Archives

Ref.TH.1308-CERN

COMMENTS ON A_2 PRODUCTION

C. Michael and P.V. Ruuskanen *)
CERN - Geneva

ABSTRACT

We discuss the analysis of high energy A_2 production data, including comparisons with ω and f_0 production and possible $f_0 - A_2$ interference effects.

---

*) On leave from Department of Theoretical Physics University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland.

Ref.TH.1308-CERN
17 March 1971

The A_2 resonance region mass spectrum and its decay characteristics have been studied in many experiments. However, the production mechanisms have received much less attention. Now that the A_2 is seen [1)] at higher energies as a single state with a width of about 100 MeV, we feel that it is meaningful to discuss the production process. The A_2 state produced at higher energies we shall treat as the normal A_2 - to be identified with the SU(3) partner of the f_o, f_o' and $K^*(1420)$ and as the exchange degenerate partner of the ρ and g. Any narrow destructively interfering dip or splitting seen at lower energy [2)] may then be treated [*)] as a small perturbation on the dominant normal A_2 production. We shall summarize some theoretical approaches to high energy production of A_2 in $\pi N \to A_2 N$. Some specific predictions from absorbed Regge cut models and from comparisons with $\pi N \to A_2 \Delta$; $\pi N \to f_o N$; $\pi N \to \omega N$, etc., will be presented. We discuss finally the possibility of observing f_o - A_2 interferences in the reactions $\pi N \to K\bar{K}N$ and $\pi N \to K\bar{K}\Delta$ at high energy.

[*)] The nearly maximal destructive interference claimed [2)] in 3 and 7 GeV/c A_2^- production and 3 GeV/c A_2^o production requires A_2 (normal state) and $\tilde{A}_2$ (anomaly) amplitudes to be comparable in strength, coherent in spin structure and precisely related in phase. If the $\tilde{A}_2$ is produced by lower lying Regge trajectories, the splitting will go away with increasing energy but it would require additional strong phase or coherence changes to produce a large splitting at 3 _and_ 7 GeV/c and none at 17 and 20 GeV/c. However, it would be relatively easy to arrange a phase or coherence difference between A_2^+ and A_2^- production at 7 GeV/c to explain the lack of splitting for A_2^+.

PARITY EXCHANGED

General arguments $^{3)}$ give the following decomposition, valid to $O(1/s)$, into unnatural (U) and natural (N) parity exchange in terms of the A_2 density matrix elements

$$\rho_1^N = \rho_{11} + \rho_{1-1} \qquad \rho_2^N = \rho_{22} - \rho_{2-2}$$

$$\rho_0^U = \rho_{00} \qquad \rho_1^U = \rho_{11} - \rho_{1-1} \qquad \rho_2^U = \rho_{22} + \rho_{2-2}$$

where ρ_{ij} is measured in any frame with y axis normal to the production plane [such as the s channel helicity frame (SHF) or the Gottfried-Jackson frame (THF)]. Experimentally, for the 3π mode of A_2 decay, the density matrix elements can only be measured when a complete spin-parity analysis is performed to select $J^P = 2^+$ states from the background. For the $K\bar{K}$ mode, the background to the A_2 signal is much smaller. Data suggest $^{4)}$ $\rho_{11} \sim \rho_{1-1} \sim 0.5$ with all other elements small to a first approximation in the THF. This indicates a dominance of natural parity exchanges.

QUARK MODEL

In the quark model the A_2 is an $\ell = 1$ $q\bar{q}$ state so that excitation from a π meson necessitates adding angular momentum to the $q\bar{q}$ system. Arguments $^{5)}$ have been given that this angular momentum to be added will be perpendicular to the production plane in the THF. Then the resulting $q\bar{q}$ state has only helicity 0 or 1 coming from a quark spin flip in the THF and so $\rho_{2i} = 0$ for all i. Data $^{4)}$ for $\pi^- p \rightarrow A_2^- p$ confirm this suggestion.

ISOSPIN

We shall use f_0 and ρ to denote isospin 0 and 1 exchanges for convenience. Then for the amplitudes,

$$\pi^- p \longrightarrow A_2^- p = f_0 + \rho$$

$$\pi^+ p \longrightarrow A_2^+ p = f_0 - \rho$$

$$\pi^- p \longrightarrow A_2^0 n = \sqrt{2}\, \rho$$

Experimental cross-section data show 6) $\sigma^- \sim \sigma^+ \sim 2\,\sigma^0$ so that $I_f = 0$ exchanges must be dominant.

ρ, f_0 REGGE POLES

To proceed further we shall discuss the natural parity exchanges ρ and f_0 since they seem to dominate in the data. For the THF amplitudes, only $\lambda_{A_2} = 1$ contributes if the quark model argument is valid. Thus $\rho_{11} = \rho_{1-1} = 0.5$ and all other elements are zero. To discuss the structure of the helicity amplitudes and eventual absorption corrections we shall, however, discuss the SHF amplitudes.

Then for exchange of a natural parity Regge pole X in SHF amplitude $F_{if}^{\lambda_{A_2}}(n)$, where i and f are initial and final nuclear helicities and n is the over-all helicity flip, we will have $F^0 = 0$ and

$$F^1_{++}(1) = F^1_{--}(1) = \sqrt{\frac{t_0-t}{4m^2}}\; \gamma^{++}_{XNN}\, \gamma^1_{X\pi A_2}\, R(X)$$

$$F^2_{++}(2) = F^2_{--}(2) = \left(\frac{t_0-t}{4m^2}\right) \gamma^{++}_{XNN}\, \gamma^2_{X\pi A_2}\, R(X)$$

$$F^1_{+-}(2) = F^1_{-+}(0) = \left(\frac{t_0-t}{4m^2}\right) \gamma^{+-}_{XNN}\, \gamma^1_{X\pi A_2}\, R(X)$$

$$F^2_{+-}(3) = F^2_{-+}(1) = \left(\frac{t_0-t}{4m^2}\right)^{3/2} \gamma^{+-}_{XNN}\, \gamma^2_{X\pi A_2}\, R(X)$$

The ρ and f_o couplings to πA_2 can be obtained from duality considerations in the three reactions $\pi^+\pi^+ \to \pi^+\pi^+$, $\pi^+\pi^+ \to \pi^+ A_2^+$ and $\pi^+\pi^+ \to A_2^+ A_2^+$. The natural parity exchanges in each case are ρ and f_o and these must cancel in the imaginary part since doubly charged mesons are not observed. Then the $\pi^+ A_2^+$ Regge couplings of ρ and f_o must be equal, both for $\lambda(A_2) = 1$ and 2 separately : $\gamma^{\lambda}_{\rho\pi A_2} = \gamma^{\lambda}_{f_o\pi A_2}$. The $\lambda = 1$ and 2 vertices may be related from the quark model argument that they correspond to pure $\lambda = 1$ after transformation to the THF.

The ρ and f_o SHF couplings to NN are well known 7) and ρ dominates the spin flip while f_o dominates the non-flip :

$$\gamma^{++}_{f_oNN} \sim 5\gamma^{++}_{\rho NN} \qquad \gamma^{+-}_{f_oNN} \sim -.1\,\gamma^{+-}_{\rho NN}$$

$$\gamma^{+-}_{\rho NN} \sim -5\,\gamma^{++}_{\rho NN} .$$

A further difference arises from the signature factors $R(f_o) = (1 + e^{-i\pi\alpha})R$ and $R(\rho) = (-1 + e^{-i\pi\alpha})R$.

Then the dominant contribution will be the f_o contribution to $F(1)$ since it has a large residue and a small power of $(t - t_o)$. The next most important contributions come from the ρ in $F(1)$, $F(2)$ and $F(0)$. The ρ contribution to the cross-section should then be much smaller than the f_o contribution although possible contributions from cuts in $F^1_{-+}(0)$ make this somewhat model dependent. With ρ and f_o out of phase by 90°, the cross-section data quoted previously give $|f|^2 \sim 3|\rho|^2$ for the averaged contributions. This is quite consistent with our discussion. Also all pole amplitudes vanish in the forward direction in agreement with $d\sigma/dt$ data 4),8) that show a forward turn-over.

REGGE CUT MODIFICATIONS

Since the Pomeron is assumed to conserve s channel helicity, the characteristics of absorption corrections are simpler to discuss in the SHF. Thus for ρ and f_o, no contributions will arise to ρ_{oo} even after absorption. The major change will be to the amplitude $F^1_{-+}(0)$, which has a factor $(t-t_o)$ for a factorizing Regge pole, whereas the cut correction is non-zero at $t = 0$. This cut contribution will have $I_t = 1$. We then predict that at the forward direction the cross-section for A_2^o production is twice as large as for $A_2^{\pm}$ production. Thus the forward dip in A_2^o production should be less sharp than in $A_2^{\pm}$ production.

The effect of such a ρ cut in $F^1_{-+}(0)$ on the density matrix elements should be larger for A_2^o production than for $A_2^{\pm}$ production since the $I_t = 1$ relative contributions are different. When transformed to the THF, the cut will also enter the amplitudes with $\lambda_{A_2} = 0$ and 2. A measure of the cut contribution is then ρ_{oo} in the THF and this is $\lesssim 0.1$ for present $A_2^{\pm}$ production data. The contribution to ρ_{2o} and ρ_{22} should be smaller than that to ρ_{oo} while ρ_{1o} and ρ_{21} receive contributions from cut-pole interference and could be more significantly modified.

At $t = -0.6$ GeV^2 the ρ Regge pole amplitudes vanish while those for f_o do not. Thus no dip is expected in $\pi^{\pm}p \rightarrow A_2^{\pm}p$ at this value of momentum transfer while for $\pi^- p \rightarrow A_2^o n$ the pole amplitudes are zero so that a dip is expected in a weak cut model. For the strong cut or Michigan model, however, zeros are anticipated 9) in single flip amplitudes at $t = -0.6$ GeV^2 irrespective of the pole signature. Since we have argued that $\pi^{\pm}p \rightarrow A_2^{\pm}p$ is dominated by single flip, this would lead to such a dip at -0.6 GeV^2 although present data 8) give no indication of any such structure. For $\pi^- p \rightarrow A_2^o n$, a mixture of amplitudes is expected and the Michigan model would suggest the absence of a dip. For this reaction $\rho_2^N \, d\sigma/dt$ could be useful for dip hunting since the over-all non-flip amplitude does not contribute.

UNNATURAL PARITY EXCHANGES

The exchange contributions of η and B mesons seem to be small experimentally for $\pi^{\pm} p \rightarrow A_2^{\pm} p$. The ηNN coupling is known to be small 7). Furthermore, η has a low lying trajectory, and so it should be negligible at higher energies. The B contribution relative to ρ can be argued to be similar for ω production and for A_2^0 production from a duality discussion of $\pi^+ \pi^+ \rightarrow \rho^+ \rho^+$ and $\pi^+ \pi^+ \rightarrow B^+ B^+$. Then unnatural parity contributions ρ_0^U and ρ_1^U should be of the same size for ω and A_2^0 production while ~25% smaller for $A_2^{\pm}$ production which is dominated by $I_t = 0$ exchange. This would also explain the claimed 6) difference in the energy dependence between the neutral and charged A_2 production cross-sections, the latter 6) being in good agreement with ρ and f_0 exchanges.

Another source of unnatural parity exchange contributions arise from cut modifications to ρ and f_0 as discussed above. We have argued that these will not contribute to ρ_{00} in the SHF. The energy dependence of such effects should be different from those due to lower lying η and B contributions.

COMPARISON WITH OTHER REACTIONS

For natural parity exchanges one expects $\pi N \rightarrow A_2 \Delta$ to show similar features to $\pi^- p \rightarrow A_2^0 n$ since the $N \Delta \rho$ vertex is flip dominated like the $N\bar{N}\rho$ vertex. Another reaction with similar exchanges is $\pi N \rightarrow \omega N$ (and $\pi N \rightarrow \omega \Delta$) where ρ and B are allowed. As discussed previously, a comparison of unnatural parity exchange contributions in A_2^0 production with the contributions ($\rho_{00} \sim 0.3$ at high energies) found in ω production is of interest. Features of $\rho_1^N \, d\sigma/dt$ should be the same for ω production as for A_2^0 production, however. This quantity for ω production seems 10) to show a dip at $t \sim -0.6$. Similarly $d\sigma/dt$ for $\pi N \rightarrow A_2 \Delta$ at 3.7 GeV/c 11) shows such structure. We would thus expect such a dip for $\pi^- p \rightarrow A_2^0 n$.

Another source of comparison is the reaction $\pi N \rightarrow f_0 N$. Here π exchange dominates but ρ_1^N and ρ_2^N select out A_2 exchange. Since the $\rho \pi A_2$ and $f_0 \pi A_2$ couplings are equal from EXD arguments we predict that, for Regge pole exchange,

$$\tan^2 \frac{\pi\alpha}{2} \, \rho_1^N \frac{d\sigma}{dt}(\pi^- p \rightarrow f_0 n) = \rho_1^N \frac{d\sigma}{dt}(\pi^- p \rightarrow A_2^0 n) .$$

The modification of F(0) by cuts will perturb this relation somewhat. A final amusing consequence is that, in the $\bar{K}K$ decay mode, it is possible to observe interference between f_0 and A_2. The Regge pole exchanges give a 90° phase difference in production due to the A_2 and ρ signature factors. Then at a mass between the f_0 and A_2 resonance peaks where the Breit-Wigner phases are about 135° for f_0 and 45° for A_2, one may have substantial interference. From duality diagram arguments the interference will be destructive for $\pi^+ n \rightarrow (\bar{K}K)^0 p$ and for $\pi^+ p \rightarrow (\bar{K}K^0)\Delta^{++}$ and constructive for $\pi^- p \rightarrow (\bar{K}K)^0 n$. Using $\rho_1^N \, d\sigma/dm^2$ to select natural parity exchange, since EXD gives equal f_0 and A_2 couplings to $K\bar{K}$ and also equal A_2 and ρ production amplitudes (apart from signature factors), one will have equal strength amplitudes and full coherence in the $A_2 - f_0$ interference. Note that $\rho_{00} \, d\sigma/dm^2$ should, however, separate out almost pure f_0 production proceeding by π exchange.

CONCLUSION

Present data on the production of the normal A_2 can be understood naturally with ρ and f_0 exchange where f_0 exchange is dominant. We have discussed the helicity amplitude structure of the exchange contributions and presented expectations for density matrix elements and differential cross-section structure. Comparisons with other reactions were presented and $f^0 - A_2$ interference was discussed.

The most useful data to further such analyses would be measurements of $d\sigma/dt$ and density matrix elements as functions of t including the important regions $t \sim t_{min}$ and $t \sim -0.6$ GeV^2. Measurements at widely separated energies (say 10 and 20 GeV/c) for $A_2^{\pm}$ and A_2^{o} production with accurate relative normalization will be most valuable.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are pleased to thank Dr. J. Tran Thanh Van, Dr. P. Weilhammer and Dr. K. Lassila for useful and interesting discussions.

REFERENCES

1) M. Alston-Garnjost et al. - Phys.Letters 33B, 607 (1970) ;
G. Grayer et al. - CERN Preprint (1970).
K.J. Foley et al. - Phys.Rev.Letters 26, 413 (1971).

2) G.E. Chikovani et al. - Phys.Letters 25B, 44 (1967) ;
H. Benz et al. - Phys.Letters 28B, 233 (1968) ;
R. Baud et al. - Phys.Letters 31B, 397 (1970) ;
H. Basile et al. - Nuovo Cimento Letters 4, 838 (1970).

3) J.P. Ader, M. Capdeville, G. Cohen-Tannoudji and Ph. Salin - Nuovo Cimento 56A, 952 (1968).

4) G. Ascoli et al. - Phys.Rev.Letters 25, 962 (1970) ;
T.F. Johnston et al. - Nuclear Phys. B24, 253 (1970) ;
G. Grayer et al. - CERN Preprint (1970).

5) A. Białas, A. Kotanski and K. Zalewski - Krakow Preprint TPJU 70-30 (1970).

6) J.T. Carroll et al. - Phys.Rev.Letters 25, 1393 (1970) ;
M. Deutschman et al. - CERN D.Ph.II Phys. 70-43 (1970).

7) C. Michael - Springer Tracts in Modern Phys. Vol. 55, G. Höhler Editor, Springer Verlag, Berlin (1970).
[see also : C. Michael and R. Odorico - CERN Preprint TH. 1282 (1971)].

8) M. Alston-Garnjost et al. - Phys.Letters 34B, 156 (1971).

9) G. Kane, F. Henyey and M. Ross - Nuclear Phys. B23, 269 (1970).

10) J. Tran Thanh Van - Orsay Preprint (1970) ;
G.S. Abrams et al. - Phys.Rev.Letters 23, 673 and 25, 619 (1970) ;
Bari-Bologna-Firenze-Orsay collaboration - Nuovo Cimento 65A, 637 (1970).

11) K.W.J. Barham et al. - UCRL 20050 (1970).