# Toward a unified description of hadro- and photoproduction S-wave $\pi$ - and $\eta$ -photoproduction amplitudes

### M. Paris<sup>GWU</sup> D. Arndt<sup>VPI</sup> R. Workman<sup>GWU</sup> W. Briscoe<sup>GWU</sup> I. Strakovsky<sup>GWU</sup>

GWU Data Analysis Center Center for Nuclear Studies The George Washington University

> <sup>VPI</sup>Formerly of the Department of Physics Virginia Tech

12th International Conference on Meson-Nucleon Physics and the Structure of the Nucleon June 2, 2010



### 1 Overview & motivation

- SAID @ CNS/DAC
- Motivation

#### 2 Amplitude parameterization

- Unitarity constraint
- Parameterizations
- Relation to N/D approach

#### 3 Results & comparisons

- Previous K-matrix approach
- Chew-Mandelstam parameterization
- Comparison to MAID

4 Conclusions & ongoing work



#### Partial-Wave Analyses at GW [Ges-Induction Pion-Nucleon Kaon-Nucleon Nucleon-Nucleon Pion Piotoproduction Pion Piotoproduction Pion Electroproduction Eta Photoproduction Eta-Prine Photoproduction Pion-Deuteron (elastic) Pion-Deuteron to Proton-Proton

#### Analyses From Other Sites Mainz (MAID – Analyses)

Mainz (MAID – Analyses) Nijmegen (Nucleon-Nucleon OnLine)

#### Contact

Richard A. Arndt William J. Briscoe Ron L. Workman Igor I. Strakovsky Mark Paris

Center for Nuclear Studies Department of Physics The George Washington University -Virginia Campus-20101 Academic Way Ashburn, VA 20147, USA



# Overview & motivation SAID @ CNS/DAC Motivation

- Motivation
- 2 Amplitude parameterization
  - Unitarity constraint
  - Parameterizations
  - Relation to N/D approach

### 3 Results & comparisons

- Previous K-matrix approach
- Chew-Mandelstam parameterization
- Comparison to MAID



#### 1 Phenomenology

- Suite of FORTRAN programs to analyze  $2 \rightarrow 2 \& 3$  body scattering and reaction data developed primarily by Dick Arndt
- Routines: database, fit, and analysis
- Implement parameterizations via field theoretic constraints
- Reactions:  $\pi N \to \pi N, \eta N, \pi \pi N$ ;  $KN \to KN$ ;  $NN \to NN$ ;  $\pi d \to \pi d$ ;  $\pi d \to pp$ ;  $\gamma N \to \pi N, \eta N, \eta' N, KY$ ;  $eN \to e\pi N$
- Open access

Passwordless secure shell: ssh -C -X said@said.phys.gwu.edu
Web interface: http://gwdac.phys.gwu.edu

Web users  $\,\sim$  100/month: modelers, comparisons to data (measured and unmeasured), exp'l planning, simulations, event generators, detector design and callibation,  $\ldots$ 

- 2 Theory & modeling
  - Dynamical multichannel effective field theory models
  - Comparison to phenomenological parameterizations
  - Derive guidance from phenomenology for approximations





- Motivation
- 2 Amplitude parameterization
  - Unitarity constraint
  - Parameterizations
  - Relation to N/D approach
- 3 Results & comparisons
  - Previous K-matrix approach
  - Chew-Mandelstam parameterization
  - Comparison to MAID



- Require a model independent method to obtain partial wave amplitudes
- **2** Existing knowledge of resonances mostly from hadronic scattering/reactions:  $\pi N \rightarrow \pi N, \pi N \rightarrow \eta N, \pi N \rightarrow \omega N$ 
  - $\rightarrow$  complete  $\pi N \rightarrow \pi N$  measurement over significant kinematic range
- 3 New precision electromagnetic facilities: Bonn, JLab, Lund, Mainz, ...
  - $\rightarrow$  renaissance in reaction theory and resonance physics
  - $\rightarrow$  quality & quantity of data rival/surpass hadronic data
  - $\rightarrow$  possibility to 'back-constrain' hadronic amplitudes in *unitary* formalism
  - → talk by I. Strakovsky, Session 6B Crystal Ball @ MAMI-C
- 4 Extend SAID approach used in hadronic sector to electromagnetic
  - Hadronic sector  $\pi N \rightarrow \pi N \& \pi N \rightarrow \eta N$  (untouched) 4 channel Chew-Mandelstam approach { $\pi N, \eta N, \pi \Delta, \rho N$ }
  - Electromagnetic sector  $\gamma N \rightarrow \pi N \& \gamma N \rightarrow \eta N$ Introduce 4 channel Chew-Mandelstam approach  $\{\pi N, \eta N, \pi \Delta, \rho N\}$  with same hadronic "rescattering" matrix
- Obtain η-photoproduction amplitude with *resonant* phase various calculations [*Green & Wycech; Kaiser et. al.; Aznauryan*] yield wide range of phases
- **6** Study baryon resonances in  $\eta N$  channel
- **7** Study  $\eta$ -sector physics



# Overview & motivation SAID @ CNS/DAC

Motivation

## 2 Amplitude parameterization

- Unitarity constraint
- Parameterizations
- Relation to N/D approach

#### 3 Results & comparisons

- Previous K-matrix approach
- Chew-Mandelstam parameterization
- Comparison to MAID



Parameterization (Chew-Mandelstam) adheres to analytic structure dictated by unitarity in the physical region  $W > m_i + m_t$ 

S matrix

$$\begin{split} S_{\alpha\beta}(E) &= \langle \mathbf{k}_{\alpha} \alpha | S | \mathbf{k}_{\beta} \beta \rangle \\ &= \delta^{(3)} (\mathbf{k}_{\alpha} - \mathbf{k}_{\beta}) \delta_{\alpha\beta} + 2i\pi \delta (E_{\alpha} - E_{\beta}) \langle \mathbf{k}_{\alpha} \alpha | T | \mathbf{k}_{\beta} \beta \rangle \end{split}$$

E = W =center-of-mass energy;  $\alpha, \beta$  channels  $\pi N, \eta N, \pi \Delta, \rho N, \dots$ 

• 
$$S^{\dagger}S = SS^{\dagger} = 1 \implies \text{constraint on } T$$
  
 $T - T^{\dagger} = T^{\dagger}\rho T$   
Im  $T^{-1} = -\rho, \ \rho_{\alpha\beta} = \delta_{\alpha\beta}\rho_{\alpha}$   
 $\rho_{\alpha} = \theta(W - m_{\alpha+}) \frac{\pi k_{\alpha} E_{\alpha1} E_{\alpha2}}{W}$ 

- Unitarity ⇒ real branch points at normal thresholds
- Ignore non-analytic structure in *W* < 0 region (for now)





## Overview & motivation SAID @ CNS/DAC

Motivation

### 2 Amplitude parameterization

Unitarity constraint

### Parameterizations

Relation to N/D approach

#### 3 Results & comparisons

- Previous K-matrix approach
- Chew-Mandelstam parameterization
- Comparison to MAID



#### Change normalization; matrix notation

#### K-matrix

Im 
$$T^{-1} = -\theta(W - M_+)$$
 a diagonal matrix  
 $T^{-1} = \operatorname{Re} T^{-1} + i\operatorname{Im} T^{-1} = K^{-1} - i\theta(W - M_+)$   
 $T = K + Ki\theta(W - M_+)T$ 

#### Chew-Mandelstam

$$\mathcal{T}^{-1} = (\mathcal{K}^{-1} + \operatorname{Re} \mathcal{C}) - (\operatorname{Re} \mathcal{C} + i\theta(\mathcal{W} - \mathcal{M}_{+})) = \overline{\mathcal{K}}^{-1} - \mathcal{C}$$
  
 $\mathcal{T} = \overline{\mathcal{K}} + \overline{\mathcal{K}}\mathcal{C}\mathcal{T}$   
 $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha}(\mathcal{W}) = rac{\mathcal{W} - \mathcal{W}_{s}}{\pi} \int_{\mathcal{W}_{t}}^{\infty} d\mathcal{W}' rac{
ho_{lpha}(\mathcal{W}')}{(\mathcal{W}' - \mathcal{W}_{s})(\mathcal{W}' - \mathcal{W})}$ 

$$K = \overline{K} + \overline{K}[\operatorname{Re} C]K \implies K = \{1 - \overline{K}[\operatorname{Re} C]\}^{-1}\overline{K}$$



## Overview & motivation SAID @ CNS/DAC

Motivation

### 2 Amplitude parameterization

- Unitarity constraint
- Parameterizations
- Relation to N/D approach

#### 3 Results & comparisons

- Previous K-matrix approach
- Chew-Mandelstam parameterization
- Comparison to MAID



$$T(W) = D^{-1}(W)N(W)$$

$$Im D(W) = N(W) Im T^{-1}(W) Im N(W) = 0 W > m_i + m_t Im N(W) = D(W) Im T(W) Im D(W) = 0 W < 0$$

$$D(W) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_p} D(W; W_i) - \frac{1}{\pi} \prod_{i=1}^{n_p} (W - W_i) \int_{W_t}^{\infty} dW' \frac{N(W')\rho(W')}{(W' - W) \prod_j (W' - W_j)}$$
$$N(W) = K \left\{ \sum_i D(W; W_i) - \frac{1}{\pi} \prod_{i=1}^{n_p} (W - W_i) \int_{W_t}^{\infty} dW' \frac{N(W')\rho(W')}{(W' - W) \prod_j (W' - W_j)} \right\}$$

Chew-Mandelstam approximates N, neglecting left-hand cut

$$egin{aligned} \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{W}) &= \overline{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{W}) \ \overline{\mathcal{K}}_{lphaeta} &= \sum_{n=0}^{n_{lphaeta}} oldsymbol{c}_{lphaeta,n} \overline{\mathcal{Z}}_{lphaeta}^n(\mathcal{W}) \end{aligned}$$



## Overview & motivation SAID @ CNS/DAC

- Motivation
- 2 Amplitude parameterization
  - Unitarity constraint
  - Parameterizations
  - Relation to N/D approach

#### 3 Results & comparisons

- Previous K-matrix approach
- Chew-Mandelstam parameterization
- Comparison to MAID



## K-matrix formalism

Two-channel formalism (trivially generalizable to N 2-body channels)

$$T_{\pi\gamma} = (1 + iT_{\pi\pi})K_{\pi\gamma} + iT_{\pi\eta}K_{\eta\gamma}$$
  $T_{\eta\gamma} = (1 + iT_{\eta\eta})K_{\eta\gamma} + iT_{\eta\pi}K_{\pi\gamma}$ 

Reduction via hadronic matrix to various forms

$$T_{\eta\gamma} = \left(K_{\eta\gamma} - \frac{K_{\pi\gamma}K_{\eta\eta}}{K_{\pi\eta}}\right)(1 + iT_{\eta\eta}) + \frac{K_{\pi\gamma}}{K_{\pi\eta}}T_{\eta\eta}$$
  
=  $A(W)(1 + iT_{\eta\eta}(W)) + B(W)T_{\eta\eta}(W)$  Form 1  
=  $A'(W)(1 + iT_{\pi\pi}(W)) + B'(W)T_{\pi\pi}(W)$  Form 2



## Overview & motivation SAID @ CNS/DAC

- Motivation
- Amplitudo poromotorizati
  - Unitarity constraint
  - Parameterizations
  - Parameterizations
  - Relation to N/D approach

### 3 Results & comparisons

- Previous K-matrix approach
- Chew-Mandelstam parameterization
- Comparison to MAID





Chew-Mandelstam parameterization  $\pi - \& \eta$ -photoproduction

Current hadronic parameterization fits  $\pi N \rightarrow \pi N, \pi N \rightarrow \eta N$ , DR, ...

$$T_{\alpha\beta} = \sum_{\sigma} [1 - \overline{K}C]_{\alpha\sigma}^{-1}\overline{K}_{\sigma\beta}$$

Generalized to photoproduction (hadronic matrix fixed by above)

$$T_{\alpha\gamma} = \sum_{\sigma} [1 - \overline{K}C]_{\alpha\sigma}^{-1}\overline{K}_{\sigma\gamma}$$

Perform fit at amplitude level to  $\operatorname{Re} E_{0+}^{\pi}$ ,  $\operatorname{Im} E_{0+}^{\pi} \& |E_{0+}^{\eta}|$ 



Solid curve:  $\operatorname{Re} E_{0+}^{\eta}$ Dashed curve:  $\operatorname{Im} E_{0+}^{\eta}$ Dot-dashed curve:  $\operatorname{Re} E_{0+}^{\pi}$ Double dot-dashed curve:  $\operatorname{Im} E_{0+}^{\pi}$ Dotted curve:  $|E_{0+}^{\eta}|$ 



## Overview & motivation SAID @ CNS/DAC

Motivation

#### 2 Amplitude parameterization

- Unitarity constraint
- Parameterizations
- Relation to N/D approach

#### 3 Results & comparisons

- Previous K-matrix approach
- Chew-Mandelstam parameterization
- Comparison to MAID





## Comparison to MAID

 $E_{0+}^{\pi}$  SAID and MAID solutions



Refitting with MAID  $E_{0+}^{\pi}$  and same  $|E_{0+}^{\eta}|$ 





### Summary

- Reviewed role of unitarity determining non-analyticities in the physical region,  $w > m_i + m_t$  [almost complete]
- Related Chew-Mandelstam form to *N*/*D* approach → 'left-hand cut' neglected in C-M
- Performed simultaneous coupled-channel fit of  $\eta$ -photoproduction  $S_{11}$  multipole modulus,  $|E_{0+}^{\eta}|$  and  $\pi$ -photoproduction amplitude,  $E_{0+}^{\pi}$
- Current approach yields resonant  $E_{0+}^{\eta}$  phase  $\rightarrow$  encourages us to pursue the C-M approach in fits to photoproduction observables (not amplitudes)

#### Outlook

- **1** Perform fit to  $\pi$ -photoproduction *data* using C-M form
- 2 Perform simultaneous fit to  $\pi$  and  $\eta$ -photoproduction *data* using C-M form
- Berform simultaneous, global fit to  $\pi N \to \pi N$ ,  $\pi N \to \eta N$ ,  $\gamma N \to \pi N$ ,  $\gamma N \to \eta N$  using C-M form: offers opportunity for precision electromagnetic data to 'back-constrain' hadronic amplitudes (some of which are very poorly known)
- 4 Generalize to correctly account for 'left-hand cuts'



To the memory of our friend and colleague, Dick Arndt, GWU Research Professor and Virginia Tech Emeritus Professor, who passed Saturday, April 10, 2010.



