# $f_0(600)$ or $\sigma$

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

## NOTE ON SCALAR MESONS

Updated January 2006 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 $\bar{K}K$ and $\eta\eta$ thresholds produce sharp cusps in the energy dependence of the resonant amplitude. Furthermore, one expects non-$\bar{q}q$ 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. For some recent reviews see AMSLER 04, BUGG 04C, CLOSE 02B.

Scalars are produced, for example, in $\pi N$ scattering on polarized/unpolarized targets, $\bar{p}p$ annihilation, central hadronic production, $J/\Psi$, $B$-, $D$- and $K$-meson decays, $\gamma\gamma$ formation, and $\phi$ 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 flavour-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.*). Dynamics near the lowest two-body thresholds in some analyses is described by crossed channel $(t, u)$ meson exchange or with an effective range parameterization instead of or in addition to resonant features in the $s$-channel, only. Furthermore, elastic $S$-wave scattering amplitudes involving soft pions have zeros close to threshold (ADLER 65, 65A), which may be shifted or removed in associated production processes.

The mass and width of a resonance are found from the position of the nearest pole in the process amplitude ($T$-matrix or $S$-matrix) at an unphysical sheet of the complex energy plane: $(E - i\,\Gamma/2)$. It is important to notice 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 parametrization) agree with this pole position.

In this note, we discuss all light scalars organized in the listings under the entries $(I = 1/2)$ $K_0^*(800)$ (or $\kappa$), $K^*(1430)$, $(I = 1)$ $a_0(980)$, $a_0(1450)$, and $(I = 0)$ $f_0(600)$ (or $\sigma$), $f_0(980)$, $f_0(1370)$, 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, $I = 1/2$ 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 in $Kp$ production, 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 (BERNARD 91, 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 "$\kappa$" meson in the 700-900 MeV region (*e.g.* $D$-meson decay analyses LINK 02, AITALA 02, 06). Some authors find this pole in their phenomenological analysis (see *e.g.* PALAEZ 04A, ZHENG 04, ISHIDA 03, BLACK 01,03, BUGG 03, DELBOURGO 98, OLLER 99, 99C, SCADRON 03, ANISOVICH 97C, JAMIN 00, SHAKIN 01), while others do not (*e.g.* CHERRY 01, KOPP 01, LINK 05I). Since it appears to be a very wide object ($\Gamma \approx 500$ MeV) near the $K\pi$ threshold, its presence and properties are difficult to establish on data.

In an important observation BES finds a $\kappa$ like structure in J/$\psi$ decays to $\bar{K}^{*0}(892)K^+\pi^-$ where $\kappa$ recoils against the $K^*(892)$ (ABLIKIM 06C).

***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 $\bar{K}K$ component in the $a_0(980)$ wave function must be large: it lies just below the opening of the $\bar{K}K$ channel to which it strongly couples. This generates 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 $\bar{p}p$-annihilation data using an unitary $K$-matrix description finds a width as determined from the $T$-matrix pole of $92 \pm 8$ MeV, while the observed width of the peak in the $\pi\eta$ mass spectrum is about 45 MeV.

The relative coupling $\bar{K}K/\pi\eta$ 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 $\bar{K}K\pi$ final states of $\bar{p}p$ annihilation at rest (ABELE 98).

The $a_0(1450)$ is seen in $\bar{p}p$ annihilation experiments with stopped and higher momenta $\bar{p}$, with a mass of about 1450 MeV or close to the $a_2(1320)$ meson which is typically a dominant feature. The broad structure at about 1300 MeV observed in $\pi N \to \bar{K}KN$ reactions (MARTIN 79) 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 $\pi\pi$, $\bar{K}K$, $\eta\eta$, $4\pi$, 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 $\sigma$ 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 $\bar{K}K$ final states. Information on the $\pi\pi$ $S$-wave phase shift $\delta^I_J = \delta^0_0$ was already extracted 30 years ago from the $\pi N$ 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 $\pi\pi \rightarrow \bar{K}K$ cross sections (WETZEL 76, POLYCHRONAKOS 79, COHEN 80, and ETKIN 82B) may have large uncertainties. The $\pi N$ data (GRAYER 74, BECKER 79) have been analyzed in combination with high-statistics data from $\bar{p}p$ annihilation at rest (see entries labeled as RVUE for re-analyses of the data). The re-analysis (KAMINSKI 97, 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 $\bar{K}K$-threshold. The phase shift $\delta_0^0$ 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 $\pi$- and $a_1(1260)$-exchange in the reaction amplitudes. The $2\pi^0$ invariant mass spectra of the $\bar{p}p$ 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 (GRAYER 74, KAMINSKI 97), which allows for the existence of the broad ($\Gamma \approx 500$ MeV) resonance called $\sigma$. An enhancement is observed in the $\pi^+\pi^-$ invariant mass near threshold in the decays $D^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^+$ (AITALA 01B, LINK 04) and $J/\psi \rightarrow \omega\pi^+\pi^-$ (AUGUSTIN 89, ABLIKIM 04A). The $\sigma$ 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 background as required by chiral symmetry, and from crossed channel exchanges, the $f_0(1370)$, and other dynamical features; it may be generated by $t$-channel meson exchanges (LOHSE 90, ZOU 94). 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 $\sigma$ and the above mentioned broad background. This can lead to a dip in the $\pi\pi$ spectrum at the $\bar{K}K$ threshold. It changes from a dip into a peak structure in the $\pi^0\pi^0$ invariant mass spectrum of the reaction $\pi^- p \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0 n$ (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 $\pi$-exchange decreases.

One also observes the $\sigma$, and the $a_0(980)$, in radiative decays ($\phi \rightarrow f_0\gamma$, $\phi \rightarrow a_0\gamma$) in SND data (ACHASOV 00F, ACHASOV 00H), CMD2 (AKHMETSHIN 99B), and in KLOE data (ALOISIO 02C, ALOISIO 02D). In addition to these observations of the $\sigma$, its existence is also supported by the reaction $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0\gamma$ in the vicinity of the $\rho$ and $\omega$ peaks. Both SND (ACHASOV 02F) and CMD-2 (AKHMETSHIN 04B) conclude that their value for the branching ratio $\rho \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0\ \gamma$ exceeds the expectations from vector dominance, and that their results are much better described if a direct coupling of $\rho \rightarrow \sigma\ \gamma$ is added.

A meson resonance that is very well studied experimentally, is the $f_0(1500)$ seen by the Crystal Barrel experiment in five decay modes: $\pi\pi$, $\bar{K}K$, $\eta\eta$, $\eta\eta'(958)$, and $4\pi$ (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 (BARBERIS 99D, BARBERIS 00E) agree on the description of the S wave with the one above. The $\bar{p}p$, $\bar{n}p/\bar{p}n$ (GASPERO 93, ADAMO 93, AMSLER 94, ABELE 96) show a single enhancement at 1400 MeV in the invariant $4\pi$ mass spectra, which is resolved into $f_0(1370)$ and $f_0(1500)$ (ABELE 01, ABELE01B). The data on $4\pi$ from central production (BABERIS 00C) require both resonances, too, but disagree on the relative content of $\rho\rho$ and $\sigma\sigma$ in $4\pi$. All investigations agree, that the $4\pi$ 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 $2\pi$ spectra, its mass and width are difficult to determine. Multichannel analyses of hadronically produced two- and three-body final states agree on a mass between 1300 MeV and 1400 MeV and a narrow $f_0(1500)$, but arrive at a somewhat smaller width for $f_0(1370)$.

Both Belle and BaBar have observed strong indications of scalars in B meson decays. For example, GARMASH 02 saw a broad structure between 1.0 and 1.5 GeV in $\pi^+\pi^-, K^+K^-$ and $K\pi$ final states. It could be a result of interference of several resonances in this mass range, but lack of statistics prevent from an unambiguous identification of this effect.

***V. Interpretation:*** What is the nature of the light scalars? In the literature, many suggestions are discussed such as conventional $q\bar{q}$ mesons, $q\bar{q}q\bar{q}$ or meson-meson bound states mixed with a scalar glueball. In reality, they can be superpositions of these components, and one depends on models to determine the dominant one. 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 $K^*(1430)$ is predominantly the quark model $s\bar{u}$ or $s\bar{d}$ 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 $K^*(1430)$ are in the same SU(3) flavour nonet being the $(\bar{u}u + \bar{d}d)$, $u\bar{d}$ and $u\bar{s}$ 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 $f_0(1700)$. 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 $\bar{u}u$, $\bar{s}s$, 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-$\bar{q}q$ states.

The $f_0(980)$ and $a_0(980)$ are often interpreted as multi-quark states (JAFFE 77, ALFORD 00, MAIANI 04A) or $\bar{K}K$ bound states (WEINSTEIN 90). The insight into their internal structure using two-photon widths (BARNES 85, LI 91, DEL-BOURGO 99, LUCIO 99, ACHASOV 00H) is not conclusive. The $f_0(980)$ appears as a peak structure in $J/\psi \rightarrow \phi\pi^+\pi^-$ and in $D_s$ decays without $f_0(600)$ background. Based on that observation it is suggested that $f_0(980)$ has a large $\bar{s}s$ component, which according to (DEANDREA 01) is surrounded by a virtual $\bar{K}K$ cloud. Data on radiative decays ($\phi \rightarrow f_0\gamma$ and $\phi \rightarrow a_0\gamma$) from SND, CMD2, and KLOE (see above) favour a 4-quark picture of the $f_0(980)$ and $a_0(980)$. The underlying model for this conclusion (BOGLIONE 03, OLLER 03B) however may be oversimplified. But it remains quite possible that the states $f_0(980)$ and $a_0(980)$, together with the $f_0(600)$ and the $K_0^*(800)$, form a new low-mass state nonet of predominantly four-quark states, where at larger distances the quarks recombine into a pair of pseudoscalar mesons forming by a meson cloud.

Attempts have been made to start directly from chiral Lagrangians (SCADRON 99, OLLER 99, ISHIDA 99, TORNQVIST 99, OLLER 03B, NAPSUCIALE 04, 04A) which predict the existence of the $\sigma$ meson near 500 MeV. Hence, *e.g.*, in the chiral linear sigma model with 3 flavours, the $\sigma$, $a_0(980)$, $f_0(980)$, and $\kappa$ (or $K_0^*(1430)$) would form a nonet (not necessarily $\bar{q}q$), 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 the unitarized quark model with coupled $q\bar{q}$ and meson-meson channels, the light scalars can be understood as additional manifestations of bare $\bar{q}q$ confinement states, strongly mass shifted from the 1.3 - 1.5 GeV region and very distorted 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 $f_0(600)$, $f_0(980)$, $K_0^*(800)$, and $a_0(980)$, as well as the regular nonet consisting of the $f_0(1370)$, $f_0(1500)$ (or $f_0(1700)$), $K^*(1430)$, 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 exist and may *e.g.* be found in 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 $\Gamma \approx 2$ Im($\sqrt{s_{pole}}$).

| VALUE (MeV) | DOCUMENT ID | | TECN | COMMENT |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **(400–1200)−*i*(250–500) OUR ESTIMATE** | | | | |
| • • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • • | | | | |
| $(441^{+16}_{-8})-i(272^{+9}_{-12.5})$ | [1] CAPRINI | 06 | RVUE | $\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$ |
| $(470 \pm 50)-i(285 \pm 25)$ | [2] ZHOU | 05 | RVUE | |
| $(541 \pm 39)-i(252 \pm 42)$ | [3] ABLIKIM | 04A | BES2 | $J/\psi \to \omega\pi^+\pi^-$ |
| $(528 \pm 32)-i(207 \pm 23)$ | [4] GALLEGOS | 04 | RVUE | Compilation |
| $(440 \pm 8)-i(212 \pm 15)$ | [5] PELAEZ | 04A | RVUE | $\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$ |
| $(533 \pm 25)-i(247 \pm 25)$ | [6] BUGG | 03 | RVUE | |
| $532 - i272$ | BLACK | 01 | RVUE | $\pi^0\pi^0 \to \pi^0\pi^0$ |
| $(470 \pm 30)-i(295 \pm 20)$ | [1] COLANGELO | 01 | RVUE | $\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$ |
| $(535^{+48}_{-36})-i(155^{+76}_{-53})$ | [7] ISHIDA | 01 | | $\Upsilon(3S) \to \Upsilon\pi\pi$ |
| $610 \pm 14 - i620 \pm 26$ | [8] SUROVTSEV | 01 | RVUE | $\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$ |
| $(558^{+34}_{-27})-i(196^{+32}_{-41})$ | ISHIDA | 00B | | $p\overline{p} \to \pi^0\pi^0\pi^0$ |
| $445 - i235$ | HANNAH | 99 | RVUE | $\pi$ 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 | $\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$ , $K\overline{K}$ |
| $(602 \pm 26)-i(196 \pm 27)$ | [9] ISHIDA | 97 | | $\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$ |
| $(537 \pm 20)-i(250 \pm 17)$ | [10] KAMINSKI | 97B | RVUE | $\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$, $4\pi$ |
| $470 - i250$ | [11,12] TORNQVIST | 96 | RVUE | $\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$, $K\pi$, $\eta\pi$ |
| $\sim (1100 - i300)$ | AMSLER | 95B | CBAR | $\overline{p}p \to 3\pi^0$ |
| $400 - i500$ | [12,13] AMSLER | 95D | CBAR | $\overline{p}p \to 3\pi^0$ |
| $1100 - i137$ | [12,14] AMSLER | 95D | CBAR | $\overline{p}p \to 3\pi^0$ |
| $387 - i305$ | [12,15] JANSSEN | 95 | RVUE | $\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$ |
| $525 - i269$ | [16] ACHASOV | 94 | RVUE | $\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$ |
| $(506 \pm 10)-i(247 \pm 3)$ | KAMINSKI | 94 | RVUE | $\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$ |
| $370 - i356$ | [17] ZOU | 94B | RVUE | $\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$ |
| $408 - i342$ | [12,17] ZOU | 93 | RVUE | $\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$ |
| $870 - i370$ | [12,18] AU | 87 | RVUE | $\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$ |
| $470 - i208$ | [19] BEVEREN | 86 | RVUE | $\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$, $\eta\eta$, ... |
| $(750 \pm 50)-i(450 \pm 50)$ | [20] ESTABROOKS | 79 | RVUE | $\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$ |
| $(660 \pm 100)-i(320 \pm 70)$ | PROTOPOP... | 73 | HBC | $\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$ |
| $650 - i370$ | [21] BASDEVANT | 72 | RVUE | $\pi\pi \to \pi\pi$ |

[1] From the solution of the Roy equation (ROY 71) for the isoscalar S-wave and using a phase-shift analysis of HYAMS 73 and PROTOPOPESCU 73 data.
[2] Reanalysis of the data from PROTOPOPESCU 73, ESTABROOKS 74, GRAYER 74, ROSSELET 77, PISLAK 03, and AKHMETSHIN 04.
[3] From a mean of six different analyses and $f_0(600)$ parameterizations.
[4] Using data on $\psi(2S) \rightarrow J/\psi\pi\pi$ from BAI 00E and on $\Upsilon(\mathrm{nS}) \rightarrow \Upsilon(\mathrm{mS})\pi\pi$ from BUTLER 94B and ALEXANDER 98.
[5] Reanalysis of data from PROTOPOPESCU 73, ESTABROOKS 74, GRAYER 74, and COHEN 80 in the unitarized ChPT model.
[6] From a combined analysis of HYAMS 73, AUGUSTIN 89, AITALA 01B, and PISLAK 01.
[7] A similar analysis (KOMADA 01) finds $(580^{+79}_{-30})-i(190^{+107}_{-\ 49})$ MeV.
[8] 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.
[9] Reanalysis of data from HYAMS 73, GRAYER 74, SRINIVASAN 75, and ROSSELET 77 using the interfering amplitude method.
[10] Average and spread of 4 variants ("up" and "down") of KAMINSKI 97B 3-channel model.
[11] 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.
[12] Demonstrates explicitly that $f_0(600)$ and $f_0(1370)$ are two different poles.
[13] Coupled channel analysis of $\overline{p}p \rightarrow 3\pi^0$, $\pi^0\eta\eta$ and $\pi^0\pi^0\eta$ on sheet II.
[14] Coupled channel analysis of $\overline{p}p \rightarrow 3\pi^0$, $\pi^0\eta\eta$ and $\pi^0\pi^0\eta$ on sheet III.
[15] Analysis of data from FALVARD 88.
[16] Analysis of data from OCHS 73, ESTABROOKS 75, ROSSELET 77, and MUKHIN 80.
[17] Analysis of data from OCHS 73, GRAYER 74, and ROSSELET 77.
[18] Analysis of data from OCHS 73, GRAYER 74, BECKER 79, and CASON 83.
[19] Coupled-channel analysis using data from PROTOPOPESCU 73, HYAMS 73, HYAMS 75, GRAYER 74, ESTABROOKS 74, ESTABROOKS 75, FROGGATT 77, CORDEN 79, BISWAS 81.
[20] Analysis of data from APEL 73, GRAYER 74, CASON 76, PAWLICKI 77. Includes spread and errors of 4 solutions.
[21] 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** | | | | |
| $513\pm32$ | [22] MURAMATSU | 02 | CLEO | $e^+e^- \approx$ 10 GeV |
| • • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • • | | | | |
| $478^{+24}_{-23}\pm17$ | AITALA | 01B | E791 | $D^+ \rightarrow \pi^-\pi^+\pi^+$ |
| $563\pm^{+58}_{-20}$ | [23] ISHIDA | 01 | | $\Upsilon(3S) \rightarrow \Upsilon\pi\pi$ |
| 555 | [24] ASNER | 00 | CLE2 | $\tau^- \rightarrow \pi^-\pi^0\pi^0\nu_\tau$ |
| $540\pm36$ | ISHIDA | 00B | | $p\overline{p} \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0\pi^0$ |
| $750\pm\ 4$ | ALEKSEEV | 99 | SPEC | $1.78\ \pi^- p_{\mathrm{polar}} \rightarrow \pi^-\pi^+ n$ |
| $744\pm\ 5$ | ALEKSEEV | 98 | SPEC | $1.78\ \pi^- p_{\mathrm{polar}} \rightarrow \pi^-\pi^+ n$ |
| $759\pm\ 5$ | [25] TROYAN | 98 | | $5.2\ np \rightarrow np\pi^+\pi^-$ |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 780±30 | ALDE | 97 | GAM2 | 450 $pp \rightarrow pp\pi^0\pi^0$ |
| 585±20 | [26] ISHIDA | 97 | | $\pi\pi \rightarrow \pi\pi$ |
| 761±12 | [27] SVEC | 96 | RVUE | 6–17 $\pi N_{polar} \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^- N$ |
| ~ 860 | [28,29] TORNQVIST | 96 | RVUE | $\pi\pi \rightarrow \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$, $K\pi$, $\eta\pi$ |
| 1165±50 | [30,31] ANISOVICH | 95 | RVUE | $\pi^- p \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0 n$, $\overline{p}p \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0\pi^0$, $\pi^0\pi^0\eta$, $\pi^0\eta\eta$ |
| ~ 1000 | [32] ACHASOV | 94 | RVUE | $\pi\pi \rightarrow \pi\pi$ |
| 414±20 | [27] AUGUSTIN | 89 | DM2 | |

[22] Statistical uncertainty only.

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

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

[25] $6\sigma$ effect, no PWA.

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

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

[28] 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.

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

[30] 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 from ANISOVICH 94.

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

[32] 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** | | | | |
| 335±67 | [33] MURAMATSU | 02 | CLEO | $e^+e^- \approx$ 10 GeV |
| • • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • • | | | | |
| $324^{+42}_{-40}\pm$ 21 | AITALA | 01B | E791 | $D^+ \rightarrow \pi^-\pi^+\pi^+$ |
| $372\pm^{+229}_{-95}$ | [34] ISHIDA | 01 | | $\Upsilon(3S) \rightarrow \Upsilon\pi\pi$ |
| 540 | [35] ASNER | 00 | CLE2 | $\tau^- \rightarrow \pi^-\pi^0\pi^0\nu_\tau$ |
| 372±80 | ISHIDA | 00B | | $p\overline{p} \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0\pi^0$ |
| 119±13 | ALEKSEEV | 99 | SPEC | 1.78 $\pi^- p_{polar} \rightarrow \pi^-\pi^+ n$ |
| 77±22 | ALEKSEEV | 98 | SPEC | 1.78 $\pi^- p_{polar} \rightarrow \pi^-\pi^+ n$ |
| 35±12 | [36] TROYAN | 98 | | 5.2 $np \rightarrow np\pi^+\pi^-$ |
| 780±60 | ALDE | 97 | GAM2 | 450 $pp \rightarrow pp\pi^0\pi^0$ |
| 385±70 | [37] ISHIDA | 97 | | $\pi\pi \rightarrow \pi\pi$ |
| 290±54 | [38] SVEC | 96 | RVUE | 6–17 $\pi N_{polar} \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^- N$ |
| ~ 880 | [39,40] TORNQVIST | 96 | RVUE | $\pi\pi \rightarrow \pi\pi$, $K\overline{K}$, $K\pi$, $\eta\pi$ |
| 460±40 | [41,42] ANISOVICH | 95 | RVUE | $\pi^- p \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0 n$, $\overline{p}p \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0\pi^0$, $\pi^0\pi^0\eta$, $\pi^0\eta\eta$ |
| ~ 3200 | [43] ACHASOV | 94 | RVUE | $\pi\pi \rightarrow \pi\pi$ |
| 494±58 | [38] AUGUSTIN | 89 | DM2 | |

[33] Statistical uncertainty only.
[34] A similar analysis (KOMADA 01) finds $301^{+145}_{-100}$ MeV.
[35] From the best fit of the Dalitz plot.
[36] $6\sigma$ effect, no PWA.
[37] Reanalysis of data from HYAMS 73, GRAYER 74, SRINIVASAN 75, and ROSSELET 77 using the interfering amplitude method.
[38] Breit-Wigner fit to S-wave intensity measured in $\pi N \rightarrow \pi^- \pi^+ N$ on polarized targets. The fit does not include $f_0(980)$.
[39] 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.
[40] Also observed by ASNER 00 in $\tau^- \rightarrow \pi^- \pi^0 \pi^0 \nu_\tau$ decays.
[41] 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 from ANISOVICH 94.
[42] The pole is on Sheet III. Demonstrates explicitly that $f_0(600)$ and $f_0(1370)$ are two different poles.
[43] Analysis of data from OCHS 73, ESTABROOKS 75, ROSSELET 77, and MUKHIN 80.

## $f_0(600)$ DECAY MODES

| | Mode | Fraction ($\Gamma_i/\Gamma$) |
|---|---|---|
| $\Gamma_1$ | $\pi\pi$ | dominant |
| $\Gamma_2$ | $\gamma\gamma$ | seen |

## $f_0(600)$ PARTIAL WIDTHS

### $\Gamma(\gamma\gamma)$ $\Gamma_2$

| VALUE (keV) | DOCUMENT ID | | TECN | COMMENT |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| • • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • • | | | | |
| $3.8\pm1.5$ | [44,45] BOGLIONE | 99 | RVUE | $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$, $\pi^0\pi^0$ |
| $5.4\pm2.3$ | [44] MORGAN | 90 | RVUE | $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$, $\pi^0\pi^0$ |
| $10 \pm6$ | COURAU | 86 | DM1 | $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^- e^+e^-$ |

[44] 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 $f_2(1270)$.
[45] Supersedes MORGAN 90.

## $f_0(600)$ REFERENCES


| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| CAPRINI | 06 | PRL 96 132001 | I. Caprini, G. Colangelo, H. Leutwyler | (BCIP+) |
| ZHOU | 05 | JHEP 0502 043 | Z.Y. Zhou *et al.* | |
| ABLIKIM | 04A | PL B598 149 | M. Ablikim *et al.* | (BES Collab.) |
| AKHMETSHIN | 04 | PL B578 285 | R.R. Akhmetshin *et al.* | (Novosibirsk CMD-2 Collab.) |
| GALLEGOS | 04 | PR D69 074033 | A. Gallegos *et al.* | |
| PELAEZ | 04A | MPL A19 2879 | J.R. Pelaez | |
| BUGG | 03 | PL B572 1 | D.V. Bugg | |
| PISLAK | 03 | PR D67 072004 | S. Pislak *et al.* | (BNL E865 Collab.) |
| MURAMATSU | 02 | PRL 89 251802 | H. Muramatsu *et al.* | (CLEO Collab.) |
| Also | | 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 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.)
BAI 00E PR D62 032002 J. Bai *et al.* (BES 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.*
ALEXANDER 98 PR D58 052004 J.P. Alexander *et al.* (CLEO Collab.)
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 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.)
BUTLER 94B PR D49 40 F. Butler *et al.* (CLEO 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+) |
| ROY | 71 | PL 36B 353 | S.M. Roy | |
| 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


| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ABLIKIM | 06C | PL B633 681 | M. Ablikim *et al.* | (BES Collab.) |
| AITALA | 06 | PR D73 032004 | E.M. Aitala *et al.* | (FNAL E791 Collab.) |
| BEDIAGA | 06 | PL B633 167 | I. Bediaga, J.M. de Miranda | |
| CHENG | 06 | PR D73 014017 | H.-Y. Cheng, C.-K. Chua, K.-C. Yang | |
| ABLIKIM | 05 | PL B607 243 | M. Ablikim *et al.* | (BES Collab.) |
| ABLIKIM | 05Q | PR D72 092002 | M. Ablikim *et al.* | (BES Collab.) |
| AUBERT,B | 05G | PR D72 052002 | B. Aubert *et al.* | (BABAR Collab.) |
| BRITO | 05 | PL B608 69 | T.V. Brito *et al.* | |
| CRONIN-HEN... | 05 | PR D72 031102R | D. Cronin-Hennessy *et al.* | (CLEO Collab.) |
| GIACOSA | 05 | PR C71 025202 | F. Giacosa *et al.* | |
| JAFFE | 05 | PRPL 409 1 | R.L. Jaffe | |
| LI | 05B | EPJ A25 263 | D.-M. Li, K.-W. Wei, H. Yu | |
| LINK | 05I | PL B621 72 | J.M. Link *et al.* | (FNAL FOCUS Collab.) |
| RODRIGUEZ | 05 | PR D71 074008 | S. Rodriguez, M. Napsuciale | |
| VIJANDE | 05 | PR D72 034025 | J. Vijande, A. Valarce, F. Fernandez | |
| AKHMETSHIN | 04B | PL B580 119 | R.R. Akhmetshin *et al.* | (Novosibirsk CMD-2 Collab.) |
| AMSLER | 04 | PRPL 389 61 | C. Amsler, N.A. Tornqvist | |
| AUBERT,B | 04O | PR D70 091103R | B. Aubert *et al.* | (BABAR Collab.) |
| AUBERT,B | 04P | PR D70 092001 | B. Aubert *et al.* | (BABAR Collab.) |
| BUGG | 04C | PRPL 397 257 | D.V. Bugg | |
| BUGG | 04D | EPJ C37 433 | D.V. Bugg | |
| FARIBORZ | 04 | IJMP A19 2095 | A.H. Fariborz | |
| KALOSHIN | 04 | EPJ A20 475 | A.E. Kaloshin *et al.* | |
| LINK | 04 | PL B585 200 | J.M. Link *et al.* | (FNAL FOCUS Collab.) |
| MAIANI | 04A | PRL 93 212002 | L. Maiani *et al.* | |
| NAPSUCIALE | 04 | PL B603 195 | M. Napsuciale, S. Rodriguez | (GUAN) |
| NAPSUCIALE | 04A | PR D70 094043 | N.N. Napsuciale, S. Rodriguez | |
| PELAEZ | 04 | PRL 92 102001 | J.R. Pelaez | |
| PRAKHOV | 04 | PR C69 042202R | S. Prakhov *et al.* | (BNL Crystal Ball Collab.) |
| PRAKHOV | 04A | PR C69 045202 | S. Prakhov *et al.* | |
| PRAKHOV | 04B | PR C70 034605 | S. Prakhov *et al.* | |
| TESHIMA | 04 | JPG 30 663 | T. Teshima *et al.* | |
| VANBEVEREN | 04 | MPL A19 1949 | E. Banbeveren, G. Rupp | |
| ZHENG | 04 | NP A733 235 | H.Q. Zheng *et al.* | |
| ABDEL-REHIM | 03 | PR D67 054001 | A. Abdel-Rehim *et al.* | |
| ABDEL-REHIM | 03B | PR D68 013008 | A. Abdel-Rehim *et al.* | |
| BOGLIONE | 03 | EPJ C30 503 | M. Boglione, M.R. Pennington | |
| 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. | | |
| ACHASOV | 02F | PL B537 201 | M.N. Achasov *et al.* | (Novosibirsk SND Collab.) |
| AITALA | 02 | PRL 89 121801 | E.M. Aitala *et al.* | (FNAL E791 Collab.) |
| ALOISIO | 02C | PL B536 209 | A. Aloisio *et al.* | (KLOE Collab.) |
| ALOISIO | 02D | PL B537 21 | A. Aloisio *et al.* | (KLOE 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 | |
| GARMASH | 02 | PR D65 092005 | A. Garmash *et al.* | (BELLE Collab.) |
| 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 | 02 | PL B525 205 | J.M. Link *et al.* | (FNAL FOCUS Collab.) |
| 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 | |
| CLOSE | 01B | EPJ C21 531 | F.E. Close, A. Kirk | |
| 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 | |
| KOPP | 01 | PR D63 092001 | S. Kopp *et al.* | (CLEO Collab.) |
| LI | 01 | JPG 27 807 | D.-M. Li, H. Yu, Q.-X. Shen | |
| NARISON | 01C | NPBPS 96 244 | S. Narison | |
| SHAKIN | 01 | PR D63 014019 | C.M. Shakin, H. Wang | |
| XIAO | 01 | NP A695 273 | Z. Xiao, H. Zheng | |
| ACHASOV | 00F | PL B479 53 | M.N. Achasov *et al.* | (Novosibirsk SND Collab.) |
| ACHASOV | 00H | PL B485 349 | M.N. Achasov *et al.* | (Novosibirsk SND Collab.) |
| ALFORD | 00 | NP B578 367 | M. Alford, R.L. Jaffe | |
| BARBERIS | 00C | PL B471 440 | D. Barberis *et al.* | (WA 102 Collab.) |
| BARBERIS | 00E | PL B479 59 | D. Barberis *et al.* | (WA 102 Collab.) |
| 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.* | |
| KAMINSKI | 00 | APP B31 895 | R. Kaminski, L. Lesniak, K. Rybicki | |
| MONTANET | 00 | NPBPS 86 381 | L. Montanet | |
| ABREU | 99J | PL B449 364 | P. Abreu *et al.* | (DELPHI Collab.) |
| AKHMETSHIN | 99B | PL B462 371 | R.R. Akhmetshin *et al.* | (Novosibirsk CMD-2 Collab.) |
| BARBERIS | 99D | PL B462 462 | D. Barberis *et al.* | (Omega Expt.) |
| BEVEREN | 99 | EPJ C10 469 | E. Van Beveren, G. Rupp | |
| 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 | |
| ISHIDA | 99 | PTP 101 661 | M. Ishida | |
| 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 | |
| TORNQVIST | 99 | EPJ C11 359 | N. Tornqvist | |
| ABELE | 98 | PR D57 3860 | A. Abele *et al.* | (Crystal Barrel Collab.) |
| ACHASOV | 98E | PR D58 054011 | N.N. Achasov, G.N. Shestakov | |
| ACKERSTAFF | 98A | EPJ C5 411 | K. Ackerstaff *et al.* | (OPAL Collab.) |
| ANISOVICH | 98 | PL B437 209 | V.V. Anisovich *et al.* | |
| BARBERIS | 98C | PL B440 225 | D. Barberis *et al.* | (WA 102 Collab.) |
| 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 | 97C | PL B413 137 | A.V. Anisovich, A.V. Sarantsev | |
| 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) |
| 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.) |
| 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) |
| ZOU | 94 | PL B329 519 | Y. Zou *et al.* | (RUTG, MINN, MICH) |
| 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 | | 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+) |
| BERNARD | 91 | PR D43 2757 | V. Bernard, N. Kaiser, U.G. Meissner | |
| LI | 91 | PR D43 2161 | Z.P. Li *et al.* | (TENN) |
| RIGGENBACH | 91 | PR D43 127 | C. Riggenbach *et al.* | (BERN, CERN, MASA) |
| BAI | 90C | PRL 65 2507 | Z. Bai *et al.* | (Mark III Collab.) |
| LOHSE | 90 | PL B234 235 | D. Lohse *et al.* | |
| WEINSTEIN | 90 | PR D41 2236 | J. Weinstein, N. Isgur | (TNTO) |
| ASTON | 88D | NP B301 525 | D. Aston *et al.* | (SLAC, NAGO, CINC, INUS) |
| BARNES | 85 | PL B165 434 | T. Barnes | |
| 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) |
| MARTIN | 79 | NP B158 520 | A.D. Martin, E.N. Ozmutlu | (DURH) IJP |
| 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+) |
| ESTABROOKS | 78 | NP B133 490 | P.G. Estabrooks *et al.* | (MCGI, CARL, DURH+) |
| 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) |
| ADLER | 65 | PR 137 B1022 | S.L. Adler | |
| ADLER | 65A | PR 139 B1638 | S.L. Adler | |