$f_0(600)$ or σ

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

NOTE ON SCALAR MESONS

Updated October 2003 by S. Spanier (University of Tennessee) and N.A. Törnqvist (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 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, central hadronic production, J/ψ, B-, 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.*).

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 ($I = 1/2$) a possible $K_0^*(800)$ (or κ), which need to be confirmed, the $K_0^*(1430)$, ($I = 1$) $a_0(980)$, $a_0(1450)$, and ($I = 0$) $f_0(600)$ or σ, $f_0(980)$, $f_0(1370)$, 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 $K_0^*(1430)$ (`ASTON 88`) is perhaps the least controversial of the light scalar mesons. The $K\pi$ S-wave scattering has two possible isospin channels, $I = 1/2$ and $I = 3/2$. The $I = 3/2$ wave is elastic and repulsive up to 1.7 GeV (`ESTABROOKS 78`) and contains no known resonances. The $I = 1/2$ $K\pi$ 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 (*e.g.*, D-meson decay analyses `LINK 02E, AITALA 02`). Some authors find this pole in their phenomenological analysis (see *e.g.*, `ISHIDA 97B,03, BLACK 01 03, DELBOURGO 98, OLLER 99,99C, ANISOVICH 97C, JAMIN 00, SHAKIN 01, SCADRON 03`), while others do not (*e.g.*, `CHERRY 01, KOPP 01`). Since it appears to be a very wide object ($\Gamma \approx 400$ 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, mostly due to the different models. For example, the analysis of the $\overline{p}p$-annihilation data using an 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 $\eta(1410)$ 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 in $\overline{p}p$ annihilation experiments with stopped and higher momenta $\overline{p}$, with a mass of about 1450 MeV, or close to the $a_2(1320)$ meson, which is typically a dominant feature. The relative couplings to the final states $\pi\eta$, $\overline{K}K$, and $\pi\eta'(958)$ are close to SU(3)-flavor predictions for an ordinary $\overline{q}q$ meson. The broad structure at about 1300 MeV observed in $\pi N \to \overline{K}KN$ reactions needs further confirmation in its existence and isospin assignment.

IV. The $I = 0$ 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 $\pi\pi$ 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 more than 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 re-analyses of the data). The re-analysis (`KAMINSKI 97`, see also `KAMINSKI 02, 03`) 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^o (in the "up") or 140^o (in the "down") solution to reach 230^o, 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, 02, 03`), 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 distinct resonance structure below 900 MeV, and these data are consistently described with the standard "down" solution, which allows for the existence of the broad ($\Gamma \approx 500$ MeV) resonance called σ. The σ pole is difficult to establish because of its large width, and can certainly not be modelled by a naive Breit-Wigner resonance. It can be distorted by a large destructive background required by chiral symmetry, and from crossed channel exchanges, the $f_0(1370)$, and other dynamical features. However, most analyses 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 the σ and the above mentioned 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`, and `ABELE 98`). Due to its interference with the $f_0(1370)$ (and $f_0(1700)$), the peak attributed to $f_0(1500)$ can appear shifted in invariant mass spectra. Therefore, the application of simple Breit-Wigner forms arrive at slightly different resonance masses for $f_0(1500)$. Analyses of central-production data of the likewise five decay modes (`BABERIS 99D, BABERIS 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, ABELE 01B`). The data on 4π from central production (`BABERIS 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 findings in $\overline{p}p$ annihilation, 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 What is the nature of the light scalars? In the literature, many suggestions are discussed in the literature such as $q\overline{q}$, $q\overline{q}q\overline{q}$ or meson-meson bound states supplemented with a scalar glueball. In reality, they are superpositions of these components, and one depends on models to determine the dominant component. Although we have seen progress in recent years, this question remains open. Here, we mention some of the present conclusions.

Almost every model on scalar states agrees that the $K_0^*(1430)$ is predominantly 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 the $f_0(1370)$, $a_0(1450)$, and the $K_0^*(1430)$ are in the same SU(3) flavor nonet being 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 $f_J(1720)$ (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 MeV region to be mixtures between an $\overline{u}u$, $\overline{s}s$, and a gluonium state, one can arrive at an arrangement 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 multi-quark states (`JAFFE 77, ALFORD 00`) or $\overline{K}K$ bound states (`WEINSTEIN 90`). 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 that the $f_0(980)$ is mainly $\overline{s}s$ surrounded by a virtual $\overline{K}K$ cloud. Recent data on radiative decays ($\phi \to f_0\gamma$ and $\phi \to a_0\gamma$) from SND (`ACHASOV 00F, ACHASOV 00H`), CMD2 (`AKHETSHIN 99C`), and KLOE (`ALOISIO 02C, ALOISIO 02D`) favor a 4-quark picture of the $f_0(980)$

and $a_0(980)$. (This conclusion may, however, be due to an oversimplified model for the radiative decays (`BOGLIONE 03`, `OLLER 03B`).) But it remains quite possible that the states $f_0(980)$ and $a_0(980)$, together with the $f_0(600)$ and the κ, may form a new nonet of predominantly four-quark states. This light scalar nonet has also been suggested (`CLOSE02B`) to consist of a central core of mainly four quarks, like those suggested by `JAFFE 77`, to make up a flavour nonet composed of four quarks in a particular colour configuration. At larger distances, the quarks would recombine into a pair of color singlet $q\overline{q}$'s, forming finally two pseudoscalars mesons and a meson cloud at the periphery.

Attempts have been made to start directly from chiral Lagrangians (`SCADRON 99`, `OLLER 99`, `ISHIDA 99`, and `TORNQVIST 99`, `OLLER 03B`), 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 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 $q\overline{q}$ and meson-meson channels, the light scalars can be understood as additional manifestations of bare $q\overline{q}$ confinement states, originally in the 1.3–1.5 GeV region, but very distorted and shifted due to the strong $^3P_0$ coupling to S-wave two-meson decay channels (`TORNQVIST 95,96`, `BEVEREN 86,99,01B`). Thus, the light scalar nonet comprising the $f_0(600)$ (σ), $f_0(980)$, $K_0^*(800)$ (κ), and $a_0(980)$, as well as the regular nonet consisting of the $f_0(1370)$,

$f_0(1500)$ (or $f_0(1710)$), $K_0^*(1430)$, and $a_0(1450)$, respectively, are two manifestations of the same bare input states (see also `BOGLIONE` 02).

Other models with different groupings of the observed resonances do of course exist. See *e.g.*, earlier versions of this review and papers listed as other related papers below.

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. • • •			
$(533 \pm 25)-i(247 \pm 25)$	[1] BUGG 03	RVUE	
$532 - i272$	BLACK 01	RVUE	$\pi^0\pi^0 \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0$
$(470 \pm 30)-i(295 \pm 20)$	[2] COLANGELO 01	RVUE	$\pi\pi \rightarrow \pi\pi$
$(535^{+48}_{-36})-i(155^{+76}_{-53})$	[3] ISHIDA 01		$\Upsilon(3S) \rightarrow \Upsilon\pi\pi$
$610 \pm 14 - i620 \pm 26$	[4] SUROVTSEV 01	RVUE	$\pi\pi \rightarrow \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$
$(558^{+34}_{-27})-i(196^{+32}_{-41})$	ISHIDA 00B		$p\overline{p} \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0\pi^0$
$445 - i235$	HANNAH 99	RVUE	π scalar form factor
$(523 \pm 12)-i(259 \pm 7)$	KAMINSKI 99	RVUE	$\pi\pi \rightarrow \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$, $\sigma\sigma$
$442 - i\ 227$	OLLER 99	RVUE	$\pi\pi \rightarrow \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$
$469 - i203$	OLLER 99B	RVUE	$\pi\pi \rightarrow \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$
$445 - i221$	OLLER 99C	RVUE	$\pi\pi \rightarrow \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$, $\eta\eta$
$(1530^{+90}_{-250})-i(560 \pm 40)$	ANISOVICH 98B	RVUE	Compilation
$420 - i\ 212$	LOCHER 98	RVUE	$\pi\pi \rightarrow \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$
$(602 \pm 26)-i(196 \pm 27)$	[5] ISHIDA 97		$\pi\pi \rightarrow \pi\pi$
$(537 \pm 20)-i(250 \pm 17)$	[6] KAMINSKI 97B	RVUE	$\pi\pi \rightarrow \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$, 4π
$470 - i250$	[7,8] TORNQVIST 96	RVUE	$\pi\pi \rightarrow \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$, $K\pi$, $\eta\pi$
$\sim (1100 - i300)$	AMSLER 95B	CBAR	$\overline{p}p \rightarrow 3\pi^0$
$400 - i500$	[8,9] AMSLER 95D	CBAR	$\overline{p}p \rightarrow 3\pi^0$
$1100 - i137$	[8,10] AMSLER 95D	CBAR	$\overline{p}p \rightarrow 3\pi^0$
$387 - i305$	[8,11] JANSSEN 95	RVUE	$\pi\pi \rightarrow \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$
$525 - i269$	[12] ACHASOV 94	RVUE	$\pi\pi \rightarrow \pi\pi$
$(506 \pm 10)-i(247 \pm 3)$	KAMINSKI 94	RVUE	$\pi\pi \rightarrow \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$
$370 - i356$	[13] ZOU 94B	RVUE	$\pi\pi \rightarrow \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$
$408 - i342$	[8,13] ZOU 93	RVUE	$\pi\pi \rightarrow \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$
$870 - i370$	[8,14] AU 87	RVUE	$\pi\pi \rightarrow \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$
$470 - i208$	[15] BEVEREN 86	RVUE	$\pi\pi \rightarrow \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$, $\eta\eta$, ...
$(750 \pm 50)-i(450 \pm 50)$	[16] ESTABROOKS 79	RVUE	$\pi\pi \rightarrow \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$
$(660 \pm 100)-i(320 \pm 70)$	PROTOPOP... 73	HBC	$\pi\pi \rightarrow \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$
$650 - i370$	[17] BASDEVANT 72	RVUE	$\pi\pi \rightarrow \pi\pi$

[1] From a combined analysis of HYAMS 73, AUGUSTIN 89, AITALA 01B, and PISLAK 01.

[2] From a phase-shift analysis of HYAMS 73 and PROTOPOPESCU 73 data.

[3] A similar analysis (KOMADA 01) finds $(580^{+79}_{-30})-i(190^{+107}_{-49})$ MeV.

[4] 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.

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

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

[7] 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.

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

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

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

[11] Analysis of data from FALVARD 88.

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

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

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

[15] Coupled-channel analysis using data from PROTOPOPESCU 73, HYAMS 73, HYAMS 75, GRAYER 74, ESTABROOKS 74, ESTABROOKS 75, FROGGATT 77, CORDEN 79, BISWAS 81.

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

[17] 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. • • •			
513 ± 32	[18] MURAMATSU 02	CLEO	$D^0 \to K^0_S\pi^+\pi^-$
$478^{+24}_{-23}\pm17$	AITALA 01B	E791	$D^+ \to \pi^-\pi^+\pi^+$
$563\pm{}^{+58}_{-20}$	[19] ISHIDA 01		$\Upsilon(3S) \to \Upsilon\pi\pi$
555	[20] 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 ± 4	ALEKSEEV 99	SPEC	1.78 $\pi^- p_{\text{polar}} \to \pi^-\pi^+ n$
744 ± 5	ALEKSEEV 98	SPEC	1.78 $\pi^- p_{\text{polar}} \to \pi^-\pi^+ n$
759 ± 5	[21] TROYAN 98		5.2 $np \to np\pi^+\pi^-$
780 ± 30	ALDE 97	GAM2	450 $pp \to pp\pi^0\pi^0$
585 ± 20	[22] ISHIDA 97		$\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$
761 ± 12	[23] SVEC 96	RVUE	6–17 $\pi N_{\text{polar}} \to \pi^+\pi^- N$
$\sim$ 860	[24,25] TORNQVIST 96	RVUE	$\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$, $K\pi$, $\eta\pi$
1165 ± 50	[26,27] 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	[28] ACHASOV 94	RVUE	$\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$
414 ± 20	[23] AUGUSTIN 89	DM2	

[18] Statistical uncertainty only.

[19] A similar analysis (KOMADA 01) finds 526^{+48}_{-37} MeV.

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

[21] 6σ effect, no PWA.

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

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

[24] 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.

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

[26] 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.

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

[28] 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. • • •			
335±67	[29] MURAMATSU 02	CLEO	$D^0 \to K^0_S \pi^+ \pi^-$
$324^{+42}_{-40} \pm 21$	AITALA 01B	E791	$D^+ \to \pi^- \pi^+ \pi^+$
$372 \pm {}^{+229}_{-95}$	[30] ISHIDA 01		$\Upsilon(3S) \to \Upsilon \pi\pi$
540	[31] 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	[32] TROYAN 98		5.2 $np \to np\pi^+\pi^-$
780±60	ALDE 97	GAM2	450 $pp \to pp\pi^0\pi^0$
385±70	[33] ISHIDA 97		$\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$
290±54	[34] SVEC 96	RVUE	6–17 $\pi N_{\text{polar}} \to \pi^+ \pi^- N$
∼ 880	[35,36] TORNQVIST 96	RVUE	$\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$, $K\pi$, $\eta\pi$
460±40	[37,38] 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	[39] ACHASOV 94	RVUE	$\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$
494±58	[34] AUGUSTIN 89	DM2	

[29] Statistical uncertainty only.

[30] A similar analysis (KOMADA 01) finds 301^{+145}_{-100} MeV.

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

[32] 6σ effect, no PWA.

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

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

[35] 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.

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

[37] 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.

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

[39] 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

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

VALUE (keV)	*DOCUMENT ID*		*TECN*	*COMMENT*
3.8±1.5	[40,41] BOGLIONE	99	RVUE	$\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$, $\pi^0\pi^0$
5.4±2.3	[40] MORGAN	90	RVUE	$\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$, $\pi^0\pi^0$
10 ±6	COURAU	86	DM1	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^- e^+e^-$

[40] 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 $f_2(1270)$.

[41] Supersedes MORGAN 90.

$f_0(600)$ REFERENCES

BUGG	03	PL B572 1	D.V. Bugg	
MURAMATSU	02	PRL 89 251802	H. Muramatsu *et al.*	(CLEO Collab.)
Also	03	PRL 90 059901 (erratum)	H. Muramatsu *et al.*	(CLEO Collab.)
AITALA	01B	PRL 86 770	E.M. Aitala *et al.*	(FNAL E791 Collab.)
BLACK	01	PR D64 014031	D. Black *et al.*	
COLANGELO	01	NP B603 125	G. Colangelo, J. Gasser, H. Leytwyler	
ISHIDA	01	PL B518 47	M. Ishida *et al.*	
KOMADA	01	PL B508 31	T. Komada *et al.*	
PISLAK	01	PRL 87 221801	S. Pislak *et al.*	(BNL E865 Collab.)
Also	03	PR D67 072004	S. Pislak *et al.*	(BNL E865 Collab.)
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	K.N. Mukhin *et al.*	(KIAE)	
		Translated from ZETFP 32 616.			
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

ABDEL-REHIM	03	PR D67 054001	A. Abdel-Rehim *et al.*
ABDEL-REHIM	03B	PR D68 013008	A. Abdlel-Rehim *et al.*
ISHIDA	03	PTPS 149 190	M. Ishida
KAMINSKI	03	PL B551 241	R. Kaminski, L. Lesniak, B. Loiseau
OLLER	03B	NP A714 161	J.A. Oller *et al.*
SCADRON	03	NP A724 391	M.D. Scadron *et al.*
SEMENOV	03	PAN 66 526	S.V. Semenov
		Translated from YAF 66 553.	

AITALA	02	PRL 89 121801	E.M. Aitala *et al.*	(FNAL E791 Collab.)
BEVEREN	02	MPL A17 1673	E. van Beveren *et al.*	
BLACK	02	PRL 88 181603	D. Black, M. Harada, J. Schechter	
BOGLIONE	02	PR D65 114010	M. Boglione, M.R. Pennington	
BRAMON	02	EPJ C26 253	A. Bramon *et al.*	
CLOSE	02B	JPG 28 R249	F.E. Close, N. Tornqvist	
HE	02	PL B536 59	J. He, Z.G. Xiao, H.Q. Zheng	
HERNANDEZ	02	PR C66 065201	E. Hernandez, E. Oset, M.J. Vicente Vacas	
ISHIDA	02	PL B539 249	S. Ishida, M. Ishida	
KAMINSKI	02	EPJ Direct C4 1	R. Kaminski, L. Lesniak, K. Rybicki	
LINK	02E	PL B535 43	J.M. Link *et al.*	(FNAL FOCUS Collab.)
TESHIMA	02	JPG 28 1391	T. Teshima, I. Kitamura, N. Morisita	
ABELE	01	EPJ C19 667	A. Abele *et al.*	(Crystal Barrel Collab.)
ABELE	01B	EPJ C21 261	A. Abele *et al.*	(Crystal Barrel Collab.)
BEVEREN	01B	EPJ C22 493	E. van Beveren	
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	
ACKERSTAFF	98A	EPJ C5 411	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	97D	ZPHY A359 173	A.V. Anisovich, V.V. Anisovich, A.V. Sarantsev	
HARADA	97	PRL 78 1603	M. Harada, F. Sannino, J. Schechter	
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)
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)
ANTINORI	95	PL B353 589	F. Antinori *et al.*	(ATHU, BARI, BIRM+)
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)
ASTON	88D	NP B301 525	D. Aston *et al.*	(SLAC, NAGO, CINC, INUS)

ACHASOV	84	ZPHY C22 53	N.N. Achasov, S.A. Devyanin, G.N. Shestakov	(NOVM)
GASSER	84	ANP 158 142	J. Gasser, H. Leutwyler	
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)