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## ABSTRACT

In a $14 \mathrm{GeV} / \mathrm{c}$ hybrid bubble chamber experiment studying the reactions $\pi^{ \pm} \mathrm{p} \rightarrow \pi^{ \pm}\left(\mathrm{n}^{+}\right)$and $\pi^{ \pm} \mathrm{p} \rightarrow \pi^{ \pm}\left(\mathrm{p} \pi^{+} \pi^{-}\right)$we observe marked similarities in the shapes of the recoiling mass spectra to those found in $p p \rightarrow p\left(n \pi^{+}\right)$and $p p \rightarrow p\left(p \pi^{+} \pi^{-}\right)$at ISR energies. We discuss these similarities as well as absolute cross sections in terms of factorization.

[^0]Present ideas of high energy scattering suggest that in the hadronic process

$$
\begin{equation*}
A+B \rightarrow A+B^{*} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $B^{*}$ is any state diffractively produced from $B$, the cross section should be a constant fraction of the elastic reaction at all energies where diffraction dominates. This follows if the diffractive amplitude factorizes into the form $g^{A A D} s^{\alpha} g^{B B+Q}$, where the $g^{\prime} s$ are vertex residues describing coupling to the Pomeron trajectory and $s^{\alpha}$ gives the energy dependence ( $s$ is the C.M. energy squared). Then $\sigma_{B^{*}} / \sigma_{e 1}=\left(g^{B B^{*} /} / g^{B B P}\right)^{2}$, independent of the incoming particle A.

This form of factorization was checked by Anderson et al., ${ }^{1}$ for $\pi-\mathrm{p} \rightarrow \pi \mathrm{N}_{1700}^{*}$ at $16 \mathrm{GeV} / \mathrm{c}$ and $\mathrm{pp} \rightarrow \mathrm{pN}_{1700}^{*}$ at $15 \mathrm{GeV} / \mathrm{c}$, using a missing mass technique. Here $N_{1700}^{*}$ is the well-documented ${ }^{2}$ mass enhancement at $\sim 1700 \mathrm{MeV}$. It is usually identified with the $\mathrm{F}_{15}$ nucleon resonance, although the actual spin states involved have never been verified. They found ( $\sigma_{1700} / \sigma_{e 1}$ ) to be the same in both reactions to $\sim 10 \%$, using one-half the observed $N_{1700}^{*}$ cross section in the pp case because of particle symmetry (we shall refer to this as the single vertex cross section). This observation allows us to relate $\pi p$ and $p$ diffractive reactions at different energies to study the s-dependent part of the amplitude.

We have obtained data on the reactions

$$
\begin{equation*}
\pi^{ \pm} \mathrm{p} \rightarrow \pi^{ \pm}\left(\mathrm{n} \pi^{+}\right) \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\pi^{ \pm} p \rightarrow \pi^{ \pm}\left(p \pi^{+} \pi^{-}\right) \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

at $14 \mathrm{GeV} / \mathrm{c}$ in a hybrid bubble chamber experiment in which the camera flash lamps were triggered when a fast forward pion scatter corresponding to an
inelastic event was detected in a downstream magnetic spectrometer. The SLAC $40^{\prime \prime}$ hydrogen bubble chamber was run at up to 12 expansions/sec for about the equivalent of 95 and 70 event/ $\mu \mathrm{b}$ exposures to $\pi^{+}$and $\pi^{-}$beams, respectively. Further details of the apparatus may be found in Ref. 3.

In the off-line data analysis we combined the spark chamber measurements with those from the film, using a modified form of the TVGP-SQUAW analysis system. The resulting sample of events of reaction (2) have less than $10 \%$ contamination from wrong mass hypotheses and a mass resolution for the ( $\mathrm{n} \pi^{+}$) system which varied between 10 and 30 MeV .

In Fig. 1 we compare the recoil mass spectrum (weighted for geometrical acceptance) found from our data at $14 \mathrm{GeV} / \mathrm{c}(\sqrt{\mathrm{s}}=5.3 \mathrm{GeV})$ to that reported by E. Nagy et al., ${ }^{4}$ for the reaction

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{pp} \rightarrow \mathrm{p}\left(\mathrm{n}^{+}\right) \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

at $\sqrt{s}=53 \mathrm{GeV}$. We plot the average $\mathrm{d} \sigma / \mathrm{dM}$ for $\pi^{+}{ }^{\mathrm{p}}$ and $\pi^{-} \mathrm{p}$ data in order to remove interference terms from $I=1$ exchange and show the total $\mathrm{d} \sigma / \mathrm{dM}$ for reaction (4) (broken histogram), which is twice the single-vertex cross section. The $\pi p$ data are selected for $0.05<|t|<0.5 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$ while the pp data have $0.05<|t|<0.8 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$. There are only a few events in $\pi p$ for $|t|>0.5 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$. In addition, we divide the data into forward $\left(\cos \theta_{J}>0\right.$. Fig. lb) and backward $\left(\cos \theta_{J}<0\right.$, Fig. ia) decay angles in the Gottfried-Jackson system. ${ }^{5}$

Figure 1 shows what we feel to be a remarkable similarity in spectral shapes in two different reactions at widely separated energies. In the forward hemisphere (Fig. 1b) we see the same slow rise to a sharp drop at $\sim 1700 \mathrm{MeV}$, while in the backward hemisphere (Fig. la) peaks and valleys develop. ${ }^{6}$ Detailed differences in the latter are probably due to statistics. ${ }^{7}$

The comparison strongly suggests that the same interfering resonances are present at both energies.

To test the factorization hypothesis, we define, for the pp reaction at C.M. energy $\sqrt{5}$, a cross section $d \sigma_{N} / \mathrm{dM}$ normalized to the $14 \mathrm{GeV} / \mathrm{c} \pi p$ reaction

$$
\frac{\mathrm{d} \sigma}{\mathrm{~N}} \mathrm{dM}_{\mathrm{dM}}=\frac{\sigma(\pi \mathrm{p} \text { elastic, } \sqrt{\mathrm{s}}=5.3 \mathrm{GeV})}{2(\mathrm{pp} \text { elastic, } \sqrt{\mathrm{s}})} \times \frac{\mathrm{d} \sigma}{\mathrm{dM}}(\mathrm{pp} \text { inelastic, } \sqrt{\mathrm{s})}
$$

which should be identical to the spectrum of the $\pi p$ reaction for any components obeying factorization as described previously. We use an average total elastic $\pi^{ \pm} p$ cross section ${ }^{3,8}$ of $4.1 \pm 0.4 \mathrm{mb}$ and a pp elastic cross section ${ }^{9}$ of $7.8 \pm 0.6 \mathrm{mb}$. The normalized spectra are shown in Fig. 1 as solid histograms. It is clear that the overall pp normalized spectrum is significantly lower in cross section than that of $\pi p$. Nagy et al. ${ }^{4}$ compared their data with pp reactions at lower energies and also noted that the pp cross section integrated over all $t$ and for $M<2 \mathrm{GeV}$ fell like $\sigma=a p_{1 a b}^{-n}$ with $n=0.4 \pm 0.1$. The prominence of peaks in the ISR data leads us to explore whether the resonance components alone obey factorization, as analysis of other data has suggested. ${ }^{10}$ To do this, we require an estimate of the resonance cross section integrated over all decay angles, since the peaks for $\cos \theta_{J}<0$ are most probably an interference phenomenon. In an attempt to isolate resonance contributions in our data we plotted the moments of the decay angular distributions,

$$
\begin{equation*}
Y_{\ell}^{\mathrm{m}}=\frac{1}{\mathrm{f}} \sum_{\text {events }} \mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{Y}_{\ell}^{\mathrm{m}}\left(\theta_{i}, \phi_{i}\right) \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $f$ is the beam $f l u x$ in events $/ \mu b, w_{i}$ is the inverse of the geometrical acceptance for event $i$, $\theta_{i}$ the polar, and $\phi_{i}$ the azimuthal angle of the neutron with respect to target proton in the $\mathrm{n}_{\pi}{ }^{+}$rest frame. ${ }^{5}$ Figure $1 \mathrm{c}-\mathrm{g}$
shows the moments with $m=0$ for the average $\pi^{+}$and $\pi^{-}$data, for $0.05<|\mathrm{t}|<0.5 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$.

In Fig. le we observe that $Y_{2}^{0}$ shows a well-defined two-peaked structure on a smooth background although the mass spectrum (Fig. 1c) does not. Rapid variations with $M_{n \pi^{+}}$in the other moments are indicative of resonance behavior at about 1400,1500 , and 1700 MeV .

Although the identification and cross section determination require a full partial wave analysis, we can estimate a cross section for the contribuof $J \geqslant 3 / 2$ resonances if we assume the $Y_{2}^{O}$ peaks result from two such states. From the expected decay angular distributions ${ }^{11}$ we observe that for $\mathrm{J} \geqslant 3 / 2$ a maximum $Y_{2}^{\circ}$ signal results if helicity is conserved in the analyzing system, e.g., for $J=3 / 2, Y_{2}^{0} / Y_{0}^{0}=1 / \sqrt{5}$, for $J=5 / 2, Y_{2}^{0} / Y_{0}^{0}=8 / 7 \sqrt{5}$, the ratio increasing slowly for higher spins. We fit the $Y_{2}^{\circ}$ spectrum to a smooth background plus two Breit-Wigner forms to obtain an integrated resonance signal and, by using the $J=3 / 2$ ratio, obtain what should be a minimum cross section $\sigma_{\text {res }}=\sqrt{4 \pi} \int \sqrt{5} Y_{2}^{o} d M=80 \pm 10 \mu \mathrm{~b}$ in the region $1.4<M_{n \pi^{+}}<1.8 \mathrm{GeV} .{ }^{12}$ The result of one such fit is shown superimposed on the $Y_{2}^{\circ}$ spectrum of Fig. le. In order to demonstrate that $\sigma_{\text {res }}$ is a reasonable estimate of the $\mathrm{J} \geqslant 3 / 2$ eross section, we subtracted the implied $Y_{0}^{0}$ contribution for $J \geqslant 3 / 2$ resonances from the overall $Y_{o}^{\circ}$ spectrum, and obtained the "background" superimposed as a broken line in Fig. 1c. Note such a background can contain any $J=1 / 2$ wave contribution plus that from waves of any spin which do not peak strongly. Finally, we have added $\left\langle\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{o}}^{0}\right\rangle \mathrm{d} \sigma_{r e s} / \mathrm{dM}$ to the derived smoothed background. The result is the solid curve shown in Fig. 1c, which gives a perfectly reasonable description of the data. We conclude that $\sigma_{\text {res }}$ therefore is not far from the true cross section for $J \geqslant 3 / 2$ resonances.

To complete the comparison, we obtain $\sigma_{M A X, I S R}$ by summing all ISR events in the same interval (using the normalized spectra of Fig. la and bl. We find $\sigma_{\text {MAX, ISR }}=25 \mu \mathrm{~b}$ (with $50 \%$ error), ${ }^{7}$ which is about a factor 3 below the minimum factorization prediction. This discrepancy appears to be large enough to exclude its being due to experimental uncertainty or to the approximations used. We can also compare our data on reaction (3) with those from the reaction

$$
\begin{equation*}
p p \rightarrow p\left(p \pi^{+} \pi^{-}\right) \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

In Fig. 2a we first show our data for $0.01<|t|<0.6 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$ compared with pp data of Rushbrooke et al. ${ }^{13}$ at $16 \mathrm{GeV} / \mathrm{c}$ and all t . The latter is normalized by Eq. (5). The spectra agree reasonably well, giving rough confirmation of the conclusion of Anderson et al., ${ }^{1}$ mentioned previously. In Fig. $2 b$ we compare our data to the normalized ISR pp result of Webb et al. ${ }^{14}(\sqrt{s}=45 \mathrm{GeV})$, both samples having $0.1<|t|<0.6 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$. Except for a possible mass shift, the two spectra appear to differ only in scale in the resonance region, which tends to confirm our previous observations.

In comparing their data with the pp missing-mass measurements of Edelstein et al., ${ }^{15}$ at lower energies, Webb et al. ${ }^{14}$ concluded that their 1700 MeV enhancement was consistent with being equal in cross section to that at $30 \mathrm{GeV} / \mathrm{c}$. That analysis required that backgrounds at both energies, as well as the 1700 MeV branching ratio to $p \pi^{+} \pi^{-}$be known. The comparison of reactions (2) and (4) does not require knowledge of the branching ratio to the $n \pi^{+}$final state.

In conclusion, we have presented evidence that the "diffractive region" in $\pi p$ and $p p$ inelastic scattering shows similar mass distributions over a factor 10 in CMS energy, but the overall cross sections fall slightly faster with $s$ than that of the elastic reaction. Whether this is from an inadequacy
of factorization as expressed in Eq. (5) or is indicative of the presence of non-diffractive processes will require further precise data at these and intermediate energy points.
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## FIGURE CAPTIONS

Figure 1. a) $n \pi^{+}$invariant mass distribution in the backward hemisphere of the Jackson frame. The data points show the average of $\pi^{+} p+\pi^{ \pm}\left(n \pi^{+}\right)$data at $\sqrt{\mathrm{S}}=5.3 \mathrm{GeV}$ and for $0.05<\left|t_{\pi \rightarrow \pi}\right|<0.5 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$. The broken histogram shows $\mathrm{pp} \rightarrow \mathrm{p}\left(\mathrm{n}^{+}\right)$data at $\sqrt{\mathrm{s}}=53 \mathrm{GeV}$ and $0.05<\left|\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{p} \rightarrow \mathrm{p}}\right|<0.8 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$. The solid histogram is the latter normalized to $14 \mathrm{GeV} / \mathrm{c}$ $\pi$ data by Eq. (5).
b) As above but for the forward decay hemisphere.
c - g) Unnormalized moment distributions for $\pi^{ \pm} p \rightarrow \pi^{ \pm}\left(n \pi^{+}\right)$ average at $14 \mathrm{GeV} / \mathrm{c}$ and $0.05<|\mathrm{t}|<0.5 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$. The curves on $Y_{0}^{\circ}$ and $Y_{2}^{0}$ show the results of the procedures described in the text.

Figure 2. a) $p \pi^{+} \pi^{-}$invariant mass distributions for the average of $\pi^{ \pm} \mathrm{p} \rightarrow \pi^{ \pm}\left(\mathrm{p}^{+} \pi^{-}\right)$at $14 \mathrm{GeV} / \mathrm{c}, 0.01<|\mathrm{t}|<0.6: \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$ (data points), and for $p p \rightarrow p\left(F \pi^{+} \pi^{-}\right)$at $16 \mathrm{GeV} / \mathrm{c}$ and all $t$ (Ref. 13) normalized to $14 \mathrm{GeV} / \mathrm{c} \pi \mathrm{p}$ data by Eq. (5).
b) Same for our data in the interval $0.1<|t|<0.6 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$, but now compared to pp at an equivalent momentum of $1030 \mathrm{GeV} / \mathrm{c}(\sqrt{\mathrm{s}}=45 \mathrm{GeV})$ normalized as above, and in the same $t$ interval.
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