Ξ_c^+

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

According to the quark model, the Ξ_c^+ (quark content usc) and Ξ_c^0 form an isospin doublet, and the spin-parity ought to be $J^P = 1/2^+$. None of I, J, or P have actually been measured.

Ξ_c^+ MASS

The fit uses the Ξ_c^+ and Ξ_c^0 mass and mass-difference measurements.

VALUE (MeV)	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
2465.1± 1.6 OUR FIT					
2465.4± 1.6 OUR AVERAGE					
2464.4± 2.0± 1.4	30	FRABETTI	93B	E687	γBe $\overline{E}_\gamma$= 220 GeV
2465.1± 3.6± 1.9	30	ALBRECHT	90F	ARG	e^+e^- at $\Upsilon(4S)$
2467 ± 3 ± 4	23	ALAM	89	CLEO	e^+e^- 10.6 GeV
2466.5± 2.7± 1.2	5	BARLAG	89C	ACCM	π^- Cu 230 GeV
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •					
2459 ± 5 ±30	56	[1] COTEUS	87	SPEC	nA $\simeq$ 600 GeV
2460 ±25	82	BIAGI	83	SPEC	Σ^- Be 135 GeV

[1] Although COTEUS 87 claims to agree well with BIAGI 83 on the mass and width, there appears to be a discrepancy between the two experiments. BIAGI 83 sees a single peak (stated significance about 6 standard deviations) in the $\Lambda K^-\pi^+\pi^+$ mass spectrum. COTEUS 87 sees *two* peaks in the same spectrum, one at the Ξ_c^+ mass, the other 75 MeV lower. The latter is attributed to $\Xi_c^+ \to \Sigma^0 K^-\pi^+\pi^+ \to (\Lambda\gamma)K^-\pi^+\pi^+$, with the γ unseen. The *combined* significance of the double peak is stated to be 5.5 standard deviations. But the absence of any trace of a lower peak in BIAGI 83 seems to us to throw into question the interpretation of the lower peak of COTEUS 87.

Ξ_c^+ MEAN LIFE

VALUE (10^{-12} s)	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
$0.35^{+0.07}_{-0.04}$ OUR AVERAGE					
$0.41^{+0.11}_{-0.08}\pm0.02$	30	FRABETTI	93B	E687	γBe $\overline{E}_\gamma$= 220 GeV
$0.20^{+0.11}_{-0.06}$	6	BARLAG	89C	ACCM	π^- (K^-) Cu 230 GeV
$0.40^{+0.18}_{-0.12}\pm0.10$	102	COTEUS	87	SPEC	nA $\simeq$ 600 GeV
$0.48^{+0.21}_{-0.15}{}^{+0.20}_{-0.10}$	53	BIAGI	85C	SPEC	Σ^- Be 135 GeV

Ξ_c^+ DECAY MODES

	Mode	Fraction (Γ_i/Γ)
Γ_1	$\Lambda K^-\pi^+\pi^+$	seen
Γ_2	$\Sigma^+ K^-\pi^+$	seen
Γ_3	$\Sigma^0 K^-\pi^+\pi^+$	seen
Γ_4	$\Xi^-\pi^+\pi^+$	seen

Ξ_c^+ BRANCHING RATIOS

$\Gamma(\Lambda K^-\pi^+\pi^+)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$ Γ_1/Γ

VALUE	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
seen	56	COTEUS	87	SPEC	nA $\simeq$ 600 GeV
seen	82	[2] BIAGI	83	SPEC	Σ^- Be 135 GeV

[2] BIAGI 85B look for but do not see the Ξ_c^+ in $pK^-\overline{K}{}^0\pi^+$ ($\Gamma(pK^-\overline{K}{}^0\pi^+)$ / $\Gamma(\Lambda K^-\pi^+\pi^+)$ <0.08 with 90% CL), $p2K^-2\pi^+$ ($\Gamma(p2K^-2\pi^+)$ / $\Gamma(\Lambda K^-\pi^+\pi^+)$ <0.03, 90% CL), $\Omega^- K^+\pi^+$, $\Lambda K^{*0}\pi^+$, and $\Sigma(1385)^+K^-\pi^+$.

$\Gamma(\Sigma^+ K^- \pi^+)/\Gamma(\Xi^- \pi^+ \pi^+)$ Γ_2/Γ_4

VALUE	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
$0.09^{+0.13+0.03}_{-0.06-0.02}$	5	BARLAG	89C	ACCM	2 $\Sigma^+ K^- \pi^+$, 3 $\Xi^- \pi^+ \pi^+$

$\Gamma(\Sigma^0 K^- \pi^+ \pi^+)/\Gamma(\Lambda K^- \pi^+ \pi^+)$ Γ_3/Γ_1

VALUE	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
0.84 ± 0.36	47	[3] COTEUS	87	SPEC	$nA \simeq$ 600 GeV

[3] See, however, the note on the COTEUS 87 Ξ_c^+ mass measurement.

$\Gamma(\Xi^- \pi^+ \pi^+)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$ Γ_4/Γ

VALUE	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
seen	30	FRABETTI	93B	E687	γBe $\overline{E}_\gamma =$ 220 GeV
seen	30	ALBRECHT	90F	ARG	$e^+ e^-$ at $\Upsilon(4S)$
seen	23	ALAM	89	CLEO	$e^+ e^-$ 10.6 GeV

Ξ_c^+ REFERENCES

FRABETTI	93B	PRL 70 1381	+Cheung, Cumalat+	(FNAL E687 Collab.)
ALBRECHT	90F	PL B247 121	+Ehrlichmann, Harder, Kruger, Nau+	(ARGUS Collab.)
ALAM	89	PL B226 401	+Katayama, Kim, Li, Lou, Sun+	(CLEO Collab.)
BARLAG	89C	PL B233 522	+Boehringer, Bosman+	(ACCMOR Collab.)
COTEUS	87	PRL 59 1530	+Binkley+	(FNAL E400 Collab.)
BIAGI	85B	ZPHY C28 175	+	(CERN WA62 Collab.)
BIAGI	85C	PL 150B 230	+	(CERN WA62 Collab.)
BIAGI	83	PL 122B 455	+	(CERN WA62 Collab.)