

TAUP-356-73

THE ($\pi^{\frac{1}{4}}$, π N) KNOCKOUT REACTIONS OF C^{1/2} FROM 30 TO 90 NEV

J. Alster, D. Ashery, S. Cochavi, H.A. Moinester, A.I. Yavin and M. Zaider Department of Physics and Astronomy Tel-Aviv University, Ramat-Aviv, Israel

Abstract

The cross sections for the knockout reactions $C^{12}(\pi^-,\pi^-n)C^{11}$ and $C^{12}(\pi^+,\pi^+n+\pi^0p)C^{11}$ were measured over the energy range of 30 to 90 MeV by an activation method, and compared to existing calculations. In this energy range, the ratio $\sigma(\pi^-C^{12})/\sigma(\pi^+C^{12})$ of the cross sections is 2 to 3 times smaller than the corresponding ratio for pions on nucleons, contrarv to the expectations of the impulse approximation. Such a behavior has previously been known only near the energy of the (3,3) resonance. The knockout reactions of the type $\Lambda(\pi^{\frac{3}{2}},\pi N)$ B constitute a major component of the pion-nucleus reaction cross section^{1,2)}. These reactions have previously been studied³⁻⁶⁾ over the energy range of 50 to 1900 MeV. The extra tation function of the reactions $C^{12}(\pi^{\frac{3}{2}},\pi N)C^{11}$ has a peak near the energy of the (3,3) resonance in the πN cross section^{5,6)}. This feature led to immulse approximation interpretations^{1,5-9)} of the knockout reaction based on the idea of quasi-free scattering of pions from individual nucleons within the nucleus.

In the plane wave impulse approximation (PWIA) calculation for the $\Lambda(\pi^{+},\pi)$ B reaction in nuclei, the free πN reaction cross sections appear explicitly^{1,6}. The ratio $R(\Lambda)$ defined by

$$R(A) = \frac{\sigma\{A(\pi, \pi, \pi, B\}}{\sigma(A(\pi, \pi, \pi^+ n + \pi^0 p)B)}$$

can then be compared to the corresponding ratio R(N) for free πN reactions, where ¹⁰

$$\mathbb{R}(\mathbb{N}) = \frac{\sigma(\pi^{-}n \to \pi^{-}n)}{\sigma(\pi^{+}n - \pi^{+}n + \pi^{0}p)} = \frac{9|f(3/2)|^{2}}{|f(3/2) + 2f(1/2)|^{2} + 2|f(3/2) - f(1/2)|^{2}}$$

We symbol f(T) is the π -nucleon scattering amplitude for isospin T. By symmetry, or a can replace $\sigma(\pi^{\mp}n)$ by available data^{11,12} for $\sigma(\pi^{\pm}p)$. Around $T_{\pi} = 180$ MeV, the πp phase 5 lifts^{13,14} show almost no T=1/2 scattering compared to T=3/2, so that R(N) = 3. A similar ratio is then expected for R(A). Recder and Markowitz⁵) investigated the $C^{12}(\pi^{*},\pi^{*}n)C^{1}$ reaction in the energy range of 50 to 1900 MeV by analyzing the β^{*} activity of the institual nucleus C^{11} . Chivers et al⁶) measured this activation cross section for $C^{12}(\pi^{*},\pi^{*}n)C^{11}$ around 120 and 180 MeV, and for $C^{12}(\pi^{*},\pi^{*}n*\pi^{*}p)C^{11}$ between $\approx \alpha$ and 280 MeV ; they found $R(C^{12})$ around $T_{\pi} = 180$ MeV to be equal to 1.0 \pm 0.1 where than the ratio of 3 predicted by the impulse approximation. Chivers et al⁶) and Plendl et al^{15,16} also studied the knockout reaction around $T_{\pi} = 180$ MeV for other targets. There have been no determination of R(A) at low pion energies.

Theoretical attempts have been made to explain the difference between the predicted and measured $R(C^{12})$ values at 180 MeV, as well as the shape of the excitation curve for $\sigma(\pi^{-}C^{12})$ up through the (3,3) resonance. Kelybasov⁷⁾ curried out a PWIA calculation, to which Selieri⁹⁾ added kinematic corrections. Dalkarov¹⁷⁾ as well as Kelybasov and Smorodinskaya¹⁸⁾ modified the calculation of Kelybasov⁷⁾ by including higher order pion rescattering processes. In the above calculations^{7,9,17,18)} the magnitude was normalized to the experimental results around $T_{\pi} = 180$ MeV, but there are considerable differences in the supe of the excitation curve at lower energies. Bertini⁸⁾ considered effects of absorption and a diffuse nuclear surface within the framework of a Monte Carlo direct knockout calculation. Hewson¹⁹⁾ got improved wardoment for $R(C^{12})$ at $T_{\pi} = 180$ MeV by including the effects of charge exchange in the final state interactions of the cutgoing neutron with the residual procleus. Robson²⁽⁾ further investigated the final state interactions and found that k(A) is very sensitive to compound nucleus formation in the final state.

- 2 -

SWARDS STREET, STREET,

We report here measurements of the cross sections on the reactions $C^{12}(\pi^{-},\pi^{-}n)C^{11}$ and $C^{12}(\pi^{+},\pi^{+}n+\pi^{0}p)C^{11}$ in the energy large of 30 to 90 MeV. The secondary pion beam from the Saclay electron linear accelerator was used. The data were obtained by analysis of the 20.4 min β^{\dagger} activity of C¹¹, so that the cross section to the sum of all the bound stares of C¹¹ is obtained. Typical beam intensities on target were about aco⁵ pions per second. The beam had an energy spread of ±10%, and also contained protons, positrons and muons. The protons were stopped by aluminum absorbers. We found that the positrons (and possible neutron background) caused no algorificant effect by carrying out measurements with a beam consisting stanly of positrons (obtained by stopping the pions in an absorber). No significant contribution to the cross section from the muons is expected. ing pion here was monitored by measuring the integrated electron current Ancident on the pion production target, and its intensity was determined from previously measured values of the pion yields²¹⁾. Variations of beam intensity with time were monitored with a small plastic scintillater placed directly behind the target. This detector was also used to measure the beam possible for each energy. The C^{12} targets consisted of graphite disks, 3 cm in diameter, with thicknesses ranging from 0.8 to 4.0 gm/cm^2 . Irradiations were carried out for a period of one to two half-lives of the C¹¹ activity. $3b + \gamma$ says from the 6^{\dagger} annihilation were measured in coincidence by two Hat (T4) detectors in a shielded area. The decay curves were recorded in a multiscaler for a period of several half-lives, and all showed the characteristic 20.4 min. activity.

- 3 -

In Fig. 1 we present our experimental data along with the results of Reeder and Markowitz⁵⁾ and of Chivers et al⁶⁾, and compare them with the calculations of Pertini⁸⁾ and of Selleri⁹⁾. Our results for $\sigma(\pi^+C^{12})$ at 70 and 90 MeV are consistent with the results of Galvers et al at 83 MeV. Our results for $\sigma(\pi^-C^{12})$ are consistent with those of Reeder and Markowitz, considering their quoted uncertainties in the incident energies of about ±8 MeV, except at 50 MeV. Comparing to theory, Bertini's calculation for $\sigma(\pi^-C^{12})$ is higher than the data but the shape is similar. Selleri's calculation of the shape for $\sigma(\pi^-C^{12})$ agrees with the data at all energies. For $\sigma(\pi^+C^{12})$, Bertini's calculation is in fair agreement with the data at low energies, but not at energies above 140 MeV.

The experimental ratios $R(C^{12})$ from our data and that of Chivers et a1⁶) are shown in Fig. 2. The ratios deduced from the pion-proton cross sections^{11,12}), and the calculation of Bertini for C^{12} are shown for comparison. Bertini's ratio is similar to the pion-proton ratio over the entire range shown. This can be expected⁸) since the absorption factors for π^- and π^+ are approximately equal. We see that the ratio $R(C^{12})$ is considerably smaller than the corresponding R(N) (by a factor of 2 to 3), not only at $T_{\pi} = 180$ MeV, where this has previously been known⁶), but at lower emergies as well.

Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Drs. J.Duclos, J.Miller and J.Morgenstern during many phases of the experiment. We are grateful to Professor D.Koltun for helpful discussions. We thank Drs. C.Tzara and F.Netter and the Saclay Laboratory personnel for the warm hospitality extended to us, and for their assistance in carrying out the experiment.

- 4 -

Figure Captions

- 5 -

- Fig. 1: Activation cross sections for the $C^{12}(\pi^{-},\pi^{-}n) C^{11}$ and $C^{12}(\pi^{+},\pi^{+}n+\pi^{0}p) C^{11}$ knockout reactions as a function of pion energy. The present data, along with the data of Reeder and Markowitz⁵ and of Chivers et al⁶ are shown. The dashed curve is the PWIA calculation of Selleri⁹, while the solid lines are smooth curves drawn through the values calculated by Bertini⁸.
- Fig. 2: Cross section ratios $\sigma(\pi^{-}C^{12})/\sigma(\pi^{-}C^{12})$ as a function of pion energy for the reactions $C^{12}(\pi^{-},\pi^{-}n)C^{11}$ and $C^{12}(\pi^{+},\pi^{+}n+\pi^{0}p)C^{11}$. The experimental points are from our data and those of Chivers et al⁶⁾. The solid lines are smooth curves drawn through the ratios deduced from the calculated points of Bertini⁸⁾ for $\sigma(\pi^{-}C^{12})$ and $\sigma(\pi^{+}C^{12})$. The dashed line is a smooth curve drawn through the ratios deduced from the pion-proton cross sections.

- 6 -

References

- 1. D.S. Koltun, Advan.Nuc.Phys.3, 71 (1969)
- T.E.O. Ericson, in Proceedings of the Banff Summer School on Intermediate Energy Nuclear Physics, edited by G.C.Neilson, W.C.Olsen and S.Varma (The University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada, 1970), p. 102.
- 3. A.M. Poskanzer and L.P. Remsberg, Phys. Rev. 134, B779 (1964).
- 4. C.O. Hower and S. Kaufman, Phys. Rev. 144, 917 (1966).
- 5. P.L. Reeder and S.S. Markowitz, Phys. Rev. 153, B639 (1964).
- D.T. Chivers, E.M. Rimmer, B.W. Allardyce, R.C. Witcomb, J.J. Domingo, N.W. Tanner, Nucl. Phys. A126, 129 (1969).
- 7. V.M. Kolybasov, SJNP 2, 101 (1966).
- 8. H.W. Bertini, Phys. Rev. 131, 1801 (1963).
- 9. F. Selleri, Phys. Rev. 164, 1475 (1967).
- W.O. Lock and D.F. Measday, in <u>Intermediate Energy Nuclear Physics</u>, Methuen and Co., London (1970).
- G. Giacomelli, P. Pini, and S. Stagni, A Compilation of Pidn-Nucleon Scattering Data, CERN Report CERN-HERA 69-1 (1969).
- 12. A.A. Carter, J.R. Williams, D.V. Bugg, P.J. Bussey, D.R. Dance, Nucl. Phys. <u>B</u>26, 445 (1971).
- 13. L.D. Roper, R.M. Wright, and B.T. Feid, Phys. Rov. 138B, 190 (1965).
- 14. L.D. Roper, and R.M. Wright, Phys. Rev. 138B, 921 (1965).

 H.S. Plendl, D. Burch, K.A. Eberhard, M. Hamm, A. Michter, C.J. Umbarger and W.F. Trower, Nucl. Phys. <u>B44</u>, 413 (1972).

- 7 -

- H.S. Plendl, A.J. Buffa, W.F. Lankford, H.O. Funsten, W.J. Kossler, V.G. Lind, Bull. Am. Phys. Soc. <u>16</u>, 1174 (1971).
- 17. O.D. Lalkorov, Phys. Lett. 26B, 610 (1969).

we need the return

- 18. V.M. Kolybasov and N. Ya. Smorodinskaya, Phys. Lett. 50B, 11 (1969).
- 19. P.W. Hewson, Nucl. Phys. A133, 659 (1969).
- 20. D. Robson, Ann. of Phys. 71, 277 (1972).
- 21. J. Duclos, J. Miller et al, C.E.A. Saclay Report DPh-N/HE/71/3, (1971).



ź

Fig. 1



