

Bonn TK -96-28

Electromagnetic N - transition form factors in a covariant quark-diquark model

V. Keiner

Institut für Theoretische Kernphysik,
Universität Bonn, Nussallee 14-16, D-53115 Bonn, FRG
(October 10, 1996)

Abstract

The electromagnetic N - transition form factors are calculated in the framework of a formally covariant constituent diquark model. As a spin- $\frac{3}{2}$ particle the Δ is assumed to be a bound state of a quark and an axial-vector diquark. The wave function is obtained from a diquark-quark Salpeter equation with an instantaneous quark exchange potential. The three transition form factors are calculated for momentum transfers squared from the pseudothreshold $(M - M_N)^2$ up to 2 (GeV/c)^2 . The magnetic form factor is in qualitative agreement with experiment. We find very interesting results for the ratios E_2/M_1 and C_2/M_1 .

PACS numbers: 14.20.Dh, 11.10.St, 12.39.Ki, 13.40.Gp, 14.20.Gk

e-mail: keiner@pythia.itkp.uni-bonn.de
Tel.: + 49 (0)228 73 2377
Fax: + 49 (0)228 73 3728

I. INTRODUCTION

The study of the electromagnetic N^- transition form factors is of extreme current interest [1]. While the transition is dominated by the magnetic M_{1+} amplitude in the resonance region the contribution from the electric E_{1+} and S_{1+} amplitudes is suppressed and even zero in spherically symmetric quark models. Their ratio to the M_{1+} , however, reveals many details about the structure of the (excited) nucleon. In a classical picture, a non-zero value of the quadrupole ratios $E2/M1$ and $C2/M1$ indicates an oblate deformation of the Δ . $SU(6)$ symmetric quark models can account for this behaviour by introducing tensor forces between the quarks, thus leading to a configuration mixing of s and d states. This then also results in a non-vanishing electric form factor of the neutron. See Refs. [2,3] for recent overviews concerning the ratio $E2/M1$. When thinking of a non-symmetric Δ -resonance the idea of introducing diquarks as correlated two-quark subsystems seems most striking. Since a quark-diquark model is able to explain in a natural way the negative mean square charge radius of the neutron a clarification of the experimental situation of the N^- transition seems to be at hand.

The aim of this paper is not only to test a relativistic quark-diquark model introduced in earlier works [4,5]. Clearly, the nucleon is not only a system of a quark and a point-like scalar or axial-vector diquark (called v -diquark in the following), see [6,7] for a discussion. Even less is the Δ a bound state of only a v -diquark and a quark. Nevertheless, it is worthwhile to explore the results obtained by a pure quark-diquark picture. A similar approach [8] using light-cone wave functions could account for a variety of experimental data at higher energies. The results may qualitatively ask for strong quark-quark correlations in three-quark models. Thereby, the formally covariant character of our model facilitates the discussion and justifies the calculation of the form factors up to intermediate momentum transfers. Apart from this we use the opportunity to list some interesting formulae not found in the literature concerning the N^- transition form factors and transition currents.

The fundamental relativistic equation describing a two-body bound state is the Bethe-Salpeter equation. Adopting the idea of a quark exchange interaction from previous works [9-12] we deduced a pair of coupled Salpeter equations in the instantaneous approximation [4,5]. In this paper we apply this formalism also to the Δ -resonance with spin $\frac{3}{2}$. Here, only the v -diquark component contributes. Thus, the calculation of the N^- transition form factors projects out the v -diquark component of the nucleon, as far as scalar v -diquark transitions are neglected [8,13]. We will see that the inclusion of these gives a surprisingly better agreement with the experimental data, especially of the magnetic neutron form factor.

This paper is structured as follows. In Sec. II we extend our quark-diquark model to the Δ , thus obtaining the Salpeter amplitude. In Sec. III the calculation of the transition currents is outlined. An interesting threshold relation is derived. Sec. IV then shows how the transition form factors are obtained from the currents. In Sec. V we present the results and compare with the experimental data. Finally, in Sec.

VI a summary is given.

II. THE MODEL

We describe the nucleon as a relativistically bound state of a scalar or v-diquark and a quark. The fundamental equation of this two-body problem is the Bethe-Salpeter equation [14]. Assuming an instantaneous quark exchange interaction we derived a system of coupled Salpeter equations. The details of the model are found in [4,5]. In the rest frame of the nucleon we defined the Salpeter amplitude:

$$(\chi)_S(\mathbf{p}) := \int_0^Z \frac{dp^0}{2} e^{ip \cdot X} \int_0^Z d^4x e^{ip \cdot x} \langle 0 | T (\chi)(\mathbf{x}_1) (\mathbf{x}_2) P^E | P = (M, \mathbf{0}) \rangle : \quad (1)$$

The optional Lorentz index χ is to be applied only in the v-diquark channel. This index and all other indices are suppressed in the following. The amplitude fulfills the quark-diquark Salpeter equation:

$$\begin{aligned} (H - M) (\chi)_S(\mathbf{p}) &= \\ &= \frac{!_1 + !_2}{!_2} H_2(\mathbf{p}) (\chi)_S(\mathbf{p}) + \frac{1}{2!_1} \int \frac{d^3p^0}{(2\pi)^3} W(\mathbf{p}; \mathbf{p}^0) (\chi)_S^0(\mathbf{p}^0) : \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Following the ideas of similar quark-diquark models [9,12,15] the interaction kernel is simply a quark exchange propagator (in the static approach):

$$W(\mathbf{p}; \mathbf{p}^0) = g^2 \frac{1}{!_q^2} (\sim (\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{p}^0) + m_q) ; \quad (3)$$

with $!_q$ the energy of the exchanged quark and g the quark-diquark coupling parameter. Whereas in this picture the nucleon is a coupled system with a scalar and a v-diquark channel the χ is a bound state of only a v-diquark and a quark. Thus, the quark-diquark Salpeter equation in Ref. [5] simplifies to:

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\chi S}^{[1]}(\mathbf{p}) &= \frac{!_1 + !_2}{!_2} H_2(\mathbf{p})_{\chi S}^{[1]}(\mathbf{p}) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2!_1} \int \frac{d^3p^0}{(2\pi)^3} (+g_v^2) \frac{1}{!_q^2} (\chi)_{\chi S}^{[1]}(\sim (\mathbf{p} + \mathbf{p}^0) + m_q) (\chi)_{\chi S}^{[1]Y}(\mathbf{p}^0) : \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

The tensor rank $^0[1]^0$ of the amplitude indicates its vector character, with $\chi; = 1:::3$ in the rest frame. S is the z-component of the total spin. An additional Gaussian diquark form factor [4] is suppressed. Eq. (4) is solved by expanding in a finite basis and using the Ritz variational principle.

III. CURRENT MATRIX ELEMENTS

As in [4,5] the electromagnetic N^- transition currents are calculated in the Mandelstam formalism [16]. In a first step we only consider the first two diagrams of Fig. 1. Since the π is a pure v -diquark-quark state the N^- transition picks up only the nucleon's v -diquark channel. E.g. the quark current is:

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle P^0, S^0 | j^{\text{quark}} | N(P, S) \rangle \\ &= e_2 \int \frac{d^4 p}{(2\pi)^4} \bar{u}_{P^0}^{S^0}(p^0) S_2^F(p_2^0) S_2^F(p_2) u_{P^S}(p) u_{P^0}^{S^0}(p_1) : \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

We recall the definition of the vertex as the amputated Salpeter amplitude:

$$V(p) = i \int \frac{d^3 p^0}{(2\pi)^3} W(p; p^0) u(p^0) \quad (6)$$

$$\bar{V}(p) = \bar{u}(p) \gamma : \quad (7)$$

As a spin- $\frac{3}{2}$ particle the vertex transforms as

$$\bar{V}_{P^0}(p^0) = \bar{V}_{(M, p^0)}(p^0) S^{-1}; \quad (8)$$

where $P^0 = (M, p^0)$. Including the flavour dependence the amplitude reads

$$V_s(p) = N \bar{u}_s(p) \frac{1}{3} \gamma \bar{V}_{\frac{1}{2}, 0}^{[1]} + \bar{V}_{\frac{1}{2}, +1}^{[1]}; \quad (9)$$

with N such that the normalization according to the scalar product of Eq. (14) in [4] fulfills

$$\langle h_j | i \rangle = 2M : \quad (10)$$

We then obtain for the N^- transition current:

$$J(q^2) = \langle h_j | j_N | i \rangle = \frac{P}{3} \int \bar{u}^{[1]} j^{\text{diquark}} u_N^{[1]E} \bar{u}^{[1]} j^{\text{quark}} u_N^{[1]E} : \quad (11)$$

As in the case of the elastic neutron current, the N^- transition current is sensitive to the difference of the quark and diquark currents. Therefore we should not expect a better description of the N^- form factors than of the elastic neutron form factors calculated in Ref. [5]. Finally, we want to state an interesting relation between the quark and diquark currents of Fig. 1 at the pseudothreshold $q_0^2 = (M - M_N)^2$. We start by assuming the vertex to transform like a spinor, thus dropping the Lorentz boost matrix in Eq. (8), and find similar to Eq. (33) of Ref. [4] (writing N instead of π):

$$J_0^N(P^0, \mathbf{p}) = \int \frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^3} \bar{u}(\mathbf{p}) \gamma_0 u(\mathbf{p}) = \int \frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^3} \bar{u}(\mathbf{p}) \gamma_0 u(\mathbf{p}) \quad (12)$$

$$= \int \frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^3} \bar{u}(\mathbf{p}) \gamma_0 u(\mathbf{p}) = \int \frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^3} \bar{u}(\mathbf{p}) \gamma_0 u(\mathbf{p}) \quad (13)$$

$$= \int \frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^3} \bar{u}(\mathbf{p}) \gamma_0 u(\mathbf{p}) = \int \frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^3} \bar{u}(\mathbf{p}) \gamma_0 u(\mathbf{p}) \quad (14)$$

$$= \int \frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^3} \bar{u}(\mathbf{p}) \gamma_0 u(\mathbf{p}) = \int \frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^3} \bar{u}(\mathbf{p}) \gamma_0 u(\mathbf{p}) \quad (15)$$

$$= \int \frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^3} \bar{u}(\mathbf{p}) \gamma_0 u(\mathbf{p}) = \int \frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^3} \bar{u}(\mathbf{p}) \gamma_0 u(\mathbf{p}) \quad (16)$$

To obtain the N^- transition current density $J_0(q^2) = J_0^N(q^2) = \langle N^- | J_0 | N^- \rangle$, the N^-N^- current J_0^N has to be multiplied with a kinematical factor arising from the Lorentz boost matrix of the outgoing amplitude (see App. A):

$$J_0(q^2) = \sum_i f^i(q^2) J_0^N(q^2); \quad (17)$$

$$\text{with } f^1(q^2) = \frac{2}{3} \frac{q}{M}; \quad f^2(q^2) = \frac{2}{3} \left(1 - \frac{P^0}{M} \right); \quad (18)$$

where i numbers the v -diquark channel components of the nucleon, see App. A. Especially, we have $f^1(q_s^2) = 0$, and $J_0^N(q_s^2) = \frac{2}{3} (J_0^{\text{quark}}(q_s^2) - J_0^{\text{diquark}}(q_s^2)) = 0$ (Eqs. (11) and (12)-(16)). So we obtain (with $q^3 = P^0 = q = 0$):

$$J_0(q_s^2) = 0 \quad (19)$$

$$\frac{d}{dP^0} J_0(q_s^2) = 0 : \quad (20)$$

Eq. (19) of course also follows from current conservation $q^0 J_0 = q^3 J_3 = 0$ at q_s^2 . We will see that these relations will guarantee a finite Coulomb form factor G_C at q_s^2 . Similar to the electric neutron form factor vanishing at $q^2 = 0$, we will even find $G_C(q_s^2) = 0$.

IV. N^- TRANSITION FORM FACTORS

In analogy to the usual Sachs decomposition of the elastic electromagnetic nucleon current the N^- transition current is expanded in terms of three independent covariant and gauge-invariant tensors G [17{19]:

$$eJ(q^2) = \langle N^- | J | N^- \rangle = e \left[\frac{2}{3} \bar{u}_{s^0}(P^0) J u_s(P) \right]; \quad (21)$$

with the decomposition

$$J = G_M (q^2) G^M + G_E (q^2) G^E + G_C (q^2) G^C : \quad (22)$$

G_M ; G_E and G_C are the conventional magnetic dipole, electric quadrupole and Coulomb quadrupole transition form factors. The avour factor in Eq. (21) arises from the normalization convention of Ref. [17]. The tensors in Eq. (22) are:

$$G^M = 3 (M + M_N) \text{ " } (\vec{P} q) = (2M_N Q^+) \quad (23)$$

$$G^E = G^M - 6 (M + M_N) \text{ " } (\vec{P} q) \text{ " } (\vec{P}^0 q) = (M_N (q^2)) \quad (24)$$

$$G^C = 3 (M + M_N) q (q^2 \vec{P} - (q \cdot \vec{P}) q) \text{ " } = (M_N (q^2)) ; \quad (25)$$

with

$$\vec{P} = \frac{1}{2} (\vec{P} + \vec{P}^0) \quad (26)$$

$$\text{ " } (\vec{P} q) = \text{ " } \vec{P} q \quad (27)$$

$$Q = (M - M_N)^2 q^2 ; \quad (q^2) = Q^+ Q : \quad (28)$$

Note that in the original Refs. [17,18] the " ^5 is defined via $\text{ " }^5 = \text{ " }^0 \text{ " }^1 \text{ " }^2 \text{ " }^3$. In the rest frame of the incoming nucleon, and choosing $q^3 = P^0 = q = \frac{1}{2} j j$ we find (with $\text{ " }^5 = i \text{ " }^5$ and dropping the global i):

$$\bar{u}_{+\frac{1}{2}} (P^0) G^M_0 u_{+\frac{1}{2}} (P) = \bar{u}_{+\frac{1}{2}} (P^0) G^E_0 u_{+\frac{1}{2}} (P) = 0 \quad (29)$$

$$\bar{u}_{+\frac{1}{2}} (P^0) G^C_0 u_{+\frac{1}{2}} (P) = \frac{P^0}{6} \frac{P^0}{2M} g(q^2) \quad (30)$$

$$\bar{u}_{+\frac{1}{2}} (P^0) G^M_+ u_{+\frac{1}{2}} (P) = \frac{P^0}{2} \frac{P^0}{2} g(q^2) \quad (31)$$

$$\bar{u}_{+\frac{1}{2}} (P^0) G^E_+ u_{+\frac{1}{2}} (P) = \frac{P^0}{2} \frac{P^0}{2} g(q^2) \quad (32)$$

$$\bar{u}_{+\frac{1}{2}} (P^0) G^C_+ u_{+\frac{1}{2}} (P) = \bar{u}_{+\frac{3}{2}} (P^0) G^C_+ u_{+\frac{1}{2}} (P) = 0 \quad (33)$$

$$\bar{u}_{+\frac{3}{2}} (P^0) G^M_+ u_{+\frac{1}{2}} (P) = \frac{3}{2} \frac{P^0}{2} g(q^2) \quad (34)$$

$$\bar{u}_{+\frac{3}{2}} (P^0) G^E_+ u_{+\frac{1}{2}} (P) = \frac{9}{2} \frac{P^0}{2} g(q^2) ; \quad (35)$$

where we defined

$$g(q^2) = \frac{M + M_N}{2M_N (P^0 + M)} P^0 = \frac{M + M_N}{2M_N} \frac{q^0}{Q} : \quad (36)$$

Inverting these equations then yields:

$$\begin{aligned} G_M(q^2) &= \frac{3}{2} \frac{P^0}{2} \frac{P^0}{2} \frac{1}{12} J_+(q^2) \\ G_E(q^2) &= \frac{3}{2} \frac{P^0}{2} \frac{P^0}{2} \frac{1}{12} J_+^0(q^2) \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

$$G_C(q^2) = \frac{3}{2} \frac{2M}{P^0 g(q^2)} J_0(q^2) = \frac{3}{2} \frac{4M}{g(q^2)} \frac{M_N}{6Q^+ Q} J_0(q^2) ; \quad (38)$$

where we wrote J_+^0 for the spin-1/2 current $J_+^0 = \frac{1}{2}(J_1 + iJ_2)$. As expected, the charge density J_0 contributes to the Coulomb form factor only, while G_M and G_E are related to the two spin-1/2 currents via a mixing matrix. Note that G_E is essentially the difference of J_+ and J_+^0 .

V. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The parameters of the model are listed in Tab. I (Set A). The parameters differ from those of Ref. [5] in order to obtain a bound without introducing a confining potential. As the current study of the timelike nucleon electromagnetic form factors shows, the bigger constituent (di-)quark masses also are needed to obtain the correct threshold behaviour which is found to be very sensitive to the masses. β is a parameter entering in the Gaussian diquark form factor [4]. The nucleon parameters are fixed to obtain a best description of the nucleon electromagnetic form factors. The resulting static properties are listed in Tab. II (Set A). The q^2 dependence of the four nucleon form factors is nearly identical to that of Ref. [5], therefore not depicted in this article. However, we find a little deterioration of $G_M^p(0)$ compared to Ref. [5]. It is interesting to find for the anomalous magnetic moment of the v -diquark $\mu_v = 1.1$, very near to the value of a point-like diquark ($\mu_0 = 1.0$). In addition to Ref. [5] we have a new parameter g_v (see Eq. (4)) introduced in order to fix the mass at 1232 MeV. With $g_v^N = g_v$ we would obtain $M_v = 1021$ MeV. This is a drawback of our model for the description of the static properties compared to other works as e.g. [20]. However, the correct description of the nucleon form factors up to 3.0 GeV^2 forced us to choose a scalar v -diquark symmetric parameter set [5], which fixes g_v^N . Fig. 2 shows the three calculated transition form factors for momentum transfers from the pseudothreshold q_0^2 up to 2.0 GeV^2 . Note that electron scattering experiments only access $q^2 \geq 0$. The data points are the experimental G_M [21][23]. The empty triangle follows from the equal-mass SU(6) limit [17]. Unfortunately, the calculated G_M is a factor of 2.8 too low. This is not surprising in a model where the magnetic transition proceeds in the v -diquark channel alone. This leads us to consider also transitions from a scalar to a v -diquark (see the third diagram in Fig. 1), which of course would contribute about equally in a three-quark model. The coupling is analogous to the Δ transition [13] and contains a scalar v -diquark coupling parameter g_{sv} . We define it via

$$j^{s\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} v} = \frac{P - \frac{1}{2}i}{2} \frac{(1 + g_{sv})}{M_N} \quad P^0 P^0 : \quad (39)$$

In the rest frame of the nucleon and choosing $P^0 = P_z^0$, such a transition only affects the spin-1/2 currents. So the r.h.s. of Eq. (11) contains an additional term $+\frac{P_z^0}{3} \frac{2}{3} \frac{[1]}{j} \text{diquark}(v\frac{1}{2} s) \frac{[0]}{N}$. Of course also the elastic nucleon form factors change. In order to find a best description of the magnetic form factors we choose Set B in Tab. I. The resulting magnetic nucleon form factors are shown in

Fig. 3. The agreement with the experimental data is indeed striking. With this Set B we obtain for the magnetic transition form factor the dash-dotted line in Fig. 2. Here, we also find an improvement, with the calculated curve still being too low, though. Of special interest is the shape of G_E and G_C . Both start at zero at the pseudothreshold q_s^2 and have a maximum at about $q^2 = 0$. The threshold behaviour $G_C(q_s^2) = 0$ results from Eqs. (19) and (20). As can be seen from Eq. (37) the electric form factor itself is very sensitive to the difference of the two currents $J_+(q^2)$ and $J_+^0(q^2)$. It is straightforward to see that $J_+^0(q^2) = \sqrt{3} J_+(q^2)$ for q^2 near to q_s^2 . With $J_+(q_s^2) = J_+^0(q_s^2) = 0$, this leads to $G_E(q_s^2) = 0$.

In Fig. 4 we show the ratio of the multipoles $E2=M1 = E_{1+}=M_{1+} = G_E(q^2)/G_M(q^2)$ [17,18] compared to the experimental $\text{Re}(E_{1+}/M_{1+}) = \text{Re} M_{1+}^2$ taken from Refs. [24,26]. The solid line corresponds to the parameter Set A. At $q^2 = 0$ the calculated ratio $E2=M1 = 5.5\%$ is near to the experimental value $E2=M1 = 2.5 - 0.2\%$ [26]. Note, that the experimental value still contains background effects. The recent analysis of Ref. [2] gives $E2=M1 = 3.5\%$ for the ‘dressed’ resonance alone. It is this number our calculation has to be compared with. For higher momentum transfers our curve decreases, similar to Ref. [19], where a light-cone quark model is employed. This disagrees with the experimental data from Refs. [24,25]. However, the experimental situation is not at all clear since large background effects hinder the extraction of $E2=M1$ from measured cross sections and make it strongly model dependent [2,3]. The dash-dotted curve is the same ratio if we include scalar(v -di)quark transitions according to Eq. (39), using Set B. The threshold value $E2=M1 = 3.4\%$ is in astonishing agreement with the above value of Ref. [2], and for higher q^2 the curve attains. Fig. 5 shows the ratio [8,18]

$$C2=M1 = S_{1+}=M_{1+} = \frac{P \frac{Q_+ Q_-}{4M^2} \frac{G_C(q^2)}{G_M(q^2)}}{G_M(q^2)} ; \quad (40)$$

The negative sign of G_C leads to a positive ratio $C2=M1$ which apparently contradicts the experimental data [24,25,27,28]. Cardarelli et al. [29] also find $G_C < 0$, and for certain wave functions also Kroll et al. [8] find this behaviour. We strictly follow the definitions of Ref. [18]. A positive J_0 then leads straightforwardly via Eqs. (38), (40) to $C2=M1 > 0$. However, the absolute values of both Set A and Set B are in satisfactory agreement with the experiment. We predict a threshold value $C2=M1 = +2.1\%$ (Set B). The dotted line is the ratio with the current density J_0 calculated via $J_0(q^2) = \frac{q^2}{q^2} J_3(q^2)$ (also Set B). Thus, the variance between the dash-dotted and the dotted curve reflects the accuracy of our prediction due to the only partially conserved current, see below. The dotted curve yields $C2=M1 = +1.4\%$. Finally, Fig. 6 shows our prediction for the helicity asymmetry ratio defined as [8]

$$A(q^2) = \frac{\mathcal{A}_{\frac{1}{2}}^2 J + \mathcal{A}_{\frac{3}{2}}^2 J}{\mathcal{A}_{\frac{1}{2}}^2 J + \mathcal{A}_{\frac{3}{2}}^2 J} = \frac{1}{2} \left[3 \frac{G_M(q^2)G_E(q^2)}{G_M^2(q^2) + 3G_E^2(q^2)} \right] ; \quad (41)$$

where $\mathcal{A}_{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{\frac{3}{2}}$ are two of the three independent electromagnetic helicity amplitudes [8]. The ratio A gives essentially the contribution of helicity nonconserving

compared to helicity conserving transitions. Symmetric three-quark models should give a constant $A(q^2) \approx 0.5$. For both Sets A and B we see a similar deviation from this rule, with curve A decreasing faster than curve B. Our results are very similar to those of Ref. [19]. There, it is explicitly shown that a satisfactory description of $G_M(q^2)$ and E_2/M_1 is mainly due to a correct relativistic treatment. So we may conclude that apart from the assumed quark-diquark structure our good results are also due to the formally covariant Salpeter model.

At last we should mention an interesting result concerning current conservation. In the previous Refs. [4,5] we could explicitly show that the currents corresponding to the diagrams in Fig. 1 were conserved separately. This is not the case in inelastic transitions, see Fig. 7. The currents alone are far from being conserved separately, but the sum of both (solid line) is conserved approximately. The maximal deviation amounts to less than 30% at $q^2 \approx 0.5 \text{ GeV}^2$. For momentum transfers $q^2 > 1.5 \text{ GeV}^2$ the current is found to be nearly conserved. While the current conservation of the elastic currents can be shown analytically in the Mandelstam formalism using time and space reversal this is not the case for transition currents. The violation of the continuity equation indicates that additional diagrams, as e.g. the coupling of the photon to the exchanged quark, are needed to fulfill gauge invariance.

V I. S U M M A R Y

We extended our studies of the nucleon in a covariant quark-diquark model to the Δ resonance. This spin- $\frac{3}{2}$ particle is described as a bound state of a quark and a v -diquark with the Salpeter equation. The interaction kernel is a quark exchange in instantaneous approximation. The electromagnetic $N \rightarrow \Delta$ transitions are calculated in the Mandelstam formalism from the pseudothreshold up to 2 GeV^2 . The resulting form factors are in qualitative agreement with the experimental data, with only the dominant magnetic transition G_M coming out too low. The inclusion of scalar (v -diquark) transitions seems to be important for the nucleon magnetic form factors as well as for the magnetic $N \rightarrow \Delta$ transition form factor. We find the correct value for E_2/M_1 at $q^2 = 0$. The positive sign of E_2/M_1 contradicts the experimental findings, its absolute value, however, describes the data well.

Summarizing, we may state that a pure quark-diquark model in a covariant approach can account qualitatively for the nucleon form factors and the $N \rightarrow \Delta$ transitions up to intermediate momentum transfers. The semi-quantitative agreement with experiment is encouraging and may point to a possible rôle of strong quark-quark correlations in subnuclear physics.

Acknowledgements: I am grateful to H.R. Petry, B.C. Metsch and U.-G. Meißner for many helpful discussions and W. Pfeil and R.W. Gothe for very useful comments. This work was supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft.

APPENDIX A : COUPLING MATRICES

In this section we evaluate the coupling matrices describing the coupling of the photon to the v -diquark. We need the coupling matrices g_{ba} of Sec. III in Ref. [5]. We apply the correct Clebsch-Gordan coefficients and take into account the boost prescription of Eq. (8), thus tearing the boost factors into the coupling matrix g_{ba} :

$$-\frac{b}{p^0} (p^0)_{ba} N(p)^a = -\frac{b^0}{(M, p^0)} (p_{out}) S^{-1} \frac{b}{b^0} g_{ba} N(p)^a \quad (A1)$$

$$= : -\frac{b^0}{(M, p^0)} (p_{out}) S^{-1} \sim g_{ba} N(p)^a : \quad (A2)$$

We then obtain the following one-row coupling matrices in the space $e_V^{[1]} (e_0^{[1]}; e_V^{[1]})$ (for the notation see Ref. [5]):

$$\sim_0 = e \frac{0}{s} \frac{2}{3} \frac{q}{M} (p_1 + p_1^0)^0 ; \frac{p}{3} \frac{2}{3} 1 \frac{P^0}{M} (p_1 + p_1^0)^0 A \quad (A3)$$

$$\sim_3 = e \frac{0}{s} \frac{2}{3} \frac{q}{M} (p_1 + p_1^0)_3 ; \frac{p}{3} \frac{2}{3} 1 \frac{P^0}{M} (p_1 + p_1^0)_3 A \quad (A4)$$

$$\sim_+ = 0 ; \frac{1}{p} \frac{2}{3} (1 +) q \frac{1}{3} \frac{2}{3} \frac{P^0}{M} \quad (A5)$$

$$\sim_+^0 = 0 ; \frac{1}{p} \frac{2}{3} (1 +) q : \quad (A6)$$

We also give them matrices in Lorentz space which appear in the coupling to the quark with a v -diquark as spectator:

$$-\frac{b}{p^0} (g_{ba})_N^a = \frac{b^0}{S^{-1} b^0} (g_{ba})_N^a \quad (A7)$$

$$= : \frac{b^0}{G_{b^0 a}} G_{b^0 a}^a : \quad (A8)$$

With the corresponding Clebsch-Gordan coefficients:

$$G_{=0;3} = e \frac{0}{s} \frac{2}{3} \frac{q}{M} ; \frac{p}{3} \frac{2}{3} 1 \frac{P^0}{M} A \quad (A9)$$

$$G_{=+} = e \frac{0}{s} \frac{2}{3} \frac{q}{M} ; \frac{p}{3} \frac{2}{3} \frac{P^0}{M} A \quad (A10)$$

$$G_{0=+} = e 0 ; \frac{2}{3} \frac{1}{A} : \quad (A11)$$

TABLES

	m_q	$m_s = m_v$	g^N	g_v			$_{sv}$
Set A	440 MeV/c ²	800 MeV/c ²	17.76	8.50	0.30 fm	1.1	-
Set B	440 MeV/c ²	800 MeV/c ²	17.76	8.50	0.30 fm	-0.07	2.4

TABLE I. The parameters of the model: Set A and Set B.

	$q^2 \overline{f}_E^p$	$q^2 \overline{f}_E^n$	$q^2 \overline{f}_M^p$	$q^2 \overline{f}_M^n$	r_p	r_n
Set A	0.79 fm	-0.110 fm ²	0.72 fm	0.86 fm	2.45 N	-1.42 N
Set B	0.79 fm	-0.110 fm ²	0.74 fm	0.75 fm	2.44 N	-1.91 N
exp.	0.847 fm	-0.119 fm ²	0.836 fm	0.889 fm	2.793 N	-1.913 N

TABLE II. Static nucleon properties as they result from the threshold behaviour of the electromagnetic nucleon form factors. For the experimental data see the analysis of Ref. [30].

FIGURES




FIG .1. The N^- transition current is the sum of the v -diquark current and the quark current. The third diagram is the scalar v -diquark transition (see Eq. (39)).




FIG .2. The three N^- transition form factors. The data points show the measured magnetic form factor G_M [21{23}]. The empty triangle follows from the equal-mass SU(6) limit [17]. The dash-dotted line is G_M with scalar v -diquark transitions included (Eq. (39)).




FIG. 3. The magnetic form factor of the proton (positive curve) and of the neutron (negative curve) calculated with the parameter Set B of Tab. I. For the experimental data see the analysis of Ref. [30].




FIG. 4. The ratio $E2/M1$. The solid line results from the parameter Set A, the dash-dotted one from Set B. The experimental data are from Refs. [24,26]. The empty triangle is from the analysis of [2].




FIG. 5. The absolute value of the ratio $C2/M1$. The solid line results from the parameter Set A, the dash-dotted one from Set B. The dotted line shows the ratio with J_0 calculated via $J_0(q^2) = \frac{q^3}{q_0^3} J_3(q^2)$. The experimental data are from Refs. [24,25,27,28].




FIG . 6. The helicity asymmetry ratio A (Eq. (41)) calculated with Set A (solid line) and with Set B (dash-dotted line).




FIG . 7. The evolution of $q^0 j_0$ and $q^3 j_3$ of the first two currents in Fig. 1 and of the sum of both (solid line).

REFERENCES

- [1] Proc. Int. Conf. 'Baryons '95', Santa Fe (1995)
- [2] O. Hanstein, D. Drechsel and L. Tiator, nucl-th/9605008, submitted to Phys. Lett. B
- [3] A.M. Bernstein, S. Nozawa and M.A. Moinester, Phys. Rev. C 47, 1247 (1993)
- [4] V. Keiner, Z. Phys. A 354, 87 (1996)
- [5] V. Keiner, hep-ph/9603226, to be published in Phys. Rev. C 54 (1996)
- [6] M. Anselmino, E. Predazzi, S. Ekelin, S. Fredriksson and D.B. Lichtenberg, Rev. Mod. Phys., Vol. 65, No.4, 1199 (1993)
- [7] D.B. Leinweber, Phys. Rev. D 47, 5096 (1993)
- [8] P. Kroll, M. Schumann and W. Schweiger, Z. Phys. A 342, 429 (1992)
- [9] H. Reinhardt, Phys. Lett. B 244, 316 (1990)
- [10] A. Buck, R. Alkofer and H. Reinhardt, Phys. Lett. B 286, 29 (1992)
- [11] S. Huang and J. Tjon, Phys. Rev. C 49, 1702 (1994)
- [12] H. Meyer, Phys. Lett. B 337, 37 (1994)
- [13] M. Anselmino, P. Kroll and B. Pire, Z. Phys. C 36, 89 (1987)
- [14] E.E. Salpeter and H.A. Bethe, Phys. Rev. 84, 132 (1951)
- [15] N. Ishii, W. Bentz and K. Yazaki, Phys. Lett. B 318, 26 (1993)
- [16] S. Mandelstam, Proc. Roy. Soc. 233, 248 (1955)
- [17] H.F. Jones and M.D. Scadron, Ann. Phys. 81, 1 (1973)
- [18] R.C.E. Devenish, T.S. Eizenschitz and J.G. Komer, Phys. Rev. D 14, 3063 (1976)
- [19] H.J. Weber, Ann. Phys. 207, 417 (1991)
- [20] C. Hanhart and S. Krewald, Phys. Lett. B 344, 55 (1995)
- [21] W. Bartel, B. Dudelzak, H. Krehbiel, J. McElroy, U. Meyer-Berkhout, W. Schmidt, V. Walther and G. Weber, Phys. Lett. B 28, 148 (1968)
- [22] S. Stein, W.B. Atwood, E.D. Bloom, R.L.A. Cottrell, H. DeStaebler, C.L. Jordan, H.G. Piel, C.Y. Prescott, R. Siemann and R.E. Taylor, Phys. Rev. D 12, 1884 (1975)
- [23] W.W. Ash, K. Berkelman, C.A. Lichtenstein, A. Ramanauskas and R.H. Siemann, Phys. Lett. B 24, 165 (1967)
- [24] J.C. Alder et al., Nucl. Phys. B 46, 573 (1972)
- [25] R. Siddle et al., Nucl. Phys. B 35, 93 (1971)
- [26] R. Beck et al. (MAMI), submitted to Phys. Rev. Lett., Sept. 1996
- [27] R.L. Crawford, Nucl. Phys. B 28, 573 (1971); exp. data from C. Mistretta et al., Phys. Rev. 184, 1487 (1969)
- [28] F. Kalleicher, Ph.D. thesis, Mainz University (1993); D. Jakob, Ph.D. thesis, Bonn University (1996); R.W. Gothe et al., ELSA proposal (1995)
- [29] F. Cardarelli, E. Pace, G. Salmé and S. Simula, Phys. Lett. B 371, 7 (1996)
- [30] P. Mergell, U.-G. Meiner and D. Drechsel, Nucl. Phys. A 596, 367 (1996)