Λ AND Σ RESONANCES

Introduction : There are no new results at all on Λ and Σ resonances. The field remains at a standstill and will only be revived if a kaon factory is built. What follows is a much abbreviated version of the note on Λ and Σ Resonances from our 1990 edition. In particular, see that edition for some representative Argand plots from partial-wave analyses.

Table 1 is an attempt to evaluate the status, both overall and channel by channel, of each Λ and Σ resonance in the Full Listings. The evaluations are of course partly subjective. A blank indicates there is no evidence at all: either the relevant couplings are small or the resonance does not really exist. The main Baryon Summary Table includes only the established resonances (overall status 3 or 4 stars). A number of the 1- and 2-star entries may eventually disappear, but there are certainly many resonances yet to be discovered underlying the established ones.

Sign conventions for resonance couplings : In terms of the isospin-0 and -1 elastic scattering amplitudes A_0 and A_1, the amplitude for $K^- p \to \overline{K}^0 n$ scattering is $\pm(A_1 - A_0)/2$, where the sign depends on conventions used in conjunction with the Clebsch-Gordan coefficients (such as, is the baryon or the meson the "first" particle). If this reaction is partial-wave analyzed and if the overall phase is chosen so that, say, the $\Sigma(1775)D_{15}$ amplitude at resonance points along the positive imaginary axis (points "up"), then any Σ at resonance will point "up" and any Λ at resonance will point "down" (along the negative imaginary axis). Thus the phase at resonance determines the isospin. The above ignores background amplitudes in the resonating partial waves.

That is the basic idea. In a similar but somewhat more complicated way, the phases of the $\overline{K}N \to \Lambda\pi$ and $\overline{K}N \to \Sigma\pi$ amplitudes for a resonating wave help determine the SU(3) multiplet to which the resonance belongs. Again, a convention has to be adopted for some overall arbitrary phases: which way is "up"? Our convention is that of Levi-Setti [1] and is shown in Fig. 1, which also compares experimental results with theoretical predictions for the signs of several resonances. In the

Listings, a + or − sign in front of a measurement of an inelastic resonance coupling indicates the sign (the *absence* of a sign means that the sign is not determined, *not* that it is positive). For more details, see Appendix II of our 1982 edition [2].

Table 1. The status of the Λ and Σ resonances. Only those with an overall status of *** or **** are included in the main Baryon Summary Table.

			Status as seen in —			
Particle	$L_{I\,2J}$	Overall status	$N\overline{K}$	$\Lambda\pi$	$\Sigma\pi$	Other channels
$\Lambda(1116)$	P_{01}	****		F		$N\pi$(weakly)
$\Lambda(1405)$	S_{01}	****	****	o	****	
$\Lambda(1520)$	D_{03}	****	****	r	****	$\Lambda\pi\pi, \Lambda\gamma$
$\Lambda(1600)$	P_{01}	***	***	b	**	
$\Lambda(1670)$	S_{01}	****	****	i	****	$\Lambda\eta$
$\Lambda(1690)$	D_{03}	****	****	d	****	$\Lambda\pi\pi, \Sigma\pi\pi$
$\Lambda(1800)$	S_{01}	***	***	d	**	$N\overline{K}^*, \Sigma(1385)\pi$
$\Lambda(1810)$	P_{01}	***	***	e	**	$N\overline{K}^*$
$\Lambda(1820)$	F_{05}	****	****	n	****	$\Sigma(1385)\pi$
$\Lambda(1830)$	D_{05}	****	***	F	****	$\Sigma(1385)\pi$
$\Lambda(1890)$	P_{03}	****	****	o	**	$N\overline{K}^*, \Sigma(1385)\pi$
$\Lambda(2000)$		*		r	*	$\Lambda\omega, N\overline{K}^*$
$\Lambda(2020)$	F_{07}	*	*	b	*	
$\Lambda(2100)$	G_{07}	****	****	i	***	$\Lambda\omega, N\overline{K}^*$
$\Lambda(2110)$	F_{05}	***	**	d	*	$\Lambda\omega, N\overline{K}^*$
$\Lambda(2325)$	D_{03}	*	*	d		$\Lambda\omega$
$\Lambda(2350)$		***	***	e	*	
$\Lambda(2585)$		**	**	n		

$\Sigma(1193)$	P_{11}	****				$N\pi$(weakly)
$\Sigma(1385)$	P_{13}	****		****	****	
$\Sigma(1480)$		*	*	*	*	
$\Sigma(1560)$		**		**	**	
$\Sigma(1580)$	D_{13}	**	*	*		
$\Sigma(1620)$	S_{11}	**	**	*	*	
$\Sigma(1660)$	P_{11}	***	***	*	**	
$\Sigma(1670)$	D_{13}	****	****	****	****	several others
$\Sigma(1690)$		**	*	**	*	$\Lambda\pi\pi$
$\Sigma(1750)$	S_{11}	***	***	**	*	$\Sigma\eta$
$\Sigma(1770)$	P_{11}	*				
$\Sigma(1775)$	D_{15}	****	****	****	***	several others
$\Sigma(1840)$	P_{13}	*	*	**	*	
$\Sigma(1880)$	P_{11}	**	**	**		$N\overline{K}^*$
$\Sigma(1915)$	F_{15}	****	***	****	***	$\Sigma(1385)\pi$
$\Sigma(1940)$	D_{13}	***	*	***	**	quasi-2-body
$\Sigma(2000)$	S_{11}	*		*		$N\overline{K}^*, \Lambda(1520)\pi$
$\Sigma(2030)$	F_{17}	****	****	****	**	several others
$\Sigma(2070)$	F_{15}	*	*		*	
$\Sigma(2080)$	P_{13}	**		**		
$\Sigma(2100)$	G_{17}	*		*	*	
$\Sigma(2250)$		***	***	*	*	
$\Sigma(2455)$		**	*			
$\Sigma(2620)$		**	*			
$\Sigma(3000)$		*	*	*		
$\Sigma(3170)$		*				multi-body

****	Existence is certain, and properties are at least fairly well explored.
***	Existence ranges from very likely to certain, but further confirmation is desirable and/or quantum numbers, branching fractions, *etc.* are not well determined.
**	Evidence of existence is only fair.
*	Evidence of existence is poor.

Errors on masses and widths: The errors quoted on resonance parameters from partial-wave analyses are often only statistical, and the parameters can change by more than these errors when a different parametrization of the waves is used. Furthermore, the different analyses use more or less the same data, so it is not really appropriate to treat the different determinations of the resonance parameters as independent or to average them together. In any case, the spread of the masses, widths, and branching fractions from the different analyses is certainly a better indication of the uncertainties than are the quoted errors. In the Baryon Summary Table, we usually give a range reflecting the spread of the values rather than a particular value with error.

For three states, the $\Lambda(1520)$, the $\Lambda(1820)$, and the $\Sigma(1775)$, there is enough information to make an overall fit to the various branching fractions. It is then necessary to use the quoted errors, but the errors obtained from the fit should not be taken seriously.

Production experiments: Partial-wave analyses of course separate partial waves, whereas a peak in a cross section or an invariant mass distribution usually cannot be disentangled from background and analyzed for its quantum numbers; and more than one resonance may be contributing to the peak. Results from partial-wave analyses and from production experiments are generally kept separate in the Listings, and in the Baryon Summary Table results from production experiments are used only for the low-mass states. The $\Sigma(1385)$ and $\Lambda(1405)$ of course lie below the $\overline{K}N$ threshold and nearly everything about them is learned from production experiments; and production and formation experiments agree quite well in the case of $\Lambda(1520)$ and results have been combined. There is some disagreement between production and formation experiments in the 1600–1700 MeV region: see the note on the $\Sigma(1670)$.

References

1. R. Levi-Setti, in *Proceedings of the Lund International Conference on Elementary Particles* (Lund, 1969), p. 339.
2. Particle Data Group, Phys. Lett. **111B** (1982).



Figure 1. The signs of the imaginary parts of resonating amplitudes in the $\overline{K}N \to \Lambda\pi$ and $\Sigma\pi$ channels. The signs of the $\Sigma(1385)$ and $\Lambda(1405)$, marked with a $\bullet$, are set by convention, and then the others are determined relative to them. The signs required by the SU(3) assignments of the resonances are shown with an arrow, and the experimentally determined signs are shown with an $\times$.