$\Delta(2420)\ H_{3,11}$

$I(J^P) = \frac{3}{2}(\frac{11}{2}^+)$ Status: ****

Most of the results published before 1975 are now obsolete and have been omitted. They may be found in our 1982 edition, Physics Letters **111B** (1982).

$\Delta(2420)$ BREIT-WIGNER MASS

VALUE (MeV)	*DOCUMENT ID*		*TECN*	*COMMENT*
2300 to 2500 (≈ 2420) OUR ESTIMATE				
2400 ±125	CUTKOSKY	80	IPWA	$\pi N \to \pi N$
2416 ± 17	HOEHLER	79	IPWA	$\pi N \to \pi N$
2400 ± 60	HENDRY	78	MPWA	$\pi N \to \pi N$
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
2400	CANDLIN	84	DPWA	$\pi^+ p \to \Sigma^+ K^+$
2358.0± 9.0	CHEW	80	BPWA	$\pi^+ p \to \pi^+ p$

$\Delta(2420)$ BREIT-WIGNER WIDTH

VALUE (MeV)	*DOCUMENT ID*		*TECN*	*COMMENT*
300 to 500 (≈ 400) OUR ESTIMATE				
450 ±150	CUTKOSKY	80	IPWA	$\pi N \to \pi N$
340 ± 28	HOEHLER	79	IPWA	$\pi N \to \pi N$
460 ±100	HENDRY	78	MPWA	$\pi N \to \pi N$
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
400	CANDLIN	84	DPWA	$\pi^+ p \to \Sigma^+ K^+$
202.2± 45.0	CHEW	80	BPWA	$\pi^+ p \to \pi^+ p$

$\Delta(2420)$ POLE POSITION

REAL PART

VALUE (MeV)	*DOCUMENT ID*		*TECN*	*COMMENT*
2260 to 2400 (≈ 2330) OUR ESTIMATE				
2300	[1] HOEHLER	93	ARGD	$\pi N \to \pi N$
2360±100	CUTKOSKY	80	IPWA	$\pi N \to \pi N$

−2×IMAGINARY PART

VALUE (MeV)	*DOCUMENT ID*		*TECN*	*COMMENT*
350 to 750 (≈ 550) OUR ESTIMATE				
620	[1] HOEHLER	93	ARGD	$\pi N \to \pi N$
420±100	CUTKOSKY	80	IPWA	$\pi N \to \pi N$

$\Delta(2420)$ ELASTIC POLE RESIDUE

MODULUS $|r|$

VALUE (MeV)	*DOCUMENT ID*		*TECN*	*COMMENT*
39	HOEHLER	93	ARGD	$\pi N \to \pi N$
18±6	CUTKOSKY	80	IPWA	$\pi N \to \pi N$

PHASE θ

VALUE (°)	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
−60	HOEHLER	93	ARGD	$\pi N \rightarrow \pi N$
−30±40	CUTKOSKY	80	IPWA	$\pi N \rightarrow \pi N$

Δ(2420) DECAY MODES

The following branching fractions are our estimates, not fits or averages.

	Mode	Fraction (Γ_i/Γ)
Γ_1	$N\pi$	5–15 %
Γ_2	ΣK	

Δ(2420) BRANCHING RATIOS

$\Gamma(N\pi)/\Gamma_{total}$ Γ_1/Γ

VALUE	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
0.05 to 0.15 OUR ESTIMATE				
0.08±0.03	CUTKOSKY	80	IPWA	$\pi N \rightarrow \pi N$
0.08±0.015	HOEHLER	79	IPWA	$\pi N \rightarrow \pi N$
0.11±0.02	HENDRY	78	MPWA	$\pi N \rightarrow \pi N$
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
0.22	CHEW	80	BPWA	$\pi^+ p \rightarrow \pi^+ p$

$(\Gamma_i\Gamma_f)^{1/2}/\Gamma_{total}$ in $N\pi \rightarrow \Delta(2420) \rightarrow \Sigma K$ $(\Gamma_1\Gamma_2)^{1/2}/\Gamma$

VALUE	DOCUMENT ID		TECN	COMMENT
−0.016	CANDLIN	84	DPWA	$\pi^+ p \rightarrow \Sigma^+ K^+$

Δ(2420) FOOTNOTES

[1] See HOEHLER 93 for a detailed discussion of the evidence for and the pole parameters of N and Δ resonances as determined from Argand diagrams of πN elastic partial-wave amplitudes and from plots of the speeds with which the amplitudes traverse the diagrams.

Δ(2420) REFERENCES

HOEHLER	93	πN Newsletter 9 1		(KARL)
CANDLIN	84	NP B238 477	+Lowe, Peach, Scotland+	(EDIN, RAL, LOWC)
PDG	82	PL 111B	Roos, Porter, Aguilar-Benitez+	(HELS, CIT, CERN)
CHEW	80	Toronto Conf. 123		(LBL) IJP
CUTKOSKY	80	Toronto Conf. 19	+Forsyth, Babcock, Kelly, Hendrick	(CMU, LBL) IJP
Also	79	PR D20 2839	Cutkosky, Forsyth, Hendrick, Kelly	(CMU, LBL)
HOEHLER	79	PDAT 12-1	+Kaiser, Koch, Pietarinen	(KARLT) IJP
Also	80	Toronto Conf. 3	Koch	(KARLT) IJP
HENDRY	78	PRL 41 222		(IND, LBL) IJP
Also	81	ANP 136 1	Hendry	(IND)