Experimental Study of the Reaction $\pi^- p \rightarrow \Lambda K^0$
at Beam Momenta Between 930 and 1130 Mev/c*

T.M. Knasel,** J. Lindquist, B. Nelson, || R.L. Sumner,+
E.C. Swallow, R. Winston, and D.M. Wolfe,†
Enrico Fermi Institute and Department of Physics
University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois 60637

P.R. Phillips
Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri 63130

K. Reibel, D.M. Schwartz, and A.J. Stevens, ++
Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210

T.A. Romanowski
Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, Illinois 60439
and Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210

J.M. Watson
Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, Illinois 60439

We have used an optical spark chamber spectro-
meter to perform a systematic study of the reaction
 $\pi^- p \rightarrow \Lambda K^0$ at beam momenta between 930 and 1130
Mev/c. The cross section, angular distribution, and
 Λ polarization have been measured. We present our
complete data from a sample of 11,400 events along
with Legendre polynomial coefficients for the angular
distributions. No striking cross-section enhancement
at ΣK threshold is observed, but there is evidence
for a small cusp effect. A simple model which takes
account of the ΣK channel provides a good fit to our data.

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, com-
pleteness or usefulness of any information, apparatus,
product or process disclosed, or represents that its use
would not infringe privately owned rights.

MASTER

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.

The total and differential cross sections and the angular distribution of the polarization have been measured for the reaction $\pi^- p \rightarrow \Lambda K^0$ near the threshold for $\pi^- p \rightarrow \Sigma K$ (1033 MeV/c). We present here our complete data: sample A, 3000 events collected at 1025 MeV/c as a calibration for a study¹ of $\Lambda \rightarrow p e \bar{\nu}$; and sample B, 8400 events collected at 14 beam momenta between 930 MeV/c and 1130 MeV/c in a search for a cusp effect at ΣK threshold.²

It has been suggested by Wigner³ and others⁴⁻⁷ that, on the basis of the unitarity constraint, one should expect all channels to be influenced by the onset of a new channel. These threshold, or cusp, phenomena are usually small; however, some examples have been found in reactions with nuclei^{8,9} and in $\pi\pi$ scattering at $K\bar{K}$ threshold.¹⁰ Several experiments¹¹⁻¹⁵ have studied the reaction $\pi^- p \rightarrow \Lambda K^0$ near ΣK threshold; however, the results are inconclusive. In the most recent experiments, Van Dyck, et al.¹⁵ found a cross section enhancement about 10 MeV/c below threshold; while in another experiment, Jones, et al.¹⁴ saw no effect. We observe a small dip in the $\pi^- p \rightarrow \Lambda K^0$ cross section, $\sigma(\Lambda K)$, and a corresponding increase in the Λ production asymmetry at ΣK threshold. We have fit our data with a simple model based on the S_{11} (1700) πN resonance. Inclusion of the effect of the ΣK threshold results in good agreement with the observed structure.

I. Pion Beam

The experiment was performed at the Argonne National Laboratory Zero-Gradient Synchrotron. Negative pions were produced by 12 GeV proton inter-

actions in a beryllium target. A two-stage configuration of magnets (Figure 1) was used to select momentum and focus the negative beam on a 2.54 cm. diameter liquid hydrogen target. The beam momentum (near 1025 MeV/c) was calibrated for several magnet current settings with a positive beam by measuring the π^+ -deuteron time of flight difference and the deuteron range.¹⁶ The uncertainty in the central momentum from these measurements including energy loss straggling in the hydrogen target was ± 3 MeV/c. Other beam momenta were obtained by linearly scaling the field of the second bending magnet and tuning the first to maximize the beam incident on the target.

The momentum acceptance was controlled by an adjustable collimator at the first focus of the beam transport system (see Figure 1). The momentum acceptance for data sample A was ± 12 MeV/c and ± 6 MeV/c for sample B including energy loss in the hydrogen target. A CO_2 gas Cherenkov counter inside the last quadrupole magnet was used to veto the 20% electron component of the beam. The muon component of the beam was measured to be 3% at 1025 MeV/c.¹⁷ Typically the instantaneous beam rate for samples A and B was (1.0 ± 0.2) MHz and (0.3 ± 0.05) MHz, respectively.

II. Event Detection and Triggering

The apparatus (Figure 2) consisted of a liquid hydrogen target surrounded by a veto counter and imbedded in an array of optical spark chambers immersed in the field of a magnet with 100 cm. gap.¹⁸ Counters on either side of the magnet detected the $\Lambda \rightarrow p\pi^-$ decay products. Above ΣK threshold we detected lambdas from $\pi^- p \rightarrow \Sigma^0 K^0$ ($\Sigma^0 \rightarrow \Lambda \gamma$) in addition to

directly produced lambdas from $\pi^- p \rightarrow \Lambda K^0$. The $\Sigma^0 K^0$ events were separated by kinematic analysis.

A beam telescope ($\overline{C1} \cdot B1 \cdot B2 \cdot B3 \cdot \overline{B4}$) and the target veto counter (T) selected pion interactions in the target which resulted in neutral final states (Neutrals). Protons from lambda decay were detected in counter P1 and in the 7-element hodoscopes P2 and P3. A water Cherenkov counter (C2) was used in anticoincidence to reject fast particles; e. g., positrons from γ conversion or π 's from K^0 decays. The proton momentum, typically 600 MeV/c, was analyzed by the field in the magnet gap (central value: 5.73 kgauss). The lambda decay pion was detected in the 6-element hodoscope (EH) on the opposite side of the magnet, and its momentum, typically 100 MeV/c, was analyzed in the magnet's fringe field. Our three trigger components thus were: (neutral production) = $\overline{C1} \cdot B1 \cdot B2 \cdot B3 \cdot \overline{B4} \cdot \overline{T}$; (proton) = $P1 \cdot P2 \cdot P3 \cdot \overline{C2}$; and (pion) = EH. These three requirements--neutral production, a slow particle on the proton side of the magnet, and one particle on the pion side--combined to provide an effective trigger for the spark chambers.

III. Data Collection

The plan and elevation views of the spark chambers were recorded on 35mm film through independent optical systems¹⁸ with a 90° stereo angle. Fiducials were located at 5 cm. intervals alongside each chamber and used to eliminate large scale optical distortions. A data box, photographed simultaneously, contained the frame and run numbers and lights indicating which hodoscope counters were involved in the event trigger.

The time of flight for each of the lambda decay products was recorded by photographing two 4-gun cathode ray tubes.¹⁹ A pulse pair was displayed

corresponding to signals from each end of the 6 EH and 7 P2 counters. An initial time marker was taken from beam counter B2 (see Figure 2). The time scale was calibrated with a 50 MHz sine wave once every 100 frames, and zero-time constants were established using e^+e^- pairs ($\beta = 1$). The time of flight resolution after removing path length differences was ± 1 ns.

The events in data sample A were collected along with $\Lambda \rightarrow p e \bar{\nu}$ data during several long running periods. The beam momentum for this data was 1025 MeV/c. Data sample B was obtained in two weeks of running during which background and beam rates were quite uniform. As a safeguard against systematic errors, three passes were made over the momentum interval 930 to 1130 MeV/c. Calibration and background information was obtained from data taken with the beam momentum set below ΛK^0 threshold, and at several momenta with the target empty. Beam track pictures were used to measure the average length of beam particles in the target, and cosmic ray pictures were used to check the alignment of the spark chambers.

IV. Data Processing

The film was scanned twice. Scanners were instructed to look for vee--events consisting of a pair of tracks having the correct charge and originating in a specified region around the target. It was also required that these tracks could be extrapolated to within half a counter width to the hodoscope counter which produced the event trigger. This double scan found vees in about 20% of the frames with an efficiency $> 96\%$. A typical pair of spark chamber pictures is shown in Figure 3.

At this point, the film for sample B went directly to be spark measured (see below) while that for sample A was processed in parallel with the $\Lambda\beta$ data. For data sample A, the 8-gun oscilloscope film was measured on image plane digitizers. A cut was imposed on the positive particle time of flight to reject positrons. Typically 75% of the frames survived this cut with a loss of less than 4% of the $\Lambda p\pi$ events. The spark chamber film was measured on image plane digitizers with a least count of .007 cm. (real space equivalent).

For data sample B, vees found by the scanners were digitized by Alice²⁰ a general-purpose flying spot scanner coupled to a PDP-10 computer at the Argonne National Laboratory Applied Mathematics Division. The film was measured in two passes, the second of which was aided by a hand-drawn sketch of the correct sparks to insure high measuring efficiency ($> 96\%$). Beam tracks were measured only for those frames which contained a single unobscured beam track. About 20% of the events did not have a beam track measurement, and the appropriate correction has been applied in the cross section calculation.

For both samples A and B spatially reconstructed spark positions along the two tracks of the vee were fit simultaneously to determine the particle momenta.²¹ In this procedure the tracks were required to have a common vertex. The χ^2 minimization procedure included the effects of spark and fiducial measuring errors, multiple coulomb scattering, spark staggering, and momentum loss (assuming the particles to be a proton and π^-).

V. Event Selection

During the scanning and measuring process essentially all the non-vee

frames were eliminated. The remaining sample of $\Lambda p\pi$ events, e^+e^- pairs, and π^-p scatters were subjected to the criteria listed in Table I. The three constraint quantities for $\pi^-p \rightarrow \Lambda K^0$ were taken to be the invariant mass of the vee (assuming π^- and p), the momentum of the Λ transverse to the production plane, and the missing mass recoiling from the Λ . Histograms of these quantities are shown in Figure 4. The missing mass plot in Figure 4 shows the separation of ΛK^0 and $\Sigma^0 K^0$ events. A cut on the missing mass at 535 MeV/c results in less than 2% contamination of the ΛK^0 sample by $\Sigma^0 K^0$ events. Comparison of our value for the K^0 mass with the present world average confirms our beam momentum calibration to within ± 3 MeV/c.

VI. Cross Sections

In determining total cross sections, the data from sample A were not used because of the uncertainty in the normalization. However, for determination of the angular distributions and polarizations samples A and B are treated identically.

From the incident pion flux and the "Neutrals" counting rate, we have calculated the cross section for $\pi^-p \rightarrow$ all neutral final states:

$$\sigma(\text{Neutrals}) = \frac{N}{B^*} \frac{1}{n \ell_T \Omega_N} - (\text{Target Empty}). \quad (1)$$

Here n is the target density (0.42×10^{23} protons/cm³); ℓ_T is the total length of hydrogen (35 cm); Ω_N is the "Neutral" detection efficiency and is 1 in this experiment; the number of "Neutral" counts is N ; and the number of effective beam pion counts is B^* . Data taken at seven momenta with the target empty

determined the non-hydrogen rates which we subtracted. In determining B^* we have included the following corrections: random anticoincidences (10%); π^- interaction losses including delta rays which hit the target anticounter (20%); beam divergence effects (20%); and muon contamination (3%).¹⁷ The resulting cross sections are compared with those from other experiments in Figure 5. Our statistical errors are negligible; however, there is an overall uncertainty in the above corrections of about $\pm 5\%$. The agreement of our cross sections with the world's data indicates the reliability of our calculation of the effective pion flux.

Our $\pi^- p \rightarrow \Lambda K^0$ cross section is calculated from

$$\sigma_K = \frac{N_{\Lambda K}}{B^*} \frac{1}{nl \Omega_{\Lambda K}} Q - (\text{Target Empty}). \quad (2)$$

The number of ΛK^0 events is $N_{\Lambda K}$; B^* is the effective pion flux including the corrections discussed above for the Neutrals cross section; l is the length of hydrogen in the production fiducial volume; and Q is a correction for scanning and measuring losses (5%) and for events without a measured beam track (20%). The detection efficiency, $\Omega_{\Lambda K}$, was determined by a Monte Carlo simulation which took account of the effects of the triggering geometry, target escape efficiency, momentum loss, multiple coulomb scattering, and decays in the flight of the pion. The efficiency for the Λ to escape from our target is a sensitive function of the Λ lifetime. We have used a lifetime value of $\tau^0 = 0.25$ nsec. The following empirical formula can be used to adjust the cross sections presented here for a revised value of the Λ lifetime, τ ,

$$\frac{\sigma - \sigma^0}{\sigma^0} = - \frac{10.2}{(p-897)^{.324}} \frac{\tau - \tau^0}{\tau^0},$$

where p is the laboratory beam momentum in MeV/c. For the branching ratio $(\Lambda \rightarrow p\pi^-)/(\Lambda \rightarrow \text{all states})$ we have used $0.640 \pm .005$. The resulting cross sections, together with those from other experiments, are shown in Figure 6a. Our values are given in Table II. Our quoted errors are statistical only; however, we estimate that there is a $\pm 10\%$ uncertainty in the overall normalization. The uncorrected yield of lambdas from $\pi^- p \rightarrow \Sigma^0 K^0$ is shown in Figure 7.

VII. Polarization and Angular Distributions

Parity conservation in the production process requires that the lambdas may only be polarized along the normal to the production plane, $\hat{n} \equiv \hat{\Lambda} \times \hat{\pi}$. In the parity violating decay $\Lambda \rightarrow p\pi$ the angular distribution of the proton with respect to the Λ spin is

$$f(\phi) = \frac{1}{2} (1 + \alpha P \cos \phi), \quad (3)$$

where α is the decay asymmetry parameter;³⁵ P is the Λ polarization, and $\cos \phi \equiv \hat{n} \cdot \hat{p}$ where $\hat{p}$ is a unit vector along the decay proton direction. To cancel symmetric biases, we have estimated αP by the ratio of moments³⁶

$$\alpha P = \langle \cos \phi \rangle / \langle \cos^2 \phi \rangle. \quad (4)$$

In this way the polarization, $P(\cos \theta)$, was determined in each of 10 production cosine bins. ($\cos \theta \equiv \pi \cdot K$ in the production center of mass.) Our Monte Carlo simulation shows no appreciable bias on αP (i. e., $< .02$). Comparison of αP calculated from Λ 's produced to the left (spin up) and from those produced to the right (spin down) also shows no bias.

Our Monte Carlo simulation gives the detection efficiency for all values of $\cos \theta$ and is used to correct for bias in the observed angular distributions. The efficiency functions are shown in Figure 8 for several beam momenta. The corrected differential cross section, $\sigma(\theta)$, is normalized to the integrated cross section calculated above and is given in Table II together with the product $\sigma(\theta)P(\theta)$. Also given is the average polarization defined as

$$\langle P \rangle = \int \sigma(\theta)P(\theta)d\Omega / \int \sigma(\theta)d\Omega, \quad (5)$$

and the production asymmetry, $A_{\Lambda K} = 2(B-F)/(B+F)$, where B and F are the numbers of lambdas going either backward or forward in the production center of mass. The cross section, average Λ polarization, and the production asymmetry are shown in Figure 6.

The angular distributions expanded in Legendre polynomials are

$$\sigma(\theta) = \sum_{\ell=0} A_{\ell} P_{\ell}, \quad (6)$$

and

$$\sigma(\theta)P(\theta) = \sum_{\ell=1} B_{\ell} P_{\ell}^1. \quad (7)$$

These have been independently fit for A_{ℓ} and B_{ℓ} with $\ell \leq 3$; higher terms are not significantly different from zero. The coefficients are given in Table III and are compared with the data of Doyle³³ and Binford, et al.³² in Figures 9a and 9b.

VIII. Amplitude Analysis

We observe no large enhancement in the ΛK^0 cross section; however, just

at ΣK threshold, we do observe a small dip in the cross section and a simultaneous increase in the backward-forward asymmetry (see Figure 6). These changes occur over too small a momentum interval to be directly associated with known πN resonances whose widths are typically 100 MeV. These narrow features can be associated with the isospin $1/2$ ΣK cross section which increases rapidly from threshold, and is approximately equal to the ΛK^0 cross section 35 MeV/c above threshold. The conditions necessary for interference of the $I = 1/2$ ΣK amplitude and the ΛK^0 S-wave amplitude are met as follows: (a) the $I = 1/2$ ΣK system is an S-wave near threshold;¹² (b) the ΛK^0 system is pure isospin $1/2$, and is about 50% S-wave near ΣK threshold;³⁸⁻⁴⁰ and (c) the $\Lambda \Sigma$ relative parity is even.³⁷

Several previous analyses³⁸⁻⁴⁰ or $\pi^- p \rightarrow \Lambda K^0$ have found the dominant amplitudes to be resonant S_{11} and P_{11} waves with smaller $J = 3/2$ (either P_{13} or D_{13}) amplitudes. The $J = 5/2$ amplitudes appear to be very small. We assume that the S_{11} (1700) resonance decays to both ΛK^0 and $|\Sigma K, I = 1/2\rangle$ states and treat the threshold effect in a manner similar to Flatté, et al.¹⁰ and Votava and Thompson.⁸ The ΛK^0 S-wave amplitude (with no background terms) is

$$S_{\Lambda K} = (\Gamma_{\pi p} \Gamma_{\Lambda K})^{1/2} / (2(E_R - E) - i\Gamma_T), \quad (8)$$

where the total width, Γ_T , represents a sum over all decay channels, πp , ΛK^0 , ΣK , and so on. The ΣK partial width is given by

$$\Gamma_{\Sigma K} = \begin{cases} b |q| & \text{above threshold} \\ ib |q| e^{-|\xi q|} & \text{below threshold,} \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

where q is the momentum in this channel. The factor $e^{-|\xi q|}$ has been intro-

duced to allow different coefficients above and below threshold.⁴¹ The proportionality constant, b , is fixed by the known $|\Sigma K, I = 1/2\rangle$ cross section (550 μ barns at 1080 MeV/c).⁴²

Higher partial wave amplitudes are parameterized as Breit-Wigner resonances with a slowly varying background:

$$f_l = e^{i\phi} (\Gamma_{\pi p} \Gamma_{\Lambda K})^{1/2} / (2(E_R - E) - i\Gamma_T) + q^{2l+1} (C_1 + C_2 q + \dots) \quad (10)$$

Here we have followed the example of Orito and Sasaki³⁹ except that we have included an overall phase, ϕ , for each resonance.⁴⁰

We have found χ^2 minima corresponding to two initial assumptions for relevant amplitudes: (I) S_{11} , P_{11} , and P_{13} ; and (II) S_{11} , P_{11} , and D_{13} . In addition, each of these solutions also contains small $J = 5/2$ background amplitudes. Only the data from this experiment were used in the χ^2 minimization.⁴³ There were 30 values of $\sigma(\theta)$ and $\sigma(\theta)P(\theta)$ at each of 15 beam momenta for a total of 450 data points. (The normalization for data sample A was taken from sample B.) Typically 11 parameters were varied to find a priori reasonable solutions; that is, we required S_{11} and P_{11} to be the dominant amplitudes.

The two solutions (corresponding to I and II above) have χ^2 of 460 and 463 with confidence levels of 23% and 20% respectively. Solution I corresponds to the solid curves in Figure 10. The parameter values in this fit are given in Table IV and are quite similar to those of references 39 and 40.

Solutions excluding the cusp are found by setting $\Gamma_{\Sigma K} = 0$ and reminimizing χ^2 . The resulting χ^2 values are 522 and 516, with confidence levels of 0.34% and 0.63% for solutions I and II respectively. Solution I is shown in Figure 10 by the dashed curves.

In all cases our parameters do not depart significantly from the currently accepted values. However, by including the cusp effect at ΣK threshold, we obtain good agreement with the observed dip in $\sigma(\Lambda K)$ and the increase in $A_{\Lambda K}$ with a substantial improvement χ^2 . We note that including the cusp introduces no additional freedom into the model as $\Gamma_{\Sigma K}$ is fixed by the $I = 1/2$ ΣK cross section.

We wish to express our gratitude to the staff of the ZGS Complex at Argonne National Laboratory, and in particular to E. Hayes, J. Terandy, C. Rush, J. Upton, and D. Burant. We thank O. Van Dyck, S. Frankel, G. Snape, and W. Flatté of the University of Pennsylvania for showing us their data before publication. The hospitality and cooperation of the Argonne National Laboratory Applied Mathematics Division, and the assistance of D. Hodges, B. Kroupa, R. Wehman and J. Haasl, is gratefully acknowledged. We are also grateful to S. Watson for help with the data analysis and to the scanners and measurers at the University of Chicago and Ohio State University.

TABLE I. Criteria used in selection of events.

-
-
- (1) Decay fiducial volume outside the target veto counter.
 - (2) Decay products must not intersect the target veto counter.
 - (3) Decay pion range greater than the distance to the pion hodoscope.
 - (4) Decay pion momentum $\leq 170 \text{ MeV}/c$.
 - (5) $\pi^- p$ effective mass between 1090 and 1140 MeV/c^2 .
 - (6) One measured beam track.
 - (7) Momentum of the Λ transverse to the production plane $\leq 70 \text{ MeV}/c$.
 - (8) Production vertex in the target fiducial volume.
 - (9) Missing mass at the production vertex
 - (a) Between 460 and 535 MeV/c^2 for $\pi^- p \rightarrow \Lambda K^0$.
 - (b) Greater than 535 MeV/c^2 for $\pi^- p \rightarrow \Sigma^0 K^0$.
-
-

TABLE II. Summary of cross sections, angular distributions and polarizations for data sample A (1025 MeV/c) and sample B (other momenta). No cross section was determined for sample A; here $\sigma(\theta)$ is normalized to sample B. The quoted error is statistical; in addition, there is a 10% uncertainty in the cross section normalization.

MeV/c	930 $\pm$ 6		980 $\pm$ 6		997 $\pm$ 6		1007 $\pm$ 6		1012 $\pm$ 6		1017 $\pm$ 6		1022 $\pm$ 6		1025 $\pm$ 12	
cos θ	σ	$\Delta\sigma$	σ	$\Delta\sigma$	σ	$\Delta\sigma$	σ	$\Delta\sigma$	σ	$\Delta\sigma$	σ	$\Delta\sigma$	σ	$\Delta\sigma$	σ	$\Delta\sigma$
0.95	19.4	12.6	79.4	23.1	116.7	30.9	85.7	23.5	90.3	26.0	116.5	27.8	90.2	23.2	134.4	23.3
0.85	38.0	17.2	51.7	14.7	78.0	18.2	72.1	15.4	113.0	21.2	86.3	15.5	110.9	17.4	93.8	9.2
0.75	42.6	16.5	55.4	13.4	71.2	14.9	67.6	12.7	120.8	18.6	110.7	15.0	102.6	14.0	112.0	8.3
0.65	21.9	10.1	42.7	10.3	65.6	12.7	91.9	13.3	68.2	12.3	87.5	11.8	68.4	10.1	90.4	6.2
0.55	18.7	8.5	46.8	10.0	69.6	12.2	68.4	10.7	77.5	12.3	64.8	9.5	85.5	10.7	78.3	5.3
0.45	13.3	6.7	40.3	8.7	62.0	11.0	67.9	10.2	63.4	10.7	65.7	9.2	66.1	9.1	68.1	4.8
0.35	18.6	7.7	46.4	9.1	68.1	11.2	75.3	10.6	64.7	10.6	44.5	7.4	49.2	7.7	48.7	3.9
0.25	24.0	8.6	36.8	7.9	47.6	9.3	52.0	8.7	54.1	9.7	40.8	7.1	42.2	7.1	61.0	4.4
0.15	12.0	6.1	28.4	7.0	49.6	9.5	55.4	9.0	47.9	9.1	58.4	8.5	50.0	7.8	47.8	3.9
0.05	6.2	4.4	30.8	7.3	70.8	11.6	40.7	7.8	47.4	9.2	56.1	8.5	54.9	8.3	57.7	4.3
-0.05	12.9	6.5	51.6	9.8	56.5	10.5	36.1	7.5	45.4	9.2	42.5	7.5	59.3	8.8	41.9	3.7
-0.15	13.7	6.9	43.0	9.1	39.4	8.9	36.1	7.6	56.7	10.5	38.9	7.3	45.8	7.8	50.5	4.2
-0.25	11.0	6.4	37.6	8.8	24.9	7.2	34.6	7.6	51.5	10.2	56.1	9.0	42.4	7.7	43.7	3.9
-0.35	19.6	8.9	25.3	7.4	46.2	10.2	45.4	9.1	44.1	9.7	23.8	6.0	47.8	8.4	35.5	3.7
-0.45	16.7	8.5	36.0	9.2	33.0	8.9	28.2	7.4	29.3	8.2	41.5	8.3	39.0	7.9	39.0	4.0
-0.55	17.7	9.0	19.4	6.9	33.4	9.4	32.9	8.3	22.3	7.5	42.3	8.8	31.1	7.4	31.8	3.8
-0.65	14.0	8.3	13.2	6.0	31.5	9.6	30.2	8.5	25.3	8.5	28.2	7.6	21.8	6.7	31.9	4.1
-0.75	0.0	6.9	14.8	6.7	19.8	8.2	38.2	10.5	33.4	10.8	21.7	7.4	16.8	6.4	23.3	3.9
-0.85	16.7	10.1	17.5	8.0	20.0	9.1	10.1	5.9	12.6	7.3	24.5	8.9	27.8	9.5	11.7	3.1
-0.95	13.4	10.3	13.5	8.1	26.1	12.5	13.3	8.0	11.0	8.0	20.2	9.6	8.2	5.9	12.6	4.0
cos θ	σ_P	$\Delta\sigma_P$	σ_P	$\Delta\sigma_P$	σ_P	$\Delta\sigma_P$	σ_P	$\Delta\sigma_P$	σ_P	$\Delta\sigma_P$	σ_P	$\Delta\sigma_P$	σ_P	$\Delta\sigma_P$	σ_P	$\Delta\sigma_P$
0.90	-5.1	25.7	10.2	31.0	41.9	40.7	26.6	31.9	13.2	38.8	30.1	33.7	66.3	33.9	45.1	15.6
0.70	29.5	26.3	40.2	23.0	42.9	26.3	69.4	25.0	80.9	30.8	57.7	24.6	53.7	22.8	82.4	10.6
0.50	-13.1	15.1	55.8	19.7	50.4	22.7	45.6	20.1	53.1	22.7	41.5	17.7	76.3	20.1	62.4	7.8
0.30	37.3	18.0	44.1	17.2	61.6	21.1	31.2	18.2	63.1	20.5	39.1	14.5	57.7	15.4	55.7	6.7
0.10	7.1	10.5	29.4	14.2	44.3	20.6	47.6	17.2	20.7	17.3	56.2	17.1	44.7	15.9	47.3	6.7
-0.10	-9.9	13.1	24.7	17.9	15.4	18.5	9.0	14.2	49.6	19.4	10.3	13.9	78.0	18.0	31.8	6.1
-0.30	16.3	15.2	18.9	15.7	48.5	18.0	-12.3	15.7	75.7	22.1	26.0	15.0	37.0	15.9	-37.3	6.1
-0.50	44.5	22.6	15.3	15.7	29.3	18.0	24.5	15.2	12.7	15.1	28.1	16.6	16.4	14.3	21.2	6.1
-0.70	25.9	24.2	-0.8	12.1	13.1	17.0	28.8	18.2	20.6	18.3	2.0	13.9	0.7	12.2	25.1	6.7
-0.90	41.8	26.8	-36.9	19.7	38.2	22.1	5.5	12.8	-21.8	17.5	26.1	18.2	-19.2	16.4	3.3	5.0
Events	83		323		433		531		479		657		684		2994	
$\sigma(AK)\mu b$	212 $\pm$ 23		467 $\pm$ 26		652 $\pm$ 31		634 $\pm$ 28		686 $\pm$ 31		665 $\pm$ 26		675 $\pm$ 26		—	
$\langle P \rangle$	.99 $\pm$.30		.55 $\pm$.15		.75 $\pm$.13		.56 $\pm$.12		.68 $\pm$.12		.59 $\pm$.10		.78 $\pm$.10		-.74 $\pm$.05	
A_{AK}	.45 $\pm$.20		.51 $\pm$.10		.72 $\pm$.08		.76 $\pm$.08		.77 $\pm$.08		.73 $\pm$.07		.71 $\pm$.07		.84 $\pm$.04	

TABLE II. (Continued.)

MeV/c	1027 $\pm$ 6		1031 $\pm$ 6		1039 $\pm$ 6		1048 $\pm$ 6		1054 $\pm$ 6		1065 $\pm$ 6		1130 $\pm$ 6	
cos θ	σ	$\Delta\sigma$	σ	$\Delta\sigma$	σ	$\Delta\sigma$	σ	$\Delta\sigma$	σ	$\Delta\sigma$	σ	$\Delta\sigma$	σ	$\Delta\sigma$
0.95	106.9	26.7	114.9	32.1	114.7	32.2	96.6	26.4	105.1	34.4	129.2	33.9	72.1	20.5
0.85	107.0	17.3	135.0	23.3	109.5	20.2	115.2	17.9	118.4	23.6	125.7	18.3	78.8	13.5
0.75	86.8	13.0	88.4	15.7	100.7	16.5	63.5	10.9	111.8	19.8	78.1	11.9	79.9	12.4
0.65	89.3	11.9	83.8	13.9	74.2	12.8	69.5	10.6	59.8	13.3	102.5	12.9	60.7	10.7
0.55	99.6	11.9	92.4	13.9	72.5	12.2	56.8	9.2	92.0	16.2	82.8	11.2	54.0	10.6
0.45	75.3	10.0	82.3	12.8	71.7	11.9	85.8	11.3	42.5	10.8	60.6	9.5	31.3	8.6
0.35	68.7	9.4	50.7	9.9	74.5	12.0	46.8	8.2	37.2	10.0	61.1	9.5	39.2	10.5
0.25	55.0	8.4	62.1	10.9	46.7	9.4	48.3	8.3	53.4	12.1	42.0	7.8	26.6	9.1
0.15	53.3	8.3	40.0	8.8	39.7	8.7	50.2	8.5	35.0	9.8	47.7	8.4	43.7	12.1
0.05	57.1	8.7	58.4	10.8	38.4	8.7	45.1	8.1	62.3	13.2	39.3	7.6	27.5	9.4
-0.05	57.5	8.9	35.0	8.5	41.2	9.1	28.6	6.5	57.4	12.7	47.8	8.4	25.5	8.7
-0.15	51.2	8.5	64.0	11.6	36.3	8.6	27.7	6.4	66.7	13.8	28.3	6.4	38.7	10.3
-0.25	39.0	7.6	36.5	8.9	35.5	8.7	33.1	7.1	45.6	11.5	43.3	8.1	26.0	8.0
-0.35	33.5	7.2	40.8	9.7	28.5	8.0	29.9	7.0	17.9	7.3	36.0	7.5	35.6	9.1
-0.45	36.1	7.8	60.8	12.4	32.9	8.9	21.9	6.1	31.9	10.2	32.1	7.3	15.3	5.9
-0.55	29.0	7.3	37.7	10.2	26.0	8.3	14.9	5.3	21.1	8.7	19.4	6.0	18.1	6.5
-0.65	37.6	9.0	21.7	8.3	9.0	5.2	29.9	8.2	36.3	12.3	14.2	5.4	12.3	5.6
-0.75	30.4	9.0	37.5	12.1	7.2	5.1	12.8	5.8	9.7	6.9	12.1	5.5	11.2	5.7
-0.85	35.7	11.2	4.8	4.8	9.2	6.5	9.7	5.7	18.2	10.7	12.1	6.2	16.0	7.4
-0.95	12.9	7.7	25.2	13.3	11.9	8.7	20.9	10.1	15.6	11.4	7.6	5.6	10.0	6.0
cos θ	σ P	$\Delta\sigma$ P	σ P	$\Delta\sigma$ P	σ P	$\Delta\sigma$ P	σ P	$\Delta\sigma$ P	σ P	$\Delta\sigma$ P	σ P	$\Delta\sigma$ P	σ P	$\Delta\sigma$ P
0.90	16.8	30.8	13.9	44.0	2.1	41.2	87.1	35.8	103.8	50.8	41.6	35.3	59.4	28.5
0.70	39.4	20.3	97.3	29.9	83.7	28.9	55.8	20.4	55.0	32.2	76.4	23.0	109.6	24.9
0.50	84.2	19.8	98.9	27.0	44.3	23.0	63.0	19.5	83.3	29.1	80.6	20.9	45.5	19.5
0.30	32.8	15.7	60.0	21.1	46.2	21.1	48.3	16.3	28.9	21.3	53.9	17.4	68.4	23.8
0.10	53.0	15.1	42.8	19.4	36.9	17.2	68.7	17.7	35.1	22.3	30.9	15.3	29.9	21.3
-0.10	15.5	15.1	58.2	20.5	55.2	19.1	31.8	13.2	65.2	26.5	56.9	16.3	38.0	19.1
-0.30	25.4	13.4	17.6	17.6	36.0	17.2	48.7	15.4	9.3	18.2	56.6	16.9	40.5	17.7
-0.50	31.7	13.9	38.1	22.3	32.5	17.6	19.5	11.8	36.0	20.2	27.5	13.8	-1.6	11.6
-0.70	32.5	16.3	7.1	19.4	10.5	10.8	14.4	13.6	11.9	19.2	5.8	10.2	5.1	10.5
-0.90	25.4	18.0	32.7	19.4	-1.7	14.2	0.6	14.5	-8.4	20.8	-1.0	10.7	9.7	13.0
Events	709		475		413		526		318		618		314	
$\sigma(\Lambda K)\mu b$	737 $\pm$ 28		734 $\pm$ 34		620 $\pm$ 31		568 $\pm$ 25		651 $\pm$ 37		640 $\pm$ 26		462 $\pm$ 26	
$\langle P \rangle$	.61 $\pm$.10		.80 $\pm$.12		.71 $\pm$.13		.97 $\pm$.12		.81 $\pm$.15		.84 $\pm$.11		1.12 $\pm$.15	
$A_{\Lambda K}$	.75 $\pm$.07		.76 $\pm$.08		1.03 $\pm$.09		.98 $\pm$.08		.77 $\pm$.10		1.01 $\pm$.07		.84 $\pm$.10	

TABLE III. Legendre polynomial coefficients as determined by a least squares fit with $l \leq 3$. The 1025 MeV/c entries are from data sample A; all others are from sample B. In these fits we used 20 points in $\sigma(\theta)$ and 10 points in $\sigma(\theta)P(\theta)$ so there are 16 degrees of freedom for A_l and 7 for the B_l .

Momentum	A_1/A_0	A_2/A_0	A_3/A_0	χ^2/DF	B_1/A_0	B_2/A_0	B_3/A_0	χ^2/DF
930	.34±.26	.54±.29	.18±.34	.48	1.10±.36	.46±.32	.46±.26	1.77
980	.68±.13	.01±.16	.15±.17	.82	.74±.16	.40±.13	-.11±.11	.72
997	.71±.11	.10±.14	.00±.16	.86	.92±.15	.17±.12	.10±.11	.68
1007	.80±.10	.08±.12	.04±.13	.96	.65±.13	.30±.11	.18±.09	1.03
1012	.88±.10	.17±.13	.19±.13	.76	.90±.15	.27±.12	-.09±.10	1.85
1017	.81±.09	.34±.11	.26±.12	1.45	.72±.12	.23±.10	.09±.09	.86
1022	.85±.09	.17±.11	.29±.11	1.11	1.03±.13	.39±.10	-.11±.09	.97
1025	.92±.05	.27±.06	.32±.06	2.16	.91±.05	.31±.04	.09±.03	1.22
1027	.81±.08	.19±.11	.07±.11	.61	.73±.15	.15±.12	.13±.11	.47
1031	.99±.10	.26±.13	.40±.15	1.58	.95±.13	.35±.11	.16±.09	.81
1039	1.15±.11	.30±.14	.11±.15	.64	.91±.15	.23±.12	-.03±.09	.61
1048	.98±.10	.27±.13	.02±.14	1.24	1.22±.14	.39±.12	.03±.10	.90
1054	.98±.14	.33±.17	.30±.18	1.92	.99±.19	.39±.16	.12±.14	1.14
1065	1.12±.10	.38±.12	.23±.12	.97	1.07±.12	.35±.10	-.01±.08	1.10
1130	1.00±.12	.41±.16	.23±.16	.79	1.35±.19	.73±.14	.20±.12	1.28

TABLE IV. Partial wave parameters. The first column gives our parameters for solution I including the cusp. In the second column are E_R , Γ_T , and $\Gamma_{\pi p}/\Gamma_T$ from the πN analysis of Almelhed and Lovelace.⁴⁴ For $(\Gamma_{\pi p}\Gamma_{\Lambda K})^{1/2}/\Gamma_T$, we give the range of values from Wagner and Lovelace.⁴⁰ Partial widths are evaluated at the resonance energy. For this solution $\xi = 1.0f$; and $\chi^2 = 460$.

	S_{11}		P_{11}		P_{13}		D_{13}		D_{15}		F_{15}	
	Our fit	Ref. 40, 44	Our fit	Ref. 40, 44	Our fit	Ref. 40, 44	Our fit	Ref. 40, 44	Our fit	Ref. 40, 44	Our fit	Ref. 40, 44
E_R	1675	1670	1670	≈ 1720	1850	≈ 1850	0	1520	0	1683	1685	1688
Γ_{TOT}	170	120	174	≈ 160	327	≈ 300	0	120	0	150	155	140
$\Gamma_{\pi p}$	30		36		85		0		0		105	
$\Gamma_{\Lambda K}$	15		8.2		20		0		0	$< .2$	.02	$< .1$
$\Gamma_{\Sigma K}$	40											
$\Gamma_{\pi p}/\Gamma_{TOT}$	.18	.33	.21	.13	.26	$\approx .17$	0	.39	0	.30	.68	.43
$(\Gamma_{\pi p} \cdot \Gamma_{\Lambda K})^{1/2}$		.17		.13								
$\frac{(\Gamma_{\pi p} \cdot \Gamma_{\Lambda K})^{1/2}}{\Gamma_{TOT}}$	.12	to .19	.10	to .17	.13	$\approx .10$	0	$\sim .08$	0		.01	
ϕ	0°		70°		31°		0		0		37°	
Background												
$C_1 \times 10^2$	0		0		0		0		$.11 \pm .08i$		0	
$C_2 \times 10^2$	0		0		0		0		0		0	

REFERENCES

- * Research supported in part by the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission, the National Science Foundation, and the Louis Block Fund of the University of Chicago.
- + Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Ph. D. in Physics at the University of Chicago. Present address: Joseph Henry Laboratory, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey 08540.
- ** Present address: Science Applications, Inc., 1651 Old Meadow Road, Mclean, Virginia 22101.
- || Present address: Department of Physics, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61801.
- † Present address: Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87106.
- ++ Present address: Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, Long Island, New York 11973.

1. J. Lindquist, R.L. Sumner, J.M. Watson, R. Winston, D.M. Wolfe, P.R. Phillips, E.C. Swallow, K. Reibel, D.M. Schwartz, A.J. Stevens and T.A. Romanowski, Phys. Rev. Letters 27, 612 (1971).
2. B. Nelson, T.M. Knasel, J. Lindquist, R.L. Sumner, E.C. Swallow, R. Winston, D.M. Wolfe, J.M. Watson, P.R. Phillips, K. Reibel, D.M. Schwartz, A.J. Stevens and T.A. Romanowski, Phys. Rev. Letters 31, 901 (1973).
3. E.P. Wigner, Phys. Rev. 73, 1002 (1948).
4. G. Breit, Phys. Rev. 107, 1612 (1957).
5. R.K. Adair, Phys. Rev. 111, 632 (1958).
6. A.N. Baz and L.B. Okun, Soviet Physics - JETP 35, 526 (1959).
7. R.H. Dalitz, "Strange Particles and Strong Interactions", Oxford University Press, Amen House, London, E. C. 4 (1962) p. 122.
8. H.J. Votava and W.J. Thompson, Phys. Letters 41B, 405 (1972).
9. Philip Malmberg, Phys. Rev. 101, 114 (1956); and H.W. Newson, R.M. Williamson, K.W. Jones, J.H. Gibbons, and H. Marshak, Phys. Rev. 108, 1294 (1957).
10. S.M. Flatté, M. Alston-Garnjost, A. Barbaro-Galtieri, J.H. Friedman, G.R. Lynch, S.D. Protopopescu, M.S. Rabin and F.T. Solmitz, Phys. Letters 38B, 232 (1972).
11. F. Eisler, P. Franzini, J.M. Gaillard, A. Garfinkel, J. Keren, R. Plano, A. Prodell, and M. Schwartz, Rev. Mod. Phys. 33, 436 (1961), and F. Eisler, J.M. Gaillard, J. Keren, M. Schwartz and S.E. Wolfe, Proceedings of the Aix-en-Provence International Conference on Elementary Particles, (C.E.N., Saclay, 1962), Vol. I, p. 203.

12. S.E. Wolfe, N. Schmitz, L.J. Lloyd, W. Laskar, F.S. Crawford, Jr., J. Button, J.A. Anderson, and G. Alexander, Rev. Mod. Phys. 33, 439 (1961); and J.A. Anderson, F.S. Crawford, B.B. Crawford, R.L. Golden, F. Grard, L.J. Lloyd, G.W. Meisner, L. R. Price, and G.A. Smith, Proceedings of the International Conference on High Energy Physics, CERN, 1962, (CERN, Geneva, 1962), page 270.
13. J. Keren, Phys. Rev. 133, B457 (1964).
14. J.J. Jones, T. Bowen, W.R. Dawes, D.A. Delise, D.W. Jenkins, R.M. Kalbach, E.I. Malamud, K.J. Neild, and D.V. Petersen, Phys. Rev. Letters 26, 860 (1971).
15. O. Van Dyck, R. Blumenthal, S. Frankel, V. Highland, J. Nagy, T. Sloan, M. Takats, W. Wales, and R. Werbeck, Phys. Rev. Letters 23, 50 (1969).
16. A.J. Stevens, D. M. Schwartz, C.J. Rush, K. Reibel, T.A. Romanowski, R.L. Sumner, E.C. Swallow, J.M. Watson, R. Winston and D.M. Wolfe, Nucl. Instr. and Methods 97, 207 (1971). The momentum was calibrated at 997, 1007, 1018, and 1027 MeV/c.
17. G.J. Marmer, K. Reibel, D.M. Schwartz, A. Stevens, P.R. Phillips, E.C. Swallow, R. Winston, D.M. Wolfe, T.A. Romanowski, and C.J. Rush, Phys. Rev. 179, 1294 (1969); and Argonne National Laboratory Report, ANL/HEP 6801 (1968).
18. T.A. Romanowski, E.R. Hayes, J. Terandy, and K. Reibel, Nucl. Instr. and Methods 73, 117 (1969).
19. R.L. Sumner, Nucl. Instr. and Methods 100, 371 (1972).

20. D. Hodges, J. Lindquist, B. Nelson, E. C. Swallow, and D.M. Schwartz, Nucl. Instr. and Methods 108, 551 (1973).
21. P.R. Phillips, Nucl. Instr. and Methods 75, 71 (1969).
22. L. Baggett, Thesis, University of California at Berkeley, UCRL 8302, (1958, unpublished).
23. L. Bertanza, A. Bigi, R. Carrara and R. Casali, Nuovo Cimento 44A, 712 (1966).
24. G. Bizard, Y. Déclais, J. Duchon, J.L. Laville, J. Séguinot, C. Bricman, J.M. Perreau, and C. Valladas, Phys. Letters 31B, 481 (1970).
25. F. Bulos, R.E. Lanou, A.E. Pifer, A.M. Shapiro, C.A. Bordner, A.E. Brenner, M.E. Law, E. E. Ronat, F. D. Rudnick, K. Strauch, J.J. Szymanski, P. Bastien, B.B. Brabson, Y. Eisenberg, B.T. Feld, V.K. Kistiakowski, I.A. Pless, L. Rosenon, R.K. Yamamoto, G. Calvelli, F. Gasparini, L. Guerriero, G.A. Salandin, A. Tomasin, L. Ventura, C. Voci, and F. Waldner, Phys. Rev. 187, 1827 (1969).
26. C.B. Chiu, R.D. Eandi, A.C. Helmholtz, R.W. Kenney, B.J. Moyer, J.A. Poirier and W.B. Richards, R.J. Cence, V.Z. Peterson, N.K. Sehgal, and V.J. Stenger, Phys. Rev. 156, 1415 (1967).
27. I. Derado and N. Schmitz, Phys. Rev. 118, 309 (1960).
28. R. Turlay, Thesis, University of Paris, C.E.A. 2136 (1962, unpublished).
29. L. Bertanza, P.L. Connolly, B.B. Culwick, F.R. Eisler, T. Morris, R. Palmer, A. Prodell, and N.P. Samios, Phys. Rev. Letters 8, 332 (1962).

30. L. B. Auerbach, D. Bowen, J. Dobbs, K. Lande, A. K. Mann, F. J. Sciulli, H. Uto, D. H. White and K. K. Young, *Nuovo Cimento* 47, 19 (1967).
31. P. Hargis, Thesis, University of Pennsylvania (1972, unpublished); and G. Snape, Thesis, University of Pennsylvania (1973, unpublished).
32. T. O. Binford, M. L. Good, V. G. Lind, D. Stern, R. Krauss, and E. Dettman, *Phys. Rev.* 183, 1134 (1969).
33. J. C. Doyle, Thesis, University of California at Berkeley, UCRL 18139 (1969, unpublished).
34. J. A. Anderson, Thesis, University of California at Berkeley, UCRL 10838 (1963, unpublished); and F. S. Crawford, M. Cresti, M. L. Good, K. Gottstein, E. M. Lyman, F. T. Solmitz, M. L. Stevenson and H. K. Ticho, *Phys. Rev.* 108, 1102 (1957).
35. For the proton asymmetry parameter in the $\Lambda \rightarrow p\pi^-$ decay ($\alpha = .646 \pm .016$) we use the average from the Review of Particle Properties [Particle Data Group, *Phys. Lett.* 39B, 1 (1972)] .
36. R. Bangerter, Thesis, University of California at Berkeley, UCRL 19244 (1969).
37. H. Courant, H. Filthuth, P. Franzini, R. Glasser, A. Minguzzi-Ranzi, A. Segar, and W. Willis, R. A. Burnstein, T. B. Day, B. Kehoe, A. J. Herz, M. Sakitt, B. Sechi-Zorn, N. Seeman, and G. A. Snow, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 10, 409 (1963); and C. Alft, N. Gelfand, U. Nauenberg, M. Nussbaum, J. Schultz, J. Steinberger, H. Brugger, L. Korsch, R. Plano, D. Berley and A. Prodell, *Phys. Rev.* 137, B1105 (1965).
38. J. E. Rush, Jr., *Phys. Rev.* 173 (1968).
39. S. Orito and S. Sasaki, *Nuovo Cimento* 1, 936 (1969).

40. F. Wagner and C. Lovelace, Nucl. Phys. B25, 411 (1971).
41. In general, the coefficients of $|q|$ in equation (9) may be different above and below threshold (see references 4 and 7). Although this parameter is not crucial to our fits, ξ takes on reasonable values ($\hbar/m_\pi$) resulting in a small improvement in χ^2 .
42. The $|\Sigma K, I = 1/2\rangle$ cross section was calculated from the cross sections compiled by E. Bracci, J. P. Droulez, E. Flaminio, J. D. Hansen, and D. R. P. Morrison, CERN/HERA 72-1 (1972).
43. The χ^2 minimizing program is Minuit from the CERN program library. The method is given by H. H. Rosenbrock, Computer Journal 3, 175 (1960).
44. S. Almehed and C. Lovelace, Nucl. Phys. B40, 157 (1972). Note that

$$\Gamma_{\pi p} = 2/3 \Gamma_{\pi N}.$$

FIGURES

1. Beam transport system. The intensity of protons incident on the beryllium target just upstream of Q1 was monitored by the "90 degree" counter telescope. An adjustable collimator, located at the first focus determined the momentum acceptance.
2. Plan view of the apparatus showing a typical $\Lambda \rightarrow p\pi^-$ event. The gas Cherenkov counter, C1, was used to veto electrons in the beam. Counter B4 has a 2.54 cm. hole and was used in anticoincidence. The trigger requirements are: Neutral production = $\overline{C1} \cdot B1 \cdot B2 \cdot B3 \cdot \overline{B4} \cdot \overline{T}$; Proton = $P1 \cdot P2 \cdot P3 \cdot \overline{C2}$; and Pion = EH.
3. Plan and elevation view spark chamber pictures. Images of several chambers have been displaced to fit within our 35mm film format.
4. Constraint quantities: (a) Pion-proton invariant mass; (b) momentum of the Λ transverse to the production plane; and (c) the missing mass recoiling from the Λ . A cut at $535 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ in the missing mass is used to separate ΛK^0 and $\Sigma^0 K^0$ events.
5. Cross section for $\pi^- p \rightarrow \text{Neutrals}$ (all neutral final states). Our statistical errors are negligible; however, we estimate the uncertainty in the overall normalization to be $\pm 5\%$. The data are from the following sources:
 $\square$ ref. 22; $\triangle$ ref. 23; $\circ$ ref. 24; ∇ ref. 25; $\blacksquare$ ref. 26; $\blacktriangle$ ref. 27; $\blacktriangledown$ ref. 28;
 and $\bullet$ this experiment.

6. (a) The $\pi^- p \rightarrow \Lambda K^0$ cross section; (b) the average Λ polarization; and (c) the backward-forward production asymmetry, $A_{\Lambda K}$. Our quoted errors are statistical; however, there is an additional uncertainty of 10% in the overall cross section normalization. The data are taken from the following sources: ∇ ref. 30; $\square$ ref. 29; $\blacksquare$ ref. 32; $\blacktriangledown$ ref. 12, 33 and 34; $\times$ ref. 11, $\triangle$ ref. 15; $\diamond$ ref. 31; $\circ$ ref. 14; $\blacktriangle$ ref. 13; and $\bullet$ from this experiment.
7. Uncorrected yield of Λ 's from $\pi^- p \rightarrow \Sigma^0 K^0$.
8. The detection efficiency of our apparatus as a function of $\cos\theta$ for several beam momenta.
9. (a) Legendre polynomial coefficients for $\sigma(\theta)$. (b) Legendre coefficients for $\sigma(\theta)P(\theta)$. Open circles are from reference 33, the open squares from reference 32, and the closed circles are the values from this experiment.
10. Solution I compared to data. Data references are the same as for Figure 6. Here the solid line represents solution I including the cusp at ΣK threshold and the dashed line represents the result of minimizing χ^2 with $\Gamma_{\Sigma K} = 0$ (no cusp).