

Single-Pion Production in pp Collisions at 0.95 GeV/c (I)

S. Abd El-Samad⁸, R. Bilger⁶, K.-Th. Brinkmann², H. Clement⁶, M. Dietrich⁶, E. Doroshkevich⁶, S. Dshemuchadse^{5,2}, A. Erhardt⁶, W. Eylich³, A. Filippi⁷, H. Freiesleben², M. Fritsch^{3,1}, R. Geyer⁴, A. Gillitzer⁴, J. Hauße³, D. Hesselbarth⁴, R. Jaekel², B. Jakob², L. Karsch², K. Kilian⁴, H. Koch¹, J. Kress⁶, E. Kuhlmann², S. Marcello⁷, S. Marwinski⁴, R. Meier⁶, K. Möller⁵, H.P. Morsch⁴, L. Naumann⁵, E. Roderburg⁴, P. Schönmeier^{2,3}, M. Schulte-Wissermann², W. Schroeder³, M. Steinke¹, F. Stinzing³, G.Y. Sun², J. Wächter³, G.J. Wagner⁶, M. Wagner³, U. Weidlich⁶, A. Wilms¹, S. Wirth³, G. Zhang^{6a}, and P. Zupranski⁹

¹ Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Germany

² Technische Universität Dresden, Germany

³ Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg, Germany

⁴ Forschungszentrum Jülich, Germany

⁵ Forschungszentrum Rossendorf, Germany

⁶ Physikalisches Institut der Universität Tübingen, Auf der Morgenstelle 14, D-72076 Tübingen, Germany

⁷ INFN Torino, Italy

⁸ Atomic Energy Authority NRC Cairo, Egypt

⁹ Soltan Institute for Nuclear Studies, Warsaw, Poland
(COSY-TOF Collaboration)

Received: July 10, 2006

Abstract. The single-pion production reactions $pp \rightarrow d\pi^+$, $pp \rightarrow np\pi^+$ and $pp \rightarrow pp\pi^0$ were measured at a beam momentum of 0.95 GeV/c ($T_p \approx 400$ MeV) using the short version of the COSY-TOF spectrometer. The implementation of a central calorimeter provided particle identification, energy determination and neutron detection in addition to time-of-flight and angle measurements. Thus all pion production channels were recorded with 1-4 overconstraints. The total and differential cross sections obtained are compared to previous data and theoretical calculations. Main emphasis is put on the discussion of the $pp\pi^0$ channel, where we obtain angular distributions different from previous experimental results, however, partly in good agreement with recent phenomenological and theoretical predictions. In particular we observe very large anisotropies for the π^0 angular distributions in the kinematical region of small relative proton momenta revealing there a dominance of proton spinflip transitions associated with π^0 s - and d -partial waves and emphasizing the important role of π^0 d -waves.

PACS. 13.75.Cs – 25.10.+s – 25.40.Ep – 29.20.Dh

1 Introduction

Single-pion production in the collision between two nucleons is thought to be the simplest inelastic process between two baryons. Therefore it came as a surprise, when first near-threshold data on the $pp\pi^0$ channel [1] revealed its cross section to be larger than predicted [2, 3, 4] by nearly one order of magnitude. Meanwhile the near-threshold data base has been much improved by exclusive measurements at TRIUMF (TINA and MINA) [5], SATURNE (SPES0) [6] and in particular at the cooler storage rings CELSIUS (PROMICE/WASA) [7, 8, 9], COSY (GEM, TOF) [10, 11] and IUCF [12], at the latter also with polarized beam and target. However, this data base is still far from

being complete and often simple observables like angular and invariant-mass distributions of the unpolarized cross section are still missing. We report in this paper on measurements of such distributions at a beam momentum of 0.95 GeV/c (corresponding to $T_p = 397$ MeV) for the reactions $pp \rightarrow d\pi^+$, $pp \rightarrow pp\pi^0$ and $pp \rightarrow np\pi^+$. For the latter we give here the total cross section only, the differential distributions will be discussed in a separate paper.

2 Experiment

The measurements have been carried out at the Jülich Cooler Synchrotron COSY using the time-of-flight spectrometer TOF at one of its external beam lines. The setup of the TOF detector system is displayed in Fig. 1. At the

^a present address: Peking University

Correspondence to: H. Clement

email: clement@pit.physik.uni-tuebingen.de




Fig. 1. Sketch of the short COSY-TOF setup used in this experiment showing (a) the full detector arrangement with inserts for (b) the start detector region with start wedges and hodoscope, (c) the central hodoscope ("Quirl") as the stop detector for TOF measurements and (d) the central calorimeter.

entrance of the detector system the beam - collimated to a diameter smaller than 2 mm - hits the LH_2 target, which has a length of 4 mm, a diameter of 6 mm and 0.9 μm thick hostaphan foils as entrance and exit windows [13]. At a distance of 22 mm downstream of the target the two layers of the start detector (each consisting of 0.5 mm thick scintillators cut into 12 wedge-shaped sectors) were placed followed by a two-plane fibre hodoscope (96 x 96 fibers, 2 mm thick each) at a distance of 165 mm from target, see Fig. 1b. Whereas the start detector mainly supplies the start times for the time-of-flight (TOF) measurements, the fibre hodoscope primarily provides a good angular resolution for the detected particle tracks. In its central part the TOF-stop detector system consists of the so-called Quirl, a 3-layer scintillator system 1081 mm downstream of the target shown in Fig. 1c and described in detail in Ref. [14] - and in its peripheral part of the so-called Ring, also a 3-layer scintillator system built in a design analogous to the Quirl, however, with inner and outer radii of 560 and 1540 mm, respectively. Finally behind the Quirl a calorimeter (Fig. 1a,d) was installed for identification of charged particles and of neutrons as well as for measuring the energy of charged particles. The calorimeter, details of which are given in Ref. [15], consists of 84 hexagon-shaped scintillator blocks of length 450 mm, which suffices to stop deuterons, protons and pions of energies up to 400, 300 and 160 MeV, respectively. The energy calibration of the calorimeter was performed by the detection of cosmic muons.

In the experiment the trigger was set to two hits in Quirl and/or Ring associated with two hits in the start

detector. From straight-line fits to the hit detector elements tracks of charged particles are reconstructed. They are accepted as good tracks, if they originate in the target and have a hit in each detector element the track passes through. In this way the angular resolution is better than 1° both in azimuthal and in polar angles. If there is an isolated hit in the calorimeter with no associated hits in the preceding detector elements, then this hit qualifies as a neutron candidate (further criteria will be discussed below). In this case the angular resolution of the neutron track is given by the size of the hit calorimeter block, i.e. by 7 - 8° . By construction of the calorimeter a particle will hit one or more calorimeter blocks. The number of blocks hit by a particular particle is given by the track reconstruction. The total energy deposited by this particle in the calorimeter is then just the (calibrated) sum of energies deposited in all blocks belonging to the particular track.

In order to have maximum angular coverage by the detector elements and to minimize the fraction of charged pions decaying in flight before reaching the stop detectors, the short version of the TOF spectrometer was used. In this way a total polar angle coverage of $3^\circ \leq \Theta_{Lab} \leq 49^\circ$ was achieved with the central calorimeter covering the region $3^\circ \leq \Theta_{Lab} \leq 28^\circ$. For fast particles the 4% energy resolution of the calorimeter is superior to that from TOF measurements, the resolution of which is reduced by the short path length. However, the TOF resolution is still much better than the ΔE resolution of the quirl elements. Hence, for particle identification, instead of plotting ΔE versus E_{cal} , the uncorrected particle energy deposited in the calorimeter, we utilize the relation $\Delta E \sim (z/\beta)^2$ with the particle charge $z = 1$ and plot $1/\beta^2$ versus E_{cal} , where the particle velocity $\beta = v/c$ is derived from the TOF measurement.

Fig. 2 shows the $1/\beta^2 - E_{cal}$ scatterplot for two-track events. The bands for d, p and π are well separated. The horizontal shadow region on the left of the deuteron band stems from deuteron breakup in the calorimeter. Note that E_{cal} in Fig. 2 is not yet corrected for energy and particle dependent quenching effects. By applying the quenching correction as well as the correction for energy loss in the preceding detector elements the kinetic energies of the detected particles are deduced.

By identifying and reconstructing the two charged tracks of an event the exit channels $d\pi^+$, $np\pi^+$ and $pp\pi^0$ can be separated. Kinematically the maximum possible laboratory (lab) polar angles are $\approx 9^\circ$ for deuterons and $\approx 32^\circ$ for protons (and neutrons). Hence 88% of the angular coverage for deuterons and 86% of that for protons from single pion production are within the angular acceptance of the calorimeter. For charged pions the angular coverage has been much lower with this setup, since kinematically they can extend up to $\Theta_{Lab} = 180^\circ$. Hence within the angular coverage of Quirl and Ring the angular acceptance for π^+ has been $\approx 40\%$ only. Nevertheless most of the phase space part necessary for a full coverage of the physics in single pion production has been covered (see below) by these measurements due to the circumstance that the center-




Fig. 2. ΔE - E plot for particles stopped in the calorimeter. Shown is the first (smaller angle) track of two-track events. For the plot the ΔE information is taken from the TOF information obtained by Quirl and start detectors and plotted as $1/\beta^2$, where $\beta = v/c$ denotes the particle velocity normalized to c . For the E information the energy deposited in the calorimeter E_{cal} has been taken.

of-mass (cm) angular distributions have to be symmetric about 90° because of identical collision partners in the incident channel.

For $\Theta_{Lab} \leq 25.5^\circ$ the $pp\pi^0$ events have been identified by requiring the two charged tracks of the events to be protons identified in the Quirl-calorimeter system and by the condition that their missing mass MM_{pp} meets the constraints $100 \text{ MeV}/c^2 \leq MM_{pp} \leq 180 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ (Fig. 3). For $\Theta_{Lab} > 28^\circ$ the protons of the $pp\pi^0$ channel have been detected in the Ring. Since kinematically they have a small β they are easily distinguished from pions hitting the Ring and also from elastically scattered protons. The same applies for the angular region $25.5^\circ > \Theta_{Lab} \leq 28^\circ$, where the protons hit only the edge of the calorimeter and in general no longer stop there. In both cases the proton energy is calculated from the corresponding TOF measured by the Start-Ring and Start-Quirl detector systems, respectively. Thus the full kinematically accessible angular range was covered for this reaction channel with exception of the beam-hole region ($\Theta_{Lab} \leq 3^\circ$).

The $d\pi^+$ events have been selected by identifying both deuteron and pion, if both hit the calorimeter or by identifying only the deuteron, if the pion hits the Ring. Corresponding missing mass checks have been applied. In addition, the coplanarity condition $170^\circ < \Delta\Phi \leq 180^\circ$ is used to further distinguish $d\pi^+$ events from three-body background. That way even the deuteron identification in the calorimeter may be omitted, thus allowing to check




Fig. 3. Spectrum of the missing mass MM_{pp} reconstructed from the detected proton pairs for the $pp\pi^0$ channel.

how well the deuteron breakup in the calorimeter is under control in the Monte Carlo (MC) simulations. Within uncertainties both ways lead to identical results.

Finally the $np\pi^+$ channel is selected by identifying proton and pion in the calorimeter or only the proton in the calorimeter, when the second charged track is in the Ring. In addition the missing $p\pi$ mass $MM_{p\pi}$ has to meet the condition $900 \text{ MeV}/c^2 \leq MM_{p\pi} \leq 980 \text{ MeV}/c^2$. Also to suppress background from the $d\pi^+$ channel - in particular when the deuteron is broken up and appears as a proton in the calorimeter - the $p\pi^+$ track is required to be non-coplanar, i.e. $\Delta\Phi < 170^\circ$ complementary to the coplanarity condition given above. Further on the neutron 4-momentum is reconstructed from the 4-momenta of proton and pion and it is checked, whether a calorimeter block in the corresponding (Θ, Φ) region recorded a hit accompanied without any entries recorded in the preceding detector elements of the Quirl. If these conditions are met, a neutron track is assumed. That way Θ_n and Φ_n are determined by the location of this calorimeter block. Thus having only the neutron energy undetermined experimentally we end up with 3 kinematic overconstraints for this channel, whereas we have 1 overconstraint for the $pp\pi^0$ channel and 4 overconstraints for the $d\pi^+$ channel. Corresponding kinematic fits were applied.

The luminosity of the experiment was determined from the analysis of pp elastic scattering. Due to their opening angle of $\delta_{pp} \approx 84^\circ$ between both tracks, such two-track events have both hits in the Ring. They are easily identified by using in addition the coplanarity constraint $170^\circ < \Delta\Phi \leq 180^\circ$. Fig. 4 shows the measured angular distribution in comparison with the prediction from the SAID database [16]. The data have been efficiency corrected by MC simulations of the detector setup. Adjustment of the data in absolute height gives the required luminosity ($L = 5 * 10^{33} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ and $dL/dt = 3 * 10^{28} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ time averaged) and the absolute normalization of the single-pion production cross sections, respectively, which will be




Fig. 4. Angular distribution of elastic scattering in the cm system. The data of elastic scattering proton pairs recorded in the ring have been adjusted in absolute height to the SAID [16] data base (solid line).

discussed in the following.

3 Results

Due to the identity of the collision partners in the entrance channel the angular distributions in the overall center-of-mass system have to be symmetric about 90° , i.e. the full information about the reaction channels is contained already in the interval $0^\circ \leq \Theta^{cm} \leq 90^\circ$. Deviations from this symmetry in the data indicate systematic uncertainties in the measurements. Hence we plot - where appropriate - the full angular range, in order to show the absence of major systematic errors present in our measurement.

Tab. 1: Total cross sections σ_{tot} at $T_p \approx 400$ MeV for the reactions $pp \rightarrow d\pi^+$, $pp \rightarrow np\pi^+$ and $pp \rightarrow pp\pi^0$ evaluated in this work and compared to previous measurements.

σ_{tot} [mb]		
$pp \rightarrow d\pi^+$	$pp \rightarrow np\pi^+$	$pp \rightarrow pp\pi^0$
0.74 (2)	0.47 (2)	0.100 (7)
0.72 ^{a)}		0.092 (7) ^{b)}
		0.070 (7) ^{c)}

^{a)} Ref. [16] ^{b)} Ref. [9] ^{c)} Ref. [5]

The evaluated total cross sections for the three channels are given in Tab. 1 together with previous results. The uncertainties assigned are based on systematics for acceptance and efficiency corrections as obtained by variation of MC simulations for the detector response, where




Fig. 5. Pion angular distribution in the cm system for the reaction $pp \rightarrow d\pi^+$. The data of this work (full circles) are compared to the SAID [16] data base (solid line).

we have varied the MC input assuming either pure phase space or some reasonable models for the reaction under consideration. Statistical uncertainties are negligible compared to the systematic uncertainties.

3.1 $pp \rightarrow d\pi^+$

Absolute and differential cross sections for this reaction channel are very well known from previous experiments. Hence we use the analysis of our data for this channel primarily as a check of the reliability of our measurement and data analysis. In Fig. 5 our results for the π^+ angular distribution are shown in comparison with the prediction from the SAID data base [16]. Since in the measurement we cover only angles $\Theta_d^{cm} < 90^\circ$ we show in Fig.5 only the appropriate half of the full angular distribution. Note, however, that due to the symmetry of the angular distribution around $\cos\Theta_d^{cm} = 0$ most of the physically relevant phase space part has been covered in this measurement. We find good agreement with the SAID data base both in absolute magnitude and in the shape of the angular distribution. Since the pions of this channel cover the angular range of both Quirl and Ring, i.e., stem from Quirl-Quirl and Quirl-Ring coincidences, the good agreement with SAID assures that there are no significant problems with correlating the efficiencies of Quirl and Ring.

3.2 $pp \rightarrow pp\pi^0$

This channel has received increasing attention since first measurements in the threshold region [12] at IUCF and later also at CELSIUS [7] uncovered the total cross section to be nearly an order of magnitude larger than predicted theoretically [2,3,4]. Very recent close-to-threshold measurements at COSY-TOF revealed the experimental total




Fig. 6. Spectra for kinetic energies and polar angles (lab system) of detected proton pairs stemming from the $pp \rightarrow pp\pi^0$ reaction. The shaded areas show the corresponding phase space distributions for comparison. Dashed and dotted lines give calculations with the ansatz eq. (4) and the ansatz of Ref. [8], i.e. eq. (3), respectively.

cross sections to be even larger by roughly 50% [11] than previously measured. There it was shown that the pp final state interaction (FSI) has a very strong influence on the reaction dynamics close to threshold with the consequence that a substantial part of the cross section is at small lab angles, which were missed in IUCF and CELSIUS measurements near threshold. At higher energies, $320 \text{ MeV} \leq T_p \leq 400 \text{ MeV}$, where the influence of the pp FSI decreases more and more, the total cross section data measured at TRIUMF [5], SATURNE [6], COSY-GEM [10] and CELSIUS (PROMICE/WASA) [9] are in agreement with each other with the exception of a 20% discrepancy at $T_p \approx 400 \text{ MeV}$ between CELSIUS and TRIUMF results. Our value, see Tab. 1, is in agreement with the CELSIUS result. Recent measurements with polarized beam [6] and partly also polarized target [1] added much to the detailed knowledge of this reaction from threshold up to $T_p \approx 400 \text{ MeV}$.

Despite the wealth of experimental information on this reaction there remain a number of problems, which are not yet sufficiently settled. E.g., the anisotropy of the pion angular distribution in the overall cm system, characterized by the anisotropy parameter b , which traditionally [5,6] is defined by

$$\sigma(\Theta_{\pi^0}^{cm}) \sim 1/3 + b * \cos^2 \Theta_{\pi^0}^{cm}, \quad (1)$$

where $\Theta_{\pi^0}^{cm}$ denotes the π^0 polar angle in the overall cm system, shows a big scatter in the results from different measurements, see, e.g., Fig.11 in Ref.[11] for $T_p \leq 400 \text{ MeV}$ and Fig.6 in Ref.[6] for higher incident energies. Note that in Ref.[11] the Legendre coefficient a_2 for p-waves is plotted according to the ansatz

$$\sigma(\Theta_{\pi^0}^{cm}) \sim 1 + a_2 * (3 \cos^2 \Theta_{\pi^0}^{cm} - 1)/2, \quad (2)$$

In this paper we will use eq. (2) analogously also for fitting the experimental proton angular distributions $\sigma(\Theta_p^{pp})$ by replacing $\Theta_{\pi^0}^{cm}$ with Θ_p^{pp} , the proton angle in the pp subsystem. The parameters b and a_2 are related by $a_2 = 2b/(1+b) \approx 2b$ for $b \ll 1$. We will use the quantity a_2 in the following discussion of the angular distributions.




Fig. 7. Dalitz plots for the invariant mass combinations $M_{p\pi^0}^2$ versus M_{pp}^2 and $M_{p\pi^0}^2$ versus $M_{p\pi^0}^2$ as obtained from the data for the $pp \rightarrow pp\pi^0$ reaction. Note that the plots are efficiency but not acceptance corrected, hence the tiny deviations from the elliptic circumference at the upper corners due to the excluded beam-hole region.

Near-isotropy is found for $T_p < 400 \text{ MeV}$ with a_2 staggering between -0.1 and $+0.1$ - with a tendency for negative values. The latter would mean that d-wave contributions inducing negative a_2 values are already present close to threshold [8]. A clearer trend towards positive a_2 values is observed for $T_p > 400 \text{ MeV}$.

As we will show below, our results for a_2 are at variance with previous results and hence need a more detailed consideration. To this end we start the presentation and discussion of our results first with energy and angular distribution of the protons in the lab system as displayed in Fig.6. In this and in the following one-dimensional figures phase space distributions are shown by shaded areas for comparison. We see that the data do not deviate vigorously from the phase space distributions, as we would expect, e.g., if Δ excitation would play a dominant role in this reaction channel. This is also visible in the experimental Dalitz plots of $M_{p\pi^0}^2$ versus M_{pp}^2 and $M_{p\pi^0}^2$ versus $M_{p\pi^0}^2$ displayed in Fig.7. The data cover essentially the full available elliptic phase space areas and yield distributions, which are close to flat with just one pronounced excursion in the region of the pp FSI. This is reflected also in the projections of the Dalitz plot leading to the spectra of the invariant masses $M_{p\pi^0}$ and M_{pp} (Fig.8). The latter exhibits a small spike at the pp threshold due to pp FSI, though in total its influence is of minor importance as expected from the small amount of s-wave between the two protons being available at this energy [12]. In the $M_{p\pi^0}$ spectrum we compare our data with the ones from CELSIUS as given in Ref.[9]. We find agreement between both data sets with the exception of the region around $M_{p\pi^0} \approx 1100 \text{ MeV}/c^2$, where we obtain a somewhat larger yield.

Now we turn again to the angular distributions, which are shown in Fig.9, on the left for the pions denoted by their cm polar angles $\Theta_{\pi^0}^{cm}$ and on the right for protons in the pp subsystem (Jackson frame) denoted by Θ_p^{pp} , i.e. we use the same coordinate system scheme as defined in the IUCF publication [12]. Both distributions are close to flat, exhibit, however, a clearly negative anisotropy pa-




Fig. 8. Differential cross sections in dependence of invariant masses M_{pp} and $M_{pp\pi^0}$ for the $pp \rightarrow pp\pi^0$ reaction. Data of this work are shown by full circles, the ones from Ref. [9] by open circles and phase space by the shaded area. For the explanation of dashed and dotted lines see caption of Fig. 6. The dash-dotted lines in the M_{pp} distribution show the partial wave contributions $Ss + Sd$ and Pp as obtained from eq. (4).




Fig. 9. Angular distributions of pions (overall cm system) and protons (pp subsystem, Jackson frame) for the $pp \rightarrow pp\pi^0$ reaction. Data of this work are shown by full circles, the fit to the data with eq. (2) by solid lines, the results of Ref. [9] by open circles and the prediction of Ref. [21] by the dash-dotted curve. For the explanation of dashed and dotted lines see caption of Fig. 6.

parameter with $a_2 = -0.12(1)$ for pions and $a_2 = -0.10(1)$ for protons.

4 Discussion of Results

The negative anisotropy parameter observed in this experiment for the π^0 angular distribution comes as a surprise, since all previous experiments around $T_p \approx 400$ MeV gave - or indicated at least - a positive value for the pions, the most serious discrepancy being with the PROMICE/WASA results [9] of $a_2 = +0.127(7)$ (note that the b values given in [9] need to be divided by a factor of 3, in order to comply with our definition of b in eq. 1), since this measurement provided the best statistics and phase space coverage of all previous experiments at this energy. Although this work reports negative a_2 values for $T_p \leq 360$ MeV, positive values are found for $T_p \geq 400$ MeV.

From their analysis of polarization data the authors of Ref. [12] also find some predictions for the unpolarized




Fig. 10. Differential cross section in dependence of q , which is half of the relative momentum between the proton pair ($q^2 = M_{pp}^2/4 - m_p^2$). Data of this work (full circles) are compared to results from Ref. [9] (open circles) and to phase space (shaded area). For ease of comparison the data from Ref. [9] have been normalized to the maximum of our distribution. For the explanation of dashed and dotted lines see caption of Fig. 6.

angular distributions, though with very large uncertainties. For protons they get $a_2 = -0.34(81)$ and for pions $a_2 = 0.17(11)$. The first one agrees in sign and value with our results, however, their value for the pions has an opposite sign. Nevertheless, since these numbers were obtained only indirectly with very large uncertainties, this is not a point of major concern - in particular since π^0 d -waves, which as we demonstrate in this paper are vital for a proper understanding of the reaction, are not taken into account in Ref. [12]. We also note that a recent measurement of this reaction at $T_p = 400$ MeV was carried out at CELSIUS-WASA, too. The results of its analysis also provide a negative a_2 parameter for the pion angular distribution [17,18]. If we restrict our data to the same proton angular range covered in the CELSIUS-WASA experiment, then we find full consistency between both results.

On the theoretical side extensive meson-exchange calculations as well as partial wave analyses were carried out very recently by the Jülich theory group [19,20,21]. Their calculations partly are in good agreement with the polarization data. Interestingly their prediction for proton and pion angular distributions (shown in Fig. 9 by the dash-dotted lines) also results in negative a_2 agreement with our results. More advanced calculations based on chiral perturbation theory are in progress. First steps in this direction have already been taken by this group [22].

In order to get a better insight into this problem and to compare in more detail with the CELSIUS results we next consider the angular distributions in dependence of q , defined as half of the relative momentum between the two protons and given by $q^2 = M_{pp}^2/4 - m_p^2$. In this definition q then denotes the momentum of a proton in the pp subsystem. The distribution obtained from our data is compared in Fig.10 with the one given in Ref. [9].




Fig. 11. Pion angular distributions (overall cm system) for 4 different q -ranges as indicated for the $pp \rightarrow pp\pi^0$ reaction. Data from this work are shown by full circles, the fit to the data with eq. 2 by solid lines. For the explanation of dashed and dotted lines see caption of Fig. 6.

Whereas good agreement between both results is found for $q \leq 150$ MeV/c, substantial deviations appear for larger q values. In general large q values are associated with large opening angles between the protons, which in our experiment are fully covered. However, with the setup at PROMICE/WASA, where protons were detected only for lab angles smaller than 20° , the high- q region was not covered as completely as at TOF and substantial extrapolations had to be applied in the acceptance correction for this part of the CELSIUS data.

4.1 q -dependence of angular distributions

In Figs. 11 and 12 we plot pion and proton angular distributions for the four different q regions indicated in Fig. 10. The corresponding anisotropy parameters a_2 obtained by fitting eq. (2) to the data are indicated in each of the plots. We see that the pion angular distribution is strongly anisotropic with $a_2 = -1$ for the lowest q range, where there are also results from Ref. [9] - and in fact they also exhibit a very strong anisotropy with $a_2 < 0$. With increasing q the pion angular distributions are getting gradually flatter and for large q the $\Theta_{\pi^0}^{cm}$ distribution gets even curved with $a_2 > 0$.

The lowest q range ($q < 53$ MeV/c) is particularly interesting. It corresponds to a kinetic energy of the protons in the pp subsystem of $T_p^{pp} = q^2/m_p < 3$ MeV, a constraint, which has been frequently used to have the pp

subsystem safely selected in a relative S -wave state. That way especially simple configurations in the exit channel are selected allowing a deeper insight into basic reaction mechanisms of π^0 production. In particular, configurations are selected that way, where $pp \rightarrow \Delta N(l=1) \rightarrow pp\pi^0$, i.e., which have the ΔN system in relative p-wave in the intermediate state. In fact, the observed exceptionally large pion anisotropy of $a_2 = -1$ equivalent to a pure $\sin^2\Theta_{\pi^0}^{cm}$ distribution means that at $T_p = 400$ MeV the π^0 production process associated with S -wave protons in the final state happens to be a pure proton spinflip process originating from the transitions ${}^3P_0 \rightarrow {}^1S_0s$ and ${}^3P_2 \rightarrow {}^1S_0d$, where capital letters refer to partial waves in the pp system and small letters to partial waves of π^0 relative to the pp system (see e.g. Table I in Ref. [12] for a list of contributing partial waves). In fact, this very special situation has been predicted in the phenomenological model of Ref. [8], which - based on the CELSIUS-WASA measurement at $T_p = 310$ MeV - gave already a good description of the RCNP data [23] at $T_p = 300, 318.5, 345$ and 390 MeV in the $T_p^{pp} < 3$ MeV range. If we use this model ansatz the cross section is given by

$$\sigma/PS \sim FSI[A_0^2 + (2A_0B_0\tilde{k}^2 + B_0^2\tilde{k}^4)\cos^2\Theta_{\pi}^{cm}] + \tilde{q}^2[C^2 + D^2\tilde{k}^2\sin^2\Theta_p^{pp}], \quad (3)$$

where PS and FSI stand for phase space and FSI factors (for the latter see eq. (2) of Ref. [8]). The pion cm momentum \tilde{k} and the momentum \tilde{q} , which is half the relative momentum between the proton pair, are given here in units of the pion mass. A_0 and B_0 denote pion s - and d -wave amplitudes for the transitions ${}^3P_0 \rightarrow {}^1S_0s$ and ${}^3P_2 \rightarrow {}^1S_0d$ - as defined in Ref. [8] with $B_0 = -1.2 A_0$ - whereas $C^2 = 0$ and $D = 0.98 A_0$ stand for proton P -wave contributions of the transitions ${}^1S_0 \rightarrow {}^3P_0s$, ${}^3P_0 \rightarrow {}^3P_1p$ and ${}^3P_1 \rightarrow {}^3P_2p$ with $j = 0, 1, 2$, respectively.

If we use eq. (3) together with the parameters A_0 , B_0 , C^2 and D^2 as determined in Ref. [8], then we obtain the dotted curves in Figs. 6 and 8 - 12. The agreement of these calculations with our data is striking for the lowest q bin (Figs. 11, 12) if renormalized to the same absolute cross section of this bin. Also for the other differential distributions it is partly surprisingly good - with the exception of the proton angular distributions, where the $\sin^2\Theta_p^{pp}$ ansatz badly fails. However, the trend in the pion angular distribution is correctly reproduced. We return to this point at the end of this chapter, section (ii).

For the pion angular distribution in the lowest- q region a very strong anisotropy with $a_2 < 0$ has recently also been observed in COSY-ANKE measurements at $T_p = 800$ MeV [24]. In a very recent work by Niskanen [25] these anisotropies are explained by a strong energy dependence of the forward cross section due to interfering pion partial waves.

For the Θ_p^{pp} proton angular distribution, unfortunately, no data are shown in Ref. [9] to compare with (there the proton angular distribution in the overall cm system is shown instead, which is slightly different from the one in the pp subsystem). In the low- q region, i.e. in the region affected most strongly by the pp FSI, we expect the 1S_0




Fig. 12. Proton angular distributions (pp -subsystem, Jackson frame) for 4 different q -ranges as indicated for the $pp \rightarrow pp\pi^0$ reaction. Data of this work are shown by full circles, the fit to the data with eq. 2 by solid lines. For the explanation of dashed and dotted lines see caption of Fig. 6.

partial wave between the two protons to dominate. Indeed, we find the $\Theta_{pp}^{\pi^0}$ angular distribution to be compatible with isotropy within uncertainties. With increasing q the distribution gets more and more anisotropic with $a_2 < 0$.

The observed trend in the angular distributions is not unexpected. In the low- q region the pp system has kinematically the least internal freedom and hence no chance to develop much dynamics involving higher partial waves. At the same time the pion has kinematically the largest freedom within the $pp\pi^0$ system with the possibility to involve dynamically higher partial waves, which then show up in appreciable anisotropies of the pion angular distributions. At large q the situation is reversed and the pions are kinematically bound to low partial waves, i.e. flat angular distributions. The observed anisotropies with negative a_2 values both for proton and pion angular distributions in the lower q range point to the importance of proton spin-flip transitions in this process, which are associated with Δ excitation in the intermediate state as well as with π^0 s - and d -waves in the exit channel. Our results are in support of the conclusions in Ref. [8] that π^0 d -waves play an important role already close to threshold, obviously favored by the possibility of exciting the Δ in this manner.

4.2 partial-wave description of data

Finally we come back to the partial-wave ansatz in Ref. [8], which is a simplified version of the more comprehensive ansatz in Ref. [9] and which we have seen to work quite well for the pion angular distributions, however, failing badly for the proton distributions. In order to overcome these shortcomings we modify eq. (3) slightly (and more plausible, if we look at the partial-wave expansions given in Ref. [9,12]) by

$$\sigma/PS \sim FSI[A_0^2 + (2A_0B_0\tilde{k}^2 + B_0^2\tilde{k}^4)\cos^2\Theta_\pi^{cm}] + \tilde{q}^2[C^2 + \tilde{k}^2D_1^2(1 + D_2(\cos^2\Theta_\pi^{pp} - 1/3))], \quad (4)$$

where the latter coefficients for the Pp waves are related to the one in eq. (3) and in Ref. [8] by $D^2 = 2/3D_1^2$ in combination with $D_2 = -3/2$. Note that in this ansatz Ps and Pp contributions are taken into account only very rudimentarily in the hope that still their most important parts are covered by the ansatz. Also for the Sd contribution a $\cos^4\Theta_\pi^{cm}$ term has been neglected due to its smallness and in order to keep the ansatz as close as possible to the one of Ref. [8].

Since the model ansatz of Ref. [8] works already very well for the pion angular distributions, we do not touch the pion s - and d -wave parts, i.e. leave the correlation $B_0 = -1.2 A_0$, take A_0 as a general scale parameter to reproduce the integral cross section and adjust C^2 , D_1^2 , D_2 for best reproduction of the proton angular and q distributions. As a result we obtain

$$B_0 = -1.2 A_0, C^2 = 0, D_1^2 = 0.22 A_0^2 \text{ and } D_2 = -0.34.$$

Actually we get a slightly better description having $C^2 = -0.006$. However, since C^2 as a squared quantity should not be negative, we set $C^2 = 0$ as was done also in Ref. [8]. The resulting values mean that aside from Ss and Sd contributions the dominant contribution comes from Pp configurations, whereas Ps configurations are of minor importance. The decomposition of the total cross section into interfering Ss and Sd wave contributions on the one hand and Pp contributions on the other hand is shown in Fig. 8 for the M_{pp} invariant mass distribution. We see that the $Ss + Sd$ wave part adds significantly to the total cross section and accounts very well for the observed FSI effect in the M_{pp} invariant mass distribution. Note that Sd contributions, which turn out here to be crucial for the understanding of the negative curvature of the pion angular distributions, have not been taken into account in the analysis of Ref. [12].

Though this ansatz is still very simple compared to the full partial-wave ansatz as given in Refs. [9,12], it is obviously sufficient to provide a near quantitative description of the data both for angular distributions and invariant masses (dashed lines in Figs. 6, 8 -12). It is not the aim of this work to provide a perfect partial-wave fit to the data. We rather put here the main emphasis on revealing the dominating partial waves in this reaction, which are responsible for the main signatures in the (unpolarized) differential observables. Compared to Ref. [8] the only major change is the replacement of the D^2 term with its inappropriate $\sin^2\Theta_\pi^{pp}$ dependence by the D_1^2 and D_2 terms,

which provide a more appropriate angular dependence for the protons. This modification, however, is not surprising, since the proton angular dependence has actually not been tested in Ref. [8]. From the successful description of our data as well of those treated in Ref. [8] we conclude that the ansatz eq. (4) provides an amazingly successful description of the (unpolarized) $pp \rightarrow pp\pi^0$ data from threshold up to $T_p = 400$ MeV.

5 Summary

It has been demonstrated that by addition of the central calorimeter the COSY-TOF setup is capable of providing a reliable particle identification on the basis of the ΔE - E technique. In this way the different single pion production channels were separated. The results for the $d\pi^+$ channel agree well with previous results. For the $pp\pi^0$ channel significant deviations from previous investigations were obtained for angular distributions as well as for invariant mass spectra. It has been demonstrated, that pions and protons exhibit q -dependent angular distributions. Hence a full coverage of the phase space appears to be mandatory for reliable experimental results on this issue. For the lower q region angular distributions with negative a_2 parameter dominate pointing to the importance of proton spinflip transitions associated with π^0 s - and d -waves. In particular, we observe a pure $\sin^2\Theta$ distribution for $T_p^{pp} < 3$ MeV, which derives from a special combination of the spinflip transitions $^3P_0 \rightarrow ^1S_0s$ and $^3P_2 \rightarrow ^1S_0d$. Different from previous experiments this has been the first measurement at $T_p \approx 400$ MeV covering practically the full reaction phase space. The data thus may serve as a reliable basis for a comprehensive phase shift analysis of this reaction.

This work has been supported by BMBF, DFG (Europ. Graduiertenkolleg 683) and COSY-FFE. We acknowledge valuable discussions with Murat Kaskulov, Pia Thorngren-Engblom, Jozef Zlomanczuk, Christoph Hanhart and Alexander Sibirtsev.

References

1. H. O. Meyer et al., Nucl. Phys. **A539**, 633 (1992)
2. D. Koltun and A. Reitan, Phys. Rev. **141**, 1413 (1966)
3. G. A. Miller and P. U. Sauer, Phys. Rev. **C44**, R1725 (1991)
4. J. A. Niskanen, Phys. Lett. **B289**, 227 (1992)
5. S. Stanislaus et al., Phys. Rev. **C44**, 2287 (1991)
6. G. Rappenecker et al., Nucl. Phys. **A590**, 763 (1995)
7. A. Bondar et al., Phys. Lett. **B356**, 8 (1995)
8. J. Zlomanczuk et al., Phys. Lett. **B436**, 251 (1998)
9. R. Bilger et al., Nucl. Phys. **A693**, 633 (2001)
10. M. Betigeri et al., Phys. Rev. **C65**, 064001 (2002)
11. S. Abd El-Samad et al., Eur. Phys. J. **A17**, 595 (2003)
12. H. O. Meyer et al., Phys. Rev. **C63**, 064002 (2001) and references therein
13. A. Hassan et al., Nucl. Inst. Meth. **A425**, 403 (1999)
14. M. Dahmen et al., Nucl. Inst. Meth. **A348**, 97 (1994)
15. J. Kress, PhD thesis Univ. Tübingen 2003, <http://w210.ub.uni-tuebingen.de/dbt/volltexte/2003/939>
16. R. A. Arndt et al., Phys. Rev. **C62**, 034005 (2000); SAID data base see also <http://said.phys.vt.edu>
17. S. Keleta, licenciate thesis Univ. Uppsala 2004
18. P. Thorngren-Engblom et al., contribution to MESON 2006, Cracow, and to be published
19. C. Hanhart, J. Haidenbauer, O. Krehl and J. Speth, Phys. Rev. **C61**, 064008 (2000)
20. P. Deepak, J. Haidenbauer and C. Hanhart, Phys. Rev. **C72**, 024004 (2005)
21. C. Hanhart, Phys. Rep. **397**, 155 (2004) and priv. comm.
22. V. Lensky et al., Eur. Phys. J. **A27**, 37 (2006)
23. Y. Maeda et al., πN Newsletter **13**, 326 (1997); K. Tamura, Y. Maeda, N. Matsuoka, Nucl. Phys. **A663**, 457c (2000)
24. S. Dymov et al., Phys. Lett. **B635**, 270 (2005); nucl-ex/0512035
25. J. A. Niskanen, nucl-th/0603072