



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

e MASS (atomic mass units u)

The primary determination of an electron's mass comes from measuring the ratio of the mass to that of a nucleus, so that the result is obtained in u (atomic mass units). The conversion factor to MeV is more uncertain than the mass of the electron in u; indeed, the recent improvements in the mass determination are not evident when the result is given in MeV. In this datablock we give the result in u, and in the following datablock in MeV.

<u>VALUE (10^{-6} u)</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
548.5799090441 ± 0.0000000097	MOHR	25	RVUE 2022 CODATA value
● ● ● We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. ● ● ●			
548.579909065 ± 0.000000016	TIESINGA	21	RVUE 2018 CODATA value
548.579909070 ± 0.000000016	MOHR	16	RVUE 2014 CODATA value
548.57990946 ± 0.000000022	MOHR	12	RVUE 2010 CODATA value
548.57990943 ± 0.000000023	MOHR	08	RVUE 2006 CODATA value
548.57990945 ± 0.000000024	MOHR	05	RVUE 2002 CODATA value
548.5799092 ± 0.00000004	¹ BEIER	02	CNTR Penning trap
548.5799110 ± 0.00000012	MOHR	99	RVUE 1998 CODATA value
548.5799111 ± 0.00000012	² FARNHAM	95	CNTR Penning trap
548.579903 ± 0.000013	COHEN	87	RVUE 1986 CODATA value

¹ BEIER 02 compares Larmor frequency of the electron bound in a $^{12}\text{C}^{5+}$ ion with the cyclotron frequency of a single trapped $^{12}\text{C}^{5+}$ ion.

² FARNHAM 95 compares cyclotron frequency of trapped electrons with that of a single trapped $^{12}\text{C}^{6+}$ ion.

e MASS

The mass is known more precisely in u (atomic mass units) than in MeV. The conversion is: $1 \text{ u} = 931.494\ 103\ 72(29) \text{ MeV}/c^2$ (2022 CODATA value, MOHR 25). The conversion error dominates the uncertainty of the masses given below.

<u>VALUE (MeV)</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
0.51099895069 ± 0.0000000016	MOHR	25	RVUE 2022 CODATA value
● ● ● We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. ● ● ●			
0.51099895000 ± 0.0000000015	TIESINGA	21	RVUE 2018 CODATA value
0.5109989461 ± 0.0000000031	MOHR	16	RVUE 2014 CODATA value
0.510998928 ± 0.000000011	MOHR	12	RVUE 2010 CODATA value
0.510998910 ± 0.000000013	MOHR	08	RVUE 2006 CODATA value
0.510998918 ± 0.000000044	MOHR	05	RVUE 2002 CODATA value
0.510998901 ± 0.000000020	^{1,2} BEIER	02	CNTR Penning trap
0.510998902 ± 0.000000021	MOHR	99	RVUE 1998 CODATA value
0.510998903 ± 0.000000020	^{1,3} FARNHAM	95	CNTR Penning trap
0.510998895 ± 0.000000024	¹ COHEN	87	RVUE 1986 CODATA value
0.5110034 ± 0.000014	COHEN	73	RVUE 1973 CODATA value

- ¹ Converted to MeV using the 1998 CODATA value of the conversion constant, 931.494013 ± 0.000037 MeV/u.
² BEIER 02 compares Larmor frequency of the electron bound in a $^{12}\text{C}^{5+}$ ion with the cyclotron frequency of a single trapped $^{12}\text{C}^{5+}$ ion.
³ FARNHAM 95 compares cyclotron frequency of trapped electrons with that of a single trapped $^{12}\text{C}^{6+}$ ion.

$$(m_{e^+} - m_{e^-}) / m_{\text{average}}$$

A test of *CPT* invariance.

VALUE	CL%	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
$< 8 \times 10^{-9}$	90	¹ FEE	93	CNTR Positronium spectroscopy
● ● ● We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. ● ● ●				
$< 4 \times 10^{-23}$	90	² DOLGOV	14	From photon mass limit
$< 4 \times 10^{-8}$	90	CHU	84	CNTR Positronium spectroscopy
¹ FEE 93 value is obtained under the assumption that the positronium Rydberg constant is exactly half the hydrogen one.				
² DOLGOV 14 result is obtained under the assumption that any mass difference between electron and positron would lead to a non-zero photon mass. The PDG 12 limit of 1×10^{-18} eV on the photon mass is in turn used to derive the value quoted here.				

$$|q_{e^+} + q_{e^-}|/e$$

A test of *CPT* invariance. See also similar tests involving the proton.

VALUE	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
$< 4 \times 10^{-8}$	¹ HUGHES	92	RVUE
● ● ● We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. ● ● ●			
$< 2 \times 10^{-18}$	² SCHAEFER	95	THEO Vacuum polarization
$< 1 \times 10^{-18}$	³ MUELLER	92	THEO Vacuum polarization
¹ HUGHES 92 uses recent measurements of Rydberg-energy and cyclotron-frequency ratios.			
² SCHAEFER 95 removes model dependency of MUELLER 92.			
³ MUELLER 92 argues that an inequality of the charge magnitudes would, through higher-order vacuum polarization, contribute to the net charge of atoms.			

e MAGNETIC MOMENT ANOMALY

$$\mu_e/\mu_B - 1 = (g-2)/2$$

VALUE (units 10^{-6})	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	CHG	COMMENT
1159.65218062 ± 0.00000012	OUR AVERAGE			
1159.65218059 ± 0.00000013	¹ FAN	23	MRS	Single electron
1159.65218073 ± 0.00000028	HANNEKE	08	MRS	Single electron
1159.6521884 ± 0.0000043	VANDYCK	87	MRS	— Single electron
● ● ● We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. ● ● ●				
1159.65218046 ± 0.00000018	MOHR	25	RVUE	2022 CODATA value
1159.65218128 ± 0.00000018	TIESINGA	21	RVUE	2018 CODATA value
1159.65218091 ± 0.00000026	MOHR	16	RVUE	2014 CODATA value
1159.65218076 ± 0.00000027	MOHR	12	RVUE	2010 CODATA value

1159.65218111 ± 0.00000074	² MOHR	08	RVUE	2006 CODATA value
1159.65218085 ± 0.00000076	³ ODOM	06	MRS –	Single electron
1159.6521859 ± 0.0000038	MOHR	05	RVUE	2002 CODATA value
1159.6521869 ± 0.0000041	MOHR	99	RVUE	1998 CODATA value
1159.652193 ± 0.000010	COHEN	87	RVUE	1986 CODATA value
1159.6521879 ± 0.0000043	⁴ VANDYCK	87	MRS +	Single positron

¹FAN 23 report the most accurate measurement of the electron magnetic moment. A one-electron quantum cyclotron is used. We do not propagate at the moment this measurement to the fine structure and other physical constants. When discrepancies in the independent determinations of alpha are resolved, the new measurement uncertainty of 0.13 ppt is available for precise tests for BSM physics.

²MOHR 08 average is dominated by ODOM 06.

³Superseded by HANNEKE 08 per private communication with Gerald Gabrielse.

⁴This VANDYCK 87 result is for a positron. We do not take it into account for the average to avoid the assumption of CPT invariance.

$(g_{e^+} - g_{e^-}) / g_{\text{average}}$

A test of *CPT* invariance.

<u>VALUE (units 10⁻¹²)</u>	<u>CL%</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
= 0.5 ± 2.1		¹ VANDYCK 87	MRS	Penning trap
● ● ● We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. ● ● ●				
< 12	95	² VASSERMAN 87	CNTR	Assumes $m_{e^+} = m_{e^-}$
22 ± 64		SCHWINBERG 81	MRS	Penning trap

¹VANDYCK 87 measured $(g_-/g_+) - 1$ and we converted it.

²VASSERMAN 87 measured $(g_+ - g_-)/(g - 2)$. We multiplied by $(g - 2)/g = 1.2 \times 10^{-3}$.

e ELECTRIC DIPOLE MOMENT (d)

A nonzero value is forbidden by both *T* invariance and *P* invariance.

<u>VALUE (10⁻²⁸ ecm)</u>	<u>CL%</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
< 0.041	90	¹ ROUSSY 23	ESR	electrons in intramolecular electric field
● ● ● We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. ● ● ●				
< 0.11	90	² ANDREEV 18	CNTR	ThO molecules
< 1.3	90	³ CAIRNCROSS 17	ESR	¹⁸⁰ Hf ¹⁹ F molecules
– 5570 ± 7980 ± 120		KIM 15	CNTR	Gd ₃ Ga ₅ O ₁₂ molecules
< 0.87	90	⁴ BARON 14	CNTR	ThO molecules
< 6050	90	⁵ ECKEL 12	CNTR	Eu _{0.5} Ba _{0.5} TiO ₃ molecules
< 10.5	90	⁶ HUDSON 11	NMR	YbF molecules
6.9 ± 7.4		REGAN 02	MRS	²⁰⁵ Tl beams
18 ± 12 ± 10		⁷ COMMINS 94	MRS	²⁰⁵ Tl beams
– 27 ± 83		⁷ ABDULLAH 90	MRS	²⁰⁵ Tl beams
– 1400 ± 2400		CHO 89	NMR	TlF molecules

– 150	± 550	± 150	MURTHY	89		Cs, no B field
– 5000	± 11000		LAMOREAUX	87	NMR	^{199}Hg
19000	± 34000	90	SANDARS	75	MRS	Thallium
7000	± 22000	90	PLAYER	70	MRS	Xenon
< 30000		90	WEISSKOPF	68	MRS	Cesium

¹ ROUSSY 23 gives a measurement corresponding to this limit as $(-1.3 \pm 2.0 \pm 0.6) \times 10^{-30}$ ecm.

² ANDREEV 18 gives a measurement corresponding to this limit as $(4.3 \pm 3.1 \pm 2.6) \times 10^{-30}$ ecm.

³ CAIRCROSS 17 gives a measurement corresponding to this limit as $(0.09 \pm 0.77 \pm 0.17) \times 10^{-28}$ ecm.

⁴ BARON 14 gives a measurement corresponding to this limit as $(-0.21 \pm 0.37 \pm 0.25) \times 10^{-28}$ ecm.

⁵ ECKEL 12 gives a measurement corresponding to this limit as $(-1.07 \pm 3.06 \pm 1.74) \times 10^{-25}$ ecm.

⁶ HUDSON 11 gives a measurement corresponding to this limit as $(-2.4 \pm 5.7 \pm 1.5) \times 10^{-28}$ ecm.

⁷ ABDULLAH 90, COMMINS 94, and REGAN 02 use the relativistic enhancement of a valence electron's electric dipole moment in a high- Z atom.

e^- MEAN LIFE / BRANCHING FRACTION

A test of charge conservation. See the “Note on Testing Charge Conservation and the Pauli Exclusion Principle” following this section in our 1992 edition (Physical Review **D45** S1 (1992), p. VI.10).

Most of these experiments are one of three kinds: Attempts to observe (a) the 255.5 keV gamma ray produced in $e^- \rightarrow \nu_e \gamma$, (b) the (K) shell x ray produced when an electron decays without additional energy deposit, e.g., $e^- \rightarrow \nu_e \bar{\nu}_e \nu_e$ (“disappearance” experiments), and (c) nuclear de-excitation gamma rays after the electron disappears from an atomic shell and the nucleus is left in an excited state. The last can include both weak boson and photon mediating processes. We use the best $e^- \rightarrow \nu_e \gamma$ limit for the Summary Tables.

Note that we use the mean life rather than the half life, which is often reported.

$e^- \rightarrow \nu_e \gamma$ and astrophysical limits

VALUE (yr)	CL%	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
>6.6 × 10²⁸	90	AGOSTINI	15B BORX	$e^- \rightarrow \nu \gamma$
● ● ● We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. ● ● ●				
>5.4 × 10 ²⁵	90	¹ AGOSTINI	24A HPGE	$e^- \rightarrow \nu \gamma$, ^{76}Ge detector
>1.22 × 10 ²⁶	68	² KLAPDOR-K...	07 CNTR	$e^- \rightarrow \nu \gamma$
>4.6 × 10 ²⁶	90	BACK	02 BORX	$e^- \rightarrow \nu \gamma$
>3.4 × 10 ²⁶	68	BELLI	00B DAMA	$e^- \rightarrow \nu \gamma$, liquid Xe
>3.7 × 10 ²⁵	68	AHARONOV	95B CNTR	$e^- \rightarrow \nu \gamma$
>2.35 × 10 ²⁵	68	BALYSH	93 CNTR	$e^- \rightarrow \nu \gamma$, ^{76}Ge detector
>1.5 × 10 ²⁵	68	AVIGNONE	86 CNTR	$e^- \rightarrow \nu \gamma$
>1 × 10 ³⁹		³ ORITO	85 ASTR	Astrophysical argument
>3 × 10 ²³	68	BELLOTTI	83B CNTR	$e^- \rightarrow \nu \gamma$

- ¹ AGOSTINI 24A search for coincident photons from the direct e -decay and from residual X-ray or Auger- e transitions.
² The authors of A. Derbin *et al.*, arXiv:0704.2047v1 argue that this limit is overestimated by at least a factor of 5.
³ ORITO 85 assumes that electromagnetic forces extend out to large enough distances and that the age of our galaxy is 10^{10} years.

Disappearance and nuclear-de-excitation experiments

VALUE (yr)	CL%	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
$>3.2 \times 10^{25}$	90	¹ ARNQUIST	24B	HPGE Ge K-shell disappearance
● ● ● We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. ● ● ●				
$>1.2 \times 10^{24}$	90	ABGRALL	17	HPGE Ge K-shell disappearance
$>4.2 \times 10^{24}$	68	BELLI	99	DAMA Iodine L-shell disappearance
$>6.4 \times 10^{24}$	68	² BELLI	99B	DAMA De-excitation of ^{129}Xe
$>2.4 \times 10^{23}$	90	³ BELLI	99D	DAMA De-excitation of ^{127}I (in NaI)
$>4.3 \times 10^{23}$	68	AHARONOV	95B	CNTR Ge K-shell disappearance
$>2.7 \times 10^{23}$	68	REUSSER	91	CNTR Ge K-shell disappearance
$>2 \times 10^{22}$	68	BELLOTTI	83B	CNTR Ge K-shell disappearance

¹ ARNQUIST 24B limit on charge nonconserving e^- capture in 37.5 kg high-purity Ge implies limit on $e \rightarrow \nu\bar{\nu}$ or more generally $e \rightarrow$ invisible.

² BELLI 99B limit on charge nonconserving e^- capture involving excitation of the 236.1 keV nuclear state of ^{129}Xe . The 90% CL limit is $>3.7 \times 10^{24}$ yr. Less stringent limits for other states are also given.

³ BELLI 99D limit on charge nonconserving e^- capture involving excitation of the 57.6 keV nuclear state of ^{127}I . Less stringent limits for the other states and for the state of ^{23}Na are also given.

LIMITS ON LEPTON-FLAVOR VIOLATION IN PRODUCTION

Forbidden by lepton family number conservation.

This section was added for the 2008 edition of this *Review* and is not complete. For a list of further measurements see references in the papers listed below.

$$\sigma(e^+e^- \rightarrow e^\pm\tau^\mp) / \sigma(e^+e^- \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-)$$

VALUE	CL%	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
$<8.9 \times 10^{-6}$	95	AUBERT	07P	BABR e^+e^- at $E_{\text{cm}} = 10.58$ GeV
● ● ● We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. ● ● ●				
$<1.8 \times 10^{-3}$	95	GOMEZ-CAD...	91	MRK2 e^+e^- at $E_{\text{cm}} = 29$ GeV

$$\sigma(e^+e^- \rightarrow \mu^\pm\tau^\mp) / \sigma(e^+e^- \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-)$$

VALUE	CL%	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
$<4.0 \times 10^{-6}$	95	AUBERT	07P	BABR e^+e^- at $E_{\text{cm}} = 10.58$ GeV
● ● ● We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. ● ● ●				
$<6.1 \times 10^{-3}$	95	GOMEZ-CAD...	91	MRK2 e^+e^- at $E_{\text{cm}} = 29$ GeV

e REFERENCES

- | | | | | |
|--------------|-----|----------------|--|--------------------------|
| MOHR | 25 | RMP 97 025002 | P.J. Mohr <i>et al.</i> | (NIST) |
| AGOSTINI | 24A | EPJ C84 940 | M. Agostini <i>et al.</i> | (GERDA Collab.) |
| ARNQUIST | 24B | NATP 20 1078 | I.J. Arnquist <i>et al.</i> | (MAJORANA Collab.) |
| FAN | 23 | PRL 118 071801 | X. Fan <i>et al.</i> | (HARV, NWES) |
| ROUSSY | 23 | SCI 381 46 | T.S. Roussy <i>et al.</i> | (COLO) |
| TIESINGA | 21 | RMP 93 025010 | E. Tiesinga <i>et al.</i> | (NIST) |
| ANDREEV | 18 | NAT 562 355 | V. Andreev <i>et al.</i> | (ACME Collab.) |
| ABGRALL | 17 | PRL 118 161801 | N. Abgrall <i>et al.</i> | (MAJORANA Collab.) |
| CAIRCROSS | 17 | PRL 119 153001 | W.B. Cairncross <i>et al.</i> | (NIST, COLO) |
| MOHR | 16 | RMP 88 035009 | P.J. Mohr, D.B. Newell, B.N. Taylor | (NIST) |
| AGOSTINI | 15B | PRL 115 231802 | M. Agostini <i>et al.</i> | (Borexino Collab.) |
| KIM | 15 | PR D91 102004 | Y.J. Kim <i>et al.</i> | (IND, YALE, LANL) |
| BARON | 14 | SCI 343 269 | J. Baron <i>et al.</i> | (ACME Collab.) |
| DOLGOV | 14 | PL B732 244 | A.D. Dolgov, V.A. Novikov | |
| ECKEL | 12 | PRL 109 193003 | S. Eckel, A.O. Sushkov, S.K. Lamoreaux | (YALE) |
| MOHR | 12 | RMP 84 1527 | P.J. Mohr, B.N. Taylor, D.B. Newell | (NIST) |
| PDG | 12 | PR D86 010001 | J. Beringer <i>et al.</i> | (PDG Collab.) |
| HUDSON | 11 | NAT 473 493 | J.J. Hadson <i>et al.</i> | (LOIC) |
| HANNEKE | 08 | PRL 100 120801 | D. Hanneke, S. Fogwell, G. Gabrielse | (HARV) |
| MOHR | 08 | RMP 80 633 | P.J. Mohr, B.N. Taylor, D.B. Newell | (NIST) |
| AUBERT | 07P | PR D75 031103 | B. Aubert <i>et al.</i> | (BABAR Collab.) |
| KLAPDOR-K... | 07 | PL B644 109 | H.V. Klapdor-Kleingrothaus, I.V. Krivosheina, I.V. Titkova | |
| ODOM | 06 | PRL 97 030801 | B. Odom <i>et al.</i> | (HARV) |
| MOHR | 05 | RMP 77 1 | P.J. Mohr, B.N. Taylor | (NIST) |
| BACK | 02 | PL B525 29 | H.O. Back <i>et al.</i> | (Borexino/SASSO Collab.) |
| BEIER | 02 | PRL 88 011603 | T. Beier <i>et al.</i> | |
| REGAN | 02 | PRL 88 071805 | B.C. Regan <i>et al.</i> | |
| BELLI | 00B | PR D61 117301 | P. Belli <i>et al.</i> | (DAMA Collab.) |
| BELLI | 99 | PL B460 236 | P. Belli <i>et al.</i> | (DAMA Collab.) |
| BELLI | 99B | PL B465 315 | P. Belli <i>et al.</i> | (DAMA Collab.) |
| BELLI | 99D | PR C60 065501 | P. Belli <i>et al.</i> | (DAMA Collab.) |
| MOHR | 99 | JPCRD 28 1713 | P.J. Mohr, B.N. Taylor | (NIST) |
| Also | | RMP 72 351 | P.J. Mohr, B.N. Taylor | (NIST) |
| AHARONOV | 95B | PR D52 3785 | Y. Aharonov <i>et al.</i> | (SCUC, PNL, ZARA+) |
| Also | | PL B353 168 | Y. Aharonov <i>et al.</i> | (SCUC, PNL, ZARA+) |
| FARNHAM | 95 | PRL 75 3598 | D.L. Farnham, R.S. van Dyck, P.B. Schwinberg | (WASH) |
| SCHAEFER | 95 | PR A51 838 | A. Schaefer, J. Reinhardt | (FRAN) |
| COMMINS | 94 | PR A50 2960 | E.D. Commins <i>et al.</i> | |
| BALYSH | 93 | PL B298 278 | A. Balysh <i>et al.</i> | (KIAE, MPIK, SASSO) |
| FEE | 93 | PR A48 192 | M.S. Fee <i>et al.</i> | |
| HUGHES | 92 | PRL 69 578 | R.J. Hughes, B.I. Deutch | (LANL, AARH) |
| MUELLER | 92 | PRL 69 3432 | B. Muller, M.H. Thoma | (DUKE) |
| PDG | 92 | PR D45 51 | K. Hikasa <i>et al.</i> | (KEK, LBL, BOST+) |
| GOMEZ-CAD... | 91 | PRL 66 1007 | J.J. Gomez-Cadenas <i>et al.</i> | (SLAC MARK-2 Collab.) |
| REUSSER | 91 | PL B255 143 | D. Reusser <i>et al.</i> | (NEUC, CIT, PSI) |
| ABDULLAH | 90 | PRL 65 2347 | K. Abdullah <i>et al.</i> | (LBL, UCB) |
| CHO | 89 | PRL 63 2559 | D. Cho, K. Sangster, E.A. Hinds | (YALE) |
| MURTHY | 89 | PRL 63 965 | S.A. Murthy <i>et al.</i> | (AMHT) |
| COHEN | 87 | RMP 59 1121 | E.R. Cohen, B.N. Taylor | (RISC, NBS) |
| LAMOREAUX | 87 | PRL 59 2275 | S.K. Lamoreaux <i>et al.</i> | (WASH) |
| VANDYCK | 87 | PRL 59 26 | R.S. van Dyck, P.B. Schwinberg, H.G. Dehmelt | (WASH) |
| VASSERMAN | 87 | PL B198 302 | I.B. Vasserman <i>et al.</i> | (NOVO) |
| Also | | PL B187 172 | I.B. Vasserman <i>et al.</i> | (NOVO) |
| AVIGNONE | 86 | PR D34 97 | F.T. Avignone <i>et al.</i> | (PNL, SCUC) |
| ORITO | 85 | PRL 54 2457 | S. Orito, M. Yoshimura | (TOKY, KEK) |
| CHU | 84 | PRL 52 1689 | S. Chu, A.P. Mills, J.L. Hall | (BELL, NBS, COLO) |
| BELLOTTI | 83B | PL 124B 435 | E. Bellotti <i>et al.</i> | (MILA) |
| SCHWINBERG | 81 | PRL 47 1679 | P.B. Schwinberg, R.S. van Dyck, H.G. Dehmelt | (WASH) |
| SANDARS | 75 | PR A11 473 | P.G.H. Sandars, D.M. Sternheimer | (OXF, BNL) |
| COHEN | 73 | JPCRD 2 664 | E.R. Cohen, B.N. Taylor | (RISC, NBS) |
| PLAYER | 70 | JP B3 1620 | M.A. Player, P.G.H. Sandars | (OXF) |
| WEISSKOPF | 68 | PRL 21 1645 | M.C. Weisskopf <i>et al.</i> | (BRAN) |