OTHER RELATED PAPERS

JENNI 83 PR D27 1031 +Burke, Telnov, Abrams, Blocker+ (SLAC, LBL)
BEHREND 82C PL 114B 378 +Chen, Fenner, Field+ (CELLO Collab.)
ABOLINS 65 Athens Conf. +Carmony, Lander, Xuong, Yager (UCSD) I
ADERHOLZ 65 PR 138B 897 (AACH3, BERL, BIRM, BONN, HAMB, LOIC, MPIM)
ALITTI 65 PL 15 69 +Baton, Deler, Crussard+ (SACL, BGNA) JP
CHUNG 65 PRL 15 325 +Dahl, Hardy, Hess, Jacobs, Kirz (LRL)
FORINO 65B PL 19 68 +Gessaroli+ (BGNA, BARI, FIRZ, ORSAY, SACL)
LEFEBVRES 65 PL 19 434 +Levrat+ (CERN Missing Mass Spect. Collab.)
SEIDLITZ 65 PRL 15 217 +Dahl, Miller (LRL)
ADERHOLZ 64 PL 10 226 + (AACH3, BERL, BIRM, BONN, DESY, HAMB+)
CHUNG 64 PRL 12 621 +Dahl, Hardy, Hess, Kalbfleisch, Kirz (LRL)
GOLDHABER 64B Dubna Conf. 1 480 +Goldhaber, O'Halloran, Shen (LRL)
Also 64 PRL 12 336 Goldhaber, Brown, Kadyk, Shen+ (LRL, UCB)
LANDER 64 PRL 13 346A +Abolins, Carmony, Hendricks, Xuong+ (UCSD)

$f_0(1370)$

$I^G(J^{PC}) = 0^+(0^{++})$

OMITTED FROM SUMMARY TABLE

We list here all claims compatible with high $\pi\pi$ S-wave inelasticity. See also minireviews under $f_0(1300)$ and non-$q\overline{q}$ candidates.

$f_0(1370)$ MASS

VALUE (MeV)	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
1365^{+20}_{-55}	[1] ANISOVICH	94	CBAR	$0.0\ \overline{p}p \rightarrow 3\pi^0, \pi^0\eta\eta$
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
1374 ± 38	AMSLER	94	CBAR	$0.0\ \overline{p}p \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-3\pi^0$
1345 ± 12	ADAMO	93	OBLX	$\overline{n}p \rightarrow 3\pi^+2\pi^-$
1430 ± 25	AMSLER	93C	CBAR	$0.0\ \overline{p}p \rightarrow \pi^0\eta\eta$
1386 ± 30	GASPERO	93	DBC	$0.0\ \overline{p}n \rightarrow 2\pi^+3\pi^-$
1440 ± 20	CHEN	91	MRK3	$J/\psi \rightarrow \gamma\pi^+\pi^-, \gamma K\overline{K}$
1440 ± 50	BOLONKIN	88	SPEC	$40\ \pi^-p \rightarrow K^0_S K^0_S n$
$1463\pm\ 9$	ETKIN	82B	MPS	$23\ \pi^-p \rightarrow n2K^0_S$

[1] From a simultaneous analysis of the annihilations $\overline{p}p \rightarrow 3\pi^0, \pi^0\eta\eta$. Supersedes AMSLER 93C.

$f_0(1370)$ WIDTH

VALUE (MeV)	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
$268\pm\ 70$	[2] ANISOVICH	94	CBAR	$0.0\ \overline{p}p \rightarrow 3\pi^0, \pi^0\eta\eta$
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
$375\pm\ 61$	AMSLER	94	CBAR	$0.0\ \overline{p}p \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-3\pi^0$
$398\pm\ 26$	ADAMO	93	OBLX	$\overline{n}p \rightarrow 3\pi^+2\pi^-$
$250\pm\ 50$	AMSLER	93C	CBAR	$0.0\ \overline{p}p \rightarrow \pi^0\eta\eta$
$310\pm\ 50$	GASPERO	93	DBC	$0.0\ \overline{p}n \rightarrow 2\pi^+3\pi^-$
$160\pm\ 40$	CHEN	91	MRK3	$J/\psi \rightarrow \gamma\pi^+\pi^-, \gamma K\overline{K}$
$250\pm\ 80$	BOLONKIN	88	SPEC	$40\ \pi^-p \rightarrow K^0_S K^0_S n$
$118^{+138}_{-\ 16}$	ETKIN	82B	MPS	$23\ \pi^-p \rightarrow n2K^0_S$

[2] From a simultaneous analysis of the annihilations $\overline{p}p \rightarrow 3\pi^0, \pi^0\eta\eta$. Supersedes AMSLER 93C.

$f_0(1370)$ DECAY MODES

	Mode	Fraction (Γ_i/Γ)	Confidence level
Γ_1	$\pi\pi$	$<12\ \%$	
Γ_2	4π	$>72\ \%$	95%
Γ_3	$4\pi^0$		
Γ_4	$2\pi^+2\pi^-$		
Γ_5	$\pi^+\pi^-2\pi^0$		
Γ_6	6π		
Γ_7	$\eta\eta$	seen	
Γ_8	$\eta\eta'$		
Γ_9	2ω		
Γ_{10}	$K\overline{K}X$		

$f_0(1370)$ BRANCHING RATIOS

$\Gamma(\pi\pi)/\Gamma_{total}$ — Γ_1/Γ

VALUE	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
<0.12	[3] GASPERO	93	RVUE	$0.0\ \overline{p}n \rightarrow$ hadrons

[3] Based on GASPERO 93 and private communications from M. Gaspero.

$\Gamma(4\pi)/\Gamma_{total}$ — $\Gamma_2/\Gamma = (\Gamma_3+\Gamma_4+\Gamma_5)/\Gamma$

VALUE	CL%	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
>0.72	95	[4] GASPERO	93	RVUE	$0.0\ \overline{p}n \rightarrow$ hadrons

[4] Based on model-dependent evaluation by GASPERO 93 and private communications from M. Gaspero.

$\Gamma(2\pi^+2\pi^-)/\Gamma(4\pi)$ — $\Gamma_4/\Gamma_2 = \Gamma_4/(\Gamma_3+\Gamma_4+\Gamma_5)$

VALUE	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
0.420 ± 0.014	[5] GASPERO	93	RVUE	$0.0\ \overline{p}n \rightarrow 2\pi^+3\pi^-$

[5] Based on model-dependent evaluation by GASPERO 93.

$\Gamma(\pi^+\pi^-2\pi^0)/\Gamma(4\pi)$ — $\Gamma_5/\Gamma_2 = \Gamma_5/(\Gamma_3+\Gamma_4+\Gamma_5)$

VALUE	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
0.512 ± 0.019	[6] GASPERO	93	RVUE	$0.0\ \overline{p}n \rightarrow$ hadrons

[6] Based on model-dependent evaluation by GASPERO 93.

$\Gamma(\eta\eta)/\Gamma_{total}$ — Γ_7/Γ

VALUE	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
seen	AMSLER	92	CBAR	$0.0\ \overline{p}p \rightarrow \eta\eta\pi^0$

$f_0(1370)$ REFERENCES

AMSLER 94 PL B322 431 +Armstrong+ (Crystal Barrel Collab.) JPC
ANISOVICH 94 PL B323 233 +Armstrong+ (Crystal Barrel Collab.) JPC
ADAMO 93 NP A558 13C +Agnello+ (OBELIX Collab.) JPC
AMSLER 93C NP A558 3C +Augustin+ (Crystal Barrel Collab.) JPC
GASPERO 93 NP A562 407 (ROMAI) JPC
AMSLER 92 PL B291 347 +Augustin, Baker+ (Crystal Barrel Collab.)
CHEN 91 Hadron 91 Conf. (Mark III Collab.)
SLAC-PUB-5669
BOLONKIN 88 NP B309 426 +Bloshenko, Gorin+ (ITEP, SERP)
ETKIN 82B PR D25 1786 +Foley, Lai+ (BNL, CUNY, TUFTS, VAND)

OTHER RELATED PAPERS

BRIDGES 86 PRL 56 211 +Brown+ (BLSU, BNL, CASE, COLU, UMD, SYRA)
BRIDGES 86B PRL 56 215 +Daftari, Kalogeropoulos, Debbe+ (SYRA, CASE)
BRIDGES 86C PRL 57 1534 +Daftari, Kalogeropoulos+ (SYRA)
BETTINI 66 NC 42A 695 +Cresti, Limentani, Bertanza, Bigi+ (PADO, PISA)

$h_1(1380)$

$I^G(J^{PC}) = ?^-(1^{+?})$

OMITTED FROM SUMMARY TABLE

Seen in partial-wave analysis of the $K^0_S K^\pm\pi^\mp$ system. Evidence for $K^*\overline{K} + \overline{K}^*K$ decays (ASTON 88C). Needs confirmation.

$h_1(1380)$ MASS

VALUE (MeV)	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
1380 ± 20	ASTON	88C	LASS	$11\ K^-p \rightarrow K^0_S K^\pm\pi^\mp\Lambda$

$h_1(1380)$ WIDTH

VALUE (MeV)	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
80 ± 30	ASTON	88C	LASS	$11\ K^-p \rightarrow K^0_S K^\pm\pi^\mp\Lambda$

$h_1(1380)$ DECAY MODES

	Mode
Γ_1	$K\overline{K}^*(892) +$ c.c.

$h_1(1380)$ REFERENCES

ASTON 88C PL B201 573 +Awaji, Bienz+ (SLAC, NAGO, CINC, INUS)