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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 $\pi-\pi$ amplitude, with a cut off at the mass of the $g$ resonance for the input kernel, and neglecting off-shell effects. We find $\alpha_p(0) = 0.30$, $\alpha_p(0) = 0.16$, an average multiplicity growing as $0.74 \ln s$, 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. However, the multi-Regge amplitude can only be expected to approximate the physical production amplitude when all subenergies are large (\(\gg 1 \text{ GeV}\)), whereas experimentally the important subenergies are of the order of or less than 1 GeV. 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 have made the kinematic approximation that

\[
s \propto s_1 s_2 \cdots s_n.
\]  

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 in another model of production processes: the multiperipheral model with pion pole dominance first proposed by Amati, Bertocchi, Fubini, Stanghellini, and Tonin in 1962. 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. 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; 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 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), 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, 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 $\pi-\pi$ 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 \(\pi-\pi\) 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

\[
T_n(P, P'; k_{01}, k_{02}, k_{11}, k_{12}, \ldots, k_{n1}, k_{n2}) = \frac{1}{((q_1^2 - \mu^2)(q_2^2 - \mu^2) \cdots (q_n^2 - \mu^2))} \chi(T^R(P, q_1; k_{01}, k_{02}) T^R(q_1, q_2; k_{11}, k_{12}) \cdots T^R(q_{n-1}, q_n; k_{n-11}, k_{n-12}) T^R(q_n, P'; k_{n1}, k_{n2})) ,
\]

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, we can derive a recursion relation for the \((2n+2)\) particle contribution to the off-shell absorptive part of the forward elastic amplitude,

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

\[ Q(s,u; s',u'; s_0) = \frac{\pi}{2(s^2 + 4\mu^2 u')^{3/2}} \theta(u's' + u's^2 - \mu^2 s_0^2 - SS's_0 + 4\mu^2 uu') \theta(s_0^2 - s'^2 - s_0^2), \]

\( (II.3) \)

where

\[
\begin{align*}
S &= s + u - \mu^2, \\
S' &= s' + u' - \mu^2, \\
S_0 &= s_0 + u + u'.
\end{align*}
\]

\( (II.4) \)

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

\[
A^R(s_0,\mu^2,\mu^2) = 2|q_{cm}|s_0^{1/2}\sigma^e(s_0,\mu^2,\mu^2),
\]

\( (II.5) \)

with \( |q_{cm}| \) 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

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

\( (II.6) \)
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):

$$A(s,u) = A^R(s,u) + \frac{1}{16\pi^3} \int_0^{s_0} ds' \int_0^s \frac{ds'}{s} \int_0^\infty \frac{d\mu'}{s'} \frac{A^R(s_0, u', u) A(s', u')}{(u' + \mu^2)^2}.$$  

(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 $s_0_{\text{max}}$ such that the contribution from $s_0 > s_0_{\text{max}}$ is negligible. For asymptotic $s$, we can therefore let the upper integration limit for $s_0$ be either $s_0_{\text{max}}$ or $\infty$. AFS conjectured that $s_0_{\text{max}}$ 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,

$$A(s,u)$$

$$\approx \frac{1}{16\pi^3} \int_0^s ds_0 \int_0^s \frac{ds'}{s} \int_0^\infty du' \frac{A^R(s_0,-u',-u) A(s',u')}{(u' + \mu^2)^2}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (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

$$A(s,u) = s^\alpha \phi(u).$$  \hspace{1cm} (II.9)

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

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

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

From (II.9), we see that the model predicts Regge asymptotic behavior, with $\alpha$ being the position of the Regge pole. Equation (II.10) has a solution only for certain values of $\alpha$, 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

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

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

$$\langle n \rangle = 2 \left[ \frac{\partial \ln s}{\partial \ln g} \right] g=1 + 2 \left[ g \frac{\partial}{\partial g} (\ln \phi_{\text{physical}}) \right] g=1.$$  \hspace{1cm} (II.12)

Thus the model predicts that average multiplicity grows as $\ln s$ 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 $\bar{E}_{\text{pion-pair}}$ be the average laboratory
energy of the primary outgoing pair of pions and $E_{\text{inc}}$ be the laboratory energy of the incident particle, then one can show

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

$$x \int_0^{x^\mu} dx(1 - x)x^\alpha,$$  \hspace{1cm} (II.13)

where

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

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

$$E_{\text{one pion}} = \frac{1}{2} E_{\text{pion-pair}}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (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\(^8\)

\[
F = (k^2 + k_T^2)^{1+\alpha} \int \int du' du'' \frac{A^R(k^2, u', u'') \varphi(u') \varphi(u'')}{(u' + \mu^2)^2 (u'' + \mu^2)^2}
\]

\[
\chi \int \int dx dy x'^\alpha y'^\alpha T[u' - (k^2 + k_T^2) x(1 + y); u'' - (k^2 + k_T^2) y(1 + x); k_T^2],
\]

(II.15)

and

\[
T(a, b, c) = \frac{\Theta(-a^2 - b^2 - c^2 + 2ab + 2ac + 2bc)}{(-a^2 - b^2 - c^2 + 2ab + 2ac + 2bc)^{3/2}},
\]

(II.16)

\[
x = \frac{s'}{s_1}, \quad y = \frac{s''}{s_2},
\]

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, \( s^{1/2} \). But as noted by AFS,\(^4\) when \( k_0 \ll s^{1/2} \),
then these upper limits are outside the support of the \( \Theta \) function.
For \( k_0 \ll s^{1/2} \), \( F \) is therefore independent of \( k_0 \) and \( s^{1/2} \), i.e.,

\[
F = F(k^2, k_T^2).
\]

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

$$A_{\pi N}(s, u) = A_{\pi N}^R(s, u) + \frac{1}{8\pi} \int_0^\infty ds_0 \int_0^\infty ds' du' \bigg[ \frac{(s' + u' + u' - 4uu' - [(s_0 + u + u')]^2)^{\alpha+1}}{(u' + \mu^2)^2} \bigg] \cdot$$

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

$$A_{\pi N}(s, u) = s^\alpha \phi_{\pi N}^\alpha(u)$$

where

$$\phi_{\pi N}^\alpha(u) = \frac{1}{16\pi^3(\alpha + 1)(2u)^{\alpha+1}} \int_0^\infty du' \phi_{\pi N}^\alpha(u') \int_0^\infty ds_0 \bigg[ \frac{(s_0 + u + u')^2 - 4uu' \mu^2}{(u' + \mu^2)^2} \bigg]^{\alpha+1}$$

where $\alpha$ is determined by the integral equation for $\pi$-$\pi$ 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

\[ A_{NN}(s, u) = A_{NN}^R(s, u) + \frac{1}{8\pi} \int_0^{\mu+m} ds_0 \int ds' du' \]

\[ \chi \frac{A_{\pi N}^R(s_0, -u', -u) A_{\pi N}(s', u') Q(s, u; s', u'; s_0)}{(u' + \mu^2)^2} \]

where \( A_{\pi N} \) is given by \( A_{\pi N}(s, -m^2) \). Making approximations as before, we get

\[ A_{NN}(s, u) = s^\alpha \phi_{\alpha, NN}(u) \]

where

\[ \phi_{\alpha, NN}(u) = \frac{1}{16\pi^2(\alpha + 1)(2u)^{\alpha+1}} \int_0^\infty du' \phi_{\alpha, NN}(u') \int ds_0 \]

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

where \( \alpha \) is again determined by (II.10) for \( \pi-\pi \) scattering.

Similarly, the ratio of the laboratory energy of the outgoing N-\( \pi \) pair to the laboratory energy of the incident \( N \) can be easily shown to be
If we now assume that the N-π pair is the decay product of \( \Delta(1236) \), then on the average \( N \) carries away 78% of the laboratory energy of \( \Delta(1236) \). The elasticity is therefore

\[
\frac{E_{N-\pi\text{pair}}}{E_{\text{inc}}} = 0.78 \frac{E_{N-\pi\text{pair}}}{E_{\text{inc}}}. \tag{II.25}
\]

Note that if we had used a more massive N-π 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

\[
\langle n \rangle_{N-N} = 2 + 2 \left[ g \frac{\partial \ln \sigma_{N-N}}{\partial \ln s} \right]_{g=1} + 2 \left[ g \frac{\partial}{\partial g} (\ln \sigma_{N-N}^{\text{Physical}}) \right]_{g=1}. \tag{II.26}
\]
The transverse-momentum and invariant-mass-squared distributions are
given by (II.15) with the substitution of $\varphi_{\alpha}(u') \varphi_{\alpha}(u'')$ for
$\varphi_{\alpha}(u') \varphi_{\alpha}(u'')$.

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),

\[ A_I(s,u) = s^{\alpha_I} \varphi_{\alpha_I}(u), \quad \text{(II.27)} \]

where

\[ \varphi_{\alpha_I}(u) = \frac{1}{16\pi^2(\alpha_I + 1)(2u)} \int_0^\infty du' \varphi_{\alpha_I}(u') \int_0^{4\mu^2} ds_0 A_I^R(s_0, -u', -u) \]

\[ \chi \frac{(s_0 + u + u' - [(s_0 + u + u')^2 - 4uu']^{1/2})^{\alpha_I + 1}}{(u' + \mu^2)^2} \quad \text{(II.28)} \]

and

\[ A_I^R(s_0, -u', -u) = \sum_T C_I^T A_I^T(s_0, -u', -u), \quad \text{(II.29)} \]
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 \( \pi^-\pi^- \) and \( \pi^-N \) isospin crossing matrices:

\[
(C_I^T)_{\pi\pi} = (C_I^T)_{\pi\pi} = \begin{pmatrix}
\frac{1}{3} & 1 & \frac{5}{3} \\
\frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{5}{6} \\
\frac{1}{3} & -\frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{6}
\end{pmatrix}, \quad (II.30a)
\]

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

\[
(C_I^T)_{\pi N} = \begin{pmatrix}
\frac{1}{(6)^{\frac{1}{2}}} & 1 \\
\frac{1}{(6)^{\frac{3}{2}}} & \frac{1}{2}
\end{pmatrix}. \quad (II.30c)
\]

Because the amplitude is proportional to \( s_I^\alpha \), in the high
energy limit, \( \langle n \rangle, \frac{\overline{F}_N}{E_{inc}}, \langle |\ell_\pi| \rangle, \) and \( \langle k^2 \rangle \) can be calculated to
a good approximation by considering just the \( I_t = 0 \) case.
III. $\pi-\pi$ 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),

$$A^R_I(s_0,\mu^2,\mu^2) = 2|\frac{\text{cm}}{C_\lambda}(\mu^2,\mu^2)| s_0^{1/2} \sum_T C^T_I o_{eT}^T(s_0,\mu^2,\mu^2).$$

(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 $\pi-\pi$ scattering experiment; so there is no direct $\pi-\pi$ data. Our present experimental knowledge about $\pi-\pi$ scattering comes from studying $\pi N \rightarrow \pi N$ reactions using an OPE model. However, we need to know $o_{eT}^T(s_0)$ 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 $\pi-\pi$ cross sections. In this paper, we use the Veneziano model for $\pi-\pi$ scattering to give us $A^R_I(s_0,\mu^2,\mu^2)$ in the resonance region.

At low energy, the $\pi-\pi$ elastic cross section is approximately equal to the $\pi-\pi$ total cross section (the $\rho$ and $f$ resonances decay totally or almost totally into $2\pi$), which by the Optical Theorem is equal to the absorptive part of the forward elastic amplitude. We represent this elastic amplitude by the $\pi-\pi$ Veneziano formula. Therefore, $A^R(s_0,\mu^2,\mu^2)$ is just a sum of 5 functions. In our calculations, we cut off the $s_0$ integration at the mass of the $g$
resonance and include the \( \rho, f, \) 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 \( 4\pi \). 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, we if we use a single Veneziano term, normalized to \( \Gamma_{\rho K} = 125 \text{ MeV} \) and \( m_\rho = 764 \text{ MeV} \), and require the correct \( I = L = 0 \) phase shifts, then we get the following representation for the \( \pi - \pi \) amplitude with \( s, t, \) and \( u \) being the usual Mandelstam invariants (we put a bar over \( u \) so as not to confuse this \( \bar{u} \) with the previous \( u \)):}

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

\[
T_s^1 = F(s,t) - F(s,\bar{u}) , \quad (III.2b)
\]

\[
T_s^2 = F(t,\bar{u}) , \quad (III.2c)
\]

where

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

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

\[
a = 0.48 \quad , \quad (III.4a)
\]

\[
b = 0.90 \text{ GeV}^{-2} \quad , \quad (III.4b)
\]

\[
\beta = -1.22 .^{10} \quad (III.4c)
\]
Equations (II.29), (II.30a), (III.2), (III.3), and (III.4) together imply

\[ A_0^R(s_0, \mu^2, \mu^2) = 16\pi \left( -\frac{\pi\beta}{b} \right) \left[ 0.71\delta(s_0 - m_\rho^2) + 1.13\delta(s_0 - m_\pi^2) + 1.27\delta(s_0 - m_g^2) \right] , \]  
(III.5a)

\[ A_1^R(s_0, \mu^2, \mu^2) = 16\pi \left( -\frac{\pi\beta}{b} \right) \left[ 0.48\delta(s_0 - m_\rho^2) + 0.71\delta(s_0 - m_\pi^2) + 0.88\delta(s_0 - m_g^2) \right] , \]  
(III.5b)

\[ A_2^R(s_0, \mu^2, \mu^2) = 16\pi \left( -\frac{\pi\beta}{b} \right) \left[ 0.03\delta(s_0 - m_\rho^2) - 0.11\delta(s_0 - m_\pi^2) + 0.09\delta(s_0 - m_g^2) \right] . \]  
(III.5c)
IV. PREDICTIONS OF MODEL AND COMPARISON WITH EXPERIMENT

When ABFSST 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) $\pi-\pi$ 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 $m_\pi^2$ and replace $A_I^R(s_0, u', -u)$ by $A_I^R(s_0, \mu_2^2, -\mu_2^2)$. 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

$$\alpha_{I=0} = 0.30 ,$$

$$\alpha_{I=1} = 0.16 ,$$

the average multiplicity to be

$$\langle n \rangle = 0.74 \ln s^{1/2}$$

the elasticity to be

$$\frac{E_N}{E_{inc}} = 0.69 ,$$

the average transverse momentum of the produced pion pairs to be

$$\langle |k_T| \rangle_{\text{pion-pair}} = 0.43 \text{ GeV/c} ,$$
and the average invariant mass squared for each pair of outgoing pions to be

\[ \langle k^2 \rangle = 0.84 \text{ GeV}^2 . \]  

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 \( \pi-\pi \) scattering\(^{14}\) are \( \frac{E}{E_{\text{inc}}} = 0.43 \),

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

The corresponding experimental numbers are

\[ \alpha_{I=0} \approx 1.0 , \]  

\[ \alpha_{I=1} \approx 0.5 , \]  

\[ \langle n \rangle \approx 1 \ln s - 2 \ln s , \]  

\[ \frac{E_N}{E_{\text{inc}}} \approx 0.5 - 0.6 , \]  

\[ \langle |k_T| \rangle_{\text{one pion}} \approx 0.30 - 0.35 \text{ GeV/c} , \]  

\[ \langle k^2 \rangle \approx 0.7 - 0.8 \text{ GeV}^2 . \]

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 $\rho$
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

$$\alpha_{I=0} = 1.00 \quad \text{(IV.3a)}$$

$$\alpha_{I=1} = 0.78 \quad \text{(IV.3b)}$$

$$\langle n \rangle = 1.04 \; \text{ln} \; s \quad \text{(IV.3c)}$$

$$\frac{E_N}{E_{\text{inc}}} = 0.62 \quad \text{(IV.3d)}$$

$$\langle |k_T| \rangle_{\text{pion-pair}} = 0.48 \; \text{GeV/c} \quad \text{(IV.3e)}$$

$$\langle k^2 \rangle = 0.76 \; \text{GeV}^2 \quad \text{(IV.3f)}$$

We conclude that with the present approximations, the kernel in our
model is of insufficient strength.

Although we use the Veneziano formula for $A_I^R(s_0,\mu^2,\mu^2)$
to get the above results, these results are actually almost independent
of the detailed shape of $A_I^R(s_0,\mu^2,\mu^2)$. Instead of evaluating
(III.5a) with 8 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, $s_0$, in (II.28), for this will surely increase our kernel strength. This was the approach of Ball and Marchesini. However, increasing $s_{0_{\text{max}}}$ 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 $\langle n \rangle \approx 0.2 \ln s$. Furthermore, increasing $s_{0_{\text{max}}}$ 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 $\alpha_I$ as $u'_c$ is varied. If we let $\sigma_{I=0}(s_0) = \frac{5 \text{ mb}}{\ln s_0}$ for $s_0 > m_g^2$, then we obtain the result shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$s_0$ (GeV$^2$)</th>
<th>$m_g^2 = 2.7$</th>
<th>12.7</th>
<th>52.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$u'_c$ (GeV$^2$/c$^2$)</td>
<td>$\infty$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_{I=0}$</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total contribution</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 $\alpha$'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. This also means that our model will be independent of $s_0$ as long as $s_{0_{\text{max}}}$ is above the resonance region.

B. Off-Shell Continuation

As there is no unique or a priori correct off-shell continuation of $A^R(s_0, \mu_1^2, \mu_2^2)$, we consider several methods of continuation.

Since the Mandelstam invariants satisfy the usual constraints

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

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, $\beta$, does not vary as we go off-shell, instead of (III.5) we now have
\[ A_0^R(s_0,-u',-u) = 16\pi \left(-\frac{\pi\beta}{b}\right) \{[0.48 - 0.45\bar{u}]\delta(s_0 - m_\rho^2) + [0.72 - 0.40\bar{u}^2 - 0.88\bar{u}]\delta(s_0 - m_f^2) + [0.87 - 0.25\bar{u}^3 - 0.9\bar{u}^2 - 1.2\bar{u}]\delta(s_0 - m_g^2)\}, \quad \text{(V.2a)} \]

\[ A_1^R(s_0,-u',-u) = 16\pi \left(-\frac{\pi\beta}{b}\right) \{0.48\delta(s_0 - m_\rho^2) + 0.71\delta(s_0 - m_f^2) + 0.88\delta(s_0 - m_g^2)\}, \quad \text{(V.2b)} \]

\[ A_2^R(s_0,-u',-u) = 16\pi \left(-\frac{\pi\beta}{b}\right) \{[0.48 + 0.90\bar{u}]\delta(s_0 - m_\rho^2) + [0.81\bar{u}^2 + 1.76\bar{u} + 0.71]\delta(s_0 - m_f^2) + \frac{1}{2}[\bar{u}^3 + 3.6\bar{u}^2 + 5.0\bar{u} + 1.8]\delta(s_0 - m_g^2)\}, \quad \text{(V.2c)} \]

where

\[ \bar{u} = -2(u + u') - s_0. \quad \text{(V.3)} \]

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

\[ A_1^R = \text{Im} T_1^t = \text{Im} F(s,t=0), \]

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\textsuperscript{20}

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

where

\[ q = \left( \frac{s_0 - 4u^2}{4} \right)^{1/2}, \quad (V.5a) \]

and

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

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 \( |q_{cm}^\ell| \) off-shell.

Wolf\textsuperscript{6} has successfully fit single and double pion production for \( |t| < 1 \text{ GeV}^2/c^2 \) and laboratory momentum between 1.6 and 20 GeV/c by using an OPE model with the Benecke-Durr off-shell continuation of partial cross sections:\textsuperscript{21}

\[ \sigma^\ell(s_0, u) = \frac{u^\ell(q_R)}{u^\ell(q_R)} \cdot \frac{q}{q_{cm}} \cdot \sigma^\ell(s_0), \quad (V.6) \]
where \( q_u \) is given by (V.5b) with \( u' = -u^2 \), \( R \) is a parameter (one for each \( \ell \)) determined by fitting data, and

\[
\begin{align*}
u_{\ell}(x) &= \frac{1}{2x^2} Q_{\ell} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2x^2}\right),
\end{align*}
\]

where \( Q_{\ell}(z) \) are Legendre functions of the second kind. Using the values of \( R \) obtained by Wolf, we find \( \frac{\sigma_{\ell}(s_0, u)}{\sigma_{\ell}(s_0)} < 1 \) 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 \( \pi-\pi \) 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 superposition 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 interference 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 $2^{1/2}$ 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 $\pi-\pi$ 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, $\eta'$s, and other particles, as well as $\pi'$s, will definitely add to our kernel strength. Since experimentally the large majority of produced particles in high energy collisions are $\pi$'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 $\pi-\pi$ 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 $\pi\pi$ 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 $NN$ scattering is closer to 1 $\ln s$ than to 2 $\ln s$ (see Ref. 15).
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FIGURE CAPTIONS

Fig. 1. Diagram for multi-Regge amplitude. Wavy lines correspond to Regge poles; \( s = (P + P')^2 \); \( s_1 = (P_0 + P_1)^2 \), \( \cdots \), \( s_n = (P_{n-1} + P_n)^2 \).

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; \( s_0 = k^2 \).

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

Fig. 7. Diagram for \( \pi-N \) 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.
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