

**$\Delta(1930) D_{35}$**

$$I(J^P) = \frac{3}{2}(\frac{5}{2}^-) \text{ Status: } ***$$

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).

The various analyses are not in good agreement.

### $\Delta(1930)$ BREIT-WIGNER MASS

VALUE (MeV)	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
<b>1920 to 1970 (<math>\approx 1930</math>) OUR ESTIMATE</b>			
1956 $\pm 22$	MANLEY	92	IPWA $\pi N \rightarrow \pi N$ & $N\pi\pi$
1940 $\pm 30$	CUTKOSKY	80	IPWA $\pi N \rightarrow \pi N$
1901 $\pm 15$	HOEHLER	79	IPWA $\pi N \rightarrow \pi N$
● ● ● We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. ● ● ●			
1955 $\pm 15$	ARNDT	96	IPWA $\gamma N \rightarrow \pi N$
2056	ARNDT	95	DPWA $\pi N \rightarrow N\pi$
1963	LI	93	IPWA $\gamma N \rightarrow \pi N$
1910.0 $^{+15.0}_{-17.2}$	CHEW	80	BPWA $\pi^+ p \rightarrow \pi^+ p$
2000	CRAWFORD	80	DPWA $\gamma N \rightarrow \pi N$
2024	BARBOUR	78	DPWA $\gamma N \rightarrow \pi N$

### $\Delta(1930)$ BREIT-WIGNER WIDTH

VALUE (MeV)	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
<b>250 to 450 (<math>\approx 350</math>) OUR ESTIMATE</b>			
530 $\pm 140$	MANLEY	92	IPWA $\pi N \rightarrow \pi N$ & $N\pi\pi$
320 $\pm 60$	CUTKOSKY	80	IPWA $\pi N \rightarrow \pi N$
195 $\pm 60$	HOEHLER	79	IPWA $\pi N \rightarrow \pi N$
● ● ● We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. ● ● ●			
350 $\pm 20$	ARNDT	96	IPWA $\gamma N \rightarrow \pi N$
590	ARNDT	95	DPWA $\pi N \rightarrow N\pi$
260	LI	93	IPWA $\gamma N \rightarrow \pi N$
74.8 $^{+17.0}_{-16.0}$	CHEW	80	BPWA $\pi^+ p \rightarrow \pi^+ p$
442	CRAWFORD	80	DPWA $\gamma N \rightarrow \pi N$
462	BARBOUR	78	DPWA $\gamma N \rightarrow \pi N$

### $\Delta(1930)$ POLE POSITION

#### REAL PART

VALUE (MeV)	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
<b>1840 to 1940 (<math>\approx 1890</math>) OUR ESTIMATE</b>			
1913	ARNDT	95	DPWA $\pi N \rightarrow N\pi$
1850	<sup>1</sup> HOEHLER	93	SPED $\pi N \rightarrow \pi N$
1890 $\pm 50$	CUTKOSKY	80	IPWA $\pi N \rightarrow \pi N$
● ● ● We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. ● ● ●			
2018	ARNDT	91	DPWA $\pi N \rightarrow \pi N$ Soln SM90

## – 2×IMAGINARY PART

<u>VALUE (MeV)</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
<b>200 to 300 (≈ 250) OUR ESTIMATE</b>			
246	ARNDT	95 DPWA	$\pi N \rightarrow N\pi$
180	<sup>1</sup> HOEHLER	93 SPED	$\pi N \rightarrow \pi N$
260±60	CUTKOSKY	80 IPWA	$\pi N \rightarrow \pi N$
● ● ● We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. ● ● ●			
398	ARNDT	91 DPWA	$\pi N \rightarrow \pi N$ Soln SM90

## Δ(1930) ELASTIC POLE RESIDUE

### MODULUS |r|

<u>VALUE (MeV)</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
8	ARNDT	95 DPWA	$\pi N \rightarrow N\pi$
20	HOEHLER	93 SPED	$\pi N \rightarrow \pi N$
18±6	CUTKOSKY	80 IPWA	$\pi N \rightarrow \pi N$
● ● ● We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. ● ● ●			
15	ARNDT	91 DPWA	$\pi N \rightarrow \pi N$ Soln SM90

### PHASE θ

<u>VALUE (°)</u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
–47	ARNDT	95 DPWA	$\pi N \rightarrow N\pi$
–20±40	CUTKOSKY	80 IPWA	$\pi N \rightarrow \pi N$
● ● ● We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. ● ● ●			
–24	ARNDT	91 DPWA	$\pi N \rightarrow \pi N$ Soln SM90

## Δ(1930) DECAY MODES

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

Mode	Fraction ( $\Gamma_i/\Gamma$ )
$\Gamma_1$ $N\pi$	10–20 %
$\Gamma_2$ $\Sigma K$	
$\Gamma_3$ $N\pi\pi$	
$\Gamma_4$ $N\gamma$	0.0–0.02 %
$\Gamma_5$ $N\gamma$ , helicity=1/2	0.0–0.01 %
$\Gamma_6$ $N\gamma$ , helicity=3/2	0.0–0.01 %

## Δ(1930) BRANCHING RATIOS

<u>Γ(Nπ)/Γ<sub>total</sub></u>	<u>DOCUMENT ID</u>	<u>TECN</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>	<u>Γ<sub>1</sub>/Γ</u>
<b>0.1 to 0.2 OUR ESTIMATE</b>				
0.18±0.02	MANLEY	92 IPWA	$\pi N \rightarrow \pi N$ & $N\pi\pi$	
0.14±0.04	CUTKOSKY	80 IPWA	$\pi N \rightarrow \pi N$	
0.04±0.03	HOEHLER	79 IPWA	$\pi N \rightarrow \pi N$	
● ● ● We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. ● ● ●				
0.11	ARNDT	95 DPWA	$\pi N \rightarrow N\pi$	
0.11	CHEW	80 BPWA	$\pi^+ p \rightarrow \pi^+ p$	

$(\Gamma_i \Gamma_f)^{1/2} / \Gamma_{\text{total}}$ in $N\pi \rightarrow \Delta(1930) \rightarrow \Sigma K$				$(\Gamma_1 \Gamma_2)^{1/2} / \Gamma$
VALUE	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT	
< 0.015	CANDLIN	84	DPWA	$\pi^+ p \rightarrow \Sigma^+ K^+$
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
-0.031	LIVANOS	80	DPWA	$\pi p \rightarrow \Sigma K$
0.018 to 0.035	<sup>2</sup> DEANS	75	DPWA	$\pi N \rightarrow \Sigma K$

$(\Gamma_i \Gamma_f)^{1/2} / \Gamma_{\text{total}}$ in $N\pi \rightarrow \Delta(1930) \rightarrow N\pi\pi$				$(\Gamma_1 \Gamma_3)^{1/2} / \Gamma$
VALUE	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT	
not seen	LONGACRE	75	IPWA	$\pi N \rightarrow N\pi\pi$

## Δ(1930) PHOTON DECAY AMPLITUDES

### Δ(1930) → Nγ, helicity-1/2 amplitude A<sub>1/2</sub>

VALUE (GeV <sup>-1/2</sup> )	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
<b>-0.009 ± 0.028 OUR ESTIMATE</b>			
-0.007 ± 0.010	ARNDT	96	IPWA $\gamma N \rightarrow \pi N$
0.009 ± 0.009	AWAJI	81	DPWA $\gamma N \rightarrow \pi N$
-0.030 ± 0.047	CRAWFORD	80	DPWA $\gamma N \rightarrow \pi N$
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •			
-0.019 ± 0.001	LI	93	IPWA $\gamma N \rightarrow \pi N$
-0.062 ± 0.064	BARBOUR	78	DPWA $\gamma N \rightarrow \pi N$

### Δ(1930) → Nγ, helicity-3/2 amplitude A<sub>3/2</sub>

VALUE (GeV <sup>-1/2</sup> )	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
<b>-0.018 ± 0.028 OUR ESTIMATE</b>			
0.005 ± 0.010	ARNDT	96	IPWA $\gamma N \rightarrow \pi N$
-0.025 ± 0.011	AWAJI	81	DPWA $\gamma N \rightarrow \pi N$
-0.033 ± 0.060	CRAWFORD	80	DPWA $\gamma N \rightarrow \pi N$
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •			
0.009 ± 0.001	LI	93	IPWA $\gamma N \rightarrow \pi N$
+0.019 ± 0.054	BARBOUR	78	DPWA $\gamma N \rightarrow \pi N$

## Δ(1930) FOOTNOTES

- <sup>1</sup> See HOEHLER 93 for a detailed discussion of the evidence for and the pole parameters of  $N$  and  $\Delta$  resonances as determined from Argand diagrams of  $\pi N$  elastic partial-wave amplitudes and from plots of the speeds with which the amplitudes traverse the diagrams.
- <sup>2</sup> The range given for DEANS 75 is from the four best solutions.

## Δ(1930) REFERENCES

For early references, see Physics Letters **111B** 70 (1982).

ARNDT	96	PR C53 430	+Strakovsky, Workman	(VPI)
ARNDT	95	PR C52 2120	+Strakovsky, Workman, Pavan	(VPI, BRCO)
HOEHLER	93	$\pi$ <i>N</i> Newsletter 9 1		(KARL)
LI	93	PR C47 2759	+Arndt, Roper, Workman	(VPI)
MANLEY	92	PR D45 4002	+Saleski	(KENT) IJP
Also	84	PR D30 904	Manley, Arndt, Goradia, Teplitz	(VPI)
ARNDT	91	PR D43 2131	+Li, Roper, Workman, Ford	(VPI, TELE) IJP
CANDLIN	84	NP B238 477	+Lowe, Peach, Scotland+	(EDIN, RAL, LOWC)
PDG	82	PL 111B	Roos, Porter, Aguilar-Benitez+	(HELS, CIT, CERN)
AWAJI	81	Bonn Conf. 352	+Kajikawa	(NAGO)
Also	82	NP B197 365	Fujii, Hayashii, Iwata, Kajikawa+	(NAGO)
CHEW	80	Toronto Conf. 123		(LBL) IJP
CRAWFORD	80	Toronto Conf. 107		(GLAS)
CUTKOSKY	80	Toronto Conf. 19	+Forsyth, Babcock, Kelly, Hendrick	(CMU, LBL) IJP
Also	79	PR D20 2839	Cutkosky, Forsyth, Hendrick, Kelly	(CMU, LBL) IJP
LIVANOS	80	Toronto Conf. 35	+Baton, Coutures, Kochowski, Neveu	(SACL) IJP
HOEHLER	79	PDAT 12-1	+Kaiser, Koch, Pietarinen	(KARLT) IJP
Also	80	Toronto Conf. 3	Koch	(KARLT) IJP
BARBOUR	78	NP B141 253	+Crawford, Parsons	(GLAS)
DEANS	75	NP B96 90	+Mitchell, Montgomery+	(SFLA, ALAH) IJP
LONGACRE	75	PL 55B 415	+Rosenfeld, Lasinski, Smadja+	(LBL, SLAC) IJP

---