

Comment on “Well-Established Nucleon Resonances Revisited by Double-Polarization Measurements”

The Letter of Thiel *et al.* [1] compares precise measurements of the double-polarization observable G to three independent predictions from the Bonn-Gatchina (BnGa) [2], Mainz (MAID) [3], and the George Washington University (SAID) [4] groups. The authors note that the SAID and MAID predictions are poor, over significant energy and angular ranges, while the BnGa result provides a good description. We show that, in fact, the BnGa and SAID predictions are qualitatively similar. The much older MAID fit does have a problem. The major source of this problem was outlined in our previous publication [4].

The most significant deviations between predictions were illustrated in Fig. 4 of Ref. [1], which plotted G as a function of the photon lab energy for center-of-mass π^0 production angles (θ_π) of 90° and 130° . We redraw this plot in Fig. 1, using predictions from our new CM12 solution [4]. The BnGa and CM12 curves both give a good representation of the data. Therefore, the inclusion of our CM12 solution in the analysis of Ref. [1] alters some conclusions of that work. The original figure in Ref. [1] used the former solution SN11 of 2011 [5]. Above 1.2 GeV, the solutions CM12 and SN11 fit existing $\pi^0 p$ G data with χ^2 per datum of 2.14 and 2.79, respectively.

Reference [4] demonstrated that the imposition of two-body unitarity in a Chew-Mandelstam form constituted a significant refinement over previous SAID parametrizations. This required the consistent and unified




FIG. 1 (color online). Double-polarization observable G for $\gamma p \rightarrow \pi^0 p$ as a function of energy for two selected bins in θ_π . Curves: solid (black): BG2011-02 of BnGa [2], dashed (red): SN11 of SAID [5], dash-dotted (green): CM12 of SAID [4], and dotted (blue): MAID07 [3]. Black dots show CB-ELSA/TAPS Collaboration data [1]. Plotted uncertainties are statistical.

incorporation of hadronic-sector amplitudes. An immediate consequence of this improvement, over earlier SAID parametrization forms, was an improved χ^2 per datum for a smaller number of parameters, as noted in Ref. [4]. The finding of the authors, that differences in the BnGa and SAID are “surprising,” are thereby obviated—both approaches incorporate two-body unitarity at the hadronic level. It is encouraging, in fact, that two groups working completely independently but using two-body unitarity approaches are in agreement—at least in this particular observable, even though the BnGa analysis utilizes a larger combined fit to many connected reactions.

The authors also note that the discrepancies between the different groups’ solutions, for the G observable, are partly due to differences in the $E_{0+}^{1/2}$ proton multipole, connected to the $N(1535)$ resonance. This issue was also discussed extensively in Ref. [4]. Values for the $E_{0+}^{1/2}$ multipole, and its phase, were compared in Figs. 6 and 7 of that publication for the BnGa solution, the MAID solution, and for the two most recent SAID solutions, SN11 and CM12.

This work was supported in part by the U.S. Department of Energy Grant No. DE-FG02-99ER41110. The work of M. W. P. was performed under the auspices of the National Nuclear Security Administration. We thank R. Beck for communicating and discussing their manuscript prior to its publication.

Ron L. Workman,¹ Mark W. Paris,²
William J. Briscoe,¹ and Igor I. Strakovsky¹

¹Data Analysis Center at the Institute for Nuclear Studies
Department of Physics

The George Washington University
Washington, DC 20052, USA

²Theory Division
Los Alamos National Laboratory
Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545, USA

Received 5 October 2012; published 19 April 2013

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.110.169101

PACS numbers: 14.20.Gk, 13.60.Le

- [1] A. Thiel *et al.* (CB-ELSA/TAPS Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 102001 (2012).
- [2] The Bonn-Gatchina analyses are available through the Bonn website: <http://pwa.hiskp.uni-bonn.de/>; see also A. V. Anisovich, R. Beck, E. Klempt, V. A. Nikonov, A. V. Sarantsev, and U. Thoma, *Eur. Phys. J. A* **48**, 15 (2012).
- [3] The MAID analyses are available through the Mainz website: <http://www.kph.kph.uni-mainz.de/MAID/>; see also D. Drechsel, S. S. Kamalov, and L. Tiator, *Eur. Phys. J. A* **34**, 69 (2007).
- [4] R. L. Workman, M. W. Paris, W. J. Briscoe, and I. I. Strakovsky, *Phys. Rev. C* **86**, 015202 (2012).
- [5] R. L. Workman, W. J. Briscoe, M. W. Paris, and I. I. Strakovsky, *Phys. Rev. C* **85**, 025201 (2012).