

# AN ISOBAR MODEL FOR $\eta$ PHOTO- AND ELECTROPRODUCTION ON THE NUCLEON

WEN-TAI CHIANG AND SHIN NAN YANG

*Department of Physics, National Taiwan University, Taipei 10617, Taiwan*

L. TIATOR AND D. DRECHSEL

*Institut für Kernphysik, Universität Mainz, 55099 Mainz, Germany*

An isobar model containing Born terms, vector meson exchange and nucleon resonances is used to analyze recent  $\eta$  photoproduction data for cross section and beam asymmetry, as well as JLab electroproduction data. Good overall description is achieved up to  $Q^2 = 4.0$  (GeV/c)<sup>2</sup>. Besides the dominant  $S_{11}(1535)$  resonance, we show that the second  $S_{11}$  resonance,  $S_{11}(1650)$ , is also necessary to be included in order to extract  $S_{11}(1535)$  resonance parameters properly. In addition, the beam asymmetry data allow us to extract very small ( $< 0.1\%$ )  $N^* \rightarrow \eta N$  decay branching ratios of  $D_{13}(1520)$  and  $F_{15}(1680)$  resonances because of the overwhelming  $s$ -wave dominance. The model is implemented as a part of the MAID program.

## 1 Introduction

Electromagnetic eta production on the nucleon,  $\gamma N \rightarrow \eta N$ , provides an alternative tool to study  $N^*$  besides  $\pi N$  scattering and pion photoproduction. The  $\eta N$  state couples to nucleon resonances with isospin  $I = 1/2$  only. Therefore, this process is cleaner and more suitable to distinguish certain resonances than other processes, e.g., pion photoproduction. It provides opportunities to access less studied resonances and the possible “missing resonances”.

Eta photoproduction at low energy is dominated by the  $S_{11}(1535)$  resonance, which is the only nucleon resonance with a substantial decay to the  $\eta N$  channel. Therefore,  $\eta$  photoproduction is an ideal process to study  $S_{11}(1535)$  properties. In contrast,  $\pi N$  scattering and pion photoproduction are always interweaved with the  $\eta N$  channel threshold opening, and often produce inconsistent and/or controversial results.

Recently, precise experimental data of this process have been measured. These data include total and differential cross sections for  $\gamma N \rightarrow \eta N$  from TAPS (MAMI/Mainz) <sup>1</sup> and GRAAL <sup>2</sup>, as well as beam asymmetries from GRAAL <sup>3</sup> and target asymmetries from ELSA (Bonn) <sup>4</sup>. In addition, there are two recent  $\eta$  electroproduction data sets from Jefferson Lab <sup>5,6</sup>.

## 2 Isobar Model

The isobar model used in this work is closely related to the unitary isobar model (UIM) developed by Drechsel *et al.* <sup>7</sup>. The major difference is that in the UIM, which deals with pion photo- and electroproduction, the phases of the multipole amplitudes are adjusted to the corresponding pion-nucleon elastic scattering phases, while in the  $\eta$  production the unitarization procedure is not feasible since the eta-nucleon scattering information is not experimentally available.

The nonresonant background contains the usual *Born terms* and *vector meson exchange* contributions, and can be obtained by evaluating the Feynman diagrams derived from an effective Lagrangian. In addition to the dominant  $S_{11}(1535)$  nucleon resonance, we also consider resonance contributions from  $D_{13}(1520)$ ,  $S_{11}(1650)$ ,  $D_{15}(1675)$ ,  $F_{15}(1680)$ ,  $D_{13}(1700)$ ,  $P_{11}(1710)$ , and  $P_{13}(1720)$ . For the relevant multipoles  $A_{\ell\pm}$  ( $= E_{\ell\pm}, M_{\ell\pm}, S_{\ell\pm}$ ) of resonance contributions, we assume a Breit-Wigner energy dependence of the form

$$A_{\ell\pm}(Q^2, W) = \tilde{A}_{\ell\pm}(Q^2) \frac{\Gamma_{tot} W_R}{W_R^2 - W^2 - iW_R\Gamma_{tot}} f_{\eta N}(W) C_{\eta N}, \quad (1)$$

where  $f_{\eta N}(W)$  is the usual Breit-Wigner factor describing the decay of the  $N^*$  resonance <sup>7</sup>, and the isospin factor  $C_{\eta N}$  is  $-1$ . The total width  $\Gamma_{tot}$  here is taken as the sum of  $\Gamma_{\eta N} + \Gamma_{\pi N} + \Gamma_{\pi\pi N}$ .

## 3 Results and Discussion

### 3.1 Photoproduction Results

We have fitted recent  $\eta$  photoproduction data including total and differential cross sections from TAPS <sup>1</sup> and GRAAL <sup>2</sup>, as well as the polarized beam asymmetry from GRAAL <sup>3</sup> with the isobar model described above. In Fig. 1, we compare our results of differential cross sections with the data from TAPS and GRAAL, and they are in very good agreement. In the low energy region the differential cross section is flat, indicating the  $s$ -wave dominance. As the energy goes higher, other partial waves start to contribute. Note that our result for  $E_\gamma^{\text{lab}} > 1$  GeV shows a sinking behavior at forward angles, which is not seen in the GRAAL data.

Our result for the total cross section is shown in Fig. 1, and compared with the TAPS and GRAAL data. Again, they are in good agreement except that the bump observed from the GRAAL data in the region  $E_\gamma^{\text{lab}} = 1050 - 1100$  MeV can not be reproduced from our model. However, note that the total cross section in the GRAAL data is obtained from integration of the




Figure 1. Differential and total cross section for  $\gamma p \rightarrow \eta p$ . Data are from TAPS and GRAAL.

differential cross sections, using a polynomial fit in  $\cos\theta$  for extrapolation to the uncovered region. We find that the discrepancy is due to the extrapolation of the GRAAL data in the forward angles and is not really supported by the data themselves.

In Fig. 1, it is shown that the background contribution is very small, and the total cross section is dominated by the  $S_{11}(1535)$  at low energy. However, the contribution from the second resonance,  $S_{11}(1650)$ , can not be neglected. Even though a single  $S_{11}$  resonance can fit the low energy data nicely (the dash-dotted curve in Fig. 1), it can by no means describe the higher energy region. Moreover, the single resonance fit yields incorrect resonance parameters. In fact, the decay width (159 vs. 191 MeV) and photon coupling ( $103$  vs.  $118 \times 10^{-3} \text{ GeV}^{-1/2}$ ) obtained in the single  $S_{11}$  resonance fit are significantly smaller than the full results when both  $S_{11}$  resonances are properly included.

One special feature in polarization measurements of  $\eta$  photoproduction is that through the interference of the dominant  $E_{0+}$  multipole with smaller multipoles, one can access small contributions from particular resonances. The available beam asymmetry data were measured at GRAAL<sup>3</sup> from threshold to  $E_{\gamma}^{\text{lab}} = 1.1$  GeV. Higher energy data up to  $E_{\gamma}^{\text{lab}} = 1.5$  GeV are being analyzed and will be available soon<sup>8</sup>. In Fig. 2, we compare our results with these data. An overall good agreement has been achieved. At low energies, we observe that the beam asymmetry has a clear  $\sin^2\theta$  dependence as a result of




Figure 2. Beam asymmetry for  $\gamma p \rightarrow \eta p$ . Data are from GRAAL.

interference between  $s$ - and  $d$ -waves. From these low energy data, a branching ratio of  $\beta_{\eta N} = 0.06\%$  can be determined for the  $D_{13}(1520)$ . When energies get higher than  $E_{\gamma}^{\text{lab}} = 930$  MeV, the data develop a forward-backward asymmetry behavior, which becomes especially evident at  $E_{\gamma}^{\text{lab}} = 1050$  MeV. The  $F_{15}(1680)$  is sensitive to this forward-backward asymmetry in  $\Sigma$  as discussed by Tiator *et al.*<sup>9</sup>. This is the reason why such a small branching ratio (0.06%) can be extracted for this resonance.

### 3.2 Electroproduction Results

When fitting recent electroproduction data from JLab<sup>5,6</sup>, we fix all the parameters determined from the photoproduction data except the  $Q^2$  dependence of the helicity amplitudes  $A_{1/2, 3/2}^p(Q^2)$ . The result for the  $S_{11}(1535)$  is shown in Fig. 3. In order to avoid large model uncertainties arising from different values of partial and total widths of the  $S_{11}(1535)$  employed in other analyses, we choose not to compare the helicity amplitudes  $A_{1/2}^p(Q^2)$  extracted from different analyses. Instead, we compare the model-independent quantity introduced by Benmerrouche *et al.*<sup>10</sup>,  $\xi = \sqrt{\chi \beta_{\eta N} / \Gamma_{\text{tot}}} A_{1/2}$ , where  $\chi = kM / (qM_R)$  is a kinematic factor. The  $\xi$  quantity covers the uncertainty from  $\beta_{\eta N}$  and  $\Gamma_{\text{tot}}$  between different analyses and is almost independent of the extraction process. In Fig. 3 we compare our  $\xi$  values with the ones extracted from the recent JLab data<sup>5,6</sup> and older data<sup>11</sup>. It is seen that overall good agreement is achieved up to  $Q^2 = 4.0$  (GeV/c)<sup>2</sup>.




Figure 3. Helicity amplitude  $A_{1/2}^p(Q^2)$  for  $S_{11}(1535) \rightarrow \gamma p$  is shown in the left figure. On the right, we plot the quantity  $\xi$  ( $\equiv \sqrt{\chi\beta_{\eta N}/\Gamma_{tot}} A_{1/2}^p$ ), and compare with the extracted values from data.

### Acknowledgments

W.-T. C. would like to thank Universität Mainz for the hospitality extended to him during his visits. This work was supported in parts by the National Science Council of ROC under Grant No. NSC89-2112-M002-078, by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (SFB 443), and by a joint project NSC/DFG TAI-113/10/0.

### References

1. B. Krusche *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74**, 3736 (1995).
2. F. Renard *et al.*, [hep-ex/0011098](#).
3. J. Ajaka *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 1797 (1998).
4. A. Bock *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 534 (1998).
5. C.S. Armstrong *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. D* **60**, 052004 (1999).
6. R. Thompson *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 1702 (2001).
7. D. Drechsel, O. Hanstein, S.S. Kamalov, and L. Tiator, *Nucl. Phys.* **A645**, 145 (1999).
8. A. D'Angelo, in these Proceedings.
9. L. Tiator, D. Drechsel, G. Knöchlein, and C. Bennhold, *Phys. Rev. C* **60**, 035210 (1999).
10. M. Benmerrouche, N.C. Mukhopadhyay, and J.F. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. D* **51**, 3237 (1995).
11. F.W. Brasse *et al.*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B139**, 37 (1978); F.W. Brasse *et al.*, *Z. Phys. C* **22**, 33 (1984); U. Beck *et al.*, *Phys. Lett. B* **51**, 103 (1974); H. Breuer *et al.*, *Phys. Lett. B* **74**, 409 (1978).