

**$\Xi(2120)$** 

$I(J^P) = \frac{1}{2}(?)$  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±4	18	<sup>1</sup> CHLIAPNIK...	79	HBC $K^+ p$ 32 GeV/c
2123±7		<sup>2</sup> GAY	76C	HBC $K^- p$ 4.2 GeV/c

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

VALUE (MeV)	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
<20	18	<sup>1</sup> CHLIAPNIK...	79	HBC $K^+ p$ 32 GeV/c
25±12		<sup>2</sup> 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**

$\Gamma(\Lambda \bar{K})/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$			$\Gamma_1/\Gamma$
VALUE	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
seen	<sup>1</sup> CHLIAPNIK...	79	HBC $K^+ p \rightarrow (\bar{\Lambda} K^+) X$
seen	<sup>2</sup> GAY	76C	HBC $K^- p$ 4.2 GeV/c

 **$\Xi(2120)$  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	P.V. Chliapnikov <i>et al.</i>	(CERN, BELG, MONS)
HEMINGWAY	77	PL 68B 197	R.J. Hemingway <i>et al.</i>	(AMST, CERN, NIJM+)
GAY	76C	PL 62B 477	J.B. Gay <i>et al.</i>	(AMST, CERN, NIJM)

NODE=B103M

NODE=B103M  
→ UNCHECKED ←

NODE=B103W

NODE=B103W

NODE=B103215;NODE=B103

DESIG=1

NODE=B103220

NODE=B103R1  
NODE=B103R1

NODE=B103

NODE=B103;LINKAGE=A

NODE=B103;LINKAGE=B

NODE=B103

REFID=22849  
REFID=32552  
REFID=32520