

---

Subject: Dalitz Decays of higher resonances.

Posted by [Adrian Dybczak](#) on Wed, 12 Oct 2011 16:54:15 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Dear Ingo

I tried to simulate Dalitz decay of higher resonances. I used macros prepared (mixed) by my self.

One can find it in attachment.

In this topic i propose to focus on one resonance N1520+ which is example.

After several tests i redeclared N1535 resonance in macro without using names from pluto. This was only way to get "proper" result.

Names in macro

```
AddAlias("N1520+", "N_star(1520)+");
```

Names in PLUTO

```
AddAlias("ND13+", "N*(1520)+");
```

So there is no conflict.

What i wanted to check was:

1/. BR value for Dalitz Decay

2/. is  $d\Gamma/dM$  (Zetenyi/Wolf model) working.

Ad 1/. I drew  $M_{inv_{\pi e}}$  from  $pp \rightarrow pN1520 \rightarrow p\pi e + e^-$  reaction

Then i drew invariant mass of  $n\pi^+$  from  $pp \rightarrow pN1520 \rightarrow p n\pi^+$  reaction.

$BR_{N\pi} = 0.55$  ; Clebsch\_Gordan coeff. =  $2/3$ .

so  $4.048e-2 / (0.55 * 0.66) = 0.11$

now getting  $5.36e-6 / 0.11 = 4.8e-5$

What was assumed in macro as  $5.0e-5$

Ad 2/.  $d\Gamma/dM$  was only check via looking on display hile processing and various value of weight.

By the way below one can find distribution of weight.


It looks slightly different from D1232 weight distribution.

Ingo could you check this macro or provide new one which can be uses to simulate Dalitz

Decay for N1520+ without any redelARATION?

### File Attachments


- 1) [reaction.C](#), downloaded 471 times
- 2) [m\\_inv\\_pee.png](#), downloaded 954 times



- 3) [m\\_inv\\_npip.png](#), downloaded 1033 times

**M\_inv\_npip {sim\_genweight}**


ll	
Entries	1000000
Mean	1.562
RMS	0.1324



4) [weight.png](#), downloaded 1065 times

**sim\_genweight**

htemp	
Entries	1000000
Mean	$6.351e-11$
RMS	$4.138e-11$



Subject: Re: Dalitz Decays of higher resonances.  
Posted by [Ingo Froehlich](#) on Thu, 13 Oct 2011 05:52:28 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Adrian Dybczak wrote on Wed, 12 October 2011 18:54

After several tests i redeclared N1535 resonance in macro without using names from pluto.  
This was only way to get "proper" result.

What was wrong with the build-in version in "dalitz\_mod"? It would be important for me to know this.

Adrian Dybczak wrote on Wed, 12 October 2011 18:54  
now getting  $5.36e-6/0.11 = 4.8e-5$   
What was assumed in macro as  $5.0e-5$

Remember: What you declare in Pluto is the static branching ratio. What you see in the histogram is the weight directly coming from the model (basically the coupling constant), this we can see here:

```
my_reaction->Do("_w = _w * {N1520+_dalitz}->GetBR([N1520+]->M());");
```

what is done here is to fold the weight with the mass-dependent branching ratio. This was (originally) implemented to feed the Pythia rho into Pluto in order to change the shape.

---

Subject: Re: Dalitz Decays of higher resonances.  
Posted by [Adrian Dybczak](#) on Thu, 13 Oct 2011 14:26:29 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hi Ingo

In the same way as previously i made several test.  
I used same macro as you send me to simulate D+ but this time ND13+ (N\*1520) was simulated (macro in attachment).

Here are results:

Mass of Delta

Mass of pee

Ratio means BR

One can see that:


- shapes are ok
- BR ratio in pole is same as expected ( $0.0051/137=3.7e-5$ )

Comment [ND13+\_dalitz] dgdm from Zetenyi/Wolf {} is displayed while processing but weight is constant


Does it means that dGamma/dM working or not?

### File Attachments


1) [mass\\_Delta.png](#), downloaded 642 times




2) [mass\\_pee.png](#), downloaded 623 times



3) [ratio.png](#), downloaded 586 times



4) [weight.png](#), downloaded 629 times



5) [test\\_elementary\\_adrian.C](#), downloaded 301 times

---

Subject: Re: Dalitz Decays of higher resonances.  
Posted by [Ingo Froehlich](#) on Thu, 13 Oct 2011 15:36:13 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You are absolutely right, there was no flat electron generator enabled. The reason is that the new decays were not recognized as Dalitz-Decays (hardcoded in PData.h).

I did the following changes in PData.h (IsDalitz):

```
int d = makeStaticData()->GetParticleBaryon(id) && // Delta0 Dalitz decay?  
((makeStaticData()->IsParticle(i1,"dilepton") &&  
makeStaticData()->GetParticleBaryon(i2)) ||  
(makeStaticData()->GetParticleBaryon(i1) &&  
makeStaticData()->IsParticle(i2,"dilepton")));  
  
return (pseudo&&eeg) || (pseudo&&mumug) ||  
(vector&&eepi) || (vector&&mumupi)  
|| D0 || Dp || pn || NS0 || NSp || d;
```

now it should print:

Info in <PDalitzModPlugin::ExecCommand>: Model <NS11+\_dalitz> uses dGamma/dM for the

branching ratio

Info in <PDalitzModPlugin::ExecCommand>: Model <NP110\_dalitz> uses dGamma/dM for the branching ratio

Info in <PDalitzModPlugin::ExecCommand>: Model <ND130\_dalitz> uses dGamma/dM for the branching ratio

Info in <PDalitzModPlugin::ExecCommand>: Model <NS110\_dalitz> uses dGamma/dM for the branching ratio

and:

[ND13+\_generator\_p\_dilepton] Dilepton generator {/generator}

---

Subject: Re: Dalitz Decays of higher resonances.

Posted by [Adrian Dybczak](#) on Thu, 13 Oct 2011 19:24:44 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

So i apply changes and it works!

Please see pictures below.

All comments were displayed hile processing.  
Weight is changing (see below).


Now BR is  $5e-5$  in pole. Shouldn't be  $3.7-5$  as before?

---


### File Attachments

1) [mass\\_comparison.png](#), downloaded 623 times






2) [ratio.png](#), downloaded 631 times



3) [weight.png](#), downloaded 632 times



---

Subject: Re: Dalitz Decays of higher resonances.

Posted by [Ingo Froehlich](#) on Thu, 13 Oct 2011 20:50:48 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Adrian Dybczak wrote on Thu, 13 October 2011 21:24  
Now BR is  $5e-5$  in pole. Shouldn't be  $3.7-5$  as before?

Hard to say. It directly comes from the model (i.e. the coupling constant). Maybe we have to check it against a calculation using the equations from the paper