Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

Recent Work

Title

SOME PREDICTIONS OF THE ABFST MULTIPERIPHERAL MODEL

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0cn5x49w

Author

Tow, Don M.

Publication Date

1970-01-06

SOME PREDICTIONS OF THE ABFST MULTIPERIPHERAL MODEL

Don M. Tow

January 6, 1970

LAWRENCE RADIATION LABORATORY
UNIVERSITY of CALIFORNIA BERKELEY

DISCLAIMER

SOME PREDICTIONS OF THE ABFST MULTIPERIPHERAL MODEL[*]

Don M. Tow

Lawrence Radiation Laboratory
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720

January 6, 1970

ABSTRACT

The predictions of the ABFST multiperipheral model based on pion pole dominance are compared quantitatively with experimental data, by using the Veneziano representation for the π-π amplitude, with a cut off at the mass of the g resonance for the input kernel, and neglecting off-shell effects. We find $\alpha_P(0) = 0.30$, $\alpha_\rho(0) = 0.16$, an average multiplicity growing as $0.74\ \ell n\ s$, an elasticity factor of 0.69, an average pion-pair transverse momentum equal to 0.43 GeV/c, and an average invariant mass squared equal to 0.84 GeV^2. The only serious discrepancies with experiment are the trajectory heights, which correspond to a kernel strength $2\frac{1}{2}$ to 5 times too weak. The inclusion of the high-subenergy contribution and the inclusion of off-shell effects by several methods of off-shell continuation are considered, but none is found to be satisfactory. The importance of interference terms, due to different ways of arranging the final-state particles along the multiperipheral chain, is discussed.

I.   INTRODUCTION

In the last two years there has been interest in the multi-Regge model (MRM) of production processes (see Fig. 1) and the corresponding multi-Regge bootstrap by way of unitarity.[1] However, the multi-Regge amplitude can only be expected to approximate the physical production amplitude when all subenergies are large ($\gg$ 1 GeV), whereas experimentally the important subenergies are of the order of or less than 1 GeV.[2] To justify the MRM then requires the unreasonable assumption that duality holds even at such small energies. Furthermore, in order to simplify their equations, some authors[1] have made the kinematic approximation that

$$s \propto s_1 s_2 \cdots s_n .$$ (I.1)

This kinematic approximation is good only if all the s_i's are large compared with the masses and momentum transfers involved.

For these reasons, there has recently been renewed interest[3] in another model of production processes: the multiperipheral model with pion pole dominance first proposed by Amati, Bertocchi, Fubini, Stanghellini, and Tonin in 1962.[4] This model is shown in Fig. 2. The model assumes that all final-state particles (with the possible exception of the first and last links) are pions, since experimentally at energies from tens of GeV to thousands of GeV the large majority of the produced particles are observed to be pions.[5] The model furthermore assumes that all exchanged particles are pions. A possible justification for this last assumption is that the one-pion-exchange (OPE) model works well when one or two pions are produced;[6] it is therefore plausible that

increasing the number of final pions just increases the number of

exchanged pions. Another way of saying this is that two-body and quasi-

two-body processes are peripheral, i.e., the amplitude is large only

when the momentum transfer is small; it is therefore plausible that

general production processes are multiperipheral, i.e., the amplitude

is large only when all the momentum transfers are small. Because of

the small pion mass, this implies the dominance of pion exchange.

The ABFST multiperipheral model predicts[4] some features of high

energy scattering which are in qualitative agreement with experiment.

The model predicts Regge asymptotic behavior, average multiplicity

growing as ℓn s, a constant elasticity (ratio of the average laboratory

energy of the primary outgoing particle to that of the incident

particle),[7] and a transverse momentum distribution of secondary

particles which is independent of the energies of the incident and

secondary particles. However, before we can seriously accept this

model, we would like to have a quantitative comparison of the predictions

of the model with experimental data.

This paper carries out such a quantitative comparison. In

Sec. II, we briefly rederive the relevant equations in AFS's paper,[4]

with the generalization of AFS's equations to include off-shell pions

in the input kernel. We also discuss the approximations that are used

in deriving these equations. In Sec. III, we describe the π-π

elastic cross sections used in our calculations. In Sec. IV, we

describe the predictions of the model and compare them with experimental

data. We also show that these predictions are almost independent of

the detailed shape of the input π-π elastic cross sections. In

Sec. V, we discuss some possible modifications of the model by the

relaxation of some of the approximations used in Sec. II. We end with

a conclusion in Sec. VI.

II. DERIVATION OF RELEVANT EQUATIONS

A. Integral Equation for Absorptive Part

Consider the process where $(n + 1)$ pairs of pions are produced. The kinematic variables are shown in Fig. 2. We first consider the incident particles to be pions with zero isospin; we will later consider the general case of physical isospin and particles other than pions. Our model assumes that the production amplitude is given by the factorized form

$$T_n(P,P'; k_{0_1}, k_{0_2}, k_{1_1}, k_{1_2}, \cdots, k_{n_1}, k_{n_2})$$

$$= \frac{1}{\{(q_1^2 - \mu^2)(q_2^2 - \mu^2)\cdots(q_n^2 - \mu^2)\}}$$

$$\times \{T^R(P,q_1; k_{0_1}, k_{0_2})\, T^R(q_1,q_2; k_{1_1}, k_{1_2})\cdots$$

$$T^R(q_{n-1}, q_n; k_{n-1_1}, k_{n-1_2})\, T^R(q_n, P'; k_{n_1}, k_{n_2})\} \quad , \qquad \text{(II.1)}$$

where the superscript R denotes elastic scattering and $\mu = m_\pi$. The Optical Theorem can then be used to relate elastic scattering to production processes. This is illustrated in Fig. 3. Following ABFST,[4] we can derive a recursion relation for the $(2n + 2)$ particle contribution to the off-shell absorptive part of the forward elastic amplitude,

$$A_n(s,u) = \frac{1}{8\pi^4} \int ds_0 \iint ds'du' \, \frac{A^R(s_0,-u',-u)Q(s,u; s',u'; s_0)A_{n-1}(s',u')}{(u' + \mu^2)^2},$$

$$\text{(II.2)}$$

where

$$Q(s,u; \; s',u'; \; s_0)$$

$$= \frac{\pi}{2(s^2 + 4\mu^2 u)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \; \Theta(uS'^2 + u'S^2 - \mu^2 S_0^2 - SS'S_0 + 4\mu^2 uu')\Theta(s^{\frac{1}{2}} - s'^{\frac{1}{2}} - s_0^{\frac{1}{2}}) \; ,$$

$$(II.3)$$

where

$$\left.\begin{array}{rcl} S & = & s + u - \mu^2 \; , \\[2ex] S' & = & s' + u' - \mu^2 \; , \\[2ex] S_0 & = & s_0 + u + u' \; . \end{array}\right\} \qquad (II.4)$$

Therefore $Q(s,u; \; s',u'; \; s_0)$ determines the limits of integration in (II.2). In (II.2), $A^R(s_0,-u',-u)$ is the off-shell continuation of $A^R(s_0,\mu^2,\mu^2)$, where

$$A^R(s_0,\mu^2,\mu^2) \; = \; 2|\underset{\sim}{q}^{cm}|s_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \; \sigma^{e\ell}(s_0,\mu^2,\mu^2) \; , \qquad (II.5)$$

with $|\underset{\sim}{q}^{cm}|$ being the center-of-mass momentum. There is no unique or a priori correct continuation of (II.5) to obtain $A^R(s_0,-u',-u)$. In Sec. V, we will consider several methods of continuing off-shell. Summing (II.2), we get

$$A(s,u)$$

$$= A^R(s,u) + \frac{1}{8\pi^4} \int ds_0 \iint ds'du' \; \frac{A^R(s_0,-u',-u)Q(s,u; \; s',u'; \; s_0)A(s',u')}{(u' + \mu^2)^2} \; .$$

$$(II.6)$$

The physical forward absorptive part of the elastic amplitude is given by $A(s,u)$ continued to $u = -\mu^2$. The integral equation (II.6) is schematically illustrated in Fig. 4.

   If we take the high energy limit and assume $s \gg \mu^2$, u, s_0, then $Q(s,u; s',u'; s_0)$ gives the following limits of integration for (II.6):

$$A(s,u)$$

$$= A^R(s,u) + \frac{1}{16\pi^3} \int_{4\mu^2} ds_0 \int_0^s \frac{ds'}{s} \int_{\frac{s'}{s}\left(u+\frac{s_0}{1-\frac{s'}{s}}\right)}^{\infty} du' \frac{A^R(s_0,-u',-u)A(s',u')}{(u' + \mu^2)^2} .$$

$$(II.7)$$

Note that there is no upper limit on s_0 except that $s_0 \ll s$. The model therefore appears to depend on where we cut off the s_0 integration. However, we know experimentally that for general production processes, the invariant mass of two adjacent pions in a multiperipheral chain (arranged, for example, according to longitudinal momentum) is bounded. This means there must be a $s_{0_{max}}$ such that the contribution from $s_0 > s_{0_{max}}$ is negligible. For asymptotic s, we can therefore let the upper integration limit for s_0 be either $s_{0_{max}}$ or ∞. AFS conjectured that $s_{0_{max}}$ is a few GeV^2. Of course, we can check the validity of this conjecture only a posteriori. This point will be further discussed in Secs. IV and V.

   The relatively large multiplicity corresponding to this small invariant mass allows us to neglect in the high energy limit $A^R(s,u)$

compared with $A(s,u)$, since the former is just the elastic contribution to the absorptive part, whereas the latter is the total absorptive part. Therefore,

$$A(s,u)$$

$$\approx \frac{1}{16\pi^3} \int_{4\mu^2} ds_0 \int_0^s \frac{ds'}{s} \int_{\frac{s'}{s}\left(u+\frac{s_0}{1-\frac{s'}{s}}\right)}^{\infty} du' \frac{A^R(s_0,-u',-u)\, A(s',u')}{(u'+\mu^2)^2} \quad . \tag{II.8}$$

(II.8) is an integral equation in two variables. This equation has the special property that it can be reduced to an integral equation of the Fredholm type in one variable by assuming a solution of the form

$$A(s,u) = s^\alpha \phi_\alpha(u) \quad . \tag{II.9}$$

Equations (II.8) and (II.9) imply

$$\phi_\alpha(u) = \frac{1}{16\pi^3(\alpha+1)(2u)^{\alpha+1}} \int_0^\infty du'\, \phi_\alpha(u') \int_{4\mu^2} ds_0\, A^R(s_0,-u',-u)$$

$$\chi \frac{\{s_0 + u + u' - [(s_0 + u + u')^2 - 4uu']^{\frac{1}{2}}\}^{\alpha+1}}{(u'+\mu^2)^2} \quad . \tag{II.10}$$

From (II.9), we see that the model predicts Regge asymptotic behavior, with α being the position of the Regge pole. Equation (II.10) has a solution only for certain values of α, and a knowledge of $A^R(s_0,-u',-u)$ allows us to calculate these values. For asymptotic s, we are interested in the largest value, corresponding to the leading Regge pole.

B. Average Multiplicity

Since $A_n(s,-\mu^2)$ is proportional to the contribution to the total cross section from the production process where $(n + 1)$ pairs of pions are produced, it is also proportional to the probability of producing $(n + 1)$ pairs of pions. This means the average number of produced pions is

$$\langle n \rangle = \frac{\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2(n + 1) A_n(s,-\mu^2)}{\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} A_n(s,-\mu^2)} \quad . \tag{II.11}$$

If we represent the variation of the strength of the π-π elastic cross section by an overall coupling constant g, where $g = 1$ corresponds to the actual coupling strength, one can easily show[4]

$$\langle n \rangle = 2 \left[g \frac{d\alpha}{dg} \right]_{g=1} \ell n \; s + 2 \left[g \frac{\partial}{\partial g} (\ell n \; \phi_\alpha^{\text{physical}}) \right]_{g=1} \quad . \tag{II.12}$$

Thus the model predicts that average multiplicity grows as $\ell n \; s$ as $s \to \infty$.

C. Elasticity, Transverse Momentum Distribution, and Average Subenergy

To derive the elasticity, we single out the primary link (one closest to the incident particle) in the multiperipheral chain. This is shown in Fig. 5. If we let $\overline{E}_{\text{pion-pair}}$ be the average laboratory

energy of the primary outgoing pair of pions and E_{inc} be the laboratory

energy of the incident particle, then one can show[4]

$$\frac{\overline{E}_{pion-pair}}{E_{inc}}$$

$$= \frac{1}{16\pi^3 \, \phi_\alpha^{physical}} \int_0^\infty du' \, \frac{\phi_\alpha(u')}{(u' + \mu^2)^2} \int_{4\mu^2} ds_0 \, A^R(s_0, -u', \mu^2)$$

$$\times \int_0^{x_\mu} dx(1 - x)x^\alpha \,, \qquad (II.13)$$

where

$$x_\mu = \frac{[(s_0 - \mu^2 + u')^2 + 4\mu^2 u']^{\frac{1}{2}} - (s_0 - \mu^2 + u')}{2\mu^2} \,.$$

If we assume this pion pair is the decay product of a pure resonance, e.g., the ρ, then on the average each pion will carry away half of the laboratory energy of the resonance. The elasticity is therefore

$$\frac{\overline{E}_{one \, pion}}{E_{inc}} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\overline{E}_{pion-pair}}{E_{inc}} \,. \qquad (II.14)$$

We see that the model predicts an elasticity which is independent of s.

To calculate the transverse momentum distribution and the average invariant mass squared of the secondary pion pairs, one has to consider diagrams of the form of Fig. 6. Calling k_T the total transverse momentum of a pion pair in the overall center-of-mass frame (or the

laboratory frame) and neglecting the pions near the ends of the

multiperipheral chain (so that we can neglect all masses and momentum

transfers relative to s' and s"), one can show[4] that the transverse

momentum distribution and the invariant mass squared distribution are

given by the expression $F \; dk_T^2 \; dk^2$, where[8]

$$F = (k^2 + k_T^2)^{1+\alpha} \iint du' du'' \; \frac{A^R(k^2, -u', -u'') \; \phi_\alpha(u') \; \phi_\alpha(u'')}{(u' + \mu^2)^2 (u'' + \mu^2)^2}$$

$$\times \iint dxdy \; x^\alpha y^\alpha \; T[u' - (k^2 + k_T^2) x(1 + y); \; u'' - (k^2 + k_T^2) y(1 + x); k_T^2],$$

$$(II.15)$$

and

$$T(a,b,c) = \frac{\Theta(-a^2 - b^2 - c^2 + 2ab + 2ac + 2bc)}{(-a^2 - b^2 - c^2 + 2ab + 2ac + 2bc)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \; ,$$

$$(II.16)$$

$$x = \frac{s'}{s_1} \; , \qquad y = \frac{s''}{s_2} \; ,$$

with $s_1 = (P + k)^2$, $s_2 = (P' + k)^2$. In (II.15), the upper limits of

integration for x and y depend on the energy of the secondary, k_0,

and on the total energy, $s^{\frac{1}{2}}$. But as noted by AFS,[4] when $k_0 \ll s^{\frac{1}{2}}$,

then these upper limits are outside the support of the Θ function.

For $k_0 \ll s^{\frac{1}{2}}$, F is therefore independent of k_0 and $s^{\frac{1}{2}}$, i.e.,

$$F = F(k^2, k_T^2) \; . \tag{II.17}$$

Thus the model correctly predicts that the transverse momentum

distribution is independent of both the incident and secondary energies.

D. Extension to N-N Scattering

First consider π-N scattering. The general multiperipheral diagram is shown in Fig. 7. Proceeding in essentially the same manner as in the π-π case, one can show that the total absorptive part is given by

$$A_{\pi N}(s,u) = A_{\pi N}^{R}(s,u) + \frac{1}{8\pi^4} \int_{(\mu+m)^2} ds_0 \iint ds' du'$$

$$\times \frac{A_{\pi N}^{R}(s_0,-u',-u) \, A_{\pi\pi}(s',u') \, Q(s,u; \, s',u'; \, s_0)}{(u' + \mu^2)^2} \quad, \tag{II.18}$$

where $m = m_N$ and $A_{\pi N}^{\text{Physical}}(s)$ is given by $A_{\pi N}(s,-m^2)$. This equation is schematically represented in Fig. 8. Making approximations similar to those in the π-π case, we have

$$A_{\pi N}(s,u) = s^{\alpha} \, \phi_{\alpha_{\pi N}}(u) \tag{II.19}$$

where

$$\phi_{\alpha_{\pi N}}(u) = \frac{1}{16\pi^3(\alpha + 1)(2u)^{\alpha+1}} \int_0^{\infty} du' \, \phi_{\alpha_{\pi\pi}}(u') \int_{(\mu+m)^2} ds_0$$

$$\times \frac{A_{\pi N}^{R}(s_0,-u',-u)\{s_0 + u + u' - [(s_0 + u + u')^2 - 4uu']^{\frac{1}{2}}\}^{\alpha+1}}{(u' + \mu^2)^2} \quad, $$

$$\tag{II.20}$$

where α is determined by the integral equation for π-π scattering, i.e., Eq. (II.10).

We can easily generalize this to N-N scattering. The general multiperipheral diagram is shown in Fig. 9. The total absorptive part is given by

$$A_{NN}(s,u) = A_{NN}{}^R(s,u) + \frac{1}{8\pi^4} \int_{(\mu+m)^2} ds_0 \iint ds'du'$$

$$\chi \quad \frac{A_{\pi N}{}^R(s_0,-u',-u) \, A_{\pi N}(s',u') \, Q(s,u; \, s',u'; \, s_0)}{(u' + \mu^2)^2} \, , \qquad \text{(II.21)}$$

where $A_{NN}{}^{Physical}(s)$ is given by $A_{NN}(s,-m^2)$. Making approximations as before, we get

$$A_{NN}(s,u) = s^\alpha \, \phi_{\alpha_{NN}}(u) \, , \qquad \text{(II.22)}$$

where

$$\phi_{\alpha_{NN}}(u) = \frac{1}{16\pi^3(\alpha+1)(2u)^{\alpha+1}} \int_0^\infty du' \, \phi_{\alpha_{\pi N}}(u') \int_{(\mu+m)^2} ds_0$$

$$\chi \quad \frac{A_{\pi N}{}^R(s_0,-u',-u)\{s_0 + u + u' - [(s_0 + u + u')^2 - 4uu']^{\frac{1}{2}}\}^{\alpha+1}}{(u' + \mu^2)^2} \, , $$

$$\text{(II.23)}$$

where α is again determined by (II.10) for π-π scattering. Similarly, the ratio of the laboratory energy of the outgoing N-π pair to the laboratory energy of the incident N can be easily shown to be

$$\frac{\overline{E}_{N-\pi pair}}{E_{inc}}$$

$$= \frac{1}{16\pi^3 \, \phi_{\alpha_{NN}}^{Physical}} \int_0^\infty du' \, \frac{\phi_{\alpha_{\pi N}}(u')}{(u' + \mu^2)^2} \int_{(\mu+m)^2} ds_0 \, A_{\pi N}^{R}(s_0, -u', m^2)$$

$$\times \int_0^{x_m} dx(1 - x)x^\alpha , \qquad (II.24)$$

where

$$x_m = \frac{[(s_0 - m^2 + u')^2 + 4m^2 u']^{\frac{1}{2}} - (s_0 - m^2 + u')}{2m^2} .$$

If we now assume that the $N-\pi$ pair is the decay product of $\triangle(1236)$, then on the average N carries away 78% of the laboratory energy of $\triangle(1236)$. The elasticity is therefore

$$\frac{\overline{E}_N}{E_{inc}} = 0.78 \, \frac{\overline{E}_{N-\pi pair}}{E_{inc}} . \qquad (II.25)$$

Note that if we had used a more massive $N-\pi$ resonance, then N would carry away even a smaller part of the resonance's energy. We can also easily show that for $N-N$ scattering, the average number of produced pions is

$$\langle n \rangle_{N-N} = 2 + 2\left[g \, \frac{\partial\alpha}{2g}\right]_{g=1} \ell n \, s + 2\left[g \, \frac{\partial}{\partial g}(\ell n \, \phi_{\alpha_{N-N}}^{Physical})\right]_{g=1} .$$

$$(II.26)$$

The transverse-momentum and invariant-mass-squared distributions are given by (II.15) with the substitution of $\phi_{\alpha_{\pi N}}(u') \phi_{\alpha_{\pi N}}(u'')$ for $\phi_{\alpha}(u') \phi_{\alpha}(u'')$.

E. Extension to Include Isospin

The generalization to include isospin is trivial once we realize that a definite isospin in the t channel is carried through the multiperipheral chain because of isospin conservation. See Fig. 11. If we work with an amplitude of definite I_t, inclusion of isospin then just introduces the parameter I_t in our equations. Using a subscript and a superscript to denote isospin in the t channel and s channel, respectively, we get in place of (II.9) and (II.10),

$$A_I(s,u) = s^{\alpha_I} \phi_{\alpha_I}(u) , \qquad\qquad (II.27)$$

where

$$\phi_{\alpha_I}(u) = \frac{1}{16\pi^3(\alpha_I + 1)(2u)^{\alpha_I+1}} \int_0^\infty du' \, \phi_{\alpha_I}(u') \int_{4\mu^2} ds_0 \, A_I^R(s_0,-u',-u)$$

$$\times \; \frac{\{s_0 + u + u' - [(s_0 + u + u')^2 - 4uu']^{\frac{1}{2}}\}^{\alpha_I+1}}{(u' + \mu^2)^2} , \qquad (II.28)$$

and

$$A_I^R(s_0,-u',-u) = \sum_T C_I^T A^{R^T}(s_0, -u',-u) , \qquad (II.29)$$

with C_I^T being the appropriate isospin crossing matrix. To obtain
$A(s,u)$ for any physical process, one has to take only the appropriate
linear combination of $A_I(s,u)$. For later applications, we here list
the π-π and π-N isospin crossing matrices:

$$(C_I^T)_{\pi\pi} = (C^T_I)_{\pi\pi} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{3} & 1 & \frac{5}{3} \\ \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{2} & -\frac{5}{6} \\ \frac{1}{3} & -\frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{6} \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \text{(II.30a)}$$

$$(C_I^T)_{\pi N} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{(6)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{3} & \frac{2(6)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{3} \\ \frac{2}{3} & -\frac{2}{3} \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \text{(II.30b)}$$

$$(C^T_I)_{\pi N} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{(6)^{\frac{1}{2}}} & 1 \\ \frac{1}{(6)^{\frac{1}{2}}} & -\frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix}. \qquad \text{(II.30c)}$$

Because the amplitude is proportional to s^{α_I}, in the high
energy limit, $\langle n \rangle$, $\dfrac{\overline{E}_{N \text{ or } \pi}}{E_{inc}}$, $\langle |k_T| \rangle$, and $\langle k^2 \rangle$ can be calculated to
a good approximation by considering just the $I_t = 0$ case.

III. π-π ELASTIC CROSS SECTIONS

From the discussion in Sec. II, we see that the basic equation

to solve is (II.28). To accomplish this we need a knowledge of

$A^R_I(s_0, -u', -u)$, where, by (II.5) and (II.29),

$$A^R_I(s_0, \mu^2, \mu^2) = 2|q^{cm}(\mu^2, \mu^2)| \, s_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_T C_I^T \, \sigma^{e\ell^T}(s_0, \mu^2, \mu^2).$$

$$(III.1)$$

As discussed in Sec. II, there is no unique or a priori correct way of

continuing A^R_I off the mass shell; in Sec. V we will consider several

methods of continuation. We now discuss what to use for $A^R_I(s_0, \mu^2, \mu^2)$.

At present, there is no π-π scattering experiment; so there

is no direct π-π data. Our present experimental knowledge about π-π

scattering comes from studying $\pi N \to \pi\pi N$ reactions using an OPE model.

However, we need to know $\sigma^{e\ell^T}(s_0)$ for all three T's. At present,

we do not have sufficient data to reliably extract this information.

Besides, there is no unique way of using an OPE model to extract

π-π cross sections. In this paper, we use the Veneziano model for

π-π scattering[9] to give us $A^R_I(s_0, \mu^2, \mu^2)$ in the resonance region.

At low energy, the π-π elastic cross section is approximately

equal to the π-π total cross section (the ρ and f resonances

decay totally or almost totally into 2π), which by the Optical Theorem

is   equal to the absorptive part of the forward elastic amplitude.

We represent this elastic amplitude by the π-π Veneziano formula.

Therefore, $A^R(s_0, \mu^2, \mu^2)$ is just a sum of δ functions. In our

calculations, we cut off the s_0 integration at the mass of the g

resonance and include the ρ, f, and g contributions (and their daughters'). In Sec. V we will discuss the implications of the s_0 cut off. The inclusion of the g contribution is somewhat questionable, since its dominant decay mode may be 4π. We include it as a compensation for the higher s_0 contribution, which we have neglected. In any case, including or excluding the g does not change any essential features of the model, but only changes somewhat the numbers obtained.

Following Shapiro,[9] if we use a single Veneziano term, normalized to $\Gamma_{\rho\pi\pi}$ = 125 MeV and m_ρ = 764 MeV, and require the correct I = L = 0 π-π phase shifts, then we get the following representation for the π-π amplitude with s, t, and $\bar{u}$ being the usual Mandelstam invariants (we put a bar over u so as not to confuse this $\bar{u}$ with the previous u):

$$T_s^0 = \frac{3}{2} F(s,t) + \frac{3}{2} F(s,\bar{u}) - \frac{1}{2} F(t,\bar{u}) , \qquad \text{(III.2a)}$$

$$T_s^1 = F(s,t) - F(s,\bar{u}) , \qquad \text{(III.2b)}$$

$$T_s^2 = F(t,\bar{u}) , \qquad \text{(III.2c)}$$

where

$$F(x,y) = \beta \frac{\Gamma[1 - \alpha(x)] \, \Gamma[1 - \alpha(y)]}{\Gamma[1 - \alpha(x) - \alpha(y)]} , \qquad \text{(III.3)}$$

where $\alpha(x) = a + bx$, with

$$a = 0.48 , \qquad \text{(III.4a)}$$

$$b = 0.90 \text{ GeV}^{-2} , \qquad \text{(III.4b)}$$

$$\beta = -1.22 .^{10} \qquad \text{(III.4c)}$$

Equations (II.29), (II.30a), (III.2), (III.3), and (III.4) together imply[11]

$$A_0^R(s_0, \mu^2, \mu^2)$$

$$= 16\pi \left(-\frac{\pi\beta}{b} \right) [0.71 \, \delta(s_0 - m_\rho^2) + 1.13 \, \delta(s_0 - m_f^2) + 1.27 \, \delta(s_0 - m_g^2)] ,$$

$$\text{(III.5a)}$$

$$A_1^R(s_0, \mu^2, \mu^2)$$

$$= 16\pi \left(-\frac{\pi\beta}{b} \right) [0.48 \, \delta(s_0 - m_\rho^2) + 0.71 \, \delta(s_0 - m_f^2) + 0.88 \, \delta(s_0 - m_g^2)] ,$$

$$\text{(III.5b)}$$

$$A_2^R(s_0, \mu^2, \mu^2)$$

$$= 16\pi \left(-\frac{\pi\beta}{b} \right) [0.03 \, \delta(s_0 - m_\rho^2) - 0.11 \, \delta(s_0 - m_f^2) + 0.09 \, \delta(s_0 - m_g^2)] .$$

$$\text{(III.5c)}$$

IV. PREDICTIONS OF MODEL AND COMPARISON WITH EXPERIMENT

When ABFST first proposed this multiperipheral model, they conjectured that the important contribution to the kernel in (II.28) comes from the low energy (the resonance region) π-π elastic cross section and that the dependence of the latter on the mass of the virtual pions is negligible. In this section, we calculate the predictions of this model under these two approximations. In (II.28), we put a cut off for the s_0 integration at m_g^2 and replace $A^R_I(s_0, -u', -u)$ by $A^R_I(s_0, \mu^2, \mu^2)$. In Sec. V, we will consider several modifications of the model by the relaxation of these approximations, but we will find that none of these is satisfactory.

Our calculations show the Regge trajectory intercepts to be

$$\alpha_{I=0} = 0.30 , \tag{IV.1a}$$

$$\alpha_{I=1} = 0.16 , \tag{IV.1b}$$

the average multiplicity to be

$$\langle n \rangle \approx 0.74 \ln s, \text{[12]} \tag{IV.1c}$$

the elasticity to be

$$\frac{\bar{E}_N}{E_{inc}} = 0.69 , \tag{IV.1d}$$

the average transverse momentum of the produced pion pairs to be

$$\langle |k_T| \rangle_{\text{pion-pair}} = 0.43 \text{ GeV/c} , \tag{IV.1e}$$

and the average invariant mass squared for each pair of outgoing pions
to be

$$\langle k^2 \rangle = 0.84 \text{ GeV}^2 .$$ (IV.1f)

The first three numbers given are the same for all scattering processes.
The last three numbers are for N-N scattering;[13] these corresponding
numbers for π-π scattering[14] are $\frac{\bar{E}_\pi}{E_{inc}} = 0.43$,

$\langle |k_T| \rangle_{pion-pair} = 0.39 \text{ GeV/c}$, and $\langle k^2 \rangle = 0.81 \text{ GeV}^2$. The pion
transverse momentum distribution for N-N scattering is plotted in
Fig. 12. We do not have an explanation for the peak at 0.9 GeV/c.
The corresponding experimental numbers are

$$\alpha_{I=0} \approx 1.0 ,$$ (IV.2a)

$$\alpha_{I=1} \approx 0.5 ,$$ (IV.2b)

$$\langle n \rangle \approx 1 \ln s - 2 \ln s,\text{[15]}$$ (IV.2c)

$$\frac{\bar{E}_N}{E_{inc}} \approx 0.5\text{-}0.6,\text{[16]}$$ (IV.2d)

$$\langle |k_T| \rangle_{one\ pion} \approx 0.30\text{-}0.35 \text{ GeV/c},\text{[17]}$$ (IV.2e)

$$\langle k^2 \rangle \approx 0.7\text{-}0.8 \text{ GeV}^2.\text{[18]}$$ (IV.2f)

Comparing these two sets of numbers, we see that the model's
predictions for elasticity, average transverse momentum, average
invariant mass, and possibly average multiplicity are close to the
experimental values, but the predictions for the Regge trajectory

intercepts are too small. To generate the experimental P and ρ

intercepts, the kernel of our integral equation (II.28) must be multiplied

by a factor of 5 and 2.5, respectively. If we increase the kernel

strength by a factor of 5, then we get

$$\alpha_{I=0} \ = \ 1.00 \ , \tag{IV.3a}$$

$$\alpha_{I=1} \ = \ 0.78 \ , \tag{IV.3b}$$

$$\langle n \rangle \ = \ 1.04 \ \ell n \ s \ , \tag{IV.3c}$$

$$\frac{\overline{E}_N}{E_{inc}} \ = \ 0.62 \ , \tag{IV.3d}$$

$$\langle |k_T| \rangle_{pion\text{-}pair} \ = \ 0.48 \ \text{GeV/c} \ , \tag{IV.3e}$$

$$\langle k^2 \rangle \ = \ 0.76 \ \text{GeV}^2 \ . \tag{IV.3f}$$

We conclude that with the present approximations, the kernel in our

model is of insufficient strength.

Although we use the Veneziano formula for $A^R_I(s_0,\mu^2,\mu^2)$

to get the above results, these results are actually almost independent

of the detailed shape of $A^R_I(s_0,\mu^2,\mu^2)$. Instead of evaluating

(III.5a) with δ functions, we have substituted Breit-Wigner forms,

normalizing to the constants in (III.5a), and got almost the same

answers.

V. POSSIBLE MODIFICATIONS OF THE MODEL

A. Inclusion of High s_0 Contribution

The most obvious way of modifying our calculations is to raise the s_0 cut off, $s_{0_{max}}$, in (II.28), for this will surely increase our kernel strength. This was the approach of Ball and Marchesini.[3] However, increasing $s_{0_{max}}$ increases the average subenergy of each pair of outgoing pions and so decreases the average multiplicity. But our multiplicity is already smaller than the experimental value. In their calculations, Ball and Marchesini can get $\alpha_{I=0} = 0.95$, but at the expense of getting $\langle n \rangle \approx 0.2 \, \ell n \, s$. Furthermore, increasing $s_{0_{max}}$ increases the average momentum transfers. One way to see this is to use a u' cut off, u'_c, in (II.28), and observe the change in α_I as u'_c is varied. If we let $\sigma_{I_t=0}(s_0) = \dfrac{5 \text{ mb}}{\ell n \, s_0}$ for $s_0 > m_g^2$, then we obtain the result shown in the table below.

$s_{0_{max}}$ (GeV^2)	$m_g^2 = 2.7$			12.7			52.7		
u'_c (GeV^2/c^2)	∞	2	5	∞	2	5	∞	2	5
$\alpha_{I=0}$	0.30	0.275	0.28	0.40	0.34	0.38	0.55	0.43	0.48
% of total contribution	100%	94%	95%	100%	84%	95%	100%	71%	83%

The last row represents the ratio of the contribution with a cut off in u' to that without a cut off in u'. These numbers are

obtained by varying the kernel strength to get the appropriate α's. This increase in average momentum transfers undermines the whole basis of the ABFST multiperipheral model--small momentum transfers and consequently the dominance of pion exchange. We therefore conclude that the inclusion of the large subenergy contribution is not the solution to our problem. If there is a modification which can fix up this model, it must damp out the large s_0 contribution.[19] This also means that our model will be independent of $s_{0_{max}}$ as long as $s_{0_{max}}$ is above the resonance region.

B. Off-Shell Continuation

As there is no unique or a priori correct off-shell continuation of $A^R(s_0,\mu^2,\mu^2)$, we   consider several methods of continuation.

Since the Mandelstam invariants satisfy the usual constraints

$$s + t + \bar{u} = \sum_{i=1}^{4} m_i^2 , \qquad (V.1)$$

the Veneziano representation (III.2) has a natural off-shell continuation by requiring $\bar{u}$ at fixed s ($t = 0$ in our case of forward scattering) to always satisfy (V.1) when the m_i^2 are taken off-shell. Assuming the Veneziano coupling constant, β, does not vary as we go off-shell, instead of (III.5) we now have

$$A_0^R(s_0, -u', -u) = 16\pi \left(-\frac{\pi\beta}{b}\right) \{[0.48 - 0.45\ \bar{u}]\delta(s_0 - m_\rho^2)$$

$$+ [0.72 - 0.40\ \bar{u}^2 - 0.88\ \bar{u}]\ \delta(s_0 - m_f^2)$$

$$+ [0.87 - 0.25\ \bar{u}^3 - 0.9\ \bar{u}^2 - 1.2\ \bar{u}]\ \delta(s_0 - m_g^2)\} , \qquad (V.2a)$$

$$A_1^R(s_0, -u', -u) =$$

$$= 16\pi \left(-\frac{\pi\beta}{b}\right) \{0.48\ \delta(s_0 - m_\rho^2) + 0.71\ \delta(s_0 - m_f^2) + 0.88\ \delta(s_0 - m_g^2)\},$$

$$(V.2b)$$

$$A_2^R(s_0, -u', -u) = 16\pi \left(-\frac{\pi\beta}{b}\right) \{[0.48 + 0.90\ \bar{u}]\ \delta(s_0 - m_\rho^2)$$

$$+ [0.81\ \bar{u}^2 + 1.76\ \bar{u} + 0.71]\ \delta(s_0 - m_f^2)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2}[\bar{u}^3 + 3.6\ \bar{u}^2 + 5.0\ \bar{u} + 1.8]\ \delta(s_0 - m_g^2)\} , \qquad (V.2c)$$

where

$$\bar{u} = -2(u + u') - s_0 . \qquad (V.3)$$

From (V.2a) and (V.3), we see that this continuation increases A_0^R.
However, as is evident from (V.2a) and (V.3), the average momentum
transfers are also drastically increased and so the basis of a multi-
peripheral model with pion pole dominance is undermined. Furthermore,
this continuation leaves A_1^R unchanged, because
$A_1^R = \mathrm{Im}\ T_1^t = \mathrm{Im}\ F(s, t=0)$, which is independent of $\bar{u}$, and it causes
A_2^R to be negative when u or $u' \to \infty$, as is evident from (V.2c)
and (V.3). This off-shell continuation is therefore unsatisfactory.

The difficulty of increasing the average momentum transfers is again encountered if in (III.1) we use the off-shell partial cross sections obtained from the Born approximation (meaning lowest-order perturbative diagram) and related to the on-shell partial cross sections by[20]

$$\sigma^{\ell}(s_0, u', u) = \left[\frac{q(u', u)}{q}\right]^{2\ell-1} \sigma^{\ell}(s_0) , \qquad (V.4)$$

where

$$q = \left(\frac{s_0 - 4\mu^2}{4}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} , \qquad (V.5a)$$

and

$$q(u', u) = \left[\frac{s_0^2 + 2s_0(u + u') + (u' - u)^2}{4s_0}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} . \qquad (V.5b)$$

Equation (V.4) implies that the partial cross sections blow up as u or $u' \to \infty$ for $\ell \geq 1$. This same difficulty of increasing momentum transfers also arises if in (III.1) we continue $|\underset{\sim}{q}^{cm}|$ off-shell.

Wolf[6] has successfully fit single and double pion production for $|t| < 1$ GeV^2/c^2 and laboratory momentum between 1.6 and 20 GeV/c by using an OPE model with the Benecke-Dürr off-shell continuation of partial cross sections:[21]

$$\sigma^{\ell}(s_0, u) = \frac{u_{\ell}(q_u R)}{u_{\ell}(qR)} \cdot \frac{q}{q_u} \cdot \sigma^{\ell}(s_0) , \qquad (V.6)$$

where q_u is given by (V.5b) with $u' = -\mu^2$, R is a parameter (one for each ℓ) determined by fitting data, and

$$u_\ell(x) = \frac{1}{2x^2} Q_\ell \left(1 + \frac{1}{2x^2} \right) , \tag{V.7}$$

where $Q_\ell(z)$ are Legendre functions of the second kind. Using the values of R obtained by Wolf, we find $\dfrac{\sigma^\ell(s_0, u)}{\sigma^\ell(s_0)} < 1$ for

$\ell = 0,1,2,3$ and for almost all relevant values of s_0 and u. Although in OPE only one pion is off-shell, we believe taking two pions off-shell by replacing q_u by $q(u',u)$ will probably make the off-shell cross sections even smaller.

Another method of continuation is the Lovelace-Wagner unitarized π-π Veneziano formula.[22] For some values of s_0 and u this method gives off-shell partial cross sections that are larger than the on-shell partial cross sections, but for the important values of s_0 and u, its off-shell partial cross sections are smaller than the on-shell partial cross sections. Therefore, this continuation again decreases the kernel strength.

Thus, the methods of off-shell continuation that we have studied either decrease the kernel strength or drastically increase the momentum transfers.

C. Inclusion of Interference Terms

In a general production process in which many particles are
produced, there are many ways of arranging the final particles along the
multiperipheral chain, with all these arrangements corresponding to the
same physical process. The total amplitude is then actually a super-
position of amplitudes. Thus in calculating production cross sections
or n-particle contributions to the unitarity sum, interference terms
appear. These interference terms correspond to non-planar diagrams,
as shown in Fig. 13. In all our discussion so far, we have neglected
such interference terms, assuming that when the momentum transfers are
small for one arrangement, they must be large for all other arrangements.
It may turn out that this assumption is a poor one. Including inter-
ference terms may increase the kernel strength, but at present no one
has calculated how large a contribution will come from such terms.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

The predictions of the ABFST multiperipheral model for elasticity, average transverse momentum, average invariant mass, and possibly average multiplicity are in the neighborhood of the experimental values. The model's predictions of trajectory heights are, however, much too small, corresponding to a kernel strength which is too weak by a factor of $2\frac{1}{2}$ to 5.

What is the explanation for the inadequate strength of our kernel? We have seen that the explanation is not due to our neglect of the high-subenergy contribution, since the inclusion of the latter decreases the average multiplicity and increases the average momentum transfers. A possible explanation lies in the off-shell continuation of the π-π cross sections, but we have seen that it is not easy for an off-shell continuation to increase the kernel strength without simultaneously increasing the average momentum transfers. The inclusion of K's, η's, and other particles, as well as π's, will definitely add to our kernel strength. Since experimentally the large majority of produced particles in high energy collisions are π's, this added strength is probably not significant. Furthermore, the use of unmodified propagators for more massive exchanged particles is probably an overestimate of their effect, since these more massive poles are farther from the physical region.

A promising possibility is the inclusion of interference terms, but at present we have not calculated the sign and the strength of such terms. Another possibility is that the physical π-π cross sections may be larger than those given by our Veneziano prescription;

this is especially important if it turns out that there are a strong threshold effect and/or a strong, low mass s-wave resonance. On this point we shall have to wait until we have more information on π-π scattering.

It is interesting to note that even when we increase our kernel strength by a factor of 5 to get the output Pomeranchuk pole at 1.0, the average multiplicity is only 1.04 $\ln$ s [see (IV.3c)]. Our model seems to indicate that the average multiplicity for N-N scattering is closer to 1 $\ln$ s than to 2 $\ln$ s (see Ref. 15).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

FOOTNOTES AND REFERENCES

* This work was supported in part by the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

1. G. F. Chew and A. Pignotti, Phys. Rev. 176, 2112 (1968); G. F. Chew,

   M.L.Goldberger, and F. E. Low, Phys. Rev. Letters 22, 208 (1969);

   I. G. Halliday, Nuovo Cimento 60A, 177 (1969); I. G. Halliday and

   L. M. Saunders, Nuovo Cimento 60A, 494 (1969); L. Caneschi and

   A. Pignotti, Phys. Rev. 180, 1525 (1969); L. Caneschi and A. Pignotti,

   Phys. Rev. 184, 1915 (1969); G. F. Chew and W. R. Frazer, Phys. Rev.

   181, 1914 (1969); J. Ball and G. Marchesini, A Bethe-Salpeter

   Approach to the Multi-Regge Bootstrap, University of Utah preprint

   (1969); S. Pinsky and W. I. Weisberger, A Multiperipheral Integral

   Equation for Forward Scattering and its Properties, Princeton

   University preprint, 1969.

2. See, e.g., S.-J. Chang and R. Rajaraman, Phys. Rev. 183, 1517

   (1969); Aachen-Berlin-Bonn-CERN-Warsaw Collaboration, Nucl. Phys.

   B8, 471 (1968).

3. G. F. Chew, T. W. Rogers, and D. R. Snider, Multiperipheral Dynamics

   with Pion-Pole Dominance, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory Report

   (to be submitted to Phys. Rev.); J. S. Ball and G. Marchesini,

   Dynamical Regge Trajectories From the Multiperipheral Model,

   Lawrence Radiation Laboratory Report UCRL-19282 (1969), Phys. Rev.

   (to be published).

4. L. Bertocchi, S. Fubini, and M. Tonin, Nuovo Cimento 25, 626 (1962);

   D. Amati, A. Stanghellini, and S. Fubini, Nuovo Cimento 26, 896

   (1962). This model will be hereafter called the ABFST multiperipheral

   model.

5. See, e.g., article by P. V. Ramana Murthy, in Symposium on Multi-particle Production, Argonne National Laboratory preprint ANL/HEP 6909 (1968).

6. See, e.g., G. Wolf, Phys. Rev. $\underline{182}$, 1538 (1969).

7. AFS calls this the inelasticity, but our notation agrees with that of most authors.

8. AFS left out a factor of $x^{\alpha} y^{\alpha}$ in their expression for F.

9. J. A. Shapiro, Phys. Rev. $\underline{179}$, 1345 (1969).

10. Shapiro normalized to $\Gamma_{\rho} = 112$ MeV; he found $\beta = -1.09$.

11. Note that there is a difference of (16π) in the normalization used by AFS in Ref. 4 and Shapiro in Ref. 8:
$$A^{AFS}(s,t) \equiv (16\pi) \, A^{Shapiro}(s,t).$$

12. Using (II.12) and (II.26), we have also calculated the constant term in the expression for $\langle n \rangle$. We found $\langle n \rangle_{\pi-\pi} = 3.7 + 0.74 \, \ell n \, s$ and $\langle n \rangle_{N-N} = 1.7 + 0.74 \, \ell n \, s$. However, these constant terms are fairly sensitive to the value of α. Note that to calculate the constant term, we have to solve the inhomogeneous integral Eq. (II.7), since there is an arbitrary normalization in the solution of the homogeneous integral equation.

13. For N-N scattering, we need to know the π-N elastic cross sections, as is evident from (II.23) and (II.20). We use those given in G. Kallen, Elementary Particle Physics (Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., Reading, Mass., 1964).

14. For π-π scattering, we also found $\alpha_{I=2} = -0.80$. In calculating this number, we have included only the ρ contribution, since in

this channel, the Veneziano formula gives a negative contribution

from the f resonance [see (III.5c)], and since cross sections

should be intrinsically positive.

15. Experimentally this number is not precisely known. From experi-

mental production cross sections at laboratory energies, Chew and

Pignotti (see Ref. 1) conclude that $\langle n \rangle \approx 1.1 \ell n$ s. On the

other hand, cosmic ray data give $\langle n \rangle \approx 2 \ell n$ s for the average

number of produced pions. See P. V. Ramana Murthy, ibid.

However, cosmic ray data are most

likely overestimating the average multiplicity, because of the use

of heavy nuclei as targets. In a preliminary analysis of their

new cosmic ray data, L. W. Jones et al., found that in the 100-400

GeV energy range the average multiplicity with a liquid hydrogen

target is about 70% of that with a carbon target. See L. W. Jones

et al., Proton-Proton Interactions Above 100 GeV, University of

Michigan preprint, 1969.

16. P. V. Ramana Murthy, ibid.; F. Turkot, in Proceedings of the Topical

Conference on High Energy Collisions, CERN 68-7 (1968).

17. G. Cocconi, Nuovo Cimento 57A, 837 (1968); P. V. Ramana Murthy,

ibid.; Aachen-Berlin-Bonn-CERN-Cracow-Heidelberg-Warsaw

Collaboration, Nucl. Phys. B13, 571 (1969).

18. Experimentally this number is not precisely known, but experiments

at laboratory energies with low multiplicity indicate that the

invariant mass is slightly above m_ρ. See, e.g., Aachen-Berlin-Bonn-

CERN-Warsaw Collaboration, ibid.; I. R. Kenyon, Nucl. Phys. B13,

255 (1969).

19. This point is discussed in detail by Chew, Rogers, and Snider in

     Ref. 3.

20. See, e.g., H. Pilkuhn, The Interactions of Hadrons (North-Holland

     Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1967), pp. 279 ff.

21. J. Benecke and H. P. Dürr, Nuovo Cimento 56A, 269 (1968).

22. C. Lovelace, in Proceedings of the Conference on $\pi\pi$ and Kπ

     Interactions (Argonne National Laboratory, 1969); F. Wagner, Nuovo

     Cimento 64A, 189 (1969).

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Fig. 1. Diagram for multi-Regge amplitude. Wavy lines correspond to

Regge poles; $s \equiv (P + P')^2$; $s_1 \equiv (P_0 + P_1)^2, \cdots, s_n \equiv (P_{n-1} + P_n)^2$.

Fig. 2. Diagram for ABFST multiperipheral amplitude. Solid lines and

wavy lines correspond to on-mass-shell and off-mass-shell

pions, respectively; $t_i = q_i^2$, for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, n$.

Fig. 3. Unitarity relates the production amplitudes to the forward

absorptive part of the elastic amplitude.

Fig. 4. Schematic representation of Eq. (II.13).

Fig. 5. Diagram used in calculating elasticity; $s_0 \equiv k^2$.

Fig. 6. Diagram used in calculating transverse momentum distribution.

Fig. 7. Diagram for π-N scattering.

Fig. 8. Schematic representation of Eq. (II.25).

Fig. 9. Diagram for N-N scattering.

Fig. 10. Schematic representation of Eq. (II.28).

Fig. 11. A definite isospin in the t channel is carried through the

multiperipheral chain because of isospin conservation.

Fig. 12. Transverse momentum distribution of pion pairs.

Fig. 13. Non-planar diagrams corresponding to interference terms.

XBL701-2106

Fig. 1.

XBL701-2107

Fig. 2.

XBL701-2281

Fig. 3.

XBL701-2108

Fig. 4.

XBL 701-2109

Fig. 5.

XBL701-2110

Fig. 6.

XBL701-2III

Fig. 7.

XBL701-2112

Fig. 8.

Fig. 9.

XBL701-2114

Fig. 10.

XBL 701-2115

Fig. 11.

Fig. 12.

XBL701-2116

XBL 701-2117

Fig. 13.