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Abstract

We have observed a signal for the decay $D^{*+} \to D^+ \gamma$ at a significance of 4 standard deviations. From the measured branching ratio $\mathcal{B}(D^{*+} \to D^+ \gamma)/\mathcal{B}(D^{*+} \to D^+ \pi^0) = 0.055 \pm 0.014 \pm 0.010$ we find $\mathcal{B}(D^{*+} \to D^+ \gamma) = 0.017 \pm 0.004 \pm 0.003$, where the first uncertainty is statistical and the second is systematic. We also report the highest precision measurements of the remaining $D^{*+}$ branching fractions.
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The decays of the excited charmed mesons, $D^{*+}$ and $D^{*0}$, have been the subject of extensive theoretical \cite{5, 11} as well as experimental \cite{4, 13} investigation. The decay of the $D^{*0}$ via emission of a $\pi^0$ or a photon has been observed and its branching ratio well measured \cite{2}. While the $D^{*+}$ hadronic decays ($D^{*+} \rightarrow D^+\pi^0$ and $D^{*+} \rightarrow D^0\pi^+$) \cite{13} have been observed and are widely used to tag $b$ quark decays, the observation of the $D^{*+}$ radiative decay remained problematic. Both $D^*$ mesons decay electromagnetically as the result of a spin-flip of either the charm quark or the light quark. In the case of the $D^{*+}$ in comparison to the $D^+$, the decay amplitudes for these two processes interfere destructively. Also, there is slightly more phase space available for the hadronic decay fraction. In the case of the $D^{*+}$, the interference results in a radiative decay fraction which competes with the hadronic decay fraction. In the case of the $D^{*+}$, the measured phase space suppression for these two processes interfere constructively. Combined with the phase space suppression of the hadronic decay, this interference results in a radiative decay fraction which competes with the hadronic decay fraction. The measurement of the hadronic decay, this interference results in a radiative decay fraction which competes with the hadronic decay fraction.

A great deal of interest in the radiative $D^{*+}$ decay was generated by an earlier Particle Data Group average of $\mathcal{B}(D^{*+} \rightarrow D^+\gamma) = (18 \pm 4)\%$ \cite{14}; this value was virtually impossible to reconcile with theory without assuming an anomalously large magnetic moment for the charm quark \cite{4}. Based on 780 pb$^{-1}$ of data, a previous CLEO II analysis \cite{10} found an upper limit of 4.2% (90% C.L.) for this branching fraction, a result which strongly affected not only the $D^{*+}$ branching fractions but also many $B$ measurements. In addition to its importance in measuring $B$ meson decays, a precision determination of the $D^{*+}$ branching fractions will provide an important test of many quark models and other theoretical approaches to heavy meson decays \cite{4}. For theories built around chiral and heavy-quark symmetry (heavy hadron chiral perturbation theory) \cite{5}, this measurement will also provide a strong constraint on the two input parameters ($g$ and $\beta$) allowing model-independent predictions to be made on a wide variety of observable quantities \cite{4}.

The theoretical uncertainty in this ratio is thought to be only of order 1% \cite{4}, so the error

$$R_\gamma^+ \equiv \frac{\mathcal{B}(D^{*+} \rightarrow D^+\gamma)}{\mathcal{B}(D^{*+} \rightarrow D^+\pi^0)} = \frac{N(D^+\gamma)}{N(D^+\pi^0)} \times \frac{\epsilon_{\pi^0}}{\epsilon_\gamma}$$

is then determined, where $N(D^+\gamma)/N(D^+\pi^0)$ is the ratio of the number of $D^{*+}$ decays observed in each mode, and $\epsilon_{\pi^0}/\epsilon_\gamma$ is the relative efficiency for finding the $\pi^0$ or the $\gamma$ from the corresponding $D^{*+}$ decay. Assuming that the three decay modes of the $D^{*+}$ add to unity and defining $R_\pi^+ \equiv \mathcal{B}(D^{*+} \rightarrow D^0\pi^+)/\mathcal{B}(D^{*+} \rightarrow D^+\pi^0)$, one finds $\mathcal{B}(D^{*+} \rightarrow D^+\gamma) = R_\gamma^+/(R_\gamma^+ + R_\pi^+ + 1)$, $\mathcal{B}(D^{*+} \rightarrow D^0\pi^0) = 1/(R_\gamma^+ + R_\pi^+ + 1)$ and $\mathcal{B}(D^{*+} \rightarrow D^0\pi^+) = R_\pi^+/(R_\gamma^+ + R_\pi^+ + 1)$. Constraints on $R_\pi^+$ can be obtained by combining the known phase space for $D^{*+} \rightarrow D^+\pi^0$ and $D^{*+} \rightarrow D^0\pi^+$ with isospin conservation and the expected $p^3$ dependence of $p$-wave decay widths to yield,

$$R_\pi^+ = 2 \left(\frac{p_{+0}}{p_{++}}\right)^3 = 2.199 \pm 0.064$$

(where $p_{+0}$ and $p_{++}$ are the momenta of the $D^0$ and $D^+$ in the $D^{*+}$ rest frame, respectively). The theoretical uncertainty in this ratio is thought to be only of order 1% \cite{4}, so the error
is dominated by those due to the $M_{D^*} - M_D$ mass differences [12]. This method has the advantage of avoiding large systematic uncertainties due to the $D$ meson branching fractions and of canceling many systematic uncertainties associated with the $D^+$ reconstruction.

The analysis was performed using data accumulated by the CLEO II detector [16] at the Cornell Electron Storage Ring (CESR). The CLEO II detector consists of three cylindrical drift chambers (immersed in a 1.5 T solenoidal magnetic field) surrounded by a time-of-flight system (TOF) and a CsI crystal electromagnetic (EM) calorimeter. The main drift chamber allows for charged particle identification via specific-ionization measurements ($dE/dx$) in addition to providing an excellent momentum measurement. The calorimeter is surrounded by a superconductor coil and an iron flux return, which is instrumented with muon counters.

A total of 4.7 fb$^{-1}$ of data were collected at center-of-mass energies on or near the $\Upsilon(4S)$ resonance. The Monte Carlo simulated events used to determine signal shapes and detection efficiencies were produced with a GEANT-based full detector simulation. Also, a continuum Monte Carlo sample (which contains roughly double the statistics of the data) was used to test the analysis code and methods.

Events were required to have three or more tracks and at least 15% of the center-of-mass energy deposited in the calorimeter. Each of the three tracks comprising a candidate $D^+ \rightarrow K^- \pi^+ \pi^+$ decay was required to satisfy either the $K^-$ or $\pi^+$ hypothesis at the $2.5\sigma$ level using $dE/dx$ alone, and then the triplet was required to satisfy the $K^- \pi^+ \pi^+$ hypothesis, including TOF information if available, with a $\chi^2$ probability greater than 10%. The three tracks were then constrained to come from a common vertex, and the invariant mass of the triplet, under the $K^- \pi^+ \pi^+$ hypothesis, was required to be within 10 MeV/$c^2$ ($\sim 1.5\sigma$) of the known $D^+$ mass.

Photon candidates were required to be in the best region of the calorimeter, $|\cos\theta| < 0.71$ (where $\theta$ is the polar angle between the EM cluster centroid and the beam axis), with a cluster energy of at least 30 MeV. It was further required that no charged particle track point within 8 cm of a crystal used in the EM cluster. If the invariant mass formed by a pair of photons was within $2.5\sigma$ of the $\pi^0$ mass, taking into account the asymmetric $\pi^0$ line shape and the small momentum dependence of the mass resolution, the photons were identified as being from a $\pi^0$. The photons were then kinematically constrained to the $\pi^0$ mass to improve the $\pi^0$ momentum measurement.

Photons from $D^{*+} \rightarrow D^+ \gamma$ decays were required to pass a lateral shower shape cut, which is 99% efficient for isolated photons, and not to form a $\pi^0$ when paired with any other photon. The decay angle $\theta_\gamma$, defined as the angle of the $\gamma$ in the $D^{*+}$ rest frame with respect to the $D^{*+}$’s direction in the laboratory frame, was required to satisfy $\cos\theta_\gamma > -0.35$. This cut helps to reduce the large combinatorial background that arises when $D^+$ mesons are combined with soft photons moving in the opposite direction.

The combinatorial background was further reduced by requiring $x_{D^*} > 0.7$, where $x_{D^*}$ is the fraction of the maximum possible momentum carried by the reconstructed $D^{*+}$. This cut also removed any contribution from $B \rightarrow D^* X$ events. The cuts on $\cos\theta_\gamma$ and $x_{D^*}$ were determined to maximize $S^2/B$ ($S$ is signal and $B$ is background) by utilizing a large sample of $D^{*0} \rightarrow D^{0}\gamma$ events from the data as well as Monte Carlo simulated events.

The primary difficulty in this analysis is the small size of the signal, due to the branching fraction, relative to a large combinatorial background and, more importantly, relative to a background due to $D^{*+}$ radiative decays where $D_s^+ \rightarrow K^- K^+ \pi^+$. Unlike the $D^{*+}$, the $D_s^{*+}$...
FIG. 1. The $M(K^-K^+\pi^+)$ distributions for $D_s^+$ background (solid) and $D^+$ signal (dashed) Monte Carlo samples.

almost always decays radiatively. This is a major problem because the $M(D_s^{*+}) - M(D_s^+)$ mass difference is $143.97 \pm 0.41$ MeV [17] and the $M(D^{*+}) - M(D^+)$ mass difference is $140.64 \pm 0.09$ MeV [12], so these two processes cannot be separated in the mass difference plot because the resolution in photon energy in the decay is $\sim 6$ MeV. Misidentification of $D_s^+ \rightarrow K^-K^+\pi^+$ as $D^+ \rightarrow K^-\pi^+\pi^+$ can occur because the TOF and $dE/dx$ information used for particle identification does not adequately separate $K$’s from $\pi$’s with momenta above $\sim 1$ GeV/c. When reconstructed under the $K\pi\pi$ hypothesis, the two invariant mass distributions partially overlap, and any attempt to estimate the fraction of $D_s^+$ under the $D^+$ peak will depend strongly on the resonant substructure of the $D_s^+ \rightarrow K^-K^+\pi^+$ decay, as well as the momentum distribution of the $D_s^+$’s. The large $D_s^+$ contribution to the lower $D^+$ sideband further complicates the analysis by preventing the use of this sideband in a subtraction of combinatorial background.

A means to veto $D_s^{*+}$ events, independent of the decay’s resonant substructure, is to require that the invariant mass of the three tracks reconstructed under the $K^-K^+\pi^+$ hypothesis be greater than a cut which removes all the $D_s^{*+}$ events. An unwanted side effect of vetoing $D_s^{*+}$ events by this method is that a cut in the $KK\pi$ mass distribution greatly distorts the $K\pi\pi$ mass distribution, making the relative normalization between the $D^+$ upper sideband and the signal region uncertain. Thus the use of a sideband subtraction to remove the combinatorial background from the mass difference plot is impossible. Fig. 2(a) shows the $\Delta M_\gamma$ distribution for events from the $M(D^+)$ signal region as well as for those from the $M(D^+)$ upper sideband (a region three times as wide as the signal region starting $\approx 3\sigma$ above the nominal $D^+$ mass). The $\Delta M_\gamma$ distribution for the combinatorial background found in the $D_s^+$ decays and that found in $D^+$ decays when one of the $\pi^+$’s is misidentified as a $K^+$. Since there are two possible tracks to assign the $K^+$ mass, both combinations are tried, and the one yielding the smaller mass is plotted.

Fig. 2(a) shows the $\Delta M_\gamma$ distribution for events from the $M(D^+)$ signal region as well as for those from the $M(D^+)$ upper sideband (a region three times as wide as the signal region starting $\approx 3\sigma$ above the nominal $D^+$ mass). The $\Delta M_\gamma$ distribution for the combinatorial background found in the $M(D^+)$ sideband is quite flat under the signal region, justifying the use of a first order polynomial in fitting this background. No $D_s^{*+}$ veto has been applied to the data in Fig. 2(a), so a fair fraction of the events in this “signal” are $D_s^{*+}$ background.
FIG. 2. The $\Delta M_\gamma \equiv M(D^+\gamma) - M(D^+)$ distributions for (a) data before the $D_s^{*+}$ veto has been applied, (b) data after the tight $D_s^{*+}$ veto has been applied. The large feature on the left of the plots is due to $D^{*+} \rightarrow D^+\pi^0$ where one of the photons from the $\pi^0$ decay is not detected. Monte Carlo studies indicate that this decay does not contribute to the signal region. The dashed histograms are data taken from the upper $M(D^+)$ sideband.

The signal was fit with a modified Gaussian, the parameters for which were obtained from a large Monte Carlo sample of $D^{*+} \rightarrow D^+\gamma$ events. The systematic error in the fit parameters was estimated by studying data versus Monte Carlo differences in the very similar decay $D^{*0} \rightarrow D^0\gamma$.

Fig. 2(b) shows the $\Delta M_\gamma$ signal and sideband distributions for events satisfying the $D_s^{*+}$ veto requirement that $M(K^-K^+\pi^+) > 1.990$ GeV/$c^2$. Monte Carlo indicates the fraction of $D_s^{*+}$ events passing this cut is $0.002^{+0.003}_{-0.002}$, thus if the entire signal yield ($180 \pm 26$ events) found in Fig. 2(a) were due to $D_s^{*+}$ decays, $0.4^{+0.6}_{-0.4}$ events would be expected in Fig. 2(b). The fit to the $\Delta M_\pi$ distribution in Fig. 2(b) yields $68 \pm 19$ events. When these data are refit with the signal constrained to be $0.4^{+0.6}_{-0.4}$ events, the $\chi^2$ of the fit increases by 15.8, corresponding to a significance of 4.0 standard deviations for the $D^{*+} \rightarrow D^+\gamma$ signal.

The presence of $D^{*+} \rightarrow D^+\gamma$ decays having been established, the $D_s^{*+}$ veto was loosened to maximize $S^2/(S+B)$ as determined by the Monte Carlo samples. Fig. 3(a) shows the $\Delta M_\gamma$ distribution for the events which passed the optimized $D_s^{*+}$ veto. The fraction of $D^+$ mesons passing the veto was determined by fitting the $\Delta M_\pi$ distribution before and after the veto was applied to the data. This distribution was fit with a double Gaussian plus a background function [18] which simulates the expected threshold behavior. Figs. 3(c) and 3(d) show the $\Delta M_\pi$ distributions, along with the fits, used to determine the $D_s^{*+}$ veto efficiency for $D^+$ mesons.

The results of fitting the $\Delta M_\gamma$ distribution for events which passed and for those which failed the $D_s^{*+}$ veto, Figs. 3(a) and 3(b) respectively, were: $N^{\text{pass}}_\gamma = 87 \pm 21$, $N^{\text{fail}}_\gamma = 95 \pm 16$ (statistical errors only). Defining $N_+ (N_s)$ as the total number of $D^{*+}$ ($D_s^{*+}$) in the data, the branching ratio $R_\gamma$ was then extracted by solving the following pair of equations
FIG. 3. (a) $\Delta M_{\gamma}$ distribution for data after the “optimal” $M(K^- K^+ \pi^+) \rightarrow D^* \gamma$ cut (the $D_s^+$ veto) has been applied. (b) $\Delta M_{\gamma}$ distribution for the vetoed data. (c) $\Delta M_{\pi}$ distribution for data prior to the $M(K^- K^+ \pi^+) \rightarrow D^* \gamma$ cut. (d) $\Delta M_{\pi}$ distribution for data after the $M(K^- K^+ \pi^+) \rightarrow D^* \gamma$ cut is applied. The dashed histograms are data taken from the upper $M(D^+)$ sideband.

\[
(1 - \epsilon_+) N_+ + (1 - \epsilon_s) N_s = N_{\gamma}^{fail} \\
\epsilon_+ N_+ + \epsilon_s N_s = N_{\gamma}^{pass}
\]

where $\epsilon_+$ is the fraction of $D^+$'s which pass the veto as determined by fitting the $\Delta M_{\pi}$ distributions ($N_{\pi}^{pass} = 1650 \pm 57$ and $N_{\pi}^{total} = 2265 \pm 66$, where the errors are statistical only), and $\epsilon_s = 0.037 \pm 0.007$ is the fraction of $D_s^{*+}$'s which escape the veto as determined by a Monte Carlo study. We find

\[
R_{\gamma}^{+} = \frac{N_{\pi}^{pass} - \epsilon_s (N_{\pi}^{fail} + N_{\pi}^{pass}) }{N_{\pi}^{pass} - \epsilon_s N_{\pi}^{total}} \times \frac{\epsilon_+}{\epsilon_\gamma} = 0.055 \pm 0.014 \pm 0.010
\]

where the ratio of efficiencies $\epsilon_+ \gamma / \epsilon_\gamma = 1.066 \pm 0.064$. From this branching ratio we can then extract the branching fractions shown in Table I. The statistical uncertainty is dominated by the $D^* \gamma$ yields, and the largest systematic uncertainty is due to variations in this yield when the mean and width of the signal shape was varied by an amount suggested by the $D^{*0} \rightarrow D^{0} \gamma$ data versus Monte Carlo comparison. A similar comparison was used to estimate...
TABLE I. The $D^*(2010)^\pm$ branching fractions determined from the measured ratio $N(D^+\gamma)/N(D^+\pi^0)$. The first uncertainty is statistical, the second is experimental systematic and the third is that which arises from the use of Eq. (2).

| Mode          | CLEO II        | PDG [12]         |
|---------------|----------------|------------------|
| $D^+\gamma$   | $(1.68 \pm 0.42 \pm 0.29 \pm 0.03)\%$ | $(1.178_{-0.033}^{+0.046})\%$ |
| $D^+\pi^0$    | $(30.73 \pm 0.13 \pm 0.09 \pm 0.61)\%$ | $(30.6 \pm 2.5)\%$ |
| $D^0\pi^+$    | $(67.59 \pm 0.29 \pm 0.20 \pm 0.61)\%$ | $(68.3 \pm 1.4)\%$ |

TABLE II. Estimates of the systematic uncertainties in the measurement of $R^+_{\pi}$.  

| Source                                | Uncertainty |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|
| efficiency ratio $\epsilon_{\pi^0}/\epsilon_{\gamma}$ | 6%          |
| fitting of background                 | 9%          |
| fitting of signal                     | 13%         |
| veto efficiency for $D^+_s$ (19\% on $\epsilon_s$) | 1%          |
| veto efficiency for $D^+$ (2\% on $\epsilon_+$) | 2%          |
| $\cos\theta_\gamma > -0.35$          | 5%          |

the uncertainty introduced by the $\cos\theta_\gamma$ cut. Table II lists the various sources of systematic uncertainty and gives estimates for their impact on the measurement of $R^+_{\pi}$.

In conclusion, we have observed, with $4\sigma$ significance, the radiative decay of the $D^{**}$ and measured $B(D^{**} \rightarrow D^+\gamma)/B(D^{**} \rightarrow D^+\pi^0) = 0.055 \pm 0.017$ (statistical and systematic uncertainties added in quadrature). Assuming Eq. (2) and that the three branching fractions of the $D^{**}$ add to unity, we find the results in Table I. The hadronic branching fractions are in good agreement with the current PDG averages, but with substantially reduced uncertainties (which are now dominated by the 3\% uncertainty in $R^+_{\pi}$). The $D^{**}$ radiative branching fraction is in good agreement with theoretical expectations and the earlier upper limits set by CLEO II [14] and ARGUS [11]. The uncertainty in this branching fraction is due primarily to the large combinatorial background under the radiative signal, so one can expect that data taken with the new CLEO II.5 detector, which includes a silicon tracker, to reduce this uncertainty further in the near future.
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