

# Status Report on the Light Baryonic States

B.M.K. Nefkens and J.W. Price

*UCLA, Los Angeles, CA 90095, U.S.A.*

(Received: October 28, 2018)

The regularities in the spectrum of the light baryon resonances are reviewed and compared with those of the light mesons. We discuss the occurrence of parity doublets and clusters, and note the trends in the values of the masses, widths, spins, and parities. The importance of SU(3) flavor is illustrated and the status of quark model calculations of the baryonic spectrum is reviewed. The absence of evidence for baryonic hybrids is particularly interesting. We propose to use better symbols for the baryon resonances which do not conflict with the simple quark structure of QCD. We shall comment also on fine tuning the Star System for the hadronic states. The importance of greater support for the construction and operation of secondary beams of  $\pi$ ,  $K$ ,  $\bar{p}$ ,  $\bar{n}$  and  $\bar{\gamma}$  up to 5 GeV/ $c$  for the future of non-perturbative QCD is emphasized.

## 1 Introduction

An important purpose of the biannual Symposium on “Meson-Nucleon Physics and the Structure of the Nucleon” (MENU) is to review the status of the light baryonic states. MENU provides a public forum for discussing the occurrence of regularities in the hadrons, and for evaluating the success of various hadron models, particularly of the light baryons which are made up of  $u$ ,  $d$ , and  $s$  quarks.

## 2 Patterns in the Widths of Baryons

The width,  $\Gamma$ , of all light baryon resonances as listed in the Review of Particle Physics [1] is shown in Fig. 1.

$\Gamma$  increases with the mass of the resonance and the magnitude depends on the strangeness number of the family (which is directly related to the number of  $u$  and  $d$  quarks.) The value of the average  $\Gamma$  for each family is given on the abscissa of Fig. 1. The relation between the widths is the following:

$$\Gamma(N^*) = \Gamma(\Delta^*) \simeq \frac{9}{4}\Gamma(\Lambda^*) = \frac{9}{4}\Gamma(\Sigma^*) \simeq 9\Gamma(\Xi^*). \quad (1)$$

Riska [2] has noted that these ratios correspond to  $[\#(u+d)]^2$ , where  $\#(u+d)$  is the number of up and down quarks. Note that the  $\Xi^*$  states are sufficiently narrow that they may be fruitfully explored in production experiments such as  $\gamma p \rightarrow \Xi^- K^+ K^+$ ; this provides a practical way for discovering many of the missing  $\Xi^*$  resonances.

## 3 Patterns in Baryon Masses, Spins and Parities

Shown in Fig. 2 is a parity-pairing plot, which displays by rectangular boxes the real part of the pole of every known  $N^*$  state in eight vertical bands, one for each spin:  $1/2, 3/2, \dots, 15/2$ . Every band has two columns; the left for the negative parity states and the right for the positive ones. The star ranking of each state is indicated by the shading: four stars (darkest shade) are awarded to well-established states and one star (lightest shade) to the iffy ones.

There are clearly 3 mass regions in Fig. 2: 4 states have  $m < 1600$  MeV, where  $m$  is the pole value of the state. None of these has a parity partner; we shall call them *bachelor* states. There are




Figure 1: The width of all known light baryons. The horizontal lines are the average value for each family.

16 states with  $1600 < m < 2200$  MeV which form 8 parity doublets, and make two clusters. The 2 remaining states at  $m > 2500$  MeV are single states; however, the searches for other states have been far from exhaustive. A similar pattern of parity doublet states is found in the  $\Delta$  family. For the case of the  $\Lambda$  and  $\Sigma$  states there are not sufficient data for drawing a firm conclusion about the similar occurrence of parity doublets.

The situation for the mesons is fundamentally different. Fig. 3 shows the parity pairing plot for the strange meson family. There is no evidence for parity doubling. The isosinglet and isotriplet meson families support this.

We conclude that parity doubling is a feature of the baryons which is *not seen* in the mesons. Possible reasons for this could be a diquark substructure [3] or some hitherto overlooked symmetry in the wave function.




Figure 2: Parity pairing of the  $N^*$  states. Each resonance is plotted by its pole value in 8 columns for spin  $\frac{1}{2}$  to  $\frac{13}{2}$  negative parity states are on the left side and positive on the right. The darkest shade of gray is for 4 star states. The lightest is for one star.

#### 4 The Flavor Symmetry of QCD

The Lagrangian of QCD,  $\mathcal{L}_{QCD}$ , is given by the following compact expression [1]:

$$\mathcal{L}_{QCD} = -\frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}^{(a)}F^{(a)\mu\nu} + i\sum_q \bar{\psi}_q^i \gamma^\mu (D_\mu)_{ij} \psi_q^j - \sum_q m_q \bar{\psi}_q^i \psi_{qi} \quad (2)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\mu\nu}^{(a)} &= \partial_\mu A_\nu^a - \partial_\nu A_\mu^a + g_s f_{abc} A_\mu^b A_\nu^c, \\ (D_\mu)_{ij} &= \delta_{ij} \partial_\mu - ig_s \sum_a \frac{\lambda_{i,j}^a}{2} A_\mu^a. \end{aligned}$$

$\psi$  is the quark field,  $A$  is the gluon field and  $m_q$  is the mass of quark  $q$ . Eq. 2 may be arranged as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{QCD} = \mathcal{L}_0 + \mathcal{L}_m. \quad (3)$$




Figure 3: Lack of parity pairing of the light strange mesons.

$\mathcal{L}_0$  consists of the first two terms of Eq. 2 and  $\mathcal{L}_m$  is the third term.  $\mathcal{L}_0$  depends only on the fields; it is the same for all 6 quarks and 8 gluons. This is the famous flavor symmetry of QCD, which is a manifestation of the universality of the strong interaction; it is broken by the mass term,

$$\mathcal{L}_m = - \sum_q \bar{\psi}_q m_q \psi_q.$$

The success of the SU(3) symmetry for systems of  $u$ ,  $d$  and  $s$  quarks is indicative of  $\mathcal{L}_0 \gg \mathcal{L}_m$ .  $\mathcal{L}_m$  produces a change of about 15% in the mass of the hyperons.

Flavor symmetry explains the stunning similarity between the features of threshold  $\pi^- p \rightarrow \eta n$  production and  $K^- p \rightarrow \eta n$  as well as the amazing analogy between the Dalitz plots of  $\pi^- p \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0 n$  and  $K^- p \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0 \Lambda$  and the dissimilarity with  $K^- p \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0 \Sigma^0$  [4].

## 5 Baryon Mass Calculations

The experimental masses [1] of the ground states of the four light baryon-octet families, the  $N$ ,  $\Lambda$ ,  $\Sigma$  and  $\Xi$ , are displayed in Fig. 4 by thick horizontal lines. Shown also are the masses of the ground states of the four decuplet families, the  $\Delta(1232)$ ,  $\Sigma(1385)$ ,  $\Xi(1530)$  and  $\Omega^-(1672)$ . We shall compare these mass spectra with three very different model calculations which are representative of the large variety of calculations in this field.

1. Lattice-gauge, L-G, results obtained by the CP-PACS group [5] for a quenched QCD calculations are indicated in Fig. 4 by the stars. The L-G calculations used as input the masses of




Figure 4: Masses of light baryons. The first column shows the  $K$ -meson, the second column the  $K^*$  and  $\phi$ . the third column the baryon octet ground states, and the fourth column the baryon decuplet ground states. Solid lines are experimental data; black dots are for Capstick-Isgur [6]; open squares Bijker et al. [7]; stars CP-PACS [5].

the  $\pi^0$ ,  $\rho$  and  $\phi$  mesons, they also set  $m_u = m_d$ . The agreement of this L-G calculation with the experimental masses is at the several percent level. For example,  $m_p(\text{L-G}) = 878 \pm 25$  MeV, while  $m_p(\text{exp}) = 938$  MeV. One should not be carried away by the level of agreement for the 8 baryon ground states of this and other calculations; this could give an undeserved sense of accomplishment. Note that the masses of the four decuplet states (which have a symmetric flavor state function) simply differ by the  $s - d$  quark mass difference. Well before the birth of QCD, the resulting equal mass spacings were known as the Gell-Mann decuplet mass splitting relation. L-G and all quark models display this decuplet relation to the level of 1 MeV, however, experimentally it only holds to the level of 17 MeV. A similar relation

applies to the octet ground-state masses, they obey the Gell-Mann-Okubo mass relation. This is different from the decuplet relation because the octets have mixed flavor symmetry. Thus, instead of 8 separate mass values there are actually only 4 independent numbers: the mass of the proton and the  $p - \Delta$ ,  $\Lambda - \Sigma$ , and the  $p - \Lambda$  mass differences.

2. The results of the relativized quark model calculations by Capstick and Isgur [6] are shown in Fig. 4 by black dots. The agreement with experiment is slightly better than the L-G model.
3. The algebraic model calculations by Bijker et al. [7], are shown by the open squares in Fig. 4. Again, the agreement with experiment is excellent which in part originates in the use of a larger input data set.

The above calculations are less satisfactory when it comes to obtaining the masses of the baryonic excited states. The limitations inherent in using a quenched QCD calculations of the present L-G models makes them not useful in their current form for the calculation of the excited states. We hope that this will change in the not too distant future.

Among the available quark model calculations we chose the Capstick-Roberts [8] work which comes from the same school as [6]. Shown in Fig. 5 are the masses of all listed [1]  $N^*$  states. We use different shades of gray to indicate the number of stars given to each resonance. The predictions by Capstick and Roberts are shown by horizontal lines with a triangle in the middle. Qualitatively, the spectrum of the experimental masses below 2000 MeV is reproduced by most quark models. A close inspection reveals several nagging discrepancies:

1. The lowest established excited  $N^*$  state is the Roper resonance, which has positive parity and spin  $\frac{1}{2}$ , like the nucleon which is the ground state. In the quark model of [8] the lowest two states have negative parity and spin  $\frac{1}{2}$  and  $\frac{3}{2}$ . This ordering is difficult to rectify except by a major modification such as the direct participation of Goldstone bosons in the quark-quark interaction [9].
2. The calculated masses of the positive parity states are all too high by some 80 MeV compared to the data, while all negative parity resonances are calculated to be too low by some 40 MeV. It is interesting that a similar quark model calculation [10] of the mesons agrees very well with the data.
3. Less than a quarter of the predicted states above 2000 MeV have been observed experimentally. The reason which is usually advanced for not seeing the “missing resonances” is their small coupling to the  $\pi N$  channel used for the identification by the  $\pi N$  partial wave analyses. A small coupling is indeed a feature of several quark models which use an independent channel calculation of the  $\pi N$  branching ratio. In reality there is a non-negligible coupling between various channels such as the  $\pi N$  and  $\eta N$  channel. In these cases the  $\pi N$  final state is enhanced because it has the larger phase space.

Experimentally it will be hard to identify the plethora of missing  $N^*$  states with a mass  $> 2000$  MeV. According to Fig. 1 we expect these states to have a width  $> 300$  MeV. In the region 2000–2300 MeV the quark model predicts 30 states, all overlapping and broad. We propose that the mystery of the missing baryonic resonances be settled by a detailed investigation of the excited  $\Xi$  because all  $N^*$  states are related by flavor symmetry, discussed in section 4, to  $\Xi$  states that have the same spin and parity and a  $\sim 450$  MeV larger mass. However, they have a narrow width of  $\sim 40$  MeV. The  $\Xi^*$  states are readily accesible in production experiments such as  $K^- p \rightarrow K^+ \Xi^*$  and  $\gamma p \rightarrow K^+ K^+ \Xi^*$ .




Figure 5:  $N^*$ -mass spectrum. The left side is for negative parity states. The right for positive. The experimental masses are given by the boxes. The lines with the triangle in the middle are the calculation by Capstick and Roberts [8].

## 6 Where are the Hybrid Baryons?

There is no argument known which is based on QCD or on our understanding of confinement for limiting the baryons to 3 quark states,  $|B\rangle = |qqq\rangle$ . We expect also  $|B\rangle = |qqqg\rangle$ ,  $|B\rangle = |qqqqg\rangle$ , etc. The latter two are called the hybrid baryons. They do not follow the simple SU(3)-flavor symmetry relations between the different light-quark baryon families. Thus, we do not expect that an  $N^*$  hybrid will have a flavor partner in the  $\Lambda$  family and vice versa. Shown in Fig. 6 by boxes are the various known  $\Lambda$  states using gray shading to indicate their star rating. We also show by the horizontal lines with crosses the SU(3) flavor prediction based on the experimentally observed  $N^*$  states and a simple expression to adjust for the flavor breaking due to the  $s - d$  quark mass difference [4]. From this figure we can conclude that:




Figure 6:  $\Lambda^*$ -mass spectrum. The left side is for negative parity states, the right for positive. The experimental  $\Lambda^*$  masses are given by the boxes. The crosses are the theoretical predictions based on the known  $N^*$  mass values [4] and flavor symmetry.

1. The Roper resonance, the  $N(1440)\frac{1}{2}^+$ , which has long been regarded as a hybrid candidate is not a hybrid because of the existence of the SU(3) flavor partner the  $\Lambda(1600)\frac{1}{2}^+$ .
2. There are no unaccounted-for  $\Lambda^*$  states, hence, there are no  $\Lambda$  hybrid candidates.

## 7 Nomenclature

To identify a specific baryonic resonance many authors use an outdated nomenclature which can be rather misleading. In this outdated system the proton is labelled a  $P_{11}$  state implying one unit of angular momentum of the constituents. This label dates back to the meson period in the history

of nuclear physics when the nucleon was considered to have a Dirac core surrounded by a P-wave pion cloud. The latter ingredient was needed to account for the observed magnetic dipole moments of the nucleons,  $\mu_p = +2.79\mu_B$  and  $\mu_n = -1.93\mu_B$ .

In the quark era, with the success of QCD, it is hard to support the notion that the proton, which is the ground state of the  $N^*$  family and has a life time (into certain channels) in excess of  $10^{32}$  years, is a P-state. We can rectify the situation by dropping the misleading nomenclature of  $L_{2I2J}$  and replace it by a simple system that uses measured parameters only. The first part is a capital or greek letter for the unique identification of the six light baryon families, the  $N, \Delta, \Lambda, \Sigma, \Xi,$  and  $\Omega$ . This is followed by the mass in brackets and by the spin and parity. Thus, the proton's new symbol is  $N(938)\frac{1}{2}^+$ , the Roper is  $N(1440)\frac{1}{2}^+$ , the  $D_{13}$  is  $N(1520)\frac{3}{2}^-$ , and the  $S_{11}$  is  $N(1535)\frac{1}{2}^-$ . Similar conventions are used for the other families, e.g. the  $\Lambda$  ground state is  $\Lambda(1116)\frac{1}{2}^+$ , the lambda-Roper is  $\Lambda(1600)\frac{1}{2}^+$ , etc.

## 8 The Star System

A practical system for quality assessment based on awarding a number of stars — as done by a well known restaurant guide — has been in use in baryon spectroscopy for many years. Every baryon resonance listed in the Review of Particle Physics [1] is awarded 1 to 4 stars. The meaning of the number of stars is the following.

\*\*\*\* Existence is certain, and properties are at least fairly well established.

\*\*\* Existence ranges from very likely to certain, but further confirmation is desirable and/or quantum numbers, branching fractions, etc. are not well determined.

\*\* Evidence of existence is only fair.

\* Evidence of existence is poor.

This system works well for the  $N$  and  $\Delta$  families where all states have been investigated in several full, energy dependent and independent,  $\pi N$  partial wave analyses (PWA). The 3 and 4 star  $\Lambda$  and  $\Sigma$  states are in good shape as they come mainly from  $\bar{K}N$  PWAs. However, there are several unsavory 1 and 2 star  $\Sigma$  candidates, which represent some questionable bumps in a few production experiments into inelastic channels. A major problem occurs in the case of the heavy baryons where all states have been discovered in production experiments. None of the new heavy baryons have an experimental determination of their spin and parity; instead, they are assigned a value based on the predictions of some popular quark models. We have seen in Sect. 5 how even the most extensive and widely used quark model does a poor job in the mass ordering of the lowest excited states. Furthermore, the actual mass calculation especially of the positive parity states is inaccurate by up to 80 MeV. Yet, the heavy baryon states have been given 3 and a few even 4 stars. The spin and parity are the vital characteristics of any resonance and a state does not warrant 3 or 4 stars when there is no experimental data on its spin and parity. We should fine tune the definition of 3 stars with this in mind.

Mark Manley [11] is floating the idea that we should establish a new class of 5 star states which is reserved for the “golden” resonances about whose existence and basic quantum numbers and properties there is no question. This idea has merits and deserves careful consideration by our community. In the meantime all physicists should be aware that the spin and parity of all heavy baryons are assigned based on the quark model without experimental verification.

## 9 Summary and Conclusions

A large body of detailed information on the properties of the light baryons [1] has been accumulated. However, our knowledge is still very incomplete; it is insufficient to allow drawing reliable conclusions about the occurrence of significant regularities such as parity doublets and clusters. Investigating the occurrence of regularities is needed to make progress on the problem of quark confinement in QCD. There is currently no evidence for the existence of hybrids but we cannot exclude them either. The lack of any clear manifestations of the gluon degree of freedom in any baryonic system is unsettling. It points to hitherto unexpected aspects of QCD in the non-perturbative regime.

New data on the properties of the many expected, but undiscovered  $\Lambda^*$ ,  $\Sigma^*$ ,  $\Xi^*$  and  $\Omega^*$  states are urgently needed so we can establish the dependence of the  $s - d$  quark mass difference on the energy and spin/parity of the confined 3 quark system. A convenient way to handle this is by investigating the validity of the Gell-Mann decuplet and the Gell-Mann-Okubo octet mass relations for high mass states with large spin and for the positive as well as negative parity states. This is needed for progress in the area of the “Origin of Mass”, one of the areas of importance in our field. A coordinated effort is needed on the existence of  $N^*$  and  $\Delta^*$  resonances with  $m > 2000$  MeV. Required for this are sophisticated detectors and secondary beams of  $\pi^\pm$ ,  $K^\pm$ ,  $\bar{p}$ ,  $\vec{n}$ , and  $\vec{\gamma}$  up to 5 GeV. It is the responsibility of this community to raise the awareness of our colleagues to the importance of the physics we are engaged in and to the experimental tools, especially the secondary beams, required to get our jobs done.

## References

- [1] D.E. Groom et al., Eur. Phys. J. **C15**, 1 (2000).
- [2] D.O. Riska, private communications (2000).
- [3] F. Iachello, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 2440 (1989).
- [4] B.M.K. Nefkens, proc. NSTAR 2001 Conference D. Drechsel et al., editors, World Scientific, in press.
- [5] S. Aoki et al. (CP-PACS), Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 238 (2000).
- [6] S. Capstick and N. Isgur, Phys. Rev. D **34**, 2809 (1986)
- [7] R. Bijker, F. Iachello, and A. Leviatan Ann. Phys. (NY) **236**, 69 (1994).
- [8] S. Capstick and W. Roberts, Phys. Rev. **D49**, 4570 (1992).
- [9] L. Glozman, D. O. Riska, Physics Reports **268** 263 (1996).
- [10] S. Godfrey, N. Isgur, Phys. Rev. D **32** (1985), 189.
- [11] M. Manley, private communication.