

ANTI-PROTONIC ATOM - A TOOL TO STUDY NUCLEI HADRONISATION, ANALYSIS OF OLD EXPERIMENTS

S. Wycech, NCBJ Warsaw

Three different – related measurements

ATOMIC LEVELS via X RAYS

3

DETECTION OF FINAL COLD NUCLEI

2

DETECTION OF FINAL PIONS

8

ADVANTAGES OF X - RAYS

ATOMIC STATE OF ANTI PROTON IS KNOWN


HIGH PRECISION REACHED

PROBLEMS

NUCLEAR INTERACTIONS OF ANTI PROTONS ARE KNOWN
CRUDELY

UPPER PART OF X-RAY CASCADE IS UNCERTAIN
ANTI PROTON OPTICAL POTENTIAL IS NOT WELL UNDERSTOOD

ANTIPROTONIC | ATOMIC LEVELS



ADVANTAGE

INDICATION OF CAPTURE ORBIT

TEST OF P-N STATES BELOW THRESHOLD

FIG. 3. Mean widths and shifts of all levels with measurable strong interaction effects. The weight of the different calcium iso-

WHY SUBTHRESHOLD STATES




FIG. 1. Quasi-three-body system: (1) antiproton, (2) nucleon, and (3) residual system. Jacobi coordinates: momentum p_3, k_{12} and space ρ, r .


In atoms

N-pbar ENERGY in CM system IS BELOW NN THRESHOLD

$$E_{\text{CM}} = 2M - \text{Binding} - \text{Recoil}$$

PROBLEM : $\bar{N} - N$ quasi-bound states

P-bar N SUBTHRESHOLD ENERGIES INVOLVED IN ATOMIC STATES
 SEPARATE REGIONS IN LIGHT NUCLEI **ALLOW TO TEST T (E)**
BELOW THRESHOLD




$$T(E, r) = V(r) \psi(r) / \phi(r) ;$$

$$\psi = \phi + G(+)\ V \psi$$

^{11}S AMPLITUDE tested in J/ψ decays

Region of energies
involved in atomic
states







FIG. 2. Subthreshold amplitudes generating the $4P_{3/2}$ hyperfine structure component in deuterium. With the Paris 09 solution this amplitude is strongly dominated by the resonant $a(^{33}P_1)$ amplitude.

Quartet f.s. state dominated by $33P_1$ baryonium state

Absorptive \bar{p} -N scattering lengths a_0 and scattering volumes a_1

Neutron/proton capture rate is energy (state) dependent



IMPORTANT PARAMETER IN HALO STUDIES

Ratio of annihilation rates

$$R_{n/p} = \sigma(\bar{p}, n) / \sigma(\bar{p}, p) =$$

$$= \langle \text{Im } T(\bar{p}, n) \rangle / \langle \text{Im } T(\bar{p}, p) \rangle \quad \text{spin averaged}$$

CALCULATED with Paris 09 : in He $R_{n/p} \sim 0.48$: in D $R_{n/p} \sim 0.80$
consistent with experiments

CALCULATIONS FOR PIONISATION EXPERIMENTS


The $R_{n/p}$ calculated with Paris 09 potential, [?], for the dominant capture states.

	C	N	Ti	Ta	Pb
$R_{n/p}$	0.698	0.780	0.774	0.889	0.920
$L_{dominant}$	2	2	4	9	8

Problems for theorists

1) NUCLEAR OPTICAL POTENTIAL $V \sim \rho(r) T_0 + 3 \text{grad } \rho(r) \text{ grad } T_1$

CONFLICT $\text{Re } T_0$ IS REPULSIVE, BUT POTENTIAL FITTED TO ATOMS IS ATTRACTIVE
 $\text{Re } T$ CHANGES SIGN AT QUASI-BOUND STATE



NUCLEAR EFFECTS : PAULI PRINCIPLE , EXTERNAL NUCLEAR FIELD
PUSH THE ZERO UPWARD

(usefull Saclay work on $K_{\text{FERMI}}(r)$ in surface region , X. Campi)

2) GOOD NUCLEAR CALCULATION of

$$A_p = \langle L, \text{valence} | [a_0(p) + 3 \nabla a_1(p) \nabla] | L, \text{valence} \rangle$$

II

STUDIES OF COLD FINAL NUCLEI


Munich –Warsaw collaboration (T. von Egidy , J. Jastrzebski)

Antiproton + Nucleus (Z , N) → Nucleus (Z-1 , N)
→ Nucleus (Z ,N-1)
→ 90 % rubbish

Radiochemical detection of residual nuclei

PROBLEM - what is the capture orbital ?

Studies of final non excited nuclei Munich – Warsaw /CERN PS



FINAL $A-1$ NUCLEI OF LOW < 8 MeV excitation (Radiochemical limit)
RATIO $(N-1)/(Z-1)$ measured

DETERMINATION OF CAPTURE ORBIT via $(A-1)/\text{TOTAL}$

MEASURED

$$\frac{N(N-1)}{N(Z-1)} = \frac{N P_{\text{emission}}}{Z P_{\text{emission}}} R_{n/p} f_{\text{HALO}}$$

$R_{n/p}$ relative rate of absorptions $(\bar{p} n) / (\bar{p} p)$

P_{emission} probability that residual $A-1$ nucleus is cold
 (below neutron emission threshold , must be calculated)

f_{HALO} local excess of neutrons in the capture region
 a phenomenological quantity

ESSENTIAL POINT : COLD CAPTURE and HADRONISATION
 DETERMINE PRODUCT $R f$

ESSENTIAL PARAMETER To STUDY NEUTRON HALO

$R_{n/p}$ relative rate of absorptions

$$\sigma(\bar{p}n) / \sigma(\bar{p}p)$$

from other experiments

0.48 in He : 0.82 in D : 0.63 in C :

1 in global optical \bar{p} -nucleus potential

ABOUT 10% of residuals are A-1 nuclei

fixes orbitals of capture

mostly „upper” levels

↓ deformed nucleus




FIG. 5. Correlation between halo factor and absolute production yield for A_T-1 nuclei.

Excess of neutrons
over protons
Reduced by N/Z

Lubinski PRC 57
Munich Warsaw

With known
capture orbit

$R_{\text{ms}}(n) - R_{\text{ms}}(p)$
Extracted




FIG. 3. Neutron halo factor (defined in the text) as a function of the target neutron separation energy B_n .

HADRONISATION (PIONISATION) EXPERIMENTS

$P\text{-bar}, N \rightarrow \pi, \pi, \pi, \pi, \pi$ FROM ATOMIC STATES

MENU :

- 1) Old experiments : analysis , difficulties
- 2) Uncertainties of calculations
- 3) Job for theorists in PUMA era

OLD EXPERIMENTS

L. Agnew et.al Phys.Rev 118(1960) 1371

W. Bugg et al. Phys.Rev. Lett 31 (1973) 4761

C,Ti ,Ta,Pb hydrogen chamber

M.Wade, V.G.Lind Phys Rev D (1976) 1182

C propane chamber


J. Riedlberger et al Phys Rev C40 (1989) 2717

N magnetic spectrometer


Not analyzed fully , N-Nbar data was poor

NOW ANALYSIS IS EASIER => LESSONS FOR PUMA

$Z=50$, $N=88$: a fancy nucleus to study



Antiproton ● makes a 2000 MeV bomb on the side of nucleus




→ Mesons from
NN-bar → $\pi \pi \pi$

● Nucleus destroyed, pions detected, less peripheral

● Cold residual nuclei detectable, more peripheral

PIONISATION EXPERIMENTS

ANTIPROTON + NUCLEUS \rightarrow $\pi \pi \pi \pi \pi$ + rubbish



Very rich experiment 8 numbers : $P(Q)$, average meson loss = ω

EXAMPLE Pb experiment (W. Bugg)

Results : $f_{\text{HALO}} = 2.34(0.50)$, $\omega = 0.221(0.014)$

SIMPLE ANALYSIS

Calculate average charge meson loss $\omega(L)$

from $\pi NN - NN$, $\pi (+/-)N \rightarrow \pi(0) N'$

Compare $\omega(L+1) < \omega < \omega(L)$

\Rightarrow capture orbital probability : : 0.5 (upper L=9) + 0.5 (lower L=8)
agreement with cascade X

Take $R_{n/p} = 0.63$ (from Carbon, BUGG)

f_{HALO} , $R_{n/p} \rightarrow$ halo radius $R_n - R_p = 0.168(0.045)$ **PERFECT**


BUT $R_{n/p} = 0.63$ IS NOT ACCEPABLE by other experiments

A more complete analysis including full information

$P(Q)$ channel probabilities
 $\langle n(+/-) \rangle$ total number of charge mesons emitted in single capture


Explicit calculations of absorptive and charge exchange pionic final state interactions

DATA : $P(Q)$, $\langle n_{\pm} \rangle$



extraction of average meson absorption - ω
 average meson charge exchange - λ
 $f_{\text{HALO}} \cdot R_{n/p}$

P-bar P capture




$\omega(+)$ $\omega(-)$
 absorption

$\lambda(+)$
 $\pi(0) \rightarrow \pi(+)$

$\lambda(-)$
 $\pi(0) \rightarrow \pi(-)$

Parameters λ ω $f_{\text{HALO}} \cdot R_{n/p}$
 obtained by best fit to data


DATA : $P(Q)$, $\langle n_{\pm} \rangle$



extraction of average meson absorption - ω
average meson charge exchange - λ
 $f_{\text{HALO}} \cdot R_{n/p}$

FOR a GIVEN CAPTURE ORBIT - L
CALCULATE

$\omega(L)$, $\lambda(L)$, $R_{n/p}(L)$



COMPARISON $\omega(L) \sim \omega$
EXTRACTION OF L



From L , $R_{n/p}$



R_{ms} (neutrons) - R_{ms} (protons)

Next iteration : corrections for nucleon correlations at surface

N - Riedlberger PR C40 (1989) High statistics , No hydrogen contamination, magnetic spectrometer , ASTERIX

: Experimental,[21], and fitted charge multiplicities $P[Q]$ in Nitrogen .

Q	exp	fit
3	1.2(.2)	0.28
+2	3.9(.4)	2.25
+1	14.2(.8)	15.6
0	39.5(1.0)	40.1
-1	31.1(.8)	32.1
-2	8.0(.5)	8.5
-3	2.1(.3)	0.44
$\langle n^\pm \rangle$	2.89(8)	2.91(0.05)
χ^2		7.5

$$R_{n/p} \cdot f^h = 0.77(.04).$$

$$\omega^+ = 0.16 ; \omega^- = .17 ; \lambda^+ = .16 ; \lambda^- = 0.10$$

These are values averaged over two pionic charges.

	$L = 2$	$L = 3$	best fit
ω	0.218	0.158	0.165
λ	0.147	0.103	.13

CONCLUSIONS from N experiment

the best fit $R_{n/p} \cdot f^h = 0.77(.04)$ and $R_{n/p} = .80$ calculated from Paris potential (Capture happens half from „upper“(L=3) , half from „lower“(L=2) orbitals.

factor $f^h = .96(.05)$ that is a weak preference for an enhanced proton tail

Consistent with separations $S(n) = 10.5$ MeV and $S(p) = 7.5$ MeV

NNNN Correlations are indicated
in Q =3, -3

CONCLUSIONS from N experiment

OBSERVATION

$$\omega^+ = 0.16 ; \omega^- = .17 ; \lambda^+ = .16 ; \lambda^- = 0.10$$

Large difference between $\pi(+)$ and $\pi(-)$ exchange probabilities in a symmetric nucleus . Related to different single nucleon spectra. Possible byproduct for PUMA

NICE SO FAR , BUT NO LONGER SO

DIFFICULTUES WITH ANALYSIS OF OLD HYDROGEN CHAMBER DATA

HYDROGEN BACKGROUND UNCERTAIN

TWO EXPERIMENTS DIFFERING BY HYDROGEN CONTAMINATION
 (BUUG - hydrogen chamber vs WADE propane chamber)
 LARGE DIFFERENCE S IN Q = -1,0 channels
 (proton and/ or hydrogen sectors)


Q	C [4]	fit (*)	C [9],	fit(**)
3	0.09(.1)	0.09	0.2 (1)	0.22
+2	1.80(.2)	1.34	2.1(2)	2.2
+1	12.5(.4)	13.2	17.5(5)	16.6
0	43.0(.8)	43.8	38.3(8)	40.4
-1	34.5(.7)	33.7	33.7(7)	31.7
-2	6.5(.5)	7.5	7.8(3)	8.6
-3	1.0(.1)	0.24	0.6(1)	0.50
$\langle n^{\pm} \rangle$	2.72(3)	2.73	2.79(4)	2.79



WADE FREON

FOUR STANDARD DEVIATION DIFFERENCE in $Q=0$

BUGG , HYDROGEN



$R_n - R_p = 1.01 (0.03)$ FREON CHAMBER
 $= 1.10 (0.03)$ HYDROGEN CHAMBER

$\Delta R - 10\%$ PROBLEM IN ALL BUGG'S EXPERIMENTS
BUT STATE OF CAPTURE IS STABLE

AN ALTERNATIVE for ALL HYDROGEN CHAMBER C, Ti, Ta , Pb analysis

With hydrogen contamination as given $\sim 10\%$ (NO ERRORS GIVEN)

- 1) Either Rn/p larger by 10 -20 % than calculated by PARIS 09
- 2) Or hydrogen contamination reduced to about 5 %

Hydrogen chamber data

Rn/p

Rn/p 1

0.5

C

Ti


Ta

Pb

enhancement needed to get Rp-Rn
as in other antiorotonic experiments

reduction of H contamination ~40%
Paris (09)

CAPTURE STATES AS EXPECTED ~ 50% „upper” L , ~ 50 „lower” L



BUT WHAT IS THE NEUTRON HALO IN LEAD NUCLEUS ?

STRANGE CORRELATION OF EXPERIMENTAL NEUTRON RADII IN Pb

Rn-Rp [fm]	~ 28	parity violation
	~ 22	pionisation
	~ 20	proton scattering
	~ 16 -18	antiproton levels, cold capture

These follow increasing peripherality of interaction region

? Possibly due to differences in assumed nuclear profiles

STATUS REPORT

PIONISATION EXPERIMENTS YIELD REASONABLE ESTIMATES OF HALO THICKNESS.

CAPTURE STATES ARE WELL EXTRACTED FROM CHANNEL P(Q) SPECTRA

THERE IS A LARGE UNCERTAINTY DUE TO HYDROGEN BACKGROUND IN OLD HYDROGEN CHAMBER EXPERIMENTS


SOME CHALLENGING PROBLEMS FOR THEORISTS

- 1) Understanding \bar{p} -N interactions below threshold, bound states there
- 2) Pauli blocking in pion charge exchange scattering on nuclei
Control of exclusion principle in the nuclear surface region
This question is of significance for antiproton – nucleus potential.
- 3) Good calculation of R_n/p ratio at nuclear surface
- 4) Analysis of future data in terms of neutron density distributions
- 5) Inclusion of nuclear correlations into analysis of PUMA data

Symmetric nuclei nonsymmetric effect : Pauli bloking

Pion is fast $\sim 400 \text{ Me V / c}$ But Nucleon is heavy and slow

$\lambda(+)$ > $\lambda(-)$ in light nuclei N



$$\pi(0) n \rightarrow \pi(-) p$$

$$\lambda(-) < \lambda(+)$$

FINAL STATE INTERACTIONS OF PIONS

π NN – NN absorption
cross sections known, poor accuracy Ashery, P R C 23(1881)
calculations W Gibbs PR C 66 (2002)
Johnson Satchler optical potential Ann Phys 238 (1996)
consistent in predicting ω to 10 %

$\pi (+/-) \rightarrow \pi(0)$ and inverse based on πp charge exchange
Gibbs, Kaufman found Pauli blocking significant

** ARE THERE STRONG CORRELATIONS ON NUCLEAR SURFACES

ALPHA PARTICLE TYPE ?

Seen in nuclear α decays

May be convenient energetically

Carbon nucleus $\approx \alpha \alpha \alpha$?

Traces in Nitrogen ($3 \alpha + \text{valence } n, p$) pionisation experiment

Studied (inconclusively) with Kaonic atoms (D. Wilkinson 1968)

THANK YOU

APPENDIX

R.Schmidt PRC58
 CASCADE IN A
 DEFORMED
 NUCLEUS




FIG. 9. Energy shifts of the transitions and widths for the levels antiprotonic ^{172}Yb which are sizably influenced by the strong

FERMI MOMENTUM AT NUCLEAR SURFACE ?


Fermi gas $K_{\text{FERMI}} \sim \rho^{1/3}$

$$\rho(x, x') = \sum \phi(x) \phi(x')^*$$

$$= \rho j_1(K_{\text{FERMI}} |x-x'|) / (K_{\text{FERMI}} |x-x'|)$$

Wigner function

correlation function



$K_{\text{FERMI}}(r)$ Fermi gas :

K_{fermi} shellmodel

X Campi, A Bouyssy , 1973

WHY STUDY NUCLEAR SURFACE ?

* Symmetry energy

$$\beta = (N - Z)/A,$$

$$\frac{E}{A}(\rho, \beta) = \frac{E}{A}(\rho, 0) + S_N(\rho)\beta^2 + \dots \quad \text{n,p Fermi Gas} \quad S_N = \frac{1}{3}E_F$$

ρ = density

Droplet Model

$$E_{(\text{binding})} / A = a_v \quad - \quad S_N \beta^2 \quad + \quad \dots$$

attractive repulsive due to Pauli


WHICH WAY THESE CANCEL AT NUCLEAR SURFACE WITH THE INCREASING NEUTRON/PROTON RATIO ? NUCLEAR MODEL DEPENDENT

** ARE THERE STRONG (nnpp) CORRELATIONS ON DISTANT SURFACE.

THE ORIGIN OF SYMMETRY ENERGY

$$A = 16$$


Lower energy



Protons Neutrons

$$|N - Z| = 0$$

Higher energy



Protons Neutrons

$$|N - Z| = 4$$

