## Measurements of Transverse Quasielastic Electron Scattering from the Deuteron at High Momentum Transfers

R. G. Arnold, D. Benton, <sup>(a)</sup> P. Bosted, L. Clogher, G. DeChambrier, A. T. Katramatou, J. Lambert, <sup>(b)</sup> A. Lung, G. G. Petratos, A. Rahbar, S. E. Rock, and Z. M. Szalata *The American University, Washington, D.C. 20016* 

> B. Debebe, M. Frodyma, R. S. Hicks, A. Hotta, <sup>(c)</sup> and G. A. Peterson University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts 01003

> > R. A. Gearhart

Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94309

J. Alster and J. Lichtenstadt Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel 69978

and

F. Dietrich and K. van Bibber Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California 94550 (Received 2 May 1988)

Cross sections for 180° inelastic electron scattering from deuterium were measured from breakup threshold to beyond the quasielastic peak for incident-beam energies of 0.843, 1.020, 1.189, and 1.281 GeV, corresponding to  $0.75 \le Q^2 \le 2.57$  (GeV/c)<sup>2</sup>. The data are in reasonable agreement with nonrelativistic models that include final-state interactions and meson-exchange currents. The scaling function F(y) for these data is generally in agreement with F(y) for forward-angle data at the same  $Q^2$ . Values of  $G_M^{\mu}$  determined from the data are in good agreement with results from previous experiments.

PACS numbers: 25.30.Fj, 13.40.Fn, 25.10.+s, 27.10.+h

Inelastic electron scattering from the deuteron is of great importance in the understanding of the nucleonnucleon interaction. If offers rich grounds for the testing of detailed calculations that go beyond the plane-wave impulse approximation (PWIA) by including final-state interactions (FSI), meson-exchange currents (MEC), and isobar configurations. Measurements at the top of the quasielastic peak provide good tests of the impulse approximation, since interaction effects are calculated to be small, and thus have been extensively used in extraction of the neutron form factors. The high- and lowmomentum sides of the quasielastic peak are the regions where the nuclear structure functions should be most sensitive to the interaction effects. Of particular value are data at high-momentum transfers, where fully relativistic models can be tested.

In this Letter, new data are presented for transverse (180°) inelastic electron scattering from the deuteron in the quasielastic region. The data extend to highermomentum transfers or cover a larger range of scattered electron energy E' than previous experiments.<sup>1-4</sup> The measurements were made with use of the Nuclear Physics Injector and the Stanford Linear Accelerator to deliver electron beams of energy E = 0.843, 1.020, 1.189, and 1.281 GeV in 1.6- $\mu$ s-long pulses at average currents of 1 to 5  $\mu$ A. The beams were transported into end sta-

tion A and through the chicane magnets of a 180° spectrometer system.<sup>5</sup> After passing through 10- or 20-cmlong liquid-deuterium cells, the beams were directed to a beam dump in end station A. Electrons scattered at 180° were momentum analyzed by the electron-arm spectrometer and detected in a set of six multiwire proportion chambers. A threshold gas Cerenkov detector and a lead-glass shower-counter array were used to reject the large flux of pions. Typically, ten spectrometer settings were used to cover the E' range from breakup threshold to the quasielastic peak and into the region where pion production dominates. The data were corrected for detector inefficiencies, trigger and electronics inefficiencies, finite-resolution effects, and the measured contributions from the target end caps. The variation of the solid angle with relative momentum was calculated with a Monte Carlo program,<sup>6</sup> and verified experimentally to  $\pm 2\%$  by a series of measurements in which the central momentum was stepped in small increments. Checks of the absolute solid-angle calculations were made by measurement of elastic scattering from hydrogen. The results agree within 2% with previous backward-angle measurements.<sup>7</sup> The spectra were radiatively corrected with the procedures described in Ref. 8. The total systematic errors ranged from 3.9% to 12.0%.

The radiatively corrected cross sections at each beam

energy E are shown as functions of scattered electron energy E' in Fig. 1. The data are in reasonable agreement with the nonrelativistic PWIA calculations of Laget<sup>9</sup> near the quasielastic peaks, but larger than the calculations by up to a factor of 2 at high E' and up to a factor of 1.5 in the dip region between the quasielastic peak and the onset of pion production at low E'. The Laget calculations use the Paris<sup>12</sup> potential and a nonrelativistic expansion of the interaction operator to terms of order  $M^{-3}$ , where M is the nucleon mass. The matrix elements are evaluated in the lab system. Except in the region where pion production dominates, calculations using the PWIA formulas of McGee as modified by Durand<sup>10</sup> are almost indistinguishable from the Laget PWIA curves when the same potential is used. At high E', the McGee-Durand calculations diverge from the data much more when the Bonn<sup>13</sup> potential is used than when the Paris potential is used, showing the great sensitivity to the short-range part of the potentials in this region.

Considerable improvement is provided by the calculations which include FSI and MEC. The model by Laget, which includes real pion production, describes the low-E'side of the peaks well, including the dip region. It reproduces the width of the peaks better than the PWIA calculations, but still underestimates the cross sections close



FIG. 1. Cross section for d(e,e') as a function of scattered electron energy  $E_i$  for four values of the incident energy E. The error bars include statistical and systematic uncertainties. The dotted curves are the PWIA calculations of Laget (Ref. 9) using the Paris potential. The short-dashed curves use the PWIA formula of McGee and Durand (Ref. 10) with the Bonn potential, and are indistinguishable from the dotted curves except at high E'. The solid (long dashed) curves are the full calculations of Laget (Arenhövel, Ref. 11) using the Paris potential.

to breakup threshold by up to a factor of 1.5. The calculations of Arenhövel<sup>11</sup> also use the Paris potential, and include isobar configurations in addition to MEC and FSI. These calculations use a complete nonrelativistic framework (except for the kinematics which are done relativistically), and the matrix elements are evaluated in the final *np* center-of-mass frame. Real pion production is not included. This model predicts peaks considerably narrower and taller than seen in the data, with the disagreement increasing at large  $Q^2$ . This model also overestimates (by typically 10%) the height of the quasielastic peak compared to low- $Q^2$  180° data of Ref. 1. Other low- $Q^2$  backward-angle data<sup>2</sup> have errors too large (typically 10%) to be able to confirm or deny this discrepancy.

To examine the dominance of the quasielastic reaction mechanism further, the data have been transformed to a scaling function F(y) that should be independent of  $Q^2$ and  $\theta$  at sufficiently high energies. There are several definitions of y and F(y) in current use, <sup>14-16</sup> most of which are based on the notion that scaling will hold true when the electrons scatter incoherently from the individual nucleons, and will be violated when FSI, MEC, or other mechanisms are important. Figure 2 shows the deduced results for two definitions of

$$F(y) = \frac{d^2\sigma}{d\,\Omega\,dE'}\,\frac{K}{\sigma_n(Q^2) + \sigma_p(Q^2)}$$

Definition I (see Ref. 14) has  $K = |\mathbf{q}| [M^2 + (|\mathbf{q}| + y)^2]^{1/2}$ , where  $|\mathbf{q}|$  is the absolute value of the threemomentum transfer, and uses an off-shell prescription<sup>19</sup>



FIG. 2. Values of F(y) from this 180° experiment (solid squares) and from experiments at forward angles (open circles, Refs. 17 and 18), for two definitions of F(y) (see text). The error bars include statistical and systematic uncertainties. The solid curves represent the full 180° calculations of Laget (Ref. 9) for the four beam energies of this experiment.

for the neutron and proton cross sections  $\sigma_n(Q^2)$  and  $\sigma_p(Q^2)$ . Definition II (see Ref. 15) has K = dE'/dy and on-shell values for  $\sigma_p(Q^2)$  and  $\sigma_N(Q^2)$  which include a recoil factor  $[1+2E\sin^2(\theta/2)M]^{-1}$ . In both cases, we used the nucleon form factors given in Ref. 10 and the definition of y that solves

$$E + M_d = E' + (M^2 + y^2)^{1/2} + [M^2 + (y + |\mathbf{q}|)^2]^{1/2}$$

where  $M_d$  is deuteron mass. These definitions were chosen in preference to others because they have the desirable property that the F(y) derived from both the PWIA and full calculations of Laget are essentially independent of electron scattering angle  $\theta$  at fixed  $Q^2$  and y. In addition, PWIA calculations scale (are independent of  $Q^2$  at fixed y) in definition I, but exhibit substantial scale breaking in definition II. For this reason, scale breaking can be directly interpreted as the result of deviations from the nonrelativistic PWIA only for definition I.

It can be seen in Fig. 2 that our data scale well for -0.2 < y < 0.05 GeV/c for both definitions of F(y). For y < -0.2 GeV/c, substantial scale breaking can be observed for definition I, indicating that FSI or other deviations from the PWIA are important. The full calcula-



FIG. 3. Ratios of experimental cross sections to the PWIA model of McGee and Durand (Ref. 10) for five values of the scaling variable y. Shown are data from this 180° experiment (solid circles), backward-angle data from Refs. 1, 2, and 4 (crosses), and forward-angle data from Refs. 2, 17, and 18 (open circles). The solid (dashed) curves are the full 180° calculations of Laget (Arenhövel).

tions of Laget also show significant scale breaking in this region. The data scale considerably better for definition II, as do the full Laget calculations. This definition appears to approximately compensate for the effects of FSI and MEC, and can therefore be used as a convenient way to parametrize data over a large kinematic range. Also shown in Fig. 2 are data<sup>17,18</sup> obtained at  $\theta=8^{\circ}$ 

Also shown in Fig. 2 are data<sup>17,18</sup> obtained at  $\theta = 8^{\circ}$ and 10° in the same  $Q^2$  region as the 180° data. The F(y) for both the forward- and backward-angle data are in good agreement, except for  $y \le -0.4$  GeV/c, where the forward-angle F(y) tend to be larger than the backward-angle F(y). This trend is not predicted by the full calculations of either Laget or Arenhövel.

In order to examine scale breaking further, in Fig. 3 we have plotted the ratio of experimental cross sections to the McGee-Durand PWIA model (using the Paris wave function) in five different y regions. It can be seen that, except for the largest |y|, the ratios for forward and backward angle are generally in agreement. The trend of the ratios is to decrease with increasing  $Q^2$  and, for the three plots with the smallest |y|, to flatten out at a value of  $Q^{\bar{2}}$  which increases with |y|. This trend can also be seen to some extent in the calculations of Laget and Arenhövel, and is most likely due to the decreasing importance of FSI with increasing  $Q^2$ . In contrast to the y = 0 and y = -0.1 bins, the ratio for the y = -0.2 bin is considerably larger than unity in the region where it is independent of  $Q^2$ . This could be ascribed either to a lack of high-momentum components in the model for the deuteron wave function, or to the influence of effects not included in the model, such as six-quark states and relativistic corrections.

Historically, quasielastic electron scattering from the deuteron has been used to extract the neutron elastic form factors. We have fitted the McGee-Durand PWIA model to our data close to the quasielastic peak to find values for the neutron magnetic form factor  $G_M^n$  in a manner similar to that described in Ref. 18. The contri-



FIG. 4. Values of  $G_M^m/G_D$  for this experiment (solid circles) and previous data (Ref. 3, open circles), where  $G_D = \mu_N/(1+Q^2/0.71)^2$  is the dipole model. The errors include both statistical and systematic errors added in quadrature.

bution of real pion production was subtracted from the data before the fitting was done, with use of the calculation of Laget.<sup>9</sup> As shown in Fig. 4, the results are in good agreement with both the dipole model  $G_D = \mu_N / (1 + Q^2/0.71)^2$  and with previous data.<sup>3,4</sup> The errors on  $G_M^n$  are dominated by uncertainties in the normalization of the experimental cross sections, uncertainties due to possible deviations from the PWIA, and the choice of deuteron wave function.

In summary, we have measured  $180^{\circ}$  cross sections for d(e,e') which fall by over 3 orders of magnitude between the quasielastic peak and breakup threshold. The results are generally in agreement with a nonrelativistic model that includes MEC and FSI. Detailed agreement has yet to be achieved near breakup threshold, where the effects of FSI, MEC, isobar configurations, and the choice of deuteron potential are found to be of increasing importance. Further work with relativistic models and a better knowledge of the short-range nucleon-nucleon interaction will be needed to fully describe the data in this region.

We would like to acknowledge the support of J. Davis, R. Eisele, C. Hudspeth, J. Mark, J. Nicol, R. Miller, L. Otts, and the rest of the SLAC staff. This work was supported in part by the Department of Energy, Contracts No. DOE-AC03-76SF00515 (SLAC), No. W-7405-ENG-48 (Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory), and No. DE-AC02-76ER-02853 (University of Massachusetts), and National Science Foundation Grant No. PHY85-10549 (American University). <sup>(b)</sup>Permanent address: Department of Physics, Georgetown University, Washington, DC 20057.

<sup>(c)</sup>Permanent address: School of Physics, Shizuoka University, Shizuoka, 422 Japan.

<sup>1</sup>B. Parker et al., Phys. Rev. C 34, 2354 (1986).

<sup>2</sup>B. Quinn et al., Phys. Rev. C 37, 1609 (1988).

<sup>3</sup>W. Bartel *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **B58**, 429 (1973); K. M. Hanson *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **8**, 753 (1973).

<sup>4</sup>A. S. Esaulov *et al.*, Yad. Fiz. **45**, 410 (1987) [Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **45**, 258 (1987)].

<sup>5</sup>A. T. Katramatou *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A **267**, 448 (1988).

<sup>6</sup>A. T. Katramatou, SLAC Report No. SLAC-NPAS-TN-86-8, 1986 (unpublished).

<sup>7</sup>L. E. Price et al., Phys. Rev. D 4, 45 (1971).

<sup>8</sup>Y. S. Tsai, SLAC Report No. SLAC-PUB-848, 1971 (unpublished); L. W. Mo and Y. S. Tsai, Rev. Mod. Phys. **41**, 205 (1969).

<sup>9</sup>J. M. Laget, Can. J. Phys. **62**, 1046 (1984); J. M. Laget, Phys. Lett. B **199**, 493 (1987), and private communication.

<sup>10</sup>I. J. McGee, Phys. Rev. **161**, 1640 (1967), and L. Durand, Phys. Rev. **123**, 1393 (1961), as presented in W. Bartel *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **B58**, 429 (1973). We used the dipole formula for  $G_{E}^{p}$ ,  $G_{M}^{p}$ , and  $G_{M}^{n}$ , and  $G_{E}^{p} = -O^{2}G_{M}^{n}/4M^{2}$ .

<sup>11</sup>H. Arenhövel, Nucl. Phys. A384, 287 (1982), and private communication.

<sup>12</sup>M. Lacombe et al., Phys. Lett. B 101, 139 (1981).

<sup>13</sup>R. Machleidt, K. Holinde, and C. Elster, Phys. Rep. 149, 1 (1987).

<sup>14</sup>C. Ciofi degli Atti et al., Phys. Rev. C 36, 1208 (1987).

<sup>15</sup>P. E. Bosted et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 49, 1380 (1982).

<sup>16</sup>G. B. West, Phys. Rep. **18C**, 263 (1975); S. A. Gurvitz and A. S. Rinat, Phys. Rev. C **35**, 696 (1987).

<sup>17</sup>W. P. Schütz *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **38**, 259 (1977); R. G. Arnold, private communication for revised results.

<sup>18</sup>S. Rock et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 49, 1139 (1982).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>(a)</sup>Present address: Department of Physics, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup>A. L. Dieperink et al., Phys. Lett. 63B, 261 (1976).