200-1112-157
200-1112-188

UM HE 72-30

ANTIPROTON-NEUTRON BOUND STATE *

Ilmun Ju and Yukio Tomozawa
Randall Laboratory of Physics
The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

NOTICE

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. Neither the United States nor the United States Atomic Energy Commission, nor any of their employees, nor any of their contractors, subcontractors, or their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights.

August 1972

MASTER

* Work supported in part by the U.S. Atomic Energy
Commission

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

fy

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency Thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

DISCLAIMER

Portions of this document may be illegible in electronic image products. Images are produced from the best available original document.

ABSTRACT

We discuss the possibility of an antiproton-neutron bound state for explaining a narrow peak which was found recently in the experiment $\bar{p} + n \rightarrow 4\pi$ and 6π . It is pointed out that the state is likely to be a 1P_1 state or a higher angular momentum state.

A recent experiment¹ of antiproton neutron annihilation at rest has shown a narrow peak in positive G parity states and $\bar{p}$ -n bound state formation was suggested for its explanation. Although the possibility of a nonrelativistic bound state of the $\bar{p}$ -n system has already been studied by several authors^{2,3}, none of these predictions could account for the reported narrow width (≤ 8 MeV) at the binding energy 83.3 ± 1.4 MeV. In this note, we point out that the observed state should correspond to a higher angular momentum state, possibly a p-state. Let us simplify the problem assuming a central square well potential for the antinucleon nucleon force. (Let the potential depth be $-V$ and the range R .) Certainly we are aware of the fact that the nuclear force depends on the spin, isospin, and velocity of the nucleons through a complicated exchange mechanism. However,

the essential part of the discussion will not depend on the detailed form of the potential, which can be seen by comparing our result with some of more elaborate calculations.³ Since we have the narrow peak only in the positive G parity state, we are dealing with 3S_1 , 1P_1 , $^3D_{1,2,3}$... states for the $I=1$ NN system and have to assume its potential for negative G-parity states to be very different from that of positive G-parity states. (The latter should be more attractive than the former.) Such a difference in the potentials for both G-parity states may be partly due to a L·S coupling force and partly due to a short range force which results from more complicated t-channel exchange and s-channel annihilation diagrams. Whether this is true or not is to be seen by a further investigation.

The formula for computing the width Γ_ℓ of annihilation from a $\bar{p}$ -n bound state with orbital angular momentum ℓ may be given by,

$$\Gamma_\ell = \sigma_\ell v \rho_\ell \quad (1)$$

where σ_ℓ designates the ℓ -th partial cross section for $\bar{p}$ -n annihilation and the densities of states are expressed as

$$\rho_s = \frac{1}{\frac{4}{3}\pi R'^3} \int_0^{R'} \int |\psi_0|^2 r^2 dr d\Omega, \quad \text{for} \quad (2)$$

s-state and

$$\rho_p = \frac{1}{\frac{4}{3}\pi R'^3} \int_0^{R'} \int \frac{|\vec{\nabla} \psi_1|^2}{k_1^2} r^2 dr d\Omega, \quad \text{for} \quad (3I)$$

p-state.

Here R' stands for the annihilation radius which is assumed to be smaller than R and

$$k_1 = \sqrt{2\mu(V - |E|)} \quad , \quad (4)$$

μ and E being the reduced mass and the binding energy, respectively.

The formulas (1) and (3I) for the p-wave reduce to those given by Jackson et al.,⁴ when $R' \rightarrow 0$, i.e.,

$$\rho_p \rightarrow \frac{1}{k_1^2} \left| \vec{\nabla} \psi_1(0) \right|^2$$

We might as well use the density for the p-state

$$\rho_p = \frac{1}{\frac{4}{3}\pi R'^3} \int_0^{R'} \int |\psi_1|^2 r^2 dr d\Omega \quad (3II)$$

which vanishes in the limit $R' \rightarrow 0$. As will be seen later (Table I), the formulas (3I) and (3II) lead to similar results as long as $R' = 0.5 F \sim 1.2 F$. (For definiteness, we have fixed the value of R to be $1.2 F$.)

Using the boundary condition at $r = R$,

$$\frac{k_1 j'_l(k_1 R)}{j_l(k_1 R)} = \frac{ik_2 h'_l{}^{(1)}(ik_2 R)}{h_l^{(1)}(ik_2 R)} \quad (5)$$

with

$$k_2 = \sqrt{2\mu|E|} \quad (6)$$

we obtain the depth of the potential

$$V = 226 \text{ MeV} \quad \text{for s-wave bound state} \quad (7a)$$

$$V = 420 \text{ MeV} \quad \text{for p-wave bound state} \quad (7b)$$

for the observed binding energy $E = - 83.3$ MeV.

From Eqs. (1) - (6), it follows that⁵

$$\Gamma_s = (\sigma v)_s \frac{|A_0|^2}{3\pi} \frac{3}{2} [j_0^2(k_1 R') + n_0(k_1 R') j_1(k_1 R')] \quad (8)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_p = (\sigma v)_p \frac{|A_1|^2}{3\pi} & 9 \left[\frac{1}{2} \{ j_1^2(k_1 R') - j_0(k_1 R') j_2(k_1 R') \} \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{j_1(k_1 R')}{k_1 R'} \left\{ j_0(k_1 R') - \frac{2}{k_1 R'} j_1(k_1 R') \right\} \right] \quad (9I) \end{aligned}$$

or

$$\Gamma_p = (\sigma v)_p \frac{3}{2\pi} |A_1|^2 [j_1^2(k_1 R') - j_0(k_1 R') j_2(k_1 R')] , \quad (9II)$$

where A_0 and A_1 are the normalization constants for the s- and p-wave, respectively, given by

$$|A_0|^2 = \frac{1}{\frac{R^3}{2} [j_0^2(k_1 R) \left\{ 1 + \frac{1}{k_2 R} \right\} + n_0(k_1 R) j_1(k_1 R)]}$$

$$|A_1|^2 = \frac{-1}{\frac{R^3}{2} \left[1 + \frac{k_1^2}{k_2^2} \right] j_0(k_1 R) j_2(k_1 R)}$$

As for the estimate of the partial annihilation cross section, we make an assumption that

$$(\sigma)_s \approx a, \quad (\sigma v)_p \approx b k^2 \quad (10)$$

where a , b are constants.

Although no direct beam experiments are available up to now, an early indirect determination of $\sigma(\bar{p}n)$ by subtracting $\bar{p}p$ cross sections from those of $\bar{p}d$, coupled with the Glauber shadow effect correction, seems to indicate that $\sigma(\bar{p}p) \approx \sigma(\bar{p}n)$ within the experimental error.^{6,7,8} Therefore, assuming the same cross sections for both antiproton-nucleon annihilations, and from the data of $\bar{p}p \rightarrow$ even number of pions, we get,

$$(\sigma v)_s \approx 10.2 \text{ mb}, \quad (\sigma v)_p \approx 0.67 \text{ mb} \quad (11)$$

for a positive G-parity state, the latter being the value at the momentum 0.66 GeV/c, which is the cm momentum of the antiproton neutron bound system in the p-state. Since we have neglected the k dependent term of the s-wave cross section which would give an ambiguity in the determination of the p-wave cross section, Eq. (11), the value quoted above for the p-wave cross section must be taken as an indication of the order of magnitude.

The result of numerical computation of the decay widths, using Eqs. (1) - (11), is given in Table 1. Notations I and II for the p-wave refer to the adopted formulas, (9I) and (9II). From the table, one can immediately notice that the s-wave annihilation gives too large a decay width, while the p-wave annihilation is consistent with the observed width ≤ 8 MeV. [We notice, however, that in a recent work,⁹ some questions are raised about the estimate of the width of the peak in the experiment.] As we mentioned earlier, the formulas I and II give approximately equal widths except for a small annihilation radius.

Accepting the premise that the observed narrow peak is due to a p-wave bound state of the p-n system (1P_1), one encounters a question why the ground s-wave bound state has not been observed in the experiment. In order to answer this question, we estimate the binding energy of the s-state using the potential (7b), obtaining

$$E_{\text{ground state}} = -248 \text{ MeV}.$$

Since both states are positive G-parity states, and

$$E_{\text{p-state}} - E_{\text{ground state}} = 165 \text{ MeV} < 2 m_{\pi},$$

the transition (1P_1) $\rightarrow$ (3S_1) by strong interaction is forbidden. The transition by electromagnetic interaction, (1P_1) $\rightarrow$ (3S_1) + γ , has a small width (≈ 0.28 MeV.) Thus the 3S_1 ground state is difficult to be observed, unless it is formed directly from $\bar{p}$ in an outer orbit. Finally it should be pointed out that our argument is merely of a qualitative nature, since the obtained potential (7b) is so deep that a nonrelativistic treatment may not be warranted.

Acknowledgment:

The authors are indebted to Professor T. Kalogeropoulos for his inspiring talk at Michigan and for giving us useful information. Thanks are also due to F. Henyey and M. Ross for discussion and D. N. Williams for reading the manuscript.

TABLE 1. Densities and Decay Widths of the $\bar{p}n$ bound states with positive G parity. (I and II for the p-wave width refer to Eqs. (9I) and (9II) in the text).

State	Annihilation Radius (R')	1.2 F		0.5 F		0.1 F		Zero	
		I	II	I	II	I	II	I	II
$L=1(^1P_1)$	$4\rho\left(\frac{\text{MeV}}{\text{mb}}\right)$	9.5	8.0	5.6	5.9	18.96	0.31	19.45	0
	$\Gamma(\text{MeV})$	6.4	5.3	3.8	4.0	12.7	0.21	13.0	0
$L=0(^3S_1)$	$4/3\rho\left(\frac{\text{MeV}}{\text{mb}}\right)$	2.8		6.4		7.5		7.55	
	$\Gamma(\text{MeV})$	28.4		64.8		76.5		77.0	

References

1. L. Gray, P. Hagerty, and T. Kalogeropoulos, Phys. Rev. Letters 26, 1491 (1971).
2. O.D. Dal'karov, V.B. Mandel'tsveig, and I.I. Shapiro, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. 11, 496 (1970);
O.D. Dal'karov, V.B. Mandel'tsveig, and Shapiro, Nucl. Phys. B21, 88 (1970).
3. R.A. Bryand and R.J.N. Phillips, Nucl. Phys. B5, 201 (1968);
L.M. Afrikan, JETP 3, 503 (1956);
David Y. Wong, Nucl. Phys. 55, 212 (1964);
G. Schierholz and S. Wagner, Fermi-Yang Model of Mesons based on a Relativistic OBE Model (preprint 1971).
4. J.D. Jackson, D.G. Ravenhall, and H.W. Wyld Jr., Nuovo Cimento 9, 834 (1960), p. 839.
5. In obtaining Eqs. (8) and (9) from Eq. (1), one should multiply by 4 for p-wave and 4/3 for s-wave in order to take into account the spin weight in the plus G-parity state, noticing that $G_{pn}^- = (-1)^{L+S}$. See J.J. Sakurai, Advanced Quantum Mechanics, (Addison Wesley, (1967), p. 227.
6. R.J. Glauber, Phys. Rev. 100, 242 (1955);
W. Galbraith, et al., Phys. Rev. 138, B913 (1965);
Tommy Elioff et al., Phys. Rev. 128, 869 (1962);
R.J.N. Phillips, Rev. of Mod. Phys. 39, 68 (1967).
7. W. Chinowsky et al., Nuovo Cimento 18A, 684 (1966);
James Ball et al., Phys. Rev. 113, 647 (1959).

References Cont.

8. E. Flamino, J.D. Hansen, D.R.O. Morrison, and N. Tovey,
CERN/HERA 70-3, October 1970.
9. L.N. Bogdanova, O.D. Dal'karov, and I.S. Shapiro, Phys.
Rev. Letters 28, 1418 (1972).