SAID for Baryon Spectroscopy

William Briscoe The George Washington University



- PWA for Baryon Spectroscopy
- Pion Photoproduction.
- Pion Photoproduction on Neutron.
- Pion-Proton Elastic.
- Nucleon-Nucleon Elastic.
- Strange Hadron Spectroscopy.
- Summary.



Supported by 👩 DE-SC0016583



PWA for *Baryons*

 Originally PWA arose as technology to determine amplitude of reaction via fitting scattering data.
 That is non-trivial mathematical problem – looking for solution of ill-posed problem following to Hadamard & Tikhonov.

• Resonances appeared as by-product

[bound states objects with definite quantum numbers, mass, lifetime, & so on].

Standard PWA

⇒ Reveals only wide Resonances, but not too wide (Γ < 500 MeV) & possessing not too small BR (BR > 4%).

 \Rightarrow Tends (by construction) to **miss** narrow Res with Γ < 20 MeV.



Most of our current knowledge about bound states of three light quarks has come mainly from $\pi N \rightarrow \pi N$ PWAs:

Karlsruhe–Helsinki,

Carnegie-Mellon-Berkeley,

& **GW.**



7/16/2018

PWA10/ATHOS5 2018, Beijing, China, July 2018

William Briscoe



Road Map to Baryon Spectroscopy









SAID Database below 4 GeV **SAID**: http://gwdac.phys.gwu.edu/

• We update **SAID** databases, develop & study PWAs, & keep current versions of phenomenological & theoretical models, both those of CNS/DAC & other research groups, on continual basis for relevant two- & three-body reactions of interest.

- In the **full database**, one will occasionally find experiments which give conflicting results.
- Some data with very large χ^2 contributions have been excluded from our fits.
- Redundant data are also excluded [these include σ_{tot} based on $d\sigma/d\Omega$ already contained in database]
- Measurements of **pol observables**

(**P**, for instance) with uncertainties more than 0.2 are not included as they have little influence in our fits.

 However, all available data have been retained in database (excluded data labeled as "flagged") so that comparisons can be made through our on-line facility



For $\pi \rightarrow 2\pi$, we use log-likelihood while for rest – least-squares technologies.



852















Direct Amplitude Reconstruction in Pion PhotoProduction



Complete Experiment for Pion PhotoProduction

• There are 16 non-redundant observables.

• They are not completely independent from each other.







Importance of Neutron Data

• EM interaction do not conserve isospin, so multipole amplitudes contain isoscalar & isovector contributions of EM current.

$$A_{\pi^{0}p} = A^{0} + \frac{1}{3}A^{1/2} + \frac{2}{3}A^{3/2} \qquad A_{\pi^{0}n} = -A^{0} + \frac{1}{3}A^{1/2} + \frac{2}{3}A^{3/2} \\ A_{\pi^{+}n} = \sqrt{2}\left(A^{0} + \frac{1}{3}A^{1/2} - \frac{1}{3}A^{3/2}\right) \qquad A_{\pi^{-}p} = \sqrt{2}\left(A^{0} - \frac{1}{3}A^{1/2} + \frac{1}{3}A^{3/2}\right)$$

• Proton data alone does not allow separation of isoscalar & isovector components.
Q: Can we avoid? A: NO!

• Need data on both proton & neutron !



D. Drechsel & L. Tiator, J. Phys. G 18, 449 (1992)

7/16/2018





SAID for Pion PhotoProduction

P. Mattione *et al*, Phys. Rev. C **96**, 035204 (2017)



	Reaction	Data (Pol)	χ²	
ſ	γ p →π ⁰ p	25,540 (23 %)	55,529	24 400 data
Í	γ p →π⁺ n	8,959 (38 %)	20,736	34,439 uata
	γ n →π⁻ p	11,590 (4 %)	16,453	
	γ n →π ⁰ n	364 (59 %)	1,540	11,954 data
	Total	46,453	94,258	
I				

•There is disbalance between $\pi^0 \& \pi^+$ data (35%)

 Pion photoproduction on the neutron much less known, 35%.







Photo-Decay Amplitudes in BW L Pole Forms

• Pole is main signature of resonance.

$$\begin{array}{c}
 A_{h}^{\text{BW}} = C \sqrt{\frac{q_{r}}{k_{r}} \frac{\pi (2J+1)M_{r}\Gamma_{r}^{2}}{m_{N}\Gamma_{\pi,r}}} \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\alpha}^{h} & A_{h}^{\text{pole}} = C \sqrt{\frac{q_{p}}{k_{p}} \frac{2\pi (2J+1)W_{p}}{m_{N}\text{Res}_{\pi/N}}} \operatorname{Res} \mathcal{A}_{\alpha}^{h} \\
 Evaluated at \\
 Res Energy & Pole
\end{array}$$

TABLE I. Breit-Wigner and pole values for selected nucleon resonances. Masses, widths, and residues are given in units of MeV, the helicity 1/2 and 3/2 photo-decay amplitudes in units of $10^{-3}(\text{GeV})^{-1/2}$. Errors on the phases are generally 2–5 degrees. For isospin 1/2 resonances the values of the proton target are given.

Resonance	nance Breit-Wig				c	Pol	e values	
	(Mass, width)	$\Gamma_{\pi}/2$	A1/2	A3/2	$({\rm Re}\;W_p,-2\;{\rm Im}\;W_p)$	Rπ	A1/2	A3/2
Δ(1232) 3/2+	(1233, 119)	60	-141 ± 3	-258 ± 5	(1211, 99)	52 [-47°]	-136 ± 5 [-18°]	$-255 \pm 5 [-6^{\circ}]$
N(1440) 1/2+	(1485, 284)	112	-60 ± 2		(1359, 162)	38 [-98°]	$-66 \pm 5 [-38^{\circ}]$	
N(1520) 3/2-	(1515, 104)	33	-19 ± 2	$+153 \pm 3$	(1515, 113)	38 [-5°]	$-24 \pm 3 [-7^{\circ}]$	$+157 \pm 6 [+10^{\circ}]$
N(1535) 1/2-	(1547, 188)	34	$+92 \pm 5$		(1502, 95)	16 [-16°]	$+77 \pm 5 [+4^{\circ}]$	
N(1650) 1/2-	(1635, 115)	58	$+35 \pm 5$		(1648, 80)	14 [-69°]	$+35 \pm 3 [-16^{\circ}]$	

R.L. Workman *et al,* Phys Rev C **87**, 068201 (2013)

A. Svarc *et al*, Phys Rev C **89**, 065208 (2014)









PWA10/ATHOS5 2018, Beijing, China, July 2018

William Briscoe





SAID-2017 BnGa2014 MAID2007



PWA10/ATHOS5 2018, Beijing, China, July 2018

William Briscoe

Courtesy of Steffen Strauch, 2018







Beam asymmetry Σ for π^+ and π^0 photoproduction on the proton for ph from 1.102 to 1.862 GeV

M. Dugger,² B. G. Ritchie,² P. Collins,^{2,*} E. Pasyuk,^{2,†} W. J. Briscoe,¹⁴ I. I. Strakovsky,¹⁴ R. L. Workman,¹⁴ Y. Azimov,²⁹ K. P. Adhikari,²⁸ D. Adikaram,²⁸ M. Aghasyan,¹⁷ M. J. Amaryan,²⁸ M. D. Anderson,³⁷ S. Anefalos Pereira,¹⁷ H. Avakian,³⁵ J. Ball,⁶ N. A. Baltzell,^{1,34} M. Battaglieri,¹⁸ V. Batourine,^{23,35} I. Bedlinskiy,²¹ A. S. Biselli,^{4,10} S. Boiarinoy,³⁵ V. D. Burkert,³⁵ J. Ball, ^o N. A. Baltzell, ^{1,34} M. Battaglieri, ¹⁸ V. Batourine, ^{23,33} I. Bedlinskiy, ²¹ A. S. Biselli, ^{4,10} S. Boiarinov, ³⁵ V. D. Burkert, ³⁵ D. S. Carman, ³⁵ A. Celentano, ¹⁸ S. Chandavar, ²⁷ P. L. Cole, ¹⁵ M. Contabrigo, ¹⁶ O. Cortes, ¹⁵ V. Crede, ¹² A. D'Angelo, ^{19,32} N. Dashyan, ⁴⁰ R. De Vita, ¹⁸ E. De Sanctis, ¹⁷ A. Deur, ³⁵ C. Djalali, ³⁴ D. Doughty, ^{7,35} R. Dur , ⁷ giyan, ^{25,35} A. El Alaoui, ¹ L. El Fassi, ¹ P. Eugenio, ¹² G. Fedotov, ^{33,34} S. Fegan, ¹⁸ J. A. Fleming, ⁹ N. Gerre, ¹⁶ J. Govern, ¹⁷ L. Giovanetti, ²² F. X. Girod, ^{6,35} J. T. Goetz, ²⁷ W. Gohn, ⁸ E. Golovatch, ³³ R. W. Gothe, ²¹ M. Gothe, ²¹ J. Goud, ¹⁰ L. Guo, ^{11,35} K. Hafdi, ¹ H. Hakobyan, ^{36,40} C. Hanretty, ³⁸ N. Harrison, ⁸ D. He^{4,41} T. Hakobyan, ³³ E. L. Isupov, ³³ H. S. ⁵ C. Munoz Camacho, ²¹ S. Lewis, ³⁷ K. Livingston, ³⁷ H. Y. Lu, ³⁴ I. J. D. MacGregor, ³⁵ F. J. Klein, ⁵ C. Munoz Camacho, ²⁰ P. Nadel-Turonski, ^{14,35} C. S. Nepali, ²⁸ S. Niccolai, ²⁰ G. Nicelesqu²² L. Niculesqu²² L. Niculesqu²² A. O. Ginenko, ¹⁸ A. L. Ostrowidov ¹² L. J. Baronalazdo ¹⁶ P. Deservaryang ^{40,8} K. Bret. ^{23,35} B. S. ISIMIAROV, E. L. ISUPOV, T. S. K. ISIMIAROV, E. L. ISIMIAROV, E. I. I. ISIMIAROV, E. I. ISIMIAROV, E. I. ISIMIAROV, E. I. ISIMIAROV, E. ISIMIAROV, E. ISIMIAROV, E. ISIMIAROV, E. I. ISIMIAROV, E. I. ISIMIAROV, E. I. ISIMIAROV, E. I. ISIMIAROV, E. ISIMIAROV, ISIMIAROV, E. ISIMIAROV, E. ISIMIAROV, E. ISIMIAROV, E. ISI 0.5 0.5 D. Protopopescu,³⁷ B. A. Raue,^{11,35} D. Rimal,¹¹ M. Ripani,¹⁸ G. Rosner,³⁷ P. Rossi,^{17,35} F. Sabatié,⁶ M. S. Saini,¹² 11 C. Salgado,²⁶ D. Schott,¹⁴ R. A. Schumacher,⁴ E. Seder,⁸ H. Serayaryan,²⁸ Y. G. Sharabian,³⁵ G. D. Smith,³⁷ D. I. Sober,⁵ D. Sokhan,³⁷ S. S. Stepanyan,²³ P. Stoler,³⁰ S. Strauch,^{14,34} M. Taiuti,^{13,4} W. Tang,²⁷ Ye Tian,³⁴ S. Tkachenko,^{28,38} B. Torayev,²⁸ H. Voskanyan,⁴⁰ E. Voutier,²⁴ N. K. Walford,⁵ D. P. Watts,⁹ D. P. Weygand,³⁵ N. Zachariou,³⁴ L. Zana,²⁵ J. Zhang,^{28,35} Z. W. Zhao,³⁸ and I. Zonta^{19,} II -0.5 (CLAS Collaboration) W = 1717–2091 MeV $\theta = 32 - 148^{\circ}$ π⁰p: 700 Σ & π⁺n: 386 Σ E-1542 MeV W-1943 MeV E-1578 MeV W-1960 MeV B-1614 MeV W-1977 MeV E-1649 MeV W-1994 MeV \square E=1685 MeV W=2010 MeV E=1720 MeV W=2027 MeV B=1756 MeV W=2043 MeV E=1791 MeV W=2059 MeV 120 60 120 60 θ (deg) Solution A* A_{1/2} A_{3/2} $(\text{GeV}^{1/2} \times 10^{-3})$ $(\text{GeV}^{1/2} \times 10^{-3})$ ∆(1700)3/2-CM12 105 ± 5 92 ± 4 -1826 MeV ¥-2075 MeV E-1862 MeV W-2091 MeV **DU13** 132 ± 5 108 ± 5 160 ± 20 165 ± 25 60 120 60 120 180 BnGa 210 MD07 226PDG12 104 ± 15 85 ± 22 ∆(1905)5/2⁺ CM12 19 ± 2 -38 ± 4 DU13 20 ± 2 -49 ± 5 BnGa 25 ± 5 -49 ± 4 MD07 18 -28PDG12 26 ± 11 -45 ± 20



PWA10/ATHOS5 2018, Beijing, China, July 2018

W = 1240 - 2260 MeV $\left(\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega}\right)$ $\left(\frac{d\Omega}{d\Omega}\right) = \left(\frac{d\Omega}{d\Omega}\right)$ $(1 - P_{P_{O}}E)$ $\gamma \vec{p} \rightarrow \pi^+ n$ $-0.9 \leq \cos(\theta_{-}^{ctm}) \leq +0.9$ W = 1.650 GeV W = 1.920 GeV W = 2.170 GeV W = 1.640 - 1.660 GeV W = 1.900 - 1.940 GeV 2.140 - 2.200 GeV SAID ST14 .luelich14 BnGa11E W = 1.640 - 1.660 GeV W = 1.900 - 1.940 GeV W = 2.140 - 2.200 GeV SAID ST14E Juelich14E BnGa14E IN-LE-ເວຣ (ອື່) cos(0^m) W = 1250²²230 MeV

after

before

First measurement of the polarization observable E in the $\vec{p}(\vec{v}, \pi^+)$ n

 $\theta = 20 - 148^{\circ}$

π⁺n: 900 E

Physics Letters 1750 (2015) 53-58 Contents lists evailable at Science/Direct Physics Letters B www.elawier.com/costs/physlab

reaction up to 2,25 GeV CLAS Collaboration

3 SEVIER

180

Strauch^{4,4}, W.J. Briscoe^m, M. Döring^m, E. Klempt²⁸, V.A. Nikonev^{42,4}, E. Pasyuk⁴⁴, D. Rönchen⁷⁶, A.V. Saranesv^{42,6}, I. Strakovsky¹⁰, R. Workman^m, K.P. Adhikari⁴⁵, N.A. Biadusi¹, J. Ball⁶, V. Batourine⁴⁴, M. Bartagjieri⁴, I. Bedlinsky¹⁰, R. Workman^m, K.P. Adhikari⁴⁵, R.A. Badusi¹, J. Ball⁶, V. Batourine⁴⁴, M. Bartagjieri⁴, I. Bedlinsky¹⁰, N. Bennouna⁴, A.S. Biselli¹, J. Bock⁴⁴, W.K. Brooks^{41,44}, V.D. Burkert⁴⁴, T. Cao⁴, C. Cartin⁴⁴, D.C. Colle¹, N. Compton⁴⁴, A. Celenano⁴, S. Chardara⁴⁴, C. Diantes⁴, L. Colle¹, N. Compton⁴⁴, A. Celenano⁴, S. Chardara⁴⁴, C. Diantes⁴, L. Colle¹, N. Compton⁴⁴, A. Celenano⁴, S. Chardara⁴⁴, C. Dialali⁴, J. Bloudrhiri⁴⁴, P. Burgen¹⁰, M. Dugger¹, R. Dupre⁴, H. Per⁴⁴, K.⁴⁴, A. El Alaoul⁴, L. E Kassi⁴⁴, L. Eloudrhiri⁴⁴, P. Eugenio⁴, M. S. Fegan⁴, A. Filippi⁴, J.A. Fleming⁴⁴, T. Forst¹, A. Fradi⁴⁴, C. Hanreny⁴⁴, M. Mugger⁴⁴, R. Dupre⁴⁴, H. Jiang⁴⁴, H.S. Fegan⁴, A. Filippi⁴, J.A. Fleming⁴⁴, C. Gatzier, ⁴⁴, C. Hanreny⁴⁴, N. Mughes⁴⁴, S. Sheyan⁴⁴, D. Jenkins⁴⁴, H. Jiang⁴⁴, H.S. Jo⁵, K. Joo¹⁶, S. Josten⁴⁴, C. Kaith⁴⁴, L. Kora⁴⁵, D. Lenkins⁴⁴, M. Linghes⁴⁴, J. S. Kegan⁴, M. Kughar⁴⁴, M. Kughar⁴⁴, M. Kughar⁴⁴, M. Kughar⁴⁴, M. Kukan⁴⁴, P. J. Penkins⁴⁴, J. Lenkins⁴⁵, A. Kiwin⁴⁵, P. K. Kukara⁴⁴, M. Kughar⁴⁴, M. Kughar⁴⁴, J. S. Kukara⁴⁴, M. Suposten⁴⁴, O. Kukara⁴⁴, M. Kukara⁴⁴, M. Kukara⁴⁴, M. Kukara⁴⁴, M. Kukara⁴⁴, J. J. D. Kaccifegpr⁴⁴, N. Kukara⁴⁴, M. Kukara⁴⁴, M. Kukara⁴⁴, M. Kukara⁴⁴, M. Kukara⁴⁴, M. Kukara⁴⁴, J. P. Toronoski⁴⁴, J. R. Neckel⁴⁵, A. Mayas⁴⁵, K. Jawa⁴⁴, M. S. Kukara⁴⁴, M. S. Kukara⁴⁴, M. Kukara⁴⁴, M. Kukara⁴⁴, M. Kukara⁴⁴, M. Sinoka⁴⁴, J. Notous⁴⁴, J. Potket⁴⁴, B. A. Ruel⁴⁴, K. Kara⁴⁴, M. J. Kutara⁴⁴, J. K. Kara

G for $\vec{\gamma}\vec{p} \rightarrow \pi^+ n$





PWA10/ATHOS5 2018, Beijing, China, July 2018

William Briscoe

T & **F** for $\vec{\gamma}\vec{p} \rightarrow \pi^+ n$

Courtesy of Mike Dugger, 2018

Courtesy of Mike Dugger, 2018

Single Pion PhotoProduction on "Neutron" Target

- Accurate evaluation of EM couplings $N^* \rightarrow \gamma N \& \Delta^* \rightarrow \gamma N$ from meson photoproduction data remains paramount task in hadron physics.
- Only with good data on both proton & neutron targets, one can hope to disentangle isoscalar & isovector EM couplings of various N*& Δ* resonances,
 K.M. Watson, Phys Rev 95, 228 (1954); R.L. Walker, Phys Rev 182, 1729 (1969) as well as isospin properties of non-resonant background amplitudes.
- The lack of $\gamma n \rightarrow \pi^- p \& \gamma n \rightarrow \pi^0 n$ data does not allow us to be as confident about determination of neutron couplings relative to those of proton.

 Radiative decay width of neutral baryons may be extracted from π⁻ & π⁰ photoproduction off neutron, which involves bound neutron target & needs use of model-dependent nuclear (FSI) corrections.
 A.B. Migdal, JETP 1, 2 (1955); K.M. Watson, Phys Rev 95, 228 (1954)

FSI for $\gamma d \rightarrow \pi p \mathcal{N} \Longrightarrow \gamma n \rightarrow \pi \mathcal{N}$

V. Tarasov, A. Kudryavtsev, W. Briscoe, H. Gao, IS, Phys Rev C **84,** 035203 (2011) V. Tarasov, A. Kudryavtsev, W. Briscoe, B. Krusche, IS, M. Ostrick, Phys At Nucl **79**, 216 (2016)

21

CLAS g13 Impact for Neutron $S = 0 \text{ I } I = \frac{1}{2}$ Couplings

BW neutron photo-decay amplitudes

P. Mattione et al, Phys. Rev. C 96, 035204 (2017)

 Selected photon decay amplitudes N^{*}→γn at resonance poles are determined for the first time.

Moduli & phases

Resonance	Coupling	MA27 modulus_phase	GB12 [g10]	BG2013 [g10]	MAID2007	Capstick	PDG 2016
		modulus, phase	10 - 1				
N(1440)1/2+	$A_{1/2}(n)$	$0.065 \pm 0.005, 5^{\circ} \pm 3^{\circ}$	$0.048 {\pm}~0.004$	$0.043 {\pm} 0.012$	0.054	-0.006	0.040 ± 0.010
N(1535)1/2-	$A_{1/2}(n)$	-0.055 \pm 0.005, 5° \pm 2°	-0.058 ± 0.006	-0.093 ± 0.011	-0.051	-0.063	-0.075 ± 0.020
N(1650)1/2-	$A_{1/2}(n)$	$0.014 \pm 0.002, -30^{\circ} \pm 10^{\circ}$	-0.040 ± 0.010	0.025 ± 0.020	0.009	-0.035	-0.050 ± 0.020
N(1720)3/2+	$A_{1/2}(n)$	$-0.016 \pm 0.006, 10^{\circ} \pm 5^{\circ}$		-0.080 ± 0.050	-0.003	0.004	-0.080 ± 0.050
N(1720)3/2+	$A_{3/2}(n)$	$0.017 \pm 0.005, 90^{\circ} \pm 10^{\circ}$		-0.140 ± 0.065	-0.031	0.011	-0.140 ± 0.065

CLAS g14 Impact for Neutron $S = 0 \text{ I} I = \frac{1}{2}$ Couplings

D. Ho et al, Phys Rev Lett **118**, 242002 (2017)

BW	A _n ^{1/2}	(10 ⁻³ GeV ^{-1/2})	(10 ⁻³ GeV ^{-1/2}) A _n ^{3/2}	
	g14 PRL	previous	g14 PRL	previous
SAID				
N(1720)3/2+	-9 ±2	-21 ±4	+19 ± 2	-38 ±7
N(2190)7/2-	-6 ±9		-28 ±10	
<u>BnGa</u>				
N(1720)3/2+	tbd	-80 ±50	tbd	-140 ±65
N(2190)7/2-	+30 ±7	-15 ±12	-23 ± 8	-33 ±20

• I = 3/2 waves ~ unchanged \iff determined by proton data.

- Inclusion of these g14 data in new PWA calculations has resulted in revised γN* couplings &, in case of N(2190)7/2⁻, convergence among different PWA groups.
- Such couplings are sensitive to **dynamical** process of **N**^{*} excitation & provide important guides to nucleon structure models.

MAX-lab for $\gamma n \rightarrow \pi^{-} p$ at *Threshold*

B. Strandberg *et al,* in progress

• It is difficult task to measure $\pi^- p$ final state close to threshold.

• We measured π^0 decay in to 2γ from $\gamma n \rightarrow \pi^- p \rightarrow \pi^0 n$.

Courtesy of Bruno Strandberg, 2018

Courtesy of Daria Sokhan, 2018

27

Meson Production off Deuteron at CB@MAMI

V. Kulikov *et al,* in progress

• Differential cross sections for $\gamma n \rightarrow \pi^0 n$.

E = 180 - 800 MeV π⁰n: 589 dσ/dΩ

 New dσ/dΩs by A2 contribution is 160% to previous world π⁰n data.

• Data up to **E** = **1500** MeV are coming.

PWA10/ATHOS5 2018, Beijing, China, July 2018

William Briscoe 29

Courtesy of Slava Kulikov, 2018

Elastic Scattering

PHYSICAL REVIEW C 91, 025205 (2015)

High-precision measurements of πp elastic differential cross sections in the second resonance region

R. L. Workman, W. J. Briscoe, and I. I. Strakovsky Institute for Nuclear Studies, Department of Physics, The George Washington University, Washington, DC 20052, USA (Received 24 January 2016; published 1 April 2016)

Aims of Jlab KLF Project

- KLF project has to establish secondary K_L beam line at Jefferson Lab with flux of three order of magnitude higher than SLAC MATCHART had
- for scattering experiments on both proton & neutron (first time !) targets in order to determine differential cross sections & self-polarization of strange hyperons with Guike detector to enable precise PWA in order to determine all resonances up to 3 GeV in spectra of Λ*, Σ*, Ξ*, & Ω*.
- In addition, we intend to do strange meson spectroscopy by studies of π -K interaction to locate pole positions in I = 1/2 & 3/2 channels.
- KLF has link to ion-ion high energy facilities as & & Will allow understand formation of our world in several microseconds after Big Bang.

Gui Hall D Beam Line Set up for K-longs

Expected Cross Sections vs Bubble Chamber Data

• **GlueX** measurements will span $\cos\theta$ from -0.95 to 0.95 in CM above W = 1490 MeV.

K_L rate is 10⁴ K_L/s = 2500 x SLAC ACCELERATOR LABORATORY

• Uncertainties (statistics only) correspond to 100 days of running time for:

37

Why We Have to Measure Double-Strange Cascades in JLab

 Heavy quark symmetry (Isgur–Wise symmetry) suggests that multiplet splittings in strange, charm, & bottom hyperons should scale as approximately inverses of corresponding quark masses: 1/m_s: 1/m_b

N. Isgur & M.B. Wise, Phys Rev Lett 66 1130 (1991)

- If they don't, that scaling failure implies that structures of corresponding states are anomalous, & very different from one another.
- So far only hyperon resonance multiplet, where this scaling can be ``tested" & seen is lowest negative parity multiplet:

Λ (1405)1/2⁻- Λ (1520)3/2⁻, Λ_{c} (2595)1/2⁻- Λ_{c} (2625)3/2⁻, Λ_{b} (5912)1/2⁻- Λ_{b} (5920)3/2⁻

- It works **approximately** (**30**%) well for those Λ -splittings. It would work **even better** for Ξ, Ξ_c, Ξ_b splittings, & should be **very good** for $\Omega, \Omega_c, \Omega_b$ splittings.
 - Jefferson Lab Thomas Jefferson Vational Accelerator Facility As <u>LHCb</u> is doing **double charm cascade** spectrum. $\Xi_{c}(2790)1/2^{-}-\Xi_{c}(2815)3/2^{-}$

S PDG-					Status as seen in —		
Particle	J^P	Overall status	$\Xi\pi$	ΛK	ΣK	$\Xi(1530)\pi$	Other channels
Ξ(1318)	1/2+	****					Decays weakly
Ξ(1530)	3/2+	****	****				
Ξ (1620)		*	*				
$\Xi(1690)$		***		***	**		
Ξ (1820)	3/2 -	***	**	***	**	**	
$\Xi(1950)$		***	**	**		*	
Ξ(2030)		***		**	***		
$\Xi(2120)$		*		*			
$\Xi(2250)$		**					3-body decays
Ξ(2370)		**					3-body decays
Ξ (2500)		*		*	*		3-body decays

Why We Have to Focus on $K\pi$ Scattering with Regards to κ Meson in JLab

- KLF proposal will have very significant impact in our knowledge of $K\pi$ scattering amplitudes in scalar I = $\frac{1}{2}$ channel.
- It will reduce by more than factor of two uncertainty in mass determination & by a factor of five uncertainty on its width (and therefore on its coupling) of controversial or k(800).
- Neutral kaon beam scattering on both proton & neutron targets at low t-Mandelstam will allow to produce & identify all four isospin partners of κ(800).

Proposal for JLab PAC46

Strange Hadron Spectroscopy with Secondary KL Beam at GlueX

A. Ali¹⁸, M. B. Ali⁴⁷, M. J. Amaryan^{45,4,†}, E. G. Anassontzis², A. V. Anisovich^{4,48} A. Austregesilo³⁰, M. Baalouch⁴⁵, F. Barbosa³⁰, J. Barlow¹³, A. Barnes⁷, E. Barriga¹³ M. Bashkanov^{10,†}, A. Bazavov²⁹, T. D. Beattie²⁰, R. Bellwied²⁰, V. V. Berdnikov⁸, V. Bernard⁴⁶ T. Black⁴², W. Boeglin¹², M. Boer⁶, W. J. Briscoe¹⁴, T. Britton³⁰, W. K. Brooks⁵³, B. E. Cannon¹³ N. Cao²², E. Chudakov³⁰, G. Colangelo³, P. L. Cole²¹, S. Cole¹, O. Cortes-Becerra¹⁴, V. Crede¹³ M. M. Dalton³⁰, T. Daniels⁴², D. Day⁵⁸, P. Degtyarenko³⁰, A. Deur³⁰, S. Dobbs¹³, G. Dodge⁴⁵ A. G. Dolgolenko²⁷, M. Döring^{14,30}, M. Dugger¹, R. Dzbygadlo¹⁸, S. Eidelman^{5,44}, R. Edwards³⁰ H. Egiyan²⁰, A. Ernst¹³, A. Eskandarian¹⁴, P. Eugenio¹³, C. Fanelli³⁶, S. Fegan¹⁴, A. Filippi²⁵, A. M. Foda⁵⁰, J. Frye²³, S. Furletov³⁰, L. Gan⁴², A. Gasparyan⁴¹, G. Gavalian³⁰, M. Gauzshiein^{54,55}, N. Gevorgyan⁶¹, C. Gleason²³, D. I. Glazier¹⁷, J. Goity^{30,19} V. S. Goryachev²⁷, K. Götzen¹⁸, A. Goncalves¹³, L. Guo¹², H. Haberzettl¹⁴ M. Hadžimehmedović⁵⁷, H. Hakobyan⁵³, A. Hamdi¹⁸, S. Han⁶⁰, J. Hardin³⁶, A. Hayrapetyan¹⁶ G. M. Huber⁵⁰, A. Hurley⁵⁰, C. E. Hyde⁴⁵, T. Horn⁸, D. G. Ireland¹⁷, M. Ito³⁰, R. Jaffe⁵⁶ N. Jarvis⁷, R. T. Jones⁹, V. Kakoyan⁶¹, G. Kalicy⁸, M. Kamel¹², C. D. Keith²⁰, C. W. Kim¹⁴, F. J. Klein¹⁴, B. Z. Kopeliovich⁵³, C. Kourkourneli², G. Krafft³⁰, S. Kuleshov⁵³, I. Kuznetsov^{54,55} A. B. Laptev³³, I. Larin³⁵, D. Lawrence³⁰, D. I. Lersch¹³, H. Leutwyler³, M. Levillain⁴¹, H. Li⁷, W. Li⁵⁰, K. Livingston¹⁷, B. Liu²², G. J. Lolos⁵⁰, V. E. Lyubovitskij^{56,54,55,53}, D. Mack²⁰ M. Mai¹⁴, D. M. Manley³¹, M. Mazouz⁴⁷, H. Marukyan⁶¹, V. Mathieu³⁰, M. Matveev⁴⁸, V. Matveev²⁷, M. McCaughan³⁰, W. McGinley⁷, M. McCracken⁷, J. McIntyre⁹, U.-G. Meißner^{4,29}, C. A. Meyer⁷, R. Miskimen¹⁵, R. E. Mitchell²³, F. Mokaya⁹, V. Mokeev³⁰, C. Morningstar⁷, B. Moussallam⁴⁶, F. Nerling¹⁸, K. Nakayama¹⁵, Y. Oh³², R. Omerović⁵⁷, H. Osmanović⁵⁷, A. Ostrovidov¹³, Z. Papandreou⁵⁰, K. Park³⁰, E. Pasyuk³⁰, M. Patsyuk³⁵ P. Pauli¹⁷, R. Pedroni⁴¹, J. R. Pelaez³⁴, L. Pentchev³⁰, K. J. Peters¹⁸, W. Phelps¹⁴, A. Pilloni³⁰ E. Pooser³⁰, J. W. Price⁶, N. Qin⁴³, J. Reinhold¹², D. Richards³⁰, D.-O. Riska¹¹, B. Ritchie¹, J. Ritman^{51,28,†}, L. Robison⁴³, A. Rodas³⁴, D. Romanov³⁷, C. Romero⁵³, J. Ruiz de Elvira³, H-Y. Ryu⁴⁹, C. Salgado⁴⁰, E. Santopinto²⁴, A. V. Sarantzev^{4,48}, T. Satogata³⁰, A. M. Schertz³⁰, R. A. Schumacher⁷, C. Schwarz¹⁸, J. Schwiening¹⁸, A. Yu. Semenov⁵⁰, I. A. Semenova⁵⁰ K. K. Seth⁴³, X. Shen²², M. R. Shepherd²³, E. S. Smith³⁰, D. I. Sober⁸, D. Sokhan¹⁷, A. Somov³⁰ S. Somov³⁷, O. Soto⁵³, M. Staib⁷, J. Stahov⁵⁷, J. R. Stevens^{50,†}, I. I. Strakovsky^{14,†}, A. Švarc⁵² A. Szczepaniak^{23,20}, V. Tarasov²⁷, S. Taylor²⁰, A. Teymurazyan²⁰, A. Trabelsi⁴⁷, G. Vasileiadis² D. Watts¹⁰, D. Werthmüller¹⁷, T. Whitlatch³⁰, N. Wickramaarachchi⁴⁵, M. Williams³⁶ B. Wojtsekhowski³⁰, R. L. Workman¹⁴, T. Xiao⁴⁵, Y. Yang³⁶, N. Zachariou¹⁰, J. Zarling²³, J. Zhang⁵⁸, Z. Zhang⁶⁰, G. Zhao²², B. Zou²⁶, Q. Zhou²², X. Zhou⁶⁰, B. Zihlmann³⁰

 203 researchers from
 61 institutes are co-authors.

• Full Proposal was submitted for JLab PAC46.

eron & inge Meson ctroscopy

