Axions (A^0) and Other Very Light Bosons, Searches for

See the related review(s):

Axions and Other Similar Particles

A^0 (Axion) MASS LIMITS from Astrophysics and Cosmology

These bounds depend on model-dependent assumptions (i.e. — on a combination of axion parameters).

VALUE (MeV)	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
>0.2	BARROSO	82	ASTR	Standard Axion
>0.25	[1] RAFFELT	82	ASTR	Standard Axion
>0.2	[2] DICUS	78C	ASTR	Standard Axion
	MIKAELIAN	78	ASTR	Stellar emission
>0.3	[2] SATO	78	ASTR	Standard Axion
>0.2	VYSOTSKII	78	ASTR	Standard Axion

[1] Lower bound from 5.5 MeV γ-ray line from the sun.

[2] Lower bound from requiring the red giants' stellar evolution not be disrupted by axion emission.

A^0 (Axion) and Other Light Boson (X^0) Searches in Hadron Decays

Limits are for branching ratios.

VALUE	CL%	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •					
$<2.4 \times 10^{-9}$	90	[1] AHN	19	KOTO	$K^0_L \rightarrow \pi^0 X^0$, $m_{X^0} = 135$ MeV
$<2 \times 10^{-10}$	95	[2] AAIJ	17AQ	LHCB	$B^+ \rightarrow K^+ X^0$ ($X^0 \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$)
$<3.7 \times 10^{-8}$	90	[3] AHN	17	KOTO	$K^0_L \rightarrow \pi^0 X^0$, $m_{X^0} = 135$ MeV
$<6 \times 10^{-11}$	90	[4] BATLEY	17	NA48	$K^\pm \rightarrow \pi^\pm X^0 (X^0 \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-)$
		[5] WON	16	BELL	$\eta \rightarrow \gamma X^0$ ($X^0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$)
$<1 \times 10^{-9}$	95	[6] AAIJ	15AZ	LHCB	$B^0 \rightarrow K^{*0} X^0$ ($X^0 \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$)
$<1.5 \times 10^{-6}$	90	[7] ADLARSON	13	WASA	$\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma X^0$ ($X^0 \rightarrow e^+e^-$), $m_{X^0} = 100$ MeV
$<2 \times 10^{-8}$	90	[8] BABUSCI	13B	KLOE	$\phi \rightarrow \eta X^0$ ($X^0 \rightarrow e^+e^-$)
		[9] ARCHILLI	12	KLOE	$\phi \rightarrow \eta X^0$, $X^0 \rightarrow e^+e^-$
$<2 \times 10^{-15}$	90	[10] GNINENKO	12A	BDMP	$\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma X^0$ ($X^0 \rightarrow e^+e^-$)
$<3 \times 10^{-14}$	90	[11] GNINENKO	12B	BDMP	$\eta(\eta') \rightarrow \gamma X^0$ ($X^0 \rightarrow e^+e^-$)
$<7 \times 10^{-10}$	90	[12] ADLER	04	B787	$K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ X^0$
$<7.3 \times 10^{-11}$	90	[13] ANISIMOVSK...	04	B949	$K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ X^0$
$<4.5 \times 10^{-11}$	90	[14] ADLER	02C	B787	$K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ X^0$
$<4 \times 10^{-5}$	90	[15] ADLER	01	B787	$K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0 A^0$
$<4.9 \times 10^{-5}$	90	AMMAR	01B	CLEO	$B^\pm \rightarrow \pi^\pm (K^\pm) X^0$
$<5.3 \times 10^{-5}$	90	AMMAR	01B	CLEO	$B^0 \rightarrow K^0_S X^0$
$<3.3 \times 10^{-5}$	90	[16] ALTEGOER	98	NOMD	$\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma X^0$, $m_{X^0} < 120$ MeV
$<5.0 \times 10^{-8}$	90	[17] KITCHING	97	B787	$K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ X^0$ ($X^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$)

$<5.2 \times 10^{-10}$	90	[18] ADLER	96	B787	$K^+ \to \pi^+ X^0$
$<2.8 \times 10^{-4}$	90	[19] AMSLER	96B	CBAR	$\pi^0 \to \gamma X^0$, $m_{X^0} < 65$ MeV
$<3 \times 10^{-4}$	90	[19] AMSLER	96B	CBAR	$\eta \to \gamma X^0$, m_{X^0}= 50–200 MeV
$<4 \times 10^{-5}$	90	[19] AMSLER	96B	CBAR	$\eta' \to \gamma X^0$, m_{X^0}= 50–925 MeV
$<6 \times 10^{-5}$	90	[19] AMSLER	94B	CBAR	$\pi^0 \to \gamma X^0$, m_{X^0}=65–125 MeV
$<6 \times 10^{-5}$	90	[19] AMSLER	94B	CBAR	$\eta \to \gamma X^0$, m_{X^0}=200–525 MeV
$<7 \times 10^{-3}$	90	[20] MEIJERDREES	94	CNTR	$\pi^0 \to \gamma X^0$, m_{X^0}=25 MeV
$<2 \times 10^{-3}$	90	[20] MEIJERDREES	94	CNTR	$\pi^0 \to \gamma X^0$, m_{X^0}=100 MeV
$<2 \times 10^{-7}$	90	[21] ATIYA	93B	B787	Sup. by ADLER 04
$<3 \times 10^{-13}$		[22] NG	93	COSM	$\pi^0 \to \gamma X^0$
$<1.1 \times 10^{-8}$	90	[23] ALLIEGRO	92	SPEC	$K^+ \to \pi^+ X^0$ ($X^0 \to e^+ e^-$)
$<5 \times 10^{-4}$	90	[24] ATIYA	92	B787	$\pi^0 \to \gamma X^0$
$<1 \times 10^{-12}$	95	[25] BARABASH	92	BDMP	$\pi^\pm \to e^\pm \nu X^0$($X^0 \to e^+ e^-$, $\gamma\gamma$), m_{X^0} = 8 MeV
$<1 \times 10^{-12}$	95	[26] BARABASH	92	BDMP	$K^\pm \to \pi^\pm X^0$($X^0 \to e^+ e^-$, $\gamma\gamma$), m_{X^0} = 10 MeV
$<1 \times 10^{-11}$	95	[27] BARABASH	92	BDMP	$K^0_L \to \pi^0 X^0$($X^0 \to e^+ e^-$, $\gamma\gamma$), m_{X^0} = 10 MeV
$<1 \times 10^{-14}$	95	[28] BARABASH	92	BDMP	$\eta' \to \eta X^0$($X^0 \to e^+ e^-$, $\gamma\gamma$), m_{X^0} = 10 MeV
$<4 \times 10^{-6}$	90	[29] MEIJERDREES	92	SPEC	$\pi^0 \to \gamma X^0$ ($X^0 \to e^+ e^-$), m_{X^0}= 100 MeV
$<1 \times 10^{-7}$	90	[30] ATIYA	90B	B787	Sup. by KITCHING 97
$<1.3 \times 10^{-8}$	90	[31] KORENCHE...	87	SPEC	$\pi^+ \to e^+ \nu A^0$ ($A^0 \to e^+ e^-$)
$<1 \times 10^{-9}$	90	[32] EICHLER	86	SPEC	Stopped $\pi^+ \to e^+ \nu A^0$
$<2 \times 10^{-5}$	90	[33] YAMAZAKI	84	SPEC	For 160$<m<$260 MeV
$<(1.5\text{–}4) \times 10^{-6}$	90	[33] YAMAZAKI	84	SPEC	K decay, $m_{X^0} \ll 100$ MeV
		[34] ASANO	82	CNTR	Stopped $K^+ \to \pi^+ X^0$
		[35] ASANO	81B	CNTR	Stopped $K^+ \to \pi^+ X^0$
		[36] ZHITNITSKII	79		Heavy axion

[1] AHN 19 is an update of AHN 17 from a new data set. See their Fig. 4 for the limits in the range of m_{X^0} = 0–250 MeV.

[2] The limit is for τ_{X^0} = 10 ps. See their Fig. 4 for limits in the range of m_{X^0} = 250–4700 MeV and τ_{X^0} = 0.1–1000 ps.

[3] The limit as a function of m_{X^0} from 0 to 250 MeV is provided in their Fig. 5 .

[4] The limit is for m_{X^0} = 216 MeV and $\tau_{X^0} \leq$ 10 ps. See their Fig. 4(c) for limits in the range of m_{X^0} = 211–354 MeV and longer lifetimes.

[5] WON 16 look for a vector boson coupled to baryon number. Derived limits on α' $<$ 10^{-3}–10^{-2} for m_{X^0} = 290–520 MeV at 95% CL. See their Fig. 4 for mass-dependent limits.

[6] The limit is for τ_{X^0} = 10 ps and m_{X^0} = 214–4350 MeV. See their Fig. 4 for mass- and lifetime-dependent limits.

[7] Limits between 2.0×10^{-5} and 1.5×10^{-6} are obtained for m_{X^0} = 20–100 MeV (see their Fig. 8). Angular momentum conservation requires that X^0 has spin $\geq$ 1.

[8] The limit is for B($\phi \to \eta X^0$)·B($X^0 \to e^+ e^-$) and applies to m_{X^0} = 410 MeV. It is derived by analyzing $\eta \to \pi^0 \pi^0 \pi^0$ and $\pi^- \pi^+ \pi^0$. Limits between 1×10^{-6} and 2×10^{-8} are obtained for $m_{X^0} \leq$ 450 MeV (see their Fig. 6).

[9] ARCHILLI 12 analyzed $\eta \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ decays. Derived limits on $\alpha'/\alpha < 2\times10^{-5}$ for m_{X^0} = 50–420 MeV at 90% CL. See their Fig. 8 for mass-dependent limits.

[10] This limit is for B($\pi^0 \to \gamma X^0$)·B($X^0 \to e^+e^-$) and applies for m_{X^0} = 90 MeV and $\tau_{X^0} \simeq 1\times10^{-8}$ sec. Limits between 10^{-8} and 2×10^{-15} are obtained for m_{X^0} = 3–120 MeV and $\tau_{X^0} = 1\times10^{-11}$–1 sec. See their Fig. 3 for limits at different masses and lifetimes.

[11] This limit is for B($\eta \to \gamma X^0$)·B($X^0 \to e^+e^-$) and applies for m_{X^0} = 100 MeV and $\tau_{X^0} \simeq 6\times10^{-9}$ sec. Limits between 10^{-5} and 3×10^{-14} are obtained for $m_{X^0} \lesssim$ 550 MeV and $\tau_{X^0} = 10^{-10}$–10 sec. See their Fig. 5 for limits at different mass and lifetime and for η' decays.

[12] This limit applies for a mass near 180 MeV. For other masses in the range m_{X^0} = 150–250 MeV the limit is less restrictive, but still improves ADLER 02C and ATIYA 93B.

[13] ANISIMOVSKY 04 bound is for m_{X^0}=0.

[14] ADLER 02C bound is for m_{X^0} <60 MeV. See Fig. 2 for limits at higher masses.

[15] The quoted limit is for m_{X^0} = 0–80 MeV. See their Fig. 5 for the limit at higher mass. The branching fraction limit assumes pure phase space decay distributions.

[16] ALTEGOER 98 looked for X^0 from π^0 decay which penetrate the shielding and convert to π^0 in the external Coulomb field of a nucleus.

[17] KITCHING 97 limit is for B($K^+ \to \pi^+ X^0$)·B($X^0 \to \gamma\gamma$) and applies for $m_{X^0} \simeq$ 50 MeV, $\tau_{X^0} < 10^{-10}$ s. Limits are provided for 0<m_{X^0} < 100 MeV, $\tau_{X^0} < 10^{-8}$ s.

[18] ADLER 96 looked for a peak in missing-mass distribution. This work is an update of ATIYA 93. The limit is for massless stable X^0 particles and extends to m_{X^0}=80 MeV at the same level. See paper for dependence on finite lifetime.

[19] AMSLER 94B and AMSLER 96B looked for a peak in missing-mass distribution.

[20] The MEIJERDREES 94 limit is based on inclusive photon spectrum and is independent of X^0 decay modes. It applies to $\tau(X^0) > 10^{-23}$ sec.

[21] ATIYA 93B looked for a peak in missing mass distribution. The bound applies for stable X^0 of m_{X^0}=150–250 MeV, and the limit becomes stronger (10^{-8}) for m_{X^0}=180–240 MeV.

[22] NG 93 studied the production of X^0 via $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0 \to \gamma X^0$ in the early universe at $T\simeq$ 1 MeV. The bound on extra neutrinos from nucleosynthesis $\Delta N_\nu < 0.3$ (WALKER 91) is employed. It applies to $m_{X^0} \ll$ 1 MeV in order to be relativistic down to nucleosynthesis temperature. See paper for heavier X^0.

[23] ALLIEGRO 92 limit applies for m_{X^0}=150–340 MeV and is the branching ratio times the decay probability. Limit is $< 1.5\times10^{-8}$ at 99%CL.

[24] ATIYA 92 looked for a peak in missing mass distribution. The limit applies to m_{X^0}=0–130 MeV in the narrow resonance limit. See paper for the dependence on lifetime. Covariance requires X^0 to be a vector particle.

[25] BARABASH 92 is a beam dump experiment that searched for a light Higgs. Limits between 1×10^{-12} and 1×10^{-7} are obtained for 3 < m_{X^0} < 40 MeV.

[26] Limits between 1×10^{-12} and 1 are obtained for 4 < m_{X^0} < 69 MeV.

[27] Limits between 1×10^{-11} and 5×10^{-3} are obtained for 4 < m_{X^0} < 63 MeV.

[28] Limits between 1×10^{-14} and 1 are obtained for 3 < m_{X^0} < 82 MeV.

[29] MEIJERDREES 92 limit applies for $\tau_{X^0} = 10^{-23}$–10^{-11} sec. Limits between 2×10^{-4} and 4×10^{-6} are obtained for m_{X^0} = 25–120 MeV. Angular momentum conservation requires that X^0 has spin ≥ 1.

[30] ATIYA 90B limit is for $B(K^+ \to \pi^+ X^0) \cdot B(X^0 \to \gamma\gamma)$ and applies for $m_{X^0} = 50$ MeV, $\tau_{X^0} < 10^{-10}$ s. Limits are also provided for $0 < m_{X^0} < 100$ MeV, $\tau_{X^0} < 10^{-8}$ s.

[31] KORENCHENKO 87 limit assumes $m_{A^0} = 1.7$ MeV, $\tau_{A^0} \lesssim 10^{-12}$ s, and $B(A^0 \to e^+ e^-) = 1$.

[32] EICHLER 86 looked for $\pi^+ \to e^+ \nu A^0$ followed by $A^0 \to e^+ e^-$. Limits on the branching fraction depend on the mass and and lifetime of A^0. The quoted limits are valid when $\tau(A^0) \gtrsim 3. \times 10^{-10}$s if the decays are kinematically allowed.

[33] YAMAZAKI 84 looked for a discrete line in $K^+ \to \pi^+ X$. Sensitive to wide mass range (5–300 MeV), independent of whether X decays promptly or not.

[34] ASANO 82 at KEK set limits for $B(K^+ \to \pi^+ X^0)$ for m_{X^0} <100 MeV as BR $< 4. \times 10^{-8}$ for $\tau(X^0 \to n\gamma\text{'s}) > 1. \times 10^{-9}$ s, BR $< 1.4 \times 10^{-6}$ for $\tau < 1. \times 10^{-9}$s.

[35] ASANO 81B is KEK experiment. Set $B(K^+ \to \pi^+ X^0) < 3.8 \times 10^{-8}$ at CL = 90%.

[36] ZHITNITSKII 79 argue that a heavy axion predicted by YANG 78 ($3 < m < 40$ MeV) contradicts experimental muon anomalous magnetic moments.

A^0 (Axion) Searches in Quarkonium Decays

Decay or transition of quarkonium. Limits are for branching ratio.

VALUE	CL%	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •					
$<2.8 \times 10^{-8}$	90	[1] ABLIKIM	16E	BES3	$J/\psi \to A^0 \gamma$ $(A^0 \to \mu^+ \mu^-)$
$<4 \times 10^{-7}$	90	[2] ABLIKIM	12	BES3	$J/\psi \to A^0 \gamma$ $(A^0 \to \mu^+ \mu^-)$
$<4.0 \times 10^{-5}$	90	[3] ANTREASYAN	90C	CBAL	$\Upsilon(1S) \to A^0 \gamma$
$<5 \times 10^{-5}$	90	[4] DRUZHININ	87	ND	$\phi \to A^0 \gamma$ $(A^0 \to e^+ e^-)$
$<2 \times 10^{-3}$	90	[5] DRUZHININ	87	ND	$\phi \to A^0 \gamma$ $(A^0 \to \gamma\gamma)$
$<7 \times 10^{-6}$	90	[6] DRUZHININ	87	ND	$\phi \to A^0 \gamma$ $(A^0 \to$ missing)
$<1.4 \times 10^{-5}$	90	[7] EDWARDS	82	CBAL	$J/\psi \to A^0 \gamma$

[1] ABLIKIM 16E limits between $2.8–495.3 \times 10^{-8}$ were obtained for 0.212 GeV $< m_{A^0} <$ 3.0 GeV. See their Fig. 5 for mass-dependent limits.

[2] ABLIKIM 12 derived limits between 4×10^{-7}–2.1×10^{-5} for 0.212 GeV $< m_{A^0} <$ 3.0 GeV. See their Fig. 2(c) for mass-dependent limits.

[3] ANTREASYAN 90C assume that A^0 does not decay in the detector.

[4] The first DRUZHININ 87 limit is valid when $\tau_{A^0}/m_{A^0} < 3 \times 10^{-13}$ s/MeV and $m_{A^0} < 20$ MeV.

[5] The second DRUZHININ 87 limit is valid when $\tau_{A^0}/m_{A^0} < 5 \times 10^{-13}$ s/MeV and $m_{A^0} < 20$ MeV.

[6] The third DRUZHININ 87 limit is valid when $\tau_{A^0}/m_{A^0} > 7 \times 10^{-12}$ s/MeV and $m_{A^0} < 200$ MeV.

[7] EDWARDS 82 looked for $J/\psi \to \gamma A^0$ decays by looking for events with a single γ [of energy $\sim 1/2$ the $J/\psi(1S)$ mass], plus nothing else in the detector. The limit is inconsistent with the axion interpretation of the FAISSNER 81B result.

A^0 (Axion) Searches in Positronium Decays

Decay or transition of positronium. Limits are for branching ratio.

VALUE	CL%	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •					
$<4.4 \times 10^{-5}$	90	[1] BADERT...	02	CNTR	o-Ps $\rightarrow \gamma X_1 X_2$, $m_{X_1}+m_{X_2} \leq$ 900 keV
$<2 \times 10^{-4}$	90	MAENO	95	CNTR	o-Ps $\rightarrow A^0\gamma$ m_{A^0}=850–1013 keV
$<3.0 \times 10^{-4}$	90	[2] ASAI	94	CNTR	o-Ps $\rightarrow A^0\gamma$ m_{A^0}=30–500 keV
$<2.8 \times 10^{-5}$	90	[3] AKOPYAN	91	CNTR	o-Ps $\rightarrow A^0\gamma$ ($A^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$), $m_{A^0} < 30$ keV
$<1.1 \times 10^{-6}$	90	[4] ASAI	91	CNTR	o-Ps $\rightarrow A^0\gamma$, $m_{A^0} < 800$ keV
$<3.8 \times 10^{-4}$	90	GNINENKO	90	CNTR	o-Ps $\rightarrow A^0\gamma$, $m_{A^0} < 30$ keV
$<(1–5) \times 10^{-4}$	95	[5] TSUCHIAKI	90	CNTR	o-Ps $\rightarrow A^0\gamma$, m_{A^0} = 300–900 keV
$<6.4 \times 10^{-5}$	90	[6] ORITO	89	CNTR	o-Ps $\rightarrow A^0\gamma$, $m_{A^0} < 30$ keV
		[7] AMALDI	85	CNTR	Ortho-positronium
		[8] CARBONI	83	CNTR	Ortho-positronium

[1] BADERTSCHER 02 looked for a three-body decay of ortho-positronium into a photon and two penetrating (neutral or milli-charged) particles.

[2] The ASAI 94 limit is based on inclusive photon spectrum and is independent of A^0 decay modes.

[3] The AKOPYAN 91 limit applies for a short-lived A^0 with $\tau_{A^0} < 10^{-13}\, m_{A^0}$ [keV] s.

[4] ASAI 91 limit translates to $g^2_{A^0 e^+ e^-}/4\pi < 1.1 \times 10^{-11}$ (90% CL) for $m_{A^0} < 800$ keV.

[5] The TSUCHIAKI 90 limit is based on inclusive photon spectrum and is independent of A^0 decay modes.

[6] ORITO 89 limit translates to $g^2_{A^0 e e}/4\pi < 6.2 \times 10^{-10}$. Somewhat more sensitive limits are obtained for larger m_{A^0}: $B < 7.6 \times 10^{-6}$ at 100 keV.

[7] AMALDI 85 set limits B($A^0\gamma$) / B($\gamma\gamma\gamma$) $< (1–5) \times 10^{-6}$ for m_{A^0} = 900–100 keV which are about 1/10 of the CARBONI 83 limits.

[8] CARBONI 83 looked for orthopositronium $\rightarrow A^0\gamma$. Set limit for A^0 electron coupling squared, $g(eeA^0)^2/(4\pi) < 6. \times 10^{-10}$–$7. \times 10^{-9}$ for m_{A^0} from 150–900 keV (CL = 99.7%). This is about 1/10 of the bound from $g-2$ experiments.

A^0 (Axion) Search in Photoproduction

VALUE	DOCUMENT ID		COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •			
	[1] BASSOMPIE...	95	$m_{A^0} = 1.8 \pm 0.2$ MeV

[1] BASSOMPIERRE 95 is an extension of BASSOMPIERRE 93. They looked for a peak in the invariant mass of e^+e^- pairs in the region $m_{e^+e^-} = 1.8 \pm 0.2$ MeV. They obtained bounds on the production rate A^0 for $\tau(A^0) = 10^{-18}$–10^{-9} sec. They also found an excess of events in the range $m_{e^+e^-}$ = 2.1–3.5 MeV.

A^0 (Axion) Production in Hadron Collisions

Limits are for $\sigma(A^0)$ / $\sigma(\pi^0)$.

VALUE	CL%	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •						
			[1] AAIJ	20AL	LHCB	$p p \to X^0 \to \mu^+ \mu^-$
			[2] GAVELA	20	CMS	$p p \to A^{*0} \to \gamma\gamma, ZZ$
			[3] SIRUNYAN	19BQ	CMS	$X^0 \to \mu^+ \mu^-$
			[4] JAIN	07	CNTR	$A^0 \to e^+ e^-$
			[5] AHMAD	97	SPEC	e^+ production
			[6] LEINBERGER	97	SPEC	$A^0 \to e^+ e^-$
			[7] GANZ	96	SPEC	$A^0 \to e^+ e^-$
			[8] KAMEL	96	EMUL	^{32}S emulsion, $A^0 \to e^+ e^-$
			[9] BLUEMLEIN	92	BDMP	$A^0 N_Z \to \ell^+ \ell^- N_Z$
			[10] MEIJERDREES	92	SPEC	$\pi^- p \to n A^0$, $A^0 \to e^+ e^-$
			[11] BLUEMLEIN	91	BDMP	$A^0 \to e^+ e^-$, 2γ
			[12] FAISSNER	89	OSPK	Beam dump, $A^0 \to e^+ e^-$
			[13] DEBOER	88	RVUE	$A^0 \to e^+ e^-$
			[14] EL-NADI	88	EMUL	$A^0 \to e^+ e^-$
			[15] FAISSNER	88	OSPK	Beam dump, $A^0 \to 2\gamma$
			[16] BADIER	86	BDMP	$A^0 \to e^+ e^-$
$<2. \times 10^{-11}$	90	0	[17] BERGSMA	85	CHRM	CERN beam dump
$<1. \times 10^{-13}$	90	0	[17] BERGSMA	85	CHRM	CERN beam dump
		24	[18] FAISSNER	83	OSPK	Beam dump, $A^0 \to 2\gamma$
			[19] FAISSNER	83B	RVUE	LAMPF beam dump
			[20] FRANK	83B	RVUE	LAMPF beam dump
			[21] HOFFMAN	83	CNTR	$\pi p \to n A^0$ ($A^0 \to e^+ e^-$)
			[22] FETSCHER	82	RVUE	See FAISSNER 81B
		12	[23] FAISSNER	81	OSPK	CERN PS ν wideband
		15	[24] FAISSNER	81B	OSPK	Beam dump, $A^0 \to 2\gamma$
		8	[25] KIM	81	OSPK	26 GeV $p N \to A^0 X$
		0	[26] FAISSNER	80	OSPK	Beam dump, $A^0 \to e^+ e^-$
$<1. \times 10^{-8}$	90		[27] JACQUES	80	HLBC	28 GeV protons
$<1. \times 10^{-14}$	90		[27] JACQUES	80	HLBC	Beam dump
			[28] SOUKAS	80	CALO	28 GeV p beam dump
			[29] BECHIS	79	CNTR	
$<1. \times 10^{-8}$	90		[30] COTEUS	79	OSPK	Beam dump
$<1. \times 10^{-3}$	95		[31] DISHAW	79	CALO	400 GeV $p p$
$<1. \times 10^{-8}$	90		ALIBRAN	78	HYBR	Beam dump
$<6. \times 10^{-9}$	95		ASRATYAN	78B	CALO	Beam dump
$<1.5 \times 10^{-8}$	90		[32] BELLOTTI	78	HLBC	Beam dump
$<5.4 \times 10^{-14}$	90		[32] BELLOTTI	78	HLBC	m_{A^0}=1.5 MeV
$<4.1 \times 10^{-9}$	90		[32] BELLOTTI	78	HLBC	m_{A^0}=1 MeV
$<1. \times 10^{-8}$	90		[33] BOSETTI	78B	HYBR	Beam dump
			[34] DONNELLY	78		

$<0.5 \times 10^{-8}$	90	HANSL	78D	WIRE	Beam dump
		[35] MICELMAC...	78		
		[36] VYSOTSKII	78		

[1] AAIJ 20AL look for a light new boson decaying into a pair of muons using the LHCb data with an integrated luminosity of 5.1 fb^{-1}, and set limits on the cross section over a range of m_{X^0} = 0.22–3 and 20–60 GeV. See Figs. 8 and 9 for mass-dependent limits.

[2] GAVELA 20 focus on the axion production as an s-channel off shell mediator, and use the Run 2 CMS public data to set limits on the product of the axion couplings to gluons and photons as well as Z bosons as $G_{A\gamma\gamma}\ G_{Agg} < 2.8 \times 10^{-7}$ GeV^{-2} and $G_{AZZ}\ G_{Agg} < 9.8 \times 10^{-7}$ GeV^{-2} for $m_{A^0} \lesssim 200$ GeV. See their Fig.3 for the limits.

[3] SIRUNYAN 19BQ look for the pair production of a new light boson decaying into a pair of muons, and set limits on the product of the production cross section times branching fraction to dimuons squared times acceptance over a range of m_{X^0} = 0.25–8.5 GeV. See the right panel of their Fig. 1 for mass-dependent limits.

[4] JAIN 07 claims evidence for $A^0 \rightarrow e^+ e^-$ produced in ^{207}Pb collision on nuclear emulsion (Ag/Br) for $m(A^0) = 7 \pm 1$ or 19 ± 1 MeV and $\tau(A^0) \leq 10^{-13}$ s.

[5] AHMAD 97 reports a result of APEX Collaboration which studied positron production in $^{238}\text{U}+^{232}\text{Ta}$ and $^{238}\text{U}+^{181}\text{Ta}$ collisions, without requiring a coincident electron. No narrow lines were found for $250 < E_{e^+} < 750$ keV.

[6] LEINBERGER 97 (ORANGE Collaboration) at GSI looked for a narrow sum-energy $e^+ e^-$-line at $\sim$ 635 keV in $^{238}\text{U}+^{181}\text{Ta}$ collision. Limits on the production probability for a narrow sum-energy $e^+ e^-$ line are set. See their Table 2.

[7] GANZ 96 (EPos II Collaboration) has placed upper bounds on the production cross section of $e^+ e^-$ pairs from $^{238}\text{U}+^{181}\text{Ta}$ and $^{238}\text{U}+^{232}\text{Th}$ collisions at GSI. See Table 2 for limits both for back-to-back and isotropic configurations of $e^+ e^-$ pairs. These limits rule out the existence of peaks in the $e^+ e^-$ sum-energy distribution, reported by an earlier version of this experiment.

[8] KAMEL 96 looked for $e^+ e^-$ pairs from the collision of ^{32}S (200 GeV/nucleon) and emulsion. No evidence of mass peaks is found in the region of sensitivity $m_{ee} > 2$ MeV.

[9] BLUEMLEIN 92 is a proton beam dump experiment at Serpukhov with a secondary target to induce Bethe-Heitler production of $e^+ e^-$ or $\mu^+ \mu^-$ from the produce A^0. See Fig. 5 for the excluded region in m_{A^0}-x plane. For the standard axion, $0.3 < x < 25$ is excluded at 95% CL. If combined with BLUEMLEIN 91, $0.008 < x < 32$ is excluded.

[10] MEIJERDREES 92 give $\Gamma(\pi^- p \rightarrow n A^0) \cdot \text{B}(A^0 \rightarrow e^+ e^-)/\Gamma(\pi^- p \rightarrow \text{all}) < 10^{-5}$ (90% CL) for m_{A^0} = 100 MeV, $\tau_{A^0} = 10^{-11}$–10^{-23} sec. Limits ranging from 2.5×10^{-3} to 10^{-7} are given for m_{A^0} = 25–136 MeV.

[11] BLUEMLEIN 91 is a proton beam dump experiment at Serpukhov. No candidate event for $A^0 \rightarrow e^+ e^-$, 2γ are found. Fig. 6 gives the excluded region in m_{A^0}-x plane ($x = \tan\beta = v_2/v_1$). Standard axion is excluded for $0.2 < m_{A^0} < 3.2$ MeV for most $x > 1$, 0.2–11 MeV for most $x < 1$.

[12] FAISSNER 89 searched for $A^0 \rightarrow e^+ e^-$ in a proton beam dump experiment at SIN. No excess of events was observed over the background. A standard axion with mass $2m_e$–20 MeV is excluded. Lower limit on f_{A^0} of $\simeq 10^4$ GeV is given for $m_{A^0} = 2m_e$–20 MeV.

[13] DEBOER 88 reanalyze EL-NADI 88 data and claim evidence for three distinct states with mass $\sim$ 1.1, $\sim$ 2.1, and $\sim$ 9 MeV, lifetimes 10^{-16}–10^{-15} s decaying to $e^+ e^-$ and note the similarity of the data with those of a cosmic-ray experiment by Bristol group (B.M. Anand, Proc. of the Royal Society of London, Section A **A22** 183 (1953)). For a criticism see PERKINS 89, who suggests that the events are compatible with π^0 Dalitz decay. DEBOER 89B is a reply which contests the criticism.

[14] EL-NADI 88 claim the existence of a neutral particle decaying into $e^+ e^-$ with mass 1.60 ± 0.59 MeV, lifetime $(0.15 \pm 0.01) \times 10^{-14}$ s, which is produced in heavy ion interactions with emulsion nuclei at ~ 4 GeV/c/nucleon.

[15] FAISSNER 88 is a proton beam dump experiment at SIN. They found no candidate event for $A^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$. A standard axion decaying to 2γ is excluded except for a region $x \simeq 1$. Lower limit on f_{A^0} of 10^2–10^3 GeV is given for $m_{A^0} = 0.1$–1 MeV.

[16] BADIER 86 did not find long-lived A^0 in 300 GeV π^- Beam Dump Experiment that decays into $e^+ e^-$ in the mass range $m_{A^0} =$ (20–200) MeV, which excludes the A^0 decay constant $f(A^0)$ in the interval (60–600) GeV. See their figure 6 for excluded region on $f(A^0)$-m_{A^0} plane.

[17] BERGSMA 85 look for $A^0 \rightarrow 2\gamma$, $e^+ e^-$, $\mu^+ \mu^-$. First limit above is for $m_{A^0} = 1$ MeV; second is for 200 MeV. See their figure 4 for excluded region on $f_{A^0} - m_{A^0}$ plane, where f_{A^0} is A^0 decay constant. For Peccei-Quinn PECCEI 77 A^0, m_{A^0} <180 keV and τ >0.037 s. (CL = 90%). For the axion of FAISSNER 81B at 250 keV, BERGSMA 85 expect 15 events but observe zero.

[18] FAISSNER 83 observed 19 1-γ and 12 2-γ events where a background of 4.8 and 2.3 respectively is expected. A small-angle peak is observed even if iron wall is set in front of the decay region.

[19] FAISSNER 83B extrapolate SIN γ signal to LAMPF ν experimental condition. Resulting 370 γ's are not at variance with LAMPF upper limit of 450 γ's. Derived from LAMPF limit that $\left[d\sigma(A^0)/d\omega \text{ at } 90^\circ\right] m_{A^0}/\tau_{A^0} < 14 \times 10^{-35}$ cm^2 sr^{-1} MeV ms^{-1}. See comment on FRANK 83B.

[20] FRANK 83B stress the importance of LAMPF data bins with negative net signal. By statistical analysis say that LAMPF and SIN-A0 are at variance when extrapolation by phase-space model is done. They find LAMPF upper limit is 248 not 450 γ's. See comment on FAISSNER 83B.

[21] HOFFMAN 83 set CL = 90% limit $d\sigma/dt\, \mathrm{B}(e^+ e^-) < 3.5 \times 10^{-32}$ cm^2/GeV^2 for 140 $< m_{A^0}$ <160 MeV. Limit assumes $\tau(A^0) < 10^{-9}$ s.

[22] FETSCHER 82 reanalyzes SIN beam-dump data of FAISSNER 81. Claims no evidence for axion since 2-γ peak rate remarkably decreases if iron wall is set in front of the decay region.

[23] FAISSNER 81 see excess μe events. Suggest axion interactions.

[24] FAISSNER 81B is SIN 590 MeV proton beam dump. Observed 14.5 ± 5.0 events of 2γ decay of long-lived neutral penetrating particle with $m_{2\gamma} \lesssim 1$ MeV. Axion interpretation with η-A^0 mixing gives $m_{A^0} = 250 \pm 25$ keV, $\tau_{(2\gamma)} = (7.3 \pm 3.7) \times 10^{-3}$ s from above rate. See critical remarks below in comments of FETSCHER 82, FAISSNER 83, FAISSNER 83B, FRANK 83B, and BERGSMA 85. Also see in the next subsection ALEKSEEV 82B, CAVAIGNAC 83, and ANANEV 85.

[25] KIM 81 analyzed 8 candidates for $A^0 \rightarrow 2\gamma$ obtained by Aachen-Padova experiment at CERN with 26 GeV protons on Be. Estimated axion mass is about 300 keV and lifetime is $(0.86 \sim 5.6) \times 10^{-3}$ s depending on models. Faissner (private communication), says axion production underestimated and mass overestimated. Correct value around 200 keV.

[26] FAISSNER 80 is SIN beam dump experiment with 590 MeV protons looking for $A^0 \rightarrow e^+ e^-$ decay. Assuming $A^0/\pi^0 = 5.5 \times 10^{-7}$, obtained decay rate limit 20/(A^0 mass) MeV/s (CL = 90%), which is about 10^{-7} below theory and interpreted as upper limit to $m_{A^0} < 2 m_{e^-}$.

[27] JACQUES 80 is a BNL beam dump experiment. First limit above comes from nonobservation of excess neutral-current-type events $\left[\sigma(\text{production})\sigma(\text{interaction}) < 7. \times 10^{-68}\right.$ cm^4, CL = 90%$\left.\right]$. Second limit is from nonobservation of axion decays into 2γ's or $e^+ e^-$, and for axion mass a few MeV.

[28] SOUKAS 80 at BNL observed no excess of neutral-current-type events in beam dump.
[29] BECHIS 79 looked for the axion production in low energy electron Bremsstrahlung and the subsequent decay into either 2γ or e^+e^-. No signal found. CL = 90% limits for model parameter(s) are given.
[30] COTEUS 79 is a beam dump experiment at BNL.
[31] DISHAW 79 is a calorimetric experiment and looks for low energy tail of energy distributions due to energy lost to weakly interacting particles.
[32] BELLOTTI 78 first value comes from search for $A^0 \rightarrow e^+e^-$. Second value comes from search for $A^0 \rightarrow 2\gamma$, assuming mass $<2m_{e^-}$. For any mass satisfying this, limit is above value$\times$(mass^{-4}). Third value uses data of PL 60B 401 and quotes σ(production)σ(interaction) $<10^{-67}$ cm^4.
[33] BOSETTI 78B quotes σ(production)σ(interaction) $< 2. \times 10^{-67}$ cm^4.
[34] DONNELLY 78 examines data from reactor neutrino experiments of REINES 76 and GURR 74 as well as SLAC beam dump experiment. Evidence is negative.
[35] MICELMACHER 78 finds no evidence of axion existence in reactor experiments of REINES 76 and GURR 74. (See reference under DONNELLY 78 below).
[36] VYSOTSKII 78 derived lower limit for the axion mass 25 keV from luminosity of the sun and 200 keV from red supergiants.

A^0 (Axion) Searches in Reactor Experiments

VALUE	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
	[1] CHANG	07		Primakoff or Compton
	[2] ALTMANN	95	CNTR	Reactor; $A^0 \rightarrow e^+e^-$
	[3] KETOV	86	SPEC	Reactor, $A^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$
	[4] KOCH	86	SPEC	Reactor; $A^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$
	[5] DATAR	82	CNTR	Light water reactor
	[6] VUILLEUMIER	81	CNTR	Reactor, $A^0 \rightarrow 2\gamma$

[1] CHANG 07 looked for monochromatic photons from Primakoff or Compton conversion of axions from the Kuo-Sheng reactor due to axion coupling to photon or electron, respectively. The search places model-independent limits on the products $G_{A\gamma\gamma}G_{ANN}$ and $G_{Aee}G_{ANN}$ for $m(A^0)$ less than the MeV range.
[2] ALTMANN 95 looked for A^0 decaying into e^+e^- from the Bugey 5 nuclear reactor. They obtain an upper limit on the A^0 production rate of $\omega(A^0)/\omega(\gamma)\ \times$B($A^0 \rightarrow e^+e^-$)$< 10^{-16}$ for $m_{A^0} = 1.5$ MeV at 90% CL. The limit is weaker for heavier A^0. In the case of a standard axion, this limit excludes a mass in the range $2m_e < m_{A^0} < 4.8$ MeV at 90% CL. See Fig. 5 of their paper for exclusion limits of axion-like resonances Z^0 in the (m_{X^0},f_{X^0}) plane.
[3] KETOV 86 searched for A^0 at the Rovno nuclear power plant. They found an upper limit on the A^0 production probability of 0.8 $\left[100\text{ keV}/m_{A^0}\right]^6 \times 10^{-6}$ per fission. In the standard axion model, this corresponds to m_{A^0} >150 keV. Not valid for $m_{A^0} \gtrsim$ 1 MeV.
[4] KOCH 86 searched for $A^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ at nuclear power reactor Biblis A. They found an upper limit on the A^0 production rate of $\omega(A^0)/\omega(\gamma(M1)) < 1.5 \times 10^{-10}$ (CL=95%). Standard axion with $m_{A^0} = 250$ keV gives 10^{-5} for the ratio. Not valid for m_{A^0} >1022 keV.
[5] DATAR 82 looked for $A^0 \rightarrow 2\gamma$ in neutron capture ($np \rightarrow dA^0$) at Tarapur 500 MW reactor. Sensitive to sum of $I = 0$ and $I = 1$ amplitudes. With ZEHNDER 81 $\left[(I = 0) - (I = 1)\right]$ result, assert nonexistence of standard A^0.

[6] VUILLEUMIER 81 is at Grenoble reactor. Set limit m_{A^0} <280 keV.

A^0 (Axion) and Other Light Boson (X^0) Searches in Nuclear Transitions

Limits are for branching ratio.

VALUE	CL%	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •					
$< 8.5 \times 10^{-6}$	90	[1] DERBIN	02	CNTR	^{125m}Te decay
		[2] DEBOER	97C	RVUE	M1 transitions
$< 5.5 \times 10^{-10}$	95	[3] TSUNODA	95	CNTR	^{252}Cf fission, $A^0 \rightarrow ee$
$< 1.2 \times 10^{-6}$	95	[4] MINOWA	93	CNTR	$^{139}\text{La}^* \rightarrow {}^{139}\text{La}\,A^0$
$< 2 \times 10^{-4}$	90	[5] HICKS	92	CNTR	^{35}S decay, $A^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$
$< 1.5 \times 10^{-9}$	95	[6] ASANUMA	90	CNTR	^{241}Am decay
$<(0.4\text{–}10) \times 10^{-3}$	95	[7] DEBOER	90	CNTR	$^{8}\text{Be}^* \rightarrow {}^{8}\text{Be}\,A^0$, $A^0 \rightarrow e^+e^-$
$<(0.2\text{–}1) \times 10^{-3}$	90	[8] BINI	89	CNTR	$^{16}\text{O}^* \rightarrow {}^{16}\text{O}\,X^0$, $X^0 \rightarrow e^+e^-$
		[9] AVIGNONE	88	CNTR	$\text{Cu}^* \rightarrow \text{Cu}\,A^0$ ($A^0 \rightarrow 2\gamma$, $A^0 e \rightarrow \gamma e$, $A^0 Z \rightarrow \gamma Z$)
$< 1.5 \times 10^{-4}$	90	[10] DATAR	88	CNTR	$^{12}\text{C}^* \rightarrow {}^{12}\text{C}\,A^0$, $A^0 \rightarrow e^+e^-$
$< 5 \times 10^{-3}$	90	[11] DEBOER	88C	CNTR	$^{16}\text{O}^* \rightarrow {}^{16}\text{O}\,X^0$, $X^0 \rightarrow e^+e^-$
$< 3.4 \times 10^{-5}$	95	[12] DOEHNER	88	SPEC	$^{2}\text{H}^*$, $A^0 \rightarrow e^+e^-$
$< 4 \times 10^{-4}$	95	[13] SAVAGE	88	CNTR	Nuclear decay (isovector)
$< 3 \times 10^{-3}$	95	[13] SAVAGE	88	CNTR	Nuclear decay (isoscalar)
$<10.6 \times 10^{-2}$	90	[14] HALLIN	86	SPEC	^{6}Li isovector decay
<10.8	90	[14] HALLIN	86	SPEC	^{10}B isoscalar decays
< 2.2	90	[14] HALLIN	86	SPEC	^{14}N isoscalar decays
$< 4 \times 10^{-4}$	90	[15] SAVAGE	86B	CNTR	$^{14}\text{N}^*$
		[16] ANANEV	85	CNTR	Li*, deut* $A^0 \rightarrow 2\gamma$
		[17] CAVAIGNAC	83	CNTR	^{97}Nb*, deut* transition $A^0 \rightarrow 2\gamma$
		[18] ALEKSEEV	82B	CNTR	Li*, deut* transition $A^0 \rightarrow 2\gamma$
		[19] LEHMANN	82	CNTR	$\text{Cu}^* \rightarrow \text{Cu}\,A^0$ ($A^0 \rightarrow 2\gamma$)
		[20] ZEHNDER	82	CNTR	Li*, Nb* decay, n-capt.
		[21] ZEHNDER	81	CNTR	$\text{Ba}^* \rightarrow \text{Ba}\,A^0$ ($A^0 \rightarrow 2\gamma$)
		[22] CALAPRICE	79		Carbon

[1] DERBIN 02 looked for the axion emission in an M1 transition in ^{125m}Te decay. They looked for a possible presence of a shifted energy spectrum in gamma rays due to the undetected axion.

[2] DEBOER 97C reanalyzed the existent data on Nuclear M1 transitions and find that a 9 MeV boson decaying into e^+e^- would explain the excess of events with large opening angles. See also DEBOER 01 for follow-up experiments.

[3] TSUNODA 95 looked for axion emission when ^{252}Cf undergoes a spontaneous fission, with the axion decaying into e^+e^-. The bound is for m_{A^0}=40 MeV. It improves to 2.5×10^{-5} for m_{A^0}=200 MeV.

[4] MINOWA 93 studied chain process, $^{139}\text{Ce} \rightarrow {}^{139}\text{La}^*$ by electron capture and M1 transition of $^{139}\text{La}^*$ to the ground state. It does not assume decay modes of A^0. The bound applies for $m_{A^0} < 166$ keV.

[5] HICKS 92 bound is applicable for $\tau_{X^0} < 4 \times 10^{-11}$ sec.

[6] The ASANUMA 90 limit is for the branching fraction of X^0 emission per ^{241}Amα decay and valid for $\tau_{X^0} < 3 \times 10^{-11}$ s.

[7] The DEBOER 90 limit is for the branching ratio ^{8}Be* (18.15 MeV, 1^+) $\rightarrow$ ^{8}BeA^0, $A^0 \rightarrow e^+ e^-$ for the mass range m_{A^0} = 4–15 MeV.

[8] The BINI 89 limit is for the branching fraction of ^{16}O*(6.05 MeV, 0^+) $\rightarrow$ ^{16}OX^0, $X^0 \rightarrow e^+ e^-$ for m_X = 1.5–3.1 MeV. $\tau_{X^0} \lesssim 10^{-11}$ s is assumed. The spin-parity of X is restricted to 0^+ or 1^-.

[9] AVIGNONE 88 looked for the 1115 keV transition C* $\rightarrow$ CuA^0, either from $A^0 \rightarrow 2\gamma$ in-flight decay or from the secondary A^0 interactions by Compton and by Primakoff processes. Limits for axion parameters are obtained for $m_{A^0} < 1.1$ MeV.

[10] DATAR 88 rule out light pseudoscalar particle emission through its decay $A^0 \rightarrow e^+ e^-$ in the mass range 1.02–2.5 MeV and lifetime range 10^{-13}–10^{-8} s. The above limit is for $\tau = 5 \times 10^{-13}$ s and m = 1.7 MeV; see the paper for the τ-m dependence of the limit.

[11] The limit is for the branching fraction of ^{16}O*(6.05 MeV, 0^+) $\rightarrow$ ^{16}OX^0, $X^0 \rightarrow e^+ e^-$ against internal pair conversion for m_{X^0} = 1.7 MeV and $\tau_{X^0} < 10^{-11}$ s. Similar limits are obtained for m_{X^0} = 1.3–3.2 MeV. The spin parity of X^0 must be either 0^+ or 1^-. The limit at 1.7 MeV is translated into a limit for the X^0-nucleon coupling constant: $g^2_{X^0 NN}/4\pi < 2.3 \times 10^{-9}$.

[12] The DOEHNER 88 limit is for m_{A^0} = 1.7 MeV, $\tau(A^0) < 10^{-10}$ s. Limits less than 10^{-4} are obtained for m_{A^0} = 1.2–2.2 MeV.

[13] SAVAGE 88 looked for A^0 that decays into $e^+ e^-$ in the decay of the 9.17 MeV $J^P = 2^+$ state in ^{14}N, 17.64 MeV state $J^P = 1^+$ in ^{8}Be, and the 18.15 MeV state $J^P = 1^+$ in ^{8}Be. This experiment constrains the isovector coupling of A^0 to hadrons, if m_{A^0} = (1.1 $\rightarrow$ 2.2) MeV and the isoscalar coupling of A^0 to hadrons, if m_{A^0} = (1.1 $\rightarrow$ 2.6) MeV. Both limits are valid only if $\tau(A^0) \lesssim 1 \times 10^{-11}$ s.

[14] Limits are for $\Gamma(A^0(1.8\text{ MeV}))/\Gamma(\pi M1)$; i.e., for 1.8 MeV axion emission normalized to the rate for internal emission of $e^+ e^-$ pairs. Valid for $\tau_{A^0} < 2 \times 10^{-11}$s. ^{6}Li isovector decay data strongly disfavor PECCEI 86 model I, whereas the ^{10}B and ^{14}N isoscalar decay data strongly reject PECCEI 86 model II and III.

[15] SAVAGE 86B looked for A^0 that decays into $e^+ e^-$ in the decay of the 9.17 MeV $J^P = 2^+$ state in ^{14}N. Limit on the branching fraction is valid if $\tau_{A^0} \lesssim 1. \times 10^{-11}$s for m_{A^0} = (1.1–1.7) MeV. This experiment constrains the iso-vector coupling of A^0 to hadrons.

[16] ANANEV 85 with IBR-2 pulsed reactor exclude standard A^0 at CL = 95% masses below 470 keV (Li* decay) and below $2m_e$ for deuteron* decay.

[17] CAVAIGNAC 83 at Bugey reactor exclude axion at any $m_{^{97}\text{Nb}^*\text{decay}}$ and axion with m_{A^0} between 275 and 288 keV (deuteron* decay).

[18] ALEKSEEV 82 with IBR-2 pulsed reactor exclude standard A^0 at CL = 95% mass-ranges m_{A^0} <400 keV (Li* decay) and 330 keV $< m_{A^0} <$2.2 MeV. (deuteron* decay).

[19] LEHMANN 82 obtained $A^0 \rightarrow 2\gamma$ rate $< 6.2 \times 10^{-5}$/s (CL = 95%) excluding m_{A^0} between 100 and 1000 keV.

[20] ZEHNDER 82 used Gosgen 2.8GW light-water reactor to check A^0 production. No 2γ peak in Li*, Nb* decay (both single p transition) nor in n capture (combined with previous Ba* negative result) rules out standard A^0. Set limit m_{A^0} <60 keV for any A^0.

[21] ZEHNDER 81 looked for $\mathrm{Ba}^* \to A^0\,\mathrm{Ba}$ transition with $A^0 \to 2\gamma$. Obtained 2γ coincidence rate $< 2.2 \times 10^{-5}$/s (CL = 95%) excluding m_{A^0} >160 keV (or 200 keV depending on Higgs mixing). However, see BARROSO 81.

[22] CALAPRICE 79 saw no axion emission from excited states of carbon. Sensitive to axion mass between 1 and 15 MeV.

A^0 (Axion) Limits from Its Electron Coupling

Limits are for $\tau(A^0 \to e^+ e^-)$.

VALUE (s)	CL%	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •					
none 4×10^{-16}–4.5×10^{-12}	90	[1] BROSS	91	BDMP	$e N \to e A^0 N$ $(A^0 \to e e)$
		[2] GUO	90	BDMP	$e N \to e A^0 N$ $(A^0 \to e e)$
		[3] BJORKEN	88	CALO	$A \to e^+ e^-$ or 2γ
		[4] BLINOV	88	MD1	$e e \to e e A^0$ $(A^0 \to e e)$
none 1×10^{-14}–1×10^{-10}	90	[5] RIORDAN	87	BDMP	$e N \to e A^0 N$ $(A^0 \to e e)$
none 1×10^{-14}–1×10^{-11}	90	[6] BROWN	86	BDMP	$e N \to e A^0 N$ $(A^0 \to e e)$
none 6×10^{-14}–9×10^{-11}	95	[7] DAVIER	86	BDMP	$e N \to e A^0 N$ $(A^0 \to e e)$
none 3×10^{-13}–1×10^{-7}	90	[8] KONAKA	86	BDMP	$e N \to e A^0 N$ $(A^0 \to e e)$

[1] The listed BROSS 91 limit is for $m_{A^0} = 1.14$ MeV. $\mathrm{B}(A^0 \to e^+ e^-) = 1$ assumed. Excluded domain in the τ_{A^0}–m_{A^0} plane extends up to $m_{A^0} \approx 7$ MeV (see Fig. 5). Combining with electron $g-2$ constraint, axions coupling only to $e^+ e^-$ ruled out for $m_{A^0} < 4.8$ MeV (90% CL).

[2] GUO 90 use the same apparatus as BROWN 86 and improve the previous limit in the shorter lifetime region. Combined with $g-2$ constraint, axions coupling only to $e^+ e^-$ are ruled out for $m_{A^0} < 2.7$ MeV (90% CL).

[3] BJORKEN 88 reports limits on axion parameters (f_A, m_A, τ_A) for $m_{A^0} < 200$ MeV from electron beam-dump experiment with production via Primakoff photoproduction, bremsstrahlung from electrons, and resonant annihilation of positrons on atomic electrons.

[4] BLINOV 88 assume zero spin, $m = 1.8$ MeV and lifetime $< 5 \times 10^{-12}$ s and find $\Gamma(A^0 \to \gamma\gamma)\mathrm{B}(A^0 \to e^+ e^-) < 2$ eV (CL=90%).

[5] Assumes $A^0 \gamma\gamma$ coupling is small and hence Primakoff production is small. Their figure 2 shows limits on axions for $m_{A^0} < 15$ MeV.

[6] Uses electrons in hadronic showers from an incident 800 GeV proton beam. Limits for $m_{A^0} < 15$ MeV are shown in their figure 3.

[7] $m_{A^0} = 1.8$ MeV assumed. The excluded domain in the $\tau_{A^0}-m_{A^0}$ plane extends up to $m_{A^0} \approx 14$ MeV, see their figure 4.

[8] The limits are obtained from their figure 3. Also given is the limit on the $A^0\gamma\gamma$–$A^0 e^+ e^-$ coupling plane by assuming Primakoff production.

Search for A^0 (Axion) Resonance in Bhabha Scattering

The limit is for $\Gamma(A^0)[B(A^0 \to e^+ e^-)]^2$.

VALUE (10^{-3} eV)	CL%	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •					
< 1.3	97	[1] HALLIN	92	CNTR	m_{A^0} = 1.75–1.88 MeV
none 0.0016–0.47	90	[2] HENDERSON	92C	CNTR	m_{A^0}= 1.5–1.86 MeV
< 2.0	90	[3] WU	92	CNTR	m_{A^0}= 1.56–1.86 MeV
< 0.013	95	TSERTOS	91	CNTR	m_{A^0} = 1.832 MeV
none 0.19–3.3	95	[4] WIDMANN	91	CNTR	m_{A^0}= 1.78–1.92 MeV
< 5	97	BAUER	90	CNTR	m_{A^0} = 1.832 MeV
none 0.09–1.5	95	[5] JUDGE	90	CNTR	m_{A^0} = 1.832 MeV, elastic
< 1.9	97	[6] TSERTOS	89	CNTR	m_{A^0} = 1.82 MeV
<(10–40)	97	[6] TSERTOS	89	CNTR	m_{A^0} = 1.51–1.65 MeV
<(1–2.5)	97	[6] TSERTOS	89	CNTR	m_{A^0} = 1.80–1.86 MeV
< 31	95	LORENZ	88	CNTR	m_{A^0} = 1.646 MeV
< 94	95	LORENZ	88	CNTR	m_{A^0} = 1.726 MeV
< 23	95	LORENZ	88	CNTR	m_{A^0} = 1.782 MeV
< 19	95	LORENZ	88	CNTR	m_{A^0} = 1.837 MeV
< 3.8	97	[7] TSERTOS	88	CNTR	m_{A^0} = 1.832 MeV
		[8] VANKLINKEN	88	CNTR	
		[9] MAIER	87	CNTR	
<2500	90	MILLS	87	CNTR	m_{A^0} = 1.8 MeV
		[10] VONWIMMER...	87	CNTR	

[1] HALLIN 92 quote limits on lifetime, $8 \times 10^{-14} - 5 \times 10^{-13}$ sec depending on mass, assuming $B(A^0 \to e^+ e^-) = 100\%$. They say that TSERTOS 91 overstated their sensitivity by a factor of 3.

[2] HENDERSON 92C exclude axion with lifetime τ_{A^0}=$1.4 \times 10^{-12} - 4.0 \times 10^{-10}$ s, assuming $B(A^0 \to e^+ e^-)$=100%. HENDERSON 92C also exclude a vector boson with τ=$1.4 \times 10^{-12} - 6.0 \times 10^{-10}$ s.

[3] WU 92 quote limits on lifetime $> 3.3 \times 10^{-13}$ s assuming $B(A^0 \to e^+ e^-)$=100%. They say that TSERTOS 89 overestimate the limit by a factor of $\pi/2$. WU 92 also quote a bound for vector boson, $\tau > 8.2 \times 10^{-13}$ s.

[4] WIDMANN 91 bound applies exclusively to the case $B(A^0 \to e^+ e^-)$=1, since the detection efficiency varies substantially as $\Gamma(A^0)_{\text{total}}$ changes. See their Fig. 6.

[5] JUDGE 90 excludes an elastic pseudoscalar $e^+ e^-$ resonance for 4.5×10^{-13} s $< \tau(A^0) < 7.5 \times 10^{-12}$ s (95% CL) at m_{A^0} = 1.832 MeV. Comparable limits can be set for m_{A^0} = 1.776–1.856 MeV.

[6] See also TSERTOS 88B in references.

[7] The upper limit listed in TSERTOS 88 is too large by a factor of 4. See TSERTOS 88B, footnote 3.

[8] VANKLINKEN 88 looked for relatively long-lived resonance ($\tau = 10^{-10}$–10^{-12} s). The sensitivity is not sufficient to exclude such a narrow resonance.

[9] MAIER 87 obtained limits $R\Gamma \lesssim$ 60 eV (100 eV) at $m_{A^0} \simeq$ 1.64 MeV (1.83 MeV) for energy resolution $\Delta E_{\text{cm}} \simeq$ 3 keV, where R is the resonance cross section normalized to that of Bhabha scattering, and $\Gamma = \Gamma^2_{ee}/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$. For a discussion implying that $\Delta E_{\text{cm}} \simeq$ 10 keV, see TSERTOS 89.

[10] VONWIMMERSPERG 87 measured Bhabha scattering for $E_{\rm cm}$ = 1.37–1.86 MeV and found a possible peak at 1.73 with $\int \sigma dE_{\rm cm}$ = 14.5 ± 6.8 keV·b. For a comment and a reply, see VANKLINKEN 88B and VONWIMMERSPERG 88. Also see CONNELL 88.

Search for A^0 (Axion) Resonance in $e^+ e^- \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$

The limit is for $\Gamma(A^0 \rightarrow e^+ e^-)\cdot\Gamma(A^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma)/\Gamma_{\rm total}$

VALUE (10^{-3} eV)	*CL%*	*DOCUMENT ID*		*TECN*	*COMMENT*
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •					
< 0.18	95	VO	94	CNTR	m_{A^0}=1.1 MeV
< 1.5	95	VO	94	CNTR	m_{A^0}=1.4 MeV
<12	95	VO	94	CNTR	m_{A^0}=1.7 MeV
< 6.6	95	[1] TRZASKA	91	CNTR	m_{A^0} = 1.8 MeV
< 4.4	95	WIDMANN	91	CNTR	m_{A^0}= 1.78–1.92 MeV
		[2] FOX	89	CNTR	
< 0.11	95	[3] MINOWA	89	CNTR	m_{A^0} = 1.062 MeV
<33	97	CONNELL	88	CNTR	m_{A^0} = 1.580 MeV
<42	97	CONNELL	88	CNTR	m_{A^0} = 1.642 MeV
<73	97	CONNELL	88	CNTR	m_{A^0} = 1.782 MeV
<79	97	CONNELL	88	CNTR	m_{A^0} = 1.832 MeV

[1] TRZASKA 91 also give limits in the range (6.6–30) × 10^{-3} eV (95%CL) for m_{A^0} = 1.6–2.0 MeV.

[2] FOX 89 measured positron annihilation with an electron in the source material into two photons and found no signal at 1.062 MeV (< 9×10^{-5} of two-photon annihilation at rest).

[3] Similar limits are obtained for m_{A^0} = 1.045–1.085 MeV.

Search for X^0 (Light Boson) Resonance in $e^+ e^- \rightarrow \gamma\gamma\gamma$

The limit is for $\Gamma(X^0 \rightarrow e^+ e^-)\cdot\Gamma(X^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma\gamma)/\Gamma_{\rm total}$. C invariance forbids spin-0 X^0 coupling to both $e^+ e^-$ and $\gamma\gamma\gamma$.

VALUE (10^{-3} eV)	*CL%*	*DOCUMENT ID*		*TECN*	*COMMENT*
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •					
< 0.2	95	[1] VO	94	CNTR	m_{X^0}=1.1–1.9 MeV
< 1.0	95	[2] VO	94	CNTR	m_{X^0}=1.1 MeV
< 2.5	95	[2] VO	94	CNTR	m_{X^0}=1.4 MeV
<120	95	[2] VO	94	CNTR	m_{X^0}=1.7 MeV
< 3.8	95	[3] SKALSEY	92	CNTR	m_{X^0}= 1.5 MeV

[1] VO 94 looked for $X^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma\gamma$ decaying at rest. The precise limits depend on m_{X^0}. See Fig. 2(b) in paper.

[2] VO 94 looked for $X^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma\gamma$ decaying in flight.

[3] SKALSEY 92 also give limits 4.3 for m_{X^0} = 1.54 and 7.5 for 1.64 MeV. The spin of X^0 is assumed to be one.

Light Boson (X^0) Search in Nonresonant $e^+ e^-$ Annihilation at Rest

Limits are for the ratio of $n\gamma +\ X^0$ production relative to $\gamma\gamma$.

VALUE (units 10^{-6})	CL%	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •					
$<$ 4.2	90	[1] MITSUI	96	CNTR	γX^0
$<$ 4	68	[2] SKALSEY	95	CNTR	γX^0
$<$40	68	[3] SKALSEY	95	RVUE	γX^0
$<$ 0.18	90	[4] ADACHI	94	CNTR	$\gamma\gamma X^0$, $X^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$
$<$ 0.26	90	[5] ADACHI	94	CNTR	$\gamma\gamma X^0$, $X^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$
$<$ 0.33	90	[6] ADACHI	94	CNTR	γX^0, $X^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma\gamma$

[1] MITSUI 96 looked for a monochromatic γ. The bound applies for a vector X^0 with $C=-1$ and m_{X^0} <200 keV. They derive an upper bound on eeX^0 coupling and hence on the branching ratio B(o-Ps $\rightarrow\ \gamma\gamma X^0$)$< 6.2 \times 10^{-6}$. The bounds weaken for heavier X^0.

[2] SKALSEY 95 looked for a monochromatic γ without an accompanying γ in $e^+ e^-$ annihilation. The bound applies for scalar and vector X^0 with $C = -1$ and m_{X^0} = 100–1000 keV.

[3] SKALSEY 95 reinterpreted the bound on γA^0 decay of o-Ps by ASAI 91 where 3% of delayed annihilations are not from $^3S_1$ states. The bound applies for scalar and vector X^0 with $C = -1$ and m_{X^0} = 0–800 keV.

[4] ADACHI 94 looked for a peak in the $\gamma\gamma$ invariant mass distribution in $\gamma\gamma\gamma\gamma$ production from $e^+ e^-$ annihilation. The bound applies for m_{X^0} = 70–800 keV.

[5] ADACHI 94 looked for a peak in the missing-mass mass distribution in $\gamma\gamma$ channel, using $\gamma\gamma\gamma\gamma$ production from $e^+ e^-$ annihilation. The bound applies for m_{X^0} <800 keV.

[6] ADACHI 94 looked for a peak in the missing mass distribution in $\gamma\gamma\gamma$ channel, using $\gamma\gamma\gamma\gamma$ production from $e^+ e^-$ annihilation. The bound applies for m_{X^0} = 200–900 keV.

Searches for Goldstone Bosons (X^0)

(Including Horizontal Bosons and Majorons.) Limits are for branching ratios.

VALUE	CL%	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •					
$<9 \quad \times 10^{-6}$	90	[1] AGUILAR-AR...	20	PIEN	$\mu^+ \rightarrow\ e^+ X^0$, Familon
$<7 \quad \times 10^{-12}$	90	[2] BALDINI	20	MEG	$\mu^+ \rightarrow\ e^+ X^0$ ($X^0 \rightarrow\ \gamma\gamma$), Familon
$<9 \quad \times 10^{-6}$	90	[3] BAYES	15	TWST	$\mu^+ \rightarrow\ e^+ X^0$, Familon
		[4] LATTANZI	13	COSM	Majoron dark matter decay
		[5] LESSA	07	RVUE	Meson, ℓ decays to Majoron
		[6] DIAZ	98	THEO	$H^0 \rightarrow\ X^0 X^0$, $A^0 \rightarrow X^0 X^0 X^0$, Majoron
		[7] BOBRAKOV	91		Electron quasi-magnetic interaction
$<3.3 \times 10^{-2}$	95	[8] ALBRECHT	90E	ARG	$\tau \rightarrow\ \mu X^0$. Familon
$<1.8 \times 10^{-2}$	95	[8] ALBRECHT	90E	ARG	$\tau \rightarrow\ e X^0$. Familon
$<6.4 \times 10^{-9}$	90	[9] ATIYA	90	B787	$K^+ \rightarrow\ \pi^+ X^0$. Familon
$<1.4 \times 10^{-5}$	90	[10] BALKE	88	CNTR	$\mu^+ \rightarrow\ e^+ X^0$. Familon
$<1.1 \times 10^{-9}$	90	[11] BOLTON	88	CBOX	$\mu^+ \rightarrow\ e^+ \gamma X^0$. Familon
		[12] CHANDA	88	ASTR	Sun, Majoron

		[13] CHOI	88	ASTR	Majoron, SN 1987A
$<5 \times 10^{-6}$	90	[14] PICCIOTTO	88	CNTR	$\pi \rightarrow e\nu X^0$, Majoron
$<1.3 \times 10^{-9}$	90	[15] GOLDMAN	87	CNTR	$\mu \rightarrow e\gamma X^0$. Familon
$<3 \times 10^{-4}$	90	[16] BRYMAN	86B	RVUE	$\mu \rightarrow eX^0$. Familon
$<1 \times 10^{-10}$	90	[17] EICHLER	86	SPEC	$\mu^+ \rightarrow e^+ X^0$. Familon
$<2.6 \times 10^{-6}$	90	[18] JODIDIO	86	SPEC	$\mu^+ \rightarrow e^+ X^0$. Familon
		[19] BALTRUSAIT...	85	MRK3	$\tau \rightarrow \ell X^0$. Familon
		[20] DICUS	83	COSM	ν(hvy) $\rightarrow \nu$(light) X^0

[1] AGUILAR-AREVALO 20 obtained limits of order 10^{-5} for m_{X^0} = 47.8–95.1 MeV. The quoted limit applies to m_{X^0} = 75 MeV. See their Fig. 1 for mass-dependent limits.

[2] BALDINI 20 obtained limits for m_{X^0} = 20–45 MeV and $\tau_{X^0} <$ 40 ps, and supersedes BOLTON 88 for m_{X^0} = 20–40 MeV. See their Fig. 17 for mass-dependent limits.

[3] BAYES 15 limits are the average over m_{X^0} = 13–80 MeV for the isotropic decay distribution of positrons. See their Fig. 4 and Table II for the mass-dependent limits as well as the dependence on the decay anisotropy. In particular, they find a limit $< 58 \times 10^{-6}$ at 90% CL for massless familons and for the same asymmetry as normal muon decay, a case not covered by JODIDIO 86.

[4] LATTANZI 13 use WMAP 9 year data as well as X-ray and γ-ray observations to derive limits on decaying majoron dark matter. A limit on the decay width $\Gamma(X^0 \rightarrow \nu\overline{\nu})$ $< 6.4 \times 10^{-19}$ s^{-1} at 95% CL is found if majorons make up all of the dark matter.

[5] LESSA 07 consider decays of the form Meson $\rightarrow \ell\nu$Majoron and $\ell \rightarrow \ell' \nu\overline{\nu}$Majoron and use existing data to derive limits on the neutrino-Majoron Yukawa couplings $g_{\alpha\beta}$ (α,β=e,μ,τ). Their best limits are $|g_{e\alpha}|^2 < 5.5 \times 10^{-6}$, $|g_{\mu\alpha}|^2 < 4.5 \times 10^{-5}$, $|g_{\tau\alpha}|^2 < 5.5 \times 10^{-2}$ at CL = 90%.

[6] DIAZ 98 studied models of spontaneously broken lepton number with both singlet and triplet Higgses. They obtain limits on the parameter space from invisible decay $Z \rightarrow H^0 A^0 \rightarrow X^0 X^0 X^0 X^0 X^0$ and $e^+ e^- \rightarrow Z H^0$ with $H^0 \rightarrow X^0 X^0$.

[7] BOBRAKOV 91 searched for anomalous magnetic interactions between polarized electrons expected from the exchange of a massless pseudoscalar boson (arion). A limit $x_e^2 < 2 \times 10^{-4}$ (95%CL) is found for the effective anomalous magneton parametrized as $x_e (G_F/8\pi\sqrt{2})^{1/2}$.

[8] ALBRECHT 90E limits are for B($\tau \rightarrow \ell X^0$)/B($\tau \rightarrow \ell\nu\overline{\nu}$). Valid for $m_{X^0} <$ 100 MeV. The limits rise to 7.1% (for μ), 5.0% (for e) for m_{X^0} = 500 MeV.

[9] ATIYA 90 limit is for m_{X^0} = 0. The limit B $< 1 \times 10^{-8}$ holds for $m_{X^0} <$ 95 MeV. For the reduction of the limit due to finite lifetime of X^0, see their Fig. 3.

[10] BALKE 88 limits are for B($\mu^+ \rightarrow e^+ X^0$). Valid for $m_{X^0} <$ 80 MeV and $\tau_{X^0} > 10^{-8}$ sec.

[11] BOLTON 88 limit corresponds to $F > 3.1 \times 10^9$ GeV, which does not depend on the chirality property of the coupling.

[12] CHANDA 88 find $v_T <$ 10 MeV for the weak-triplet Higgs vacuum expectation value in Gelmini-Roncadelli model, and $v_S > 5.8 \times 10^6$ GeV in the singlet Majoron model.

[13] CHOI 88 used the observed neutrino flux from the supernova SN 1987A to exclude the neutrino Majoron Yukawa coupling h in the range $2 \times 10^{-5} < h < 3 \times 10^{-4}$ for the interaction $L_{\text{int}} = \frac{1}{2} i h \overline{\psi}^c_\nu \gamma_5 \psi_\nu \phi_X$. For several families of neutrinos, the limit applies for $(\Sigma h_i^4)^{1/4}$.

[14] PICCIOTTO 88 limit applies when $m_{X^0} <$ 55 MeV and $\tau_{X^0} >$ 2ns, and it decreases to 4×10^{-7} at m_{X^0} = 125 MeV, beyond which no limit is obtained.

[15] GOLDMAN 87 limit corresponds to $F > 2.9 \times 10^9$ GeV for the family symmetry breaking scale from the Lagrangian $L_{\rm int} = (1/F)\overline{\psi}_\mu \gamma^\mu\ (a+b\gamma_5)\ \psi_e \partial_\mu \phi_{X^0}$ with $a^2+b^2 = 1$. This is not as sensitive as the limit $F > 9.9 \times 10^9$ GeV derived from the search for $\mu^+ \rightarrow e^+ X^0$ by JODIDIO 86, but does not depend on the chirality property of the coupling.

[16] Limits are for $\Gamma(\mu \rightarrow e X^0)/\Gamma(\mu \rightarrow e \nu \overline{\nu})$. Valid when m_{X^0} = 0–93.4, 98.1–103.5 MeV.

[17] EICHLER 86 looked for $\mu^+ \rightarrow e^+ X^0$ followed by $X^0 \rightarrow e^+ e^-$. Limits on the branching fraction depend on the mass and and lifetime of X^0. The quoted limits are valid when $\tau_{X^0} \lesssim 3. \times 10^{-10}$ s if the decays are kinematically allowed.

[18] JODIDIO 86 corresponds to $F > 9.9 \times 10^9$ GeV for the family symmetry breaking scale with the parity-conserving effective Lagrangian $L_{\rm int} = (1/F)\ \overline{\psi}_\mu \gamma^\mu \psi_e \partial^\mu \phi_{X^0}$.

[19] BALTRUSAITIS 85 search for light Goldstone boson(X^0) of broken U(1). CL = 95% limits are $B(\tau \rightarrow \mu^+ X^0)/B(\tau \rightarrow \mu^+ \nu \nu) < 0.125$ and $B(\tau \rightarrow e^+ X^0)/B(\tau \rightarrow e^+ \nu \nu) < 0.04$. Inferred limit for the symmetry breaking scale is $m >$3000 TeV.

[20] The primordial heavy neutrino must decay into ν and familon, f_A, early so that the red-shifted decay products are below critical density, see their table. In addition, $K \rightarrow \pi f_A$ and $\mu \rightarrow e f_A$ are unseen. Combining these excludes $m_{\rm heavy\nu}$ between 5×10^{-5} and 5×10^{-4} MeV (μ decay) and $m_{\rm heavy\nu}$ between 5×10^{-5} and 0.1 MeV (K-decay).

Majoron Searches in Neutrinoless Double β Decay

Limits are for the half-life of neutrinoless $\beta\beta$ decay with a Majoron emission.
No experiment currently claims any such evidence. Only the best or comparable limits for each isotope are reported.

$t_{1/2}(10^{21}$ yr)	CL%	ISOTOPE	TRANSITION	METHOD	DOCUMENT ID	
>7200	**90**	**^{128}Te**		**CNTR**	[1] BERNATOW...	92
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •						
> 4.4	90	^{100}Mo	$0\nu1\chi$	NEMO-3	[2] ARNOLD	19
> 37	90	^{82}Se	$0\nu1\chi$	NEMO-3	[3] ARNOLD	18
> 420	90	^{76}Ge	$0\nu1\chi$	GERDA	[4] AGOSTINI	15A
> 400	90	^{100}Mo	$0\nu1\chi$	NEMO-3	[5] ARNOLD	15
>1200	90	^{136}Xe	$0\nu1\chi$	EXO-200	[6] ALBERT	14A
>2600	90	^{136}Xe	$0\nu1\chi$	KamLAND-Zen	[7] GANDO	12
> 16	90	^{130}Te	$0\nu1\chi$	NEMO-3	[8] ARNOLD	11
> 1.9	90	^{96}Zr	$2\nu1\chi$	NEMO-3	[9] ARGYRIADES	10
> 1.52	90	^{150}Nd	$0\nu1\chi$	NEMO-3	[10] ARGYRIADES	09
> 27	90	^{100}Mo	$0\nu1\chi$	NEMO-3	[11] ARNOLD	06
> 15	90	^{82}Se	$0\nu1\chi$	NEMO-3	[12] ARNOLD	06
> 14	90	^{100}Mo	$0\nu1\chi$	NEMO-3	[13] ARNOLD	04
> 12	90	^{82}Se	$0\nu1\chi$	NEMO-3	[14] ARNOLD	04
> 2.2	90	^{130}Te	$0\nu1\chi$	Cryog. det.	[15] ARNABOLDI	03
> 0.9	90	^{130}Te	$0\nu2\chi$	Cryog. det.	[16] ARNABOLDI	03
> 8	90	^{116}Cd	$0\nu1\chi$	$CdWO_4$ scint.	[17] DANEVICH	03
> 0.8	90	^{116}Cd	$0\nu2\chi$	$CdWO_4$ scint.	[18] DANEVICH	03
> 500	90	^{136}Xe	$0\nu1\chi$	Liquid Xe Scint.	[19] BERNABEI	02D
> 5.8	90	^{100}Mo	$0\nu1\chi$	ELEGANT V	[20] FUSHIMI	02

$>$ 0.32	90	^{100}Mo	$0\nu1\chi$	Liq. Ar ioniz.	[21] ASHITKOV	01
$>$ 0.0035	90	^{160}Gd	$0\nu1\chi$	^{160}Gd$_2$SiO$_5$:Ce	[22] DANEVICH	01
$>$ 0.013	90	^{160}Gd	$0\nu2\chi$	^{160}Gd$_2$SiO$_5$:Ce	[23] DANEVICH	01
$>$ 2.3	90	^{82}Se	$0\nu1\chi$	NEMO 2	[24] ARNOLD	00
$>$ 0.31	90	^{96}Zr	$0\nu1\chi$	NEMO 2	[25] ARNOLD	00
$>$ 0.63	90	^{82}Se	$0\nu2\chi$	NEMO 2	[26] ARNOLD	00
$>$ 0.063	90	^{96}Zr	$0\nu2\chi$	NEMO 2	[26] ARNOLD	00
$>$ 0.16	90	^{100}Mo	$0\nu2\chi$	NEMO 2	[26] ARNOLD	00
$>$ 2.4	90	^{82}Se	$0\nu1\chi$	NEMO 2	[27] ARNOLD	98
$>$ 7.2	90	^{136}Xe	$0\nu2\chi$	TPC	[28] LUESCHER	98
$>$ 7.91	90	^{76}Ge		SPEC	[29] GUENTHER	96
$>$ 17	90	^{76}Ge		CNTR	BECK	93

[1] BERNATOWICZ 92 studied double-β decays of ^{128}Te and ^{130}Te, and found the ratio $\tau(^{130}\text{Te})/\tau(^{128}\text{Te}) = (3.52 \pm 0.11) \times 10^{-4}$ in agreement with relatively stable theoretical predictions. The bound is based on the requirement that Majoron-emitting decay cannot be larger than the observed double-beta rate of ^{128}Te of $(7.7 \pm 0.4) \times 10^{24}$ year. We calculated 90% CL limit as $(7.7–1.28 \times 0.4=7.2) \times 10^{24}$.

[2] ARNOLD 19 uses the NEMO-3 tracking calorimeter to determine limits for the Majoron emitting double beta decay, with spectral index n = 3. The limit corresponds to the range of the g_{ee} coupling of 0.013–0.035; dependimg on the nuclear matrix elements used.

[3] ARNOLD 18 use the NEMO-3 tracking detector. The limit corresponds to $\langle g_{ee}\rangle <$ 3.2–8.0 $\times 10^{-5}$; the range corresponds to different nuclear matrix element calculations.

[4] AGOSTINI 15A analyze a 20.3 kg yr of data set of the GERDA calorimeter to determine $g_{\nu\chi} <$ 3.4–8.7 $\times 10^{-5}$ on the Majoron-neutrino coupling constant. The range reflects the spread of the nuclear matrix elements.

[5] ARNOLD 15 use the NEMO-3 tracking calorimeter with 3.43 kg yr exposure to determine the limit on Majoron emission. The limit corresponds to $g_{\nu\chi} <$ 1.6–3.0 $\times 10^{-4}$. The spread reflects different nuclear matrix elements. Supersedes ARNOLD 06.

[6] ALBERT 14A utilize 100 kg yr of exposure of the EXO-200 tracking calorimeter to place a limit on the $g_{\nu\chi} <$ 0.8–1.7 $\times 10^{-5}$ on the Majoron-neutrino coupling constant. The range reflects the spread of the nuclear matrix elements.

[7] GANDO 12 use the KamLAND-Zen detector to obtain the limit on the $0\nu\chi$ decay with Majoron emission. It implies that the coupling constant $g_{\nu\chi} <$ 0.8–1.6 $\times 10^{-5}$ depending on the nuclear matrix elements used.

[8] ARNOLD 11 use the NEMO-3 detector to obtain the reported limit on Majoron emission. It implies that the coupling constant $g_{\nu\chi} <$ 0.6–1.6 $\times 10^{-4}$ depending on the nuclear matrix element used. Supercedes ARNABOLDI 03.

[9] ARGYRIADES 10 use the NEMO-3 tracking detector and ^{96}Zr to derive the reported limit. No limit for the Majoron electron coupling is given.

[10] ARGYRIADES 09 use ^{150}Nd data taken with the NEMO-3 tracking detector. The reported limit corresponds to $\langle g_{\nu\chi}\rangle <$ 1.7–3.0 $\times 10^{-4}$ using a range of nuclear matrix elements that include the effect of nuclear deformation.

[11] ARNOLD 06 use ^{100}Mo data taken with the NEMO-3 tracking detector. The reported limit corresponds to $\langle g_{\nu\chi}\rangle <$ (0.4–1.8) $\times 10^{-4}$ using a range of matrix element calculations. Superseded by ARNOLD 15.

[12] NEMO-3 tracking calorimeter is used in ARNOLD 06 . Reported half-life limit for ^{82}Se corresponds to $\langle g_{\nu\chi}\rangle <$ (0.66–1.9) $\times 10^{-4}$ using a range of matrix element calculations. Supersedes ARNOLD 04.

[13] ARNOLD 04 use the NEMO-3 tracking detector. The limit corresponds to $\langle g_{\nu\chi}\rangle$ < (0.5–0.9)10^{-4} using the matrix elements of SIMKOVIC 99, STOICA 01 and CIVITARESE 03. Superseded by ARNOLD 06.

[14] ARNOLD 04 use the NEMO-3 tracking detector. The limit corresponds to $\langle g_{\nu\chi}\rangle$ < (0.7–1.6)10^{-4} using the matrix elements of SIMKOVIC 99, STOICA 01 and CIVITARESE 03.

[15] Supersedes ALESSANDRELLO 00. Array of TeO_2 crystals in high resolution cryogenic calorimeter. Some enriched in ^{130}Te. Derive $\langle g_{\nu\chi}\rangle$ < 17–33 $\times 10^{-5}$ depending on matrix element.

[16] Supersedes ALESSANDRELLO 00. Cryogenic calorimeter search.

[17] Limit for the $0\nu\chi$ decay with Majoron emission of ^{116}Cd using enriched $CdWO_4$ scintillators. $\langle g_{\nu\chi}\rangle$ < 4.6–8.1 $\times 10^{-5}$ depending on the matrix element. Supersedes DANEVICH 00.

[18] Limit for the $0\nu 2\chi$ decay of ^{116}Cd. Supersedes DANEVICH 00.

[19] BERNABEI 02D obtain limit for $0\nu\chi$ decay with Majoron emission of ^{136}Xe using liquid Xe scintillation detector. They derive $\langle g_{\nu\chi}\rangle$ < 2.0–3.0 $\times 10^{-5}$ with several nuclear matrix elements.

[20] Replaces TANAKA 93. FUSHIMI 02 derive half-life limit for the $0\nu\chi$ decay by means of tracking calorimeter ELEGANT V. Considering various matrix element calculations, a range of limits for the Majoron-neutrino coupling is given: $\langle g_{\nu\chi}\rangle$ <(6.3–360) $\times 10^{-5}$.

[21] ASHITKOV 01 result for $0\nu\chi$ of ^{100}Mo is less stringent than ARNOLD 00.

[22] DANEVICH 01 obtain limit for the $0\nu\chi$ decay with Majoron emission of ^{160}Gd using Gd_2SiO_5:Ce crystal scintillators.

[23] DANEVICH 01 obtain limit for the $0\nu 2\chi$ decay with 2 Majoron emission of ^{160}Gd.

[24] ARNOLD 00 reports limit for the $0\nu\chi$ decay with Majoron emission derived from tracking calorimeter NEMO 2. Using ^{82}Se source: $\langle g_{\nu\chi}\rangle < 1.6 \times 10^{-4}$. Matrix element from GUENTHER 96.

[25] Using ^{96}Zr source: $\langle g_{\nu\chi}\rangle < 2.6 \times 10^{-4}$. Matrix element from ARNOLD 99.

[26] ARNOLD 00 reports limit for the $0\nu 2\chi$ decay with two Majoron emission derived from tracking calorimeter NEMO 2.

[27] ARNOLD 98 determine the limit for $0\nu_\chi$ decay with Majoron emission of ^{82}Se using the NEMO-2 tracking detector. They derive $\langle g_{\nu_\chi}\rangle < 2.3$–$4.3 \times 10^{-4}$ with several nuclear matrix elements.

[28] LUESCHER 98 report a limit for the 0ν decay with Majoron emission of ^{136}Xe using Xe TPC. This result is more stringent than BARABASH 89. Using the matrix elements of ENGEL 88, they obtain a limit on $\langle g_{\nu\chi}\rangle$ of 2.0×10^{-4}.

[29] See Table 1 in GUENTHER 96 for limits on the Majoron coupling in different models.

Invisible A^0 (Axion) MASS LIMITS from Astrophysics and Cosmology

$v_1 = v_2$ is usually assumed (v_i = vacuum expectation values). For a review of these limits, see RAFFELT 91 and TURNER 90. In the comment lines below, D and K refer to DFSZ and KSVZ axion types, discussed in the above minireview.

VALUE (eV)	CL%	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •					
$> 2 \times 10^{-17}$		[1] IRSIC	20	COSM	Isocurvature fluctuations
		[2] PODDAR	20	ASTR	Compact binary systems
$> 2.1 \times 10^{-21}$		[3] SCHUTZ	20	COSM	Fuzzy DM
none 6.4–8.0×10^{-13}	95	[4] SUN	20	ASTR	BH superradiance
none 2.9–4.6×10^{-21}		[5] DAVOUDIASL	19	ASTR	BH superradiance

none 10^{-21}–6×10^{-20}		[6] MARSH	19	ASTR	Fuzzy DM
none 1.1–4×10^{-13}	95	[7] PALOMBA	19	ASTR	BH superradiance
$<$ 0.06		[8] CHANG	18	ASTR	K, SN 1987A
$<$ 0.67	95	[9] ARCHIDIACO...	13A	COSM	K, hot dark matter
none 0.7–3×10^{5}		[10] CADAMURO	11	COSM	D abundance
$<$105	90	[11] DERBIN	11A	CNTR	D, solar axion
		[12] ANDRIAMON...	10	CAST	K, solar axions
$<$ 0.72	95	[13] HANNESTAD	10	COSM	K, hot dark matter
		[14] ANDRIAMON...	09	CAST	K, solar axions
$<$191	90	[15] DERBIN	09A	CNTR	K, solar axions
$<$334	95	[16] KEKEZ	09	HPGE	K, solar axions
$<$ 1.02	95	[17] HANNESTAD	08	COSM	K, hot dark matter
$<$ 1.2	95	[18] HANNESTAD	07	COSM	K, hot dark matter
$<$ 0.42	95	[19] MELCHIORRI	07A	COSM	K, hot dark matter
$<$ 1.05	95	[20] HANNESTAD	05A	COSM	K, hot dark matter
3 to 20		[21] MOROI	98	COSM	K, hot dark matter
$<$ 0.007		[22] BORISOV	97	ASTR	D, neutron star
$<$ 4		[23] KACHELRIESS	97	ASTR	D, neutron star cooling
$<(0.5$–$6)\times10^{-3}$		[24] KEIL	97	ASTR	SN 1987A
$<$ 0.018		[25] RAFFELT	95	ASTR	D, red giant
$<$ 0.010		[26] ALTHERR	94	ASTR	D, red giants, white dwarfs
		[27] CHANG	93	ASTR	K, SN 1987A
$<$ 0.01		WANG	92	ASTR	D, white dwarf
$<$ 0.03		WANG	92C	ASTR	D, C-O burning
none 3–8		[28] BERSHADY	91	ASTR	D, K, intergalactic light
$<$ 10		[29] KIM	91C	COSM	D, K, mass density of the universe, supersymmetry
		[30] RAFFELT	91B	ASTR	D,K, SN 1987A
$<$ 1 $\times10^{-3}$		[31] RESSELL	91	ASTR	K, intergalactic light
none 10^{-3}–3		BURROWS	90	ASTR	D,K, SN 1987A
		[32] ENGEL	90	ASTR	D,K, SN 1987A
$<$ 0.02		[33] RAFFELT	90D	ASTR	D, red giant
$<$ 1 $\times10^{-3}$		[34] BURROWS	89	ASTR	D,K, SN 1987A
$<(1.4$–$10)\times10^{-3}$		[35] ERICSON	89	ASTR	D,K, SN 1987A
$<$ 3.6 $\times10^{-4}$		[36] MAYLE	89	ASTR	D,K, SN 1987A
$<$ 12		CHANDA	88	ASTR	D, Sun
$<$ 1 $\times10^{-3}$		RAFFELT	88	ASTR	D,K, SN 1987A
		[37] RAFFELT	88B	ASTR	red giant
$<$ 0.07		FRIEMAN	87	ASTR	D, red giant
$<$ 0.7		[38] RAFFELT	87	ASTR	K, red giant
$<$ 2–5		TURNER	87	COSM	K, thermal production
$<$ 0.01		[39] DEARBORN	86	ASTR	D, red giant
$<$ 0.06		RAFFELT	86	ASTR	D, red giant
$<$ 0.7		[40] RAFFELT	86	ASTR	K, red giant
$<$ 0.03		RAFFELT	86B	ASTR	D, white dwarf
$<$ 1		[41] KAPLAN	85	ASTR	K, red giant
$<$ 0.003–0.02		IWAMOTO	84	ASTR	D, K, neutron star
$>$ 1 $\times10^{-5}$		ABBOTT	83	COSM	D,K, mass density of the universe

$>1\ \times 10^{-5}$		DINE	83	COSM	D,K, mass density of the universe
<0.04		ELLIS	83B	ASTR	D, red giant
$>1\ \times 10^{-5}$		PRESKILL	83	COSM	D,K, mass density of the universe
<0.1		BARROSO	82	ASTR	D, red giant
<1	42	FUKUGITA	82	ASTR	D, stellar cooling
<0.07		FUKUGITA	82B	ASTR	D, red giant

[1] IRSIC 20 used the Lyman-α forest constraint on small-scale isocurvature perturbation to derive limits on the axion mass and decay constant, assuming that the axion makes up all dark matter in the post-inflationary scenario. See their Fig. 1 for other astrophysical limits as well as the limits on the case of the temperature-dependent axion mass.

[2] PODDAR 20 used the observed decay in orbital period of four compact binary systems to derive a limit on the emission of axions with $m_{A^0} < 1 \times 10^{-19}$ eV, assuming they couple to nucleons and the strong CP phase vanishes at the potential minimum. They exclude $f_{A^0} \lesssim 10^{11}$ GeV for such axions.

[3] SCHUTZ 20 set a limit on fuzzy dark matter based on the existing limits for warm dark matter derived from the inferred subhalo mass function.

[4] SUN 20 look for quasimonochromatic gravitational waves emitted from boson clouds around the Cygnus X-1 black hole. The quoted limit assume the black hole age of 5×10^6 years. A mass range of 9.6–15.5 $\times 10^{-13}$ eV is disfavored when repeated induction of bosenova for string axions with decay constant $f_{A^0} \simeq 10^{15}$ GeV prevents the superradiance from being saturated.

[5] DAVOUDIASL 19 used the observed data of M87* by the Event Horizon Telescope to set the limit. A mass range of 0.85–4.6 $\times 10^{-21}$ eV is disfavored for a spin-1 boson.

[6] MARSH 19 considered heating of star clusters due to the stochastic oscillations of the core and granular quasiparticles in the outer halo. The limit was derived by requiring the survival of the old star cluster in Eridanus II, where the lower end is set by the validity of diffusion approximation. The effect of tidal stripping is also discussed for lower masses.

[7] PALOMBA 19 used the LIGO O2 dataset to derive limits on nearly monochromatic gravitational waves emitted by boson clouds formed around a stellar-mass black hole. They exclude boson masses in a range of 1.1×10^{-13} and 4×10^{-13} eV for high initial black hole spin, and 1.2×10^{-13} and 1.8×10^{-13} eV for moderate spin. See their Figs. 2 and 3 for limits based on various values of black hole initial spin, boson cloud age, and distance.

[8] CHANG 18 update axion bremsstrahlung emission rates in nucleon-nucleon collisions, shifting the excluded mass range to higher values. They rule out the hadronic axion with mass up to a few hundred eV, closing the hadronic axion window. See their Fig. 11 for results based on several different choices of the temperature and density profile of the proto-neutron star.

[9] ARCHIDIACONO 13A is analogous to HANNESTAD 05A. The limit is based on the CMB temperature power spectrum of the Planck data, the CMB polarization from the WMAP 9-yr data, the matter power spectrum from SDSS-DR7, and the local Hubble parameter measurement by the Carnegie Hubble program.

[10] CADAMURO 11 use the deuterium abundance to show that the m_{A^0} range 0.7 eV – 300 keV is excluded for axions, complementing HANNESTAD 10.

[11] DERBIN 11A look for solar axions produced by Compton and bremsstrahlung processes, in the resonant excitation of ^{169}Tm, constraining the axion-electron $\times$ axion nucleon couplings.

[12] ANDRIAMONJE 10 search for solar axions produced from ^{7}Li (478 keV) and D(p,γ)^{3}He (5.5 MeV) nuclear transitions. They show limits on the axion-photon coupling for two reference values of the axion-nucleon coupling for $m_A < 100$ eV.

[13] This is an update of HANNESTAD 08 including 7 years of WMAP data.

[14] ANDRIAMONJE 09 look for solar axions produced from the thermally excited 14.4 keV level of ^{57}Fe. They show limits on the axion-nucleon $\times$ axion-photon coupling assuming $m_A < 0.03$ eV.

[15] DERBIN 09A look for Primakoff-produced solar axions in the resonant excitation of ^{169}Tm, constraining the axion-photon $\times$ axion-nucleon couplings.

[16] KEKEZ 09 look at axio-electric effect of solar axions in HPGe detectors. The one-loop axion-electron coupling for hadronic axions is used.

[17] This is an update of HANNESTAD 07 including 5 years of WMAP data.

[18] This is an update of HANNESTAD 05A with new cosmological data, notably WMAP (3 years) and baryon acoustic oscillations (BAO). Lyman-α data are left out, in contrast to HANNESTAD 05A and MELCHIORRI 07A, because it is argued that systematic errors are large. It uses Bayesian statistics and marginalizes over a possible neutrino hot dark matter component.

[19] MELCHIORRI 07A is analogous to HANNESTAD 05A, with updated cosmological data, notably WMAP (3 years). Uses Bayesian statistics and marginalizes over a possible neutrino hot dark matter component. Leaving out Lyman-α data, a conservative limit is 1.4 eV.

[20] HANNESTAD 05A puts an upper limit on the mass of hadronic axion because in this mass range it would have been thermalized and contribute to the hot dark matter component of the universe. The limit is based on the CMB anisotropy from WMAP, SDSS large scale structure, Lyman α, and the prior Hubble parameter from HST Key Project. A χ^2 statistic is used. Neutrinos are assumed not to contribute to hot dark matter.

[21] MOROI 98 points out that a KSVZ axion of this mass range (see CHANG 93) can be a viable hot dark matter of Universe, as long as the model-dependent $g_{A\gamma}$ is accidentally small enough as originally emphasized by KAPLAN 85; see Fig. 1.

[22] BORISOV 97 bound is on the axion-electron coupling $g_{ae} < 1 \times 10^{-13}$ from the photo-production of axions off of magnetic fields in the outer layers of neutron stars.

[23] KACHELRIESS 97 bound is on the axion-electron coupling $g_{ae} < 1 \times 10^{-10}$ from the production of axions in strongly magnetized neutron stars. The authors also quote a stronger limit, $g_{ae} < 9 \times 10^{-13}$ which is strongly dependent on the strength of the magnetic field in white dwarfs.

[24] KEIL 97 uses new measurements of the axial-vector coupling strength of nucleons, as well as a reanalysis of many-body effects and pion-emission processes in the core of the neutron star, to update limits on the invisible-axion mass.

[25] RAFFELT 95 reexamined the constraints on axion emission from red giants due to the axion-electron coupling. They improve on DEARBORN 86 by taking into proper account degeneracy effects in the bremsstrahlung rate. The limit comes from requiring the red giant core mass at helium ignition not to exceed its standard value by more than 5% (0.025 solar masses).

[26] ALTHERR 94 bound is on the axion-electron coupling $g_{ae} < 1.5 \times 10^{-13}$, from energy loss via axion emission.

[27] CHANG 93 updates ENGEL 90 bound with the Kaplan-Manohar ambiguity in $z=m_u/m_d$ (see the Note on the Quark Masses in the Quark Particle Listings). It leaves the window $f_A=3\times10^5$–3×10^6 GeV open. The constraint from Big-Bang Nucleosynthesis is satisfied in this window as well.

[28] BERSHADY 91 searched for a line at wave length from 3100–8300 Å expected from 2γ decays of relic thermal axions in intergalactic light of three rich clusters of galaxies.

[29] KIM 91C argues that the bound from the mass density of the universe will change drastically for the supersymmetric models due to the entropy production of saxion (scalar component in the axionic chiral multiplet) decay. Note that it is an *upperbound* rather than a lowerbound.

[30] RAFFELT 91B argue that previous SN 1987A bounds must be relaxed due to corrections to nucleon bremsstrahlung processes.

[31] RESSELL 91 uses absence of any intracluster line emission to set limit.

[32] ENGEL 90 rule out $10^{-10} \lesssim g_{AN} \lesssim 10^{-3}$, which for a hadronic axion with EMC motivated axion-nucleon couplings corresponds to 2.5×10^{-3} eV $\lesssim m_{A^0} \lesssim 2.5 \times 10^4$ eV. The constraint is loose in the middle of the range, i.e. for $g_{AN} \sim 10^{-6}$.

[33] RAFFELT 90D is a re-analysis of DEARBORN 86.

[34] The region $m_{A^0} \gtrsim 2$ eV is also allowed.

[35] ERICSON 89 considered various nuclear corrections to axion emission in a supernova core, and found a reduction of the previous limit (MAYLE 88) by a large factor.

[36] MAYLE 89 limit based on naive quark model couplings of axion to nucleons. Limit based on couplings motivated by EMC measurements is 2–4 times weaker. The limit from axion-electron coupling is weak: see HATSUDA 88B.

[37] RAFFELT 88B derives a limit for the energy generation rate by exotic processes in helium-burning stars $\epsilon < 100$ erg g^{-1} s^{-1}, which gives a firmer basis for the axion limits based on red giant cooling.

[38] RAFFELT 87 also gives a limit $g_{A\gamma} < 1 \times 10^{-10}$ GeV^{-1}.

[39] DEARBORN 86 also gives a limit $g_{A\gamma} < 1.4 \times 10^{-11}$ GeV^{-1}.

[40] RAFFELT 86 gives a limit $g_{A\gamma} < 1.1\times10^{-10}$ GeV^{-1} from red giants and $< 2.4\times10^{-9}$ GeV^{-1} from the sun.

[41] KAPLAN 85 says $m_{A^0} < 23$ eV is allowed for a special choice of model parameters.

[42] FUKUGITA 82 gives a limit $g_{A\gamma} < 2.3 \times 10^{-10}$ GeV^{-1}.

Search for Relic Invisible Axions

Limits are for the dimensionless quantity $[G_{A\gamma\gamma}/m_{A^0}]^2\rho_A$ where $G_{A\gamma\gamma}$ denotes the axion two-photon coupling, $L_{\text{int}} = -\frac{G_{A\gamma\gamma}}{4}\phi_A F_{\mu\nu}\widetilde{F}^{\mu\nu} = G_{A\gamma\gamma}\phi_A \mathbf{E}\cdot\mathbf{B}$, and ρ_A is the axion energy density near the earth, unless otherwise stated. Notice that for QCD axions $G_{A\gamma\gamma}/m_{A^0}$ does not depend on m_{A^0}. For the reference values $m_{A^0} = 1\ \mu$eV, $G_{A\gamma\gamma} = 3.9 \times 10^{-16}$ GeV^{-1} (that would apply to KSVZ axions at that mass), and $\rho_A = 300$ MeV/cm^3 one finds $[G_{A\gamma\gamma}/m_{A^0}]^2\rho_A = 3.5 \times 10^{-43}$.

VALUE	CL%	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •					
$<1.6 \times 10^{-29}$	95	[1] DEVLIN	21	TRAP	$m_{A^0} = 2.7906$–2.7914 neV
$<1.9 \times 10^{-44}$	90	[2] BRAINE	20	ADMX	$m_{A^0} = 2.81$–$3.31\ \mu$eV
$<2 \times 10^{-35}$	90	[3] CRISOSTO	20	SLIC	$m_{A^0} = 180.07$–180.15 neV
$<4 \times 10^{-37}$	95	[4] DARLING	20A	ASTR	$m_{A^0} = 4.2$–$165.6\ \mu$eV
$<3.2 \times 10^{-36}$	95	[5] FOSTER	20	ASTR	$m_{A^0} = 5$–7, 10–11μeV
$<5.7 \times 10^{-41}$	90	[6] JEONG	20	CASK	$m_{A^0} = 13.0$–$13.9\ \mu$eV
		[7] KENNEDY	20		$m_{S^0} = 10^{-19}$–10^{-17} eV
$<4.8 \times 10^{-42}$	90	[8] LEE	20A	CASK	$m_{A^0} = 6.62$–$6.82\ \mu$eV
$<2.6 \times 10^{-39}$	95	[9] ALESINI	19	QUAX	$m_{A^0} = 37.5\ \mu$eV
$<6 \times 10^{-5}$		[10] FUJITA	19	ASTR	$m_{A^0} < 10^{-21}$ eV
$<2 \times 10^{-27}$	95	[11] OUELLET	19A	ABRA	$m_{A^0} = 0.31$–8.3 neV
$<7.3 \times 10^{-40}$	90	[12] BOUTAN	18	ADMX	$m_{A^0} = 17.38$–$17.57\ \mu$eV
$<1.8 \times 10^{-39}$	90	[12] BOUTAN	18	ADMX	$m_{A^0} = 21.03$–$23.98\ \mu$eV
$<3.4 \times 10^{-39}$	90	[12] BOUTAN	18	ADMX	$m_{A^0} = 29.67$–$29.79\ \mu$eV
$<1.4 \times 10^{-44}$	90	[13] DU	18	ADMX	$m_{A^0} = 2.66$–$2.81\ \mu$eV

$<2.87 \times 10^{-42}$	90	[14] ZHONG	18	HYST	m_{A^0} =23.15–24 μeV
		[15] BRANCA	17	AURG	m_{S^0} = 3.5–3.9 peV
$<3 \times 10^{-42}$	90	[16] BRUBAKER	17	HYST	m_{A^0} = 23.55–24.0 μeV
$<1.0 \times 10^{-29}$	95	[17] CHOI	17	CASK	m_{A^0} = 24.7–29.1 μeV
$<8.6 \times 10^{-42}$	90	[18] HOSKINS	16	ADMX	m_{A^0} =3.36–3.52 or 3.55–3.69 μeV
		[19] BECK	13		m_{A^0} = 0.11 meV
$<3.5 \times 10^{-43}$		[20] HOSKINS	11	ADMX	m_{A^0} = 3.3–3.69 $\times 10^{-6}$ eV
$<2.9 \times 10^{-43}$	90	[21] ASZTALOS	10	ADMX	m_{A^0} = 3.34–3.53 $\times 10^{-6}$ eV
$<1.9 \times 10^{-43}$	97.7	[22] DUFFY	06	ADMX	m_{A^0} = 1.98–2.17 $\times 10^{-6}$ eV
$<5.5 \times 10^{-43}$	90	[23] ASZTALOS	04	ADMX	m_{A^0} = 1.9–3.3 $\times 10^{-6}$ eV
		[24] KIM	98	THEO	
$<2 \times 10^{-41}$		[25] HAGMANN	90	CNTR	m_{A^0} = (5.4–5.9)10^{-6} eV
$<6.3 \times 10^{-42}$	95	[26] WUENSCH	89	CNTR	m_{A^0} = (4.5–10.2)10^{-6} eV
$<5.4 \times 10^{-41}$	95	[26] WUENSCH	89	CNTR	m_{A^0} = (11.3–16.3)10^{-6} eV

[1] DEVLIN 21 use the superconducting resonant detection circuit of a cryogenic Penning trap with a single antiproton. See their Fig. 3 for mass-dependent limits.

[2] BRAINE 20 is analogous to DU 18. See Fig. 4 for their mass-dependent limits.

[3] CRISOSTO 20 used a resonant LC circuit to look for lighter axion dark matter. They obtained a similar, slightly weaker limit for m_{A^0} = 174.98–175.19 and 177.34–177.38 neV. See their Fig. 4 for mass-dependent limits.

[4] DARLING 20A use VLA data to look for radio-frequency radiation converted from axion dark matter in the magnetosphere of the Galactic Center magnetar PSR J1745-2900. They extended the results of DARLING 20, which used only data with the highest angular resolution, by adding sub-optimal data. They use $\rho_A = 6.5 \times 10^4$ GeV/cm^3 in the vicinity of the magnetar. See their Fig. 2 for mass-dependent limits.

[5] FOSTER 20 look for radio-frequency radiation converted from axion dark matter in the magnetic field around neutron stars. They use the observed data of isolated local neutron stars and in the Galactic center. The quoted limit applies to $m_{A^0} \simeq 7$ μeV. See their Fig. 2 for mass-dependent limits.

[6] JEONG 20 is analogous to LEE 20A, and they use a double-cell cavity to look for axions with mass > 10 μeV. See their Fig. 5 for mass-dependent limits.

[7] KENNEDY 20 is analogous to BRANCA 17, and they compare the frequency ratios of the Si cavity measured by a Sr optical lattice clock and by a H maser. Assuming the local density of moduli dark matter, $\rho_S = 0.3$ GeV/cm^3, they obtain a limit $G_{S\gamma\gamma} < 5.8 \times 10^{-24}$ GeV^{-1} at $m_{S^0} = 2 \times 10^{-19}$ eV. See their Fig. 2 for mass-dependent limits as well as limits on the modulus coupling to electrons.

[8] LEE 20A used a microwave cavity detector at the IBS/CAPP to search for dark matter axions. See Fig. 3 for the mass-dependent limits.

[9] ALESINI 19 used a superconducting resonant cavity made of NbTi to increase the quality factor. The limit applies to a mass range of 0.2 neV around m_{A^0} = 37.5 μeV.

[10] FUJITA 19 look for photon birefringence under the oscillating axion background using the polarimetric imaging observation of a protoplanetary disk, AB Aur. See their Fig. 2 for a more conservative limit taking account of possible systematic effects.

[11] OUELLET 19A look for the axion-induced oscillating magnetic field generated by a toroidal magnetic field. The quoted limit applies at m_{A^0} = 8 neV. See their Fig. 3 for the mass-dependent limits.

[12] BOUTAN 18 use a small high frequency cavity installed above the main ADMX cavity to look for heavier axion dark matter. See their Fig. 4 for mass-dependent limits.

[13] DU 18 is analogous to DUFFY 06. They upgraded a dilution refrigerator to reduce the system noise. The quoted limit is around $m_{A^0} = 2.69$ μeV for the boosted Maxwellian axion line shape. See Fig. 4 for their mass-dependent limits.

[14] ZHONG 18 is analogous to BRUBAKER 17. The quoted limit applies at $m_{A^0} = 23.76$ μeV. See Fig. 4 for their mass-dependent limits.

[15] BRANCA 17 look for modulations of the fine-structure constant and the electron mass due to moduli dark matter by using the cryogenic resonant-mass AURIGA detector. The limit on the assumed dilatonic coupling implies $G_{S\gamma\gamma} < 1.5 \times 10^{-24}$ GeV^{-1} for the scalar to two-photon coupling. See Fig. 5 for the mass-dependent limits.

[16] BRUBAKER 17 used a microwave cavity detector at the Yale Wright Laboratory to search for dark matter axions. See Fig. 3 for the mass-dependent limits.

[17] CHOI 17 used a microwave cavity detector with toroidal geometry. See Fig. 4 for their mass-dependent limits.

[18] HOSKINS 16 is analogous to DUFFY 06. See Fig. 12 for mass-dependent limits in terms of the local dark matter density.

[19] BECK 13 argues that dark-matter axions passing through Earth may generate a small observable signal in resonant S/N/S Josephson junctions. A measurement by HOFFMANN 04 [Physical Review **B70** 180503 (2004)] is interpreted in terms of subdominant dark matter axions with $m_{A^0} = 0.11$ meV.

[20] HOSKINS 11 is analogous to DUFFY 06. See Fig. 4 for the mass-dependent limit in terms of the local density.

[21] ASZTALOS 10 used the upgraded detector of ASZTALOS 04 to search for halo axions. See their Fig. 5 for the m_{A^0} dependence of the limit.

[22] DUFFY 06 used the upgraded detector of ASZTALOS 04, while assuming a smaller velocity dispersion than the isothermal model as in Eq. (8) of their paper. See Fig. 10 of their paper on the axion mass dependence of the limit.

[23] ASZTALOS 04 looked for a conversion of halo axions to microwave photons in magnetic field. At 90% CL, the KSVZ axion cannot have a local halo density more than 0.45 GeV/cm^3 in the quoted mass range. See Fig. 7 of their paper on the axion mass dependence of the limit.

[24] KIM 98 calculated the axion-to-photon couplings for various axion models and compared them to the HAGMANN 90 bounds. This analysis demonstrates a strong model dependence of $G_{A\gamma\gamma}$ and hence the bound from relic axion search.

[25] HAGMANN 90 experiment is based on the proposal of SIKIVIE 83.

[26] WUENSCH 89 looks for condensed axions near the earth that could be converted to photons in the presence of an intense electromagnetic field via the Primakoff effect, following the proposal of SIKIVIE 83. The theoretical prediction with $[G_{A\gamma\gamma}/m_{A^0}]^2 = 2 \times 10^{-14}$ MeV^{-4} (the three generation DFSZ model) and $\rho_A = 300$ MeV/cm^3 that makes up galactic halos gives $(G_{A\gamma\gamma}/m_{A^0})^2\ \rho_A = 4 \times 10^{-44}$. Note that our definition of $G_{A\gamma\gamma}$ is $(1/4\pi)$ smaller than that of WUENSCH 89.

Invisible A^0 (Axion) Limits from Photon Coupling

Limits are for the modulus of the axion-two-photon coupling $G_{A\gamma\gamma}$ defined by $L = -G_{A\gamma\gamma}\phi_A \mathbf{E}\cdot\mathbf{B}$. For scalars S^0 the limit is on the coupling constant in $L = G_{S\gamma\gamma}\phi_S(\mathbf{E}^2 - \mathbf{B}^2)$. The relation between $G_{A\gamma\gamma}$ and m_{A^0} is not used unless stated otherwise, i.e., many of these bounds apply to low-mass axion-like particles (ALPs), not to QCD axions.

VALUE (GeV^{-1})	CL%	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •					
$<1.8 \times 10^{-11}$	95	[1] XIAO	21	ASTR	$m_{A^0} < 3.5 \times 10^{-11}$eV

$<7 \times 10^{-4}$	95	[2] ABUDINEN	20	BEL2	$m_{A^0} = 0.2$–1 GeV
$<2 \times 10^{-4}$	90	[3] BANERJEE	20A	NA64	$m_{A^0} < 55$ MeV
$<1.0 \times 10^{-11}$	95	[4] BUEHLER	20	ASTR	$m_{A^0} < 3$ neV
$<5 \times 10^{-10}$		[5] CALORE	20	ASTR	$m_{A^0} \lesssim 10^{-11}$ eV
		[6] CARENZA	20	ASTR	Globular clusters
2–4×10^{-10}	95	[7] DENT	20A	ASTR	Solar axions
		[8] DEPTA	20	COSM	Axion-like particles
$<3.6 \times 10^{-12}$	95	[9] DESSERT	20A	ASTR	$m_{A^0} < 5 \times 10^{-11}$ eV
		[10] ESTEBAN	20	ANIT	Axion-like particles
4–6×10^{-10}	90	[11] GAO	20	ASTR	Solar axions
$<2.8 \times 10^{-11}$	95	[12] KOROCHKIN	20	ASTR	$m_{A^0} = 25$ eV
none 6.0×10^{-9}–1.3×10^{-5}		[13] LUCENTE	20A	ASTR	$m_{A^0} < 270$ MeV
$<2.6 \times 10^{-11}$	95	[14] MEYER	20	FLAT	$m_{A^0} < 3 \times 10^{-10}$ eV
$<8.4 \times 10^{-8}$	99	[15] YAMAMOTO	20	COSM	$m_{A^0} < 4 \times 10^{-6}$ eV
$<1 \times 10^{-3}$	95	[16] ALONI	19	PRMX	$m_{A^0} = 0.16$ GeV
$<1.4 \times 10^{-14}$	95	[17] CAPUTO	19	ASTR	$m_{A^0} = 5 \times 10^{-24}$ eV
$<9.6 \times 10^{-14}$	95	[18] FEDDERKE	19	CMB	$m_{A^0} = 10^{-22}$ eV
$<7 \times 10^{-13}$	95	[19] IVANOV	19	ASTR	$m_{A^0} = 5 \times 10^{-23}$ eV
$<4 \times 10^{-11}$	95	[20] LIANG	19	ASTR	$m_{A^0} = 1.2 \times 10^{-7}$ eV
		[21] FORTIN	18	ASTR	Axion-like particles
$<5.0 \times 10^{-3}$	90	[22] YAMAJI	18	LSW	$m_{A^0} = 46$–1020 eV
$<1 \times 10^{-11}$	99.9	[23] ZHANG	18	ASTR	$m_{A^0} = 0.6$–4 neV
		[24] ADE	17	CMB	Axion-like particles
$<6.6 \times 10^{-11}$	95	[25] ANASTASSO...	17	CAST	$m_{A^0} < 0.02$ eV
		[26] DOLAN	17	RVUE	Axion-like particles
$<2.51 \times 10^{-4}$	95	[27] INADA	17	LSW	$m_{A^0} < 0.1$ eV
$>1.5 \times 10^{-11}$	95	[28] KOHRI	17	ASTR	$m_{A^0} = 0.7$–50 neV
$<2.6 \times 10^{-12}$	95	[29] MARSH	17	ASTR	$m_{A^0} \leq 10^{-13}$ eV
$<6 \times 10^{-13}$		[30] TIWARI	17	COSM	$m_{A^0} \leq 10^{-15}$ eV
$<5 \times 10^{-12}$	95	[31] AJELLO	16	ASTR	$m_{A^0} = 0.5$–5 neV
$<1.2 \times 10^{-7}$	95	[32] DELLA-VALLE	16	LASR	$m_{A^0} = 1.3$ meV
$<7.2 \times 10^{-8}$	95	[33] DELLA-VALLE	16	LASR	$m_{A^0} < 0.5$ meV
$<8 \times 10^{-4}$		[34] JAECKEL	16	ALPS	$m_{A^0} = 0.1$–100 GeV
$<6 \times 10^{-21}$		[35] LEEFER	16		$m_{S^0} < 10^{-18}$ eV
		[36] ANASTASSO...	15	CAST	Chameleons
$<1.47 \times 10^{-10}$	95	[37] ARIK	15	CAST	$m_{A^0} = 0.39$–0.42 eV
$<3.5 \times 10^{-8}$	95	[38] BALLOU	15	LSW	$m_{A^0} < 2 \times 10^{-4}$ eV
		[39] BRAX	15	ASTR	$m_{S^0} < 4 \times 10^{-12}$ eV
$<5.42 \times 10^{-4}$	95	[40] HASEBE	15	LASR	$m_{A^0} = 0.15$ eV
		[41] MILLEA	15	COSM	Axion-like particles
		[42] VANTILBURG	15		Dilaton-like dark matter
$<4.1 \times 10^{-10}$	99.7	[43] VINYOLES	15	ASTR	$m_{A^0} = 0.6$–185 eV
$<3.3 \times 10^{-10}$	95	[44] ARIK	14	CAST	$m_{A^0} = 0.64$–1.17 eV

$<6.6 \times 10^{-11}$	95	[45] AYALA	14	ASTR	Globular clusters
$<1.4 \times 10^{-7}$	95	[46] DELLA-VALLE	14	LASR	$m_{A^0} = 1$ meV
		[47] EJLLI	14	COSM	$m_{A^0} = 2.66$–$48.8\ \mu$eV
$<8 \times 10^{-8}$	95	[48] PUGNAT	14	LSW	$m_{A^0} < 0.3$ meV
$<1 \times 10^{-11}$		[49] REESMAN	14	ASTR	$m_{A^0} < 1 \times 10^{-10}$ eV
$<2.1 \times 10^{-11}$	95	[50] ABRAMOWSKI	13A	IACT	$m_{A^0} = 15$–60 neV
$<2.15 \times 10^{-9}$	95	[51] ARMENGAUD	13	EDEL	$m_{A^0} < 200$ eV
$<4.5 \times 10^{-8}$	95	[52] BETZ	13	LSW	$m_{A^0} = 7.2 \times 10^{-6}$ eV
$<8 \times 10^{-11}$		[53] FRIEDLAND	13	ASTR	Red giants
$>2 \times 10^{-11}$		[54] MEYER	13	ASTR	$m_{A^0} < 1 \times 10^{-7}$ eV
$<8.3 \times 10^{-12}$	95	[55] WOUTERS	13	ASTR	$m_{A^0} < 7 \times 10^{-12}$ eV
		[56] CADAMURO	12	COSM	Axion-like particles
$<2.5 \times 10^{-13}$	95	[57] PAYEZ	12	ASTR	$m_{A^0} < 4.2 \times 10^{-14}$ eV
$<2.3 \times 10^{-10}$	95	[58] ARIK	11	CAST	$m_{A^0} = 0.39$–0.64 eV
$<6.5 \times 10^{-8}$	95	[59] EHRET	10	ALPS	$m_{A^0} < 0.7$ meV
$<2.4 \times 10^{-9}$	95	[60] AHMED	09A	CDMS	$m_{A^0} < 100$ eV
< 1.2–2.8×10^{-10}	95	[61] ARIK	09	CAST	$m_{A^0} = 0.02$–0.39 eV
		[62] CHOU	09		Chameleons
$<7 \times 10^{-10}$		[63] GONDOLO	09	ASTR	$m_{A^0} <$ few keV
$<1.3 \times 10^{-6}$	95	[64] AFANASEV	08		$m_{S^0} < 1$ meV
$<3.5 \times 10^{-7}$	99.7	[65] CHOU	08		$m_{A^0} < 0.5$ meV
$<1.1 \times 10^{-6}$	99.7	[66] FOUCHE	08		$m_{A^0} < 1$ meV
< 5.6–13.4×10^{-10}	95	[67] INOUE	08		$m_{A^0} = 0.84$–1.00 eV
$<5 \times 10^{-7}$		[68] ZAVATTINI	08		$m_{A^0} < 1$ meV
$<8.8 \times 10^{-11}$	95	[69] ANDRIAMON...	07	CAST	$m_{A^0} < 0.02$ eV
$<1.25 \times 10^{-6}$	95	[70] ROBILLIARD	07		$m_{A^0} < 1$ meV
2–5×10^{-6}		[71] ZAVATTINI	06		$m_{A^0} = 1$–1.5 meV
$<1.1 \times 10^{-9}$	95	[72] INOUE	02		$m_{A^0} = 0.05$–0.27 eV
$<2.78 \times 10^{-9}$	95	[73] MORALES	02B		$m_{A^0} < 1$ keV
$<1.7 \times 10^{-9}$	90	[74] BERNABEI	01B		$m_{A^0} < 100$ eV
$<1.5 \times 10^{-4}$	90	[75] ASTIER	00B	NOMD	$m_{A^0} < 40$ eV
		[76] MASSO	00	THEO	induced γ coupling
$<2.7 \times 10^{-9}$	95	[77] AVIGNONE	98	SLAX	$m_{A^0} < 1$ keV
$<6.0 \times 10^{-10}$	95	[78] MORIYAMA	98		$m_{A^0} < 0.03$ eV
$<3.6 \times 10^{-7}$	95	[79] CAMERON	93		$m_{A^0} < 10^{-3}$ eV, optical rotation
$<6.7 \times 10^{-7}$	95	[80] CAMERON	93		$m_{A^0} < 10^{-3}$ eV, photon regeneration
$<3.6 \times 10^{-9}$	99.7	[81] LAZARUS	92		$m_{A^0} < 0.03$ eV
$<7.7 \times 10^{-9}$	99.7	[81] LAZARUS	92		$m_{A^0} = 0.03$–0.11 eV
$<7.7 \times 10^{-7}$	99	[82] RUOSO	92		$m_{A^0} < 10^{-3}$ eV
$<2.5 \times 10^{-6}$		[83] SEMERTZIDIS	90		$m_{A^0} < 7 \times 10^{-4}$ eV

[1] XIAO 21 use X-ray data from Betelgeuse to look for signals from axions produced in the stellar core that were converted to X-rays by the Galactic magnetic field. See their Fig. 1 for the mass-dependent limit.

[2] ABUDINEN 20 look for the process $e^+ e^- \rightarrow \gamma A^0$ ($A^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$) and set upper limits of around 10^{-3} over the mass range. The quoted limit is at $m_{A^0} = 0.3$ GeV. See their Fig. 5 for mass dependent limits.

[3] BANERJEE 20A look for axions produced from high-energy bremsstrahlung photons through the Primakoff effect with the electric field of the target nuclei. They exclude $G_{A\gamma\gamma} = 2 \times 10^{-4}$–$5 \times 10^{-2}$ GeV^{-1} for $m_{A^0} < 55$ MeV. See their Fig. 5 for mass-dependent limits.

[4] BUEHLER 20 look for the γ-ray transparency due to axion-photon oscillations using high-energy photon events from 79 sources in the Second Fermi-LAT Catalog of High-Energy Sources. The quoted limit is for the intergalactic magnetic field strength and coherence length of $B = 1$ nG and $s = 1$ Mpc. See their Figs. 4 and 5 for mass-dependent limits and for different magnetic-field parameters.

[5] CALORE 20 use the isotropic diffuse γ-ray background measured by the Fermi-LAT to constrain the γ-ray flux converted in the Galactic magnetic field from axions produced from past core-collapse supernovae. They also derive a limit on a heavier axion with $m_{A^0} \gtrsim$ keV decaying into two photons of $G_{A\gamma\gamma} \lesssim 5 \times 10^{-11}$ GeV^{-1} for $m_{A^0} = 5$ keV. See their Figs. 5 and 7 for the limits as well as limits in the presence of axion-nucleon couplings.

[6] CARENZA 20 extend the globular cluster bound of AYALA 14 to heavier masses ($m_{A^0} \leq$ a few 100 keV) by taking account of the coalescence process $\gamma + \gamma \rightarrow A^0$ as well as the decay of the ALP inside the stellar core. See their Fig.4 for mass-dependent limits.

[7] DENT 20A is analogous to GAO 20. The quoted limit is from their arXiv:2006.15118v3 (v2 is their published version), using the relativistic Hartree-Fock form factor. The limit is up to two times weaker than the published one. See Fig. 4 in their arXiv version 3 for the correlation between $G_{A\gamma\gamma}$ and g_{Aee} corresponding to the excess reported in APRILE 20.

[8] DEPTA 20 correct the underestimated D abundance in MILLEA 15, and derive robust cosmological bounds by allowing the reheating temperature, $N_{\rm eff}$, and neutrino chemical potential to vary. See their Fig. 6 for mass-dependent limits.

[9] DESSERT 20A use the NuSTAR data of the Quintuplet and Westerlund 1 super star clusters to look for X-rays converted in the Galactic magnetic field from the axions produced in stellar cores. See their Fig. 3 for the mass-dependent limits.

[10] ESTEBAN 20 show that the two anomalous ANITA events can be explained by the reflected radio pulses that are resonantly produced in the ionosphere via axion-photon conversion for $m_{A^0} \lesssim 1 \times 10^{-7}$ eV , if an axion clump passes the Earth about once a month. See their Fig.5 for the region consistent with this interpretation for different values of the axion density inside the clumps.

[11] GAO 20 correct the limit of APRILE 20 by including inverse Primakoff scattering in the XENON1T detector. The quoted limit is from their arXiv:2006.14598v4 (v3 is their published version), taking account of the atomic form factor of Xe as pointed out in ABE 20J. The limit is weaker by a factor of 1.5–2 than the published one. See Fig. 3 in their arXiv version 4 for correlation between $G_{A\gamma\gamma}$ and g_{Aee} corresponding to the excess reported in APRILE 20.

[12] KOROCHKIN 20 assume the axion makes up all dark matter, and look for a dip in the observed gamma-ray spectrum of the blazer 1ES 1218+304 by Fermi/LAT and VERITAS due to the extragalactic background light produced by the axion decay. Their analysis favors nonzero axion-induced absorption with $G_{A\gamma\gamma} = 3 \times 10^{-11}$–$2 \times 10^{-10}$ GeV^{-1} over a range of $m_{A^0} = 2$–18 eV. See their Fig. 1 for mass-dependent limits between $0.25 < m_{A^0} < 25$ eV.

[13] LUCENTE 20A study the SN 1987A energy-loss argument on the axion-like particle production. In addition to the Primakoff process, they take account of photon coalescence as well as gravitational trapping that become relevant at m_{A^0} > 100 MeV. See their Fig. 12 for the mass-dependent limit.

[14] MEYER 20 look for prompt γ-rays converted in the Galactic magnetic fields from axions produced via the Primakoff process in a sample of 20 extragalactic core-collapse supernovae. The limits assume a progenitor mass of 10 times the solar mass and certain models for the optical emission and the galactic magnetic field. See their Figs. 2 and 6 in the erratum for mass- and model-dependent limits.

[15] YAMAMOTO 20 look for X-ray photons converted by the Earth's magnetic field from the axions produced by the two-body decay of dark matter, and set the limits by using the Suzaku data. The quoted limit is for the monochromatic X-ray line from the galactic dark matter with lifetime $\tau = 4.32 \times 10^{17}$ sec. They also derive limits on the continuum spectrum from the extragalactic component. See their Fig. 7 for the limits.

[16] ALONI 19 used the data collected by the PRIMEX experiment to derive a limit based on a data-driven method. See their Fig. 2 for mass-dependent limits.

[17] CAPUTO 19 look for an oscillating variation of the polarization angle of the pulsar J0437-4715, where they assume the local axion energy density $\rho_A = 0.3$ GeV/cm^3. See their Fig. 2 for mass-dependent limits for 5×10^{-24} eV $\leq m_{A^0} \leq 2 \times 10^{-19}$ eV.

[18] FEDDERKE 19 look for a uniform reduction of the CMB polarization at large scales, which is induced by the oscillating axion background during CMB decoupling. The quoted limit is based on the assumption that axions make up all of the dark matter. See their Fig. 3 for mass-dependent limits for $m_{A^0} = 10^{-22}$–10^{-19} eV.

[19] IVANOV 19 look for the axion-induced periodic changes in the polarization angle of parsec-scale jets in active galactic nuclei observed by the MOJAVE program, where they use the axion energy density $\rho_A = 20$ GeV/cm^3. See their Fig. 6 for mass-dependent limits for 5×10^{-23} eV $\leq m_{A^0} \leq 1.2 \times 10^{-21}$ eV.

[20] LIANG 19 look for spectral irregularities in the spectrum of 10 bright H.E.S.S. sources in the Galactic plane, assuming photon-ALP mixing in the Galactic magnetic fields. See their Fig. 2 for mass-dependent limits with different Galactic magnetic field models.

[21] FORTIN 18 studied the conversion of axion-like particles produced in the core of a magnetar to hard X-rays in the magnetosphere. See their Fig. 5 for mass-dependent limits with different values of the magnetar core temperature.

[22] YAMAJI 18 search for axions with an x-ray LSW at Spring-8, using the Laue-case conversion in a silicon crystal. They also obtain $G_{A\gamma\gamma} < 4.2 \times 10^{-3}$ GeV^{-1} for $m_{A^0} <$ 10 eV. See their Fig. 5 for mass-dependent limits.

[23] ZHANG 18 look for spectral irregularities in the spectrum of PKS 2155-304 measured by Fermi LAT, assuming photon-ALP mixing in the intercluster and Galactic magnetic fields. See their Figs. 2 and 3 for mass-dependent limits with different values of the intercluster magnetic field parameters.

[24] ADE 17 look for cosmic birefringence from axion-like particles using CMB polarization data taken by the BICEP2 and Keck Array experiments. They set a limit $G_{A\gamma\gamma} H_I < 7.2 \times 10^{-2}$ at 95 %CL for $m_{A^0} < 10^{-28}$ eV, where H_I is the Hubble parameter during inflation.

[25] ANASTASSOPOULOS 17 looked for solar axions by the CAST axion helioscope in the vacuum phase, and supersedes ANDRIAMONJE 07.

[26] DOLAN 17 update existing limits on $G_{A\gamma\gamma}$ for axion-like particles. See their Fig. 2 for mass-dependent limits.

[27] INADA 17 search for axions with an x-ray LSW at Spring-8. See their Fig. 4 for mass-dependent limits.

[28] KOHRI 17 attributed to axion-photon oscillations the excess of cosmic infrared background observed by the CIBER experiment. See their Fig. 5 for the region preferred by their scenario.

[29] MARSH 17 is similar to WOUTERS 13, using Chandra observations of M87. See their Fig. 6 for mass-dependent limits.

[30] TIWARI 17 use observed limits of the cosmic distance-duality relation to constrain the photon-ALP mixing based on 3D simulations of the magnetic field configuration. The quoted value is for the averaged magnetic field of 1nG with a coherent length of 1 Mpc. See their Fig. 5 for mass-dependent limits.

[31] AJELLO 16 look for irregularities in the energy spectrum of the NGC1275 measured by Fermi LAT, assuming photon-ALP mixing in the intra-cluster and Galactic magnetic felds. See their Fig. 2 for mass-dependent limits.

[32] DELLA-VALLE 16 look for the birefringence induced by axion-like particles. See their Fig. 14 for mass-dependent limits.

[33] DELLA-VALLE 16 look for the dichroism induced by axion-like particles. See their Fig. 14 for mass-dependent limits.

[34] JAECKEL 16 use the LEP data of $Z \to 2\gamma$ and $Z \to 3\gamma$ to constrain the ALP production via $e^+ e^- \to Z \to A^0 \gamma$ ($A^0 \to \gamma\gamma$), assuming the ALP coupling with two hypercharge bosons. See their Fig. 4 for mass-dependent limits.

[35] LEEFER 16 derived limits by using radio-frequency spectroscopy of dysprosium and atomic clock measurements. See their Fig. 1 for mass-dependent limits as well as limits on Yukawa-type couplings of the scalar to the electron and nucleons.

[36] ANASTASSOPOULOS 15 search for solar chameleons with CAST and derived limits on the chameleon coupling to photons and matter. See their Fig. 12 for the exclusion region.

[37] ARIK 15 is analogous to ARIK 09, and search for solar axions for m_{A^0} around 0.2 and 0.4 eV. See their Figs. 1 and 3 for the mass-dependent limits.

[38] Based on OSQAR photon regeneration experiment. See their Fig. 6 for mass-dependent limits on scalar and pseudoscalar bosons.

[39] BRAX 15 derived limits on conformal and disformal couplings of a scalar to photons by searching for a chaotic absorption pattern in the X-ray and UV bands of the Hydra A galaxy cluster and a BL lac object, respectively. See their Fig. 8.

[40] HASEBE 15 look for an axion via a four-wave mixing process at quasi-parallel colliding laser beams. They also derived limits on a scalar coupling to photons $G_{S\gamma\gamma} < 2.62 \times 10^{-4}$ GeV^{-1} at $m_{S^0} = 0.15$ eV. See their Figs. 11 and 12 for mass-dependent limits.

[41] MILLEA 15 is similar to CADAMURO 12, including the Planck data and the latest inferences of primordial deuterium abundance. See their Fig. 3 for mass-dependent limits.

[42] VANTILBURG 15 look for harmonic variations in the dyprosium transition frequency data, induced by coherent oscillations of the fine-structure constant due to dilaton-like dark matter, and set the limits, $G_{S\gamma\gamma} < 6 \times 10^{-27}$ GeV^{-1} at $m_{S^0} = 6 \times 10^{-23}$ eV. See their Fig. 4 for mass-dependent limits between $1 \times 10^{-24} < m_{S^0} < 1 \times 10^{-15}$ eV.

[43] VINYOLES 15 performed a global fit analysis based on helioseismology and solar neutrino observations. See their Fig. 9.

[44] ARIK 14 is similar to ARIK 11. See their Fig. 2 for mass-dependent limits.

[45] AYALA 14 derived the limit from the helium-burning lifetime of horizontal-branch stars based on number counts in globular clusters.

[46] DELLA-VALLE 14 use the new PVLAS apparatus to set a limit on vacuum magnetic birefringence induced by axion-like particles. See their Fig. 6 for the mass-dependent limits.

[47] EJLLI 14 set limits on a product of primordial magnetic field and the axion mass using CMB distortion induced by resonant axion production from CMB photons. See their Fig. 1 for limits applying specifically to the DFSZ and KSVZ axion models.

[48] PUGNAT 14 is analogous to EHRET 10. See their Fig. 5 for mass-dependent limits on scalar and pseudoscalar bosons.

[49] REESMAN 14 derive limits by requiring effects of axion-photon interconversion on gamma-ray spectra from distant blazars to be no larger than errors in the best-fit optical

depth based on a certain extragalactic background light model. See their Fig. 5 for mass-dependent limits.

[50] ABRAMOWSKI 13A look for irregularities in the energy spectrum of the BL Lac object PKS 2155–304 measured by H.E.S.S. The limits depend on assumed magnetic field around the source. See their Fig. 7 for mass-dependent limits.

[51] ARMENGAUD 13 is analogous to AVIGNONE 98. See Fig. 6 for the limit.

[52] BETZ 13 performed a microwave-based light shining through the wall experiment. See their Fig. 13 for mass-dependent limits.

[53] FRIEDLAND 13 derived the limit by considering blue-loop suppression of the evolution of red giants with 7–12 solar masses.

[54] MEYER 13 attributed to axion-photon oscillations the observed excess of very high-energy γ-rays with respect to predictions based on extragalactic background light models. See their Fig.4 for mass-dependent lower limits for various magnetic field configurations.

[55] WOUTERS 13 look for irregularities in the X-ray spectrum of the Hydra cluster observed by Chandra. See their Fig. 4 for mass-dependent limits.

[56] CADAMURO 12 derived cosmological limits on $G_{A\gamma\gamma}$ for axion-like particles. See their Fig. 1 for mass-dependent limits.

[57] PAYEZ 12 derive limits from polarization measurements of quasar light (see their Fig. 3). The limits depend on assumed magnetic field strength in galaxy clusters. The limits depend on assumed magnetic field and electron density in the local galaxy supercluster.

[58] ARIK 11 search for solar axions using ^{3}He buffer gas in CAST, continuing from the ^{4}He version of ARIK 09. See Fig. 2 for the exact mass-dependent limits.

[59] ALPS is a photon regeneration experiment. See their Fig. 4 for mass-dependent limits on scalar and pseudoscalar bosons.

[60] AHMED 09A is analogous to AVIGNONE 98.

[61] ARIK 09 is the ^{4}He filling version of the CAST axion helioscope in analogy to INOUE 02 and INOUE 08. See their Fig. 7 for mass-dependent limits.

[62] CHOU 09 use the GammeV apparatus in the afterglow mode to search for chameleons, (pseudo)scalar bosons with a mass depending on the environment. For pseudoscalars they exclude at 3σ the range 2.6×10^{-7} GeV^{-1} $<$ $G_{A\gamma\gamma}$ $<$ 4.2×10^{-6} GeV^{-1} for vacuum m_{A^0} roughly below 6 meV for density scaling index exceeding 0.8.

[63] GONDOLO 09 use the all-flavor measured solar neutrino flux to constrain solar interior temperature and thus energy losses.

[64] LIPSS photon regeneration experiment, assuming scalar particle S^0. See Fig. 4 for mass-dependent limits.

[65] CHOU 08 perform a variable-baseline photon regeneration experiment. See their Fig. 3 for mass-dependent limits. Excludes the PVLAS result of ZAVATTINI 06.

[66] FOUCHE 08 is an update of ROBILLIARD 07. See their Fig. 12 for mass-dependent limits.

[67] INOUE 08 is an extension of INOUE 02 to larger axion masses, using the Tokyo axion helioscope. See their Fig. 4 for mass-dependent limits.

[68] ZAVATTINI 08 is an upgrade of ZAVATTINI 06, see their Fig. 8 for mass-dependent limits. They now exclude the parameter range where ZAVATTINI 06 had seen a positive signature.

[69] ANDRIAMONJE 07 looked for Primakoff conversion of solar axions in 9T superconducting magnet into X-rays. Supersedes ZIOUTAS 05.

[70] ROBILLIARD 07 perform a photon regeneration experiment with a pulsed laser and pulsed magnetic field. See their Fig. 4 for mass-dependent limits. Excludes the PVLAS result of ZAVATTINI 06 with a CL exceeding 99.9%.

[71] ZAVATTINI 06 propagate a laser beam in a magnetic field and observe dichroism and birefringence effects that could be attributed to an axion-like particle. This result is now excluded by ROBILLIARD 07, ZAVATTINI 08, and CHOU 08.

[72] INOUE 02 looked for Primakoff conversion of solar axions in 4T superconducting magnet into X ray.

[73] MORALES 02B looked for the coherent conversion of solar axions to photons via the Primakoff effect in Germanium detector.
[74] BERNABEI 01B looked for Primakoff coherent conversion of solar axions into photons via Bragg scattering in NaI crystal in DAMA dark matter detector.
[75] ASTIER 00B looked for production of axions from the interaction of high-energy photons with the horn magnetic field and their subsequent re-conversion to photons via the interaction with the NOMAD dipole magnetic field.
[76] MASSO 00 studied limits on axion-proton coupling using the induced axion-photon coupling through the proton loop and CAMERON 93 bound on the axion-photon coupling using optical rotation. They obtained the bound $g_p^2/4\pi < 1.7 \times 10^{-9}$ for the coupling $g_p \overline{p} \gamma_5 p \phi_A$.
[77] AVIGNONE 98 result is based on the coherent conversion of solar axions to photons via the Primakoff effect in a single crystal germanium detector.
[78] Based on the conversion of solar axions to X-rays in a strong laboratory magnetic field.
[79] Experiment based on proposal by MAIANI 86.
[80] Experiment based on proposal by VANBIBBER 87.
[81] LAZARUS 92 experiment is based on proposal found in VANBIBBER 89.
[82] RUOSO 92 experiment is based on the proposal by VANBIBBER 87.
[83] SEMERTZIDIS 90 experiment is based on the proposal of MAIANI 86. The limit is obtained by taking the noise amplitude as the upper limit. Limits extend to $m_{A^0} = 4 \times 10^{-3}$ where $G_{A\gamma\gamma} < 1 \times 10^{-4}$ GeV^{-1}.

Limit on Invisible A^0 (Axion) Electron Coupling

The limit is for $g_{Aee}\ \phi_A\ \overline{e}(i\,\gamma_5)e$, or equivalently, the dipole-dipole potential $-\frac{g^2_{Aee}}{16\pi m^2_e}\,((\boldsymbol{\sigma}_1\cdot\boldsymbol{\sigma}_2) - 3(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_1\cdot\boldsymbol{n})\,(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_2\cdot\boldsymbol{n}))/r^3$ where $\boldsymbol{n}=\boldsymbol{r}/r$ and the sign of the potential was corrected based on DAIDO 17.

VALUE	CL%	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •					
$<3 \times 10^{-12}$	90	[1] AGOSTINI	20	HPGE	m_{A^0} = 0.06–1 MeV
$<1 \times 10^{-9}$	90	[2] AMARAL	20	SCDM	m_{A^0} = 1.2–50 eV
$<2 \times 10^{-14}$	90	[3] APRILE	20	XE1T	m_{A^0} = 1 keV
$2.6–3.7 \times 10^{-12}$	90	[4] APRILE	20	XE1T	Solar axions
$<6 \times 10^{-13}$	90	[5] ARALIS	20	SCDM	m_{A^0} = 0.04–500 keV
$<1.3 \times 10^{-13}$	95	[6] CAPOZZI	20	ASTR	Tip of the Red Giant Branch
$<1.7 \times 10^{-11}$	95	[7] CRESCINI	20	QUAX	m_{A^0} = 42.4–43.1 μeV
$<1.8 \times 10^{-9}$		[8] GHOSH	20A	COSM	$m_{A^0} \lesssim 0.5$ MeV
$<1.48 \times 10^{-13}$	95	[9] STRANIERO	20	ASTR	Tip of the Red Giant Branch
$<2.48 \times 10^{-11}$	90	[10] WANG	20A	CDEX	Solar axions
$<4 \times 10^{-13}$	90	[11] WANG	20A	CDEX	m_{A^0} = 1.5 keV
$<1.7 \times 10^{-11}$	90	[12] ADHIKARI	19B	C100	Solar axions
$<2.3 \times 10^{-14}$	90	[13] APRILE	19D	XE1T	m_{A^0} = 0.186–1 keV
		[14] DESSERT	19	ASTR	Magnetic white dwarf
$<2.6 \times 10^{-10}$	95	[15] TERRANO	19		Torsion pendulum
$<1.5 \times 10^{-13}$	90	[16] ABE	18F	XMAS	m_{A^0} = 40–120 keV
$<1.1 \times 10^{-11}$	90	[17] ARMENGAUD	18	EDE3	Solar axions
$<4 \times 10^{-13}$	90	[18] ARMENGAUD	18	EDE3	m_{A^0} = 0.8–500 keV

$<4.9 \times 10^{-10}$	95	[19] CRESCINI	18	QUAX	$m_{A^0} = 58\ \mu$eV
		[20] FICEK	18	THEO	$m_{A^0} < 10$ keV
$<4.5 \times 10^{-13}$	90	[21] ABGRALL	17	HPGE	$m_{A^0} = 11.8$ keV
$<3.5 \times 10^{-12}$	90	[22] AKERIB	17B	LUX	Solar axions
$<4.2 \times 10^{-13}$	90	[23] AKERIB	17B	LUX	$m_{A^0} = 1$–16 keV
$<2.3 \times 10^{-13}$	90	[24] APRILE	17B	X100	$m_{A^0} = 6$ keV
$<4 \times 10^{-4}$	90	[25] FICEK	17	THEO	$m_{A^0} < 1$ keV
$<4.35 \times 10^{-12}$	90	[26] FU	17A	PNDX	Solar axions
$<4.3 \times 10^{-14}$	90	[27] FU	17A	PNDX	$m_{A^0} = 2$ keV
$<5 \times 10^{-13}$	90	[28] LIU	17A	CDEX	$m_{A^0} = 13$ keV
$<2.5 \times 10^{-11}$	90	[29] LIU	17A	CDEX	Solar axions
<0.15	95	[30] LUO	17		$m_{A^0} = 300$ eV
$<3.3 \times 10^{-13}$	68	[31] BATTICH	16	ASTR	White dwarf cooling
$<7 \times 10^{-13}$		[32] CORSICO	16	ASTR	White dwarf cooling
$<1.39 \times 10^{-11}$	90	[33] YOON	16	KIMS	Solar axions
$<7.4 \times 10^{-9}$	95	[34] TERRANO	15		$m_{A^0} < 30\ \mu$eV
$<8 \times 10^{-13}$	90	[35] ABE	14F	XMAS	$m_{A^0} = 60$ keV
$<7.7 \times 10^{-12}$	90	[36] APRILE	14B	X100	Solar axions
		[37] APRILE	14B	X100	$m_{A^0} = 5$–7 keV
$< 0.96–8.2 \times 10^{-8}$	90	[38] DERBIN	14	CNTR	$m_{A^0} = 0.1$–1 MeV
$<2.8 \times 10^{-13}$	99	[39] MILLER-BER...	14	ASTR	White dwarf cooling
$<5.4 \times 10^{-11}$	90	[40] ABE	13D	XMAS	Solar axions
$<1.07 \times 10^{-12}$	90	[41] ARMENGAUD	13	EDEL	$m_{A^0} = 12.5$ keV
$<2.59 \times 10^{-11}$	90	[42] ARMENGAUD	13	EDEL	Solar axions
		[43] BARTH	13	CAST	Solar axions
$< 1.4–9.7 \times 10^{-7}$	90	[44] DERBIN	13	CNTR	$m_{A^0} = 0.1$–1 MeV
$<1.5 \times 10^{-8}$	68	[45] HECKEL	13		$m_{A^0} \leq 0.1\ \mu$eV
$<4.3 \times 10^{-13}$	95	[46] VIAUX	13A	ASTR	Low-mass red giants
$<7 \times 10^{-13}$	95	[47] CORSICO	12	ASTR	White dwarf cooling
$<2.2 \times 10^{-10}$	90	[48] DERBIN	12	CNTR	Solar axions
$< 0.02–1 \times 10^{-10}$	90	[49] AALSETH	11	CNTR	$m_{A^0} = 0.3$–8 keV
$<1.4 \times 10^{-12}$	90	[50] AHMED	09A	CDMS	$m_{A^0} = 2.5$ keV
$<4 \times 10^{-9}$		[51] DAVOUDIASL	09	ASTR	Earth cooling
$<2.7 \times 10^{-8}$	66	[52] NI	94		Induced magnetism
		[52] CHUI	93		Induced magnetism
$<3.6 \times 10^{-7}$	66	[53] PAN	92		Torsion pendulum
$<2.9 \times 10^{-8}$	95	[52] BOBRAKOV	91		Induced magnetism
$<1.9 \times 10^{-6}$	66	[54] WINELAND	91	NMR	
$<7 \times 10^{-7}$	66	[53] RITTER	90		Torsion pendulum
$<6.6 \times 10^{-8}$	95	[52] VOROBYOV	88		Induced magnetism

[1] AGOSTINI 20 is analogous to AHMED 09A. The quoted limit applies to $m_{A^0} = 150$ keV. See their Fig.3 for mass-dependent limits.

[2] AMARAL 20 use a second-generation SuperCDMS high-voltage eV-resolution detector to set limits on dark-matter axion absorption. The quoted limit is for $m_{A^0} \simeq 17$ eV. The local density $\rho_{\gamma'} = 0.3$ GeV/cm^3 is assumed. See their Fig. 3 for mass-dependent limits.

[3] APRILE 20 is an update of APRILE 17B where they look for an absorption signal of axion dark matter. They obtained the limit, $g_{Aee} \lesssim 2\times10^{-14}$–$1\times10^{-12}$ at 90%CL for m_{A^0} = 1–200 keV. They also found an excess over known backgrounds, which favors the mass $m_{A^0} = 2.3 \pm 0.2$ keV with a 3 σ significance. See their Fig. 10 for mass-dependent limits.

[4] APRILE 20 look for solar axions from the ABC interactions, the Primakoff conversion, and the 14.4 keV M1 transition of ^{57}Fe, and set limits on g_{Aee}, $G_{A\gamma\gamma}$, g_{ANN}, and their products. An excess is observed at low energies between 2 and 3 keV. See their Fig.8 for correlation between the couplings. The quoted limit applies to the case of vanishing $G_{A\gamma\gamma}$ and g_{ANN}.

[5] ARALIS 20 is analogous to AHMED 09A. The quoted limit applies to m_{A^0} = 0.3 keV. See their Fig. 9 for mass-dependent limits.

[6] CAPOZZI 20 obtains a limit on the axion-electron coupling from the brightness of the tip of the red-giant branch in ω Centauri. A similar limit of $< 1.6\times10^{-13}$ is obtained in NGC 4258.

[7] CRESCINI 20 is an update of CRESCINI 18. They assume a local axion dark matter density, ρ_A = 0.3 GeV/cm^3. See their Fig.4 for the limits.

[8] GHOSH 20A study thermal production of axion via coupling to leptons in the early universe and estimate its contribution to $\Delta N_{\rm eff}$. The quoted limit is for $\Delta N_{\rm eff} < 0.5$. See their Fig. 7 for their mass-dependent limits.

[9] STRANIERO 20 is analogous to CAPOZZI 20, with 22 galactic globular clusters used to derive the limit.

[10] WANG 20A is an update of LIU 17A. See their Fig. 9.

[11] WANG 20A is an update of LIU 17A. They assume a local axion dark matter density, ρ_A = 0.3 GeV/cm^3. See their Fig. 10 for limits between $0.185 < m_{A^0} < 10$ keV.

[12] ADHIKARI 19B is analogous to LIU 17A.

[13] APRILE 19D is analogous to APRILE 17B, but they use only ionization signals. The quoted limit applies to m_{A^0} = 0.7 keV. See their Fig. 5(e) for mass-dependent limits.

[14] DESSERT 19 used the Suzaku observations of a magnetic white dwarf (RE J0317-853) to look for X-ray signatures converted from axions in the surrounding magnetic fields. They obtained the limit, $g_{Aee}\cdot G_{A\gamma\gamma} < 1.6\times10^{-24}$ GeV^{-1} at 95%CL for $m_{A^0} \lesssim 10^{-5}$ eV. See their Fig. 2 for mass-dependent limits.

[15] TERRANO 19 look for the axion-induced oscillating magnetic field acting on the electron spin, using data taken with a rotating torsion pendulum containing polarized electrons. The quoted limit applies to $m_{A^0} = 10^{-23}$–10^{-18} eV and assumes a local axion dark matter density, ρ_A = 0.45 GeV/cm^3. See their Fig. 5 for mass-dependent limits.

[16] ABE 18F is an update of ABE 14F. The quoted limit applies to m_{A^0} = 60 keV. See their Fig. 5 for mass-dependent limits.

[17] ARMENGAUD 18 is analogous to LIU 17A.

[18] ARMENGAUD 18 is analogous to AHMED 09A. See the left panel of Fig. 5 for mass-dependent limits.

[19] CRESCINI 18 look for collective excitations of the electron spins caused by dark matter axions. The quoted limit assumes the local dark matter density, ρ_A = 0.45 GeV/cm^3.

[20] FICEK 18 use the measurements of the hyperfine structure of antiprotonic helium to constrain a dipole-dipole potential between electron and antiproton. See their Fig. 3 for limits on various spin- and velocity-dependent potentials.

[21] ABGRALL 17 is analogous to AHMED 09A using the MAJORANA DEMONSTRATOR. See their Fig. 2 for limits between 6 keV $< m_{A^0} <$ 97 keV.

[22] AKERIB 17B is analogous to LIU 17A.

[23] AKERIB 17B is analogous to AHMED 09A. See their Fig. 7 for mass-dependent limits.

[24] APRILE 17B is analogous to AHMED 09A. They found a bug in their code and needed to correct the limits in Fig. 7 of APRILE 14B. See their Fig. 1 for the corrected limits between 1 keV $< m_{A^0} <$ 40 keV.

[25] FICEK 17 look for spin-dependent interactions between electrons by comparing precision spectroscopic measurements in ^{4}He with theoretical calculations. See their Fig. 1 for limits up to $m_{A^0} = 10$ keV.

[26] FU 17A is analogous to LIU 17A. See their Fig. 3 for mass-dependent limits.

[27] FU 17A is analogous to AHMED 09A. See their Fig. 4 for mass-dependent limits.

[28] LIU 17A is analogous to AHMED 09A. See their Fig. 9 for limits between 0.25 keV $< m_{A^0} <$ 20 keV.

[29] LIU 17A look for solar axions produced from Compton, bremsstrahlung, atomic-recombination and deexcitation channels, and set a limit for $m_{A^0} <$ 1 keV.

[30] LUO 17 use a recent measurement of the dipole-dipole interaction between two iron atoms at the nanometer scale and set a limit for $m_{A^0} <$ 1 keV. See their Fig. 3 for mass-dependent limits.

[31] BATTICH 16 is analogous to CORSICO 16 and used the pulsating DB white dwarf PG 1351+489.

[32] CORSICO 16 studied the cooling rate of the pulsating DA white dwarf L19-2 based on an asteroseismic model.

[33] YOON 16 look for solar axions with the axio-electric effect in CsI(Tl) crystals and set a limit for $m_{A^0} <$ 1 keV.

[34] TERRANO 15 used a torsion pendulum and rotating attractor with 20-pole electron-spin distributions. See their Fig. 4 for a mass-dependent limit up to $m_{A^0} = 500\ \mu$eV.

[35] ABE 14F set limits on the axioelectric effect in the XMASS detector assuming the pseudoscalar constitutes all the local dark matter. See their Fig. 3 for limits between m_{A^0} = 40–120 keV.

[36] APRILE 14B look for solar axions using the XENON100 detector.

[37] APRILE 14B is analogous to AHMED 09A. Their Fig. 7 was later found to be incorrect due to a bug in their code. See Fig. 1 in APRILE 17B for the corrected limits.

[38] DERBIN 14 is an update of DERBIN 13 with a BGO scintillating bolometer. See their Fig. 3 for mass-dependent limits.

[39] MILLER-BERTOLAMI 14 studied the impact of axion emission on white dwarf cooling in a self-consistent way.

[40] ABE 13D is analogous to DERBIN 12, using the XMASS detector.

[41] ARMENGAUD 13 is similar to AALSETH 11. See their Fig. 10 for limits between 3 keV $< m_{A^0} <$ 100 keV.

[42] ARMENGAUD 13 is similar to DERBIN 12, and take account of axio-recombination and axio-deexcitation effects. See their Fig. 12 for mass-dependent limits.

[43] BARTH 13 search for solar axions produced by axion-electron coupling, and obtained the limit, $g_{Aee} \cdot G_{A\gamma\gamma} <\ 8.1 \times 10^{-23}$ GeV^{-1} at 95%CL.

[44] DERBIN 13 looked for 5.5 MeV solar axions produced in $pd \rightarrow {}^3\text{He}\ A^0$ in a BGO detector through the axioelectric effect. See their Fig. 4 for mass-dependent limits.

[45] HECKEL 13 studied the influence of 2 or 4 stationary sources each containing 6.0×10^{24} polarized electrons, on a rotating torsion pendulum containing 9.8×10^{24} polarized electrons. See their Fig. 4 for mass-dependent limits.

[46] VIAUX 13A constrain axion emission using the observed brightness of the tip of the red-giant branch in the globular cluster M5.

[47] CORSICO 12 attributed the excessive cooling rate of the pulsating white dwarf R548 to emission of axions with $g_{Aee} \simeq\ 4.8 \times 10^{-13}$.

[48] DERBIN 12 look for solar axions with the axio-electric effect in a Si(Li) detector. The solar production is based on Compton and bremsstrahlung processes.

[49] AALSETH 11 is analogous to AHMED 09A. See their Fig. 4 for mass-dependent limits.

[50] AHMED 09A assume keV-mass pseudoscalars are the local dark matter and constrain the axio-electric effect in the CDMS detector. See their Fig. 5 for mass-dependent limits.
[51] DAVOUDIASL 09 use geophysical constraints on Earth cooling by axion emission.
[52] These experiments measured induced magnetization of a bulk material by the spin-dependent potential generated from other bulk material with aligned electron spins, where the magnetic field is shielded with superconductor. The sign of the limit set by CHUI 93 is opposite to that of the axion-mediated dipole-dipole potential.
[53] These experiments used a torsion pendulum to measure the potential between two bulk matter objects where the spins are polarized but without a net magnetic field in either of them. The limits reflect the corrected sign of the dipole-dipole potential.
[54] WINELAND 91 looked for an effect of bulk matter with aligned electron spins on atomic hyperfine splitting using nuclear magnetic resonance.

Invisible A^0 (Axion) Limits from Nucleon Coupling

Limits are for the axion mass in eV.

VALUE (eV)	CL%	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •					
<24	90	[1] ABDELHAME..	20	CNTR	Solar axion
		[2] ABDELHAME..	20	CNTR	Solar axion
		[3] APRILE	20	XE1T	Solar axion
		[4] KLIMCHITSK...	20		Casimir effect
<7.3	90	[5] WANG	20A	CDEX	Solar axion
<0.03		[6] LEINSON	19	ASTR	Neutron star cooling
$<9.6 \times 10^{-3}$	95	[7] LLOYD	19	ASTR	γ-rays from NS
		[8] SMORRA	19		$\overline{p}$ g-factor
		[9] WU	19	NMR	Axion dark matter
<65	95	[10] AKHMATOV	18	CNTR	Solar axion
<6.6	90	[11] ARMENGAUD	18	EDE3	Solar axion
<0.085	90	[12] BEZNOGOV	18	ASTR	Neutron star cooling
<12.7	95	[13] GAVRILYUK	18	CNTR	Solar axion
<0.01		[14] HAMAGUCHI	18	ASTR	Neutron star cooling
		[15] ABEL	17		Neutron EDM
<93	90	[16] ABGRALL	17	HPGE	Solar axion
<4	90	[17] FU	17A	PNDX	Solar axion
		[18] KLIMCHITSK...	17A		Casimir effect
<177	90	[19] LIU	17A	CDEX	Solar axion
<0.079	95	[20] BERENJI	16	ASTR	γ-rays from NS
<100	95	[21] GAVRILYUK	15	CNTR	Solar axion
		[22] KLIMCHITSK...	15		Casimir-less
		[23] BEZERRA	14		Casimir effect
		[24] BEZERRA	14A		Casimir effect
		[25] BEZERRA	14B		Casimir effect
		[26] BEZERRA	14C		Casimir effect
		[27] BLUM	14	COSM	^{4}He abundance
		[28] LEINSON	14	ASTR	Neutron star cooling
<250	95	[29] ALESSANDRIA	13	CNTR	Solar axion
<155	90	[30] ARMENGAUD	13	EDEL	Solar axion
$<8.6 \times 10^{3}$	90	[31] BELLI	12	CNTR	Solar axion
$<1.4 \times 10^{4}$	90	[32] BELLINI	12B	BORX	Solar axion
<145	95	[33] DERBIN	11	CNTR	Solar axion
		[34] BELLINI	08	CNTR	Solar axion
		[35] ADELBERGER	07		Test of Newton's law

[1] ABDELHAMEED 20 look for the resonant excitation of ^{169}Tm (8.41 keV) by solar axions produced via the Primakoff effect. The mass bound assumes the KSVZ axion model, $S = 0.5$, and $m_u/m_d = 0.56$. They set a limit on the product of axion couplings to photons and nucleons as $G_{A\gamma\gamma} \cdot g_{App} < 1.44 \times 10^{-14}$ GeV^{-1} (90 % CL).

[2] ABDELHAMEED 20 look for the resonant excitation of ^{169}Tm (8.41 keV) by solar axions produced via the axion-electron coupling. They set a limit on the product of axion couplings to electrons and nucleons as $g_{Aee} \cdot g_{App} < 2.81 \times 10^{-16}$ (90 % CL).

[3] APRILE 20 look for solar axions from the ABC interactions, the Primakoff conversion, and the 14.4 keV M1 transition of ^{57}Fe. An excess is observed at low energies between 2 and 3 keV. See their Fig.8 for correlation between the couplings.

[4] KLIMCHITSKAYA 20 use the measurement of the Casimir force between a Au-coated microsphere and a SiC plate to constrain the force due to two-axion exchange for 17.8 $< m_{A^0} <$ 100 eV. See their Fig. 2 for mass-dependent limits.

[5] WANG 20A is an update of LIU 17A. The limit assumes the DFSZ axion. See their Fig. 7 for the limit on product of axion couplings to electrons and nucleons.

[6] LEINSON 19 is analogous to BEZNOGOV 18, but estimating the axion luminosity based on the Tolman's analytic solution to the Einstein equations of spherical fluids in hydrostatic equilibrium. The dimensionless axion-neutron coupling is constrained as $g_{Ann} < 1.0 \times 10^{-10}$.

[7] LLOYD 19 is analogous to BERENJI 16. They highlight that the limit obtained with this technique strongly depends on the assumed NS core temperature.

[8] SMORRA 19 look for spin-precession effects from ultra-light axion dark matter in the $\overline{p}$ spin-flip resonance data. Assuming $\rho_A = 0.4$ GeV/cm^3, they constrain the dimensionless axion-antiproton coupling as $g_{A\overline{p}\overline{p}} <$ 2–9 at 95% CL for $m_{A^0} = 2\times10^{-23}$–$4\times10^{-17}$ eV. See the right panel of their Fig. 3.

[9] WU 19 look for axion-induced time-oscillating features of the NMR spectrum of acetonitrile-2-^{13}C. Assuming $C_p = C_n$ and $\rho_A = 0.4$ GeV/cm^3, they constrain the dimensionless axion-nucleon coupling as $g_{ANN} < 6 \times 10^{-5}$ for $m_{A^0} = 10^{-21}$–1.3×10^{-17} eV. Note that the limits for $m_{A^0} < 10^{-21}$ eV in their Fig. 3(a) should be weaker than those for heavier masses. See ADELBERGER 19 and WU 19C on this issue.

[10] AKHMATOV 18 is an update of GAVRILYUK 15.

[11] ARMENGAUD 18 is analogous to ALESSANDRIA 13. The quoted limit assumes the DFSZ axion model. See their Fig. 4 for the limit on product of axion couplings to electrons and nucleons.

[12] BEZNOGOV 18 constrain the axion-neutron coupling by assuming that thermal evolution of the hot neutron star HESS J1731-347 is dominated by the lowest possible neutrino emission. The quoted limit assumes the KSVZ axion with the effective Peccei-Quinn charge of the neutron $C_n = -0.02$. The dimensionless axion-neutron couling is constrained as $g_{Ann} < 2.8 \times 10^{-10}$.

[13] GAVRILYUK 18 look for the resonant excitation of ^{83}Kr (9.4 keV) by solar axions produced via the Primakoff effect. The mass bound assumes $m_u/m_d = 0.56$ and $S = 0.5$.

[14] HAMAGUCHI 18 studied the axion emission from the neutron star in Cassiopeia A based on the minimal cooling scenario which explains the observed rapid cooling rate. The quoted limit corresponds to $f_A > 5 \times 10^8$ GeV obtained for the KSVZ axion with $C_p = -0.47$ and $C_n = -0.02$.

[15] ABEL 17 look for a time-oscillating neutron EDM and an axion-wind spin-precession effect respectively induced by axion dark matter couplings to gluons and nucleons. See their Fig. 4 for limits in the range of $m_{A^0} = 10^{-24}$–10^{-17} eV.

16 ABGRALL 17 limit assumes the hadronic axion model used in ALESSANDRIA 13. See their Fig. 4 for the limit on product of axion couplings to electrons and nucleons.

17 FU 17A look for the 14.4 keV ^{57}Fe solar axions. The limit assumes the DFSZ axion model. See their Fig. 3 for mass-dependent limits on the axion-electron coupling. Notice that in this figure the DFSZ and KSVZ lines should be interchanged.

18 KLIMCHITSKAYA 17A use the differential measurement of the Casimir force between a Ni-coated sphere and Au and Ni sectors of the structured disc to constrain the axion coupling to nucleons for 2.61 meV $< m_{A^0} <$ 0.9 eV. See their Figs. 1 and 2 for mass dependent limits.

19 LIU 17 is analogous to ALESSANDRIA 13. The limit assumes the hadronic axion model. See their Fig. 6(b) for the limit on product of axion couplings to electrons and nucleons.

20 BERENJI 16 used the Fermi LAT observations of neutron stars to look for photons from axion decay. They assume the effective Peccei-Quinn charge of the neutron $C_n = 0.1$ and a neutron-star core temperature of 20 MeV.

21 GAVRILYUK 15 look for solar axions emitted by the M1 transition of ^{83}Kr (9.4 keV). The mass bound assumes $m_u/m_d = 0.56$ and $S = 0.5$.

22 KLIMCHITSKAYA 15 use the measurement of differential forces between a test mass and rotating source masses of Au and Si to constrain the force due to two-axion exchange for $1.7 \times 10^{-3} < m_{A^0} <$ 0.9 eV. See their Figs. 1 and 2 for mass dependent limits.

23 BEZERRA 14 use the measurement of the thermal Casimir-Polder force between a Bose-Einstein condensate of ^{87}Rb atoms and a SiO_2 plate to constrain the force mediated by exchange of two pseudoscalars for 0.1 meV $< m_{A^0} <$ 0.3 eV. See their Fig. 2 for the mass-dependent limit on pseudoscalar coupling to nucleons.

24 BEZERRA 14A is analogous to BEZERRA 14. They use the measurement of the Casimir pressure between two Au-coated plates to constrain pseudoscalar coupling to nucleons for 1×10^{-3} eV $< m_{A^0} <$ 15 eV. See their Figs. 1 and 2 for the mass-dependent limit.

25 BEZERRA 14B is analogous to BEZERRA 14. BEZERRA 14B use the measurement of the normal and lateral Casimir forces between sinusoidally corrugated surfaces of a sphere and a plate to constrain pseudoscalar coupling to nucleons for 1 eV $< m_{A^0} <$ 20 eV. See their Figs. 1–3 for mass-dependent limits.

26 BEZERRA 14C is analogous to BEZERRA 14. They use the measurement of the gradient of the Casimir force between Au- and Ni-coated surfaces of a sphere and a plate to constrain pseudoscalar coupling to nucleons for 3×10^{-5} eV $< m_{A_0} <$ 1 eV. See their Figs. 1, 3, and 4 for the mass-dependent limits.

27 BLUM 14 studied effects of an oscillating strong *CP* phase induced by axion dark matter on the primordial ^{4}He abundance. See their Fig. 1 for mass-dependent limits.

28 LEINSON 14 attributes the excessive cooling rate of the neutron star in Cassiopeia A to axion emission from the superfluid core, and found $C_n^2\ m_{A^0}^2 \simeq 5.7 \times 10^{-6}$ eV^2, where C_n is the effective Peccei-Quinn charge of the neutron.

29 ALESSANDRIA 13 used the CUORE experiment to look for 14.4 keV solar axions produced from the M1 transition of thermally excited ^{57}Fe nuclei in the solar core, using the axio-electric effect. The limit assumes the hadronic axion model. See their Fig. 4 for the limit on product of axion couplings to electrons and nucleons.

30 ARMENGAUD 13 is analogous to ALESSANDRIA 13. The limit assumes the hadronic axion model. See their Fig. 8 for the limit on product of axion couplings to electrons and nucleons.

31 BELLI 12 looked for solar axions emitted by the M1 transition of ^{7}Li* (478 keV) after the electron capture of ^{7}Be, using the resonant excitation ^{7}Li in the LiF crystal. The mass bound assumes $m_u/m_d = 0.55$, $m_u/m_s = 0.029$, and the flavor-singlet axial vector matrix element $S = 0.4$.

32 BELLINI 12B looked for 5.5 MeV solar axions produced in the $p d \rightarrow {}^3\text{He}\ A^0$.The limit assumes the hadronic axion model. See their Figs. 6 and 7 for mass-dependent limits on productsof axion couplings to photons, electrons, and nucleons.

[33] DERBIN 11 looked for solar axions emitted by the M1 transition of thermally excited ^{57}Fe nuclei in the Sun, using their possible resonant capture on ^{57}Fe in the laboratory. The mass bound assumes $m_u/m_d = 0.56$ and the flavor-singlet axial vector matrix element $S = 3F - D \simeq 0.5$.

[34] BELLINI 08 consider solar axions emitted in the M1 transition of ^{7}Li* (478 keV) and look for a peak at 478 keV in the energy spectra of the Counting Test Facility (CTF), a Borexino prototype. For $m_{A^0} < 450$ keV they find mass-dependent limits on products of axion couplings to photons, electrons, and nucleons.

[35] ADELBERGER 07 use precision tests of Newton's law to constrain a force contribution from the exchange of two pseudoscalars. See their Fig. 5 for limits on the pseudoscalar coupling to nucleons, relevant for m_{A^0} below about 1 meV.

Axion Limits from *T*-violating Medium-Range Forces

The limit is for the coupling $g = g_{\rm p}\, g_{\rm s}$ in a T-violating potential between nucleons or nucleon and electron of the form $V = \frac{g\hbar^2}{8\pi m_p}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{r}})\,(\frac{1}{r^2}+\frac{1}{\lambda r})\,e^{-r/\lambda}$, where $g_{\rm p}$ and $g_{\rm s}$ are dimensionless scalar and pseudoscalar coupling constants and $\lambda = \hbar/(m_A c)$ is the range of the force.

VALUE	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
	[1] DZUBA	18	THEO	atomic EDM
	[2] STADNIK	18	THEO	atomic and molecular EDMs
	[3] CRESCINI	17	SQID	paramagnetic GSO crystal
	[4] AFACH	15		ultracold neutrons
	[5] STADNIK	15	THEO	nucleon spin contributions for nuclei
	[6] TERRANO	15		torsion pendulum
	[7] BULATOWICZ	13	NMR	polarized ^{129}Xe and ^{131}Xe
	[8] CHU	13		polarized ^{3}He
	[9] TULLNEY	13	SQID	polarized ^{3}He and ^{129}Xe
	[10] RAFFELT	12		stellar energy loss
	[11] HOEDL	11		torsion pendulum
	[12] PETUKHOV	10		polarized ^{3}He
	[13] SEREBROV	10		ultracold neutrons
	[14] IGNATOVICH	09	RVUE	ultracold neutrons
	[15] SEREBROV	09	RVUE	ultracold neutrons
	[16] BAESSLER	07		ultracold neutrons
	[17] HECKEL	06		torsion pendulum
	[18] NI	99		paramagnetic Tb F_3
	[19] POSPELOV	98	THEO	neutron EDM
	[20] YOUDIN	96		
	[21] RITTER	93		torsion pendulum
	[22] VENEMA	92		nuclear spin-precession frequencies
	[23] WINELAND	91	NMR	

[1] DZUBA 18 used atomic EDM measurements to derive limits on the product of the pseudoscalar coupling to nucleon and the scalar coupling to electron, which improved on the laboratory bounds for $m_{A^0} > 0.01$ eV. See their Fig. 1 for mass-dependent limits.

[2] STADNIK 18 used atomic and molecular EDM experiments to derive limits on the product of the pseudoscalar couplings to electron and the scalar coupling to nucleon and electron. See their Fig. 2 for mass-dependent limits, which improved on the laboratory bounds for $m_{A^0} > 0.01$ eV.

[3] CRESCINI 17 use the QUAX-$g_p g_s$ experiment to look for variation of a paramagnetic GSO crystal magnetization when rotating lead disks are positioned near the crystal, and find $g = g^e_p g^N_s < 4.3 \times 10^{-30}$ for λ = 0.1–0.2 m at 95% CL. See their Fig. 6 for limits as a function of λ.

[4] AFACH 15 look for a change of spin precession frequency of ultracold neutrons when a magnetic field with opposite directions is applied, and find $g < 2.2 \times 10^{-27}$ (m/λ)^2 at 95% CL for 1 μm $< \lambda <$ 5 mm. See their Fig. 3 for their limits.

[5] STADNIK 15 studied proton and neutron spin contributions for nuclei and derive the limits $g < 10^{-28}$–10^{-23} for $\lambda > 3 \times 10^{-4}$ m using the data of TULLNEY 13. See their Figs. 1 and 2 for λ-dependent limits.

[6] TERRANO 15 used a torsion pendulum and rotating attractor, and derived a restrictive limit on the product of the pseudoscalar coupling to electron and the scalar coupling to nucleons, $g < 9 \times 10^{-29}$–5×10^{-26} for $m_{A^0} <$ 1.5–400 μeV. See their Fig. 5 for mass-dependent limits.

[7] BULATOWICZ 13 looked for NMR frequency shifts in polarized ^{129}Xe and ^{131}Xe when a zirconia rod is positioned near the NMR cell, and find $g < 1 \times 10^{-19}$–1×10^{-24} for λ = 0.01–1 cm. See their Fig. 4 for their limits.

[8] CHU 13 look for a shift of the spin precession frequency of polarized ^{3}He in the presence of an unpolarized mass, in analogy to YOUDIN 96. See Fig. 3 for limits on g in the approximate m_{A^0} range 0.02–2 meV.

[9] TULLNEY 13 look for a shift of the precession frequency difference between the colocated ^{3}He and ^{129}Xe in the presence an unpolarized mass, and derive limits g $< 3 \times 10^{-29}$–2×10^{-22} for $\lambda > 3 \times 10^{-4}$ m. See their Fig. 3 for λ-dependent limits.

[10] RAFFELT 12 show that the pseudoscalar couplings to electron and nucleon and the scalar coupling to nucleon are individually constrained by stellar energy-loss arguments and searches for anomalous monopole-monopole forces, together providing restrictive constraints on g. See their Figs. 2 and 3 for results.

[11] HOEDL 11 use a novel torsion pendulum to study the force by the polarized electrons of an external magnet. In their Fig. 3 they show restrictive limits on g in the approximate m_{A^0} range 0.03–10 meV.

[12] PETUKHOV 10 use spin relaxation of polarized ^{3}He and find $g < 3 \times 10^{-23}$ (cm/λ)^2 at 95% CL for the force range $\lambda = 10^{-4}$–1 cm.

[13] SEREBROV 10 use spin precession of ultracold neutrons close to bulk matter and find $g < 2 \times 10^{-21}$ (cm/λ)^2 at 95% CL for the force range $\lambda = 10^{-4}$–1 cm.

[14] IGNATOVICH 09 use data on depolarization of ultracold neutrons in material traps. They show λ-dependent limits in their Fig. 1.

[15] SEREBROV 09 uses data on depolarization of ultracold neutrons stored in material traps and finds $g < 2.96 \times 10^{-21}$ (cm/λ)^2 for the force range $\lambda = 10^{-3}$–1 cm and $g < 3.9 \times 10^{-22}$ (cm/λ)^2 for $\lambda = 10^{-4}$–10^{-3} cm, each time at 95% CL, significantly improving on BAESSLER 07.

[16] BAESSLER 07 use the observation of quantum states of ultracold neutrons in the Earth's gravitational field to constrain g for an interaction range 1 μm–a few mm. See their Fig. 3 for results.

[17] HECKEL 06 studied the influence of unpolarized bulk matter, including the laboratory's surroundings or the Sun, on a torsion pendulum containing about 9×10^{22} polarized electrons. See their Fig. 4 for limits on g as a function of interaction range.

[18] NI 99 searched for a T-violating medium-range force acting on paramagnetic Tb F_3 salt. See their Fig. 1 for the result.

[19] POSPELOV 98 studied the possible contribution of T-violating Medium-Range Force to the neutron electric dipole moment, which is possible when axion interactions violate CP. The size of the force among nucleons must be smaller than gravity by a factor of 2×10^{-10} (1 cm/λ_A), where $\lambda_A = \hbar/m_A c$.

[20] YOUDIN 96 compared the precession frequencies of atomic ^{199}Hg and Cs when a large mass is positioned near the cells, relative to an applied magnetic field. See Fig. 3 for their limits.
[21] RITTER 93 studied the influence of bulk mass with polarized electrons on an unpolarized torsion pendulum, providing limits in the interaction range from 1 to 100 cm.
[22] VENEMA 92 looked for an effect of Earth's gravity on nuclear spin-precession frequencies of ^{199}Hg and ^{201}Hg atoms.
[23] WINELAND 91 looked for an effect of bulk matter with aligned electron spins on atomic hyperfine resonances in stored ^{9}Be^{+} ions using nuclear magnetic resonance.

Hidden Photons: Kinetic Mixing Parameter Limits

Limits are on the kinetic mixing parameter χ which is defined by the Lagrangian

$$L = -\frac{1}{4}\, F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{4}\, F'_{\mu\nu}F'^{\mu\nu} - \frac{\chi}{2}\, F_{\mu\nu}F'^{\mu\nu} + \frac{m^2_{\gamma'}}{2} A'_{\mu}A'^{\mu},$$

where A_μ and A'_μ are the photon and hidden-photon fields with field strengths $F_{\mu\nu}$ and $F'_{\mu\nu}$, respectively, and $m_{\gamma'}$ is the hidden-photon mass.

VALUE	CL%	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •					
$<2 \times 10^{-2}$	95	[1] KRIBS	21		$m_{\gamma'} \lesssim 10$ GeV
$<1 \times 10^{-4}$	90	[2] AAIJ	20C	LHCB	$m_{\gamma'} = 214$ MeV
		[3] AAIJ	20C	LHCB	$m_{\gamma'} = 218$–315 MeV
		[4] ABLIKIM	20AB	BES3	$m_{\gamma'} = 0.2$–2.1 GeV
$<2.5 \times 10^{-12}$	90	[5] AGOSTINI	20	HPGE	$m_{\gamma'} = 60$ keV – 1 MeV
$<3.3 \times 10^{-14}$	90	[6] AMARAL	20	SCDM	$m_{\gamma'} = 1.2$–50 eV
$<1.2 \times 10^{-14}$	90	[7] AN	20	XE1T	$m_{\gamma'} = 200$ eV
$<6.72 \times 10^{-13}$	95	[8] ANDRIANAV...	20	FUNK	$m_{\gamma'} = 1.95$–8.55 eV
$<1 \times 10^{-16}$	90	[9] APRILE	20	XE1T	$m_{\gamma'} = 1$–200 keV
$<9 \times 10^{-16}$	90	[10] ARALIS	20	SCDM	$m_{\gamma'} = 0.04$–500 keV
$<3 \times 10^{-5}$	90	[11] ARGUELLES	20	THEO	$m_{\gamma'} = 0.01$ GeV
$<7 \times 10^{-14}$	90	[12] ARNAUD	20	EDEL	$m_{\gamma'} = 1$–40 eV
$<8.2 \times 10^{-5}$	90	[13] BANERJEE	20	NA64	$m_{\gamma'} = 1.5$–24 MeV
$<7 \times 10^{-15}$	90	[14] BARAK	20	SENS	$m_{\gamma'} = 1.2$–12.8 eV
		[15] KRASNIKOV	20	RVUE	$m_{\gamma'} = 16.7$ MeV
$<1.4 \times 10^{-14}$	90	[16] SHE	20	CDEX	$m_{\gamma'} = 10$–300 eV
$<1.3 \times 10^{-15}$	90	[17] SHE	20	CDEX	$m_{\gamma'} = 0.1$–4 keV
$<1 \times 10^{-3}$	90	[18] SIRUNYAN	20AQ	CMS	$m_{\gamma'} = 11.5$–75 GeV, 110–200 GeV
$<4.3 \times 10^{-10}$	95	[19] TOMITA	20		$m_{\gamma'} = 115.79$–115.85 μeV
$<9 \times 10^{-16}$	90	[20] WANG	20A	CDEX	$m_{\gamma'} = 0.185$–10 keV
		[21] AABOUD	19G	ATLS	$m_{\gamma'} = 20$–60 GeV
$<6 \times 10^{-3}$	90	[22] ABLIKIM	19A	BES3	$m_{\gamma'} = 0.01$–2.4 GeV
$<3.4 \times 10^{-3}$	90	[23] ABLIKIM	19H	BES3	$m_{\gamma'} = 0.1$–2.1 GeV

<8	$\times 10^{-15}$	90	[24] AGUILAR-AR...	19A	DAMC	$m_{\gamma'}$ = 1.2–30 eV
<9	$\times 10^{-17}$	90	[25] APRILE	19D	XE1T	$m_{\gamma'}$ = 0.186–5 keV
<7.5	$\times 10^{-6}$	90	[26] BANERJEE	19	NA64	$m_{\gamma'}$ = 1–200 MeV
<2	$\times 10^{-11}$		[27] BHOONAH	19	ASTR	$m_{\gamma'}$ = 10^{-22}–10^{-10} eV
<5	$\times 10^{-12}$	95	[28] BRUN	19	SHUK	$m_{\gamma'}$ = 20.8–28.3 μeV
<4.4	$\times 10^{-4}$	90	[29] CORTINA-GIL	19	NA62	$m_{\gamma'}$ = 60–110 MeV
<3	$\times 10^{-5}$	95	[30] DANILOV	19	TEXO	$m_{\gamma'}$ = 20 eV - 1 MeV
<6	$\times 10^{-9}$	95	[31] HOCHBERG	19		$m_{\gamma'}$ = 0.8–4 eV
<1	$\times 10^{-11}$	95	[32] KOPYLOV	19	CNTR	$m_{\gamma'}$ = 9–40 eV
<1.5	$\times 10^{-9}$		[33] KOVETZ	19	COSM	$m_{\gamma'}$ = 10^{-23}–10^{-13} eV
<3	$\times 10^{-14}$	95	[34] NGUYEN	19	WDMX	$m_{\gamma'}$ = 6 neV – 2.07 μeV
<4.5	$\times 10^{-14}$	90	[35] ABE	18F	XMAS	$m_{\gamma'}$ = 40–120 keV
<2.5	$\times 10^{-3}$	95	[36] ADRIAN	18	HPS	$m_{\gamma'}$ = 19–81 MeV
<4.4	$\times 10^{-4}$	90	[37] ANASTASI	18B	KLOE	$m_{\gamma'}$ = 519–987 MeV
<4	$\times 10^{-15}$	90	[38] ARMENGAUD	18	EDE3	$m_{\gamma'}$ = 0.8–500 keV
			[39] BANERJEE	18	NA64	$m_{\gamma'}$ = 1–23 MeV
<1.8	$\times 10^{-5}$	90	[40] BANERJEE	18A	NA64	$m_{\gamma'}$ = 1–100 MeV
<1	$\times 10^{-8}$	90	[41] KNIRCK	18		$m_{\gamma'}$ = 0.67–0.92 meV
<3.1	$\times 10^{-14}$	90	[42] ABGRALL	17	HPGE	$m_{\gamma'}$ = 11.8 keV
<6	$\times 10^{-4}$	90	[43] ABLIKIM	17AA	BES3	$m_{\gamma'}$ = 1.5–3.4 GeV
<7	$\times 10^{-15}$	90	[44] ANGLOHER	17	CRES	$m_{\gamma'}$ = 0.3–0.7 keV
<1.2	$\times 10^{-4}$	90	[45] BANERJEE	17	NA64	$m_{\gamma'}$ = 0.002–0.4 GeV
<2	$\times 10^{-11}$		[46] CHANG	17	ASTR	$m_{\gamma'}$ = 15 MeV
<4.5	$\times 10^{-3}$	90	[47] DUBININA	17	EMUL	$m_{\gamma'}$ = 1.1–24 MeV
<4	$\times 10^{-4}$	90	[48] LEES	17E	BABR	$m_{\gamma'}$ = 4.7 GeV
			[49] AAD	16AG	ATLS	$m_{\gamma'}$ = 0.1–2 GeV
<4.4	$\times 10^{-4}$	90	[50] ANASTASI	16	KLOE	$m_{\gamma'}$ = 527–987 MeV
<1.7	$\times 10^{-6}$	95	[51] KHACHATRY...	16	CMS	$m_{\gamma'}$ = 2 GeV
<4	$\times 10^{-2}$	95	[52] AAD	15CD	ATLS	$m_{\gamma'}$ = 15–55 GeV
<1.4	$\times 10^{-3}$	90	[53] ADARE	15		$m_{\gamma'}$ = 30–90 MeV
			[54] AN	15A		$m_{\gamma'}$ = 12 eV - 40 keV
			[55] ANASTASI	15	KLOE	$m_{\gamma'}$ = $2m_\mu$ - 1 GeV
<1.7	$\times 10^{-3}$	90	[56] ANASTASI	15A	KLOE	$m_{\gamma'}$ = 5–320 MeV
<4.2	$\times 10^{-4}$	90	[57] BATLEY	15A	NA48	$m_{\gamma'}$ = 36 MeV
			[58] JAEGLE	15	BELL	$m_{\gamma'}$ = 0.1–3.5 GeV
<3	$\times 10^{-13}$		[59] KAZANAS	15	ASTR	$m_{\gamma'}$ = $2m_e$ – 100 MeV
<6	$\times 10^{-12}$		[60] SUZUKI	15		$m_{\gamma'}$ = 1.9–4.3 eV
<2.3	$\times 10^{-13}$	99.7	[61] VINYOLES	15	ASTR	$m_{\gamma'}$ = 8 eV

$<2 \times 10^{-13}$		[62] ABE	14F	XMAS	$m_{\gamma'} = 40$–120 keV
$<1.8 \times 10^{-3}$	90	[63] AGAKISHIEV	14	HDES	$m_{\gamma'} = 63$ MeV
$<9.0 \times 10^{-4}$	90	[64] BABUSCI	14	KLOE	$m_{\gamma'} = 969$ MeV
		[65] BATELL	14	BDMP	$m_{\gamma'} = 10^{-3}$–1 GeV
$<1.3 \times 10^{-7}$	95	[66] BLUEMLEIN	14	BDMP	$m_{\gamma'} = 0.6$ GeV
$<3 \times 10^{-18}$		[67] FRADETTE	14	COSM	$m_{\gamma'} = 50$–300 MeV
$<3.5 \times 10^{-4}$	90	[68] LEES	14J	BABR	$m_{\gamma'} = 0.2$ GeV
$<9 \times 10^{-4}$	95	[69] MERKEL	14	A1	$m_{\gamma'} = 40$–300 MeV
$<3 \times 10^{-15}$		[70] AN	13B	ASTR	$m_{\gamma'} = 2$ keV
$<7 \times 10^{-14}$		[71] AN	13C	XE10	$m_{\gamma'} = 100$ eV
$<8 \times 10^{-4}$		[72] DIAMOND	13	BDMP	$m_{\gamma'} = 30$–250 MeV
$<2 \times 10^{-3}$	90	[73] GNINENKO	13	BDMP	$m_{\gamma'} = 25$–120 MeV
$<2.2 \times 10^{-13}$		[74] HORVAT	13	HPGE	$m_{\gamma'} = 230$ eV
$<8.06 \times 10^{-5}$	95	[75] INADA	13	LSW	$m_{\gamma'} = 0.04$ eV$-$26 keV
$<2 \times 10^{-10}$	95	[76] MIZUMOTO	13		$m_{\gamma'} = 1$ eV
$<1.7 \times 10^{-7}$		[77] PARKER	13	LSW	$m_{\gamma'} = 53$ μeV
$<5.32 \times 10^{-15}$		[78] PARKER	13		$m_{\gamma'} = 53$ μeV
$<1 \times 10^{-15}$		[79] REDONDO	13	ASTR	$m_{\gamma'} = 2$ keV
$<8 \times 10^{-8}$	90	[80] GNINENKO	12A	BDMP	$m_{\gamma'} = 1$–135 MeV
$<1 \times 10^{-7}$	90	[81] GNINENKO	12B	CHRM	$m_{\gamma'} = 1$–500 MeV
$<1 \times 10^{-3}$	90	[82] ABRAHAMY...	11		$m_{\gamma'} = 175$–250 MeV
$<9 \times 10^{-8}$	95	[83] BLUEMLEIN	11	BDMP	$m_{\gamma'} = 70$ MeV
$<1 \times 10^{-7}$		[84] BJORKEN	09	BDMP	$m_{\gamma'} = 2$–400 MeV
$<5 \times 10^{-9}$		[85] BJORKEN	09	ASTR	$m_{\gamma'} = 2$–50 MeV

[1] KRIBS 21 used the HERA data on neutral current deep inelastic ep scattering to derive the limits, which become weaker for heavier masses. See their Fig. 3 for mass-dependent limits.

[2] AAIJ 20C look for hidden photons produced from the pp collision in the decay channel $\gamma' \to \mu^+ \mu^-$. For prompt decaying hidden photons, limits at the level of 10^{-4}–10^{-3} are obtained for $m_{\gamma'} = 0.214$–30 GeV. See their Fig. 2 for mass-dependent limits.

[3] AAIJ 20C look for hidden photons produced from the pp collision in the decay channel $\gamma' \to \mu^+ \mu^-$. For hidden photons with lifetimes of order ps, limits at the level of 10^{-5} are obtained for $m_{\gamma'} = 218$–315 MeV. See their Fig. 4 for mass-dependent limits.

[4] ABLIKIM 20AB search for $J/\psi \to \eta' \gamma'$ ($\gamma' \to \gamma \pi^0$), and set the upper limit on the product branching fraction of order 10^{-7}. See their Fig. 7 for mass-dependent limits.

[5] AGOSTINI 20 is analogous to ABE 14F. The quoted limit applies to $m_{\gamma'} = 120$ keV. The local density $\rho_{\gamma'} = 0.3$ GeV/cm^3 is assumed. See their Fig. 3 for mass-dependent limits.

[6] AMARAL 20 use a second-generation SuperCDMS high-voltage eV-resolution detector to set limits on dark-matter dark photon absorption. The quoted limit is for $m_{\gamma'} \simeq$ 17 eV. The local density $\rho_{\gamma'} = 0.3$ GeV/cm^3 is assumed. See their Fig. 3 for mass-dependent limits.

[7] AN 20 updates the direct detection limit of AN 13C on solar flux of hidden photons; $\chi < 1.6 \times 10^{-12}$ (eV/$m_{\gamma'}$) for $m_{\gamma'} < 6$ eV (90% C.L.). For $m_{\gamma'} > 6$ eV, see their Fig. 1 for mass-dependent limits.

[8] ANDRIANAVALOMAHEFA 20 is analogous to SUZUKI 15, but uses a mirror that is about one order of magnitude larger than in similar studies in the past. Limits at the level of 10^{-12} are obtained for $m_{\gamma'} =$ 2.5–7 eV. See their Fig.23 and Table III for mass-dependent limits.

[9] APRILE 20 is analogous to ABE 14F, and set limits $\chi \lesssim 10^{-16}$–10^{-12}. The quoted limit applies to $m_{\gamma'} = 1$ keV. They also found an excess over known backgrounds, which favors the mass $m_{\gamma'} = 2.3 \pm 0.2$ keV with a 3 σ significance. See their Fig. 10 for mass-dependent limits.

[10] ARALIS 20 is analogous to ABE 14F. The quoted limit applies to $m_{\gamma'} = 0.1$ keV. The local density $\rho_{\gamma'} = 0.3$ GeV/cm^3 is assumed. See their Fig. 10 for mass-dependent limits.

[11] ARGUELLES 20 examine hidden-photon production in atmospheric cosmic-ray showers and its decay in IceCube and Super-Kamiokande. The quoted limit assumes a lifetime of $c\tau = 0.1$ km. See their Fig. 16 for mass- and lifetime-dependent limits.

[12] ARNAUD 20 look for the absorption signal of hidden photon dark matter in a Ge detector. The quoted limit applies to $m_{\gamma'} \simeq$ 9 eV. The local density $\rho_{\gamma'} = 0.3$ GeV/cm^3 is assumed. See their Fig. 3 for mass-dependent limits.

[13] BANERJEE 20 is an update of BANERJEE 18. They exclude $8.2 \times 10^{-5} \lesssim \chi \lesssim 1 \times 10^{-2}$ for $m_{\gamma'} =$ 1.5–24 MeV. In particular, they exclude $\chi = 1.2 \times 10^{-4}$–$6.8 \times 10^{-4}$ for the 16.7 MeV gauge boson. See their Fig. 5 for mass-dependent limits.

[14] BARAK 20 is analogous to AGUILAR-AREVALO 19A, and look for hidden photon dark matter by using the Skipper CCD. The quoted limit applies to $m_{\gamma'} = 12.8$ eV. See their Fig. 4 for mass-dependent limits.

[15] KRASNIKOV 20 showed that the limit of BANERJEE 20 combined with the measured anomalous magnetic moment of the electron exclude the 16.7 MeV gauge boson suggested by the ATOMKI (KRASZNAHORKAY 16) experiment if it has pure vector or axial-vector interactions.

[16] SHE 20 look for solar hidden photons. The quoted limit applies to $m_{\gamma'} = 180$ eV. See their Fig. 4 for mass-dependent limits.

[17] SHE 20 look for hidden photon dark matter and set limits $\chi < 1.3 \times 10^{-15}$–$2.8 \times 10^{-14}$ for the quoted mass range. The local density $\rho_{\gamma'} = 0.3$ GeV/cm^3 is assumed. See their Fig. 6 for mass-dependent limits.

[18] SIRUNYAN 20AQ look for a narrow resonance decaying into a pair of muons. For $m_{\gamma'} < 45$ GeV, they use dedicated high-rate dimuon triggers to reduce the muon transverse momentum thresholds. The quoted limit applies to $m_{\gamma'} = 50$ GeV, and limits of order 10^{-3} are obtained for the quoted mass range. See their Fig. 3 for mass-dependent limits.

[19] TOMITA 20 look for hidden photon dark matter using a planar metal plate and cryogenic receiver and set limits $\chi <$ 1.8–4.3 $\times 10^{-10}$ for the quoted mass range. The local density $\rho_{\gamma'} = 0.39$ GeV/cm^3 is assumed. See their Fig. 7 for mass-dependent limits.

[20] WANG 20A is analogous to ABE 14F. The quoted limit applies to $m_{\gamma'}$ = 185 eV. The local density $\rho_{\gamma'}$ = 0.3 GeV/cm^3 is assumed. See their Fig. 11 for mass-dependent limits.

[21] AABOUD 19G look for $h \to \gamma' \gamma'$ ($\gamma' \to \mu^+ \mu^-$) and exclude a kinetic mixing around 10^{-9}–10^{-8} for B($h \to \gamma' \gamma'$) = 0.01 and 0.1. See their Fig. 9 for mass-dependent limits.

[22] ABLIKIM 19A look for $J/\psi \to \gamma' \eta$ ($\gamma' \to e^+ e^-$). Limits between 6×10^{-3} and 5×10^{-2} are obtained (see their Fig. 8).

[23] ABLIKIM 19H look for $J/\psi \to \gamma' \eta'$ ($\gamma' \to e^+ e^-$). Limits between 3.4×10^{-3} and 2.6×10^{-2} are obtained. See their Fig. 5 for mass-dependent limits.

[24] AGUILAR-AREVALO 19A look for the absorption signal of hidden photon dark matter by using a CCD. The quoted limit applies to $m_{\gamma'}$ = 17 eV. The local density $\rho_{\gamma'}$ = 0.3 GeV/cm^3 is assumed. See their Fig. 4 for mass-dependent limits.

[25] APRILE 19D is analogous to ABE 14F. The quoted limit applies to $m_{\gamma'}$ = 0.7 keV. See their Fig. 5(f) for mass-dependent limits.

[26] BANERJEE 19 is an update of BANERJEE 18A. The quoted limit is at $m_{\gamma'}$ = 1 MeV. See their Fig. 3 for mass-dependent limits.

[27] BHOONAH 19 examine heating of Galactic Center gas clouds by hidden photon dark matter. The quoted limit applies to $m_{\gamma'} \simeq 10^{-12}$ eV. See their Fig. 2 for mass-dependent limits.

[28] BRUN 19 is analogous to SUZUKI 15. The limit is derived under an assumption that hidden photons constitute the local dark matter density $\rho_{\gamma'}$ = 0.3 GeV/cm^3.

[29] CORTINA-GIL 19 look for an invisible hidden photon in the reaction $K^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^0$ ($\pi^0 \to \gamma\gamma'$). The quoted limit applies to $m_{\gamma'}$ = 62.5–65 MeV. See their Figs. 6 and 7 for mass-dependent limits.

[30] DANILOV 19 examined the hidden photon production in nuclear reactors, correctly taking account of the effective photon mass in the reactor and detector. The limit gets weaker for $m_{\gamma'}$ less than the effective photon mass in proportion to $1/m^2_{\gamma'}$. See their Fig. 1 for mass-dependent limits.

[31] HOCHBERG 19 look for the absorption signal of hidden photon dark matter by using superconducting-nanowire single-photon detectors. The quoted limit applies to $m_{\gamma'} \simeq$ 1 eV. The local density $\rho_{\gamma'}$ = 0.3 GeV/cm^3 is assumed. See their Fig. 4 for mass-dependent limits.

[32] KOPYLOV 19 look for hidden-photon dark matter using a counter with an aluminum cathode and derive limits assuming it constitute all the local dark matter. The quoted limit applies to $m_{\gamma'}$ = 12 eV. See their Fig. 7 for mass-dependent limits.

[33] KOVETZ 19 examine heating of the early Universe plasma by hidden photon dark matter, and derive the limits by requiring that the cosmic mean 21 cm brightness temperature relative to the CMB temperature satisfy $T_{21} > -100$ mK. The quoted limit applies to $m_{\gamma'} \simeq 2 \times 10^{-14}$ eV. See their Fig. 3 for mass-dependent limits.

[34] NGUYEN 19 look for hidden photon dark matter with a resonant cavity, and set limits $\sim 10^{-12}$ for $m_{\gamma'}$ = 0.2–2.07μeV. The quoted limit applies to $m_{\gamma'}$ = 1.3 μeV. The local density $\rho_{\gamma'}$ = 0.3 GeV/cm^3 is assumed. See their Fig. 19 for mass-dependent limits.

[35] ABE 18F is an update of ABE 14F. The quoted limit applies to $m_{\gamma'} \simeq$ 40 keV. See their Fig. 5 for mass-dependent limits.

[36] ADRIAN 18 look for a hidden photon resonance in the reaction $e^- Z \to e^- Z \gamma'$ ($\gamma' \to e^+ e^-$). The quoted limit applies to $m_{\gamma'} = 40$ MeV. See their Fig. 4 for mass-dependent limits.

[37] ANASTASI 18B look for a hidden photon resonance in the reaction $e^+ e^- \to \gamma' \gamma$ ($\gamma' \to \mu^+ \mu^-$). The quoted limit is obtained by combining the result of ANASTASI 16 and it applies to $m_{\gamma'} \simeq$ 519–987 MeV. See their Fig. 9 for mass-dependent limits.

[38] ARMENGAUD 18 is analogous to ABE 14F. The quoted limits applies to $m_{\gamma'} = 1.6$ keV. See the right panel of Fig. 5 for mass-dependent limits.

[39] BANERJEE 18 look for hidden photons produced in the reaction $e^- Z \to e^- Z \gamma'$ ($\gamma' \to e^+ e^-$), and exclude $9.2 \times 10^{-5} \lesssim \chi \lesssim 1 \times 10^{-2}$ for $m_{\gamma'} =$ 1–23 MeV. They also set a limit on the electron coupling to a 16.7 MeV gauge boson suggested by the ATOMKI (KRASZNAHORKAY 16) experiment. See their Fig. 3 for mass-dependent limits.

[40] BANERJEE 18A look for invisible decays of hidden photons produced in the reaction $e^- Z \to e^- Z \gamma'$. The quoted limit is at $m_{\gamma'} = 1$ MeV. See their Fig. 15 for mass-dependent limits.

[41] KNIRCK 18 is analogous to SUZUKI 15. See their Fig. 5 for mass-dependent limits.

[42] ABGRALL 17 is analogous to ABE 14F using the MAJORANA DEMONSTRATOR. See their Fig. 3 for limits between 6 keV $< m_{\gamma'} <$ 97 keV.

[43] ABLIKIM 17AA look for $e^+ e^- \to \gamma \gamma'$ ($\gamma' \to e^+ e^-$ or $\mu^+ \mu^-$) . Limits between 10^{-3} and 10^{-4} are obtained (see their Fig. 3).

[44] ANGLOHER 17 is analogous to ABE 14F. The quoted limit is at $m_{\gamma'} = 0.7$ keV. See their Fig. 8 for mass-dependent limits.

[45] BANERJEE 17 look for invisible decays of hidden photons produced in the reaction $e^- Z \to e^- Z \gamma'$. The quoted limit applies to $m_{\gamma'} = 2$ MeV. See their Fig. 3 for mass-dependent limits.

[46] CHANG 17 examine the hidden photon emission from SN1987A, including the effects of finite temperature and density on χ and obtain limits χ ($m_{\gamma'}$/MeV) $\lesssim 3 \times 10^{-9}$ for $m_{\gamma'} <$ 15 MeV and $\chi \lesssim 10^{-9}$ for $m_{\gamma'} =$ 15–120 MeV.

[47] DUBININA 17 look for $\mu^+ \to e^+ \overline{\nu}_\mu \nu_e \gamma'$ ($\gamma' \to e^+ e^-$) in a nuclear photoemulsion. The quoted limit applies to $m_{\gamma'} = 1.1$ MeV. Limits between 4.5×10^{-3} and 10^{-2} are obtained (see their Fig. 3).

[48] LEES 17E look for invisible decays of hidden photons produced in the reaction $e^+ e^- \to \gamma \gamma'$. See their Fig. 5 for limits in the mass range $m_{\gamma'} \leq$ 8 GeV.

[49] AAD 16AG look for hidden photons promptly decaying into collimated electrons and/or muons, assuming that they are produced in the cascade decays of squarks or the Higgs boson. See their Fig. 10 and Fig.13 for their limits on the cross section times branching fractions.

[50] ANASTASI 16 look for the decay $\gamma' \to \pi^+ \pi^-$ in the reaction $e^+ e^- \to \gamma \gamma'$. Limits between 4.3×10^{-3} and 4.4×10^{-4} are obtained for $527 < m_{\gamma'} < 987$ MeV (see their Fig. 9).

[51] KHACHATRYAN 16 look for $\gamma' \to \mu^+ \mu^-$ in a dark SUSY scenario where the SM-like Higgs boson decays into a pair of the visible lightest neutralinos with mass 10 GeV, both of which decay into γ' and a hidden neutralino with mass 1 GeV. See the right panel in their Fig. 2.

[52] AAD 15CD look for $H \to Z \gamma' \to 4\ell$ with the ATLAS detector at LHC and find $\chi <$ 4–17 $\times 10^{-2}$ for $m_{\gamma'} =$ 15–55 GeV. See their Fig. 6.

[53] ADARE 15 look for a hidden photon in π^0, $\eta^0 \to \gamma e^+ e^-$ at the PHENIX experiment. See their Fig. 4 for mass-dependent limits.

[54] AN 15A derived limits from the absence of ionization signals in the XENON10 and XENON100 experiments, assuming hidden photons constitute all the local dark matter. Their best limit is $\chi < 1.3\times10^{-15}$ at $m_{\gamma'} = 18$ eV. See their Fig. 1 for mass-dependent limits.

[55] ANASTASI 15 look for a production of a hidden photon and a hidden Higgs boson with the KLOE detector at DAΦNE, where the hidden photon decays into a pair of muons and the hidden Higgs boson lighter than $m_{\gamma'}$ escape detection. See their Figs. 6 and 7 for mass-dependent limits on a product of the hidden fine structure constant and the kinetic mixing.

[56] ANASTASI 15A look for the decay $\gamma' \to e^+e^-$ in the reaction $e^+e^- \to e^+e^-\gamma$. Limits between 1.7×10^{-3} and 1×10^{-2} are obtained for $m_{\gamma'} =$ 5–320 MeV (see their Fig. 7).

[57] BATLEY 15A look for $\pi^0 \to \gamma\gamma'$ ($\gamma' \to e^+e^-$) at the NA48/2 experiment. Limits between 4.2×10^{-4} and 8.8×10^{-3} are obtained for $m_{\gamma'} =$ 9–120 MeV (see their Fig. 4).

[58] JAEGLE 15 look for the decay $\gamma' \to e^+e^-$, $\mu^+\mu^-$, or $\pi^+\pi^-$ in the dark Higgstrahlung channel, $e^+e^- \to \gamma' H'$ ($H' \to \gamma'\gamma'$) at the BELLE experiment. They set limits on a product of the branching fraction and the Born cross section as well as a product of the hidden fine structure constant and the kinetic mixing. See their Figs. 3 and 4.

[59] KAZANAS 15 set limits by studying the decay of hidden photons $\gamma' \to e^+e^-$ inside and near the progenitor star of SN1987A. See their Fig. 6 for mass-dependent limits.

[60] SUZUKI 15 looked for hidden-photon dark matter with a dish antenna and derived limits assuming they constitute all the local dark matter. Their limits are $\chi < 6\times10^{-12}$ for $m_{\gamma'} =$ 1.9–4.3 eV. See their Fig. 7 for mass-dependent limits.

[61] VINYOLES 15 performed a global fit analysis based on helioseismology and solar neutrino observations, and set the limits $\chi m_{\gamma'} < 1.8\times10^{-12}$ eV for $m_{\gamma'} = 3\times10^{-5}$–8 eV. See their Fig. 11.

[62] ABE 14F look for the photoelectric-like interaction in the XMASS detector assuming the hidden photon constitutes all the local dark matter. Limits between 2×10^{-13} and 1×10^{-12} are obtained, where the relation $\chi^2 = \alpha'/\alpha$ is used to translate the original bound on the ratio of the hidden and EM fine-structure constants. See their Fig. 3 for mass-dependent limits.

[63] AGAKISHIEV 14 look for hidden photons $\gamma' \to e^+e^-$ at the HADES experiment, and set limits on χ for $m_{\gamma'} =$ 0.02–0.6 GeV. See their Fig. 5 for mass-dependent limits.

[64] BABUSCI 14 look for the decay $\gamma' \to \mu^+\mu^-$ in the reaction $e^+e^- \to \mu^+\mu^-\gamma$. Limits between 4×10^{-3} and 9.0×10^{-4} are obtained for 520 MeV $< m_{\gamma'} <$ 980 MeV (see their Fig. 7).

[65] BATELL 14 derived limits from the electron beam dump experiment at SLAC (E-137) by searching for events with recoil electrons by sub-GeV dark matter produced from the decay of the hidden photon. Limits at the level of 10^{-4}–10^{-1} are obtained for $m_{\gamma'} = 10^{-3}$–1 GeV, depending on the dark matter mass and the hidden gauge coupling (see their Fig. 2).

[66] BLUEMLEIN 14 analyzed the beam dump data taken at the U-70 accelerator to look for γ'-bremsstrahlung and the subsequent decay into muon pairs and hadrons. See their Fig. 4 for mass-dependent excluded region.

[67] FRADETTE 14 studied effects of decay of relic hidden photons on BBN and CMB to set constraints on very small values of the kinetic mixing. See their Figs. 4 and 7 for mass-dependent excluded regions.

[68] LEES 14J look for hidden photons in the reaction $e^+e^- \to \gamma\gamma'$ ($\gamma' \to e^+e^-$, $\mu^+\mu^-$). Limits at the level of 10^{-4}–10^{-3} are obtained for 0.02 GeV $< m_{\gamma'} <$ 10.2 GeV. See their Fig. 4 for mass-dependent limits.

[69] MERKEL 14 look for $\gamma' \to e^+ e^-$ at the A1 experiment at the Mainz Microtron (MAMI). See their Fig. 3 for mass-dependent limits.

[70] AN 13B examined the stellar production of hidden photons, correcting an important error of the production rate of the longitudinal mode which now dominates. See their Fig. 2 for mass-dependent limits based on solar energy loss.

[71] AN 13C use the solar flux of hidden photons to set a limit on the atomic ionization rate in the XENON10 experiment. They find $\chi\, m_{\gamma'} < 3 \times 10^{-12}$ eV for $m_{\gamma'} < 1$ eV. See their Fig. 2 for mass-dependent limits.

[72] DIAMOND 13 analyzed the beam dump data taken at the SLAC millicharge experiment to constrain a hidden photon invisibly decaying into lighter long-lived particles, which undergo elastic scattering off nuclei in the detector. Limits between 8×10^{-4}–2×10^{-2} are obtained. The quoted limit is applied when the dark gauge coupling is set equal to the electromagnetic coupling. See their Fig.4 for mass-dependent limits.

[73] GNINENKO 13 used the data taken at the SINDRUM experiment to constrain the decay, $\pi^0 \to \gamma\gamma'$ ($\gamma' \to e^+ e^-$) to derive limits. See their Fig. 2 for their mass-dependent excluded region.

[74] HORVAT 13 look for hidden-photo-electric effect in HPGe detectors induced by solar hidden photons. See their Fig. 3 for mass-dependent limits.

[75] INADA 13 search for hidden photons using an intense X-ray beamline at SPring-8. See their Fig. 4 for mass-dependent limits.

[76] MIZUMOTO 13 look for solar hidden photons. See their Fig. 5 for mass-dependent limits.

[77] PARKER 13 look for hidden photons using a cryogenic resonant microwave cavity. See their Fig.5 for mass-dependent limits.

[78] PARKER 13 derived a limit for the hidden photon CDM with a randomly oriented hidden photon field.

[79] REDONDO 13 examined the solar emission of hidden photons including the enhancement factor for the longitudinal mode pointed out by AN 13B, and also updated stellar-energy loss arguments. See their Fig.3 for mass-dependent limits, including a review of the currently best limits from other arguments.

[80] GNINENKO 12A obtained bounds on B($\pi^0 \to \gamma\gamma'$) · B($\gamma' \to e^+ e^-$) from the NOMAD and PS191 neutrino experiments, and derived limits between 8×10^{-8}–2×10^{-4}. See their Fig.4 for mass-dependent excluded regions.

[81] GNINENKO 12B used the data taken at the CHARM experiment to constrain the decay, $\eta(\eta') \to \gamma\gamma'$ ($\gamma' \to e^+ e^-$), and derived limits between 1×10^{-7}–1×10^{-4}. See their Fig.4 for mass-dependent excluded region.

[82] ABRAHAMYAN 11 look for $\gamma' \to e^+ e^-$ in the electron-nucelon fixed-target experiment at the Jefferson Laboratory (APEX). See their Fig. 5 for mass-dependent limits.

[83] BLUEMLEIN 11 analyzed the beam dump data taken at the U-70 accelerator to look for $\pi^0 \to \gamma\gamma'$ ($\gamma' \to e^+ e^-$). See their Fig. 5 for mass-dependent limits.

[84] BJORKEN 09 analyzed the beam dump data taken at E137, E141, and E774 to constrain a hidden photon produced by bremsstrahlung, subsequently decaying into $e^+ e^-$, and derived limits between 10^{-7} and 10^{-2}. See their Fig. 1 for mass-dependent excluded region.

[85] BJORKEN 09 required the energy loss in the γ' emission from the core of SN1987A not to exceed 10^{53} erg/s, and derived limits between 5×10^{-9} and 2×10^{-6}. See their Fig. 1 for mass-dependent excluded region.

REFERENCES FOR Searches for Axions (A^0) and Other Very Light Bosons

DEVLIN	21	PRL 126 041301	J.A. Devlin *et al.*	(BASE Collab.)
KRIBS	21	PRL 126 011801	G.D. Kribs, D. McKeen, N. Raj	(OREG, TRIU)
XIAO	21	PRL 126 031101	M. Xiao *et al.*	
AAIJ	20AL	JHEP 2010 156	R. Aaij *et al.*	(LHCb Collab.)
AAIJ	20C	PRL 124 041801	R. Aaij *et al.*	(LHCb Collab.)
ABDELHAME...	20	EPJ C80 376	A.H. Abdelhameed *et al.*	
ABE	20J	PL B815 136174	T. Abe, K. Hamaguchi, N. Nagata	(TOKY)
ABLIKIM	20AB	PR D102 052005	M. Ablikim *et al.*	(BESIII Collab.)
ABUDINEN	20	PRL 125 161806	F. Abudinen *et al.*	(Belle II Collab.)
AGOSTINI	20	PRL 125 011801	M. Agostini *et al.*	(GERDA Collab.)
AGUILAR-AR...	20	PR D101 052014	A. Aguilar-Arevalo *et al.*	(PIENU Collab.)
AMARAL	20	PR D102 091101	D.W. Amaral *et al.*	(SuperCDMS Collab.)
AN	20	PR D102 115022	H. An *et al.*	(VIEN, MINN, VICT, TSIN)
ANDRIANAV...	20	PR D102 042001	A. Andrianavalomahefa *et al.*	(FUNK Collab.)
APRILE	20	PR D102 072004	E. Aprile *et al.*	(XENON Collab.)
ARALIS	20	PR D101 052008	T. Aralis *et al.*	(SuperCDMS Collab.)
ARGUELLES	20	JHEP 2002 190	C. Arguelles *et al.*	(MIT, VALE)
ARNAUD	20	PRL 125 141301	Q. Arnaud *et al.*	(EDELWEISS Collab.)
BALDINI	20	EPJ C80 858	A.M. Baldini *et al.*	(MEG Collab.)
BANERJEE	20	PR D101 071101	D. Banerjee *et al.*	(NA64 Collab.)
BANERJEE	20A	PRL 125 081801	D. Banerjee *et al.*	(NA64 Collab.)
BARAK	20	PRL 125 171802	L. Barak *et al.*	(SENSEI Collab.)
BRAINE	20	PRL 124 101303	T. Braine *et al.*	(ADMX Collab.)
BUEHLER	20	JCAP 2009 027	R. Buehler *et al.*	(DESY, MADU)
CALORE	20	PR D102 123005	F. Calore *et al.*	(LAPP, BARI, HEID, +)
CAPOZZI	20	PR D102 083007	F. Capozzi, G. Raffelt	(MPIM)
CARENZA	20	PL B809 135709	P. Carenza *et al.*	
CRESCINI	20	PRL 124 171801	N. Crescini *et al.*	(QUAX Collab.)
CRISOSTO	20	PRL 124 241101	N. Crisosto *et al.*	(ADMX SLIC Collab.)
DARLING	20	PRL 125 121103	J. Darling	(COLO)
DARLING	20A	APJ 900 L28	J. Darling	(COLO)
DENT	20A	PRL 125 131805	J.B. Dent *et al.*	
DEPTA	20	JCAP 2005 009	P.F. Depta, M. Hufnagel, K. Schmidt-Hoberg	(DESY)
DESSERT	20A	PRL 125 261102	C. Dessert, J.W. Foster, B.R. Safdi	(MICH)
ESTEBAN	20	EPJ C80 259	I. Esteban *et al.*	
FOSTER	20	PRL 125 171301	J.W. Foster *et al.*	(MICH, ILL, TOKY+)
GAO	20	PRL 125 131806	C. Gao *et al.*	(FNAL, EFI, CHIC, ANL+)
GAVELA	20	PRL 124 051802	M.B. Gavela *et al.*	
GHOSH	20A	JCAP 2010 060	D. Ghosh, D. Sachdeva	
IRSIC	20	PR D101 123518	V. Irsic, H. Xiao, M. McQuinn	
JEONG	20	PRL 125 221302	J. Jeong *et al.*	
KENNEDY	20	PRL 125 201302	C.J. Kennedy *et al.*	(COLO, STAN)
KLIMCHITSK...	20	PR D101 056013	G.L. Klimchitskaya, P. Kuusk, V.M. Mostepanenko	
KOROCHKIN	20	JCAP 2003 064	A. Korochkin, A. Neronov, D. Semikoz	
KRASNIKOV	20	MPL A35 2050116	N.V. Krasnikov	
LEE	20A	PRL 124 101802	S .Lee *et al.*	(CULTASK Collab.)
LUCENTE	20A	JCAP 2012 008	G. Lucente *et al.*	
MEYER	20	PRL 124 231101	M. Meyer, T. Petrushevska	(Fermi-LAT Collab.)
Also		PRL 125 119901 (errat.)	M. Meyer, T. Petrushevska	(Fermi-LAT Collab.)
PODDAR	20	PR D101 083007	T.K. Poddar, S. Mohanty, S. Jana	
SCHUTZ	20	PR D101 123026	K. Schutz	(MIT)
SHE	20	PRL 124 111301	Z. She *et al.*	(CDEX Collab.)
SIRUNYAN	20AQ	PRL 124 131802	A.M. Sirunyan *et al.*	(CMS Collab.)
STRANIERO	20	AA 644 A166	O. Straniero *et al.*	(SASSO, BGNA, GRAN)
SUN	20	PR D101 063020	L. Sun, R. Brito, M. Isi	(CIT, ROMAI, MIT)
TOMITA	20	JCAP 2009 012	N. Tomita *et al.*	
WANG	20A	PR D101 052003	Y. Wang *et al.*	(CDEX Collab.)
YAMAMOTO	20	JCAP 2002 011	R. Yamamoto *et al.*	
AABOUD	19G	PR D99 012001	M. Aaboud *et al.*	(ATLAS Collab.)
ABLIKIM	19A	PR D99 012006	M. Ablikim *et al.*	(BESIII Collab.)
ABLIKIM	19H	PR D99 012013	M. Ablikim *et al.*	(BESIII Collab.)
ADELBERGER	19	PRL 123 169001	E.G. Adelberger, W.A. Terrano	(WASH, PRIN)
ADHIKARI	19B	ASP 114 101	P. Adhikari *et al.*	(COSINE-100 Collab.)
AGUILAR-AR...	19A	PRL 123 181802	A. Aguilar-Arevalo *et al.*	(DAMIC Collab.)
AHN	19	PRL 122 021802	J.K. Ahn *et al.*	(KOTO Collab.)
ALESINI	19	PR D99 101101	D. Alesini *et al.*	(QUAX Collab.)
ALONI	19	PRL 123 071801	D. Aloni *et al.*	(REHO, MIT, CERN, HAIF)
APRILE	19D	PRL 123 251801	E. Aprile *et al.*	(XENON1T Collab.)

ARNOLD	19	EPJ C79 440	R. Arnold *et al.*	(NEMO-3 Collab.)
BANERJEE	19	PRL 123 121801	D. Banerjee *et al.*	(NA64 Collab.)
BHOONAH	19	PR D100 023001	A. Bhoonah *et al.*	
BRUN	19	PRL 122 201801	P. Brun, L. Chevalier, C. Flouzat	(SACL)
CAPUTO	19	PR D100 063515	A. Caputo *et al.*	
CORTINA-GIL	19	JHEP 1905 182	E. Cortina Gil *et al.*	(NA62 Collab.)
DANILOV	19	PRL 122 041801	M. Danilov, S. Demidov, D. Gorbunov	(LEBD, INRM+)
DAVOUDIASL	19	PRL 123 021102	H. Davoudiasl, P.B. Denton	(BNL)
DESSERT	19	PRL 123 061104	C. Dessert, A.J. Long, B.R. Safdi	(MICH)
FEDDERKE	19	PR D100 015040	M.A. Fedderke, P.W. Graham, S. Rajendran	(STAN+)
FUJITA	19	PRL 122 191101	T. Fujita, R. Tazaki, K. Toma	(KYOT, GEVA, TOHO)
HOCHBERG	19	PRL 123 151802	Y. Hochberg *et al.*	(HEBR, MIT, NIST)
IVANOV	19	JCAP 1902 059	M.M. Ivanov *et al.*	
KOPYLOV	19	JCAP 1907 008	A. Kopylov, I. Orekhov, V. Petukhov	(INRM)
KOVETZ	19	PR D99 123511	E.D. Kovetz, I. Cholis, D.E. Kaplan	(JHU)
LEINSON	19	JCAP 1911 031	L.B. Leinson	
LIANG	19	JCAP 1906 042	Y-F. Liang *et al.*	
LLOYD	19	PR D100 063005	S.J. Lloyd *et al.*	
MARSH	19	PRL 123 051103	D.J.E. Marsh, J.C. Niemeyer	(GOET)
NGUYEN	19	JCAP 1910 014	L.H. Nguyen, A. Lobanov, D. Horns	(WISPDMX Collab.)
OUELLET	19A	PRL 122 121802	J.L. Ouellet *et al.*	(ABRACADABRA Collab.)
PALOMBA	19	PRL 123 171101	C. Palomba *et al.*	
SIRUNYAN	19BQ	PL B796 131	A.M. Sirunyan *et al.*	(CMS Collab.)
SMORRA	19	NAT 575 310	C. Smorra *et al.*	
TERRANO	19	PRL 122 231301	W. Terrano *et al.*	(WASH)
WU	19	PRL 122 191302	T. Wu *et al.*	(CASPEr-ZULF Collab.)
WU	19C	PRL 123 169002	T. Wu *et al.*	(CASPEr-ZULF Collab.)
ABE	18F	PL B787 153	K. Abe *et al.*	(XMASS Collab.)
ADRIAN	18	PR D98 091101	P.H. Adrian *et al.*	(HPS Collab.)
AKHMATOV	18	PPN 49 599	Z.A. Akhmatov *et al.*	
ANASTASI	18B	PL B784 336	A. Anastasi *et al.*	(KLOE-2 Collab.)
ARMENGAUD	18	PR D98 082004	E. Armengaud *et al.*	(EDELWEISS-III Collab.)
ARNOLD	18	EPJ C78 821	R. Arnold *et al.*	(NEMO-3 Collab.)
BANERJEE	18	PRL 120 231802	D. Banerjee *et al.*	(NA64 Collab.)
BANERJEE	18A	PR D97 072002	D. Banerjee *et al.*	(NA64 Collab.)
BEZNOGOV	18	PR C98 035802	M.V. Beznogov *et al.*	
BOUTAN	18	PRL 121 261302	C. Boutan *et al.*	(ADMX Collab.)
CHANG	18	JHEP 1809 051	J.C. Chang, R. Essig, S.D. McDermott	
CRESCINI	18	EPJ C78 703	N. Crescini *et al.*	(QUAX Collab.)
DU	18	PRL 120 151301	N. Du *et al.*	(ADMX Collab.)
DZUBA	18	PR D98 035048	V.A. Dzuba *et al.*	
FICEK	18	PRL 120 183002	F. Ficek *et al.*	
FORTIN	18	JHEP 1806 048	J.-F. Fortin, K. Sinha	(LAVL, OKLA)
GAVRILYUK	18	JETPL 107 589	Yu.M. Gavrilyuk *et al.*	
HAMAGUCHI	18	PR D98 103015	K. Hamaguchi *et al.*	
KNIRCK	18	JCAP 1811 031	S. Knirck *et al.*	
STADNIK	18	PRL 120 013202	Y.V. Stadnik, V.A. Dzuba, V.V. Flambaum	
YAMAJI	18	PL B782 523	T. Yamaji *et al.*	(TOKY, RIKEN, KEK)
ZHANG	18	PR D97 063009	C. Zhang *et al.*	
ZHONG	18	PR D97 092001	L. Zhong *et al.*	(HAYSTAC Collab.)
AAIJ	17AQ	PR D95 071101	R. Aaij *et al.*	(LHCb Collab.)
ABEL	17	PR X7 041034	C. Abel *et al.*	(nEDM Collab.)
ABGRALL	17	PRL 118 161801	N. Abgrall *et al.*	(MAJORANA Collab.)
ABLIKIM	17AA	PL B774 252	M. Ablikim *et al.*	(BESIII Collab.)
ADE	17	PR D96 102003	P.A.R. Ade *et al.*	(BICEP2/Keck Array Collab.)
AHN	17	PTEP 2017 021C01	J.K. Ahn *et al.*	(KOTO Collab.)
AKERIB	17B	PRL 118 261301	D.S. Akerib *et al.*	(LUX Collab.)
ANASTASSO...	17	NATP 13 584	V. Anastassopoulos *et al.*	(CAST Collab.)
ANGLOHER	17	EPJ C77 299	G. Angloher *et al.*	(CRESST-II Collab.)
APRILE	17B	PR D95 029904	E. Aprile *et al.*	(XENON100 Collab.)
BANERJEE	17	PRL 118 011802	D. Banerjee *et al.*	(NA64 Collab.)
BATLEY	17	PL B769 67	J.R. Batley *et al.*	(NA48/2 Collab.)
BRANCA	17	PRL 118 021302	A. Branca *et al.*	(AURIGA Collab.)
BRUBAKER	17	PRL 118 061302	B.M. Brubaker *et al.*	(YALE, UCB, NIST+)
CHANG	17	JHEP 1701 107	J.H. Chang, R. Essig, S.D. McDermott	(STON)
CHOI	17	PR D96 061102	J. Choi *et al.*	(CAPP-ACTION Collab.)
CRESCINI	17	PL B773 677	N. Crescini *et al.*	(QUAX-gpgs Collab.)
DAIDO	17	PL B772 127	R. Daido, F. Takahashi	
DOLAN	17	JHEP 1712 094	M.J. Dolan *et al.*	
DUBININA	17	PAN 80 461	V.V. Dubinina *et al.*	
FICEK	17	PR A95 032505	F. Ficek *et al.*	

FU	17A	PRL 119 181806	C. Fu *et al.*	(PandaX-II Collab.)
INADA	17	PRL 118 071803	T. Inada *et al.*	
KLIMCHITSK...	17A	PR D95 123013	G.L. Klimchitskaya, V.M. Mostepanenko	
KOHRI	17	PR D96 051701	K. Kohri, H. Kodama	(KEK, KYOT)
LEES	17E	PRL 119 131804	J.P. Lees *et al.*	(BABAR Collab.)
LIU	17	PL B766 117	X.-H. Liu	(TINT)
LIU	17A	PR D95 052006	S.K. Liu *et al.*	(CDEX Collab.)
LUO	17	PR D96 055028	P. Luo *et al.*	
MARSH	17	JCAP 1712 036	M.C.D. Marsh *et al.*	
TIWARI	17	PR D95 023005	P. Tiwari	(Technion)
AAD	16AG	JHEP 1602 062	G. Aad *et al.*	(ATLAS Collab.)
ABLIKIM	16E	PR D93 052005	M. Ablikim *et al.*	(BESIII Collab.)
AJELLO	16	PRL 116 161101	M. Ajello *et al.*	(Fermi-LAT Collab.)
ANASTASI	16	PL B757 356	A. Anastasi *et al.*	(KLOE-2 Collab.)
BATTICH	16	JCAP 1608 062	T. Battich *et al.*	
BERENJI	16	PR D93 045019	B. Berenji *et al.*	
CORSICO	16	JCAP 1607 036	A.H. Corsico *et al.*	
DELLA-VALLE	16	EPJ C76 24	F. Della Valle *et al.*	(PVLAS Collab.)
HOSKINS	16	PR D94 082001	J. Hoskins *et al.*	(ADMX Collab.)
JAECKEL	16	PL B753 482	J. Jaeckel, M. Spannowsky	(HEID, DURH)
KHACHATRY...	16	PL B752 146	V. Khachatryan *et al.*	(CMS Collab.)
KRASZNAHO...	16	PRL 116 042501	A.J. Krasznahorkay *et al.*	(HINR, ANIK+)
LEEFER	16	PRL 117 271601	N. Leefer *et al.*	(MAINZ, BONN, LBL, UCB+)
WON	16	PR D94 092006	E. Won *et al.*	(BELLE Collab.)
YOON	16	JHEP 1606 011	Y.S. Yoon *et al.*	(KIMS Collab.)
AAD	15CD	PR D92 092001	G. Aad *et al.*	(ATLAS Collab.)
AAIJ	15AZ	PRL 115 161802	R. Aaij *et al.*	(LHCb Collab.)
ADARE	15	PR C91 031901	A. Adare *et al.*	(PHENIX Collab.)
AFACH	15	PL B745 58	S. Afach *et al.*	(ETH, PSI, CAEN, +)
AGOSTINI	15A	EPJ C75 416	M. Agostini *et al.*	(GERDA Collab.)
AN	15A	PL B747 331	H. An *et al.*	(CIT, VICT, VIEN)
ANASTASI	15	PL B747 365	A. Anastasi *et al.*	(KLOE-2 Collab.)
ANASTASI	15A	PL B750 633	A. Anastasi *et al.*	(KLOE-2 Collab.)
ANASTASSO...	15	PL B749 172	V. Anastassopoulos *et al.*	(CAST Collab.)
ARIK	15	PR D92 021101	M. Arik *et al.*	(CAST Collab.)
ARNOLD	15	PR D92 072011	R. Arnold *et al.*	(NEMO-3 Collab.)
BALLOU	15	PR D92 092002	R. Ballou *et al.*	(OSQAR Collab.)
BATLEY	15A	PL B746 178	J.R. Batley *et al.*	(NA48/2 Collab.)
BAYES	15	PR D91 052020	R. Bayes *et al.*	(TWIST Collab.)
BRAX	15	PR D92 083501	P. Brax, P. Brun, D. Wouters	(SACL, SACL5)
GAVRILYUK	15	JETPL 101 664	Yu.M. Gavrilyuk *et al.*	
		Translated from ZETFP 101 739.		
HASEBE	15	PTEP 2015 073C01	T. Hasebe *et al.*	
JAEGLE	15	PRL 114 211801	I. Jaegle *et al.*	(BELLE Collab.)
KAZANAS	15	NP B890 17	D. Kazanas *et al.*	
KLIMCHITSK...	15	EPJ C75 164	G.L. Klimchitskaya, V.M. Mostepanenko	
MILLEA	15	PR D92 023010	M. Millea, L. Knox, B. Fields	(UCD, ILL)
STADNIK	15	EPJ C75 110	Y.V. Stadnik, V.V. Flambaum	(SYDN)
SUZUKI	15	JCAP 1509 042	J. Suzuki *et al.*	
TERRANO	15	PRL 115 201801	W.A. Terrano *et al.*	(WASH)
VANTILBURG	15	PRL 115 011802	K. Van Tilburg *et al.*	
VINYOLES	15	JCAP 1510 015	N. Vinyoles *et al.*	
ABE	14F	PRL 113 121301	K. Abe *et al.*	(XMASS Collab.)
AGAKISHIEV	14	PL B731 265	G. Agakishiev *et al.*	(HADES Collab.)
ALBERT	14A	PR D90 092004	J.B. Albert *et al.*	(EXO-200 Collab.)
APRILE	14B	PR D90 062009	E. Aprile *et al.*	(XENON100 Collab.)
ARIK	14	PRL 112 091302	M. Arik *et al.*	(CAST Collab.)
AYALA	14	PRL 113 191302	A. Ayala *et al.*	
BABUSCI	14	PL B736 459	D. Babusci *et al.*	(KLOE-2 Collab.)
BATELL	14	PRL 113 171802	B. Batell, R. Essig, Z. Surujon	(EFI, STON)
BEZERRA	14	PR D89 035010	V.B. Bezerra *et al.*	
BEZERRA	14A	EPJ C74 2859	V.B. Bezerra *et al.*	
BEZERRA	14B	PR D90 055013	V.B. Bezerra *et al.*	
BEZERRA	14C	PR D89 075002	V.B. Bezerra *et al.*	
BLUEMLEIN	14	PL B731 320	J. Bluemlein, J. Brunner	(CPPM, DESY)
BLUM	14	PL B737 30	K. Blum *et al.*	(IAS, PRIN)
DELLA-VALLE	14	PR D90 092003	F. Della Valle *et al.*	(PVLAS Collab.)
DERBIN	14	EPJ C74 3035	A.V. Derbin *et al.*	
EJLLI	14	PR D90 123527	D. Ejlli	
FRADETTE	14	PR D90 035022	A. Fradette *et al.*	
LEES	14J	PRL 113 201801	J.P. Lees *et al.*	(BABAR Collab.)

LEINSON	14	JCAP 1408 031	L. Leinson	
MERKEL	14	PRL 112 221802	H. Merkel *et al.*	(A1 at MAMI)
MILLER-BER...	14	JCAP 1410 069	M.M. Miller Bertolami *et al.*	
PUGNAT	14	EPJ C74 3027	P. Pugnat *et al.*	(OSQAR Collab.)
REESMAN	14	JCAP 1408 021	R. Reesman *et al.*	(OSU)
ABE	13D	PL B724 46	K. Abe *et al.*	(XMASS Collab.)
ABRAMOWSKI	13A	PR D88 102003	A. Abramowski *et al.*	(H.E.S.S. Collab.)
ADLARSON	13	PL B726 187	P. Adlarson *et al.*	(WASA-at-COSY Collab.)
ALESSANDRIA	13	JCAP 1305 007	F. Alessandria *et al.*	(CUORE Collab.)
AN	13B	PL B725 190	H. An, M. Pospelov, J. Pradler	
AN	13C	PRL 111 041302	H. An, M. Pospelov, J. Pradler	
ARCHIDIACO...	13A	JCAP 1310 020	M. Archidiacono *et al.*	
ARMENGAUD	13	JCAP 1311 067	E. Armengaud *et al.*	(EDELWEISS-II Collab.)
BABUSCI	13B	PL B720 111	D. Babusci *et al.*	(KLOE-2 Collab.)
BARTH	13	JCAP 1305 010	K. Barth *et al.*	(CAST Collab.)
BECK	13	PRL 111 231801	C. Beck	
BETZ	13	PR D88 075014	M. Betz *et al.*	(CROWS Collab.)
BULATOWICZ	13	PRL 111 102001	M. Bulatowicz *et al.*	
CHU	13	PR D87 011105	P.-H. Chu *et al.*	(DUKE, IND, SJTU)
DERBIN	13	EPJ C73 2490	A. V. Derbin *et al.*	
DIAMOND	13	PRL 111 221803	M.D. Diamond, P. Schuster	
FRIEDLAND	13	PRL 110 061101	A. Friedland, M. Giannotti, M. Wise	
GNINENKO	13	PR D87 035030	S.N. Gninenko	(INRM)
HECKEL	13	PRL 111 151802	B. R. Heckel *et al.*	
HORVAT	13	PL B721 220	R. Horvat *et al.*	
INADA	13	PL B722 301	T. Inada *et al.*	
LATTANZI	13	PR D88 063528	M. Lattanzi *et al.*	
MEYER	13	PR D87 035027	M. Meyer, D. Horns, M. Raue	
MIZUMOTO	13	JCAP 1307 013	T. Mizumoto *et al.*	
PARKER	13	PR D88 112004	S. Parker *et al.*	
REDONDO	13	JCAP 1308 034	J. Redondo, G. Raffelt	
TULLNEY	13	PRL 111 100801	K. Tullney *et al.*	
VIAUX	13A	PRL 111 231301	N. Viaux *et al.*	
WOUTERS	13	APJ 772 44	D. Wouters, P. Brun	(SACL)
ABLIKIM	12	PR D85 092012	M. Ablikim *et al.*	(BESIII Collab.)
ARCHILLI	12	PL B706 251	F. Archilli *et al.*	(KLOE-2 Collab.)
BELLI	12	PL B711 41	P. Belli *et al.*	(DAMA-KIEV)
BELLINI	12B	PR D85 092003	G. Bellini *et al.*	(Borexino Collab.)
CADAMURO	12	JCAP 1202 032	D. Cadamuro *et al.*	(MPIM)
CORSICO	12	JCAP 1212 010	A.H. Corsico *et al.*	(LAPL, RGSUL, WASH+)
DERBIN	12	JETPL 95 339	A.V. Derbin *et al.*	(PNPI)
		Translated from ZETFP 95 379.		
GANDO	12	PR C86 021601	A. Gando *et al.*	(KamLAND-Zen Collab.)
GNINENKO	12A	PR D85 055027	S.N. Gninenko	(INRM)
GNINENKO	12B	PL B713 244	S.N. Gninenko	(INRM)
PAYEZ	12	JCAP 1207 041	A. Payez *et al.*	(LIEG)
RAFFELT	12	PR D86 015001	G. Raffelt	(MPIM)
AALSETH	11	PRL 106 131301	C.E. Aalseth *et al.*	(CoGeNT Collab.)
ABRAHAMY...	11	PRL 107 191804	S. Abrahamyan *et al.*	
ARIK	11	PRL 107 261302	M. Arik *et al.*	(CAST Collab.)
ARNOLD	11	PRL 107 062504	R. Arnold *et al.*	(NEMO-3 Collab.)
BLUEMLEIN	11	PL B701 155	J. Bluemlein, J. Brunner	(DESY)
CADAMURO	11	JCAP 1102 003	D. Cadamuro *et al.*	(MPIM, AARHUS)
DERBIN	11	PAN 74 596	A.V. Derbin *et al.*	(PNPI)
		Translated from YAF 74 620.		
DERBIN	11A	PR D83 023505	A.V. Derbin *et al.*	(PNPI)
HOEDL	11	PRL 106 041801	S.A. Hoedl *et al.*	(WASH)
HOSKINS	11	PR D84 121302	J. Hoskins *et al.*	(ADMX Collab.)
ANDRIAMON...	10	JCAP 1003 032	S. Andriamonje *et al.*	(CAST Collab.)
ARGYRIADES	10	NP A847 168	J. Argyriades *et al.*	(NEMO-3 Collab.)
ASZTALOS	10	PRL 104 041301	S.J. Asztalos *et al.*	(ADMX Collab.)
EHRET	10	PL B689 149	K. Ehret *et al.*	(ALPS Collab.)
HANNESTAD	10	JCAP 1008 001	S. Hannestad *et al.*	
PETUKHOV	10	PRL 105 170401	A.K. Petukhov *et al.*	
SEREBROV	10	JETPL 91 6	A.P. Serebrov *et al.*	
		Translated from ZETFP 91 8.		
AHMED	09A	PRL 103 141802	Z. Ahmed *et al.*	(CDMS Collab.)
ANDRIAMON...	09	JCAP 0912 002	S. Andriamonje *et al.*	
ARGYRIADES	09	PR C80 032501	J. Argyriades *et al.*	(NEMO-3 Collab.)
ARIK	09	JCAP 0902 008	E. Arik *et al.*	(CAST Collab.)
BJORKEN	09	PR D80 075018	J. Bjorken *et al.*	
CHOU	09	PRL 102 030402	A.S. Chou *et al.*	(GammeV Collab.)

DAVOUDIASL	09	PR D79 095024	H. Davoudiasl, P. Huber	
DERBIN	09A	PL B678 181	A.V. Derbin *et al.*	
GONDOLO	09	PR D79 107301	P. Gondolo, G. Raffelt	(UTAH, MPIM)
IGNATOVICH	09	EPJ C64 19	V.K. Ignatovich, Y.N. Pokotilovski	(JINR)
KEKEZ	09	PL B671 345	D. Kekez *et al.*	
SEREBROV	09	PL B680 423	A.P. Serebrov	(PNPI)
AFANASEV	08	PRL 101 120401	A. Afanasev *et al.*	
BELLINI	08	EPJ C54 61	G. Bellini *et al.*	(Borexino Collab.)
CHOU	08	PRL 100 080402	A.S. Chou *et al.*	(GammeV Collab.)
FOUCHE	08	PR D78 032013	M. Fouche *et al.*	
HANNESTAD	08	JCAP 0804 019	S. Hannestad *et al.*	
INOUE	08	PL B668 93	Y. Inoue *et al.*	
ZAVATTINI	08	PR D77 032006	E. Zavattini *et al.*	(PVLAS Collab.)
ADELBERGER	07	PRL 98 131104	E.G. Adelberger *et al.*	
ANDRIAMON...	07	JCAP 0704 010	S. Andriamonje *et al.*	(CAST Collab.)
BAESSLER	07	PR D75 075006	S. Baessler *et al.*	
CHANG	07	PR D75 052004	H.M. Chang *et al.*	(TEXONO Collab.)
HANNESTAD	07	JCAP 0708 015	S. Hannestad *et al.*	
JAIN	07	JP G34 129	P.L. Jain, G. Singh	
LESSA	07	PR D75 094001	A.P. Lessa, O.L.G. Peres	
MELCHIORRI	07A	PR D76 041303	A. Melchiorri, O. Mena, A. Slosar	
ROBILLIARD	07	PRL 99 190403	C. Robilliard *et al.*	
ARNOLD	06	NP A765 483	R. Arnold *et al.*	(NEMO-3 Collab.)
DUFFY	06	PR D74 012006	L.D. Duffy *et al.*	
HECKEL	06	PRL 97 021603	B.R. Heckel *et al.*	
ZAVATTINI	06	PRL 96 110406	E. Zavattini *et al.*	(PVLAS Collab.)
HANNESTAD	05A	JCAP 0507 002	S. Hannestad, A. Mirizzi, G. Raffelt	
ZIOUTAS	05	PRL 94 121301	K. Zioutas *et al.*	(CAST Collab.)
ADLER	04	PR D70 037102	S. Adler *et al.*	(BNL E787 Collab.)
ANISIMOVSK...	04	PRL 93 031801	V.V. Anisimovsky *et al.*	(BNL E949 Collab.)
ARNOLD	04	JETPL 80 377	R. Arnold *et al.*	(NEMO-3 Collab.)
		Translated from ZETFP 80 429.		
ASZTALOS	04	PR D69 011101	S.J. Asztalos *et al.*	
HOFFMANN	04	PR B70 180503	C. Hoffmann *et al.*	
ARNABOLDI	03	PL B557 167	C. Arnaboldi *et al.*	
CIVITARESE	03	NP A729 867	O. Civitarese, J. Suhonen	
DANEVICH	03	PR C68 035501	F.A. Danevich *et al.*	
ADLER	02C	PL B537 211	S. Adler *et al.*	(BNL E787 Collab.)
BADERT...	02	PL B542 29	A. Badertscher *et al.*	
BERNABEI	02D	PL B546 23	R. Bernabei *et al.*	(DAMA Collab.)
DERBIN	02	PAN 65 1302	A.V. Derbin *et al.*	
		Translated from YAF 65 1335.		
FUSHIMI	02	PL B531 190	K. Fushimi *et al.*	(ELEGANT V Collab.)
INOUE	02	PL B536 18	Y. Inoue *et al.*	
MORALES	02B	ASP 16 325	A. Morales *et al.*	(COSME Collab.)
ADLER	01	PR D63 032004	S. Adler *et al.*	(BNL E787 Collab.)
AMMAR	01B	PRL 87 271801	R. Ammar *et al.*	(CLEO Collab.)
ASHITKOV	01	JETPL 74 529	V.D. Ashitkov *et al.*	
		Translated from ZETFP 74 601.		
BERNABEI	01B	PL B515 6	R. Bernabei *et al.*	(DAMA Collab.)
DANEVICH	01	NP A694 375	F.A. Danevich *et al.*	
DEBOER	01	JP G27 L29	F.W.N. de Boer *et al.*	
STOICA	01	NP A694 269	S. Stoica, H.V. Klapdor-Kleingrothous	
ALESSAND...	00	PL B486 13	A. Alessandrello *et al.*	
ARNOLD	00	NP A678 341	R. Arnold *et al.*	
ASTIER	00B	PL B479 371	P. Astier *et al.*	(NOMAD Collab.)
DANEVICH	00	PR C62 045501	F.A. Danevich *et al.*	
MASSO	00	PR D61 011701	E. Masso	
ARNOLD	99	NP A658 299	R. Arnold *et al.*	(NEMO Collab.)
NI	99	PRL 82 2439	W.-T. Ni *et al.*	
SIMKOVIC	99	PR C60 055502	F. Simkovic *et al.*	
ALTEGOER	98	PL B428 197	J. Altegoer *et al.*	
ARNOLD	98	NP A636 209	R. Arnold *et al.*	(NEMO-2 Collab.)
AVIGNONE	98	PRL 81 5068	F.T. Avignone *et al.*	(Solar Axion Experiment)
DIAZ	98	NP B527 44	M.A. Diaz *et al.*	
KIM	98	PR D58 055006	J.E. Kim	
LUESCHER	98	PL B434 407	R. Luescher *et al.*	
MORIYAMA	98	PL B434 147	S. Moriyama *et al.*	
MOROI	98	PL B440 69	T. Moroi, H. Murayama	
POSPELOV	98	PR D58 097703	M. Pospelov	
AHMAD	97	PRL 78 618	I. Ahmad *et al.*	(APEX Collab.)
BORISOV	97	JETP 83 868	A.V. Borisov, V.Y. Grishinia	(MOSU)

DEBOER	97C	JP G23 L85	F.W.N. de Boer *et al.*	
KACHELRIESS	97	PR D56 1313	M. Kachelriess, C. Wilke, G. Wunner	(BOCH)
KEIL	97	PR D56 2419	W. Keil *et al.*	
KITCHING	97	PRL 79 4079	P. Kitching *et al.*	(BNL E787 Collab.)
LEINBERGER	97	PL B394 16	U. Leinberger *et al.*	(ORANGE Collab.)
ADLER	96	PRL 76 1421	S. Adler *et al.*	(BNL E787 Collab.)
AMSLER	96B	ZPHY C70 219	C. Amsler *et al.*	(Crystal Barrel Collab.)
GANZ	96	PL B389 4	R. Ganz *et al.*	(GSI, HEID, FRAN, JAGL+)
GUENTHER	96	PR D54 3641	M. Gunther *et al.*	(MPIK, SASSO)
KAMEL	96	PL B368 291	S. Kamel	(SHAMS)
MITSUI	96	EPL 33 111	T. Mitsui *et al.*	(TOKY)
YOUDIN	96	PRL 77 2170	A.N. Youdin *et al.*	(AMHT, WASH)
ALTMANN	95	ZPHY C68 221	M. Altmann *et al.*	(TUM, LAPP, CPPM)
BASSOMPIE...	95	PL B355 584	G. Bassompierre *et al.*	(LAPP, LCGT, LYON)
MAENO	95	PL B351 574	T. Maeno *et al.*	(TOKY)
RAFFELT	95	PR D51 1495	G. Raffelt, A. Weiss	(MPIM, MPIG)
SKALSEY	95	PR D51 6292	M. Skalsey, R.S. Conti	(MICH)
TSUNODA	95	EPL 30 273	T. Tsunoda *et al.*	(TOKY)
ADACHI	94	PR A49 3201	S. Adachi *et al.*	(TMU)
ALTHERR	94	ASP 2 175	T. Altherr, E. Petitgirard, T. del Rio Gaztelurrutia	
AMSLER	94B	PL B333 271	C. Amsler *et al.*	(Crystal Barrel Collab.)
ASAI	94	PL B323 90	S. Asai *et al.*	(TOKY)
MEIJERDREES	94	PR D49 4937	M.R. Drees *et al.*	(BRCO, OREG, TRIU)
NI	94	Physica B194 153	W.T. Ni *et al.*	(NTHU)
VO	94	PR C49 1551	D.T. Vo *et al.*	(ISU, LBL, LLNL, UCD)
ATIYA	93	PRL 70 2521	M.S. Atiya *et al.*	(BNL E787 Collab.)
Also		PRL 71 305 (erratum)	M.S. Atiya *et al.*	(BNL E787 Collab.)
ATIYA	93B	PR D48 1	M.S. Atiya *et al.*	(BNL E787 Collab.)
BASSOMPIE...	93	EPL 22 239	G. Bassompierre *et al.*	(LAPP, TORI, LYON)
BECK	93	PRL 70 2853	M. Beck *et al.*	(MPIK, KIAE, SASSO)
CAMERON	93	PR D47 3707	R.E. Cameron *et al.*	(ROCH, BNL, FNAL+)
CHANG	93	PL B316 51	S. Chang, K. Choi	
CHUI	93	PRL 71 3247	T.C.P. Chui, W.T. Ni	(NTHU)
MINOWA	93	PRL 71 4120	M. Minowa *et al.*	(TOKY)
NG	93	PR D48 2941	K.W. Ng	(AST)
RITTER	93	PRL 70 701	R.C. Ritter *et al.*	
TANAKA	93	PR D48 5412	J. Tanaka, H. Ejiri	(OSAK)
ALLIEGRO	92	PRL 68 278	C. Alliegro *et al.*	(BNL, FNAL, PSI+)
ATIYA	92	PRL 69 733	M.S. Atiya *et al.*	(BNL, LANL, PRIN+)
BARABASH	92	PL B295 154	L.S. Barabash *et al.*	(JINR, CERN, SERP+)
BERNATOW...	92	PRL 69 2341	T. Bernatowicz *et al.*	(WUSL, TATA)
BLUEMLEIN	92	IJMP A7 3835	J. Bluemlein *et al.*	(BERL, BUDA, JINR+)
HALLIN	92	PR D45 3955	A.L. Hallin *et al.*	(PRIN)
HENDERSON	92C	PRL 69 1733	S.D. Henderson *et al.*	(YALE, BNL)
HICKS	92	PL B276 423	K.H. Hicks, D.E. Alburger	(OHIO, BNL)
LAZARUS	92	PRL 69 2333	D.M. Lazarus *et al.*	(BNL, ROCH, FNAL)
MEIJERDREES	92	PRL 68 3845	R. Meijer Drees *et al.*	(SINDRUM I Collab.)
PAN	92	MPL A7 1287	S.S. Pan, W.T. Ni, S.C. Chen	(NTHU)
RUOSO	92	ZPHY C56 505	G. Ruoso *et al.*	(ROCH, BNL, FNAL, TRST)
SKALSEY	92	PRL 68 456	M. Skalsey, J.J. Kolata	(MICH, NDAM)
VENEMA	92	PRL 68 135	B.J. Venema *et al.*	
WANG	92	MPL A7 1497	J. Wang	(ILL)
WANG	92C	PL B291 97	J. Wang	(ILL)
WU	92	PRL 69 1729	X.Y. Wu *et al.*	(BNL, YALE, CUNY)
AKOPYAN	91	PL B272 443	M.V. Akopyan *et al.*	(INRM)
ASAI	91	PRL 66 2440	S. Asai *et al.*	(ICEPP)
BERSHADY	91	PRL 66 1398	M.A. Bershady, M.T. Ressell, M.S. Turner	(CHIC+)
BLUEMLEIN	91	ZPHY C51 341	J. Bluemlein *et al.*	(BERL, BUDA, JINR+)
BOBRAKOV	91	JETPL 53 294	V.F. Bobrakov *et al.*	(PNPI)
		Translated from ZETFP 53 283.		
BROSS	91	PRL 67 2942	A.D. Bross *et al.*	(FNAL, ILL)
KIM	91C	PRL 67 3465	J.E. Kim	(SEOUL)
RAFFELT	91	PRPL 198 1	G.G. Raffelt	(MPIM)
RAFFELT	91B	PRL 67 2605	G. Raffelt, D. Seckel	(MPIM, BART)
RESSELL	91	PR D44 3001	M.T. Ressell	(CHIC, FNAL)
TRZASKA	91	PL B269 54	W.H. Trzaska *et al.*	(TAMU)
TSERTOS	91	PL B266 259	H. Tsertos *et al.*	(ILLG, GSI)
WALKER	91	APJ 376 51	T.P. Walker *et al.*	(HSCA, OSU, CHIC+)
WIDMANN	91	ZPHY A340 209	E. Widmann *et al.*	(STUT, GSI, STUTM)
WINELAND	91	PRL 67 1735	D.J. Wineland *et al.*	(NBSB)
ALBRECHT	90E	PL B246 278	H. Albrecht *et al.*	(ARGUS Collab.)

ANTREASYAN	90C	PL B251 204	D. Antreasyan *et al.*	(Crystal Ball Collab.)
ASANUMA	90	PL B237 588	T. Asanuma *et al.*	(TOKY)
ATIYA	90	PRL 64 21	M.S. Atiya *et al.*	(BNL E787 Collab.)
ATIYA	90B	PRL 65 1188	M.S. Atiya *et al.*	(BNL E787 Collab.)
BAUER	90	NIM B50 300	W. Bauer *et al.*	(STUT, VILL, GSI)
BURROWS	90	PR D42 3297	A. Burrows, M.T. Ressell, M.S. Turner	(ARIZ+)
DEBOER	90	JP G16 L1	F.W.N. de Boer, J. Lehmann, J. Steyaert	(LOUV)
ENGEL	90	PRL 65 960	J. Engel, D. Seckel, A.C. Hayes	(BART, LANL)
GNINENKO	90	PL B237 287	S.N. Gninenko *et al.*	(INRM)
GUO	90	PR D41 2924	R. Guo *et al.*	(NIU, LANL, FNAL, CASE+)
HAGMANN	90	PR D42 1297	C. Hagmann *et al.*	(FLOR)
JUDGE	90	PRL 65 972	S.M. Judge *et al.*	(ILLG, GSI)
RAFFELT	90D	PR D41 1324	G.G. Raffelt	(MPIM)
RITTER	90	PR D42 977	R.C. Ritter *et al.*	(UVA)
SEMERTZIDIS	90	PRL 64 2988	Y.K. Semertzidis *et al.*	(ROCH, BNL, FNAL+)
TSUCHIAKI	90	PL B236 81	M. Tsuchiaki *et al.*	(ICEPP)
TURNER	90	PRPL 197 67	M.S. Turner	(FNAL)
BARABASH	89	PL B223 273	A.S. Barabash *et al.*	(ITEP, INRM)
BINI	89	PL B221 99	M. Bini *et al.*	(FIRZ, CERN, AARH)
BURROWS	89	PR D39 1020	A. Burrows, M.S. Turner, R.P. Brinkmann	(ARIZ+)
Also		PRL 60 1797	M.S. Turner	(FNAL, EFI)
DEBOER	89B	PRL 62 2639	F.W.N. de Boer, R. van Dantzig	(ANIK)
ERICSON	89	PL B219 507	T.E.O. Ericson, J.F. Mathiot	(CERN, IPN)
FAISSNER	89	ZPHY C44 557	H. Faissner *et al.*	(AACH3, BERL, PSI)
FOX	89	PR C39 288	J.D. Fox *et al.*	(FSU)
MAYLE	89	PL B219 515	R. Mayle *et al.*	(LLL, CERN, MINN, FNAL+)
Also		PL B203 188	R. Mayle *et al.*	(LLL, CERN, MINN, FNAL+)
MINOWA	89	PRL 62 1091	H. Minowa *et al.*	(ICEPP)
ORITO	89	PRL 63 597	S. Orito *et al.*	(ICEPP)
PERKINS	89	PRL 62 2638	D.H. Perkins	(OXF)
TSERTOS	89	PR D40 1397	H. Tsertos *et al.*	(GSI, ILLG)
VANBIBBER	89	PR D39 2089	K. van Bibber *et al.*	(LLL, TAMU, LBL)
WUENSCH	89	PR D40 3153	W.U. Wuensch *et al.*	(ROCH, BNL, FNAL)
Also		PRL 59 839	S. de Panfilis *et al.*	(ROCH, BNL, FNAL)
AVIGNONE	88	PR D37 618	F.T. Avignone *et al.*	(PRIN, SCUC, ORNL+)
BALKE	88	PR D37 587	B. Balke *et al.*	(LBL, UCB, COLO, NWES+)
BJORKEN	88	PR D38 3375	J.D. Bjorken *et al.*	(FNAL, SLAC, VPI)
BLINOV	88	SJNP 47 563	A.E. Blinov *et al.*	(NOVO)
		Translated from YAF 47 889.		
BOLTON	88	PR D38 2077	R.D. Bolton *et al.*	(LANL, STAN, CHIC+)
Also		PRL 56 2461	R.D. Bolton *et al.*	(LANL, STAN, CHIC+)
Also		PRL 57 3241	D. Grosnick *et al.*	(CHIC, LANL, STAN+)
CHANDA	88	PR D37 2714	R. Chanda, J.F. Nieves, P.B. Pal	(UMD, UPR+)
CHOI	88	PR D37 3225	K. Choi *et al.*	(JHU)
CONNELL	88	PRL 60 2242	S.H. Connell *et al.*	(WITW)
DATAR	88	PR C37 250	V.M. Datar *et al.*	(IPN)
DEBOER	88	PRL 61 1274	F.W.N. de Boer, R. van Dantzig	(ANIK)
Also		PRL 62 2644 (erratum)	F.W.N. de Boer, R. van Dantzig	(ANIK)
Also		PRL 62 2638	D.H. Perkins	(OXF)
Also		PRL 62 2639	F.W.N. de Boer, R. van Dantzig	(ANIK)
DEBOER	88C	JP G14 L131	F.W.N. de Boer *et al.*	(LOUV)
DOEHNER	88	PR D38 2722	J. Dohner *et al.*	(HEIDP, ANL, ILLG)
EL-NADI	88	PRL 61 1271	M. el Nadi, O.E. Badawy	(CAIR)
ENGEL	88	PR C37 731	J. Engel, P. Vogel, M.R. Zirnbauer	
FAISSNER	88	ZPHY C37 231	H. Faissner *et al.*	(AACH3, BERL, SIN)
HATSUDA	88B	PL B203 469	T. Hatsuda, M. Yoshimura	(KEK)
LORENZ	88	PL B214 10	E. Lorenz *et al.*	(MPIM, PSI)
MAYLE	88	PL B203 188	R. Mayle *et al.*	(LLL, CERN, MINN, FNAL+)
PICCIOTTO	88	PR D37 1131	C.E. Picciotto *et al.*	(TRIU, CNRC)
RAFFELT	88	PRL 60 1793	G. Raffelt, D. Seckel	(UCB, LLL, UCSC)
RAFFELT	88B	PR D37 549	G.G. Raffelt, D.S.P. Dearborn	(UCB, LLL)
SAVAGE	88	PR D37 1134	M.J. Savage, B.W. Filippone, L.W. Mitchell	(CIT)
TSERTOS	88	PL B207 273	A. Tsertos *et al.*	(GSI, ILLG)
TSERTOS	88B	ZPHY A331 103	A. Tsertos *et al.*	(GSI, ILLG)
VANKLINKEN	88	PL B205 223	J. van Klinken *et al.*	(GRON, GSI)
VANKLINKEN	88B	PRL 60 2442	J. van Klinken	(GRON)
VONWIMMER...	88	PRL 60 2443	U. von Wimmersperg	(BNL)
VOROBYOV	88	PL B208 146	P.V. Vorobiev, Y.I. Gitarts	(NOVO)
DRUZHININ	87	ZPHY C37 1	V.P. Druzhinin *et al.*	(NOVO)
FRIEMAN	87	PR D36 2201	J.A. Frieman, S. Dimopoulos, M.S. Turner	(SLAC+)
GOLDMAN	87	PR D36 1543	T. Goldman *et al.*	(LANL, CHIC, STAN+)

KORENCHE...	87	SJNP 46 192	S.M. Korenchenko *et al.*	(JINR)
		Translated from YAF 46 313.		
MAIER	87	ZPHY A326 527	K. Maier *et al.*	(STUT, GSI)
MILLS	87	PR D36 707	A.P. Mills, J. Levy	(BELL)
RAFFELT	87	PR D36 2211	G.G. Raffelt, D.S.P. Dearborn	(LLL, UCB)
RIORDAN	87	PRL 59 755	E.M. Riordan *et al.*	(ROCH, CIT+)
TURNER	87	PRL 59 2489	M.S. Turner	(FNAL, EFI)
VANBIBBER	87	PRL 59 759	K. van Bibber *et al.*	(LLL, CIT, MIT+)
VONWIMMER...	87	PRL 59 266	U. von Wimmersperg *et al.*	(WITW)
BADIER	86	ZPHY C31 21	J. Badier *et al.*	(NA3 Collab.)
BROWN	86	PRL 57 2101	C.N. Brown *et al.*	(FNAL, WASH, KYOT+)
BRYMAN	86B	PRL 57 2787	D.A. Bryman, E.T.H. Clifford	(TRIU)
DAVIER	86	PL B180 295	M. Davier, J. Jeanjean, H. Nguyen Ngoc	(LALO)
DEARBORN	86	PRL 56 26	D.S.P. Dearborn, D.N. Schramm, G. Steigman	(LLL+)
EICHLER	86	PL B175 101	R.A. Eichler *et al.*	(SINDRUM Collab.)
HALLIN	86	PRL 57 2105	A.L. Hallin *et al.*	(PRIN)
JODIDIO	86	PR D34 1967	A. Jodidio *et al.*	(LBL, NWES, TRIU)
Also		PR D37 237 (erratum)	A. Jodidio *et al.*	(LBL, NWES, TRIU)
KETOV	86	JETPL 44 146	S.N. Ketov *et al.*	(KIAE)
		Translated from ZETFP 44 114.		
KOCH	86	NC 96A 182	H.R. Koch, O.W.B. Schult	(JULI)
KONAKA	86	PRL 57 659	A. Konaka *et al.*	(KYOT, KEK)
MAIANI	86	PL B175 359	L. Maiani, R. Petronzio, E. Zavattini	(CERN)
PECCEI	86	PL B172 435	R.D. Peccei, T.T. Wu, T. Yanagida	(DESY)
RAFFELT	86	PR D33 897	G.G. Raffelt	(MPIM)
RAFFELT	86B	PL 166B 402	G.G. Raffelt	(MPIM)
SAVAGE	86B	PRL 57 178	M.J. Savage *et al.*	(CIT)
AMALDI	85	PL 153B 444	U. Amaldi *et al.*	(CERN)
ANANEV	85	SJNP 41 585	V.D. Ananev *et al.*	(JINR)
		Translated from YAF 41 912.		
BALTRUSAIT...	85	PRL 55 1842	R.M. Baltrusaitis *et al.*	(Mark III Collab.)
BERGSMA	85	PL 157B 458	F. Bergsma *et al.*	(CHARM Collab.)
KAPLAN	85	NP B260 215	D.B. Kaplan	(HARV)
IWAMOTO	84	PRL 53 1198	N. Iwamoto	(UCSB, WUSL)
YAMAZAKI	84	PRL 52 1089	T. Yamazaki *et al.*	(INUS, KEK)
ABBOTT	83	PL 120B 133	L.F. Abbott, P. Sikivie	(BRAN, FLOR)
CARBONI	83	PL 123B 349	G. Carboni, W. Dahme	(CERN, MUNI)
CAVAIGNAC	83	PL 121B 193	J.F. Cavaignac *et al.*	(ISNG, LAPP)
DICUS	83	PR D28 1778	D.A. Dicus, V.L. Teplitz	(TEXA, UMD)
DINE	83	PL 120B 137	M. Dine, W. Fischler	(IAS, PENN)
ELLIS	83B	NP B223 252	J. Ellis, K.A. Olive	(CERN)
FAISSNER	83	PR D28 1198	H. Faissner *et al.*	(AACH)
FAISSNER	83B	PR D28 1787	H. Faissner *et al.*	(AACH3)
FRANK	83B	PR D28 1790	J.S. Frank *et al.*	(LANL, YALE, LBL+)
HOFFMAN	83	PR D28 660	C.M. Hoffman *et al.*	(LANL, ARZS)
PRESKILL	83	PL 120B 127	J. Preskill, M.B. Wise, F. Wilczek	(HARV, UCSBT)
SIKIVIE	83	PRL 51 1415	P. Sikivie	(FLOR)
Also		PRL 52 695 (erratum)	P. Sikivie	(FLOR)
ALEKSEEV	82	JETP 55 591	E.A. Alekseeva *et al.*	(KIAE)
		Translated from ZETF 82 1007.		
ALEKSEEV	82B	JETPL 36 116	G.D. Alekseev *et al.*	(MOSU, JINR)
		Translated from ZETFP 36 94.		
ASANO	82	PL 113B 195	Y. Asano *et al.*	(KEK, TOKY, INUS, OSAK)
BARROSO	82	PL 116B 247	A. Barroso, G.C. Branco	(LISB)
DATAR	82	PL 114B 63	V.M. Datar *et al.*	(BHAB)
EDWARDS	82	PRL 48 903	C. Edwards *et al.*	(Crystal Ball Collab.)
FETSCHER	82	JP G8 L147	W. Fetscher	(ETH)
FUKUGITA	82	PRL 48 1522	M. Fukugita, S. Watamura, M. Yoshimura	(KEK)
FUKUGITA	82B	PR D26 1840	M. Fukugita, S. Watamura, M. Yoshimura	(KEK)
LEHMANN	82	PL 115B 270	P. Lehmann *et al.*	(SACL)
RAFFELT	82	PL 119B 323	G. Raffelt, L. Stodolsky	(MPIM)
ZEHNDER	82	PL 110B 419	A. Zehnder, K. Gabathuler, J.L. Vuilleumier	(ETH+)
ASANO	81B	PL 107B 159	Y. Asano *et al.*	(KEK, TOKY, INUS, OSAK)
BARROSO	81	PL 106B 91	A. Barroso, N.C. Mukhopadhyay	(SIN)
FAISSNER	81	ZPHY C10 95	H. Faissner *et al.*	(AACH3)
FAISSNER	81B	PL 103B 234	H. Faissner *et al.*	(AACH3)
KIM	81	PL 105B 55	B.R. Kim, C. Stamm	(AACH3)
VUILLEUMIER	81	PL 101B 341	J.L. Vuilleumier *et al.*	(CIT, MUNI)
ZEHNDER	81	PL 104B 494	A. Zehnder	(ETH)
FAISSNER	80	PL 96B 201	H. Faissner *et al.*	(AACH3)
JACQUES	80	PR D21 1206	P.F. Jacques *et al.*	(RUTG, STEV, COLU)
SOUKAS	80	PRL 44 564	A. Soukas *et al.*	(BNL, HARV, ORNL, PENN)

BECHIS	79	PRL 42 1511	D.J. Bechis *et al.*	(UMD, COLU, AFRR)
CALAPRICE	79	PR D20 2708	F.P. Calaprice *et al.*	(PRIN)
COTEUS	79	PRL 42 1438	P. Coteus *et al.*	(COLU, ILL, BNL)
DISHAW	79	PL 85B 142	J.P. Dishaw *et al.*	(SLAC, CIT)
ZHITNITSKII	79	SJNP 29 517	A.R. Zhitnitsky, Y.I. Skovpen	(NOVO)
		Translated from YAF 29 1001.		
ALIBRAN	78	PL 74B 134	P. Alibran *et al.*	(Gargamelle Collab.)
ASRATYAN	78B	PL 79B 497	A.E. Asratyan *et al.*	(ITEP, SERP)
BELLOTTI	78	PL 76B 223	E. Bellotti, E. Fiorini, L. Zanotti	(MILA)
BOSETTI	78B	PL 74B 143	P.C. Bosetti *et al.*	(BEBC Collab.)
DICUS	78C	PR D18 1829	D.A. Dicus *et al.*	(TEXA, VPI, STAN)
DONNELLY	78	PR D18 1607	T.W. Donnelly *et al.*	(STAN)
Also		PRL 37 315	F. Reines, H.S. Gurr, H.W. Sobel	(UCI)
Also		PRL 33 179	H.S. Gurr, F. Reines, H.W. Sobel	(UCI)
HANSL	78D	PL 74B 139	T. Hansl *et al.*	(CDHS Collab.)
MICELMAC...	78	LNC 21 441	G.V. Mitselmakher, B. Pontecorvo	(JINR)
MIKAELIAN	78	PR D18 3605	K.O. Mikaelian	(FNAL, NWES)
SATO	78	PTP 60 1942	K. Sato	(KYOT)
VYSOTSKII	78	JETPL 27 502	M.I. Vysotsky *et al.*	(ASCI)
		Translated from ZETFP 27 533.		
YANG	78	PRL 41 523	T.C. Yang	(MASA)
PECCEI	77	PR D16 1791	R.D. Peccei, H.R. Quinn	(STAN, SLAC)
Also		PRL 38 1440	R.D. Peccei, H.R. Quinn	(STAN, SLAC)
REINES	76	PRL 37 315	F. Reines, H.S. Gurr, H.W. Sobel	(UCI)
GURR	74	PRL 33 179	H.S. Gurr, F. Reines, H.W. Sobel	(UCI)
ANAND	53	PRSL A22 183	B.M. Anand	

OTHER RELATED PAPERS

SREDNICKI	85	NP B260 689	M. Srednicki	(UCSB)
BARDEEN	78	PL 74B 229	W.A. Bardeen, S.-H.H. Tye	(FNAL)