## <span id="page-0-4"></span>**Positivity constraints on spin observables in hadronic inclusive reactions**

Claude Bourrel[y\\*](#page-0-0)

*Centre de Physique The´orique, CNRS Luminy Case 907, F-13288 Marseille Cedex 09, France*

Jacques Soffer[†](#page-0-1)

*Department of Physics, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122-6082, USA* (Received 2 April 2007; published 25 June 2007)

<span id="page-0-5"></span>We study the implications on experimental data and theoretical models of the positivity constraints on spin observables for the reaction  $A(\text{spin1}/2) + B(\text{unpolarized}) \rightarrow C(\text{spin1}/2) + \text{anything}.$ 

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.75.117501](http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.75.117501) PACS numbers: 13.88.+e, 13.75.Ev, 13.85.Ni

The positivity constraints have been widely used in hadron physics to restrict, in a model-independent way, the domain of allowed values for spin observables [[1](#page-1-0),[2\]](#page-1-1). Consider the following parity conserving reaction:

$$
A(\text{spin } 1/2) + B(\text{unpolarized}) \rightarrow C(\text{spin } 1/2) + X. \quad (1)
$$

For this process one can define *eight* independent observ-For this process one can define *eigni* independent observables, which depend on three kinematic variables,  $\sqrt{s}$  the center-of-mass energy and  $x_F$ , and  $p_T$  the longitudinal and transverse momenta of the final particle *C*. In order to define these observables, we recall the standard notation already used in Ref. [\[1](#page-1-0)] (Appendix 3), *AB*j*CX*-, where the spin directions of *A*, *B*, *C*, and *X* are specified in one of the three possible directions: *L*, *N*, *S*. Since only one initial and one final spin are observed, we have in fact  $(A0|C0)$ , and **L**, **N**, **S** are unit vectors, in the center-of-mass system, along the incident momentum, along the normal to the scattering plane which contains *A*, *B*, and *C*, and along  $N \times L$ , respectively. In addition to the unpolarized cross section,  $\sigma_0 = (00|00)$ , there are *seven* spin-dependent observables, *two* single transverse spin asymmetries,

$$
A_N = (N0|00) \text{ and } P_C = (00|N0), \tag{2}
$$

and *five* depolarization parameters,

$$
D_{LL} = (L0|L0),
$$
  
\n
$$
D_{SS} = (S0|S0),
$$
  
\n
$$
D_{LS} = (L0|S0),
$$
  
\n
$$
D_{NN} = (N0|N0),
$$
 and  
\n
$$
D_{SL} = (S0|L0).
$$
 (3)

Several years ago, Doncel and Méndez [\[3](#page-2-0)] derived very general inequalities constraining these parameters which read:

<span id="page-0-2"></span>
$$
(1 \pm D_{NN})^2 \ge (P_C \pm A_N)^2 + (D_{LL} \pm D_{SS})^2
$$
  
 
$$
+ (D_{LS} \mp D_{SL})^2.
$$
 (4)

Let us first concentrate on a particular reaction  $p^{\dagger}p \rightarrow$  $\Lambda^{\dagger}X$ , where the incoming proton beam is polarized and the polarization of the outgoing  $\Lambda$  is measured. We consider the case where the particle spins are normal to the scattering plane, then the inequalities [\(4](#page-0-2)) give

$$
1 \pm D_{NN} \ge |P_{\Lambda} \pm A_N|.\tag{5}
$$

<span id="page-0-3"></span>These constraints must be satisfied for any kinematic val-These constraints must be satisfy<br>ues of the variables  $x_F$ ,  $p_T$ ,  $\sqrt{s}$ .

These inequalities involve three spin parameters; once we fix the value of one parameter, the other two are restricted to lie in a certain domain. For instance, Fig. [1](#page-1-2) shows that for  $D_{NN} = 0$ ,  $P_{\Lambda}$  and  $A_N$  are correlated within the shaded area of a square with boundaries  $(-1, +1)$ . This domain is more restricted when  $D_{NN} = 1/3$  (see Fig. [1\)](#page-1-2), and in the limit  $D_{NN} = 1$  we immediately deduce from Eq. ([5\)](#page-0-3) that  $P_A = A_N$ . In the case where  $D_{NN}$  is negative, one obtains the same regions, but  $P_A$  and  $A_N$ are interchanged with respect to their axes.

Various applications can be envisaged with the above inequalities: in particular, testing, on the one hand, the consistency of experimental data and, on the other hand, the validity of the spin observables predicted by theoretical models.

At Fermilab, the experiment E-704 [[4\]](#page-2-1) has performed the measurement of  $P_A$ ,  $A_N$ , and  $D_{NN}$  with a transversely polarized proton beam at 200  $GeV/c$ , in the kinematic range  $0.2 \le x_F \le 1.0$  and  $0.1 \le p_T \le 1.5$  GeV/c. Their data indicate a negative  $A_N$  and a value of  $D_{NN}$  up to 30%. If we take, for instance,  $p_T \sim 1$  GeV/c,  $x_F \sim 0.8$ , then  $D_{NN}$  ~ 30%, for these kinematical values, they have  $A_N$  ~  $-10\%$  and  $P_A \sim -30\%$ . In this case the inequalities [\(5\)](#page-0-3) are well satisfied.

The DISTO Collaboration [\[5](#page-2-2)] has measured the  $A_N$  and  $D_{NN}$  parameters, for three beam momenta 3.67, 3.31, and 2.94 GeV/c, as a function of  $x_F$ ,  $p_T$ , for the exclusive reaction  $p^{\dagger} p \rightarrow p K^+ \Lambda^{\dagger}$ . In the range  $-0.6 \le x_F \le 0.8$ ,

<span id="page-0-0"></span>[<sup>\\*</sup>C](#page-0-4)laude.Bourrely@cpt.univ-mrs.fr

<span id="page-0-1"></span>[<sup>†</sup>](#page-0-5) jsoffer@temple.edu

<span id="page-1-2"></span>

FIG. 1. The polarization  $P_A$  versus the analyzing power  $A_N$  in the cases  $D_{NN} = 0$ , 1/3.

they find  $D_{NN} \approx -50\%$  and  $-15\% \le A_N \le 0$ , so by using the above inequalities we obtain the constraint  $-35\% \le P_A \le 50\%$ . They also have [[6](#page-2-3)] at 3.67 GeV/c and  $x_F = -0.45$ ,  $D_{NN} = -0.57 \pm 0.07$  and  $A_N =$  $-0.27 \pm 0.02$ , which gives a stronger constraint on  $P_{\Lambda}$ .

Finally, let us mention the measurement of  $D_{NN}$  in the inclusive process  $p^{\dagger}p \rightarrow p^{\dagger}X$  at 6 GeV/c incident momen-tum [\[7](#page-2-4)]. For the momentum transfer  $-t = 0.20 \text{ GeV}^2$ ,  $D_{NN}$  was found rather large and close to  $+1$ , so positivity implies  $P_p \sim A_N$ , as indicated above. Unfortunately the data is unavailable, so we were not able to check this expectation.

We see that these constraints are useful to check experimental data, which must lie inside the domain allowed by positivity.

On the theoretical side, different phenomenological models have been proposed to understand the important polarization effects in hyperon production [[8\]](#page-2-5). In Ref. [[9](#page-2-6)], a semiclassical picture is proposed where the direction of the orbital motion of the polarized valence quarks in the initial proton induces the left-right asymmetry for inclusive  $\Lambda$ . These calculations lead to a reasonable agreement for  $P_{\Lambda}$ ,  $A_N$ , and  $D_{NN}$  in the inclusive  $\Lambda$  production, which satisfies the positivity constraints. This model was also applied successfully to the diffractive process  $pp \rightarrow \Lambda K^+ p$  with  $D_{NN} = +1$ , which implies  $P_{\Lambda} = A_N$  [\[10\]](#page-2-7).

When the polarization is not normal to the scattering plane, one has new depolarization parameters. In the case where both  $p$  and  $\Lambda$  are longitudinally polarized, one can measure  $D_{LL}$ , and when each particle has a transverse polarization in the scattering plane, one can measure  $D_{SS}$ . In this case, one gets the nontrivial constraint

$$
1 \pm D_{NN} \ge |D_{LL} \pm D_{SS}|. \tag{6}
$$

<span id="page-1-3"></span>Note that the two depolarization parameters in the righthand side of Eq. ([6](#page-1-3)) have not been measured. The RHIC *pp* collider at Brookhaven National Laboratory is certainly the most appropriate machine for these experiments at high energy, due to the existence of both longitudinally and transversely polarized proton beams. Positivity was used to determine the allowed domains for  $D_{LL}$  [\[11\]](#page-2-8) and  $D_{NN}$ [\[12\]](#page-2-9).

J.S. is grateful to R. Bertini and M. Maggiora for interesting discussions and information, prior to publication, on DISTO data. Centre de Physique Théorique is Unité Mixte de Recherche 6207 du CNRS et des Universités Aix-Marseille I, Aix-Marseille II et de l'Université du Sud Toulon-Var—Laboratoire affilié à la FRUMAM.

- <span id="page-1-0"></span>[1] C. Bourrely, E. Leader, and J. Soffer, Phys. Rep. **59**, 95 (1980).
- <span id="page-1-1"></span>[2] For a review, see X. Artru, M. Elchikh, J.-M. Richard, J. Soffer, and O. Teryaev (unpublished).
- <span id="page-2-0"></span>[3] M. R. Doncel and A. Méndez, Phys. Lett. **41B**, 83 (1972).
- <span id="page-2-1"></span>[4] A. Bravar *et al.* (Fermilab E-704 Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 3073 (1995); **78**, 4003 (1997). See also the review by L. G. Pondrom, Phys. Rep. **122**, 57 (1985).
- <span id="page-2-2"></span>[5] R. Bertini (DISTO Collaboration), Cesk. Cas. Fyz. **51**, 77 (2001); R. Bertini, Nucl. Phys. **A680**, 342 (2001); M. Maggiora, Nucl. Phys. **A691**, 329 (2001).
- <span id="page-2-3"></span>[6] R. Bertini and M. Maggiora (private communication).
- <span id="page-2-4"></span>[7] H. Courant *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **44**, 1373 (1980).
- <span id="page-2-5"></span>[8] J. Félix, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **14**, 827 (1999).
- <span id="page-2-6"></span>[9] C. Boros and Liang Zuo-tang, Phys. Rev. D **53**, R2279 (1996); Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 3608 (1997).
- <span id="page-2-7"></span>[10] Liang Zuo-tang and C. Boros, Phys. Rev. D **61**, 117503 (2000).
- <span id="page-2-8"></span>[11] D. de Florian, M. Stratman, and W. Vogelsang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 530 (1998).
- <span id="page-2-9"></span>[12] D. de Florian, J. Soffer, M. Stratman, and W. Vogelsang, Phys. Lett. B **439**, 176 (1998).