## Analysis of backward $\pi N$ scattering using complex Regge poles

Robert T. Park

## Department of Physics and Astronomy, California State University, Northridge, Northridge, California 91324 (Received 15 July 1974)

The current data on backward  $\pi N$  scattering cross sections and polarization, including CERN-I.P.N. Orsay-Oxford measurements, are analyzed using complex Regge poles. Good fits are obtained with complex  $N_a$ ,  $N_{\gamma\gamma}$  and  $\Delta_{\delta}$  trajectories. There are no MacDowell partners and each trajectory produces the usual baryon spectrum at positive u.

In a previous work<sup>1</sup> excellent fits to the  $\pi N$  differential cross-section data were obtained using the complex-Regge-pole model (CRP).<sup>2,3</sup> The trajectories were generated from a *D* function with fixed cut and square-root singularity at the branch point.  $N_{\alpha}$  and  $\Delta_{\delta}$  trajectories were assumed to dominate the *u*-channel exchange. There were no MacDowell partners and the two trajectories were consistent with the usual baryon spectrum at positive *u*.

Predictions were also given for  $\pi^+ p$  and  $\pi^- p$ elastic polarizations in the backward direction at  $P_{\rm lab} = 5.9$  BeV/c. However, subsequent CERN-I.P.N. Orsay-Oxford measurements<sup>4,5</sup> of backward polarization at  $P_{\rm lab} = 6$  BeV/c have demonstrated that these predictions were incorrect and have posed a challenge to pole and cut models alike. In fact, some authors have argued that the conventional pole and cut models are incapable of fitting the data.<sup>6</sup>

In the present work we have retained the essential features of the previous model except that in addition to  $N_{\alpha}$  and  $\Delta_{\delta}$  exchange,  $N_{\gamma}$  exchange is also used. This has resulted in successful fits to the existing  $\pi N$  backward cross section and polarization data with trajectories that produce the usual baryon resonances and no MacDowell partners.

We shall now review the formalism of the model. As before, the D function takes the form

$$D(j, W) = j - \alpha_0(W) - 2\beta(W)(j - \alpha_c)^{1/2}, \qquad (1)$$

with  $u = W^2$  and

 $\alpha_0(W) = a + bW + cW^2, \qquad (2)$ 

$$\beta(W) = dW. \tag{3}$$

This leads to trajectories  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$  given by

$$\alpha_{1,2} = a + bW + (2d^{2} + c)W^{2} \pm 2dW [(a - \alpha_{c}) + bW + (d^{2} + c)W^{2}]^{1/2}.$$
(4)

Then, using the BMZ approximation<sup>2</sup> the amplitudes become<sup>1</sup>



FIG. 1. The theoretical curves for differential cross sections obtained from the best fit are plotted along with selected data points for (a)  $\pi^+p$  backward elastic, (b)  $\pi^-p$  backward elastic, and (c)  $\pi^-p$  backward charge-exchange scattering. Data are from Ref. 7.

3095

10

$$F^{\tau P}(W, s) = \gamma^{\tau P}(\alpha_1, W) \xi_{\tau}(\alpha_1) \nu^{\alpha_1 - 1/2} + \gamma^{\tau P}(\alpha_2, W) \xi_{\tau}(\alpha_2) \nu^{\alpha_2 - 1/2},$$
(5)

with

$$\nu = (s-t)/2s_0, \quad s_0 = 1 \text{ BeV}^2,$$
 (6)

$$\xi_{\tau}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = (\boldsymbol{\alpha} + \frac{1}{2})(\boldsymbol{\alpha} + \frac{3}{2}) \frac{1 + \tau \exp\left[-i\pi(\boldsymbol{\alpha} - \frac{1}{2})\right]}{\sin\pi(\boldsymbol{\alpha} - \frac{1}{2})} .$$
(7)

The residues are parametrized as follows:

$$\gamma^{\tau P}(\alpha, W) = g_0 (1 + g_1 W + g_2 \alpha + g_3 \alpha W) e^{h_1 W^2} .$$
 (8)

The residues here differ from those in Ref. 1 by the elimination of the scaling term,  $e^{h_0\alpha}$ , which seems to play a nonessential role in the fits.

The trajectories and residues for  $N_{\alpha}(\tau = +1, P = +1)$ ,  $N_{\gamma}(\tau = -1, P = -1)$  and  $\Delta_{\delta}(\tau = -1, P = +1)$  exchange are parametrized according to Eqs. (4) and (8). There are ten parameters for each trajectory-residue combination.

Fits to the differential cross section data<sup>7</sup> are shown in Fig. 1. They are in good agreement with the data, although there is slight disagreement between theory and experiment for  $\pi^- p$  elastic scattering near u=0.

The recent measurements of elastic polarization are compared with our model in Fig. 2. The agreement is very good and is consistent with the experimental error of the measurements.

In Table I we have given the parameter values for the best fit in the model. As before, each trajectory has a steep and flat branch, and Mac-Dowell partners are avoided since the steep trajectories are on the unphysical sheet for W < 0.

We have shown that the CRP model is consistent with the latest  $\pi N$  backward scattering data and have determined the parameter values in the model.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author is grateful to D. Gregorich and P. Kaus for useful discussions.



FIG. 2. Fits to the elastic polarization data in the backward direction at  $P_{\text{Lab}} = 6 \text{ BeV}/c$  for (a)  $\pi^+ p \rightarrow p \pi^+$  and (b)  $\pi^- p \rightarrow p \pi^-$ . Data are from Refs. 4 and 5.

TABLE I. Parameter values for the best fit.

Parameter	Nα	Nγ	$\Delta_{\delta}$
a	-0.41	-0.40	-0.02
$b \ (\text{BeV}^{-1})$	-0.04	0.01	-0.01
$c (\text{BeV}^{-2})$	-0.47	-0.23	0.01
$d (\text{BeV}^{-1})$	0.76	0.58	0.49
$\alpha_c$	-0.43	-0.41	-0.15
$g_0 \pmod{\operatorname{BeV}}$	166	80.7	-0.033
$g_1 \ (\mathrm{BeV}^{-1})$	0.43	-0.87	260
$g_2$	2.70	2.10	261
$g_3 ~({ m BeV}^{-1})$	1.70	-1.85	575
$h_1 \ (BeV^{-2})$	3.38	-0.17	1.54

<sup>1</sup>D. T. Gregorich, P. Kaus, and R. T. Park, Phys. Rev. D 4, 834 (1971).

- <sup>2</sup>J. S. Ball, G. Marchesini, and F. Zachariasen, Phys. Lett. 31B, 383 (1970), referred to in this paper as BMZ.
- <sup>3</sup>B. R. Desai, P. Kaus, R. T. Park, and F. Zachariasen, Phys. Rev. Lett. <u>25</u>, 1389 (1970); <u>25</u>, 1686(E) (1970).
- <sup>4</sup>L. Dick et al., Nucl. Phys. <u>B43</u>, 522 (1972).

<sup>5</sup>L. Dick et al., Nucl. Phys. <u>B64</u>, 45 (1973).

- <sup>6</sup>J. K. Storrow and G. A. Winbow, Nucl. Phys. <u>B53</u>, 62 (1973).
- <sup>7</sup>The data on  $\pi^{\pm}p$  elastic scattering are taken from D. P. Owen *et al.*, Phys. Rev. <u>181</u>, 1794 (1969). Chargeexchange data are from J. P. Boright *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 24, 964 (1970).

3096