SLAC-PUB-8408
June 2000

FIRST DIRECT MEASUREMENT OF THE PARITY-VIOLATING COUPLING OF THE Z^0 TO THE s-QUARK*

The SLD Collaboration**

Stanford Linear Accelerator Center
Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94309

Abstract

We have made the first direct measurement of the parity-violating coupling of the Z^0 boson to the strange quark, A_s, using ~550,000 $e^+e^- \to Z^0 \to$hadrons events produced with a polarized electron beam and recorded by the SLD experiment. $Z^0 \to s\bar{s}$ events were tagged by the absence of B or D hadrons and the presence in each hemisphere of a high-momentum $K^\pm$ or K^0_s. From the polar angle distributions of the strangeness-signed thrust axis, we obtained $A_s = 0.895 \pm 0.066(stat.) \pm 0.062(syst.)$. The analyzing power and $u\bar{u}+d\bar{d}$ background were constrained using the data.

Contributed to the XXXth International Conference on High Energy Physics, July 27–August 2, 2000, Osaka, Japan; Ref: Pa03-694.

*Work supported in part by Department of Energy contract DE-AC03-76SF00515.

The extent of parity violation in the electroweak coupling of the Z^0 boson to an elementary fermion f can be specified by the parameter $A_f = 2v_f a_f/(v_f^2 + a_f^2)$, where v_f (a_f) is the vector (axial-vector) $Zf\bar{f}$ coupling. In the Standard Model (SM), universal couplings are expected for the leptons ($A_e = A_\mu = A_\tau$), the down-type quarks ($A_d = A_s = A_b$) and the up-type quarks ($A_u = A_c = A_t$). Precise measurements of the A_f allow stringent tests of the SM and sensitivity through radiative corrections to e.g.: the top quark and Higgs boson masses ($A_{e,\mu,\tau}$); new physics that affects primarily the right-handed couplings ($A_{d,s,b}$); and new physics that couples more strongly to heavier quarks (deviations from universality).

All except A_t can be measured in e^+e^- annihilations at the Z^0 resonance via forward-backward production asymmetries in θ_f, the polar angle of the outgoing f with respect to the incoming e^- beam. At the SLC, the e^- beam has longitudinal polarization P_e, the e^+ beam is unpolarized, and the Born-level differential cross-section for the process $e^+e^- \to Z^0 \to f\bar{f}$ is:

$$d\sigma_f/dx \propto (1 - A_e P_e)(1 + x^2) + 2A_f(A_e - P_e)x, \qquad (1)$$

where the last term is antisymmetric in $x = \cos\theta_f$. Using both left- ($P_e < 0$) and right-polarized ($P_e > 0$) beams of magnitude $|P_e|$, one can measure both the initial- (A_e) and final-state (A_f) couplings directly [1, 2]; for $P_e = 0$ one can measure only their product, or $A_{FB}^f \equiv 3A_e A_f/4$.

The most precisely measured coupling is A_e, with a relative error of 1.3% [1, 3], and lepton universality is verified at the 8% level [3]. In the quark sector, several measurements of A_b and A_c that use properties of the leading B and D hadrons can be combined to yield precisions of 2.0% and 4.4%, respectively [3]. However there are few measurements of A_u, A_d or A_s [4, 5] because the leading particles in u, d and s jets are more difficult to identify experimentally; they have relatively low energy, are not unique to events of a particular flavor, and nonleading particles of the same species are produced in hadronic jets of all flavors. Furthermore, these aspects of jet fragmentation are not well measured, and previous indirect measurements either relied on imprecise constraints from their data (OPAL: $A_{FB}^u = 0.040 \pm 0.073$; $A_{FB}^{ds} = 0.068 \pm 0.037$ [4]) or are model-dependent (DELPHI: $A_{FB}^s = 0.101 \pm 0.012$ [5]).

In this Letter we present the first direct measurement of A_s. We used high-momentum $K^\pm$ and K_s^0 to tag $Z^0 \to s\bar{s}$ events, and the $K^\pm$ charge to separate s jets from $\bar{s}$ jets. The heavy flavor ($c\bar{c} + b\bar{b}$) event background was suppressed by identifying B and D decay vertices. The $u\bar{u} + d\bar{d}$ background was suppressed and the s-$\bar{s}$ separation enhanced by requiring an $s/\bar{s}$-tag in each event hemisphere, reducing any model dependence. The remaining $u\bar{u} + d\bar{d}$ background and the s-$\bar{s}$ separation were constrained using related observables in the data.

We used the sample of approximately 550,000 hadronic Z^0 decays recorded by the SLD [6] experiment at the SLAC Linear Collider, with $\langle |P_e| \rangle = 0.735 \pm 0.005$ [1], from 1993–1998. Charged tracks were measured in the Central Drift Chamber (CDC) [7] and the original (upgraded) Vertex Detector (VXD) [8] in 26.5% (73.5%) of the data; the resolution

on the impact parameter d in the plane perpendicular to the beam direction, including the uncertainty on the interaction point, was $\sigma_d = 11 \oplus 70/(p \sin^{3/2}\theta)$ μm ($8 \oplus 29/(p \sin^{3/2}\theta)$ μm), where p is the track momentum in GeV/c and θ its polar angle with respect to the beamline. Tracks were identified as $\pi^{\pm}$, $K^{\pm}$ or p/$\bar{\rm p}$ in the Cherenkov Ring Imaging Detector (CRID) [9], which allowed the identification with high efficiency and purity of $\pi^{\pm}$ with $0.3 < p < 35$ GeV/c, $K^{\pm}$ with $0.75 < p < 6$ GeV/c or $9 < p < 35$ GeV/c, and p/$\bar{\rm p}$ with $0.75 < p < 6$ GeV/c or $10 < p < 46$ GeV/c [10]. The event thrust axis [11] was calculated using energy clusters measured in the Liquid Argon Calorimeter [12].

After selecting hadronic Z^0 decays [13], we removed $c\bar{c}$ and $b\bar{b}$ events by requiring no more than one well-measured [13] track with $d/\sigma_d > 2.5$ in the event. The efficiency for selecting light-flavor events with $|\cos\theta_{thrust}| < 0.71$ and the VXD, CDC and CRID operational was estimated to be over 95%; the selected sample comprised 205,708 events, with an estimated contribution of 14.2% (3.4%) from $c\bar{c}$ ($b\bar{b}$) events. Such performance parameters were estimated from a detailed Monte Carlo (MC) simulation [13, 14] of the SLD based on the JETSET 7.4 [15] event generator, tuned to reproduce many measured properties of hadronic Z^0 decays, including the momentum-dependent production of $K^{\pm}$, K^0, K^* and ϕ mesons.

Each selected event was divided into two hemispheres by the plane perpendicular to the thrust axis, and in each hemisphere we searched for high-momentum strange particles $K^{\pm}$, K^0_s and $\Lambda^0/\bar{\Lambda}^0$. Candidate $K^{\pm}$ tracks were required to have $p > 9$ GeV/c, $d < 1$ mm, to extrapolate through an active region of the CRID gaseous radiator system, and to have a log-likelihood [10] for the $K^{\pm}$ hypothesis $\mathcal{L}_K$ that exceeded both $\mathcal{L}_\pi$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\rm p}$ by at least 3 units. For $p > 9$ GeV/c, the estimated $K^{\pm}$ selection efficiency (purity) was 48% (91.5%).

Candidate $K^0_s \to \pi^+\pi^-$ and $\Lambda^0/\bar{\Lambda}^0 \to {\rm p}\pi^-/\bar{\rm p}\pi^+$ decays were reconstructed as described in [10, 16] from tracks not identified as $K^{\pm}$. We required $p > 5$ GeV/c and a reconstructed invariant mass $m_{\pi\pi}$ or $m_{{\rm p}\pi}$ within two standard deviations of the K^0_s or Λ^0 mass. If CRID information was available for the p/$\bar{\rm p}$ track in a $\Lambda^0/\bar{\Lambda}^0$ candidate, we required $\mathcal{L}_{\rm p} > \mathcal{L}_\pi$; otherwise we required that the $\Lambda^0/\bar{\Lambda}^0$ not be a K^0_s candidate and that the flight distance exceed 10 times its uncertainty. The estimated $\Lambda^0/\bar{\Lambda}^0$ reconstruction efficiency (purity) was 12% (90.7%). These $\Lambda^0/\bar{\Lambda}^0$ were removed from the K^0_s sample, for an estimated K^0_s efficiency (purity) of 24% (90.7%).

We considered only the selected strange particle with the highest momentum in each hemisphere (5.5% of those tagged contained more than one), and tagged the event as $s\bar{s}$ if one hemisphere contained a $K^{\pm}$ and the other contained either an oppositely charged $K^{\pm}$ or a K^0_s. The $\Lambda^0/\bar{\Lambda}^0$ tags provided a useful veto in multiply tagged hemispheres and important checks of the simulation; however their inclusion did not improve the total error on A_s. The thrust axis, signed so as to point into the hemisphere containing (opposite) the K^- (K^+), was used as an estimate of the initial s-quark direction. Table 1 shows the number of events tagged in each mode, along with the predictions of the simulation, which are consistent. Also shown are the simulated $s\bar{s}$ event purities and analyzing powers $a_s \equiv (N_r - N_w)/(N_r + N_w)$, where N_r (N_w) is the number of events in which the signed thrust axis pointed into the true s ($\bar{s}$) hemisphere.

Mode	# Events in Data	MC Prediction	$s\bar{s}$ Purity	Analyzing Power
K^+K^-	1290	1312	0.73	0.95
$K^\pm K^0_s$	1580	1617	0.60	0.70
$K^+\Lambda^0, K^-\bar{\Lambda}^0$	219	213	0.66	0.89
$\Lambda^0\bar{\Lambda}^0$	17	14	0.57	0.70
$\Lambda^0 K^0_s, \bar{\Lambda}^0 K^0_s$	193	194	0.50	0.32

Table 1: Summary of the selected event sample for the two tagging modes and the three cross-check modes.

Figure 1 shows the distributions of the measured s-quark polar angle θ_s for the K^+K^- and $K^\pm K^0_s$ modes. In each case, production asymmetries of opposite sign and different magnitude for left- and right-polarized e^- beams are visible. The content of the largest $|\cos\theta_s|$ bins is reduced by the detector acceptance. The estimated backgrounds (discussed below) are indicated: those from $c\bar{c}+b\bar{b}$ events exhibit asymmetries of the same sign and similar magnitude to those of the signal, so the measured A_s is largely insensitive to them; those from $u\bar{u}+d\bar{d}$ events exhibit asymmetries of opposite sign, and A_s is more sensitive to the associated uncertainties.

A simultaneous maximum likelihood fit to these four distributions was performed using the function:

$$L = \prod_{k=1}^{N_{data}} \sum_{q=udscb} N_q\{(1-A_eP_e)(1+x_k^2) + 2(A_e-P_e)(1+\delta)a_qA_qx_k\}. \qquad (2)$$

Here, the number of tagged $q\bar{q}$ events $N_q = N_{events}R_q\epsilon_q$, $R_q = \Gamma(Z^0\to q\bar{q})/\Gamma(Z^0\to\text{hadrons})$, ϵ_q is the tagging efficiency, a_q is the analyzing power for tagging the q direction, and the correction for hard gluon radiation $\delta = -0.013$ was derived [17] as in [2]. The values of the ϵ_q and a_q depend on the tagging mode. World average values [3] of A_e, A_c, A_b, R_c and R_b were used, along with SM values of A_u, A_d, R_u, R_d and R_s. Simulated values of ϵ_c, ϵ_b, a_c and a_b were used, as they depend primarily on measured quantities with well defined uncertainties.

For the light flavors, the relevant parameter values were derived where possible from the data. The number of events $N_u+N_d+N_s$ was determined by subtracting the simulated N_c and N_b from the total observed. The values of a_s and the ratio $(N_u+N_d)/N_s$ were constrained (see below) using the data; since the simulation was consistent with the data, the simulated values of a_s were used and the simulated ϵ_u, ϵ_d and ϵ_s were scaled by a common factor to give the measured $N_u+N_d+N_s$. The average $a_{ud} \equiv (N_ua_u+N_da_d)/(N_u+N_d)$ can also be constrained from the data; however our constraint is less precise than the range $-a_s < a_u, a_d < 0$, obtained by noting that a u (d) jet can produce a leading K^+ ($K^{*0}\to K^+\pi^-$), giving $a_u(a_d)<0$, but with an associated K^- or $\bar{K}^0$, and a K^- can be selected with reduced probability, giving $|a_u|(|a_d|)< |a_s|$. We scaled the simulated



Figure 1: Measured s-quark polar angle distributions (dots) for selected events in the a,b) K^+K^- and c,d) $K^\pm K^0_s$ modes, produced with a,c) left- and b,d) right-polarized electron beams. The histograms represent the result of a simultaneous fit to the four distributions, and the upper (lower) hatched areas indicate the estimated $u\bar{u}+d\bar{d}$ ($c\bar{c}+b\bar{b}$) backgrounds.

a_u and a_d by a common factor such that $a_{ud} = -a_s/2$ for each mode. The fit yielded $A_s = 0.895 \pm 0.066$ (stat.). Histograms corresponding to this value are shown in fig. 1 and are consistent with the data; the binned χ^2 is 42 for 48 bins.

We considered several sources of systematic uncertainty, summarized in table 2. The values of R_c, R_b, A_c and A_b were varied by the uncertainties on their world averages [3]. A large number of quantities in the simulation of heavy flavor events and detector performance were varied as in [14] with negligible effect on the measured value of A_s. The yield and analyzing power of true $K^\pm$ from D (B) decays have been derived from SLD data in the context of a measurement [18] of A_c (A_b), and our simulation reproduces them within the measurement errors. We applied corresponding relative variations of $\pm 9\%$ to ϵ_c, $\pm 3.3\%$ to ϵ_b, $\pm 5\%$ (15%) to a_c and $\pm 3.6\%$ (4.4%) to a_b for the K^+K^- ($K^\pm K^0_s$) mode. The sum in quadrature of the uncertainties due to heavy flavor background is listed in Table 2; the largest contribution is from δa_c.

The key to this measurement is the understanding of the light-flavor parameters, for which there are few experimental constraints, and these gave rise to the dominant systematic uncertainties [16]. In order to minimize model dependence, we used our data to constrain the largest uncertainties in these parameters within the context of our simulation, which reproduces existing measurements of relevant quantities such as leading particle production and strange-antistrange correlations [16].

To constrain the analyzing power a_s, we note that to mistag an s jet as an $\bar{s}$ jet we must either identify a true K^+ or misidentify a π^+ or p as a K^+. A true high-

momentum K^+ in an s jet must be produced in association with an antistrange particle, yielding a jet with three high-momentum particles of nonzero strangeness. In our data we found 61 hemispheres containing three selected $K^\pm$ and/or K^0_s; the MC prediction of 67 is consistent. We quantified this as a constraint on a_s by subtracting the simulated $(c{+}\bar{c}{+}b{+}\bar{b})$ contribution of 9.3, scaling by the simulated ratio $(s{+}\bar{s})/(u{+}\bar{u}{+}d{+}\bar{d}{+}s{+}\bar{s}) = 0.74$, and comparing with the MC prediction for $(s{+}\bar{s})$. Propagating the data and MC statistical errors yielded an 18.5% relative constraint on the wrong-sign fraction, $w_s = (1-a_s)/2$, in $s/\bar{s}$ hemispheres. This constraint is not entirely model-independent but any further uncertainties are small compared with 18.5%. Assuming equal production of charged and neutral kaons, this procedure delivers a calibration of w_s for both tagging modes, which we varied simultaneously by $\pm 18.5\%$ relative. To account for misidentified particles we varied the production of >9 GeV/c p and π^+ in s jets by $\pm 100\%$, and varied the misidentification probability by its measured relative uncertainty of $\pm 25\%$ [10]. The sum in quadrature of these three effects is shown in table 2 and is dominated by the 3-kaon calibration.

The relative $u\bar{u}+d\bar{d}$ background $B_{ud} = (N_u + N_d)/N_s$ was constrained in a similar manner, by exploiting the fact that an even number of particles with nonzero strangeness must be produced in a u or d jet. The three quantities, the number $N_1 = 1262$ of hemispheres in the data containing an identified K^+K^- pair, $N_2 = 983$ hemispheres containing a $K^\pm K^0_s$ pair, and $N_3 = 503$ events with an identified $K^\pm$ of the same charge in both hemispheres, constrain B_{ud} in complementary ways: N_1 and N_2 are primarily sensitive to $K\bar{K}$ production in u/d jets; $(N_1 - N_2)$ to ϕ production in s jets; and N_3 to these and also the production and misidentification of $\pi^\pm$ and $\mathrm{p}/\bar{\mathrm{p}}$. Furthermore, all are sensitive to deviations from the assumed values of R_u, R_d and R_s. The MC predictions of $N_1 = 1218$, $N_2 = 1002$ and $N_3 = 559$ are consistent, and relative constraints on B_{ud} of 4.6%, 5.1% and 8.1%, respectively, were derived. Since N_3 constrains the sum of all contributions, we varied B_{ud} by $\pm 8.1\%$.

These quantities are also sensitive to a_u and a_d, however our limited event sample did not allow us to obtain a useful constraint. We therefore took $-a_s < a_u, a_d < 0$ as hard limits and scaled a_u and a_d simultaneously such that $a_{ud} = -a_s/2 \pm a_s/\sqrt{12}$. This yielded the dominant systematic error on A_s and is a quantity that must be understood experimentally before a more precise measurement can be made. Since the product $A_q a_q$ appears in Eqn. 2, this is equivalent to varying A_u and A_d down to half of their SM values and up to well over unity; we considered no additional variation of A_u or A_d. The uncertainties listed in table 2 were added in quadrature to yield a total relative systematic error of ± 0.069.

Several systematic checks were also performed. Ad hoc corrections [16] to the simulation of the kaon momentum distributions and identification efficiencies, and the charged track reconstruction efficiency and impact parameter resolution were removed and the analysis repeated; changes in the measured value of A_s were much smaller than the systematic error. We fitted each tagging mode separately, including those involving Λ^0 tags, with consistent results. We repeated the analysis using all $K^\pm$, and all $\Lambda^0/\bar{\Lambda}^0$, hemispheres with no tag required in the opposite hemisphere; results were consistent. This

Source		Systematic variation	$\delta A_s/A_s$
Heavy flavor background		See text	0.014
Correction for gluon radiation		-0.013 ± 0.006	0.006
$\langle\lvert P_e\rvert\rangle$		0.735 ± 0.005	0.006
MC statistics			0.014
a_s	K^+K^-	0.949 ± 0.012	
	$K^\pm K^0_s$	0.701 ± 0.060	0.032
$(N_u+N_d)/N_s$	K^+K^-	0.190 ± 0.015	
(incl. $(R_u+R_d)/R_s$)	$K^\pm K^0_s$	0.316 ± 0.026	0.021
a_u, a_d		$-a_s/2\pm a_s/\sqrt{12}$	0.054
A_u, A_d		–	
Total			0.069

Table 2: Summary of the systematic uncertainties.

$K^\pm$ analysis is similar to that in [5]; it has a relative statistical precision of 0.03, but of 0.18 systematic.

In conclusion, we have made the first direct measurement of the parity-violating coupling of the Z^0 boson to the strange quark,

$$A_s = 0.895\pm0.066(stat.)\pm0.062(syst.),$$

using high-momentum identified $K^\pm$ and K^0_s to tag $Z^0\to s\bar{s}$ decays and determine the s-quark direction. Our high $K^\pm$ identification efficiency allowed the use of a relatively high-purity, double-tagged event sample, and the extraction from the data of constraints on the analyzing power of the method and the $u\bar{u}$+$d\bar{d}$ background, using events with same-charge double tags and jets with two or three identified kaons. This result is consistent with the Standard Model expectation, $A_s = 0.935$, and with less precise, previous measurements of A^s_{FB} [4, 5]. It is also consistent with a recent world average b-quark asymmetry, $A_b = 0.881\pm0.018$ [3], providing a 10% test of down-type quark universality.

We thank the personnel of the SLAC accelerator department and the technical staffs of our collaborating institutions for their outstanding efforts on our behalf. This work was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, the UK Particle Physics and Astronomy Research Council (Brunel, Oxford and RAL); the Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare of Italy (Bologna, Ferrara, Frascati, Pisa, Padova, Perugia); the Japan-US Cooperative Research Project on High Energy Physics (Nagoya, Tohoku); and the Korea Science and Engineering Foundation (Soongsil).

References

[1] SLD Collab., K. Abe *et al.*, SLAC-PUB-8401, to appear Physical Review Letters (June 26, 2000).

[2] SLD Collab., K. Abe *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83** (1999) 3384.

[3] The LEP Collabs., the LEP Electroweak Working Group, and the SLD Heavy Flavor and Electroweak Groups, CERN-EP/99-015 (1999).

[4] OPAL Collab., K. Ackerstaff *et al.*, Z. Phys. **C76** (1997) 387.

[5] DELPHI Collab., P. Abreu *et al.*, Z. Phys. **C67** (1995) 1; CERN-EP/99-134, submitted to Eur. Phys. J. C.

[6] SLD Design Report, SLAC-Report 273 (1984).

[7] M. D. Hildreth *et al.*, Nucl. Instr. Meth. **A367** (1995) 111.

[8] C.J.S. Damerell *et al.*, Nucl. Instr. Meth. **A288** (1990) 236; Nucl. Instr. Meth. **A400** (1997) 287.

[9] K. Abe *et al.*, Nucl. Inst. Meth. **A343** (1994) 74.

[10] SLD Collab., K. Abe *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D59** (1999) 52001.

[11] S. Brandt *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **12** (1964) 57.
E. Farhi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **39** (1977) 1587.

[12] D. Axen *et al.*, Nucl. Inst. Meth. **A328** (1993) 472.

[13] SLD Collab., K. Abe *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D53** (1996) 1023.

[14] SLD Collab., K. Abe *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80** (1998) 660.

[15] T. Sjöstrand, Comput. Phys. Commun. **82** (1994) 74.

[16] H. Stängle, Ph.D. Thesis, Colorado State University (1999), SLAC-R-549.

[17] S. Narita, Ph.D. Thesis, Tohoku University (1998), SLAC-R-520.

[18] SLD Collab., K. Abe *et al.*, SLAC-PUB-8199, SLAC-PUB-8200, unpublished.

**List of Authors

Koya Abe,[24] Kenji Abe,[15] T. Abe,[21] I. Adam,[21] H. Akimoto,[21] D. Aston,[21]
K.G. Baird,[11] C. Baltay,[30] H.R. Band,[29] T.L. Barklow,[21] J.M. Bauer,[12]
G. Bellodi,[17] R. Berger,[21] G. Blaylock,[11] J.R. Bogart,[21] G.R. Bower,[21]
J.E. Brau,[16] M. Breidenbach,[21] W.M. Bugg,[23] D. Burke,[21] T.H. Burnett,[28]
P.N. Burrows,[17] A. Calcaterra,[8] R. Cassell,[21] A. Chou,[21] H.O. Cohn,[23]
J.A. Coller,[4] M.R. Convery,[21] V. Cook,[28] R.F. Cowan,[13] G. Crawford,[21]
C.J.S. Damerell,[19] M. Daoudi,[21] S. Dasu,[29] N. de Groot,[2] R. de Sangro,[8]
D.N. Dong,[13] M. Doser,[21] R. Dubois, I. Erofeeva,[14] V. Eschenburg,[12] E. Etzion,[29]
S. Fahey,[5] D. Falciai,[8] J.P. Fernandez,[26] K. Flood,[11] R. Frey,[16] E.L. Hart,[23]
K. Hasuko,[24] S.S. Hertzbach,[11] M.E. Huffer,[21] X. Huynh,[21] M. Iwasaki,[16]
D.J. Jackson,[19] P. Jacques,[20] J.A. Jaros,[21] Z.Y. Jiang,[21] A.S. Johnson,[21]
J.R. Johnson,[29] R. Kajikawa,[15] M. Kalelkar,[20] H.J. Kang,[20] R.R. Kofler,[11]
R.S. Kroeger,[12] M. Langston,[16] D.W.G. Leith,[21] V. Lia,[13] C. Lin,[11]
G. Mancinelli,[20] S. Manly,[30] G. Mantovani,[18] T.W. Markiewicz,[21]
T. Maruyama,[21] A.K. McKemey,[3] R. Messner,[21] K.C. Moffeit,[21] T.B. Moore,[30]
M. Morii,[21] D. Muller,[21] V. Murzin,[14] S. Narita,[24] U. Nauenberg,[5] H. Neal,[30]
G. Nesom,[17] N. Oishi,[15] D. Onoprienko,[23] L.S. Osborne,[13] R.S. Panvini,[27]
C.H. Park,[22] I. Peruzzi,[8] M. Piccolo,[8] L. Piemontese,[7] R.J. Plano,[20]
R. Prepost,[29] C.Y. Prescott,[21] B.N. Ratcliff,[21] J. Reidy,[12] P.L. Reinertsen,[26]
L.S. Rochester,[21] P.C. Rowson,[21] J.J. Russell,[21] O.H. Saxton,[21] T. Schalk,[26]
B.A. Schumm,[26] J. Schwiening,[21] V.V. Serbo,[21] G. Shapiro,[10] N.B. Sinev,[16]
J.A. Snyder,[30] H. Staengle,[6] A. Stahl,[21] P. Stamer,[20] H. Steiner,[10] D. Su,[21]
F. Suekane,[24] A. Sugiyama,[15] A. Suzuki,[15] M. Swartz,[9] F.E. Taylor,[13]
J. Thom,[21] E. Torrence,[13] T. Usher,[21] J. Va'vra,[21] R. Verdier,[13] D.L. Wagner,[5]
A.P. Waite,[21] S. Walston,[16] A.W. Weidemann,[23] E.R. Weiss,[28] J.S. Whitaker,[4]
S.H. Williams,[21] S. Willocq,[11] R.J. Wilson,[6] W.J. Wisniewski,[21] J.L. Wittlin,[11]
M. Woods,[21] T.R. Wright,[29] R.K. Yamamoto,[13] J. Yashima,[24] S.J. Yellin,[25]
C.C. Young,[21] H. Yuta.[1]

(The SLD Collaboration)

[1] *Aomori University, Aomori, 030 Japan,*
[2] *University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom,*
[3] *Brunel University, Uxbridge, Middlesex, UB8 3PH United Kingdom,*
[4] *Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts 02215,*
[5] *University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80309,*
[6] *Colorado State University, Ft. Collins, Colorado 80523,*
[7] *INFN Sezione di Ferrara and Universita di Ferrara, I-44100 Ferrara, Italy,*
[8] *INFN Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, I-00044 Frascati, Italy,*
[9] *Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland 21218-2686,*
[10] *Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720,*
[11] *University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts 01003,*
[12] *University of Mississippi, University, Mississippi 38677,*

[13] *Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139,*
[14] *Institute of Nuclear Physics, Moscow State University, 119899 Moscow, Russia,*
[15] *Nagoya University, Chikusa-ku, Nagoya, 464 Japan,*
[16] *University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403,*
[17] *Oxford University, Oxford, OX1 3RH, United Kingdom,*
[18] *INFN Sezione di Perugia and Universita di Perugia, I-06100 Perugia, Italy,*
[19] *Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Chilton, Didcot, Oxon OX11 0QX United Kingdom,*
[20] *Rutgers University, Piscataway, New Jersey 08855,*
[21] *Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94309,*
[22] *Soongsil University, Seoul, Korea 156-743,*
[23] *University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee 37996,*
[24] *Tohoku University, Sendai, 980 Japan,*
[25] *University of California at Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, California 93106,*
[26] *University of California at Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz, California 95064,*
[27] *Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee 37235,*
[28] *University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98105,*
[29] *University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706,*
[30] *Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut 06511.*