SLAC-PUB-180
March 1966

# PHOTOPRODUCTION OF $N^*$ RESONANCES IN THE QUARK MODEL

R. G. Moorhouse†

Stanford Linear Accelerator Center
Stanford University, Stanford, California

(Submitted to Phys. Rev. Letters)

*Work supported by the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission.

†Permanent address: Rutherford Laboratory, Chilton, Didcot, England

The non-relativistic quark model[1,2] for elementary particles has had some empirical success. Lipkin and Schek[3] have deduced certain relations, peculiar to the quark model, between forward scattering amplitudes which appear to be well satisfied. Becchi and Morpurgo[4] have shown that the photoproduction of the 33 resonance proceeds through the M1 transition only,[5] in accordance with well-established experimental information.[2] In the non-relativistic quark model, the total orbital angular momentum of the quarks is $L = 0$, for the baryon octet and decuplet. There now appear to be a large number of $N^*$ resonances[6] with masses between 1400 and 2000 MeV, and Dalitz has attempted a tentative classification of these using orbital angular momenta $L = 1$ and $L = 2$ in the quark model. In view of the success of the quark model in its predications for the photoproduction of the 33 resonance, it seems worthwhile to examine here the consequences of the model for the photoproduction of these higher $N^*$ resonances. We will show that the vertex couplings, $\gamma NN^*$, vanish for certain $N^*$ states of the non-relativistic quark model.

Consider the $T = 1/2$, s- and d-wave (odd parity) pion-nucleon resonances. In the quark model these can be accommodated[2] in orbital angular momentum states with $L = 1$ and odd parity. Firstly, there are the $\{8\}\ {}^2P_J$ states whose strangeness zero members are $s_{11}$ and $d_{13}$ pion-nucleon states. The $J = 3/2$ member is identified with the old 'second' pion-nucleon resonance, the $d_{13}N^*(1527)$,[6] and the $J = 1/2$ member with the $s_{11}\eta N$, $\pi N$ state[7] just above $\eta N$ threshold. About the photoproduction of these two states the quark model makes no remarkable statements the allowed electromagnetic multipole transitions being also allowed by the quark model. In particular, the M2 transition to the $d_{13}$ state is allowed while experiment seems, roughly, compatible with E1 excitation only.[8] However, the pion-nucleon amplitude analyses[6] indicate that there are many important partial waves ($p_{33}$, $s_{31}$, $s_{11}$, $d_{13}$, $p_{11}$) in the energy region, all of which may be strongly photo-excited (see below) and in this complicated situation a considerable M2 transition to the $d_{13}$ state cannot be ruled out.

Secondly, there are the $\{8\}\ ^4P_J$ states whose strangeness zero members are $s_{11}$, $d_{13}$ and $d_{15}$ pion-nucleon states. The $J = 1/2$ member is identified with the probable $s_{11}$ resonance[9] at ~ 1700 MeV, the $J = 5/2$ member with the $d_{15}$ resonance[9,10] at ~1670 MeV, while the $J = 3/2$ member is as yet unidentified.[11] Now the ($\gamma N N^*$) vertex for these states involves the transition

$$\{8\}\ ^2S_{1/2} \to \{8\}\ ^4P_J$$

from a nucleon in a state with total quark spin 1/2 (doublet state) to a state with total quark spin 3/2 (quartet state). It is evident that such transitions can only proceed through the quark magnetic moment term in the electromagnetic interaction since the quark charge and current terms do not involve the quark spin.

We may write this term in the form

$$M = \sum_{i=1} \mu_i \underline{\sigma}_i \cdot (\underline{k} \times \underline{\epsilon}) \exp(i\underline{k}\cdot\underline{r}_i) \qquad (1)$$

where $\underline{r}_i$, $\mu_i$, $\underline{\sigma}_i$ are respectively the position, the magnetic moment and the spin operator of the $i^{th}$ quark, $\underline{k}$ is the momentum of the photon and $\underline{\epsilon}$ its polarization vector. We now proceed to write down the wave functions for the 3-quark systems which form the baryons.

Let $\alpha_i, \beta_i$ be the spin functions for the $i^{th}$ quark with z-axis spin +1/2, -1/2 respectively; we write spin functions for the 3-quark system which have total z-axis quark spin $S_z = +1/2$. The $S = 3/2$ spin function is

$$q = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} (\beta_1\alpha_2\alpha_3 + \alpha_1\beta_2\alpha_3 + \alpha_1\alpha_2\beta_3) \tag{2}$$

and is totally symmetric under permutations of the quark indices. There are two $S = 1/2$ or doublet spin functions which we select as

$$q_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} (\beta_1\alpha_2 + \alpha_1\beta_2)\alpha_3 - \frac{2}{3} \alpha_1\alpha_2\beta_3 \tag{3}$$

$$q_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\beta_1\alpha_2 - \alpha_1\beta_2)\alpha_3 \tag{4}$$

and these form a basis for a $2 \times 2$ representation of the permutation group generated by permutations of the quark indices. ('Mixed symmetry' wave functions.)

The three-quark states with the quantum numbers of proton, neutron and lambda we denote by $\pi_i$, $\nu_i$ and $\lambda_i$. There are two independent ('mixed symmetry') octet states and those of positive charge are

$$v_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} (\nu_1\pi_2 + \pi_1\nu_2)\pi_3 - \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \pi_1\pi_2\nu_3 \tag{5}$$

$$v_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\nu_1\pi_2 - \pi_1\nu_2)\pi_3 \tag{6}$$

and these obviously form a basis for the same $2 \times 2$ representation of the permutation group as the spin functions $q_1$ and $q_2$. If $\underline{\rho}_i$ is the position vector of the $i^{th}$ quark with respect to the center-of-mass of the three quarks, then we define

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\Phi}_1 &= 3\underline{\rho}_1 + 3\underline{\rho}_2 \\ \underline{\Phi}_2 &= 3\,(\underline{\rho}_1 - \underline{\rho}_2) \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

These are P-wave functions of odd parity (there are only two independent ones) which form a basis for the same $2 \times 2$ representation of the permutation group as $q_1$, $q_2$ and $v_1$, $v_2$do. Let $\Phi(\rho_1,\rho_2,\rho_3)$, $\Phi'(\rho_1,\rho_2,\rho_3)$ be S-state internal wave functions totally antisymmetric under permutations of the quark indices of the scalar distances $\rho_i$. Then the totally antisymmetric functions are given by[12] (the center-of-mass motion has been taken out)

$$\{8\}\ {}^2S_{1/2} \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (q_1v_1 + q_2v_2)\Phi \tag{9}$$

$$\{8\}\ {}^4P_{1/2} \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} q(v_1\underline{\Phi}_1 + v_2\underline{\Phi}_2)\Phi' \tag{10}$$

We may now evaluate the transition matrix element induced by the operator (1). It is sufficient to consider the term

$$\mu_3\underline{\sigma}_3 \cdot (\underline{k} \times \epsilon)\ \exp\ (ik \cdot r_i) \tag{11}$$

$\mu_i$ may be written as an operator on $SU_3$, 3-component spinors

$$\mu_i = \mu \begin{pmatrix} \frac{2}{3} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{3} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{3} \end{pmatrix} \tag{12}$$

and we obtain the matrix element[13] of (11) between the spin-SU(3) functions of Eqs. (9) and (10) to be zero. Consequently, the electromagnetic vertex ($\gamma NN^*$) vanishes for $N^* = \left\{8\right\}\ {}^4P_J$; the argument obviously includes electroproduction as well as photoproduction.

We could have constructed another $\left\{8\right\}\ {}^4P_J$ wave-function still with Fermi statistics (total antisymmetry in all the quark indices) by choosing an S-wave function $\Phi''(\rho_1,\rho_2,\rho_3)$ totally <u>symmetric</u> in $\rho_1,\rho_2,\rho_3$. Then a suitable function is

$$\left\{8\right\}\ {}^4P_J \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\, q(v_1\underline{\Phi}_2 - v_2\underline{\Phi}_1)\Phi'' \tag{13}$$

It can be easily verified that this also gives a vanishing matrix element.

A first consequence that may be noted is that, in the context of the quark model, the result reinforces the assignation of the $d_{13}N^*(1527)$, and the $N\eta$, resonances to the $\left\{8\right\}\ {}^2P_J$ configurations rather than the $\left\{8\right\}\ {}^4P_J$ configurations. This is because strong photoproduction was the original means by which the $d_{13}N^*(1527)$ was first observed; now very strong $\eta N$ photoproduction at threshold has been observed and has been attributed[14] to the $N\eta$ resonance. Secondly, it should be possible to test the quark model and these assignations to the $\{8\}\ {}^4P_J$ states by observation of photoproduction in the region of the so-called 'third' pion-nucleon resonance since the photoproduction of the $f_{15}N^*(1690)$ is predicted, together with the absence of photo-excitation of the $d_{15}N^*(\sim 1670)$ and the probable $s_{11}N^*(1700)$. At present there is no compelling evidence for the presence or absence of photoproduction of the $d_{15}$ resonance, for example. It should be borne in mind that the vertex function $(\gamma NN^*)$ may not be the only mechanism for the photoproduction of the resonance and that some configuration mixing could be present in the quark model without destroying its general validity; however, marked photoproduction would be a rather strong contra-indication of the validity of this extension of the nonrelativistic quark model to higher (quark) orbital angular momentum states.

In Ref. 2 it is suggested that the $p_{11}$ resonance, which it is difficult to dispose, may be assigned to an $\{8\}\ {}^2S_{1/2}$ with symmetric space symmetry:

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\,(q_1 v_2 - q_2 v_1)\Phi''$$

Then it can similarly be shown that the photoproduction matrix element vanishes. It may be possible to make some judgement on this from present or shortly available, experimental data. Indeed, there is evidence in $N^* + \pi$ photoproduction[15] of a much earlier and sharper rise than can well be explained by the inelastic decay of the $d_{13}N^*(1527)$. The most likely source of this is the inelastic $p_{11}$ resonance (already strong at 1400 MeV) and if this is the case, and avoiding angular momentum excitation, one must rather assign the $p_{11}$ to an $\left\{8\right\}\,{}^2S_{1/2}$ state with an (excited) anti-symmetric space-wave function, so that its spin-wave function is the same as that of the nucleon.

Assignment[2] of the $s_{31}$ resonance[6] to a $\left\{10\right\}\,{}^2P_{1/2}$ state gives a non-vanishing photoproduction vertex.

The author would like to thank Professor A. B. Clegg for much early discussion and he is grateful to Professor D. Leith for drawing his attention to some of the experimental data and for valuable conversations.

## LIST OF REFERENCES


1. G. Morpurgo, Physics 2, 95 (1965).
2. R. H. Dalitz, Les Houches Summer School Lecture Notes, 1965 (to be published by Gordon and Breach); Proc. Oxford International Conf. on Elementary Particles, p. 157 (Rutherford Laboratory 1965).
3. H. J. Lipkin and F. Scheck, Phys. Rev. Letters 16, 71 (1966).
4. C. Becchi and G. Morpurgo, Phys. Letters 17, 352 (1965).
5. H. Harari and H. J. Lipkin, Phys. Rev. 140, B1617 (1965), show that the vanishing of the E2 transition is also a result of $SU(6)_W$ symmetry.
6. P. Bareyre, C. Bricman, A. V. Stirling and G. Villet, Phys. Letters 18, 342 (1965); P. Auvil, A. Donnachie, A. Lea and C. Lovelace, Phys. Letters 12, 76 (1964); A. Donnachie, A. T. Lea and C. Lovelace, Phys. Letters 19, 146 (1965); B. H. Bransden, P. J. O'Donnell and R. G. Moorhouse, Phys. Letters 11, 339 (1964); Phys. Rev. 139, B1566 (1965); Phys. Letters 19, 420 (1965); L. D. Roper, Phys. Rev. Letters 12, 340 (1964); L. D. Roper, R. M. Wright and B. T. Feld, Phys. Rev. 138, B140 (1965).
7. A. W. Hendry and R. G. Moorhouse, Phys. Letters 18, 171 (1965).
8. R. F. Peierls, Phys. Rev. 118, 325 (1960). A recent experiment on $\gamma + p \to \pi^0 + p$ differential cross sections by H. de Staebler, E. F. Erickson, A. C. Hearn and C. Schaerf, Phys. Rev. 140, B336 (1965), gives an angular distribution $[(4.32 \pm 0.16) + (0.0 \pm 0.21) \cos\theta + (-3.06 \pm 0.34) \cos^2\theta]$ at $E_\gamma = 760$ MeV. This is to be compared with $5 - 3\cos^2\theta$ for a purely dipole, $J = 3/2$ production.

9. P. Bareyre, C. Bricman, A. V. Stirling and G. Villet, Phys. Letters 18, 171 (1965); B. H. Bransden, P. J. O'Donnell and R. G. Moorhouse, Phys. Letters 19, 420 (1965).

10. P. J. Duke et al., Phys. Rev. Letters 15, 468 (1965).

11. However, in the amplitude analysis of Bareyre et al. (Ref. 6) the $d_{13}$ amplitude exhibits a most peculiar behavior between 1630 and 1760 MeV center-of-mass energy. If one demands an explanation for this curious behavior, it is not incompatible with the onset of an inelastic resonance, imposed upon the already existing background in this wave.

12. The construction of similar functions is treated by G. Derrick and J. M. Blatt, Nucl. Phys. 8, 310 (1958).

13. Taking both wave-functions to have $S_z = +\frac{1}{2}$ is equivalent to choosing the z-axis along $\underline{k} \times \underline{\epsilon}$, which may here be done without loss of generality.

14. R. Prepost, D. Lundquist and D. Quinn, Stanford preprint, HEPL-384 (1965); C. Bacci et al., Phys. Rev. Letters 16, 157 (1966).

15. H. R. Crouch et al., Proc. Hamburg Conference, 1965 (to be published); J. V. Allaby et al., Stanford preprint, HEPL-385 (1965)(to be published in Phys. Rev.).