REACTION $\gamma p \rightarrow p \rho^0$ WITH LINEARLY POLARIZED PHOTONS AT 2.8 and 4.7 GeV: CROSS SECTIONS AND THE ρ^0 MASS SHIFT*

H. H. Bingham, W. B. Fretter, K. C. Moffeit, W. J. Podolsky, M. S. Rabin, A. H. Rosenfeld, and R. Windmolders[†]

Department of Physics and Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720

and

J. Ballam, G. B. Chadwick, R. Gearhart, Z. G. T. Guiragossián, M. Menke, J. J. Murray, P. Seyboth,[‡] A. Shapira,[§] C. K. Sinclair, I. O. Skillicorn,[∥] and G. Wolf^{**} Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305

and

R. H. Milburn Tufts University, Medford, Massachusetts 02155 (Received 12 March 1970)

Rho photoproduction is studied at 2.8 and 4.7 GeV using a linearly polarized photon beam in a hydrogen bubble chamber. The dependence of the ρ^0 mass shape on the momentum transfer is inconsistent with the Ross-Stodolsky factor. The production of $\pi^+\pi^$ pairs in the *s*-channel c.m. helicity-conserving *p*-wave state accounts for almost all events in the ρ region. Evidence is presented for an interference of ρ^0 production with background. The data are compared with the Söding model and total and differential cross sections for ρ^0 production are presented.

Previous studies of $\rho^{\rm 0}$ photoproduction in the reaction

$$\gamma p \to p \pi^+ \pi^- \tag{1}$$

have shown that the rho shape is skewed with respect to a p-wave Breit-Wigner resonance, resulting in an apparent mass shift of the order of 40 MeV.^{1,2} These observations have necessitated the use of models to fit the data, and because no model has been preferred experimentally, the ρ^0 -production cross section has been uncertain to ~20%. We present model-independent cross sections for production of $\pi^+\pi^-$ pairs from Reaction (1) in the *s*-channel c.m. helicity-conserving *p*-wave state which dominates in the ρ region.³ We also determined the ρ^0 -production cross sections using the Söding model,⁴ which was found to agree with the data.

The results published here are part of a detailed study of photoproduction with a bubble chamber using a linearly polarized photon beam. We obtained 90 ± 4 and 149 ± 6 events/µb at 2.8 and 4.7 GeV, respectively. Measurements of the total γp cross section at 1.4, 2.8, and 4.7 GeV have already been reported⁵; the analysis of the ρ^0 decay distributions and results on ω and Δ^{++} production are given elsewhere.³

I. Experimental setup. – The 82-in. hydrogen bubble chamber at the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center (SLAC) was exposed to a photon beam obtained by Compton backscattering a linearly polarized ruby-laser beam on high-energy electrons. By collimating both the electron and the backscattered photon beam to less than 10^{-5} rad, the width at half-maximum of the photon energy spectrum is ± 2.6 and $\pm 3.3\%$ at 2.8 and 4.7 GeV, respectively. The average degree of linear polarization as calculated for the Compton scattering process is 94 and 92%, respectively. Most of the film was taken with 70 to 80 photons per picture. More details of the beam can be found elsewhere.^{5,6}

II. Analysis of the film. - Approximately 292000 and 454000 photographs were taken, resulting in a total of 11000 and 19000 events at 2.8 and 4.7 GeV, respectively. All pictures were double scanned and the combined scanning efficiency was found to be greater than 99% for all topologies. Half the film was measured on conventional measuring machines at SLAC and half at Lawrence Radiation Laboratory (LRL) (the last twothirds at LRL were processed by the Spiral Reader II). The events were analyzed using the programs TVGP and SQUAW, After three measurement passes, less than 2% of the three-prong events remained to be measured. The fraction of three-prong events which could not be measured due to secondary scatters or track obscuration was 5%. The calculated effective-mass error for $\pi\pi$ pairs of Reaction (1) near the ρ mass was ±5 MeV. There were 2854 and 2910 events at 2.8 and 4.7 GeV, respectively, which gave a

Table I. Total cross sections for $\gamma p \rightarrow p \pi^+ \pi^-$; total and forward differential cross sections and slope A for production of $\pi^+\pi^-$ pairs in the *s*-channel c.m. helicity-conserving *p*-wave state (II) and for ρ^0 production as determined from fits with the Söding model.

		Helicity-conserving p wave (II)			ρ^0 production		
Ε _γ (GeV)	σ(γ <i>p</i> → <i>p</i> π ⁺ π [−]) (μb)	σ (μb)	$d\sigma/dt$ ($t = 0$) (μ b/GeV ²)	A (GeV ⁻²)	σ (μb)	$d\sigma/dt$ ($t=0$) ($\mu b/GeV^2$)	A (GeV ^{−2})
2.8 4.7	31.4 ± 1.3 20.2 ± 0.8	$18.9 \pm 1.1 \\ 13.5 \pm 1.0$	$\begin{array}{c} 144 \pm 13 \\ 102 \pm 8 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{7.5} \pm \textbf{0.6} \\ \textbf{7.2} \pm \textbf{0.5} \end{array}$	16.4 ± 1.0 14.4 ± 0.7	$\begin{array}{c} 93 \pm 7 \\ 80 \pm 5 \end{array}$	$5.4 \pm 0.4 \\ 5.5 \pm 0.3$

three-constraint fit to Reaction (1) consistent with the observed ionization and with a fitted photon energy in the interval $2.4 < E_{\gamma} < 3.3$ GeV or $4.1 < E_{\gamma} < 5.3$ GeV. The effects of possible contamination by wide-angle electron-positron pair production and scanning losses of events with a short proton recoil track were estimated. The corrections were found to be negligible for events with |t| > 0.02 GeV² (*t* is the square of the four-momentum transfer between incoming and outgoing proton) and, consequently, for all further studies, only events with $|t| > 0.02 \text{ GeV}^2$ were considered.

III. <u>Results</u>. – The corrected total cross sections for Reaction (1) are given in Table I and agree with other experiments.² Figure 1 shows the $\pi^+\pi^-$ mass distributions for various *t* intervals. The dominant feature is ρ^0 production; $\Delta^{++}(1236)$ production, which is also present in Reaction (1), is discussed elsewhere.³ We have



FIG. 1. $\pi^+\pi^-$ mass distributions for events of the reaction $\gamma \rho \rightarrow \rho \pi^+\pi^-$. The helicity-conserving ρ -wave intensity II (see text) is shown by the closed circles. The curves give the results of a maximum-likelihood fit using for the ρ^0 the parametrization $(M_{\rho}/M_{\pi\pi})^{n(r)}$ (the dashed line) and the Söding model (the solid line).

looked in the $\pi^+\pi^-$ mass distributions for the production of higher mass mesons, in particular the vector mesons ρ' and ρ'' with masses of ~1.3 and ~1.7 GeV predicted by the Veneziano model.⁷ The upper limits (1 standard deviation) on their production cross sections at 4.7 GeV are 0.5 and 0.4 µb, respectively, assuming for both ρ' and ρ'' a width of 200 MeV and decay into $\pi^+\pi^-$ only. These upper limits agree with other experiments⁸ but are still consistent with a recent Venezianomodel calculation.⁹

In order to test the Ross-Stodolsky factor¹⁰ we have multiplied the p-wave Breit-Wigner factor for the ρ by a factor of $(M_{\rho}/M_{\pi\pi})^{n(t)}$. Maximum-likelihood fits have been made to the events of Reaction (1) allowing for ρ^0 and $\Delta^{++}(1236)$ production and a phase-space term,¹¹ and fitting these contributions together with the parameter n(t) as a function of t. The fits describe the $\pi^+\pi^-$ mass spectra well, as shown by the dashed curves in Fig. 1. The fitted values for n(t) are shown in Figs. 2(c) and 2(d). In contrast to the prediction of Ross and Stodolsky, namely n(t=0) = 4, the parameter n is ~5 near t=0; it drops to



FIG. 2. Reaction $\gamma p \rightarrow p \pi^+ \pi^-$: (a), (b) The exponential slope of the *t* distribution as a function of the $\pi^+\pi^-$ mass, taking all events in a given $\pi^+\pi^-$ mass bin and with $0.02 < |t| < 0.4 \text{ GeV}^2$. The curves show the result of the Söding model. (c), (d) Fitted values for n(t) using the parametrization $(M_\rho/M_{\pi\pi})^{r(t)}$. (e), (f) Ratio of the fitted ρ^0 production to Drell cross sections, $\sigma_\rho(t)/\sigma_D(t)$. The curves show the predictions of the Söding model.

zero around $|t| = 0.5 \text{ GeV}^2$.

The analysis of the ρ^0 decay in this experiment has shown³ that, for $|t| < 0.4 \text{ GeV}^2$, the ρ^0 -decay angular distribution is

$$W(\theta, \psi) = (3/8\pi) \{ \sin^2\theta + P_{\chi} \sin^2\theta \cos 2\psi \}.$$
 (2)

Here θ is the polar angle of the decay π^+ ; ψ is the polarization angle defined as $\psi = \varphi - \Phi$, where φ is the azimuthal angle of the π^+ with respect to the production plane; Φ is the angle between the photon electric vector and the production plane; and P_{γ} is the degree of linear polarization of the photon. All angles are calculated in the $\pi^+\pi^$ helicity system. Equation (2) can be expressed in terms of the moments $Y_0^{\ 0}(\theta, \psi)$, $Y_2^{\ 0}(\theta, \psi)$, and $\operatorname{Re} Y_2^{\ 2}(\theta, \psi)$. Because of its ψ dependence, $\operatorname{Re} Y_2^{\ 2}(\theta, \psi)$ is the least affected by background and therefore has been used to determine the intensity of the *s*-channel c.m. helicity-conserving *p*-wave $\pi\pi$ contribution, II:

$$\Pi = \frac{1}{P_{\gamma}} \left(\frac{40\pi}{3}\right)^{1/2} \sum \operatorname{Re} Y_{2}^{2}, \qquad (3)$$

where the summation is over all events. The dots marked on the histograms of Fig. 1 show II as a function of $M_{\pi\pi}$ for different *t* intervals. We notice that (a) in the ρ region, II accounts for almost all events and shows the same skewing as the mass distributions; (b) above $M_{\pi\pi} = 1$ GeV, II is zero within errors, again emphasizing the absence of higher vector mesons; this also shows that the background which is present above 1 GeV does not contribute to $\text{Re}Y_2^2$. The total helicity-conserving *p*-wave cross section (corrected for the interval |t| < 0.02 GeV²) is given in Table I.

Further analysis of the $\pi\pi$ angular distribution was made by studying the $M_{\pi\pi}$ dependence of other moments $Y_L^{\mathcal{M}}(\theta, \psi)$. In Fig. 3 we show the moments Y_2^0 and Y_4^0 at 4.7 GeV. The moment Y_2^0 shows the behavior expected for the $\sin^2\theta$ decay of the ρ^0 . The positive values of Y_2^0 above 1 GeV are due to the Δ^{++} reflection. The moment Y_4^0 shows a distinctive interference pattern in the ρ region which can be interpreted as an interference between the ρ^0 and a $\pi^+\pi^-$ state of spin $J \ge 3$.¹²

In view of the observed interference effect we compared our data with the model of Söding,^{4,13} which explains the ρ -mass shift in terms of an interference between the ρ^0 production and a Drell-type background amplitude.¹⁴ The solid lines shown in Figs. 1-3 were calculated from the Söding model after fitting the ratio of the to-tal ρ^0 and Drell cross sections, σ_0/σ_D , and al-



FIG. 3. Reaction $\gamma p \rightarrow p \pi^+ \pi^-$: The moments $Y_2^{0}(\theta, \psi)$ and $Y_4^{0}(\theta, \psi)$ in the helicity frame as a function of $M_{\pi\pi}$ for $0.02 \le |t| \le 0.4$ GeV². The curves show the results of the Söding model.

lowing for Δ^{++} production and an additional background term. At 2.8 GeV the Drell term did not include a Δ^{++} contribution. The fitted values of $\sigma_{\rho}/\sigma_{\rm D}$ are shown in Figs. 2(e) and 2(f) as a function of *t*. The Söding model describes the *t* dependence of the $\pi^+\pi^-$ mass distributions and of $\sigma_{\rho}/\sigma_{\rm D}$ and, consequently, the related dependence of the exponential slope of the *t* distribution on the $\pi^+\pi^-$ mass^{2, 15} [see Figs. 2(a) and 2(b)]. The shape of the interference pattern observed for Y_4^{0} is also correctly predicted (see Fig. 3). The total ρ^0 -production cross sections obtained by fitting the Söding model to our data (and correcting for the interval $|t| < 0.02 \text{ GeV}^2$) are given in Table I.

In Fig. 4 we show the differential cross sections obtained from fits with the Söding model, those for II, and also those resulting from the parametrization $(M_{\rho}/M_{\pi\pi})^{n(t)}$. Fitting the differential cross section values for |t| < 0.4 GeV² with the form $d\sigma/dt = (d\sigma/dt)_{t=0} \exp(At)$, we obtain $(d\sigma/dt)_{t=0}$ and A as given in Table I. We remark that for |t| < 0.4 GeV² the differential cross sections and the slopes obtained for II(t) and for the ρ^{0} cross sections fitted with the parametrization $(M_{\rho}/M_{\pi\pi})^{n(t)}$ or with the Ross-Stodolsky factor agree within errors. The ρ^{0} cross sections obtained from fitting the Söding model lead to smaller values for the forward differential cross section (by ~25%) and for the slope.

The forward $\rho^{\rm o}$ cross sections obtained from



FIG. 4. Reaction $\gamma p \rightarrow \rho \pi^{+}\pi^{-}$: Differential cross sections as a function of t for the helicity-conserving p-wave contribution II (open triangles), and for ρ^{0} production as obtained from fits with the Söding model (closed circles) and using the parametrization $(M_{\rho}/M_{\pi\pi})^{n(t)}$ (open circles).

fitting the Söding model are about 60 μ b/GeV² smaller at both energies than the values quoted by the DESY-Massachusetts Institute of Technology group,¹⁶ who used an interference model which is different from that of Söding.

IV. Conclusions. – The production of $\pi^+\pi^-$ pairs in the s-channel c.m. helicity-conserving p-wave state, determined in a model-independent way, accounts for almost all events in the ρ region and shows the same skewing as the $\pi^+\pi^-$ mass distributions. We have observed a variation of the ρ mass shape as a function of t, a variation of the exponential slope of the t distribution with $M_{\pi\pi}$, and an interference of the ρ^0 amplitude with background. These features are inconsistent with a model using only the Ross-Stodolsky factor to explain the ρ^0 mass shift, but are well described by the interference model of Söding. Since it is necessary to use a model to determine the ρ^0 differential cross section, we emphasize that an uncertainty is introduced which is much larger than our experimental errors.

Our thanks go to the SLAC accelerator operation group, and to R. Watt and the 82-in, bubblechamber crew. We are also indebted to the scanners at SLAC and Berkeley and in particular to W. Hendricks, Mrs. Tartar, and A. Wang for their coordinating effort. The help of W. Graves is gratefully acknowledged.

*Work supported in part by the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission and the National Science Foundation.

†Visitor from Laboratoire Interuniversitaire des Hautes Energies, Brussels, Belgium.

[‡]On leave from Max-Planck-Institut für Physik und Astrophysik, Munich, Germany.

\$On leave from Weizmann Institute, Rehovoth, Israel. ∥On leave from Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, N. Y.

**On leave from DESY, Hamburg, Germany.

¹H. R. Crouch *et al.*, in *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Electron and Photon Interactions at High Energies*, 1965, edited by G. Höhler *et al.* (Deutsche Physikalische Gesellschaft, Hanau, Germany, 1966), Vol. II, p. 13.

²Aachen-Berlin-Bonn-Hamburg-Heidelberg-München Collaboration, Phys. Rev. <u>175</u>, 1669 (1968), and references given therein.

³SLAC-Berkeley-Tufts Collaboration, Stanford Linear Accelerator Center Reports No. SLAC-PUB-728, No. SLAC-PUB-729, and No. SLAC-PUB-730, 1970 (to be published).

⁴P. Söding, Phys. Letters <u>19</u>, 702 (1965); see also A. S. Krass, Phys. Rev. <u>159</u>, 1496 (1967).

⁵J. Ballam *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Letters <u>23</u>, 498, 817(E) (1969).

⁶J. J. Murray and P. Klein, Stanford Linear Accelerator Center Report No. SLAC-TN-67-19 (unpublished); C. K. Sinclair, J. J. Murray, P. Klein, and M. Rabin, IEEE Trans. Nucl. Sci. <u>16</u>, No. 3, 1065 (1969).

⁷J. A. Shapiro, Phys. Rev. 179, 1345 (1969).

⁸A. Silverman, in *Proceedings of the International* Symposium on Electron and Photon Interactions at High Energies, Liverpool, 1969, edited by D. W. Braben (Daresbury Nuclear Physics Laboratory, Lancashire, England, 1970), p. 71.

⁹H. Satz and K. Schilling, CERN Report No. TH-1127, January 1970 (to be published). These authors explain the ρ -mass shift but, in contradiction to experiment, their model predicts *t*-channel helicity conservation for ρ^0 production.

¹⁰M. Ross and L. Stodolsky, Phys. Rev. <u>149</u>, 1172 (1966).

¹¹For the density distribution on the Dalitz plot we use formula (A1) of Ref. 2 with the addition of the factors $\exp(7t)$ and $\exp(7.1t_{\Delta})$ $(t_{\Delta} = \text{square of four-momentum}$ transfer between incoming proton and outgoing Δ^{++}) which multiply the ρ and Δ^{++} Breit-Wigner terms. ¹²At 2.8 GeV the moment Y_4^{0} does not show a statistic-

¹²At 2.8 GeV the moment Y_4^0 does not show a statistically significant interference effect. This is probably due to the large Δ^{++} production, which plays only a minor role at 4.7 GeV.

¹³The predictions of the Söding model have been calculated using a Monte Carlo program written by P. Söding. The formulas employed differ from those given in Ref. 4 in the following points: The pion-nucleon scattering is calculated from the phase shift data keeping only the spin-nonflip term (within errors the same ρ^0 cross sections are obtained when the extreme assumption is made that the πN elastic-scattering amplitude, A, is completely imaginary, i.e., A=i|A|; the rho amplitude is assumed to be helicity conserving in the s-channel c.m. system. The ρ mass, M_{ρ} , and width, Γ_{ρ} , used in the determination of the differential cross sections were obtained from fits to the events in the interval $0.02 < |t| < 0.5 \text{ GeV}^2$. The resulting values were $M_{\rho} = 765 \pm 3$ MeV (760 ± 3 MeV) and $\Gamma_{\rho} = 132 \pm 6$ MeV $(141 \pm 5 \text{ MeV})$ at 2.8 GeV (4.7 GeV). We note that there are theoretical difficulties with the Söding model, namely, gauge invariance, uncertainties in the offmass shell corrections, and neglect of a possible real part of the ρ^0 production amplitude. Double-counting corrections as proposed by D. R. Yennie and by J. Pumplin (private communications) lead to ρ^0 forward differential cross sections of 101 ± 7 and $90 \pm 6 \ \mu b/GeV^2$ and to slopes of 5.6 \pm 0.3 and 5.8 \pm 0.3 GeV⁻² at 2.8 and 4.7 GeV, respectively.

¹⁴The ρ mass shift has also been discussed by G. Kramer and J. L. Uretsky, Phys. Rev. <u>181</u>, 1918 (1969), and P. D. Mannheim and U. Maor, to be published.

¹⁵M. Davier *et al.*, Stanford Linear Accelerator Center Report No. SLAC-PUB-613, and Phys. Rev. (to be published).

¹⁶H. Alvensleben *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Letters <u>23</u>, 1058 (1969).