$\rho(1700)$

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

THE $\rho(1450)$ AND THE $\rho(1700)$

Updated December 2003 by S. Eidelman (Novosibirsk) and J. Hernandez (Valencia).

In our 1988 edition, we replaced the $\rho(1600)$ entry with two new ones, the $\rho(1450)$ and the $\rho(1700)$, because there was emerging evidence that the 1600-MeV region actually contains two ρ-like resonances. ERKAL 86 had pointed out this possibility with a theoretical analysis on the consistency of 2π and 4π electromagnetic form factors and the $\pi\pi$ scattering length. DONNACHIE 87, with a full analysis of data on the 2π and 4π final states in e^+e^- annihilation and photoproduction reactions, had also argued that in order to obtain a consistent picture, two resonances were necessary. The existence of $\rho(1450)$ was supported by the analysis of $\eta\rho^0$ mass spectra obtained in photoproduction and e^+e^- annihilation (DONNACHIE 87B), as well as that of $e^+e^- \to \omega\pi$ (DONNACHIE 91).

The analysis of DONNACHIE 87 was further extended by CLEGG 88, 94 to include new data on 4π systems produced in e^+e^- annihilation, and in τ decays (τ decays to 4π and e^+e^- annihilation to 4π can be related by the Conserved Vector Current assumption). These systems were successfully analyzed using interfering contributions from two ρ-like states, and from the tail of the $\rho(770)$ decaying into two-body states. While specific conclusions on $\rho(1450) \to 4\pi$ were obtained, little could be said about the $\rho(1700)$.

Independent evidence for two 1^- states is provided by KILLIAN 80 in 4π electroproduction at $\langle Q^2 \rangle = 1$ (GeV/c)^2, and by FUKUI 88 in a high-statistics sample of the $\eta\pi\pi$ system in π^-p charge exchange.

This scenario with two overlapping resonances is supported by other data. BISELLO 89 measured the pion form factor in the interval 1.35–2.4 GeV, and observed a deep minimum around 1.6 GeV. The best fit was obtained with the hypothesis of ρ-like resonances at 1420 and 1770 MeV, with widths of about 250 MeV. ANTONELLI 88 found that the $e^+e^- \rightarrow \eta\pi^+\pi^-$ cross section is better fitted with two fully interfering Breit-Wigners, with parameters in fair agreement with those of DONNACHIE 87 and BISELLO 89. These results can be considered as a confirmation of the $\rho(1450)$.

Decisive evidence for the $\pi\pi$ decay mode of both $\rho(1450)$ and $\rho(1700)$ came from recent results in $\overline{p}p$ annihilation at rest (ABELE 97). It was shown that these resonances also possess a $K\overline{K}$ decay mode (ABELE 98, BERTIN 98B, ABELE 99D). High statistics studies of the decays $\tau \rightarrow \pi\pi\nu_\tau$ (BARATE 97M, URHEIM 97), and $\tau \rightarrow 4\pi\nu_\tau$ (EDWARDS 00), also require the $\rho(1450)$, but are not sensitive to the $\rho(1700)$, because it is too close to the τ mass.

The structure of these ρ states is not yet completely clear. BARNES 97 and CLOSE 97C claim that $\rho(1450)$ has a mass consistent with radial $2S$, but its decays show characteristics of hybrids, and suggest that this state may be a $2S$-hybrid mixture. DONNACHIE 99 argues that hybrid states could have a 4π decay mode dominated by the $a_1\pi$. Such behavior has recently been observed by AKHMETSHIN 99E in $e^+e^- \rightarrow 4\pi$ in the energy range 1.05–1.38 GeV, and by EDWARDS 00 in $\tau \rightarrow 4\pi$ decays. ALEXANDER 01B observed the $\rho(1450) \rightarrow \omega\pi$ decay mode in B-meson decays, however, didn't find $\rho(1700) \rightarrow \omega\pi^0$. A similar conclusion is made by AKHMETSHIN 03B who studied the process $e^+e^- \rightarrow \omega\pi^0$. Various decay modes of the $\rho(1450)$ and $\rho(1700)$ were observed in $\overline{p}n$ and $\overline{p}p$ annihilation (ABELE

01B, BARGIOTTI 03B), but no definite conclusions could be drawn. More data should be collected to clarify the nature of the ρ states, particularly in the energy range above 1.6 GeV.

We also list under the $\rho(1450)$ the $\phi\pi$ state with $J^{PC} = 1^{--}$ or $C(1480)$ observed by BITYUKOV 87. While ACHASOV 96B shows that it may be a threshold effect, CLEGG 88 and LANDSBERG 92 suggest two independent vector states with this decay mode. Note, however, that $C(1480)$ in its $\phi\pi$ decay mode was not confirmed by e^+e^- (DOLINSKY 91, BISELLO 91C) and $\overline{p}p$ (ABELE 97H) experiments.

Several observations on the $\omega\pi$ system in the 1200-MeV region (FRENKIEL 72, COSME 76, BARBER 80C, ASTON 80C, ATKINSON 84C, BRAU 88, AMSLER 93B) may be interpreted in terms of either $J^P = 1^-$ $\rho(770) \to \omega\pi$ production (LAYSSAC 71), or $J^P = 1^+$ $b_1(1235)$ production (BRAU 88, AMSLER 93B). We argue that no special entry for a $\rho(1250)$ is needed. The LASS amplitude analysis (ASTON 91B) showing evidence for $\rho(1270)$ is preliminary and needs confirmation. For completeness, the relevant observations are listed under the $\rho(1450)$.

Evidence for ρ-like mesons decaying into 6π states was first noted by CLEGG 90 in the analysis of 6π mass spectra from e^+e^- annihilation (BISELLO 81, CASTRO 88) and diffractive photoproduction (ATKINSON 85). CLEGG 90 argued that two states at about 2.1 and 1.8 GeV exist: while the former is a candidate for a new resonance ($\rho(2150)$), the latter could be a manifestation of the $\rho(1700)$ distorted by threshold effects. Recently, the E687 Collaboration at Fermilab reported an observation of a narrow dip structure at 1.9 GeV/c^2 in the $3\pi^+3\pi^-$ diffractive photoproduction (FRABETTI 01). A similar effect of the dip in the cross section of $e^+e^- \to 6\pi$ around 1.9 GeV has been earlier reported by DM2 (CASTRO 88), where 6π included both $3\pi^+3\pi^-$ and $2\pi^+2\pi^-2\pi^0$. Later the dip in the

R value (the total cross section of $e^+e^- \to$ hadrons divided by the cross section of $e^+e^- \to \mu^+\mu^-$) was observed by ANTONELLI 96, again around 1.9 GeV. This energy is close to the $N\overline{N}$ threshold, which hints to the possible relation between the dip and $N\overline{N}$, *e.g.*, the frequently discussed narrow $N\overline{N}$ resonance or just a threshold effect. Such behaviour is also characteristic of exotic objects like vector $q\overline{q}$ hybrids. Note that AGNELLO 02 failed to find this state in the reaction $\overline{n}p \to 3\pi^+2\pi^-\pi^0$. Recent reanalysis of the E687 data by FRABETTI 04 shows that a dip may arise due to interference of a narrow object with a broad $\rho(1700)$ independently of the nature of the former. We list these observations under a separate particle $\rho(1900)$, which needs confirmation.

$\rho(1700)$ MASS

$\eta\rho^0$ AND $\pi^+\pi^-$ MODES

VALUE (MeV)	*DOCUMENT ID*
1720±20 OUR ESTIMATE	

$\eta\rho^0$ MODE

VALUE (MeV)	*DOCUMENT ID*		*TECN*	*COMMENT*
The data in this block is included in the average printed for a previous datablock.				
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
1740±20	ANTONELLI	88	DM2	$e^+e^- \to \eta\pi^+\pi^-$
1701±15	[2] FUKUI	88	SPEC	8.95 $\pi^-p \to \eta\pi^+\pi^-n$

$\pi\pi$ MODE

VALUE (MeV)	*DOCUMENT ID*		*TECN*	*COMMENT*
The data in this block is included in the average printed for a previous datablock.				
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
1780 $^{+37}_{-29}$	[3] ABELE	97	CBAR	$\overline{p}n \to \pi^-\pi^0\pi^0$
1719 ±15	[3] BERTIN	97C	OBLX	0.0 $\overline{p}p \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$
1730 ±30	CLEGG	94	RVUE	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-$
1768 ±21	BISELLO	89	DM2	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-$
1745.7±91.9	DUBNICKA	89	RVUE	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-$
1546 ±26	GESHKEN...	89	RVUE	
1650	[4] ERKAL	85	RVUE	20–70 $\gamma p \to \gamma\pi$
1550 ±70	ABE	84B	HYBR	20 $\gamma p \to \pi^+\pi^-p$

1590 ±20		[5] ASTON	80	OMEG	20–70 $\gamma p \rightarrow p 2\pi$
1600 ±10		[6] ATIYA	79B	SPEC	50 $\gamma C \rightarrow C 2\pi$
1598 $^{+24}_{-22}$		BECKER	79	ASPK	17 $\pi^- p$ polarized
1659 ±25		[4] LANG	79	RVUE	
1575		[4] MARTIN	78C	RVUE	17 $\pi^- p \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- n$
1610 ±30		[4] FROGGATT	77	RVUE	17 $\pi^- p \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- n$
1590 ±20		[7] HYAMS	73	ASPK	17 $\pi^- p \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- n$

$\pi\omega$ MODE

VALUE (MeV)	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
1550 to 1620	[8] ACHASOV	00I	SND	$e^+ e^- \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0 \gamma$
1580 to 1710	[9] ACHASOV	00I	SND	$e^+ e^- \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0 \gamma$
1710±90	ACHASOV	97	RVUE	$e^+ e^- \rightarrow \omega \pi^0$

$K\overline{K}$ MODE

VALUE (MeV)	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	CHG	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •						
1740.8±22.2	27k	[1] ABELE	99D	CBAR	±	0.0 $\overline{p} p \rightarrow K^+ K^- \pi^0$
1582 ±36	1600	CLELAND	82B	SPEC	±	50 $\pi p \rightarrow K^0_S K^\pm p$

[1] K-matrix pole. Isospin not determined, could be $\omega(1650)$ or $\phi(1680)$.

$2(\pi^+\pi^-)$ MODE

VALUE (MeV)	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •					
1851^{+27}_{-24}		ACHASOV	97	RVUE	$e^+ e^- \rightarrow 2(\pi^+ \pi^-)$
1570± 20		[10] CORDIER	82	DM1	$e^+ e^- \rightarrow 2(\pi^+ \pi^-)$
1520± 30		[5] ASTON	81E	OMEG	20–70 $\gamma p \rightarrow p 4\pi$
1654± 25		[11] DIBIANCA	81	DBC	$\pi^+ d \rightarrow p p 2(\pi^+ \pi^-)$
1666± 39		[10] BACCI	80	FRAG	$e^+ e^- \rightarrow 2(\pi^+ \pi^-)$
1780	34	KILLIAN	80	SPEC	11 $e^- p \rightarrow 2(\pi^+ \pi^-)$
1500		[12] ATIYA	79B	SPEC	50 $\gamma C \rightarrow C 4\pi^\pm$
1570± 60	65	[13] ALEXANDER	75	HBC	7.5 $\gamma p \rightarrow p 4\pi$
1550± 60		[5] CONVERSI	74	OSPK	$e^+ e^- \rightarrow 2(\pi^+ \pi^-)$
1550± 50	160	SCHACHT	74	STRC	5.5–9 $\gamma p \rightarrow p 4\pi$
1450±100	340	SCHACHT	74	STRC	9–18 $\gamma p \rightarrow p 4\pi$
1430± 50	400	BINGHAM	72B	HBC	9.3 $\gamma p \rightarrow p 4\pi$

$\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0\pi^0$ MODE

VALUE (MeV)	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
1660±30	ATKINSON	85B	OMEG	20–70 γp

$3(\pi^+\pi^-)$ AND $2(\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0)$ MODES

VALUE (MeV)	*DOCUMENT ID*		*TECN*	*COMMENT*
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
1730±34	[14] FRABETTI	04	E687	$\gamma p \rightarrow 3\pi^+ 3\pi^- p$
1783±15	CLEGG	90	RVUE	$e^+e^- \rightarrow 3(\pi^+\pi^-)2(\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0)$

[2] Assuming $\rho^+ f_0(1370)$ decay mode interferes with $a_1(1260)^+\pi$ background. From a two Breit-Wigner fit.
[3] T-matrix pole.
[4] From phase shift analysis of HYAMS 73 data.
[5] Simple relativistic Breit-Wigner fit with constant width.
[6] An additional 40 MeV uncertainty in both the mass and width is present due to the choice of the background shape.
[7] Included in BECKER 79 analysis.
[8] Taking into account both $\rho(1450)$ and $\rho(1700)$ contributions. Using the data of ACHASOV 00I on $e^+e^- \rightarrow \omega\pi^0$ and of EDWARDS 00A on $\tau^- \rightarrow \omega\pi^-\nu_\tau$. $\rho(1450)$ mass and width fixed at 1400 MeV and 500 MeV respectively.
[9] Taking into account the $\rho(1700)$ contribution only. Using the data of ACHASOV 00I on $e^+e^- \rightarrow \omega\pi^0$ and of EDWARDS 00A on $\tau^- \rightarrow \omega\pi^-\nu_\tau$.
[10] Simple relativistic Breit-Wigner fit with model dependent width.
[11] One peak fit result.
[12] Parameters roughly estimated, not from a fit.
[13] Skew mass distribution compensated by Ross-Stodolsky factor.
[14] From a fit with two resonances with the JACOB 72 continuum.

$\rho(1700)$ WIDTH

$\eta\rho^0$ AND $\pi^+\pi^-$ MODES

VALUE (MeV)	*DOCUMENT ID*
250±100 OUR ESTIMATE	

$\eta\rho^0$ MODE

VALUE (MeV)	*DOCUMENT ID*		*TECN*	*COMMENT*
The data in this block is included in the average printed for a previous datablock.				
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
150±30	ANTONELLI	88	DM2	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \eta\pi^+\pi^-$
282±44	[16] FUKUI	88	SPEC	$8.95\ \pi^- p \rightarrow \eta\pi^+\pi^- n$

$\pi\pi$ MODE

VALUE (MeV)	*DOCUMENT ID*		*TECN*	*COMMENT*
The data in this block is included in the average printed for a previous datablock.				
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
275 ± 45	[17] ABELE	97	CBAR	$\overline{p} n \rightarrow \pi^-\pi^0\pi^0$
310 ± 40	[17] BERTIN	97C	OBLX	$0.0\ \overline{p} p \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$
400 ±100	CLEGG	94	RVUE	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$
224 ± 22	BISELLO	89	DM2	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$
242.5±163.0	DUBNICKA	89	RVUE	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$
620 ± 60	GESHKEN...	89	RVUE	
<315	[18] ERKAL	85	RVUE	$20–70\ \gamma p \rightarrow \gamma\pi$

$280\ ^{+\ 30}_{-\ 80}$	ABE	84B	HYBR	$20\ \gamma p \to \pi^+ \pi^- p$
230 ± 80	[19] ASTON	80	OMEG	$20–70\ \gamma p \to p 2\pi$
283 ± 14	[20] ATIYA	79B	SPEC	$50\ \gamma C \to C 2\pi$
$175\ ^{+\ 98}_{-\ 53}$	BECKER	79	ASPK	$17\ \pi^- p$ polarized
232 ± 34	[18] LANG	79	RVUE	
340	[18] MARTIN	78C	RVUE	$17\ \pi^- p \to \pi^+ \pi^- n$
300 ± 100	[18] FROGGATT	77	RVUE	$17\ \pi^- p \to \pi^+ \pi^- n$
180 ± 50	[21] HYAMS	73	ASPK	$17\ \pi^- p \to \pi^+ \pi^- n$

$K\overline{K}$ MODE

VALUE (MeV)	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	CHG	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •						
187.2 ± 26.7	27k	[15] ABELE	99D	CBAR	$\pm$	$0.0\ \overline{p} p \to K^+ K^- \pi^0$
265 ± 120	1600	CLELAND	82B	SPEC	$\pm$	$50\ \pi p \to K^0_S K^\pm p$

[15] K-matrix pole. Isospin not determined, could be $\omega(1650)$ or $\phi(1680)$.

$2(\pi^+ \pi^-)$ MODE

VALUE (MeV)	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •					
510 ± 40		[22] CORDIER	82	DM1	$e^+ e^- \to 2(\pi^+ \pi^-)$
400 ± 50		[19] ASTON	81E	OMEG	$20–70\ \gamma p \to p 4\pi$
400 ± 146		[23] DIBIANCA	81	DBC	$\pi^+ d \to p p 2(\pi^+ \pi^-)$
700 ± 160		[22] BACCI	80	FRAG	$e^+ e^- \to 2(\pi^+ \pi^-)$
100	34	KILLIAN	80	SPEC	$11\ e^- p \to 2(\pi^+ \pi^-)$
600		[24] ATIYA	79B	SPEC	$50\ \gamma C \to C 4\pi^\pm$
340 ± 160	65	[25] ALEXANDER	75	HBC	$7.5\ \gamma p \to p 4\pi$
360 ± 100		[19] CONVERSI	74	OSPK	$e^+ e^- \to 2(\pi^+ \pi^-)$
400 ± 120	160	[26] SCHACHT	74	STRC	$5.5–9\ \gamma p \to p 4\pi$
850 ± 200	340	[26] SCHACHT	74	STRC	$9–18\ \gamma p \to p 4\pi$
650 ± 100	400	BINGHAM	72B	HBC	$9.3\ \gamma p \to p 4\pi$

$\pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0 \pi^0$ MODE

VALUE (MeV)	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
300 ± 50	ATKINSON	85B	OMEG	$20–70\ \gamma p$

$\omega \pi^0$ MODE

VALUE (MeV)	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
350 to 580	[27] ACHASOV	00I	SND	$e^+ e^- \to \pi^0 \pi^0 \gamma$
490 to 1040	[28] ACHASOV	00I	SND	$e^+ e^- \to \pi^0 \pi^0 \gamma$

$3(\pi^+\pi^-)$ AND $2(\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0)$ MODES

VALUE (MeV)	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
315±100	[29] FRABETTI	04	E687	$\gamma p \rightarrow 3\pi^+ 3\pi^- p$
285± 20	CLEGG	90	RVUE	$e^+ e^- \rightarrow 3(\pi^+\pi^-) 2(\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0)$

[16] Assuming $\rho^+ f_0(1370)$ decay mode interferes with $a_1(1260)^+\pi$ background. From a two Breit-Wigner fit.
[17] T-matrix pole.
[18] From phase shift analysis of HYAMS 73 data.
[19] Simple relativistic Breit-Wigner fit with constant width.
[20] An additional 40 MeV uncertainty in both the mass and width is present due to the choice of the background shape.
[21] Included in BECKER 79 analysis.
[22] Simple relativistic Breit-Wigner fit with model-dependent width.
[23] One peak fit result.
[24] Parameters roughly estimated, not from a fit.
[25] Skew mass distribution compensated by Ross-Stodolsky factor.
[26] Width errors enlarged by us to $4\Gamma/\sqrt{N}$; see the note with the $K^*(892)$ mass.
[27] Taking into account both $\rho(1450)$ and $\rho(1700)$ contributions. Using the data of ACHASOV 00I on $e^+ e^- \rightarrow \omega\pi^0$ and of EDWARDS 00A on $\tau^- \rightarrow \omega\pi^-\nu_\tau$. $\rho(1450)$ mass and width fixed at 1400 MeV and 500 MeV respectively.
[28] Taking into account the $\rho(1700)$ contribution only. Using the data of ACHASOV 00I on $e^+ e^- \rightarrow \omega\pi^0$ and of EDWARDS 00A on $\tau^- \rightarrow \omega\pi^-\nu_\tau$.
[29] From a fit with two resonances with the JACOB 72 continuum.

$\rho(1700)$ DECAY MODES

	Mode	Fraction (Γ_i/Γ)
Γ_1	4π	
Γ_2	$2(\pi^+\pi^-)$	large
Γ_3	$\rho\pi\pi$	dominant
Γ_4	$\rho^0\pi^+\pi^-$	large
Γ_5	$\rho^0\pi^0\pi^0$	
Γ_6	$\rho^\pm\pi^\mp\pi^0$	large
Γ_7	$a_1(1260)\pi$	seen
Γ_8	$h_1(1170)\pi$	seen
Γ_9	$\pi(1300)\pi$	seen
Γ_{10}	$\rho\rho$	seen
Γ_{11}	$\pi^+\pi^-$	seen
Γ_{12}	$\pi\pi$	seen
Γ_{13}	$K\overline{K}^*(892)+$ c.c.	seen
Γ_{14}	$\eta\rho$	seen
Γ_{15}	$a_2(1320)\pi$	not seen
Γ_{16}	$K\overline{K}$	seen
Γ_{17}	e^+e^-	seen
Γ_{18}	$\pi^0\omega$	seen

$\rho(1700)$ $\Gamma(i)\Gamma(e^+e^-)/\Gamma(\text{total})$

This combination of a partial width with the partial width into e^+e^- and with the total width is obtained from the cross-section into channel$_I$ in e^+e^- annihilation.

$\Gamma(2(\pi^+\pi^-)) \times \Gamma(e^+e^-)/\Gamma_{total}$ — $\Gamma_2\Gamma_{17}/\Gamma$

VALUE (keV)	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
2.6 ± 0.2	DELCOURT	81B	DM1	$e^+e^- \to 2(\pi^+\pi^-)$
2.83 ± 0.42	BACCI	80	FRAG	$e^+e^- \to 2(\pi^+\pi^-)$

$\Gamma(\pi^+\pi^-) \times \Gamma(e^+e^-)/\Gamma_{total}$ — $\Gamma_{11}\Gamma_{17}/\Gamma$

VALUE (keV)	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
0.13	[30] DIEKMAN	88	RVUE	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-$
$0.029^{+0.016}_{-0.012}$	KURDADZE	83	OLYA	0.64–1.4 $e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-$

[30] Using total width = 220 MeV.

$\Gamma(K\overline{K}^*(892)+\text{c.c.}) \times \Gamma(e^+e^-)/\Gamma_{total}$ — $\Gamma_{13}\Gamma_{17}/\Gamma$

VALUE (keV)	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
0.305 ± 0.071	[31] BIZOT	80	DM1	e^+e^-

$\Gamma(\eta\rho) \times \Gamma(e^+e^-)/\Gamma_{total}$ — $\Gamma_{14}\Gamma_{17}/\Gamma$

VALUE (eV)	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
7 ± 3	ANTONELLI	88	DM2	$e^+e^- \to \eta\pi^+\pi^-$

$\Gamma(K\overline{K}) \times \Gamma(e^+e^-)/\Gamma_{total}$ — $\Gamma_{16}\Gamma_{17}/\Gamma$

VALUE (keV)	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
0.035 ± 0.029	[31] BIZOT	80	DM1	e^+e^-

$\Gamma(\rho\pi\pi) \times \Gamma(e^+e^-)/\Gamma_{total}$ — $\Gamma_3\Gamma_{17}/\Gamma$

VALUE (keV)	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
3.510 ± 0.090	[31] BIZOT	80	DM1	e^+e^-

[31] Model dependent.

$\rho(1700)$ BRANCHING RATIOS

$\Gamma(\pi^+\pi^-)/\Gamma_{total}$ — Γ_{11}/Γ

VALUE	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
$0.287^{+0.043}_{-0.042}$	BECKER	79	ASPK	17 $\pi^- p$ polarized
0.15 to 0.30	[32] MARTIN	78C	RVUE	17 $\pi^- p \to \pi^+\pi^- n$
<0.20	[33] COSTA...	77B	RVUE	$e^+e^- \to 2\pi, 4\pi$
0.30 ±0.05	[32] FROGGATT	77	RVUE	17 $\pi^- p \to \pi^+\pi^- n$
<0.15	[34] EISENBERG	73	HBC	5 $\pi^+ p \to \Delta^{++} 2\pi$
0.25 ±0.05	[35] HYAMS	73	ASPK	17 $\pi^- p \to \pi^+\pi^- n$

[32] From phase shift analysis of HYAMS 73 data.
[33] Estimate using unitarity, time reversal invariance, Breit-Wigner.
[34] Estimated using one-pion-exchange model.
[35] Included in BECKER 79 analysis.

$\Gamma(\pi^+\pi^-)/\Gamma(2(\pi^+\pi^-))$ — Γ_{11}/Γ_2

VALUE	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
0.13±0.05	ASTON	80	OMEG	20–70 $\gamma p \to p 2\pi$
<0.14	[36] DAVIER	73	STRC	6–18 $\gamma p \to p 4\pi$
<0.2	[37] BINGHAM	72B	HBC	9.3 $\gamma p \to p 2\pi$

[36] Upper limit is estimate.
[37] 2σ upper limit.

$\Gamma(\pi\pi)/\Gamma(4\pi)$ — Γ_{12}/Γ_1

VALUE	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
0.16±0.04	[42,43] ABELE	01B	CBAR	0.0 $\overline{p} n \to 5\pi$

$\Gamma(K\overline{K}^*(892)+\text{c.c.})/\Gamma(2(\pi^+\pi^-))$ — Γ_{13}/Γ_2

VALUE	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
0.15±0.03	[38] DELCOURT	81B	DM1	$e^+e^- \to \overline{K} K \pi$

[38] Assuming $\rho(1700)$ and ω radial excitations to be degenerate in mass.

$\Gamma(\eta\rho)/\Gamma_{total}$ — Γ_{14}/Γ

VALUE	CL%	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •					
possibly seen		AKHMETSHIN	00D	CMD2	$e^+e^- \to \eta\pi^+\pi^-$
<0.04		DONNACHIE	87B	RVUE	
<0.02	58	ATKINSON	86B	OMEG	20–70 γp

$\Gamma(a_2(1320)\pi)/\Gamma_{total}$ — Γ_{15}/Γ

VALUE	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
not seen	AMELIN	00	VES	37 $\pi^- p \to \eta\pi^+\pi^- n$

$\Gamma(\eta\rho)/\Gamma(2(\pi^+\pi^-))$ — Γ_{14}/Γ_2

VALUE	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
0.123 ± 0.027	DELCOURT	82	DM1	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^-$ MM
~ 0.1	ASTON	80	OMEG	20–70 γp

$\Gamma(\pi^+\pi^-\text{neutrals})/\Gamma(2(\pi^+\pi^-))$ — $(\Gamma_5+\Gamma_6+0.714\Gamma_{14})/\Gamma_2$

VALUE	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
2.6 ± 0.4	[39] BALLAM	74	HBC	9.3 γp

[39] Upper limit. Background not subtracted.

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

VALUE	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •					
not seen	2382	AKHMETSHIN	03B	CMD2	$e^+e \to \pi^0\pi^0\gamma$
seen		ACHASOV	97	RVUE	$e^+e^- \to \omega\pi^0$

$\Gamma(a_1(1260)\pi)/\Gamma(4\pi)$ — Γ_7/Γ_1

VALUE	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
0.16 ± 0.05	[42] ABELE	01B	CBAR	0.0 $\overline{p}n \to 5\pi$

$\Gamma(h_1(1170)\pi)/\Gamma(4\pi)$ — Γ_8/Γ_1

VALUE	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
0.17 ± 0.06	[42] ABELE	01B	CBAR	0.0 $\overline{p}n \to 5\pi$

$\Gamma(\pi(1300)\pi)/\Gamma(4\pi)$ — Γ_9/Γ_1

VALUE	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
0.30 ± 0.10	[42] ABELE	01B	CBAR	0.0 $\overline{p}n \to 5\pi$

$\Gamma(\rho\rho)/\Gamma(4\pi)$ — Γ_{10}/Γ_1

VALUE	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
0.09 ± 0.03	[42] ABELE	01B	CBAR	0.0 $\overline{p}n \to 5\pi$

$\Gamma(\rho\pi\pi)/\Gamma(4\pi)$ — Γ_3/Γ_1

VALUE	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
0.28 ± 0.06	[42] ABELE	01B	CBAR	0.0 $\overline{p}n \to 5\pi$

$\Gamma(K\overline{K})/\Gamma(2(\pi^+\pi^-))$ — Γ_{16}/Γ_2

VALUE	CL%		DOCUMENT ID		TECN	CHG	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •							
0.015±0.010		40	DELCOURT	81B	DM1		$e^+e^- \to \overline{K}K$
<0.04	95		BINGHAM	72B	HBC	0	9.3 γp

[40] Assuming $\rho(1700)$ and ω radial excitations to be degenerate in mass.

$\Gamma(K\overline{K})/\Gamma(K\overline{K}^*(892)+\text{c.c.})$ — Γ_{16}/Γ_{13}

VALUE	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
0.052±0.026	BUON	82	DM1	$e^+e^- \to$ hadrons

$\Gamma(\rho^0\pi^+\pi^-)/\Gamma(2(\pi^+\pi^-))$ — Γ_4/Γ_2

VALUE	EVTS		DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •						
∼ 1.0			DELCOURT	81B	DM1	$e^+e^- \to 2(\pi^+\pi^-)$
0.7 ±0.1	500		SCHACHT	74	STRC	5.5–18 $\gamma p \to p4\pi$
0.80		41	BINGHAM	72B	HBC	9.3 $\gamma p \to p4\pi$

[41] The $\pi\pi$ system is in S-wave.

$\Gamma(\rho^0\pi^0\pi^0)/\Gamma(\rho^\pm\pi^\mp\pi^0)$ — Γ_5/Γ_6

VALUE	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	CHG	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •					
<0.10	ATKINSON	85B	OMEG		20–70 γp
<0.15	ATKINSON	82	OMEG	0	20–70 $\gamma p \to p4\pi$

[42] $\omega\pi$ not included.
[43] Using ABELE 97.

$\rho(1700)$ REFERENCES

FRABETTI	04	PL B578 290	P.L. Frabetti et al.	(FNAL E687 Collab.)
AKHMETSHIN	03B	PL B562 173	R.R. Akhmetshin et al.	(Novosibirsk CMD-2 Collab.)
ABELE	01B	EPJ C21 261	A. Abele et al.	(Crystal Barrel Collab.)
ACHASOV	00I	PL B486 29	M.N. Achasov et al.	(Novosibirsk SND Collab.)
AKHMETSHIN	00D	PL B489 125	R.R. Akhmetshin et al.	(Novosibirsk CMD-2 Collab.)
AMELIN	00	NP A668 83	D. Amelin et al.	(VES Collab.)
EDWARDS	00A	PR D61 072003	K.W. Edwards et al.	(CLEO Collab.)
ABELE	99D	PL B468 178	A. Abele et al.	(Crystal Barrel Collab.)
ABELE	97	PL B391 191	A. Abele et al.	(Crystal Barrel Collab.)
ACHASOV	97	PR D55 2663	N.N. Achasov et al.	(NOVM)
BERTIN	97C	PL B408 476	A. Bertin et al.	(OBELIX Collab.)
CLEGG	94	ZPHY C62 455	A.B. Clegg, A. Donnachie	(LANC, MCHS)
CLEGG	90	ZPHY C45 677	A.B. Clegg, A. Donnachie	(LANC, MCHS)
BISELLO	89	PL B220 321	D. Bisello et al.	(DM2 Collab.)
DUBNICKA	89	JPG 15 1349	S. Dubnicka et al.	(JINR, SLOV)
GESHKEN...	89	ZPHY C45 351	B.V. Geshkenbein	(ITEP)
ANTONELLI	88	PL B212 133	A. Antonelli et al.	(DM2 Collab.)
DIEKMAN	88	PRPL 159 101	B. Diekmann	(BONN)
FUKUI	88	PL B202 441	S. Fukui et al.	(SUGI, NAGO, KEK, KYOT+)
DONNACHIE	87B	ZPHY C34 257	A. Donnachie, A.B. Clegg	(MCHS, LANC)
ATKINSON	86B	ZPHY C30 531	M. Atkinson et al.	(BONN, CERN, GLAS+)
ATKINSON	85B	ZPHY C26 499	M. Atkinson et al.	(BONN, CERN, GLAS+)
ERKAL	85	ZPHY C29 485	C. Erkal, M.G. Olsson	(WISC)
ABE	84B	PRL 53 751	K. Abe et al.	
KURDADZE	83	JETPL 37 733 Translated from ZETFP 37 613.	L.M. Kurdadze et al.	(NOVO)

ATKINSON 82 PL 108B 55 M. Atkinson *et al.* (BONN, CERN, GLAS+)
BUON 82 PL 118B 221 J. Buon *et al.* (LALO, MONP)
CLELAND 82B NP B208 228 W.E. Cleland *et al.* (DURH, GEVA, LAUS+)
CORDIER 82 PL 109B 129 A. Cordier *et al.* (LALO)
DELCOURT 82 PL 113B 93 B. Delcourt *et al.* (LALO)
ASTON 81E NP B189 15 D. Aston (BONN, CERN, EPOL, GLAS, LANC+)
DELCOURT 81B Bonn Conf. 205 B. Delcourt (ORSAY)
Also 82 PL 109B 129 A. Cordier *et al.* (LALO)
DIBIANCA 81 PR D23 595 F.A. di Bianca *et al.* (CASE, CMU)
ASTON 80 PL 92B 215 D. Aston (BONN, CERN, EPOL, GLAS, LANC+)
BACCI 80 PL 95B 139 C. Bacci *et al.* (ROMA, FRAS)
BIZOT 80 Madison Conf. 546 J.C. Bizot *et al.* (LALO, MONP)
KILLIAN 80 PR D21 3005 T.J. Killian *et al.* (CORN)
ATIYA 79B PRL 43 1691 M.S. Atiya *et al.* (COLU, ILL, FNAL)
BECKER 79 NP B151 46 H. Becker *et al.* (MPIM, CERN, ZEEM, CRAC)
LANG 79 PR D19 956 C.B. Lang, A. Mas-Parareda (GRAZ)
MARTIN 78C ANP 114 1 A.D. Martin, M.R. Pennington (CERN)
COSTA... 77B PL 71B 345 B. Costa de Beauregard, B. Pire, T.N. Truong (EPOL)
FROGGATT 77 NP B129 89 C.D. Froggatt, J.L. Petersen (GLAS, NORD)
ALEXANDER 75 PL 57B 487 G. Alexander *et al.* (TELA)
BALLAM 74 NP B76 375 J. Ballam *et al.* (SLAC, LBL, MPIM)
CONVERSI 74 PL 52B 493 M. Conversi *et al.* (ROMA, FRAS)
SCHACHT 74 NP B81 205 P. Schacht *et al.* (MPIM)
DAVIER 73 NP B58 31 M. Davier *et al.* (SLAC)
EISENBERG 73 PL 43B 149 Y. Eisenberg *et al.* (REHO)
HYAMS 73 NP B64 134 B.D. Hyams *et al.* (CERN, MPIM)
BINGHAM 72B PL 41B 635 H.H. Bingham *et al.* (LBL, UCB, SLAC) IGJP
JACOB 72 PR D5 1847 M. Jacob, R. Slansky

OTHER RELATED PAPERS

ACHASOV 03C JETP 96 789 M.N. Achasov *et al.* (Novosibirsk SND Collab.)
Translated from ZETF 123 899.
AKHMETSHIN 03 PL B551 27 R.R. Akhmetshin *et al.* (Novosibirsk CMD-2 Collab.)
Also 02 PAN 65 1222 E.V. Anashkin, V.M. Aulchenko, R.R. Akhmetshin
Translated from YAF 65 1255.
BARGIOTTI 03B PL B561 233 M. Bargiotti *et al.*
ACHASOV 02B PAN 65 153 N.N. Achasov, A.A. Kozhevnikov
Translated from YAF 65 158.
AGNELLO 02 PL B527 39 M. Agnello *et al.* (OBELIX Collab.)
CLOSE 02 PR D65 092003 F.E. Close, A. Donnachie, Yu.S. Kalashnikova
FRABETTI 01 PL B514 240 P.L. Frabetti *et al.* (FNAL E687 Collab.)
ACHASOV 00J PR D62 117503 N.N. Achasov, A.A. Kozhevnikov
ANDERSON 00A PR D61 112002 S. Anderson *et al.* (CLEO Collab.)
EDWARDS 00A PR D61 072003 K.W. Edwards *et al.* (CLEO Collab.)
ABELE 99C PL B450 275 A. Abele *et al.* (Crystal Barrel Collab.)
DONNACHIE 99 PR D60 114011 A. Donnachie, Yu.S. Kalashnikova
KULZINGER 99 EPJ C7 73 G. Kulzinger *et al.*
ANTONELLI 98 NP B517 3 A. Antonelli *et al.* (FENICE Collab.)
BELOZEROVA 98 PPN 29 63 T.S. Belozerova, V.K. Henner
Translated from FECAY 29 148.
BARNES 97 PR D55 4157 T. Barnes *et al.* (ORNL, RAL, MCHS)
CLOSE 97C PR D56 1584 F.E. Close *et al.* (RAL, MCHS)
URHEIM 97 NPBPS 55C 359 J. Urheim (CLEO Collab.)
ACHASOV 96B PAN 59 1262 N.N. Achasov, G.N. Shestakov (NOVM)
Translated from YAF 59 1319.
ANTONELLI 96 PL B365 427 A. Antonelli *et al.* (FENICE Collab.)
AMSLER 93B PL B311 362 C. Amsler *et al.* (Crystal Barrel Collab.)
LANDSBERG 92 SJNP 55 1051 L.G. Landsberg (SERP)
Translated from YAF 55 1896.
ASTON 91B NPBPS 21 105 D. Aston *et al.* (LASS Collab.)
DONNACHIE 91 ZPHY C51 689 A. Donnachie, A.B. Clegg (MCHS, LANC)
ACHASOV 88C PL B209 373 N.N. Achasov, A.A. Kozhevnikov (NOVM)
BRAU 88 PR D37 2379 J.E. Brau *et al.* JP
CASTRO 88 Preprint LAL-88-58 A. Castro *et al.* (DM2 Collab.)
ERKAL 86 ZPHY C31 615 C. Erkal, M.G. Olsson (WISC)
ATKINSON 85 ZPHY C29 333 M. Atkinson *et al.* (BONN, CERN, GLAS+)
BARKOV 85 NP B256 365 L.M. Barkov *et al.* (NOVO)
ATKINSON 84C NP B243 1 M. Atkinson *et al.* (BONN, CERN, GLAS+) JP
ATKINSON 83B PL 127B 132 M. Atkinson *et al.* (BONN, CERN, GLAS+)

ATKINSON	83C	NP B229 269	M. Atkinson *et al.*	(BONN, CERN, GLAS+)	
AUGUSTIN	83	LAL 83-21	J.E. Augustin *et al.*	(LALO, PADO, FRAS)	
SHAMBROOM	82	PR D26 1	W.D. Shambroom *et al.*	(HARV, EFI, ILL+)	
BISELLO	81	PL 107B 145	D. Bisello *et al.*	(DM1 Collab.)	
ASTON	80C	PL 92B 211	D. Aston	(BONN, CERN, EPOL, GLAS, LANC+)	
BARBER	80C	ZPHY C4 169	D.P. Barber *et al.*	(DARE, LANC, SHEF)	
KILLIAN	80	PR D21 3005	T.J. Killian *et al.*	(CORN)	
COSME	76	PL 63B 352	G. Cosme *et al.*	(ORSAY)	
FRENKIEL	72	NP B47 61	P. Frenkiel *et al.*	(CDEF, CERN)	
ALVENSLEB...	71	PRL 26 273	H. Alvensleben *et al.*	(DESY, MIT)	G
BRAUN	71	NP B30 213	H.M. Braun *et al.*	(STRB)	G
BULOS	71	PRL 26 149	F. Bulos *et al.*	(SLAC, UMD, IBM, LBL)	G
LAYSSAC	71	NC 6A 134	J. Layssac, F.M. Renard	(MONP)	