



$I(J^P) = \frac{1}{2}(\frac{1}{2}^+)$ 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	8.6k	¹ LESIAK	05	BELL	e^+e^- , $\gamma(4S)$
2470.0 ± 2.8 ± 2.6	85	FABETTI	98B	E687	γ Be, $\overline{E}_\gamma = 220$ GeV
2469 ± 2 ± 3	9	HENDERSON	92B	CLEO	Ω^-K^+
2472.1 ± 2.7 ± 1.6	54	ALBRECHT	90F	ARG	e^+e^- at $\gamma(4S)$
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 FABETTI	93C	E687	See FABETTI 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 FABETTI 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		LESIAK	05	BELL	e^+e^- , $\gamma(4S)$
7.0 ± 4.5 ± 2.2		ALBRECHT	90F	ARG	e^+e^- at $\gamma(4S)$
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
150.4 ± 2.8 OUR AVERAGE		Error includes scale factor of 1.4.		

148.0 ± 2.3 ± 2.2	1 AAIJ	22Y LHCb	$p p \rightarrow \Xi_c^0 + X$, $\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow p K^- K^- \pi^+$	
153.4 ± 2.4 ± 0.7	22k ^{2,3} AAIJ	19AG LHCb	$\Xi_b^- \rightarrow \Xi_c^0 \mu^- \bar{\nu}_\mu + X$, $\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow p K^- K^- \pi^+$	

118	± 14	± 5	110	LINK	02H	FOCS	γ nucleus, ≈ 180 GeV
101	± 25	± 5	42	FRABETTI	93C	E687	γ Be, $\bar{E}_\gamma = 220$ GeV
82	± 59	± 30	4	BARLAG	90	ACCM	$\pi^- (K^-)$ Cu 230 GeV

¹ Measured in Ξ_c^0 produced promptly in $p\bar{p}$ collisions, using $D^0 \rightarrow K^+ K^- \pi^+ \pi^-$ as normalisation mode. AAIJ 22Y reports this lifetime value as $(148.0 \pm 2.3 \pm 2.2 \pm 0.2) \times 10^{-15}$ s where the last uncertainty is due to the uncertainty on the D^0 lifetime value from PDG 20 average, $\tau_{D^0} = (410.1 \pm 1.5)$ fs.

² 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.

³ Measured in Ξ_c^0 produced in semileptonic Ξ_b^- decays.

Ξ_c^0 DECAY MODES

Mode	Fraction (Γ_i/Γ)	Confidence level
Cabibbo-favored decays		
$\Gamma_1 p K^- K^- \pi^+$	$(4.9 \pm 1.0) \times 10^{-3}$	
$\Gamma_2 p K^- \bar{K}^*(892)^0, \bar{K}^{*0} \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$	$(2.0 \pm 0.6) \times 10^{-3}$	
$\Gamma_3 p K^- K^- \pi^+ (\text{no } \bar{K}^{*0})$	$(3.0 \pm 0.8) \times 10^{-3}$	
$\Gamma_4 \Lambda K_S^0$	$(3.2 \pm 0.6) \times 10^{-3}$	
$\Gamma_5 \Lambda K^- \pi^+$	$(1.45 \pm 0.28) \%$	
$\Gamma_6 \Lambda \bar{K}^*(892)^0$	$(2.6 \pm 0.6) \times 10^{-3}$	
$\Gamma_7 \Lambda \bar{K}^0 \pi^+ \pi^-$	seen	
$\Gamma_8 \Lambda K^- \pi^+ \pi^+ \pi^-$	seen	
$\Gamma_9 \Sigma^0 K_S^0$	$(5.4 \pm 1.4) \times 10^{-4}$	
$\Gamma_{10} \Sigma^+ K^-$	$(1.8 \pm 0.4) \times 10^{-3}$	
$\Gamma_{11} \Sigma^0 \bar{K}^*(892)^0$	$(9.9 \pm 1.9) \times 10^{-3}$	
$\Gamma_{12} \Sigma^+ K^*(892)^-$	$(4.9 \pm 1.3) \times 10^{-3}$	
$\Gamma_{13} \Xi^- \pi^+$	$(1.43 \pm 0.27) \%$	
$\Gamma_{14} \Xi^- \pi^+ \pi^+ \pi^-$	$(4.8 \pm 2.3) \%$	
$\Gamma_{15} \Xi^0 K^+ K^-$		
$\Gamma_{16} \Xi^0 \phi, \phi \rightarrow K^+ K^-$	$(5.2 \pm 1.2) \times 10^{-4}$	
$\Gamma_{17} \Xi^0 K^+ K^- \text{ nonresonant}$	$(5.6 \pm 1.2) \times 10^{-4}$	
$\Gamma_{18} \Omega^- K^+$	$(4.2 \pm 0.9) \times 10^{-3}$	
$\Gamma_{19} \Xi^- e^+ \nu_e$	$(1.05 \pm 0.20) \%$	
$\Gamma_{20} \Xi^- \mu^+ \nu_\mu$	$(1.01 \pm 0.21) \%$	
$\Gamma_{21} \Xi^0 \gamma$	$< 1.7 \times 10^{-4}$	90%
Cabibbo-suppressed decays		
$\Gamma_{22} \Lambda_c^+ \pi^-$	$(5.5 \pm 1.1) \times 10^{-3}$	
$\Gamma_{23} \Xi^- K^+$	$(3.9 \pm 1.1) \times 10^{-4}$	
$\Gamma_{24} \Lambda K^+ K^- (\text{no } \phi)$	$(4.1 \pm 1.3) \times 10^{-4}$	

$$\Gamma_{25} \quad \Lambda\phi \quad (4.9 \pm 1.3) \times 10^{-4}$$

FIT INFORMATION

An overall fit to 7 branching ratios uses 8 measurements to determine 4 parameters. The overall fit has a $\chi^2 = 1.4$ for 4 degrees of freedom.

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

x_5	64			
x_{13}	86	74		
x_{22}	64	55	75	
	x_1	x_5	x_{13}	

Ξ_c^0 BRANCHING RATIOS

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

$\Gamma(pK^- K^- \pi^+)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$		Γ_1/Γ		
VALUE (%)	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
0.49 ± 0.10 OUR FIT				
$0.58 \pm 0.23 \pm 0.05$	17 ± 5	LI	19A	BELL $e^+ e^-$ at $\gamma(4S)$
$\Gamma(pK^- K^- \pi^+)/\Gamma(\Xi^- \pi^+)$			Γ_1/Γ_{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	LESIAK	05	BELL $e^+ e^-$, $\gamma(4S)$
0.35 ± 0.06 ± 0.03	148 ± 18	DANKO	04	CLEO $e^+ e^-$
$\Gamma(pK^- \bar{K}^*(892)^0, \bar{K}^{*0} \rightarrow K^- \pi^+)/\Gamma(\Xi^- \pi^+)$			Γ_2/Γ_{13}	
VALUE	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
$0.14 \pm 0.03 \pm 0.01$		DANKO	04	CLEO $e^+ e^-$
$\Gamma(pK^- K^- \pi^+ (\text{no } \bar{K}^{*0})) / \Gamma(\Xi^- \pi^+)$			Γ_3/Γ_{13}	
VALUE	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
$0.21 \pm 0.04 \pm 0.02$		DANKO	04	CLEO $e^+ e^-$
$\Gamma(\Lambda K_S^0)/\Gamma(\Xi^- \pi^+)$			Γ_4/Γ_{13}	
VALUE	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
0.225 ± 0.013 OUR AVERAGE				
0.229 $\pm 0.008 \pm 0.012$	5.6k	LI	21F	BELL $e^+ e^-$ at $\gamma(nS)$
0.21 $\pm 0.02 \pm 0.02$	465 ± 37	LESIAK	05	BELL $e^+ e^-$, $\gamma(4S)$
$\Gamma(\Lambda K^- \pi^+)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$			Γ_5/Γ	
VALUE (%)	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
1.45 ± 0.28 OUR FIT				
$1.17 \pm 0.37 \pm 0.09$	24 ± 6	LI	19A	BELL $e^+ e^-$ at $\gamma(4S)$

$\Gamma(\Lambda K^- \pi^+)/\Gamma(\Xi^- \pi^+)$

<u>VALUE</u>	<u>EVTS</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
1.02±0.14 OUR FIT		Error includes scale factor of 1.1.		
1.07±0.12±0.07	2979 ± 211	LESIAK	05	BELL $e^+ e^-$, $\gamma(4S)$

 $\Gamma(\Lambda \bar{K}^*(892)^0)/\Gamma(\Xi^- \pi^+)$

<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 $\gamma(nS)$

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

<u>VALUE</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
seen	FRABETTI	98B	γ Be, $\bar{E}_\gamma = 220$ GeV

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

<u>VALUE</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
seen	FRABETTI	98B	γ Be, $\bar{E}_\gamma = 220$ GeV

 $\Gamma(\Sigma^0 K_S^0)/\Gamma(\Xi^- \pi^+)$

<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 $\gamma(nS)$

 $\Gamma(\Sigma^+ K^-)/\Gamma(\Xi^- \pi^+)$

<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 $\gamma(nS)$

 $\Gamma(\Sigma^0 \bar{K}^*(892)^0)/\Gamma(\Xi^- \pi^+)$

<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 $\gamma(nS)$

 $\Gamma(\Sigma^+ K^*(892)^-)/\Gamma(\Xi^- \pi^+)$

<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 $\gamma(nS)$

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

<u>VALUE (%)</u>	<u>EVTS</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
1.43±0.27 OUR FIT				
1.80±0.50±0.14	45 ± 7	LI	19A	BELL $e^+ e^-$ at $\gamma(4S)$

 $\Gamma(\Xi^- \pi^+)/\Gamma(\Xi^- \pi^+ \pi^+ \pi^-)$

<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 $\gamma(4S)$

 $\Gamma(\Omega^- K^+)/\Gamma(\Xi^- \pi^+)$

<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	$e^+ e^- \approx \gamma(4S)$

 $\Gamma(\Xi^0 \phi, \phi \rightarrow K^+ K^-)/\Gamma(\Xi^- \pi^+)$

<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 $\gamma(nS)$

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

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

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

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

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

VALUE	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
0.730±0.021±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 ± 0.14 ± 0.22 ACHARYA 21A ALCE $p p$ at 13 TeV

3.1 ± 1.0 ± 0.3 54 ALEXANDER 95B CLE2 $e^+ e^- \approx \gamma(4S)$

0.96 ± 0.43 ± 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.

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

VALUE	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
-------	-------------	------	---------

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

1.03 $\pm 0.05 \pm 0.07$ ¹ LI 21c $e^+ e^-$ at 10.52, 10.58 GeV

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

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

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

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

$\Gamma(\Xi^0 \gamma)/\Gamma(\Xi^- \pi^+)$ Γ_{21}/Γ_{13}

VALUE	CL%	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
$<1.2 \times 10^{-2}$	90	LI	23	BELL $e^+ e^- \rightarrow \gamma(nS)$

Cabibbo-suppressed decays

$\Gamma(\Lambda_c^+ \pi^-)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$ Γ_{22}/Γ

VALUE (units 10^{-3})	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
5.5±1.1 OUR FIT				

5.5±0.2±1.8 6.3k ¹ AAIJ 20AH LHCb $p p$ at 13 TeV

¹ AAIJ 20AH extracts $B(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ \pi^-)$ using two different normalization modes: $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p K^- \pi^+$ and $\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow p K^- \pi^+$. 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 $B(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p K^- \pi^+) = (6.23 \pm 0.33) \times 10^{-2}$ and $B(\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow p K^- \pi^+) = (4.5 \pm 2.1 \pm 0.7) \times 10^{-3}$ (from LI 19C). Its correlation with $B(\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow p K^- \pi^+)$, as measured in AAIJ 20AH, is 0.414.

$\Gamma(\Lambda_c^+ \pi^-)/\Gamma(\Xi^- \pi^+)$					Γ_{22}/Γ_{13}
VALUE	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT	
0.38±0.05 OUR FIT					
0.38±0.04±0.04	1468	¹ TANG	23	BELL $e^+ e^- \rightarrow \gamma(nS)$	
1 TANG 23 reports fitted masses $m_{\Lambda_c^+} = 2286.55 \pm 0.03$ MeV and $m_{\Xi_c^0} = 2470.43 \pm 0.06$ MeV.					
$\Gamma(\Xi^- K^+)/\Gamma(\Xi^- \pi^+)$					Γ_{23}/Γ_{13}
VALUE (units 10^{-2})	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT	
2.75±0.51±0.25	314 ± 58	CHISTOV	13	BELL $e^+ e^- \approx \gamma(4S)$	
$\Gamma(\Lambda K^+ K^- (\text{no } \phi))/\Gamma(\Xi^- \pi^+)$					Γ_{24}/Γ_{13}
VALUE (units 10^{-2})	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT	
2.86±0.61±0.37	510 ± 110	CHISTOV	13	BELL $e^+ e^- \approx \gamma(4S)$	
$\Gamma(\Lambda \phi)/\Gamma(\Xi^- \pi^+)$					Γ_{25}/Γ_{13}
VALUE (units 10^{-2})	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT	
3.43±0.58±0.32	316 ± 54	CHISTOV	13	BELL $e^+ e^- \approx \gamma(4S)$	

Ξ_c^0 DECAY PARAMETERS

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

α FOR $\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^- \pi^+$					
VALUE	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT	
-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. • • •					
$-0.56 \pm 0.39 \begin{matrix} +0.10 \\ -0.09 \end{matrix}$	138	CHAN	01	CLE2 $e^+ e^- \approx \gamma(4S)$	
α FOR $\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^+ \pi^-$					
VALUE	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT	
0.61±0.05±0.01		LI	21C	BELL $e^+ e^-$ at 10.52, 10.58 GeV	
α FOR $\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Lambda \bar{K}^*(892)^0$					
VALUE	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT	
0.15±0.22±0.04	4k	¹ JIA	21	BELL $e^+ e^-$ at $\gamma(nS)$	
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 $\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^+ K^*(892)^-$

VALUE	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
$-0.52 \pm 0.30 \pm 0.02$	373	¹ JIA	21	BELL e ⁺ e ⁻ at $\gamma(nS)$
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

LI	23	PR D107 032001	Y. Li <i>et al.</i>	(BELLE Collab.)
TANG	23	PR D107 032005	S.S. Tang <i>et al.</i>	(BELLE Collab.)
AAIJ	22Y	SCIB 67 479	R. Aaij <i>et al.</i>	(LHCb Collab.)
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.)
PDG	20	PTEP 2020 083C01	P.A. Zyla <i>et al.</i>	(PDG 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 (errat.)	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.)
FRAEBETTI	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 (errat.)	J. Alexander <i>et al.</i>	(CLEO Collab.)
ALBRECHT	93B	PL B303 368	H. Albrecht <i>et al.</i>	(ARGUS Collab.)
FRAEBETTI	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.)
AVERY	89	PRL 62 863	P. Avery <i>et al.</i>	(CLEO Collab.)