Submitted to Physical Review C

LBL-7182
Preprint

AN ENERGY-DEPENDENT PHASE SHIFT ANALYSIS OF PION-NUCLEON SCATTERING BELOW 400 MeV

Glenn Rowe, Martin Salomon, and
Rubin H. Landau

February 1978

Prepared for the U. S. Department of Energy
under Contract W-7405-ENG-48

DISCLAIMER

AN ENERGY-DEPENDENT PHASE SHIFT ANALYSIS OF PION-NUCLEON SCATTERING BELOW 400 MeV

Glenn Rowe* and Martin Salomon
Department of Physics, University of B.C.
Vancouver, British Columbia V6T 1W5 Canada

and

Rubin H. Landau**
Department of Physics, Oregon State University,
Corvallis, Oregon 97331, U.S.A.
and
Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory
Berkeley, California 94720

ABSTRACT

An analytic function of energy is fit to the available S, P, and D wave πN phase shifts of various groups below 400 MeV. This global average, which reproduces well most of the experimental cross-sections, is anticipated to be useful in pion-nucleus and pion-nucleon interaction calculations.

Key Word

[NUCLEAR REACTIONS $\pi^{\pm}N$; 0-400 MeV; analytic function fit to tabulated phase shifts.]

*Present address: Department of Physics, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario M5S 1A7, Canada.

**Supported in part by the Research Corporation, M.J. Murdock Grant, and partially by Division of Nuclear Physics, Nuclear Science Division, U.S. Department of Energy.

The prime source of information on the πN interaction is scattering experiments which provide information on the on-shell scattering amplitude or phase shifts.[1] These energy-dependent phase shifts are a convenient parametization of the on-shell πN interaction and are employed in numerous pion-nucleon and pion-nucleus interaction calculations. Unfortunately, the emphasis in recent years on extending and intensifying our knowledge of these phase shifts at higher and higher energies has proceeded without accurate determination of the low energy phases. Indeed, the task of accurately measuring the low energy phases in all the partial waves is presently being assumed by the meson factories.

In this work we fit an analytic function of energy to recent S, P, and larger D wave πN phase shifts determined by various groups for energies below 400 MeV. In the past energy-dependent phase shift analyses have been carried out at low[2,3] and high energies.[4,5,6] We do not aim to repeat all those analyses, rather we wish to provide a smooth "best" fit to all the modern πN phase shifts which will permit convenient and reliable interpolation in energy, and help indicate where further experimental work is called for. The functions so obtained can then be simply used, e.g. to construct potential or field theoretic models of the πN interaction, to predict pion-nucleus dynamics, and to evaluate dispersion integrals. Indeed a previous fit of this sort[7] has helped improve the reliability of low energy pion-nucleus calculations and has shown the crucial importance of not using obsolete phases.[8] The present fit incorporates more recent data than in the TRIUMF report[7] and uses improved statistical techniques.

We hasten to repeat that our prime aim is to summarize much data over a wide range of energy; a study of the elementary nature of the πN

interaction for its own sake should employ the elementary cross section data with a consistent treatment of Coulomb effects and analyticity. However, in light of the "ancient" fits presently being used in pion-nucleus physics,[8] we feel this type of global average is necessary.

The pure nuclear phase shifts in each eigenchannel are fit with an analytic function which incorporates the threshold behavior expected for a finite range interaction plus a term which represents the nearest πN resonance:

$$\frac{\tan \delta_\ell}{q^{2\ell+1}} = b + cq^2 + dq^4 + \frac{x\Gamma_0\omega_0 q_0^{-(2\ell+1)}}{\omega_0^2 - \omega^2} \quad , \tag{1}$$

where q is the πN center-of-mass momentum and ω is the πN c.m. energy. Although Eq. (1) does not represent a fundamental form for the πN interaction it is sufficiently realistic so that values for the real constants b, c, and d could be found which fit the data well for $T_\pi < 400$ MeV. (No fit has been made to the inelasticity parameter η which is > 97% for $T_\pi < 400$ MeV.) The resonant parameters, x, Γ_0, q_0, and ω_0, were fixed at the values given in the Particle Properties Table[9] and are reproduced in Table 1.

The values of the parameters were determined by performing a least squares fit[10] to $\tan \delta_\ell / q^{2\ell+1}$ and the scattering lengths with each datum point having its published, or an assigned, error. The assigned errors were chosen as either the same error as other comparably smooth data points, or (in those instances with large fluctuations) as the standard deviation of the data from a smooth curve. In addition, an error of 2% was assumed for all values of momentum q to account for the energy uncertainty.

-P2'-

- Insert after page 2 -

At this point we wish to caution the reader that the quality of the data and our limited energy region only permit a truly significant separation of "background" and resonance amplitudes in the P_{33} channel. In all other channels the "resonance" contribution is ≈10% of the total amplitude and thus we are only on the tail of the resonance. In these channels we consider the Breit-Wigner form simply a convenient parametization of some higher power q-dependence and have kept the elasticity parameter x (Γ_{el}/Γ) constant at its on-resonance value. Permitting x to be energy-dependent would complicate the parametization without adding additional physics. Setting $x \equiv 1$ in other channels than P_{33} would be quite reasonable for these low energies - yet this tends to increase the χ^2 by 10-20% and mainly change the least-well-determined parameter "d".

The phase shifts are taken from Refs. 11 to 17 and the scattering lengths from Ref. 16. These are either recent elastic $\pi^{\pm}p$ experiments or improved analyses of older experiments. The data from Ref. 15 was used for $250 < T_{\pi} < 400$ MeV to insure a smooth transition to the high energy region. (An average of "Berkeley Path 1", "Berkeley Boone 21", "Cern Theoretical" and "Glasgow Station A" was used, as these formed a consistent set which extrapolated well to lower energies.)

The fitted parameters b, c, and d are given in Table 2 along with the number of data points, the chi square, and the deduced scattering length. Some typical fits to the data are shown in Figs. 1 and 2. We see that although the fits appear reasonable in all channels there is considerable deviation of the data from the best fit. This is a prime reason for the need of such a fit. All χ^2 values indicate reasonable fits with the exception of S_{11} where there seem to be large systematic errors or an under-estimate of statistical errors.

Since we did not fit to the actual cross section data, we have confirmed the significance of our fits by using the fitted function to calculate πN elastic scattering cross sections and compared these to the actual measurements. As we show in Figs. 3 and 4 the agreement is quite respectable for π^+p at all energies but less good for π^-p — especially at the lower energies. The reason is threefold. First, the smaller $I = 1/2$ phases are not determined very well from experiment (as is evident in Fig. 1). Second, low energy π^-p experiments are more difficult that the π^+p ones and improved π^-p ones are needed. Finally, for $T_{\pi} < 50$ MeV the radiative capture reaction, $\pi^-p \to \gamma n$ is known to contribute significantly to the total cross section (10-30%) but it has not been included in the original phase shift analysis (which assumed real phases). Thus some caution appears necessary[18] in the use of all low energy phases until this problem is investigated more fully.

In Table 2 are also listed the deduced values of the scattering lengths for each eigenchannel (lim tan $\delta_\ell/q^{2\ell+1}$). Our analysis produces a slightly negative isoscalar scattering length $(a_1 + 2a_3) = (-0.011\pm0.008)m_\pi^{-1}$ comparable with the values listed in Ref. 16.

A somewhat different type of fit to the low energy partial waves has been obtained by Nielsen and Oades.[19] In that work the Almehed-Lovelace[14] and Carter et al. phases[11] were used as input to a dispersion relation and amplitudes were determined which had the analyticity of the Mandelstam representation, s-u crossing symmetry, and an imposed (self-consistent) unitarity. Their tabulated phases generally agree with the output of Eq. (1) to within 10% (with significant increasing discrepancy at lower energies). Since Ref. 19 fits the amplitudes with functions of s, t, and u, it should be possible to numerically project out the s channel behavior of their amplitudes and thus obtain results comparable to Eq. (1). While the amplitudes so determined may be theoretically more sound, this procedure is inconvenient, slow, possibly inaccurate, and does not provide the summary of an increasing number of data presented by Eq. (1).

In general, our analysis matches continuously to the higher energy analysis of Almehed and Lovelace[14] but provides a smooth extrapolation to lower energies. For $T_\pi < 100$ MeV our results differ significantly from the CERN theory analysis particularly in the S wave isoscalar amplitude. These differences have already been shown to be significant for low energy pion-nucleus scattering and would change most of the potential and field theory models for the low energy πN interaction.

We would like to thank TRIUMF for their support and in addition one of us (RHL) wishes to thank the University of British Columbia for their warm hospitality.

REFERENCES

1. H. Muirhead, The Physics of Elementary Particles (Pergamon, N.Y., 1968).
2. L. D. Roper, R. M. Wright, and B. T. Feld, Phys. Rev. B 138, 190 (1965).
3. J. M. McKinley, Rev. Mod. Phys. 35, 788 (1963).
4. A. T. Davies, Nucl. Phys. B21, 359 (1970).
5. B. H. Bransden et al., Phys. Rev. B 139, 1566 (1965).
6. P. W. Coulter, Phys. Rev. Letters 29, 450 (1972).
7. M. Salomon, "Low Energy Pion-Nucleon Phase Shifts", TRIUMF Report TRI-74-2.
8. M. McMillan and R. H. Landau, TRIUMF Report TRI-74-1., R. H. Landau and A. W. Thomas, Phys. Lett. 41B, 361 (1976).
9. Particle Data Group, Rev. of Mod. Phys. 48, 1 (1976).
10. W. T. Eadie et al, "Statistical Methods in Experimental Physics" (North-Holland Publishing Co., 1971).
11. J. R. Carter, D. V. Bugg, and A. A. Carter, Nucl. Phys. B58, 378 (1973).
12. D. Axen et al., 1974 Berkeley Expt. (unpublished).
13. P. Y. Bertin et al., Nucl. Phys. B106, 341 (1976).
14. S. Almehed and C. Lovelace, Nucl. Phys. B40, 157 (1972).
15. D. J. Herndon et al., UCRL-20030 (1970).
16. M. M. Nagels et al., Nucl. Phys. B109, 44 (1976).
17. C. Amsler et al., Lett. to Nuovo Cimento, 15, 209 (1976).
18. G. Rasche and W. S. Woolcock, Helv. Physica Acta 50, 407 (1977).
19. H. Nielsen and G. C. Oades, Nucl. Phys. B72, 310 (1974).

TABLE 1 Fixed Resonance Parameters for Eq. (1)

Channel	x	ω_o [MeV]	q_o [MeV/c]	Γ_o [MeV]
S_{11}	0.44	1550	477	105
S_{31}	0.31	1655	550	170
P_{11}	0.61	1435	393	230
P_{13}	0.23	1815	656	255
P_{31}	0.22	1850	678	200
P_{33}	0.99	1233	228	116
D_{13}	0.54	1525	459	125
D_{15}	0.43	1670	560	155

TABLE 2 Fitted Parameters for Eq. (1)

Channel	b $[10^{-2} m_\pi^{-(2\ell+1)}]$	c $[10^{-3} m_\pi^{-(2\ell+3)}]$	d $[10^{-4} m_\pi^{-(2\ell+5)}]$	N	$\frac{\chi^2}{N-3}$	Scattering Length $[m_\pi^{-(2\ell+1)}]$
S_{11}	16.8 ± 0.75	-35.4 ± 5.4	27 ± 11	38	4.7	0.185 ± .008
S_{31}	-11.2 ± 0.20	-30.7 ± 1.1	21 ± 2	54	1.1	-0.098 ± .003
P_{11}	-5.71 ± 0.54	25.4 ± 2.1	-29 ± 3	35	1.8	-0.047 ± .004
P_{13}	-1.31 ± 0.08	1.22 ± 0.32	-0.4 ± 0.3	40	1.2	-0.013 ± .002
P_{31}	-2.91 ± 0.08	3.45 ± 0.27	-1.5 ± 0.2	53	0.6	-0.029 ± .002
P_{33}	11.4 ± 0.30	-15.4 ± 2.1	7.2 ± 2.1	49	1.8	0.205 ± .050
D_{13}	0.109 ± 0.012	-0.031 ± 0.062	0.003 ± 0.065	54	0.4	0.0013 ± .0005
D	0.112 ± 0.007	-0.270 ± 0.030	0.19 ± 0.02	57	0.7	0.0012 ± .0005

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Fig. 1 Phase shifts in degrees for S_{31}, P_{11}, P_{31}, and P_{33} waves. The points have been taken from Refs. 11 to 17. The full lines are the results of the fits using Eq. (1).

Fig. 2 Phase shifts in degrees for S_{11}, P_{13}, and D_{15} waves.

Fig. 3 Comparison of some experimental cross-sections with cross-sections calculated using our fitted phase shifts for π^+p.

Fig. 4 Cross section comparison for π^-p.



$-\delta_{P_{11}}, -\delta_{S_{31}}, -\delta_{P_{31}}$ [°]
P11
P33
$\delta_{P_{33}}$,
S31
P31
q [MeV/c]
32
28
24
20
16
12
8
4
0
100
200
300
400
160
140
120
100
80
60
40
20

Fig. 1


$-\delta_{P_{13}}$, $\delta_{D_{15}}$ [°]
$\delta_{S_{11}}$, $\delta_{D_{13}}$
q [MeV/C]
S_{11}
$-P_{13}$
D_{13}
D_{15}
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
0
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16
0
100
200
300
400

Fig. 2



dσ/dΩ [mb/st]
π⁺p
166.0 MeV
291.4 MeV
114.1 MeV
95.9 MeV
67.4 MeV
24
22
20
18
16
14
12
10
8
6
4
2
-1.0
-0.5
0
0.5
COSθ CM

Fig. 3



$\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega}$ $\left[\frac{mb}{st}\right]$
$\pi^- p$
161.9 MeV
263.7 MeV
88.5 MeV
2.0
1.5
1.0
0.5
-1.0
-0.5
0
0.5
COS θ_{CM}

Fig. 4

This report was done with support from the Department of Energy. Any conclusions or opinions expressed in this report represent solely those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of The Regents of the University of California, the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory or the Department of Energy.

TECHNICAL INFORMATION DEPARTMENT
LAWRENCE BERKELEY LABORATORY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94720