

**$\Xi(2120)$** 

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

$J, P$  need confirmation.

OMITTED FROM SUMMARY TABLE

 **$\Xi(2120)$  MASS**

VALUE (MeV)	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
<b><math>\approx 2120</math> OUR ESTIMATE</b>				
2137 $\pm$ 4	18	1 CHLIAPNIK...	79 HBC	$K^+ p$ 32 GeV/c
2123 $\pm$ 7		2 GAY	76C HBC	$K^- p$ 4.2 GeV/c

 **$\Xi(2120)$  WIDTH**

VALUE (MeV)	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
<20	18	1 CHLIAPNIK...	79 HBC	$K^+ p$ 32 GeV/c
25 $\pm$ 12		2 GAY	76C HBC	$K^- p$ 4.2 GeV/c

 **$\Xi(2120)$  DECAY MODES**

Mode	Fraction ( $\Gamma_i/\Gamma$ )
$\Gamma_1 \Lambda \bar{K}$	seen

 **$\Xi(2120)$  BRANCHING RATIOS**

$\Gamma(\Lambda \bar{K})/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$	$\Gamma_1/\Gamma$
seen	1 CHLIAPNIK...
seen	2 GAY

 **$\Xi(2120)$  FOOTNOTES**

<sup>1</sup> CHLIAPNIKOV 79 does not uniquely identify the  $K^+$  in the  $(\bar{\Lambda} K^+) X$  final state. It also reports bumps with fewer events at 2240, 2540, and 2830 MeV.

<sup>2</sup> GAY 76C sees a 4-standard deviation signal. However, HEMINGWAY 77, with more events from the same experiment points out that the signal is greatly reduced if a cut is made on the 4-momentum  $u$ . This suggests an anomalous production mechanism if the  $\Xi(2120)$  is real.

 **$\Xi(2120)$  REFERENCES**

CHLIAPNIK... 79 NP B158 253  
HEMINGWAY 77 PL 68B 197  
GAY 76C PL 62B 477

P.V. Chliapnikov *et al.*  
R.J. Hemingway *et al.*  
J.B. Gay *et al.*

(CERN, BELG, MONS)  
(AMST, CERN, NIJM+)  
(AMST, CERN, NIJM)