

TUHE-9911  
 hep-ph/9901294

## New experimental tests of sum rules for charmed baryon masses

Jerrold Franklin  
 Department of Physics, Temple University,  
 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122-6082  
 V5030E@VM.TEMPLE.EDU  
 January 13, 1999

### Abstract

New experimental measurements are used to test model independent sum rules for charmed baryon masses. Sum rules for medium-strong mass differences are found to be reasonably well satisfied with increasing accuracy, and the new measurements permit an improved prediction of  $2778 \pm 9$  MeV for the mass of the  $\Lambda_c^0$ . But an isospin breaking sum rule for the  $\Lambda_c$  mass splittings is still in significant disagreement posing a serious problem for the quark model of charmed baryons. Individual  $\Lambda_c$  mass splittings are investigated, using the new CLEO measurement of the  $\Lambda_c^0$  mass splitting, but the accuracy is not yet sufficient for a good test.

PACS numbers: 12.40.Yx., 14.20.-c, 14.40.-n

Model independent sum rules[1-3] were derived some time ago for heavy-quark baryon masses using fairly minimal assumptions within the quark model. The sum rules depend on standard quark model assumptions, and an additional assumption that the interaction energy of a pair of quarks in a particular spin state does not depend on which baryon the pair of quarks is in ("baryon independence"). This is a somewhat weaker assumption than full SU(3) symmetry of the wave function, which would require the same spatial wave function for each octet baryon, and each individual wave function to be SU(3) symmetrized. Instead, we use wave functions with no SU(3) symmetry, as described in Ref.[4]. The wave functions can also be different

for different quarks. For instance, a u-s pair in the  $\Sigma^+$  hyperon can have a different spatial wave function than a u-d pair in the proton, but is assumed to have the same interaction energy as a u-s pair in the  $\Sigma^0$  hyperon.

In deriving the sum rules, no assumptions are made about the type of potential, and no internal symmetry beyond baryon independence is assumed. The sum rules allow any amount of symmetry breaking in the interactions and individual wave functions, but do rest on baryon independence for each quark-quark interaction energy. Several of the sum rules [Eqs. (4), (5), and (6) below] also rely on the assumption that there is no orbital angular momentum so that the three  $\text{spin}=\frac{1}{2}$  quark spins add directly to  $\text{spin}=\frac{1}{2}$  or  $\text{spin}=\frac{3}{2}$ . More detailed discussion of the derivation of the sum rules is given in Refs. [1] and [4].

We have previously tested these sum rules in Refs. [2] and [3] using early measurements of heavy-quark baryon masses. Those tests showed reasonable agreement within fairly large experimental errors for two sum rules for medium-strong charmed baryon mass differences and for one sum rule for bottom baryon mass differences. But there was a relatively large, and worrisome, discrepancy for the isospin breaking mass differences between the  $\Sigma_c$  charge states. Since those tests, there have been a number of new experiments [6-11] resulting in more accurate and more reliable values for some of the charmed baryon masses used in the sum rules. In this paper we look at the effect on the sum rules of these new experiments, especially the recent CLEO II measurement [10] of the  $\Sigma_c^{0+}$  and  $\Sigma_c^0$  masses.

The measured charmed baryon masses that will be used in the sum rules are listed in table I for the expected baryon assignments. The  $\Sigma_c^{0+}$  baryon and the  $\Sigma_c^0$  baryon are distinguished, in the quark model, by having different spin states for the u-s quark pair. The  $\Sigma_c^{0+}$  is the  $\text{spin}=\frac{1}{2}$  usc baryon having the u-s quarks in a spin zero state, and the  $\Sigma_c^0$  has the u-s quarks in a spin one state. A similar distinction is made for the d-s quark pair in the  $\Sigma_c^+$  and  $\Sigma_c^0$  charmed baryons. The numerical values in Table I are given in terms of appropriate mass differences when that corresponds to how the measurement was made. Where new experiments have given more accurate numbers since our previous test of the sum rules, a star has been put after the reference. Masses for light quark (u,d,s) baryons are all taken from the Review of Particle Physics [5].

Baryon	Mass (MeV)	Reference
$\begin{smallmatrix} + \\ c \end{smallmatrix}$	2284.9 ± 6	[5]
$\begin{smallmatrix} + + \\ c \end{smallmatrix}$	$\begin{smallmatrix} + \\ c \end{smallmatrix} + 167.9 ± 2$	[5, 6, 7]*
$\begin{smallmatrix} 0 \\ c \end{smallmatrix}$	$\begin{smallmatrix} + + \\ c \end{smallmatrix} - 0.6 ± 2$	[5, 6]*
$\begin{smallmatrix} + \\ c \end{smallmatrix}$	$\begin{smallmatrix} 0 \\ c \end{smallmatrix} + 1.4 ± 6$	[12]
$\begin{smallmatrix} + + \\ c \end{smallmatrix}$	$\begin{smallmatrix} + \\ c \end{smallmatrix} + 234.5 ± 1.4$	[8]*
$\begin{smallmatrix} 0 \\ c \end{smallmatrix}$	$\begin{smallmatrix} + \\ c \end{smallmatrix} + 232.6 ± 1.3$	[8]*
$\begin{smallmatrix} + \\ c \end{smallmatrix}$	2465.6 ± 1.4	[5, 9]*
$\begin{smallmatrix} 0 \\ c \end{smallmatrix}$	2470.3 ± 1.8	[5]
$\begin{smallmatrix} 0 + \\ c \end{smallmatrix}$	$\begin{smallmatrix} + \\ c \end{smallmatrix} + 107.8 ± 3.0$	[10]*
$\begin{smallmatrix} 0 0 \\ c \end{smallmatrix}$	$\begin{smallmatrix} 0 \\ c \end{smallmatrix} + 107.0 ± 2.9$	[10]*
$\begin{smallmatrix} + \\ c \end{smallmatrix}$	$\begin{smallmatrix} 0 \\ c \end{smallmatrix} + 174.3 ± 1.1$	[11]*
$\begin{smallmatrix} 0 \\ c \end{smallmatrix}$	$\begin{smallmatrix} + \\ c \end{smallmatrix} + 178.2 ± 1.1$	[13]
$\begin{smallmatrix} 0 \\ c \end{smallmatrix}$	2704 ± 4	[5]

Table 1: Charmed baryon masses used in the sum rules.

The isospin breaking sum rule for the  $\begin{smallmatrix} 0 \\ c \end{smallmatrix}$  masses is [2]

$$\begin{smallmatrix} + + \\ c \end{smallmatrix} - \begin{smallmatrix} 0 \\ c \end{smallmatrix} = \begin{smallmatrix} + + \\ c \end{smallmatrix} - \begin{smallmatrix} 0 \\ c \end{smallmatrix} = \begin{smallmatrix} + + \\ c \end{smallmatrix} + \begin{smallmatrix} 0 \\ c \end{smallmatrix} - 2 \begin{smallmatrix} + \\ c \end{smallmatrix}; \quad (1)$$

$$(1.7 \pm 2) \quad (2.6 \pm 2.1) \quad (2.2 \pm 1.2)$$

where we have written the experimental values in MeV below each equation. There is reasonable agreement for the  $\begin{smallmatrix} + + \\ c \end{smallmatrix}$  sum rule, as well as for several other isospin breaking sum rules for light quark baryons [1, 4]. But the  $\begin{smallmatrix} 0 \\ c \end{smallmatrix}$  isospin splitting combination is significantly different from the other two combinations in Eq. (1). As noted in Ref. [2], this disagreement poses a serious problem because it is difficult to see how any reasonable quark model of charmed baryons could lead to the relatively large negative value for the  $\begin{smallmatrix} 0 \\ c \end{smallmatrix}$  combination in Eq. (1). A large number of specific quark model calculations [14] of charmed baryon masses generally satisfy the  $\begin{smallmatrix} 0 \\ c \end{smallmatrix}$  sum rule, and all predict large positive values for the  $\begin{smallmatrix} 0 \\ c \end{smallmatrix}$  mass combination in Eq. (1).

The experimental input that has been used for this combination of  $\begin{smallmatrix} 0 \\ c \end{smallmatrix}$  masses are the two separate mass difference measurements

$$\begin{smallmatrix} + + \\ c \end{smallmatrix} - \begin{smallmatrix} 0 \\ c \end{smallmatrix} = 0.6 \pm 2 \quad \text{Ref: [5]} \quad (2)$$

$$\begin{smallmatrix} + \\ c \end{smallmatrix} - \begin{smallmatrix} 0 \\ c \end{smallmatrix} = 1.4 \pm 6 \quad \text{Ref: [12]} \quad (3)$$

The  $\Lambda_c^{++} - \Lambda_c^0$  mass difference results from four separate experiments that are reasonably consistent with one another, while there is only one experiment [12] that has measured the  $\Lambda_c^+ - \Lambda_c^0$  difference. There is no reason to question this experimental measurement of  $\Lambda_c^+ - \Lambda_c^0$ , and the result of Ref. [12] for  $\Lambda_c^{++} - \Lambda_c^0$  agrees well with the other experiments [15]. However, the extreme importance of the large discrepancy in the  $\Lambda_c$  sum rule of Eq. (1) should make a new experimental measure of the mass difference  $\Lambda_c^+ - \Lambda_c^0$  a high priority.

The new experimental measurement of the  $\Lambda_c^0$  masses [10] makes it possible, in principle, to test sum rules for separate mass differences of the  $\Lambda_c$ . These are

$$\Lambda_c^{++} - \Lambda_c^0 = \Lambda_c^+ - \Lambda_c^0 + 2[(\Lambda_c^0 - \Lambda_c^+) + (\Lambda_c^{0+} - \Lambda_c^0)] \quad (4)$$

$$\Lambda_c^+ - \Lambda_c^0 = \Lambda_c^0 - \Lambda_c^+ + (\Lambda_c^0 - \Lambda_c^+) + (\Lambda_c^{0+} - \Lambda_c^0) \quad (5)$$

Unfortunately, the experimental errors on the  $\Lambda_c^0$  mass differences are still too large at this point to make an accurate comparison with the  $\Lambda_c$  mass differences.

Although the discrepancy noted above for the  $\Lambda_c$  mass differences puts any other quark model study of charmed baryons into question, we now look at sum rules for medium-strong mass differences, anticipating some eventual resolution (theoretical or experimental) of the difficulties posed by the  $\Lambda_c$  mass splittings. A new measurement [8] of the masses of the  $\Lambda_c^{++}$  and  $\Lambda_c^0$  baryons makes possible a more accurate test of the sum rule [3]

$$(\Lambda_c^+ - \Lambda_c^0) + \frac{1}{2}(\Lambda_c^+ - \Lambda_c^0) = (\Lambda_c^0 - \Lambda_c^0) + \frac{1}{2}(\Lambda_c^0 - \Lambda_c^0): \quad (6)$$

We use the measured  $\Lambda_c^{++}$  mass for the  $\Lambda_c^+$  mass, but that difference is probably small. A corresponding sum rule [3] for the b-quark baryons  $\Lambda_b^0$ ,  $\Lambda_b^+$  has not changed, and is in good agreement.

In Ref. [2] we used a sum rule to predict 2583  $\pm$  3 MeV for the  $\Lambda_c^{0+}$  mass. This mass has now been measured [10], and is listed in Table I. This permits a test of the sum rule, which we write here as

$$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} ++ \\ c \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ c \end{array} 2 \begin{array}{c} 0+ \\ c \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} + \\ c \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ c \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 0 \\ c \end{array} \quad (7) \\ (10 \quad 8) \quad (15) \end{array}$$

The two sum rules in Eqs. (6) and (7) are satisfied to about the same extent as light-quark baryon sum rules relating spin- $\frac{1}{2}$  baryon masses to spin- $\frac{3}{2}$  baryon masses.[1, 4]

The new experimental measurements can be used to improve the accuracy of our previous prediction [3] of the as yet unmeasured  $c_0$  mass

$$c_c^0 = c_c^0 + 2(c_c^+ - c_c^0)(c_c^{++} - c_c^+) = 2779.9; \quad (8)$$

In conclusion, we can say that increasingly accurate experimental mass determinations are making the model independent sum rules discussed here increasingly useful tests of the quark model for charmed baryons. We see that sum rules for medium-strong energy differences are satisfied at least as well for heavy-quark baryons as for light-quark baryons. However there remains a serious disagreement for the  $c$  isospin breaking sum rule, which is violated by three standard deviations. Since sum rules in disagreement are of more concern than those which are satisfied, resolving the  $c$  mass differences is of prime importance. Thus far no theoretical suggestion has been forthcoming.

## References

- [1] J.Franklin, Phys. Rev. D 12, 2077 (1975).
- [2] J.Franklin, Phys. Rev. D 53, 564 (1996).
- [3] J.Franklin, Phys. Rev. D 55, 423 (1997).
- [4] J.Franklin Phys. Rev. 172, 1807 (1968).
- [5] Review of Particle Properties, Phys. Rev. D 50, 1173 (1994).
- [6] E.M. Aitala et al. (E791), Phys. Lett. 96B, 292 (1991).
- [7] P. Frabetti et al. (E687), Phys. Lett. B 365, 461 (1996).

- [8] G. Brandenburg et al. (CLEO II), Phys. Rev. Lett. 78, 2304 (1997).
- [9] K. Edwards et al. (CLEO II), Phys. Lett. B 373, 261 (1996).
- [10] C. P. Jessup et al. \Observation of Two Narrow States Decaying Into  $\rho_c^{0+}$  and  $\rho_c^0$ , CLNS 98/1581, CLEO 98-13, hep-ex/9810036 (unpublished).
- [11] L. Gibbon et al. (CLEO II), Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, 4364 (1996).
- [12] Crawford et al. (CLEO II), Phys. Rev. Lett. 71, 3259 (1993).
- [13] P. Avery et al. (CLEO II), Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, 810 (1995).
- [14] C. Itoh et al., Progr. Th. Phys. 54, 908 (1975); K. Lane and S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. 37, 717 (1976); S. Ono, Phys. Rev. D 15, 3492 (1977); N. G. Deshpande, et al., Phys. Rev. D 15, 1885 (1977); L-H. Chan, Phys. Rev. D 15, 2478 (1977); *ibid.* 31, 204 (1985); D. B. Lichtenberg, Phys. Rev. D 16, 231 (1977); C. S. Kalman and G. Jakimow, Lett. al Nuovo Cimento 19, 403 (1997); A. C. D. Wright, Phys. Rev. D 17, 3130 (1978); N. Isgur, Phys. Rev. D 21, 779 (1980); J. M. Richard and P. Taxil, Z. Phys. C 26, 421 (1984); W-Y. Wang and D. B. Lichtenberg, Phys. Rev. D 35, 3526 (1987); S. Capstick, Phys. Rev. D 36, 2800 (1987); S. Sinha, et al., Phys. Lett. B 218, 333 (1989); M. Genovese, et al., Phys. Rev. D 59, 014012 (1999).
- [15] Reference [12] is the only experiment to simultaneously measure both  $\rho_c$  mass differences. For this single experiment, the  $\rho_c$  sum rule combination gives  $\rho_c^{++} + \rho_c^0 - 2\rho_c^+ = 1:7 \pm 1:0$ .