C00-1112-163

C00-1112-194

Toward a General Description of Two-Body Hadron Reactions

B.J. Hartley

Lab de Physique Theorique et Particules Elementaires

Orsay, France

G.L. Kane *

Physics Department

University of Michigan

Ann Arbor, Michigan

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.

January 1973

- * Research supported in part by the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission. Much of this work was done while the author was a J.S. Guggenheim Fellow visiting Rutherford Laboratory.

MASTER

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

leg

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

501-2111-009

We present a model for describing two-body high energy hadron reactions at energies above the resonance region. Although no real theory yet exists, we can give a procedure for obtaining a (possibly correct) description of the amplitudes for any two-body reaction (whatever the spins involved, including real and imaginary parts of amplitudes, any helicity flip π exchange as well as vector and tensor exchanges, etc.). The most important new physical effect involved is using the appropriate t -dependent phase for the vacuum exchange amplitude (the "Pomeron"), both in elastic scattering and in describing absorption effects. The Pomeron is not a Regge pole.

The model is very simple to formulate and has a reasonable physical interpretation in terms of important unitarity effects and absorption. It allows us to understand the partial successes and the inadequacies of previous approaches such as the dual absorptive model, the strong absorption model, the view that some amplitudes have Regge pole behavior while others do not, etc. In the present paper we analyze all the $0^{-\frac{1}{2}+} \rightarrow 0^{-\frac{1}{2}+}$ reactions, $np \rightarrow pn$, and $\bar{p}p \rightarrow \bar{n}n$, cross sections, polarizations, and amplitudes; these include all the important kinds of helicity amplitudes for any two-body reactions. Apart from a few places the results are very good; we argue that the few places where there may be some difficulty are due to effects we have left out rather than to the structure of the model.

Although the input Reggeon exchanges are not all exchange degenerate, the phases of the output amplitudes after absorption show a remarkable and unexpected resemblance to what one would expect from exchange degenerate poles, apart from the necessity of having a zero structure related to important absorption corrections.

A number of related results, some of which are considered puzzles, are discussed (total cross section differences for πN and KN , the increase in $\sigma_T(K^+p)$, crossovers, shrinkage, real parts of elastic amplitudes, polarization single and double zeros, line reversed reactions, pp scattering at the ISR, etc.) and some predictions are given.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Model	2
Reggeons	
Pomeron	
Quasi-elastic Processes	
Absorption	
S^{EFF}	
Motivation	5
Reggeon	5
Pomeron - Evidence for our Pomeron	7
Quasi-elastic Processes	10
Absorption	11
S^{EFF}	11
General Structure of Amplitudes	13
Phase	14
Shrinkage	16
Physical Interpretation of Parameters	19
$0^{-1/2+} \rightarrow 0^{-1/2+}$ Reactions	23
$\alpha^{EFF}, \Delta\sigma_T (\pi N, KN)$	25, 29
Crossover Zeros	27
$\sigma_T (K^+p)$ Rise, Forward Real Parts	27
Polarizations	30
$KN, \bar{KN}$ and Line Reversed Reactions	32
Hypercharge Exchange	35
$np \rightarrow pn$ and $\bar{p}p \rightarrow \bar{n}n$	36
Comments	39
Arbitrary Two-Body Reactions and Exchanges	44
Possible Phenomenological Weaknesses in the Model	45
Physics Not In the Model	46
Other Approaches	46
Conclusions	51
Appendix I - Conventions	53
Appendix II - Numerical Procedure	55
Table 1	58
Table 2	59
References	60
Figures	64

INTRODUCTION

There is no need to emphasize how far we are from possessing a theory of hadron interactions at the present time. For those who are not content to wait for some inspired individual to produce a theory, a promising path is to slowly increase the extent to which we can understand the experimental data on hadron interactions in terms of reasonable physical ideas. In this paper we try to pursue this approach for two-body, high energy, hadron reactions.

In the following we conjecture, although we cannot yet derive, a procedure for obtaining a description of all helicity amplitudes and their phases for two body reactions in terms of a few parameters. All the parameters have (we believe) a simple physical interpretation and their values are generally a priori approximately known. Even though the formulation of the model is extremely simple, leaving out many effects which will ultimately have to be included, (such as t-channel unitarity, low lying exchanges, etc.), the model appears to be able to give a unified description of all elastic and single particle exchange reactions and a good description of most existing high energy data. It accounts for many observed effects, such as the different behaviors of $\Delta\sigma_T(\pi p)$ and $\Delta\sigma_T(Kp)$, the rise of $\sigma_T(K^+p)$, signs of forward real parts, polarization zeros, polarization in $np \rightarrow pn$ and $\bar{p}p \rightarrow \bar{n}n$ (the latter was calculated before there was data), the lack of a large negative polarization in $\pi^-p \rightarrow \pi^0n$, the ISR small t $d\sigma(pp)/dt$, and others, in a simple way.

In addition, it is possible to see why various previous approaches^{1,2} (such as the weak or strong absorption models, the dual absorptive model, the view that flip amplitudes were Regge

pole behaved, exchange degeneracy for flip amplitudes, etc.) were sometimes successful, sometimes inadequate or inapplicable.

Almost all two-body reactions can in practice be described in terms of four kinds of s-channel helicity amplitudes. We have included examples of all four amplitudes in our analysis, so no new kinds of amplitudes will be encountered in extending our model to most reactions. Thus we are entitled to be very optimistic about further applications of our model. We have tried to state clearly how the model can be applied to any two body reaction by any high energy physicist interested in analyzing data or obtaining predictions. Although difficulties in describing data may well show up in the future, at the moment it seems to us that the biggest problem is providing a theoretical basis for our conjectures on the structure of the Pomeron amplitude and the absorption procedure.

We will state the model as a definite procedure here and discuss the motivation and implications of each step in the next section.

Consider any two-body process

$$a+b \rightarrow c+d$$

where the particles have helicities $\lambda_a, \lambda_b, \lambda_c, \lambda_d$. Define the helicity flip quantum numbers n and x by putting

$$m_a = \lambda_c - \lambda_a, m_b = \lambda_d - \lambda_b, \quad n = |m_b - m_a|, \quad n+x = |m_b| + |m_a| \quad (1)$$

Then calculate the s-channel helicity amplitudes with the following assumptions.

A. For each particle that can be exchanged the amplitude for a definite parity Reggeon is

$$R_{\lambda_c \lambda_d; \lambda_a \lambda_b} = \pm (-t)^{\frac{n+x}{2}} \gamma_{ca} \gamma_{bd} \Gamma\left(\frac{J-\alpha}{2}\right) \frac{s}{s_0} e^{-i\pi/2} e^{-i\pi J/2} \quad (2)$$

where $\alpha = \alpha(t)$ is the Reggeon trajectory (in practice assumed linear in the region of interest), J is the spin of the lowest physical particle on the trajectory (0 for π , 1 for ρ and ω , 2 for f and A_2 , $\frac{1}{2}$ for N , $3/2$ for Δ , etc.), and $\gamma_{ca}^R, \gamma_{db}^R$ are factorized residues (assumed to be constants). Relations among residues due to symmetries such as parity invariance can be obtained by the method of Ref. 3.

B. For elastic scattering the "Pomeron" amplitude for $n = 0$ (nonflip amplitude) has the form

$$P(s, t) = -is \left[A e^{Bt} + A_0 e^{B_0 t} J_0 \left(R_0 \sqrt{-t} \sqrt{\ln s - i\pi/2} \right) \right] \quad (3)$$

We arbitrarily assume the energy scale is 1 GeV² for the Pomeron

C. For quasi-elastic processes (e.g., diffraction dissociation), s-channel helicity amplitudes with net helicity flip n have a "Pomeron" contribution of the form

$$D_n(s, t) = -is e^{Dt} J_n \left(R_0 \sqrt{-t} \sqrt{\ln s - i\pi/2} \right) \quad (4)$$

D. As in most conventional absorption models, we calculate the full s-channel helicity amplitude for the process $a+b \rightarrow c+d$ from

$$M_{\lambda_c \lambda_d; \lambda_a \lambda_b}(s, t) = \int_0^\infty b \, db \, R_{\lambda_c \lambda_d; \lambda_a \lambda_b}(s, b) S_{\text{EFF}}(s, b) J_n(b\sqrt{-t}) \quad (5)$$

or equivalently (phenomenologically)

$$M_{\lambda_c \lambda_d; \lambda_a \lambda_b}(s, t) = \sum_J (2J+1) R_{\lambda_c \lambda_d; \lambda_a \lambda_b}^J(s) S_{\text{EFF}}^J(s) d_{\lambda_a - \lambda_b, \lambda_c - \lambda_d}^J(\cos \theta) \quad (6)$$

where $R(s,b)$ and $R^j(s)$ are given by the usual transforms

$$R_{\lambda_c \lambda_d; \lambda_a \lambda_b}(s,b) = \frac{1}{2q^2} \int_0^\infty \sqrt{-t} d\sqrt{-t} R_{\lambda_c \lambda_d; \lambda_a \lambda_b}(s,t) J_n(b\sqrt{-t}) \quad (7)$$

$$R_{\lambda_c \lambda_d; \lambda_a \lambda_b}^j(s) = \frac{1}{2} \int dz R_{\lambda_c \lambda_d; \lambda_a \lambda_b}(s,t) d_{\lambda_a - \lambda_b, \lambda_c - \lambda_d}^j(z) \quad (8)$$

with similar definitions for any impact parameter transform or partial wave expansion. This is formally equivalent to the usual form of the absorption model, but depends crucially on the specification of S_{EFF} . We assume for a given reaction that all exchanges are absorbed with the same S_{EFF} , and that S_{EFF} is independent of helicities.

E. With the definition

$$S_{\text{EFF}}(s,b) = 1 - \frac{iq}{4\pi W} M_{\text{EFF}}(s,b) \quad (9)$$

we assume that

$$M_{\text{EFF}}(s,b) = P(s,b) + D_0(s,b). \quad (10)$$

D_0 represents the contribution from the sum over intermediate states other than the elastic one. We assume that it can be well approximated by the nonflip quasi-elastic contribution D_0 , i.e., that it arises mainly from the edge in impact parameter and that it does not fall in strength with energy except from shrinkage. Thus the effective strength of the absorption is given by all of the elastic plus "diffractive" production intermediate states which can couple to the Pomeron. No Reggeon contributions are included and the diffractive production contribution is only assumed to be

important in S_{EFF} for helicity nonflip (diffractive production contributions which flip helicities will ultimately have to be included in S_{EFF} , but they will only contribute a "correction" to most efforts).

With the above procedure, by adding together the contributions of the Pomeron and the appropriate Reggeons, one can construct any s-channel helicity amplitude for any two-body process.

MOTIVATION

Our basic philosophy is that unitarity effects are of overriding importance in determining the structure of hadron interactions and that the unitarity effects can be approximately taken into account at high energies by treating hadron interactions as largely absorptive. The "Born term" is defined by a Reggeon exchange, of definite parity, whose intrinsic quantum numbers and symmetry properties characterize the exchange, but whose s and t dependence and size is strongly modified by the unitarity effects. Our "Born term" should be thought of as the part of the amplitude which actually has the particle poles with factorizable residues and the phase appropriate to a power law energy dependence S^α .

A. The various pieces of the Reggeon contribution can be understood as follows. Most are described in Ref. 4'.

The residues λ_{ca} and λ_{db} are assumed to go with factorized pole vertices, and to be constant for our purpose: we can use them repeatedly from one place to another. The overall plus or minus sign is to allow consistent definition of the factorized residues.

The function $\Gamma((j-\alpha)/2)$ contains the particle poles⁴. It is a simple form which has particle poles at every other integer on the Regge trajectory, beginning at the lowest allowed state whose spin is J , and no unphysical poles. In the absence of arguments which input more physics, it is the sensible propagator to take. It is interesting and important to note that because of the J in the Γ function the Reggeon "remembers" the "range of force"; because spin and mass increase together, the force gets less peripheral as the mass of the lowest particle which can be exchanged increases, just as would be expected from a naive point of view. Thus there is considerable physics in this choice of propagator form (see Fig. 1).

Because all bound states and resonances in quantum mechanics and nuclear physics lie on Regge trajectories, and because we believe particle exchanges are in the same category, we assume that pole amplitudes have a Regge power law s^α where α is a function of t . General analyticity and crossing arguments then require that the amplitude have a phase $e^{-i\pi\alpha/2}$. For Fermions there are some subtleties about phases, and the appropriate pole amplitudes can be found in Ref. 5.

Note that we are assuming that the amplitude with a definite parity Reggeon exchange has no zeros away from $t = 0$. Our attitude is that zeros are surely introduced into the full amplitude by the absorption correction (see below), and we will not introduce any zeros directly into the pole unless we find a place where the experimental data explicitly requires one. So far this has not occurred.

B. Here we discuss the interpretation and motivation for our Pomeron amplitude⁶. We assume that the Pomeron structure is almost completely determined by s-channel unitarity effects, and that there are two different sorts of contributions. In the s-channel unitarity sum there is an important part due to complicated structureless intermediate states, e.g., pionization. This contribution behaves as a featureless term falling off smoothly in t and we assume it can be approximated by a constant $\times e^{Bt}$ for small t .

On the other hand, we also believe there is an important contribution from peripheral (perhaps two-body-like) terms in the unitarity sum, which is equivalent to saying they arise in some sense from the edge of the proton, a peripheral structure. From the impact parameter point of view, we assume that a peripheral structure or an edge contribution gives rise to a smoothly falling term times the Bessel function J_0 of $R\sqrt{-t}$. This gives the second term in the Pomeron. Although we speak of the "Pomeron", it is clear that we always mean the full vacuum contribution to the elastic amplitude. The "Pomeron" is not a Regge pole.

There are two different arguments which lead us to believe that we should choose the energy dependence of the radius to be R^2 proportional to $\ln s$. The first is just that the two-body origin of this term suggests that it will remember its Regge behavior with R^2 behaving like $\alpha' \ln s$. From a different point of view, the increase of the radius with increasing energy arises because the multiplicity increases with increasing energy⁷. Then there are more virtual particles around during collisions at higher energy and there is a greater probability of a collision at a large impact

parameter than there was at lower energy at that impact parameter. This approach gives R^2 growing like the multiplicity, or $\ln s$.

To find the phase of the Pomeron we give two different points of view. The first, for the theorist, is just that we want to have a Pomeron amplitude of even signature only, and we can insure this by insisting that it be a function only of the variable $(se^{-i\pi/2})$. This is the form that appears in Eq. (3).

A completely different and naive point of view which gives a similar result is as follows: Just as the edge in impact parameter space gives rise to a contribution to the imaginary part, so it will give a contribution to the real part. But we still want the Pomeron to be purely imaginary at $t=0$. Therefore the real part must have a second contribution presumably of shorter range. To have the total area in impact parameter be zero, so that the Pomeron is pure imaginary at $t = 0$, these two contributions give the difference of two J_0 's. That difference is essentially the derivative of J_0 , which is J_1 evaluated at a point between the two. Thus if the imaginary part of the Pomeron is $J_0(R_0\sqrt{-t}\sqrt{\ln s})$, the real part of the Pomeron will go like $\sqrt{-t} J_1(R_0\sqrt{-t}\sqrt{\ln s})$. Physically one could even imagine the radii in the real and imaginary parts being different, if the edge contribution to the real part is really at the edge and the shorter range contribution is further in; then the radius in the real part will be a little bit smaller than that in the imaginary part.

The similarity of the two forms obtained is clear when we note that at high energies

$$J_0(R_0\sqrt{-t}/\ln s - i\pi/2) = J_0(R_0\sqrt{-t}\ln s) + \frac{i\pi R_0\sqrt{-t}}{4\sqrt{\ln s}} J_1(R_0\sqrt{-t}\ln s)$$

Thus the naive impact parameter argument and the analyticity argument agree on the physics.

In a theory which gave rise to such a Pomeron, the even signature could come about in a complicated way; the procedure above to get even signature is of course not unique. Thus, although the naive argument about the real part in impact parameter space does not obviously give us just an even signature contribution (although it is close to it), it is possible that it represents the physical situation more faithfully.

A different way to say it is that we might not have the s -dependence of $\text{Im}(\text{Pom})$ exactly right. It could be that we go wrong in a way which has little effect on the actual energy dependence of the amplitudes but which has a big effect on the phase through the phase-energy relation. Thus determining the real part by a separate physical argument may be a good procedure. Even so, in practice the simplicity and economy that arise from having exactly an even signature Pomeron probably justify using it in fitting data.

Evidence for our Pomeron

There are currently several pieces of evidence (in addition to its success in meson-baryon elastic scattering in the present paper) which can be interpreted as support for our elastic amplitude. These are

(i) Several studies, based on quite different assumptions, have given, at 6 GeV/c in πN scattering, the absolute phase of the isoscalar exchange helicity nonflip amplitude, including the present analysis. They differ quantitatively, but all have found a real part which looks qualitatively like ours and has a zero at some $-t$ value before 1 GeV^2 , and an imaginary part which decreases mono-

tonically and has no zero. The πN absolute phase has been fixed by constraints from finite energy sum rules⁸, t-channel unitarity⁹, dispersion relations¹⁰, and the absorption model^{11,12}.

(ii) Quite independently of these analyses, analysis of nucleon-deuteron scattering, particularly including deuteron polarization has suggested¹³ the need for an elastic nucleon-nucleon t-dependent phase consistent with that of our Pomeron.

(iii) As we have often emphasized in this paper, a Pomeron with our phase makes the absorption model "work" well for many non-elastic processes. If the physical assumptions underlying the absorption model are valid, this is also support for our Pomeron amplitude.

(iv) The main qualitative features of the smaller t ISR data³³ on pp elastic scattering, i.e., the increase in slope as $-t$ decreases below about 0.15 GeV^2 , and the more rapid shrinkage in the $-t$ region below about 0.15 GeV^2 than above it, are naturally explained⁶ by our Pomeron.

An additional, possibly non-trivial, point is that we currently know of no phenomenological evidence against a Pomeron amplitude with s and t dependence such as ours.

C. The arguments for the quasi elastic or diffraction dissociation processes are essentially the same as for the Pomeron. But in this case because there is no elastic coherence, the central piece is presumably missing or very small. Similarly, because these contributions are smaller, the contributions with non-zero helicity flip will in general be important for the quasi elastic processes, so that one has to use the full set of amplitudes. In Ref.14 a detailed discussion is given to motivate these forms and to suggest that

existing data is consistent with the amplitudes obtained from them. For our purposes here we only need the diffractive production with net helicity flip zero proportional to the Bessel function J_0 to use in S_{EFF} . The main property that matters is that the diffractive production arise mainly from the edge and is more peripheral than the elastic Pomeron.

D. We have nothing to add here to the formal expression for the absorption correction that has been used by many workers in the past; it is the interpretation of S_{EFF} that we wish⁴ to modify. From the high energy point of view, the partial wave expansion or impact parameter expansion points of view are equivalent and will give the same results for any reaction. They can differ considerably in the continuation to lower energies.

The derivation of the standard absorption correction is not especially compelling. One of the more remarkable aspects is that different workers have always arrived at exactly the same answer - even the Russian analyses¹⁵, based on physics which is not simply connected to absorption ideas, obtained this answer. It is tempting to consider the possibility that in some sense the amplitude form given in eqn 5 is exact rather than a crude approximation, and that the theoretical problem is to properly interpret the sum over intermediate states which is involved in obtaining S_{EFF} from M^{EL} and other contributions.

E. Our basic understanding of how to choose S_{EFF} is at a rather low level. The form we actually used is determined by a combination of theory, simplicity and phenomenology. Any model for S_{EFF} , of course will include the Pomeron contribution in M_{EFF} , and this is indeed the most significant contribution with many implications for the

for the structure of the absorbed amplitude. We believe, in addition, that one should include an important contribution^{4,15} from intermediate states in addition to the elastic ones. And we assume that this can be represented by the diffractive term included. Since the diffractive term arises mainly from the edge in impact parameter, the shape of M_{EFF} and M_{ELASTIC} in impact parameter are not the same⁴.

We also assume that no Reggeons contribute to M_{EFF} . That is, we do not use the full elastic amplitude in constructing M_{EFF} but only the Pomeron part of elastic scattering. This means that there are no Regge-Regge cuts in the absorbed Reggeon exchange. We do this for two reasons: the first is that Worden¹⁶ has recently shown that many reactions (e.g., $\pi^- p \rightarrow \pi^0 n$) have no Regge-Regge cuts in exchange degenerate theory. Although we have no particular confidence in the detailed selection rules of such theories our final amplitudes have many exchange degenerate properties and we would not be surprised if approximate selection rules of this sort were to hold. The second reason is the great simplicity which such a procedure affords us. If there were Reggeons in M_{EFF} we would have to construct them by an iterative procedure, first absorbing with Pomeron plus diffractive to get the absorbed Reggeon, then putting the absorbed Reggeon in M_{EFF} , etc. As it is now, we can simply construct M_{EFF} once and for all for each process, and absorb all Reggeons in the same way. This is a very important simplification for practical work.

There is still considerable opportunity for obtaining a deeper theoretical insight into the structure of M_{EFF} .

General Structure of Scattering Amplitudes

In many aspects our model is close to a simple quantum mechanical view of hadrons as strongly absorbing matter, or black discs. The essential modernizations of this view are mainly due to particles behaving as Reggeons and to the t -dependent phase of the Pomeron. In this section we give a qualitative discussion of the general structure of the amplitudes, particularly those aspects which deviate from naive absorption models.

Concerning the Reggeons an important role is played for us by the fact that the propagator remembers the range of the force. This is illustrated in Fig. 1, which shows $\Gamma(z)$ for $z = (J - \alpha)/2$ in the range it covers when $0 \leq -t \leq 1$. One can see clearly how exchanged trajectories give more peripheral contributions as the lowest spin physical contribution allowed on the trajectory goes toward lighter mass. Such an effect occurs in a different way in models with signature zeros, where the peripherality is essentially determined by the zero structure.

Next consider the Pomeron. At small t the J_0 piece is important and gives a contribution whose slope is fixed by the requirement that J_0 has a diffractive zero near $-t = 0.2 \text{ GeV}^2$. Since the radius grows as $\sqrt{t \ln s}$ this contribution shrinks as the energy increases. It is responsible for the behavior of the pp cross section at the ISR for $-t \leq 0.1 \text{ GeV}^2$ which can thus be thought of as a diffractive effect. For larger $-t$ the J_0 changes sign and interferes destructively with the central contribution, giving a flattening of the imaginary part, though not a minimum since the exponentials due to the spread-out nature of the edge and center provide damping. The real part of the Pomeron, which is present for theoretical consistency,

is mainly observable through its effect on elastic polarizations in the 5-15 GeV/c range and through its effects on absorption.

We can understand the effect of the real part of the Pomeron on the absorbed amplitudes as follows. It is worth some trouble to do this since in our model this is the main physical effect accounting for the structure of polarizations and for the remarkable exchange degenerate behavior of the absorbed amplitudes.

Consider vector exchange (e.g., ρ or ω). Then the Reggeon amplitude is proportional to

$$R \sim i e^{-i\pi\alpha/2}$$

so for small t

$$\text{Re } R \sim + \sin \pi \alpha/2$$

$$\text{Im } R \sim + \cos \pi \alpha/2$$

Then the full amplitude is given by (M is the full absorbed amplitude, R the Reggeon, and P the Pomeron)

$$M(s,t) \sim R(s,t) - i \int dt_1 dt_2 K(t, t_1, t_2, s) R(s, t_1) P(s, t_2)$$

where K is a known real positive kinematic function; this form is equivalent to the forms (which are more convenient for numerical work) given above. It says one has a kind of double scattering. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Re } M &\sim \text{Re } R + \int (\text{Re } R \text{ Im } P + \text{Im } R \text{ Re } P) \\ \text{Im } M &\sim \text{Im } R + \int (\text{Im } R \text{ Im } P - \text{Re } P \text{ Re } R). \end{aligned}$$

For the important region of integration $\text{Re } R$, $\text{Im } R$ and $\text{Re } P$ are positive, while $\text{Im } P$ is negative (with our conventions, where $\text{Im } P(s, t=0) = -i\sigma_T$). The dominant contribution at small t in each

is the old contribution with $\text{Im } P$. For the imaginary part the old contribution, $\text{Im } P \text{ Im } R$, is enhanced by $\text{Re } P \text{ Re } R$. Thus the $\text{Im } M$ for vector exchange is absorbed more strongly due to the $\text{Re } P$.

On the other hand, for $\text{Re } M$ the new contribution $\text{Re } P \text{ Im } R$ tends to cancel the old absorbing piece $\text{Im } P \text{ Re } R$, so the $\text{Re } M$ is absorbed less. Further, as $-t$ increases the integral in $\text{Re } M$ has a zero because of the term with $\text{Re } P$ so that for t values larger than about $-t \sim 1/2 \text{ GeV}^2$ one has a positive contribution to $\text{Re } R$ rather than a negative one. This would be obvious if all terms were evaluated at the same t ; because of the integration it is subtle, but it must happen because $\text{Im } P(t) \text{ Re } R(t)$ has a zero (becoming positive) near $-t = 0.5$ while $\text{Im } R(t) \text{ Re } P(t)$ is positive for all $-t \leq 1$.

Thus it is clear physically how the presence of $\text{Re } P$ rotates the absorbed amplitude. Quite remarkably, the final result (e.g., in Fig. 5) contains an imaginary part for the full ρ amplitude which behaves as in the naive strong absorption model, with a very nice diffractive zero, while the real part of the full ρ amplitude has been rotated up to have a "double-zero" structure resembling that of a ρ Regge-pole with a signature zero when $\alpha_\rho = 0$ (although the large secondary maximum of the pure pole after the double zero is generally not present). It is basically the real part of the Pomeron which produces in our model this pattern so often noticed in the past as characteristic of the data, with the imaginary part of the vector exchange "strongly absorbed" while the real part is not far from the "exchange degenerate pole" amplitude.

For tensor exchange (e.g., f , A_2) one can see what happens from the structure of the pole term. First, the signature is opposite so relative to vector there is a factor of i ; thus $\text{Re } T \sim -\text{Im } V$ and

$\text{Im}T \sim \text{Re}V$. In addition, the tensor exchanges are less peripheral so the zeros are at larger values of $-t$. Altogether, we expect the real parts of the tensor amplitudes to exhibit the peripheral zeros but at larger $-t$ values, while the imaginary parts of the tensor amplitudes will be rotated toward the double zero structure as the real parts of the vector amplitudes were. However, since tensor exchanges are so short range they depend considerably on the details of the absorption of the low partial waves. Considerable caution should be used in interpreting results that are sensitive to that.

Next let us look at the structure of the amplitude in the approximate situation where the input pole is simply taken as $s^{\alpha(t)} e^{-i\pi\alpha(t)/2}$. (This approximation is only used in this section.) This will illustrate nicely some qualitative features, particularly the energy dependence and shrinkage behavior.

For illustrative purposes here, then, we write the pole as

$$R(s,t) \approx (s e^{-i\pi/2})^{\alpha(t)} = a e^{\alpha'(\ln s - i\pi/2)t} \quad (11)$$

where $a = s_0^{\alpha_0} e^{-i\pi\alpha_0/2}$. Let us calculate the absorption correction with

$$M_{\text{EFF}} = -is[Ae^{Bt} + A_0 e^{B_0 t} J_0(R\Delta)] + sA_1 e^{B_1 t} J_1(R'\Delta) \quad (12)$$

where the coefficients A , A_0 , and A_1 are positive and

$$R^2 = R_0^2 \ln s \quad (13)$$

$$\Delta^2 = -t \quad (14)$$

Using the two identities

$$\int d\Delta^2 e^{-b\Delta^2} J_0(r\Delta) = (e^{-r^2/4b}) / b \quad (15)$$

$$d\Delta^2 e^{-b\Delta^2} J_0(r\Delta) J_0(R\Delta) = \frac{1}{b} I_0\left(\frac{rR}{2b}\right) e^{-(r^2+R^2)/4b} \quad (16)$$

one can then calculate analytically all of the Hankel transforms and the absorbed amplitude. The result is

$$M(s,t) = R(s,t) - C(s,t) \quad (17)$$

where M is the full amplitude, R is the Reggeon, and C is the absorption correction,

$$C(s,t) = \frac{Aa}{8\pi(B+b)} e^{\frac{bB}{b+B}t} \left[1 + \frac{A_0}{A} \frac{B+b}{B_0+b} e^{\left(\frac{bB_0}{b+B_0} \frac{bB}{b+B}\right)t} - \frac{R^2}{4(b+B_0)} J_0\left(\frac{bR\Delta}{b+B_0}\right) \right] + (\text{due to } \text{Re } M_{\text{EFF}}) \quad (18)$$

For our purposes now we ignore the effect of $\text{Re } M_{\text{EFF}}$, whose effect is probably more easily understood in terms of the arguments we gave above. First note the "1" in the bracket and the standard coefficient $\exp\left(\frac{bB}{b+B}\right)t$; these come from the central term and are exactly of the form one obtained in the past for absorption with a fixed pure imaginary Pomeron. It is very important to understand, however, that here the strength of this term is even less than that of the elastic contribution since in the Pomeron one makes up σ_T from the coefficients of both the central and edge terms in about an equal mixture.

Now recall that under our assumptions the various quantities have an energy dependence

$$b \sim \ln s$$

$$R^2 \sim \ln s$$

$$B, B_0, B_1 \sim \text{constant}$$

The most important thing to note is then the factor

$$\exp(-R^2/4(B_0+b)) \approx \exp(-R_0^2 \ln s/4(p+\alpha' \ln s)),$$

(with $p \gg 2 \text{ GeV}^{-2}$ in most models where it includes B_0 and a contribution from t dependence in the pole which we have ignored here). If there were not a $\ln s$ in the denominator above this factor would give a power law decrease of the effect on absorption of the edge contribution! In fact, it begins as a power law decrease at lower s and goes to a constant limit (apart from the shrinkage of J_0 away from $t=0$) as $\ln s \gg p$. Thus the effective strength of the absorption decreases rapidly with energy at a few GeV/c and settles down beyond about 20 GeV/c to essentially a constant strength. Whether this final value is larger than or less than the absorption that would result from elastic absorption cannot yet be determined a priori; for our results we have asymptotically an effective absorption strength of only about 90% of that we would obtain from using $M_{\text{EFF}} = -i\sigma_T e^{Bt}$; while at 6 GeV/c the effective absorption is about 25% greater than we would get from $M_{\text{EFF}} = -i\sigma_T e^{Bt}$; these numbers are calculated just by comparing the size of $C(s, t=0)$ at various energies.

The most important insight the above analysis gives us is an understanding of the way in which the present model solves one of the main problems of all previous models with absorption or cuts, the shrinkage problem (this has been most emphasized in Ref. 17). Essentially this problem is that in the past the cuts, with a flatter slope $(\frac{bB}{b+B} < b)$, have dominated at larger t and sometimes (as in $\pi^- p \rightarrow \pi^0 n$) they give too little shrinkage. Here we see that the cut strength decreases with energy so that the cut has a

larger effective shrinkage at energies below 10-15 GeV/c. Asymptotically the naive cut slope does dominate, but there is no longer any disagreement between experiment and theory concerning shrinkage at a few GeV/c. When one amplitude dominates in this energy range one will now see shrinkage; when several are important they will usually still add up over a short energy range in a way to hide most of the shrinkage of the individual amplitudes.

In this section we have seen qualitatively how the present model solves the two major problems of previous absorption models for two body reactions, the "phase" problem (e.g., that real and imaginary parts of vector exchange amplitudes did not appear to originate from the same mechanism), and the "shrinkage" problem (that absorbed amplitudes continued to shrink at low energies in a way similar to the poles). Now we discuss the description of the experimental data.

PHYSICAL INTERPRETATION OF PARAMETERS

Here we discuss how one should go about comparing our model with experimental data and how one should interpret the quantities in the amplitudes which are not predetermined.

For the Reggeon the situation before we look at any data is as always - each Reggeon has a trajectory, each amplitude has a strength, and there are the energy scale factors s_0 . Although this seems like a lot of parameters for one exchange, it is not if that exchange is simultaneously considered in several reactions, and if α' and/or s_0 are fixed ahead of time. We assume all trajectories have unit slope, and all have the same s_0 (except possibly for the A_2).

For the Pomeron we have to determine A , A_0 , B , B_0 , R . Consider a given elastic reaction. We will see that the latter three of these have a clear physical interpretation which constrains them. If the effective fall off in momentum transfer is as e^{Bt} , it is as $e^{-b^2/4B}$ in impact parameter. One fermi corresponds to 5 GeV^{-1} . Thus if the center has a "width" of $0.6 \text{ fermi} = 3 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$ (choosing this number since it must be significantly smaller than a fermi but still take up a lot of the volume of the hadron) we get

$$\begin{aligned}\sqrt{4B} &\approx 3 \text{ GeV}^{-1} \\ B &\approx 9/4 \text{ GeV}^{-2}\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, if the edge has a full width at half maximum of d it corresponds approximately to

$$B_0 \approx d^2/4$$

so if $d \approx 2.5 \text{ GeV}^{-1} = 0.5 \text{ fermi}$ we have

$$B_0 \approx 1.5 \text{ GeV}^{-2}.$$

Also, of course, at some typical energy above a few GeV/c we expect

$$R \approx 1 \text{ fermi} = 5 \text{ GeV}^{-1}.$$

At $p_L = 6 \text{ GeV}/c$, for example, this would give $(R^2 = R_0^2 \ln s) R'_0 = 3.1 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$, while at $60 \text{ GeV}/c$, beyond which most cross sections will not change much, it gives $R_0 = 2.4 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$.

If any of these numbers should deviate significantly from these estimates (say more than about $\pm 1 \text{ GeV}^{-2}$ for B , B_0 or $\pm 1 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$ for R) we have not got the physics correct. In the present analysis, of course, we meet these requirements. In future applications it is important to obey these constraints.

Presumably (to the extent we understand these things) the same arguments apply for the diffractive production. Thus in the vacuum exchange contributions only the relative size of the edge and center contributions of the Pomeron and the relative size of the inelastic intermediate state contribution can be treated as free parameters. There are just two numbers for all $0^{-\frac{1}{2}+}$ reactions.

We emphasize here and again later that once we have analyzed some data and found values for most of the parameters, one can go to new reactions with very few unknowns.

SU(3) is used, so we assume ρ and ω have the same trajectories, and A_2 and f have the same trajectories. Thus the two intercepts $\alpha_\rho(0)$ and $\alpha_{A_2}(0)$ are parameters. For the K^* and K^{**} contributions we use one symmetry breaking parameter, measuring $\alpha_\rho(0) - \alpha_{K^*}(0) = \alpha_{A_2}(0) - \alpha_{K^{**}}(0)$. There is a d/f ratio for flip and for nonflip amplitudes, assumed the same for vector and tensor multiplets, and fixed a priori. The ratio of flip to nonflip coupling is taken to be the same for ρ and A_2 .

Given the Pomeron and diffractive production contributions for πN we determine them for KN by simply scaling their overall magnitude by the ratio $\sigma_T(KN)/\sigma_T(\pi N)$ and for the hypercharge exchange reactions by scaling M_{EFF} by the average $(\sigma_T(KN) + \sigma_T(\pi N))$. All hypercharge exchange reactions are always absorbed with the same M_{EFF} .

As the interaction gets stronger, however, we believe that one should not just continue to scale up M_{EFF} but instead the shape of the disc in impact parameter changes, with the edge more filled in, closer to a "black disc". Thus for the NN reactions we should not just scale but we must fill in the disc, exactly as one would naively

hope.

Due to the limitations of both human and computing systems we do not yet have a single comprehensive analysis of all reactions. Instead, we have a unified analysis of $0^{-\frac{1}{2}+} \rightarrow 0^{-\frac{1}{2}+}$ reactions, and a separate but essentially compatible analysis of $np \rightarrow pn$ and $\bar{p}p \rightarrow \bar{n}n$, including polarizations. The latter analysis was performed mainly by M. Vaughn¹⁸ and is a part of a comprehensive analysis of all NN reactions compatible with our present analysis; it will be published separately. For completeness Vaughn has allowed us to include here these processes to show both that the polarizations and the π exchange problem can be handled satisfactorily. Thus essentially all common data on two body reactions can be described in terms of the amplitudes we examine in this paper (net helicity flip $n = 0, 1, 2$ and the evasive amplitude for $n = 2$).

Another general point which needs emphasis before we examine our results in detail is the concept of a global fit to the data. We are able to obtain here, with no surprises and with about one parameter per reaction, a rather good description of almost all $0^{-\frac{1}{2}+}$ data for $-t \leq 1.5 \text{ GeV}^2$ and $p_L \geq 4 \text{ GeV}/c$. As we will discuss below, our model is so simple in its formulation that many aspects of the physics are oversimplified or left out. A few aspects of the data are not described very well. If we go from the global fit to a local one where we allow small changes in the global parameters we can obtain good fits everywhere. Since we have so few parameters, and so much of the structure is due to the general behavior of our amplitudes, we interpret this as implying that we are not completely missing any essential aspect of the physics.

$0^{-\frac{1}{2}+} \rightarrow 0^{-\frac{1}{2}+}$ Reactions

Now we discuss the application of the model to the 16 connected spin 0 - spin 1/2 forward reactions.

As is fairly widely known, fits to experimental data are never unique. In addition to showing the fits we wish to make the following points about the physics involved:

(a) It is possible to obtain a reasonable, simultaneous description of all these reactions, with only the high lying Reggeons (ρ , A_2 , ω , f), our Pomeron, SU(3), and our absorptive corrections. No qualitative effects are left out. The forward peak in t and all energies above the resonance region are included. We call this the "Global Fit". Any particular part of the data plays a small role since many cross sections and polarizations are fitted.

(b) If one wants, one can take a smaller segment of the sixteen reactions (e.g., πN) and, beginning from the Global Fit, obtain a still better "Local Fit" by small changes in parameters.

(c) Various results which had been thought to be puzzles, or at least not well understood, can be simply related and interpreted. These include energy dependence of σ_T , $\Delta\sigma_T(\pi N)$, $\Delta\sigma_T(KN)$, relations among crossovers for πN and KN and their energy dependence, energy energy dependence of $\pi^- p \rightarrow \pi^0 n$, the increased slope and shrinkage at small t in $d\sigma/dt$ for pp scattering (and πN , KN as well), line reversed reactions, etc.

(d) In addition to general properties of the model - different range for V , T exchange, the effect of the Pomeron phase and edge on absorption, the contribution of inelastic states to M_{EFF} - one more (parameter-dependent) property is essential. Just as we

do not assume an exchange degenerate residue structure for V, T we also do not assume exchange degenerate trajectories. On the contrary, in fact, by specifically not having degenerate trajectories we obtain amplitudes surprisingly degenerate in phase. With $\alpha_V(0) - \alpha_T(0) \approx 0.15 \pm 0.05$ we can understand various qualitative features such as the rise in $\sigma_T(K^+p)$ and the behavior of line reversed reactions. In all the following analyses of data we assume as a basic property that $\alpha_V(0) - \alpha_T(0) \approx 0.15$. This property is essential in understanding a number of aspects of the data, including line reversed reactions, the rise in $\Delta\sigma_T(K^+p)$, and several polarizations.

We have illustrated the results of the model compared with representative data over as wide a range of energies as data exists, but we have not tried to include every piece of data. This is simply to make the diagrams less cluttered; our fit to data we have omitted are generally similar.

Our procedure is essentially as follows. We possess most information about the πN system, particularly at $P_{lab} = 6$ GeV/c. This determines most of our parameters. The magnitude of the Pomeron plus an f exchange (absorbed with S_{EFF} for πN) is fixed by the magnitude of the nonflip, isoscalar amplitude of Halzen and Michael¹⁹, a knowledge of the s -dependence of $\sigma_{tot}(\pi p)$ also constraining $\text{Im } P(t=0)$ and $\text{Im } f(t=0)$. The phase of the Pomeron is chosen such that the absorbed ρ gives the Halzen and Michael isovector amplitude. These also fix β_{++} for ρ exchange. The α_0 for the ρ largely determines the s -dependence of $d\sigma/dt(\pi^-p \rightarrow \pi^0n)$ near $t = 0$. We choose a universal $s_0 = 0.5$ (except possibly for the A_2) and $\alpha' = 1.0$, these being about the values obtained in our earlier analysis¹².

We fix the A_2 pole parameters ($\alpha_0, s_0, \beta_{++}$) to give a reasonable representation of $\pi^- p \rightarrow \eta n$, using the same absorption as for πN .

Fixing the magnitude of ω_{++} to give $\Delta\sigma_{tot}(Kp)$, and scaling the Pomeron and D in the ratio of total cross sections, we then predict KN reactions with no further parameters using SU(3).

For the hypercharge-exchange reactions we scale S_{EFF} by $\frac{1}{2}(\sigma_{tot}(\pi p) + \sigma_{tot}(Kp))/\sigma(\pi p)$ and vary α_0 for K^* and K^{**} and the d/f ratio. The d/f ratios are essentially as given by Michael², but varied slightly since our assumptions are slightly different from theirs.

The results are shown in Figs. 5-27. A good deal of discussion is given in the figure captions. The basic effects one needs to understand the results are listed below. Some are general properties of any absorption model and others are only a consequence of our model - we will try to distinguish.

(i) At finite energies and small t an absorbed amplitude has a higher $\alpha^{EFF}(t)$ than the equivalent input $\alpha(t)$. To see this, represent the amplitude as

$$\begin{aligned} M &\sim \text{Pole} - \text{Abs} \\ &\sim s^\alpha [1 - c/\ln s] \end{aligned}$$

where at small t the absorption correction falls with energy faster than the pole and we have typified that extra fall off by $\text{const}/\ln s$. (This form is only really correct for nonflip amplitudes at $t = 0$, but it is not misleading at small t for all amplitudes for purposes of our argument.) Then as s increases the factor in brackets increases, so very crudely

$$[1 - c/\ell ns] \sim s^\epsilon$$

where ϵ , while depending slowly on energy, is positive (and almost constant over a few GeV/c). Thus

$$\alpha^{EFF} = \alpha + \epsilon > \alpha$$

Further, since the absorption is stronger for nonflip than flip amplitudes, one has $\alpha_{++}^{EFF} > \alpha_{+-}^{EFF} > \alpha$. This effect accounts for slower fall off of $\Delta\sigma_T(\pi N)$ than $d\sigma/dt(\pi^- p \rightarrow \pi^0 n)$ since $\Delta\sigma_T$ only samples $\alpha_\rho^{EFF}(t=0)$ in the nonflip amplitude while the $\pi^- p \rightarrow \pi^0 n$ cross section always samples away from $t = 0$ and the flip amplitude. Our global fit (Fig. 21) has $\alpha_\rho^{EFF}(t=0) - \alpha_\rho(t=0) = 0.12$, i.e., $\alpha_\rho^{EFF}(0) = 0.57$, and by paying attention to $\Delta\sigma_T$ in the fitting one can easily get $\alpha_\rho^{EFF}(0) = 0.63$ (the Serpukhov result is $0.67 \pm .05$).

(ii) At the same time, however, since $\sigma_T(KN) < \sigma_T(\pi N)$ the absorption in KN reactions is simply less than in πN (Fig. 7), so $\alpha_\omega^{EFF}(0)$ is not so high and $\Delta\sigma_T(KN)$ must fall faster than $\Delta\sigma_T(\pi N)$ in the absorption model.

(The only objection a reader could raise here is why $\Delta\sigma_T(p^+p^-)$ does not fall still slower since $\sigma_T(NN) > \sigma_T(\pi N)$. Since we have not yet had time to do a full simultaneous treatment of all NN reactions and all meson-baryon ones we are not absolutely sure that this is not an objection, but we think it is not because the main effect of increasing σ_T as one gets nearer to the unitarity limit is to fill out the disc rather than blacken it more; this makes the real part even more important in the absorption, and brings both $\Delta\sigma_T$ and the crossover zero closer to KN than to πN . We will explain this in more detail below and in Ref. 18.)

This result is also connected to the crossover zero, which is mainly due to a zero in $\text{Im } \rho$ or $\text{Im } \omega$ near $-t = 0.2 \text{ GeV}^2$. This zero arises from absorption, and since $\sigma_T(\pi N) > \sigma_T(KN)$ the absorption is stronger in πN and the crossover zero is expected to be closer to $t = 0$ in πN than it is in KN (for NN see remark just above and discussion below). Since the strength of the absorption decreases with energy (see discussion under general structure) the crossover zero will move out in $-t$ with increasing energy up to some energy (at least to $p_L \sim 30 \text{ GeV}/c$) and then the Regge shrinkage will take over and the zero will slowly move back in. How far it moves is model dependent; we would expect a shift outward of about $\Delta t = 0.1 \text{ GeV}^2$ from $6 \text{ GeV}/c$ to $20 \text{ GeV}/c$.

(iii) By pursuing these same arguments one can see that in our model the rise in $\sigma_T(K^+p)$ occurs naturally and is due solely to Reggeons. At the same time one can see the origin of the forward real parts of the elastic amplitudes.

Fig. 9a shows the contribution of the f exchange in K^+p elastic scattering at $t = 0$ in an Argand plot (all the diagrams in Fig. 9 are meant to illustrate qualitative effects and may not represent precise numerical values). Now, around $10 \text{ GeV}/c$ (say) we know that $\sigma_T(K^+p)$ is constant in energy, so there it must happen that $\text{Im}(\omega) + \text{Im}(f) = 0$. The input even signature f pole with $\alpha(0) \sim 1/4$ has a phase like $-e^{-i\pi/4} = e^{i\pi/4}$ and our absorption rotates it toward the real axis, giving $|\text{Re}(\omega)| > |\text{Im}(\omega)|$. Thus we can draw Fig. 9b showing f and ω contributions, with $\text{Im}(\omega) + \text{Im}(f) = 0$.

Then we will get $\text{Re}M(K^+p)$ large and negative since $\text{Re}(f)$ and $\text{Re}(\omega)$ add. This is in agreement with experimental data. This

shows that we chose the correct sign for the f and ω contributions; otherwise they would give a positive $\text{Re}M(K^+p)$.

Now, however, as the energy increases the f contribution will go away faster than the ω contribution because it is a general property of our model that $\alpha_T^{\text{EFF}} < \alpha_V^{\text{EFF}}$. Thus at some energy, higher than the energy where $\sigma_T(K^+p)$ behaves as a constant, $\sigma_T(K^+p)$ must rise to a higher constant asymptotic value, just from the way the Reggeons go away with energy ($\text{ImReggeons}/\text{ImPomeron} < 0$). Without any effort one obtains rises of 1/4 mb, and the Serpukhov data²⁰ can be fit (a rise of 1/2 mb up to 50 GeV/c) if one desires.

Exactly the same argument and statement apply in pp scattering. There, however, for reasons connected with coupling strengths and having no simple connection to s and t dependence or absorption models, at energies in the 10-20 GeV/c range one still has σ_T falling with s . The f contribution, while falling faster, is still larger than ω . Thus the rise to a constant limit is displaced to higher energies for pp, and will be correspondingly small because the size of the Reggeons is smaller at higher s . Its precise size will be estimated in the NN analysis. (In this analysis we have assumed that the Pomeron contributes a constant σ_T . If that should turn out to rise with energy, its rise will be in addition to that of the Reggeons.)

The situation for the other elastic reactions can be seen from Fig. 9. For $K^-p \rightarrow K^-p$ the sign of the ω exchange reverses since it is an odd-charge conjugation exchange.

Thus necessarily we have $\text{Re}(K^-p)/\text{Im}(K^-p) > 0$ and a falling σ_T . For π^+p it is as in Fig. 9. For π^-p σ_T can only fall, while for π^+p

a small rise could eventually occur; it is a detail of the numbers whether one can see the Reggeons at the energy where $\text{Im}(\rho) > \text{Im}(f)$. For the baryons $\bar{p}p$ will always fall, while pp could rise somewhat.

(iv) Returning to the argument of (i) just above, we emphasize that amplitudes with different net helicity flip n will feel different strength of absorption in any absorption model, and thus different helicity amplitudes will have different α^{EFF} . In particular, for $\pi^-p \rightarrow \pi^0n$, $\alpha_{++}^{\text{EFF}}(t)$ will be considerably above $\alpha_p(t)$, while $\alpha_{+-}^{\text{EFF}}(t)$ will only be a little above $\alpha_p(t)$ since the flip amplitude feels less absorption. Consequently, $d\sigma(\pi^-p \rightarrow \pi^0n)/dt$ or $\sigma(\pi^-p \rightarrow \pi^0n)$ will fall faster with energy than $\Delta\sigma_T(\pi^+p)$ since the latter only sees $\alpha_{++}^{\text{EFF}}(0)$, the maximum value. This is observed at Serpukhov²¹. As s increases $\alpha^{\text{EFF}} \rightarrow \alpha$ and the two will come together, $\Delta\sigma_T$ falling faster as $\alpha_{++}^{\text{EFF}}(0)$ decreases, and $\sigma(\pi^-p \rightarrow \pi^0n)$ falling more slowly as the nonflip amplitude becomes more important relative to flip. For a similar reason the forward turnover in $d\sigma(\pi^-p \rightarrow \pi^0n)/dt$ will slowly turn into a peak, with zero slope at $t = 0$ at some energy above 45 GeV/c (Fig. 18). (Note that we have assumed a ratio of flip to nonflip ρ coupling such that the poles alone give a peak since the absorption always reduces the nonflip pole more than the flip; this is the ratio we need to describe the πN data.)

In particular, as shown in Fig. 11, we find $\Delta\sigma_T(\pi N) \sim s^{-0.40}$, $\sigma(\pi^-p \rightarrow \pi^0n) \sim s^{-1.20}$, $d\sigma(\pi^-p \rightarrow \pi^0n)/dt \sim s^{-0.96}$ at $t = 0$ (the difference between $d\sigma/dt$ at $t = 0$ and $\Delta\sigma_T$ is due to the faster falloff of the real part of the ρ amplitude since the real part is absorbed less than the imaginary part). The Serpukhov values²⁰ are $s^{-0.35}$, $s^{-1.09}$, and $s^{-0.84}$ respectively, with 10-15% errors on the exponents.

In addition, as mentioned above, we necessarily find that
 $\Delta\sigma_T(K^+p)$ falls faster with energy than $\Delta\sigma_T(\pi^+p)$, since the amount
of absorption is less for KN than for πN and thus $\alpha_{\rho, \pi N}^{EFF} > \alpha_{\omega, KN}^{EFF}$
even though $\alpha_{\rho}(t) \approx \alpha_{\omega}(t)$. Numerically we get $\Delta\sigma_T(K^+p) \sim s^{-0.48}$
while $\Delta\sigma_T \sim s^{-0.40}$. While these numbers are not as different as
the Serpukhov data²⁰ suggest, ($s^{-0.56}$ and $s^{-0.33}$), they are signifi-
cantly different in the correct direction and are actually not
inconsistent with the experimental data, as can be seen in Fig. 10.
By fitting we could increase these differences from 0.08 to perhaps
0.14, but a larger difference would probably require $\alpha_{\omega}(0) < \alpha_{\rho}(0)$.
(Since $m_{\omega}^2 - m_{\rho}^2 \simeq 0.03$ one could perhaps reasonably expect to lower
the ω by 0.03 more.)

(v) Now we consider the structure of polarizations. We can
correlate the structure in $\pi^-p \rightarrow \pi^0n$, $\pi^+p \rightarrow \pi^+p$, $K^+p \rightarrow K^+p$, $pp \rightarrow pp$,
 $np \rightarrow pn$, and $\bar{p}p \rightarrow \bar{n}n$.

In Fig. 20 we show $P(\pi^-p \rightarrow \pi^0n)$. It has been widely pointed out that
the predictions of older absorption models were qualitatively
wrong here, giving a large negative polarization for $-t \leq 0.5 \text{ GeV}^2$.
The rotation of the absorption by Re Pom removes that problem here
as we have discussed before - essentially the effect is to have
 $\text{Im } \rho = 0$ before $\text{Re } \rho = 0$.

Polarizations are very sensitive things in models. For
example, the widely different polarizations in Fig. come from
a set of almost equal amplitudes whose real parts are shown there.
The CERN measurements²³ that showed no deep dip in $P(\pi^-p \rightarrow \pi^0n)$
were important and taught us a lot, but the current disagreement
between the CERN²³ and Argonne²⁴ measurements is not important.

Rather, the Argonne experiment confirms that the polarization is not large and negative before the dip in $d\sigma/dt$. The difference between the two experiments can be interpreted as being whether $\text{Re } M_{++}^1$ actually has a zero near $-t \sim 0.35$ and stays slightly negative (the Argonne case) or almost vanishes but then stays slightly positive (the CERN case). The basic physics is insensitive to this distinction, so it should not be a matter of great concern.

Obtaining the double zero in the elastic π^+p polarizations²⁵ has long been considered a great problem for models without signature zeros in the Regge pole. The solution, which we have previously discussed (Ref. 12), is that both contributions $\text{Im } P \text{ Re } \rho_{+-}$ and $\text{Re } P \text{ Im } \rho_{+-}$ are important, with both containing a double-zero-like structure. For the former it arises because $\text{Im } P$ is monotonic while $\text{Re } \rho_{+-}$ has a double zero because of the rotated absorption; for the latter the double zero is due to a single zero in each factor at nearby t values. In both cases the double zero arises from the effects of $\text{Re } P$, once from its affect on the absorption and once explicitly due to its zero.

For K^+p polarizations²⁵ we automatically get the nice result which has been considered a success of dual models, that $P(K^+p)$ rises rapidly away from $t = 0$, while $P(K^-p)$ has an extra power of t and rises slowly. It is clear from the amplitudes in Fig. 5 why this occurs - our Reggeon contribution to K^+p is indeed mainly real and our Reggeon contribution to K^-p is indeed oscillating and mainly imaginary at small t , while the polarization is due to the interference of these with the mainly imaginary Pomeron.

Another interesting point concerns the polarizations²⁵ in the exotic channels $K^+p \rightarrow K^+p$ and $pp \rightarrow pp$ near $-t = 1$; K^+p appears to

have a single zero there and pp has a double zero. In the conventional exchange degenerate models with an imaginary Pomeron and real Reggeon contribution the simple approaches have no zeros in either the Pomeron or the Reggeon and no zero near $-t = 1$ in the polarization; more complicated ones will put a zero structure in the (real) Reggeon contribution, which will then produce the same result in both K^+p and pp . In our analysis for K^+p one has $\text{Im}(\text{Reggeons}) \approx 0$ since σ_T is flat, so the polarization is indeed the product of $\text{Im}P$ with $\text{Re}M_{+-}^1$, and as shown in Fig. , $\text{Re}M_{+-}^1$ indeed has a normal absorptive zero at $-t \approx 1$ (farther out than for the ρ alone because of the shorter range tensor mesons). Thus $P(K^+p)$ is expected to have a single zero near $-t = 1$. For pp on the other hand, σ_T is decreasing so at $t = 0$ $\text{Im}(\text{Reggeons})$ is positive relative to $\text{Im}(\text{Pomeron})$ and significant. As $-t$ increases, $\text{Im}(\text{Reggeons})$ has a zero, and one can work out that for $-t \sim 0.8$ one has a cancellation between $\text{Im}(\text{Reggeons})$ and $\text{Im}P$ giving a zero in $\text{Im}M_{++}^0$. The zero in $\text{Re}M_{+-}^1$ is still there, and so $P(pp)$ is expected to show an approximate double zero.

Our model also allows us to understand for the first time the polarization²⁶ in $np \rightarrow pn$ and predict reasonably well the polarization in $\bar{p}p \rightarrow \bar{n}n$ as shown in Fig. 31. Again here we are quoting preliminary results from M. Vaughn's NN calculations; the complete details will soon be published.

Altogether, the phases of our amplitudes seem able to describe polarization effects rather well.

KN, $\bar{K}N$ and Line Reversed Reactions

In this section we discuss our view of line reversed reactions. Our approach and our results are different from the usual ones. We will use as examples and emphasize the pair

$K^-p \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 n$ and $K^+n \rightarrow K^0 p$, but the behavior in general and the results also apply to the line reversed pairs of hypercharge exchange reactions such as $\pi^+p \rightarrow K^+\Sigma^+$ and $K^-p \rightarrow \pi^-\Sigma^+$, $\pi^-p \rightarrow K^0\Lambda$ and $K^-p \rightarrow \pi^0\Lambda$, etc.

Consider the ρ and A_2 poles. Since $\alpha_\rho(0) \approx 0.45$ while $\alpha_{A_2}(0) \approx 0.3$ (the exact numbers don't matter as long as $\alpha_T(0) < \alpha_V(0)$) the ρ ($\sim e^{-i\pi\alpha/2}$) lies at about 45° in an Argand plot (say for typical t values in the range $0.05 \leq -t \leq 0.35$) while the A_2 ($\sim e^{-i\pi\alpha/2}$) lies at about 150° , more real than imaginary.

For $K^+n \rightarrow K^0 p$ or $K^-p \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 n$ one has respectively $\rho-A_2$ and $\rho+A_2$. Since the real parts add for K^+ and cancel for K^- we find in general that the magnitude of the pole term is larger for the real process than for the rotating one. This is a qualitative feature of our pole terms and is not sensitive to parameter values.

Next consider how they are absorbed. As is familiar, because K^+ is more "real" while K^- is more "rotating" (due here to A_2 exchange being less peripheral than ρ) the former is more strongly absorbed. Thus the K^+ is absorbed in size down toward K^- . In our results the two become approximately equal in the final amplitudes (after absorption) at $P_L \sim 5$ GeV/c. As we have seen above, the effective strength of the absorption decreases (due to the shrinkage of the edge contribution to the Pomeron) as the energy increases. Consequently, beyond 6-8 GeV/c the K^+ reaction is no longer absorbed down to the K^- reaction and we predict that

$$\sigma(K^+n \rightarrow K^0 p) / \sigma(K^-p \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 n) > 1.$$

and increasingly so as P_L increases (until of course at very high

energies the ρ begins to dominate both and the ratio goes back to 1). The size of the effect is somewhat model dependent but it is not small - one result is shown in Fig.23, giving a ratio of about 1.5 at around 30 GeV/c. The result holds equally well for the integrated cross section or for $d\sigma/dt$ over a range of small t values (say, $-t \leq .4$). A similar analysis holds for hypercharge exchange reactions, with similar predictions. For the hypercharge case additional uncertainties such as the relative strengths of absorption and R*R cuts make the detailed results even more model dependent, but the basic structure is the same - in all cases the "real" process will have a bigger cross section than the "rotating" one even at higher energies. In addition, for all line reversed pairs, the "real" process is absorbed more so it will have a steeper slope (measured, say, from $.15 \leq -t \leq .4$) than the "rotating" one.

It is instructive to note what happens as P_L decreases below 5 GeV/c. In our model the absorption strength continues to increase with decreasing s , so K^+ is absorbed more and $\sigma(K^+)$ falls below $\sigma(K^-)$, contrary to the lower energy data. Such low energy disagreement will often happen in our model, which is a high energy one not meant to apply at lower s , because as the energy decreases the slope of the Regge pole ($\alpha' \ln s$) decreases so the pole does not fall off in a reasonable way at larger angles; then the cut formed by integration over the pole gets too big. It is clear in general that a real theory will produce a cut which decreases in size again as one goes toward threshold. Thus in such a theory one will get a result below about 5 GeV/c perhaps like that shown by the dashed line of Fig.23, and one will predict $\sigma(K^+ n \rightarrow K^0 p) / \sigma(K^- p \rightarrow K^0 n) \geq 1$ for all energies.

For the kaon reaction it is currently thought that the cross section ratio is about 1 at both 5 and 12 GeV/c. If that persists as experimental normalizations change, our curve (if basically correct) is rising too rapidly at small s because of the low energy behavior of the model. In any case, we predict $\sigma(K^+n \rightarrow K^0p)/\sigma(K^-p \rightarrow \bar{K}^0n) > 1$ above 12 GeV/c, although we could overestimate the size of the effect, which is very sensitive to details of the interference. A reasonable conjecture for a realistic result is shown by the dashed line in Fig. 23.

Hypercharge Exchange Reactions

Considerable work has been devoted to studying hypercharge exchange processes (HCEX), particularly line reversed pairs. Their interest is enhanced by the disagreement of simple exchange degeneracy predictions with the data. Since we do not have exchange degenerate poles we view these processes as any other ones. As shown in figures and discussed in the previous section, we do find the correct systematics for cross sections and polarizations, and the K^* , K^{**} amplitudes (for comparison see Ref. 33) are shown in Fig. 25.

It appears to us that there is much disagreement about normalizations among the data, and possibly systematic errors in the data. The results are very sensitive to SU(3) quantities and SU(3) breaking, both of which are physically separate from the structure of our model which deals with s and t dependence of amplitudes. Thus it seems to us that an unprejudiced detailed comparison of experiment and theory is not currently possible. Consequently, we simply calculated for the Global fit the behavior we expected using the non-HCEX reactions and SU(3) and lowering the K^* , K^{**} intercepts by a (fitted) amount 0.08 from the ρ , A_2 intercepts.

We found results consistent with the data (for at least one set of reported normalizations). The interested reader can begin without amplitudes and quickly get results which conform to his prejudices with small changes in the quantities we have fixed or fitted, all given in Table 2.

We obtain results consistent with the data for two main reasons. First, the trajectories are split ($\alpha_{A_2}(0) < \alpha_\rho(0)$) by an amount $\Delta\alpha \sim 0.1 - 0.2$, and the A_2 is shorter range, which implies the "real" pole is larger than the rotating one. Second, the phase is rotated by the absorption; the result is sensitive to $\text{Re}M_{\text{eff}}$. Since the absorption strength decreases with energy we expect the "real" cross section to be larger than the "rotating" one at almost all energies. See the discussion in the previous section and Fig. 24. The polarization systematics can be most easily understood from the amplitudes in Fig. 25; the tensor amplitudes are like the vector ones with real and imaginary parts interchanged and with zeros moved out in $-t$ because of their shorter range.

If the "real" member of a pair of line reversed reactions has a cross section considerably larger ($\sim 30\%$) than the "rotating" one at 20-40 GeV/c energies it should be very effective in judging the validity of current ideas. Models with exchange degenerate poles will not easily produce such behavior.

np and $\bar{p}p$ Charge Exchange

As we remarked above, for completeness we include here a brief analysis of these reactions. The results here are largely due to M. Vaughn and will be published¹⁸ in more detail as part of a complete study of NN reactions.

There are several reasons to include these reactions:

(a) They have traditionally been the most difficult processes for high energy models to treat. One reason for this has been the π exchange, which has been a failure for all models except strong absorption ones, and even there it has been a problem at the detailed quantitative level. A second reason is the measured polarization in $np \rightarrow pn$ which has previously not been understandable in any model. Since we claim a generally applicable model it is important for us to show that we have solved these problems.

(b) Most two-body reactions can be described in terms of four different s-channel helicity amplitudes. Two of these, with net helicity flip $n = 0$ and $n = 1$, occur for the $0^{-\frac{1}{2}+}$ reactions. The other two, one with $n = 2$, $x = 0$ and the other with $n = 0$, $x = 2$ (the evasive $n = 0$ amplitude) occur in $np \rightarrow pn$ and $\bar{p}p \rightarrow \bar{n}n$. With these amplitudes understood we can go on to describe most other processes without needing new results. In particular, the evasive $n = 0$ amplitude is the one responsible for the famous sharp peak of width m_{π}^2 in $np \rightarrow pn$, $\gamma p \rightarrow n\pi^+$, $\pi N \rightarrow \rho N$.

(c) An important aspect of our model, which is well illustrated here, is that in a given process all exchanges are absorbed alike; the properties of the absorption are assumed to depend only on the external particles and not on the exchange. Older absorption model approaches simply enhanced the absorption strength by a multiplicative factor, λ , different for each exchange and usually very large for the π . We do not do that, nor do we need to; the S_{EFF} describing the absorption is the same one for all Reggeons (π , ρ , ω , A_2 , f) exchanged in any nucleon-nucleon process, whether elastic or charge-exchange.

Complete results on all NN reactions will be published in a paper in preparation¹⁸. Here we show only the 8 GeV/c charge exchange processes, for the above reasons.

The only subtlety is the $\pi - A_2$ interference, which is crucial for quantitative agreement. In the real parts of $\varphi_2(n=0, x=2)$ and $\varphi_4(n=2, x=0)$ the π and A_2 interfere in opposite ways because the π has unnatural parity and the A_2 natural parity, and φ_2 and φ_4 differ only by putting helicities into minus themselves at one vertex which gives $\varphi_2(\pi) = \varphi_4(\pi)$, $\varphi_2(A_2) = -\varphi_4(A_2)$ for the definite parity poles. The interference is constructive in φ_2 , destructive in φ_4 , so the forward narrow peak is enhanced while the maximum in φ_4 is decreased. The phases arising from absorption with our rotated Pomeron again enhance the effect in the direction needed to get quantitative agreement with data.

Fig. 32 shows the most interesting amplitude, $\varphi_2(n=0, x=2)$. The pion pole vanishes at $t = 0$ like $t/(m_\pi^2 - t)$, while the cut does not have to vanish since $n = 0$, and varies very slowly with t at small t . The A_2 pole also vanishes at $t = 0$ since $x = 2$, but without the

nearby pole of the π case its maximum is further out in $-t$. The A_2 cut varies slowly in $-t$. Because of the different behavior of π and A_2 poles the $\pi + A_2$ pole term has a broad maximum, while the $\pi + A_2$ cut is still very slowly varying. Thus $\text{Re } \varphi_2$ (the main contribution since the φ pole is mainly real) has a large forward peak and then a broad minimum, independent of the numerical details of the parameters. Since the π and A_2 occur together in just the same way in $\gamma p \rightarrow \pi^+ n$, $\pi N \rightarrow \rho N$, $KN \rightarrow K^* N$, etc., one will find the same effect in all these reactions to the extent the ratio of π to A_2 couplings is approximately constant for these reactions and for $np \rightarrow pn$. A similar analysis has already been carried out by Worden²⁷ for photoproduction reactions, in which he uses the same absorption for all exchanges and verifies that the relative $\pi - A_2$ sign needed can be obtained from symmetry arguments.

Comments

Several points should be emphasized or remarked on.

(1) To avoid any confusion we repeat that the old approximation of the strong absorption model where $M_{\text{EFF}} = \lambda M^{\text{EL}}$ is not used here. We do include a contribution from non-elastic intermediate states for the same reasons⁴ as previously. In a sense it can be considered as enhancing the edge in impact parameter rather than the whole hadron, with $M_{\text{EFF}} = P + D$. The Pomeron (P) has a central and an edge part while the diffractive inelastic part (D), which is assumed to approximate the contribution of non-elastic intermediate states, arises wholly from the edge and enhances the edge contribution of the Pomeron. Thus the one parameter measuring the strength of D replaces the many λ 's of past work; there is a large reduction in the freedom due to parameters and the physical interpretation is improved.

This distinction is particularly important in $np \rightarrow pn$ where it is a qualitative departure from previous work. Now all exchanges including the π are absorbed with exactly the same M_{EFF} and the full π exchange peak is produced without any extra absorption.

(2) Our input Regge poles factorize although our full absorbed amplitudes do not. The pole factorization allows us to define coupling constants which can be used wherever an exchange appears. Although we have not had time to check all processes, it appears that our work and previous absorption models suggest that most or perhaps all high lying exchanges (ρ , A_2 , f , ω , π , N , Δ) can be described in terms of couplings which conform to our prejudices on the values they should have at the particle poles.

(3) One of the most important virtues of our approach is that it is of general applicability. All other models we are aware of are only formulated for some limited set of reactions or exchanges or amplitudes.

(4) When making predictions or fits with our model one should proceed as follows. For exchanges used in some previous analysis with our model use trajectories and scale factors as previously determined. Use an S_{EFF} consistent with a previous one for KN , πN , NN reactions, etc. In the Pomeron the parameters must have values not very different from those we have specified. With these constraints, calculate what is expected for the reaction in question. By making small changes in various quantities (e.g., α_0 , R_0 , ...) - perhaps up to 10% - try to fit existing data for the reaction in question, or related data. Then make a prediction. Our results depend in an essential way on the form of the Regge pole,

the Pomeron structure, the general structure of S_{EFF} , and the split of vector and tensor trajectories and amplitudes.

(5) Note that the absorption correction will always be destructively interfering with the Reggeon at small t , as it must if it is in fact an absorption correction. When looked at in the complex angular momentum plane, the absorption correction behaves like a Regge cut, usually referred to as Regge-Pomeron cut. Since there has been some recent confusion about this, we emphasize here that the sign of this cut is negative with respect to the pole, if the cut arises from absorption. If the amplitude had cuts with positive signs relative to the pole they would not have anything to do with absorption corrections. Although this contribution contains a cut, we will continue to refer to it as an absorption correction to avoid any confusion of this sort in this paper where we deal mainly with phenomenological applications. The $\bar{J}$ plane structure of this model will be considered in a different context.

(6) It may be useful to emphasize the differences between our results and conventional EXD pole models. We have (a) no overall signature zeros in our poles, (b) poles which remember the range of the force by avoiding unphysical states and having $J \sim m^2$, (c) splitting of the V and T trajectories, and (d) rotated absorption. All of these are essential to obtain our results, which appear to look so like the exchange degenerate pole results and in addition are consistent with experimental data.

to see whether it is possible to begin to understand the

A related point is that we are predicting that a given kind of amplitude (n, x fixed) will behave similarly in all reactions. That will not in general happen in EXD pole models.

(7) Because the A_2 exchange is rather short range the $\pi^- p \rightarrow \eta n$ analysis is very sensitive to details of the absorption of the low partial waves and to changes in the low partial waves of the pole. As shown in Figs. 18 and 19 the basic behavior we obtain are about right, with a dip at $-t \gtrsim 1 \text{ GeV}^2$ even though we have no input signature zeros, and a phase behavior suggestive of exchange-degenerate amplitudes. With small changes the interested reader can get a good description of the data.

(8) Because of the finite nature of computing facilities and our strength we did not ever include the isoscalar exchange helicity flip amplitudes. There is no gross behavior of the data which requires them, but they do effect small improvements in the data fit when included. They are essentially uncoupled from the rest of the analysis, only entering into final comparison with a few experimental quantities. By not including them we do not wish to imply that they are not present (for ω or f or even Pomeron) but only that their effect is currently only observable at a very detailed, quantitative level.

(9) We have not considered larger t behavior. After this work was largely finished, and stimulated by the recent ISR data of Rubbia et al. showing a dip at $-t \sim 1.4 \text{ GeV}^2$, a better form for the "Pomeron" amplitude has suggested itself. Above and in Ref. 6 we assumed that the "central" part had a Gaussian falloff in impact parameter. For very strongly interacting hadrons perhaps a better assumption is a sharper falloff, more like a central black disc in impact parameter. Thus the first term in Eq(3)

should be $-isAe^{\theta t} J_1(R_c \sqrt{-t})/R_c \sqrt{-t}$.

R_c is the central radius, perhaps of order $2/3 - 3/4$ fermi. Whether R_c should grow with energy as $\sqrt{\ln s}$ or be fixed is not clear; it depends on arguments about the energy dependence of the part of the multiplicity arising from central collisions and on s-channel unitarity questions. In either case one gets a good description of the ISR data $0 \leq -t \sim 3 \text{ GeV}^2$; the first zero of J_1 is at $-t \sim 1.3 \text{ GeV}^2$ and so is the second zero of J_1 , producing a dip there. The role of the Pomeron in absorption is not affected much since that is mainly determined by its small t properties, which are not changed much. The improved form is being fully studied in the nucleon-nucleon analysis of Ref. 18, both in its effect on absorption and for elastic scattering where considerable large angle data are available over a range of energies. The systematics as one goes from reaction to reaction are very interesting and will be considered elsewhere.

Arbitrary Two-Body Reactions and Exchanges

If it should be true that a given kind of s-channel helicity amplitude for a given exchange behaves the same way in whatever reaction it appears, then it is rather likely that our model will be widely applicable. For data for $-t \leq 1 \text{ GeV}^2$ many two-body reactions can be described essentially completely in terms of amplitudes we have discussed here (the main exceptions are $n = 3$ amplitudes which have a factor $-t^{3/2}$ and are usually small effects for the forward peak). These include vector and tensor exchange for $n = 0, x = 0$; $n = 0, x = 2$; $n = 1, x = 0$; $n = 2, x = 0$; and π exchange for $n = 0, x = 2$ and $n = 2, x = 0$. For example, in backward $\pi^- p \rightarrow p \pi^-$ the Δ exchange will behave as forward A_2 exchange in the two amplitudes $n = 0, 1$ and $x = 0$, apart from lowering the intercept a little and from effects due to McDowell symmetry questions; unfortunately, the latter effects can play an important role in modifying the t-dependence of the amplitudes so that calculations will still be necessary.

Thus for his own reactions the reader can make predictions by listing the independent helicity amplitudes involved, writing down the pole term(s) for each amplitude by adding together a term of the form of Eqn. 2 for each exchange that contributes to that amplitude, taking S_{EFF} from Eqn. 9 and Table 2, and absorbing according the Eqn. 5 to obtain the full amplitude. The pole residue $\gamma_{ca} \gamma_{bd}$ is obtained by multiplying an SU(3) factor from Table 1 (defined to be unity for $KN \rightarrow KN$) with a factor β obtained from Table 2. In Appendix 2

we summarize a few details concerning the absorption procedure for those who are interested in extensive calculations or minimization. The graphs of our various amplitudes can be used for debugging purposes.

Although the absorption procedure can be carried out analytically with our Pomeron if the pole is given an exponential residue, as shown above, for numerical work it is generally just as easy to carry out the actual partial wave expansions or impact parameter transforms numerically. The integrands are never very complicated and no subtleties are encountered apart from computing time questions, discussed in Appendix 2. For π exchange some care is necessary because of the long tail in impact parameter.

Possible Weaknesses

What failures might our model have? It must be tested against other reactions, particularly photoproduction and backward scattering. It is only a high energy model, with no physics designed to make it applicable in the resonance region; the cuts get too large at very low energies.

At higher energies we are only aware of one potential shortcoming - we may be absorbing the real parts of tensor exchange amplitudes too much. There are three possible clues to this. First, the ^{Global} fit to $\pi^- p \rightarrow \eta n$ is not great, because the real part of the flip amplitude is absorbed a bit too much and has a zero near $-t = 1.1$ instead of $-t = 1.35$. Second the real part of the f exchange is too small at $t = 0$, giving real parts for $\pi^+ p$ which are smaller than the data. Third, the difference between line-

reversed hypercharge exchange reactions would be described better if the real part of the K^{**} nonflip were absorbed a little less. A related point is that a recent study²⁹ of the $0^{-}\frac{1}{2}^{+}$ reactions uses amplitudes similar to ours for the vector exchange but different ones for tensor exchange, with little absorption of tensor exchange, and gets a reasonable description of the data.

On the other hand, as noted in Fig. 19, with fairly small changes we get a rather good description of $\pi^{-}p \rightarrow \eta n$. All of these effects are at a detailed level and we do not really think they indicate anything significantly wrong with the structure of the model, but they should be watched. Perhaps they are a clue to an improvement of S_{EFF} .

Our judgment is that we are simply seeing the effects of the short range nature of the tensor exchange, which makes it very sensitive to the details of the absorption of the low partial waves. We suspect that a slightly better understanding of S_{EFF} at small impact parameter would eliminate this possible difficulty. The low energy behavior is the main improvement of interest phenomenologically.

Physics Not in the Model

As we have said above, we have tried to construct a very simple model from the point of view of the input physics. That way we can see the origins of all of its successes and shortcomings. As we have enthusiastically remarked, the oversimplified model works well. Nevertheless, (a) it does not work perfectly, and (b) certain effects must clearly be part of the physics of any complete model - if they are not important we will have to learn why. In this section we discuss those effects which we are aware of and speculate on where they will show up.

(1) The most obvious omission is lower-lying contributions. It would seem fairly remarkable if only the vector and tensor mesons and the π could largely account for the forward meson exchange data, but it seems (from our results) to be reasonable to claim that. Improved data and more detailed phenomenology will presumably show some places where lower-lying mesons contribute, particularly in vector meson production²⁷.

In addition, Regge-Regge cuts are probably important in some reactions. Worden's result¹² argues that they will be small in odd signature reactions, but they could be much larger in even signature ones. As we discussed briefly above, it is possible that we are "effectively" including some lower-lying contributions in our choice of S_{EFF} (and therefore some effective R^*R cuts). When data are available over a large enough energy range it should be possible to decide phenomenologically whether $M_{\text{EFF}} - P$ falls like a power²⁸ of s .

Although it is very nice to describe data only in terms of high-lying, well-known exchanges, it will ultimately be necessary to account for the absence of lower-lying contributions in the data.

(2) Another obvious effect which must be understood is the t -dependence of Regge residues. Even the small t analysis could be affected by these because of the integration over t to construct the absorption correction; in different words, if Reggeons fell off less rapidly in t than we have assumed, say, they would have larger low partial waves and be more affected by absorption. Given the reasonable quality of our description of the data there does not seem to be much point in trying new forms for the residues until one has a good theoretical reason.

(3) The most interesting question is the effect of t-channel unitarity^{15,30} on the absorbed amplitude. This may require the discontinuity of the J-plane cut to vanish at the J-plane branch point and currently for our nonflip amplitudes it does not. Whether the modifications which are needed will affect the value of the cut at finite energies is an open question. Current work³⁰ suggests the cut term might gain a factor $\sim 1/(a+b \ln \ln s)^m$, $m \sim 2$, which would provide additional shrinkage and generally be useful.

For the Pomeron itself, t-channel unitarity could have a large effect also. It is not yet clear how to modify the current form of the Pomeron to insure that it does not violate t-channel unitarity. The Pomeron structure is complicated enough to give rise to some interesting subtleties. For example, the Pomeron form we are using has an essential singularity at $J = 1$ but the absorbed amplitude at $t = 0$ has no J-plane essential singularity. It is clear that there is considerable room here for further understanding.

(4) Several other more detailed sorts of effects should be considered. For example, if the Pomeron is not an $SU(3)$ singlet it will lead to different absorption in different hypercharge exchange reactions. Similarly, it is possible that the absorption could be weaker in $\pi^- p \rightarrow \eta n$ than in $\pi^- p \rightarrow \pi^0 n$ ($\sigma_T(\eta n) < \sigma_T(\pi n)$). The effect of this is illustrated in Fig. 19. In general, initial and final state absorption can be different. A full understanding and derivation of S_{EFF} will be required to understand these questions.

In another direction, it may be that P has small helicity flip contributions, and it is very likely that the diffractive contribution to S_{EFF} has significant helicity flip contributions. The

effect of a small piece in S_{EFF} which flips helicities should be studied. Indeed, a virtue of our approach is that one can systematically improve the understanding and structure of S_{EFF} as better theories or data become available.

Other Approaches

By studying our amplitudes we can see in some cases why earlier models have succeeded or failed. We use $V(T)$ for vector (tensor) meson exchange.

In the Strong Absorption Model⁴ (SAM) with a purely imaginary Pomeron there were several effects. In that model one simply enhanced the strength of the elastic absorption by a factor λ . Then one could get good results for $\text{Im}(V)$, which is indeed strongly absorbed, leading to the Bessel function systematics⁴ $M_n \sim J_n(R\sqrt{-t})$. In the present paper, on the other hand, the extra absorption of the imaginary part largely arises from the presence of $\text{Re}P$, as discussed above. But for $\text{Re}V$ the effect of multiplying by λ or the effect of $\text{Re}P$ were opposite at larger $-t$, so the SAM failed to get good results for $\text{Re}(V)$ (as indicated by $P(\pi^-p \rightarrow \pi^0n)$). For T exchange a similar effect occurs with $\text{Re}(T) \leftrightarrow \text{Im}(T)$; in addition the reduction in peripherality of the T poles was not present.

The Dual Absorption Model (DAM) of Harari³² preserved the most successful part of the SAM, the Bessel function systematics of $\text{Im}(V)$. It also retained the SAM Bessel function systematics for $\text{Im}(T)$; however, although the matter is far from settled conclusively, most workers feel that $\text{Im}(T)$ does not behave as $J_0(R\sqrt{-t})$ for $n = 0$ amplitudes. In any case the present model shows us why $\text{Re}(V)$, (T) do not behave as in SAM; if the present model turns out to be correct in its predictions for $\text{Im}(T)$ it will

have accounted for why only $\text{Im}(V)$ (but not $\text{Re}(V)$, $\text{Re}(T)$, $\text{Im}(T)$) behaves ^{as} in the SAM or the DAM.

Another standard observation for which we can account is that "flip amplitudes behave like Regge poles with signature zeros". We start with an input ρ Reggeons with $\text{Re}(\rho) \sim \sin \pi\alpha_\rho/2$. This has a strong linear zero where $\alpha_\rho = 0$. But the presence of $\text{Re}(P)$ in the absorption, as we showed above, just rotates the $\text{Re}(\rho)$ until it has a double zero (See Fig. 5) as in the case of the pole with signature zero (where $(\rho) \sim 1 - \cos \pi\alpha$). The ways in which our full $\text{Re}(\rho)$ amplitude differs significantly from the pole with signature zero are only quantitative details; ours is larger relative to $\text{Im}(\rho)$ at smaller t and ours does not have as large a secondary maximum at $-t \sim 1$.

Indeed, one of our more surprising and remarkable results is the extent to which all of our V, T amplitudes (See Fig. 5) resemble in their phases those expected from an exchange degenerate pole model. We assume neither exchange degenerate trajectories for ρ , A_2 nor exchange degenerate forms for the poles. The $\pi^- p \rightarrow \pi^0 n$, $\pi^- p \rightarrow \eta n$ amplitudes show the differences. But the "real" and "rotating" amplitudes, $K^+ n \rightarrow K^0 p$ and $K^- p \rightarrow K^0 n$ respectively, show precisely the "real" and "rotating" behavior, modified only by the absorptive zeros. $K^+ n$ is essentially real except where the real part has its zeros; these zeros show up in polarizations (in $K^+ p, pp$), so they can be verified. $K^- p \rightarrow K^0 n$ is really rotating. We have $\alpha_T < \alpha_V$ but T exchange is shorter range so it is absorbed more and α_T^{EFF} is closer to α_V^{EFF} than α_T is to α_V . At higher energies the exchange degeneracy gets worse as the T exchange goes away faster. This prediction will be easily tested at NAL and

Serpukhov; some cross sections are shown for KN in Fig.22 and for $\pi^+p \rightarrow K^+\Sigma^+$ vs. $K^-p \rightarrow \pi^-\Sigma^+$ in Fig. 25.

It should perhaps be emphasized that we have found results such as $\text{Im}p_{++} \sim J_0$ while $\text{Re}p_{++}$ has a "double zero" in an analytic way, without any special treatment or assumptions concerning amplitudes of any net helicity flip or their real or imaginary parts.

Conclusions

(a) We have a good chance to describe all data on two body reactions, in the forward peak, at energies above the resonance region, with a simple model rooted in sound physics.

(b) If our model and interpretations are correct much of the behavior of hadron interactions as functions of s and t and spin is dominated by unitarity effects (well approximated at high energies by absorption) and it will be rather hard to untangle underlying exchange structure. For example, we find very nice exchange degeneracy properties in some situations but our input is not exchange degenerate and our amplitudes are not dual in any conventional sense. If unitarity will be as crucial a part of any hadron theory as we claim, it does not make one optimistic about arriving at such a theory soon. On the other hand, to make up for this price, perhaps our results are good enough so that we can assume that all the fundamental concepts needed to construct a theory of hadron interactions are already available.

Acknowledgments

One of us (B.J.U.) would like to thank the Royal Society for the award of a European Fellowship and to acknowledge that this work was initiated while he was a Research Fellow at the University of London.

was initiated while he was a Research Assistant at Imperial College, London. We are indebted to Dr. R.J.N. Phillips for the hospitality extended to us by the Rutherford Laboratory where much of this work was carried out. We have profited considerably from conversations with M. Vaughn, F. Henyey, R. Worden, and M. Ross.

APPENDIX I - CONVENTIONS

We carry out our discussion entirely in terms of s-channel helicity amplitudes.

Our normalization is such that (for $0^{-1/2+} \rightarrow 0^{-1/2+}$)

$$\frac{d\sigma}{dt} [\text{mb}/(\text{GeV}/c)^2] = \frac{.389}{64\pi k^2 s} (|M_{++}|^2 + |M_{+-}|^2),$$

where M_{++} and M_{+-} are the nonflip and flip amplitudes, respectively, and

$$\sigma_{\text{total}}[\text{mb}] = \frac{.389}{2k\sqrt{s}} M_{\text{elastic}++}(\theta = 0),$$

where k is the magnitude of the initial state center-of-mass three momentum and θ is the center-of-mass scattering angle.

With our conventions the polarization and spin-rotation parameters are

$$P = \frac{-2 \text{Im}(M_{++} M_{+-}^*)}{|M_{++}|^2 + |M_{+-}|^2}$$

$$R = \frac{-(|M_{++}|^2 - |M_{+-}|^2) \cos \theta_R - 2 \text{Re}(M_{++} M_{+-}^*) \sin \theta_R}{|M_{++}|^2 + |M_{+-}|^2}$$

$$A = \frac{(|M_{++}|^2 - |M_{+-}|^2) \sin \theta_R - 2 \text{Re}(M_{++} M_{+-}^*) \cos \theta_R}{|M_{++}|^2 + |M_{+-}|^2}$$

where θ_R is the nuclear recoil angle in the lab frame, with

$$\tan \theta_R = \frac{\sqrt{1 - \cos^2 \theta}}{\frac{E_2}{m_2} \left(\frac{1 - (m_2/E_2)^2}{1 - (m_4/E_4)^2} - \cos \theta \right)}$$

where m_2 and E_2 are the mass and c.m. energy, respectively, of the target nucleon, and m_4 and E_4 are the mass and c.m. energy of the recoil nucleon, respectively.

APPENDIX II - NUMERICAL PROCEDURE

This section gives a brief outline of our particular method of calculation to help the reader generate his own results without too much difficulty when computing speed is required.

We used partial-wave expansions rather than the impact-parameter representation, essentially because we already had an absorption model program which worked in conjunction with the CERN minimizer MINUIT.

The Regge amplitudes were first expanded in partial-wave series

$$R_{\lambda_c \lambda_d; \lambda_a \lambda_b}(s, t) = \sum_j (2j+1) R_{\lambda_c \lambda_d; \lambda_a \lambda_b}^j(s) d_{\lambda_a - \lambda_b, \lambda_c - \lambda_d}^j(\cos \theta).$$

The partial-wave amplitudes, given by

$$R_{\lambda_c \lambda_d; \lambda_a \lambda_b}^j(s) = \int_{-1}^{+1} d(\cos \theta) R_{\lambda_c \lambda_d; \lambda_a \lambda_b}(s, t) d_{\lambda_a - \lambda_b, \lambda_c - \lambda_d}^j(\cos \theta),$$

were calculated from $j_{\min} = \max(|\lambda_a - \lambda_b|, |\lambda_c - \lambda_d|)$ up to a cut-off $j_{\max}$ (discussed below).

The integrations were performed using an M-point Gauss-Jacobi quadrature, according to which

$$\int_{-1}^{+1} dx f(x) = \sum_{m=1}^M W_m f(x_m),$$

where W_m is the quadrature weight associated with the point x_m . We define 'new weights'

$$W'_m(j; \lambda_a - \lambda_b, \lambda_c - \lambda_d) = \frac{1}{2} d_{\lambda_a - \lambda_b, \lambda_c - \lambda_d}^j(\cos \theta_m) W_m,$$

which were calculated and stored at the beginning of each computer

run, thus greatly reduced the running time of the program. This was important since we were minimizing, although it meant storing large arrays. The symmetry properties

$$d_{\lambda\mu} j(x) = (-1)^{\lambda-\mu} d_{\mu\lambda} j(x) = d_{-\mu, -\lambda} j(x) ,$$

reduced the number of different sets of 'new weights' needed. We then calculated the partial-wave amplitudes using the formula

$$R_{\lambda_c, \lambda_d; \lambda_a, \lambda_b} j(s) = \sum_{m=1}^M R_{\lambda_c, \lambda_d; \lambda_a, \lambda_b} (s, \cos \theta_m) W_m(j; \lambda_a - \lambda_b, \lambda_c - \lambda_d) .$$

The absorbed partial-wave amplitudes were obtained from the standard absorption model prescription

$$M_{\lambda_c, \lambda_d; \lambda_a, \lambda_b} j(s) = S_{\text{EFF}} j R_{\lambda_c, \lambda_d; \lambda_a, \lambda_b} j(s) ,$$

with R and S_{EFF} as discussed in this paper.

The absorbed amplitude is given by

$$M_{\lambda_c, \lambda_d; \lambda_a, \lambda_b} (s, t) = \sum_{j=j_{\min}}^{\infty} (2j+1) M_{\lambda_c, \lambda_d; \lambda_a, \lambda_b} j(s) d_{\lambda_c - \lambda_d, \lambda_a - \lambda_b} j(\cos \theta)$$

We chose $j_{\max}$ to be at least large enough to give $S_{\text{EFF}} j_{\max} = 1$, since then partial-wave amplitudes with $j > j_{\max}$ are unaltered by the absorption. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & M_{\lambda_c, \lambda_d; \lambda_a, \lambda_b} (s, t) \\ &= \sum_{j=j_{\min}}^{j_{\max}} (2j+1) \left[M_{\lambda_c, \lambda_d; \lambda_a, \lambda_b} j(s) - R_{\lambda_c, \lambda_d; \lambda_a, \lambda_b} j(s) \right] \\ & \quad d_{\lambda_a - \lambda_b, \lambda_c - \lambda_d} j(\cos \theta) + R(s, t) . \end{aligned}$$

It was therefore not necessary to continue the partial-wave expansion to sufficiently large j for the contribution of the higher partial-wave amplitudes to be negligible. This is a particularly important detail for π exchange.

The value of $j_{\max}$ increases with increasing energy, and hence the higher the order of Gaussian quadrature required to give the high partial-wave amplitudes accurately. Experience showed $j_{\max} = 50$ and $M = 48$ to be large enough, although smaller values were sufficient at lower energies.

Table 1
SU(3) Couplings

Reaction	Exchange	Coupling
$\pi^- p \rightarrow K^0 \Sigma^0$	K^* K^{**}	$-\sqrt{2}(1-2F)$ $\sqrt{2}(1-2F)$
$\pi^+ p \rightarrow K^+ \Sigma^+$	K^* K^{**}	$-2(1-2F)$ $2(1-2F)$
$K^- p \rightarrow \pi^- \Sigma^+$	K^* K^{**}	$2(1-2F)$ $2(1-2F)$
$\pi^- p \rightarrow K^0 \Lambda$	K^* K^{**}	$\sqrt{2/3}(1+2F)$ $-\sqrt{2/3}(1+2F)$
$K^- n \rightarrow \pi^- \Lambda$	K^* K^{**}	$-\sqrt{2/3}(1+2F)$ $-\sqrt{2/3}(1+2F)$
$K^- p \rightarrow \pi^0 \Lambda$	K^* K^{**}	$-1/\sqrt{3}(1+2F)$ $-1/\sqrt{3}(1+2F)$
$K^- p \rightarrow \eta_8 \Lambda$	K^* K^{**}	$-(1+2F)$ $1/3(1+2F)$
$K^- n \rightarrow \eta_8 \Sigma^-$	K^* K^{**}	$\sqrt{6}(1-2F)$ $-\sqrt{2/3}(1-2F)$
$\pi^\pm p \rightarrow \pi^\pm p$	f ρ	2 ± 2
$K^\pm p \rightarrow K^\pm p$	ω f ρ A_2	± 1 1 ± 1 1
$\pi^- p \rightarrow \pi^0 n$	ρ	$2\sqrt{2}$
$\pi^- p \rightarrow \eta n$	A_2	$2\sqrt{2/3}$
$K^- p \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 n$	ρ A_2	-2 2
$K^+ n \rightarrow K^0 p$	ρ A_2	2 2
$K_2^- p \rightarrow K_1^- p$	ω ρ	1 1

The residues $\gamma_{ca} \gamma_{db}$ in the Reggeon are calculated by multiplying the SU(3) numbers of Table 1 by the β 's of Table 2.

TABLE 2

Global Fit Parameters (fixed and variable)	Constraint or Expectation	Value	Comment
A	—	32	
B	$\sim 2 \text{ GeV}^{-2}$	1.7 GeV^{-2}	
A_0	$A+A_0 \sim \sigma_T$	27	$P = -is \left[A e^{Bt} + A_0 e^{B_0 t} J_0 \left(R_0 \sqrt{t(4ns - i\pi/2)} \right) \right]$
B_0	$\sim 2 \text{ GeV}^{-2}$	2 GeV^{-2}	
R_0	$\sim 2.5 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$	2.5 GeV^{-1}	
C	—	54	$M_{eff} = P + D_0$
D	$\sim 2 \text{ GeV}^{-2}$	2 GeV^{-2}	$D_0 = -is C e^{Dt} J_0 \left(R_D \sqrt{t(4ns - i\pi/2)} \right)$
R_{D_0}	$\sim 2.5 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$	2 GeV^{-1}	
α'	1 GeV^{-2}	fixed	all Reggeons ($\rho, A_2, \omega, f, \pi$)
s_0	$\frac{1}{2} \text{ GeV}^2$	fixed	all Reggeons except A_2
$s_0(A_2)$	$\frac{1}{2} \text{ GeV}^2$	$\frac{1}{2}$ or 2 GeV^{-2}	see text and figures
$\alpha_\rho(0) = \alpha_\omega(0)$	$\sim \frac{1}{2}$	0.45	
$\alpha_{A_2}(0) = \alpha_f(0)$	—	0.25	neither input pole trajectories nor residues are exchange degenerate
$\beta_{++}(\rho)$	—	-3.5	all β 's are the product $\gamma_{ca} \gamma_{db}$ given in eqn. 2. up to the SU(3) factors of Table 1.
$\beta_{+-}(\rho)$	$\beta_{+-}^2 \gg \beta_{++}^2$	-13.5	
$\beta_{\pm\pm}(A_2)/\beta_{\pm\pm}(\rho)$	—	-6.4	
$\beta_{++}(\omega)$	4-5 times $\beta(\omega)$	-13	
$\beta_{++}(f)$	—	45	
$\beta_{+-}(\omega) = \beta_{+-}(f)$	—	0	fixed; see discussion
$\beta_{\pm\pm}(K^*)/\beta_{\pm\pm}(\rho)$	—		
$= \beta_{\pm\pm}(K^{**})/\beta_{\pm\pm}(A_2)$	SU(3)	see table 1	fixed
$f(\text{non-flip})$	1	1.42	fixed (see text)
$f(\text{flip})$	~ 0.4	0.20	fixed (see text)
$\alpha_\rho(0) - \alpha_{K^*}(0)$	—	0.08	SU(3) breaking parameter
$\alpha_{K^{**}}(0) - \alpha_{K^*}(0)$	—		

References

1. R.J.N. Phillips, Rapporteur talk at the Amsterdam International Conference on Elementary Particles (1971).
2. C. Michael, Rapporteur talk at the Oxford International Conference on High Energy Collisions (April 1972).
3. G. Cohen-Tannoudji, A. Morel, and Ph. Salin, *Nuovo Cimento* 55A, 412 (1968).
4. M. Ross, F.S. Henyey, and G.L. Kane, *Nucl. Phys.* B23, 372 (1969).
5. R. Kelly, G.L. Kane, and F.S. Henyey, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 24, 1511 (1970).
6. G.L. Kane, *Phys. Lett.* 40B, 363 (1972).
7. L. Stodolsky, SLAC preprint (unpublished).
8. V. Barger and R.J.N. Phillips, *Phys. Rev.* 187, 2210 (1969).
9. R.L. Kelly, *Phys. Lett.* B39, 635 (1972).
10. G. Höhler, in *High Energy Phenomenology*, Proceedings of the Sixth Rencontre de Moriond (ed. J. Tran Thanh Van).
11. M.H. Ross, *Phys. Lett.* 38B, 321 (1972).
12. B.J. Hartley and G.L. Kane, *Phys. Lett.* 39B, 531 (1972).
13. O. Overseth, private communication.
14. G.L. Kane, "Phenomenology of Diffractive Reactions," Lectures at the XII Crakow School of Theoretical Physics, Zakopane, Poland (June 1972); and Rutherford Lab preprint RRP/T/20.
15. V.N. Gribov, I. Ya. Pomeranchuk, and K.A. Ter Martirosyan, *Phys. Rev.* 139, B184 (1965).
16. R. Worden, *Phys. Lett.* 40B, 260 (1972).
17. G. Fox, Proceedings of the Third International Conference on High Energy Collisions, Stony Brook, New York (1969).
18. M. Vaughn and G.L. Kane, in preparation.
19. F. Halzen and C. Michael, *Phys. Lett.* 36B, 367 (1971).
20. S.P. Denisov, *et al.*, *Phys. Lett.* 36B, 415 (1971).

21. V.N. Bolotov, et al., Phys. Lett. 38B, 120 (1972).
22. G. Barbeillini, et al., Phys. Lett. 39B, 663 (1972).
23. P. Bonamy, et al., preprint (1972).
24. D. Hill, et al., Paper No. 212, XVI International Conference on High Energy Physics, Chicago (September 1972).
25. CERN-Orsay-Pisa Collaboration, presented by L. Dick at the Second International Conference on Polarized Targets, Berkeley (1971).
26. $np \rightarrow pn$: Argonne, Ohio State, Michigan State collaboration, submitted to the Oxford International Conference on High Energy Collisions, and to be published; and P.R. Robrish, et al., Phys. Lett. 31B, 617 (1970).
 $\overline{pp} \rightarrow nn$: CERN, ETH Zurich, I.C. London, CEN Saclay Collaboration, submitted to the XVI International Conference on High Energy Physics (September 1972) and to be published.
27. R. Worden, Nucl. Phys. B37, 253 (1971).
28. A. Martin and P. Stevens, Phys. Rev. D5, 147 (1972).
29. G.A. Ringland, R.G. Roberts, D.P. Roy and J. Tran Thanh Van, Nucl. Phys. B44, 395 (1972).
30. F. Guerin, Nice preprint.
F. Henyey, D. Richards, and W. Zakrzewski (to be published).
31. J. Bronzan and C.E. Jones, Phys. Rev. 160, 1494 (1967).
32. H. Harari, Phys. Rev. Lett. 26, 1400 (1971).
33. V. Barger and A.D. Martin, Phys. Lett. 39B, 379 (1972).
J.S. Loos and J.A.J. Matthews, SLAC preprint.
34. V. Barger, K. Geer, and R.J.N. Phillips, Nucl. Phys. B36 (1972).
35. G.A. Ringland and D.P. Roy, Phys. Lett. 39B, 531 (1972).

36. W. Galbraith, et al., Phys. Rev. 138, B913 (1965).
W.F. Baker, et al., Phys. Rev. 129, 2285 (1967).
K.J. Foley, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 19, 330 (1967).
S.P. Denisov, et al., Phys. Lett. 36B, 415 (1971); Phys. Lett. 36B, 528 (1971).
37. S. Brandt, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 10, 413 (1963).
K.J. Foley, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 11, 425 (1963).
C.T. Coffin, et al., Phys. Rev. 159, 1169 (1967).
D.R. Rust, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 24, 1361 (1970).
38. K.J. Foley, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 11, 503 (1963).
W. De Baere, et al., Nuovo Cimento 45A, 885 (1966).
J. Mott, et al., Phys. Lett. 23, 171 (1966).
M. Aderholz, et al., Phys. Lett. 24, 434 (1967).
R.J. Miller, et al., Phys. Lett. 34B, 230 (1971).
39. K.J. Foley, et al., Phys. Rev. 181, 1775 (1969).
40. M. Borghini, et al., Phys. Lett. 31B, 405 (1970); CERN preprint (1972).
41. A. De Lesquen, et al., Phys. Lett. 40B, 278 (1972).
42. A.V. Stirling, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 14, 763 (1965).
P. Sonderegger, et al., Phys. Lett. 20, 75 (1966).
43. O. Guisan, et al., Phys. Lett. 18, 200 (1965).
K. Ruddick, et al., private communication.
44. D.D. Drobnis, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 20, 274 (1968).
P. Bonamy, et al., Nucl Phys. B16, 335 (1970); and Reference 23.
45. P. Astbury, et al., Phys. Lett. 23, 396 (1966).
D. Chine, et al., University of Wisconsin Report (1969); Phys. Rev. Lett. 23, 1318 (1969).
A. Firestone, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 25, 958 (1970).
M. Haguenaue, et al., Phys. Lett. 37B, 538 (1971).
46. E.H. Willen, et al., paper contributed to Oxford Conference (1972).
47. S.M. Pruss, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 23, 189 (1969).
A. Bashian, et al., Phys. Rev. D4, 2667 (1971).
48. P. Kalbaci, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 27, 74 (1971).
49. C.E.W. Ward, et al., Argonne National Laboratory preprint (1971).
50. L. Moscoso, et al., Nucl. Phys. 36B, 332 (1972).

51. D. Birnbaum, et al., Phys. Lett. 31B, 484 (1970).
52. W.L. Yen, et al., Phys. Rev. 188, 2011 (1969).
53. D.J. Crennell, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 23, 1347 (1969).
54. M. Abramovich, et al., Nucl. Phys. B27, 477 (1971).

Figure 1. A graph of $\Gamma(z)$ vs. z showing the region of z where $-t$ varies from 0 to 1 GeV^2 for a given exchange, with $z = (J - \alpha(t))/2$. Note, for example, how the ρ is more peripheral than the A_2 , as seen by the sharper forward peak. For a given exchange $z = (J - \alpha(t))/2$, where J is the spin of the least massive physical particle on the trajectory.

Figure 2. The real and imaginary parts of the Pomeron amplitude are shown (they have opposite sign), at two energies to illustrate the energy dependence, for the global fit.

Figure 3. (a) The pieces of the imaginary part of the Pomeron are shown in impact parameter to illustrate the shapes and sizes of the central and edge contributions are the energy dependence of the edge contribution. s is given in GeV^2 . (b) The central contribution is shown again and the full Pomeron given by central plus edge contributions. The arrow shows one fermi. (These curves are for a Gaussian central region rather than the "black disc" mentioned in the comments section.)

Figure 4. (a) The Global fit Pomeron and effective diffractive dissociation contributions to M_{eff} at 6 GeV/c for $\pi N \rightarrow \pi N$. The normalization is as in the text. (b) The resulting S_{eff}^j is also shown. Note the different shapes of $\text{Im} M_{\text{eff}}$ and $2\text{Im} P$ (which is similar to the old $\lambda \text{Im} M_{++}(\text{elastic})$). This shows how much more our hadrons behave as absorbing discs than the ones of the older strong absorption model. Also shown in part (b) is a (preliminary) result from Ref. 18 for S_{eff} for NN scattering, to show that the main difference coming from the larger σ_T of NN will be to give a blacker disc, rather than extra absorption at the center (dash-dot line).

Figure 5. Global fit nonflip and flip final amplitudes for ρ , A_2 , and $\pm\rho+A_2$ exchanges in πN and KN charge exchange at 6 GeV/c. The real and imaginary parts of the ρ amplitudes at 16 GeV/c are shown as dotted and dashed lines respectively. Note the remarkable resemblance to exchange degenerate phases, with the $K^+n \rightarrow K^0 p$ amplitudes mainly real, the $K^-p \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 n$ amplitudes showing a rotating phase, and the ηn flip amplitude, where absorption is smaller, having the right sort of zero structure.

Figure 5

Figure 6. The Global fit isovector amplitudes in πN scattering at 6 GeV/c compared with the results of Halzen and Michael from Ref.19 . (We use their notation in this figure.)

Figure 7. The Global fit ρ amplitude for $\pi^- p \rightarrow \pi^0 n$ and $K^+ n \rightarrow K^0 p$, to show the effect of having different absorption because $\sigma_T(\pi N) > \sigma_T(KN)$. Note the shift in the place where $\text{Im}M_{++} = 0$, which is reflected in the KN crossover zero being further out than the πN crossover (assuming ρ and ω are otherwise the same).

Figure 8. Global fit partial-wave projections (equivalent to impact parameter) of the ρ and A_2 exchange amplitudes in $\pi^- p \rightarrow \pi^0 n$ and $\pi^- p \rightarrow \eta n$ at 6 GeV/c. One fermi is at $j \approx 7.5$. Note for the nonflip amplitude that $\text{Im } M$ for vector exchange and $\text{Re } M$ for tensor exchange show simple peripheral behavior.

Figure 9. Argand diagrams showing the size and phases of various contributions to various elastic process, to help understand the energy dependence of σ_T and the forward real parts of these processes. The implications are described in the text. Part (b) shows why $\sigma_T(K^+p)$ rises due to Reggeons ω and f dying out as s increases.

Figure 10. Global fit total cross sections for $\pi^\pm p$ and $K^\pm p$ scattering. Data from Ref. 36. See text for detailed discussion of $\Delta\sigma_T$ behavior and rise of $\sigma_T(K^+p)$; the latter is entirely due to Reggeons going away with energy in our model and could account for the observed behavior.

Figure 11. Theoretical energy dependence of several quantities compared for the Global fit. The left hand scale shows integrated differential cross section in μb and the right hand scale $d\sigma/dt$ at $t=0$ in $\mu\text{b}/\text{GeV}^2$. For $\pi^-p \rightarrow \pi^0 n$ one can compare $[\Delta\sigma_T(\pi N)]^2$ which is proportional to the square of $\text{Im}M(\pi^-p \rightarrow \pi^0 n)$ at $t=0$, $d\sigma/dt$ at $t=0$ which is proportional to $(\text{Im}M)^2 + (\text{Re}M)^2$ at $t=0$, and the integrated cross section. These would all have the same energy dependence in a pole model and behave as shown in our absorption model. See discussion in text for detailed comparison with data. For the integrated cross sections for $\pi^-p \rightarrow \pi^0 n$ and $\pi^-p \rightarrow \eta n$ the dashed lines shown the behavior of the experimental results from Serpukov.

Figure 11

Figure 12. Global fit differential cross sections for $\pi^\pm p \rightarrow \pi^\pm p$.
Data from Ref.37.

Figure 13. $K^\pm p$ differential cross sections calculated from Global fit. Data from Ref. 38.

Figure 14. The Global fit ratio of $(\text{Re } M_{++}/\text{Im } M_{++})_{t=0}$ for $\pi^\pm p$ and $K^\pm p$ elastic scattering. The data are from Ref.39. The signs of all four follow from general arguments given in the text.

Figure 15. Global fit polarizations for $\pi^\pm p \rightarrow \pi^\pm p$. Data from Ref.40. The predicted polarizations at 45 GeV/c and 100 GeV/c are shown by dashed and dotted lines, respectively. The isoscalar flip amplitude has been assumed to be zero.

Figure 16. Polarizations for $K^* p \rightarrow K^* p$ calculated from the Global fit. Data from Ref. 40. The predicted polarizations at 45 GeV/c and 100 GeV/c are shown by dashed and dotted lines, respectively.

Figure 17. R and A parameters for $\pi^+ p \rightarrow \pi^+ p$ and $\pi^- p \rightarrow \pi^0 n$. Data from Ref.41. The isoscalar flip amplitude has not been included.

Figure 18. Global fit differential cross sections for $\pi^-p \rightarrow \pi^0 n$ and $\pi^-p \rightarrow \eta n$. The theoretical curve for η production has been multiplied by the branching ratio $(\eta \rightarrow 2\gamma)/(\eta \rightarrow \text{all modes})$ which we took to be 0.38. Data from Refs. 42 and 43.

Figure 19. This illustrates the sensitivity of the $\pi^- p \rightarrow \eta n$ cross section to minor changes in the model. It is so sensitive mainly because the tensor exchange has a short range and the final amplitudes depend strongly on the details of the absorption of the low partial waves. The large t dip in the cross section is mainly dependent on where $\text{Re}M_{+-}=0$, and that can occur anywhere from $-t \approx 1$ to $-t \approx 1.4$ depending on detailed considerations. Note from this and Figure 18 that we always have a large t dip in $d\sigma/dt$ even though we have no signature zero in the A_2 contribution.

Figure 20. Global fit polarizations for $\pi^- p \rightarrow \pi^0 n$ and $\pi^- p \rightarrow \eta n$. Data from Ref. 44. The dash-dotted line at 5 GeV/c shows a polarization curve if we use the Global fit with only the change $\alpha_\rho(t) = 0.5 + 0.85t$, illustrating how sensitive the polarization is to minor changes; with this change the cross sections and elastic polarizations are still well described. Near the dip region the polarization is extremely sensitive to very small changes in the real parts of the amplitudes (where small means by amounts small compared to the magnitude of the amplitude in that region) so that a knowledge of the data in that region will help to fix the details within a model which already has real parts like those in Figure 5 for ρ exchange. Of course, as is well known now, the absence of a large negative spike in the polarization before the dip in $d\sigma/dt$ provided the clue that a rotation such as that provided by our complex Pomeron was needed to understand the data (see discussion in text). The dashed and dotted lines are predictions for 45 GeV/c and 100 GeV/c respectively.

Figure 20

Figure 21. Four polarizations are shown which are essentially physically equivalent. They differ because of the small differences in the real parts of the amplitudes, shown with matching lines. The imaginary parts of the amplitudes are essentially identical for all of them. Also shown for comparison on the ReM graphs is a typical old strong absorption result for the real parts; it is basically different compared to any of the others and resulted in the deep negative spike in $P(t)$ which has been ruled out by the data.

Figure 22. The Global fit α_{eff} for $\pi^- p \rightarrow \pi^0 n$ over the energy range 5.9 to 18.2 GeV/c. The data are from Ref. 4. Note that previous difficulties with shrinkage in this energy range are no longer present (see discussion in text).

Figure 23. Global fit differential cross sections for the line-reversed reactions $K^-p \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 n$ and $K^+n \rightarrow K^0 p$. Data from Refs. 45 and 46. The predicted polarizations are also shown. Note that at higher energies we predict the "real" reaction $K^+n \rightarrow K^0 p$ to have a larger cross section than the "rotating" one; a similar prediction holds for any line reversed pair. See Figure 24 and section in text.

Figure 24. The solid curve shows the ratio we predict in the model for $R = \sigma(K^+n \rightarrow K^0p) / \sigma(K^-p \rightarrow K^0n)$, either for the integrated cross sections or for the differential cross sections at small t . The dashed curve shows a conjectured behavior (for the same ratio) which has the same high energy physics built in but takes into account that as the energy decreases toward threshold the strength of the absorption will decrease rather than continue to grow as in the model; the dashed curve is meant to be a good guess for the actual behavior. Note that we expect $R > 1$ at all energies and significantly larger than 1 at higher energies.

Figure 25. Global fit nonflip and flip amplitudes for K^* and K^{**} exchange in $\pi^+ p \rightarrow K^+ \Sigma^+$.

Figure 26. Global fit differential cross sections for $\pi N \rightarrow K \Sigma$ and $K N \rightarrow \pi \Sigma$. Data from Refs. 46 through 51. See discussion in text about line reversed reactions.

Figure 27. Global fit differential cross sections for $\pi N \rightarrow K \Lambda$ and $K N \rightarrow \pi \Lambda$. Data from Refs. 46, 49, 50, 52 and 53. See discussion in text about line reversed reactions.

Figure 28. Global fit polarizations for the hypercharge exchange reactions. Data from Refs. 47, 49, 50, 52, and 54.

Figure 29. Preliminary results from Ref. 18 for the NN charge exchange reactions, to illustrate the general applicability of the model to cross sections, polarizations, and amplitudes besides the $0^{-1/2^{+}}$ ones. See discussion in text. The π is a standard Regge pole as described in the text with $\alpha' = 1 \text{ GeV}^{-2}$ and $s_0 = 1/2 \text{ GeV}^2$ and the ρ and A_2 are the same as in the $0^{-1/2^{+}}$ analysis.

Figure 30. Preliminary results from Ref. 18 for the NN charge exchange reactions, to illustrate the general applicability of the model to cross sections, polarizations, and amplitudes besides the $0^{-1/2+}$ ones. See discussion in text. The π is a standard Regge pole as described in the text with $\alpha' = 1 \text{ GeV}^{-2}$ and $s_0 = 1/2 \text{ GeV}^2$ and the ρ and A_2 are the same as in the $0^{-1/2+}$ analysis.

Figure 31. Preliminary results from Ref. 18 for the NN charge exchange reactions, to illustrate the general applicability of the model to cross section, polarizations, and amplitudes besides the $0^{-1/2^{+}}$ ones. See discussion in text. The π is a standard Regge pole as described in the text with $\alpha' = 1 \text{ GeV}^{-2}$ and $s_0 = 1/2 \text{ GeV}^2$ and the ρ and A_2 are the same as in the $0^{-1/2^{+}}$ analysis. This illustrates for the main new amplitude, the $n=0, x=2$ one ("evasive"), how the effects arise in detail. Part (a) shows the (dominant) real part of ϕ_2 for the π pole ($\sim t/(t-m_\pi^2)$), the full π amplitude after absorption, the full amplitude including ρ and A_2 . It also includes the magnitude of ϕ_2 , and $\text{Re}\phi_4$. The latter illustrates how ϕ_4 is suppressed relative to ϕ_2 because the π and A_2 interfere destructively in ϕ_4 and constructively in ϕ_2 ; this leads to no secondary maximum near $-t \sim 0.05 \text{ GeV}^2$ in $np \rightarrow pn$. Part (b) shows the $\text{Im}\phi_2$, which illustrates the effect of the phase of the Pomeron on absorption.

Figure 31