$f_0(600)$ or σ

$I^G(J^{PC}) = 0^+(0^{++})$

SCALAR MESONS

Revised April 2002 by S. Spanier (SLAC) and N.A. Törnqvist (University of Helsinki).

I. Introduction: In contrast to the vector and tensor mesons, the identification of the scalar mesons is a long-standing puzzle. Scalar resonances are difficult to resolve because of their large decay widths, which cause a strong overlap between resonances and background, and also because several decay channels open up within a short mass interval. In addition, the $\overline{K}K$ and $\eta\eta$ thresholds in particular produce sharp cusps in the energy dependence of the resonant amplitude. Furthermore, one expects non-$\overline{q}q$ scalar objects, like glueballs and multiquark states in the mass range below 1800 MeV. The number of experimental and theoretical publications since our last issue indicates great activity in this field.

Scalars are produced, for example, in πN scattering on polarized/unpolarized targets, $\overline{p}p$ annihilation (high statistics), central hadronic production, $J/\psi(1S)$ decays, D- and K-meson decays, $\gamma\gamma$ formation, and ϕ radiative decays. Experiments are accompanied by the development of theoretical models for the reaction amplitudes, which are based on common fundamental principles of two-body unitarity, analyticity, Lorentz invariance, and chiral- and flavor-symmetry using different techniques (K-matrix formalism, N/D-method, Dalitz-Tuan ansatz, unitarized quark models with coupled channels, effective chiral field theories like the linear sigma model, etc.). A least-biased procedure is the energy-independent extraction of partial-wave amplitudes (moment analysis), whereas the dynamical content of an amplitude is modeled in a second step.

The mass and width of a resonance are found from the position of the nearest pole in the T matrix (or equivalently, in the S matrix) at an unphysical sheet of the complex energy plane: $(E - i\frac{\Gamma}{2})$. It is important to realize that only in the case of narrow well-separated resonances, far away from the opening of decay channels, does the naive Breit-Wigner parameterization (or K-matrix pole parameterization) agree with the T-matrix pole position in the amplitude.

In this note, we discuss all light scalars organized in the listings under the entries $(I = 1/2)$ $K^*(1430)$, $(I = 1)$ $a_0(980)$, $a_0(1450)$, and $(I = 0)$ σ or $f_0(600)$, $f_0(980)$, $f_0(1370)$, and $f_0(1500)$. This list is minimal and does not necessarily exhaust the list of actual resonances. The $(I = 2)$ $\pi\pi$ and $(I = 3/2)$ $K\pi$ phase shifts do not exhibit any resonant behavior. See also our notes in previous issues for further comments on *e.g.*, scattering lengths and older papers.

II. The $I = 1/2$ States: The $K^*(1430)$ (`ASTON 88`) is perhaps the least controversial of the light scalar mesons. The $K\pi$ S-wave scattering has two possible isospin channels, $I = \frac{1}{2}$ and $I = \frac{3}{2}$. The $I = \frac{3}{2}$ wave is elastic and repulsive up to 1.7 GeV (`ESTABROOKS 78`) and contains no known resonances. The $I = \frac{1}{2}$ $K\pi$ phase shift, measured from about 100 MeV above threshold on, rises smoothly, passes 90° at 1350 MeV, and continues to rise to about 170° at 1600 MeV. The first important inelastic threshold is $K\eta'(958)$. In the inelastic region, the continuation of the amplitude is uncertain since the partial-wave decomposition has several solutions. The data are extrapolated towards the $K\pi$ threshold using effective range-type formulas (`ASTON 88`, `ABELE 98`) or chiral perturbation predictions (`JAMIN 00`, `CHERRY 01`). In analyses using unitarized amplitudes, there is agreement on the presence of a resonance pole around 1410 MeV having a width of about 300 MeV. In recent years, there has been controversy about the existence of a light and very broad "κ" meson in the 700–900 MeV region. Some authors find this pole in their phenomenological analysis (*e.g.*, `ISHIDA 97B`, `BLACK 98,01`, `DELBOURGO 98`, `OLLER 99,99C`, `BEVEREN 99`, `ANISOVICH 97C`, `JAMIN 00`, `SHAKIN 01`), while others, in particular `CHERRY 01`, `KOPP 01` do not. Since it appears to be a very wide object ($\Gamma \approx 600$ MeV) near threshold, its presence and properties are difficult to establish on data.

III. The $I = 1$ States: Two isovector states are known, the established $a_0(980)$ and the $a_0(1450)$. Independent of any model, the $\overline{K}K$ component in the $a_0(980)$-wave function must be large: it lies just below the opening of the $\overline{K}K$ channel to which it couples strongly. This gives an important cusp-like behavior in the resonant amplitude. Hence, its mass and width parameters are strongly distorted. To reveal its true coupling constants, a coupled channel model with energy-dependent widths and mass shift contributions is necessary. In all measurements in our Listings, the mass position agrees on a value near 984 MeV, but the width takes values between 50 and 300 MeV, due to the different applied models. For example, the analysis of the $\overline{p}p$-annihilation data using a unitary K-matrix description finds a width as determined from the T-matrix pole of 92 ± 8 MeV, while the observed width of the peak in the $\pi\eta$ mass spectrum is about 45 MeV.

The relative coupling $\overline{K}K/\pi\eta$ is determined indirectly from $f_1(1285)$ (`BARBERIS 98C`, `CORDEN 78`, `DEFOIX 72`) or $\eta(1440)$

decays (BAI 90C, BOLTON 92B, AMSLER 95C), from the line shape observed in the $\pi\eta$ decay mode (FLATTE 76, AMSLER 94D, BUGG 94, JANSSEN 95), or from the coupled-channel analysis of $\pi\pi\eta$ and $\overline{K}K\pi$ final states of $\overline{p}p$ annihilation at rest (ABELE 98).

The $a_0(1450)$ is seen by the Crystal Barrel experiment in its $\pi\eta$, $\overline{K}K$, and $\pi\eta'(958)$ decay modes. The relative couplings to the different final states are found to be close to SU(3)-flavor predictions for an ordinary $\overline{q}q$ meson. The observation of a broad structure at about 1300 MeV in $\pi N \to \overline{K}KN$ reactions needs further confirmation in its existence and isospin assignment.

The IV. I = 0 States: The $I = 0$, $J^{PC} = 0^{++}$ sector is the most complex one, both experimentally and theoretically. The data have been obtained from $\pi\pi$, $\overline{K}K$, $\eta\eta$, 4π, and $\eta\eta'(958)$ systems produced in S wave. Analyses based on several different production processes conclude that probably four poles are needed in the mass range from the $\pi\pi$ threshold to about 1600 MeV. The claimed isoscalar resonances are found under separate entries σ or $f_0(600)$, $f_0(980)$, $f_0(1370)$, and $f_0(1500)$.

Below 1100 MeV, the important data come from the $\pi\pi$ and $\overline{K}K$ final states. Information on the $\pi\pi$ S-wave phase shift $\delta^I_J = \delta^0_0$ was already extracted 25 years ago from the πN scattering with unpolarized (GRAYER 74) and polarized targets (BECKER 79), and near threshold from the K_{e4}-decay (ROSSELET 77). The $\pi\pi$ S-wave inelasticity is not accurately known, and the reported $\pi\pi \to \overline{K}K$ cross sections (WETZEL 76, POLYCHRONAKOS 79, COHEN 80, and ETKIN 82B) may have large uncertainties. The πN data (GRAYER 74, BECKER 79) have been analyzed in combination with high-statistics data from $\overline{p}p$ annihilation at rest (see entries labeled as RVUE for reanalyzes of the data). The re-analysis (KAMINSKI 97) finds two out of four relevant solutions, with the S-wave phase shift rising slower than the P-wave [$\rho(770)$], which is used as a reference. One of these corresponds to the well-known "down" solution of `GRAYER 74`. The other "up" solution shows a decrease of the modulus in the mass interval between 800–980 MeV. Both solutions exhibit a sudden drop in the modulus and inelasticity at 1 GeV, due to the appearance of $f_0(980)$ which is very close to the opening of the $\overline{K}K$-threshold. The phase shift δ_0^0 rises smoothly up to this point, where it jumps by 120° (in the "up") or 140° (in the "down") solution to reach 230°, and then both continue to rise slowly.

The suggestion (`SVEC 97`) of the existence of a narrow f_0 state near 750 MeV, with a small width of 100 to 200 MeV, is excluded by unitarity as shown by (`KAMINSKI 97,00`), using both the π- and $a_1(1260)$-exchange in the reaction amplitudes. Also, the $2\pi^0$ invariant mass spectra of the $\overline{p}p$ annihilation at rest (`AMSLER 95D`, `ABELE 96`) and the central collision (`ALDE 97`) do not show a narrow resonance below 900 MeV, and these data are consistently described with the standard "down" solution (`GRAYER 74`, `KAMINSKI 97`), which allows for the existence of the broad ($\Gamma \approx 500$ MeV) resonance called σ. The σ is difficult to establish because of its large width. In addition, it is distorted by a large destructive background from a contact term (or by a derivative coupling) as required by chiral symmetry, crossed channel exchanges, the $f_0(1370)$, and other dynamical features. However, most analyzes listed in our issue under $f_0(600)$ agree on a pole position near $500 - i\,250$ MeV.

The $f_0(980)$ overlaps strongly with this broad background. This can lead to a dip in the $\pi\pi$ spectrum at the $\overline{K}K$ threshold. It changes from a dip into a peak structure in the $\pi^0\pi^0$ invariant mass spectrum of the reaction $\pi^- p \to \pi^0\pi^0 n$ (`ACHASOV 98E`), with increasing four-momentum transfer to the $\pi^0\pi^0$ system, which means increasing the a_1-exchange contribution in the amplitude, while the π-exchange decreases.

A meson resonance that is very well studied experimentally is the $f_0(1500)$, seen by the Crystal Barrel experiment in five decay modes: $\pi\pi$, $\overline{K}K$, $\eta\eta$, $\eta\eta'(958)$, and 4π (`AMSLER 95D`, `ABELE 96,98`). Due to its interference with the $f_0(1370)$ (and $f_0(1710)$), the peak attributed to $f_0(1500)$ can appear shifted in invariant mass spectra. Therefore, the application of simple Breit-Wigner forms arrives at slightly different resonance masses for $f_0(1500)$. Recent analyses of central-production data of the five decay modes (`BARBERIS 99D`, `BARBERIS 00E`) agree on the description of the S wave with the one above. The $\overline{p}p$, $\overline{n}p/\overline{p}n$ (`GASPERO 93`, `ADAMO 93`, `AMSLER 94`, `ABELE 96`) show a single enhancement at 1400 MeV in the invariant 4π mass spectra, which is resolved into $f_0(1370)$ and $f_0(1500)$ (`ABELE 01,01B`). The data on 4π from central production (`BARBERIS 00C`) require both resonances, too, but disagree on the relative content of $\rho\rho$ and $\sigma\sigma$ in 4π. All investigations agree that the 4π decay mode represents about half of the $f_0(1500)$ decay width and is dominant for $f_0(1370)$.

The determination of the $\pi\pi$ coupling of $f_0(1370)$ is aggravated by the strong overlap with the broad $f_0(600)$ and $f_0(1500)$. Since it does not show up prominently in the 2π spectra, its mass and width are difficult to determine. The three-channel approach (`KAMINSKI 99`) supports the Crystal Barrel findings, and yields a broad $f_0(1370)$ with a mass around 1400 MeV and a narrow $f_0(1500)$. Here, the $f_0(1370)$ couples more strongly to $\pi\pi$ than to $\overline{K}K$. The $f_0(1370)$ is identified as $\eta\eta$ resonance in the $\pi^0\eta\eta$ final state of the $\overline{p}p$ annihilation at rest (`AMSLER 95D`).

V. Interpretation: Almost every model on scalar states agrees that the $K^*(1430)$ is the quark model $s\overline{u}$ or $s\overline{d}$ state.

If one uses the naive quark model (which may be too naive because of lack of chiral symmetry constraints), it is natural to assume that the $f_0(1370)$, $a_0(1450)$, and the $K^*(1430)$ are in the same SU(3) flavor nonet, which is the $(\overline{u}u + \overline{d}d)$, $u\overline{d}$ and $u\overline{s}$ state, respectively. In this picture, the choice of the ninth member of the nonet is ambiguous. The controversially discussed candidates are $f_0(1500)$ and $f_0(1710)$ (assuming $J = 0$). Compared to the above states, the $f_0(1500)$ is very narrow. Thus, it is unlikely to be their isoscalar partner. It is also too light to be the first radial excitation. Assuming the three f_0's in the 1300–1700 region to be mixtures between an $u\overline{u}$, an $s\overline{s}$, and a gluonium state, one can reach an understanding of these states, although different analyses (`CLOSE 01B`, `LI 01`) do not agree in detail. See our Note on "Non-$\overline{q}q$ States."

The $f_0(980)$ and $a_0(980)$ are often interpreted as multiquark states (`JAFFE 77`, `ALFORD 00`), $\overline{K}K$-bound states (`WEINSTEIN 90`), or vacuum scalars (`CLOSE 93A`), excluding them from the scalar nonet. The insight into their internal structure using two-photon widths (`BARNES 85`, `LI 91`, `DELBOURGO 99`, `LUCIO 99`, `ACHASOV 00H`) is not conclusive. Based on D_s decays, `DEANDREA 01` suggests the $f_0(980)$ is an $\overline{s}s$ surrounded by a virtual $\overline{K}K$ cloud. The results from SND and CMD2 (`ACHASOV 00H` and `AKHMETSHIN 99B`) reveal a much higher branching ratio for radiative $\phi \to \gamma f_0/a_0$ decays than expected for $\overline{q}q$ mesons, but also for $\overline{K}K$ molecules (`CLOSE 93B`, `FAZIO 01`). On the other hand, the states $f_0(980)$ and $a_0(980)$ may form a new low-mass state nonet together with the $f_0(600)$ as a central ingredient, plus the κ. The $f_0(980)$ and $a_0(980)$

inclusive production properties in hadronic Z^0 decays are consistent with mesons of other nonets (`ACKERSTAFF 98A,98Q`, `ABREU 99J`).

Attempts have been made to start directly from chiral Lagrangians (`SCADRON 99`, `OLLER 99`, `ISHIDA 99`, and `TORNQVIST 99`) which predict the existence of the σ meson near 500 MeV. Hence, *e.g.*, in the chiral linear sigma model with 3 flavors, the σ, $a_0(980)$, $f_0(980)$, and κ (or $K_0^*(1430)$) would form a nonet (not necessarily $\overline{q}q$), while the lightest pseudoscalars would be their chiral partners. In the approach of `OLLER 99`, the above resonances are generated starting from chiral perturbation theory predictions near the first open channel, and then by extending the predictions to the resonance regions using unitarity.

In unitarized quark models with coupled channels, six of the light scalars are understood as different manifestations of bare, nearly degenerate, nonet states (`TORNQVIST 95,96`, `BEVEREN 86`). The σ, $f_0(980)$, $f_0(1370)$, $a_0(980)$, $a_0(1450)$, and $K^*(1430)$ are described as unitarized remnants of strongly shifted and mixed states derived from the original bare states. The $f_0(980)$ and $f_0(1370)$, as well as $a_0(980)$ and $a_0(1450)$, are two manifestations (one $\overline{q}q$ and one meson-meson) of the same bare input state.

QCD sum-rule techniques (`FANG 00`) generally find that the lightest scalars are nearly decoupled from $\overline{q}q$, which would suggest a non-$\overline{q}q$ structure. But this is also consistent with their being unitarized remnants of $\overline{q}q$ surrounded by large "clouds" of light mesons (forming part of the $\overline{q}q$ sea).

Other detailed models exist, which arrive at different groupings of the observed resonances.

References

References may be found at the end of the $f_0(600)$ Listing.

f_0(600) T-MATRIX POLE $\sqrt{s}$

Note that $\Gamma \approx 2\ \mathrm{Im}(\sqrt{s_{\mathrm{pole}}})$.

VALUE (MeV)	*DOCUMENT ID*	*TECN*	*COMMENT*
(400–1200)−*i*(300–500) OUR ESTIMATE			
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •			
$532 - i272$	BLACK 01	RVUE	$\pi^0\pi^0 \to \pi^0\pi^0$
$(580 \pm 80) - i(190 \pm 100)$	[1] ISHIDA 01		$\Upsilon \to \Upsilon\pi\pi$
$610 \pm 14 - i620 \pm 26$	[2] SUROVTSEV 01	RVUE	$\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$
$548 - i196$	ISHIDA 00B		$p\overline{p} \to \pi^0\pi^0\pi^0$
$445 - i235$	HANNAH 99	RVUE	π scalar form factor
$(523 \pm 12) - i(259 \pm 7)$	KAMINSKI 99	RVUE	$\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$, $\sigma\sigma$
$442 - i\ 227$	OLLER 99	RVUE	$\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$
$469 - i203$	OLLER 99B	RVUE	$\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$
$445 - i221$	OLLER 99C	RVUE	$\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$, $\eta\eta$
$(1530^{+\ 90}_{-250}) - i(560 \pm 40)$	ANISOVICH 98B	RVUE	Compilation
$420 - i\ 212$	LOCHER 98	RVUE	$\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$
$(602 \pm 26) - i(196 \pm 27)$	[3] ISHIDA 97		$\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$
$(537 \pm 20) - i(250 \pm 17)$	[4] KAMINSKI 97B	RVUE	$\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$, 4π
$470 - i250$	[5,6] TORNQVIST 96	RVUE	$\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$, $K\pi$, $\eta\pi$
$\sim (1100 - i300)$	AMSLER 95B	CBAR	$\overline{p}p \to 3\pi^0$
$400 - i500$	[6,7] AMSLER 95D	CBAR	$\overline{p}p \to 3\pi^0$
$1100 - i137$	[6,8] AMSLER 95D	CBAR	$\overline{p}p \to 3\pi^0$
$387 - i305$	[6,9] JANSSEN 95	RVUE	$\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$
$525 - i269$	[10] ACHASOV 94	RVUE	$\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$
$(506 \pm 10) - i(247 \pm 3)$	KAMINSKI 94	RVUE	$\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$
$370 - i356$	[11] ZOU 94B	RVUE	$\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$
$408 - i342$	[6,11] ZOU 93	RVUE	$\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$
$870 - i370$	[6,12] AU 87	RVUE	$\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$
$470 - i208$	[13] BEVEREN 86	RVUE	$\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$, $\eta\eta$, ...
$(750 \pm 50) - i(450 \pm 50)$	[14] ESTABROOKS 79	RVUE	$\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$
$(660 \pm 100) - i(320 \pm 70)$	PROTOPOP... 73	HBC	$\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$
$650 - i370$	[15] BASDEVANT 72	RVUE	$\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$

[1] Errors increased to cover upper and lower error bars and related solution of KOMADA 01.

[2] Coupled channel reanalysis of BATON 70, BENSINGER 71, BAILLON 72, HYAMS 73, HYAMS 75, ROSSELET 77, COHEN 80, and ETKIN 82B using the uniformizing variable.

[3] Reanalysis of data from HYAMS 73, GRAYER 74, SRINIVASAN 75, and ROSSELET 77 using the interfering amplitude method.

[4] Average and spread of 4 variants ("up" and "down") of KAMINSKI 97B 3-channel model.

[5] Uses data from BEIER 72B, OCHS 73, HYAMS 73, GRAYER 74, ROSSELET 77, CASON 83, ASTON 88, and ARMSTRONG 91B. Coupled channel analysis with flavor symmetry and all light two-pseudoscalars systems.

[6] Demonstrates explicitly that $f_0(600)$ and $f_0(1370)$ are two different poles.

[7] Coupled channel analysis of $\overline{p}p \to 3\pi^0$, $\pi^0\eta\eta$ and $\pi^0\pi^0\eta$ on sheet II.

[8] Coupled channel analysis of $\overline{p}p \to 3\pi^0$, $\pi^0\eta\eta$ and $\pi^0\pi^0\eta$ on sheet III.

[9] Analysis of data from FALVARD 88.

[10] Analysis of data from OCHS 73, ESTABROOKS 75, ROSSELET 77, and MUKHIN 80.

[11] Analysis of data from OCHS 73, GRAYER 74, and ROSSELET 77.

[12] Analysis of data from OCHS 73, GRAYER 74, BECKER 79, and CASON 83.

[13] Uses data from PROTOPOPESCU 73, HYAMS 73, HYAMS 75, GRAYER 74, ESTABROOKS 74, ESTABROOKS 75, FROGGATT 77, CORDEN 79, BISWAS 81.

[14] Analysis of data from APEL 73, GRAYER 74, CASON 76, PAWLICKI 77. Includes spread and errors of 4 solutions.

[15] Analysis of data from BATON 70, BENSINGER 71, COLTON 71, BAILLON 72,PROTOPOPESCU 73, and WALKER 67.

$f_0(600)$ BREIT-WIGNER MASS OR K-MATRIX POLE PARAMETERS

VALUE (MeV)	*DOCUMENT ID*		*TECN*	*COMMENT*
(400–1200) OUR ESTIMATE				
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
$478^{+24}_{-23}\pm17$	AITALA	01B	E791	$D^+ \to \pi^-\pi^+\pi^+$
563 ± 60	[16] ISHIDA	01		$\Upsilon(3S) \to \Upsilon\pi\pi$
555	[17] ASNER	00	CLE2	$\tau^- \to \pi^-\pi^0\pi^0\nu_\tau$
540 ± 36	ISHIDA	00B		$p\overline{p} \to \pi^0\pi^0\pi^0$
$750\pm\ 4$	ALEKSEEV	99	SPEC	$1.78\ \pi^- p_{\text{polar}} \to \pi^-\pi^+ n$
$744\pm\ 5$	ALEKSEEV	98	SPEC	$1.78\ \pi^- p_{\text{polar}} \to \pi^-\pi^+ n$
$759\pm\ 5$	[18] TROYAN	98		$5.2\ np \to np\pi^+\pi^-$
780 ± 30	ALDE	97	GAM2	$450\ pp \to pp\pi^0\pi^0$
585 ± 20	[19] ISHIDA	97		$\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$
761 ± 12	[20] SVEC	96	RVUE	$6\text{–}17\ \pi N_{\text{polar}} \to \pi^+\pi^- N$
$\sim$ 860	[21,22] TORNQVIST	96	RVUE	$\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$, $K\pi$, $\eta\pi$
1165 ± 50	[23,24] ANISOVICH	95	RVUE	$\pi^- p \to \pi^0\pi^0 n$, $\overline{p}p \to \pi^0\pi^0\pi^0$, $\pi^0\pi^0\eta$, $\pi^0\eta\eta$
$\sim$ 1000	[25] ACHASOV	94	RVUE	$\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$
414 ± 20	[20] AUGUSTIN	89	DM2	

[16] Errors increased to cover upper and lower error bars and related solution of KOMADA 01.

[17] From the best fit of the Dalitz plot.

[18] 6σ effect, no PWA.

[19] Reanalysis of data from HYAMS 73, GRAYER 74, SRINIVASAN 75, and ROSSELET 77 using the interfering amplitude method.

[20] Breit-Wigner fit to S-wave intensity measured in $\pi N \to \pi^-\pi^+ N$ on polarized targets. The fit does not include $f_0(980)$.

[21] Uses data from ASTON 88, OCHS 73, HYAMS 73, ARMSTRONG 91B, GRAYER 74, CASON 83, ROSSELET 77, and BEIER 72B. Coupled channel analysis with flavor symmetry and all light two-pseudoscalars systems.

[22] Also observed by ASNER 00 in $\tau^- \to \pi^-\pi^0\pi^0\nu_\tau$ decays.

[23] Uses $\pi^0\pi^0$ data from ANISOVICH 94, AMSLER 94D, and ALDE 95B, $\pi^+\pi^-$ data from OCHS 73, GRAYER 74 and ROSSELET 77, and $\eta\eta$ data fromANISOVICH 94.

[24] The pole is on Sheet III. Demonstrates explicitly that $f_0(600)$ and $f_0(1370)$ are two different poles.

[25] Analysis of data from OCHS 73, ESTABROOKS 75, ROSSELET 77, and MUKHIN 80.

$f_0(600)$ BREIT-WIGNER WIDTH

VALUE (MeV)	*DOCUMENT ID*		*TECN*	*COMMENT*
(600–1000) OUR ESTIMATE				
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
$324^{+42}_{-40} \pm 21$	AITALA	01B	E791	$D^+ \to \pi^- \pi^+ \pi^+$
372 ± 230	[26] ISHIDA	01		$\Upsilon(3S) \to \Upsilon \pi \pi$
540	[27] ASNER	00	CLE2	$\tau^- \to \pi^- \pi^0 \pi^0 \nu_\tau$
372 ± 80	ISHIDA	00B		$p\overline{p} \to \pi^0 \pi^0 \pi^0$
119 ± 13	ALEKSEEV	99	SPEC	$1.78\ \pi^- p_{\text{polar}} \to \pi^- \pi^+ n$
77 ± 22	ALEKSEEV	98	SPEC	$1.78\ \pi^- p_{\text{polar}} \to \pi^- \pi^+ n$
35 ± 12	[28] TROYAN	98		$5.2\ np \to np\pi^+\pi^-$
780 ± 60	ALDE	97	GAM2	$450\ pp \to pp\pi^0\pi^0$
385 ± 70	[29] ISHIDA	97		$\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$
290 ± 54	[30] SVEC	96	RVUE	6–17 $\pi N_{\text{polar}} \to \pi^+ \pi^- N$
~ 880	[31,32] TORNQVIST	96	RVUE	$\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$, $K\pi$, $\eta\pi$
460 ± 40	[33,34] ANISOVICH	95	RVUE	$\pi^- p \to \pi^0 \pi^0 n$, $\overline{p}p \to \pi^0\pi^0\pi^0$, $\pi^0\pi^0\eta$, $\pi^0\eta\eta$
~ 3200	[35] ACHASOV	94	RVUE	$\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$
494 ± 58	[30] AUGUSTIN	89	DM2	

[26] Errors increased to cover upper and lower error bars and related solution of KOMADA 01.

[27] From the best fit of the Dalitz plot.

[28] 6σ effect, no PWA.

[29] Reanalysis of data from HYAMS 73, GRAYER 74, SRINIVASAN 75, and ROSSELET 77 using the interfering amplitude method.

[30] Breit-Wigner fit to S-wave intensity measured in $\pi N \to \pi^- \pi^+ N$ on polarized targets. The fit does not include $f_0(980)$.

[31] Uses data from ASTON 88, OCHS 73, HYAMS 73, ARMSTRONG 91B, GRAYER 74, CASON 83, ROSSELET 77, and BEIER 72B. Coupled channel analysis with flavor symmetry and all light two-pseudoscalars systems.

[32] Also observed by ASNER 00 in $\tau^- \to \pi^- \pi^0 \pi^0 \nu_\tau$ decays.

[33] Uses $\pi^0\pi^0$ data from ANISOVICH 94, AMSLER 94D, and ALDE 95B, $\pi^+\pi^-$ data from OCHS 73, GRAYER 74 and ROSSELET 77, and $\eta\eta$ data fromANISOVICH 94.

[34] The pole is on Sheet III. Demonstrates explicitly that $f_0(600)$ and $f_0(1370)$ are two different poles.

[35] Analysis of data from OCHS 73, ESTABROOKS 75, ROSSELET 77, and MUKHIN 80.

$f_0(600)$ DECAY MODES

	Mode	Fraction (Γ_i/Γ)
Γ_1	$\pi\pi$	dominant
Γ_2	$\gamma\gamma$	seen

$f_0(600)$ PARTIAL WIDTHS

$\Gamma(\gamma\gamma)$ Γ_2

VALUE (keV)	*DOCUMENT ID*		*TECN*	*COMMENT*
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
3.8±1.5	[36,37] BOGLIONE	99	RVUE	$\gamma\gamma \to \pi^+\pi^-$, $\pi^0\pi^0$
5.4±2.3	[36] MORGAN	90	RVUE	$\gamma\gamma \to \pi^+\pi^-$, $\pi^0\pi^0$
10 ±6	COURAU	86	DM1	$e^+e^- \to \pi^+\pi^- e^+e^-$

[36] This width could equally well be assigned to the $f_0(1370)$. The authors analyse data from BOYER 90 and MARSISKE 90 and report strong correlation with $\gamma\gamma$ width of $f_2(1270)$.

[37] Supersedes MORGAN 90.

$f_0(600)$ REFERENCES

AITALA	01B	PRL 86 770	E.M. Aitala *et al.*	(FNAL E791 Collab.)
BLACK	01	PR D64 014031	D. Black *et al.*	
ISHIDA	01	PL B518 47	M. Ishida *et al.*	
KOMADA	01	PL B508 31	T. Komada *et al.*	
SUROVTSEV	01	PR D63 054024	Y.S. Surovtsev, D. Krupa, M. Nagy	
ASNER	00	PR D61 012002	D.M. Asner *et al.*	(CLEO Collab.)
ISHIDA	00B	PTP 104 203	M. Ishida *et al.*	
ALEKSEEV	99	NP B541 3	I.G. Alekseev *et al.*	
BOGLIONE	99	EPJ C9 11	M. Boglione, M.R. Pennington	
HANNAH	99	PR D60 017502	T. Hannah	
KAMINSKI	99	EPJ C9 141	R. Kaminski, L. Lesniak, B. Loiseau	(CRAC, PARIN)
OLLER	99	PR D60 099906 (erratum)	J.A. Oller *et al.*	
OLLER	99B	NP A652 407 (erratum)	J.A. Oller, E. Oset	
OLLER	99C	PR D60 074023	J.A. Oller, E. Oset	
ALEKSEEV	98	PAN 61 174	I.G. Alekseev *et al.*	
ANISOVICH	98B	UFN 41 419	V.V. Anisovich *et al.*	
LOCHER	98	EPJ C4 317	M.P. Locher *et al.*	(PSI)
TROYAN	98	JINRRC 5-91 33	Yu. Troyan *et al.*	
ALDE	97	PL B397 350	D.M. Alde *et al.*	(GAMS Collab.)
ISHIDA	97	PTP 98 1005	S. Ishida *et al.*	(TOKY, MIYA, KEK)
KAMINSKI	97B	PL B413 130	R. Kaminski, L. Lesniak, B. Loiseau	(CRAC, IPN)
Also	96	PTP 95 745	S. Ishida *et al.*	(TOKY, MIYA, KEK)
SVEC	96	PR D53 2343	M. Svec	(MCGI)
TORNQVIST	96	PRL 76 1575	N.A. Tornqvist, M. Roos	(HELS)
ALDE	95B	ZPHY C66 375	D.M. Alde *et al.*	(GAMS Collab.)
AMSLER	95B	PL B342 433	C. Amsler *et al.*	(Crystal Barrel Collab.)
AMSLER	95D	PL B355 425	C. Amsler *et al.*	(Crystal Barrel Collab.)
ANISOVICH	95	PL B355 363	V.V. Anisovich *et al.*	(PNPI, SERP)
JANSSEN	95	PR D52 2690	G. Janssen *et al.*	(STON, ADLD, JULI)
ACHASOV	94	PR D49 5779	N.N. Achasov, G.N. Shestakov	(NOVM)
AMSLER	94D	PL B333 277	C. Amsler *et al.*	(Crystal Barrel Collab.)
ANISOVICH	94	PL B323 233	V.V. Anisovich *et al.*	(Crystal Barrel Collab.)
KAMINSKI	94	PR D50 3145	R. Kaminski, L. Lesniak, J.P. Maillet	(CRAC+)
ZOU	94B	PR D50 591	B.S. Zou, D.V. Bugg	(LOQM)
ZOU	93	PR D48 R3948	B.S. Zou, D.V. Bugg	(LOQM)
ARMSTRONG	91B	ZPHY C52 389	T.A. Armstrong *et al.*	(ATHU, BARI, BIRM+)
BOYER	90	PR D42 1350	J. Boyer *et al.*	(Mark II Collab.)
MARSISKE	90	PR D41 3324	H. Marsiske *et al.*	(Crystal Ball Collab.)
MORGAN	90	ZPHY C48 623	D. Morgan, M.R. Pennington	(RAL, DURH)
AUGUSTIN	89	NP B320 1	J.E. Augustin, G. Cosme	(DM2 Collab.)
ASTON	88	NP B296 493	D. Aston *et al.*	(SLAC, NAGO, CINC, INUS)
FALVARD	88	PR D38 2706	A. Falvard *et al.*	(CLER, FRAS, LALO+)
AU	87	PR D35 1633	K.L. Au, D. Morgan, M.R. Pennington	(DURH, RAL)
BEVEREN	86	ZPHY C30 615	E. van Beveren *et al.*	(NIJM, BIEL)
COURAU	86	NP B271 1	A. Courau *et al.*	(CLER, LALO)
CASON	83	PR D28 1586	N.M. Cason *et al.*	(NDAM, ANL)
ETKIN	82B	PR D25 1786	A. Etkin *et al.*	(BNL, CUNY, TUFTS, VAND)
BISWAS	81	PRL 47 1378	N.N. Biswas *et al.*	(NDAM, ANL)
COHEN	80	PR D22 2595	D. Cohen *et al.*	(ANL) IJP
MUKHIN	80	JETPL 32 601 Translated from ZETFP 32 616.	K.N. Mukhin *et al.*	(KIAE)

BECKER	79	NP B151 46	H. Becker *et al.*	(MPIM, CERN, ZEEM, CRAC)	
CORDEN	79	NP B157 250	M.J. Corden *et al.*	(BIRM, RHEL, TELA+)	JP
ESTABROOKS	79	PR D19 2678	P. Estabrooks	(CARL)	
FROGGATT	77	NP B129 89	C.D. Froggatt, J.L. Petersen	(GLAS, NORD)	
PAWLICKI	77	PR D15 3196	A.J. Pawlicki *et al.*	(ANL)	IJ
ROSSELET	77	PR D15 574	L. Rosselet *et al.*	(GEVA, SACL)	
CASON	76	PRL 36 1485	N.M. Cason *et al.*	(NDAM, ANL)	IJ
ESTABROOKS	75	NP B95 322	P.G. Estabrooks, A.D. Martin	(DURH)	
HYAMS	75	NP B100 205	B.D. Hyams *et al.*	(CERN, MPIM)	
SRINIVASAN	75	PR D12 681	V. Srinivasan *et al.*	(NDAM, ANL)	
ESTABROOKS	74	NP B79 301	P.G. Estabrooks, A.D. Martin	(DURH)	
GRAYER	74	NP B75 189	G. Grayer *et al.*	(CERN, MPIM)	
APEL	73	PL 41B 542	W.D. Apel *et al.*	(KARL, PISA)	
HYAMS	73	NP B64 134	B.D. Hyams *et al.*	(CERN, MPIM)	
OCHS	73	Thesis	W. Ochs	(MPIM, MUNI)	
PROTOPOP...	73	PR D7 1279	S.D. Protopopescu *et al.*	(LBL)	
BAILLON	72	PL 38B 555	P.H. Baillon *et al.*	(SLAC)	
BASDEVANT	72	PL 41B 178	J.L. Basdevant, C.D. Froggatt, J.L. Petersen	(CERN)	
BEIER	72B	PRL 29 511	E.W. Beier *et al.*	(PENN)	
BENSINGER	71	PL 36B 134	J.R. Bensinger *et al.*	(WISC)	
COLTON	71	PR D3 2028	E.P. Colton *et al.*	(LBL, FNAL, UCLA+)	
BATON	70	PL 33B 528	J.P. Baton, G. Laurens, J. Reignier	(SACL)	
WALKER	67	RMP 39 695	W.D. Walker	(WISC)	

OTHER RELATED PAPERS

ABELE	01	EPJ C19 667	A. Abele *et al.*	(Crystal Barrel Collab.)
ABELE	01B	EPJ C21 261	A. Abele *et al.*	(Crystal Barrel Collab.)
CHERRY	01	NP A688 823	S.N. Cherry, M.R. Pennington	
DEANDREA	01	PL B502 79	A. Deandrea *et al.*	
FAZIO	01	PL B521 15	F. De Fazio, M.R. Pennington	
GOKALP	01	PR D64 053017	A. Gokalp, O. Yilmaz	
NARISON	01C	NPBPS 96 244	S. Narison	
XIAO	01	NP A695 273	Z. Xiao, H. Zheng	
ACHASOV	00H	PL B485 349	M.N. Achasov *et al.*	(Novosibirsk SND Collab.)
ALFORD	00	NP B578 367	M. Alford, R.L. Jaffe	
BLACK	00B	PR D61 074030	D. Black, A. Fariborz, J. Schechter	
FANG	00	NP A671 416	Fang Shi *et al.*	
JAMIN	00	NP B587 331	M. Jamin *et al.*	
MONTANET	00	NPBPS 86 381	L. Montanet	
ABREU	99J	PL B449 364	P. Abreu *et al.*	(DELPHI Collab.)
BLACK	99	PR D59 074026	D. Black *et al.*	
DELBOURGO	99	PL B446 332	R. Delbourgo, D. Liu, M. Scadron	
IGI	99	PR D59 034005	K. Igi, K. Hikasa	
LUCIO	99	PL B454 365	J.L. Lucio, M. Napsuciale	
MINKOWSKI	99	EPJ C9 283	P. Minkowski, W. Ochs	
SCADRON	99	EPJ C6 141	M. Scadron	
TAKAMATSU	99	PAN 62 435	K. Takamatsu	
ABELE	98	PR D57 3860	A. Abele *et al.*	(Crystal Barrel Collab.)
ACKERSTAFF	98A	EPJ C5 411	K. Ackerstaff *et al.*	(OPAL Collab.)
ACKERSTAFF	98Q	EPJ C4 19	K. Ackerstaff *et al.*	(OPAL Collab.)
ANISOVICH	98	PL B437 209	V.V. Anisovich *et al.*	
DELBOURGO	98	IJMP A13 657	R. Delbourgo *et al.*	
OLLER	98	PRL 80 3452	J.A. Oller *et al.*	
ANISOVICH	97	PL B395 123	A.V. Anisovich, A.V. Sarantsev	(PNPI)
ANISOVICH	97B	ZPHY A357 123	A.V. Anisovich *et al.*	(PNPI)
ANISOVICH	97C	PL B413 137	A.V. Anisovich, A.V. Sarantsev	
ANISOVICH	97D	ZPHY A359 173	A.V. Anisovich, V.V. Anisovich, A.V. Sarantsev	
CLOSE	97B	PR D55 5749	F. Close *et al.*	(RAL, RUTG, BEIJT)
ISHIDA	97B	PTP 98 621	S. Ishida *et al.*	
KAMINSKI	97	ZPHY C74 79	R. Kaminski, L. Lesniak, K. Rybicki	(CRAC)
MALTMAN	97	PL B393 19	K. Maltman, C.E. Wolfe	(YORKC)
OLLER	97	NP A620 438	J.A. Oller *et al.*	(VALE)
SVEC	97	PR D55 4355	M. Svec	
SVEC	97B	PR D55 5727	M. Svec	(MCGI)
ABELE	96	PL B380 453	A. Abele *et al.*	(Crystal Barrel Collab.)
AMSLER	96	PR D53 295	C. Amsler, F.E. Close	(ZURI, RAL)
BIJNENS	96	PL B374 210	J. Bijnens *et al.*	(NORD, BERN, WIEN+)
BONUTTI	96	PRL 77 603	F. Bonutti *et al.*	(TRSTI, TRSTT, TRIU)
BUGG	96	NP B471 59	D.V. Bugg, A.V. Sarantsev, B.S. Zou	(LOQM, PNPI)

HARADA	96	PR D54 1991	M. Harasa *et al.*	(SYRA)
ISHIDA	96	PTP 95 745	S. Ishida *et al.*	(TOKY, MIYA, KEK)
AMSLER	95C	PL B353 571	C. Amsler *et al.*	(Crystal Barrel Collab.)
AMSLER	95F	PL B358 389	C. Amsler *et al.*	(Crystal Barrel Collab.)
ANTINORI	95	PL B353 589	F. Antinori *et al.*	(ATHU, BARI, BIRM+)
BUGG	95	PL B353 378	D.V. Bugg *et al.*	(LOQM, PNPI, WASH)
GASPERO	95	NP A588 861	M. Gaspero	(ROMA)
TORNQVIST	95	ZPHY C68 647	N.A. Tornqvist	(HELS)
AMSLER	94	PL B322 431	C. Amsler *et al.*	(Crystal Barrel Collab.)
BUGG	94	PR D50 4412	D.V. Bugg *et al.*	(LOQM)
ADAMO	93	NP A558 13C	A. Adamo *et al.*	(OBELIX Collab.)
GASPERO	93	NP A562 407	M. Gaspero	(ROMAI)
MORGAN	93	PR D48 1185	D. Morgan, M.R. Pennington	(RAL, DURH)
Also	93C	NC A Conf. Suppl.	D. Morgan	(RAL)
BOLTON	92B	PRL 69 1328	T. Bolton *et al.*	(Mark III Collab.)
SVEC	92	PR D45 55	M. Svec, A. de Lesquen, L. van Rossum	(MCGI+)
SVEC	92B	PR D45 1518	M. Svec, A. de Lesquen, L. van Rossum	(MCGI+)
SVEC	92C	PR D46 949	M. Svec, A. de Lesquen, L. van Rossum	(MCGI+)
RIGGENBACH	91	PR D43 127	C. Riggenbach *et al.*	(BERN, CERN, MASA)
BAI	90C	PRL 65 2507	Z. Bai *et al.*	(Mark III Collab.)
WEINSTEIN	90	PR D41 2236	J. Weinstein, N. Isgur	(TNTO)
WEINSTEIN	89	UTPT 89 03	J. Weinstein, N. Isgur	(TNTO)
ASTON	88D	NP B301 525	D. Aston *et al.*	(SLAC, NAGO, CINC, INUS)
LONGACRE	86	PL B177 223	R.S. Longacre *et al.*	(BNL, BRAN, CUNY+)
ACHASOV	84	ZPHY C22 53	N.N. Achasov, S.A. Devyanin, G.N. Shestakov	(NOVM)
GASSER	84	ANP 158 142	J. Gasser, H. Leutwyler	
BINON	83	NC 78A 313	F.G. Binon *et al.*	(BELG, LAPP, SERP+)
TORNQVIST	82	PRL 49 624	N.A. Tornqvist	(HELS)
COSTA	80	NP B175 402	G. Costa *et al.*	(BARI, BONN, CERN, GLAS+)
BECKER	79B	NP B150 301	H. Becker *et al.*	(MPIM, CERN, ZEEM, CRAC)
NAGELS	79	PR D20 1633	M.M. Nagels, T.A. Rijken, J.J. de Swart	(NIJM)
POLYCHRO...	79	PR D19 1317	V.A. Polychronakos *et al.*	(NDAM, ANL) IJP
CORDEN	78	NP B144 253	M.J. Corden *et al.*	(BIRM, RHEL, TELA+)
JAFFE	77	PR D15 267,281	R. Jaffe	(MIT)
FLATTE	76	PL 63B 224	S.M. Flatte	(CERN)
WETZEL	76	NP B115 208	W. Wetzel *et al.*	(ETH, CERN, LOIC)
DEFOIX	72	NP B44 125	C. Defoix *et al.*	(CDEF, CERN)