

Weak Decays of Antitriplet Charmed Baryons from the Perspective of Flavor Symmetry

Huiling Zhong, Fanrong Xu, Qiaoyi Wen, Yu Gu

*Department of Physics, Jinan University,
Guangzhou 510632, P.R. China*

E-mail: fanrongxu@jnu.edu.cn

ABSTRACT: In this work, we carry out a global fit for the two-body weak decays of antitriplet charmed baryons in both SU(3) respected and broken scenarios incorporating all the available data up to date. In the SU(3) irreducible representation approach (IRA), more amplitudes for irreducible representation terms are taken into account and the ranges for their coefficients in each scenario are predicted. By a comparison among various fitting schemes in this work, experimental data prefer the SU(3) symmetry breaking scenario. Observables of interest, branching fractions and decay asymmetries of all the Cabibbo-favored (CF), singly Cabibbo-suppressed (SCS) and doubly Cabibbo-suppressed (DCS) channels are calculated in the chosen fitting scheme. Most of our predictions are consistent well with experimental data. We further propose more ways to explore the SU(3) symmetry in charmed baryon decays: (i) A clear measurement of branching fraction on CF mode $\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^0 \pi^0$ as a large difference exists between SU(3) respected and broken scenarios. (ii) The decay asymmetries of the five yet-to-be measured CF decay modes, $\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Lambda^0 K_S, \Sigma^0 K_S, \Xi^0 \pi^0, \Xi^0 \eta, \Xi^0 \eta'$, for their opposite signs in the two different cases. (iii) The future measurement on branching fraction ratios indicated from Eq. (2.10) and presented on Table 7. An improved measurement for $\alpha(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p K_S)$ is called for since predictions from both fittings, including the one in current work and earlier works, and the pole model calculation prefer an opposite sign from previous experimental value. Given branching fractions of most of the CF modes and part of the SCS modes being measured, predictions for the remaining channels, including the DCS modes as well as more decay asymmetries, are anticipated to be checked by the upcoming experiments in BESIII, Belle/Belle-II and LHCb.

KEYWORDS: Charmed baryons, weak decays, flavor symmetry

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Formalism	3
2.1	The irreducible representation and kinematics	3
2.2	Decay amplitudes	5
3	Numerical Analysis	6
3.1	Fitting schemes	6
3.2	Results and discussion	8
4	Summary and conclusion	13
A	The comparison among different schemes	16

1 Introduction

In recent years, more and more attentions have been paid on two-body hadronic weak decays of charmed baryons both experimentally and theoretically. Especially for the branching fractions and decay asymmetries of antitriplet charmed baryon decays, continuous progresses have been made in summer 2022. For the first time, branching fractions of the following channels have been measured by BESIII [1–4]

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow n\pi^+) &= (6.6 \pm 1.2 \pm 0.4) \times 10^{-4}, \\
\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p\eta') &= (5.62_{-2.04}^{+2.46} \pm 0.26) \times 10^{-4}, \\
\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Lambda^0 K^+) &= (6.21 \pm 0.44 \pm 0.26 \pm 0.34) \times 10^{-4}, \\
\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ K_S^0) &= (4.8 \pm 1.4 \pm 0.2 \pm 0.3) \times 10^{-4}, \\
\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^0 K^+) &= (4.7 \pm 0.9 \pm 0.1 \pm 0.3) \times 10^{-4}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{1.1}$$

Meanwhile, Belle has made independent contributions in the measurements of both branching fractions and decay asymmetries, giving [5–7]

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p\eta') &= (4.73 \pm 0.82 \pm 0.47 \pm 0.24) \times 10^{-4}, \\
\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Lambda^0 K^+) &= (6.57 \pm 0.17 \pm 0.11 \pm 0.35) \times 10^{-4}, \\
\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^0 K^+) &= (3.58 \pm 0.19 \pm 0.06 \pm 0.19) \times 10^{-4}, \\
\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \eta) &= (3.14 \pm 0.35 \pm 0.11 \pm 0.25) \times 10^{-3}, \\
\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \eta') &= (4.16 \pm 0.75 \pm 0.21 \pm 0.33) \times 10^{-3},
\end{aligned}
\tag{1.2}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Lambda^0 K^+) &= -0.585 \pm 0.049 \pm 0.018, \\
\alpha(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^0 K^+) &= -0.55 \pm 0.18 \pm 0.09, \\
\alpha(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \eta) &= -0.99 \pm 0.03 \pm 0.05, \\
\alpha(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \eta') &= -0.46 \pm 0.06 \pm 0.03.
\end{aligned}
\tag{1.3}$$

In addition, the branching fraction measurements of $\Lambda_c \rightarrow \Sigma^+ K_S$ and $\Lambda_c \rightarrow p\eta'$ have been improved by BESIII and Belle, respectively. Moreover, decay asymmetries of $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Lambda^0 \pi^+$, $\Sigma^0 \pi^+$ and $\Sigma^+ \pi^0$ have been measured more precisely.

The dynamics of charmed baryon weak decays, especially for antitriplet charmed baryon, had a long research history for several decades [8–11] and recently has been studied extensively [12–15] promoted by rapid developments in experiment, which has been reviewed in [16]. These phenomenological studies are model dependent, due to the lack of a consistent QCD-inspired framework to deal with charmed baryon decays so far, still require further checks from experiments. On the other hand, without involving the non-perturbative details, the fitting methodology provides a tool as a complementary way to interpret data and further predict the yet-to-be measured channels. Two different ways, IRA (irreducible representation approach) and TDA (topological diagram approach), have been developed to carry out the fitting analysis. In IRA, different decay channels can be

connected [17–19] via irreducible representations for the SU(3) flavor symmetry. Another attempt, TDA, is to take topological diagrams as basic elements to implement the fitting scheme [20]. The topic that whether an equivalence between the two approaches exists or not, has been discussed recently for mesons [21–23] and for baryons [24], and further efforts are still required.

In this work, we adopt the IRA to carry out such a global fitting analysis. Meanwhile in charmed baryon decays whether the SU(3) flavor symmetry is strictly respected or broken is still a question worth answering. Hence the two scenarios, SU(3) symmetry being kept strictly and broken, are both taken in the following study by incorporating the latest experimental data. We will give explicitly the relations among different channels at the amplitude level. Coefficients of amplitudes in terms of irreducible representations will be fitted after comparing with different fitting schemes. Branching fractions and decay asymmetries of all the two-body decays, including CF, SCS and DCS channels, will be predicted based on the coefficients in the fixed scheme. Armed with the explicit predicted values, we propose ways to discriminate SU(3) symmetry between its keeping and breaking scenarios, including the focus on branching fraction of special modes ($\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^0 \pi^0$ as an example), decay asymmetries of particular modes (like $\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Lambda^0 K_S$) as well as branching fraction ratios of some certain channels (of which an example is $\mathcal{B}(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow p \pi^-) / \mathcal{B}(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow p K^-)$). We point out that theoretical predictions from both fittings and model calculations as well as experimental measuring provide complementary information to explore charmed baryon weak decays from different aspects. In general, opportunities are indicated in these inconsistent channels, of which an example is $\alpha(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p K_S)$. By combing predictions in different independent ways, some suggestions for experiments are also given.

The remaining part of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we set up the framework of the entire fitting work, including theoretical formalism and a summary of experimental data. In both scenarios, connections among decay amplitudes are also presented in this section. Then fitting schemes are introduced in the first part of Sec. 3, while in the second part we present all the numerical results and related discussion. A conclusion is made in Sec. 4. For more details of choosing fitting schemes, results for a comparison are displayed in Appendix A.

2 Formalism

2.1 The irreducible representation and kinematics

The state-of-the-art effective Hamiltonian approach is adopted to describe charmed baryon decays. At quark level, the effective Hamiltonian to depict quark decay process $c \rightarrow \bar{q}_1 q_2 u$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}} &= \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{q_1 c}^* V_{u q_2} (c_+ \mathcal{O}_+ + c_- \mathcal{O}_-) + h.c. \\ \mathcal{O}_+ &= \frac{1}{2} (\mathcal{O}_1 + \mathcal{O}_2), \quad \mathcal{O}_- = \frac{1}{2} (\mathcal{O}_1 - \mathcal{O}_2) \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

in which $\mathcal{O}_1 = (\bar{q}_1 c)(\bar{u} q_2)$, $\mathcal{O}_2 = (\bar{u} c)(\bar{q}_1 q_2)$, and the bilinear operator is defined as $(\bar{q}_1 q_2) = \bar{q}_1 \gamma^\mu (1 - \gamma_5) q_2$. In particular, the quark flavors of the four-quark operator are denoted

as $(q_1, q_2) = (s, d), \{(s, s), (d, d)\}, (d, s)$, corresponding to Cabibbo-favored (CF), singly Cabibbo-suppressed (SCS) and doubly Cabibbo-suppressed (DCS) processes, respectively.

From the point of view of SU(3) flavor symmetry, the four-quark operators \mathcal{O}_\pm in the weak Hamiltonian fall into two irreducible representations ($\mathbf{6}, \overline{\mathbf{15}}$) [18, 19, 25], given by

$$H(\overline{\mathbf{15}})_{ij}^k = \left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & s_c & 1 \\ s_c & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -s_c^2 & -s_c \\ -s_c^2 & 0 & 0 \\ -s_c & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right), \quad (2.2)$$

$$H(\mathbf{6})_{ij} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & -2s_c \\ 0 & -2s_c & 2s_c^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

with $s_c = \sin \theta_c = \sqrt{0.23}$ [26] and $(i, j, k) = 1, 2, 3$, in which traceless $H(\overline{\mathbf{15}})$ is symmetric for the superscript indices while $H(\mathbf{6})$ is symmetric for the subscript indices. For the two-body decays of antitriplet charmed baryon B_c into hadrons in the baryon and meson octets B_n and M , the amplitudes are separated as S - and P -waves [18], given

$$\mathcal{M} = \langle M B_n | \mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}} | B_c \rangle = i \bar{u}_f (A - B \gamma_5) u_i. \quad (2.3)$$

If the S - and P -wave amplitudes (A and B terms) are invariant under SU(3) symmetry, generically they can further be parameterized by the irreducible representations of SU(3) group,

$$A_0 = a_0 H(\mathbf{6})_{ij}(\mathbf{B}'_c)^{ik}(\mathbf{B}_n)_k^j(M)_\ell^\ell + a_1 H(\mathbf{6})_{ij}(\mathbf{B}'_c)^{ik}(\mathbf{B}_n)_k^\ell(M)_\ell^j + a_2 H(\mathbf{6})_{ij}(\mathbf{B}'_c)^{ik}(M)_k^\ell(\mathbf{B}_n)_\ell^j$$

$$+ a_3 H(\mathbf{6})_{ij}(\mathbf{B}_n)_k^i(M)_\ell^j(\mathbf{B}'_c)^{k\ell} + a'_0(\mathbf{B}_n)_j^i(M)_\ell^\ell H(\overline{\mathbf{15}})_i^{jk}(\mathbf{B}_c)_k + a_4 H(\overline{\mathbf{15}})_k^{\ell i}(\mathbf{B}_c)_j(M)_i^j(\mathbf{B}_n)_\ell^k$$

$$+ a_5(\mathbf{B}_n)_j^i(M)_i^\ell H(\overline{\mathbf{15}})_\ell^{jk}(\mathbf{B}_c)_k + a_6(\mathbf{B}_n)_i^j(M)_\ell^m H(\overline{\mathbf{15}})_m^{\ell i}(\mathbf{B}_c)_j + a_7(\mathbf{B}_n)_i^\ell(M)_j^i H(\overline{\mathbf{15}})_\ell^{jk}(\mathbf{B}_c)_k$$

$$B_0 = A_0 \Big|_{a_i \rightarrow b_i}, \quad (2.4)$$

where

$$\mathbf{B}_c = (\Xi_c^0, -\Xi_c^+, \Lambda_c^+),$$

$$\mathbf{B}_n = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}\Lambda^0 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Sigma^0 & \Sigma^+ & p \\ \Sigma^- & \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}\Lambda^0 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Sigma^0 & n \\ \Xi^- & \Xi^0 & -\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\Lambda^0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.5)$$

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\pi^0 + c_\phi \eta + s_\phi \eta') & \pi^+ & K^+ \\ \pi^- & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(-\pi^0 + c_\phi \eta + s_\phi \eta') & K^0 \\ K^- & \bar{K}^0 & -s_\phi \eta + c_\phi \eta' \end{pmatrix},$$

and $(\mathbf{B}'_c)^{ij} \equiv \epsilon^{ijk}(\mathbf{B}_c)_k$. Here the mixing of η and η' have also been considered in which $(c_\phi, s_\phi) = (\cos \phi, \sin \phi)$ with $\phi = 39.3^\circ$ [27, 28]. The coefficients a_i and b_i will be determined by experimental data. Thanks to the more and more accumulated data, here we incorporate the terms characterized by $a'_0, a_{4,5,7}$ (and the corresponding terms in P -wave), which were neglected in [18] and recently have been recollected in [19].

It is known that in D meson sector, SU(3) breaking effect takes up a certain contribution in the decays [29–31]. To incorporate the analogous SU(3) breaking effect in the decays of charmed baryons is a reasonable and interesting attempt. In the earlier studies, it has been shown that there are several SU(3) representations to describe the breaking effect [32, 33]. In this work, we continue to take the assumption that $\bar{\mathbf{3}}$ is the dominant source of SU(3) breaking [34] and the corresponding amplitudes can be parameterized as

$$\begin{aligned} A' &= u_1(\mathbf{B}_c)_i H(\bar{\mathbf{3}})^i (\mathbf{B}_n)_k^j (M)_j^k + u_2(\mathbf{B}_c)_i H(\bar{\mathbf{3}})^j (\mathbf{B}_n)_k^i (M)_j^k \\ &\quad + u_3(\mathbf{B}_c)_i H(\bar{\mathbf{3}})^j (\mathbf{B}_n)_j^k (M)_k^i \\ B' &= A' \Big|_{u_i \rightarrow v_i} \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

with

$$H(\bar{\mathbf{3}}) = (s_c, 0, 0), \quad (2.7)$$

which manifests in the SCS processes.¹

Then in terms of the total S - and P -wave amplitudes $A = A_0 + A'$, $B = B_0 + B'$, the observables of interest, decay width Γ and decay asymmetry α , are given as

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma &= \frac{p_c}{8\pi} \left(\frac{(m_i + m_f)^2 - m_P^2}{m_i^2} |A|^2 + \frac{(m_i - m_f)^2 - m_P^2}{m_i^2} |B|^2 \right) \\ \alpha &= \frac{2\kappa \text{Re}(A^* B)}{|A|^2 + \kappa^2 |B|^2} \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

where m_i, m_f, m_P stand for the masses of initial state baryons, final state baryons and mesons with p_c being the c.m. three-momentum in the rest frame of initial baryon. And the auxiliary parameter κ is defined as $\kappa = p_c / (E_f + m_f) = \sqrt{(E_f - m_f) / (E_f + m_f)}$.

2.2 Decay amplitudes

Without involving the dynamics of decay details, decay amplitudes containing SU(3) breaking effect can be expressed by coefficients of irreducible representations by expanding Eqs. (2.4) and (2.6). From the detailed expressions exhibited in Tables 1, 2 and 3, the relations of amplitudes (here S -wave amplitudes are taken as an illustration) between some of the CF and DCS decays can be established, giving

$$\begin{aligned} A(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^0 \pi^+) &= -A(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \pi^0) \\ A(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow n K^+) &= \sin^2 \theta_c A(\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow \Xi^0 \pi^+) \\ A(\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow n \pi^+) &= \sin^2 \theta_c A(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Xi^0 K^+) \\ A(\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ K^0) &= \sin^2 \theta_c A(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p \bar{K}^0) \\ A(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p K^0) &= \sin^2 \theta_c A(\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \bar{K}^0) \\ A(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^- K^+) &= -\sin^2 \theta_c A(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^- \pi^+) \\ A(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow p \pi^-) &= -\sin^2 \theta_c A(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^+ K^-). \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

¹Although this occurs under the $\bar{\mathbf{3}}$ dominance assumption, the feature is in agreement with the fit in terms of topological diagrams [29, 31].

Table 1. The S-wave amplitudes for Cabibbo-favored decays of $B_c \rightarrow B_n M$ in terms of coefficients of irreducible representation amplitudes (IRA). The P-wave amplitudes can be obtained by replacing a_i by b_i accordingly.

Channel	A	Channel	A
$\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Lambda^0 \pi^+$	$\frac{\sqrt{6}}{6}(-2a_1 - 2a_2 - 2a_3 + a_5 - 2a_6 + a_7)$	$\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow \Xi^0 \pi^+$	$-2a_3 - a_4 - a_6$
$\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p \bar{K}^0$	$-2a_1 + a_5 + a_6$	$\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Lambda^0 \bar{K}^0$	$\frac{\sqrt{6}}{6}(-4a_1 + 2a_2 + 2a_3 - 2a_5 + a_6 + a_7)$
$\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^0 \pi^+$	$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}(-2a_1 + 2a_2 + 2a_3 + a_5 - a_7)$	$\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^0 \bar{K}^0$	$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}(-2a_2 - 2a_3 + a_6 - a_7)$
$\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \pi^0$	$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}(2a_1 - 2a_2 - 2a_3 - a_5 + a_7)$	$\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^+ K^-$	$2a_2 + a_4 + a_7$
$\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \eta$	$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{6}c_\phi(-12a_0 - 6a_1 - 6a_2 + 6a_3 + 6a'_0 + 3a_5 + 3a_7) + s_\phi(2a_0 - a'_0 - a_4)$	$\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^0 \pi^0$	$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}(-2a_1 + 2a_3 + a_4 - a_5)$
$\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \eta'$	$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{6}s_\phi(-12a_0 - 6a_1 - 6a_2 + 6a_3 + 6a'_0 + 3a_5 + 3a_7) - c_\phi(2a_0 - a'_0 - a_4)$	$\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^0 \eta$	$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{6}c_\phi(12a_0 + 6a_1 - 6a_3 + 6a'_0 + 3a_4 + 3a_5) + \frac{1}{3}s_\phi(-6a_0 - 6a_2 - 3a'_0 - 3a_7)$
$\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Xi^0 K^+$	$-2a_2 + a_4 + a_7$	$\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^0 \eta'$	$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{6}s_\phi(12a_0 + 6a_1 - 6a_3 + 6a'_0 + 3a_4 + 3a_5) - \frac{1}{3}c_\phi(-6a_0 - 6a_2 - 3a'_0 - 3a_7)$
$\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \bar{K}^0$	$2a_3 - a_4 - a_6$	$\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^- \pi^+$	$2a_1 + a_5 + a_6$

Except the first relation which holds between the two CF modes, other connections are established between CF and DCS modes. In addition to the relations in Eq. (2.9), more relations can be recovered if SU(3) symmetry is strictly respected,²

$$\begin{aligned}
A(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ K^0) &= A(\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow p \bar{K}^0) \\
A(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow n \pi^+) &= A(\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow \Xi^0 K^+) \\
A(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow n \bar{K}^0) &= -A(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^0 K^0) \\
A(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow p \pi^-) &= \sin \theta_c A(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow p K^-) = -\sin \theta_c A(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \pi^-) = -\sin^2 \theta_c A(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^+ K^-) \\
A(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^- K^+) &= \sin \theta_c A(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^- K^+) = -\sin \theta_c A(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^- \pi^+) = -\sin^2 \theta_c A(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^- \pi^+)
\end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

most of which manifest in SCS modes. These relations displayed in Eqs. (2.9) and (2.10) can be confirmed in [19] up to a sign in some channels.³ It is interesting to notice that any violation of the relations in Eq. (2.10) is a signal for SU(3) symmetry breaking in charmed baryon decays.

3 Numerical Analysis

3.1 Fitting schemes

To fit the existed data and make predictions to the unmeasured channels, a χ^2 function is defined by incorporating all the up to date observables, giving

$$\chi^2 = \sum_i \frac{(\mathcal{B}_i^{\text{th}} - \mathcal{B}_i^{\text{exp}})^2}{\delta_{1i}^2} + \sum_i \frac{(\mathcal{R}_i^{\text{th}} - \mathcal{R}_i^{\text{exp}})^2}{\delta_{2i}^2} + \sum_i \frac{(\alpha_i^{\text{th}} - \alpha_i^{\text{exp}})^2}{\sigma_i^2}, \tag{3.1}$$

²It can be easily obtained by setting u_i and v_i zero in Table 2.

³Note the sign difference originates from the convention in irreducible representations of $\bar{15}$ and 6, which is unphysical.

Table 2. The same as Table 1, except for singly Cabibbo-suppressed (SCS) decays of $B_c \rightarrow B_n M$.

Channel	$s_c^{-1}A$	Channel	$s_c^{-1}A$
$\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Lambda^0 K^+$	$\frac{\sqrt{6}}{6}(2a_1 - 4a_2 + 2a_3 + 3a_4 - a_5 + 2a_6 + 2a_7 - 2u_2 + u_3)$	$\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow \Xi^0 K^+$	$2a_2 + 2a_3 + a_6 - a_7 - u_2$
$\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p\pi^0$	$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}(2a_2 + 2a_3 - a_6 - a_7 + u_2)$	$\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Lambda^0 \pi^0$	$\frac{\sqrt{3}}{6}(-2a_1 - 2a_2 + 4a_3 + 3a_4 - a_5 - a_6 - a_7 + u_2 + u_3)$
$\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p\eta$	$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}c_\phi(4a_0 + 2a_2 - 2a_3 - 2a'_0 + a_6 - a_7 + u_2) + s_\phi(-2a_0 - 2a_1 + a'_0 + a_4 + a_5 + a_6 - u_3)$	$\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Lambda^0 \eta$	$\frac{\sqrt{3}}{6}c_\phi(12a_0 + 2a_1 + 2a_2 - 4a_3 + 6a'_0 + 3a_4 + a_5 + a_6 + a_7 + 2u_1 + u_2 + u_3) + \frac{\sqrt{6}}{6}s_\phi(-6a_0 - 4a_1 - 4a_2 + 2a_3 - 3a'_0 - 2a_5 + a_6 - 2a_7 + 2u_1)$
$\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p\eta'$	$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}s_\phi(4a_0 + 2a_2 - 2a_3 - 2a'_0 + a_6 - a_7 + u_2) - c_\phi(-2a_0 - 2a_1 + a'_0 + a_4 + a_5 + a_6 - u_3)$	$\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Lambda^0 \eta'$	$\frac{\sqrt{3}}{6}s_\phi(12a_0 + 2a_1 + 2a_2 - 4a_3 + 6a'_0 + 3a_4 + a_5 + a_6 + a_7 + 2u_1 + u_2 + u_3) - \frac{\sqrt{6}}{6}c_\phi(-6a_0 - 4a_1 - 4a_2 + 2a_3 - 3a'_0 - 2a_5 + a_6 - 2a_7 + 2u_1)$
$\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow n\pi^+$	$2a_2 + 2a_3 + a_6 - a_7 + u_2$	$\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow pK^-$	$-2a_2 - a_4 - a_7 + u_1 + u_3$
$\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^0 K^+$	$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}(2a_1 - 2a_3 - a_4 - a_5 + u_3)$	$\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow n\bar{K}^0$	$2a_1 - 2a_2 - 2a_3 + a_5 - a_7 + u_1$
$\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ K^0$	$2a_1 - 2a_3 + a_4 - a_5 + u_3$	$\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^0 \pi^0$	$\frac{1}{2}(2a_1 + 2a_2 - a_4 + a_5 - a_6 + a_7 + 2u_1 + u_2 + u_3)$
$\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow \Lambda^0 \pi^+$	$\frac{\sqrt{6}}{6}(2a_1 + 2a_2 - 4a_3 - 3a_4 - a_5 - a_6 - a_7 - u_2 - u_3)$	$\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^0 \eta$	$\frac{1}{2}c_\phi(-4a_0 - 2a_1 - 2a_2 - 2a'_0 - a_4 - a_5 + a_6 - a_7 + u_2 + u_3) + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}s_\phi(2a_0 - 2a_3 + a'_0 + a_6)$
$\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow p\bar{K}^0$	$2a_1 - 2a_3 + a_4 - a_5 - u_3$	$\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^0 \eta'$	$\frac{1}{2}s_\phi(-4a_0 - 2a_1 - 2a_2 - 2a'_0 - a_4 - a_5 + a_6 - a_7 + u_2 + u_3) - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}c_\phi(2a_0 - 2a_3 + a'_0 + a_6)$
$\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^0 \pi^+$	$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}(2a_1 - 2a_2 + a_4 - a_5 + a_6 + a_7 + u_2 - u_3)$	$\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^0 K^0$	$-2a_1 + 2a_2 + 2a_3 - a_5 + a_7 + u_1$
$\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \pi^0$	$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}(-2a_1 + 2a_2 + a_4 + a_5 + a_6 - a_7 - u_2 + u_3)$	$\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \pi^-$	$2a_2 + a_4 + a_7 + u_1 + u_3$
$\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \eta$	$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}c_\phi(4a_0 + 2a_1 + 2a_2 - 2a'_0 - a_4 - a_5 - a_6 - a_7 - u_2 - u_3) + s_\phi(-2a_0 + 2a_3 + a'_0 - a_6)$	$\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^- \pi^+$	$2a_1 + a_5 + a_6 + u_1 + u_2$
$\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \eta'$	$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}s_\phi(4a_0 + 2a_1 + 2a_2 - 2a'_0 - a_4 - a_5 - a_6 - a_7 - u_2 - u_3) - c_\phi(-2a_0 + 2a_3 + a'_0 - a_6)$	$\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^- K^+$	$-2a_1 - a_5 - a_6 + u_1 + u_2$

in which $\mathcal{B}^{\text{th}}, \mathcal{R}^{\text{th}}, \alpha^{\text{th}}$ ($\mathcal{B}^{\text{exp}}, \mathcal{R}^{\text{exp}}, \alpha^{\text{exp}}$) are theoretical formulas (experimental central values) for branching fractions, their ratios and decay asymmetries while $\delta_1, \delta_2, \sigma$ are experimental errors for corresponding quantities.

We use Eq. (2.8), together with explicit amplitudes shown in Tables 1, 2, 3 to calculate various theoretical quantities. In practice, two sets of amplitude formulas with or without SU(3) symmetry breaking effects are adopted inside Eq. (2.8), corresponding to the two different scenarios. As for the experimental measurements, in Table 4 we have collected all the available results up to date, including 20 branching fractions, 10 ratios and 9 decay asymmetries. To make a reasonable choice of experimental values as part of inputs of the χ^2 function, we make a comparison among 3 groups of fittings with different choices of experimental data shown in Appendix A.

The detailed numerical calculation in Appendix A helps interpret experimental data and make a choice of inputs. A common feature of all the 6 fitting results is that the one containing SU(3) breaking has a better goodness than the corresponding fit without symmetry

Table 3. The same as Table 1, except for doubly Cabibbo-suppressed (DCS) processes.

Channel	$s_c^{-2}A$	Channel	$s_c^{-2}A$
$\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow pK^0$	$2a_3 - a_4 - a_6$	$\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ K^0$	$-2a_1 + a_5 + a_6$
$\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow nK^+$	$-2a_3 - a_4 - a_6$	$\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Lambda^0 K^0$	$\frac{\sqrt{6}}{6}(-2a_1 + 4a_2 + 4a_3 - a_5 - a_6 + 2a_7)$
$\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow \Lambda^0 K^+$	$\frac{\sqrt{6}}{6}(-2a_1 + 4a_2 + 4a_3 + a_5 + a_6 - 2a_7)$	$\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow p\pi^-$	$-2a_2 - a_4 - a_7$
$\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow p\pi^0$	$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}(-2a_2 - a_4 + a_7)$	$\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow n\pi^0$	$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}(2a_2 - a_4 + a_7)$
$\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow p\eta$	$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}c_\phi(-4a_0 - 2a_2 + 2a'_0 + a_4 + a_7)$ $+s_\phi(2a_0 + 2a_1 - 2a_3 - a'_0 - a_5)$	$\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow n\eta$	$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}c_\phi(-4a_0 - 2a_2 - 2a'_0 - a_4 - a_7)$ $+s_\phi(2a_0 + 2a_1 - 2a_3 + a'_0 + a_5)$
$\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow p\eta'$	$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}s_\phi(-4a_0 - 2a_2 + 2a'_0 + a_4 + a_7)$ $-c_\phi(2a_0 + 2a_1 - 2a_3 - a'_0 - a_5)$	$\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow n\eta'$	$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}s_\phi(-4a_0 - 2a_2 - 2a'_0 - a_4 - a_7)$ $-c_\phi(2a_0 + 2a_1 - 2a_3 + a'_0 + a_5)$
$\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow n\pi^+$	$-2a_2 + a_4 + a_7$	$\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^0 K^0$	$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}(2a_1 + a_5 - a_6)$
$\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^0 K^+$	$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}(-2a_1 + a_5 - a_6)$	$\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^- K^+$	$-2a_1 - a_5 - a_6$

breaking terms. This SU(3) breaking preference is also indicated from the measurement of \mathcal{R}_{10} shown in Table 4. The branching fraction of $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p\pi^0$ is the main challenge for the first group of fitting (Fit-I and Fit-I'), no matter to include SU(3) symmetry breaking or not. To incorporate both \mathcal{R}_i and single decay branching fraction make the observables double counting, and the values of $\chi^2_{\min}/\text{d.o.f.}$ are not the best among all the 3 groups as shown in Table 9. So in Fit-II and Fit-II' all the ratios of branching fractions \mathcal{R}_i are not incorporated in the definition of χ^2 . Moreover, it is easy to find that in all the 6 fitting schemes the sign of $\alpha(\Lambda_c \rightarrow pK_S)$ is negative while BESIII provided a positive sign before. The similar situation occurs in the branching fraction of $\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow \Xi^0\pi^+$. Considering a correlation between $\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow \Xi^0\pi^+$ and $\Xi^0 \rightarrow \Xi^-\pi^+$, the three observables mentioned above are removed from Fit-II/II', marked as Fit-III/III'. Apparently, the numbers of deviations from experimental results with more than 1σ is larger in Fit-II compared with Fit-III. Though \mathcal{R}_i is not taken as input in the definition of χ^2 in the scheme Fit-III, more predictions for \mathcal{R}_i are consistent well with experiments. Therefore, we choose the group of Fit-III and Fit-III' as a benchmarking combination of input in the following analysis.

3.2 Results and discussion

In total there are 18 fitting parameters to be determined in the SU(3) respected situation while the number increases to 24 containing SU(3) breaking terms. Throughout this work, we rely on the package IMINUIT [36] to perform all the fitting analysis. A local minimum of χ^2 , from a certain starting point, can be obtained by combing Newton steps and gradient-descents within the algorithm of the function 'Minuit'. To achieve a global minimum, we further take the obtained local minimum as input fixing one of the parameters to different values. We finally get a set of solution of which most of the parameters can be ensured that its central value locates at the minimum region.

The fitting results of IRA amplitude coefficients are listed in Table 5. In the flavor

Table 4. A summary of current experimental results, including branching fractions, branching fraction ratios and decay asymmetries. All the data without references is quoted from PDG [26].

Channel	Expt.	Channel	Expt.
$10^2 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Lambda^0 \pi^+)$	1.30 ± 0.07	$\mathcal{R}_1 = \frac{\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \eta)}{\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \pi^0)}$	0.25 ± 0.03 [7]
$10^2 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p K_S)$	1.59 ± 0.08	$\mathcal{R}_2 = \frac{\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \eta')}{\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \pi^0)}$	0.33 ± 0.06 [7]
$10^2 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^0 \pi^+)$	1.29 ± 0.07	$\mathcal{R}_3 = \frac{\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \eta')}{\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \eta)}$	1.34 ± 0.29 [7]
$10^2 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \pi^0)$	1.25 ± 0.10	$\mathcal{R}_4 = \frac{\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Lambda^0 K^+)}{\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Lambda^0 \pi^+)}$	$(4.68 \pm 0.39) \times 10^{-2}$ [3]
$10^2 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \eta)$	0.44 ± 0.20		$(5.05 \pm 0.16) \times 10^{-2}$ [6]
	0.314 ± 0.044 [7]		$(4.7 \pm 0.9) \times 10^{-2}$
$10^2 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \eta')$	1.50 ± 0.60	$\mathcal{R}_5 = \frac{\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^0 K^+)}{\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^0 \pi^+)}$	$(3.61 \pm 0.73) \times 10^{-2}$ [4]
	0.416 ± 0.085 [7]		$(2.78 \pm 0.16) \times 10^{-2}$ [6]
$10^2 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Xi^0 K^+)$	0.55 ± 0.07		$(4.0 \pm 0.6) \times 10^{-2}$
$10^3 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p \eta)$	1.42 ± 0.12	$\mathcal{R}_6 = \frac{\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^0 \pi^+)}{\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Lambda^0 \pi^+)}$	0.98 ± 0.05
$10^4 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p \eta')$	4.73 ± 0.97 [5]	$\mathcal{R}_7 = \frac{\mathcal{B}(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Lambda^0 K_S)}{\mathcal{B}(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^- \pi^+)}$	0.225 ± 0.013
	$5.62_{-2.04}^{+2.46} \pm 0.26$ [2]	$\mathcal{R}_8 = \frac{\mathcal{B}(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^0 K_S)}{\mathcal{B}(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^- \pi^+)}$	$(3.8 \pm 0.72) \times 10^{-2}$
$10^4 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Lambda^0 K^+)$	6.21 ± 0.61 [3]	$\mathcal{R}_9 = \frac{\mathcal{B}(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^+ K^-)}{\mathcal{B}(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^- \pi^+)}$	0.123 ± 0.0122
	6.57 ± 0.40 [6]	$\mathcal{R}_{10} = \frac{\mathcal{B}(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^- K^+)}{\mathcal{B}(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^- \pi^+)}$	$(2.75 \pm 0.57) \times 10^{-2}$
$10^4 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^0 K^+)$	4.7 ± 0.95 [4]	$\alpha(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Lambda^0 \pi^+)$	-0.84 ± 0.09
	3.58 ± 0.28 [6]		-0.755 ± 0.006 [6]
$10^4 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow n \pi^+)$	6.6 ± 1.3 [1]	$\alpha(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p K_S)$	0.18 ± 0.45
$10^4 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ K_S)$	4.8 ± 1.4 [4]	$\alpha(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^0 \pi^+)$	-0.73 ± 0.18
$10^4 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p \pi^0)$	< 0.80 [35]		-0.463 ± 0.018 [6]
$10^2 \mathcal{B}(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^- \pi^+)$	1.43 ± 0.32	$\alpha(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \pi^0)$	-0.55 ± 0.11
$10^3 \mathcal{B}(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^- K^+)$	0.38 ± 0.12		-0.48 ± 0.03 [7]
$10^3 \mathcal{B}(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Lambda^0 K_S)$	3.34 ± 0.67	$\alpha(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^- \pi^+)$	-0.64 ± 0.05
$10^3 \mathcal{B}(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^0 K_S)$	0.69 ± 0.24	$\alpha(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \eta)$	-0.99 ± 0.06 [7]
$10^3 \mathcal{B}(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^+ K^-)$	1.8 ± 0.4	$\alpha(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \eta')$	-0.46 ± 0.07 [7]
$10^2 \mathcal{B}(\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow \Xi^0 \pi^+)$	1.6 ± 0.8	$\alpha(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Lambda^0 K^+)$	-0.585 ± 0.052 [6]
		$\alpha(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^0 K^+)$	-0.55 ± 0.20 [6]

SU(3) respected framework, the coefficients $a_{1,2,3,6}$ and $b_{2,5}$ are well fitted as their errors are controlled less than 10% comparing with their corresponding central values. With an around 20% \sim 50% relative error, $a_{5,7}$ and $b_{1,4,6}$ can provide useful information. However, the errors are too large for $a'_0, a_{0,4}$ and $b'_0, b_{0,3,7}$. Keeping other a_i similar precision, the fitting precision of a_5 is improved with a price of large uncertainty for u_1 in SU(3) breaking framework. For the P -wave amplitude coefficients, the errors of $b_{1,2,4,6}$ are less than 50%, while the errors of $b_5, v_{2,3}$ are between 50% and 100%. The others are with large uncertainty. We should also keep in mind that the errors of each coefficients are also correlated. The

correlation matrix R are given as

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -0.00 & -0.02 & 0.03 & 0.99 & -0.02 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & -0.00 & 0.00 & 0.01 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.01 & -0.01 & -0.00 & 0.00 \\ -0.00 & 1 & 0.09 & 0.09 & 0.00 & -0.01 & 0.89 & -0.13 & 0.11 & 0.00 & -0.25 & 0.02 & 0.09 & -0.00 & -0.09 & -0.67 & -0.05 & 0.07 \\ -0.02 & 0.09 & 1 & -0.42 & 0.02 & 0.28 & 0.08 & 0.04 & 0.78 & 0.01 & 0.09 & -0.50 & 0.12 & -0.01 & -0.05 & -0.05 & -0.14 & -0.40 \\ 0.03 & 0.09 & -0.42 & 1 & -0.03 & -0.39 & -0.05 & -0.39 & -0.10 & -0.00 & 0.22 & 0.17 & 0.24 & 0.00 & -0.01 & 0.09 & -0.26 & 0.27 \\ 0.99 & 0.00 & 0.02 & -0.03 & 1 & 0.02 & -0.00 & -0.00 & -0.00 & 0.00 & -0.00 & -0.01 & 0.00 & -0.00 & -0.01 & 0.00 & 0.00 & -0.00 \\ -0.02 & -0.01 & 0.28 & -0.39 & 0.02 & 1 & -0.11 & -0.37 & -0.19 & 0.01 & 0.17 & -0.20 & 0.09 & -0.01 & 0.12 & 0.03 & -0.13 & -0.25 \\ 0.00 & 0.89 & 0.08 & -0.05 & -0.00 & -0.11 & 1 & 0.21 & 0.17 & 0.00 & -0.48 & 0.00 & -0.11 & -0.00 & -0.12 & -0.74 & 0.22 & 0.08 \\ 0.00 & -0.13 & 0.04 & -0.39 & -0.00 & -0.37 & 0.21 & 1 & 0.27 & 0.00 & -0.54 & -0.11 & -0.47 & -0.00 & 0.01 & -0.01 & 0.48 & -0.02 \\ 0.00 & 0.11 & 0.78 & -0.10 & -0.00 & -0.19 & 0.17 & 0.27 & 1 & -0.00 & -0.02 & -0.41 & 0.10 & 0.00 & -0.13 & -0.13 & -0.04 & -0.29 \\ -0.00 & 0.00 & 0.01 & -0.00 & 0.00 & 0.01 & 0.00 & 0.00 & -0.00 & 1 & -0.01 & -0.02 & 0.01 & 0.99 & -0.01 & 0.01 & 0.00 & 0.01 \\ 0.00 & -0.25 & 0.09 & 0.22 & -0.00 & 0.17 & -0.48 & -0.54 & -0.02 & -0.01 & 1 & 0.00 & 0.78 & 0.01 & 0.03 & 0.38 & -0.89 & -0.07 \\ 0.00 & 0.02 & -0.50 & 0.17 & -0.01 & -0.20 & 0.00 & -0.11 & -0.41 & -0.02 & 0.00 & 1 & -0.10 & 0.02 & -0.10 & -0.07 & 0.05 & 0.63 \\ 0.00 & 0.09 & 0.12 & 0.24 & 0.00 & 0.09 & -0.11 & -0.47 & 0.10 & 0.01 & 0.78 & -0.10 & 1 & -0.01 & -0.32 & -0.02 & -0.83 & 0.22 \\ 0.00 & -0.00 & -0.01 & 0.00 & -0.001 & -0.01 & -0.00 & -0.00 & 0.00 & 0.99 & 0.01 & 0.02 & -0.01 & 1 & 0.01 & -0.01 & -0.00 & -0.01 \\ 0.01 & -0.09 & -0.05 & -0.01 & -0.01 & 0.12 & -0.12 & 0.01 & -0.13 & -0.01 & 0.03 & -0.10 & -0.32 & 0.01 & 1 & 0.15 & -0.06 & -0.55 \\ -0.00 & -0.67 & -0.05 & 0.09 & 0.00 & 0.03 & -0.74 & -0.01 & -0.13 & 0.01 & 0.38 & -0.07 & -0.02 & -0.01 & 0.15 & 1 & -0.14 & -0.01 \\ -0.00 & -0.05 & -0.14 & -0.26 & 0.00 & -0.13 & 0.22 & 0.48 & -0.04 & 0.00 & -0.89 & 0.05 & -0.83 & -0.00 & -0.06 & -0.14 & 1 & 0.06 \\ 0.00 & 0.07 & -0.40 & 0.27 & -0.00 & -0.25 & 0.08 & -0.02 & -0.29 & 0.01 & -0.07 & 0.63 & 0.22 & -0.01 & -0.55 & -0.01 & 0.06 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.2)$$

Here we only present the 18×18 correlation matrix in the exact SU(3) respected scenario as an illustration, and in practical calculation another 24×24 correlation matrix for SU(3) broken case is also needed.

Combing the errors in Table 5 and the correlation matrices, Eq. (3.2) as an example, one can straightforwardly calculate the physical quantities of interest, decay branching fractions and decay asymmetries of all the two-body weak decays of antitriplet charmed baryons. The results of the total 16 CF, 26 CSC and 16 DCS channels, together with their S - and P -wave amplitudes, are displayed in Table 6. Though 6 more fitting parameters are introduced in the case of SU(3) breaking, as shown in Table 9 the goodness is better for $\chi^2_{\min}/\text{d.o.f.} = 1.27$ comparing with $\chi^2_{\min}/\text{d.o.f.} = 2.15$ for the symmetry keeping case.

So far all the CF modes of antitriplet charmed baryons weak decays have been measured except the channels $\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ K_S$ and $\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^0 \pi^0, \Xi^0 \eta, \Xi^0 \eta'$. The prediction in current work, $\mathcal{B}(\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ K_S) = (0.85^{+0.15}_{-0.16}) \times 10^{-2}$ and corresponding $\alpha = 0.65 \pm 0.25$, is consistent with the one in [19] but differs the sign of α from the pole model calculation [13]. Suppose that the two modes $\Xi_c^{+,0} \rightarrow \Xi^{0,-} \pi^+$ can be improved by Belle/Belle-II in the near future, we have removed them from fitting input lists in current scheme and find other predictions for the CF measured modes are consistent well in the two scenarios. To discriminate whether SU(3) symmetry is kept or broken from the aspect of branching fraction, the CF channel $\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^0 \pi^0$ may play a role as its central value is around 7 times larger in the SU(3) breaking case. In addition, the decay asymmetries of the yet-to-be measured modes $\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Lambda^0 K_S, \Sigma^0 K_S, \Xi^0 \pi^0, \Xi^0 \eta, \Xi^0 \eta'$ provide alternative options to explore the flavor symmetry since the corresponding signs of α differ from each other in the two scenarios. Moreover, from the relations exhibited in Eq. (2.10) the branching fraction ratios between corresponding modes should be a good window to observe SU(3) symmetry in charmed baryon decays. We have defined several ratios as \mathcal{R}_{1i} and calculated them based on the fitted parameters in both scenarios presented in Table 7. In principle, once the relative size between S - and P -wave amplitudes of corresponding channel are known, the ratios can be calculated theoretically. The predictions of $\mathcal{R}_{1,2,\dots,10}$ have been mostly confirmed by experimental data from the Fit-III column of Table 10, hence a further confirmation of predictions in Table 7 is highly expected. For the SCS modes, there are only 7 of 26

Table 5. The fitting results of amplitude coefficients in irreducible amplitude approach (see Eq. (2.4) and (2.6)) in the unit of $10^{-2}G_F\text{GeV}^2$.

SU(3) respected (Fit-III')				SU(3) breaking (Fit-III)			
Coefficient	Value	Coefficient	Value	Coefficient	Value	Coefficient	Value
a_0	-0.10 ± 1.00	b_0	-0.50 ± 2.70	a_0	-1.20 ± 1.00	b_0	-0.70 ± 3.30
a_1	$-3.75^{+0.20}_{-0.17}$	b_1	$3.50^{+1.00}_{-0.90}$	a_1	$-3.50^{+0.21}_{-0.13}$	b_1	$8.60^{+1.30}_{-0.90}$
a_2	$1.10^{+0.17}_{-0.16}$	b_2	$4.04^{+0.33}_{-0.47}$	a_2	$1.45^{+0.16}_{-0.25}$	b_2	$4.00^{+0.90}_{-1.60}$
a_3	$-1.66^{+0.12}_{-0.10}$	b_3	$0.80^{+1.00}_{-0.90}$	a_3	$-1.98^{+0.15}_{-0.13}$	b_3	$-0.80^{+1.20}_{-0.70}$
a'_0	1.60 ± 2.00	b'_0	2.00 ± 5.00	a'_0	0.10 ± 2.00	b'_0	2.00 ± 7.00
a_4	$0.04^{+0.18}_{-0.21}$	b_4	$-1.20^{+0.60}_{-0.70}$	a_4	$0.23^{+0.29}_{-0.28}$	b_4	-3.40 ± 0.90
a_5	$1.36^{+0.45}_{-0.37}$	b_5	$-9.10^{+0.60}_{-0.70}$	a_5	$2.14^{+0.26}_{-0.23}$	b_5	$3.00^{+1.70}_{-2.20}$
a_6	$1.26^{+0.16}_{-0.22}$	b_6	$8.00^{+1.60}_{-1.70}$	a_6	$1.56^{+0.14}_{-0.20}$	b_6	$10.10^{+1.50}_{-2.30}$
a_7	$-1.04^{+0.33}_{-0.29}$	b_7	$0.60^{+0.90}_{-1.10}$	a_7	$-0.59^{+0.33}_{-0.42}$	b_7	$-0.90^{+1.90}_{-3.20}$
				u_1	0.00 ± 110	v_1	13.00^{+47}_{-36}
				u_2	$1.20^{+0.80}_{-0.70}$	v_2	$-3.00^{+1.70}_{-2.00}$
				u_3	2.80 ± 0.70	v_3	$4.80^{+1.40}_{-1.60}$

branching fractions and 2 of 26 decay asymmetries have been measured, with them predictions in Fit-III are consistent well. In the case with exact SU(3) symmetry (Fit-III') the predicted $\alpha(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^0 K^+)$ has a deviation from Belle measured value [6] originated mainly from the difference in P -wave amplitude. Among all the 16 DCS channels, the two modes $\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^0 K^+$ and $\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ K^0$ are most possibly to access in next few years with branching ratio at the order of 10^{-4} and negative decay asymmetries in both scenarios, which are also in agreement with the theoretical prediction combing the pole model and MIT bag model [37].

The comparison with experimental values combing fitting results from other groups [18–20] as well as the model calculation[13, 37], see Table 8, is meaningful. As a typical example, the sign of decay asymmetry of $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow pK_S$ helps discriminate theoretical calculations, fitting calculations and experimental measurement. In all the 6 different fitting schemes of this work (see also Table 9), the predictions provide a negative sign, which is also supported by the earlier fitting [18] as well as the model calculation [13]. However, the central value of the same quantity provided by BESIII, together with a previous fitting analysis [19], prefers a positive sign (though there is still a possibility that the sign is negative considering the errors). Currently the error is still too large to determine the sign of α yet, when more data accumulated BESIII, Belle/Belle-II and LHCb are supposed to give the final word. The branching fraction of $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \eta'$ was firstly measured in 2019 by BESIII measured, given $(1.50 \pm 0.60) \times 10^{-2}$ [26], which is supported by earlier fitting results [18, 19]. However, the recent independent measurement from Belle gives a smaller

Table 7. Predictions of branching fraction ratios between some special modes in both scenarios on SU(3) flavor symmetry.

	SU(3) respected	SU(3) broken
$\mathcal{R}_{11} \equiv \frac{\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ K^0)}{\mathcal{B}(\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow p K_S)}$	0.57 ± 0.03	0.32 ± 0.09
$\mathcal{R}_{12} \equiv \frac{\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow n \pi^+)}{\mathcal{B}(\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow \Xi^0 K^+)}$	0.99 ± 0.01	$0.58^{+0.20}_{-0.24}$
$\mathcal{R}_{13} \equiv \frac{\mathcal{B}(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow n K_S)}{\mathcal{B}(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^0 K_S)}$	$1.60^{+0.26}_{-0.25}$	$14.53^{+7812.23}_{-7931.44}$
$\mathcal{R}_{14} \equiv \frac{\mathcal{B}(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow p \pi^-)}{\mathcal{B}(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow p K^-)}$	$(5.87 \pm 0.07)10^{-2}$	$(1.36^{+19.62}_{-18.84})10^{-2}$
$\mathcal{R}_{15} \equiv \frac{\mathcal{B}(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^- K^+)}{\mathcal{B}(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^- K^+)}$	$(5.34 \pm 0.05)10^{-2}$	$(10.63^{+46.06}_{-29.87})10^{-2}$
$\mathcal{R}_{16} \equiv \frac{\mathcal{B}(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^- K^+)}{\mathcal{B}(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^- \pi^+)}$	0.84 ± 0.01	$0.23^{+1.32}_{-1.15}$

central value with decreased error, $(0.416 \pm 0.085) \times 10^{-2}$ [7], which locates in the predicted region in current work.

For the decay of $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p \eta'$, predictions of the two fittings in SU(3) IRA [18, 19] are both larger than recent measured results from both BESIII [2] and Belle [5], while the two scenarios in current work as well as the fitting based on topological diagram [20] can give consistent predictions. Although the branching ratio of $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p \pi^0$ haven't been measured yet, an upper limit has been updated by Belle [35], which is supported also by current fitting in both two scenarios consistent with the fittings in [18] and [20]. For the recent measured decay asymmetry of $\Lambda_c \rightarrow \Sigma^0 K^+$ [6], both current fitting in Fit-III and the pole model calculation [13] converge well.

The dynamical theoretical calculation, the kinetic fitting calculation and the experimental measurement provide complementary ways to explore two-body weak decays of charmed baryon from different aspects. Each of them can help the other two methodologies to improve their predictions/measured values. For example, by taking more experimental values into account as inputs, more reliable predictions can be produced by the fitting methodology. On the other hand, calculation from both fitting methods and a model calculation provide a strong motivation to revise $\alpha(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p K_S)$ in experiment. Now except $\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \bar{K}^0$ (or $\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ K_S$) all the branching fractions of CF modes as well as part of SCS modes have been measured. It is highly anticipated that more observables and modes can be accessible, which provide more evidence to confirm and improve fitting calculation in current work, in the coming years.

4 Summary and conclusion

In this work, based on SU(3) flavor symmetry we have carried out a global fitting analysis for the two-body weak decays of antitriplet charmed baryons incorporating the latest experimental data. Two scenarios for fitting, both in the flavor symmetry strictly respected case and the SU(3) breaking case, are considered. In the framework of keeping exact SU(3) symmetry, more amplitudes in terms of SU(3) irreducible representation have been taken

Table 8. The comparison of theoretical predictions for branching fractions and decay asymmetries in different methods and the latest measured experimental values.

channel	Fit-III	Fit-III'	GLT [18]	HXH [19]	ZWHY [20]	ZXMC [13, 37]	Expt.
$10^2 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Lambda^0 \pi^+)$	$1.30^{+0.12}_{-0.14}$	$1.27^{+0.08}_{-0.09}$	1.30 ± 0.07	1.307 ± 0.069	1.32 ± 0.34	1.30	1.30 ± 0.07
$10^2 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p K_S)$	1.65 ± 0.11	1.59 ± 0.10	1.57 ± 0.08	1.587 ± 0.077	1.57 ± 0.05	1.06	1.59 ± 0.08
$10^2 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^0 \pi^+)$	1.27 ± 0.09	1.30 ± 0.06	1.27 ± 0.06	1.272 ± 0.056	1.26 ± 0.32	2.24	1.29 ± 0.07
$10^2 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \pi^0)$	1.27 ± 0.09	1.30 ± 0.06	1.27 ± 0.06	1.283 ± 0.057	1.23 ± 0.17	2.24	1.25 ± 0.10
$10^2 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \eta)$	$0.30^{+0.06}_{-0.07}$	0.31 ± 0.05	0.32 ± 0.13	0.45 ± 0.19	0.47 ± 0.22	0.74	0.44 ± 0.20 0.314 ± 0.044 [7]
$10^2 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \eta')$	0.39 ± 0.08	0.24 ± 0.05	1.44 ± 0.56	1.5 ± 0.60	0.93 ± 0.28	-	1.50 ± 0.60 0.416 ± 0.085 [7]
$10^2 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Xi^0 K^+)$	$0.50^{+0.06}_{-0.09}$	0.38 ± 0.03	0.56 ± 0.09	0.548 ± 0.068	0.59 ± 0.17	0.73	0.55 ± 0.07
$10^3 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p \eta)$	1.27 ± 0.11	$1.36^{+0.11}_{-0.12}$	1.15 ± 0.27	1.27 ± 0.24	1.14 ± 0.35	1.28	1.42 ± 0.12
$10^4 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p \eta')$	$4.65^{+0.79}_{-0.77}$	$5.93^{+0.73}_{-0.71}$	24.5 ± 14.6	27 ± 38	7.1 ± 1.4	-	4.73 ± 0.97 [5] $5.62^{+2.46}_{-2.04} \pm 0.26$ [2]
$10^4 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Lambda^0 K^+)$	$6.54^{+0.42}_{-0.49}$	$6.62^{+0.23}_{-0.22}$	6.5 ± 1.0	6.4 ± 1.0	5.9 ± 1.7	10.7	6.21 ± 0.61 [3] 6.57 ± 0.40 [6]
$10^4 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^0 K^+)$	$3.71^{+0.39}_{-0.36}$	$3.56^{+0.68}_{-0.69}$	5.4 ± 0.7	5.04 ± 0.56	5.5 ± 1.6	7.2	4.7 ± 0.95 [4] 3.58 ± 0.28 [6]
$10^4 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow n \pi^+)$	$6.47^{+1.33}_{-1.55}$	$8.15^{+0.69}_{-0.67}$	8.5 ± 2.0	3.5 ± 1.1	7.7 ± 2.0	-	6.6 ± 1.3 [1]
$10^4 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ K_S)$	$1.99^{+0.49}_{-0.46}$	$3.11^{+0.35}_{-0.34}$	5.45 ± 0.75	1.03 ± 0.42	9.55 ± 2.4	7.2	4.8 ± 1.4 [4]
$10^4 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p \pi^0)$	$0.51^{+0.59}_{-0.61}$	0.16 ± 0.09	1.2 ± 1.2	44.5 ± 8.5	$0.8^{+0.9}_{-0.8}$	1.26	< 0.80 [35]
$10^2 \mathcal{B}(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^- \pi^+)$	$2.43^{+0.60}_{-0.64}$	$0.70^{+0.25}_{-0.22}$	2.21 ± 0.14	1.21 ± 0.21	1.93 ± 0.28	6.47	1.43 ± 0.32
$10^3 \mathcal{B}(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^- K^+)$	$0.60^{+1.03}_{-0.67}$	$0.31^{+0.11}_{-0.09}$	0.98 ± 0.06	0.47 ± 0.083	0.56 ± 0.08	3.90	0.38 ± 0.12
$10^3 \mathcal{B}(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Lambda^0 K_S)$	$3.34^{+0.97}_{-0.98}$	$3.79^{+0.66}_{-0.61}$	5.25 ± 0.3	3.34 ± 0.65	4.16 ± 2.51	6.65	3.34 ± 0.67
$10^3 \mathcal{B}(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^0 K_S)$	$0.74^{+0.25}_{-0.30}$	$0.73^{+0.25}_{-0.25}$	0.4 ± 0.4	0.69 ± 0.24	3.96 ± 0.25	0.2	0.69 ± 0.24
$10^3 \mathcal{B}(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^+ K^-)$	$1.86^{+0.45}_{-0.71}$	$1.74^{+0.41}_{-0.51}$	5.9 ± 1.1	2.21 ± 0.68	22.0 ± 5.7	4.6	1.8 ± 0.4
$10^2 \mathcal{B}(\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow \Xi^0 \pi^+)$	$0.55^{+0.19}_{-0.20}$	0.81 ± 0.11	0.38 ± 0.20	0.54 ± 0.18	0.93 ± 0.36	1.72	1.6 ± 0.8
$\alpha(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Lambda^0 \pi^+)$	-0.75 ± 0.01	-0.75 ± 0.01	-0.87 ± 0.10	-0.841 ± 0.083	-	-0.93	-0.84 ± 0.09 -0.755 ± 0.006 [6]
$\alpha(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p K_S)$	-0.29 ± 0.24	-0.57 ± 0.21	$-0.90^{+0.22}_{-0.10}$	0.19 ± 0.41	-	-0.75	0.18 ± 0.45
$\alpha(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^0 \pi^+)$	-0.47 ± 0.03	-0.47 ± 0.03	-0.35 ± 0.27	-0.605 ± 0.088	-	-0.76	-0.73 ± 0.18 -0.463 ± 0.018 [6]
$\alpha(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \pi^0)$	-0.47 ± 0.03	-0.47 ± 0.03	-0.35 ± 0.27	-0.603 ± 0.088	-	-0.76	-0.55 ± 0.11 -0.48 ± 0.03 [7]
$\alpha(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^- \pi^+)$	$-0.64^{+0.11}_{-0.09}$	-0.64 ± 0.07	$-0.98^{+0.07}_{-0.02}$	-0.56 ± 0.32	-	-0.95	-0.64 ± 0.05
$\alpha(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \eta)$	-0.95 ± 0.06	-0.96 ± 0.05	-0.40 ± 0.47	0.3 ± 3.8	-	-0.95	-0.99 ± 0.06 [7]
$\alpha(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \eta')$	-0.47 ± 0.05	-0.43 ± 0.07	$1.00^{+0.00}_{-0.17}$	0.8 ± 1.9	-	-	-0.46 ± 0.07 [7]
$\alpha(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Lambda^0 K^+)$	-0.57 ± 0.06	-0.55 ± 0.06	0.32 ± 0.32	-0.24 ± 0.15	-	-0.96	-0.585 ± 0.052 [6]
$\alpha(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^0 K^+)$	-0.67 ± 0.05	$-0.97^{+0.02}_{-0.01}$	$-1.00^{+0.06}_{-0.00}$	-0.953 ± 0.040	-	-0.73	-0.55 ± 0.20 [6]
$\alpha(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Xi^0 K^+)$	0.99 ± 0.01	$0.91^{+0.03}_{-0.04}$	$0.94^{+0.06}_{-0.11}$	0.866 ± 0.090	-	0.90	

into account benefited from new data. As for the SU(3) breaking effect, in current working scenario only SCS processes receive changes while CF and DCS processes keep unchanged.

Making use of the data of the measured 20 branching fractions and 9 decay asymmetries, we obtain the ranges of 18 parameters in SU(3) keeping scenario as well as the 24 ones in SU(3) breaking case, though some of which are with large uncertainties. In general, the goodness is better by incorporating SU(3) symmetry breaking effect. In both scenarios, we have calculated branching fractions and decay asymmetries for all the CF, SCS and DCS

modes of antitriplet charmed baryon weak decays. Most of the predictions for branching fractions and decay asymmetries are consistent well with experimental measurements. For more details, we have

- Among the branching fractions of all the 16 CF channels, there are still 4 of them unmeasured. It is highly anticipated to be measured in the upcoming years for the four modes $\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ K_S, \Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^0 \pi^0, \Xi^0 \eta, \Xi^0 \eta'$.
- Current data prefers SU(3) flavor symmetry breaking in charmed baryon weak decays.
- We propose three ways to further explore SU(3) symmetry. (i) Measuring the branching fraction of CF decay $\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^0 \pi^0$ for the large difference exists in two scenarios. (ii) Measuring the decay asymmetries in the CF decays $\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Lambda^0 K_S, \Sigma^0 K_S, \Xi^0 \pi^0, \Xi^0 \eta, \Xi^0 \eta'$ as their signs are opposite correspondingly in the two cases. (iii) Measuring series of branching fraction ratios, some of which have been presented in Table 7.
- Fittings in different schemes of current work, as well as independent fittings by other groups all indicate a 2 or 3 times smaller value for the branching fraction of $\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow \Xi^0 \pi^+$. Hence we remove this mode as well the correlated mode $\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^- \pi^+$ from the inputs of fitting. We hope experiments in the near future can help clarify the two modes.
- Predictions from most fitting works and pole model calculation prefer a negative $\alpha(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p K_S)$ while BESIII provided a positive central value with large uncertainty. Future measurements from both BESIII and other experiments are expected to make a further clarification.
- Both fittings (in IRA and TDA) and pole model calculation give a positive and large value for $\alpha(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Xi^0 K^+)$, then a check from experiment would be interesting.

Together with other results presented in Table 6, all the predictions of current work are expected to be checked and improved by the upcoming experiments with the more accumulated data.

Acknowledgments

The authors benefited by discussions with Prof. H.-Y. Cheng, C.-Q. Geng and C.-W. Liu. The communication with Prof. C. D. Lu, X.R. Lyu, F. -S. Yu, P.-R. Li and T. Luo are acknowledged. This work is supported by NSFC under Grant Nos. U1932104, 12142502 and 12047503, and by Guangdong Provincial Key Laboratory of Nuclear Science with No. 2019B121203010.

Note Added

All the authors contribute equally and they are co-first authors, while F. Xu is the corresponding author.

Appendix

A The comparison among different schemes

We present 3 groups of fitting schemes here, in which those with a prime stand for SU(3) symmetry being strictly respected while those without a prime receiving symmetry breaking terms. In particular, the first group (Fit-I/I') contains all the values of all the observables in Table 4 while the second group (Fit-II/II') delete all the ratios between branching fractions in the definition of χ^2 in Fit-I/I'. Then the

Table 9. Predictions of branching fractions and decay asymmetries in different schemes, in which the scheme with a prime stands for the SU(3) respected scenario while these without a prime containing SU(3) breaking effect. The corresponding experimental values for a comparison are given in the last column.

Channel ($\chi^2_{\min}/\text{d.o.f.}$)	Fit-I 1.16	Fit-I' 2.60	Fit-II 1.98	Fit-II' 2.20	Fit-III 1.27	Fit-III' 2.15)	Expt.
$10^2 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Lambda \pi^+)$	$1.32^{+0.12}_{-0.14}$	$1.32^{+0.12}_{-0.14}$	$1.30^{+0.12}_{-0.14}$	$1.28^{+0.12}_{-0.13}$	$1.30^{+0.12}_{-0.14}$	$1.27^{+0.08}_{-0.09}$	1.30 ± 0.07
$10^2 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p K_S)$	$1.59^{+0.33}_{-0.38}$	$1.58^{+0.25}_{-0.30}$	$1.66^{+0.15}_{-0.17}$	$1.56^{+0.12}_{-0.13}$	1.65 ± 0.11	1.59 ± 0.10	1.59 ± 0.08
$10^2 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^0 \pi^+)$	1.28 ± 0.09	1.30 ± 0.09	1.27 ± 0.09	1.31 ± 0.09	1.27 ± 0.09	1.30 ± 0.06	1.29 ± 0.07
$10^2 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \pi^0)$	1.28 ± 0.09	1.30 ± 0.09	1.27 ± 0.09	1.31 ± 0.09	1.27 ± 0.09	1.30 ± 0.06	1.25 ± 0.10
$10^2 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \eta)$	0.30 ± 0.06	0.29 ± 0.06	0.28 ± 0.06	$0.32^{+0.06}_{-0.07}$	$0.30^{+0.06}_{-0.07}$	0.31 ± 0.05	0.44 ± 0.20 0.314 ± 0.044 [7]
$10^2 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \eta')$	0.40 ± 0.08	$0.06^{+0.73}_{-0.74}$	0.42 ± 0.08	0.26 ± 0.06	0.39 ± 0.08	0.24 ± 0.05	1.50 ± 0.60 0.416 ± 0.085 [7]
$10^2 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Xi^0 K^+)$	$0.60^{+0.07}_{-0.09}$	$0.38^{+0.06}_{-0.08}$	$0.50^{+0.06}_{-0.08}$	$0.38^{+0.06}_{-0.08}$	$0.50^{+0.06}_{-0.09}$	0.38 ± 0.03	0.55 ± 0.07
$10^3 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p \eta)$	$1.31^{+0.23}_{-0.25}$	$1.27^{+0.21}_{-0.22}$	$1.23^{+0.16}_{-0.17}$	1.36 ± 0.12	1.27 ± 0.11	$1.36^{+0.11}_{-0.12}$	1.42 ± 0.12
$10^4 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p \eta')$	$5.04^{+0.75}_{-0.78}$	$3.90^{+0.97}_{-0.94}$	4.95 ± 0.77	$6.14^{+0.95}_{-0.91}$	$4.65^{+0.79}_{-0.77}$	$5.93^{+0.73}_{-0.71}$	4.73 ± 0.97 [5] $5.62^{+2.46}_{-2.04} \pm 0.26$ [2]
$10^4 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Lambda K^+)$	$6.55^{+0.42}_{-0.50}$	$6.62^{+0.42}_{-0.49}$	$6.68^{+0.42}_{-0.50}$	$6.66^{+0.42}_{-0.49}$	$6.54^{+0.42}_{-0.49}$	$6.62^{+0.23}_{-0.22}$	6.21 ± 0.61 [3] 6.57 ± 0.40 [6]
$10^4 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^0 K^+)$	$3.63^{+0.38}_{-0.36}$	$3.65^{+0.49}_{-0.45}$	$3.78^{+0.39}_{-0.36}$	$3.58^{+0.49}_{-0.45}$	$3.71^{+0.39}_{-0.36}$	$3.56^{+0.68}_{-0.69}$	4.7 ± 0.95 [4] 3.58 ± 0.28 [6]
$10^4 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow n \pi^+)$	$4.67^{+1.17}_{-1.38}$	$8.43^{+1.66}_{-1.97}$	$5.99^{+1.28}_{-1.48}$	$8.19^{+1.62}_{-1.92}$	$6.47^{+1.33}_{-1.55}$	$8.15^{+0.69}_{-0.67}$	6.6 ± 1.3 [1]
$10^4 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ K_S)$	$1.75^{+0.50}_{-0.48}$	$2.67^{+0.66}_{-0.64}$	$1.83^{+0.46}_{-0.44}$	$3.14^{+0.74}_{-0.72}$	$1.99^{+0.49}_{-0.46}$	$3.11^{+0.35}_{-0.34}$	4.8 ± 1.4 [4]
$10^4 \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p \pi^0)$	$2.01^{+1.08}_{-1.11}$	$1.45^{+1.01}_{-1.04}$	0.02 ± 0.10	$0.15^{+0.19}_{-0.17}$	$0.51^{+0.59}_{-0.61}$	0.16 ± 0.09	< 0.80 [35]
$10^2 \mathcal{B}(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^- \pi^+)$	$1.40^{+0.32}_{-0.28}$	$1.27^{+0.32}_{-0.29}$	$1.01^{+0.27}_{-0.24}$	$0.92^{+0.26}_{-0.23}$	$2.43^{+0.60}_{-0.64}$	$0.70^{+0.25}_{-0.22}$	1.43 ± 0.32
$10^3 \mathcal{B}(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^- K^+)$	$0.36^{+12.44}_{-12.22}$	$0.56^{+17.17}_{-17.01}$	$0.39^{+13.88}_{-13.95}$	$0.40^{+14.65}_{-14.53}$	$0.60^{+1.03}_{-0.67}$	$0.31^{+0.11}_{-0.09}$	0.38 ± 0.12
$10^3 \mathcal{B}(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Lambda K_S)$	$3.25^{+0.68}_{-0.59}$	$3.15^{+0.66}_{-0.58}$	$3.96^{+0.76}_{-0.68}$	$4.25^{+0.93}_{-0.91}$	$3.34^{+0.97}_{-0.98}$	$3.79^{+0.66}_{-0.61}$	3.34 ± 0.67
$10^3 \mathcal{B}(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^0 K_S)$	$0.53^{+0.40}_{-0.50}$	$0.57^{+0.58}_{-0.80}$	$0.78^{+0.32}_{-0.40}$	$0.79^{+0.31}_{-0.42}$	$0.74^{+0.25}_{-0.30}$	$0.73^{+0.25}_{-0.25}$	0.69 ± 0.24
$10^3 \mathcal{B}(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^+ K^-)$	$1.71^{+1.43}_{-2.18}$	$1.51^{+0.61}_{-1.08}$	$1.74^{+1.35}_{-2.03}$	$1.71^{+1.22}_{-2.05}$	$1.86^{+0.45}_{-0.71}$	$1.74^{+0.41}_{-0.51}$	1.8 ± 0.4
$10^2 \mathcal{B}(\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow \Xi^0 \pi^+)$	0.66 ± 0.21	$0.83^{+0.24}_{-0.27}$	0.51 ± 0.19	$0.83^{+0.24}_{-0.26}$	$0.55^{+0.19}_{-0.20}$	0.81 ± 0.11	1.6 ± 0.8
$\alpha(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Lambda \pi^+)$	-0.75 ± 0.01	-0.76 ± 0.01	-0.76 ± 0.01	-0.75 ± 0.01	-0.75 ± 0.01	-0.75 ± 0.01	-0.84 ± 0.09 -0.755 ± 0.006 [6]
$\alpha(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p K_S)$	-0.95 ± 0.06	-0.98 ± 0.04	$-0.65^{+0.18}_{-0.19}$	-0.50 ± 0.22	-0.29 ± 0.24	-0.57 ± 0.21	0.18 ± 0.45
$\alpha(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^0 \pi^+)$	-0.47 ± 0.03	-0.47 ± 0.03	-0.48 ± 0.03	-0.47 ± 0.03	-0.47 ± 0.03	-0.47 ± 0.03	-0.73 ± 0.18 -0.463 ± 0.018 [6]
$\alpha(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \pi^0)$	-0.47 ± 0.03	-0.48 ± 0.03	-0.48 ± 0.03	-0.47 ± 0.03	-0.47 ± 0.03	-0.47 ± 0.03	-0.55 ± 0.11 -0.48 ± 0.03 [7]
$\alpha(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^- \pi^+)$	-0.65 ± 0.05	-0.71 ± 0.05	-0.65 ± 0.06	-0.66 ± 0.06	$-0.64^{+0.11}_{-0.09}$	-0.64 ± 0.07	-0.64 ± 0.05
$\alpha(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \eta)$	-0.97 ± 0.06	-0.39 ± 0.09	-0.95 ± 0.06	-0.96 ± 0.05	-0.95 ± 0.06	-0.96 ± 0.05	-0.99 ± 0.06 [7]
$\alpha(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \eta')$	-0.50 ± 0.05	-0.88 ± 0.06	-0.48 ± 0.05	-0.41 ± 0.07	-0.47 ± 0.05	-0.43 ± 0.07	-0.46 ± 0.07 [7]
$\alpha(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Lambda K^+)$	$-0.61^{+0.05}_{-0.06}$	-0.55 ± 0.06	$-0.58^{+0.05}_{-0.06}$	-0.56 ± 0.06	-0.57 ± 0.06	-0.55 ± 0.06	-0.585 ± 0.052 [6]
$\alpha(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^0 K^+)$	-0.63 ± 0.05	-0.98 ± 0.01	-0.66 ± 0.05	-0.97 ± 0.02	-0.67 ± 0.05	$-0.97^{+0.02}_{-0.01}$	-0.55 ± 0.20 [6]
$\alpha(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Xi^0 K^+)$	0.98 ± 0.01	$0.92^{+0.03}_{-0.04}$	$0.996^{+0.005}_{-0.006}$	$0.90^{+0.03}_{-0.04}$	0.99 ± 0.01	$0.91^{+0.03}_{-0.04}$	

Table 10. Predictions of ratios between branching fractions in different schemes, in which the definition of \mathcal{R}_i are given in Table 4.

Channel	Fit-I	Fit-I'	Fit-II	Fit-II'	Fit-III	Fit-III'	Expt.
\mathcal{R}_1	0.24 ± 0.04	0.22 ± 0.04	0.22 ± 0.04	$0.25^{+0.06}_{-0.16}$	$0.23^{+0.05}_{-0.06}$	0.24 ± 0.04	0.25 ± 0.03 [7]
\mathcal{R}_2	0.31 ± 0.04	0.05 ± 0.03	$0.33^{+0.05}_{-0.06}$	$0.20^{+0.04}_{-0.43}$	$0.30^{+0.06}_{-0.07}$	0.19 ± 0.04	0.33 ± 0.06 [7]
\mathcal{R}_3	$1.31^{+0.24}_{-0.26}$	$0.20^{+0.22}_{-0.24}$	$1.49^{+0.34}_{-0.36}$	$0.81^{+0.14}_{-1.37}$	$1.30^{+0.38}_{-0.39}$	$0.77^{+0.20}_{-0.21}$	1.34 ± 0.29 [7]
$10^2 \mathcal{R}_4$	$4.98^{+0.30}_{-0.34}$	$5.04^{+0.30}_{-0.34}$	$5.13^{+0.37}_{-0.38}$	$5.22^{+0.38}_{-0.40}$	$5.03^{+0.51}_{-0.65}$	$5.22^{+0.39}_{-0.41}$	4.78 ± 0.39 [3] 5.05 ± 0.16 [6]
$10^2 \mathcal{R}_5$	$2.85^{+0.21}_{-0.26}$	$2.81^{+0.14}_{-0.17}$	$2.98^{+0.19}_{-0.18}$	2.74 ± 0.13	$2.93^{+0.31}_{-0.35}$	$2.74^{+0.13}_{-0.14}$	3.61 ± 0.73 [4] 2.78 ± 0.16 [6]
\mathcal{R}_6	0.97 ± 0.07	0.99 ± 0.07	0.97 ± 0.08	1.02 ± 0.08	$0.97^{+0.11}_{-0.13}$	1.02 ± 0.09	0.98 ± 0.05
\mathcal{R}_7	0.46 ± 0.05	0.49 ± 0.05	0.79 ± 0.11	$0.93^{+0.19}_{-0.18}$	$0.27^{+0.05}_{-0.09}$	1.09 ± 0.33	0.225 ± 0.013
$10^2 \mathcal{R}_8$	$7.55^{+3.69}_{-3.58}$	$8.85^{+2.90}_{-2.30}$	$15.31^{+7.54}_{-7.35}$	$16.97^{+6.31}_{-5.92}$	$6.04^{+2.38}_{-2.64}$	$20.58^{+9.67}_{-9.13}$	3.8 ± 0.7
$10^2 \mathcal{R}_9$	$12.23^{+5.66}_{-6.49}$	$11.89^{+1.92}_{-2.34}$	$17.28^{+10.22}_{-10.08}$	$18.64^{+6.13}_{-6.78}$	$7.64^{+2.49}_{-3.05}$	$24.88^{+10.98}_{-10.93}$	12.3 ± 1.22
$10^2 \mathcal{R}_{10}$	$2.61^{+0.15}_{-0.14}$	4.38 ± 0.03	$3.90^{+0.19}_{-0.18}$	4.39 ± 0.02	$2.46^{+4.26}_{-2.76}$	4.40 ± 0.02	2.75 ± 0.57

third group is defined based on Fit-II/II' by subtracting $\alpha(\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow pK_S)$, $\mathcal{B}(\Xi_c^0 \rightarrow \Xi^- \pi^+)$ and $\mathcal{B}(\Xi_c^+ \rightarrow \Xi^0 \pi^+)$.

In Table 9 we show predictions of branching fractions and decay asymmetries in various schemes by comparing them with experimental values. To catch a glimpse of goodness of fit, explicit values of $\chi^2_{\min}/\text{d.o.f.}$ in each scheme are also listed therein. We also theoretically calculate the ratios between particular modes which have been measured as an auxiliary illustration in Table 10.

References

- [1] BESIII collaboration, *Observation of the Singly Cabibbo Suppressed Decay $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow n\pi^+$* , *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128** (2022) 142001 [2201.02056].
- [2] BESIII collaboration, *Measurement of the absolute branching fraction of the singly Cabibbo suppressed decay $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p\eta'$* , *Phys. Rev. D* **106** (2022) 072002.
- [3] BESIII collaboration, *Measurement of the Branching Fraction of the Singly Cabibbo-Suppressed Decay $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Lambda K^+$* , 2208.04001.
- [4] BESIII collaboration, *Measurement of Branching Fractions of Singly Cabibbo-suppressed Decays $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^0 K^+$ and $\Sigma^+ K_S^0$* , 2207.10906.
- [5] BELLE collaboration, *First Measurement of the $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p\eta'$ decay*, *JHEP* **03** (2022) 090 [2112.14276].
- [6] BELLE collaboration, *Measurement of branching fractions and decay asymmetry parameters for $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Lambda h^+$ and $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^0 h^+$ ($h = K, \pi$), and search for CP violation in baryon decays*, 2208.08695.
- [7] BELLE collaboration, *Measurements of branching fractions of $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \eta$ and $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \eta'$ and asymmetry parameters of $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \pi^0$, $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \eta$, and $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \eta'$* , 2208.10825.

- [8] J. G. Korner and M. Kramer, *Exclusive nonleptonic charm baryon decays*, *Z. Phys. C* **55** (1992) 659.
- [9] Q. P. Xu and A. N. Kamal, *The Nonleptonic charmed baryon decays: $B(c) \rightarrow B(3/2^+, \text{decuplet}) + P(0^-)$ or $V(1^-)$* , *Phys. Rev. D* **46** (1992) 3836.
- [10] H.-Y. Cheng and B. Tseng, *Cabibbo allowed nonleptonic weak decays of charmed baryons*, *Phys. Rev. D* **48** (1993) 4188 [[hep-ph/9304286](#)].
- [11] M. A. Ivanov, J. G. Korner, V. E. Lyubovitskij and A. G. Rusetsky, *Exclusive nonleptonic decays of bottom and charm baryons in a relativistic three quark model: Evaluation of nonfactorizing diagrams*, *Phys. Rev. D* **57** (1998) 5632 [[hep-ph/9709372](#)].
- [12] H.-Y. Cheng, X.-W. Kang and F. Xu, *Singly Cabibbo-suppressed hadronic decays of Λ_c^+* , *Phys. Rev. D* **97** (2018) 074028 [[1801.08625](#)].
- [13] J. Zou, F. Xu, G. Meng and H.-Y. Cheng, *Two-body hadronic weak decays of antitriplet charmed baryons*, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020) 014011 [[1910.13626](#)].
- [14] P.-Y. Niu, J.-M. Richard, Q. Wang and Q. Zhao, *Hadronic weak decays of Λ_c in the quark model*, *Phys. Rev. D* **102** (2020) 073005 [[2003.09323](#)].
- [15] S. Groote and J. G. Körner, *Topological tensor invariants and the current algebra approach: analysis of 196 nonleptonic two-body decays of single and double charm baryons – a review*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82** (2022) 297 [[2112.14599](#)].
- [16] H.-Y. Cheng, *Charmed baryon physics circa 2021*, *Chin. J. Phys.* **78** (2022) 324 [[2109.01216](#)].
- [17] C.-D. Lü, W. Wang and F.-S. Yu, *Test flavor $SU(3)$ symmetry in exclusive Λ_c decays*, *Phys. Rev. D* **93** (2016) 056008 [[1601.04241](#)].
- [18] C. Q. Geng, C.-W. Liu and T.-H. Tsai, *Asymmetries of anti-triplet charmed baryon decays*, *Phys. Lett. B* **794** (2019) 19 [[1902.06189](#)].
- [19] F. Huang, Z.-P. Xing and X.-G. He, *A global analysis of charmless two body hadronic decays for anti-triplet charmed baryons*, *JHEP* **03** (2022) 143 [[2112.10556](#)].
- [20] H. J. Zhao, Y.-L. Wang, Y. K. Hsiao and Y. Yu, *A diagrammatic analysis of two-body charmed baryon decays with flavor symmetry*, *JHEP* **02** (2020) 165 [[1811.07265](#)].
- [21] D. Wang, C.-P. Jia and F.-S. Yu, *A self-consistent framework of topological amplitude and its $SU(N)$ decomposition*, *JHEP* **21** (2020) 126 [[2001.09460](#)].
- [22] X.-G. He and W. Wang, *Flavor $SU(3)$ Topological Diagram and Irreducible Representation Amplitudes for Heavy Meson Charmless Hadronic Decays: Mismatch and Equivalence*, *Chin. Phys. C* **42** (2018) 103108 [[1803.04227](#)].
- [23] X.-G. He, Y.-J. Shi and W. Wang, *Unification of Flavor $SU(3)$ Analyses of Heavy Hadron Weak Decays*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80** (2020) 359 [[1811.03480](#)].
- [24] Y. K. Hsiao, Y. L. Wang and H. J. Zhao, *Equivalent $SU(3)_f$ approaches for two-body anti-triplet charmed baryon decays*, *JHEP* **09** (2022) 035 [[2111.04124](#)].
- [25] M. J. Savage and R. P. Springer, *$SU(3)$ Predictions for Charmed Baryon Decays*, *Phys. Rev. D* **42** (1990) 1527.
- [26] PARTICLE DATA GROUP collaboration, *Review of Particle Physics*, *PTEP* **2022** (2022) 083C01.

- [27] T. Feldmann, P. Kroll and B. Stech, *Mixing and decay constants of pseudoscalar mesons*, *Phys. Rev. D* **58** (1998) 114006 [[hep-ph/9802409](#)].
- [28] T. Feldmann, P. Kroll and B. Stech, *Mixing and decay constants of pseudoscalar mesons: The Sequel*, *Phys. Lett. B* **449** (1999) 339 [[hep-ph/9812269](#)].
- [29] H.-Y. Cheng and C.-W. Chiang, *Two-body hadronic charmed meson decays*, *Phys. Rev. D* **81** (2010) 074021 [[1001.0987](#)].
- [30] H.-n. Li, C.-D. Lu and F.-S. Yu, *Branching ratios and direct CP asymmetries in $D \rightarrow PP$ decays*, *Phys. Rev. D* **86** (2012) 036012 [[1203.3120](#)].
- [31] H.-Y. Cheng and C.-W. Chiang, *CP violation in quasi-two-body $D \rightarrow VP$ decays and three-body D decays mediated by vector resonances*, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021) 073003 [[2104.13548](#)].
- [32] M. J. Savage, *$SU(3)$ violations in the nonleptonic decay of charmed hadrons*, *Phys. Lett. B* **257** (1991) 414.
- [33] D. Pirtskhalava and P. Uttayarat, *CP Violation and Flavor $SU(3)$ Breaking in D -meson Decays*, *Phys. Lett. B* **712** (2012) 81 [[1112.5451](#)].
- [34] C. Q. Geng, Y. K. Hsiao, C.-W. Liu and T.-H. Tsai, *$SU(3)$ symmetry breaking in charmed baryon decays*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **78** (2018) 593 [[1804.01666](#)].
- [35] BELLE collaboration, *Measurements of the branching fractions of $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p\eta$ and $\Lambda_c^+ \rightarrow p\pi^0$ decays at Belle*, *Phys. Rev. D* **103** (2021) 072004 [[2102.12226](#)].
- [36] H. Dembinski and P. O. et al., *Scikit-Hep/Iminuit:v2.16.0*. Zenodo, Dec, 2020, [10.5281/zenodo.3949207](#).
- [37] G. Meng, S. M.-Y. Wong and F. Xu, *Doubly Cabibbo-suppressed decays of antitriplet charmed baryons*, *JHEP* **11** (2020) 126 [[2005.12111](#)].