \rightarrow K^-\pi^+\pi^+$ (ca 80% Kπ S-wave)

- Use P, D wave as “interferometer” to extract K-π S-wave’s magnitude and phase in a model independent way

colours added for illustration, not error bands

total Kπ S-wave

Kπ S-wave w/o $K_0^*(1430)$

isobar S-wave w/o $K_0^*(1430)$



CLEO: PhysRevD.78.052001 (2008)

E791 isobar analysis: Phys. Rev. Lett 89, 121801 (2002); *E791 model indep analysis:Phys. Rev. D73, 032004 (2006);
**CLEO: PhysRevD.78.052001 (2008) ; FOCUS K-matrix Phys Lett B. 653,1,11 (2007), model indep.: Phys.Lett.B681:14-21,2009

$D^+ \rightarrow K^- \pi^+ \pi^+$ (ca 80% Kπ S-wave)

- Use P, D wave as "interferometer" to extract K-π S-wave's magnitude and phase in a model independent way

- Pioneered in by E791, recent results by FOCUS and CLEO (largest statistics by CLEO, 140k evts, shown on right).

colours added for illustration, not error bands



CLEO: PhysRevD.78.052001 (2008)

E791 isobar analysis: Phys. Rev. Lett 89, 121801 (2002); *E791 model indep analysis:Phys. Rev. D73, 032004 (2006);
**CLEO: PhysRevD.78.052001 (2008) ; FOCUS K-matrix Phys Lett B. 653,1,11 (2007), model indep.: Phys.Lett.B681:14-21,2009

$D^+ \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+$ (ca 80% Kπ S-wave)

- Use P, D wave as “interferometer” to extract K-π S-wave’s magnitude and phase in a model independent way
- Pioneered in by E791, recent results by FOCUS and CLEO (largest statistics by CLEO, 140k evts, shown on right).
- Result: binned magnitudes and phases. Plot compares model-indep. with isobar (incl κ)

colours added for illustration, not error bands



CLEO: PhysRevD.78.052001 (2008)

E791 isobar analysis: Phys. Rev. Lett 89, 121801 (2002); *E791 model indep analysis:Phys. Rev. D73, 032004 (2006);
**CLEO: PhysRevD.78.052001 (2008) ; FOCUS K-matrix Phys Lett B. 653,1,11 (2007), model indep.: Phys.Lett.B681:14-21,2009

$D^+ \to K^- \pi^+ \pi^+$ (ca 80% $K\pi$ S-wave)

- Use P, D wave as "interferometer" to extract K-π S-wave's magnitude and phase in a model independent way
- Pioneered in by E791, recent results by FOCUS and CLEO (largest statistics by CLEO, 140k evts, shown on right).
- Result: binned magnitudes and phases. Plot compares model-indep. with isobar (incl κ)
- Also: Found that fit significantly improves when adding a I=2 $\pi^+\pi^+$ S-wave component.

colours added for illustration, not error bands



CLEO: PhysRevD.78.052001 (2008)

E791 isobar analysis: Phys. Rev. Lett 89, 121801 (2002); *E791 model indep analysis:Phys. Rev. D73, 032004 (2006);
**CLEO: PhysRevD.78.052001 (2008) ; FOCUS K-matrix Phys Lett B. 653,1,11 (2007), model indep.: Phys.Lett.B681:14-21,2009

FOCUS Kπ S-wave in $D^+ \rightarrow K^-\pi^+\pi^+$

Focus recently re-analysed their data using a the model-independent analysis (57k evts, 1/3 of CLEO-c). Below: Comparison of FOCUS' three S-wave fits



magnitude

phase

$D_S^+ \to \pi^-\pi^+\pi^+$

10.5k signal events at BaBar, with 80% signal purity







All plots and dots by BaBar: arXiv:0808.0971v3 [hep-ex]
Red and blue bands based on FOCUS [2] and E791 [3]

- Dominated by S-wave (fit fraction 83%).
- BaBar: model-independent analysis[1] of S-wave component. Result compatible with FOCUS (K-matrix) [2] and E791 (isobar) [3] analyses.
- Many more results in paper.

[1] Method pioneered by E791: Phys. Rev. D 73, 032004 (2006).
[2] E791: Phys. Rev. Lett. 86, 765 (2001)
[3] FOCUS: Phys. Lett. B 585, 200 (2004)

CLEO-c

$e^+e^- \rightarrow \psi(3770) \rightarrow D\overline{D}$

- Threshold production of correlated DD.
- D mesons must have opposite CP and flavour.
- Gives access to different D-Dbar superpositions, and thus access to phases. E.g.:



“tag” D	signal D rate
CP+, eg KK	$\Gamma = \left\| (A_D - \overline{A}_D)/\sqrt{2} \right\|^2$
Flavour, e.g. $K^- e^+ \nu_e$	$\Gamma = \|A_D\|^2$

CLEO-c

- Threshold production of correlated DD.
- D mesons must have opposite CP and flavour.
- Gives access to different D-Dbar superpositions, and thus access to phases. E.g.:

“tag” D	signal D rate
CP+, eg KK	$\Gamma = \| (A_D - \bar{A}_D)/\sqrt{2} \|^2$
Flavour, e.g. $K^- e^+ \nu_e$	$\Gamma = \|A_D\|^2$



Exploiting Quantum Correlations at CLEO-c



PRL 100, 221801 (2008), PRD 78, 012001 (2008)

- CP-tagged rates

$$\propto (1 \pm 2\, r_D^{K\pi} \cos \delta_D^{K\pi} \pm y)$$

- Combined analysis in many modes sensitive to $\delta_D^{K\pi}$ w/o ambiguity.
- Crucial input to charm mixing measurements, as well as helping measure γ
- Result: $\delta_D^{K\pi} = 22^{o}{}^{+11^{o}}_{-12^{o}}{}^{+9^{o}}_{-11^{o}}$

See Chris Thomas' presentation

Analysis based on 1/3 of data set - update with full 818/fb soon.

New kids on the block



Fig. 2. The first event rec

BES-III at the charm threshold

Hai-Bo Li



BES-III: Correllated D-Dbar pairs. To collect ~20×CLEO-c statistics. (already collected ca 1×CLEO-c)

LHCb: Unprecedented Statistics

Franz Muheim

$D^- \rightarrow K^- \pi^+ \pi^-$ in LHCb's first 0.8/nb = 0.000008/fb.



First run (1-2 years): 1/fb. Expect huge charm samples.

Summary

- In this talk: A lot of new branching fractions, including recent results from CLEO-c's full D_s dataset • Several new modes • $SU(3)_F$ and U-spin tests • Dalitz analyses to study light resonances • Correlated D-Dbar pairs to measure phases.

- Dalitz analyses in charm are experiencing a renaissance as an important tool in charm and B physics, but we don't really understand them. What are those S-wave contributions? (Can we develop accurate, physically motivated models?)

- Expect lots of new data from LHCb (unprecedented statistics) and BES-III (charm threshold, ca 20x CLEO statistics); also, by far not all B-factory, CLEO and CDF charm data fully exploited.

Backup

D->Kpipi Dalitz fit comparison

TABLE II: Decay fractions (%) and phases, in degress, from the MIPWA Dalitz plot fit compared to E791 and CLEO-c.

mode	FOCUS MIPWA	E791	CLEO-c
$K^-\pi^+$ S-wave	80.24±1.38±0.23±0.25±0.26	78.6±2.3	83.8±3.8
$\overline{K}_0^*(1430)\pi^+$	-	-	13.3±0.62
	-	-	51 (fixed)
$\overline{K}^*(892)^0\pi^+$	12.36±0.34±0.19±0.16±0.23	11.9±2.0	9.88±0.46
	0 (fixed)	0 (fixed)	0 (fixed)
$\overline{K}^*(1680)^0\pi^+$	1.75±0.62±0.24±0.23±0.42	1.2±1.2	0.20±0.12
	67±6±2±2±3	43±17	113±14
$\overline{K}_2^*(1430)\pi^+$	0.58±0.1±0.04±0.03±0.04	0.2±0.1	0.20±0.04
	336±7±3±2±2	-12±29	15±9

Conclusion

- Crucial for B physics, especially for a high-precision measurement of CKM angle γ in B decays.
- Properties of the charm system such as mixing and CP violation. CPV in charm is highly sensitive to New Physics.
- Decay amplitudes and rates: important parameters that need to be measured, and provide a window to low-energy QCD, its symmetries (Isospin, U-spin, SU(3)-flavour, ...) and how they are broken.
- Properties of light meson resonances - important in its own right, but could become very revelant for precision charm and B physics Dalitz analyses.

B

$\downarrow$

D

$\downarrow$

$K^* \rho a_1 f(980)$...

$\sigma(?) \kappa(?)$...

Conclusion

- Crucial for B physics, especially for a high-precision measurement of CKM angle γ in B decays.

- Properties of the charm system such as mixing and CP violation. CPV in charm is highly sensitive to New Physics.

- Decay amplitudes and rates: important parameters that need to be measured, and provide a window to low-energy QCD, its symmetries (Isospin, U-spin, SU(3)-flavour, ...) and how they are broken.

- Properties of light meson resonances - important in its own right, but could become very revelant for precision charm and B physics Dalitz analyses.

$$B \downarrow D \downarrow K^* \rho a_1 f(980) \ldots \sigma(?) \kappa(?) \ldots$$

CLEO-c's quantum correlations as input for others

- Measure phase difference between $D \to K^+\pi^-$ and $D \to K^+\pi^-$, $\delta^{K\pi}$. Needed for extracting the charm mixing parameters x, y from time-dependent analyses using $D \to K^+\pi^-$ which are sensitive to x', y':

$$x' = x \cos(\delta^{K\pi}) + y \sin(\delta^{K\pi})$$

$$y' = y \cos(\delta^{K\pi}) - x \sin(\delta^{K\pi})$$

- Same for $D \to K^+\pi^-\pi^0$.

- Phase information from CLEO-c also provides important input to extracting the CPV phase γ from $B^\pm \to DK^\pm$ modes with various final states of the D, such as $K_S\pi\pi$, K_SKK, $K\pi\pi\pi$ (Chris Thomas' presentation).

$D_S^+ \to K_S \pi^+ (\pi^- \pi^+)$



Discovered by FOCUS

Phys.Lett.B660:147-153,2008

$$\frac{\Gamma\left(D_S^+ \to K_S^0 \pi^+\right)}{\Gamma\left(D_S^+ \to K_S^0 K^+\right)} = 0.104 \pm 0.024 \pm 0.013$$

$$\frac{\Gamma\left(D_S^+ \to K_S^0 \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+\right)}{\Gamma\left(D_S^+ \to K_S^0 K^+ \pi^- \pi^+\right)} = 0.18 \pm 0.04 \pm 0.05$$

$D_S^+ \to K_S \pi^+$ confirmed by CLEO & BELLE

$\Gamma\left(D_S^+ \to K_S^0 \pi^+\right) = (0.1263 \pm 0.0106 \pm 0.0026 \pm 0.0073)\,\%$ CLEO-c PhysRevD.81.052013 (2009)

$\Gamma\left(D_S^+ \to K_S^0 \pi^+\right) = (0.120 \pm 0.009)\,\%$ BELLE PhysRevD.80.111101 (2009)

BELLE also use $D_S^+ \to K_S K^+$, $D_S^+ \to K_S \pi^+$ for CPV measurement* - see Anze Zupanc's talk

*)PhysRevLett.104.181602 (2010)

1st Observation of $D_s^+ \to K^+K^+\pi^-$ by BELLE

- BELLE made the first observation of DCS $D_s^+ \to K^+K^+\pi^-$. Use CF $D_s^+ \to K^+K^+\pi^-$. as normalisation.
- Repeat measurement with SU(3)-flavour related D+ modes.





Decay mode	$\mathcal{N}_{\text{signal}}$	$\mathcal{B}_{\text{rel}}$ (%)
$D^+ \to K^+\pi^+\pi^-$	2637.7 ± 84.4	$0.569 \pm 0.018 \pm 0.014$
$D^+ \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+$	482702 ± 727	100
$D_s^+ \to K^+K^+\pi^-$	281.4 ± 33.8	$0.229 \pm 0.028 \pm 0.012$
$D_s^+ \to K^+K^-\pi^+$	118127 ± 452	100

$$\frac{\mathcal{B}(D_s^+ \to K^+K^+\pi^-)}{\mathcal{B}(D_s^+ \to K^+K^-\pi^+)} \frac{\mathcal{B}(D^+ \to K^+\pi^+\pi^-)}{\mathcal{B}(D^+ \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+)} = \tan^8\theta_C$$

H. J. Lipkin, Nucl. Phys. B, Proc. Suppl. 115, 117 (2003).

Phys. Rev. Lett. 102, 221802 (2009)

1st Observation of $D_s^+ \rightarrow K^+K^+\pi^-$ by BELLE

- BELLE made the first observation of DCS $D_s^+ \rightarrow K^+K^+\pi^-$. Use CF $D_s^+ \rightarrow K^+K^+\pi^-$. as normalisation.

- Repeat measurement with SU(3)-flavour related D+ modes.

Decay mode	$\mathcal{N}_{\text{signal}}$	$\mathcal{B}_{\text{rel}}$ (%)
$D^+ \to K^+\pi^+\pi^-$	2637.7 ± 84.4	$0.569 \pm 0.018 \pm 0.014$
$D^+ \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+$	482702 ± 727	100
$D_s^+ \to K^+K^+\pi^-$	281.4 ± 33.8	$0.229 \pm 0.028 \pm 0.012$
$D_s^+ \to K^+K^-\pi^+$	118127 ± 452	100





$$\frac{\mathcal{B}(D_s^+ \to K^+K^+\pi^-)}{\mathcal{B}(D_s^+ \to K^+K^-\pi^+)} \frac{\mathcal{B}(D^+ \to K^+\pi^+\pi^-)}{\mathcal{B}(D^+ \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+)} = (1.57 \pm 0.21) \tan^8 \theta_C ;$$

Phys. Rev. Lett. 102, 221802 (2009)

Recent first observations at the B factories

$D^0 \rightarrow \omega\eta$ $(2.21 \pm 0.08 \pm 0.22)\cdot 10^{-3}$

$D^0 \rightarrow K^{*0}\eta$ $(4.8 \pm 1.0 \pm 0.4)\cdot 10^{-5}$

BaBar preliminary (2009)

Caitlin Malone on behalf of BaBar at APS April Meeting 2009

$D_s^+ \rightarrow K^+K^+\pi^-$ $(1.3 \pm 0.2 \pm 0.1)\cdot 10^{-4}$

BELLE 2009

BELLE: Phys. Rev. Lett. 102, 221802 (2009)



BELLE:	Expect from SU(3)	get
$\frac{\Gamma(D^+ \rightarrow K^+K^+\pi^-)}{\Gamma(D^+ \rightarrow K^+K^-\pi^+)} \frac{\Gamma(D^+ \rightarrow K^+\pi^+\pi^-)}{\Gamma(D^+ \rightarrow K^-\pi^+\pi^+)}$	$\tan^8\theta$ H. J. Lipkin, Nucl. Phys. B, Proc. Suppl. 115, 117 (2003).	$(1.57 \pm 0.21)\times\tan^8\theta$ BELLE: Phys. Rev. Lett. 102, 221802 (2009)

SU(3) tests

	Expect from SU(3)	get
$\frac{\Gamma(D^+ \to K_S\pi^+) - \Gamma(D^+ \to K_L\pi^+)}{\Gamma(D^+ \to K_S\pi^+) + \Gamma(D^+ \to K_L\pi^+)}$	$\approx$0.4 D.-N. Gao, Phys. Lett. B **645**, 59 (2007)	0.022±0.016±0.018 281/pb at CLEO: PRL **100,** 091801 (2008)
$\frac{\Gamma(D^+ \to K^+K^+\pi^-)}{\Gamma(D^+ \to K^+K^-\pi^+)} \frac{\Gamma(D^+ \to K^+\pi^+\pi^-)}{\Gamma(D^+ \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+)}$	$\tan^8\theta$ H. J. Lipkin, Nucl. Phys. B, Proc. Suppl. 115, 117 (2003).	$(1.57 \pm 0.21)\times\tan^8\theta$ BELLE: Phys. Rev. Lett. 102, 221802 (2009)

SU(3) tests

	Expect from SU(3)	get
$\frac{\Gamma(D^+ \to K_S\pi^+) - \Gamma(D^+ \to K_L\pi^+)}{\Gamma(D^+ \to K_S\pi^+) + \Gamma(D^+ \to K_L\pi^+)}$	≈0.4 D.-N. Gao, Phys. Lett. B **645**, 59 (2007)	0.022±0.016±0.018 281/pb at CLEO: PRL **100,** 091801 (2008)
$\frac{\Gamma(D^+ \to K^+K^+\pi^-)\,\Gamma(D^+ \to K^+\pi^+\pi^-)}{\Gamma(D^+ \to K^+K^-\pi^+)\,\Gamma(D^+ \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+)}$	$\tan^8\theta$ H. J. Lipkin, Nucl. Phys. B, Proc. Suppl. 115, 117 (2003).	$(1.57 \pm 0.21)\times\tan^8\theta$ BELLE: Phys. Rev. Lett. 102, 221802 (2009)

1st Observation of $D_s^+ \to K^+K^+\pi^-$ (BELLE 2009)



Prospects for direct CPV

- Example: $D^o \rightarrow K^+K^-$
    - BaBar 2008: (0.00 ± 0.34 ± 0.13)%
    - BELLE 2008: (-0.43 ± 0.30 ± 0.11)%
    - World average (HFAG): (+0.22 ± 0.37)%
- CDF has obtained its result of (+2.0 ± 1.2 ± 0.6)% with only 2% of its current data set. CDF could beat world stat precision now.
- LHCb expects stat precision of ~0.1% in 1/fb

Charm Physics with the first LHCb data

- LHCb gets more charm than B. Charm measurements highly sensitive to New Physics:

$$y_{CP} = \frac{\tau(K^-\pi^+)}{\tau(K^+K^-)} - 1$$

$$A_\Gamma = \frac{\tau(\overline{D}^0 \to K^-K^+) - \tau(D^0 \to K^+K^-)}{\tau(\overline{D}^0 \to K^-K^+) + \tau(D^0 \to K^+K^-)}$$

- Best measurement currently by BELLE who have ca 100,000 flavour-tagged (i.e. know if it's a D or a D-bar) D→KK in 540/fb.

- We expect a few million such events in the first 0.1/fb.

Charm in our first

0.8/nb = 0.000008/fb





$D^o \to V\eta$

Mode	Theory B.F. $/10^{-3}$ B. Bhattacharya, J. L. Rosner, arXiv: 0812.3167v1 [hep-ph] (2008)		Experiment previously[1]	BaBar Results (preliminary) April 09 [2]	
	Sol A	Sol B		BF / 10^{-3}	yield
$D^o \to \varphi\eta$	0.93 ± 0.09	1.4 ± 0.1	0.14 ± 0.04	0.21 ± 0.01 ± 0.02	513 ± 26
$D^o \to \omega\eta$	1.4 ± 0.09	1.27 ± 0.09		2.21 ± 0.08 ± 0.22	4450 ± 103
$D^o \to K^{*o}\,\eta$	0.038 ± 0.004	0.037 ± 0.004		0.048 ± 0.010 ± 0.004	117 ± 37

[1] BELLE: Phys.Rev.Lett.92:101803,2004 [2] Caitlin Malone on behalf of the BaBar Collaboration at APS April Meeting 2009

Dalitz Plot

R.H. Dalitz, Philos. Mag. 44, 1068 (1953)

$D_S^+ \to K^-K^+\pi^+$

M²(KK) fit projection with f₀(1370) S-wave contribution



$D_S^+ \to K^-K^+\pi^+$ M²(KK) projections

CLEO: arXiv:0903.1301v1 [hep-ex] (March 2009)



[1] P.L. Frabetti et al. (E687 Collaboration), Phys. Lett., B351, 591 (1995)
See also FOCUS: A.M. Rahimi, FERMILAB-THESIS-2000-13 and S. Malvezzi, AIP Conf. Proc. 549, 569 (2002)

VMD, $D^o \rightarrow V\gamma$ and $D^o \rightarrow V\rho^o$

- Dominated by long-distance effects. Difficult to calculate.

- Vector-Meson-Dominance approach[1]



- Predicts

$$\frac{\mathcal{B}(D^0 \to \phi\gamma)}{\mathcal{B}(D^0 \to \bar{K}^{*0}\gamma)} = \frac{\mathcal{B}(D^0 \to \phi\rho^0)}{\mathcal{B}(D^0 \to \bar{K}^{*0}\rho^0)}$$

- Find

$$\frac{\mathcal{B}(D^0 \to \phi\gamma)}{\mathcal{B}(D^0 \to \bar{K}^{*0}\gamma)} = (6.27 \pm 0.71 \pm 0.79) \times 10^{-2}$$ BaBar 08

$$\frac{\mathcal{B}(D^0 \to \phi\rho^0)}{\mathcal{B}(D^0 \to \bar{K}^{*0}\rho^0)} = (6.7 \pm 1.6) \times 10^{-2}$$ PDG 07

[1] G. Burdman, E. Golowich, J. L. Hewett, and S. Pakvasa, Phys. Rev. , 6383 (1995)

$D_S^+ \to K^- K^+ \pi^+$

- Find good agreement with E687 model parameters.
- Get much-improved fit to our data with additional KK S-wave contribution.
- Tried many options. Best results with $f_0(1370)$

12k $D_S^+ \to K^- K^+ \pi^+$ fit projections

CLEO: arXiv:0903.1301v1 [hep-ex] (March 2009)



[1] P.L. Frabetti et al. (E687 Collaboration), Phys. Lett., B351, 591 (1995)
[2] [4]A.M. Rahimi, FERMILAB-THESIS-2000-13
[3] S. Malvezzi, AIP Conf. Proc. 549, 569 (2002)

Theory of $D_s^+ \rightarrow pn$



- Short Distance:

$$\mathcal{B}(D_s^+ \to p\bar{n})_{\mathrm{SD}} = (0.4^{+1.1}_{-0.3}) \times 10^{-6}$$





- Long Distance $\mathcal{B}(D_s^+ \to p\bar{n}) \approx \left(0.8^{+2.4}_{-0.6}\right) \times 10^{-3}$
- Measured $\mathcal{B}(D_s^+ \to p\bar{n}) = (1.30 \pm 0.36^{+0.12}_{-0.16}) \times 10^{-3}$

Chen, Cheng, Hsiao: Phys.Lett.B663:326-329,2008

Absolute Ds→KKπ BF at CLEO-c

M(D_s^-) vs M(D_s^+)



KK pair mass - full phase space (not just **φ**) included in analysis (see also Sheldon Stone's talk why this is important)



298 /pb of CLEO-c data at E_{cm} = 4.17 GeV

B(Ds → K^- K^+ π^+) = (5.50 ± 0.23 ± 0.16)%

Phys.Rev.Lett.100:161804,2008 (arxiv)

$D_S^+ \to \pi^-\pi^+\pi^+$

- $D_S^+ \to (\pi^+\pi^-)_{S\text{-wave}}\ \pi^+$ dominates.
- Model-independent S-wave fit compatible with $f_0(980)$ resonance.
- Also with FOCUS's K-matrix and E791's isobar fit
- Signs of something going on near $f_0(1370)$, $f_0(1500)$.
- Large D-wave component with $f_2(1270)$

Fit Fractions

Decay Mode	Decay fraction(%)
$f_2(1270)\pi^+$	$10.1\pm1.5\pm1.1$
$\rho(770)\pi^+$	$1.8\pm0.5\pm1.0$
$\rho(1450)\pi^+$	$2.3\pm0.8\pm1.7$
$\mathcal{S}$-wave	$83.0\pm0.9\pm1.9$
Total	$97.2\pm3.7\pm3.8$
χ^2/NDF	$\frac{437}{422-64} = 1.2$

BaBar: arXiv:0808.0971v3 [hep-ex], submitted to PRD

$D_S^+ \rightarrow \pi^-\pi^+\pi^+$

Model independent S-wave parameterisation



BaBar: arXiv:0808.0971v3 [hep-ex], submitted to PRD

S-wave

- S-wave resonances $\sigma \to \pi^+\pi^-$, $\kappa \to K^+\pi^-$: are they real?
  - needed in isobar fits to $D^+ \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^+$, $D^0 \to K_S\pi^+\pi^-$, $D^+ \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+$
  - unclear if compatible with LASS scattering data
  - not required in $D^0 \to K^-\pi^+\pi^0$, $D^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ isobar fits (BaBar, PhysRevD.74.091102).
- K-matrix Models don't explicitly require σ, κ.



Phys. Rev. Lett 89, 121801 (2002)



P. Naik on behalf of CLEO at HADRON 07

Hadronic Charm decays

- Crucial for B physics, especially for a high-precision measurement of CKM angle γ in B decays.
- Properties of the charm system such as mixing and CP violation. CPV in charm is highly sensitive to New Physics.
- Decay amplitudes and rates: important parameters that need to be measured, and provide a window to low-energy QCD, its symmetries (Isospin, U-spin, SU(3)-flavour, ...) and how they are broken.
- Properties of light meson resonances - important in its own right, but could become very revelant for precision charm and B physics Dalitz analyses.

$$B \downarrow D \downarrow K^{*} \rho a_1 f(980)\ldots \sigma(?) \kappa(?)\ldots$$

Hadronic Charm decays

- Crucial for B physics, especially for a high-precision measurement of CKM angle γ in B decays.
- Properties of the charm system such as mixing and CP violation. CPV in charm is highly sensitive to New Physics.
- Decay amplitudes and rates: important parameters that need to be measured, and provide a window to low-energy QCD, its symmetries (Isospin, U-spin, SU(3)-flavour, ...) and how they are broken.
- Properties of light meson resonances - important in its own right, but could become very revelant for precision charm and B physics Dalitz analyses.

$$B \rightarrow D \rightarrow K^* \rho a_1 f(980)\ldots \sigma(?)\kappa(?)\ldots$$

BR($D^+_{(s)} \rightarrow K_S K^+$), BR($D^+_{(s)} \rightarrow K_S \pi^+$) at BELLE

- Precise Ratio of BR recently measured at BELLE (using CF modes $D^+ \to K_S\pi^+$, $D_s^+ \rightarrow K_S K^+$ for normalisation)

$$\mathcal{B}(D^+ \to K^0_S K^+) = (2.75 \pm 0.08) \times 10^{-3}$$

$$\mathcal{B}(D^+_s \to K^0_S \pi^+) = (1.20 \pm 0.09) \times 10^{-3}$$

- Ratio not what you'd expect from SU(3).

$$\mathcal{B}(D^+ \to K^0_S K^+)/\mathcal{B}(D^+_s \to K^0_S \pi^+) = 2.29 \pm 0.18$$

- $D_s^+ \rightarrow K_S K^+$, $D_s^+ \rightarrow K_S \pi^+$ also used for CPV measurement - see Anze Zupanc's talk

PhysRevLett.104.181602 (2010)

PhysRevD.80.111101 (2009)