C00 264-601

EFI 72-5

MEASURING $\pi\text{-}\pi$ PHASE SHIFTS IN
COLLIDING BEAM EXPERIMENTS

Carl E. Carlson
Enrico Fermi Inst., University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., 60637

and

Wu-Ki Tung

The Enrico Fermi Institute
and the Department of Physics
The University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois 60637

JANUARY, 1972

Contract No. AT (11-1)-264

C00 264-601

January, 1972

MEASURING $\pi\text{-}\pi$ PHASE SHIFTS IN
COLLIDING BEAM EXPERIMENTS*

Carl E. Carlson

Enrico Fermi Inst., University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., 60637

and

Wu-Ki Tung

The Enrico Fermi Institute
and the Department of Physics

The University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois 60637

ABSTRACT

The possibility of exploiting the unique features of the two photon process $ee \rightarrow ee\pi\pi$ in colliding beam experiments to measure the even partial wave $\pi\text{-}\pi$ phase shifts is examined in detail. The commonly used Weizsacker-Williams approximation is shown to be inadequate. An exact procedure of phenomenological analysis to extract the relevant phase shifts is formulated. Dynamical (model-dependent) calculations are performed separately to study the expected effects due to the final state pion-pion interaction. The sensitivity of the measured cross-sections to various prominent features of the s-wave $\pi\text{-}\pi$ phase shifts (scattering length, existence of scalar meson resonance) is investigated.

*Supported in part by the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission.

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.

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

MASTER

phd

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.

I. INTRODUCTION

It has been generally recognized by now that in the forthcoming generation of e^+e^- and e^-e^- colliding beam experiments at energies of 3 GeV or higher, the two photon processes will play a dominant role. Calculations based on quantum electrodynamics indicate that the cross-section for this new type of process become larger than that of the single photon annihilation processes (which has dominated colliding beam physics up to now) at about 1.5 - 2.0 GeV energy per beam.¹⁻³ Motivated by these developements, we studied, in a previous paper⁴ (hereafter referred to as I), the general features of two photon processes in colliding beam experiments for arbitrary hadronic final states⁵ and investigated the new possibilities offered by this new type of process in studying hadron physics. We pointed out the possibility of probing the constituents of a near mass-shell photon by the other one in the deep inelastic region. This was also done by other groups and, in particular, in some detail by Brodsky et al.⁶ We also emphasized the unique possibilities for studying the s-wave $\pi-\pi$ interaction in the kinematically most favored exclusive channel, the two pion production,⁷ i.e., $ee \rightarrow ee\pi\pi$. It is toward a detailed study of this latter problem that this paper is devoted.

The uniqueness of this reaction (essentially $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi\pi$) lies in two facts: (i) there is no other final state hadron except the two pions (in contrast to all studies of the $\pi\pi$ system in pure hadronic reactions where a baryon is always present in the final state); (ii) because the initial state has positive charge conjugation, the two pions must have

$$J^P = 0^+, 2^+, \dots \text{and } I^G = 0^+, 2^+, \dots$$

(in contrast to the corresponding one photon annihilation process where $J^P = 1^-, I^G = 1^+$). The advantages are obvious: because of (i), no theoretically ambiguous final state correction effects (e.g., between the outgoing nucleon and pions.

have to be taken into account in order to extract information on $\pi-\pi$ interaction; because of (ii), the dominant p-wave interaction (ρ -meson) is absent allowing an ideal chance to study the s-wave $\pi-\pi$ interaction cleanly over a large energy range. In our previous work⁴ (I), we outlined a phenomenological procedure to extract the s-wave $\pi-\pi$ phase shifts δ_0^I and proposed a model to calculate the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi\pi$ amplitude when δ_0^I are given. Some related works⁸ have also appeared in the last year. In all these works (including I) one assumes the standard equivalent photon or Weizsäcker-Williams approximation formula (hereafter referred to as the W-W approximation) which reduces the $ee \rightarrow ee\pi\pi$ process to that of $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi\pi$ for on-shell photons. It is not hard to see, however, that although the W-W approximation is appropriate for order-of-magnitude calculations (which were what the original investigations intended), it can induce errors of up to 50% in the differential cross-section. This is comparable or, in certain regions, bigger than the effects due to $\pi-\pi$ interactions which one tries to isolate in the present case. In order to extract useful information from this process one clearly needs to improve the approximation scheme.

In this paper we do three things: (i) we investigate the range of validity of the W-W approximation and propose substitutes for it which are appropriate for the purpose of extracting information on $\pi-\pi$ interactions; (ii) we propose phenomenological procedures for extracting $\pi-\pi$ phase shifts which are as model independent as possible and discuss built in checks; (iii) we present model calculations which illustrate the effects of the $\pi-\pi$ interaction on the measured cross-sections and test the sensitivity of the latter to certain qualitative features of the s-wave $\pi-\pi$ phase shifts, for instance the value of the scattering length and the existence of the σ -resonance.

An attempt is made to make this paper reasonably self-contained. We try to make the procedure and reasoning clear and the results explicit without giving too many details which either can be found in I or are relegated to the Appendices.

II. EXACT FORMULATION OF THE SCATTERING AMPLITUDES AND CROSS-SECTION

Consider the process

$$e + e \rightarrow e + e + \pi + \pi \quad (1)$$

via the two photon exchange mechanism. This is depicted in fig. 1 which also specifies our momentum variables. The kinematics of this process is fully specified by 8 independent variables. In the laboratory (the C.M. of the incoming leptons) these can be chosen as E , the incoming energy; ϵ , θ , ϕ , ϵ' , θ' , ϕ' , the energy and angles of two outgoing particles, say the two leptons; and θ'' the scattering angle of a third particle, say a pion, which also defines the x-z plane (Fig. 2a). For calculational purposes, it is more convenient to choose as independent variables k^2 and q^2 (the two virtual photon masses); the "hadronic variables" s (the total C.M. energy squared) and θ_π (the scattering angle for the process $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi\pi$ in its C.M. frame); and "lepton variables" (ψ, χ) and (ψ', χ') which specify respectively the configuration of each of the two pairs of lepton momenta in the "rest frame" of the corresponding virtual photon (Fig. 3b). These two sets of variables are defined in Fig. 3 and in I; the relations between them are given in Appendix A of I. We shall write out these relations explicitly when needed in subsequent discussions.

The exact amplitude for the above process corresponding to Fig. 1, can be written as

$$f = \langle k_2 | j_\mu | k_1 \rangle \frac{e^2}{k^2} \left[\int d^4x e^{ikx} \langle p_1 p_2 | T(J^\mu(x) J^\nu(0)) | 0 \rangle \right] \frac{e^2}{q^2} \langle q_2 | j_\nu | q_1 \rangle \quad (2)$$

Decomposing the virtual photons into their helicity components, each of the two vector products can be written as:

$$j_\mu J^\mu = \sum_m j^{(m)}_\mu J^{(m)}_\mu = \sum_m [j \cdot \epsilon^{(m)*}] [\epsilon^{(m)} \cdot J] \quad (3)$$

where $\epsilon^{(m)}_\mu(k)$, $m = 1, 0, -1$, are the helicity polarization vectors associated with the virtual photon k . Substituting into (2), we obtain the following physically transparent expression for the scattering amplitude.

$$f = \langle k_2 | j^{(m)} | k_1 \rangle \frac{e^2}{k^2} T_{m,n}(k^2, q^2, s, \theta_\pi) \frac{e^2}{q^2} \langle q_2 | j^{(n)} | q_1 \rangle \quad (4)$$

where

$$T_{m,n} = \int d^4x e^{ikx} \langle p_1 p_2 | T(J_\mu(x) J_\nu(0)) | 0 \rangle \epsilon^{(m)}_\mu(k) \epsilon^{(n)}_\nu(q) \quad (5)$$

is clearly the helicity amplitude for the "hadronic process":

$$\gamma(k, m) + \gamma(q, n) \rightarrow \pi(p_1) + \pi(p_2), \quad (6)$$

The cross-section for $ee \rightarrow ee\pi\pi$ is:

$$d\sigma_{ee} = \frac{\alpha^4}{2^8 \pi^4 E^2} \left(1 - \frac{4\mu^2}{s}\right)^2 \frac{1}{k^2 q^2} d\phi d\Omega_\pi \quad (7)$$

$$\times L^{2m}(\psi, \chi) W_{\lambda, j; m, n}(k^2, q^2, s, \cos\theta_\pi) L^{2n}(\psi', \chi')$$

where the same factorized form as in Eq. (4) is explicitly displayed. We have:

$$W_{\lambda, j; m, n} = T_{\lambda j}^* T_{m, n},$$

$$L^{2m}(\psi, \chi) = (1/2k^2)_{\lambda_1 \lambda_2} \sum_{\lambda} \langle k_2 \lambda_2 | j^{(m)} | k_1 \lambda_1 \rangle^* \langle k_2 \lambda_2 | j^{(m)} | k_1 \lambda_1 \rangle,$$

$$L^{2n}(\psi', \chi') = (1/2q^2)_{\lambda_1 \lambda_2} \sum_{\lambda} \langle q_2 \lambda_2 | j^{(n)} | q_1 \lambda_1 \rangle^* \langle q_2 \lambda_2 | j^{(n)} | q_1 \lambda_1 \rangle,$$

$$d\phi = (d^3k_2/k_2^0) (d^3q_2/q_2^0) = \text{invariant phase space element for the outgoing leptons},$$

$$d\Omega_\pi = \text{solid angle element in C. M. of } \pi\pi. \quad (8)$$

In equation (7), the leptonic matrix elements which are known functions of the leptonic variables are completely factored from the hadron amplitudes which are unknown functions of k^2 , q^2 and the other hadron variables. This formula gives the exact connection between the measured $ee \rightarrow ee\pi\pi$

cross-section and the "density matrix" $W_{lj, mn}$ for the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi\pi$ process. The diagonal elements of this matrix $W_{mn, mn}$ are clearly just proportional to the cross-section for $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi\pi$, Eq. (6).

In principle, by measuring the distributions in the pure lepton variables (ψ, χ, ψ', χ' or their laboratory equivalents) one can isolate all the elements $W_{lj, mn}$ and from them determine the scattering amplitudes T_{mn} for $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi\pi$. We emphasized in I, that because the kinematics favor the low energy region and because the exclusion of the strong p-wave by charge conjugation, the s-partial wave plays the dominating role for this process. Since in the elastic unitary region the phases of the partial wave amplitudes are just those of the $\pi\pi$ scattering¹⁰, one should be able to get very interesting information on the s-wave $\pi\pi$ phase shifts.

The exact relation Eq. (7) contain 20 distinct terms as given in (A-9) of I. In practice, one needs to simplify the expression in order to make the problem more tractable, both experimentally and theoretically. One way is to average over the azimuthal angles χ and χ' . (These are the azimuthal angles of the scattering planes of the two pairs of leptons with respect to the scattering plane of the strong process $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi\pi$ in the C. M. frame of the latter, Fig. 2b). We get:

$$d\sigma = \frac{\alpha^4}{2^6 \pi^2 E^2} \left(1 - \frac{4\nu^2}{s}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{k^2 q^2} d\rho' d\Omega_\pi \{ (\cosh^2 \psi + 1)(\cosh^2 \psi' + 1) \frac{1}{2} (W_{11,11} + W_{1-1,1-1}) + (\cosh^2 \psi + 1)(\cosh^2 \psi' - 1) W_{10,10} + (\cosh^2 \psi - 1)(\cosh^2 \psi' + 1) W_{01,01} + (\cosh^2 \psi - 1)(\cosh^2 \psi' - 1) W_{00,00} \} \quad (9)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} d\rho' &= d\rho/d\chi d\chi' \\ \cosh \psi &= -q \cdot (k_1 + k_2) / [(k \cdot q)^2 - k^2 q^2]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \cosh \psi' &= -k \cdot (q_1 + q_2) / [(k \cdot q)^2 - k^2 q^2]^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Eq. (9), which is still an exact expression for our process (Eq. (1) and Fig. 1), serves as the basis for our subsequent discussions.

So far, we have discussed only one diagram (i.e. Fig. 1) contributing to process (1). In principle there are other diagrams of the same order in α which could also contribute to this process, e.g. Fig. 3a, b. It is clear, however, that diagrams of the type Fig. 3a are a factor α down from the single photon annihilation processes which themselves are insignificant at high energies. Diagrams of the type Fig. 3b have been studied by several groups^{2,11} and shown to be negligible as compared to the main diagram, Fig. 1, as long as one does not restrict oneself to the large k^2, q^2 region. None of these should create a serious background problem for process (1) for energies of the order $E \gtrsim 3$ GeV.

III. THE WEIZSÄCKER-WILLIAMS APPROXIMATION AND ITS RANGE OF VALIDITY.

It is customary to approximate Eq. (9) by noting that the small virtual photon mass region $k^2 = 0$, $q^2 = 0$ is most important. Setting $k^2 = 0$, $q^2 = 0$ in the curly bracket in Eq. (9), two significant simplifications occur: (i) the hadron amplitudes involving longitudinal photons vanish, thus only the first term survives; (ii) the kinematics simplify, thus the lepton lab. scattering angles $\theta = \theta' = 0$ and one can show:

$$\begin{aligned} \cosh \psi &= (E + \epsilon)/(E - \epsilon) \\ \cosh \psi' &= (E + \epsilon')/(E - \epsilon'). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

After integrating over all the lepton variables, one gets the standard formula: ^{1-3, 12}

$$\frac{d\sigma^{(ee)}}{ds d(\cos\theta_\pi)} = 4\left(\frac{\alpha}{\pi}\right)^2 \ln^2\left(\frac{E}{m}\right) \left(\ln \frac{4E^2}{s} - \frac{3}{2}\right) \frac{d\sigma^{(\gamma\gamma)}}{d(\cos\theta_\pi)} \quad (12)$$

where $d\sigma^{(\gamma\gamma)}/d(\cos\theta_\pi)$ is just the on-shell $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi\pi$ differential cross-section. The great majority of recent works on process (1) are based on the use of (12), which allows one to concentrate on the simpler process $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi\pi$ with on-shell photons.

What is the range of validity of eq. (12)? To answer this question, we have studied in some detail the case of point-like pions, for which one knows the exact form of the matrix elements T_{mn} (and thus $W_{2j,mn}$).¹³ One can then calculate the cross-section from the exact formula, Eq. (9). The relevant Feynman diagrams are given in Fig. 4. The calculations are quite involved. We relegate the details to Appendix A and only discuss the results here.

Making use of some previous results of Baier and Fadin,¹⁴ our detailed calculations yield:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\sigma^{(ee)}}{ds d(\cos\theta_\pi)} &= \frac{\alpha^4}{\pi s^2} B \left\{ [L^2(L_s - \frac{3}{2}) - L_s^2(\frac{1}{3}L_s - \frac{3}{2}) - \frac{17}{3}L L_s] A \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{3}L L_s B \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \beta^2 &= 1 - 4\mu^2/s \\ L &= \ln(4E^2/m_\pi^2) \\ L_s &= \ln(4E^2/s) \\ A &= \frac{(4\mu^2/s)^2 + \beta^4 \sin^4\theta_\pi}{(1 - \beta^2 \cos^2\theta_\pi)^2} \\ B &= 1 + \frac{16\mu^2/s}{1 - \beta^2 \cos^2\theta_\pi} + \frac{2\beta^4 \sin^2 2\theta_\pi}{(1 - \beta^2 \cos^2\theta_\pi)^2} \\ \mu &= \text{pion mass.} \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Eq. (13) is accurate up to terms which are quadratic in the large logarithmic factors L and L_s . Terms linear in these as well as terms of the form $(s/4E^2)L^2$ or $(s/4E^2)LL_s$ which are small in the energy range we consider are neglected. The standard Weizsäcker-Williams formula Eq. (12) corresponds to keeping only the term $L^2(L_s - \frac{3}{2})A$ on the right hand side of eq. (13) and approximating L^2 by:

$$L^2 \approx 4 \ln^2(E/m).$$

To get some feeling about Eq. (13), let us substitute some typical values of the variables. Thus, for $E = 3$ GeV, $W = \sqrt{s} = 2.25 \mu$ we get

$$s/4E^2 = 2.7 \times 10^{-3}$$

$$L = 18.7$$

$$L_s = 5.8$$

The coefficient of the A -term in (13) comes out to be ~ 880 while the corresponding number obtained from the W-W formula, Eq. (12), is ~ 1300 . The difference is $\sim 50\%$ of the true answer! The main correction effect comes from the $-(17/3)LL_s$ term. The second term in the square brackets and the B -term make relatively small corrections.

Previously, Brodsky et al.³ investigated the validity of the W-W approximation for the simpler case of single π^0 production. They found the exact result to be about 25% higher than that given by Eq. (12) and the effect is reduced by inserting a form factor for the π^0 vertex. The fact that the corrections to eq. (12) in these two cases occur in opposite directions can be readily understood. This is explained in a footnote.¹⁵ We shall show later on that strong interaction effects are not likely to reduce the size of the corrections to eq. (12) for our case.

Clearly, if one hopes to extract useful information from the two photon process $ee \rightarrow ee\pi\pi$, 50% inaccuracy can not be tolerated and eq. (12), as it stands, is useless. One must go back to the exact formula eq. (9).

This is not necessarily a setback as it might appear to be. A moment's reflection will reveal that the simple formula eq. (12) can not be used even if it were accurate. The reason is, that to make certain that one is indeed measuring the $ee \rightarrow ee\pi\pi$ process, one has to tag one of the outgoing electrons in addition to detecting the pions. Only in this way, can one exclude the one photon annihilation background as well as eliminate the possibility of producing additional neutral particles. The Weizsäcker-Williams approximation formula, eq. (12), having integrated over all lepton variables, does not describe this situation. One will have to go back to the complete differential formula eq. (7), or the partially integrated formula eq. (9).

We believe the latter is a more practical choice.

IV. EXTRACTION OF $\pi-\pi$ PHASE SHIFTS - PHENOMENOLOGICAL ANALYSIS

We begin our phenomenological analysis by assuming the ideal situation where measurements of the process can be done with great accuracy and outline the model independent procedure to extract the $\pi-\pi$ phase shifts. Later on we introduce the usual plausible dynamical assumptions which simplify the analysis with less than perfect data.

Consider the helicity amplitudes $T_{mn}(k^2, q^2, s, \cos\theta_\pi)$ introduced earlier (eq. (5)) for the process $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi\pi$ (eq. (6)). We shall take the variables k^2, q^2 , and s to be fixed and only explicitly display the θ_π dependence. Each of the helicity amplitudes has the partial wave expansion:

$$T_{mn}(\theta_\pi) = \sum_{\ell \text{ even}} (2\ell+1) a_{mn}^{(\ell)} d_{m-n,0}^{(\ell)}(\theta_\pi). \quad (15)$$

where $d^{(\ell)}(\theta_\pi)$ are the usual rotational matrices. The important features to notice are: (i) because the charge conjugation quantum number for the $\gamma\gamma$ state is +, the two pions can only be in states with even isospin and even angular momentum; (ii) to lowest order in α , the unitarity condition demands that the phase of each partial wave amplitude $a_{mn}^{(\ell)}$ (for given isospin $I=0,2$) is the same as the corresponding partial wave amplitude for $\pi-\pi$ scattering, at least when s is below the inelastic threshold, i.e.

$$a_{mn}^{(\ell)I} = |a_{mn}^{(\ell)I}| e^{i\delta_\ell^I}, \quad (16)$$

where δ_ℓ^I is the $\pi-\pi$ phase shift for isospin I and angular momentum ℓ .

Substituting (15) and (16) into Eq. (7) or (9) we get the connection between the measured cross-section and the $\pi-\pi$ phase shifts. To be more explicit, let us consider eq. (9). The $W_{\ell j, mn}$ which enter into this formula can be written out (we omit the isospin index):

$$\begin{aligned}
W_{11,11} &= |a_{11}^{(0)}|^2 + 10|a_{11}^{(0)}||a_{11}^{(2)}|\cos(\delta_0 - \delta_2)d_{0,0}^{(2)}(\theta_\pi) \\
&\quad + 25|a_{11}^{(2)}|^2[d_{0,0}^{(2)}(\theta_\pi)]^2 + \dots \\
W_{1-1,1-1} &= 25|a_{1,-1}^{(2)}|^2[d_{2,0}^{(2)}(\theta_\pi)]^2 + \dots \\
W_{01,01} &= 25|a_{0,1}^{(2)}|^2[d_{-1,0}^{(2)}(\theta_\pi)]^2
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

with similar expressions for $W_{10,10}$ and $W_{00,00}$. If one can separate the various terms in the above formulas (by measuring the distributions in ψ and θ_π for fixed k^2 , q^2 and s) one can eliminate the unknowns $|a_{mn}^{(\ell)}|$ and solve for $\cos(\delta_\ell - \delta_{\ell'})$, $\ell, \ell' = \text{even integers}$. A very important feature of this type of phase shift analysis is the fact that the factors $\cos(\delta_\ell - \delta_{\ell'})$ enter linearly in the cross-section formula. Consequently, the well known ambiguities associated with phase shift analysis in hadron-hadron elastic scattering do not arise at all in this case.

To simplify the parametrization, one can invoke the argument of angular momentum barriers for higher partial waves and assume the final state interaction is negligible except in the lowest angular momentum states. Further, since higher angular momentum corresponds to larger impact parameter where the interaction is dominated by the exchange of the least massive particles, one expects the higher partial waves to be dominated by the single pion exchange Born diagram, Fig. 4a. Gauge invariance demands that the crossed Born diagram and seagull diagram, Fig. 4b, c, be also included. One can, therefore, set in eq. (17).

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_\ell &= 0 \\
a_{mn}^{(\ell)} &= a_{mn}^{(\ell)}(B) \quad \text{for } \ell > \ell_0
\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

where $a_{mn}^{(\ell)}(B)$ are the partial wave amplitudes calculated from the Born diagrams of Fig. 4 and ℓ_0 is some small even integer.

More directly, one can write

$$\begin{aligned}
W_{\ell j, mn} &= T_{\ell j}^* T_{mn} \\
T_{mn} &= T_{mn}^{(B)} + \sum_{\ell=0}^{\ell_0} (2\ell+1) [|a_{mn}^{(\ell)}| e^{i\delta_\ell} a_{mn}^{(\ell)}(B)] d_{m-n,0}^{(\ell)}(\theta_\pi)
\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

and substitute into eq. (9) or eq. (7). The phase shifts δ_ℓ can then be extracted from data by systematically eliminating the unknowns $|a_{mn}^{(\ell)}|$, $\ell = 0, \dots, \ell_0$. For energies not too far from the threshold, one can simply take $\ell_0 = 0$ (we remind the reader again that the p-wave is absent) and the procedure outlined above then reduces to that of I. The validity of the assumptions which go into this phenomenological procedure can, of course, be directly checked by experiment. As the quality of the data improves, one can increase the value of ℓ_0 and see if the approximation (18) is valid or not. A similar procedure is known to be very useful in N-N phase-shift analysis¹⁶ (where the situation is more complex due to nonlinear unitarity).

Except for eq. (16), we have not included the isospin in our discussion. In principle, the only model independent way of disentangling the $I = 0$ and $I = 2$ amplitudes is to measure both the $\pi^+\pi^-$ and $\pi^0\pi^0$ final states. However, there are both theoretical reasons and experimental evidence^{17,18} that the $I = 2$ final state interaction is not important in the low energy region. Therefore, as a first approximation, one can again use the gauge invariant Born diagram result for the $I = 2$ part. As the range and quality of data improves, this approximation can be removed.

In an actual experiment, one may not be able to completely average over the two variables x and x' as proposed. In that case, Eq. (7) still applies. With incomplete integration over x and x' , some terms in addition to those in Eq. (9) will survive. They can be treated in the same manner as outlined in the above. An important point to bear in mind is that most additional amplitudes involve one or more longitudinal photons (helicity index 0) and give small contributions to the cross-section.

In addition to the phenomenological analysis, discussed above, one can make dynamical assumptions which allow one to "calculate" the unknowns $|a_{mn}^{(\ell)}|$ and δ_ℓ in the formulas given. One can then "predict" the measured $ee \rightarrow ee\pi\pi$ cross-sections through eq. (7) or eq. (9). In particular, dispersion relations (which connect the real and imaginary parts of an analytic function) can be used to relate $|a_{mn}^{(\ell)}|$ to δ_ℓ provided the latter is known for all energies. On the other hand, some predictions on δ_ℓ itself can be made if one imposes some combinations of constraints due to crossing symmetry, analyticity, unitarity, PCAC, and current algebra - to the best of one's ability. The dynamical theories involved, however, are far from perfected. A direct comparison of experimental data with such "predictions" which are obtained after a long chain of model-dependent calculations probably will not be particularly revealing. Since theoretically the $\pi\pi$ phase shifts δ_ℓ^I are much more interesting than the absolute values of the partial wave amplitudes $|a_{mn}^{(\ell)}|$, it is clearly desirable to extract δ_ℓ from the data in as model-independent a way as possible and then compare the results with theoretical models for $\pi\pi$ scattering. This is the approach advocated here.

V. MODEL CALCULATIONS - SENSITIVITY OF MEASURED CROSS-SECTION TO QUALITATIVE FEATURES OF THE S-WAVE $\pi\pi$ PHASE SHIFT.

In spite of our caution against making theoretical predictions, if one wants to get some feeling of the effectiveness of extracting the $\pi\pi$ phase shifts from $e + e \rightarrow e + e + \pi + \pi$, it is useful to estimate the order of magnitude of correction effects due to $\pi\pi$ interaction on the measured cross-section. Such studies could be useful in providing a guide for the planning of relevant experiments. The precise results may be somewhat model dependent, but the qualitative features should be instructive if the dynamical assumptions made are reasonable.

Our model consists of using dispersion relations to calculate $|a_{mn}^{(0)}|$ from assumed phenomenological test phase shifts δ_0^I . We then test the sensitivity of the measured $ee \rightarrow ee\pi\pi$ cross section to variations of some important qualitative features of the s-wave $\pi\pi$ phase shifts, such as the magnitude of the scattering length and the existence of the scalar meson around 700 MeV.

As mentioned before, in an actual experiment, it is probably necessary to tag one or both of the outgoing electrons, thus specifying the full kinematics of $ee \rightarrow ee\pi\pi$. However, in order to understand the qualitative features, it is more transparent to present results for the case where the lepton variables are integrated. This we shall do in what follows. Our basic formula is therefore Eq. (9) with fixed s and $\cos\theta_\pi$ but all remaining lepton variables integrated over. We have discussed in some detail the results of such a calculation for the case of point-like pions (Born approximation) in Section III and Appendix A. For the present case, we perform the same calculation with only one modification, namely the s-wave Born amplitudes $a_{mn}^{(0)B}$ are replaced by the unitarity-corrected $|a_{mn}^{(0)}|e^{i\delta_0}$. (See Eqn. (19) with $\delta_0 = 0$.)

The essential features of our model were described in our previous paper.⁴ We shall outline them here.

1) From our experience in Section III and Appendix A, we know that $W_{00,00}$, being proportional to $k^2 q^2$, does not contribute significantly to the cross-section. (This is because the factor $k^2 q^2$ cancels the denominator $(1/k^2 q^2)$ from the virtual photon propagator, so the integrated cross-section then loses two powers of $L = \ln(4E^2/m_e^2)$ which is the dominating factor.) We can write therefore:

$$\frac{d\sigma}{ds d(\cos\theta_\pi)} = \frac{\alpha^4}{2^9 \pi E^2} \left(1 - \frac{4\mu^2}{s}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \int d\phi'' \frac{1}{k^2 q^2} \{ (\cosh^2 \psi + 1)(\cosh^2 \psi' + 1) \frac{1}{2} (W_{11,11} + W_{1-1,1-1}) + (\cosh^2 \psi + 1)(\cosh^2 \psi' - 1) W_{10,10} + (\cosh^2 \psi - 1)(\cosh^2 \psi' + 1) W_{01,01} \} \quad (20)$$

where $d\phi'' = d\phi/dx dx' ds$ and $\cosh \psi$ and $\cosh \psi'$ are given by (10).

2) Now, we apply Eq. (19) which reads in this case:

$$W_{mn,mn} = |T_{mn}|^2$$

$$T_{11} = T_{11}^{(B)} + |a_{11}^{(0)}| e^{i\delta_0} - a_{11}^{(0)(B)} \quad (21)$$

$$T_{mn} = T_{mn}^{(B)} \text{ for } (m,n) = (1,-1), (0,1) \text{ and } (1,0).$$

The amplitudes $T_{mn}^{(B)}$ for charged pions are given in Appendix A. The only s-wave partial wave amplitude (for $(m,n) = (1,1)$) is

$$a_B(s, k^2, q^2) = \frac{s}{s+k^2+q^2} a_B(s, 0, 0) + \frac{2(k^2+q^2)}{s+k^2+q^2} \quad (22)$$

$$\text{where } a_B(s, 0, 0) = \frac{1-\beta^2}{2\beta} \ln \frac{1+\beta}{1-\beta} \quad (23)$$

$$\beta^2 = 1 - 4\mu^2/s.$$

The corresponding amplitudes for $\pi^0\pi^0$ production are obviously zero.

The amplitudes with definite isospin are related to the charged (c) and neutral (n) amplitudes by:

$$T^{(I=0)} = \frac{2}{3} T^c - \frac{1}{3} T^n$$

$$T^{(I=2)} = (\sqrt{2}/3) (T^c + T^n) \quad (24)$$

or

$$T^c = T^{(0)} + (1/\sqrt{2}) T^{(2)}$$

$$T^n = -T^{(0)} + \sqrt{2} T^{(2)} \quad (25)$$

3) The unitarized s-wave amplitude $a(s)$ in Eq. (21) is calculated from the dispersion relation for the partial wave amplitude. Assuming elastic unitarity, this dispersion relation becomes a standard Omnes-type integral equation. This equation can be solved in a standard way for any given set of $\pi-\pi$ phase shifts. The form of this integral equation and explicit expressions for the solution are given in Appendix B. We only make two relevant remarks here:

(i) strictly speaking, the solution to the Omnes equation is not unique; possible polynomial terms could be added. The arbitrariness can be fixed by additional physical requirements on the asymptotic behavior of the amplitude. In obtaining our solution, we have assumed that the s-wave partial wave does not rise linearly in s as $s \rightarrow \infty$.

(ii) In this model, the $\pi^0\pi^0$ production proceeds entirely through the s-wave partial amplitude and is isotropic in the $\pi-\pi$ C.M. frame. The cross-section for $ee \rightarrow ee\pi^0\pi^0$ can be obtained from Eq. (20) by setting

$$\begin{aligned}
 w_{10,10}^{(n)} &= w_{01,01}^{(n)} = w_{1-1,1-1}^{(n)} = 0 \\
 w_{11,11}^{(n)} &= |T_{1,1}^{(n)}|^2 = -|a^{(0)} + \sqrt{2} a^{(2)}|^2.
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{28}$$

Now, we have everything expressed in terms of $\delta_0^I(s)$. We can therefore perform the calculation by assuming various possible sets of phenomenological phase shifts. Since we are interested only in the qualitative features of our model calculations, we choose simple analytic forms for the phase shifts which possess the desired properties. In choosing these phase shifts we obviously also bear in mind the available experimental information as well as theoretical models for $\delta_0^I(s)$. There are three features of the phase shift which determine its qualitative behavior over the elastic scattering region. These are: (i) the scattering length; (ii) possible resonances ($\delta = \frac{\pi}{2}$); (iii) asymptotic behavior (δ increases to $n\pi$ or decreases to zero). We have chosen many sets of phase shifts which exhibit different types of behavior under these three categories and tested the effects on the measured cross-section.

We present here results obtained from 4 sets of such phase shifts which illustrate the qualitative features of our model calculations. One of these is chosen to agree qualitatively with the phase shifts calculated by Kang and Lee or Brown and Goble using current algebra, unitarity, dispersion theory, and crossing symmetry. The features of this phase shift are its small scattering length, resonant behavior near $\sqrt{s} = 700$ MeV., and asymptotic return to zero. Each of the other three phase shifts differs from the first qualitatively in one respect, that is, one has no σ -resonance, one has a large scattering length, and one approaches the value π as $s \rightarrow \infty$. These phase shifts, as functions of the pion C. M. momentum are depicted in Fig. 5. Analytic forms

for these test phase shifts and the corresponding Omnes functions are given in Appendix B.

Some typical results are presented in Figures 6-7. In Fig. 6, the integrated cross-section $d\sigma/ds$ is plotted as a function of the pion momentum. The incident electron energy is taken to be 3 GeV. The solid curve is the cross-section due to the Born diagrams without π - π interaction. The other curves are the unitarity-corrected cross-sections with the 4 different sets of phase shifts mentioned previously. Note that; (i) the π - π interaction can produce a very significant effect on the measured cross-section; (ii) the cross-section is concentrated in the near-threshold region, it becomes quite small beyond 200 MeV/c pion C. M. momentum.

In Fig. 7 we plot the differential cross-section $d\sigma/ds d(\cos\theta_\pi)$ as a function of the pion C.M. scattering angle θ_π for four different values of s . The various lines have the same significance as in Fig. 6.

From these curves we can see that the measured cross-section for $ee \rightarrow ee\pi\pi$ should be quite sensitive to the π - π interaction effect. In particular, the set of phase shift with scattering length of order unity gives rise to cross-sections which are significantly different from the others. The other sets all taken to have zero scattering lengths, tend to behave in qualitatively similar ways with 10-20% differences in the actual cross-sections. Other phase shifts with small but non-zero scattering length give similar results. Stated explicitly, in the region near the threshold where our model should be fairly reliable (and where the bulk of the cross-section lies) we see great sensitivity to the scattering length. We might point out that the absolute normalization for this process can be measured by comparing with the pure QED process $ee \rightarrow ee\mu\mu$.

In contrast, the model calculation yields small cross-section and relative insensitivity to the various phase shifts in the 700 MeV region where

the suspected scalar meson σ lies. In fact, the one phase shift which does not rise above 48° throughout, yields cross-sections almost indistinguishable from those from the other sets which do go through 90° near 700 MeV. In the context of our model, this happens because the unitarity-corrected s-wave amplitude becomes small as compared to the remaining Born amplitudes and the distinction between various phase shifts becomes insignificant. This fact is in turn related to the assumed asymptotic behaviors of the phase shifts and the s-wave amplitude. The predictions in this region can be easily changed by modifying these two factors. We see, therefore in our model, the cross-section has little sensitivity to the existence or non-existence of the σ -meson. Its effect is mixed up with the asymptotic behavior of the phase shift wherein lies the most ambiguous aspect of this model.

The failure of the model to demonstrate a clear signal for the σ -meson does not mean, however, that this very interesting subject can not be studied in this reaction. The model is simply not reliable in this respect. The circumstance only underlines the need of pursuing a model independent procedure of extracting the π - π phase shifts as outlined in the previous section. There exist in the literature other model calculations on this process either using a procedure similar to ours or involving some form of resonance parametrization for the relevant amplitudes. So far as we can tell, all suffer from ambiguities in this respect not less severe than those we explicitly spelled out.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We wish to thank Professor Jack Sandweiss for several helpful comments.

APPENDIX A

Here we outline the calculation of the differential cross-section $d\sigma_{ee \rightarrow ee\pi\pi}^{(B)} / ds d(\cos\theta_\pi)$ for the case of point-like pions. The result is used in the text both in Section III where the validity of the W-W approximation is discussed and in Section V where the model calculation including unitarity corrections is reduced to a form similar to the present case.

For point-like pions, the scattering amplitudes are given by the gauge invariant Feynman diagrams, Fig. 4a-c. By neglecting terms proportional to $(k^2 q^2)$ (justification of this approx. is given later in this appendix), we get:

$$\begin{aligned} T_{1,1}^{(B)} &= \frac{2}{s+k^2+q^2} \left[\frac{4u^2}{1-\beta^2 \cos^2 \theta_\pi} + (k^2 + q^2) \right] \\ T_{1,-1}^{(B)} &= \frac{2s}{s+k^2+q^2} \cdot \frac{\beta^2 \sin^2 \theta_\pi}{1-\beta^2 \cos^2 \theta_\pi} \\ T_{1,0}^{(B)} &= -\sqrt{2s} q^2 \frac{(s-k^2+q^2)}{(s+k^2+q^2)} \cdot \frac{\beta^2 \sin 2\theta_\pi}{1-\beta^2 \cos^2 \theta_\pi} \\ T_{0,1}^{(B)} &= -\sqrt{2s} k^2 \frac{(s+k^2-q^2)}{(s+k^2+q^2)} \cdot \frac{\beta^2 \sin 2\theta_\pi}{1-\beta^2 \cos^2 \theta_\pi} \end{aligned} \quad (A-1)$$

where $\beta = \sqrt{1 - \frac{4u^2}{s}}$ is the velocity of the pions in their C.M. frame. In the same approximation the remaining lepton variables ψ, ψ' in Eq. (9) are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \cosh \psi &= \frac{8E(E-\epsilon') - s - k^2 + q^2}{s + k^2 + q^2} \\ \cosh \psi' &= \frac{8E(E-\epsilon) - s + k^2 - q^2}{s + k^2 + q^2} \end{aligned} \quad (A-2)$$

Substituting (A-1) and (A-2) into Eq. (9) and integrate over all variables except s and $\cos\theta_\pi$ we get:

$$\frac{d\sigma_{ee \rightarrow ee\pi\pi}^{(B)}}{ds d(\cos\theta_\pi)} = \frac{\alpha^4}{\pi s^2} \beta \sum_{i=1}^4 z_i(s) Z_i(s, \cos\theta_\pi) \quad (A-3)$$

where:

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_1(s, \cos \theta_\pi) &= \frac{(1-\beta^2)^2 + \beta^4 \sin^4 \theta_\pi}{[1-\beta^2 \cos^2 \theta_\pi]^2} \\
Z_2(s, \cos \theta_\pi) &= \frac{2(1-\beta^2)}{1-\beta^2 \cos^2 \theta_\pi} \\
Z_3(s, \cos \theta_\pi) &= 1 \\
Z_4(s, \cos \theta_\pi) &= \frac{\beta^4 \sin^2 2\theta_\pi}{[1-\beta^2 \cos^2 \theta_\pi]^2}
\end{aligned} \tag{A-4}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
z_i(s) &= \frac{s^2}{16E^2} \int \frac{dp''}{k^2 q^2} \left\{ \left[\frac{8E(E-\epsilon')-s-k^2+q^2}{s+k^2+q^2} \right]^2 + 1 \right\} \left\{ \left[\frac{8E(E-\epsilon)-s+k^2+q^2}{s+k^2+q^2} \right]^2 + 1 \right\} \\
&\quad \times \bar{z}_i(s, k^2, q^2) \quad i=1,2,3
\end{aligned}$$

$$\bar{z}_1 = s^2 / (s+k^2+q^2)^2$$

$$\bar{z}_2 = s(k^2+q^2) / (s+k^2+q^2)^2$$

$$\bar{z}_3 = (k^2+q^2)^2 / (s+k^2+q^2)^2$$

(A-5)

$$\begin{aligned}
z_4(s) &= \frac{s^2}{8E^2} \int \frac{dp''}{k^2 q^2} \left\{ \left[\frac{8E(E-\epsilon')-s-k^2+q^2}{s+k^2+q^2} \right]^2 + 1 \right\} \left\{ \left[\frac{8E(E-\epsilon)-s+k^2+q^2}{s+k^2+q^2} \right]^2 - 1 \right\} \\
&\quad \times \frac{sq^2(s+k^2-q^2)^2}{(s+k^2+q^2)^4}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\text{and } dp'' = \left(\frac{d^3 k_2}{k_0^2} \frac{d^3 q_2}{q_0^2} \right) / dx dx' ds.$$

The integrals involved in evaluating $z_i(s)$, Eqs. (A-5), are three fold integrals over, say k^2 , q^2 and ϵ (or ϵ'). Although very complicated, these integrals can be in principle done more or less exactly. For dimensional reasons, the result can only involve quantities like β and

$$x = s/4E^2$$

$$L = \ln \frac{4E^2}{m_e^2}$$

$$L_s = \ln \frac{4E^2}{s} = -\ln x.$$

For all practical purposes, it suffices to obtain results which are at least quadratic in the large logarithmic factors L , L_s and these only with constant coefficients (i.e., one can neglect terms like $x^n L$, $x^n L_s$, ..., $n=1,2,\dots$). The task then becomes considerably simpler. For instance, one immediately recognizes that the L factor can only come from the lower limit of the k^2 (or q^2) integral with the photon propagator factor $(1/k^2)$ in the integrand. Thus, if the propagator factor $(1/k^2 q^2)$ is cancelled by other factors in the integrand, then the result can, at most, be of order L_s (from the ϵ -integration). Thus we are justified in neglecting terms proportional to $(k^2 q^2)$ in our calculation. Using similar arguments, one can easily isolate the coefficients of the leading terms proportional to $L^2 L_s$, L_s^3 , $L L_s^2$, ..., etc.

Similar calculations for the cross-section integrated over $\cos \theta_\pi$, i.e. $(d\sigma_{ee \rightarrow e e \pi}^{(B)} / ds)$, have been done by Baier and Fadin¹⁴ up to terms linear in the logarithmic factors. The integrals $z_i(s)$ can also be inferred from their results by integrating our Eq. (A-3) over $\cos \theta_\pi$ and comparing the results.

One then obtains:

$$\begin{aligned}
z_1(s) &= L^2 (L_s - \frac{3}{2}) - L_s^2 (\frac{1}{3} L_s - \frac{3}{2}) - \frac{17}{3} L L_s - L (\frac{\pi^2}{6} - \frac{815}{144}) \\
z_2(s) &= \frac{2}{3} L (L_s - \frac{11}{6}) \\
z_3(s) &= \frac{1}{3} L (L_s - \frac{7}{3})
\end{aligned} \tag{A-6}$$

$$z_4(s) = \frac{2}{3} L(L_s - \frac{25}{12}).$$

If one only retains terms quadratic in L and L_s , z_2 , z_3 and z_4 become proportional. The corresponding terms in (A-3) can be combined and we get the result quoted in Section III, Eq. (13). In our direct calculations of the integrals $z_i(s)$, Eqs. (A-5), we have checked all the coefficients except those of LL_s and L_s .

APPENDIX B

In this Appendix we show some of the formulae relevant to our dispersion (Omnes equation) treatment of the s-wave strong interaction modified amplitude, including a list of the test phase shifts that we employed.

In writing down the dispersion relation for $a^I(s)$ (we shall omit the angular momentum and helicity labels l, m, n), we assume that the right hand cut is dominated by elastic unitarity and that the only important contribution to the left hand cut comes from the Born term. The relation is

$$a^I(s, k^2, q^2) = a^{I(B)}(s, k^2, q^2) + \frac{s}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{ds'}{4\mu^2} \frac{a^I(s', k^2, q^2) \sin \delta_0^I e^{-i\delta_0^I}}{s'(s'-s)} \quad (B-1)$$

This standard Omnes equation has the solution

$$a^I(s, k^2, q^2) = a^{I(B)}(s, k^2, q^2) + \frac{s e^{\Delta^I(s)}}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{ds'}{4\mu^2} \frac{a^{I(B)}(s', k^2, q^2) \sin \delta_0^I e^{-\text{Re} \Delta^I(s')}}{s'(s'-s)} \quad (B-2)$$

with

$$\Delta^I(s) = \frac{s}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{ds'}{4\mu^2} \frac{\delta_0^I(s')}{s'(s'-s)} \quad (B-3)$$

For the test phase shifts we use, the ambiguity associated with the Omnes solution is fixed by requiring the s-wave amplitude not to rise linearly in energy as $s \rightarrow \infty$.

The Born amplitude over the elastic unitarity region, can be well approximated by one or two poles on the left hand cut. For example, for the charged amplitude

$$a_B(s, 0, 0) = \frac{14.7\mu^2}{s+3.35\mu^2} \quad (B-4)$$

is accurate to 4% over the range $4\mu^2 \leq s \leq 16\mu^2$, and

$$a_B(s,0,0) = \frac{7.05\mu^2}{s+1.86\mu^2} + \frac{9.15\mu^2}{s+66.4\mu^2} \quad (B-5)$$

is accurate to 1% for $4\mu^2 \leq s \leq 100\mu^2$. If the pole approximation is made, the Omnes solution can be integrated analytically.

Thus, writing

$$a^{I(B)}(s,k^2,q^2) = \frac{s}{s+k^2+q^2} a_0^{I(B)}(s) + \frac{k^2+q^2}{s+k^2+q^2} a_1^{I(B)}(s) \quad (B-6)$$

$$a_0^{I(B)}(s) = a^{I(B)}(s,0,0) = \sum_i \frac{b_i^I}{s+c_i}$$

$$a_1^{I(B)} = \frac{4}{3} \text{ for } I=0 \text{ and } (2\sqrt{2}/3) \text{ for } I=2,$$

we get

$$a^I(s,k^2,q^2) = \frac{s}{s+k^2+q^2} a_0^I(s) + \frac{k^2+q^2}{s+k^2+q^2} a_1^I(s),$$

where

$$a_0^I(s) = e^{\Delta^I(s)} \times \sum_i \frac{b_i^I}{c_i} \left[1 - \frac{s}{s+c_i} e^{-\Delta^I(-c_i)} \right] \quad (B-7)$$

$$a_1^I(s) = e^{\Delta^I(s)} \left\{ a_1^{I(B)} [1 - s\Delta^I(0)] + \sum_i \frac{sb_i^I}{c_i} [1 + c_i\Delta^I(0) - e^{-\Delta^I(-c_i)}] \right\}$$

In obtaining (B-7) we have again neglected terms of higher order in k^2 and q^2 for reasons already mentioned. The most important feature of Eq. (B-7) is that $a^I(s,k^2,q^2)$ is written in the same form as the Born amplitude, with only the substitutions $a_0^{I(B)}(s) \rightarrow a_0^I(s)$ and $a_1^{I(B)} \rightarrow a_1^I(s)$. Since the integration involved in evaluating Eq. (20) is done for fixed s , there are no changes in any of the integrals that one needs to evaluate. Thus one needs only to isolate the s-wave part of the Born calculation discussed in Appendix A, make the appropriate substitutions of $a^I(s,k^2,q^2)$ for $a^{I(B)}(s,k^2,q^2)$, and then one can

write down the integrated answer directly. The substitutions affect only the Z_i of Appendix A, and we shall give just the modified forms of these Z_i here.

$$Z_1 \rightarrow Z_1 + \frac{1-\beta^2}{D} \text{Re}(-a_0^{(B)} + a_0^0 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} a_0^2)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{4} ||-a_0^{(B)} + a_0^0 + a_0^2 ||^2$$

$$Z_2 \rightarrow \frac{1}{2} \text{Re} \left(2 \frac{1-\beta^2}{D} - a_0^{(B)} + a_0^0 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} a_0^2 \right) (a_1^0 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} a_1^2)^*$$

(B-8)

$$Z_3 \rightarrow \frac{1}{4} ||a_1^0 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} a_1^2 ||^2$$

$$Z_4 \rightarrow Z_4,$$

with $D = 1 - \beta^2 \cos^2 \theta_\pi$. We would like to call the reader's attention to the fact that the large corrections to the W-W approximation exhibited in Eq. (13) remain also in this case. This is important because these corrections are in the opposite direction to the unitarity corrections and of comparable magnitude in a wide region of the variables.

For completeness, we give the analytic forms for the test phase shifts and the corresponding Omnes functions. The isospin zero phase shifts are

$$\delta_1(s) = 67.6\pi (s-4)/(s+28)^2$$

$$\delta_2(s) = \frac{1}{2} \delta_1(s)$$

(B-9)

$$\delta_3(s) = \frac{5}{2} \sqrt{5} \pi \sqrt{s-4}/(s+26)$$

$$\delta_4(s) = \pi (s-4)/(s+16)$$

Three of these phase shifts, δ_1 , δ_3 , and δ_4 , pass through 90° at $s=24$.

The Omnes functions are

$$\Delta_1(s) = 67.6 \times \left\{ \frac{s}{196} \frac{s+252}{(s+28)^2} \ln 32 - \frac{s-4}{(s+28)^2} \ln(s-4) - \frac{1}{28} \frac{s}{s+28} - \frac{1}{196} \ln 4 \right\}$$

$$\Delta_2(s) = \frac{1}{2} \Delta_1(s) \quad (B-10)$$

$$\Delta_3(s) = \frac{5}{4} \frac{s}{s+16} \ln 20 - \frac{s-4}{s+16} \ln(s-4) - \frac{1}{4} \ln 4.$$

$$\Delta_4(s) = \frac{5\sqrt{5}}{52} \pi \left[2 - \frac{s\sqrt{30}}{(s+26)} \right].$$

For the isospin 2 corrections, which are small, we always took the $I=2$ phase shift to be $-\frac{1}{4} \delta_1(s)$.

REFERENCES

1. V. E. Balakin, V. M. Badnev and I. F. Ginsburg, ZhETF Pid. Red. 11, 559 (1970). [English Translation: JETP Letters 11, 388 (1970).]
2. N. A-Romero, A. Jaccarini and P. Kessler, Phys. Rev. D3, 1569 (1971) and earlier references cited therein; J. Parisi, N. A-Romero, A. Jaccarini and P. Kessler, Phys. Rev. D4, 2927 (1971).
3. S. J. Brodsky, T. Kinoshita and H. Terazawa, Phys. Rev. Letters 25, 972 (1970); and Phys. Rev. D4, 1532 (1971).
4. C. E. Carlson and Wu-Ki Tung, Phys. Rev. D4, 2873 (1971).
5. R. Brown and I. Muzinich D4, 1496 (1971).
6. S. J. Brodsky, T. Kinoshita and H. Terazawa, Phys. Rev. Letters, 27, 280 (1971).
7. P. C. DeCelles and J. F. Goehl, Jr., Phys. Rev. 184, 1617 (1969).
8. D. H. Lyth, Nuclear Physics B30, 195 (1971); and Erratum, ibid, B34, 640 (1971). H. Schierholz and K. Sundermeyer, unpublished. R. Goble and J. Rosner, unpublished.
9. Explicitly,

$$L^{\ell m}(\psi, x) = e^{-i(\ell-m)\chi} [\bar{d}(\psi)^{\ell}_{-1} \bar{d}(\psi)^m_1 + \bar{d}(\psi)^{\ell}_{-1} \bar{d}(\psi)^m_{-1}]$$

where $\bar{d}(\psi) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2}(\cosh \psi + 1) & -\sinh \psi / \sqrt{2} & -\frac{1}{2}(\cosh \psi - 1) \\ -\sinh \psi / \sqrt{2} & \cosh \psi & \sinh \psi / \sqrt{2} \\ -\frac{1}{2}(\cosh \psi - 1) & \sinh \psi / \sqrt{2} & \frac{1}{2}(\cosh \psi + 1) \end{pmatrix}.$

For details see ref. 4 and T. P. Cheng and Wu-Ki Tung, Phys. Rev. D3 733 (1971).

References (continued)

10. K. Watson, Phys. Rev. 88, 1163 (1952).
11. K. Fujikawa, unpublished (University of Chicago Preprint EFI, 71-51).
12. More complete versions of the equivalent photon approximation can be found in: R.B. Curtis, Phys. Rev. 104, 211 (1956); R. H. Dalitz and D. R. Yennie, Phys. Rev. 105, 1598 (1957).
13. The question of the validity of the W-W approximation was also raised by H. Cheng and T. T. Wu, Nuclear Physics B32, 461 (1971).
14. V. N. Baier and V. S. Fadin, ZhETF Pid. Red. 13, 293 (1971). [English Translation: JETP Letters 13, 208 (1971)].
15. The logarithmic factor L can only come from the lower limits of the k^2 and q^2 integration. The L_s factor can come both from the upper limits of the k^2 and q^2 integration and from the ϵ (or ϵ') integration. In the case of $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi\pi$, the matrix elements T_{mn} are at most constant in the virtual photon masses k^2 and q^2 , there are enough damping factors from the other factors in Eq. (9), however, to cut off the k^2 and q^2 integration at about s (instead of extending to the upper limit $4E^2$). No L_s factor can come from this source. One consequence is that the coefficient of the LL_s^2 term is zero. On the other hand, for $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0$ the matrix element is proportional to $[(s+k^2+q^2)^2 - 4k^2q^2]^{\frac{1}{2}}$ which cancels part of the damping factors in the k^2 and q^2 integrations mentioned above and it is easy to demonstrate that the LL_s^2 term does occur with a positive contribution. This then becomes the main correction effect. When a form factor is put in, however, the upper ranges of the k^2 , q^2 integrations are again damped, thus reducing this correction effect.

References (cont.)

16. See for instance, G. Breit and R. D. Haracz in High Energy Physics, Vol. 1, Ed. by E. Burhop, Academic Press, New York, 1967.
17. D. Morgan and G. Shaw, Phys. Rev. D2, 521 (1970).
18. E. Tryon, Phys. Rev. Letters 20, 769 (1968);
L. S. Brown and R. L. Goble, Phys. Rev. D4, 723 (1971);
J. S. Kang and B. W. Lee, Phys. Rev. D3, 2814 (1971).

Figure Captions

- Fig. 1: The two pion production process via two photon exchange in e-e collision. The dashed lines are electrons, wavy lines virtual photons, and solid lines, pions.
- Fig. 2: (a) Kinematics of process (1) defined in the laboratory frame. The particle momenta correspond to those of Fig. 1. The quantities in parentheses after the momentum labels are the associated energy variables in the lab.
- (b) Kinematics of process (1) defined in the C. M. frame of the two outgoing pions. The pion momenta p_1 and p_2 are in the x-z plan and are not shown in the figure to avoid confusion. χ and χ' are the respective azimuthal angles of the planes of scattering for the two pairs of leptons. The variables ψ and ψ' can not be given a simple geometrical interpretation in this figure (see footnote 9).
- Fig. 3: Additional diagrams of the same order in α as Fig. 1 which may contribute to process (1).
- Fig. 4: Gauge invariant "Born diagrams" for point-like pions.
- Fig. 5: Four sets of phase shifts used in the calculation of the magnitude of s-wave partial wave amplitude for $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi\pi$.
- Fig. 6: Integrated cross-section for process (1), $\frac{d\sigma}{ds}$, as a function of p , the magnitude of pion momentum in the dipion C. M. Frame. The solid line is the cross-section for point like pions. The other lines are unitarity-corrected using the 4 sets of phase shifts given in Fig. 5. The incident electron energy is $E = 3$ GeV.

Figure Captions (continued)

- Fig. 7: Differential cross-sections $\frac{d\sigma}{ds d(\cos\theta_\pi)}$ for fixed s plotted against the pion C. M. scattering angle θ_π . The various lines have the same meaning as in Fig. 6.

Fig.1'

Fig.2

Fig.3

Fig.4

Fig.5

Fig.6

Fig.7(a)

Fig.7(b)

Fig.7(c)

Fig.7(d)