of matter and antimatter, such as the theory of<br>Alfvén and Klein.<sup>12</sup> Alfven and Klein.<sup>12</sup>

The author would like to thank Professor S. Coleman for bringing this topic to his attention, as well as for helpful discussions. It is also a pleasure to acknowledge stimulating discussions with Professor B. S. DeWitt, Professor G. Carrier, Professor S. Deser, and Professor F. A. E. Pirani.

<sup>1</sup>L. Parker, thesis, Harvard University, 1966 (unpublished).

 ${}^{2}$ T. Imamura, Phys. Rev. 118, 1430 (1960).

3P. Roman and R. Aghassi, J. Math Phys. 7, <sup>1273</sup> (1966).

40. Nachtmann, Commun. Math. Phys. 6, 1 (1967). 50. Nachtmann, Z. Physik 208, 113 (1968).

6R. Sexi and H. Urbantke, "Cosmic Particle Creation," to be published.

 $^7$ Additional terms involving the scalar curvature at the present time would be dwarfed by the term involving the  $\pi$ -meson mass.

 ${}^8$ The details are in the author's thesis (Ref. 1), and will appear in subsequent articles.

 ${}^{9}$ L. Parker, Nuovo Cimento  $40B$ , 99 (1965).

 $^{10}$ V. Bargmann, Sitzber. Deut. Akad. Wiss. Berlin, Math. -Naturw. Kl. 1932, 346.

<sup>11</sup>R. Penrose in Relativity, Groups and Topology edited by C. and B. DeWitt (Gordon and Breach Publishers, Inc., New York, 1964) p. 565. See also L. Infeld and B. L. van der Waerden, Sitzber. Deut. Akad. Wiss. Berlin, Math. -Naturw. Kl. 1933, 380; W. Bade and H. Jehle, Rev. Mod. Phys. 25, 714 (1953).

<sup>12</sup>H. Alfvén, Rev. Mod. Phys.  $37, 652$  (1965); O. Klein, Nature 211, 1337 (1967).

## LORENTZ POLES IN EQUAL-MASS SCATTERING FROM ANALYTICITY AND FACTORIZATION\*

J. B. Bronzan and C. Edward Jones

Laboratory for Nuclear Science and Physics Department, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139 (Received 24 June 1968)

It is shown, by means of factorization, that the daughter Regge trajectories implied by analyticity in unequal-mass scattering amplitudes constitute a single Lorentz pole when they couple to an equal-mass channel. At zero energy the equal-mass elastic amplitude has the form const $\times D_{-\alpha(0)-2}^{-1}(-z)$ .

In the past few years, two different approaches have been used to study the properties of Regge poles and S-matrix elements at zero total energy  $(u=0)$ . The first involves analyticity<sup>1</sup> and the second uses group theory.<sup>2</sup> The analyticity approach can be employed when the particles in the  $u$  channel have unequal masses (like pion-nucleon scattering). In this case an apparent conflict arises between the presence of poles in the angular-momentum plane and the requirement of analyticity in the total energy at  $u = 0$ . The conflict is resolved by introducing a set of daughter Regge trajectories at  $\alpha(0)$  -  $k$   $(k = 1, 2, \cdots)$ , where  $\alpha(0)$  is the leading or parent trajectory.

If the masses in the  $u$  channel are pair-wise equal, the foregoing conflict with analyticity does not arise, but one may invoke the  $O(4)$  [or  $O(3)$ , I)] symmetry of the scattering amplitude which results from the vanishing at  $u = 0$  of  $Q_u$ , the total center-of-mass four-momentum in the  $u$ channel. Poles in the  $u$  channel are classified according to irreducible representations of O(4), and then each such Lorentz pole  $n(0)$  gives rise to a sequence of daughter Regge poles with the parent trajectory located at  $\alpha(0) = n(0)$ . The

daughter sequence lies below  $\alpha(0)$  with a spacing of two units,  $\alpha(0) - 2n$   $(n = 1, 2, \cdots)$ , if the scattering particles are spinless, and a spacing of one unit if the particles have spin. The ratios of the residues of the daughter trajectories are also determined by expanding the Gegenbauer function in terms of Legendre functions. On the other hand, the group theoretic approach cannot be immediately applied to the scattering amplitudes for unequal-mass particles, essentially because the center-of-mass three-momentum becomes infinite at  $u = 0$ .

It is naturally desirable to attempt to bridge the gap between the analyticity and group theoretic treatments of daughter trajectories, and to see if the analyticity and group-theory daughters are really the same in some sense. Some insight on this question has been achieved by relying heavily on sophisticated group theoretic techniques.<sup>3</sup> However, it would be nice to have a discussion which embodies directly the tools of Smatrix theory, such as analyticity and factorization of residues. It is the purpose of this note to provide such a discussion and to prove that the daughters deduced from analyticity in unequal-

mass scattering give rise to a single Lorentz pole in equal-mass channels to which they couple.

Recently, it was shown that the properties of daughter trajectories which follow from broken (by  $u \neq 0$ ) O(4) symmetry can be derived entirely from analyticity.<sup>4</sup> This could be accomplished by considering unequal-mass scattering because the properties of trajectory functions must be independent of the particular channels to which they couple. It was suggested at that time that it would be difficult to show by taking an equalmass limit that the analyticity daughters correspond to a single Lorentz pole. Nothing in that discussion could eliminate the possibility that the daughters represented a string of integerspaced Lorentz poles rather than a single Lorentz pole. The stronger results of the present paper come about by considering, in addition, an amplitude which couples equal- and unequalmass channels, and by enforcing factorization of Regge-poIe residues.

The following development assumes that all particles are spinless and deals with analyticity and factorization constraints enforced simultaneously on two  $u$ -channel amplitudes having a common unequal-mass channel. The first amplitude corresponds to the unequal-mass elastic process  $M + \mu \rightarrow M + \mu$  designated UU. The second amplitude involves the same unequal-mass channel scattering into an equal-mass channel,  $M + \mu$ <br>-  $m + m$ , designated UE.

For the UU amplitude a leading Regge pole which has the value  $\alpha_0$  at  $u = 0$  must, in order to preserve analyticity at  $u = 0$ , be accompanied by daughters located at  $\alpha_0-k$   $(k = 1, 2, 3, \cdots)$  at  $u = 0$ . The most singular parts of the daughter residues are calculated in Ref. 4:

$$
\gamma_k \text{UU} = \gamma_0 \frac{\text{UU}(-1)^k \epsilon^k}{k!} \left[ \frac{\Gamma(\alpha_0 + 1)}{\Gamma(\alpha_0 - k + 1)} \right]^2
$$

$$
\times \frac{\Gamma(2\alpha_0 - 2k + 2)}{\Gamma(2\alpha_0 - k + 2)}, \tag{1}
$$

where  $\epsilon = (M^2 - \mu^2)^2$ . The subscript k labels the daughter trajectories and  $\gamma_k {\rm U}{\rm U}/u^k$  is the coefficient of the leading power  $s^{\,\alpha_0\, - k}$  of the  $k$ th daugh ter.

We now proceed to derive the relation analogous to (1) for the amplitude UE by enforcing analyticity at  $u = 0$ . The parent trajectory  $\alpha_0(u)$  gives

a contribution proportional to  $Q_{-1-\alpha_0(u)}(-z_u)$ which for this mass configuration is

$$
z_{\mu} = \frac{2s + u - \Sigma}{4q_{\Pi}q_{\Pi}},
$$
\n(2)

where

$$
\Sigma = M^{2} + \mu^{2} + 2m^{2},
$$
\n
$$
q_{\text{U}}^{2} = \frac{[u - (M + \mu)^{2}][u - (M - \mu)^{2}]}{4u},
$$
\n
$$
q_{\text{E}}^{2} = \frac{u}{4} - m^{2}.
$$
\n(3)

Writing  $Q_{-1-\alpha_0}$  in terms of a hypergeometric function, the contribution of the  $\alpha_{_0}$  trajectory to the UE amplitude can be written as

$$
T_0^{UE} = \gamma_0^{UE}(u) X^{\alpha_0(u)} F(-\frac{1}{2}\alpha_0(u), -\frac{1}{2}\alpha_0(u) + \frac{1}{2};
$$
  

$$
-\alpha_0(u) + \frac{1}{2}; (2q_U q_E/X)^2),
$$
  

$$
X = s + \frac{1}{2}u - \frac{1}{2}\Sigma.
$$
 (4)

The need for daughters arises in Eq. (4) because the coefficient of each power of  $X$  must be analytic at  $u = 0$ . The expansion of F in Eq. (4) shows that the singular parts of these coefficients are of the form

$$
X^{\alpha_0(u) - 2n} (q_{\mathbf{U}})^{2n} \propto X^{\alpha_0(u) - 2n} / u^n. \tag{5}
$$

Thus, Eq. (5) shows the necessity of daughters at  $\alpha_k(0) = \alpha_0(0) - k$ ,  $k = 2n$   $(n = 1, 2, \dots)$ , with residues<br> $\gamma_k$ <sup>UE</sup> having the behavior  $u^{-k/2}$  as  $u \to 0$ . We see here that only the even daughters contribute to the UE amplitude, a fact which anticipates the known O(4) result that only even daughters result from a single Lorentz pole in equal-mass scattering. The full amplitude  $T<sup>UE</sup>$  is thus a sum over the parent and daughter trajectories:

$$
T^{UE}(s, u) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} T_{2n}^{UE}(s, u).
$$
 (6)

The  $T_k^{\text{UE}}$  are the same as (4) with  $\alpha_{\text{o}}$  and  $\gamma_{\text{o}}$ replaced by  $\alpha_k$  and  $\gamma_k^{\text{UE}}$ . A calculation requir ing that the coefficient of  $X^{\alpha}(0) - 2n/u^n$  in Eq. (6) vanish leads in analogy to the similar calculation in Ref. 4 to the following result:

$$
\gamma_{k}^{\text{UE}} = \left(-\frac{m^{2}\epsilon}{4}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}k} \frac{\pi \sec \pi \alpha_{0}}{\Gamma(-\alpha_{0})} \frac{\Gamma(k-\alpha_{0})(\alpha_{0}-k+\frac{1}{2})\gamma_{0}^{\text{UE}}}{(\frac{1}{2}k)!\Gamma(k-\alpha_{0}+\frac{1}{2})\Gamma(\alpha_{0}-\frac{1}{2}k+\frac{3}{2})}, \quad k = 2n \ (n = 1, 2, 3, \cdots). \tag{7}
$$

Assuming that the residues given by Eqs. (7) and (1) factorize, we have the relation

$$
(\gamma_k^{\text{UE}})^2 = \gamma_k^{\text{UU}} \gamma_k^{\text{EE}}, \tag{8}
$$

where  $\gamma_k^{EE}$  represents the analogous Regge-pole residue in the process  $m+m-m+m$ , designated EE. Combining Eqs. (7) and (1) we obtain the following formula for the residues of the equal-mass amplitude EE:

$$
\sum_{k} \mathbf{E} \mathbf{E} = \gamma_0 \mathbf{E} \left( \frac{m^2}{4} \right)^k \frac{k!}{\left[\frac{1}{2}k\right]!} \frac{\pi^2 \sec^2 \pi \alpha_0 (\alpha_0 - k + \frac{1}{2})^2 \Gamma(2\alpha_0 - k + 2)}{\Gamma(2\alpha_0 - 2k + 2) \left[\Gamma(\alpha_0 - \frac{1}{2}k + \frac{3}{2}) \Gamma(k - \alpha_0 + \frac{1}{2})\right]^2}, \quad k = 2n \ (n = 1, 2, 3, \cdots). \tag{9}
$$

The contribution of all the even daughters to the EE amplitude is now given by

$$
T^{\mathbf{EE}}(u, z_u) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \gamma_{2n}^{\mathbf{EE}}(u) \left(2q_{\mathbf{E}}^2 z_u\right)^{\alpha} 2n^{(u)} F\left(-\frac{1}{2}\alpha_{2n}(u), -\frac{1}{2}\alpha_{2n}(u) + \frac{1}{2}; -\alpha_{2n}(u) + \frac{1}{2}; z_u \right)^{-2}.
$$
 (10)

At  $u = 0$  the  $\gamma_k$ <sup>EE</sup> are given by Eq. (9), and then it can be shown that Eq. (10) is proportional to the expansion of a Gegenbauer function in terms of Legendre functions of the second kind. Thus

$$
T^{\mathbf{EE}}(0, z_u) = \text{const} D_{-\alpha_0(0) - 2}^{-1}(-z_u), \quad (11)
$$

where  $D_{\alpha-2}^1$  is a Gegenbauer function. The function  $\overline{D} - \alpha(0) - 2^1$ , however, corresponds to a single Lorentz pole at  $n = \alpha(0)$  since the Gegenbauer functions are the  $O(4)$  analogs of the Legendre functions. This completes the demonstration that the daughter Regge trajectories implied by analyticity constitute a single Lorentz pole in equal-mass scattering.

The very powerful role played by the assumption of factorization of residues in this argument should perhaps be re-emphasized. It is factorization which insures that we are dealing with a single Lorentz pole. Without this assumption, it is very doubtful that one can prove that analyticity daughters give rise to a single Lorentz pole, as indicated in Ref. 4.

We remark that in Ref. 4 it is shown that the

derivatives of the daughter trajectory functions in UU scattering satisfy certain "mass formulas. "

We find exactly the same formulas when the corresponding calculations are performed for the UE process, except of course, the formulas for the odd daughters cannot be derived by considering the UE process. If we had not found the same formulas, there would be a serious inconsistency between analyticity at  $u = 0$  and Regge theory.

<sup>\*</sup>Work supported in part through funds provided by the Atomic Energy Commission under Contract No. A T(30-1)2098.

 $<sup>1</sup>M$ . L. Goldberger and C. E. Jones, Phys. Rev. 150,</sup> <sup>1269</sup> (1966); D. Z. Freedman and J. M. Wang, Phys. Rev. 153, 1596 (1967).

 ${}^{2}$ M. Toller, Nuovo Cimento 37, 63 (1965), and 54A, 295 (1968), and references contained therein; D. Z. Freedman and J. M. Wang, Phys. Rev. 160, <sup>1560</sup> (1967).

 ${}^{3}G$ . Domokos and G. L. Tindle, Phys. Rev. 165, 1906 (1968).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>J. B. Bronzan, C. E. Jones, and P. K. Kuo, to be published.