Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

Recent Work

Title

ANALYSIS OF PION-NUCLEON SCATTERING UP TO 10 GeV/c

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7k6258s9>

Author

Hendry, Archibald W.

Publication Date

1978-02-01

Submitted to Physical Review Letters

LBL-7524 C.2
Preprint

ANALYSIS OF PION-NUCLEON SCATTERING UP TO 10 GeV/c

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

Archibald W. Hendry

February 24, 1978

Prepared for the U. S. Department of Energy
under Contract W-7405-ENG-48

LBL-7524 C.2

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.

0

ANALYSIS OF PION-NUCLEON SCATTERING UP TO 10 GeV/c

Archibald W. Hendry^{*}Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory
University of California, Berkeley, California 94720

and

Physics Department[†]
Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47401

February 24, 1978

ABSTRACT

We have analyzed pion-nucleon elastic scattering data from 1.6 GeV/c up to 10 GeV/c. The analysis makes use of a physical impact parameter picture as an intermediate step. Many of the resulting partial wave amplitudes show structure in their Argand plots. These are discussed in terms of possible high spin resonances.

^{*} Participating Guest: Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory.

[†] Permanent Address.

This note reports the results of a detailed analysis of pion-nucleon scattering. The analysis was carried out over a wide range of energies, overlapping with previous analyses¹⁻⁴ at the lower end, but extending well beyond them up to 10 GeV/c. The aim of the investigation was to see whether there was any evidence for any new high mass resonances. Such states are predicted by almost all present theories of hadronic states, either as members of Regge families or as higher excitations of constituents, but none so far have been seen. We find that the partial waves which emerge from this analysis do indeed show interesting resonance-like behavior. Assuming a resonance plus background approximation, we extract corresponding values of masses and widths. These values should be important for future comparison with theoretical models.

It should be understood that this analysis is not a complete re-analysis of pion-nucleon scattering going all the way up from threshold. Rather, the emphasis is on looking at data above the region which has been thoroughly analyzed before, in the hope of detecting the more prominent resonances, should any exist. We do however choose an overlap region ($p_{lab} = 1.6$ to 2.74 GeV/c) so that our analysis can be compared with the other analyses there, and at the same time provide a guideline for our extension to higher energies.

The actual laboratory momenta at which the analysis was carried out were 1.6, 1.8, 1.99, 2.19, 2.30, 2.39, 2.50, 2.74, 3.0, 3.5, 4.0, 5.0, 6.0 and 10.0 GeV/c. The data at the higher momenta

are probably more plentiful than one might realize, though of course their total amount is small compared to the wealth of data in the more-investigated lower region. For the beam momenta mentioned above 2.74 GeV/c, there are $\pi^\pm p$ differential cross-section measurements over all or most of the angular range, with some polarizations near the forward and usually also the backward direction. There are less CEX data, but for all momenta there are differential cross-sections at least in the forward and backward directions, and polarizations in the forward direction. In addition, we take the amplitudes at $\theta = 0^\circ$ as given from forward dispersion relations.⁵

A study of the data indicates that much is happening in this higher energy domain. It is true that the shapes of the differential cross-sections and polarizations near the forward direction have more or less settled down (apart from some gradual shrinkage) to what are known to be their shapes all the way up to Fermilab energies. However, in the intermediate angle range, there are several deep valleys which develop and then go away as the energy increases. Also, we mention the oscillations in the $\pi^\pm p$ and CEX differential cross-sections at 180° that have been known for some time. Perhaps strangest of all is the polarization in the vicinity of the backward direction (the polarization of course vanishes identically at 180°), which at first sight seems to fluctuate rather wildly as the energy is changed. We have tried to keep these experimental features in mind as we performed the analysis since part of our aim was to understand how these features came about from the contributing partial waves.

This analysis also has a new approach, in the sense that we did not follow the canonical way of many partial wave analyses, which usually is to parametrize the individual phase shifts $\delta_{\ell\pm}$ and inelasticities $\eta_{\ell\pm}$ for each orbital angular momentum and isospin. This way becomes less practical as the number of partial waves that have to be included increases (at 10 GeV/c, partial waves up through at least $\ell = 25$ have to be included). Instead, we chose to do the analysis in two steps.

The first step is to attempt to fit the data on the basis of a reasonable physical model. This model incorporates features that are generally believed to describe the general picture of hadronic scattering: namely, one in which much of the scattering can be understood in terms of a substantial diffraction component, together with a smaller contribution from peripheral scattering. To perform the first step therefore, we adopted an impact parameter type of representation into which these features can be easily built. For example, we may write

$$\text{Im}(kf_\ell) = A e^{-Bb^2} + [D + (-1)^{\ell+1} E] e^{-C(b-r)^2}, \quad (1)$$

where $b = \ell/k$. A sum over ℓ is retained in the full amplitude, not an integral over b . The two parts on the right hand side of (1) have a clear physical interpretation. Actually this is a tremendous advantage since one can quickly develop a feeling for appropriate values of the parameters. For instance, A and B in (1) above are determined essentially by the size and slope of the forward

diffraction peaks in elastic π^+p scattering, while r is approximately 1 fermi for both. With a little thought, good guesses can be made for many of the parameters. Moreover, these b-space parameters do not change much from energy to energy (even though the individual l -partial waves change), which is clearly advantageous for continuity and stability.

The main hope of this first step is that it will provide values of the real and imaginary parts of $kf_{l\pm}$ ($l = 3/2$ and $1/2$) which are fairly close to the correct ones. This will be true if our physical picture of diffraction plus peripheral scattering is a good one. The second step in our analysis was therefore to let the individual partial waves vary freely around their values determined in the first step, but the final values of the partial waves were never far from the values obtained in Step 1. Our solution seems to be a stable one, though we did not search everywhere in partial wave amplitude space to check on the possibility of others.

This two-step procedure was tested over the lower momentum range 1.6 to 2.74 GeV/c, and the resulting partial wave amplitudes compared with the Saclay '74 values¹ (available from the Particle Data Group⁶). The agreement was very reasonable (since we incorporated data that have only recently become available, perfect agreement was not expected).

Fortified by these lower energy fits, we proceeded to the higher energies. This is where the strength of our method becomes clearer. For the same number of parameters $A, B, \dots$, we can include as many partial waves as are necessary in Step 1. It is only in Step

2 that a large number of parameters needs to be varying simultaneously. (Perhaps our approach may be practical in analyzing other scattering processes when one proceeds to higher energies and where the quality of the data is deteriorating; compared to standard methods, our procedure is quick and can be done with only moderate computing facilities.)

The final product of an analysis of this kind is a long table of partial wave amplitudes and many Argand diagrams. A report, with full details of all the amplitudes, is in preparation. Here we illustrate our results with a few Argand diagrams. Figure 1 shows the partial wave behavior for the $f_{l+}(l = 3/2)$ waves $H_{3,11}$, $K_{3,15}$ and $M_{3,19}$; the $f_{l-}(l = 3/2)$ waves $G_{3,7}$, $H_{3,9}$ and $I_{3,11}$; the $f_{l+}(l = 1/2)$ waves $G_{1,9}$ and $I_{1,13}$; and the $f_{l-}(l = 1/2)$ waves $H_{1,9}$, $I_{1,11}$, $K_{1,13}$, and $M_{1,17}$. Most of these clearly show resonance-like loops. For the higher partial waves, the Argand diagrams are essentially of two types. The $f_{l+}(l = 3/2)$ and $f_{l-}(l = 1/2)$ amplitudes typically first develop positive real parts, but then get overtaken by a slowly varying "background" (coming from the diffractive component in the particular partial wave; it has a growing negative real part and a growing positive imaginary part). This "background" component is stronger in the case of the $f_{l-}(l = 3/2)$ and $f_{l+}(l = 1/2)$ amplitudes so that the higher partial waves take off towards negative real values in the Argand diagrams. The latter waves show much less structure and less can be said about them.

It is a matter of dispute as to whether loops in Argand diagrams correspond to resonances or not. However, if they are

interpreted as resonances, we obtain the values shown in Table 1 for their masses, widths and elasticities. These numbers were deduced by assuming a Breit-Wigner shape multiplied by a phase factor, plus a smooth background. Generally speaking, however, the resonance parameters are determined by the first half of the resonance since the resonance quickly becomes submerged in the background as the energy increases. The ranges within which we believe the resonance parameters lie, are also indicated in the Table.

Plots of the resonance spins j against the mass M , the mass squared and the pion-nucleon c.m. momentum k show that these resonances fall on effective linear trajectories of the form $j \sim kR$, with R about 1 Fermi. In a sense, this is not surprising since it is expected in various theoretical models. However, we stress that it is necessitated by the data, such as π^+p crossover, the shape of $d\sigma/dt(\pi^+p)$ near the backward direction etc. We also find that the peripheral partial waves play an important part in explaining some of the more subtle experimental features observed in the 1.6 to 10 GeV/c region. For example, the π^+p polarizations near the backward direction which as mentioned earlier vary quite rapidly with energy, can be shown to arise⁷ from alternate constructive and destructive interference between successive peripheral waves (which change sign with increasing ℓ) and a slowly varying piece from the lower partial waves. We expect our results to be general features of other analyses over this energy region.

I would like to thank Charles R. Ellis for assistance in computing. I also wish to thank Professors G. Chew and J. D. Jackson for the hospitality of the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory. This work was supported in part by the U. S. Department of Energy.

REFERENCES

1. R. Ayed and P. Bareyre, private communication to the Particle Data Group (1974).
2. R. E. Cutkosky, R. E. Hendrick and R. L. Kelly, Phys. Rev. Lett. 37, 645 (1976).
3. D. M. Chew and M. Urban, Proceedings of the Topical Conference on Baryon Resonances (eds. R. T. Ross and D. H. Saxon), Oxford (1976), p. 156.
4. E. Pietarinen, Proceedings of the Topical Conference on Baryon Resonances (eds. R. T. Ross and D. H. Saxon), Oxford (1976), p. 20. This analysis is also being done up to 10 GeV/c.
5. G. Höhler, H. P. Jakob and R. Kaiser, Tables of Pion-Nucleon Forward Amplitudes, University of Karlsruhe (1976); R. E. Hendrick and B. Lautrap, Phys. Rev. D11, 529 (1975).
6. We thank Dr. R. Kelly for forwarding these to us.
7. F. Halzen, M. G. Olsson and A. Yokosawa, Nucl. Phys. B113, 269 (1970) have also suggested the importance of the peripheral waves for these data, based on the Saclay 1974 results (Ref. 1).

FIGURE CAPTION

Fig. 1: Argand diagrams for a selection of partial waves.

		Mass (GeV)		Full Width(GeV)		Elasticity	
		$M \pm \Delta M$		$\Gamma \pm \Delta \Gamma$		$x \pm \Delta x$	
$f_{\ell+}^{3/2}$	G_{39}	2.20	0.10	0.45	0.20	0.10	0.03
	$H_{3,11}$	2.40	0.06	0.46	0.10	0.11	0.02
	$I_{3,13}$	2.65	0.10	0.50	0.10	0.05	0.01
	$K_{3,15}$	2.85	0.10	0.70	0.20	0.03	0.01
	$L_{3,17}$	3.30	0.20	1.10	0.30	0.03	0.01
	$M_{3,19}$	3.70	0.20	1.30	0.40	0.025	0.01
	$N_{3,21}$	4.1	0.3	1.6	0.5	0.018	0.01
$f_{\ell-}^{3/2}$	G_{37}	2.28	0.08	0.40	0.15	0.09	0.02
	H_{39}	2.45	0.10	0.50	0.20	0.08	0.02
	$I_{3,11}$	2.85	0.15	0.70	0.20	0.06	0.02
	$K_{3,13}$	3.2	0.2	1.0	0.3	0.045	0.02
$f_{\ell+}^{1/2}$	G_{19}	2.2	0.1	0.35	0.10	0.09	0.02
$f_{\ell-}^{1/2}$	G_{17}	2.14	0.04	0.27	0.05	0.16	0.04
	H_{19}	2.30	0.10	0.45	0.15	0.12	0.04
	$I_{1,11}$	2.70	0.10	0.90	0.10	0.08	0.02
	$K_{1,13}$	3.00	0.10	0.90	0.15	0.07	0.02
	$L_{1,15}$	3.50	0.20	1.3	0.2	0.055	0.02
	$M_{1,17}$	3.80	0.20	1.6	0.2	0.040	0.015
	$N_{1,19}$	4.1	0.2	1.9	0.3	0.030	0.015

Table 1. Resonance parameters

XBL 783-437

Fig. 1

This report was done with support from the Department of Energy. Any conclusions or opinions expressed in this report represent solely those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of The Regents of the University of California, the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory or the Department of Energy.

TECHNICAL INFORMATION DEPARTMENT
LAWRENCE BERKELEY LABORATORY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94720