

Reference = BELOUS 07; PRL 99 011801
 Verifier code = BELLE

Normally we send all verifications for one experiment to one person, usually the spokesperson or data-analysis coordinator, who then distributes them to the appropriate people. Please tell us if we should send the verifications for your experiment to someone else.

PLEASE READ NOW

**PLEASE
REPLY
WITHIN
ONE WEEK**

Tom Browder

EMAIL: teb@phys.hawaii.edu

April 14, 2008

Dear Colleague,

The attached sheets from the "Review of Particle Physics" Particle Listings contain information from your experiment that was recently added to our database. There may be other papers that we have not yet added; please inform us of any such journal papers if they have been accepted for publication. You are the *only* author of this paper to whom this request is being sent, so please forward this to another author if appropriate.

We ask you to check the information marked "YOUR DATA" and "YOUR PAPER," note any necessary changes, and return the corrected sheets to us. In particular:

- (1) Return the sheets to us *even if no change is needed*, marking them in that case "OK."
- (2) Please feel free to comment on our treatment of other data listed on these sheets. We appreciate suggestions for improvements.
- (3) You may respond by electronic mail, but then be sure to include the "Reference" above and the **NAME** of the particle, the **PROPERTY**, and the **PROPERTY NODE** on which you are commenting. (The "**PROPERTY NODE**" is the code given on the right-hand side of the data, e.g., "NODE=S043M.")

Thank you for helping us make the Review accurate and useful.

Sincerely,

Klaus Mönig
 DESY-Zeuthen
 Plataneallee 6
 D-15735 Zeuthen, Germany

PHONE: 49-33762 77271
 FAX: 49-33762 77330
 EMAIL: klaus.monig@cern.ch

LEPTONS

τ

$$J = \frac{1}{2}$$

τ discovery paper was PERL 75. $e^+ e^- \rightarrow \tau^+ \tau^-$ cross-section threshold behavior and magnitude are consistent with pointlike spin-1/2 Dirac particle. BRANDELIK 78 ruled out pointlike spin-0 or spin-1 particle. FELDMAN 78 ruled out $J = 3/2$. KIRKBY 79 also ruled out $J=\text{integer}$, $J = 3/2$.

τ MASS

VALUE (MeV)	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
1776.84±0.17 OUR AVERAGE				

YOUR DATA	1776.81 ^{+0.25} _{-0.23} ± 0.15	81	ANASHIN	07	KEDR	6.7 pb ⁻¹ , $E_{cm}^{ee} = 3.54\text{--}3.78$ GeV
	1776.61 ± 0.13 ± 0.35	1	BELOUS	07	BELL	414 fb ⁻¹ $E_{cm}^{ee} = 10.6$ GeV
	1775.1 ± 1.6 ± 1.0	13.3k	² ABBIENDI	00A	OPAL	1990–1995 LEP runs
	1778.2 ± 0.8 ± 1.2		ANASTASSOV 97	CLEO		$E_{cm}^{ee} = 10.6$ GeV
	1776.96 ^{+0.18} _{-0.21} ^{+0.25} _{-0.17}	65	³ BAI	96	BES	$E_{cm}^{ee} = 3.54\text{--}3.57$ GeV
	1776.3 ± 2.4 ± 1.4	11k	⁴ ALBRECHT	92M	ARG	$E_{cm}^{ee} = 9.4\text{--}10.6$ GeV
	1783 ⁺³ ₋₄	692	⁵ BACINO	78B	DLCO	$E_{cm}^{ee} = 3.1\text{--}7.4$ GeV
	• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •					
	1777.8 ± 0.7 ± 1.7	35k	⁶ BALEST	93	CLEO	Repl. by ANASTASSOV 97
	1776.9 ^{+0.4} _{-0.5} ± 0.2	14	⁷ BAI	92	BES	Repl. by BAI 96

¹ BELOUS 07 fit τ pseudomass spectrum in $\tau \rightarrow \pi\pi^+\pi^-\nu_\tau$ decays. Result assumes $m_{\nu_\tau} = 0$.

² ABBIENDI 00A fit τ pseudomass spectrum in $\tau \rightarrow \pi^\pm \leq 2\pi^0\nu_\tau$ and $\tau \rightarrow \pi^\pm\pi^+\pi^- \leq 1\pi^0\nu_\tau$ decays. Result assumes $m_{\nu_\tau} = 0$.

³ BAI 96 fit $\sigma(e^+e^- \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-)$ at different energies near threshold.

⁴ ALBRECHT 92M fit τ pseudomass spectrum in $\tau^- \rightarrow 2\pi^-\pi^+\nu_\tau$ decays. Result assumes $m_{\nu_\tau} = 0$.

⁵ BACINO 78B value comes from $e^\pm X^\mp$ threshold. Published mass 1782 MeV increased by 1 MeV using the high precision $\psi(2S)$ mass measurement of ZHOLENTZ 80 to eliminate the absolute SPEAR energy calibration uncertainty.

⁶ BALEST 93 fit spectra of minimum kinematically allowed τ mass in events of the type $e^+e^- \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^- \rightarrow (\pi^+ n\pi^0\nu_\tau)(\pi^- m\pi^0\nu_\tau)$ $n \leq 2$, $m \leq 2$, $1 \leq n+m \leq 3$. If $m_{\nu_\tau} \neq 0$, result increases by $(m_{\nu_\tau}^2/1100$ MeV).

⁷ BAI 92 fit $\sigma(e^+e^- \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-)$ near threshold using $e\mu$ events.

NODE=LXXX005

NODE=S035

NODE=S035

NODE=S035205

NODE=S035M

NODE=S035M;LINKAGE=BE

NODE=S035M;LINKAGE=BB

NODE=S035M;LINKAGE=F

NODE=S035M;LINKAGE=D

NODE=S035M;LINKAGE=A

NODE=S035M;LINKAGE=C

NODE=S035M;LINKAGE=E

NODE=S035MDF

NODE=S035MDF

NODE=S035MDF

NODE=S035

REFID=51655

REFID=51866

REFID=47796

REFID=45273

REFID=46530

REFID=44698

REFID=43373

REFID=42211

REFID=43117

REFID=10320

REFID=10321

τ REFERENCES

YOUR PAPER	ANASHIN 07	JETPL 85 347 Translated from ZETFP 85 429.	V.V. Anashin <i>et al.</i>	(KEDR Collab.)
	BELOUS 07	PRL 99 011801	K. Belous <i>et al.</i>	(BELLE Collab.)
	ABBIENDI 00A	PL B492 23	G. Abbiendi <i>et al.</i>	(OPAL Collab.)
	ANASTASSOV 97	PR D55 2559	A. Anastassov <i>et al.</i>	(CLEO Collab.)
	Also	PR D58 119903 (erratum)	A. Anastassov <i>et al.</i>	(CLEO Collab.)
	BAI 96	PR D53 20	J.Z. Bai <i>et al.</i>	(BES Collab.)
	BALEST 93	PR D47 R3671	R. Balest <i>et al.</i>	(CLEO Collab.)
	ALBRECHT 92M	PL B292 221	H. Albrecht <i>et al.</i>	(ARGUS Collab.)
	BAI 92	PRL 69 3021	J.Z. Bai <i>et al.</i>	(BES Collab.)
	ZHOLENTZ 80	PL 96B 214	A.A. Zholents <i>et al.</i>	(NOVO)
	Also	SJNP 34 814 Translated from YAF 34 1471.	A.A. Zholents <i>et al.</i>	(NOVO)

KIRKBY	79	SLAC-PUB-2419 Batavia Lepton Photon Conference.	J. Kirkby	(SLAC) J	REFID=10283
BACINO	78B	PRL 41 13 Also Tokyo Conf. 249	W.J. Bacino <i>et al.</i> J. Kirz	(DELCO Collab.) J (STON)	REFID=10304 REFID=10305
Also		PL 96B 214	A.A. Zholents <i>et al.</i>	(NOVO)	REFID=10320
BRANDELIK	78	PL 73B 109	R. Brandelik <i>et al.</i>	(DASP Collab.) J	REFID=10280
FELDMAN	78	Tokyo Conf. 777	G.J. Feldman	(SLAC) J	REFID=10355
PERL	75	PRL 35 1489	M.L. Perl <i>et al.</i>	(LBL, SLAC)	REFID=10294

Reference = EPIFANOV 07; PL B654 65
 Verifier code = BELLE

Normally we send all verifications for one experiment to one person, usually the spokesperson or data-analysis coordinator, who then distributes them to the appropriate people. Please tell us if we should send the verifications for your experiment to someone else.

PLEASE READ NOW

**PLEASE
REPLY
WITHIN
ONE WEEK**

Tom Browder

EMAIL: teb@phys.hawaii.edu

April 14, 2008

Dear Colleague,

The attached sheets from the "Review of Particle Physics" Particle Listings contain information from your experiment that was recently added to our database. There may be other papers that we have not yet added; please inform us of any such journal papers if they have been accepted for publication. You are the *only* author of this paper to whom this request is being sent, so please forward this to another author if appropriate.

We ask you to check the information marked "YOUR DATA" and "YOUR PAPER," note any necessary changes, and return the corrected sheets to us. In particular:

- (1) Return the sheets to us *even if no change is needed*, marking them in that case "OK."
- (2) Please feel free to comment on our treatment of other data listed on these sheets. We appreciate suggestions for improvements.
- (3) You may respond by electronic mail, but then be sure to include the "Reference" above and the **NAME** of the particle, the **PROPERTY**, and the **PROPERTY NODE** on which you are commenting. (The "**PROPERTY NODE**" is the code given on the right-hand side of the data, e.g., "NODE=S043M.")

Thank you for helping us make the Review accurate and useful.

Sincerely,

Klaus Mönig
 DESY-Zeuthen
 Plataneallee 6
 D-15735 Zeuthen, Germany

PHONE: 49-33762 77271
 FAX: 49-33762 77330
 EMAIL: klaus.monig@cern.ch

LEPTONS

τ

$$J = \frac{1}{2}$$

τ discovery paper was PERL 75. $e^+ e^- \rightarrow \tau^+ \tau^-$ cross-section threshold behavior and magnitude are consistent with pointlike spin-1/2 Dirac particle. BRANDELIK 78 ruled out pointlike spin-0 or spin-1 particle. FELDMAN 78 ruled out $J = 3/2$. KIRKBY 79 also ruled out $J=\text{integer}$, $J = 3/2$.

τ^- BRANCHING RATIOS

$\Gamma(\pi^- \bar{K}^0 \nu_\tau) / \Gamma_{\text{total}}$

Γ_{35}/Γ

Data marked "avg" are highly correlated with data appearing elsewhere in the Listings, and are therefore used for the average given below but not in the overall fits. "f&a" marks results used for the fit and the average.

VALUE (%)	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
0.831 ± 0.030 OUR AVERAGE Error includes scale factor of 1.4. See the ideogram below.				

YOUR DATA $0.808 \pm 0.004 \pm 0.026$ f&a 53k EPIFANOV 07 BELL $351 \text{ fb}^{-1} E_{\text{cm}}^{\text{ee}} = 10.6 \text{ GeV}$ |

$0.933 \pm 0.068 \pm 0.049$ f&a 377 ABBIENDI 00C OPAL 1991–1995 LEP runs

$0.928 \pm 0.045 \pm 0.034$ f&a 937 ¹ BARATE 99K ALEP 1991–1995 LEP runs

$0.855 \pm 0.117 \pm 0.066$ avg 509 ² BARATE 98E ALEP 1991–1995 LEP runs

$0.704 \pm 0.041 \pm 0.072$ avg ³ COAN 96 CLEO $E_{\text{cm}}^{\text{ee}} \approx 10.6 \text{ GeV}$

$0.95 \pm 0.15 \pm 0.06$ f&a ⁴ ACCIARRI 95F L3 1991–1993 LEP runs

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

0.79 $\pm 0.10 \pm 0.09$ 98 ⁵ BUSKULIC 96 ALEP Repl. by BARATE 99K

¹ BARATE 99K measure K^0 's by detecting K_L^0 's in their hadron calorimeter.

² BARATE 98E reconstruct K^0 's using $K_S^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-$ decays. Not independent of BARATE 98E $B(K^0 \text{ particles}^- \nu_\tau)$ value.

³ Not independent of COAN 96 $B(h^- K^0 \nu_\tau)$ and $B(K^- K^0 \nu_\tau)$ measurements.

⁴ ACCIARRI 95F do not identify π^- / K^- and assume $B(K^- K^0 \nu_\tau) = (0.29 \pm 0.12)\%$.

⁵ BUSKULIC 96 measure K^0 's by detecting K_L^0 's in their hadron calorimeter.

$\Gamma(\pi^- \bar{K}^0 (\text{non-}K^*(892)^-) \nu_\tau) / \Gamma_{\text{total}}$

Γ_{36}/Γ

VALUE (units 10^{-4})	CL%	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
5.4 ± 2.1 ¹ EPIFANOV 07 BELL $351 \text{ fb}^{-1} E_{\text{cm}}^{\text{ee}} = 10.6 \text{ GeV}$				

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

<17 95 ACCIARRI 95F L3 1991–1993 LEP runs

¹ EPIFANOV 07 quote $B(\tau^- \rightarrow K^*(892)^- \nu_\tau) B(K^*(892)^- \rightarrow K_S^0 \pi^-) / B(\tau^- \rightarrow K_S^0 \pi^- \nu_\tau) = 0.933 \pm 0.027$. We multiply their $B(\tau^- \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 \pi^- \nu_\tau)$ by $[1 - (0.933 \pm 0.027)]$ to obtain this result.

$\Gamma(K^*(892)^- \nu_\tau) / \Gamma_{\text{total}}$

Γ_{112}/Γ

VALUE (%)	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
1.20 ± 0.07 OUR AVERAGE Error includes scale factor of 1.8. See the ideogram below.				

YOUR DATA $1.131 \pm 0.006 \pm 0.051$ 49k ¹ EPIFANOV 07 BELL $351 \text{ fb}^{-1} E_{\text{cm}}^{\text{ee}} = 10.6 \text{ GeV}$ |

1.326 ± 0.063 BARATE 99R ALEP 1991–1995 LEP runs

1.11 ± 0.12 ² COAN 96 CLEO $E_{\text{cm}}^{\text{ee}} \approx 10.6 \text{ GeV}$

$1.42 \pm 0.22 \pm 0.09$ ³ ACCIARRI 95F L3 1991–1993 LEP runs

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

1.39 $\pm 0.09 \pm 0.10$ ⁴ BUSKULIC 96 ALEP Repl. by BARATE 99R

1.45 $\pm 0.13 \pm 0.11$ 273 ⁵ BUSKULIC 94F ALEP Repl. by BUSKULIC 96

$1.23 \pm 0.21 \pm 0.11$ 54 ⁶ ALBRECHT 88L ARG $E_{\text{cm}}^{\text{ee}} = 10 \text{ GeV}$

$1.9 \pm 0.3 \pm 0.4$ 44 ⁷ TSCHIRHART 88 HRS $E_{\text{cm}}^{\text{ee}} = 29 \text{ GeV}$

$1.5 \pm 0.4 \pm 0.4$ 15 ⁸ AIHARA 87C TPC $E_{\text{cm}}^{\text{ee}} = 29 \text{ GeV}$

$1.3 \pm 0.3 \pm 0.3$ 31 YELTON 86 MRK2 $E_{\text{cm}}^{\text{ee}} = 29 \text{ GeV}$

1.7 ± 0.7 11 DORFAN 81 MRK2 $E_{\text{cm}}^{\text{ee}} = 4.2\text{--}6.7 \text{ GeV}$

NODE=LXXX005

NODE=S035

NODE=S035

NODE=S035220

NODE=S035220

NODE=S035B32

NODE=S035B32

NODE=S035B32

NOTFITTED

NOTFITTED

NODE=S035B32;LINKAGE=9K

NODE=S035B32;LINKAGE=B9

NODE=S035B32;LINKAGE=B

NODE=S035B32;LINKAGE=A

NODE=S035B32;LINKAGE=B6

NODE=S035B52

NODE=S035B52

NODE=S035B52;LINKAGE=EP

NODE=S035R9

NODE=S035R9

¹ EPIFANOV 07 quote $B(\tau^- \rightarrow K^*(892)^- \nu_\tau) B(K^*(892)^- \rightarrow K_S^0 \pi^-) = (3.77 \pm 0.02(\text{stat}) \pm 0.12(\text{syst}) \pm 0.12(\text{mod})) \times 10^{-3}$. We add the systematic and model uncertainties in quadrature and divide by $B(K^*(892)^- \rightarrow K_S^0 \pi^-) = 0.3333$.

² Not independent of COAN 96 $B(\pi^- \bar{K}^0 \nu_\tau)$ and BATTLE 94 $B(K^- \pi^0 \nu_\tau)$ measurements. $K\pi$ final states are consistent with and assumed to originate from $K^*(892)^-$ production.

³ This result is obtained from their $B(\pi^- \bar{K}^0 \nu_\tau)$ assuming all those decays originate in $K^*(892)^-$ decays.

⁴ Not independent of BUSKULIC 96 $B(\pi^- \bar{K}^0 \nu_\tau)$ and $B(K^- \pi^0 \nu_\tau)$ measurements.

⁵ BUSKULIC 94F obtain this result from BUSKULIC 94F $B(\bar{K}^0 \pi^- \nu_\tau)$ and BUSKULIC 94E $B(K^- \pi^0 \nu_\tau)$ assuming all of those decays originate in $K^*(892)^-$ decays.

⁶ The authors divide by $\Gamma_2/\Gamma = 0.865$ to obtain this result.

⁷ Not independent of TSCHIRHART 88 $\Gamma(\tau^- \rightarrow h^- \bar{K}^0 \geq 0 \text{ neutrals} \geq 0 K_L^0 \nu_\tau) / \Gamma$.

⁸ Decay π^- identified in this experiment, is assumed in the others.

$$\frac{\Gamma(K^*(892)^- \nu_\tau \rightarrow \pi^- \bar{K}^0 \nu_\tau)}{\Gamma(\pi^- \bar{K}^0 \nu_\tau)} / \frac{\Gamma_{113}}{\Gamma_{35}}$$

YOUR DATA	VALUE	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
	0.933 ± 0.027	49k	EPIFANOV 07	BELL	$351 \text{ fb}^{-1} E_{\text{cm}}^{ee} = 10.6 \text{ GeV}$

τ REFERENCES

YOUR PAPER	EPIFANOV ABBIENDI BARATE BARATE BARATE BARATE BUSKULIC COAN ACCIARRI BATTLE BATTLE BUSKULIC BUSKULIC ALBRECHT TSCHIRHART AIHARA YELTON DORFAN KIRKBY	07 00C 99K 99R 98E 96 95F 96 95F 94 94E 94F 88L 88 87C 86 81 79	PL B654 65 EPJ C13 213 EPJ C10 1 EPJ C11 599 EPJ C4 29 ZPHY C70 579 PR D53 6037 PL B352 487 PRL 73 1079 PL B332 209 PL B332 219 ZPHY C41 1 PL B205 407 PRL 59 751 PRL 56 812 PRL 46 215 SLAC-PUB-2419 Batavia Lepton Photon Conference. PL 73B 109 Tokyo Conf. 777 PRL 35 1489	D. Epifanov <i>et al.</i> G. Abbiendi <i>et al.</i> R. Barate <i>et al.</i> R. Barate <i>et al.</i> R. Barate <i>et al.</i> D. Buskulic <i>et al.</i> T.E. Coan <i>et al.</i> M. Acciarri <i>et al.</i> M. Battle <i>et al.</i> D. Buskulic <i>et al.</i> D. Buskulic <i>et al.</i> H. Albrecht <i>et al.</i> R. Tschirhart <i>et al.</i> H. Aihara <i>et al.</i> J.M. Yelton <i>et al.</i> J.M. Dorfan <i>et al.</i> J. Kirkby	(BELLE Collab.) (OPAL Collab.) (ALEPH Collab.) (ALEPH Collab.) (ALEPH Collab.) (CLEO Collab.) (L3 Collab.) (CLEO Collab.) (ALEPH Collab.) (ALEPH Collab.) (ARGUS Collab.) (HRS Collab.) (TPC Collab.) (Mark II Collab.) (Mark II Collab.) (SLAC) J	REFID=51929 REFID=47440 REFID=47181 REFID=47366 REFID=45917 REFID=44588 REFID=44667 REFID=44280 REFID=43918 REFID=43898 REFID=43899 REFID=40861 REFID=40640 REFID=40428 REFID=10351 REFID=10323 REFID=10283
	BRANDELIK FELDMAN PERL	78 78 75	PL 73B 109 Tokyo Conf. 777 PRL 35 1489	R. Brandelik <i>et al.</i> G.J. Feldman M.L. Perl <i>et al.</i>	(DASP Collab.) J (SLAC) J (LBL, SLAC) J	REFID=10280 REFID=10355 REFID=10294

NODE=S035R9;LINKAGE=EP

NODE=S035R9;LINKAGE=E

NODE=S035R9;LINKAGE=C

NODE=S035R9;LINKAGE=D

NODE=S035R9;LINKAGE=B

NODE=S035R9;LINKAGE=AL

NODE=S035R9;LINKAGE=A

NODE=S035R9;LINKAGE=AI

NODE=S035C68

NODE=S035C68

NODE=S035

Reference = MIYAZAKI 08; PL B660 154
 Verifier code = BELLE

Normally we send all verifications for one experiment to one person, usually the spokesperson or data-analysis coordinator, who then distributes them to the appropriate people. Please tell us if we should send the verifications for your experiment to someone else.

PLEASE READ NOW

**PLEASE
REPLY
WITHIN
ONE WEEK**

Tom Browder

EMAIL: teb@phys.hawaii.edu

April 14, 2008

Dear Colleague,

The attached sheets from the "Review of Particle Physics" Particle Listings contain information from your experiment that was recently added to our database. There may be other papers that we have not yet added; please inform us of any such journal papers if they have been accepted for publication. You are the *only* author of this paper to whom this request is being sent, so please forward this to another author if appropriate.

We ask you to check the information marked "YOUR DATA" and "YOUR PAPER," note any necessary changes, and return the corrected sheets to us. In particular:

- (1) Return the sheets to us *even if no change is needed*, marking them in that case "OK."
- (2) Please feel free to comment on our treatment of other data listed on these sheets. We appreciate suggestions for improvements.
- (3) You may respond by electronic mail, but then be sure to include the "Reference" above and the **NAME** of the particle, the **PROPERTY**, and the **PROPERTY NODE** on which you are commenting. (The "**PROPERTY NODE**" is the code given on the right-hand side of the data, e.g., "NODE=S043M.")

Thank you for helping us make the Review accurate and useful.

Sincerely,

Klaus Mönig
 DESY-Zeuthen
 Plataneallee 6
 D-15735 Zeuthen, Germany

PHONE: 49-33762 77271
 FAX: 49-33762 77330
 EMAIL: klaus.monig@cern.ch

LEPTONS

τ

$$J = \frac{1}{2}$$

τ discovery paper was PERL 75. $e^+ e^- \rightarrow \tau^+ \tau^-$ cross-section threshold behavior and magnitude are consistent with pointlike spin-1/2 Dirac particle. BRANDELIK 78 ruled out pointlike spin-0 or spin-1 particle. FELDMAN 78 ruled out $J = 3/2$. KIRKBY 79 also ruled out $J=\text{integer}$, $J = 3/2$.

τ^- BRANCHING RATIOS

$\Gamma(e^- e^+ e^-)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$

Test of lepton family number conservation.					
VALUE	CL%	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT	
$< 3.6 \times 10^{-8}$	90	MIYAZAKI	08	BELL 535 fb $^{-1}$ $E_{\text{cm}}= 10.6$ GeV	
$\bullet \bullet \bullet$ We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. $\bullet \bullet \bullet$					
$< 4.3 \times 10^{-8}$	90	AUBERT	07BK BABR	376 fb $^{-1}$ $E_{\text{cm}}= 10.6$ GeV	
$< 2.0 \times 10^{-7}$	90	AUBERT	04J BABR	91.5 fb $^{-1}$ $E_{\text{cm}}= 10.6$ GeV	
$< 3.5 \times 10^{-7}$	90	YUSA	04	BELL 87.1 fb $^{-1}$ $E_{\text{cm}}= 10.6$ GeV	
$< 2.9 \times 10^{-6}$	90	BLISS	98	CLEO $E_{\text{cm}}= 10.6$ GeV	
$< 0.33 \times 10^{-5}$	90	¹ BARTEL	94	CLEO Repl. by BLISS 98	
$< 1.3 \times 10^{-5}$	90	ALBRECHT	92K ARG	$E_{\text{cm}}= 10$ GeV	
$< 2.7 \times 10^{-5}$	90	BOWCOCK	90	CLEO $E_{\text{cm}}= 10.4-10.9$	
$< 40 \times 10^{-5}$	90	HAYES	82	MRK2 $E_{\text{cm}}= 3.8-6.8$ GeV	

¹ BARTEL 94 assume phase space decays.

Γ_{172}/Γ

NODE=S035220

NODE=S035220

NODE=S035R58

NODE=S035R58

NODE=S035R58

$\Gamma(e^- \mu^+ \mu^-)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$

Test of lepton family number conservation.					
VALUE	CL%	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT	
$< 3.7 \times 10^{-8}$	90	AUBERT	07BK BABR	376 fb $^{-1}$ $E_{\text{cm}}= 10.6$ GeV	
$\bullet \bullet \bullet$ We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. $\bullet \bullet \bullet$					
$< 4.1 \times 10^{-8}$	90	MIYAZAKI	08	BELL 535 fb $^{-1}$ $E_{\text{cm}}= 10.6$ GeV	
$< 3.3 \times 10^{-7}$	90	AUBERT	04J BABR	91.5 fb $^{-1}$ $E_{\text{cm}}= 10.6$ GeV	
$< 2.0 \times 10^{-7}$	90	YUSA	04	BELL 87.1 fb $^{-1}$ $E_{\text{cm}}= 10.6$ GeV	
$< 1.8 \times 10^{-6}$	90	BLISS	98	CLEO $E_{\text{cm}}= 10.6$ GeV	
$< 0.36 \times 10^{-5}$	90	¹ BARTEL	94	CLEO Repl. by BLISS 98	
$< 1.9 \times 10^{-5}$	90	ALBRECHT	92K ARG	$E_{\text{cm}}= 10$ GeV	
$< 2.7 \times 10^{-5}$	90	BOWCOCK	90	CLEO $E_{\text{cm}}= 10.4-10.9$	
$< 33 \times 10^{-5}$	90	HAYES	82	MRK2 $E_{\text{cm}}= 3.8-6.8$ GeV	

¹ BARTEL 94 assume phase space decays.

Γ_{173}/Γ

NODE=S035R56

NODE=S035R56

NODE=S035R56

$\Gamma(e^+ \mu^- \mu^-)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$

Test of lepton family number conservation.					
VALUE	CL%	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT	
$< 2.3 \times 10^{-8}$	90	MIYAZAKI	08	BELL 535 fb $^{-1}$ $E_{\text{cm}}= 10.6$ GeV	
$\bullet \bullet \bullet$ We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. $\bullet \bullet \bullet$					
$< 5.6 \times 10^{-8}$	90	AUBERT	07BK BABR	376 fb $^{-1}$ $E_{\text{cm}}= 10.6$ GeV	
$< 1.3 \times 10^{-7}$	90	AUBERT	04J BABR	91.5 fb $^{-1}$ $E_{\text{cm}}= 10.6$ GeV	
$< 2.0 \times 10^{-7}$	90	YUSA	04	BELL 87.1 fb $^{-1}$ $E_{\text{cm}}= 10.6$ GeV	
$< 1.5 \times 10^{-6}$	90	BLISS	98	CLEO $E_{\text{cm}}= 10.6$ GeV	
$< 0.35 \times 10^{-5}$	90	¹ BARTEL	94	CLEO Repl. by BLISS 98	
$< 1.8 \times 10^{-5}$	90	ALBRECHT	92K ARG	$E_{\text{cm}}= 10$ GeV	
$< 1.6 \times 10^{-5}$	90	BOWCOCK	90	CLEO $E_{\text{cm}}= 10.4-10.9$	

¹ BARTEL 94 assume phase space decays.

Γ_{174}/Γ

NODE=S035R75

NODE=S035R75

NODE=S035R75

NODE=S035R75;LINKAGE=B9

$\Gamma(\mu^- e^+ e^-)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$

Test of lepton family number conservation.

VALUE	CL%	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
$< 2.7 \times 10^{-8}$	90	MIYAZAKI	08	BELL $535 \text{ fb}^{-1} E_{\text{cm}} = 10.6 \text{ GeV}$
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
$< 8.0 \times 10^{-8}$	90	AUBERT	07BK	BABR $376 \text{ fb}^{-1} E_{\text{cm}} = 10.6 \text{ GeV}$
$< 2.7 \times 10^{-7}$	90	AUBERT	04J	BABR $91.5 \text{ fb}^{-1} E_{\text{cm}} = 10.6 \text{ GeV}$
$< 1.9 \times 10^{-7}$	90	YUSA	04	BELL $87.1 \text{ fb}^{-1} E_{\text{cm}} = 10.6 \text{ GeV}$
$< 1.7 \times 10^{-6}$	90	BLISS	98	CLEO $E_{\text{cm}} = 10.6 \text{ GeV}$
$< 0.34 \times 10^{-5}$	90	¹ BARTEL	94	CLEO Repl. by BLISS 98
$< 1.4 \times 10^{-5}$	90	ALBRECHT	92K	ARG $E_{\text{cm}} = 10 \text{ GeV}$
$< 2.7 \times 10^{-5}$	90	BOWCOCK	90	CLEO $E_{\text{cm}} = 10.4-10.9$
$< 44 \times 10^{-5}$	90	HAYES	82	MRK2 $E_{\text{cm}} = 3.8-6.8 \text{ GeV}$

¹ BARTEL 94 assume phase space decays. Γ_{175}/Γ

NODE=S035R57

NODE=S035R57

NODE=S035R57

 $\Gamma(\mu^+ e^- e^-)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$

Test of lepton family number conservation.

VALUE	CL%	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
$< 2.0 \times 10^{-8}$	90	MIYAZAKI	08	BELL $535 \text{ fb}^{-1} E_{\text{cm}} = 10.6 \text{ GeV}$
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
$< 5.8 \times 10^{-8}$	90	AUBERT	07BK	BABR $376 \text{ fb}^{-1} E_{\text{cm}} = 10.6 \text{ GeV}$
$< 1.1 \times 10^{-7}$	90	AUBERT	04J	BABR $91.5 \text{ fb}^{-1} E_{\text{cm}} = 10.6 \text{ GeV}$
$< 2.0 \times 10^{-7}$	90	YUSA	04	BELL $87.1 \text{ fb}^{-1} E_{\text{cm}} = 10.6 \text{ GeV}$
$< 1.5 \times 10^{-6}$	90	BLISS	98	CLEO $E_{\text{cm}} = 10.6 \text{ GeV}$
$< 0.34 \times 10^{-5}$	90	¹ BARTEL	94	CLEO Repl. by BLISS 98
$< 1.4 \times 10^{-5}$	90	ALBRECHT	92K	ARG $E_{\text{cm}} = 10 \text{ GeV}$
$< 1.6 \times 10^{-5}$	90	BOWCOCK	90	CLEO $E_{\text{cm}} = 10.4-10.9$

¹ BARTEL 94 assume phase space decays. Γ_{176}/Γ

NODE=S035R76

NODE=S035R76

NODE=S035R76

 $\Gamma(\mu^- \mu^+ \mu^-)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$

Test of lepton family number conservation.

VALUE	CL%	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
$< 3.2 \times 10^{-8}$	90	MIYAZAKI	08	BELL $535 \text{ fb}^{-1} E_{\text{cm}} = 10.6 \text{ GeV}$
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
$< 5.3 \times 10^{-8}$	90	AUBERT	07BK	BABR $376 \text{ fb}^{-1} E_{\text{cm}} = 10.6 \text{ GeV}$
$< 1.9 \times 10^{-7}$	90	AUBERT	04J	BABR $91.5 \text{ fb}^{-1} E_{\text{cm}} = 10.6 \text{ GeV}$
$< 2.0 \times 10^{-7}$	90	YUSA	04	BELL $87.1 \text{ fb}^{-1} E_{\text{cm}} = 10.6 \text{ GeV}$
$< 1.9 \times 10^{-6}$	90	BLISS	98	CLEO $E_{\text{cm}} = 10.6 \text{ GeV}$
$< 0.43 \times 10^{-5}$	90	¹ BARTEL	94	CLEO Repl. by BLISS 98
$< 1.9 \times 10^{-5}$	90	ALBRECHT	92K	ARG $E_{\text{cm}} = 10 \text{ GeV}$
$< 1.7 \times 10^{-5}$	90	BOWCOCK	90	CLEO $E_{\text{cm}} = 10.4-10.9$
$< 49 \times 10^{-5}$	90	HAYES	82	MRK2 $E_{\text{cm}} = 3.8-6.8 \text{ GeV}$

¹ BARTEL 94 assume phase space decays. Γ_{177}/Γ

NODE=S035R55

NODE=S035R55

NODE=S035R55

 τ REFERENCES

YOUR PAPER	MIYAZAKI	08	PL B660 154	Y. Miyazaki <i>et al.</i>	(BELLE Collab.)
	AUBERT	07BK	PRL 99 251803	B. Aubert <i>et al.</i>	(BABAR Collab.)
	AUBERT	04J	PRL 92 121801	B. Aubert <i>et al.</i>	(BABAR Collab.)
	YUSA	04	PL B589 103	Y. Yusa <i>et al.</i>	(BELLE Collab.)
	BLISS	98	PR D57 5903	D.W. Bliss <i>et al.</i>	(CLEO Collab.)
	BARTEL	94	PRL 73 1890	J.E. Bartelt <i>et al.</i>	(CLEO Collab.)
	ALBRECHT	92K	ZPHY C55 179	H. Albrecht <i>et al.</i>	(ARGUS Collab.)
	BOWCOCK	90	PR D41 805	T.J.V. Bowcock <i>et al.</i>	(CLEO Collab.)
	HAYES	82	PR D25 2869	K.G. Hayes <i>et al.</i>	(Mark II Collab.)
	KIRKBY	79	SLAC-PUB-2419	J. Kirkby	(SLAC) J
	Batavia Lepton Photon Conference.				
	BRANDELIK	78	PL 73B 109	R. Brandelik <i>et al.</i>	(DASP Collab.) J
	FELDMAN	78	Tokyo Conf. 777	G.J. Feldman	(SLAC) J
	PERL	75	PRL 35 1489	M.L. Perl <i>et al.</i>	(LBL, SLAC)

NODE=S035

REFID=52177

REFID=52094

REFID=49925

REFID=49905

REFID=45943

REFID=43919

REFID=42198

REFID=41239

REFID=10330

REFID=10283

REFID=10280

REFID=10355

REFID=10294