UCRL-16195 rev.

University of California

Ernest O. Lawrence Radiation Laboratory

TOTAL AND DIFFERENTIAL CROSS SECTIONS FOR $\pi^- p \rightarrow \eta n$ FROM THRESHOLD TO 1300 MeV

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.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Lawrence Radiation Laboratory
Berkeley, California

AEC Contract No. W-7405-eng-48

July 7, 1967

ERRATA

TO: All recipients of UCRL-16195 Rev

FROM: Technical Information Division

SUBJECT: UCRL-16195 Rev., "Total and Differential Cross Sections for $\pi^- p \rightarrow \eta n$ from Threshold to 1300 MeV," by W. Bruce Richards, Charles B. Chiu, Richard D. Eandi, A. Carl Helmholz, Robert W. Kenney, Burton J. Moyer, John A. Poirier, Robert J. Cence, Vincent Z. Peterson, Narender K. Sehgal, and Victor J. Stenger, April 27, 1966. (Phys. Rev. Letters 16, 26, June 27, 1966)

Please make the following corrections on subject report.

1. The lower limit of integration in Eq. (2) should read:

$$\beta^{-1}\cos(\phi_{max}/2).$$

2. The caption of Table I should be: Partial η-production cross section, ratio of η to π production, and coefficients of the Legendre-polynomial expansion of the η differential cross section, normalized to the partial production cross section. Errors given for the coefficients do not include error of normalization.

Submitted to Physical Review Letters

UCRL-16195 rev.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
Lawrence Radiation Laboratory
Berkeley, California

AEC Contract No. W-7405-eng-48

TOTAL AND DIFFERENTIAL CROSS SECTIONS FOR $\pi^- p \rightarrow \eta n$ FROM THRESHOLD TO 1300 MeV

W. Bruce Richards, Charles B. Chiu, Richard D. Eandi, A. Carl Helmholz, Robert W. Kenney, Burton J. Moyer, John A. Poirier, Robert J. Cence, Vincent Z. Peterson, Narender K. Sehgal, and Victor J. Stenger

April 27, 1966

TOTAL AND DIFFERENTIAL CROSS SECTIONS FOR $\pi^- p \rightarrow \eta n$ FROM THRESHOLD TO 1300 MeV.*

W. Bruce Richards,† Charles B. Chiu, Richard D. Eandi,‡
A. Carl Helmholtz, Robert W. Kenney,
Burton J. Moyer, and John A. Poirier.**

Lawrence Radiation Laboratory
University of California
Berkeley, California

and

Robert J. Cence, Vincent Z. Peterson,
Narender K. Sehgal, and Victor J. Stenger

University of Hawaii
Honolulu, Hawaii

April 27, 1966

We have measured the total and differential cross sections for the reaction

$$\pi^- p \rightarrow \eta n, \quad \eta \rightarrow 2\gamma \qquad (1)$$

at seven different pion energies from threshold to 1300 MeV. We find that the total cross section for (1) rises steeply from threshold to a value of nearly 1 mb at an incident-pion kinetic energy (T_{π^-}) between 655 and 704 MeV, and then falls gradually to 0.25 mb at 1300 MeV. This agrees with previous work.[1] Our η angular distributions are isotropic near threshold, but in contrast to Ref. 1, require terms through $\cos^2 \theta_\eta^*$ for an adequate fit at $T_{\pi^-} = 655$ MeV, with higher-order terms gradually appearing with increasing energy.

The experimental setup consisted of a cubic array of six steel-plate spark chambers (4π solid angle) surrounding a liquid hydrogen target at the center of a 1-m^3 cavity. Only events with neutral final particles were allowed to trigger the spark chambers. This apparatus will be described more fully elsewhere.[2]

A Monte Carlo study was made of the detection efficiency of the spark chambers for high-energy photons. For the gammas from η decay this turned out to be close to 100%.

Two-shower events were accepted for analysis when (a) each shower produced sparks in three of five consecutive gaps, (b) no sparks appeared in the first four gaps (the first four plates were 1/16-in. Al), and (c) the event appeared to originate near the target. About 3400 η events survived these selection criteria. The η events were separated from the π^0 events (from $\pi^- p \rightarrow \pi^0 n$) by means of the distribution in opening angle of the two gamma rays. Figure 1 shows the opening-angle distribution obtained at $T_{\pi^-} = 704$ MeV. Opening-angle distributions were calculated by Monte Carlo techniques for various reactions contributing to the background. A linear combination of the expected opening-angle distributions was fit to the experimental distribution by the method of least squares, yielding the relative strength of the various competing reactions. The ratio of η production to π-N charge exchange was multiplied by the charge-exchange cross section, also measured in this experiment,[2] to yield the "partial" η production cross section. This ratio is listed in Table I. The cross section is plotted in Fig. 2, along with the results from Ref. 1. The agreement is excellent. It should be emphasized that these numbers represent the "partial" production cross section for $\eta \rightarrow 2\gamma$ only.

To form the angular distribution at each energy, two-shower events were selected within opening-angle limits from 3 deg below the minimum to a maximum angle which included 75% of the η events.

We were not able to measure the relative energy of the two showers well enough to resolve the two-fold ambiguity in the η direction. Consequently, we used the angular distributions of the bisector between the two observed showers to determine the η angular distributions. If we write the distribution of bisectors

$$\left.\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega}\right|_{bis} = \sum_i A_i P_i (\cos\theta_{bis}),$$

then the true angular distribution is

$$\left.\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega}\right|_{\eta} = \sum_i (A_i/\zeta_i) P_i(\cos\theta_\eta) .$$

Here we define

$$\zeta_i = \int_{\beta^{-1}(\phi_{max}/2)}^{1} \frac{(1-\beta^2)\, x P_i(x) dx}{(1-x^2)^{1/2}(1-\beta^2 x^2)^{3/2}} , \qquad (2)$$

where ϕ_{max} is the upper limit of the opening-angle interval from which the sample was taken, and β is the c.m. velocity of the meson. Expression (2) is valid only if the γ-ray detector subtends 4π solid angle and has 100% efficiency.

Figure 3 shows the angular distributions, normalized to the partial cross sections listed in Table I.

The coefficients of the Legendre polynomial expansion of the bisector distribution were divided by the factors of Eq. (2), normalized so that $\zeta_0 = 1$, and the solid line in each graph is a plot of the new expansion, representing the true η angular distribution. Table I contains the Legendre polynomial coefficients of the η angular distribution.

These distributions may be compared with those of Ref. 1, where the production angular distributions are found to be isotropic up to $T_{\pi^-} \simeq 950$ MeV. The major difference between the two experiments is our use of six spark chambers, as opposed to only four chambers in Ref. 1. (There were no chambers above and below the hydrogen target in that work.)

In a Monte Carlo calculation we simulated both experiments for $T_{\pi^-} = 700$ MeV and found that, without the top and bottom spark chambers, the experimentally observed bisector distributions that would result from isotropic and from $(1 + \cos^2\theta)$ angular distributions are quite similar. We conclude that the authors of Ref. 1, with only enough events to subdivide the scattering solid angle into five bins, had insufficient data to detect with certainty a possible $\cos^2$ component in their angular distributions.

As the authors of Ref. 1 point out, the first two data points on a plot of production cross section vs η c.m. momentum fall closely on a straight line through the origin. Our first data point is intermediate between their two and falls near this line. This and the fact that our angular distribution at this first energy is isotropic reinforce their conclusion that η production proceeds through S-wave at threshold.

Comparison with the results of recent phase-shift analyses of elastic π-N scattering suggests strongly that the observed absorption in the π-N S_{11} state in this energy region may be explained entirely by the η production. Figure 2 shows a plot of the inelastic cross section calculated from the S_{11} absorption parameter (b_{11}) of different phase-shift analyses,[3-7] using

$$\sigma_{inel.}(S_{11}) = 0.35 \cdot \frac{2}{3} \cdot \frac{\pi}{k^2} (1 - b_{11}{}^2).$$

Here 0.35 is the branching ratio $R(\eta \rightarrow 2\gamma/\eta \rightarrow \text{all decays})$,[8] and 2/3 is an isotopic-spin projection factor. It is seen that the experimental η production and the S_{11} absorption cross section are very similar below the η peak, while above the peak the η production seems to be greater than can be explained by absorption in only the S_{11} π-nucleon state. Recently two detailed analyses have been completed, relating η production to π-N phase shifts.[9,10]

To explain our angular distributions at 655 and 704 MeV, it is sufficient to invoke S_{11}, P_{11}, and D_{13} waves, which have been found to be highly inelastic in this energy region in π-N phase-shift analyses. However, by the Minami ambiguity we could replace the D_{13} wave by a P_{13} wave.

Even though the phase-shift analysis of Bareyre et al.[4] shows that at the N*(1688) resonance F_{15} and D_{15} waves are highly absorptive, the lack of any enhancement in the η production cross section near $T_{\pi^-} = 900$ MeV plus the absence of high-order terms in the η angular distributions near this energy show that this resonance does not decay with an observable rate into the η-N channel.

FOOTNOTES AND REFERENCES

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

†Present address: Tufts University, Medford, Massachusetts 02155.

‡Present address: DESY, Hamburg, Germany.

**Present address: University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana.

1. Brandeis-Brown-Harvard-M. I. T. -Padova Collaboration, Phys. Rev. Letters 13, 486 (1964).
2. Charles B. Chiu, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory Report UCRL-16209 (Ph. D. thesis), November 1965, unpublished. See also: W. Bruce Richards, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory Report UCRL-16195 (Ph. D. thesis), November 1965, unpublished, and C. B. Chiu, R. D. Eandi, R. W. Kenney, B. J. Moyer, W. B. Richards, R. J. Cence, V. Z. Peterson, V. J. Stenger, and J. A. Poirier, Phys. Rev. (to be submitted).
3. P. Auvil, C. Lovelace, A. Donnachie, and A. T. Lee, Phys. Letters 12, 76 (1964).
4. P. Bareyre, C. Brickman, A. V. Stirling, and G. Villet, Phys. Letters 18, 342 (1965).
5. B. H. Bransden, P. J. O'Donnell, and R. G. Moorhouse, Phys. Letters 11, 339 (1964).
6. Robert J. Cence, Phys. Letters 20, 306 (1966).
7. L. David Roper, R. M. Wright, and B. T. Feld, Phys. Rev. 138B, 190 (1965).
8. A. H. Rosenfeld, A. Barbaro-Galtieri, W. H. Barkas, P. L. Bastien, J. Kirz, and M. Roos, Rev. Mod. Phys. 56, 977 (1964).

9. P. N. Dobson, Jr., "Zero Effective Range Analysis of Pion-Nucleon Reactions near the η^0 Production Threshold", Phys. Rev. (in press).

10. J. S. Ball, "The η-Nucleon Interaction and η Production in π-Nucleon Scattering" submitted to Phys. Rev.

Table I. Coefficients of Legendre polynomial expansion of the η differential cross section, normalized to the partial production cross section. Errors shown do not include error of normalization.

T_{π^-} (MeV)	$\sigma(\pi^- p \to \eta n;\ \eta \to 2\gamma)$ (mb)	η/π (%)	Coefficients (μb/sr)				
			A_0	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4
592	0.60 ± 0.06	7.8 ± 0.6	46 ± 3				
655	0.93 ± 0.08	17.1 ± 0.9	73 ± 4	7 ± 8	49 ± 14		
704	0.93 ± 0.08	19.5 ± 1.1	74 ± 3	38 ± 6	36 ± 9		
875	0.41 ± 0.06	6.4 ± 0.8	33 ± 2	16 ± 3	19 ± 5	-34 ± 9	
975	0.46 ± 0.06	15.5 ± 1.4	36 ± 2	52 ± 4	1 ± 6	-33 ± 9	
1117	0.45 ± 0.05	20.7 ± 1.6	36 ± 1	39 ± 2	-6 ± 3	-26 ± 5	
1300	0.25 ± 0.03	11.8 ± 1.1	20 ± 1	31 ± 1	9 ± 2	-21 ± 3	-20 ± 4

FIGURE LEGENDS

Fig. 1. Histogram showing the experimental opening-angle distribution at $T_{\pi^-} = 704$ MeV. The inset shows the region of the η peak with an expanded vertical scale. Events were chosen from the region between the vertical lines to form the angular distribution of the bisectors.

Fig. 2. Partial cross section for η production from this experiment and from Ref. 1, compared with the S_{11} inelastic cross section predicted by various phase-shift analyses.

Fig. 3. Partial differential cross section for η production. The dotted line is the best fit to the bisector distribution data points, and the solid line is the η differential cross section.


T = 704 MeV
Number of events
600
500
400
300
200
100
0
100
80
60
40
20
0
0 20 40 60 80 100 120 140 160 180
Center-of-mass opening angle (deg)

Fig. 1



MUB-10187

Fig. 2


T = 592 MeV
T = 655 MeV
T = 704 MeV
T = 875 MeV
T = 975 MeV
T = 1117 MeV
T = 1300 MeV
dσ/dΩ (μb/sr)
150
120
90
60
30
0
0.8
0.4
0
-0.4
-0.8
Cos θc.m.

Fig. 3

This report was prepared as an account of Government sponsored work. Neither the United States, nor the Commission, nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission:

A. Makes any warranty or representation, expressed or implied, with respect to the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of the information contained in this report, or that the use of any information, apparatus, method, or process disclosed in this report may not infringe privately owned rights; or

B. Assumes any liabilities with respect to the use of, or for damages resulting from the use of any information, apparatus, method, or process disclosed in this report.

As used in the above, "person acting on behalf of the Commission" includes any employee or contractor of the Commission, or employee of such contractor, to the extent that such employee or contractor of the Commission, or employee of such contractor prepares, disseminates, or provides access to, any information pursuant to his employment or contract with the Commission, or his employment with such contractor.