$$\omega$$
(782)

$$I^{G}(J^{PC}) = 0^{-}(1^{--})$$

ω(782) MASS

VALUE (MeV)	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
782.65 ± 0.12 OUR A	VERAGE	Error includes scale	facto	r of 1.9.	See the ideogram below.
$783.20 \!\pm\! 0.13 \!\pm\! 0.16$	18680	AKHMETSHIN	05	CMD2	$\begin{array}{c} 0.601.38 \hspace{0.1 cm} e^{+} \hspace{0.1 cm} e^{-} \rightarrow \\ \pi^{0} \hspace{0.1 cm} \gamma \end{array}$
$782.68 \!\pm\! 0.09 \!\pm\! 0.04$	11200	¹ AKHMETSHIN	04	CMD2	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$
$782.79 \pm 0.08 \pm 0.09$	1.2M	² ACHASOV	03 D	RVUE	$\begin{array}{c} 0.44-2.00 \ e^{+} e^{-} \rightarrow \\ \pi^{+} \pi^{-} \pi^{0} \end{array}$
$782.7\ \pm 0.1\ \pm 1.5$	19500	WURZINGER	95	SPEC	1.33 $pd \rightarrow {}^{3}\text{He}\omega$
$781.96 \!\pm\! 0.17 \!\pm\! 0.80$	11k	³ AMSLER	94C	CBAR	$0.0 \overline{p} p \rightarrow \omega \eta \pi^0$
$782.08 \!\pm\! 0.36 \!\pm\! 0.82$	3463	⁴ AMSLER	94C	CBAR	$0.0 \overline{p} p \rightarrow \omega \eta \pi^0$
$781.96 \!\pm\! 0.13 \!\pm\! 0.17$	15k	AMSLER	93 B	CBAR	$0.0 \ \overline{p} p \rightarrow \ \omega \pi^0 \pi^0$
782.4 ± 0.2	270k	WEIDENAUER	93	ASTE	$\overline{p}p \rightarrow 2\pi^+ 2\pi^- \pi^0$
$782.2\ \pm0.4$	1488	KURDADZE	83 B	OLYA	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$
$782.4\ \pm0.5$	7000	⁵ KEYNE	76	CNTR	$\pi^- p \rightarrow \omega n$
$\bullet \bullet \bullet$ We do not use	the follow	ng data for averages	, fits,	limits, e	etc. • • •
$781.91 \!\pm\! 0.24$		⁶ LEES	12G	BABR	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$
$781.78 \!\pm\! 0.10$		⁷ BARKOV	87	CMD	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$
$783.3\ \pm0.4$	433	CORDIER	80	DM1	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$
$782.5 \hspace{0.1in} \pm 0.8 \hspace{0.1in}$	33260	ROOS	80	RVUE	0.0–3.6 <u>p</u> p
$782.6\ \pm0.8$	3000	BENKHEIRI	79	OMEG	9–12 π^{\pm} p
$781.8 \ \pm 0.6$	1430	COOPER	78 B	HBC	0.7–0.8 $\overline{p} p \rightarrow 5\pi$
$782.7 \hspace{0.1in} \pm 0.9$	535	VANAPEL	78	HBC	7.2 $\overline{p}p \rightarrow \overline{p}p\omega$
$783.5 \hspace{0.1 in} \pm 0.8 \hspace{0.1 in}$	2100	GESSAROLI	77	HBC	$11 \ \pi^- p \rightarrow \omega n$
782.5 ± 0.8	418	AGUILAR	72B	HBC	3.9,4.6 K ⁻ p
783.4 ± 1.0	248	BIZZARRI	71	HBC	$0.0 \ p\overline{p} \to \ K^+ K^- \omega$
$781.0 \hspace{0.1in} \pm 0.6$	510	BIZZARRI	71	HBC	0.0 $p \overline{p} \rightarrow K_1 K_1 \omega$
783.7 ±1.0	3583	⁸ COYNE	71	HBC	$3.7 \ \pi^+ p \rightarrow \\ p \pi^+ \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0$
784.1 ±1.2	750	ABRAMOVI	70	HBC	3.9 $\pi^{-}p$
783.2 ±1.6		⁹ BIGGS	70 B	CNTR	$<4.1 \ \gamma C \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- C$
$782.4\ \pm 0.5$	2400	BIZZARRI	69	HBC	0.0 <u>p</u> p

¹ Update of AKHMETSHIN 00C. ² 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.

³ From the $\eta \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$ decay. ⁴ From the $\eta \rightarrow 3\pi^0$ decay.

⁵Observed by threshold-crossing technique. Mass resolution = 4.8 MeV FWHM.

⁶ From the $\rho - \omega$ interference in the $\pi^+ \pi^-$ mass spectrum using the Breit-Wigner for the ω and leaving its mass and width as free parameters of the fit.

⁷Systematic uncertainties underestimated.

⁸ From best-resolution sample of COYNE 71.

⁹ From ω - ρ interference in the $\pi^+\pi^-$ mass spectrum assuming ω width 12.6 MeV.



 ω (782) mass (MeV)

ω (782) WIDTH

VALUE (MeV)	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
8.49±0.08 OUR AV	ERAGE				
$8.68\!\pm\!0.23\!\pm\!0.10$	11200	¹ AKHMETSHIN	04	CMD2	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$
$8.68\!\pm\!0.04\!\pm\!0.15$	1.2M	² ACHASOV	03 D	RVUE	$\begin{array}{c} 0.44-2.00 \ e^{+} e^{-} \rightarrow \\ \pi^{+} \pi^{-} \pi^{0} \end{array}$
8.2 ± 0.3	19500	WURZINGER	95	SPEC	1.33 pd \rightarrow ³ He ω
8.4 ± 0.1		³ 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	83 B	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	7 2B	OSPK	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$
\bullet \bullet \bullet We do not use	the followin	g data for averages	, fits,	limits, e	etc. ● ● ●
8.13 ± 0.45		⁴ LEES	12G	BABR	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$
12 ± 2	1430	COOPER	78 B	HBC	0.7–0.8 $\overline{p} p \rightarrow 5\pi$
9.4 ± 2.5	2100	GESSAROLI	77	HBC	$11 \ \pi^- p \rightarrow \omega n$
10.22 ± 0.43	20000	⁵ KEYNE	76	CNTR	$\pi^- p \rightarrow \omega n$
13.3 ± 2	418	AGUILAR	72 B	HBC	3.9,4.6 K ⁻ p
10.5 ± 1.5		BORENSTEIN	72	HBC	2.18 K ⁻ p
$7.70\!\pm\!0.9\ \pm1.15$	940	BROWN	72	MMS	$2.5 \pi^{-} p \rightarrow n MM$
10.3 ± 1.4	510	BIZZARRI	71	HBC	0.0 $p\overline{p} \rightarrow K_1 K_1 \omega$
$12.8 \hspace{0.1in} \pm 3.0 \hspace{0.1in}$	248	BIZZARRI	71	HBC	$0.0 \ p\overline{p} \rightarrow \ K^+ K^- \omega$
$9.5~\pm1.0$	3583	COYNE	71	HBC	3.7 $\pi^+ p \rightarrow$
					$p \pi^{+} \pi^{+} \pi^{-} \pi^{0}$

HTTP://PDG.LBL.GOV Page 2

¹ Update of AKHMETSHIN 00C.

² 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.

³Relativistic Breit-Wigner includes radiative corrections.

⁴ From the $\rho - \omega$ interference in the $\pi^+ \pi^-$ mass spectrum using the Breit-Wigner for the ω and leaving its mass and width as free parameters of the fit.

⁵Observed by threshold-crossing technique. Mass resolution = 4.8 MeV FWHM.

	Mode	Fraction (Γ_i/Γ)	Scale factor/ Confidence level
Γ ₁	$\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$	(89.2 \pm 0.7) %	
Γ2	$\pi^{0}\gamma$	(8.28±0.28) %	S=2.1
Γ ₃	$\pi^+\pi^-$	$(1.53^{+0.11}_{-0.13})\%$	S=1.2
Γ ₄	neutrals (excluding $\pi^0 \gamma$)	$(8 +8 \\ -5) imes 10$	-3 S=1.1
Γ ₅	$\eta \gamma$	(4.6 ± 0.4) $ imes 10$	-4 S=1.1
Г ₆	$\pi^0 e^+ e^-$	(7.7 ± 0.6) $ imes$ 10	-4
Γ ₇	$\pi^0 \mu^+ \mu^-$	(1.3 \pm 0.4) $ imes$ 10	-4 S=2.1
Г ₈	$\eta e^+ e^-$		
Г9	e ⁺ e ⁻	$(7.28 \pm 0.14) imes 10$	-5 S=1.3
Γ ₁₀	$\pi^{+}\pi^{-}\pi^{0}\pi^{0}$	< 2 × 10	⁻⁴ CL=90%
Γ_{11}	$\pi^+\pi^-\gamma$	< 3.6 × 10	-3 CL=95%
Γ ₁₂	$\pi^+\pi^-\pi^+\pi^-$	< 1 × 10	-3 CL=90%
Γ ₁₃	$\pi^0 \pi^0 \gamma$	(6.6 ± 1.1) $ imes$ 10	-5
Γ_{14}	$\eta \pi^{0} \gamma$	< 3.3 × 10	⁻⁵ CL=90%
Γ_{15}	$\mu^+\mu^-$	(9.0 ± 3.1) $ imes$ 10	-5
Γ ₁₆	3γ	< 1.9 × 10	-4 CL=95%
	Charge conjugation	n(C) violating modes	
Γ_{17}	$\eta \pi^0$	$C < 2.1 \times 10$	-4 CL=90%
Γ ₁₈	$2\pi^{0}$	$C < 2.1 \times 10$	⁻⁴ CL=90%
Γ_{19}	3π ⁰	C < 2.3 × 10	-4 CL=90%

ω (782) DECAY MODES

CONSTRAINED FIT INFORMATION

An overall fit to 15 branching ratios uses 51 measurements and one constraint to determine 10 parameters. The overall fit has a $\chi^2 = 51.8$ for 42 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.

<i>x</i> 2	22									
x ₃	-18	-4								
<i>x</i> 4	-92	-56	1							
×5	7	7	-1	_9						
×6	-1	0	0	0	0					
x ₇	-1	0	0	0	0	0				
x ₉	-38	-33	7	44	-21	0	0			
×13	1	4	0	-2	0	0	0	-1		
×15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	<i>x</i> ₁	<i>x</i> ₂	<i>x</i> 3	<i>x</i> 4	×5	×6	x ₇	xg	<i>x</i> ₁₃	

 ω (782) PARTIAL WIDTHS

$\Gamma(\pi^0 \gamma)$						Г2
VALUE (keV)	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECI	COMM	ENT	
• • • We do not us	se the followi	ng data for ave	rages, fits,	limits, etc	5. ● ● ●	
880 ± 50	7815 1	ACHASOV	13 SNC	0 1.05-2	2.00 $e^+e^- \rightarrow$	$\pi^0 \pi^0 \gamma$
$788 \pm 12 \pm 27$	36500 2	ACHASOV	03 SND	0.60-0	$0.97 \ e^+e^- \rightarrow$	$\pi^0\gamma$
764 ± 51	10625	DOLINSKY	89 ND	e^+e^-	$\rightarrow \pi^0 \gamma$	
1 Systematic unce 2 Using ${\sf \Gamma}_\omega=$ 8.4	ertainty not e $4\pm$ 0.09 Me	estimated. W and $B(\omega ightarrow$	$\pi^0\gamma$) from	n ACHAS(OV 03.	
$\Gamma(\eta\gamma)$						Γ ₅
VALUE (keV)		DOCUMENT	T ID	TECN C	COMMENT	
• • • We do not us	se the followi	ng data for ave	rages, fits,	limits, etc	5. ● ● ●	
6.1 ± 2.5		¹ DOLINSK	Y 89	ND e	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \eta\gamma$	
1 Using $ {\sf \Gamma}_\omega =$ 8.4	± 0.1 MeV	and B($\omega ightarrow \eta$	γ) from D	OLINSKY	89.	
Γ(e ⁺ e ⁻)						Гэ
VALUE (keV)	EVTS	DOCUMENT	T ID	TECN C	COMMENT	
0.60 ± 0.02 OUR	EVALUATIO	N	<i>c</i> .			
• • • We do not us	se the followi	ng data for ave	rages, fits,	limits, etc	5. ● ● ●	0
0.591 ± 0.015	11200	^{1,2} AKHMET	SHIN 04	CMD2 e	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+$	$\pi^{-}\pi^{0}$
$0.653 \pm 0.003 \pm 0.02$	21 1.2M	³ ACHASO\	✓ 03 D	RVUE C).44–2.00 e ⁺ e	$^{-} \rightarrow$
0.600 ± 0.031	10625	DOLINSK	Y 89	ND e	$e^+e^- \xrightarrow{\pi}{\rightarrow} \pi^0$	γ
HTTP://PDG.L	BL.GOV	Page	4	Created	d: 10/1/201	6 20:05

¹Using B($\omega \rightarrow \pi^{+}\pi^{-}\pi^{0}$) = 0.891 ± 0.007 and Γ_{total} = 8.44 ± 0.09 MeV.

² Update of AKHMETSHIN 00c.

³ Using ACHASOV 03, ACHASOV 03D and B($\omega \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$) = (1.70 ± 0.28)%.



¹ Supersedes ACHASOV 05A.

²A simultaneous fit to $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$, $\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$, $\pi^0\gamma$, $\eta\gamma$, $K\overline{K}$, and $\tau^- \rightarrow \pi^-\pi^0\nu_{\tau}$ data. Supersedes BENAYOUN 10. ³From $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-(\gamma)$ data of LEES 12G. $\Gamma(e^+e^-)/\Gamma_{\text{total}} \times \Gamma(\eta\gamma)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$ $\Gamma_9/\Gamma \times \Gamma_5/\Gamma$

DOCUMENT ID *VALUE* (units 10^{-8}) EVTS TECN COMMENT 3.32±0.28 OUR FIT Error includes scale factor of 1.1. 3.18 ± 0.28 OUR AVERAGE ¹ ACHASOV 078 SND 0.6-1.38 $e^+e^- \rightarrow \eta\gamma$ $3.10 \pm 0.31 \pm 0.11$ 33k $3.17^{+1.85}_{-1.31}{\pm}0.21$ CMD2 0.60-1.38 $e^+e^- \rightarrow n\gamma$ ² AKHMETSHIN 05 17.4k ^{3,4} AKHMETSHIN 01B CMD2 $e^+e^- \rightarrow \eta\gamma$ $3.41 \pm 0.52 \pm 0.21$ 23k • • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • • ⁵ BENAYOUN 10 RVUE 0.4–1.05 $e^+e^ 4.50 \pm 0.10$ ¹From a combined fit of $\sigma(e^+e^- \rightarrow \eta\gamma)$ with $\eta \rightarrow 3\pi^0$ and $\eta \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$, and fixing B($\eta \rightarrow 3\pi^0$) / B($\eta \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$) = 1.44 ± 0.04. Recalculated by us from the cross section at the peak. Supersedes ACHASOV 00D and ACHASOV 06A. ² From the $\eta \rightarrow 2\gamma$ decay and using $B(\eta \rightarrow \gamma\gamma) = 39.43 \pm 0.26\%$. ³ From the $\eta \rightarrow 3\pi^0$ decay and using $B(\eta \rightarrow 3\pi^0) = (32.24 \pm 0.29) \times 10^{-2}$. ⁴ 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). ⁵ A simultaneous fit of $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$, $\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$, $\pi^0\gamma$, $\eta\gamma$ data.

ω (782) BRANCHING RATIOS

 $\Gamma(\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0)/\Gamma_{\rm total}$ NIECKNIG 12 describes final-state interactions between the three pions in a dispersive

Γ1/Γ

framework using data on the $\pi\pi$ *P*-wave scattering phase shift. VALUE EVTS DOCUMENT ID TECN COMMENT • • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • • ¹ AMBROSINO 08G KLOE 1.0–1.03 $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-2\pi^0$, $2\pi^0\gamma$ 0.9024 ± 0.0019 ^{2,3} ACHASOV 03D RVUE 0.44–2.00 e^+e^- ^{3,4} AKHMETSHIN 00C CMD2 $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^ 0.8965 \pm 0.0016 \pm 0.0048$ 1.2M $0.880 \pm 0.020 \pm 0.032 11200$ ³ DOLINSKY $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ 0.8942 ± 0.0062 89 ND ¹Not independent of $\Gamma(\pi^0 \gamma) / \Gamma(\pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0)$ from AMBROSINO 08G. ² Using ACHASOV 03, ACHASOV 03D and B($\omega \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$) = (1.70 ± 0.28)%. ³ Not independent of the corresponding $\Gamma(e^+e^-) \times \Gamma(\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}^2$.

⁴ Using $\Gamma(e^+e^-)=0.60 \pm 0.02$ keV.

$\Gamma(\pi^0 \gamma) / \Gamma_{\text{total}}$

 Γ_2/Γ

VALUE (units 10^{-2}) EVTS DOCUMENT ID TECN COMMENT • • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • • ¹ AMBROSINO 08G KLOE $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-2\pi^0$, $2\pi^0\gamma$ 8.09 ± 0.14 ^{2,3} AKHMETSHIN 05 CMD2 0.60-1.38 $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^0 \gamma$ $9.06 \pm 0.20 \pm 0.57$ 18680 ³ ACHASOV 03 SND 0.60–0.97 $e^+e^- \to \pi^0 \gamma$ $9.34 \pm 0.15 \pm 0.31$ 36500 03D RVUE 0.44-2.00 $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ 96 RVUE $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma$ ^{4,5} ACHASOV $8.65 \pm 0.16 \pm 0.42$ 1.2M ⁶ BENAYOUN 8.39 ± 0.24 9975 ³ DOLINSKY $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^0 \gamma$ 89 ND 10625 $8.88 \!\pm\! 0.62$

¹Not independent of $\Gamma(\pi^0 \gamma) / \Gamma(\pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0)$ from AMBROSINO 08G.

2
 Using B($\omega
ightarrow e^+e^-)$ = (7.14 \pm 0.13) $imes$ 10 $^{-5}$

² Using B($\omega \rightarrow e^+e^-$) = (7.14 ± 0.15) × 10⁻¹. ³ Not independent of the corresponding $\Gamma(e^+e^-) \times \Gamma(\pi^0\gamma)/\Gamma^2_{total}$. ⁴ Using ACHASOV 03, ACHASOV 03D and B($\omega \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$) = (1.70 ± 0.28)%. ⁵ Not independent of the corresponding $\Gamma(e^+e^-) \times \Gamma(\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0)/\Gamma^2_{total}$.

⁶Reanalysis of DRUZHININ 84, DOLINSKY 89, DOLINSKY 91 taking into account the triangle anomaly contributions.

 $\Gamma(\pi^0\gamma)/\Gamma(\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0)$ Γ_2/Γ_1 *VALUE* (units 10^{-2}) COMMENT DOCUMENT ID TECN 9.28±0.31 OUR FIT Error includes scale factor of 2.3. 9.05±0.27 OUR AVERAGE Error includes scale factor of 1.8. AMBROSINO 08G KLOE $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-2\pi^0$, $2\pi^0\gamma$ 8.97 ± 0.16 ¹ AULCHENKO 00A SND $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-2\pi^0$, $2\pi^0\gamma$ $9.94 \!\pm\! 0.36 \!\pm\! 0.38$ CNTR $\pi^- p \rightarrow \omega n$ **KEYNE** 76 8.4 ±1.3 72C OSPK $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^0 \gamma$ $10.9 \ \pm 2.5$ BENAKSAS BALDIN 71 HLBC 2.9 $\pi^+ p$ 8.1 ± 2.0 69B HLBC 2.05 $\pi^+ p \rightarrow \pi^+ p \omega$ 13 ± 4 JACQUET • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • ^{2,3} ACHASOV 03D RVUE 0.44-2.00 $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ $9.7 \pm 0.2 \pm 0.5$ ² DOLINSKY $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^0 \gamma$ 9.9 ± 0.7 89 ND ¹From $\sigma_0^{\omega \pi^0} \xrightarrow{\to} \pi^0 \pi^0 \gamma(m_{\phi}) / \sigma_0^{\omega \pi^0} \xrightarrow{\to} \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0 \pi^0(m_{\phi})$ with a phase-space correction factor of 1/1.023. ² Not independent of the corresponding $\Gamma(e^+e^-) \times \Gamma(\pi^0 \gamma) / \Gamma_{total}^2$ ³Using ACHASOV 03. Based on 1.2M events. $\Gamma(\pi^+\pi^-)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$ Γ_3/Γ See also $\Gamma(\pi^+\pi^-)/\Gamma(\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0)$. VALUE (units 10^{-2}) EVTS DOCUMENT ID TECN COMMENT 1.53+0.11 OUR FIT Error includes scale factor of 1.2. 1.49 ± 0.13 OUR AVERAGE Error includes scale factor of 1.3. See the ideogram below. ¹ AKHMETSHIN 07 $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^ 1.46 \pm 0.12 \pm 0.02$ 900k ² AKHMETSHIN 04 CMD2 $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^ 1.30\!\pm\!0.24\!\pm\!0.05\ 11.2k$ $\begin{array}{c} 1.1 - 1.38 \ e^{+} e^{-} \\ \pi^{+} \pi^{-} \pi^{0} \\ e^{+} e^{-} \rightarrow \pi^{+} \pi \end{array}$ $2.38^{+1.77}_{-0.90} \pm 0.18$ 5.4k ³ ACHASOV 02E SND $2.3\ \pm 0.5$ OLYA BARKOV 85 $1.6 \begin{array}{c} +0.9 \\ -0.7 \end{array}$ $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ DM1 QUENZER 78 72 OSPK $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ BENAKSAS $3.6 \ \pm 1.9$ • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ ⁴ ACHASOV 05A SND 4.5M 1.75 ± 0.11 RVUE $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ ⁵ BENAYOUN 2.01 ± 0.29 03 RVUE $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ ⁶ GARDNER 99 $1.9\ \pm 0.3$ RVUE $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-, \mu^+\mu^-$ ⁷ BENAYOUN 98 $2.3 \hspace{0.1in} \pm 0.4$ $1.0\ \pm 0.11$ ⁸ WICKLUND 78 ASPK 3,4,6 $\pi^{\pm} N$ 1.22 ± 0.30 ALVENSLEB... 71C CNTR Photoproduction $1.3 \begin{array}{c} +1.2 \\ -0.9 \end{array}$ MOFFEIT 71 HBC 2.8,4.7 γp $0.80 \substack{+0.28 \\ -0.20}$ ⁹ BIGGS 70B CNTR $4.2\gamma C \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-C$

- ¹A combined fit of AKHMETSHIN 07, AULCHENKO 06, and AULCHENKO 05.
- ² Update of AKHMETSHIN 02.
- ³ From the $m_{\pi^+\pi^-}$ spectrum taking into account the interference of the $\rho\pi$ and $\omega\pi$ amplitudes.

⁴Using $\Gamma(\omega \rightarrow e^+e^-)$ from the 2004 Edition of this Review (PDG 04).

- ⁵ Using the data of AKHMETSHIN 02 in the hidden local symmetry model.
- ⁶ Using the data of BARKOV 85.
- ⁷ Using the data of BARKOV 85 in the hidden local symmetry model.
- ⁸ From a model-dependent analysis assuming complete coherence.

⁹ Re-evaluated under $\Gamma(\pi^+\pi^-)/\Gamma(\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0)$ by BEHREND 71 using more accurate $\omega \rightarrow \rho$ photoproduction cross-section ratio.



¹ The fitted width of these data is 160 MeV in agreement with present average, thus the ω contribution is overestimated. Assuming ρ width 145 MeV.

²Significant interference effect observed. NB of $\omega \rightarrow 3\pi$ comes from an extrapolation.

³ROOS 70 combines ABRAMOVICH 70 and BIZZARRI 70.

Citation: C. Patrignani et al. (Particle Data Group), Chin. Phys. C, 40, 100001 (2016)

$\Gamma(\pi^+\pi^-)/\Gamma(\pi^+\pi^-)$	⁰ γ)					Γ_3/Γ_2
VALUE	<u>EVTS</u>	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	<u>COMMENT</u>	
0.20±0.04	1.98M	¹ ALOISIO	03	KLOE	$1.02 e^+ e^- \pi^+ \pi^-$	π^{0}
1 Using the data	a of ALOISIO ()2 D.				~
$\Gamma(\text{neutrals})/\Gamma_{\text{to}}$	otal					$(\Gamma_2 + \Gamma_4)/\Gamma$
VALUE	<u>EVTS</u>	DOCUMENT	ID	TECN	COMMEN	T
0.091 ± 0.006 OU						
	R AVERAGE		71		0.0 =	
0.075 ± 0.025			60r		0.0 pp	
0.079 ± 0.019			69c		P 21 - 7	
$\bullet \bullet \bullet We do not$	use the followi	ng data for avera	unes fits	, CNI imite		,
	use the followi					,
0.073 ± 0.018	42	BASILE	72E	3 CNI	R 1.67 π	p
$\Gamma(\text{neutrals})/\Gamma(2)$	$\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0)$					$(\Gamma_2 + \Gamma_4)/\Gamma_1$
VALUE	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT	
0.102±0.008 OUI	R FIT					
$0.103^{+0.011}_{-0.010}$ OU	R AVERAGE					
0.15 ± 0.04	46	AGUILAR	72B	HBC	3.9,4.6 K ⁻	p
0.10 ± 0.03	19	BARASH	67B	HBC	0.0 <u>p</u> p	
0.134 ± 0.026	850	DIGIUGNO	66B (CNTR	1.4 $\pi^{-}p$	
0.097 ± 0.016	348	FLATTE	66 I	HBC	1.4 - 1.7 k	$X^- p \rightarrow \Lambda MM$
$0.06 \begin{array}{c} +0.05 \\ -0.02 \end{array}$		JAMES	66 I	HBC	2.1 $\pi^+ p$	
0.08 ± 0.03	35	KRAEMER	64 I	DBC	1.2 $\pi^+ d$	
• • • We do not	use the followi	ng data for avera	iges, fits	s, limits	, etc. • • •	•
0.11 ± 0.02	20	BUSCHBECK	63 I	HBC	1.5 K ⁻ p	
$\Gamma(\pi^0\gamma)/\Gamma(neut)$	trals)					$\Gamma_2/(\Gamma_2+\Gamma_4)$
VALUE	<u>_CL%</u>	DOCUMENT	ID	TECN	COMMEN	T
• • • We do not	use the followi	ng data for avera	iges, fits	s, limits	, etc. • • •	•
0.78 ± 0.07		¹ DAKIN	72	OSP	$\times 1.4 \pi^{-}$	$p \rightarrow n MM$
>0.81	90	DEINET	69 E	B OSPI	ĸ	
¹ Error statistic decay.	al only. Autho	ors obtain good f	it also	assumir	ng $\pi^0\gamma$ as	the only neutral
$\Gamma(\text{neutrals})/\Gamma(0)$	charged parti	cles)			(Γ ₂ +	$(\Gamma_4)/(\Gamma_1+\Gamma_3)$
VALUE		DOCUMENT	ID	TECN	COMMEN	T
0.100±0.008 OUI	R FIT					
0.124±0.021		FELDMAN	670	: OSPI	K 1.2 π^{-})

$\Gamma(\eta\gamma)/\Gamma_{ ext{total}}$					Г ₅ /Г	
VALUE (units 10^{-4})	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT	
4.6 \pm 0.4 OUR FIT	' Error in	ncludes scale factor o	of 1.1	-		
6.3 ±1.3 OUR AVE	ERAGE	Error includes scale f	actor	of 1.2.		
6.6 ± 1.7		¹ ABELE	97e	CBAR	$0.0 \ \overline{p} p ightarrow 5\gamma$	
$8.3\ \pm 2.1$		ALDE	93	GAM2	$38\pi^- p \rightarrow \omega n$	
$3.0 \ +2.5 \ -1.8$		² ANDREWS	77	CNTR	6.7–10 γ Cu	
• • • We do not use	the follo	wing data for average	es, fit	s, limits,	, etc. ● ● ●	
$4.3 \ \pm 0.5 \ \pm 0.1$	33k	³ ACHASOV	07 B	SND	0.6–1.38 $e^+e^- \rightarrow \eta \gamma$	
$4.44^{+2.59}_{-1.83}{\pm}0.28$	17.4k	^{4,5} AKHMETSHIN	05	CMD2	0.60-1.38 $e^+e^- \rightarrow \eta \gamma$	
$5.10\!\pm\!0.72\!\pm\!0.34$	23k	⁶ AKHMETSHIN	01 B	CMD2	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \eta \gamma$	
0.7 to 5.5		⁷ CASE	00	CBAR	$0.0 \ p \overline{p} \rightarrow \eta \eta \gamma$	
$6.56^{+2.41}_{-2.55}$	3525	^{2,8} BENAYOUN	96	RVUE	$e^+e^- ightarrow \eta \gamma$	
7.3 ±2.9		^{2,4} DOLINSKY	89	ND	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \eta \gamma$	
¹ No flat $\eta \eta \gamma$ background assumed. ² Solution corresponding to constructive $\omega - \rho$ interference. ³ ACHASOV 07B reports $[\Gamma(\omega(782) \rightarrow \eta \gamma)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}] \times [B(\omega(782) \rightarrow e^+e^-)] = (3.10 \pm 0.31 \pm 0.11) \times 10^{-8}$ which we divide by our best value $B(\omega(782) \rightarrow e^+e^-) = (7.28 \pm 0.14) \times 10^{-5}$. Our first error is their experiment's error and our second error is the systematic error from using our best value. Supersedes ACHASOV 00D and						
⁴ Not independent	of the co	rresponding $\Gamma(e^+e^-)$.) × Г	$(\eta \gamma) / \Gamma_{\pm}^2$	2 total:	
⁵ Using $B(\omega \rightarrow e^+e^-) = (7.14 \pm 0.13) \times 10^{-5}$ and $B(\eta \rightarrow \gamma\gamma) = 39.43 \pm 0.26\%$. ⁶ 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 ω - ρ 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 $\Gamma(e^+e^-) \times \Gamma(\eta\gamma)/\Gamma_{a-1}^2$.						
7		iolai			/	

⁷ Depending on the degree of coherence with the flat $\eta\eta\gamma$ background and using B($\omega \rightarrow \pi^{0}\gamma$)=(8.5 ± 0.5) × 10⁻². ⁸ Reanalysis of DRUZHININ 84, DOLINSKY 89, DOLINSKY 91 taking into account the triangle anomaly contributions.

$\Gamma(\eta\gamma)/\Gamma(\pi^0\gamma)$				Г	₅ /Γ ₂
VALUE	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT	
$\bullet~\bullet~\bullet$ We do not use the following	data for averages	, fits,	limits, e	etc. • • •	
0.0098 ± 0.0024	¹ ALDE	93	GAM2	$38\pi^- p \rightarrow \omega n$	
0.0082 ± 0.0033	² DOLINSKY	89	ND	$e^+e^- ightarrow \eta \gamma$	
0.010 ± 0.045	APEL	72 B	OSPK	4–8 $\pi^- p \rightarrow n 3\gamma$	
1 Model independent determinat 2 Solution corresponding to cons	ion. tructive $\omega\text{-} ho$ interl	ferenc	e.		

$\Gamma(\pi^0 e^+ e^-)/\Gamma_{\rm tot}$	al				Г ₆ /Г
VALUE (units 10^{-4}) E	VTS	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
7.7 \pm 0.6 OUR FIT	•				
7.7 \pm 0.6 OUR AV	ERAGE				
$7.61\!\pm\!0.53\!\pm\!0.64$		ACHASOV	80	SND	0.36–0.97 $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^0 e^+e^-$
$8.19\!\pm\!0.71\!\pm\!0.62$		AKHMETSHIN	05A	CMD2	0.72-0.84 e^+e^-
$5.9 \hspace{0.1in} \pm 1.9$	43	DOLINSKY	88	ND	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^0 e^+ e^-$

HTTP://PDG.LBL.GOV Page 10 Created: 10/1/2016 20:05

Citation: C. Patrignani et al. (Particle Data Group), Chin. Phys. C, 40, 100001 (2016)

 $\Gamma(\pi^0 \mu^+ \mu^-) / \Gamma_{\text{total}}$ Γ_7/Γ *VALUE* (units 10^{-4}) EVTS DOCUMENT ID TECN COMMENT **1.3** \pm **0.4 OUR FIT** Error includes scale factor of 2.1. **1.3** \pm **0.4 OUR AVERAGE** Error includes scale factor of 2.1. $1.72\!\pm\!0.25\!\pm\!0.14$ 09 NA60 3k ARNALDI 158A In–In collisions 0.96 ± 0.23 DZHELYADIN 81B CNTR 25-33 $\pi^- p \rightarrow \omega n$ $\Gamma(\eta e^+ e^-)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$ Γ_8/Γ VALUE (units 10^{-5}) DOCUMENT ID TECN COMMENT • • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • • AKHMETSHIN 05A CMD2 0.72-0.84 e⁺e⁻ < 1.1 $\Gamma(e^+e^-)/\Gamma_{total}$ Γ9/Γ *VALUE* (units 10^{-4}) DOCUMENT ID EVTS TECN COMMENT 0.728±0.014 OUR FIT Error includes scale factor of 1.3. • • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • • ^{1,2} AKHMETSHIN 04 CMD2 $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ 11200 0.700 ± 0.016 03D RVUE 0.44-2.00 $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ 89 ND $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ ^{2,3} ACHASOV 1.2M $0.752 \pm 0.004 \pm 0.024$ ² DOLINSKY 0.714 ± 0.036 $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ ² BARKOV 87 CMD 0.72 ± 0.03 83B OLYA $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ ² KURDADZE 0.64 ± 0.04 1488 $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ ² CORDIER 80 DM1 0.675 ± 0.069 433 72B OSPK $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ ² BENAKSAS $0.83 \ \pm 0.10$ 451 ⁴ AUGUSTIN 69D OSPK $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ 0.77 ± 0.06 ⁵ ASTVACAT... 33 68 OSPK Assume SU(3)+mixing 0.65 ± 0.13 ¹Using B($\omega \to \pi^{+}\pi^{-}\pi^{0}$) = 0.891 ± 0.007. Update of AKHMETSHIN 00C. ²Not independent of the corresponding $\Gamma(e^+e^-) \times \Gamma(\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0)/\Gamma_{total}^2$. ³ Using ACHASOV 03, ACHASOV 03D and B($\omega \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$) = (1.70 ± 0.28)%. ⁴Rescaled by us to correspond to ω width 8.4 MeV. Systematic errors underestimated. ⁵ Not resolved from ρ decay. Error statistical only. $\Gamma(\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0\pi^0)/\Gamma_{\rm total}$ Γ_{10}/Γ *VALUE* (units 10^{-4}) CL% DOCUMENT ID TECN COMMENT $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0\pi^0$ 09A SND < 2 90 ACHASOV • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • OLYA $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0\pi^0$ <200 90 **KURDADZE** 86 $\Gamma(\pi^+\pi^-\gamma)/\Gamma_{\rm total}$ Γ_{11}/Γ DOCUMENT ID VALUE CL% TECN COMMENT WEIDENAUER 90 ASTE $p \overline{p} \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^+ \pi^- \gamma$ < 0.0036 95 • • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • • 88B SPEC 32 $\pi^- p \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \gamma X$ < 0.004 BITYUKOV 95

Citation: C. Patrignani et al. (Particle Data Group), Chin. Phys. C, 40, 100001 (2016)



$\Gamma(\pi^0\pi^0\gamma)/\Gamma(\mathrm{neu})$	ıtrals)				$\Gamma_{13}/(\Gamma_2+\Gamma_4)$
VALUE	<u>CL%</u>	DOCUMENT ID	TEC	<u>COMMEN</u>	IT
• • • We do not us	e the followi	ng data for average	es, fits, limi	ts, etc. • • •	•
0.22 ± 0.07		¹ DAKIN	72 OS	PK 1.4 π^-	n MM
<0.19	90	DEINET	69B OS	PK	
¹ See $\Gamma(\pi^{0}\gamma)/\Gamma(r$	eutrals).				
$\Gamma(\eta\pi^0\gamma)/\Gamma_{ ext{total}}$					Г ₁₄ /Г
VALUE (units 10^{-5})	CL%	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT	
<3.3	90	AKHMETSHIN	04b CMD	2 0.6–0.97 $\epsilon_{\eta \pi^{0} \gamma}$	$+e^{-} \rightarrow$
$\Gamma(\mu^+\mu^-)/\Gamma_{total}$					Г ₁₅ /Г
$\frac{VALUE \text{ (units } 10^{-5})}{2004}$	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TEC	CN COMMEN	IT
9.0±3.1 OOR FIT 9.0±2.9±1.1	18	HEISTER	02c AL	EP $Z ightarrow \mu$	$^+\mu^- + X$
$\Gamma(\mu^+\mu^-)/\Gamma(\pi^+)$	$\pi^{-}\pi^{0})$				Γ_{15}/Γ_1
VALUE (units 10^{-3})	CL%	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT	
<0.2	90	WILSON 69	OSPK	12 $\pi^- C \rightarrow$	Fe
• • • We do not us	e the followi	ng data for average	es, fits, limi	ts, etc. • • •	•
<1.7	74	FLATTE 60	5 HBC	$1.2 - 1.7 K^{-1}$ $\Lambda \mu^{+} \mu^{-1}$	$^{-}p \rightarrow$
<1.2		BARBARO 65	5 HBC	2.7 K ⁻ p	
$\Gamma(\pi^0\mu^+\mu^-)/\Gamma(\mu$	ι ⁺ μ ⁻)				Γ ₇ /Γ ₁₅
VALUE	<u> </u>	DOCUMENT ID	<u>TEC</u>	<u>CN COMMEN</u>	IT
• • • We do not us	e the followi	ng data for average	es, fits, limi	ts, etc. ● ● ●	
1.2 ± 0.6	30	¹ DZHELYADIN	N 79 CN	TR 25–33 π	— р
¹ Superseded by D	ZHELYADII	N 81B result above			
$\Gamma(3\gamma)/\Gamma_{total}$					Г ₁₆ /Г
VALUE (units 10^{-4})	<u>CL%</u>	DOCUMENT ID	TEC	<u>CN</u> <u>COMMEN</u>	IT
<1.9	95	¹ ABELE	97E CB	AR 0.0 <u>p</u> p-	\rightarrow 5 γ
• • • We do not us	e the followi	ng data for average	es, fits, limi	ts, etc. ● ● ●	
<2	90	¹ PROKOSHKI	N 95 GA	M2 38 π ⁻ p	$\rightarrow 3\gamma n$
¹ From direct 3γ d	lecay search				
$\Gamma(\eta \pi^0) / \Gamma_{\text{total}}$	servation				Г ₁₇ /Г
VALUE	<u>CL%</u>	DOCUMENT ID	TEC	<u>COMMEN</u>	IT
• • • We do not us	e the followi	ng data for average	es, fits, limi	ts, etc. • • •	•
<0.001	90	ALDE	94b GA	M2 $38\pi^{-}p$	$\rightarrow \eta \pi^0 n$

 $\mathsf{HTTP:}//\mathsf{PDG.LBL.GOV}$

 $\left[\Gamma(\eta\gamma) + \Gamma(\eta\pi^{0})\right]/\Gamma(\pi^{+}\pi^{-}\pi^{0})$ $(\Gamma_5 + \Gamma_{17})/\Gamma_1$ VALUE <u>TECN</u> COMMENT ¹ FLATTE 90 < 0.016 66 HBC $1.2 - 1.7 \ K^- p \rightarrow$ • • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • JACQUET 95 69B HLBC 2.05 $\pi^+ p \rightarrow \pi^+ p \omega$ < 0.045 ¹Restated by us using B($\eta \rightarrow$ charged modes) = 29.2%. $\Gamma(\eta \pi^0) / \Gamma(\pi^0 \gamma)$ Γ_{17}/Γ_2 iolatès C conservation. <u>VALUE (units</u> 10^{-3}) DOCUMENT ID TECN COMMENT CL% ¹ STAROSTIN 09 CRYM $\gamma p \rightarrow \eta \pi^0 p$ 90 <2.6 ¹STAROSTIN 09 reports $[\Gamma(\omega(782) \rightarrow \eta \pi^0)/\Gamma(\omega(782) \rightarrow \pi^0 \gamma)] \times [B(\eta \rightarrow 2\gamma)]$ $< 1.01 \times 10^{-3}$ which we divide by our best value B($\eta \rightarrow 2\gamma$) = 39.41 $\times 10^{-2}$. $\Gamma(2\pi^0)/\Gamma(\pi^0\gamma)$ Γ_{18}/Γ_2 Violates C conservation and Bose-Einstein statistics. VALUE (units 10^{-3}) DOCUMENT ID TECN COMMENT CL% STAROSTIN 09 CRYM $\gamma p \rightarrow 2\pi^0 p$ <2.59 90 $\Gamma(3\pi^0)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$ Γ₁₉/Γ Violates C conservation. VALUE DOCUMENT ID TECN COMMENT CL% • • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • • PROKOSHKIN 95 GAM2 38 $\pi^- p \rightarrow 3\pi^0 n$ $< 3 \times 10^{-4}$ 90 $\Gamma(3\pi^0)/\Gamma(\pi^0\gamma)$ Γ_{19}/Γ_{2} iolates C conservation. <u>VALUE</u> (units 10^{-3}) CL% DOCUMENT ID TECN COMMENT CRYM $\gamma p \rightarrow 3\pi^0 p$ <2.72 90 STAROSTIN 09 $\frac{\Gamma(3\pi^0)}{\Gamma(\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0)}$ Violates *C* conservation. Γ_{19}/Γ_1 VALUE <u>CL%</u> DOCUMENT ID COMMENT \bullet \bullet \bullet We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. \bullet 01 450 $pp \rightarrow p_f 3\pi^0 p_c$ BARBERIS < 0.009 90

PARAMETER Λ IN $\omega \rightarrow \pi^0 \mu^+ \mu^-$ DECAY

In the pole approximation the electromagnetic transition form factor for a resonance of mass M is given by the expression:

 $|F|^2 = (1 - M^2/\Lambda^2)^{-2}$, where for the parameter Λ vector dominance predicts $\Lambda = M_p \approx 0.770$ GeV. The

ARNALDI 09 measurement is in obvious conflict with this expectation. Note that for $\eta \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^- \gamma$ decay ARNALDI 09 and DZHELYADIN 80 obtain the value of Λ consistent with vector dominance.

VALUE (GeV)	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
$0.668 \pm 0.009 \pm 0.003$	3k	ARNALDI	09	NA60	158A In–In collisions
$\bullet \bullet \bullet$ We do not use the	e following o	data for averages	, fits,	limits, e	tc. ● ● ●
0.65 ± 0.03		DZHELYADIN	81 B	CNTR	$2533 \ \pi^{-} p \rightarrow \omega n$

ω (782) REFERENCES

ACHASOV	13	PR D88 054013	M.N. Achasov et al.	(SND Collab.)
BENAYOUN	13	EPJ C73 2453	M. Benayoun, P. David,	L. DelBuono (PARIN, BERLIN+)
DAVIER	13	EPJ C73 2597	M. Davier <i>et al.</i>	
LEES	12G	PR D86 032013	J.P. Lees <i>et al.</i>	(BABAR Collab.)
NIECKNIG	12	EPJ C72 2014	F. Niecknig, B. Kubis, S	S.P. Schneider (BONN)
BENAYOUN	10	EPJ C65 211	M. Benayoun <i>et al.</i>	
ACHASOV	09A	JETP 109 379	M.N. Achasov <i>et al.</i>	(SND Collab.)
	00	DI R677 260	ZETF 130 442. P Arnaldi at al	(NA60 Collab)
	09	DR C70 065201	A Starostin et al	(Crystal Ball Collab at MAMI)
	09	IETP 107 61	M.N. Achasov et al	(Crystal Dall Collab. at MANI) (SND Collab.)
/(01//00/	00	Translated from	ZETF 134 80.	(SIVE CONAD.)
AMBROSINO	08G	PL B669 223	F. Ambrosino <i>et al.</i>	(KLOE Collab.)
ACHASOV	07B	PR D76 077101	M.N. Achasov <i>et al.</i>	(SND Collab.)
AKHMETSHIN	07	PL B648 28	R. Akhmetshin et al.	(Novosibirsk CMD-2 Collab.)
ACHASOV	06	JETP 103 380	M.N. Achasov et al.	(Novosibirsk SND Collab.)
		Translated from	ZETF 130 437.	,
ACHASOV	06A	PR D74 014016	M.N. Achasov et al.	(SND Collab.)
AULCHENKO	06	JETPL 84 413	V.M. Aulchenko et al.	(Novosibirsk CMD-2 Collab.)
		Translated from	ZETFP 84 491.	
ACHASOV	05A	JETP 101 1053	M.N. Achasov <i>et al.</i>	(Novosibirsk SND Collab.)
	05	DI DECE 26	ZEIF 120 1201. P.P. Alamatshin at al	(Novosibirsk CMD 2 Collab.)
	05	DL D612 20	P.P. Akhmetshin et al.	(Novosibirsk CMD-2 Collab.)
	05A	FL DUIS 29	N.R. Akimetsiin et al.	(Novosibirsk CIVID-2 Collab.)
AULCHENKU	05	Translated from	7ETEP 82 841	(NOVOSIDITSK CIVID-2 CONAD.)
AKHMETSHIN	04	PI B578 285	R R Akhmetshin <i>et al</i>	(Novosibirsk CMD-2 Collab.)
AKHMETSHIN	04R	PL R580 110	R R Akhmetshin et al	(Novosibirsk CMD-2 Collab.)
ALIBERT B	04D	PR D70 072004	B Aubert et al	(RABAR Collab.)
	041	DI DE02 1	S Eidelman et al	(DADAR Collab.)
	04	DI D550 171	M N Acharov at al	(Novosibirsk SND Collab.)
ACHASOV	02	PD D60 050006	M.N. Achasov et al.	(Novosibirsk SND Collab.)
ACHASOV	030	DI DE61 EE	M.N. Achasov et al.	(NOVOSIDITSK SIND COILD.)
	03	FL D301 33	A. AIOISIO <i>et al.</i>	(KLUE Collab.)
	03	EPJ C29 397	M. Denayoun <i>et al.</i>	(Neuralbinste CND, Callate)
ACHASOV	02E	PK D00 032001	M.N. Achasov <i>et al.</i>	(Novosibirsk SND Collab.)
ACHASOV	02F	PL B537 201	IVI.IN. Achasov et al.	(Novosidirsk SND Collab.)
AKHMEISHIN	02	PL B527 101	R.R. Aknmetshin <i>et al.</i>	(Novosibirsk CIVID-2 Collab.)
ALOISIO	02D	PL B537 21	A. Aloisio <i>et al.</i>	(KLOE Collab.)
HEISTER	02C	PL B528 19	A. Heister <i>et al.</i>	(ALEPH Collab.)
ACHASOV	01E	PR D63 072002	M.N. Achasov <i>et al.</i>	(Novosibirsk SND Collab.)
AKHMEISHIN	01B	PL B509 217	R.R. Akhmetshin <i>et al.</i>	(Novosibirsk CMD-2 Collab.)
BARBERIS	01	PL B507 14	D. Barberis <i>et al.</i>	
ACHASOV	00	EPJ C12 25	M.N. Achasov <i>et al.</i>	(Novosibirsk SND Collab.)
ACHASOV	00D	JETPL 72 282	M.N. Achasov <i>et al.</i>	(Novosibirsk SND Collab.)
	000	Iranslated from	ZEIFP /2 411.	(Neuralbinde SND Callab)
ACHASOV	00G	JEIPL /1 355 Translated from	VI.IN. ACHASOV <i>et al.</i> 7ETEP 71 510	(NOVOSIDIPSK SIND COLLAD.)
Δκημετοριν	000	PI R476 33	R R Akhmetshin et al	(Novosibirsk CMD-2 Collab.)
	000	IETP 00 027	V M Aulchenko et al	(Novosibirsk SND Collab.)
AUCCILINIO	004	Translated from	ZETF 117 1067.	
CASE	00	PR D61 032002	T. Case et al.	(Crystal Barrel Collab.)
ACHASOV	99E	PL B462 365	M.N. Achasov <i>et al.</i>	(Novosibirsk SND Collab.)
GARDNER	99	PR D59 076002	S. Gardner, H.B. O'Con	nell
BENAYOUN	98	EPJ C2 269	M. Benavoun <i>et al.</i>	(IPNP. NOVO. ADLD+)
ABELE	97E	PL B411 361	A. Abele <i>et al.</i>	(Crystal Barrel Collab.)
BENAYOUN	96	7PHY (72 221	M Benavoun <i>et al</i>	(IPNP_NOVO)
PROKOSHKIN	95	SPD 40 273	Y D Prokoshkin V D	Samoilenko (SERP)
	55	Translated from	DANS 342 610.	
WURZINGER	95	PR C51 443	R. Wurzinger et al.	(BONN, ORSAY, SACL+)
ALDE	94B	PL B340 122	D.M. Alde et al.	(SERP, BELG, LANL, LAPP+)
AMSLER	94C	PL B327 425	C. Amsler et al.	(Crystal Barrel Collab.)
ALDE	93	PAN 56 1229	D.M. Alde <i>et al.</i>	(SERP. LAPP. LANL. BELG+)
		Translated from	YAF 56 137.	
Also		ZPHY C61 35	D.M. Alde et al.	(SERP, LAPP, LANL, BELG+)
AMSLER	93B	PL B311 362	C. Amsler et al.	(Crystal Barrel Collab.)
WEIDENAUER	93	ZPHY C59 387	P. Weidenauer et al.	(ASTERIX Collab.)
ANTONELLI	92	ZPHY C56 15	A. Antonelli <i>et al.</i>	(DM2 Collab.)
DOLINSKY	91	PRPL 202 99	S.I. Dolinsky <i>et al.</i>	(NOVO)
WEIDENAUER	90	ZPHY C47 353	P. Weidenauer et al.	(ASTERIX Collab.)
DOLINSKY	89	ZPHY C42 511	S.I. Dolinsky <i>et al.</i>	(NOVO)
BITYUKOV	88B	SJNP 47 800	S.I. Bityukov et al.	(SERP)
		Translated from	YAE 47 1258	. ,

HTTP://PDG.LBL.GOV

Page 15

Created: 10/1/2016 20:05

DOLINSKY	88	SJNP 48 277	S.I. Dolinsky <i>et al.</i>	(NOVO)
KURDADZE	88	JETPL 47 512 Translated from 7FTFP 4	+42. L.M. Kurdadze <i>et al.</i> 7 432	(NOVO)
AULCHENKO BARKOV	87 87	PL B186 432 JETPL 46 164 Translated from ZETER 4	V.M. Aulchenko <i>et al.</i> L.M. Barkov <i>et al.</i>	(NOVO) (NOVO)
KURDADZE	86	JETPL 43 643 Translated from ZETEP 4	L.M. Kurdadze <i>et al.</i> 3 497	(NOVO)
BARKOV DRUZHININ KURDADZE	85 84 83B	NP B256 365 PL 144B 136 JETPL 36 274	L.M. Barkov <i>et al.</i> V.P. Druzhinin <i>et al.</i> A.M. Kurdadze <i>et al.</i>	(NOVO) (NOVO) (NOVO)
DZHELYADIN CORDIER DZHELYADIN ROOS BENKHEIRI DZHELYADIN COOPER QUENZER VANAPEL WICKLUND ANDREWS GESSAROLI KEYNE AIso KALBFLEISCH AGUILAR APEL BASILE BENAKSAS BENAKSAS BENAKSAS BENAKSAS BENAKSAS BORENSTEIN BROWN DAKIN RATCLIFF ALVENSLEB	81B 80 80 79 78 78 78 78 77 77 76 75 72B 72B 72B 72B 72B 72C 72 72 72 72 72 72 72 72	PL 102B 296 NP B172 13 PL 94B 548 LNC 27 321 NP B150 268 PL 84B 143 NP B146 1 PL 76B 512 NP B133 245 PR D17 1197 PRL 38 198 NP B126 382 PR D14 28 PR D14 28 PR D14 28 PR D14 28 PR D1 987 PR D6 29 PL 41B 234 Phil. Conf. 153 PL 39B 289 PL 42B 511 PR D5 1559 PL 42B 511 PR D6 2321 PR D6 2321 PL 38B 345 PR L 27 888	 R.I. Dzhelyadin et al. A. Cordier et al. R.I. Dzhelyadin et al. M. Roos, A. Pellinen P. Benkheiri et al. R.I. Dzhelyadin et al. A. Dynelyadin et al. A.M. Cooper et al. A. Quenzer et al. G.W. van Apeldoorn et al. A.B. Wicklund et al. D.E. Andrews et al. G.S. Kalbfleisch, R.C. Strand, M. Basile et al. D. Benaksas et al. D. Benaksas et al. D. Benaksas et al. S.R. Borenstein et al. S.R. Borenstein et al. S.R. Borenstein et al. M. Brown et al. M. Brown et al. M. Ratcliff et al. H. Alvensleben et al. 	(SERP) (LALO) (SERP) (HELS) (EPOL, CERN, CDEF+) (SERP) (TATA, CERN, CDEF+) (LALO) (ZEEM) (ANL) (ROCH) (BGNA, FIRZ, GENO+) (LOIC, SHMP) (LOIC, SHMP) (LOIC, SHMP) (LOIC, SHMP) (LOIC, SHMP) (LOIC, SHMP) (LOIC, SHMP) (LOIC, SHMP) (LOIC, SHMP) (LOIC, SHMP) (CERN) (ORSAY) (ORSAY) (ORSAY) (ORSAY) (ORSAY) (BNL, MICH) (ILL, ILLC) (PRIN) (SLAC) (DESY)
BALDIN	71	SJNP 13 758 Translated from YAF 13 1	A.B. Baldin <i>et al.</i> 1318.	(ITEP)
BEHREND BIZZARRI COYNE MOFFEIT ABRAMOVI BIGGS BIZZARRI ROOS	71 71 71 70 70B 70 70 70	PRL 27 61 NP B27 140 NP B32 333 NP B29 349 NP B20 209 PRL 24 1201 PRL 25 1385 DNPL/R7 173 Study. Weekend No. 1	H.J. Behrend <i>et al.</i> R. Bizzarri <i>et al.</i> D.G. Coyne <i>et al.</i> K.C. Moffeit <i>et al.</i> M. Abramovich <i>et al.</i> P.J. Biggs <i>et al.</i> R. Bizzarri <i>et al.</i> M. Roos	(ROCH, CORN, FNAL) (CERN, CDEF) (LRL) (LRL, UCB, SLAC+) (CERN) (DARE) (ROMA, SYRA) (CERN)
AUGUSTIN BIZZARRI DEINET JACQUET WILSON Also ASTVACAT BOLLINI BARASH FELDMAN DIGIUGNO FLATTE JAMES BARBARO BARMIN KRAEMER	69D 69 69B 69B 69B 69B 69 68 68 67B 67C 66B 66 66 66 66 64 64 64	PL 28B 513 PL 28B 513 NP B14 169 PL 30B 426 NC 63A 743 Private Comm. PR 178 2095 PL 27B 45 NC 56A 531 PR 156 1399 PR 159 1219 NC 44A 1272 PR 145 1050 PR 142 896 PRL 14 279 JETP 18 1289 Translated from ZETF 45 PR 136 B496 Size Conf. 1 166	J.E. Augustin et al. R. Bizzarri et al. W. Deinet et al. F. Jacquet et al. R. Wilson A.A. Wehmann et al. R.G. Astvatsaturov et al. D. Bollini et al. N. Barash et al. M. Feldman et al. G. Di Giugno et al. S.M. Flatte et al. F.E. James, H.L. Kraybill A. Barbaro-Galtieri, R.D. Tripp V.V. Barmin et al. 1879. R.W. Kraemer et al.	(ORSAY) (CERN, CDEF) (KARL, CERN) (EPOL, BERG) (HARV) (HARV, CASE, SLAC+) (JINR, MOSU) (CERN, BGNA, STRB) (COLU) (PENN) (NAPL, FRAS, TRST) (LRL) (YALE, BNL) (LRL) (JHU, NWES, WOOD)
BUSCHBECK	63	Siena Conf. 1 166	B. Buschbeck et al.	(VIEN, CERN, ANIK)

 $\mathsf{HTTP:}//\mathsf{PDG.LBL.GOV}$