



$$I(J^P) = \frac{1}{2}(\frac{1}{2}^+) \text{ Status: } ****$$

Neither J or P has actually been measured.

Ξ_c^0 MASS

The fit uses the Ξ_c^0 and Ξ_c^+ mass and mass-difference measurements.

VALUE (MeV)	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
2470.44 ± 0.28 OUR FIT		Error includes scale factor of 1.2.		
2470.99^{+0.30}_{-0.50} OUR AVERAGE				
2470.85 ± 0.24 ± 0.55	3.4k	AALTONEN	14B	CDF $p\bar{p}$ at 1.96 TeV
2471.0 ± 0.3 ^{+0.2} _{-1.4}	8.6k	¹ LESIAK	05	BELL e^+e^- , $\Upsilon(4S)$
2470.0 ± 2.8 ± 2.6	85	FRABETTI	98B	E687 γ Be, $\bar{E}_\gamma = 220$ GeV
2469 ± 2 ± 3	9	HENDERSON	92B	CLEO $\Omega^- K^+$
2472.1 ± 2.7 ± 1.6	54	ALBRECHT	90F	ARG e^+e^- at $\Upsilon(4S)$
2473.3 ± 1.9 ± 1.2	4	BARLAG	90	ACCM $\pi^- (K^-)$ Cu 230 GeV
2472 ± 3 ± 4	19	ALAM	89	CLEO e^+e^- 10.6 GeV
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
2462.1 ± 3.1 ± 1.4	42	² FRABETTI	93C	E687 See FRABETTI 98B
2471 ± 3 ± 4	14	AVERY	89	CLEO See ALAM 89

¹ The systematic error was (wrongly) given the other way round in LESIAK 05.

² The FRABETTI 93C mass is well below the other measurements.

$\Xi_c^0 - \Xi_c^+$ MASS DIFFERENCE

VALUE (MeV)	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
2.72 ± 0.23 OUR FIT		Error includes scale factor of 1.1.		
2.91 ± 0.26 OUR AVERAGE				
2.85 ± 0.30 ± 0.04	5.1/3.4k	AALTONEN	14B	CDF $p\bar{p}$ at 1.96 TeV
2.9 ± 0.5		LESIK	05	BELL e^+e^- , $\Upsilon(4S)$
7.0 ± 4.5 ± 2.2		ALBRECHT	90F	ARG e^+e^- at $\Upsilon(4S)$
6.8 ± 3.3 ± 0.5		BARLAG	90	ACCM $\pi^- (K^-)$ Cu 230 GeV
5 ± 4 ± 1		ALAM	89	CLEO $\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^- \pi^+$, $\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow \Xi^- \pi^+ \pi^+$

Ξ_c^0 MEAN LIFE

VALUE (10^{-15} s)	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
151.9 ± 2.4 OUR AVERAGE				
153.4 ± 2.4 ± 0.7	22k	¹ AAIJ	19AG	LHCB $\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow p K^- K^- \pi^+$
118 ⁺¹⁴ ₋₁₂ ± 5	110	LINK	02H	FOCS γ nucleus, ≈ 180 GeV

101	$\begin{matrix} +25 \\ -17 \end{matrix} \pm 5$	42	FRABETTI	93C E687	γ Be, $\bar{E}_\gamma = 220$ GeV
82	$\begin{matrix} +59 \\ -30 \end{matrix}$	4	BARLAG	90 ACCM	$\pi^- (K^-)$ Cu 230 GeV

¹ AAIJ 19AG reports $[\Xi_c^0 \text{ MEAN LIFE}] / [D^\pm \text{ MEAN LIFE}] = 0.1485 \pm 0.0017 \pm 0.0016$ which we multiply by our best value $D^\pm \text{ MEAN LIFE} = (1.033 \pm 0.005) \times 10^{-12}$ s. Our first error is their experiment's error and our second error is the systematic error from using our best value.

Ξ_c^0 DECAY MODES

Mode	Fraction (Γ_i/Γ)	Scale factor	
Cabibbo-favored decays			
Γ_1	$pK^- K^- \pi^+$	$(4.8 \pm 1.2) \times 10^{-3}$	1.1
Γ_2	$pK^- \bar{K}^*(892)^0, \bar{K}^{*0} \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$	$(2.0 \pm 0.6) \times 10^{-3}$	
Γ_3	$pK^- K^- \pi^+$ (no \bar{K}^{*0})	$(3.0 \pm 0.9) \times 10^{-3}$	
Γ_4	ΛK_S^0	$(3.2 \pm 0.7) \times 10^{-3}$	
Γ_5	$\Lambda K^- \pi^+$	$(1.45 \pm 0.33) \%$	1.1
Γ_6	$\Lambda \bar{K}^*(892)^0$	$(2.6 \pm 0.7) \times 10^{-3}$	
Γ_7	$\Lambda \bar{K}^0 \pi^+ \pi^-$	seen	
Γ_8	$\Lambda K^- \pi^+ \pi^+ \pi^-$	seen	
Γ_9	$\Sigma^0 K_S^0$	$(5.4 \pm 1.6) \times 10^{-4}$	
Γ_{10}	$\Sigma^+ K^-$	$(1.8 \pm 0.4) \times 10^{-3}$	
Γ_{11}	$\Sigma^0 \bar{K}^*(892)^0$	$(9.8 \pm 2.3) \times 10^{-3}$	
Γ_{12}	$\Sigma^+ K^*(892)^-$	$(4.9 \pm 1.4) \times 10^{-3}$	
Γ_{13}	$\Xi^- \pi^+$	$(1.43 \pm 0.32) \%$	1.1
Γ_{14}	$\Xi^- \pi^+ \pi^+ \pi^-$	$(4.8 \pm 2.3) \%$	
Γ_{15}	$\Xi^0 K^+ K^-$		
Γ_{16}	$\Xi^0 \phi, \phi \rightarrow K^+ K^-$	$(5.1 \pm 1.3) \times 10^{-4}$	
Γ_{17}	$\Xi^0 K^+ K^-$ nonresonant	$(5.6 \pm 1.4) \times 10^{-4}$	
Γ_{18}	$\Omega^- K^+$	$(4.2 \pm 1.0) \times 10^{-3}$	
Γ_{19}	$\Xi^- e^+ \nu_e$	$(1.04 \pm 0.24) \%$	
Γ_{20}	$\Xi^- \mu^+ \nu_\mu$	$(1.01 \pm 0.25) \%$	
Cabibbo-suppressed decays			
Γ_{21}	$\Lambda_c^+ \pi^-$	$(5.5 \pm 1.8) \times 10^{-3}$	
Γ_{22}	$\Xi^- K^+$	$(3.9 \pm 1.2) \times 10^{-4}$	
Γ_{23}	$\Lambda K^+ K^-$ (no ϕ)	$(4.1 \pm 1.4) \times 10^{-4}$	
Γ_{24}	$\Lambda \phi$	$(4.9 \pm 1.5) \times 10^{-4}$	

CONSTRAINED FIT INFORMATION

An overall fit to 5 branching ratios uses 6 measurements and one constraint to determine 4 parameters. The overall fit has a $\chi^2 = 1.4$ for 3 degrees of freedom.

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

x_5	68	
x_{13}	89	76
	x_1	x_5

Ξ_c^0 BRANCHING RATIOS

Cabibbo-favored ($S = -2$) decays

$\Gamma(pK^- K^- \pi^+) / \Gamma_{\text{total}} \quad \Gamma_1 / \Gamma$

VALUE (%)	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
0.48 ± 0.12 OUR FIT	Error includes scale factor of 1.1.			
0.58 ± 0.23 ± 0.05	17 ± 5	LI	19A	BELL $e^+ e^-$ at $\Upsilon(4S)$

$\Gamma(pK^- K^- \pi^+) / \Gamma(\Xi^- \pi^+) \quad \Gamma_1 / \Gamma_{13}$

VALUE	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
0.339 ± 0.035 OUR FIT				
0.34 ± 0.04 OUR AVERAGE				
0.33 ± 0.03 ± 0.03	1908 ± 62	LESIK	05	BELL $e^+ e^-$, $\Upsilon(4S)$
0.35 ± 0.06 ± 0.03	148 ± 18	DANKO	04	CLEO $e^+ e^-$

$\Gamma(pK^- \bar{K}^*(892)^0, \bar{K}^{*0} \rightarrow K^- \pi^+) / \Gamma(\Xi^- \pi^+) \quad \Gamma_2 / \Gamma_{13}$

VALUE	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
0.14 ± 0.03 ± 0.01	DANKO 04	CLEO	$e^+ e^-$

$\Gamma(pK^- K^- \pi^+ (\text{no } \bar{K}^{*0})) / \Gamma(\Xi^- \pi^+) \quad \Gamma_3 / \Gamma_{13}$

VALUE	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
0.21 ± 0.04 ± 0.02	DANKO 04	CLEO	$e^+ e^-$

$\Gamma(\Lambda K_S^0) / \Gamma(\Xi^- \pi^+) \quad \Gamma_4 / \Gamma_{13}$

VALUE	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
0.225 ± 0.013 OUR AVERAGE				
0.229 ± 0.008 ± 0.012	5.6k	LI	21F	BELL $e^+ e^-$ at $\Upsilon(nS)$
0.21 ± 0.02 ± 0.02	465 ± 37	LESIK	05	BELL $e^+ e^-$, $\Upsilon(4S)$

$\Gamma(\Lambda K^- \pi^+) / \Gamma_{\text{total}} \quad \Gamma_5 / \Gamma$

VALUE (%)	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
1.45 ± 0.33 OUR FIT	Error includes scale factor of 1.1.			
1.17 ± 0.37 ± 0.09	24 ± 6	LI	19A	BELL $e^+ e^-$ at $\Upsilon(4S)$

$\Gamma(\Lambda K^- \pi^+) / \Gamma(\Xi^- \pi^+) \quad \Gamma_5 / \Gamma_{13}$

VALUE	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
1.02 ± 0.15 OUR FIT	Error includes scale factor of 1.2.			
1.07 ± 0.12 ± 0.07	2979 ± 211	LESIK	05	BELL $e^+ e^-$, $\Upsilon(4S)$

$\Gamma(\Lambda\bar{K}^*(892)^0)/\Gamma(\Xi^-\pi^+)$					Γ_6/Γ_{13}
<u>VALUE</u>	<u>EVTS</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>	
0.18±0.02±0.01	4k	JIA	21	BELL	e^+e^- at $\Upsilon(nS)$
$\Gamma(\Lambda\bar{K}^0\pi^+\pi^-)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$					Γ_7/Γ
<u>VALUE</u>		<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>	
seen		FRABETTI	98B	E687	γ Be, $\bar{E}_\gamma = 220$ GeV
$\Gamma(\Lambda K^-\pi^+\pi^+\pi^-)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$					Γ_8/Γ
<u>VALUE</u>		<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>	
seen		FRABETTI	98B	E687	γ Be, $\bar{E}_\gamma = 220$ GeV
$\Gamma(\Sigma^0 K_S^0)/\Gamma(\Xi^-\pi^+)$					Γ_9/Γ_{13}
<u>VALUE (units 10^{-2})</u>	<u>EVTS</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>	
3.8±0.6±0.4	279	LI	21F	BELL	e^+e^- at $\Upsilon(nS)$
$\Gamma(\Sigma^+ K^-)/\Gamma(\Xi^-\pi^+)$					Γ_{10}/Γ_{13}
<u>VALUE (units 10^{-2})</u>	<u>EVTS</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>	
12.3±0.7±1.0	889	LI	21F	BELL	e^+e^- at $\Upsilon(nS)$
$\Gamma(\Sigma^0\bar{K}^*(892)^0)/\Gamma(\Xi^-\pi^+)$					Γ_{11}/Γ_{13}
<u>VALUE</u>	<u>EVTS</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>	
0.69±0.03±0.03	6.3k	JIA	21	BELL	e^+e^- at $\Upsilon(nS)$
$\Gamma(\Sigma^+ K^*(892)^-)/\Gamma(\Xi^-\pi^+)$					Γ_{12}/Γ_{13}
<u>VALUE</u>	<u>EVTS</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>	
0.34±0.06±0.02	373	JIA	21	BELL	e^+e^- at $\Upsilon(nS)$
$\Gamma(\Xi^-\pi^+)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$					Γ_{13}/Γ
<u>VALUE (%)</u>	<u>EVTS</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>	
1.43±0.32 OUR FIT	Error includes				scale factor of 1.1.
1.80±0.50±0.14	45 ± 7	LI	19A	BELL	e^+e^- at $\Upsilon(4S)$
$\Gamma(\Xi^-\pi^+)/\Gamma(\Xi^-\pi^+\pi^+\pi^-)$					Γ_{13}/Γ_{14}
<u>VALUE</u>		<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>	
0.30±0.12±0.05		ALBRECHT	90F	ARG	e^+e^- at $\Upsilon(4S)$
$\Gamma(\Omega^- K^+)/\Gamma(\Xi^-\pi^+)$					Γ_{18}/Γ_{13}
<u>VALUE</u>	<u>EVTS</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>	
0.294±0.018±0.016	650	AUBERT,B	05M	BABR	$e^+e^- \approx \Upsilon(4S)$
$\Gamma(\Xi^0\phi, \phi \rightarrow K^+K^-)/\Gamma(\Xi^-\pi^+)$					Γ_{16}/Γ_{13}
<u>VALUE</u>	<u>EVTS</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>	
0.036±0.004±0.002	311	¹ MCNEIL	21	BELL	e^+e^- at $\Upsilon(nS)$

¹ MCNEIL 21 assumes an azimuthally symmetric amplitude model to recover resonant and nonresonant contributions to $\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi_c^0 K^+ K^-$.

$$\Gamma(\Xi^0 K^+ K^- \text{ nonresonant})/\Gamma(\Xi^- \pi^+) \quad \Gamma_{17}/\Gamma_{13}$$

VALUE	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
$0.039 \pm 0.004 \pm 0.002$	311	¹ MCNEIL	21	BELL e^+e^- at $\Upsilon(nS)$

¹ MCNEIL 21 assumes an azimuthally symmetric amplitude model to recover resonant and nonresonant contributions to $\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^0 K^+ K^-$.

$$\Gamma(\Xi^- e^+ \nu_e)/\Gamma(\Xi^- \pi^+) \quad \Gamma_{19}/\Gamma_{13}$$

VALUE	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
$0.730 \pm 0.021 \pm 0.039$		¹ LI	21C	BELL e^+e^- at 10.52, 10.58 GeV

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

1.38 $\pm 0.14 \pm 0.22$ ACHARYA 21A ALCE pp at 13 TeV

3.1 $\pm 1.0 \begin{smallmatrix} +0.3 \\ -0.5 \end{smallmatrix}$ 54 ALEXANDER 95B CLE2 $e^+e^- \approx \Upsilon(4S)$

0.96 $\pm 0.43 \pm 0.18$ 18 ² ALBRECHT 93B ARG $e^+e^- \approx 10.4$ GeV

¹ LI 21C measures ratio $B(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^- e^+ \nu_e) / B(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^- \mu^+ \nu_\mu) = 1.03 \pm 0.05 \pm 0.07$.

² This ALBRECHT 93B value is the average of the $(\Xi^- e^+ \text{ anything})/\Xi^- \pi^+$ and $(\Xi^- \mu^+ \text{ anything})/\Xi^- \pi^+$ ratios. Here we average it with the $\Xi^- e^+ \nu_e/\Xi^- \pi^+$ ratio.

$$\Gamma(\Xi^- \mu^+ \nu_\mu)/\Gamma(\Xi^- \pi^+) \quad \Gamma_{20}/\Gamma_{13}$$

VALUE	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
$0.708 \pm 0.033 \pm 0.056$	¹ LI	21C	BELL e^+e^- at 10.52, 10.58 GeV

¹ LI 21C measures ratio $B(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^- e^+ \nu_e) / B(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^- \mu^+ \nu_\mu) = 1.03 \pm 0.05 \pm 0.07$.

$$\Gamma(\Xi^- e^+ \nu_e)/\Gamma(\Xi^- \mu^+ \nu_\mu) \quad \Gamma_{19}/\Gamma_{20}$$

VALUE	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
$1.03 \pm 0.05 \pm 0.07$	¹ LI	21C	BELL e^+e^- at 10.52, 10.58 GeV

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

¹ LI 21C value is not independent from other quoted measurements.

———— Cabibbo-suppressed decays ————

$$\Gamma(\Lambda_c^+ \pi^-)/\Gamma_{\text{total}} \quad \Gamma_{21}/\Gamma$$

VALUE (units 10^{-3})	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
$5.5 \pm 0.2 \pm 1.8$	6.3k	¹ AAIJ	20AH	LHCB pp at 13 TeV

¹ AAIJ 20AH extracts $B(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ \pi^-)$ using two different normalization modes: $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow pK^- \pi^+$ and $\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow pK^- \pi^+$. The mean value of both results, taking their correlations into account, is presented as the final result. The measurement assumes production fraction ratios $f_{\Xi_c^0}/f_{\Lambda_c^+} = (9.7 \pm 0.9 \pm 3.1) \times 10^{-2}$ (from AAIJ 19AB plus heavy quark symmetry arguments) as well as $f_{\Xi_c^0}/f_{\Xi_c^+} = 1.00 \pm 0.01$. It further uses the

inputs $B(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow pK^- \pi^+) = (6.23 \pm 0.33) \times 10^{-2}$ and $B(\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow pK^- \pi^+) = (4.5 \pm 2.1 \pm 0.7) \times 10^{-3}$ (from LI 19C). Its correlation with $B(\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow pK^- \pi^+)$, as measured in AAIJ 20AH, is 0.414.

$\Gamma(\Xi^- K^+)/\Gamma(\Xi^- \pi^+)$					Γ_{22}/Γ_{13}
<u>VALUE (units 10^{-2})</u>	<u>EVTS</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>	
2.75±0.51±0.25	314 ± 58	CHISTOV	13	BELL	$e^+ e^- \approx \Upsilon(4S)$

$\Gamma(\Lambda K^+ K^- (\text{no } \phi))/\Gamma(\Xi^- \pi^+)$					Γ_{23}/Γ_{13}
<u>VALUE (units 10^{-2})</u>	<u>EVTS</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>	
2.86±0.61±0.37	510 ± 110	CHISTOV	13	BELL	$e^+ e^- \approx \Upsilon(4S)$

$\Gamma(\Lambda \phi)/\Gamma(\Xi^- \pi^+)$					Γ_{24}/Γ_{13}
<u>VALUE (units 10^{-2})</u>	<u>EVTS</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>	
3.43±0.58±0.32	316 ± 54	CHISTOV	13	BELL	$e^+ e^- \approx \Upsilon(4S)$

Ξ_c^0 DECAY PARAMETERS

See the note on “Baryon Decay Parameters” in the neutron Listings.

α FOR $\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^- \pi^+$

<u>VALUE</u>	<u>EVTS</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>	
−0.64±0.05±0.01		LI	21C	BELL	$e^+ e^-$ at 10.52, 10.58 GeV
● ● ● We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. ● ● ●					
$-0.56 \pm 0.39^{+0.10}_{-0.09}$	138	CHAN	01	CLE2	$e^+ e^- \approx \Upsilon(4S)$

α FOR $\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^+ \pi^-$

<u>VALUE</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>	
0.61±0.05±0.01	LI	21C	BELL	$e^+ e^-$ at 10.52, 10.58 GeV

α FOR $\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Lambda \bar{K}^*(892)^0$

<u>VALUE</u>	<u>EVTS</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>	
0.15±0.22±0.04	4k	¹ JIA	21	BELL	$e^+ e^-$ at $\Upsilon(nS)$
¹ JIA 21 measures $\alpha(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Lambda \bar{K}^*(892)^0) \alpha(\Lambda \rightarrow p \pi^-) = 0.115 \pm 0.164 \pm 0.031$, and uses $\alpha(\Lambda \rightarrow p \pi^-) = 0.747 \pm 0.010$.					

α FOR $\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^+ K^*(892)^-$

<u>VALUE</u>	<u>EVTS</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>	
−0.52±0.30±0.02	373	¹ JIA	21	BELL	$e^+ e^-$ at $\Upsilon(nS)$
¹ JIA 21 measures $\alpha(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \bar{K}^*(892)^-) \alpha(\Sigma^+ \rightarrow p \pi^0) = 0.514 \pm 0.295 \pm 0.012$, and uses $\alpha(\Sigma^+ \rightarrow p \pi^0) = -0.980 \pm 0.017$.					

Ξ_c^0 REFERENCES

ACHARYA	21A	PRL 127 272001	S. Acharya <i>et al.</i>	(ALICE Collab.)
JIA	21	JHEP 2106 160	S. Jia <i>et al.</i>	(BELLE Collab.)
LI	21C	PRL 127 121803	Y.B. Li <i>et al.</i>	(BELLE Collab.)
LI	21F	PR D105 L011102	Y. Li <i>et al.</i>	(BELLE Collab.)
MCNEIL	21	PR D103 112002	J.T. McNeil <i>et al.</i>	(BELLE Collab.)
AAIJ	20AH	PR D102 071101	R. Aaij <i>et al.</i>	(LHCb Collab.)
AAIJ	19AB	PR D99 052006	R. Aaij <i>et al.</i>	(LHCb Collab.)
AAIJ	19AG	PR D100 032001	R. Aaij <i>et al.</i>	(LHCb Collab.)
LI	19A	PRL 122 082001	Y.B. Li <i>et al.</i>	(BELLE Collab.)

LI	19C	PR D100 031101	Y.B. Li <i>et al.</i>	(BELLE Collab.)
AALTONEN	14B	PR D89 072014	T. Aaltonen <i>et al.</i>	(CDF Collab.)
CHISTOV	13	PR D88 071103	R. Chistov <i>et al.</i>	(BELLE Collab.)
AUBERT,B	05M	PRL 95 142003	B. Aubert <i>et al.</i>	(BABAR Collab.)
LESIAK	05	PL B605 237	T. Lesiak <i>et al.</i>	(BELLE Collab.)
Also		PL B617 198 (erratum)	T. Lesiak <i>et al.</i>	(BELLE Collab.)
DANKO	04	PR D69 052004	I. Danko <i>et al.</i>	(CLEO Collab.)
LINK	02H	PL B541 211	J.M. Link <i>et al.</i>	(FNAL FOCUS Collab.)
CHAN	01	PR D63 111102	S. Chan <i>et al.</i>	(CLEO Collab.)
FRABETTI	98B	PL B426 403	P.L. Frabetti <i>et al.</i>	(FNAL E687 Collab.)
ALEXANDER	95B	PRL 74 3113	J. Alexander <i>et al.</i>	(CLEO Collab.)
Also		PRL 75 4155 (erratum)	J. Alexander <i>et al.</i>	(CLEO Collab.)
ALBRECHT	93B	PL B303 368	H. Albrecht <i>et al.</i>	(ARGUS Collab.)
FRABETTI	93C	PRL 70 2058	P.L. Frabetti <i>et al.</i>	(FNAL E687 Collab.)
HENDERSON	92B	PL B283 161	S. Henderson <i>et al.</i>	(CLEO Collab.)
ALBRECHT	90F	PL B247 121	H. Albrecht <i>et al.</i>	(ARGUS Collab.)
BARLAG	90	PL B236 495	S. Barlag <i>et al.</i>	(ACCMOR Collab.)
ALAM	89	PL B226 401	M.S. Alam <i>et al.</i>	(CLEO Collab.)
VERY	89	PRL 62 863	P. Avery <i>et al.</i>	(CLEO Collab.)
