

# $\Sigma_c(2455)$

$$I(J^P) = 1(\frac{1}{2}^+) \quad \text{Status: } ****$$

The angular distribution of  $B^- \rightarrow \Sigma_c(2455)^0 \bar{p}$  favors  $J = 1/2$  (as the quark model predicts).  $J = 3/2$  is excluded by more than four  $\sigma$  see AUBERT 08BN.

## $\Sigma_c(2455)$ MASSES

The masses are obtained from the mass-difference measurements that follow.

### $\Sigma_c(2455)^{++}$ MASS

<u>VALUE (MeV)</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>
<b>2454.03 ± 0.18 OUR FIT</b>	

### $\Sigma_c(2455)^+$ MASS

<u>VALUE (MeV)</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>
<b>2452.9 ± 0.4 OUR FIT</b>	

### $\Sigma_c(2455)^0$ MASS

<u>VALUE (MeV)</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>
<b>2453.76 ± 0.18 OUR FIT</b>	

## $\Sigma_c(2455) - \Lambda_c^+$ MASS DIFFERENCES

### $m_{\Sigma_c^{++}} - m_{\Lambda_c^+}$

<u>VALUE (MeV)</u>	<u>EVTS</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
<b>167.56 ± 0.11 OUR FIT</b>				
<b>167.57 ± 0.13 OUR AVERAGE</b>				

167.4 ± 0.1 ± 0.2	2k	ARTUSO	02	CLE2	$e^+ e^- \approx \Upsilon(4S)$
167.35 ± 0.19 ± 0.12	461	LINK	00C	FOCS	$\gamma$ nucleus, $\bar{E}_\gamma$ 180 GeV
167.76 ± 0.29 ± 0.15	122	AITALA	96B	E791	$\pi^- N$ , 500 GeV
167.6 ± 0.6 ± 0.6	56	FRABETTI	96	E687	$\gamma$ Be, $\bar{E}_\gamma \approx 220$ GeV
168.2 ± 0.3 ± 0.2	126	CRAWFORD	93	CLE2	$e^+ e^- \approx \Upsilon(4S)$
167.8 ± 0.4 ± 0.3	54	BOWCOCK	89	CLEO	$e^+ e^-$ 10 GeV
168.2 ± 0.5 ± 1.6	92	ALBRECHT	88D	ARG	$e^+ e^-$ 10 GeV
167.4 ± 0.5 ± 2.0	46	DIESBURG	87	SPEC	$nA \sim 600$ GeV

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

167 ± 1	2	JONES	87	HBC	$\nu p$ in BEBC
166 ± 1	1	BOSETTI	82	HBC	See JONES 87
168 ± 3	6	BALTAY	79	HLBC	$\nu$ Ne-H in 15-ft
166 ± 15	1	CAZZOLI	75	HBC	$\nu p$ in BNL 7-ft

$$m_{\Sigma_c^+} - m_{\Lambda_c^+}$$

VALUE (MeV)	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
<b>166.4±0.4 OUR FIT</b>				
<b>166.4±0.2±0.3</b>	661	AMMAR	01	CLE2 $e^+e^- \approx \Upsilon(4S)$
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
168.5±0.4±0.2	111	CRAWFORD	93	CLE2 See AMMAR 01
168 ±3	1	CALICCHIO	80	HBC $\nu p$ in BEBC-TST

$$m_{\Sigma_c^0} - m_{\Lambda_c^+}$$

VALUE (MeV)	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
<b>167.30±0.11 OUR FIT</b>				
<b>167.29±0.13 OUR AVERAGE</b>				
167.2 ±0.1 ±0.2	2k	ARTUSO	02	CLE2 $e^+e^- \approx \Upsilon(4S)$
167.38±0.21±0.13	362	LINK	00C	FOCS $\gamma$ nucleus, $\bar{E}_\gamma$ 180 GeV
167.38±0.29±0.15	143	AITALA	96B	E791 $\pi^- N$ , 500 GeV
167.8 ±0.6 ±0.2		ALEEV	96	SPEC $n$ nucleus, 50 GeV/c
166.6 ±0.5 ±0.6	69	FRABETTI	96	E687 $\gamma$ Be, $\bar{E}_\gamma \approx 220$ GeV
167.1 ±0.3 ±0.2	124	CRAWFORD	93	CLE2 $e^+e^- \approx \Upsilon(4S)$
168.4 ±1.0 ±0.3	14	ANJOS	89D	E691 $\gamma$ Be 90–260 GeV
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
167.9 ±0.5 ±0.3	48	<sup>1</sup> BOWCOCK	89	CLEO $e^+e^-$ 10 GeV
167.0 ±0.5 ±1.6	70	<sup>1</sup> ALBRECHT	88D	ARG $e^+e^-$ 10 GeV
178.2 ±0.4 ±2.0	85	<sup>2</sup> DIESBURG	87	SPEC $nA \sim 600$ GeV
163 ±2	1	AMMAR	86	EMUL $\nu A$

<sup>1</sup> This result enters the fit through  $m_{\Sigma_c^{++}} - m_{\Sigma_c^0}$  given below.

<sup>2</sup> See the note on DIESBURG 87 in the  $m_{\Sigma_c^{++}} - m_{\Sigma_c^0}$  section below.

## $\Sigma_c(2455)$ MASS DIFFERENCES

$$m_{\Sigma_c^{++}} - m_{\Sigma_c^0}$$

VALUE (MeV)	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
<b>0.27±0.11 OUR FIT</b>	Error includes scale factor of 1.1.		
<b>0.26±0.14 OUR AVERAGE</b>	Error includes scale factor of 1.2.		
+ 0.2 ±0.1 ±0.1	ARTUSO	02	CLE2 $e^+e^- \approx \Upsilon(4S)$
− 0.03±0.28±0.11	LINK	00C	FOCS $\gamma$ nucleus, $\bar{E}_\gamma$ 180 GeV
+ 0.38±0.40±0.15	AITALA	96B	E791 $\pi^- N$ , 500 GeV
+ 1.1 ±0.4 ±0.1	CRAWFORD	93	CLE2 $e^+e^- \approx \Upsilon(4S)$
− 0.1 ±0.6 ±0.1	BOWCOCK	89	CLEO $e^+e^-$ 10 GeV
+ 1.2 ±0.7 ±0.3	ALBRECHT	88D	ARG $e^+e^- \sim 10$ GeV
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •			
−10.8 ±2.9	<sup>3</sup> DIESBURG	87	SPEC $nA \sim 600$ GeV

<sup>3</sup> DIESBURG 87 is completely incompatible with the other experiments, which is surprising since it agrees with them about  $m_{\Sigma_c(2455)^{++}} - m_{\Lambda_c^+}$ . We go with the majority here.

$$m_{\Sigma_c^+} - m_{\Sigma_c^0}$$

VALUE (MeV)	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
<b>-0.9±0.4 OUR FIT</b>			

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

1.4±0.5±0.3	CRAWFORD	93	CLE2	See AMMAR 01
-------------	----------	----	------	--------------

### $\Sigma_c(2455)$ WIDTHS

#### $\Sigma_c(2455)^{++}$ WIDTH

VALUE (MeV)	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
<b>2.23±0.30 OUR AVERAGE</b>				
2.3 ±0.2 ±0.3	2k	ARTUSO	02	CLE2 $e^+e^- \approx \Upsilon(4S)$
2.05 <sup>+0.41</sup> <sub>-0.38</sub> ±0.38	1110	LINK	02	FOCS $\gamma$ nucleus, $\bar{E}_\gamma \approx 180$ GeV

#### $\Sigma_c(2455)^+$ WIDTH

VALUE (MeV)	CL%	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
<b>&lt;4.6</b>	90	661	AMMAR	01	CLE2 $e^+e^- \approx \Upsilon(4S)$

#### $\Sigma_c(2455)^0$ WIDTH

VALUE (MeV)	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
<b>2.30±0.29 OUR AVERAGE</b>				Error includes scale factor of 1.1.
2.6 ±0.5 ±0.3		AUBERT	08BN BABR	$B^- \rightarrow \bar{p}\Lambda_c^+\pi^-$
2.5 ±0.2 ±0.3	2k	ARTUSO	02	CLE2 $e^+e^- \approx \Upsilon(4S)$
1.55 <sup>+0.41</sup> <sub>-0.37</sub> ±0.38	913	LINK	02	FOCS $\gamma$ nucleus, $\bar{E}_\gamma \approx 180$ GeV

### $\Sigma_c(2455)$ DECAY MODES

$\Lambda_c^+\pi$  is the only strong decay allowed to a  $\Sigma_c$  having this mass.

Mode	Fraction ( $\Gamma_i/\Gamma$ )
$\Gamma_1 \Lambda_c^+\pi$	$\approx 100\%$

### $\Sigma_c(2455)$ REFERENCES

AUBERT	08BN PR D78 112003	B. Aubert <i>et al.</i>	(BABAR Collab.)
ARTUSO	02 PR D65 071101R	M. Artuso <i>et al.</i>	(CLEO Collab.)
LINK	02 PL B525 205	J.M. Link <i>et al.</i>	(FNAL FOCUS Collab.)
AMMAR	01 PRL 86 1167	R. Ammar <i>et al.</i>	(CLEO Collab.)
LINK	00C PL B488 218	J.M. Link <i>et al.</i>	(FNAL FOCUS Collab.)
AITALA	96B PL B379 292	E.M. Aitala <i>et al.</i>	(FNAL E791 Collab.)
ALEEV	96 JINRRC 3-77 31	A.N. Aleev <i>et al.</i>	(Serpukhov EXCHARM Collab.)
FRABETTI	96 PL B365 461	P.L. Frabetti <i>et al.</i>	(FNAL E687 Collab.)
CRAWFORD	93 PRL 71 3259	G. Crawford <i>et al.</i>	(CLEO Collab.)
ANJOS	89D PRL 62 1721	J.C. Anjos <i>et al.</i>	(FNAL E691 Collab.)
BOWCOCK	89 PRL 62 1240	T.J.V. Bowcock <i>et al.</i>	(CLEO Collab.)
ALBRECHT	88D PL B211 489	H. Albrecht <i>et al.</i>	(ARGUS Collab.)
DIESBURG	87 PRL 59 2711	M. Diesburg <i>et al.</i>	(FNAL E400 Collab.)
JONES	87 ZPHY C36 593	G.T. Jones <i>et al.</i>	(CERN WA21 Collab.)
AMMAR	86 JETPL 43 515	R. Ammar <i>et al.</i>	(ITEP)

Translated from ZETFP 43 401.

BOSETTI	82	PL 109B 234	P.C. Bosetti <i>et al.</i>	(AACH3, BONN, CERN+)
CALICCHIO	80	PL 93B 521	M. Calicchio <i>et al.</i>	(BARI, BIRM, BRUX+)
BALTAY	79	PRL 42 1721	C. Baltay <i>et al.</i>	(COLU, BNL) I
CAZZOLI	75	PRL 34 1125	E.G. Cazzoli <i>et al.</i>	(BNL)

---