

Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

Recent Work

Title

MULTIPLE MESON PRODUCTION IN NUCLEON-ANTI-NUCLEON ANNIHILATIONS

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2ts0683m>

Authors

Cook, LeRoy P.
Lepore, Joseph V.

Publication Date

1959-12-02

UNIVERSITY OF
CALIFORNIA

Ernest O. Lawrence

*Radiation
Laboratory*

TWO-WEEK LOAN COPY

*This is a Library Circulating Copy
which may be borrowed for two weeks.
For a personal retention copy, call
Tech. Info. Division, Ext. 5545*

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

DISCLAIMER

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. While this document is believed to contain correct information, neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor the Regents of the University of California, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by its trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof, or the Regents of the University of California. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof or the Regents of the University of California.

For Publ. in Phys. Rev. non std.

UCRL-8841 Rev

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

**Lawrence Radiation Laboratory
Berkeley, California**

Contract No. W-7405-eng-48

MULTIPLE MESON PRODUCTION IN NUCLEON-ANTINUCLEON ANNIHILATIONS

LeRoy F. Cook, Jr. and Joseph V. Lepore

December 2, 1959

MULTIPLE MESON PRODUCTION IN NUCLEON-ANTINUCLEON ANNIHILATIONS

LeRoy F. Cook, Jr. and Joseph V. Lepore

Lawrence Radiation Laboratory
University of California
Berkeley, California

December 2, 1959

ABSTRACT

A two-parameter model is proposed for treating complicated production problems in a relatively simple way. It is assumed that the interaction may be characterized by a range of interaction and by a coupling strength. After the model is developed, it is applied to the problem of pion production in $N-\bar{N}$ annihilations. The two parameters are fixed by the experimental data for the multiplicity and energy spectra. It is found that all the data can be satisfied if one chooses the radius of interaction to be one pion Compton wavelength. Under certain restrictions the model reduces to the Fermi model.

MULTIPLE MESON PRODUCTION IN NUCLEON-ANTINUCLEON ANNIHILATIONS*

LeRoy F. Cook, Jr.[†] and Joseph V. Lepore

Lawrence Radiation Laboratory
University of California
Berkeley, California

December 2, 1959

INTRODUCTION

Since the discovery of the antiproton in 1955,¹ a large amount of experimental work has been devoted to its interaction with nucleons.²⁻⁵ The results of these investigations present two conspicuous features: (a) cross sections that are large compared to similar N-N interactions and (b) multiplicities that appear large in light of calculations based on the Fermi model⁶ if a radius of interaction is chosen to agree with current ideas of nuclear structure, i. e. $1/\mu$.⁷

Recently, several authors⁸⁻¹⁰ have attempted to understand one or both of these features on the basis of phenomenological models that preserve our present understanding of the nucleon structure, and of these, two have been moderately successful, viz., those of Koba and Takeda⁸ and of Ball and Chew.⁹

*This work was performed under the auspices of the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission.

†Submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of California, Berkeley, California.

Present address: Palmer Physical Laboratory, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey.

The model of Koba and Takeda attempts to describe both of the salient features by means of two distinct interactions. It is assumed that the actual $N-\bar{N}$ annihilation occurs between the cores, producing pions, and in such a short time that the pion clouds are unaffected. The resulting "unattached" clouds then disperse, producing additional pions. By assigning an effective core radius of $2/3\mu$, they are able to fit the total and absorptive cross sections as well as the pion multiplicity fairly well. However, it is difficult to understand the available energy-spectra data on this basis. Thus if we assume that all the pions emitted are in S states, relative to the barycentric system of the $N-\bar{N}$ system, we have $kR \geq 0$, where k is the wave number and R is the radius of interaction. Accordingly, we should expect for the maximum contribution, $kR \sim 2$ or $k \sim 400 \text{ Mev/c}$.¹¹ On this basis we would obtain a momentum spectra peaked around 400 Mev/c. Although this is in agreement with an average value of $E_0/5$, it is rather large with respect to the experimental value, viz., $k \sim 300 \text{ Mev/c}$. Koba and Takeda point out that interactions in the annihilation region can change the energy spectra and that their actual numerical value for the effective core radius is not to be taken seriously, but one wonders whether any reasonable effective core radius, producing half of the pions, will lead to the correct spectra. This is particularly true if the cross-section data is still to be satisfied.

The approach of Ball and Chew, although along the same lines, eliminates this problem. They treat only the problem of cross sections and assume that the "cores" annihilate in the sense that an ingoing-wave boundary condition is present to represent the large probability of annihilation if the particles come close together. On this basis they are able to obtain the low-energy experimental data for the cross sections. Further, the results of their calculations, as expected in the considered energy range, are very insensitive to the location of this boundary.

Considering the success of Ball and Chew, it is not unreasonable to hope that the pion multiplicity can also be treated without attaching special characteristics to the nuclear core and pion cloud. However, attempts along this line of reasoning, e. g., by the Fermi model and modifications to it,^{12, 13, 14} have not lead to favorable results. Present results show, nevertheless, that a similar approach will reproduce the experimental data if one includes (a) the approximate energy dependence of the matrix elements, which are neglected in the Fermi model, and (b) the results of the calculation of Ball and Chew with respect to the partial waves involved in annihilation. The present model cannot be considered a statistical model in the Fermi sense, but under certain restrictions reduces to it.

II. THE INTERACTION MODEL

A. Formulation of the Proposed Model

In this section we will develop a model, the interaction model, for treating complicated production problems in a relatively simple way. As the essential physical approximation, we assume that the primary features of a given process are produced by an interaction confined to a small volume in coordinate space and further characterized by a parameter giving the coupling strength. In order to implement this approximation, we begin by writing the scattering amplitude in the coordinate representation. The resulting integral equation is rewritten in terms of some complete set of states, these states being chosen for their convenience in describing the process. The coefficients of these states, the partial-wave scattering amplitudes, are coordinate integrals over the interaction operator, and we introduce the above approximation by restricting the limits of the integrals to a small volume of space. Of course, these contributions must be such that the appropriate

quantum numbers are conserved. This physical approximation is closely related to that in the Fermi model, and in fact we shall show that under certain restrictions the interaction model reduces, essentially, to the Fermi model.

We begin by constructing the states to describe a given system of particles. Proceeding in the usual way, we describe physical one-particle states by a complete orthonormal set of one-particle state vectors in a Hilbert subspace. The subspace describing a state of n particles of different types, i. e., nucleons, pions, etc., is given by the direct product of n one-particle subspaces corresponding to the appropriate type of particle. The total Hilbert space is given by the sum of all such subspaces. We may choose as the basis set for the one-particle state vectors the coordinate eigenvectors, and the n -particle subspace basis set for particle types i, \dots, j , is therefore

$$|r_1^i \dots r_n^j\rangle = |r_1^i\rangle \dots |r_n^j\rangle.$$

Of course, depending on the nature of the particles, we must symmetrize the state vectors appropriately.

In the following, we shall confine ourselves to nucleons and pions for which we will use $|r\rangle$ and $|\xi\rangle$, respectively. A system of nucleons and pions is thus given as

$$|N \pi\rangle = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{r_1 \dots \\ \xi_1 \dots}} \psi_{np}(r_1, \dots, r_n; \xi_1, \dots, \xi_p) |r_1 \dots r_n; \xi_1 \dots \xi_p\rangle, \quad (1)$$

where $\psi_{np}(r_1 \dots r_n; \xi_1 \dots \xi_p)$ represents the probability amplitude for finding n nucleons and p pions at their respective positions, $r_1, \dots, r_n; \xi_1, \dots, \xi_p$. If $|N \pi\rangle$ represents a system of noninteracting particles, then, of course, we have $\psi_{np}(r_1 \dots \xi_p) = \psi(r_1) \dots \psi(r_n) \phi(\xi_1) \dots \phi(\xi_p)$, where $\psi(r_i)$ and $\phi(\xi_j)$ represent the appropriate one-particle wave functions for describing nucleons and pions, respectively.

In the Schrodinger picture, the time development of such a system of particles is given by the Schrodinger equation,

$$(\underline{H}_0 + \underline{V}) \psi = i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} | \psi \rangle,$$

where $| \psi \rangle$ is the state vector for the system and \underline{H}_0 is the Hamiltonian operator for a system of noninteracting nucleons and pions. The interaction operator, \underline{V} , contains all of the interaction and can include the creation and destruction of particles.

If we consider this as a stationary-state scattering problem in which there is a continuous incoming and outgoing flux of particles, we have

$$| \psi \rangle = e^{-iE_0 t} | \psi \rangle,$$

which gives

$$(\underline{E}_0 - \underline{H}_0) | \psi \rangle = \underline{V} | \psi \rangle,$$

and we apply the usual scattering formalism. We thus have the formal solution,

$$| \psi \rangle = | \phi_0 \rangle + \underline{g}_0(E_0) \underline{V} | \psi \rangle, \quad (2)$$

where $| \phi_0 \rangle$ and $\underline{g}_0(E_0)$ are defined by the equations,

$$(\underline{E}_0 - \underline{H}_0) | \phi_0 \rangle = 0 \quad (3)$$

and

$$(\underline{E}_0 - \underline{H}_0) \underline{g}_0(E_0) = \underline{I} \quad (4)$$

and \underline{I} is the identity operator. As seen from Eq. (3), the state vector ϕ_0 represents a free particle state of nucleons and pions with a total energy E_0 , and from Eq. (4), $\underline{g}_0(E_0)$ is the free many-particle Green's operator for the parameter, E_0 .

For definiteness, we can take $|\phi_0\rangle$ to represent a state of n' nucleons and p' pions for which we have

$$E_0 = E(N_1) + \dots + E(N_{n'}) + W(\pi_1) + \dots + W(\pi_{p'}) .$$

Thus the probability amplitude for finding a state of n nucleons and p pions is given by the scalar product of $|\psi\rangle$ with the subspace describing the system of n nucleons and p pions. If we use the coordinate basis set for this projection, then we find, from Eq. (2),

$$\begin{aligned} \langle r_1 \dots r_n \xi_1 \dots \xi_p | \psi \rangle &= \langle r_1 \dots \xi_p | \phi_{0n'p'} \rangle \\ &+ \langle r_1 \dots \xi_p | g_0(E_0) V | \psi \rangle \end{aligned}$$

or

(5)

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(r_1 \dots r_n \xi_1 \dots \xi_p) &= \psi(r_1) \dots \psi(\xi_p) \delta_{nn'} \delta_{pp'} \\ &+ \int d^3 r_1' \dots d^3 \xi_p' g_0(r_1 \dots \xi_p; r_1' \dots \xi_p'; E_0) \\ &\times \langle r_1' \dots \xi_p' | V | \psi \rangle , \end{aligned}$$

which is an integral equation to determine $|\psi\rangle$.

If we confine ourselves to the problem of particle production in collisions and annihilations, then Eq. (5) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(r_1 \dots r_n \xi_1 \dots \xi_p) &= \int d^3 r_1' \dots d^3 \xi_p' g_0(r_1 \dots \xi_p; r_1' \dots \xi_p'; E_0) \\ &\times \langle r_1' \dots \xi_p' | V | \psi \rangle . \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

We now introduce a complete set of states in terms of the identity operator; these

states are energy eigenfunctions with additional quantum numbers chosen for their convenience in treating a particular problem. Representing these states by ν and η for the nucleons and pions, respectively, from Eq. (6) and using

$$\underline{E} | \nu_i \rangle = E_i | \nu_i \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{E} | \eta_i \rangle = \omega_i | \eta_i \rangle ,$$

we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(r_1 \dots \xi_p) = & \sum_{\nu, \eta} \langle r_1 \dots \xi_p | \nu_1 \dots \eta_p \rangle \left\{ \frac{1}{E_0 - E_1 - \dots - \omega_p} \right. \\ & \times \int d^3 r_1' \dots d^3 \xi_p' \langle \nu_1 \dots \eta_p | r_1' \dots \xi_p' \rangle \\ & \left. \times \langle r_1' \dots \xi_p' | \underline{V} | \psi \rangle \right\} . \end{aligned}$$

To be precise, we must of course define the Green's function properly, but we will take the point of view that the primary effect is to impose energy conservation.

That is, we know

$$T_{ab} = -2\pi i \delta(E_a - E_b) T_{ab}^+ \quad \text{where} \quad T_{ab} = (\phi_a, V \psi_b^+) .$$

Additional factors will occur, but in the actual calculations we will work only with ratios for which we may assume that these factors balance out. Thus we replace the Green's function by a Kronecker delta and write

$$\psi(r_1 \dots \xi_p) = \sum_{\nu, \eta} \int d^3 r_1' \dots d^3 \xi_p' \langle \nu_1 \dots \eta_p | r_1' \dots \xi_p' \rangle \delta_{E_0, E_1 + \dots + \omega_p} \psi(\nu_1 \dots \eta_p) , \quad (7)$$

where, ¹⁵

$$\psi(\nu_1 \dots \eta_p) = \int d^3 r_1' \dots d^3 \xi_p' \langle \nu_1 \dots \eta_p | r_1' \dots \xi_p' \rangle \langle r_1' \dots \xi_p' | \underline{V} | \psi \rangle . \quad (8)$$

Of course, $\psi(\nu_1 \dots \eta_p)$ is just the scattered wave amplitude in terms of another complete set. From Eq. (7) we have for the total probability,

$$P_{np} = \sum_{\nu, \eta} \delta_{E_0; E_1 + \dots + E_p} \left| \psi(\nu_1 \dots \eta_p) \right|^2. \quad (9)$$

In the present development we shall propose an approximate method of calculating $\psi(\nu_1 \dots \eta_p)$. Rewriting Eq. (8) we have

$$\psi(\nu_1 \dots \eta_p) = \int d^3 r_1' \dots d^3 \xi_p' \psi_{\nu_1}^*(r_1') \dots \psi_{\eta_p}^*(\xi_p') \langle r_1' \dots \xi_p' | \underline{V} | \psi \rangle. \quad (10)$$

This is an overlap integral in the usual fashion if we interpret $\langle r_1' \dots \xi_p' | \underline{V} | \psi \rangle$ as an initial state. We will adopt this viewpoint in the sense that $\langle r_1' \dots \xi_p' | \underline{V} | \psi \rangle$ specifies the conserved dynamical variables, remembering that the effect of the interaction operator must also be included. In order to calculate $\psi(\nu_1 \dots \eta_p)$, we approximate the effect of $\langle r_1' \dots \xi_p' | \underline{V} | \psi \rangle$ by assuming that the essential features of the problem are given by considering only the contributions from a small volume of the coordinate space. We will always consider ourselves to be working in the barycentric system, and then we will take

$$\begin{aligned} \langle r_1' \dots \xi_p' | \underline{V} | \psi \rangle &= G_N^n G_\pi^p \bar{\Psi}(r_1' \dots \xi_p') \\ &= G_N^n G_\pi^p C \theta(R - r_1') \dots \theta(R - \xi_p') Y(\hat{r}_1' \dots \hat{\xi}_p') S(N) I(N \pi), \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where G_N and G_π are of the nature of dimensionless coupling constants, C is a constant determined by our interpretation of the initial state, i. e.,

$$\int \left| \bar{\Psi}(r_1' \dots \xi_p') \right|^2 d^3 r_1' \dots d^3 \xi_p' = 1, \quad (12)$$

and $Y(\hat{r}_1', \dots, \hat{\xi}_p')$, $S(N)$, and $I(N\pi)$ are angular, mechanical spin, and isotopic spin functions, respectively. We take G_N , G_π , and R as characterizing the interaction leading to a given final state, $\psi(\nu_1 \dots \eta_p)$. In order to distinguish this approximation from the form in Eq. (10) we will write,

$$S(\nu_1 \dots \eta_p) = G_N^n G_\pi^p \int d^3 r_1' \dots d^3 \xi_p' \psi_{\nu_1}^*(r_1') \dots \phi_{\eta_p}^*(\xi_p') \Psi(r_1' \dots \xi_p'). \quad (13)$$

Although we represent the effect of the interaction by the factors G_N and G_π and we interpret $\Psi(r_1' \dots \xi_p')$ as an initial state, $\Psi(r_1' \dots \xi_p')$ can possibly have other properties that are related to the interaction. From a field-theoretic viewpoint, we would expect \underline{V} itself to be composed of particle fields combined to produce current terms. It is not unreasonable thus to expect $S(\nu_1 \dots \eta_p)$ to have additional energy dependence. In general, this is unknown, and is suppressed in Eq. (13). However, since pions are involved in the process, pion field operators should occur in \underline{V} . We can at least include the normalization of this field and write, instead of Eq. (13),

$$S(\nu_1 \dots \eta_p) = G_N^n G_\pi^p \int d^3 r_1' \dots d^3 \xi_p' \psi_{\nu_1}^*(r_1') \dots \phi_{\eta_p}^*(\xi_p') \times \frac{\Psi(r_1' \dots \xi_p')}{\sqrt{2\omega_1 R \dots 2\omega_p R}} \quad (14)$$

where we include the factor R for dimensional reasons. Instead of Eq. (9) we have

$$P_{np} = \sum_{\nu, \eta} \delta_{E_0; E_1 + \dots + \omega_p} \left| S(\nu_1 \dots \eta_p) \right|^2 \quad (15)$$

In the above, $\Psi(r_1' \dots \xi_p')$ has been taken to be a step function in the radial coordinates, but this is not necessary and other forms could be chosen. However, if this model is at all meaningful, the results should be practically independent of such variations. In the present case involving nucleons and pions, we should expect from other considerations, e. g., Fermi model or static model, that R should be at most of the order of a pion Compton wavelength. If the nucleons are considered nonrelativistic, then the free-particle wave functions do not have violent changes for $r < R$, and we would not expect the results obtained by using a step function to vary appreciably from those resulting from another choice.

B. Relation to the Fermi Model

Before considering the problem of $N-\bar{N}$ annihilations, we shall show that, with additional restrictions, the interaction model essentially reduces to the Fermi model.⁶ Consider the case where the complete set consists of plane waves. Then from Eq. (13), we write

$$S_{np}(\vec{K}_1, \dots, \vec{K}_n; \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) = G_N^n G_\pi^p \int d^3 r_1' \dots d^3 \xi_p' \\ \times \frac{e^{-i\vec{K}_1 \cdot \vec{r}_1'}}{\sqrt{V}} \dots \frac{e^{-i\vec{k}_p \cdot \vec{\xi}_p'}}{\sqrt{V}} \Psi(r_1' \dots \xi_p').$$

We neglect the possible mechanical and isotopic spin dependence of $\Psi(r_1' \dots \xi_p')$ and take an isotropic angular distribution. Then from Eq. (11) we have

$$\Psi(r_1' \dots \xi_p') = C \theta(R - r_1') \dots \theta(R - \xi_p'),$$

where C , determined from Eq. (12), is

$$C = \left(\frac{4\pi}{3} R^3 \right)^{-\frac{n+p}{2}}.$$

Typical integrals are of the form,

$$I(\beta) = \int d^3 p e^{-i\vec{\beta} \cdot \vec{p}} \theta(R-p) = 4\pi R^3 \frac{j_1(\beta R)}{\beta R},$$

where $j_1(\beta R)$ is the usual spherical Bessel function. Thus, we can write

$$S(\vec{K}_1 \dots \vec{K}_p) = G_N^{2n} G_\pi^{2p} \left(\frac{4\pi}{3} R^3 \right)^{-(n+p)/2} \frac{(4\pi R^3)^{n+p}}{V^{(n+p)/2}} \frac{j_1(K_1 R)}{K_1 R} \dots \frac{j_1(k_p R)}{k_p R}$$

and

$$P_{np} = G_N^{2n} G_\pi^{2p} \sum_{\vec{K}, \vec{k}} \delta_{E_0; E_1 + \dots + \omega_p} \frac{(4\pi R^3)^{n+p} V^{n+p}}{V^{n+p}} \frac{j_1^2(K_1 R)}{(K_1 R)^2} \dots \frac{j_1^2(k_p R)}{(k_p R)^2}$$

(16)

with the condition that the momentum values must be such that momentum is conserved.

Now let us impose the condition that the kinetic energy available to the particles is small so that $K_i R \ll 1$ and $k_i R \ll 1$ for all i . Using the relation,

$$j_1(\beta R) \xrightarrow{\beta R \rightarrow 0} \frac{\beta R}{3}$$

we have

$$P_{np} \xrightarrow{KR \ll 0} G_N^{2n} G_\pi^{2p} \sum_{\vec{K}, \vec{k}} \delta_{E_0; E_1 + \dots + \omega_p} \left(\frac{4\pi}{3} R^3 \right)^{n+p} V^{n+p}$$

and the matrix element is independent of the momenta. Passing to a continuous spectrum and setting $G_N = G_\pi = 1$, we obtain Fermi's result,

$$P_{np} = \left(\frac{4\pi}{3} \frac{R^3}{(2\pi)^3} \right)^{n+p} \int d^3k_1 \dots d^3k_p \delta(E_0 - E_1 - \dots - \omega_p),$$

with the additional constraint that momentum be conserved. Of course, one could certainly take the point of view that in the Fermi model only the product $G^2 \frac{4\pi}{3} R^3$ is important. Thus if $kR \ll 1$, then a two-parameter model, the interaction model, reduces to a one-parameter model, the Fermi model.

If we had made the reduction in terms of angular momenta, the result would not have been as clear, but since we take $kR \ll 1$, it follows that only S waves will contribute, and thus the matrix element is independent of the momenta.

As pointed out in the introduction, in the case of $N-\bar{N}$ annihilation, the Fermi model yields a surprisingly large value for the interaction radius to give the correct pion multiplicity. The above remarks show that this is not surprising, for in $N-\bar{N}$ annihilation, if we chose $R \sim 1/\mu$, we would have $kR \sim 1$ to 7, and the restriction $kR \ll 1$ would certainly not be satisfied. However, it is still possible to use a very crude approximation in the case of plane waves to arrive at a rough idea of the interaction radius. We notice from Eq. (16) that we are summing (or integrating) over a product of similar functions. One should expect that the main contribution to the sum should occur when these functions are all near their maximum values, i. e., $kR \sim 2$. Thus we consider the average value of k , \bar{k} , in a given process and estimate R . In $N-\bar{N}$ annihilations, we can write

$$\bar{\omega} = \sqrt{\bar{k}^2 + \mu^2} = \frac{E_0}{M},$$

where M is the experimental multiplicity. Considering the relevant quantities, this gives $R \sim (0.7) \frac{1}{\mu}$. This number does not include the effects of momentum conservation or of the wave-function symmetrization, and a somewhat better estimate leads to $R \sim (0.9) \frac{1}{\mu}$.

III. APPLICATION TO NUCLEON-ANTINUCLEON ANNIHILATION

A. Analysis in Terms of Angular Momenta

In this section we will treat the problem of multiple meson production in $N-\bar{N}$ annihilations. In order to accomplish this, it is convenient to use as our complete set of states those which are eigenfunctions of the energy and angular momenta. Ball and Chew⁹ have shown that only certain partial waves in the $N-\bar{N}$ system annihilate to produce mesons, thus we wish to impose the condition that the meson system form only these angular momentum states. This is most easily done by using angular-momentum eigenfunctions.

We are interested in the scattered-wave amplitudes for a system of p pions (we shall consider K -particle production later), and from Eq. (14) we have

$$S(\eta_1 \dots \eta_p) = G_\pi^p \int d^3\xi_1 \dots d^3\xi_p \phi_{\eta_1}^*(\xi_1) \dots \phi_{\eta_p}^*(\xi_p) \frac{\Psi(\xi_1 \dots \xi_p)}{\sqrt{2\omega_1 R \dots 2\omega_p R}} .$$

Since we wish to use a complete set of angular momentum states, we take

$$\phi_{\eta_i}(\xi_i) = \sqrt{\frac{2k_i^2}{D}} j_{\ell_i}(k_i \xi_i) Y_{\ell_i}^{m_i}(\theta_i, \phi_i) \chi_1^{\beta_i}(i) .$$

where $\chi_1^{\beta_i}(i)$ is an isotopic-spin wave function, and D is the radius of the normalization volume. Thus we write

$$S(\eta_1 \dots \eta_p) = G_\pi^p \sqrt{\frac{2k_1^2 \dots 2k_p^2}{D^p}} \int d^3\xi_1 \dots d^3\xi_p \prod_i j_{\ell_i}(k_i \xi_i) Y_{\ell_i}^{m_i}(\theta_i, \phi_i) \chi_1^{\beta_i}(i) \frac{\Psi(\xi_1 \dots \xi_p)}{\sqrt{2\omega_1 R \dots 2\omega_p R}} \quad (17)$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{2k_1^2 \dots 2k_p^2}{D^p}} \bar{S}(\eta_1 \dots \eta_p) . \quad (18)$$

For the probability we have, from Eqs. (15) and (18),

$$P_p = \sum_{\eta_1 \dots \eta_p} \delta_{E_0; \omega_1 + \dots + \omega_p} \left| S(\eta_1 \dots \eta_p) \right|^2$$

which becomes, in the limit $D \rightarrow \infty$,

$$P_p = \left(\frac{2}{\pi} \right)^p \sum_l \sum_m \sum_\beta \int k_1^2 dk_1 \dots k_p^2 dk_p \delta(E_0 - \omega_1 - \dots - \omega_p) \left| \bar{S}(\eta_1 \dots \eta_p) \right|^2 \quad (19)$$

Thus, in order to determine the probability for a state of p pions, it is necessary to determine the $\bar{S}(\eta_1 \dots \eta_p)$. However, before proceeding to that calculation, we must first recognize that the pions are bosons and symmetrize the wave functions. We accomplish this approximately in the usual way by just including the normalization factor. Using Eqs. (17) and (18), we find

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{S}(\eta_1 \dots \eta_p) = G_\pi^p & \left[\frac{(N_\eta!)}{p!} \right]^{1/2} \int d^3\xi_1 \dots d^3\xi_p \\ & \times \prod_i j_{l_i}(k_i \xi_i) Y_{l_i}^{m_i}(\theta_i, \phi_i) \chi_{l_i}^{m_i}(\xi_i) \frac{\Psi(\xi_1 \dots \xi_p)}{2\omega_1 R \dots 2\omega_p R} \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where N_η is the number of times a particular state, $(k \ l \ m \ \beta)$, occurs. This approximation has the effect of neglecting possible cross terms in $|\bar{S}|^2$, but again since we will always work with ratios we may assume that this effect is small.

Now consider $\Psi(\xi_1 \dots \xi_p)$. From Eq. (11) we have

$$\Psi(\xi_1 \dots \xi_p) = C \theta(R - \xi_1) \dots \theta(R - \xi_p) Y(\hat{\xi}_1 \dots \hat{\xi}_p) I(\pi), \quad (11')$$

where $Y(\hat{\xi}_1 \dots \hat{\xi}_p)$ gives the angular dependence and is thus a superposition of angular momentum states. Thus let us write,

$$Y(\hat{\xi}_1 \dots \hat{\xi}_p) = \sum_{J, M} a_J^M Y_J^M(\hat{\xi}_1 \dots \hat{\xi}_p). \quad (21)$$

If we wish, we may also write

$$Y_J^M(\hat{\xi}_1 \dots \hat{\xi}_p) = \sum_{j_1 \dots j_p}^J A_{J j_1 \dots j_p}^M Y_{J j_1 \dots j_p}^M(\hat{\xi}_1 \dots \hat{\xi}_p), \quad (22)$$

where $Y_{J j_1 \dots j_p}^M(\hat{\xi}_1 \dots \hat{\xi}_p)$ is an eigenfunction of $J, M, j_1 \dots j_p$.

We can form $Y_{J j_1 \dots j_p}^M$ in the usual way as

$$Y_{J j_1 \dots j_p}^M(\hat{\xi}_1 \dots \hat{\xi}_p) = \sum_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_p} \langle J, M; j_1 \dots j_p \ j_1 \dots j_p, \mu_1 \dots \mu_p \rangle \times Y_{j_1}^{\mu_1}(\hat{\xi}_1) \dots Y_{j_p}^{\mu_p}(\hat{\xi}_p). \quad (23)$$

Equations (21), (22), and (23) allow us to express the amount of various partial waves in the $N-\bar{N}$ system contributing to the annihilation, the possible values of the pion angular momenta, and their m -value contributions. We write the isotopic spin part in an analogous way and obtain, after the angular and isotopic-spin integration,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{S}(\eta_1 \dots \eta_p) = C & \frac{\prod(N_{\eta_i}!)}{\eta^{1/2}} F_{l_1 \dots l_p}(k_1 \dots k_p) \\ & \times \left[\sum_{J, M} a_J^M A_{J l_1 \dots l_p}^M \langle J, M; l_1 \dots l_p \ l_1 \dots l_p, m_1 \dots m_p \rangle \right] \\ & \times \left[\sum_{I, I_z} b_I^{I_z} B_{I, 1, \dots, 1}^{I_z} \langle I, I_z; 1 \dots 1 \ 1 \dots 1; \beta \dots \beta_p \rangle \right], \quad (24) \end{aligned}$$

where we have set

$$F_{l_1 \dots l_p}(k_1 \dots k_p) = \prod_i \left[\frac{G_{\pi}}{\sqrt{2\omega_i R}} \int \xi_i^2 d\xi_i j_{l_i}(k_i \xi_i) \theta(R - \xi_i) \right]. \quad (25)$$

Thus from Eqs. (19) and (24), we find

$$\begin{aligned} P_p = C^2 \left(\frac{2}{\pi} \right)^p & \int k_1^2 dk_1 \dots k_p^2 dk_p \delta(E_0 - \omega_1 - \dots - \omega_p) \\ & \times \sum_{J, M} \sum_{I, I_z} \sum_{l_1 \dots l_p}^J \left| a_J^M \right|^2 \left| A_{J l_1 \dots l_p}^M \right|^2 \left| b_I^{I_z} \right|^2 \left| B_{I, 1, \dots, 1}^{I_z} \right|^2 \\ & \times \frac{\prod(N_{\eta_i}!)}{p!} \left| F_{l_1 \dots l_p}(k_1 \dots k_p) \right|^2 \quad (26) \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the relation,

$$\sum_{m_1 \dots m_p} \langle J, M; l_1 \dots l_p \mid l_1 \dots l_p m_1 \dots m_p \rangle \langle J', M'; l_1 \dots l_p \mid l_1 \dots l_p m_1 \dots m_p \rangle = \delta_{JJ'} \delta_{MM'}$$

At large distances we take the $N-\bar{N}$ system to be a plane wave; thus only $M = 0$ values will contribute. Further since we consider an averaging over the $N-\bar{N}$ states, we consider the A and B terms to be independent of the various variables and set them equal to one. Finally we impose the results of the calculations of Ball and Chew and take a_j and b_l to be one or zero corresponding to whether a given $N-\bar{N}$ state, (J, I) , will or will not annihilate. The initial charge state, of course, determines I_z . Because of the normalization of the angular functions, we take $C^2 = (R^3/3)^{-P}$, and thus from Eq. (26) we have

$$P_p = (6/\pi R^3)^P \int k_1^2 dk_1 \dots k_p^2 dk_p \delta(E_0 - \omega_1 - \dots - \omega_p) \times \sum_{J, I} \sum_{l_1 \dots l_p} \frac{(N_\eta)!}{\eta^{P!}} \left| F_{l_1 \dots l_p}(k_1 \dots k_p) \right|^2 \quad (27)$$

where $\sum_{J, I}$ means the sum over the states (J, I) leading to annihilations.

This can be cast into a more convenient form by considering summations of the $l_1 \dots l_p$ on $F_{l_1 \dots l_p}(k_1 \dots k_p)$ in Eq. (27). Since the integrals are independent (except for the energy delta function) and we integrate over all the momenta, we see that F is invariant under such permutations. Thus for a particular selection of the l_1, \dots, l_p , which we shall call the set $\{l_1 \dots l_p\}$, F gives the same contribution. Since there are $\frac{P!}{\eta^{(N_\eta!)}}$ possible permutations, we have

$$l_1 \dots l_p \sum^J \left| F_{l_1 \dots l_p} (k_1 \dots k_p) \right|^2 = \sum^J \frac{p!}{\prod (N_\eta!)} \left| F_{\{l_1 \dots l_p\}} (k_1 \dots k_p) \right|^2$$

and thus arrive at

$$P_p = (6/\pi R^3)^p \int k_1^2 dk_1 \dots k_p^2 dk_p \delta(E_0 - \omega_1 - \dots - \omega_p) \times \sum_{J,I} \sum^J \left| F_{\{l_1 \dots l_p\}} (k_1 \dots k_p) \right|^2 \quad (28)$$

B. Calculation of the Probabilities

In order to calculate the probabilities, it is convenient to investigate the properties of the quantities $F_{\{l_1 \dots l_p\}} (k_1 \dots k_p)$. From the previous section we know

$$F_{\{l_1 \dots l_p\}} = \frac{G_\pi^p}{2\omega_1 R \dots 2\omega_p R} \int_0^\infty \xi_1^2 d\xi_1 \dots \int_0^\infty \xi_p^2 d\xi_p j_{l_1} (k_1 \xi_1) \dots j_{l_p} (k_p \xi_p) \theta(R - \xi_1) \dots \theta(R - \xi_p) \quad (25')$$

and thus we have products of integrals of the form,

$$\int_0^R \xi_i^2 d\xi_i j_{l_i} (k_i \xi_i) \theta(R - \xi_i) = \frac{1}{k_i^3} \int_0^{k_i R} p_i^2 j_{l_i} (p_i) dp_i = \frac{K_{l_i} (k_i R)}{k_i^3} \quad (29)$$

The quantities $K_{l_i}(k_i R)$ have been plotted in Fig. 1 for $l = 0, 1, 2$. From Eqs. (28) and (29), we can write

$$P_p = (6/\pi)^p G_\pi^{2p} \int d(k_1 R) \dots \int d(k_p R) \delta(E_0 R - \omega_1 R - \dots - \omega_p R) \\ \times \sum_{J, I} \sum_{\text{sets}} \frac{K_{l_i}^2(k_i R)}{2\omega_1 R(k_i R)^4} \dots \frac{K_{l_p}^2(k_p R)}{2\omega_p R(k_p R)^4} .$$

This becomes, ¹⁶ after introduction of the variable $z_i^2 = k_i^2 R^2 + \mu^2 R^2$,

$$P_p = (6/\pi)^p G_\pi^{2p} \sum_{J, I} \sum_{\text{sets}} \int_{\mu R}^{\infty} dz_1 \dots \int_{\mu R}^{\infty} dz_p \delta(E_0 R - z_1 - \dots - z_p) \\ \times A_{l_i}(z_i; \mu R) \dots A_{l_p}(z_p; \mu R) , \quad (30)$$

where

$$A_{l_i}(z_i; \mu R) = \frac{K_{l_i}^2(\sqrt{z_i^2 - \mu^2 R^2})}{2[z_i^2 - \mu^2 R^2]^{5/2}} . \quad (31)$$

In Figs. 2a and 2b we have plotted $A_l(z; \mu R)$ for $R = 1/2\mu$ and $R = 1/\mu$, respectively, for various values of l .

Although it is possible to perform the integrations in Eq. (30) explicitly, it is more convenient to approximate the functions $A_{l_i}(z_i; \mu R)$ by Gaussians. Thus let us take

$$A_l(z; \mu R) = H_l \exp \left\{ - \left[\frac{z - \bar{z}_l}{a_l} \right]^2 \right\} . \quad (32)$$

where $H_l(\mu R)$, $\bar{z}_l(\mu R)$, and $a_l(\mu R)$ are constants independent of z , and we impose the condition

$$\int_{\mu R}^{\infty} dz H_l \exp - \left\{ \left[\frac{z - \bar{z}_l}{a_l} \right]^2 \right\} = \int_{\mu R}^{\infty} A_l(z; \mu R) dz = A_l(\mu R). \quad (33)$$

However we notice

$$\int_{\mu R}^{\infty} dz H_l e^{-\frac{(z - \bar{z}_l)^2}{a_l^2}} \approx \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dz H_l e^{-\frac{z^2}{a_l^2}} = \sqrt{\pi} H_l a_l,$$

and thus, from Eq. (33) we obtain

$$a_l(\mu R) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{A_l(\mu R)}{H_l(\mu R)},$$

where $A_l(\mu R)$ is determined by measuring the area under the curves in Fig. 2 with a planimeter, and we take

$$H_l(\mu R) = \text{Max} \{A_l(z; \mu R)\},$$

which occurs for $z = \bar{z}_l$. Thus $H_l(\mu R)$, $\bar{z}_l(\mu R)$ and $a_l(\mu R)$ are determined, and $A_l(z; \mu R)$ is represented by Gaussian forms. To show that this approximation is not a bad one we have plotted the appropriate Gaussian for $l = 0$ and $l = 3$ in Fig. 2a as dashed curves.

From Eqs. (30) and (32) we thus write

$$P_p = (6/\pi)^p (G_{\pi}^2)^p \sum_{J, I \text{ sets}} \Sigma^I \Sigma^J I(E_0 R, \mu R; l_1 \dots l_p), \quad (34)$$

where

$$I(E_0 R, \mu R; l_1 \dots l_p) = \int_{\mu R}^{\infty} dz_1 \dots \int_{\mu R}^{\infty} dz_p \delta(E_0 R - z_1 - \dots - z_p) \\ \times \prod_{i=1}^p H_{l_i} \exp \left[- \left\{ \frac{(z_i - \bar{z}_i)}{a_i} \right\}^2 \right].$$

This integral can be well approximated (see Appendix) and gives

$$I(E_0 R, \mu R; l_1 \dots l_p) = \frac{A_{l_1}(\mu R) \dots A_{l_p}(\mu R)}{\sqrt{\pi}} \\ \times \frac{\exp \left[- \left\{ \frac{RE_0 - \bar{z}_1 - \dots - \bar{z}_p}{a_1^2 + \dots + a_p^2} \right\}^2 \right]}{\sqrt{a_1^2 + \dots + a_p^2}}$$

Table I lists the appropriate quantities for $R = 1/\mu$ and $1/2\mu$.

The value of $I(E_0 R, \mu R; l_1 \dots l_p)$ was calculated on the IBM-650 computer for various values of l for $R = 1/(3\mu)$, $1/(2\mu)$, $3/(4\mu)$, and $1/\mu$.

Further, these calculations were done for an incident antiproton with a laboratory kinetic energy of 200 Mev, and all following results are for this energy.

To arrive at the probabilities, we must impose the various conservation laws. For a given J and I of the system, only certain sets of l values are allowed, these l values being determined by the selection rules. The selection rules have been discussed by many authors^{17, 18} and are given in Table II. Further, as pointed out earlier, Ball and Chew have shown that not all combinations and values of J and I will contribute to the annihilation. In Table II only those states with a transmission coefficient of one will contribute. Using the results from the

Table I

| Parameters for the Gaussian approximation | | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------------|--|
| $R = 1/\mu$ | | | | | |
| l | $A_l(1)$ | $H_l(1)$ | $a_l(1)$ | $\bar{z}_l(1)$ | |
| 0 | 0.0939 | 0.0533 | 0.992 | 1.82 | |
| 1 | 0.0706 | 0.0277 | 1.438 | 3.10 | |
| 2 | 0.0520 | 0.0170 | 1.725 | 4.62 | |
| 3 | 0.0403 | 0.0130 | 1.750 | 5.80 | |
| 4 | 0.0320 | 0.0090 | 2.007 | 7.07 | |
| 5 | 0.0258 | 0.0063 | 2.310 | 8.20 | |
| 6 | 0.0225 | 0.0046 | 2.753 | 9.40 | |
| 7 | 0.0210 | 0.0037 | 3.205 | 10.50 | |
| 8 | 0.0205 | 0.0035 | 3.302 | 11.70 | |
| 9 | 0.0205 | 0.0035 | 3.302 | 12.90 | |

| $R = 1/2\mu$ | | | | | |
|--------------|------------|------------|------------|------------------|--|
| l | $A_l(1/2)$ | $H_l(1/2)$ | $a_l(1/2)$ | $\bar{z}_l(1/2)$ | |
| 0 | 0.1030 | 0.0533 | 1.085 | 1.60 | |
| 1 | 0.0746 | 0.0277 | 1.513 | 3.05 | |
| 2 | 0.0550 | 0.0170 | 1.812 | 4.60 | |
| 3 | 0.0420 | 0.0130 | 1.901 | 5.80 | |
| 4 | 0.0325 | 0.0090 | 2.029 | 7.07 | |
| 5 | 0.0258 | 0.0063 | 2.310 | 8.20 | |
| 6 | 0.0225 | 0.0046 | 2.753 | 9.40 | |
| 7 | 0.0210 | 0.0037 | 3.205 | 10.50 | |
| 8 | 0.0205 | 0.0035 | 3.302 | 11.70 | |
| 9 | 0.0205 | 0.0035 | 3.302 | 12.90 | |

Table II

Table of selection rules.^a

| | | J | | | |
|-------------------|---|------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------|
| | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| even ^b | S | $1^1S_0^1$ | $3^3S_1^1$ | | |
| | P | $1^3P_0^1$ | $1^3P_1^0$ $3^1P_1^1$ | $1^3P_2^1$ | |
| | S | | $3^3D_1^0$ | $3^3D_2^0$ $1^1D_2^0$ | $3^3D_3^0$ |
| odd ^c | P | $3^1S_0^1$ | $1^3S_1^1$ | | |
| | D | $3^3P_0^0$ | $1^1P_1^0$ $3^3P_1^1$ | $3^3P_2^1$ | |
| | | | $1^3D_1^0$ $3^3D_2^0$ | $1^3D_2^0$ $3^1D_2^0$ | $1^3D_3^1$ |

^aThe notation employed for ${}^S_L J^T$ is as follows: S, is the spin state; I, the isotopic spin state; L, the orbital angular momentum; T, the transmission coefficient; J, the total angular momentum.

^bFor n = 2, the diagonal terms are removed.

^cFor n = 3, 3^3P_0 does not contribute.

IBM 650 and the selection rules as modified by Ball and Chew, we can now calculate the probabilities. How the states are selected will depend on the initial $N-\bar{N}$ state. The following results are for the case of $P-\bar{P}$ annihilations. The probabilities are given in Table III for the cases when $R = 1/(2\mu)$, $3/(4\mu)$, and $1/\mu$, where G_π is adjusted to give a multiplicity of 4.90.

At this point no mention of momentum conservation has been made, but the quantities in Table III include it in an approximate way. Fermi has calculated the statistical weight for n outgoing particles without momentum conservation, and Lepore and Stuart have calculated the same quantity with momentum conservation.¹⁹ Call these S_{nF} and S_{nLS} , respectively. By including momentum conservation, the possible final states are restricted, and this, of course, leads to a reduction of the statistical weight. Although the statistical weights have little meaning in themselves, their ratio, S_{nLS}/S_{nF} , should give the fractional reduction of the statistical weight in an absolute sense. Since the probabilities are proportional to the statistical weights, this ratio should give a good approximate evaluation of the reduction of the probability ratios. Even though the Fermi model is not as general as the present model, the fractional reduction produced should be compatible with the spirit of the present calculation.

In order to calculate this fractional reduction, it is convenient to use the explicit formulas of Lepore and Stuart which apply only to extremely relativistic particles. Of course, in the case of annihilation, all of the pions are not relativistic, but on the other hand, the effect is most pronounced for small numbers of pions, in which case the particles are at least relativistic. Further for larger multiplicities, the probabilities are small and do not greatly influence the value of the multiplicity. The explicit formulas are

Table III

Probabilities for finding a certain number, p , of pions.

| p | $P_p, R = 1/(2\mu)$ | $P_p, R = 3/(4\mu)$ | $P_p, R = 1/\mu$ |
|-----|---------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 2 | 0.024 | 0.016 | 0.014 |
| 3 | 0.151 | 0.221 | 0.236 |
| 4 | 0.260 | 0.213 | 0.190 |
| 5 | 0.220 | 0.208 | 0.235 |
| 6 | 0.174 | 0.179 | 0.144 |
| 7 | 0.091 | 0.100 | 0.104 |
| 8 | 0.046 | 0.046 | 0.055 |
| 9 | 0.018 | 0.014 | 0.017 |
| 10 | 0.008 | 0.004 | 0.005 |

$$S_{nF} = \frac{\Omega^{n-1} E^{3n-1}}{\pi^{2n} (3n-1)!}$$

and

$$S_{nLS} = \frac{\Omega^{n-1} (4n-4)! E^{3n-4}}{\pi^{2n-2} 2^{4n-4} (2n-1)! (2n-2)! (3n-4)!}$$

According to the previous remarks, we write,

$$P_n^w = P_n^{wo} \frac{S_{nLS}}{S_{nF}},$$

where P_n^w and P_n^{wo} represent the probability for finding n particles with and without including momentum conservation, respectively. It is convenient to work with,

$$\frac{P_n^w}{P_2^w} = R_2^n \frac{P_n^{wo}}{P_2^{wo}},$$

where

$$R_2^n = \frac{S_{nLS}}{S_{nF}} \frac{S_{2F}}{S_{2LS}}.$$

We find,

| | |
|----------------|--------------------|
| $R_2^2 = 1$ | $R_2^7 = 11.31$ |
| $R_2^3 = 2.45$ | $R_2^8 = 14.09$ |
| $R_2^4 = 4.26$ | $R_2^9 = 17.14$ |
| $R_2^5 = 6.19$ | $R_2^{10} = 20.28$ |
| $R_2^6 = 8.72$ | |

C. Multiplicity

As seen in Section III E, the probabilities depend on two parameters, R and G , which in Table III have been adjusted to give a multiplicity of 4.9. In order for the model to have any physical meaning, it should satisfy at least two sets of data. In the case of $P\bar{P}$ annihilation, these two sets are taken to be the pion multiplicity and energy spectra.

The total pion multiplicity, M , is given as

$$M(G, R) = \frac{\sum_{n=2}^N n \frac{P_n}{P_2}}{\sum_{n=2}^N \frac{P_n}{P_2}},$$

where N is the maximum number of pions that can be produced compatible with the energy, E_0 . In Fig. 3, the results of the calculations are given by plotting the multiplicity against G^2 for curves of constant R .

Since only charged annihilation events are measured experimentally, it is of interest to give probabilities for various numbers of prongs and for the charged, M^{\pm} , and uncharged, M^0 , multiplicity as well as the total multiplicity. In Table IV we give the results for the case when $M = 4.9$ with $R = 1/\mu$ and $1/(2\mu)$, where G is adjusted appropriately. Column I gives the probability of finding a given number of prongs resulting from an annihilation with a certain total number of final particles, n . Column II gives the same probability weighted to give the probability of finding a certain total number of final particles. At the bottom of Column II, we find the probabilities for finding a particular number of prongs. The probabilities given for various numbers of prongs are in agreement with the present experimental results, although the two-prong annihilation events seem to be somewhat high. The fractions of charged particles resulting from a particular mode are given in Column III. These fractions lead to the final result,

$$R = 1/(2\mu) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} M^\pm = 3.24 \\ M^0 = 1.66 \end{array} \right.$$

and

$$R = 1/\mu \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} M^\pm = 3.21 \\ M^0 = 1.69 \end{array} \right.$$

This is in agreement with the present experimental results. Given the total number of charged particles resulting from a group of annihilations, Column IV gives the fraction contributed by annihilations resulting in n final particles. These are to be compared with the probabilities given in Section IIIB, where a small difference is observed.

D. Energy Spectra

We have seen in Section IIIC that it is possible to fit the experimental data for the pion multiplicity by an appropriate choice of both G and R . In this section we shall show that the data available on the energy spectra can also be described, and leads to definite values of G and R .

The energy distribution of the pions is

$$P_p(E_0 R, \mu R; z_1) dz_1 = (6/\pi)^p G_\pi^{2p} \sum_{J,I} \sum_{l_1 \dots l_p} \frac{p!}{\prod_n N_n!} \quad (35)$$

$$\times A_{l_1}(z_1; \mu R) I(E_0 R - z_1, \mu R; l_2 \dots l_p) dz_1.$$

We have seen from Fig. 2 that $A_{l_1}(z_1; \mu R)$ is effectively zero except in a given region; thus as an approximation we take

$$I(E_0 R - z_1, \mu R; l_2 \dots l_p) \simeq I(E_0 R - \bar{z}_1, \mu R; l_2 \dots l_p).$$

Table IV

Probabilities for various prong multiplicities

| n | Column I ^a | | | | | |
|----|-----------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|
| | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 2 | 0.167 | 0.833 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 0.100 | 0.900 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 0.033 | 0.567 | 0.400 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 0.014 | 0.338 | 0.648 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 0.005 | 0.176 | 0.635 | 0.184 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 0.002 | 0.086 | 0.503 | 0.410 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | 0 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.700 | 0.10 | 0 |
| 9 | 0 | 0 | 0.05 | 0.500 | 0.450 | 0 |
| 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.15 | 0.60 | 0.15 |

^aI am indebted to B. Desai, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, University of California, Berkeley for supplying these numbers. Those for n = 8, 9, and 10 are estimates.

Table IV cont.

Table IV (Continued)

| Column II | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| n | R = 1/(2μ) | | | | | | R = 1/μ | | | | | |
| | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 2 | 0.004 | 0.020 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.002 | 0.012 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 0.015 | 0.136 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.024 | 0.212 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 0.009 | 0.147 | 0.104 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.006 | 0.108 | 0.076 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 0.003 | 0.074 | 0.143 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.003 | 0.079 | 0.152 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 0.001 | 0.031 | 0.110 | 0.032 | 0 | 0 | 0.001 | 0.025 | 0.091 | 0.026 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 0 | 0.008 | 0.046 | 0.037 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.009 | 0.052 | 0.043 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | 0 | 0.005 | 0.005 | 0.032 | 0.005 | 0 | 0 | 0.006 | 0.006 | 0.037 | 0.006 | 0 |
| 9 | 0 | 0 | 0.001 | 0.009 | 0.008 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.001 | 0.009 | 0.007 | 0 |
| 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.001 | 0.005 | 0.001 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.001 | 0.003 | 0.001 |
| Total | 0.032 | 0.421 | 0.409 | 0.111 | 0.018 | 0.001 | 0.036 | 0.451 | 0.378 | 0.116 | 0.016 | 0.001 |

Table IV (Cont.)

Table IV (Continued)

| Column III | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----|
| n | R = 1/(2μ) | | | | | | R = 1/μ | | | | | |
| | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |
| 2 | 0 | 0.020 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.012 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 0 | 0.091 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.141 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 0.074 | 0.104 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.054 | 0.076 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 0 | 0.030 | 0.115 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.032 | 0.122 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 0 | 0.010 | 0.073 | 0.032 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.008 | 0.060 | 0.026 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 0 | 0.002 | 0.026 | 0.032 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.003 | 0.030 | 0.037 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | 0 | 0.001 | 0.003 | 0.024 | 0.005 | 0 | 0 | 0.002 | 0.003 | 0.028 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.006 | 0.008 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.006 | 0.007 | 0 |
| 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.001 | 0.004 | 0.001 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 0 | 0.228 | 0.321 | 0.095 | 0.017 | 0.001 | 0 | 0.252 | 0.291 | 0.097 | 0.015 | 0 |

Table IV (Continued)

| Column IV | | |
|-----------|----------------|-------------|
| n | $R = 1/(2\mu)$ | $R = 1/\mu$ |
| | 0.030 | 0.018 |
| | 0.138 | 0.216 |
| | 0.269 | 0.198 |
| | 0.219 | 0.236 |
| | 0.174 | 0.144 |
| | 0.091 | 0.107 |
| | 0.050 | 0.060 |
| | 0.021 | 0.020 |
| | 0.009 | 0 |

This allows us to calculate these quantities on the IBM-650 computer in exactly the same way as was done for the actual probabilities. In this case we obtain the energy spectra as a superposition of the energy dependences of the various angular-momentum functions. The coefficients are determined primarily by the values of the $I(E_0 R - \bar{E}_1, \mu R; l_2 \dots l_p)$ and by the fact that we have

$$P_p(E_0 R; \mu R) = \int_{\mu R}^{\infty} P_p(E_0 R, \mu R; z_1) dz_1 .$$

The resulting kinetic-energy distributions, $P(E_0 R, \mu R; \omega)$, are plotted in Fig. 4 for $R = 1/(2\mu)$, $3/(4\mu)$, and $1/\mu$. The calculations become quite tedious for $R > 3/(4\mu)$ and the curve for $R = 1/\mu$ is estimated by assuming that the increase in higher angular momentum states is linear. Although this is not correct, the curve for $R = 1/\mu$ should not be too different from that calculated explicitly. For the total spectra, the actual contributions are

$$P\left(\frac{E_0}{2\mu}, \frac{1}{2}; \omega\right) d\omega = \frac{1}{2\mu} \left[7.59 A_0\left(\omega; \frac{1}{2}\right) + 2.29 A_1\left(\omega; \frac{1}{2}\right) \right.$$

$$\left. + 0.27 A_2\left(\omega; \frac{1}{2}\right) + 0.01 A_3\left(\omega; \frac{1}{2}\right) \right] d\omega ,$$

$$P\left(\frac{3E_0}{4\mu}, \frac{3}{4}; \omega\right) d\omega = \frac{3}{4\mu} \left[5.58 A_0\left(\omega; \frac{3}{4}\right) + 4.16 A_1\left(\omega; \frac{3}{4}\right) \right.$$

$$\left. + 2.14 A_2\left(\omega; \frac{3}{4}\right) + 0.69 A_3\left(\omega; \frac{3}{4}\right) + 0.11 A_4\left(\omega; \frac{3}{4}\right) \right] d\omega ,$$

and

$$P\left(\frac{E_0}{\mu}, 1; \omega\right) d\omega = \frac{1}{\mu} \left[4.41 A_0(\omega; 1) + 5.23 A_1(\omega; 1) \right.$$

$$\left. + 3.22 A_2(\omega; 1) + 1.09 A_3(\omega; 1) + 0.17 A_4(\omega; 1) \right] d\omega ,$$

which are normalized as, $\int P(E_0 R, \mu R; \omega) d\omega = 1 .$

These distributions are to be compared with the recent experimental data of Horwitz et al.,²⁰ Agnew,²¹ and Goldhaber et al.²² in Fig. 5. Although the experimental data has a range in incident energy of from 0 to 500 Mev, the fractional change in the total energy in the barycentric system is small, and it is reasonable to compare our calculations with their data. It should be pointed out that the data presented is the charged-pion spectra, while the curves in Fig. 4 are for both charged and uncharged pions. However, as mentioned in Section III C, the probabilities for charged and uncharged pions do not differ appreciably, and thus, within the framework of the present model, we can expect their spectra to be essentially the same. The data of Goldhaber et al. includes only 4- and 6-prong events, but the effect of the 2-prong events should be small, just raising slightly the intermediate section of the histogram (300 to 600 Mev). The comparison shows that the results of the choice $R = 1/p$ give a good representation of the data, particularly for that of Goldhaber et al., where the statistics are best.

It is interesting to note, however, that the characteristic feature of the lower-energy data is found in the height of the distribution at the most probable kinetic energy 175 Mev. If this has statistical significance, it can possibly be related to the selection rules in the angular momentum states. It has been pointed out that for annihilations at rest the predominant angular momentum states contributing are S or P.²³ Thus we should expect a relative increase in S and P state pions which will have the effect in the theoretical curves of raising the maximum while reducing the intermediate and tail regions.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

As pointed out in the introduction, the nucleon-antinucleon interaction shows two primary effects, viz., an "anomalously" large total cross section and pion multiplicity. However, the data on the total and elastic cross sections can be understood, as shown by the work of Ball and Chew,⁹ in much the same way as the nucleon-nucleon interaction in the energy range where the use of the WKB approximation is justified. The present paper shows that it is also possible to understand the data available concerning the pion multiplicity as well as the data concerning the energy spectra of the emitted pions, while still maintaining that the interaction takes place in a volume characterized by a radius of one pion Compton wave length. This is accomplished by making two physical assumptions. The first of these is that only those partial waves with a transmission coefficient of one, as obtained from the results of the calculations of Ball and Chew, will contribute to the production of pions. This has the effect of restricting the number of possible initial states as seen in Table II. The other consists of including, in an approximate way, the momentum dependence of the matrix elements involved in the annihilation reaction. This momentum dependence strongly influences the probability of finding a particular number of pions with assigned values of the angular momentum, and thus is the essential feature in obtaining the theoretical energy spectra.

In connection with these remarks it is of some interest to estimate the relative importance of these two physical characteristics, viz., the matrix element is momentum-dependent, and only certain partial waves are annihilated. If we ignore the momentum dependence, then in accordance with the remarks in Section II we have a one-parameter model with an effective volume of

$\Omega(R, G) = G^2 \left(\frac{4}{3} \pi R^3 \right)$. However, using the curves in Fig. 3, we see that this effective volume varies; in fact, to produce a multiplicity of 4.9, we have for $\Omega(R, G)$

$$\Omega\left(\frac{1}{\mu}, 6\right) = 6\Omega_0$$

$$\Omega\left(\frac{1}{2\mu}, 12\right) = 1.3\Omega_0$$

$$\Omega\left(\frac{3}{4\mu}, 8\right) = 4.2\Omega_0$$

$$\Omega\left(\frac{1}{3\mu}, 19\right) = 0.4\Omega_0$$

where $\Omega_0 = \frac{4}{3} \pi (1/\mu)^3$. It seems reasonable to assume that these differences are primarily due to the restrictions on the annihilating partial waves, since the momentum dependence has been removed. However, using the Fermi model to give a multiplicity of approximately five, we must have $\Omega \sim 10 \Omega_0$. Because we have taken into account approximately the effect of the partial waves, it appears that the discrepancy between $10 \Omega_0$ and the figures given above is due to the inclusion of the momentum dependence of the matrix element. Therefore, we see that for $R \sim 1/\mu$ the two physical characteristics both produce about the same effect, i. e., to reduce the effective volume, but for $R \leq 3/(4\mu)$ the restrictions on the annihilating partial waves become the predominant feature.

There remain two problems in meson-producing annihilations which should be investigated. Recently, measurements have been made on the angular correlation of the pions; in particular, the angles between the emitted pions have been measured in two charge combinations.²⁴ On the basis of momentum conservation, it is possible to obtain the angular distribution of these angles, neglecting the charges. In the pairing by unlike charges one finds approximate agreement with the theoretical curves, but for the like charges a marked disagreement appears. It has been suggested that this phenomena may be the result of a final-state pion-pion interaction, but it has also been pointed out that the effect of the Bose statistics should not be overlooked. This question is being investigated

in order to determine whether or not there is evidence for a π - π interaction. Our calculations do not include such an effect, but one should expect that even a final-state interaction would not change the results in Section III in an essential way since the correlation functions given by Kalogeropoulos are not very different for the two charge combinations.²⁴

The second problem to be investigated is that of strange-particle production. The present experimental data show that approximately 5% of the annihilations involve K particles, this factor depending slightly on the incident energy. Although the interaction model can treat K-particle production, the results would not be definitive and have not been treated in this paper. At present, essentially no information is available concerning the energy spectra of pions produced with K particles in annihilation. Thus we have only one piece of data to fit two parameters. If it were possible to relate the coupling strength, G , to the various coupling constants in field theory, then it would be possible to estimate the effect on the basis of present data. For example, if one were to assume some relation between the G values and the field-theory coupling constants, and that the form of the π -N and K-N interactions were the same, then G_K would be approximately known, and the radius for K-particle production would then be chosen to agree with the experimental data.

As indicated in Section II, the present model can be used to treat any production problem, and it may be of some interest to examine the data available on pion production in N-N collisions. It is known that the Fermi model does not give remarkably good agreement with the experimental data, and it is to be hoped that the same parameters would satisfy the N-N data as have satisfied the N- \bar{N} data.

APPENDIX

We wish to evaluate

$$I = I(E_0 R, \mu R; l_1 \dots l_p) = \int_{\mu R}^{\infty} dz_1 \dots \int_{\mu R}^{\infty} dz_p \delta(E_0 R - z_1 - \dots - z_p) \\ \times H_{l_1} \dots H_{l_p} \exp \left\{ - \left[\frac{z_1 - \bar{z}_1}{a_1} \right]^2 \right\} \dots \exp \left\{ - \left[\frac{z_p - \bar{z}_p}{a_p} \right]^2 \right\} .$$

We begin by noticing

$$I \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dz_1 \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dz_p H_{l_1} \exp \left\{ - \frac{z_1 - \bar{z}_1}{a_1} \right\}^2 \dots H_{l_p} \exp \left\{ - \frac{z_p - \bar{z}_p}{a_p} \right\}^2 \\ \times \delta(E_0 R - z_1 - \dots - z_p) ,$$

and thus we have

$$I = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty - i\epsilon}^{\infty - i\epsilon} da \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dz_1 \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dz_p e^{ia(RE_0 - z_1 - \dots - z_p)} \\ \times H_{l_1} \exp \left\{ - \left[\frac{z_1 - \bar{z}_1}{a_1} \right]^2 \right\} \dots H_{l_p} \exp \left\{ - \left[\frac{z_p - \bar{z}_p}{a_p} \right]^2 \right\} ;$$

$\epsilon > 0$.

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \frac{1}{2\pi} H_{f_1} \dots H_{f_p} \int_{-\infty-i\epsilon}^{\infty-i\epsilon} da e^{iaRE_0} \\
 &\quad \times \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dz_1 \exp \left[-(z_1/a_1)^2 - ia(z_1 + \bar{z}_1) \right] \dots \\
 &\quad \times \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dz_p \exp \left[-(z_p/a_p)^2 - ia(z_p + \bar{z}_p) \right] \\
 &= \frac{1}{2\pi} H_{f_1} \dots H_{f_p} \int_{-\infty-i\epsilon}^{\infty-i\epsilon} da e^{-ia(RE_0 - z_1 - \dots - \bar{z}_p)} \\
 &\quad \times \exp \left[-(\alpha a_1/2)^2 - \dots - (\alpha a_p/2)^2 \right] \\
 &\quad \times \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dz_1 \exp \left[-\left(\frac{z_1}{a_1} + \frac{iaa_1}{2} \right)^2 \right] \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dz_p \exp \left[-\left(\frac{z_p}{a_p} + \frac{iaa_p}{2} \right)^2 \right] \\
 &= \frac{1}{2\pi} H_{f_1} \dots H_{f_p} \int_{-\infty-i\epsilon}^{\infty-i\epsilon} da \exp \left[-ia(RE_0 - \bar{z}_1 - \dots - \bar{z}_p \right. \\
 &\quad \left. - (\alpha^2/4)(a_1^2 + \dots + a_p^2) \right] \pi^{p/2} a_1 \dots a_p \\
 &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \pi^{p/2} H_{f_1} a_1 \dots H_{f_p} a_p \exp \left[\frac{-(RE_0 - \bar{z}_1 - \dots - \bar{z}_p)^2}{a_1^2 + \dots + a_p^2} \right] \\
 &\quad \times \int_{-\infty-i\epsilon}^{\infty-i\epsilon} da \exp \left\{ - \left[\frac{a}{2} \sqrt{a_1^2 + \dots + a_p^2} \right. \right. \\
 &\quad \left. \left. + \frac{i(RE_0 - \bar{z}_1 - \dots - \bar{z}_p)}{\sqrt{a_1^2 + \dots + a_p^2}} \right]^2 \right\} \dots
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \pi^{p/2} H_{l_1}^{a_1} \dots H_{l_p}^{a_p} \exp \left[\frac{-(RE_0 - \bar{z}_1 - \dots - \bar{z}_p)^2}{a_1^2 + \dots + a_p^2} \right] \\
 &\quad \times \frac{2\sqrt{\pi}}{\sqrt{a_1^2 + \dots + a_p^2}} \\
 &= \frac{A_{l_1}(\mu R) \dots A_{l_p}(\mu R)}{\sqrt{\pi}} \\
 &\quad \times \frac{\exp \left\{ - \left[\frac{RE_0 - \bar{z}_1 - \dots - \bar{z}_p}{\sqrt{a_1^2 + \dots + a_p^2}} \right]^2 \right\}}{\sqrt{a_1^2 + \dots + a_p^2}}
 \end{aligned}$$

which is the desired result.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to Dr. Lewis Agnew and Drs. Gerson and Sulamith Goldhaber for furnishing their unpublished experimental results, and to Mrs. Marjory Simmons for her help with the IBM-650 computer.


LEGENDS



- Fig. 1. $K_l(kR)$ vs. kR for $l = 0, 1, \text{ and } 2$.
- Fig. 2. (a) $A_l(z, l)$ vs. z for $l = 0, 1, 2, \text{ and } 3$ (solid curve) with comparison to Gaussian approximation for $l = 0$ and 3 (dashed curve).
(b) $A_l(z, 1/2)$ vs. z for $l = 0, 1, \text{ and } 2$.
- Fig. 3. Multiplicity vs. G^2 for constant R values.
- Fig. 4. Energy spectra as a function of the barycentric pion kinetic energy for $R = 1/\mu, 3/(4\mu), 1/(2\mu)$, with G values chosen to give a multiplicity of 4.9.
- Fig. 5. (a) Spectra data of Horwitz et al.;²⁰ 6 events at an average incident energy of 50 Mev and 75 events at rest. (b) Spectra data of Agnew;²¹ 100 events at an average incident energy of 80 Mev and 30 events at rest. (c) Four- and six-prong spectra data of Goldhaber et al.;²² 450 events at an average incident energy of 450 Mev and essentially no events at rest.

FOOTNOTES


1. Chamberlain, Segré, Wiegand, and Ypsilantis, *Phys. Rev.* 100, 947 (1955).
2. Chamberlain, Chupp, Ekspong, Goldhaber, Goldhaber, Lofgren, Segre, Wiegand, Amaldi, Baroni, Castagnoli, Franzinetti, and Manfredini, *Phys. Rev.* 102, 921 (1956).
3. Agnew, Chamberlain, Keller, Mermod, Roger, Steiner, and Wiegand, *Phys. Rev.* 108, 1545 (1957).
4. Goldhaber, Kalogeropoulos, and Silberberg, *Phys. Rev.* 110, 1474 (1958).
5. Chamberlain, Goldhaber, Jauneau, Kalogeropoulos, Segre, and Silberberg, *Phys. Rev.* 113, 1615 (1959).
6. Enrico Fermi, *Progr. Theoret. Phys.* 5, 570 (1950).
7. We always take $\hbar = c = 1$, and μ is the pion rest mass.
8. Z. Koba and G. Takeda, *Progr. Theoret. Phys.* 19, 269 (1958).
9. J. S. Ball and G. Chew, *Phys. Rev.* 109, 1385 (1958); J. S. Ball and J. Fulco, *Phys. Rev.* 113, 647 (1959).
10. Ziro Koba, *Progr. Theoret. Phys.* 19, 594 (1958).
11. Bhabha has argued in a similar fashion, although in a slightly different sense; see H. J. Ehabha, *Proc. Roy. Soc., A*, 219, 293 (1953).
12. R. Gatto, *Nuovo cimento* 3, 468 (1956).
13. George Sudarshan, *Phys. Rev.* 103, 777 (1956).
14. S. Z. Belen'kii and I. S. Rozental', *Soviet Physics (JETP)* 3, 786 (1956).
15. Although not explicitly written out, such integrals are always considered to include sums over the various spin spaces.
16. Again, since we will work with ratios, we have dropped a factor of R .
17. Charles Goebel, *Phys. Rev.* 103, 258 (1956).

18. T. D. Lee and C. N. Yang, *Nuovo cimento* 3, 749 (1956).
19. J. Lepore and R. N. Stuart, *Phys. Rev.* 94, 1724 (1954); see also Richard H. Milburn, *Revs. Modern Phys.* 27, 1 (1955).
20. Horwitz, Miller, Murray, and Tripp, *Low-Energy Antiproton Interactions in Hydrogen and Deuterium*, UCRL-8591, January 7, 1959.
21. Lewis Agnew, *Antiproton Interactions in Hydrogen and Carbon Below 200 Mev* (Thesis) UCRL-8785, July 1959.
22. Goldhaber, Fowler, Goldhaber, Hoang, Kalogeropoulos, Powell, *Pion-Pion Correlations in Antiproton Annihilation Events*, UCRL-8814, July 14, 1959, and private communication. The experimental histogram consists of at least 80% hydrogen events. Details concerning the selected sample are available in the paper quoted.
23. Day, Snow, and Sucher, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 3, 61 (1959).
24. Theodore Kalogeropoulos, *A Study of the Antiproton Annihilation Process In Complex Nuclei* (Thesis), UCRL-8677, March 6, 1959; see also reference 19.









z Fig 2



7/21



8841 K



T_{π} (Mev)

Fig. 55