$\phi(1020)$

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

ϕ(1020) MASS

VALUE (MeV)	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
1019.461±0.016 OUR AVERAGE					
1019.463±0.061	2.3M	[1] KOZYREV	18	CMD3	$e^+e^- \to K^+K^-$, $K^0_S K^0_L$
1019.462±0.042±0.056	28k	[2] LEES	14H	BABR	$e^+e^- \to K^0_S K^0_L \gamma$
1019.51 ±0.02 ±0.05		[3] LEES	13Q	BABR	$e^+e^- \to K^+K^-\gamma$
1019.30 ±0.02 ±0.10	105k	AKHMETSHIN	06	CMD2	0.98–1.06 $e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$
1019.52 ±0.05 ±0.05	17.4k	AKHMETSHIN	05	CMD2	0.60-1.38 $e^+e^- \to \eta\gamma$
1019.483±0.011±0.025	272k	[4] AKHMETSHIN	04	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to K^0_L K^0_S$
1019.42 ±0.05	1900k	[5] ACHASOV	01E	SND	$e^+e^- \to K^+K^-$, $K_S K_L$, $\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$
1019.40 ±0.04 ±0.05	23k	AKHMETSHIN	01B	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to \eta\gamma$
1019.36 ±0.12		[6] ACHASOV	00B	SND	$e^+e^- \to \eta\gamma$
1019.38 ±0.07 ±0.08	2200	[7] AKHMETSHIN	99F	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^- \geq 2\gamma$
1019.51 ±0.07 ±0.10	11169	AKHMETSHIN	98	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$
1019.5 ±0.4		BARBERIS	98	OMEG	450 $pp \to pp2K^+2K^-$
1019.42 ±0.06	55600	AKHMETSHIN	95	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to$ hadrons
1019.7 ±0.3	2012	DAVENPORT	86	MPSF	400 $pA \to 4KX$
1019.7 ±0.1 ±0.1	5079	ALBRECHT	85D	ARG	10 $e^+e^- \to K^+K^-X$
1019.3 ±0.1	1500	ARENTON	82	AEMS	11.8 polar. $pp \to KK$
1019.67 ±0.17	25080	[8] PELLINEN	82	RVUE	
1019.52 ±0.13	3681	BUKIN	78C	OLYA	$e^+e^- \to$ hadrons
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •					
1019.469±0.061	1.7M	KOZYREV	18	CMD3	$e^+e^- \to K^+K^-$
1019.457±0.061	610k	KOZYREV	16	CMD3	$e^+e^- \to K^0_S K^0_L$
1019.48 ±0.01		LEES	13F	BABR	$D^+ \to K^+K^-\pi^+$
1019.441±0.008±0.080	542k	[9] AKHMETSHIN	08	CMD2	1.02 $e^+e^- \to K^+K^-$
1019.63 ±0.07	12540	[10] AUBERT,B	05J	BABR	$D^0 \to \overline{K}^0 K^+K^-$
1019.8 ±0.7		ARMSTRONG	86	OMEG	85 $\pi^+/pp \to \pi^+/p4Kp$
1020.1 ±0.11	5526	[10] ATKINSON	86	OMEG	20–70 γp
1019.7 ±1.0		BEBEK	86	CLEO	$e^+e^- \to \Upsilon(4S)$
1019.411±0.008	642k	[11] DIJKSTRA	86	SPEC	100–200 $\pi^\pm$, $\overline{p}$, p, $K^\pm$, on Be
1020.9 ±0.2		[10] FRAME	86	OMEG	13 $K^+p \to \phi K^+p$
1021.0 ±0.2		[10] ARMSTRONG	83B	OMEG	18.5 $K^-p \to K^-K^+\Lambda$
1020.0 ±0.5		[10] ARMSTRONG	83B	OMEG	18.5 $K^-p \to K^-K^+\Lambda$

1019.7	±0.3			[10] BARATE	83	GOLI	190 π^- Be → $2\mu X$
1019.8	±0.2	±0.5	766	IVANOV	81	OLYA	1–1.4 $e^+e^- \to K^+K^-$
1019.4	±0.5		337	COOPER	78B	HBC	0.7–0.8 $\overline{p}p \to K^0_S K^0_L \pi^+\pi^-$
1020	±1		383	[10] BALDI	77	CNTR	10 $\pi^- p \to \pi^- \phi p$
1018.9	±0.6		800	COHEN	77	ASPK	6 $\pi^\pm N \to K^+K^- N$
1019.7	±0.5		454	KALBFLEISCH	76	HBC	2.18 $K^- p \to \Lambda K \overline{K}$
1019.4	±0.8		984	BESCH	74	CNTR	2 $\gamma p \to p K^+ K^-$
1020.3	±0.4		100	BALLAM	73	HBC	2.8–9.3 γp
1019.4	±0.7			BINNIE	73B	CNTR	$\pi^- p \to \phi n$
1019.6	±0.5		120	[12] AGUILAR-...	72B	HBC	3.9,4.6 $K^- p \to \Lambda K^+ K^-$
1019.9	±0.5		100	[12] AGUILAR-...	72B	HBC	3.9,4.6 $K^- p \to K^- p K^+ K^-$
1020.4	±0.5		131	COLLEY	72	HBC	10 $K^+ p \to K^+ p \phi$
1019.9	±0.3		410	STOTTLE...	71	HBC	2.9 $K^- p \to \Sigma/\Lambda K \overline{K}$

[1] Average of KOZYREV 16 and KOZYREV 18 values taking into account the correlated uncertainties. Supersedes individual KOZYREV 16 and KOZYREV 18 results.
[2] Using a vector meson dominance model with contribution from ϕ(1020) and higher mass excitations of ρ(770), ω(782), and ϕ(1020).
[3] Using a phenomenological model based on KUHN 90 with a sum of Breit-Wigner resonances for ρ(770), ω(782), ϕ(1020) and their higher mass excitations.
[4] Update of AKHMETSHIN 99D
[5] From the combined fit assuming that the total ϕ(1020) production cross section is saturated by those of K^+K^-, $K_S K_L$, $\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$, and $\eta\gamma$ decays modes and using ACHASOV 00B for the $\eta\gamma$ decay mode.
[6] Using a total width of 4.43 ± 0.05 MeV. Systematic uncertainty included.
[7] Using a total width of 4.43 ± 0.05 MeV.
[8] PELLINEN 82 review includes AKERLOF 77, DAUM 81, BALDI 77, AYRES 74, DEGROOT 74.
[9] Strongly correlated with AKHMETSHIN 04.
[10] Systematic errors not evaluated.
[11] Weighted and scaled average of 12 measurements of DIJKSTRA 86.
[12] Mass errors enlarged by us to $\Gamma/\sqrt{N}$; see the note with the $K^*(892)$ mass.

ϕ(1020) WIDTH

VALUE (MeV)	*EVTS*	*DOCUMENT ID*		*TECN*	*COMMENT*
4.249±0.013 OUR AVERAGE	Error includes scale factor of 1.1.				
4.245±0.013	2.3M	[1] KOZYREV	18	CMD3	$e^+e^- \to K^+K^-$, $K^0_S K^0_L$
4.205±0.103±0.067	28k	[2] LEES	14H	BABR	$e^+e^- \to K^0_S K^0_L \gamma$
4.29 ±0.04 ±0.07		[3] LEES	13Q	BABR	$e^+e^- \to K^+K^-\gamma$
4.30 ±0.06 ±0.17	105k	AKHMETSHIN	06	CMD2	0.98–1.06 $e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$
4.280±0.033±0.025	272k	[4] AKHMETSHIN	04	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to K^0_L K^0_S$
4.21 ±0.04	1900k	[5] ACHASOV	01E	SND	$e^+e^- \to K^+K^-$, $K_S K_L$, $\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$
4.44 ±0.09	55600	AKHMETSHIN	95	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to$ hadrons

4.5	±0.7	1500	ARENTON	82	AEMS	11.8 polar. $p p \to K K$
4.2	±0.6	766	[6] IVANOV	81	OLYA	1–1.4 $e^+ e^- \to K^+ K^-$
4.3	±0.6		[6] CORDIER	80	DM1	$e^+ e^- \to \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0$
4.36	±0.29	3681	[6] BUKIN	78C	OLYA	$e^+ e^- \to$ hadrons
4.4	±0.6	984	[6] BESCH	74	CNTR	$2 \gamma p \to p K^+ K^-$
4.67	±0.72	681	[6] BALAKIN	71	OSPK	$e^+ e^- \to$ hadrons
4.09	±0.29		BIZOT	70	OSPK	$e^+ e^- \to$ hadrons

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

4.249	±0.015	1.7M	KOZYREV	18	CMD3	$e^+ e^- \to K^+ K^-$
4.240	±0.017	610k	KOZYREV	16	CMD3	$e^+ e^- \to K^0_S K^0_L$
4.37	±0.02		LEES	13F	BABR	$D^+ \to K^+ K^- \pi^+$
4.24	±0.02 ±0.03	542k	[7] AKHMETSHIN	08	CMD2	1.02 $e^+ e^- \to K^+ K^-$
4.28	±0.13	12540	[8] AUBERT,B	05J	BABR	$D^0 \to \overline{K}^0 K^+ K^-$
4.45	±0.06	271k	DIJKSTRA	86	SPEC	100 π^- Be
3.6	±0.8	337	[6] COOPER	78B	HBC	0.7–0.8 $\overline{p} p \to K^0_S K^0_L \pi^+ \pi^-$
4.5	±0.50	1300	[6,8] AKERLOF	77	SPEC	400 $p A \to K^+ K^- X$
4.5	±0.8	500	[6,8] AYRES	74	ASPK	3–6 $\pi^- p \to K^+ K^- n$, $K^- p \to K^+ K^- \Lambda / \Sigma^0$
3.81	±0.37		COSME	74B	OSPK	$e^+ e^- \to K^0_L K^0_S$
3.8	±0.7	454	[6] BORENSTEIN	72	HBC	2.18 $K^- p \to K \overline{K} n$

[1] Average of KOZYREV 16 and KOZYREV 18 values taking into account the correlated uncertainties. Supersedes individual KOZYREV 16 and KOZYREV 18 results.

[2] Using a vector meson dominance model with contribution from $\phi(1020)$ and higher mass excitations of $\rho(770)$, $\omega(782)$, and $\phi(1020)$.

[3] Using a phenomenological model based on KUHN 90 with a sum of Breit-Wigner resonances for $\rho(770)$, $\omega(782)$, $\phi(1020)$ and their higher mass excitations.

[4] Update of AKHMETSHIN 99D

[5] From the combined fit assuming that the total $\phi(1020)$ production cross section is saturated by those of $K^+ K^-$, $K_S K_L$, $\pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0$, and $\eta \gamma$ decays modes and using ACHASOV 00B for the $\eta \gamma$ decay mode.

[6] Width errors enlarged by us to $4\Gamma/\sqrt{N}$; see the note with the $K^*(892)$ mass.

[7] Strongly correlated with AKHMETSHIN 04.

[8] Systematic errors not evaluated.

ϕ(1020) DECAY MODES

	Mode	Fraction (Γ_i/Γ)	Scale factor/ Confidence level
Γ_1	$K^+ K^-$	(49.2 ±0.5) %	S=1.3
Γ_2	$K^0_L K^0_S$	(34.0 ±0.4) %	S=1.3
Γ_3	$\rho \pi + \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0$	(15.24 ±0.33) %	S=1.2
Γ_4	$\rho \pi$		
Γ_5	$\pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0$		
Γ_6	$\eta \gamma$	(1.303±0.025) %	S=1.2
Γ_7	$\pi^0 \gamma$	(1.30 ±0.05) $\times 10^{-3}$	

Γ_8	$\ell^+\ell^-$			—	
Γ_9	e^+e^-			$(2.973\pm0.034)\times10^{-4}$	S=1.3
Γ_{10}	$\mu^+\mu^-$			$(2.86\pm0.19)\times10^{-4}$	
Γ_{11}	ηe^+e^-			$(1.08\pm0.04)\times10^{-4}$	
Γ_{12}	$\pi^+\pi^-$			$(7.3\pm1.3)\times10^{-5}$	
Γ_{13}	$\omega\pi^0$			$(4.7\pm0.5)\times10^{-5}$	
Γ_{14}	$\omega\gamma$		$<$	5 %	CL=84%
Γ_{15}	$\rho\gamma$		$<$	1.2×10^{-5}	CL=90%
Γ_{16}	$\pi^+\pi^-\gamma$			$(4.1\pm1.3)\times10^{-5}$	
Γ_{17}	$f_0(980)\gamma$			$(3.22\pm0.19)\times10^{-4}$	S=1.1
Γ_{18}	$\pi^0\pi^0\gamma$			$(1.12\pm0.06)\times10^{-4}$	
Γ_{19}	$\pi^+\pi^-\pi^+\pi^-$			$(3.9\ {}^{+2.8}_{-2.2})\times10^{-6}$	
Γ_{20}	$\pi^+\pi^+\pi^-\pi^-\pi^0$		$<$	4.6×10^{-6}	CL=90%
Γ_{21}	$\pi^0e^+e^-$			$(1.33\ {}^{+0.07}_{-0.10})\times10^{-5}$	
Γ_{22}	$\pi^0\eta\gamma$			$(7.27\pm0.30)\times10^{-5}$	S=1.5
Γ_{23}	$a_0(980)\gamma$			$(7.6\pm0.6)\times10^{-5}$	
Γ_{24}	$K^0\overline{K}^0\gamma$		$<$	1.9×10^{-8}	CL=90%
Γ_{25}	$\eta'(958)\gamma$			$(6.22\pm0.21)\times10^{-5}$	
Γ_{26}	$\eta\pi^0\pi^0\gamma$		$<$	2×10^{-5}	CL=90%
Γ_{27}	$\mu^+\mu^-\gamma$			$(1.4\pm0.5)\times10^{-5}$	
Γ_{28}	$\rho\gamma\gamma$		$<$	1.2×10^{-4}	CL=90%
Γ_{29}	$\eta\pi^+\pi^-$		$<$	1.8×10^{-5}	CL=90%
Γ_{30}	$\eta\mu^+\mu^-$		$<$	9.4×10^{-6}	CL=90%
Γ_{31}	$\eta U\to\ \eta e^+e^-$		$<$	1×10^{-6}	CL=90%
Γ_{32}	invisible		$<$	1.7×10^{-4}	CL=90%
	Lepton Family number (LF) violating modes				
Γ_{33}	$e^{\pm}\mu^{\mp}$	*LF*	$<$	2×10^{-6}	CL=90%

CONSTRAINED FIT INFORMATION

An overall fit to 30 branching ratios uses 82 measurements and one constraint to determine 14 parameters. The overall fit has a χ^2 = 63.7 for 69 degrees of freedom.

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

x_2	−78									
x_3	−59	−4								
x_6	−23	19	6							
x_7	−15	14	4	10						
x_9	54	−52	−17	−38	−27					
x_{10}	−7	7	2	5	3	−13				
x_{12}	−3	3	1	2	2	−6	1			
x_{13}	−5	4	1	3	2	−8	1	1		
x_{17}	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
x_{18}	−11	10	3	19	5	−20	2	1	2	0
x_{19}	−1	1	0	1	0	−2	0	0	0	0
x_{23}	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
x_{25}	−8	6	2	33	3	−12	2	1	1	0
	x_1	x_2	x_3	x_6	x_7	x_9	x_{10}	x_{12}	x_{13}	x_{17}

x_{19}	0		
x_{23}	0	0	
x_{25}	6	0	0
	x_{18}	x_{19}	x_{23}

ϕ(1020) PARTIAL WIDTHS

$\Gamma(\eta\gamma)$ Γ_6

VALUE (keV)	*DOCUMENT ID*		*TECN*	*COMMENT*
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
58.9±0.5±2.4	ACHASOV	00	SND	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \eta\gamma$

$\Gamma(\pi^0\gamma)$ Γ_7

VALUE (keV)	*DOCUMENT ID*		*TECN*	*COMMENT*
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
$5.40 \pm 0.16^{+0.43}_{-0.40}$	ACHASOV	00	SND	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma$

$\Gamma(\ell^+\ell^-)$ Γ_8

VALUE (keV)	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •			
$1.320\pm0.017\pm0.015$	[1] AMBROSINO 05	KLOE	$1.02\ e^+e^- \to \mu^+\mu^-$

[1] Weighted average of Γ_{ee} and $\sqrt{\Gamma_{ee}\Gamma_{\mu\mu}}$ from AMBROSINO 05 assuming lepton universality.

$\Gamma(e^+e^-)$ Γ_9

VALUE (keV)	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
1.27 ±0.04 OUR EVALUATION			
1.251±0.021 OUR AVERAGE	Error includes scale factor of 1.1.		
$1.235\pm0.006\pm0.022$	[1] AKHMETSHIN 11	CMD2	$1.02\ e^+e^- \to \phi$
$1.32\ \pm0.05\ \pm0.03$	[2] AMBROSINO 05	KLOE	$1.02\ e^+e^- \to e^+e^-$
$1.28\ \pm0.05$	AKHMETSHIN 95	CMD2	$1.02\ e^+e^- \to \phi$

[1] Combined analysis of the CMD-2 data on $\phi \to K^+K^-$, $K^0_S K^0_L$, $\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$, $\eta\gamma$ assuming that the sum of their branching fractions is 0.99741 ± 0.00007.

[2] From forward-backward asymmetry and using $\Gamma_{total} = 4.26 \pm 0.05$ MeV from the 2004 edition of this Review.

$(\Gamma(e^+e^-) \times \Gamma(\mu^+\mu^-))^{1/2}$ $(\Gamma_9\Gamma_{10})^{1/2}$

VALUE (keV)	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
$1.320\pm0.018\pm0.017$	AMBROSINO 05	KLOE	$1.02\ e^+e^- \to \mu^+\mu^-$

$\phi(1020)$ $\Gamma(i)\Gamma(e^+e^-)/\Gamma(\text{total})$

$\Gamma(K^+K^-) \times \Gamma(e^+e^-)/\Gamma_{total}$ $\Gamma_1\Gamma_9/\Gamma$

VALUE (keV)	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
$0.6340\pm0.0070\pm0.0039$		[1] LEES 13Q	BABR	$e^+e^- \to K^+K^-\gamma$
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
$0.669\ \pm0.001\ \pm0.023$	1.7M	KOZYREV 18	CMD3	$e^+e^- \to K^+K^-$

[1] Using a phenomenological model based on KUHN 90 with a sum of Breit-Wigner resonances for $\rho(770)$, $\omega(782)$, $\phi(1020)$ and their higher mass excitations. The first error combines statistical and systematic uncertainties. The second one is due to the parametrization of the charged kaon form factor and mass calibration.

$\Gamma(K^0_L K^0_S) \times \Gamma(e^+e^-)/\Gamma_{total}$ $\Gamma_2\Gamma_9/\Gamma$

VALUE (keV)	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
$0.4200\pm0.0033\pm0.0123$	28k	[1] LEES 14H	BABR	$e^+e^- \to K^0_S K^0_L \gamma$

[1] Using a vector meson dominance model with contribution from $\phi(1020)$ and higher mass excitations of $\rho(770)$, $\omega(782)$, and $\phi(1020)$.

$\phi(1020)$ $\Gamma(i)\Gamma(e^+e^-)/\Gamma^2(\text{total})$

$\Gamma(K^+K^-)/\Gamma_{\text{total}} \times \Gamma(e^+e^-)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$ — $\Gamma_1/\Gamma \times \Gamma_9/\Gamma$

VALUE (units 10^{-5})	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
14.63 ±0.29 OUR FIT Error includes scale factor of 1.5.				
14.6 ±0.5 OUR AVERAGE Error includes scale factor of 1.8. See the ideogram below.				
15.789±0.541	1.7M	KOZYREV 18	CMD3	$e^+e^- \to K^+K^-$
14.27 ±0.05 ±0.31	542k	AKHMETSHIN 08	CMD2	1.02 $e^+e^- \to K^+K^-$
13.93 ±0.14 ±0.99	1000k	[1] ACHASOV 01E	SND	$e^+e^- \to K^+K^-$, $K_S K_L$, $\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$

[1] From the combined fit assuming that the total $\phi(1020)$ production cross section is saturated by those of K^+K^-, $K_S K_L$, $\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$, and $\eta\gamma$ decays modes and using ACHASOV 00B for the $\eta\gamma$ decay mode.



$\Gamma(K^0_L K^0_S)/\Gamma_{\text{total}} \times \Gamma(e^+e^-)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$ — $\Gamma_2/\Gamma \times \Gamma_9/\Gamma$

VALUE (units 10^{-5})	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
10.10 ±0.12 OUR FIT Error includes scale factor of 1.1.				
10.07 ±0.13 OUR AVERAGE				
10.078±0.223	610k	[1] KOZYREV 16	CMD3	$e^+e^- \to K^0_S K^0_L$
10.01 ±0.04 ±0.17	272k	[2] AKHMETSHIN 04	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to K^0_L K^0_S$
10.27 ±0.07 ±0.34	500k	[3] ACHASOV 01E	SND	$e^+e^- \to K^+K^-$, $K_S K_L$, $\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$

[1] KOZYREV 16 also reports $\Gamma(e^+e^-)$ B($\phi \to K^0_S K^0_L$) = (0.428 ± 0.001 ± 0.009) keV.
[2] Update of AKHMETSHIN 99D
[3] From the combined fit assuming that the total ϕ(1020) production cross section is saturated by those of K^+K^-, $K_S K_L$, $\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$, and $\eta\gamma$ decays modes and using ACHASOV 00B for the $\eta\gamma$ decay mode.

$[\Gamma(\rho\pi)+\Gamma(\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0)]/\Gamma_{total} \times \Gamma(e^+e^-)/\Gamma_{total}$ — $\Gamma_3/\Gamma \times \Gamma_9/\Gamma$

VALUE (units 10^{-5})	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
4.53 ±0.10 OUR FIT Error includes scale factor of 1.1.					
4.46 ±0.12 OUR AVERAGE					
4.51 ±0.16 ±0.11	105k	AKHMETSHIN	06	CMD2	0.98–1.06 $e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$
4.30 ±0.08 ±0.21		AUBERT,B	04N	BABR	10.6 $e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0\gamma$
4.665±0.042±0.261	400k	[1] ACHASOV	01E	SND	$e^+e^- \to K^+K^-$, $K_S K_L$, $\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$
4.35 ±0.27 ±0.08	11169	[2] AKHMETSHIN	98	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •					
4.38 ±0.12		BENAYOUN	10	RVUE	0.4–1.05 e^+e^-

[1] From the combined fit assuming that the total ϕ(1020) production cross section is saturated by those of K^+K^-, $K_S K_L$, $\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$, and $\eta\gamma$ decays modes and using ACHASOV 00B for the $\eta\gamma$ decay mode.
[2] Recalculated by us from the cross section in the peak.

$\Gamma(\eta\gamma)/\Gamma_{total} \times \Gamma(e^+e^-)/\Gamma_{total}$ — $\Gamma_6/\Gamma \times \Gamma_9/\Gamma$

VALUE (units 10^{-6})	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
3.87 ±0.07 OUR FIT Error includes scale factor of 1.2.					
3.93 ±0.09 OUR AVERAGE Error includes scale factor of 1.3. See the ideogram below.					
4.050±0.067±0.118	33k	[1] ACHASOV	07B	SND	0.6–1.38 $e^+e^- \to \eta\gamma$
$4.093^{+0.040}_{-0.043}$±0.247	17.4k	[2] AKHMETSHIN	05	CMD2	0.60-1.38 $e^+e^- \to \eta\gamma$
3.850±0.041±0.159	23k	[3,4] AKHMETSHIN	01B	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to \eta\gamma$
4.00 ±0.04 ±0.11		[5] ACHASOV	00	SND	$e^+e^- \to \eta\gamma$
3.53 ±0.08 ±0.17	2200	[6,7] AKHMETSHIN	99F	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to \eta\gamma$
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •					
4.19 ±0.06		[8] BENAYOUN	10	RVUE	0.4–1.05 e^+e^-

[1] From a combined fit of $\sigma(e^+e^- \to \eta\gamma)$ with $\eta \to 3\pi^0$ and $\eta \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$, and fixing B($\eta \to 3\pi^0$) / B($\eta \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$) = 1.44 ± 0.04. Recalculated by us from the cross section at the peak. Supersedes ACHASOV 00D and ACHASOV 06A.
[2] From the $\eta \to 2\gamma$ decay and using B($\eta \to \gamma\gamma$) = 39.43 ± 0.26%.
[3] From the $\eta \to 3\pi^0$ decay and using B($\eta \to 3\pi^0$)= (32.24 ± 0.29) × 10^{-2}.
[4] The combined fit from 600 to 1380 MeV taking into account ρ(770), ω(782), ϕ(1020), and ρ(1450) (mass and width fixed at 1450 MeV and 310 MeV respectively).
[5] From the $\eta \to 2\gamma$ decay and using B($\eta \to 2\gamma$) =(39.21 ± 0.34) × 10^{-2}.
[6] Recalculated by the authors from the cross section in the peak.
[7] From the $\eta \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ decay and using B($\eta \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$) =(23.1 ± 0.5) × 10^{-2}.
[8] A simultaneous fit of $e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-$, $\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$, $\pi^0\gamma$, $\eta\gamma$ data.



$\Gamma\big(\eta\gamma\big)/\Gamma_{\rm total} \times \Gamma\big(e^+ e^-\big)/\Gamma_{\rm total}$ $\Gamma_6/\Gamma \times \Gamma_9/\Gamma$

$\Gamma\big(\pi^0\gamma\big)/\Gamma_{\rm total} \times \Gamma\big(e^+e^-\big)/\Gamma_{\rm total}$ $\Gamma_7/\Gamma \times \Gamma_9/\Gamma$

VALUE (units 10^{-7})	*EVTS*	*DOCUMENT ID*		*TECN*	*COMMENT*
3.88±0.14 OUR FIT					
3.87±0.15 OUR AVERAGE					
$4.04\pm0.09\pm0.19$		[1] ACHASOV	16A	SND	0.60–1.38 $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma$
$3.75\pm0.11\pm0.29$	18k	AKHMETSHIN	05	CMD2	0.60-1.38 $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma$
$3.67\pm0.10^{+0.27}_{-0.25}$		[2] ACHASOV	00	SND	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma$
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •					
4.29 ± 0.11		[3] BENAYOUN	10	RVUE	0.4–1.05 e^+e^-

[1] From the VMD model with the interfering $\rho(770)$, $\omega(782)$, $\phi(1020)$ resonances, and an additional resonance describing the total contribution of the $\rho(1450)$ and $\omega(1420)$ states. Supersedes ACHASOV 00.
[2] From the $\pi^0 \rightarrow 2\gamma$ decay and using B($\pi^0 \rightarrow 2\gamma$) = $(98.798 \pm 0.032) \times 10^{-2}$.
[3] A simultaneous fit of $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$, $\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$, $\pi^0\gamma$, $\eta\gamma$ data.

$\Gamma\big(\mu^+\mu^-\big)/\Gamma_{\rm total} \times \Gamma\big(e^+e^-\big)/\Gamma_{\rm total}$ $\Gamma_{10}/\Gamma \times \Gamma_9/\Gamma$

VALUE (units 10^{-8})	*DOCUMENT ID*		*TECN*	*COMMENT*
8.5 $^{+0.5}_{-0.6}$ OUR FIT				
8.8 ±0.9 OUR AVERAGE Error includes scale factor of 1.5. See the ideogram below.				
$8.36\pm0.59\pm0.37$	ACHASOV	01G	SND	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$
$9.9\pm1.4\pm0.9$	[1] ACHASOV	99C	SND	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$
14.4 ± 3.0	[2] VASSERMAN	81	OLYA	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$
8.6 ± 5.9	[2] AUGUSTIN	73	OSPK	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$

[1] Recalculated by the authors from the cross section in the peak.
[2] Recalculated by us from the cross section in the peak.



$\Gamma(\mu^+\mu^-)/\Gamma_{total} \times \Gamma(e^+e^-)/\Gamma_{total}$ $\Gamma_{10}/\Gamma \times \Gamma_9/\Gamma$

$\Gamma(\pi^+\pi^-)/\Gamma_{total} \times \Gamma(e^+e^-)/\Gamma_{total}$ $\Gamma_{12}/\Gamma \times \Gamma_9/\Gamma$

VALUE (units 10^{-8})	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
2.2 ±0.4 OUR FIT				
2.2 ±0.4 OUR AVERAGE				
2.1 ±0.3 ±0.3	[1] ACHASOV	00C	SND	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-$
$1.95^{+1.15}_{-0.87}$	[2] GOLUBEV	86	ND	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-$
$6.01^{+3.19}_{-2.51}$	[2] VASSERMAN	81	OLYA	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-$
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
3.31±0.99	[3] BENAYOUN	13	RVUE	0.4–1.05 e^+e^-

[1] Recalculated by the authors from the cross section in the peak.
[2] Recalculated by us from the cross section in the peak.
[3] A simultaneous fit to $e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-$, $\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$, $\pi^0\gamma$, $\eta\gamma$, $K\overline{K}$, and $\tau^- \to \pi^-\pi^0\nu_\tau$ data.

$\Gamma(\omega\pi^0)/\Gamma_{total} \times \Gamma(e^+e^-)/\Gamma_{total}$ $\Gamma_{13}/\Gamma \times \Gamma_9/\Gamma$

VALUE (units 10^{-8})	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
1.40±0.15 OUR FIT				
1.37±0.17±0.01	[1,2] AMBROSINO	08G	KLOE	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-2\pi^0$, $2\pi^0\gamma$

[1] Recalculated by the authors from the cross section at the peak.
[2] AMBROSINO 08G reports $[\Gamma(\phi(1020) \to \omega\pi^0)/\Gamma_{total} \times \Gamma(\phi(1020) \to e^+e^-)/\Gamma_{total}] \times [B(\omega(782) \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0)] = (1.22 \pm 0.13 \pm 0.08) \times 10^{-8}$ which we divide by our best value $B(\omega(782) \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0) = (89.3 \pm 0.6) \times 10^{-2}$. Our first error is their experiment's error and our second error is the systematic error from using our best value.

$\Gamma(\pi^0\pi^0\gamma)/\Gamma_{total} \times \Gamma(e^+e^-)/\Gamma_{total}$ — $\Gamma_{18}/\Gamma \times \Gamma_9/\Gamma$

VALUE (units 10^{-8})	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
3.34±0.17 OUR FIT			
$3.33^{+0.04}_{-0.09}{}^{+0.19}_{-0.20}$	[1] AMBROSINO 07	KLOE	$e^+e^- \to \pi^0\pi^0\gamma$

[1] Calculated by the authors from the cross section at the peak.

$\Gamma(\pi^+\pi^-\pi^+\pi^-)/\Gamma_{total} \times \Gamma(e^+e^-)/\Gamma_{total}$ — $\Gamma_{19}/\Gamma \times \Gamma_9/\Gamma$

VALUE (units 10^{-9})	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
$1.2^{+0.8}_{-0.7}$ OUR FIT				
1.17±0.52±0.64	3285	[1] AKHMETSHIN 00E	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^+\pi^-$

[1] Recalculated by the authors from the cross section in the peak.

ϕ(1020) BRANCHING RATIOS

$\Gamma(K^+K^-)/\Gamma_{total}$ — Γ_1/Γ

VALUE	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
0.492±0.005 OUR FIT Error includes scale factor of 1.3.				
0.493±0.010 OUR AVERAGE				
0.492±0.012	2913	AKHMETSHIN 95	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to K^+K^-$
0.44 ±0.05	321	KALBFLEISCH 76	HBC	2.18 $K^-p \to \Lambda K^+K^-$
0.49 ±0.06	270	DEGROOT 74	HBC	4.2 $K^-p \to \Lambda\phi$
0.540±0.034	565	BALAKIN 71	OSPK	$e^+e^- \to K^+K^-$
0.48 ±0.04	252	LINDSEY 66	HBC	2.1–2.7 $K^-p \to \Lambda K^+K^-$
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
0.493±0.003±0.007		[1] AKHMETSHIN 11	CMD2	1.02 $e^+e^- \to K^+K^-$
0.476±0.017	1000k	[2] ACHASOV 01E	SND	$e^+e^- \to K^+K^-$, $K_S K_L$, $\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$

[1] Combined analysis of the CMD-2 data on $\phi \to K^+K^-$, $K^0_S K^0_L$, $\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$, $\eta\gamma$ assuming that the sum of their branching fractions is 0.99741 ± 0.00007.
[2] Using B($\phi \to e^+e^-$)= (2.93 ± 0.14) × 10^{-4}.

$\Gamma(K^0_L K^0_S)/\Gamma_{total}$ — Γ_2/Γ

VALUE	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
0.340±0.004 OUR FIT Error includes scale factor of 1.3.				
0.331±0.009 OUR AVERAGE				
0.335±0.010	40644	AKHMETSHIN 95	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to K^0_L K^0_S$
0.326±0.035		DOLINSKY 91	ND	$e^+e^- \to K^0_L K^0_S$
0.310±0.024		DRUZHININ 84	ND	$e^+e^- \to K^0_L K^0_S$

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

0.336±0.002±0.006		[1] AKHMETSHIN	11	CMD2	1.02 $e^+ e^- \to K^0_S K^0_L$
0.351±0.013	500k	[2] ACHASOV	01E	SND	$e^+ e^- \to K^+ K^-$, $K_S K_L$, $\pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0$
0.27 ±0.03	133	KALBFLEISCH	76	HBC	2.18 $K^- p \to \Lambda K^0_L K^0_S$
0.257±0.030	95	[3] BALAKIN	71	OSPK	$e^+ e^- \to K^0_L K^0_S$
0.40 ±0.04	167	LINDSEY	66	HBC	2.1–2.7 $K^- p \to \Lambda K^0_L K^0_S$

[1] Combined analysis of the CMD-2 data on $\phi \to K^+ K^-$, $K^0_S K^0_L$, $\pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0$, $\eta\gamma$ assuming that the sum of their branching fractions is 0.99741 ± 0.00007.
[2] Using B($\phi \to e^+ e^-$)= (2.93 ± 0.14) × 10^{-4}.
[3] Balakin error increased by Paul.

$\Gamma(K^0_L K^0_S)/\Gamma(K^+ K^-)$ — Γ_2/Γ_1

VALUE	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
0.690±0.015 OUR FIT	Error includes scale factor of 1.3.				
0.740±0.031 OUR AVERAGE					
0.70 ±0.06	2732	BUKIN	78C	OLYA	$e^+ e^- \to K^0_L K^0_S$
0.82 ±0.08		LOSTY	78	HBC	4.2 $K^- p \to \phi$hyperon
0.71 ±0.05		LAVEN	77	HBC	10 $K^- p \to K^+ K^- \Lambda$
0.71 ±0.08		LYONS	77	HBC	3–4 $K^- p \to \Lambda \phi$
0.89 ±0.10	144	AGUILAR-...	72B	HBC	3.9,4.6 $K^- p$
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •					
0.638±0.022	2.3M	[1] KOZYREV	18	CMD3	$e^+ e^- \to K^0_L K^0_S$, $K^+ K^-$
0.68 ±0.03		[2] AKHMETSHIN	95	CMD2	$e^+ e^- \to K^0_L K^0_S$, $K^+ K^-$

[1] The prediction taking into account phase-space difference, radiative corrections, isospin breaking, and the Sommerfeld-Gamow-Sakharov factor gives 0.630.
[2] Theoretical analysis of BRAMON 00 taking into account phase-space difference, electromagnetic radiative corrections, as well as isospin breaking, predicts 0.62. FLOREZ-BAEZ 08 predicts 0.63 considering also structure-dependent radiative corrections. FISCHBACH 02 calculates additional corrections caused by the close threshold and predicts 0.68. See also BENAYOUN 01 and DUBYNSKIY 07. BENAYOUN 12 obtains 0.71±0.01 in the HLS model.

$\Gamma(K^0_L K^0_S)/\Gamma(K\overline{K})$ — $\Gamma_2/(\Gamma_1+\Gamma_2)$

VALUE	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
0.408±0.005 OUR FIT	Error includes scale factor of 1.3.				
0.45 ±0.04 OUR AVERAGE					
0.44 ±0.07		[1] LONDON	66	HBC	2.24 $K^- p \to \Lambda K \overline{K}$
0.48 ±0.07	52	BADIER	65B	HBC	3 $K^- p$
0.40 ±0.10	34	SCHLEIN	63	HBC	1.95 $K^- p \to \Lambda K \overline{K}$

[1] This is probably not affected by their controversial background subtraction; the value is from their numbers of $K_1 K_2$ vs $K^+ K^-$ events.

$[\Gamma(\rho\pi) + \Gamma(\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0)]/\Gamma_{total}$ Γ_3/Γ

VALUE	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
0.1524±0.0033 OUR FIT Error includes scale factor of 1.2.					
0.151 ±0.009 OUR AVERAGE Error includes scale factor of 1.7.					
0.161 ±0.008	11761	AKHMETSHIN	95	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$
0.143 ±0.007		DOLINSKY	91	ND	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •					
0.155 ±0.002 ±0.005		[1] AKHMETSHIN	11	CMD2	1.02 $e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$
0.159 ±0.008	400k	[2] ACHASOV	01E	SND	$e^+e^- \to K^+K^-$, $K_S K_L$, $\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$
0.145 ±0.009 ±0.003	11169	[3] AKHMETSHIN	98	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$
0.139 ±0.007		[4] PARROUR	76B	OSPK	e^+e^-

[1] Combined analysis of the CMD-2 data on $\phi \to K^+K^-$, $K^0_S K^0_L$, $\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$, $\eta\gamma$ assuming that the sum of their branching fractions is 0.99741 ± 0.00007.
[2] Using B($\phi \to e^+e^-$)= $(2.93 \pm 0.14) \times 10^{-4}$.
[3] Using B($\phi \to e^+e^-$)=$(2.99 \pm 0.08) \times 10^{-4}$.
[4] Using Γ(ϕ)= 4.1 MeV. If interference between the $\rho\pi$ and 3π modes is neglected, the fraction of the $\rho\pi$ is more than 80% at the 90% confidence level.

$[\Gamma(\rho\pi) + \Gamma(\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0)]/\Gamma(K^+K^-)$ Γ_3/Γ_1

VALUE	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
0.310±0.009 OUR FIT Error includes scale factor of 1.2.					
0.28 ±0.09	34	AGUILAR-...	72B	HBC	3.9,4.6 K^-p

$[\Gamma(\rho\pi) + \Gamma(\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0)]/\Gamma(K\overline{K})$ $\Gamma_3/(\Gamma_1+\Gamma_2)$

VALUE	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
0.183±0.005 OUR FIT Error includes scale factor of 1.2.				
0.24 ±0.04 OUR AVERAGE				
0.237±0.039	CERRADA	77B	HBC	4.2 $K^-p \to \Lambda 3\pi$
0.30 ±0.15	LONDON	66	HBC	2.24 $K^-p \to \Lambda\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$

$[\Gamma(\rho\pi) + \Gamma(\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0)]/\Gamma(K^0_L K^0_S)$ Γ_3/Γ_2

VALUE	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
0.448±0.011 OUR FIT Error includes scale factor of 1.1.					
0.51 ±0.05 OUR AVERAGE					
0.56 ±0.07	3681	BUKIN	78C	OLYA	$e^+e^- \to K^0_L K^0_S$, $\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$
0.47 ±0.06	516	COSME	74	OSPK	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$

$\Gamma(\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0)/\Gamma_{total}$ Γ_5/Γ

VALUE	CL%	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •						
≃ 0.0087		1.98M	[1,2] ALOISIO	03	KLOE	1.02 $e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$
<0.0006	90		[3] ACHASOV	02	SND	1.02 $e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$
<0.23	90		[3] CORDIER	80	DM1	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$
<0.20	90		[3] PARROUR	76B	OSPK	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$

[1] From a fit without limitations on charged and neutral ρ masses and widths.
[2] Adding the direct and $\omega\pi$ contributions and considering the interference between the $\rho\pi$ and $\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$.
[3] Neglecting the interference between the $\rho\pi$ and $\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$.

$\Gamma(\eta\gamma)/\Gamma_{total}$ Γ_6/Γ

VALUE (units 10^{-2})	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
1.303±0.025 OUR FIT	Error includes scale factor of 1.2.				
1.26 ±0.04 OUR AVERAGE					
1.246±0.025±0.057	10k	[1] ACHASOV	98F	SND	$e^+e^- \to 7\gamma$
1.18 ±0.11	279	[2] AKHMETSHIN	95	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-3\gamma$
1.30 ±0.06		[3] DRUZHININ	84	ND	$e^+e^- \to 3\gamma$
1.4 ±0.2		[4] DRUZHININ	84	ND	$e^+e^- \to 6\gamma$
0.88 ±0.20	290	KURDADZE	83C	OLYA	$e^+e^- \to 3\gamma$
1.35 ±0.29		ANDREWS	77	CNTR	6.7–10 γCu
1.5 ±0.4	54	[3] COSME	76	OSPK	e^+e^-
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •					
1.38 ±0.02 ±0.02		[5] AKHMETSHIN	11	CMD2	1.02 $e^+e^- \to \eta\gamma$
1.36 ±0.05 ±0.02	33k	[6] ACHASOV	07B	SND	0.6–1.38 $e^+e^- \to \eta\gamma$
1.373±0.014±0.085	17.4k	[7,8] AKHMETSHIN	05	CMD2	0.60-1.38 $e^+e^- \to \eta\gamma$
1.287±0.013±0.063		[9,10] AKHMETSHIN	01B	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to \eta\gamma$
1.338±0.012±0.052		[11] ACHASOV	00	SND	$e^+e^- \to \eta\gamma$
1.18 ±0.03 ±0.06	2200	[12] AKHMETSHIN	99F	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to \eta\gamma$
1.21 ±0.07		[13] BENAYOUN	96	RVUE	0.54-1.04 $e^+e^- \to \eta\gamma$

[1] Using B($\phi \to e^+e^-$) = $(2.99 \pm 0.08) \times 10^{-4}$ and B($\eta \to 3\pi^0$)= $(32.2 \pm 0.4) \times 10^{-2}$.
[2] From $\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ decay mode of η.
[3] From 2γ decay mode of η.
[4] From $3\pi^0$ decay mode of η.
[5] Combined analysis of the CMD-2 data on $\phi \to K^+K^-$, $K^0_S K^0_L$, $\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$, $\eta\gamma$ assuming that the sum of their branching fractions is 0.99741 ± 0.00007.
[6] ACHASOV 07B reports [$\Gamma(\phi(1020) \to \eta\gamma)/\Gamma_{total}$] × [B($\phi(1020) \to e^+e^-$)] = $(4.050 \pm 0.067 \pm 0.118) \times 10^{-6}$ which we divide by our best value B($\phi(1020) \to e^+e^-$) = $(2.973 \pm 0.034) \times 10^{-4}$. Our first error is their experiment's error and our second error is the systematic error from using our best value. Supersedes ACHASOV 00D and ACHASOV 06A.
[7] Using B($\phi \to e^+e^-$) = $(2.98 \pm 0.04) \times 10^{-4}$ and B($\eta \to \gamma\gamma$) = 39.43 ± 0.26%.
[8] Not independent of the corresponding $\Gamma(e^+e^-) \times \Gamma(\eta\gamma)/\Gamma^2_{total}$.
[9] Using B($\phi \to e^+e^-$) = $(2.99 \pm 0.08) \times 10^{-4}$ and B($\eta \to 3\pi^0$)=$(32.24 \pm 0.29) \times 10^{-2}$.
[10] The combined fit from 600 to 1380 MeV taking into account $\rho(770)$, $\omega(782)$, $\phi(1020)$, and $\rho(1450)$ (mass and width fixed at 1450 MeV and 310 MeV respectively).
[11] From the $\eta \to 2\gamma$ decay and using B($\phi \to e^+e^-$) =$(2.99 \pm 0.08) \times 10^{-4}$.
[12] From $\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ decay mode of η and using B($\phi \to e^+e^-$)= $(2.99 \pm 0.08) \times 10^{-4}$.
[13] Reanalysis of DRUZHININ 84, DOLINSKY 89, and DOLINSKY 91 taking into account a triangle anomaly contribution.

$\Gamma(\pi^0\gamma)/\Gamma_{total}$ Γ_7/Γ

VALUE (units 10^{-3})	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
1.30 ±0.05 OUR FIT					
1.31 ±0.13 OUR AVERAGE					
1.30 ±0.13		DRUZHININ	84	ND	$e^+e^- \to 3\gamma$
1.4 ±0.5	32	COSME	76	OSPK	e^+e^-

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

1.367±0.072		[1] ACHASOV	16A	SND	0.60–1.38 $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma$
1.258±0.037±0.077	18k	[2,3] AKHMETSHIN	05	CMD2	0.60-1.38 $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma$
$1.226\pm0.036^{+0.096}_{-0.089}$		[4] ACHASOV	00	SND	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma$
1.26 ±0.17		[5] BENAYOUN	96	RVUE	0.54-1.04 $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma$

[1] Using B($\phi \rightarrow e^+e^-$) from PDG 15. Supersedes ACHASOV 00.
[2] Using B($\phi \rightarrow e^+e^-$) = (2.98 ± 0.04) × 10^{-4}.
[3] Not independent of the corresponding $\Gamma(e^+e^-) \times \Gamma(\pi^0\gamma)/\Gamma^2_{total}$.
[4] From the $\pi^0 \rightarrow 2\gamma$ decay and using B($\phi \rightarrow e^+e^-$) = (2.99 ± 0.08) × 10^{-4}.
[5] Reanalysis of DRUZHININ 84, DOLINSKY 89, and DOLINSKY 91 taking into account a triangle anomaly contribution.

$\Gamma(\eta\gamma)/\Gamma(\pi^0\gamma)$ Γ_6/Γ_7

VALUE	*DOCUMENT ID*		*TECN*	*COMMENT*
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
$10.9\pm0.3^{+0.7}_{-0.8}$	ACHASOV	00	SND	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \eta\gamma, \pi^0\gamma$

$\Gamma(e^+e^-)/\Gamma_{total}$ Γ_9/Γ

VALUE (units 10^{-4})	*EVTS*	*DOCUMENT ID*		*TECN*	*COMMENT*
2.973±0.034 OUR FIT	Error includes scale factor of 1.3.				
2.98 ±0.07 OUR AVERAGE	Error includes scale factor of 1.1.				
2.93 ±0.14	1900k	[1] ACHASOV	01E	SND	$e^+e^- \rightarrow K^+K^-$, $K_S K_L$, $\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$
2.88 ±0.09	55600	AKHMETSHIN	95	CMD2	$e^+e^- \rightarrow$ hadrons
3.00 ±0.21	3681	BUKIN	78C	OLYA	$e^+e^- \rightarrow$ hadrons
3.10 ±0.14		[2] PARROUR	76	OSPK	e^+e^-
3.3 ±0.3		COSME	74	OSPK	$e^+e^- \rightarrow$ hadrons
2.81 ±0.25	681	BALAKIN	71	OSPK	$e^+e^- \rightarrow$ hadrons
3.50 ±0.27		CHATELUS	71	OSPK	e^+e^-

[1] From the combined fit assuming that the total $\phi(1020)$ production cross section is saturated by those of K^+K^-, $K_S K_L$, $\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$, and $\eta\gamma$ decays modes and using ACHASOV 00B for the $\eta\gamma$ decay mode.
[2] Using total width 4.2 MeV. They detect 3π mode and observe significant interference with ω tail. This is accounted for in the result quoted above.

$\Gamma(\mu^+\mu^-)/\Gamma_{total}$ Γ_{10}/Γ

VALUE (units 10^{-4})	*DOCUMENT ID*		*TECN*	*COMMENT*
2.86±0.19 OUR FIT				
2.5 ±0.4 OUR AVERAGE				
2.69±0.46	[1] HAYES	71	CNTR	8.3,9.8 $\gamma C \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^- X$
2.17±0.60	[1] EARLES	70	CNTR	6.0 $\gamma C \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^- X$

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

$2.87 \pm 0.20 \pm 0.14$	[2] ACHASOV	01G	SND	$e^+e^- \to \mu^+\mu^-$
$3.30 \pm 0.45 \pm 0.32$	[3] ACHASOV	99C	SND	$e^+e^- \to \mu^+\mu^-$
4.83 ± 1.02	[4] VASSERMAN	81	OLYA	$e^+e^- \to \mu^+\mu^-$
2.87 ± 1.98	[4] AUGUSTIN	73	OSPK	$e^+e^- \to \mu^+\mu^-$

[1] Neglecting interference between resonance and continuum.
[2] Using B($\phi \to e^+e^-$) = $(2.91 \pm 0.07) \times 10^{-4}$.
[3] Using B($\phi \to e^+e^-$)=$(2.99 \pm 0.08) \times 10^{-4}$.
[4] Recalculated by us using B($\phi \to e^+e^-$)= $(2.99 \pm 0.08) \times 10^{-4}$.

$\Gamma(\eta e^+e^-)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$ Γ_{11}/Γ

VALUE (units 10^{-4})	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
1.08 ±0.04 OUR AVERAGE					
$1.075 \pm 0.007 \pm 0.038$	30k	[1] BABUSCI	15	KLOE	$1.02\ e^+e^- \to \eta e^+e^-$
$1.19 \pm 0.19 \pm 0.12$	213	[2] ACHASOV	01B	SND	$e^+e^- \to \eta e^+e^-$
$1.14 \pm 0.10 \pm 0.06$	355	[3] AKHMETSHIN	01	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to \eta e^+e^-$
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •					
$1.13 \pm 0.14 \pm 0.07$	183	[4] AKHMETSHIN	01	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to \eta e^+e^-$
$1.21 \pm 0.14 \pm 0.09$	130	[5] AKHMETSHIN	01	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to \eta e^+e^-$
$1.04 \pm 0.20 \pm 0.08$	42	[6] AKHMETSHIN	01	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to \eta e^+e^-$
$1.3\ ^{+0.8}_{-0.6}$	7	GOLUBEV	85	ND	$e^+e^- \to \eta e^+e^-$

[1] Using B($\eta \to 3\pi^0$) = (32.57 ± 0.23)% from PDG 12.
[2] Using B($\eta \to \gamma\gamma$) = (39.25 ± 0.32)%, B($\phi \to \eta\gamma$) = (1.26 ± 0.06)%, and B($\phi \to e^+e^-$) = $(3.00 \pm 0.06) \times 10^{-4}$.
[3] The average of the branching ratios separately obtained from the $\eta \to \gamma\gamma$, $3\pi^0$, $\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ decays.
[4] From $\eta \to \gamma\gamma$ decays and using B($\eta \to \gamma\gamma$) = $(39.33 \pm 0.25) \times 10^{-2}$, B($\eta \to \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$) = $(4.75 \pm 11) \times 10^{-2}$, and B($\phi \to \eta\gamma$) = $(1.297 \pm 0.033) \times 10^{-2}$.
[5] From $\eta \to 3\pi^0$ decays and using B($\pi^0 \to \gamma\gamma$) = $(98.798 \pm 0.033) \times 10^{-2}$, B($\eta \to 3\pi^0$) = $(32.24 \pm 0.29) \times 10^{-2}$, B($\eta \to \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$) = $(4.75 \pm 0.11) \times 10^{-2}$, and B($\phi \to \eta\gamma$) = $(1.297 \pm 0.033) \times 10^{-2}$.
[6] From $\eta \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ decays and using B($\pi^0 \to \gamma\gamma$) = $(98.798 \pm 0.033) \times 10^{-2}$, B($\pi^0 \to e^+e^-\gamma$) = $(1.198 \pm 0.032) \times 10^{-2}$, B($\eta \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$) = $(23.0 \pm 0.4) \times 10^{-2}$, B($\phi \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$) = $(15.5 \pm 0.6) \times 10^{-2}$, and B($\phi \to \eta\gamma$) = $(1.297 \pm 0.033) \times 10^{-2}$.

$\Gamma(\pi^+\pi^-)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$ Γ_{12}/Γ

VALUE (units 10^{-4})	CL%	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •					
$0.71 \pm 0.11 \pm 0.09$		[1] ACHASOV	00C	SND	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-$
$0.65\ ^{+0.38}_{-0.29}$		[1] GOLUBEV	86	ND	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-$
$2.01\ ^{+1.07}_{-0.84}$		[1] VASSERMAN	81	OLYA	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-$
<6.6	95	BUKIN	78B	OLYA	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-$
<2.7	95	ALVENSLEB...	72	CNTR	$6.7\ \gamma C \to C\pi^+\pi^-$

[1] Using B($\phi \to e^+e^-$)=$(2.99 \pm 0.08) \times 10^{-4}$.

$\Gamma(\omega\pi^0)/\Gamma_{total}$ — Γ_{13}/Γ

VALUE (units 10^{-5})	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
4.7±0.5 OUR FIT				
$5.2^{+1.3}_{-1.1}$	[1,2] AULCHENKO	00A	SND	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0\pi^0$
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
4.4±0.6	[3] AMBROSINO	08G	KLOE	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-2\pi^0,\ 2\pi^0\gamma$
∼ 5.4	[4] ACHASOV	00E	SND	$e^+e^- \to \pi^0\pi^0\gamma$
$5.5^{+1.6}_{-1.4}\pm0.3$	[2,5] AULCHENKO	00A	SND	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0\pi^0$
$4.8^{+1.9}_{-1.7}\pm0.8$	[4] ACHASOV	99	SND	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0\pi^0$

[1] Using the 1996 and 1998 data.
[2] (2.3 ± 0.3)% correction for other decay modes of the $\omega(782)$ applied.
[3] Not independent of the corresponding $\Gamma(\omega\pi^0) \times \Gamma(e^+e^-) / \Gamma^2$(total).
[4] Using the 1996 data.
[5] Using the 1998 data.

$\Gamma(\omega\gamma)/\Gamma_{total}$ — Γ_{14}/Γ

VALUE	CL%	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
<0.05	84	LINDSEY	66	HBC	2.1–2.7 $K^-p \to \Lambda\pi^+\pi^-$ neutrals

$\Gamma(\rho\gamma)/\Gamma_{total}$ — Γ_{15}/Γ

VALUE (units 10^{-4})	CL%	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
< 0.12	90	[1] AKHMETSHIN	99B	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •					
< 7	90	AKHMETSHIN	97C	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$
<200	84	LINDSEY	66	HBC	2.1–2.7 $K^-p \to \Lambda\pi^+\pi^-$ neutrals

[1] Supersedes AKHMETSHIN 97C.

$\Gamma(\pi^+\pi^-\gamma)/\Gamma_{total}$ — Γ_{16}/Γ

VALUE (units 10^{-4})	CL%	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
0.41±0.12±0.04		30175	[1] AKHMETSHIN	99B	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •						
< 0.3	90		[2] AKHMETSHIN	97C	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$
<600	90		KALBFLEISCH	75	HBC	2.18 $K^-p \to \Lambda\pi^+\pi^-\gamma$
< 70	90		COSME	74	OSPK	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$
<400	90		LINDSEY	65	HBC	2.1–2.7 $K^-p \to \Lambda\pi^+\pi^-$ neutrals

[1] For $E_\gamma > 20$ MeV and assuming that B($\phi(1020) \to f_0(980)\gamma$) is negligible. Supersedes AKHMETSHIN 97C.
[2] For $E_\gamma > 20$ MeV and assuming that B($\phi(1020) \to f_0(980)\gamma$) is negligible.

$\Gamma(f_0(980)\gamma)/\Gamma_{total}$ — Γ_{17}/Γ

VALUE (units 10^{-4})	CL%	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
3.22±0.19 OUR FIT Error includes scale factor of 1.1.					
3.21±0.19 OUR AVERAGE					
$3.21^{+0.03}_{-0.09}\pm0.18$			[1] AMBROSINO 07	KLOE	$e^+e^- \to \pi^0\pi^0\gamma$
$2.90\pm0.21\pm1.54$			[2] AKHMETSHIN 99C	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$, $\pi^0\pi^0\gamma$
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •					
4.47 ± 0.21		2438	[3] ALOISIO 02D	KLOE	$e^+e^- \to \pi^0\pi^0\gamma$
$3.5\ \pm0.3\ ^{+1.3}_{-0.5}$		419	[4,5] ACHASOV 00H	SND	$e^+e^- \to \pi^0\pi^0\gamma$
$1.93\pm0.46\pm0.50$		27188	[6] AKHMETSHIN 99B	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$
$3.05\pm0.25\pm0.72$		268	[7] AKHMETSHIN 99C	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to \pi^0\pi^0\gamma$
$1.5\ \pm0.5$		268	[8] AKHMETSHIN 99C	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to \pi^0\pi^0\gamma$
$3.42\pm0.30\pm0.36$		164	[4] ACHASOV 98I	SND	$e^+e^- \to 5\gamma$
<1	90		[9] AKHMETSHIN 97C	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$
<7	90		[10] AKHMETSHIN 97C	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$
<20	90		DRUZHININ 87	ND	$e^+e^- \to \pi^0\pi^0\gamma$

[1] Obtained by the authors taking into account the $\pi^+\pi^-$ decay mode. Includes a component due to $\pi\pi$ production via the $f_0(500)$ meson. Supersedes ALOISIO 02D.

[2] From the combined fit of the photon spectra in the reactions $e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$, $\pi^0\pi^0\gamma$.

[3] From the negative interference with the $f_0(500)$ meson of AITALA 01B using the ACHASOV 89 parameterization for the $f_0(980)$, a Breit-Wigner for the $f_0(500)$, and ACHASOV 01F for the $\rho\pi$ contribution. Superseded by AMBROSINO 07.

[4] Assuming that the $\pi^0\pi^0\gamma$ final state is completely determined by the $f_0\gamma$ mechanism, neglecting the decay B($\phi \to K\overline{K}\gamma$) and using B($f_0 \to \pi^+\pi^-$)= 2B($f_0 \to \pi^0\pi^0$).

[5] Using the value B($\phi \to \eta\gamma$)=$(1.338 \pm 0.053) \times 10^{-2}$.

[6] For $E_\gamma > 20$ MeV. Supersedes AKHMETSHIN 97C.

[7] Neglecting other intermediate mechanisms ($\rho\pi$, $\sigma\gamma$).

[8] A narrow pole fit taking into account $f_0(980)$ and $f_0(1200)$ intermediate mechanisms.

[9] For destructive interference with the Bremsstrahlung process

[10] For constructive interference with the Bremsstrahlung process

$\Gamma(f_0(980)\gamma)/\Gamma(\eta\gamma)$ — Γ_{17}/Γ_6

VALUE (units 10^{-2})	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
$\mathbf{2.47^{+0.15}_{-0.16}}$ **OUR FIT** Error includes scale factor of 1.1.				
$\mathbf{2.6\ \pm0.2\ ^{+0.8}_{-0.3}}$	419	[1] ACHASOV 00H	SND	$e^+e^- \to \pi^0\pi^0\gamma$

[1] Assuming that the $\pi^0\pi^0\gamma$ final state is completely determined by the $f_0\gamma$ mechanism, neglecting the decay B($\phi \to K\overline{K}\gamma$) and using B($f_0 \to \pi^+\pi^-$)= 2B($f_0 \to \pi^0\pi^0$).

$\Gamma(\pi^0\pi^0\gamma)/\Gamma_{total}$ — Γ_{18}/Γ

VALUE (units 10^{-4})	CL%	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
1.07 ±0.06 OUR AVERAGE					
$1.07\ ^{+0.01}_{-0.03}\ ^{+0.06}_{-0.06}$			[1] AMBROSINO 07	KLOE	$e^+e^- \to \pi^0\pi^0\gamma$
$1.08\ \pm0.17\ \pm0.09$		268	AKHMETSHIN 99C	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to \pi^0\pi^0\gamma$

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

$1.09 \pm0.03 \pm0.05$		2438	ALOISIO	02D	KLOE	$e^+e^- \to \pi^0\pi^0\gamma$
$1.158\pm0.093\pm0.052$		419	[2,3] ACHASOV	00H	SND	$e^+e^- \to \pi^0\pi^0\gamma$
<10	90		DRUZHININ	87	ND	$e^+e^- \to 5\gamma$

[1] Supersedes ALOISIO 02D.
[2] Using the value B($\phi \to \eta\gamma$)=(1.338 ± 0.053) × 10^{-2}.
[3] Supersedes ACHASOV 98I. Excluding $\omega\pi^0$.

$\Gamma(\pi^0\pi^0\gamma)/\Gamma(\eta\gamma)$ — Γ_{18}/Γ_6

VALUE (units 10^{-2})	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
0.86 ±0.04 OUR FIT					
0.865±0.070±0.017	419	[1] ACHASOV	00H	SND	$e^+e^- \to \pi^0\pi^0\gamma$
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •					
$0.90 \pm0.08 \pm0.07$	164	ACHASOV	98I	SND	$e^+e^- \to 5\gamma$

[1] Supersedes ACHASOV 98I. Excluding $\omega\pi^0$.

$\Gamma(\pi^+\pi^-\pi^+\pi^-)/\Gamma_{total}$ — Γ_{19}/Γ

VALUE (units 10^{-6})	CL%	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
6.5 ±2.7 ±1.6		6.8k	[1] AKHMETSHIN	17	CMD3	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^+\pi^-$
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •						
$3.93\pm1.74\pm2.14$		3.3k	AKHMETSHIN	00E	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^+\pi^-$
< 870	90		CORDIER	79	WIRE	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^+\pi^-$

[1] Using the cross section at the ϕ meson peak $\sigma(\phi) = 4172 \pm 42$ nb, the nonresonant cross section $\sigma(0) = 1.263 \pm 0.027$ nb and Re(Z) = 0.146 ± 0.030, Im(Z) = −0.002 ± 0.024 for the complex amplitude of the $\phi \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^+\pi^-$ transition.

$\Gamma(\pi^+\pi^+\pi^-\pi^-\pi^0)/\Gamma_{total}$ — Γ_{20}/Γ

VALUE (units 10^{-6})	CL%	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
< 4.6	90	AKHMETSHIN	00E	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •					
<150	95	BARKOV	88	CMD	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$

$\Gamma(\pi^0 e^+e^-)/\Gamma_{total}$ — Γ_{21}/Γ

VALUE (units 10^{-5})	CL%	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
$1.33^{+0.07}_{-0.10}$ OUR AVERAGE						
$1.35\pm0.05^{+0.05}_{-0.10}$		9.5k	[1] ANASTASI	16B	KLOE	$e^+e^- \to \pi^0e^+e^-$
$1.01\pm0.28\pm0.29$		52	[2] ACHASOV	02D	SND	$e^+e^- \to \pi^0e^+e^-$
$1.22\pm0.34\pm0.21$		46	[3] AKHMETSHIN	01C	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to \pi^0e^+e^-$
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •						
<12	90		DOLINSKY	88	ND	$e^+e^- \to \pi^0e^+e^-$

[1] Using B($\pi^0 \to \gamma\gamma$) from the 2014 Edition of this Review (PDG 14).
[2] Using various branching ratios from the 2000 Edition of this Review (PDG 00).
[3] Using B($\pi^0 \to \gamma\gamma$) = 0.98798 ± 0.00032, B($\phi \to \eta\gamma$) = (1.297 ± 0.033) × 10^{-2}, and B($\eta \to \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$) = (4.75 ± 0.11) × 10^{-2}.

$\Gamma(\pi^0\eta\gamma)/\Gamma_{total}$ Γ_{22}/Γ

VALUE (units 10^{-5})	CL%	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
7.27±0.30 OUR AVERAGE			Error includes scale factor of 1.5. See the ideogram below.		
7.06±0.22		16.9k	[1] AMBROSINO 09F	KLOE	1.02 $e^+e^- \rightarrow \eta\pi^0\gamma$
8.51±0.51±0.57		607	[2] ALOISIO 02C	KLOE	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \eta\pi^0\gamma$
7.96±0.60±0.40		197	[3] ALOISIO 02C	KLOE	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \eta\pi^0\gamma$
8.8 ±1.4 ±0.9		36	[4] ACHASOV 00F	SND	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \eta\pi^0\gamma$
9.0 ±2.4 ±1.0		80	AKHMETSHIN 99C	CMD2	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \eta\pi^0\gamma$
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •					
7.01±0.10±0.20		13.3k	[2,5] AMBROSINO 09F	KLOE	1.02 $e^+e^- \rightarrow \eta\pi^0\gamma$
7.12±0.13±0.22		3.6k	[3,6] AMBROSINO 09F	KLOE	1.02 $e^+e^- \rightarrow \eta\pi^0\gamma$
8.3 ±2.3 ±1.2		20	ACHASOV 98B	SND	$e^+e^- \rightarrow 5\gamma$
<250	90		DOLINSKY 91	ND	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^0\eta\gamma$

[1] Combined results of $\eta \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ and $\eta \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ decay modes measurements.
[2] From the decay mode $\eta \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$.
[3] From the decay mode $\eta \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$.
[4] Supersedes ACHASOV 98B.
[5] Using B($\phi \rightarrow \eta\gamma$) = (1.304 ± 0.025)%, B($\eta \rightarrow 3\pi^0$) = (32.56 ± 0.23)%, and B($\eta \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$) = (39.31 ± 0.20)%.
[6] Using B($\phi \rightarrow \eta\gamma$) = (1.304 ± 0.025)%, B($\eta \rightarrow 3\pi^0$) = (32.56 ± 0.23)%, and B($\eta \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$) = (22.73 ± 0.28)%.



$\Gamma(a_0(980)\gamma)/\Gamma_{total}$ — Γ_{23}/Γ

VALUE (units 10^{-5})	CL%	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
7.6±0.6 OUR FIT						
7.6±0.6 OUR AVERAGE						
7.4±0.7			[1] ALOISIO	02C	KLOE	$e^+e^- \to \eta\pi^0\gamma$
8.8±1.7		36	[2] ACHASOV	00F	SND	$e^+e^- \to \eta\pi^0\gamma$
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •						
11 ±2			[3] GOKALP	02	RVUE	$e^+e^- \to \eta\pi^0\gamma$
<500	90		DOLINSKY	91	ND	$e^+e^- \to \pi^0\eta\gamma$

[1] Using $M_{a_0(980)}$=984.8 MeV and assuming $a_0(980)\gamma$ dominance.
[2] Assuming $a_0(980)\gamma$ dominance in the $\eta\pi^0\gamma$ final state.
[3] Using data of ACHASOV 00F.

$\Gamma(f_0(980)\gamma)/\Gamma(a_0(980)\gamma)$ — Γ_{17}/Γ_{23}

VALUE	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
6.1±0.6	[1] ALOISIO	02C	KLOE	$e^+e^- \to \eta\pi^0\gamma$

[1] Using results of ALOISIO 02D and assuming that $f_0(980)$ decays into $\pi\pi$ only and $a_0(980)$ into $\eta\pi$ only.

$\Gamma(K^0\overline{K}^0\gamma)/\Gamma_{total}$ — Γ_{24}/Γ

VALUE	CL%	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
$<1.9 \times 10^{-8}$	90	AMBROSINO	09C	KLOE	$e^+e^- \to K^0_S K^0_S \gamma$

$\Gamma(\eta'(958)\gamma)/\Gamma_{total}$ — Γ_{25}/Γ

VALUE (units 10^{-5})	CL%	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
6.22±0.21 OUR FIT						
6.22±0.30 OUR AVERAGE						
6.22±0.27±0.12		3407	[1] AMBROSINO	07A	KLOE	1.02 $e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^- 7\gamma$
6.7 $^{+2.8}_{-2.4}$ ±0.8		12	[2] AULCHENKO	03B	SND	$e^+e^- \to \eta'\gamma$
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •						
6.7 $^{+5.0}_{-4.2}$ ±1.5		7	AULCHENKO	03B	SND	$e^+e^- \to 7\gamma$
6.10±0.61±0.43		120	[3] ALOISIO	02E	KLOE	1.02 $e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^- 3\gamma$
8.2 $^{+2.1}_{-1.9}$ ±1.1		21	[4] AKHMETSHIN	00B	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^- 3\gamma$
4.9 $^{+2.2}_{-1.8}$ ±0.6		9	[5] AKHMETSHIN	00F	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^+\pi^- \geq 2\gamma$
6.4 ±1.6		30	[6] AKHMETSHIN	00F	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to \eta'(958)\gamma$

$6.7\ ^{+3.4}_{-2.9}\ \pm1.0$	5	[7] AULCHENKO	99	SND	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^- 3\gamma$
<11	90	AULCHENKO	98	SND	$e^+e^- \rightarrow 7\gamma$
$12\ ^{+7}_{-5}\ \pm2$	6	[4] AKHMETSHIN	97B	CMD2	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^- 3\gamma$
<41	90	DRUZHININ	87	ND	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma\eta\pi^+\pi^-$

[1] AMBROSINO 07A reports $[\Gamma(\phi(1020) \rightarrow \eta'(958)\gamma)/\Gamma_{total}]$ / $[B(\phi(1020) \rightarrow \eta\gamma)] = (4.77 \pm 0.09 \pm 0.19) \times 10^{-3}$ which we multiply by our best value $B(\phi(1020) \rightarrow \eta\gamma) = (1.303 \pm 0.025) \times 10^{-2}$. Our first error is their experiment's error and our second error is the systematic error from using our best value.
[2] Averaging AULCHENKO 03B with AULCHENKO 99.
[3] Using $B(\phi \rightarrow \eta\gamma) = (1.297 \pm 0.033)\%$.
[4] Using the value $B(\phi \rightarrow \eta\gamma) = (1.26 \pm 0.06) \times 10^{-2}$.
[5] Using $B(\phi \rightarrow K^0_L K^0_S) = (33.8 \pm 0.6)\%$.
[6] Averaging AKHMETSHIN 00B with AKHMETSHIN 00F.
[7] Using the value $B(\eta' \rightarrow \eta\pi^+\pi^-) = (43.7 \pm 1.5) \times 10^{-2}$ and $B(\eta \rightarrow \gamma\gamma) = (39.25 \pm 0.31) \times 10^{-2}$.

$\Gamma(\eta'(958)\gamma)/\Gamma(K^0_L K^0_S)$ — Γ_{25}/Γ_2

VALUE (units 10^{-4})	*EVTS*	*DOCUMENT ID*		*TECN*	*COMMENT*
1.83±0.06 OUR FIT					
$\mathbf{1.46^{+0.64}_{-0.54}\pm0.18}$	9	[1] AKHMETSHIN	00F	CMD2	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^+\pi^- \geq 2\gamma$

[1] Using various branching ratios of K^0_S, K^0_L, η, η' from the 2000 edition (The European Physical Journal **C15** 1 (2000)) of this Review.

$\Gamma(\eta'(958)\gamma)/\Gamma(\eta\gamma)$ — Γ_{25}/Γ_6

VALUE (units 10^{-3})	*EVTS*	*DOCUMENT ID*		*TECN*	*COMMENT*
4.77±0.15 OUR FIT					
4.78±0.20 OUR AVERAGE					
4.77±0.09±0.19	3407	AMBROSINO	07A	KLOE	$1.02\ e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^- 7\gamma$
4.70±0.47±0.31	120	[1] ALOISIO	02E	KLOE	$1.02\ e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^- 3\gamma$
$6.5\ ^{+1.7}_{-1.5}\ \pm0.8$	21	AKHMETSHIN	00B	CMD2	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^- 3\gamma$
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •					
$9.5\ ^{+5.2}_{-4.0}\ \pm1.4$	6	[2] AKHMETSHIN	97B	CMD2	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^- 3\gamma$

[1] From the decay mode $\eta' \rightarrow \eta\pi^+\pi^-$, $\eta \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$.
[2] Superseded by AKHMETSHIN 00B.

$\Gamma(\eta\pi^0\pi^0\gamma)/\Gamma_{total}$ — Γ_{26}/Γ

VALUE (units 10^{-5})	*CL%*	*DOCUMENT ID*		*TECN*	*COMMENT*
<2	90	AULCHENKO	98	SND	$e^+e^- \rightarrow 7\gamma$

$\Gamma(\mu^+\mu^-\gamma)/\Gamma_{total}$ — Γ_{27}/Γ

VALUE (units 10^{-5})	*EVTS*	*DOCUMENT ID*		*TECN*	*COMMENT*
1.43±0.45±0.14	27188	[1] AKHMETSHIN	99B	CMD2	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-\gamma$
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •					
2.3 ±1.0	824 ± 33	[2] AKHMETSHIN	97C	CMD2	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-\gamma$

[1] For $E_\gamma > 20$ MeV. Supersedes AKHMETSHIN 97C.
[2] For $E_\gamma > 20$ MeV.

$\Gamma(\rho\gamma\gamma)/\Gamma_{total}$ — Γ_{28}/Γ

VALUE (units 10^{-4})	CL%	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
<1.2	90	AULCHENKO	08	CMD2	$\phi \to \pi^+\pi^-\gamma\gamma$
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •					
<5	90	AKHMETSHIN	98	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\gamma\gamma$

$\Gamma(\eta\pi^+\pi^-)/\Gamma_{total}$ — Γ_{29}/Γ

VALUE (units 10^{-5})	CL%	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
< 1.8	90	AKHMETSHIN	00E	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •					
< 6.1	90	AULCHENKO	08	CMD2	$\phi \to \eta\pi^+\pi^-$
<30	90	AKHMETSHIN	98	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\gamma\gamma$

$\Gamma(\eta\mu^+\mu^-)/\Gamma_{total}$ — Γ_{30}/Γ

VALUE (units 10^{-6})	CL%	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
<9.4	90	AKHMETSHIN	01	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to \eta e^+e^-$

$\Gamma(\eta U \to \eta e^+e^-)/\Gamma_{total}$ — Γ_{31}/Γ

VALUE	CL%	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
$<1 \times 10^{-6}$	90	[1] BABUSCI	13B	KLOE	1.02 $e^+e^- \to \eta e^+e^-$

[1] For a narrow vector U with mass between 5 and 470 MeV, from the combined analysis of $\eta \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ and $\eta \to \pi^0\pi^0\pi^0$ from ARCHILLI 12. Measured 90% CL limits as a function of m_U range from 2.2×10^{-8} to 10^{-6}.

$\Gamma(\text{invisible})/\Gamma(K^+K^-)$ — Γ_{32}/Γ_1

VALUE	CL%	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
$<3.4 \times 10^{-4}$	90	ABLIKIM	18S	BES3	$J/\psi \to \phi\eta \to \phi\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$

Lepton Family number (LF) violating modes

$\Gamma(e^\pm\mu^\mp)/\Gamma_{total}$ — Γ_{33}/Γ

VALUE	CL%	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
$<2 \times 10^{-6}$	90	ACHASOV	10A	SND	$e^+e^- \to e^\pm\mu^\mp$

$\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ / $\rho\pi$ AMPLITUDE RATIO a_1 IN DECAY OF $\phi \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$

NIECKNIG 12 describes final-state interactions between the three pions in a dispersive framework using data on the $\pi\pi$ P-wave scattering phase shift.

VALUE (units 10^{-2})	CL%	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
9.1±1.2 OUR AVERAGE						
10.1±4.4±1.7		80k	[1] AKHMETSHIN	06	CMD2	1.017–1.021 $e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$
9.0±1.1±0.6		1.98M	[2,3] ALOISIO	03	KLOE	1.02 $e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •						

$-6 < a_1 < 6$		500k	[3] ACHASOV	02	SND	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$
$-16 < a_1 < 11$	90	9.8k	[1,4] AKHMETSHIN	98	CMD2	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma\gamma$

[1] Dalitz plot analysis taking into account interference between the contact and $\rho\pi$ amplitudes.
[2] From a fit without limitations on charged and neutral ρ masses and widths.
[3] Recalculated by us to match the notations of AKHMETSHIN 98.
[4] Assuming zero phase for the contact term.

PARAMETER β IN $\phi \rightarrow Pe^+e^-$ DECAYS

In the one-pole approximation the electromagnetic transition form factor for $\phi \rightarrow Pe^+e^-$ ($P = \pi,\eta$) is given as a function of the e^+e^- invariant mass squared, q^2, by the expression:

$$|F(q^2)|^2 = (1 - q^2/\Lambda^2)^{-2},$$

where vector meson dominance predicts parameter $\Lambda \approx 0.770$ GeV ($\Lambda^{-2} \approx 1.687$ GeV^{-2}). The slope of this form factor, $\beta = dF/dq^2(q^2{=}0)$, equals Λ^{-2} in this approximation.

The measurements below obtain β in the one-pole approximation.

PARAMETER β IN $\phi \rightarrow \pi^0 e^+e^-$ DECAY

VALUE (GeV^{-2})	*EVTS*	*DOCUMENT ID*		*TECN*	*COMMENT*
2.02±0.11	9.5k	[1] ANASTASI	16B	KLOE	1.02 $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^0 e^+e^-$

[1] The error combines statistical and systematic uncertainties.

PARAMETER β IN $\phi \rightarrow \eta e^+e^-$ DECAY

VALUE (GeV^{-2})	*EVTS*	*DOCUMENT ID*		*TECN*	*COMMENT*
1.29±0.13 OUR AVERAGE					
$1.28\pm0.10^{+0.09}_{-0.08}$	30k	BABUSCI	15	KLOE	1.02 $e^+e^- \rightarrow \eta e^+e^-$
3.8 ±1.8	213	[1] ACHASOV	01B	SND	1.02 $e^+e^- \rightarrow \eta e^+e^-$

[1] The uncertainty is statistical only. The systematic one is negligible, in comparison.

ϕ(1020) REFERENCES

ABLIKIM	18S	PR D98 032001	M. Ablikim *et al.*	(BES III Collab.)
KOZYREV	18	PL B779 64	E.A. Kozyrev *et al.*	(CMD3 Collab.)
AKHMETSHIN	17	PL B768 345	R.R. Akhmetshin *et al.*	(CMD-3 Collab.)
ACHASOV	16A	PR D93 092001	M.N. Achasov *et al.*	(SND Collab.)
ANASTASI	16B	PL B757 362	A. Anastasi *et al.*	(KLOE-2 Collab.)
KOZYREV	16	PL B760 314	E.A. Kozyrev *et al.*	(CMD3 Collab.)
BABUSCI	15	PL B742 1	D. Babusci *et al.*	(KLOE-2 Collab.)
PDG	15	RPP 2015 at pdg.lbl.gov		(PDG Collab.)
LEES	14H	PR D89 092002	J.P. Lees *et al.*	(BABAR Collab)
PDG	14	CP C38 070001	K. Olive *et al.*	(PDG Collab.)
BABUSCI	13B	PL B720 111	D. Babusci *et al.*	(KLOE-2 Collab.)
BENAYOUN	13	EPJ C73 2453	M. Benayoun, P. David, L. DelBuono	(PARIN, BERLIN+)
LEES	13F	PR D87 052010	J.P. Lees *et al.*	(BABAR Collab.)
LEES	13Q	PR D88 032013	J.P. Lees *et al.*	(BABAR Collab.)
ARCHILLI	12	PL B706 251	F. Archilli *et al.*	(KLOE-2 Collab.)
BENAYOUN	12	EPJ C72 1848	M. Benayoun *et al.*	
NIECKNIG	12	EPJ C72 2014	F. Niecknig, B. Kubis, S.P. Schneider	(BONN)
PDG	12	PR D86 010001	J. Beringer *et al.*	(PDG Collab.)
AKHMETSHIN	11	PL B695 412	R.R. Akhmetshin *et al.*	(CMD2 Collab.)
ACHASOV	10A	PR D81 057102	M.N. Achasov *et al.*	(Novosibirsk SND Collab.)
BENAYOUN	10	EPJ C65 211	M. Benayoun *et al.*	

AMBROSINO	09C	PL B679 10	F. Ambrosino *et al.*	(KLOE Collab.)
AMBROSINO	09F	PL B681 5	F. Ambrosino *et al.*	(KLOE Collab.)
AKHMETSHIN	08	PL B669 217	R.R. Akhmetshin *et al.*	(CMD-2 Collab.)
AMBROSINO	08G	PL B669 223	F. Ambrosino *et al.*	(KLOE Collab.)
AULCHENKO	08	JETPL 88 85	V. Aulchenko *et al.*	(CMD-2 Collab.)
		Translated from ZETFP 88 93.		
FLOREZ-BAEZ	08	PR D78 077301	F.V. Florez-Baez, G. Lopez Castro	
ACHASOV	07B	PR D76 077101	M.N. Achasov *et al.*	(SND Collab.)
AMBROSINO	07	EPJ C49 473	F. Ambrosino *et al.*	(KLOE Collab.)
AMBROSINO	07A	PL B648 267	F. Ambrosino *et al.*	(KLOE Collab.)
DUBYNSKIY	07	PR D75 113001	S. Dubynskiy *et al.*	
ACHASOV	06A	PR D74 014016	M.N. Achasov *et al.*	(SND Collab.)
AKHMETSHIN	06	PL B642 203	R.R. Akhmetshin *et al.*	(CMD-2 Collab.)
AKHMETSHIN	05	PL B605 26	R.R. Akhmetshin *et al.*	(Novosibirsk CMD-2 Collab.)
AMBROSINO	05	PL B608 199	F. Ambrosino *et al.*	(KLOE Collab.)
AUBERT,B	05J	PR D72 052008	B. Aubert *et al.*	(BABAR Collab.)
AKHMETSHIN	04	PL B578 285	R.R. Akhmetshin *et al.*	(Novosibirsk CMD-2 Collab.)
AUBERT,B	04N	PR D70 072004	B. Aubert *et al.*	(BABAR Collab.)
ALOISIO	03	PL B561 55	A. Aloisio *et al.*	(KLOE Collab.)
AULCHENKO	03B	JETP 97 24	V.M. Aulchenko *et al.*	(Novosibirsk SND Collab.)
		Translated from ZETF 124 28.		
ACHASOV	02	PR D65 032002	M.N. Achasov *et al.*	(Novosibirsk SND Collab.)
ACHASOV	02D	JETPL 75 449	M.N. Achasov *et al.*	(Novosibirsk SND Collab.)
		Translated from ZETFP 75 539.		
ALOISIO	02C	PL B536 209	A. Aloisio *et al.*	(KLOE Collab.)
ALOISIO	02D	PL B537 21	A. Aloisio *et al.*	(KLOE Collab.)
ALOISIO	02E	PL B541 45	A. Aloisio *et al.*	(KLOE Collab.)
FISCHBACH	02	PL B526 355	E. Fischbach, A.W. Overhauser, B. Woodahl	
GOKALP	02	JP G28 2783	A. Gokalp *et al.*	
ACHASOV	01B	PL B504 275	M.N. Achasov *et al.*	(Novosibirsk SND Collab.)
ACHASOV	01E	PR D63 072002	M.N. Achasov *et al.*	(Novosibirsk SND Collab.)
ACHASOV	01F	PR D63 094007	N.N. Achasov, V.V. Gubin	(Novosibirsk SND Collab.)
ACHASOV	01G	PRL 86 1698	M.N. Achasov *et al.*	(Novosibirsk SND Collab.)
AITALA	01B	PRL 86 770	E.M. Aitala *et al.*	(FNAL E791 Collab.)
AKHMETSHIN	01	PL B501 191	R.R. Akhmetshin *et al.*	(Novosibirsk CMD-2 Collab.)
AKHMETSHIN	01B	PL B509 217	R.R. Akhmetshin *et al.*	(Novosibirsk CMD-2 Collab.)
AKHMETSHIN	01C	PL B503 237	R.R. Akhmetshin *et al.*	(Novosibirsk CMD-2 Collab.)
BENAYOUN	01	EPJ C22 503	M. Benayoun, H.B. O'Connell	
ACHASOV	00	EPJ C12 25	M.N. Achasov *et al.*	(Novosibirsk SND Collab.)
ACHASOV	00B	JETP 90 17	M.N. Achasov *et al.*	(Novosibirsk SND Collab.)
		Translated from ZETF 117 22.		
ACHASOV	00C	PL B474 188	M.N. Achasov *et al.*	(Novosibirsk SND Collab.)
ACHASOV	00D	JETPL 72 282	M.N. Achasov *et al.*	(Novosibirsk SND Collab.)
		Translated from ZETFP 72 411.		
ACHASOV	00E	NP B569 158	M.N. Achasov *et al.*	(Novosibirsk SND Collab.)
ACHASOV	00F	PL B479 53	M.N. Achasov *et al.*	(Novosibirsk SND Collab.)
ACHASOV	00H	PL B485 349	M.N. Achasov *et al.*	(Novosibirsk SND Collab.)
AKHMETSHIN	00B	PL B473 337	R.R. Akhmetshin *et al.*	(Novosibirsk CMD-2 Collab.)
AKHMETSHIN	00E	PL B491 81	R.R. Akhmetshin *et al.*	(Novosibirsk CMD-2 Collab.)
AKHMETSHIN	00F	PL B494 26	R.R. Akhmetshin *et al.*	(Novosibirsk CMD-2 Collab.)
AULCHENKO	00A	JETP 90 927	V.M. Aulchenko *et al.*	(Novosibirsk SND Collab.)
		Translated from ZETF 117 1067.		
BRAMON	00	PL B486 406	A. Bramon *et al.*	
PDG	00	EPJ C15 1	D.E. Groom *et al.*	(PDG Collab.)
ACHASOV	99	PL B449 122	M.N. Achasov *et al.*	
ACHASOV	99C	PL B456 304	M.N. Achasov *et al.*	
AKHMETSHIN	99B	PL B462 371	R.R. Akhmetshin *et al.*	(Novosibirsk CMD-2 Collab.)
AKHMETSHIN	99C	PL B462 380	R.R. Akhmetshin *et al.*	(Novosibirsk CMD-2 Collab.)
AKHMETSHIN	99D	PL B466 385	R.R. Akhmetshin *et al.*	
Also		PL B508 217 (errat.)	R.R. Akhmetshin *et al.*	(Novosibirsk CMD-2 Collab.)
AKHMETSHIN	99F	PL B460 242	R.R. Akhmetshin *et al.*	(Novosibirsk CMD-2 Collab.)
AULCHENKO	99	JETPL 69 97	V.M. Aulchenko *et al.*	
		Translated from ZETFP 69 87.		
ACHASOV	98B	PL B438 441	M.N. Achasov *et al.*	(Novosibirsk SND Collab.)
ACHASOV	98F	JETPL 68 573	M.N. Achasov *et al.*	(Novosibirsk SND Collab.)
ACHASOV	98I	PL B440 442	M.N. Achasov *et al.*	
AKHMETSHIN	98	PL B434 426	R.R. Akhmetshin *et al.*	(CMD-2 Collab.)
AULCHENKO	98	PL B436 199	V.M. Aulchenko *et al.*	(Novosibirsk SND Collab.)
BARBERIS	98	PL B432 436	D. Barberis *et al.*	(Omega Expt.)
AKHMETSHIN	97B	PL B415 445	R.R. Akhmetshin *et al.*	(NOVO, BOST, PITT+)
AKHMETSHIN	97C	PL B415 452	R.R. Akhmetshin *et al.*	(Novosibirsk CMD-2 Collab.)
BENAYOUN	96	ZPHY C72 221	M. Benayoun *et al.*	(IPNP, NOVO)

AKHMETSHIN	95	PL B364 199	R.R. Akhmetshin *et al.*	(Novosibirsk CMD-2 Collab.)
DOLINSKY	91	PRPL 202 99	S.I. Dolinsky *et al.*	(NOVO)
KUHN	90	ZPHY C48 445	J.H. Kuhn *et al.*	(MPIM)
ACHASOV	89	NP B315 465	N.N. Achasov, V.N. Ivanchenko	
DOLINSKY	89	ZPHY C42 511	S.I. Dolinsky *et al.*	(NOVO)
BARKOV	88	SJNP 47 248	L.M. Barkov *et al.*	(NOVO)
		Translated from YAF 47 393.		
DOLINSKY	88	SJNP 48 277	S.I. Dolinsky *et al.*	(NOVO)
		Translated from YAF 48 442.		
DRUZHININ	87	ZPHY C37 1	V.P. Druzhinin *et al.*	(NOVO)
ARMSTRONG	86	PL 166B 245	T.A. Armstrong *et al.*	(ATHU, BARI, BIRM+)
ATKINSON	86	ZPHY C30 521	M. Atkinson *et al.*	(BONN, CERN, GLAS+)
BEBEK	86	PRL 56 1893	C. Bebek *et al.*	(CLEO Collab.)
DAVENPORT	86	PR D33 2519	T.F. Davenport	(TUFTS, ARIZ, FNAL, FSU, NDAM+)
DIJKSTRA	86	ZPHY C31 375	H. Dijkstra *et al.*	(ANIK, BRIS, CERN+)
FRAME	86	NP B276 667	D. Frame *et al.*	(GLAS)
GOLUBEV	86	SJNP 44 409	V.B. Golubev *et al.*	(NOVO)
		Translated from YAF 44 633.		
ALBRECHT	85D	PL 153B 343	H. Albrecht *et al.*	(ARGUS Collab.)
GOLUBEV	85	SJNP 41 756	V.B. Golubev *et al.*	(NOVO)
		Translated from YAF 41 1183.		
DRUZHININ	84	PL 144B 136	V.P. Druzhinin *et al.*	(NOVO)
ARMSTRONG	83B	NP B224 193	T.A. Armstrong *et al.*	(BARI, BIRM, CERN+)
BARATE	83	PL 121B 449	R. Barate *et al.*	(SACL, LOIC, SHMP, IND)
KURDADZE	83C	JETPL 38 366	L.M. Kurdadze *et al.*	(NOVO)
		Translated from ZETFP 38 306.		
ARENTON	82	PR D25 2241	M.W. Arenton *et al.*	(ANL, ILL)
PELLINEN	82	PS 25 599	A. Pellinen, M. Roos	(HELS)
DAUM	81	PL 100B 439	C. Daum *et al.*	(AMST, BRIS, CERN, CRAC+)
IVANOV	81	PL 107B 297	P.M. Ivanov *et al.*	(NOVO)
Also		Private Comm.	S.I. Eidelman	(NOVO)
VASSERMAN	81	PL 99B 62	I.B. Vasserman *et al.*	(NOVO)
Also		SJNP 35 240	L.M. Kurdadze *et al.*	
		Translated from YAF 35 352.		
CORDIER	80	NP B172 13	A. Cordier *et al.*	(LALO)
CORDIER	79	PL 81B 389	A. Cordier *et al.*	(LALO)
BUKIN	78B	SJNP 27 521	A.D. Bukin *et al.*	(NOVO)
		Translated from YAF 27 985.		
BUKIN	78C	SJNP 27 516	A.D. Bukin *et al.*	(NOVO)
		Translated from YAF 27 976.		
COOPER	78B	NP B146 1	A.M. Cooper *et al.*	(TATA, CERN, CDEF+)
LOSTY	78	NP B133 38	M.J. Losty *et al.*	(CERN, AMST, NIJM+)
AKERLOF	77	PRL 39 861	C.W. Akerlof *et al.*	(FNAL, MICH, PURD)
ANDREWS	77	PRL 38 198	D.E. Andrews *et al.*	(ROCH)
BALDI	77	PL 68B 381	R. Baldi *et al.*	(GEVA)
CERRADA	77B	NP B126 241	M. Cerrada *et al.*	(AMST, CERN, NIJM+)
COHEN	77	PRL 38 269	D. Cohen *et al.*	(ANL)
LAVEN	77	NP B127 43	H. Laven *et al.*	(AACH3, BERL, CERN, LOIC+)
LYONS	77	NP B125 207	L. Lyons, A.M. Cooper, A.G. Clark	(OXF)
COSME	76	PL 63B 352	G. Cosme *et al.*	(ORSAY)
KALBFLEISCH	76	PR D13 22	G.R. Kalbfleisch, R.C. Strand, J.W. Chapman	(BNL+)
PARROUR	76	PL 63B 357	G. Parrour *et al.*	(ORSAY)
PARROUR	76B	PL 63B 362	G. Parrour *et al.*	(ORSAY)
KALBFLEISCH	75	PR D11 987	G.R. Kalbfleisch, R.C. Strand, J.W. Chapman	(BNL+)
AYRES	74	PRL 32 1463	D.S. Ayres *et al.*	(ANL)
BESCH	74	NP B70 257	H.J. Besch *et al.*	(BONN)
COSME	74	PL 48B 155	G. Cosme *et al.*	(ORSAY)
COSME	74B	PL 48B 159	G. Cosme *et al.*	(ORSAY)
DEGROOT	74	NP B74 77	A.J. de Groot *et al.*	(AMST, NIJM)
AUGUSTIN	73	PRL 30 462	J.E. Augustin *et al.*	(ORSAY)
BALLAM	73	PR D7 3150	J. Ballam *et al.*	(SLAC, LBL)
BINNIE	73B	PR D8 2789	D.M. Binnie *et al.*	(LOIC, SHMP)
AGUILAR-...	72B	PR D6 29	M. Aguilar-Benitez *et al.*	(BNL)
ALVENSLEB...	72	PRL 28 66	H. Alvensleben *et al.*	(MIT, DESY)
BORENSTEIN	72	PR D5 1559	S.R. Borenstein *et al.*	(BNL, MICH)
COLLEY	72	NP B50 1	D.C. Colley *et al.*	(BIRM, GLAS)
BALAKIN	71	PL 34B 328	V.E. Balakin *et al.*	(NOVO)
CHATELUS	71	Thesis LAL 1247	Y. Chatelus	(STRB)
Also		PL 32B 416	J.C. Bizot *et al.*	(ORSAY)
HAYES	71	PR D4 899	S. Hayes *et al.*	(CORN)
STOTTLE...	71	Thesis ORO 2504 170	A.R. Stottlemyer	(UMD)
BIZOT	70	PL 32B 416	J.C. Bizot *et al.*	(ORSAY)
Also		Liverpool Sym. 69	J.P. Perez-y-Jorba	

EARLES	70	PRL 25 1312	D.R. Earles *et al.*	(NEAS)
LINDSEY	66	PR 147 913	J.S. Lindsey, G. Smith	(LRL)
LONDON	66	PR 143 1034	G.W. London *et al.*	(BNL, SYRA) IGJPC
BADIER	65B	PL 17 337	J. Badier *et al.*	(EPOL, SACL, AMST)
LINDSEY	65	PRL 15 221	J.S. Lindsey, G.A. Smith	(LRL)
LINDSEY 65 data included in LINDSEY 66.				
SCHLEIN	63	PRL 10 368	P.E. Schlein *et al.*	(UCLA) IGJP