

# Combined Partial Wave Analysis for the description of exclusive $p+p \rightarrow p+K^+\Lambda$ production

Robert Muenzer<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Excellence Cluster Universe - Technical University Munich, Boltzmannstrasse 2, 85748 Garching, Germany*

*E-mail: rmuenger@ph.tum.de*

(Received )

The production of  $pK^+\Lambda$  in elementary  $p+p$  collision was investigated using the Bonn Gatchina Partial Wave Analysis framework. This approach allows the determination of possible participating production wave depending on the quantum numbers of the system. For the analysis seven data samples, measured at different detectors and beam energies, were used. For the extraction of the  $\Lambda$ - $p$  scattering length a cross check with established methods is required. Furthermore the total cross-section of the production process is needed to extra cross section for the separate waves. Both methods are described in this work.

**KEYWORDS:** Partial Wave Analysis, Strangeness Production, Lambda-Proton Interaction,  $N^{**}$  Resonances,  $\Sigma$ -N Cusp

The production of strangeness in elementary proton-proton reaction is an important ingredient for different fields in hadron physics. On the one hand a sufficient description of the production mechanism is required from transport model calculation [1]. The main input for the description of strangeness production are the energy dependent cross section, the branching ratio and non-isotropic production distributions. Especially at energies in the low GeV range the production of  $pK^+\Lambda$  can be realized by non-resonant and several resonant channels, for example  $N^{**}$ , which play a dominant role [2].

Furthermore a sufficient understanding of the production mechanism, which includes also  $p$ - $\Lambda$  final state interaction, is necessary to look for new exotic production channels like the one of kaonic clusters. This state, which may have a very broad width [3], is likely to be visible only by small deviation from the known channels. For that reason insufficiencies in the description of the production can lead to wrong interpretation of such kind of deviations [4].

In the last years a campaign was started to analyze the production mechanism using Partial Wave Analysis methods, to understand the contributions of different possible production processes including also interference between the wave functions of the different channels.

This aim of a combined analysis is to fit exclusive experimental  $p+p \rightarrow pK^+\Lambda$  data from different experiments using partial wave analysis method, to extract a description of all data sample with on set of transition amplitudes.

The experimental data used for this analysis are listed in Table I. In this table the beam energy the available used statistics are listed.

The extraction of the exclusive events are explained elsewhere [4–7].

For the Analysis the Bonn-Gatchina Framework is used, which allows to fit uncorrected data. This is done by weighting the total transition waves with experiment-specific full scale simulation. In the BG-PWA the treatment of the final system depends on the corresponding channels. For our analysis the case of non-resonant and resonant production are treated in a different way. A description of the total parametrization can be found in [4, 7, 8].

Experiment	E <sub>Beam</sub> (GeV)	statistics	Experiment	E <sub>Beam</sub> (GeV)	statistics
DISTO [5]	2.14	121000	FOPI [7]	3.1	903
COSY-TOF -TOF [6]	2.16	43662	HADES [4]	3.50	133155
DISTO [5]	2.5	304000	HADES [4]	3.50	8155
DISTO [5,9]	2.85	424000			

**Table I.** List of beam energy and available statistics for the reaction  $pK^+\Lambda$  measured by the COSY-TOF , DISTO , FOPI and HADES collaborations.

For resonant production the final system consists of  $N^{*+}$  and p, with certain mass M, width  $\Gamma$  and quantum numbers (see Table II) . For the spectral function a relativistic Breit-Wigner formula is used:

$$A_{2b}^\beta(s) = \frac{1}{(M^2 - s - i\Gamma M)}, \quad (1)$$

The production of the  $\Sigma$ -N cusp is treated as a two particle system of the  $K^+$  and the  $\Sigma$ -N quasi-

$N^{*+}$	$J^P$	Mass GeV $c^{-2}$	Width GeV $c^{-2}$	$\Gamma_{K^+\Lambda}/\Gamma_{tot}$ (%)	$N^{*+}$	$J^P$	Mass GeV $c^{-2}$	Width GeV $c^{-2}$	$\Gamma_{K^+\Lambda}/\Gamma_{tot}$ (%)
1650	$\frac{1}{2}^-$	1.655	0.150	3-11	1880	$\frac{1}{2}^+$	1.870	0.235	2 $\pm$ 1
1710	$\frac{1}{2}^+$	1.710	0.100	5-25	1895	$\frac{1}{2}^-$	2.090	0.090	18 $\pm$ 5
1720	$\frac{3}{2}^+$	1.720	0.250	1-15	1900	$\frac{3}{2}^+$	1.900	0.250	0-10
1875	$\frac{3}{2}^-$	1.875	0.220	4 $\pm$ 2					

**Table II.**  $N^{*+}$  resonances included in the Partial Wave Analysis written in the spectroscopic notation with their the mass and the width, taken form [10]

particle. According to the different possible quantum numbers (JP=0+ or 1+) [11] separate wave are added.

The parameterization of the cusp is done in two different approaches. A phenomenological approach was used using a relativistic Breit-Wigner (Equation 1), which is motivated by a symmetric shape of the cusp structure in the experimental data. A pole mass of 2.13GeV $c^{-2}$  and width of 20MeV $c^{-2}$  were used. A second approach using Flatte parametrization [11] is also investigated.

In case the final state consists of three particles - like for non-resonant production- the  $\Lambda$  and the proton form a two particle  $p\Lambda$  -subsystem. The total final state is considered as a two particle system of a  $p\Lambda$  and a  $K^+$  particle. The  $p$ - $\Lambda$  FSI is parametrized by an effective range parametrization:

$$A_{2b}^\beta = \frac{\sqrt{s_i}}{1 - \frac{1}{2}r^\beta q^2 a_{p\Lambda}^\beta + iq a_{p\Lambda}^\beta q^{2L}/F(q, r^\beta, L)}, \quad (2)$$

where q is the relative momentum between the p and  $\Lambda$ .  $a_{p\Lambda}^\beta$  is the  $p\Lambda$ -scattering length and  $r^\beta$  is the effective range of the  $\Lambda$ -p system for the channel  $\beta$ .  $F(q,r,L)$  is the Blatt-Weisskopf factor, which is used for normalization (with  $F(q,r,L=0)=1$ ) [8].

The values for the scattering length and the effective range can be set as free parameters for the fit, which allows the extraction of these values from the fitting procedure. A crosscheck can be done using the scattering length extraction method described in [12]. In this method one divide the  $p$ - $\Lambda$  invariant mass spectrum including FSI by the spectrum produced by pure phase space. This resulting spectrum ( $\frac{1}{PS} \frac{d\sigma}{dm_{p\Lambda}}$ ) is fitted by the following function in the region  $m_0 = m_p + m_\Lambda$  and  $m_{max} = m_0 +$

40MeVc<sup>-2</sup>.

$$\frac{1}{PS} \frac{d\sigma}{dm_{p\Lambda}} = \exp \left[ C_0 + \frac{C_1}{m_{p\Lambda} - C_2} \right], \quad (3)$$


The scattering length can be determined by:

$$\alpha(C_1, C_2) = -\frac{1}{2} C_1 \sqrt{\left( \frac{m_0^2}{m_p m_\Lambda} \right) \cdot \frac{(m_{max}^2 - m_0^2)}{(m_{max}^2 - C_2) \cdot (m_0^2 - C_2)^3} \hbar c} \quad (4)$$

The crosscheck was performed by choosing certain input parameters ( $\alpha_{S\text{inglet}} = -1.9 \text{ GeVc}^{-1} / \alpha_{T\text{riplett}} = -9.14 \text{ GeVc}^{-1}$ ) for the PWA and extracting the resulting mass spectra for the p- $\Lambda$  S-Wave channel. Since the values are only used for checking the method, they differ from literature values. In Figure 1 the phase-space divided p- $\Lambda$  invariant mass spectra are plotted for the S-wave singlett (left) and the S-wave triplett (right) wave. the black line indicates the fitted curve of Equation 3.

From the fit the values  $\alpha_{S\text{inglett}} = -3.1 \pm 0.2 \pm 1.5 \text{ GeVc}^{-1}$  and  $\alpha_{T\text{riplett}} = -7 \pm 3 \pm 1.5 \text{ GeVc}^{-1}$  are extracted. The first error represent the fitting error, while the second originates in the theory [12].

This shows, that the result agrees with the errors of the method. After the fitting converges and pro-



**Fig. 1.** Invariant mass of  $\Lambda$ -p distribution, for the non resonant production channel with  $\Lambda$ -p produced in S-Wave Singlett (left) and Triplett (right). The spectra are divided by pure phase space distributions. The black line indicated the fit of the the function given in Equation 3 (see text)


vides a sufficient description of the experimental data, the relative strength of the different production channels can be extracted. This strength can be translated into a cross section by multiply these values with the total production cross section of the  $pK^+\Lambda$  at the corresponding energy.

Since the total production cross section was not measured for all experimental data, which are used in this analysis, the cross section has to be extracted by a Phase-Space function [13]:

$$\sigma_{pKL}[\mu b] = C_1 \left( 1 - \frac{s_0}{(\sqrt{s_0} + \epsilon[MeV])^2} \right)^{C_2} \left( \frac{s_0}{(\sqrt{s_0} + \epsilon[MeV])^2} \right)^{C_3} \quad (5)$$

The input value are taken from [2, 4, 11, 14]. The resulting fit function is shown in Figure 2. The grey band indicated the fitting error. The resulting values from the fit are  $C_1 = 4.0 \pm 0.5 \cdot 10^2$ ,  $C_2 = 1.49 \pm 0.04$ , and  $C_3 = 1.4 \pm 0.4$ . Using the results from the phase space fit, the total cross section for the energies of the different data sample can be determined (see Table III). To reduce influence of systematical error, for all energies the value from the phase space fit are taken.

For the calculation of the total production cross section of the  $N^{*+}$  resonances additionally the branching ratio has to be taken into account, which are taken listed in Table II.



**Fig. 2.** Total cross section versus excess energy taken from literature values [2, 4, 11, 14] ). The grey band lines indicates a phase space fit (Equation 5)

experiment	$E_{\text{Beam}}$	$\sigma_{\text{tot}}$	experiment	$E_{\text{Beam}}$	$\sigma_{\text{tot}}$
DISTO	2.14	$19.0 \pm 3.3$	DISTO	2.85	$38.7 \pm 7.9$
COSY-TOF	2.16	$19.7 \pm 3.5$	FOPI	3.1	$43.1 \pm 9.3$
DISTO	2.5	$30.5 \pm 5.7$	HADES	3.50	$48.0 \pm 11.5$

**Table III.** Total Production cross section of  $pK^+\Lambda$  extracted from Phase-Space fit (see text)

**Summary** Using the BG-PWA fitting method and the extraction of production cross section a combined fit of several experimental data sample provides a very powerful tool to extract the excitation function for non-resonant and resonant production of  $pK^+\Lambda$  in  $p+p$  collisions, as well to determine the singlett and triplett scattering length of  $p\text{-}\Lambda$  S-Wave final state interaction.

In this paper the basic framework was explained, a fundamental test for the reliabilty of the extracted scattering length and the method to determine the total cross section were presented. The results are necessary for the further work, which will be presented in near future.

## References

- [1] M.Bleicher et al.: J.Phys. G25 (1999)
- [2] S. Abd El-Samad, et al: Phys.Lett. B688 (2010)
- [3] A. Dote et al.: Phys.Rev C79 (2009); T.Yamazaki et al.: Phys. Rev. C76 (2007)
- [4] E.Epple: PhD Thesis, TU Munich (2014);G. Agakishiev et al.: Physics Letters B742 (2015)
- [5] M.Maggiore et al.: Nucl.Phys. A835 (2010); M.Maggiore et al: Nucl.Phys. A691 (2001)
- [6] M.Roeder et al: Eur. Phys. J. A49 (2013)
- [7] R.Muenzer: PhD Thesis, TU Munich (2014);
- [8] Anisovich, A.V. and Sarantsev, A.V.: Eur.Phys.J. A30 (2006); A.V. Anisovich, et al.: Eur.Phys.J. A47 (2011); K.N. Ermakov et al.: Eur.Phys.J. A47 (2011)
- [9] F.Balestra et al: Phys.Rev.Lett. 83 (1999)
- [10] K. A. Olive et al., Chin. Phys. C38, 090001 (2014); A. V. Anisovich et al., Eur. Phys. J. A48, 15 (2012)
- [11] S. Abd El-Samad, et al: Eur.Phys.J. A49 (2013)
- [12] A. Gasparyan et al.: Phys. Rev. C69(2004); A. Gasparyan et al.: Phys. Rev. C72(2005) ; F.Hauenstein, Dissertation (2014)
- [13] A. Sibirtsev et al.: Nucl.Phys. A632 (1998)
- [14] R. Bilger et al.: Phys.Lett. B420 (1998); S. Abd El-Samad et al: Phys.Lett. B632 (2006); A. Baldini et. al. in Landolt-Brnstein, New Series, vol. 12 Subvolume a and b, p. 417(a) and 468(b), Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 1985.; P.Kowina et al: Eur.Phys.J.A22 (2004); A. Budzanowski, et al: Phys.Lett.B692 (2010); E. Shikov: Phys.Lett.C81 (2010)