





### $\omega(782)$ WIDTH

VALUE (MeV)	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
<b>8.49±0.08 OUR AVERAGE</b>				
8.68±0.23±0.10	11200	<sup>9</sup> AKHMETSHIN 04	CMD2	$e^+ e^- \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0$
8.68±0.04±0.15	1.2M	<sup>10</sup> ACHASOV 03D	RVUE	$0.44\text{--}2.00 e^+ e^- \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0$
8.2 ± 0.3	19500	WURZINGER 95	SPEC	$1.33 pd \rightarrow {}^3He \omega$
8.4 ± 0.1		AULCHENKO 87	ND	$e^+ e^- \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0$
8.30±0.40		BARKOV 87	CMD	$e^+ e^- \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0$
9.8 ± 0.9	1488	KURDADZE 83B	OLYA	$e^+ e^- \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0$
9.0 ± 0.8	433	CORDIER 80	DM1	$e^+ e^- \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0$
9.1 ± 0.8	451	BENAKSAS 72B	OSPK	$e^+ e^- \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0$
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
12 ± 2	1430	COOPER 78B	HBC	$0.7\text{--}0.8 \bar{p}p \rightarrow 5\pi$
9.4 ± 2.5	2100	GESSAROLI 77	HBC	$11 \pi^- p \rightarrow \omega n$
10.22±0.43	20000	<sup>12</sup> KEYNE 76	CNTR	$\pi^- p \rightarrow \omega n$
13.3 ± 2	418	AGUILAR-...	72B HBC	$3.9, 4.6 K^- p$
10.5 ± 1.5		BORENSTEIN 72	HBC	$2.18 K^- p$
7.70±0.9 ± 1.15	940	BROWN 72	MMS	$2.5 \pi^- p \rightarrow n MM$
10.3 ± 1.4	510	BIZZARRI 71	HBC	$0.0 p\bar{p} \rightarrow K_1 K_1 \omega$
12.8 ± 3.0	248	BIZZARRI 71	HBC	$0.0 p\bar{p} \rightarrow K^+ K^- \omega$
9.5 ± 1.0	3583	COYNE 71	HBC	$3.7 \pi^+ p \rightarrow p\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$

<sup>9</sup> Update of AKHMETSHIN 00c.<sup>10</sup> From the combined fit of ANTONELLI 92, ACHASOV 01E, ACHASOV 02E, and ACHASOV 03D data on the  $\pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0$  and ANTONELLI 92 on the  $\omega \pi^+ \pi^-$  final states. Supersedes ACHASOV 99E and ACHASOV 02E.<sup>11</sup> Relativistic Breit-Wigner includes radiative corrections.<sup>12</sup> Observed by threshold-crossing technique. Mass resolution = 4.8 MeV FWHM. **$\omega(782)$  DECAY MODES**

Mode	Fraction ( $\Gamma_i/\Gamma$ )	Scale factor/ Confidence level
$\Gamma_1$ $\pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0$	(89.1 $\pm$ 0.7) %	S=1.1
$\Gamma_2$ $\pi^0 \gamma$	( 8.90 $\pm$ 0.27 ) %	S=1.1
$\Gamma_3$ $\pi^+ \pi^-$	( 1.70 $\pm$ 0.27 ) %	S=1.4
$\Gamma_4$ neutrals (excluding $\pi^0 \gamma$ )	( 1.6 $\pm$ 7.4 ) $\times 10^{-3}$	
$\Gamma_5$ $\eta \gamma$	( 4.9 $\pm$ 0.5 ) $\times 10^{-4}$	
$\Gamma_6$ $\pi^0 e^+ e^-$	( 7.7 $\pm$ 0.9 ) $\times 10^{-4}$	S=1.1
$\Gamma_7$ $\pi^0 \mu^+ \mu^-$	( 9.6 $\pm$ 2.3 ) $\times 10^{-5}$	
$\Gamma_8$ $\eta e^+ e^-$		
$\Gamma_9$ $e^+ e^-$	( 7.18 $\pm$ 0.12 ) $\times 10^{-5}$	S=1.1
$\Gamma_{10}$ $\pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0 \pi^0$	< 2 %	CL=90%
$\Gamma_{11}$ $\pi^+ \pi^- \gamma$	< 3.6 $\times 10^{-3}$	CL=95%
$\Gamma_{12}$ $\pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+ \pi^-$	< 1 $\times 10^{-3}$	CL=90%
$\Gamma_{13}$ $\pi^0 \pi^0 \gamma$	( 6.7 $\pm$ 1.1 ) $\times 10^{-5}$	
$\Gamma_{14}$ $\eta \pi^0 \gamma$	< 3.3 $\times 10^{-5}$	CL=90%
$\Gamma_{15}$ $\mu^+ \mu^-$	( 9.0 $\pm$ 3.1 ) $\times 10^{-5}$	
$\Gamma_{16}$ $3\gamma$	< 1.9 $\times 10^{-4}$	CL=95%

**Charge conjugation ( $C$ ) violating modes**

$\Gamma_{17}$	$\eta \pi^0$	$C < 1$	$\times 10^{-3}$	CL=90%
$\Gamma_{18}$	$3\pi^0$	$C < 3$	$\times 10^{-4}$	CL=90%

**CONSTRAINED FIT INFORMATION**

An overall fit to 15 branching ratios uses 47 measurements and one constraint to determine 10 parameters. The overall fit has a  $\chi^2 = 33.3$  for 38 degrees of freedom.

The following *off-diagonal* array elements are the correlation coefficients  $\langle \delta x_i \delta x_j \rangle / (\delta x_i \cdot \delta x_j)$ , in percent, from the fit to the branching fractions,  $x_i \equiv \Gamma_i / \Gamma_{\text{total}}$ . The fit constrains the  $x_i$  whose labels appear in this array to sum to one.

$x_2$	28								
$x_3$	-36	-10							
$x_4$	-89	-55	1						
$x_5$	6	8	-2	-8					
$x_6$	-1	0	0	0	0				
$x_7$	0	0	0	0	0	0			
$x_9$	-44	-53	16	53	-15	1	0		
$x_{13}$	1	3	0	-2	0	0	0	-2	
$x_{15}$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	$x_1$	$x_2$	$x_3$	$x_4$	$x_5$	$x_6$	$x_7$	$x_9$	$x_{13}$

## $\omega(782)$ PARTIAL WIDTHS

### $\Gamma(e^+ e^-)$

VALUE (keV)	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT	$\Gamma_9$
-------------	------	-------------	------	---------	------------

#### 0.60 ± 0.02 OUR EVALUATION

• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •

0.591 ± 0.015	11200	13,14 AKHMETSHIN 04	CMD2	$e^+ e^- \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0$	
0.653 ± 0.003 ± 0.021	1.2M	15 ACHASOV	03D RVUE	$0.44-2.00 e^+ e^- \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0$	
0.600 ± 0.031	10625	DOLINSKY	89 ND	$e^+ e^- \rightarrow \pi^0 \gamma$	

13 Using  $B(\omega \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0) = 0.891 \pm 0.007$  and  $\Gamma_{\text{total}} = 8.44 \pm 0.09$  MeV.

14 Update of AKHMETSHIN 00C.

15 Using ACHASOV 03, ACHASOV 03D and  $B(\omega \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-) = (1.70 \pm 0.28)\%$ .

### $\Gamma(\pi^0 \gamma)$

VALUE (keV)	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT	$\Gamma_2$
-------------	------	-------------	------	---------	------------

• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •

788 ± 12 ± 27	36500	16 ACHASOV	03 SND	$0.60-0.97 e^+ e^- \rightarrow \pi^0 \gamma$	
764 ± 51	10625	DOLINSKY	89 ND	$e^+ e^- \rightarrow \pi^0 \gamma$	

16 Using  $\Gamma_\omega = 8.44 \pm 0.09$  MeV and  $B(\omega \rightarrow \pi^0 \gamma)$  from ACHASOV 03.



- <sup>22</sup> From the  $\eta \rightarrow 2\gamma$  decay and using  $B(\eta \rightarrow \gamma\gamma) = 39.43 \pm 0.26\%$ .  
<sup>23</sup> From the  $\eta \rightarrow 3\pi^0$  decay and using  $B(\eta \rightarrow 3\pi^0) = (32.24 \pm 0.29) \times 10^{-2}$ .  
<sup>24</sup> The combined fit from 600 to 1380 MeV taking into account  $\rho(770)$ ,  $\omega(782)$ ,  $\phi(1020)$ , and  $\rho(1450)$  (mass and width fixed at 1450 MeV and 310 MeV respectively).  
<sup>25</sup> From the  $\eta \rightarrow 3\pi^0$  decay and using  $B(\eta \rightarrow 3\pi^0) = (32.2 \pm 0.4) \times 10^{-2}$ .

## $\omega(782)$ BRANCHING RATIOS

$\Gamma(\text{ neutrals})/\Gamma(\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0)$	$(\Gamma_2 + \Gamma_4)/\Gamma_1$			
VALUE	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
<b><math>0.102 \pm 0.008</math> OUR FIT</b>				
<b><math>0.103^{+0.011}_{-0.010}</math> OUR AVERAGE</b>				
0.15 $\pm 0.04$	46	AGUILAR-...	72B HBC	3.9, 4.6 $K^- p$
0.10 $\pm 0.03$	19	BARASH	67B HBC	0.0 $\bar{p}p$
$0.134 \pm 0.026$	850	DIGIUGNO	66B CNTR	1.4 $\pi^- p$
$0.097 \pm 0.016$	348	FLATTE	66 HBC	1.4 – 1.7 $K^- p \rightarrow \Lambda MM$
$0.06^{+0.05}_{-0.02}$		JAMES	66 HBC	2.1 $\pi^+ p$
0.08 $\pm 0.03$	35	KRAEMER	64 DBC	1.2 $\pi^+ d$
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
0.11 $\pm 0.02$	20	BUSCHBECK	63 HBC	1.5 $K^- p$
$\Gamma(\pi^+\pi^-)/\Gamma(\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0)$	$\Gamma_3/\Gamma_1$			
See also $\Gamma(\pi^+\pi^-)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$ .				
VALUE	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
<b><math>0.0191 \pm 0.0030</math> OUR FIT</b>	Error includes scale factor of 1.4.			
<b><math>0.026 \pm 0.005</math> OUR AVERAGE</b>				
0.021 $\pm 0.028$	27	RATCLIFF	72 ASPK	$15 \pi^- p \rightarrow n 2\pi$
$0.028 \pm 0.006$		BEHREND	71 ASPK	Photoproduction
$0.022^{+0.009}_{-0.01}$	28	ROOS	70 RVUE	
$\Gamma(\pi^0\gamma)/\Gamma(\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0)$	$\Gamma_2/\Gamma_1$			
VALUE	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
<b><math>0.0999^{+0.0029}_{-0.0025}</math> OUR FIT</b>	Error includes scale factor of 1.1.			
<b><math>0.097 \pm 0.005</math> OUR AVERAGE</b>				
0.0994 $\pm 0.0036 \pm 0.0038$	29	AULCHENKO	00A SND	$e^+ e^- \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0 \pi^0, \pi^0 \pi^0 \gamma$
0.084 $\pm 0.013$		KEYNE	76 CNTR	$\pi^- p \rightarrow \omega n$
0.109 $\pm 0.025$		BENAOKSAS	72C OSPK	$e^+ e^- \rightarrow \pi^0 \gamma$
0.081 $\pm 0.020$		BALDIN	71 HLBC	$2.9 \pi^+ p$
0.13 $\pm 0.04$		JACQUET	69B HLBC	$2.05 \pi^+ p \rightarrow \pi^+ p \omega$
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
0.097 $\pm 0.002 \pm 0.005$	1.2M	30, 31 ACHASOV	03D RVUE	$0.44 - 2.00 \pi^+ e^- \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0$
0.099 $\pm 0.007$		30 DOLINSKY	89 ND	$e^+ e^- \rightarrow \pi^0 \gamma$











- 27 Significant interference effect observed. NB of  $\omega \rightarrow 3\pi$  comes from an extrapolation.
- 28 ROOS 70 combines ABRAMOVICH 70 and BIZZARRI 70.
- 29 From  $\sigma_0^{\omega\pi^0} \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0\gamma(m_\phi)/\sigma_0^{\omega\pi^0} \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0\pi^0(m_\phi)$  with a phase-space correction factor of 1/1.023.
- 30 Not independent of the corresponding  $\Gamma(e^+e^-) \times \Gamma(\pi^0\gamma)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}^2$ .
- 31 Using ACHASOV 03.
- 32 In the model assuming the  $\rho \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0\gamma$  decay via the  $\omega\pi$  and  $f_0(600)\gamma$  mechanisms.
- 33 In the model assuming the  $\rho \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0\gamma$  decay via the  $\omega\pi$  mechanism only.
- 34 Superseded by ACHASOV 02F.
- 35 Restated by us using  $B(\eta \rightarrow \text{charged modes}) = 29.2\%$ .
- 36 Model independent determination.
- 37 Solution corresponding to constructive  $\omega\text{-}\rho$  interference.
- 38 Not independent of the corresponding  $\Gamma(e^+e^-) \times \Gamma(\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}^2$ .
- 39 Using  $B(\omega \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0) = 0.891 \pm 0.007$ . Update of AKHMETSHIN 00C.
- 40 Using ACHASOV 03, ACHASOV 03D and  $B(\omega \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-) = (1.70 \pm 0.28)\%$ .
- 41 Rescaled by us to correspond to  $\omega$  width 8.4 MeV. Systematic errors underestimated.
- 42 Not resolved from  $\rho$  decay. Error statistical only.
- 43 Update of AKHMETSHIN 02.
- 44 From the  $m_{\pi^+\pi^-}$  spectrum taking into account the interference of the  $\rho\pi$  and  $\omega\pi$  amplitudes.
- 45 Using the data of AKHMETSHIN 02 in the hidden local symmetry model.
- 46 Using the data of BARKOV 85.
- 47 Using the data of BARKOV 85 in the hidden local symmetry model.
- 48 From a model-dependent analysis assuming complete coherence.
- 49 Re-evaluated under  $\Gamma(\pi^+\pi^-)/\Gamma(\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0)$  by BEHREND 71 using more accurate  $\omega \rightarrow \rho$  photoproduction cross-section ratio.
- 50 Using the data of ALOISIO 02D.
- 51 Error statistical only. Authors obtain good fit also assuming  $\pi^0\gamma$  as the only neutral decay.
- 52 No flat  $\eta\eta\gamma$  background assumed.
- 53 Solution corresponding to constructive  $\omega\text{-}\rho$  interference.
- 54 Not independent of the corresponding  $\Gamma(e^+e^-) \times \Gamma(\eta\gamma)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}^2$ .
- 55 Using  $B(\omega \rightarrow e^+e^-) = (7.14 \pm 0.13) \times 10^{-5}$  and  $B(\eta \rightarrow \gamma\gamma) = 39.43 \pm 0.26\%$ .
- 56 Using  $B(\omega \rightarrow e^+e^-) = (7.07 \pm 0.19) \times 10^{-5}$  and using  $B(\eta \rightarrow 3\pi^0) = (32.24 \pm 0.29) \times 10^{-2}$ . Solution corresponding to constructive  $\omega\text{-}\rho$  interference. The combined fit from 600 to 1380 MeV taking into account  $\rho(770)$ ,  $\omega(782)$ ,  $\phi(1020)$ , and  $\rho(1450)$  (mass and width fixed at 1450 MeV and 310 MeV respectively). Not independent of the corresponding  $\Gamma(e^+e^-) \times \Gamma(\eta\gamma)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}^2$ .
- 57 Using  $B(\omega \rightarrow e^+e^-) = (7.07 \pm 0.19) \times 10^{-5}$  and  $B(\eta \rightarrow 3\pi^0) = (32.2 \pm 0.4) \times 10^{-2}$ .
- 58 Depending on the degree of coherence with the flat  $\eta\eta\gamma$  background and using  $B(\omega \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma) = (8.5 \pm 0.5) \times 10^{-2}$ .
- 59 Reanalysis of DRUZHININ 84, DOLINSKY 89, DOLINSKY 91 taking into account the triangle anomaly contributions.
- 60 Superseded by DZHELYADIN 81B result above.
- 61 Using  $\Gamma(e^+e^-) = 0.60 \pm 0.02$  keV.
- 62 From direct  $3\gamma$  decay search.
- 63 Using  $B(\omega \rightarrow e^+e^-) = (7.14 \pm 0.13) \times 10^{-5}$ .
- 64 Reanalysis of DRUZHININ 84, DOLINSKY 89, DOLINSKY 91 taking into account the triangle anomaly contributions.



